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Abstract

We consider random graphs sampled uniformly from a structured class of graphs, such as the class of graphs embeddable in a given surface. We sharpen and extend earlier results on pendant appearances, concerning for example numbers of leaves; and obtain results on the asymptotic distribution of components other than the giant component, under quite general conditions.

1. Introduction and statement of results

We consider a set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs satisfying some general structural conditions, such as the class of graphs embeddable in a given surface. (Recall that a class of graphs is a set of graphs which is closed under graph isomorphism.) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $\mathcal{A}_n$ be the set of graphs in $\mathcal{A}$ on vertex set $[n]$, and we write $R_n \in_u \mathcal{A}$ to mean that the random graph $R_n$ is sampled uniformly from $\mathcal{A}_n$ (implicitly assumed to be non-empty).

Roughly speaking, a connected graph $H$ has a pendant appearance in a graph $G$ if deleting a bridge from $G$ yields a component isomorphic to $H$, see Section 1.1 for a full definition. Pendant appearances in $R_n$ have been well studied, with numerous applications, for example concerning symmetries and vertex degrees, see [10, 11] and for example [17, 22]. Here we give much more precise results on pendant appearances in $R_n$, presented in Section 1.1 and we use them to deduce Theorem 1.4 and further results concerning the fragment of $R_n$ (the part of the graph not in the giant component), presented in Section 1.2. For these latter results, we assume only that $\mathcal{A}$ has a growth constant, and show that the asymptotic joint distribution of the components in the fragment of $R_n$ which are ‘free for $\mathcal{A}$’ is a Boltzmann Poisson distribution.
We also extend the idea of a pendant appearance to the more general one of a ‘vertex-pendant’ appearance, see Section 1.3 and in fact we use Theorem 1.7 on vertex-pendant appearances in $R_n$ to deduce the key result Theorem 1.1 on pendant appearances. This introductory Section 1 ends with a brief discussion in Subsection 1.4 of related work.

The plan of the rest of the paper is that, after some further preliminary definitions given in Section 2, the results on pendant appearances are proved in Section 3. Section 4 gives two new lemmas related to ‘bridge-addability’, and these lemmas are used in Section 5 in the proof of Theorem 1.4 on the fragment of $R_n$. Section 6 contains a more general but weaker version of Theorem 1.4, and finally Section 7 contains a few concluding remarks.

Recall that the radius of convergence $\rho_A$ or $\rho(A)$ of (the exponential generating function of) a set $A$ of graphs is given by

$$\rho_A = \left( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left( \frac{|A_n|}{n!} \right)^{1/n} \right)^{-1},$$

so $0 \leq \rho_A \leq \infty$. We say that $A$ has growth constant $\gamma_A$ if $0 < \gamma_A < \infty$ and

$$\left( \frac{|A_n|}{n!} \right)^{1/n} \to \gamma_A \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

in this case clearly $\gamma_A = 1/\rho_A$. For example the class $P$ of planar graphs has growth constant $\gamma_P \approx 27.2269$, and thus has radius of convergence $\rho_P = 1/\gamma_P \approx 0.0367$, see [9]. More generally, by [4], if $S$ is any given surface then the class $E^S$ of graphs embeddable in $S$ has the same growth constant $\gamma_P$. See for example [25] for background on embeddings.

### 1.1. Pendant Appearances in $R_n$

Let $H$ be a connected $h$-vertex graph with a specified root vertex $r$, forming $H^\bullet$ or $H'$. ($H$ will always refer to a connected graph, as will $H^\bullet$, $H'$ and so on.) Let $G$ be a graph and let $W$ be a set of $h$ vertices in $G$. If there is exactly one edge in $G$ (the link edge) between $W$ and $V(G) \setminus W$, say the edge $wx$ with $w \in W$ and $x \in V \setminus W$, and there is an isomorphism $\phi$ from $H$ to the induced subgraph $G[W]$ such that $\phi(r) = w$, then we say that $G$ has a pendant appearance of $H^\bullet$ on $W$. The set of pendant appearances of $H^\bullet$ in $G$ is denoted by $\text{Pend}(G,H^\bullet)$, with size $\text{pend}(G,H^\bullet)$.

Let $A$ be a set of graphs and let $H^\bullet$ be a vertex-rooted connected graph. We say that $H^\bullet$ can be attached to $A$ if for every graph $G$ the following holds: if there is a pendant appearance of $H^\bullet$ in $G$ on a set $W$ and $G \setminus W \in A$, then $G \in A$. Also, $H^\bullet$ can be detached from $A$ if for every graph $G \in A$, if there is a pendant appearance of $H^\bullet$ in $G$ on a set $W$ then $G \setminus W \in A$. For example, if $H^\bullet$ is a vertex-rooted connected planar graph, then $H^\bullet$ can be attached to and deleted from the class $E^S$ of graphs embeddable in the surface $S$.

The original Pendant Appearances Theorem [10, 11], see also [13, 14, 15] says essentially that, if the set $A$ of graphs has a growth constant, and the
vertex-rooted connected graph $H^\bullet$ is attachable to $\mathcal{A}$, then there exists $\beta > 0$ such that for $R_n \in u \mathcal{A}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{pend}(R_n, H^\bullet) \leq \beta n) = e^{-\Omega(n)}. \quad (1)$$

A more general version of the Pendant Appearances Theorem is given and used in [17, 18]: this version assumes for $\mathcal{A}$ only that $0 < \rho_A < \infty$, and says that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\rho(\{G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \leq \beta v(G) \}) > \rho_A. \quad (2)$$

(This easily implies (1).)

Our main result in this section, the new Pendant Appearances Theorem, Theorem 1.1, extends this last result (2), and has much more precise conclusions. Given $H^\bullet$, the theorem specifies the ‘optimal’ value $\alpha$ corresponding to the constant $\beta$ in equation (1) above: part (a) of the theorem says that few graphs in $\mathcal{A}_n$ have many less than $\alpha n$ pendant appearances of $H^\bullet$, and part (b) says that few graphs in $\mathcal{A}_n$ have many more than $\alpha n$ pendant appearances of $H^\bullet$.

We denote the automorphism group of a graph $G$ by Aut $G$ and let aut $G$ be its size. Similarly we let Aut $H^\bullet$ be the set of automorphisms of a rooted connected graph $H^\bullet$ (that is, the set of automorphisms of $H$ which fix the root vertex $r$), with size aut $H^\bullet$.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let the set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs satisfy $0 < \rho_A < \infty$. Let $H^\bullet$ be a vertex-rooted connected graph, let $\alpha = \rho_A^{v(H)/\text{aut } H^\bullet}$, and let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then there exists $\nu > 0$ depending on $\rho_A, H^\bullet$ and $\varepsilon$ (and not on $\mathcal{A}$ itself) such that the following holds.

(a) If $H^\bullet$ can be attached to $\mathcal{A}$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$

(b) If $H^\bullet$ can be detached from $\mathcal{A}$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$

Next let us consider an unrooted version of this theorem, with the following natural corresponding definitions. Let $H$ be a connected graph. Given a graph $G$ and a set $W$ of vertices of $G$, we say that $G$ has a pendant appearance of $H$ on $W$ if and only if $G$ has a pendant appearance on $W$ of some vertex-rooting $H^\bullet$ of $H$. Similarly, we say that $H$ can be attached to $\mathcal{A}$ if each vertex-rooting $H^\bullet$ can be attached to $\mathcal{A}$, and $H$ can be detached from $\mathcal{A}$ if each vertex-rooting $H^\bullet$ can be detached from $\mathcal{A}$. The set of pendant appearances of $H$ in $G$ is denoted by $\text{Pend}(G, H)$, with size $\text{pend}(G, H)$.

We shall see that, by summing over the possible roots in $H^\bullet$, Theorem 1.1 directly yields the following corresponding result for unrooted pendant appearances.
Corollary 1.2. Let the set $A$ of graphs satisfy $0 < \rho_A < \infty$. Let $H$ be a connected graph, and let $\alpha = h\rho_A^{v(H)}/\text{aut } H$, and let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then there exists $\nu > 0$ depending on $\rho_A, H$ and $\varepsilon$ (and not on $A$ itself) such that the following holds.

(a) If $H$ can be attached to $A$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in A : \text{pend}(G, H) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G)\}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$ 

(b) If $H$ can be detached from $A$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in A : \text{pend}(G, H) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G)\}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$ 

Given a sequence $A_n$ of events we say that $A_n$ occurs with high probability (whp) if $P(A_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, and $A_n$ occurs with very high probability (wvhp) if $P(A_n) = 1 - e^{-\Omega(n)}$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus for example equation (1) says that $\text{pend}(R_n, H) > \beta n$ wvhp. We close this subsection with a result which follows directly from Corollary 1.2 when we assume that $A$ has a growth constant. We shall use this result to deduce our results on components (presented in Section 1.2).

Corollary 1.3. Let the set $A$ of graphs have a growth constant, and let $R_n \in u A$. Let $H$ be a connected graph, let $h = v(H)$, and let $\alpha = h\rho_A^{h}/\text{aut } H$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

(a) If $H$ can be attached to $A$ then $\text{pend}(R_n, H) > (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha n$ wvhp.

(b) If $H$ can be detached from $A$ then $\text{pend}(R_n, H) < (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha n$ wvhp.

The following observation is used in [22] concerning $R_n \in u A$. Suppose that the set $B$ of graphs contains $A$ and has the same growth constant as $A$. By part (a) of Corollary 1.3 applied to $B$, if $H$ can be attached to $B$ (and not necessarily to $A$) then

$$\left|\{G \in A_n : \text{pend}(G, H) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha n\}\right| \leq \left|\{G \in B_n : \text{pend}(G, H) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha n\}\right| \leq e^{-\Omega(n)}|B_n| = e^{-\Omega(n)}|A_n|,$$

so $\text{pend}(R_n, H) > (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha n$ wvhp. Similarly, if $H$ can be detached from $B$ then we have the conclusion of part (b) of Corollary 1.3.

In Corollary 1.3 it follows of course that, if $H$ can be both attached to $A$ and detached from $A$ then $|\text{pend}(R_n, H)/n - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ wvhp; and thus $\text{pend}(R_n, H)/n \to \alpha$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. In the special case when $A$ is the class $\mathcal{E}^S$ of graphs embeddable in a given surface $S$, it is known further that $\text{pend}(R_n, H)$ is asymptotically normally distributed [9, 4].

4
1.2. Components of $R_n$

The fragment $\text{Frag}(G)$ of a graph $G$ is the graph (possibly empty) obtained from $G$ by deleting its largest component (breaking ties in some way), considered as an unlabelled graph. We let $\text{frag}(G)$ be the number of vertices in $\text{Frag}(G)$. We do not consider the largest component here, except to comment that it has $v(G) - \text{frag}(G)$ vertices. Given a set $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs and a graph $G$, we let $\text{Frag}(G, \mathcal{F})$ be the graph formed from the components of the fragment of $G$ which are in $\mathcal{F}$, and let $\text{frag}(G, \mathcal{F})$ be the number of vertices in this graph.

Given a set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs, we say that a connected graph $H$ is free for $\mathcal{A}$ when, for every graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$, if $G'$ is obtained from $G$ by adding or deleting either a component isomorphic to $H$ or a bridge to such a component, then $G' \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus if $H$ is free for $\mathcal{A}$ then $H$ can be attached to and detached from $\mathcal{A}$ (and much more). Also, if connected graphs $A$ and $B$ are free for $\mathcal{A}$ then so is any graph formed from disjoint copies of $A$ and $B$ by adding a bridge between them. For example, if $S$ is a given surface then the connected graphs which are free for $\mathcal{E}^S$ are precisely the connected planar graphs. For another example, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a minor-closed class of graphs, then the one-vertex graph $K_1$ is free for $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if each excluded minor has minimum degree at least two (see Section 2 for definitions and amplification).

Corollary 1.3 provides a key step in the proof of the next result. In Section 2 we recall the definition (following [13]) of the Boltzmann Poisson distribution $BP(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$ on unlabelled graphs, for a given decomposable class $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs and a suitably small $\rho > 0$.

**Theorem 1.4.** Let the set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs have a growth constant. Let $C$ be a non-empty class of connected graphs which are free for $\mathcal{A}$, with exponential generating function $C(x)$; and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the (decomposable) class of graphs such that each component is in $C$. Then $\rho_A = \rho_A$ satisfies $C(\rho) < \infty$; and for $R_n \in \mathcal{A}$ we have (a) $E[\text{frag}(R_n, \mathcal{F})] < 2$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and (b) $\text{Frag}(R_n, \mathcal{F})$ converges in total variation to $BP(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$ as $n \to \infty$.

It follows from Theorem 1.4 and equation (6) for the Boltzmann Poisson random graph that, with premises as in the theorem, for each integer $k \geq 0$

$$P(\text{frag}(R_n, \mathcal{F}) = k) \to e^{-C(\rho)} |\mathcal{F}_k| \rho^k / k! \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,$$

and in particular $P(\text{Frag}(R_n, \mathcal{F}) = \emptyset) \to e^{-C(\rho)}$. Thus if also $\text{Frag}(R_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ whp then $P(R_n \text{ is connected}) \to e^{-C(\rho_A)}$ as $n \to \infty$; see Corollaries 1.5 and 1.6 below.

The class $\mathcal{P}$ of planar graphs is minor-closed, with excluded minors the complete graphs $K_5$ and $K_{3,3}$ which are both 2-connected. Other minor-closed graph classes with 2-connected excluded minors include for example series-parallel graphs and outerplanar graphs. Every proper minor-closed class $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs with 2-connected excluded minors has a growth constant [11] [13], and it is easy to see that all connected graphs in $\mathcal{A}$ are free for $\mathcal{A}$. Thus from Theorem 1.4 we obtain the following result.
Corollary 1.5. [13, Theorem 1.5] Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a proper minor-closed class of graphs with 2-connected excluded minors, and let $R_n \in u \mathcal{A}$. Then $\text{Frag}(R_n)$ converges in total variation to $BP(\mathcal{A}, \rho_\mathcal{A})$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular we have $\mathbb{P}(R_n \text{ is connected}) \to e^{-C(\rho_\mathcal{A})}$ as $n \to \infty$, where $C(x)$ is the exponential generating function for the class of connected graphs in $\mathcal{A}$.

Consider again the class $\mathcal{P}$ of planar graphs. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the class of connected planar graphs, with exponential generating function $C(x)$; and note that every graph in $\mathcal{C}$ is free for $\mathcal{P}$. Let $p^* = e^{-C(\rho_\mathcal{P})} \approx 0.96325$, see [9]. It follows from Theorem 1.4 or from Corollary 1.5 that for $R_n \in u \mathcal{P}$, the fragment $\text{Frag}(R_n)$ converges in total variation to $BP(\mathcal{P}, \rho_\mathcal{P})$ as $n \to \infty$; and thus we have $\mathbb{P}(R_n \text{ is connected}) \to p^*$ as $n \to \infty$, as shown in [9].

We can extend these results concerning $\mathcal{P}$ to general surfaces. As mentioned above, if $S$ is any fixed surface then the class $\mathcal{E}^S$ of graphs embeddable in $S$ has growth constant $\gamma_\mathcal{P}$, and the connected graphs which are free for $\mathcal{E}^S$ are precisely the connected planar graphs. Also, for $R_n \in u \mathcal{E}^S$ whp $\text{Frag}(R_n)$ is planar, see the start of the proof of Theorem 5.2 in [4], and see Theorem 1 of [22] for a stronger version of this result which is ‘uniform over all surfaces $S’.

Thus from Theorem 1.4 we obtain the next result, which essentially contains Theorems 5.2 and 5.3 of [4].

Corollary 1.6. Let $S$ be any fixed surface and let $R_n \in u \mathcal{E}^S$. Then $\text{Frag}(R_n)$ converges in total variation to $BP(\mathcal{P}, \rho_\mathcal{P})$ as $n \to \infty$; and in particular

$$\mathbb{P}(R_n \text{ is connected}) \to p^* \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$
appearance of $H^\bullet$ on $W$ with link edge incident to vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus W$ if and only if $G$ has a vertex-pendant appearance of $(H^+)\bullet$ on $W \cup \{x\}$ with distinguished vertex $x$. Thus $\text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) = \text{vpend}(G, (H^+)\bullet)$. Also there is a natural bijection between $\text{Aut } H^\bullet$ and $\text{Aut } (H^+)\bullet$. Thus from results on vertex-pendant appearances we can read off results on the original pendant (or ‘edge-pendant’) appearances. Indeed, we shall deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.7 below.

We need to define the appropriate notions here for ‘attached to’ and ‘detached from’. Let $A$ be a set of graphs, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $K^\bullet$ be an $(h+1)$-vertex graph $K$ with root vertex $r$ such that both $K$ and $K - r$ are connected. We say that $K^\bullet$ can be vertex-attached to $A$ if for every graph $G$ the following holds: if there is a vertex-pendant appearance of $K^\bullet$ in $G$ on a set $W^\bullet$ with distinguished vertex $w^\bullet$ and $G \setminus (W \setminus \{w^\bullet\}) \in A$, then $G \in A$. Also we say that $K^\bullet$ can be vertex-detached from $A$ if for every graph $G \in A$, if there is a vertex-pendant appearance of $K^\bullet$ in $G$ on a set $W^\bullet$ with distinguished vertex $w^\bullet$ then $G \setminus (W \setminus \{w^\bullet\}) \in A$. We can now state the ‘Vertex-Pendant Appearances Theorem’.

**Theorem 1.7.** Let the set $A$ of graphs satisfy $0 \leq \rho_A < \infty$. Let $h \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K^\bullet$ be an $(h+1)$-vertex graph $K$ with root vertex $r$ such that both $K$ and $K - r$ are connected, and let $\alpha = \rho_A^h / \text{aut } K^\bullet$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then there exists $\nu > 0$ depending on $\rho, K^\bullet$ and $\varepsilon$ (and not on $A$ itself) such that the following holds.

(a) If $K^\bullet$ can be vertex-attached to $A$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, K^\bullet) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G)\}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$  

(b) If $K^\bullet$ can be vertex-detached from $A$ then

$$\rho(\{G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, K^\bullet) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G)\}) \geq \rho_A + \nu.$$  

There are natural corollaries to Theorem 1.7 corresponding to the corollaries to Theorem 1.1 given in Section 1.1: we leave these to the reader. Theorem 1.7 will allow us to deduce results for example about the class of 2-edge-connected planar graphs (about which Theorem 1.1 says nothing), though we do not pursue such a development here.

### 1.4. Related work

Following [11] (see also [10]) we call a set $A$ of graphs smooth if $|A_n|/(n|A_{n-1}|)$ tends to a limit as $n \to \infty$ (which must the growth constant $\gamma_A$). Bender, Canfield and Richmond [2] showed that the class $\mathcal{E}^S$ of graphs embeddable in a given surface $S$ is smooth, and this also follows from the asymptotic formula for $|\mathcal{E}^S_n|$ in [4]. In contrast, the graph classes considered above (for example in Theorem 1.4) need not be smooth. (In Theorem 1.3 we could say take $A$ as the class of graphs $G$ which are embeddable in the sphere $S_0$ if $v(G)$ is even and in the torus $S_1$ if $v(G)$ is odd. Observe that in this case the class of connected
graphs which are free for \( \mathcal{A} \) is the class of connected planar graphs \( G \) with \( v(G) \) even.

The composition method from \cite{2} can be used to show that certain other classes \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs are smooth; and for a class \( \mathcal{A} \) which is smooth we can prove results like those presented above, in particular like Corollary \cite{13} (with wvhp weakened to whp), Theorem \cite{14} and Corollaries \cite{15} and \cite{16}. This approach naturally yields also other results concerning for example the typical size of the core. See \cite{13, 15, 17, 18, 20}.

2. Preliminaries

We recall some definitions concerning minors of graphs and concerning sets of graph, and recall Boltzmann Poisson distributions on unlabelled graphs.

Minors of graphs

A minor of a graph \( G \) is a graph obtained from a subgraph of \( G \) by contracting edges (and removing any loops or multiple copies of edges formed). A class \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs is minor-closed if each minor of a graph in \( \mathcal{A} \) is in \( \mathcal{A} \). Given a minor-closed class \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs, an excluded minor for \( \mathcal{A} \) is a graph \( G \) not in \( \mathcal{A} \) but such that each proper minor of \( G \) is in \( \mathcal{A} \). By the Robertson-Seymour Theorem, for any minor-closed class the set of excluded minors is finite (see Robertson and Seymour \cite{31} or, for example, Diestel \cite{11}).

Further definitions for sets of graphs

We say that a set \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs is bridge-addable if for every graph \( G \in \mathcal{A} \) with vertices \( u \) and \( v \) in distinct components, the graph \( G + uv \) is in \( \mathcal{A} \), where \( G + uv \) denotes the graph obtained from \( G \) by adding an edge between \( u \) and \( v \). For example, for every surface \( S \) the class \( \mathcal{E}^S \) of graphs embeddable in \( S \) is bridge-addable. A set of graphs is decomposable when a graph is in the set if and only if each component is. We call the set addable if it is decomposable and bridge-addable (following \cite{10, 11}). It is straightforward to check that a minor-closed class is addable if and only if its excluded minors are 2-connected.

Thus Corollary \cite{15} concerns an addable minor-closed class \( \mathcal{A} \).

We will introduce some more definitions for the proofs, in the short Section \ref{sec:4} and in Section \ref{sec:5} before Lemma \ref{lem:5.2}.

Convergence in total variation

Let \( X_1, X_2, \ldots \) and \( Y \) be random variables in some probability space. We say that \( X_n \) converges in total variation to \( Y \) if for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists \( N \) such that for every \( n \geq N \) and every measurable set \( A \) we have

\[
|\mathbb{P}(X_n \in A) - \mathbb{P}(Y \in A)| < \varepsilon.
\]

This is a strong version of saying that \( X_n \) converges in distribution to \( Y \).

Boltzmann Poisson distribution (\cite{13})

Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a non-empty decomposable class of graphs, with exponential generating function \( F(x) \); and let \( \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \) denote the set of unlabelled graphs in \( \mathcal{F} \),
where by convention $\bar{F}$ contains the empty graph $\phi$. Fix $\rho > 0$ such that $F(\rho)$ is finite; and let

$$\mu(G) = \frac{\rho^{e(G)}}{\text{aut } G} \text{ for each } G \in \bar{F}$$

(where aut $\phi = 1$ and so $\mu(\phi) = 1$). We normalise these quantities to give probabilities. Standard manipulations, see [13], show that

$$F(\rho) = \sum_{G \in \bar{F}} \mu(G).$$

The Boltzmann Poisson random graph $R = \text{BP}(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$ takes values in $\bar{F}$, with

$$\mathbb{P}(R = G) = \frac{\mu(G)}{F(\rho)} \text{ for each } G \in \bar{F}.$$ 

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the class of connected graphs in $\mathcal{F}$. Observe that $\mathbb{P}(R = \phi) = F(\rho)^{-1} = e^{-C(\rho)}$. Also, for example, if the one-vertex graph $K_1$ is in $\mathcal{F}$ then $\mathbb{P}(R = K_1) = \rho e^{-C(\rho)}$. More generally, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}(v(R) = k) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\text{aut}(G)}{e^{C(G)}} e^{-C(\rho)} \frac{\rho^k}{\text{aut}(G)} = |\mathcal{F}_k| e^{-C(\rho)} \frac{\rho^k}{k!}.$$ 

(6)

For each graph $G$ and each connected graph $H$, let $\kappa(G, H)$ denote the number of components of $G$ isomorphic to $H$. Then, see [13, Theorem 1.3], the random variables $\kappa(R, H)$ for $H \in \bar{C}$ are independent, with $\kappa(R, H) \sim \text{Po}(\mu(H))$.

3. Proofs for results on pendant appearances

We first prove part (a) then part (b) of Theorem 1.7. We then use Theorem 1.7 to prove Theorem 1.1 and deduce Corollary 1.2. We have already noted that Corollary 1.3 follows directly from Corollary 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.7 (a).** Let

$$\mathcal{B}^- = \{G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{vpend}(G, K^\ast) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha \nu(G) \}.$$ 

We must show that $\rho(\mathcal{B}^-) \geq \rho + \nu$ for a suitable $\nu > 0$. The idea of the proof is that from each graph in $\mathcal{A}_n$, we can construct many graphs in $\mathcal{A}_{n+\delta n}$ by attaching vertex-pendant copies of $K^\ast$, and if we start from graphs in $\mathcal{B}^-_n$ there is limited double-counting. Thus if $\mathcal{B}^-_n$ were not small then we could form too many graphs in $\mathcal{A}_{n+\delta n}$.

Let $\delta = \varepsilon \alpha / 4$. Recall that $v(K) = h + 1$. Let $\eta > 0$ be sufficiently small that

$$(1 + \eta)^{1+\delta} (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{\delta/h} \leq 1 - \eta.$$ 

(7)

We can take $\nu = \eta p$. Let $k = k(n) = (\delta/h) n$, and suppose for convenience that $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $m = n + \delta n = n + h k$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ has radius of convergence $\rho$, there exists $n_0$ (depending on $\mathcal{A}$) sufficiently large that

$$(|\mathcal{A}_n| / n!)^{1/n} \leq (1 + \eta) \rho^{-1} \text{ for each } n \geq n_0.$$ 

(8)
Let $b$ be the size of the orbit of the root vertex $r$ under the action of $\text{Aut } K$ on the vertices of $K$.

Let $n \geq n_0$. For each $n$-subset $W$ of $[m]$ and each $n$-vertex graph $G$ in $B^-$ on $W$ we construct many graphs $G'$ in $A_m$ as follows. The first step is to partition the set $[m] \setminus W$ of the $\delta n = hk$ ‘extra’ vertices into $k$ $h$-sets; then for each of these $h$-sets $U$ we choose a vertex $r_U \in W$ and put a copy of $K^*$ on $U \cup \{r_U\}$ rooted at $r_U$. For each choice of $U$, the number of ways of doing these last steps is

$$\frac{(h+1)!}{\text{aut } K} \frac{b}{h+1} n = \frac{h!}{\text{aut } K^*} n.$$  

Hence the number of constructions of graphs $G' \in A_m$ is

$$\binom{m}{\delta n} |B_n^\epsilon| \frac{(\delta n)!}{(h!)^k k!} \left(\frac{h!}{\text{aut } K^*}\right)^k n^k = m! \frac{|B_n^\epsilon|}{n!} (\text{aut } K^*)^{-\epsilon n}.$$  

How often can each graph $G'$ be constructed? Suppose that we start with a graph $G_0$, pick a vertex $r \in V(G_0)$, add a set $U$ of $h$ new vertices, and put a copy of $K^*$ on $U \cup \{r\}$ rooted at $r$, thus forming the new graph $G_1$. Then $v\text{pend}(G_1, K^*) \leq v\text{pend}(G_0, K^*) + h + 1$, since any new vertex-pendant copy of $K^*$ must have its root in $U \cup \{r\}$, $r$ is the root vertex of exactly one vertex-pendant copy of $K^*$, and each vertex of $U$ can be the root vertex of at most one vertex-pendant copy of $K^*$. Thus for each graph $G'$ constructed we have

$$v\text{pend}(G', K^*) \leq (1 - \epsilon \alpha n + (h+1)k \leq \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon \alpha + 2\delta) n}{(h+1)/h \leq 2} = (1 - \epsilon/2) \alpha n.$$  

It follows that each graph $G'$ can be constructed at most

$$\binom{m}{\delta n} |B_n^\epsilon| \left((1 - \epsilon/2)\alpha n\right)^k n^k / k!$$  

times. Hence, cancelling factors $n^k / k!$

$$\frac{|A_m|}{m!} \geq \frac{|B_n^\epsilon|}{n!} \left((\text{aut } K^*) (1 - \epsilon/2) \alpha\right)^{-k} = \frac{|B_n^\epsilon|}{n!} (1 - \epsilon/2)^{-k} \rho^{-\delta n}.$$  

since $(\text{aut } K^*) \alpha = \rho h = \rho^\delta$. Therefore

$$\left(\frac{|B_n^\epsilon|}{n!}\right)^{1/n} \leq \left(\frac{|A_m|}{m!}\right)^{1/n} (1 - \epsilon/2)^{\delta/h} \rho^\delta \leq (1 + \eta)\rho^{-1} (1 - \epsilon/2)^{\delta/h} \rho^\delta \leq \rho^{-1} (1 + \eta) (1 - \epsilon/2)^{\delta/h} \leq (1 - \eta) \rho^{-1}$$  

by (7). It follows that

$$\rho (B^-) - \rho \geq (1 - \eta)^{-1} \rho - \rho > \eta \rho = \nu,$$  

as required. \qed
Proof of Theorem 1.7 (b). The proof mirrors the proof of part (a). Let
\[ B^+ = \{ G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, K^\bullet) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \}. \]

We must show that \( \rho(B^-) \geq \rho + \nu \) for a suitable \( \nu > 0 \). The idea of the proof is that from each graph in \( B^+_n \) we can construct many graphs in \( A_{n-\delta n} \) by deleting the non-root vertices of many ‘near-disjoint’ vertex-pendant copies of \( K^\bullet \), and there is limited double-counting. Thus if \( B^+_n \) were not small then we could form too many graphs in \( A_{n-\delta n} \).

Let \( \delta = \varepsilon \alpha / 4 \), and assume wlog that \( \delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \). Let \( k = k(n) = (\delta/h)n \) and suppose for convenience that \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( \eta > 0 \) be sufficiently small that
\[
(1 + \varepsilon/2)^{-\delta/h} (1 + \eta) \leq 1 - \eta. \tag{9}
\]
and let \( \nu = \eta \rho \). We may assume that \( n_0 \) is sufficiently large that the upper bound (8) holds for this choice of \( \eta \). Let \( n \geq n_0/(1 - \delta) \). Since \( k(h + 1) \leq 2kh \leq 2\delta n = \varepsilon \alpha n/2 \), we have
\[
(1 + \varepsilon) \alpha n - k(h + 1) \geq (1 + \varepsilon/2)\alpha n. \tag{10}
\]

Call two vertex-pendant appearances of \( K^\bullet \) in a graph \( G \) near-disjoint if their vertex sets are either disjoint or the unique common vertex is their common root. For a given vertex-pendant appearance \( A \) of \( K^\bullet \) in \( G \), if a distinct vertex-pendant appearance of \( K^\bullet \) fails to be disjoint from \( A \) then its root vertex must be one of the \( h \) non-root vertices of \( A \). Thus the total number of vertex-pendant appearances of \( K^\bullet \) in \( G \) which fail to be near-disjoint from \( A \) (including \( A \) itself) is at most \( h + 1 \).

Consider a graph \( G \in B^+_n \). Choose \( k \) pairwise near-disjoint vertex-pendant appearances of \( K^\bullet \) out of the at least \( (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha n \) vertex-pendant appearances of \( K^\bullet \) in \( G \), and from each one delete the \( h \) vertices other than the root, to form a graph \( G' \in A \) on a set of \( n - kh = n - \delta n \) vertices in \([n]\). The number of constructions is at least
\[
|B^+_n| \frac{((1 + \varepsilon/2)\alpha n - k(h + 1))^k}{k!} \geq |B^+_n| \frac{((1 + \varepsilon/2)\alpha n)^k}{k!}
\]
by inequality (10). The number of times \( G' \) is constructed is the number of graphs in \( A_n \) which we can construct by ‘attaching’ \( k \) pairwise near-disjoint vertex-pendant appearances of \( K^\bullet \) to \( G'' \) (so the \( k \) root vertices are in \( V(G'') \)) and the \( kh \) non-root vertices form the set \([n] \setminus V(G'') \), which is
\[
\frac{(hk)!}{(h!)^k k!} \left( \frac{(1 - \delta)n}{\text{aut } K}\right)^k \leq \frac{(hk)! n^k}{k! (\text{aut } K^\bullet)^k}
\]
(dropping the factor \((1 - \delta)^k\)). Hence the number of distinct graphs \( G' \) constructed is at least
\[
|B^+_n| \frac{((1 + \varepsilon/2)\alpha n)^k}{k!} \frac{k! (\text{aut } K^\bullet)^k}{(hk)! n^k} = |B^+_n| \frac{(1 + \varepsilon/2)^k \rho \delta n}{(\delta n)!}
\]
since $\alpha^k(\text{aut }K^*)^k = \rho^\delta n$. But this must be at most $\binom{n}{\delta n} |A_{n-\delta n}|$. Therefore, by (8) since $(1 - \delta)n \geq n_0$,

$$|B^+_n| \leq (\delta n)! (1 + \varepsilon/2)^{-k} \rho^{-\delta n} \binom{n}{\delta n} ((1 + \eta)\rho^{-1})^{n-\delta n} = n! \rho^{-n} (1 + \varepsilon/2)^{-k} (1 + \eta)^n \leq n! \rho^{-n} (1 + \eta)^n \leq n! \rho^{-n} (1 - \eta)^n$$

where the last step uses (9). Hence $\rho(B^+) - \rho \geq (1 - \eta)^{-1} \rho - \rho > \nu$ as before, and this completes the proof.

It remains in this section to use Theorem 1.7 to prove Theorem 1.1, and then deduce Corollary 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.7.** Recall that $(H^+)\mathcal{H}$ be obtained from $H^\bullet$ by adding a new vertex adjacent to the root $r$ of $H^\bullet$ and making it the new root vertex. We noted that $\text{aut } H^\bullet = \text{aut } (H^+)\mathcal{H}$; and $H^\bullet$ can be attached to $A$ if and only if $(H^+)\mathcal{H}$ can be vertex-attached to $A$, and similarly $H^\bullet$ can be detached from $A$ if and only if $(H^+)\mathcal{H}$ can be vertex-detached from $A$. Also $\text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) = \text{vpend}(G, (H^+)\mathcal{H})$ for every graph $G$.

Let us first prove part (a). If $H^\bullet$ can be attached to $A$ then $(H^+)\mathcal{H}$ can be vertex-attached to $A$, and so by Theorem 1.7(a) there exists $\nu > 0$ as required (that is, depending on $\rho$, $H^\bullet$, and $\varepsilon$) such that

$$\rho\{G \in A : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} = \rho\{G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, (H^+)\mathcal{H}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} \geq \rho(A) + \nu.$$ 

We may prove part (b) in the same way. If $H^\bullet$ can be detached from $A$ then $(H^+)\mathcal{H}$ can be vertex-detached from $A$, and so by Theorem 1.7(b) there exists $\nu > 0$ as required such that

$$\rho\{G \in A : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} = \rho\{G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, (H^+)\mathcal{H}) \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} \geq \rho(A) + \nu,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Corollary 1.2 from Theorem 1.1.** Let us prove part (a): there is a very similar proof for part (b). Consider a copy of $H$, and the corresponding action of Aut $H$ on $V(H)$, with set $U$ of orbits. Choose one root vertex $r_U$ from each orbit $U$, and note that $\text{aut } H^{r_U} = (\text{aut } H)/[U]$. For every graph $G$

$$\text{pend}(G, H) = \sum_{U \in U} \text{pend}(G, H^{r_U}).$$

Thus if

$$\text{pend}(G, H) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\log}{\text{aut } H} v(G),$$

then

$$\rho\{G \in A : \text{pend}(G, H^\bullet) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} = \rho\{G \in A : \text{vpend}(G, H^{r_U}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \alpha v(G) \} \geq \rho(A) + \nu,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.
then for some orbit $U$
\[
\text{pend}(G, H^v) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{|U|}{\text{aut } H} \rho^h v(G) = (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\rho^h}{\text{aut } H^v} v(G).
\]
Hence
\[
\rho\left\{ G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\rho^h}{\text{aut } H} v(G) \right\} \geq \min_{r \in V(H)} \rho\left\{ G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H^r) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\rho^h}{\text{aut } H^r} v(G) \right\}.
\] (12)

Now suppose that $H$ can be attached to $\mathcal{A}$. Then each rooted graph $H^r$ can be attached to $\mathcal{A}$, and so by Theorem 1.1 there exists $\nu > 0$ such that
\[
\rho\left\{ G \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pend}(G, H^r) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\rho^h}{\text{aut } H^r} v(G) \right\} \geq \rho(\mathcal{A}) + \nu_r
\]
for each $r \in V(H)$. Finally, let $\nu = \min_r \nu_r > 0$, and the result (a) follows using (12).

4. Bridge-addability

In this section we present and prove two lemmas, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, which extend some earlier results on bridge-addable sets of graphs, see [1, 11, 14, 16, 19, 23, 24]. We shall use these new results in the proof of Lemma 5.2, which is used in the proof of Theorem 1.4, and elsewhere in the proof of Theorem 1.4. (The other lemma in this section, Lemma 4.3, is used only in the proof of Lemma 4.1.) We need some definitions.

Given a set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs, we say that a connected graph $H$ is bridge-addable to $\mathcal{A}$ if, whenever a graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ has a component isomorphic to $H$ and we form $G'$ by adding a bridge between this component and the rest of the graph, we have $G' \in \mathcal{A}$. For example, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a bridge-addable class of graphs and $H$ is any connected graph in $\mathcal{A}$ then $H$ is bridge-addable to $\mathcal{A}$. If the connected graph $H$ is free for $\mathcal{A}$ then $H$ is bridge-addable to $\mathcal{A}$ (and much more).

Given a class $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs and a graph $G$, we let $\kappa(G, \mathcal{F})$ be the number of components of $G$ which are in $\mathcal{F}$; and we let $\kappa^+(G, \mathcal{F})$ be $\kappa(G, \mathcal{F})$ if every component of $G$ is in $\mathcal{F}$ and otherwise be $\kappa(G, \mathcal{F}) + 1$. Also recall that $\text{Frag}(G, \mathcal{F})$ is the graph formed by the components of the fragment of $G$ which are in $\mathcal{F}$; and $\text{frag}(G, \mathcal{F})$ is $v(\text{Frag}(G, \mathcal{F}))$. Observe that $\kappa^+(G, \mathcal{F}) = 1$ if and only if either $G$ is connected and in $\mathcal{F}$ or $G$ has no components in $\mathcal{F}$; that is, if and only if $G$ has no proper component in $\mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of graphs, let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of connected graphs which are each bridge-addable to $\mathcal{A}$, and let $R_n \in \mathcal{A}$.

(a) $\mathbb{E}[\text{frag}(R_n, \mathcal{C})] < 2$.

(b) Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of graphs $G \in \mathcal{A}$ which have a component $H \in \mathcal{C}$ with $a \leq v(H) \leq v(G) - a$. Then $\mathbb{P}(R_n \in \mathcal{B}) < 2/a$ for $n \geq 2a$. 

Part (a) of Lemma 4.1 directly gives part (a) of Theorem 1.4. Part (b) is used in the proof of Lemma 5.2. Lemma 4.1 is used also in the proof of Lemma 5.6.

We say that a set \( C \) of connected graphs is \textit{bridge-stable} if (a) for each disjoint pair of graphs in \( C \) the graph formed from them by adding a bridge is in \( C \), and (b) for each graph \( H \in C \) with a bridge \( e \), if either component of \( H - e \) is in \( C \) then both components are in \( C \). For example, the class of connected planar graphs is bridge-stable, as is the class of connected planar graphs \( C \) with \( v(C) \) even. The next lemma is used in the proof of Lemma 5.2.

\textbf{Lemma 4.2.} Let \( A \) be a set of graphs, let \( C \) be a set of connected graphs which are bridge-addable to \( A \), and suppose that \( C \) is bridge-stable. Then for \( R_n \in_u A \) we have \( \kappa^+(R_n, C) \leq s + \text{Po}(1) \).

In the remainder of this section we prove the above two lemmas. Note that in each lemma we may assume wlog that \( A \) and \( C \) are non-empty. To prove Lemma 4.1 we use one preliminary lemma. Given a graph \( G \) we let \( \text{Cross}(G) \) be the set of 'non-edges' of \( G \) with end-vertices in two distinct components; and given also a set \( F \) of graphs we let \( \text{Cross}(G, F) \) be the set of 'non-edges' of \( G \) with end-vertices in two distinct components, where at least one of these components is in \( F \).

\textbf{Lemma 4.3.} For every graph \( G \) and set \( F \) of graphs we have 
\[ |\text{Cross}(G, F)| \geq \frac{1}{2} v(G) \cdot \text{frag}(G, F). \]

\textit{Proof.} Let \( W \) be the set of vertices of \( G \) in the components of the fragment which are in \( F \). Let \( G' \) be a graph on \( V(G) \) which agrees with \( G \) on \( W \) (i.e. \( G'[W] = G[W] \)) and has a connected component on \( V(G) \setminus W \). Then \( \text{Frag}(G, F) = \text{Frag}(G') \) and \( \text{Cross}(G, F) \supseteq \text{Cross}(G') \). But \( |\text{Cross}(G')| \geq \frac{1}{2} v(G') \cdot \text{frag}(G') \), by Lemma 3.5 of [14], see also [12]. Hence
\[ |\text{Cross}(G, F)| \geq |\text{Cross}(G')| \geq \frac{1}{2} v(G') \cdot \text{frag}(G') = \frac{1}{2} v(G) \cdot \text{frag}(G, F), \]
yielding the required inequality. \( \square \)

\textit{Proof of Lemma 4.1} (a) Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) be such that \( \mathcal{A}_n \neq \emptyset \). Let \( C \) be the set of pairs \((G, e)\) such that \( G \in \mathcal{A}_n \) and \( e \in \text{Cross}(G, C) \); and let \( B \) be the set of pairs \((G, e)\) such that \( G \in \mathcal{A}_n \) and \( e \in \text{Bridge}(G) \). If \( (G, e) \in C \) then \( G + e \in \mathcal{A}_n \). Thus the mapping \((G, e)\) to \((G + e, e)\) gives an injection from \( C \) to \( B \), and so \( |C| \leq |B| \). Hence, using Lemma 4.3 for the first inequality,
\[
\frac{(n/2)}{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_n} \text{frag}(G, C)} \leq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_n} |\text{Cross}(G, C)| = |C| \leq |B| = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_n} |\text{Bridge}(G)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_n| \cdot (n - 1).
\]
Thus for $R_n \in \mathcal{A}$

$$E[\text{frag}(R_n, \mathcal{C})] \leq (2/n) \cdot (n - 1) < 2,$$

as required for part (a).

(b) Let $n \geq 2a$. If $G \in \mathcal{B}_n$ then $G$ has a component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $a \leq v(C) \leq n - a$, and so

$$|\text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})| \geq v(C)(n - v(C)) \geq a(n - a) \geq an/2.$$ 

Hence, arguing as in the proof of part (a)

$$(an/2)|\mathcal{B}_n| \leq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{B}_n} |\text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})| \leq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{A}_n} |\text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})| \leq |\mathcal{A}_n| \cdot (n - 1),$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}(R_n \in \mathcal{B}) \leq \frac{2(n - 1)}{an} < 2/a,$$

as required. \hfill \Box

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathcal{A}_n \neq \emptyset$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{A}^k = \{G \in \mathcal{A}_n : \kappa^+(G, \mathcal{C}) = k\}$; let $S^k$ be the set of pairs $(G, e)$ such that $G \in \mathcal{A}^k$ and $e$ is a bridge in $G$; and let $T^k$ be the set of pairs $(G, e)$ such that $G \in \mathcal{A}^k$ and $e \in \text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{k+1} \neq \emptyset$, there is a natural injection $\phi$ from $T^{k+1}$ to $S^k$, which we define as follows. Given $(G, e) \in T^{k+1}$ we let $\phi((G, e)) = (G^+, e)$, where $G^+ = G + e$. Clearly $\phi$ is an injection, since deleting $e$ from $G^+$ gives back $G$; and $G^+ \in \mathcal{A}$ and $e$ is a bridge in $G^+$. We must show that $\kappa^+(G^+, \mathcal{C}) = k$. Let $C_1, C_2$ be the two components of $G$ containing the end vertices of the non-edge $e$. There are two cases to check: if both $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in $\mathcal{C}$ then the new component $C_1 \cup C_2 + e$ in $G^+$ is in $\mathcal{C}$; and if exactly one of $C_1, C_2$ is in $\mathcal{C}$ then $(C_1 \cup C_2) + e$ is not in $\mathcal{C}$. Thus in both cases $G^+$ has exactly one less component in $\mathcal{C}$ than $G$, and $G^+$ has a component not in $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if $G$ does. Hence $\kappa^+(G^+, \mathcal{C}) = \kappa^+(G, \mathcal{C}) - 1 = k$, and so $(G^+, e) \in S^k$, as required. Thus we have shown that $|T^{k+1}| \leq |S^k|$.

Now we argue as in the proof of Theorem 2.5 of [5] (see also Theorem 2.6 in that paper). Firstly, $|S^k| \leq |\mathcal{A}^k|(n - k)$, since each graph in $\mathcal{A}^k$ has at least $k$ components and so has at most $n - k$ bridges. Secondly, consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{A}^{k+1}$, and note that $|\text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})|$ is minimised when $k$ of the components in $\mathcal{C}$ are singletons (and the rest of $G$ is either a single component in $\mathcal{C}$ or a non-empty union of components not in $\mathcal{C}$); and in this case $|\text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})| = k(n - k) + \binom{k}{2} \geq k(n - k)$. Hence, each graph $G \in \mathcal{A}^{k+1}$ has at least $k(n - k)$ non-edges $e \in \text{Cross}(G, \mathcal{C})$, so that $(G, e) \in T^{k+1}$; and it follows that $|T^{k+1}| \geq |\mathcal{A}^{k+1}| k(n - k)$.

Putting the above inequalities together we obtain

$$|\mathcal{A}^{k+1}| k(n - k) \leq |T^{k+1}| \leq |S^k| \leq |\mathcal{A}^k|(n - k),$$
so $|\mathcal{A}^{k+1}| \leq \frac{1}{5^k} |\mathcal{A}^k|$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa^+(R, C) = k + 1) \leq \frac{1}{5^k} \mathbb{P}(\kappa^+(R, C) = k)$$

for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hence $\kappa^+(R, C) \leq 1 + \text{Po}(1)$ by Lemma 3.4 of [14], see also [10]. This completes the proof. 

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4 on components

In this section we use the earlier results on pendant appearances (in particular Corollary 1.2), together with the results on bridge-addability in Section 4, to prove Theorem 1.4(b). (Recall that part (a) of Theorem 1.4 was proved earlier from part (a) of Lemma 4.1.)

We use seven lemmas. The first, Lemma 5.1, is a preliminary lemma. The second, Lemma 5.2, is the main workhorse in this section: it has two parts, (a) and (b), and its premises are rather general. Lemma 5.3 has the same premises as Lemma 5.2 when we combine the parts of that lemma. Indeed, each of the sequence of lemmas, Lemmas 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 have these same rather general premises. Lemma 5.6 is used in [22]. Finally Lemma 5.7 follows from Lemma 5.6 by specialising to components which are free: it is essentially Theorem 1.4(b). Lemma 6.1 in the next section is also based on Lemma 5.2, and is also used in [22].

Given a graph $G$ and a set $C$ of connected graphs, let $\text{Pend}(G, C)$ be the union of the sets $\text{Pend}(G, H)$ for $H \in C$.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $C$ be a set of connected graphs with $\max\{v(H) : H \in C\} = h^* \in \mathbb{N}$. Let the graph $G$ have a pendant appearance of a graph $H_0 \in C$ on the set $W \subseteq V(G)$ (so $H_0$ is the induced subgraph $G[W]$), and let $G'$ be $G \setminus W$. Let $Q = \text{Pend}(G, C) \setminus \text{Pend}(G', C)$. Then $|Q| \leq 2h^*$.

**Proof.** Each member of $Q$ is specified by its oriented link in $G$. Let $wx$ (with $w \in W$) be the link of the pendant appearance of $H_0$ on $W$, and let $H_0^+$ be the graph obtained by adding the (unoriented) edge $\{w, x\}$ to $H_0$.

Let $Q'$ be the set of members of $Q$ such that the (unoriented) bridge corresponding to its link is not in $H_0^+$. Observe that if a member of $Q'$ has vertex set $W'$ then we must have $\{w, x\} \subseteq W'$ and so its link edge must point away from $W'$. Consider a member of $Q'$ with vertex set $W_1$ as large as possible, and suppose that it is a pendant appearance of $H_1 \in C$. Then for every other member of $Q'$ the bridge corresponding to its link is a bridge in $H_1$ and not in $H_0^+$. There are at most $v(H_1) - v(H_0) - 1 \leq h^* - v(H_0) - 1$ such bridges, so $|Q'| \leq h^* - v(H_0)$. But there are at most $v(H_0)$ bridges in $H_0^+$, so

$$|Q| \leq |Q'| + 2v(H_0) \leq h^* + v(H_0) \leq 2h^*,$$

as required. 

The bound in Lemma 5.1 is tight. For example, suppose that $C$ consists of all paths with at most $h^*$ vertices. Let the graph $G$ have a component which is
a path $P$ with $h^* + 1$ vertices, and let $W$ be the set of vertices in $P$ apart from one end-vertex. Then for each of the $h^*$ bridges in $P$, both of the orientations yield a pendant appearance of a graph in $C$, and thus $|Q| = 2h^*$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of graphs, and let $H$ be a connected graph. We say that $H$ is addable to $\mathcal{A}$ if $G \in \mathcal{A} \implies G \cup H \in \mathcal{A}$; and $H$ is removable from $\mathcal{A}$ if $G \cup H \in \mathcal{A} \implies G \in \mathcal{A}$. (Recall that $G \cup H$ denotes the disjoint union of $G$ and $H$.) We say that $H$ is bridge-flexible in $\mathcal{A}$ if the following holds: if $G \cup H$ is in $\mathcal{A}$ then $G \cup H + e$ is in $\mathcal{A}$ for each edge $e$ between $G$ and $H$, and if $G \cup H + e$ is in $\mathcal{A}$ for some edge $e$ between $G$ and $H$ then $G \cup H$ is in $\mathcal{A}$. (Thus $H$ is bridge-flexible in $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if it is both bridge-addable to $\mathcal{A}$ and ‘bridge-removable’ from $\mathcal{A}$.) Recall that $\kappa(G, H)$ is the number of components of $G$ which are isomorphic to $H$; and ‘bridge-stable’ was defined just before Lemma [1.2].

**Lemma 5.2.** Let the set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs have growth constant $\gamma$, and let $\rho = \rho_\mathcal{A} (= 1/\gamma)$. Let the non-empty set $\mathcal{C}$ of connected graphs be bridge-stable, and suppose that each graph in $\mathcal{C}$ is bridge-flexible in $\mathcal{A}$. List the (unlabelled) graphs in $\mathcal{C}$ as $H_1, H_2, \ldots$ so that $v(H_1) \leq v(H_2) \leq \cdots$. Call $k \in \mathbb{N}$ relevant when $k \leq |\mathcal{C}|$ (where $\mathcal{C}$ may be infinite). For each relevant $i$ let $\alpha_i = \rho^{\gamma_i}/\text{aut } H_i$ and let $\alpha_i = 1$ be independent. Also, for each relevant $k$ let $\sigma_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i$. Let $R_n \in \mathcal{A}$.

(i) Suppose that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every graph $H_i$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we have $\text{pend}(R_n, H_i) > (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha_i\rho n$ whp. Then for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exists a relevant $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every relevant $k \geq k_0$ the following two statements hold.

(i) For all $n$ sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) e^{-\sigma_k};$$

(ii) For every $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$ and $n \geq N^*$

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).$$

(b) Suppose that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every graph $H_i$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we have $\text{pend}(R_n, H_i) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\alpha_i\rho n$ whp. Then for every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and every relevant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the following two statements hold.

(i) For all $n$ sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) e^{-\sigma_k};$$

(ii) For every $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$ and all $n \geq N^*$

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).$$
Note the asymmetry here: we require \( k \) to be large in part (a) but not in part (b). The condition in part (a) above holds if each graph \( H_i \) in \( \mathcal{C} \) is addable to \( \mathcal{A} \), by Corollary 1.3 (a); and similarly, the condition in part (b) holds if each graph in \( \mathcal{C} \) is removable from \( \mathcal{A} \), by Corollary 1.3 (b). See also the observation immediately following Corollary 1.3.

**Proof.** For all \( n \geq 1 \), relevant \( k \) and \( n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 0 \) let

\[
\mathcal{A}_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = \{ G \in \mathcal{A}_n : \Lambda_{i=1}^k \kappa(G, H_i) = n_i \}.
\]

Also, for relevant \( k \) write \( \tilde{C}(k) \) for \( \{ H_1, \ldots, H_k \} \). Let \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \).

Proof of part (a). After some preliminaries, we see how to construct many graphs in \( \mathcal{A}_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \), by choosing a ‘typical’ graph \( G \) in \( \mathcal{A}_n(0) \) and deleting the link edge in \( G \) from \( n_i \) pendant appearances of \( H_i \) for each \( i \in [k] \). This yields (14), and then (14) easily gives (15).

Pick a relevant \( k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) sufficiently large that either \( v(H_{k_0}) \geq 24/\varepsilon \), or \( \tilde{C} \) is finite and \( k_0 = |\tilde{C}| \). Let \( k \geq k_0 \) be relevant, and let \( h^* = v(H_k) \). Let \( n^* \in \mathbb{N} \). (We shall define a suitable \( N^* \) below.) Let \( s^* = n^* \sum_{i=1}^k h_i \), and let \( B \) be the set of graphs \( G \in \mathcal{A} \) which have a component \( H_j \in \mathcal{C} \) such that \( j > k \) and \( v(H_j) \leq h^* + s^* \). Once \( n \geq 2h^* + s^* \), by Lemma 4.3 (b) (with \( a = h^* \)) we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(R_n \in B) < 2/h^* \leq \varepsilon/12.
\]

Also, by Lemma 4.2

\[
\kappa^+(R_n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 1 + \text{Po}(1);
\]

and thus for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) we have

\[
\mathbb{P}(\kappa^+(R_n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 1) \geq 1/e.
\]

Once \( n > h^* \), by the last inequality we have

\[
|\mathcal{A}_n(0)| \geq |\mathcal{A}_n|/e > |\mathcal{A}_n|/3,
\]

where \( 0 \) is the \( k \)-tuple of 0’s.

Let \( t^* = kn^* \). Let \( 0 < \eta < 1/2 \) satisfy \( (1 - 2\eta)t^* \geq 1 - \varepsilon/2 \). Let \( \mathcal{A}^- \) be the set of graphs \( G \in \mathcal{A} \) such that \( \text{pend}(G, H_i) \leq (1 - \eta) \alpha_i h_i v(G) \) for some \( i \in [k] \). By assumption \( R_n \notin \mathcal{A}^- \) whp. Let \( N_1 \) be sufficiently large that for all \( n \geq N_1 \), \( |\mathcal{A}_n^-| \leq (\varepsilon/12)|\mathcal{A}_n| \). Let \( N_2 = (2h^* t^*)/(\eta \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \alpha_i h_i) \), and let \( N^* \) be the maximum of \( N_1, N_2 \) and \( 2(h^* + s^*) \).

We have now completed the preliminaries for the proof of inequality (14). Let \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \), and let \( t = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \) (so \( t \leq t^* \)). Let \( n \geq N^* \). Let

\[
G \in \mathcal{A}_n(0) \setminus (\mathcal{A}^- \cup B).
\]

We aim to choose a pendant appearance in \( G \) of a graph \( H_j \) in \( \tilde{C}(k) \) such that \( n_j \geq 1 \), delete the link edge to form the graph \( G' \in \mathcal{A}_n \) (which contains a component \( H_j \)), and update the numbers \( n_i \) to \( n'_i \) (setting \( n'_j = n_j - 1 \) and \( n'_i = n_i \) for \( i \neq j \)); then choose a pendant appearance in \( G' \) of a graph \( H_{j'} \) in \( \mathcal{C}(k) \).
with \( n'_j \geq 1 \), delete the link edge and so on: we continue until either we have chosen \( n_i \) pendant copies of \( H_i \) for each \( i \in [k] \) and deleted their link edges, or we fail at some stage. By Lemma \([5,1]\) deleting the link edge of a pendant appearance of a graph in \( \tilde{C}(k) \) can destroy at most \( 2h^* \) pendant appearances of a graph in \( \tilde{C}(k) \), so in total we can destroy at most \( 2h^*t \leq 2h^*t^* \) pendant appearances of graphs in \( \tilde{C}(k) \). Observe that \((1-\eta)\alpha_h n - 2h^*t \geq (1-\eta)\alpha_h n \) (since \( n \geq N^* \geq N_2 \)). Thus starting from \( G \) we do not fail, and we may construct at least

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{((1-2\eta)\alpha_i h_i n)^{n_i}}{n_i!} = (1-2\eta)^t n! \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i h_i n^{n_i}}{n_i!}
\]

graphs \( G' \in A_n \).

To see that \( G' \in A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \) it remains to check that there are no ‘extra’ components in \( \tilde{C}(k) \). From any component \( C \) of \( G \) this process removes at most \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i h_i \leq s^* \) vertices, and if that left a component in \( C \) itself would be in \( \tilde{C} \) (since \( C \) is bridge-stable) with at most \( h^* + s^* \) vertices; but \( G \in A_n(0) \setminus B \) so that cannot happen. Thus \( G' \in A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \), as we wished to show.

Also, each graph \( G' \) is constructed at most \( n^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} h_i^{n_i} \) times, since this quantity bounds the number of ways of re-attaching the components \( H_i \) to form pendant appearances. Hence

\[
|A_n(0) \setminus (A^- \cup B)| \cdot (1-2\eta)^t n! \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i h_i n^{n_i}}{n_i!} \leq |A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k)| \cdot n! \prod_{i=1}^{k} h_i^{n_i}.
\]

Thus

\[
|A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k)| \geq |A_n(0) \setminus (A^- \cup B_n)| (1-2\eta)^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i n^{n_i}}{n_i!}.
\]

But \( |A^-_n| \leq (\varepsilon/12) |A_n| \) since \( n \geq N^* \geq N_1 \). Also \( |B_n| \leq (\varepsilon/12) |A_n| \) by \([17]\) since \( n \geq N^* \geq 2(h^* + s^*) \), so \( |A^-_n \cup B_n| \leq (\varepsilon/6) |A_n| \leq (\varepsilon/2) |A_n(0)| \) by \([19]\). Thus

\[
|A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k)| \geq (|A_n(0)| - |A^-_n \cup B_n|) (1-2\eta)^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i n^{n_i}}{n_i!}
\]

\[
\geq (1-\varepsilon/2) |A_n(0)| (1-2\eta)^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i n^{n_i}}{n_i!}
\]

\[
\geq (1-\varepsilon) |A_n(0)| e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i)
\]

since \( (1-2\eta)^t \geq (1-2\eta)^{t^*} \geq 1-\varepsilon/2 \), and \( (1-\varepsilon/2)^2 \geq 1-\varepsilon \). Dividing both sides of this inequality by \( |A_n| \) yields inequality \([14]\).

We next prove \([13]\). We may assume that \( 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/3 \), so \( (1-\varepsilon/3)^2 \geq (1+\varepsilon)^{-1} \). We use \([14]\) with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/3 \) to prove \([13]\). Let \( n^* \) be
sufficiently large that $\prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq n^*) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/3$, and let $n \geq N^*$. By summing (14) over all $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$ we obtain

$$|\mathcal{A}_n| \geq |\{G \in \mathcal{A}_n : \land_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(G, H_i) \leq n^*\}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon/3) |\mathcal{A}_n(0)| e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq n^*) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/3)^2 |\mathcal{A}_n(0)| e^{\sigma_k}.$$ 

Hence $|\mathcal{A}_n(0)| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) |\mathcal{A}_n| e^{-\sigma_k}$, which yields (13) and thus completes the proof of part (a).

Proof of part (b). We may think of the inequality (16) which we need to prove as giving a lower bound on $|\mathcal{A}_n(0)|$. After some preliminaries, we see how to construct enough graphs in $\mathcal{A}_n(0)$ by picking a ‘typical’ graph $G \in \mathcal{A}_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ and adding a link edge to each component $H_i$ (to form a pendant appearance). Finally we use (16) to prove (15).

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be relevant, let $h^* = v(H_k)$, and let $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$\beta = \min_{0 \leq n_i \leq n^*} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i^{n_i}}{n_i!}$$

where the minimum is over all $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$, and note that $\beta > 0$. As before, let $s^* = n^* \sum_{i=1}^{k} h_i$ and $t^* = k n^*$. Let $\eta > 0$ satisfy $(1 + 2\eta)^{2t^* + \eta} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^+$ be the set of graphs $G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{pend}(G, H_i) \geq (1 + \eta) \alpha_i h_i v(G)$ for some $i \in [k]$. By assumption $R_n \not\in \mathcal{A}^+$ whp. Let $N_i$ be sufficiently large that for all $n \geq N_i$ we have $|\mathcal{A}_n^+| \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \beta |\mathcal{A}_n|$; let $N_2 = 2t^* h^*/(\eta \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \alpha_i h_i)$; and let $N^*$ be the maximum of $N_1, N_2$ and $s^*(1 + 2\eta)/2\eta$. This completes the preliminaries.

Let $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$ be given, and let $n \geq N^*$. We must prove that inequality (16) holds. Let $t = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i$, so $t \leq t^*$; and let $s = \sum_{i=1}^{k} h_i n_i$, so $s \leq s^*$. Let

$$G \in \mathcal{A}_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \setminus \mathcal{A}_n^+.$$ 

From $G$, for each component isomorphic to one of the graphs $H_i$ in $C_{(k)}$ we pick one of the $h_i$ vertices in the component and one of the $n - s \geq n - s^*$ vertices of $G$ in a component not in $C_{(k)}$, and add a bridge between these two vertices, which forms a pendant copy of $H_i$ in a new component which is not in $C_{(k)}$ (since either it is not in $C$ or it has more than $h^*$ vertices). In this way we construct at least

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} (h_i(n - s^*))^{n_i} = (n - s^*)^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} h_i^{n_i}$$

graphs $G' \in \mathcal{A}_n(0)$. By Lemma [5.1] each time we add a bridge as here we can construct at most $2h^*$ new pendant copies of graphs in $C_{(k)}$, so in total we
construct at most $2\theta n^*$ new pendant copies of graphs in $C(k)$. Since $n \geq N_2$ we have $2\theta n^* \leq \eta \alpha_i h_i n$ for each $i$, and so

$$\text{pend}(G', H_i) \leq (1 + \eta)\alpha_i h_i n + 2\theta n^* \leq (1 + 2\eta)\alpha_i h_i n;$$

so the number of times $G'$ is constructed is at most

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( \left[ (1 + 2\eta)\alpha_i h_i n \right] \right) \leq (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(\alpha_i h_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!}.$$

Hence

$$|A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \setminus A^+| \leq (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(\alpha_i h_i)^{n_i}}{n_i!}.$$

Thus, using $1 - s^*/n \geq (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t$ (which holds since $n \geq N^* \geq s^*/(1 + 2\eta)/2\eta$) we have

$$|A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \setminus A^+_n| \leq |A_n(0)| (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i^{n_i}}{n_i!}.$$

Now

$$|A^+_n| \leq \frac{1}{3} \eta \beta |A_n| \leq \eta \beta |A_n(0)|$$

by (19) in the proof of part (a). Hence

$$|A_n(n_1, \ldots, n_k)| \leq |A_n(0)| \left[ (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i^{n_i}}{n_i!} + \eta \beta \right]$$

$$\leq |A_n(0)| \left( (1 + 2\eta)^t n^t + \eta \right) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\alpha_i^{n_i}}{n_i!}$$

$$\leq (1 + \varepsilon) |A_n(0)| e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} P(X_i = n_i)$$

by our choice of $\eta$. Thus inequality (16) holds.

Finally, we use (16) with $\varepsilon$ replaced by $\varepsilon/3$ to prove (15). By Lemma 4.1

$$\mathbb{E}[\kappa(R_n, C)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\text{frag}(R_n, C)] < 2.$$
The last lemma and the following lemmas involve both a set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs and a class $\mathcal{C}$ of connected graphs which satisfy several conditions which say roughly that the graphs in $\mathcal{C}$ are free in $\mathcal{A}$. We shall eventually simplify matters and assume that this is indeed the case, but in the meantime we want to stay more general. The next lemma, Lemma 5.3, follows quickly from Lemma 5.2. In Lemma 5.3, $k$ is required to be at least some value $k_0$ (depending on $\varepsilon$). In Lemma 5.4 we shall drop this restriction on $k$ (using Lemma 5.3 in the proof). For $x, y > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ the notation $y = (1 \pm \varepsilon)x$ means $(1 - \varepsilon)x \leq y \leq (1 + \varepsilon)x$.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let the set $\mathcal{A}$ of graphs have growth constant $\gamma$, and let $\rho = \rho_A (= 1/\gamma)$. Let the non-empty class $\mathcal{C}$ of connected graphs be bridge-stable, and suppose that each graph in $\mathcal{C}$ is bridge-flexible in $\mathcal{A}$. List the (unlabelled) graphs in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ as $H_1, H_2, \ldots$ so that $v(H_1) \leq v(H_2) \leq \cdots$. Call $k \in \mathbb{N}$ relevant when $k \leq |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}|$ (where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ may be infinite). For each relevant $i$ let $h_i = v(H_i)$, let $\rho_i = \rho^{h_i}/\mathrm{aut} H_i$ and let $X_i \sim \mathrm{Po}(\rho_i)$; and let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be independent. Also, for each relevant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\sigma_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i h_i$. Let $R_n \in u \mathcal{A}$. Suppose that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every graph $H_i$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, we have $1 - \varepsilon < \mathrm{pend}(R_n, H_i)/\rho_i h_i n < (1 + \varepsilon)$ whp.

Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a relevant $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all relevant $k \geq k_0$ and $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds: there exists $N^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N^*$ and all $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) = (1 + \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

**Proof.** Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. We will use Lemma 5.2 with $\varepsilon$ replaced by $\eta = \varepsilon/3$. Let $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be as given in Lemma 5.2 (a) (with $\varepsilon$ replaced by $\eta$), and let $k \geq k_0$. Let $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.2 there exists $N^*$ sufficiently large that all of (13), (14), (15) and (16) hold for all $n \geq N^*$. Let $n \geq N^*$ and let $0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^*$. Then by (14) and (15), since $(1 - \eta)^2 \geq 1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i);$$

and by (16) and (13), since $(1 + \eta)^2 \leq 1 + \varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).$$

Thus (20) holds, as required. \hfill \square

We now show that in the last lemma we do not need to insist that $k$ be large. The following lemma has the same premises as Lemma 5.3.
Lemma 5.4. Let the premises be as in Lemma 5.3. Then for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), relevant \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( n^* \in \mathbb{N} \) the following holds: there exists \( N^* \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( n \geq N^* \) and all \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \)

\[
P \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).
\]

(21)

Proof. Let \( \varepsilon > 0, k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( n^* \in \mathbb{N} \). We shall use Lemma 5.3 (with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/2 \)) to prove (21). Let \( k_0 \) be as given in Lemma 5.3 (with \( \varepsilon/2 \)). If \( k \geq k_0 \) we may take \( N^* \) as in Lemma 5.3 and we are done; so we may assume that \( k < k_0 \). Let

\[
\mu = \min_{n_i \leq n^*} \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i)
\]

(22)

where the minimum is over all \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \). By Lemma 4.2 we have \( \kappa(R_n, C) \leq s + 1 + \text{Po}(1) \). Let \( \hat{n} \) be sufficiently large that (i) \( \mathbb{P}(\kappa(R_n, C) > \hat{n}) \leq (\varepsilon/2) \mu \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), and (ii) \( \prod_{i=k+1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq \hat{n}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2) \). Let \( N^* \) be as given by Lemma 5.3 with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/2 \), \( k = k_0 \) and \( n^* \) replaced by \( \hat{n} \).

Let \( n \geq N^* \), and let \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \). By summing in (20) over all \( 0 \leq n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_{k_0} \leq \hat{n} \) we obtain

\[
P \left( \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \land \left( \bigwedge_{i=k+1}^{k_0} \kappa(R_n, H_i) \leq \hat{n} \right) \right) = (1 \pm \varepsilon/2) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i) \prod_{i=k+1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq \hat{n}).
\]

Hence

\[
P \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)^2 \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i)
\]

\[
\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i);
\]

and

\[
P \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i) + \mathbb{P}(\kappa(R_n, C) > \hat{n})
\]

\[
\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i = n_i).
\]

Thus (21) holds, as required. \[\square\]

Lemma 5.5. Let the premises be as in Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. Let \( C(x) \) be the exponential generating function for \( C \). Then \( C(\rho) \leq 1 \).
Proof. We may assume that $C$ is non-empty. Fix a relevant $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $X_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.4, $X_n$ converges in distribution to $Y$, where $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i$ and $Y \sim \text{Po}(\lambda)$. Hence for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{E}[(X_n)_{(t)}] \geq \text{E}[Y_{(t)}] = \lambda^t.$$ 

By Lemma 4.2, $X_n \leq \kappa(R_n, C) \leq Z$ where $Z \sim 1 + \text{Po}(1)$; and so for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\text{E}[(X_n)_{(t)}] \leq \text{E}[Z_{(t)}] = t + 2.$$ 

Thus $\lambda^t \leq t + 2$ for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $\lambda \leq 1$, and so $C(\rho) \leq 1$, as required.  

From Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5 we obtain the following lemma, Lemma 5.6. Note that in Lemma 5.6 we have $C(\rho) < \infty$ by Lemma 5.5 so $\text{BP}(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$ is well defined.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let the premises be as in Lemmas 5.3 to 5.5. Let $C(x)$ be the exponential generating function for $C$, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the (decomposable) class of graphs such that each component is in $C$. Then $\text{Frag}(\mathcal{R}_n, \mathcal{F})$ converges in total variation to $\text{BP}(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$ as $n \to \infty$.

This result (together with the observation involving $\mathcal{B}$ following Lemma 1.3) is used in the proof of Theorem 9 in [22].

**Proof.** Observe that the set $\mathcal{F}$ of unlabelled graphs is countable, and our random variables take values in this set. Write $F_n$ for $\text{Frag}(\mathcal{R}_n, \mathcal{F})$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and write $\text{BP}$ for $\text{BP}(\mathcal{F}, \rho)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We must show that there exists $N^*$ such that for every $A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and every $n \geq N^*$ we have

$$|\mathbb{P}(F_n \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\text{BP} \in A)| < \varepsilon.$$ 

(23)

By Lemma 4.1 (a), $\mathbb{E}[v(F_n)] = \mathbb{E}[v(\text{frag}(\mathcal{R}_n, \mathcal{F}))] < 2$. Thus there exists $n^*$ such that $\mathbb{P}(v(F_n) > n^*) < \varepsilon/2$ and $\mathbb{P}(v(\text{BP}) > n^*) < \varepsilon/2$. If $A'$ is the set of graphs $G$ in $A$ with $v(G) \leq n^*$ then

$$|\mathbb{P}(F_n \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\text{BP} \in A)| < |\mathbb{P}(F_n \in A') - \mathbb{P}(\text{BP} \in A')| + \varepsilon/2.$$ 

Thus to prove (23) it suffices to show that there exists $N^*$ such that for every subset $A$ of graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ with at most $n^*$ vertices and every $n \geq N^*$ we have

$$|\mathbb{P}(F_n \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\text{BP} \in A)| < \varepsilon/2.$$ 

(24)

List the (connected unlabelled) graphs in $\mathcal{C}$ as $H_1, H_2, \ldots$ such that $v(H_1) \leq v(H_2) \leq \cdots$. Let $k$ be the least integer such that $v(H_{k+1}) > n^*$, and let $\mu$ be as in equation (22). Given a graph $G$, let $\text{big}(G) = v(G) - \text{frag}(G)$, the order of the ‘big’ component of $G$. Since $A$ has a growth constant, and $n^*$ is fixed, there exists $N^*_0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{big}(\mathcal{R}_n) \leq n^*) \leq \varepsilon \mu/5 \quad \text{for each } n \geq N^*_0.$$
By Lemma 5.4 (with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/5 \)) there exists \( N^* \geq N_0^* \) such that for all \( n \geq N^* \) and all \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \):

\[
P \left( \wedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) = (1 \pm \varepsilon/5) \prod_{i=1}^{k} P(X_i = n_i).
\]

Each graph \( G \in A \) corresponds to a unique \( k \)-tuple \( n = (n_1, \ldots, n_k) \) with \( 0 \leq n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq n^* \). Let \( B \) be the set of \( k \)-tuples \( n \) corresponding to the graphs in \( A \). Let \( n \geq N^* \). Then

\[
P(F_n \in A) = \sum_{n \in B} P \left( \wedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right).
\]

so

\[
\left| P(F_n \in A) - \sum_{n \in B} P \left( \wedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) \right| \leq P(\text{big}(R_n) \leq n^*) \leq \varepsilon \mu/5.
\]

But

\[
\sum_{n \in B} P \left( \wedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = n_i \right) = (1 \pm \varepsilon/5) \sum_{n \in B} \prod_{i=1}^{k} P(X_i = n_i)
\]

so

\[
P(F_n \in A) = (1 \pm \varepsilon/5)^2 \sum_{n \in B} \prod_{i=1}^{k} P(X_i = n_i)
\]

\[
= (1 \pm \varepsilon/2) P(BP \in A).
\]

The inequality (24) follows, and this completes the proof.

When we add the assumption to Lemma 5.6 that the graphs in \( C \) are free in \( A \) we obtain our final lemma in this series, Lemma 5.7. This is essentially part (b) of Theorem 1.4 and thus completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. (Recall that part (a) of Theorem 1.4 was proved earlier from part (a) of Lemma 4.1.)

**Lemma 5.7.** Let the class \( A \) of graphs have a growth constant. Let \( C \) be the class of connected graphs which are free for \( A \), with exponential generating function \( C(x) \), and assume that \( C \) is non-empty (and so \( \tilde{C} \) is infinite). Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the (decomposable) class of graphs such that each component is in \( C \). Let \( R_n \in \mathcal{A} \). Then \( \text{Frag}(R_n, \mathcal{F}) \) converges in total variation to \( \text{BP}(\mathcal{F}, \rho_A) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

### 6. A general lemma

Lemma 5.2 was a key step in proving Theorem 1.4. It also yields Lemma 6.1 below, and may be useful generally when we are dealing with graphs \( H \) which have some but not all the properties of being free to \( A \). Recall that by Theorem 1.4 if \( A \) has a growth constant, and \( C \) is the class of connected graphs which are free for \( A \), with exponential generating function \( C(x) \), then

\[
P(\text{Frag}(R_n, C) = \emptyset) \to e^{-C(\rho_A)} \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\]
Lemma 6.1. Let the class \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs have a growth constant, and let \( \rho = \rho_\mathcal{A} \). Let the non-empty class \( \mathcal{C} \) of connected graphs be bridge-stable, and suppose that each graph in \( \mathcal{C} \) is bridge-flexible in \( \mathcal{A} \). For each graph \( H \in \mathcal{C} \) let \( \alpha_H = h\rho^h/\text{aut } H \) where \( h = v(H) \). Let \( C(x) \) be the exponential generating function of \( \mathcal{C} \). Let \( \mathcal{R}_n \in_u \mathcal{A} \).

(a) For every graph \( H \in \mathcal{C} \), suppose that for every \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \) we have \( \text{pend}(\mathcal{R}_n, H) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha_H n \) whp. (This holds if each graph in \( \mathcal{C} \) is addable to \( \mathcal{A} \).) Then \( C(\rho) \leq 1 \) and

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{Frag}(\mathcal{R}_n, \mathcal{C}) = \emptyset) \leq e^{-C(\rho)}.
\]

(b) For every graph \( H \in \mathcal{C} \), suppose that for every \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \) we have \( \text{pend}(\mathcal{R}_n, H) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\alpha_H n \) whp. (This holds if each graph in \( \mathcal{C} \) is detachable from \( \mathcal{A} \).) Then \( C(\rho) \leq 1 \) and

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{Frag}(\mathcal{R}_n, \mathcal{C}) = \emptyset) \geq e^{-C(\rho)}.
\]

Lemma 6.1 is used in the investigations in [22] of classes of graphs embeddable in order-dependent surfaces: in particular, Theorem 2 (a) of [22] uses Lemma 6.1 (a). Throughout the proof of Lemma 6.1 we shall use Lemma 5.2 and its notation, much as in the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Proof of part (a). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Let \( k_0 \) be as in Lemma 5.2 (a), and let \( k \geq k_0 \) (think of \( k \) as large). By taking appropriate sums in inequality (14) (with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/2 \)) we see that the following holds. For every \( n^* \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists \( N^* \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( n \geq N^* \),

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) \leq n^* \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2) \mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq n^*). \]

Choose \( n^* \) sufficiently large that \( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq n^*) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/2 \). Let \( N^* \) be as above. Then for \( n \geq N^* \), by the last inequality (and noting that \( (1 - \varepsilon/2)^2 \geq 1 - \varepsilon \)) we have

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) \leq n^* \right) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) e^{\sigma_k},
\]

so

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1} e^{-\sigma_k}.
\]

But by inequality (19),

\[
1/e \leq \mathbb{P}\left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0 \right)
\]

for all \( n > v(H_k) \). Hence \( \sigma_k \) tends to a limit at most 1 as \( k \to \infty \). Recalling that \( \sigma_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \rho h_i/\text{aut } H_i \), we see that

\[
C(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho h_i/\text{aut } H_i \leq 1.
\]
Thus
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{Frag}(R_n, C) = \emptyset) \leq e^{-C(\rho)},
\]
as required for (a).

Proof of part (b). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). By Lemma 4.1 (a) (or otherwise) there exists \( n^* \) sufficiently large that \( \mathbb{P}(\kappa(R_n, C) > n^*) < \varepsilon/4 \). By Lemma 4.1 (b) (or otherwise) there exists \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) which is relevant (so there is a graph \( H_k \)) and sufficiently large that
\[
\mathbb{P}(\text{Frag}(R_n, H_i) > 0 \text{ for some } i > k) < \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
By taking appropriate sums in inequality (16) (with \( \varepsilon \) replaced by \( \varepsilon/4 \)) we see that the following holds. There exists \( N^* \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( n \geq N^* \),
\[
\mathbb{P}\left(\wedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) \leq n^*\right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon/4) \mathbb{P}\left(\wedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0\right) e^{\sigma_k} \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq n^*) \leq (1 + \varepsilon/4) \mathbb{P}\left(\wedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0\right) e^{\sigma_k}.
\]
But
\[
1 - \varepsilon/4 < \mathbb{P}(\kappa(R_n, C) \leq n^*) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\wedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) \leq n^*\right).
\]
Thus, noting that \( 1 - \varepsilon/4 \geq (1 + \varepsilon/4)(1 - \varepsilon/2) \),
\[
\mathbb{P}\left(\wedge_{i=1}^k \kappa(R_n, H_i) = 0\right) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon/4}{1 + \varepsilon/4} e^{-\sigma_k} \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2) e^{-\sigma_k} \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2) e^{-C(\rho)}.
\]
Hence
\[
\mathbb{P}(\text{Frag}(R_n, C) = \emptyset) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2) e^{-C(\rho)} - \varepsilon/2 \geq e^{-C(\rho)} - \varepsilon.
\]
This completes the proof of part (b).

7. Concluding Remarks

We investigated random graphs \( R_n \) sampled uniformly from a structured class \( \mathcal{A} \) of graphs, such as the class \( \mathcal{E}^S \) of graphs embeddable in a given surface \( S \). We sharpened results on pendant appearances in \( R_n \) when the class has a growth constant (or at least a finite non-zero radius of convergence) to give the correct constants, and deduced results concerning the fragment of \( R_n \), for example in Theorem 1.4 giving the asymptotic distribution for the free components. We also extended the results on pendant appearances to the more general notion of vertex- pendant appearances.
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