

A surprising symmetry for the greedy independent set on Cayley trees

Alice Contat*

Abstract

We prove a surprising symmetry between the law of the size G_n of the greedy independent set on a uniform Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n of size n and that of its complement. We show that G_n has the same law as the number of vertices at even height in \mathcal{T}_n rooted at a uniform vertex. This enables us to compute the exact law of the G_n . We also give a Markovian construction of the greedy independent set, which highlights the symmetry of G_n and whose proof uses a new Markovian exploration of *rooted* Cayley trees which is of independent interest.




Figure 1: Example of the greedy independent set obtained on a tree of size 30. The labels represent the order in which vertices are inspected in the construction of the greedy independent set. The green vertices are the active vertices whereas the red vertices are the blocked vertices.

1 Introduction

An *independent* set of a graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ is a subset of vertices where no pair of vertices are connected to each other. Finding an independent set of maximal size is a notoriously difficult problem in general [15]. However, using a greedy procedure, we can construct a *maximal* (for the

*Université Paris-Saclay E-mail: alice.contat@universite-paris-saclay.fr

inclusion order) independent set by inspecting the vertices of the graph one by one in a random order, adding the current vertex and blocking its neighbours if it is not connected to any previously added vertex. More precisely, the vertices are divided in three possible statuses: the undetermined vertices \mathcal{U}_k , the active vertices \mathcal{A}_k and the blocked vertices \mathcal{B}_k . Initially, we start with $\mathcal{U}_0 = V$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}_0 = \emptyset$. At step $k \geq 1$, we choose an undetermined vertex v_k uniformly at random, change its status to active and change the status of all its undetermined neighbours to blocked. We stop at $\tau = \min\{k \geq 0, \mathcal{U}_k = \emptyset\}$. Note that at each step k , no vertices of \mathcal{A}_k are neighbors and \mathcal{A}_τ is a maximal independent set, which we call the (random) *greedy* independent set, see Figure 1.

Of course the independent set obtained by the greedy algorithm is usually not *maximum* in the sense that it does not have the maximal possible size. In the case of trees, finding an independent set of maximal size is much simpler than in general. However, from a probabilistic or combinatorial point of view the greedy independent set is still worth investigation even on (random) trees. Greedy independent sets on (random) graphs have been studied extensively with a particular focus on the proportion of vertices of the graph in the greedy independent set called the *greedy independence ratio* or *jamming constant*. Recently, Krivelevich, Mészáros, Michaeli and Shikelman [17] used Aldous' objective method [3] to prove under mild assumptions that if a sequence of random finite graphs with a root vertex chosen uniformly at random converges locally, then the sequence of their greedy independence ratios also converges in probability.

Recall that a *Cayley tree* of size n is an unrooted and unordered tree over the n labeled vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and we let \mathcal{T}_n be a random Cayley tree sampled uniformly at random among the n^{n-2} Cayley trees of size n . We shall denote by \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet the rooted tree obtained from \mathcal{T}_n by distinguishing a vertex uniformly at random. Using the local limit of \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet given by Kesten's infinite tree, Krivelevich, Mészáros, Michaeli and Shikelman [17, Section 2.3] proved the "intriguing fact" that the asymptotic greedy independence ratio of uniform Cayley trees is $1/2$. Meir and Moon proved in [18] that the size of a maximum independent set of a uniform Cayley tree concentrates around ρn where $\rho \approx 0.5671$ is the unique solution of $xe^x = 1$.

In this note we prove a much stronger, and perhaps surprising statement concerning the size of the greedy independent set on a uniform Cayley tree showing that it has (almost) the same law as that of its complement! We denote by G_n the size of the greedy independent set $|\mathcal{A}_\tau|$ on a uniform Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n and H_n the number of vertices at even height in \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet . Our first observation is that G_n has the same law as H_n , which enables us to compute the exact law of G_n .

Theorem 1. *The size G_n of the greedy independent set on \mathcal{T}_n has the same law as the number H_n of vertices at even height in \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet . As a consequence, for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(G_n = k) = \mathbb{P}(H_n = k) = \binom{n}{k} \frac{k^{n-k} (n-k)^{k-1}}{n^{n-1}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the invariance of Cayley trees under rerooting at a uniform vertex. The exact computation of the law of H_n is a consequence of a result of [14] on bi-type alternating Galton–Watson trees. This equality in distribution of G_n and H_n suggests that their common law is almost symmetric with respect to $n/2$ with a little drift caused by the root vertex.

Indeed, it follows from Theorem 1 that G_n/n converges in probability to $1/2$ (thus, recovering [17, Section 2.3]) and we also have a local central limit theorem for G_n : for all $A \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} + x\sqrt{n} \right\rfloor\right) \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(1/4)^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2 \cdot (1/4)^2}\right)$$

uniformly for $x \in [-A, A]$. We also give a ‘‘Markovian’’ construction of the greedy independent set which brings to light this symmetry of G_n .

Theorem 2. *There exists a random variable \mathcal{E}_n with values in $\{0, 1\}$ such that we have*

$$G_n \stackrel{(d)}{=} (n - G_n) + \mathcal{E}_n.$$

Moreover $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 1) \rightarrow 1/4$ as n goes to ∞ .

This symmetry between G_n and $n - G_n$ is striking because the geometry of a greedy independent set and that of its complement are totally different (see Figure 1). The main idea for the proof of Theorem 2 is to consider the underlying tree as ‘‘unknown’’ and to discover it as we build the greedy independent set. See [5, 6, 16] for similar applications of this technique for other random graph models. In our case, we develop in Section 3 a new type of Markovian explorations of uniform Cayley trees inspired by Pitman’s famous algorithm [19] but more *flexible* in the sense that we can choose which vertex to explore at each step of the procedure. By choosing the next vertex to explore as the next vertex inspected by the greedy algorithm, we connect these Markovian explorations with the construction of the greedy independent set. We expect these explorations to be applicable to a wider range of contexts, e.g. we shed new light on Aldous-Broder algorithm [4, 7] and Pitman’s construction [19] of \mathcal{T}_n using particular cases of our Markovian explorations (see Section 3). Similar explorations are used in a forthcoming work [10] on the parking process on Cayley trees.

Independent sets of edges. Instead of an independent set of vertices, we could have considered an independent set of edges or a *matching*, that is a set of edges in which no pair of elements have a vertex in common. As for the vertices, we can construct a maximal independent set of edges greedily by inspecting the edges one by one in a uniform random order, keep it if our edge set stays independent and stop once we have inspected all the edges. Denoting by M_n the number of edges kept after applying this algorithm on a uniform Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n of size n , our Markovian exploration allows us to show that M_n/n concentrates around $3/8$ and to obtain a Central Limit Theorem for M_n . We do not include the details here since this result has already been shown by Dyer, Frieze and Pittel in [12, Theorem 2] by other means.

But in the case of plane trees i.e. on rooted and ordered unlabeled trees, the invariance under rerooting at a uniform edge plays the same role as the invariance under rerooting at a uniform vertex above and enables us to compute the exact law of the size of the greedy independent set of edges. More precisely, we let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ be a uniform plane tree¹ of size n (i.e. with n vertices) and let \tilde{M}_n be the law of the size of the greedy independent set of edges obtained on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$.

¹rooted and ordered (unlabeled) tree.

Theorem 3. *The size \tilde{M}_n of the greedy independent set of edges on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ has law given by*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M}_n = k) = \frac{n}{k} \frac{\binom{n+k-2}{2k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}}{\binom{2n-2}{n-1}} = \frac{n!(n-1)!(n+k-2)!}{k!(2k-1)!(n-2k)!(2n-2)!}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. As a consequence, for all $A \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{M}_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{3} + x\sqrt{n} \right\rfloor\right) \underset{n \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(2/9)^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2 \cdot (2/9)^2}\right)$$

uniformly for $x \in [-A, A]$.

We prove this theorem at the end of Section 2.

Acknowledgments. The author is very grateful to Mireille Bousquet-Mélou, Vincent Delecroix and Philippe Duchon for enlightening discussions during the 2021 Aléa days. In particular, we are indebted to Mireille Bousquet-Mélou for first computing the law of G_n in Theorem 2. We thank Igor Kortchemski for a discussion about bicolored trees. We also thank Matthieu Jonckheere for stimulating discussions and Nicolas Curien for his constant guidance.

2 Greedy independent sets and bicolored trees

In this section, we prove Theorems 1 and 3 by relating the construction of greedy independent sets with bicolored Galton–Watson trees with alternating colors. Our main tool will be invariance of the underlying random tree with respect to rerooting at a uniform vertex or edge.

2.1 Independent set of vertices for Cayley trees.

The following lemma is well known (see for instance [2, Section 2.1]) and implies in particular the invariance of uniform Cayley tree under independent uniform relabeling of the vertices.

Lemma 1. *If \mathcal{T}_n is a Galton–Watson plane tree with $\text{Poisson}(1)$ offspring distribution conditioned to have n vertices, then the tree \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet obtained by labeling its vertices by $\{1, \dots, n\}$ uniformly at random, forgetting the planar ordering but keeping the root vertex, is a uniform rooted Cayley tree.*

In particular, if σ_n is a uniform permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ independent of \mathcal{T}_n , then the tree $\mathcal{T}_n^{\sigma_n}$ obtained by relabelling the vertex i of \mathcal{T}_n by $\sigma_n(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is still a uniform Cayley tree. In the rest of this section, we shall always consider that \mathcal{T}_n and \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet are built from \mathcal{T}_n as above.

Remark. By invariance under rerooting, the tree \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet has the same law, seen as unlabeled rooted tree, as the tree \mathcal{T}_n rooted at any deterministic vertex $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In the next section, we shall always suppose that our Cayley trees are rooted at the vertex with label n , but in this section, it is better to think of them as rooted on a uniform vertex.

We now decompose the proof of Theorem 1 in two parts. We first prove in Lemma 2 that G_n has the same law as H_n and then compute explicitly the law of H_n using bi-type alternating Galton-Watson trees in Lemma 3.

Lemma 2. *The size G_n of the greedy independent set on \mathcal{T}_n has the same law as the number H_n of vertices at even height in \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet .*

Proof. The proof of this lemma relies on Lemma 1. We will show that G_n and H_n obey the characteristic same recursive distributional equation.

Let us start with H_n . Recall that \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet is built from the conditioned Galton–Watson plane tree \mathcal{T}_n by assigning uniform labels, keeping the root vertex and forgetting about the plane ordering. If we denote by $K \geq 0$ the number of vertices of height 2 in \mathcal{T}_n , by T_1, \dots, T_K the plane trees (ordered from left to right) attached to these vertices in \mathcal{T}_n , by N_1, \dots, N_K their respective sizes (see Figure 2), then by properties of the Galton–Watson measure, conditionally on (K, N_1, \dots, N_K) , the plane rooted trees (T_1, \dots, T_K) are independent Galton–Watson plane tree with Poisson(1) offspring distribution conditioned to have sizes (N_1, \dots, N_K) . Since the number of vertices at even height in \mathcal{T}_n is just 1 (for the root vertex) plus the sum of the number of vertices at even height in every tree T_i for $1 \leq i \leq K$, it follows that

$$H_n \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 + \sum_{i=1}^K H_{N_i}^{(i)}, \quad (1)$$

where $(H_j^{(i)} : 1 \leq i, j)$ are independent variables also independent of (K, N_1, \dots, N_K) and $H_j^{(i)}$ has law H_j for every $i, j \geq 1$.




Figure 2: On the left, an illustration of the recursive equation in law for the number H_n of vertices at even height on \mathcal{T}_n . In black at the bottom, the root vertex, in white its neighbours, and the next vertices to include are the black roots in each tree T_i . On the right, an illustration of the first step of the greedy algorithm. With our coupling with \mathcal{T}_n , the first vertex that we add in the greedy independent set is the root vertex of \mathcal{T}_n (in green at the bottom and in red, its neighbours). The next vertices (in green) to inspect in each T_i are then not necessarily the root vertices of T_i .

Let us now move on to the size of the greedy independent set. By construction, it is built first by

including a uniform vertex V with label in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and blocking its neighbours (which are the vertices at distance 1 from the vertex V). We can assume that this vertex is actually the root vertex of \mathcal{T}_n^\bullet (or equivalently of \mathcal{T}_n) since it is a uniform vertex of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Using the same notation as above (see Figure 2), the crucial observation is that the greedy independent set is obtained by joining the existing root vertex of \mathcal{T}_n together with the independent sets obtained by applying the greedy algorithm on the trees T_1, \dots, T_K independently. The difference with the case of H_n above is that, in each tree T_i , the next vertex to inspect is not necessarily the root of T_i (induced by \mathcal{T}_n) but a “new” uniform vertex of T_i (see Figure 2). But by invariance of uniform Cayley trees under uniform rerooting, we still have

$$G_n \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 + \sum_{i=1}^K G_{N_i}^{(i)} \quad (2)$$

where $(G_j^{(i)} : 1 \leq i, j)$ are independent variables also independent of (K, N_1, \dots, N_K) and $G_j^{(i)}$ has law G_j for $i, j \geq 1$.

Moreover, the equations (1) and (2) characterize the law of H_n and G_n since $N_1 + \dots + N_K \leq n - 1$ almost surely. Hence G_n and H_n have the same law and we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 3. *For $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(H_n = k) = \binom{n}{k} \frac{k^{n-k} (n-k)^{k-1}}{n^{n-1}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, the variable H_n has the same law as the number of vertices at even height in a Galton–Watson tree with Poisson(1) offspring distribution conditioned to have n vertices. To compute it, we artificially introduce two types of vertices (white vertices and black vertices) and let \mathcal{T}_b be a two-type alternating Galton–Watson tree with a black root and with Poisson(1) offspring distribution (for both types of vertices), so that all vertices at even height are black and have white children, and all vertices at odd height are white and have black children. We denote by N_b (resp. N_w) the number of black (resp. white) vertices in \mathcal{T}_b . Using the result of [9] and more precisely [14, Corollary 3.4] and denoting by S_j the sum of j i.i.d. random variables with law Poisson(1) for $j \geq 1$, so that S_j has law Poisson(j), we obtain, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(H_n = k) &= \mathbb{P}(N_b = k, N_w = n - k | N_b + N_w = n) \\ &= \frac{n}{k} \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_k = n - k) \mathbb{P}(S_{n-k} = k - 1)}{\mathbb{P}(S_n = n - 1)} \\ &= \binom{n}{k} \frac{k^{n-k} (n-k)^{k-1}}{n^{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

The law of large numbers and the local central limit theorem follows by straightforward applications of Stirling’s formula.

2.2 Independent set of edges for plane trees.

As mentioned in the introduction, this construction of the greedy independent set of vertices on uniform Cayley trees, which are invariant under rerooting at a uniform vertex, suggests a similar construction for the greedy independent set of edges on uniform plane trees which are invariant under rerooting at a uniform edge. Recall that we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ a uniform plane tree of size n (i.e. with n vertices). It can be seen as a graph properly embedded in the plane with only one face of degree $2n - 2$ and rooted at the oriented edge going from the root vertex to its leftmost child (see Figure 3). The crucial observation is that if, conditionally on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$, we let \vec{e} be a uniform oriented edge of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$, then the tree $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n^{\vec{e}}$ obtained by rerooting the tree $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ at the edge \vec{e} is still a uniform plane tree.




Figure 3: On the left, a plane tree rooted at the black oriented edge. On the right, the usual representation of this plane tree rerooted at the green oriented edge.

Moreover, as uniform Cayley trees, uniform plane trees of size n can be seen as conditioned Galton–Watson trees with the appropriate offspring distribution (see for instance [2]).

Lemma 4. *A Galton–Watson plane tree with $\text{Geom}(1/2)$ offspring distribution conditioned to have n vertices is a uniform (rooted) plane tree of size n , where a random variable X has law $\text{Geom}(1/2)$ if for all $k \geq 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(X = k) = 2^{-k-1}$.*

Using this lemma and the invariance under rerooting at a uniform oriented edge, we now prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. By invariance under rerooting at a uniform oriented edge, we can assume that our greedy algorithm on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_n$ first includes the root edge, blocks its “neighbouring edges” i.e. the edges between the two endpoints of the root edge and their respective neighbours (see Figure 4, left). We denote by K_2 the number of children of the root vertex minus 1 (or number of brothers of the root edge), by K_1 the number of children of the first child of the root, and by $T_1^1, \dots, T_{K_1}^1$ and $T_1^2, \dots, T_{K_2}^2$ the trees attached to these vertices (ordered from left to right, see Figure 4), which have respective sizes $N_1^1, \dots, N_{K_1}^1$ and $N_1^2, \dots, N_{K_2}^2$. Then, conditionally on $(K_1, K_2, N_1^1, \dots, N_{K_1}^1, N_1^2, \dots, N_{K_2}^2)$, the trees $(T_1^1, \dots, T_{K_1}^1, T_1^2, \dots, T_{K_2}^2)$ are independent Galton–Watson trees with $\text{Geom}(1/2)$ offspring

distribution conditioned to have respective sizes $(N_1^1, \dots, N_{K_1}^1, N_1^2, \dots, N_{K_2}^2)$. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, we deduce that \tilde{M}_n satisfies the following recursive distributional equation

$$\tilde{M}_n \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K_1} \tilde{M}_{N_i^1}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{K_2} \tilde{M}_{N_i^2}^{(K_2+i)}, \quad (3)$$

where $(\tilde{M}_j^{(i)} : 1 \leq i, j)$ are independent variables also independent of $(K_1, K_2, N_1^1, \dots, N_{K_1}^1, N_1^2, \dots, N_{K_2}^2)$ and $\tilde{M}_j^{(i)}$ has law \tilde{M}_j for $1 \leq i, j$.

As in the proof of Theorem 1 we interpret the last recursive distributional equation using two-type Galton–Watson tree. Specifically, let \mathbb{T} be a two-type alternating Galton–Watson tree, with green and red vertices, with a green root and where the red vertices have Bernoulli of parameter $1/2$ offspring distribution and the green vertices have the law of the sum of two independent variables with law $\text{Geom}(1/2)$. We denote by N^g (resp. N^r) the number of green (resp. red) vertices in \mathbb{T} . Writing N_n^g for the number of green vertices in the tree \mathbb{T} conditioned to have $n - 1$ vertices in total, then N_n^g obeys the same recursive equation (3) as \tilde{M}_n (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: On the left, an illustration of the first step of the greedy algorithm for the independent set of edges. The first edge that we add in the independent set is the green root edge, and we block its neighbouring edges (red). The next edge to inspect is a uniform edge in each tree T_i^j , but can be taken as the root edge by invariance under rerooting. On the right, a plane tree \mathbf{t} with black vertices and with edges colored as follow: we color the root edge in green, its neighbouring edges in red and reapply the procedure in each tree by taking first the root edge (in green). Its corresponding bi-type alternating plane tree \mathbf{t}_g is obtained by considering the edge of \mathbf{t} as the vertices of \mathbf{t}_g : the children of a green vertex in \mathbf{t}_g corresponds its children followed by its brothers in \mathbf{t} , and a red vertex has a green child in \mathbf{t}_g if the red corresponding edge has (at least) a child in \mathbf{t} .

Using again [14, Corollary 3.4] and denoting by \tilde{S}_j^g the sum of j i.i.d. random variables with law $\text{Geom}(1/2)$ and \tilde{S}_j^r the sum of j i.i.d. random variables with Bernoulli law of parameter $1/2$ for

$j \geq 1$, so that \tilde{S}_j^r has binomial distribution of parameters j and $1/2$, we obtain, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{M}_n = k) &= \mathbb{P}(N^g = k, N^r = n - 1 - k | N^g + N^r = n - 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_{2k}^g = n - 1 - k) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_{n-1-k}^r = k - 1)}{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_n^g = n - 1)} \\ &= \frac{n}{k} \frac{\binom{n+k-2}{2k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}}{\binom{2n-2}{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Markovian explorations of a rooted tree

In this section, we introduce the Markovian explorations of Cayley trees which we will use to prove the symmetry of the law of G_n (Theorem 2) and which we shall call “peeling explorations” by analogy with the peeling process in the theory of random planar maps, see [11]. Given a Cayley tree \mathbf{t} , an *exploration* of \mathbf{t} will be a sequence of forests $(\mathbf{f}_0, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{n-1})$ starting from the forest \mathbf{f}_0 made of n isolated vertices and ending at $\mathbf{f}_{n-1} = \mathbf{t}$, such that we pass from \mathbf{f}_i to \mathbf{f}_{i+1} by adding one edge. In our setup, the edge to add at each step will be the edge linking the vertex *peeled* at step i to its parent. To do so, we thus need to root our tree \mathbf{t} by distinguishing a vertex and orienting all edges towards it. That is why in the rest of the paper (and contrary to the previous section) we will always see a Cayley tree \mathbf{t} as rooted at the vertex of index n .

Specifically, we let $\mathcal{F}^*(n, k)$ be the set of (unordered) rooted forests on labeled vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with exactly k edges where one of the tree is distinguished: in the following, the distinguished tree and its vertices are seen as being *blue* whereas the other trees and vertices are *white*, see Figure 5. We denote by $\mathcal{F}_n^* = \cup_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{F}^*(n, k)$ the set of such rooted forests on $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Below, the blue component will correspond to the component of the “real” root of the tree in our peeling exploration of rooted Cayley tree. Given a forest $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}^*(n, k)$, we say that a rooted Cayley tree \mathbf{t} *contains* \mathbf{f} if \mathbf{t} can be obtained from \mathbf{f} by adding edges between each white root of a tree and another compatible vertex i.e. a vertex contained in a different tree of \mathbf{f} . Moreover, if v_1 is the root of a white tree and v_2 is a vertex of another tree, we denote by $\mathbf{f}_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2}$ the forest obtained from \mathbf{f} by adding an edge from v_1 to v_2 and coloring the resulting component with the color of v_2 . Assume now that we have a function \mathbf{a} called the *peeling algorithm* which associates $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_n^* \setminus \mathcal{F}^*(n, n-1)$ with a white root of a tree of the forest \mathbf{f} .

Definition 1. *Let \mathbf{t} be a Cayley tree with n vertices rooted at the vertex labeled n . The peeling exploration of \mathbf{t} with algorithm \mathbf{a} is the sequence*

$$\mathbf{F}_0^{\mathbf{a}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F}_1^{\mathbf{a}} \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \mathbf{F}_{n-2}^{\mathbf{a}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{F}_{n-1}^{\mathbf{a}}$$

obtained by starting from $\mathbf{F}_0^{\mathbf{a}}$ the unique element of $\mathcal{F}^(n, 0)$ with isolated vertices, which are all white except the blue vertex n , and at step $i \geq 1$, the forest $\mathbf{F}_i^{\mathbf{a}}$ is obtained from $\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^{\mathbf{a}})$*




Figure 5: Example of a forest \mathbf{F}_{10}^a which can be obtained after 10 steps of exploration of a given tree \mathbf{t} of size 18. The edges which are still unknown are in dashed. If the vertex labeled $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_{10}^a) = 16$ is the next peeled vertex, then the next edge to add in the dashed orange edge.

as follows: if v is the parent of $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^a)$ in \mathbf{t} , then we add the vertex from $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^a)$ to v to \mathbf{F}_{i-1}^a and color the vertices of the resulting component with the color of v to obtain $\mathbf{F}_i^a = (\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^a)_{\alpha(\mathbf{F}_{i-1}^a) \rightarrow v}$.

Notice that \mathbf{F}_{n-1}^a is the tree \mathbf{t} with blue vertices, regardless of the choice of \mathbf{a} . Moreover, when $\mathbf{t} = \mathcal{T}_n$ is a uniform Cayley tree rooted at n , then the sequence $(\mathbf{F}_i^a)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$ is a Markov chain:

Proposition 1. Fix a peeling algorithm \mathbf{a} . If \mathcal{T}_n is a uniform Cayley tree of size n rooted at n , then the exploration $(\mathbf{F}_i^a)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1}$ of \mathcal{T}_n with algorithm \mathbf{a} is a Markov chain whose probability transitions are described as follows: for $i \geq 0$, conditionally on \mathbf{F}_i^a and on $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$, we denote by $m \geq 1$ the size of the connected component of $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ and by $\ell \geq 1$ the number of blue vertices in \mathbf{F}_i^a .

- For every blue vertex v , the parent of $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ is v with probability $(\ell + m)/(\ell n)$ and in that case, we add an edge from $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ to v and color the resulting component blue to obtain \mathbf{F}_{i+1}^a .
- For every white vertex v which does not belong to the component of $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$, the parent of $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ is v with probability $1/n$ and in that case we add an edge from $\alpha(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ to v to obtain \mathbf{F}_{i+1}^a .

This proposition is a direct corollary of the following lemma.

Lemma 5. If $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}^*(n, k)$ is a forest on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with k edges and $\ell \geq 1$ blue vertices (hence $n - k - 1$ white trees and a blue tree), then the number $N(\mathbf{f})$ of rooted Cayley trees containing \mathbf{f} is equal to ℓn^{n-k-2} .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Pitman in [19, Lemma 1]. We introduce the number $N^*(\mathbf{f})$ of refining sequences of \mathbf{f} , that is the number of sequences $(\mathbf{f}_j, \dots, \mathbf{f}_1)$ where $\mathbf{f}_j = \mathbf{f}$ and for $i \leq j$, the forest \mathbf{f}_i has a blue tree and $i - 1$ white trees, and \mathbf{f}_{i-1} can be obtained from \mathbf{f}_i by adding an edge as above. Any forest \mathbf{f}_j that contains a given \mathbf{f}_1 has $j - 1$ fewer edges than \mathbf{f}_1 . Hence there

are $(j-1)!$ refining sequences from \mathbf{f}_j to \mathbf{f}_1 and $N^*(\mathbf{f}_j) = (j-1)!N(\mathbf{f}_j)$. Now we prove the result on $N(\mathbf{f})$ by induction over $j-1$, the number of white trees of \mathbf{f} . When $j=1$, then $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}^*(n, k)$ is simply a blue rooted tree and the result is clear.

Suppose the result holds for some $j-1 \geq 0$. Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}^*(n, n-j-1)$ be a forest on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with $n_1 \geq 1$ blue vertices and j white trees $(\mathbf{t}_2, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{j+1})$ of size (n_2, \dots, n_{j+1}) . Then, if r_i is the root of the white tree \mathbf{t}_i ,

- for each blue vertex v_1 , by induction, there are $N^*(\mathbf{f}_{r_i \rightarrow v_1}) = (n_1 + n_i)n^{j-2}(j-2)!$ refinements of $\mathbf{f}_{r_i \rightarrow v_1}$ and there are n_1 such vertices v_1 ,
- and for each vertex v_j in a white tree \mathbf{t}_j with $i \neq j$, by induction, there are $N^*(\mathbf{f}_{r_i \rightarrow v_j}) = n_1 n^{j-2}(j-2)!$ refinements of $\mathbf{f}_{r_i \rightarrow v_j}$ and there are $n - (n_i + n_1)$ such vertices v_j .

In total, the number of refinements of \mathbf{f} is

$$N^*(\mathbf{f}) = \sum_{i=2}^j n_1(n_1 + n_i)n^{j-2}(j-2)! + (n - (n_i + n_1))n_1 n^{j-2}(j-2)! = (j-1)!n_1 n^{j-1},$$

and we get the desired result. \square

Now we can prove Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. It suffices to notice that since \mathcal{T}_n is uniform, for all $i \geq 0$, conditionally on \mathbf{F}_i^a , the tree \mathcal{T}_n is a uniform tree among those which contain \mathbf{F}_i^a . Hence, for every (compatible) vertex v ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{F}_{i+1}^a = (\mathbf{F}_i^a)_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{F}_i^a) \rightarrow v} | \mathbf{F}_i^a, \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{F}_i^a)) = \frac{|\{\mathbf{t} \text{ s.t } \mathbf{t} \text{ contains } (\mathbf{F}_i^a)_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{F}_i^a) \rightarrow v}\}|}{|\{\mathbf{t} \text{ s.t } \mathbf{t} \text{ contains } \mathbf{F}_i^a\}|}.$$

Using Lemma 5, we recognize the transition probabilities given in Proposition 1 and obtain the desired result. \square

The strength of Proposition 1 is that different peeling algorithms yield different explorations (hence different types of information) of the same underlying tree. Let us illustrate this with several examples of peeling algorithms.

Pitman's algorithm and \mathbf{a}_{unif} . A natural choice of algorithm \mathbf{a} is, given a forest \mathbf{f} , to choose a root of a white tree of \mathbf{f} uniformly at random for $\mathbf{a}_{\text{unif}}(\mathbf{f})$. This does not seem to enter our setup since \mathbf{a}_{unif} is not a deterministic function of \mathbf{f} . However we can imagine that we first condition on the randomness involved in \mathbf{a}_{unif} making it deterministic. Once \mathbf{a}_{unif} is fixed, we apply it to a random Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n , thus independent of the choice of \mathbf{a}_{unif} . The Markov chain obtained in Proposition 1 to this peeling is reminiscent of (but not identical to) Pitman's construction [19] of uniform rooted Cayley trees, which we quickly recall: Start from the forest made of the n isolated vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and at step $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, pick a vertex V_k uniformly at random and then pick a root R_k uniformly at random among the $n-k$ trees which do not contain V_k , and add the directed edge from R_k to V_k . Note that in Pitman's construction, we first pick a uniform vertex

then a uniform compatible root and the “real” root of the Cayley tree is found out only at the end of the exploration whereas in our peeling exploration with algorithm \mathbf{a}_{unif} , we first fix the root as the vertex labelled n and during the exploration we choose uniformly a root of a white tree whose parent is chosen almost uniformly among the compatible vertices.

Building branches and Aldous-Broder algorithm. Let us mention another choice of algorithm which sheds new light on Aldous-Broder’s construction [4, 7] of \mathcal{T}_n by using a random walk on the complete graph *with loops*. We assume in this paragraph that $n \geq 2$. Given a forest $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_n^*$, let $\mathbf{a}_{AB}(\mathbf{f})$ be the root of the tree which contains the white vertex with the smallest label. For example, starting at $\mathbf{F}_0^{\alpha_{AB}}$, then $\mathbf{a}_{AB}(\mathbf{F}_i^{\alpha_{AB}})$ is the root of the component of 1 until the exploration hits the blue root n . Let $T_1^{\alpha_{AB}} = \min\{i \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } 1 \text{ is a blue vertex in } F_i^{\alpha_{AB}}\}$ be the length of the first “branch” built in this exploration. Then, for $k \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1^{\alpha_{AB}} = k) = \frac{k}{n} \prod_{i=2}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right).$$

Recall now Aldous-Broder’s algorithm [4, 7] on the complete graph on n vertices, that is the graph with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and all possible edges including the loops (i, i) : Consider a random walk $(X_i : i \geq 0)$ starting at $X_0 := n$ and where the X_i ’s are i.i.d. uniform random variables on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for $i \geq 1$. We denote by $\tau_k := \inf\{i : X_i = k\} < \infty$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The walk induces the tree \mathcal{T}^{AB} which consists of the tree on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with the edges $(X_{\tau_k-1}, X_{\tau_k})$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ (we only take the edges which lead to newly discovered vertices). Consider $T_1^{AB} = \min\{i \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } X_i \in \{X_0, \dots, X_{i-1}\}\}$ the time of the first repetition of the walk $(X_i : i \geq 0)$. Then by construction, $\mathbb{P}(T_1^{AB} = 1) = 1/n$ and for $k \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1^{AB} = k) = \frac{k}{n} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) = \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{P}(T_1^{\alpha_{AB}} = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1^{AB} \neq 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_1^{\alpha_{AB}} = k).$$

We deduce that conditionally on $X_1 \neq n$, the law of the length T_1^{AB} of the first branch is identical to that of the length of the branch linking n and 1 in \mathcal{T}_n , see [1]. A similar result holds for the next branches in both constructions. This has been already observed by Camarri and Pitman in the more general context of p -trees in [8, Theorem 2]

Greedy construction. In the next section, we use a peeling algorithm (with additional decorations) tailored to the construction of the greedy independent set on \mathcal{T}_n .

4 Markovian construction of the greedy independent set

This section is devoted to the proof of symmetry of the law of G_n given in Theorem 2 which we use our Markovian exploration of Cayley trees.

4.1 Markovian construction and its transitions

Recall from the introduction the greedy algorithm: given a Cayley tree, we inspect its vertices sequentially in a uniform random order and at each step, if the considered vertex is undetermined, we change its status to active and change the status of all its undetermined neighbours to blocked. By Lemma 1, we have an invariance property of \mathcal{T}_n under independent uniform relabelling. Hence we can and will directly use the labels of \mathcal{T}_n to define the order of exploration of the greedy independent set on \mathcal{T}_n .

Recall that we rooted our tree at the vertex n . The idea here is to link the greedy construction to a peeling exploration of \mathcal{T}_n : we explore and inspect at each step a vertex and update its status and possibly *that of its parent in the tree but not these of its children*. In particular, the root n of the tree is possibly the last vertex to be considered (when it is not previously blocked).

More precisely, given the Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n rooted at n , we divide its vertices into three statuses (undetermined, active or blocked) as before and set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_0^n = \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0^n = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0^n = \emptyset.$$

Then inductively at step i , we inspect v_i the *undetermined* vertex with the smallest label and we let w_i be its parent in \mathcal{T}_n (unless $v_i = n$). Then we update their statuses as follows:

- If $v_i = n$, then the vertex n becomes active i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{i+1}^n = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^n \cup \{v_i\}$
- If w_i is undetermined, then v_i becomes active (it is taken in the greedy independent set) and w_i becomes blocked i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n \setminus \{v_i, w_i\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^n \cup \{v_i\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_i^n \cup \{w_i\}$.
- If w_i is blocked (resp. active), then v_i becomes active (resp. blocked), that is $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n \setminus \{v_i\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^n \cup \{v_i\}$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{i+1}^n = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_i^n \cup \{v_i\}$).

As before, at each step i , the set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i^n$ is an independent set and we stop the process when all vertices are active or blocked i.e. at time $\theta_n = \inf\{i \geq 0, \mathcal{U}_i^n = \emptyset\}$. It is then easy to check that the random subset $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\theta_n}^n$ is equal to the greedy independent set \mathcal{A}_τ defined in the introduction (if we inspect vertices according to their labels in the tree). The advantage of the above construction over the one of the introduction where we update the status of all neighbors of the inspected vertex is that it can be seen as a Markovian exploration of \mathcal{T}_n in the sense of the preceding section (where we additionally keep track of the status of the vertices). Indeed, it is equivalent to the peeling of \mathcal{T}_n started at the forest $\mathbf{F}_0^{\text{aGreedy}}$ made of an undetermined blue vertex with label n and $n - 1$ isolated white undetermined vertices and where at step $i + 1$, we peel the vertex

$$v_i = \min \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n := \mathbf{a}_{\text{Greedy}}(\mathbf{F}_i^{\text{aGreedy}})$$

the undetermined vertex with the smallest label and update the status of the vertices as above, see Figure 6. Recall the two possible colors for the vertices during a peeling exploration: the vertices which are in the connected component of the vertex labeled n which is “real root” of the tree are *blue* whereas the other vertices are *white*. We make the following remarks which are easily checked




Figure 6: Illustration of the possible transitions in the peeling exploration with α_{Greedy} together with the updating of the status of the vertices. The interior color represents the color of the vertices (blue or white) in the peeling exploration and the boundary color represents the status of the vertices in the greedy construction of the independent set: black for the undetermined vertices, green for the active vertices and red for the blocked vertices. The new edge which we explore (between v_i and w_i) is in dotted gray. When $v_i = n$, there is no peeling step but v_i is the last undetermined vertex and it becomes active.

by induction: with the possible exception of the vertex n , the undetermined vertices are white whereas the active or blocked vertices can be white or blue. Moreover at each step $i < \theta_n$, the forest $\mathbf{F}_i^{\alpha_{\text{Greedy}}}$ is made of white isolated undetermined vertices, white trees of size larger than 2 rooted at a blocked vertex, and a blue tree, see Figure 7.

A small caveat is that a priori the peeling exploration with algorithm α_{Greedy} is not defined after time θ_n : Generically, at that time, although the status in the greedy independent set of all vertices is known, the whole geometric structure of \mathcal{T}_n is not completely revealed since there are many white vertices in $\mathbf{F}_{\theta_n}^{\alpha_{\text{Greedy}}}$ (we never peel the blocked roots of white trees). For the sake of completeness we may continue the peeling exploration (for example by peeling the white (blocked) root of a tree with the smallest label), but we shall not use it.

We denote by $(U_i^n, A_i^n, B_i^n)_{i \geq 0}$ the number of undetermined, active and blocked vertices in the process on a uniform Cayley tree \mathcal{T}_n with the greedy peeling algorithm α_{Greedy} i.e. the size of \tilde{U}_i^n , \tilde{A}_i^n and \tilde{B}_i^n . For the active and blocked vertices, we distinguish the number of white vertices $A_i^{n,w}$ and $B_i^{n,w}$ from the number of blue vertices $A_i^{n,b}$ and $B_i^{n,b}$. Then with the notation of Theorem 2, we have $G_n = A_{\theta_n}^n$ and using (a decorated version of) Proposition 1, we see that

$$(U_i^n, A_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b}, B_i^{n,b} : 0 \geq i \geq \theta_n)$$

is a Markov chain. To describe its probability transitions, we introduce $\Delta X_i := X_{i+1} - X_i$ the




Figure 7: Illustration of a possible value of $\mathbf{F}_{10}^{\text{Greedy}}$. As in Figure 6, the interior color represents the color of the vertices in the peeling exploration and the boundary color represents the status of the vertices in the greedy construction of the independent set: black for the undetermined vertices, green for the active vertices and red for the blocked vertices. The new vertex to peel has label 12 here.

increment of a random process $(X_j : j \geq 0)$ at time $i \geq 0$. Suppose that $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n$ is not empty. On the one hand, when $n \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n$, then n is the only blue vertex in \mathbf{F}_i^a , hence $A_i^{n,b} = B_i^{n,b} = 0$. On the other hand, when $n \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n$, then $A_i^{n,b} \geq 1$ and $B_i^{n,b} \geq 1$. Note that as long as $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n$ is neither $\{n\}$ nor the emptyset \emptyset , the vertex $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{F}_i^a)$ is a white isolated vertex in \mathbf{F}_i^a . Therefore, conditionally on $(U_i^n, A_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b}, B_i^{n,b})$, the transitions of the increments of $((U_i^n, A_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b}, B_i^{n,b}) : i \geq 0)$ are given by:

If $A_i^{n,b} = B_i^{n,b} = 0$ and $U_i^n = 1$ i.e. if $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n = \{n\}$ then almost surely,

$$\Delta(U_i^n, A_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b}, B_i^{n,b}) = (-1, 0, 0, +1, 0).$$

If $A_i^{n,b} = B_i^{n,b} = 0$ and $U_i^n \geq 2$,

If $A_i^{n,b} \geq 1, B_i^{n,b} \geq 1$ and $U_i^n \geq 1$,

with prob.	$\frac{U_i^n - 2}{n}$	$\frac{A_i^{n,w}}{n}$	$\frac{B_i^{n,w}}{n}$	$\frac{2}{n}$	with prob.	$\frac{U_i^n - 1}{n}$	$\frac{A_i^{w,b}}{n}$	$\frac{B_i^{w,b}}{n}$	$\frac{A_i^{n,b}(A_i^{n,b} + B_i^{n,b} + 1)}{(A_i^{n,b} + B_i^{n,b})n}$	$\frac{B_i^{n,b}(A_i^{n,b} + B_i^{n,b} + 1)}{(A_i^{n,b} + B_i^{n,b})n}$
ΔU_i^n	-2	-1	-1	-2	ΔU_i^n	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1
$\Delta A_i^{n,w}$	+1	0	+1	0	$\Delta A_i^{n,w}$	+1	0	+1	0	0
$\Delta B_i^{n,w}$	+1	+1	0	0	$\Delta B_i^{n,w}$	+1	+1	0	0	0
$\Delta A_i^{n,b}$	0	0	0	+1	$\Delta A_i^{n,b}$	0	0	0	0	+1
$\Delta B_i^{n,b}$	0	0	0	+1	$\Delta B_i^{n,b}$	0	0	0	+1	0

4.2 Symmetry of the greedy independent set

We now prove Theorem 2 which states the symmetry between the law of $A_{\theta_n}^n$ the size of the maximal independent set obtained by the greedy algorithm and $B_{\theta_n}^n$ that of its complement. The main observation is the following lemma.

Lemma 6. For $j \geq 0$, the laws of $(A_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b})_{0 \leq i \leq j+1}$ and $(B_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,b})_{0 \leq i \leq j+1}$ are the same on the event $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i^n \neq \{n\}$ for all $i \leq j$.

Proof. Notice then that the role of $(A_i^{n,w}, A_i^{n,b})$ and that of $(B_i^{n,w}, B_i^{n,b})$ are exchangeable in the probability transitions (4) as long as $\tilde{U}_i^n \neq \{n\}$. The lemma follows. \square

Thanks to the previous lemma, we notice that conditionally on $\tilde{U}_i^n \neq \{n\}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq \theta_n$, then the size $A_{\theta_n}^n$ of the greedy independent set has the same law as that its complement $B_{\theta_n}^n$. Otherwise, if there exists $i \geq 0$ such that $\tilde{U}_i^n = \{n\}$, then this i corresponds to $\theta_n - 1$ and in that case, $A_{\theta_n-1}^n$ and $B_{\theta_n-1}^n$ have the same law and $A_{\theta_n}^n = G_n = A_{\theta_n-1}^n + 1$ and $B_{\theta_n}^n = B_{\theta_n-1}^n$. Hence, the random variable \mathcal{E}_n in Theorem 2 is the indicator function of the event $\{\exists i \geq 0, \tilde{U}_i^n = \{n\}\}$ and to prove Theorem 2, it only remains to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\exists i, \tilde{U}_i^n = \{n\}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1/4.$$

To compute the above probability and also obtain the fluctuations of G_n , we study the *fluid limit* of our system (see [13, Chapter 11]). The transition probabilities (4) in both cases point to the idea of gathering blue and white vertices and focusing only on their status. Indeed, the Markov chain $(U_i^n, A_i^n, B_i^n : i \geq 0)$ has bounded increments and for $i < \theta_n$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \Delta U_i^n \\ \Delta A_i^n \\ \Delta B_i^n \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} U_i^n \\ A_i^n \\ B_i^n \end{pmatrix} \right] - F \left(\frac{U_i^n}{n}, \frac{A_i^n}{n}, \frac{B_i^n}{n} \right) \right| \leq \frac{3}{n}, \quad \text{where } F(x, y, z) = \begin{pmatrix} -2x - y - z \\ x + z \\ x + y \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

This suggests to study the deterministic system which is solution of the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} u'(t) = -2u(t) - a(t) - b(t), & u(0) = 1, \\ a'(t) = u(t) + b(t), & a(0) = 0, \\ b'(t) = u(t) + a(t), & b(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The solution is given by

$$\begin{cases} u(t) = 2e^{-t} - 1, \\ a(t) = b(t) = 1 - e^{-t}. \end{cases}$$

In particular $t^* = \min\{t \geq 0, u(t) = 0\} = \ln(2)$ and $a(t^*) = 1/2$. We can now apply [13, Theorem 2.1 p456] to the process $X_n(t) = 1/n \cdot (U_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}^n, A_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}^n, B_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}^n)$ which starts at $X_n(0) = (1, 0, 0)$ with, using the notation of [13], the function F is given by (5) and

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{(-2,1,1)}(x, y, z) = x, \\ \beta_{(-1,0,1)}(x, y, z) = y, \\ \beta_{(-1,1,0)}(x, y, z) = z. \end{cases}$$

We obtain that at least for all $t < t^*$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left| \left(\frac{U_{\lfloor sn \rfloor}^n}{n}, \frac{A_{\lfloor sn \rfloor}^n}{n}, \frac{B_{\lfloor sn \rfloor}^n}{n} \right) - (u(s), a(s), b(s)) \right| > \varepsilon \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Since $u'(t^*) < 0$, we can apply [13, Theorem 4.1 p464] which states that the stopping time of our Markov chain also concentrates around its expected value and has Gaussian fluctuations around it:

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\theta_n}{n} - t^* \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \mathcal{N}(0, 3/4). \quad (6)$$

Hence, noting that $\mathcal{E}_n = 1$ when the vertex n stays undetermined at each step $1 \leq i \leq \theta_n - 1$, that is, with probability $1 - 2/n$ at each step, we obtain by dominated convergence that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 1) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{2}{n} \right)^{\theta_n - 1} \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} e^{-2t^*} = \frac{1}{4},$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

References

- [1] D. ALDOUS, *The continuum random tree. I*, Ann. Probab., 19 (1991), pp. 1–28.
- [2] D. ALDOUS, *The continuum random tree III*, Ann. Probab., 21 (1993), pp. 248–289.
- [3] D. ALDOUS AND J. M. STEELE, *The objective method: probabilistic combinatorial optimization and local weak convergence*, in Probability on discrete structures, vol. 110 of Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., Springer, Berlin, 2004, pp. 1–72.
- [4] D. J. ALDOUS, *The random walk construction of uniform spanning trees and uniform labelled trees*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 3 (1990), pp. 450–465.
- [5] P. BERMOLEN, M. JONCKHEERE, AND P. MOYAL, *The jamming constant of uniform random graphs*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 127 (2017), pp. 2138–2178.
- [6] G. BRIGHTWELL, S. JANSON, AND M. LUCZAK, *The greedy independent set in a random graph with given degrees*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 51 (2017), pp. 565–586.
- [7] A. Z. BRODER, *Generating random spanning trees*, in FOCS, vol. 89, Citeseer, 1989, pp. 442–447.
- [8] M. CAMARRI AND J. PITMAN, *Limit distributions and random trees derived from the birthday problem with unequal probabilities*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 5 (2000), pp. 1–18.
- [9] L. CHAUMONT AND R. LIU, *Coding multitype forests: application to the law of the total population of branching forests*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 368 (2016), pp. 2723–2747.
- [10] A. CONTAT AND N. CURIEN, *Parking on Cayley trees and Frozen Multiplicative Coalescents*, (in preparation).

- [11] N. CURIEN, *Peeling random planar maps*, *Saint-Flour course 2019*, <https://www.imo.universite-paris-saclay.fr/~curien/>.
- [12] M. DYER, A. FRIEZE, AND B. PITTEL, *The average performance of the greedy matching algorithm*, *The Annals of Applied Probability*, (1993), pp. 526–552.
- [13] S. N. ETHIER AND T. G. KURTZ, *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*, vol. 282, John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [14] V. FÉRAY AND I. KORTCHEMSKI, *The geometry of random minimal factorizations of a long cycle via biconditioned bitype random trees*, *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 1 (2018), pp. 149–226.
- [15] A. FRIEZE AND C. MCDIARMID, *Algorithmic theory of random graphs*, *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 10 (1997), pp. 5–42.
- [16] M. JONCKHEERE AND M. SÁENZ, *Asymptotic optimality of degree-greedy discovering of independent sets in configuration model graphs*, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 131 (2021), pp. 122–150.
- [17] M. KRIVELEVICH, T. MÉSZÁROS, P. MICHAELI, AND C. SHIKHELMAN, *Greedy maximal independent sets via local limits*, in *31st International Conference on Probabilistic, Combinatorial and Asymptotic Methods for the Analysis of Algorithms*, 2020.
- [18] A. MEIR AND J. W. MOON, *The expected node-independence number of random trees*, in *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, vol. 76, Elsevier, 1973, pp. 335–341.
- [19] J. PITMAN, *Coalescent random forests*, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 85 (1999), pp. 165–193.