

3.2 The series F and G on their circle of convergence

Objektyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **45 (1999)**

Heft 1-2: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **19.09.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

3.2 THE SERIES F AND G ON THEIR CIRCLE OF CONVERGENCE

In this subsection we study the singularities the series F and G may have on their circle of convergence. The smallest positive real singularity has a special importance:

DEFINITION 3.4. For a series $f(t)$ with positive coefficients, let $\rho(f)$ denote its radius of convergence. Then f is $\rho(f)$ -recurrent if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \rho(f)} f(t) = \infty .$$

Otherwise, it is $\rho(f)$ -transient.

As typical examples, $1/(\rho - t)$ is ρ -recurrent, as are all rational series; $\sqrt{\rho - t}$ is ρ -transient, while $1/\sqrt{\rho - t}$ is not.

To study the singularities of F or G , we may suppose that $\star = \dagger$; indeed in was shown in [Kes59] and [Woe83, Lemma 1] that the singularities of F and G do not depend on the choice of \star and \dagger . We make that assumption for the remainder of the subsection. We will also suppose throughout that \mathcal{X} is d -regular, that the radius of convergence of F is $1/\alpha$ and the radius of convergence of G is $1/(d\nu) = 1/\beta$.

DEFINITION 3.5. Let \mathcal{X} be a connected graph. A *proper cycle* in \mathcal{X} is a proper circuit (π_1, \dots, π_n) such that $\overline{\pi_1} \neq \pi_n$. The *proper period* p and *strong proper period* p_s are defined as follows:

$$p = \gcd\{n \mid \text{there exists a proper cycle } \pi \text{ in } \mathcal{X} \text{ with } |\pi| = n\},$$

$$p_s = \gcd\{n \mid \forall x \in V(\mathcal{X}) \text{ there exists} \\ \text{a proper cycle } \pi \text{ in } \mathcal{B}(x, n) \text{ with } |\pi| = n\},$$

where by convention the gcd of the empty set is ∞ . The graph \mathcal{X} is *strongly properly periodic* if $p = p_s$.

The *period* q and *strong period* q_s of \mathcal{X} are defined analogously with ‘proper cycle’ replaced by ‘circuit’. \mathcal{X} is *strongly periodic* if $q = q_s$.

THEOREM 3.6 (Cartwright [Car92]). *Let \mathcal{X} have proper period p and strong proper period p_s . Then the singularities of F on its circle of convergence are among the*

$$\frac{e^{2i\pi k/p_s}}{\alpha}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p_s .$$

If moreover \mathcal{X} is strongly properly periodic, the singularities of F on its circle of convergence are precisely these numbers.

Let \mathcal{X} have period q and strong period q_s . Then the singularities of G on its circle of convergence are among the

$$\frac{e^{2i\pi k/q_s}}{\beta}, \quad k = 1, \dots, q_s.$$

If moreover \mathcal{X} is strongly periodic, the singularities of G on its circle of convergence are precisely these numbers.

If \mathcal{X} is connected and non-trivial, there is a path of even length at every vertex (a sequence of bumps, for instance). All graphs are then either 2-periodic (if they are bipartite) or 1-periodic. If there is a constant N such that for all $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$ there is at x a circuit of odd length bounded by N , then \mathcal{X} is strongly 1-periodic; otherwise \mathcal{X} is strongly 2-periodic. The singularities of G on its circle of convergence are then at $1/\beta$, and also at $-1/\beta$ if \mathcal{X} is strongly periodic with period 2.

If \mathcal{X} is not strongly periodic, there may be one or two singularities on G 's circle of convergence; consider for instance the 4-regular tree, and at a vertex \star delete two or three edges replacing them by loops. The resulting graphs \mathcal{X}_2 and \mathcal{X}_3 are still 4-regular and their circuit series, as computed using (7.2), are respectively

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} G_2(t) &= \frac{3}{2 - 6t + \sqrt{1 - 12t^2}}, \\ G_3(t) &= \frac{6}{5 - 18t + \sqrt{1 - 12t^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

G_2 has singularities at $\pm 1/\sqrt{12}$ on its circle of convergence, while G_3 has only $2/7$ as singularity on its circle of convergence.

Following the proof of Corollary 3.2 above, we see that if $\beta < d$ the singularities of F on its circle of convergence are in bijection with those of G , so are at $1/\alpha$ and possibly $-1/\alpha$, if \mathcal{X} is strongly two-periodic. If $\beta = d$, though, \mathcal{X} can have any strong proper period; consider for example the cycles on length k studied in Section 7.2: they are strongly properly k -periodic.

The forthcoming simple result shows how \mathcal{X} can be approximated by finite subgraphs.

LEMMA 3.7. Let \mathcal{X} be a graph and x, y two vertices in \mathcal{X} . Let $\mathfrak{G}_{x,y}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{x,y}$ be the path series and enriched path series respectively from x to y in \mathcal{X} , and let $\mathfrak{G}_{x,y}^n$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{x,y}^n$ be the path series and enriched path series respectively from x to y in the ball $\mathcal{B}(x, n)$ (they are 0 if $y \notin \mathcal{B}(x, n)$). Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{G}_{x,y}^n = \mathfrak{G}_{x,y}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{F}_{x,y}^n = \mathfrak{F}_{x,y}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\lim \mathfrak{G}_{x,y}^n = \mathfrak{G}_{x,y}$ means that both terms are sums of paths, say A_n and A , such that the minimal length of paths in the symmetric difference $A_n \triangle A$ tends to infinity. Now the difference between $\mathfrak{G}_{x,y}^n$ and $\mathfrak{G}_{x,y}$ consists only of paths in \mathcal{X} that exit $\mathcal{B}(x, n)$, and thus have length at least $2n - \delta(x, y) \rightarrow \infty$. The same argument holds for \mathfrak{F} . \square

DEFINITION 3.8. The graph \mathcal{X} is *quasi-transitive* if $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ acts with finitely many orbits.

LEMMA 3.9. Let \mathcal{X} be a regular quasi-transitive connected graph with distinguished vertex \star , and let f_n and g_n denote respectively the number of proper circuits and circuits at \star of length n . Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n / \beta^n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n / \alpha^n = \begin{cases} 1/|\mathcal{X}| & \text{if } \mathcal{X} \text{ is finite and has odd circuits;} \\ 2/|\mathcal{X}| & \text{if } \mathcal{X} \text{ is finite} \\ & \text{and has only even circuits;} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{X} \text{ is infinite.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If \mathcal{X} is finite, then $\beta = d$, the degree of \mathcal{X} ; after a large even number of steps, a random walk starting at \star will be uniformly distributed over \mathcal{X} (or over the vertices at even distance of \star , in case all circuits have even length). A long enough walk then has probability $1/|\mathcal{X}|$ (or $2/|\mathcal{X}|$ if all circuits have even length) of being a circuit.

If \mathcal{X} is infinite, we consider two cases. If $G(1/\beta) < \infty$, i.e. G is $1/\beta$ -transient, the general term g_n/β^n of the series $G(1/\beta)$ tends to 0. If G is $1/\beta$ -recurrent, then, as \mathcal{X} is quasi-transitive, $\beta = d$ by [Woe98, Theorem 7.7]. We then approximate \mathcal{X} by the sequence of its balls of radius R , by Lemma 3.7:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_n}{\beta^n} = \lim_{R, n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_{R,n}}{d^n} = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1 \text{ or } 2)}{|\mathcal{B}(\star, R)|} = 0,$$

where we expand the circuit series of $\mathcal{B}(\star, R)$ as $\sum g_{R,n} t^n$.

The same proof holds for the f_n . Its particular case where \mathcal{X} is a Cayley graph appears in [Woe83]. \square

Note that if \mathcal{X} is not quasi-transitive, a somewhat weaker result holds [Kit98, §7.1]: if \mathcal{X} is transient or null-recurrent then the common limsup is 0. If \mathcal{X} is positive-recurrent then the limsups are normalized coefficients of \mathcal{X} 's Perron-Frobenius eigenvector. Lemma 3.9 is not true for arbitrary d -regular graphs: consider for instance the graph \mathcal{X}_3 described above. Its circuit series G_3 , given in (3.3), has radius of convergence $1/\beta = 2/7$, and one easily checks that all its coefficients g_n satisfy $g_n/\beta^n \geq 1/2$.

We obtain the following characterization of rational series:

THEOREM 3.10. *For regular quasi-transitive connected graphs \mathcal{X} , the following are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{X} is finite;
2. $G(t)$ is a rational function of t ;
3. $F(t)$ is a rational function of t , and \mathcal{X} is not an infinite tree.

Proof. By Corollary 2.7, Statement 1 implies the other two. By Corollary 2.6, and a computation on trees done in Section 7.3 to deal with the case $F(t) = 1$, Statement 2 implies 3. It remains to show that Statement 3 implies 1.

Assume that $F(t) = \sum f_n t^n$ is rational, not equal to 1. As the f_n are positive, F has a pole, of multiplicity m , at $1/\alpha$. There is then a constant $a > 0$ such that $f_n > a \binom{n}{m-1} \alpha^n$ for infinitely many values of n [GKP94, page 341]. It follows by Lemma 3.9 that $m = 1$ and the graph \mathcal{X} is finite, of cardinality at most $1/a$. \square

It is not known whether the same holds for regular, or even arbitrary connected graphs. Certainly an altogether different proof would be needed.

3.3 APPLICATION TO LANGUAGES

Let S be a finite set of cardinality d and let $\bar{\cdot}$ be an involution on S . A *word* is an element w of the free monoid S^* . A *language* is a set L of words. The language L is called *saturated* if for any $u, v \in S^*$ and $s \in S$ we have

$$uv \in L \iff us\bar{v} \in L;$$

that is to say, L is stable under insertion and deletion of subwords of the form $s\bar{s}$. The language L is called *desiccated* if no word in L contains a subword of the form $s\bar{s}$. Given a language L we may naturally construct its *saturation*