

# Notes on Raney's Lemmas

Tyler Neylon

251.2015

In a 1960 paper, George Raney proved the first two lemmas below; the lemmas suppose we have a finite sequence of numbers meeting certain constraints, and provide the number of cycle shifts that contain all-positive partial sums (Raney 1960).

These notes expand on the ideas behind these lemmas. The final section of these notes discusses cyclic shifts for finite sequences of independent, uniformly random values; as far as I know, the work in that section is new.

I personally learned of these lemmas in chapter 7 of the book *Concrete Mathematics* (Knuth, Patashnik, and Graham 1998), which explores their applications to generating functions. The presentation of the lemmas here is based on the presentation in *Concrete Mathematics* rather than on Raney's original paper.

## 1 Integer sequences

**Lemma 1** Suppose  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$ , where all  $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Extend the sequence by letting  $x_{n+p} = x_p$  for  $1 \leq p \leq n$ . Then there is a unique  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , such that

$$\sum_{i=j}^{j+k-1} x_i > 0; \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

---

Intuitively, we can think of such an index  $j$  as a cyclic shift of the sequence that has partial sums that are all positive.

For example, the finite sequence  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_5 \rangle = \langle 3, -2, 4, -1, 1 \rangle$  offers  $j = 5$  as the unique shift providing  $\langle x_5, x_6 = x_1, \dots, x_9 = x_4 \rangle = \langle 1, 3, -2, 4, -5 \rangle$  with partial sums  $\langle 1, 4, 2, 6, 1 \rangle$  that are all positive.

**Definitions** Given a sequence  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ , it's useful to say that an index  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  is a *positive-sum shift* if and only if the partial sums of

$\langle x_i, \dots, x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1} \rangle$  are all positive. Since these notes focus on finite sequences, we'll implicitly use arbitrary indexes  $x_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , to refer to  $x_k$  with  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, k \equiv j \pmod{n}$ .

We'll use the subscript-free letter  $x$  to denote an entire finite sequence  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ . We'll write  $\sigma(x)$  to indicate the number of indexes of  $x$  that are positive-sum shifts.

We can now concisely state a related result proved by Raney:

**Lemma 2** *Suppose  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \ell$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $x_i \leq 1$  for all  $i$ . Then  $\sigma(x) = \ell$ ; that is, exactly  $\ell$  indexes in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  are positive-sum shifts.*

---

For example, let  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_8 \rangle = \langle -2, 1, 1, 0, -1, 1, 1, 1 \rangle$ . Then  $\sum x_i = 2$ , and  $x_2, x_6$  are the only positive-sum shifts:

shift	partial sums
$\langle x_2, \dots \rangle = \langle 1, 1, 0, -1, 1, 1, 1, -2 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2 \rangle$
$\langle x_6, \dots \rangle = \langle 1, 1, 1, -2, 1, 1, 0, -1 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 3, 2 \rangle$

Note that lemma 2 is not a strict generalization of lemma 1 as it adds the condition  $x_i \leq 1$ . This condition is necessary for lemma 2; without it we may have, for example, the one-element sequence  $x = \langle 2 \rangle$  with sum  $\ell = 2$  and  $\sigma(x) = 1$ .

Rather than proving the above two lemmas directly, we'll jump to the general case of real sequences  $x$  and prove strictly more general bounds on  $\sigma(x)$  in that context.

## 2 Real sequences

In a moment we'll prove a general guarantee that  $\sum x_i > 0 \Rightarrow \sigma(x) \geq 1$ . In the context of a sequence  $x$ , it will be useful to write  $s_i$  to denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum of  $x$ ; that is,  $s_0 = 0$ , and

$$s_i = \sum_{j=1}^i x_j, \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.$$

We can define  $s_i$  for  $i > n$  using the implicitly periodic sequence characterized by  $x_{n+i} = x_i$ .

**Property 3** *Suppose  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i > 0$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $s_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum of  $x$ , and let  $j$  be the largest index in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $s_{j-1} = \min_{0 \leq i < n} s_i$ . Then  $j$  is a positive-sum shift.*

---

**Proof** Let

$$s'_i = \sum_{k=j}^{j+i-1} x_k$$

denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum of the shifted sequence  $\langle x_j, \dots, x_{j+n-1} \rangle$ . Then, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$s'_i = s_{j+i-1} - s_{j-1} \begin{cases} > 0 \text{ (by definition of } j) & \text{when } j+i-1 < n \\ = s_n + s_{j+i-1-n} - s_{j-1} \geq s_n > 0 & \text{when } j+i-1 \geq n. \end{cases}$$

□

Now we can assume without loss of generality that any sequence of real numbers  $\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$  with  $\sum x_i > 0$  is already shifted so that all its partial sums  $s_i > 0$  for  $i > 0$ . As we'll see in the next property, this assumption allows us to provide a nice general expression for  $\sigma(x)$ . This expression depends on the set  $S(x)$ , defined as  $\{\min_{j \leq i \leq n} s_i \mid 1 \leq j \leq n\}$  for any finite sequence  $x$  with  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum  $s_i$ .

**Property 4** *Suppose that  $x$  is a finite real sequence with  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum  $s_i$ , and that  $s_i > 0$  for all  $i > 0$ . Then*

$$\sigma(x) = \#S(x) = \# \left\{ \min_{j \leq i \leq n} s_i \mid 1 \leq j \leq n \right\}. \quad (1)$$

*More specifically, an index  $j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n$  is a positive-sum shift iff*

$$s_{j-1} < s_i \quad \forall i : j \leq i \leq n. \quad (2)$$


---

**Proof** We'll start by supposing we have an index  $j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $s_{j-1} < s_i$  for all  $i$  with  $j \leq i \leq n$ ; our goal is to show that such a  $j$  must be a positive-sum shift. Our approach will be similar to the proof of property 3.

Let  $s'_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum of  $\langle x_j, \dots, x_{j+n-1} \rangle$ :

$$s'_i = \sum_{k=j}^{j+i-1} x_k.$$

Then

$$s'_i = s_{j+i-1} - s_{j-1} \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } j+i-1 \leq n, \\ = s_{j+i-1-n} + s_n - s_{j-1} > 0 & \text{if } j+i-1 > n; \end{cases}$$

the last inequality follows since  $s_{j+i-1-n} > 0$  and  $s_n > s_{j-1}$ .

On the other hand, if  $s_{j-1} \geq s_i$  for some  $i, j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$ , then  $s'_{i-j+1} = s_i - s_{j-1} \leq 0$ , so that  $j$  isn't a positive-sum shift. This completes the proof of the last part of the property.

Now let's verify that the set  $S = S(x)$  from (1) has size  $\sigma(x)$ .

Let  $j_1, \dots, j_k$  be all the positive-sum shifts with  $1 < j_i \leq n$ ; note that  $k = \sigma(x) - 1$  since the trivial shift index 1 has been excluded. Let  $T = \{s_{j_1-1}, \dots, s_{j_k-1}, s_n\}$ .

Notice that  $j = n + 1$  trivially meets condition (2); combine this with the first part of the proof to see that all elements of  $T$  meet condition (2). This guarantees that all the elements are unique, so that  $|T| = \sigma(x)$ . This also means that  $T \subset S$ . Finally, observe that, for any  $s_j \in S$ , there's a largest index  $j'$  with  $1 \leq j' \leq n$  and  $s_{j'} = s_j$ ; this index  $j'$  meets condition (2), so that  $S \subset T$ , confirming that  $|S| = |T| = \sigma(x)$ .  $\square$

Property 4 lends itself to a nice visual intuition. Consider the example sequence  $\langle 2, -1, 2, 2, -3, 2, 1, 1, -1, -2 \rangle$  of length  $n = 10$ . Below is the line graph of its partial sums, starting with  $s_0 = 0$ .



Figure 1: *Line graph of the partial sums  $s_i$  of the example sequence.*

Imagine an observer standing far to the right of the graph and looking directly to the left so they can only see along a perfectly horizontal line of sight. Below  $s_n$ , they can only see the three points  $s_0$ ,  $s_2$ , and  $s_5$ . These are exactly the partial sums meeting condition (2), so that they correspond directly to all the positive-sum shifts of  $x$ , which have indexes 1, 3, and 6.

This visual intuition — that points visible-from-the-right and below  $s_n$  correspond exactly to the positive-sum shifts — extends to any sequence meeting the suppositions of property 4.

It's now possible to prove a simple general upper and lower bound for  $\sigma(x)$  in the case that each  $x_i$  is an integer. We'll see below that these bounds provide both lemmas 1 and 2 as corollaries.

**Property 5** *Suppose we have a finite integer sequence  $x = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$  with  $s_n > 0$ . Let  $m = \max_i x_i$ . Then*

$$\lceil s_n/m \rceil \leq \sigma(x) \leq s_n.$$

**Proof idea** Here is the informal intuition behind the proof: We'll start by noticing that, for sum-positive  $x$ ,  $S(x) \subset (0, s_n]$ ; this is the basis used for the upper bound. The lower bound is based on the idea that each jump upwards from one  $s_i \in S(x)$  to the next  $s_j \in S(x)$  is limited by distance  $m$ . The smallest element in  $S(x)$  can be at most  $m$  above  $s_0 = 0$ , and the largest is necessarily  $s_n$ , so that there must be at least  $s_n/m$  elements between the extremes.

**Proof** Notice that we can work with any cyclic shift  $x'$  of  $x$  without changing  $s_n$  or  $m$ . Thus, using property 3, we can assume without loss of generality that  $s_i > 0$  for  $i > 0$ .

Next, we can bound the elements of  $S(x)$  via

$$0 < \min_{j \leq i \leq n} s_i \leq s_n$$

for all  $j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . So all elements of  $S(x)$  are in the range  $(0, s_n]$ , and are integers. Hence  $\#S(x) \leq s_n$ , completing the proof of the upper bound.

Toward the lower bound, let's suppose that  $S(x) = \{s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_k}\}$  with each  $s_{j_i}$  meeting condition (2) and  $0 < s_{j_i} < s_{j_{i+1}}$ . We know such  $s_{j_i}$  exist as they are simply those partial sums in  $s_{j_i} \in S(x)$  chosen so that  $j_i = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{k : s_k = s_{j_i}\}$ .

By our definition of  $s_{j_i}$ , we have

$$s_{j_i} = \min_{j_i \leq k \leq n} s_k \text{ and } s_{j_{i+1}} = \min_{j_{i+1} \leq k \leq n} s_k.$$

This means that

$$s_{j_{i+1}} - s_{j_i} = \min_{j_i+1 \leq k \leq n} s_k - s_{j_i} \leq s_{j_{i+1}} - s_{j_i} \leq m.$$

Note that  $s_{j_k} = s_n$  so that  $s_n - s_{j_{k-1}} \leq m \Rightarrow s_{j_{k-1}} \geq s_n - m$ . This can be extended to see that  $s_{j_{k-2}} \geq s_n - 2m$ , and in general that

$$s_{j_{k-p}} \geq s_n - pm.$$

Our definition of  $m$  gives us that  $s_{j_1} \leq m$ , so  $m \geq s_{j_1} \geq s_n - (k-1)m$ , from which we can derive that

$$1 \geq s_n/m - (k-1) \Rightarrow k \geq s_n/m \Rightarrow k \geq \lceil s_n/m \rceil;$$

the last inequality uses the fact that  $k = \sigma(x)$  is an integer. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### The Contraction Perspective

Next we'll consider a contraction operation that may shorten a sequence  $x$  while preserving  $\sigma(x)$ .

Call a sequence  $x = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$  *sum-positive* iff  $s_i > 0$  when  $i > 0$ . We'll say that a sequence  $x' = \langle x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1} \rangle$  is a *contraction* of the length- $n$  sum-positive sequence  $x$  iff there is some index  $j$  so that  $x_{j+1} \leq 0$  and, for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ,

$$x'_i = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } i < j, \\ x_i + x_{i+1} & \text{if } i = j, \text{ and} \\ x_{i+1} & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

For example.  $x' = \langle 2, -1, 2 \rangle$  is a contraction of  $x = \langle 3, -1, -1, 2 \rangle$  since the sequences are same except for the replacement of  $x_1, x_2$  by their sum as  $x'_1$ , and  $x_2 = -1 \leq 0$ . The alternative sequence  $x'' = \langle 3, -1, 1 \rangle$  is *not* a contraction as it replaces  $x_3, x_4$  with their sum  $x''_3$ , but  $x_4 = 2 > 0$ .

**Property 6** *If  $x'$  is a contraction of  $x$ , then  $x'$  is sum-positive and  $\sigma(x') = \sigma(x)$ .*

**Proof** Let  $j$  be the contracted index, so that  $x'_j = x_j + x_{j+1}$  and  $x_{j+1} \leq 0$ .

Let  $s'_i$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum of  $x'$ . Then

$$s'_i = \begin{cases} s_i & \text{if } 0 \leq i < j \\ s_{i+1} & \text{if } j \leq i \leq n-1. \end{cases}$$

So  $s'_i > 0$  for  $0 < i \leq n-1$ , making  $x'$  sum-positive.

Since  $x_{j+1} \leq 0$ ,  $s_{j+1} \leq s_j$ . This means that

$$\min_{k \leq i \leq n} s_i = \min_{k \leq i \leq n, i \neq j} s_i, \text{ and } \min_{k \leq i \leq n} s'_i = \begin{cases} \min_{k \leq i \leq n} s_i & \text{if } k < j, \text{ and} \\ \min_{k+1 \leq i \leq n} s_i & \text{if } k \geq j, \end{cases}$$

for all  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . This last equality ensures that  $S(x) = S(x')$ , so that  $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x')$  using property 4. This completes the proof.  $\square$

As long as a sum-positive sequence  $x$  has any element  $x_i \leq 0$ , we can apply a contraction to it to arrive at a shorter sequence. Thus, we can always apply a series of contractions to arrive at a sum-positive, length- $k$  sequence  $x'$  with all elements  $x'_i > 0$ . All shifts of this  $x'$  are positive-sum shifts, so that  $\sigma(x') = k$ , and thus  $\sigma(x) = k$  as well. In other words, we can find  $\sigma(x)$  by contracting  $x$  until it can be contracted no more.

To add both intuition and more detail to this process, think of any sum-positive sequence  $x$  as consisting of subsequences starting with  $x_j$  for each positive-sum shift index  $j$ . For example, suppose sequence  $x$  has positive-sum shift indexes 1, 3, and 4. Then

$$\langle x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6 \rangle = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \langle x_3 \rangle \langle x_4, x_5, x_6 \rangle.$$

Contractions effectively work within these subsequences. A contraction can never combine elements across a subsequence boundary because the first element of

any subsequence must be positive. Our last proof showed that the set  $S(x)$  is preserved by contraction. That proof also showed that the indexes  $j_1, \dots, j_k$  with  $\{s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_k}\} = S(x)$  are preserved as well, excepting a possible shift-by-one in the latter elements to account for the contraction. In other words, if an element  $x_j$  begins a subsequence before a contraction, then it will be mapped to  $x'_k$  with either  $k = j$  or  $k = j - 1$ , with  $x'_k = x_j$ , and with  $x'_k$  also acting as a positive-sum shift for  $x'$ .

The final result of any maximal series of contractions is therefore deterministic: we must arrive at exactly the sequence of sums of the original subsequences. Using our last example sequence, we may make the following series of underlined contractions:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
& \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle & \langle x_3 \rangle & \langle x_4, x_5, x_6 \rangle \\
\rightarrow & \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle & \langle x_3 \rangle & \langle \underline{x_4 + x_5}, x_6 \rangle \\
\rightarrow & \langle \underline{x_1 + x_2} \rangle & \langle x_3 \rangle & \langle x_4 + x_5, x_6 \rangle \\
\rightarrow & \langle x_1 + x_2 \rangle & \langle x_3 \rangle & \langle x_4 + \underline{x_5 + x_6} \rangle.
\end{array}$$

The final sequence has 3 positive elements, so we can't perform any more contractions. We have freedom in the order in which we execute those contractions, but the end result is independent of this order. Note that, although we've highlighted the subsequence structure here, we don't need to be aware of that structure to execute the contractions.

### 3 Random sequences

(NOTE This section is kind of messed up currently while I fix some major plot holes.)

In this section, we'll consider a finite sequence  $s = \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle$  whose elements  $s_i$  are independent random variables, each uniformly distributed in the interval  $(0, 1]$ . These are the partial sums of the sequence  $x_i = s_i - s_{i-1}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , where we define  $s_0 = 0$ . Generating  $x$  in this manner ensures it is sum-positive.

This section focuses on the question: what is the expected value of  $\sigma(x)$ ?

Notice that, if  $i \neq j$ , then  $s_i \neq s_j$  with probability 1. In the context of finding an expected value, we can thus assume without loss of generality that we're only considering sequences  $x$  with distinct partial sums  $s_i$ .

Let's use the term *n-permutation* to refer to a bijective map  $\pi : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then we can view a sequence  $s$  of distinct elements  $s_i$  as corresponding to a permutation  $\pi$  such that  $s_{\pi(i)}$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  smallest element, where  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . For example, a strictly increasing  $s$  would correspond to the permutation  $\pi$  with  $\pi(i) = i$ ; a strictly decreasing  $s$  would correspond to  $\pi$  with  $\pi(i) = n - i + 1$ .

In a moment, we'll prove that our random choice of  $s$  corresponds with a uniformly random permutation  $\pi$ . The core intuition is to notice that, for any

partial sum sequence  $s = \langle \dots s_i \dots s_j \dots \rangle$ , the new sequence with  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  swapped,  $s' = \langle \dots s_j \dots s_i \dots \rangle$ , is just as likely.

It will be useful to define a *swap of  $i$  and  $j$*  as a permutation  $\rho$  such that the distinct elements  $i, j$  in its range have  $\rho(i) = j$ ,  $\rho(j) = i$ , and for which  $\rho(k) = k$  when  $k \neq i, j$ . Given two  $n$ -permutations  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , we'll use the equivalent notations  $\pi_1(\pi_2)$  and  $\pi_1 \circ \pi_2$  to denote the composed permutation  $\pi_3$  defined by  $\pi_3(i) = \pi_1(\pi_2(i))$ .

**Claim** *Suppose we have a probability space over the set of  $n$ -permutations, and that, for any  $n$ -permutation  $\pi$  and swap  $\rho$ ,  $\text{Prob}(\pi) = \text{Prob}(\rho(\pi))$ . Then all  $n$ -permutations are equally likely in this space.*

**Proof** Let  $\rho_{ij}$  denote the swap of  $i$  and  $j$ . Then the set of swaps  $\{\rho_{ij} | 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ , when closed under composition, generates the set of all  $n$ -permutations. One way to see this is by considering the Steinhaus-Johnson-Trotter algorithm, which enumerates all  $n$ -permutations using only swap operations to move from one permutation to the next (Wikipedia 2015).

Since any pair of  $n$ -permutations  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are a finite pair of swaps apart, they must have the same probability. More formally, there must exist a finite sequence of swaps  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k$  so that  $\pi_1 = \rho_1 \circ \dots \circ \rho_k \circ \pi_2$ . Then

$$\text{Prob}(\pi_2) = \text{Prob}(\rho_k \circ \pi_2) = \dots = \text{Prob}(\rho_1 \circ \dots \circ \rho_k \circ \pi_2) = \text{Prob}(\pi_1).$$

□

The proof only depended on two key facts about the probability space on sequences  $s$ :

1. that elements  $s_i$  are distinct with probability 1, and
2. that permutation elements separated by a swap have the same probability.

In other words, the claim holds for any sequence  $s_i$  whose elements are chosen independently using the same probability distribution in which all individual elements have probability zero. Choosing  $s_i$  uniformly from  $(0, 1]$  is just one example of a probability space that meets these conditions.

---

(TODO stuff below here will be heavily edited or rewritten altogether.)

In this section, we'll consider a finite sequence  $x$  of length  $n$  whose elements  $x_i$  are independent random variables, each uniformly distributed in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ .

The partial sums of such a sequence have two interesting properties:

1. If  $i \neq j$ , then  $s_i \neq s_j$  with probability 1.



$$2. \text{Prob}(s_i > s_j) = \text{Prob}(s_i < s_j).$$

To see the first property, suppose  $i < j$  and that we're given the values of  $x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}$ . If we are about to choose a random value  $x_j \in [-1, 1]$ , then there is at most one value which could give  $s_i = s_j$ , so that the event must have probability zero.

We can verify the second property by a symmetry argument. Notice that any fixed value for  $x_i$  is as likely as its opposite value  $-x_i$ . This means that every measurable set of sequences  $X$  has the same probability as its negation  $\{-x = \langle -x_1, \dots, -x_n \rangle \mid x \in X\}$ . So the set  $\{x \mid s_i < s_j\}$  has the same probability as the set  $\{x \mid s_i > s_j\}$ .

So, almost surely,  $\text{Prob}(s_i > s_j) = \text{Prob}(s_i < s_j) = 1/2$  for any  $i, j$  with  $0 \leq i < j \leq n$ . As we'll explain in more detail below, this means that the sequence  $s = \langle s_0, \dots, s_n \rangle$ , seen as a permutation, is probabilistically equivalent to a uniformly random permutation.

(TODO argue that this means almost surely that the order of the  $s_i$  sequence is probabilistically equivalent to a uniformly random permutation. Also improve the phrasing in the last paragraph.)

TODO transition into the remark below TEMP Remove the two horizontal breaks below and these remarks (including the TODO above)

---

**Remark** Suppose we have a probability space whose elements are length- $n$  permutations, and that  $\text{Prob}(\pi(i) < \pi(j)) = 1/2$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Then all length- $n$  permutations are equally likely in this space.

**Proof** This is not actually true. Consider

1 2 3 4  
4 3 2 1

Oh, dear.  $\square$

---

So we can learn more about our random sequence  $x$  by considering what we can learn about a partial order sequence  $s$  which is directly chosen as a uniformly random permutation. The next property focuses on the expected value of  $\sigma(x)$  in this setting. It will be useful to define the  $n^{\text{th}}$  harmonic number  $H_n$  as  $\sum_{i=1}^n 1/i$ .

**Property 7** Suppose that the random length- $n$  sequence  $x$  has  $i^{\text{th}}$  partial sum  $s_i$ , that  $s_i > 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and that  $\text{Prob}(s_i > s_j) = \text{Prob}(s_j > s_i) = 1/2$  for any  $i, j$  with  $0 \leq i < j \leq n$ . Then the expected value of  $\sigma(x)$  is  $H_n$ .

This property immediately tells us that  $\sigma(x)$  averages to  $H_n$  across all  $x$  with sum  $s_n > 0$  since we can always shift  $x$  so that  $s_i > 0$  for  $i > 0$  without changing  $\sigma(x)$ . To make this even more general, we can notice that  $\text{Prob}(s_n > 0) = \text{Prob}(s_n < 0) = 1/2$ . There are zero positive-sum shifts when  $s_n < 0$ , so the average of  $\sigma(x)$  for an arbitrary length- $n$  sequence is exactly  $H_n/2$ .

**Proof of property 7** We can assume without loss of generality that  $s_i \neq s_j$  for  $i \neq j$ ; this is excluding a zero-probability case, so it doesn't affect the expected value of  $\sigma(x)$ .

We'll say that  $s_i$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  smallest partial sum iff  $j = \#\{s_k | s_k < s_i, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ . Now we can define a map  $\pi : [1, n] \rightarrow [1, n]$  so that  $s_{\pi(i)}$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  smallest partial sum. Effectively,  $\pi$  is a permutation that captures the order of the elements of  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ ;  $s_{\pi(i)} < s_{\pi(j)}$  iff  $i < j$ .

We can use the set  $S(x)$  to determine  $\sigma(x)$ . Notice that  $s_{\pi(k)} \in S(x)$  iff  $\pi(i) < \pi(k)$  for all  $i < k$ ; call this event  $e_k$ . This event is entirely determined by the order of  $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(k)$ , of which there are  $k!$  equally likely possibilities. Exactly  $1/k$  of those orderings have  $\pi(k)$  as the largest element. Thus,  $\text{Prob}(e_k) = 1/k$ .

Finally, the expected value of  $\sigma(x)$  is

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \text{Prob}(e_k) = \sum_{k=1}^n 1/k = H_n,$$

using the linearity of the expected value. This completes the proof.  $\square$

(TODO 1. Figure out the statement of the property. 2. Prove it. 3. Go back and review whatever depth of connection I want to make with uniformly random permutations. )

## References

- Knuth, Donald E., Oren Patashnik, and Ronald L. Graham. 1998. *Concrete Mathematics: A Foundation for Computer Science*. addison-wesley.
- Raney, George. 1960. "Functional Composition Patterns and Power Series Reversion." *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 94: 441–51.
- Wikipedia. 2015. "Steinhaus-Johnson-Trotter Algorithm — Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steinhaus-Johnson-Trotter\\_algorithm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steinhaus-Johnson-Trotter_algorithm).