Logical Limit Laws for Layered Permutations and Related Structures

Matthew Kukla
(Joint with Samuel Braunfeld)

University of Maryland, College Park

February 2022

Overview

1. Introduction
2. Convex linear orders
3. Uniform interdefinability
4. Layered permutations
5. Compositions

1 Introduction

2 Convex linear orders

3 Uniform interdefinability

4 Layered permutations

5 Compositions

Introduction: zero-one laws

Definition

A class C of structures in some first-order language admits a *zero-one law if, for any sentence φ, the probability that a randomly selected C-structure of size n satisfies φ converges asymptotically to zero or one as n $\to \infty$.*

Introduction: zero-one laws

Definition

A class C of structures in some first-order language admits a *zero-one law if, for any sentence φ, the probability that a randomly selected C-structure of size n satisfies φ converges asymptotically to zero or one as n $\to \infty$.*

- Classical example: finite graphs [Glebskii et. al]

Introduction: zero-one laws

Definition

A class C of structures in some first-order language admits a *zero-one law if, for any sentence φ, the probability that a randomly selected C-structure of size n satisfies φ converges asymptotically to zero or one as n $\to \infty$.*

- Classical example: finite graphs [Glebskii et. al]
- Convergence to zero or one is a rather strict requirement

Definition

A class C of structures in some first-order language admits a *logical limit law if, for any sentence φ, the probability that a randomly selected C-structure of size n satisfies φ converges asymptotically (not necessarily to zero or one) as n $\to \infty$.*

Introduction: logical limit laws

Definition

A class C of structures in some first-order language admits a *logical limit law if, for any sentence φ, the probability that a randomly selected C-structure of size n satisfies φ converges asymptotically (not necessarily to zero or one) as $n \to \infty$.*

- "Unlabeled limit law" — class of *unlabeled* structures admits a limit law
- "Labeled limit law" — class of *labeled* structures admits a limit law

Introduction: main results

Theorem

Convex linear orders and layered permutations admit both unlabeled and labeled limit laws. Compositions admit an unlabeled limit law.

1 Introduction

2 Convex linear orders

3 Uniform interdefinability

4 Layered permutations

5 Compositions

Convex linear orders

Definition

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the language containing two binary relations: $<$ and E. A convex linear order is an $\mathcal{L}$-structure satisfying:

- $<$ is a total order on points
- E is an equivalence relation
- $x \; E \; z, x < y < z \Rightarrow z \; E \; x, y$

Sum operators

Definition

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a convex linear order. Define $\widehat{\mathfrak{C}}$ to be the convex linear order obtained by adding one additional point to the last class of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Sum operators

Definition

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a convex linear order. Define $\widehat{\mathfrak{C}}$ to be the convex linear order obtained by adding one additional point to the last class of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Definition

For convex linear orders $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$, define $\mathfrak{C} \oplus \mathfrak{D}$ as the convex linear order placing $\mathfrak{D}$ $<$-after $\mathfrak{C}$.

Constructing convex linear orders

Lemma

Every finite convex linear order containing n points can be uniquely constructed by applying $\widehat{(-)}$ and/or $- \oplus \bullet$ to $\bullet$ repeatedly.

Lemma

Every finite convex linear order containing n points can be uniquely constructed by applying $\widehat{(-)}$ and/or $- \oplus \bullet$ to $\bullet$ repeatedly.

Proof

Proceed by induction.

- Base case: $n = 1$ trivial
- When $n = 2$, two possible cases: $\mathfrak{C} \simeq \bullet \oplus \bullet$ or $\mathfrak{C} \simeq \widehat{\bullet}$
- In general: last class of $\mathfrak{C}$ contains one or more points. Apply $- \oplus \bullet$ or $\widehat{(-)}$ appropriately. $\square$

Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé games

- Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé game on two structures: back-and-forth game between players Spoiler and Duplicator in which corresponding points are marked on each structure
- In game of length k between $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, Duplicator has a winning strategy iff $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ agree on all sentences of quantifier depth at most k.
- Write $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_k \mathfrak{B}$ in this case

Lemma

Let $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{N}'$ be convex linear orders such that $\mathfrak{M} \equiv_k \mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{M}' \equiv_k \mathfrak{N}'$. The following equivalences hold:

- $\mathfrak{M} \oplus \mathfrak{M}' \equiv_k \mathfrak{N} \oplus \mathfrak{N}'$
- $\widehat{\mathfrak{M}} \equiv_k \widehat{\mathfrak{N}}$

Lemma

For a convex linear order $\mathfrak{M}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $s, t > \ell$,

$$\bigoplus_{s} \mathfrak{M} \equiv_k \bigoplus_{t} \mathfrak{M}$$

The limit law

- Labeled limit laws: count all possible structures over $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ as $n \to \infty$
- Unlabeled: count all structures *up to isomorphism*

The limit law

- Labeled limit laws: count all possible structures over $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ as $n \to \infty$
- Unlabeled: count all structures *up to isomorphism*
- Finite linearly ordered structures have no nontrivial automorphisms, hence, no distinction in this case

The limit law

General idea:

- For first-order sentence φ (with quantifier rank k), associate a Markov chain M_φ
- States of M_φ are $\equiv_k$-classes
- Probability that randomly selected structure of size n satisfies φ is probability that M_φ is in a state that satisfies φ after n transitions

For an $\equiv_k$-class C, define

$$C \oplus \bullet := [\mathfrak{M} \oplus \bullet]_{\equiv_k}$$

and

$$\widehat{C} := [\widehat{\mathfrak{M}}]_{\equiv_k}$$

The limit law

For φ an $\mathcal{L}$-sentence (with quantifier depth k), construct a Markov chain M_φ as follows:

- Starting state: $[\bullet]_{\equiv_k}$
- From any $\equiv_k$-class C, there are two possible transitions out: to $C \oplus \bullet$ or $\widehat{C}$
- Each transition probability is $1/2$

The limit law

Definition

A Markov chain M is *fully aperiodic* if there do not exist disjoint sets of M-states $P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_{d-1}$ for some $d > 1$ such that for every state in P_i, M transitions to a state in P_{i+1} with probability 1 (with P_{d-1} transitioning to P_0).

Lemma

Let M be a finite, fully aperiodic Markov chain with initial state S, and let $Pr^{n-1}(S, Q)$ denote the probability that M is in state Q after $n - 1$ steps. For any Q, $\lim_{n\to\infty} Pr^{n-1}(S, Q)$ converges.

The limit law

Theorem

M_φ is fully aperiodic for any first-order sentence φ.

Proof

Suppose M_φ were not fully aperiodic.

- There would exist disjoint sets of M_φ-states ($\equiv_k$-classes) $P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_{d-1}$ for $d > 1$ where every state in P_i, M_φ transitions to a state in P_{i+1} with probability 1 (P_{d-1} transitioning to P_0).
- Thus, for any $Q \in P_0$, $Q \oplus i\bullet$ is in P_0 iff $d \mid i$.
- By equivalence lemmas, this is not possible □

The limit law

Theorem

Convex linear orders admit a logical limit law.

Proof

Fix a first-order sentence φ, and consider M_φ.

- For each state S in M_φ, either each structure in S satisfies φ or no structures in S satisfy φ.
- Let S_φ denote the set of states in M_φ for which all structures in that state satisfy φ.
- $\widehat{(-)}$ and $- \oplus \bullet$ are well-defined on $\equiv_k$-classes, hence, moving $n-1$ steps in M_φ is equivalent to starting with any structure in the current state, applying $\widehat{(-)}$ or $- \oplus \bullet$ $n-1$ times, and taking the $\equiv_k$-class.

The limit law

Proof (continued)

- The probability that after n steps, M_φ is in a state of S_φ equals probability that uniformly randomly selected structure of size n satisfies φ
- Suffices to show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{Q \in S_\varphi} Pr^{n-1}(\bullet, Q)$ converges, which follows from Markov chain lemma $\square$

1 Introduction

2 Convex linear orders

3 Uniform interdefinability

4 Layered permutations

5 Compositions

Transfer lemmas

Fix languages $\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1$ and classes C_0, C_1 of $\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1$ structures respectively.

Lemma

Let f be a map from the set of $\mathcal{L}_0$-structures to the set of $\mathcal{L}_1$-structures, and g a map from the set of $\mathcal{L}_0$-sentences to the set of $\mathcal{L}_1$-sentences such that, for any C_0-structure $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathcal{L}_0$-sentence φ:

1. $\mathfrak{M} \models \varphi \iff f(\mathfrak{M}) \models g(\varphi)$
2. f is a bijection between C_0 and C_1 structures of size n
3. The class C_1 admits a logical limit law

Then, C_0 admits a logical limit law as well.

Uniform interdefinability

Definition

Classes C_0 and C_1 of structures (over a with a common domain of $[n]$) are said to be *uniformly interdefinable* if there exists a map $f_I : C_0 \to C_1$ (bijective on structures), along with formulae $\varphi_{R_{0,i}}, \varphi_{R_{1,i}}$ for each relation $R_{0,i}$ in $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $R_{1,i}$ in $\mathcal{L}_1$ such that, for each $\mathfrak{M}_0$ in C_0 and $\mathfrak{M}_1$ in C_1:

- $\mathfrak{M}_0 \models R_{0,i}(\bar{x}) \iff f_I(\mathfrak{M}_0) \models \varphi_{R_{0,i}}(\bar{x})$
- $\mathfrak{M}_1 \models R_{1,i}(\bar{x}) \iff f_I^{-1}(\mathfrak{M}_1) \models \varphi_{R_{1,i}}(\bar{x})$

Theorem

Let C_0, C_1 be uniformly interdefinable classes of $\mathcal{L}_0$, $\mathcal{L}_1$ structures. If C_1 admits a logical limit law, C_0 admits one as well.

Proof

Take the transfer maps f, g to be:

- $f = f_I$
- g is the map sends an $\mathcal{L}_0$-sentence to the $\mathcal{L}_1$-sentence with each ocurrence of $R_{0,i}$ replaced with $\varphi_{R_{0,i}}$

$\square$

1 Introduction

2 Convex linear orders

3 Uniform interdefinability

4 Layered permutations

5 Compositions

Layered permutations

- Permutations can be viewed as structures in the language $\mathcal{L} = \{<_1, <_2\}$ with two linear orders. The order $<_1$ gives the unpermuted order of the points (before applying the permutation) and $<_2$ describes the points in permuted order.
- *Blocks* are maximal subsets which are monotone $<_1/<_2$-intervals
- A *layered permutation* is composed of increasing blocks, each of which contains a decreasing permutation

Layered permutations



Layered permutations

Lemma

Layered permutations and ordered equivalence relations are uniformly interdefinable.

Proof

Define f_l to be the map taking blocks of a layered permutation to classes of a convex linear order, and points in an order-preserving manner. The relations $<_1$ and $<_2$ are rewritten as:

- $\varphi_{<_1} : a <_1 b \rightsquigarrow a < b$
- $\varphi_{<_2} : a <_2 b \rightsquigarrow (a\ E\ b \wedge b < a) \vee (\neg(a\ E\ b) \wedge a < b)$

$\square$

Layered permutations



Layered permutations

Theorem

Layered permutations admit a logical limit law.

Proof

Layered permutations are uniformly interdefinable with convex linear orders. Because convex linear orders admit a logical limit law, layered permutations admit one as well. $\square$

1 Introduction

2 Convex linear orders

3 Uniform interdefinability

4 Layered permutations

5 Compositions

Fractured orders

- Let $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{E, <\}$ be the language of convex linear orders
- Define $\mathcal{L}_1 = \{E, <_1, <_2\}$
- Fractured orders take a convex linear order $<$ and break it into two parts: $<_1$ *between* E-classes, and $<_2$ *within* E-classes.

Fractured orders

Definition

A *fractured order* is an $\mathcal{L}_1$-structure satisfying:

1. $<_1$, $<_2$ are partial orders
2. E is an equivalence relation
3. Distinct points a, b are $<_1$-comparable iff they **are not** E-related
4. Distinct points a, b are $<_2$-comparable iff they **are** E-related
5. $a\ E\ a'$, $a <_1 b \Rightarrow a' <_1 b$ (convexity)

We denote the class of all finite fractured orders by $\mathcal{F}$.

Fractured orders

Theorem

Fractured orders and convex linear orders are uniformly interdefinable.

Proof

Define $f_l : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{C}_0$ such that:

- $\mathfrak{M}_1 \models a\ E\ b \iff f_l(\mathfrak{M}_1) \models a\ E\ b$
- $\mathfrak{M}_1 \models a <_1 b \iff f_l(\mathfrak{M}_1) \models \neg a\ E\ b \wedge a < b$
- $\mathfrak{M}_1 \models a <_2 b \iff f_l(\mathfrak{M}_1) \models a\ E\ b \wedge a < b$

This map satisfies the requirments for uniform interdefinability. □

Reducts and limit laws

Lemma

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a language and $\mathcal{L}' \subset \mathcal{L}$. Given a class C of $\mathcal{L}$-structures which admits a logical limit law, any class C' of $\mathcal{L}'$-structures which expand uniquely to C-structures also admits a logical limit law.

Lemma

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a language and $\mathcal{L}' \subset \mathcal{L}$. Given a class C of $\mathcal{L}$-structures which admits a logical limit law, any class C' of $\mathcal{L}'$-structures which expand uniquely to C-structures also admits a logical limit law.

Proof

Construct the transfer maps *f* and *g* from earlier:

- *f* is taken to be the map sending a structure in C' to its unique expansion in C
- This expansion is unique, hence *f* is bijective on structures of size *n* for all *n*
- *g* is given by the identity map on formulas

$\square$

Compositions

- *Compositions* are structures in the reduct $\mathcal{L}_2 \subset \mathcal{L}_1$ given by $\mathcal{L}_2 = \{E, \prec_1\}$
- Order defined on equivalence classes, but not on points within each class

Compositions

Lemma

Every composition expands uniquely to a fractured order, up to isomorphism.

Proof

There is a unique way to linearly order each E-class individually. Because ordering these classes determines $<_2$, there is a unique way to define $<_2$ on any composition, expanding it to a fractured order. □

Compositions

Theorem

The class of compositions admit an unlabeled logical limit law.

Proof

The language of compositions is a reduct of the language of fractured orders, and every composition expands uniquely to a fractured order. The class of fractured orders admits a logical limit law, therefore, by the previous lemma, compositions admit a limit law as well. □

References

S. Braunfeld, M. Kukla.
Logical Limit Laws for Layered Permutations and Related Structures.
Enumerative Combinatorics and Applications **2:4** (2021).

Yu. V. Glebskii, D.I. Kogan, M.I. Liogon'kiI, V.A. Talanov.
Range and degree of realizability of formulas in the restricted predicate calculus.
Cybernetics, **5(2)**:142–154 (1969).

John Foy, Alan R. Woods.
Probabilities of sentences about two linear orderings.
Feasible Mathematics: 181-193 (1990).