

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree.

Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree. Now we need to show that the obtained tree is the same as the one that created the sequence.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree. Now we need to show that the obtained tree is the same as the one that created the sequence. In each step of computing the sequence, we can mark the deleted leaf as “finished”.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree. Now we need to show that the obtained tree is the same as the one that created the sequence. In each step of computing the sequence, we can mark the deleted leaf as “finished”. The labels that do not yet appear in the remainder of the sequence we generate are the unfinished vertices that are not leaves.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree. Now we need to show that the obtained tree is the same as the one that created the sequence. In each step of computing the sequence, we can mark the deleted leaf as “finished”. The labels that do not yet appear in the remainder of the sequence we generate are the unfinished vertices that are not leaves. Because the next leaf deleted is the least, the edge deleted in each stage of computing the sequence is precisely the edge added when constructing the graph.

Proof of Cayley's Formula

Now we show that the two operations described previously are inverses of each other.

First, we show that when we start with a sequence, we indeed produce a tree. Note that we start of the i th step with $n - i + 1$ unfinished vertices and $n - i - 1$ remaining vertices in the sequence. Therefore y can be chosen as described, and the algorithm produces a graph of order n and size $n - 1$. Each step joins two unfinished vertices and marks one of them as finished. Thus after i steps the graph has $n - i$ components, each containing exactly one unfinished vertex. The final step connects the graph thereby creating a tree. Now we need to show that the obtained tree is the same as the one that created the sequence. In each step of computing the sequence, we can mark the deleted leaf as “finished”. The labels that do not yet appear in the remainder of the sequence we generate are the unfinished vertices that are not leaves. Because the next leaf deleted is the least, the edge deleted in each stage of computing the sequence is precisely the edge added when constructing the graph. Therefore the correspondence between the sequences and labeled trees is a bijection.