

Hag - Random

Recall the min. degree graph process:

$Y_i(t)$: # of vertices of degree i in G_t

$H_t := (G_0, \dots, G_t)$: History up to step t

We showed last class:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t+1) - Y_i(t) | H_t) &= -\delta_{i0} + \delta_{i1} + \frac{Y_{i+1}(t) - Y_i(t)}{n-1} \\ &= -\delta_{i0} + \delta_{i1} + \frac{Y_{i+1}(t) - Y_i(t)}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

(By setting $Y_{-1}(t) = 0$)

Let $Z'_i = -\delta_{i0} + \delta_{i1} + Z_{i+1} - Z_i$ for every $i \geq 0$, with $Z_{-1}(x) = 0$ for all x ,
with initial conditions: $Z_0(0) = 1$ and $Z_i(0) = 0 \quad \forall i \geq 1$.

For $i=0$: $Z'_0 = -1 - Z_0$

which gives $Z_0(x) = 2e^{-x} - 1$.

For $i=1$: $Z'_1 = 1 + (2e^{-x} - 1) - Z_1 = 2e^{-x} - Z_1$

which gives $Z_1(x) = 2xe^{-x}$

In general, $Z_i(x) = \frac{2x^i}{i!} e^{-x}$

Theorem: Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose $0 < \epsilon < \ln 2$ fixed. Then

a.a.s.

$$Y_i(t) = n Z_i(t/n) + o(n)$$

uniformly for all $0 \leq i \leq a$ for all $0 \leq t \leq sn$.

Proof: By checking all hypotheses of DE Theorem (Exercise!).

Theorem

Fixed $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ $1 \leq l \leq a$. $Y_l: S^{n_l+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $P_l: \mathbb{R}^{a+l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

\mathcal{D} : Bounded, connected open set containing the closure of $\{(0, z_1, \dots, z_a) : P_l(Y_l(0) = z_l(n), 1 \leq l \leq a) \neq 0 \text{ for some } n\}$

(i) (Boundedness) $|Y_l(t+1) - Y_l(t)| \leq c$ for all $1 \leq l \leq a$

(ii) (Trend Hypothesis) $\mathbb{E}(Y_l(t+1) - Y_l(t) | \mathcal{H}_t) = P_l(\frac{t}{n}, \frac{Y_1(t)}{n}, \dots, \frac{Y_a(t)}{n}) + o(1)$

(iii) (Lipschitz) P_l is and Lipschitz on $\mathcal{D} \cap \{(t, z_1, \dots, z_a) : t \geq 0\}$

Then,

(a) Uniqueness and existence of the sol'n to the ODEs.

(b) For every $\epsilon > 0$, a.s. $Y_l(t) = nZ_l(t/n) + o(n)$ uniformly for all $0 \leq t \leq \sigma n$ for all $1 \leq l \leq a$, where σ is the supremum of x to which the sol of the ODEs can be extended before within a 2ϵ -distance of the boundary of \mathcal{D} .

Proof:

We are only going to prove the case where $a=1$. Let $\lambda > 0$ be specified later. Let $w = \lambda n$.

First, we prove concentration of $Y(t+w) - Y(t)$.

Assume that $(\frac{t}{n}, \frac{Y(t)}{n})$ is in 2ϵ -distance of least 2ϵ from the boundary of \mathcal{D} .

For all $k=1, \dots, w$:

$$Y(t+k) = Y(t) + O(c) \quad (\text{By (i)})$$

Hence, $(\frac{t+k}{n}, \frac{Y(t+k)}{n}) \in \mathcal{D}$ for every $k \leq w$.



Proof (cont.)

By (ii) and (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) | \mathcal{H}_k) &= f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) + o(n) \\ &= \underbrace{f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right)}_{\substack{\text{Since } Y(t_k) = Y(t) + O(k) \\ \text{from previous}}} + O\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) + o(n) \\ &\hookrightarrow f \text{ Lipschitz.} \end{aligned}$$

There exists $g(n) = o(1)$ such that

$$E(Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) | \mathcal{H}_k) \leq f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) + g(n)$$

Hence,

$$(Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) - k f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) - k g(n))_{k=0}^{\infty}$$

is a supermartingale in k w.r.t $\mathcal{H}_0, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n$

We want to check Lipschitz:

$$|Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) - (k+1) f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) - (k+1) g(n)|$$

$$= |Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) - k f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) - k g(n)| + |f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) + g(n)|$$

$$\leq \underbrace{|Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k)|}_{\leq C} + \underbrace{|f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right)|}_{\leq C'} + \underbrace{|g(n)|}_{o(n)}$$

Since Lipschitz on D

$$\leq \text{Some sufficiently large constant. (call it } \frac{C}{\alpha})$$

So, by Azuma's Inequality

$$P(Y(t_{k+1}) - Y(t_k) - \omega f\left(\frac{t_k}{n}, \frac{Y(t_k)}{n}\right) \geq \omega g(n) + C \sqrt{2\omega\alpha} | \mathcal{H}_k)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\frac{C^2 \cdot 2\omega\alpha}{2\omega\alpha^2}\right)$$

$$= e^{-\alpha}$$

Proof: Contd

The lower tail can be bounded using exactly the same argument, but using submartingale.

$$\Rightarrow \Pr(|Y(t_n) - Y(t) - \omega f(t_n, Y(t/n))| \geq \omega g(n) + c\sqrt{t_n} \mid H_t) \leq 2e^{-\alpha}.$$

(We will fix α later).

Both tails.

(So, we've shown concentration of Y)

But, we also need to show that Y follows the trajectory of I .

Next, we are going to compare $Y(t)$ with $nZ(t/n)$.

Define $k_i = i\omega$, $i=0, 1, \dots, i_0$, where $i_0 = \lceil \frac{\omega n}{\omega} \rceil$.

(k_i is the i th "~~chunk~~" ^{"check"}). \leftarrow We chunk up the function and show at each chunk, the error is small.

We will show, by induction, that:

$$\Pr(|Y(k_i) - Z(\frac{k_i}{n}) \cdot n| \geq B_i) = O(e^{-\alpha})$$

where $B_i = B_0 \left(1 + \frac{\omega}{n}\right) \left(\left(1 + \frac{B_0 \omega}{n}\right)^i - 1\right)$

and B_0, B_i are $\lambda = O(1)$ and B is a constant

Base case: $i=0$: $Z(0) = \frac{Y(0)}{n}$, so there is no error.

Induction: Assume it holds for the first i checks.

\hookrightarrow

Proof (cont)

Approximated by F

$$|Y(k_{i+1}) - z(\frac{k_{i+1}}{n}) \cdot n| = |A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4|$$

where

Approximated by derivative

$$A_1 = Y(k_i) - n \cdot z(\frac{k_i}{n})$$

$$A_2 = Y(k_{i+1}) - Y(k_i) - \omega F(\frac{k_i}{n}, \frac{Y(k_i)}{n})$$

$$A_3 = \omega Z'(\frac{k_i}{n}) + n Z(\frac{k_i}{n}) - n Z(\frac{k_{i+1}}{n})$$

$$A_4 = \omega F(\frac{k_i}{n}, \frac{Y(k_i)}{n}) - \omega Z'(\frac{k_i}{n})$$

And, we will bound each A_i to show that the sum is bounded.

By induction $|A_1| \leq B_i$ with prob $\geq 1 - O(e^{-\alpha})$

We've shown that

$$|A_2| \leq \omega g(n) + O(\sqrt{\omega \alpha}) \text{ with prob } \geq 1 - 2e^{-\alpha}$$

$$\leq C' \omega \tilde{\lambda}$$

by choosing $\alpha, \tilde{\lambda}$ such that $g(n) = O(\tilde{\lambda})$, $\tilde{\lambda} = O(\omega)$
and $\alpha = O(\omega \tilde{\lambda}^2)$.

Since Z is the solution of the ODE and F is Lipschitz:

$$|Z(\frac{k_{i+1}}{n}) - Z(\frac{k_i}{n}) - \frac{\omega}{n} Z'(\frac{k_i}{n})| \leq C'' \frac{\omega^2}{n^2} \text{ for some constant } C'' > 0.$$

By Taylor expansion.

$$\text{Thus, } |A_3| \leq C'' \frac{\omega^2}{n^2}$$

C''

Proof (cont)

Finally, for A_n

→ Induction + Lipschitz

$$|W_n| \leq \omega \left| f\left(\frac{k_i}{n}, \frac{y(k_i)}{n}\right) - f\left(\frac{k_i}{n}, z\left(\frac{k_i}{n}\right)\right) \right| \\ + \omega \left| f\left(\frac{k_i}{n}, z\left(\frac{k_i}{n}\right)\right) - z'\left(\frac{k_i}{n}\right) \right|.$$

= 0, by def'n.

$$\leq c'' \cdot \omega \left| \frac{y(k_i)}{n} - z\left(\frac{k_i}{n}\right) \right|$$

$$\leq c''' \frac{\omega}{n} \cdot B_i \quad \text{with prob} \geq 1 - O(e^{-\alpha})$$

So, with prob $\geq 1 - O(e^{-\alpha}) - O(e^{-\alpha})$
 $= 1 - O((i+1)e^{-\alpha})$

← Concentration error (A_2)

$$|y(k_{i+1}) - n z\left(\frac{k_{i+1}}{n}\right)| \leq B_{i+1}$$

by summing $\sum_{i=1}^n |A_i|$ and choosing sufficiently large B .

We still want to check that B_i is not too big!

$$B_i = B_0 \left(\tilde{\lambda} + \frac{\omega}{n} \right) \left((1 + \frac{B_0}{n})^i - 1 \right)$$

$$= \lambda \quad = B\lambda$$

$$= B_0 \left(\tilde{\lambda} + \lambda \right) \left((1 + B\lambda)^i - 1 \right).$$

$$\leq \tilde{\lambda}$$

~~since~~

since $\lambda \leq \delta(n) \leq \tilde{\lambda} = o(1)$

$$\leq B_0 (\tilde{\lambda} + \tilde{\lambda}) \left((1 + B\lambda)^i - 1 \right)$$

$$= 2B_0 \tilde{\lambda} \left((1 + B\lambda)^i - 1 \right)$$

$$\leq e^{B\lambda i} = e^{B\lambda \frac{\omega}{n}} = e^{B\lambda \tilde{\lambda}} = e^{B\tilde{\lambda}^2} = o(1)$$

$$= o(n)$$

(We will finish the rest on Monday!).