From mafia expansion to analytic functions in percolation theory

Agelos Georgakopoulos

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Joint work with John Haslegrave,
and with Christoforos Panagiotis

A “social” network evolves in
(continuous or discrete)
time according to the following rules

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph M(λ)).

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Does the limit $M(\lambda)$ depend on the starting network?

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Does the limit $M(\lambda)$ depend on the starting network?

No! In other words,

Theorem

There is a unique random graph $M(\lambda)$ invariant under the above operation.

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Does the limit $M(\lambda)$ depend on the starting network?

No! In other words,

Theorem

There is a unique random graph $M(\lambda)$ invariant under the above operation.

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Is $M(\lambda)$ finite or infinite?

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Is $M(\lambda)$ finite or infinite?

It is finite almost surely

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Is its expected size finite or infinite?

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

Is its expected size finite or infinite?
finite in the synchronous case,
we don't know in the asynchronous case

A model for Mafia growth

- When a (Poisson) clock ticks, vertices split into two;
- When a vertex splits, each of its edges gets randomly inherited by one of its offspring (with probability 1/2);
- Moreover, a Poisson(λ)-distributed number of new edges are added between the two offspring.

Theorem (G & Haslegrave (thanks to G. Ray), 18+)

As time goes to infinity, the distribution of the component of a designated vertex converges (to a random graph $M(\lambda)$).

How does the expected size depend on λ?

The expected size of $M(\lambda)$

Let $\chi(\lambda) := \mathbb{E}(|M(\lambda)|)$

Theorem (G & Haslegrave '18+)

$$e^{c\lambda} \leq \chi(\lambda) \leq e^{e^{C\lambda}}$$

The expected size of $M(\lambda)$

Let $\chi(\lambda) := \mathbb{E}(|M(\lambda)|)$

Theorem (G & Haslegrave '18+)

$$e^{c\lambda} \leq \chi(\lambda) \leq e^{e^{C\lambda}}$$

Conjecture:

$$\chi(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{c\lambda}$$

(backed by simulations)

The expected size of $M(\lambda)$

Let $\chi(\lambda) := \mathbb{E}(|M(\lambda)|)$

Theorem (G & Haslegrave '18+)

$$e^{c\lambda} \leq \chi(\lambda) \leq e^{e^{C\lambda}}$$

Conjecture:

$$\chi(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{c\lambda}$$

(backed by simulations)

Is $\chi(\lambda)$ continuous in λ?

Percolation model



Bernoulli bond percolation on an infinite graph, i.e.

Each edge
-present with probability p,
and
-absent with probability $1 - p$
independently of other edges.

Percolation threshold:

$$p_c := \sup\{p \mid \mathbb{P}_p(\text{ component of } o \text{ is infinite }) = 0\}$$

E.g. p_c(square grid) $= 1/2$ (Harris '59 + Kesten '80)

Analyticity below p_c

$\chi(p) := \mathbb{E}_p(|C(o)|)$,

i.e. the expected size of the component of the origin o.

Theorem (Kesten '82)

$\chi(p)$ is an analytic function of p for $p \in [0, p_c)$ when G is a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Analyticity below p_c

$\chi(p) := \mathbb{E}_p(|C(o)|)$,

i.e. the expected size of the component of the origin o.

Theorem (Kesten '82)

$\chi(p)$ is an analytic function of p for $p \in [0, p_c)$ when G is a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proved by extending p and $\chi(p)$ to the complex numbers, and using classical complex analysis (Weierstrass).

Some complex analysis basics

Theorem (Weierstrass): Let $f = \sum f_n$ be a series of analytic functions which converges uniformly on each compact subset of a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Then f is analytic on Ω.

Weierstrass M-test: Let (f_n) be a sequence of functions such that there is a sequence of 'upper bounds' M_n satisfying

$$|f_n(z)| \leq M_n, \forall x \in \Omega \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum M_n < \infty.$$

Then the series $\sum f_n(x)$ converges uniformly on Ω.

Some complex analysis basics

Theorem (Weierstrass): Let $f = \sum f_n$ be a series of analytic functions which converges uniformly on each compact subset of a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Then f is analytic on Ω.

Weierstrass M-test: Let (f_n) be a sequence of functions such that there is a sequence of 'upper bounds' M_n satisfying

$$|f_n(z)| \leq M_n, \forall x \in \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \sum M_n < \infty.$$

Then the series $\sum f_n(x)$ converges uniformly on Ω.

Theorem (Aizenman & Barsky '87)

In every vertex-transitive percolation model,

$$\mathbb{P}_p(|C| > n) \leq c_p^{-n},$$

for every $p < p_c$ and some $c_p > 1$.

Conjectures on the percolation probability

$\theta(p) := \mathbb{P}_p(|C| = \infty)$,

i.e. the percolation probability.



Fig. 1.1. It is generally believed that the percolation probability $\theta(p)$ behaves roughly as indicated here. It is known, for example, that θ is infinitely differentiable except at the critical point p_c. The possibility of a jump discontinuity at p_c has not been ruled out when $d \geq 3$ but d is not too large.

$\theta(p)$ analytic?

Open problem:

Is $\theta(p)$ analytic for $p > p_c$?

Appearing in the textbooks Kesten '82, Grimmett '96, Grimmett '99.

Our results (G & Panagiotis '18+)

- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all regular trees.
  –trivial for binary tree, but what about higher degrees?

Our results (G & Panagiotis '18+)

- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all regular trees.
  –trivial for binary tree, but what about higher degrees?
- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all planar lattices. *–previously open for all graphs; C^∞ known for $\mathbb{Z}^d$*

Our results (G & Panagiotis '18+)

- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all regular trees.
  –trivial for binary tree, but what about higher degrees?
- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all planar lattices. *–previously open for all graphs; C^∞ known for $\mathbb{Z}^d$*

- n-point functions τ, τ^f analytic for $p > p_c$ on all planar lattices.
  – Braga et.al. '04 prove analyticity near $p = 1$ for $\mathbb{Z}^d$
- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for continuum percolation in $\mathbb{R}^2$.
  –asked by Last et.al '16; C^∞ known

Our results (G & Panagiotis '18+)

- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all regular trees.
  –trivial for binary tree, but what about higher degrees?
- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for all planar lattices. *–previously open for all graphs; C^∞ known for $\mathbb{Z}^d$*

- n-point functions τ, τ^f analytic for $p > p_c$ on all planar lattices.
  – Braga et.al. '04 prove analyticity near $p = 1$ for $\mathbb{Z}^d$
- $p_c = p_{\mathbb{C}}$ for continuum percolation in $\mathbb{R}^2$.
  –asked by Last et.al '16; C^∞ known

- $p_{\mathbb{C}} < 1$ for all finitely presented Cayley graphs.
  –proved for $\mathbb{Z}^d$ by Braga et.al. '02
- $p_{\mathbb{C}} < 1$ for all non-amenable graphs.
- $p_{\mathbb{C}} \leq 1/2$ for certain families of triangulations.
  – progress on questions of Benjamini & Schramm '96, and Benjamini '16.

$\theta(p)$ analytic?

Open problem:

$$\text{Is } \theta(p) \text{ analytic for } p > p_c?$$

$\theta(p)$ analytic?

Open problem:

$$\text{Is } \theta(p) \text{ analytic for } p > p_c?$$

'it is a well-known problem of debatable interest...'
–Grimmett '99

$\theta(p)$ analytic?

Open problem:

$$\text{Is } \theta(p) \text{ analytic for } p > p_c?$$

'it is a well-known problem of debatable interest...'
–Grimmett '99

'...this in not just an academic matter. For instance, there are examples of disordered systems in statistical mechanics that develop a Griffiths singularity, i.e., systems that have a phase transition point even though their free energy is a C^∞ function.'
–Braga, Proccaci & Sanchis '02

Partitions of n

Theorem (Hardy & Ramanujan 1918)

The number of partitions of the integer n is of order

$$exp(\sqrt{n}).$$

Elementary proof: [*P. Erdös, Annals of Mathematics '42*]

Separating curves in higher dimensions

Question:

Does the expected number of separating ‘surfaces’ of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ of size n surrounding o decay exponentially in n for all $p \neq p_c$?

Outlook

- Is the expected size of the asynchronous mafia finite?
- Find other mafia-type rules
- Prove $p_{\mathbb{C}} = p_c$ in higher dimensions

Further reading:

[*A. Georgakopoulos and J. Haslegrave, Percolation on an infinitely generated group*]

[*H. Duminil-Copin, Sixty years of percolation*]

[*H. Duminil-Copin & V. Tassion, A new proof of the sharpness of the phase transition for Bernoulli percolation on* $\mathbb{Z}^d$]

These slides are on-line

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission
Supporting top researchers from anywhere in the world
European Commission
Horizon 2020
European Union funding for Research & Innovation