The publication of John Moon's *Counting Labelled Trees* marks yet another milestone in the history of the Canadian Mathematical Congress. It is hoped that this monograph will be the first of a continuing series.

Historically, the early publications of Congress were confined to the *Proceedings of Congresses* and shortly after that the *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*. In those first days the publication of the Canadian Journal was a large undertaking and tended to push into the background other efforts of publication. With the coming of the *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, other publications were virtually neglected. In retrospect, this is a great pity since such activities as our biennial seminars contained a large number of magnificent lecture series. Many of these appeared as mimeographed lecture notes which, besides their unattractive appearance, were available only to a few. In fact, they deserved widespread circulation and this would have been achieved if the notes had been edited and published in book form.

Congress is very fortunate in having the first book of this series written by John Moon. With impeccable scholarship, he has put together the results of an attractive subject in a highly readable form.

As president of the Canadian Mathematical Congress, I wish to congratulate Professor Moon for launching the series and setting a high standard for others to follow.

N. S. Mendelsohn
My object has been to gather together various combinatorial results on labelled trees. The basic definitions are given in the first chapter; enumerative results are presented in the next five chapters, classified according to the type of argument involved; some probabilistic problems on random trees are treated in the last chapter. Some familiarity with matrices and generating functions is presupposed, in places, but much of the exposition should be accessible to anyone who knows something about finite mathematics or probability theory.

This material was originally prepared for a series of lectures I gave at the Twelfth Biennial Seminar of the Canadian Mathematical Congress at the University of British Columbia in August, 1969. I am indebted to Professors Ronald Pyke and John J. McNamee for their invitation and encouragement.

Edmonton, Alberta
February, 1970
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1. Definitions. A graph \( G_n \) consists of a finite set of \( n \) nodes some pairs of which are joined by a single edge; we usually assume the nodes are labelled 1, 2, \ldots, \( n \) and that no edge joins a node with itself. A node and an edge are incident if the edge joins the node to another node. The degree of a node is the number of edges incident with it; an endnode of a graph is a node of degree one.

Suppose the graphs \( G_n \) and \( H_n \) have the same number of nodes. If nodes \( i \) and \( j \) of \( G_n \) are joined by an edge if and only if nodes \( i \) and \( j \) of \( H_n \) are joined by an edge, then we say \( G_n \) and \( H_n \) determine the same labelled graph; more generally, if \( G_n \) and \( H_n \) determine the same labelled graph for some relabelling of their nodes, then we say \( G_n \) and \( H_n \) are isomorphic or that they determine the same unlabelled graph. The labelled graphs with three nodes and the unlabelled graphs with four nodes are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

A path is a sequence of edges of the type \( ab, bc, cd, \ldots, im \) where each edge \( ij \) joins the nodes \( i \) and \( j \). We usually assume the nodes \( a, b, \ldots, l \) are distinct; if \( a = m \) we call the path a cycle. The length of a path or cycle is the number of edges it contains; sometimes it is convenient to consider a single node as a path of length zero. A graph is connected if every pair of nodes is joined by a path; any graph is the union of its connected components. The distance between two nodes in a connected graph is the length of any shortest path joining them.

1.2. Properties of Trees. A tree is a connected graph that has no cycles. König (1937; pp. 47–48) lists some of the early works in which the concept of a tree appears; the earliest were by Kirchhoff and von Staudt in 1847.
We shall use the following properties of a tree in what follows (these properties and others can be combined to provide at least sixteen equivalent definitions of a tree; see Anderson and Harary (1967) and Harary and Manvel (1968)).

**Lemma 1.1.** If a tree has at least two nodes, then it has at least two endnodes.

This may be proved by considering two nodes joined by one of the longest paths in the tree.

**Lemma 1.2.** If a tree has \( n \) nodes, then it has \( n - 1 \) edges.

This may be proved by induction on \( n \), using Lemma 1.1.

**Lemma 1.3.** Any two nodes of a tree are joined by a unique path.

Any two nodes of a tree must be joined by at least one path because a tree is connected; if they were joined by more than one path the tree would contain a cycle and this is impossible by definition.

**1.3. Summary.** Let \( T(n) \) denote the number of trees \( T_n \) with \( n \) labelled nodes, for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \). The formula \( T(n) = n^{n-2} \) is usually attributed to Cayley (1889). He pointed out, however, that an equivalent result was proved earlier by Borchardt (1860); this result appeared without proof in an even earlier paper by Sylvester (1857). The formula for the number of labelled trees has been rediscovered, conjectured, proved, and generalized many times. Our object here is to summarize various results of a combinatorial or probabilistic nature that are known about labelled trees and to survey the more important methods that have been used to establish these results. For additional material on these and related problems see, for example, Riordan (1958) and Knuth (1968a).
ASSOCIATING SEQUENCES

WITH TREES

2

2.1. Prüfer Sequences. Some enumeration problems for trees can be treated by associating certain sequences with trees; a useful feature of this type of argument is that various properties of the trees are reflected in the corresponding sequences.

THEOREM 2.1. If \( n \geq 3 \) there is a one-to-one correspondence between the trees \( T_n \) with \( n \) labelled nodes and the \( n^{n-2} \) sequences \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \) that can be formed from the numbers \( 1, 2, \ldots, n \).

Cayley would prove this when \( n = 5 \) by classifying the terms in a certain expansion as follows (the symbols \( a, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \) and \( \epsilon \) denote the numbers \( 1, 2, 3, 4, \) and \( 5 \) in some order):

\[
\begin{align*}
1a^3 & \quad 5 \\
(\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta + \epsilon)^3a^3\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon & = + 3a^2\beta & \quad 20 \\
& + 6a^2\beta & \quad 60 \\
& + 6a^2\gamma & \quad 60 \\
& + 125 
\end{align*}
\]

The multinomial coefficients 1, 3, and 6 show how many times these terms appear, and the numbers 5, 20, and 10 show how many terms like these can be formed with the factors \( a, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \) and \( \epsilon \). The terms of the type \( a^2\beta^2\delta\epsilon \) correspond to the trees \( T_3 \) that have a node \( \alpha \) of degree four; the terms \( a^2\beta^2\gamma\delta\epsilon \) correspond to the trees \( T_4 \) with a node \( \alpha \) of degree three joined to a node \( \beta \) of degree two; the terms \( a^2\beta^2\gamma^2\delta\epsilon \) correspond to the paths on five nodes with endnodes \( \delta \) and \( \epsilon \).

Cayley gives no explicit rule for establishing the correspondence between trees and sequences in general. He merely exhibits such a correspondence when \( n = 6 \) and remarks that "... it will be at once seen that the proof given for this particular case is applicable for any value whatever of \( n \)."

Prüfer (1918), apparently unaware of Cayley's paper, constructs the correspondence as follows. From any tree \( T_n \) remove the endnode (and its incident edge) with the smallest label to form a smaller tree \( T_{n-1} \) and let \( a_1 \) denote the (label of the) node that was joined to the removed node; repeat this process on \( T_{n-1} \) to determine \( a_2 \) and continue until only two nodes, joined by an edge, are left. The tree in Figure 4, for example, determines the sequence \( (2, 8, 6, 2, 8, 2) \). Different trees \( T_n \) determine different sequences \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \); it remains to show that each such sequence corresponds to some tree \( T_n \).

Suppose \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \) is any sequence formed from the numbers \( 1, 2, \ldots, n \). If \( b_1 \) denotes the smallest positive integer that does not occur in the sequence, let \( (c_2, \ldots, c_{n-2}) \) denote the sequence obtained from \( (a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \) by diminishing all terms larger than \( b_1 \) by one. Then \( (c_2, \ldots, c_{n-2}) \) is a sequence of length \( n - 3 \) formed from the numbers \( 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1 \) and we may assume there exists a tree \( T_{n-1} \) with nodes \( 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1 \) that corresponds to this sequence. Relabel the nodes of \( T_{n-1} \) by adding one to each label that is not less than \( b_1 \); if we introduce an \( n \)th node labelled \( b_1 \) and join it to the node labelled \( a_1 \) in \( T_{n-1} \), we obtain a tree \( T_n \) that corresponds to the original sequence \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \). This shows that Prüfer's construction provides a one-to-one correspondence between these sequences and the trees \( T_n \).

Neville (1953) gives three methods for defining a sequence corresponding to a tree (see also Knuth (1968a; p. 397)). The first is the method just described. The second differs in that if we have just removed a node \( b_1 \) that was joined to \( a_1 \), we remove \( a_1 \) next if \( a_1 \) is now an endnode; otherwise we remove the endnode with the smallest label as before. In the third method all the endnodes of the original tree are removed in the order of the size of their labels; then all the endnodes of the remaining tree are removed, and so on. The sequences \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \) are defined in terms of the nodes removed as before. The tree in Figure 4, for example, determines the sequences \( (2, 8, 6, 2, 8, 2) \) and \( (2, 8, 6, 2, 2, 2) \) if these last two methods are used. It can be shown by modifications of the argument given earlier that each sequence \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-2}) \) corresponds to some tree \( T_n \) with respect...
to these methods. (The last two methods described are not quite the same as the methods described by Neville; he would never remove the node labelled \( n \).)

It is not difficult to see that if node \( i \) of \( T_n \) has degree \( d_i \), then the number \( i \) occurs \( d_i - 1 \) times in the sequence associated with \( T_n \) (this is true no matter which of the three methods for constructing the sequence is used). Since any sequence \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \) formed from the numbers \( 1, 2, \ldots, n \) determines a tree \( T_n \), it follows that the only restriction on the \( d_i's \) is that they be positive integers and that \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_i - 1) = n - 2 \). Thus the positive integers \( (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \) form the degree sequence of some tree \( T_n \) if and only if their sum is \( 2(n - 1) \). This result apparently first appears in a paper by Senior (1951) as a special case of a more general result (see also Babler (1953), Hakimi (1962), Menon (1964), and Ramanujacharyulu (1965)). It also follows from Priifer's construction that the number of trees \( T_n \) with a given degree sequence \( (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \) is given by the multinomial coefficient

\[
\binom{n-2}{d_1-1, \ldots, d_n-1}.
\]

This formula, which was pointed out by Moon (1964, 1967a) and Riordan (1966), can be used to derive a number of other results as we shall see later. (Zarankiewicz (1946) has pointed out that if a tree has \( p \) endnodes and \( q \) nodes whose degree exceeds two, then the sum of the degrees of these latter \( q \) nodes equals \( 2(q - 1) + p \).)

### 2.2 Tree Functions

Before describing some extensions of Priifer's methods we introduce more terminology. Suppose we choose some specific node of a tree \( T_n \), say the \( n \)th node, and call it the root. There exists a unique path from any other node \( i \) to the root; if \( ij \) is the first edge in this path let \( f(i) = j \). The function \( f \) is called the tree function of \( T_n \). We could represent the function \( f \) by the directed rooted tree—sometimes called an arborescence—obtained from \( T_n \) by replacing each edge \( ij \) by an arc \( i \rightarrow j \) directed from \( i \) to \( j \), where \( j = f(i) \); each node, with the exception of the root, now has exactly one arc directed away from it. Suppose \( f \) is any function that maps \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n - 1\} \) into \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). Glicksman (1963) has shown that \( f \) is a tree function if and only if \( \{f(i) : i \in A\} \neq A \) for every non-empty subset \( A \) of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n - 1\} \). The necessity of this condition follows from the fact that a tree has no cycles; the sufficiency can be proved by constructing a tree that corresponds to \( f \) by working backwards inductively from the root.

A. Lempel, E. Palmer, and perhaps others have observed that there are \( n^{n-3} \) different trees with \( n \) unlabelled nodes and \( n - 1 \) edges labelled \( 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1 \) when \( n \geq 3 \). One way to prove this is as follows. Let \( f \) denote the tree function of a node-labelled tree \( T_n^* \); assign the label \( f \) to the edge \( ij \), where \( j = f(i) \), for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1 \). It is not difficult to see that this defines a mapping of the set of \( n^{n-2} \) node-labelled trees \( T_n^* \) onto the set of edge-labelled trees and, when \( n \geq 3 \), each edge-labelled tree is the image of \( n \) node-labelled trees. Palmer (1969) has treated similar problems for a different type of tree.

We digress a moment to mention the following problem of Riordan's, although perhaps it is not obvious that the problem has anything to do with trees. There are \( n \) parking spaces available along a street and each of \( n \) drivers, arriving consecutively, has a preferred parking space; the \( i \)th driver will park in space \( g(i) \) if it is still available when he arrives and if it is not he will park in the next unoccupied space he finds (if there is one). Every driver can find a parking space (without driving around the block) if there exists a permutation \( \pi \) of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( \pi(j) \) is the least integer greater than or equal to \( g(j) \) that is not in the set \( \{\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(j-1)\} \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). Schützenberger (1968) showed by induction that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the preference functions \( g \) in which everyone finds a parking space and the tree functions that map \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) into \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n + 1\} \). Riordan (1969) has given other more direct proofs of the fact that there are \( (n + 1)^{n-1} \) such functions \( g \).

#### 2.3. Knuth's Generalization of Priifer Sequences

A directed graph \( D \) consists of a collection of nodes some ordered pairs of which are joined by a directed edge, or arc; we say the arc \( ij \) is directed from node \( i \) to node \( j \). The graph \( D \) may contain both of the arcs \( ij \) and \( ji \) and it may contain arcs of the type \( ii \) called loops.

A graph is a spanning subgraph of a second graph if they have the same nodes and every edge (or arc) in the first graph is also in the second. When we refer to a spanning subtree of a directed graph, we shall always mean a directed rooted tree of the type described above in which each arc is directed towards the root; in particular, if the directed graph is rooted at a particular node \( x \), then the spanning subtree is to be rooted at \( x \).

If \( D \) is any directed graph with \( h \) labelled nodes and \( (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_h) \) is any composition of \( n \) into \( h \) positive integers, let \( H \) denote the graph obtained by replacing each node \( i \) of \( D \) by a set \( S_i \) of \( s_i \) nodes; the arc \( xy \) is in \( H \) if and only if \( x \) and \( y \) belong to subsets \( S_i \) and \( S_j \) such that the arc \( ij \) was in \( D \). (Notice that if \( D \) had some loops, then \( H \) also has loops.) We assume for convenience that the \( n \) nodes are labelled so that if \( i < j \) then the nodes of \( S_i \) have smaller labels than the nodes of \( S_j \). We also assume \( S_1 = 1 \) so \( S_h \) consists simply of the \( n \)th node; we think of this node as the root of both \( D \) and \( H \) although it is labelled differently in the two graphs.

Let \( \Gamma(S_i) \) denote the set of nodes \( y \) in \( H \) such that \( y \) is the terminal node
of some arc issuing from a node of $S_i$ (notice that $S_i \subseteq \Gamma(S_i)$ if the loop $ii$ is in $D$). If $f$ is the tree function of a spanning subtree of $G$ that is rooted at the $h$th node of $G$, let $f(S_i) = S_j$ if $j = f(i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, h - 1$. We shall let $|X|$ denote the number of elements in the set $X$.

The following result is a special case of a more general result due to Knuth (1968); it expresses the number $c(H)$ of spanning subtrees of $H$ (rooted at node $n$) in terms of the spanning subtrees of $D$ (rooted at node $h$).

**Theorem 2.2.** If $h \geq 2$, then

$$c(H) = \sum_f \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{h-1} |\Gamma(S_i)|^{x_i-1} \cdot |f(S_i)| \right\},$$

where the sum is over the tree functions $f$ of all spanning subtrees of $D$.

The proof involves showing there is a one-to-one correspondence between trees spanning $H$ and the ordered sets of $h - 1$ sequences of the form

$$(a(i, 1), a(i, 2), \ldots, a(i, s_i)),$$

where $a(i, j)$ is any member of $\Gamma(S_i)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, s_i - 1$, and $a(i, s_i)$ is any member of $f(S_i)$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, h - 1$, for the tree function $f$ of some spanning subtree of $D$.

Suppose the tree $T$ spans the graph $H$. We successively remove the end-nodes with the smallest labels, as before; now, however, when we remove an endnode $b$ from a subset $S_i$ we write the label of the node joined to $b$ in the next position of the $i$th sequence. When only one edge remains, joining some node of $S_n$, say, to the $n$th node, we put an $n$ in the last position of the $i$th sequence. It is clear that each term $a(i, j)$ belongs to $\Gamma(S_i)$. When the last node $b$ of $S_i$ is removed, suppose the node joined to $b$ belongs to the subset $S_j$. If we let $j = f(i)$, then it is not difficult to show, using Glicksman’s result, that the function $f$ is the tree function of a spanning subtree of $D$. Thus, every tree spanning $H$ can be associated with a set of sequences of the type described above. It can be shown by induction that there exists a spanning tree of $H$ corresponding to each such set of sequences.

Knuth’s more general result applies when $s_h \geq 1$ and one wants to determine the number of families of disjoint directed rooted trees that collectively span $H$ and whose roots constitute specified subsets of nodes of $H$; we now describe three corollaries he deduced from his theorem.

### 2.4. Special Cases.

Suppose the graph $H$ is obtained from the directed graph $D$ illustrated in Figure 5. There is only one spanning subtree of $D$

![Figure 5](image)

(rooted at the bottom node) and its arcs are $\overrightarrow{1,2}$, $\overrightarrow{2,3}$, and $\overrightarrow{3,4}$. It follows from Theorem 2.2 that there are $s_h^1 s_h^2 (s_1 + 1)^{s_h - 1}$ spanning subtrees of $H$. If we think of the bottom node as a member of $S_1$, then we can think of $H$ as having arisen from a directed 3-cycle and we can abandon the restriction $s_h = 1$. The following more general result can be proved in the same way.

**Corollary 2.2.1.** If the graph $D$ is a directed $h$-cycle and $h \geq 2$, then there are

$$s_h^{x_1-1} s_h^{x_2} \cdots s_h^{x_{h-1}}$$

spanning subtrees of $H$ that are rooted at any given node of the first subset of nodes.

Theorem 2.2 also applies when the graphs $D$ and $H$ are ordinary undirected graphs since any undirected graph $G$ can be transferred into an equivalent directed graph $D$ by replacing each edge $ij$ by the arcs $i \overrightarrow{j}$ and $j \overrightarrow{i}$. The following result, apparently proved first by Rohlickova (1966) by another method, is the analogue of Corollary 2.2.1 for ordinary undirected graphs.

**Corollary 2.2.2.** If $G$ is a cycle of length $h(\geq 2)$, then

$$c(H) = (s_h + s_h)^{x_1-1} (s_1 + s_3)^{x_2-1} \cdots (s_{h-1} + s_3)^{x_h-1} s_h s_h s_h \cdots s_h$$

$$\times ((s_1 s_2)^{-1} + (s_2 s_3)^{-1} + \cdots + (s_h s_1)^{-1}).$$

To prove this we select some node to serve as a root, treat it as though it constituted a separate subset by itself, and apply Theorem 2.2 as before; the details of the derivation are somewhat more complicated than they were in the proof of Corollary 2.2.1, however, because the root-node is joined to nodes from two other subsets of nodes of $H$ and there are more spanning subtrees to consider.

If the (undirected) graph $G$ is a tree with $h$ nodes, there is only one spanning subtree of $G$, namely $G$ itself. There is no loss of generality if we assume the $h$th node is an endnode. If we ignore the restriction $s_h = 1$ and treat some node in the $h$th subset of nodes of $H$ as a root-node constituting a separate subset by itself, we find that the formula in Theorem
2.2 can be rewritten as follows. (The result still holds even if $G$ has some loops if they are ignored in determining the degree sequence.)

**Corollary 2.2.3.** If $G$ is a tree with degree sequence $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$, then

$$c(H) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |\Gamma(S_i)|^{s_i-1} s_i!^{r_i-1}.$$ 

An $r$ by $s$ bipartite graph is a graph with $r$ "dark" nodes and $s$ "light" nodes such that every edge of the graph joins a dark node with a light node. If we let $G$ be the graph consisting of a single edge joining two nodes, then it follows from Corollary 2.2.3 (or 2.2.1) that there are $r^{s-1} s^{r-1}$ bipartite trees with $r$ labelled dark nodes and $s$ labelled light nodes. This particular result was apparently first proved by Fiedler and Sedláček (1958); we shall discuss their derivation and others later. If $(r_1, \ldots, r_s)$ and $(s_1, \ldots, s_s)$ are compositions of $r + s - 1$ into positive integers, then it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.2 that there are

$$\binom{s - 1}{r_1 - 1, \ldots, r_r - 1} \binom{r - 1}{s_1 - 1, \ldots, s_s - 1}$$

bipartite trees for which the degree sequences of the $r$ dark nodes and the $s$ light nodes are $(r_1, \ldots, r_r)$ and $(s_1, \ldots, s_s)$. This formula can be used to derive the following results of Klee and Witzgall (1967); if $s = ru + 1$ then there are $(ru + 1)^{r-1}(ru)!/(ru)!^r$ by $s$ trees in which the $r$ dark nodes all have degree $u + 1$; if $s = ru - 1$ then there are $r^{s-2}(ru - 1)!/(ru)!^r$ by $s$ trees in which $u - 1$ of the nodes joined to each dark node are endnodes.

Every tree $T_n$ corresponds to two $r$ by $s$ bipartite trees, for some values of $r$ and $s$ (if we think of the $n$th node as belonging to one of the two node sets then the $i$th node will belong to the same node set or the other node set according as the distance between $i$ and $n$ in $T_n$ is even or odd). It follows from this observation that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k-1}(n-k)^k = 2n^{n-2};$$

this is a special case of the second identity listed later in Table 1 and Austin (1960) has derived a multinomial extension of this identity.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 also yields a solution to a problem considered by Raney (1964) in the course of deriving a formal power series solution to the equation $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \exp(BX) = X$. Let $B$ denote some subset of $k$ nodes of a subset $A$ of $n$ labelled nodes; let $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_t)$ and $e = (e_1, \ldots, e_t)$ denote compositions of $n$ and $n - k$ into $t$ non-negative integers. Let $T(n, k; c, e)$ denote the number of forests $F$ of $k$ disjoint rooted trees that can be formed on the nodes of $A$ subject to the following conditions: (1) each tree $T$ in the forest $F$ contains just one node of $B$ and this node is the root of $T$; (2) each node of $A$ is assigned one of $t$ colours and there are $c_i$ nodes of the $i$th colour; and (3) each edge in a tree $T$ of $F$ is given the same colour as the node with which it is incident that is nearest the root of $T$ and there are $e_i$ edges of the $i$th colour in $F$.

**Corollary 2.2.4.**

$$T(n, k; c, e) = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{c_1, \ldots, c_t} \binom{n - k}{e_1, \ldots, e_t} c_1^t \cdots c_t^t.$$ 

Let $G$ denote the graph on three nodes in which the second node is joined to the first and third nodes; the first node is also joined to itself by a loop. Let $H$ be the graph defined earlier with $h = 3$ and $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (n - k, k, 1)$; we consider the nodes of $S_2$ as the nodes of $B$ and the nodes of $S_1$ as the remaining nodes of $A$. It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.2 that each spanning subtree of $H$ corresponds to a pair of sequences

$$(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n - k}) \quad \text{and} \quad (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k),$$

where $a_i \in S_1 \cup S_2$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - k - 1$, $a_{n - k} \in S_2$, $b_i \in S_1 \cup \{n + 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1$, and $b_k = n + 1$. It is not difficult to see that forests $F$ on the nodes of $A = S_1 \cup S_2$ consisting of $k$ disjoint rooted trees each of which is rooted at a node of $B = S_2$ correspond to spanning subtrees of $H$ in which the (fictitious) $(n + 1)$st node is joined to every node of $B$; such subtrees correspond to the sequences in which $b_i = n + 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. It remains to enumerate the sequences $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n - k})$ corresponding to forests $F$ satisfying conditions (2) and (3) also.

There are $\binom{n}{c_1, \ldots, c_t}$ ways to colour the nodes of $A$ and satisfy condition (2). Once this has been done, there must be $e_i$ positions in the sequence $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n - k})$ in which the label of one of the $c_i$ nodes of colour $i$ appears. These positions can be chosen and filled in

$$\binom{n - k}{e_1, \ldots, e_t} c_1^t \cdots c_t^t$$

ways. Of all the possible sequences thus constructed only the fraction $k/n$ have the additional property that $a_{n - k} \in S_2 = B$ and thus correspond to suitable forests $F$. This completes the proof of the corollary. If $t = 1$, then the above formula reduces to $k n^{n-k-1}$; this particular result was also stated by Cayley and, implicitly, by Borchardt.
In what follows we shall make use of some special cases of the identities listed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>$A_n(x, y; p, q)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$x^{-1} (x + y + n)^n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(x^{-1} + y^{-1})(x + y + n)^{n-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$y^{-1} (x + y + n + \beta(x))^{n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$y^{-1} ((x + y + n + \beta(x; 2))^{n} + (x + y + n + \alpha + \gamma(x))^{n})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The convention is adopted that

$\alpha_k = k!$, \quad $\beta(x) \equiv \beta_n(x) = k! (x + k)$,

$[\beta(x; 2)]^k = \beta_k(x; 2) = [\beta(x) + \beta(x)]^k$,

and

$\gamma_k(x) \equiv \gamma_n(x) = k \cdot k! (x + k)$. 

3.2. Trees with a Given Degree Sequence. We saw earlier that formula (2.1) for the number $T(n; d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$ of trees $T_n$ whose degree sequence is $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$ could be deduced from Prüfer's argument. The following derivation, given by Moon (1967b), is based on the fact that the multinomial coefficients satisfy the recurrence relation

$$
\binom{m}{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_l} = \sum \binom{m-1}{a_1, \ldots, a_l-1, \ldots, a_l},
$$

where the sum is over all $i$ such that $a_i \geq 1$.

**Theorem 3.1.** If $n \geq 3$, then

$$
T(n; d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) = \binom{n-2}{d_1-1, \ldots, d_l-1}.
$$

We may suppose that $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$ is a composition of $2(n-1)$ into positive integers since $T(n; d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) = 0$ otherwise. It will simplify the notation later if we assume that $d_n = 1$ (this is no real loss of generality since some nodes must be joined to only one other node). We now show that

$$
T(n; d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) = \sum T(n-1; d_1, \ldots, d_l-1, \ldots, d_n-1),
$$

where the sum is over all $i$ such that $d_i \geq 2$.

Let

$$
C_n = C_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = \sum X_1^{d_1(n-1)} \cdots X_n^{d_n(n-1)},
$$

where the sum is over all trees $T$ with $n$ labelled nodes and $d_i(T)$ denotes the degree of the $i$th node of $T$. Rényi (1970) shows that

$$
C_n(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, 0) = (X_1 + \cdots + X_{n-1})C_{n-1}(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}),
$$

by essentially the same argument as we used to establish (3.2). He then deduces that $C_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = (X_1 + \cdots + X_n)^{n-2}$ by applying induction and appealing to the fact that $C_n$ is a symmetric polynomial in its $n$ variables and is homogeneous of degree $n - 2$; he suggests that this may have been the argument Cayley originally had in mind.
An oriented tree is a tree in which each edge $ij$ is replaced by one (and only one) of the arcs $ij$ or $ji$. The out-degree $w_i$ and in-degree $l_i$ of the $i$th node is the number of arcs of the type $ij$ and $ji$, respectively, in the tree. Let $(w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ and $(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ be two compositions of $n-1$ into non-negative integers such that $w_i + l_i \geq 1$ for each $i$. Menon (1964) proved that these conditions are necessary and sufficient for there to exist an oriented tree $T_n$ whose $i$th node has out-degree $w_i$ and in-degree $l_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. The argument used to prove Theorem 3.1 can be extended to show that there are

$$\binom{n-2}{w_1 + l_1 - 1, \ldots, w_n + l_n - 1}$$

such trees.

### 3.3. Trees in which the Degree of a Given Node is Specified

Let $C(n, k)$ denote the number of trees $T_n$ in which a given node, say the $n$th, has degree $d_n = k$. The following result is due to Clarke (1958).

**Theorem 3.2.** If $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, then $C(n, k) = \binom{n-2}{k-1}(n-1)^{n-k-1}$.

Let $R_n$ denote any tree in which $d_n = k - 1$ and suppose we remove one of the $n-k$ edges $ij$ not incident with the $n$th node. If $f(i) = j$, where $f$ is the tree function of $R_n$, then if we join the $n$th and $i$th nodes by an edge we obtain a tree $T_n$ in which $d_n = k$. The same tree $T_n$ could, however, be obtained from different trees $R_n$ in this way.

If we were to remove the $n$th node (and its $k$ incident edges) from $T_n$, the graph remaining would be forest of $k$ subtrees. We can transform $T_n$ back into a tree $R_n$ in which $d_n = k - 1$ by replacing any edge of the type $nj$ by an edge $j\ell$, where $l$ and $j$ do not belong to the same subtree. If there are $n_i$ nodes in the $i$th subtree, then there are

$$(n - 1 - n_i) + \cdots + (n - 1 - n_k) = k(n - 1) - (n - 1) = (k - 1)(n - 1)$$

ways of doing this. If we count in two ways the number of ordered pairs of trees $R_n$ and $T_n$ that can be transformed into each other in this way, we obtain the recurrence relation

$$(n-k)C(n, k-1) = (k-1)(n-1)C(n, k) \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3, \ldots, n-1.$$

The theorem now follows by induction on (decreasing) $k$ since

$$C(n, n-1) = 1.$$

The formula for $C(n, k)$ also follows from Theorem 3.1 and from Prüfer's construction (see Bedrosian (1964); de Bruijn (1964) posed the formula as a problem. Klee and Witzgall (1967) used Clarke's method to show that there are

$$r^{t-1}\binom{r - 1}{k - 1}(s - 1)^{t-k}$$

$r$ by $s$ bipartite trees in which a specified light node has degree $k$ (this also follows from formula (2.2)).

Any tree $T_{n+1}$ for which $d_{n+1} = k$ can be constructed by partitioning the first $n$ nodes into $k$ non-empty subsets, forming a tree on the nodes of each subset, and then joining the $(n+1)$st node to some node of each of the $k$ trees. If we count the number of ways of doing these things and appeal to Theorem 3.2, we obtain the identity

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1}n^{n-k} = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=1}^{n} j^{k-1} \ldots j^{k-1},$$

where the sum is over all compositions of $n$ into $k$ positive integers. Conversely, if identity (3.4) can be established by some other means, then Theorem 3.2 and the formula $T(n) = n^{n-2}$ follow immediately by induction. Robertson (1964) followed this approach and obtained (3.4) as a special case of a multinomial extension of Abel's identity (see also Helmer (1965)).

We now give a second proof of Theorem 3.2 that is based on an idea employed by Göbel (1963) to treat a closely related problem; the argument can easily be extended to treat a more general problem that we shall mention presently. The main step is to show that

$$C(n, k) = \binom{n-1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k-1} C(n-k, t)k^t,$$

where whenever necessary we adopt the convention that an empty sum equals one.

There are $\binom{n-1}{k}$ ways to choose $k$ nodes to join to the $n$th node. Temporarily discard these $k$ nodes and construct a tree $T_{n-k}$ on the remaining nodes in which the $n$th node has degree $t$; this can be done in $C(n-k, t)$ ways. Now reintroduce the $k$ discarded nodes, join each of them to the $n$th node, and replace each of the $t$ edges of the type $jn$ in $T_{n-k}$ by an edge joining $j$ to one of the $k$ nodes; these replacements can be made in $k^t$ ways. The recurrence relation for $C(n, k)$ now follows upon summing over the possible values of $t$. If we assume that the formula for $C(m, t)$
holds whenever $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$ and $m < n$, then

$$C(n, k) = \binom{n-1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-2}{t-1}(n-k-1)^{n-k-t-1}k^t$$

$$= k\binom{n-1}{k}(n-1)^{n-k-2} = \binom{n-2}{k-1}(n-1)^{n-k-1}.$$ 

Theorem 3.2 now follows by induction on $n$.

### 3.4. The Number of $k$-Trees

We saw in the proof of Theorem 1.1 that a tree $T_{n+1}$ could be defined inductively as any graph obtained by joining a new node to any node in a tree $T_n$. This suggests the following generalization of a tree. The graph consisting of two nodes joined by an edge is a 2-tree, and a 2-tree with $n+1$ nodes is any graph obtained by joining a new node to any two nodes already joined in a 2-tree with $n$ nodes. The 2-trees with up to five nodes and the number of ways of labelling their nodes are shown in Figure 6. A $k$-tree can be defined analogously starting with a complete $k$-graph, or $k$ nodes each of which is joined to the remaining $k - 1$ nodes (we remark that in many papers, especially those applying graph theory to the study of electrical networks, the term $k$-tree refers to a forest of $k$ disjoint trees).

Beineke and Pippert (1969) determined the number $B_k(n)$ of $k$-trees with $n$ labelled nodes by an argument we shall mention later (see also Palmer (1969)). Let $C_k(n, d)$ denote the number of $k$-trees with $n$ labelled nodes in which exactly $d$ nodes are joined to each node of a given $k$-tuple of nodes forming a complete subgraph; Moon (1969b) pointed out that the argument used to derive equation (3.5) can easily be extended to show that

$$C_k(n, d) = \binom{n-k}{d} \sum_{t=1}^{n-d-k} \binom{n-d-2}{t-1}(n-d-1)^{n-d-t-1}k^t.$$

It now follows by induction that if $1 \leq d \leq n - k$, then

$$C_k(n, d) = \binom{n-k-1}{d-1}(k(n-k))^{n-d-k}.$$ 

Consequently, there are

$$R_k(n) = \sum_{d=1}^{n-k} C_k(n, d) = \{k(n-k) + 1\}^{n-k-1}$$

$k$-trees in which any given $k$-tuple of nodes forms a complete subgraph.

There are $\binom{n}{k}$ ways to select a $k$-tuple of nodes and each $k$-tree contains \{\{n-k\}+1\} complete $k$-graphs, so it must be that

$$\binom{n}{k} R_k(n) = \{k(n-k) + 1\}B_k(n).$$

This implies Beineke and Pippert's formula,

$$B_k(n) = \binom{n}{k} \{k(n-k) + 1\}^{n-k-2}.$$ 

Notice that when $k = 1$ this reduces to the formula $T(n) = n^{n-2}$. Beineke and Moon (1969) gave several other derivations of the formula for $B_k(n)$, one of which is based on Clarke's proof of Theorem 3.2.

### 3.5. Forests of Trees with Specified Roots

Let $F(n, k)$ denote the number of forests with $n$ labelled nodes that consist of $k$ disjoint trees such that $k$ specified nodes belong to distinct trees.

**Theorem 3.3.** If $1 \leq k \leq n$, then $F(n, k) = kn^{n-k-1}$.

Göbel (1963) proved this by first showing that

$$F(n, k) = \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \binom{n-k}{t}k^tF(n-k, t);$$

this follows upon classifying the forests according to the number $t$ of nodes that are joined to the $k$ specified nodes. The formula for $F(n, k)$ now follows by induction. This argument can be extended to show that there are

$$(s^r + sk - k)\binom{s-1}{r-1}^r s^{r-1}$$

$r$ bipartite forests of $k + l$ nodes in which $k$ specified dark nodes and $l$ specified light nodes belong to distinct trees. Szwarz and Wintgen (1965) used this type of argument to prove a result equivalent to the special case $k = 0$ in the course of showing there are $r_{t-1}^{s-1}$ feasible and unfeasible bases of an $r$ by $s$ transportation problem; this formula has also been derived by the use of generating functions when $k = l$ by Austin (1960) and in the general case by Moon (1967b).

We saw earlier that Theorem 3.3 could be derived by Prüfer's method. Rényi (1959b) pointed out that it is also a consequence of Theorem 3.2,
and conversely; if we are constructing a tree $T_{n+1}$ for which $d_{n+1} = k$, then once the $k$ nodes joined to the $(n + 1)$st node are chosen the remaining edges can be chosen in $F(n, k)$ ways and, consequently, $C(n + 1, k) = \binom{n}{k} F(n, k)$. Rényi (1959a) deduced the formula for $F(n, k)$ from identity (3.4) which he established by induction using generating functions (see also Riordan (1964, 1968b)).

If $f$ is one of the $v^n$ functions that maps $\{1, 2, \ldots, u\}$ into $\{1, 2, \ldots, v\}$, where $u \leq v$, then $f$ may be represented by a directed graph on $v$ labelled nodes in which an arc $ij$ is directed from $i$ to $j$ if and only if $f(i) = j$. It is not difficult to see that each connected component of such a graph consists of a collection of rooted trees whose roots determine a directed cycle (see Figure 7) or, if $u < v$, a directed tree that is rooted, in effect, at one

![Figure 7](image)

of the nodes $u + 1, u + 2, \ldots, v$. Blakely (1964) considered a problem for such mapping functions $f$ that is equivalent to the problem treated in Theorem 3.3. (In what follows we adopt the notation $(x)_t = 1$ and $(x)_t = x(x - 1) \cdots (x - t + 1)$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$)

If $F(t, u, v)$ of the functions $f$ just described are such that exactly $t$ nodes in the graph of $f$ belong to cycles, then

$$v^n = \sum_{t=0}^{u} F(t, u, v).$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$F(t, u, v) = \binom{u}{t} t! F(0, u - t, v),$$

for $t = 0, 1, \ldots, u$, if we adopt the convention that $F(0, 0, v) = 1$; if we assume that $F(0, w, v) = (v - w)w^n - 1$ for $w < u$, then

$$v^n = F(0, u, v) + \sum_{i=1}^{u} (u)(v - u + i)v^{n-1 - i}$$

$$= F(0, u, v) + \sum_{i=1}^{u} (u)v^{n-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{u} (u)_{i-1}v^{n-1 + i}$$

$$= F(0, u, v) + uv^{n-1}.$$
and Read (1966) drew the functional digraphs with up to six nodes that have no cycles of length one; see also Harary, Read, and Palmer (1967).)

Notice that when \( k = 1 \), the graphs counted are rooted directed trees in which the root is distinguished by the presence of a loop; consequently, \( T(n) = n^{-1} D(n, 1) = n^{n-2} \).

Rényi (1959b) showed, in effect, that Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 are also equivalent; once we have formed a directed cycle on \( k \) nodes the remaining arcs can be chosen in \( D(n, k) \) ways and, consequently,

\[
D(n, k) = (k - 1)! \binom{n}{k} F(n, k) = (n!/k!) S(n - 1, k).
\]

If we ignore the directions of the arcs in these graphs, it follows that there are \( \frac{1}{2} D(n, k) \) connected graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( n \) edges in which the cycle has length \( k \) when \( 3 \leq k \leq n \). Various extensions of this result are known; we shall mention these and some other problems on random mapping functions later.

3.7. Trees with a Given Number of Endnodes. The proof of the next result uses properties of the Stirling numbers \( S(n, k) \) of the second kind; they may be defined (see, for example, Riordan (1958; p. 3)) by the identity

\[
(3.7) \quad x^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} S(n, k) x^k,
\]

for \( n = 0, 1, \ldots \). Since

\[
x \cdot x^{n-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (k + 1) S(n - 1, k) x^k
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} k S(n - 1, k) x^k + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S(n - 1, k) x^{k+1},
\]

it follows that \( S(0, 0) = 1 \) and

\[
(3.8) \quad S(n, k) = k S(n - 1, k) + S(n - 1, k - 1)
\]

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots , n \) for \( n \geq 1 \). We can now derive a formula for \( R(n, k) \), the number of trees \( T_n \) with exactly \( k \) endnodes.

**Theorem 3.5.** If \( 2 \leq k \leq n \), then \( R(n, k) = \frac{n!}{k!} S(n - 2, n - k) \).

Suppose we remove one of the endnodes \( x \) from a tree \( T_n \) with \( k \) endnodes; the remaining tree \( T_{n-1} \) has \( k \) or \( k - 1 \) endnodes according as the node joined with \( x \) is or is not an endnode in \( T_{n-1} \). If we count the number of ways these alternatives can occur, we are led to the recurrence relation

\[
k n^{-1} R(n, k) = (n - k) R(n - 1, k - 1) + k R(n - 1, k),
\]

for \( k = 2, 3, \ldots , n \) and \( n \geq 3 \). The result now follows by induction, using relation (3.8). Notice that

\[
T(n) = \sum_{k=2}^{n} R(n, k) = \sum_{k=2}^{n} \frac{n!}{k!} S(n - 2, n - k)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} S(n - 2, k)(n)_k = n^{n-2},
\]

by (3.7).

Rényi (1959a) attributes the preceding derivation to V. T. Sós. Beineke and Moon (1969) used this type of argument to show that there are \( M(n - 3, k)(n - 2) \) 2-trees with \( n \) nodes in which a given pair of nodes are joined by an edge and exactly \( n - 2 - k \) of the remaining nodes have degree two; the numbers \( M(n, k) \) are defined by the relation

\[
(2x + 1)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} M(n, k)(x)_k.
\]

It follows from (3.8) that there are \( k! S(n, k) \) ways to distribute \( n \) different objects in \( k \) different places in such a way that no place remains empty (classify the distributions according as the \( n \)th object is or is not put by itself in one of the \( k \) places); Rényi (1959a) used this fact to derive Theorem 3.5 by Prüfer's method. (These arguments can be used to show that there are

\[
r! \cdot s! \cdot \frac{S(s - 1, r - k)}{k!} S(r - 1, s - l)
\]

\( r \) by \( s \) bipartite trees with \( k \) dark endnodes and \( l \) light endnodes.) The Stirling numbers \( S(n, k) \) can be expressed as a sum involving binomial coefficients; the corresponding expression for \( R(n, k) \) can also be derived directly by the method of inclusion and exclusion if one already knows the formula \( T(n) = n^{n-2} \). We shall consider the distribution of the number of endnodes in a random tree later.

3.8. Recurrence Relations for \( T(n) \). Heretofore we have derived recurrence relations for the number of trees \( T_n \) in which various parameters (in addition to the number of nodes) assumed certain values. It is also possible to derive recurrence relations for \( T(n) \) itself in various ways.

Suppose we partition \( n \) \( (\geq 2) \) labelled nodes into two non-empty subsets, the first having \( i \) nodes and the second \( n - i \) nodes, and form a tree on each subset; if we join one of the \( i \) nodes of the first tree to one of the \( n - i \) nodes of the second tree we obtain a tree \( T_n \). If we perform these
operations in all possible ways we obtain each tree $T_n$ $2(n - 1)$ times; consequently,

$$2(n - 1)T(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i}T(i)T(n - i)i(n - i).$$

(Mullin and Stanton (1967) apply this type of argument in a somewhat more general setting.)

Dziobek (1917) and Bol (1938) both derive this recurrence relation for $T(n)$ and they both use it to derive a relation for the generating function of the numbers $T(n)$; we shall return to that part of their arguments later.

Dziobek also says, however, that R. Rothe pointed out to him that the result $T(1!) = n^{n-2}$ follows by induction from the recurrence relation and the identity

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i}(-1)^{i-1}(i-1)!n^{n-1-i} = 0.$$ 

This identity follows from the second identity in Table 1; it also is the special case $k = 2$ of identity (3.4) which we inferred from Theorem 3.2.

Perhaps it should be pointed out that Dziobek was actually treating the problem of counting the number of sets of $n - 1$ transpositions of $n$ objects such that each of the $n!$ permutations of these objects can be expressed as a product of transpositions of the set; it can be shown by induction that a set of $n - 1$ transpositions has this property if and only if the graph on $n$ nodes whose edges $ij$ correspond to the transpositions $(i,j)$ is a tree (see also Pólya (1937; pp. 208–209)). Dénès (1959) has shown that the number of ways of representing a cyclic permutation $(1, 2, \ldots, n)$ as a product of $n - 1$ transpositions is also equal to $T(n)$.

Another proof of the formula $T(n) = n^{n-2}$ is based on the identity

$$n^{n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{j-1}j^{j-2}(n-j)^{n-j};$$

this is a special case of the first identity in Table 1. Consider one of the $n^{n-1}$ functions $f$ mapping $1, 2, \ldots, n-1$ into $1, 2, \ldots, n$. We have already seen how such a function can be represented by a directed graph on $n$ nodes. If we classify these functions according to the number of nodes in the connected component of their graph that contains the $n$th node we obtain the relation

$$n^{n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{j-1}T(j)(n-j)^{n-j};$$

The formula for $T(n)$ now follows by induction.

The last derivation we give of this type is based on the fact that

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{\binom{n}{j}}(n-j)^k = 0$$

for any positive integer $k$ less than $n$. The left member is the number of ways, using the method of inclusion and exclusion, of distributing $k$ different objects in $n$ different places in such a way that no place remains empty; it also is equal to $\Delta n^k = n! S(k, n)$.

Moon (1963) observed that if there are $C(n, m)$ connected graphs with $n$ labelled nodes and $m$ edges and $H(n, m, l)$ of these have exactly $l$ endnodes, then

$$H(n, m, l) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j-1} \binom{n}{j}C(n-j, m-j)(n-j)^{m-j}.$$ 

if $n \geq 3$ (Gilbert (1956) gave a generating function for the numbers $C(n, m)$). This follows from the method of inclusion and exclusion and the fact that two endnodes of a connected graph cannot be joined to each other if $n \geq 3$. If $m = n - 1$, then these graphs are trees and $H(n, n-1, 0) = 0$, by Lemma 1.1. Therefore,

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j-1} \binom{n}{j}T(n-j)(n-j)^{l} = 0$$

and the formula for $T(n)$ now follows by induction using the case $k = n - 2$ of the identity (we shall describe later another derivation due to Dziobek (1917) of a relation very similar to this one). Notice that this yields another proof of Theorem 3.5, since

$$R(n, k) = H(n, n-1, k) = \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} (-1)^{j-k} \binom{n}{j}C(n-j, m-j)^{n-j}$$

$$= \binom{n}{k} \sum_{h=0}^{n-k} (-1)^{h} \binom{n-k}{h}((n-k)-h)^{n-k} = \frac{n!}{k!} S(n-2, n-k).$$

3.9 Connected Graphs with Unlabelled Endnodes. Moon (1969a) also used the formula for $H(n, m, l)$ to obtain a formula for the number $E(n + k, m + k, k)$ of connected graphs $G$ with $n + k$ nodes and $m + k$ edges such that $n (\geq 3)$ of the nodes are labelled and are not endnodes and $k$ of the nodes are not labelled and are endnodes. If we remove the $k$ endnodes of such a graph $G$, then the remaining graph $G'$ is one of the $H(n, m, l)$ connected graphs with $m$ edges and $n$ labelled nodes of which $l$ are endnodes, for some integer $l$ not exceeding $k$. 

$2 + c.l.t.$
The number of ways of joining \(k\) unlabelled nodes to such a graph \(G'\) so that these \(k\) nodes are the only endnodes in the resulting graph \(G\) is equal to the coefficient of \(x^k\) in
\[
(x + x^2 + \cdots)(1 + x + x^2 + \cdots)^{n-1} = x'(1 - x)^{-n},
\]
or
\[
(-1)^{k-I}inom{-n}{k-I} = \binom{k+n-1-l}{n-1}.
\]
Therefore,
\[
E(n + k, m + k, k) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^{k-i-1} \binom{-n}{k-i} H(n, m, I).
\]

If we wish to count the number \(T^*(n)\) of trees with \(n\) (\(\geq 3\)) nodes in which all nodes except endnodes are labelled, we replace \(n + k\) by \(n\) and \(C(n - j, m - j)\) by \((n - k - j)^{n-k-2}\), and sum from \(k = 2\) to \(k = n - 1\); hence,
\[
T^*(n) = \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} (-1)^j \binom{n-k}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k} (n-k-j)^{n-k-2}.
\]
The last formula is equivalent to a result obtained earlier by Harary, Mowshowitz, and Riordan (1969).

---

**APPLICATIONS OF GENERATING FUNCTIONS**

### 4

Generating functions provide a useful tool for the solution of many combinatorial problems. We now illustrate their application to certain enumeration problems for labelled trees; we shall give more examples later when we consider the distribution of various parameters associated with trees.

Let \(g_n\) denote the number of graphs \(G_n\) each component of which enjoys a certain property \(P\) and let \(c_n\) denote the number of these that are connected. It is not difficult to see that there are

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} c_k c_{n-k} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{c_k}{k!} \cdot \frac{c_{n-k}}{(n-k)!}
\]
of these graphs \(G_n\) with exactly two connected components. Thus if

\[
C = C(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \frac{x^n}{n!}
\]
is the (exponential) generating functions for the connected graphs with property \(P\), then the coefficient of \(x^n/n!\) in \(4C^2(x)\) is the number of 2-component graphs \(G_n\) with property \(P\). More generally, the generating function for the \(k\)-component graphs with property \(P\) is \(C^K(x)/k!\). Hence, if

\[
G = G(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n \frac{x^n}{n!}
\]
is the generating function for all graphs \( G_n \) with property \( P \), then

\[ G = C + \frac{1}{2!} C^2 + \frac{1}{3!} C^3 + \cdots = e^C - 1. \]

This relation appears in many papers (see, for example, Riddell and Uhlenbeck (1953) and Gilbert (1956)); the argument can easily be modified to cover situations where more parameters are involved or where the nodes are not labelled. Another derivation is based on the fact that the derivative of a generating function for labelled graphs, multiplied by \( x \), gives the generating function for the corresponding rooted graphs; since the root node of a graph effectively singles out one connected component of the graph, it follows that \( xG' = xC'(1 + G) \) which implies that \( C = \ln (1 + G) \) or \( G = e^C - 1 \).

4.2. Counting Rooted Trees and Forests. We now specialize the preceding argument to trees. If

\[ Y = Y(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nT(n) \frac{x^n}{n!} \]

denotes the generating function for rooted trees, then \((1/k!) Y^k\) is the generating function for forests of \( k \) rooted trees. If we join each root node of a forest of rooted trees to a new node we obtain, in effect, a rooted tree with one more node than the original forest. Every rooted tree (or at least those with more than one node) can be obtained uniquely this way. It follows, therefore, that \( Y \) satisfies the functional relation

\[ Y = x + xY + \frac{xy^2}{2!} + \cdots = xe^y, \]

or

\[ x = Ye^{-y}. \]

This argument is due to Pólya (1937) who uses Lagrange's inversion formula to deduce from (4.1) that

\[ Y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{n-1} x^n \frac{1}{n!}, \]

from which it follows that \( T(n) = n^{n-2} \).

Lagrange's formula (see, for example, Whittaker and Watson (1946)) states that if

\[ z = x\phi(z), \]

then

\[ f(z) = f(0) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!} D^{n-1}[\phi'(z)\phi^n(z)]_{z=0}, \]

subject to certain conditions on the functions \( \phi \) and \( f \). If \( z = Y, \phi(z) = e^y, \) and \( f(Y) = Y^k \), then

\[ D^{n-1}[f'(Y)\phi^n(Y)]_{Y=0} = D^{n-1}[k Y^{k-1} e^{ny}]_{Y=0} = k \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} D^i(Y^{k-1})D^{n-1-i}(e^{ny}) \bigg|_{Y=0} = k(n-1)!(k-1)! n^{n-k} = kn^{n-k-1}(n)_k. \]

Therefore, if \( Y = xe^y \), where \( Y(0) = 0 \), then

\[ \frac{Y^k}{k!} = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k-1} \frac{x^n}{n!}, \]

for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \).

Notice that formula (4.2) is equivalent to identity (3.4) which we derived by a combinatorial argument. It follows from (4.2) that there are \( \binom{n}{k} kn^{n-k-1} \) forests with \( n \) labelled nodes consisting of \( k \) rooted trees, for \( 1 \leq k \leq n \); this result is equivalent to Theorem 3.3 since the \( k \) root nodes can be selected in \( \binom{n}{k} \) ways. As a partial check notice that the total number of forests of rooted trees on \( n \) nodes is equal to

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k-1} = (n+1)^n - 1, \]

as it should be, since there is a one-to-one correspondence between forests of rooted trees with \( n \) nodes and trees with \( n+1 \) nodes rooted at the \( (n+1) \)st node. (Riordan (1968b) has pointed out that there are \( \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k} \) forests of \( n \) labelled nodes of \( k \) rooted trees in which every non-root node is joined directly to a root node and that there are \( \frac{n!}{k!} \binom{n-1}{k-1} \) forests of \( k \) paths each rooted at an endnode.)

4.3. Counting Unrooted Trees and Forests. Dziobek (1917) and Bol (1938) both deduce relation (4.1) from the recurrence relation

\[ 2(n-1)T(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i} T(i)T(n-i)(n-i) \]
which we derived in Section 3.8. Let

\[ y = y(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T(n) \frac{x^n}{n!} \]

denote the generating function for (unrooted) labelled trees so that

(4.4)

\[ Y = xy'. \]

If we multiply both sides of the above recurrence relation by \( x^n/n! \) and sum over \( n \), we obtain the relation \( 2Y - 2y = Y^2 \), or

(4.5)

\[ y = Y - \frac{1}{2} Y^2. \]

It follows from (4.4) and (4.5) that

\[ \frac{dx}{x} = \frac{1 - y}{Y} \, dY \]

and this implies that \( x = Ye^{-y} \), as required (the constant of integration must be zero since \( T(1) = 1 \)).

Bol, having established equation (4.1), uses Cauchy's integral formula to determine the coefficients in \( Y \). Dziobek makes the substitution

\[ \chi^j = Y' e^{-iy} = Y^j + (-j) \frac{Y^{j+2}}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{(-j)^{n-j} Y^n}{(n-j)!} + \cdots \]

in the right hand side of

\[ Y = T(1)x + 2 \cdot T(2) \frac{x^2}{2!} + \cdots + j \cdot T(j) \frac{x^j}{j!} + \cdots, \]

for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots \), and equates the coefficients of \( Y^n \) in the resulting expression; this yields (after multiplying through by \( n! \)) the relation

\[ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} T(n-j)(n-j)^{j+1} = 0 \]

for \( n = 2, 3, \ldots \) (cf. equation (3.10)). The result \( T(n) = n^{n-2} \) now follows by induction using identity (3.9).

Rényi (1959a) used relations (4.2) and (4.5) to derive a formula for the number \( f_s(n) \) of forests with \( n \) labelled nodes consisting of \( k \) (unrooted) trees.

**Theorem 4.1.** If \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), then

\[ f_s(n) = \binom{n}{k} n^{n-k-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-\frac{1}{2})^i \binom{k}{i} (k + i) \frac{(n-k)i}{n!}. \]

The generating function for forests of \( k \) trees is \( y^k/k! \), by the argument given in Section 4.1; it follows, therefore, from (4.5) that

\[ \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} f_s(n) \frac{x^n}{n!} = \frac{1}{k!} Y^k = \frac{1}{k!} (Y - \frac{1}{2} Y^2)^k \]

\[ = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \binom{k}{i} (-\frac{1}{2})^i Y^{k+i}. \]

If we use formula (4.2) to determine the coefficient of \( x^n \) in the right hand member, we obtain the required formula for \( f_s(n) \). A few special cases of this formula are

\[ f_1(n) = n^{n-2}, \quad f_2(n) = \frac{1}{2} n^{n-4}(n-1)(n+6), \]

\[ f_3(n) = \frac{1}{3} n^{n-6}(n-1)(n-2)(n+13n+60), \ldots, \]

\[ f_{n-k}(n) = \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{k} (n^2 + 3n + 4), \]

\[ f_{n-k-1}(n) = \binom{n}{k}, \quad \text{and} \quad f_n(n) = 1. \]

If we let \( c(k, h) \) denote the coefficient of \( n^{n-h} \) in the formula for \( f_s(n) \), for \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, 2k \), we find after some simplification that

\[ c(k, 1) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-\frac{1}{2})^i \binom{k}{i} (k + i) = 0, \]

and

\[ c(k, 2) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-\frac{1}{2})^i (k + i) \binom{k}{i} (k + i) = \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}. \]

Therefore,

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f_s(n)}{n^{n-2}} = \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}, \]

for each fixed \( k \); if \( F(n) \) denotes the total number of forests with \( n \) labelled nodes then it follows from Tannery's theorem (see Bromwich (1931)) that

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{F(n)}{n^{n-2}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} = e^{1/2}. \]

(We would expect, therefore, that the average number of trees in a random forest with a large number of nodes would be about \( \frac{1}{2} \)). Rényi shows that

\[ F(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} H_k(-1) k n^{n-k-1}(n)_k, \]
where
\[ H_k(x) = \frac{1}{k!} e^{x^2/2} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left( e^{-x^2/2} \right) \]
is the kth Hermite polynomial. Dénes (1959) pointed out that \( f_k(n) \) is also given by the formula
\[ f_k(n) = n! \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{a_j!} \left( \frac{n-j-1}{j!} \right) \]
where the sum is over all non-negative integer solutions of the equations
\[ \sum_{j=1}^n a_j = k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^n ja_j = n. \]

Riordan (1964) derived a pair of inverse relations that involve the numbers \( f_k(n) \). In (1968b) he showed that there are
\[ \frac{n!}{2^k k!} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} (n-j-1) \]
forests with \( n \) labelled nodes that consist of \( k \) paths. He also derived recurrences and congruences involving these and related numbers.

4.4. Bipartite Trees and Forests. Austin (1960) and Scoins (1962) derived the formula for \( T(r, s) \), the number of \( r \) by \( s \) bipartite trees, by a slight modification of Pólya’s argument. If
\[ R = R(x, y) = \sum_{r,s} rT(r, s) \frac{x^r}{r!} \frac{y^s}{s!} \]
and
\[ S = S(x, y) = \sum_{r,s} sT(r, s) \frac{x^r}{r!} \frac{y^s}{s!} \]
denote the generating functions for bipartite trees rooted at a dark node and a light node, then essentially the same argument we used before shows that \( R = xe^y \) and \( S = ye^x \). Consequently,
\[ R = x \exp y \exp R, \]
and we can apply Lagrange’s formula with \( z = R, \phi(R) = \exp y \exp R, \) and \( f(R) = R^k \). If we expand \( \phi(R) \) as a power series in \( R \) we find that
\[ D^{r-1} [f'(R)\phi'(R)]_{R=0} = D^{r-1} [kR \exp ry \exp R]_{R=0} = k(r-1)_{k-1} \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{(ry)^a}{a!} \cdot \frac{x^r}{r!} \cdot \frac{y^s}{s!} \]
and
\[ \frac{x \partial B}{\partial x} = R \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{y \partial B}{\partial y} = S. \]
The relation
\[ B = R + S - RS \]
can be established by verifying that both sides have the same derivatives and vanish when \( x = y = 0 \) or by considering a bipartite analogue of the recurrence formula (4.3). It follows, therefore, that
\[ \sum_{r,s} f_k(r, s) \frac{x^r}{r!} \cdot \frac{y^s}{s!} = \frac{1}{k!} B^k = \frac{1}{k!} (R + S - RS)^k \]
in particular,
\[ R^k = \sum_{r,s} k(r)_{r_k-1} x^r \cdot \frac{y^s}{r!} \cdot \frac{y^s}{s!}, \]
which implies that \( T(r, s) = r^{s-1} s^{-1} \).

More generally, it can be shown that
\[ (r - 1)^h \sum_{a+b=k-h} \frac{R^{h+a}}{a!} \cdot \frac{S^{h+b}}{b!} \]
for \( h = 0 \). Hence,
If we use equation (4.6) to determine the coefficient of \(x^ty^s\) in the last expression, we obtain the formula

\[
J_s(r, s) = r^{s-1}s^{r-1} \sum_{h=0}^{k} \frac{(-1)^h (r)_h (s)_h}{h! r^h s^h} \\
\times \sum_{a+b=k-h} \{r(h + b) + s(h + a) - (h + a)(h + b)\} \times \binom{r - h}{a} \binom{s - h}{b} r^{-a} s^{-b},
\]

if \(r + s \geq k\); in particular, \(J_1(r, s) = r^{s-1}s^{r-1}\) and

\[
J_2(r, s) = r^{s-2}s^{r-2}(r^2 + s^2 - rs + r + s - 2).
\]

4.5. Counting Trees by Number of Inversions. Suppose the tree \(T_n\) is rooted at node \(n\); if \(g(i)\) denotes the number of nodes \(j\) such that \(j > i\) and the (unique) path in \(T_n\) from \(j\) to \(n\) passes through \(i\), then \(\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(i)\) is the number of inversions of \(T_n\) (the number of inversions of a permutation is the number of transpositions needed to restore the natural order). Mallows and Riordan (1968) derived a functional relation for the polynomials \(J_s(x)\) in which the coefficient of \(x^t\) is the number of trees \(T_n\) with \(t\) inversions, for \(t = 0, 1, \ldots, \binom{n - 1}{2}\).

Let \(K_s(x)\) denote the corresponding polynomial for planted trees \(T_n\), that is, rooted trees in which the root is an endnode. If the root \(n\) is joined only to node \(j\) then \(T_n\) has \((n - 1) - j\) more inversions than the tree \(T_{n-1}\) obtained from \(T_n\) by removing \(j\) and joining \(n\) directly to the nodes originally joined to \(j\) (we should also diminish by one the labels of all nodes \(y\) such that \(y > j\), but this does not affect the number of inversions). It follows, therefore, that

\[
K_s(x) = (1 + x + \cdots + x^{n-2})J_{n-1}(x)
\]

for \(n = 2, 3, \ldots\).

Any rooted tree can be formed by identifying the roots of a forest of planted subtrees. If the tree \(T_{n+1}\) is rooted at node \(n + 1\) let \(T^*\) denote the planted subtree that contains, say, the 1st node; if \(T^*\) contains \(k\) nodes besides the 1st and \((n + 1)st\) nodes, then there are \(\binom{n - 1}{k}\) choices possible for these nodes. The number of inversions of \(T_{n+1}\) equals the number of inversions of \(T^*\) plus the number of inversions of the rooted subtrees determined by the root \(n + 1\) and the nodes not in \(T^*\). Hence,

\[
J_{n+1}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} K_{k+2}(x) J_{n-k}(x)
\]

for \(n = 1, 2, \ldots\), since the number of inversions of a tree depends only on the relative sizes of the labels of the nodes.

If

\[
J = J(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} J_{n+1}(x) \frac{y^n}{n!}
\]

and

\[
K = K(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} K_{n+1}(x) \frac{y^n}{n!},
\]

then it follows from (4.7) that

\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial K}{\partial y} J;
\]

this implies that

\[
J = e^x
\]

or

\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} J_{n+1}(x) \frac{y^n}{n!} = \exp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{n}(x) \frac{x^n-1}{x-1} \cdot \frac{y^n}{n!}
\]

(The constant of integration is determined by the fact that \(J = 1\) and \(K = 0\) when \(y = 0\).)

Mallows and Riordan derived relation (4.9) first (by an argument similar to the argument used to establish relation (4.1)) and then deduced (4.8) as a consequence; they show that the polynomials \(J_n(x)\) appear in the generating function of the cumulants of the lognormal distribution. The first few values of \(J_n = J_n(x)\) are found to be

\[
J_1 = J_2 = 1, \quad J_3 = 2 + x, \quad J_4 = 6 + 6x + 3x^2 + x^3,
\]

and

\[
J_5 = 24 + 36x + 30x^2 + 20x^3 + 10x^4 + 4x^5 + x^6.
\]

4.6. Connected Graphs with Given Blocks. Uhlenbeck and Ford (1962, 1963) discuss certain problems in physics that lead to enumeration problems for graphs (the number of terms in the \(n\)th successive approximation to certain functions equals the number of graphs with certain properties; see also, for example, Temperley (1958, 1964) and Groeneveld (1967a,b)). Before proving one of their earlier results we introduce some more terminology.

The automorphism group of a graph is the set of all permutations \(\alpha\) of the nodes such that nodes \(x\) and \(y\) are joined by an edge if and only if nodes \(\alpha(x)\) and \(\alpha(y)\) are joined. The group of the complete \(k\)-graph, for example,
is the symmetric group of order $k!$ and the group of a $k$-cycle is the dihedral group of order $2k$. If the group of a graph $G$ with $n$ nodes has order $g$, then there are $n!/g$ different labellings of the nodes of $G$; we shall use later the equivalent result that there are $n!/g$ ways to construct a graph isomorphic to $G$ on a given set of $n$ labelled nodes. This follows from the result that if $A$ is a group of permutations acting on an object set $X$, then the index of the stabilizer of an object $x$ in $X$ equals the number of objects in the orbit of $x$.

A cut-node of a graph is a node whose removal increases the number of connected components in the graph; a block of a graph is a maximal connected subgraph that contains no cut-nodes of itself. (Notice that a single node is not a block unless it forms a connected component by itself.) A non-trivial tree can be defined as a connected graph all of whose blocks are complete 2-graphs (that is, single edges joining two nodes). Any connected graph can be thought of as a tree-like structure consisting of a collection of blocks attached to each other at cut-nodes. For example, the connected graphs whose blocks consist of one complete 2-graph and connected graph can be thought of as a tree-like structure consisting of a

Let $B_i$ denote some block with $m_i$ (>1) nodes whose automorphism group has order $g_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, b$. Ford and Uhlenbeck (1956a) extended Pólya’s argument to determine the number $T(n; c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_b)$ of rooted connected graphs $G$ with $n$ labelled nodes $c_i$ of whose blocks are isomorphic to $B_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, b$.

**Theorem 4.2.** If

$$\sum_{i=1}^{b} c_i(m_i - 1) = n - 1,$$

then

$$T(n; c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_b) = \frac{(n - 1)! n^{\sum_i c_i}}{\Pi(g_i/m_i^{c_i} c_i)!}.$$

The $c$'s and the $m$'s must satisfy the first equation if the total number of nodes in $G$ is to be $n$. Let us first consider the case $b = 1$ when there is only one type of block available. If

$$U(x) - x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T(n; c) \frac{x^n}{n!},$$

denotes the generating function for the number of rooted connected graphs whose blocks are isomorphic to $B = B_1$ (notice that $T(n, c) = 0$ unless $n = c(m - 1) + 1$, where $m = m_1$), then

$$U(x) = U(x) + U_1(x) + U_2(x) + \cdots$$

where $U_j(x)$ is the generating function for those graphs in which the root belongs to exactly $j$ copies of $B$. We first determine a relation for $U_j(x)$.

Consider a graph $H$ with $n$ labelled nodes that consists of $m$ rooted connected components; each block is isomorphic to $B$ except that one component is singled out and consists of an isolated node $r$ and some of the other components may also consist of an isolated node. The number of such graphs $H$ (that are, in effect, doubly rooted at an isolated node $r$) is equal to the coefficient of $x^n/n!$ in $xU^{m-1}(x)/(m - 1)!$. The factor $x$ takes into account the isolated root node $r$, and the $(m - 1)!$ is present because there is no significance to the ordering of the remaining components (the fact that some of these other components may also consist of an isolated node is why we defined $U(x)$ to contain the term $x$).

There are $m!/g$ ways to join the roots of the components of such a graph $H$ so that the subgraph determined by these nodes is isomorphic to $B$, where $g = g_1$ denotes the order of the group of $B$. The resulting graph is connected, each of its blocks is isomorphic to $B$, and the root node $r$ belongs to just one copy of $B$. It follows, therefore, that the generating function for the number of such graphs satisfies the relation

$$U_j(x) = x \frac{m}{g} U^{m-1}(x).$$

Graphs $G$ in which the root belongs to $j$ copies of $B$ may be constructed by identifying the roots of $j$ graphs in which the root belongs to just one copy of $B$. Consequently,

$$U_j(x) = \frac{x}{j} \left( U_j(x) \right)^j,$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$; the $x$'s take into account the nodes that are lost in this process and the $j!$ reflects the fact that there is no significance to the ordering of the $j$ graphs.

When we combine equations (4.10)–(4.12) we obtain the relation

$$U = x \exp \frac{m}{g} U^{m-1}.$$
If we apply Lagrange's formula with \( z = U \), \( \phi(U) = \exp \frac{m}{g} U^{m-1} \), and \( f(U) = U \), we find that if \( c(m - 1) = n - 1 \), then

\[
T(n, c) = D^{n-1}[f'(U)\phi^n(U)]_{U=0} = D^{n-1}\left[ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(mn)^{n-1} U^{n-1}}{j!} \right]_{U=0} = \frac{(n-1)! n^e (g/m)^c e!}{(g/m)^c e!}.
\]

Notice that if \( B \) is the complete 2-graph (so that \( g = m = 2 \) and \( c = n - 1 \)) then the formula reduces to \( n^{n-1} \), the number of rooted trees with \( n \) labelled nodes.

In the general case, when there are an arbitrary number \( b \) of blocks available, let

\[
U(x; y_1, \ldots, y_b) - x = \sum_n \left( \sum T(n; c_1, \ldots, c_b) y_1^{c_1} \cdots y_b^{c_b} \right) \frac{x^n}{n!}
\]

denote the generating function for the number of rooted connected graphs that can be formed using the blocks \( B_i \); the outer sum starts at \( n = \min \{m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_b\} \) and the inner sum is over all admissible values of the \( c_i \)'s. The relation

\[
U = x \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^{b} \frac{m_i}{g_i} y_i U^{m_i-1} \right)
\]
can be established by the same argument as before except that now, in determining \( U_n \), we must take into account that the root can belong to any one of the blocks \( B_i \); the \( y_i \) identifies the type of block to which the root belongs. The theorem now follows upon applying Lagrange's formula to this relation. (Notice that if we want to count unrooted connected graphs formed from the blocks \( B_i \), then we should decrease the exponent of \( n \) by one.)

**Corollary 4.2.1.** If \( \sum_{i=3}^{b} c_i(i-1) = n - 1 \), then there are

\[
\frac{1}{2} (n-1)! \Pi c_i! \cdot (4n)^{c_i-1}
\]

connected graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes among whose blocks are \( c_i \) cycles of length \( i \), for \( 3 \leq i \leq b \).

**Corollary 4.2.2.** If \( \sum_{i=2}^{b} c_i(i-1) = n - 1 \), then there are

\[
\frac{(n-1)! n^{c_i-1}}{\Pi(i-1)! c_i!}
\]

connected graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes among whose blocks are \( c_i \) complete \( i \)-graphs, for \( 2 \leq i \leq b \).

Husimi (1950) derived Corollary 4.2.2 by an extension of Bol's argument; Ford and Uhlenbeck (1956a) showed that Bol's method could also be used to prove Theorem 4.2. Notice that Theorem 4.2 contains Theorem 3.4, in effect, as a special case.

If \( b = n \) and we sum the formula in Corollary 4.2.2 over all solutions in non-negative integers to the equations

\[
\sum_{i=2}^{n} c_i(i-1) = n - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=2}^{n} c_i = k,
\]

we find that there are \( S(n - 1, k)n^{k-1} \) connected graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes and \( k \) blocks each of which is a complete graph, where \( S(n - 1, k) \) denotes a Stirling number of the second kind and \( 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) (notice that \( S(n - 1, k)n^{k-1} = n^{n-2} \) when \( k = n - 1 \)); this result is given by Kreweras (1970).

He proves Corollary 4.2.2 by associating a bipartite tree \( T = T(G) \) with every connected graph \( G \); the dark nodes, say, of \( T \) correspond to the nodes of \( G \), the light nodes correspond to the blocks of \( G \), and a dark node \( p \) is joined to a light node \( q \) if and only if in \( G \) the node corresponding to \( p \) belongs to the block corresponding to \( q \) (a bipartite tree \( T \) can be associated with some graph \( G \) in this manner if and only if all the endnodes of \( T \) are dark). Thus the number of connected graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes and \( \sum_{i=2}^{b} c_i = k \) blocks of which \( c_i \) are complete \( i \)-graphs is equal to the number of \( n \) by \( k \) bipartite trees in which \( c_i \) light nodes have degree \( i \), for \( 2 \leq i \leq b \); the formula in Corollary 4.2.2 now follows from the formula (2.2) for the number of bipartite trees with given degree sequences. Theorem 4.2 can also be proved in essentially the same way.

Ford and Uhlenbeck, in (1956b) and (1957), investigated the asymptotic behaviour of the number of graphs with certain properties. They showed, in particular, that the number of connected graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes each of whose blocks is a cycle or a complete 2-graph is asymptotically equal to

\[
n! \frac{b}{2\sqrt{\pi}} a^{-n + (1/2)n - (5/2)},
\]

where \( b = 0.87170 \) and \( a = 0.23874 \), as \( n \) tends to infinity. They also considered the distribution of the nodes among the different blocks in a connected graph formed from a given collection of blocks.

Good (1965) has developed a multivariate generalization of Lagrange's theorem that he applies to various enumeration problems for different
types of trees; his method is particularly well adapted for problems involving constraints on the colouring and ordering of the nodes with different constraints, perhaps, for nodes at different distances (generations) from a root node. Knuth (1968b) points out that one of Good's results provides another proof of Theorem 2.2.

5

5.1. Introduction. Many papers have been written in which certain concepts of graph theory are applied to the study of electrical networks. The following quotation is taken from a book by Seshu and Reed (1961; p. 24).

"The 'tree' is perhaps the single most important concept in graph theory insofar as electrical network theory is concerned.... The number of independent Kirchhoff equations, the method of choosing independent equations, the structure of the coefficient matrices, and the topological formulas for network functions, are all stated in terms of the single concept of a tree."

Our main object in this chapter is to derive a result that expresses the number of spanning trees of a graph as the determinant of a matrix whose entries depend on the graph. (The determinant arises in applying Cramer's rule to solve certain sets of equations associated with an electrical network; for additional material on the application of graph theory to electrical networks see, for example, Weinberg (1962), Bryant (1967), or Slepian (1968).)

5.2. The Incidence Matrix of a Graph. Let \( G \) denote a graph with \( n \) (\( \geq 2 \)) labelled nodes and \( b \) edges; suppose we number the edges of \( G \) from 1 to \( b \) and orient each edge arbitrarily (we ignore the orientations of the edges when considering subgraphs of \( G \)). The (node-edge or node-branch) incidence matrix of \( G \) is the \( n \) by \( b \) matrix \( A_g = [a_{ij}] \) in which \( a_{ij} \) equals +1 or −1 if the \( j \)th edge is oriented away from or towards the \( i \)th node and zero otherwise. (An example of a graph and its incidence matrix is given in Figure 9.)
Notice that each column of an incidence matrix \( A_a \) contains one +1, one -1, and \( n - 2 \) zeros. The following result is essentially due to Kirchhoff (1847).

**Lemma 5.1.** If the graph \( G \) has \( n \) nodes and is connected, then the rank of its incidence matrix \( A_a \) is \( n - 1 \).

The sum of any \( r \) rows of \( A_a \) must contain at least one non-zero entry if \( r < n \) for \( G \) would not be connected otherwise; this implies that no \( r \) rows are linearly dependent if \( r < n \). The result now follows from the fact that the sum of all \( n \) rows vanishes. (If \( G \) has \( s \) connected components then the rank of \( A_a \) is \( n - s \); this follows upon applying this lemma to the submatrices corresponding to the connected components of \( G \).)

The reduced incidence matrix \( A \) of a connected graph \( G \) is the matrix obtained from the incidence matrix \( A_a \) by deleting some row, say the \( n \)th. (If \( G \) has \( s \) components, then \( A \) is obtained by removing \( s \) rows from \( A_a \) corresponding to nodes in different components.) The matrix \( A \) has the same rank and furnishes the same information as \( A_a \). The next result was proved by Poincaré (1901).

**Lemma 5.2.** If \( B \) is any non-singular square submatrix of \( A_a \) (or \( A \)), then the determinant of \( B \) is \( \pm 1 \).

If \( B \) is non-singular then each column of \( B \) must contain at least one non-zero entry but not all columns can contain two non-zero entries; hence, some column of \( B \) must contain just one non-zero entry. The required result now follows by induction if we expand the determinant of \( B \) along this column.

The next result was proved by Chuard (1922).

**Lemma 5.3.** If \( B \) is a submatrix of order \( n - 1 \) of \( A \), then \( B \) is non-singular if and only if the edges corresponding to the columns of \( B \) determine a spanning subtree of \( G \).

If \( H \) denotes the spanning subgraph of \( G \) whose \( n - 1 \) edges correspond to the columns of \( B \), then \( B \) is the reduced incidence matrix of \( H \). Hence, \( B \) is non-singular if and only if \( H \) is connected.

**Theorem 5.1.** If \( A \) is a reduced incidence matrix of the graph \( G \), then the number of spanning trees of \( G \) equals the determinant of \( A \cdot A^t \).

The Binet-Cauchy theorem states that if \( R \) and \( S \) are matrices of size \( p \times q \) by \( q \) by \( p \) where \( p \leq q \), then

\[
\det(RS) = \sum \det(B) \cdot \det(C),
\]

where the sum is over the square submatrices \( B \) and \( C \) of \( R \) and \( S \) of order \( p \) such that the columns of \( R \) in \( B \) are numbered the same as the rows of \( S \) in \( C \). If we apply this to \( A \) and \( A^t \), assuming that \( n - 1 \leq p \), and appeal to Lemma 5.2, we find that

\[
\det(A \cdot A^t) = \sum \det(B) \cdot \det(B^t) = \sum (\det(B))^2 = \sum 1,
\]

where the last sum is over all non-singular \((n - 1)\) by \((n - 1)\) submatrices of \( A \). The required result now follows from Lemma 5.3.

If \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n \) are variables identified with the edges of the (connected) graph \( G \), let \( M(e) = [m_{ij}] \) denote the \( n \) by \( n \) matrix in which \( m_{ij} \) equals \(-e_i \) if edge \( e_i \) joins the distinct nodes \( i \) and \( j \) and zero otherwise, and \( m_{ii} \) equals the sum of the edges incident with node \( i \); let \( M(e) \) denote the cofactor of \( m_{ii} \) in \( M(e) \). A tree product is a product \( \Pi(T) \) of edges of a spanning subtree \( T \) of \( G \).

**Theorem 5.2.** If \( n \geq 2 \), then

\[
M_n(e) = \sum \Pi(T),
\]

where the sum is over all spanning subtrees \( T \) of \( G \).

**Corollary 5.2.1.** If \( c(G) \) denotes the number of spanning trees of \( G \) and \( M \) denotes the matrix obtained from \( M(e) \) by replacing each \( e_i \) by 1, then \( c(G) = M_n \).

It is easy to verify that \( M_n(e) = \det(AYA^t) \), where \( Y = [y_{ij}] \) is the \( b \) by \( b \) diagonal matrix such that \( y_{ii} = e_i \). The result now follows by applying the Binet-Cauchy theorem to the product \( AYA^t \). (If the row and column sums of a matrix all vanish, as they do for \( M(e) \), then the cofactors of its
The sum of the tree products of the spanning trees of a graph $G$ is sometimes called the tree polynomial of $G$. If $G$ is the graph in Figure 9, for example, we find that
\[
M_4(e) = \begin{vmatrix}
e_1 + e_4 & -e_1 & 0 \\
-e_1 & e_1 + e_2 + e_5 & -e_2 \\
0 & -e_2 & e_2 + e_3
\end{vmatrix} = e_1e_2e_3 + e_1e_2e_4 + e_1e_2e_5
+ e_2e_3e_4 + e_2e_3e_5 + e_2e_4e_5.
\]

The determinants of other submatrices of $M(e)$ also have combinatorial interpretations; for example, the non-vanishing terms in the expansion of the determinant of the submatrix obtained by deleting the $i$th and $n$th rows and columns of $M(e)$ correspond to spanning forests of two trees in which nodes $i$ and $n$ belong to different trees (see, for example, Percival (1953)). Theorem 5.2 is frequently called Maxwell’s Rule (see Maxwell (1892) and, in particular, the appendix to Chapter 6 by the editor J. J. Thompson). Borchardt (1860), however, proved an equivalent result in the course of expressing the resultant of two polynomials in terms of their values at certain points. His expression involved a determinant of the same form as $M_n(e)$; he showed that the determinant equalled a sum of the above type and he determined the number of terms in this expression (see also Dixon (1909)). Sylvester (1857) stated without proof a similar rule for expanding certain determinants called unisignants; Cayley referred to Sylvester’s Rule in (1856) and to Borchardt’s work in (1889). Kirchhoff (1847) gave a result dual to Theorem 5.2 in which a matrix determined by the cycles of $G$ plays the role of $A$ and the sum is over the products of edges forming the complement of a spanning tree of $G$ (for discussions of these papers see, for example, Muir (1911), Ku (1952), Weinberg (1958a), and Chen (1968)). Brooks, Smith, Stone, and Tutte (1940) gave an inductive proof of Theorem 5.2 that was subsequently extended by Tutte (1948) to directed graphs; we shall describe his more general result later.

Let $p(\lambda)$ denote the characteristic polynomial of $M$. Kelmans (1965, 1966) calls $B(\lambda) = p(-\lambda)/\lambda$ the characteristic polynomial of the graph $G$; it is easy to see that $c(G) = B(0)/n$. Kelmans investigates properties of the polynomials $B(\lambda)$ in these and other papers and gives an algorithm for determining $B(\lambda)$ that depends on decomposing $G$ into simpler graphs whose polynomials are easier to determine.

Let $R = [r_{ij}]$ denote an $m \times m$ upper triangular matrix. Nakagawa (1958) gives the following recursive definition of the foldant $\|R\|$ of such a matrix:

If $m = 1$, then $\|R\| = r_{11}$ and if $m > 1$, then
\[
\begin{vmatrix}
r_{11} + r_{2m} & r_{12} + r_{3m} & \cdots & r_{1,m-1} + r_{m,m} \\
0 & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2,m-1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & r_{m-1,m-1}
\end{vmatrix}
= e_1e_2e_3 + e_1e_2e_4 + e_1e_2e_5
+ e_2e_3e_4 + e_2e_3e_5 + e_2e_4e_5.
\]

We now illustrate how Corollary 5.2.1 has been used to obtain formulas for the number of spanning trees in certain graphs $G$.

5.4. Applications. The number $T(n)$ of trees with $n$ labelled nodes is equal to the number of spanning trees of the complete $n$-graph. If we apply
Corollary 5.2.1 to the complete 4-graph, for example, we find that

\[
T(4) = \begin{vmatrix}
3 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
-1 & 3 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
-1 & -1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{vmatrix} = 4^2.
\]

The general formula \( T(n) = n^{n-2} \) can be proved in the same way, as pointed out by Weinberg (1958b). Weinberg also treated the following two generalizations of this problem.

**Theorem 5.3.** If \( W(n, k) \) denotes the number of spanning trees of a graph obtained from the complete \( n \)-graph by removing \( k \) edges no two of which have a node in common, then

\[
W(n, k) = (n - 2)n^{n-2-k}
\]

if \( 0 \leq 2k \leq n \).

There is no loss of generality if we assume the missing edges joined nodes \( 1 \) and \( 2, 3 \) and \( 4, \ldots, 2k - 1 \) and \( 2k \). If we apply Corollary 5.2.1 when \( k = 2 \) and \( n = 7 \) we find that

\[
W(7, 2) = \begin{vmatrix}
5 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
-1 & 6 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
5 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
6 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
6 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= 5^2 \cdot 7^2 ((6 + 1)(6 - 1)) = 5^2 \cdot 7^3.
\]

The general formula is proved in the same way (usually the first step in evaluating these determinants is to add to the first row all the other rows).

**Theorem 5.4.** If \( w(n, k) \) denotes the number of spanning trees of a graph obtained from the complete \( n \)-graph by removing \( k \) edges all of which are incident with a given node, then

\[
w(n, k) = (n - 1 - k)(n - 1)^{n-1-k-2}
\]

if \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \).

We may assume the missing edges joined node 1 to nodes 2, 3, \ldots, \( k + 1 \). If we apply Corollary 5.2.1 when \( k = 3 \) and \( n = 7 \) we find that

\[
 w(7, 3) = \begin{vmatrix}
3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 5 & -1 & -1 \\
0 & -1 & 5 & -1 \\
0 & -1 & -1 & 5 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
6 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
0 & -1 & -1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= \begin{vmatrix}
6 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 5 & -1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
= 7^2 \cdot 5 - 1 = 7^2 \cdot 5 - 1
= 3 \cdot 7^2 \cdot 0 - 6 = 3 \cdot 7^2 \cdot 6.
\]
The general formula is proved in the same way.

Fiedler and Sedláček (1958) and Simmonard and Hadley (1959) determined the number \( T(r, s) \) of \( r \) by \( s \) bipartite trees by this method. We may assume the \( r + s \) nodes are labelled so that the first \( r \) nodes are the dark nodes and the last \( s \) nodes are the light nodes. If we apply Corollary 5.2.1 when \( r = 2 \) and \( s = 4 \), we find that

\[
T(2, 4) = \begin{vmatrix} 4 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{vmatrix} = 2^3 \cdot 4^1.
\]

The general formula \( T(r, s) = r^{s-1} s^{r-1} \) is proved in the same way.

Corollary 5.2.1 has been applied to a number of classes of graphs whose structure is sufficiently simple for the determinant \( M_n \) to be evaluated. Most of the formulas that have been derived this way, however, can be derived by other methods also so we will postpone describing more of these results until later.

5.5. The Matrix Tree Theorem for Directed Graphs. Let \( D \) denote a directed graph with \( n \) (\( \geq 2 \)) labelled nodes and \( b \) arcs; we assume for the present that each arc joins two distinct nodes but there may be several arcs that join the same pair of nodes. If \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_b \) are variables identified with the arcs of \( D \), let \( C = [c_{ij}] \) denote the \( n \) by \( n \) matrix in which \( -c_{ij} \) equals the sum of the arcs directed from node \( i \) to node \( j \) (or zero, if there are no such arcs) for \( i \neq j \), and \( c_{ii} \) equals the sum of the arcs directed from \( i \) to other nodes. Let \( C_i \) denote the cofactor of \( c_{ii} \) in \( C \); since the row sums of \( C \) all vanish it follows that the cofactors of the entries in any given row are all equal. If \( T \) is a directed spanning subtree of \( G \) rooted at node \( n \), say, then the tree product \( \prod(T) \), as before, is the product of the arcs of \( T \).

The following theorem is due to Tutte (1948); the proof we give here involves some modifications due to Knuth (1968a; p. 578) of Tutte's proof (see also van Aardene-Ehrenfest and de Bruijn (1951), Bott and

Mayberry (1954), Fiedler and Sedláček (1958), and Chen (1965, 1966a)).

**Theorem 5.5.** If \( n \geq 2 \), then

\[
C_n = \sum \Pi(T),
\]

where the sum is over all directed spanning subtrees \( T \) of \( D \) that are rooted at the \( n \)th node.

If some node \( i \) \((< n)\) of \( D \) has out-degree zero, then every entry in the \( i \)th row of \( C \) is zero and there are no directed spanning subtrees \( T \) of \( D \) that are rooted at node \( n \). Hence \( C_n = 0 = \sum \Pi(T) \) in this case.

We next consider the case in which each of the first \( n - 1 \) nodes has out-degree one and the \( n \)th node has out-degree zero. If \( D \) is not a directed tree, then some subset of the first \( n - 1 \) nodes determines a connected component; the sum of the columns of \( C \) corresponding to these nodes vanishes, so \( C_n = 0 = \sum \Pi(T) \) again. Suppose \( D \) is a directed tree (rooted at node \( n \)); if the nodes of \( D \) are relabelled (this amounts to simultaneously permuting rows and columns of \( C \)) according to the order in which they would be removed in determining the Prüfer sequence associated with the tree, then \( C \) becomes an upper triangular matrix and \( C_n \) equals the tree product of \( D \).

It remains to consider the case in which the first \( n - 1 \) nodes all have positive out-degree and there is some node, say the 1st, whose out-degree exceeds one. If \( e \) denotes some arc directed from node 1 to some other node, say node 2, let \( E \) and \( F \) denote the matrices obtained by suppressing the \( e \)'s, and all variables except the \( e \)'s, in the first row of \( C \). The matrices \( E \) and \( F \) correspond to the graphs obtained from \( D \) by deleting arc \( e \) and by deleting all arcs except \( e \) that lead away from the 1st node. These graphs both have fewer edges than \( D \) so we may assume \( E_n \) and \( F_n \) enumerate their spanning subtrees that are rooted at node \( n \). It is not difficult to see that \( E_n \) enumerates those spanning subtrees of \( D \) rooted at node \( n \) that do not contain arc \( e \) while \( F_n \) enumerates those that do. Since \( C_n = E_n + F_n \), the required result now follows by induction on the number of arcs of \( D \).

The spanning subtrees of \( D \) that are rooted at node \( i \) are enumerated by the cofactor \( C_i \); it is not difficult to reformulate the statement of Theorem 5.5 so as to enumerate the rooted spanning subtrees of \( D \) whose arcs are all directed away from the root. A directed graph \( D \) is balanced if for each node \( i \) there are an equal number of arcs directed away from and towards \( i \). If \( D \) is balanced then the column sums of the matrix obtained from \( C \) by replacing the \( e \)'s by 1's all vanish; hence all the cofactors are equal and the number of spanning subtrees of \( D \) is independent of the root node. If \( D \) is symmetric, that is, if the arc \( \bar{ij} \) is in \( D \) if and only if the arc \( ji \) is in \( D \), then
Theorem 5.5 reduces, in effect, to Theorem 5.2. Knuth (1968b) shows that Theorem 5.5 can also be used to derive Theorem 2.2.

5.6. Trees in the Arc-Graph of a Directed Graph. The arc-graph $A = A(D)$ of a directed graph $D$ is the directed graph whose nodes $N(i, j)$ correspond to the arcs $ij$ of $D$ and in which an arc is directed from $N(i, j)$ to $N(k, h)$ if and only if $j = k$ (see Figure 10). If there are $w_i$ arcs of the type $ij$ in $D$ and $I_i$ of the type $kf$, then $A$ has $w_i + \cdots + w_n = l_1 + \cdots + l_n$ nodes and $w_l l_1 + \cdots + w_n l_n$ arcs. If $l_i = 0$ there are no nodes of the type $N(k, i)$ in $A$. Let $D'$ denote the graph obtained from $D$ by removing all nodes $i$ such that $l_i = 0$ (and all arcs of the type $ij$). We may suppose $D'$ is the subgraph determined by the first $m$ nodes of $D$ (in the example, $m = 3$). Knuth (1967) used Theorem 5.5 to express the number of spanning subtrees of $A(D)$ rooted at a given node $N(u, v)$ in terms of the numbers $t_y$ of spanning subtrees of $D'$ rooted at various nodes $y$.

**Theorem 5.6.** There are

$$w_1^{v-1} \cdot \cdots \cdot w_n^{v-1} (t_v - w_v^{-1} \sum t_v)$$

spanning subtrees of $A(D)$ rooted at node $N(u, v)$, where the sum is over all nodes $y$ of $D'$ such that $y \neq u$ and the arc $\rightarrow y$ is in $D'$.

Let the matrices $C(A)$ and $C = C(D')$ be defined as before for the graphs $A$ and $D'$ except that all the variables are replaced by 1's (we ignore any loops the graphs may have in defining these matrices). We may assume the nodes of $A$ are grouped together so that $C(A)$ can be expressed as an $m$ by $m$ array of submatrices $B_{jk}$, where if $j \neq k$ the entries of $B_{jk}$ indicate the arcs directed from nodes $N(i, j)$ to nodes $N(k, h)$; we may also assume $v = 1$ and that the first row and column of $C(A)$ correspond to the root $N(u, v)$. If $A$ is the arc-graph in Figure 10 rooted at node $N(2, 1)$, then

$$C(A) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Notice that when $j \neq k$ each column of $B_{jk}$ consists entirely of 0's or -1's and that there are $-c_{jk}$ columns of the latter type where $-c_{jk}$ denotes the number of arcs directed from $j$ to $k$ in $D'$.

Let $C^*$ denote the matrix obtained from $C(A)$ by adding the column $(\lambda, 0, \ldots, 0)$ to the first column of $C$ for some indeterminate $\lambda$. Since $\det C(A) = 0$, it follows that $\det C^* = \lambda C_1(A)$, where the cofactor $C_1(A)$ of the first entry in $C(A)$ is the required number of spanning trees of $A$. It remains, therefore, to evaluate the determinant of $C^*$.

Add to the first column of each submatrix $B_{jk}$ of $C^*$ all the remaining columns of $B_{jk}$ and then subtract the first row of each submatrix $B_{jk}$ from the remaining rows of $B_{jk}$. It is not difficult to see that these transformed submatrices $B_{jk}$ now have the form

$$B_{jk} = \begin{bmatrix} c_{jk} & - \cdots & - \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

or $B_{kk} = \begin{bmatrix} c_{kk} + \lambda \delta_{k1} & - \cdots & - \\ -\lambda \delta_{k1} & w_k & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -\lambda \delta_{k1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & w_k \end{bmatrix}$

according as $j \neq k$ or $j = k$; the dashes indicate entries left unspecified for the present. (To establish the second expression recall that the original submatrix $B_{kk}$ has a -1 in an off-diagonal position only if the column corresponds to a loop in $D'$; the number $c_{kk}$ equals $w_k$ minus the number of loops at the $k$th node of $D'$.)

If we apply these steps to the example considered earlier we find that

$$\det C^* = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + \lambda & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -\lambda & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$
where we have factored out diagonal entries that are the only non-zero entry in their rows, removed the corresponding rows and columns, and then added the last \( m - 1 = 2 \) columns to the first column. In the general case we find that

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\lambda & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\
-\lambda & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\lambda & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
-1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{vmatrix} = 1 \cdot 3
\]

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\lambda & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\
-\lambda & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\lambda & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\
\end{vmatrix} = 1 \cdot 3
\]

\[
\det C^* = w_2^{m-1} \cdots w_m^{m-1}
\]

\[
\det C^* = w_2^{m-1} \cdots w_m^{m-1} \left( \lambda w_1^{m-1} C_{11} - \lambda w_1^{m-2} \sum C_{yi} \right)
\]

The unspecified entries in the column corresponding to a node of the type \( N(y, 1) \), where \( y \neq u \), are all zero except when \( x \) is a node of \( D' \) in which case there is a \(-1\) in the row in which \( c_{y2}, \ldots, c_{ym} \) appear. Hence, if we expand the last determinant along the first column we find that

\[
\lambda C_1(A) = \det C^* = w_2^{m-1} \cdots w_m^{m-1} \left( \lambda w_1^{m-1} C_{11} - \lambda w_1^{m-2} \sum C_{yi} \right),
\]

where \( C_{yi} \) denotes the cofactor of \( c_{yi} \) in the matrix \( C \) of \( D' \) and the sum is over all nodes \( y \) in \( D' \) such that \( y \neq u \) and the arc \( yi \) is in \( D' \). This suffices to complete the proof of the theorem, since it follows from Theorem 5.5 that \( C_{11} = t_1 \) and \( C_{yi} = C_{yy} = t_v \).

If the digraph \( D \) is balanced then the formula in Theorem 5.6 simplifies to \( w_2^{m-1} \cdots w_m^{m-1} \omega_m/a \), where \( t \) is the number of spanning subtrees of \( D' \) with a given root; if \( D \) is regular of degree \( d \), that is, if \( w_i = d = t_i \) for all \( i \), the formula simplifies further to \( t d^{md-(d-1)} \).

5.7. Listing the Trees in a Graph. Feussner (1902, 1904) gave a method for listing the spanning trees of a graph \( G \) that is based upon the fact that any spanning tree either does or does not contain a given edge \( e \). Let \( G' \) denote the graph obtained from \( G \) by removing edge \( e \) and let \( G'' \) denote the graph obtained from \( G \) by removing all edges that join the endnodes of \( e \) and then identifying the endnodes of \( e \). The graphs \( G' \) and \( G'' \) are simpler than \( G \) and the tree polynomial of \( G \) equals the tree polynomial of \( G' \) plus \( e \) times the tree polynomial of \( G'' \). This process can be repeated until the trees can be determined by inspection (notice that the tree polynomial of a graph equals the product of the tree polynomials of its blocks). If we use this method to determine the number \( c(\langle 4 \rangle) \) of trees spanning the complete 4-graph, we find that

\[
c(\langle 4 \rangle) = c(\langle 3 \rangle) + c(\langle 3 \rangle) + 2c(\langle 2 \rangle) + c(\langle 1 \rangle)
\]

\[
= 4 + 2 \cdot 2^2 + 4 = 16.
\]

The idea upon which Feussner's method is based can also be exploited to prove various results, such as Theorems 5.2 and 5.5 and Nakagawa's foldant algorithm, by induction on the size of the graph. Many papers have been written giving algorithms, of varying degrees of usefulness, for listing the spanning trees of a graph; a small fraction of them, for example, are those by Wang (1934), Duffin (1959), Hakimi (1961), Mayeda and Seshu (1965), Mukherjee and Sarker (1966), Chen (1966b), Berger (1967), and Char (1968).
THE METHOD OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

6

6.1. Introduction. The method of inclusion and exclusion can be used to express the number of spanning trees of a given graph \( G \) in terms of the number of trees that contain different subsets of edges that do not belong to \( G \). In this section we illustrate this approach on various problems where the expressions obtained are reasonably manageable. Some of the material in the first part of this chapter was presented at a course on "Graph Theory and its Uses" at the London School of Economics in July, 1964 and appeared in Moon (1967b).

6.2. The Number of Trees Spanned by a Given Forest. Any spanning subgraph of a tree \( T_n \) is a forest \( F_n \) of one or more disjoint trees. Let \( l = l(F_n) \) denote the number of components of \( F_n \) (some of which may be isolated nodes) and let \( p = p(F_n) \) denote the product of the number of nodes in the \( l \) components of \( F_n \). The following useful result shows that the number \( T(F_n) \) of trees \( T_n \) that contain a given forest \( F_n \) depends only on the size of the components of \( F_n \) and not on their individual structure.

Theorem 6.1. \( T(F_n) = p(F_n)n^{l(F_n)-2} \).

Suppose the components of \( F_n \) are labelled from 1 to \( l \) (in the order, say, of the size of the smallest label associated with the nodes of each component) and suppose the \( i \)th component has \( j_i \) nodes where \( j_1 + j_2 + \cdots + j_l = n \). Pretend, for a moment, that each component is a node by itself and construct a tree \( T_l \) with degree-sequence \((d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_l)\) on these \( l \) nodes. To transform \( T_l \) into a tree \( T_n \) containing \( F_n \), we replace each of the \( d_i \) edges incident with the \( i \)th node of \( T_l \) by an edge incident with one of the \( j_i \) nodes of the \( i \)th component of \( F_n \), for each \( i \). If we carry out these operations in all possible ways, then it follows from Theorem 3.1 and the

multinomial theorem that

\[
T(F_n) = \sum_{\substack{i \geq 1 \\text{such that } d_i - 1}} \left(\begin{array}{c} l-2 \\ i-1 \end{array}\right) j_1^{d_1-1} \cdots j_l^{d_l-1} = j_1 \cdots j_l (j_1 + \cdots + j_l)^{l-2} = pn^{l-2}.
\]

Notice that the formula reduces to \( n^{l-2} \) when \( F_n \) consists of \( n \) isolated nodes. Glicksman (1963) and Knuth (1968b) have proved an equivalent result involving mapping functions. Glicksman's proof is by induction and uses ideas similar to those used by Göbel in the proof of Theorem 3.3; Knuth's proof is by an extension of Prüfer's method. Sediček (1966) used matrix methods to prove the special case when only one component of \( F_n \) has more than one node (in 1967 he used this case to give a combinatorial proof of an identity involving binomial coefficients; in this paper he also showed that if node \( x \) has degree \( f \) in the connected graph \( G \) and belongs to \( e_x \) blocks, then \( G \) has a spanning tree in which \( x \) has degree \( k \) for any integer \( k \) such that \( a \leq k \leq b \).

Theorem 6.1 can be used, for example, to give alternate derivations of Weinberg's formulas in Theorems 5.3 and 5.4. To prove Theorem 5.3 notice that if the forest \( F_n \) consists of \( t \) edges no two of which have a node in common and \( n - 2t \) isolated nodes, then \( T(F_n) = 2^{-t} n^{n-t-2} \). Hence, if \( w(n, k) \) denotes the number of spanning trees of a graph obtained from the complete \( n \)-graph by removing \( k \) edges no two of which have a node in common, it follows from the method of inclusion and exclusion that

\[
w(n, k) = n^{n-2} - k 2^{n-3} + \frac{k}{2} 2^2 n^{-4} - \ldots
\]

if \( 0 \leq 2k \leq n \).

To prove Theorem 5.4 notice that if the forest \( F_n \) consists of \( t \) edges incident with the same node and \( n - (t + 1) \) isolated nodes, then \( T(F_n) = (t + 1) n^{n-t-2} \). Hence, if \( w(n, k) \) denotes the number of spanning trees of a graph obtained from the complete \( n \)-graph by removing \( k \) edges incident with a given node, then

\[
w(n, k) = n^{n-2} - k 2n^{n-3} + \left(\frac{k}{2}\right) 3n^{n-4} - \ldots
\]

\[
= n^{n-2} \sum_{i=0}^{n} (i+1)\left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ i \end{array}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^i
\]

\[
= n^{n-2} \left\{ - \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^k \right\}
\]

\[
= n^{n-2} \left(1 - \frac{k + 1}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-1}
\]

if \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \).
6.3. The Number of Spanning Trees of a Graph. This approach can be used, in principle, to determine the number of spanning trees of any (connected) graph \( G \). If \( H_m \) is any graph with \( m \) labelled nodes and \( n \) is any positive integer, let

\[
f(H_m, n) = \sum p(F_m)(-n)^{-l(F_m)} n^{-l},
\]

where the sum is over all spanning forests \( F_m \) of \( H_m \) (notice that \( m - l(F_m) \) is the number of edges in \( F_m \)); it follows from this definition that if the connected components of the graph \( H \) are \( A, B, \ldots \), then

\[
f(H, n) = f(A, n)f(B, n) \ldots .
\]

The complement of a graph \( G_n \) is the graph \( \overline{G_n} \) obtained from the complete \( n \)-graph by removing all edges that appear in \( G_n \). The following general formula follows readily from Theorem 6.1 and the method of inclusion and exclusion.

**THEOREM 6.2.** \( c(G_n) = n^{n-2} f(G_n, n) \).

Temperley (1964) obtained this result by applying a transformation to the matrix in Theorem 5.2. Bedrosian (1964b) stated that \( c(G_n) \) equals \( n^{n-2} \) times a product of factors associated with the components of \( G_n \) and he gave formulas for the factors associated with certain graphs.

6.4. Examples. One nice feature of Theorem 6.2 is that once the polynomials \( f \) have been evaluated for a collection \( X \) of graphs (this is the hard part), then one can immediately give formulas for the number of trees spanning any graph \( G \) the components of whose complement belong to \( X \). We now determine the polynomials \( f(H_m, n) \) for a few classes of graphs \( H_m \); it is usually convenient to express \( f(H_m, n) \) as a double sum, where the outer sum is over the exponent of \( n \) and the inner sum is over all spanning forests with the appropriate number of components (or edges).

**THEOREM 6.3.** If \( \langle m \rangle \) denotes the complete \( m \)-graph, then

\[
f(\langle m \rangle, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{m}{n} \right)^{n-1}.
\]

If we apply the definition of \( f(\langle m \rangle, n) \) and use identity (3.4) we find that

\[
f(\langle m \rangle, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(-n)^{i-1}}{i!} \prod_{j=1}^{i} \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^{j-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \frac{m-1}{i-1} \right) \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^{i-1} = \left( 1 - \frac{m}{n} \right)^{n-1}.
\]

The complete \( k \)-partite graph \( \langle c_1, \ldots, c_k \rangle \) consists of \( c_i \) nodes of colour \( i \), for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k \), and all edges of the type \( xy \) where nodes \( x \) and \( y \) have different colours. The following result follows from Theorems 6.2 and 6.3.

**COROLLARY 6.3.1.** If \( c_1 + c_2 + \cdots + c_k = n \), then

\[
c(\langle c_1, \ldots, c_k \rangle) = n^{n-2} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( 1 - \frac{c_i}{n} \right)^{n-1}.
\]

This formula was apparently derived first by Austin (1960) who used the result in Corollary 5.2.1; Good (1965) used a multivariate generating function to give another derivation and Oláh (1968) gave a proof based on Prüfer's method. Notice that when \( k = 2 \) this reduces to the formula derived earlier for the number of bipartite trees.

**THEOREM 6.4.** If \( \langle r, s \rangle \) denotes the complete \( r \) by \( s \) bipartite graph, then

\[
f(\langle r, s \rangle, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{r}{n} \right)^{s-1} \left( 1 - \frac{s}{n} \right)^{r-1} \left( 1 - \frac{r + s}{n} \right).
\]

If \( F(r, s; k, l) \) denotes the number of \( r \) by \( s \) bipartite forests of \( k + l \) trees \( k \) of which are rooted at a dark node and \( l \) at a light node, then it follows from the definition of \( f(\langle r, s \rangle, n) \) and equation (4.7) that

\[
f(\langle r, s \rangle, n) = \sum_{k+l=1}^{n} (-n)^{-r-s} \sum_{k+l=1}^{n} F(r, s; k, l) = \sum_{k+l=1}^{n} (-n)^{-r-s} \sum_{k+l=1}^{n} \binom{r}{k} \binom{s}{l} \binom{r+l}{k+l} \binom{n}{r+s} \binom{-r-s}{r+s-n-k-l} \binom{n}{r+s} \binom{-r-s}{r+s-n-k-l} = \left( 1 - \frac{r}{n} \right)^{s-1} \left( 1 - \frac{s}{n} \right)^{r-1} \left( 1 - \frac{r + s}{n} \right).
\]

If we apply Theorems 6.2 and 6.4 to determine \( c(G_n) \) when the components of \( G_n \) are either complete bipartite graphs or isolated nodes, we obtain a formula O'Neil and Slepian (1966) established by evaluating the appropriate determinant. Notice that Weinberg's formulas for \( W(n, k) \) and \( w(n, k) \) also follow from Theorems 6.2 and 6.4. O'Neil, in a letter dated March, 1969, states that he has generalized Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 by 3 + C.L.T.
showing, in effect, that if $c_1 + c_2 + \cdots + c_k = m$, then

$$f(c_1, \ldots, c_k, n) = \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left(1 - \frac{m - c_i}{n}\right)^{c_i - 1};$$

this formula can be derived using Corollary 2.3.3.

**THEOREM 6.5.** If $P_m$ denotes a path of length $m - 1$, then

$$f(P_m, n) = \sum_{e=0}^{m-1} \binom{2m - 1 - e}{e} (-1)^e \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^e.$$

Every component of a forest $F_m$ spanning $P_m$ is itself a path. It is not difficult to see that the sum $\sum \rho(F_n)$, taken over all spanning forests $F_m$ of $P_m$ such that $l(F_m) = l$, equals the coefficient of $x^m$ in

$$x + 2x^2 + 3x^3 + \cdots = [x(1 - x)^{-2}].$$

Therefore

$$f(P_m, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\frac{m + i - 1}{m - i}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{m-1} = \sum_{e=0}^{m-1} \binom{2m - 1 - e}{e} (-1)^e \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^e.$$ 

**THEOREM 6.6.** If $C_m$ denotes a cycle of length $m$, then

$$f(C_m, n) = \sum_{s=0}^{m-2} \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} j^2 \binom{2m - 2 - e - j}{e + 1 - j} (-n)^{-e} + m^2(-n)^{1-n}.$$ 

Every component of a forest $F_m$ spanning $C_m$ is a path. Suppose we label the components of $F_m$ beginning with the component containing an arbitrary node $u$ and proceeding along the cycle in the clockwise sense. The sum $\sum \rho(F_n)$, taken over all spanning forests $F_m$ of $C_m$ such that $l(F_m) = l$, is equal to

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_l} j_1 j_2 \cdots j_l$$

summed over all compositions of $m$ into $l$ positive integers (the extra factor $j_i$ arises from the fact that the node $u$ could be any of the $j_i$ nodes in the first component of $F_n$). When $l = 1$, the expression equals $m^2$; when $l > 1$ we can set $j_1 = j$ and sum over the remaining factors. This latter sum is the same as the sum we considered in the proof of Theorem 6.5 except that $m$ and $l$ are replaced by $m - j$ and $l - 1$. Therefore,

$$f(C_m, n) = m^2(-n)^{1-n} + \sum_{s=2}^{m-2} \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} \binom{m - j + l - 2}{m - j - l + 1} (-n)^{j-n}.$$ 

If we let $e = m - l$ this becomes the formula given above.

Bercovici (1969) has shown that

$$f(C_m, n) = \frac{1}{n^m} \left[ \prod_{s=1}^{m-2} \left(1 - \frac{4}{n} \sin^2 \left(\frac{kn\pi}{m}\right)\right) \right],$$

where the matrix has $m$ rows and columns. If $\rho(m) = f(P_{m+1}, n)$, then he has also shown that

$$\rho(a + b) = \rho(a)\rho(b) - \frac{1}{n^2} \rho(a - 1)\rho(b - 1);$$

this implies that

$$\rho(a + 1) = \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)\rho(a) - \frac{1}{n^2} \rho(a - 1),$$

$$\rho(2a) = \rho^2(a) - \frac{1}{n^2} \rho(a - 1),$$

and

$$\rho(2a + 1) = \rho(a)\left[2\rho(a + 1) - \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)\rho(a)\right].$$

(He has also given analogous recurrence relations for the polynomials of graphs obtained from the graphs $\langle 1, 3 \rangle$ or $\langle 1, 4 \rangle$ by inserting additional nodes in the edges so as to form more edges.) The first few polynomials for paths and cycles are given in Table 2. Bedrosian (1970) pointed out that

$$(n - 4) f^2(P_m, n) = f(C_{2m}, n).$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$n^{n-1} f(P_m, n)$</th>
<th>$n^{n-1} f(C_m, n)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$n - 2$</td>
<td>$(n - 3)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$(n - 1)(n - 3)$</td>
<td>$(n - 3)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$(n - 2)(n^2 - 4n + 2)$</td>
<td>$(n - 2)(n - 4)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$(n^2 - 3n + 1)(n^3 - 5n + 5)$</td>
<td>$(n^2 - 5n + 5)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$(n - 1)(n - 2)(n - 3)(n^2 - 4n + 1)$</td>
<td>$(n - 1)^2(n - 3)^2(n - 4)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bedrosian (1961, 1964b) derived formulas for \( f(P_m, n) \) and \( f(C_m, n) \) using the foldant algorithm of Nakagawa (1958) and he has expressed these polynomials in terms of a third family of polynomials the absolute values of whose coefficients add up to a Fibonacci number. Bedrosian (1964b) and Ku and Bedrosian (1965) consider the problem of determining the polynomial of a subgraph \( I \) of a graph \( H \) when the polynomials of \( H \) and the complement of \( I \) in \( H \) are known; they state, for example, that if \((m, h)\) denotes the graph obtained from a complete \( m \)-graph by removing edges that form a complete \( h \)-graph, then

\[
f((m, h), n) = \left(1 - \frac{m-h}{n}\right)^{h-1}\left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{m-h}
\]

if \( h \leq m \). They also consider analogous enumeration problems for graphs in which several edges may join the same pair of nodes.

If \( A \) and \( B \) are two disjoint graphs with \( a + 1 \) and \( b + 1 \) nodes, respectively, let \( A \circ B \) denote a graph obtained by identifying some node of \( A \) with some node of \( B \); we shall let \( x \) denote the node common to \( A \) and \( B \).

Kasai et al. (1966a) used matrix methods to determine \( \phi(G) \) when \( G \) consists of isolated nodes and one of ten types of graphs \( A \circ B \) where \( A \) and \( B \) are complete graphs, cycles, paths or complete \( 1 \times s \) bipartite graphs (in a subsequent paper (1966b) they discussed the use of continuants in evaluating determinants that arise in these problems). The formulas that arise when \( A \) or \( B \) are paths or cycles are rather complicated so we shall derive polynomials of \( A \circ B \) only when \( A \) and \( B \) are complete graphs \((m)\) or complete bipartite graphs \((m, s)\).

For some of these problems it is slightly more convenient to consider a graph \( A \oplus B \) obtained by joining a node \( x \) in \( A \) to a node \( y \) in \( B \). Some examples of graphs \( A \circ B \) and \( A \oplus B \) are given in Figure 11.

---

**THEOREM 6.7.** If \( A = (1, a) \), \( B = (1, b) \), and \( A \oplus B \) is the graph obtained by joining the dark node \( x \) of \( A \) to the dark node \( y \) of \( B \), then

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = f(A, n)f(B, n) + \sum_{i,j} \binom{a+b-2}{j}(-n)^{-1-l}I_j^{m}.
\]

If \( T \) and \( A \) are two graphs, let \( A - T \) denote the subgraph determined by the nodes of \( A \) that do not belong to \( T \) and let \( \gamma(T) \) denote the number of nodes in the graph \( T \). To determine \( f(A \oplus B, n) \) we shall use the fact that

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = f(A, n)f(B, n) + \sum_{T} \gamma(T)(-n)^{\gamma(T)}f(A - T, n)f(B - T, n),
\]

where the sum is over all subtrees \( T \) of \( A \oplus B \) that contain the edge \( xy \); this follows immediately from the definition of \( A \oplus B \) and the polynomials \( f \).

**THEOREM 6.7.** If \( A = (1, a) \), \( B = (1, b) \), and \( A \oplus B \) is the graph obtained by joining the dark node \( x \) of \( A \) to the dark node \( y \) of \( B \), then

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{a+b-2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{a+b+2}\left(1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n}\right) + \frac{ab}{m^2}.
\]

There are \( \binom{a+b}{j} \) subtrees \( T \) of \( A \oplus B \) that contain the edge \( xy \) and \( i \) additional nodes of \( A \) and \( j \) additional nodes of \( B \) (see Figure 11). It follows, therefore, from (6.2) and Theorem 6.4 that

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = f(A, n)f(B, n) + \sum_{i,j} \binom{a+b-2}{j}(-n)^{-1-l}f(A - T, n)f(B - T, n),
\]

where the sum is over all subtrees \( T \) of \( A \oplus B \) that contain the edge \( xy \).

This last expression equals the right hand side of the required formula. We shall need the identities

\[
\sum_{l=0}^{m} \binom{m}{l}(l + 1)^{m-l}(-1)^{l}(1 - \frac{m-l}{n})^{m-l-1} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})(1 - \frac{m}{n})^{m-1}
\]

and

\[
\sum_{l=0}^{m} \binom{m}{l}(l + 1)^{m-l}(-1)^{l}(1 - \frac{m-l}{n})^{m-l-1} = (1 - \frac{m + 1}{n})^{m}.
\]
in proving the next three theorems; they follow from the first two identities in Table 1.

**Theorem 6.8.** If \( A = \langle a, 1 \rangle \), \( B = \langle b + 1 \rangle \), and \( A \oplus B \) denotes the graph obtained by joining the dark node \( x \) of \( A \) to any node \( y \) of \( B \), then

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \left\{ \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) \right\}.
\]

There are \( \binom{a}{i} \binom{b}{j}(j + 1)^{j-1} \) subtrees of \( A \oplus B \) that contain the edge joining \( A \) and \( B \) and \( i \) additional nodes of \( A \) and \( j \) additional nodes of \( B \). Hence,

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \sum_{i,j} \binom{a}{i} \binom{b}{j}(j + 1)^{j-1}(j + 1)^{j-1}(i + j + 2)(-n)^{-1-i-1}
\times \left( 1 - \frac{a - i}{n} \right)^{a-i} \left( 1 - \frac{b - j}{n} \right)^{b-j-1}
\]

by (6.2) and Theorem 6.8. This expression can be reduced to the stated formula by much the same procedure as was used in proving Theorem 6.8 except that now identities (6.3) and (6.4) must be used twice each.

To determine \( f(A \circ B, n) \) we shall use the fact that

\[
f(A \circ B, n) = \sum \gamma(T)(-n)^{-1-k}f(A - T, n)f(B - T, n),
\]

where the sum is over all subtrees \( T \) of \( A \circ B \) that contain the node \( x \); this follows immediately from the definition of \( f(A \circ B, n) \). Notice that this implies relation (6.1) when node \( x \) is joined only to one other node of \( A \) or of \( B \). The next result was stated by Bedrosian (1964b).

**Theorem 6.10.** If \( A = \langle a, 1 \rangle \), \( B = \langle b + 1 \rangle \), and \( A \circ B \) is the graph obtained by identifying the dark node \( x \) of \( A \) with any node of \( B \), then

\[
f(A \circ B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \frac{a}{n^2} \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) + \frac{b}{n^2} \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right)^{b-1}.
\]

This last expression equals the right hand side of the required formula.

The next two cases were not among the ten considered by Kasai et al. (1966a), but they can be treated in much the same way as were the last two.

**Theorem 6.9.** If \( A = \langle a + 1 \rangle \) and \( B = \langle b + 1 \rangle \), then

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \left\{ \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) \right\}.
\]

There are \( \binom{a}{i} \binom{b}{j}(j + 1)^{j-1}(j + 1)^{j-1} \) subtrees of \( A \oplus B \) that contain the edge joining \( A \) and \( B \) and \( i \) additional nodes of \( A \) and \( j \) additional nodes of \( B \). Hence,

\[
f(A \oplus B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \sum_{i,j} \binom{a}{i} \binom{b}{j}(j + 1)^{j-1}(j + 1)^{j-1}(i + j + 2)(-n)^{-1-i-1}
\times \left( 1 - \frac{a - i}{n} \right)^{a-i} \left( 1 - \frac{b - j}{n} \right)^{b-j-1}
\]

by (6.2) and Theorem 6.8. This expression can be reduced to the stated formula by much the same procedure as was used in proving Theorem 6.8 except that now identities (6.3) and (6.4) must be used twice each.

To determine \( f(A \circ B, n) \) we shall use the fact that

\[
f(A \circ B, n) = \sum \gamma(T)(-n)^{-1-k}f(A - T, n)f(B - T, n),
\]

where the sum is over all subtrees \( T \) of \( A \circ B \) that contain the node \( x \); this follows immediately from the definition of \( f(A \circ B, n) \). Notice that this implies relation (6.1) when node \( x \) is joined only to one other node of \( A \) or of \( B \). The next result was stated by Bedrosian (1964b).

**Theorem 6.11.** If \( A = \langle a + 1 \rangle \) and \( B = \langle b + 1 \rangle \), then

\[
f(A \circ B, n) = \frac{a}{n^2} \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) + \frac{b}{n^2} \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right)^{b-1}.
\]

This last expression is similar to an expression occurring in the proof of Theorem 6.8 and it can be simplified in the same way.

**Theorem 6.12.** If \( A = \langle a + 1 \rangle \) and \( B = \langle b + 1 \rangle \), then

\[
f(A \circ B, n) = \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right)^{a-1} \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right)^{b-1}
\times \frac{a}{n^2} \left( 1 - \frac{a + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{b + 1}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{a + b + 2}{n} \right)^{b-1}.
\]

This expression is similar to an expression occurring in the proof of Theorem 6.8 and it can be simplified in the same way.
There are \( \binom{m}{h} \) spanning forests \( F \) of \( \langle 1, m \rangle \) that have \( m - h + 1 \) components and \( h \) edges, and \( p(F) = h + 1 \) for each such forest. Hence,

\[
f(H, e, n) = \sum_{h=e}^{m} (-1)^{e} \frac{m!}{e! (m - e)!} \frac{m - e - 1}{h - e} (h + 1)(n)_{h - e}^{m - e - 1}.
\]

If we let \( j = h - e \) and apply the binomial theorem twice we obtain the formula stated above. (Notice that this implies Weinberg's formula for \( w(n, k) \) when \( e = 0 \).)

**Theorem 6.13.** If \( 0 \leq e \leq m - 1 \) and \( H = \langle m \rangle \), then

\[
f(H, e, n) = \binom{m - 1}{e} \binom{m}{m} \binom{1}{1 - \frac{m}{n}}^{m - e - 1}.
\]

**Corollary 6.13.1.** If \( n \) labelled nodes are partitioned into \( c \) subsets the \( i \)th of which has \( m_{i} \) nodes then there are

\[
n^{c - 2} \prod_{i=1}^{c} \binom{m_{i} - 1}{e_{i}} m_{i}^{e_{i}} (n - m_{i})^{m_{i} - e_{i}}.
\]
and \( n - 1 \) edges is constructed at random, the probability that the graph is connected is increased by a factor ranging between one or two if the nodes are partitioned into subsets and only edges joining nodes from different subsets are used. Moon (1968a) showed that their formula could be deduced from Theorem 6.1. Notice that if \( e_1 = \cdots = e_s = 0 \), then this is the same as Corollary 6.3.1. Weinberg’s formula for \( W(n, k) \) and Theorem 3.3, for example, can also be derived from special cases of Corollary 6.13.1.

**Theorem 6.14.** If \( 0 \leq e \leq 2s - 1 \) and \( H = \langle s, s \rangle \), then

\[
f(H, e, n) = \binom{s}{n} \left( 1 - \frac{s}{n} \right)^{n - 2} \left( \binom{2s}{e} \left( 1 - \frac{2s - e}{n} \right) - \frac{2(s - 1)}{e - 2} \right).
\]

It follows from definition (6.6) and the proof of Theorem 6.4 that

\[
f(r, s, e, n) = \sum_{h=0}^{r+s-1} (-1)^{h} \binom{h}{e} \sum_{i+j=n} \binom{i}{j} \left( -\frac{s}{n} \right)^{i-1} \left( -\frac{s}{n} \right)^{j-1} \left( \frac{r}{n} - \frac{i}{n} \right) \left( \frac{r}{n} - \frac{j}{n} \right).
\]

When \( r = s \), the inner sum equals

\[
\binom{2s}{h} \left( -\frac{s}{n} \right)^{h} - \left( \frac{2(s - 1)}{h - 2} \right) \left( -\frac{s}{n} \right)^{h}
\]

and the remaining sum can be evaluated by using the binomial theorem.

### 6.6. Miscellaneous Results

A wheel \( W_{n+1} \) where \( n \geq 3 \) consists of a cycle of length \( n \) each node of which is joined to an \((n + 1)\)st node; a ladder \( L_{2m} \) consists of two paths of length \( m - 1 \) such that corresponding nodes in the two paths are joined; the Möbius ladder \( M_{2r} \), where \( r \geq 2 \) consists of a cycle of length \( 2r \) in which diagonally opposite nodes are joined by an edge. Sedláček (1968, 1969, 1970) has shown that

\[
c(W_{n+1}) = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2} n + \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2} n - 2,
\]

\[
c(L_{2m}) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \left( (2 + \sqrt{3})m - (2 - \sqrt{3})m \right),
\]

and

\[
c(M_{2r}) = \frac{r}{2} \left( (2 + \sqrt{3})r + (2 - \sqrt{3})r + 2 \right).
\]

Let \( A_n \) denote the set of all positive integers \( q \) for which there exists a graph \( G_n \) such that \( c(G_n) = q \); for example,

\[
A_1 = A_2 = \{1\}, \quad A_3 = \{1, 3\}, \quad A_4 = \{1, 3, 4, 8, 16\},
\]

and

\[
A_5 = \{1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, 24, 40, 45, 75, 125\}.
\]

Sedláček (1966) determined the nine largest elements of \( A_n \) for \( n \geq 8 \); in (1969) he showed that \( |A_4| \geq \frac{1}{4}(n^2 - 3n + 4) \) and G. Baron presented a sharper bound for \( |A_n| \) at the 1969 Oberwolfach Conference on Graph Theory. They also consider analogous problems for regular graphs.

Dambit (1965) and Sedláček (1966) have shown that a planer graph and its dual have the same number of spanning trees, assuming they both are connected and have no loops.
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7.1. Random Mapping Functions. Let \( f \) denote a function that maps \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) into \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \); we have seen that each such function determines a directed graph \( D = D(f) \) on \( n \) nodes in which an arc goes from \( i \) to \( j \) if and only if \( f(i) = j \). In this section we shall use some of the earlier results to study the distribution of some parameters associated with such functions; Harris (1960) and Riordan (1962) give additional material and references on such problems.

In what follows we shall need to approximate various sums by integrals; we shall omit most of the details. Most of the estimates used are based on the fact that if \( 0 < t < 1 \), then
\[
e^{-t(1-t)} < 1 - t < e^{-t}.
\]
It follows from this that if \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), then
\[
\exp \left\{ -\frac{k^2}{2(n+1-k)} \right\} \leq \frac{(n)_k}{n^k} \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{k}{2} \right) \right\}.
\]
in particular, if \( k = o(n^{2/3}) \) then
\[
(7.1) \quad \frac{(n)_k}{n^k} = e^{-k^2/2n}(1 + o(1)).
\]
Katz (1955) and Rényi (1959b) proved the following result (sometimes we shall say \( f \) has a certain property when we really mean the graph \( D(f) \) has the property).

**Theorem 7.1.** If \( C(n) \) denotes the number of connected mapping functions \( f \), then
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} C(n)/n^{n-1/2} = (\pi/2)^{1/2}.
\]

We saw in Theorem 3.3 that there are \( D(n, k) = (n)_k n^{n-k-1} \) connected functions \( f \) whose graph has a cycle of length \( k \); hence,
\[
C(n) = n^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{(n)_k}{n^k}.
\]
If we use the above inequalities and approximate the sum by an integral, we find that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} C(n)/n^{n-1/2} = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u^{3/2}} du = (\pi/2)^{1/2}.
\]

**Corollary 7.1.1.** The probability that a random mapping function \( f \) is connected is asymptotic to \((\pi/2n)^{1/2}\) as \( n \to \infty \).

Notice that the limit of \( C(n)/n^{n-1/2} \) is not changed if we omit the first one or two terms in the sum; hence, if we only consider functions \( f \) such that \( f(i) \neq i \), the probability that \( D(f) \) is connected is asymptotic to
\[
\{C(n)/n^{n-1/2}\} \cdot (n^{n-1/2}/(n-1)^n) \sim (e/2(n-1))^{1/2}.
\]
Katz gives a table of these probabilities for selected values of \( n \) up to 100.

**Corollary 7.1.2.** The number of connected (undirected) graphs with \( n \) labelled nodes and \( n \) edges is asymptotic to \((\pi/8n)^{1/2} n^n\) as \( n \to \infty \).

Let \( \gamma_n \) denote the length of the cycle in the graph of a connected mapping function \( f \). Since
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} k(n)_k/n^k = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n)_k/n^k - \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n)_{k-1}/n^k = n,
\]
it follows that the expected value \( E(\gamma_n) \) of \( \gamma_n \) satisfies the relation
\[
E(\gamma_n) = n^{n-1}/C(n) \sum_{k=1}^{n} k(n)_k/n^k = n^3/C(n) \sim (2n/\pi)^{1/2}.
\]
More generally, if \( x \) is any positive constant and \( P(E) \) denotes the probability of the event \( E \), then we find that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} P(\gamma_n/n^{1/2} < x) = (2/\pi)^{1/2} \int_0^{x} e^{-u^{3/2}} du = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-u^{3/2}} du.
\]
This implies the following result due to Rényi (1959b).
Theorem 7.2. The distribution of \( \gamma_n/n^{1/2} \) approaches, as \( n \to \infty \), the distribution of the absolute value of a random variable that has a normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance.

Let \( \delta_n \) denote the number of arcs that belong to cycles in the graph of a (not necessarily connected) mapping function \( f \). Gobel (1963) has studied the distribution of \( \delta_n \) and has shown that the distribution of \( \delta_n \) approaches a normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance. He also showed that the kth factorial moment of the number of cycles of length \( i \geq 2 \) in the graph of such a function tends to \( i^{k-1} \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Theorem 7.3. There are \( k(n)n^{n-k-1} \) functions \( f \) such that \( \delta_n = k \).

Consider one of the \( C(n + 1, k) \) rooted directed trees in which the \( (n + 1) \)st node is the root and has \( k \) arcs directed towards it. If we remove the root, then the \( k \) nodes originally joined to the root can be arranged on \( (k!) \) ways. Hence, appealing to Theorem 3.2, the number of functions \( f \) such that \( \delta_n = k \) is equal to

\[
k! C(n + 1, k) = k! \binom{n-1}{k-1} n^{n-k} = k(n)n^{n-k-1};
\]

this also follows from the result of Blakely (1964) described in §3.5.

It follows from Theorem 7.3 that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E(\delta_n)/n^{1/2} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{n}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} k^2(n)/n^2 = \int_0^\infty u^2 e^{-u^2/2} du = (\pi/2)^{1/2}
\]

and

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E(\delta_n)/\sqrt{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} k^2(n)/n^2 = \int_0^\infty u^2 e^{-u^2/2} du = 2,
\]

so

\[
E(\delta_n) \sim (\pi n/2)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2(\delta_n) \sim (n/2)^{1/2}.
\]

Theorem 7.4. If \( x \) is any positive constant, then

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} P(\delta_n/n^{1/2} < x) = 1 - e^{-x^2/2}.
\]

This follows from Theorem 7.3 and the fact that

\[
\int_0^\infty x e^{-x^2/2} dx = e^{-x^2/2}.
\]

Rubin and Sitgreaves (1954) and Harris (1960) show that the distribution of \( \delta_n \) is the same as the distribution of the number of nodes that can be reached along a directed path from a given node in the graph of a random mapping function \( f \). Gobel (1963) has studied the distribution of the number of nodes that don't belong to cycles in the graph of a random mapping function \( f \) with the property that \( f(i) \neq i \) for all \( i \) (it was in the course of doing this that he proved a result equivalent to Theorem 7.4).

3.3); he also showed that the kth factorial moment of the number of cycles of length \( i \geq 2 \) in the graph of such a function tends to \( i^{k-1} \) as \( n \to \infty \).

The proof of the next result uses properties of the signless Stirling numbers \( c(m, r) \) of the first kind; they may be defined (see, for example, Riordan (1958; p. 71)) by the identity

\[
C_m(x) = x(x + 1) \cdots (x + m - 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} c(m, k)x^k,
\]

for \( m = 1, 2, \ldots \). Since \( C_m(x) = (x + m - 1)C_{m-1}(x) \), it follows that

\[
c(m, k) = c(m - 1, k - 1) + (m - 1)c(m - 1, k).
\]

This recurrence relation can be used to show by induction that there are \( c(m, k) \) permutations of \( m \) objects that consist of \( k \) cycles (to establish this same recurrence relation for the number of such permutations, consider separately the cases when the \( m \)th object does or does not belong to a unit cycle). We can now prove the following result given by Kruskal (1954); the derivation we give resembles the derivation given by Riordan (1962).

Theorem 7.5. If \( \tau_n \) denotes the number of components in the graph of a random mapping function \( f \), then

\[
E(\tau_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{(n)_k}{n^k}.
\]

There are \( \binom{n - 1}{m - 1} n^{n-m} c(m, k) \) mapping functions \( f \) whose graph has \( m \) edges belonging to \( \tau_n = k \) cycles; this follows from a slight modification of the argument used to prove Theorem 7.4 if we use the combinatorial interpretation of the numbers \( c(m, k) \). Consequently,

\[
E(\tau_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} kP(\tau_n = k) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} k \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \frac{(n - 1)}{m - 1} n^{n-m} c(m, k)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \frac{(n - 1)}{m - 1} n^{n-m} k c(m, k).
\]

If we differentiate both sides of equation (7.2) and then set \( x = 1 \), we find that the inner sum equals \( m! (1 + 1/2 + \cdots + 1/m) \).

Hence,

\[
E(\tau_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{m}{m+1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{1}{k} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \frac{m}{m+1} \frac{(n)_m}{n^{m+1}}.
\]
The required formula now follows from the fact that the inner sum is equal to
\[ \sum_{n=k}^{n} (n + m - n)(n)_m/n^{n+1} = \sum_{m=k}^{n} (n)_m/n^n - \sum_{m=k+1}^{n} (n)_m/n^{n+1} \]
\[ = (n)_n/n^n. \]

**Corollary 7.5.1.** \( \lim_{n \to \infty} E(\tau_n)/\frac{1}{2} \log n = 1. \)

If \( k/n^{1/2} \to 0, \) then \( (n)_k/n^k \to 1; \) if \( k/n^{1/2} \to \infty, \) then \( (n)_k/n^k \to 0. \) Hence, \( E(\tau_n) \) is approximately equal to
\[ \sum_{k=n^{1/2}}^{k} \frac{1}{k} \sim \log(n^{1/2}) \]
when \( n \) is large.

Kruskal (1954) established Theorem 7.5 by solving a differential equation for a certain generating function; he obtained an integral formula for \( E(\tau_n) \) from which he deduced that
\[ E(\tau_n) = \frac{1}{2} \log n + \frac{1}{2}(\log 2 + C) + o(1), \]
where \( C = 0.5772 \ldots \) is Euler's constant. (Recall that if \( f \) is a random permutation, then the expected number of cycles, or components, is \( \log n + C + o(1). \) It is not difficult to write expressions for the higher factorial moments of the distribution of \( \tau_n. \) Austin, Fagen, Penney, and Riordan (1959) have considered the problem of determining the expected number of components in an undirected graph with a given number of nodes and edges.

### 7.2. The Degrees of the Nodes in Random Trees

If \( d(x) \) denotes the degree of node \( x \) in a random tree \( T_n, \) then it follows from Theorem 3.2 that
\[ P(d(x) = k) = \binom{n-2}{k-1} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-k-1} \]
for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1. \)

Consequently, \( d(x) \) (or rather \( d(x) + 1 \)) has a binomial distribution and the mean and variance of \( d(x) \) are given by the formulas
\[ E(d(x)) = 2(1 - 1/n) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2(d(x)) = (1 - 1/n)(1 - 2/n). \]

The distribution can be approximated by the Poisson distribution when \( n \) is large. In this section we shall show that the maximum degree \( D = D(T_n) \) of the nodes of the tree \( T_n \) is approximately equal to \( \log n/\log \log n \) for most trees \( T_n \) when \( n \) is large, and we shall consider the distribution of the number \( X = X(k, n) \) of nodes of degree \( k \) in a random tree \( T_n. \)

The following lemmas are quite straightforward consequences of the inequalities \( (k/e)^k < k! < k^k \) and \( t < -\log(1 - t) < t/(1 - t) \) where \( 0 < t < 1. \)

**Lemma 7.1.** If
\[ k = \left\lfloor \frac{(1 + \epsilon) \log n}{\log \log n} \right\rfloor, \]
then \( n/k! < n^{-\epsilon + o(1)} \) as \( n \to \infty, \) for any positive constant \( \epsilon. \)

**Lemma 7.2.** If
\[ k = \left\lfloor \frac{(1 - \epsilon) \log n}{\log \log n} \right\rfloor, \]
then \( n/k! > n^{\epsilon + o(1)} \) as \( n \to \infty, \) for any positive constant \( \epsilon. \)

**Lemma 7.3.** If \( k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor, \) then \( n/k! < n^2 \log n/n^{2 \log \log n} \) for all sufficiently large values of \( n. \)

We now show that
\[ P(D > k) \leq n/k!; \]
this and Lemma 7.1 imply that if \( \epsilon \) is any positive constant, then
\[ D \leq (1 + \epsilon) \log n/\log \log n \]
for almost all trees \( T_n, \) that is, for all but a fraction that tends to zero as \( n \to \infty. \)

It follows from (7.3) that
\[ P(d(x) = k) = \frac{(n - 2)^n}{(k - 1)!} \frac{n^2}{(n - 1)^2} \frac{(n - 2)^{k-1}}{(n - 1)^{k-1}} < \frac{e^{-1}}{k!} \]
for \( k \geq 3 \) (the last two expressions are asymptotically equal if \( k = o(n^{1/2}). \) ) Therefore,
\[ P(d(x) > k) < e^{-1}\left\{ \frac{1}{k!} + \frac{1}{(k + 1)!} + \cdots \right\} < \frac{e^{-1}}{k!} \]
\[ \times \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{k + 1} + \frac{1}{(k + 1)^2} + \cdots \right\} = \frac{e^{-1}}{k!} (1 + 1/k) < 1/k!, \quad \text{if } k \geq 2. \]

Inequality (7.4) now follows upon applying Boole's inequality
\[ P(\cup E_i) \leq \sum P(E_i) \]
(the result is obviously true when \( k = 1). \)

Next we show that
\[ P(D \leq k) < cn^{1/2} \exp(-n/e \cdot k!) \]

\[ \text{for all sufficiently large } n. \]
for some positive constant \(c\); this and Lemma 7.2 imply that if \(\epsilon\) is any positive constant, then

\[
D > (1 - \epsilon) \log n / \log \log n
\]

for almost all trees \(T_n\).

If \(t(n, k)\) denotes the number of trees \(T_n\) such that \(D(T_n) \leq k\), then it follows from Theorem 3.1 that

\[
t(n, k) = (n - 2)! \times \text{the coefficient of } z^{n-2} \text{ in } \left(1 + z + \frac{z^2}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{z^{k-1}}{(k - 1)!}\right)^n,
\]

hence,

\[
t(n, k) < (n - 2)! \left(1 + \frac{1}{1!} + \frac{1}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{1}{(k - 1)!}\right)^n < (n - 2)! \left(1 - \frac{1}{k!}\right)^n < cn^{n - \kappa^2} \exp\left(-\frac{n}{k!}\right),
\]

for some constant \(c\), by Stirling's formula. If we divide this inequality by \(n^{\kappa - 2}\), the total number of trees \(T_n\), we obtain inequality (7.6). Moon (1968b) used these inequalities to prove the following result.

**THEOREM 7.6.** If \(E(D)\) denotes the expected value of the maximum degree of the nodes of a random tree \(T_n\), then

\[
E(D) \sim \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]

If \(\epsilon\) is any positive constant, let

\[
k_1 = \left[\frac{(1 - \epsilon) \log n}{\log \log n}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad k_2 = [\log n].
\]

Since

\[
E(D) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} P(D = k) \leq k_1 P(D \leq k_1) + k_2 P(D > k_1) + (n - 1) P(D > k_2),
\]

it follows from (7.4) and Lemmas 7.1 and 7.3 that

\[
E(D) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \log n / \log \log n + (\log n)n^{-\epsilon + o(1)} + n^\theta \log n / n^{\log \log n} = (1 + \epsilon + o(1)) \log n / \log \log n, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]

Furthermore,

\[
E(D) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} P\left(D > (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq (1 - \epsilon - o(1)) \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,
\]

by inequality (7.7). These two inequalities suffice to prove the theorem because \(\epsilon\) can be arbitrarily small.

If sharper inequalities for \(n/k!\) are used, then it can be shown that

\[
(1 - \epsilon)g(n) < D(T_n) - \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} < (1 + \epsilon)g(n),
\]

where

\[
g(n) = (\log n)(\log \log n)(\log \log \log n)^{-2},
\]

for almost all trees \(T_n\) and each positive constant \(\epsilon\).

Rényi (1959a) proved the case \(k = 1\) of the following result; Meir and Moon (1968) stated the general formula.

**THEOREM 7.7.** If \(X = X(n, k)\) denotes the number of nodes of degree \(k\) in a random tree \(T_n\) and \(p^{-1} = e \cdot (k - 1)!\), then

\[
E(X) \sim np + o(p),
\]

and

\[
\sigma^2(X) \sim np(1 - p) - np^2(k - 2)^2,
\]

for each fixed value of \(k\) as \(n \to \infty\).

If \(k\) is some fixed positive integer, let the variable \(X_i\) equal one if the \(i\)th node of a random tree \(T_n\) has degree \(k\), and zero otherwise. Then

\[
x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n = X,
\]

the number of nodes of degree \(k\) in \(T_n\).

It follows from equation (7.3) that

\[
E(x_i) = E(x_i^2) = \frac{(1 - 1/n)^{n-k} \cdot (n - 1)^k}{(k - 1)!} \cdot \frac{(n - 1)^k}{(n - 1)!} = p(1 - (k^2 - k - 3)/2n) + O(1/n^2)
\]

and

\[
\sigma^2(x_i) = E(x_i^2) - E^2(x_i) = p(1 - p) - p(1 - 2p)(k^2 - k - 3)/2n + O(1/n^2);
\]

furthermore, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that

\[
E(x_i x_j) = E(x_i x_j) = \frac{(1 - 2/n)^{n-k} \cdot (n - 2)^{k-1}}{(k - 1)!^2} \cdot \frac{(n - 2)^{k-1}}{(n - 2)^{k-1}} = p^2(1 - (2k^2 - 5k + 1)/n) + O(1/n^2)
\]

and

\[
\text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) = E(x_i x_j) - E(x_i)E(x_j) = -p^2(k^2 - k - 3)/2n + O(1/n^2),
\]

for \(1 \leq i < j \leq n\). Consequently,

\[
E(X) = \sum_i E(x_i) = np - p(k^2 - k - 3)/2 + O(1/n)
\]
\[ \sigma^2(X) = \sum_i \sigma^2(x_i) + 2 \sum_{i < j} \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) = np(1 - p) - np^2(k - 2)^2 + 0(1). \]

The distribution of \((X - \mu)/\sigma\), where \(\mu = np\) and \(\sigma^2 = np(1 - p) - np^2(k - 2)^2\), tends to the normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance as \(n \to \infty\). This was proved by Rényi (1959a) when \(k = 1\) and by Meir and Moon (1968) when \(k = 2\); the general result follows from the special case of a theorem proved by Sevast'yanov and Chistyakov (1964).

It is not difficult to show, using Theorem 3.1, that the 4th factorial moment of \(X(n, k)\) tends to \((n)_4p^2\), the 4th factorial moment of the binomial distribution, as \(n \to \infty\). This is not enough, however, to show that the standardized distribution of \(X\) tends to the binomial distribution and hence to the normal distribution; the higher terms cannot be neglected in calculating the central moments. Notice that \(\sigma^2(X)\) is asymptotic to what it would be if the variables \(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\) were independent only when \(k = 2\).

Theorem 3.5 states that the number \(R(n, k)\) of trees \(T_n\) for which \(X(n, 1) = k\) is given by the formula \(R(n, k) = (n)_kS(n - 2, n - k)\); it follows from equation (3.7) that

\[ \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} R(n, k) \frac{(n)_k}{(n-k)!} = x^{n-2}. \]

Rényi uses this relation to show that the characteristic function of \((X - \mu)/\sigma\) tends to the characteristic function of the normal distribution, that is,

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \frac{R(n, k)}{n^{n-2}} \exp \{it(k - \mu)/\sigma\} = e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \]

for every real \(t\); this suffices to show that the distribution of \((X - \mu)/\sigma\) is asymptotically normal. (See also Weiss (1958) and Rényi (1962, 1966).)

If \(0 \leq k \leq n - 2\), let \(I(n, k)\) denote the number of trees \(T_n\) such that \(X(n, 2) = k\). Such a tree can be formed by (1) choosing the \(k\) nodes whose degree is to be two, (2) constructing a tree \(T_{n-k}\) with no nodes of degree two, and (3) inserting the \(k\) nodes in the edges of the tree \(T_{n-k}\). It follows, therefore, that

\[ I(n, k) = \left( \frac{n}{k} \right) (n - 2)_k I(n - k, 0). \]

and

\[ n^{n-2} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} I(n, k) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) (n - 2)_k I(n - k, 0). \]

If we let

\[ f(n) = \frac{n^{n-2}}{(n - 2)!} \quad \text{and} \quad g(n) = \frac{I(n, 0)}{(n - 2)!}, \]

then this relation may be rewritten as

\[ f(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) g(k), \]

for \(n = 0, 1, \ldots\), if we assume that \(f(n) = g(n) = 0\) when \(n = 0\) or \(1\); if we invert this relation we find that

\[ g(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^n \frac{1}{k!} f(k) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^n \frac{1}{k^2} \left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) \frac{k^{k-2}}{(k - 2)!}. \]

Consequently,

\[ I(n, k) = (n - 2)! \left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) g(n - k) = (n - 2)! \left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) \sum_{i=2}^{n-k} (-1)^{n-k-i} \frac{1}{i(i-2)!} \]

(This formula can also be derived by the method of inclusion and exclusion.)

It follows from equation (7.8) or Theorem 3.1 that \(g(n)\) equals the coefficient of \(z^{n-2}\) in the expansion of \((e - z)^n\). Hence,

\[ \frac{g(n)}{(e - 1)^n} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C z \left( \frac{e^z - z}{z(e - 1)} \right)^n dz \]

where \(C\) is some contour about the origin, by Cauchy's integral formula. Meir and Moon (1968) use this fact to show that

\[ \frac{g(n)}{(e - 1)^n} \sim ((e - 1)/2\pi n)^{1/2} \]

as \(n \to \infty\). It now follows from Stirling's formula that

\[ I(n, 0) \sim \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e} \right)^{n+1/2} n^{-2}. \]

(Notice that if we had assumed the variables \(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\) were independent and that \(P(x_i = 1) = 1/e\), we would have obtained the estimate \((1 - 1/e)^{n+1/2} n^{-2}\) for \(I(n, 0)\).)
More generally, if \( n - k \to \infty \), then

\[
\frac{I(n, k)}{n^{a-2}} = \frac{(n - 2)!}{n^{a-2}} \binom{n}{k} g(n - k)
\]

\[
\sim \frac{e(n - 2)!}{(2\pi)^{1/2} n^{a-2}} \binom{n}{k} \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^n \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e} \right)^{-e - 1} \left( e - \frac{1}{e} \right)^{1/2} \binom{n}{k}^2 \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{n-k} \left( e - \frac{1}{e} \right)^{1/2}.
\]


If \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are constants such that

\[
\frac{\alpha e}{(n(e - 1))^{1/2}} < \frac{n}{e} - k < \frac{\beta e}{(n(e - 1))^{1/2}},
\]

then

\[
\frac{n(e - 1)}{(n - k)e} = 1 + \frac{k - n/e}{n - k} = 1 + 0(n^{-1/2}).
\]

Hence, if \( \sigma^2 = ne^{-1}(1 - e^{-1}) \), then

\[
P(\alpha < (X - n/e)\sigma < \beta) = \sum_k P(n, k) \frac{I(n, k)}{n^{a-2}} \sim \sum_k \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{e} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e} \right)^n \theta \sum_k \frac{1}{e} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e} \right)^n \theta
\]

where the sums are over \( k \) such that \( \alpha k < n/e < \beta k \). It now follows from the De Moivre-Laplace Theorem that the distribution of

\[
(X(n, 2) - n/e)/\sigma
\]

tends to the normal distribution as \( n \to \infty \).

7.3. The Distance between Nodes in Random Trees. If \( u \) and \( v \) are any two nodes in a tree \( T_n \) let \( \delta_n = \delta(T_n; u, v) \) denote the number of nodes in the unique path joining \( u \) and \( v \); the distance \( d(u, v) = d(T_n; u, v) \) between \( u \) and \( v \) is the number of edges in this path so that \( d(u, v) = \delta_n - 1 \). In this section we consider some problems related to the distribution of the distance between nodes in a random tree \( T_n \). The following result is due to Meir and Moon (1970a).

**Theorem 7.8.** If \( 2 \leq k \leq n \), then

\[
P(\delta_n = k) = \frac{k}{n-1} \cdot \frac{(n)!}{n^k}.
\]

There are \((n - 2)!/(n - 2)\) ways to construct a path from \( u \) to \( v \) that passes through \( k - 2 \) of the remaining \( n - 2 \) nodes and, by Theorem 6.1, there are \( k(n - 1) \) trees \( T_n \) that contain any given path of \( k \) nodes. Hence, there are

\[
(n - 2)!/(n - 2) = k(n - 1) \cdot \frac{(n)!}{n^k}.
\]

Trees \( T_n \) such that \( \delta(T_n; u, v) = k \). If we divide this expression by \( n^{a-2} \), the total number of trees \( T_n \), we obtain the above formula for the probability that \( \delta_n = k \).

It follows from Theorem 7.8 that \( P(\delta_n = 2) = 2/n \) and

\[
P(\delta_n = k + 1) = \frac{k + 1}{k} \cdot \frac{n - k}{n} P(\delta_n = k), \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3, \ldots, n - 1.
\]

It can be shown that

\[
\max_{\delta_n} P(\delta_n = k) = (1 + o(1))(en)^{-1/2};
\]

if \( t = [n^{1/2}] \), the maximum occurs when \( k = t \) or \( t + 1 \) according as \( t(t + 1) \geq n \) or \( t(t + 1) < n \).

If we compare Theorems 7.3 and 7.8 we see that when \( n \) is large the probability that there are \( k \) nodes in the path joining \( u \) and \( v \) is very close to the probability that there are \( k \) arcs that belong to cycles in the graph of a random mapping function \( f \). The proof of the following result involves the same arguments as were outlined after Theorem 7.3 (see Meir and Moon for the missing details).

**Theorem 7.9.** The mean and variance of \( \delta_n \) satisfy the relations

\[
E(\delta_n) \sim \left( \frac{4e}{\pi} \right)^{1/2}
\]

and

\[
\sigma^2(\delta_n) \sim (2 - \pi/2)n
\]

as \( n \to \infty \); furthermore, if \( x \) is any positive constant, then

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{P(\delta_n/n^{1/2} < x)}{\frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}} = 1 - e^{-x^2/2}.
\]

Mr. J. Hubert calculated the entries in Table 3.
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If \( \lambda_n = \lambda(T_n, k) \) denotes the number of paths of length \( k - 1 \) in a tree \( T_n \), then it can be shown that

\[
E(\lambda_n) = \frac{1}{2} k n \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{n^k} \right)
\]

and

\[
\sigma^2(\lambda_n) \sim nk(k - 1)^2/(k - 2)/24
\]

for each fixed value of \( k \) as \( n \to \infty \).

The argument used in this section can also be modified to show that the expected number of inversions in a random tree \( T_n \) (see §4.5) is equal to

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} k^2(n)_k/n^k - n + \frac{1}{2} \sim (n/8)^{3/2}/n^{3/2}.
\]

7.4. Trees with Given Height and Diameter. If the tree \( T_n \) is rooted at a given node \( u \), then the height \( h_u = h(T_n, u) \) of \( T_n \) (with respect to \( u \)) is the maximum of \( d(u, v) \) taken over all nodes \( v \) of \( T_n \); let \( t_u(k) \) denote the number of trees \( T_n \) such that \( h(T_n, u) \leq k \) (notice that \( t_u(k) = 0 \) unless \( 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \), except that \( t_u(0) = 1 \)). If

\[
G_k = G_k(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n t_u(k) x^n / n!
\]

denotes the generating function for the number of rooted trees with height at most \( k \), then \( G_k/! \) is the generating function for forests of the rooted trees each of whose height is at most \( k \); this follows by the same argument as was used in §4.1. If we join the roots of these \( i \) trees to a new node we obtain, in effect, a rooted tree with one additional node whose height is at most \( k + 1 \). It follows, therefore, that \( G_k = x \) and

\[
G_{k+1} = x + xG_k + xG_k/2! + \cdots = x \exp G_k
\]

for \( k = 0, 1, \ldots \); this relation was derived by Riordan (1960) and Rényi and Szekeres (1967). (Harris and Schoenfeld (1967, 1968, 1970) have considered, among other things, a problem equivalent to determining the asymptotic expansion of the coefficients in \( G_k = x \exp xe^u \).)

If

\[
H_k = H_k(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n h_u(k) x^n / n!
\]

where \( h_u(k) = t_u(k) - t_u(k - 1) \), denotes the generating function for the number of rooted trees of height \( k \), then \( H_0 = x \) and

\[
H_k(x) = G_k(x) - G_{k-1}(x)
\]

for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \) (Riordan gives a table of the numbers \( h_u(k) \) for \( 1 \leq k < n \leq 10 \). Rényi and Szekeres use (7.9) and the fact that

\[
\frac{h_u(k)}{(n-1)!} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{G_k(x) - G_{k-1}(x)}{x^{n+1}} dx,
\]

where \( C \) is a contour about the origin, to determine the asymptotic distribution of the numbers \( h_u(k) \) for large \( n \) and \( k \). Their argument is quite complicated; they show, among other things, that

\[
E(h_u) \sim (2\pi n)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2(h_u) \sim \frac{1}{2}(\pi - 3)n,
\]

as \( n \to \infty \). Notice that \( E(h_u) \sim \frac{1}{2} E(h_a) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

The diameter \( d(T_n) \) of a tree \( T_n \) is the greatest distance between any two nodes of \( T_n \), that is,

\[
d(T_n) = \max \{d(u, v) : u, v \in T_n\} = \max \{h(T_n, u) : u \in T_n\};
\]

if \( n \geq 3 \), then \( 2 \leq d(T_n) \leq n - 1 \) and \( h(T_n) \leq d(T_n) \leq 2h(T_n) \). Let \( r_u(k) \) denote the number of trees \( T_n \) such that \( d(T_n, u) = k \); we now derive an expression for the generating function

\[
D_k = D_k(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_u(k) x^n / n!
\]

Any tree with odd diameter \( 2h + 1 \) can be formed by joining the roots of two rooted trees each of height \( h \) (such trees are said to be bicentred; see König (1936; chapter 5)). It follows, therefore, that

\[
D_{2h+1}(x) = \frac{1}{2} H_{2h+1}(x)
\]

Any tree with even diameter \( 2h \) can be formed by identifying the roots of two or more rooted trees of height at most \( h \) if at least two of these trees have height \( h \) (such trees are said to be centred). In fact, every rooted tree of height \( h \) has diameter \( 2h \) except for those in which the root is incident with only one edge leading to nodes whose distance from the root is \( h \); the generating function for these exceptions is \( G_{h-1} \cdot H_{h-1} \). It follows, therefore, that

\[
D_{2h}(x) = H_h(x) - G_{h-1}(x) \cdot H_{h-1}(x).
\]

These relations for \( D_k(x) \) were derived by Riordan; he gives a table of the numbers \( r_u(k) \) for \( 2 \leq k \leq n \leq 10 \). The asymptotic distribution of these numbers apparently has not been determined.

7.5. The First Two Moments of the Complexity of a Graph. We mentioned earlier that in certain physical problems there is a correspondence between the terms in the \( n \)th successive approximation to certain functions
and graphs with certain properties. There is at least one case where the actual value of the terms has a graph-theoretical interpretation.

The coefficients in the expansion of various thermodynamic quantities of a gas can be expressed as a sum of integrals, called cluster integrals, which correspond to graphs with a given number of nodes and edges; there is a factor in the integrand, representing the intermolecular potential function, corresponding to each edge of the graph. Uhlenbeck and Ford (1962; see also 1963) show that if the intermolecular potential is a gaussian function of the type

\[ f(r) = -e^{-r^2}, \]

then the cluster integral corresponding to the graph \( G \) can be expressed in terms of the number \( c(G) \) of spanning trees of \( G \) (the number \( c(G) \) is sometimes called the complexity of the graph \( G \) in physical contexts; see also Temperley (1964)).

It would be of some interest to know the distribution of the number \( c = c(n, e) \) of spanning trees of graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( e \) edges; Uhlenbeck and Ford (1962) give numerical data which suggests that the distribution of \( c \) tends to the normal distribution as \( n \) increases if \( e \) is near \( tN = t(n - 1) \). It seems, however, that formulas for only the first two moments are known in general; we now derive formulas for \( E(c) \) and \( E(c^2) \) where the expectations are taken over the \( \binom{N}{e} \) graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( e \) edges.

**THEOREM 7.10.** If \( n - 1 \leq e \leq N \), then

\[ E(c) = n^{e-2} \left( \frac{e}{n} \right)_{\frac{n-1}{2}}. \]

Each of the \( n^{e-2} \) trees \( T_n \) has \( n - 1 \) edges; hence, the number of graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( e \) edges containing any such tree is the number of ways of selecting \( e - (n - 1) \) of the \( N - (n - 1) \) pairs of nodes not already joined by an edge. Therefore,

\[ E(c) = n^{e-2} \left( \frac{N}{e - (n - 1)} \right). \left( \frac{N}{e} \right)^{-1} = n^{e-2} \left( \frac{e}{n} \right)_{\frac{n-1}{2}}. \]

**THEOREM 7.11.** If \( n - 1 \leq e \leq N \), then

\[ E(c^2) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} T_m(n) \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^{m-j} \binom{m}{j} \left( \frac{e}{n} \right)_{n-3n-1-j}. \]

where

\[ T_m(n) = \frac{n^{2(n-m-2)-(n-1)m}}{l!} \sum_{t=0}^{n} (n-t)^{n-t-1} \left( \frac{m}{t} \right). \]

We first determine an expression for the number \( T_m(n) \) of ordered pairs of trees with \( n \) nodes that have at least \( m \) (\( \leq n - 1 \)) edges in common (each such pair of trees is counted separately for each set of \( m \) edges they have in common). If two trees have \( m \) edges in common then these \( m \) edges and the \( n \) nodes determine a forest of \( I = n - m \) subtrees. It follows from Theorem 6.1 and the derivation of Theorem 4.1 that

\[ T_m(n) = \frac{n^{2(n-m-2)}}{l!} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \binom{n}{j} j^{l-2} \left( (j_1, \ldots, j_l)^2 \right), \]

where the sum is over all compositions of \( n \) into \( l \) positive integers.
It follows, therefore, that

\[ E(c^2) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \left[ \frac{\phi(n, e)}{N(2n-1)} \right] \sum_{j=0}^{m} (-1)^j \binom{m+j}{m} T_{n+1}^{m+1}(n) \]

\begin{align*}
&= \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} T_{n}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m} (-1)^{m-j} \left( \binom{m+1}{j} \right) \frac{\phi(n, e)}{N(2n-1)} \cdot \frac{j!}{(m-j)!} \cdot \frac{1}{j!} \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{T_{n}^{m}}{j!} \cdot \frac{1}{(m-j)!} \cdot \frac{1}{j!} \\
&= \frac{2^{m}}{m!} \cdot \left( 1 - \gamma \right)^{m} \gamma^{m}
\end{align*}

for each fixed value of \( m \); it follows therefore, from Tannery’s theorem (see Bromwich (1931)) that

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{E(c^2)}{\phi(n, e)} = \exp 2(1 - \gamma)/\gamma. \]

The corollary now follows from Theorem 7.10 and inequality (7.1).

Theorems 7.10 and 7.11 were proved by Uhlenbeck and Ford (1932) and Moon (1964), respectively; Groeneveld (1965) has given another derivation of Theorem 7.11 that also applies to graphs in which several edges may join the same pair of nodes.

We remark that Erdős and Rényi (1960) have shown that if \( e \sim \rho n^{(k-2)/(k-1)} \), then the distribution of the number of isolated trees with \( k \) nodes in a random graph with \( n \) nodes and \( e \) edges tends to the Poisson distribution with mean

\[ \lambda = \frac{(2\rho)^{k-1}n^{k-2}}{k^1} \]

as \( n \to \infty \); Palásti (1961) has obtained an analogous result for bipartite trees.

7.6. Removing Edges from Random Trees. If some edges of a tree \( T_n \) are removed the graph remaining is a forest of disjoint subtrees of \( T_n \); let \( r \) denote the number of nodes in the subtree containing a given node \( x \) (say the \( n \)th node). In this section we shall determine the distribution of \( r \) under the assumptions that (1) the tree \( T_n \) is chosen at random from the set of \( n^{n-2} \) trees with \( n \) labelled nodes, and (2) the edges removed from \( T_n \) are chosen independently at random so that any given edge is removed with probability \( p = 1/2 \); in particular, we shall show that the mean \( E(r) \) and variance \( \sigma^2(r) \) of \( r \) tend to 4 and 16, respectively, as \( n \) tends to infinity.

**Theorem 7.12.** If \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), then

\[ P(r = k) = (2n)^{k-1}(n-k)^{n-k-1}. \]

If \( r = k \), then there are \( \binom{n-1}{k-1} \) choices possible for the subtree \( T_k \) that contains node \( x \) and \( k - 1 \) other nodes after a random selection of edges has been removed from a random tree \( T_n \). If \( 1 \leq k < n \), let \( j \) denote the number of edges in \( T_n \) that joined nodes of \( T_k \) to nodes not in \( T_k \); the probability that these edges were removed and the \( k - 1 \) edges of \( T_k \) were left intact is \( \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^j k^k \). There are \( \binom{n-k-1}{j} \) \( k^k \) \( (n-k)^{n-k-1} \) trees \( T_n \) that contain a given tree \( T_k \) on \( k \) given nodes and such that \( j \) edges join nodes of \( T_k \) to nodes not in \( T_k \); this follows from Theorem 3.2 if we temporarily consider \( T_k \) as a special node \( y \), construct a tree on node \( y \) and the remaining \( n - k \) nodes in which \( d(y) = j \), and then replace the \( j \) edges incident with \( y \) by edges incident with one of the \( k \) nodes of \( T_k \). It follows, therefore, that if \( 1 \leq k < n \), then

\[ P(r = k) = (2n)^{k-1}(n-k)^{n-k-1}. \]

The corollary now follows from Theorem 7.10 and inequality (7.1).

Theorems 7.10 and 7.11 were proved by Uhlenbeck and Ford (1932) and Moon (1964), respectively; Groeneveld (1965) has given another derivation of Theorem 7.11 that also applies to graphs in which several edges may join the same pair of nodes.

We remark that Erdős and Rényi (1960) have shown that if \( e \sim \rho n^{(k-2)/(k-1)} \), then the distribution of the number of isolated trees with \( k \) nodes in a random graph with \( n \) nodes and \( e \) edges tends to the Poisson distribution with mean

\[ \lambda = \frac{(2\rho)^{k-1}n^{k-2}}{k^1} \]

as \( n \to \infty \); Palásti (1961) has obtained an analogous result for bipartite trees.

We shall use some of the identities in Table 1 to simplify the expressions we obtain from Theorem 7.12 for \( E(r) \) and \( E(r^2) \). If \( x = 0, y = n, p = 1, 4 + \text{c.l.t.} \)
and \( q = -1 \), it then follows from the third identity in Table 1 that

\[
A_4(0, n; 1, -1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{k+1}(2n - k)^{n-k-1}
\]

\[
= n^{-1}[\beta(0) + 2n]^n
= n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k!/(2n)^{n-k}
\]

\[
= 2(2n)^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n} k(n)_k/(2n)^k.
\]

Furthermore,

\[
[\beta(0; 2)]^n = [\beta(0) + \beta(0)]^n
= \sum_{t=0}^{n} \binom{n}{t} t!(k - t)! (k - t)!
\]

\[
= k! \sum_{t=0}^{k} t(k - t) = k! \left( \binom{k+1}{3} \right),
\]

and

\[
(\alpha + \gamma(0))^n = \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} t^3! (k - t)! = \frac{k!}{4} k(k + 1)(2k + 1);
\]

it follows from the fourth identity in Table 1, after some simplification, that

\[
A_4(0, n; 2, -1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{k+2}(2n - k)^{n-k-1}
\]

\[
= n^{-1}((2n + \beta(0; 2))^n + (2n + \alpha + \gamma(0))^n)
\]

\[
= (2n)^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n} k^2(k + 1)(n)_k/(2n)^k.
\]

**Corollary 7.12.1.** \( \lim_{n \to \infty} E(r) = 4 \) and \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \sigma^2(r) = 16. \)

It follows from Theorem 7.12 and the identity for \( A_4(0, n; 1, -1) \) that

\[
E(r) = (2n)^{1-n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{k+1}(2n - k)^{n-k-1}
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n} k(n)_k/(2n)^k;
\]

therefore,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E(r) = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n} (1/2)^k = 4.
\]

by Tannery's Theorem (see Bromwich (1931)). Similarly,

\[
E(r^2) = (2n)^{1-n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} k^{k+2}(2n - k)^{n-k-1}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{n} k^2(k + 1)(n)_k/(2n)^k
\]

and

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E(r^2) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} k^2(k + 1)(1/2)^k = 32;
\]

consequently,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sigma^2(r) = \lim_{n \to \infty} (E(r^2) - E^2(r)) = 16.
\]

These results are due to Moon (1970a); the formula for \( E(r) \) can also be derived from Theorem 7.8. More generally, if the probability of removing any given edge of \( T_n \) is \( p \), where \( 0 < p < 1 \), then it can be shown that

\[
P(r = k) = \frac{p^n}{1 - p} \binom{n}{k} \frac{n}{1 - \frac{n}{1 - k}} (\frac{n}{1 - k})^{n-k-1},
\]

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E(r) = p^{-1},
\]

and

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sigma^2(r) = 2(1 - p)p^{-4}.
\]

Professor N. J. Pullman computed the following values of \( E(r) \) and \( E(r^2) \) when \( p = 1/2. \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( E(r) )</th>
<th>( E(r^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0781</td>
<td>5.4062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4207</td>
<td>7.8837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5468</td>
<td>8.9661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6530</td>
<td>9.9573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7439</td>
<td>10.8673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8227</td>
<td>11.7050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( E(r) )</th>
<th>( E(r^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8918</td>
<td>12.7484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9529</td>
<td>13.1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0073</td>
<td>13.8592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0562</td>
<td>14.4779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1004</td>
<td>15.0552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2698</td>
<td>17.4455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3846</td>
<td>19.2378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.6539</td>
<td>24.0788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9039</td>
<td>29.5671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.7. Climbing Random Trees. If the tree $T_n$ where $n \geq 2$ is rooted at node $x$ suppose we select some edge incident with $x$ and proceed along it to node $y$; then we select some other edge $yz$ incident with $y$ and proceed to $z$. If we continue this process as long as possible, let $s = s(T_n)$ denote the number of edges traversed before we reach some endnode $u$ (other than $x$, if $x$ is an endnode). In this section we shall determine the mean $E(s)$ and variance $\sigma^2(s)$ of $s$ under the assumptions that (1) the tree $T_n$ is chosen at random from the $n^{-n}$ trees $T_n$ that are rooted at node $x$, and (2) whenever we reach a node $q$ that isn’t an endnode, the next edge is chosen at random from the edges incident with $q$ that lead away from $x$; it will follow that $E(s) \rightarrow 2e - 1$ and $\sigma^2(s) \rightarrow 2e(e - 1)$ as $n \to \infty$. The different rooted trees $T_n$ are illustrated in Figure 12 along with their relative frequencies and the calculations showing that $E(s) = 17/8$ when $n = 4$.
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If $y$ is any node joined to the root $x$ of a tree $T_n$, then $y$ can be thought of as the root of the subtree $T^*$ determined by those nodes $z$ of $T_n$ such that the unique path joining $x$ and $z$ contains the edge $xy$. Let $\rho(n, k)$ denote the probability that the subtree $T^*$ of a random rooted tree $T_n$ has $k$ nodes.

**Lemma 7.4.** If $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$, then

$$\rho(n, k) = \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \binom{n-1}{k-1} k^{k-2} (n - k - 1)^{n-k-1}.$$ 

The $k$ nodes of $T^*$ can be chosen in $\binom{n-1}{k}$ ways and, having chosen the nodes, $T^*$ can be formed in $k^{k-2}$ ways. If the root $x$ has degree $t$ in $T_n$, where $1 \leq t \leq n - k$, then by Theorem 3.2 there are

$$\binom{n - k - 2}{t - 2}(n - k - 1)^{n-k-t}$$

ways to form a tree on the $n - k$ nodes not in $T^*$. The node $y$ in $T^*$ that is joined to the root $x$ can be chosen in $k$ ways and this node $y$ could have been any one of the $t$ nodes joined to $x$. Hence,

$$\rho(n, k) = \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \binom{n-1}{k} (n - k - 2)^{t-2} k^{k-2} (n - k - 1)^{n-k-1}.$$

The lemma now follows by applying the binomial theorem (twice) to replace the sum by $(n - k - 1)^{n-k-1}$.

**Theorem 7.13.** If $n \geq 1$, then

$$E(s) = 2 \left( \frac{n+1}{n} \right)^{n-2} - 1$$

and

$$E(s(s - 1)) = 6 \left( \frac{n+2}{n} \right)^{n-2} - 8 \left( \frac{n+1}{n} \right)^{n-2} + 2.$$

**Corollary 7.13.1.** As $n \to \infty$, $E(s) \to 2e - 1$ and $\sigma^2(s) \to 2e(e - 1)$.

If $0 \leq l \leq n - 1$, let $P(n, l)$ denote the probability that $s(T_n) = l$; we adopt the convention that $P(n, 0) = 0$ if $n = 1$ and zero otherwise.

Suppose we select one of the edges $xy$ incident with the root $x$ of a random tree $T_n$ and proceed along it to $y$; then $s(T_n) = l$ if and only if $s(T^*) = l - 1$, where $T^*$ is the subtree defined earlier. Hence, if $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$ then it follows from Lemma 7.4 that

$$P(n, l) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \rho(n, k) P(k, l - 1) = \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} k^{k-2} (n - k - 1)^{n-k-1} P(k, l - 1).$$

If $\mu(n) = E(s)$, then

$$\mu(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} l P(n, l) = \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} k^{k-2} (n - k - 1)^{n-k-1} (\mu(k) + 1)$$

for $n = 2, 3, \ldots$, if we substitute the formula for $P(n, l)$ and interchange the order of summation ($\mu(1) = 0$ by definition). We can now prove the
formula for \( \mu(n) \) by induction. If we assume \( \mu(k) + 1 = 2(1 + 1/k)^{k-2} \) and apply the second identity in Table 1 with \( x = 2, y = -1 \) and \( n \) and \( k \) replaced by \( n - 1 \) and \( k - 1 \), we find that

\[
\mu(n) = \frac{2}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(n - 1)}{(k - 1)}(k + 1)^{k-2}(n - k - 1)^{n-k-1} \\
= \frac{2}{n^{n-2}} \left(-2n^{n-2} + (n + 1)^{n-2}\right) = 2\left(\frac{n + 1}{n}\right)^{n-2} - 1,
\]

as required.

Similarly, if \( \tau(n) = E(s(s - 1)) \) then

\[
\tau(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i(l - 1)P(n, l) \\
= \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(n - 1)}{(k - 1)}k^{k-2}(n - k - 1)^{n-k-1}(\tau(k) + 2\mu(k)).
\]

If we assume, as our induction hypothesis, that

\[
\tau(k) + 2\mu(k) = 6\left(\frac{k + 2}{k}\right)^{k-2} - 4\left(\frac{k + 1}{k}\right)^{k-2}
\]

and apply the second identity in Table 1 twice, we find that

\[
\tau(n) = \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(n - 1)}{(k - 1)}[6(k + 2)^{k-2} - 4(k + 1)^{k-2}](n - k - 1)^{n-k-1} \\
= \frac{1}{n^{n-2}} \left[6\left(-\frac{3}{4}(n + 1)^{n-2} + (n + 2)^{n-2}\right) - 4\left(-\frac{3}{4}n^{n-2} + (n + 1)^{n-2}\right)\right] \\
= 6\left(\frac{n + 2}{n}\right)^{n-2} - 8\left(\frac{n + 1}{n}\right)^{n-2} + 2,
\]

as required. The corollary follows immediately from the theorem and the fact that \( \tau'(s) = E(s(s - 1)) + E(s) - E^2(s) \).

Theorem 7.13 can also be proved by expressing the generating functions of the numbers \( \mu(n) \) and \( \tau(n) \) in terms of the function \( Y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-1} x^n/n! \) and then applying formula (4.2) (see Moon (1970b)). It can be shown that if \( 1 \leq l \leq n - 1 \), then

\[
P(n, l) = \frac{l}{n^{n-2}} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \left(l - 1\right)\left(-1\right)^j(n - 2 - j)^{n-2}.
\]

Thus

\[
P_l = \lim_{n \to \infty} P(n, l) = lp^2q^{l-1}
\]

for \( l = 0, 1, \ldots \), where \( p = 1 - q = e^{-1} \), and the distribution of \( s(T_n) - 1 \) tends to the negative binomial distribution of order two as \( n \to \infty \).

If \( 1 \leq t \leq n - 1 \) and \( \mu(n, t) \) and \( \tau(n, t) \) denote the expected value of \( s \) and \( s(s - 1) \) over the set of trees \( T_n \) in which the root \( x \) has degree \( t \), then the preceding arguments can be extended to show that

\[
\mu(n, t) = \frac{t + 1}{t} \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)^{n-t-2}
\]

and

\[
\tau(n, t) = \frac{2}{t} \left(t + 2\left(\frac{n + 1}{n-1}\right)^{n-t-2} - \left(1 + t\right)^2\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)^{n-t-2}\right).
\]

As a partial verification, notice that

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} P(d(x) = t)\mu(n, t) = \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \left(t + 1\right)\left(\frac{n - 1}{n}\right)^{n-t-1} = 2\left(\frac{n + 1}{n}\right)^{n-1} - 1 = \mu(n),
\]

by Theorem 3.2 and the binomial theorem.

D. A. Klamer pointed out, in a letter dated March, 1969, that there are \( n(n - 1)^{n-1} \) ways to select a tree \( T_n \), choose a root node \( x \), and then proceed along a path from \( x \) to some endnode; hence, the average number of ways of rooting a tree \( T_n \) and then proceeding from the root to some endnode is

\[
\frac{n(n - 1)^{n-1}}{n^{n-2}} \sim n^2/e.
\]

Perhaps it should be emphasized that \( E(s) \) is not the same as the average distance between the root \( x \) and a node \( u \) given that \( u \) is an endnode. The second proof of Theorem 3.2 and the proof of Theorem 7.8 can be modified to show that if \( u \) is an endnode then the expected distance between \( x \) and \( u \) is

\[
\frac{1}{n - 1} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} t^2\left(\frac{n - 1}{n - 1}\right)^{(n - 1)},
\]

if \( x \) and \( u \) are both endnodes the expected distance between them is

\[
\frac{1}{n - 2} \sum_{t=1}^{n-2} t(t + 1)\left(\frac{n - 2}{n - 2}\right)^{(n - 2)},
\]

if \( n \geq 3 \). Both of these quantities are asymptotic to the expected distance between two arbitrary nodes in a random tree \( T_n \) as \( n \to \infty \).
7.8. Cutting Down Random Trees. Suppose the tree $T_n$ where $n \geq 2$ is rooted at a given node $x$. If we remove some edge $e$ of $T_n$, the tree falls into two subtrees one of which, $T_k$ say, contains the root $x$; if $k \geq 2$ we can remove some edge of $T_k$ and obtain an even smaller subtree containing $x$. If we repeat this process as long as possible, let $A = A(T_n)$ denote the number of edges removed before we obtain the subtree consisting of the root $x$ itself. In this section we shall determine the mean $\mu(n)$ and variance $\sigma^2(n)$ of $A(T_n)$ under the assumptions that (1) $T_n$ is chosen at random from the $n^{n-2}$ trees $T_n$ that are rooted at node $x$, and (2) at each stage the edge removed is chosen at random from edges of the remaining subtree containing $x$; it will follow that $\mu(n) \approx (\sqrt{\pi n})^{1/2}$ and $\sigma^2(n) \approx (2 - \sqrt{\pi})n$ as $n \to \infty$. These and some related results are due to Meir and Moon (1970b).

The average values of $A(T_n)$ for the different trees $T_n$ are indicated in Figure 13; it can be shown that if $T_n$ is a path rooted at an endnode, for example, then $E(\lambda(T_n)) = 1 + 1/2 + \cdots + 1/(n - 1)$.

\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc}
$T_n$: & x & x & x & x \\
$E(\lambda(T_n))$: & $1$ & $1/2$ & $2$ & $3$ \\
$\mu(4)$: & $3/8$ & $11/6$ & $5/2$ & $2$ & $3/16$ & $1/16$ & $3 = 2$ & $3/16$
\end{tabular}
\caption{Figure 13}
\end{center}
\end{figure}

**Theorem 7.14.** If $n \geq 2$, then

$$\mu(n) = \sum_{I=1}^{n-1} \frac{l + 1}{l} \cdot \frac{(n - 1)!}{n^l}.$$ 

**Corollary 7.14.1.** As $n \to \infty$,

$$\mu(n) = (\sqrt{\pi n})^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \log n + O((\log n)^{1/2}).$$

If $0 \leq l \leq n - 1$, let $P(n, l)$ denote the probability that $\lambda(T_n)$ equals $l$; we adopt the convention that $P(n, 0)$ equals one if $n = 1$ and zero otherwise.

Suppose we remove one of the $n - 1$ edges of a random tree $T_n$ and obtain a subtree $T_k$ containing the root $x$. There are \binom{n-1}{k-1} possible choices for the $k - 1$ nodes of $T_k$ other than $x$ and, having chosen these nodes, there are $k^{k-2}$ possible trees $T_k$. There are $(n - k)n^{-k-2}$ trees that could be formed on the remaining $n - k$ nodes and the removed edge could have joined any of the $k$ nodes of $T_k$ to any of the remaining $n - k$ nodes. Since $\lambda(T_k) = l$ if and only if $\lambda(T_n) = l - 1$, it follows that

$$P(n, l) = \frac{1}{(n - 1)n^{-k-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k-1} P(k, l-1) k^{k-1} (n - k)^{-k-1}.$$ 

for $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$.

If $\mu(n)$ denotes the expected value of $\lambda(T_n)$, then

$$\mu(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} lP(n, l)$$

and recall that the generating function

$$Y = Y(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n \frac{n^n}{(n - 1)!}$$

satisfies the relations

$$Y = xe^Y \quad \text{and} \quad Y' = \frac{Y}{1 - Y}.$$ 

(Since $\mu(n) \leq n - 1$, $M(x)$ certainly converges if $|x| < e^{-1}$.) If we multiply equation (7.11) by $(n - 1)n^{-k-2}x^k/(n - 1)!$ and sum over $n$, we obtain the relation

$$xM' - M = xM' Y + xY' Y$$

between $M$ and $Y$. This may be rewritten as

$$\frac{M}{Y'} = Y'(1 - Y)^{-1},$$

from which it follows that

$$M = Y \ln (1 - Y) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l} Y'_{l+1}.$$ 

(The constant of integration must be zero since $\mu(1) = 0$.) If we use relation (4.2) to equate the coefficients of $x^n$ in this equation, we obtain the required formula for $\mu(n)$. 

\[4^*)\]
Instead of determining the variance of $\lambda$ directly, it is more convenient to determine $\tau(n)$, the expected value of $\lambda(\lambda - 1)$; the variance $\sigma^2(n)$ is then given by the formula $\sigma^2(n) = \tau(n) + \mu(n) - \mu^2(n)$.

**Theorem 7.15.** If $n \geq 2$ and

$$
\alpha_j = \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{j}
$$

for $j = 2, 3, \ldots (\alpha_1 = 0)$, then

$$
\tau(n) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j} + \frac{\alpha_j}{j} \right) (j + 1) \frac{(n - 1)}{n!}.
$$

**Corollary 7.15.** As $n \to \infty$, $\sigma^2(n) = (2 - \frac{1}{\pi})n + O((n \log n)^{1/2})$.

It follows from equation (7.10) that

$$
\tau(n) = \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \tau(t)P(n, t)
$$

for $n = 2, 3, \ldots (\tau(1) = 0$ by definition). If we let

$$
S = S(x) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \tau(n)x^{n-1} - \frac{x^n}{(n-1)!},
$$

then it follows from the recurrence relation for $\tau(n)$ that

$$
xS' = xS' Y + 2x M' Y.
$$

This can be rewritten as

$$
(S/Y)' = \frac{2}{1-Y} M' = 2Y \{ Y(1-Y)^{-a} - \ln(1-Y) \cdot (1-Y)^{-1} \};
$$

consequently,

$$
S = Y[2Y(1-Y)^{-1} + 2\ln(1-Y) + \ln^2(1-Y)]
$$

$$
= 2 \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j} + \frac{\alpha_j}{j} \right) Y^j + 1.
$$

If we equate the coefficients of $x^n$ in this equation we obtain the required formula for $\tau(n)$.

The recurrence relation (7.10) can be used to express the generating functions of the numbers $P(n, t)$ in terms of $Y$ also, but the resulting expressions seem too complicated in general to be particularly useful; it can be shown, for example, that

$$
P(n, 1) = (n - 1)^{n-3}/n^{n-2},
$$
$$
P(n, 2) = (5n + 1)(n - 2)(n - 1)^{n-5}/2n^{n-2},
$$
and

$$
P(n, 1) = (103n^2 + 73n + 4)(n - 3)(n - 2)(n - 1)^{n-7}/24n^{n-2}.
$$

Theorem 3.3 states that if $1 \leq t \leq n$, then there are $t^{n-1-1}$ forests $F_n$ of $t$ trees with a total of $n$ labelled nodes such that $t$ given nodes, say the nodes $1, 2, \ldots, t$, belong to different trees; we may consider these $t$ nodes as the roots of the trees in $F_n$. Let $\mu(n, t)$ and $\tau(n, t)$ denote the expected value of $\lambda$ and $\lambda(\lambda - 1)$ where $\lambda = \lambda(F_n)$ is the number of edges that must be removed from a random forest $F_n$ of $t$ rooted trees before isolating the $t$ roots; at each stage the edge removed is chosen at random from the edges of the remaining subtrees containing the $t$ roots.

$$
\mu(n, t) = \sum_{n=t+1}^{\infty} \mu(n, t)tn^{n-t-1} \frac{x^n}{(n-t)!}
$$

and

$$
\tau(n, t) = \sum_{n=t+1}^{\infty} \tau(n, t)tn^{n-t-1} \frac{x^n}{(n-t)!}.
$$

then the argument used earlier in the case $t = 1$ can be extended to show that

$$
M_i = -tY' \ln(1-Y) = t \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} Y^{i+1}
$$

and

$$
S_t = tY'(2Y(1-Y)^{-1} + 2\ln(1-Y) + t \ln^2(1-Y))
$$

$$
= 2t \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j} + \frac{\alpha_j}{j} \right) Y^{j+1}
$$

for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$. If we equate the coefficients of $x^n$ in these equations we obtain the following formulas for $\mu(n, t)$ and $\tau(n, t)$.

**Theorem 7.16.** If $1 \leq t \leq n - 1$, then

$$
\mu(n, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + t - \frac{(n - t)}{j}}{n^j}
$$
and

\[ \tau(n, t) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j} + \frac{t \alpha_j}{j} \right) (j + t) \frac{(n - t)_{j}}{n!} \]

Notice that \( M_t = t Y^{t-1} M_1 \) and \( S_t = t Y^{t-1} S_1 \), so the numbers \( \mu(n, t) \) and \( \tau(n, t) \) can be expressed in terms of the numbers \( \mu(m) = \mu(m, 1) \) and \( \tau(m) = \tau(m, 1) \) for \( 2 \leq m \leq n - t + 1 \).

Theorem 3.2 states that if \( 1 \leq t \leq n - 1 \), then there are \( \binom{n-2}{t-1} \) trees \( T_n \) in which the root \( x \) has degree \( t \); let \( D(n, t) \) and \( U(n, t) \) denote the expected value of \( \lambda \) and \( \lambda - 1 \) for such trees. The argument used to establish equation (7.11) can be extended to show that

\[ D(n, t) = \frac{1}{(t-1)!} \binom{n-2}{t-1} (n-1)^{n-t-1} \]

\[ \times \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-t} \binom{n-1}{k} \binom{k-2}{t-1} (k-1)^{k-1} (n-k)^{n-k-1} (D(k, t) + 1) \right\} \]

\[ + \sum_{k=0}^{n-t} \binom{n-1}{k} \binom{k-2}{t-1} (k-1)^{k-1} (n-k)^{n-k-1} (D(k, t-1) + 1) \}

if \( 1 \leq t \leq n - 1 \) (otherwise \( D(n, t) = 0 \)); the main difference is that now we must consider two possibilities when removing an edge \( e \) from a random tree \( T_n \) (in which \( d(x) = t \)) to obtain a subtree \( T_k \) containing the root \( x \).

If \( e \) is not incident with \( x \) then \( d(x) = t - 1 \) in \( T_k \) and \( e \) joins one of the \( k - 1 \) nodes of \( T_k \) other than \( x \) to one of the \( n - k \) nodes not in \( T_k \). The two sums in the right hand side of equation (7.13) correspond to these two possibilities.

If

\[ D_t = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D(n, t) \binom{n-2}{t-1} (n-1)^{n-t-1} \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}, \]

then it follows from equation (7.13) that

\[ x D_t = x D Y + D_{t-1} Y + x Y X Y(t-1), \]

or equivalently, that

\[ D_t = \frac{1}{(t-1)!} Y^{t-1} X Y(t-1) + D_{t-1} Y \]

for \( t = 1, 2, \ldots \). The result

\[ D_t = \frac{1}{(t-1)!} Y^{t-1} \ln (1 - Y) = \frac{1}{(t-1)!} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} Y^{j+t-1} \]

can now be established by induction if we use the fact that \( D_t(0) = 0 \) for all \( t \) and \( D_0 = 0 \). This implies the following formula.

**Theorem 7.17.** If \( 0 \leq t \leq n - 1 \), then

\[ D(n+1, t+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-t} \frac{j + t}{j} \binom{n-1}{j} (n-1-t)^{n-1-j} \]

**Corollary 7.17.** If \( 1 \leq t \leq n - 1 \), then

\[ \mu(n, t) = \left( 1 - \frac{t}{n} \right) D(n+1, t+1). \]

This corollary follows from Theorems 7.16 and 7.17; for fixed values of \( n \), \( D(n+1, t+1) \) increases to \( n \) as \( t \) increases while \( \mu(n, t) \) eventually decreases to 1. If

\[ U_t = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} U(n, t) \binom{n-2}{t-1} (n-1)^{n-t-1} \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}, \]

then similar arguments can be used to show that

\[ U_t = \frac{1}{(t-1)!} \]

\[ \times \left\{ 2 Y (1 - Y)^{-1} + 2 Y^{t-1} \ln (1 - Y) + (t - 1) Y^{t-2} \ln^2 (1 - Y) \right\} \]

\[ = \frac{2}{(t-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j+1} + \frac{(t-1)\alpha_j+2}{j+2} \right) Y^{j+t} \]

for \( t = 1, 2, \ldots \). This implies the following result.

**Theorem 7.18.** If \( 1 \leq t \leq n - 1 \), then

\[ U(n, t) = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{j+1} + \frac{(t-1)\alpha_j+2}{j+2} \right) \binom{n-1}{j+2} \frac{1}{n(t+1)}. \]

Notice that \( (t-1)! D_t = Y^{t-1} D_1 \) and \( (t-1)! U_t = Y^{t-1} U_1 + (t-1) Y^{t-2} \ln^2 (1 - Y) \), so the numbers \( D(n, t) \) and \( U(n, t) \) can be expressed in terms of the numbers \( D(m, 1) \) and \( U(m, 1) \) for \( 2 \leq m \leq n - t + 1 \).
THEOREM 7.19. If \( 0 \leq t \leq (n/\log n)^{1/2} \), then
\[
D(n + 1, t + 1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( 1 + \frac{t}{k + 1} \right) C_k
\]
where
\[
C_k = \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left( 1 - \frac{t + j}{n} \right)
\]
for all \( k \); hence,
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k \leq 1 + n^{1/2} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-x/2} dx = 1 + (\frac{\pi}{4})^{1/2}.
\]

Since \( 1 - x < e^{-x} \) for \( x > 0 \) it follows that
\[
C_k \leq e^{-k^2/8n}
\]
for all \( k \); hence,
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k \leq 1 + n^{1/2} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx = 1 + (\frac{\pi}{4})^{1/2}.
\]

If \( k \geq K = 2(n \log n)^{1/2} \), then \( C_k \leq 1/n^2 \); hence,
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{t}{k + 1} C_k \leq t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k + 1} + \frac{t}{n^2} \frac{n}{K} \leq \frac{1}{2} t (\log n + \log \log n + 4)
\]
for sufficiently large \( n \). Therefore,
\[
D(n + 1, t + 1) \leq (\frac{\pi}{4})^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} t (\log n + \log \log n + 4) + 1
\]
if \( 0 \leq t \leq n - 1 \) and \( n \) is sufficiently large.

It can also be shown that if \( 0 \leq t \leq (n/\log n)^{1/2} \) and \( n \) is sufficiently large, then
\[
D(n + 1, t + 1) \geq (\frac{\pi}{4})^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} t (\log n - \log \log n - 5) - (\log n)^{1/2}.
\]
The theorem now follows upon combining these two inequalities (see Meir and Moon (1970b) for the missing details). It follows from Corollary 7.17.1 that if \( 1 \leq t \leq (n/\log n)^{1/2} \) then the conclusion of Theorem 7.19 remains valid if \( D(n + 1, t + 1) \) is replaced by \( \mu(n, t) \); in particular, Corollary 7.14.1 holds. The average degree of the root in a random tree \( T_n \) is \( 2 - 2/n \) so perhaps it is not too surprising that \( \mu(n) = \mu(n, 1) \) is asymptotically equal to \( D(n, 2) \) for large \( n \).

We now determine the asymptotic behaviour of the variance \( \sigma^2(n) \) of \( \lambda \) for ordinary rooted trees \( T_n \). It follows from Theorems 7.14 and 7.15 and the identity
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} k(n)_k/n^k = n,
\]
that
\[
\tau(n) = 2(n - 1) - 2\mu(n) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \alpha_k \frac{k + 1}{k} \frac{(n - 1)_k}{n^k}.
\]
If \( s_n \) denotes the last sum, then
\[
s_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(\log k + 0(1)) k + 1}{k} \frac{(n - 1)_k}{n^k} = \frac{1}{2} \log n + 0(1)\mu(n) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \log (kn^{-1/2}) \frac{k + 1}{k} \frac{(n - 1)_k}{n^k}.
\]
Now \((k + 1)/k \leq 2 \) and \((n - 1)_k/n^k < \exp(-k^2/2n)\); if the last sum is divided by \( n^{1/2} \) it is bounded by an approximate Riemann sum for \( \int_{0}^{\infty} \log x \cdot e^{-x^2/2} dx \). Therefore,
\[
\sigma^2 = \tau(n) + \mu(n) - \mu^2(n)
\]
\[
= 2n + (\log n + 0(1))\mu(n) - \mu^2(n) + O(n^{1/2})
\]
as \( n \to \infty \); this completes the proof of Corollary 7.15.1. More generally, it can be shown that if \( 1 \leq t \leq (n/\log n)^{1/2} \) then the variance of \( \lambda \) for forests \( F_n \) of \( t \) rooted trees or for trees \( T_n \) in which \( d(x) = t \) also equals \( (2 - \frac{1}{2} t)n + o(n) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

The entries in the following tables were computed by Mr. J. Hubert.

| Table 5. Values of \( \mu(n, t) \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| \( n \) | \( t \) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1.6667 | 2.1875 | 2.624 | 3.0046 | 3.3451 | 3.6551 | 3.9409 | 4.2072 |
| 2 | 1 | 1.75 | 2.36 | 2.8796 | 3.3357 | 3.7444 | 4.1163 | 4.4586 |
| 3 | 1 | 1.8 | 2.4722 | 3.0554 | 3.5728 | 4.0394 | 4.4666 |
| 4 | 1 | 1.8333 | 2.5510 | 3.1836 | 3.7508 | 4.2626 |
| 5 | 1 | 1.8571 | 2.6094 | 3.2812 | 3.8894 |
| 6 | 1 | 1.875 | 2.6543 | 3.358 |
| 7 | 1 | 1.8889 | 2.69 |
| 8 | 1 | 1.9 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 |
Problems on Random Trees

Let $y$ denote the number of edges that must be removed from a random tree $T_n$ before separating two given nodes $u$ and $v$, where at each stage the edge removed is chosen at random from the remaining subtree containing $u$ and $v$. The preceding argument can be modified to show that the expected value of $y$, given that the distance from $u$ to $v$ is $d$, is

$$1 + \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d+t} (n-1-d),$$

for $1 \leq d \leq n - 1$.

### TABLE 6. Values of $D(n, t)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td>2.2185</td>
<td>2.5104</td>
<td>2.7747</td>
<td>3.0181</td>
<td>3.2450</td>
<td>3.4583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.6056</td>
<td>3.9026</td>
<td>4.1772</td>
<td>4.4336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9333</td>
<td>4.3194</td>
<td>4.6700</td>
<td>4.9925</td>
<td>5.2923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9444</td>
<td>5.3469</td>
<td>5.7164</td>
<td>6.0591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9524</td>
<td>6.3672</td>
<td>6.7514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9583</td>
<td>7.3827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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