



HAL
open science

Cycles of random permutations with restricted cycle lengths

Florent Benaych-Georges

► **To cite this version:**

Florent Benaych-Georges. Cycles of random permutations with restricted cycle lengths. 2007. hal-00196123v2

HAL Id: hal-00196123

<https://hal.science/hal-00196123v2>

Preprint submitted on 17 Dec 2007 (v2), last revised 16 Jan 2009 (v6)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CYCLES OF RANDOM PERMUTATIONS WITH RESTRICTED CYCLE LENGTHS

FLORENT BENAYCH-GEORGES

ABSTRACT. We prove some general results about the asymptotics of the distribution of the number of cycles of given length of a random permutation which distribution is invariant under conjugation. These results were first established to be applied in a forthcoming paper ([BG]) where we prove results about cycles of random permutations which can be written as free words in several independent random permutations. However, we also apply them here to prove asymptotic results about random permutations with restricted cycle lengths. More specifically, for A set of positive integers, we consider a random permutation chosen uniformly among permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ which have all their cycle lengths in A , and then let n tend to infinity. Improving slightly a recent result of Yakymiv, we prove that if A is infinite and large enough, then the numbers of cycles with different lengths of this random permutation are asymptotically independent and distributed according to Poisson distributions. In the case where A is finite, we prove that the behavior of these random variables is completely different: cycles with length $\max A$ are predominant.

INTRODUCTION

0.1. Presentation of the results. It is well known that if for all positive integer n , σ_n is a random permutation chosen uniformly among all permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and if for all positive integer l , $N_l(\sigma_n)$ denotes the number of cycles of length l in the decomposition of σ_n as a product of cycles with disjoint supports, then for all $l \geq 1$, the joint distribution of the random vector

$$(N_1(\sigma_n), \dots, N_l(\sigma_n))$$

converges weakly, as n goes to infinity, to

$$\text{Poiss}(1/1) \otimes \text{Poiss}(1/2) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Poiss}(1/l),$$

where for all positive number λ , $\text{Poiss}(\lambda)$ denotes the Poisson distribution with mean λ .

The proof of this result is rather simple (one can find it in [ABT05]) because the uniform distribution on the symmetric group is easy to handle. However, many other distributions on the symmetric group give rise to limit distributions for the number of cycles of given length. In the first section of this paper, we shall prove a general theorem about the convergence of the distributions of the number of cycles of given length of random permutations (theorem 1.5). This result will play a key roll in a forthcoming paper ([BG]) where we prove results about cycles of random permutations which can be written as free words in several independent random permutations with restricted cycle length.

Date: December 17, 2007.

MSC 2000 subject classifications. primary 20B30, 60B15, secondary 60C05.

Key words. Random permutation, cycle, random permutation with restricted cycle length.

In the second part of the paper, for A set of positive integers, we introduce $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ to be the set of permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ which have all their cycle lengths in A . For all n such that $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)} \neq \emptyset$, we consider a random permutation σ_n chosen uniformly in $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$.

We first prove, as an application of our general result mentioned above, that under certain hypothesis on an infinite set A , the result presented in the first paragraph about uniform random permutations stays as true as it can (as long as we consider the fact that for all $l \notin A$, $N_l(\sigma_n) = 0$): for all $l \geq 1$, the distribution of the random vector

$$(1) \quad (N_k(\sigma_n))_{1 \leq k \leq l, k \in A}$$

converges weakly, as n goes to infinity in such a way that $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ is non empty, to

$$(2) \quad \bigotimes_{1 \leq k \leq l, k \in A} \text{Pois}(1/k).$$

Here, we shall mention that as the author published this work on arxiv, it was pointed out to him that proving this result under some slightly stronger hypothesis was exactly the purpose of a very recent paper ([Y07]). However, the method used in this article is different from the one we use here: it relies on an identity in law between the random vector of (1) and a vector with law (2) conditioned to belong to a certain set and on some estimations provided by asymptotic behavior of generating functions. It is the approach of analytic combinatorics, which provides a powerful machinery for the analysis of random combinatorial objects. The book [FS08] offers synthetic presentation of these tools. It is possible that the result presented in this paragraph can be deduced from chapter IX of this book, but our proof is very short, and the object of the present paper is overall to prove the general result presented above about random permutations which distributions are invariant under conjugation.

Note that the result presented in the previous paragraph implies that the number of cycles of any given length takes large values with a very small probability even though n goes to infinity. Hence if A is finite, such a result cannot be expected. We also study this case here, and prove that if one denotes $\max A$ by d , for all $l \in A$, $N_l(\sigma_n)/n^{l/d}$ converges in every L^p space to $1/l$. As a consequence, the cycles with length d will be predominant: the cardinality of the subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ covered by the supports of cycles with length d in such a random permutation is equivalent to n , which means that the random permutation is not faraway from having order d . This remark will appear to be very helpful in the study of words in independent such random permutations.

0.2. Comments on these results and open questions. a) In corollary 1.7, we give a general sufficient condition on certain sequences σ_n of random permutations to have the weak convergence of the distribution of $(N_1(\sigma_n), \dots, N_l(\sigma_n))$ to $\text{Pois}(1/1) \otimes \text{Pois}(1/2) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Pois}(1/l)$ for all $l \geq 1$ as n goes to infinity. It would be interesting to know if this condition is sufficient. For more details, see remark 1.8.

b) There is another question the author would like to point at: in the case where A is finite, the convergence we prove for the (renormalised) sequence $N_l(\sigma_n)$ is to a constant limit: $N_l(\sigma_n)/n^{l/d}$ tends to $1/l$. It would be interesting to know if we have a dilation of the random variables of $N_l(\sigma_n)/n^{l/d} - 1/l$ which has a non degenerate weak limit as n goes to infinity. It seems possible that analytic combinatorics, as presented in [FS08], will offer a way to answer this question.

0.3. Notations. In this text, for n integer, we shall denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$ and the group of permutations of $[n]$ by \mathfrak{S}_n . For A set of positive integers, $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ denotes the set of permutations

of $[n]$ which cycles have length in A . For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $l \geq 1$, we shall denote by $N_l(\sigma)$ the number of cycles of length l in the decomposition of σ as a product of cycles with disjoint supports. For $\lambda > 0$, $\text{Poiss}(\lambda)$ will denote the Poisson distribution with parameter λ . \mathbb{N} will denote the set of non negative integers.

1. A GENERAL RESULT ABOUT CYCLES OF RANDOM PERMUTATIONS

1.1. Technical preliminaries about boolean polynomials. This section is devoted to the proof of corollary 1.3, that we did not find in the literature. Let us first introduce the terminology of [B01]. A *boolean polynomial* $f(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ in the indeterminate sets X_1, \dots, X_N is a formula of the type

$$f(X_1, \dots, X_N) = (\cap_{i \in I} X_i) \cap (\cap_{j \in J} X_j^c),$$

where I, J are disjoint subsets of $[N]$ and where for all j , X_j^c designs the complementary set of X_j . It is said to be *complete* if J is the complementary set of I . A *disjoint sum of complete boolean polynomials* is a formula of the type

$$f(X_1, \dots, X_N) = \cup_{i=1}^L f_i(X_1, \dots, X_N),$$

where $L \geq 1$ and the f_i 's are pairwise distinct complete boolean polynomials.

Remark 1.1. *Using the classical distributivity rules, it is easy to see that any boolean polynomial can be put under the form of a disjoint sum of complete boolean polynomials.*

The following theorem can be found in section 1.4 of [B01], but for the convenience of the reader, we give its proof.

Theorem 1.2. *Fix $n \geq 1$, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$, f_1, \dots, f_n boolean polynomials in the indeterminate sets X_1, \dots, X_N . Then in order to have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k P(f_k(A_1, \dots, A_N)) \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } = 0)$$

for all family A_1, \dots, A_N of events in any probability space (Ω, Σ, P) , it suffices to prove it under the additional hypothesis that each of the A_i 's is either \emptyset or Ω .

Proof. We only prove the result for \geq and the other one follows. Using remark 1.1, we can suppose that there exists a family $(C_I)_{I \subset [N]}$ of real numbers indexed by the set of subsets of $[N]$ such that for all family A_1, \dots, A_N of events in a probability space (Ω, Σ, P) ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k P(f_k(A_1, \dots, A_N)) = \sum_{I \subset [N]} C_I P[(\cap_{i \in I} X_i) \cap (\cap_{j \in I^c} X_j^c)].$$

It suffices to prove that for all $I_0 \subset [N]$, $C_{I_0} \geq 0$. It follows from the equation

$$\sum_{I \subset [N]} C_I P[(\cap_{i \in I} X_i) \cap (\cap_{j \in I^c} X_j^c)] = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k P(f_k(A_1, \dots, A_N)) \geq 0$$

where we chose every A_i to be either Ω or \emptyset according to $i \in I_0$ or not. \square

We shall use the following corollary to prove theorem 1.5.

Corollary 1.3. Consider a probability space (Ω, Σ, P) , $q \geq 1$, and for all $i = 1, \dots, q$, $(A_{i,j})_{j \in I_i}$ a finite family of events. Let us define, for $i = 1, \dots, q$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$C_i(\omega) = |\{j \in I_i; \omega \in A_{i,j}\}|.$$

Let us also define, for $k = (k_1, \dots, k_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q \setminus \{0\}$,

$$S_k = \sum_{\substack{J_1 \subset I_1 \\ |J_1|=k_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{J_q \subset I_q \\ |J_q|=k_q}} P(\cap_{l=1}^q \cap_{j \in J_l} A_{l,j})$$

and $S_0 = 1$. Then for all $r = (r_1, \dots, r_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q$,

$$(3) \quad P(C = r) = \sum_{k_1=r_1}^{|I_1|} \cdots \sum_{k_q=r_q}^{|I_q|} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}.$$

Moreover, "alternating inequalities" are satisfied in the following way: for all $m \geq 0$ odd (resp. even),

$$(4) \quad P(C = r) \geq \sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, |I_1| \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, |I_q| \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)} \quad (\text{resp. } \leq).$$

Proof. First note that the alternating inequalities, used for m large enough, imply (3). So we are only going to prove the alternating inequalities.

Then, let us suppose that for all $i = 1, \dots, q$, $I_i = [n_i]$, with $n_i \geq 1$. As an application of the previous theorem, one can suppose every $A_{i,j}$ to be either \emptyset or Ω . In this case, for all $i = 1, \dots, q$, the random variable C_i is constant, equal to the number c_i of j 's such that $A_{i,j} = \Omega$, and for all $k = (k_1, \dots, k_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q$,

$$S_k = \binom{c_1}{k_1} \cdots \binom{c_q}{k_q}.$$

Hence for $(r_1, \dots, r_q) = (c_1, \dots, c_q)$, for all $m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, n_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, n_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k_1=c_1, \dots, n_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q=c_q, \dots, n_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{c_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{c_q} \binom{c_1}{k_1} \cdots \binom{c_q}{k_q}, \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to 1, i.e. to $P(C = r)$.

Now consider $(r_1, \dots, r_q) \neq (c_1, \dots, c_q)$. Then $P(C = r) = 0$ and we have to prove that the right-hand-side term in equation (4) is either non negative or non positive according to m is

even or odd. For all $m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, n_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, n_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \dots \binom{k_q}{r_q} \mathcal{S}_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, n_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, n_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \dots \binom{k_q}{r_q} \binom{c_1}{k_1} \dots \binom{c_q}{k_q} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, c_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, c_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \dots \binom{k_q}{r_q} \binom{c_1}{k_1} \dots \binom{c_q}{k_q}.
\end{aligned}$$

If there exists i such that $r_i > c_i$, then the previous sum is zero. In the other case, since for all $0 \leq r \leq k \leq c$, $\binom{k}{r} \binom{c}{k} = \binom{c}{r} \binom{c-r}{l}$ for $l = k - r$, the previous sum is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{c_1}{r_1} \dots \binom{c_q}{r_q} \sum_{\substack{l_1=0, \dots, c_1-r_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_q=0, \dots, c_q-r_q \\ l_1+\dots+l_q \leq m}} (-1)^{l_1+\dots+l_q} \binom{c_1-r_1}{l_1} \dots \binom{c_q-r_q}{l_q}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have to prove that for all $d = (d_1, \dots, d_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q \setminus \{0\}$ and for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Z(m, d) := (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{l_1=0, \dots, d_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_q=0, \dots, d_q \\ l_1+\dots+l_q \leq m}} (-1)^{l_1+\dots+l_q} \binom{d_1}{l_1} \dots \binom{d_q}{l_q}
\end{aligned}$$

is non negative. Let us prove it by induction over $d_1 + \dots + d_q \geq 1$.

If $d_1 + \dots + d_q = 1$, then

$$Z(m, d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } m > 0, \end{cases}$$

so the result holds.

Suppose the result to be proved to the rank $d_1 + \dots + d_q - 1 \geq 1$. First note that if $m = 0$, then $Z(m, d) = 1$, so the result holds. So let us suppose that $m \geq 1$. Since $d_1 + \dots + d_q \geq 2$, there exists i_0 such that $d_{i_0} \neq 0$. One can suppose that $i_0 = q$. Using $\binom{d_q}{l_q} = \binom{d_q-1}{l_q} + \binom{d_q-1}{l_q-1}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
Z(m, d) = (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{l_1=0, \dots, d_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_q=0, \dots, d_q \\ l_1+\dots+l_q \leq m}} (-1)^{l_1+\dots+l_q} \binom{d_1}{l_1} \dots \binom{d_{q-1}}{l_{q-1}} \left[\binom{d_q-1}{l_q} + \binom{d_q-1}{l_q-1} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (-1)^m \sum_{\substack{l_1=0, \dots, d_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_{q-1}=0, \dots, d_{q-1} \\ l_q=0, \dots, d_q-1 \\ l_1+\dots+l_q \leq m}} (-1)^{l_1+\dots+l_q} \binom{d_1}{l_1} \cdots \binom{d_{q-1}}{l_{q-1}} \binom{d_q-1}{l_q} \\
&+ (-1)^{m-1} \sum_{\substack{l_1=0, \dots, d_1 \\ \vdots \\ l_{q-1}=0, \dots, d_{q-1} \\ l_q=0, \dots, d_q-1 \\ l_1+\dots+l_q \leq m-1}} (-1)^{l_1+\dots+l_q} \binom{d_1}{l_1} \cdots \binom{d_{q-1}}{l_{q-1}} \binom{d_q-1}{l_q} \\
&= Z(m, (d_1, \dots, d_{q-1}, d_q-1)) + Z(m-1, (d_1, \dots, d_{q-1}, d_q-1)) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which closes the proof of the induction, and of the corollary. \square

Remark 1.4. We use the same notations as in the previous corollary. One can easily prove, using theorem 1.2, that for all $r = (r_1, \dots, r_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q$, one has

$$(5) \quad S_{(r_1, \dots, r_q)} = \sum_{k_1=r_1}^{|I_1|} \cdots \sum_{k_q=r_q}^{|I_q|} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} P(C_1 = k_1, \dots, C_q = k_q).$$

1.2. Number of cycles of a given length of random permutations. The main results of section 1 are the following ones. Both of them play a key roll in a forthcoming paper ([BG]).

Theorem 1.5. Consider a family of positive integers $q, l_1 < \dots < l_q$ and μ_1, \dots, μ_q probability measures on the set of nonnegative integers. Let, for each n in a certain infinite set of positive integers, σ_n be a random element of \mathfrak{S}_n such that the law of σ_n is invariant under conjugation by any element of \mathfrak{S}_n . Suppose that for all $k = (k_1, \dots, k_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q$, denoting $k_1 l_1 + \dots + k_q l_q$ by p , for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_p$ which has k_1 cycles of length l_1, \dots, k_q cycles of length l_q , the sequence

$$\frac{n^p}{l_1^{k_1} \cdots l_q^{k_q} k_1! \cdots k_q!} P(\{\forall i = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(i) = \sigma(i)\})$$

converges, as n goes to infinity, to a limit denoted by S_k such that for all $r_1, \dots, r_q \geq 0$, the series

$$(6) \quad \sum_{k_1 \geq r_1} \cdots \sum_{k_q \geq r_q} (-1)^{k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}$$

converges to

$$(7) \quad \prod_{1 \leq i \leq q} \mu_i(r_i).$$

Then the law of $(N_{l_1}(\sigma_n), \dots, N_{l_q}(\sigma_n))$ converges, as n goes to infinity, to $\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_q$.

Remark 1.6. Note that the series of (6) are not asked to converge absolutely. We only ask the sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq r_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q \geq r_q \\ k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q \leq n}} (-1)^{k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)},
\end{aligned}$$

to have a the limit of (7) as n goes to infinity.

Before the proof of the theorem, let us give its main corollary:

Corollary 1.7. *Let A be a set of positive integers and let, for each n in a certain infinite set of positive integers, σ_n be a random element of \mathfrak{S}_n such that the law of σ_n is invariant under conjugation by any element of \mathfrak{S}_n . Suppose that for all $p \geq 1$, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_p^{(A)}$, the probability of the event*

$$\{\forall m = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(m) = \sigma(m)\}$$

is equivalent to n^{-p} as n goes to infinity. Then for all finite subset K of A , the law of $(N_l(\sigma_n))_{l \in K}$ converges, as n goes to infinity, to $\bigotimes_{l \in K} \text{Poiss}(1/l)$.

Proof of the corollary. The proof is immediate, since clearly, if one fixes a finite family $l_1 < \dots < l_q$ of elements of A , then theorem 1.5 can be applied with $\mu_1 = \text{Poiss}(1/l_1), \dots, \mu_q = \text{Poiss}(1/l_q)$ and with the S_k 's given by

$$\forall k_1, \dots, k_q, \quad S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)} = \frac{1}{l_1^{k_1} \dots l_q^{k_q} k_1! \dots k_q!}.$$

□

Remark 1.8. *It would be interesting to know if the inverse implication is true, at least when A is the set of all positive integers: with the same hypothesis of invariance of the distribution of σ_n under conjugation, let us suppose that for all $q \geq 1$, the law of $(N_1(\sigma_n), \dots, N_q(\sigma_n))$ converges, as n goes to infinity, to $\bigotimes_{1 \leq l \leq q} \text{Poiss}(1/l)$. Is that true that for all $p \geq 1$, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_p$, the probability of the event*

$$\{\forall m = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(m) = \sigma(m)\}$$

is equivalent to n^{-p} as n goes to infinity? The main difficulty, to prove it, is the fact that no alternating inequality seems to hold in (5). Such a result would be useful to prove the reciprocal implications of certain results proved in this paper.

Proof of theorem 1.5. Before the beginning of the proof, let us introduce a few notations. Let, for all n and for all $c \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ cycle, $E_c(n)$ be the event " c appears in the cycle decomposition of σ_n ". Let, for all $l, n \geq 1$, $\mathfrak{C}_l(n)$ be the set of cycles of \mathfrak{S}_n with length l .

Step I. In order to prove the theorem, we fix a family of non negative integers (r_1, \dots, r_q) , and we prove that the probability of the event

$$\{\forall i = 1, \dots, q, N_{l_i}(\sigma_n) = r_i\}$$

converges, as n goes to infinity, to

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq q} \mu_i(r_i),$$

i.e. to

$$(8) \quad \sum_{k_1 \geq r_1} \dots \sum_{k_q \geq r_q} (-1)^{k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \dots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}.$$

With the notations introduced above, we have to prove that the probability of the event

$$(9) \quad \{\forall i = 1, \dots, q, \text{ exactly } r_i \text{ of the events of the family } (E_c(n))_{c \in \mathfrak{C}_{l_i}(n)} \text{ occur}\}$$

converges, as n goes to infinity, to (8).

By (3), for all n , the probability of the event of (9) is

$$(10) \quad \sum_{k_1=r_1, \dots, |C_{l_1}(n)|} \cdots \sum_{k_q=r_q, \dots, |C_{l_q}(n)|} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}(n),$$

where we have defined $S_0(n) = 1$ and for all $k = (k_1, \dots, k_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(11) \quad S_k(n) := \sum P\left(\bigcap_{i \in [q]} \bigcap_{c \in J_i} E_c(n)\right),$$

the sum being taken on all families $(J_i)_{i \in [q]}$ such that for all i , $J_i \subset \mathfrak{C}_{l_i}(n)$ and $|J_i| = k_i$.

Step II. Let us fix $k = (k_1, \dots, k_q) \in \mathbb{N}^q \setminus \{0\}$ and compute $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_k(n)$. Define $p = k_1 \cdot l_1 + \dots + k_q \cdot l_q$ and consider $\sigma \in S_p$ such that the decomposition in cycles of σ contains k_1 cycles of length l_1 , k_2 cycles of length l_2 , \dots , k_q cycles of length l_q . Then the invariance by conjugation of the law of σ_n allows us to claim that $S_k(n)$ is equal to the probability of the event

$$\{\forall i = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(i) = \sigma(i)\}$$

times the number of subsets J of \mathfrak{S}_n which consist exactly in k_1 cycles of length l_1 , k_2 cycles of length l_2 , \dots , k_q cycles of length l_q such that these cycles are pairwise disjoint. Such a subset J is defined by a set of pairwise disjoint subsets of $[n]$ in which there are exactly k_1 subsets of cardinality l_1 , k_2 subsets of cardinality l_2 , \dots , k_q subsets of cardinality l_q , and by the choice of a cycle build in every of these subsets. Hence there are exactly

$$\underbrace{\frac{n!}{(n-p)! l_1^{k_1} l_2^{k_2} \dots l_q^{k_q} k_1! k_2! \dots k_q!}}_{\text{counting the sets of pairwise disjoint subsets of } [n]} \underbrace{\frac{1}{(l_1-1)!^{k_1} (l_2-1)!^{k_2} (l_3-1)!^{k_3} \dots (l_q-1)!^{k_q}}}_{\text{choice of the cycles}}$$

such subsets J . So

$$S_k(n) = \frac{n!}{(n-p)! l_1^{k_1} l_2^{k_2} \dots l_q^{k_q} k_1! k_2! \dots k_q!} P(\{\forall i = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(i) = \sigma(i)\}).$$

Hence by hypothesis,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_k(n) = S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}.$$

Step III. Now, let us prove that the probability of the event of (9) converges to (8). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $m_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $m \geq m_0$, the absolute value of

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq r_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q \geq r_q \\ k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q > m}} (-1)^{k_1 - r_1 + \dots + k_q - r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)},$$

is less than $\varepsilon/2$.

By (4) for all $m, m' \geq m_0$ such that m is odd and m' is even, the probability of the event of (9) is minored by

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, |C_1(n)| \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, |C_q(n)| \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{r_1+k_1+\dots+r_q+k_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}(n)$$

and majored by

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1=r_1, \dots, |C_1(n)| \\ \vdots \\ k_q=r_q, \dots, |C_q(n)| \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m'}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}(n).$$

Hence for n large enough, the probability of the event of (9) is minored by

$$-\varepsilon/2 + \sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq r_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q \geq r_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)}$$

and majored by

$$\varepsilon/2 + \sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq r_1 \\ \vdots \\ k_q \geq r_q \\ k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q \leq m'}} (-1)^{k_1-r_1+\dots+k_q-r_q} \binom{k_1}{r_1} \cdots \binom{k_q}{r_q} S_{(k_1, \dots, k_q)},$$

hence is ε -closed to the sum of (8). It closes the proof of the theorem. \square

2. CYCLES OF RANDOM PERMUTATIONS WITH RESTRICTED CYCLE LENGTHS

First of all, let us recall that for n large enough, $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ is non empty if and only if n is divided by the greatest common divisor of A (see lemma 2.3 of [Ne07] for example).

2.1. Case where A is infinite. The following proposition is the analogous of the result stated in the beginning of the introduction, in the case where the random permutation we consider is not anymore distributed uniformly on the symmetric group but on the set of permutations with cycle lengths in A (indeed, in this case, for all $k \notin A$, $N_k(\sigma_n) = 0$).

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that A is a set of positive integers such that if one denotes by q the greatest common divisor of A and by u_n the quotient $|\mathfrak{S}_{qn}^{(A)}|/(qn)!$, one has*

$$(12) \quad \frac{u_n}{u_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

We consider, for n large enough, a random permutation σ_n which has uniform distribution on $\mathfrak{S}_{qn}^{(A)}$. Then for all $l \geq 1$, the distribution of the random vector

$$(N_k(\sigma_n))_{1 \leq k \leq l, k \in A}$$

converges weakly, as n goes to infinity, to

$$\bigotimes_{1 \leq k \leq l, k \in A} \text{Pois}(1/k).$$

Note also that this result implies that even for large values of n , every $N_l(\sigma_n)$ takes large values with a very small probability.

Proof. By corollary 1.7, it suffices to prove that for all $p \geq 1$, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_p^{(A)}$, the probability P_n of the event $\{\forall m = 1, \dots, p, \sigma_n(m) = \sigma(m)\}$ is equivalent to n^{-p} as n goes to infinity.

We have

$$P_n = \frac{|\{s \in \mathfrak{S}_{qn}^{(A)}; \forall m = 1, \dots, p, s(m) = \sigma(m)\}|}{|\mathfrak{S}_{qn}^{(A)}|} = \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{qn-p}^{(A)}|}{|\mathfrak{S}_{qn}^{(A)}|},$$

and (12) allows to conclude. \square

Remark 2.2. (1) Note that this result improves Theorem 1 of [Y07], which states the same result under the slightly stronger hypothesis that (u_n) is a sequence with regular variation with exponent in $(-1, 0]$. However, the author did not find any example where the hypothesis of this result are satisfied but the hypothesis of Theorem 1 of [Y07] are not. We also didn't find any example where the hypothesis of this result are satisfied but the greatest common divisor of A is not 1.

(2) A number of examples of classes of sets A for which the hypothesis of this proposition hold can be found in the list of examples following Theorem 2 of [Y05a]. They hold as an example if the ratio $|A \cap [n]|/n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$. More details are given in Theorem 3.3.1 of the book [Y05b].

2.2. Case where A is finite. We are going to prove the following result:

Theorem 2.3. Suppose that A is a finite set of positive integers, and denote its maximum by d . We consider, for all n such that $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ is non empty, a random permutation σ_n which has uniform distribution on $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$. Then for all $l \in A$, as n goes to infinity in such a way that $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ is non empty, $\frac{N_l(\sigma_n)}{n^{l/d}}$ converges in all L^p spaces ($p \in [1, +\infty)$) to $1/l$.

Note that it implies that for all $l \in A$, the distribution of $\frac{N_l(\sigma_n)}{n^{l/d}}$ converges weakly to the Dirac mass at $1/l$. Since constant random variables are always independent, this result also contains the asymptotic independence of the family $\left(\frac{N_l(\sigma_n)}{n^{l/d}}\right)_{l \in A}$.

To prove this theorem, we shall need the following lemmas. The first one is well known (see, for instance, Theorem 3.53 of [B04]). The second one is lemma 3.6 of [Ne07].

Lemma 2.4. Let p be the greatest common divisor of A . Then for all complex number z , one has

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{pn}^{(A)}|}{(pn)!} z^{pn} = \exp\left(\sum_{k \in A} \frac{z^k}{k}\right).$$

Lemma 2.5. Let B be a finite set of positive integers. Let $(c_j)_{j \in B}$ be a finite family of positive numbers. Let $\sum_{n \geq 1} b_n w^n$ be the power expansion of $\exp\left(\sum_{j \in B} c_j w^j\right)$. Suppose that $b_n > 0$ for sufficiently large n . Then as n goes to infinity,

$$\frac{b_{n-1}}{b_n} \sim \left(\frac{n}{bc_b}\right)^{1/b},$$

with $b = \max B$.

Proof of the theorem. First note that by Hölder formula, it suffices to prove that for all p positive integer, the expectation of the $2p$ -th power of

$$\frac{N_l(\sigma_n)}{n^{l/d}} - \frac{1}{l}$$

tends to zero as n goes to infinity. Hence by the binomial identity, it suffices to prove that for all $l \in A$, for all $m \geq 1$, the expectation of the m -th power of $N_l(\sigma_n)$ is equivalent to $n^{ml/d}/l^m$ as n goes to infinity in such a way that $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}$ is non empty.

So let us fix $l \in A$ and $m \geq 1$. Since $N_l(\sigma_n) = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{k=1}^n 1_{\{k \text{ belongs to a cycle of length } l\}}$, one has

$$\mathbb{E}[N_l(\sigma_n)^m] = \frac{1}{l^m} \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_n \geq 0 \\ m_1 + \dots + m_n = m}} \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k=1}^n (1_{\{k \text{ belongs to a cycle of length } l\}})^{m_k} \right]$$

But the distribution of σ_n is invariant by conjugation, so for all $m_1, \dots, m_n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k=1}^n (1_{\{k \text{ belongs to a cycle of length } l\}})^{m_k} \right]$$

depends only on the number j of k 's such that $m_k \neq 0$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N_l(\sigma_n)^m] &= \frac{1}{l^m} \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_n \geq 0 \\ |\{k \in [n]; m_k \neq 0\}| = j \\ m_1 + \dots + m_n = m}} \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_n} P(1, \dots, j \text{ belong to cycles of length } l) \\ (13) \quad &= \frac{1}{l^m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\binom{n}{j} P(1, \dots, j \text{ belong to cycles of length } l) \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_j \geq 1 \\ m_1 + \dots + m_j = m}} \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_j} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us compute, for $j \geq 1$, an equivalent of $P(1, \dots, j \text{ belong to cycles of length } l)$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{P}(j)$ the set of partitions of $[j]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &P(1, \dots, j \text{ belong to cycles of length } l) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(j)} P(1, \dots, j \text{ are in cycles of length } l) \\ &\text{and } \forall i, i' \in [j], [i, i' \text{ belong to the same cycle}] \Leftrightarrow [i = i' \pmod{\pi}] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(j) \\ \pi = \{V_1, \dots, V_{|\pi|}\}}} \binom{n-j}{l - |V_1|, \dots, l - |V_{|\pi|}|, n - l|\pi|} ((l-1)!)^{|\pi|} \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{n-l|\pi|}^{(A)}|}{|\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}|} \\ (14) \quad &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(j)} \frac{1}{n(n-1) \cdots (n-j+1)} \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{n-l|\pi|}^{(A)}| / (n-l|\pi|)!}{|\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}| / n!} \prod_{V \in \pi} \frac{(l-1)!}{(l-|V|)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Let p be the greatest common divisor of A . We know that for all positive integer n , $\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)} \neq \emptyset \implies p|n$, and that for sufficiently large n , the inverse implication is also true (lemma 2.3 of [Ne07]). Hence by lemma 2.4, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{pn}^{(A)}|}{(pn)!} (z^p)^n = \exp \left(\sum_{j \in \frac{1}{p} \cdot A} \frac{(z^p)^j}{pj} \right).$$

Hence for $w \in \mathbb{C}$, one has

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{pn}^{(A)}|}{(pn)!} w^n = \exp \left(\sum_{j \in \frac{1}{p} \cdot A} \frac{w^j}{pj} \right).$$

So by lemma 2.5, as n goes to infinity,

$$\frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{pn-p}^{(A)}| / (pn-p)!}{|\mathfrak{S}_{pn}^{(A)}| / (pn)!} \sim \left(\frac{n}{(d/p)1/d} \right)^{p/d} = (pn)^{p/d}.$$

Hence by induction on k positive integer divided by p , one can easily prove that, as n goes to infinity in such a way that p divides n ,

$$\frac{|\mathfrak{S}_{n-k}^{(A)}| / (n-k)!}{|\mathfrak{S}_n^{(A)}| / (n)!} \sim n^{k/d}.$$

Hence in (14), for each partition π , the corresponding term is equivalent to

$$n^{l|\pi|/d-j} \prod_{V \in \pi} \frac{(l-1)!}{(l-|V|)!},$$

thus in (14), the leading term is the one of the singletons partition, and

$$(15) \quad P(1, \dots, j \text{ belong to cycles of length } l) \sim n^{(l/d-1)j}.$$

Mixing (13) and (15), one gets $\mathbb{E}[N_l(\sigma_n)^m] \sim \frac{n^{lm/d}}{l^m}$, which closes the proof of the theorem.

□

REFERENCES

- [ABT05] Arratia, Richard; Barbour, A. D.; Tavaré, Simon *Logarithmic combinatorial structures: a probabilistic approach* EMS Monographs in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2003.
- [BG] Benaych-Georges, Florent *Cycles of free words in several random permutations with restricted cycles lengths*. Submitted, available on <http://www.proba.jussieu.fr/~benaych/>
- [B01] Bollobás, B. *Random Graphs*, second edition. 2001.
- [B04] Bóna, M. *Combinatorics of permutations*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004
- [FS08] Flajolet, P, Sedgewick, *Analytic combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, Coming in 2008, now available on the web.
- [Ne07] Neagu, M. *Asymptotic freeness of random permutation matrices with restricted cycles lengths*. arxiv, to appear in Indiana University Math. Journal
- [Y05a] A. L. Yakymiv, *The distribution of lengths of the m -th maximal cycle in a random A permutation*. Discrete Math. Appl. 15 (5), 527-546 (2005).
- [Y05b] A. L. Yakymiv, *Probabilistic applications of Tauberian theorems*. Translated by Andrei V. Kolchin. (English) Modern Probability and Statistics. Leiden: VSP.
- [Y07] A. L. Yakymiv, *Random A -Permutations: Convergence to a Poisson Process*. Mathematical Notes, 2007, Vol. 81, No. 6, pp. 840-846.

FLORENT BENAYCH-GEORGES, LPMA, UPMC UNIV PARIS 6, CASE COURIER 188, 4, PLACE JUSSIEU, 75252 PARIS CEDEX 05, FRANCE.

E-mail address: florent.benaych@gmail.com