## Lecture 14: percolation on trees

Tuesday, October 23, 2007 12:44 PM

Physicists introduced percolation theory to help answer the following question: if a porous rock is immersed in water, will the water reached the center of the rock? To answer this question, they modeled the rock by a grid graph. We will model a two-dimensional rock by a two-dimensional grid graph. The internal structure of the rock is assumed to be random. Water can potentially flow along the edges. Each edge is chosen to be "open" with probability p and "closed" with probability 1-p.water can flow along the open edges but not along closed edges.

As the boundary of the graph is in contact with water, water will reach the center of the rock if the center vertex is connected by a path of open edges to the boundary.

Instead of considering finite grid graphs, physicists prefer to consider the infinite grid. They then ask how large p needs to be before some given vertex is probably contained and in an infinite component of open edges. They called the critical probability the probability below which this is zero and above which it is finite. For the two-dimensional grid, the critical probability turns out to be one half.

In today's lecture we will consider percolation on infinite trees. We will start with the infinite binary tree. I will present three proofs that the critical probability for the infinite binary tree is one half.

Percolation on trees is related to many other interesting things, including:

Population dynamics

The spread of epidemics

The formation of the giant component in random graphs.

In the next lecture, we will use our study of percolation on trees to prove that

for 
$$H \leq 70$$
,  $f \subset S$ . I. for  $p = \frac{1}{12}$ 

Pr [largest compared of  $G$  has  $2 \text{ cn vertices} \}$ ]

and for  $P = \frac{1-2}{n}$ 

Pr [largest compared of  $G$  has  $4 \text{ clip} = \frac{1}{n}$ 

GEG(n,p)

Instead of thinking about edges being opened or closed, as the physicists do, I will talk about edges being present or not present. To be formal I will identify the vertices of the complete binary tree with the strings over the alphabet 0/1.

Let C be the component of P, and let

We will now show that  $P_c = \frac{1}{2}$ . In particular, we will show that

$$\frac{\Phi(P)}{P} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 & P \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{2P-1}{P^2} & P > \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right.$$

Let Ao be the event that node of is in an infinite component "going forwards".

That is, not muduing  $\phi$ .

Let A, be the same for 1.

By self-smilarity

Pr[A0] = Pr[A] = O(P)

Let Bi be the event that there is can ease from  $\phi$  to i and that  $A\bar{\imath}$  holds. Then

Pr[Bi] = po(P).

As Bo and B, are independent,

O(P) = Pr[BovBi] = Pr[Bo] + Pr[Bi] - Pr[BovBi] = 2pO(P) - (pO(P))<sup>2</sup>.

One solution of this equation is O(P)=0. If O(P) =0, we can divide by O(P) to get

$$|=2P-P^{2}O(P), \text{ or}$$

$$O(P)=\frac{2P-1}{P^{2}}.$$
So, for  $P>\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{2P-1}{P^{2}}$  is a solution.
But, do we believe this ruplies  $O(P)=\frac{2P-1}{P^{2}}$ ?

In case you don't, or in case you are uncomfortable and infinite trees, we will now do a more concrete proof. We will consider the infinite tree as the limit of finite trees of increasing depth. Let

The tree of depthd,

so 
$$T_2^\circ = \emptyset$$
,  $T_2^\prime = \emptyset^{-1}$ , rete.

Let  $\Theta_2(P) = P_1 \left[ \exists \text{ a path Ron } \emptyset \text{ b a} \right]$ 

We can either prove or take as a definition

$$\Theta(P) = \lim_{d \to \infty} \Theta_d(P).$$

Let's first prove, for 
$$P = 0$$

$$\lim_{\delta \to \infty} Q_{\delta}(P) = 0$$

We have

Pr [ ] a path from 0 to a leaf]

E Tr [each edge on path 0 to 2 appears]
XE \( \{ \int \{ 0, 1\} \} \) \

 $= \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^d} p^d = 2^q p^d = (2p)^d$   $= \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^d} p^d = 2^q p^d = (2p)^d$   $= \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^d} p^d = 2^q p^d = (2p)^d$ 

Now, I'll show you that for  $P^{2\frac{1}{2}}$  $\lim_{d\to00} \frac{\partial Q(P)}{\partial P^{2}} = \frac{2P-1}{P^{2}}$ 

Let's compute the first for values. By the previous analysis, we have

or  $\Theta_d(p) = f(\Theta_{d-1}(p))$ , where

$$f(x) = Zpx - p^2x^2$$

$$\Theta_0(\mathfrak{P}) = 1$$

$$\Theta_{\ell}(P) = 2p - P^2$$

etz.

$$(. f(x^{\dagger}) = x^{\dagger})$$
 and

2. 
$$\Theta_{\partial}(P) = (> \times *$$

To show that Od(P) >x\* forcell d,
I will show f(x) > x\* forcell x > x\*

As  $f(x^*) = x^*$ , it suffices to show that f is increasing on  $[x^*, 1]$ .

So, look of the derivitive:

$$f'(x) = Zp - 2p^{2}x = 2p(-px) > 0$$

So, f'(t) is increasing for X < 1, which suffices

In the rest of the lecture, we will consider known trees.

These have Cortical probability PC= E.

These have Cortical probability PC= E.

For PCPC, we will exemue the size of the corporat of P.

To do this, imagine a process in which each vertex in the component of

Goes through two states. It begins asleep, at some time it wakes up, has some children, and then retires.

Each node has to opportunities to have Children, and succedes in each opportunity with probability P.

We will assign a number to each vertex according to when it appears. We assign number I to node Ø. If it has j Children, we assign them numbers I, i, j. Each time a node has children, we assign its children the next available numbers.

Let it be the number of children of node i. So, the children of node i begin at number  $1+i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_{\bar{z}-1}$ .

We consider a process in which exactly 1 node is active in each time step.

At stept, node thas children and then retires.

The process dies out if at time to there is no node numbered to let Zt be the number of nodes present at the end of time t.

So, 20=1, Z,=1+Y, Ze=1+Y,+"+Y+

The process clies if Zt Let's consider the chance of this. That is

Pr [2+ 2++1]

= Pr[Y,+"+"+ L+]

We have Y:= X2,1+-+X2,K

where  $X\bar{z}_i\bar{j}=1$  with pulp 0 0.6.

So, 4= E[Y1+1-+4]= PKt.

If we set  $P = \frac{(1-\epsilon)}{k}$ , then

Rr [Y, +, +Y<sub>t</sub> ≥ t] = Pr [Y, +, +Y<sub>t</sub> ≥ 
$$\mu(1-\epsilon)$$
]
$$= \text{Rr}[Y, +, +Y_t ≥ (1+\delta)\mu], \text{ where}$$

$$\delta = \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} - 1 ≥ \epsilon.$$

Applying the Cherroft Doed, we find this protocolility is at most

$$-\frac{\varepsilon^2 \mu}{3} = e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2(1-\varepsilon)t}{3}}$$

ulith becaus very small as to sows.

So, it is exposertally couliely that the component becomes big.