

Resolvent of Large Random Graphs

Charles Bordenave^{*} and Marc Lelarge[†]

January 3, 2019

Abstract

We analyze the convergence of the spectrum of large random graphs to the spectrum of a limit infinite graph. We apply these results to graphs converging locally to trees and derive a new formula for the Stieljes transform of the spectral measure of such graphs. We illustrate our results on the uniform regular graphs, Erdős-Renyi graphs and preferential attachment graphs. We sketch examples of application for weighted graphs, bipartite graphs and the uniform spanning tree of n vertices.

MSC-class: 05C80, 15A52 (primary), 47A10 (secondary).

1 Definition and Main Results

1.1 Convergence of the spectral measure of random graphs

We denote a (multi-)graph G with vertex set V and undirected edge set E by $G = (V, E)$. The degree of the vertex $v \in V$ in G is $\deg(G, v)$. In this paper, a network is a graph $G = (V, E)$ together with a complete separable space \mathcal{H} called the mark space and maps from V to \mathcal{H} . When needed, we use the following notation: G will denote a graph and \overline{G} a network with underlying graph G . A rooted network (\overline{G}, o) is a network \overline{G} with a distinguished vertex o of G , called the root. A rooted isomorphism of rooted networks is an isomorphism of the underlying networks that takes the root of one to the root of the other. $[\overline{G}, o]$ will denote the class of rooted networks that are rooted-isomorphic to (\overline{G}, o) . We shall use the following notion introduced by Benjamini and Schramm [5] and Aldous and Steele [2]. Let $\overline{\mathcal{G}}^*$ (respectively \mathcal{G}^*) denote the set of rooted isomorphism classes of rooted connected locally finite networks (respectively graphs). Define a metric on $\overline{\mathcal{G}}^*$ by letting the distance between (\overline{G}_1, o_1) and (\overline{G}_2, o_2) be $1/\alpha$, where α is the supremum of those $r > 0$ such that there is some rooted isomorphism of the balls of (graph-distance) radius $\lfloor r \rfloor$ around the roots of G_i such that each mark has distance less than $1/r$. We define the same metric on \mathcal{G}^* , by considering that a graph is a network with a constant

^{*}Institut de Mathématiques - Université de Toulouse & CNRS - France. Email: bordenave@math.ups-tlse.fr

[†]INRIA-ENS - France. Email: marc.lelarge@ens.fr

mark attached to each vertex. $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$ and \mathcal{G}^* are separable and complete metric spaces [1]. For probability measures $\overline{\rho}, \overline{\rho}_n$ on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$, we write $\overline{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \overline{\rho}$ when $\overline{\rho}_n$ converges weakly with respect to this metric.

For a finite network \overline{G} , let $U(\overline{G})$ denote the distribution on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$ obtained by choosing a uniform random vertex of G as root (see [1]). We also define $U_2(\overline{G})$ as the distribution on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*} \times \overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$ of the pair of rooted graphs $((\overline{G}, o_1), (\overline{G}, o_2))$ where (o_1, o_2) is a uniform random pair of vertices of G . If $(\overline{G}_n), n \in \mathbb{N}$, are finite networks and $\overline{\rho}$ is a probability measure on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$, we say the random weak limit of \overline{G}_n is $\overline{\rho}$ if $U(\overline{G}_n) \Rightarrow \overline{\rho}$. If (\overline{G}, o) is a random rooted network whose distribution of its equivalent class in $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$ is $\overline{\rho}$, then we also shall say that the random weak limit of \overline{G}_n is \overline{G} . We shall also consider a sequence of *random* finite networks $(\overline{G}_n), n \in \mathbb{N}$, the expectation with respect to the randomness of the graph being denoted by $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$. The measure $\overline{\rho}_n = U(\overline{G}_n)$ is now a random measure on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$ and, following Aldous and Steele [2], we will say that the random weak limit of \overline{G}_n is $\overline{\rho}$ if $\mathbb{E}\overline{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \overline{\rho}$ (recall that the average measure $\mathbb{E}\overline{\rho}_n$ is defined by $(\mathbb{E}\overline{\rho}_n)(A) = \mathbb{E}(\overline{\rho}_n(A))$ for all measurable events A on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^*}$). Note that the notion of random weak convergence for random graphs involves the averaging with respect to the randomness of the graph.

In the first part of this paper, we consider a sequence of finite graphs $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ with measure $\rho_n \in \mathcal{G}^*$ converging to a random weak limit ρ , where $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We will also consider a sequence of random finite graphs $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ converging to a random weak limit ρ .

We denote by $A^{(n)} = A(G_n)$, the $n \times n$ adjacency matrix of G_n , in which $A_{ij}^{(n)} = |\{(ij) \in E_n\}|$ and $A_{ij}^{(n)} = 0$ otherwise. The Laplace matrix of G_n is $L^{(n)} = D^{(n)} - A^{(n)}$, where $D^{(n)}$ is the degree diagonal matrix in which $D_{ii}^{(n)} = \deg(G_n, i) = \sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij}^{(n)}$ is the degree of i in G_n and $D_{ij}^{(n)} = 0$ for all $i \neq j$. The main object of this paper is to study the convergence of the empirical measures of the eigenvalues of $A^{(n)}$ and $L^{(n)}$ respectively when the sequence of graphs converges weakly. Note that the spectra of $A^{(n)}$ or $L^{(n)}$ do not depend on the labeling of the graph G_n . If we label the vertices of G_n differently, then the resulting matrix is unitarily equivalent to $A^{(n)}$ and $L^{(n)}$ and it is well-known that the spectra are unitarily invariant. For ease of notation, we define

$$\Delta_\alpha^{(n)} = A^{(n)} - \alpha D^{(n)},$$

with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ so that $\Delta_0^{(n)} = A^{(n)}$ and $\Delta_1^{(n)} = -L^{(n)}$. The spectral measure of $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$ is denoted by $\mu_\alpha^{(n)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_{\alpha,i}^{(n)}}$, where $(\lambda_{\alpha,i}^{(n)})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are the eigenvalues of $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$. We endow the set of measures on \mathbb{R} with the usual weak convergence topology. This convergence is metrizable with the Levy distance $L(\mu, \nu) = \inf\{h \geq 0 : \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \mu((-\infty, x-h]) - h \leq \nu((-\infty, x]) \leq \mu((-\infty, x-h]) + h\}$.

We will consider two assumptions, one, denoted by (D), for a given sequence of finite graphs and another, denoted by (R), for a sequence of random finite graphs.

D. As n goes to infinity, $U(G_n)$ converges weakly to ρ .

R. As n goes to infinity, $U_2(G_n)$ converges weakly to $\rho \otimes \rho$.

An uniform integrability assumption will also be needed in this work. Let $\deg(G_n, o) := \deg(U(G_n), o)$ denotes the degree of the root under ρ_n or under $\mathbb{E}\rho_n$, according to the case (D) or (R).

A. The sequence of variables $(\deg(G_n, o)), n \in \mathbb{N}$, is uniformly integrable.

Assumption (A) is satisfied for example if for some $\gamma > 1$, $\limsup_n \mathbb{E} \deg(G_n, o)^\gamma < \infty$.

Theorem 1 (i) Let $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ be a sequence of graphs satisfying assumptions (D-A), then there exists a probability measure μ_α on \mathbb{R} such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\alpha^{(n)} = \mu_\alpha$.
(ii) Let $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ be a sequence of random graphs satisfying assumptions (R-A), then there exists a probability measure μ_α on \mathbb{R} such that, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} L(\mu_\alpha^{(n)}, \mu_\alpha) = 0$.

In (ii), note that the stated convergence implies the weak convergence of the law of $\mu_\alpha^{(n)}$ to δ_{μ_α} : for all bounded continuous functions f on the measures on \mathbb{R} , $\lim_n \mathbb{E} f(\mu_\alpha^{(n)}) = f(\mu_\alpha)$.

We now sketch the method of proof. We denote $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the set of holomorphic functions f from \mathbb{C}_+ to \mathbb{C}_+ such that $|f(z)| \leq \frac{1}{\Im z}$. We introduce the resolvent of the matrix $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$:

$$R^{(n)}(z) = (\Delta_\alpha^{(n)} - zI_n)^{-1}.$$

Recall [4] that the Stieltjes transform of the empirical spectral distribution is given by:

$$m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{x - z} d\mu_\alpha^{(n)}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} R^{(n)}(z)$$

where $z = u + iv$ with $v > 0$. We will see that for any $i \in [n]$, we have $R_{ii}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{H}$ and the space \mathcal{H} equipped with the topology induced by the uniform convergence on compact sets is a complete separable metrizable compact space. \mathcal{H} will be our mark space: to each vertex $i \in [n]$ we attach the mark $R_{ii}^{(n)}$. $\overline{G}_n = \{G_n, (R_{ii}^{(n)})_{i \in [n]}\}$ is a finite network and let $\overline{\rho}_n$ be the probability measure on $\overline{\mathcal{G}}^*$ of $U(\overline{G}_n)$. Note that we have

$$m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{ii}^{(n)}(z) = \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle d\overline{\rho}_n[G, o].$$

Under an hypothesis of uniformly bounded degree in G , [15] has proved that the adjacency operator of G is self adjoint. Thus we will be able to define the resolvent R of the possibly infinite graph (G, o) with law ρ . We will then obtain a network with law $\overline{\rho}$ and prove the following convergence result: $\overline{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \overline{\rho}$. As a corollary, we will get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle d\overline{\rho}_n[G, o] = \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle d\overline{\rho}[G, o].$$

To relax the hypothesis of uniformly bounded degree and prove Theorem 1 (i), we will use a standard difference inequality. In order to prove Theorem 1(ii), some more work will be needed since, the argument depicted above only leads to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle(z) d\bar{\rho}[G, o]$. The correlation assumption R will be used to obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left| m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) - \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle(z) d\bar{\rho}[G, o] \right| = 0$.

1.2 Random graphs with trees as local weak limit

We now consider a sequence random of graphs $(G_n, n \in \mathbb{N}^*)$ which converges as n goes to infinity to a possibly infinite tree. A Galton-Watson Tree (GWT) with *offspring* distribution F is the random tree obtained by a standard Galton-Watson branching process with offspring distribution F . For example, the infinite k -ary tree is a GWT with offspring distribution δ_k , see Figure 1. A GWT with *degree* distribution F_* is a rooted random tree obtained by a Galton-Watson branching process where the root has offspring distribution F_* and all other genitors have offspring distribution F where for all $k \geq 1$, $F(k-1) = kF_*(k) / \sum_k kF_*(k)$ (we assume $\sum_k kF_*(k) < \infty$). For example the infinite k -regular tree is a GWT with degree distribution δ_k , see Figure 1. It is easy to check that a GWT with degree distribution F_* defines a unimodular probability measure on \mathcal{G}^* (for a definition and properties of unimodular measures, refer to [1]).




Figure 1: Left: representation of a 3-ary tree. Right: representation of a 3-regular tree.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $G_n = ([n], E_n)$, be a random graph on the finite vertex set $[n]$ and edge set E_n . As above, let $\mathbb{E}\rho_n$ be the probability measure of the rooted graph $U(G_n)$ with root o uniformly drawn on $[n]$. We will assume that assumption (A) holds and that the following holds

RT. As n goes to infinity, $U_2(G_n)$ converges weakly to $\rho \otimes \rho$, where $\rho \in \mathcal{G}^*$ is the probability measure of GWT with degree distribution F_* .

We mention three important classes of graphs which converge locally to a tree and which satisfy our assumptions.

Example 1 *Uniform regular graph.* The uniform k -regular graph on n vertices satisfies these assumptions with the infinite k -regular tree as local limit. It follows for example easily from Bollobás [6], see also the survey Wormald [19].

Example 2 *Erdős-Rényi graph.* Similarly, consider the Erdős-Rényi graph on n vertices where there is an edge between two vertices with probability p/n independently of everything else. This sequence of random graphs satisfies the assumptions with limiting tree the GWT with degree distribution $Poi(p)$.

Example 3 *Graphs with asymptotic given degree and preferential attachment graphs.* More generally, the usual random graph with asymptotic degree distribution F_* satisfies this set of hypothesis provided that $\int xF_*(dx) < \infty$ (see Chapter 3 in Durrett [8]).

Recall that $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)} = A^{(n)} - \alpha D^{(n)}$, with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, the spectral measure of $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$ is denoted by $\mu_\alpha^{(n)}$. The resolvent of $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$ is $R^{(n)}(z) = (\Delta_\alpha^{(n)} - zI_n)^{-1}$. For all $i \in [n]$, the mapping $z \mapsto (R^{(n)}(z))_{ii} \in \mathcal{H}$ and, under $\mathbb{E}\rho_n$, we define the random variable in \mathcal{H}

$$X_\alpha^{(n)} = R_{oo}^{(n)}.$$

Finally, the Stieljes transform of $\mu_\alpha^{(n)}$ is denoted by $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x-z)^{-1} d\mu_\alpha^{(n)}(x) = n^{-1} \text{tr} R^{(n)}(z)$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2 *Under assumptions (RT-A),*

(i) *There exists a unique probability measure $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,*

$$Y(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha(N+1) + \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where N has distribution F and Y and Y_i are iid copies independent of N with law Q_α .

(ii) *For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$ converges as n tends to infinity in L^1 to $\mathbb{E}X_\alpha(z)$, where for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,*

$$X_\alpha(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha N_* + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} Y_i(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where N_ has distribution F_* and Y_i are iid copies with law Q_α , independent of N_* .*

Equation (1) is a Recursive Distributional Equation (RDE). They appear often in combinatorial optimization and branching processes, see Aldous and Bandyopadhyay [3] for a survey on max-type RDE. In random matrix theory, the Stieljes transform appears classically as a fixed point of a mapping on \mathcal{H} . For example, in the Wigner case (i.e. the matrix

$W_n = (A_{ij}/\sqrt{n})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ where A_{ij} are iid copies of A with $\text{var}(A) = \sigma^2$), the Stieljes transform $m(z)$ of the limiting spectral measure, the semi circular law with radius 2σ , satisfies for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$m(z) = -(z + \sigma^2 m(z))^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

Here, in Theorem 2, the fixed point is at the level of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. This is due to the fact that the weak limit of $X_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$ is not necessarily a deterministic variable, and $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = n^{-1} \text{tr} R^{(n)}(z)$ has to converge to the mean of the weak limit of $X_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$.

Note that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$ and $X_\alpha(z)$ have a bounded support, hence the convergence in Theorem 2(iii) of $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$ to $\mathbb{E}X_\alpha(z)$ holds in L^p for all $p \geq 1$. It is tempting to conjecture that on \mathcal{H} , $X_\alpha^{(n)}$ converges weakly to X_α . In this paper, we only prove that $X_\alpha^{(n)}$ converges weakly to X_α if the degree $\deg(\mathcal{G}_n, o)$ is uniformly bounded by some constant M .

Example 2 If G_n is the a Erdős-Rényi graph on $[n]$, with parameter p/n then G_n converges to the GWT with degree distribution $Poi(p)$. In this case, F and F_* have the same distribution, and then the law of X_0 is Q_0 . Theroem 2 sheds a new light a result of Khorunzhy, Shcherbina and Vengerovsky [12], Theorems 3 and 4, Equations (2.17), (2.24). Indeed, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, we may easily find a fixed point equation for the Fourier transform of $Y(z)$ using the formula $e^{i\theta w} = 1 - \sqrt{\theta} \int_0^\infty \frac{J_1(2\sqrt{\theta t})}{\sqrt{t}} e^{-itw^{-1}} dt$ valid for all $\theta \geq 0$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}_+$, and where $J_1(t) = \frac{t}{2} \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(-t^2/4)^k}{k!(k+1)!}$ is the Bessel function of the first kind.

Example 1 If G_n is the uniform k -regular graph on $[n]$, with $k \geq 2$, then G_n converges to the GWT with degree distribution δ_k . We consider the case $\alpha = 0$, looking for deterministic solutions of Y , we find: $Y(z) = -(z + (k-1)Y(z))^{-1}$, hence, in view of (3), $Y(z) = -\frac{1}{2(k-1)}(z - \sqrt{z^2 - 4(k-1)})$, and Y is simply the Stieljes transform of the semi-circular law with radius $2\sqrt{k-1}$. For $X_0(z)$ we obtain,

$$X_0(z) = -(z + kY(z))^{-1} = -\frac{2(k-1)}{(k-2)z + k\sqrt{z^2 - 4(k-1)}}.$$

In particular $\Im X_0(z) = \Im(z + kY(z))/|z + kY(z)|^2$. Using the formula $\mu_0[a, b] = \lim_{v \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im X_0(x + iv) dx$, valid for all continuity points $a < b$ of μ_0 , we deduce easily that $\mu_0^{(n)}$ converges weakly to the probability measure $\mu_0(dx) = f(x)dx$ which has a density f on $[-2\sqrt{k-1}, 2\sqrt{k-1}]$ given by

$$f(x) = \frac{k}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{4(k-1) - x^2}}{k^2 - x^2},$$

and $f(x) = 0$ if $x \notin [-2\sqrt{k-1}, 2\sqrt{k-1}]$. This formula for the density of the spectral measure is already known and it is due to McKay [13]. This probability measure appeared first in Kesten [11] in the context of simple random walks on groups. To the best of our knowledge, the proof of Theorem 2 is the first proof using the resolvent method of McKay's Theorem. It is interesting to notice that this measure and the semi-circle distribution are simply related by their Stieljes transform.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows, in Section 2, we prove Theorem 1, in Section 3 we prove Theorem 2. Finally, in Section 4, we extend and apply our results to related graphs.

2 Proof of Theorems 1

2.1 Definition of the random finite networks $\bar{\rho}_n$

In this section, we check the definition of the finite networks $\{G_n, (R_{ii}^{(n)})_{i \in [n]}\}$ defined in Section 1.1. First note that by standard linear algebra, we have

$$R_{ii}^{(n)}(z) = \frac{1}{\Delta_{ii}^{(n)} - z - \alpha_i^t (\Delta_i^{(n)} - zI_{n-1})^{-1} \alpha_i},$$

where α_i is the $((n-1) \times 1)$ i th column vector of $\Delta^{(n)}$ with the i th element removed and $\Delta_i^{(n)}$ is the matrix obtained from $\Delta^{(n)}$ with the i th row and column deleted (corresponding to the graph with vertex i deleted). An easy induction on n shows that $R_{ii}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{H}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Lemma 2.1 *The space \mathcal{H} equipped with the topology induced by the uniform convergence on compact sets is a complete separable metrizable compact space.*

Proof. This lemma follows from Chapter 7 of [7]. The compactness follows from: for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{C}_+$, we define $d(K) = \min\{|y - z|, y \in \mathbb{R}, z \in K\} > 0$. Then we have

$$f \in \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow \sup_{z \in K} |f(z)| \leq d(K)^{-1}.$$

By Montel's Theorem, \mathcal{H} is a normal family in the set of holomorphic functions on \mathbb{C}_+ . Since \mathcal{H} is closed, the compactness follows. \square

2.2 Linear operators associated with a graph of bounded degree

We first recall some standard results that can be found in Mohar and Woess [16]. Let (G, o) be the random weak limit of G_n . In this section we assume that $\deg(G) = \sup\{\deg(G, u), u \in V\} < \infty$. Let A be the adjacency matrix of G . We define the matrix $\Delta(\alpha) = \Delta = A - \alpha D$, where D is the degree diagonal matrix and $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $e_k = \{\delta_{ik} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be the specified complete orthonormal system of $L^2(\mathbb{N})$. Then Δ can be interpreted as a linear operator over $L^2(\mathbb{N})$, which is defined on the basis vector e_k as follows:

$$\langle \Delta e_k, e_j \rangle = \Delta_{kj}.$$

Since G is locally finite, Δe_k is an element of $L^2(\mathbb{N})$ and Δ can be extended by linearity to a dense subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{N})$, which is spanned by the basis vectors $\{e_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Denote this dense

subspace H_0 and the corresponding operator Δ_0 . The operator Δ_0 is symmetric on H_0 and thus closable (Section VIII.2 in [17]). We will denote the closure of Δ_0 by the same symbol Δ as the matrix. The operator Δ is by definition a closed symmetric transformation: the coordinates of $y = \Delta x$ are

$$y_i = \sum_j \Delta_{ij} x_j, \quad i \in \mathbb{N},$$

whenever these series converge.

The following lemma is proved in [15] for the case $\alpha = 0$ and the case $\alpha = 1$ follows by the same argument.

Lemma 2.2 *Assume that $\deg(G) = \sup\{\deg(G, u), u \in V\} < \infty$, then Δ is self-adjoint.*

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1 (i) - bounded degree

We assume that $\deg(G) = \sup\{\deg(G, u), u \in V\} < \infty$. Let (G, o) be the random weak limit of G_n . Let $\Delta^{(n)}$ denote also the (random) operator associated to the graph $U(G_n)$ as in section 2.2. Since G_n is finite, $\Delta^{(n)}$ is a bounded self-adjoint operator. By the Skorokhod representation theorem, we can assume that $U(G_n)$, G are defined on a common probability space such that a.s. G_n has a random weak limit G . The random operators $\Delta^{(n)}$ are defined on the same probability space and we have by definition

$$\Delta^{(n)}\phi \rightarrow \Delta\phi \text{ a.s.}, \quad (4)$$

for each $\phi \in H_0$ the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{N})$, which is spanned by the basis vectors $\{e_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By Theorem VIII.25(a) in [17], the convergence (4) and the fact that Δ is a self-adjoint operator imply the convergence of $\Delta^{(n)} \rightarrow \Delta$ in the strong resolvent sense:

$$R_\alpha^{(n)}(z)x - R(z)x \rightarrow 0, \text{ for any } x \in L^2(\mathbb{N}), \text{ and for all } z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

This last statement implies $\bar{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \bar{\rho}$. If we consider the same probability space as above, we can write

$$m^{(n)}(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle R^{(n)}(z)e_i, e_i \rangle \rightarrow \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle d\rho[G, o] =: \text{Tr}(R(z)),$$

since we have the domination $|\langle R^{(n)}(z)e_i, e_i \rangle| \leq (\Im z)^{-1}$ and where the trace was defined in [1]. Under the assumption $\deg(G) = \sup\{\deg(G, u), u \in V\} < \infty$, we proved

$$m^{(n)}(z) \rightarrow \text{Tr}(R(z)), \quad (5)$$

since the limit is deterministic.

2.4 Proof of Theorem 1 (i) - general case

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the graph \tilde{G}_n on $[n]$ obtained from G_n by removing all edges adjacent to a vertex i , if $\deg(G_n, i) \geq M$. Therefore the adjacency matrix of \tilde{G}_n denoted by $B^{(n)}$ is equal to

$$B_{ij}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} A_{ij}^{(n)} & \text{if } \max\{\deg(G_n, i), \deg(G_n, j)\} \leq M \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The empirical measure of the eigenvalues of $B^{(n)}$ is denoted by $\mu^{(n,M)}$. By the Difference Inequality Lemma (Lemma 2.3 in [4]),

$$L^3(\mu^{(n)}, \mu^{(n,M)}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(A^{(n)} - B^{(n)})^2,$$

where L denotes the Levy distance. We denote $\xi_i^{(n)} = \deg(G_n, i)$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A^{(n)} - B^{(n)})^2 &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (A_{ij}^{(n)})^2 \mathbf{1}(\max(\xi_i^{(n)}, \xi_j^{(n)}) > M) \\ &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} A_{ij}^{(n)} (\mathbf{1}(\xi_i^{(n)} > M) + \mathbf{1}(\xi_j^{(n)} > M)) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\xi_i^{(n)} > M) \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij}^{(n)} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^{(n)} \mathbf{1}(\xi_i^{(n)} > M), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore:

$$L^3(\mu^{(n)}, \mu^{(n,M)}) \leq 2 \int \deg(G, o) \mathbf{1}(\deg(G, o) > M) d\rho_n[G, o] =: p_{n,M}.$$

We now define $m^{(n,M)}(z)$ as the Stieljes transform of $\mu^{(n,M)}$. By Lemma 6.2, we deduce that

$$|m^{(n,M)}(z) - m^{(n)}(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\Im z} \left((p_{n,M})^{1/3} + (p_{n,M})^{2/3} + p_{n,M} \right). \quad (6)$$

By assumptions (D-A), we have

$$p_{n,M} \rightarrow 2 \int \deg(G, o) \mathbf{1}(\deg(G, o) > M) d\rho[G, o],$$

where the right-hand term tends to 0 as M tends to infinity. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, for M sufficiently large and $n \geq N(M)$, we have

$$|m^{(n,M)}(z) - m^{(n)}(z)| \leq \frac{C\epsilon}{\Im z}.$$

Hence we get, for $n \geq N(M)$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|m^{(n+q)}(z) - m^{(n)}(z)| \leq \frac{2C\epsilon}{\Im z} + |m^{(n+q,M)}(z) - m^{(n,M)}(z)|.$$

By (5), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^{(n,M)}(z) = m^M(z)$ for some $m^M \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence the sequence $m^{(n)}(z)$ is Cauchy and the proof of Theorem 1(i) is complete.

2.5 Proof of Theorem 1 (ii) - bounded degree

We assume first the following

A'. There exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [n]$, $\deg(G_n, i) < M$.

With this extra assumption, $\Delta^{(n)}$ and Δ are self adjoint operators and, as in §2.3, we deduce that $\mathbb{E}\bar{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \bar{\rho}$. In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[m^{(n)}(z)] \rightarrow \int \langle R(z), o, o \rangle d\bar{\rho}[G, o].$$

Hence, in order to prove Theorem 1 (ii) with the additional assumption (A'), it is sufficient to prove that, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left| m^{(n)}(z) - \mathbb{E}[m^{(n)}(z)] \right|^2 = 0. \quad (7)$$

Take $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ with $v := \Im z > M$. Notice, that by Vitali's convergence Theorem, it is sufficient to prove (7) for all z such that $\Im z > M$. Since $|(\Delta^{(n)})_{ii}^k| \leq M^k$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ii}^{(n)}(z) &= - \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(\Delta^{(n)})_{ii}^k}{z^{k+1}} - \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} \frac{(\Delta^{(n)})_{ii}^k}{z^{k+1}} \\ &=: X_i^{(n)}(\ell) + \epsilon_i^{(n)}(\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\epsilon_i^{(n)}(\ell)| \leq \epsilon(\ell) := \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} \frac{M^k}{v^{k+1}}$. We denote $\bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell) = X_i^{(n)}(\ell) - \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)}(\ell)]$. Since $|X_i^{(n)}(\ell) - R_{ii}^{(n)}| = |\epsilon_i^{(n)}(\ell)| \leq \epsilon(\ell)$, we have

$$\left| m^{(n)}(z) - \mathbb{E}[m^{(n)}(z)] \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell) \right| + 2\epsilon(\ell).$$

Therefore if for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we prove that in L^2

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell) = 0, \quad (8)$$

then the proof of (7) will be complete. We now prove (8):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell) \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} \bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell) \bar{X}_j^{(n)}(\ell) + \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell)^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\bar{X}_{o_1}^{(n)}(\ell) \bar{X}_{o_2}^{(n)}(\ell) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (o_1, o_2) is a uniform pair of vertices. We then notice that $\bar{X}_i^{(n)}(\ell)$ is a measurable function of the ball of radius ℓ and center i . Thus, by assumption (R), $\lim_n \mathbb{E} \bar{X}_{o_1}^{(n)}(\ell) \bar{X}_{o_2}^{(n)}(\ell) = \lim_n \mathbb{E} \bar{X}_{o_1}^{(n)}(\ell) \mathbb{E} \bar{X}_{o_2}^{(n)}(\ell) = 0$, and (8) follows. Hence we proved (7) under the assumption (A').

2.6 Proof of Theorem 1 (ii) - general case

We now relax assumption (A') by assumption (A). By the same argument as in §2.4, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| m^{(n,M)}(z) - m^{(n)}(z) \right| \right] \leq \frac{C}{\Im z} \left((\bar{p}_{n,M})^{1/3} + (\bar{p}_{n,M})^{2/3} + \bar{p}_{n,M} \right),$$

where $\bar{p}_{n,M} = 2\mathbb{E} [\deg(G_n, o) \mathbf{1}(\deg(G_n, o) > M)]$. By assumptions (R-A),

$$p_{n,M} \rightarrow 2 \int \deg(G, o) \mathbf{1}(\deg(G, o) > M) d\rho[G, o],$$

where the right-hand term tends to 0 as M tends to infinity. The end of the proof follows by the same argument, since we have now for $n \geq N(M)$, $q \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} |m^{(n+q)}(z) - m^{(n)}(z)| \leq \frac{2C\epsilon}{\Im z} + \mathbb{E} |m^{(n+q,M)}(z) - m^{(n,M)}(z)|.$$

3 Proof of Theorem 2

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2 (i)

In this paragraph, we check the existence and the unicity of the solution of the RDE (1). Let $\Theta = \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{H}^\infty$, where \mathcal{H}^∞ is the usual infinite product space. We define a map $\psi : \Theta \mapsto \mathcal{H}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(n, (h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) : \quad \mathbb{C}_+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}_+ \\ z &\mapsto -(z + \alpha(n+1) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(z))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let Ψ be a map from $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ to itself, where $\Psi(P)$ is the distribution of $\psi(N, (Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$, where

- (i) $(Y_i, i \geq 1)$ are independent with distribution P ;
- (ii) N has distribution F ;
- (iii) the families in (i) and (ii) are independent.

We say $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is a solution of the RDE (1) if $Q = \Psi(Q)$.

Lemma 2.3 *There exists a unique measure $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ solution of the RDE (1).*

Proof. Let Ω be a bounded open set in \mathbb{C}_+ with an empty intersection with the ball of center 0 and radius $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}N} + 1$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of probability measures on \mathcal{H} . We define the distance on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$

$$W(P, Q) = \inf \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |X(z) - Y(z)| dz$$

where the infimum is over all possible coupling of the distributions P and Q where X has law P and Y has law Q . The fact that W is the distance follows from the fact that two holomorphic functions equal on a set containing a limit point are equal. The space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ equipped with the metric W gives a complete metric space.

Let X with law P , Y with law Q coupled so that $W(P, Q) = \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |X(z) - Y(z)| dz$. We consider $(X_i, Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ iid copies of (X, Y) and independent of the variable N . By definition, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} W(\Psi(P), \Psi(Q)) &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |\psi(N, (X_i); z) - \psi(N, (Y_i); z)| dz \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N X_i(z) - Y_i(z)}{\left(z + \alpha(N+1) + \sum_{i=1}^N X_i(z)\right) \left(z + \alpha(N+1) + \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(z)\right)} \right| dz \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N |X_i(z) - Y_i(z)| dz \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} N (\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z)^{-2} W(P, Q). \end{aligned}$$

Then since $\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z > \sqrt{\mathbb{E} N}$, Ψ is a contraction and from Banach fixed point Theorem, there exists a unique probability measure Q_{α} on \mathcal{H} such that $\Psi(Q_{\alpha}) = Q_{\alpha}$. \square

3.2 Resolvent of a tree

In this paragraph, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1 *Let F_* be a distribution with finite mean, and $(T_n, 1)$ be a GWT rooted at 1 with degree distribution F_* stopped at generation n . Let $A^{(n)}$ be the adjacency matrix of T_n , and $\Delta_{\alpha}^{(n)} = A^{(n)} - \alpha D^{(n)}$. Let $R^{(n)}(z) = (\Delta_{\alpha}^{(n)} - z I_n)^{-1}$ and $X_{\alpha}^{(n)}(z) = R_{11}^{(n)}(z)$. For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, as n goes to infinity $X_{\alpha}^{(n)}(z)$ converges weakly to $X_{\alpha}(z)$ defined by Equation (2).*

We start with the following Lemma which explains where the RDE (1) comes from.

Lemma 2.4 *Let F be a distribution with finite mean, and $(T_n, 1)$ be a GWT rooted at 1 with offspring distribution F stopped at generation n . Let $A^{(n)}$ be the adjacency matrix of T_n . We define the matrix $\bar{\Delta}_{\alpha}^{(n)} = A^{(n)} - \alpha(D^{(n)} + V^{(n)})$, where $V_{11}^{(n)} = 1$ and $V_{ij}^{(n)} = 0$ for all $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$. Let $R^{(n)}(z) = (\bar{\Delta}_{\alpha}^{(n)} - z I_n)^{-1}$ and $Y^{(n)}(z) = R_{11}^{(n)}(z)$. For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, as n goes to infinity $Y^{(n)}(z)$ converges weakly to $Y(z)$ given by the RDE (1).*

Proof. We start with the standard formula:

$$Y^{(n)}(z) = - \left(z + \alpha(D_{11}^{(n)} + 1) + \sum_{2 \leq i, j \leq n} \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(n-1)} A_{1i}^{(n)} A_{1j}^{(n)} \right)^{-1},$$

where $\tilde{R}^{(n-1)} = (\tilde{\Delta}^{(n-1)} - zI_{n-1})^{-1}$ with $\tilde{\Delta}^{(n-1)}$ is the matrix obtained from $\bar{\Delta}_\alpha^{(n)}$ with the first row and column deleted. Since T_n is a tree $\tilde{R}_{ij}^{(n-1)} A_{1i}^{(n)} A_{1j}^{(n)} = 0$ if $i \neq j$, so that we get

$$Y^{(n)}(z) = - \left(z + \alpha(N+1) + \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^{(n-1)}(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N has distribution F and $Y_i^{(n-1)}$ are iid copies of $Y^{(n-1)}$, independent of N . In other words, we have $Y^{(n)} = \Psi(Y^{(n-1)})$, where the mapping Ψ was defined in §3.1. The end of the proof follows directly from Lemma 2.3. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Again, we use the decomposition formula:

$$X_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = - \left(z + \alpha D_{11}^{(n)} + \sum_{2 \leq i, j \leq n} \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(n-1)} A_{1i}^{(n)} A_{1j}^{(n)} \right)^{-1},$$

where $\tilde{R}^{(n-1)} = (\tilde{\Delta}^{(n-1)} - zI_{n-1})^{-1}$ with $\tilde{\Delta}^{(n-1)}$ is the matrix obtained from $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$ with the first row and column deleted. Since T_n is a tree $\tilde{R}_{ij}^{(n-1)} A_{1i}^{(n)} A_{1j}^{(n)} = 0$ if $i \neq j$, so that we get

$$X_\alpha^{(n)}(z) = - \left(z + \alpha N_* + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} Y_i^{(n-1)}(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N_* has distribution F_* and $Y_i^{(n-1)}$ are iid copies of $Y^{(n-1)}$, independent of N , defined in Lemma 2.4. Proposition 2.1 follows easily from Lemma 2.4. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2 (ii) - bounded degree

We first assume that Assumption (A') holds. Then, as in §2.2, 2.5, $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$ and Δ_α are self adjoint operators and $\mathbb{E}\bar{\rho}_n \Rightarrow \bar{\rho}$. From Theorem 1, we have

$$m^{(n)}(z) \xrightarrow{L^1} \int \langle R(z)o, o \rangle d\bar{\rho}[G, o].$$

Proposition 2.1 and Theorem VIII.25(a) in [17] imply that $\langle R(z)o, o \rangle \stackrel{d}{=} X_\alpha(z)$. The proof of Theorem 2 (ii) is complete with the extra assumption (A').

3.4 Proof of Theorem 2 (ii) - general case

We now relax assumption (A') by assumption (A). From Theorem 1, it is sufficient to prove that $\lim_n \mathbb{E}m^{(n)}(z)$ converges to $\mathbb{E}X_\alpha(z)$, where X_α is defined by Equation (2). By the same argument as in §2.4, it is sufficient to prove that, for the weak convergence on \mathcal{H} ,

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} X_\alpha^{(M)} = X_\alpha$$

where $X_\alpha^{(M)}$ is defined by Equation (2) with a degree distribution $F_*^{(M)}$ which converges weakly to F as M goes to infinity. This continuity property is established in Lemma 6.3 (in Appendix). The proof of the theorem is complete.

4 Motivated applications and discussion

4.1 Weighted graphs

A weighted graph is a graph $G = (V, E)$ with attached weights on its edges. As in §1.1, we consider a sequence of graphs G_n , and a sequence of symmetric matrices $W^{(n)} = (w_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, with $(w_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq j}$ iid real variables, independent of G_n and $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$. We define $C^{(n)} = W^{(n)} \circ A^{(n)}$ where \circ denotes the Hadamard product (for all i, j , $(A \circ B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$) and $T^{(n)}$ is the diagonal matrix whose entry ii is equal to $\sum_j w_{ij}A_{ij}^{(n)}$. Finally, we define $\nu_\alpha^{(n)}$ as the spectral measure of the matrix $\Xi_\alpha^{(n)} = C^{(n)} - \alpha T^{(n)}$. We consider a new assumption

B. The sequence of variables $(\sum_{i=1}^n A_{io}^{(n)} |w_{io}|^2), n \in \mathbb{N}$, is uniformly integrable.

A straightforward extension of Theorem 1 is

Theorem 3 (i) Let $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ be a sequence of graphs satisfying assumptions (D-B). Then there exists a probability measure μ_α on \mathbb{R} such that a.s. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_\alpha^{(n)} = \mu_\alpha$.
(ii) Let $G_n = ([n], E_n)$ be a sequence of random graphs satisfying Assumptions (R-B). Then there exists a probability measure ν_α on \mathbb{R} such that, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}L(\nu_\alpha^{(n)}, \nu_\alpha) = 0$.

We may also state an analog of Theorem 2 for the case $\alpha = 0$, that is $\Delta_0^{(n)} = A^{(n)}$. We denote by $s^{(n)}$ the Stieljes transform of $\nu_0^{(n)}$ and by $X^{(n)}(z) = \left((\Xi_0^{(n)} - zI_n)^{-1} \right)_{oo}$ the value of the resolvent of $\Xi^{(n)}$ at the root. The proof of the next result is a straightforward extension of the proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 4 Assume that assumptions (RT-B) hold, then

(i) There exists a unique probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$Y(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \sum_{i=1}^N |w_i|^2 Y_i(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N has distribution F , w_i are iid copies with distribution w_{11} , Y and Y_i are iid copies with law P and the variables N, w_i, Y_i are independent.

(ii) For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $s^{(n)}(z)$ converges as n tends to infinity in L^1 to $\mathbb{E}X(z)$, where for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$X(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} |w_i|^2 Y_i(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N_* has distribution F_* , w_i are iid copies with distribution w_{11} , Y_i are iid copies with law P and the variables N, w_i, Y_i are independent.

The case $\alpha = 1$ is more complicated: the diagonal term $T^{(n)}$ introduces a dependence within the matrix which breaks the nice recursive structure of the RDE.

4.2 Bipartite graphs

In §1.2, we have considered a sequence of random graphs converging weakly to a GWT tree. Another important class of random graphs are the bipartite graphs. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is bipartite if there exists two disjoint subsets V^a, V^b , with $V^a \cup V^b = V$ such that all edges in E have an adjacent vertex in V^a and the other in V^b . The analysis of random bipartite graphs finds strong motivation in coding theory, see for example Richardson and Urbanke [18].

The natural limit for random bipartite graphs is the following Bipartite Galton-Watson Tree (BGWT) with degree distribution (F_*, G_*) and scale $p \in (0, 1)$. The BGWT is obtained from a Galton-Watson branching process with alternated degree distribution. With probability p , the root has offspring distribution F_* , all odd generation genitors have an offspring distribution G , and all even generation genitors (apart from the root) have an offspring distribution F . With probability $1 - p$, the root has offspring distribution G_* , all odd generation genitors have an offspring distribution F , and all even generation genitors have an offspring distribution G .

We now consider a sequence (G_n) of random bipartite graphs satisfying assumptions $(R - A)$ with weak limit a BGWT with degree distribution (F_*, G_*) and scale $p \in (0, 1)$. The weak convergence of a natural ensemble of bipartite graphs toward a BGWT with degree distribution (F_*, G_*) and scale $p \in (0, 1)$ follows from [18], p being the proportion of vertices in V^a , F_* the asymptotic degree distribution of vertices in V^a and G_* the asymptotic degree distribution of vertices in V^b . As usual, we denote by $\mu_\alpha^{(n)}$ the spectral measure of $\Delta_\alpha^{(n)}$, $m_\alpha^{(n)}$ is the Stieljes transform of $\mu_\alpha^{(n)}$, and $X_\alpha^{(n)} = R_{oo}^{(n)}$ the value of the resolvent taken at the uniformly chosen root. We give without proof the following theorem which is a generalization of Theorem 2.

Theorem 5 *Under the foregoing assumptions,*

(i) *There exists a unique pair of probability measures $(R_\alpha^a, R_\alpha^b) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,*

$$Y^a(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha(N^a + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^a} Y_i^b(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad Y^b(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha(N^b + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{N^b} Y_i^a(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N^a (resp. N^b) has distribution F (resp. G) and Y_i^a, Y_i^a (resp. Y_i^b, Y_i^b) are iid copies with law R_α^a (resp. R_α^b), and the variables N^b, Y_i^a, N^a, Y_i^b are independent.

(ii) For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $m_\alpha^{(n)}(z)$ converges as n tends to infinity in L^1 to $p\mathbb{E}X_\alpha^a(z) + (1-p)\mathbb{E}X_\alpha^b(z)$ where for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$X_\alpha^a(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha N_*^a + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*^a} Y_i^b(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad X_\alpha^b(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + \alpha N_*^b + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*^b} Y_i^a(z) \right)^{-1},$$

where N_*^a (resp. N_*^b) has distribution F_* (resp. G_*) and Y_i^a (resp. Y_i^b) are iid copies with law R_α^a (resp. R_α^b), independent of N_*^b (resp. N_*^a).

In the case $\alpha = 0$ and for bi-regular graphs (i.e. BGWT with degree distribution (δ_k, δ_l) and parameter p), the limiting spectral measure is already known and first derived by Godsil and Mohar [9], see also Mizuno and Sato [14] for an alternative proof.

4.3 Uniform random trees

The uniformly distributed tree on $[n]$ converges weakly to the Skeleton tree T_∞ which is defined as follows. Consider a sequence T_0, T_1, \dots of independent GWT with offspring distribution the Poisson distribution with intensity 1 and let v_0, v_0, \dots denote their roots. Then add all the edges (v_i, v_{i+1}) for $i \geq 0$. The distribution in \mathcal{G}^* of the corresponding infinite tree is the Skeleton tree. See [2] for further properties and Grimmett [10] for the original proof of the weak convergence of the uniformly distributed tree on $[n]$ to the Skeleton tree T_∞ .

Let $\mu_0^{(n)}$ denote the spectral measure of the adjacency matrix of the random spanning tree $T^{(n)}$ on $[n]$ drawn uniformly (for simplicity of the statement, we restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha = 0$). We denote by $X^{(n)}(z) = ((A^{(n)} - zI_n)^{-1})_{oo}$ the value of the resolvent of $A^{(n)}$ taken at the uniform root and by $m^{(n)}(z)$ the Stieljes transform of $\mu_0^{(n)}$. As an application of Theorems 1, 2, we have the following:

Theorem 6 (i) *There exists a unique probability measure $R \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$,*

$$X(z) \stackrel{d}{=} (W(z)^{-1} - X_1(z))^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

where $W \in \mathcal{H}$ is the resolvent taken at the root of a GWT with offspring distribution $\text{Poi}(1)$, X and X_1 have law R and the variables W and X_1 are independent.

(ii) *For all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $m^{(n)}(z)$ converges as n tends to infinity in L^1 to $\mathbb{E}X(z)$.*

Sketch of Proof. The sequence $T^{(n)}$ satisfy (R-A), thus, from Theorem 1, it is sufficient to show that the resolvent operator $R = (A - zI)^{-1}$ of the Skeleton tree taken at the root satisfies the

RDE (9). The distribution invariant structure of T_∞ implies that $X(z) \stackrel{d}{=} R(z)_{v_1 v_1}$. The number of offsprings of the root, v_1 of T_1 is a Poisson random variable with intensity 1, say N . We denote the offsprings of v_1 in T_1 by $v_{i_1}^1, \dots, v_{i_N}^1$. From the decomposition formula, we have

$$R(z)_{v_1 v_1} = - \left(z + \tilde{R}(z)_{v_2 v_2} + \sum_{i=1}^N R^i(z)_{v_i^1 v_i^1} \right)^{-1},$$

where $\tilde{R}(z)$ is the resolvent of the infinite tree obtained by removing T_1 and v_1 and $R^i(z)$ is the resolvent of the subtree of the descendants of v_i^1 in T_1 . Now, by construction $\tilde{R}(z)$ has the same distribution than $R(z)$, and $R^i(z)$ are independent copies, independent of $\tilde{R}(z)$ of $W(z)$. Thus we obtain

$$X(z) \stackrel{d}{=} - \left(z + X'(z) + \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

$$\stackrel{d}{=} - \left(-W(z)^{-1} + X_1(z) \right)^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

where in (11), we have applied (1) for GWT with Poisson offspring distribution. The existence and unicity of the solution of (9) follows from (10) using the same proof as in Lemma 2.3. \square

Appendix

Some elementary facts on the resolvent of an hermitian matrix.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $n \geq 1$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Im z = v > 0$, A be an hermitian $n \times n$ matrix, $R = (A - zI_n)^{-1}$ and α be a complex vector in \mathbb{C}^n . Then,*

$$(i) \text{ For all } 1 \leq i \leq n, |R_{ii}| \leq v^{-1}.$$

$$(ii) \Im(\alpha^* R \alpha) \geq 0,$$

$$(iii) \left| (z + \alpha^* R \alpha)^{-1} - (z + \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 R_{ii})^{-1} \right| \leq v^{-2} \left| \sum_{i \neq j} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j R_{ij} \right|.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. We start with (ii). We write $z = u + iv$, since $\Im(a^{-1}) = -\Im(a)/|a|^2$, we have $\Im(\alpha^*(A - zI_n)^{-1}\alpha) = v\alpha^*((A - uI_n)^2 + v^2I)^{-1}\alpha \geq 0$. We now prove (iii). We write,

$$(z + \alpha^* R \alpha)^{-1} - (z + \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 R_{ii})^{-1} = \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j R_{ij}}{(z + \alpha^* R \alpha)(z + \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 R_{ii})}$$

From (i), $|z + \alpha^* R \alpha| \geq \Im(z + \alpha^* R \alpha) \geq v$. Similarly (i) applied to a vector whose only non zero entry is i gives $\Im(R_{ii}) \geq 0$, and therefore $|z + \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^2 R_{ii}| \geq v$. We thus obtain (iii).

It remains to prove (i). It is sufficient to check it for $i = 1$. Let \tilde{R} be the resolvent of the matrix obtained from A by putting to 0 the first column and row. We write:

$$R_{11} = -(z + \sum_{2 \leq i, j \leq n} A_{1i} \bar{A}_{1j} \tilde{R}_{ij})^{-1} = -(z + \alpha^* \tilde{R} \alpha)^{-1}.$$

With $\alpha^* = (0, \bar{A}_{12}, \dots, \bar{A}_{1n})$. By (ii), $\Im(z + \alpha^* \tilde{R} \alpha) \geq v$, hence $|R_{11}| = |z + \alpha^* \tilde{R} \alpha|^{-1} \leq v^{-1}$. \square

Lemma 6.2 *Let F, G be two distribution functions on \mathbb{R} with Stieljes transform m_F and m_G . There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $\Im z > 1$.*

$$|m_F(z) - m_G(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\Im z} (L(F, G) + L^2(F, G) + L^3(F, G))$$

Proof. Fix $z = u + iv$ and $h = L(F, G)$, then $F(x - h) - h \leq G(x) \leq F(x + h) + h$. Notice that $m_G(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(x-z)^2} G(x) dx$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} |m_F(z) - m_G(z)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(x) - G(x)}{(x-z)^2} dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|F(x) - G(x)|}{|x-z|^2} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{h}{(x-u)^2 + v^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\max(F(x) - F(x-h), F(x+h) - F(x))}{(x-u)^2 + v^2} dx \\ &\leq \pi h v^{-1} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(x) - F(x-h)}{(x-u)^2 + v^2} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x)}{(x-u)^2 + v^2} dx \\ &\leq \pi h v^{-1} + 4 \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{1}{(x-h)^2 + v^2} - \frac{1}{x^2 + v^2} \right| dx \\ &\leq \pi h v^{-1} + 4 \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{2xh - h^2}{((x-h)^2 + v^2)(x^2 + v^2)} \right| dx, \end{aligned}$$

and a direct computation gives the result. \square

Lemma 6.3 *Let $(F_*^{(n)}), n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{N} converging to F_* such that $\sup_n \sum k F_*^{(n)}(k) < \infty$. Denote by $X_\alpha^{(n)}$ and X_α the variable defined by (2) with degree distribution $F_*^{(n)}$ and F_* respectively. Then, for the weak convergence on \mathcal{H} , $\lim_n X_\alpha^{(n)} = X_\alpha$.*

Proof. Let F_* and F'_* be two probability measures on \mathbb{N} with finite mean, and let $d_{TV}(F_*, F'_*) = \sup_{A \subset \mathbb{N}} |\int_A F_*(dx) - \int_A F'_*(dx)| = 1/2 \sum_k |F_*(k) - F'_*(k)|$ be the total variation distance. Let N_*, N'_*, N, N' denote variables with law F_*, F'_*, F, F' respectively, and coupled so that $2\mathbb{P}(N_* \neq N'_*) = d_{TV}(F_*, F'_*)$ and $2\mathbb{P}(N \neq N') = d_{TV}(F, F')$ (the existence of these variables is guaranteed by the coupling inequality). We now reintroduce the distance defined in the proof of Lemma 2.3. Let Ω be a bounded open set in \mathbb{C}_+ with an empty intersection with the ball of center 0

and radius $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}N} + 1$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of probability measures on \mathcal{H} . We define the distance on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$

$$W(P, P') = \inf \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |X(z) - X'(z)| dz$$

where the infimum is over all possible coupling of the distributions P and P' where X has law P and X' has law P' . With our assumptions, we may introduce the variables $X := X_{\alpha}$ (with law P) and $X' := X'_{\alpha}$ (with law P') defined by (2) with degree distribution F_* and F'_* respectively. The proof of the lemma will be complete if we prove that there exists C , not depending on F_* and F'_* , such that

$$W(P, P') \leq C \max(d_{TV}(F_*, F'_*), d_{TV}(F, F')). \quad (12)$$

We denote by Y (with law Q) and Y' (with law Q') the variable defined by (1) with offspring distribution F and F' , coupled so that $W(Q, Q') = \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |Y(z) - Y'(z)| dz$. We consider $(Y_i, Y'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ iid copies of (Y, Y') and independent of the variable N_* . By definition, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} W(P, P') &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |X'(z) - X(z)| \mathbf{1}(N_* \neq N'_*) dz \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} \left| \left(z + \alpha N_* + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} Y_i(z) \right)^{-1} - \left(z + \alpha N_* + \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} Y'_i(z) \right)^{-1} \right| dz \\ &\leq d_{TV}(F_*, F'_*) \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-1} dz + \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^{N_*} |Y_i(z) - Y'_i(z)| dz \\ &\leq d_{TV}(F_*, F'_*) \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-1} dz + \mathbb{E} N_* (\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z)^{-2} W(Q, Q'). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

We then argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.3. Since $\Psi(Q) = Q$ and $\Psi'(Q') = Q'$ (where Ψ' is defined as Ψ with the distribution F' instead of F), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} W(Q, Q') &= W(\Psi(Q), \Psi'(Q')) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |\psi(N, (Y_i); z) - \psi(N', (Y'_i); z)| dz \\ &\leq d_{TV}(F, F') \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-1} dz + \mathbb{E} \int_{\Omega} |\psi(N, (Y_i); z) - \psi(N, (Y'_i); z)| dz \\ &\leq d_{TV}(F, F') \int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-1} dz + \mathbb{E} N (\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z)^{-2} W(Q, Q'). \end{aligned}$$

Then since $\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z > \sqrt{\mathbb{E}N}$, we deduce that

$$W(Q, Q') \leq d_{TV}(F, F') \frac{\int_{\Omega} (\Im z)^{-1} dz}{1 - \mathbb{E}N (\inf_{z \in \Omega} \Im z)^{-2}}.$$

This last inequality, together with (13), implies (12). \square

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Nouredine El Karoui for fruitful discussions and his interest in this work.

References

- [1] D. Aldous and R. Lyons. Processes on unimodular random networks. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 12:1454–1508, 2007.
- [2] D. Aldous and J. M. Steele. The objective method: probabilistic combinatorial optimization and local weak convergence. In *Probability on discrete structures*, volume 110 of *Encyclopedia Math. Sci.*, pages 1–72. Springer, Berlin, 2004.
- [3] D. J. Aldous and A. Bandyopadhyay. A survey of max-type recursive distributional equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(2):1047–1110, 2005.
- [4] Z. D. Bai. Methodologies in spectral analysis of large-dimensional random matrices, a review. *Statist. Sinica*, 9(3):611–677, 1999. With comments by G. J. Rodgers and Jack W. Silverstein; and a rejoinder by the author.
- [5] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm. Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 6:no. 23, 13 pp. (electronic), 2001.
- [6] B. Bollobás. A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 1(4):311–316, 1980.
- [7] J. B. Conway. *Functions of one complex variable*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 11.
- [8] R. Durrett. *Random graph dynamics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [9] C. D. Godsil and B. Mohar. Walk generating functions and spectral measures of infinite graphs. In *Proceedings of the Victoria Conference on Combinatorial Matrix Analysis (Victoria, BC, 1987)*, volume 107, pages 191–206, 1988.
- [10] G. R. Grimmett. Random labelled trees and their branching networks. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 30(2):229–237, 1980/81.
- [11] H. Kesten. Symmetric random walks on groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 92:336–354, 1959.
- [12] O. Khorunzhy, M. Shcherbina, and V. Vengerovsky. Eigenvalue distribution of large weighted random graphs. *J. Math. Phys.*, 45(4):1648–1672, 2004.

- [13] B. D. McKay. The expected eigenvalue distribution of a large regular graph. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 40:203–216, 1981.
- [14] H. Mizuno and I. Sato. The semicircle law for semiregular bipartite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 101(2):174–190, 2003.
- [15] B. Mohar. The spectrum of an infinite graph. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 48:245–256, 1982.
- [16] B. Mohar and W. Woess. A survey on spectra of infinite graphs. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 21(3):209–234, 1989.
- [17] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis*. Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [18] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke. *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [19] N. C. Wormald. Models of random regular graphs. In *Surveys in combinatorics, 1999 (Canterbury)*, volume 267 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 239–298. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.