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## Motivations

- combinatorics [Tutte 1963]
- large $N$ expansion of matrix integrals [Brézin-Itzykson-Parisi-Zuber 1979]
- 2D quantum gravity
- statistical physics on dynamical random surfaces
- probability theory: "Brownian map", connection with conformally-invariant processes


## General model:

Each face of valency $k$ comes with fugacity $g_{k}$ :

$$
Z=\sum_{\operatorname{maps}} \prod_{k \geq 1} g_{k}^{\#\{k-\text { valent faces }\}}
$$

## Simple models: triangulations (resp. quadrangulations)

$$
g_{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
g \text { for } k=3 \quad(\text { resp. } k=4) \quad Z=\sum_{\substack{\text { (ri) } \\
\text { (ruadr)-- } \\
\text { angulations }}} g^{\text {"area" }} \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

## General model:

Each face of valency $k$ comes with fugacity $g_{k}$ :

$$
Z=\sum_{\operatorname{maps}} \prod_{k \geq 1} g_{k}^{\#\{k-\text { valent faces }\}}
$$

## Simple models: triangulations (resp. quadrangulations)

$$
g_{k}= \begin{cases}g \text { for } k=3 & (\text { resp. } k=4) \quad Z=\sum_{\substack{\text { (tri) } u \text { uadr)-- } \\ \text { angulations }}} g^{\text {"area" }} \text { " }{ }^{\text {otherwise }}\end{cases}
$$

Here no extra "matter" degrees of freedom.

## Outline

(1) First problem: maps with a boundary (review)
(2) Second problem: maps with two points at given distance
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Computing the partition function is an enumeration problem. It is simpler to count rooted maps with fixed root degree $n$ i.e compute their generating function
$F_{n} \equiv F_{n}\left(\left\{g_{k}\right\}_{k \geq 1}\right)=\frac{\partial Z}{\partial g_{n}}$ ( $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{o}$ weight $g_{n}$ for the root face).
$F(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F_{n} z^{n}$ is the disk amplitude.


## Connection with matrix models

Consider a random $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix $M$ with measure

$$
d M \exp N\left(-\frac{\operatorname{Tr} M^{2}}{2}+\sum_{k \geq 1} g_{k} \frac{\operatorname{Tr} M^{k}}{k}\right)
$$

then we have informally

$$
\begin{align*}
F_{n} & =\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N}\left\langle\operatorname{Tr} M^{n}\right\rangle \\
F(z) & =\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N}\left\langle\operatorname{Tr}(1-z M)^{-1}\right\rangle \tag{resolvent}
\end{align*}
$$

## Tutte's equation (1968) a.k.a. loop equation

The $F_{n}$ are fully determined by the quadratic equation

$$
F_{n}=\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} F_{i} F_{n-2-i}+\sum_{k \geq 1} g_{k} F_{n+k-2}
$$
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The $F_{n}$ are fully determined by the quadratic equation

$$
F(z)=1+z^{2} F(z)^{2}+\sum_{k \geq 1} g_{k} z^{2-k} F(z)+P\left(z^{-1}\right)
$$
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By Brown's lemma/one-cut hypothesis
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## Review of the solution of Tutte's equation

By the previous equation

$$
F(z)=\frac{1}{2 z^{2}}\left(1-\sum_{k \geq 1} g_{k} z^{2-k} \pm \sqrt{\Delta(z)}\right)
$$

## By Brown's lemma/one-cut hypothesis

$$
F(z)=\frac{1}{2 z^{2}}\left(1-\sum_{k \geq 1} g_{k} z^{2-k}-\Gamma\left(z^{-1}\right) \sqrt{1+\kappa_{1} z+\kappa_{2} z^{2}}\right)
$$

with $\Gamma\left(z^{-1}\right)$ a polynomial or power series in $z^{-1}$.
But $F(z)$ contains only nonnegative powers of $z$ ! This constraint allows to deduce explicit expressions for $\Gamma\left(z^{-1}\right), \kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}$.

## Example: quadrangulations

For $g_{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}g \text { for } k=4 \\ 0 \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$ this method leads to

$$
F_{2 n}=\sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2 n)!}{n!(n-1)!} \frac{(2 a+n-1)!}{a!(a+n+1)!}(3 g)^{a} \quad F_{2 n+1}=0
$$
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For $g_{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}g \text { for } k=4 \\ 0 \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$ this method leads to

$$
F_{2 n}=\sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2 n)!}{n!(n-1)!} \frac{(2 a+n-1)!}{a!(a+n+1)!}(3 g)^{a} \quad F_{2 n+1}=0
$$

The sum converges for $g \leq g_{c}=1 / 12$. Similar expressions exist for triangulations (where $g_{c}=\sqrt{4 / 27}$ ). It is now easily to analyze the (well-known) critical behaviour:

- for fixed finite $n$, as $g \rightarrow g_{c}, \partial F_{n} / \partial g$ and $\partial^{2} Z / \partial g^{2}$ have a square-root singularity ( " $\gamma_{\text {string }}=-1 / 2$ "),
- the relevant scaling is $n \propto 1 / \sqrt{g_{c}-g}$ : the dominant singular term of $F_{n}$ corresponds to the universal disk amplitude of pure gravity.


## General combinatorial structure of the solution
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$$
\kappa(z) \equiv 1+\kappa_{1} z+\kappa_{2} z^{2}=(1-S z)^{2}-4 R z^{2}
$$

then

$$
\sqrt{\kappa(z)}=1-S z-2 R z^{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P^{+}(n ; R, S) z^{n}
$$

$P^{+}(n ; R, S)$ is the generating function for Motzkin paths of length $n$, with weight $R$ (resp. $S$ ) per down-step (resp. level-step).

$P^{+}(n ; R, S)_{\equiv}$

## General combinatorial structure of the solution

(1) immediately yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{n}=R \sum_{q \geq 0} \gamma_{q} P^{+}(n+q ; R, S) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
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By now writing that (1) (divided by $\sqrt{\kappa(z)}$ ) contains no negative powers in $z$ and that its constant term is 1 , we may obtain:

- algebraic equations determining the "master unknowns" $R, S$
- expressions for the $\gamma_{q}$ in terms of $R, S$.


## General combinatorial structure of the solution

(1) immediately yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{n}=R \sum_{q \geq 0} \gamma_{q} P^{+}(n+q ; R, S) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The only dependence in $n$ is via the path length!
By now writing that (1) (divided by $\sqrt{\kappa(z)}$ ) contains no negative powers in $z$ and that its constant term is 1 , we may obtain:

- algebraic equations determining the "master unknowns" $R, S$
- expressions for the $\gamma_{q}$ in terms of $R, S$.

Remark: these may also be given a combinatorial interpretation via

$$
1 / \sqrt{\kappa(z)}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P(n ; R, S) z^{n}
$$



## Summary/conclusion on the first problem

- Maps with a boundary can be enumerated effectively via Tutte's equation.
- A remarkable combinatorial/algebraic structure related to the physical one-cut hypothesis.
- $F(z)$ is a master function in terms of which generating functions for maps with several boundaries and of higher genus ("global observables") can be expressed.
- Generalizations to models with matter are known.


## Outline

## (1) First problem: maps with a boundary (review)

(2) Second problem: maps with two points at given distance


## Geodesic/graph distance: minimal number of edges connecting two given vertices

 (i.e each edge has length 1 )What are the metric properties of large random maps?


Simple observable: the distance-dependent two-point function [Ambjørn-Watabiki 1996] is the generating function for maps with two marked points at given distance. Computing it is again an enumeration problem!

Probabilistic interpretation: it encodes the distribution of distances between two uniformly chosen random random points.

## By a transfer matrix approach, Ambjørn and Watabiki successfully predicted the universal scaling form of the two-point function for pure gravity.

By a transfer matrix approach, Ambjørn and Watabiki successfully predicted the universal scaling form of the two-point function for pure gravity.

Scaling: distance $\propto\left(g_{c}-g\right)^{-1 / 4} \propto(\text { area })^{1 / 4}$
In a canonical ensemble (maps of fixed area), the rescaled distance between two uniform random points admits a limiting distribution:


$$
\begin{gathered}
\sim d^{3} \text { for } d \rightarrow 0 \\
\sim e^{-C d^{4 / 3}} \text { for } d \rightarrow \infty
\end{gathered}
$$

An exact discrete expression whose scaling form agrees with the Ambjørn-Watabiki prediction was found for quadrangulations and, more generally, maps with even face valencies. [B., Di Francesco, Guitter 2003]

An exact discrete expression whose scaling form agrees with the Ambjørn-Watabiki prediction was found for quadrangulations and, more generally, maps with even face valencies. [B., Di Francesco, Guitter 2003]

Ingredients:

- coding of maps by trees (Schaeffer's bijection and generalizations)
- identification of the two-point function with tree g.f.
- equation following from recursive decomposition of such trees
- guess of the solution!


## Example: quadrangulations

The discrete two-point function is the solution of the equation

$$
R_{n}=1+g R_{n}\left(R_{n-1}+R_{n}+R_{n+1}\right) \quad\left(n \geq 1, R_{0}=0\right)
$$
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## Explicit solution

$$
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## Example: quadrangulations

The discrete two-point function is the solution of the equation

$$
R_{n}=1+g R_{n}\left(R_{n-1}+R_{n}+R_{n+1}\right) \quad\left(n \geq 1, R_{0}=0\right)
$$

## Explicit solution

$$
\begin{gather*}
R_{n}=R \frac{u_{n} u_{n+3}}{u_{n+1} u_{n+2}}  \tag{3}\\
R=1+3 g R^{2} \quad u_{n}=1-x^{n} \quad x+\frac{1}{x}+1=\frac{1}{g R^{2}}
\end{gather*}
$$

There are also equations with explicit solutions in more general cases! The form (3) still holds (but $u_{n}$ gets more complicated). Why?

## New approach [B., Guitter 2010]

The two-point function is encoded in the continued fraction expansion of the disk amplitude $F(z)$ !

- Maps with even face valencies: Stieljes fraction

$$
F(z) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_{2 n} z^{2 n}=\frac{1}{1-\frac{R_{1} z^{2}}{1-\frac{R_{2} z^{2}}{1-\cdots}}}
$$

- Maps with arbitrary face valencies: Jacobi fraction

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_{n} z^{n}=\frac{1}{1-S_{0} z-\frac{R_{1} z^{2}}{1-S_{1} z-\frac{R_{2} z^{2}}{1-\cdots}}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Elements of the proof:

- the combinatorial theory of continued fractions [Flajolet 1980]
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## Combinatorial equivalent of (4)

$F_{n}$ is equal to the generating function for Motzkin paths of length $n$, with weight $R_{m}$ (resp. $S_{m}$ ) per down-step (resp. level-step) starting at height $m$.

- a suitable decomposition of maps with a boundary (via trees or "slices" ): Motzkin paths code the distances from the origin to the vertices incident to the root face.

external face of degree $n$
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This essentially explains the form (3).
These relations hold in the general theory of continued fractions. In our map model, the specific form of $F_{n}$ lead to specific Hankel determinants, which are symplectic Schur functions $\operatorname{sp}_{2 p}(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$.

The general formula for $F_{n}$ is

$$
F_{n}=\sum_{q=0}^{p} A_{q} P^{+}(n+q)
$$

Substituting into the Hankel determinant

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{n} & =\operatorname{det}_{0 \leq i, j \leq n}\left(\sum_{q=0}^{p} A_{q} P^{+}(i+j+q)\right) \\
& \propto \operatorname{det}_{0 \leq k, \ell \leq n}\left(\sum_{q=0}^{p} A_{q}\left(P_{k-\ell}(q)-P_{k+\ell+2}(q)\right)\right) \\
& \propto \operatorname{sp}_{2 p}\left(\lambda_{p, n+1}, \mathbf{x}\right) \\
& \propto \operatorname{det}_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}\left(x_{i}^{n+j}-x_{i}^{-n-j}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$



The $x$ 's are roots of

$$
\sum_{r=-p}^{p} \sum_{q=0}^{p} A_{q} P_{r}(q) x^{r}=0
$$

$\lambda_{p, n+1}$ is the "rectangular" partition


## Remark

We make use of two different formulas for $F_{n}$ involving Motzkin paths:

- as a sum (2) over Motzkin paths of variable length $n, \ldots, n+p$ and height-independant weights $R, S$ per step
- as a sum (4) over Motzkin paths of fixed length $n$ and height-dependant weights $R_{m}, S_{m}$ per step


## Remark

We make use of two different formulas for $F_{n}$ involving Motzkin paths:

- as a sum (2) over Motzkin paths of variable length $n, \ldots, n+p$ and height-independant weights $R, S$ per step
- as a sum (4) over Motzkin paths of fixed length $n$ and height-dependant weights $R_{m}, S_{m}$ per step


## Caveat

The expression involving Schur functions assumes that face valencies are bounded: $g_{k}=0$ for $k>p+2 . H_{n}$ may then be rewritten as a $p \times p$ determinant (rather than $(n+1) \times(n+1)$ ), easier to study in the limit of large distance $n$.

## Example \& combinatorial interpretation: triangulations

Suppose that $g_{k}=0$ for $k \neq 3$ (faces are triangles), i.e $p=1$ :
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$$
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## Example \& combinatorial interpretation: triangulations

Suppose that $g_{k}=0$ for $k \neq 3$ (faces are triangles), i.e $p=1$ :

$$
F_{n}=A_{0} P^{+}(n ; R, S)+A_{1} P^{+}(n+1 ; R, S)
$$


$F_{i+j}$ can be interpreted as paths on a weighted graph. By the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma, the determinant $H_{n}$ counts configurations of non-intersecting lattice paths on this graph

Such configurations of non-intersecting lattice paths are highly constrained and, actually, in bijection with configurations of 1D dimers.


Counting 1D dimer configurations is easy, we obtain

$$
H_{n} \propto \frac{1}{(1+y)^{n+1}} \frac{1-y^{n+2}}{1-y}
$$

with $y$ related to the dimer weight $-g_{3}^{2} R^{3}$ by

$$
y+\frac{1}{y}+2=\frac{1}{g_{3}^{2} R^{3}}
$$

It yields the simple formula

$$
R_{n}=R \frac{\left(1-y^{n}\right)\left(1-y^{n+2}\right)}{\left(1-y^{n+1}\right)^{2}}
$$

and similarly

$$
S_{n}=S-g_{3} R^{2} y^{n} \frac{(1-y)\left(1-y^{2}\right)}{\left(1-y^{n+1}\right)\left(1-y^{n+2}\right)}
$$

## Conclusion and outlook

- We have shown that the disk amplitude and the two-point function are encoded in the same function $F(z)$.
- Our results are purely discrete. One may now turn to asymptotic analysis. The generic behaviour is pure gravity ("Brownian map").
- Possible directions:
- Connections with orthogonal polynomials and matrix models
- Other distance-related observables (not so many known! radius, three-point function, numbers of geodesics...)
- Generalizations to models with matter
- Maps with large faces?
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