Lattice path asymptotics via Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables

> Mark C. Wilson Department of Computer Science University of Auckland

Algebra/Number Theory/Combinatorics Seminar Claremont McKenna College 2016-12-06

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで





Lattice walks have many applications: modelling physical and chemical structures, encoding trees, statistical inference. Their random analogues are important in queueing theory.

Example (A harder problem)

► How many n-step lattice walks are there, if walks start from the origin, are confined to the first quadrant, and take steps in {S, NE, NW}? Call this a_n.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Example (A harder problem)

- ► How many n-step lattice walks are there, if walks start from the origin, are confined to the first quadrant, and take steps in {S, NE, NW}? Call this a_n.
- This has both forward and back steps in each dimension, and it is not so easy to derive an explicit formula.

Example (A harder problem)

- ▶ How many n-step lattice walks are there, if walks start from the origin, are confined to the first quadrant, and take steps in {S, NE, NW}? Call this a_n.
- This has both forward and back steps in each dimension, and it is not so easy to derive an explicit formula.
- Conjectured by Bostan & Kauers:

$$a_n \sim 3^n \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi n}}.$$

• Consider nearest-neighbour walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 , defined by a set $S \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of short steps.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Consider nearest-neighbour walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 , defined by a set $S \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of short steps.
- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative quadrant. We concentrate on the last case, the most challenging. We can also restrict so the endpoint is on the x or y-axis, or the origin.

- Consider nearest-neighbour walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 , defined by a set $S \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of short steps.
- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative quadrant. We concentrate on the last case, the most challenging. We can also restrict so the endpoint is on the x or y-axis, or the origin.
- ▶ We keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a trivariate sequence $a_{r,s,n}$ with generating function (GF)

$$C(x, y, t) := \sum_{r, s, n} a_{r, s, n} x^r y^s t^n.$$

- Consider nearest-neighbour walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 , defined by a set $S \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of short steps.
- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative quadrant. We concentrate on the last case, the most challenging. We can also restrict so the endpoint is on the x or y-axis, or the origin.
- ▶ We keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a trivariate sequence $a_{r,s,n}$ with generating function (GF)

$$C(x, y, t) := \sum_{r,s,n} a_{r,s,n} x^r y^s t^n.$$

Summing over r, s gives a univariate series $C(1, 1, t) := f(t) = \sum_n f_n t^n$.

- Consider nearest-neighbour walks in \mathbb{Z}^2 , defined by a set $S \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ of short steps.
- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative quadrant. We concentrate on the last case, the most challenging. We can also restrict so the endpoint is on the x or y-axis, or the origin.
- ▶ We keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a trivariate sequence $a_{r,s,n}$ with generating function (GF)

$$C(x, y, t) := \sum_{r,s,n} a_{r,s,n} x^r y^s t^n.$$

- Summing over r, s gives a univariate series $C(1, 1, t) := f(t) = \sum_n f_n t^n$.
- We seek in particular the asymptotics of f_n .

 Unrestricted walks — rational functions — have been understood "forever".

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Unrestricted walks rational functions have been understood "forever".
- Walks confined to a halfspace algebraic functions understood since Bousquet-Mélou & Petkovšek (2000), using the *kernel method*.

- Unrestricted walks rational functions have been understood "forever".
- Walks confined to a halfspace algebraic functions understood since Bousquet-Mélou & Petkovšek (2000), using the *kernel method*.
- 23 classes of walks confined to a quadrant D-finite functions — satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients — reasonably well understood.

- Unrestricted walks rational functions have been understood "forever".
- Walks confined to a halfspace algebraic functions understood since Bousquet-Mélou & Petkovšek (2000), using the *kernel method*.
- 23 classes of walks confined to a quadrant D-finite functions — satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients — reasonably well understood.
- 56 quadrant classes, steps that are not small non D-finite functions — poorly understood.

 Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010): there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010): there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ► They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite in exactly 23 cases.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010): there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ► They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite in exactly 23 cases.
- ► They used finiteness to show for 22 cases that C(x, y, t) is D-finite. For 19 of these, used the orbit sum method and for 3 more, the half orbit sum method.

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010): there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ► They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite in exactly 23 cases.
- ► They used finiteness to show for 22 cases that C(x, y, t) is D-finite. For 19 of these, used the orbit sum method and for 3 more, the half orbit sum method.
- Bostan & Kauers (2010) explicitly showed that for the 23rd case (Gessel walks), f(t) is algebraic (and hence D-finite).

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010): there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ► They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite in exactly 23 cases.
- ► They used finiteness to show for 22 cases that C(x, y, t) is D-finite. For 19 of these, used the orbit sum method and for 3 more, the half orbit sum method.
- Bostan & Kauers (2010) explicitly showed that for the 23rd case (Gessel walks), f(t) is algebraic (and hence D-finite).
- ► In the other 56 cases, f(t) is indeed not D-finite. So there are 23 nice inequivalent cases to discuss now.

Bostan & Kauers (2009): conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 nice cases. Four of these were dealt with by direct attack. We borrow their table below.

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

- Bostan & Kauers (2009): conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 nice cases. Four of these were dealt with by direct attack. We borrow their table below.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech (2016): expressed f(t) in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 of these cases.

- Bostan & Kauers (2009): conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 nice cases. Four of these were dealt with by direct attack. We borrow their table below.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech (2016): expressed f(t) in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 of these cases.
- Melczer & Mishna (2014): derived rigorous asymptotics for f_n in 4 cases.

- Bostan & Kauers (2009): conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 nice cases. Four of these were dealt with by direct attack. We borrow their table below.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech (2016): expressed f(t) in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 of these cases.
- Melczer & Mishna (2014): derived rigorous asymptotics for f_n in 4 cases.
- ▶ Open: proof of asymptotics of *f_n* for 15 cases. We solve that here via a unified approach.

Previous results on quadrant walks

Table of All Conjectured D-Finite *F*(*t*; 1, 1) [Bostan & Kauers 2009]

| | OEIS | S | alg | equiv | | OEIS | S | alg | equiv |
|--|---------|-------------------|-----|---|----|---------|--------------|-----|--|
| 1 | A005566 | \Leftrightarrow | Ν | $\frac{4}{\pi} \frac{4^n}{n}$ | 13 | A151275 | \mathbf{X} | Ν | $\frac{12\sqrt{30}}{\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 2 | A018224 | Х | Ν | $\frac{2}{\pi} \frac{4^n}{n}$ | 14 | A151314 | ₩ | Ν | $\frac{\sqrt{6}\lambda\mu C^{5/2}}{5\pi} \frac{(2C)^n}{n^2}$ |
| 3 | A151312 | \mathbb{X} | Ν | $\frac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \frac{6^n}{n}$ | 15 | A151255 | Å | Ν | $\frac{24\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{2})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 4 | A151331 | 畿 | Ν | $\frac{8}{3\pi}\frac{8^n}{n}$ | 16 | A151287 | 捡 | Ν | $\frac{2\sqrt{2}A^{7/2}}{\pi} \frac{(2A)^n}{n^2}$ |
| 5 | A151266 | Y | Ν | $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}\frac{3^n}{n^{1/2}}}$ | 17 | A001006 | ÷, | Y | $\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}\frac{3^n}{n^{3/2}}}$ |
| 6 | A151307 | ₩ | Ν | $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{5}{2\pi}}\frac{5^n}{n^{1/2}}$ | 18 | A129400 | 裪 | Y | $\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}}\frac{6^n}{n^{3/2}}$ |
| 7 | A151291 | ™ | Ν | $\frac{4}{3\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{4^n}{n^{1/2}}$ | 19 | A005558 | × | Ν | $\frac{8}{\pi} \frac{4^n}{n^2}$ |
| 8 | A151326 | ₩. | Ν | $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3\pi}} \frac{6^n}{n^{1/2}}$ | | | | | |
| 9 | A151302 | X | N | $\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{5}{2\pi}}\frac{5^n}{n^{1/2}}$ | 20 | A151265 | ¥ | Y | $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(1/4)} \frac{3^n}{n^{3/4}}$ |
| 10 | A151329 | 翜 | N | $\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{7}{3\pi}}\frac{7^n}{n^{1/2}}$ | 21 | A151278 | Þ | Y | $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{2}\Gamma(1/4)}\frac{3^n}{n^{3/4}}$ |
| 11 | A151261 | A | Ν | $\frac{12\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^2}$ | 22 | A151323 | ⋪ | Y | $\frac{\sqrt{23^{3/4}}}{\Gamma(1/4)} \frac{6^n}{n^{3/4}}$ |
| 12 | A151297 | 鏉 | N | $\frac{\sqrt{3}B^{7/2}}{2\pi} \frac{(2B)^n}{n^2}$ | 23 | A060900 | Å | Y | $\frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3\Gamma(1/3)}\frac{4^n}{n^{2/3}}$ |
| $A = 1 + \sqrt{2}, B = 1 + \sqrt{3}, C = 1 + \sqrt{6}, \lambda = 7 + 3\sqrt{6}, \mu = \sqrt{\frac{4\sqrt{6}-1}{20}}$ | | | | | | | | | |

▷ Computerized discovery by enumeration + Hermite-Padé + LLL/PSLQ.

Frédéric Chyzak Small-Step Walks

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

► The standard idea is to analyse singularities of f(t), and use complex analysis.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- ► The standard idea is to analyse singularities of f(t), and use complex analysis.
- Pros: f(t) is a univariate function, and asymptotic theory will be easier. We may be able to use f(t) for other purposes.

- ► The standard idea is to analyse singularities of f(t), and use complex analysis.
- ▶ Pros: f(t) is a univariate function, and asymptotic theory will be easier. We may be able to use f(t) for other purposes.
- Cons: f(t) may be nasty to describe (not algebraic). We don't need to compute it if we only want the asymptotics of its coefficients. The computational effort can be enormous.

- ► The standard idea is to analyse singularities of f(t), and use complex analysis.
- ▶ Pros: f(t) is a univariate function, and asymptotic theory will be easier. We may be able to use f(t) for other purposes.
- Cons: f(t) may be nasty to describe (not algebraic). We don't need to compute it if we only want the asymptotics of its coefficients. The computational effort can be enormous.
- Our idea: there is a tradeoff between niceness of generating function and dimension. We use recently developed tools for asymptotics of higher dimensional rational GFs.

Univariate approaches don't work well yet

► We can find a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients satisfied by f(t). The polynomials may have large degree and coefficients, and take gigabytes of storage.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Univariate approaches don't work well yet

- ► We can find a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients satisfied by f(t). The polynomials may have large degree and coefficients, and take gigabytes of storage.
- We can use results of Birkhoff-Trjitinsky which give a basis for the asymptotic formulae. This is believed not to be fully rigorous. We encounter the *connection problem*: it can be surprisingly hard to compute the coefficients or tell whether they are nonzero.

Univariate approaches don't work well yet

- ► We can find a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients satisfied by f(t). The polynomials may have large degree and coefficients, and take gigabytes of storage.
- We can use results of Birkhoff-Trjitinsky which give a basis for the asymptotic formulae. This is believed not to be fully rigorous. We encounter the *connection problem*: it can be surprisingly hard to compute the coefficients or tell whether they are nonzero.
- Another approach uses hypergeometric integrals. This requires computation of integrals which have not yet been done explicitly.

Diagonals

The orbit sum approach yields f as the positive part of a rational series. This is the leading diagonal of a closely related series. Thus we have f = diag F where

$$F(x, y, t) = \frac{xyP(x^{-1}, y^{-1})}{(1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1}))(1 - x)(1 - y)}$$

and S and P are Laurent polynomials:

$$S(x,y) = \sum_{(i,j)\in S} x^i y^j$$
 (step enumerator)
 $P(x,y) = \sum_{\sigma\in G} \operatorname{sign}(\sigma)\sigma(xy).$

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

Diagonals

The orbit sum approach yields f as the positive part of a rational series. This is the leading diagonal of a closely related series. Thus we have f = diag F where

$$F(x, y, t) = \frac{xyP(x^{-1}, y^{-1})}{(1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1}))(1 - x)(1 - y)}$$

and S and P are Laurent polynomials:

$$\begin{split} S(x,y) &= \sum_{(i,j)\in S} x^i y^j \text{ (step enumerator)} \\ P(x,y) &= \sum_{\sigma\in G} \operatorname{sign}(\sigma) \sigma(xy). \end{split}$$

► The trivariate GF is rational but the diagonal is only D-finite and can't be easily described. We instead compute asymptotics of [xⁿyⁿtⁿ]f(x, y, t).

ACSV

▶ Robin Pemantle and I derived general formulae for asymptotics of coefficients of rational functions F = G/H in dimension d (see our book).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

ACSV

- ▶ Robin Pemantle and I derived general formulae for asymptotics of coefficients of rational functions F = G/H in dimension d (see our book).
- Analysis is based on the geometry of the singular variety (zero-set of H) near contributing critical points z_{*} depending on the direction r.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

ACSV

- ▶ Robin Pemantle and I derived general formulae for asymptotics of coefficients of rational functions F = G/H in dimension d (see our book).
- Analysis is based on the geometry of the singular variety (zero-set of H) near contributing critical points z_{*} depending on the direction r.
- The ultimate justification involves Morse theory, but convex analysis often suffices in the combinatorial case.
ACSV

- ▶ Robin Pemantle and I derived general formulae for asymptotics of coefficients of rational functions F = G/H in dimension d (see our book).
- Analysis is based on the geometry of the singular variety (zero-set of H) near contributing critical points z_{*} depending on the direction r.
- The ultimate justification involves Morse theory, but convex analysis often suffices in the combinatorial case.
- ► We deal in particular with multiple points (locally a transverse intersection of k smooth factors). If 1 ≤ k ≤ d, formulae look like

$$a_{\mathbf{r}} \sim {\mathbf{z}_{*}}^{-\mathbf{r}} \sum_{l \ge 0} b_{l} ||\mathbf{r}||^{-(d-k)/2-l}.$$

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Example (Univariate pole: Fibonacci)

Consider F(z) = z/(1 − z − z²), the GF for Fibonacci numbers. There are two poles, at φ := 2/(1 + √5) and −φ⁻¹. Using a circle of radius φ − ε yields, by Cauchy's theorem

$$a_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\phi-\varepsilon}} z^{-r-1} F(z) \, dz$$

so that a_r has exponential rate at least $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2$.

Example (Univariate pole: Fibonacci)

Consider F(z) = z/(1 - z - z²), the GF for Fibonacci numbers. There are two poles, at φ := 2/(1 + √5) and -φ⁻¹. Using a circle of radius φ - ε yields, by Cauchy's theorem

$$a_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\phi-\varepsilon}} z^{-r-1} F(z) \, dz$$

so that a_r has exponential rate at least $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2$.

By Cauchy's residue theorem,

$$a_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\phi+\varepsilon}} z^{-r-1} F(z) \, dz - \operatorname{Res}(z^{-r-1} F(z); z=1).$$

Example (Univariate pole: Fibonacci)

Consider F(z) = z/(1 - z - z²), the GF for Fibonacci numbers. There are two poles, at φ := 2/(1 + √5) and -φ⁻¹. Using a circle of radius φ - ε yields, by Cauchy's theorem

$$a_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\phi-\varepsilon}} z^{-r-1} F(z) \, dz$$

so that a_r has exponential rate at least $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2$.

By Cauchy's residue theorem,

$$a_r = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_{\phi+\varepsilon}} z^{-r-1} F(z) \, dz - \operatorname{Res}(z^{-r-1}F(z); z=1).$$

► The integral is $O((\phi + \varepsilon)^{-r})$ while the residue is order $\phi^{-r}/\sqrt{5}$. Thus $[z^r]F(z) \sim \phi^{-r}/\sqrt{5}$ as $r \to \infty$.

Example (Essential singularity: saddle point method)

► Here F(z) = exp(z). The Cauchy integral formula on a circle C_R of radius R gives a_n ≤ F(R)/Rⁿ.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Example (Essential singularity: saddle point method)

- ► Here F(z) = exp(z). The Cauchy integral formula on a circle C_R of radius R gives a_n ≤ F(R)/Rⁿ.
- ► Consider the "height function" $\log F(R) n \log R$ and try to minimize over R. In this example, R = n is the minimum.

Example (Essential singularity: saddle point method)

- ► Here F(z) = exp(z). The Cauchy integral formula on a circle C_R of radius R gives a_n ≤ F(R)/Rⁿ.
- ► Consider the "height function" $\log F(R) n \log R$ and try to minimize over R. In this example, R = n is the minimum.
- The integral over C_n has most mass near z = n, so that

$$a_n = \frac{F(n)}{2\pi n^n} \int_0^{2\pi} \exp(-in\theta) \frac{F(ne^{i\theta})}{F(n)} d\theta$$

$$\approx \frac{e^n}{2\pi n^n} \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \exp\left(-in\theta + \log F(ne^{i\theta}) - \log F(n)\right) d\theta.$$

Example (Saddle point example continued)

The Maclaurin expansion yields

$$-in\theta + \log F(ne^{i\theta}) - \log F(n) = -n\theta^2/2 + O(n\theta^3).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Example (Saddle point example continued)

The Maclaurin expansion yields

$$-in\theta + \log F(ne^{i\theta}) - \log F(n) = -n\theta^2/2 + O(n\theta^3).$$

► This gives, with $b_n = 2\pi n^n e^{-n} a_n$, Laplace's approximation:

$$b_n \approx \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \exp(-n\theta^2/2) \, d\theta \approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-n\theta^2/2) \, d\theta = \sqrt{2\pi/n}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Example (Saddle point example continued)

The Maclaurin expansion yields

$$-in\theta + \log F(ne^{i\theta}) - \log F(n) = -n\theta^2/2 + O(n\theta^3).$$

► This gives, with $b_n = 2\pi n^n e^{-n} a_n$, Laplace's approximation:

$$b_n \approx \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \exp(-n\theta^2/2) \, d\theta \approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-n\theta^2/2) \, d\theta = \sqrt{2\pi/n}.$$

▶ This recaptures Stirling's approximation, since $n! = 1/a_n$:

$$n! \sim n^n e^{-n} \sqrt{2\pi n}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

 (Bender 1974) "Practically nothing is known about asymptotics for recursions in two variables even when a GF is available. Techniques for obtaining asymptotics from bivariate GFs would be quite useful."

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- (Bender 1974) "Practically nothing is known about asymptotics for recursions in two variables even when a GF is available. Techniques for obtaining asymptotics from bivariate GFs would be quite useful."
- (Odlyzko 1995) "A major difficulty in estimating the coefficients of mvGFs is that the geometry of the problem is far more difficult. ... Even rational multivariate functions are not easy to deal with."

- (Bender 1974) "Practically nothing is known about asymptotics for recursions in two variables even when a GF is available. Techniques for obtaining asymptotics from bivariate GFs would be quite useful."
- (Odlyzko 1995) "A major difficulty in estimating the coefficients of mvGFs is that the geometry of the problem is far more difficult. ... Even rational multivariate functions are not easy to deal with."

► (Flajolet/Sedgewick 2009) "Roughly, we regard here a bivariate GF as a collection of univariate GFs"

- (Bender 1974) "Practically nothing is known about asymptotics for recursions in two variables even when a GF is available. Techniques for obtaining asymptotics from bivariate GFs would be quite useful."
- (Odlyzko 1995) "A major difficulty in estimating the coefficients of mvGFs is that the geometry of the problem is far more difficult. ... Even rational multivariate functions are not easy to deal with."

- (Flajolet/Sedgewick 2009) "Roughly, we regard here a bivariate GF as a collection of univariate GFs"
- We aimed to improve the multivariate situation.

► Asymptotics in the direction r̄ are determined by the geometry of V near a (finite) set of critical points, computable via symbolic algebra.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- ► Asymptotics in the direction r are determined by the geometry of V near a (finite) set of critical points, computable via symbolic algebra.
- ► For computing asymptotics in direction r
 , we may restrict to a dominant point z_{*}(r
) lying in the positive orthant.

- ► Asymptotics in the direction r are determined by the geometry of V near a (finite) set of critical points, computable via symbolic algebra.
- ► For computing asymptotics in direction r
 , we may restrict to a dominant point z_{*}(r
) lying in the positive orthant.
- ► There is an expansion a_r ~ formula(z_{*}) where formula(z_{*}) is an asymptotic series that depends on the type of geometry of V near z_{*}, and each term is computable from finitely many derivatives of G and H at z_{*}.

- ► Asymptotics in the direction r̄ are determined by the geometry of V near a (finite) set of critical points, computable via symbolic algebra.
- ► For computing asymptotics in direction r

 , we may restrict to a dominant point z_{*}(r

) lying in the positive orthant.
- ► There is an expansion a_r ~ formula(z_{*}) where formula(z_{*}) is an asymptotic series that depends on the type of geometry of V near z_{*}, and each term is computable from finitely many derivatives of G and H at z_{*}.

This yields

```
a_{\mathbf{r}} \sim \text{formula}(\mathbf{z}_*)
```

where the expansion is uniform on compact subsets of directions, provided the geometry does not change.

 Several dominant points can occur (linked to periodicity of coefficients).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Several dominant points can occur (linked to periodicity of coefficients).
- Dominant point may not be in first orthant (linked to negative coefficients).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Several dominant points can occur (linked to periodicity of coefficients).
- Dominant point may not be in first orthant (linked to negative coefficients).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 Initial terms can vanish in expansion, higher ones harder to compute explicitly.

- Several dominant points can occur (linked to periodicity of coefficients).
- Dominant point may not be in first orthant (linked to negative coefficients).

- Initial terms can vanish in expansion, higher ones harder to compute explicitly.
- Geometry of \mathcal{V} near \mathbf{z}_* can be strange.

- Several dominant points can occur (linked to periodicity of coefficients).
- Dominant point may not be in first orthant (linked to negative coefficients).
- Initial terms can vanish in expansion, higher ones harder to compute explicitly.
- Geometry of \mathcal{V} near \mathbf{z}_* can be strange.
- All of these occur in applications, the first three in our lattice point analysis.

• (smooth point, or multiple point with $n \leq d$)

$$\mathbf{z}_*^{-\mathbf{r}} \sum_{k \ge 0} a_k |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-n)/2-k}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

• (smooth point, or multiple point with $n \leq d$)

$$\mathbf{z}_*^{-\mathbf{r}} \sum_{k \ge 0} a_k |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-n)/2-k}.$$

• (smooth/multiple point n < d)

$$a_0 = G(\mathbf{z}_*)C(\mathbf{z}_*)$$

where C depends on the derivatives to order 2 of H;

• (smooth point, or multiple point with $n \leq d$)

$$\mathbf{z}_*^{-\mathbf{r}} \sum_{k \ge 0} a_k |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-n)/2-k}.$$

• (smooth/multiple point n < d)

$$a_0 = G(\mathbf{z}_*)C(\mathbf{z}_*)$$

where C depends on the derivatives to order 2 of H;

• (multiple point,
$$n = d$$
)

$$a_0 = G(\mathbf{z}_*)(\det J)^{-1}$$

where J is the Jacobian matrix $(\partial H_i/\partial z_j)$, other a_k are zero;

• (smooth point, or multiple point with $n \leq d$)

$$\mathbf{z}_*^{-\mathbf{r}} \sum_{k \ge 0} a_k |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-n)/2-k}.$$

• (smooth/multiple point n < d)

$$a_0 = G(\mathbf{z}_*)C(\mathbf{z}_*)$$

where C depends on the derivatives to order 2 of H;

$$a_0 = G(\mathbf{z}_*)(\det J)^{-1}$$

where J is the Jacobian matrix $(\partial H_i/\partial z_j)$, other a_k are zero; (multiple point, $n \ge d$)

$$\mathbf{z_*}^{-\mathbf{r}}G(\mathbf{z}_*)P\left(\frac{r_1}{z_1^*},\ldots,\frac{r_d}{z_d^*}\right),$$

P a piecewise polynomial of degree $n - d \rightarrow \langle a \rangle \langle a \rangle \langle a \rangle$

Lattice path asymptotics Application of general methods to lattice paths

Back to lattice paths

 We seek asymptotics on the leading diagonal of a trivariate GF.

・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ

Lattice path asymptotics Application of general methods to lattice paths

Back to lattice paths

 We seek asymptotics on the leading diagonal of a trivariate GF.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Pros:

Lattice path asymptotics Application of general methods to lattice paths

Back to lattice paths

- We seek asymptotics on the leading diagonal of a trivariate GF.
- Pros:
 - ► The functional form of *F* is simple, a product of 3 smooth factors that are easy to understand. We can compute formulae for everything in terms of the step enumerator.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Lattice path asymptotics

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Back to lattice paths

- We seek asymptotics on the leading diagonal of a trivariate GF.
- Pros:
 - ► The functional form of *F* is simple, a product of 3 smooth factors that are easy to understand. We can compute formulae for everything in terms of the step enumerator.

Cons: non-generic behaviour occurs.

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Back to lattice paths

- We seek asymptotics on the leading diagonal of a trivariate GF.
- Pros:
 - ► The functional form of *F* is simple, a product of 3 smooth factors that are easy to understand. We can compute formulae for everything in terms of the step enumerator.
- Cons: non-generic behaviour occurs.
- In the following, we use notation

$$S_j = \{i : (i,j) \in S\}$$
 for each $j \in \{-1,0,1\}$.

Lattice path asymptotics

-Application of general methods to lattice paths

Singularities

► The factor $H_1 := 1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1})$ is a polynomial. Then $\nabla_{\log} H_1 := (x\partial H_1/\partial x, y\partial H_1/\partial y, t\partial H_1/\partial t)$ $= (-1 + ty\partial S/\partial x, -1 + tx\partial S/\partial y, -1)$

and thus this factor is everywhere smooth.

Lattice path asymptotics

-Application of general methods to lattice paths

Singularities

• The factor $H_1 := 1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1})$ is a polynomial. Then

$$\nabla_{\log} H_1 := (x \partial H_1 / \partial x, y \partial H_1 / \partial y, t \partial H_1 / \partial t)$$
$$= (-1 + ty \partial S / \partial x, -1 + tx \partial S / \partial y, -1)$$

and thus this factor is everywhere smooth.

► Other singularities come from factors of (1 − x), (1 − y) and possibly from clearing denominators of xyP(x⁻¹, y⁻¹).

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Singularities

▶ The factor $H_1 := 1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1})$ is a polynomial. Then

$$\nabla_{\log} H_1 := (x \partial H_1 / \partial x, y \partial H_1 / \partial y, t \partial H_1 / \partial t)$$

= $(-1 + ty \partial S / \partial x, -1 + tx \partial S / \partial y, -1)$

and thus this factor is everywhere smooth.

- ► Other singularities come from factors of (1 − x), (1 − y) and possibly from clearing denominators of xyP(x⁻¹, y⁻¹).
- When F is combinatorial, there is a dominant singularity for direction 1 lying in the positive orthant.

Lattice path asymptotics

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Critical points

H₁ contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1,1,1) if and only if ∇ S(x⁻¹, y⁻¹) = 0.
Application of general methods to lattice paths

Critical points

- H₁ contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1,1,1) if and only if ∇ S(x⁻¹, y⁻¹) = 0.
- This occurs if and only if

$$\sum_{i=-1,j} y^j - x^{-2} \sum_{i=1,j} y^j = 0$$
$$\sum_{i\in S_{-1}} x^i - y^{-2} \sum_{i\in S_1} x^i = 0$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

-Application of general methods to lattice paths

Critical points

- H₁ contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1,1,1) if and only if ∇ S(x⁻¹, y⁻¹) = 0.
- This occurs if and only if

$$\sum_{i=-1,j} y^j - x^{-2} \sum_{i=1,j} y^j = 0$$
$$\sum_{i\in S_{-1}} x^i - y^{-2} \sum_{i\in S_1} x^i = 0.$$

• If S has a vertical axis of symmetry, then $(x^2 - 1) \sum_j y^j = 0$.

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Structure of G

Write

$$S(x,y) = y^{-1}A_{-1}(x) + A_0(x) + yA_1(x)$$

= $x^{-1}B_{-1}(y) + B_0(y) + xB_1(y)$.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Structure of G

Write

$$S(x,y) = y^{-1}A_{-1}(x) + A_0(x) + yA_1(x)$$

= $x^{-1}B_{-1}(y) + B_0(y) + xB_1(y)$.

► G is dihedral, generated by the involutions (considered as algebra homomorphisms)

$$(x,y) \mapsto \left(x^{-1}\frac{B_{-1}(y)}{B_{1}(y)}, y\right)$$
$$(x,y) \mapsto \left(x, y^{-1}\frac{A_{-1}(x)}{A_{1}(x)}\right)$$

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Structure of G

Write

$$S(x,y) = y^{-1}A_{-1}(x) + A_0(x) + yA_1(x)$$

= $x^{-1}B_{-1}(y) + B_0(y) + xB_1(y)$.

► G is dihedral, generated by the involutions (considered as algebra homomorphisms)

$$\begin{aligned} (x,y) &\mapsto \left(x^{-1}\frac{B_{-1}(y)}{B_{1}(y)}, y\right) \\ (x,y) &\mapsto \left(x, y^{-1}\frac{A_{-1}(x)}{A_{1}(x)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

If S has vertical symmetry then B₁ = B₋₁, these maps commute, and G has order 4.

► This covers Cases 1–16. The possible denominators from P are x² + 1, x² + x + 1. Neither can contribute because the problem is combinatorial and aperiodic. The dominant point has x = 1.

Vertical axis of symmetry, I

- ► This covers Cases 1–16. The possible denominators from P are x² + 1, x² + x + 1. Neither can contribute because the problem is combinatorial and aperiodic. The dominant point has x = 1.
- ► The numerator vanishes iff |S₁| = |S₋₁| (symmetry on both axes). In that case cancellation occurs and there is a smooth point at (1,1,1/|S|)). This solves Cases 1–4: leading term C|S|ⁿn^{-1/2}.

Vertical axis of symmetry, I

- ► This covers Cases 1–16. The possible denominators from P are x² + 1, x² + x + 1. Neither can contribute because the problem is combinatorial and aperiodic. The dominant point has x = 1.
- ► The numerator vanishes iff |S₁| = |S₋₁| (symmetry on both axes). In that case cancellation occurs and there is a smooth point at (1,1,1/|S|)). This solves Cases 1–4: leading term C|S|ⁿn^{-1/2}.
- ► Otherwise, there is a double point at (1,1,1/|S|). Its contribution is nonzero if and only if the numerator does not vanish and the direction (1,1,1) lies in a certain cone.

Vertical axis of symmetry, I

- ► This covers Cases 1–16. The possible denominators from P are x² + 1, x² + x + 1. Neither can contribute because the problem is combinatorial and aperiodic. The dominant point has x = 1.
- ► The numerator vanishes iff |S₁| = |S₋₁| (symmetry on both axes). In that case cancellation occurs and there is a smooth point at (1,1,1/|S|)). This solves Cases 1–4: leading term C|S|ⁿn^{-1/2}.
- ► Otherwise, there is a double point at (1,1,1/|S|). Its contribution is nonzero if and only if the numerator does not vanish and the direction (1,1,1) lies in a certain cone.
- ► The direction lies in the cone iff ∂S/∂x(1,1) ≥ 0, iff |S₁| ≥ |S₋₁| (happens in Cases 1–10).

Vertical axis of symmetry, I

- ► This covers Cases 1–16. The possible denominators from P are x² + 1, x² + x + 1. Neither can contribute because the problem is combinatorial and aperiodic. The dominant point has x = 1.
- ► The numerator vanishes iff |S₁| = |S₋₁| (symmetry on both axes). In that case cancellation occurs and there is a smooth point at (1,1,1/|S|)). This solves Cases 1–4: leading term C|S|ⁿn^{-1/2}.
- ► Otherwise, there is a double point at (1,1,1/|S|). Its contribution is nonzero if and only if the numerator does not vanish and the direction (1,1,1) lies in a certain cone.
- ▶ The direction lies in the cone iff $\partial S / \partial x(1,1) \ge 0$, iff $|S_1| \ge |S_{-1}|$ (happens in Cases 1–10).
- ► Thus for Cases 5–10 we have leading term $C|S|^n n^{-1}$.

► There is a smooth critical point where y² = |S₁|/|S₋₁|, so y is a quadratic irrational at worst.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- ► There is a smooth critical point where y² = |S₁|/|S₋₁|, so y is a quadratic irrational at worst.
- The exponential rate is

$$S(1, y^{-1}) = |S_0| + y^{-1}|S_1| + y|S_{-1}| = |S_0| + 2\sqrt{|S_1||S_{-1}|}.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- ► There is a smooth critical point where y² = |S₁|/|S₋₁|, so y is a quadratic irrational at worst.
- The exponential rate is

$$S(1, y^{-1}) = |S_0| + y^{-1}|S_1| + y|S_{-1}| = |S_0| + 2\sqrt{|S_1||S_{-1}|}.$$

► The arithmetic-geometric mean inequality shows that this is smaller than |S|, with equality if and only if |S₁| = |S₋₁|.

- ► There is a smooth critical point where y² = |S₁|/|S₋₁|, so y is a quadratic irrational at worst.
- The exponential rate is

$$S(1, y^{-1}) = |S_0| + y^{-1}|S_1| + y|S_{-1}| = |S_0| + 2\sqrt{|S_1||S_{-1}|}.$$

- ► The arithmetic-geometric mean inequality shows that this is smaller than |S|, with equality if and only if |S₁| = |S₋₁|.
- This holds in Cases 11–16.

▶ Normally the polynomial correction starts with n⁻¹, since (3-1)/2 = 1. The *l*th term is of order n^{-l}.

- ロ ト - 4 回 ト - 4 □ - 4

- ► Normally the polynomial correction starts with n⁻¹, since (3-1)/2 = 1. The *l*th term is of order n^{-l}.
- ► If the numerator vanishes at the dominant point, the l = 1 term vanishes.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- ► Normally the polynomial correction starts with n⁻¹, since (3-1)/2 = 1. The *l*th term is of order n^{-l}.
- ► If the numerator vanishes at the dominant point, the l = 1 term vanishes.
- ▶ This happens in all cases 11–16. The numerator simplifies at the smooth point to $(1 + x)(1 y^2|S_{-1}|/|S_1|)$, which is zero from the critical point equation for y.

- ▶ Normally the polynomial correction starts with n⁻¹, since (3-1)/2 = 1. The *l*th term is of order n^{-l}.
- ► If the numerator vanishes at the dominant point, the l = 1 term vanishes.
- ▶ This happens in all cases 11–16. The numerator simplifies at the smooth point to $(1 + x)(1 y^2|S_{-1}|/|S_1|)$, which is zero from the critical point equation for y.
- The leading term asymptotic is $C(|S_0| + 2\sqrt{|S_1||S_{-1}|})^n n^{-2}$.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Lattice path asymptotics Application of general methods to lattice paths

Explanation

 The key quantity for walks with vertical symmetry is the difference between the upward and downward steps (the drift).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Lattice path asymptotics Application of general methods to lattice paths

Explanation

- The key quantity for walks with vertical symmetry is the difference between the upward and downward steps (the drift).
- ► If this is positive, there are more possible walks that don't cross the boundary, so the quarter plane restriction is encountered less often. Asymptotics come from the double point (1, 1, 1/|S|).

Explanation

- The key quantity for walks with vertical symmetry is the difference between the upward and downward steps (the drift).
- ► If this is positive, there are more possible walks that don't cross the boundary, so the quarter plane restriction is encountered less often. Asymptotics come from the double point (1, 1, 1/|S|).
- If the drift is nonpositive, asymptotics come from the highest smooth point.

Explanation

- The key quantity for walks with vertical symmetry is the difference between the upward and downward steps (the drift).
- ► If this is positive, there are more possible walks that don't cross the boundary, so the quarter plane restriction is encountered less often. Asymptotics come from the double point (1, 1, 1/|S|).
- If the drift is nonpositive, asymptotics come from the highest smooth point.
- This explains Cases 1–16 in a unified way. We could derive higher order asymptotics too (e.g. using Sage package implementing Raichev & Wilson papers).

Application of general methods to lattice paths



 Cases 17–19 also follow as above, with slightly different formulae and more work.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Other cases

- Cases 17–19 also follow as above, with slightly different formulae and more work.
- Cases 20–23 are harder. We don't have a nice diagonal expression, and the conjectured asymptotics show that analysis will be trickier. However the GFs are known to be algebraic and 1-dimensional methods can be used.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Extensions

► We can derive similar expressions for the number of walks returning to the *x*-axis, the *y*-axis, or the origin. A very similar analysis proves recently conjectured asymptotics of Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers, and Pech.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Extensions

- We can derive similar expressions for the number of walks returning to the x-axis, the y-axis, or the origin. A very similar analysis proves recently conjectured asymptotics of Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers, and Pech.
- ► Usually, the asymptotics are changed by a factor of n or √n. Sometimes the exponential rate changes, depending on the shape of the step set.

Extensions

- We can derive similar expressions for the number of walks returning to the x-axis, the y-axis, or the origin. A very similar analysis proves recently conjectured asymptotics of Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers, and Pech.
- ► Usually, the asymptotics are changed by a factor of n or √n. Sometimes the exponential rate changes, depending on the shape of the step set.
- Our approach allows for unified analysis of rational trivariate GFs, which provides results and insight, rather than ad hoc analysis of complicated univariate GFs, which provides results sometimes and no insight.

| n | \mathcal{S} | Asymptotics | n | \mathcal{S} | Asymptotics | n | S | Asymptotics |
|--|---------------|---|----|---------------|---|----|--------------|---|
| 1 | + | $\frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n}$ | 9 | \square | $rac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\cdotrac{3^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 17 | | $\frac{4 \cdot A_n}{\pi} \cdot \frac{(2\sqrt{2})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 2 | | $\frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n}$ | 10 | \mathbb{Y} | $rac{4}{3\sqrt{\pi}}\cdotrac{4^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 18 | | $rac{3\sqrt{3}\cdot B_n}{\pi}\cdot rac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 3 | \mathbb{X} | $rac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi}\cdot rac{6^n}{n}$ | 11 | Ϋ́ | $\frac{\sqrt{5}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\cdot\frac{5^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 19 | | $rac{\sqrt{8}(1+\sqrt{2})^{7/2}}{\pi}\cdotrac{(2+2\sqrt{2})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 4 | \mathbb{X} | $\frac{8}{3\pi} \cdot \frac{8^n}{n}$ | 12 | | $\frac{\sqrt{5}}{3\sqrt{2\pi}}\cdot \frac{5^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 20 | | $rac{6C_n}{\pi}\cdot rac{(2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 5 | | $rac{2\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(1/4)}\cdotrac{3^n}{n^{3/4}}$ | 13 | Η | $\frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3\sqrt{\pi}}\cdot\frac{6^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 21 | | $rac{\sqrt{3}(1+\sqrt{3})^{7/2}}{2\pi}\cdotrac{(2+2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 6 | | $rac{3\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{2}\Gamma(1/4)}\cdotrac{3^n}{n^{3/4}}$ | 14 | \mathbb{X} | $\frac{\sqrt{7}}{3\sqrt{3\pi}}\cdot \frac{7^n}{\sqrt{n}}$ | 22 | \mathbb{X} | $\frac{\sqrt{6(379+156\sqrt{6})(1+\sqrt{6})^7}}{5\sqrt{95}\pi}\cdot\frac{(2+2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^2}$ |
| 7 | \mathbb{X} | $rac{\sqrt{6\sqrt{3}}}{\Gamma(1/4)}\cdot rac{6^n}{n^{3/4}}$ | 15 | | $rac{3\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\cdotrac{3^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | 23 | $ \Sigma $ | $\frac{8}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^2}$ |
| 8 | \neq | $rac{4\sqrt{3}}{3\Gamma(1/3)}\cdotrac{4^{n}}{n^{2/3}}$ | 16 | \mathbb{X} | $rac{3\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\cdotrac{6^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | | | |
| TABLE 1. Asymptotics for the 23 D-finite models. | | | | | | | | |
| $A_n = 4(1 - (-1)^n) + 3\sqrt{2}(1 + (-1)^n), B_n = \sqrt{3}(1 - (-1)^n) + 2(1 + (-1)^n), C_n = 12/\sqrt{5}(1 - (-1)^n) + \sqrt{30}(1 + (-1)^n)$ | | | | | | | | |

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

| S | C(0, 1, t) | C(1, 0, t) | C(0, 0, t) | 8 | C(0,1,t) | C(1, 0, t) | C(0,0,t) |
|--------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | $C(0,1,t)$ $\frac{8}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{3\sqrt{6}}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{6^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4\sqrt{3}} \frac{3^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | $\frac{8}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^{n}}{n^{2}}$ $\delta_{n} \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \cdot \frac{6^{n}}{n^{2}}$ $\delta_{n} \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{2})^{n}}{n^{2}}$ $(5.4)^{n}$ | $\delta_n \frac{32}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^3}$ $\delta_n \frac{3\sqrt{6}}{\pi} \cdot \frac{6^n}{n^3}$ $\epsilon_n \frac{16\sqrt{2}}{n^3} \frac{(2\sqrt{2})^n}{n^3}$ | | $\delta_n \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{32}{9\pi} \cdot \frac{8^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{8}{3\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{4^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | $\delta_n \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{32}{9\pi} \cdot \frac{8^n}{n^2}$ $\delta_n \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{n^2} \frac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^2}$ | $\delta_n \frac{8}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^3}$ $\frac{128}{27\pi} \cdot \frac{8^n}{n^3}$ $\delta_n \frac{12\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^3}$ |
| \square | $\frac{5\sqrt{10}}{16\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{5^n}{n^{3/2}}$ $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{6^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | $\frac{\sqrt{2A^{3/2}}}{\pi} \frac{(2A)^{1/2}}{n^2}$ $\frac{2\sqrt{3B^{3/2}}}{3\pi} \frac{(2B)^n}{n^2}$ | $\frac{2A^{3/2}}{\pi} \frac{(2A)^{n}}{n^{3}}$ $\frac{2B^{3/2}}{\pi} \frac{(2B)^{n}}{n^{3}}$ | | $\frac{5\sqrt{10}}{24\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{5^n}{n^{3/2}}$ $\frac{7\sqrt{21}}{54\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{7^n}{n^{3/2}}$ | $\delta_n \frac{4\sqrt{30}}{5\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^2}$ $\frac{D}{285\pi} \frac{(2C)^n}{n^2}$ | $\delta_n \frac{24\sqrt{30}}{25\pi} \frac{(2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^3}$ $\frac{2E}{1805\pi} \frac{(2C)^n}{n^3}$ |
| \mathbb{R} | $\frac{\frac{27\sqrt{3}}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{3^{n}}{n^{5/2}}}{\frac{27\sqrt{3}}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{6^{n}}{n^{5/2}}}$ | $\frac{\frac{27\sqrt{3}}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{3^{n}}{n^{5/2}}}{\frac{27\sqrt{3}}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{6^{n}}{n^{5/2}}}$ | $\sigma_n rac{81\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \cdot rac{3^n}{n^4} \ rac{27\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \cdot rac{6^n}{n^4}$ | | $\delta_n \frac{32}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^3}$ | $\frac{32}{\pi} \cdot \frac{4^n}{n^3}$ | $\delta_n rac{768}{\pi} \cdot rac{4^n}{n^5}$ |

TABLE 2. Asymptotics of boundary returns for the highly symmetric, positive drift, and sporadic cases.

| S | C(0,1,t) | S | C(0, 1, t) |
|---|---|--------------|---|
| | $ \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_n \frac{448\sqrt{2}}{9\pi} + \epsilon_{n-1} \frac{640}{9\pi} + \epsilon_{n-2} \frac{416\sqrt{2}}{9\pi} + \epsilon_{n-3} \frac{512}{9\pi} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{(2\sqrt{2})^n}{n^3} \\ \frac{4A^{7/2}}{\pi} \cdot \frac{(2A)^n}{n^3} \\ 38^{7/2} \cdot (2B)^n $ | \mathbb{X} | $ \begin{pmatrix} \delta_n \frac{36\sqrt{3}}{\pi} + \delta_{n-1} \frac{54}{\pi} \cdot \frac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^3} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{(2\sqrt{3})^n}{n^3} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \delta_n \frac{72\sqrt{30}}{5\pi} + \delta_{n-1} \frac{864\sqrt{5}}{25\pi} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{(2\sqrt{6})^n}{n^3} \\ \epsilon_{14571+1856}(\delta_0)\sqrt{23-3\sqrt{6}} (2C)^n \end{cases} $ |
| | $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ · $\frac{1}{n^3}$ | | 1805π n^3 |

TABLE 3. Asymptotics of C(0, 1, t) for negative drift cases; other asymptotics of S are the same as those of -S above.

$$A = 1 + \sqrt{2}, \qquad B = 1 + \sqrt{3}, \qquad C = 1 + \sqrt{6}, \qquad D = (156 + 41\sqrt{6})\sqrt{23 - 3\sqrt{6}}, \qquad E = (583 + 138\sqrt{6})\sqrt{23 - 3\sqrt{6}}$$

$$\delta_n = 1 \text{ if } n \equiv 0 \text{ mod } 2, \ \sigma_n = 1 \text{ if } n \equiv 0 \text{ mod } 3, \text{ and } \epsilon_n = 1 \text{ if } n \equiv 0 \text{ mod } 4 - \text{ each is } 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

Possible future work

Higher dimensions: d = 3 has been studied empirically by Bostan, Bousquet-Mélou, Kauers & Melczer. The orbit sum method appears to work relatively rarely, however.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Possible future work

- Higher dimensions: d = 3 has been studied empirically by Bostan, Bousquet-Mélou, Kauers & Melczer. The orbit sum method appears to work relatively rarely, however.
- Special families in arbitrary dimension: for example, if each element of S has the same d − 1 axial symmetries, similar results hold to above with some technical problems (in progress with S. Melczer).

Possible future work

- Higher dimensions: d = 3 has been studied empirically by Bostan, Bousquet-Mélou, Kauers & Melczer. The orbit sum method appears to work relatively rarely, however.
- Special families in arbitrary dimension: for example, if each element of S has the same d − 1 axial symmetries, similar results hold to above with some technical problems (in progress with S. Melczer).
- Random walk variants can be treated by simply scaling the variables by probabilities. We anticipate few changes to the overall analysis.

Possible future work

- Higher dimensions: d = 3 has been studied empirically by Bostan, Bousquet-Mélou, Kauers & Melczer. The orbit sum method appears to work relatively rarely, however.
- Special families in arbitrary dimension: for example, if each element of S has the same d − 1 axial symmetries, similar results hold to above with some technical problems (in progress with S. Melczer).
- Random walk variants can be treated by simply scaling the variables by probabilities. We anticipate few changes to the overall analysis.
- Walks in a Weyl chamber (Gessel & Zeilberger) yield very similar generating functions, analysable in the same way.

Application of general methods to lattice paths

Closing remarks

The methods in the ACSV book are still under-utilized by other researchers. This problem was a fairly straightforward application of general theory.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Closing remarks

- The methods in the ACSV book are still under-utilized by other researchers. This problem was a fairly straightforward application of general theory.
- Many researchers in enumeration use extra ("catalytic") variables and then throw them away; they ought to keep them and use multivariate methods more often.

General references

 S. Melczer & M. C. Wilson, Asymptotics of lattice walks via analytic combinatorics in several variables. http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02527.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <
General references

- S. Melczer & M. C. Wilson, Asymptotics of lattice walks via analytic combinatorics in several variables. http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02527.
- R. Pemantle & M.C. Wilson, Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables, Cambridge University Press 2013. Draft available on my website.

General references

- S. Melczer & M. C. Wilson, Asymptotics of lattice walks via analytic combinatorics in several variables. http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02527.
- R. Pemantle & M.C. Wilson, Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables, Cambridge University Press 2013. Draft available on my website.

 Sage implementations by Alex Raichev: https://github.com/araichev/amgf.

General references

- S. Melczer & M. C. Wilson, Asymptotics of lattice walks via analytic combinatorics in several variables. http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02527.
- R. Pemantle & M.C. Wilson, Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables, Cambridge University Press 2013. Draft available on my website.

- Sage implementations by Alex Raichev: https://github.com/araichev/amgf.
- S. Melczer & M. Mishna, Asymptotic Lattice Path Enumeration Using Diagonals, 2014.

General references

- S. Melczer & M. C. Wilson, Asymptotics of lattice walks via analytic combinatorics in several variables. http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02527.
- R. Pemantle & M.C. Wilson, Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables, Cambridge University Press 2013. Draft available on my website.
- Sage implementations by Alex Raichev: https://github.com/araichev/amgf.
- S. Melczer & M. Mishna, Asymptotic Lattice Path Enumeration Using Diagonals, 2014.
- G. Fayolle, R. lasnogorodski, V. Malyshev, Random Walks in the Quarter Plane, 1999.