Lattice path asymptotics via Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables

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

NZ Math Colloquium, Christchurch, 2015-12-03

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

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

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

- 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.

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

- 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. 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.

- 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.

Example (A test problem)

▶ How many *n*-step nearest neighbour 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 test problem)

- ▶ How many *n*-step nearest neighbour 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*.
- Conjectured by Bostan & Kauers:

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

Example (A test problem)

- ▶ How many *n*-step nearest neighbour 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*.
- Conjectured by Bostan & Kauers:

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

These kinds of lattice walks have many applications. They model physical and chemical structures. Their random analogues are important in queueing theory.

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

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

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

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

We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative orthant. The last is the most challenging, and we concentrate on it today.

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

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

- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative orthant. The last is the most challenging, and we concentrate on it today.
- We can keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a d + 1-variate sequence a_{r,n} with generating function (GF) ∑_{r,n} a_{r,n}x^rtⁿ.

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

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

- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative orthant. The last is the most challenging, and we concentrate on it today.
- We can keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a *d* + 1-variate sequence *a*_{**r**,n} with generating function (GF) ∑_{**r**,n} *a*_{**r**,n}**x**^{**r**}*t*ⁿ.
- Summing over **r** gives a univariate series $f(t) = \sum_n f_n t^n$.

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

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

- We can consider unrestricted walks, walks restricted to a halfspace, and walks restricted to the nonnegative orthant. The last is the most challenging, and we concentrate on it today.
- We can keep track of the endpoint, and also the length. This gives a *d* + 1-variate sequence *a*_{**r**,n} with generating function (GF) ∑_{**r**,n} *a*_{**r**,n}**x**^{**r**}*t*ⁿ.
- Summing over **r** gives a univariate series $f(t) = \sum_n f_n t^n$.
- ► We seek in particular the asymptotics of f_n, the number of walks of a given length.

Rational functions



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

- Rational functions
- Algebraic functions

- Rational functions
- Algebraic functions
- D-finite functions (satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients)

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

- Rational functions
- Algebraic functions
- D-finite functions (satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients)

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

Worse functions

- Rational functions
- Algebraic functions
- D-finite functions (satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients)
- Worse functions
- Unrestricted and halfspace walks with short steps yield rational/algebraic GFs via the kernel method and are well understood (Bousquet-Mélou & Petkovsek).

- Rational functions
- Algebraic functions
- D-finite functions (satisfy a linear ODE with polynomial coefficients)
- Worse functions
- Unrestricted and halfspace walks with short steps yield rational/algebraic GFs via the kernel method and are well understood (Bousquet-Mélou & Petkovsek).

 We concentrate today on 2-dimensional walks in the nonnegative quadrant.

Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010) showed that for d = 2 there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.

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

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010) showed that for d = 2 there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ▶ They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite (of size 4, 6, or 8) in exactly 23 cases.

- Bousquet-Mélou & Mishna (2010) showed that for d = 2 there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ▶ They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite (of size 4, 6, or 8) in exactly 23 cases.
- They used finiteness to show for 22 cases that F 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) showed that for d = 2 there are 79 inequivalent nontrivial cases.
- ▶ They introduced a symmetry group *G*(*S*) and showed that this is finite (of size 4, 6, or 8) in exactly 23 cases.
- They used finiteness to show for 22 cases that F is D-finite. For 19 of these, used the orbit sum method and for 3 more, the half orbit sum method.
- ▶ Bostan & Kauers (2010): for d = 2, explicitly showed the 23rd case (Gessel walks) has algebraic f.

▶ Bostan & Kauers (2009): for d = 2, conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 cases.

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

- ▶ Bostan & Kauers (2009): for d = 2, conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 cases.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech: for d = 2, expressed f in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 cases. We use their numbering of the cases and borrow their table below.

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

- ▶ Bostan & Kauers (2009): for d = 2, conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 cases.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech: for d = 2, expressed f in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 cases. We use their numbering of the cases and borrow their table below.
- ▶ Melczer & Mishna (2014): derived asymptotics for *f_n* in cases 1–4.

- ▶ Bostan & Kauers (2009): for d = 2, conjectured asymptotics for f_n in the 23 cases.
- Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers & Pech: for d = 2, expressed f in terms of hypergeometric integrals in 19 cases. We use their numbering of the cases and borrow their table below.
- ► Melczer & Mishna (2014): derived asymptotics for f_n in cases 1-4.

▶ Open: proof of asymptotics of f_n for cases 5–16. We solve that here.

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

	OEIS	S	alg	equiv		OEIS	S	alg	equiv
1	A005566	⇔	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	P	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	鮾	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	Ν	$\frac{\sqrt{3}B^{7/2}}{2\pi} \frac{(2B)^n}{n^2}$	23	A060900	A	Y	$\frac{4\sqrt{3}}{3\Gamma(1/3)}\frac{4^n}{n^{2/3}}$
$A = 1 + \sqrt{2}, B = 1 + \sqrt{3}, C = 1 + \sqrt{6}, \lambda = 7 + 3\sqrt{6}, \mu = \sqrt{\frac{4\sqrt{6}-1}{10}}$									

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

Frédéric Chyzak Small-Step Walks

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

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- ▶ 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.

- ▶ 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.

- ▶ 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 are of the form

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

Diagonals

The orbit sum approach yields F as the positive part of a rational series.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

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.

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.
- The GF for walks restricted to the quarter plane has the form

$$f = \operatorname{diag} \frac{xyP(x^{-1}, y^{-1})}{(1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1}))(1 - x)(1 - y)}$$

where S and P are polynomials:

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

▲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.
- ▶ The GF for walks restricted to the quarter plane has the form

$$f = \operatorname{diag} \frac{xyP(x^{-1}, y^{-1})}{(1 - txyS(x^{-1}, y^{-1}))(1 - x)(1 - y)}$$

where S and P are polynomials:

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

► The trivariate GF is rational but the diagonal is only D-finite.

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.

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).

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.

Critical points

▶ H_1 contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1, 1, 1) if and only if $\nabla S(x^{-1}, y^{-1}) = 0$.

Critical points

- H_1 contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1, 1, 1) if and only if $\nabla S(x^{-1}, y^{-1}) = 0$.
- 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 少へ⊙

Critical points

- ▶ H_1 contains a smooth critical point (x, y, t) for the direction (1, 1, 1) if and only if $\nabla S(x^{-1}, y^{-1}) = 0$.
- 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 $(x^2 - 1) \sum_j y^j = 0$.

Structure of G

Write

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

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

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

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 generated by the involutions (considered as algebra homomorphisms)

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

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

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 generated by the involutions (considered as algebra homomorphisms)

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

▶ If S has vertical symmetry then $B_1 = B_{-1}$, 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.

- ► 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|. In that case cancellation occurs and k = 1 (smooth point at (1,1,1/|S|)). This solves Cases 1–4: leading term C|S|ⁿn^{-1/2}.

- ► 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|. In that case cancellation occurs and k = 1 (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 (k = 2) 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.

- ► 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|. In that case cancellation occurs and k = 1 (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 (k = 2) 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).

- ► 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|. In that case cancellation occurs and k = 1 (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 (k = 2) 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 $y^2 = |S_1|/|S_{-1}|$, so y is a quadratic irrational at worst.

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

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

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

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

- ► 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 $C(|S_0| + 2\sqrt{|S_1||S_{-1}|})^n n^{-2}$.

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

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

- 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|).

- 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.

- 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).

Other cases

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

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

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.

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

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

- 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 (in progress with S. Melczer).

- 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 (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.

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

- 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 (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.
When the length GF is *D*-finite, we could try to compute its defining ODE and analyse asymptotics using Birkhoff-Trjitinsky methodology.

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

- When the length GF is *D*-finite, we could try to compute its defining ODE and analyse asymptotics using Birkhoff-Trjitinsky methodology.
- The main difficulty encountered is the connection problem: it can be surprisingly hard (possibly incomputable in general) to rigorously express the GF in question as a linear combination of basis elements produced by the method.

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

- When the length GF is *D*-finite, we could try to compute its defining ODE and analyse asymptotics using Birkhoff-Trjitinsky methodology.
- The main difficulty encountered is the connection problem: it can be surprisingly hard (possibly incomputable in general) to rigorously express the GF in question as a linear combination of basis elements produced by the method.
- Ongoing work of Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers, and Pech attempts to get around this problem by using creative telescoping techniques combined with the kernel method to represent the walk GFs explicitly in terms of hypergeometric functions.

- When the length GF is *D*-finite, we could try to compute its defining ODE and analyse asymptotics using Birkhoff-Trjitinsky methodology.
- The main difficulty encountered is the connection problem: it can be surprisingly hard (possibly incomputable in general) to rigorously express the GF in question as a linear combination of basis elements produced by the method.
- Ongoing work of Bostan, Chyzak, van Hoeij, Kauers, and Pech attempts to get around this problem by using creative telescoping techniques combined with the kernel method to represent the walk GFs explicitly in terms of hypergeometric functions.
- Although such a representation should, in principle, allow one to rigorously determine asymptotics, in practice this depends on computing hard integrals of hypergeometric functions.