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Abstract

It was recently shown in [23] and [27] that Ramanujan graphs, i.e., graphs with the optimal spectrum, exhibit cutoff of the simple random walk in optimal time and have optimal almost-diameter. We prove that this spectral condition can be replaced by a weaker condition, the Sarnak-Xue density of eigenvalues property, to deduce similar results.

We show that a family of Schreier graphs of the $SL_2(F_t)$-action on the projective line satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density condition, and hence exhibit the desired properties. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first known example of optimal cutoff and almost-diameter on an explicit family of graphs that are neither random nor Ramanujan.

1 Introduction

Various works (e.g. [5, 24]) proved that many families of $(q + 1)$-regular graphs are expanders, and in particular, their diameter (i.e., the largest distance between a pair of vertices) is equal $\log_q(n)$ up to a multiplicative constant, where $n$ is the number of vertices. In this paper, we show that under certain conditions, the distance between most of the vertices in a graph is approximately optimal, that is, equal to $(1 + o(1)) \log_q(n)$.

We start with a special case of Schreier graphs of $SL_2(F_t)$, which follows from Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 via Theorem 1.11.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed, let $t > 2$ be a prime and let $P^1(F_t)$ be the projective line over $F_t$. Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_l$ be $l$ elements in $SL_2(F_t)$ chosen uniformly at random. Construct a $2l$-regular Schreier graph by connecting each point $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$ of $P^1(F_t)$ to $s_i^\pm \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$, $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Then as $t \to \infty$, with probability $1 - o(1)$ the following two statements hold:

- The distance between all but $o_\epsilon(t^2)$ of the pairs $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{bmatrix} \in P^1(F_t)$ satisfies

$$d\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \log_{2l-1}(t).$$
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• Consider the distribution of the simple random walk \( A^k \delta_{x_0} \), starting from some \( x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} \in P^1(\mathbb{F}_t) \).

Then for all but \( o(\epsilon) \) of \( x_0 \in P^1(\mathbb{F}_t) \), for every \( k > (1 + \epsilon) \frac{2l}{2l - 2} \log_{2l - 1}(n) \), it holds that

\[
\|A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 = o(1),
\]

where \( A \) is the adjacency operator on \( L^2(P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)) \) defined by the graph structure, \( \delta_{x_0} \) is the probability \( \delta \)-function supported on \( x_0 \) and \( \pi \) is the constant probability function.

Bourgain and Gamburd proved in [5] that the Cayley graphs of \( SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t) \) with respect to random generators are expanders with probability tending to 1 as \( t \to \infty \). Since the graphs of Theorem 1.1 are quotients of those graphs, they are expanders as well, which implies that the distance between every two elements is bounded by \( C \log_{2l - 1}(t) \), \( C \) some constant. Theorem 1.1 further shows that this constant is \( 1 + o(1) \) when we consider almost all the pairs. Bourgain and Gamburd’s result is however essential for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lubetzky and Peres proved in [23] that the simple random walk on a Ramanujan graph exhibits cutoff for every starting vertex. The second part of the theorem above implies that the random walk on the graphs in Theorem 1.1 exhibits cutoff for almost every starting vertex (see Theorem 1.4 and its discussion).

Let us provide some context to this result. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of finite \((q + 1)\)-regular connected graphs with the number of vertices tending to infinity. The graphs can have multiple edges and loops. Let \( X \in \mathcal{F} \) be a graph from the family, and let \( n \) denote its number of vertices. By \( A : L^2(X) \to L^2(X) \) we denote the normalized adjacency operator of \( X \)

\[
Af(x_0) = \frac{1}{q + 1} \sum_{x_1 \sim x_0} f(x_1).
\]

There are various results relating the eigenvalues of \( A \) with the geometry of \( X \). In particular, if the largest eigenvalue of \( A \) in absolute value, excluding \( \pm 1 \), is bounded by some \( \lambda < 1 \), i.e., \( X \) is an expander, it is well known that the diameter of the graph is logarithmic in its size (see e.g., [19]). Explicitly, in [8] it is proven that the diameter is bounded by

\[
\left\lfloor \frac{\cosh^{-1}(n - 1)}{\cosh^{-1}(1/\lambda)} \right\rfloor + 1.
\]

A special case is when the graph is a Ramanujan graph, which means that \( \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{q}/(q + 1) \), then the upper bound on the diameter is \( 2 \log_q(n) + O(1) \), proved by Lubotzky, Phillips and Sarnak ([24]). The Alon-Boppana theorem states that Ramanujan graphs are asymptotically the best spectral expanders, and it seems like there are no known better bounds on the diameter using spectral methods. Recently, it was proven by Lubetzky and Peres ([23]) and independently by Sardari ([27]) that when one considers the almost-diameter of a Ramanujan graph \( X \), it is \( (1 + o(1)) \log_q(n) \), which is, up to the \( o(1) \) factor, an optimal result. In [23] it is also shown that the simple random walk on \( X \) exhibits cutoff in the \( L^1 \)-norm.

We show, following the work of Sarnak and Xue ([29]) on multiplicities of automorphic representations and recent results on random walks on hyperbolic surfaces ([28, 14]), that results of similar strength can be proven if one only assumes expansion and certain density of eigenvalues. This density property is a relaxation of the Ramanujan assumption, and is also equivalent to a natural combinatorial path counting property (see Definition 1.6).
Let \( \lambda_0 = 1 \geq \lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_{n-1} \geq -1 \) be the eigenvalues of \( A \). We associate to \( \lambda_i \) its \( p \)-value \( p_i \) as follows

\[
\begin{cases}
p_i = 2 & \text{if } |\lambda_i| \leq \frac{q^2}{q^2 + q} \\
2 < p_i \leq \infty & \text{such that } |\lambda_i| = \frac{1}{q^{1/p_i}} (q^{1/p_i} + q^{1-1/p_i}) ,
\end{cases}
\]

where we use the convention that \( 1/\infty = \lim_{p \to \infty} 1/p = 0 \). In particular, \( p_0 = \infty \), and if \( X \) is bipartite, then \( \lambda_{n-1} = -1 \) and \( p_{n-1} = \infty \) as well. The definition of \( p_i \) is based on the action of \( A \) on the \( L^p \)-functions on the \( (q+1) \)-regular tree, namely, the \( L^p \)-norm of \( A \) on the \( (q+1) \)-regular tree is \( \frac{1}{q^{1/p}} (q^{1/p} + q^{1-1/p}) \), see [21].

We use the following notations. For a real function \( f(X, y, z) \) of the graph \( X \) and auxiliary parameters \( y, z \), we write \( f(X, y, z) \ll_{f, y} g(X, y, z) \) if there exists a constant \( C \) depending on the family \( F \) and \( y \), but not on \( X \) and \( z \), such that \( f(X, y, z) \leq C \cdot g(X, y, z) \). The parameters may also depend on \( q \), and we do not mention it explicitly. We write \( f(\cdot) = O_{F, y}(g(\cdot)) \) for \( f(\cdot) \ll_{f, y} g(\cdot) \), and \( f(\cdot) \asymp_{F, y} g(\cdot) \) if both \( f(\cdot) \ll_{f, y} g(\cdot) \) and \( g(\cdot) \ll_{f, y} f(\cdot) \) take place. We write \( f(X, y, z) = o_{F, y}(g(X, y, z)) \), if for every \( c > 0 \) and for \( n = |X| \) large enough depending on \( F, y \), it holds that \( f(X, y, z) \leq cg(X, y, z) \).

**Definition 1.2.** We say that a family \( F \) of graphs satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property, if for every graph \( X \in F, p > 2 \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \),

\[
\# \{ i : p_i \geq p \} \ll_{F, \epsilon} n^{2/p + \epsilon},
\]

where \( n \) is the number of vertices of \( X \).

We prove two theorems which follow from the density property. Since the number of vertices in a ball of radius \( r \) in the \( (q + 1) \)-regular tree is \( 1 + (q + 1) \frac{q^r}{q^r - 1} \leq 3q^r \), the distance from a certain vertex to all but \( o(n) \) of the other vertices is bounded from below by \( \log_q(n) - o(1) \). This shows that up to \((1 + o(1))\) factor, the following theorem is optimal.

**Theorem 1.3.** If \( X \) is an expander which satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property, then for every \( \epsilon > 0 \), for all but \( o_{\epsilon, F}(n) \) of \( x_0 \in X \), almost all the vertices of \( X \) are within \((1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n)\) distance from \( x_0 \), i.e.,

\[
\# \{ y \in X : d(x_0, y) > (1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n) \} = o_{\epsilon, F}(n).
\]

If in addition, the graphs in \( F \) are vertex-transitive, then the statement is true for all \( x_0 \in X \). Moreover, in such case, for \( n \) large enough \( 2(1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n) \) is a bound on the diameter of \( X \).

The second theorem concerns the cutoff phenomena, as discussed by Lubetzky and Peres in [23]. To simplify the result, we assume that the graph \( X \) is a non-bipartite graph. We let \( \delta_{x_0} \in L^2(X) \) be the delta probability function supported on \( x_0 \), defined as \( \delta_{x_0}(x_0) = 1 \) and \( \delta_{x_0}(x) = 0 \) if \( x \neq x_0 \). Then \( A^k \delta_0 \) describes the probability distribution of the simple random walk that starts at \( x_0 \) after \( k \) steps. Since \( X \) is non-bipartite, this probability converges pointwise to the constant probability \( \pi \), defined as \( \pi(x) = \frac{1}{n} \) for all \( x \in X \). The following theorem describes the speed of the convergence of this random walk in the \( L^1 \)-norm.

**Theorem 1.4.** Assume that \( X \in F \) is a non-bipartite graph. Then for every \( \epsilon > 0 \):

1. For every \( x_0 \in X \), for \( k < (1 - \epsilon) \frac{q + 1}{q - 1} \log_q(n) \), it holds that

\[
|| A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi ||_1 = 2 - o_{\epsilon}(1).
\]
2. Assume moreover that $X$ is an expander, which satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property. Then for all but $o_\varepsilon(F(n))$ of $x_0 \in X$, for every $k > (1+\epsilon)\frac{q+1}{q-1}\log_q(n)$, it holds that

$$\|A^k\delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 = o(1).$$

If $X$ is moreover a vertex-transitive graph, the same result holds for every $x_0 \in X$.

The cutoff phenomenon has been studied extensively in different settings in recent years and in particular its relation to the Ramanujan property (e.g. [23, 22, 15, 7]). Theorem 1.4 was recently proved independently in [4]. The relation between the optimality of the almost-diameter and the Ramanujan property is also studied in different contexts. We already mentioned the work of Sardari ([27]) and Lubetzky and Peres ([23]), but it is also closely related to the work of Parzanchevski and Sarnak about Golden Gates ([26]) and the general results of Ghosh, Gorodnik and Nevo ([13]). In works [28, 14] on hyperbolic surfaces, it was noted that the “Ramanujan” condition can be replaced with a weaker “density condition”.

We deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 by showing that the family of graphs satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property. We do this by a path counting argument, which is explained in the rest of the introduction.

The Sarnak-Xue Density Property and The Weak Injectivity Radius Property

We give a parameterized version of the Sarnak-Xue density property defined above.

**Definition 1.5.** We say that a family $F$ satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $0 < A \leq 1$, if for every $p > 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\#\{i : p_i \geq p\} \ll_\epsilon F n^{1-A(1-2/p)+\epsilon},$$

for every graph $X \in F$.

Note that the trivial eigenvalue 1 (and also −1 if $X$ is bipartite) is always counted in the l.h.s. of the inequality, so the parameter $A$ is always bounded from above by 1. Ramanujan graphs automatically satisfy the density property with parameter $A = 1$, since for $p > 2$, $\#\{i : p_i \geq p\} \in \{1, 2\}$ (depending on whether the graph is bipartite or not). The density property does not necessarily implies uniform expansion of the family, since arbitrary large eigenvalues can appear as long as there are few of them. However, if $X$ is a Cayley graph of a quasirandom group $G$ in the sense of [16], meaning that the smallest non-trivial representation of $G$ is of dimension $\gg |G|^\beta$, then there is a lower bound on the multiplicity of every eigenvalue $\lambda_i$. Then if $A + \beta > 1$, it holds that for $p > \frac{2A}{A+1}$ and $n$ large enough, $\#\{i : p_i \geq p\} = 1$, implying expansion. This was indeed Sarnak and Xue’s idea on how to prove spectral gap for congruence subgroups of arithmetic cocompact subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$. It was already used before that for $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ in a similar context by Huxley in [20].

Another result we should mention is the connection between Sarnak-Xue density and Benjamini-Schramm convergence. As it is shown in Section 7, it follows from the results of Abert, Glasner and Virag ([2]) that the Sarnak-Xue density property with any parameter $A > 0$ implies Benjamini-Schramm convergence of the family to the $(q+1)$-regular tree.
Definition 1.6. Let \( X \) be a graph and \( x_0 \in X \) be a vertex. Let \( P(X, k, x_0) \) be the number of non-backtracking paths of length \( k \) starting and ending at \( x_0 \), and let \( P(X, k) = \sum_{x_0} P(X, k, x_0) \). We say that \( X \) satisfies the Sarnak-Xue weak injective radius property with parameter \( 0 < A \leq 1 \), if for every \( k < 2A \log_q n \), we have for every \( \epsilon > 0 \)
\[
P(X, k) \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}.
\] (1.1)

Sarnak and Xue ([29]) essentially proved the if part of the following theorem in the context of Lie groups of rank 1. They later showed that the weak injective radius property, and hence the density property, holds in all sequences of principal congruence subgroups of cocompact arithmetic subgroups of \( SL_2(\mathbb{R}) \) and \( SL_2(\mathbb{C}) \).

Theorem 1.7. The Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter \( 0 < A \leq 1 \) is satisfied if and only if the Sarnak-Xue weak injective radius property with the same parameter \( A \) is satisfied.

The girth of a graph, that is the length of the shortest cycle, is equal to twice the injectivity radius of a graph (plus one, if the girth is odd). Therefore, if there are no cycles in \( X \) of length \( \leq 2A \log_q n \), or equivalently the graph has injective radius \( \geq A \log_q n \), then the weak injective radius property with parameter \( A \) is automatically satisfied. However, one can show that the weak injective radius property can be satisfied for larger values of \( A \). For example, Ramanujan graphs satisfy the weak injective radius property with parameter \( A = 1 \) (as follows from Theorem 1.7), while it is not known if Ramanujan graphs with girth close to \( 2 \log_q (n) \) exist. The best known asymptotic result about girth is that the bipartite Ramanujan graphs constructed by Lubotzky, Phillips and Sarnak have girth at least \( (4/3 - o(1)) \log_q (n) \). Another example is that by [12], random Cayley graphs in \( SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t) \) have girth at least \( (1/3 - o(1)) \log_q (n) \), while we show that the weak injective radius property holds with parameter \( 1/3 \), that is essentially double of what follows from the girth.

Graphs Satisfying Sarnak-Xue Density Property

We focus on Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter \( A = 1 \). There are a number of examples of graphs satisfying this property.

Ramanujan graphs. This is straightforward since, by definition, there are no eigenvalues with \( p \)-value greater than 2 except for the trivial ones. Let us remark that while the proof that the LPS graphs of [24] are Ramanujan is far from being elementary and eventually relies heavily on the machinery of algebraic geometry, the fact that Sarnak-Xue density property holds for them requires only elementary number theoretical tools, and is contained implicitly in [9, Theorem 4.4.4] (see also Theorem 1.10 and its proof for this argument).

One-sided Ramanujan graphs. These are graphs with \( \lambda_i \leq 2\sqrt{q}/(q+1) \) for every \( i > 0 \). Such non-bipartite graphs are constructed by the interlacing polynomials method of [25] and [17]. See Proposition 5.4 for the proof of this case.

Random regular graphs. With high probability a random \((q+1)\)-regular graph of size \( n \) and, more generally, with high probability a random \( n \)-cover (or \( n \)-lift) of a fixed \((q+1)\)-regular graph, satisfies the
Sarnak-Xue density property. This follows from Alon’s second eigenvalue conjecture, which was proved by Friedman ([10]), and its extension to random lifts proved by Bordenave ([3]).

**Schreier Graphs of $SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$**. Let $t$ be prime and $P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$ be the projective line over $\mathbb{F}_t$, which we consider as a quotient of $SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ by Mobius transformations. Let $S_t \subset SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ be a symmetric generating set, and let $X_t = Cayley(SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t),S_t)$ be the corresponding Cayley graph. Let $Y_t$ be the Schreier quotient of $X_t$, whose vertex set is $P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$. We note that unlike expansion, the fact that density holds for a graph $X$ does not immediately imply that it holds for its quotient $Y$. However, in this case we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.8.** If $X_t$ satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A \geq 1/3$, then $Y_t$ satisfies this property with parameter $A = 1$. In particular, if in addition, the graphs $Y_t$ are expanders, they have optimal almost-radius at almost every point and cutoff at almost every point, as stated in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4.

One can also replace $SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ in Theorem 1.8 with either $PGL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ or $PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$.

Here are three interesting cases for which it is known that $X_t$ satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A \geq 1/3$. In all of these cases, one can also show expansion for $X_t$, and hence for $Y_t$, using the results of Bourgain and Gamburd ([5]). Recall that we assume that $t$ is prime in all cases.

**Theorem 1.9.** Let $S \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ be a symmetric set of size $|S| = (q+1)$, which generates a free subgroup in $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, and assume that each element $s \in S$ has operator norm $\|s\| \leq q$. Then the graphs $X_t$ = Cayley($SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t),S \mod t$) satisfy the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A = 1/3$.

A particularly interesting case is the set
\[
S = \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \pm 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ \pm 2 & 1 \end{array} \right) \right\}.
\]

If $\pm 2$ is replaced with $\pm 1$ then the subgroup generated in $SL_2$ is not free, so the corresponding graphs $X_t$ do not even Benjamini-Schramm converge to the 4-regular infinite tree and, in particular, do not satisfy the density property. On the other hand, for $S = \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \pm 3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ \pm 3 & 1 \end{array} \right) \right\}$ the norm of every element is greater than $q = 3$, so it is not known whether the graphs satisfy the density property with parameter $A \geq 1/3$.

**Theorem 1.10.** For primes $q, t > 2$ let $X^{q,t}$ be the $(q+1)$-regular Cayley graphs of $PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ or $PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$ constructed by Davidoff, Sarnak and Valette in [9]. Let $S_t$ be a symmetric subset of the generators of $X^{q,t}$ of size $|S_t| \geq q^2+1 \geq \sqrt{q}+1$, and let $X_t$ be the $(q+1)$-regular Cayley graph generated by $S_t$. Then the graphs $X_t$ satisfy the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A = 1/3$.

The graphs $X^{q,t}$ above are usually denoted $X^{p,q}$ but we do differently to avoid confusion with the rest of the article. These graphs are a slight generalization of the LPS graphs of [24], since the congruence conditions for $p$ and $q$ is not assumed.

**Theorem 1.11.** Let $S_t$ be a random set of size $(q+1)/2$ in $SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$, and $X_t = Cayley(SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t),S_t \cup S_t^{-1})$. Then as $t \to \infty$, with probability $1 - o(1)$, the graphs $X_t$ satisfy the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A = 1/3$.

This together with Theorem 1.8 implies Theorem 1.1.
Structure of the Paper.

We start with the application of the results to the Schreier graphs on the projective line in Section 2, where we prove Theorem 1.8 and show that the examples satisfy the requirements of it.

In Section 3 we recall some basic results from the spectral theory of graphs. In Section 4 we prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 for Ramanujan graphs. These results also appear in [23, 27], but we provide the proof for them in order to simplify the proof of the other results. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.7 and discuss other different conditions equivalent to the density property. In Section 6 we prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Finally, in Section 7 we shortly discuss the connection between the density property and Benjamini-Schramm convergence.
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2 Schreier Graphs on the Projective Line

Let $t$ be a prime, $G_t = SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$, and $P_t = P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$ be the projective line over $\mathbb{F}_t$, i.e., the set of vectors $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$ such that $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_t$, not both zero, quotiented by the equivalence relation $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} \sim \begin{bmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{bmatrix}$ if and only if $ba' = ab'$.

The group $G_t$ acts transitively on $P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$, the stabilizer of $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$ is $K_p = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_t^\times \right\}$, and therefore $P_t$ can be identified with the symmetric space $P_t \simeq G_t/K_t$. Explicitly, $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} \in P^1(\mathbb{F}_t)$ corresponds to the set of matrices $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$, with first column equivalent to $\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$.

Let $S_t \subset G_t$ be a symmetric generating set of $G_t$, with $|S_t| = q + 1$. Let $X_t$ the Cayley graph of $G_t$ w.r.t. $S_t$, and let $Y_t$ be the Schreier graph of the quotient $G_t/K_t$ w.r.t. the set $S_t$.

**Theorem 2.1.** If $X_t$ has weak injective radius with parameter $A$, then $Y_t$ has weak injective radius with parameter $\min \{1, 3A\}$.

*Proof.* For simplicity we assume $S_t = R_t \cup R_t^{-1}$ with $|R_t| = |S_t|/2$. We will also first assume that $P_t = PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)$. Let $F_R$ be the free group generated by a set $R$ of size $|R| = |R_t| = (q + 1)/2$. An identification $R \simeq R_t$ defines a homomorphism $\varphi_t : F_R \rightarrow G_t \simeq X_t$.

Note that if $N \subset F_R$ is a finite index subgroup which defines a Schreier graph $X = F_R/N$, then the weak injective radius property with parameter $A$ holds for $X$ if and only if for $k \leq 2A \log_q (|X|)$,

$$\# \{ (g, xN) \in F_R \times X : l(g) = k, gxN = xN \} \ll_{\epsilon} |X|^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}.$$
Denote \( N_t = \ker \varphi_t \) and \( M_t = \left\{ g \in F_R : \varphi_t(g) \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \), where the equality is in \( P^1(\mathbb{F}_t) \) (alternatively one can say that \( \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_t \) is an eigenvector of \( \varphi_t(g) \)). \( M_t \) is a subgroup of \( F_R \) and contains \( N_t \) which is its normal core in \( F_R \). \( M_t \) defines the graph \( Y_t \), while \( N_t \) defines the graph \( X_t \). Since \( N_t \) is normal in \( F_R \), and since \( |X_t| = (t-1)(t+1)t/2 \approx t^3 \), the assumed Sarnak-Xue weak injective property with parameter \( A \) for \( X_t \) implies that for \( k \leq 2 \left[ A \log_q (|X_t|) \right] = 6A \log_q (t) + O(1) \), it holds that

\[
\# \left\{ g \in N_t : l(g) = k \right\} \ll t^k q^{k/2}.
\]

Let us try to bound the size of the set \( M_{t,k} = \left\{ (g,y) \in F_R \times Y_t : l(g) = k, \varphi(g) y = y \right\} \). If \( (g,y) \in M_{t,k} \), then \( y \in P^1(\mathbb{F}_t) \) is a projective eigenvector of \( \varphi_t(g) \), i.e., the lift of \( y \) to \( \mathbb{F}_t^2 \) is an eigenvector of \( \varphi_t(g) \). There are two options: either \( \varphi_t(g) = I \in G_t \) (i.e., \( g \in N_t \)) and then \( \varphi_t(g) \) has \( (t+1) \) projective eigenvectors, or \( \varphi_t(g) \neq I \in G_t \), and \( \varphi_t(g) \) has at most \( 2 \) projective eigenvectors (note that here the assumption that the group is actually \( PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_t) \) is used). Hence for \( k \leq 6A \log_q (t) - O(1) = 2(3A) \log_q (t) - O(1) \),

\[
|M_{t,k}| \leq (t+1) \left| \left\{ g \in N_t : l(g) = k \right\} \right| + 2 \left| \left\{ g \in F_R : l(g) = k \right\} \right| \ll_{\epsilon} |Y_t|^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2} + q^k.
\]

Note that for \( k \leq 2 \log_q (|Y_t|) \) it holds that

\[
q^k \leq |Y_t| q^{k/2},
\]

and this implies that the weak injective property for \( Y_t \) holds with parameter \( \min \{1, 3A\} \).

The treatment of the case \( SL_2 \) is similar to that of \( PSL_2 \) except for the case of the elements \( g \in F_R \) such that \( \varphi_t(g) = -I \). Such elements also have \( (t+1) \) eigenvectors. We treat this case by showing that the number of such elements of length \( k \leq 6A \log_q (t) \) is also bounded by \( \ll_{\epsilon} t^k q^{k/2} \). This follows from the general Lemma 6.5 in Section 6.

We now prove the examples mentioned in the introduction have Sarnak-Xue weak injective radius \( A = 1/3 \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.9.** Let \( S \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) be a symmetric set of size \( |S| = (q+1) \), which generates a free group in \( SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \), and assume that each element \( s \in S \) has operator norm \( \|s\| \leq q \). We show that \( X_t = \text{Cayley}(SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t), S \mod t) \) has weak injective radius with parameter \( A = 1/3 \).

We know that for \( \Gamma = SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) ([11])

\[
\Gamma(t) \cap B_T \ll_{\epsilon} \left( T/t^2 + 1 \right) (T/t + 1) T^\epsilon,
\]

where

\[
B_T = \left\{ A \in M_n(\mathbb{R}) : \|A\| \leq T \right\}.
\]
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For completeness, let us give a short proof of this fact. Write

\[ \gamma = \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ c & d \end{array} \right). \]

We replace the operator norm \( \| \| \) by the norm \( \| \gamma \|_\infty = \max \{|a|, |b|, |c|, |d|\} \), which does not matter for 2.1, since all the norms on \( M_2(\mathbb{R}) \) are equivalent. Then if \( \gamma \in \Gamma(t) \), i.e. \( \gamma = I \mod t \), it is a simple exercise to see that

\[ a + d = 2 \mod t^2. \]

Then if \( \| \gamma \|_\infty \leq T \) there are \( \ll \left( \frac{T}{t^2} + 1 \right) \) options for \( a + d \), \( \ll (T/t^2 + 1) (T/t + 1) \) options for \( a, d \). Then if \( ad \neq 1 \) we have \( bc = 1 - ad \neq 0 \) and by standard bounds on the divisor function (\([18]\)) there are \( \ll T \tau \) options for \( b, c \). The case where \( ad = 1 \) is also simple.

Returning to the proof, by Equation 2.1, the number of paths of length \( k \) in \( X_t \) is bounded by

\[ \Gamma(t) \cap B_{\varphi^k} \ll \left( \frac{q^k}{t^2} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{q^k}{t} + 1 \right) q^{k\epsilon}. \]

For \( k \leq 2A \log_q (t^2) = 2 \log_q(t) \), i.e. \( t \geq q^{k/2} \) it holds that

\[ \left( \frac{q^k}{t^2} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{q^k}{t} + 1 \right) \ll q^{k/2}, \]

which means that \( X_t \) satisfies the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter \( A = 1/3 \).

Let us complete the analysis of

\[ S = \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \pm 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ \pm 2 & 1 \end{array} \right) \right\}. \]

We need to calculate the norm of the generators. Denote by \( \lambda_{\text{max}} \) the maximal eigenvalue of a semi-definite matrix. Then

\[
\left\| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 = \lambda_{\text{max}} \left( \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \lambda_{\text{max}} \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ = \frac{6 \pm \sqrt{36 - 1}}{2} \leq 6 \leq 3^2 = q^2, \]

and similarly for the other generators.

**Proof of Theorem 1.10.** For primes \( q, t > 2 \) let \( X^{q,t} \) be the \((q + 1)\)-regular Cayley graphs of \( \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q) \) or \( \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{F}_t) \) constructed by Davidoff, Sarnak and Valette in \([9]\). Let \( S_t \) be a symmetric subset of the generators of \( X^{q,t} \) of size \( |S_t| \geq q^t + 1 \geq \sqrt{q} + 1 \), and let \( X_t \) be the \((q' + 1)\)-regular Cayley graph generated by \( S_t \).

Then as shown in \([9, \text{Lemma 4.4.2}]\), for \( k = 0 \mod 2 \), the number of cycles \( P(X^{q,t}, k, \text{id}) \) is bounded by the number \( s_Q(q^k) \) of ways to represent \( q^k \) by the quadratic form

\[ Q(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_0^2 + 4t^2 (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2). \]
Following the analysis in [9, Theorem 4.4.4], \(x_0\) may be chosen in \(\ll (q^{k/2}/t^2 + 1)\) ways, and then \(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = (q^k - x_0^2)/4t^2\) may be chosen in \(\ll (q^k/t^2 + 1)^{1/2+\epsilon}\) ways by standard bounds on the quadratic form \(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2\). Therefore we know

\[
P(X_1, k, id) \leq P(X^{\circ}, k, id) \ll_{\epsilon} q^{k\epsilon} \left(\frac{q^{k/2}}{t^2} + 1\right) \left(\frac{q^{k/2}}{t} + 1\right).
\]

For \(k \leq 2 \log_q t\) it therefore holds that

\[
P(X_1, k, id) \ll_{\epsilon} t^* q^{k/2},
\]

as needed. \(\square\)

**Proof of Theorem 1.11.** Let \(S_t\) be a random set of size \((q + 1)/2\) in \(SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t)\), and \(X_t = \text{Cayley} \left( SL_2(\mathbb{F}_t), S_t \cup S_t^{-1} \right)\). By [12, Lemma 10], the probability that a word \(w\) of length \(k\), when \(k = O(t/\log(t))\), will evaluate to 1 is \(\leq \frac{1}{t} + o(t^{-2})\). Let \(k \leq 2 \log_q (t)\). Then the expected number of cycles of length \(k\) is bounded by:

\[
E(P(X_t, k)) \ll q^{k^2} t^{k} \leq kq^{k/2}.
\]

Therefore by Markov’s inequality, for every \(\epsilon > 0\), the probability that \(P(X_t, k) > C_\epsilon q^{k/2} t^*\), is bounded by \(CC^{-1}_\epsilon t^{-\epsilon} k \leq 2CC^{-1}_\epsilon \log_q (t) t^{-\epsilon}\). By choosing \(C_\epsilon = m^2\) for \(\epsilon = \frac{1}{m}\) we can ensure that with probability tending to 1 as \(t \to \infty\), for every \(\epsilon > 0\) of the form \(\epsilon = \frac{1}{m}\) it will holds that \(P(X_t, k) \leq C_\epsilon q^{k/2} t^*\). Therefore the same will hold for every \(\epsilon > 0\), as needed. \(\square\)

## 3 Preliminaries on the Spectral Theory of Graphs

We start with some basics of the spectral theory of graphs. See [21] for some more details.

As before let \(X\) be a finite \((q + 1)\)-regular graph on \(n\) vertices, possibly with multiple edges and self-loops. For \(k \geq 0\), define the distance \(k\) Hecke-operator \(A_k : L^2(X) \to L^2(X)\) by

\[
A_k f (x_0) = \frac{1}{(q + 1)q^{k-1}} \sum_{(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}) \text{ non-backtracking path}} f(x_{k-1}).
\]

As we assume multiples edges, non-backtracking paths are paths such that no two consecutive steps take the *same* edge in the opposite direction. We sum over all \((q + 1)q^{k-1}\) non-backtracking paths, so the same path on the level of vertices may be counted a couple of times. On the \((q + 1)\)-regular infinite tree \(A_k\) acts by averaging over the sphere of radius \(k\) around a vertex.

Note that the path-counting functions defined in Definition 1.6 can be expressed as

\[
P(X, k, x_0) = (q + 1)q^{k-1} \langle A_k \delta_{x_0}, \delta_{x_0} \rangle
\]

\[
P(X, k) = (q + 1)q^{k-1} \text{tr} A_k.
\]
It holds that $A_0 = I$, $A_1 = A$, and the following recursive relation takes place for $k \geq 1$

$$AA_k = \frac{q}{q+1} A_{k+1} + \frac{1}{q+1} A_{k-1}.$$  

Therefore, if $v \in L^2(X)$ is an eigenfunction of $A$, i.e., $Av = \lambda v$, then $A_k v = \lambda^{(k)} v$, where $\lambda^{(k)}$ is a function of $\lambda$ and $k$. In order to calculate $\lambda^{(k)}$, write

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{q+1} (\theta + q\theta^{-1}),$$

for some $0 \neq \theta \in \mathbb{C}$. This equation always has two (possibly, equal) solutions $\theta_\pm$ satisfying $\theta_+\theta_- = q$, and

$$\theta_\pm = \frac{(q+1)\lambda \pm \sqrt{(q+1)\lambda^2 - 4q^2}}{2}.$$  

Solving this equation and recalling that $A$ is a self-adjoint operator of norm 1, so its eigenvalues are real and satisfy $-1 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, we have:

- If $|\lambda| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{q}}{q+1}$, then $|\theta_\pm| = \sqrt{q}$. In this case, we let $p(\lambda) = 2$ be the $p$-value of $\lambda$, and we let $\theta$ be one of $\theta_\pm$.

- If $\frac{2\sqrt{q}}{q+1} < |\lambda| \leq 1$, then both $\theta_\pm$ are real, and we let $\theta$ be the larger one in absolute value. It holds that $\sqrt{q} < |\theta| \leq q$ and $\theta$ has the same sign as $\lambda$. It also holds that $|\theta| = q^{1-1/p}$, where $2 < p = p(\lambda) \leq \infty$ is the $p$-value of $\lambda$.

The relation between $\theta$ and the eigenvalues $\lambda^{(k)}$ of $A_k$ is given by the following formula, which may be verified by induction

$$\lambda^{(k)} = \frac{1}{(q+1)q^{k-1}} \left( \theta^k + (q\theta^{-1})^k + (1-q^{-1}) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^i \theta^{k-2i} \right).$$  

(3.1)  

The following proposition provides upper and lower bound for $\lambda^{(k)}$.

**Corollary 3.1.** If $p(\lambda) = 2$ then for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left| \lambda^{(k)} \right| \leq (k+1) q^{-k/2} \ll_\varepsilon q^{(1/2+\varepsilon)}.$$  

If $p(\lambda) > 2$ then for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$q^{-k/p(\lambda)} \leq \left| \lambda^{(k)} \right| \leq (k+1) q^{-k/p(\lambda)} \ll_\varepsilon q^{(-1/p(\lambda)+\varepsilon)}.$$  

Moreover, if $k = 0 \mod 2$ then $\lambda^{(k)}$ is positive, otherwise $\lambda^{(k)}$ has the same sign as $\lambda$.

**Proof.** The upper bounds follow directly from the explicit expression in Equation 3.1. Note that since $|\theta| \geq |q\theta^{-1}|$, the value $\theta^k$ is the largest one in absolute value in Equation 3.1.

It is left to prove the lower bound in the case of $p = p(\lambda) > 2$. We can assume that $\lambda > 0$, so $\theta > 0$, and hence all the summands in Equation 3.1 are positive. Consider the function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as
\( f(x) = q^{-x/p} \). This function is decreasing, hence for any \( x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R} \)

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(x_i) \geq f(\max\{x_i\}).
\]

Apply this to the following multiset (i.e., a set with repetitions) of numbers: \( q^k \) times \( k \), \((q-1)q^{k-1}\) times \( k-2i \) for \( 0 < i < k \), and once the value \(-k\). There are \( N \) elements in this multiset, where

\[ N = q^k + (q-1) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{k-1-i} + 1 = q^k + q^{k-1} = (q+1)q^{k-1}. \]

Therefore we have

\[
\frac{1}{(q+1)q^{k-1}} \left( q^{k}q^{-k/p} + (q-1) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{k-1-i}q^{-(k-2i)/p} + 1 \cdot q^{k/p} \right) \geq f(k) = q^{-k/p}.
\]

The left hand side is equal to \( \lambda^{(k)} \).

\[
\square
\]

## 4 Ramanujan Graphs

In this section, we discuss the analogs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 for Ramanujan graphs. The results can essentially be found in the work of Lubetzky and Peres ([23]) or Sardari ([27]). We include them here in a slightly different form in order to make use of them later.

In what follows in this section, we assume the graphs to be non-bipartite. However, the bipartite case can be treated similarly with the main difference that the eigenvalue \((-1)\) has to be taken into account just as 1, as we explain now. If \( X \) is non-bipartite, define

\[
L_0^2(X) = \left\{ f \in L^2(X) : \sum_{x \in X} f(x) = 0 \right\}.
\]

If \( X \) is an expander then the norm of \( A \) on \( L_0^2(X) \) is bounded by \( \lambda_0 < 1 \). Let \( \pi(x) = \frac{1}{n} \) be the constant probability function. Then we may write every delta function as

\[
\delta_{x_0} = \pi + (\delta_{x_0} - \pi),
\]

with \( \delta_{x_0} - \pi \in L_0^2(X) \). It holds that \( A_k \pi = \pi \) for every \( k \geq 0 \).

If \( X \) is bipartite, the vertex set can be decomposed into two equal parts \( X = X_L \cup X_R \), where \( |X_L| = |X_R| = n/2 \), and all the edges are between a vertex in \( X_L \) and a vertex in \( X_R \). Then define

\[
L_{00}^2 = \left\{ f \in L^2(X) : \sum_{x \in X_L} f(x) = \sum_{x \in X_R} f(x) = 0 \right\}.
\]

In this case, if \( X \) is an expander then the norm of \( A \) on \( L_{00}^2(X) \) is bounded by \( \lambda_0 < 1 \). Let \( \pi_- \in L^2(X) \) be
the function
\[
\pi_-(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{n} & x \in X_L \\
-\frac{1}{n} & x \in X_R.
\end{cases}
\]

Then the delta function for \(x_0 \in X_L\) can be written as
\[
\delta_{x_0} = \pi + \pi_- + (\delta_{x_0} - \pi - \pi_-)
\]
with \(\delta_{x_0} - \pi - \pi_- \in L^2_{00}(X)\), and analogously for \(x_0 \in X_R\) it holds that
\[
\delta_{x_0} = \pi - \pi_- + (\delta_{x_0} - \pi + \pi_-),
\]
with \(\delta_{x_0} - \pi + \pi_- \in L^2_{00}(X)\). It holds that that \(A_k \pi = \pi\) for every \(k \geq 0\) and \(A_k \pi_- = (-1)^k \pi_-\).

Using the Equation 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 we can understand the action of \(A_k\), for \(k \geq 0\), on \(\delta_{x_0}\).

For simplicity, we consider from now on the non-bipartite case only. The statements and proofs can be extended to the bipartite case with minor adjustments.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \(X\) be a \((q + 1)\)-regular non-bipartite graph of size \(n\). Assume that for \(b \in \mathbb{R}\),
\[
\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2^2 \leq cn^{-b}.
\]

Then
\[
\# \{ y : d(x_0, y) > k \} \leq cn^{-b+2}.
\]

**Proof.** The result follows from the fact, that if \(d(x_0, y) > k\), then \(A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)(y) = -\frac{1}{n}\) and therefore,
\[
\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2^2 \geq \# \{ y : d(x_0, y) > k \} n^{-2}.
\]

**Theorem 4.2.** If \(X\) is a Ramanujan graph, then for every \(\epsilon > 0\) and every \(x_0 \in X\),
\[
\# \{ y \in X : d(x_0, y) > (1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n) \} = o_\epsilon(n),
\]
and for \(n\) large enough, \((2 + \epsilon) \log_q(n)\) is an upper bound on the diameter of \(X\).

**Proof.** For simplicity assume that \(X\) is non-bipartite, the bipartite case is similar. Write \(\delta_{x_0}\) as
\[
\delta_{x_0} = \pi + (\delta_{x_0} - \pi),
\]
with \(\delta_{x_0} - \pi \in L^2_{00}(X)\). Then, by Proposition 3.1
\[
\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2 \leq (k + 1) q^{-k/2} \|\delta_{x_0}\|_2 = (k + 1) q^{-k/2}.
\]
And for \(k \geq (1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n)\),
\[
\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2 = o_\epsilon(n^{-1}).
\]
which implies, by Lemma 4.1, that

$$\# \{ y : d(x_0, y) > (1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n) \} = o_\epsilon(n).$$

The diameter bound can be deduced from the almost-diameter bound, since for \( n \) large enough every two vertices have a third vertex of distance at most \((1 + \epsilon) \log_q(n)\) from the both of them. However, it can also be deduced directly by a similar argument. For \( k \geq (2 + \epsilon) \log_q(n) \),

$$\| A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi) \|_2^2 = o(n^{-2}),$$

which implies by Lemma 4.1 that \((2 + \epsilon) \log_q(n)\) is an upper bound on the diameter of \( A \).

Let us give some remarks on the proof and some generalizations.

1. The same proof shows that if every non-trivial eigenvalue \( \lambda \) of \( X \) is bounded by \( |\lambda| \leq \lambda_0 = \frac{1}{q+1} (q^{1/p} + q^{1-1/p}) \), then the almost-diameter is bounded by \((1 + \epsilon) (p/2) \log_q(n)\) and the diameter is bounded by \((1 + \epsilon) p \log_q(n)\).

2. A bit more careful analysis implies that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( n \) large enough the almost-diameter is actually bounded by \( \log_q(n) + (2 + \epsilon) \log_q(\log_q(n)) \) and the diameter is bounded by \( \log_q(n) + (1 + \epsilon) \log_q(\log_q(n)) \).

3. Both previous remarks can be improved, following the method in [8]. Assume \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X] \) is a polynomial of degree \( k \), such that \( P(1) = 1 \) and \( P(\lambda) = o\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \) for \( |\lambda| \leq \lambda_0 \). Then using the operator \( P(A) \) instead of the operator \( A_k \), the same proof implies that the almost-diameter is bounded by \( k \). In [8] it is shown that the optimal choice of \( P \) (depending on \( \lambda_0 \)) is some twist of the Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind, which satisfies for \( |\lambda| \leq \lambda_0 \) that \( P(\lambda) \leq \cosh \left( k \frac{q}{\lambda_0} \right)^{-1} \). It has the effect of reducing the almost-diameter of Ramanujan graphs to \( \log_q(n) + O(g(n)) \), where \( g(n) \to \infty \) arbitrarily slowly. In the non-Ramanujan case this analysis is even better, and improves the coefficient of \( \log_q(n) \) to \( \frac{\ln(q)}{2} \left( \cosh \left( \frac{q}{\lambda_0} \right) \right)^{-1} \). Similar improvements can be made to the diameter. The main results of our work cannot be improved similarly, since all the gain from the better analysis is lost due the weaker assumptions.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( X \) be a non-bipartite graph. Then for every \( \epsilon_0 > 0 \), and \( x_0 \in X \) the probability distributions \( A^k \delta_{x_0} \) of the simple random walk on \( X \) satisfy the following:

1. For \( k < (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q-1} \log_q(n) \), it holds that

   $$\| A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi \|_1 = 2 - o_{\epsilon_0}(1).$$

2. If \( X \) is Ramanujan, for \( k > (1 + \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q-1} \log_q(n) \), it holds that

   $$\| A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi \|_1 = o_{\epsilon_0}(1).$$

The proof of this theorem is based on the following lemma, whose proof can be found in [23, Section 2].
Lemma 4.4. It holds that $A^k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i^{(k)} A_i$ for some constants $\alpha_i^{(k)}$, satisfying $0 \leq \alpha_i^{(k)}$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i^{(k)} = 1$. Moreover for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i \geq (\epsilon + 1) \frac{q+1}{q+2}} \alpha_i^{(k)} = o(1)$$

as $k \to \infty$.

The constants $\alpha_i^{(k)}$ in the lemma are the probability that the simple random walk on the $(q+1)$-regular tree starting from some vertex $x_0$ is at distance $i$ from $x_0$ after $k$ steps. Therefore, lemma is a crude estimate on the rate of escape of the simple random walk, and it follows from the fact that the random walk is transient almost-surely, and once we leave for the last time the root $x_0$ we move away from $x_0$ with probability $\frac{q}{q+1}$ and move towards $x_0$ with probability $\frac{1}{q+1}$. For more precise statements, including a Central Limit Theorem for this deviation, see [23, Section 2].

Proof of Theorem 4.3. For (1), assume that $k < (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q} \log_q (n)$. Choose $\epsilon_1 > 0$ small enough relatively to $\epsilon_0$. It holds, by Lemma 4.4, that

$$\|A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i^{(k)} (A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi) \right\|_1$$

$$\geq - \sum_{i \geq \left(\epsilon + 1 \frac{q+1}{q+2}\right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 + \left\| \sum_{i \leq \left(\epsilon + 1 \frac{q+1}{q+2}\right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} (A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi) \right\|_1.$$  

The first term is $o_{\epsilon_0}(1)$ by Lemma 4.4. In the second term, for $i \leq \left(\epsilon + 1 \frac{q+1}{q+2}\right) k$, $A_i \delta_{x_0}$ is supported on a ball of radius at most

$$\left(\epsilon + 1 \frac{q+1}{q+2}\right) (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q+1} \log_q (n) \leq (1 - \epsilon_2) \log_q (n)$$

around $x_0$, where $\epsilon_2 > 0$ is some small constant depending on $\epsilon_0$. Therefore $A_i \delta_{x_0}$ is non-zero on at most

$$O\left(q^{1-\epsilon_2} \log_q (n)\right) = o_{\epsilon_0}(n)$$

of the vertices of the graph, which implies

$$\left\| \sum_{i \leq \left(\epsilon + 1 \frac{q+1}{q+2}\right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} (A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi) \right\|_1 \geq 2 - o_{\epsilon_0}(1).$$
Therefore
\[
\left\| \sum_{i \leq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} \right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} (A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi) \right\|_1 \geq \left( \sum_{i \leq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} \right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} \right) (2 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1))
\]
\[
\geq (1 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1)) (2 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1))
\]
\[
= 2 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1),
\]
which implies
\[
\left\| A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi \right\|_1 \geq -o_{\epsilon_0} (1) + 2 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1)
\]
\[
= 2 - o_{\epsilon_0} (1).
\]

For (2), assume that \( k > (1 + \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q} \log_q (n) \). Choose \( \epsilon > 0 \) small enough relatively to \( \epsilon_0 \). Then
\[
\left\| A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi \right\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i^{(k)} (A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi) \right\|_1
\]
\[
\leq \left\| \sum_{i \leq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} + \epsilon_1 \right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 \right. + \sum_{i \geq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} - \epsilon_1 \right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1.
\]
The first term is \( o_1 (1) \) by Lemma 4.4. The second term can be bounded by Cauchy-Schwartz
\[
\sum_{i \geq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} - \epsilon_1 \right) k} \alpha_i^{(k)} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 \leq \sup_{i \geq \left( \frac{q-1}{q+1} - \epsilon_1 \right) k} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1
\]
\[
\leq \sqrt{n} \|A_1 \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_2.
\]
But since \( k > (1 + \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q} \log_q (n) \) and \( \epsilon_1 \) is small enough relatively to \( \epsilon_0 \), it holds that \( i > \left( \frac{(q-1)}{q+1} - \epsilon_1 \right) k \) satisfies \( i > (1 + \epsilon_2) \log_q (n) \) for some \( \epsilon_2 > 0 \). Then
\[
\sqrt{n} \|A_i \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|A_i\|_{L_2^q(X)} \|\delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_2
\]
\[
\ll \epsilon \sqrt{\frac{nq}{\epsilon}}. \]

By choosing \( \epsilon > 0 \) small enough relatively to \( \epsilon_0 \) we get that the last value is \( o(1) \).

Remark 4.5. As in Theorem 4.2, the results can be improved in the Ramanujan case by a more careful analysis. In particular, the condition \( k < (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q} \log_q (n) \) can be replaced by
\[
k < \frac{q+1}{q-1} \log_q (n) - (\log_q (n))^{1/2 + \epsilon_0}
\]
and similarly for the upper bound (see [23] for more details).
5 Equivalence of the Density and the Path-Counting Properties

Recall that the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$ for a graph $X$ on $n$ vertices is that for every $p > 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\# \{ i : p_i \geq p \} \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{1-A(1-2/p) + \epsilon}.$$

Here $p_i$ is the $p$-value of the $i$-th eigenvalue.

**Lemma 5.1.** The Sarnak-Xue density condition with parameter $A$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_i n^{-1+A(1-2/p_i)} \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^\epsilon. \quad (5.1)$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.7.** Assume Inequality 5.1 holds. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $p > 2$,

$$n^\epsilon \gg_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i : p_i \geq p} n^{-1+A(1-2/p_i)} \geq \sum_{i : p_i \geq p} n^{-1+A(1/p)} = n^{-1+A(1-2/p)} \# \{ i : p_i \geq p \},$$

which implies the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$.

For the other direction, we apply discrete integration by parts (see [18, Theorem 421]). For a smooth function $f : [2, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence of points $x_i$, let $M(x) = \# \{ i : x_i \geq x \}$. Then the following holds

$$\sum_i f(x_i) = M(2) f(2) + \int_2^\infty M(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) \, dx.$$

Let $f(x) = n^{-1+A(1-2/x)}$ and assume the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$, then

$$\sum_i n^{-1+A(1-2/p_i)} = \sum_i f(x_i) = n^{-1} \# \{ i : p_i \geq 2 \} + \int_2^\infty \# \{ i : p_i \geq p \} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} n^{-1+A(1-2/x)} \, dx \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{-1} \cdot n + \int_2^\infty n^{1-A(1-2/p)+\epsilon} \ln(n) A \frac{2}{x^2} n^{-1+A(1-2/x)} \, dx \ll 1 + n^\epsilon \int_2^\infty \frac{1}{x^2} \, dx \ll n^\epsilon.$$

First assume that Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$ is satisfied for $X$. We should prove that $P(X, k) \ll n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}$ for $k \leq 2A \log_q n$. Note that if the Sarnak-Xue density property holds for $A$ then it holds for any $A' \leq A$, so we may assume that $k = 2A \log_q (n)$ when proving the weak injective radius.
property. Then the following holds

\[ P(X, k) = (q + 1) q^{k-1} \text{tr} A_k = \]

\[ = (q + 1) q^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

\[ \leq (q + 1) q^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i^{(k)}| \]

\[ \leq (q + 1) q^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (q + 1) q^{-k/p_i} \]

\[ \ll \sum_{i=1}^{n} q^{k(1-1/p_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n^{2A(1-1/p_i)} \]

\[ = n^A n \sum_{i=1}^{n} n^{-1+A(1-1/p_i)} \]

\[ \ll_{\epsilon} q^{k/2} n \epsilon = n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}. \]

Here we used the upper bounds of Corollary 3.1 in the fourth line, and Lemma 5.1 in the last line.

For the other direction, assume the injective radius property with parameter \( A \). Let \( k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q n \rfloor \).

Then by the weak injective radius property we have for every \( \epsilon > 0 \),

\[ n^{1+A+\epsilon} \ll n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2} \gg_{\epsilon} P(X, k) = \]

\[ = (q + 1) q^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

\[ \gg q^k \sum_{i:p_i=2} \lambda_i^{(k)} + q^k \sum_{i:p_i > 2} \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

\[ \geq q^k \sum_{i:p_i > 2} q^{-k/p_i} + q^k \sum_{i:p_i > 2} \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

\[ \geq q^k \sum_{i:p_i > 2} n^{-2A/p_i} + q^k \sum_{i:p_i > 2} \lambda_i^{(k)}. \]

Here we applied the lower bound of Corollary 3.1 in the last line and used the fact that \( k \) is even. By re-arranging and applying the upper bounds of Corollary 3.1, we have

\[ \sum_{i:p_i > 2} n^{-2A/p_i} \ll_{\epsilon} q^{-k} n^{1+A+\epsilon} - \sum_{i:p_i=2} \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

\[ \ll_{\epsilon} n^{-A+\epsilon} + nq^{-k(1/2+\epsilon)} \]

\[ \asymp n^{1-A+\epsilon}. \]

This proves that the Sarnak-Xue density property holds as in Lemma 5.1.

\[ \square \]

Remark 5.2. The proof shows that it is enough to show the Sarnak-Xue injective radius property for the single value \( k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q n \rfloor \) (or any other close even value). Checking odd values is obviously not enough
since in bipartite graphs there are no odd-length paths from $x_0$ to itself. We do not know if checking the condition for odd-length paths is enough in non-bipartite graphs.

**Remark 5.3.** One may also weaken the Sarnak-Xue density property so we have to consider only positive eigenvalues of $A$. We have:

**Proposition 5.4.** The Sarnak-Xue injective radius property with parameter $A$ ($0 < A \leq 1$) holds if for every $p > 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\# \{ i : \lambda_i > 0, p_i \geq p \} \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{1 - A(1 - 2/p) + \epsilon}.$$  

Note that the difference between this property and the Sarnak-Xue density property (Definition 1.5) is that we restricted ourselves to positive eigenvalues. One cannot hope to prove analogous statement but for the negative eigenvalues only, as the smallest negative eigenvalue may stay within the Ramanujan range even without Benjamini-Schramm convergence to the $(q + 1)$-regular tree ([6]).

**Proof.** Assume the weaker condition. Let $k = 2\lfloor A \log_q n \rfloor + 1$. From the geometric interpretation of $\text{tr}A_k$ as path counting, we know that $\text{tr}A_k \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i : p_i = 2} \lambda_i^{(k)} + \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i > 0} \lambda_i^{(k)} + \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i < 0} \lambda_i^{(k)} \geq 0.$$  

So using Corollary 3.1 and Lemma 5.1 we get for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i < 0} n^{-2A/p_i} \leq \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i < 0} q^{-k/p_i} \leq -\sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i < 0} \lambda_i^{(k)} \leq \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i > 0} \lambda_i^{(k)} + \sum_{i : p_i = 2} \lambda_i^{(k)} \ll_{\epsilon} \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i > 0} q^{-k(1/p_i + \epsilon)} + \sum_{i : p_i = 2} q^{-k(1/2 + \epsilon)} \ll_{\epsilon} \sum_{i : p_i > 2, \lambda_i > 0} n^{-2A/p_i + \epsilon} + n \cdot n^{-A(1 + \epsilon)} \ll_{\epsilon} n^{1 - A + \epsilon}.$$  

Applying Lemma 5.1 again we have for every $p > 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\# \{ i : \lambda_i < 0, p_i \geq p \} \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{1 - A(1 - 2/p) + \epsilon},$$  

and together with the weaker condition we have the full Sarnak-Xue density.

The Sarnak-Xue density can also be stated in terms of non-backtracking cycles, i.e. non-backtracking paths of length $k \geq 2$ such that the last edge is not the inverse of the first edge. We consider two cycles as equivalent if they are rotations of one another. We say that a cycle $C$ is primitive if there is no $l|k$ and a cycle $C'$ of length $l$, such that $C$ is equivalent to the concatenation of $C'$ to itself $k/l$ times.
The Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$ is also equivalent to a bound on the number of primitive cycles of length $k \leq 2A \log_q(n)$. The theorem below shows a stronger result that it is enough to consider only cycles of length $k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q(n) \rfloor$. The theorem is based on the graph prime number theorem of [30].

**Theorem 5.5.** Denote by $\pi_X(k)$ the number of equivalence classes of primitive cycles of length $k$, and by $N_X(k)$ the number of cycles of length $k$ (i.e. proper cycles, not equivalence classes).

For a sequence of graphs $X \in \mathcal{F}$, the Sarnak-Xue density property with parameter $A$ is satisfied if and only if for $k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q(n) \rfloor$, either $\pi_X(k) \ll \epsilon n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}$ or $N_X(k) \ll \epsilon n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}$.

**Proof.** We first show that the last two conditions are equivalent. We have (see [30, Section 10])

$$N_X(k) = \sum_{m \mid k} m \pi_X(m),$$

which implies

$$\pi_X(k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m \mid k} \mu \left( \frac{k}{m} \right) N_X(m),$$

where $\mu$ is the Mobius function. Then

$$\left| \pi_X(k) - \frac{1}{k} N_X(k) \right| = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m \mid k, m \neq k} \mu \left( \frac{k}{m} \right) N_X(m)$$

Using the trivial bound

$$N_X(m) \ll nq^m$$

and, the fact that the largest divisor of $k$ is $k/2$ and

$$\sum_{m \mid k} 1 \leq k$$

we have

$$\left| \pi_X(k) - \frac{1}{k} N_X(k) \right| \ll_{\epsilon} n q^{k/2}.$$ Using $k \ll_{\epsilon} n^\epsilon$, we see that $\pi_X(k) \ll_{\epsilon} n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}$ if and only if $N_X(k) \ll_{\epsilon} n^{1+\epsilon} q^{k/2}$.

We now show the claim for $N_X(k)$. Let $E_X$ be the set of directed edges of $X$, for $e \in E_X$ let $o(e), t(e) \in X$ be the origin and terminus of $e$, and let $\bar{e} \in E_X$ be the opposite edge. Let $H : L^2(E_X) \to L^2(E_X)$ be Hashimoto’s non-backtracking operator, defined by

$$H f (e) = \sum_{e' : o(e') = t(e), e' \neq \bar{e}} f (e').$$

The following is well-known, and follows from the theory of the graph Ihara zeta function, see [30, Section 10] :

1. $N_X(k) = \text{tr} H^k$. 
20
2. If the eigenvalues of $A$ are $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$, then the eigenvalues of $H$ are $\theta_{i,\pm}$, defined as in Section 3, by

$$
\theta_{i,\pm} = \frac{(q + 1) \lambda_i \pm \sqrt{(q + 1) \lambda_i^2 - 4q^2}}{2},
$$

and also has the eigenvalues $\pm 1$, each with multiplicity $|E_X|/2 - n$.

Therefore

$$
N_X(k) = \left(1 + (-1)^k\right)(|E_X|/2 - n) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta_{i,+}^k + \theta_{i,-}^k\right).
$$

Note that for $k = 0 \mod 2$ and $p_i > 2$ we have

$$
\theta_{i,+}^k + \theta_{i,-}^k = q^{k(1-1/p_i)} + q^{k/p_i}.
$$

Choose $k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q(n) \rfloor$. We then have

$$
N_X(k) - \sum_{i:p_i > 2} \left(\theta_{i,+}^k + \theta_{i,-}^k\right) = N_X(k) - \sum_{i:p_i > 2} \left(q^{k(1-1/p_i)} + q^{k/p_i}\right) =
$$

$$
= 2(\lfloor|E_X|/2 - n\rfloor) + \sum_{i:p_i = 2} \left(\theta_{i,+}^k + \theta_{i,-}^k\right).
$$

Using the fact that for $p = 2$ it holds that $|\theta| = \sqrt{q}$ we have

$$
\left|N_X(k) - \sum_{i:p_i > 2} q^{k(1-1/p_i)}\right| \ll nq^{k/2}.
$$

Therefore $N_X(k) \ll \epsilon n^{1+\epsilon}q^{k/2}$ if and only if $\sum_{i:p_i > 2} q^{k(1-1/p_i)} \ll \epsilon n^{1+\epsilon}q^{k/2}$. Using the fact that $k = 2 \lfloor A \log_q(n) \rfloor$ and Lemma 5.1 we get the claim for $N_X(k)$.

\[ \square \]

6 Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4

Before proving the theorems we give some other useful definition.

**Definition 6.1.** We say that $x_0 \in X$ has *local Sarnak-Xue property with parameter $A$* if for every $k \leq 2A \log_q(n)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ it holds that

$$
P(X, k, x_0) \ll_{\mathcal{F}, \epsilon} n^\epsilon q^{k/2}.
$$

Let $u_0, \ldots, u_{n-1}$ be an orthogonal basis of $L^2(X)$ composed of eigenvectors of $A$, with eigenvalue $\lambda_i$ and $p$-value $p_i$.

**Lemma 6.2.** The vertex $x_0 \in X$ has local Sarnak-Xue property with parameter $A$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 n^{A(1-2/p_i)} \ll_{\mathcal{F}, \epsilon} n^\epsilon.
$$

(6.1)
Proof. It holds that

\[ P(X, k, x_0) = (q + 1) q^{k-1} \langle \delta_{x_0}, A_k \delta_{x_0} \rangle. \]

By the spectral decomposition

\[ \delta_{x_0} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle u_i \]

we have

\[ P(X, k, x_0) \approx q^k \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \lambda_i^{(k)} \]

= \( q^k \sum_{i:p_i=2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \lambda_i^{(k)} + q^k \sum_{i:p_i>2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \lambda_i^{(k)}. \)

the first term always satisfies for every \( \epsilon > 0, \)

\[ q^k \left| \sum_{i:p_i=2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \lambda_i^{(k)} \right| \ll \epsilon q^k q^{-k/2} q^k \sum_{i:p_i=2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \]

\[ \leq q^{k \epsilon} q^{k/2}. \]

Therefore the local Sarnak-Xue density is satisfied if and only if for every \( k \leq 2A \log_q (n) \)

\[ q^k \sum_{i:p_i>2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 \lambda_i^{(k)} \ll n^\epsilon q^{k/2}. \]

Since for \( k = 0 \mod 2 \) it holds that \( q^{k/p_i} \leq \lambda_i^{(k)} \ll q^{(1/p_i+\epsilon)} \) and for \( k = 1 \mod 2 \) we know the upper bound in absolute value, the last condition holds if and only if for every \( k \leq 2A \log_q (n), \)

\[ q^k \sum_{i:p_i>2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 q^{-k(1/p_i+\epsilon)} \ll n^\epsilon q^{k/2} \]

i.e., the local Sarnak-Xue density with parameter \( A \) is satisfied if and only if for every \( k \leq 2A \log_q (n) \) and \( \epsilon > 0, \)

\[ \sum_{i:p_i>2} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 q^{k(1/2-1/p_i)} \ll n^\epsilon. \]

This condition for \( k = 2A \lfloor \log_q (n) \rfloor \) shows that local Sarnak-Xue density with parameter \( A \) implies Equation 6.1. But if this condition holds for \( k \) then it obviously holds for \( k' \leq k. \) Therefore Equation 6.1 also implies the local Sarnak-Xue density with parameter \( A. \)

\[ \square \]

Lemma 6.3. If a vertex \( x_0 \in X \) has local Sarnak-Xue density with parameter \( A = 1 \) and \( X \) is an expander then:

- For every \( \epsilon_0 > 0, \) for all but \( \alpha_X (n) \) of \( y \in X \) it holds that \( d(x, y) \leq (1 + \epsilon_0) \log_q (n), \) i.e. \( R(n) = (1 + \epsilon_0) \log_q (n) \) is an almost-radius of \( X \) at \( x_0. \)
• For every $\epsilon_0 > 0$, for $k > (1 + \epsilon_0) \frac{q+1}{q-1} \log_q(n)$, it holds that

$$\|A^k \delta_{x_0} - \pi\|_1 = o(1).$$

Proof. As before, we assume that $X$ is non-bipartite, and the bipartite case can be treated similarly. We let $u_0, \ldots, u_{n-1}$ be the orthogonal basis of $L^2(X)$ as above. We assume that $u_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ is the $L^2$-normalized constant function.

The fact that $X$ is an expander means that there exists $p' < \infty$ (depending only on $F$) such that for all $i > 0$ it holds that $p_i \leq p'$.

Let $k \geq \left\lfloor (1 + \epsilon_0) \log_q(n) \right\rfloor$. By Lemma 4.1 and the proof of Theorem 4.3 it suffices to prove that

$$\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2^2 = o_{F, \epsilon} (n^{-1}).$$

Decompose $\delta_{x_0} - \pi = \sum_{i > 1} (\delta_{x_0}, u_i) u_i$. Then by Corollary 3.1, for every $\epsilon > 0$.

$$\|A_k (\delta_{x_0} - \pi)\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |(\delta_{x_0}, u_i)|^2 |\lambda(i)|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |(\delta_{x_0}, u_i)|^2 q^{2k(-1/p_i + \epsilon)}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |(\delta_{x_0}, u_i)|^2 n^{2(-1/p_i + \epsilon)(1+\epsilon_0)}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |(\delta_{x_0}, u_i)|^2 n^{2(-1/p_i + \epsilon)} n^{2(-1/p_0 + \epsilon_0)}$$

If we choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ depending only on $p_0$ and $\epsilon_0$ such that for $\epsilon_2 > 0$

$$\leq n^{-\epsilon_1/p_0} \sum_{i=2}^{n} |(\delta_{x_0}, u_i)|^2 n^{-2/p_i}$$

$$\leq \epsilon_2 n^{-\epsilon_1/p_0} n^{-1+\epsilon_2},$$

where we used Lemma 6.2 and the local Sarnak-Xue condition. Choosing $\epsilon_2 > 0$ small enough we get the desired result. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 6.4. Assume that $F$ is a family of graphs satisfying the Sarnak-Xue density with parameter $A = 1$. Then we may choose for each graph $X \in F$ a subset $Y \subset X$ of the vertices with $|Y| \geq |X| \left(1-o(1)\right)$ such that for every $x_0 \in Y$ the local Sarnak-Xue property with parameter $A = 1$ is satisfied at $x_0$.

Proof. Since $P(X, k) = \sum P(X, k, x_0)$, if the Sarnak-Xue density property (or equivalently, the weak injective radius property) with parameter $A = 1$ holds then the local Sarnak-Xue density holds on average over all the vertices $x_0$. More precisely, for every $\epsilon_0 > 0$, if we choose $\epsilon = \epsilon_0/2$ in the Sarnak-Xue injective radius property, the number of $x_0 \in X$ satisfying $P \left(X, 2 \left[\log_q(n)\right], x_0\right) > n^{1+\epsilon_0/2}$ is at most $C_{\epsilon_0} n^{1-\epsilon_0/2}$, $C_{\epsilon_0}$ some constant.
Now, for each \(k = 1, 2, \ldots\) let \(\epsilon_k = 1/k\). Let \(N_k\) be large enough so that \(C_{\epsilon_k} N_k^{1-\epsilon_k/2} = o(N_k)\). Now for each \(X\) choose \(k\) maximal such that \(n = |X| > N_k\). Let \(Y \subset X\) be the set of vertices \(x_0 \in X\) such that \(P(X, 2 \lfloor \log_q(n) \rfloor, x_0) \leq n^{1+\epsilon_k}\). By construction \(|Y| \geq |X|(1 - o(1))\).

We show that the local Sarnak-Xue density holds: for every \(\epsilon > 0\) let \(k\) be such that \(\epsilon_k < 2\epsilon\). Then for \(|X| > N_k\), for \(x_0 \in Y\), \(P(X, 2 \lfloor \log_q(n) \rfloor, x_0) \leq n^{1+\epsilon_k/2} \leq n^{1+\epsilon}\). Since there is a finite number of graphs \(X \in \mathcal{F}\) with \(|X| < N_k\) we are done. \(\Box\)

We can now prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.** The proof follows from the combination of Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.3. \(\Box\)

Finally, we prove the following lemma, needed in the proof of Theorem 1.8.

**Lemma 6.5.** If \(X\) is a Cayley graph which satisfies the Sarnak-Xue weak injective radius property with parameter \(A\), then for every \(x_0, y_0 \in X\) and \(k < 2A \log_q n\), we have for every \(\epsilon > 0\)

\[
P(X, k, x_0, y_0) = \ll_{\epsilon, \mathcal{F}} n^{\epsilon} q^{k/2},
\]

where \(P(X, k, x_0, y_0)\) is the number of non-backtracking paths from \(x_0\) to \(y_0\).

**Proof.** It holds that

\[
P(X, k, x_0, y_0) \leq (q + 1)^2 q^{k-2} \langle A_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \delta_{x_0}, A_{\lceil k/2 \rceil} \delta_{x_0} \rangle,
\]

since the right hand side counts more paths than just non-backtracking paths between \(x_0\) and \(y_0\). Therefore by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

\[
P(X, k, x_0, y_0) \ll q^k \| A_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \delta_{x_0} \|_2 \| A_{\lceil k/2 \rceil} \delta_{x_0} \|_2.
\]

Since \(X\) is a Cayley graph, both \(x_0\) and \(y_0\) have local Sarnak-Xue property with parameter \(A\), which means that if for every \(k \leq 2A \log_q(n)\) and \(\epsilon > 0\) it holds that

\[
P(X, k, x_0) = P(X, k, y_0) = \ll_{\mathcal{F}, \epsilon} n^{\epsilon} q^{k/2}.
\]

As in Lemma 6.2, this is equivalent to the fact that for every \(\epsilon > 0\)

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle|^2 n^{A(1-2/p_i)} = \ll_{\mathcal{F}, \epsilon} n^{\epsilon}.
\]
Therefore for $k \leq 2A \log_q(n)$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$
\|A_{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \delta_{x_0}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left| \chi_i^{(\lfloor k/2 \rfloor)} \right|^2 \|\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle\|^2
\ll \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^{-k/p_i} \|\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle\|^2
\ll q^{-k/2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^{k/2 - k/p_i} \|\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle\|^2
\ll q^{-k/2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^{A(1 - 2/p_i)} \|\langle \delta_{x_0}, u_i \rangle\|^2
\ll \epsilon q^{-k/2} n^\epsilon.
$$

Inserting this and the similar claim for $\lceil k/2 \rceil$ into Equation 6.2 we have for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$
P(X, k, x_0, y_0) \ll \epsilon n^\epsilon q^{k/2},
$$
as needed.

\[ \square \]

### 7 Benjamini-Schramm Convergence

Our goal in this section is to state the following theorem, which follows from [1] and [2].

**Theorem 7.1.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of $(q + 1)$-regular graphs with the number of vertices growing to infinity. The following are equivalent, and if they hold we say that the sequence of graphs Benjamini-Schramm converges to the $(q + 1)$-regular tree:

1. For every $k > 0$, as $n \to \infty$

   $$
   \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{P(X, k)}{n} \to 0.
   $$

2. For every $k > 0$

   $$
P(X, k)/n \ll_{\epsilon, k} n^\epsilon q^{k/2}.
   $$

3. For every $\epsilon > 0$,

   $$
   \# \{ \lambda \in \text{spec}A : |\lambda| > (1 + \epsilon) 2\sqrt{q} \} / n \to 0.
   $$

4. The spectral measure of $A$ converges to the spectral measure of the tree.

**Proof.** The equivalence of (1), (3) and (4) is a consequence of [2, Theorem 5] (the result is slightly more general than [2, Theorem 4], but follows in the same way).

The fact that (2) and (3) are equivalent is proven in the same way as Theorem 1.7, and is a slightly stronger version of [2, Corollary 7].

\[ \square \]
One interesting corollary of the proof of Theorem 1.8 for the context of Benjamini-Schramm convergence is the following:

**Corollary 7.2.** If we have a family Cayley($SL_2(F_t), S_t$), where $t$ is prime, which Benjamini-Schramm converges to the $(q+1)$-regular tree, then the corresponding family of Schreier graphs on $P^1(F_t)$ also Benjamini-Schramm converges to the $(q+1)$-regular tree.
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