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Abstract

Coboundary and cosystolic expansion are notions of expansion that generalize the Cheeger constant or edge expansion of a graph to higher dimensions. The classical Cheeger inequality implies that for graphs edge expansion is equivalent to spectral expansion. In higher dimensions this is not the case: a simplicial complex can be spectrally expanding but not high dimensional edge-expanding.

The phenomenon of high dimensional edge expansion in higher dimensions is much more involved than spectral expansion, and is far from being understood. In particular, the only known bounded degree cosystolic expanders are derived from deep mathematical tools that are far from being elementary!

In this work we study high dimensional complexes which are strongly symmetric. Namely, there is a group that acts transitively on top dimensional cells of the simplicial complex [e.g., for graphs it corresponds to a group that acts transitively on the edges]. Using the strong symmetry, we develop a new machinery to prove high dimensional edge expansion. We then use this machinery to construct a new elementary family of bounded degree two-dimensional cosystolic expanders.

Bounded degree cosystolic expanders play a major role in a recent breakthrough construction of quantum error correcting codes that break the state of the art constructions. Thus, any advancement in their construction, and in particular, an elementary construction of such objects is of a major importance.

1 Introduction

High dimensional expansion is a vibrant emerging field that has found applications to PCPs [DK17] and property testing [KL14], to counting problems and matroids [ALOGV19], to list decoding [DHK+19], and recently to a breakthrough construction of decodeable quantum error correcting codes that outperform the state-of-the art previously known codes [EKZ20]. We refer the reader to [Lub17] for a recent (but already outdated) survey.

The term high dimensional expander means a simplicial complex that have expansion properties that are analogous to expansion in a graph. We recall that a $n$-dimensional simplicial complex $X$ is
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a hypergraph whose maximal hyperedges are of size \( n + 1 \), and which is closed under containment. Namely, for every hyperedge \( \tau \) (called a face) in \( X \), and every \( \eta \subseteq \tau \), it must be that \( \eta \) is also in \( X \). In particular, \( \emptyset \in X \). For example, a graph is a 1-dimensional simplicial complex.

Nevertheless, the question of what is a high dimensional expander is still unclear. There is a spectral definition of high dimensional expanders that generalizes the spectral definition of expander graphs and a geometrical/topological definition that generalizes the notion of edge expansion (or Cheeger constant) of a graph. For a graph the spectral and the geometric definitions of expansion are known to be equivalent (via the celebrated Cheeger inequality) while in high dimensions the spectral and geometric definitions are known to be NOT equivalent (see [GW12, Theorem 4] and [SKM14]).

The aim of this paper is to present elementary constructions of new families of simplicial complexes with high dimensional edge expansion, and in particular, of new elementary bounded degree families of cosystolic expanders (see exact definition below).

In the one dimensional case a random bounded degree family of graphs is expanding both spectrally and topologically (i.e. it has the edge expansion property). In higher dimensions, the phenomenon of expansion is a rare phenomenon that is not abundant as in the one dimensional case. In particular, a random bounded degree family of two dimensional simplicial complexes is not expanding topologically and not expanding spectrally. So, this raises the natural question of how to construct bounded degree families of high dimensional spectrally and topologically expanding families. Namely, if random families are not expanding then how to come up with expanding families, what should they look like?

The question of giving an elementary construction of a family of bounded degree spectrally high dimensional expanders got recently a satisfactory answer. Namely, it was understood that such a family needs to obey a specific local spectral criterion and recently, [KO18] have found methods to materialize this criterion and to construct elementary families of high dimensional spectrally expanding families (prior non-elementary constructions were known).

However, prior to our work, for the high dimensional topological expanding case, there was no elementary construction of bounded degree topological (cosystolic) expanders. The only known construction of that were known were in the flavor of Ramanujan complexes and were based on very deep mathematical tools.

As we have discussed, bounded degree families of two dimensional cosystolic expanders play a major role in a recent breakthrough construction of quantum error correcting codes. Thus, an elementary construction of such families is highly desired, and this is what we are going to construct in this work!

Let us recall the geometric notion of expansion in graphs known as the edge expansion or Cheeger constant of a graph:

**Definition 1.1** (Cheeger constant of a graph). For a graph \( X = (V, E) \):

\[
h(X) := \min_{A \neq \emptyset, V} \frac{|E(A, \bar{A})|}{\min\{w(A), w(\bar{A})\}}.
\]

where for a set of vertices \( U \subseteq V \), \( w(U) \) denotes is the sum of the degrees of the vertices in \( U \).

The generalization of the Cheeger constant to higher dimensions originated in the works of Linial, Meshulam and Wallach ([LM06], [MW09]) and independently in the work of Gromov ([Gro10]) and is now known as coboundary expansion (the exact definition is given below). Later,
a weaker variant of high dimensional edge expansion known as cosystolic expansion arose in order to answer questions regarding topological overlapping. Currently, there are very few explicitly known families of coboundary or cosystolic expanders. There are two known criteria for coboundary/cosystolic expansion:

1. In [LMM16] (elaborating on the ideas of Gromov in [Gro10]), Lubotzky, Meshulam and Mozes gave a criterion for coboundary expansion for “building-like” simplicial complexes.

2. In [EK16], Evra and the first named author gave a criterion for cosystolic expansion based on spectral expansion and local coboundary expansion (coboundary expansion of the links). Below, we generalize the methods of [LMM16] to give a new machinery for proving coboundary expansion for strongly symmetric simplicial complexes and in particular for a special type of strongly symmetric complexes known as coset complexes. We then use our new machinery to construct new explicit families of two-dimensional coboundary expanders and then (using the criterion of [EK16]) we also construct new families of bounded degree two-dimensional cosystolic expanders.

1.1 The coboundary/cosystolic expansion and high order Cheeger constants

Let $X$ be an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. A simplicial complex $X$ is called pure if every face in $X$ is contained in some face of size $n+1$. The set of all $k$-faces of $X$ is denoted $X(k)$, and we will be using the convention in which $X(-1) = \{\emptyset\}$.

In order to define coboundary and cosystolic expansion, we also need the following terminology:

1. The space of $k$-cochains denoted $C^k(X) = C^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is the $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space of functions from $X(k)$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$.

2. The coboundary map $d_k : C^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) \rightarrow C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is defined as:

$$d_k(\phi)(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma, \lvert \tau \rvert = \lvert \sigma \rvert - 1} \phi(\tau),$$

3. The spaces of $k$-coboundaries and $k$-cocycles are subspaces of $C^k(X)$ defined as:

$B^k(X) = B^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Image}(d_{k-1}) = \text{the space of } k\text{-coboundaries}.$

$Z^k(X) = Z^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Ker}(d_k) = \text{the space of } k\text{-cocycles}.$

4. The function $w : \bigcup_{k=-1}^n X(k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as

$$\forall \tau \in X(k), w(\tau) = \frac{\lvert \{\sigma \in X(n) : \tau \subseteq \sigma\} \rvert}{\binom{n+1}{k+1} \lvert X(n) \rvert}.$$ We note that $\sum_{\tau \in X(k)} w(\tau) = 1.$

5. For every $\phi \in C^k(X)$, $w(\phi)$ is defined as

$$w(\phi) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{supp}(\phi)} w(\tau).$$
6. For every $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, define the following $k$-expansion constants:

$$\text{Exp}^k_b(X) = \min \left\{ \frac{w(d_k \phi)}{\min_{\psi \in B^k(X)} w(\phi + \psi)} : \phi \in C^k(X) \setminus B^k(X) \right\},$$

$$\text{Sys}^k(X) = \min \left\{ w(\psi) : \psi \in Z^k(X) \setminus B^k(X) \right\},$$

and

$$\text{Exp}^k_z(X) = \min \left\{ \frac{w(d_k \phi)}{\min_{\psi \in Z^k(X)} w(\phi + \psi)} : \phi \in C^k(X) \setminus Z^k(X) \right\}.$$

After these notations, we can define coboundary/cosystolic expansion:

**Definition 1.2** (Coboundary expansion). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant. We say that $X$ is an $\varepsilon$-coboundary expander if for every $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, $\text{Exp}^k_b(X) \geq \varepsilon$. A family of complexes

**Remark 1.3.** We leave it for the reader to verify that in the case where $X$ is a graph, i.e., the case where $n = 1$, $\text{Exp}^0_b(X)$ is exactly the Cheeger constant of $X$. Thus, we think of $\text{Exp}^k_b(X)$ as the $k$-dimensional Cheeger constant of $X$.

**Definition 1.4** (Cosystolic expansion). Let $\varepsilon > 0, \mu > 0$ be constants and $X$ an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex $X$. We say that $X$ is a $(\varepsilon, \mu)$-cosystolic expander if for every $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, $\text{Exp}^k_z(X) \geq \varepsilon$ and $\text{Sys}^k(X) \geq \mu$.

**Remark 1.5.** We note that if $\text{Exp}^k_b(X) > 0$, then it can be shown that $B^k(X) = Z^k(X)$ and thus $\text{Exp}^k_b(X) = \text{Exp}^k_z(X)$. However, there are examples of simplicial complexes with $\text{Exp}^k_b(X) = 0$ and $\text{Exp}^k_z(X) > 0, \text{Sys}^k(X) > 0$.

**Remark 1.6.** The motivation behind the definition of cosystolic expansion as a weaker variant of coboundary expansion is that it was shown that implies the topological overlapping property (see Definition 8.2 below).

### 1.2 New two-dimensional bounded degree cosystolic expanders

A family of $n$-dimensional simplicial complexes $\{Y^{(s)}\}_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of bounded degree cosystolic expanders if:

- The number of vertices of $Y^{(s)}$ tends to infinity with $s$.
- There are universal constants $\varepsilon > 0, \mu > 0$ such that for every $s$, $X^{(s)}$ is a $(\varepsilon, \mu)$-cosystolic expander.
- There is a universal constant $L$ such for every $s$ every vertex in $X^{(s)}$ is contained in at most $L$ $n$-dimensional simplices.

The original motivation of finding such a family was answering a question of Gromov asking if there is a family of bounded degree topological expanders. As said before, recent growing interest in two dimensional bounded degree cosystolic expanders is related to their importance for constructing the best known quantum error correcting codes [EKZ20]. The first known bounded degree two-dimensional cosystolic expanders were given in [KKL16] using Ramanujan complexes. This was
later generalized to all dimensions by [EK16] and the construction given there also used Ramanujan complexes (or in fact quotients of affine buildings).

The drawback of the constructions of [KKL16] and [EK16] is that they require the deep theory of buildings. We note that the same issue arose regarding spectral expansion: the first known constructions of bounded degree high dimensional spectral expanders relied heavily on the theory of buildings, until in [KO18], the authors gave an elementary construction of bounded degree spectral expanders. Below, we show that we can use the same construction as in [KO18] to give an elementary construction of a family of two-dimensional bounded degree cosystolic expanders.

In order to describe our construction we introduce the following key definition of a strongly symmetric complex.

Definition 1.7 (Strongly symmetric complex). A complex $X$ is called strongly symmetric if there is a group that acts simply transitive on its top dimensional faces. E.g., For graphs (one dimensional complexes) we require a group that acts simply transitive on the edges.

We comment here that the well studied Ramanujan complexes which implied previously known bounded degree cosystolic expanders are not strongly symmetric. Namely, they do not obey this strong symmetry requirement.

In the following we introduce a specific structure of complexes that are called coset complexes that are (under certain additional conditions) strongly symmetric.

Definition 1.8 (Coset complex). Given a group $G$ with subgroups $K_{i}$, $i \in I$, where $I$ is a finite set. The coset complex $X = X(G, (K_{i})_{i \in I})$ is a simplicial complex defined as follows:

1. The vertex set of $X$ is composed of disjoint sets $S_{i} = \{gK_{i} : g \in G\}$.

2. For two vertices $gK_{i}, g'K_{j}$ where $i, j \in I, g, g' \in G$, \{$gK_{i}, g'K_{j}$\} \in $X(1)$ if $i \neq j$ and $gK_{i} \cap g'K_{j} \neq \emptyset$.

3. The simplicial complex $X$ is the clique complex spanned by the 1-skeleton defined above, i.e., \{$g_{0}K_{i_{0}}, ..., g_{k}K_{i_{k}}$\} \in $X(k)$ if for every $0 \leq j, j' \leq k$, $g_{j}K_{i_{j}} \cap g_{j'}K_{i_{j'}} \neq \emptyset$.

The construction of bounded degree family of cosystolic expanders. In [KO18], we used coset complexes to construct $n$-dimensional spectral expanders. Below, we only describe the construction for $n = 3$: Fix $s \in \mathbb{N}, s > 4$ and $q$ be a prime power. Denote $G^{(s)}(q)$ to be the group of $4 \times 4$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}_{q}[t]/(t^{s})$ generated by the set

$$\{e_{1,2}(a + bt), e_{2,3}(a + bt), e_{3,4}(a + bt), e_{4,1}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\}.$$  

For $0 \leq i \leq 2$, define $H_{\{i\}}$ to be the subgroup of $G^{(s)}$ generated by

$$\{e_{j,j+1}(a + bt), e_{4,1}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}, 1 \leq j \leq 3, j \neq i + 1\}$$

and define $H_{\{3\}}$ to be the subgroup of $G^{(s)}$ generated by

$$\{e_{1,2}(a + bt), e_{2,3}(a + bt), e_{3,4}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\}.$$ 

Denote $X^{(s)} = X(G^{(s)}, (H_{\{i\}})_{i \in \{0, ..., 3\}})$ to be the coset complex as defined above. Using this construction, we prove the following:
Theorem 1.9 (First Main Theorem - elementary two dimensional bounded degree cosystolic expanders). Let \( s \in \mathbb{N}, s > 4 \) and \( q \) be a prime power and let \( G^{(s)}(q), H_{(0)}, ..., H_{(3)} \) and \( X^{(s)} = X(G^{(s)}(q), (H_{(i)})_{i \in \{0, ..., 3\}}) \) as above. For every \( s \), let \( Y^{(s)} \) be the 2-skeleton of \( X^{(s)} \), i.e., the 2-dimensional complex \( Y^{(s)} = X^{(s)}(0) \cup X^{(s)}(1) \cup X^{(s)}(2) \). For any sufficiently large odd prime power \( q \), the family \( \{Y^{(s)}\}_{s \in \mathbb{N}, s > 4} \) is a family of bounded degree cosystolic expanders.

The idea behind proving is to us spectral expansion and coboundary expansion of the links. To explain this, we recall the following definition: For every \( -1 \leq i \leq n - 2 \), the one skeleton of \( X_{\tau} \) is a graph and we denote second largest eigenvalue of the random walk on this graph as is \( \lambda_{\tau} \).

Definition 1.10 (Local spectral expansion). A pure \( n \)-dimensional complex \( X \) is a \( \lambda \)-local-spectral expander if for every \( -1 \leq i \leq n - 2 \), and for every \( \tau \in X(i) \), \( \lambda_{\tau} \leq \lambda \).

In [EK16], Shai Evra and the first named author gave a local criterion for cosystolic expansion:

Theorem 1.11. [EK16, Theorem 1] Let \( X \) be an \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex. For every \( \varepsilon' > 0 \), there is \( \lambda > 0 \) such that if all the links of \( X \) are coboundary expanders with \( \text{Exp}_k^{X} \geq \varepsilon' \) and \( X \) is a \( \lambda \)-local spectral expander, then there are \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\varepsilon', \lambda) > 0 \) and \( \mu = \mu(\varepsilon', \lambda) > 0 \) such that \((n - 1)\)-skeleton of \( X \) is a \((\varepsilon, \mu)\)-cosystolic expander.

Regarding our construction, we already showed in [KO18] that given \( G^{(s)} = G^{(s)}(q), H_{(0)}, ..., H_{(3)} \) and \( X^{(s)} = X(G^{(s)}, (H_{(i)})_{i \in \{0, ..., 3\}}) \) as above, \( X^{(s)} \) is a bounded degree simplicial complex (where the degree depends only on \( q \) and not on \( s \)) and that it is a \( \sqrt{q - 3} \)-local spectral expander for every \( s > 4 \). Thus, to prove Theorem 1.9 using Theorem 1.11 it remains to show that the links of \( X^{(s)} \) are coboundary expanders and the expansion does not depend on \( q \).

Since the links of \( X^{(s)} \) are strongly symmetric coset complexes, this leads us to discussing coboundary expansion for such complexes.

1.3 Coboundary expansion for strongly symmetric simplicial complexes

As noted above, unlike the case of graphs, in simplicial complexes a high dimensional version of Cheeger inequality does not hold. Thus, there is a need to develop machinery in order to prove coboundary expansion that does not rely on spectral arguments. For graphs such machinery is available, under the assumptions that the graph has a large symmetry group. A discussion regarding the Cheeger constant of symmetric graphs appear in [Chu97, Section 7.2] and in particular, the following Theorem is proven there:

Theorem 1.12. [Chu97, Theorem 7.1] Let \( X \) be a finite connected graph such that there is a group \( G \) acting transitively on the edges of \( X \). Denote \( h(X) \) to be the Cheeger constant of \( X \) and \( D \) to be the diameter of \( X \). Then \( h(X) \geq \frac{1}{2D} \).

Remark 1.13. Note that the inequality stated in the Theorem does not hold without the assumption of symmetry. For instance, let \( X_{N} \) be the graph that is the ball of radius \( N \) in the 3-regular infinite tree. Then the diameter of \( X \) is \( 2N + 1 \) and \( h(X_{N}) \) is of order \( O(\frac{1}{2^{N}}) \).

In this paper, using the ideas of [LMM16], we prove a generalization of Theorem 1.12 to the setting of strongly symmetric simplicial complexes and coset complexes. This is done in several steps: First, we prove a bound on the coboundary expansion of the complex for symmetric complexes that is based on a high dimensional generalization of the diameter (or more precisely of the
radius) of the complex. Second, we show how the high dimensional analogue of the radius could be bounded using filling constants of the complex. Third, we show that for coset complexes, these (first two) filling constants can be bounded using the presentation of the group from which the complex arose and thus one can show coboundary expansion for coset complexes via the presentation of the symmetry group.

We apply all this machinery on the two-dimensional links of our complexes $X^{(s)} = X(G^{(s)}(q), (K_{i})_{i \in \{0, 1, 2\}})$ described above to prove that they have coboundary expansion independent of $q$. Following [KO18], all the 2-dimensional links are isomorphic and can be described explicitly as coset complexes in the following way.

**The construction of the new family of coboundary expanders.** Denote the group $G$ to be a subgroup of $4 \times 4$ invertible matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ in generated by the set $\{e_{i,i+1}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q, 1 \leq i \leq 4\}$. More explicitly, an $4 \times 4$ matrix $A$ is in $G$ if and only if

$$A(i,j) = \begin{cases} 
1 & i = j \\
0 & i > j \\
a_0 + a_1t + ... + a_{j-i}t^{j-i} & i < j, a_0, ..., a_{j-i} \in \mathbb{F}_q 
\end{cases},$$

(observe that all the matrices in $G$ are upper triangular).

For $0 \leq i \leq 3$, define a subgroup $K_{i} < G$ as

$$K_{i} = \langle e_{j,j+1}(a + bt) : j \in \{1, ..., 4\} \setminus \{i + 1\}, a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q \rangle.$$

Define $X$ to be the coset complex $X = X(G, (K_{i})_{i \in \{0, ..., 2\}})$, then all the 2-dimensional links of $X^{(s)}$ are isomorphic to $X$.

**Theorem 1.14.** [KO20, Theorems 2.4, 3.5] The complex $X$ above is strongly symmetric.

We apply our machinery for proving coboundary expansion for strongly symmetric coset complexes on $X$ and prove the following:

**Theorem 1.15** (Second Main Theorem - new explicit two dimensional coboundary expanders). For every odd prime power $q$, $X$ is a coboundary expander and $\text{Exp}_0(X), \text{Exp}_1(X)$ are bounded from below by a constant that is independent of $q$.

As noted above, combining this Theorem with Theorem 1.11 proves Theorem 1.9. We also note that this Theorem is of independent interest since there are not many known examples of coboundary expanders.

### 1.4 Organization of the paper

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review the basic definitions and notations regarding (co)homology that we will use throughout the paper. In Section 3, we prove that for symmetric simplicial complexes, the cone radius can be used to bound the coboundary expansion. In Section 4, we define filling constants of a simplicial complex and show that filling constants of the complex can be used to bound the cone radius. In Section 5, we review the idea of coset complexes and show that our assumption of strong symmetry combined with some extra assumptions on our complex imply that it is a coset complex. In Section 6, we deduce a bound on the first two filling
constants for a coset complex in terms of algebraic properties of the presentation of the group and subgroups from which it arises. In Section 7, we give new examples of coboundaries expanders arising from coset complexes of unipotent groups. In Section 8, we give new examples of bounded degree cosystolic and topological expanders. Last, in Appendix A we show that the existence of a cone function is equivalent to the vanishing of (co)homology.
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2 Homological and Cohomological definitions and notations

The aim of this section is to recall a few basic definitions regarding homology and cohomology of simplicial complexes that we will need below.

Let $X$ be an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. A simplicial complex $X$ is called pure if every face in $X$ is contained in some face of size $n + 1$. The set of all $k$-faces of $X$ is denoted $X(k)$, and we will be using the convention in which $X(-1) = \{\emptyset\}$.

We denote by $C_k(X) = C_k(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ the $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space with basis $X(k)$ (or equivalently, the $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space of subsets of $X(k)$), and $C^k(X) = C^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ the $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space of functions from $X(k)$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$.

The boundary map $\partial_k : C_k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) \to C_{k-1}(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is:

$$\partial_k(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma, |\tau| = |\sigma| - 1} \tau,$$

where $\sigma \in X(k)$, and the coboundary map $d_k : C^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) \to C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is:

$$d_k(\phi)(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma, |\tau| = |\sigma| - 1} \phi(\tau),$$

where $\phi \in C^k$ and $\sigma \in X(k+1)$.

For $A \in C_k(X)$ and $\phi \in C^k(X)$, we denote

$$\phi(A) = \sum_{\tau \in A} \phi(\tau),$$

Thus, for $\phi \in C^k(X)$ and $A \in C_{k+1}(X)$

$$(d_k \phi)(A) = \phi(\partial_{k+1} A)$$

We sometimes refer to $k$-chains as subsets of $X(k)$, e.g., the 0-chain $\{u\} + \{v\}$ will be sometimes referred to as the set $\{\{u\}, \{v\}\}$. For $A \in C_k(X)$, we denote $|A|$ to be the size of $A$ as a set.

Well known and easily calculated equations are:

$$\partial_k \circ \partial_{k+1} = 0 \text{ and } d_{k+1} \circ d_k = 0$$  \hfill (1)

Thus, if we denote: $B_k(X) = B_k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Image}(\partial_{k+1})$ = the space of $k$-boundaries.
$Z_k(X) = Z_k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Ker}(\partial_{k+1})$ is the space of $k$-cycles.

$B^k(X) = B^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Image}(d_{k-1})$ is the space of $k$-coboundaries.

$Z^k(X) = Z^k(X, \mathbb{F}_2) = \text{Ker}(d_k)$ is the space of $k$-cocycles.

We get from (1)

$$B_k(X) \subseteq Z_k(X) \subseteq C_k(X) \text{ and } B^k(X) \subseteq Z^k(X) \subseteq C^k(X).$$

Define the quotient spaces $\tilde{H}_k(X) = Z_k(X)/B_k(X)$ and $\tilde{H}^k(X) = Z^k(X)/B^k(X)$, the $k$-homology and the $k$-cohomology groups of $X$ (with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_2$).

## 3 Cone radius as a bound on coboundary expansion

Below, we define a generalized notion of diameter (or more precisely radius) of a simplicial complex. We will later show that in symmetric simplicial complexes a bound on this radius yields a bound on the coboundary expansion of the complex.

**Definition 3.1** (Cone function). Let $X$ be a pure $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. Let $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$ be a constant and $v$ be a vertex of $X$. A $k$-cone function with apex $v$ is a linear function $\text{Cone}_k^v : \bigoplus_{j=1}^k C_j(X) \to \bigoplus_{j=1}^k C_{j+1}(X)$ defined inductively as follows:

1. For $k = -1$, $\text{Cone}_{-1}^v(\emptyset) = \{v\}$.

2. For $k \geq 0$, $\text{Cone}_k^v \mid \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k-1} C_j(X)$ is a $(k-1)$-cone function with an apex $v$ and for every $A \in C_k(X)$, $\text{Cone}_k^v(A) \in C^{k+1}(X)$ is a $(k+1)$-chain that fulfills the equation

$$\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(A) = A + \text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_k A).$$

**Observation 3.2.** By linearity, the condition that

$$\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(A) = A + \text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_k A), \forall A \in C^k(X)$$

is equivalent to the condition:

$$\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau) = \tau + \text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_k \tau), \forall \tau \in X(k).$$

**Remark 3.3.** We note that by linearity, a $k$-cone function is needs only to be defined on $k$-simplices, but it gives us homological fillings for every $k$-cycle in $X$: for every $A \in Z_k(X)$,

$$\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(A) = A + \text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_k A) = A + \text{Cone}_k^v(0) = A,$$

i.e., $\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(A) = A$. This might be computationally beneficial for other needs (apart from the results of this paper), since usually there are exponentially more $k$-cycles than $k$-simplices.

**Example 3.4** (0-cone example). Let $X$ be an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. Fix some vertex $v$ in $X$. By definition, for every $\{u\} \in X(0)$, $\text{Cone}_0^v(\{u\})$ is a 1-chain such that $\partial_0 \text{Cone}_0^v(\{u\}) = \{u\} + \{v\}$.

If the 1-skeleton of $X$ is connected, we can define $\text{Cone}_0^v(\{u\})$ to be a 1-chain that consists of a sum of edges that form a path between $\{u\}$ and $\{v\}$. If the 1-skeleton of $X$ is not connected, a 0-cone function does not exist: for $\{u\} \in X(0)$ that is not in the connected component of $\{v\}$, $\text{Cone}_0^v(\{u\})$ cannot be defined. Assuming that the 1-skeleton of $X$ is connected, we note that the construction of $\text{Cone}_0^v$ is usually not unique: different choices of paths between $\{u\}$ and $\{v\}$ give different 0-cone functions.
Example 3.5 (1-cone example). Let \( X \) be an \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex. Assume that the 1-skeleton of \( X \) is connected and define a 0-cone function as in the example above and define \( \text{Cone}^0_v \) on \( C_0(X) \) as that 0-cone function. We note that for every \( \{u, w\} \in X(1) \), \( \{u, w\} + \text{Cone}^0_v(\{u\}) + \text{Cone}^0_v(\{w\}) \) forms a closed path, i.e., a 1-cycle, in \( X \). If \( H_1(X) = 0 \), we can deduce that \( \{u, w\} + \text{Cone}_k^1(\{u\}) + \text{Cone}_k^1(\{w\}) \) is a boundary. Therefore, for every \( \{u, w\} \in X(1) \), we can choose \( \text{Cone}_k^1(\{u, w\}) \in X(2) \) such that

\[
\partial_2 \text{Cone}_k^1 = \{u, w\} + \text{Cone}_k^1(\{u\}) + \text{Cone}_k^1(\{w\}).
\]

Definition 3.6 (Cone radius). Let \( X \) be an \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex, \(-1 \leq k \leq n-1\) and \( v \) a vertex of \( X \). Given a \( k \)-cone function \( \text{Cone}^v_k \) define the volume of \( \text{Cone}^v_k \) as

\[
\text{Vol}(\text{Cone}^v_k) = \max_{\tau \in X^{(k)}} |\text{Cone}^v_k(\tau)|.
\]

Define the \( k \)-th cone radius of \( X \) to be

\[
\text{Crad}_k(X) = \min \{ \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}^v_k) : \{v\} \in X(0), \text{Cone}^v_k \text{ is a } k\text{-cone function} \}.
\]

If \( k \)-cone functions do not exist, we define \( \text{Crad}(X) = \infty \).

Remark 3.7. The reason for the name “cone radius” is that in the case where \( k = 0 \), \( \text{Crad}_0(X) \) is exactly the (graph) radius of the 1-skeleton of \( X \). Indeed, for \( k = 0 \), choose \( \{v\} \in X(0) \) such that for every \( \{v'\} \in X(0) \),

\[
\max_{\{u\} \in X(0)} \text{dist}(v, u) \leq \max_{\{u\} \in X(0)} \text{dist}(v', u),
\]

where \( \text{dist} \) denotes the path distance. For such a \( \{v\} \in X(0) \), define \( \text{Cone}^v_0(\{u\}) \) to be the edges of a shortest path between \( v \) and \( u \). By our choice of \( v \), it follows that \( \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}^v_0) \) is the radius of the one-skeleton of \( X \) and we leave it to the reader to verify that this choice gives \( \text{Crad}_0(X) = \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}^v_0) \).

The main result of this section is that in a symmetric simplicial complex \( X \), the \( k \)-th cone radius gives a lower bound on \( \text{Exp}_k(X) \):

Theorem 3.8. Let \( X \) be a pure finite \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex. Assume that there is a group \( G \) of automorphisms of \( X \) acting transitively on \( X(n) \). For every \( 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \), if \( \text{Crad}_k(X) < \infty \), then \( \text{Exp}_k(X) \geq \frac{1}{(k+1) \text{Crad}_k(X)} \).

Theorem 3.8 stated above generalizes a result of Lubotzky, Meshulam and Mozes [LMM16] in which coboundary expansion was proven for symmetric simplicial complexes given that they are “building-like”, i.e., that they have have sub-complexes that behave (in some sense) as apartments in a Bruhat-Tits building.

We note that the notion of a cone function is already evident in Gromov’s original work [Gro10]. Gromov considered what he called “random cones”, which was a probability over a family of cone functions and show that the expectancy of the occurrence of a simplex in the support of this family bounds \( \text{Exp}_k(X) \) (see also the work of Kozlov and Meshulam [KM18, Theorem 2.5]). Using Gromov’s terminology, in the proof of the Theorem above, we show that under the assumption of symmetry a single cone function yields a family of random cones and the needed expectancy is bounded by the cone radius. In the sake of completeness, we will not prove the Theorem without using Gromov’s results.

In order to prove Theorem 3.8 we will need some additional lemmas.
Lemma 3.9. For $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and a $k$-cone function $\text{Cone}_k^v$ with apex $v$. Define the contraction operator $\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}$,

$$\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v} : \bigoplus_{j=-1}^k C^{j+1}(X) \to \bigoplus_{j=-1}^k C^j(X)$$

as follows: for $\phi \in C^{j+1}(X)$ and $A \in C_j(X)$, we define

$$(\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}\phi)(A) = \phi(\text{Cone}_k^v(A)).$$

Then for every $\phi \in C^k(X)$,

$$\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}d_k\phi = \phi + d_{k-1}\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}\phi.$$

Proof. Let $A \in C_k(X)$, then

$$\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}d_k\phi(A) = (d_k\phi)(\text{Cone}_k^v(A))$$

$$= \phi(\partial_{k+1}(\text{Cone}_k^v(A)))$$

$$= \phi(A + (\text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_k A)))$$

$$= \phi(A) + (\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}\phi)(\partial_k A)$$

$$= \phi(A) + (d_{k-1}\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}\phi)(A),$$

as needed. \qed

Naively, it might seem that this Lemma gives a direct approach towards bounding the coboundary expansion: if one could find is some constant $C = C(n, k, \text{Crad}_k(X))$ such that $w(\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}d_k\phi) \leq Cw(d_k\phi)$, then for every $\phi$,

$$\frac{w(d_k\phi)}{\min_{\psi \in B_k(X)} w(\phi + \psi)} \geq \frac{1}{C} \frac{w(\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}d_k\phi)}{w(\phi + d_{k-1}\iota_{\text{Cone}_k^v}\phi)} = \frac{1}{C}.$$ 

However, by Remark 1.13, we note that without symmetry, the existence of a $k$-cone function cannot give an effective bound on the coboundary expansion.

Our proof strategy below is to improve on this naive idea by using the symmetry of $X$: we will show that for a group $G$ that acts on $X$, the group $G$ also acts on $k$-cone functions and we will denote this action by $\rho$. We then show that when $G$ acts transitively on $X(n)$, we can average the action on the $k$-cone function that realizes the cone radius and deduce that

$$\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} w(\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v d_k\phi) \leq \binom{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crad}_k(X)w(d_k\phi).$$

Thus, using an averaged version of the naive argument above will get a bound on the coboundary expansion.

We start by defining an action on $k$-cone functions. Assume that $G$ is a group acting simplicially on $X$. For every $g \in G$ and every $k$-cone function $\text{Cone}_k^v$ define

$$(\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v)(A) = g.(\text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.A)), \forall A \in \bigoplus_{j=-1}^k C_j(X).$$
Lemma 3.10. For $g \in G$, $-1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and a $k$-cone function $\text{Cone}_k^v$ with apex $v$, $\rho(g)$. $\text{Cone}_k^v$ is a $k$-cone function with apex $g.v$ and $\text{Vol}(g.\text{Cone}_k^v) = \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_k^v)$. Moreover, $\rho$ defines an action of $G$ on the set of $k$-cone functions.

Proof. If we show that $g.\text{Cone}_k^v$ is a $k$-cone function the fact that $\text{Vol}(g.\text{Cone}_k^v) = \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_k^v)$ will follow directly from the fact that $G$ acts simplicially.

The proof that $\rho(g)$. $\text{Cone}_k^v$ is a $k$-cone function is by induction on $k$. For $k = -1$,

$$ (\rho(g).\text{Cone}_{-1}^v)(\emptyset) = g.\text{Cone}_{-1}^v(g^{-1}.\emptyset) = g.\text{Cone}_{-1}(\emptyset) = g.\{v\} = \{g.v\}, $$

then $\rho(g).\text{Cone}_{-1}^v$ is a $(-1)$-cone function with an apex $g.v$.

Assume the assertion of the lemma holds for $k - 1$. Thus, $\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v\bigcap_{j=1}^{k} \text{C}j(X)$ is a $(k-1)$-cone function with an apex $g.v$ and, by Observation 3.2, we are left to check that for every $\tau \in X(k)$,

$$ \partial + 1(\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v)(\tau) = \tau + g.\text{Cone}_k^v(\partial \tau). $$

Note that the $G$ acts simplicially on $X$ and thus the action of $G$ commutes with the $\partial$ operator. Therefore, for every $\tau \in X(k)$,

$$ \partial + 1(\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v)(\tau) = \partial + 1(g.(\text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.\tau))) $$

$$ = g. (\partial + 1 \text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.\tau)) $$

$$ = \tau + g.\text{Cone}_k^v(\partial \tau) $$

$$ = \tau + \rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v(\partial \tau). $$

The fact that $\rho$ is an action is straight-forward and left for the reader. 

Applying our proof strategy above, will lead us to consider the constant $\theta(\eta)$ defined in the Lemma below.

Lemma 3.11. Assume that $G$ is a group acting simplicially on $X$ and that this action is transitive on $n$-simplices. Let $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and assume that $\text{Crad}_k(X) < \infty$. Fix $\text{Cone}_k^v$ to be a $k$-cone function such that $\text{Crad}_k(X) = \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_k^v)$. For every $\eta \in X(k + 1)$, denote

$$ \theta(\eta) = \frac{1}{w(\eta)|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \sum \{w(\tau) : \tau \in X(k), \eta \in (\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v)(\tau)\}. $$

Then for every $\eta \in X(k + 1)$, $\theta(\eta) \leq (\frac{n+1}{k+1}) \text{Crad}_k(X)$.

Proof. Fix some $\eta \in X(k + 1)$. First, we note that $G$ acts transitively on $X(n)$ and therefore $\bigcup_{g \in G} \{g.\sigma : \sigma \in X(n), \eta \subseteq \sigma\} = X(n)$. This yields that

$$ |X(n)| \leq \frac{|G|}{|G_\eta|} |\{\sigma \in X(n) : \eta \subseteq \sigma\}|, $$

and therefore $|G_\eta| \leq |G|^{\frac{n+1}{k+1}} w(\eta)$.

Second, we note that for every $g \in G$, and every $\eta \in X(k + 1)$,

$$ \eta \in (\rho(g).\text{Cone}_k^v)(\tau) \Leftrightarrow \eta \in g.(\text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.\tau)) $$

$$ \Leftrightarrow g^{-1}.\eta \in \text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.\tau). $$
Thus,

\[
\theta(\eta) = \frac{1}{w(\eta)|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \sum \{ w(\tau) : \tau \in X(k), \eta \in (\rho(g). \text{Cone}_k^v)(\tau) \}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{w(\eta)|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \sum \{ w(g^{-1}.\tau) : \tau \in X(k), g^{-1}.\eta \in \text{Cone}_k^v(g^{-1}.\tau) \}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{w(\eta)|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \sum \{ w(\tau) : \tau \in X(k), g^{-1}.\eta \in \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau) \}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{w(\eta)|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \sum \{ w(\tau) : \tau \in X(k), g^{-1}.\eta \in \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau) \}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{w(\eta)} \sum_{\tau \in X(k)} w(\tau) |\text{Cone}_k^v(\tau)| \frac{|G|}{|G|}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{w(\eta)} \sum_{\tau \in X(k)} w(\tau) \text{Crاد}_k(X) \binom{n+1}{k+1} w(\eta)
\]

\[
= \binom{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crاد}_k(X) \sum_{\tau \in X(k)} w(\tau) = \binom{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crاد}_k(X),
\]

as needed.

We turn now to prove Theorem 3.8.

**Proof.** Assume that \( G \) is a group acting simplicially on \( X \) such that the action is transitive on \( X(n) \). Let \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) and assume that \( \text{Crاد}_k(X) < \infty \). For \( \phi \in C^k(X) \), we denote

\[
[\phi] = \{ \phi + \psi : \psi \in B^k(X) \}, \text{ and } w([\phi]) = \min_{\phi' \in [\phi]} w(\phi').
\]

Thus, we need to prove that for every \( \phi \in C^k(X) \),

\[
\frac{1}{\binom{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crاد}_k(X)} w([\phi]) \leq w(d_k\phi),
\]

or equivalently,

\[
|G| w([\phi]) \leq |G| w(d_k\phi) \left( \binom{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crاد}_k(X) \right).
\]

Fix \( \text{Cone}_k^v \) to be a \( k \)-cone function such that \( \text{Crاد}_k(X) = \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_k^v) \). By Lemma 3.10, for every \( g \in G, \rho(g). \text{Cone}_k^v \) is a \( k \)-cone function.
In the notation of Lemma 3.9, for every \( g \in G \), denote \( \iota_g = \iota_{\rho(g), \text{Cone}_k^v} \). By Lemma 3.9 for every \( g \in G \), \( w([\phi]) \leq w(\iota_g d_k \phi) \) and therefore

\[
|G|w([\phi]) \leq \sum_{g \in G} \sum_{\tau \in \text{supp}(\iota_g d_k \phi)} |w(\tau)| = \sum_{g \in G} \sum_{\tau \in X(k), \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau) = 1} |w(\tau)| \leq \sum_{\eta \in \text{supp}(d_k \phi)} \sum_{g \in G} \sum_{\tau \in X(k), \tau \in \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau)} |w(\tau)| = \sum_{\eta \in \text{supp}(d_k \phi)} |G|w(\eta)\theta(\eta) \leq \text{Lemma 3.11} |G|w(d_k \phi) \left( \frac{n+1}{k+1} \text{Crad}_k(X) \right),
\]

as needed. \( \square \)

The converse of Theorem 3.8 is also true, i.e., the existence of a cone function is equivalent to vanishing of (co)homology and thus to coboundary expansion. This fact will not be used in the sequel and thus we give the exact statement and the proof in Appendix A.

4 Bounding the high order radius by the filling constants of the complex

Once we realize that the \( k \)-th cone radius of the complex can be used to bound the generalized Cheeger constant of the complex, we need to find a way to bound the cone radius. In order to do so, we define what we call the “filling constants” of the complex. We will discuss to types of filling constants - homological and homotopical.

In a nutshell, the homological filling constant measure for a given \( G \)-cycle \( B \), how large is a \( k+1 \)-cochain \( A \) that satisfy \( \partial_{k+1} A = B \). The filling constants will be small if \( |A| \) is not much larger than \( |B| \). They will be infinite if there is no \( A \) such that \( \partial_{k+1} A = B \).

In order to give the precise definition, we will need the following notation:

1. For every \( 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \), \( \text{Sys}_k(X) \) denotes the size of the smallest \( k \)-systole in \( X \):

\[
\text{Sys}_k(X) = \min \{|A| : A \in Z_k(X) \setminus B_k(X)\},
\]

(if \( Z_k(X) = B_k(X) \), we define \( \text{Sys}_k(X) = \infty \)).

2. For every \( 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \) and \( B \in Z_k(X) \), we define \( \text{Fill}_k(B) \) as follows: for \( B \in B_k(X) \),

\[
\text{Fill}_k(B) = \min \{|A| : A \in C_{k+1}(X), \partial_{k+1} A = B\},
\]

and for \( B \in Z_k(X) \setminus B_k(X) \), \( \text{Fill}_k(B) = \infty \). Furthermore, for every \( M \in \mathbb{N} \), we define

\[
\text{Fill}_k(M) = \max \{\text{Fill}_k(B) : B \in Z_k(X), |B| \leq M\}.
\]
**Proposition 4.1.** Let $X$ be a pure finite $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. Define the following sequence of constants recursively: $M_{-1} = 1$ and for every $0 \leq k \leq n - 1,$

$$M_k = \text{Fill}_k((k + 1)M_{k-1} + 1).$$

If $\text{Sys}_j(X) > (j + 1)M_{j-1} + 1$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k,$ then $\text{Crad}_k(X) \leq M_k.$

In order to prove this Proposition, we will need the following Lemma:

**Lemma 4.2.** Let $X$ be an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex, $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and $\{v\} \in X(0).$ If $\text{Cone}_{k-1}^v$ is a $(k-1)$-cone function, then for every $\tau \in X(k),$ $\tau + \text{Cone}_{k-1}^v(\partial_k \tau) \in Z_k(X).$

**Proof.** For $k = 0,$ we note that for every $\{u\} \in X(0),$

$$\text{Cone}_{-1}^v(\partial_0 \{u\}) = \text{Cone}_{-1}^v(\emptyset) = \{v\}$$

and thus

$$\partial_0(\{u\} + \text{Cone}_{-1}^v(\partial_0 \{u\})) = \partial_0(\{u\} + \{v\}) = 2\emptyset = 0.

Assume that $k > 0,$ then by the definition of the cone function, for every $\tau \in X(k-1),$

$$\partial_k(\tau + \text{Cone}_{k-1}^v(\partial_k \tau)) = \partial_k \tau + \partial_k \text{Cone}_{k-1}^v(\partial_k \tau)$$

$$= \partial_k \tau + \partial_k \tau + \text{Cone}_{k-1}^v(\partial_{k-1} \partial_k \tau)$$

$$= 2\partial_k \tau + \text{Cone}_{k-1}^v(0)$$

$$= 0.$$

\[\square\]

**Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Let $M_k, 0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ be the constants of Proposition 4.1. Fix $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and assume that for every $0 \leq j \leq k,$ $\text{Sys}_j(X) > (j + 1)M_{j-1} + 1.$ We will show that under these conditions $\text{Crad}_k(X) \leq M_k.$

The proof is by an inductive construction of a $j$-cone function $\text{Cone}_{j}^v$ with volume $\leq M_j$ for every $-1 \leq j \leq k.$ The construction is as follows: fix some $\{v\} \in X(0)$ and define $\text{Cone}_{-1}^v(\emptyset) = \{v\}.$ Then $\text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_{-1}^v) = 1 = M_{-1}$ as needed.

Let $0 \leq j \leq k$ and assume that $\text{Cone}_{j-1}^v$ is defined such that $\text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_{j-1}^v) \leq M_{j-1}.$ We define

$$\text{Cone}_{j}^v(\bigcup_{i = -1}^{j-1} c_i(X)) = \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v$$

and we are left to define $\text{Cone}_{j}^v(\tau)$ for every $\tau \in X(j).$ Fix some $\tau \in X(j).$ By our induction assumption,

$$|\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\partial_j \tau)| \leq$$

$$1 + \sum_{\alpha \in X(j-1), \alpha \subseteq \tau} |\text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\alpha)| \leq$$

$$1 + (j + 1) \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_{j-1}^v) \leq (j + 1)M_{j-1} + 1.$$

We assumed that $\text{Sys}_j(X) > (j + 1)M_{j-1} + 1$ and thus $\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\partial_j \tau) \notin Z_j(X) \setminus B_j(X).$

By Lemma 4.2, for any $\tau \in X(j),$ $\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\partial_j \tau) \in Z_j(X)$ and therefore we deduce that $\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\partial_j \tau) \in B_j(X),$ i.e., there is $A \in C_{j+1}(X)$ such that

$$\partial_{j+1}A = \tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^v(\partial_j \tau).$$
Also, we can choose this \( A \) to be minimal in the sense that for every \( A' \in C_{k+1}(X) \), if \( \partial_{j+1}A' = \tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^{\nu} \partial_j\tau \), then \(|A| \leq |A'|\). For such a minimal \( A \), define \( \text{Cone}_{j}^{\nu}(\tau) = A \). Since we chose \( A \) to be minimal, it follows that
\[
|\text{Cone}_{j}^{\nu}(\tau)| \leq \text{Fill}_{j}(\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^{\nu} \partial_j\tau) \leq \text{Fill}_{j}(\|\tau + \text{Cone}_{j-1}^{\nu} \partial_j\tau\|) \leq \text{Fill}_{j}((j+1)M_{j-1} + 1) = M_j.
\]
Thus, \( \text{Vol}(\text{Cone}_{j}^{\nu}) \leq M_j \) as needed.

Combining Proposition 4.1 with Theorem 3.8, we deduce the following:

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( X \) be a pure finite \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex. Let \( M_k \) be the constants defined in Proposition 4.1. Assume that there is a group \( G \) of automorphisms of \( X \) acting transitively on \( X(n) \). Fix \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \). If \( \text{Sys}_j(X) > (j+1)M_{j-1} + 1 \) for every \( 0 \leq j \leq k \), then \( \text{Exp}_k(X) \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)M_k} \).

A variant of Proposition 4.1 that will be useful for use is working with homotopy fillings instead of homological filling. In order to define these constants, we will need some additional notations. For \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) denote \( D^k \) to be the unit disk in \( \mathbb{R}^k \), i.e.,
\[
D^k = \{ \tau \in \mathbb{R}^k : \|\tau\| \leq 1 \},
\]
where \( \|\cdot\| \) here denotes the Euclidean norm in \( \mathbb{R}^k \). We work with the convention that \( D^0 \) is always a single point. Also denote \( S^k \) to be the unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \), i.e.,
\[
S^k = \{ \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1} : \|\tau\| = 1 \}.
\]
We work with the convention that \( S^{-1} \) is always the empty set. We further denote \( S^k_\Delta \) and \( D^k_\Delta \) to be triangulations of \( S^k \) and \( D^k \) respectively. We treat \( S^k_\Delta \) (and \( D^k_\Delta \)) as a pure \( k \)-dimensional \((k + 1)\)-dimensional simplicial complex. Note that for \( k > 0 \), \( S^k_\Delta, D^k_\Delta \) are not well defined, since there are infinitely many triangulations of \( S^k \) and \( D^k \). With these notations, we can define the notion of \( k \)-connectedness:

**Definition 4.4.** A simplicial complex \( X \) is called \( k \)-connected if for every \(-1 \leq i \leq k \), if there is a simplicial function \( f : S^i_\Delta \to X \) (where \( S^i_\Delta \) is some triangulated \( i \)-sphere), then there is a triangulated \( i + 1 \) disc \( D^{i+1}_\Delta \) and a simplicial function \( F : D^{i+1}_\Delta \to X \) such that the \( i \)-sphere of \( D^{i+1}_\Delta \) is \( S^i_\Delta \) and \( F|_{S^i_\Delta} = f \). In that case, we will say that \( F \) is an extension of \( f \).

**Remark 4.5.** We note that \( X \) is \((-1)\)-connected means that \( X \) is non-empty and \( X \) is \( 0 \)-connected means that it is non-empty and its 1-skeleton is connected (as a graph).

**Remark 4.6.** We note that by Hurewicz Theorem [Spa87, Theorem 7.5.5] a simplicial complex \( X \) is \( k \)-connected if and only if it is simply connected and for every \( 0 \leq j \leq k \), \( \tilde{H}^j(X, \mathbb{Z}) = 0 \). Thus, if \( X \) is \( k \)-connected, then by the universal coefficient Theorem for every \( 0 \leq j \leq k \), \( \tilde{H}^j(X) = 0 \). The converse is false: first, it could be that \( \tilde{H}^1(X, \mathbb{Z}) = 0 \), but \( X \) is not simply connected. Second, it can be that the homology with \( \mathbb{F}_2 \) coefficients vanish, but the homology with \( \mathbb{Z} \) coefficients do not vanish: for instance for every \( p > 2 \) prime, the lens space \( L(p, 1) \) is an orientable 3-dimensional manifold such that \( \tilde{H}^j(L(p, 1)) = 0 \) for \( j = 0, 1, 2 \), but \( H^1(L(p, 1), \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathbb{F}_p \) (see more details in [Bre93, Examples 10.7, 13.6]). The lens space \( L(p, 1) \) is not a simplicial complex, but taking a triangulation of it yields a simplicial complex with the same homologies.
For a simplicial complex \( X \), if we assume that \( X \) is \( k \)-connected, we define the \( k \)-th homotopy filling constant to be function as follows. First, for \( 0 \leq i \leq k \) and a simplicial map \( f : S^{i}_{\Delta} \to X \), we define

\[
\text{SFill}_{i}(f) = \min\{|D^{i+1}_{\Delta}(i + 1)| : F : D^{i+1}_{\Delta} \to X \text{ is an extension of } f\}.
\]

A simplicial map \( F : D^{i+1}_{\Delta} \to X \) extending \( f \) such that \( |D^{i+1}_{\Delta}(i + 1)| = \text{SFill}_{i}(f) \) will be called a minimal extension of \( f \). Second, for \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), we define

\[
\text{SFill}(N) = \max\{\text{SFill}_{i}(f) : f : S^{i}_{\Delta} \to X \text{ simplicial and } |S^{i}_{\Delta}(i)| \leq N\}.
\]

With these definitions, we have analogues results to Proposition 4.11 and Theorem 4.8, namely:

**Theorem 4.7.** Let \( X \) be a pure finite \( n \)-dimensional simplicial complex. Let \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) and assume that \( X \) is \( k \)-connected. Define the following sequence of constants recursively: \( N_{-1} = 1 \) and for every \( 0 \leq j \leq k \),

\[
N_{j} = \text{SFill}_{j}((j + 1)N_{j-1} + 1).
\]

Then \( \text{Cradm}_{k}(X) \leq N_{k} \).

The proof of Theorem 4.7 is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.11 with the adaptation we use admissible functions to construct the cone function:

**Proof.** Assume \( X \) is \( k \)-connected and let \( N_{0},...,N_{k} \) be the constants of Theorem 4.7.

Fix \( \{v\} \in X(0) \). We will construct a simplicial complexes \( Y^{-1},...,Y^{k} \) that will allow us to define a cone function with apex \( v \). These complexes will be constructed iteratively (at each step of the construction we will add simplices to the previous complex).

**The complex \( Y^{-1} \):** \( Y^{-1} \) is a simplicial complex with a single vertex \( Y^{-1}(0) = \{\{y\}\} \). We denote \( D^{0} = Y^{-1} \) (note that \( D^{0} \) is by definition a 0-disc) and a function \( F^{0} : D^{0}_{\Delta} \to X \) defined as \( F^{0}(\{y\}) = \{v\} \) (where \( v \) is our fixed vertex in \( X \)).

**The complex \( Y^{0} \):** Define a complex \( (Y^{-1})' \) as the 0-dimensional complex defined as \( (Y^{-1})' = Y^{-1} \cup \{\{x_{u}\} : \{u\} \in X(0)\} \). In other words, \( (Y^{-1})' \) is isomorphic to the union of \( Y^{-1} \) and the 0-skeleton of \( X(0) \). For every \( \{u\} \in X(0) \), we define \( S^{(u)} \subseteq (Y^{-1})' \) to be a triangulated 0-sphere defined as \( S^{(u)} = \{\{y\}, \{x_{u}\}\} \) and define a simplicial map \( f^{(u)} : S^{(u)} \to X \) as

\[
f^{(u)}(\{y\}) = F^{0}(D^{0}) = \{v\}, f^{(u)}(\{x_{u}\}) = \{u\}.
\]

By our assumption, \( X \) is 0-connected and thus there is a minimal extension of \( f^{(u)} \) which is a triangulated 1-disc denoted \( D^{(u)} \) and a simplicial function \( F^{(u)} : D^{(u)} \to X \) extending \( f^{(u)} \) such that \( |D^{(u)}(1)| \) is minimal. Define \( Y^{0} = (Y^{-1})' \cup \bigcup_{\{u\} \in X(0)} D^{(u)} \). We note the following properties (some of them are just rephrasing of properties stated above in a convenient form):

1. \( \{\{x_{u}\} : \{u\} \in X(0)\} \subseteq Y^{0}(0) \).
2. For every \( \{u\} \in X(0) \), \( D^{(u)} \) is a subcomplex of \( Y^{0} \) that is a triangulated 1-disc with the sphere

\[
S^{(u)} = \{\{y\}, \{x_{u}\}\} \\
= \{\{x_{u}\}\} \cup D^{0} \\
= \{\{x_{u}\} : u \in \{u\}\} \cup \bigcup_{\tau \subseteq \{u\}, |\tau| = |\{u\}|-1} D^{\tau}.
\]
3. The map $F^u : D^u \to X$ is a minimal extension of the map $f^u : S^u \to X$ that is defined as follows: for every $\tau' = \{x_u\}$, 
\[
f^u(\tau') = \begin{cases} 
\{u\} & \tau' = \{x_u\} \\
F^\tau(D^\tau) & \tau' \in \partial_0 \{u\}.
\end{cases}
\]

4. By the definition of $N_0$, for every $\{u\} \in X(0)$, $|D^u(1)| \leq N_0$.

**The complex $Y^i$:** Assume by induction that $Y^{i-1}$ is defined and has the following properties:

1. For every $0 \leq j \leq i - 1$ and every $\eta \in X(j)$, $\{x_u\}_{u \in \eta} \in Y^{i-1}(j)$.

2. For every $0 \leq j \leq i - 1$ and every $\eta \in X(j)$, $D^\eta$ is a subcomplex of $Y^{i-1}$ that is triangulated $j$-disc with the sphere $S^\eta = \{\{x_u\}_{u \in \eta}\} \cup \bigcup_{\eta' \subseteq \eta, |\eta'| = |\eta| - 1} D^{\eta'}$.

3. For every $\eta \in X(i-1)$, the map $F^\eta : D^\eta \to X$ is a minimal extension of the map $f^\eta : S^\eta \to X$ that is defined as follows: first, we define $(Y^{i-1})' = Y^{i-1} \cup \{\{x_u\}_{u \in \tau} : \tau \in X(i)\}$. For every $\tau \in X(i)$, we define a subcomplex of $(Y^{i-1})'$:
\[
S^\tau = \{x_u\}_{u \in \tau} \cup \bigcup_{\tau' \in \partial_\tau} D^{\tau'}.
\]

We note that this is gluing $i + 1$ triangulated $i$-discs along their boundaries and that the resulting $S^\tau$ is a triangulated $i$-sphere. We define a simplicial map $f^\tau : S^\tau \to X$ as
\[
f^\tau(\tau') = \begin{cases} 
\tau & \tau' = \{x_u\}_{u \in \tau} \\
F^{\tau'}(D^{\tau'}) & \tau' \in \partial_\tau \tau.
\end{cases}
\]

By the assumption that $X$ is $k$-connected, there is a triangulated $(i+1)$-disc that we will denote by $D^{\tau}$ and a minimal extension of $f^\tau$, which we will denote by $F^{\tau} : D^{\tau} \to X$. We note that properties (1)-(3) hold for $Y^i$. Also, we note that
\[
|S^\tau(i)| = 1 + \sum_{\tau' \in \partial_\tau} |D^{\tau'}(i)| \leq 1 + (i + 1)N_{i-1}.
\]

Thus, by definition, $|D^{\tau}(i + 1)| \leq N_i$.

After this construction, we can define a cone function $\text{Cone}_{k}^{\tau} : \bigoplus_{j=-1}^{k} C_j(X) \to \bigoplus_{j=-1}^{k} C_{j+1}(X)$ as follows: for every $-1 \leq i \leq k$ and every $\tau \in X(i)$, define
\[
\text{Cone}_{k}^{\tau}(\eta) = \sum_{\eta \in F^\tau(D^{\tau})(i+1)} \eta.
\]
Since the function $F^\tau$ is simplicial, it follows that
\[
\partial_{i+1} \text{Cone}_k^v(\tau) = \partial_{i+1} \left( \sum_{\eta \in F^\tau(D^\tau)(i+1)} \eta \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{\tau' \in \partial_{i+1} F^\tau(D^\tau)(i+1)} \tau'
\]
\[
= \sum_{\tau' \in F^\tau(\partial_{i+1} D^\tau)(i+1)} \tau'
\]
\[
= \sum_{\tau' \in F^\tau(S^\tau)(i+1)} \tau'
\]
\[
= \tau + \sum_{\tau' \in \partial_{i} \tau} \sum_{\eta \in F^\tau(D^\tau)(i)} \eta
\]
\[
= \tau + \text{Cone}_k^v(\partial_i \tau).
\]

Thus, Cone$_k^v$ is indeed a cone function and it follows that for every $\tau \in X(k)$, $|\text{Cone}_k^v(\tau)| \leq |F^\tau(D^\tau)(i+1)| \leq N_k$, thus $\text{Crad}_k(X) \leq N_k$ as needed.

Combining Theorem 4.7 with Theorem 3.8, we deduce the following:

**Theorem 4.8.** Let $X$ be a pure finite $n$-dimensional simplicial complex. Assume that $X$ is $k$-connected and let $N_k$ be the constant defined in Theorem 4.7 above. Assume that there is a group $G$ of automorphisms of $X$ acting transitively on $X(n)$. Then $\text{Exp}_k^b(X) \geq \frac{1}{(k+1)N_k}$.

## 5 Symmetric complexes and coset complexes

In Theorem 3.8 above, we saw how coboundary expansion of a simplicial complex $X$ can be deduced from the cone radius under the assumption of strong symmetry, i.e., under the assumption that there is a group $G$ acting transitively on the top dimensional simplices of $X$. Below, we note that this assumption, together with the assumption that $X$ is a partite clique complex actually imply that $X$ can be identified with cosets of $G$. This result was already known - for instance it is stated in [BC13] in the language of coset geometries (for a dictionary between coset geometries and simplicial complexes see [KO20]) and we include the proof below for completeness.

We start with the following definitions:

**Definition 5.1** (Clique complex). A simplicial complex $X$ is called a clique complex if every clique in its one-skeleton spans a simplex, i.e., for every $\{v_0\},...,\{v_k\} \in X(0)$ if $\{v_i,v_j\} \in X(1)$ for every $0 \leq i < j \leq k$, then $\{v_0,...,v_k\} \in X(k)$.

**Definition 5.2** (Partite complex, type). Let $X$ be a pure $n$-dimensional simplicial complex over a vertex set $V$. The complex $X$ is called $(n+1)$-partite, if there are disjoint sets $S_0,...,S_n \subset V$, called the sides of $X$, such that for $V = \bigcup S_i$ and for every $\sigma \in X(n)$ and every $0 \leq i \leq n$, ...
|σ ∩ S_i| = 1, i.e., every n-dimensional simplex has exactly one vertex in each of the sides of X. In a pure n-dimensional, (n + 1)-partite complex X, each simplex σ ∈ X(k) has a type which is a subset of \{0,...,n\} of cardinality k + 1 that is defined by type(σ) = \{i : σ ∩ S_i ≠ ∅\}.

**Definition 5.3 (Coset complex).** Given a group \(G\) with subgroups \(K_{\{i\}}, i ∈ I\), where I is a finite set. The coset complex \(X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i ∈ I})\) is a simplicial complex defined as follows:

1. The vertex set of \(X\) is composed of disjoint sets \(S_i = \{gK_{\{i\}} : g ∈ G\}\).
2. For two vertices \(gK_{\{i\}}, g'K_{\{j\}}\) where \(i, j ∈ I\), \(g, g' ∈ G\), \(\{gK_{\{i\}}, g'K_{\{j\}}\} ∈ X(1)\) if \(i ≠ j\) and \(gK_{\{i\}} ∩ g'K_{\{j\}} ≠ \emptyset\).
3. The simplicial complex \(X\) is the clique complex spanned by the 1-skeleton defined above, i.e., \(\{g_0K_{\{i_0\}}, ..., g_kK_{\{i_k\}}\} ∈ X(k)\) if \(0 ≤ j, j' ≤ k\), \(g_jK_{\{i_j\}} ∩ g'_jK_{\{i'_j\}} ≠ \emptyset\).

**Observation 5.4.** For \(G\) and \(K_{\{i\}}, i ∈ I\) as above, the coset complex \(X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i ∈ I})\) is a clique complex and \(G\) acts on \(X\) simplicially by \(g'gK_{\{i\}} = g'gK_{\{i\}}, ∀ g, g' ∈ G, i ∈ I\).

The following proposition shows that under some assumptions, a strongly symmetric complex is always (isomorphic to) a coset complex:

**Proposition 5.5.** Let \(Y\) be a pure n-dimensional clique complex and let \(G\) be a group acting by type preserving automorphisms on \(Y\) such that the action is transitive on n-simplices. Fix \(\{v_0, ..., v_n\} ∈ Y(n)\) such that \(v_i\) is of type \(i\) and denote \(K_{\{i\}} = \text{Stab}(v_i)\). Then \(Y\) is isomorphic to \(X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i ∈ \{0, ..., n\}})\). Furthermore, there is an isomorphism \(Φ : X → Y\) that is equivariant with respect to the action of \(G\).

**Proof.** Define \(Φ : X(0) → Y(0)\) by \(Φ(gK_{\{i\}}) = g.v_i\).

The map \(Φ\) is well-defined: if \(gK_{\{i\}} = g'K_{\{i\}}\), then there is \(h ∈ K_{\{i\}}\) such that \(g' = gh\) and therefore \(g'v_i = ghv_i = g.v_i\).

The map \(Φ\) is injective: \(Φ(gK_{\{i\}}) = Φ(g'K_{\{i\}})\) implies that \(g.v_i = g'.v_i\) or equivalently \(g^{-1}g' ∈ K_{\{i\}}\). Thus,

\[gK_{\{i\}} = gg^{-1}g'K_{\{i\}} = g'K_{\{i\}}\]

The map \(Φ\) is surjective: the group \(G\) acts transitively on \(n\) dimensional simplices in \(Y\) and is type preserving and thus acts transitively on vertices of the same type. As a result if \(v\) is a vertex in \(Y\) of type \(i\), there is \(g ∈ G\) such that \(g.v_i = v\) and therefore \(Φ(gK_{\{i\}}) = v\).

Observe that \(Φ\) is also equivariant under the action of \(G\).

When extended to a map between \(X\) and \(Y\), the map \(Φ\) is a simplicial isomorphism: we note that since both \(X\) and \(Y\) are clique complexes, it is enough to check that \(Φ\) maps an edge in \(X\) to an edge in \(Y\), and, vice-versa, the preimage of an edge in \(Y\) is an edge in \(X\). Let \(gK_{\{i\}}, g'K_{\{i'\}}\) be vertices in \(X\) that are connected by an edge. Then by definition, there is \(g'' ∈ G\) such that \(g''K_{\{i\}} = gK_{\{i\}}\) and \(g''K_{\{i'\}} = g'K_{\{i'\}}\). Thus, \(Φ(gK_{\{i\}}) = g''v_i\) and \(Φ(g'K_{\{i'\}}) = g''v_{i'}\). The vertices \(v_i, v_{i'}\) are connected by an edge in \(Y\) and \(G\) acts simplicially on \(Y\) and therefore \(g''.v_i\) and \(g''.v_{i'}\) are also connected by an edge as needed.

In the other direction, let \(v, u\) vertices in \(Y\) such that \(\{v, u\} ∈ Y(1)\). The complex \(Y\) is \((n + 1)\)-partite and therefore there are \(0 ≤ i, i' ≤ n\), \(i ≠ i'\) such that \(v\) is of type \(i\) and \(u\) is of type \(i'\). Without loss of generality, we will assume that \(v\) is of type 0 and \(u\) is of type 1. The complex \(Y\) is pure \(n\)-dimensional and therefore there are vertices \(u_2, ..., u_n\) such that \(\{v, u, u_2, ..., u_n\} ∈ Y(n)\).
The group $G$ acts transitively on $n$-dimensional simplices of $Y$ and as a result there is $g \in G$ such that $g \cdot \{v_0, \ldots, v_n\} = \{v, u, u_2, \ldots, u_n\}$ and the action is type preserving which implies that $g \cdot v_0 = v, g \cdot v_1 = u$. Thus for that $g$, $\Phi(gK_{i_0}) = v$ and $\Phi(gK_{i_1}) = u$, i.e, the preimage of $\{v, u\}$ is $\{gK_{i_0}, gK_{i_1}\} \in X(1)$ as needed.

Thus, under the assumption of partiteness, instead of working with symmetric simplicial complexes, we can work with coset complexes. However, one should note the following issue: the action of $G$ on the coset complex $X = X(G, (K_{i_1})_{i \in \{0, \ldots, n\}})$ is always transitive on vertices of the same type in $X$, but, in general, it need not be transitive on $X(n)$. The following result gives a criterion for transitivity on $X(n)$:

**Theorem 5.6.** [BC13, Theorem 1.8.10] Let $G$ be a group with subgroups $K_{i_0}, i \in I$, where $I$ is a finite set. Denote $X = X(G, (K_{i_1})_{i \in I})$ to be the coset complex defined above. Denote further for every $\emptyset \neq \tau \subseteq I$, $K_\tau = \bigcap_{i \in \tau} K_{i_0}$ and $K_\emptyset = G$. The action of $G$ on $X(n)$ is transitive (and thus $X$ is strongly symmetric) if and only if for every $\tau \subseteq I$ and every $i \in I \setminus \tau$, $K_\tau K_{i_0} = \bigcap_{j \in \tau} K_{j_0} K_{i_0}$.

6 Bounding the first two filling constants for coset complexes

In Theorem 4.8, we showed that for a symmetric simplicial complex, the high order Cheeger constants can be bounded using the filling constants of the complex. In the previous section we have seen that under suitable assumptions coset complexes are examples of symmetric complexes (see Theorem 5.6) and that under the assumption of partiteness, a strongly symmetric clique complex is a coset complex (see Proposition 5.3). Thus, under suitable assumptions, the problem of bounding the Cheeger constants of a complex is reduced to bounding the filling constants of the correspondent coset complex.

Throughout this section, $G$ is a group with subgroups $K_{i_1}, i \in I$, where $I$ is a finite set and $|I| \geq 2$, and we denote $X = X(G, (K_{i_1})_{i \in I})$ to be the coset complex defined above. We always assume that $X$ is strongly symmetric.

Below, we will show how to bound the first two filling constants of a coset complex, based to the properties of the symmetry group $G$ and the stabilizer subgroups $K_{i_1}, i \in I$.

There are known criteria in the literature for connectedness and simply connectedness of coset complexes (see for instance [AH93] or [Gar79, Chapter 6] and reference therein). Namely, Abels and Holtz [AH93] proved the following:

**Theorem 6.1.** [AH93, Theorem 2.4] Let $G, K_{i_1}, i \in I$ and $X$ be as above.

1. The 1-skeleton of $X$ is connected if and only if the subgroups $K_{i_1}, i \in I$ generate $G$.

2. The simplicial complex $X$ is connected and simply connected if and only if there is a presentation of $G$ of the form $G = \langle \bigcup_{i} K_{i_1} \mid R \rangle$, where every relation in $R$ is a relation in some $K_{i_1}$, i.e., every relation is of the form $g_1 \ldots g_k = e$ where there is some $i \in I$ such that $g_1, \ldots, g_k \in K_{i_1}$.

Below, we prove quantitative versions of these criteria in order to bound $N_0$ and $N_1$. 
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6.1 Bound on \( N_0 \)

Recall that for a group \( G \) with subgroups \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \), we say that \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \) boundedly generate \( G \) if there is some \( L \in \mathbb{N} \) such that every \( g \in G \) can be written as a product of at most \( L \) elements in \( \bigcup_{i \in I} K_{(i)} \). We will show below that in this case \( L + 1 \) is a bound on \( N_0 \).

**Lemma 6.2.** Two vertices \( gK_{(i)}, g'K_{(i')} \) in \( X(0) \) are connected by an edge if and only if there is \( h' \in K_{(i')} \) such that \( gK_{(i)} = g'h'K_{(i)} \).

**Proof.** Recall that by definition \( gK_{(i)}, g'K_{(i')} \) are connected by an edge if and only if \( gK_{(i)} \cap g'K_{(i')} \neq \emptyset \).

Assume that there is \( h' \in K_{(i')} \) such that \( gK_{(i)} = g'h'K_{(i)} \). Then

\[
gK_{(i)} \cap g'K_{(i')} = g'h'K_{(i)} \cap g'h'K_{(i')},
\]

Thus, \( g'h' \in gK_{(i)} \cap g'K_{(i')} \) and the intersection is not empty.

Conversely, if \( gK_{(i)} \cap g'K_{(i')} \neq \emptyset \), then there are \( h \in K_{(i)}, h' \in K_{(i')} \) such that \( gh = g'h' \) and it follows that \( g = g'h'h^{-1} \). Thus,

\[
gK_{(i)} = g'h'h^{-1}K_{(i)} = g'h'K_{(i)},
\]
as needed. \( \square \)

**Proposition 6.3.** Let \( G \) be a group with subgroups \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \), where \( I \) is a finite set and \( |I| \geq 2 \). Denote \( X = X(G, (K_{(i)})_{i \in I}) \) to be the coset complex defined above. Assume that subgroups \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \) boundedly generate \( G \), and denote

\[
L = \max_{g \in G} \min \left\{ l : g = g_1...g_l \text{ and } g_1,...,g_l \in \bigcup_{i} K_{(i)} \right\}.
\]

Then the diameter of the 1-skeleton of \( X \) is bounded by \( L + 1 \).

**Proof.** Assume that \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \) boundedly generate \( G \). Recall that the group \( G \) acts simplicially on \( X \) and transitively on vertices of the same type. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that for every \( i', i'' \in I \) and every \( g \in G \), the vertices \( K_{(i')} \) and \( gK_{(i'')} \) are connected by a path of length less or equal to \( L + 1 \).

By our assumption, there is \( l \leq L \) and \( g_1,...,g_l \in \bigcup_{i} K_{(i)} \) such that \( g = g_1...g_l \). We will show that there is a path of length \( l + 1 \) connecting \( K_{(i')} \) and \( gK_{(i'')} \).

Let \( i_j \in I \) such that \( g_{i_j} \in K_{(i_j)} \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq l-1 \). Then by Lemma 6.2 for every \( 1 \leq j \leq l \), \( g_1...g_{i_{j+1}}K_{(i_{j+1})} \) and \( g_1...g_{i_j}K_{(i_j)} \) are connected by an edge. Thus there is a path of length \( l - 1 \) in the 1-skeleton of \( X \) connecting \( g_1K_{(i_1)} \) and \( g_1...g_lK_{(i_l)} = gK_{(i)} \). Note that \( g_1K_{(i_1)} = K_{(i_1)} \) and thus \( g_1K_{(i_1)} \cap K_{(i)} \neq \emptyset \). Also, \( gK_{(i)} \cap gK_{(i')} \neq \emptyset \) and thus there is a path of length \( l + 1 \) connecting \( K_{(i')} \) and \( gK_{(i'')} \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 6.4.** Let \( G \) be a group with subgroups \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \), where \( I \) is a finite set and \( |I| \geq 2 \). Denote \( X = X(G, (K_{(i)})_{i \in I}) \) and let \( N_0 \) be the constant defined in Theorem 4.7. If \( K_{(i)}, i \in I \) boundedly generate \( G \), then \( N_0 \) is bounded by

\[
1 + \max_{g \in G} \min \left\{ l : g = g_1...g_l \text{ and } g_1,...,g_l \in \bigcup_{i} K_{(i)} \right\}.
\]

**Proof.** Note that by definition \( N_0 \) is the radius of the 1-skeleton of \( X \) and thus it is bounded by the diameter of the 1-skeleton of \( X \) and the corollary follows. \( \square \)
6.2 Bound on $N_1$

In order to state the criterion, we recall some definitions regarding the Dehn function of a group presentation.

Let $G = \langle S|R \rangle$ be a finitely presented group, where $S$ is a symmetric generating set of $G$ and $R$ is a set of relators. Denote $\text{Free}(S)$ to be the free group with a generating set $S$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $R \subseteq \text{Free}(S)$ are cyclically reduced words. A relation in $G$ is a freely reduced word $w \in \text{Free}(S)$ such that $w = 1$ in $G$. We note that every relation is in the normal closure of $R$ in $\text{Free}(S)$.

Given a relation $w$, the area of $w$, denoted $\text{Area}(w)$, is the minimal number $a \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that there are $r_1, \ldots, r_a \in R$ and $u_1, \ldots, u_a \in \text{Free}(S)$ such that

$$w = u_1^{-1}r_1u_1\ldots u_a^{-1}r_a u_a \text{ in } \text{Free}(S).$$

The **Dehn function of $G$ with respect to $S, R$** is the function $\text{Dehn}: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined as

$$\text{Dehn}(m) = \max\{\text{Area}(w) : w = 1 \text{ in } G, |w| \leq m\},$$

where $|w|$ denotes the word length of $w$ in $\text{Free}(S)$.

The idea behind the Dehn function is that it counts how many reduction moves are needed to reduce $w$ to the trivial word. More precisely, following [CM17, Chapter 8], we define the following moves on a word $w$:

1. Free reduction: remove a sub-word of the form $ss^{-1}$ or $s^{-1}s$ within the word $w$, where $s \in S$.

2. Applying a relation: replace a sub-word $w'$ in $w$ with a new subword $w''$ where $w'(w'')^{-1}$ or $w''(w')^{-1}$ is a cyclic permutation of a word in $R$.

The only fact that we will need regarding the Dehn function is that one can reduce a word $w = 1$ with $|w| = m$ to the trivial word using at most $\text{Dehn}(m)$ applications of relations and at most $(\max_{r \in R}|r|)\text{Dehn}(m) + m$ free reductions (see [CM17, Chapter 8]). For a far more extensive introduction regarding Dehn functions, the reader is referred to Riley’s or Bridson’s expository articles on this subject (see [CM17, Chapter 8] or [Bri02]).

**Theorem 6.5.** Let $G$ be a group with subgroups $K_{\{i\}}, i \in I$, where $I$ is a finite set and $|I| \geq 3$ and assume that the subgroups $K_{\{i\}}, i \in I$ are all finite and that they generate $G$. Denote $X = X(G,(K_{\{i\}})_{i \in I})$ to be the coset complex defined above. For every $i \in I$, denote $R_i$ to be all the non-trivial relations in the multiplication table of $K_{\{i\}}$, i.e., all the relations of the form $g_1g_2g_3 = e$, where $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in K_{\{i\}} \setminus \{e\}$. Assume that $G = \langle \bigcup_{i} K_{\{i\}} \bigcup_{i} R_i \rangle$ and let $\text{Dehn}$ denote the Dehn function of $G$ with respect to this presentation of $G$. Then for triangulated 1-sphere $S^1_\Delta$ such that $|S^1_\Delta(1)| \leq m$ and every simplicial map $f : S^1_\Delta \to X$, there is a an extension $F : D^1_\Delta \to X$ with

$$|D^1_\Delta(2)| \leq p(m, \text{Dehn}(m)),$$

where $p(x, y)$ is the polynomial

$$p(x, y) = 16y^2 + 6x^2 + 20xy + 24y + 10x + 1.$$

Before proving this Theorem, we will need to set up some terminology, notation and lemmata. We recall the following definitions taken from [ST76]:

$p(x, y)$ is the polynomial
Definition 6.6. Two simplicial maps \( f, f' : S^1_\triangle \to X \) are called contiguous if for every simple \( \sigma \in S^1_\triangle \), \( f(\sigma) \cup f'(\sigma) \) is a simplex in \( X \). Also, \( f, f' : S^1_\triangle \to X \) are called contiguously equivalent, if there are simplicial maps \( f_0, \ldots, f_k : S^1_\triangle \to X \) where \( f = f_0, f' = f_k \) and \( f_i, f_{i+1} \) are contiguous for all \( 0 \leq i \leq k \).

A basic fact is that if \( f, f' : S^1_\triangle \to X \) are contiguous, then they are homotopic and thus \( f \) and \( f' \) are homotopy equivalent. Furthermore, \( f \) can be extended to a map \( F : D^2_\triangle \to X \) if and only if \( f' \) can be extended to a map \( F' : (D^2_\triangle)' \to X \). We want to quantify this statement:

Lemma 6.7. Let \( f, f' : S^1_\triangle \to X \) be contiguous simplicial maps. Assume that \( F : D^2_\triangle \to X \) is a minimal extension of \( f \), then there is a minimal extension of \( f' \), \( F' : (D^2_\triangle)' \to X \) such that

\[ |(D^2_\triangle)'(2)| \leq |D^2_\triangle(2)|+2|\{u \in S^1_\triangle(0) : f(\{u\}) \neq f'(\{u\})\}|.\]

Proof. By induction on \( |\{u \in S^1_\triangle(0) : f(\{u\}) \neq f'(\{u\})\}| \) it is enough to prove that if \( f, f' \) are contiguous and there is only a single \( \{u\} \in S^1_\triangle(0) \) such that \( f(\{u\}) \neq f'(\{u\}) \), it follows that

\[ |(D^2_\triangle)'(2)| \leq |D^2_\triangle(2)|+2.\]

Let \( F : D^2_\triangle \to X \) be a minimal extension of \( f \) and denote by \( \{v\}, \{w\} \in S^1_\triangle(0) \) the two neighbours of \( \{u\} \). We will show that there is an extension of \( f' \), \( F' : (D^2_\triangle)' \to X \) such that

\[ |(D^2_\triangle)'(2)| = |D^2_\triangle(2)|+2.\]

We do not claim that the extension \( F' \) which we will define below is minimal and thus for a minimal extension of \( f' \) there is an inequality.

Define \((D^2_\triangle)'\) as follows: add a vertex \( \{u'\} \) to \( D^2_\triangle \), connect \( \{u'\} \) to the vertices \( \{u\}, \{v\}, \{w\} \in S^1_\triangle \subseteq D^2_\triangle \) and take \((D^2_\triangle)'\) to be the resulting clique complex. In other words,

\[ (D^2_\triangle)'(0) = D^2_\triangle(0) \cup \{\{u'\}\}, \]

\[ (D^2_\triangle)'(1) = D^2_\triangle(1) \cup \{\{u', u\}, \{u', v\}, \{u', w\}\}, \]

\[ (D^2_\triangle)'(2) = D^2_\triangle(2) \cup \{\{u', u, v\}, \{u', u, w\}\}. \]

Define \( F' : (D^2_\triangle)' \to X \) to be the following map

\[ F'(\sigma) = \begin{cases} F(\sigma) & u' \notin \sigma \\ F(\sigma \setminus \{u'\}) \cup f'(\{u\}) & u' \in \sigma \end{cases}. \]

We note that \( F'|_{S^1_\triangle} = f' \). To verify that \( F' \) is simplicial it is enough to verify that it is simplicial on \( \{\{u', u, v\}, \{u', u, w\}\} \). Indeed, since \( f, f' \) are contiguous, if follows that \( f(\{u, v\}) \cup f'(\{u, v\}) \in X \), and we note that

\[ F'(\{u', u, v\}) = f(\{u, v\}) \cup f'(\{u, v\}) \in X. \]

Similarly, \( F' \) is simplicial on \( \{u', u, w\} \). Thus \( F' \) is an extension of \( f' \) and \( |(D^2_\triangle)'(2)| = |D^2_\triangle(2)|+2 \) as needed (note that \( F' \) is not necessarily minimal and thus the inequality).
This Lemma allows us to pass to contiguous maps and “bookkeep” the maximal change in the number of 2-simplices in a minimal extension.

Next, we will use the fact that $X$ is a coset complex code to code the paths in $X$. For convenience we define $S_m$ to be the triangulated 1-sphere with vertices $S_m^1(0) = \{ (j) : 0 \leq j \leq m-1 \}$ and edges $S_m^1(1) = \{ (j,j+1) : 0 \leq j \leq m-1 \}$ where $j+1$ is taken modulo $m$. Using this notation, the vertices of $S_m^1$ are $\{ 0, \ldots, m-1 \}$ and a simplicial map $f : S_m^1 \to X$ is determined by $f(j)$ where $0 \leq j \leq m-1$.

**Definition 6.8.** Let $G, K_{\{i\}}, i \in I$ and $X$ be as above. For $(g_1, \ldots, g_m) \in (\bigcup_i K_{\{i\}})^m$ with $g_1 \ldots g_m = e$, a simplicial map $f : S_m^1 \to X$ is called a $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-map if there are $i_0, \ldots, i_{m-1} \in I$ such that:

1. $f(0) = K_{\{i_0\}} = g_1 \ldots g_m K_{\{i_0\}}$.
2. For every $1 \leq j \leq m-1$, $f(j) = g_j g_{j+1} K_{\{i_j\}}$.
3. It holds that $g_1 \ldots g_m = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$ or, in other words, $f(m-1) = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$.

**Lemma 6.9.** Let $G, K_{\{i\}}, i \in I$ and $X$ be as above. For every simplicial map $f : S_m^1 \to X$ there is $g \in G$ and $(g_1, \ldots, g_m) \in (\bigcup_i K_{\{i\}})^m$ with $g_1 \ldots g_m = e$ such that $g.f$ is a $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-map.

**Proof.** Recall that $G$ acts transitively on the $n$-simplices of $X$, thus if $f(0) = hK_{\{i_0\}}$ and $f(m-1) = h'K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$ there is $g \in G$ such that $g.f(0) = K_{\{i_0\}}$ and $g.f(m-1) = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$. By the definition of $g.f$ there are $h_1, \ldots, h_{m-2} \in G$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_{m-2} \in I$ such that for every $1 \leq j \leq j-2$, $g.f(j) = h_j K_{\{i_j\}}$.

Denote $h_0 = h_{m-1} = e$. By Lemma 6.2 there are $g_1, \ldots, g_{m-1} \in \bigcup_i K_{\{i\}}$ such that $h_j K_{\{i_j\}} = h_j g_j K_{\{i_j\}}$ for every $0 \leq j \leq m-1$. Since $h_0 = e$, it follows that $g.f(j) = g_j g_{j+1} K_{\{i_j\}}$ for every $0 \leq j \leq m-1$. Note that $h_{m-1} = e$ implies that $g_1 \ldots g_{m-1} K_{\{i_{m-1}\}} = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$ and therefore $g_1 \ldots g_{m-1} = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$ and we can choose $g_m = (g_1 \ldots g_{m-1})^{-1} \in K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$. Thus $g_1 \ldots g_m = e$ and $g_1 \ldots g_{m-1} K_{\{i_0\}} = K_{\{i_0\}}$ as needed.

Since $G$ acts by automorphisms on $X$, the takeaway for this Lemma is that it is enough to prove Theorem 6.5 on $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-maps.

**Lemma 6.10.** Let $f : S_m^1 \to X$ be a $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-map. If for some $1 \leq j' \leq m-1$, there is $i' \in I$ such that $g_{j'} g_{j'+1} = K_{\{i'\}}$ and $g_{j'} g_{j'+1} = g_{j'+1}$, then there is $f' : S_m^1 \to X$ such that $f'$ is a $(g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, e, g_{j'+1}, \ldots, g_m)$-map and $\text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 2$.

**Proof.** Assume $g_{j'} g_{j'+1} = g_{j'+1}$ and $g_{j'} g_{j'+1} = K_{\{i'\}}$. Define $f' : S_m^1 \to X$ to be the map induced by:

$$f'(j) = \begin{cases} f(j) & j \neq j' \\ g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1} K_{\{i'\}} & j = j'. \end{cases}$$

If we show that $f'$ is a simplicial map then it is a $(g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, e, g_{j'+1}, \ldots, g_m)$-map. If we also show that $f'$ is contiguous to $f$, it will follow from Lemma 6.7 that $\text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 2$.

In order to show that $f'$ is simplicial, we need to verify that $\{ f'(j'-1), f'(j') \} \in X$ and $\{ f'(j'+1), f'(j') \} \in X$. Note that

$$f'(j'-1) \cap f'(j') = g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1} K_{\{i_{j'-1}\}} \cap g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1} K_{\{i'\}},$$

thus $g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1} \in f'(j'-1) \cap f'(j')$ and therefore $\{ f'(j'-1), f'(j') \} \in X$. Also, note that since $g_{j'} \in K_{\{i'\}}$ it follows that

$$f'(j') = g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1} K_{\{i'\}} = g_1 \ldots g_{j'} K_{\{i'\}}.$$
Thus $g_1...g_{j'} \in f'(j'+1) \cap f'(j')$ and $\{f'(j'+1), f'(j')\} \in X$.

Next, we will show that $f$ and $f'$ are contiguous. First, we observe that

$$f(j') \cap f'(j') = g_1...g_{j'}K_{\{i\}} \cap g_1...g_{j'}K_{\{i'\}},$$

thus $\{f(j'), f'(j')\} \in X$. Second, we note that

$$\{f(j'-1), f(j')\} \cup \{f'(j'-1), f'(j')\} = \{f(j'-1), f(j'), f'(j')\},$$

and we already know that $\{f(j'-1), f(j')\} \in X$ and $\{f'(j'-1), f'(j')\} \in X$. Thus, if we show that $\{f(j'), f'(j')\} \in X$ it will follow that $\{f(j'+1), f'(j')\} \in X$ (since $X$ is a clique complex). A similar argument shows that $\{f(j'+1), f'(j')\} \cup \{f'(j'+1), f'(j')\} \in X$. Thus $f$ and $f'$ are contiguous as needed.

An immediate corollaries of this Lemma are:

**Corollary 6.11.** Let $f : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ be a $(g_1,...,g_m)$-map where $(g_1,...,g_m) \in (\bigcup i K_{\{i\}})^m$ and $g_1...g_m = e$. If for some $1 \leq j' \leq m$, $g_{j'} = e$, then there is $f' : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ such that $f'$ is a $(e,g_1,...,g_{j'-1},g_{j'+1},...,g_m)$-map and $S\text{Fill}_1(f) \leq S\text{Fill}_1(f') + 2(j' - 1)$.

*Proof.* By induction on $j'$, it is enough to prove that for every $2 \leq j' \leq m - 1$, if $g_{j'} = e$, there is $f' : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ such that $f'$ is a $(g_1,...,e,g_{j'-1},g_{j'+1},...,g_m)$-map and $S\text{Fill}_1(f) \leq S\text{Fill}_1(f') + 2$. Note that there is some $i' \in I$ such that $e,g_{j'-1} \in K_{\{i'\}}$ and therefore the needed assertion follows from (1) in Lemma 6.10.

**Corollary 6.12.** Let $f : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ be a $(g_1,...,g_m)$-map where $(g_1,...,g_m) \in (\bigcup i K_{\{i\}})^m$ and $g_1...g_m = e$. If for some $1 \leq j' \leq m - 2$, $g_{j'+1} = g_{j'-1}^{-1}$, then there is $f' : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ such that $f'$ is a $(g_1,...g_{j'-1},e,e,g_{j'+2},...,g_m)$-map and $S\text{Fill}_1(f) \leq S\text{Fill}_1(f') + 2$.

*Proof.* This follows immediately from Lemma 6.10.

**Lemma 6.13.** Let $f : S^1_{m-1} \rightarrow X$ be a $(e,g_2,...,g_m)$-map where $(e,g_2,...,g_m) \in (\bigcup i K_{\{i\}})^{m-1}$ and $eg_2...g_m = e$. Then there is a $(g_2,...,g_m)$-map $f' : S^1_{m-1} \rightarrow X$ such that $S\text{Fill}_1(f) \leq S\text{Fill}_1(f') + 2$.

*Proof.* Define $f'' : S^1_m \rightarrow X$ by

$$f''(j) = \begin{cases} f(1) & j = 0 \\ f(j) & 0 < j \end{cases}.$$ 

Note that $f''(0) = f(1) = K_{\{i\}}$ and $f''(m-1) = f(m-1) = K_{\{i_{m-1}\}}$, therefore $e \in f''(0) \cap f''(m-1)$ and thus $\{f''(0), f''(m-1)\} \in X$ and $f''$ is simplicial. Also note that

$$e \in f''(0) \cap f(0) \cap f(1) \cap f(m-1)$$

and thus $f$ and $f''$ are contiguous. It follows from Lemma 6.7 that $S\text{Fill}_1(f) \leq S\text{Fill}_1(f'') + 2$. We finish by defining $f' : S^1_{m-1} \rightarrow X$ by $f'(j) = f''(j+1)$ and noting that $S\text{Fill}_1(f'') = S\text{Fill}_1(f')$.

After this lemmas, we can prove the following Theorem that summarizes all the homotopy moves on $(g_1,...,g_m)$-maps:
Theorem 6.14 (Homotopy moves Theorem). Let \( f : S^1_m \to X \) be a \((g_1, \ldots, g_m)\)-map and assume that \( m > 2 \).

1. **Identity reduction move:** If for some \( 1 \leq j' \leq m \), \( g_j = e \), then there is \( f' : S^1_{m-1} \to X \) such that \( f' \) is a \((g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, g_{j'+1}, \ldots, g_m)\)-map and \( \text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 4 + 2(j' - 1) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 4 + 2(m - 1) \).

2. **Free reduction move:** If for some \( 1 \leq j' \leq m - 2 \), \( g_{j'+1} = g_{j'}^{-1} \), then there is \( f' : S^1_{m-2} \to X \) such that \( f' \) is a \((g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, g_{j'+2}, \ldots, g_m)\)-map and \( \text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 6 + 4(j' - 1) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 6 + 4(m - 1) \).

3. **Relation move 1:** If for some \( 1 \leq j' \leq m - 1 \), there is \( i' \in I \) such that \( g_{j'}', g_{j'+1}, g_{j'}g_{j'+1} \in K_{i'} \) then there is \( f' : S^1_{m-1} \to X \) such that \( f' \) is a \((g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, g_{j'}g_{j'+1}, g_{j'+2}, \ldots, g_m)\)-map and \( \text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 4 + 2(j' - 1) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 4 + 2(m - 1) \).

4. **Relation move 2:** If for some \( 1 \leq j' \leq m - 1 \), there is \( i' \in I \) such that \( g_{j'}' \in K_{i'} \) and \( g_{j'}' = g_{j'}'g''_j \) with \( g_{j'}', g''_j \in K_{i'} \), then there is \( f' : S^1_{m+1} \to X \) such that \( f' \) is a \((g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, g_{j'}, g''_j, g_{j'+1}, \ldots, g_m)\)-map and \( \text{SFill}_1(f) \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 2 \).

**Proof.** **Identity reduction move:** Combine Corollary 6.11 and Lemma 6.13.

**Free reduction move:** Combine Corollary 6.12, Corollary 6.11 and Lemma 6.13.

**Relation move 1:** Combine Lemma 6.10, Corollary 6.11 and Lemma 6.13.

**Relation move 2:** Assume \( g_{j'}' = g_{j'}', g''_j \) and \( g_{j'}', g''_j, g''_{j'} \in K_{i'} \). Define first \( f'' : S^1_{m+1} \to X \) by

\[
f''(j) = \begin{cases} 
  f(j) & j \leq j' \\
  f(j - 1) & j > j'. 
\end{cases}
\]

It is easy to see that \( f'' \) is simplicial and that \( \text{SFill}_1(f) = \text{SFill}_1(f'') \). Define \( f' : S^1_{m+1} \to X \) by

\[
f'(j) = \begin{cases} 
  f''(j) & j \neq j' \\
  g_1 \ldots g_{j'}'K_{i'} & j = j'. 
\end{cases}
\]

Note that

\[
f'(j' + 1) = f''(j' + 1) = f'(j') = g_1 \ldots g_{j'}'K_{i'} = g_1 \ldots g_{j'}'g''_{j'}K_{i'}. 
\]

Thus, if we show that \( f' \) is simplicial, it will be a \((g_1, \ldots, g_{j'-1}, g_{j'}', g''_{j'} g_{j'+1}, \ldots, g_m)\)-map. As above, we will show that \( f' \) is simplicial and that \( f'' \) and \( f' \) are contiguous and it will follow from Lemma 6.14 that

\[ \text{SFill}_1(f) = \text{SFill}_1(f'') \leq \text{SFill}_1(f') + 2. \]

Note that \( g_{j'}', g''_{j'} \in K_{i'} \) implies that

\[ f'(j') = g_1 \ldots g_{j'}'K_{i'} = g_1 \ldots g_{j'-1}K_{i'}, \]

and

\[ f'(j') = g_1 \ldots g_{j'}'g''_{j'}K_{i'} = g_1 \ldots g_{j'}K_{i'}. \]

Thus \( f'(j') \cap f'(j' - 1) \) and \( f'(j') \cap f'(j' + 1) \) are non-empty and it follows that \( f' \) is simplicial and that \( f'' \) and \( f' \) are contiguous (we use the fact that \( X \) is a clique complex). \( \square \)
Observe that the homotopy moves described in this Theorem correspond to reducing the word $w = g_1 \ldots g_m$ to the trivial word using relations from $\bigcup_i R_i$ and free reductions. We will use this Theorem we are ready to prove Theorem 6.5.

**Proof of Theorem 6.5.** By Lemma 6.13 it is enough to prove the Theorem for $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-maps.

We note that for every simplicial map $f : S^i_m \to X$, it holds that if $m = 2$, then $\text{SFILL}_1(f) \leq 1$. Thus, we will assume that $m > 2$.

Let $f : S^i_m \to X$ be a $(g_1, \ldots, g_m)$-map. Some of the $g_i$'s might be equal to $e$ and we start by preforming identity reduction moves on $f$ to eliminate them. Indeed, by preforming identity reduction moves (if needed), we pass to a map $f^{(0)} : S^i_{m_0} \to X$ such that $m_0 \leq m$, $f^{(0)}$ is a $(g^{(0)}_1, \ldots, g^{(0)}_m)$-map, $g^{(0)}_1, \ldots, g^{(0)}_{m_0} \neq e$ and

$$\text{SFILL}_1(f) \leq \text{SFILL}_1(f^{(0)}) + (m - m_0)(4 + 2(m - 1)) \leq 4m + 2m^2.$$

If $m_0 \leq 2$, then it follows that $\text{SFILL}_1(f) \leq 2m^2 + 4m + 1$ and we are done, so we will assume that $m_0 > 2$.

We define the following reduction algorithm on $f^{(0)}$: Note that $w = g^{(0)}_1 \ldots g^{(0)}_m$ is a trivial word and thus is an algorithm for reducing it to the trivial map using the relations in $\bigcup_i R_i$ and free reductions. We call this the reduction algorithm of $w$ and denote by $w_k$ the word after the $k$-step in the algorithm. We note that each relation in $\bigcup_i R_i$ either increases the word length of $w$ by 1 or it decreases it by 1 and a free reduction move reduces the length of $w$ by 2. Use the reduction algorithm of $w$ to define a reduction algorithm of $f^{(0)}$: Let $f^{(k)} : S^i_{m_k} \to X$ be an ordered $(g^{(k)}_1, \ldots, g^{(k)}_{m_k})$-map, where $w_k = g^{(k)}_1 \ldots g^{(k)}_{m_k}$. Note that every reduction step of $w$ corresponds to a homotopy move in Theorem 6.14, thus the difference between $\text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k)})$ and $\text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k+1)})$ can be bounded using this Theorem.

Note that since we are using relations of length 3, if follows that $|w_k| \leq |w_k| + 1$ and thus for every $k$, $m_k \leq m + \text{Dehn}(m)$. It follows from Theorem 6.14 that for every $k$,

$$\text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k)}) \leq \text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k+1)}) + 6 + 4(m_k - 1) \leq 6 + 4(m + \text{Dehn}(m)).$$

Let $k_{\text{stop}}$ be the smallest number such that $|w_{k_{\text{stop}}}| \leq 2$. By the fact stated regarding the Dehn function, $k_{\text{stop}} \leq 4\text{Dehn}(m) + m$. Also, $\text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k_{\text{stop}})}) \leq 1$. Thus

$$\text{SFILL}_1(f^{(0)}) \leq k_{\text{stop}}(6 + 4(m + \text{Dehn}(m))) + \text{SFILL}_1(f^{(k_{\text{stop}})})$$

$$\leq (4\text{Dehn}(m) + m)(6 + 4(m + \text{Dehn}(m))) + 1$$

$$= 16\text{Dehn}(m)^2 + 4m^2 + 20m\text{Dehn}(m) + 24\text{Dehn}(m) + 6m + 1.$$

Recall that $\text{SFILL}_1(f) \leq \text{SFILL}_1(f^{(0)}) + 2m^2 + 4m$ and therefore is follows that

$$\text{SFILL}_1(f) \leq 16\text{Dehn}(m)^2 + 6m^2 + 20m\text{Dehn}(m) + 24\text{Dehn}(m) + 10m + 1.$$

$\square$

**Remark 6.15.** As the reader might have noted, we did not optimize the bounds in proofs Theorems 6.14, 6.15 so the polynomial $p(x, y)$ in Theorem 6.3 if far from being a tight bound.

Combining Corollary 7.10 and Theorem 6.3 yields the following Theorem:
The aim of this section is to show that if \( n \) and thus it is a product of 4 elements in \( K \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 7.1.} \quad & \text{New coboundary expanders arising from unipotent group over finite field} \\
\text{Let } & \text{ the Dehn function of } G \text{ with respect to this presentation of } G. \\
\text{Then:} & \\
1. & \text{ The constant } N_0 \text{ is bounded by } \left( 1 + \max_{g \in G} \min \left\{ l : g = g_1...g_l \text{ and } g_1, ..., g_l \in \bigcup_i K_i \right\} \right). \\
2. & \text{ The constant } N_1 \text{ is bounded by } p(2N_0 + 1, \text{Dehn}(2N_0 + 1)), \text{ where } p(x, y) \text{ is the polynomial} \\
& \quad p(x, y) = 16y^2 + 6x^2 + 20xy + 24y + 10x + 1.
\end{align*}
\]

7 New coboundary expanders

The aim of the section is to prove new examples of coboundary expanders. While our main motivation is proving Theorem 1.15 of the introduction. We start with the simplified case of a coset complex arising from a unipotent group over finite field. We then use this case to consider the more general case of a coset complex arising from unipotent group with polynomial entries (and those are the complexes that appear in Theorem 1.15).

7.1 New coboundary expanders arising from unipotent group over finite field

Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 2 \) and \( q \) a prime power. For \( 1 \leq i, j \leq n + 1, i \neq j \) and \( a \in \mathbb{F}_q \) let \( e_{i,j}(a) \) be the \((n+1) \times (n+1)\) (elementary) matrix with 1’s along the main diagonal, \( a \) in the \((i,j)\) entry and 0’s in all the other entries. The Unipotent group \( \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) is the group generated by

\[
\{e_{i,j}(a) : a \in \mathbb{F}_q, 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1\},
\]

and it is easy to verify that \( \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) is in fact the group of upper triangular \((n+1) \times (n+1)\) matrices with entries in \( \mathbb{F}_q \).

For \( 0 \leq i \leq n - 1 \), define a subgroup \( K_{\{i\}} \subset \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) as

\[
K_{\{i\}} = \langle e_{j,j+1}(a) : j \in \{1, ..., n\} \setminus \{i + 1\}, a \in \mathbb{F}_q \rangle.
\]

The aim of this section is to show that if \( n \geq 4 \) or \( q \) is odd, then for \( X = X(\text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q), (K_{\{i\}})_{i=0,...,n-1}), \text{Exp}_b(X), \text{Exp}_b(X) \) are bounded from below independently of \( q \).

Lemma 7.1. The subgroup \( K_{\{0\}}, ..., K_{\{n-1\}} \) boundedly generate \( \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) and in fact every \( g \in \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) can be written as a product of at most 6 elements in \( K_{\{0\}} \cup K_{\{n-1\}} \).

Proof. Let \( g \in \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \). By Gauss elimination, there are \( g_1 \in K_{\{0\}}, g_2 \in K_{\{n-1\}} \) and \( a \in \mathbb{F}_q \) such that \( g_2^{-1}g_1^{-1}g = e_{1,n+1}(a) \). Note that

\[
e_{1,n+1}(a) = e_{1,n}(-a)e_{n,n+1}(-1)e_{1,n}(a)e_{n,n+1}(1),
\]

and thus it is a product of 4 elements in \( K_{\{0\}} \cup K_{\{n-1\}} \). \( \square \)
Corollary 7.2. For every prime power \( q \), \( n \geq 2 \), let \( G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q), K_0, \ldots, K_{n-1} \) as above and \( X = X(G, (K_i)_{i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}}) \). The filling constant \( N_0 \) of \( X \) satisfies \( N_0 \leq 7 \) and in particular is bounded independently of \( q \).

Proof. Combine Lemma 7.1 and Corollary 7.10. \( \square \)

After bounding \( N_0 \), we want to apply Theorem 6.16 in order to bound \( N_1 \). Thus we need to show that the group \( G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) can be presented as

\[
G = \langle \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{\{i\}} \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} R_i \rangle,
\]

where \( R_i \) are all the relations of \( K_{\{i\}} \) and that the Dehn function for this presentation can be bounded independently of \( q \).

We start by introducing a known set of relations for \( G \). We recall that for a group \( G \) and \( g,h \in G \), the commutator \([g,h] \) is defined by \([g,h] = g^{-1}h^{-1}gh \). Fix \( n \geq 2 \) and for \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n+1 \), \( a \in \mathbb{F}_q \), denote by \( e_{i,j}(a) \) the elementary matrix defined above. The Steinberg relations of \( G \) are the following (we leave it to the reader to verify that these relations holds):

(St 1) For every \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n+1 \), and every \( a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q \),

\[
e_{i,j}(a_1)e_{i,j}(a_2) = e_{i,j}(a_1 + a_2).
\]

(St 2) For every \( 1 \leq i_1 < j_1 \leq n+1, 1 \leq i_2 < j_2 \leq n+1 \), and every \( a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q \),

\[
[e_{i_1,j_1}(a_1), e_{i_2,j_2}(a_2)] = \begin{cases} 1 & i_1 \neq j_2, i_2 \neq j_1 \\ e_{i_1,j_2}(a_1a_2) & j_1 = i_2 \\ e_{i_2,j_1}(-a_1a_2) & j_2 = i_1 \end{cases}.
\]

Lemma 7.3. Let \( G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q) \), \( S_{el} \) be the set of all elementary matrices and \( R_{Steinberg} \) be the Steinberg relations. Then \( \langle S_{el} | R_{Steinberg} \rangle = G \) and the Dehn function for this presentation is bounded independently of \( q \).

Proof. We observe that every \( g \in G \) can be written as a product of the form

\[
g = e_{1,2}(a_{1,2})e_{1,3}(a_{1,3})\ldots e_{n,n+1}(a_{n,n+1}),
\]

where \( a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q \). Moreover, \( g = e \) if and only if \( a_{i,j} = 0 \) for every \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n+1 \). Thus, it is enough to prove that any word \( w \) of length \( m \) can be brought to this form using the Steinberg relations and that the number of relations applied is independent of \( q \).

Let \( w \) be a word of length \( m \). We bring \( w \) to the desired form using the Steinberg relations above to perform bubble sort. First, we can always write \( w \) as \( w = w_1e_{1,2}(a_{1,2}^{(1)})w_2e_{1,2}(a_{1,2}^{(2)})\ldots w_ke_{1,2}(a_{1,2}^{(k)})w_{k+1} \) where \( w_i \) do not contain any \( e_{1,2} \)'s element. We use the Steinberg relations (St 2) to permute the \( e_{1,2} \) and relation (St 1) to merge them and bring \( w \) to the form \( e_{1,2}(a_{1,2}^{(1)}) + \ldots + (a_{1,2}^{(k)})w' \) where \( e_{1,2}(a_{1,2}) = e_{1,2}(a_{1,2}^{(1)}) + \ldots + (a_{1,2}^{(k)}) \) and \( w' = w_1w'_{k+1} \). Note that the number of relations that are applied is \( \leq 2m \) (at most \( m \) “bubble” permutations and at most \( m \) merges). Also note that while \( w' \) may be longer than \( w \) (since applying relation (St 2) can add a letter to the word) its
length is at most $2m$ and it does not contain any elements of the form $e_{1,2}$. Thus, ordering $e_{1,2}$ “cost” us at most $2m$ relations and made the prefix at most $2$ times longer. Repeat the same algorithm on $w'$ to order $e_{1,3}$: since $w'$ is at length $\leq 2m$, this will “cost” at most $4m$ applications of the relations and make the word into $w'' = e_{1,2}(a_{1,2})e_{1,3}(a_{1,3})w''$, where the length of $w''$ is at most $4m$ and is contains no $e_{1,2}, e_{1,3}$’s. Repeating this ordering procedure for all the $e_{i,j}$’s we are able to bring $w$ to the desired form applying at most $2m + 4m + ... + 2^{(n+1)}$ relations and this number does not depend on $m$. Thus if we denote $\text{Dehn}_{St}$ to be the is the Dehn function with respect to the Steinberg relations (with the generating set of elementary matrices), we proved that $\text{Dehn}_{St}(m) \leq 2m + 4m + ... + 2^{(n+1)}m$ and this number does not depend on $q$. We note that the bound we gave on $\text{Dehn}_{St}$ is far from tight, since we made no to effort to optimize this bound, but only show it is independent of $q$.

Note that every $g \in \bigcup_i K_{(i)}$ can be written as a product of at most $\binom{n}{2}$ and thus from the above Lemma we can conclude that in order to show that

$$G = \langle \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{(i)} \big| \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} R_i \rangle$$

and that the Dehn function for this presentation can be bounded independently of $q$, it is sufficient to show that every Steinberg relation can be reduced to the trivial word using $\bigcup_i R_i$ and that the number of relations in $\bigcup_i R_i$ that are applied in such a reduction is bounded independently of $q$. Formally, when proving that

$$G = \langle \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{(i)} \big| \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} R_i \rangle$$

we can not refer to elements of the form $e_{1,n+1}(a)$ since they do not appear in our set of generators. The way to overcome this problem is to formally define $e_{1,n+1}(a)$ as $e_{1,n+1}(a) = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a)]$. The following observation states that we do not have to consider all the Steinberg relations, since some already appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$:

**Observation 7.4.** We note that a lot of Steinberg relations already appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$. Namely, if we denote $e_{1,n+1}(a) = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a)]$ the Steinberg relations that do not appear in $R_0 \cup R_{n-1}$ are:

1. For every $1 < j \leq n, 2 \leq i < n + 1, i \neq j$ and every $a, b \in F_q$

   $$[e_{1,j}(a), e_{i,n+1}(b)] = 1.$$  

2. For every $1 < j < n + 1$ and every $a, b \in F_q$,

   $$[e_{1,j}(a), e_{j,n+1}(b)] = e_{1,n+1}(ab).$$

3. For every $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ and every $a, b \in F_q$,

   $$[e_{i,j}(a), e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1.$$ 

4. For every $a, b \in F_q$,

   $$e_{1,n+1}(a)e_{1,n+1}(b) = e_{1,n+1}(a + b).$$
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In [BD01], Biss and Dasgupta proved the following:

**Theorem 7.5.** [BD01, Theorem 1] Let $n \geq 3$ and $G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $s_1, ..., s_n$ be the generators of the abstract group $G_0$ and define the following relations:

(B-D 1) For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $s_i^0 = 1$.

(B-D 2) For every $1 \leq i \leq n-2$ and every $j > i - 1$, $[s_i, s_j] = 1$.

(B-D 3) For every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$[s_i, [s_i, s_{i+1}]] = [s_{i+1}, [s_i, s_{i+1}]] = 1.$$ 

(B-D 4) For every $1 \leq i \leq n-2$,

$$[[s_i, s_{i+1}], [s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}]] = 1.$$ 

Then $G_0$ which is $\{s_i^\pm : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ with the relations (1) - (4) is isomorphic to $G$. Moreover, if $q$ is odd, the relations of the form (4) are not needed.

Explicitly, the proof of [BD01, Theorem 1] shows the following: Define in $G_0$ (by abuse of notation) $e_{i,j}(1)$ inductively as $e_{i,j}(1) = s_i$ if $j = i + 1$ and $e_{i,j}(1) = [e_{i,j-1}(1), s_{j-1}]$. Then every relation of the form

1. For every $1 \leq i_1 < j_1 \leq n+1$, $1 \leq i_2 < j_2 \leq n+1$,

$$[e_{i_1,j_1}(1), e_{i_2,j_2}(1)] = \begin{cases} 1 & i_1 \neq j_2, i_2 \neq j_1 \\ e_{i_1,j_2}(1) & j_1 = i_2 \\ e_{i_2,j_1}(-1) & j_2 = i_1 \end{cases}.$$

2. For every $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4$,

$$[e_{i_1,i_2}(1), [e_{i_2,i_3}(1), e_{i_3,i_4}(1)]] = [[e_{i_1,i_2}(1), e_{i_2,i_3}(1)], e_{i_3,i_4}(1)].$$

3. For every $1 \leq l < i < j \leq n+1$,

$$[e_{l,i}(1), e_{i,j}(1)] = e_{l,j}(1).$$

can be deduced from (1) - (4) (or (1) - (3) if $q$ is odd) in a finite number of steps.

**Corollary 7.6.** Let $n \geq 3$ and $G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Fix $a_1, ..., a_n \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, denote $s_i(a_i) = e_{i,i+1}(a_i)$ and consider the following relations in $G$:

1. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $s_i(a_i)^0 = 1$.

2. For every $1 \leq i \leq n-2$ and every $j > i - 1$, $[s_i(a_i), s_j(a_j)] = 1$.

3. For every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$[s_i(a_i), [s_i(a_i), s_{i+1}(a_{i+1})]] = [s_{i+1}(a_{i+1}), [s_i(a_i), s_{i+1}(a_{i+1})]] = 1.$$
4. For every $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$,
\[ [s_i(a_i), s_{i+1}(a_{i+1})], [s_{i+1}(a_{i+1}), s_{i+2}(a_{i+2})] = 1. \]

Denote $a_i^j = \prod_{l=i}^{j-1} a_l$ and define $e_{i,j}(a_i^j)$ inductively as $e_{i,i+1}(a_i^{i+1}) = s_i(a_i)$ if and $e_{i,j}(a_i^j) = [e_{i,j-1}(a_i^{j-1}), s_{j-1}(a_{j-1})]$. Then every relation of the form

1. For every $1 \leq i_1 < j_1 \leq n + 1, j_1 \leq i_2 < j_2 \leq n + 1$,
\[ [e_{i_1,j_1}(a_{i_1}^{j_1}), e_{i_2,j_2}(a_{i_2}^{j_2})] = \begin{cases} 1 & i_1 \neq j_2, i_2 \neq j_1 \\ e_{i_1,j_2}(a_{i_1}^{j_1} a_{i_2}^{j_2}) & j_1 = i_2 \\ e_{i_2,j_1}(-a_{i_1}^{j_1} a_{i_2}^{j_2}) & j_2 = i_1 \end{cases}. \]

2. For every $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4$,
\[ [e_{i_1,i_2}(a_{i_1}^{i_2}), e_{i_2,i_3}(a_{i_2}^{i_3}), e_{i_3,i_4}(a_{i_3}^{i_4})] = [e_{i_1,i_2}(a_{i_1}^{i_2}), e_{i_2,i_3}(a_{i_2}^{i_3}), e_{i_3,i_4}(a_{i_4}^{i_4})]. \]

3. For every $1 \leq l < i < j \leq n + 1$,
\[ [e_{l,i}(a_l^i), e_{i,j}(a_i^j)] = e_{l,j}(a_l^j). \]

can be deduced from (1) – (4) (or (1) – (3) if $q$ is odd) in a finite number of steps (that is independent of $q$).

Proof. Consider the isomorphism $\Psi : G \to G$ defined by $\Psi(s_i(a_i)) = s_i(1)$ and apply Theorem 7.5 on $\Psi(G)$. \hfill \Box

After this Corollary, we are ready to prove the following Theorem:

**Theorem 7.7.** Let $G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, with $K_{(0)}, \ldots, K_{(n-1)}, R_0, \ldots, R_{n-1}$ as above. If $n \geq 4$ or $q$ is odd, then $G = \bigcup_i K_{(i)} \bigcup_i R_i$ and the Dehn function of this presentation is bounded independently of $q$.

Proof. First, we note that all the relations $(B - D1) - (B - D4)$ of Theorem 7.5 appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$ and therefore $G = \langle \bigcup_i K_{(i)} \bigcup_i R_i \rangle$. Thus we already know all the Steinberg relations holds in $\langle \bigcup_i K_{(i)} \bigcup_i R_i \rangle$ and we just need to verify that every Steinberg relation can be deduced from a finite number of relations in $\bigcup_i R_i$ that is independent of $q$. As stated in Observation 7.4 we do not have to check all the Steinberg relations (since some appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$) and it is enough to check relations (1) – (4) that were stated in Observation 7.4.

**Observation 7.4** relations of type (1): We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $1 < j \leq n, 2 \leq i < n + 1, i \neq j$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$
\[ [e_{1,j}(a), e_{i,n+1}(b)] = 1. \]

Apply Corollary 7.6 with $a_1 = a, a_2 = \ldots = a_{n-1} = 1, a_n = b$. Then for every $j \leq n, a_j^1 = a$ and every $2 \leq i, a_i^{n+1} = b$ and from Corollary 7.6 $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that
\[ [e_{1,j}(a), e_{i,n+1}(b)] = 1, \]
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and the number of relations for deducing this relation is independent of $q$.

**Observation 7.4 relations of type (2):** We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $1 < j < n + 1$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$,

$$[e_{1,j}(a), e_{j,n+1}(b)] = e_{1,n+1}(ab),$$

where $e_{1,n+1}(ab)$ is formally defined as

$$e_{1,n+1}(ab) = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(ab)].$$

We will first show this with $j = 1$. Let $a_1 = ... = a_{j-2} = 1, a_{j-1} = a$ and $a_j = ... = a_n = 1$. Then $a_1^j = a, e_j^{n+1} = 1, a_1^{n+1} = a$ and by Corollary 7.6 $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that

$$[e_{1,j}(a), e_{j,n+1}(1)] = [e_{1,j}(a_1^j), e_{j,n+1}(a_1^{n+1})] = e_{1,n+1}(a_1^{n+1}) = e_{1,n+1}(a)$$

and the number of relations needed for deducing this relation is independent of $q$.

Next, we will treat the case where $a, b$ are general and $j < n$. We first note that

$$[e_{j,j+1}(b), e_{j+1,n+1}(1)] = e_{j,n+1}(b),$$

is in $R_0$ and thus (after applying one relation)

$$[e_{1,j}(a), e_{j,n+1}(b)] = [e_{1,j}(a), [e_{j,j+1}(b), e_{j+1,n+1}(1)]]$$

Last, in the case where $j = n$, we use the relation $e_{1,n}(a) = [e_{1,2}(a), e_{2,n}(1)]$ and using similar arguments as above, we show that

$$[e_{1,n}(a), e_{n,n+1}(b)] = [e_{1,2}(a), e_{2,n+1}(b)],$$

and thus we can use the previous case.

**Observation 7.4 relations of type (3):** We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$,

$$[e_{i,j}(a), e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1,$$

and that the number of relations used is independent of $q$. We will first prove the case where $\{i, j\} \neq \{1, n + 1\}$. Let $a, b$ as above. If $a = 0$, then $e_{i,j}(a)$ is the identity and there is nothing to prove. Assume that $a \neq 0$ and define $a_1 = a, a_2 = ... = a_{n-1} = 1, a_n = \frac{b}{a}$. Then $a_{i,j} = a, a_{1,n+1} = b$ and the relation follows from Corollary 7.6. We are left to prove that

$$[e_{1,n+1}(a), e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1,$$

but this follows from the previous case combined with the fact that by definition $e_{1,n+1}(a) = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a)]$.

**Observation 7.4 relations of type (4):** We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$,

$$e_{1,n+1}(a)e_{1,n+1}(b) = e_{1,n+1}(a + b),$$
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and that the number of relations used is independent of $q$. By definition, this is equivalent to showing that

$$[e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a)] [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(b)] = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a+b)].$$

Indeed,

$$[e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(a+b)]$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1) e_{n,n+1}(-a-b) e_{1,n}(1) e_{n,n+1}(a+b)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1) e_{n,n+1}(-a) e_{1,n}(1) e_{n,n+1}(b) e_{n,n+1}(a)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1) e_{n,n+1}(-a) e_{1,n}(1) e_{1,n+1}(b) e_{n,n+1}(a)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1) e_{n,n+1}(-a) e_{1,n}(1) e_{n,n+1}(a) e_{1,n+1}(b),$$

as needed.

**Corollary 7.8.** Let $G = \text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ with subgroups $K_{\{i\}, \ldots, K_{\{n-1\}}}$ as above and let $X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}})$ be the coset complex. If $n \geq 4$ or $q$ is odd then the constants $N_0$ and $N_1$ of $X$ are bounded independently of $q$ and thus $\text{Exp}_0^0(X), \text{Exp}_1^0(X)$ are bounded from below independently of $q$.

**Proof.** By [KO20, Theorem 3.5] and Theorem 5.6 stated above, $X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}})$ is strongly symmetric. Thus, combining Corollary 7.2 and Theorems 7.7, 4.8 and 6.16 yields the desired result.

### 7.2 New coboundary expanders arising from unipotent group with polynomial entries

Below, we will show that we can generalize the example given above and get new examples of coboundary expander from unipotent groups with polynomial entries.

Define the group $G$ to be a subgroup of $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ invertible matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ in generated by the set $\{e_{i,i+1}(a+bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. More explicitly, an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix $A$ is in $G$ if and only if

$$A(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j \\ 0 & i > j \\ a_0 + a_1 t + \ldots + a_{j-i} t^{j-i} & i < j, a_0, \ldots, a_{j-i} \in \mathbb{F}_q \end{cases},$$

(observe that all the matrices in $G$ are upper triangular).

For $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, define a subgroup $K_{\{i\}} < G$ as

$$K_{\{i\}} = \langle e_{j,i+1}(a+bt) : j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i+1\}, a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q \rangle.$$

Define $X$ to be the coset complex $X = X(G, (K_{\{i\}})_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}})$. By applying Theorems 4.8 and 6.16 we will prove that for any odd $q$, the 0-dimensional and the 1-dimensional Cheeger constants of $X$ can be bounded away from 0 and this bound is independent of $q$.

The bound on $N_0$ of $X$ follows from the following Lemma:
Lemma 7.9. Let $q$ be a prime power, $n \geq 2$ and $G, K_{[0]}, \ldots, K_{[n-1]}$ be the groups defined above. Then the subgroups $K_{[0]}, \ldots, K_{[n-1]}$ boundedly generate $G$ and

$$\max \min_{g \in G} \left\{ t : g = g_1 \ldots g_t \text{ and } g_1, \ldots, g_t \in \bigcup_i K_{[i]} \right\} \leq 2 + 4(n + 1).$$

The proof of this Lemma is very similar to the proof of Lemma 7.1.

Proof. Let $g \in G$ be some group element. By Gauss elimination, there are $g_1 \in K_{[0]}, g_2 \in K_{[n-1]}$ such that

$$g_2^{-1} g_1^{-1} g = e_{1,n+1}(a_0 + a_1 + \ldots + a_n t^n) = e_{1,n+1}(a_0)e_{1,n+1}(a_1 t) \ldots e_{1,n+1}(a_n t^n).$$

Thus, it is enough to show that every element of the form $e_{1,n+1}(a_j t^j)$ can be written as a product of 4 elements in $K_{[0]} \cup K_{[n]}$.

For every $0 \leq j < n$ and every $a_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$, we have that $e_{1,n} (\pm a_j t^j) \in K_{[0]}, e_{1,n+1} (\pm 1) \in K_{[n]}$ and that

$$e_{1,n+1}(a_j t^j) = e_{1,n}(-a_j t^j)e_{n,n+1}(-1)e_{1,n}(a_j t^j)e_{n,n+1}(1),$$

as needed. Also, for every $a_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$, we have that $e_{1,n+1}(\pm a_n t^n-1) \in K_{[0]}, e_{n,n+1}(\pm t) \in K_{[n]}$ and that

$$e_{1,n+1}(a_n t^n) = e_{1,n}(-a_n t^n-1)e_{n,n+1}(-t)e_{1,n}(a_n t^n-1)e_{n,n+1}(t).$$

Corollary 7.10. For every prime power $q$, $n \geq 2$, let $G, K_{[0]}, \ldots, K_{[n]}$ as above and $X = X(G, (K_{[i]}), i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\})$. The filling constant $N_0$ of $X$ satisfies $N_0 \leq 3 + 4(n + 1)$ and in particular is bounded independently of $q$.

Proof. Combine Lemma 7.9 and Corollary 7.10.

After bounding $N_0$, we want to apply Theorem 6.16 in order to bound $N_1$. Thus we need to show that the group $G$ can be presented as

$$G = \langle \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{[i]} | \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} R_i \rangle,$$

where $R_i$ are all the relations of $K_{[i]}$ and that the Dehn function for this presentation can be bounded independently of $q$.

As in the case where Unip$(\mathbb{F}_q)$ discussed above, the group $G$ can be presented using Steinberg relations. Fix $n \geq 2$ and for $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$, $r \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ of degree $\leq j - i$, denote by $e_{i,j}(r)$ the elementary matrix defined above. The Steinberg relations of $G$ are the following (we leave it to the reader to verify that these relations holds):

(S1) For every $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$, and every $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ of degree $\leq j - i$,

$$e_{i,j}(r_1)e_{i,j}(r_2) = e_{i,j}(r_1 + r_2).$$
For every \( 1 \leq i_1 < j_1 \leq n + 1, 1 \leq i_2 < j_2 \leq n + 1 \), and every \( r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q[t] \) of degree \( \leq j_1 - i_1, j_2 - i_2 \),

\[
[e_{i_1,j_1}(r_1), e_{i_2,j_2}(r_2)] = \begin{cases} 
1 & i_1 \neq j_2, i_2 \neq j_1 \\
e_{i_1,j_2}(r_1 r_2) & j_1 = i_2 \\
e_{i_2,j_1}(-r_1 r_2) & j_2 = i_1
\end{cases}
\]

Lemma 7.11. Let \( G \) be as above, \( S < G \) be the set \( S = \{e_{i,j}(r) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1, r \in \mathbb{F}_q[t], \deg(r) \leq j - i \} \) and \( R_{\text{Steinberg}} \) be the Steinberg relations as above. Then \( (S|R_{\text{Steinberg}}) = G \) and the Dehn function for this presentation is bounded independently of \( q \).

The proof is repeating the proof of Lemma 7.3 almost verbatim and we give it below for completeness.

**Proof.** We observe that every \( g \in G \) can be written as a product of the form

\[
g = e_{1,2}(r_{1,2})e_{1,3}(r_{1,3})...e_{n,n+1}(r_{n,n+1}),
\]

where \( r_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q[t] \) of degree \( \leq j - i \). Moreover, \( g = e \) if and only if \( r_{i,j} = 0 \) for every \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1 \). Thus, it is enough to prove that any word \( w \) of length \( m \) can be brought to this form using the Steinberg relations and that the number of relations applied is independent of \( q \).

Let \( w \) be a word of length \( m \). We bring \( w \) to the desired form using the Steinberg relations above to perform bubble sort. First, we can always write \( w \) as \( w = w_1 e_{1,2}(r_{1,2})w_2 e_{1,2}(r_{1,2})...w_k e_{1,2}(r_{1,2})w_{k+1} \) where \( w_i \) do not contain any \( e_{1,2} \)'s element. We use the Steinberg relations \((\text{S}2)\) to permute the \( e_{1,2} \) and relation \((\text{S1})\) to merge them and bring \( w \) to the form \( e_{1,2}(r_{1,2} + ... + r_{1,2})w' \) where \( e_{1,2}(r_{1,2}) = e_{1,2}(r_{1,2} + ... + r_{1,2}) \) and \( w' = w_1...w_k w_{k+1} \). Note that the number of relations that are applied is \( \leq 2m \) (at most \( m \) “bubble” permutations and at most \( m \) merges). Also note that while \( w' \) may be longer than \( w \) (since applying relation \((\text{3})\) adds a letter to the word) its length is at most \( 2m \) and it does not contain any elements of the form \( e_{1,2} \). Thus, ordering \( e_{1,2} \) “cost” us at most \( 2m \) relations and made the prefix at most \( 2m \) times longer. Repeat the same algorithm on \( w' \) to order \( e_{1,3} \): since \( w' \) is at length \( \leq 2m \), this will “cost” at most \( 4m \) applications of the relations and make the word into \( w'' = e_{1,2}(r_{1,2})e_{1,3}(r_{1,3})w''' \), where the length of \( w''' \) is at most \( 4m \) and is contains no \( e_{1,2}, e_{1,3} \)'s. Repeating this ordering procedure for all the \( e_{i,j} \)'s we are able to bring \( w \) to the desired form applying at most \( 2m + 4m + ... + 2^{(n+1)} \) relations and this number does not depend on \( m \). Thus is \( \text{Dehn}_{\text{Steinberg}} \) is the Dehn function with respect to the Steinberg relations, we proved that \( \text{Dehn}_{\text{Steinberg}}(m) \leq 2m + 4m + ... + 2^{(n+1)} \) and this number does not depend on \( q \). We note that the bound we gave on \( \text{Dehn}_{\text{Steinberg}} \) is far from tight, since we made no to effort to optimize this bound, but only show it is independent of \( q \). \( \square \)

Next, we define what we call pure degree Steinberg relations that are the following subset of the Steinberg relations mentioned above:

\((\text{pdS}1)\) For every \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1 \), every \( 0 \leq k \leq j - i \) and every \( a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q \)

\[
e_{i,j}(at^k)e_{i,j}(bt^k) = e_{i,j}((a + b)t^k),
\]
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For every $1 \leq i_1 < j_1 \leq n + 1, 1 \leq i_2 < j_2 \leq n + 1$, every $0 \leq k_1 \leq j_1 - i_1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq j_2 - i_2$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$, 

$$[e_{i_1,j_1}(at^{k_1}), e_{i_2,j_2}(bt^{k_2})] = \begin{cases} 
1 & i_1 \neq j_2, i_2 \neq j_1 \\
e_{i_1,j_2}(abt^{k_1+k_2}) & j_1 = i_2 
\ne_{i_2,j_1}(-abt^{k_1+k_2}) & j_2 = i_1 
\end{cases}.$$ 

We observe that every Steinberg relation can be written as a finite number of conjugates of pure degree relations and thus if we consider the presentation of $G$ with respect to pure dimension Steinberg relations and the generating set $\{e_{i,j}(at^k) : a \in \mathbb{F}_q, 1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1, 0 \leq k \leq j - i\}$, we will get that up to a multiplicative constant that is independent of $q$ the Dehn function with respect to this presentation bounds the function $\text{Dehn}_{\text{Steinberg}}$ discussed above. The upshot of this discussion is that in order to show that the group $G$ above can be presented as 

$$G = \langle \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{\{i\}} \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} R_i \rangle$$ 

and that the Dehn function for this presentation can be bounded independently of $q$, it is sufficient to show that every pure degree Steinberg relation can be reduced to the trivial word using $\bigcup_i R_i$ and that the number of relations in $\bigcup_i R_i$ that are applied in such a reduction is bounded independently of $q$. Similar to Observation 7.12, we observe that we do not have to prove all the pure degree Steinberg relations, since some already appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$: 

**Observation 7.12.** We note that a lot of Steinberg relations already appear in $\bigcup_i R_i$. Namely, if we denote 

$$e_{1,n+1}(at^k) = \begin{cases} 
[e_{1,n}(t^k), e_{n,n+1}(a)] & k < n \\
[e_{1,n}(t^{k-1}), e_{n,n+1}(at)] & k = n 
\end{cases}$$ 

the pure degree Steinberg relations that do **not** appear in $R_0 \cup R_{n-1}$ are: 

1. For every $1 < j \leq n, 2 \leq i < n + 1, i \neq j$, every $0 \leq k_1 \leq j - 1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n + 1 - i$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ 

$$[e_{i,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{i,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1.$$ 

2. For every $1 < j < n + 1$, every $0 \leq k_1 \leq j - 1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n + 1 - j$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$, 

$$[e_{i,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{j,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = e_{1,n+1}(abt^{k_1+k_2}).$$ 

3. For every $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$, every $0 \leq k_1 \leq j - i, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n$ and every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$, 

$$[e_{i,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{1,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1.$$ 

4. For every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and every $0 \leq k \leq n$, 

$$e_{1,n+1}(at^k)e_{1,n+1}(bt^k) = e_{1,n+1}((a + b)t^k).$$ 

Let $r_1, ..., r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ of degree $\leq 1$. We denote $\text{Unip}_{n+1}(r_1, ..., r_n)$ to be the subgroup of $G$ generated by $\{e_{i,j+1}(r_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. 
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**Lemma 7.13.** Let $G, K_{\{0\}}, ..., K_{\{n\}}, R_0, ..., R_{n-1}$ as above. Fix $r_1, ..., r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ of degree $\leq 1$ and the Dehn function of this presentation is bounded independently of $q$.

**Proof.** We note that the subgroup of $G$ generated by $\{e_{i,i+1}(r_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Unip}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and thus we can apply Theorem 7.14. □

Using this Lemma we can prove the following Theorem:

**Theorem 7.14.** Let $G, K_{\{0\}}, ..., K_{\{n-1\}}, R_0, ..., R_{n-1}$ as above. If $n \geq 4$ or $q$ is odd, then

$$G = \bigcup_i K_i \bigcup_i R_i$$

and the Dehn function of this presentation is bounded independently of $q$.

**Proof.** Denote

$$e_{1,n+1}(at^k) = \begin{cases} [e_{1,n}(tk), e_{n,n+1}(a)] & k < n \\ [e_{1,n}(tk-1), e_{n,n+1}(at)] & k = n \end{cases}$$

We only need to show that one can deduce each relation of types (1)-(4) of Observation 7.12 from a finite number of relations in $\bigcup_i R_i$ that is independent of $q$.

**Observation 7.12.** relations of type (1): We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $1 < j \leq n, 2 \leq i < n + 1, i \neq j$, every $0 \leq k_1 \leq j - 1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n + 1 - i$ and every $a,b \in \mathbb{F}_q$

$$[e_{1,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{i,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1,$$

and that the number of relations needed to deduce this relation is independent of $q$. We will only prove this for $n = 3$. The proof in the general case is similar, but more tedious and is left for the reader. In this case, either $j = 2$ and $i = 3$ or $j = 3$ and $i = 2$. If $j = 2$ and $i = 3$, then the needed relation appears in $R_1$ and we are done. Thus we are left to show that

$$[e_{1,3}(at^{k_1}), e_{2,4}(bt^{k_2})] = 1,$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and $0 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq 2$. Applying Lemma 7.13 in all the cases where $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \{1, t\}$ prove the cases where $k_1 = k_2$ and the cases where $k_1 = 1$ or $k_2 = 1$. Thus, we are left to prove the cases

$$[e_{1,3}(a), e_{2,4}(bt^2)] = 1,$$
and
\[ [e_{1,3}(at^2), e_{2,4}(b)] = 1. \]

We will show only \([e_{1,3}(a), e_{2,4}(bt^2)] = 1\): Applying Lemma 7.13 with \(r_1 = t + a, r_2 = t + 1, r_3 = bt\), we get that
\[ [e_{1,3}(t^2 + (a + 1)t + a), e_{2,4}(bt^2 + bt)] = 1. \]

For the relations in \(R_0 \cup R_2\), we have that
\[ e_{1,3}(t^2 + (a + 1)t + a) = e_{1,3}(t^2)e_{1,3}((a + 1)t)e_{1,3}(a), \]
\[ e_{2,4}(bt^2 + bt) = e_{2,4}(bt^2)e_{2,4}(bt). \]

We also already showed that
\[ [e_{1,3}(t^2), e_{2,4}(bt^2)] = 1, [e_{1,3}(t^2), e_{2,4}(bt)] = 1, [e_{1,3}((a + 1)t), e_{2,4}(bt^2)] = 1, \]
\[ [e_{1,3}((a + 1)t), e_{2,4}(bt)] = 1, [e_{1,3}(a), e_{2,4}(bt)] = 1, \]
and thus it follows from \([e_{1,3}(t^2 + (a + 1)t + a), e_{2,4}(bt^2 + bt)] = 1\), that
\[ [e_{1,3}(a), e_{2,4}(bt^2)] = 1, \]
as needed.

**Observation 7.12, relations of type (2):** We need to show that \(\bigcup_i R_i\) imply that for every \(1 < j < n + 1\), every \(0 \leq k_1 \leq j - 1, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n + 1 - j\) and every \(a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q\),
\[ [e_{1,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{j,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = e_{1,n+1}(ab^{k_1+k_2}), \]
and that the number of relations needed to deduce this relation is independent of \(q\). This follows from Lemma 7.13 by taking \(r_1 = ... = r_{k_1} = t, r_{k_1+1} = ... = r_{j-1} = 1, r_j = ... = r_{j+k_2-1} = t, r_{j+k_2} = ... = r_n = 1\).

**Observation 7.12, relations of type (3):** We need to show that \(\bigcup_i R_i\) imply that for every \(1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1\), every \(0 \leq k_1 \leq j - i, 0 \leq k_2 \leq n\) and every \(a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q\),
\[ [e_{i,j}(at^{k_1}), e_{1,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1, \]
and that the number of relations needed to deduce this relation is independent of \(q\). We note that since every elementary matrix in \(G\) can be written as a product of elements of the form \(e_{i,i+1}(a)\) and \(e_{i,i+1}(at)\) and the number of elements in such product is bounded independently of \(q\). Thus, it is enough to show that for every \(1 \leq i \leq n\),
\[ [e_{i,i+1}(a), e_{1,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1, \]
and
\[ [e_{i,i+1}(at), e_{1,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1. \]

If \(k_2 < n\), then for every \(i\), we can always choose \(r_1, ..., r_n \in \{1, t\}\) such that exactly \(k_2\) of them are \(t\) and \(r_i = 1\). With this choice, applying Lemma 7.13 implies that
\[ [e_{i,i+1}(a), e_{1,n+1}(bt^{k_2})] = 1. \]
Similarly, if $k_2 > 0$, we can apply Lemma [7.13] and show that

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at), e_{1,n+1}(b^{t^{k_2}})] = 1.$$ 

Thus, we are left with the cases

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at), e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1,$$

and

$$[e_{i,i+1}(a), e_{1,n+1}(b^{t^n})] = 1.$$ 

We will prove the first case. Apply Lemma [7.13] with $r_i = at + b$ and all the other $r_j$’s equal 1. We get that

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at + b), e_{1,n+1}(at + b)] = 1.$$ 

Note that

$$e_{i,i+1}(at + b) = e_{i,i+1}(at)e_{i,i+1}(b),$$

and that

$$e_{1,n+1}(at + b) = [e_{1,n}(1), e_{n,n+1}(at + b)]$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1)e_{n,n+1}(-at - b)e_{1,n}(1)e_{n,n+1}(at + b)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1)e_{n,n+1}(-b)e_{n,n+1}(-at)e_{1,n}(1)e_{n,n+1}(at)e_{n,n+1}(b)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1)e_{n,n+1}(-b)e_{1,n}(1)e_{n,n+1}(at)e_{n,n+1}(b)$$

$$= e_{1,n}(-1)e_{n,n+1}(at)e_{1,n}(1)e_{n,n+1}(b)$$

$$= e_{1,n+1}(b)e_{1,n+1}(at),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that we already proven that $e_{1,n+1}(at)$ commutes with all the elementary matrices. Thus, we have that

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at)e_{i,i+1}(b), e_{1,n+1}(at)e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1.$$ 

We already showed that

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at), e_{1,n+1}(at)] = 1, [e_{i,i+1}(b), e_{1,n+1}(at)] = 1,$$

and thus it follows that

$$[e_{i,i+1}(at), e_{1,n+1}(b)] = 1,$$

as needed.

**Observation [7.12], relations of type (4):** We need to show that $\bigcup_i R_i$ imply that for every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and every $0 \leq k \leq n$,

$$e_{1,n+1}(at^k)e_{1,n+1}(bt^k) = e_{1,n+1}((a + b)t^k),$$

and that the number of relations needed to deduce this relation is independent of $q$. This follows from Lemma [7.13] with $r_1 = \ldots r_k = t$ and $r_{k+1} = \ldots = r_n = 1$. 

As a corollary, we get a generalization of Theorem [1.15] that appeared in the introduction:
Corollary 7.15. Let $G, K_{(0)}, \ldots, K_{(n-1)}$ as above and let $X = X(G, (K_{(i)})_{i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}})$ be the coset complex. If $n \geq 4$ or $q$ is odd then the constants $N_0$ and $N_1$ of $X$ are bounded independently of $q$ and thus $\text{Exp}_b^0(X), \text{Exp}_b^1(X)$ are bounded from below independently of $q$ (the bound does depend on $n$).

Proof. By [KO20] Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 5.6 stated above, $X = X(G, (K_{(i)})_{i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}})$ is strongly symmetric. Thus, combining Corollary 7.10 and Theorems 7.14, 4.8 and 6.16 yields the desired result. \qed

8 New cosystolic and topological expanders

After all this, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.9 from the introduction. Let us state it again for completeness:

Theorem 8.1. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}, s > 4$ and $q$ be a prime power. Denote $G^{(s)}(q)$ to be the group of $4 \times 4$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q[1]/(t^s)$ generated by the set
\[
\{e_{1,2}(a + bt), e_{2,3}(a + bt), e_{3,4}(a + bt), e_{4,1}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q\}.
\]
For $0 \leq i \leq 2$, define $K_{(i)}$ to be the subgroup of $G^{(s)}$ generated by
\[
\{e_{i,j+1}(a + bt), e_{i,1}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q, 1 \leq j \leq 3, j \neq i + 1\}
\]
and define $K_{(3)}$ to be the subgroup of $G^{(s)}$ generated by
\[
\{e_{1,2}(a + bt), e_{2,3}(a + bt), e_{3,4}(a + bt) : a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q\}.
\]
Denote $X^{(s)} = X(G^{(s)}(q), (K_{(i)})_{i \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}})$ to be the coset complex as defined above. Then for any fixed $q$, $\{X^{(s)}\}_{s \geq 5}$ is a family of bounded degree simplicial complexes and if $q$ is odd and large enough, then there are $\varepsilon > 0, \mu > 0$ such that for every $s$, the 2-skeleton of $X^{(s)}$ is a $(\varepsilon, \mu)$-cosystolic expander. Thus, the sequence of 2-skeleton of $X^{(s)}$ is a sequence of bounded degree cosystolic and topological expanders.

Proof. We start by proving that there is $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that for every $s > 4$ and every odd $q$, all the links of $X^{(s)}$ are $\varepsilon'$-coboundary expanders. Since $X^{(s)}$ is 3-dimensional, we have to consider links of edges and links of vertices.

For links of edges, it is shown in [KO18] that every link is a bipartite graph with a second eigenvalue $\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. In this case, $\text{Exp}_b^0$ is equal to the Cheeger of the graph and thus by the Cheeger inequality it is always larger than $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$.

For links of vertices, we note that every link is exactly the simplicial complex discussed in Theorem 1.15 and thus these links are coboundary expanders with expansion that does not depend on $q$.

Let $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon')$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\varepsilon', \lambda) > 0$ and $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon', \lambda) > 0$ be the constants of Theorem 1.11. For every odd $q$ such that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \lambda$, we have that $X^{(s)}$ is a $\lambda$-local spectral expander and thus by Theorem 1.14 the 2-skeleton of $X^{(s)}$ is a $(\varepsilon, \mu)$-cosystolic expander. \qed

The motivation behind the definition of cosystolic expansion was to prove topological overlapping: Let $X$ be an $n$-dimensional simplicial complex as before. Given a map $f : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, a topological extension of $f$ is a continuous map $\tilde{f} : X \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which coincides with $f$ on $X^{(0)}$. 42
Definition 8.2 (Topological overlapping). A simplicial complex $X$ as above is said to have $c$-topological overlapping (with $1 \geq c > 0$) if for every $f : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and every topological extension $\tilde{f}$, there is a point $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$|\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : z \in \tilde{f}(\sigma)\}| \geq c|X^{(n)}|.$$ 

In other words, this means that at least $c$ fraction of the images of $n$-simplices intersect at a single point.

A family of pure $n$-dimensional simplicial complexes $\{X_j\}$ is called a family of topological expanders, if there is some $c > 0$ such that for every $j$, $X_j$ has $c$-topological overlapping.

In [DKW18], it was shown that cosystolic expansion implies topological expansion and thus as a Corollary of [DKW18, Theorem 8] and Theorem ?? we get that:

Theorem 8.3. There is a constant $Q$ such that for every odd prime power $q \geq Q$, such there is $c > 0$ such that for every $s > 4$, the $2$-skeleton of $X^{(s)}$ is $c$-topological overlapping, i.e., the family $\{2$-skeleton of $X^{(s)}\}_{s>4}$ is a family of bounded degree topological expanders.

### A The existence of a cone function and vanishing of (co)homology

As seen in Examples 3.4, 3.5 above, for a simplicial complex $X$ and $k \geq 0$, a $k$-cone function may not exist and if it exists it may not be unique. The existence of a $k$-cone function turns out to be equivalent to vanishing of (co)homology (we recall that by the universal coefficient theorem the vanishing of the $j$-th homology with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_2$ is equivalent to the vanishing of the $j$-th cohomology with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_2$):

Proposition A.1. Let $X$ be a finite $n$-dimensional simplicial complex and $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$. There exists a $k$-cone function (with some apex) if and only if $\tilde{H}_j(X) = \tilde{H}^j(X) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k$.

Proof of Proposition A.1. Let $X$ be a finite $n$-dimensional simplicial complex and $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Assume first that for every $0 \leq j \leq k$, $\tilde{H}_j(X) = 0$. Then by definition, for every $0 \leq j \leq k$, $\text{Sys}_j(X) = \infty$. Thus conditions of Proposition 4.1 are fulfilled trivially and as a result there exists a $k$-cone function.

In the other direction, assume there exists a $k$-cone function $\text{Cone}^k_v$. Let $A \in Z_k(X)$. Then by the definition of the cone function,

$$\partial_{k+1} \text{Cone}^k_v(A) = A + \text{Cone}^k_v(\partial_kA) = A + \text{Cone}^k_v(0) = A,$$

thus $A \in B_k(X)$ and since this holds for every $A$, it follows that $\tilde{H}^k(X) = 0$.

By definition, the existence of a $k$-cone function implies the existence of a $j$-cone function for every $0 \leq j \leq k$ and therefore the above argument shows that $\tilde{H}^j(X) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k$. 
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