

ON THE RELATIVIZED ALON SECOND EIGENVALUE CONJECTURE I: MAIN THEOREMS, EXAMPLES, AND OUTLINE OF PROOF

JOEL FRIEDMAN AND DAVID KOHLER

ABSTRACT. This is the first in a series of six articles devoted to showing that a typical covering map of large degree to a fixed, regular graph has its new adjacency eigenvalues within the bound conjectured by Alon for random regular graphs. Many of the techniques we develop hold whether or not the base graph is regular.

Our first main theorem in this series of articles is that if the base graph is d -regular, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, as the degree, n , of the covering map tends to infinity, some new adjacency eigenvalue of the map is larger in absolute value than $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ with probability at most order $1/n$. Our second main theorem is that if, in addition, the base graph is Ramanujan, then this probability is bounded above and below by $1/n$ to the power of a positive integer that we call the *tangle power* of the model, i.e., of the probability spaces of random covering maps of degree n .

The tangle power is fairly easy to bound from below, and at times to compute exactly; it measures the probability that certain *tangles* appear in the random covering graph, where a *tangle* is a local event that forces the covering graph to have a new eigenvalue strictly larger than $2(d-1)^{1/2}$.

If the base graph has no *half-loops*, then our simplest model of a random covering map is the model where one uniformly and independently chooses a permutation for each edge of the base graph; a half-loop is, roughly speaking, an unorientable self-loop. More generally, our theorems are valid for any model of random covering maps that is *algebraic*, which is a set of conditions that our trace methods require. Our main theorems are relativizations of Alon's conjecture on the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs of large degree.

In this first article of the series, we introduce all the terminology needed in this series, motivate this terminology, precisely state all the results in the remaining articles, and make some remarks about their proofs. As such, this article provides an overview of the entire series of articles; furthermore, the rest of the articles in this series may be read independently of one another.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Historical Context	4
1.2. Organization of This Series of Articles	5
1.3. Organization of This Article	6
2. Basic Terminology	7
2.1. Basic Notation and Conventions	7

Date: Thursday 14th November, 2019.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 68R10.

Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

2.2.	Conventions Regarding Digraphs and Graphs	7
2.3.	Coordinatized Coverings and Our Basic Models	8
2.4.	Morphisms, Covering and Etale Morphisms	10
2.5.	Adjacency Matrices and New/Old Spectrum	10
3.	Some Results in this Series of Articles	11
4.	Definitions Regarding Walks and Expected Traces	13
4.1.	Walks and Adjacency Matrices	13
4.2.	SNBC Walks and the Hashimoto or Non-backtracking Matrix	13
4.3.	The Visited Subgraph of a Walk	14
4.4.	The Order of a Graph and Its Fundamental Properties	15
4.5.	(B, ν) -Bounded Functions and Expansions	15
4.6.	Tangles	16
5.	Main Theorems in This Series of Articles	17
5.1.	The Tangle Power	17
5.2.	The HasTangles Probability Upper Bound	18
5.3.	The HasTangles Probability Lower Bound	18
5.4.	The Expected Number of Non-Alon Eigenvalues in Tangle-Free Graphs	18
5.5.	The Algebraic Power of a Model	19
5.6.	The First Main Theorem	20
5.7.	The Second Main Theorem	21
5.8.	Bounds on τ_{tang}	21
6.	The Trace Methods of Broder-Shamir and Friedman for Random Graphs	22
6.1.	The Framework for Random Graphs	22
6.2.	Subdividing Walks by Their Order	23
6.3.	Homotopy Type	23
6.4.	Expansions for Order Zero Walks	24
6.5.	Algebraic Models	25
6.6.	Expansions for Order One Walks: Theta Graph Example	26
6.7.	B -Graphs and Ordered Graphs	27
6.8.	Homotopy Type and Expected Walk Formulas in the Theta Graph Example	28
6.9.	Realizable Wordings, Letterings, and Regular Languages	30
6.10.	Examples of B -graphs with Non-trivial Automorphisms	31
7.	B -Graphs, Orderings, and Strongly Algebraic Models	32
7.1.	B -Graphs	32
7.2.	Ordered Graphs	33
7.3.	First-Encountered Ordering	33
7.4.	The Fibre Counting Functions \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}	33
7.5.	Ordered B -Graphs and Strongly Algebraic Models	33
8.	The Homotopy Type of a Walk and VLG's (Variable-Length Graphs)	36
8.1.	Bead Suppression	36
8.2.	The Homotopy Type of a Non-Backtracking Walk and of its Ordered Visited Subgraph	38
8.3.	Variable-Length Graphs (VLG's)	39
9.	Algebraic Models	39
9.1.	Regular Languages and NBWALKS(B)	40

9.2.	<i>B</i> -Wordings	40
9.3.	<i>B</i> -Types	42
9.4.	The Definition of Algebraic	42
9.5.	The Eigenvalues of a Regular Language, of a <i>B</i> -type, and of an Algebraic Model	43
9.6.	Our Basic Models are Algebraic	44
10.	Article II: Expansion Theorems	45
10.1.	Asymptotic Expansions for Walks of a Given <i>B</i> -Type	45
10.2.	Asymptotic Expansions for Walks Times Inclusions	46
11.	Article III: The Certified Trace Expansion Theorems	46
12.	Article IV: The Sidestepping Theorem	48
12.1.	Intuition Behind the Sidestepping Theorem	48
12.2.	Precise Statement of the Sidestepping Theorem	48
13.	Article V: Proofs of the First Main Theorem	50
14.	Article VI: Sharp Exponents for Regular Ramanujan Base Graphs	50
Appendix A.	Certified Trace and Indicator Function Approximation	51
Appendix B.	Definition Summary and Notes	53
	References	56

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this series of six articles is to prove a relativization of Alon’s Second Eigenvalue Conjecture, formulated in [Fri03], for any *base graph*, B , that is regular; a proof of this theorem appears in our preprint [FK14]. This series of six articles represents a “factorization” of the proof in [FK14] into many independent parts. This includes some original work beyond [FK14], and serves to clarify underlying principles of the proof. It also makes it easier to generalize the results here—for possible future use to related questions.

This series of articles also represents some improvements over [Fri08], which resolved Alon’s original conjecture, in that (1) one technical tool of [Fri08]—the *selective traces*—is replaced with a much simpler tool of *certified traces*, and (2) for certain values of d , our results get improved bounds on the probability estimates in the Alon’s original conjecture for d -regular graphs. We also correct a minor error in [Fri08] regarding the model $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}$ there, which we generalize here as the *cyclic model*.

This particular article has two main goals: first, to give an overall view of this series of articles, and, second, to motivate and precisely state the terminology used and the main results in the subsequent articles. In this way, each of the subsequent can be read independently of one another, assuming the terminology we define in this article; each subsequent article summarizes the terminology it needs, and the reader of subsequent articles may prefer to begin with its summary and consult this article for motivation as needed.

In addition to our main goal, this article has a number of additional resources, such as: (1) the optional Section 6 that summarizes some of the definitions and methods of [BS87, Fri91], to help the reader better understand the definitions of Sections 7–9; (2) aside from precisely stating the main theorems of subsequent articles, we make additional remarks on them and/or their proofs; (3) in one appendix

we explain some of the ideas of [Fri08] in terms of *certified traces*, which is an idea new to [FK14] and this series of articles, which replaces and significantly simplifies the *selective traces* of [Fri08]; (4) in another appendix we list all the terminology we use and make comments on it (the reader can search this appendix for terms to see where they are formally defined).

1.1. Historical Context. Recall that Alon’s Second Eigenvalue Conjecture says that for fixed integer $d \geq 3$, and a real $\epsilon > 0$, a random d -regular graph on n vertices has second adjacency eigenvalue at most $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ with *high probability*, i.e., probability that tends to one as n tends to infinity. The interest in this conjecture is that the conclusion implies that most graphs have, in a sense, almost optimal spectral properties, which in turn implies a number of “expansion” or “well connectedness” properties of the graph. The conjecture was established with weaker bounds—i.e., with $2(d-1)^{1/2}$ replaced by a larger function of d —in [BS87, FKS89, Fri91], and finally settled affirmatively in [Fri08]. All these papers bound not only the second eigenvalue with high probability, but also give the same bound on the absolute value of the all eigenvalues except the first, i.e., on the most negative eigenvalue. The paper [Fri08] obtained bounds on the probability of having an eigenvalue, excepting the first, larger in absolute value than $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$, where the upper and lower bounds match to within a factor of n , and for many values of d they match to within a constant factor; in this series of articles we determine bounds matching to within a constant factor for all d , and, more generally, the analog for covering maps to a fixed base graph that is regular and Ramanujan.

One generalization of the above spectral bounds for random d -regular graphs involves the notion of a relative expander, discussed in [Fri93a]¹; roughly speaking, for any covering map $G \rightarrow B$, we consider its *new adjacency eigenvalues*, i.e., the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of G not arising from eigenfunctions pulled back from the *base graph* B . In the special case where B has only one vertex, say of degree d , then G is a random d -regular graph, and the *new eigenvalues* are all eigenvalues except the first, namely d . The article [Fri93a] was searching for distinguished covering maps to (i.e., whose target is) the Boolean cube; this article identified a unique degree two covering map to the cube that was an “optimal relative expander.” The motivation for this search was the connection between covering maps in graph theory and extension fields discussed in [Fri93b], with the idea that some covering maps of the Boolean cube may shed some light on the complexity theory of Boolean functions. Since then the study of covering maps has yielded new ways to build expanders, including the remarkable works [BL06, MSS15] ([BL06] building on [FM99]) regarding degree two covering maps, which proves the existence of families of Ramanujan graphs of any given degree.

The relativized Alon conjecture, regarding random covering maps, was formulated in [Fri03], inspired both by [LN98] and by the success of Grothendieck’s notion of *relativization*. Weaker forms of this conjecture were proven in [Fri03, LP10, LSV11, ABG10, Pud15]. The conjecture for regular base graphs was established in [FK14]. As in [Fri08], the high probability bound in [FK14] is of form $1 - O(n^{-\tau})$ with $\tau \geq 1$; furthermore the largest possible value of τ can be determined for our *basic models* of random covering maps of a base graph that is d -regular and

¹ This article was circulated in a limited fashion, but was rejected for publication on the basis of having no interesting applications (at the time).

Ramanujan. In such cases

$$\tau \geq \left\lfloor \left((d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \right) / 2 \right\rfloor + 1$$

(where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the “floor” function, denoting the largest integer whose value is at most x) and this bound is achieved for certain d -regular B . We remark that the results in this series of articles therefore improve upon [Fri08] where the optimal value of τ was not determined for certain models of random d -regular graphs for certain values of d .

There are a number of notable results related to ours. Puder’s [Pud15] results prove a relative Alon conjecture with new eigenvalue bounds within a multiplicative factor of 3 for any base graph B , regular or not; his results also give a bound for d -regular graphs that is close to $2(d-1)^{1/2}$, and his proof is conceptually simple, although requires the results of [PP15]. Recently Bordenavé [Bor15] has given a proof of the original Alon conjecture [Fri08] as well as the relativized Alon conjecture for regular base graphs, which uses trace methods that avoids tangles of order greater than zero, but that require more involved probabilistic estimates. More recently, Bordenavé and Collins [BC19] have proved a very general result about random permutation matrices, that in particular proves the full relativized Alon conjecture, i.e., for arbitrary base graphs.

Bilu and Linial [BL06] point out that if the base graph is “approximately” a disjoint unions of many small graphs, then most degree two covers will be very poor relative expanders. Our main theorem, by contrast, shows that for any fixed regular base graph, covers of large degree are, with high probability, nearly relatively Ramanujan.

Our approach to the relativized Alon conjecture follows the Broder-Shamir trace method of [BS87], with its refinements of [Fri91, Fri08], which we adapt to the more general situation of random, degree n covering maps of a fixed graph, B . However, the proofs here (and in [FK14]) significantly simplify some of the arguments of [Fri08]; perhaps the greatest simplifications are (1) we replace the *selective trace* of [Fri08] by the much simpler *certified trace* of this series of articles, and (2) we give an improved “Sidestepping Lemma” that is much easier to apply. As mentioned before, this series of articles factors the proof in [FK14], and some of the parts are written in greater generality, for possible future use.

This series of articles has two main results: the first is that the relativized Alon conjecture holds for regular base graphs. The second is that one can determine, to within a constant factor, the probability that a graph does not satisfy the Alon bound, provided that the base graph is *Ramanujan*. Curiously, this is analogous to the work [LSV11], where the new eigenvalue bounds depend on the spectrum of the d -regular base graph, B , and degrade when B has eigenvalues close to—but less than— d .

1.2. Organization of This Series of Articles. This is the first in a series of six articles devoted to factoring the main theorems in [FK14] and their proofs into independent parts; [FK14] contain some additional results not covered in these six articles, especially regarding “mod- S functions” (Section 3.5 there).

For brevity, we refer to the articles in this series as Article I through Article VI.

The individual articles have the following content.

Article I (this article): statement of the main theorems in this series of articles, proven in Articles V and VI, and of the results from Articles II-IV

needed in Article V; definitions all terminology needed for these statements; some supplemental material, including additional remarks on Articles II–VI; an optional Section 6 that explain aspects of [BS87, Fri91] and its connection to some of our terminology; an optional appendix that reviews some of the methods in Article III based on [Fri08] but introduces *certified traces*; a second appendix that gathers the terminology in all the definitions of this article.

Each subsequent article is independent of the others, although they all require some of the definitions and notation of Article I (each subsequent article reviews those definitions and notation it needs).

Article II: main theorems regarding asymptotic expansions in random coverings; this is an adaptation of [Fri91] to our more general situation, but we factor this material into a few independent parts and we simplify some of the proofs in [Fri91].

Article III: main theorems on *certified traces*, using the results of Article II. These ideas rely heavily on [Fri08], although the certified traces are new to [FK14], which replace the significantly more cumbersome idea of *selective traces* of [Fri08].

Article IV: the *Sidestepping Theorem* we use in this series of articles; this is a lemma in probability theory needed to infer eigenvalue location based in the results in Article III; it is an strengthening of the Sidestepping Lemma in [Fri08].

Article V: our *basic models* are *algebraic*; conclusion of the proof of the relativized Alon conjecture for regular base graphs (our first main result); definition of *algebraic power* and *tangle power* of an algebraic model; for a fixed *tangle*, any covering graph of sufficiently high degree containing the tangle has a non-Alon new eigenvalue; more precise form of the first main result in terms of *algebraic power* and *tangle power*;

Article VI: our standard models are *pseudo-magnifying*; proof that for regular, Ramanujan graphs, the *algebraic power* equals $+\infty$; corollary that our bounds on the Alon conjecture probabilities are tight to within a constant factor when the base graph is Ramanujan (our second main result); estimates on the *tangle power* of a model.

1.3. Organization of This Article. The rest of this article is organized as follows. The results of this series of articles that will likely be of most interest in applications are stated in Section 3 after some preliminary definitions in Section 2. The main theorems in this series of articles are stated in Section 5 after some preliminary terminology in Section 4.

Section 6 is an optional section where we review some ideas of [BS87, Fri91] and give some examples to motivate and more easily understand some technical aspects of definitions that we give in Sections 7–9.

In Section 7 we introduce the notions of an *ordered graph*, a *B-graph*, and a *strongly algebraic* model. The permutation model is an example of a model that is strongly algebraic. In Section 8 we discuss homotopy types and VLG’s (variable-length graphs).

At this point the reader has a choice. Sections 7 and 8 are all that is needed to read our summary of the results in Articles II–VI, which are respectively covered

in Sections 10–14, and the reader may skip to there. Section 9 is more technical, but (1) defines algebraic models (some of our basic models are algebraic but not strongly algebraic), and (2) gives the reader more insight into Article II (beyond Section 6).

In Appendix A we describe a bit more regarding the techniques used in Article III (which are based on those of [Fri08], but has some simplifications such as *certified traces*).

Appendix B collects all the definitions in this article and makes additional remarks on the definitions that are not standard.

2. BASIC TERMINOLOGY

In this section we introduce some preliminary terminology needed to state the main results in this article.

2.1. Basic Notation and Conventions. We use $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{N}$ to denote, respectively, the the real numbers, the complex numbers, the integers, and positive integers or natural numbers; we use $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ to denote the set of non-negative integers. We denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$.

If A is a set, we use \mathbb{N}^A to denote the set of maps $A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$; we will refer to its elements as *vectors*, denoted in bold face letters, e.g., $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^A$ or $\mathbf{k}: A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$; we denote its *component* in the regular face equivalents, i.e., $k(a) \in \mathbb{N}$ for the a -component of \mathbf{k} . As usual, \mathbb{N}^n denotes $\mathbb{N}^{[n]} = \mathbb{N}^{\{1, \dots, n\}}$. We use similar conventions for \mathbb{N} replaced by \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C} , etc.

If A is a set, then $\#A$ denotes the cardinality of A . We often denote a set with all capital letters, and its cardinality in lower case letters; for example, when we define $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$, we will write $\text{snbc}(G, k) = \#\text{SNBC}(G, k)$.

If $A' \subset A$ are sets, then $\mathbb{I}_{A'}: A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ (with A understood) denotes the characteristic function of A' , i.e., $\mathbb{I}_{A'}(a)$ is 1 if $a \in A'$ and otherwise is 0; at times we write $\mathbb{I}_{A'}$ (with A understood) when A' is not a subset of A , by which we mean $\mathbb{I}_{A' \subset A}$.

All probability spaces $\mathcal{P} = (\Omega, P)$ are finite, i.e., $\#\Omega < \infty$, and all elements of Ω (which we also call *atoms*) have nonzero probability, i.e., $\omega \in \Omega$ implies that $P(\omega) > 0$; an event is any subset of Ω . We use \mathcal{P} and Ω interchangeably when P is understood and confusion is unlikely. A *complex-valued random variable* on \mathcal{P} or Ω is a function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and similarly for real-, integer-, and natural-valued random variable; we use denote its \mathcal{P} -expected value by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega}[f(\omega)] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} f(\omega)P(\omega).$$

If $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ we denote the probability of Ω' by

$$\text{Prob}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\Omega'] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega'} P(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\mathbb{I}_{\Omega'}(\omega)].$$

At times we write $\text{Prob}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\Omega']$ where Ω' is not a subset of Ω , by which we mean $\text{Prob}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\Omega' \cap \Omega]$.

2.2. Conventions Regarding Digraphs and Graphs.

Definition 2.1. A *directed graph* is a tuple $B = (V_B, E_B^{\text{dir}}, t_B, h_B)$ —or more simply $B = (V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h)$ when B is clear—where V and E are sets—the *vertex* and

(directed) edge sets—and t and h are maps $E \rightarrow V$ —the *tail* and *head* map; we say that $e \in E$ is a *self-loop* if $h(e) = t(e)$. We also say that $e \in E$ *runs* (or *is*) *from* $t(e)$ to $h(e)$.

In particular, our directed graphs can have *multiple edges*—more than one edge with the same tail and head—and self-loops.

Definition 2.2. A *undirected graph*, or simply a *graph*, is a tuple $G = (V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h, \iota)$ where $(V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h)$ is a directed graph—the *underlying directed graph*—and $\iota: E^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow E^{\text{dir}}$ is an involution (i.e., $\iota^2 = \text{id}_{E^{\text{dir}}}$)—the graph’s *edge involution*—that is orientation reversing (i.e., $h\iota = t$, and hence $t\iota = h$); we also refer to ιe *opposite edge* of e . We say that $e \in E^{\text{dir}}$ is a *half-loop* if $h(e) = t(e)$ and $\iota e = e$, and a *whole-loop* if $h(e) = t(e)$ and $\iota e \neq e$. We denote by E_G —the set of *edges* of G —the set of orbits of ι , i.e., all singleton sets $\{e\}$ where $e \in E_G^{\text{dir}}$ is a half-loop, and otherwise all two element sets of the form $\{e, \iota e\}$ with $e \in E_G^{\text{dir}}$ not a half-loop. By an *orientation* of an edge $\{e, \iota e\}$ in the graph, G , we mean (the choice of) either e or ιe ; by an *orientation* of G we mean a subset of ι_G orbit representatives $E_G^{\text{or}} \subset E_G^{\text{dir}}$, i.e., E_G^{or} contains all the half-loops and one orientation for each two-element edge, $\{e, \iota e\}$.

Whole-loops are the more standard type of self-loop one sees in graph theory. Half-loops are useful in a number of ways, such as to give models of regular random graphs of odd degree [Fri08].

2.3. Coordinatized Coverings and Our Basic Models. The following generalizes the models of random regular graphs used in [Fri03, Fri08], based on [BS87, Fri91].

Definition 2.3. Let B be a digraph, and $n \geq 1$ an integer. A digraph, G , is called a *coordinatized cover* (over B and of degree n) if G satisfies

$$(1) \quad V_G = V_B \times [n], \quad E_G^{\text{dir}} = E_B^{\text{dir}} \times [n], \quad t_G(e, i) = (t_B e, i), \quad h_G(e, i) = (h_B e, \sigma(e)i)$$

for some $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$. Given G , the map σ is uniquely determined and conversely; we refer to σ as *the permutation map* $E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ *associated to* G , and to G as the (coordinatized) cover associated to B .

It is extremely useful—although rather pedantic—to remark that if G is a coordinatized cover, then B and n are uniquely determined by G , for the following set theoretic reasons: V_G consists of pairs (v, i) , and the set of all v that appear as such form V_B ; similarly the set of all i determine n ; similarly $E_G^{\text{dir}}, t_G, h_G$ determine $E_B^{\text{dir}}, t_B, h_B$. Hence if G is a “coordinatized cover,” then B, n are uniquely determined from G .

Definition 2.4. If B is a graph and n is an integer, then G is a *coordinatized cover* (over B of degree n) if the underlying digraph of G is a coordinatized cover over the underlying digraph of B , and that

$$\iota_G(e, i) = (\iota_B(e), \sigma(e)i).$$

We use $\text{Coord}_n(B)$ to denote the set of all coordinatized covers of B of degree n .

If $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ is the permutation map associated to a coordinatized graph G over B , then the above definitions imply that

$$(2) \quad \sigma(\iota e_B) = (\sigma(e))^{-1}, \quad \iota_G(e, i) = (\iota_B(e), \sigma(e)i);$$

conversely, any $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ satisfying (2) is a permutation map associated to a (unique) coordinatized graph G over B of degree n .

We now turn to defining the models of random covering maps of interest to us. It is useful to introduce some common properties of our models.

Definition 2.5. Let B be a graph. A *model over B* is a family of probability spaces $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ indexed by a parameter n that ranges over some infinite subset, N , of \mathbb{N} , such that the atoms of each $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ lie in $\text{Coord}_n(B)$; we say that the model is *edge-independent* if for any orientation E_B^{or} the random variables $\{\sigma(e)\}_{e \in E_B^{\text{or}}}$ of the associated maps $E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ are independent. Also we often write simply $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ or $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}$ for $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ if confusion is unlikely to occur.

Each edge-independent models is therefore described by specifying the distribution of $\sigma(e) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ for every edge $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$ and $n \in N$.

We now describe what we call *our basic models*; these models are the ones that are most convenient for our methods.

Definition 2.6. Let B be a graph. By *our basic models* we mean one of the models edge-independent models $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ over B of degrees in N :

- (1) The *permutation model* assumes B is any graph without half-loops and $N = \mathbb{N}$: for each n and $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, $\sigma(e) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is a uniformly chosen permutation.
- (2) The *permutation-involution of even degrees* is defined for any B and for N being the even naturals: this is the same as the permutation, except that if e is a half-loop, then $\sigma(e)$ is a uniformly chosen *perfect matching* on $[n]$, i.e., a map $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ that has no fixed points and satisfies $\sigma^2 = \text{id}$.
- (3) The *permutation-involution of odd degrees* is defined the same, except that if e is a half-loop, then $\sigma(e)$ is a uniformly chosen *near perfect matching* on $[n]$, by which we mean a map $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ with exactly one fixed point and with $\sigma^2 = \text{id}$.
- (4) The *full cycle model* (or simply *cyclic model*) is defined liked the permutation model (so B is assumed to have no half-loops), except that when e is a whole-loop then $\sigma(e)$ is a uniform permutation whose cyclic structure consists of a single cycle of length n .
- (5) The *full cycle-involution of even degree* and *odd degree models* (or simply *cyclic-involution of either degree*) are defined for arbitrary B and either n even or n odd, is the full cycle model with the distributions of $\sigma(e)$ for half-loops, e , as in the permutation-involution.

Definition 2.7. Let $B = (V_B, E_B^{\text{dir}}, t_B, h_B)$ be a digraph. The *adjacency matrix of B* , denoted A_B , is the square matrix indexed on V_B such that for $v, v' \in V_B$, $(A_B)_{v, v'}$ is the number of edges from v to v' . The *indegree* (respectively, *outdegree*) of a vertex, $v \in V_B$, is the number of edges whose head (tail) is v . We say that B is *strongly d -regular* if $V_B \neq \emptyset$ and the indegree and outdegree of each vertex equals d . If B is a graph, then the *degree* of a vertex, $v \in V_B$, denoted $\deg_B(v)$, is its indegree in the underlying directed graph (which equals its outdegree there); we say that B is *d -regular* if its underlying directed graph is strongly d -regular, i.e., if $V_B \neq \emptyset$ and the degree of each vertex is d .

Definition 2.8. If $a, b \geq 0$ are integers, we say that B is a *bouquet of a whole-loops and b half-loops* if $\#V_B = 1$ and E_B consists of a whole-loops and b half-loops.

Example 2.9. If B is a bouquet of whole-loops or half-loops, then the models $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ in Definition 2.6 are models of a random d -regular graph. The papers [BS87, Fri91] deal exclusively with the permutation model in the case where B is a bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops for some even integer $d \geq 4$. The paper [Fri08] works with a number of other models, including the permutation-involution model for the bouquet of d half-loops.

The permutation-involution model is a natural generalization of the models $\mathcal{I}_{n,d}$ (n even) and $\mathcal{J}_{n,d}$ (n odd) in [Fri08], and the full cycle-involution model of $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}$ there. In [Fri08] we see: (1) $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}$ is interesting since it has a higher probability of satisfying the Alon bound (compare the value of τ_{fund} in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 of [Fri08]), and (2) $\mathcal{I}_{n,d}$ (n even) and $\mathcal{J}_{n,d}$ (n odd) need to be treated separately since they give rise to different asymptotic expansions in the trace method.

2.4. Morphisms, Covering and Etale Morphisms. It is important to note that coordinatized covers are really covering morphisms of graphs. This latter (“coordinate free”) view is crucial to methods.

Definition 2.10. A *morphism* $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ of directed graphs is a pair $\pi = (\pi_V, \pi_E)$ of maps, $\pi_V: V_G \rightarrow V_B$ and $\pi_E: E_G \rightarrow E_B$ which respect the heads and tail maps (i.e., $h_B \pi_E = \pi_V h_G$ and $t_B \pi_E = \pi_V t_G$); we refer to the values of π_V^{-1} as the *vertex fibres* of π , and similarly with π_E^{-1} as *edge fibres*; furthermore we say that π is a *covering map* (respectively, *étale map*) if for each $v \in V_G$, π_E gives an isomorphism (respectively, injection) of those edges in G with head v to those in B with head $\pi_V(v)$, and the same with “head” replaced with “tail.” A covering map $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ is of *degree* n if each vertex fibre and each edge fibre is of size n .

If B is connected and $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ is a covering map, then one easily shows that π is of degree n for some n .

Definition 2.11. A *morphism*, $\pi: G \rightarrow B$, of graphs is a morphism $\pi = (\pi_V, \pi_E)$ of the underlying directed graphs which respects the edge involutions (i.e., $\iota_B \pi_E = \pi_E \iota_G$); furthermore, π is a *covering morphism* (respectively, *étale morphism*) if this is true of π as a map of underlying directed graphs.

Etale morphisms are important in studying walks in graphs for the following reason: we will organize walks by the subgraph they traverse; it will useful to notice that if a graph G' is a subgraph of a G that admits a covering map $\pi: G \rightarrow B$, then $G' \rightarrow B$ is étale. This statement has certain converses: for example, if B has no half-loops and $G' \rightarrow B$ is étale, then for sufficiently large n , G' is a subgraph of at least one element of $\text{Coord}_n(B)$ ². More important to us is—for similar reasons—the prominence of étale graphs in the definition of *strongly algebraic* (see Definition 7.11).

2.5. Adjacency Matrices and New/Old Spectrum. The definitions in this subsection are first given for digraphs; the corresponding notion for graphs reduces to the digraph notion of the underlying digraph(s).

Definition 2.12. The *adjacency matrix*, A_B , of a graph B is that of B 's underlying digraph (Definition 2.7). As such A_B is real symmetric, and if $n = \#B$, we use

$$\lambda_1(B) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n(B)$$

² This theorem is sometimes called *Hall's theorem*; see [Sta83].

to denote the n eigenvalues A_B (listed with multiplicities).

Definition 2.13. Let $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ be a covering map of digraphs. A *vertex-fibre* is any subset of V_G of the form $\pi_V^{-1}(v)$ with $v \in V_B$. We say that a function $V_G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an *old function* (of V_G) if it is constant on each vertex-fibre, and a *new function* (of V_G) if its sum on any vertex-fibre is zero. [We easily see that the space of functions $V_G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ decomposes as a direct sum of old and new functions, and that A_G leaves each of these two spaces invariant.] We define the *new spectrum* of A_G , denoted $\text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$, to be spectrum (i.e., the multiset of eigenvalues counted with multiplicities) of A_G restricted to the new functions of V_G ; we define the *new spectral radius* of A_G , denoted $\rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$ to be the maximum absolute value of the elements of $\text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$. We define the *old spectrum* to be the multiset of eigenvalues of A_G restricted to the old functions, or, equivalently, the multiset of eigenvalues of A_B .

Since

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)} \lambda^k = \text{Trace}(A_G^k) - \text{Trace}(A_B^k),$$

we see that $\text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$ is determined from G and B alone, and not the particular covering map $\pi: G \rightarrow B$.

Definition 2.14. If $G \rightarrow B$ is a covering map of graphs, then all terms in Definition 2.13 are those of the covering map of the underlying directed graphs.

3. SOME RESULTS IN THIS SERIES OF ARTICLES

The main results in this series of articles, stated in Section 5, require some definitions in Section 4. However, at this point we can state some consequences of these results that are simpler to state and likely of most interest in applications.

Definition 3.1. Let $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ be a covering map of d -regular graphs. For an $\epsilon > 0$ we define the ϵ -non-Alon multiplicity of G relative to B to be the integer

$$\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\{\lambda \in \text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G) \mid |\lambda| > 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon\},$$

where the above λ are counted with their multiplicity in $\text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$.

If B is not d -regular, then one can similarly define this notion by replacing $2\sqrt{d-1}$ above with $\|A_{\widehat{B}}\|_2$, i.e., the L^2 norm of the adjacency operator on the universal covering, \widehat{B} , of B ; this is due to the well-known fact that

$$\|A_{\widehat{B}}\|_2 = 2\sqrt{d-1}$$

if B is d -regular, since then \widehat{B} is the (there is only one, up to isomorphism) infinite d -regular tree.

Alon was interested in $\lambda_2(G)$ for a random d -regular graph, G , on n vertices, with n large, and not in $\lambda_n(G)$, i.e., Alon was interested in the case where B has one vertex, and was interested in only the *positive* non-Alon eigenvalues defined above. However our trace methods, like most trace methods, simultaneously bound the negative non-Alon eigenvalues as well.

Theorem 3.2. Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be any of our basic models over a d -regular graph B . Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon)$ for which

$$(3) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0] \leq C(\epsilon)/n .$$

Of course, (3) implies

$$(4) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) > 0] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

conjectured (in parenthesis) in Section 1 of [Fri03]; we call this the *relativized Alon conjecture* in [FK14].

Our second main result gives a much sharper result for B that are d -regular and *Ramanujan*

Definition 3.3. We say that a d -regular graph B is *Ramanujan* if all eigenvalues of A_B lie in

$$\{d, -d\} \cup \left[-2\sqrt{d-1}, 2\sqrt{d-1}\right].$$

Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be any of our basic models over a graph B that is d -regular Ramanujan. Then there is an integer τ_{tang} and a constant $C' > 0$ such that for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$C'/n^{\tau_{\text{tang}}} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0],$$

and for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon)$ for which

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0] \leq C(\epsilon)/n^{\tau_{\text{tang}}}.$$

Furthermore

$$\tau_{\text{tang}} \geq ((d-1)^{1/2} - 1)/2 + 1.$$

We remark that the above theorem improves the results of [Fri08] for certain values of d : for example, if d is even and B consists of $d/2$ whole-loops, then upper and lower bounds in [Fri08] for

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0]$$

differ by a factor of n if $d = m^2 + 1$ for an odd integer m (but for all other d are tight within a constant factor). Hence our results improve those in [Fri08] in these cases. We also claim that this series of articles is easier to read—or at least more “factored”—than [Fri08].

We conjecture that Theorem 3.4 holds for any d -regular graph, B , but this conjecture requires us to estimate another integer, τ_{alg} , of the model, which seems difficult to compute directly.

We will define τ_{tang} in terms of what we will call *tangles*; in the terminology of Definition 4.3 of [Fri08], τ_{tang} is the smallest *order* of a hypercritical tangle. This integer was computed in [Fri08] in a number of cases where B has one vertex (in which case $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is a model of a random d -regular graph on n vertices), and these results are:

- (1) if d is even and B is a bouquet of $d/2$ self-loops, then for the permutation model we have

$$(5) \quad \tau_{\text{tang}} = \left\lfloor \left((d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \right) / 2 \right\rfloor + 1$$

(where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the floor function, i.e., the largest integer no greater than x), and for the full-cycle model we have

$$(6) \quad \tau_{\text{tang}} = \left\lfloor (d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \right\rfloor + 1$$

- (2) if d is a bouquet of d half-loops, then for the even degree permutation involution or full-cycle involution model we have

$$\tau_{\text{tang}} = \lfloor (d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \rfloor + 1$$

and for the odd degree permutation involution or full-cycle involution model we have

$$\tau_{\text{tang}} = \lfloor (d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \rfloor + 1$$

In Article VI we shall prove the same bounds for slightly more general B . As noted in [Fri08], (5) and (6) show that τ_{tang} for the full cycle model is roughly twice as large as for the permutation model; hence the model, for the same base graph B , can make a significant difference in the probability of having non-Alon eigenvalues.

4. DEFINITIONS REGARDING WALKS AND EXPECTED TRACES

In this section we give some background needed to for our trace methods, and introduce some terminology necessary for our discussion of asymptotic expansions of the $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ -expected values of the the traces we use.

4.1. Walks and Adjacency Matrices.

Definition 4.1. Let G be a digraph and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. A *walk of length k in G from v_0 to v_k* (alternatively *originating in v_0 and terminating in v_k*) is an alternating sequence of vertices and directed edges,

$$(7) \quad w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, v_2, \dots, e_k, v_k)$$

for which $t_G(e_i) = v_{i-1}$ and $h_G(e_i) = v_i$ for all $i \in [k]$. We say that a walk is *closed* if $v_0 = v_k$. A *walk* (respectively, *of length k* , and/or *closed*) in a graph is a walk (of length k , and/or closed) its underlying directed graph.

In the above definition, a walk of length $k = 0$ is simply a vertex, and a walk of length $k \geq 1$ can be inferred from its sequence e_1, \dots, e_k of directed edges (and the knowledge of h_G and t_G).

It is a standard fact that the number of walks of length k from e to e' equals the e, e' entry of A_G^k , and hence

$$(8) \quad \text{Trace}(A_G^k) = \#\{\text{closed walks of length } k \text{ in } G\}.$$

4.2. SNBC Walks and the Hashimoto or Non-backtracking Matrix.

Graphs, unlike directed graphs, have a notion of *non-backtracking* walk and numerous related notions crucial to our trace methods.

Definition 4.2. Let G be a graph, and w a walk in G given by (7). We say that w is *non-backtracking* if $\iota_G e_{i+1} \neq e_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, and moreover *strictly non-backtracking closed*, abbreviated *SNBC*, if in addition $\iota_G e_k \neq e_1$. The *oriented line graph* of G , denoted $\text{Line}(G)$, is the directed graph given by $V_{\text{Line}(G)} = E_G^{\text{dir}}$, and $E_G^{\text{dir}} \subset V_{\text{Line}(G)} \times V_{\text{Line}(G)}$ is the subset of pairs (e, e') such that (e, e') forms a non-backtracking walk of length 2 in G , and the tail and head of (e, e') are, respectively, e and e' . The *Hashimoto matrix* of G is the adjacency matrix, H_G , of its oriented line graph. We use $\mu_1(G)$ to denote the the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of H_G , and $\mu_2(G), \dots, \mu_m(G)$ with $m = \#E_G^{\text{dir}}$ (the cardinality of E_G^{dir}) to denote the other eigenvalues of H_G , ordered arbitrarily.

The term *Hashimoto matrix* is used in [ST96, ST00, TS07, Ter11] based on Hashimoto's work [Has90], which connects to Ihara's [Iha66], although Serre ([Ser77], page 5) first connected Ihara's work to graph theory and Sunada [Sun86] describes the Hashimoto matrix and the connection to Ihara's Zeta function for regular graphs. The Hashimoto matrix is also called the *non-backtracking matrix* elsewhere in the literature.

Definition 4.3. For any graph, G , and $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$ to denote the set of strictly non-backtracking walks of length k in G ; we use $\text{sdbc}(G, k)$ to denote the cardinality of $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$.

We easily see that for $k \geq 1$, the map

$$(v_0, e_1, \dots, e_k, v_k) \mapsto (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k, e_1)$$

gives a bijection from $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$ to closed walks in $\text{Line}(G)$ of length k (where we omit the directed edges in $\text{Line}(G)$ since there is at most one edge from one vertex in $\text{Line}(G)$ to another). Hence, in view of (8), we have

$$(9) \quad \text{Trace}(H_G^k) = \text{sdbc}(G, k).$$

The trace methods we use most directly work with the $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected value of (9) rather than (8). For d -regular graphs, G , it is known that $\mu_1(G) = d - 1$, and that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(10) \quad \max_{i>1} |\lambda_i| \leq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon \iff \max_{j>1} |\mu_j| \leq \sqrt{d-1} + \delta.$$

Both of these facts follow from the following version of the *Ihara determinantal formula* that we will prove in Article V, which states that

$$(11) \quad \det(uI - H_G) = \det(u^2I - uA_G + (D_G - I))(u+1)^{o_1(G)}(u^2-1)^{o_2(G)-n},$$

where $o_1(G)$ is the number of half-loops in G and $o_2(G)$ is the number of edges that are not half-loops. Our proof is a straightforward generalization of proofs of this well-known result for graphs without half-loops (see [Ter11]). It follows that (10) holds if we replace the λ_i with $i > 1$ with the new adjacency eigenvalues of G , and the μ_j with $j > 1$ with the new adjacency eigenvalues of the directed graph $\text{Line}(G)$.

In view of the above remarks and the fact that

$$(12) \quad \sum_{\mu \in \text{Spec}_B^{\text{new}}(H_G)} \mu^k = \text{Trace}(H_G^k) - \text{Trace}(H_B^k) = \text{sdbc}(G, k) - \text{sdbc}(B, k),$$

we focus on estimating the $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected value of $\text{sdbc}(G, k)$, whose dominant term we expect to be $\text{Trace}(H_B^k)$ for k small relative to n (namely for $k = o(n^{1/2})$).

4.3. The Visited Subgraph of a Walk. Our trace methods will ultimately organize all walks by their *homotopy type*, and more finely by their *visited subgraph* which we now define.

Definition 4.4. Let $w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, \dots, e_k, v_k)$ be a walk in a digraph (respectively, graph) G . The *visited subgraph* of w , denoted $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$, is the smallest subdigraph (respectively, subgraph) of G containing all elements of w .

We warn the reader that when G is a graph, then $S = \text{VisSub}_G(w)$ depends on G , i.e., on the map ι_G , rather than on $v_0, e_1, \dots, e_k, v_k$ alone (since E_S^{dir} includes $\iota_G e_i$ for $i \in [k]$, so we need to know ι_G to determine E_S^{dir}); by contrast $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ does not depend on G , i.e., can be inferred from the sequence (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k) alone, if G is a digraph (this is very easy to see) or if G is a coordinatized graph (this is not hard to see).

4.4. The Order of a Graph and Its Fundamental Properties.

Definition 4.5. Let S be a graph. We define its *order* to be

$$\text{ord}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\#E_S) - (\#V_S) ;$$

we define the order of a walk, w , to be $\text{ord}(S)$ where $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$. We let $\text{snbc}_r(G, k)$ (respectively $\text{snbc}_{<r}(G, k)$ and $\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)$) denote the number of SNBC walks in G of length k and order r (respectively $< r$ and $\geq r$).

Note that each half-loop contributes 1 to the order. The order of a graph is fundamental to all of our trace methods since for our basic models $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ we will prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\#\{\text{subgraphs of } G \text{ isomorphic to } S\}] = cn^{-\text{ord}(S)}(1 + o(1/n))$$

for some $c > 0$, unless this expected value is 0 for all n sufficiently large; see also Definitions 7.11 and 9.6.

4.5. (B, ν) -Bounded Functions and Expansions. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, [Fri08] formally defined *d-Ramanujan functions*, which are fundamental to our *asymptotic expansions* of expected traces; these are also implicit in [BS87, Fri91]. Here we define a generalization of this notion, needed when $\#V_B > 1$.

Definition 4.6. By a (*univariate*) *polyexponential function* we mean a function $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (or sometimes $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of the form

$$f(k) = \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i^k p_i(k) ,$$

where $\nu_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and the p_i are polynomials with coefficients in \mathbb{C} , where we understand that if $\nu_i = 0$ then the expression $\nu_i^k p_i(k)$ refers to some function that vanishes for sufficiently large k ; we refer to the ν_i as the *bases* of f , and the p_i as the *polynomials* of f . We say that a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (or $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$) is *of growth* ρ for a real $\rho \geq 0$ if for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$|f(k)| \leq (\rho + \epsilon)^k .$$

for sufficiently large k .

Jordan canonical form shows that if M is an $n \times n$ matrix, then for any $i, j \in [n]$, $f(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (M^k)_{i,j}$ is linear combination of functions of the form

$$k(k-1) \dots (k-\ell+1) \nu^{k-\ell}$$

where ν is an eigenvalue of M and ℓ is any integer less than the maximum Jordan block of M associated to the eigenvalue of ν . Hence $f(k)$ is a polyexponential function whose bases are the eigenvalues of M ; this also explains our convention regarding $\nu_i = 0$ in Definition 4.6.

Definition 4.7. Let B be a graph and $\nu \geq 1$ a real number. By a (B, ν) -*bounded function* we mean a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that is the sum of a function of growth ν plus a polyexponential function whose bases are bounded in absolute value by $\mu_1(B)$; furthermore we say that f is a (B, ν) -*Ramanujan function* if all these bases are eigenvalues of H_B .

Definition 4.8. Let $N \subset \mathbb{N}$ be an infinite subset. Let $f = f(k, n)$ be a function $\mathbb{N} \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, let B be a graph, $\nu > 0$ a real number, and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that f has a (B, ν) -*Ramanujan (respectively, (B, ν) -bounded) asymptotic expansion to order r* if there is a function $c_r(k)$ of growth bounded by $\mu_1(B)$, and (B, ν) -Ramanujan (respectively, (B, ν) -bounded) functions $c_0(k), \dots, c_{r-1}(k)$, and a constant C such that

$$f(k, n) = c_0(k) + c_1(k)/n + \dots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r,$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n^{1/2}/C$ and $n \in N$ (where the constant in $O(1)$ is universal, i.e., independent of k, n).

In our trace methods, $c_r(k)$ is actually bounded by $O(k^{2r} \mu_1^k(B))$, so the above definition is looser but simpler. Also, for our trace methods it suffices to have the expansion to hold in the range $1 \leq k \leq g(n)$ for any $g(n) \gg \log n$; however, typically the expansions are valid in the above larger range of k .

Example 4.9. Theorem 2.18 of [Fri91] implies that if d is even and B has $d/2$ whole loops, then

$$(13) \quad f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}(G, k)] = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(H_G^k)]$$

has a (B, ν) -Ramanujan expansion of order r , where r is proportional to $d^{1/2}$; Theorem 2.12 of [Fri08] implies that f above cannot have a (B, ν) -Ramanujan expansion to order roughly $d^{1/2} \log d$, due to *tangles* that we describe below.

[In the above example the word “implies” is used since the theorems quoted above work with the expected values of A_G^k , not H_G^k ; (11) allows us to translate between asymptotic expansions regarding such expansions when B is regular.]

4.6. Tangles.

Definition 4.10. Let $\nu > 1$ be a real number, and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that a connected graph, ψ , is a $\geq \nu$ -*tangle* (respectively, $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -*tangle*) if $\mu_1(\psi) \geq \nu$ (respectively, and $\text{ord}(\psi) < r$) and all vertices of ψ have degree at least two. We use

$$\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$$

to denote, respectively, the class of graphs, G , such that no (respectively, some) subgraph of G is a $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangle; we refer to the elements of this class as $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -*tangle-free* (respectively, *having $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangles*).

In Article III we will prove that for any ν, r there is a finite set of graphs, ψ_1, \dots, ψ_s such that any graph in $\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$ has a subgraph isomorphic to some ψ_i (see also Lemma 9.2 of [Fri08]); this is not true for $\text{HasTangles}(> \nu, < r)$ defined in the evident sense, i.e., replacing the condition $\mu_1(\psi) \geq \nu$ with $\mu_1(\psi) > \nu$. For this reason it will turn out to be crucial—at least in our methods—that we work with the condition $\mu_1(\psi) \geq \nu$ and not $\mu_1(\psi) > \nu$ when we speak of tangles; by contrast, the condition $< r$ is equivalent to $\leq r - 1$, and it is not crucial (but mildly more notationally convenient) to work with the strict inequality $< r$. We

write $(\geq \nu, < r)$ instead of (ν, r) to emphasize the weak inequality $\geq \nu$ and the strict inequality $< r$.

5. MAIN THEOREMS IN THIS SERIES OF ARTICLES

In this section we will state the main theorems in this series of articles and comment on their proofs. More comments on these proofs will be made in Sections 10–14 where we discuss the individual contents of each of Articles II–VI. Complete proofs of the theorems appear in Articles II–VI.

Our theorems are valid for all of our basic models (Definition 2.6); however, in this section we often use the term *algebraic models* (Definition 9.6), since this is a wider class of models and a simpler setting for our proofs. Hence the reader is free to substitute “our basic models” for any theorem in this section in which the term “algebraic models” appears.

5.1. The Tangle Power.

Definition 5.1. Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a model over a graph, B . We say that a graph, S , *occurs in* $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an element $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ such that some subgraph of G is isomorphic to S .

In our basic models, and the *algebraic models* that we define later, it turns out that if S occurs in $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ then there are $C_1, C_2 > 0$ for which

$$(14) \quad C_1 n^{-\text{ord}(S)} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[G \text{ contains a subgraph isomorphic to } S] \leq C_2 n^{-\text{ord}(S)}$$

for all sufficiently large n (i.e., aside for some small values of n where the above probability can be zero); the lower bound is proven in Article III (see Theorem 11.2 below), and the upper bound follows easily from the definition of *algebraic model*, Definition 9.6 below.

To motivate the above definition, we note that if $n(\#V_B) < \#V_S$, then no $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a subgraph isomorphic to S , since $\#V_G < \#V_S$. Hence the term “sufficiently large” is necessary. Furthermore, our models of interest will have a dichotomy: either S occurs in the model $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, or for sufficiently large n no $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ will contain a subgraph isomorphic to S .

Definition 5.2. Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a model over a graph, B . By the *tangle power* of $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}$, denoted τ_{tang} , we mean the smallest order, $\text{ord}(S)$, of any graph, S , that occurs in $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}$ and satisfies $\mu_1(S) > \mu_1^{1/2}(B)$.

The tangle power is relatively easy to bound from below. In fact, in Article VI we use the results of Section 6.3 of [Fri08] to prove that for any algebraic model over a d -regular graph, B ,

$$\tau_{\text{tang}} \geq m = m(d)$$

where

$$m(d) = \left\lceil \left((d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \right) / 2 \right\rceil + 1,$$

and for each even $d \geq 4$ there are d -regular B where equality holds (namely, if B has $m(d) + 1$ whole-loops about some vertex, which is the case if B is a bouquet of $d/2$ whole loops).

5.2. The HasTangles Probability Upper Bound. Our interest in the tangle power, τ_{tang} , of an algebraic model is explained by the theorems we state in this subsection and the next. These theorems deal with non-Alon eigenvalues for the event $\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$, and they are relatively easy to prove.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an algebraic model of tangle power τ_{tang} over a graph, B . For every $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$ and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a constant $C = C(\nu, r)$ such that*

$$(15) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)] \leq C(\nu, r)n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.$$

Hence the condition that a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangle for any r and any ν of interest to us—namely those $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$ —is an event of probability of order at most $n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$.

This theorem is not difficult to prove and is based on the proof of Lemma 9.2 in [Fri08]; let us sketch the proof: a “compactness” property of variable-length graphs shows that there are only finitely many graphs that are minimal with respect to inclusion among all graphs, S , satisfying $\mu_1(S) \geq \nu$ and $\text{ord}(S) < r$. Since any such S occurs as a subgraph of some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with probability $O(n^{-\text{ord}(S)})$, which is $O(n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}})$ for $\mu_1(S) > (d-1)^{1/2}$, the union bound completes the proof.

We remark that the constant $C = C(\nu, r)$ in Theorem 5.3 seems very difficult to bound: it depends—at least in principle—on the number of minimal S with $\mu_1(S) \geq \nu$ and $\text{ord}(S) < r$; the “compactness” approach above gives no effective bound on this number of S .

5.3. The HasTangles Probability Lower Bound. To complement Theorem 5.3 we give the following lower bound.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an algebraic model of tangle power τ_{tang} over a graph, B . Let S be a connected graph that occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with $\text{ord}(S) = \tau_{\text{tang}}$ and $\mu_1(S) > (d-1)^{1/2}$. Then for any $r > \text{ord}(S)$ and $\nu \leq \mu_1(S)$, there is a constant $C' > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all n sufficiently large we have*

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[(G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)) \text{ and } (\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon_0) > 0) \right] \geq C'n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.$$

This theorem is based on two facts: first, S , as above, is a subgraph of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with probability at least $C'n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$ (this follows from Theorem 11.2 below, proven in Article III). Second, in Article V, using the methods of Friedman-Tillich [FT05] and the “Curious Theorem” of [Fri08], we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.5. *Let B be a d -regular graph, and S be any graph with $\mu_1(S) \geq (d-1)^{1/2}$. If $G \rightarrow B$ is a covering map of degree n , and G has a subgraph isomorphic to S , then $G \rightarrow B$ has a new adjacency eigenvalue greater than*

$$\mu_1(S) + \frac{d-1}{\mu_1(S)} - \epsilon(n)$$

where $\epsilon(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

5.4. The Expected Number of Non-Alon Eigenvalues in Tangle-Free Graphs.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be an algebraic model over a d -regular graph B . For any ν with $(d-1)^{1/2} < \nu < d-1$, let ϵ' be given by*

$$(16) \quad 2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon' = \nu + \frac{d-1}{\nu}$$

(since $\nu + (d-1)/\nu$ is a monotone increasing function in $\mu > (d-1)^{1/2}$, we have that $\epsilon' > 0$). Then either

- (1) there is an integer $\tau = \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \geq 1$ such that for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ there are constants $C = C(\epsilon), C' > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n we have

$$(17) \quad n^{-\tau} C' \leq \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon' + \epsilon)] \leq n^{-\tau} C(\epsilon),$$

or

- (2) for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon' + \epsilon)] \leq O(n^{-j})$$

in which case we use the notation $\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) = +\infty$.

[We believe that $\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r)$ is never $+\infty$ in our basic models, although this doesn't seem important to us.]

The proof of Theorem 5.6 represents the majority of Articles II–IV. Article II is based on the asymptotic expansions proven in [Fri91]; Articles III and IV are based on the way [Fri08] utilizes such expansions to prove the original Alon conjecture.

The reason we use the term *algebraic power* is because $\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r)$ is determined from the polyexponential parts of the coefficients of the asymptotic expansion of

$$f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(H_G^k)],$$

and the existence of these expansions is due to the fact that the model is assumed to be algebraic (in the sense of Definition 9.6).

If a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a nonzero number of non-Alon new adjacency eigenvalues, then this number is between 1 and $(n-1)(\#V_B)$. Hence we get the following corollary.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be an algebraic model over a d -regular graph B , and let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(d-1)^{1/2} < \nu < d-1$; let ϵ' and $\tau = \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r)$ be as in Theorem 5.6. Then for any ϵ there are constants $C = C(\epsilon), C'$ such that for sufficiently large n we have*

$$(18) \quad C' n^{-\tau-1} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[(G \in \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)) \text{ and } (\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon' + \epsilon) > 0) \right] \leq C n^{-\tau}$$

(unless $\tau = +\infty$, in which case the upper bound above holds for all $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$).

5.5. The Algebraic Power of a Model. For fixed $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$ and r , all graphs are divided into two families, namely

$$\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r), \quad \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r).$$

Theorem 5.7 implies that

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) > 0]$$

is bounded above by

$$(19) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)] + O(n^{-\tau(\nu, r)}).$$

In this section we define the *algebraic power* of a model, which arises when we choose ν, r to minimize (19) to within a multiplicative constant. This involves two observations.

The first observation is that, for trivial reasons, if $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$ and $r_1 \geq r_2$, then the event of being $(\geq \nu_1, < r_1)$ tangle-free is more restrictive than being $(\geq \nu_2, < r_2)$ tangle-free. Hence the characteristic function of $\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu_1, < r_1)$ is smaller than that of $\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu_2, < r_2)$, and hence

$$(20) \quad \tau(\nu_1, r_1) \geq \tau(\nu_2, r_2).$$

Said otherwise, by decreasing ν and increasing r , the set $\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$ either says the same or gets larger and $\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)$ the same or smaller.

The second observation is that Theorem 5.4 implies that for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) > 0] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$$

for n sufficiently large. Hence (19) is at best $O(n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}})$. But this theorem also implies that

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)]$$

is never larger any larger than a constant times $n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$. Hence we can take ν as close to $(d-1)^{1/2}$ and r as large as we like, which in (19) makes the $\tau(\nu, r)$ as favourable as possible in view of (20), without giving up more than a constant in the HasTangles term.

This discussion motivates the following definition.

Definition 5.8. Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an algebraic model over a d -regular graph B . For each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and ν with $(d-1)^{1/2} < \nu < d-1$, let $\tau(\nu, r)$ be as in Theorem 5.6. We define the *algebraic power* of the model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ to be

$$\tau_{\text{alg}} = \max_{\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}, r} \tau(\nu, r) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty, \nu \rightarrow (d-1)^{1/2}} \tau(\nu, r)$$

where ν tends to $(d-1)^{1/2}$ from above (and we allow $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$ when this maximum is unbounded or if $\tau(\nu, r) = \infty$ for some r and $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$).

Of course, according to Theorem 5.6, $\tau(\nu, r) \geq 1$ for all r and all relevant ν , and hence $\tau_{\text{alg}} \geq 1$.

5.6. The First Main Theorem. Combining the above results, and diving graphs by whether or not they have $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangles, with r sufficiently large and ν sufficiently close to $(d-1)^{1/2}$ to make $\tau(\nu, r) = \tau_{\text{alg}}$, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 5.9. *Let B be a d -regular graph, and let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be an algebraic model of tangle power τ_{tang} and algebraic power τ_{alg} . Let*

$$\tau_1 = \min(\tau_{\text{tang}}, \tau_{\text{alg}}), \quad \tau_2 = \min(\tau_{\text{tang}}, \tau_{\text{alg}} + 1).$$

Then $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1 \geq 1$, and for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small there are C, C' such that for sufficiently large n we have

$$(21) \quad C' n^{-\tau_2} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) > 0] \leq C n^{-\tau_1}.$$

5.7. The Second Main Theorem. Generally speaking, τ_{tang} tends to be relatively easy to compute or approximate; it was computed exactly in [Fri08] when B is a bouquet of either whole-loops or of half-loops, for some of our basic models. On the other hand, τ_{alg} is very difficult to compute directly, at least in the asymptotic expansions that determine it.

In [Fri91], where B was a bouquet of $d/2$ of whole-loops (so d is even), the analog of τ_{alg} was determined in two steps: first one proves that for certain r one has

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(A_G^k)] = c_{-1}(k)n + c_0(k) + \dots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r$$

where for $i < r$ the $c_i(k)$ are all of the form $d^k p(k) + g(k)$ where g is of growth $2(d-1)^{1/2}$ and $p(k)$ is a polynomial (which is not explicitly computed). Second, standard counting arguments about the *magnification* of expanders and taking $k = \log^2(n)$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$ to deduce that these polynomials must all vanish. A similar two-part strategy was used in [Fri08], which involved traces of powers of H_G , where the coefficients are first provably of the form $(d-1)^k p(k)$ plus a function of growth $(d-1)^{1/2}$, and then a ‘‘Sidestepping Lemma’’ is used. Critical to both these computations is that the polyexponential parts of these coefficients can be linked to a lack of magnification; if B has more than one vertex, this same strategy works provided that $\pm(d-1)$ are the only possible larger bases of the coefficients $c_i(k)$ in expansions of

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(H_G^k)]$$

as $\nu \rightarrow (d-1)^{1/2}$ and $r \rightarrow \infty$. This is necessarily true if B is a d -regular Ramanujan graph (Definition 3.3); if B is not Ramanujan, then our expansion theorems do not rule out polyexponential parts whose bases may be between $d-1$ and $(d-1)^{1/2}$ in absolute value; at present we have no proof that such bases cannot occur.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be one of our basic models over d -regular Ramanujan graph, B . Then $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$.*

The above theorem holds for any algebraic model that satisfies a certain weak *magnification* condition; in Article VI we describe this condition and prove that it holds for all of our basic models. The proof uses standard counting arguments; for large values of d the argument is very easy; for small values of d our argument is a more delicate calculation similar to those in Chapter 12 of [Fri08].

Whenever $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$, or merely $\tau_{\text{alg}} \geq \tau + 1$, then in Theorem 5.9, $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_{\text{tang}}$. In [Fri08], some values of τ_{tang} were computed for our basic models in the case where B has one vertex. In the next subsection we give some implications of these computations for general B .

5.8. Bounds on τ_{tang} . Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of [Fri08] develops a number of techniques to determine what is called there τ_{fund} , which is the smallest order of a graph, S , that occurs in the model and has $\mu_1(S) \geq (d-1)^{1/2}$ (note the weak inequality here). So τ_{tang} is the same except that the weak inequality is replaced with the strong inequality $\mu_1(S) > (d-1)^{1/2}$. The techniques of [Fri08] easily prove the following results.

Theorem 5.11. *Let S be a connected graph of order m for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then*

- (1) $\mu_1(S) \leq 2m + 1$, with equality if S is a bouquet of $m + 1$ whole-loops;
- (2) if S has no whole-loops, then $\mu_1(S) \leq m + 1$, with equality if S consists of two vertices joined by $m + 2$ edges.

Here are a number of conclusions that follow.

Corollary 5.12. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \geq 3$ let*

$$m(d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\lfloor \frac{(d-1)^{1/2} - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + 1,$$

$$m'(d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\lfloor (d-1)^{1/2} - 1 \right\rfloor + 1,$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the “floor” of x , i.e., the largest integer no greater than x . Let B be a d -regular graph with $d \geq 3$. Then

(1) *for any algebraic model,*

$$(22) \quad \tau_{\text{tang}} \geq m(d)$$

with equality whenever B is a graph for which there is some vertex that has $m(d) + 1$ whole-loops;

(2) *Moreover we have*

$$\tau_{\text{tang}} \geq m'(d)$$

in any of the following cases:

- (a) *the cyclic model;*
- (b) *the cyclic-involution model of either even or odd degree;*
- (c) *B has no whole-loops;*

equality holds if some vertex of B has at least $m'(d) + 2$ half-loops or some two vertices of B are joined by at least $m'(d) + 2$ edges.

6. THE TRACE METHODS OF BRODER-SHAMIR AND FRIEDMAN FOR RANDOM GRAPHS

In this section we review some ideas of [BS87, Fri91] and give a few examples which help to motivate some terminology in Sections 7–9, including ordered graphs, B -graphs, homotopy type, algebraic models, (our interest in) regular languages, and B -types.

This section is not needed for the rest of this article, but we find it easier to read Sections 7–9 while keeping in mind the examples we give here. All these examples are implicit in the articles [BS87, Fri91] on random graphs.

We will be brief on details here, and for a more complete discussion we refer the reader to Sections 7–9 in this article, and to Article II and [BS87, Fri91, Fri08].

6.1. The Framework for Random Graphs. Throughout this section $d \in \mathbb{N}$ will be even, and B will be a bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops, with the notation

$$(23) \quad V_B = \{u\}, \quad E_B^{\text{dir}} = \{f_1, \iota_B f_1, \dots, f_{d/2}, \iota_B f_{d/2}\};$$

we let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be the permutation model unless otherwise stated. Hence $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is a model of a random d -regular graph on n vertices.

We will explain the methods of Broder-Shamir [BS87] and Friedman [Fri91] as they apply to estimating

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(H_G^k)].$$

In fact [BS87, Fri91] estimate the above with A_G replacing H_G , so the asymptotic expansions are slightly different; also [BS87, Fri91] work with a $2d$ -regular graph, so the d in those articles is not the regularity of B .




FIGURE 1. “Figure 8,” “Barbell,” and “Theta” homotopy types for SNBC walks of order 1

6.2. Subdividing Walks by Their Order. The broad framework of [BS87, Fri91], stated with H_G replacing A_G , is as follows: we consider

$$(24) \quad f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(H_G^k)] = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}(G, k)],$$

and for a fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we want to find an asymptotic expansion to order r for $f(k, n)$, i.e.,

$$(25) \quad f(k, n) = c_0(k) + c_1(k)/n + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r$$

for appropriate $c_i(k)$. To do so, we write

$$(26) \quad \text{snbc}(G, k) = \text{snbc}_0(G, k) + \text{snbc}_1(G, k) + \cdots + \text{snbc}_{r-1}(G, k) + \text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)$$

recalling (Definition 4.5) that $\text{snbc}_m(G, k)$ denotes the number of SNBC walks whose visited subgraph has order m , and $\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)$ those of order at least r . We now take expected values in (26).

The first step is to show that for $k \leq n/2$ we have

$$(27) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)] \leq O(d-1)^k k^{2r}/n^r$$

([Fri91], middle of page 352, based on Lemma 3 of [BS87]). Hence if we can show that for each $m = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$ there is an order r expansion (25) for

$$(28) \quad f_m(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_m(G, k)],$$

then it follows that we such an expansion for (24).

6.3. Homotopy Type. The next broad step is to fix $m < r$ in (28), and to subdivide all SNBC walks of order m (in an arbitrary graph) as belonging to a finite number of possible *homotopy types*. Here is the rough idea.

If w is an SNBC walk in an arbitrary graph, then each vertex of $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$ has degree at least two. We easily see that

$$(29) \quad \text{ord}(S) = (1/2) \sum_v (\text{deg}'_S(v) - 2)$$

(where $\text{deg}'_S(v)$ is the degree of v in S , except that a half-loop contributes 2 to the degree of a vertex, since a half-loop’s contribution to $\text{ord}(S)$ is, by definition, -1). This formula implies that there are a finite number of possible *homotopy types* or “shapes” of such graphs (see Lemma 2.4 of [Fri91]), for example, if S does not have half-loops (which is the case here since B is a bouquet of whole-loops), then

- (1) if $m = 0$, then S is necessarily a *cycle* (i.e., S is a connected graph all of whose vertices have degree 2)
- (2) if $m = 1$, (see Figure 1, which reproduces Figure 6 of [LP10]) then except for the vertices of degree 2, either
 - (a) S has one vertex of degree 4, which is called a “figure 8 graph,” or
 - (b) S has two vertices of degree 3, which is called a “barbell graph” if each vertex has one whole-loop, or a “theta graph” if the two degree 3 vertices are joined by three edges

(If B has half-loops, then there are more homotopy types of order 1, such as a cycle where one vertex has, in addition, a half-loop, or a bouquet of two half-loops, or a path where the two endpoints each have an extra half-loop.)

Our notion of the homotopy type of a walk will remember some extra information beyond the above homotopy type defined for connected graphs each of whose vertices have degree at least two. We remark that the above notion of homotopy type is not the topological one, since topologically the above figure 8, barbell, and theta graphs are topologically homotopy equivalent. Instead, our notion of homotopy type—common to trace methods (e.g., Figure 6 in [LP10])—is the graph obtained by *suppressing the beads*, i.e., by suppressing the vertices of degree two in the graph, and retaining only the vertices of degree three or higher.

6.4. Expansions for Order Zero Walks. The methods of Broder-Shamir yield an estimate

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_0(G, k)] = c_0(k) + O(1)k^2(d-1)^k/n,$$

where $c_0 = c_0(k)$ is a function of k that for fixed d and large k satisfies the estimate

$$(31) \quad c_0(k) = (d-1)^k + O(k)(d-1)^{k/2}.$$

Refinements of (30) are given in [Fri91], the simplest of which is

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_0(G, k)] = c_0(k) + c_1(k)/n + O(k^4)(d-1)^k/n^2$$

where $c_0(k)$ satisfies (31) and

$$(32) \quad c_1(k) = p(k)(d-1)^k + O(k^2)(d-1)^{k/2}$$

where $p(k)$ is some polynomial that is not explicitly computed.

To show (31) and (32), we first make a general remark. For any $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$, we easily see that any walk in G of length k can be written as

$$(33) \quad w_G = ((u, i_0), (e_1, i_0), (u, i_1), \dots, (e_k, i_{k-1}), (u, i_k))$$

where $i_0, \dots, i_k \in [n]$ and

$$(34) \quad w_B = (u, e_1, u, e_2, \dots, e_k, u)$$

is a walk in B ; we also easily check that w_G is SNBC iff $i_k = i_0$ and w_B is SNBC in B . Our discussion of homotopy type implies that $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$ has order 0 implies that S is a cycle of some length k' (i.e., S is connected with k' vertices, each of degree two). Hence it suffices to check, for each k' between 1 and k , whether or not w_G is a cycle of length k' ; since $i_k = i_0$, we must $k'|k$ (k' divides k).

So fix an $i_0 \in [n]$ and an SNBC walk w_B as in (34); if σ is the random permutation assignment associated to a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then i_1, \dots, i_k are given by

$$(35) \quad i_1 = \sigma(e_1)i_0, \dots, i_k = \sigma(e_k)i_{k-1};$$

for $k'|k$, let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Cycle}, k'}(w_B, i_0)$ be the event that the visited subgraph of w_G is a cycle of length k' , where w_G is determined by w_B, i_0 and (35). The Broder-Shamir method shows that

$$(36) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Cycle}, k}(w_B, i_0)] = 1/n + O(k^2)/n^2;$$

their proof considers the probability that i_1 is distinct from i_0 , and then that i_2 is distinct from i_0, i_1 , etc.; this argument is quite robust and is used in [Fri03] for arbitrary base graph, B . Checking that the eigenvalues of H_B are $(d-1)$ (with multiplicity one) and ± 1 , we easily check that the number of SNBC walks, w_B , of

length k is the trace of H_B^k , which is therefore $(d-1)^k + O(1)$. Multiplying the right-hand-side of (36) by $(d-1)^k + O(1)$ and then by n for the n possible values of i_0 yields the $(d-1)^k$ terms of (30) and (31).

The only other contributions to $\text{sbc}_0(G, k)$ come from w_G whose visited subgraph is a cycle of length $k' < k$ and $k'|k$, and therefore $k' \leq k/2$; since such w_B must be powers of an SNBC walk of length k' , we get a terms bounded by $(d-1)^{k/2} + O(1)$ for each $k'|k$, which implies (30) and (31).

To refine (30) we refine (36) by showing that

$$(37) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Cycle}, k}(w_B, i_0)] = 1/n + c_1(w_B)/n^2 + O(k^4)/n^2$$

where $c_1(w_B)$ genuinely depends on w_B , and is given by

$$(38) \quad c_1(w_B) = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq d/2} a_{w_B}(f_{j_1}, f_{j_2}).$$

where $a_{w_B}(f_j)$ is the number of times the directed edges $f_j, \iota_B f_j$ appear in the list of edges e_1, \dots, e_k . This is based on the exact formula

$$(39) \quad \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Cycle}, k}(w_B, i_0)]$$

$$(40) \quad = (n-1)(n-2) \dots (n-k+1) \prod_{j=1}^{d/2} \frac{1}{n(n-1) \dots (n-a_{w_B}(f_j)+1)},$$

where the $(n-1)(n-2) \dots (n-k+1)$ represents the number of ways to choose $i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} \in [n]$ such that i_0, \dots, i_{k-1} are distinct, and the other terms are the probability that (35) holds for any fixed such i_0, \dots, i_{k-1} . We then expand

$$(41) \quad (n-1)(n-2) \dots (n-k+1) = n^{k-1} - n^{k-2} \binom{k}{2} + O(n^{-k-3})k^3$$

and similarly expand each factor in the product in (40); this, and the fact that $k = a_{w_B}(f_1) + \dots + a_{w_B}(f_{d/2})$ yields (37) with

$$c_1(w_B) = - \binom{k}{2} + \binom{a_{w_B}(f_1)}{2} + \dots + \binom{a_{w_B}(f_{d/2})}{2}$$

which simplifies to (38).

Given (37), we prove that

$$(42) \quad \sum_{w_B \in \text{SNBC}(B, k)} c_1(w_B)$$

is of the form $p(k)(d-1)^k + (-1)^k q(k) + r(k)$ for polynomials p, q, r (see top of page 346, [Fri91]), which gives the main term in (32).

We remark that (42) is an abstract sum over $\text{SNBC}(B, k)$ without reference to trace methods or models $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. Article II in this series and [Fri91] deal with generalizations of such sums.

6.5. Algebraic Models. Sums like (42) arise for similar reasons in our trace methods, and the key fact is that $c_1(w_B)$ is a polynomial in the parameters $a(f_j) = a_{w_B}(f_j)$, such as (38). This approach works for any model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ where generalizations of probabilities like (39) have similar asymptotic expansions in powers of $1/n$ to any fixed order r , whose coefficients are polynomials in the $a_j(w_B)$. This is the main condition for a model to be *algebraic*. We will elaborate on this later in this section.




FIGURE 2. The first 11 steps of walk that visits a theta graph




FIGURE 3. B -Graph Structure and Ordered Graph Structure

6.6. **Expansions for Order One Walks: Theta Graph Example.** Next we discuss asymptotic expansions for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_1(G, k)].$$

In [Fri91] we write this as

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{fig8}(G, k)] + \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{barb}(G, k)] + \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{theta}(G, k)]$$

where $\text{fig8}(G, k)$ denotes those walks, w_G , with $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$ being a figure 8 graph (Figure 1), and similarly for barbell graphs and theta graphs. Let us focus on the theta graph term and study some example of walks whose visited subgraphs are theta graphs.

The number of SNBC walks of length k in a fixed theta graph S is a far more complicated function of k than in the case of cycles and walks of order zero. For example, consider a walk w_G whose visited subgraph, $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$, is determined

by its first 11 “steps”

$$(u, i_0), (e_1, i_0), (u, i_1), \dots, (e_{11}, i_{10}), (u, i_{11})$$

and is depicted in Figure 2: our conventions are that repeated vertices are indicated in red, and we assume that these first 11 steps encounter every vertex and every edge—in at least one of its orientations—of $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$. Let us make some observations about such a walk, w_G , and about $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$ used in [Fri91].

First, fix $i_0, \dots, i_{11} \in [n]$, subject to the constraints in Figure 2 ($i_2 = i_7, i_1 = i_8$, etc.), and consider the event that this graph occurs (i.e., exists) as a subgraph of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$: in terms of the permutation assignment σ , this graph requires that $\sigma(f_1)$ take on 5 specified values: $\sigma(f_1)i_j = i_{j+1}$ for $j = 0, 1, 3$ and $\sigma(\iota_B f_1)i_j = (\sigma(f_1))^{-1}i_j = i_{j+1}$ for $j = 6, 9$. Similarly this graph requires that $\sigma(f_2)$ on 4 specified values; from this it is not hard to see that the probability that σ satisfies these constraints is

$$\prod_{j=1}^{d/2} \frac{1}{n(n-1)\dots(n-a(f_j)+1)}$$

where $a(f_1) = 5, a(f_2) = 4$ count the number of times that f_1, f_2 occur in S . Hence for any given S , we can define $a(f_j) = a_S(f_j)$ to be the number of times that f_j or $\iota_B f_j$ occurs in such a diagram, and the probability that S occurs is precisely the product in (40). Similarly the number of ways of choosing $i_0, \dots, i_{11} \in [n]$ subject to the indicated constraints is

$$n(n-1)\dots(n-b+1)$$

where $b = b_S$ is the total number of vertices in S . Hence the expected number times σ satisfies the above constraints when i_0, \dots, i_{11} vary is

$$(43) \quad n(n-1)\dots(n-b_S+1) \prod_{j=1}^{d/2} \frac{1}{n(n-1)\dots(n-a_S(f_j)+1)}$$

which is an analog of (40) (with an additional factor of n since i_0 is also varying).

6.7. B -Graphs and Ordered Graphs. We now make some observations regarding the formula (43) to motivate the notions of a B -graph and an *ordered graph*:

- (1) this formula depends only on how S maps to B under projection, which is depicted in the left diagram of Figure 3 (i.e., we omit the i_0, \dots, i_{11});
- (2) this formula counts the $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected number of graphs, S , as above, along with the order in which the vertices and edges are first encountered along w_G , and for each edge the orientation in which it is first encountered; this order is depicted in the right diagram of Figure 3;
- (3) equivalently, this formula counts the $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected of walks that are *similar* to any fixed w_G whose first 11 steps are as indicated, where we call two walks similar if they differ by a renumbering of the i_0, \dots, i_{11} subject to the imposed identities on these numbers (i.e., $i_7 = i_2$, etc.).

To express the above notions more precisely, we define:

- (1) a B -graph to be a graph, S , along with a map $S \rightarrow B$; and
- (2) an *ordered graph* to be a graph, S , along with (1) a total ordering of its vertex set, (2) a total ordering of its edge set, and (3) an orientation $E_S^{\text{or}} \subset E_S^{\text{dir}}$; a walk, w with $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$ induces its *first encountered* ordering on S which indicates the order in which the vertices, edges, and edge orientation

of each edge are first encountered along S . (Some edges may be encountered in only one orientation.)

We use the symbol $S_{/B}$ to denote a graph S with a given B -graph structure, i.e., a given morphism $S \rightarrow B$; we use S^{\leq} to denote a graph S along with an ordering; and we use $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ to denote a graph S with both a B -graph structure and an ordering. If w_G is a walk in some $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$, then w_G endows $S = \text{VisSub}(w_G)$ with both a B -graph structure and an ordering, and we sometimes write $\text{VisSub}_{/B}^{\leq}(w_G)$ to indicate these structures.

We emphasize that if $S_{/B}^{\leq} = \text{VisSub}_{/B}^{\leq}(w_G)$ for a walk in some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then the ordering on S is important for a number of reasons:

- (1) when we subdivide walks by homotopy type (below), the ordering is useful to make sure that we are counting the number of walks correctly; and
- (2) (more importantly) when $S_{/B}$ has non-trivial automorphisms (as a B -graph), then (43) does not count the number of subgraphs in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ that are isomorphic to $S_{/B}$ (as a B -graph).

The second reason is subtle but extremely important: if $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ is an ordered B -graph, and $G_{/B}$ is a B -graph, we use the notation

- (1) $[S_{/B}]$ for the class of B -graphs isomorphic to $S_{/B}$ (where we forget its ordering), and $[S_{/B}] \cap G$ for the set of B -subgraphs $H_{/B} \subset G_{/B}$ with $H_{/B} \in [S_{/B}]$; and
- (2) $[S_{/B}^{\leq}]$ for the class of ordered B -graphs isomorphic to $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ (as ordered B -graphs), and $[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G$ for the set of $H_{/B}^{\leq} \in [S_{/B}^{\leq}]$ such that (when we forget the ordering on $H_{/B}^{\leq}$) $H_{/B} \subset G_{/B}$.

Then for any $G_{/B}$ we easily see that

$$(44) \quad \#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B} = (\#[S_{/B}] \cap G_{/B}) (\#\text{Aut}(S_{/B})),$$

where $\text{Aut}(S_{/B})$ denotes the set of B -graph automorphisms of $S_{/B}$; (43) equals

$$(45) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B}] = (\#\text{Aut}(S_{/B})) \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\#[S_{/B}] \cap G_{/B}].$$

In Subsection 6.10 we give examples of $S_{/B}$ with non-trivial automorphisms and comment more on this formula. Even for a fixed S , $\#\text{Aut}(S_{/B})$ generally depends on the B -graph structure of S ; for this reason, our trace methods—e.g., the definition of an *algebraic* model—involve $[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G$ rather than $[S_{/B}] \cap G$.


We remark that (44) implies that $[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap S_{/B}$ and $\text{Aut}(S_{/B})$ have the same size; this formula, along with examples in Subsection 6.10, may provide helpful intuition.

6.8. Homotopy Type and Expected Walk Formulas in the Theta Graph

Example. Let us return to the example depicted in Figures 2 and 3 of Subsection 6.6. We wish to define its *homotopy type* and a “formula” for the number of SNBC walks of length k whose ordered visited subgraph is all of this graph, in the ordering depicted. It is helpful to keep in mind that eventually we will sum over all such i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{11} in $[n]$ (subject to $i_0 = i_8$ and the other constraints), multiply by the probability that such a graph is a subgraph of an element of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, and ultimately we will use this—the terminology and formulas—to estimate

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\text{theta}(G, k)];$$

we will need to overcome several new difficulties that do not appear with walks of order 0, whose visited subgraphs are cycles.

FIGURE 4. A Homotopy Type, T^{\leq} , and a Wording $E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$

So let w_G be any walk in some $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$ whose first 11 steps are as in Figure 2, and such that these 11 steps already cover all of $S_B^{\leq} = \text{VisSub}_B^{\leq}(w_G)$. From the B -graph and ordered graph structure of S depicted in Figure 3 we extract its *homotopy type* which is the ordered graph depicted on the left side of Figure 4.

Here the *homotopy type* refers to the ordered graph T^{\leq} obtained by suppressing all the beads of S except its first vertex (if it is a bead); each directed edge of T correspond to a beaded path in S ; the ordering on S gives rise to a natural ordering on T . The homotopy type in Figure 4 has four vertices and four edges that come oriented (eight directed edges) labeled there as

$$V_T = \{v_{T,1}, v_{T,2}, v_{T,3}\}, \quad E_T^{\text{or}} = \{e_{T,1}, \dots, e_{T,4}\} \subset E_T^{\text{dir}} = \{e_{T,1}, \iota_T e_{T,1}, \dots, \iota_T e_{T,4}\}.$$

To reconstruct S_B^{\leq} from T^{\leq} we simply need to know the walk in B corresponding to directed edge in T ; since this walk is determined by its sequence of directed edges, we define a *wording* on T^{\leq} to be this map

$$W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*,$$

where $(E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ denotes the set of finite sequences of elements of E_B^{dir} (i.e., the set of words over the alphabet E_B^{dir} is the sense formal or regular language theory). The right diagram of Figure 4 depicts the wording corresponding to the example of Figures 2 and 3; in this diagram $W(\iota_T e_{T,j})$ is implicit, as it must be the reverse walk of $W(e_{T,j})$.

Abstractly we say that a map $W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ is a *wording* if (1) for each $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, $W(e)$ is a non-backtracking walk and $W(\iota_T e)$ is the reverse walk of $W(e)$, and (2) for each $v \in V_T$, the first letter of each $W(e)$ with $\iota_T e = v$ must have the same tail. In this case, W determines a B -graph (unique up to isomorphism) that we denote by $\text{VLG}(T^{\leq}, W)$ (in analogy with variable-length graphs, see Article III and Lemma 9.2 of [Fri08]).

We emphasize that the above notion of homotopy type, T^{\leq} , can be defined for any SNBC walk, w_G , in any $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$, but this homotopy type depends only on $S_B^{\leq} = \text{VisSub}_B^{\leq}(w_G)$.

The estimate of (46) in [Fri91] is based on the following observations. First if S_B^{\leq} is any ordered B -graph whose homotopy type is T^{\leq} above, then the length of any walk w_G whose visited subgraph is S_B^{\leq} equals

$$k = k_1 m_1 + \dots + k_4 m_4$$

where k_i is the length of the path in S_B^{\leq} corresponding to the i -th oriented edge of T , and m_i is the number times that this edge is traversed in w_G (as an edge, i.e., in either orientation); we will use \mathbf{k} as shorthand for the vectors whose components are the k_i , which can also be regarded a vector $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ indexed on E_T , and similarly for \mathbf{m} , whereupon the length, k , of the walk equals

$$\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k_1 m_1 + \cdots + k_4 m_4.$$

Furthermore, for fixed S_B^{\leq} the number of walks with these values of m_1, \dots, m_4 is a function $g = g(m_1, \dots, m_4)$ depending only on the m_j and not on the wording. We then (fairly easily) prove that the total number of SNBC walks of length k and homotopy type T^{\leq} is

$$(47) \quad \sum_{W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_W \cdot \mathbf{m} = k} f(W, n) g(\mathbf{m})$$

where (1) g is as above, (2) $f(W, n)$ denotes (43) (b_S and the $a_S(f_j)$ can be inferred from W), (3) \mathbf{k}_W are the lengths of the paths corresponding to the directed edges of T (which depend only on W), and (4) the sum is over all wordings W that represent wordings that are *realizable*, i.e., are wordings of the visited subgraph of some SNBC walk in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$; let us discuss the notion of realizability a bit further.

6.9. Realizable Wordings, Letterings, and Regular Languages. To analyze (47) we need to study the set of wordings $W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ that can arise from graphs $S_B^{\leq} = \text{VisSub}_B^{\leq}(w_G)$. Aside from the conditions on W in the definition of wording above, if $S_B \subset G_B$ with $G_B \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$ then S_B must be étale; in the permutation model this turns out to be sufficient for (43) to hold. Furthermore, the condition for $\text{VLG}(T^{\leq}, W)$ to be étale is precisely that for each $v \in V_T$, the first letters of the $W(e)$ with $t_{Te} = v$ are distinct. It turns out to be convenient [Fri91, Fri08] to define the *lettering* of W to be the information consisting of the first letter of each $W(e)$ (which through $W(\iota_{Te})$ also specifies its last letter). These articles sum over (47) by fixing all letterings that give rise to étale graphs, and summing over such W . The advantage is that the set of all such W of a fixed lettering is a direct product indexed over any orientation E_B^{or} of B of regular languages

$$\text{NBWALK}(B, e, e')$$

with $e, e' \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, defined to be the set of non-backtracking walks in B whose first directed edge is e and whose last is e' . One can then prove asymptotic expansions for (46) by summing over all fixed letterings of the wordings W determined by

$$\prod_{e \in E_T^{\text{or}}} \text{NBWALK}(B, \text{first}(e), \text{last}(e))$$

using the techniques of Chapter 2 of [Fri91], where $\text{first}(e), \text{last}(e)$ are those letters, i.e., elements of E_B^{dir} , specified by the lettering.

It turns out that similar asymptotic expansion theorems holds whenever one sums (43) over the wordings determined by any direct product

$$(48) \quad \prod_{e \in E_T^{\text{or}}} \mathcal{R}(e)$$

where for each $e \in E_T^{\text{or}}$, $\mathcal{R}(e)$ is a regular language. This turns out to be useful in defining algebraic models: the main property of algebraic models is that, roughly speaking, for each ordered B -graph, S_B^{\leq} , we require that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\# [S_B^{\leq}] \cap G]$$

has an asymptotic expansion

$$c_0(S_B) + c_1(S_B)/n + \cdots + c_{r-1}(S_B)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(S_B)/n^r,$$

where the c_i are polynomials in the variables $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(S_B)$ which count the number of times each edge of E_B appears in S_B ; by (44), the c_i don't depend on the ordered graph structure of S_B^{\leq} , so we write $c_i(S_B)$ instead of $c_i(S_B^{\leq})$. However, for the permutation model, $c_0 = 1$ for S_B where S is a cycle, but $c_0 = 0$ and $c_1 = 1$ when S is a theta graph; hence we see that the polynomials must depend—at the very least—on the order of S . Although for the permutation model these polynomials depend only on the order of S , for other of our basic models—including the cyclic model—the polynomials for the $c_i = c_i(S_B)$ not only depend on the order and homotopy type S , but also also depend on a finite number of other features. However, as long as these features can be expressed by sets of the form (48), then all of our main theorems hold. In other words, our main results will still hold provided that for each homotopy type, T^{\leq} , we can partition all wordings $W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ into a finite number of sets, each of which is a product (48) for some \mathcal{R} , such that some polynomial of $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{S_B}$ gives each $c_i(S_B)$ for all the S_B determined by such wordings.

6.10. Examples of B -graphs with Non-trivial Automorphisms.

Example 6.1. Let $d = 2$, so that σ represents a single permutation $\sigma(f_1)$. For $i_0, k \in [n]$, we easily see that the probability that i_0 lies on a cycle of length k is exactly $1/n^3$. So the expected number of cycles of length k is $1/k$, but the expected number of walks w_G of the form

$$(u, i_0), (f_1, i_1), (u, i_1), \dots, (f_1, i_{k-1}), (u, i_k)$$

with i_0, \dots, i_{k-1} distinct and $i_k = i_0$ is 1. This difference from $1/k$ to 1 occurs because the automorphism group of the cycle with a given B -graph structure is of order k . Moreover, if we forget the B -graph structure, the number of automorphisms of a cycle of length k , as a graph, is $2k$.

Example 6.2. Consider a B -graph with two vertices v_1, v_2 , joined by two edges from v_1 to v_2 , one labeled f_1 , the other $\iota_B f_1$, plus one whole-loop at v_1 and one at v_2 . This graph has order 2 and has one non-trivial automorphism iff the whole-loops have the same label. Similarly if the whole-loops are replaced by beaded paths in which each directed edge is labeled.

Example 6.3. Say that we allow B to have half-loops, then say f_1 is a half-loop and f_2 a whole loop. Consider the B -graph S_B where S is a barbell graph, where the “bar” is a single edge over f_1 , and the other edges are labeled with $f_2, \iota_B f_2$. Then S_B has a non-trivial automorphism iff the two loops have the same length. More generally, a B -graph S_B where S is a barbell graph can have non-trivial

³ Indeed, setting $i_j \neq \sigma(f_1)i_{j-1}$ for all $j \in [k]$, we have $i_1 \neq i_0$ with probability $(n-1)/n$, and given this the probability that i_2 is distinct from i_0, i_1 is $(n-2)/(n-1)$, etc., and given all these events, $i_k = i_0$ with probability $1/(n-k)$.

automorphisms depending on the lengths of its loops and how we label its edges. Keeping track of this automorphism group would make our methods significantly more tedious.

We remark that any automorphism of a graph $S_{/B}$ must take vertices of degree three or more to themselves, and if each vertex of S has degree at least two, then then number of such vertices is at least one and at most $2 \operatorname{ord}(S)$ unless S is a cycle. It easily follows that the size of the automorphism group is bounded as a function of $\operatorname{ord}(S)$ if $\operatorname{ord}(S) \geq 1$; this contrasts the case where S is a cycle, where the size of the automorphism group can be any number dividing the length of the cycle, depending on the structure map $S \rightarrow B$.

7. B -GRAPHS, ORDERINGS, AND STRONGLY ALGEBRAIC MODELS

In this section we define the notion of a *strongly algebraic model* which is a special case of *algebraic models* that are easier to describe. The permutation models and the permutation-involution models of even degree are examples of strongly algebraic models.

In order to define the term *strongly algebraic* we introduce some terminology fundamental to our trace methods, such as *B -graphs* and *ordered graphs*. This terminology is illustrated in Section 6, specifically the discussion regarding Figure 3.

7.1. B -Graphs.

Definition 7.1. Let B be a graph. By a *B -graph* we mean a graph, G , endowed with a morphism $\phi: G \rightarrow B$; we typically write $G_{/B}$ for such a structure, with ϕ understood. We say that ϕ or $G_{/B}$ is an *étale* (respectively, *covering*) B -graph if ϕ is an étale (respectively, covering) morphism.

A B -graph can therefore be viewed as a morphism $G \rightarrow B$, although the concepts regarding B -graphs are usually understood as working with G along with an underlying map $G \rightarrow B$.

Definition 7.2. By a *morphism of B -graphs*, from $\phi: G \rightarrow B$ to $\phi': G' \rightarrow B$, or $G_{/B} \rightarrow G'_{/B}$, we mean a morphism of the sources, i.e., $\nu: G \rightarrow G'$, that respects the B -structure in the evident sense, i.e., $\phi = \phi'\nu$.

In the literature, B -graphs are often called *graphs over B* , and this construction is referred to as a *slice category*.

We will use some common nomenclature regarding B -graphs. If G is a B -graph with $G \rightarrow B$ understood, we will speak of the *B -graph structure on G* as the morphism $G \rightarrow B$. Similarly, if G is a graph, to *endow G with the structure of a B -graph* means to specify a morphism $G \rightarrow B$. If $\pi: G \rightarrow B$ is a B -graph and $v \in V_B$, then the *vertex fibre of v (in G)* refers to $\pi^{-1}(v)$ (more precisely $\pi_V^{-1}(v)$); similarly for directed edge fibres and edge fibres.

Example 7.3. For any graph B and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any $G \in \operatorname{Coord}_n(B)$ comes with its projection $\pi: G \rightarrow B$, which is its projection “onto the first component,” since $V_G = V_B \times [n]$ and $E_G^{\operatorname{dir}} = E_B^{\operatorname{dir}} \times [n]$ in view of (1). We easily see that G is a covering B -graph; any subgraph of G inherits a B -structure from G , and making it necessarily an étale B -subgraph. Each vertex fibre and directed edge fibre of G is identified with $[n]$ (by its projection onto the second component, in (1)).

7.2. Ordered Graphs.

Definition 7.4. By an *ordered graph* we mean a $G^{\leq} = (G, E_G^{\text{or}}, \leq_V, \leq_E)$ where G is a graph, $E_G^{\text{or}} \subset E_G^{\text{dir}}$ is an orientation of G , \leq_V is a total ordering of V_G , and \leq_E is a total ordering of E_G^{or} ; we sometimes simply write G if the orientation and two orderings are understood. By a *morphism* of ordered graphs $G_1^{\leq} \rightarrow G_2^{\leq}$ we mean a morphism of graphs that preserves the orientations and two orderings in the evident sense.

An ordered graph G^{\leq} has no non-trivial automorphisms, since such a morphism would have to (1) be the identity on V_G (since it preserves the vertex ordering), (2) take E_G^{or} to itself, (3) be the identity on E_G^{or} (by order preservation), and (4) therefore be the identity map on E_G^{dir} . It follows that there is at most one isomorphism from one ordered graph to another.

7.3. First-Encountered Ordering.

Definition 7.5. Let $w = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k)$ be a walk in a graph, G , and let $S = \text{VisSub}_G(w)$. By the *w-first-encountered ordering* of S we mean the ordering on the vertices of S in the order in which they occur first in the sequence v_0, \dots, v_k , the orientation $E_S^{\text{or}} \subset E_S^{\text{dir}}$ which gives the orientation in which an edge first occurs in the sequence, e_1, \dots, e_k , and the ordering on E_S in the order in which they first occur—in either orientation—in the sequence e_1, \dots, e_k . We use $\text{VisSub}_G^{\leq}(w)$ to denote S with this ordering.

7.4. The Fibre Counting Functions \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} .

Definition 7.6. If $\phi: S \rightarrow B$ is a B -graph, the *vertex-fibre counting vector* of ϕ or $G_{/B}$ is the vector $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{S/B}: V_B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ given by

$$b(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\phi_V^{-1}(v);$$

one similarly defines the *directed-edge-fibre counting vector* $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{S/B}: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ defined by

$$a(e) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\phi_E^{-1}(e);$$

it follows that $a(\iota_B e) = a(e)$ for any $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, and when convenient we may view \mathbf{a} as a function $E_B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ whose value on an $\{e, \iota_B e\}$ is $a(\iota_B e) = a(e)$. If w is a walk in a B -graph, then we similarly define $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_w$ (and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_w$) as $\mathbf{a}_{S/B}$ (and $\mathbf{b}_{S/B}$) where $S_{/B} = \text{VisSub}_{/B}(w)$.

The vectors \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} are crucial to our notion of *algebraic models*: see (51), (55), and (56) below, and (40) and (43) in Section 6 (where $\#V_B = 1$).

7.5. Ordered B -Graphs and Strongly Algebraic Models. In this section we describe most of the conditions for a model to be *strongly algebraic*; this involves ordered B -graphs.

Definition 7.7. By an *ordered B -graph*, $G_{/B}^{\leq}$, we mean a graph, G , which is endowed with an ordering and the structure of a B -graph. By a *morphism* $G_{/B}^{\leq} \rightarrow H_{/B}^{\leq}$ we mean a morphism of graphs $G \rightarrow H$ which respects the B -structure and the ordering.

Example 7.8. If w is a walk in a B -graph $G_{/B}$, then its visited subgraph, $\text{VisSub}(w)$, is naturally endowed with the structure of a B -graph and of an ordered graph; we sometimes write $\text{VisSub}_{/B}^{\leq}(w)$ to emphasize these structures.

Definition 7.9. If $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ is an ordered B -graph, we use $[S_{/B}^{\leq}]$ to describe the class of all ordered B -graphs isomorphic to $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ (as ordered B -graphs). If $G_{/B}$ is another B -graph, we use $[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B}$ to denote the set of ordered B -graphs, $U_{/B}^{\leq} \in [S_{/B}^{\leq}]$ such that $U_{/B}$ is a B -subgraph of $G_{/B}$.

If $[S_{/B}]$ refers to the isomorphism class of S as a B -graph, with its ordering ignored, and $[S_{/B}] \cap G_{/B}$ is the set of subgraphs of $G_{/B}$ isomorphic to $S_{/B}$ as B -graphs, then it is easy to see that

$$(49) \quad \#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B} = (\#\text{Aut}(S_{/B}))(\#[S_{/B}] \cap G_{/B})$$

where $\text{Aut}(S_{/B})$ is the number of automorphisms of $S_{/B}$ (as a B -graph). However, $\#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B}$ are better adapted to developing asymptotic expansions, as the following example illustrates: if B has no half-loops and $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is the permutation model, then for any étale B -graph, $S_{/B}$, and any ordering on $S_{/B}$ we have

$$(50) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B}] = n^{-\text{ord}(S)}(1 + c_1/n + \cdots + c_{r-1}/n^{r-1} + O(1/n^r))$$

for large n , where the c_i are universal polynomials in $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{S_{/B}}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{S_{/B}}$ of degree $2i$, otherwise independent (!) of $S_{/B}$; indeed, similar reasoning as in (43) shows that the right-hand-side of (50) equals

$$(51) \quad \prod_{v \in V_B} \left(n(n-1) \cdots (n - b_{S_{/B}}(v) + 1) \right) \prod_{e \in E_B} \frac{1}{n(n-1) \cdots (n - a_S(e) + 1)};$$

now we expand this in an asymptotic series in $1/n$ (as in the bottom of page 336 of [Fri91], or extending the derivation of (37) and (38)).

Definition 7.10. We say that a graph S is *pruned* if each vertex of S has degree at least two.

We easily see that if w is an SNBC walk of positive length in some graph, G , then $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ is pruned: otherwise some $v \in V_G$ is isolated, or incident upon exactly one half-loop or exactly one edge that isn't a self-loop, and we easily check that no SNBC walk can pass through v (note that if e is a half-loop about v , then v, e, \dots, e, v is not SNBC, since $\iota_G e = e$).

Definition 7.11. Let B be a graph and $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a model over B . We say that a B -graph $S_{/B}$ *occurs* in $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, such that $G_{/B}$ has a B -subgraph isomorphic to $S_{/B}$. We say that the family of probability spaces $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *strongly algebraic* provided that

- (1) for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a function, $g = g(k)$, of growth $\mu_1(B)$ such that if $k \leq n/4$ we have

$$(52) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)] \leq g(k)/n^r$$

(recall Definition 4.5 for $\text{snbc}_{\geq r}$);

- (2) for any r there exists a function g of growth 1 and real $C > 0$ such that the following holds: for any ordered B -graph, $S_{/B}^{\leq}$, that is pruned and of order less than r ,
 - (a) if $S_{/B}$ occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then for $1 \leq \#E_S^{\text{dir}} \leq n^{1/2}/C$,

$$(53) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\#[[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G]] = c_0 + \cdots + c_{r-1}/n^{r-1} + O(1)g(\#E_S)/n^r$$

- where the $O(1)$ term is bounded in absolute value by C (and therefore independent of n and $S_{/B}$), and where $c_i = c_i(S_{/B}) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that c_i is 0 if $i < \text{ord}(S)$ and $c_i > 0$ for $i = \text{ord}(S)$; and
- (b) if $S_{/B}$ does not occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then for any n with $\#E_S^{\text{dir}} \leq n^{1/2}/C$,

$$(54) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[\#([S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G) \right] = 0$$

(or, equivalently, no graph in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a B -subgraph isomorphic to $S_{/B}^{\leq}$);

- (3) $c_0 = c_0(S_{/B})$ equals 1 if S is a cycle (i.e., $\text{ord}(S) = 0$ and S is connected) that occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$;
- (4) $S_{/B}$ occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ iff $S_{/B}$ is an étale B -graph and S has no half-loops; and
- (5) there exist polynomials $p_i = p_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ such that $p_0 = 1$ (i.e., identically 1), and for every étale B -graph, $S_{/B}^{\leq}$ we have that

$$(55) \quad c_{\text{ord}(S)+i}(S_{/B}) = p_i(\mathbf{a}_{S_{/B}}, \mathbf{b}_{S_{/B}}).$$

We write $c_i(S_{/B})$ rather than $c_i(S_{/B}^{\leq})$, and similarly in (55), since (49) implies that that the c_i do not depend on the ordering on $S_{/B}^{\leq}$.

[Of course, if $S_{/B}$ does not occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then (54) implies that (53) holds trivially, with all $c_i = 0$; however, it seems better pedagogically to separate the case of $S_{/B}$ occurring and not occurring in the model.]

Note that if B does not have half-loops, then if $S \rightarrow B$ is étale, then S has no half-loops; however, in B does have half-loops, then in our basic model of odd degree n , elements of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ can have half-loops, and then formulas for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[\#([S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G) \right]$$

in terms of $\mathbf{a}_{S_{/B}}, \mathbf{b}_{S_{/B}}$ depend on the half-loops in S . Hence the polynomials p_i in (55) must depend on the kind of half-loops in $S_{/B}$; such a model cannot be strongly algebraic.

Notice that the condition on cycles, S , is implied by the condition $p_0 = 1$; however, it is convenient to leave it there when we define an *algebraic* model. We also note that if $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$ where w is an SNBC walk, then S is necessarily connected (clearly) and if $\text{ord}(S) = 0$ then S must be a cycle (in view of (29), where each half-loop is counted as contributing 2 to the degree of v because of the definition of order).

We remark that for our main theorems we only need (53) to hold in the range $1 \leq \#E_S \leq h(n)$ for a function $h(n)$ asymptotically larger than $\log n$; however, for all our basic models (53) holds in the larger range $1 \leq \#E_S \leq n^{1/2}/C$. Also, in all our basic models we can take $g(\#E_S)$ to be merely $(\#E_S)^{2r+2}$ (making g a polynomial, and hence of growth 1); this more precise bound is unimportant to us. Finally we remark that in all our basic models, (53) holds for all S without isolated vertices, or all S without conditions if we replace $\#E_S$ by $\#E_S + \#V_S$; however, we only need (53) for graphs, S , each of whose vertex is of degree at least two, and working with such S simplifies some later considerations.

In Article V will prove that the permutation model and the permutation-involution model of even degree are algebraic, as an easy consequence of Lemmas 3.7–3.9 of [Fri91]. However, in the permutation-involution model of odd degree, one has different polynomials p_i in (55) depending on how many half-loops

S_B^{\leq} contains. An *algebraic model* allows the polynomial to depend on some finite amount of data that we call the *B-type* of S_B ; we will define *B-type* in Section 9.

8. THE HOMOTOPY TYPE OF A WALK AND VLG'S (VARIABLE-LENGTH GRAPHS)

In this section we define the *homotopy type* of an SNBC walk in a graph and *variable-length graphs (VLG's)*, similar to Section 3 of [Fri08]; see also Section 6 of this article. The main theorems in Article II, used by Article III, require these definitions.

In this section we make these notions precise, which are well known but a bit tedious to spell out; the essential ideas are illustrated by the examples in Section 6.

8.1. Bead Suppression.

Definition 8.1. Let S be a graph. By a *bead of S* we mean a vertex of S that is of degree two and not incident upon a self-loop. Let $V' \subset V_S$ be any subset consisting entirely of beads; by a *V' -beaded path* in S we mean a non-backtracking walk (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k) in S such that $v_0, v_k \notin V'$ but $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V'$.

A beaded path is therefore a walk, involving directed edges; hence its visited subgraph is a graph known as a “path” (i.e., a tree with two leaves and all other vertices of degree two). However, a beaded path—as opposed to a path—also specifies an orientation of the edges and a walk from one end to the other.

The idea of *homotopy type*—of a graph or an ordered graph—is to classify them by “suppressing” as many beads as possible. (This is therefore a refinement of the topological notion of homotopy type, since any two connected graphs without half-loops and of the same order are topologically homotopy equivalent). However, this idea only works well on certain classes of graphs: for example, if we work with connected graphs each of whose vertices has degree at least two, then there are finitely many homotopy types of graphs of a fixed order; see Subsection 6.3. However, if one allows graphs to have vertices of degree one, then the number of homotopy types—defined by suppressing all the beads of a graph—becomes infinite, even connected graphs of order -1 , i.e., trees. Similarly, the notion of the homotopy type of an ordered graph works well on ordered graphs of the form $\text{VisSub}^{\leq}(w)$ when w is an SNBC walk in a graph (or a non-backtracking walk), but not for general walks, w . So some care must be taken when we “suppress” the beads of a graph or of an ordered graph to define its homotopy type. Here is an easy lemma in this direction.

Lemma 8.2. *Let S be a connected graph and $V' \subset V_S$ any set of beads such that V' is a proper subset of V_S if S is a cycle. Then any $e \in E_S^{\text{dir}}$ lies on a unique V' -beaded path in S .*

Proof. Set $e_1 = e$, $v_1 = h_S e$, $v_0 = t_S e$. If $v_1 = h_S e$ lies in V' , then v_1 is of degree two and not incident upon a self-loop; hence $e \neq \iota_S e$, and v_1 is incident upon one edge in S other than $\{e, \iota_S e\}$. It follows that there is a unique $e_2 \in E_S^{\text{dir}}$ such that

$$(v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, h_S e_2)$$

is non-backtracking. Continuing in this manner, we construct a unique non-backtracking walk

$$(v_0, e_1, v_1, \dots, e_m, v_m)$$

for some $m \leq \#V_S$ with v_0, \dots, v_{m-1} distinct elements of V' and v_m either equal to one of v_0, \dots, v_{m-1} or $v_m \notin V'$. We claim that (1) v_m cannot equal any v_i with $i < m$ (or otherwise v_i is of degree greater than two), (2) $v_m \neq v_0$ (or else S is a cycle and $V' = V_S$). Hence $v_m \notin V'$. Similar we walk “along $\iota_S e_1$ ” to construct a unique two-sided non-backtracking walk

$$(v_{-m'}, e_{-m'+1}, v_{-m'+1}, \dots, v_0, e_1, \dots, e_m, v_m)$$

where $m' \geq 0$, $v_{-m'} \notin V'$, and all the v_i with $-m' \leq i \leq m-1$ distinct elements of V' . This is clearly the unique V' -beaded path of S containing e . \square

This lemma motivates the following definition.

Definition 8.3. Let S be a graph. We say that a subset $V' \subset V_S$ of beads of S is a *proper bead set* of S if V' does not contain all the vertices of any connected component of S that is a cycle.

Definition 8.4. Let S be a graph, and $V' \subset V_S$ be a proper bead set of S . We define the *suppression of V' in S* , denoted S/V' , to be the graph, T , given as:

- (1) $V_T = V_S \setminus V'$ (i.e., the complement of V' in V_S);
- (2) E_T^{dir} is the set of V' -beaded paths in S ;
- (3) for $e_T = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k) \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, we define its tail (i.e., t_{Te_T}) to be v_0 , its head (i.e., h_{Te_T}) to be v_k , and ι_{Te_T} to be its *reverse walk*, i.e., $(v_k, \iota_S e_k, \dots, \iota_S e_1, v_0)$.

In addition, for $e_T = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k) \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, we define the *length* of e_T to be k ; since the lengths of e_T and ι_{Te_T} are the same, we define the *length* of an edge in E_T to be the length of an orientation of this edge.

Notice that by definition each directed edge of $T = S/V'$ is a walk in S ; hence—for pedantic reasons—one can completely reconstruct S from $T = S/V'$: each directed edge $e_T = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k)$ comes paired with its inverse edge $\iota_{Te_T} = (v_k, \iota_S e_k, \dots, \iota_S e_1, v_0)$, and so we can recover not only $V_S, E_S^{\text{dir}}, h_S, t_S$, but the pairing allows us to determine how ι_S acts.

However, we define the *homotopy type* of a graph S (or of an ordered graph) in terms of the isomorphism class of S/V' rather than S/V' itself. It becomes important to note that we can reconstruct S up to isomorphism (as a graph) provided that we know a graph, T , isomorphic to S/V' , and the function $\mathbf{k}: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ or $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that gives the length of directed edge or edge of S/V' under the isomorphism from T to S/V' .

Example 8.5. The usual graph theoretic notion of the *homotopy type* of a connected graph S is (any graph isomorphic to) the suppression S/V' of all beads of V_S , except that V' omits one vertex if S is a cycle of length at least two. For example, if S is a connected graph of order 1 without self-loops and leaves (i.e., vertices of degree 1), then S is of one of three homotopy types: figure-eight, barbell, or theta (see, for example, Figure 1 above or Figure 6 in [LP10]).

For an SNBC walk in a graph, we want to define a notion of *homotopy type* that will “remember” its first encountered ordering; this will consist of the usual homotopy type of a graph, but have some additional information that we now make precise.

8.2. The Homotopy Type of a Non-Backtracking Walk and of its Ordered Visited Subgraph.

Definition 8.6. Let w be a non-backtracking walk in some graph, G , and let $S^\leq = \text{VisSub}_G^\leq(w)$. By the *reduction* of w is the ordered graph R^\leq where:

- (1) $R = S/V'$, where V' is the set of all beads of w except the first and last vertices of w (if one or both of them are beads);
- (2) the ordering R^\leq is given as follows:
 - (a) the vertex ordering for $v_1, v_2 \in V_R$ is $v_1 < v_2$ iff v_1 is encountered first before v_2 along w ;
 - (b) the orientation of R are those $e \in E_R^{\text{dir}}$ whose corresponding beaded-path is encountered before the reverse beaded-path along w ;
 - (c) the edge ordering is $e_1 < e_2$ if the beaded-path corresponding to the orientation of e_1 is encountered along w before the one corresponding to e_2 .

We also write S^\leq/V' for R^\leq to emphasize the ordering. By the *edge-lengths of w on R* we mean the edge-lengths of S/V' . We say that w is of *homotopy type T^\leq* if $R^\leq \simeq T^\leq$ (as ordered graphs); in this case the isomorphism is unique, and the *edge-lengths of w in T^\leq* are the edge-lengths $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (and $E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$) obtained from composing this unique isomorphism with the edge-lengths on R .

We easily see that in the above definition we can recover the ordering of $S^\leq = \text{VisSub}_G^\leq(w)$ from the ordering on the homotopy type of w : the point is that if a non-backtracking walk encounters the first directed edge in a beaded path, then it must immediately traverse the entire beaded path. This is not true of general walks w , and the above definition does not work well in this general case.

Notice that if in the above definition w is an SNBC walk in some graph, then (1) the first and last vertices of v are equal, and (2) each degree of a vertex in $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$ is at least two. (If w is merely closed and non-backtracking, then property (1) holds but not generally property (2).) Since we are interested in SNBC walks, we will have properties (1) and (2). In Article II it turns out to be convenient to know that a graph, G , contains a $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangle iff it contains such a tangle where each vertex is of degree at least two (obtained by repeatedly “pruning” all leaves in the tangle).

In the above definition we do not suppress the first and last vertices of w . This implies that V' is automatically a proper bead set of S , which is convenient. However, the real reason we do not suppress the first and last vertices of w (even if S is not a cycle) is that we need the first and last vertex to correctly reconstruct the order S^\leq from the order on its homotopy type, T^\leq (which we cannot do if the walk does not begin and end on vertices in T^\leq).

Clearly the reduction of R^\leq of a walk, w , depends only on information that can be inferred from $\text{VisSub}^\leq(w)$; this enables us to make the following definition.

Definition 8.7. If S^\leq is an ordered graph that is the visited subgraph of some non-backtracking walk, w , on some graph, we define the *reduction, homotopy type, and edge-lengths* of S^\leq to be those of the walk w .

Our trace methods will count the SNBC walks in a graph by dividing them into their homotopy types (as do [BS87, Fri91, Fri08]). Here are the particular counting functions.

Definition 8.8. Let G be a graph and T^\leq an ordered graph. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbf{k} functions $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we use

- (1) $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq; G, k)$ to denote the set of SNBC walks in G of length k and homotopy type T^\leq ;
- (2) $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \mathbf{k}; G, k)$ to denote those elements of $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq; G, k)$ whose edge-lengths in T equal \mathbf{k} ;
- (3) $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \geq \mathbf{k}; G, k)$ to denote

$$\bigcup_{\mathbf{k}' \geq \mathbf{k}} \text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \mathbf{k}'; G, k)$$

where $\mathbf{k}' \geq \mathbf{k}$ means $k'(e) \geq k(e)$ for all $e \in E_T$; and

- (4) in the above, we replace SNBC with snbc to denote the cardinality of such a set.

The sets $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq; G, k)$ and $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \mathbf{k}; G, k)$ are implicit in [BS87] and appear explicitly in [Fri91]; however, the sets $\text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \geq \mathbf{k}; G, k)$ are special to our *certified traces*, a concept which is simpler than (and replaces) the *selective traces* of [Fri08].

8.3. Variable-Length Graphs (VLG's). Variable-length graphs (VLG's) is, in a sense, the opposite of bead suppression. They were introduced by Shannon [SW49] in the context of directed graphs to model Morse Code; we will need VLGs (see Theorem 10.1) for the same reasons they were needed in [Fri08], beginning in Section 3.4 there.

Informally, if T is a graph and $\mathbf{k}: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a function, then the variable-length graph $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ refers to a graph (it is not unique) obtained by replacing each edge $e \in E_T$ with a path of length $k(e)$. Here is a more precise definition.


Definition 8.9. Let T be a graph and $\mathbf{k}: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $k(e) = 1$ whenever e is a half-loop. By a *variable-length graph (VLG) on T with edge-lengths \mathbf{k}* , denoted $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$, we mean any graph S such that for some subset of beads, $V' \subset V_S$ we have (1) T is isomorphic to S/V' , (2) the edge-lengths of S/V' are \mathbf{k} (under this isomorphism), and (3) V' omits at least vertex in each connected component of S .

It is immediate that $S = \text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ always exists: we form S from T , by taking each $e \in E_T$ such that $k(e) > 1$ and replacing e with $k(e)$ edges that form an (undirected) path of length $k(e)$, which in the process introduces $k(e) - 1$ new vertices (all of which become beads in S). Sometimes VLG's are defined as pairs T, \mathbf{k} as above, and $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ is defined as the *realization* of (T, \mathbf{k}) . Of course, $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ is only defined up to isomorphism. We illustrate this construction in Figure 5.

Definition 8.9 shows that forming VLG's is a sort of "opposite" of forming bead suppressions.

9. ALGEBRAIC MODELS

In this section we define *algebraic models*, which are models that are strongly algebraic except that the polynomials p_i in (55) can depend on some information including regarding S_B which includes the homotopy type of S_B . The precise information is called a *B-type*, which is based on *B-wordings* which we define beforehand; we will also need some background on *regular languages*, which we now review.

FIGURE 5. T and \mathbf{k} : $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (left) and $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ (right)

9.1. Regular Languages and $\text{NBWALKS}(B)$. We will use some notions from the theory of regular languages (e.g., [Sip96], Chapter 1): if \mathcal{A} is an alphabet (i.e., a finite set) and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we use \mathcal{A}^k to denote the set of *words* (or *strings*) of length k over \mathcal{A} (i.e., finite sequences of k elements of \mathcal{A}), and we use \mathcal{A}^* to denote the union of \mathcal{A}^k over all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$; a *language* over \mathcal{A} (i.e., a subset of \mathcal{A}^*) is *regular* if it is recognized by some (deterministic) finite automaton or, equivalently, if it can be expressed as a regular expression.

Definition 9.1. If B is a graph, recall that a walk $w = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k)$ of positive length (i.e., $k \geq 1$) is determined by its sequence $(e_1, \dots, e_k) \in (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ of directed edges. If B is a graph, we use $\text{NBWALKS}(B) \subset (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$ to denote those words (e_1, \dots, e_k) of positive length that are the directed edges of a non-backtracking walk in B , i.e., for which $t_B e_i = h_B e_{i-1}$ and $\iota_B e_i \neq e_{i-1}$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k$. Similarly, if $e, e' \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, we use $\text{NBWALKS}(B, e, e')$ to denote the subset of $(e_1, \dots, e_k) \in \text{NBWALKS}(B)$ for which $e_1 = e$ and $e_k = e'$.

For all graphs B $\text{NBWALKS}(B)$ is a regular language, since the possible values of e_i are determined by those of e_{i-1} for a word $(e_1, \dots, e_i) \in \text{NBWALKS}(B)$; similarly, for any $e, e' \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, $\text{NBWALKS}(B, e, e')$ is a regular language.

At times we will identify an $(e_1, \dots, e_k) \in \text{NBWALK}$ with its associated non-backtracking walk $(v_0, e_1, \dots, e_k, v_k)$ in B , if confusion is unlikely to occur.

9.2. B -Wordings. Consider any suppression, $T = S/V'$, of a graph, S , with edge lengths \mathbf{k} : $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (or $E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$); then $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ is isomorphic—as a graph—to S . In this subsection we consider the information needed to recover S when we endow it with the structure of a B -graph; we will this information a *B -wording*. Let us first abstractly define this notion.

Definition 9.2. Let B, T be a graphs. By a *B -wording of T* we mean a function

$$W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \text{NBWALK}(B)$$

such that

- (1) for all $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, $W(\iota_T e) = W(e)^R$ is the reverse walk, i.e., if $W(e) = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$, then $W(e)^R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\iota_B e_k, \dots, \iota_B e_1)$;
- (2) if $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$ is a half-loop, then $W(e)$ is of length one whose single letter is a half-loop of B ;
- (3) the first vertex in $W(e)$ (i.e., the tail of the first directed edge) depends only on $t_T e$ (i.e., $W(e), W(e')$ have the same first vertex for any $e, e' \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$ for which $t_T e = t_T e'$).




FIGURE 6. A B -wording, W , on a graph, T , of two vertices joined by one edge; $V_T = \{u_T, v_T\}$ (labeled in green), $E_T^{\text{dir}} = \{e_T, \iota_T e_T\}$. $W(e_T)$ is the word $e_B f_B$ over the alphabet E_B^{dir} , which is identified with the NB walk $(u_B, e_B, w_B, f_B, v_B)$ in B , where $u_B = t_B e_B$, $w_B = h_B e_B = t_B f_B$, $v_B = h f_B$. $\text{VLG}_{/B}(T, W)$ is a path of length 2, with the indicated B -graph structure (in red on the right).

By the *edge lengths* of W we mean the function $E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ mapping e to the length of $W(e)$; since the length of $W(e)$ equals that of $W(\iota_T e)$, we also view the edge lengths as a function $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (whose value on an edge is that of an orientation of e).

Let us explain how wordings arise.

Definition 9.3. If S_B is a B -graph, and $T = S/V'$ is a suppression of S , the *wording on T induced by S_B* refers to the following map $W: E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \text{NBWALK}(B)$: let $\pi: S \rightarrow B$ be the structure map of S_B ; by definition (Definition 8.4) each element of E_T^{dir} is non-backtracking walk

$$e_T = (v_0, \dots, e_k, v_k)$$

in S ; we set

$$W(e_T) = \pi(e_1), \pi(e_2), \dots, \pi(e_k).$$

We easily check in the above definition that an induced wording is actually a wording. We also check that for any B -wording, W , of a graph T , there is a B -graph S_B with a suppression S/V' such that (1) there is an isomorphism $\mu: T \rightarrow S/V'$, (2) the wording induced by S_B on S/V' , when pulled back via μ , is the wording W ; we easily see that any two such S_B are isomorphic as B -graphs.

Definition 9.4. If W is a B -wording of a graph, T , with edge lengths \mathbf{k} , then the *realization of W* , denoted $\text{VLG}_{/B}(T, W)$ or $\text{VLG}(T, W)$, refers to any B -graph S_B whose underlying graph is $S = \text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$, and whose B -graph structure is the one given in the last paragraph: namely, if $e_T \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$ corresponds to the beaded path in S given as e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k , then we take e_i to the i -th letter in $W(e_T)$. (The directed edge e_i appears in exactly one beaded path by Lemma 8.2.)

Of course, since $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ does not refer to a unique graph, the above definition gives rise to many possible S_B . But we easily see that all such B -graphs are isomorphic as B -graphs.

See Figure 6 for an example.

We remark that if T is endowed with an ordering T^{\leq} arising from an SNBC walk, then this ordering induces one on $\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})$ and therefore on the realization of W . This ordering will be used in Article II; however here we want to define only what is meant by an *algebraic* model, and this notion relies only on wordings of graphs rather than of ordered graphs.

Notice that if $S_B^\leq = \text{VLG}(T^\leq, W)$ for a B -wording, W , then the invariants \mathbf{a}_{S_B} and \mathbf{b}_{S_B} can be inferred from W , and we may therefore write \mathbf{a}_W and \mathbf{b}_W .

9.3. B -Types.

Definition 9.5. Let B be a graph. By a B -type we mean a pair $T^{\text{type}} = (T, \mathcal{R})$ where T is a graph, and \mathcal{R} is function from E_T^{dir} to the set of regular languages over the alphabet E_B^{dir} that are subsets of $\text{NBWALKS}(B) \subset (E_B^{\text{dir}})^*$, such that

- (1) for all $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, $w \in \mathcal{R}(e)$ iff $w^R \in \mathcal{R}(\iota_T e)$;
- (2) if W is any function $E_T^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \text{NBWALKS}(B)$ such that for all $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, $W(e) \in \mathcal{R}(e)$ and $W(\iota_T e) = W(e)^R$, then W is a B -wording.

Furthermore, we say that any B -wording W as in (2) is of type \mathcal{R} and belongs to \mathcal{R} , and the same with T^{type} replacing \mathcal{R} .

The novelty of this definition, which is crucial to Article II (and [Fri91]), is that if $E_T^{\text{or}} \subset E_T^{\text{dir}}$ is any orientation of T , then the set of B -wordings that belong to any B -type $T^{\text{type}} = (T, \mathcal{R})$ is in one-to-one correspondence with

$$\prod_{e \in E_T^{\text{or}}} \mathcal{R}(e).$$

9.4. The Definition of Algebraic.

Definition 9.6. Let B be a graph, and $N \subset \mathbb{N}$ an infinite set, and for $n \in N$ let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be a probability space whose atoms are elements of $\text{Coord}_n(B)$. Recall that a B -graph S_B occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ if for all sufficiently large $n \in N$ there is a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ such that $[S_B] \cap G$ is nonempty, i.e., G contains a B -subgraph isomorphic to S_B . Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ satisfy (1)–(3) of Definition 7.11. If \mathcal{T} is a subset of B -graphs, we say that $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is algebraic when restricted to \mathcal{T} if either all $S_B \in \mathcal{T}$ occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ or they all do not, and (if so) there are polynomials $p_i = p_i(\mathbf{a}_{S_B})$ such that for each $S_B \in \mathcal{T}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(56) \quad c_i(S_B) = p_i(\mathbf{a}_{S_B})$$

(where $c_i = c_i(S_B)$ are as in Definition 7.11). We say that the family of probability spaces $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ is algebraic provided that it satisfies conditions (1)–(3) of Definition 7.11, and

- (1) the number of B -graph isomorphism classes of étale B -graphs S_B such that S is a cycle of length k and S does not occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is equals $h(k)$ where h is a function of growth $(d-1)^{1/2}$; and
- (2) for any pruned, ordered graph, T^\leq , there is a finite number of B -types, $T_j^{\text{type}} = (T^\leq, \mathcal{R}_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, such that (1) any B -wording, W , of T belongs to exactly one \mathcal{R}_j , and (2) $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is algebraic when restricted to T_j^{type} .

Let us make a few remarks on the above definition.

First, in (56), the p_i are written in terms of \mathbf{a} alone since (1) for fixed B -type (T, \mathcal{R}_j) , \mathbf{b} turns out to be a fixed, linear function of \mathbf{a} , and (2) this will be convenient to us in Article II.

Second, in proving our main theorems in Article II, it is convenient to insist that each wording belong to a unique B -type (T, \mathcal{R}_j) rather than to at least one. However, it is easy to prove that if each B -wording belongs to at least one of (T, \mathcal{R}_j)

in the above definition, then there is another set of B -types for which (1) and (2) of Definition 9.6 holds: indeed, let us give a proof, starting with the general fact that if L_1, \dots, L_u are any sets, and for $A \subset [u]$ we set

$$L^A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{a \in A} L_a \setminus \bigcup_{b \notin A} L_b,$$

then each element of $L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_u$ lies in a unique L^A (with $A \neq \emptyset$); moreover, if each L_i is a regular language over some common alphabet, then so is each L^A (by the closure properties of regular languages); finally, it will be useful to note that for any $a \in [u]$ and $A \subset [u]$,

$$(57) \quad L^A \cap L_a \neq \emptyset \quad \Rightarrow \quad a \in A \quad \Rightarrow \quad L^A \subset L_a$$

(both reverse implications hold whenever $L^A \neq \emptyset$). Now take L_1, \dots, L_u to be all sets of the form $\mathcal{R}_j(e)$ with $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$ [one could use an orientation E_T^{or} instead of all of E_T^{or}], and consider all B -types of the form (T, \mathcal{R}') where for each $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$, $\mathcal{R}'(e)$ is of the form $L^{A(e)}$ for some $A(e) \subset [u]$, and where (T, \mathcal{R}') contains at least one B -wording of T . In this way, then each B -wording of T , W , lies in a unique such B -type (T, \mathcal{R}') . But now we claim that $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ restricted to any such (T, \mathcal{R}') is algebraic: indeed, such a (T, \mathcal{R}') contains some wording, W , and such a wording is of \mathcal{R}_j for at least one j ; fix such a j . We have $W(e) \in \mathcal{R}'(e) \cap \mathcal{R}_j(e)$ for all $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, and therefore (57) implies that $\mathcal{R}'(e) \subset \mathcal{R}_j(e)$ for all $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$. Therefore any wording of type \mathcal{R}' is also of type \mathcal{R}_j , and since $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is algebraic when restricted to \mathcal{R}_j , it is also algebraic when restricted to \mathcal{R}' .

9.5. The Eigenvalues of a Regular Language, of a B -type, and of an Algebraic Model. In this subsection we define what we mean by the *eigenvalues* of an algebraic model. The *eigenvalues* of an algebraic model appear in the statements of the main theorems of Articles II and III; they are also fundamental to the main theorem of Article VI, where we prove that $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$ under certain conditions, one of which is that all *larger eigenvalues* of the model are either $\pm(d-1)$.

First we point out an easy fact about regular languages.

Proposition 9.7. *Let L be a regular language, and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $f(k)$ be the number of words in L of length k . Then $f(k)$ is a polyexponential function of k (Definition 4.6), i.e., there are unique distinct $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathbb{C}$ and unique non-zero polynomials $p_1(k), \dots, p_m(k)$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$(58) \quad f(k) = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i(k) \mu_i^k,$$

where we understand that $p_i(k) \mu_i^k$ with $\mu_i = 0$ refers to a non-zero function that is zero for k sufficiently large. [And we understand the convention that if f is identically zero, then $m = 0$ and $L = \emptyset$.]

The proof follows by considering a finite automaton, M , recognizing L , and letting A_M be the square matrix indexed on the states, Q , of M with $(A_M)_{q_1, q_2}$ equal to the number of letters in the alphabet taking state q_1 to state q_2 . Then

$$f(k) = \sum_{q \in F} (A_M^k)_{q_0, q}$$

where q_0 is the initial state of M and F is the set of accepting states of M ; the proposition follows from the Jordan canonical form of A_M (an eigenvalue 0 of A_M yields a nilpotent Jordan block, which explains our convention for $\mu_i = 0$).

Example 9.8. If $L = \text{NBWALKS}(B, e, e')$ for a graph B and $e, e' \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$, then the number of strings of length k in L is just the (e, e') entry of H_B^k ; in this case the μ_i above are always a subset of the $\mu_i(B)$, the eigenvalues of the Hashimoto matrix H_B . Also the oriented line graph of B easily yields a finite automaton recognizing L , which shows that L is a regular language.

Note that it is crucial that we view $\text{NBWALKS}(B)$ as strings in E_B^{dir} so that the eigenvalues are what we want: one could view any $L \subset \text{NBWALKS}(B)$ as a set of alternating strings of V_B and E_B^{dir} , then this would roughly double the length of each word in L and therefore change the eigenvalues of L . Hence it is crucial that we omit the vertices when describing NB walks in order to get the correct values of *eigenvalues of L* that we need for our trace methods, even though the notion of *regular language* is (easily checked to be) the same whether or not we omit the vertices.

Definition 9.9. If L is a regular language, then the *eigenvalues of L* are the unique $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathbb{C}$ in Proposition 9.7. If B is a graph, the *eigenvalues of a B -type (T^{\leq}, \mathcal{R})* is the union of the eigenvalues of all the regular languages $\mathcal{R}(e)$ with $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$. If $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_n$ is an algebraic model, then a *set of eigenvalues* of the model is any subset of \mathbb{C} that for any T^{\leq} contains all the eigenvalues of some set of B -types $(T^{\leq}, \mathcal{R}_j)$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 9.6.

In the above definition, a *set of eigenvalues* is not unique; we can always add some extraneous eigenvalues by subdividing a B -type into a number of smaller B -types whose underlying regular languages have additional eigenvalues; it is not clear to us (at least from the definition) that there is a unique minimal set of eigenvalues of a model.

9.6. Our Basic Models are Algebraic. In Article V we will prove that all of our basic models (Definition 2.6) over a graph, B , are algebraic, and a set of eigenvalues for these models is possibly 1 (for models involving full-cycles) and some subset of the eigenvalues of H_B . Let us make some remarks regarding this proof; these remarks help to motivate our definition of B -type.

First, it is not hard to prove that any model that is strongly algebraic is also algebraic. The main point (see Article V for details) is that for a strongly algebraic model, for any S_B (55) implies that

$$c_{\text{ord}(S)+i}(S_B) = \begin{cases} p_i(\mathbf{a}_{S_B}, \mathbf{b}_{S_B}) & \text{if } S_B \text{ is an étale } B\text{-graph, and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

However, if $S_B = \text{VLG}_{/B}(T, W)$, then whether or not S_B is étale depends only on the first and last letters of $W(e)$ for all $e \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$. So if (T, \mathcal{R}) varies over all B -types where all $\mathcal{R}(e)$ are sets of the form $\text{NBWALK}(B, e_1, e_2)$, then each B -wording belongs to a unique (T, \mathcal{R}) ; furthermore, the polynomials expressing $c_i(S_B)$ in terms of $\mathbf{a}_{S_B}, \mathbf{b}_{S_B}$ depend only on which \mathcal{R} gives rise to S_B (i.e., as $\text{VLG}_{/B}(T, W)$ with $W \in \mathcal{R}$). Furthermore, it is easy to see that for a fixed B -type (T, \mathcal{R}) , the variables \mathbf{b}_{S_B} are fixed, linear functions of the \mathbf{a}_{S_B} . For this reason all strongly algebraic models are algebraic.

We remark that B -types (T, \mathcal{R}) , as above, based on the first and last letters of each $W(e)$, corresponds to the notion of a *lettering* in in [Fri91], page 338, and [Fri08] (Definition 5.8). [In both these articles, $\text{Irr}_{k,e,e'}$ denotes the elements of $\text{NBWALK}(B, e, e')$ of length k .] See also Subsection 6.9 of this article.

The main reason why we want to allow $\mathcal{R}(e)$ to be a more general regular language (more general than $\text{NBWALK}(B, e_1, e_2)$) is because of the cyclic model: a random full cycle, π , in \mathcal{S}_n with a of its values fixed occurs with probability

$$\frac{1}{(n-1)\dots(n-a)}$$

provided that the values fixed do not force π to have a cycle of length $\leq n-1$. It follows that when we identify wordings of type (T, \mathcal{R}) with

$$\prod_{E_T^{\text{or}}} \mathcal{R}(e)$$

for an orientation E_T^{or} , we must be careful to avoid wordings that force the associated $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ to have a cycle of length $\leq n-1$ at any whole-loop $e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$ (i.e., that force $\sigma(e)$ —which we insist is a full-cycle in this model—to have a cycle of length less than n). For example, if $e_T \in E_T^{\text{dir}}$ is a whole-loop, and $e_B \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$ is a whole-loop, then we must forbid $W(e_T)$ to be a word in $(e_B)^*$ (i.e., of the form $(e_1)^\ell = (e_1, \dots, e_1)$). Hence for the cyclic model our B -types include (T, \mathcal{R}) where $\mathcal{R}(e)$ can take on values such as

$$\text{NBWALK}(B, e_B, e_B) \setminus e_B^*, \quad e_B^*,$$

(whenever e_B is a whole-loop), as well as the sets $\text{NBWALK}(e_1, e_2)$. Since e_B^* is a language whose eigenvalues are 1 (there is exactly one word of any length), the eigenvalues of the cyclic model must include 1 in addition to the $\mu_i(B)$. [For similar reasons, the language $\text{NBWALK}(B, e_B, e_B) \setminus e_B^*$ has 1 as an eigenvalue in addition to some of the $\mu_i(B)$.]

The above remarks about the cyclic model were overlooked in [Fri08]; so working with regular languages and B -types as defined here is one way to fix this error. This correction doesn't change any of the computations, since these computations are done modulo functions of growth $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$ in the NB walk statistics.

10. ARTICLE II: EXPANSION THEOREMS

Our asymptotic expansions theorems are akin to those in [Fri91] and proven by the same methods. Let us briefly describe a special case of the main result of Article II that indicates the general type of result.

10.1. Asymptotic Expansions for Walks of a Given B -Type. The main expansion theorems in Article II can be understood for the special case of the expected number of walks of a given type.

Theorem 10.1. *Let B be a graph, and $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ an algebraic model over B . Let T^\leq be an ordered graph, let $\xi: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function, and let*

$$\nu = \max\left(\mu_1^{1/2}(B), \mu_1(\text{VLG}(T, \xi))\right).$$

Then for any $r \geq 1$ we have

$$f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}(T^\leq, \geq \xi; G; k)]$$

has a (B, ν) -bounded expansion

$$c_0(k) + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r$$

to order r , where the bases of the coefficients $c_i = c_i(k)$ is a subset of a set of eigenvalues of the model; furthermore $c_i(k) = 0$ for $i < \text{ord}(T)$.

10.2. Asymptotic Expansions for Walks Times Inclusions. If $S_{/B}, G_{/B}$ are fixed B -graphs, then for any ordering on $S_{/B}$,

$$(59) \quad N(S_{/B}, G_{/B}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_B$$

is independent of the ordering; the quantity $N(S_{/B}, G_{/B})$ features prominently in our trace methods because (1) in Article III we will use linear combinations of $N(S_{/B}, G_{/B})$ —where $S_{/B}$ varies over a finite number of $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangles—to approximate the indicator function

$$\mathbb{I}_{\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G)$$

which we use to prove the main theorems there (e.g., Theorem 11.1; see also Appendix A), and (2) we can prove the following variant of Theorem 10.1 with only minor additional difficulties.

Theorem 10.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be an algebraic model over a graph B . Let T^{\leq} be an ordered graph, let $\xi: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function, and let*

$$\nu = \max\left(\mu_1^{1/2}(B), \mu_1(\text{VLG}(T, \xi))\right).$$

Let $\psi_{/B}^{\leq}$ be any ordered B -graph. Then for any $r \geq 1$ we have

$$(60) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[(\#[\psi_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G) \text{snbc}(T^{\leq}; \geq \xi, G, k)]$$

has a (B, ν) -bounded expansion

$$c_0(k) + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r,$$

to order r ; the bases of the coefficients $c_i = c_i(k)$ are some subset of the eigenvalues of the model, and $c_i(k) = 0$ for i less than the order of any B -graph that contains both a walk of homotopy type T^{\leq} and a subgraph isomorphic to $\psi_{/B}$.

Technically Theorem 10.2 is a generalization of Theorem 10.1, by taking $\psi_{/B}^{\leq}$ to be the empty graph. However, we first prove Theorem 10.1, since its proof is less notationally cumbersome and illustrates the key ideas in the proof of Theorem 10.2.

We wish to make one technical remark regarding Article II: one could scale the entries of the matrix H_B to prove a more general expansion theorem; one limit of this scaling occurs in what is called the Dot Convolution Theorem in this article; this requires the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of any scaled form of H_B to be at least one (or else one in defining (B, ν) -functions one must require $\nu \geq 1$).

11. ARTICLE III: THE CERTIFIED TRACE EXPANSION THEOREMS

Most of Article III is devoted to proving the following result.

Theorem 11.1. *Let B be a connected graph with $\mu_1(B) > 1$, and let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an algebraic model over B . Let $r > 0$ be an integer and $\nu \geq \mu_1^{1/2}(B)$ be a real number. Then*

$$(61) \quad f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(H_G^k)]$$

has a (B, ν) -bounded expansion to order r ,

$$f(k, n) = c_0(k) + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1)c_r(k)/n^r,$$

where

$$c_0(k) = \sum_{k'|k} \text{Trace}(H_B^{k'})$$

where the sum is over all positive integers, k' , dividing k ; hence

$$c_0(k) = \text{Trace}(H_B^k) + O(k)\mu_1^{k/2}(B);$$

furthermore, the larger bases of each $c_i(k)$ (with respect to $\mu_1^{1/2}(B)$) is some subset of the eigenvalues of the model. Finally, for any $r' \in \mathbb{N}$ the function

$$(62) \quad \tilde{f}(n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r')}(G)] = \text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [G \in \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r')]$$

has an asymptotic expansion in $1/n$ to any order r ,

$$\tilde{c}_0 + \cdots + \tilde{c}_{r-1}/n^{r-1} + O(1)/n^r;$$

where $\tilde{c}_0 = 1$; furthermore, if j_0 is the smallest order of a $(\geq \nu)$ -tangle occurring in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then $\tilde{c}_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j < j_0$ and $\tilde{c}_j > 0$ for $j = j_0$ (provided that $r \geq j_0 + 1$ so that \tilde{c}_{j_0} is defined).

Notice that a model may have—at least in principle—an infinite number of eigenvalues, which means that for each r, ν , the number of bases of the $c_i(k)$ may be unbounded as $i \rightarrow \infty$; however there are a few remarks to consider:

- (1) Taking $\nu = \mu_1^{1/2}(B)$, for each r , the $c_i(k)$ with $i < r$ have a finite number of exponent bases;
- (2) since for any fixed k we have

$$c_i(k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^i (f(k, n) - c_0(k) - \cdots - n^{1-i} c_{i-1}(k)),$$

the function $c_i(k)$ is uniquely defined and independent of r over all $r > i$; hence a fixed $c_i(k)$ has a finite number of larger (than ν) bases.

- (3) In all our basic models, the eigenvalues consist only of the $\mu_j(B)$ and possibly the eigenvalue 1; hence all larger bases of the $c_i(k)$ lie in this finite set.

We remark (see [FK14]) that one could replace the condition $\nu \geq \mu_1^{1/2}$ by $\nu \geq \mu_1^{1/N}$ for any positive integer N , but then the coefficients in the asymptotic expansions may depend on the class of n modulo the least common multiple of the numbers from 1 to N .

A description of the methods used to prove Theorem 11.1 is given in Appendix A. These methods include ideas regarding tangles, minimal tangles, and indicator function approximations [Fri08], Section 9 (see Article III for more detailed references) with the expansion theorems proven in Article II. The main difference between Article III and [Fri08] is that Article III involves *certified traces*, which are simpler to define and much easier to work with than the *selective traces* of [Fri08].

In Article V we will also need the following result, whose proof is similar to the proof of the expansion for (62) above.

Theorem 11.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be an algebraic model over a graph, B , and let S_B be a connected, pruned graph of positive order that occurs in this model. Then for some constant, C' , and n sufficiently large,*

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[[S_B] \cap G \neq \emptyset \right] \geq C' n^{-\text{ord}(S_B)}.$$

12. ARTICLE IV: THE SIDESTEPPING THEOREM

In Article IV we prove an improved form of the *Sidestepping Lemma* of [Fri08], suited to our more general context.

12.1. Intuition Behind the Sidestepping Theorem. Let us give the intuition behind our Sidestepping Theorem. To fix ideas, say that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, ξ_n is a random variable on a probability space \mathcal{P}_n with $\xi_n = 2$ on an event E_n of probability $1 - (1/n^3)$, and ξ_n is uniformly distributed on $[4, 5]$ on the complement of E_n . In this case we have

$$f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[\xi_n^k] = 2^k + (1/n^3)(c_k - 2^k),$$

where c_k is the k -th moment of the uniform distribution on $[4, 5]$. Similarly, if M_n is a random $n \times n$ matrix whose eigenvalues are all distributed as ξ_n , then one has

$$(63) \quad f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[\text{Trace}(M_n^k)] = 2^k n + (1/n^2)(c_k - 2^k).$$

The Sidestepping Theorem attempts to invert this process, namely given a random $n \times n$ matrix M_n for which

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Trace}(M_n^k)] = c_{-1}(k)n + c_0(k) + \cdots + c_r(k)/n^{r-1} + O(1/n^r),$$

with some assumptions on the eigenvalues of M_n and some assumptions on the $c_i(k)$, this theorem guarantees (very) high probability bounds on the locations of M_n 's eigenvalues. Our Sidestepping Theorem assumes that $c_{-1}(k) = 0$, since this is the case for expected traces of powers of the Hashimoto matrices in our models.

It turns out that all the techniques and results in Article IV can be stated as theorems regarding the random set of n eigenvalues of M_n ; for example, $\text{Trace}(M_n^k)$ is just the sum of their k -th powers. However, we state our results in Article IV in terms of $\text{Trace}(M_n^k)$ because this is how we will apply these results, namely to draw conclusions about these eigenvalues based on facts regarding the $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected values of $\text{Trace}(H_G^k)$ times the indicator function of G that indicates that G is free of certain tangles. Let us state the precise theorem.

12.2. Precise Statement of the Sidestepping Theorem.

Definition 12.1. Let $\Lambda_0 < \Lambda_1$ be positive real numbers. By a (Λ_0, Λ_1) *matrix model* we mean a collection of finite probability spaces $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \in N}$ where $N \subset \mathbb{N}$ is an infinite subset, and where the atoms of \mathcal{M}_n are $n \times n$ real-valued matrices whose eigenvalues lie in the set

$$B_{\Lambda_0}(0) \cup [-\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1]$$

in \mathbb{C} . Let $r \geq 0$ be an integer and $K: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $K(n)/\log n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We say that this model has an *order r expansion* with *range $K(n)$* (with Λ_0, Λ_1 understood) if as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have that

$$(64) \quad \mathbb{E}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_n}[\text{Trace}(M^k)] = c_0(k) + c_1(k)/n + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(c_r(k))/n^r$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq K(n)$, where (1) $c_r = c_r(k)$ is of growth Λ_1 , (2) the constant in the $O(c_r(k))$ is independent of k and n , and (3) for $0 \leq i < r$, $c_i = c_i(k)$ is

an approximate polyexponential with Λ_0 error term and whose larger bases (i.e., larger than Λ_0 in absolute value) lie in $[-\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1]$; at times we speak of an *order r expansion* without explicitly specifying K . When the model has such an expansion, then we use the notation L_r to refer to the union of all larger bases of $c_i(k)$ (with respect to Λ_0) over all i between 0 and $r - 1$, and call L_r the *larger bases (of the order r expansion)*.

Note that in Definition 12.1, the larger bases of the c_i are an arbitrary finite subset of $[-\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1] \setminus [-\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0]$ (e.g., there is no bound on the number of bases). In our applications we will take $\Lambda_1 = d - 1$ and Λ_0 slightly larger than $(d - 1)^{1/2}$.

We also note that (64) implies that for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(65) \quad c_i(k) = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}, n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_n} [\text{Trace}(M^k)] - (c_0(k) + \cdots + c_{i-1}(k)/n^{i-1}) \right) n^i$$

for all $i \leq r - 1$; we conclude that the $c_i(k)$ are uniquely determined, and that $c_i(k)$ is independent of r for any $r > i$ for which (64) holds. We also see that if (64) holds for some value of r , then it also holds for smaller values of r . It follows that if (64) holds for some r , then L_i is defined for each $i < r$ (as the set of larger bases of the functions $c_0(k), \dots, c_{i-1}(k)$). Furthermore L_i is empty iff $c_0(k), \dots, c_{i-1}(k)$ are all functions of growth Λ_0 .

Let us remark on what N in the above definition typically looks like. In our applications the matrices will be that of the new functions on H_G (times an indicator function), over $G \in \mathcal{C}_{n'}(B)$ where $n' \in N'$, with N' some infinite set. Hence the spaces \mathcal{M}_n would vary over dimension $n = (n' - 1)(\#E_B^{\text{dir}})$ with $n' \in N'$.

If \mathcal{M} is a probability space of $n \times n$ matrices, and $R \subset \mathbb{C}$, it will be very useful to use the shorthand

$$(66) \quad \mathbb{E}\text{in}_{\mathcal{M}}[R] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\text{out}_{\mathcal{M}}[R],$$

respectively, as the expected number of eigenvalues of $M \in \mathcal{M}$ (counted with multiplicity) that lie, respectively, in R and not in R . Hence the sum of these two expected values is n .

Here is the main theorem of Article IV, a strengthening and easier to apply version of the Sidestepping Lemma of [Fri08].

Theorem 12.2. *Let $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a (Λ_0, Λ_1) -bounded matrix model, for some real $\Lambda_0 < \Lambda_1$, that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ has an order r expansion; let $p_i(k)$ denote the polyexponential part of $c_i(k)$ (with respect to Λ_0) in (64) (which is independent of $r \geq i + 1$ by (65)). If $p_i(k) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*

$$(67) \quad \mathbb{E}\text{out}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon}(0)] = O(n^{-j}).$$

Otherwise let j be the smallest integer for which $p_j(k) \neq 0$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all $\theta > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$(68) \quad \mathbb{E}\text{out}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon}(0) \cup B_{n^{-\theta}}(L_{j+1})] = o(n^{-j});$$

moreover, if $L = L_{j+1}$ is the (necessarily nonempty) set of bases of p_j , then for each $\ell \in L$ there is a real $C_\ell > 0$ such that

$$(69) \quad p_j(k) = \sum_{\ell \in L} \ell^k C_\ell,$$

and for all $\ell \in L$ for sufficiently small $\theta > 0$,

$$(70) \quad \mathbb{E}\text{in}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{n^{-\theta}}(\ell)] = n^{-j} C_\ell + o(n^{-j}).$$

13. ARTICLE V: PROOFS OF THE FIRST MAIN THEOREM

Article V begins by proving some easy results that we stated in this article, namely (1) the Ihara Determinantal formula in the context of graphs that can have half-loops, and (2) that all our standard models (Definition 2.6) are algebraic. Our proof of the Ihara formula is a simple adaptation of Bass’ elegant proof [Bas92] of the usual Ihara formula. Our proof that our basic models are algebraic is based in [BS87, Fri91]; we also correct an error in [Fri08] regarding the cyclic (and cyclic-involution) models that we described in Subsections 6.9 and 9.6.

After these easy results we gather the results of Articles III and IV to easily prove the first main theorem, Theorem 3.2, the relativized Alon conjecture for any algebraic model over a d -regular graph, B .

Then we prove Theorem 5.9. Most of the work is to show the following result: let B be a d -regular graph for some $d \geq 3$, and let S be a graph with $\mu_1(S) > (d-1)^{1/2}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be real. Then for sufficiently large n , any covering map $G \rightarrow B$ of degree n has a new adjacency eigenvalue that is larger than

$$\mu_1(S) + \frac{d-1}{\mu_1(S)} - \epsilon$$

provided that G has a subgraph isomorphic to S . Our proof uses the “Curious Theorem” (in Section 3.8) of [Fri08], as well as the methods of Friedman-Tillich [FT05].

We finish Article V with a section showing a number of examples regarding trace methods for new eigenvalues of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ where B is d -regular. These examples concern trace methods proving high probability bounds for the new spectral radius of A_G ; we show in these examples—where the high probability bound is larger than the Alon bound, $2(d-1)^{1/2}$ —one gets improved bounds by applying the trace method to H_G , and then converting the high probability bounds on the new spectral radius of H_G back to those on A_G (using the Ihara determinantal formula). We have no rigorous proof that applying a trace method to H_G gives better bounds than applying it to A_G for random graphs G ; this just happens to be the case in all examples that we know.

14. ARTICLE VI: SHARP EXPONENTS FOR REGULAR RAMANUJAN BASE GRAPHS

In this article we prove a number of results needed to prove our second main theorem, Theorem 5.10, for our basic models $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ when B is Ramanujan. This requires a number of independent results.

The main computation in this article regards the *magnification* [Alo86] of a graph, G , which refers to the smallest $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $U \subset V_G$ with $\#U \leq (1/2)(\#V_G)$ we have

$$\#(\Gamma(U) \setminus U) \geq \gamma(\#U)$$

where $\Gamma(U)$ is the set of neighbouring vertices of U (i.e., of distance one, i.e., joined to U by some edge in G).

First, we show that all our basic models $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ have a sort of *magnification* property that, roughly speaking, says that for $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with very high probability—larger than $1 - O(n^{-s})$ for any fixed $s \in \mathbb{N}$ — G will only be a poor magnifier if it has a small sized, disconnected component. This is a fairly involved computation that closely resembles those in [Fri08], Chapter 12.

Second, it is then an easy consequence that if B is Ramanujan, then $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$ for our basic models and, more generally, any algebraic model over such B that satisfies a similar magnification property. [Beyond this, we conjecture that $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$ for our basic models regardless of B .]

These two results imply that the probability of having a non-Alon eigenvalue when B is d -regular and Ramanujan is bounded from below and above as of order $n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$. More precisely, having a non-Alon eigenvalue $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ or greater, for fixed $\epsilon > 0$ is bounded above by $n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$ times a constant depending on ϵ , and bounded below—for $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with n sufficiently large—by an absolute constant times $n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}$, for ϵ sufficiently small. This is always the case when $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$, or, more weakly, when $\tau_{\text{alg}} \geq \tau_{\text{tang}} + 1$.

We finish Article VI with some remarks on the value of τ_{tang} for our basic models. In particular, we prove Corollary 5.12 using the results of [Fri08], Sections 6.3 and 6.4.

APPENDIX A. CERTIFIED TRACE AND INDICATOR FUNCTION APPROXIMATION

In this appendix we give an overview of contents of Article III, which is the proof of Theorem 11.1. This appendix involves some remarks on *certified traces*, which are new to this series of articles (and [FK14]), which significantly simplify the *selective traces* of [Fri08]. In addition, we make some remarks of indicator function approximation from [Fri08] that are used essentially verbatim in Article III.

This appendix also illustrates how Articles II and III work together.

Our strategy to obtain expansion theorems for

$$(71) \quad f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(H_G^k)],$$

as well that in [Fri08], can be explained as follows. Given a model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, and an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, say that we find a “modified trace” function, $\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)$, with the following properties:

(1) for any graph, G , and any k, ν, r ,

$$(72) \quad 0 \leq \text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r) \leq \text{Trace}(H_G^k),$$

(2) we have

$$(73) \quad \text{sbc}_{< r}(G, k) = \text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r) \quad \text{if } G \in \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r),$$

and

(3) both the functions

$$(74) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)]$$

and

$$(75) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)]$$

have (B, ν) -bounded asymptotic expansions to order r .

Then, of course, one also has such an expansion for the difference of (74) and (75), which equals (71).

In Theorem 2.2 of [Fri08] one sees that, intuitively, $\text{Trace}(H_G^k)$ is so large on graphs with tangles, that the function

$$f(k, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} [\text{Trace}(H_G^k)],$$

cannot have (B, ν) -bounded coefficients, at least for r larger than roughly $d^{1/2}$. In this series of articles, and in [Fri08], we define $\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)$ as a function that counts some elements of $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$ and ignores others, with the property that we only ignore elements of $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$ when G has a $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -tangle; such a count automatically satisfies (72) and (73). The difficulty is to define $\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)$ in a way that guarantees that (74) and (75) have the desired expansions.

The modified trace functions in [Fri08] were called *selective traces*, and are a bit involved to describe precisely. Our approach in this series of articles is much simpler: namely we take we discard *all* walks whose visited subgraph, S , satisfies $\mu_1(S) \geq \nu$ or $\text{ord}(S) \geq r$. In other words, we take $\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)$ to be

$$\text{cert}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k) = \#\text{CERT}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k),$$

where $\text{CERT}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k)$ is the subset of $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$ of elements, w , whose visited subgraph, $S = \text{VisSub}(w)$ has $\mu_1(S) < \nu$ and $\text{ord}(S) < r$. It is immediate that $\text{cert}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k)$ satisfies (72) and (73). Our strategy for proving that (74) and (75) have (B, ν) -expansions to order r begins with the following preliminary observations.

- (1) We are free to discard all walks of order r or greater when computing expansions to order r (see (27) or (52)).
- (2) For fixed r , there are finitely many homotopy types of SNBC walks of order less than r .
- (3) Since each SNBC walk is of a unique homotopy type, T^\leq , the elements of $\text{CERT}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k)$ is a sum over all homotopy types of order less than r , T^\leq , of those walks, w , whose ordered visited subgraph, $S = \text{VisSub}^\leq(w)$ satisfies $\mu_1(S) < \nu$.
- (4) It therefore suffices to fix a homotopy type, T^\leq , and prove a (B, ν) -asymptotic expansion exists for the $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ -expected number of walks $w \in \text{SNBC}(G, k)$, whose visited subgraph is isomorphic to $\text{VLG}(T^\leq, \mathbf{k})$ where \mathbf{k} lies in

$$\text{Certified}(T^\leq, < \nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{k}: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid \mu_1(\text{VLG}(T, \mathbf{k})) < \nu\}.$$

So we now focus on the above sets $\text{Certified}(T^\leq, < \nu)$. We may view the functions $E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as a partially ordered set, by the usual partial order on \mathbb{N}^{E_T} , i.e., $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{k}'$ if for all $e \in E_T$, $k(e) \leq k'(e)$. Then $\text{Certified}(T^\leq, < \nu)$ is an *upper set*, i.e., if it contains \mathbf{k} then it contains all \mathbf{k}' with $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{k}'$ (this follows from the theory of VLG's). It then follows (by general remarks on upper sets in \mathbb{N}^{E_T}) that for fixed T^\leq and ν there are a finite number of elements $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m \in \mathbb{N}^{E_T}$ such that $\text{Certified}(T^\leq, < \nu)$ is the same as

$$\{\mathbf{k}: E_T \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid \mathbf{k} \geq \xi_i \text{ for some } i\}.$$

We call ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m a set of *certificates* for T^\leq, ν .

Inclusion-exclusion then implies that it is enough to individually prove asymptotic expansion theorems for expected counts of walks

$$\{w \in \text{SNBC}(G, k) \mid \text{VisSub}^\leq(w) \simeq \text{VLG}(T^\leq, \mathbf{k}), \mathbf{k} \geq \xi\}$$

for a fixed ξ with $\text{VLG}(T^\leq, \xi)$ having $\mu_1 < \nu$. This is precisely

$$(76) \quad f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{snbc}(T^\leq, \geq \xi; G, k)].$$

The proof that such a function has a (B, ν) -asymptotic expansion is a straightforward adaptation of the methods of [Fri91]; we do this in Article II, where we factor this proof into a number of general results and simplify part of [Fri91]. Such results then imply a (B, ν) -asymptotic expansion to order r for (74), where $\text{cert}_{<\nu, <r}(G, k)$ is used for $\text{ModifiedTrace}(G, k, \nu, r)$.

To prove (75) we adapt the methods of Chapter 9 of [Fri08] to our situation. The idea, roughly speaking, is to count pairs $(w, \tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq})$ where $w \in \text{SNBC}(T^{\leq}, \geq \xi; G, k)$ and $\tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq}$ is a fixed $(\geq \nu, <r)$ -tangle. In Article II we prove the existence of asymptotic expansions for

$$f_{T^{\leq}, \xi, \tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq}}(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[(\#\tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq} \cap G_{/B}) \text{snbc}(T^{\leq}, \geq \xi; G, k)];$$

the proof uses the same methods in [Fri91] as for (76), except that we need the notion of pairs and their homotopy types, along the lines of Chapter 9 of [Fri08].

The techniques in Chapter 9 of [Fri08] are used to show that

$$\mathbb{I}_{\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, <r)}(G)$$

can be approximated by linear combinations of the functions $\#\tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq} \cap G_{/B}$ so well—in various expressions involving $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ expected values—that we can use functions $f_{T^{\leq}, \xi, \tilde{S}_{/B}^{\leq}}(k, n)$ to approximate

$$f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, <r)}(G) \text{snbc}(T^{\leq}, \geq \xi; G, k)].$$

APPENDIX B. DEFINITION SUMMARY AND NOTES

In this section we list terminology appearing in the definitions in this paper. We also make some notes, mostly to explain the definitions that are not standard or to indicate some finer points regarding these definitions.

In Sections 2 and 3 we introduce terminology to state our first main result, namely a proof of the relativized Alon conjecture for some basic models of a random covering map to a regular base graph.

We define a *graph* (i.e., *undirected graph*) to be a directed graph with some additional structure, as in [Fri93b]. This allows our graphs to have for multiple edges and two types of self-loops: whole-loops (which contribute 2 to the degree of a vertex), and half-loops (which contribute 1). Half-loops are not entirely standard, but are useful to describe random d -regular graphs on n vertices for a fixed odd integer d . Half-loops are also needed to make the models in [Fri08] special cases of our second main result when B is a Ramanujan regular graph (this result closes a gap in upper and lower bounds in some cases in [Fri08] for the models there).

Another advantage of viewing a graph as a directed graph with some additional structure is that there are a number of concepts that are much easier to define: for example, the correct definition of a *covering map* of graphs—in the presence of self-loops and multiple edges—is a bit tricky to define correctly. However, the correct notion of a covering map of directed graphs is easy to define, and the correct notion on graphs is merely that the morphism be a covering map of the underlying directed graphs. In fact, we define most of our graph theoretic concepts first on directed graphs, and then easily “extend” these concepts to graphs.

We also remark that our trace methods involve the *oriented line graph* of a graph, which itself is a directed graph, not a graph; for this and related reasons, we need to keep directed graphs in mind for much of this series of articles.

Definition 2.1: *directed graph*, $B = (V_B, E_B^{\text{dir}}, t_B, h_B)$, *vertex set* V_B , *directed edge set* E_B^{dir} , and *heads and tails maps*, t_B, h_B , from $E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow V_B$, *self-loops* ($e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}$ with $t_B e = h_B e$).

Definition 2.2: (*undirected*) *graph*, $G = (V_G, E_G^{\text{dir}}, t_G, h_G, \iota_G)$, its *underlying directed graph*, $(V_G, E_G^{\text{dir}}, t_G, h_G)$, the *edge involution* ι_G ; *self-loops, whole-loops, half-loops* ($e \in E_G^{\text{dir}}$ with $\iota_G e = e$, i.e., directed edges paired with themselves), *edge set* E_G (the ι_G orbits in E_G^{dir}), *orientation* of an edge or of the graph (a choice of orbit representative(s)).

Definition 2.3: *coordinatized cover* for digraphs, $V_G = V_B \times [n]$, $E_G^{\text{dir}} = E_B^{\text{dir}} \times [n]$, $t_G(e, i) = (t_B e, i)$, $h_G(e, i) = (h_B e, \sigma(e)i)$, where σ is the associated permutation map $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$.

Definition 2.4: *coordinatized covers* for graphs, i.e., ι_G must satisfy $\iota_G(e, i) = (\iota_B e, \sigma(e)i)$ (this implies σ must satisfy $\sigma(\iota_B e) = \sigma(e)^{-1}$).

Definition 2.5: *models* (of covering maps to a fixed based graph), *edge-independence* for a model, meaning that the $\sigma(e) \in \mathcal{S}_n$ are independent in e ranging over any orientation of B .

Definition 2.6: our *basic models*: the *permutation model*, the *permutation-involution model* (of even or odd degree), the *full cycle model* (or *cyclic model*), and the *full cycle-involution model* (or *cyclic-involution*) (even or odd degree).

Definition 2.7: *indegree and outdegree* (of a vertex) and *adjacency matrix* for a digraph; *degree and adjacency matrix* for graphs; *strongly regular digraphs and regular graphs*.

Definition 2.8: *bouquets* (graphs on one vertex).

Definition 2.10: *morphisms* of digraphs; *vertex/edge fibres*; *covering* and *étale* morphisms; *degree* of a covering morphism.

Definition 2.11: *morphisms* of graphs; *covering* and *étale* morphisms.

Definition 2.12: notation: $\lambda_i(B)$ of a graph, B (the eigenvalues of A_B in decreasing order).

Definition 2.13, 2.14: *mew/old functions, new/old spectrum, new spectral radius*, for digraphs and graphs.

Definition 3.1: notation: $\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon)$, the number of ϵ -*non-Alon eigenvalues*.

Definition 3.3: *Ramanujan regular graphs*.

The definitions in Section 4 allow us to state the two main theorems in this series of articles. These theorems involve two invariants, τ_{tang} and τ_{alg} , of a model of random covering of a fixed base graph.

Definition 4.1: *walk* in a digraph or graph, *closed walk*, *length* of a walk.

Definition 4.2: *non-backtracking walk*, *strictly non-backtracking closed (SNBC) walk* in a graph; *oriented line graph*, *Hashimoto* (or *non-backtracking*) matrix of a graph.

Definition 4.3: notation $\text{SNBC}(G, k)$, $\text{snbc}(G, k)$ (the set and number of strictly non-backtracking walks of length k in G).

Definition 4.4: the *visited subgraph*, $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$, of a walk, w , in a digraph or graph, G . Note that to determine $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$, it is not generally enough to know the sequence w , except under some assumption(s) on G ; it is enough if we restrict ourselves to G that are coordinatized covers.

Definition 4.5: the *order* $\text{ord}(G) = \#E_G - \#V_G$ of a graph, G ; $\text{SNBC}_r(G, k)$, $\text{SNBC}_{<r}(G, k)$, $\text{SNBC}_{\geq r}(G, k)$, and their cardinalities, $\text{snbc}_r(G, k)$, $\text{snbc}_{<r}(G, k)$, $\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)$.

Definition 4.6: (univariate) *polyexponential* functions, their *bases*, functions of *growth* ρ for a $\rho > 0$.

Definition 4.7, 4.8: (B, ν) -*bounded* function, (B, ν) -*Ramanujan* function, (B, ν) -*bounded asymptotic expansions*, (B, ν) -*Ramanujan asymptotic expansion*.

Definition 4.10: $\geq \nu$ -*tangle*, $(\geq \nu, < r)$ -*tangle*, $\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)$, $\text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$ (here the weak inequality $\geq \nu$ is crucial).

Definition 5.1: S *occurs* in a model $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Definition 5.2: The *tangle power*, τ_{tang} , of a model.

Definition 5.8: The *algebraic power*, τ_{alg} , of a model.

The definitions in Section 7 culminates in our definition of a *strongly algebraic model* (of a family of random, degree n covering maps, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, to a fixed graph B); if B has no half-loops, then the *permutation model* is an example of a strongly algebraic model.

Definition 7.1, 7.2: B -*graphs*, denoted $G_{/B}$, and *morphisms* of B -graphs.

Definition 7.4, 7.5: *ordered* graphs, denoted G^{\leq} , the *first-encountered ordering*, $\text{VisSub}^{\leq}(w)$ that w endows upon its visited subgraph $\text{VisSub}(w)$.

Definition 7.6: the *fibre counting* functions $\mathbf{a}: E_B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ (at times $E_B^{\text{dir}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$), and $\mathbf{b}: V_B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, defined for a walk in, or a subgraph of, a coordinatized graph over B .

Definition 7.7: *ordered B-graph*, denoted $G_{/B}^{\leq}$, and their *morphisms*.

Definition 7.9: the class $[S_{/B}^{\leq}]$, the set $[S_{/B}^{\leq}] \cap G_{/B}$ for a B -graph, $G_{/B}$. We similarly define $[S_B]$ and $[S_B] \cap G_{/B}$ after this definition.

Definition 7.10: a graph that is *pruned* (all vertices have degree at least two).

Definition 7.11: a B -graph *occurs* in a model, *strongly algebraic* models.

The definitions in Section 8 are needed to state the results of Article II (this terminology is not needed after Article III).

Definition 8.1: *beads* in a graph, (vertices of degree two not incident upon any half-loops), *beaded paths* in a graph.

Definition 8.3: a *proper bead set* (a set of beads that does not contain all the vertices of any connected component of a graph, which would have to be a cycle).

Definition 8.4: the *reverse* walk in a graph, *bead suppression* and the resulting *lengths* of its edges.

Definition 8.6: *reduction*, *edge-lengths*, and *homotopy type* of a non-backtracking walk, w . The *reduction* is the graph obtained from $\text{VisSub}^{\leq}(w)$ by suppressing its beads and its first and last vertices; *homotopy type* is the isomorphism class (as ordered graphs) of the *reduction*. It is crucial that the *reduction* and *homotopy type* are ordered graphs. We need to suppress the first and last vertices in order to reconstruct the first encountered ordering that w induces on $\text{VisSub}^{\leq}(w)$ from the homotopy type of w .

Definition 8.7: *reduction*, *edge-lengths*, and *homotopy type* of the (ordered) visited subgraph, S^{\leq} , of an SNBC walk.

Definition 8.8: notation: $\text{SNBC}(T^{\leq}; G, k)$ for the set of walks in a graph of a given edge-lengths, and homotopy type; also with, in addition, specified edge lengths, $\text{SNBC}(T^{\leq}, \mathbf{k}; G, k)$, or edge length lower bounds, $\text{SNBC}(T^{\leq}, \geq \mathbf{k}; G, k)$; their cardinalities $\text{snbc}(T^{\leq}; G, k)$, $\text{snbc}(T^{\leq}, \mathbf{k}; G, k)$, $\text{snbc}(T^{\leq}, \geq \mathbf{k}; G, k)$. The function $\text{snbc}(T^{\leq}, \geq \mathbf{k}; G, k)$ is fundamental to our treatment of certified traces, in Article III.

Definition 8.9: *variable-length graph* or *VLG*.

The definitions in Section 9 are needed to define the notion of an *algebraic* model.

Definition 9.1: The notation $\text{NBWALKS}(B)$ to denote the non-backtracking walks of positive length in a graph, B , viewed as words over the alphabet E_B^{dir} (i.e., we omit the vertices, which are redundant in a walk of positive length in a known graph B); also $\text{NBWALKS}(B, e, e')$. It is essential that we omit the vertices in order to get the correct *eigenvalues* (defined below) of the relevant regular languages.

Definition 9.2: a *B-wording* of a graph, T , that describes the B -graph structure $S_{/B}$ of a graph, S where T is a suppression of S ; the *edge lengths* of a wording.

Definition 9.3: the *B-wording induced by* a B -graph, $S_{/B}$, on any suppression of S .

Definition 9.4: the *realization*, $\text{VLG}_{/B}(T, W)$, of a B -wording, W , on a graph, T .

Definition 9.5: B -type, $T^{\text{type}} = (T, \mathcal{R})$ for a graph T and map \mathcal{R} from E_T^{dir} to regular languages over the alphabet E_B^{dir} ; a wording that *belongs* to a B -type;

Definition 9.6: *algebraic* model.

Definition 9.9: the *eigenvalues* of a regular language or a B -type; a *set of eigenvalues* of a model.

Definition 12.1: a (Λ_0, Λ_1) *matrix model*, needed in the statement of the Sidestepping Theorem.

Section 12 has some additional notation, such as $\mathbb{E}\text{in}_{\mathcal{M}}[R]$ and $\mathbb{E}\text{out}_{\mathcal{M}}[R]$ in (66).

REFERENCES

- [ABG10] Louigi Addario-Berry and Simon Griffiths, *The spectrum of random lifts*, December 2010, available as <http://arxiv.org/abs/1012.4097>, 35 pages.
- [Alo86] N. Alon, *Eigenvalues and expanders*, *Combinatorica* **6** (1986), no. 2, 83–96, Theory of computing (Singer Island, Fla., 1984). MR 88e:05077
- [Bas92] Hyman Bass, *The Ihara-Selberg zeta function of a tree lattice*, *Internat. J. Math.* **3** (1992), no. 6, 717–797. MR 1194071 (94a:11072)
- [BC19] Charles Bordenave and Benoît Collins, *Eigenvalues of random lifts and polynomials of random permutation matrices*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **190** (2019), no. 3, 811–875. MR 4024563
- [BL06] Yonatan Bilu and Nathan Linial, *Lifts, discrepancy and nearly optimal spectral gap*, *Combinatorica* **26** (2006), no. 5, 495–519. MR 2279667 (2008a:05160)
- [Bor15] Charles Bordenave, *A new proof of friedman’s second eigenvalue theorem and its extension to random lifts*, 2015.
- [BS87] Andrei Broder and Eli Shamir, *On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs*, *Proceedings 28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1987, pp. 286–294.
- [FK14] Joel Friedman and David-Emmanuel Kohler, *The relativized second eigenvalue conjecture of alon*, Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.3462>.
- [FKS89] J. Friedman, J. Kahn, and E. Szemerédi, *On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs*, 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 1989, pp. 587–598.
- [FM99] Alan M. Frieze and Michael Molloy, *Splitting an expander graph*, *J. of Algorithms* **33** (1999), 166–172.
- [Fri91] Joel Friedman, *On the second eigenvalue and random walks in random d -regular graphs*, *Combinatorica* **11** (1991), no. 4, 331–362. MR 93i:05115
- [Fri93a] ———, *Relative expansion and an extremal degree two cover of the boolean cube*, preprint, unpublished, available at http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/cover.html.
- [Fri93b] ———, *Some geometric aspects of graphs and their eigenfunctions*, *Duke Math. J.* **69** (1993), no. 3, 487–525. MR 94b:05134
- [Fri03] ———, *Relative expanders or weakly relatively Ramanujan graphs*, *Duke Math. J.* **118** (2003), no. 1, 19–35. MR 1978881

- [Fri08] ———, *A proof of Alon's second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **195** (2008), no. 910, viii+100. MR 2437174
- [FT05] Joel Friedman and Jean-Pierre Tillich, *Generalized Alon–Boppana theorems and error-correcting codes*, SIAM J. Discret. Math. **19** (2005), 700–718.
- [Has90] Ki-ichiro Hashimoto, *On zeta and L -functions of finite graphs*, Internat. J. Math. **1** (1990), no. 4, 381–396. MR 1080105 (92e:11089)
- [Iha66] Yasutaka Ihara, *On discrete subgroups of the two by two projective linear group over p -adic fields*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **18** (1966), 219–235. MR 0223463 (36 #6511)
- [LN98] Alexander Lubotzky and Tatiana Nagnibeda, *Not every uniform tree covers Ramanujan graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **74** (1998), no. 2, 202–212. MR 1654133 (2000g:05052)
- [LP10] Nati Linial and Doron Puder, *Word maps and spectra of random graph lifts*, Random Structures Algorithms **37** (2010), no. 1, 100–135. MR 2674623
- [LSV11] Eyal Lubetzky, Benny Sudakov, and Van Vu, *Spectra of lifted Ramanujan graphs*, Adv. Math. **227** (2011), no. 4, 1612–1645. MR 2799807 (2012f:05181)
- [MSS15] Adam W. Marcus, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava, *Interlacing families I: Bipartite Ramanujan graphs of all degrees*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 1, 307–325. MR 3374962
- [PP15] Doron Puder and Ori Parzanchevski, *Measure preserving words are primitive*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 63–97. MR 3264763
- [Pud15] Doron Puder, *Expansion of random graphs: new proofs, new results*, Invent. Math. **201** (2015), no. 3, 845–908. MR 3385636
- [Ser77] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Arbres, amalgames, SL_2* , Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1977, Avec un sommaire anglais, Rédigé avec la collaboration de Hyman Bass, Astérisque, No. 46; article available at http://www.numdam.org/issue/AST_1983__46__1_0.pdf. MR 0476875
- [Sip96] Michael Sipser, *Introduction to the theory of computation*, 1st ed., International Thomson Publishing, 1996.
- [ST96] H. M. Stark and A. A. Terras, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings*, Adv. Math. **121** (1996), no. 1, 124–165. MR 1399606 (98b:11094)
- [ST00] ———, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings. II*, Adv. Math. **154** (2000), no. 1, 132–195. MR 1780097 (2002f:11123)
- [Sta83] John R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 3, 551–565. MR 695906 (85m:05037a)
- [Sun86] Toshikazu Sunada, *L -functions in geometry and some applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1201** (1986), 266–284.
- [SW49] Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The mathematical theory of communication*, University of Illinois Press, 1971/1949.
- [Ter11] Audrey Terras, *Zeta functions of graphs*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 128, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011, A stroll through the garden. MR 2768284 (2012d:05016)
- [TS07] A. A. Terras and H. M. Stark, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings. III*, Adv. Math. **208** (2007), no. 1, 467–489. MR 2304325 (2009c:05103)

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T 1Z4, CANADA

E-mail address: jf@cs.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T 1Z2, CANADA

Current address: 422 Richards St, Suite 170, Vancouver BC V6B 2Z4, CANADA

E-mail address: David.kohler@a3.epfl.ch