ON THE RELATIVIZED ALON SECOND EIGENVALUE CONJECTURE V: PROOF OF THE RELATIVIZED ALON
CONJECTURE FOR REGULAR BASE GRAPHS

JOEL FRIEDMAN AND DAVID KOHLER

Abstract. This is the fifth in a series of articles devoted to showing that a
typical covering map of large degree to a fixed, regular graph has its new ad-
jacency eigenvalues within the bound conjectured by Alon for random regular
graphs.

In this article we use the results of Articles III and IV in this series to prove
that if the base graph is regular, then as the degree, \( n \), of the covering map
tends to infinity, some new adjacency eigenvalue has absolute value outside the
Alon bound with probability bounded by \( \mathcal{O}(1/n) \). In addition, we give upper
and lower bounds on this probability that are tight to within a multiplicative
constant times the degree of the covering map. These bounds depend on two
positive integers, the algebraic power (which can also be \(+\infty\)) and the tangle
power of the model of random covering map.

We conjecture that the algebraic power of the models we study is always
\(+\infty\), and in Article VI we prove this when the base graph is regular and
Ramanujan. When the algebraic power of the model is \(+\infty\), then the results
in this article imply stronger results, such as (1) the upper and lower bounds
mentioned above are matching to within a multiplicative constant, and (2)
with probability smaller than any negative power of the degree, the some
new eigenvalue fails to be within the Alon bound only if the covering map
contains one of finitely many “tangles” as a subgraph (and this event has low
probability).
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1. Introduction

The is the fifth article in a series of six articles whose goal 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 series of articles includes some original work beyond
that required to merely factor [FK14]: this series of articles has some simplifications and generalizations of [FK14] and of [Fri91, Fri08] (on which much of [FK14] is based). As such, the tools we develop in this series of articles will likely make it easier to generalize these results to related questions about the adjacency matrix eigenvalues of families of random graphs. Furthermore we close a gap in [Fri08] between the upper and lower bound on the probability of having eigenvalues outside the Alon bound.

In this article we complete the proof of the first main theorem in this series of articles. This theorem shows that the Relativized Alon Conjecture holds for algebraic models of coverings over any \( d \)-regular base graph; more precisely, it shows that the probability of having non-Alon new eigenvalues—meaning new eigenvalues larger than \( 2(d - 1)^{1/2} + \epsilon \) for a fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \)—for a random cover of degree \( n \) is bounded above by a function of order \( 1/n \). This proof is given in Section 6. Much of this article is devoted to proving a much stronger theorem that results from our trace methods. Let us describe this theorem in rough terms.

For each graph \( B \), we formulate models of random covering maps that we call our basic models; these are based on the models in [Fri08]. All these models turn out to be algebraic, meaning that they satisfy a set of conditions that allow us to apply our trace methods. To any algebraic model we associate an integer, its tangle power, \( \tau_{\text{tang}} \); this is relatively easy to estimate and was determined exactly in [Fri08] when \( B \) is a bouquet of whole-loops or of half-loops (and therefore \( B \) has only one vertex). To any algebraic model we also associate its algebraic power, \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \), which is either a positive integer or \( +\infty \); determining \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \) is much more difficult in practice and relies on computing certain asymptotic expansions involving the expected values of certain traces of matrices (the Hashimoto or non-backtracking matrix) associated to the covering graph. In this paper we show that when the base graph is regular, then the probability that a random covering graph having a new eigenvalue outside of the Alon bound is bounded above proportional to \( n^{-\tau_1} \) and below proportional to \( n^{-\tau_2} \), where

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

This is the second main theorem in this article, although there is a more remarkable result that follows from the proof of this theorem. Namely, whenever \( B \) is regular and \( \tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty \), then the probability of having a non-Alon new eigenvalue is \( O(n^{-j}) \) for any \( j \), provided that we discard those graphs that contain one of finitely many tangles (this finite number depends on \( j \) and the \( \epsilon > 0 \) above in defining non-Alon eigenvalues); furthermore, the probability that such tangles exist is \( O(n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}) \) (where the constant in the \( O() \) depends on \( j \) and \( \epsilon \)). We conjecture that \( \tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty \) for all graphs, \( B \), and in Article VI (i.e., the sixth article in this series) we will prove this when \( B \) is regular and Ramanujan; in this case, then \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_{\text{tang}} \).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the main definitions that we will use in this series of papers; for more details and motivation regarding these definitions, we refer the reader to Article I.

In Section 3 we state the two main results of this article: first, that the Relativized Alon Bound holds for all regular base graphs, and second, that the more precise bounds involving \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \) above hold; we also include some conjectures regarding \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \) and discuss the consequences of \( \tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty \). In Section 3 we also recall the main results of Articles III and IV which we need in this article.
Sections 4–8 are devoted to proving the main theorems in Section 3. In Section 4 we prove what is sometimes called Ihara’s Determinantal Formula, which for $d$-regular graphs gives a precise description of adjacency matrix eigenvalues in terms of those of its Hashimoto matrix (also called the non-backtracking matrix) of the graph. In Section 5 we prove that our basic models of covering graphs of a given base graph satisfy the “algebraic” properties we need in Articles II and III. Both Sections 4 and Section 5 can be viewed as “loose ends” from Article I, and are independent of the rest of this article. In Section 6 we prove the Relativized Alon Conjecture for regular base graphs. In Section 7 we use the methods of Friedman-Tillich [FT05] to show that the existence of certain tangles in any covering graph of sufficiently large degree implies the existence of a new eigenvalue outside of the Alon bound. In Section 8 we complete the proof of the second main theorem in this article.

In Section 9 we make an observation, apparently new as of [FK14], that applies to trace methods for random regular graphs, such as [Fri91, Fri03, LP10, Pud15], that prove a high probability new adjacency spectral bound that is strictly greater than the Alon bound: namely, these bounds can be improved by the analogous trace methods applied to Hashimoto (i.e., non-backtracking) new eigenvalues, and then converting these bounds back to adjacency matrix bounds. Section 9 is independent of the rest of the article, beyond some of the terminology in Section 2.

2. Review of the Main Definitions

We refer the reader to Article I for the definitions used in this article, the motivation of such definitions, and an appendix there that lists all the definitions and notation. In this section we briefly review these definitions and notation.

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

If $A$ is a set, we use $\mathbb{N}^A$ to denote the set of maps $A \to \mathbb{N}$; we will refers to its elements as vectors, denoted in bold face letters, e.g., $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^A$ or $\mathbf{k}: A \to \mathbb{N}$; we denote its component in the regular face equivalents, i.e., for $a \in A$, we use $k(a) \in \mathbb{N}$ to denote the $a$-component of $\mathbf{k}$. As usual, $\mathbb{N}^n$ denotes $\mathbb{N}^\{1, \ldots, n\}$.

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 $\text{snbc}(G, k)$ for $\#\text{SNBC}(G, k)$.

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

All probability spaces are finite; hence a probability space is a pair $\mathcal{P} = (\Omega, P)$ where $\Omega$ is a finite set and $P: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\omega) = 1$; hence an event is any subset of $\Omega$. We emphasize that $\omega \in \Omega$ implies that $P(\omega) > 0$ with strict inequality; we refer to the elements of $\Omega$ as the atoms of the probability space. We use $\mathcal{P}$ and $\Omega$ interchangeably when $P$ is understood and confusion is unlikely.
A complex-valued random variable on $\mathcal{P}$ or $\Omega$ is a function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and similarly for real-, integer-, and natural-valued random variable; we 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 $\Omega'$ by

$$\text{Prob}_{\mathcal{P}}[\Omega'] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega'} P(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\mathbb{1}_{\Omega'}(\omega)].$$

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

2.2. Graphs, Our Basic Models, Walks. A directed graph, or simply a digraph, is a tuple $G = (V_G, E^\text{dir}_G, h_G, t_G)$ consisting of sets $V_G$ and $E^\text{dir}_G$ (of vertices and directed edges) and maps $h_G, t_G$ (heads and tails) $E^\text{dir}_G \rightarrow V_G$. Therefore our digraphs can have multiple edges and self-loops (i.e., $e \in E^\text{dir}_G$ with $h_G(e) = t_G(e)$).

A graph is a tuple $G = (V_G, E^\text{dir}_G, h_G, t_G, \iota_G)$ where $(V_G, E^\text{dir}_G, h_G, t_G)$ is a digraph and $\iota_G: E^\text{dir}_G \rightarrow E^\text{dir}_G$ is an involution with $t_G \iota_G = h_G$: the edge set of $G$, denoted $E_G$, is the set of orbits of $E^\text{dir}_G$ modulo $\iota_G$; if $\{e\} \in E_G$ is a singleton, then necessarily $e$ is a self-loop with $\iota_G e = e$, and we call $e$ a half-loop; other elements of $E_G$ are sets $\{e, e'\}$ of size two, i.e., with $e \neq \iota_G e'$, and for such $e$ we say that $e$ (or, at times, $\{e, \iota_G e\}$) is a whole-loop if $h_G e = t_G e$ (otherwise $e$ has distinct endpoints).

Hence these definitions allow our graphs to have multiple edges and two types of self-loops—whole-loops and half-loops—as in [Fri93, Fri08]. The indegree and outdegree of a vertex in a graph is the number of edges whose tail, respectively head, is the vertex; the degree of a vertex in a graph is its indegree (which equals its outdegree) in the underlying digraph; therefore a whole-loop about a vertex contributes 2 to its degree, whereas a half-loop contributes 1.

An orientation of a graph, $G$, is a choice $E^\text{or}_G \subset E^\text{dir}_G$ of $\iota_G$ representatives; i.e., $E^\text{or}_G$ contains every half-loop, $e$, and one element of each two-element set $\{e, e'\}$.

A morphism $\pi: G \rightarrow H$ of directed graphs is a pair $\pi = (\pi_V, \pi_E)$ where $\pi_V: V_G \rightarrow V_H$ and $\pi_E: E^\text{dir}_G \rightarrow E^\text{dir}_H$ are maps that intertwine the heads maps and the tails maps of $G, H$ in the evident fashion; such a morphism is covering (respectively, étale, elsewhere called an immersion) if for each $v \in V_G$, $\pi_E$ maps those directed edges whose head is $v$ bijectively (respectively, injectively) to those whose head is $\pi_V(v)$, and the same with tail replacing head. If $G, H$ are graphs, then a morphism $\pi: G \rightarrow H$ of covering of underlying directed graphs where $\pi_E \iota_G = \iota_H \pi_E$; $\pi$ is called covering or étale if it is so as a morphism of underlying directed graphs. We use the words morphism and map interchangeably.

A walk in a graph or digraph, $G$, is an alternating sequence $w = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ of vertices and directed edges with $t_G e_i = v_{i-1}$ and $h_G e_i = v_i$ for $i \in [k]$; $w$ is closed if $v_k = v_0$; if $G$ is a graph, $w$ is non-backtracking, or simply NB, if $\iota_G e_i \neq e_{i+1}$ for $i \in [k - 1]$, and strictly non-backtracking closed, or simply SNBC, if it is closed, non-backtracking, and $\iota_G e_k \neq e_1$. The visited subgraph of a walk, $w$, in a graph $G$, denoted $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ or simply $\text{VisSub}(w)$, is the smallest subgraph of $G$ containing all the vertices and directed edges of $w$; $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ generally depends on $G$, i.e., $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ cannot be inferred from the sequence $v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ alone without knowing $\iota_G$. 
The adjacency matrix, $A_G$, of a graph or digraph, $G$, is defined as usual (its $(v_1, v_2)$-entry is the number of directed edges from $v_1$ to $v_2$); if $G$ is a graph on $n$ vertices, then $A_G$ is symmetric and we order its eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) and denote them
\[ \lambda_1(G) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n(G). \]
If $G$ is a graph, its Hashimoto matrix (also called the non-backtracking matrix), $H_G$, is the adjacency matrix of the oriented line graph of $G$, i.e., the oriented line graph of $G$ is a graph whose vertices are $E_G$ and whose directed edges are the subset of $E_G^{\text{dir}} \times E_G^{\text{dir}}$ consisting of pairs $(e_1, e_2)$ such that $e_1, e_2$ form the directed edges of a non-backtracking walk (of length two) in $G$ (the tail of $(e_1, e_2)$ is $e_1$, and its head $e_2$); therefore $H_G$ is the square matrix indexed on $E_G^{\text{dir}}$, whose $(e_1, e_2)$ entry is 1 or 0 according to, respectively, whether or not $e_1, e_2$ form a non-backtracking walk (i.e., $h_G e_1 = t_G e_2$ and $t_G e_1 = e_2$). We use $\mu_1(G)$ to denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $H_G$, and use $\mu_i(G)$ with $1 < i \leq \#E_G^{\text{dir}}$ to denote the other eigenvalues of $H_G$ (which are generally complex-valued) in any order.

If $B, G$ are both digraphs, we say that $G$ is a coordinatized graph over $B$ of degree $n$ if

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

for some map $\sigma: E_B^{\text{dir}} \to S_n$, where $S_n$ is the group of permutations on $[n]$; we call $\sigma$ (which is uniquely determined by (1)) the permutation assignment associated to $G$. [Any such $G$ comes with a map $G \to B$ given by “projection to the first component of the pair,” and this map is a covering map of degree $n$.] If $B, G$ are graphs, we say that a graph $G$ is a coordinatized graph over $B$ of degree $n$ if (1) holds and also

(2) \[ \iota_G(e, i) = (\iota_B e, \sigma(e)i), \]

which implies that

(3) \[ (e, i) = \iota_G \iota_G(e, i) = (e, \sigma(\iota_B e)\sigma(e)i) \quad \forall e \in E_B^{\text{dir}}, \quad i \in [n], \]

and hence $\sigma(\iota_B e) = \sigma(e)^{-1}$; we use $\text{Coord}_n(B)$ to denote the set of all coordinatized covers of a graph, $B$, of degree $n$.

The order of a graph, $G$, is $\text{ord}(G) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\#E_G) - (\#V_G)$. Note that a half-loop and a whole-loop each contribute 1 to $\#E_G$ and to the order of $G$. The Euler characteristic of a graph, $G$, is $\chi(G) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\#V_G) - (\#E_G^{\text{dir}})/2$. Hence $\text{ord}(G) \geq -\chi(G)$, with equality if $G$ has no half-loops.

If $w$ is a walk in any $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$, then one easily sees that $\text{VisSub}_G(w)$ can be inferred from $B$ and $w$ alone.

If $B$ is a graph without half-loops, then the permutation model over $B$ refers to the probability spaces $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where the atoms of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ are coordinatized coverings of degree $n$ over $B$ chosen with the uniform distribution. More generally, a model over a graph, $B$, is a collection of probability spaces $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ where $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is an infinite subset, and where the atoms of each $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ are elements of $\text{Coord}_n(B)$. There are a number of models related to the permutation model, which are generalizations of the models of [Fri08], that we call our basic models and are defined in Article I; let us give a rough description.

All of our basic models are edge independent, meaning that for any orientation $E_B^{\text{or}} \subset E_B^{\text{dir}}$, the values of the permutation assignment, $\sigma$, on $E_B^{\text{or}}$ are independent
of one another (of course, \(\sigma_{(G,e)} = (\sigma(e))^{-1}\), so \(\sigma\) is determined by its values on any orientation \(E^B_G\)); for edge independent models, it suffices to specify the \((S_n,\sigma)-valued\) random variable \(\sigma(e)\) for each \(e\) in \(E^\text{or}_B\) or \(E^\text{dir}_B\). The permutation model can be alternatively described as the edge independent model that assigns a uniformly chosen permutation to each \(e\) in the full cycle model (which requires \(B\) to have no half-loops); the full cycle (or simply cyclic) model is the same, except that if \(e\) is a whole-loop then \(\sigma(e)\) is chosen uniformly among all permutations whose cyclic structure consists of a single \(n\)-cycle. If \(B\) has half-loops, then we restrict \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) either to \(n\) even or \(n\) odd and for each half-loop \(e\) in \(E^\text{dir}_B\) we choose \(\sigma(e)\) as follows: if \(n\) is even we choose \(\sigma(e)\) uniformly among all perfect matchings, i.e., involutions (maps equal to their inverse) with no fixed points; if \(n\) is odd then we choose \(\sigma(e)\) uniformly among all nearly perfect matchings, meaning involutions with one fixed point. We combine terms when \(B\) has half-loops: for example, the term full cycle-involution (or simply cyclic-involution) model of odd degree over \(B\) refers to the model where the degree, \(n\), is odd, where \(\sigma(e)\) follows the full cycle rule when \(e\) is not a half-loop, and where \(\sigma(e)\) is a near perfect matching when \(e\) is a half-loop; similarly for the full cycle-involution (or simply cyclic-involution) model of even degree and the permutation-involution model of even degree or of odd degree.

If \(B\) is a graph, then a model, \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), over \(B\) may well have \(N \neq \mathbb{N}\) (e.g., our basic models above when \(B\) has half-loops); in this case many formulas involving the variable \(n\) are only defined for \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). For brevity, we often do not explicitly write \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) in such formulas; for example we usually write

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \quad \text{to abbreviate} \quad \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}, \; n \to \infty}.
\]

Also we often write simply \(C_n(B)\) or \(\{C_n(B)\}\) for \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) if confusion is unlikely to occur.

A graph is pruned if all its vertices are of degree at least two (this differs from the more standard definition of pruned meaning that there are no leaves). If \(w\) is any SNBC walk in a graph, \(G\), then we easily see that \(\text{VisSub}_G(w)\) is necessarily pruned: i.e., any of its vertices must be incident upon a whole-loop or two distinct edges [note that a walk of length \(k = 1\) about a half-loop, \((v_0, e_1, v_1)\), by definition, is not SNBC since \(\iota_G e_k = e_1\)]. It easily follows that \(\text{VisSub}_G(w)\) is contained in the graph obtained from \(G\) by repeatedly “pruning any leaves” (i.e., discarding any vertex of degree one and its incident edge) from \(G\). Since our trace methods only concern (Hashimoto matrices and) SNBC walks, it suffices to work with models \(C_n(B)\) where \(B\) is pruned. It is not hard to see that if \(B\) is pruned and connected, then \(\text{ord}(B) = 0\) iff \(B\) is a cycle, and \(\mu_1(B) > 1\) iff \(\chi(B) < 0\); this is formally proven in Article III (Lemma 6.4). Our theorems are not usually interesting unless \(\mu_1(B) > \mu_1^{1/2}(B)\), so we tend to restrict our main theorems to the case \(\mu_1(B) > 1\) or, equivalently, \(\chi(B) < 0\); some of our techniques work without these restrictions.

2.3. Asymptotic Expansions. A function \(f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}\) is a polyexponential if it is a sum of functions \(p(k)\mu^k\), where \(p\) is a polynomial and \(\mu \in \mathbb{C}\), with the convention that for \(\mu = 0\) we understand \(p(k)\mu^k\) to mean any function that vanishes for sufficiently large \(k\); we refer to the \(\mu\) needed to express \(f\) as the exponents or bases

\[\footnote{This convention is used because then for any fixed matrix, \(M\), any entry of \(M^k\), as a function of \(k\), is a polyexponential function of \(k\); more specifically, the \(\mu = 0\) convention is due to the fact that a Jordan block of eigenvalue 0 is nilpotent.}\]
of $f$. A function $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}$ is of growth $\rho$ for a $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ if $|f(k)| = o(1)(\rho + \epsilon)^k$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. A function $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}$ is $(B, \nu)$-bounded if it is the sum of a function of growth $\nu$ plus a polyexponential function whose bases are bounded by $\mu_1(B)$ (the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $H_B$); the larger bases of $f$ (with respect to $\nu$) are those bases of the polyexponential function that are larger in absolute value than $\nu$. Moreover, such an $f$ is called $(B, \nu)$-Ramanujan if its larger bases are all eigenvalues of $H_B$.

We say that a function $f = f(k, n)$ taking some subset of $\mathbb{N}^2$ to $\mathbb{C}$ has a $(B, \nu)$-bounded expansion of order $r$ if for some constant $C$ we have

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

whenever $f(k, n)$ is defined and $1 \leq k \leq n^{1/2}/C$, where for $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, the $c_i(k)$ are $(B, \nu)$-bounded and $c_r(k)$ is of growth $\mu_1(B)$. Furthermore, such an expansion is called $(B, \nu)$-Ramanujan if for $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, the $c_i(k)$ are $(B, \nu)$-Ramanujan.

Typically our functions $f(k, n)$ as in (4) are defined for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for an infinite set $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ representing the possible degrees of our random covering maps in the model $\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ at hand.

2.4. Tangles. A $(\geq \nu)$-tangle is any connected graph, $\psi$, with $\mu_1(\psi) \geq \nu$, where $\mu_1(\psi)$ denotes the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $H_B$; a $(\geq \nu, < r)$-tangle is any $(\geq \nu)$-tangle of order less than $r$; similarly for $(> \nu)$-tangles, i.e., $\psi$ satisfying the weak inequality $\mu_1(\psi) > \nu$, and for $(> \nu, r)$-tangles. We use TangleFree$(\geq \nu, < r)$ to denote those graphs that don’t contain a subgraph that is $(\geq \nu, < r)$-tangle, and HasTangles$(\geq \nu, < r)$ for those that do; we never use $(> \nu)$-tangles in defining TangleFree and HasTangles, for the technical reason (see Article III or Lemma 9.2 of [Fri08]) that for $\nu > 1$ and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ that there are only finitely many $(\geq \nu, < r)$-tangles, up to isomorphism, that are minimal with respect to inclusion².

2.5. B-Graphs, Ordered Graphs, and Strongly Algebraic Models. An ordered graph, $G^\leq$, is a graph, $G$, endowed with an ordering, meaning an orientation (i.e., $\theta_G$-orbit representatives), $E^\leq_G \subseteq E^{\text{dir}}_G$, and total orderings of $V_G$ and $E_G$; a walk, $w = (v_0, \ldots, v_k, v_{k'})$ in a graph endows VisSub$(w)$ with a first-encountered ordering: namely, $v \leq v'$ if the first occurrence of $v$ comes before that of $v'$ in the sequence $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k$, similarly for $e \leq e'$, and we orient each edge in the order in which it is first traversed (some edges may be traversed in only one direction). We use VisSub$(w)$ to refer to VisSub$(w)$ with this ordering.

A morphism $G^\leq \to H^\leq$ of ordered graphs is a morphism $G \to H$ that respects the ordering in the evident fashion. We are mostly interested in isomorphisms of ordered graphs; we easily see that any isomorphism $G^\leq \to G^\leq$ must be the identity morphism; it follows that if $G^\leq$ and $H^\leq$ are isomorphic, then there is a unique isomorphism $G^\leq \to H^\leq$.

If $B$ is a graph, then a $B$-graph, $G_{/B}$, is a graph $G$ endowed with a map $G \to B$ (its $B$-graph structure). A morphism $G_{/B} \to H_{/B}$ of $B$-graphs is a morphism $G \to H$ that respects the $B$-structures in the evident sense. An ordered $B$-graph, $G^\leq_{/B}$, is a graph

² By contrast, there are infinitely many minimal $(> \nu, < r)$-tangles for some values of $\nu > 1$ and $r$: indeed, consider any connected pruned graph $\psi$, and set $r = \text{ord}(\psi) + 2$, $\nu = \mu_1(\psi)$. Then if we fix two vertices in $\psi$ and let $\psi_1$ be the graph that is $\psi$ with an additional edge of length $s$ between these two vertices, then $\psi_1$ is an $(> \nu, < r)$-tangle. However, if $\psi_2$ is $\psi$ with any single edge deleted, and $\psi'_2$ is $\psi$ with this edge deleted, then one can show that $\mu_1(\psi'_2) < \nu$ for $s$ sufficiently large.
endowed with both an ordering and a $B$-graph structure; a morphism of ordered $B$-graphs is a morphism of the underlying graphs that respects both the ordering and $B$-graph structures. If $w$ is a walk in a $B$-graph, $G_B$, we use $\text{VisSub}_B(w)$ to denote $\text{VisSub}(w)$ with the $B$-graph structure it inherits from $G$ in the evident sense; we use $\text{VisSub}^e_B(w)$ to denote $\text{VisSub}_B(w)$ with its first-encountered ordering.

At times we drop the superscript $^e$ and the subscript $^B$; for example, we write $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$ instead of $G_B \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ (despite the fact that we constantly utilize the $B$-graph structure on elements of $\text{Coord}_n(B)$).

A $B$-graph $G_B$ is covering or étale if its structure map $G \to B$ is.

If $\pi : S \to B$ is a $B$-graph, we use $a = a^S_B$ to denote the vector $E^\text{dir}_B \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ given by $a_{S_B}(e) = \# \pi^{-1}(e)$; since $a_{S_B}(\iota_B e) = a_{S_B}(e)$ for all $e \in E^\text{dir}_B$, we sometimes view $a$ as a function $E_B \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, i.e., as the function taking $\{e, \iota_B e\}$ to $a_{S_B}(e) = a_{S_B}(\iota_B e)$. We similarly define $b_{S_B} : V_B \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ by setting $b_{S_B}(v) = \# \pi^{-1}(v)$. If $w$ is a walk in a $B$-graph, we set $a_w$ to be $a_{S_B}$ where $S_B = \text{VisSub}_B(w)$, and similarly for $b_w$. We refer to $a, b$ (in either context) as $B$-fibre counting functions.

If $S^e_B$ is an ordered $B$-graph and $G^e_B$ is a $B$-graph, we use $[S^e_B] \cap G^e_B$ to denote the set of ordered graphs $G^e_B \subset G^e_B$ and $G^e_B \simeq S^e_B$ (as ordered $B$-graphs); this set is naturally identified with the set of injective morphisms $S^e_B \to G^e_B$, and the cardinality of these sets is independent of the ordering on $S^e_B$.

A $B$-graph, $S_B$, or an ordered $B$-graph, $S^e_B$, occurs in a model $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_B$ is isomorphic to a $B$-subgraph of some element of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$; similarly a graph, $S$, occurs in $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if it can be endowed with a $B$-graph structure, $S_B$, that occurs in $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

A model $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of coverings of $B$ is strongly algebraic if

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

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

where $\text{snbc}_{\geq r}(G, k)$ is the number of SNBC walks of length $k$ in $G$ whose visited subgraph is of order at least $r$;

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, $S^e_B$, that is pruned and of order less than $r$,

(a) if $S_B$ occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then for $1 \leq \# E^\text{dir}_S \leq n^{1/2}/C$,

$$E_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\#(\lfloor S^e_B \cap G \rfloor)\right] = c_0 + \cdots + c_{r-1}/n^{r-1} + O(1)g(\#E_S)/n^r$$

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 $\# E^\text{dir}_S \leq n^{1/2}/C$,

$$E_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\#(\lfloor S^e_B \cap G \rfloor)\right] = 0$$

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

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 \( p_i = p_i(a, b) \) such that \( p_0 = 1 \) (i.e., identically 1), and for every "étale" \( B \)-graph, \( S^b_\partial \), we have that

\[
(8) \quad c_{\text{ord}(S)+1}(S^b_\partial) = p_i(a_{S^b_\partial}, b_{S^b_\partial}).
\]

Notice that condition (3), regarding \( S \) that are cycles, is implied by conditions (4) and (5); we leave in condition (3) since this makes the definition of algebraic (below) simpler. Notice that (6) and (8) are the main reasons that we work with ordered \( B \)-graphs: indeed, the coefficients depend only on the \( B \)-fibre counting function \( a, b \), which depend on the structure of \( S^b_\partial \) as a \( B \)-graph; this is not true if we don’t work with ordered graphs: i.e., (6) fails to hold if we replace \( S \) and (5); we leave in condition (3) since this makes the definition of the underlying graph is subgraph; the reduction \( S/V \) we use \( S/V \) the beaded path, and (4) \( \iota \) gives the first and last vertex of the beaded path, and (4) \( \iota_{S/V} \) takes a beaded path to its reverse walk (i.e., takes \( (v_0, e_1, \ldots, v_k) \) to \( (v_k, \iota e_k, \ldots, \iota e_1, v_0) \)). One can recover \( S \) from the suppression \( S/V' \) for pedantic reasons, since we have defined its directed edges to be beaded paths of \( S \). If \( S^\partial = \text{VisSub}^\partial(w) \) where \( w \) is a non-backtracking walk, then the ordering of \( S \) can be inferred by the naturally corresponding order on \( S/V' \), and we use \( S^\partial/V' \) to denote \( S/V' \) with this ordering.

Let \( w \) be a non-backtracking walk in a graph, and \( S^\partial = \text{VisSub}^\partial(w) \) its visited subgraph; the reduction of \( w \) is the ordered graph, \( R^\partial \), denoted \( S^\partial/V' \), whose underlining graph is \( S/V' \) where \( V' \) is the set of beads of \( S \) except the first and last vertices of \( w \) (if one or both are beads), and whose ordering is naturally arises from that on \( S^\partial \); the edge lengths of \( w \) is the function \( E_{S/V'} \to \mathbb{N} \) taking an edge of \( S/V' \) to the length of the beaded path it represents in \( S \); we say that \( w \) is of homotopy type \( T^\partial \) for any ordered graph \( T^\partial \) that is isomorphic to \( S^\partial/V' \); in this case the lengths of \( S^\partial/V' \) naturally give lengths \( E_T \to \mathbb{N} \) by the unique isomorphism from \( T^\partial \) to \( S^\partial/V' \). If \( S^\partial \) is the visited subgraph of a non-backtracking walk, we define the reduction, homotopy type, and edge-lengths of \( S^\partial \) to be that of the walk, since these notions depend only on \( S^\partial \) and not the particular walk.

If \( T \) is a graph and \( k: E_T \to \mathbb{N} \) a function, then we use \( \text{VLG}(T, k) \) (for variable-length graph) to denote any graph obtained from \( T \) by gluing in a path of length...
k(e) for each e ∈ E_T. If S^≤ is of homotopy type T^≤ and k: E_T → N its edge lengths, then VLG(T, k) is isomorphic to S (as a graph). Hence the construction of variable-length graphs is a sort of inverse to bead suppression.

If T^≤ is an ordering on T that arises as the first encountered ordering of a non-backtracking walk on T (whose visited subgraph is all of T), then this ordering gives rise to a natural ordering on VLG(T, k) that we denote VLG^≤(T^≤, k). Again, this ordering on the variable-length graph is a sort of inverse to bead suppression on ordered graphs.

2.7. B-graphs and Wordings. If w_B = (v_0, e_1, ..., e_k, v_k) with k ≥ 1 is a walk in a graph B, then we can identify w_B with the string e_1, e_2, ..., e_k over the alphabet E^dir_B. For technical reasons, the definitions below of a B-wording and the induced wording, are given as strings over E^dir_B rather than the full alternating string of vertices and directed edges. The reason is that doing this gives the correct notion of the eigenvalues of an algebraic model (defined below).

Let w be a non-backtracking walk in a B-graph, whose reduction is S^≤ / V’, and let S_B^≤ = VisSub^≤. Then the wording induced by w on S^≤ / V’ is the map W from E^dir_{S/B’} to strings in E^dir_B of positive length, taking a directed edge e ∈ E^dir_{S/B’} to the string of E^dir_B edges in the non-backtracking walk in B that lies under the walk in S that it represents. Abstractly, we say that a B-wording of a graph T is a map W from E^dir_T to words over the alphabet E^dir_B that represent (the directed edges of) non-backtracking walks in B such that (1) W(τ e) is the reverse word (corresponding to the reverse walk) in B of W(e), (2) if e ∈ E^dir_T is a half-loop, then W(e) is of length one whose single letter is a half-loop, and (3) the tail of the first directed edge in W(e) (corresponding to the first vertex in the associated walk in B) depends only on τ_T e; the edge-lengths of W is the function E^dir_T → N taking e to the length of W(e). [Hence the wording induced by w above is, indeed, a B-wording.]

Given a graph, T, and a B-wording W, there is a B-graph, unique up to isomorphism, whose underlying graph is VLG(T, k) where k is the edge-lengths of W, and where the B-graph structure maps the non-backtracking walk in VLG(T, k) corresponding to an e ∈ E^dir_T to the non-backtracking walk in B given by W(e). We denote any such B-graph by VLG(T, W); again this is a sort of inverse to starting with a non-backtracking walk and producing the wording it induces on its visited subgraph.

Notice that if S_B^≤ = VLG(T^≤, W) for a B-wording, W, then the B-fibre counting functions a_S_B and b_S_B can be inferred from W, and we may therefore write a_W and b_W.

2.8. Algebraic Models. By a B-type we mean a pair T^{type} = (T, R) consisting of a graph, T, and a map from E^dir_T to the set of regular languages over the alphabet E^dir_B (in the sense of regular language theory) such that (1) all words in R(e) are positive length strings corresponding to non-backtracking walks in B, (2) if for e ∈ E^dir_T we have w = e_1 ... e_k ∈ R(e), then w^R = e_1 ... e_k lies in R(τ_T e), and (3) if W: E^dir_T → (E^dir_B)^* (where (E^dir_B)^* is the set of strings over E^dir_B) satisfies W(e) ∈ R(e) and W(τ_T e) = W(e)^R for all e ∈ E^dir_T, then W is a B-wording. A B-wording W of T is of type T^{type} if W(e) ∈ R(e) for each e ∈ E^dir_T.

Let C_n(B) be a model that satisfies (1)–(3) of the definition of strongly algebraic. If T a subset of B-graphs, we say that the model is algebraic restricted to T if
either all \( S_n \in \mathcal{T} \) occur in \( \mathcal{C}_n(B) \) or they all do not, and if so there are polynomials \( p_0, p_1, \ldots \) such that \( c_i(S_n) = p_i(S_n) \) for any \( S_n \in \mathcal{T} \). We say that \( \mathcal{C}_n(B) \) is \textit{algebraic} if

1. setting \( h(k) \) to be the number of \( B \)-graph isomorphism classes of étale \( B \)-graphs \( S_n \) such that \( S \) is a cycle of length \( k \) and \( S \) does not occur in \( \mathcal{C}_n(B) \), we have that \( h \) 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, \( T^\text{type}_j = (T^\leq, R_j), \ j = 1, \ldots, s \), such that (1) any \( B \)-wording, \( W \), of \( T \) belongs to exactly one \( R_j \), and (2) \( \mathcal{C}_n(B) \) is algebraic when restricted to \( T^\text{type}_j \).

[In Article I we show that if instead each \( B \)-wording belong to \textit{at least one} \( B \)-type \( T^\text{type}_j \), then one can choose a another set of \( B \)-types that satisfy (2) and where each \( B \)-wording belongs to a \textit{unique} \( B \)-type; however, the uniqueness is ultimately needed in our proofs, so we use uniqueness in our definition of algebraic.]

We remark that one can say that a walk, \( w \), in a \( B \)-graph, or an ordered \( B \)-graphs, \( S_n \), is of homotopy type \( T^\leq \), but when \( T \) has non-trivial automorphism one \textit{cannot} say that is of \( B \)-type \((T, R)\) unless—for example—one orders \( T \) and speaks of an \( ordered \ B \)-type, \((T^\leq, R)\). [This will be of concern only in Article II.]

We define the \textit{eigenvalues} of a regular language, \( R \), to be the minimal set \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m \) such that for any \( k \geq 1 \), the number of words of length \( k \) in the language is given as

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(k) \mu_i^k
\]

for some polynomials \( p_i = p_i(k) \), with the convention that if \( \mu_i = 0 \) then \( p_i(k) \mu_i^k \) refers to any function that vanishes for \( k \) sufficiently large (the reason for this is that a Jordan block of eigenvalue 0 is a nilpotent matrix). Similarly, we define the eigenvalues of a \( B \)-type \( T^\text{type} = (T, R) \) as the union of all the eigenvalues of the \( R(e) \). Similarly a set of eigenvalues of a graph, \( T \) (respectively, an algebraic model, \( \mathcal{C}_n(B) \)) is any set containing the eigenvalues containing the eigenvalues of some choice of \( B \)-types used in the definition of algebraic for \( T \)-wordings (respectively, for \( T \)-wordings for all \( T \)).

[In Article V we prove that all of our basic models are algebraic; some of our basic models, such as the permutation-involution model and the cyclic models, are not strongly algebraic.]

We remark that a homotopy type, \( T^\leq \), of a non-backtracking walk, can only have beads as its first or last vertices; however, in the definition of algebraic we require a condition on \textit{all pruned graphs}, \( T \), which includes \( T \) that may have many beads and may not be connected; this is needed when we define homotopy types of pairs in Article II.

2.9. \textbf{SNBC Counting Functions.} If \( T^\leq \) is an ordered graph and \( k : E_T \to \mathbb{N} \), we use \( \text{SNBC}(T^\leq, k; G, k) \) to denote the set of \( \text{SNBC} \) walks in \( G \) of length \( k \) and of homotopy type \( T^\leq \) and edge lengths \( k \). We similarly define

\[
\text{SNBC}(T^\leq, \geq, \xi; G, k) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{k \geq \xi} \text{SNBC}(T^\leq, k; G, k)
\]

where \( k \geq \xi \) means that \( k(e) \geq \xi(e) \) for all \( e \in E_T \). We denote the cardinality of these sets by replacing \( \text{SNBC} \) with \( \text{snbc} \); we call \( \text{snbc}(T^\leq, \geq, \xi; G, k) \) the set of
\(\xi\)-certified traces of homotopy type \(T \leq k\) in \(G\); in Article III we will refer to certain \(\xi\) as certificates.

3. Main Results

In this section we give some more definitions and explain the results we prove in this article and the next article in this series. We also state the main results from Articles III and IV that we will need to quote here; more details about these results can be found in Articles III and IV, and some rough remarks on these results and articles can be found in Article I.

3.1. The First Main Theorem. If \(B\) is a graph, \(\|A_\hat{B}\|_2\) denotes the \(L^2\) norm of the adjacency operator on a universal cover, \(\hat{B}\), of \(B\); it is well-known that if \(B\) is \(d\)-regular, then \(\|A_\hat{B}\|_2 = 2\sqrt{d - 1}\) (see, for example, [MW89]). If \(\pi: G \to B\) is a covering map graphs, and \(\epsilon > 0\), the \(\epsilon\)-non-Alon multiplicity of \(G\) relative to \(B\) is

\[
\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \#\{\lambda \in \text{Spec}_{\text{new}}^B(A_G) \mid |\lambda| > \|A_\hat{B}\|_2 + \epsilon\},
\]

where the above \(\lambda\) are counted with their multiplicity in \(\text{Spec}_{\text{new}}^B(A_G)\).

Here is our first main theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \(B\) be a \(d\)-regular graph, and \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) an algebraic model over \(B\). Then for any \(\epsilon > 0\) there is a constant \(C = C(\epsilon)\) for which

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

In fact, we conjecture that for the above probability there are matching upper and lower bounds, within a constant depending on \(\epsilon\) (but not on \(n\)), that we now describe. It will be convenient to first recall the main results from Article III.

3.2. Results Needed from Article III. Let us recall the main theorem of Article III.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \(B\) be a connected graph with \(\mu_1(B) > 1\), and let \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) 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

\[
f(k, n) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\mathbb{P}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(H_G^k)]
\]

has a \((B, \nu)\)-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

\[
c_0(k) = \sum_{k' | k} \text{Trace}(H_{\hat{B}}^{k'}) - h(k)
\]

where the sum is over all positive integers, \(k'\), dividing \(k\) and where \(h(k)\) is of growth \((d - 1)^{1/2}\); hence

\[
c_0(k) = \text{Trace}(H_{\hat{B}}^k) + \tilde{h}(k)
\]

where \(\tilde{h}(k)\) is a function of growth \((d - 1)^{1/2}\); 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. Also,
the function $h(k)$ in (10) is precisely the function described in condition (1) of the definition of algebraic model. Finally, for any $r' \in \mathbb{N}$ the function

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

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 $\tilde{c}_j$ is defined).

We will also need the following result of Article III, whose proof is related to the result (12) (actually both results are special cases of a more general result proven there).

**Theorem 3.3.** 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 (recall that this means that for some $n$ and some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, $G_B$ has a subgraph isomorphic to $S_B$). Then for some constant, $C'$, and $n$ sufficiently large,

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

Of course, by definition of an algebraic model we know that for any ordering $S \subseteq S_B$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\#(S_B) \cap G] = n^{-\text{ord}(S)}(c + o(1/n))$$

for some $c = c(S_B) > 0$ (and actually $c = 1$ in all of our basic models); and from this it follows that (see Article I or III)

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\#(S_B) \cap G] = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\frac{\#(S_B) \cap G}{\#(\text{Aut}(S_B))}\right]$$

is also proportional to $n^{-\text{ord}(S)}$. The idea behind the proof of Theorem 3.3 in Article III is that by inclusion-exclusion one can show that the probability that a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ contains two or more subgraphs isomorphic to $S_B$ is $O(n^{-1-\text{ord}(S)})$. However, Article III develops more powerful inclusion-exclusion tools of this sort and proves theorems that contain Theorem 3.3 as a special case.

### 3.3. The Tangle Power of a Model

**Definition 3.4.** Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a model over a graph, $B$ with $\mu_1(B) > 1$. By the tangle power of $\{\mathcal{C}_n(B)\}$, denoted $\tau_{\text{tang}}$, 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 finite when $\mu_1(B) > 1$, because if $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $G$ occurs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ and $\mu_1(G) = \mu_1(B) > \mu_1^{1/2}(B)$; hence if $\mu_1(B) > 1$, the tangle power of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is at most the minimum order of such $G$. The restriction that $\mu_1(B) > 1$ is not a serious restriction, because we are only interested in $B$ connected and pruned, and hence $\mu_1(B) > 1$ unless $B$ is a cycle, which is not of interest to us.

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
\[ m(d) = \left\lfloor \left( (d - 1)^{1/2} - 1 \right)/2 \right\rfloor + 1, \]
and equality holds for each even \( d \geq 4 \) in the case where \( B \) is a bouquet of \( d/2 \) whole loops.

The following theorem explains our interest in \( \tau_{\text{tang}} \) regarding the relativized Alon conjecture.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let \( \{ C_n(B) \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an algebraic model of tangle power \( \tau_{\text{tang}} \) over a \( d \)-regular graph, \( B \). Let \( S \) be a connected graph that occurs in \( C_n(B) \) with \( \text{ord}(S) = \tau_{\text{tang}} \) and \( \mu_1(S) > (d - 1)^{1/2} \), and set
\[
\epsilon_0 = \mu_1(S) + \frac{d - 1}{\mu_1(S)} - 2(d - 1)^{1/2}.
\]
Then there is a constant \( C' \) and \( n_0 \) such that for any \( r \in \mathbb{N} \) and real \( \nu \) with
\[
r \geq \text{ord}(S), \quad (d - 1)^{1/2} < \nu \leq \mu_1(S),
\]
for any \( n \geq n_0 \) we have
\[
\text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \left( G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r) \right) \text{ and } \left( \text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon_0/2) > 0 \right) \right] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.
\]
Furthermore, for any \( r, \nu \) satisfying (14) there is a constant \( C = C(\nu, r) \) such that
\[
\text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \left( G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r) \right) \text{ and } \left( \text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0 \right) \right] \leq C(\nu, r) n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.
\]

When we prove this theorem in Section 8; there we will see that (16) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2, but our proof of (15) requires some work, which generalizes some of the results in Friedman-Tillich [FT05].

Theorem 3.5 implies that for \( \epsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small (namely \( \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0/2 \) with \( \epsilon_0 \) as in (13)) we have
\[
\text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0 \right] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.
\]
We conjecture that this lower bound has a matching upper bound to within a constant depending on \( \epsilon > 0 \), and in Article VI we will prove this for our basic models when \( B \) is \( d \)-regular and Ramanujan. Let us explain this in more detail.

### 3.4. The Algebraic Power of a Model

In this article we combine the results of Articles I–IV to prove the following main result.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let \( C_n(B) \) be an algebraic model over a \( d \)-regular graph \( B \). For any \( \nu \) with \( (d - 1)^{1/2} < \nu < d - 1 \), let \( \epsilon' > 0 \) be given by
\[
2(d - 1)^{1/2} + \epsilon' = \nu + \frac{d - 1}{\nu}.
\]
Then
\[
(1) \text{ there is an integer } \tau = \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \geq 1 \text{ such that for any sufficiently small } \epsilon > 0 \text{ there are constants } C = C(\epsilon), C' > 0 \text{ such that for sufficiently large } n \text{ we have }
\]
\[
(17) \quad n^{-\tau} C' \leq \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)} [\mathbb{I}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon' + \epsilon)] \leq n^{-\tau} C(\epsilon),
\]
or
(2) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \) we have

\[
E_{G \in C_n(B)} I_{TangleFree(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon + \epsilon) \leq O(n^{-j})
\]

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

Moreover, if \( \tau = \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \) is finite, then for some eigenvalue, \( \ell \in \mathbb{R} \), of the model with \( |\ell| > \nu \), there is a real \( C_\ell > 0 \) such that for sufficiently small \( \theta > 0 \)

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \#(\text{Spec}_B^\nu(H_G) \cap B_{\nu - \theta}(\ell)) \right] \geq C_\ell n^{-\tau} + o(n^{-\tau}).
\]

[Note that \( C' \) in (17) is independent of small \( \epsilon > 0 \) since as \( \epsilon \) decreases \( \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) \) is non-decreasing.]

Notice if \( \nu_1 \leq \nu_2 < r_1 \leq r_2 \) then

\[
I_{TangleFree(\geq \nu_1, < r_1)}(G) \leq I_{TangleFree(\geq \nu_2, < r_2)}(G),
\]

for the simple reason that \( I_{TangleFree(\geq \nu_1, < r_1)}(G) = 1 \) implies that \( G \) has no \((\geq \nu_2, < r_2)\)-tangles, and hence no \((\geq \nu_1, < r_1)\)-tangles; then (17) and (18) imply that

\[
\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu_1, r_1) \leq \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu_2, r_2).
\]

**Definition 3.7.** Let \( \{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an algebraic model over a \( d \)-regular graph \( B \). For each \( r \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \nu \) with \((d - 1)^{1/2} < \nu < d - 1 \), let \( \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \) be as in Theorem 3.6.

We define the algebraic power of the model \( C_n(B) \) to be

\[
\tau_{\text{alg}} = \max_{\nu > (d - 1)^{1/2}} \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) = \lim sup_{r \to \infty, \nu \to (d - 1)^{1/2}} \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r)
\]

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

Of course, according to Theorem 3.6, \( \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \geq 1 \) for all \( r \) and all relevant \( \nu \), and hence \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \geq 1 \). Furthermore, since \( \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \) is an integer or \(+\infty\), if \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \) is finite then for some \( \nu_0 > (d - 1)^{1/2} \) and \( r_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) we have \( \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu_0, r_0) = \tau_{\text{alg}} \); in this case (20) implies that for \((d - 1)^{1/2} < \nu < \nu_0 \) and \( r < r_0 \) we have \( \tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) = \tau_{\text{alg}} \).

Since the number of new eigenvalues of a covering map \( G \to B \) of degree \( n \) is \((\#E_G^\text{dir}) - (\#E_B^\text{dir}) = (n - 1)(\#E_B^\text{dir})\), we have that

\[
\text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left( \left( G \in \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r) \right) \text{ and } \left( \text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0 \right) \right)
\]

is between 1 and \( 1/((n - 1)(\#E_B^\text{dir})) \) times

\[
E_{G \in C_n(B)} I_{TangleFree(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon).
\]

### 3.5. A More Precise Form of the First Main Theorem.

Taking \( \nu \to (d - 1)^{1/2} \) (from above) and \( r \to \infty \) in (16) and (15), it is not hard to deduce our second main result, which refines our first.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let \( B \) be a \( d \)-regular graph, and let \( C_n(B) \) be an algebraic model of tangle power \( \tau_{\text{tang}} \) and algebraic power \( \tau_{\text{alg}} \) (both of which are at least 1). 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

\[
C'n^{-\tau_2} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) > 0 \right] \leq Cn^{-\tau_1}.
\]

Since \( \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon) \) is non-increasing in \( \epsilon \), the value \( C' \) in (21) is independent of sufficiently small \( \epsilon \); however, \( C \) depends on \( \epsilon \).
3.6. The Main Theorem of Article VI. The following theorem will be proven in Article VI.

Definition 3.9. 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 3.10. Let \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be one of our basic models over \(d\)-regular Ramanujan graph, \(B\). Then \(\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty\).

The above theorem holds for any \(d\)-regular Ramanujan graph, \(B\), and for any algebraic model over \(B\) that satisfies a certain weak magnification condition; in Article VI we describe this magnification condition and prove that it holds for all of our basic models (for any \(B\), regular or not). 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].

We point out that in [Fri08], the upper and lower bounds on the probability of \(\text{NonAlon}_{d}(G;\epsilon) > 0\) differed by a factor proportional to \(n\), rather than a constant, for random \(d\)-regular graphs for certain values of \(d\), namely for \(d = 1 + m^2\) for an odd integer \(m \geq 3\), such as \(d = 10, 26, 50\). Hence Theorems 3.8 and 3.10 improve this factor of \(n\) to a constant depending on \(\epsilon\) (for such \(d\)).

3.7. Conjectures Regarding Theorem 3.10. We make the following successively strong conjectures regarding Theorem 3.8.

Conjecture 3.11. Let \(\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be one of our basic models over \(d\)-regular graph, \(B\). Then
\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ For } \epsilon > 0 \text{ sufficiently small there are } C, C' \text{ such that for sufficiently large } n \text{ we have } \\
& C'^{-n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}} \leq \text{Prob}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_{d}(G;\epsilon) > 0] \leq C n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}}.
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & \tau_{\text{tang}} \leq \tau_{\text{alg}} - 1. \\
(3) & \tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty.
\end{align*}
\]

Theorem 3.10 proves the strongest conjecture in the case where the base graph is Ramanujan.

3.8. Results Needed from Article IV. We recall the main result from Article IV; we refer to this article and Article I for intuition regarding this result. This result is purely a lemma in probability theory.

Definition 3.12. Let \(\Lambda_0 < \Lambda_1\) be positive real numbers. By a \((\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)\) matrix model we mean a collection of finite probability spaces \(\{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) 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 \(K\): \(\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\) be a function such that \(K(n)/\log n \to \infty\) as \(n \to \infty\). We say that this model has an order \(r\) expansion with range \(K(n)\) (with \(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1\) understood) if as \(n \to \infty\) we have that
\[
\text{E}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_n}[\text{Trace}(M^k)] = c_0(k) + c_1(k)/n + \cdots + c_{r-1}(k)/n^{r-1} + O(c_r(k))/n^r
\]
for all \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) with \(k \leq K(n)\), where (1) \(c_r = c_r(k)\) is of growth \(\Lambda_1\), (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 $\Lambda_0$ error term and whose larger bases (i.e., larger than $\Lambda_0$ 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 $\Lambda_0$) over all $i$ between 0 and $r - 1$, and call $L_r$ the larger bases (of the order $r$ expansion).

Note that in the above definition, the larger bases of the $c_i$ are arbitrary, provided that they lie in $[-\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1]$ (e.g., there is no bound on the number of bases). We also note that (22) implies that for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

\begin{equation}
(23) \quad c_i(k) = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}, n \to \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
\end{equation}

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 (22) holds.

**Theorem 3.13.** Let $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a $(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)$-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 $\Lambda_0$) in (22) (which is independent of $r \geq i + 1$ by (23)). If $p_i(k) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$

\begin{equation}
(24) \quad \text{Eout}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{\Lambda_0+\epsilon}(0)] = O(n^{-j}).
\end{equation}

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

\begin{equation}
(25) \quad \text{Eout}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{\Lambda_0+\epsilon}(0) \cup B_{n^{-\theta}}(L_{j+1})] = o(n^{-j});
\end{equation}

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

\begin{equation}
(26) \quad p_j(k) = \sum_{\ell \in L} \ell^k C_\ell,
\end{equation}

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

\begin{equation}
(27) \quad \text{Ein}_{\mathcal{M}_n} [B_{n^{-\theta}}(\ell)] = n^{-j} C_\ell + o(n^{-j}).
\end{equation}

4. **The Ihara’s Determinantal Formula for Graphs with Half-Loops**

In this section we prove a generalization of what is often called Ihara’s Determinantal Formula; our proof follows that of Bass (see [Ter11], specifically Proposition 19.9, page 172, and the references on page 43, the beginning of Part II, to the work of Ihara, Serre, Sunada, Hashimoto, and Bass); our generalization allows for graphs to have half-loops.

Recall that for a graph, $G$, we use $A_G, H_G$ to respectively denote the adjacency matrix and Hashimoto (or non-backtracking walk) matrix of $G$.

**Theorem 4.1.** For a graph, $G$, and an indeterminate $\mu$ we have

\begin{equation}
(28) \quad \det(\mu I - H_G) = \det(\mu^2 I - \mu A_G + (D_G - I))(\mu + 1)^{o_1(G)}(\mu^2 - 1)^{o_2(G)} - n,
\end{equation}

where $o_1(G)$ is the number of half-loops in $G$ and $o_2(G)$ is the number of whole-loops and edges that are not whole-loops (and where the $I$ on the left-hand-side of (28) is the square identity matrix indexed on $E^\text{dir}_G$, and the two $I$’s on the right-hand-side are the same indexed on $V_G$).
The origin of this formula is [Iha66], where it is shown that
\[ \zeta_G(u) = \frac{1}{\det(I - uA_G + u^2(D_G - I))(1 - u^2)^{-\chi(G)}} \]
for the Zeta function, \( \zeta_G(u) \), of certain graphs, \( G \), of interest in [Iha66]; however, the interpretation of this formula in terms of graph theory occurs only later (see [Ser77], page 5, or [Ser03], page IX). The equality
\[ \zeta_G(u) = \frac{1}{\det(I - uH_G)} \]
(which is relatively easy to see), and the connection to graph theory, was made explicit by [Sun86], for regular graphs, and [Has90] for all graphs. Our proof is a simple adaptation of Bass’s elegant proof this theorem for graphs without half-loops (see [Bas92, Ter11]).

**Proof.** Let \( u \) be a single indeterminate. We set \( d_h \) the \( V_G \times E_G^{dir} \) matrix whose \((v, e)\) entry is 1 if \( he = v \), and 0 otherwise; we similarly define \( d_t \). Introducing an indeterminate \( u \), we easily verify the block matrix equality
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{V_G} & 0 \\
\dfrac{d_h}{I_{E_G^{dir}}} & I_{E_G^{dir}} - H_Gu
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{V_G}(1 - u^2) & 0 \\
d_t & I_{E_G^{dir}} - H_Gu
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{V_G} & 0 \\
\dfrac{d_t}{I_{E_G^{dir}}} & I_{E_G^{dir}} + \iota_Gu
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{V_G} & 0 \\
\dfrac{d_h}{I_{E_G^{dir}}} & I_{E_G^{dir}} + \iota_Gu
\end{bmatrix}
\]
We take determinants of the above, and make use of the identity
\[
\det \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ N_2 & M_2 \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & N_1 \\ 0 & M_2 \end{bmatrix} = \det(M_1) \det(M_2)
\]
(for square block matrices \( M_1, M_2 \) and \( N_1, N_2 \) of appropriate size) to conclude that
\[
(1 - u^2)^{\#V_G} \det(I_{E_G^{dir}} - H_Gu) = \det(I_{V_G} - A_Gu + (D_G - I_{V_G})u^2) \det(I_{E_G^{dir}} + \iota_Gu).
\]
But if \( G \) has \( \alpha_1 \) half-loops and \( \alpha_2 \) edges (i.e., \( \iota_G \) orbits) that are not half-loops, we have
\[
\det(I_{E_G^{dir}} + \iota_Gu) = (1 - u^2)^{\alpha_2}(1 + u)^{\alpha_1}.
\]
Combining (29) and (30), and substituting \( \mu = 1/u \) and multiplying by \( \mu^{nd} \) yields (28). \( \square \)

The reason we write our proof with \( u \) instead of \( \mu = 1/u \) is that this is the usual way the proof is written, because one usually writes \( \zeta_G(u) \), the Ihara Zeta function [Iha66] of a graph, \( G \), as
\[
\zeta_G(u) = \prod_p \left(1 - u^{\text{length}(p)}\right)^{-1}
\]
where the product is over all “primes” \( p \) (primitive, oriented SNBC walks in \( G \)) whereupon it is not hard to see (taking logarithms and considering the relationship between the trace of \( H_G^k \) and primes of length dividing \( k \)) that
\[
\zeta_G(u) = \frac{1}{\det(I - uH_G)}.
\]
5. Our Basic Models are Algebraic

In this section we prove that our basic models are algebraic. For ease of reading, we recall the definition of what we call our basic models.


Definition 5.1. Let $B$ be a graph. A model over $B$ is a family of probability spaces $\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ indexed by a parameter $n$ that ranges over some infinite subset $N \subset \mathbb{N}$, such that the atoms of each $C_n(B)$ lie in $\text{Coord}_n(B)$; we say that the model is edge-independent if for any orientation, $E^\text{dir}_B$, of $B$, and each $n \in N$, if $\{\sigma(e)\}_{e \in E^\text{dir}_B}$ are the $E^\text{dir}_B \rightarrow S_n$ maps associated to the $G \in C_n(B)$, then the (random variables) $\{\sigma(e)\}$ varying over $e \in E^\text{dir}_B$ are independent.

An edge-independent model $\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ is therefore described by specifying the distribution of $\sigma(e) \in S_n$ for every $n \in N$ and every edge $e \in E^\text{dir}_B$, or equivalently, every edge $e \in E^\text{dir}_B$ where $E^\text{dir}_B \subset E^\text{dir}_B$ is some orientation of $B$.

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

Definition 5.2. Let $B$ be a graph. By our basic models we mean one of the models edge-independent models $\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in N}$ 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 $e \in E^\text{dir}_B$, $\sigma(e) \in S_n$ 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 $\sigma \in S_n$ that has no fixed points and satisfies $\sigma^2 = \text{id}$.
3. The permutation-involution of odd degrees is defined the same, except that $e$ is a half-loop, then $\sigma(e)$ is a uniformly chosen near perfect matching on $[n]$, i.e., a map $\sigma \in S_n$ with exactly one fixed point and with $\sigma^2 = \text{id}$.
4. The full cycle model (or simply cyclic model) is defined like 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 (or simply cyclic-involution) of even degree and of odd degree are the two models 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.

5.2. Coincidences and the Order Bound for the Permutation Model. In this subsection we prove (5) for all of our basic models (Definition 5.2). This proof is based on the approach of Broder-Shamir to trace methods for regular graphs; this approach is also the basis of our asymptotic expansions, which go back to [Fri91]. We use the notion of coincidences of [Fri91] (see the second displayed formula on page 352 for the bound, or Lemma 5.7 of [Fri08]), which is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 3 of [BS87]; see also Lemma 2.2 of [Fri03].

If $B$ is a graph, then any walk in an element of $\text{Coord}_n(B)$ is an alternating sequence of vertices and directed edges, and therefore an alternating sequence of elements of $V_B \times [n]$ and $E^\text{dir}_B \times [n]$; hence such a walk is necessarily of the form

$$w = (v_0, i_0), (e_1, i_0), (v_1, i_1), \ldots, (e_k, i_{k-1}), (v_k, i_k)$$

(31)
with $i_0, \ldots, i_k \in [n]$ and $(v_0, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ an alternating sequence of elements of $V_B$ and $E_{B}^\text{dir}$ which we easily verify is a walk in $B$ (via (1) and (2)); if $\sigma: E_{B}^\text{dir} \to \mathcal{S}_n$ is the map associated to any $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$ (see (1)), then $w$ above lies in $G$ iff for $j = 1, \ldots, k$ we have
\begin{equation}
(32) \quad i_j = \sigma(e_j)i_{j-1}.
\end{equation}
Furthermore, (1) and (2) easily show that $w$ above is SNBC iff $i_k = i_0$ and the walk $(v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ is SNBC in $B$.

**Definition 5.3.** Let $\pi: G \to B$ be a coordinatized covering map, $\sigma$ its associated map $E_{B}^\text{dir} \to \mathcal{S}_n$. For $w_B = (v_0, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ and $i_0 \in [n]$, for $j = 0, \ldots, k$ let $i_j = i_j(\sigma, w_B, i_0)$ be as in (32) and let
\begin{equation}
(33) \quad \gamma_j = \gamma_j(\sigma, w_B, i_0) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{VisSub}\{(v_0, i_0), (e_1, i_0), \ldots, (e_j, i_{j-1}), (v_j, i_j)\}.
\end{equation}

We say that (with respect to $\sigma, i_0, w_B$) $j \in [k]$ is
1. a **forced choice** if $\gamma_j(\sigma) = \gamma_{j-1}(\sigma)$ (i.e., $\sigma(e_j)i_{j-1}$ has already been determined, i.e., for some $\ell < j$ either $e_j = e_\ell$ and $i_j = i_\ell$ or $e_j = t_Be_\ell$ and $i_j = i_\ell + 1$), and
2. a **free choice** otherwise (i.e., $\sigma(e_j)i_{j-1}$ has not been determined by the values of $\sigma(e_\ell)i_\ell$ for $\ell < j$, i.e., the edge $(e_j, i_j)$ does not lie in $\gamma_{j-1}$), and in this case
   (a) a **coincidence** if $\gamma_j(\sigma)$ has one more edge but the same number of vertices as $\gamma_j(\sigma)$, (i.e., $(v_j, i_j)$ lies in $\gamma_{j-1}$), and
   (b) a **new choice** if $\gamma_j(\sigma)$ has one more edge and one more vertex than $\gamma_j(\sigma)$ (i.e., $(v_j, i_j)$ does not lie in $\gamma_{j-1}$).

The terms **forced/free choice** is from [BS87] (page 289, end of second paragraph before Lemma 3), and **coincidence** from [Fri91] (bottom of page 335).

In other words, we view $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k$ as random graphs that evolve, beginning with $\gamma_0$ which consists of just $(v_0, i_0)$, ending with $\gamma_k$ which is the entire visited subgraph of $w$: for each $j \in [k]$, $\gamma_j$ either equals $\gamma_{j-1}$ (when $\sigma(e_j)i_{j-1}$ has already been determined), or else $\gamma_j$ consists of one new edge and possibly one new vertex. Notice that the order of $\gamma_j$ equals the order of $\gamma_{j-1}$ except when $j$ is a coincidence, in which case the order of $\gamma_j$ is one more than that of $\gamma_{j-1}$. Hence the order $\gamma_k$ is the order of $\gamma_0$ (i.e., $-1$) plus the number of coincidences among the $j \in [k]$.

Notice that coincidences and forced/free choices can be viewed as purely graph theoretic properties of the successive visited subgraphs of the first $j$ steps of the walk in a graph, $j = 0, \ldots, k$.

**Lemma 5.4.** Let $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ be any of our standard models (Definition 5.2). Then $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ satisfies (5), i.e., the order bound.

**Proof.** If $w$ is an SNBC walk in a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then $w$ is of the form (31), where $w_B = (v_0, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ is SNBC in $B$. Fix any such $w_B$ and an $i_0 \in [n]$. Consider the event that $\sigma: E_{B}^\text{dir} \to \mathcal{S}_n$ is such that the resulting walk (31) given with $i_j$ as in (32) is SNBC and has order at least $r$, such a $\sigma$ has at least $r + 1$ coincidences. So fix any $r + 1$ values, $j_1 < \cdots < j_{r+1}$ in $[k]$ which are the first $r + 1$ coincidences (in fact, any particular $r + 1$ coincidences chosen for each $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ would also work). The probability that a fixed $j \in [k]$ is a coincidence given a fixed value of $\gamma_{j-1}$ is at most $j/(n - 2j + 2)$, since at most $2j - 2$ values of $\sigma(e_j)$ can be
determined by \( \gamma_{j-1} \), and the coincidence happens when \( \sigma(e_j)i_{j-1} \) takes on one of at most \( j \) values of at least \( n-2j+2 \) possible values in a uniformly chosen permutation or cycle or perfect matching or near perfect matching. Hence the probability that \( j_1 < \cdots < j_{r+1} \) are all coincidences is at most \( k/(n-2k+1)^{r+1} \). Since the number of choices for \( w_B \), for \( i_0 \), and for \( 1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_{r+1} \leq k \) are respectively 

\[
\text{Trace}(H^k_B), \quad n, \quad \binom{k}{r+1},
\]

the union bound implies that the expected number of SNBC walks of length \( k \) and order at least \( r \) is bounded by

\[
(34) \quad \text{Trace}(H^k_B)n\left(1 + \frac{k}{n-2k+1}\right)^{r+1}.
\]

Using the crude bounds

\[
\text{Trace}(H^k_B) \leq (\#E^\text{dir}_B)\mu^k_1(B), \quad \binom{k}{r+1} \leq k^{r+1},
\]

and, under the assumption that \( 2k \leq n/2 \), the bound

\[
\left(1 + \frac{k}{n-2k+1}\right)^{r+1} \leq k^{r+1}(n/2)^{-r-1},
\]

gives an upper bound on (34) of

\[
O(1)\mu^k_1(B)\frac{k^{2r+2}}{n^r}
\]

(where \( O(1) \) depends only on \( r \)), and is therefore bounded by \( g(k)/n^r \) where \( g \) is a function of growth \( \mu_1(B) \).

**5.3. The Permutation Model is Strongly Algebraic.** We now prove that the permutation model is strongly algebraic; of all of our basic models, the permutation model involves the simplest formulas; all of our other basic models will be proved to be algebraic or strongly algebraic in a similar fashion in the remaining subsections.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \( B \) be a graph without half-loops, and \( C_n(B) \) the permutation model over \( B \). If \( S^\leq_{B} \) is any ordered \( \acute{e}tale \) \( B \)-graph, and \( E^\text{or}_B \subset E^\text{dir}_B \) is any orientation of \( B \), then

\[
(35) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\#(S^\leq_B \cap G)] = \prod_{e \in E^\text{or}_B} \frac{1}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-a_{S^\leq_B}(e))} \times \prod_{v \in V_B} \left(n(n-1)\cdots(n-b_{S^\leq_B}(v)+1)\right)
\]

(with \( a_{S^\leq_B}, b_{S^\leq_B} \) as in Subsection 2.5) provided that \( \#V_S, \#E_S \leq n \); if \( S^\leq_B \) is any ordered \( B \)-graph that is not \( \acute{e}tale \), then

\[
(36) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\#(S^\leq_B \cap G)] = 0.
\]

**Proof.** Clearly inclusions and covering maps are \( \acute{e}tale \), and clearly the composition of \( \acute{e}tale \) maps is \( \acute{e}tale \). Hence any \( B \)-subgraph of a \( G \in \text{Coord}_n(B) \) is an \( \acute{e}tale \) \( B \)-graph, and this implies (37) if \( S^\leq_B \) is not an \( \acute{e}tale \) \( B \)-graph.
It remains to let $S_{b}^{\Sigma}$ be étale and to prove (35) and (36); let $\pi : S \to B$ be the structure map of $S_{b}$. Consider any $(S')_{b}^{\Sigma}$ that is an element of $S_{b}^{\Sigma} \cap G_{b}$ for some $G \in C_{n}(B)$; then we have
\[
V_{S'} = \bigcup_{v \in V_{B}} \{v\} \times I_{v}, \quad E_{S'}^{\text{dir}} = \bigcup_{e \in E_{B}^{\text{dir}}} \{e\} \times I_{e},
\]
where the above $I_{v}$ and $I_{e}$ are subsets of $[n]$, and
\[
t_{S'}(e, i) = (t_{BE}, i), \quad h_{S'}(e, i) = (h_{BE}, \sigma'(e)i), \quad \iota_{S'}(e, i) = (\iota_{BE}, \sigma'(e)i),
\]
where for each $e \in E_{B}^{\text{dir}}$, $\sigma'(e) : I(e) \to I(\iota_{B}e)$ is an isomorphism; since $\iota_{S'}(e, i)$ is an involution, we must have $\sigma'(e)^{-1} = \sigma(\iota_{B}e)$ for all $e \in E_{B}^{\text{dir}}$. The unique isomorphism $S_{b}^{\Sigma} \to (S')_{B}^{\Sigma}$ gives rise to an isomorphism for each $v \in V_{B}$:
\[
\mu_{v} : \pi^{-1}(v) \to I_{v} \subset [n].
\]
Conversely, we easily see that any other family of injections
\[
\mu_{v}' : \pi^{-1}(v) \to I_{v}' \subset [n]
\]
gives rise (using the heads and tails maps of $S$) to a unique ordered graph, $(S'^{\Sigma}_{b})^{\Sigma}$, also isomorphic to $S_{b}^{\Sigma}$, and $(S'^{\Sigma}_{b})^{\Sigma}$ and $(S'^{\Sigma}_{b})_{B}^{\Sigma}$ are isomorphic iff $\mu_{v}' = \mu_{v}$ for all $v$. (Here the orderings are crucial, since $S_{b}^{\Sigma}$ can be isomorphic as a $B$-graph to $S_{b}$ without $(S'^{\Sigma}_{b})_{B}^{\Sigma}$ and $(S'^{\Sigma}_{b})_{B}^{\Sigma}$ being isomorphic.)

Since $|I_{v}| = b_{S_{b}}(v)$, the number of families $\{\mu_{v}\}_{V_{B}}$ of injections as in (38) is
\[
\prod_{v \in V_{B}} \left( n(n-1) \ldots (n - b_{S_{b}}(v) + 1) \right).
\]
Furthermore, clearly a $G \in C_{n}(B)$, with corresponding permutation map $\sigma$, contains $S'_{b}$ as above iff for each $e \in E_{B}^{\text{dir}}$, $\sigma \in S_{n}$ agrees with $\sigma'$ on $I_{e}$; for each $e \in E_{B}^{\text{dir}}$ this occurs with probability
\[
\frac{1}{n(n-1) \ldots (n - |I_{e}| + 1)}.
\]
Since $|I_{e}| = a_{S_{b}}(e)$, we conclude (35) and (36).

\[\square\]

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $B$ be a graph without half-loops, and $C_{n}(B)$ the permutation model over $B$. Then $C_{n}(B)$ is strongly algebraic.

**Proof.** According to Lemma 5.4, $C_{n}(B)$ satisfies (5). According to Lemma 2.8 of [Fri91] we have that for fixed integers $a \geq 0$ and $r > 1$ we have
\[
(39) \quad \frac{1}{n(n-1) \ldots (n - a + 1)} = n^{-a}(1 + R_{1}(a)n^{-1} + \ldots + R_{r-1}(a)n^{-r+1} + O(n^{-r})),
\]
where the $R_{i}(a)$ are polynomials of degree $2i$. Lemma 2.9 there shows a similar expansion
\[
n(n-1) \ldots (n - b + 1) = n^{b}(1 - Q_{1}(b)n^{-1} + \ldots + (-1)^{r-1}Q_{r-1}(b)n^{-r+1} + O(n^{-r}))
\]
where the $Q_{i}(b)$ are polynomials of degree $2i$. It follows that
\[
(40) \quad E_{G \in C_{n}(B)} \left[ \#(S_{b}^{\Sigma}) \cap G \right] = n^{-\text{ord}(S)}(1 + c_{1}(a, b)n^{-1} + \ldots + c_{r-1}(a, b)n^{-r+1} + cn^{-r}),
\]
where \( c_i \) is a polynomial of degree \( 2i \), and—according to Lemma 2.7 of [Fri91] and (6) there (see also the discussion around (20) in [Fri08])—where \( \epsilon = \epsilon(n, a, b, r) \) is bounded by

\[
|\epsilon(n, a, b, r)| \leq \frac{1}{(1 - C/n)^r} (\alpha + \beta)^r
\]

where

\[
\alpha = \sum_{e \in E_B} \left( 1 + 2 + \ldots + (a_{S_B}(e) - 1) \right)
\]

and

\[
\beta = \sum_{v \in V_B} \left( 1 + 2 + \ldots + (b_{S_B}(v) - 1) \right)
\]

and where \( C \) is an upper bound on the components of \( a \) and of \( b \); we may take \( \#E_S \) as such an upper bound on these components, and we easily check that

\[
\alpha = \sum_{e \in E_B} \left( 1 + 2 + \ldots + (a_{S_B}(e) - 1) \right) = \sum_{e \in E_B} \left( a_{S_B}(e) \cdot 1 \right) \leq \left( \frac{\#E_S}{2} \right) \leq (\#E_S)^2
\]

and we similarly bound

\[
\beta \leq (\#V_S)^2 \leq (\#E_{\text{dir}}_S)^2
\]

(the inequality \( \#V_S \leq \#E_{\text{dir}}_S \) follows since \( S \) has no isolated vertices and hence each vertex of \( S \) is the tail of some directed edge of \( S \)); it follows that for \( \#E_S \leq n/2 \),

\[
|\epsilon(n, a, b, r)| \leq O(\#E_S)^{2r} .
\]

This establishes (6) and (8) in the case where \( S_B = S \) is an étale \( B \)-graph; if \( S_B \) is not étale, then Lemma 5.5 shows that the left-hand-side of (6) vanishes, whereupon one can take \( c_0 = \cdots = c_{r-1} = 0 \) to satisfy (6).

It remains to show that if \( S \) is a cycle and \( S_B \) is an étale \( B \)-graph, then \( c_0(S_B) = 1 \); but this follows from (40). \( \square \)

5.4. The Permutation-Involution Model of Even Degree is Strongly Algebraic.

**Lemma 5.7.** Let \( B \) be a graph with half-loops, and let \( \{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the permutation-involution model of even degree (so \( \mathbb{N} \) consists of the even natural numbers). Then \( C_n(B) \) is strongly algebraic.

**Proof.** This follows from the proof of Lemma 5.6. The only difference is that if \( e \in E_{\text{dir}}_B \) is a half-loop, then \( \sigma(e) \in S_n \) is required to be an involution without fixed points, and so if \( e \) occurs \( a \) times in \( S_B \), the probability that an \( (S')_B^a \) occurs as a subgraph of \( C_n(B) \) is

\[
\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-3) \ldots (n-2a+1)} .
\]

Hence the probability of \( (S')_B^a \) being contained in an element of \( C_n(B) \) is

\[
\prod_{e \in E_{\text{dir}}_B \setminus \text{Half}_B} \frac{1}{n(n-1) \ldots (n-a_{S_B}(e)+1)} \prod_{e \in \text{Half}_B} \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-3) \ldots (n-2a_{S_B}(e)+1)} .
\]

This establishes (6) and (8) in the case where \( S_B \) is an étale \( B \)-graph; if \( S_B \) is not étale, then Lemma 5.5 shows that the left-hand-side of (6) vanishes, whereupon one can take \( c_0 = \cdots = c_{r-1} = 0 \) to satisfy (6).

It remains to show that if \( S \) is a cycle and \( S_B \) is an étale \( B \)-graph, then \( c_0(S_B) = 1 \); but this follows from (40). \( \square \)
where Half$_B$ denotes all the half-edges of $B$ and $E^\text{dir}_B \subseteq E^\text{dir}_B$ is an orientation of $B$. Hence we get an asymptotic expansion of this probability in powers of $1/n$, with different polynomials $p_i = p_i(a, b)$ reflecting the fact that for fixed $a$

$$\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-3) \ldots (n-2a+1)}$$

has coefficients that are different polynomials in $a$, but whose leading term is still $n^{-a}c_0$ with $c_0 = 1$. □

5.5. **Strongly Algebraic Models are Algebraic.** Here we formally state the almost immediate fact that a strongly algebraic model is also algebraic.

**Lemma 5.8.** Let $B$ be a graph. Any strongly algebraic model over $B$ is also algebraic, and a set of eigenvalues for such a model is the set of eigenvalues of $H_B$.

In this proof we say that a map $\pi: S \rightarrow B$ of graphs is étale at a vertex, $v$, of $S$ if $\pi$ is an injection when restricted to the elements of $E^\text{dir}_S$ whose head is $v$; since $S,B$ are graphs, this condition is equivalent if “head” is replaced with “tail;” hence, by our definitions, $\pi$ is étale iff it is étale at each vertex of $S$. We similarly speak of a $B$-graph, $S/B$, as being étale at a vertex of $S$, referring to the structure map $S \rightarrow B$.

**Proof.** The coefficients for the asymptotic expansions for

$$f(k, n) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \left[\#(\{S_B^\leq\} \cap G)\right]$$

depend on whether or not $S_B^\leq$ is an étale $B$-graph. If $S_B^\leq$ is étale, then $f(k, n)$ above has an expansion with coefficients

$$c_{\text{ord}(S)+1}(S_B) = p_i(a_{S_B}, b_{S_B})$$

(and if $S_B^\leq$ is not étale, then all coefficients vanish). But if $S_B^\leq$ is of homotopy type $T^\leq$, then $\text{ord}(S) = \text{ord}(T)$ and $b_{S_B}$ is determined by $a_{S_B}$ and $\text{ord}(T)$. Hence the coefficients are polynomials of $a_{S_B}$ alone when $S_B^\leq$ is of a fixed homotopy type.

To prove the theorem it therefore remains to see fix an ordered graph, $T^\leq$, and prove the following: we can subdivide all $B$-wordings, $W$, of $T$ into types—i.e., expressed as regular languages associated to each $e \in E^\text{dir}_T$, that express the property that $S_B^\leq = \text{VLG}_B(T^\leq, W)$ is étale. We easily see that for such a $W$ and $S_B^\leq$, the map $S \rightarrow B$ is étale at each vertex of $S$ that is not a vertex of $T$ (i.e., each vertex of $S$ that is an intermediate vertex in a beaded path associated to some $W(e)$), and for $v \in V_T \subseteq V_S$, $S_B^\leq$ is étale at $v$ iff the edges in $E^\text{dir}_S$ whose tail is $v$ are mapped to distinct edges in $E^\text{dir}_B$. But this latter property depends only on the first and last letters of $W(e)$ for all $e \in E^\text{dir}_T$; moreover, the set of $W(e)$ that begin and end with, respectively, $e_1, e_2 \in E^\text{dir}_B$, is a regular language, and the eigenvalues of this regular language are a subset of the eigenvalues of $H_B$, since the number of such words of length $k$ is the $e_1, e_2$ entry of $H_B^k$. □

The knowledge of the letters with which each $W(e)$ begins and ends was called the lettering in [Fri91, Fri08].
5.6. The Permutation-Involution Model of Odd Degree is Algebraic.

Lemma 5.9. Let \( B \) be a graph with half-loops, and let \( \{ C_n(B) \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the permutation-involution model of odd degree (so \( \mathbb{N} \) consists of the odd natural numbers). Then \( C_n(B) \) is algebraic, and a set of eigenvalues for this model is the set of eigenvalues of \( H_B \).

Proof. This follows from the proof of Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7. The main difference is that there are two types of maps \( \sigma'(e) : I(e) \to [n] \) over half-loops \( e \in E^\text{dir}_B \), which are required to be involutions, namely

1. those where \( \sigma'(e) \) has not specified the unique fixed point of the involution, so that if \( a \) edges over \( e \) occur in \( S_{\leq}^B \) then the probability that any \( (S')_{\leq}^B \) is a subgraph of an element of \( C_n(B) \) is

\[
\frac{1}{(n - 2)(n - 4) \ldots (n - 2a)},
\]

and

2. otherwise \( S_{\leq}^B \) and \( S'_{\leq}^B \) have a half-loop over this \( e \), and the probability becomes

\[
\frac{1}{n(n - 2) \ldots (n - 2a + 2)}.
\]

Furthermore the reduction of \( S_{\leq}^B \) contains \( e \) and its incident vertex \( v = tSe = hSe \); therefore if \( \pi : (S')_{\leq}^B \to \text{VLG}_{\leq}^B(T^\leq, W) \) is an isomorphism, then \( W(\pi(e)) \) gives the edge in \( E^\text{dir}_B \)—which is necessarily a half-loop—over which \( \pi(e) \) lies. Hence knowing the homotopy type of \( T \) and the first letter of each \( W(e) \) with \( e \in E^\text{dir}_B \) allows us to infer which of the two above cases applies to each half-loop, \( e \).

Hence for a fixed ordered graph, \( T^\leq \), the coefficients of the asymptotic expansion of

\[
f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \frac{\# (S_{\leq}^B \cap G)}{\# (S_{\leq}^B)} \right]
\]

of any \( S_{\leq}^B \) isomorphic to an ordered \( B \)-graph of the form \( \text{VLG}_{\leq}^B(T^\leq, W) \) depend on knowing only the first and last letters of \( W(e) \) for all \( e \in E^\text{dir}_B \). Since both (44) and (45) have leading term \( n^{-a}c_0 \) with \( c_0 = 1 \), we again verify (6) and (8): as for all our basic models, (5) follows from Lemma 5.4. \( \square \)

5.7. The Cyclic Model is Algebraic.

Lemma 5.10. Let \( B \) be a graph without half-loops, and let \( \{ C_n(B) \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the cyclic model. Then \( C_n(B) \) is algebraic, and a set of eigenvalues for this model consists of the eigenvalues of \( H_B \) and possibly 1.

Proof. Our proof is again based on that of Lemma 5.6, but there is one essential difference. For an \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), an \( I \subset [n] \), and a map \( \sigma' : I \to [n] \), say that \( \sigma' \) is feasible if the following evidently equivalent conditions hold:

1. there is a \( \sigma \in S_n \) such that \( \sigma \) is a full cycle whose restriction, \( \sigma|_I \), to \( I \) equals \( \sigma' \);
2. the directed graph \( G = G_{\sigma'} \) given by

\[
V_G = [n], \quad E^\text{dir}_G = I, \quad t_G = \text{Identity}, \quad h_G = \sigma'
\]

(which is necessarily of indegree and outdegree at most one at each vertex) has no cycles of length less than \( n \).
We easily see that if \( \sigma': I \to [n] \) is feasible, then for any \( i \notin I \), we may extend \( \sigma' \) to a feasible map \( I \cup \{i\} \to [n] \) in \( n - a - 1 \) ways if \( a = \#I < n \) (i.e., there are \( n - a - 1 \) possible values for the new value \( \sigma'(i) \)); therefore the number of full cycles that agree with \( \sigma' \) on \( I \) is \((n - a - 1)\). It follows that if \( \sigma' \) is feasible, the probability that a random full cycle, \( \sigma \in S_n \), agrees with \( \sigma' \) on \( I \) is

\[
\frac{(n - a - 1)!}{(n - 1)!} = \frac{1}{(n - 1)(n - 2) \ldots (n - a)}
\]

Like the similar probability expressions involving \( n \) and \( a \), this function also has an asymptotic expansion to any order with leading term \( n^{-a}c_0 \) with \( c_0 = 1 \) and coefficients that are polynomials in \( a \).

The subtlety is that for a ordered graph \( T^\le \), we need to know which \( B \)-wordings, \( W \), are \emph{feasible} in the sense that for any \((S')_{\le B}^E\) isomorphic to \( \mathrm{VLG}_{\le B}(T, W) \), the associated map \( \sigma': E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \to S_n \) to \( S'_{\le B} \) has maps \( \sigma'(e): I(e) \to [n] \) that are feasible (for all whole-loops, \( e \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \)). (And we must describe such wordings in terms of regular languages.) Since the formulas and expansions we obtain need hold only for \((S')_{\le B}^E\) with \#\( E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \le n^{1/2}/C \) for a constant, \( C \) (of our choosing, for fixed \( T^\le \)), we may always assume \( C > 1 \), so that \#\( E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \le n - 1 \). Hence, if for any whole-loop, \( e \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \), the graph in (46) has a cycle—with \( \sigma' = \sigma'(e) \) and \( I = I(e) \)—then this cycle is automatically of length strictly less than \( n \). It follows that the \( B \)-wordings, \( W \), that are feasible in this sense are precisely those for which for any whole-loop, \( e \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \), the edges over \( e \) in \( \mathrm{VLG}_{\le B}(T, W) \) have no cycle. So to determine the correct polynomial of \( a, b \) for each coefficient \( c_i(S_B) \), we not only need to know the first and last letter of each \( W(e_T) \) for \( e_T \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \), but also which of the words \( W(e_T) \) is a power \( e_B^k \) for some whole-loop \( e_B \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \). So it suffices to know if \( W(e_T) \) lies in the regular language \( e_B^* \) for some \( e_B \in E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \) with \( e_B \) a whole-loop, or in the languages

\[
\mathrm{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'') \setminus \bigcup_e \{e^*\}
\]

with \( e', e'' \) ranging over \( E_{\le B}^\text{dir} \) and \( e \) above ranging over all whole-loops. Since the language \( \{e^*\} \) has exactly one word of each length, its sole eigenvalue is 1; hence the eigenvalues of the regular language \( \{e^*\} \) or any language of the form (48) are those of \( H_B \) and (possibly) 1.

The above subtlety regarding the cycle model was overlooked in [Fri08].

5.8. **All Our Basic Models Are Algebraic.** We are now able to finish our claims about all our basic models.

**Lemma 5.11.** Let \( B \) be a graph. All our basic models are algebraic, and a set of eigenvalues for each model consist of possibly 1 and some subset of the eigenvalues \( \mu_i(B) \) of the Hashimoto matrix \( H_B \).

**Proof.** The proof that the cyclic-involution models of even and of odd degree follows by combining the proofs of the permutation-involution and cyclic models above. The regular languages used in the types are all of one of the three forms:

\[
\mathrm{NBWALKS}(B, e', e''), e^*, \mathrm{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'') \setminus \bigcup_e e^*;
\]

\[
\mathrm{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'') \setminus \bigcup_e e^*;
\]

\[
\mathrm{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'');
\]
the exponents of the first form are some subset of the $\mu_i(B)$, since the number of words of length $k$ in these languages is an entry of $H^B_k$; the exponents of the language $e^*$ is 1 since there is exactly one word of length $k$ for each $k$; and the number of words of length $k$ in $\text{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'') \setminus \bigcup_e e^*$ is that of $\text{NBWALKS}(B, e', e'')$ unless $e' = e'' = e$ is a whole-loop of $B$, in which case the number is the same minus 1.

6. The Proof of the Relativized Alon Conjecture for Regular Base Graphs

In this section we prove Theorem 3.6 and then Theorem 3.1, the Relativized Alon Conjecture for regular base graphs.

6.1. Main Lemma. Our first lemma is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let $B$ be a connected graph with $\mu_1(B) > 1$, and let $\{C_n(B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an algebraic model over $B$. Let $r > 0$ be an integer and $\nu \geq \mu_1^2(B)$ be a real number. Then

(49) $f(k, n) = f_{\nu, r}(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ \left( \text{Trace}(H^B_k) - \text{Trace}(H^G_k) \right) I_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \right]$ has a $(B, \nu)$-bounded expansion to order $r$

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

such that

(1) $c_0(k)$ is of growth $(d - 1)^{1/2}$ (and is independent of $\nu$ and $r$);

(2) the larger exponent bases of each $c_i(k)$ (with respect to $\nu$) is some subset of the union of the eigenvalues of $H_B$ and the eigenvalues of the model.

Notice that in the above lemma, $f(k, n)$ and the $c_i(k)$ all depend on $\nu, r$.

**Proof.** The $c_i(k)$ in (50) equal, in the notion of Theorem 3.2,

$c_i(k) - \tilde{c}_i \text{Trace}(H^k_B)$.

The claim about $c_0(k)$ in (50) follows from the fact that $\tilde{c}_i = 1$ and (11). □

6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.6.

**Proof of Theorem 3.6.** Let $q = \#E^\text{dir}_B$. For a $G \in \text{Coord}_n(B)$, let $\hat{H}_G$ denote the restriction of $H_G$ to the new space of functions $E^\text{dir}_G \to \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., whose sum on each $E^\text{dir}$ fibre is zero); then $\hat{H}_G$ can be viewed as a $(n - 1)q \times (n - 1)q$ square matrix with respect to some basis of the new functions, and $\text{Trace}(\hat{H}_G^k)$ is independent of this basis.

Let

$f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ I_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(\hat{H}_G^k - H^B_k) \right]$

$= \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)} \left[ I_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G) \text{Trace}(\hat{H}_G^k) \right]$.

Then

$f(k, n) = \mathbb{E}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{(n-1)q}} \left[ \text{Trace}(M^k) \right],$

where $\mathcal{M}_{(n-1)q}$ is the space of random matrices

$I_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G)\hat{H}_G$
where $G$ varies over $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. Setting $\Lambda_0 = \nu$ and $\Lambda_1 = d - 1$, Theorem 3.2 shows that $(\mathcal{M}_{(n-1)q})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a $(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)$-matrix model. Hence, by Theorem 3.13, for sufficiently small $\epsilon'' > 0$, either
\begin{equation}
\mathbb{E}_{\text{out}}[B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon''}(0)] = O(n^{-j})
\end{equation}
for all $j$, or else for some $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that for sufficiently large $n$
\begin{equation}
C' n^{-\tau} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\text{out}}[B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon''}(0)] \leq C(\epsilon'') n^{-\tau}
\end{equation}
The Ihara Determinantal Formula implies that each eigenvalue $\lambda$ of $A_G$ of a $d$-regular graph $G$ corresponds to two eigenvalues $\mu$ of $H_G$ given by
$\
\mu^2 - \lambda \mu + (d - 1) = 0$
$\
(51)$

(52) $\
(\text{and aside from these } 2n \text{ eigenvalues of } H_G, \text{ the other eigenvalue of } H_G \text{ are } \pm 1).$

In particular, there is a one-to-one correspondence between eigenvalues of $H_G$, $\mu$, with $|\mu| > (d - 1)\frac{1}{2}$ and those eigenvalues of $A_G$, $\lambda$, with $|\lambda| > 2(d - 1)\frac{1}{2}$, taking $\mu$ to
\begin{equation}
\lambda = \mu + \frac{d - 1}{\mu}.
\end{equation}

In particular, since $\Lambda_0 = \nu > (d - 1)\frac{1}{2}$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between $H_G$ new eigenvalues outside $B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon''}(0)$ and $A_G$ new eigenvalues outside
\begin{equation}
\lambda_{\epsilon''} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \nu + \epsilon'' + \frac{d - 1}{\nu + \epsilon''}.
\end{equation}

Since
\begin{equation}
\nu + \frac{d - 1}{\nu} = 2(d - 1)\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon',
\end{equation}
and since $\mu + (d - 1)/\mu$ is continuous and monotone increasing for $\mu > (d - 1)\frac{1}{2}$, for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ there is an $\epsilon'' > 0$ such that $\lambda_{\epsilon''}$ above equals $2(d - 1)\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon' + \epsilon$. For this value of $\epsilon''$ we have
$\
\mathbb{E}_{\text{out}, \mathcal{M}_{(n-1)q}}[B_{\Lambda_0 + \epsilon''}(0)] = \mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{E}_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < \tau)}(G) \text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon' + \epsilon)].
\end{equation}

Then (51) and (52) imply the claim of the theorem. \hfill \Box

7. The Fundamental Subgraph Lemma

In this section we prove the following fundamental lemma regarding new spectrum of graphs that contain fixed subgraph.

**Lemma 7.1.** Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer, $B$ a $d$-regular graph, and $\psi_B$ a fixed $B$-graph with $\mu_1(\psi) > (d - 1)\frac{1}{2}$. Set
\begin{equation}
\lambda = \mu_1(\psi) + \frac{d - 1}{\mu_1(\psi)}.
\end{equation}
Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that if $\pi: G \to B$ is a covering map of degree at least $n_0$ such that $G_B$ has a subgraph isomorphic to $\psi_B$, then $\text{Spec}_{B}^{\text{new}}(A_G)$ contains an eigenvalue larger than $\lambda - \epsilon$.

We remark that the above lemma holds, more simply, in the context of graphs rather than $B$-graphs (i.e., it is enough for $G$ to be $d$-regular and that $\psi$ be any graph); however, is it simpler to work with $B$-graphs in the construction of a universal cover (namely $\text{Tree}_{\psi_B}(\psi_B)$) described below.
Lemma 7.1 is a generalization of the Theorem 3.13 (i.e., the “Curious Theorem” of Subsection 3.8) of [Fri08] which proves a form of the above lemma when $B$ has one vertex.

Our proof Lemma 7.1 uses two types of methods: (1) the general methods of Section 8 (in particular, Theorem 8.2) of [FT05], which are based on the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of a graph with boundary Theorem 2.3 of [Fri93], and (2) some specific facts regarding graphs with tangles proven in Section 3 of [Fri08]. The first type of methods are a more robust variant of the methods used for the Alon-Boppana theorem ([Nil91], and its improvement by Friedman [Fri93] Corollary 3.7 and Kahale [Kah95] Section 3); in addition to being more robust—which is demonstrated in this section—the methods of Friedman-Tillich yield slightly better constants in the error term of [Fri93, Kah95]. The second type of methods are based on those used to prove the “Curious Theorem.” Theorem 3.13, of [Fri08], which are based on standard types of calculations with forms of Shannon’s algorithm, and the relation with the spectrum of infinite graphs and their finite quotients; we cite Buck [Buc86] for the relation we need, which is the earliest explicit reference we know for these results (this relation seems so fundamental that they may have appear elsewhere in spectral theory, at least implicitly).

Let us state a number of preliminary definitions and lemmas, mainly reviewing the above methods, before we prove Lemma 7.1.

7.1. Basic Notation and the Perturbation of Rayleigh Quotients. In this subsection we give some general notation and facts, including a standard type of estimate when a Rayleigh quotient argument is perturbed (Lemma 7.2 below).

First we recall that if $A$ is any real, $n \times n$, symmetric matrix and $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is nonzero, then the Rayleigh quotient of $f$ on $A$ is defined as

$$
\mathcal{R}_A(f) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(Af, f)}{(f, f)}
$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n$; we have

$$
|\mathcal{R}_A(f)| \leq \|A\| \|f\|,
$$

where $\|A\|$ is the $L^2$-operator norm of $A$, which equals the largest absolute value of an eigenvalue of $A$; furthermore, if $A$ has non-negative entries and $f \geq 0$ (i.e., pointwise, i.e., $f$ has non-negative components), then for $f$ nonzero and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$
Af \geq \lambda f \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}_A(f) \geq \lambda
$$

(again, $Af \geq \lambda f$ means pointwise, i.e., component-by-component); to prove (54) we note that

$$
(Af, f) \geq (\lambda f, f) = \lambda (f, f),
$$

and we divide by $(f, f)$.

Next recall the special case of adjacency matrices of graphs [Fri93, FT05] and the following notation and easy facts: if $G$ is a graph and $f : V_G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the Rayleigh quotient of $f$ (on $G$, or of $A_G$) is given by

$$
\mathcal{R}_{A_G}(f) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(A_G f, f)}{(f, f)}
$$
where \((\ , \ )\) denotes the standard inner product on \(\mathbb{R}^{V_G}\) given by
\[
(55) \quad (f_1, f_2) = (f_1, f_2)_{L^2(V_G)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{v \in V_G} f_1(v)f_2(v).
\]

Aside from the norm \(\|f\|_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|f\|_{L^2(V_G)} = \sqrt{(f, f)}\), we will have occasion to use the following notation and easy facts:

1. we have
\[
\|f\|_2 \geq \|f\|_\infty \overset{\text{def}}{=} \max_{v \in V_G} |f(v)| \quad \text{(since each vertex in } L^2(V_G) \text{ above has measure 1)};
\]
2. we use \(\text{supp}(f)\) to denote the support of \(f\) (i.e., the set of vertices on which \(f\) does not vanish);
3. we have
\[
\left| (f_1, f_2) \right| \leq \left( \# \text{supp}(f_1f_2) \right) \| f_1f_2 \|_\infty \leq \left( \# \text{supp}(f_1) \right) \| f_1 \|_\infty \| f_2 \|_\infty
\]
which implies
\[
(56) \quad \left| (f_1, f_2) \right| \leq \left( \# \text{supp}(f_1) \right) \| f_1 \|_2 \| f_2 \|_\infty
\]
since \(\| f_1 \|_2 \geq \| f_1 \|_\infty\).

We will need an easy perturbation result on the Rayleigh quotient, which we state in a general context.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let \(A\) be any bounded, symmetric operator on a real inner product space. If \(f_1, f_2\) are elements of the space with
\[
\| f_2 - f_1 \| \leq \epsilon \| f_1 \|
\]
for some \(0 < \epsilon < 1\), then
\[
(57) \quad | \mathcal{R}_A(f_2) - \mathcal{R}_A(f_1) | \leq 2 \| A \| \epsilon
\]
where \(\mathcal{R}_A(f) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (Af, f)/(f, f)\).

(The above lemma also holds for \(\epsilon \geq 1\) for the trivial reason that \(|\lambda_i| \leq \| A \|\) for \(i = 1, 2\).)

**Proof.** Let us make some simplifying assumptions before making a computation. It suffices to work in, \(V\), the 2-dimensional span of \(f_1, f_2\). By choosing an orthonormal basis for \(V\), we may assume that we are working in \(\mathbb{R}^2\) under the standard inner product. By choosing an orthonormal eigenbasis for \(A\) and applying the associated orthogonal matrix, we may further assume that
\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix},
\]
and hence \(\| A \| = \max(|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_2|)\). Since \(f_1 = 0\) implies \(f_2 = 0\) and hence implies (57), we may assume \(f_1 \neq 0\). Since \(\mathcal{R}_A(f)\) is invariant under scaling \(f\), we may divide \(f_1\) and \(f_2\) by \(\| f_1 \|\), so that we may further assume that \(f_1\) is a unit vector, say \((\cos \theta, \sin \theta)\). Finally, \(f_2 \neq 0\) since \(\epsilon < 1\), and hence \(f_2\) is a positive multiple of a unit vector \((\cos \theta', \sin \theta')\) with \(\theta' - \theta < \pi/2\), and the closest multiple of \((\cos \theta', \sin \theta')\) to \((\cos \theta, \sin \theta)\) is (by drawing a trigonometry diagram) at a distance \(|\sin(\theta - \theta')|\); hence
\[
|\sin(\theta - \theta')| \leq \| f_2 - f_1 \| \leq \| f_1 \| \epsilon = \epsilon.
\]
Now we make an easy computation. We have
\[ R_A(f_1) = \lambda_1 \cos^2 \theta + \lambda_2 \sin^2 \theta = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \cos^2 \theta + \lambda_2, \]
and similarly for \( R_A(f_2) \), whereupon
\[ |R_A(f_2) - R_A(f_1)| = |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| |\cos^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta'|. \]
Using the fact that
\[ \cos^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta' = \sin(\theta + \theta') \sin(\theta - \theta') \]
it follows that
\[ |\cos^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta'| \leq |\sin(\theta - \theta')| \leq \epsilon; \]
hence this bound and (58) implies that
\[ |R_A(f_2) - R_A(f_1)| \leq |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \epsilon \leq (|\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|) \epsilon \leq 2\|A\| \epsilon. \]
\[ \square \]

7.2. Friedman-Tillich Methods of Large Graphs Containing a Fixed Subgraph. In this subsection we describe some results akin to those of Section 8 of [FT05], partially inspired by [Fri93].

**Definition 7.3.** Let \( \psi \subset G \) be graphs, and let \( f : V_\psi \to \mathbb{R} \) be a function. By the **extension of \( f \) by zero in \( G \)**, denoted \( f_G \), we mean the function \( V_G \to \mathbb{R} \) that is \( f \) on \( V_\psi \subset V_G \) and otherwise 0 (i.e., on \( V_G \setminus V_\psi \)).

**Lemma 7.4.** Let \( \psi \) be a graph and \( f \) be a function \( V_\psi \to \mathbb{R} \). Let \( G \) be any graph containing \( \psi \) as a subgraph, and for some \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \delta > 0 \) let \( f_1, \ldots, f_m \) be a set of orthonormal functions on \( V_G \) (with respect to (55)) such that \( \|f_i\|_\infty \leq \delta \) for all \( i \in [m] \). Let
\[ p = \text{Proj}_{f_1, \ldots, f_m}(f_G) \overset{\text{def}}{=} f_G - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (f_G, f_i) f_i, \]
which is the projection of \( f_G \), the extension of \( f \) by zero, onto the orthogonal complement of the span of \( f_1, \ldots, f_m \). Then
\[ \|p - f_G\|_2 \leq m(#V_\psi) \delta\|f_G\|_2 \]
Proof. The triangle inequality and \( \|f_i\|_2 = 1 \) for all \( i \) implies
\[ \|p - f_G\|_2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} |(f_G, f_i)| \|f_i\|_2 \leq m|\langle f_G, f_i \rangle|, \]
so the result follows from (56). \[ \square \]

The methods of [FT05] also require the following type of results, which we gather in two lemmas.

**Lemma 7.5.** Let \( \psi \subset T \) be two graphs. Then there exists a \( f : V_\psi \to \mathbb{R} \) that maximizes \( R_{A_\psi} \) over all functions \( V_\psi \to \mathbb{R} \); by scaling \( f \) one can assume \( f \geq 0 \) (i.e., \( f(v) \geq 0 \) for all \( v \in V_\psi \)). If \( f_T \) denotes the extension by zero of \( f \) to \( T \), and setting \( \lambda = R_{A_\psi}(f) \), we have \( A_T f_T \geq \lambda f_T \) pointwise, i.e.,
\[ (A_T f_T)(v) \geq \lambda f_T(v), \ \forall v \in V_T. \]
Proof. The existence of \( f \geq 0 \) is implied by the Perron-Frobenius theorem and the symmetry of \( A_v \) (or Theorem 2.3 of [Fri93] for a more general context, such as \( G \) infinite and weights on \( V_G \) in the Rayleigh quotient) and it satisfies
\[
A_v f = \lambda f
\]
on \( V_v \). It follows that \( (A_G f_G)(v) = \lambda f_G(v) \) on \( V_v \); for \( v \notin V_v \) we have \( f_G(v) = 0 \) and
\[
(A_G f_G)(v) \geq 0
\]
since \( f_G \geq 0 \) everywhere; this implies that \( (A_G f_G)(v) \geq \lambda f_G(v) \) for \( v \notin V_v \), and hence we deduce (60).

\[\square\]

**Definition 7.6.** If \( \pi: T \to G \) is any covering map (of possibly infinite graphs), for any finitely supported function \( g: V_T \to \mathbb{R} \) we define the push forward of \( f \) along \( \pi \), denoted \( \pi^* g \), to be the function \( V_G \to \mathbb{R} \) given by
\[
(\pi^* g)(v) = \sum_{\pi(u) = v} g(u).
\]
We easily see that if \( \pi^* f = f \circ \pi \) then \( \pi^* \) is the adjoint of \( \pi^* \) with respect to the inner products (55) on \( L^2(V_T) \) and \( L^2(V_G) \) provided that \( \pi \) is finite-to-one or we restrict to finitely supported functions; however this is not particularly important here.

**Lemma 7.7.** Let \( \pi: T \to G \) be a covering map (of possibly infinite graphs), and \( g: V_T \to \mathbb{R} \) a finitely supported function such that \( A_T g \geq \lambda g \) (pointwise, i.e., at each \( v \in V_T \)) for some \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
\[
A_G(\pi^* g) \geq \lambda \pi^* g
\]
(pointwise); furthermore if \( g \geq 0 \) and is nonzero, then
\[
R_{A_G}(\pi^* g) \geq \lambda.
\]

Proof. It is easy to see that \( \pi^* A_T = A_G \pi^* \) on finitely supported functions, so that applying \( \pi^* \) on the left to (60) we get (62). Furthermore, if \( g \geq 0 \) and is nonzero, then \( f = \pi^* g \geq 0 \) and \( f \) is nonzero, and hence (54) implies that \( R_{A_G}(\pi^* g) \geq \lambda \). \[\square\]

**7.3. Spectral Results on Infinite Graphs.** Let us quote some standard spectral results about infinite graphs used in [Fri08]. If \( G \) is a locally finite graph, meaning that \( V_G, E_G^\text{dir} \) may be infinite but the degree of each vertex is finite, we use \( \|A_G\| \) to denote the norm of the adjacency matrix, \( A_G \), of \( G \), viewed as operator on \( L^2(V_G) \) where each vertex in \( V_G \) has measure 1. It is a standard result in operator theory that \( \|A_G\| \) is also the spectral radius of \( G \), and that if \( G \) is connected then for every \( v \in V_G \) we have
\[
\|A_G\| = \lim_{r \to \infty} c(v, 2r)^{1/(2r)}
\]
where \( c(v, k) \) denotes the number of closed walks in \( G \) from \( v \) (to \( v \)) of length \( k \) (e.g., [Buc86], Proposition 3.2). It follows from standard spectral theory (see, for example, Theorem 3.11 of [Fri08]) that for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) there is a finitely supported function \( f: V_G \to \mathbb{R} \), i.e., where
\[
\text{supp}(f) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ v \mid f(v) \neq 0 \}.
\]
is finite, for which
\[
\|A_G f\| \geq (\|A_G\| - \epsilon)\|f\|.
\]

7.4. Relative Trees. Now we review some facts from Section 3 of [Fri08], stated in our context. First we describe the analogue of \(\text{Tree}_d(\psi)\) of Section 3.8 of [Fri08]; we state it as a lemma.

**Lemma 7.8.** Let \(B\) be a graph and \(\psi_B\) a connected étale \(B\)-graph. Then there exists a graph \(T = \text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\) (on infinitely many vertices) that is a universal cover of \(B\)-graphs extending \(\psi_B\) in the following sense: if \(G_B\) is a covering \(B\)-graph (possibly on infinitely many vertices) that contains \(\psi_B\) as a subgraph, then there exists a unique morphism \(T_B \to G_B\) that fixes \(\psi_B\). The graph \(T = \text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\) is unique up to unique isomorphism.

This lemma is illustrated by an example in Subsection 3.8 of [Fri08] in Figure 1 (which we reproduce here): in this example we work with graphs rather than \(B\)-graphs, and \(\text{Tree}_d(\psi)\) is the case of \(\text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\) where \(B\) consists of a single vertex of degree \(d\) (in any combination of whole-loops and half-loops) and where we otherwise forget the \(B\)-structure. Let us describe the proof of Lemma 7.8 informally: the proof is a standard adaptation of the notion of a universal cover: we build \(\text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\) by taking any vertex \(v \in V_\psi\) where \(\psi \to B\) is not a local isomorphism, and to each such \(v\) we add new edges, each with its own new vertex; this gives us a graph \(\psi_B^1\) containing \(\psi_B\) such that \(\psi_B^1 \to B\) is a local isomorphism at all vertices of \(\psi_B\); then \(\psi_B^1 \to B\) can only fail to be a local isomorphism at the newly created leaves of \(\psi_B^1\), and we similarly create \(\psi_B^2\) by adding edges and leaves to \(\psi_B^1\); we continue to build \(\psi_B^3, \psi_B^4, \ldots\), with
\[
\psi_B \subset \psi_B^1 \subset \psi_B^2 \subset \cdots
\]
and we set \(T_B = \text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\) to be the limit (i.e., the union). Then we easily show that \(T_B\) has the universal property claimed.

**Definition 7.9.** Given a graph, \(B\) and a connected étale \(B\)-graph, \(\psi_B\), the relative \(\psi_B\) tree refers to any \(B\)-graph isomorphic to \(\text{Tree}_B(\psi_B)\).
Lemma 7.10. Let $B$ be a $d$-regular graph for some $d \geq 3$, and let $\psi_B$ be a $B$-graph with $\mu_1(\psi) > (d - 1)^{1/2}$. Setting $T_B = \text{Tree}_\psi(\psi_B)$, we have

$$||A_T|| = \mu_1(\psi) + (d - 1)/\mu_1(\psi)$$

where $A_T$ is the adjacency operator/matrix on the infinite graph, $T$ and $||A_T||$ denotes the norm of $A_T$ as an operator on $L^2(V_T)$.

This lemma is a more precise version of Theorem 3.13 of [Fri08], and will be proven in a similar fashion; the special case of this lemma where $\psi$ is a bouquet of whole loops appears in [Pud15], Table 2 (in the column “The Growth Rate for the Bouquet $B_{d/2}$”). For sake of completeness we review facts about Shannon’s algorithm proven in Section 3 of [Fri08] so that we can precisely quote the results in the proof of Theorem 3.13 there.

7.5. Shannon’s Algorithm. To prove Lemma 7.10 we need to recall some facts from Section 3.4 of [Fri08] regarding Shannon’s algorithm to compute the Perron-Frobenius $\lambda_1(G)$ where $G = \text{VLG}(T, k)$ for a directed graph, $T$ and $k: E^\text{dir}_T \to \mathbb{N}$.

First, if $Z = Z(z)$ is a $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are formal power series in a single indeterminate $z$ with non-negative coefficients, then we easy verify that the following are equal under the assumption that the radius of convergence of each entry of $Z(z)$ is positive:

1. the smallest positive real solution, $z_0 > 0$, of the equation $\det(I - Z(z)) = 0$,
2. the smallest radius of convergence, $z_0 > 0$, among the radii of convergence of the $n^2$ entries of the matrix of power series

$$I + Z(z) + Z^2(z) + \cdots$$

(allowing for $z_0 = \infty$, i.e., $\det(I - Z(z)) = 0$ has no positive real solution and, equivalently, the above matrix power series converging for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$).

Definition 7.11. Let $Z = Z(z)$ be an square matrix whose entries are formal power series in a single indeterminate $z$ with non-negative coefficients, and assume that each entry has a nonzero radius of convergence. We call $1/z_0$ the valence of $Z(z)$ (if $z_0 = \infty$ we say the valence is zero).

If $T$ is a directed graph, (possibly with a countable number of vertices and directed edges) and $k: E^\text{dir}_T \to \mathbb{N}$, we define a square matrix $Z_T(k) = Z_{T,k}(z)$ indexed on $V_T$ and whose entries are formal power series in an indeterminate $z$ whose $v_1, v_2$ entry (with $v_1, v_2 \in V_T$) given by

$$Z_{v_1,v_2} = (Z_T(k))(v_1,v_2) = \sum_{h(e) = v_1, t(e) = v_2} z^{k(e)}.$$ 

Shannon noted that if $T$ is finite, then $\lambda_1(\text{VLG}(T, k))$ is the valence of $Z_{T,k}(z)$.

Shannon’s algorithm is remarkably robust; for example, it generalizes well for $k: E^\text{dir}_T \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and when $E^\text{dir}_T$ is infinite. The situation where $E^\text{dir}_T$ arises naturally, such as when one wishes to “eliminates vertices” in the same way and for the same reason that one eliminates states in a GNFA to produce a regular expression from a finite automaton (see [Sip96], Chapter 1); it also arises when approximating an infinite graph by an equivalent graph with a finite subset of vertices, as we now explain.
An Infinite Version of Shannon’s Algorithm. Let us formally state the infinite version of Shannon’s algorithm needed in \[\text{[Fri08]}\].

**Definition 7.12.** Let $G$ be a possibly infinite directed graph, and $V' \subset V_G$. By the directed suppression of $V'$ in $G$, denoted $G/V'$, we mean the graph $H$ given by

1. $V_H = V_G \setminus V'$;
2. $E^\text{dir}_H$ is the set of (finite length) walks in $G$

$$w = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$$

such that $v_0, v_k \in V_H$, and $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1} \in V'$; we set $h_Hw = v_k$, $t_Hw = v_0$. We define the edge-lengths of $G/V'$ to be the function $E^\text{dir}_{G/V'} \to \mathbb{N}$ taking $w \in E^\text{dir}_{G/V'}$ as above to its length, $k$.

This notion of suppression is akin to the notion of bead suppression used to define homotopy type; however, even if $G$ is finite, $G/V'$ will generally have infinitely many directed edges (unless no element of $E^\text{dir}_G$ traverses a vertex of $V'$ twice).

If $G$ above is the underlying directed graph of a graph with involution $\iota_G$, then $G/V'$ becomes a graph with the evident involution $\iota_H$ taking $w = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ to its reverse walk

$$w^R \overset{\text{def}}{=} (v_k, \iota_G e_k, \ldots, \iota_G e_1, v_0).$$

**Definition 7.13.** For a digraph $G$, we define edge-lengths on $G$ to be any function $\ell: E^\text{dir}_G \to \mathbb{N}$. If $w = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ is a walk in $G$, we define the $\ell$-length of $w$ to be

$$\ell(w) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \ell(e_1) + \cdots + \ell(e_k)$$

(the notation $\ell(w)$ is different from the values, $\ell(e)$, of $\ell$ on $e$ and is unlikely to cause confusion). If, in Definition 7.12, $\ell$ is a set of edge-lengths on $G$, we define the restriction of $\ell$ to $G/V'$ to be the edge-lengths on $G/V'$, i.e., the function $\ell': E_{G/V'}^\text{dir} \to \mathbb{N}$, taking $w = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$ to

$$\ell'(w) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \ell(w) = \ell(e_1) + \cdots + \ell(e_k).$$

It is easy to see that if $G$ is any connected digraph that is the underlying digraph of some graph, and $G$ is endowed with edge-lengths $\ell: E^\text{dir}_G \to \mathbb{N}$, and $V' \subset V_G$ is any proper subset, then for any $v \in V_{G/V'}$, we have that the $v, v$ entry of

$$I + Z_{G/V', \ell}(z) + Z_{G/V', \ell}^2(z) + \cdots$$

is just the sum

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} c_{G, \ell}(v, k) z^k$$

where $c_{G, \ell}(v, k)$, akin to (64), denotes the number of walks, $w$ in $G$ from $v$ to itself of length $k = \ell(w)$.

If the degree of each vertex of $G$ is bounded above, and the values of $\ell$ are bounded above, then it is easy to see that this power series has the same radius of convergence as

$$\sum_{k \text{ even}} c_{G, \ell}(v, k) z^k,$$

and that this radius is independent of $v$ if $G$ is connected. Hence if $G$ is a digraph (with unit edge-lengths $\ell = 1$) that is the underlying digraph of a graph, then (64) implies that this radius of convergence equals $1/\|A_G\|$. Let us formally record this.
fact, since it is fundamental to our methods; it is a sort of “infinite version” of Shannon’s algorithm.

Lemma 7.14. Let $G$ be a connected graph, possibly infinite, with vertex degree bounded from above. Then if $V' \subset G$ is a proper subset, and $k$ are the edge lengths of $G/V'$ (i.e., induced from unit length on $E_G'$) then the valence of $\text{VLG}(G/V', k)$ equals $\|A_G\|$.

7.7. The Curious Theorem of [Fri08]. In this subsection we recall some results from the proof of Theorem 3.13 (the “Curious Theorem”) of [Fri08].

If $T_d$ is the infinite undirected rooted tree each of whose interior node has $d - 1$ children, and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we use $a_k$ to denote the number of walks of length $k$ from the root to itself (which is zero when $k$ is odd), then we set

$$S_d(z) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k$$

which is a power series with non-negative integer coefficients which we easily see is given by (see [Fri08], equation (13) after the statement of Theorem 3.13)

$$S_d(z) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4(d - 1)z^2}}{2},$$

in the sense that we understand

$$\sqrt{1 - 4(d - 1)z^2} = 1 - (1/2)4(d - 1)z^2 + (1/2) \left(4(d - 1)z^2\right)^2 - (1/3) \left(4(d - 1)z^2\right)^3 + \cdots$$

so that $S_d(z) = (d - 1)z^2 + \cdots$ is a power series with non-negative coefficients. Of course, $S_d(z)/(d - 1)$ represents the same series for a rooted tree where the root has one child and each other node has $d - 1$ children.

If $\psi_B$ is a $B$-graph of a $d$-regular graph, then if $D_\psi$ is the diagonal degree counting of $\psi$, then

$$Z(z) = Z_\psi(z) + \frac{S_d(z)}{d - 1} (dI - D_\psi), \quad Z_\psi(z) = zA_\psi$$

is the power series representing Shannon’s algorithm matrix $Z_\psi(z) = zA_\psi$ plus the addition at each $v \in V_\psi$ a series for the number of walks from $v$ to $v$ along an additional $d - \deg(v)$ edges each of which is grown into a $d$-regular tree. Hence the power series in $z$ representing all of walks in $T = \text{Tree}_{\psi_B}(\psi_B)$ from any vertex of $V_\psi$ to another is given by the corresponding entry of

$$I + Z(z) + (Z(z))^2 + \cdots$$

It follows from Theorem 3.10 of [Fri08] (which refers to [Buc86] for a proof) that the valence of $Z(z)$ is the spectral radius of $A_T$. Then an easy computation shows that (67) implies that

$$I - Z(z) = \left(1 - S_d(z)\right)\left(I - yA_\psi + y^2(D_\psi - I)\right), \quad \text{where} \quad y = y(z) = \frac{z}{1 - S_d(z)}.$$


Proof. By the Ihara Determinantal Formula, Theorem 4.1 (or [God93], Exercise 13, page 72), we have that $\mu_1(\psi) = 1/y_0$ where $y_0 > 0$ is the smallest positive root of

$$\det(I - y_0A_\psi + y_0^2(D_\psi - I)).$$
Since \( \mu_1(\psi) > (d-1)^{1/2} \), we have \( y_0 < 1/(d-1)^{1/2} \). According to (68), \( \lambda_1(T_{in}) = 1/z_0 \) where \( z_0 > 0 \) is the radius of convergence at \( z = 0 \) of the power series

\[
(I - Z(z))^{-1} = \left( (1 - S_d(z))(1 - y(z)A_{\psi} + y^2(z)(D_{\psi} - I)) \right)^{-1}
\]

where

\[ y = y(z) = \frac{z}{1 - S_d(z)}. \]

The radius of convergence \( S_d(z) \) is easily seen to be \( z = 1/(2\sqrt{d-1}) \). The radius of convergence of

\[
(I - y(z)A_{\psi} + y^2(z)(D_{\psi} - I))^{-1}
\]

is \( 1/z_0 \), where \( z_0 \) the smallest value of \( z \) where \( y(z) = y_0 = 1/\mu_1(\psi) \), i.e., with

\[
\frac{z}{1 - S_d(z)} = 1/\mu_1 = 1/\mu_1(\psi).
\]

Solving for \( z \) we get

\[
z\mu_1 = 1 - S_d(z) = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4(d-1)z^2}}{2}
\]

where \( \mu_1 = \mu_1(\psi) \), so

\[ 2z\mu_1 - 1 = \sqrt{1 - 4(d-1)z^2} \]

so

\[ 4z^2\mu_1^2 - 4z\mu_1 + 1 = 1 - 4(d-1)z^2 \]

so

\[ z(d - 1 + \mu_1^2) = \mu_1. \]

Hence

\[
1/z_0 = \frac{d - 1}{\mu_1} + \mu_1
\]

which is no smaller than \( 2\sqrt{d-1} \). Hence the radius of convergence of (69) is this \( z_0 \), and hence

\[ \lambda_1(T) = \frac{d - 1}{\mu_1} + \mu_1 \]

where \( \mu_1 = \mu_1(\psi) \).

\section*{7.9. Proof of Lemma 7.1.}

\textit{Proof of Lemma 7.1.} According to Lemma 7.10, \( \lambda \) in (53) is just \( \|A_T\| \). Fix an \( \epsilon > 0 \). According to (65) with \( T_{in} = \text{Tree}_m(\psi_{in}) \), there is a finitely supported \( g \geq 0 \) in \( L^2(V_T) \) such that

\[ \|A_Tg\| \geq (\|A_T\| - \epsilon)\|g\| = (\lambda - \epsilon)\|g\|. \]

Let \( \psi \) be the subgraph of \( T \) induced on the vertices either in support of \( g \) or connected to the support by an edge. Then \( \psi \) is finite and contains both the support of \( g \) and \( A_Tg \); it follows that

\[ \|A_{\psi}g\|_{L^2(V_\psi)} \geq (\lambda - \epsilon)\|g\|_{L^2(V_\psi)}. \]

It follows that if \( f \geq 0 \) is a the Rayleigh quotient maximizer on \( \psi \), then \( R_{A_\psi}(f) \geq R_{A_\psi}(g) \), and hence Lemma 7.5 implies that

\[ A_Tf_T \geq (\lambda - \epsilon)f_T \]

(i.e., pointwise).
Now assume that $G_B$ is a $B$-graph that contains a $B$-subgraph $\psi_B'$ isomorphic to $
abla_B$; there is a covering morphism $\mu: T \to G$ taking $\psi_B$ to $\psi_B'$. Hence Lemma 7.4 implies that
\[ A_G(\mu_* f_T) \geq (\lambda - \epsilon) \mu_* f_T, \]
and hence $\mu_* f_T$ is a finitely supported function on $G$ and (by (54))
\begin{equation}
R_{A_G}(\mu_* f_T) \geq \lambda - \epsilon.
\end{equation}
(70)

Now for $v \in V_B$ let $\mathbb{I}_v: V_B \to \{0, 1\}$ be the Dirac delta function (i.e., indicator function) of $v$. Then for any covering map $\pi: G \to B$ of degree $n$, for $v$ varying over $V_B,$
\[ f_v \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{I}_v \circ \pi/\sqrt{n} \]
are orthonormal functions on $V_G,$ and $\|f\|_\infty = 1/\sqrt{n}$. Of course, the projection of any function onto the subspace orthogonal to all the $f_v$ is a new function on $V_G$ with respect to $\pi: G \to B$; let $p$ be this projection applied to $\mu_* f_T$. In view of Lemma 7.4 we have that if $m(\# V_v)/\sqrt{n} \leq \epsilon$ then
\[ \|p - \mu_* f_T\|_2 \leq \epsilon \|\mu_* f_T\|_2, \]
whereupon Lemma 7.2 implies that
\[ R_{A_G}(p) \geq R_{A_G}(\mu_* f_T) - \epsilon \|A_G\|_2 \geq \lambda - \epsilon - \epsilon d = \lambda - \epsilon(1 + d) \]
Hence some new function has $A_G$ Rayleigh quotient at least $\lambda - \epsilon(1 + d)$, and hence the largest eigenvalue of $A_G$ restricted to the new functions is at least $\lambda - \epsilon(1 + d)$. Replacing $\epsilon$ by $\epsilon/(1 + d)$ we conclude that $A_G$ has a new eigenvalue of at least $\lambda - \epsilon$ for $n$ sufficiently large. \hfill \Box

8. Proofs of Theorems 3.5 and 3.8

In this section we gather the results of Sections 6 and 7 to prove Theorems 3.5 and 3.8.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Since $S$ occurs in $C_B$, some $G \in C_B$ for some $n$ contains $\psi_B$ as a subgraph, and the $B$-graph structure on $S$ endows $S$ with the structure of a $B$-graph, $S_B$, that occurs in $C_B$. Therefore $S_B$ is a $(\nu, < r)$-tangle, which occurs in $C_B$, and hence (Theorem 3.3)
\begin{equation}
\text{Prob}_{G \in C_B}[S_B \cap G \neq \emptyset] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{tangle}}}. \tag{71}
\end{equation}

Applying Lemma 7.1 with $\psi_B = S_B$ we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$, for $n$ sufficiently large, $[S_B] \cap G_B \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., if $G_B$ has a subgraph isomorphic to $S_B$), then $A_G$ has a new eigenvalue at least
\[ \mu_1(S) + \frac{d - 1}{\mu_1(S)} - \epsilon = 2(d - 1)^{1/2} + \epsilon_0 - \epsilon. \]
Taking $\epsilon = \epsilon_0/2$ we have that for some $n_0,$
\begin{equation}
[S_B] \cap G \neq \emptyset \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon_0/2) > 0 \quad \text{provided that } n \geq n_0. \quad \text{ (72)}
\end{equation}

In view of (14), $S$ is a $(\nu, < r)$-tangle, and therefore we have
\begin{equation}
[S_B] \cap G \neq \emptyset \quad \Rightarrow \quad G \in \text{HasTangles}(\nu, < r). \tag{73}
\end{equation}
Combining (71)–(73) implies (15).

To prove (16), we see that the results on the $\tilde{c}_i$ in the asymptotic expression for (12) in Theorem 3.2 implies that for every $\nu$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\Pr_{G \in C_n(B)}[G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)] \leq C(\nu, r)n^{-j}$$

where $j$ is the smallest order of any $(\geq \nu, < r)$ tangle; in view of (14), we have $j = \tau_{\text{tang}}$. This upper bound is also valid for any sub-event of $G$ of the event that $G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)$, and therefore we have (16). \qed

**Proof of Theorem 3.8.** For any $\nu, r, \epsilon, n$ we have

$$f_0(n, \epsilon) = \Pr_{G \in \mathbb{C}_a(B)}\left[\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0\right]$$

is the sum of

$$f_1(\nu, r, n, \epsilon) \triangleq \Pr_{G \in \mathbb{C}_a(B)}\left[(G \in \text{HasTangles}(\geq \nu, < r)) \land (\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0)\right]$$

and

$$f_2(\nu, r, n, \epsilon) \triangleq \Pr_{G \in \mathbb{C}_a(B)}\left[(G \in \text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)) \land (\text{NonAlon}_B(G; \epsilon) > 0)\right]$$

Let us first show that for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small there is a constant $C = C(\epsilon)$ such that

$$(74) \quad f_0(n, \epsilon) \leq C(\epsilon)n^{-\tau_1}.$$  

By definition of $\tau_{\text{tang}}$, there exists a graph $S$ occurring in $\mathbb{C}_a(B)$ with $\text{ord}(S) = \tau_{\text{tang}}$ and $\mu_1(S) > (d - 1)^{1/2}$. Fix any such $S$. By Theorem 3.5 we have

$$(75) \quad f_1(\nu, r, n, \epsilon) \leq C(\nu, r)n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}} \leq C(\nu, r)n^{-\tau_1},$$

where $C = C(\nu, r)$ is independent of $\epsilon$. Next let $\nu_0 > (d - 1)^{1/2}$ be sufficiently small, and $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large so that $\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r) \geq \tau_1$: this is possible if $\tau_{\text{alg}}$ is finite, by the paragraph after below Definition 3.7, and also possible if $\tau_{\text{alg}} = +\infty$ by similar observations, since in this case $\tau_1 = \tau_{\text{tang}}$ is finite. Let $\epsilon_0$ be given by

$$2(d - 1)^{1/2} + \epsilon_0 = \nu_0 + \frac{d - 1}{\nu_0}.$$  

If $0 < \epsilon/2 < \epsilon_0$, then we have

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

with $(d - 1)^{1/2} < \nu' < \nu$; applying apply Theorem 3.6 with $\epsilon'$ set to $\epsilon/2$, and where $\epsilon$ in the theorem is taken to be some number $\leq \epsilon/2$; it follows that for $\tilde{\epsilon}$ between $\epsilon'$ and $\epsilon'/2$ we have

$$(76) \quad f_2(\nu, r, n, \tilde{\epsilon}) \leq Cn^{-\tau_1}.$$  

Adding (75) and (76) we have that for each $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$f_0(n, \epsilon) = f_1(\nu, r, n, \epsilon) + f_2(\nu, r, n, \epsilon) \leq C''n^{-\tau_1},$$

for some $\tilde{\epsilon} \leq \epsilon$ and $C''$. Since $f_0(n, \epsilon)$ is clearly non-increasing in $\epsilon$, we have

$$f_0(n, \epsilon) \leq f_0(n, \tilde{\epsilon}) \leq C''n^{-\tau_1}.$$  

This proves (74).
Next let us show that there is a constant, $C'$, such that $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we have
\begin{equation}
  f_0(n, \epsilon) \geq C' n^{-\tau_2}.
\end{equation}

First consider the case where $\tau_{\text{tang}} = \tau_2$.

In this case, fix a graph $S$ occurring in $C_n(B)$ with $\text{ord}(S) = \tau_{\text{tang}}$ and $\mu_1(S) > (d-1)^{1/2}$. Let $\epsilon_0$ be given by (13), and consider any real $\nu$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that (14) holds. According to Theorem 3.5, for $n$ sufficiently large we have
\[ f_1(\nu, r, n, \epsilon_0 / 2) \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{tang}}} = C' n^{-\tau_2}. \]

Then
\[ f_0(n, \epsilon_0 / 2) \geq f_1(\nu, r, n, \epsilon_0 / 2) \geq C' n^{-\tau_2}, \]
and hence for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 / 2$ we have
\[ f_0(n, \epsilon) \geq f_0(n, \epsilon / 2) \geq C' n^{-\tau_2}, \]
which proves (77).

Next consider the case that $\tau_{\text{tang}} \neq \tau_2$. In this case $\tau_2 = \tau_{\text{alg}} + 1$. Then, as above, by the paragraph after below Definition 3.7, there are $\nu > (d-1)^{1/2}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tau_{\text{alg}}(\nu, r)$ (as in Theorem 3.6) equals $\tau_{\text{alg}}$. Then (17) implies that
\[ \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_\nu(B)}[T_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G)\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon_0 / 2 + \epsilon)] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{alg}}} \]
for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Setting $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_0 / 2 + \epsilon$, we have
\[ \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_\nu(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon_1)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_\nu(B)}[T_{\text{TangleFree}(\geq \nu, < r)}(G)\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon_1)] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{alg}}} \]
for some $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_0 / 2$. Since the number of new eigenvalues of $A_G$ with $G \in C_n(B)$ is $(n-1)(\# C_n(B))$, we have
\[ (n-1)(\# C_n(B))f_2(\nu, r, n, \epsilon_1) \geq \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_\nu(B)}[\text{NonAlon}_d(G; \epsilon_1)] \geq C' n^{-\tau_{\text{alg}}}, \]
and hence for $n > 1$ there is a constant $C''$ such that
\[ f_2(\nu, r, n, \epsilon_1) \geq C'' n^{-\tau_{\text{alg}} - 1} = C'' n^{-\tau_2}. \]

It follows that for any $\epsilon < \epsilon_1$ we have
\[ f_2(n, \epsilon) \geq f_2(\nu, r, n, \epsilon_1) \geq C'' n^{-\tau_2}. \]

This establishes (77) in the case where $\tau_2 = \tau_{\text{alg}} + 1$, and hence (77) in both cases.

\[ \square \]

9. Improved Markov Bounds in Trace Methods

The papers [BS87, Fri91, Fri03, LP10, Pud15] get spectral bounds by applying a Markov type bound to the expected trace of a single power of the adjacency matrix of the random graphs. This contrasts with the Sidestepping Theorem, whose proof involves the expected trace of a number of consecutive powers of random matrices; see Article IV.] It seems to have gone unnoticed until [FK14] that all these papers get better results for regular graphs by working with expected Hashimoto traces as opposed to adjacency traces. In this section we discuss these improvements. The formulas we give demonstrate these improvements, although we have no principle that explains why the Hashimoto matrix approach gives better bounds (or if there could be further improvement using some other “transform” of the adjacency matrix into equivalent spectral information).
In this section we use $\rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$ to denote the spectral radius of $A_G$ restricted to the new functions of a covering map $G \to B$, i.e., the largest absolute value of a new eigenvalue. Since the sum of the $k$-th powers of the eigenvalues of $A_G$ restricted to these new functions equals $\text{Trace}(A_G^k) - \text{Trace}(A_B^k)$, we see that the new eigenvalues of $A_G$, and therefore $\rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G)$, depends only on $G$ and $B$ and not on the particular covering map $G \to B$. We similarly use $\rho_B^{\text{new}}(H_G)$ for the new Hashimoto spectral radius, and similar remarks apply.

9.1. The Adjacency Markov-Type Bound. The papers [BS87, Fri91, Fri03] essentially give an estimate for some fixed $r$ and $\log k \ll \log n$ of the form

\[(78) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(A_G^k) - \text{Trace}(A_B^k)] \leq (n + O(1))\rho(A_B)^k + O(1/n^r)k^{O(1)}\lambda_1(B)^k\]

where $\rho(A_B)$ denotes the spectral radius of the adjacency operator on $\hat{B}$, the universal cover of $B$. Choosing $k$ to be even and to balance the two summands of the right-hand-side of (78) yields a high probability bound of

\[(79) \quad \rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G) \leq \lambda_1(B)^{1/r} \rho(A_B)^{r/(r+1)} + \epsilon\]

for any $\epsilon > 0$.

The papers [BS87, Fri91] do this for $B$ equal to the bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops and achieve (78) for, respectively, $r = 1$ and all $r$ with $2r - 1 < (d - 1)^{1/2}$ (the bound in [BS87] is slightly weaker since their order $n$ term in (78) is larger). For $B$ regular we have

$$\lambda_1(B) = d, \quad \rho(A_B) = 2\sqrt{d - 1};$$

for $r = 2\lfloor (d - 1)^{1/2} + 1 \rfloor$ as in [Fri91], the high probability bound (79) becomes

$$2\sqrt{d - 1} \left(\frac{d}{2\sqrt{d - 1}}\right)^{1/r} + \epsilon = 2\sqrt{d - 1} + (1/2)\log_d d - \log_d(2) + o(1)$$

for large $d$.

9.2. Markov Hashimoto Bounds. The papers [BS87, Fri91] obtain bounds (78) by first estimating expected counts of non-backtracking walks. These methods can be restricted to SNBC walks, giving a bound

\[(80) \quad \mathbb{E}_{G \in C_n(B)}[\text{Trace}(H_G^k) - \text{Trace}(H_B^k)] \leq (d - 1)^{k/2}O(1) + O(1/n^r)C k^C (d - 1)^k\]

for the same values of $r$ as they do in (78). Taking $k$ even and using the fact that all nonreal eigenvalues of $H_G$ have absolute value $(d - 1)^{1/2}$, one gets a high probability bound on the largest new eigenvalue of $H_G$ of

$$\rho_B^{\text{new}}(H_G) \leq (d - 1)^{1/2}(d - 1)^{1/(2r)} + \epsilon,$$

which in view of the Ihara Determinantal Formula corresponds to a high probability eigenvalue bound of

\[(81) \quad \rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G) \leq (d - 1)^{1/2}((d - 1)^{1/(2r)} + (d - 1)^{-1/(2r)}) + \epsilon\]

Curiously this bound, which is based on seemingly equivalent walk estimates, improves the bound (79). For example, for $r$ as in [Fri91], (81) yields a bound of

$$2\sqrt{d - 1} + \frac{(\log_d d)^2}{16d^{l/2}}(1 + o(1))$$

which for large $d$ is a significant improvement.
9.3. **Improvements to [Pud15]**. Doron Puder and the first author [FP] have noted a similar improvement in the new $A_G$ eigenvalue bound for $d$-regular $G$ in [Pud15], again by first converting the expected adjacency trace bounds there to expected Hashimoto trace bounds as above. The bounds in [Pud15] are of the form

$$E_{G \in C_n(d)} [\text{Trace}(A_G^k) - \text{Trace}(A_B^k)] \leq nc_0(k) + \ldots + c_{d-1}(k)/n^{d-1},$$

where each $c_i(k)$ is bounded by roughly $\rho_i^k$ where

$$2\sqrt{d-1} = \rho_1 \leq \rho_2 \leq \cdots \leq \rho_{d-1} = d$$

(see [Pud15], Table 2). Taking $k$ even and to balance the two dominant terms of this estimate gives a new eigenvalue bound of

$$2\sqrt{d-1} + (0.86 \ldots) + \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, converting to expected Hashimoto traces gives the improved bound [FP] of

$$2\sqrt{d-1} + O(d^{-1/2}).$$
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