

# Entropy waves, the zig-zag graph product, and new constant-degree expanders

By OMER REINGOLD, SALIL VADHAN, and AVI WIGDERSON\*

## Abstract

The main contribution of this work is a new type of graph product, which we call the *zig-zag product*. Taking a product of a large graph with a small graph, the resulting graph inherits (roughly) its size from the large one, its degree from the small one, and its expansion properties from both! Iteration yields simple explicit constructions of constant-degree expanders of arbitrary size, starting from one constant-size expander.

Crucial to our intuition (and simple analysis) of the properties of this graph product is the view of expanders as functions which act as “entropy wave” propagators — they transform probability distributions in which entropy is concentrated in one area to distributions where that concentration is dissipated. In these terms, the graph product affords the constructive interference of two such waves.

Subsequent work [ALW01], [MW01] relates the zig-zag product of graphs to the standard semidirect product of groups, leading to new results and constructions on expanding Cayley graphs.

## Contents

1. Introduction
  - 1.1. Expander graphs
  - 1.2. Overview of expander construction
  - 1.3. The zig-zag graph product
  - 1.4. Intuition
  - 1.5. Expanders and extractors
  - 1.6. Extensions to the expander construction
  - 1.7. Subsequent work: Connections with semidirect product in groups
  - 1.8. Organization of the paper

---

\*Part of the research of the first author was performed while visiting the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ. Work of the second author was done while at MIT, supported by an NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship. The third author was partially supported by NSF grants CCR-9987007 and CCR-9987845.

*Key words:* expander graphs, graph products, entropy.

2. Preliminaries
  - 2.1. Graphs and rotations
  - 2.2. Eigenvalues and expansions
  - 2.3. Squaring and tensoring
3. The zig-zag product and the expander construction
  - 3.1. The zig-zag graph product
  - 3.2. The recursion
4. Analysis of the zig-zag product
  - 4.1. The basic eigenvalue bound
  - 4.2. Improved analysis of the eigenvalue
5. The base graph
  - 5.1. The affine plane
  - 5.2. Low-degree polynomials
6. Variants on the zig-zag theme
  - 6.1. A “derandomized” zig-zag product
  - 6.2. The replacement product

## 1. Introduction

1.1. *Expander graphs.* Expanders are graphs which are sparse but nevertheless highly connected. A precise definition will be given in the next section, but here we informally list some properties of such graphs (which are equivalent when formally stated and can serve as alternate definitions)

- The graph satisfies “strong” isoperimetric inequalities.
- Every set of vertices has “many” neighbors.
- Every cut has “many” edges crossing it.
- A random walk on the graph converges quickly to the stationary distribution.

Expander graphs have been used to address many fundamental problems in computer science, on topics including network design (e.g. [Pip87], [PY82], [AKS83]), complexity theory ([Val77], [Sip88], [Urq87]), derandomization ([NN93], [INW94], [IW97]), coding theory ([SS96], [Spi96]), and cryptography ([GILVZ90]). Expander graphs have also found some applications in various areas of pure mathematics [KR83], [Lub94], [Gro00], [LP01].

Standard probabilistic arguments ([Pin73]) show that almost every constant-degree ( $\geq 3$ ) graph is an expander. However, explicit and efficient construction of such graphs (which is required by most of the computer science applications above) seems to be much harder. This problem leads to an exciting and extensive body of research, developed mainly by mathematicians intrigued by this computer science challenge.

Most of this work was guided by the algebraic characterization of expanders, developed in [Tan84], [AM85], [Alo86a]. They showed the intimate relation of (appropriate quantitative versions of) all the properties above to the spectral gap in the adjacency matrix (or, almost equivalently, the Laplacian) of the graph. Using it, expanders can be defined as follows: An infinite family  $G_n$  of  $D$ -regular graphs is an *expander family* if for all  $n$  the second largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of  $G_n$  is bounded *uniformly* from above by the same  $\lambda < D$ . (Note that the degree  $D$  is independent of  $n$ ; this is what we mean by “constant degree.”)<sup>1</sup>

This algebraic definition naturally led researchers to consider algebraic constructions, where this eigenvalue can be estimated. The celebrated sequence of papers [Mar73], [GG81], [AM85], [AGM87], [JM87], [LPS88], [Mar88], [Mor94] provided such constant-degree expanders. All these graphs are very simple to describe: given the name of a vertex (in binary), its neighbors can be computed in polynomial time (or even logarithmic space). This level of explicitness is essential for many of the applications. However, the analysis bounding the eigenvalue is quite sophisticated (and often based on deep mathematical results). Thus, it is hard to intuitively understand why these graphs are expanders.

A deviation from this path was taken in [Ajt94], where a combinatorial construction of cubic expanders was proposed. It starts with an arbitrary cubic  $N$ -vertex graph and applies a sequence of polynomially many local operations which gradually increase the girth and turn it into an expander. However, the resulting graphs do not have any simply described form, and they lack the explicitness level (and hence applicability) of the algebraic constructions mentioned above.

In this work, we give a simple, combinatorial construction of constant-degree expander graphs. Moreover, the analysis proving expansion (via the second eigenvalue) is as simple and follows a clear intuition. The construction is iterative, and needs as a basic building block a *single, almost arbitrary* expander of constant size. The parameters required from it can be easily obtained explicitly, but exhaustive search is an equally good solution since it requires only constant time. Simple operations applied to this graph generate another whose size is increased but whose degree and expansion remain unchanged. This process continues, yielding arbitrarily large expanders.

---

<sup>1</sup>On an intuitive level, the connection between the spectral gap and the combinatorial and probabilistic properties of expanders listed above should not be surprising. For example, it is well known that the standard random walk on the graph converges exponentially with base  $\lambda/D$  to the stationary uniform distribution. Moreover, equal partitions of the vertices of a graph, thought of as  $\pm 1$ -vectors, are orthogonal to the uniform distribution, and so the bilinear form representing the number of edges in the cut can be bounded in terms of the gap between  $D$  and  $\lambda$ .

The heart of the iteration is our new “zig-zag” graph product. Informally, taking a product of a large graph with a small graph, the resulting graph inherits (roughly) its size from the large one, its degree from the small one, and its expansion properties from both! (That is, the composed graph has good expansion properties as long as the two original graphs have good expansion properties.)

In the next subsections we give high level descriptions of the iterative construction, the new graph product, the intuition behind it, various extensions. We then mention subsequent work on the relation of the zig-zag product in graphs to the semidirect product in groups and its applications to expanding Cayley graphs.

**1.2. Overview of expander construction.** In this section, we describe a simplified, but less efficient, version of our expander construction and omit formal proofs. Our full construction is described in detail in Section 3. Throughout this section, all graphs are regular, undirected, and may have loops and parallel edges. The *adjacency matrix* of an  $N$ -vertex graph  $G$  is the matrix  $M$  whose  $(u, v)^{\text{th}}$  entry is the number of edges between vertices  $u$  and  $v$ . If the graph is  $D$ -regular, then the *normalized adjacency matrix* is simply  $M/D$ . Note that this stochastic matrix is the transition probability matrix of the natural random walk on  $G$ , every step of which moves a “token” from a current vertex along a uniformly chosen edge to a neighboring vertex. It is easy to see that this matrix has an eigenvalue of 1, corresponding to the constant eigenvector, and it turns out that all other eigenvalues have absolute value less than 1. Our primary interest will be the second largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue (which is known to govern the convergence rate of the random walk, and as mentioned above is the essence of expansion).

Thus, three essential parameters play a role in an expander — size, degree and expansion. We classify graphs accordingly.

**Definition 1.1.** An  $(N, D, \lambda)$ -graph is any  $D$ -regular graph on  $N$  vertices, whose normalized adjacency matrix has second largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue at most  $\lambda$ .

The basic operations. We use two operations on (the adjacency matrices of) graphs — the standard matrix squaring, and our new zig-zag graph product. Here is their effect on these three parameters.

**SQUARING:** Let  $G^2$  denote the square of  $G$ . Then

**Fact 1.2.**  $(n, d, \lambda)^2 \rightarrow (n, d^2, \lambda^2)$ .

**THE ZIG-ZAG PRODUCT:** Let  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  denote the new graph product of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . Then

**THEOREM 1.3.**  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1) \circledast (D_1, D_2, \lambda_2) \rightarrow (N_1 \cdot D_1, D_2^2, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2).$

(The eigenvalue bound of  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2$  is improved somewhat in Sections 3 and 4.)

*The iterations.* Let  $H$  be any  $(D^4, D, 1/5)$ -graph, which will serve as the building block for our construction. We define a sequence of graphs  $G_i$  as follows.

- $G_1 = H^2,$
- $G_{i+1} = G_i^2 \circledast H.$

From Fact 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 above, it is easy to conclude that this sequence is indeed an infinite family of expanders:

**THEOREM 1.4.** *For every  $i$ ,  $G_i$  is an  $(N_i, D^2, 2/5)$ -graph with  $N_i = D^{4i}$ .*

This construction is not as efficient as we would like — computing neighborhoods in  $G_i$  takes time polynomial in  $N_i$  rather than polynomial in  $\log N_i$ . As we show in Section 3, this is easily overcome by augmenting the iterations with another standard graph operation.

**1.3. The zig-zag graph product.** The new product mentioned above takes a large graph and a small one, and produces a graph that (roughly speaking) inherits the size of the large one but the degree of the small one. This was the key to creating arbitrarily large graphs with bounded degrees. Naturally, we are concerned with maintaining the expansion properties of the two graphs. First, we describe the product.

For simplicity, we assume that the edges in our  $D$ -regular graphs are  $D$ -colored; that is, they are partitioned to  $D$  perfect matchings. (This assumption loses generality, and we will remove it in the formal construction in §2.) For a color  $i \in [D]$  and a vertex  $v$  let  $v[i]$  be the neighbor of  $v$  along the edge colored  $i$ . With this simple notation, we can formally define the zig-zag product  $\circledast$  (and then explain it).

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $G_1$  be an  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  and  $G_2$  a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$ . Then  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is a  $D_2^2$ -regular graph on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  defined as follows: For all  $v \in [N_1], k \in [D_1], i, j \in [D_2]$ , the edge  $(i, j)$  connects the vertex  $(v, k)$  to the vertex  $(v[k[i]], k[i][j])$ .

What is going on? Note that the size of the small graph  $G_2$  is the degree of the large graph  $G_1$ . Thus a vertex name in  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  has a first component which is a vertex of the large graph, and a second which is viewed both as a vertex of the small graph *and* an edge color of the large one. The edge label in  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is just a pair of edge labels in the small graph. One step in the

new product graph from a vertex  $(v, k)$  along the edge  $(i, j)$  can be broken into three substeps.

1.  $(v, k) \rightarrow (v, k[i])$  — A step (“zig”) in the small graph moving  $k$  to  $k[i]$ . This affects only the second component, according to the first edge label.
2.  $(v, k[i]) \rightarrow (v[k[i]], k[i])$  — A step in the large graph, changing the first component according to the second, viewed as an edge color.
3.  $(v[k[i]], k[i]) \rightarrow (v[k[i]], k[i][j])$  — A step (“zag”) in the small graph moving  $k[i]$  to  $k[i][j]$ . This affects only the second component, according to the second edge label.

1.4. *Intuition.* Why does it work? More precisely, why does Theorem 1.3 hold? What this theorem says intuitively, is that  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is a good expander as long as both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are good expanders. Consider the above three steps as a random walk on  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ . Then Steps 1 and 3 are independent random steps on the small graph. If at least one of them “works” as well as it does in the small graph, then this would guarantee that the new graph is as good an expander as the small one. So let us argue (very intuitively) that indeed one of them “works.”

A random step in an expander increases the ( $H_2$ -) entropy of a distribution on the vertices, *provided that it is not already too close to uniform*. Let us consider a distribution on the vertices of the new graph  $(v, k)$ . Roughly speaking, there are two cases.

- If the distribution of the second component  $k$  (conditioned on  $v$ ) is not too uniform, then Step 1 “works.” Since Step 2 is just a permutation and Step 3 is a random step on a regular graph, these steps cannot make the distribution less uniform and undo the progress made in Step 1.
- If  $k$  (conditioned on  $v$ ) is very close to uniform, then Step 1 is a “waste.” However, Step 2 is then like a real random step in the large expander  $G_1$ ! This means that the entropy of the first component  $v$  increases. Note that Step 2 is a permutation on the vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ , so if entropy increases in the first component, it decreases in the second. That means that in Step 3 we are in the good case (the conditional distribution on the second component is far from uniform), and the entropy of the second component will increase by the expansion of the small graph.

The key to this product is that Step 2 is simultaneously a permutation (so that any progress made in Step 1 is preserved) and an operation whose “projection” to the first component is simply a random step on the large graph (when the second component is random). All previous discussions of expanders focused on the increase of entropy to the vertex distribution by a step along a

random edge. We insist on keeping track of that edge name, and consider the joint distribution! In a good expander, if the edge is indeed random, the entropy propagates from it to the vertex. This reduces the (conditional) entropy in the edge. Thus the “entropy wave” in Step 2, in which no fresh randomness enters the distribution on vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ , is what facilitates entropy increase in Steps 1 or 3. Either the “zig” step does it, if there is room for more entropy in  $k$ , or if not (which may be viewed as destructive interference of the large and small waves in Step 1), Step 2 guarantees constructive interference in Step 3. Moreover, Step 1 is not redundant as, if there is no or little initial entropy in  $k$ , the wave of Step 2 (being a permutation) may flood  $k$  with entropy, destroying the effect of Step 3.

The formal proof of Theorem 1.3 follows this intuition quite closely, and separately analyzes these two extreme cases. Indeed, since it becomes linear algebra, these two cases are very natural to define, and the only ones to worry about — all intermediate cases follow by linearity! Moreover, the variational definition of the second eigenvalue better captures the symmetry of the zig and zag steps (and gives a better bound than what can be obtained from this asymmetric intuition).

**1.5. Expanders and extractors.** Here we attempt an intuitive explanation of how we stumbled on the definition of the zig-zag product, and the intuition that it does what it should. While this subsection may not be self-contained, it will at least lead the interested reader to discover more of the fascinating world of extractors.

The current paper is part of research described in our conference paper [RVW00] which deals with constructions of both expanders and extractors. Extractors are combinatorial objects, defined by [NZ96], which, roughly speaking, “purify” arbitrary nonuniform probability distributions into uniform ones. These objects are as fascinating and as applicable as expanders (see, e.g., the survey papers [Nis96], [NT99]). Like expanders, their applications demand explicit construction. Like with expanders, the quest for such constructions has been extremely fruitful and illuminating for complexity theory. Unlike expanders, the construction of optimal extractors is still a challenge, although the best existing ones are quite close to optimal (see the current state of the art, as well as a survey of previous constructions, in [RSW00], [Tuz01]).

Expander graphs were ingredients in some previous extractor constructions (as extractors may be viewed as graphs as well). Here the situation is reversed. The expander construction of this paper *followed* our discovery of nearly optimal *high min-entropy* extractors, which handle the “purification” of distributions which are already not too far from being uniform. A key idea in approaching optimality (following [RR99]) was preserving the unused entropy in a random step on an extractor. This lead to a (more complex) type of zig-zag

product, and from it, iterative constructions of such extractors. Translating this idea to the expander world turned out to be cleaner and more natural than in the extractor world. It led to our understanding of the role of the edge-name as a keeper of the unused entropy in a step of a standard random walk, and to the zig-zag product defined above.

**1.6. Extensions to the expander construction.** The list below details the extensions and refinements we obtain to the basic expander construction outlined above. All these will be part of the formal sections which follow.

*More explicit graphs.* As mentioned above, this construction is not as efficient as we would like — computing neighborhoods in  $G_i$  takes time polynomial in  $N_i$  rather than in  $\log N_i$ . As we show in Section 3, this is easily overcome by augmenting the iterations with another standard graph operation, namely taking tensor powers of the adjacency matrix.

*Describing graphs by “rotation maps.”* Another explicitness problem in the simple construction above is the assumption that the our  $D$ -regular graphs are given together with a proper  $D$ -coloring of the edges. This property is not preserved by the zig-zag product. To avoid it, we describe graphs more generally by their “rotation maps,” and show how this description is explicitly preserved by all graph operations in our construction.

*Smaller degree.* A naive and direct implementation of our graph product yields expanders whose degree is reasonable, but not that small (something under 1000). In Section 3.2, we show how to combine this construction, together with *one, constant-size cycle*, to obtain an infinite family of explicit degree 4 expanders. Again, this combination uses the zig-zag product. In fact, using the replacement product described below, we obtain explicit degree 3 expanders (which is the smallest possible).

*Choice of the base graph.* Our expander construction requires an initial “constant size” base graph  $H$  as a building block. While exhaustive search can be used to find such an  $H$  (since it is constant size), for completeness we include two elementary explicit constructions (from [Alo86b, AR94]) which can be used instead.

*Better degree vs. eigenvalue relation.* The best relationship between degree and second largest eigenvalue is obtained by *Ramanujan* graphs, in which the second eigenvalue is  $2\sqrt{D-1}/D$ . This equals the first eigenvalue of the  $D$ -regular infinite tree, and it is known that no finite  $D$ -regular graph can have a smaller second largest eigenvalue (cf., [Alo86a], [LPS88], [Nil91]). Remarkable graphs achieving this optimal bound were first constructed independently by [LPS88] (who coined the term Ramanujan graphs) and by [Mar88].

Our constructions do not achieve this tight relationship. The zig-zag product, applied recursively to one fixed Ramanujan graph, will yield  $D$ -regular expanders of second largest eigenvalue  $O(1/D^{1/4})$ . A “partially derandomized” variant of our zig-zag product, given in Section 6, improves this relation and achieves second eigenvalue  $O(1/D^{1/3})$ .

*A simpler product.* Perhaps the most natural way to combine  $G_1$  with  $G_2$  when the size of  $G_2$  is the degree of  $G_1$  is simply replace every vertex of  $G_1$  with a copy of  $G_2$  in the natural way, keeping the edges of both graphs. This *replacement product*, which was often used for degree-reduction purposes (e.g., when  $G_2$  is a cycle the resulting graph has degree 3) turns out to enjoy similar properties of the zig-zag product: if both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are expanders, then so is their replacement product. Moreover, the proof is by a reduction — the zig-zag product is a subgraph of the cube ( $3^{\text{rd}}$  power) of the replacement product, immediately giving an eigenvalue bound.

**1.7. Subsequent work: Connections with semidirect product in groups.** Subsequent to this work, it was shown in [ALW01] that the zig-zag (and replacement) products can be viewed as a generalization of the standard semidirect product of groups. This was used in [ALW01] to construct a family of groups which is expanding with one (constant size) set of generators, but is not expanding with another such set. The connection was further developed in [MW01] to produce new families of expanding Cayley graphs, via bounds on the number of irreducible representations of different dimensions in terms of the expansion.

**1.8. Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we give preliminary definitions and basic facts. In Section 3, we define the zig-zag graph product, describe the construction of expanders, and state their properties. In particular, it deals with the first four “extensions” listed in the previous subsection. In Section 4, we analyze the expansion of the zig-zag product. In Section 5, we discuss some ways to obtain the base graph used in our expander construction. In Section 6, we give two extensions to the basic zig-zag product. The first is a “derandomized” variant of our basic zig-zag product, which enjoys a better relationship between the degree and the expansion. The second is the simple, natural *replacement* product.

## 2. Preliminaries

**2.1. Graphs and rotations.** All graphs we discuss may have self-loops and parallel edges. They are best described by their (nonnegative, integral) adjacency matrix. Such a graph is *undirected* if and only if the adjacency matrix is symmetric. It is  $D$ -*regular* if the sum of entries in each row (and column) is  $D$  (so exactly  $D$  edges are incident to every vertex).

Let  $G$  be a  $D$ -regular undirected graph on  $N$  vertices. Suppose that the edges leaving each vertex of  $G$  are labeled from 1 to  $D$  in some arbitrary, but fixed, way. Then for  $v, w \in [N]$  and  $i \in [D]$ , it makes sense (and is standard) to say “the  $i^{\text{th}}$  neighbor of vertex  $v$  is  $w$ .” In this work, we make a point to always keep track of the edge traversed to get from  $v$  to  $w$ . This is formalized as follows:

*Definition 2.1.* For a  $D$ -regular undirected graph  $G$ , the *rotation map*  $\text{Rot}_G : [N] \times [D] \rightarrow [N] \times [D]$  is defined as follows:  $\text{Rot}_G(v, i) = (w, j)$  if the  $i^{\text{th}}$  edge incident to  $v$  leads to  $w$ , and this edge is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  edge incident to  $w$ .

This definition enables us to remove the simplifying assumption made in the introduction, which was that the label of an edge is the same from the perspective of both endpoints, i.e.  $\text{Rot}_G(v, i) = (w, j) \Rightarrow i = j$ . From Definition 2.1, it is clear that  $\text{Rot}_G$  is a permutation, and moreover  $\text{Rot}_G \circ \text{Rot}_G$  is the identity map.

We will always view graphs as being specified by their rotation maps. Hence we call a family  $\mathcal{G}$  of graphs *explicit* if for every  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\text{Rot}_G$  is computable in time  $\text{poly}(\log N)$ , where  $N$  is the number of vertices of  $G$ . That is, graphs in  $\mathcal{G}$  are indexed by some parameters (such as the number of vertices and the degree, which may be required to satisfy some additional relations) and there should be a single algorithm which efficiently computes  $\text{Rot}_G$  for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  when given these parameters as an additional input. The notation  $\text{poly}()$  stands for a fixed (but unspecified) polynomial function in the given variables. We will often informally refer to an individual graph as explicit, as shorthand for saying that the graph comes from an explicit family.

Our constructions will be iterative (or recursive), and will be based on a sequence of composition operations, constructing new graphs from given ones. The definition of these compositions (or products) will show how the rotation map of the new graph can be computed using “oracle access” to the rotation maps of the given graphs. (By giving an algorithm “oracle access” to a function  $f$ , we mean that the algorithm is given power to evaluate  $f$  on inputs of its choice at the cost of one time step per evaluation.) Given the time complexity of such a computation *and* the number of oracle calls made, it will be easy to compute the total time required by a recursive construction.

**2.2. Eigenvalues and expansions.** The *normalized adjacency matrix*  $M$  of  $G$  is the adjacency matrix of  $G$  divided by  $D$ . In terms of the rotation map, we have:

$$M_{u,v} = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \left| \{(i, j) \in [D]^2 : \text{Rot}_G(u, i) = (v, j)\} \right|.$$

$M$  is simply the transition matrix of a random walk on  $G$ . By the  $D$ -regularity of  $G$ , the all-1’s vector  $1_N = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is an eigenvector of  $M$  of

eigenvalue 1. It turns out that all the other eigenvalues of  $M$  have absolute value at most 1, and it is well known that the second largest eigenvalue of  $G$  is a good measure of  $G$ 's expansion properties [Tan84], [AM85], [Alo86a]. We will use the following variational characterization of the second largest eigenvalue.

*Definition 2.2.*  $\lambda(G)$  denotes the *second largest eigenvalue* (in absolute value) of  $G$ 's normalized adjacency matrix. Equivalently,

$$\lambda(G) = \max_{\alpha \perp 1_N} \frac{|\langle \alpha, M\alpha \rangle|}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} = \max_{\alpha \perp 1_N} \frac{\|M\alpha\|}{\|\alpha\|}.$$

Above,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  refers to the standard inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\|\alpha\| = \sqrt{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ .

The meaning of  $\lambda(G)$  can be understood as follows: Suppose  $\pi \in [0, 1]^N$  is a probability distribution on the vertices of  $G$ . By linear algebra,  $\pi$  can be decomposed as  $\pi = u_N + \pi^\perp$ , where  $u_N = 1_N/N$  is the uniform distribution and  $\pi^\perp \perp u_N$ . Then  $M\pi = u_N + M\pi^\perp$  is the probability distribution on vertices obtained by selecting a vertex  $v$  according to  $\pi$  and then moving to a uniformly selected neighbor of  $v$ . By Definition 2.2,  $\|M\pi^\perp\| \leq \lambda(G) \cdot \|\pi^\perp\|$ . Thus  $\lambda(G)$  is a measure of how quickly the random walk on  $G$  converges to the uniform distribution. Intuitively, the smaller  $\lambda(G)$  is, the better the expansion properties of  $G$ . Accordingly, an (infinite) family  $\mathcal{G}$  of graphs is called a family of *expanders* if these eigenvalues are bounded away from 1, i.e. there is a constant  $\lambda < 1$  such that  $\lambda(G) \leq \lambda$  for all  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . It was shown by Tanner [Tan84] and Alon and Milman [AM85] that this implies (and is in fact equivalent to [Alo86a]) the standard notion of *vertex expansion*: there is a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for every  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  and for any set  $S$  of at most half the vertices in  $G$ , at least  $(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |S|$  vertices of  $G$  are connected to some vertex in  $S$ .

As mentioned in the introduction, we refer to a  $D$ -regular undirected graph  $G$  on  $N$  vertices such that  $\lambda(G) \leq \lambda$  as an  $(N, D, \lambda)$ -graph. Clearly, achieving expansion is easier as the degree gets larger. The main goal in constructing expanders is to minimize the degree, and, more generally, obtain the best degree-expansion tradeoff. Using the probabilistic method, Pinsker [Pin73] showed that most 3-regular graphs are expanders (in the sense of vertex expansion), and this result was extended to eigenvalue bounds in [Alo86a], [BS87], [FKS89], [Fri91]. The best-known bound on the eigenvalues of random graphs is due to Friedman [Fri91], who showed that most  $D$ -regular graphs have second largest eigenvalue at most  $2/\sqrt{D} + O((\log D)/D)$  (for even  $D$ ). In fact, the bound of  $2\sqrt{D-1}/D$  is the best possible for an infinite family of graphs, as shown by Alon and Boppana (cf. [Alo86a], [LPS88], [Nil91]). Graphs whose second largest eigenvalue meets this optimal bound are called *Ramanujan graphs*. It is easy to verify that this value is the *largest* eigenvalue of the random walk on the *infinite*  $D$ -regular tree.

While these probabilistic arguments provide strong existential results, applications of expanders in computer science often require *explicit* families of constant-degree expanders. The first such construction was given by Margulis [Mar73], with improvements and simplifications by Gabber and Galil [GG81], Jimbo and Maruoka [JM87], Alon and Milman [AM85], and Alon, Galil, and Milman [AGM87]. Explicit families of Ramanujan graphs were first constructed by Lubotzky, Phillips, and Sarnak [LPS88] and Margulis [Mar88], with more recent constructions given by Morgenstern [Mor94]. The best eigenvalues we know how to achieve using our approach are  $O(1/D^{1/3})$ .

**2.3. Squaring and tensoring.** In addition to the new zig-zag product, our expander construction makes use of two standard operations on graphs — squaring and tensoring. Here we describe these operations in terms of rotation maps and state their effects on the eigenvalues.

Let  $G$  be a  $D$ -regular multigraph on  $[N]$  given by rotation map  $\text{Rot}_G$ . The  $t^{\text{th}}$  power of  $G$  is the  $D^t$ -regular graph  $G^t$  whose rotation map is given by  $\text{Rot}_{G^t}(v_0, (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_t)) = (v_t, (\ell_t, \ell_{t-1}, \dots, \ell_1))$ , where these values are computed via the rule  $(v_i, \ell_i) = \text{Rot}_G(v_{i-1}, k_i)$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** *If  $G$  is an  $(N, D, \lambda)$ -graph, then  $G^t$  is an  $(N, D^t, \lambda^t)$ -graph. Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G^t}$  is computable in time  $\text{poly}(\log N, \log D, t)$  with  $t$  oracle queries to  $\text{Rot}_G$ .*

*Proof.* The normalized adjacency matrix of  $G^t$  is the  $t^{\text{th}}$  power of the normalized adjacency matrix of  $G$ , so all the eigenvalues also get raised to the  $t^{\text{th}}$  power.  $\square$

Let  $G_1$  be a  $D_1$ -regular multigraph on  $[N_1]$  and let  $G_2$  be a  $D_2$ -regular multigraph on  $[N_2]$ . Define the *tensor product*  $G_1 \otimes G_2$  to be the  $D_1 \cdot D_2$ -regular multigraph on  $[N_1] \times [N_2]$  given by  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \otimes G_2}((v, w), (i, j)) = ((v', w'), (i', j'))$ , where  $(v', i') = \text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, i)$  and  $(w', j') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(w, j)$ . In order to analyze this construction (and our new graph product), we need some concepts from linear algebra. For vectors  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$ , their *tensor product* is the vector  $\alpha \otimes \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \cdot N_2}$  whose  $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$  entry is  $\alpha_i \cdot \beta_j$ . If  $A$  is an  $N_1 \times N_1$  matrix and  $B$  is an  $N_2 \times N_2$  matrix, then there is a unique  $N_1 N_2 \times N_1 N_2$  matrix  $A \otimes B$  (again called the *tensor product*) such that  $(A \otimes B)(\alpha \otimes \beta) = (A\alpha) \otimes (B\beta)$  for all  $\alpha, \beta$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.4.** *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is an  $(N_2, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \otimes G_2$  is an  $(N_1 \cdot N_2, D_1 \cdot D_2, \max(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))$ -graph. Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \otimes G_2}$  is computable in time  $\text{poly}(\log N_1 N_2, \log D_1 D_2)$  with one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .*

*Proof.* The normalized adjacency matrix of  $G_1 \otimes G_2$  is the tensor product of the normalized adjacency matrices of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . Hence its eigenvalues are the pairwise products of eigenvalues of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . The largest eigenvalue is  $1 \cdot 1$ , and the second largest eigenvalue is either  $1 \cdot \lambda_2$  or  $\lambda_1 \cdot 1$ .  $\square$

### 3. The zig-zag product and the expander construction

In the introduction, we described how to obtain a family of expanders by iterating two operations on graphs — squaring and the new “zig-zag” product. That description used a simplifying assumption about the edge labeling. In terms of rotation maps, the assumption was that  $\text{Rot}(v, i) = (w, j) \Rightarrow i = j$ . In this section, we describe the construction in terms of arbitrary rotation maps and prove its properties. The expander construction given here will also use tensoring to improve the efficiency to polylogarithmic in the number of vertices. This deals with the first two items in the “extensions” subsection of the introduction, which are summarized in Theorem 3.2. The third item, obtaining expanders of degree 4, will follow in Corollary 3.4. The analysis of the zig-zag product is deferred to the following section.

**3.1. The zig-zag graph product.** We begin by describing the new graph product in terms of rotation maps. Let  $G_1$  be a  $D_1$ -regular multigraph on  $[N_1]$  and  $G_2$  a  $D_2$ -regular multigraph on  $[D_1]$ . Their *zig-zag product* is a  $D_2^2$ -regular multigraph  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$ . We view every vertex  $v$  of  $G_1$  as being blown up to a “cloud” of  $D_1$  vertices  $(v, 1), \dots, (v, D_1)$ , one for each edge of  $G_1$  leaving  $v$ . Thus for every edge  $e = (v, w)$  of  $G_1$ , there are two associated vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  —  $(v, k)$  and  $(w, \ell)$ , where  $e$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$  edge leaving  $v$  and the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  edge leaving  $w$ . Note that these pairs satisfy the relation  $(w, \ell) = \text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k)$ . Since  $G_2$  is a graph on  $[D_1]$ , we can also imagine connecting the vertices of each such cloud using the edges of  $G_2$ . Now, the edges of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  are defined (informally) as follows: we connect two vertices  $(v, k)$  and  $(w, \ell)$  if it is possible to get from  $(v, k)$  to  $(w, \ell)$  by a sequence of moves of the following form:

1. Move to a neighboring vertex  $(v, k')$  within the initial cloud (using an edge of  $G_2$ ),
2. Jump across clouds (using edge  $k'$  of  $G_1$ ) to get to  $(w, \ell')$ ,
3. Move to a neighboring vertex  $(w, \ell')$  within the new cloud (using an edge of  $G_2$ ).

To make this precise, we describe how to compute the  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast G_2}$  given  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .

*Definition 3.1.* If  $G_1$  is a  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and  $G_2$  is a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ , then their *zig-zag product*  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is defined to be the  $D_2^2$ -regular graph on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  whose rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast G_2}$  is as follows:

$\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast G_2}((v, k), (i, j))$ :

1. Let  $(k', i') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(k, i)$ ,
2. Let  $(w, \ell') = \text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k')$ ,
3. Let  $(\ell, j') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(\ell', j)$ ,
4. Output  $((w, \ell), (j', i'))$ .

The important feature of this graph product is that  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is a good expander if both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are, as shown by the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.2.** *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is a  $(D_1, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is a  $(N_1 \cdot D_1, D_2^2, f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))$ -graph, where  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2$  and  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < 1$  when  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 1$ . Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast G_2}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log N, \log D_1, \log D_2)$  with one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and two oracle queries to  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .*

Stronger bounds on the function  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  are given in Section 4. Before proving Theorem 3.2, we show how it can be used to construct an infinite family of constant-degree expanders starting from a constant-size expander.

**3.2. The recursion.** The construction is like the construction in the introduction, except that we use tensoring to reduce the depth of the recursion and thereby make the construction run in polylogarithmic time (in the size of the graph).

Let  $H$  be a  $(D^8, D, \lambda)$ -graph for some  $D$  and  $\lambda$ . (Various methods for obtaining such an  $H$  are described in §5.) For every  $t \geq 1$ , we will define a  $(D^{8t}, D^2, \lambda_t)$ -graph  $G_t$ .  $G_1$  is  $H^2$  and  $G_2$  is  $H \otimes H$ . For  $t > 2$ ,  $G_t$  is recursively defined by

$$G_t = \left( G_{\lceil \frac{t-1}{2} \rceil} \otimes G_{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{2} \rfloor} \right)^2 \circledast H.$$

**THEOREM 3.3.** *For every  $t \geq 0$ ,  $G_t$  is an  $(D^{8t}, D^2, \lambda_t)$ -graph with  $\lambda_t = \lambda + O(\lambda^2)$ . Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_t}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(t, \log D)$  with  $\text{poly}(t)$  oracle queries to  $\text{Rot}_H$ .*

*Proof.* A straightforward induction establishes that the number of vertices in  $G_t$  is  $D^{8t}$  and that its degree is  $D^2$ . To analyze the eigenvalues, define  $\mu_t = \max\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_t\}$ . Then we have  $\mu_t \leq \max\{\mu_{t-1}, \mu_{t-1}^2 + \lambda + \lambda^2\}$  for all

$t \geq 2$ . Solving this recurrence gives  $\mu_t \leq \lambda + O(\lambda^2)$  for all  $t$ . For the efficiency, note that the depth of the recursion is at most  $\log_2 t$  and evaluating the rotation maps for  $G_t$  requires 4 evaluations of rotation maps for smaller graphs, so the total number of recursive calls is at most  $4^{\log_2 t} = t^2$ .  $\square$

In order for Theorem 3.3 to guarantee that graphs  $\{G_t\}$  are expanders, the second largest eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of the building block  $H$  must be sufficiently small (say,  $\lambda \leq 1/5$ ). This forces the degree of  $H$  and hence the degree of the expander family to be rather large, though still constant. However, by zig-zagging the family  $\{G_t\}$  with a cycle, we can obtain a family of degree 4 expanders. More generally, we can use this method convert any family of odd-degree expanders into a family of degree 4 expanders:

**COROLLARY 3.4.** *For every  $\lambda < 1$  and every odd  $D$ , there exists a  $\lambda' < 1$  such that if  $G$  is an  $(N, D, \lambda)$ -graph and  $C$  is the cycle on  $D$  vertices, then  $G \circledast C$  is a  $(ND, 4, \lambda')$ -graph.*

*Proof.* As with any connected and nonbipartite graph,  $\lambda(C)$  is strictly less than 1 for an odd cycle  $C$  (though  $\lambda(C) \rightarrow 1$  as  $D \rightarrow \infty$ ). Thus, the corollary follows from Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

#### 4. Analysis of the zig-zag product

This section has two subsections. In the first, we give the basic (suboptimal) bound of Theorem 3.2. This bound uses only the intuitive ideas of the introduction, and suffices for the construction of the previous section. In the next, we state and prove a tighter eigenvalue bound. It uses extra information about the zig-zag product (which is less intuitive). It also gives more information about the worst interplay between the two extreme cases studied in the basic analysis, and may hopefully shed a bit of light on the structure of the eigenvectors of the zig-zag product.

**4.1. The basic eigenvalue bound.** Now we prove Theorem 3.2. Recall the intuition behind the zig-zag product. We aim to show that for any (nonuniform) initial probability distribution  $\pi$  on the vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ , taking a random step on  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  results in a distribution that is more uniform. We argued this intuitively in the introduction, by considering two extreme cases, based on the conditional distributions induced by  $\pi$  on the  $N_1$  “clouds” of  $D_1$  vertices each: one in which these conditional distributions are far from uniform, and the second in which they are uniform. The actual linear algebra proof below will restrict itself to these two cases by decomposing any other vector into a linear combination of the two. Also, the argument in the introduction

was not symmetric in the first and second steps on the small graph. Using the variational definition of the second largest eigenvalue, we get a cleaner analysis than by following that intuition directly.

Let  $M$  be the normalized adjacency matrix of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ . According to Definition 2.2, we must show that, for every vector  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \cdot D_1}$  such that  $\alpha \perp 1_{N_1 D_1}$ ,  $|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle|$  is smaller than  $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle$  by a factor  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ . For intuition,  $\alpha$  should be thought of as the nonuniform component of the probability distribution  $\pi$  referred to above, i.e.  $\pi = u_{N_1 D_1} + \alpha$ , where  $u_{N_1 D_1} = 1_{N_1 D_1} / N_1 D_1$  is the uniform distribution on  $[N_1 D_1]$ . Thus, we are showing that  $\pi$  becomes more uniform after a random step on  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ .

For every  $v \in [N_1]$ , define  $\alpha_v \in \mathbb{R}^{D_1}$  by  $(\alpha_v)_k = \alpha_{vk}$ . Also define a (linear) map  $C : \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \cdot D_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$  by  $(C\alpha)_v = \sum_{k=1}^{D_1} \alpha_{vk}$ . Thus, for a probability distribution  $\pi$  on the vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ ,  $\pi_v$  is a multiple of the conditional distribution on “cloud  $v$ ” and  $C\pi$  gives the marginal distribution on set of clouds. By definition,  $\alpha = \sum_v e_v \otimes \alpha_v$ , where  $e_v$  denotes the  $v^{\text{th}}$  standard basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{N_1}$ . By basic linear algebra, every  $\alpha_v$  can be decomposed (uniquely) into  $\alpha_v = \alpha_v^{\parallel} + \alpha_v^{\perp}$  where  $\alpha_v^{\parallel}$  is parallel to  $1_{D_1}$  (i.e., all of its entries are the same) and  $\alpha_v^{\perp}$  is orthogonal to  $1_{D_1}$  (i.e., the sum of its entries are 0). Thus, we obtain a decomposition of  $\alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \sum_v e_v \otimes \alpha_v \\ &= \sum_v e_v \otimes \alpha_v^{\parallel} + \sum_v e_v \otimes \alpha_v^{\perp} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha^{\parallel} + \alpha^{\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition corresponds to the two cases in our intuition:  $\alpha^{\parallel}$  corresponds to a probability distribution on the vertices of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  such that the conditional distributions on the clouds are all uniform.  $\alpha^{\perp}$  corresponds to a distribution such that the conditional distributions on the clouds are all far from uniform. Another way of matching  $\alpha^{\parallel}$  with the intuition is to note that  $\alpha^{\parallel} = C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1} / D_1$ . Since  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha^{\perp}$  are both orthogonal to  $1_{N_1 D_1}$ , so is  $\alpha^{\parallel}$  and hence also  $C\alpha$  is orthogonal to  $1_{N_1}$ .

To analyze how  $M$  acts on these two vectors, we relate  $M$  to the normalized adjacency matrices of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , which we denote by  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. First, we decompose  $M$  into the product of three matrices, corresponding to the three steps in the definition of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ ’s edges. Let  $\tilde{B}$  be the (normalized) adjacency matrix of the graph on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  where we connect the vertices within each cloud according to the edges of  $G_2$ .  $\tilde{B}$  is related to  $B$  by the relation  $\tilde{B} = I_{N_1} \otimes B$ , where  $I_{N_1}$  is the  $N_1 \times N_1$  identity matrix. Let  $\tilde{A}$  be the permutation matrix corresponding to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$ . The relationship between  $\tilde{A}$  and  $A$  is somewhat subtle, so we postpone describing it until later.

By the definition of  $G_1 \circledast G_2$ , we have  $M = \tilde{B} \tilde{A} \tilde{B}$ . Note that both  $\tilde{B}$  and  $\tilde{A}$  are symmetric matrices, due to the undirectedness of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

Recall that we want to bound  $|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| / \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ . By the symmetry of  $\tilde{B}$ ,

$$(1) \quad \langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle = \langle \tilde{B} \tilde{A} \tilde{B} \alpha, \alpha \rangle = \langle \tilde{A} \tilde{B} \alpha, \tilde{B} \alpha \rangle.$$

Now note that  $\tilde{B}\alpha^{\parallel} = \alpha^{\parallel}$ , because  $\alpha^{\parallel} = C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1}/D_1$ ,  $\tilde{B} = I_{N_1} \otimes B$ , and  $B1_{D_1} = 1_{D_1}$ . This corresponds to the fact that if the conditional distribution within each cloud is uniform, then taking a random  $G_2$ -step does nothing. Hence,  $\tilde{B}\alpha = \tilde{B}(\alpha^{\parallel} + \alpha^{\perp}) = \alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}$ . Substituting this into (1), we have

$$(2) \quad \langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle = \langle \tilde{A}(\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}), \alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp} \rangle.$$

Expanding and using the fact that  $\tilde{A}$  is length-preserving (because it is a permutation matrix), we have

$$(3) \quad |\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| |\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle| + 2\|\alpha^{\parallel}\| \cdot \|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\| + \|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\|^2.$$

Now we apply the expansion properties of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  to bound each of these terms. First, we bound  $\|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\|$ , which corresponds to the intuition that when the conditional distributions within the clouds are far from uniform, they become more uniform when we take a random  $G_2$ -step.

*Claim 4.1.*  $\|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\| \leq \lambda_2 \cdot \|\alpha^{\perp}\|$ .

*Proof of claim.*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp} &= \tilde{B} \left( \sum_v e_v \otimes \alpha_v^{\perp} \right) \\ &= \sum_v e_v \otimes B\alpha_v^{\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

By the expansion of  $G_2$ ,  $\|B\alpha_v^{\perp}\| \leq \lambda_2 \cdot \|\alpha_v^{\perp}\|$  for all  $v$ . Hence,  $\|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\| \leq \lambda_2 \cdot \|\alpha^{\perp}\|$ .  $\square$

Next, we bound  $|\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle|$ , which corresponds to the intuition that when the conditional distribution within each cloud is uniform, the jump between the clouds makes the marginal distribution on clouds themselves more uniform.

*Claim 4.2.*  $|\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle| \leq \lambda_1 \cdot \langle \alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle$ .

*Proof of claim.* To prove this, we must first relate  $\tilde{A}$  to  $A$ . Recall that when  $k$  is uniformly distributed,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k)$  gives a pair  $(w, \ell)$  where  $w$  is a uniformly selected neighbor of  $v$ . Similarly, if  $e_v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$  is the  $v^{\text{th}}$  standard basis vector, then  $Ae_v$  gives the uniform distribution over the neighbors of  $v$ . This similarity is captured by the formula  $C\tilde{A}(e_v \otimes 1_{D_1}/D_1) = Ae_v$  for all  $v$ . (Tensoring  $e_v$  with  $1_{D_1}/D_1$  corresponds to taking the uniform distribution

over  $k$  and applying  $C$  corresponds to discarding  $\ell$  and looking just at  $w$ .) Because the  $e_v$ 's form a basis, this formula extends to all vectors  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$ :  $C\tilde{A}(\beta \otimes 1_{D_1}/D_1) = A\beta$ . Applying this formula to  $\alpha^{\parallel} = C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1}/D_1$ , we have  $C\tilde{A}(\alpha^{\parallel}) = AC\alpha$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle &= \langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1} \rangle / D_1 \\ &= \langle C\tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, C\alpha \rangle / D_1 \\ &= \langle AC\alpha, C\alpha \rangle / D_1.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $C\alpha$  is orthogonal to  $1_{N_1}$ , we may apply the expansion of  $G_1$  to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle| &\leq \lambda_1 \cdot \langle C\alpha, C\alpha \rangle / D_1 \\ &= \lambda_1 \cdot \langle C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1}, C\alpha \otimes 1_{D_1} \rangle / D_1^2 \\ &= \lambda_1 \cdot \langle \alpha^{\parallel}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle.\end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Substituting the bounds of Claim 4.1 and 4.2 into (3), we have:

$$(4) \quad |\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| \leq \lambda_1 \cdot \|\alpha^{\parallel}\|^2 + 2\lambda_2 \cdot \|\alpha^{\parallel}\| \cdot \|\alpha^{\perp}\| + \lambda_2^2 \cdot \|\alpha^{\perp}\|^2.$$

If we let  $p = \|\alpha^{\parallel}\|/\|\alpha\|$  and  $q = \|\alpha^{\perp}\|/\|\alpha\|$ , then  $p^2 + q^2 = 1$ , and the above expression can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle|}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \leq \lambda_1 \cdot p^2 + 2\lambda_2 \cdot pq + \lambda_2^2 \cdot q^2 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2.$$

This shows that we can take  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2$ . It remains to show that we can set  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < 1$  as long as  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 1$ . We consider two cases, depending on the length of  $\|\alpha^{\perp}\|$ . First, suppose that  $\|\alpha^{\perp}\| \leq \frac{1-\lambda_1}{3\lambda_2} \cdot \|\alpha\|$ . Then, from (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| &\leq \lambda_1 \cdot \|\alpha\|^2 + 2\lambda_2 \cdot \left( \frac{1-\lambda_1}{3\lambda_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &\quad + \lambda_2^2 \cdot \left( \frac{1-\lambda_1}{3\lambda_2} \right)^2 \|\alpha\|^2 < \left( 1 - \frac{1-\lambda_1}{9} \right) \cdot \|\alpha\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $\|\alpha^{\perp}\| > \frac{1-\lambda_1}{3\lambda_2} \cdot \|\alpha\|$ . Notice that  $\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}$  is orthogonal to  $\alpha^{\parallel}$ :  $\langle \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle = \langle \alpha^{\perp}, \tilde{B}\alpha^{\parallel} \rangle = \langle \alpha^{\perp}, \alpha^{\parallel} \rangle = 0$ . Using this, we can bound (2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| &= |\langle \tilde{A}(\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}), \alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp} \rangle| \leq \|\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\|^2 = \|\alpha^{\parallel}\|^2 + \|\tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\alpha\|^2 - \|\alpha^{\perp}\|^2 + \lambda_2^2 \cdot \|\alpha^{\perp}\|^2 \leq \|\alpha\|^2 - (1 - \lambda_2^2) \cdot \left( \frac{1-\lambda_1}{3\lambda_2} \right)^2 \cdot \|\alpha\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can take

$$f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq 1 - \min \left\{ \frac{1-\lambda_1}{9}, \frac{(1-\lambda_1)^2 \cdot (1-\lambda_2^2)}{9\lambda_2^2} \right\} < 1.$$

4.2. *Improved analysis of the eigenvalue.* In this subsection we state and prove an improved upper bound on the second largest eigenvalue produced by the zig-zag product.

**THEOREM 4.3** (Thm. 3.2, improved). *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is a  $(D_1, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \circledast G_2$  is a  $(N_1 \cdot D_1, D_2^2, f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))$ -graph, where*

$$f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda_2^2)\lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1 - \lambda_2^2)^2\lambda_1^2 + 4\lambda_2^2}.$$

Although the function  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  looks ugly, it can be verified that it has the following nice properties:

1.  $f(\lambda, 0) = f(0, \lambda) = \lambda$  and  $f(\lambda, 1) = f(1, \lambda) = 1$  for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .
2.  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  is a strictly increasing function of both  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  (except when one of them is 1).
3. If  $\lambda_1 < 1$  and  $\lambda_2 < 1$ , then  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < 1$ .
4.  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$  for all  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds along the same lines as the proof of Theorem 3.2, except that we will use a geometric argument to directly bound (2) rather than first passing to (3). That is, we must bound (using the same notation as in that proof)

$$\frac{\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} = \frac{\langle \tilde{A}(\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}), \alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp} \rangle}{\|\alpha^{\parallel} + \alpha^{\perp}\|^2}.$$

The key observation is:

*Claim 4.4.*  $\tilde{A}$  is a reflection through a linear subspace  $S$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{N_1 D_1}$ . Hence, for any vector  $v$ ,  $\langle \tilde{A}v, v \rangle = (\cos 2\theta) \cdot \|v\|^2$ , where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $v$  and  $S$ .

*Proof of claim.* By the symmetry of  $\tilde{A}$ , we can decompose  $\mathbb{R}^{N_1 D_1}$  into the sum of orthogonal eigenspaces of  $\tilde{A}$ . Since  $\tilde{A}^2 = I_{N_1 D_1}$ , the only eigenvalues of  $\tilde{A}$  are  $\pm 1$ . Take  $S$  to be the 1-eigenspace of  $\tilde{A}$ .  $\square$

Thus, the expression we want to bound is

$$\frac{|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle|}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} = |\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\|\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}\|^2}{\|\alpha^{\parallel} + \alpha^{\perp}\|^2} = |\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'},$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}$  and  $S$ ,  $\phi \in [0, \pi/2]$  is the angle between  $\alpha^{\parallel}$  and  $\alpha^{\parallel} + \alpha^{\perp}$ , and  $\phi' \in [0, \pi/2]$  is the angle between  $\alpha^{\parallel}$  and  $\alpha^{\parallel} + \tilde{B}\alpha^{\perp}$ .

If we also let  $\psi$  be the angle between  $\alpha^\parallel$  and  $S$ , then we clearly have  $\theta \in [\psi - \phi', \psi + \phi']$ .

Now we translate Claims 4.1 and 4.2 into this geometric language. Claim 4.1 constrains the relationship between  $\phi'$  and  $\phi$  by

$$\frac{\tan \phi'}{\tan \phi} = \frac{\|\tilde{B}\alpha^\perp\|}{\|\alpha^\perp\|} \leq \lambda_2.$$

Claim 4.2 says  $|\cos 2\psi| \leq \lambda_1$ . For notational convenience, we will denote the exact values of  $(\tan \phi')/(\tan \phi)$  and  $|\cos 2\psi|$  by  $\mu_2$  and  $\mu_1$ , respectively. We will work with these values until the end of the proof, at which point we will upper bound them by  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_1$ .

To summarize, we want to maximize

$$(5) \quad |\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'}$$

over the variables  $\theta, \phi, \phi'$ , and  $\psi$ , subject to the following constraints:

1.  $\phi, \phi', \psi \in [0, \pi/2]$ .
2.  $\theta \in [\psi - \phi', \psi + \phi']$ .<sup>2</sup>
3.  $\tan \phi'/\tan \phi = \mu_2$ .
4.  $|\cos 2\psi| = \mu_1$ .

There are two cases, depending on whether  $|\cos 2x|$  ever achieves the value 1 in the interval  $[\psi - \phi', \psi + \phi']$ .

*Case I.*  $\phi' \leq \min\{\psi, \pi/2 - \psi\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\cos 2\theta| &= \max\{|\cos 2(\psi + \phi')|, |\cos 2(\psi - \phi')|\} \\ &= |\cos 2\psi \cdot \cos 2\phi'| + |\sin 2\psi \cdot \sin 2\phi'|. \end{aligned}$$

After some trigonometric manipulations, we have

$$|\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'} = \frac{1}{2} \left| (1 - \mu_2^2) \cos 2\psi + (1 + \mu_2^2) \cos 2\psi \cos 2\phi' \right| + \frac{1}{2} |2\mu_2 \sin 2\psi \sin 2\phi'|.$$

The choice of  $\phi$  which maximizes this is to have  $(\cos 2\phi, \sin 2\phi)$  be a unit vector in the direction of  $(\pm(1 + \mu_2^2)\cos 2\psi, 2\mu_2 \sin 2\psi)$ ; thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'} &\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \mu_2^2)|\cos 2\psi| + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1 + \mu_2^2)^2 \cos^2 2\psi + 4\mu_2^2 \sin^2 2\psi} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \mu_2^2)\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1 + \mu_2^2)^2 \mu_1^2 + 4\mu_2^2(1 - \mu_1^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>We do not require  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$  so that we do not have to worry about “wraparound” in the interval  $[\psi - \phi', \psi + \phi']$ . Adding a multiple of  $\pi/2$  to  $\theta$  does not change the value of (5).

*Case II.*  $\phi' > \min\{\psi, \pi/2 - \psi\}$ . In this case, we cannot obtain any nontrivial bound on  $|\cos 2\theta|$ , so, after some trigonometric manipulations, the problem is reduced to bounding:

$$(6) \quad |\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'} \leq \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'} = \mu_2^2 + (1 - \mu_2^2) \cos^2 \phi.$$

The condition  $\phi' > \min\{\psi, \pi/2 - \psi\}$  implies that  $\cos 2\phi' < |\cos 2\psi| = \mu_1$ . After some trigonometric manipulations, we have

$$\cos 2\phi' = \frac{(1 + \mu_2^2) \cos^2 \phi - \mu_2^2}{(1 - \mu_2^2) \cos^2 \phi + \mu_2^2},$$

and the condition  $\cos 2\phi' < \mu_1$  is equivalent to

$$\cos^2 \phi < \frac{\mu_2^2(1 + \mu_1)}{(1 - \mu_1) + \mu_2^2(1 + \mu_1)}.$$

Substituting this into (6) and simplifying, we conclude that

$$|\cos 2\theta| \cdot \frac{\cos^2 \phi}{\cos^2 \phi'} < \frac{2\mu_2^2}{1 - \mu_1 + \mu_2^2(1 + \mu_1)}.$$

It can be verified that the bound obtained in Case I is an increasing function of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  and is always greater than or equal to the bound in Case II. Therefore, replacing  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  by  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  in the Case I bound proves the theorem.  $\square$

## 5. The base graph

Our construction of an infinite family of expanders in Section 3.2 requires starting with a  $(D^8, D, \lambda)$ -graph  $H$  (for a sufficiently small  $\lambda$ , say  $\leq 1/5$ ). Since  $D$  is a “constant,” such a graph can be found by exhaustive search (given that one exists, which can be proven by (nontrivial) probabilistic arguments [Alo86a], [BS87], [FKS89], [Fri91]). However, for these parameters, there are simple explicit constructions known. We describe two of them below. The first is simpler and more intuitive, but the second yields better parameters.

**5.1. The affine plane.** The first construction is based on the “projective plane” construction of Alon [Alo86b], but we instead use the affine plane in order to make  $N$  exactly  $D^2$  and then use the zig-zag product to obtain a graph with  $N = D^8$ . For a prime power  $q = p^t$ , let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field of size  $q$ ; an explicit representation of such a field can be found deterministically in time  $\text{poly}(p, t)$  [Sho90]. We define a graph  $\text{AP}_q$  with vertex set  $\mathbb{F}_q^2$ , and edge set  $\{((a, b), (c, d)) : ac = b + d\}$ . That is, we connect the vertex  $(a, b)$  to all points on the line  $L_{a,b} = \{(x, y) : y = ax - b\}$ . (Note that we have chosen the sign of  $b$  to make the graph undirected.)

LEMMA 5.1.  $\text{AP}_q$  is an  $(q^2, q, 1/\sqrt{q})$ -graph. Moreover, a rotation map for  $\text{AP}_q$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log q)$  given a representation of the field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

*Proof.* The expansion of  $\text{AP}_q$  will follow from the fact the square of  $\text{AP}_q$  is almost the complete graph, which in turn is based on the fact that almost all pairs of lines in the plane  $\mathbb{F}_q^2$  intersect. Let  $M$  be the  $q^2 \times q^2$  normalized adjacency matrix of  $\text{AP}_q$ ; we will now calculate the entries of  $M^2$ . The entry of  $M^2$  in row  $(a, b)$  and column  $(a', b')$  is exactly the number of common neighbors of  $(a, b)$  and  $(a', b')$  in  $\text{AP}_q$  divided by  $q^2$ , i.e.,  $|L_{a,b} \cap L_{a',b'}|/q^2$ . If  $a \neq a'$ , then  $L_{a,b}$  and  $L_{a',b'}$  intersect in exactly one point. If  $a = a'$  and  $b \neq b'$ , then their intersection is empty, and if  $a = a'$  and  $b = b'$ , then their intersection is of size  $q$ . Thus, if we let  $I_q$  denote the  $q \times q$  identity matrix and  $J_q$  the  $q \times q$  all-1's matrix, we have

$$M^2 = \frac{1}{q^2} \begin{pmatrix} qI_q & J_q & \cdots & J_q \\ J_q & qI_q & & J_q \\ \vdots & & \ddots & J_q \\ J_q & J_q & \cdots & qI_q \end{pmatrix} = \frac{I_q \otimes qI_q + (J_q - I_q) \otimes J_q}{q^2}.$$

Now we can calculate the eigenvalues explicitly.  $J_q$  has eigenvalues  $q$  (multiplicity 1) and 0 (multiplicity  $q-1$ ). So  $(J_q - I_q) \otimes J_q$  has eigenvalues  $(q-1) \cdot q$ ,  $-1 \cdot q$ , and 0. Adding  $I_q \otimes qI_q$  increases all these eigenvalues by  $q$ , and then we divide by  $q^2$ . Hence the eigenvalues of  $M^2$  are 1 (multiplicity 1), 0 (multiplicity  $q-1$ ), and  $1/q$  (multiplicity  $(q-1) \cdot q$ ). Therefore, the second largest eigenvalue of  $M$  has absolute value  $1/\sqrt{q}$ .

A rotation map for  $\text{AP}_q$  is given by

$$\text{Rot}_q((a, b), t) = \begin{cases} ((t/a, t-b), t) & \text{if } a \neq 0 \text{ and } t \neq 0, \\ ((t, -b), a) & \text{if } a = 0 \text{ or } t = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $a, b, t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ .  $\square$

Now, define the following graphs inductively:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AP}_q^1 &= \text{AP}_q \otimes \text{AP}_q \\ \text{AP}_q^{i+1} &= \text{AP}_q^i \oslash \text{AP}_q. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 3.2, we immediately deduce:

PROPOSITION 5.2.  $\text{AP}_q^i$  is a  $(q^{2(i+1)}, q^2, O(i/\sqrt{q}))$ -graph.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, a rotation map for  $\text{AP}_q^i$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(i, \log q)$  given a representation of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>The hidden constant in  $O(i/\sqrt{q})$  can be reduced to 1 using the improved analysis of the zig-zag product in Theorem 4.3.

Taking  $i = 7$  and a sufficiently large  $q$  gives a graph suitable for the expander construction in Section 3.2.

**5.2. Low-degree polynomials.** The graphs we describe here are derived from constructions of Alon and Roichman [AR94], which are Cayley graphs derived from the generator matrix of an error-correcting code. In order to give a self-contained presentation, we specialize the construction to a Reed-Solomon code concatenated with a Hadamard code (as used in, e.g. [AGHP92]).

For a prime power  $q$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define a graph  $\text{LD}_{q,d}$  on vertex set  $\mathbb{F}_q^{d+1}$  with degree  $q^2$ . For a vertex  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^{d+1}$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , the  $(x, y)^{\text{th}}$  neighbor of  $a$  is  $a + (y, yx, yx^2, \dots, yx^d)$ .

**PROPOSITION 5.3.**  *$\text{LD}_{q,d}$  is a  $(q^{d+1}, q^2, d/q)$ -graph. Moreover, a rotation map for  $\text{LD}_{q,d}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log q, d)$  given a representation of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .*

As above, taking  $d = 7$  and sufficiently large  $q$  gives a graph suitable for our expander construction. These graphs are better than those of Proposition 5.2 because the eigenvalue-degree relationship is the optimal  $\lambda = O(1/\sqrt{D})$  (as  $q$  grows), which implies an eigenvalue of  $O(1/D^{1/4})$  for the family constructed in Theorem 3.3.

*Proof.* To simplify notation, let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $M$  be the  $q^{d+1} \times q^{d+1}$  normalized adjacency matrix of  $\text{LD}_{q,d}$ . We view vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^{q^{d+1}}$  as functions  $f : \mathbb{F}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . We will now explicitly describe the eigenvectors of  $M$ . Let  $p$  be the characteristic of  $\mathbb{F}$ , let  $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/p}$  be a primitive  $p^{\text{th}}$  root of unity, and let  $L : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$  be any surjective  $\mathbb{F}_p$ -linear map. (For simplicity, one can think of the special case that  $p = q$  and  $L$  is the identity map.)

For every sequence  $a = (a_0, \dots, a_d) \in \mathbb{F}^{d+1}$ , define the function  $\chi_a : \mathbb{F}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $\chi_a(b) = \zeta^{L(\sum a_i b_i)}$ . Clearly,  $\chi_a(b+c) = \chi_a(b)\chi_a(c)$  for any  $b, c \in \mathbb{F}^{d+1}$ . Moreover, it can be verified that the  $\{\chi_a\}$  are orthogonal under the standard inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_b f(b)g(b)^*$ , and thus form a basis for  $\mathbb{C}^{q^{d+1}}$ . Hence, if we show that each  $\chi_a$  is an eigenvector of  $M$ , then they are all the eigenvectors of  $M$ . This can be done by direct calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} (M\chi_a)(b) &= \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{c \in \mathbb{F}^{d+1}} M_{bc} \cdot \chi_a(c) \\ &= \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{F}} \chi_a(b + (y, yx, \dots, yx^d)) \\ &= \left( \frac{\sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{F}} \chi_a(y, yx, \dots, yx^d)}{q^2} \right) \cdot \chi_a(b) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda_a \cdot \chi_a(b). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\chi_a$  is an eigenvector of  $M$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_a$  and all eigenvectors of  $M$  are of this form. So we simply need to show that  $|\lambda_a| \leq d/q$  for all but one  $a \in \mathbb{F}^{d+1}$ . To do this, note that

$$\lambda_a = \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{F}} \chi_a((y, yx, \dots, yx^d)) = \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{F}} \zeta^{L(y \cdot p_a(x))},$$

where  $p_a(x)$  is the polynomial  $a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_dx^d$ . When  $x$  is a root of  $p_a$ , then  $\zeta^{L(y \cdot p_a(x))} = 1$  for all  $y$ ; hence  $x$  contributes  $q/q^2 = 1/q$  to  $\lambda_a$ . When  $x$  is not a root of  $p_a(x)$ ,  $yp_a(x)$  takes on all values in  $\mathbb{F}$  as  $y$  varies, and hence  $\zeta^{L(y \cdot p_a(x))}$  varies uniformly over all  $p^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity. Since the sum of all  $p^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity is 0, these  $x$ 's contribute nothing to  $\lambda_a$ . When  $a \neq 0$ ,  $p_a$  has at most  $d$  roots, so  $|\lambda_a| \leq d/q$ .  $\square$

## 6. Variants on the zig-zag theme

The two subsections of this section contain two variants of the basic zig-zag product. The first is aimed at improving the relation between the degree and the eigenvalue bound. The second is aimed at simplifying the product, at the cost of deteriorating this relationship.

**6.1. A “derandomized” zig-zag product.** In this section we provide a variant of our original zig-zag product, which achieves a better relationship between the degree and the expansion of the resulting graph. The term “derandomized” will become clearer when we define it.

Recall that the optimal second-largest eigenvalue for an infinite family of  $D$ -regular graphs is  $\Theta(1/D^{1/2})$ , and families of graphs meeting this bound (with the right constant) are referred to as Ramanujan. A basic question is how close can we come to this optimal bound using our techniques. Starting with a constant-size Ramanujan graph (or the graphs of §5.2), our basic construction of Theorem 3.3 achieves a second-largest eigenvalue of  $O(1/D^{1/4})$  for the family of expanders generated..

Here, we define a variant of the zig-zag product, which makes more efficient use of the expansion of the small graph. Using the new product in our iterative construction (of §3.2) with an initial constant-size Ramanujan graph or even the graphs of Proposition 5.3, we obtain a second-largest eigenvalue of  $O(1/D^{1/3})$  for the family of expanders generated. It is an interesting open problem to construct families of graphs achieving the optimal eigenvalue  $O(1/D^{1/2})$  using a similar graph product.

We now turn to the formal definition of the new zig-zag product. It will have two “zig” moves and two “zag” moves, but they will not be independent. The second “zig” and the first “zag” will use the same random bits!

*Definition 6.1.* Let  $G_1$  be a  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and let  $G_2$  be a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ . Suppose that for every  $i \in [D_2]$ ,  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}(\cdot, i)$  induces a permutation on  $[D_1]$ .<sup>4</sup> Then the *modified zig-zag product* of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is defined to be the  $D_2^3$ -regular graph  $G_1 \circledast' G_2$  on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  whose rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast' G_2}$  is as follows:

$\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast' G_2}((v, k), (h, i, j))$ :

1. Let  $(k', h') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(k, h)$ .
2. Let  $(k'', i') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(k', i)$ .
3. Let  $(w, \ell'') = \text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k'')$ .
4. Find the unique  $\ell' \in [D_1]$  such that  $(\ell'', i'') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(\ell', i)$  for some  $i''$ . ( $\ell'$  exists by the assumption on  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .)
5. Let  $(\ell, j') = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(\ell', j)$ .
6. Output  $((w, \ell), (j', i, h'))$ .

Again, in this graph product we do *two* random steps on the small graph in both the zig and the zag parts. However, to save random bits (i.e., decrease the degree) we use *the same* random bits for the second move of the zig part and the first move of the zag part. Thus the degree of the new graph is  $D_2^3$ . However, we will show that the bound on the eigenvalue will be as if these moves were independent. This proof will follow the lines of the basic analysis of the original zig-zag product.

**THEOREM 6.2.** *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is a  $(D_1, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \circledast' G_2$  is a  $(N_1 \cdot D_1, D_2^3, \lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2^2)$ -graph. Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledast' G_2}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log N, \log D_1, D_2)$  with one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and  $D_2 + 2$  oracle queries to  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .*

*Proof.* We use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Like there, we need to bound  $|\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle|/\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ , where  $M$  is the normalized adjacency matrix of  $G_1 \circledast' G_2$  and  $\alpha \perp 1_{N_1 D_1}$ . Let  $B_i$  be the  $D_1 \times D_1$  permutation matrix induced by  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}(\cdot, i)$ , and let  $\tilde{B}_i = I_{N_1} \otimes B_i$ . Then

$$\tilde{B} = \frac{1}{D_2} \sum_{i=1}^{D_2} \tilde{B}_i.$$

---

<sup>4</sup>By this we mean that the function  $f_i(x) = \text{“the first component of } \text{Rot}_{G_2}(x, i)\text{”} = \text{“the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ neighbor of } x\text{”}$  is a permutation for every  $i$ .

Note that the normalized adjacency matrix corresponding to Steps 2–4 in the definition of  $G_1 \circledast' G_2$  is given by

$$M' = \frac{1}{D_2} \sum_i \tilde{B}_i \tilde{A} \tilde{B}_i^T,$$

where  $\tilde{B}_i^T$  is the transpose (equivalently, inverse) of  $\tilde{B}_i$ . Thus,  $M = \tilde{B} M' \tilde{B}$ . The main observation is that not only does  $\tilde{B}\alpha^\parallel = \alpha^\parallel$  (as we used in the original analysis), but also  $\tilde{B}_i^T \alpha^\parallel = \alpha^\parallel$  for every  $i$  (because  $B_i$  is a permutation matrix). Hence,

$$M'\alpha^\parallel = \frac{1}{D_2} \sum_i \tilde{B}_i \tilde{A} \tilde{B}_i^T \alpha^\parallel = \frac{1}{D_2} \sum_i \tilde{B}_i \tilde{A} \alpha^\parallel = \tilde{B} \tilde{A} \alpha^\parallel.$$

Applying this (and the symmetry of  $\tilde{B}$  and  $M'$ ), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle &= \langle M\alpha^\parallel, \alpha^\parallel \rangle + 2\langle M\alpha^\parallel, \alpha^\perp \rangle + \langle M\alpha^\perp, \alpha^\perp \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{A}\alpha^\parallel, \alpha^\parallel \rangle + 2\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^\parallel, \tilde{B}^2\alpha^\perp \rangle + \langle M'\tilde{B}\alpha^\perp, \tilde{B}\alpha^\perp \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Being the normalized adjacency matrix of an undirected, regular graph,  $M'$  has no eigenvalues larger than 1 and hence does not increase the length of any vector. Using this together with Claims 4.1 and 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle M\alpha, \alpha \rangle| &\leq |\langle \tilde{A}\alpha^\parallel, \alpha^\parallel \rangle| + 2\|\alpha^\parallel\| \cdot \|\tilde{B}^2\alpha^\perp\| + \|\tilde{B}\alpha^\perp\|^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_1 \cdot \|\alpha^\parallel\|^2 + 2\lambda_2^2 \cdot \|\alpha^\parallel\| \cdot \|\alpha^\perp\| + \lambda_2^2 \cdot \|\alpha^\perp\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, using the fact that  $\|\alpha^\parallel\|^2 + \|\alpha^\perp\|^2 = \|\alpha\|^2$  yields the desired bound.  $\square$

**6.2. The replacement product.** In this section, we describe an extremely simple and intuitive graph product, which shares similar properties to the zig-zag product. Namely, when taking the product of two expanders, we get a larger expander whose degree depends only on that of the smaller graph. Here simplicity is the important feature, and the expansion quality is not as good as above. This product is so natural that it was used in various contexts before. Indeed, Gromov [Gro83] even estimates the second eigenvalue of an iterated replacement product of the graph of the Boolean hypercube with smaller copies of itself. (Of course, in this very special case the outcome is not expanding, since the cube is not.) Our proof of its expansion will be a simple reduction to the expansion properties of the zig-zag product. However, one can also prove it directly in a manner similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2 (and thereby obtain a stronger bound).

Assume (as in the basic zig-zag product) that  $G_1$  is a  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  and  $G_2$  is a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$ . A natural idea is to place a “copy” (or “cloud”) of  $G_2$  around each vertex of  $G_1$ , maintaining the edges of both. More precisely, every vertex will be connected to all its original neighbors

in its cloud, as well as to one vertex in the neighboring cloud it defines. For example, if  $G_1$  is the  $n$ -dimensional Boolean cube graph, and  $G_2$  is the cycle on  $n$  vertices, then the resulting graph is the so-called *cube connected cycle*, which used to be a popular architecture for parallel computers. Note that in this example the small graph had degree 2, and the product graph had degree 3. In general, the resulting graph would have degree  $D_2 + 1$ . In terms of rotation maps, this product is defined as follows.

*Definition 6.3.* If  $G_1$  is a  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and  $G_2$  is a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ , then their *replacement product*  $G_1 \circledcirc G_2$  is defined to be the  $(D_2 + 1)$ -regular graph on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  whose rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledcirc G_2}$  is as follows:

$\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledcirc G_2}((v, k), i)$ :

1. If  $i \leq D_2$ , let  $(m, j) = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(k, i)$  and output  $((v, m), j)$ .
2. If  $i = D_2 + 1$ , output  $(\text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k), i)$ .

The expansion properties of the replacement product are given in the next theorem, relating it to those of the zig-zag product.

**THEOREM 6.4.** *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is a  $(D_1, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \circledcirc G_2$  is a  $(N_1 \cdot D_1, D_2 + 1, g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, D_2))$ -graph, where (using the function  $f$  from Theorems 3.2 or 4.3)*

$$g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, D_2) \leq (p + (1 - p)f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))^{1/3},$$

and  $p = D_2^2/(D_2 + 1)^3$ . In particular,  $g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, D_2) < 1$  when  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 1$ . Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledcirc G_2}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log N, \log D_1, \log D_2)$  with one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  or  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .

*Proof.* The idea of the proof is that the graph of the zig-zag product is a regular subgraph of the cube of the graph of the replacement product. Let  $M$  denote the normalized adjacency matrix of  $G_1 \circledcirc G_2$ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we let  $A, B$  respectively denote the normalized adjacency matrices of  $G_1, G_2$ , and define their “liftings”  $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}$  in the same way. By inspection, we have  $M = (\tilde{A} + D_2 \tilde{B})/(D_2 + 1)$ . The key observation is that

$$M^3 = \frac{(\tilde{A} + D_2 \tilde{B})^3}{(D_2 + 1)^3} = p \tilde{B} \tilde{A} \tilde{B} + (1 - p)C,$$

where  $\tilde{B} \tilde{A} \tilde{B}$  is the normalized adjacency matrix of  $G_1 \circledcirc G_2$ ,  $C$  is the normalized adjacency matrix of an undirected, regular graph (and in particular does not increase the length of any vector), and  $p = D_2^2/(D_2 + 1)^3$ . As eigenvalues of powers of matrices are the respective powers of the original eigenvalues (see Proposition 2.3), we have

$$g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq (p + (1 - p)f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))^{1/3}.$$

□

Thus, for “constant” degrees  $D_2$  the replacement product indeed transforms two expanders into a larger one. As in Corollary 3.4, we can use this to get degree 3 expanders.

**COROLLARY 6.5.** *For every  $\lambda < 1$  and every odd  $D$ , there exists a  $\lambda' < 1$  such that if  $G$  is an  $(N, D, \lambda)$ -graph and  $C$  is the cycle on  $D$  vertices, then  $G \circledR C$  is a  $(ND, 3, \lambda')$ -graph.*

To make the expansion properties in Theorem 6.4 independent of how large  $D_2$  is, we now slightly modify the replacement product to have  $D_2$  copies of each edge which goes between clouds. This makes the degree of every vertex  $2D_2$ , of which  $D_2$  stay within the same cloud, and the other  $D_2$  all connect to the same vertex in a neighbor cloud. This “balancing” make the random walk give the same weight to edges defined by  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

**Definition 6.6.** If  $G_1$  is a  $D_1$ -regular graph on  $[N_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and  $G_2$  is a  $D_2$ -regular graph on  $[D_1]$  with rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ , then their *balanced replacement product*  $G_1 \circledR G_2$  is defined to be the  $2D_2$ -regular graph on  $[N_1] \times [D_1]$  whose rotation map  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledR G_2}$  is as follows:

$\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledR G_2}((v, k), i)$ :

1. If  $i \leq D_2$ , let  $(m, j) = \text{Rot}_{G_2}(k, i)$  and output  $((v, m), j)$ .
2. If  $i > D_2$ , output  $(\text{Rot}_{G_1}(v, k), i)$ .

**THEOREM 6.7.** *If  $G_1$  is an  $(N_1, D_1, \lambda_1)$ -graph and  $G_2$  is a  $(D_1, D_2, \lambda_2)$ -graph, then  $G_1 \circledR G_2$  is a  $(N_1 \cdot D_1, 2D_2, h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2))$ -graph, where (using the function  $f$  from Theorems 3.2 or 4.3)*

$$h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \leq \left( \frac{7}{8} + \frac{1}{8} \cdot f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \right)^{1/3}.$$

In particular,  $h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < 1$  when  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 1$ . Moreover,  $\text{Rot}_{G_1 \circledR G_2}$  can be computed in time  $\text{poly}(\log N, \log D_1, \log D_2)$  with one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_1}$  and one oracle query to  $\text{Rot}_{G_2}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of Theorem 6.4, noting instead that  $M = (\tilde{A} + \tilde{B})/2$ .  $\square$

As a final note, we observe the weakness of the replacement products relative to the zig-zag product. Informally, in zig-zag the expansion quality of the product improves with those of its component, while in the replacement it does not. More formally, while the function  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  tends to zero when  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  do, the functions  $g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, D_2)$  and  $h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  do not.

*Acknowledgments.* We are grateful to David Zuckerman for illuminating discussions and a number of useful suggestions early in the stages of this work. We thank the organizers of the DIMACS Workshop on Pseudorandomness and Explicit Combinatorial Constructions in October 1999, where we began this research. We are grateful to Peter Winkler for suggesting the name “zig-zag product.” We also thank Neil Agarwal, Noga Alon, Oded Goldreich, Peter Sarnak, Ronen Shaltiel, Dan Spielman, and the anonymous referee for helpful comments and pointers.

AT&T LABS - RESEARCH, FLORHAM PARK, NJ

*E-mail address:* omer@research.att.com

DIVISION OF ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCES, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA

*E-mail address:* salil@eecs.harvard.edu

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, PRINCETON AND THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM,  
ISREAL

*E-mail address:* avi@math.ias.edu

#### REFERENCES

- [Ajt94] M. AJTAI, Recursive construction for 3-regular expanders, *Combinatorica* **14** (1994), 379–416.
- [AKS83] M. AJTAI, J. KOMLÓS, and E. SZEMERÉDI, Sorting in  $c \log n$  parallel steps, *Combinatorica* **3** (1983), 1–19.
- [Alo86a] N. ALON, Eigenvalues and expanders, *Combinatorica* **6** (1986), 83–96.
- [Alo86b] ———, Eigenvalues, geometric expanders, sorting in rounds, and Ramsey theory, *Combinatorica* **6** (1986), 207–219.
- [AGM87] N. ALON, Z. GALIL, and V. D. MILMAN, Better expanders and superconcentrators, *J. Algorithms* **8** (1987), 337–347.
- [AGHP92] N. ALON, O. GOLDREICH, J. HÄSTAD, and R. PERALTA, Simple constructions of almost  $k$ -wise independent random variables, *Random Structures Algorithms* **3** (1992), 289–304.
- [ALW01] N. ALON, A. LUBOTZKY, and A. WIGDERSON, Semi-direct product in groups and zig-zag product in graphs: Connections and applications, in *42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Las Vegas, Nevada, 14–17 October 2001, IEEE, to appear.
- [AM85] N. ALON and V. D. MILMAN,  $\lambda_1$ , Isoperimetric inequalities for graphs, and superconcentrators, *J. Combinatorial Theory* **38** (1985), 73–88.
- [AR94] N. ALON and Y. ROICHMAN, Random Cayley graphs and expanders, *Random Structures Algorithms* **5** (1994), 271–284.
- [BS87] A. BRODER and E. SHAMIR, On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs (preliminary version), in *28th Annual Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 286–294, Los Angeles, California, 12–14 October 1987, IEEE.
- [Fri91] J. FRIEDMAN, On the second eigenvalue and random walks in random  $d$ -regular graphs, *Combinatorica* **11** (1991), 331–362.
- [FKS89] J. FRIEDMAN, J. KAHN, and E. SZEMERÉDI, On the second eigenvalue in random regular graphs, in *Proc. of the Twenty-First Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 587–598, Seattle, Washington, 15–17 May 1989.

- [GG81] O. GABBER and Z. GALIL, Explicit constructions of linear-sized superconcentrators, *J. Computer System Sciences* **22** (1981), 407–420.
- [GILVZ90] O. GOLDREICH, R. IMPAGLIAZZO, L. LEVIN, R. VENKATESAN, and D. ZUCKERMAN, Security preserving amplification of hardness, in *31st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, volume I, pages 318–326, St. Louis, Missouri, 22–24 October 1990, IEEE.
- [Gro83] M. GROMOV, Filling Riemannian manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* **81** (1983), 1–147.
- [Gro00] ———, Spaces and questions, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **2000**, 118–161, Part I of Special Volume on GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999).
- [INW94] R. IMPAGLIAZZO, N. NISAN, and A. WIGDERSON, Pseudorandomness for network algorithms, in *Proc. of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 356–364, Montréal, Québec, Canada, 23–25 May 1994.
- [IW97] R. IMPAGLIAZZO and A. WIGDERSON,  $P = BPP$  if  $E$  requires exponential circuits: Derandomizing the XOR lemma, in *Proc. of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 220–229, El Paso, Texas, 4–6 May 1997.
- [JM87] S. JIMBO and A. MARUOKA, Expanders obtained from affine transformations, *Combinatorica* **7** (1987), 343–355.
- [KR83] N. J. KALTON and J. W. ROBERTS, Uniformly exhaustive submeasures and nearly additive set functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **278** (1983), 803–816.
- [Lub94] A. LUBOTZKY, *Discrete Groups, Expanding Graphs and Invariant Measures*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1994.
- [LP01] A. LUBOTZKY and I. PAK, The product replacement algorithm and Kazhdan’s property (T), *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **14** (2001), 347–363 (electronic).
- [LPS88] A. LUBOTZKY, R. PHILLIPS, and P. SARNAK, Ramanujan graphs, *Combinatorica* **8** (1988), 261–277.
- [Mar73] G. A. MARGULIS, Explicit constructions of expanders, *Problemy Peredachi Informacii* **9** (1973), 71–80.
- [Mar88] ———, Explicit group-theoretic constructions of combinatorial schemes and their applications in the construction of expanders and concentrators, *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* **24** (1988), 51–60.
- [MW01] R. MESHULAM and A. WIGDERSON, Expanders in group algebras, in preparation, 2001.
- [Mor94] M. MORGENSEN, Existence and explicit constructions of  $q + 1$  regular Ramanujan graphs for every prime power  $q$ , *J. Combinatorial Theory* **62** (1994), 44–62.
- [NN93] J. NAOR and M. NAOR, Small-bias probability spaces: efficient constructions and applications, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **22** (1993), 838–856.
- [Nil91] A. NILLI, On the second eigenvalue of a graph, *Discrete Math.* **91** (1991), 207–210.
- [Nis96] N. NISAN, Extracting randomness: How and why: a survey, in *Proc. Eleventh Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 44–58, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 24–27 May 1996, IEEE, Computer Society Press.
- [NT99] N. NISAN and A. TA-SHMA, Extracting randomness: a survey and new constructions, *J. Computer System Sciences* **58** (1999), 148–173.
- [NZ96] N. NISAN and D. ZUCKERMAN, Randomness is linear in space, *J. Computer System Sciences* **52** (1996), 43–52.
- [Pin73] M. S. PINSKER, On the complexity of a concentrator, in *7th Annual Teletraffic Conference*, pages 318/1–318/4, Stockholm, 1973.
- [Pip87] N. PIPPENGER, Sorting and selecting in rounds, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **16** (1987), 1032–1038.

- [PY82] N. PIPPENGER and A. C. YAO, Rearrangeable networks with limited depth, *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods* **3** (1982), 411–417.
- [RR99] R. RAZ and O. REINGOLD, On recycling the randomness of the states in space bounded computation, in *Proc. of the Thirty-First Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, Atlanta, GA, May 1999, 159–168.
- [RSW00] O. REINGOLD, R. SHALTIEL, and A. WIGDERSON, Extracting randomness via repeated condensing, in *41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Redondo Beach, California, 12–14 November 2000, IEEE.
- [RVW00] O. REINGOLD, S. VADHAN, and A. WIGDERSON, Entropy waves, the zig-zag graph product, and new constant-degree expanders and extractors (extended abstract), in *41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Redondo Beach, California, 12–14 November 2000, IEEE. See a more complete version in ECCC TR01-018, <http://www.eccc.uni-trier.de/eccc>.
- [Sho90] V. SHOUP, New algorithms for finding irreducible polynomials over finite fields, *Mathematics of Computation* **54** (1990), 435–447.
- [Sip88] M. SIPSER, Expanders, randomness, or time versus space, *J. Computer System Sciences* **36** (1988), 379–383.
- [SS96] M. SIPSER and D. A. SPIELMAN, Expander codes, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **42** (1996), 1710–1722.
- [Spi96] D. A. SPIELMAN, Linear-time encodable and decodable error-correcting codes, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **42** (1996), 1723–1731.
- [TUZ01] A. TA-SHMA, C. UMANS, and D. ZUCKERMAN, Loss-less condensers, unbalanced expanders, and extractors, in *Proc. of the Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 143–162, Crete, Greece, 6–8 July 2001.
- [Tan84] R. M. TANNER, Explicit concentrators from generalized  $N$ -gons, *SIAM J. on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **5** (1984), 287–293.
- [Urq87] A. URQUHART, Hard examples for resolution, *J. Association for Computing Machinery* **34** (1987), 209–219.
- [Val77] L. G. VALIANT, Graph-theoretic arguments in low-level complexity, in *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (Proc. Sixth Sympos., Tatranská Lomnica, 1977)*, pages 162–176, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* **53**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.

(Received July 10, 2000)