# A Local-to-Global Framework: Simplicial Complex

Zhidan Li

## Contents



## 1 Markov Chains and Local Properties

Given a distribution $\mu$ over state space $\Omega$, let $P$ be a reversible Markov chain with respect to $\Omega$. We define the mixing time of $P$ at initial state $x \in \Omega$ as

$$t_{\mathrm{mix}}(P, x, \varepsilon) = \inf\left\{t \geq 0 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P^t(x, \cdot) \,\middle\|\, \mu\right) \leq \varepsilon\right\}.$$

The functional inequality is introduced to bound the mixing time of $P$. For two functions $f, g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define the Dirichlet form with assumption that all terms are well-defined to be

$$\mathcal{E}_P(f, g) := \langle f, (I - P)g\rangle_\mu = \int_{x\in\Omega} f(x)(I-P)g(x)\ \mathrm{d}\mu(x). \tag{1}$$

**Definition 1.1** (Functional Inequalities)**.** Given a reversible Markov chain $P$ with respect to its stationary distribution $\mu$ over $\Omega$, we define the *spectral gap* of $P$ as

$$\mathrm{Gap}(P) := \inf_{f:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_P(f, f)}{\mathbf{Var}_\mu[f]}$$

and we define the *modified log-Sobolev inequality constant* (MLSI) of $P$ as

$$\rho_{\mathrm{LS}}(P) := \inf_{f:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_P(f, \log f)}{\mathbf{Ent}_\mu[f]}$$

where the variance and the entropy of $f$ with respect to $\mu$ are defined as

$$\mathbf{Var}_\mu[f] = \mathbf{E}_\mu\left[f^2\right] - \mathbf{E}_\mu[f]^2, \quad \mathbf{Ent}_\mu[f] = \mathbf{E}_\mu[f \log f] - \mathbf{E}_\mu[f] \log \mathbf{E}_\mu[f].$$

Moreover, for every reversible $P$, it holds that $\mathrm{Gap}(P) = 1 - \lambda_2(P)$.

Previously several works have used the functional inequalities to bound the mixing time.

**Lemma 1.2** (Theorem 12.4 in [LP17])**.** *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that the followings hold for all $x \in \Omega$,*

$$t_{\mathrm{mix}}(P, x, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C}{\mathrm{Gap}(P)}\left(\log\frac{1}{\mu(x)} + \log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right),$$
$$t_{\mathrm{mix}}(P, x, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C}{\rho_{\mathrm{LS}}(P)}\left(\log\log\frac{1}{\mu(x)} + \log\frac{1}{\mu(x)}\right).$$

**Dirichlet form and continuous-time random walk**

The Dirichlet form is introduced in Bobkov and Tetali [BT06] to analyze the mixing time of Markov chains. To briefly see this, consider the following Markov process:

$$P_t = e^{-(I-P)t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Let $\mu_0$ be the initial distribution and $\mu_t = \mu_0 P_t$. Consider the function $f_t$ supported on $\Omega$ as $f_t = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_t}{\mathrm{d}\mu}$. Thus $\langle f_t, \mathbf{1}\rangle_\mu = 1$ and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_t = -(I-P) f_t, \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \log f_t = -(I-P)\mathbf{1}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \mathbf{Var}_\mu [f_t] &= \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left( \langle f_t, f_t \rangle_\mu - \langle f_t, \mathbf{1}\rangle_\mu^2 \right) \\
&= \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_t, f_t \right\rangle_\mu + \left\langle f_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_t \right\rangle_\mu - 2 \langle f_t, \mathbf{1}\rangle_\mu \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_1, \mathbf{1} \right\rangle_\mu \\
&= 2 \langle f_t, -(I-P) f_t \rangle_\mu - 2 \langle f_t, \mathbf{1}\rangle_\mu \langle -(I-P) f_t, \mathbf{1}\rangle_\mu \\
&= -2\mathcal{E}_P(f_t, f_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the relative entropy we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{KL}} (\mu_t \parallel \mu) &= \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \mathbf{Ent}_\mu [f_t] \\
&= \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \langle f_t, \log f_t \rangle_\mu \\
&= \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f_t, \log f_t \right\rangle_\mu + \left\langle f_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \log f_t \right\rangle_\mu \\
&= \langle -(I-P) f_t, \log f_t \rangle_\mu + \langle f_t, -(I-P)\mathbf{1} \rangle_\mu \\
&= -2\mathcal{E}_P(f_t, \log f_t).
\end{aligned}$$

The two inequalities drive us to bound the spectral gap and MLSI constant.

## 1.1 Spectral independence

Now we consider the case $\Omega \subseteq [q]^n$ for a positive integer $q \geq 2$. It makes common sense since we focus on the mixing rate of the Glauber dynamics for the Gibbs distribution of $q$-spin systems.

The local property named *spectral independence* is firstly introduced in Anari, Liu and Oveis Gharan [ALOG20] to evaluate the local dependence in hard-core models.

**Definition 1.3** (Spectral Independence - Boolean Domain)**.** Let $\mu$ be a distribution over $\Omega \subseteq \{-1, +1\}^n$. We define the *influence matrix* $\Psi_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to be

$$\Psi_\mu(i,j) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{X \sim \mu} \left[ X_i \mid X_j = 1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{X \sim \mu} \left[ X_i \mid X_j = -1 \right], \quad \forall i, j \in [n].$$

For $\eta > 0$, we say $\mu$ is $\eta$-spectrally independent if $\left\| \Psi_\mu \right\|_{\mathrm{OP}} \leq \eta$.

For arbitrary $q \geq 2$, Feng, Guo, Yin and Zhang [FGYZ22] extend the definition of the influence matrix of $\mu$ and introduce the generalized version of the spectral independence.

**Definition 1.4** (Spectral Independence)**.** Let $\mu$ be a distribution over $\Omega \subseteq [q]^n$. For any $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$ and every feasible pinning $\tau \in [q]^\Lambda$, the *absolute influence matrix* $\Psi_\mu^\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$ is defined as, for every distinct $u, v \in [n]$,

$$\Psi_\mu^\tau(u,v) := \inf_{i,j \in [q]} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{TV}} \left( \mu_v^{\tau \cup \{u \leftarrow i\}} \,\middle\|\, \mu_v^{\tau \cup \{u \leftarrow j\}} \right).$$

For $\eta > 0$, we say $\mu$ is $\eta$-spectrally independent if for all $\Lambda \subseteq [n]$ and $\tau \in [q]^\Lambda$, the spectral radius of the absolute influence matrix satisfies $\rho(\Psi_\mu^\tau) \leq \eta$.

The following argument relates the influence matrix to the correlation of the distribution. This might explain the motivation and the intuition that we take the spectral independence into account and serve it as a local property of the distribution.

**Lemma 1.5.** *Given a distribution $\mu$ over $\Omega \subseteq \{-1,+1\}^n$, define the correlation matrix of $\mu$ as*

$$\mathbf{Cor}(\mu) := \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)\right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)\right)^{-1/2}.$$

*Then* $\Psi_\mu = \mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)\right)^{-1}$ *and*

$$\left\|\Psi_\mu\right\|_{\mathrm{OP}} = \|\mathbf{Cor}(\mu)\|_{\mathrm{OP}}.$$

*Proof.* Let $X$ be a random variable drawn from $\mu$. For $i, j \in [n]$, by calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)_{i,j} &= \mathbf{E}\left[X_i X_j\right] - \mathbf{E}\left[X_i\right]\mathbf{E}\left[X_j\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[X_i \mid X_j = 1\right]\mathbf{Pr}\left[X_j = 1\right]\left(1 - \mathbf{E}\left[X_j\right]\right) - \mathbf{E}\left[X_i \mid X_j = -1\right]\mathbf{Pr}\left[X_j = 1\right]\left(1 + \mathbf{E}\left[X_j\right]\right) \\
&= \Psi_\mu(i,j)\left(1 - \mathbf{E}\left[X_j\right]^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

thus leading to the identity $\Psi_\mu = \mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)\right)^{-1}$. To prove the second identity, let $\mathbf{v}$ be an eigenvector of $\mathbf{Cor}(\mu)$ and its associated eigenvalue is $\lambda$. For simplicity let $D = \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right)\right)$. Then,

$$\lambda \mathbf{v} = D^{-1/2}\mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) D^{-1/2}\mathbf{v}.$$

Let $\mathbf{u} = D^{1/2}\mathbf{v}$. Thus we obtain

$$\lambda \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) D^{-1/2}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{Cov}\left(\mu\right) D^{-1}\mathbf{u} = \Psi_\mu \mathbf{u}.$$

Then we know $\Psi_\mu$ and $\mathbf{Cor}(\mu)$ share the same spectrum, meaning that their operator norms are equal. ◻

## 2 High-Dimensional Expander: Simplicial Complex

Now we introduce a framework relate the local property to the global rate of the mixing of Markov chains.

**Definition 2.1** (Simplicial Complex)**.** A simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ is a non-empty downwards closed collection of sets (called faces) over a finite ground set of elements. It satisfies

- $\varnothing \in \mathscr{C}$;
- if $S \in \mathscr{C}$ and $T \subseteq S$, then $T \in \mathscr{C}$.

Additionally, we assume that $\mathscr{C}$ is pure, *i.e.*, for all maximal elements $S \in \mathscr{C}$, they share the same size denoted by $d = \mathrm{rank}(\mathscr{C})$. For all $S \in \mathscr{C}$, let $\mathrm{rank}(S) := |S|$. According to the rank function, we partition $\mathscr{C}$ into $d+1$ parts as: for every $0 \le k \le d$, define the $k$-skeleton as

$$\mathscr{C}(k) := \{S \in \mathscr{C} \mid \mathrm{rank}(S) = k\}.$$

For every face $S \in \mathscr{C}$, define the link at $S$ as

$$\mathscr{C}_S := \{T \in \mathscr{C} \mid S \cap T = \varnothing, S \cup T \in \mathscr{C}\}$$

and for all $0 \le k \le d - \mathrm{rank}(S)$, define the $k$-skeleton at $S$ as

$$\mathscr{C}_S(k) := \{T \in \mathscr{C}_S \mid \mathrm{rank}(T) = k\}.$$

## 2.1 Weight functions and random walks on the simplicial complex

Given a distribution $\mu$ over $\Omega = \mathscr{C}(d)$, we define the weight function $w : \mathscr{C} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as

$$w(S) = \begin{cases} \mu(S) & S \in \mathscr{C}(d); \\ \sum_{T \supseteq S, T \in \mathscr{C}(k+1)} w(T) & S \in \mathscr{C}(k), k < d. \end{cases}$$

For every link $\mathscr{C}_S$ at face $S \in \mathscr{C}$, we define $w_S(T) = w(S \cup T)$ for every $T \in \mathscr{C}_S$.

To see the random walks on $\mathscr{C}$, firstly we introduce the distribution on it. For every $0 \leq k \leq d$, we define the distribution $\pi_d$ on $\mathscr{C}(k)$ as

$$\pi_k(S) = \frac{w(S)}{\sum_{T \in \mathscr{C}(k)} w(T)}, \quad \forall S \in \mathscr{C}(k).$$

Similarly for the link at $S$, we can also define the distribution $\pi_{S,k}$ over $\mathscr{C}_S(k)$.

For $0 \leq k \leq d$ and every $S \in \mathscr{C}(k)$, by calculation,

$$w(S) = \frac{n!}{k!}\mu(S).$$

This leads to the identity

$$\pi_k(S) = \frac{w(S)}{\sum_{T \in \mathscr{C}(k)} w(T)} = \frac{\mu(S)}{\sum_{T \in \mathscr{C}(k)} \mu(T)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}}\mu(S).$$

For simplicity of notations and analysis, we assume that the dimension of all the matrices is $\mathscr{C}(1)$, and we add zeros to appropriate positions. For every $0 \leq k \leq d$, we define $\Pi_k := \operatorname{diag}(\pi_k)$ to be the diagonal matrix induced by $\pi_k$, and similarly define $\Pi_{S,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathscr{C}(1) \times \mathscr{C}(1)}$ for all links at $S \in \mathscr{C}$ and $0 \leq k \leq d - \operatorname{rank}(S)$, and the inverse of them means taking inverse only on their non-zero entries.

There are two natural random walks on the simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$: up-walk and down-walk.

- 'Up-Walk' $\mathsf{P}_k^{\uparrow}$: starting from $S \in \mathscr{C}(k)$, we add an element $x \in \mathscr{C}_S(1)$ as $\pi_{S,1}$.
- 'Down-Walk' $\mathsf{P}_k^{\downarrow}$: starting from $S \in \mathscr{C}(k)$, we remove an element $x \in S$ uniformly at random.

We write them in a explicit form: for $0 \leq k \leq d - 1$, $S \in \mathscr{C}(k)$, $T \in \mathscr{C}(k+1)$,

$$\mathsf{P}_k^{\uparrow}(S,T) = \frac{w(T)}{w(S)} \mathbb{1}\left[S \subseteq T\right]$$

and for $1 \leq k \leq d$, $S \in \mathscr{C}(k)$, $T \in \mathscr{C}(k-1)$,

$$\mathsf{P}_k^{\downarrow}(S,T) = \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{1}\left[T \subseteq S\right].$$

Based on the two walks, we define the following up-down walk and down-up walk (note that they are all lazy random walks):

$$\mathsf{P}_k^{\Delta} = \mathsf{P}_k^{\uparrow}\mathsf{P}_{k+1}^{\downarrow}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq d-1,$$
$$\mathsf{P}_k^{\nabla} = \mathsf{P}_k^{\downarrow}\mathsf{P}_{k-1}^{\uparrow}, \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq d.$$

For the up-down walks, usually we consider its non-lazy version $\mathsf{P}_k^{\wedge} := \frac{k+1}{k}\mathsf{P}_k^{\Delta} - \frac{1}{k}I$. For the link $\mathscr{C}_\tau$ at $\tau \in \mathscr{C}$, it is similar to define the random walks $\mathsf{P}_{\tau,k}^{\Delta}$, $\mathsf{P}_{\tau,k}^{\nabla}$ and $\mathsf{P}_{\tau,k}^{\wedge}$. Among all these walks, we pay quite a special attention to the local walk $\mathsf{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}$ and $\mathsf{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla}$. Define the matrix $W_{\tau,2}$ supported on $\mathscr{C}_\tau(1) \times \mathscr{C}_\tau(1)$ as $W_{\tau,2}(x,y) = \pi_{\tau,2}(\{x,y\})$ for $x, y \in \mathscr{C}_\tau(1)$ and $\{x,y\} \in \mathscr{C}_\tau(2)$. By definition, it holds that

$$\mathsf{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} = \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{\tau,1}^{-1}W_{\tau,2}, \tag{2}$$
$$\mathsf{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla} = \mathbf{1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}. \tag{3}$$

Moreover, directly from the definition, for the distributions of the two adjacent layers, it holds that

$$\Pi_{k+1}\mathrm{P}_{k+1}^{\downarrow} = \left(\mathrm{P}_k^{\uparrow}\right)^{\top}\Pi_k, \forall 0 \le k \le d-1. \tag{4}$$

Multiplying all-ones vector on both sides, we obtain,

$$\pi_{k+1}\mathrm{P}_{k+1}^{\downarrow} = \pi_k, \tag{5}$$

$$\pi_k\mathrm{P}_k^{\uparrow} = \pi_{k+1}. \tag{6}$$

## 2.2 Garland's method

The kernel of the local-to-global theorem is to establish the relationship between local walks and global walks. The Garland's method is implicit in the work of Oppenheim [Opp18] and we put it in a more direct and explicit form.

**Lemma 2.2** (Garland's Method)**.** *The following identities hold:*

1. $\Pi_1 = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\right]$.
2. $\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}\right]$.
3. $\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge})^2 = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right]$.

*Proof.* We prove these identities entry by entry.

1. For every $x \in \mathscr{C}(1)$, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_1(x,x) &= \pi_1(x)\\ &= \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\mathscr{C}(1)} \frac{1}{2}\pi_2(\{x,y\})\\ &= \sum_{y\in\mathscr{C}(1)} \pi_1(y)\frac{\pi_2(\{x,y\})}{2\pi_1(y)}\\ &= \mathbf{E}_{y\sim\pi_1}\left[\Pi_{y,1}(x,x)\right].\end{aligned}$$

2. By (2), it holds that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}\right] = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\frac{1}{2}W_{\tau,2}\right] = 2W_2.$$

   On the other hand, by definition,

$$\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} = 2\Pi_1\mathrm{diag}\left(\pi_1\right)^{-1}W_2 = 2W_2.$$

   Then we conclude the identity.

3. For every $x, y \in \mathscr{C}(1)$,

$$\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge})^2(x,y) = \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(1)} \pi_1(x)\pi_{x,1}(\tau)\pi_{\tau,1}(y).$$

   On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right](x,y) &= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(1)} \pi_1(\tau)\pi_{\tau,1}(x)\pi_{\tau,1}(y)\\ &= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(1)} \pi_1(x)\pi_{x,1}(\tau)\pi_{\tau,1}(y).\end{aligned}$$

   Thus we conclude the identity.

□

Additionally the following two identities between two skeletons are important.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The following identities hold*

1. $\Pi_k \mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge} = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{k-1}}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}\right]$.
2. $\Pi_k \mathrm{P}_k^{\nabla} = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{k-1}}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla}\right] = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{k-1}}\left[\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right]$.

*Proof.* The proofs of two identities are similar.

1. By direct calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_k \mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge} &= \Pi_k \cdot \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} \\
&= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \frac{1}{k}\Pi_k \mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} \\
&= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \pi_{k-1}(\tau)\frac{\Pi_k}{k\pi_{k-1}(\tau)}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} \\
&= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \pi_{k-1}(\tau)\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Similarly to above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_k \mathrm{P}_k^{\nabla} &= \Pi_k \cdot \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla} \\
&= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \pi_{k-1}(\tau)\frac{\Pi_k}{k\pi_{k-1}(\tau)}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla} \\
&= \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(k-1)} \pi_{k-1}(\tau)\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\nabla}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.3 Trickling-down theorem

Based on the identities in Section 2.2, we establish more properties of the local walks.

**Definition 2.4** (Local Spectral Expander)**.** For a simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ equipped with distribution $\mu$, for $0 \le k \le d-2$ and $\gamma_k \in [0,1]$, we say $\mathscr{C}(k)$ is a $\gamma_k$*-local spectral expander* if it holds that

$$\lambda_2(\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}) \le \gamma_k, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathscr{C}(k),$$

or equivalently,

$$\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top} \preceq \gamma_k\left(\Pi_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right).$$

Moreover, we say $\mathscr{C}$ is a $(\gamma_0,\dots,\gamma_{d-2})$*-local spectral expander* if $\mathscr{C}(k)$ is a $\gamma_k$-local spectral expander for all $0 \le k \le d-2$.

The following lemma shows, if $\mathscr{C}(k)$ is a local spectral expander, then we can see $\mathscr{C}(k-1)$ is also a local spectral expander.

**Theorem 2.5** (Oppenheim's Trickling-Down Theorem, [Opp18])**.** *Suppose that $\mathscr{C}(k)$ is a $\gamma$-local spectral expander for some $1 \le k \le d-2$. Then $\mathscr{C}(k-1)$ is a $\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}$-local spectral expander (assuming the total connectivity of the random walk).*

*Proof.* When $k > 1$, we can only focus the link at each face in $\mathscr{C}(k)$ and this is the case $k = 1$. Then we assume that $k = 1$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_1 \mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} &= \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}\right]\\ &\preceq \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}\left[\gamma\Pi_{\tau,1} + (1-\gamma)\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right]\\ &= \gamma\Pi_1 + (1-\gamma)\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\nabla})^2\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that the local spectral expander means

$$\Pi_{\tau,1} - \Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} \succeq (1-\gamma)(\Pi_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}).$$

Now we consider the eigenvector $\mathbf{v}_2$ of $\mathrm{P}_1^{\nabla}$ with respect to the second largest eigenvalue $\lambda_2$. Then,

$$\lambda_2 \langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2\rangle_{\pi_1} \le \gamma \langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2\rangle_{\pi_1} + (1-\gamma)\lambda_2^2 \langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2\rangle_{\pi_1}.$$

This means $(1-\lambda_2)((1-\gamma)\lambda_2 - \gamma) \le 0$. Since $\lambda_2 < 1$ (otherwise the bound is meaningless), we have $\lambda_2 \le \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}$. □

Observe that in Theorem 2.5, we only consider the second largest eigenvalue of the local walk. When we take more eigenvalues into account, the improved trickling-down theorem is introduced in Abdolazimi, Liu and Oveis Gharan [ALOG21].

**Theorem 2.6** (Matrix Trickling-Down Theorem, [ALOG21])**.** *Given a simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ equipped with distribution $\mu$, suppose that the following holds:*

1. $\lambda_2(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge}) < 1$, i.e., $\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge}$ *is irreducible.*
2. *There exists a family of symmetric matrices* $\left\{M_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathscr{C}(1)\times\mathscr{C}(1)}\right\}_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}(1)}$ *such that*

$$\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge} - \alpha\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top} \preceq M_\tau \preceq \frac{1}{2\alpha+1}\Pi_{\tau,1}$$

*for all* $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(1)$.

*Then for every* $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathscr{C}(1)\times\mathscr{C}(1)}$ *satisfying* $M \preceq \frac{1}{2\alpha}\Pi_1$ *and* $\mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{\tau,1}}[M_\tau] \preceq M - \alpha M\Pi_1^{-1}M$, *it holds that*

$$\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} - \left(2 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\pi_1\pi_1^{\top} \preceq M.$$

*In particular,* $\lambda_2(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge}) \le \rho(\Pi_1^{-1}M)$.

*Proof.* We take expectation on all sides of the assumption and by Lemma 2.2,

$$\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} - \alpha\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge})^2 \preceq \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_1}[M_\tau] \preceq \frac{1}{2\alpha+1}\Pi_1.$$

Therefore, $\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} - \alpha\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge})^2 \preceq M - \alpha M\Pi_1^{-1}M$. Set $Q = \mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} - \beta\cdot\mathbf{1}\pi_1^{\top}$ with $\beta = 2 - \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Then we know

$$\Pi_1\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge} - \alpha\Pi_1(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge})^2 = \Pi_1 Q - \alpha\Pi_1 Q^2.$$

Thus we know

$$\Pi_1 Q - \alpha\Pi_1 Q^2 \preceq M - \alpha M\Pi_1^{-1}M.$$

Since $\lambda_2(\mathrm{P}_{\tau,1}^{\wedge}) \le \frac{1}{2\alpha+1}$ for every $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(1)$, by Theorem 2.5, $\lambda_2(\mathrm{P}_1^{\wedge}) \le \frac{1}{2\alpha}$. Combined with $\beta = 2 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ge 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}$ we have $Q \preceq \frac{1}{2\alpha}I$. By Lemma 2.3 in [ALOG21], we have $\Pi_1 Q \preceq M$. □

Commonly in use we apply the following proposition induced by Theorem 2.6.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Given a simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ equipped with distribution $\mu$, if there exists a family of symmetric matrices* $\left\{M_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathscr{C}(1)\times\mathscr{C}(1)}\right\}_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}}$ *satisfying*

1. ***Base Cases:*** *For every $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(d-2)$,*

$$\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{\tau,1} - 2\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top} \preceq M_\tau \preceq \frac{1}{5}\Pi_{\tau,1}.$$

2. ***Recursive Conditions:*** *For every $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(d-k)$ with $k \geq 3$, one of the followings holds:*

   - *The matrices satisfy*

$$M_\tau \preceq \frac{k-1}{3k-1}\Pi_{\tau,1}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{x\sim\pi_{\tau,1}}\left[M_{\tau\cup\{x\}}\right] \preceq M_\tau - \frac{k-1}{k-2}M_\tau\Pi_{\tau,1}^{-1}M_\tau.$$

   - *$(\mathscr{C}_\tau, \pi_{\tau,k})$ is the product of $m$ pure weighted simplicial complexes $(\mathscr{C}^{(1)}, \pi^{(1)}), \ldots, (\mathscr{C}^{(m)}, \pi^{(m)})$ of dimension $d_1, \ldots, d_m$ respectively and,*

$$M_\tau = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{d_j(d_j-1)}{k(k-1)} M_{\tau\cup\eta_j}$$

     *where $\eta_j = \eta \setminus \mathscr{C}^{(j)}(1)$ for an arbitrary $\eta \in \mathscr{C}_\tau(k)$.*

*Then for every $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(d-k)$ with $k \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{\tau,1} - \frac{k}{k-1}\pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top} \preceq M_\tau \preceq \frac{k-1}{3k-1}\Pi_{\tau,1}.$$

*In particular, $\lambda_2(\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{\tau,1}) \leq \rho(\Pi_{\tau,1}^{-1}M_\tau)$ for all $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(d-k)$ with $k \geq 2$.*

### 2.4 The local-to-global theorem

Now we are ready to introduce the method named *Alev-Lau's Local-to-Global Theorem* introduced in Alev and Lau [AL20].

**Theorem 2.8** (Alev-Lau's Local-to-Global Theorem, [AL20]). *Assume that $\mathscr{C}$ is an $(\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{d-2})$-local spectral expander. Then for any $1 \leq k \leq d$, it holds that*

$$\mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k}) = \mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\Delta}_{k-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k}\prod_{i=0}^{k-2}(1-\alpha_i).$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for all $1 \leq k \leq d-1$,

$$\mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k+1}) = \mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\Delta}_{k}) \geq \frac{k}{k+1}(1-\alpha_{k-1})\mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k}). \tag{7}$$

Together with the hypothesis induction and $\mathrm{Gap}(\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{1}) = 1$ we can conclude the theorem.

To prove (7), firstly observe that $\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k+1}$ and $\mathsf{P}^{\Delta}_{k}$ share the same non-zero eigenvalues and thus their spectral gaps are the same. By Lemma 2.3, for every $1 \leq k \leq d-1$,

$$\Pi_k\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{k} - \Pi_k\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k} = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{k-1}}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right].$$

Since $\mathscr{C}$ is an $(\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{d-2})$-local spectral expander, for every $\tau \in \mathscr{C}(k-1)$, the local walks satisfy:

$$\Pi_{\tau,1}\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top} \preceq \alpha_{k-1}(\Pi_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}).$$

Plugging it into above, by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_k\mathsf{P}^{\wedge}_{k} - \Pi_k\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k} &\preceq \alpha_{k-1}\mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_{k-1}}\left[\Pi_{\tau,1} - \pi_{\tau,1}\pi_{\tau,1}^{\top}\right] \\ &= \alpha_{k-1}(\Pi_k - \Pi_k\mathsf{P}^{\nabla}_{k}).\end{aligned}$$

This means

$$\Pi_k(I_{\mathscr{C}(k)} - \mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge}) \geq (1-\alpha_{k-1})\Pi_k(I_{\mathscr{C}(k)} - \mathrm{P}_k^{\nabla})$$

thus leading to $\mathrm{Gap}(\mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge}) \geq (1-\alpha_{k-1})\mathrm{Gap}(\mathrm{P}_k^{\nabla})$. To finish the proof, note that

$$\mathrm{P}_k^{\Delta} = \frac{k}{k+1}\mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge} + \frac{1}{k+1}I_{\mathscr{C}(k)},$$

meaning that

$$\mathrm{Gap}(\mathrm{P}_k^{\Delta}) = \frac{k}{k+1}\mathrm{Gap}(\mathrm{P}_k^{\wedge}) \geq \frac{k}{k+1}(1-\alpha_{k-1})\mathrm{Gap}(\mathrm{P}_k^{\nabla}).$$

□

*Remark* 2.9. Note that, the random walk $\mathrm{P}_d^{\nabla}$ is the typical single-site Glauber dynamics $P^{\mathrm{GD}}$. When $\mu$ is $\eta$-spectrally independent, it was shown in [ALOG20] that the corresponding simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ equipped with $\mu$ is a $(\frac{\eta}{d-1}, \frac{\eta}{d-2}, \dots, \eta)$-local spectral expander. Then we know the spectral gap of $P^{\mathrm{GD}}$ is bounded by

$$\mathrm{Gap}(P^{\mathrm{GD}}) \geq \frac{1}{d}\prod_{i=0}^{k-2}\left(1 - \frac{\eta}{d-i-1}\right).$$

By Lemma 1.2 we can show the mixing rate of $P^{\mathrm{GD}}$.

## 2.5 Variance and entropy contraction

Now we give an alternative view of Theorem 2.8. Given a simplicial complex $\mathscr{C}$ of dimension $d$, for $0 \leq \ell < k \leq d$, we define the following random walks

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow} &= \mathrm{P}_k^{\downarrow}\mathrm{P}_{k-1}^{\downarrow}\dots\mathrm{P}_{\ell+1}^{\downarrow},\\
\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow} &= \mathrm{P}_\ell^{\uparrow}\mathrm{P}_{\ell+1}^{\uparrow}\dots\mathrm{P}_{k-1}^{\uparrow},\\
\mathrm{P}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}^{\nabla} &= \mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow}\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow},\\
\mathrm{P}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}^{\Delta} &= \mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}\mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we consider the Dirichlet form of $\mathrm{P}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}^{\nabla}$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}^{\nabla}}(f,f) &= \left\langle f, \left(I - \mathrm{P}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}^{\nabla}\right)f\right\rangle_{\pi_k}\\
&= f^\top\Pi_k f - f^\top\Pi_k\mathrm{P}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}^{\nabla}f\\
&= f^\top\Pi_k f - f^\top\Pi_k\mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow}\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}f\\
&\overset{(a)}{=} f^\top\Pi_k f - f^\top\left(\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}\right)^\top\Pi_\ell\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}f\\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}[f] - \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}f\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $(a)$ holds from (4) and $(b)$ holds from (6). Similarly, for the Dirichlet form of $\mathrm{P}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}^{\Delta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}^{\Delta}}(f,f) &= \left\langle f, \left(I - \mathrm{P}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}^{\Delta}\right)f\right\rangle_{\pi_\ell}\\
&= f^\top\Pi_\ell f - f^\top\Pi_\ell\mathrm{P}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}^{\Delta}f\\
&= f^\top\Pi_\ell f - f^\top\Pi_\ell\mathrm{P}_{\ell\to k}^{\uparrow}\mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow}f\\
&= \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}[f] - \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}\left[\mathrm{P}_{k\to\ell}^{\downarrow}f\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Follow the similar routine together with Jenssen's inequality, and we obtain the following identities and inequalities:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}^{\nabla}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}}(f,f) = \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}[f] - \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}\left[\mathrm{P}^{\uparrow}_{\ell\to k}f\right], \tag{8}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}^{\Delta}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}}(f,f) = \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}[f] - \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}\left[\mathrm{P}^{\downarrow}_{k\to\ell}f\right], \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}^{\nabla}_{k\leftrightarrow\ell}}(f,\log f) \geq \mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_k}[f] - \mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_\ell}\left[\mathrm{P}^{\uparrow}_{\ell\to k}f\right], \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{P}^{\Delta}_{\ell\leftrightarrow k}}(f,\log f) \geq \mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_\ell}[f] - \mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_k}\left[\mathrm{P}^{\downarrow}_{k\to\ell}f\right]. \tag{11}$$

The identities or inequalities as above show us that, when we want to show a Poincaré's inequality, it suffices to show the variance/entropy contraction.

**Lemma 2.10** ([CGM21])**.** *Let $0 \leq \ell \leq k \leq d$ and $f^{(k)} : \mathscr{C}(k) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function on $\mathscr{C}(k)$. Then*

$$\mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_k}\left[f^{(k)}\right] = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\left[f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right]\right] + \mathbf{Ent}_{\pi_\ell}\left[f^{(\ell)}\right]$$

*where $f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}(\sigma) := f^{(k)}(\tau\cup\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in \mathscr{C}_\tau(k-\ell)$, and $f^{(\ell)} := \mathrm{P}^{\uparrow}_{\ell}\mathrm{P}^{\uparrow}_{\ell+1}\dots\mathrm{P}^{\uparrow}_{k-1}f^{(k)}$.*

*Moreover, for all $f^{(k)} : \mathscr{C}(k) \to \mathbb{R}$, it holds that*

$$\mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}\left[f^{(k)}\right] = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\mathbf{Var}_{\pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\left[f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right]\right] + \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}\left[f^{(\ell)}\right].$$

*Proof.* We prove the identity for variance and the identity for entropy is similar. Note that, as a simple application of the Garland's method, it holds that

$$\Pi_k = \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\overline{\Pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\right].$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{E}_{\pi_k}\left[f^{(k)}\right] = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Var}_{\pi_k}\left[f^{(k)}\right] &= \left(f^{(k)}\right)^\top \Pi_k f^{(k)} \\
&= \left(f^{(k)}\right)^\top \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\overline{\Pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\right] f^{(k)} \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\left(f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right)^\top \Pi_{\tau,k-\ell} f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\mathbf{Var}_{\pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\left[f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right]\right] + \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\mathbf{E}_{\pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\left[\left(f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right)^2\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{\tau\sim\pi_\ell}\left[\mathbf{Var}_{\pi_{\tau,k-\ell}}\left[f_\tau^{(k-\ell)}\right]\right] + \mathbf{Var}_{\pi_\ell}\left[f^{(\ell)}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

For entropy the proof is similar and we can just assume that $\mathbf{E}_{\pi_k}\left[f^{(k)}\right] = 1$. □

# References


[AL20] Vedat Levi Alev and Lap Chi Lau. Improved Analysis of Higher Order Random Walks and Applications. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2020, page 1198–1211, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. 8

[ALOG20] Nima Anari, Kuikui Liu, and Shayan Oveis Gharan. Spectral Independence in High-Dimensional Expanders and Applications to the Hardcore Model. In Sandy Irani, editor, *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS2020, Durham, NC, USA, November 16-19, 2020*, pages 1319–1330. IEEE, 2020. 2, 9

[ALOG21] Dorna Abdolazimi, Kuikui Liu, and Shayan Oveis Gharan. A Matrix Trickle-Down Theorem on Simplicial Complexes and Applications to Sampling Colorings. In *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 161–172, 2021. 7

[BT06] Sergey G. Bobkov and Prasad Tetali. Modified Logarithmic Sobolev Inequalities in Discrete Settings. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 19(2):289–336, 2006. 2

[CGM21] Mary Cryan, Heng Guo, and Giorgos Mousa. Modified Log-Sobolev Inequalities for Strongly Log-Concave Distributions. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(1):506–525, 2021. 10

[FGYZ22] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, Yitong Yin, and Chihao Zhang. Rapid mixing from spectral independence beyond the boolean domain. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(3), oct 2022. 2

[LP17] David Asher Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. American Mathematical Society Providence, Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island, second edition edition, 2017. 1

[Opp18] Izhar Oppenheim. Local Spectral Expansion Approach to High Dimensional Expanders Part I: Descent of Spectral Gaps. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 59(2):293–330, 2018. 5, 6