

Topological expansion for posets and the homological k -connectivity of random q -complexes

Ran Tessler * Elad Tzalik †

Weizmann Institute of Science

January 24, 2024

Abstract

We study high dimensional expansion beyond simplicial complexes (posets) and focus on q -complexes which are complexes whose basic building blocks are linear spaces over \mathbb{F}_q . We show that the complete q -complex (consists of all subspaces of a given linear space) may have non-trivial homology groups and therefore some techniques for simplicial complexes fail. We develop new techniques to bypass this. In particular:

1. We describe a new construction of cones and use it to determine when the homology of the complete q -complex is trivial. We use this construction to prove the "projective support dimension conjecture" conjectured by Mnukhin and Siemons [20].
2. We define topological high dimensional expansion and topological overlap for posets, and show that the complete q -complex has linear (in the number of lines) coboundary expansion and satisfies the topological overlap property.
3. We define the q -Linial-Meshulam model of random q complexes and prove a sharp threshold for the connectivity of random q -complexes.

1 Introduction

In recent years, a theory of "high dimensional expanders" has emerged, and been successfully applied in mathematics and computer science to resolve longstanding open problems ([6], [2]). Another thread of research is using the geometry of vector spaces to obtain better construction in TCS, most notably, in the seminal works [7], [8] a weaker variant of the unique games conjecture was reduced to an expansion problem on the Grassmann graph which was later solved in [16]. The Grassmann graph is a graph whose vertices are the ℓ dimensional linear spaces of some \mathbb{F}_q^n and two subspaces U, W are connected by an edge if $\dim(U \cap W) = \ell - 1$.

In this work we initiate the study of coboundary high-dimensional expansion on structures beyond simplicial complexes (in contrast to spectral expansion which was studied in [15]), and mainly specialize in understanding q -complexes (see Section 1.1 for definition) which is a collection of linear subspaces of some space V that are closed under inclusion. This gives rise to a boundary

*ran.tessler@weizmann.ac.il

†elad.tzalik@weizmann.ac.il

map, for which the boundary of a subspace U is the formal sum of all the subspaces of codimension 1 contained in U .

1.1 The setting

Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space with $\dim(V) = n$, over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q . Denote by $Gr(V)$ the set of all subspaces of V and by $Gr_k(V)$ the set of all k dimensional subspaces of V . We also use the notation $Gr(n)$ to denote $Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$. Similarly define $Gr_k(n) = Gr_k(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$.

We remind that $|Gr_k(n)|$ is the Gaussian binomial coefficient, denoted by $\binom{n}{k}_q$ and satisfies:

$$|Gr_k(V)| = \binom{n}{k}_q = \frac{(q^n - 1) \dots (q^n - q^{k-1})}{(q^k - 1) \dots (q^k - q^{k-1})}$$

Definition 1. A q -complex X is a collection of subspaces of some vector space V closed under inclusion. That is: $U \in X \implies Gr(U) \subseteq X$.

This should be thought of as a q -analog of simplicial complexes where the " $q = 1$ limit" is simplicial complexes. One defines analogously the set of k faces, $X(k)$ to be the set of all k -spaces in X .

Fix a ring R . A formal sum $\sum_{U \in X(k)} \alpha_U U$ with $\alpha_U \in R$ is a k -chain of X over R . The space of all k chains is an R -module denoted by $C_k(X)$. One can define a boundary map $\partial_k : C_k(X) \rightarrow C_{k-1}(X)$ by extending linearly:

$$\partial_k(U) = \sum_{W \subseteq_1 U} W$$

Where $W \subseteq_1 U$ denotes that W is a subspace of co-dimension 1 in U .

This boundary map was previously considered in the paper [20] by Mnukhin and Siemons, who studied the homology of the complete q -complex (collection of all subspaces of a given fixed space V).

The space of k cochains is defined by $C^k(X) = Hom(C_k(X), R)$, and the a coboundary operator $d_k : C^k(X) \rightarrow C^{k+1}(X)$ is the adjoint operator of ∂_{k+1} , and satisfies:

$$d_k(\alpha)(U) = \alpha(\partial_{k+1}(U))$$

If the complex is finite one can abuse the notation and consider $d_k : C_k(X) \rightarrow C_{k+1}(X)$ by associating $U \leftrightarrow \delta_U$ where δ_U is the cochain that satisfies: $\delta_U(W) = \delta_{U=W}$. where the R.H.S is the Kronecker delta function. We also use $\mathbf{0}$ to denote the 0-chain supported on the zero space with coefficient one, that is $\mathbf{0} = 1 \cdot Span\{0\}$

We say $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is zero in the unital ring R if t maps to zero under the natural map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow R$. When the ring R is suitable the map ∂ is indeed a boundary map:

Claim 2. $\partial^2 = 0$ if and only if $(q+1)r = 0$ for all $r \in R$.

Proof. Let $[\alpha]_W$ denote the W coordinate with respect to the standard basis of $C_k(X)$ of α . Then:

$$[\partial^2(r \cdot U)]_W = \#\{W \subseteq_1 Y \subseteq_1 U\} \cdot r$$

By the correspondence theorem, this set is in bijection with lines in the space $U/W \cong \mathbb{F}_q^2$. As there are $q+1$ such lines:

$$[\partial^2(r \cdot U)]_W = (q+1)r$$

□

Remark 3. We use the notation $\partial^{(R)}$ to denote the operators ∂ when the chains and cochains are over a ring R which may not satisfy $(\partial^{(R)})^2 = 0$.

We can define (co)boundaries and (co)cycle in an analogous way to the definition in the theory of simplicial complexes. Elements of $Z_k(X, R) = \ker(\partial_k)$ are cycles, and elements of $Z^k(X, R) = \ker(d_k)$ are cocycles. $B_k = \text{Im}(\partial_{k+1})$ is the set of k -boundaries and $B^k = \text{Im}(d_{k-1})$ is the set of k -coboundaries.

From now on, unless stated otherwise we assume $(q+1)r = 0$ for all $r \in R$. This means that $B_k \subseteq Z_k$ by Claim 2 therefore we can define the homology group of X by $H_k(X, R) = Z_k/B_k$ and the cohomology group by $H^k(X, R) = Z^k/B^k$.

We use the notation $C_\bullet(\text{Gr}(V))$ to denote the chain complex associated with $\text{Gr}(V)$ with the boundary map above.

1.2 Homology of $C_\bullet(\text{Gr}(V))$

In Section 2 we study the homological properties of the complete q -complex $C_\bullet(\text{Gr}(V))$ for some V . We give a different, elementary, proof to a result of [20] about the homology of the complete q -complex:

Theorem 4. *Let V be an n dimensional space over \mathbb{F}_q then:*

1. *If $n = 2k + 1$, then $C_\bullet(\text{Gr}(V))$ is exact. That is $H_t(\text{Gr}(V)) = 0$ for all t .*
2. *If $n = 2k$, then $H_t(\text{Gr}(V)) = 0$ for all $t \neq k$. That is all homology groups are trivial except the middle one.*

The same conclusion is true for the cohomology groups, as $H_t(\text{Gr}(V)) \cong H^{n-t}(\text{Gr}(V))$.

In [20], Mnukhin and Siemons asked for a different, direct, proof ("It would be desirable to have a direct proof of this result"). A key ingredient in our proof is a new construction of topological cones for the Grassmannian. In particular, [20] conjectured that $\text{Ker}(\partial^{(R)})$ is generated by rather compact elements, for all rings R for which $\text{char}(R)$ is coprime to q , (they named this conjecture by "Projective Support Dimension Conjecture"). Our construction confirms their conjecture:

Proposition 18. *$\text{Ker}(\partial_k^{(R)})$ is generated by chains $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ such that each α_i is supported on a $2k$ dimensional subspace.*

The techniques we develop are robust and suitable for studying the homology and expansion of other posets (in particular differential posets), as well as proving that $\text{Ker}(\partial_k)$ has compact generators.

1.3 Coboundary expansion

Coboundary expansion was first defined in the foundational works of Linial, Meshulam and Wallach ([17], [19]) on the k -homological connectivity of random complexes. It was later defined again in the pioneering work of Gromov on topological overlap [11].

For a cochain α its size is defined by $|\alpha| = |\text{supp}(\alpha)|$. Define the size of the cohomology class of α to be the minimum size over elements in the class of α , that is

$$\|\alpha\| = \min\{|\alpha - d_{k-1}\beta| \text{ for } \beta \in C^{k-1}\}.$$

With those two notions, one can generalize the coboundary expansion of graphs to other cochain complexes. The coboundary expansion at dimension k , h_k is defined by:

$$h_k = \min_{\alpha \in C^k(X) \setminus B^k(X)} \left\{ \frac{|d_k \alpha|}{\|\alpha\|} \right\}$$

In Section 2.2 we show (with explicit bound on C_k):

Theorem 23. *Let $h_{k,n}$ be the expansion constant of k cochains of $Gr(V)$ where $\dim V = n > 2k$. There exist a constant C_k that depends on k, q such that:*

$$h_{k,n} \geq C_k \binom{n}{1}_q$$

We remark that our proof also applies in the case $q = 1$, though the bound on the expansion constant is noticeably worse than the optimal one obtained by Meshulam and Wallach [19].

We also propose, in Section 2.4, a generalization of Gromov's topological overlap property [11], and prove that the complete Grassmannian complex $Gr(n)$ satisfies it (for all q).

1.4 Linial-Meshulam model for posets

We consider the connectivity of Linial-Meshulam random q -complexes. Let $X \subseteq Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ be a $k + 1$ dimensional complex with $X(k) = Gr_k(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, the Linial-Meshulam random q -complex is the probability measure $\Delta^q(n, k, p)$ such that the probability of X is:

$$\mathbb{P}[X] = p^{|X(k+1)|} \cdot (1-p)^{\binom{n}{k+1}_q - |X(k+1)|}$$

A q -complex is k connected if $H^k(X) = 0$. We show that Linial-Meshulam random q complexes exhibit phase transition at $p = \ln \binom{n}{k}_q / \binom{n-k}{1}_q$.

Theorem 5. *Let $X \sim \Delta^q(n, k, p)$ be a random k dimensional q -complex. For any $\omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$:*

1. *If $p = \left(\ln \binom{n}{k}_q - \omega(n) \right) / \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ then $Pr[H^k(X) = 0] \rightarrow 0$.*
2. *If $p = \left(\ln \binom{n}{k}_q + \omega(n) \right) / \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ then $Pr[H^k(X) = 0] \rightarrow 1$.*

1.5 General definitions for graded posets

Consider (X, \leq, rk) a ranked poset. That is, (X, \leq) is a poset with a rank function $rk : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which satisfies (i) there is a unique element $0 \in X$ such that $rk(0) = 0$, (ii) for $x < y$ one has $rk(x) < rk(y)$, and if there is no $z \in X$ such that $x < z < y$ then $rk(x) + 1 = rk(y)$. In such case one gets a natural partition of X by rk valuations $X = X(0) \cup X(1) \cup \dots$, where $X(i) = \{x \in X \mid rk(x) = i\}$.

Define the space of chains $C_k(X)$, over R to be the set of formal R linear combinations of finitely many elements of $X(k)$, and the space of cochains as $C^k(X) = Hom(C_k(X), R)$. To have a notion of homology one needs a boundary signing map:

$$[-, -] : X(k) \times X(k-1) \rightarrow R$$

If the boundary signing map is the constant 1 function we say the boundary map is the modular boundary map. The boundary operator is defined by extending linearly:

$$\partial(x) = \sum_{y \leq x, rk(y)=rk(x)-1} [x, y]y$$

This gives rise to the space of k -cycles $Z_k(X, R) = Ker(\partial_k)$, the space of k -boundaries $B_k(X, R) = Im(\partial_k)$, and when $\partial^2 = 0$ one can define the k^{th} homology group of X with R -coefficients by $H_k(X, R) = Z_k(X, R)/B_k(X, R)$.

The space of cochains is defined naturally as $C^k(X) = Hom(C_k(X), R)$, and the coboundary operator is defined as being the adjoint of ∂ , that is: $d_k\alpha(x) = \alpha(\partial_{k+1}x)$. The space of k -cocycles is $Z^k(X, R) = Ker(d_k)$, k -coboundaries $B^k(X, R) = Im(d_{k-1})$, and when $\partial^2 = 0$ one can define the k^{th} cohomology of X by $H^k(X, R) = Z^k(X, R)/B^{k-1}(X, R)$.

For a cochain α define $|\alpha| = |supp(\alpha)|$, the weight of it's cohomology class is

$$\|[\alpha]\| = \min\{|\alpha - d_{k-1}\beta| \text{ for } \beta \in C^{k-1}\}.$$

The k^{th} *cosystolic expansion constant* of X is defined by:

$$h_k(X) = \min_{\alpha \in C^k(X) \setminus Z^k(X)} \left\{ \frac{|d_k\alpha|}{\|[\alpha]\|} \right\}$$

Remark 6. *In applications posets may also be associated with a weight function, see e.g. [14]. Such a weight function induces a norm and inner product on the spaces of chains and cochains, which generalize the uniform weight we have used above. One can similarly define expansions with respect to such weights.*

In the paper, we mainly focus on the complete Grassmannian complex which has almost all homologies trivial (Theorem 17), and therefore coboundary expansion is equivalent to cosystolic expansion in almost all cases.

Finally, we define the *Linial-Meshulam random X -subcomplex of rank k with probability p* , denoted by $\Delta(X, k, p)$ is the probability measure such that the probability supported on subposets X' of X satisfying $\cup_{i=0}^{k-1} X(i) \subseteq X' \subseteq \cup_{i=0}^k X(i)$ such that the events $y \in X'$ are i.i.d *Bernulli*(p) random variables.

Acknowledgments We thank Jonathan Zin for his generous help with many computer simulations and fruitful discussions. R.T., incumbent of the Lillian and George Lyttle Career Development Chair, acknowledges the support provided by the ISF grants No. 335/19 and 1729/23, and by a research grant from the Center for New Scientists of Weizmann Institute.

2 Homological Properties of $C_\bullet(Gr(V))$

This section studies the homological properties of $C_\bullet(Gr(V))$ for some subspace V . We start with the following useful Heisenberg-like identity that relates linearly the operators $\partial_{k+1}d_k, d_{k-1}\partial_k, id$:

Claim 7. *If n is odd then $\partial_{k+1}d_k - d_{k-1}\partial_k = (-1)^k id$*

Proof. The term $d_{k-1}\partial_k(U)$ corresponds to “walking” down to a subspace of U and then going up to a subspace containing it. The symmetric term corresponds to walking up and then down. Therefore if we look at the U coordinate of L.H.S. $[d_{k-1}\partial_k(U)]_U = \binom{k}{1}_q$ since this corresponds to walking to a codimension 1 subspaces of U and returning to U . Similarly $[\partial_{k+1}d_k(U)]_U = \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ since this is the number of W with $U \subseteq_1 W \subseteq V$.

Notice that $\binom{t}{1}_q$ satisfies the following modulo $q+1$:

$$\binom{t}{1}_q = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} q^i = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (-1)^i = \mathbb{1}_{(t \bmod 2)=1}$$

Since $char(R) \mid q+1$ we get $\binom{t}{1}_q = (t \bmod 2)$ in the ring R as well. Therefore by the assumption that n is odd:

$$[\partial_{k+1}d_k(U) - d_{k-1}\partial_k(U)]_U = (n-k \bmod 2) - (k \bmod 2) = (-1)^k$$

For $W \neq U$ the walk $U \rightarrow U \cap W \rightarrow W$ exists if and only if the walk $U \rightarrow U+W \rightarrow W$ exists and these are the only possible walks, therefore, we get: $[\partial_{k+1}d_k(U) - d_{k-1}\partial_k(U)]_W = 0$

This concludes that $\partial_{k+1}d_k - d_{k-1}\partial_k = (-1)^k id$ for odd n . □

Corollary 8. *For odd n the full Grassmannian (as a chain complex) is exact.*

Proof. If $\partial_k(x) = 0$ then by plugging x to the identity above $x = \partial((-1)^k d_k(x))$. □

2.1 Constructing cones

A cone c is a family of linear homomorphisms from $C_k(Gr(V))$ to $C_{k+1}(Gr(V))$ (they depend on k which will usually be clear from context and therefore omitted) that satisfies the identity:

$$\partial c(\alpha) = \alpha - c(\partial \alpha) \tag{1}$$

The name cone comes from the construction of a cone over a topological space that satisfies the identity above. We will consider a set of cones that depend on some index b , in this case, we will denote the cone with index b of the chain α by $c_{b,\alpha}$.

In this subsection, we construct cones by using the Claim 7. The main idea of our construction is to use the identity locally (while restricting it to some small subspace) instead of the whole space.

Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all ordered bases of V . We will construct for each $(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \vec{b} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $u \in C_k(X)$ a $k+1$ chain $c_{\vec{b},u}$ that satisfy $\partial c_{\vec{b},u} = u - c_{\vec{b},\partial(u)}$. For a k dimensional subspace W define the subspace $W_{\vec{b}}^{(i)}$ to be the subspace $W + Span\{b_1, \dots, b_i\}$. Let i^* be the first index such that $dim(W_{\vec{b}}^{(i^*)}) = 2k+1$, define $W_{\vec{b}} := W_{\vec{b}}^{(i^*)}$.

Lemma 9. Let \vec{b} be a basis of V , and let $W \leq V$ be a subspace of V of dimension k . Then:

1. $W \leq W_{\vec{b}}$
2. If $W' \leq W$ then $W'_{\vec{b}} \leq W_{\vec{b}}$

Proof. The first bullet is clear by definition of $W_{\vec{b}}$ as the first subspace of dimension $2k+1$ containing W by appending vectors from \vec{b} .

For the second bullet, assume $\dim(W') = t < k$, then by definition $W'_{\vec{b}} = W' + \text{Span}\{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$ and r is the minimal r such that $\dim(W'_{\vec{b}}) = 2t + 1$. Since W' is of co-dimension $k - t$ in W it implies that $\dim(W + \text{Span}\{b_1, \dots, b_r\}) \leq 2t + 1 + (k - t) = k + t + 1 < 2k + 1$, therefore $W + \text{Span}\{b_1, \dots, b_r\} \leq W_{\vec{b}}$. This concludes the proof as:

$$W'_{\vec{b}} \leq W + \text{Span}\{b_1, \dots, b_r\} \leq W_{\vec{b}}$$

□

Definition 10. The cone $c_{\vec{b}, \bullet}$ w.r.t. \vec{b} is defined recursively on generators $W \in \text{Gr}(V)$, and then extended linearly to $C_{\bullet}(\text{Gr}(V))$. This is done as follows. We set $c_{\vec{b}, \mathbf{0}} = \text{span}\{b_1\}$ and for $W \in \text{Gr}_k(V)$ we define:

$$c_{\vec{b}, W} = d_k|_{W_{\vec{b}}} \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right)$$

Remark 11. A crucial remark is that by Lemma 9 the definition above is well defined. A priori, some elements of $\text{supp}(c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)})$ may not be inside $W_{\vec{b}}$, in such case the above definition is not defined. By Lemma 9 it follows that assuming each element of the support of $c_{\vec{b}, W}$, is contained in $W'_{\vec{b}} \leq W_{\vec{b}}$ for $W' < W$, it follows that each element of $\text{supp}(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)})$ is contained in $W_{\vec{b}}$ and thus one can indeed restrict the coboundary operator to the sub q -complex contained in $W_{\vec{b}}$. Since $c_{\vec{b}, \mathbf{0}} = \text{span}\{b_1\}$ it follows by induction that each element of $\text{supp}(c_{\vec{b}, W})$ is contained in $W_{\vec{b}}$ as needed.

Remark 12. Notice that the cone of a k dimensional subspace W depends only on (b_1, \dots, b_{2k+1}) . Therefore when working on a fixed dimension k , we may consider cones with respect to any set of $2k + 1$ linearly independent vectors.

The following proposition justifies the name cones.

Proposition 13. For $u \in C_k(\text{Gr}(V))$ we have $\partial c_{\vec{b}, u} = u - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(u)}$

Proof. It is enough to prove the identity for a k space W . The proof is by induction on k . Indeed, by definition, we have:

$$\partial(c_{\vec{b}, W}) = \partial \left(d_k|_{W_{\vec{b}}} (-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right)$$

Since $\dim(W_{\vec{b}})$ is odd we can apply Claim 7 and get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \left(d_k|_{W_{\vec{b}}} (-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) &= d_{k-1}|_{W_{\vec{b}}} \partial_k \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) + (-1)^k \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) \\ &= d_{k-1}|_{W_{\vec{b}}} \partial_k \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) + \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

To prove the claim it's enough to show that

$$d_{k-1}|_{W_{\vec{b}}} \partial_k \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) = 0$$

Indeed, by induction $\partial \left(c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) = \partial(W) - c_{\vec{b}, \partial^2(W)} = \partial(W) :$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k \left((-1)^k \left(W - c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \right) &= (-1)^k \partial(W) + (-1)^{k+1} \partial \left(c_{\vec{b}, \partial(W)} \right) \\ &= (-1)^k \partial(W) + (-1)^{k+1} \partial(W) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Before we show this implies the vanishing of all homology groups except the middle one, we need a few observations on the symmetry of $Gr(V)$. Equip $C^k(X)$ with a bilinear form:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := \sum_{W, \dim(W)=k} \alpha(W) \beta(W)$$

In particular, the following observation is implied from the adjointness of ∂ and d :

Observation 14. For any $\alpha \in C^{k+1}(X)$ and $\beta \in C^k(X) :$

$$\langle \partial \alpha, \beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, d_k \beta \rangle$$

We also note that in the space $Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ there is a projective duality between k spaces and $n - k$ spaces that lifts to a duality between k -chains and $n - k$ -cochains. Concretely, fix any non-degenerate bilinear form $\langle -, - \rangle$ on \mathbb{F}_q^n , e.g. $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \cdot y_i$ and for a subspace U define $U^\perp = \{v \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \forall u \in U, \langle v, u \rangle = 0\}$. We can extend $^\perp$ linearly to get an operation $^\perp : C_k \rightarrow C_{n-k}$.

Claim 15. $\forall x \in C_k(\mathbb{F}_q^{n+1}) : (\partial_{n-k} x)^\perp = d_k(x^\perp)$

Proof. It is enough to prove this for $x = U$ for some subspace U . For a subspace U the claim follows since $U' \subseteq_1 U \iff U^\perp \subseteq_1 (U')^\perp$ for any non degenerate form. □

Corollary 16. Let V be an n dimensional space. Then $H_t(Gr(V)) \cong H^{n-t}(Gr(V))$

We can use Proposition 13 to determine when the homology groups $H_t(Gr(V))$ vanishes when $\dim(V)$ is even:

Theorem 17. Let $n = 2k$, and V be a linear space over \mathbb{F}_q of dimension n . Then $H_t(Gr(V)) = 0$ for $t \neq k$.

Proof. Fix some basis \vec{b} . Notice that if $\tau \in Z_t(X)$, i.e. $\partial \tau = 0$, and $t < k$ then $c_{\vec{b}, \tau}$ is defined. By Proposition 13:

$$\partial c_{\vec{b}, \tau} = \tau - c_{\vec{b}, \partial \tau} = \tau + c_{\vec{b}, 0} = \tau$$

Therefore $\tau \in B_{t+1}(X)$ as needed. By the universal coefficient theorem for cohomology we also have that $H^t(X)$ is trivial. Finally, the groups H_t, H^t are trivial for $t > k$ by Corollary 16. □

We remark that Theorem 17 together with Corollary 8 imply Theorem 4. With the cone construction above we can prove:

Proposition 18. *Let R be an arbitrary ring such that q is not zero in R . Then $\text{Ker}(\partial_k^{(R)})$ is generated by chains $\{\alpha_i\}$, where α_i is contained in some $2k$ dimensional space.*

Proof. Notice that the cone construction applies over any ring for which $\text{char}(R) \nmid q$. Indeed, we still have an identity of type Claim 7 which can be explicitly written for $n = 2k + 1$ by: $\partial_{k+1}d_k - d_{k-1}\partial_k = \binom{n-k}{1}_q - \binom{k}{1}_q = q^k$. In particular, since q^k is invertible mod $\text{char}(R)$. We get that the cone construction applies with a slight change in the definition:

$$c_{\vec{b},W} = d_k|_{W_{\vec{b}}} \left(q^{-k} \left(W - c_{\vec{b},\partial(W)} \right) \right)$$

Let $\alpha = \sum_W \alpha(W)W$ be a chain in Z_k . The statement is trivial for $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$ thus we turn to the case $k < \frac{n}{2}$. Since for such k we can build cones for any basis \vec{b} we get:

$$\alpha = \partial c_{\vec{b},\alpha} = \sum_{W \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \alpha(W) \partial c_{\vec{b},W} = \sum_{W \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \alpha(W) \left(W - c_{\vec{b},\partial W} \right)$$

We claim that the chains $\{W - c_{\vec{b},\partial W}\}_{\vec{b},W}$ are the required chains. Let t be the smallest index for which $\dim(W_{\vec{b}}^t) = 2k$. Appending the t vectors to $U \in \partial W$ yields a subspace of dimension at most $2k$, in particular this implies that:

$$\forall U \in \partial W : U_{\vec{b}} \subseteq W_{\vec{b}}^t$$

And by the definition of the cone of U , this implies that $\text{supp}(c_{\vec{b},U})$ is contained in $W_{\vec{b}}^t$. In conclusion this implies that $W - c_{\vec{b},\partial W}$ is contained in the $2k$ dimensional space $W_{\vec{b}}^t$ as needed. \square

2.2 Expansion

We now use the cones constructed for $Gr(V)$ to show that $Gr(V)$ has good coboundary expansion. Using cones to prove expansion is a technique developed in the work of Gromov [11] on topological overlap, and was implicitly defined in the work of Meshulam and Wallach [19]. Since then this technique was further developed and applied in greater generality e.g. [18], [13].

We use this technique together with the cone construction of Section 2 to prove coboundary expansion of $Gr(V)$.

We remark that there is small set expansion, meaning that if a chain has a few subspaces then it must expand by simple counting:

Claim 19. *For $\alpha \in C^k(X)$ we have $|d_k \alpha| \geq \binom{n-k}{1}_q |\alpha| - |\alpha| (|\alpha| - 1)$*

Proof. Notice that every subspace in $\text{supp}(\alpha)$ is contained in $\binom{n-k}{1}_q$ subspaces of codimension 1, so the number of subspaces that contain elements from α is at least:

$$\binom{n-k}{1}_q |\alpha| - \binom{|\alpha|}{2}$$

Since out of the $\binom{n-k}{1}_q |\alpha|$ subspaces we counted, the subspaces that contain k elements from α are counted k times and therefore by subtracting $\binom{|\alpha|}{2}$ each such term is counted $k - \binom{k}{2} \leq 1$ times. There is clearly a surjection from $\binom{\text{supp}(\alpha)}{2}$ to the subspaces that contain more than one element, therefore:

$$|d_k \alpha| \geq \binom{n-k}{1}_q |\alpha| - \binom{|\alpha|}{2} - \binom{|\alpha|}{2} \geq \binom{n-k}{1}_q |\alpha| - |\alpha| (|\alpha| - 1)$$

□

2.2.1 Coboundary expansion

We now turn to prove high dimensional expansion of $Gr(V)$. We refer the interested reader to Appendix A for a different inductive argument for expansion of 1-cochains via a different method of studying the expansion of a cochain by restricting it to a uniformly chosen, codimension 1 hyperplane. We adapt the language of [18]. We start with the following claim:

Claim 20. $\iota_s d_k \alpha + d_{k-1} \iota_s \alpha = \alpha$ where the contraction ι_s is given by $\iota_s \alpha(W) = \alpha(c_{s,W})$

Proof. Let W be a subspace, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_s d_k \alpha(W) + d_{k-1} \iota_s \alpha(W) &= d_k \alpha(c_{s,W}) + \iota_s \alpha(\partial W) \\ &= \alpha(\partial c_{s,W}) + \alpha(c_{s,\partial W}) \\ &= \alpha(\partial c_{s,W} + c_{s,\partial W}) \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 13 we know this equals to $\alpha(W)$ as required. □

Claim 21. Let \vec{b} be any basis and W any k space then:

$$|c_{\vec{b},W}| \leq [k+1]_q \left([k]_q!^2 \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{[j]_q!^2} \right) \right)$$

Proof. Let $f(k)$ be a bound of the size of a cone of a k space. By definition, $c_{\vec{b},W}$ is the coboundary of a $(-1)^k (W - c_{\vec{b},\partial W})$ in some $2k+1$ therefore:

$$|c_{\vec{b},W}| \leq [k+1]_q (|W| + |c_{\vec{b},\partial W}|) \leq [k+1]_q (1 + [k]_q f(k-1))$$

Thus,

$$f(k) \leq [k+1]_q (1 + [k]_q f(k-1)) \quad (2)$$

The proof follows since the RHS of the equation in the claim satisfies Equation (2), and bounds the cone size for zero dimensional subspace. □

Remark 22. This bound is stronger than the bound $|c_{\vec{b},W}| \leq \binom{2k+1}{k+1}_q$ by roughly a factor of q^k .

Theorem 23. Let $h_{k,n}$ be the expansion constant of k cochains of $Gr(V)$ where $\dim V = n$. Let b be the bound of the cone size for k chains, and assume $k < \frac{n}{2}$. Then:

1. $h_{k,n} \geq \frac{[n-k]_q}{[k+1]_q} \cdot \frac{1}{b}$, where b bounds the cone size.
2. $h_{n-k,n} \geq \frac{1}{b}$.

Proof. For the first item, let S be the set of all bases of \mathbb{F}_q^n then

$$\begin{aligned}
|S| \cdot \|\alpha\| &\leq \sum_{s \in S} \|\alpha - d_{k-1} \iota_s \alpha\| \\
&= \sum_{s \in S} \|\iota_s d_k \alpha\| \\
&\leq \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{W \in Gr(k,n)} \mathbf{1}_{d_k \alpha(c_{s,W}) \neq 0} \\
&\leq \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{W \in Gr(k,n)} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}(c_{s,W}) \cap \text{supp}(d_k \alpha) \neq \emptyset}
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry each element of $Gr(k+1, n)$ will be in the support of $c_{s,W}$ the same number of times over all $s \in S$ and $W \in Gr(k, n)$. This is true in particular for all the elements of $\text{supp}(d_k \alpha)$ therefore we can bound the last term above by $|S| \cdot |Gr(k, n)| \cdot b \cdot \|d_k \alpha\|$ thus:

$$|S| \cdot \|\alpha\| \leq \frac{|S| \cdot |Gr_k(n)| \cdot b}{|Gr_{k+1}(n)|} \cdot \|d_k \alpha\|$$

Which implies:

$$\frac{\|d_k \alpha\|}{\|\alpha\|} \geq \frac{|Gr_{k+1}(n)|}{|Gr_k(n)| \cdot b} = \frac{[n-k]_q}{[k+1]_q} \cdot \frac{1}{b}$$

For the second item, each closed chain $\alpha \in Z_k$ can be filled by $c_{b,\alpha}$ for some basis α which has size at most $b|\alpha|$. The claim follows by Claim 15. \square

2.3 Elements in $H_n(Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^{2n}))$

We now present two constructions of chains in different, non-trivial, homology classes of $H_n(Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^{2n}))$ denoted by η_n, ψ_n . These constructions appear in the work of James [12], in his study of the representation theory of $GL(V)$, though we present them from the viewpoint of cones which in some cases is more general.

2.3.1 Construction of η_n

The following observation is immediate from the cone identity and gives an easy way to construct closed chains from existing ones.

Observation 24. Let \vec{b}_1, \vec{b}_2 be bases then for $\alpha \in Z_k$ we have $c_{\vec{b}_1, \alpha} - c_{\vec{b}_2, \alpha} \in Z_{k+1}$.

We now describe James's construction which may be viewed as successive uses of Observation 24. Consider the independent sets $\vec{b}_{2i}^+ = (e_1, \dots, e_{2i-2}, e_{2i-1})$, and $\vec{b}_{2i}^- = (e_1, \dots, e_{2i-2}, e_{2i})$. The chains will be defined by: $\eta_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\eta_i = c_{\vec{b}_{2i}^+, \eta_{i-1}} - c_{\vec{b}_{2i}^-, \eta_{i-1}}$.

It is clear by the observation that $\eta_i \in Z_i(\text{Gr}(2i))$. One can also write an explicit formula for η_n . For any sequence of $(\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $A = \{a_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq i \leq j < n}$ with $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q$ there will be a vector space in the support of η_n . Explicitly, define the following vector:

$$v_i^{(\epsilon, A)} := \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_{i,j} e_{2j-\epsilon_j} + e_{2i-1} + \epsilon_i (e_{2i} - e_{2i-1})$$

Then the spaces in the support will be:

$$W^{(\epsilon, A)} := \text{Span}\{v_1^{(\epsilon, A)}, \dots, v_n^{(\epsilon, A)}\}$$

Denote $\text{sgn}(\epsilon) = (-1)^{\sum \epsilon_i}$, then:

Claim 25 (James [12]). $\eta_n = (-1)^{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\epsilon \in \{0,1\}^n, A} \text{sgn}(\epsilon) W^{(\epsilon, A)}$, where the sum is over A as above.

Proof. The proof is by induction. For $n = 1$ we have $c_{\vec{b}_2^+, \eta_0} = c_{e_1, 0} = \text{span}\{e_1\}$, and similarly $c_{\vec{b}_2^-, \eta_0} = \text{Span}\{e_2\}$ thus by definition $\eta_1 = \text{Span}\{e_1\} - \text{Span}\{e_2\}$.

For $n + 1$, we have by definition that $c_{\vec{b}_{2i}^+, \eta_n} = (-1)^n d\eta_n|_{\text{Span}\vec{b}_{2i}^+}$. We can decompose $c_{\vec{b}_{2i}^+, \eta_n} = \beta^+ + \gamma^+$ where β^+ is supported on subspaces contained in $\text{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{2n}\}$ and γ^+ support is not contained in $\text{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{2n}\}$.

We can decompose analogously $c_{\vec{b}_{2i}^-, \eta_n} = \beta^- + \gamma^-$. We know that $\beta^+ = \beta^- = d\eta_n|_{\text{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{2n}\}}$. We conclude that:

$$\eta_{n+1} = (-1)^n (\gamma^+ - \gamma^-)$$

It is clear that γ^+, γ^- has disjoint support, since each subspace of γ^+ contains vector with a non zero e_{2n+2} coordinate.

We claim that each subspace $W^{(\epsilon, A)}$ in $\text{supp}(\eta_n)$ can be extended into $\text{Span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{2n}, e_{2n+2}\}$ in exactly q^n ways by having a vector $e_{2n+2} + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{n,j} e_{2j-\epsilon_j}$. This follows since in the RREF (reduced row echelon form) of W with respect to the standard basis $e_{2j-(1-\epsilon_j)}$ is a leading term of the matrix. Since subspaces with e_{2n+2} come from the term γ^- , and correspond to $\epsilon_{n+1} = 1$ then assuming $W^{(\epsilon, A)}$ has coefficient $\text{sgn}(\epsilon)$ then the sign of $W^{((\epsilon, \epsilon_{n+1}), A)}$ is $-\text{sgn}(\epsilon) = \text{sgn}((\epsilon, \epsilon_{n+1}))$. \square

Remark 26. The cross polytope is the simplicial complex on the set $CP_n = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{2n}\}$ that consists of all subsets $S \subseteq CP_n$ for which $\forall i : |S \cap \{s_i, s_{n+i}\}| \leq 1$. In the cross polytope the elements s_i, s_{n+i} are considered antipodal and usually given negatives signs in ± 1 . By definition, one can construct CP_n by taking two cones of CP_{n-1} with the two new antipodal vertices, $\{s_n, s_{2n}\}$. With this in mind, notice that the chain above is the analog of this decomposition of CP_n , and by setting $q = 1$ there are no A coefficients and the chain reduces to the signed chain of all n sets of the n -cross polytope.

2.3.2 Construction of ψ_n

We now consider a different q -analog of the cross polytope, denoted by ψ_n . The construction is based on the theory of polar spaces and specifically, the polar space associated with the orthogonal quadratic form. We will review the facts we need from the theory of quadratic forms over a finite field to construct ψ_n (we refer the reader to [3], [5] for a thorough treatment)

Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q . Let $Q : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ be a quadratic form, that is Q satisfies $Q(av) = a^2Q(v)$ and also $B(u, v) = Q(u + v) - Q(u) - Q(v)$ is a bilinear form. We assume B is non-degenerate. In the cases $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}_q) \neq 2$ one can work with a symmetric bilinear form directly, but for $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}_q) = 2$ the extra information of Q is necessary. A vector v is *singular* if $Q(v) = 0$. A pair of singular vectors $\{e, f\}$ is a *hyperbolic pair*, if $B(e, f) = 1$.

Fact 27. *Every V of dimension $2n$ as above has a decomposition $V = \text{Span}\{e_1, f_1, \dots, e_n, f_n\}$ where:*

1. e_i, f_i form an hyperbolic pair.
2. $\text{Span}\{e_i, f_i\}$ is orthogonal to $\text{Span}\{e_j, f_j\}_{j \neq i}$.

Definition 28. *A subspace $W \subseteq V$ is totally singular if:*

- $\forall w \in W : Q(w) = 0$
- $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W : B(w_1, w_2) = 0$

A subspace $W \subseteq V$ is maximal totally singular if it is of dimension n . Let $MTS = MTS(V)$ be the collection of maximal totally singular spaces of V . The chain ψ_n will have MTS as support. Regarding signs we will need the following property which appears in [3]:

Fact 29. *Let $W_1, W_2 \in MTS$ be subspaces of V , and consider the graph $G_{MTS} = (MTS, E)$ such that $(W_1, W_2) \in E$ if $\dim(W_1/W_1 \cap W_2)$ is odd, then G is bipartite.*

Notice that by the fact above one can sign MTS by fixing some $W_1 \in MTS$ and taking: $\text{sgn}(W) = (-1)^{\dim(W_1/W_1 \cap W)}$. Therefore we consider ψ_n to be $\sum_{W \in MTS} \text{sgn}(W)W$. The subspaces in the support of the chain ψ_n will be the set of all totally singular spaces.

We remark that this object was also studied in the context of orbifolds in the theory of TQFTs [10].

Example 30. *Equip \mathbb{F}_q^{2n} with the orthogonal quadratic form: $Q(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_{2i-1} \cdot x_{2i}$. In the case $n = 2$, fix $W = \text{Span}\{e_1, e_4\}$, then $MTS = MTS_1 \cup MTS_{-1}$ with:*

- $MTS_1 = \text{Span}\{e_1 + \lambda e_3, e_2 - \lambda^{-1} e_4\} \cup \{e_1, e_4\} \cup \{e_2, e_3\}$
- $MTS_{-1} = \text{Span}\{e_1 + \lambda e_4, e_2 - \lambda^{-1} e_3\} \cup \{e_1, e_3\} \cup \{e_2, e_4\}$

Similarly to Remark 26, the chains ψ_n also correspond to the cross polytope with $q = 1$. The way to see this is that there is the antipodal map on the cross polytope $\text{ant}(\pm e_i) = \mp e_i$, and the orthogonal quadratic form on subsets S of the vertices cross polytope. A subset S is totally singular if $\text{ant}(S) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Consider the symmetric bilinear form associated with the orthogonal quadratic form:

$$B(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_{2i-1} \cdot y_{2i} + y_{2i-1} \cdot x_{2i}$$

Definition 31. A subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{2n}$ is totally singular if:

- $\forall w \in W : Q(w) = 0$
- $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W : B(w_1, w_2) = 0$

Observation 32. $\psi_n \in Z_n$

Proof. Let U be an $n - 1$ dimensional totally singular space. The form Q on the space U^\perp/U defined by $Q(v + U) = Q(v)$ is well-defined, non-degenerate and induces a symmetric bilinear form therefore by Fact 27 we know that U is contained in exactly two maximal totally singular spaces U_1, U_2 and it is easy to see that for all W they have different sign. \square

Observation 33. If $\alpha \in Z_k(Gr(n))$ and $\beta \in C_k(Gr(n))$ satisfy:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \neq 0$$

Then $\beta \notin B^{k-1}(Gr(n))$

Proof. If $\beta = d_{k-1}\gamma$ then by Observation 14:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, d_{k-1}\gamma \rangle = \langle \partial\alpha, \gamma \rangle = 0$$

\square

Corollary 34. If $\alpha \in Z^k(Gr(2k))$, $\beta \in Z_k(Gr(2k))$ and $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \neq 0$ then $[\beta] \neq [0]$ i.e. β is non-trivial in the homology group.

Claim 35 (James [12]). The chains ψ, η satisfy $\langle \psi_i, \eta_i \rangle = 1$. In particular ψ_n, η_n are non trivial in $H_n(Gr(2n))$.

Proof. Consider the form on \mathbb{F}_q^{2n} on which $\{e_{2i-1}, e_{2i-1} + e_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$ each form hyperbolic pairs (and different pairs are orthogonal to each other). It's enough to show that $|\text{supp}(\eta_n) \cap \text{supp}(\psi_n)| = 1$. Pick $W^{(\epsilon, A)} \in \text{supp}(\eta_n)$, and notice that if $\epsilon = 0$ then $W = \text{Span}\{e_1, e_3, \dots, e_{2n-1}\}$ is totally singular by the form's definition. For other ϵ , let ϵ_i be the first non-zero index of ϵ . If $W^{(\epsilon, A)}$ is totally isotropic it means that $A_{j,t} = 0$ for $j < i$, therefore the first $i - 1$ vectors of W are e_1, \dots, e_{2i-3} and since $\epsilon_i = 1$ together with the vanishing of the A coefficient this implies that e_{2i} is a vector in $W^{(\epsilon, A)}$ which is a contradiction since it is not one of the singular vectors in $\text{Span}\{e_{2i-1}, e_{2i-1} + e_{2i}\}$ by the form's definition. \square

It is well known (see Theorem 3.9.3 in [4]) that the number of maximal isotropic spaces in a $2n$ dimensional space is $\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 + q^i)$, therefore $\|\psi_n\| = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 + q^i)$. It is not hard to see this is smaller than the number of spaces in $\text{supp}(\eta_n)$ by a factor of roughly 2^n .

2.4 Topological overlap

We now define topological overlap for posets and show the complete Grassmannian is a poset that satisfies the topological overlap property.

A ranked poset X is a join-semilattice if for every finite set $S \subseteq X$ the set $\{x \in X \mid \forall s \in S s \leq x\}$ has a minimum element denoted by $\text{join}(S)$, and $\text{rk}(\text{join}(S)) \leq \sum_{s \in S} \text{rk}(s)$.

A ranked poset X is a downwards join-semilattice if, for every $x \in X$, the set $X_{\leq x} = \{x' \leq x \mid x' \in X\}$ is a join-semilattice. For example, simplicial complexes and q -complexes are such posets.

For a downwards join-semilattice X , and $x \in X$, a subset $I \subseteq X_{\leq x}$ is said to be independent if: (1) $0 \notin I$, (2) $\text{rk}(\text{join}(I)) = \sum_{i \in I} \text{rk}(i)$.

Definition 36. For a downwards join-semilattice X , the independence complex of X denoted by X^{IND} is a simplicial complex with $X^{IND}(1) = X(1)$, and

$$X^{IND}(i) = \{I \subseteq X(1) \mid I \text{ is independent in } X_{\leq x} \text{ for some } x \in X\}.$$

Observe that for every simplicial complex X , $X^{IND} = X$ (with $\text{rk}(x) = |x|$ for a set x). For a q -complex X an element of the simplicial complex X^{IND} (with $\text{rk}(x) = \dim(x)$) will be a set of lines ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k in X that are independent, and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \ell_i$ is in X and k dimensional.

Recall that a simplicial complex D has the topological overlap property if for every d dimensional piecewise linear manifold M and every continuous map $f : D \rightarrow M$ there exists a point $p \in M$ that is contained in the images of a positive fraction $\mu > 0$ of the $d + 1$ -sets of D^1 .

Definition 37 (Topological Overlap Property for Posets). A downwards join-semilattice X is said to have topological overlap in dimension d , if X^{IND} has topological overlap in dimension d .

It is often the case that cohomological high dimensional expansion implies topological overlap, as was proved in the pioneering work of Gromov [11], see [9] for a nice exposition and definitions.

We show that the complete Grassmannian has the topological expansion property, according to Definition 37. To do so, let G_n denote the independence complex of $Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$. We show that G_n has sufficiently large coboundary expansion.

Claim 38. G_n is a good high dimensional expander over \mathbb{F}_2 . Explicitly, for $k < \frac{n}{2}$,

$$h_k(G_n) = \Omega\left(|G_n(1)| \frac{1}{k!}\right).$$

Proof. We adapt the proof strategy of the coboundary expansion of $Gr(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ to the simplicial setting. Let $\text{Cone}_v(\sigma)$ denote the standard simplicial cone, defined on a face σ and $v \in G_n(1)$ such that $v \cup \sigma$ is a face by:

$$\text{Cone}_v(\sigma) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} v \cup \sigma & \text{if } v \notin \sigma \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in \sigma \end{array} \right\}$$

and extended linearly to chains. Notice that the construction above satisfies the cone identity whenever $v \cup \sigma$ is a face in G_n , but in case $v \cup \sigma$ is not a face there is no meaning for a cone identity as the simplicial cone is not defined.

We now construct cone maps for G_n that apply to all $\sigma \in G_n(k)$ for $k < \frac{n}{2}$, fix a basis $\vec{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Define inductively on $|\sigma|$ a chain $c'_{\vec{b}, \sigma}$ satisfying the cone identity, appearing in

¹By a continuous map from D to M we mean a continuous map from the geometric realization of D to M]

Equation (1). For $\sigma = \emptyset$, define $c'_{\vec{b}, \emptyset} = \text{Span}\{b_1\} = \text{Cone}_{\text{Span}\{b_1\}}(\sigma)$. In general, let b_i be the vector with minimal i such that $b_i \notin \text{Span}\{\sigma \cup \text{supp}(c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma})\}$, in this case we can inductively define the cone of σ (and then extend linearly to all chains in $C_k(G_n)$) with respect to \vec{b} by:

$$c'_{\vec{b}, \sigma} = \text{Cone}_{\text{Span}\{b_i\}}(\sigma + c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma}) \quad (3)$$

Notice that picking i such that $b_i \notin \text{Span}\{\sigma \cup \text{supp}(c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma})\}$, guarantees that $\forall x \in \text{supp}(\sigma + c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma})$, $\text{Span}\{b_i\} \cup x \in G_n(k+1)$, hence the right hand side of Equation (3) is defined.

Observe that one can show by induction that $c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma} \subseteq \text{Span}(\sigma) + \text{Span}(\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{|\sigma|+1})$ hence the construction above of $c'_{\vec{b}, \sigma}$ works for $k < \frac{n}{2}$, as for such k one can always find b_i for which Equation (3) is well defined.

Regarding the expansion constant, observe that since Cone_v preserves the size of closed chains, hence $\|c'_{\vec{b}, \sigma}\| = \|\text{Cone}_{\text{Span}\{b_i\}}(\sigma + c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma})\| = |\text{supp}(\sigma + c'_{\vec{b}, \partial\sigma})|$.

We get that if $f(i)$ denotes the maximal size of a cone of an i -set, then $f(i) \leq 1 + if(i-1)$ which implies $f(i) = O(i!)$. Carrying out the same analysis as in Theorem 23 one gets that for every cochain α :

$$\frac{\|d_k \alpha\|}{\|[\alpha]\|} \geq \frac{|G_n(k+1)|}{|G_n(k)| \cdot f(k)} \quad (4)$$

By plugging

$$|G_n(k)| = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (q^n - q^i)}{(q-1)^k}$$

into Equation (4) together with the bound $f(k) = O(k!)$ we obtain that:

$$\frac{\|d_k \alpha\|}{\|[\alpha]\|} \geq \frac{q^n - q^k}{q-1} \cdot \frac{1}{O(k!)}$$

Since $q^n - q^k > \frac{1}{2}(q^n - 1)$ for $q > 1$ and $k < \frac{n}{2}$ we may conclude that

$$\frac{\|d_k \alpha\|}{\|[\alpha]\|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{q^n - 1}{q-1} \cdot \frac{1}{O(k!)} = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{k!} \cdot |G_n(1)|\right).$$

□

We can now deduce:

Proposition 39. *The Grassmannian poset has the topological overlap property: Assume $n > 2d$ is large enough. There exist a constant $c(d)$ for any d dimensional piecewise-linear manifold M and any continuous map² $f : G_n \rightarrow M$ point $p \in M$ such that:*

$$|\{\sigma \in G_n(d+1) \mid p \in f(\sigma)\}| \geq c(d)|G_n(d+1)|$$

Proof. We show that the G_n satisfies the conditions of Theorem 8 of [9] (Gromov's Topological Overlap Theorem) which implies the proposition. The first condition is that G_n has high enough

²By a continuous map from G_n to M we mean a continuous map from the geometric realization of G_n to M]

cosystolic expansion in dimensions $1 \leq k \leq d+1$, since they work with normalized norms the first condition in their paper is the existence of L such that for all $k \leq d+1$:

$$\frac{\|d_k \alpha\|}{|G_n(k+1)|} \geq \frac{1}{L} \frac{\|\alpha\|}{|G_n(k)|}$$

By Claim 38 this holds for $k \leq d+1$ for some $L(d)$ with $L(d) = O(d+1)!$.

The second condition is large cosystoles in dimensions $0, \dots, d$. This means that all cocycles which are not coboundaries must have large norms. In Claim 38 we have proved that $h_k(G_n) > 0$ hence all cocycles are necessarily coboundaries hence this condition holds vacuously say with the constant 1.

In case these two conditions hold, there exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d, L(d), 1)$, such that if G_n is locally ε -sparse (to be defined next) for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ then for any continuous map f as in the statement of the theorem there exists $p \in M$ such that:

$$|\sigma \in G_n(d+1) \mid p \in f(\sigma)| \geq \mu |G_n(d+1)|$$

With $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon_0) = \mu(d)$ since ε_0 will depend only on d .

Therefore it remains to show that for any ε_0 , G_n is locally ε_0 -sparse for large enough n . Intuitively, a complex is locally sparse in dimension k if for any k -face σ , the number of face τ that intersect σ is small. Formally, we need to show for every $\sigma \in G_n(k)$ that:

$$|\{\tau \in G_n(k) \mid \tau \cap \sigma \neq \emptyset\}| \leq \varepsilon_0 |G_n(k)|$$

Denote $\sigma = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\}$, then by a union bound:

$$|\{\tau \in G_n(k) \mid \tau \cap \sigma \neq \emptyset\}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\{\tau \in G_n(k) \mid \sigma_i \in \tau\}| \leq k |G_n(1)|^{k-1}.$$

Hence it is enough to show that for large enough n we have:

$$k |G_n(1)|^{k-1} \leq \varepsilon_0 |G_n(k)|$$

Recall that have $|G_n(k)| = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (q^n - q^i)}{(q-1)^k}$, hence since for $n > k \geq i$, and $q \geq 2$ it holds that $q^n - q^i \geq \frac{1}{2}(q^n - 1)$ hence $|G_n(k)| \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|G_n(1)|^k}{q-1}$ and we get:

$$k |G_n(1)|^{k-1} \leq \frac{k 2^k (q-1)}{|G_n(1)|} |G_n(k)| = \frac{k 2^k (q-1)^2}{q^n - 1} |G_n(k)| \leq \frac{k 2^k}{q^{n-2}} |G_n(k)|$$

Notice that for $n > 2 + \log_2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0}) + 2d$ the expression $\frac{k 2^k}{q^{n-2}}$ is bounded by ε_0 , since $q \geq 2$ and $k \leq 2^k$. Hence:

$$|\{\tau \in G_n(k) \mid \tau \cap \sigma \neq \emptyset\}| \leq k |G_n(1)|^{k-1} \leq \varepsilon_0 |G_n(k)|$$

The proposition follows. □

3 Phase transition in connectivity of random q -complexes

The aim of this section is to prove a q -analog of the seminal works of Linial, Meshulam, and Wallach ([17], [19]) on random simplicial complexes. They studied the probability measure $\Delta(n, k, p)$ on simplicial complexes X that contain subsets of size at most $k + 1$ for some parameter k and contain all k subsets in their support. For each such complex X the probability to get X is:

$$\mathbb{P}[X] = p^{|X^{(k+1)}|} \cdot (1-p)^{\binom{n}{k+1}_q - |X^{(k+1)}|}$$

Their motivation was to generalize the result of Erdős–Rényi on the threshold for connectivity of a random graph to a higher dimension. They considered homological connectivity, which simply is defined by having $H^k(X) = 0$. Their main result is that a complex sampled from $\Delta(n, k, p)$ the for connectivity is sharp around $p = \frac{k \ln(n)}{n}$ in the sense of Theorem 5.

The strategy of their proof is to union bound over the probability that a cochain $\alpha \in C^k(X) \setminus B^{k-1}(X)$ is a cocycle in X . Each such α is a cocycle in X exactly when $\text{supp}(d_{k-1}\alpha) \cap X = \emptyset$ which happens with probability $(1-p)^{|d_{k-1}\alpha|}$.

In order to bound these probabilities, they proved that the complete complex is a coboundary expander. With this observation, the probability that α will be a cocycle in the random complex can be bounded by $\exp(-\|\alpha\| \cdot cn)$ for some constant $c > 0$. Even with this estimate, there are still too many cochains to union-bound over. The way they overcome this is by looking at the Down-Up connected components of α , specifically considering the graph G_α which vertex set is $\text{supp}(\alpha)$ and two sets v, u are connected if $|v \cap u| = k - 1$. The main observation is that if G_α is disconnected, and $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ is a decomposition of α with respect to these components, then $\text{supp}(d_k \alpha_1) \cap \text{supp}(d_k \alpha_2) = \emptyset$. In particular α is a cocycle iff α_1, α_2 are cocycles. Therefore it is enough to union bound over α which are minimal in their cohomology class and have connected support.

We use the same strategy to prove the phase transition in connectivity of random q -complexes. We already proved in Section 2.2 that the complete q -complex is a coboundary expander with good expansion that is linear in $\binom{n}{1}_q$ for any fixed k . In Section 3.1 we apply their technique to prove a similar estimate to the number of chains with connected support and prescribed coboundary size. In Section 3.2 we combine this estimate with the expansion bounds to complete the proof of Theorem 5.

3.1 The number of ϕ with prescribed $|d_k \phi|$

We now give estimates on the number of ϕ with prescribed $|d_k \phi|$. This section applies the technique developed in [19], adapted to the structure of the Grassmannian poset. Let \mathcal{G}_n denote the set of cochains on \mathbb{F}_q^n with connected support, i.e.

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \{\phi \in C^{k-1}(\mathbb{F}_q^n) : |\phi| = \|\phi\|, G_\phi \text{ is connected}\}.$$

Denote the set of such chains of support size m and minimal in their cohomology class by:

$$\mathcal{G}_n(m) = \{\phi \in \mathcal{G}_n : |\text{supp}(\phi)| = m\}$$

We also use the following notation for $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$

$$\mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta) = \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{G}_n(m) : |d_k \phi| = (1 - \theta)m \binom{n-k}{1}_q \right\}.$$

Write $g_n(m) = |\mathcal{G}_n(m)|$ and $g_n(m, \theta) = |\mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta)|$. We know by Theorem 23 that $g_n(m, \theta) = 0$ for $\theta > \theta_k := 1 - 1/\left([k]_q!^2 \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{[j]_q!^2}\right)\right)$. We assume we work over a finite ring of cardinality r , the main estimate is:

Proposition 40. *For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ there exist a constant $c_1 = c_1(\epsilon, k, q, r)$ such that for large enough n and any $\theta < B_k$ for some $B_k < 1$ we have:*

$$g_n(m, \theta) \leq c_1^m \left(\binom{n}{k}_q / m \right)^{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m} .$$

The proof of the proposition above depends on a partial domination property of Grassmannian set systems. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{V}{k}$ be a collection of k dimensional subspaces of V with $|\mathcal{F}| = m$. For $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ define

$$\beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = |\{\tau \in \binom{V}{k+1} : \binom{\tau}{k} \cap \mathcal{F} = \{\sigma\}\}|$$

and let $\beta(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} \beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$. Clearly $\beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) \leq \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ and $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \leq m \binom{n-k}{1}_q$. For $S \subset \mathcal{F}$ let

$$\Gamma(S) = \{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \dim(\eta \cap \sigma) = k-1 \text{ for some } \sigma \in S\} .$$

Claim 41. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and $n > k+1 + \log_q(2) + \log_q(\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$. Suppose that*

$$\beta(\mathcal{F}) \leq (1-\theta)m \binom{n-k}{1}_q$$

for some $0 < \theta \leq 1$. Then there exists a subfamily $S \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$|\Gamma(S)| \geq (1-\epsilon)\theta m$$

and

$$|S| < (20m \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} + 2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon \theta} .$$

Proof. Let $c(\epsilon) = 2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Choose a random subfamily $S \subset \mathcal{F}$ by picking each $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ independently with probability $c(\epsilon) \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}$ (This number is smaller than 1 by assumption on n). Notice that if τ of dimension $k+1$ contains σ and does not contribute to $\beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ then there is $\sigma' \subset \tau$ such that $\sigma' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\dim(\sigma' \cap \sigma) = k-1$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}[\sigma \notin \Gamma(S)] \leq \left(1 - c(\epsilon) \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}\right)^{\binom{n-k}{1}_q - \beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)} ,$$

hence

$$E[|\mathcal{F} - \Gamma(S)|] \leq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} \left(1 - c(\epsilon) \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}\right)^{\binom{n-k}{1}_q - \beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)} . \quad (5)$$

Since

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\binom{n-k}{1}_q - \beta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) \right) = m \binom{n-k}{1}_q - \beta(\mathcal{F}) \geq \theta m \binom{n-k}{1}_q$$

it follows by convexity from (5) that

$$\begin{aligned} E[|\mathcal{F} - \Gamma(S)|] &\leq (1 - \theta)m + \theta m \left(1 - c(\epsilon) \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} \right)^{\binom{n-k}{1}_q} \leq \\ &(1 - \theta)m + \theta m e^{-c(\epsilon)} = (1 - \theta)m + \theta m \epsilon^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$E[|\Gamma(S)|] \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)\theta m .$$

Hence, since $|\Gamma(S)| \leq |\mathcal{F}| = m$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[|\Gamma(S)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)\theta m] > \epsilon(1 - \epsilon)\theta . \quad (6)$$

On the other hand

$$E[|S|] = c(\epsilon)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q$$

and by a large deviation inequality (see e.g. Theorem A.1.12 in [1])

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|S| > \lambda c(\epsilon)m \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} \right] < \left(\frac{e}{\lambda} \right)^{\lambda c(\epsilon)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}} \quad (7)$$

for all $\lambda \geq 1$. Let

$$\lambda = 10 + \frac{\binom{n-k}{1}_q}{m} \left(\frac{\log \frac{1}{\theta}}{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}} + 1 \right)$$

then

$$\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)\theta > \left(\frac{e}{\lambda} \right)^{\lambda c(\epsilon)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}} .$$

Hence by combining (6) and (7) there exists an $S \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that $|\Gamma(S)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)\theta m$ and

$$|S| \leq \lambda c(\epsilon)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} = (20 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) \cdot m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} + 2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} .$$

□

Proof of Proposition 40: Define

$$\mathcal{F}_n(m, \theta) = \left\{ \mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}_q : |\mathcal{F}| = m, \beta(\mathcal{F}) \leq (1 - \theta)m \binom{n-k}{1}_q \right\}$$

and let $f_n(m, \theta) = |\mathcal{F}_n(m, \theta)|$. If $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta)$, then $\mathcal{F} = \text{supp}(\phi) \in \mathcal{F}_n(m, \theta)$. Indeed, if τ is a $k + 1$ dimensional subspace that contain a unique k subspace from \mathcal{F} then $d_{k-1}\phi(\tau) = \phi(\sigma) \neq 0$, hence $\beta(\mathcal{F}) \leq |d_k\phi| = (1 - \theta)m \binom{n-k}{1}_q$. Therefore

$$g_n(m, \theta) \leq (r - 1)^m f_n(m, \theta) .$$

We next estimate $f_n(m, \theta)$. By applying Claim 41 with any $\theta < B_k$ and ϵ , it follows that there exists an $S \subset \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $|S| \leq c_2 m \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}$ with $c_2 = c_2(\epsilon, k)$, such that $|\Gamma(S)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)\theta m$. By the injectivity of the mapping

$$\mathcal{F} \rightarrow (S, \Gamma(S), \mathcal{F} - \Gamma(S))$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(m, \theta) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{c_2 m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}} \binom{\binom{n}{k}_q}{i} \cdot 2^{\binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} \cdot \binom{k}{k-1}_q \cdot \binom{n}{1}_q} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m} \binom{\binom{n}{k}_q}{j} \leq \\ &c_3^m \binom{\binom{n}{k}_q}{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m} \leq \\ &c_4^m \left(\binom{n}{k}_q / m \right)^{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$g_n(m, \theta) \leq c_1^m \left(\binom{n}{k}_q / m \right)^{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m}.$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 5

1. The first item follows by a standard second-moment argument that a cochain that corresponds to an uncovered k -dimensional subspaces will be a cocycle w.h.p.
2. For the second item we use the union bound. We sum over all k -cochains α the probability that α is non trivial H^k . i.e. we show that:

$$\sum_m \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_n(m)} (1-p)^{|d_k(\alpha)|} = o(1) \quad (8)$$

We will use Claim 19 for $m \leq \frac{1}{10k} \binom{n-k}{1}_q = T$. Notice that in this range $g(n, m) \leq (r-1)^m \binom{\binom{n}{k}_q}{m} \leq c_5^m \binom{n}{k}_q^m / m^m$ by the bound $\binom{n}{k} \leq (\frac{en}{k})^k$. Therefore we can estimate the sum in Equation (8) by:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha \in g(n, m), m \leq \frac{1}{10k} \binom{n-k}{1}_q} (1-p)^{|d_k(\alpha)|} &\leq \sum_{m=1}^T \left(c_5^m \binom{n}{k}_q^m / m^m \right) (1-p)^{\binom{n-k}{1}_q \cdot m - m^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^T \left(c_5^m \binom{n}{k}_q^m / m^m \right) e^{-p \binom{n-k}{1}_q \cdot m + pm^2} \end{aligned}$$

Since $p \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q = \left(\ln \left(\binom{n}{k}_q \right) + \omega(n) \right)$, and since $m \leq T$ we obtain that the sum is bounded by

$$\sum_{m=1}^T \left(c_5 \frac{e^{-\omega(n)+pm}}{m} \right)^m \leq \sum_{m=1}^T \left(c_5 \frac{\exp \left(-\omega(n)/2 + \ln \left(\binom{n}{k}_q \right) \cdot m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} \right)}{m} \right)^m.$$

We note that the sum above is $o(1)$. Indeed if $m \leq \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ then the term $\ln \left(\binom{n}{k}_q \right) \cdot m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1}$ is $O(1)$ and therefore the sum is geometric and bounded up to constant by the first term $O(e^{-\omega(n)/2}) = o(1)$. If $m \geq \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ then we can use the same bound of geometric sum since:

$$\frac{\exp \left(\ln \left(\binom{n}{k}_q \right) \cdot m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{-1} \right)}{m} \leq \binom{n}{k}_q^{\frac{1}{10k}} / \binom{n-k}{1}_q^{\frac{1}{2}} = o(1).$$

The last inequality follows since $q^{nk} \geq \binom{n}{k}_q$ and $\binom{n-k}{1}_q \geq q^{n-k-1}$ hold and n is large enough. For $m \geq \frac{1}{10k} \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ we bound the sum Equation (8) by summing over $\mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta)$ in two ranges of θ . For $\theta \leq \epsilon_1$ we get that if $\epsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{2k}$ then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\theta \leq \epsilon_1} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta)} (1-p)^{|d_k \phi|} = \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\theta \leq \epsilon_1} g_n(m, \theta) (1-p)^{(1-\theta)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q} \leq \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} g_n(m) (1-p)^{(1-\epsilon_1)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q} \leq \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} g_n(m) \cdot \exp \left(-p(1-\epsilon_1)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q \right) \leq \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} \left(c_6 \frac{\binom{n}{k}_q}{m} \right)^m \binom{n}{k}_q^{-(1-\epsilon_1)m} \leq \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} \left(c_6 \frac{\binom{n}{k}_q^{\epsilon_1}}{m} \right)^m = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Where the last equality follow from the same bounds $q^{nk} \geq \binom{n}{k}_q$ and $\binom{n-k}{1}_q \geq q^{n-k-1}$ as before to get that in our range of m we have:

$$\binom{n}{k}_q^{\epsilon_1} < (q^{nk})^{\frac{1}{2k}} = q^{n/2} = o(m^{2/3})$$

For $\theta > \epsilon_1$ we will use the linear expansion of the Grassmannian poset and apply Proposition 40 to $\epsilon = \frac{1-\theta_k}{4k \cdot \theta_k}$. Notice that since $g_n(m, \theta) = 0$ for $\theta > \theta_k$ then we can use the constant c_1 of Proposition 40 that depends only on q, k, r with the bound $B_k = \theta_k$ as it works for all $\theta < \theta_k$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\theta \geq \epsilon_1} \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{G}_n(m, \theta)} (1-p)^{|d_k \phi|} = \\ & \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\theta \geq \epsilon_1} g_n(m, \theta) (1-p)^{(1-\theta)m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q} \leq \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \geq \epsilon_1 \\ g_n(m, \theta) \neq 0}} \left(c_1 \cdot \binom{n}{k}_q \cdot m^{-1} \right)^{(1-(1-\epsilon)\theta)m} \cdot \binom{n}{k}_q^{-(1-\theta)m} = \\ \sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \geq \epsilon_1 \\ g_n(m, \theta) \neq 0}} \left(c_1 \cdot \binom{n}{k}_q^{\epsilon\theta} \cdot m^{-1+\theta-\epsilon\theta} \right)^m. \end{aligned}$$

By using the fact that $\binom{n}{k}_q^{\frac{1}{2k}} \leq m$ for $m \geq T$ and large enough n the sum is bounded by

$$\sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \geq \epsilon_1 \\ g_n(m, \theta) \neq 0}} \left(c_1 \cdot m^{2k\epsilon\theta} \cdot m^{-1+\theta-\epsilon\theta} \right)^m.$$

Notice that the function $h(\theta) = -1 + \theta + (2k-1)\epsilon\theta$ is bounded from above by $-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\theta_k}{2}$ in the range $[0, \theta_k]$. Therefore the sum above is bounded by:

$$\sum_{m \geq T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \geq \epsilon_1 \\ g_n(m, \theta) \neq 0}} \left(c_1 \cdot m^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\theta_k}{2}} \right)^m.$$

There is at most $\left(\binom{n}{k}_q \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q \right)^2$ choices for θ since it is a rational with denominator $m \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q$ we get that this sum is bounded by

$$\left(\binom{n}{k}_q \cdot \binom{n-k}{1}_q \right)^2 \sum_{m \geq T} \left(c_1 \cdot m^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\theta_k}{2}} \right)^m = o \left(\binom{n}{1}_q^{-\Omega \left(\binom{n}{1}_q \right)} \right).$$

4 Concluding Remarks

In this work, we studied the homology of Grassmannian posets, its topological expansion, and a generalization of the Linial-Meshulam model for random q -complexes.

The Grassmannian poset is the $q \neq 1$ -analog of the simplex, hence it should be the building block for more general Grassmannian complexes. Unlike its $q = 1$ analog, the simplex, its homology is non-trivial. This non-triviality may imply a very rich homological picture for more complicated Grassmannian complexes.

Despite this complication, the topological expansion of the simplex generalizes to general q , as well as the phase transition in homological connectivity. It makes sense to ask which other topological and probabilistic properties of complexes generalize well.

Does the giant component phenomena in random graphs generalize to q -complexes sampled in the q -Linial-Meshulam model? A possible definition of a giant component is a subspace of codimension $O(1)$ such that the induced complex on it has trivial homology.

Question 42. *What is the threshold for having a giant connected component? Which properties of the random graph $G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ transfer to random q graphs? (E.g. scale of a critical window, decorated expander structure, etc.)*

Another natural question, which may have application to error correcting codes, is whether, for all dimensions d , there is a family of bounded degree (each line is contained in at most C faces for some constant $C(d)$) q -complexes which are coboundary expanders in dimension d .

Finally, we believe a very interesting question is to find a signed boundary map for the Grassmannian poset which satisfies $\partial^2 = 0$ over a ring of characteristic 0. Specifically, we believe it is intriguing to decide whether there is a boundary signing map for the complete q -complex with signs in the subring of \mathbb{C}^\times of the $q + 1$ roots of unity.

References

- [1] Noga Alon and Joel H. Spencer. *The Probabilistic Method*. Wiley Publishing, 4th edition, 2016.
- [2] Nima Anari, Kuikui Liu, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Cynthia Vinzant. Log-concave polynomials II: high-dimensional walks and an FPRAS for counting bases of a matroid. In Moses Charikar and Edith Cohen, editors, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23-26, 2019*, pages 1–12. ACM, 2019. doi:10.1145/3313276.3316385.
- [3] M Aschbacher. *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics: Finite group theory series number 10*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2 edition, June 2000.
- [4] Simeon Ball and Zsuzsa Weiner. *An introduction to finite geometry*. 2011.
- [5] Claude C Chevalley. *The algebraic theory of spinors and Clifford algebras: V. 2*. Collected works of Claude Chevalley. Springer, Berlin, Germany, December 1995.
- [6] Irit Dinur, Shai Evra, Ron Livne, Alexander Lubotzky, and Shahar Mozes. Locally testable codes with constant rate, distance, and locality. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 357–374. ACM, 2022. doi:10.1145/3519935.3520024.
- [7] Irit Dinur, Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Dor Minzer, and Muli Safra. On non-optimally expanding sets in grassmann graphs. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, TR17-094, 2017. URL: <https://eccc.weizmann.ac.il/report/2017/094>, arXiv:TR17-094.
- [8] Irit Dinur, Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Dor Minzer, and Muli Safra. Towards a proof of the 2-to-1 games conjecture? In Ilias Diakonikolas, David Kempe, and Monika Henzinger, editors, *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 376–389. ACM, 2018. doi:10.1145/3188745.3188804.
- [9] Dominic Dotterer, Tali Kaufman, and Uli Wagner. On Expansion and Topological Overlap. In Sándor Fekete and Anna Lubiw, editors, *32nd International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2016)*, volume 51 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 35:1–35:10, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. URL: <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2016/5927>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2016.35.

- [10] Davide Gaiotto and Justin Kulp. Orbifold groupoids. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2021, 2020.
- [11] Mikhail Gromov. Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. part 2: from combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 20:416–526, 08 2010. doi:10.1007/s00039-010-0073-8.
- [12] G D James. Isotropic spaces. In *Representations of General Linear Groups*, pages 114–123. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, May 1984.
- [13] Tali Kaufman and Izhar Oppenheim. Coboundary and cosystolic expansion from strong symmetry. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 84:1–84:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.84.
- [14] Tali Kaufman and Ran J. Tessler. Local to global high dimensional expansion and garland’s method for general posets. *CoRR*, abs/2101.12621, 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.12621>, arXiv:2101.12621.
- [15] Tali Kaufman and Ran J. Tessler. New cosystolic expanders from tensors imply explicit quantum LDPC codes with $\Omega(\sqrt{n} \log^k n)$ distance. In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC ’21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 1317–1329. ACM, 2021. doi:10.1145/3406325.3451029.
- [16] Subhash Khot, Dor Minzer, and Muli Safra. Pseudorandom sets in grassmann graph have near-perfect expansion. In Mikkel Thorup, editor, *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pages 592–601. IEEE Computer Society, 2018. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2018.00062.
- [17] Nathan Linial and Roy Meshulam. Homological connectivity of random 2-complexes. *Comb.*, 26(4):475–487, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00493-006-0027-9.
- [18] Alexander Lubotzky, Roy Meshulam, and Shahar Mozes. Expansion of building-like complexes. *arXiv: Combinatorics*, 2014.
- [19] Roy Meshulam and N. Wallach. Homological connectivity of random k -dimensional complexes. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 34(3):408–417, 2009. doi:10.1002/rsa.20238.
- [20] V.B. Mnukhin and I.J. Simons. On modular homology in projective space. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 151(1):51–65, 2000. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022404999000535>, doi:10.1016/S0022-4049(99)00053-5.

A Expansion by restrictions

Claim 43. *There exist $c > 0$ that depend only on q such that for any 1-co-chain α on $Gr_1(n)$:*

$$|d_1\alpha| \geq c|\alpha| \cdot \left(\binom{n}{1}_q - |\alpha| \right)$$

Proof. The proof is by induction. Assume that for a co-chain α on $Gr_1(n)$:

$$|d_1\alpha| \geq c|\alpha| \cdot \left(\binom{n}{1}_q - |\alpha| \right)$$

Let α be a co-chain on $Gr(1, n+1)$, then we can calculate $|d_0\alpha|$ by calculating its restrictions on hyperplanes of codimension 1. i.e.

$$|d_1\alpha| = \frac{1}{|Gr_{n-2}(n-1)|} \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} |d_1\alpha|_H \geq \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{1}_q} \sum_{H \in Gr_{n-2}(n-1)} |d_1|_H |\alpha|_H$$

Where we used the fact that every plane in $\text{supp}(d_1\alpha)$ is counted for each hyperplane that contains it and this set is in bijection with $Gr_{n-2}(n-1)$. Now we use the induction hypothesis on each $\alpha|_H$. Notice that if $\alpha = \sum_{v_i \in \text{supp}(\alpha)} \mathbb{1}_{v_i}$ then $\alpha|_H = \sum_{v_i \in \text{supp}(\alpha); v_i \subseteq H} \mathbb{1}_{v_i}$, therefore:

$$\binom{n-1}{1}_q |d_1\alpha| \geq \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} |d_1|_H |\alpha|_H \geq \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} c \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right) \cdot \left(\binom{n}{1}_q - \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right) \right) \quad (9)$$

$$\geq c \left(\binom{n}{1}_q \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right) - \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right)^2 \right) \quad (10)$$

We bound each term in Equation (10), for the term on the left we get:

$$\sum_{H \in Gr_{n-2}(n-1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right) = \sum_{v_i} \sum_{v_i \subseteq H \in Gr_n(n+1)} 1 = \binom{n}{1}_q |\alpha| \quad (11)$$

For the second term we get that:

$$\sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right)^2 = \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \sum_{v_i \in H} 1 + \sum_{v_i \neq v_j} \sum_{v_i \oplus v_j \subseteq H} 1 = \binom{n}{1}_q |\alpha| + |\alpha| \cdot (|\alpha| - 1) \binom{n-1}{1}_q$$

We combine those two bounds to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{c} \binom{n-1}{1}_q |d_1 \alpha| &\geq \binom{n}{1}_q \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right) - \sum_{H \in Gr_n(n+1)} \left(\sum_{v_i \in H} 1 \right)^2 \\
&\geq \binom{n}{1}_q^2 |\alpha| - \binom{n}{1}_q |\alpha| - |\alpha| \cdot (|\alpha| - 1) \binom{n-1}{1}_q \\
&= \left(\binom{n}{1}_q^2 - \binom{n}{1}_q + \binom{n-1}{1}_q \right) |\alpha| - \binom{n-1}{1}_q |\alpha|^2 \\
&= \left(q \binom{n}{1}_q \binom{n-1}{1}_q + \binom{n-1}{1}_q \right) |\alpha| - \binom{n-1}{1}_q |\alpha|^2 \\
&= \left(\binom{n+1}{1}_q \binom{n-1}{1}_q \right) |\alpha| - \binom{n-1}{1}_q |\alpha|^2
\end{aligned}$$

And therefore:

$$|d_1 \alpha| \geq c \binom{n+1}{1}_q |\alpha| - c |\alpha|^2 = c |\alpha| \cdot \left(\binom{n}{1}_q - |\alpha| \right)$$

□