

Quantum Expander Mixing Lemma and its Converse

Ning Ning¹

¹*Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University. e-mail: patning@tamu.edu*

Abstract: Expander graphs are fundamental in both computer science and mathematics, with a wide array of applications. With quantum technology reshaping our world, quantum expanders have emerged, finding numerous uses in quantum information theory. The classical expander mixing lemma plays a central role in graph theory, offering essential insights into edge distribution within graphs and aiding in the analysis of diverse network properties and algorithms. This paper establishes the quantum analogue of the classical expander mixing lemma and its converse for quantum expanders.

1. Introduction

Expander graphs are foundational in both computer science and mathematics, offering diverse applications across these domains (Hoory et al., 2006; Lubotzky, 2012). Leveraging their expansion property, these graphs contribute significantly to algorithmic innovations, cryptographic protocols, analysis of circuit and proof complexity, development of derandomization techniques and pseudo-random generators, as well as the theory of error-correcting codes. Additionally, expander graphs play pivotal roles in shaping structural insights within group theory, algebra, number theory, geometry, and combinatorics. As quantum technology is revolutionizing the world, quantum expanders were introduced and have found numerous applications in the field of quantum information theory (Ambainis and Smith, 2004; Ben-Aroya et al., 2008; Hastings, 2007a; Hastings and Harrow, 2009; Aharonov et al., 2014).

Quantum expanders are the quantum extension of expander graphs, described by means of operators that map quantum states to quantum states. A general quantum state is a density matrix, which is a trace-one and positive semidefinite operator, i.e.,

$$\rho = \sum_v p_v |\psi_v\rangle \langle \psi_v|, \quad 0 \leq p_v \leq 1, \quad \sum_v p_v = 1,$$

with $\{\psi_v\}$ being some orthonormal basis of a Hilbert space \mathcal{V} . Notice that $\rho \in L(\mathcal{V}) := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V})$. An admissible quantum transformation $F : L(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{V})$ is any transformation that can be implemented by a quantum circuit, with unitary operators and measurements. Thus, admissible quantum operators map density matrices to density matrices; see, Nielsen and Chuang (2001); Kitaev et al. (2002).

In this paper, we rigorously define quantum expanders following [Hastings \(2007b\)](#) and [Pisier \(2014\)](#). In essence, we consider a quantum operator $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$ in the following normalized form (dividing by d):

$$T_n(\eta) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \eta u_j^{(n)*}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $M(N_n)$ stands for the space of $N_n \times N_n$ complex matrices, $(u_1^{(n)}, \dots, u_d^{(n)})$ is a d -tuple of unitary matrices with d being a positive integer that is independent of n , and the superscript “ $*$ ” represents the conjugate transpose. We have the operator norm $\|T_n\| = 1$ and $T_n(I_{N_n}) = I_{N_n}$, where $I_{N_n} \in M(N_n)$ is the identity matrix. In the quantum context, the spectral gap is delineated by the reduced spectral radius $\|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|$, where T_n is restricted to the orthogonal complement $I_{N_n}^\perp$ of the identity matrix. A quantum expander sequence comprises those having reduced spectral radius smaller than 1 uniformly for all n , as N_n tends to infinity with n .

The aim of this paper is to establish the quantum counterpart of the classical expander mixing lemma and its converse. The expander mixing lemma intuitively states that the edges of certain d -regular graphs are evenly distributed throughout the graph. Specifically, the normalized number of edges connecting two vertex subsets S_1 and S_2 is always close to the expected number of edges between them in a random d -regular graph, which is $\frac{1}{n}|S_1||S_2|$. This well-known result is demonstrated, for example, in Corollary 9.2.5 of [Alon and Spencer \(2000\)](#). The expander mixing lemma plays a pivotal role in graph theory, providing crucial insights into the distribution of edges within graphs and facilitating the analysis of various network properties and algorithms. Variants of the expander mixing lemma have been proposed. For instance, [Chen et al. \(2013\)](#) established an operator version of the expander mixing lemma, utilizing it iteratively for bias amplification. This approach was further employed in [Jeronimo et al. \(2022\)](#) to formulate the iterated operator expander mixing lemma.

We establish the expander mixing lemma for quantum expanders, termed the quantum expander mixing lemma, for the first time to the authors’ best knowledge. This lemma asserts that for any two orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in M(N_n)$, the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product of P_1 and $T_n P_2$ is always close to $\frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2)$ for all n , for T_n being in the normalized form given in (1.1). In quantum mechanics, the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product of two matrices (which symbolize quantum states) serves as a measure of the similarity between these states. A substantial inner product implies a significant degree of similarity or correlation between the states, whereas a small inner product indicates dissimilarity or orthogonality.

Studying the converse of the expander mixing lemma enhances the understanding of graph properties and their implications in diverse fields, leading to more robust theories, algorithms, and applications. The converse of the expander mixing lemma has been articulated in two distinct ways. The first way involves investigating the upper bound of the second-largest (in absolute value) eigen-

value of the d -regular graph, when the normalized number of edges between two vertex subsets S_1 and S_2 is always close to $\frac{1}{n}|S_1||S_2|$, as demonstrated in [Bilu and Linial \(2006\)](#). The second way examines whether there exist vertex subsets S_1 and S_2 such that the normalized number of edges in between, compared to $\frac{1}{n}|S_1||S_2|$, cannot fall below a certain threshold, as shown in [Lev \(2015\)](#).

In this paper, we further establish the converse of the expander mixing lemma for quantum expanders, which is the first result to the best of the authors' knowledge. Following the second way, our focus lies on exploring the bounds of that difference. Specifically, our quantum expander mixing lemma states that there exist two orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in M(N_n)$ such that the difference of the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product of P_1 and $T_n P_2$ to $\frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2)$ cannot be small up to a certain threshold for all n .

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In [Section 2](#), we formally define expander graphs and then present the classical expander mixing lemma. In [Section 3](#), we rigorously define quantum expander graphs and then state our quantum expander mixing lemma along with its converse. Technical proofs of this paper are provided in [Section 4](#). Throughout the paper, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Hilbert–Schmidt norm when applied to a matrix and the operator norm when applied to an operator, with the specific meaning determined by the context.

2. Expander mixing lemma

We start by defining formally the concept of an expander graph and then state the expander mixing lemma in [Theorem 2.3](#). There exist several equivalent definitions of expander graphs, which can be characterized through vertex, edge, or spectral expansion. We adopt the spectral perspective towards expander graphs, defining them in terms of a certain spectral gap by means of Markov operators. We refer interested readers to [Tao \(2015\)](#) for further details.

We consider an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices and E is the set of edges. A graph is finite if V is finite, and hence E is finite. We consider \mathcal{G} as a d -regular graph, where each vertex of V is contained in exactly d edges in E ; we say that d is the degree of the regular graph \mathcal{G} . We let $\ell^2(V)$ be the finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space of functions $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with norm and inner product given respectively as

$$\|f\|_{\ell^2(V)} := \left(\sum_{v \in V} |f(v)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f, g \rangle_{\ell^2(V)} := \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \overline{g(v)},$$

where the overline notation represents the complex conjugate. We then define the adjacency operator $A : \ell^2(V) \rightarrow \ell^2(V)$ on functions $f \in \ell^2(V)$ as the sum of f over all of the neighbours of v , i.e.,

$$Af(v) := \sum_{w \in V: \{v,w\} \in E} f(w).$$

Clearly, A is a linear operator and one can associate it with the adjacency matrix.

Since \mathcal{G} is d -regular, a linear algebraic definition of expansion is possible based on the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix A . For \mathcal{G} being undirected, A is real symmetric. It is known that for \mathcal{G} being a d -regular graph having n vertices, the spectral theorem implies that A has n real-valued eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and these eigenvalues are in $[-d, d]$. Because \mathcal{G} is regular, the uniform distribution $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with entry $u_i = 1/n$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, is its stationary distribution. Thus, u is an eigenvector of A with eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = d$, i.e., $Au = du$. The spectral gap of \mathcal{G} is defined to be $d - \lambda_2$, which measures the spectral expansion.

The normalized variants of these definitions are commonly employed and offer greater convenience when displaying certain results. Consider the matrix $\frac{1}{d}A$, which is the Markov transition matrix of \mathcal{G} , and its eigenvalues are in $[-1, 1]$. It is associated with the Markov operator $T : \ell^2(V) \rightarrow \ell^2(V)$ defined by

$$\langle T\delta_x, \delta_y \rangle_{\ell^2(V)} = \begin{cases} 1/d & (x, y) \in E, \\ 0 & (x, y) \notin E, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where δ_x is the Kronecker delta function on x . Then, T is self-adjoint (equal to its conjugate transpose T^*) and the operator norm $\|T\| = 1$. Denote $1_V \in \ell^2(V)$ for the constant function $v \mapsto 1$, and then $T(1_V) = 1_V$. We can observe the reduction in the operator norm of T when it is restricted to the orthogonal complement 1_V^\perp .

Definition 2.1. Define the reduced spectral radius $\rho(\mathcal{G})$ of \mathcal{G} as the restricted operator norm

$$\rho(\mathcal{G}) := \|T|_{1_V^\perp}\|.$$

In this paper, we assume graph \mathcal{G} is connected, and then the largest eigenvalue 1 of T has multiplicity 1. We assume \mathcal{G} is non-bipartite, and then -1 is not an eigenvalue of T . Therefore, the reduced spectral radius $\rho(\mathcal{G})$ is always smaller than 1. We identify \mathcal{G} with the set of vertices. A sequence $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of finite d -regular simple connected graphs with the cardinality of the vertex set $|V_n| = n \rightarrow \infty$. For a given sequence of d -regular graphs $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, the reduced spectral radius $\rho(\mathcal{G}_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is always smaller than 1. The operator $\Delta := 1 - T$ is sometimes known as the (combinatorial or graph) Laplacian. This is a positive semidefinite operator with at least one zero eigenvalue. To inquire whether a uniform gap exists between $\rho(\mathcal{G}_n)$ and 1, here is the definition of the expander sequence.

Definition 2.2. A graph is called an expander if there is a spectral gap of size $\epsilon > 0$ in Δ , in the sense that the first eigenvalue of Δ exceeds the second by at least ϵ , equivalently $1 - \rho(\mathcal{G}) \geq \epsilon$. A sequence of d -regular graphs (\mathcal{G}_n) is called an expander sequence if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\rho(\mathcal{G}_n) \leq 1 - \epsilon$ for all n .

We have defined the notion of an expander sequence, which is a family of graphs instead of an individual graph. It is also commonly defined through the

(n, d, λ) -graph, which is a d -regular graph with n vertices such that all of the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix except one have absolute value at most λ , i.e., $\max_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i| \leq \lambda$. If we fix d and λ then (n, d, λ) -graphs form a family of expander graphs with a constant spectral gap. The expander mixing lemma states the number of edges between two vertex subsets S_1 and S_2 is always close to the expected number of edges between them in a random d -regular graph, namely $\frac{d}{n}|S_1||S_2|$; see, for instance, Corollary 9.2.5 of [Alon and Spencer \(2000\)](#).

Theorem 2.3 (Expander mixing lemma, [Alon and Spencer \(2000\)](#)). *Consider the expander sequence defined in accordance to Definition 2.2. For any two subsets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq V$, let*

$$e(S_1, S_2) = \left| \{(x, y) \in S_1 \times S_2 : xy \in E\} \right|$$

be the number of edges between S_1 and S_2 (counting edges contained in the intersection of S_1 and S_2 twice). Then

$$\left| \frac{1}{d}e(S_1, S_2) - \frac{1}{n}|S_1||S_2| \right| \leq (1 - \epsilon)\sqrt{|S_1||S_2|}.$$

A converse to the above well-known expander mixing lemma is provided in Corollary 4 of [Lev \(2015\)](#).

Theorem 2.4 (Converse of expander mixing lemma, [Lev \(2015\)](#)). *Consider the expander sequence defined in accordance to Definition 2.2. With $e(S_1, S_2)$ as in Theorem 2.3, there exist non-empty subsets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq V$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{d}e(S_1, S_2) - \frac{1}{n}|S_1||S_2| \right| \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{32\sqrt{2}(\log(2/(1 - \epsilon)) + 4)}\sqrt{|S_1||S_2|}.$$

3. Main results

In this section, we define formally the concept of quantum expanders following [Hastings \(2007b\)](#) and [Pisier \(2014\)](#). Before that, it is worth providing the motivation from classical expanders and explaining how quantum expanders appear as a non-commutative version of the classical ones.

The story could be started with the Cayley graph. Consider G as a finite group generated by $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_d\}$. Suppose S is symmetric in the sense that $s \in S$ whenever $s^{-1} \in S$ and does not contain the identity 1 to avoid loops. The Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is defined as the graph with vertex set G and edge set $\{\{sx, x\} : x \in G, s \in S\}$. Each vertex $x \in G$ is connected to the $|S| = d$ elements sx for $s \in S$ and hence $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is a d -regular graph. A unitary representation of G is the Hilbert space $\ell^2(G)$, together with a homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow U(\ell^2(G))$ from G to the group $U(\ell^2(G))$ of unitary transformations on $\ell^2(G)$. Define the (left) regular unitary representation of G as $\pi_G : G \rightarrow U(\ell^2(G))$ such that

$$(\pi_G(g)f)(x) = f(g^{-1}x)$$

for $f \in \ell^2(G)$ and $x, g \in G$. Unitary operator $\pi_G(s)$ is a unitary induced by the permutation of vertices of the graph.

To discuss expanders, let us assume that we are given a sequence of Cayley graphs $\text{Cay}(G_n, S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, where $S_n = \{s_1(n), \dots, s_d(n)\} \subset G_n$ for each n with d being a positive integer independent of n . Then $\{\text{Cay}(G_n, S_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ where

$$N_n := |G_n| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

is an expander sequence if and only if the sequence of d -tuples of unitaries

$$\left\{ (\pi_{G_n}(s_1(n)), \dots, \pi_{G_n}(s_d(n))) \in U(\ell^2(G_n))^d \right\}_{n=1}^\infty$$

satisfies that with $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_n \left\| \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi_{G_n}(s_i(n)) \right) \right\|_{1_{G_n}^\perp} \leq 1 - \epsilon,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Hilbert–Schmidt norm. This is equivalent to the condition that there exists a sequence of d -tuples of unitaries

$$\left\{ (u_1^{(n)}, \dots, u_d^{(n)}) \in U(N_n)^d \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \quad \text{with } u_j^{(n)} = \pi_{G_n}(s_j(n)),$$

such that for any $n \geq 1$, some $\epsilon > 0$, and any x being a $N_n \times N_n$ diagonal complex matrix,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \left(x - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(x) \right) u_j^{(n)*} \right\| \leq (1 - \epsilon) \left\| x - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(x) \right\|, \quad (3.1)$$

where $U(N_n)$ stands for the set of $N_n \times N_n$ unitary matrices.

The term “quantum expander” is just to designate unitaries $(u_1^{(n)}, \dots, u_d^{(n)})$ to satisfy (3.1) for a general $x \in M(N_n)$ beyond being diagonal, where $M(N_n)$ stands for the space of $N_n \times N_n$ complex matrices. In this light, quantum expanders can be seen as a non-commutative version of the classical ones. Identifying $M(N_n)$ with the space $B(\ell_2^{N_n})$ of bounded operators on the N_n -dimensional Hilbert space $\ell_2^{N_n}$, different to the Markov operator T defined in (2.1), in the quantum setting we consider quantum operators act on $\ell_2^{N_n} \otimes \ell_2^{N_n}$ of the following form for each n :

$$T_n = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \otimes \bar{u}_j^{(n)}, \quad u_j^{(n)} \in U(N_n),$$

where $\bar{u}_j^{(n)}$ is the complex conjugate of the matrix $u_j^{(n)}$. Identifying as usual $\ell_2^{N_n} \otimes \ell_2^{N_n}$ as $S_2^{N_n}$, the Hilbert space obtained by equipping $M(N_n)$ with the

corresponding scalar product and the Hilbert–Schmidt norm. We can write

$$\left\| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \otimes \bar{u}_j^{(n)} : \ell_2^{N_n} \otimes \bar{\ell}_2^{N_n} \rightarrow \ell_2^{N_n} \otimes \bar{\ell}_2^{N_n} \right\| = \|T_n : S_2^{N_n} \rightarrow S_2^{N_n}\|.$$

Then we may consider T_n as an operator acting on $M(N_n)$ defined by

$$T_n(\eta) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \eta u_j^{(n)*}, \quad \forall \eta \in M(N_n),$$

which satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \otimes \bar{u}_j^{(n)} \right\| \\ &= \sup \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^{(n)} \eta u_j^{(n)*} \right\| \mid \eta \in M(N_n), \|\eta\| \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{d} \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \operatorname{tr}(u_j^{(n)} \eta u_j^{(n)*} \zeta^*) \right| \mid \eta, \zeta \in M(N_n), \|\eta\| \leq 1, \|\zeta\| \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the classical setting, we have the operator norm $\|T_n\| = 1$ and $T_n(I_{N_n}) = I_{N_n}$, where $I_{N_n} \in M(N_n)$ is the identity matrix. Then we ask how much the operator norm of the quantum operator T_n would be decreased if it is restricted to the orthogonal complement $I_{N_n}^\perp$ of the identity matrix. For that purpose, we give the quantum version of Definition 2.1.

Definition 3.1. *Define the reduced spectral radius $\rho(n)$ as the restricted operator norm*

$$\rho(n) := \|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|.$$

The definition of a quantum expander is defined in terms of $\rho(n)$. It says that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\rho(n) \leq 1 - \epsilon$ for all n , which is in consistent with the classical expander sequence in Definition 2.2.

Definition 3.2 (Hastings (2007b) and Pisier (2014)). *Fix a positive integer d and a sequence of positive integers $\{N_n\}$ with $N_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We say a sequence of d -tuples of unitaries*

$$\left\{ (u_1^{(n)}, \dots, u_d^{(n)}) \in U(N_n)^d \right\}_{n=1}^\infty$$

is a quantum expander sequence if their reduced spectral radius $\rho(n)$ is smaller than 1 uniformly for all n .

The following two theorems are our main results of this paper.

Theorem 3.3 (Quantum expander mixing lemma). *Consider a quantum expander sequence defined in accordance to Definition 3.2. For any two orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in M(N_n)$, we have that for all n ,*

$$\left| \langle P_1, T_n P_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2) \right| \leq (1 - \epsilon) \sqrt{\text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2)},$$

where the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product of two matrices A and B is defined as usual

$$\langle A, B \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \text{tr}(A^* B).$$

Theorem 3.4 (Converse of quantum expander mixing lemma). *Consider a quantum expander sequence defined in accordance to Definition 3.2. There exist two universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and two non-zero orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in M(N_n)$, such that for all n ,*

$$\left| \langle P_1, T_n P_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2) \right| \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{C_1(-\log(1 - \epsilon) + C_2)} \sqrt{\text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2)}.$$

4. Proofs of the paper

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let $E : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$ be the orthogonal projection onto the space $\langle I_{N_n} \rangle = \ker(1 - T_n)$. Then

$$E(P_2) = \frac{\text{tr}(P_2)}{N_n} I_{N_n}.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2) = \langle P_1, N_n E(P_2) \rangle_{\text{HS}}.$$

We have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and properties of the unitaries that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle P_1, T_n P_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2) \right|^2 &= \left| \langle P_1, (T - E)P_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right|^2 \\ &\leq \text{tr}(P_1^* P_1) \text{tr} \left(((T - E)P_2)^* ((T - E)P_2) \right) \\ &\leq \text{tr}(P_1) \|T|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|^2 \text{tr}(P_2) \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon)^2 \text{tr}(P_1) \text{tr}(P_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

To prove Theorem 3.4, we commence by introducing the Schatten norm. In mathematics, particularly in functional analysis, the Schatten norm, also known as the Schatten–von-Neumann norm, emerges as a generalization of p -integrability, akin to the trace class norm and the Hilbert–Schmidt norm. For $p \in [1, \infty)$, define the Schatten p -norm of $A \in M(N_n)$ as

$$\|A\|_p = \left[\text{tr}((A^* A)^{\frac{p}{2}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}};$$

for $p = \infty$, the convention is to define $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ as the operator norm

$$\|A\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\|=1} \|Ax\|.$$

The Schatten norms are unitarily invariant in the sense that for unitaries U, V and $p \in [1, \infty]$,

$$\|UAV\|_p = \|A\|_p. \quad (4.1)$$

Considering $q = 1$ as the dual index to $p = \infty$, the noncommutative Hölder's inequality says that for all $p, q, r \in [1, \infty]$ such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r}$, we have that for any matrices $A, B \in M(N_n)$,

$$\|AB\|_r \leq \|A\|_p \|B\|_q.$$

Its special case is the well-known inequality

$$\|A\|^2 = \|A\|_2^2 \leq \|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is called the trace norm or the nuclear norm, $\|\cdot\|_2$ is called the Frobenius norm or the Hilbert–Schmidt norm, and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is called the spectral norm or the operator norm. [Lev \(2015\)](#) defined height (Definition 4.1) of a matrix using these three important norms; by (4.2) the height of any matrix is at least one.

Definition 4.1 ([Lev \(2015\)](#)). *Define the height of a non-zero matrix $A \in M(N_n)$ by*

$$h(A) := \frac{\sqrt{\|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty}}{\|A\|}.$$

We define the Schatten norm induced operator norm as $\|T_n\|_{p \rightarrow p}$ for operator $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$. Then the three special cases $p = 1, 2$ and ∞ give operator norms $\|T\|_{1 \rightarrow 1}$, $\|T\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}$ and $\|T\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}$, respectively. Then we define a linear map for unitaries $U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2 \in M(N_n)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2) : \mathbb{C}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n \\ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) &\mapsto \text{diag}(U_2 T_n(U_1 D_\lambda V_1) V_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where D_λ is the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Here, we follow the convention that when the diag operator is applied to a vector, it yields the corresponding diagonal matrix, and when applied to a matrix, it produces the corresponding diagonal vector. Then we have

$$\|T_n\|_{p \rightarrow p} = \sup_{U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2} \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_{p \rightarrow p}. \quad (4.4)$$

The next lemma is a special case of [Gillespie \(1991\)](#) on page 226 therein.

Lemma 4.2 (Gillespie (1991)). *For any linear operator $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$, we have*

$$\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2 \leq \|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}.$$

Similar to the definition of height for a matrix in Definition 4.1, we give definition of the height of a linear operator here; by Lemma 4.2 the height of any linear operator is at least one.

Definition 4.3. *For any linear operator $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$, define its height by*

$$h(T_n) := \frac{\sqrt{\|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}}}{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}}.$$

Recall that in the classical setting, for an operator $T : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$\|T\|_{\ell^1 \rightarrow \ell^1} = \|T^*\|_{\ell^\infty \rightarrow \ell^\infty}.$$

In the quantum setting, denote T_n^* as the adjoint of $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$ with respect to the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \mu, \text{diag}(U_2 T_n (U_1 D_\lambda V_1) V_2) \right\rangle &= \left\langle D_\mu, U_2 T_n (U_1 D_\lambda V_1) V_2 \right\rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &= \left\langle U_2^* D_\mu V_2^*, T_n (U_1 D_\lambda V_1) \right\rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &= \left\langle U_1^* T_n^* (U_2^* D_\mu V_2^*) V_1^*, D_\lambda \right\rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &= \left\langle \text{diag}(U_1^* T_n^* (U_2^* D_\mu V_2^*) V_1^*), \lambda \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)^* = T^*(U_2^*, U_1^*, V_2^*, V_1^*).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} &= \|T_n^*\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}, \\ \|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} &= \|T_n^*\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} = \|T_n^*\|_{1 \rightarrow 1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

By Definition 4.3,

$$h(T_n) = h(T_n^*) \tag{4.6}$$

In the classical setting, Lev (2015) defined the logarithmic diameter for a non-zero vector $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$\ell(z) := \frac{\max\{|z_i| : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}}{\max\{|z_i| : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, z_i \neq 0\}}. \tag{4.7}$$

In the quantum setting, considering complex matrices, we define the logarithmic diameter as follows.

Definition 4.4. For $A \in M(N_n)$, let

$$0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_k$$

be all the non-zero (strictly positive) eigenvalues of A^*A . We define the logarithmic diameter of A by

$$\ell(A) := \sqrt{\lambda_k/\lambda_1}.$$

The following lemma will serve as the cornerstone for the subsequent proofs.

Lemma 4.5. If $T : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$ is a linear map with $h(T) \leq K$ for $K \geq 1$ a real number, then there exists a non-zero matrix $A \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$\|T_n(A)\| > \frac{1}{4}\|T\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}\|A\| \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(A) < 32K^2 + 1.$$

Proof. By the definition of $T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)$ given in (4.3) where U_1, U_2, V_1 and V_2 are unitaries in $M(N_n)$, together with (4.4), we have

$$\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} = \sup_{U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2} \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \leq 2\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|, \quad (4.8)$$

which yields that

$$\frac{1}{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}} \geq \frac{1}{2\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|}.$$

Then by the definition of the height of a matrix given in Definition 4.1, together with (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2))^2 &= \frac{\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_1 \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_\infty}{\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_2^2} \\ &\leq 4 \frac{\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_1 \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|_\infty}{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}} \\ &\leq 4 \frac{\|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}}{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the definition of height of a linear operator given in Definition 4.2, we have

$$h(T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)) \leq 2h(T) \leq 2K.$$

By Lemma 1 of Lev (2015), there exists $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)z\| > \frac{1}{2}\|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\| \cdot \|z\|, \quad (4.9)$$

and then the logarithmic diameter for a non-zero vector defined in (4.7)

$$\ell(z) < 8(2K)^2 + 1.$$

Taking the matrix

$$A = U_1 D_z V_1, \quad (4.10)$$

with D_z being the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(z)$, the logarithmic diameter for a non-zero matrix defined in Definition 4.4

$$\ell(A) = \ell(z) < 32K^2 + 1.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_n(A), T_n(A) \rangle_{\text{HS}} &= \left\langle U_2 T_n(A) V_2, U_2 T_n(A) V_2 \right\rangle_{\text{HS}} \\ &\geq \left\langle \text{diag}(U_2 T_n(A) V_2), \text{diag}(U_2 T_n(A) V_2) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that by the definition of $T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)$ given in (4.3),

$$\text{diag}(U_2 T_n(A) V_2) = T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2) z,$$

using the specific form of A . By equation (4.9),

$$\langle T_n(A), T_n(A) \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2) z\|^2 > \frac{1}{4} \|T_n(U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2)\|^2 \|z\|^2.$$

At last, using equations (4.1) and (4.8), we have by the specific form of A that

$$\langle T_n(A), T_n(A) \rangle_{\text{HS}} > \frac{1}{16} \|T\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2 \|A\|^2,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.6. *If $X \in M(N_n)$ is a matrix with $h(X) \leq K$ for $K \geq 1$ a real number, then there exists a non-zero orthogonal projection $P \in M(N_n)$ such that*

$$|\langle X, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4\log(2K) + 2}} \|X\| \|P\|.$$

Proof. We proceed the proof in two steps. In the first step, we establish the desired result for a self-adjoint matrix. In the second step, we extend that to a general matrix.

Step 1. Suppose $A \in M(N_n)$ is a self-adjoint matrix with height $h(A) \leq K$ for $K \geq 1$ a real number, where $h(A)$ is given in Definition 4.1. Since A is self-adjoint, there exists a unitary $U \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$U A U^* = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in M(N_n).$$

By the definition of height and the unitarily invariant property (4.1), we have

$$h(A)^2 = \frac{\|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty}{\|A\|^2} = \frac{\|U A U^*\|_1 \|U A U^*\|_\infty}{\|U A U^*\|^2} = h(U A U^*)^2.$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T)^2 &= \frac{\|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T\|_1 \|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T\|_\infty}{\|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\|\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_1 \|\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_\infty}{\|\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|^2} \\ &= h(UAU^*)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript “ T ” represents the transpose, and the norms applied to vectors or matrices by their corresponding definitions. Hence,

$$h((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T) = h(A) \leq K.$$

Then by Lemma 4 of [Lev \(2015\)](#), there exists an n -dimensional binary vector $\xi \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that

$$|\cos((\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T, \xi)| \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(2K^2) + 1}}, \quad (4.11)$$

where, for non-zero vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\cos(u, v) = \langle u, v \rangle / \|u\| \|v\|.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\| &= \|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T\|, \\ \|U^* \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) U\| &= \|(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T\|, \end{aligned}$$

and given that the trace is invariant under circular shifts

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle A, U^* \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) U \right\rangle_{\text{HS}} &= \text{tr} \left(A^* U^* \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) U \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(U A^* U^* \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \right) \\ &= \left\langle (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T, (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$P = U^* \text{diag}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) U \quad (4.12)$$

which is an orthogonal projection in $M(N_n)$. Then by equation (4.11), we have that

$$|\langle A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(2K^2) + 1}} \|A\| \|P\|. \quad (4.13)$$

Step 2. According to the Toeplitz decomposition, each $X \in M(N_n)$ can be written uniquely as

$$X = A + iB,$$

in which $A, B \in M(N_n)$ are self-adjoint matrices; see [Horn and Johnson \(2012\)](#). Since

$$\|X\|_1 = \|X^*\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|X\|_\infty = \|X^*\|_\infty,$$

we have

$$\|A\|_1 = \left\| \frac{X + X^*}{2} \right\|_1 \leq \frac{\|X\|_1 + \|X^*\|_1}{2} = \|X\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|A\|_\infty \leq \|X\|_\infty. \quad (4.14)$$

Additionally, for the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, we have

$$\|X\|^2 = \text{tr}((A + iB)(A - iB)) = \text{tr}(A^2) + \text{tr}(B^2) = \|A\|^2 + \|B\|^2.$$

Replacing X by iX if necessarily, we may assume $\|A\|^2 \geq \|B\|^2$, which gives

$$\|A\| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|X\|.$$

Then, by the definition of height given in [Definition 4.1](#), equation (4.14), and the condition that $h(X) \leq K$,

$$h(A) = \frac{\sqrt{\|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty}}{\|A\|} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\|X\|_1 \|X\|_\infty}}{\|X\|/\sqrt{2}} \leq \sqrt{2}K.$$

By the result of Step 1, specifically (4.13), there exists an orthogonal projection $P \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| &\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(2(\sqrt{2}K)^2) + 1}} \|A\| \|P\| \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(4K^2) + 1}} \frac{\|X\|}{\sqrt{2}} \|P\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4\log(2K) + 2}} \|X\| \|P\|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with

$$|\langle X, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| = |\langle A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}} + i\langle B, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| \geq |\langle A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}|$$

yields the desired estimate. \square

Theorem 4.7. *For any linear map $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$, there exists a non-zero orthogonal projection $P \in M(N_n)$ such that*

$$\frac{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}}{8\sqrt{4(\log(48h^2(T_n)) + 2)}} < \frac{\|T_n P\|}{\|P\|} \leq \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}.$$

Proof. The second inequality clearly holds by the definition of $\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}$, since P being a non-zero projection is a special case of a complex matrix. Now, we prove the first inequality.

Suppose $h(T_n) = K$ for $K \geq 1$ a real number. By Lemma 4.5, there exists a non-zero matrix $A \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$\|T_n(A)\| > \frac{1}{4}\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}\|A\| \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(A) < 32K^2 + 1. \quad (4.15)$$

Furthermore, by equations (4.5) and (4.6), we have

$$\|T_n^*(A)\| \geq \frac{1}{4}\|T_n^*\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}\|A\| = \frac{1}{4}\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}\|A\|. \quad (4.16)$$

Consider the spectral decomposition of $(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as

$$(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{i \in I} \sigma_i P_i,$$

where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the set of eigenvalues of $(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and P_i is the corresponding spectral projection. Then, for $p \in [1, \infty)$, the Schatten p -norm of $A \in M(N_n)$ can be written as

$$\|A\|_p = \left[\text{tr}((A^*A)^{\frac{p}{2}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left(\sum_{i \in I} \sigma_i^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}};$$

while for $p = \infty$, it can be written as

$$\|A\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\|=1} \|Ax\| = \max_{i \in I} \sigma_i.$$

Now, choose $j \in I$ such that

$$\sigma_j = \min_{i \in I} \{\sigma_i \mid \sigma_i \neq 0\}.$$

By the definition of $\ell(A)$ given in Definition 4.4 which is defined in terms of eigenvalues of A^*A (instead of $(A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$), together with equation (4.15), we obtain

$$h^2(A) = \frac{\|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty}{\|A\|^2} \leq \frac{(\sum \sigma_i) \ell(A) \sigma_j}{\sum \sigma_i^2} \leq \ell(A) < 36K^2.$$

Furthermore, by equation (4.15),

$$\begin{aligned} h^2(T_n(A)) &= \frac{\|T_n(A)\|_1 \|T_n(A)\|_\infty}{\|T_n(A)\|^2} < \frac{\|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|A\|_1 \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \|A\|_\infty}{\left(\frac{1}{4}\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}\|A\|\right)^2} \\ &= 16h^2(T_n)h^2(A). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$h(T_n(A)) < 4h(T_n)h(A) < 24K^2.$$

By Lemma 4.6, there exists an orthogonal projection $P \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$|\langle T_n^* A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| > \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4\log(48K^2) + 2}} \|T_n^* A\| \|P\|.$$

Therefore, by equation (4.16),

$$|\langle A, T_n P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| = |\langle T_n^* A, P \rangle_{\text{HS}}| > \frac{1}{8\sqrt{4(\log(48K^2) + 2)}} \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|A\| \|P\|,$$

which yields that

$$\|T_n P\| > \frac{1}{8\sqrt{4(\log(48K^2) + 2)}} \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|P\|,$$

as desired. □

Theorem 4.8. *There exist two universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and two non-zero orthogonal projections $P, Q \in M(N_n)$, such that for any linear map $T_n : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$, we have*

$$\frac{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}}{C_1(\log(h(T_n Q)) + C_2)} < \frac{\langle P, T_n Q \rangle_{\text{HS}}}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(P)\text{tr}(Q)}} \leq \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}$$

Proof. The second inequality clearly holds by the definition of $\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}$, because the non-zero projections P and Q are specific instances of complex matrices. Now, we prove the first inequality.

Suppose $h(T_n) = K$ for $K \geq 1$ a real number. Define

$$f(K) := 8\sqrt{4(\log(48K^2) + 2)}.$$

Theorem 4.7 states that there exists an orthogonal projection P such that

$$\|T_n(P)\| > \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|P\| / f(K), \quad (4.17)$$

which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} h(T_n(P)) &= \frac{\sqrt{\|T_n(P)\|_1 \|T_n(P)\|_\infty}}{\|T_n(P)\|} < \frac{\sqrt{\|T_n\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|P\|_1 \|T_n\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \|P\|_\infty}}{\|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|P\| / f(K)} \\ &= h(T_n) \frac{\sqrt{\|P\|_1 \|P\|_\infty}}{\|P\|} f(K). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for an orthogonal projection P , we have

$$\|P\|^2 = \|P\|_1 \|P\|_\infty.$$

Then we have

$$h(T_n(P)) < K f(K).$$

By Lemma 4.6, there exists an orthogonal projection $Q \in M(N_n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T_n(P), Q \rangle_{\text{HS}}| &\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4\log(2Kf(K)) + 2}} \|T_n(P)\| \|Q\| \\ &> \frac{1}{2f(K)\sqrt{4\log(2Kf(K)) + 2}} \|T_n\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \|P\| \|Q\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.17) in the last inequality. Note that

$$2f(K)\sqrt{4\log(2Kf(K)) + 2} \leq C_1(\log K + C_2)$$

for some $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$. The proof is complete. \square

With Theorem 4.8, we are finally ready to establish the converse of quantum expander mixing lemma.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. As in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we let $E : M(N_n) \rightarrow M(N_n)$ be the orthogonal projection onto the space $\langle I_{N_n} \rangle = \ker(1 - T_n)$. Then $T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}$ is the restriction of T_n onto $(1 - E)$.

According to the definition of a quantum expander sequence given in Definition 3.2, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\| \leq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Here, we consider ϵ as the largest of those constants that suffice the above inequality. Then by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}$, we have

$$\|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$h(T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}) \leq \frac{\sqrt{\|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \|T_n|_{I_{N_n}^\perp}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}}}{1 - \epsilon} \leq \frac{2}{1 - \epsilon}.$$

By Theorem 4.8, there exist two universal constants $C'_1, C'_2 > 0$ and two non-zero orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in M(N_n)$, such that

$$\langle P_1, (T_n - E)P_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{C'_1(\log(\frac{2}{1 - \epsilon}) + C'_2)} \sqrt{\text{tr}(P_1)\text{tr}(P_2)}.$$

Noting that

$$\langle P_1, EP_2 \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \text{tr}\left(P_1^* \frac{\text{tr}(P_2)}{N_n} I_{N_n}\right) = \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1)\text{tr}(P_2),$$

we have P_1 and P_2 satisfies

$$\left| \langle P_1, T_n(P_2) \rangle_{\text{HS}} - \frac{1}{N_n} \text{tr}(P_1)\text{tr}(P_2) \right| \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{C_1(-\log(1 - \epsilon) + C_2)} \sqrt{\text{tr}(P_1)\text{tr}(P_2)},$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are two universal constants. \square

Acknowledgments

This research project was partially supported by NIH grant 1R21AI180492-01 and the Individual Research Grant at Texas A&M University. The author gives special thanks to Ryo Toyota for conversations on this subject.

References

- Aharonov, D., Harrow, A. W., Landau, Z., Nagaj, D., Szegedy, M., and Vazirani, U. (2014). Local tests of global entanglement and a counterexample to the generalized area law. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 246–255. IEEE.
- Alon, N. and Spencer, J. H. (2000). *The Probabilistic Method, second edition*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ambainis, A. and Smith, A. (2004). Small pseudo-random families of matrices: Derandomizing approximate quantum encryption. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques: 7th International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems, APPROX 2004, and 8th International Workshop on Randomization and Computation, RANDOM 2004, Cambridge, MA, USA, August 22-24, 2004. Proceedings*, pages 249–260. Springer.
- Ben-Aroya, A., Schwartz, O., and Ta-Shma, A. (2008). Quantum expanders: Motivation and constructions. In *2008 23rd Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 292–303. IEEE.
- Bilu, Y. and Linial, N. (2006). Lifts, discrepancy and nearly optimal spectral gap. *Combinatorica*, 26(5):495–519.
- Chen, S., Moore, C., and Russell, A. (2013). Small-bias sets for nonabelian groups: derandomizations of the Alon-Roichman theorem. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 436–451. Springer.
- Gillespie, T. (1991). Noncommutative variations on theorems of Marcel Riesz and others. In *PAUL HALMOS Celebrating 50 Years of Mathematics*, pages 221–236. Springer.
- Hastings, M. B. (2007a). Entropy and entanglement in quantum ground states. *Physical Review B*, 76(3):035–114.
- Hastings, M. B. (2007b). Random unitaries give quantum expanders. *Physical Review A*, 76(3):032315.
- Hastings, M. B. and Harrow, A. W. (2009). Classical and quantum tensor product expanders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0804.0011*, 9(3):336–360.
- Hoory, S., Linial, N., and Wigderson, A. (2006). Expander graphs and their applications. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 43(4):439–561.
- Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. (2012). *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press.
- Jeronimo, F. G., Mittal, T., Roy, S., and Wigderson, A. (2022). Almost Ramanujan expanders from arbitrary expanders via operator amplification. In

- 2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), pages 378–388. IEEE.
- Kitaev, A. Y., Shen, A., and Vyalıy, M. N. (2002). *Classical and quantum computation*. Number 47. American Mathematical Soc.
- Lev, V. F. (2015). Discrete norms of a matrix and the converse to the expander mixing lemma. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 483:158–181.
- Lubotzky, A. (2012). Expander graphs in pure and applied mathematics. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 49(1):113–162.
- Nielsen, M. A. and Chuang, I. L. (2001). *Quantum computation and quantum information*, volume 2. Cambridge university press Cambridge.
- Pisier, G. (2014). Quantum expanders and geometry of operator spaces. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 16(6):1183–1219.
- Tao, T. (2015). *Expansion in finite simple groups of Lie type*, volume 164. American Mathematical Soc.