

Random permutations acting on k -tuples have near-optimal spectral gap for $k = \text{poly}(n)$

Ewan Cassidy

Abstract

We extend Friedman’s theorem to show that, for any fixed r , the random $2r$ -regular Schreier graphs depicting the action of r random permutations of $[n]$ on k_n -tuples of distinct elements in $[n]$ are a.a.s. weakly Ramanujan, for any $k_n \leq n^{\frac{1}{12} - \epsilon}$. Previously this was known only for k -tuples where k is fixed. In fact, we prove the stronger result of strong convergence of random matrices in irreducible representations of S_n of quasi-exponential dimension.

We also give a new bound for the expected stable irreducible character of a random permutation obtained via a word map, showing that $\mathbb{E}[\chi^\mu(w(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r))] = O(n^{-k})$, where k is the number of boxes outside the first row of the Young diagram μ , solving one aspect of a conjecture of Hanany and Puder. We obtain this bound using an extension of Wise’s w -cycle conjecture.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Strong Convergence	5
1.2	Overview of paper	6
2	Background	6
2.1	Symmetric group	7
2.2	Partition algebra	7
	2.2.1 Set partitions	7
	2.2.2 Partition algebra	8
2.3	Schur–Weyl–Jones duality	9
2.4	Refinement	9
2.5	The Weingarten calculus	12
2.6	C^* -algebras of free groups	12
2.7	Polynomials and random walks	13
	2.7.1 Random walks and free groups	13
	2.7.2 Temperedness and strong convergence	14
2.8	Schreier graphs	14
2.9	Word maps	15
3	Proof of Theorem 1.9 from Theorem 1.5	15

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5	22
4.1 Overview of proof	22
4.2 Expected character as a ratio of polynomials in $\frac{1}{n}$	23
4.3 Combinatorial integration	23
4.4 Graphical Interpretation	29
4.5 Obtaining the bound	33
4.5.1 Stackings	33
4.5.2 Bounding expected character	33
4.6 Proof of Theorem 4.1	38

1 Introduction

Let G_n be a connected $2r$ -regular graph on n vertices, A_{G_n} its adjacency matrix with eigenvalues $2r = \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$. Let $\lambda(G_n) = \max(\lambda_2, |\lambda_n|)$. The Alon–Boppana bound dictates that

$$\lambda(G_n) \geq 2\sqrt{2r-1} - o(1),$$

so that $2r$ -regular graphs with $\lambda(G_n) \leq 2\sqrt{2r-1}$ have optimal spectral gap, see [Alo86; Fri03; Nil91] for example.

Alon conjectured in [Alo86] that most d -regular graphs on a large number of vertices are weakly Ramanujan with high probability, and a breakthrough paper by Friedman [Fri08] proved Alon’s conjecture, proving that random $2r$ -regular Schreier graphs (see §2.8), $\text{Sch}(S_n \curvearrowright [n], \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ are asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) weakly Ramanujan, where a.a.s. means with probability $\rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Questions remain about the expansion properties of Cayley graphs of S_n . These questions are very different in the sense that the Cayley graphs have $n! \sim n^n$ vertices, rather than only n vertices. Kassabov, in [Kas05], proved the following.

Theorem 1.1 (Kassabov). *There exist $L, \epsilon > 0$ such that, for any n , there exists an explicit generating set X_n of S_n , of size at most L , such that the Cayley graphs $\left\{ \text{Cay}(S_n, X_n) \right\}_{n \geq 1}$ form a family of ϵ -expanders.*

Whether or not *random* Cayley graphs of S_n (ie with a random generating set) are uniform expanders, or if they satisfy the conclusion of Friedman’s theorem, are still open questions. Our main result below is in this direction.

For any integers $r, k > 0$, define $\mathcal{G}_r(n, k)$ to be the collection of Schreier graphs $\text{Sch}(S_n \curvearrowright [n]_k, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, where $[n]_k$ denotes the set of all k -tuples of distinct elements in $[n]$.

Theorem 1.2. *Fix any integer $r > 1$ and let $\alpha < \frac{1}{12}$. For any sequence of positive integers $(k_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $k_n \leq n^\alpha$, let $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random $2r$ -regular Schreier graphs, where for each $n \geq 1$, $G_n \in \mathcal{G}_r(n, k_n)$ is obtained by choosing r i.i.d. uniformly random permutations, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in S_n$.*

Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\lambda(G_n) \leq 2\sqrt{2r-1} + \epsilon] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

The case $\alpha = 0$ is exactly Friedman’s theorem. The collection of Schreier graphs $\mathcal{G}_r(n, n)$ is the collection of Cayley graphs of S_n , so proving the above result for $\alpha = 1$ would show that random Cayley graphs of S_n are a.a.s. weakly Ramanujan. Nevertheless, Theorem 1.2 is the first result showing that the Schreier graphs constructed using random permutations acting on tuples of distinct elements have near-optimal spectral gap with high probability, in the case where the size of the tuple is allowed to grow with n .

Previously, this was known for tuples of size 1 by [Fri08] (and later, with a shorter proof, by Bordenave [Bor20]); for pairs of distinct elements by Bordenave and Collins [BC19] and more recently, for k -tuples for any fixed k , by Chen, Garza-Vargas, Tropp and van Handel in [Che+24].

Remark 1.3. Prior to the result for fixed k in [Che+24], it was already known that for any fixed k , a random regular Schreier graph of S_n has a uniform spectral gap with high probability. Indeed, in [Fri+98, Theorem 2.1], they prove that, for any fixed $k, r > 0$, if $G_n \in \mathcal{G}_r(n, k)$ is a random Schreier graph, then for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\lambda(G_n) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2r \left(\frac{\sqrt{2r-1}}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

Remark 1.4. A comment on ‘derandomization’. In [MOP20], using Bordenave’s proof of Friedman’s theorem, they give a construction of a regular graph on $O(N)$ vertices, that is near-Ramanujan with high probability (probability $\geq 1 - O\left(\frac{\log N}{2^{100(\log N)^{\frac{1}{4}}}}\right)$). They obtain such a graph by randomly choosing a ‘seed’ $s \in \{0, 1\}^{O(\log(N)^2)}$ and using this as the input to an algorithm. That is, their construction requires $\sim \log(N)^2$ random bits. With the construction in Theorem 1.2, one can construct a regular graph on N vertices that is near-Ramanujan with high probability (probability $\geq 1 - O\left(\frac{1}{(\log(N)^{12})^{1-(12+\epsilon)\alpha}}\right)$), using $\sim \log(N)^{12}$ random bits, by sampling random permutations $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in S_n$, with $n \sim \log(N)^{12}$. Although this requires slightly more random bits than the algorithm given in [MOP20], it is a more algebraic construction and illustrates a different approach to such a problem. ¹

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on the remarkable new approach to *strong convergence* detailed in [Che+24], see §1.1, as well as the additional criterion for temperedness of *arbitrary* functions on finitely generated groups Γ with a finite fixed generating set (an adaptation of the classical notion of a tempered representation) given by Magee and de la Salle in [MS24].

To use this approach effectively, we prove our other main theorem pertaining to word maps and stable irreducible characters (see §2.9), in which we prove a new bound on the expected stable irreducible character of a w -random permutation. Given a Young diagram $\lambda \vdash k$ and $n \geq k + \lambda_1$, we define the Young diagram $\lambda^+(n) = (n - k, \lambda) \vdash n$, see §2.1.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $w \in F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ be a word in the free group on r generators with $w \neq e$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\lambda \vdash k$. Then $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$ is a rational*

¹We thank Ramon van Handel for pointing out this application.

expression in n and, if w is not a proper power, then

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{n^k} \right).$$

Remark 1.6. That $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$ can be written as a rational expression in n follows from (24) or indeed by combining [Nic94; LP10] with [HP23, Proposition B.2]. In the case of w being a proper power, the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 follows from [Nic94] and [LP10, Section 4].

Remark 1.7. We prove Theorem 1.5 using ‘combinatorial integration’. We use a projection formula obtained in our previous paper [Cas23] to translate the computation of $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$ in to combinatorial problem. We then prove an extension of Wise’s w -cycles conjecture (see [LW17; HW16; Wis05]), a theorem in low-dimensional topology, to obtain our final bound.

Theorem 1.5 generalizes the work of Nica [Nic94] and Linial and Puder [LP10], where it is established that, if $\#\text{fix}(\sigma)$ is the number of fixed points of a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$, then, if w is not a proper power,

$$\mathbb{E}_w [\#\text{fix}(\sigma) - 1] = O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \tag{1}$$

Of course, $\#\text{fix}-1$ is the character of the standard representation of S_n , $\chi^{(n-1,1)}$, so that this is a special case of our theorem. In [PP15], Puder and Parzanchevski improve this, showing that

$$\mathbb{E}_w [\#\text{fix}(\sigma) - 1] = O \left(\frac{1}{n^{\pi(w)-1}} \right)$$

where $\pi(w)$ is the *primitivity rank* of the word w (see, for example [PP15, Definition 1.7], for the definition). Hanany and Puder [HP23, Theorem 1.3] generalize this result to other stable irreducible representations of S_n . They show that, if w is not a proper power, then for any $k \neq 0, 1$ and for any $\lambda \vdash k$,

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{n^{\pi(w)}} \right).$$

Theorem 1.5 is thus an improvement on this bound in the regime $k > \pi(w)$.

In [HP23, Conjecture 1.8], it is conjectured that

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{n^{k(\pi(w)-1)}} \right).$$

So Theorem 1.5 confirms the conjecture for words w with primitivity rank $\pi(w) = 2$. In cases where there is no further information on w other than $w \neq e$ and w is not a proper power, the bound given in Theorem 1.5 is expected to be sharp. In fact, it has recently been conjectured by Puder and Shomroni (see [PS23, Conjecture 1.2]) that we should have

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{n^{k(s\pi(w))}} \right),$$

where $s\pi(w)$ is a property of w known as the *stable primitivity rank* (this was first introduced by Wilton in [Wil24], indeed see Definition 10.6 in (*ibid.*) or [PS23, Definition 4.1] for an equivalent definition). They also conjecture that this bound is the best one possible. That is, for every word $w \in F_r$, for every k , there is a Young diagram $\lambda \vdash k$ such that $\frac{1}{n^{k(s\pi(w))}} = O\left(\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}\right]\right)$. An additional conjecture of Wilton (see eg [PS23, Conjecture 4.7]) posits that, for any $w \in F_r$, we have the equality $s\pi(w) = \pi(w) - 1$, so that the conjecture of Hanany and Puder is a combination of these two conjectures.

1.1 Strong Convergence

As we noted earlier, we actually prove a stronger statement than Theorem 1.2, that of strong convergence of random representations of $F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ that factor through permutations.

Definition 1.8. Given a sequence of random, finite dimensional, unitary representations $\{\pi_n : F_r \rightarrow U(N_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$, we say that π_n strongly converge to the left regular representation $\lambda : F_r \rightarrow U(l^2(F_r))$ a.a.s. if, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} [|\|\pi_n(z)\| - \|\lambda(z)\|| > \epsilon] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1. \quad (2)$$

The norms here are operator norms, see §2.6.

We are interested in the cases whereby the representations $\pi_n = \rho \circ \phi_n$, where $\phi_n \in \text{Hom}(F_r, S_n)$ is random and $\rho : S_n \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ is a representation of S_n of dimension N_n . The power of strong convergence in this setting is that, since the convergence must hold for *every* $z \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$, it allows us to prove results like Theorem 1.2, which require (2) to hold only for specific elements of $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$.

For example, proving Friedman's Theorem is equivalent to showing that

$$\mathbb{P} [|\|\pi_n(z)\| - 2\sqrt{2r-1}| > \epsilon] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 \quad (3)$$

where

$$z = x_1 + x_1^{-1} + \dots + x_r + x_r^{-1} \quad (4)$$

and $\pi_n = \rho^{(n-1,1)} \circ \phi_n$, with $\phi_n \in \text{Hom}(F_r, S_n)$ uniformly random (ie obtained by uniformly randomly choosing a permutation $\sigma_i \in S_n$ for each i and mapping $x_i \mapsto \sigma_i$) and where

$$\rho^{(n-1,1)} : \mathbb{C}[S_n] \rightarrow \text{End}\left(V^{(n-1,1)}\right)$$

is the standard representation of S_n . This is because, if $\rho : S_n \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is the permutation representation of S_n , then

$$\rho(\sigma_1 + \sigma_1^{-1} + \dots + \sigma_r + \sigma_r^{-1})$$

is the adjacency matrix of the graph $\text{Sch}(S_n \curvearrowright [n], \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ and $2\sqrt{2r-1} = \|\lambda(z)\|$ in this case. We consider the orthogonal complement to the S_n -invariant vectors in \mathbb{C}^n to account for the trivial eigenvalue $2r$. In the case of ρ above, that is the standard representation.

More generally, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ we define

$$\bar{\rho}_{n,k} : \mathbb{C}[S_n] \rightarrow \text{End}\left((\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}\right),$$

the k^{th} tensor power of the permutation representation. We then define

$$\rho_{n,k} : \mathbb{C}[S_n] \rightarrow \text{End}(V_{n,k})$$

to be the restriction of $\bar{\rho}_{n,k}$ to the orthocomplement to the S_n -invariant vectors, $V_{n,k} \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ and define a random sequence of unitary representations of F_r , $\{\pi_{n,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho_{n,k} \circ \phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, with $\phi_n \in \text{Hom}(F_r, S_n)$ uniformly random as before.

Bordenave and Collins [BC19] proved strong convergence to the left regular representation $\lambda : F_r \rightarrow U(l^2(F_r))$ a.a.s. for the sequence of random representations of F_r , $\{\pi_{n,1}\}_{n \geq 1}$. They extend their results to show strong convergence a.a.s. for $\{\pi_{n,2}\}_{n \geq 1}$. With the new approach in [Che+24], strong convergence a.a.s. for $\{\pi_{n,k}\}_{n \geq 1}$ for any fixed k is now known. We adopt and extend this new approach to prove our final main theorem below.

Theorem 1.9. *For any $\alpha < \frac{1}{12}$, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{k_n \leq n^\alpha} \|\|\pi_{n,k_n}(z)\| - \|\lambda(z)\|\| < \epsilon \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

Remark 1.10. Theorem 1.2 follows immediately from Theorem 1.9 by taking $z = x_1 + x_1^{-1} + \dots + x_r + x_r^{-1}$. Theorem 1.9 is a much stronger statement, and it is certainly not necessary to prove such a statement to prove Theorem 1.2.

1.2 Overview of paper

§2 gives background information on variations of Schur–Weyl duality, including a refinement of Schur–Weyl–Jones duality and a projection formula given by the author in [Cas23]. We also give a brief overview of the Weingarten calculus for the symmetric group and a number of necessary results from [MS24].

§3 contains our proof of Theorem 1.9, assuming Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 4.1. The proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 4.1 are given in §4.

Acknowledgements

This paper is part of a project that received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 949143).

We thank Michael Magee for the many conversations regarding this paper, as well as Doron Puder, Lars Louder and Ramon van Handel for their valuable input.

2 Background

A note on notation

We will use the following Vinogradov notation. Given two functions f, g of $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we will write $f \ll g$ to indicate that there exist constants C and

N such that $f(n) \leq Cg(n)$ for all $n \geq N$. We will then write $f = O(g)$ to mean that $f \ll |g|$ and $f \asymp g$ to mean that $f \ll g$ and $f \gg g$. If the implied constants depend on some additional parameter, then these will be added as subscripts.

2.1 Symmetric group

We will denote by S_n the symmetric group on n elements and view this as the group of permutations of $[n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, n\}$.

A *Young diagram* (YD) $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{l(\mu)}) \vdash n$ is an arrangement of boxes in to aligned rows, in which row i contains μ_i boxes. By definition, we have $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{l(\mu)} > 0$, so that the number of boxes in each row is non-increasing as the row index increases. We also have $\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_{l(\mu)} = |\mu| = n$.

The equivalence classes of complex irreducible representations of S_n are in a natural bijection with the set of Young diagrams $\mu \vdash n$, see [VO05] for example. We will denote the representation corresponding to μ by V^μ and denote its character by χ^μ .

Every finite-dimensional complex representation V of S_n admits a decomposition

$$V \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \vdash n} (V^\mu)^{\oplus a_\mu},$$

unique up to isomorphism (ie unique up to isomorphisms that preserve each component $(V^\mu)^{\oplus a_\mu}$ of the decomposition). For each $\mu \vdash n$, the subspace $(V^\mu)^{\oplus a_\mu}$ is called the V^μ -isotypic component of V .

We will denote by $d_\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi^\mu(e)$, so that $d_\mu = \dim(V^\mu)$. Given a representation V of S_n and a permutation σ , we may write $V(\sigma)$ or just σ to mean the element of $\text{End}(V)$ corresponding to σ , defined by the representation.

Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{l(\lambda)})$, we define $V^{\lambda^+(n)}$ to be the irreducible representation of S_n (when $n - |\lambda| > \lambda_1$) corresponding to the YD

$$\lambda^+(n) = (n - |\lambda|, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{l(\lambda)}) \vdash n.$$

2.2 Partition algebra

The *partition algebra* appeared in the work of Martin [Mar94], Martin and Saleur [MS93] and Jones [Jon94] as a generalization of the Temperley–Lieb algebra and the Potts model in statistical mechanics. It is closely connected to the symmetric group via Schur–Weyl–Jones duality, which was first detailed explicitly by Jones in [Jon94].

2.2.1 Set partitions

A set partition of the set $[m]$ is a grouping of the elements in to non-empty, disjoint subsets in which every element is in exactly one subset. We will write $i \sim j$ to indicate that i and j are in the same subset of a partition, and refer to the subsets as *blocks*. The number of blocks of a partition $\pi \in \text{Part}([m])$ will be denoted $|\pi|$. Obviously, $1 \leq |\pi| \leq m$.

We denote by $\text{Part}([m])$ the set of set partitions of $[m]$. One may define a natural partial ordering on $\text{Part}([m])$ by refinement: $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$ if every block of π_1 is contained in a block of π_2 . We say that π_1 is finer than π_2 or that π_2 is coarser than π_1 .

From this partial ordering one may derive the Möbius function μ on $\text{Part}([m])$. If $\pi_2 = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{|\pi_2|}\}$ and π_1 is a refinement of π_2 in which each block \mathcal{P}_i is split into b_i subsets, then

$$\mu(\pi_1, \pi_2) = (-1)^{|\pi_1| - |\pi_2|} \prod_{i=1}^{|\pi_2|} (b_i - 1)!,$$

as is described in the foundational paper by Rota [Rot64].

Given partitions $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Part}([m])$, their *meet* $\pi_1 \wedge \pi_2$ is defined by $i \sim j$ in $\pi_1 \wedge \pi_2 \iff i \sim j$ in both π_1 and π_2 . Their *join* $\pi_1 \vee \pi_2$ is defined by $i \sim j$ in $\pi_1 \vee \pi_2 \iff i \sim j$ in either π_1 or π_2 .

2.2.2 Partition algebra

Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{C}$, the partition algebra $P_k(n)$ is an associative unital algebra over \mathbb{C} . It is the vector space

$$\langle \pi : \pi \in \text{Part}([2k]) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}},$$

with a natural multiplication as described below

To each $\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])$ we associate a diagram consisting of two rows of k vertices labeled from $1, \dots, k$ on the top row and from $k+1, \dots, 2k$ on the bottom row. We draw an edge between any two vertices i and j if and only if $i \sim j$ in π .

Any diagram consisting of two rows of k vertices with all connected components complete clearly corresponds to an element $\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])$.

The product $\pi_1 \pi_2$ is obtained by merging the bottom row of vertices of π_1 with the top row of vertices of π_2 to obtain a new diagram $\tilde{\pi}_3$ with three rows of k vertices; adding edges between any vertices that are in the same connected component (where there is not already an edge); removing the middle row of vertices and any adjacent edges to obtain $\pi_3 \in \text{Part}([2k])$. Then we have

$$\pi_1 \pi_2 = n^\gamma \pi_3,$$

where γ is the number of connected components of $\tilde{\pi}_3$ with vertices solely in the middle row.

Martin and Saleur [MS93] describe some important properties of $P_k(n)$.

Theorem 2.1. *The partition algebra $P_k(n)$ is semisimple for any $n \in \mathbb{C}$, unless n is an integer in the range $[0, 2k-1]$.*

Theorem 2.2. *If $P_k(n)$ is semisimple, then there is a natural bijection between the equivalence classes of simple modules over $P_k(n)$ and the set*

$$\Lambda_{k,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\lambda \vdash i : i = 0, \dots, k\}.$$

By convention, there is exactly one Young diagram $\lambda \vdash 0$. We will write R^λ to denote the equivalence class corresponding to λ .

2.3 Schur–Weyl–Jones duality

There is an analogue of classical Schur–Weyl duality due to Jones [Jon94], which we refer to as Schur–Weyl–Jones duality.

There is a natural right action of $P_k(n)$ on the vector space $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$. For any standard orthonormal basis vectors $e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}$ and $e_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_{2k}}$ and any $\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])$, we have

$$\langle (e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}) \pi, e_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_{2k}} \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \sim l \text{ in } \pi \implies i_j = i_l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This extends linearly to define a right action on $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$. For each $\pi \in P_k(n)$, we define $p_\pi \in \text{End}((\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k})$, where $p_\pi(v) = v\pi$.

The symmetric group S_n acts on $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ on the left via the diagonal permutation action, ie for $g \in S_n$ and basis vector $e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k} \in (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$,

$$g(e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}) = e_{g(i_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{g(i_k)}.$$

Schur–Weyl–Jones duality asserts the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *When S_n and $P_k(n)$ act as above and $n \geq 2k$,*

1. $P_k(n)$ generates $\text{End}_{S_n}((\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k})$,
2. $\mathbb{C}[S_n]$ generates $\text{End}_{P_k(n)}((\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k})$.
3. As a $(S_n, P_k(n))$ -bimodule,

$$(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{k,n}} V^{\lambda^+(n)} \otimes R^\lambda.$$

2.4 Refinement

In [Cas23], the author gives a refinement of Schur–Weyl–Jones duality. We give a brief overview of the main results of this paper. We will assume that $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $n \geq 2k$.

There is an algebra inclusion

$$\iota : \mathbb{C}[S_k] \rightarrow P_k(n),$$

where, for each $\sigma \in S_k$,

$$\iota(\sigma) = \{\{1, k + \sigma^{-1}(1)\}, \dots, \{k, k + \sigma^{-1}(k)\}\}.$$

There is also a corresponding restriction map

$$R : P_k(n) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[S_k]$$

in the sense that $R \circ \iota = \text{Id} : \mathbb{C}[S_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[S_k]$ with $R(\pi) = 0$ for any set partition $\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])$ that is *not* the image of some permutation in S_k .

Notice that the image of ι is the complex linear span of all partitions that contain exactly one element i with $0 \leq i \leq k$ and exactly one element j satisfying $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k$ (equivalently, all partitions for which the corresponding diagram consists of k connected components, each containing exactly one vertex from each row).

Definition 2.4. We define the linear contraction map $T_j : (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k-1}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & T_j (e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}) \\ &= e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \dot{e}_{i_j} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_{j-1}} \otimes e_{i_{j+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.5. The vector subspace $D_k(n) \subset (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ is defined to be

$$D_k(n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k} : |\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}| = k \rangle_{\mathbb{C}},$$

the complex linear span of all k -tuples of distinct elements.

We use the contraction maps and $D_k(n)$ to construct a subspace on which we have a version of Schur–Weyl duality involving only the symmetric groups.

Definition 2.6. The vector subspace $A_k(n) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ is defined by

$$A_k(n) = D_k(n) \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^k \text{Ker}(T_j).$$

Lemma 2.7. *We have*

$$A_k(n) = \bigcap_{\pi \in \text{Ker}(R)} \text{Ker}(\pi).$$

Which is to say that, for $\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])$ and $v \in A_k(n)$, we have $p_\pi(v) = 0$ unless $\pi = \iota(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in S_k$. Moreover, if $\sigma \in S_k$, then $p_{\iota(\sigma)} \in \text{End}\left((\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}\right)$ permutes the tensor coordinates according to σ . That is,

$$p_{\iota(\sigma)}(e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}) = e_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_{\sigma(k)}}.$$

This extends linearly to define an action of $\mathbb{C}[S_k]$ on $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ (and suitable subspaces).

We then view $A_k(n)$ as a representation of $S_n \times S_k$, where once again $g \in S_n$ acts via the diagonal permutation action and $\sigma \in S_k$ acts via $p_{\iota(\sigma^{-1})}$. We denote this representation

$$\Delta : \mathbb{C}[S_n \times S_k] \rightarrow \text{End}(A_k(n)).$$

The version of Schur–Weyl duality on $A_k(n)$ is given in the following theorem from [Cas23].

Theorem 2.8. *Where S_n and S_k act as above,*

1. $\mathbb{C}[S_k]$ generates $\text{End}_{S_n}(A_k(n))$,
2. $\mathbb{C}[S_n]$ generates $\text{End}_{S_k}(A_k(n))$.
3. *The decomposition of $A_k(n)$ in to irreducible $S_n \times S_k$ representations is*

$$A_k(n) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash k} V^{\lambda^+(n)} \otimes V^\lambda.$$

The main result of [Cas23] is a formula for the orthogonal projection from $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ to subspaces isomorphic to the irreducible ‘blocks’ in the decomposition of $A_k(n)$. Define

$$\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (e_1 - e_2) \otimes \cdots \otimes (e_{2k-1} - e_{2k}) \in A_k(n).$$

We denote by $\xi_\lambda^{\text{norm}}$ the normalised projection of ξ to the V^λ -isotypic subspace of $A_k(n)$. This can be shown to be non-zero, giving the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *For any $\lambda \vdash k$, the $S_n \times S_k$ representation generated by $\xi_\lambda^{\text{norm}}$ is isomorphic to $V^{\lambda^+(n)} \otimes V^\lambda$. That is,*

$$\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \Delta(g, \sigma)(\xi_\lambda^{\text{norm}}) : g \in S_n, \sigma \in S_k \rangle_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V^{\lambda^+(n)} \otimes V^\lambda.$$

This leads to the main theorem and a corollary of the author in [Cas23] which will be key for the combinatorial integration method used in this paper.

Theorem 2.10. *For any $\lambda \vdash k$, the orthogonal projection*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n} : (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n}$$

is given by

$$\sum_{\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])} c(n, k, \lambda, \pi) p_\pi,$$

where

$$c(n, k, \lambda, \pi) = d_\lambda d_{\lambda^+(n)} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \left(\sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \in S_k} \sum_{\pi' \leq \iota(\sigma^{-1}\sigma') \wedge \pi} \chi^\lambda(\sigma) \chi^\lambda(\sigma') \frac{(-1)^{|\pi'|} \mu(\pi', \pi)}{(n)^{|\pi'|}} \right). \quad (5)$$

Corollary 2.11. *For any $\lambda \vdash k$ and any $g \in S_n$, $\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}(g)$ is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{d_\lambda} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n}}(g) \\ &= \frac{1}{d_\lambda} \text{btr}_{(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}}(g, \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\pi \leq \iota(\tau)$ for some $\tau \in S_k$, then the diagram corresponding to π is obtained from that of $\iota(\tau)$ by deleting edges. Let $\text{del}(\pi)$ be the number of edges deleted (ie $\text{del}(\pi) = |\pi| - k$, so that if $\pi \leq \iota(\tau_1)$ and $\pi \leq \iota(\tau_2)$, then $\text{del}(\pi)$ is independent of whether we count the edges deleted from τ_1 or τ_2).

Lemma 2.12. *If $\pi \leq \iota(\tau)$ for some $\tau \in S_k$, then*

$$c(n, k, \lambda, \pi) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{\text{del}(\pi)}}\right).$$

Proof. The terms in (5) with the greatest power of n occur when $\pi' = \pi$. In this case, we have some coefficient multiplied by

$$n^k n^{-|\pi|} = n^{k-|\pi|} = n^{-\text{del}(\pi)}.$$

□

Remark 2.13. If $\pi = \iota(\tau)$, then this is $O(1)$.

2.5 The Weingarten calculus

An important part of the proof of Theorem 2.10 is the Weingarten calculus. Originally developed by Weingarten [Wei78] and Xu [Xu97] and then more rigorously by Collins [Col03] and Collins and Sniady [CS06], the Weingarten calculus is a method for computing integrals of matrix coefficients using Schur–Weyl duality analogues.

Below is the main formulation for the Weingarten calculus for the symmetric group, we direct the reader to the survey [CMN21, Section 3] or indeed any of the aforementioned papers for an in depth discussion.

Define, for any multi-index $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$ with $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [n]$ and any set partition $\pi \in \text{Part}([m])$, the function δ_π , where

$$\delta_\pi(I) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \sim l \text{ in } \pi \implies i_j = i_l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.14. *For any multi-indices $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$, $J = (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in [n]^m$, with respect to the uniform measure, we have*

$$\int_{S_n} g_{i_1 j_1} \dots g_{i_m j_m} dg = \sum_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Part}([m])} \delta_{\pi_1}(I) \delta_{\pi_2}(J) \text{Wg}_{n,m}(\pi_1, \pi_2),$$

where $\text{Wg}_{n,m}$ is the Weingarten function for S_n ,

$$\text{Wg}_{n,m}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \sum_{\pi \leq \pi_1 \wedge \pi_2} \mu(\pi, \pi_1) \mu(\pi, \pi_2) \frac{1}{(n)_{|\pi|}}.$$

Remark 2.15. For any $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \text{Part}([m])$, $\text{Wg}_{n,m}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{|\pi_1 \wedge \pi_2|}}\right)$. In particular, $\text{Wg}_{n,m}(\pi_1, \pi_1) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{|\pi_1|}}\right)$.

2.6 C^* -algebras of free groups

We refer to [NS06] for a thorough introduction. To the free group F_r we associate its group algebra $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$, the collection of elements of the form

$$x = \sum_{w \in F_r} x(w)w,$$

where each $x(w) \in \mathbb{C}$ and only finitely many are non-zero.

We define a norm on $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ by

$$\|x\|_{C^*(F_r)} = \sup \{ \|\pi(x)\|_{\text{op}} : \pi \text{ a representation of } F_r \},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ is the operator norm on $l^2(F_r)$. The completion of $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ in this norm is the C^* -algebra of F_r , denoted $C^*(F_r)$.

The left regular representation of F_r is denoted λ and admits the *reduced norm* on $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ by

$$\|x\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} = \|\lambda(x)\|_{\text{op}}.$$

The completion of $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ in this norm is the reduced C^* -algebra of F_r , denoted $C_\lambda^*(F_r)$.

We define a trace τ on $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ to be the map

$$\tau(x) = x(e).$$

This extends continuously to both the C^* -algebras defined above and remains a trace in both cases.

2.7 Polynomials and random walks

We collect some results and definitions on polynomials and random walks that are required for the analysis in §3. The proofs are readily available in [MS24]. See also [Che+24] for more background.

Lemma 2.16 ([MS24, Lemma 4.2]). *For every polynomial P in one variable with bounded degree, $\deg(P) \leq D$ and for every integer $k \leq D$,*

$$\sup_{[0, \frac{1}{2D^2}]} |P^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2^{2k+1} D^{4k}}{(2k-1)!!} \sup_{n \geq D^2} \left| P\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right|,$$

where $(2k-1)!! = (2k-1)(2k-3)\dots(3)1$.

2.7.1 Random walks and free groups

Definition 2.17. We call a symmetric (ie $\mu(g) = \mu(g^{-1})$) probability measure μ on the free group F_r *reasonable* if its support is finite, contains the identity element and generates F_r .

We denote by $(g_n)_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding random walk in F_r . So we write

$$g_n = s_1 \dots s_n$$

where $s_i \in F_r$ are i.i.d. according to μ .

The spectral radius $\rho = \rho(\mu)$ measures how fast the probability that a random walk returns to where it started decays. It is equal to the norm of $\lambda(\mu)$ on $l^2(F_r)$, where λ is the left regular representation of F_r .

Define a *proper power* in the free group to be an element of the form u^d for $u \in F_r$ and $d \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.18 ([MS24, Proposition 6.1]). *For any reasonable probability measure μ , there is a constant $C = C_\mu$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(g_n \text{ is a proper power}) \leq C n^5 \rho^5.$$

We denote the subspace of elements of $\mathbb{C}[F_r]$ supported in the ball of radius q by $\mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$. Given a non-decreasing sequence of positive real numbers $(w(q))_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$, we define the space

$$\mathcal{S}_w(F_r) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ x \in C^*(F_r) : x = \sum_q x_q, x_q \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r], \sum_q w(q) \|x_q\|_{C^*(F_r)} < \infty \right\}. \quad (6)$$

If $w(q) = (1+q)^i$ for some i then we write $\mathcal{S}_i(F_r)$ in place of $\mathcal{S}_w(F_r)$.

$\mathcal{S}_w(F_r)$ is always a Banach space when equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \left\{ \sum_q w(q) \|x_q\|_{C^*(F_r)} : x = \sum_q x_q \in \mathcal{S}_w(F_r) \right\}.$$

2.7.2 Temperedness and strong convergence

The following definition and proposition can be found in [MS24, Section 5]. Fix a generating set of size r for the free group F_r .

Definition 2.19. A function $u : F_r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called tempered if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |u((x^*x)^n)|^{\frac{1}{2n}} \leq \|\lambda(x)\|_{\text{op}}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{C}(F_r)$, where λ is the left regular representation.

The above property is a part of a criterion for strong convergence of random representations.

Proposition 2.20. *Let $u_n : F_r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions, π_n a sequence of random unitary representations of F_r with finite and non-random dimension. Let $\epsilon_n > 0$. If the following conditions are satisfied:*

- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$,
- we have $|\mathbb{E}\text{Tr}(\pi_n(x)) - u_n(x)| \leq \epsilon_n \exp\left(\frac{q}{\log(2+q)^2}\right) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}$ for every q and every $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, and
- u_n is tempered and there is a polynomial P_n such that, for every q and every $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, $|u_n(x)| \leq P_n(q) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}$.

Then, for every $y \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$ and for every $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\pi_n(y)\| > \|\lambda(y)\| + \delta] \leq C(y, \delta) \epsilon_n$$

for some constant $C(y, \delta)$. In particular,

$$\lim_n \mathbb{P}[\|\pi_n(y)\| > \|\lambda(y)\| + \delta] = 0. \quad (7)$$

To prove that a function is tempered, we can use the following proposition (stated here for free groups only), from [MS24, Proposition 6.3].

Proposition 2.21. *Let $u : F_r \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and assume that, for every reasonable probability measure μ on F_r , if $(g_n)_n$ is the associated random walk on F_r ,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbb{E}|u(g_n)|)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \rho(\mu).$$

Then u is tempered.

Remark 2.22. That this proposition holds for free groups is a result of Haagerup's inequality [Haa78, Lemma 1.5], which asserts that free groups with their standard generating sets have the *rapid decay property*.

2.8 Schreier graphs

Definition 2.23. Let G be a finite group acting on a finite set X and let $g_1, \dots, g_r \in G$. The Schreier graph $\text{Sch}(S_n \curvearrowright X, g_1, \dots, g_r)$ is the $2r$ -regular graph on $|X|$ vertices, consisting of vertex set X and, for every vertex $x \in X$, for each g_i , we add an edge between x and $g_i x$. Note that we allow multiple edges and loops.

2.9 Word maps

Given a word $w \in F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ and a (finite) group G , one obtains a *word map*

$$w : G^r \rightarrow G$$

by substitutions. For example, if $w = [x_1, x_2] = x_1 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1} \in F_2$ and $g, h \in G$, then $w(g, h) = ghg^{-1}h^{-1} \in G$.

For any finite group G and class function $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\mathbb{E}_w [\chi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{g_1, \dots, g_m \in G} [\chi(w(g_1, \dots, g_m))].$$

In this paper, we will only be considering word maps for the symmetric group S_n .

Remark 2.24. $\mathbb{E}_w [\chi]$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Hom}(F_r, S_n)} [\chi(\phi(w))]$, where $\phi \in \text{Hom}(F_r, S_n)$ is chosen uniformly randomly by choosing uniformly random i.i.d. $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \in S_n$ and mapping each $x_i \mapsto \sigma_i$, as is described in §1.1.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.9 from Theorem 1.5

The results of this section are almost completely analogous to those of [MS24, Section 7]. Throughout, C will denote a constant that does not depend on anything, but that may change from line to line. We require our bound on the expected irreducible stable character of a w -random permutation from Theorem 1.5, as well as our formulation of this expected character as a ratio of two polynomials in $\frac{1}{n}$, from Theorem 4.1.

Fix any integer $k > 0$ and define

$$\Sigma_{n,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash k} V^{\lambda^+(n)}.$$

Then $\Sigma_{n,k} \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$, so that

$$\dim(\Sigma_{n,k}) \leq n^k. \tag{8}$$

The following theorem follows immediately by combining Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 3.1. *For every word $w \in F_r$, there is a rational function $\phi_w \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ such that*

1. For $n \geq k \max(l(w), 2)$,

$$\phi_w\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_w [\text{Tr}_{\Sigma_{n,k}}].$$

2. If w is not the identity and $l(w) \leq q$, then $g_{q,k} \phi_w$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq D_q = 3kq + q^2$.
3. If w is not a proper power then, for all $i < 2k$,

$$\phi_w^{(i)}(0) = 0.$$

We collect some facts about the polynomial

$$g_{L,k}(x) = \prod_{c=1}^L (1 - cx)^L \left[\prod_{j=1}^{2k} (1 - (j-1)x) \right]^L$$

in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Fix an integer $L > 0$. Then, for every t satisfying*

$$0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{L^2(L+1) + L(2k-1)(2k)}$$

and every integer $i \geq 0$:

1. $\frac{1}{2} \leq g_{L,k}(t) \leq 1$
2. $|g_{L,k}^{(i)}(t)| \leq (i+1) (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^i$
3. $\left| \left(\frac{1}{g_{L,k}} \right)^{(i)}(t) \right| \leq (2i)!! 2^{2i+1} (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^i$.

Proof. Fix any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{L^2(L+1) + L(2k-1)(2k)}$. That $g_{L,k}(t) \leq 1$ follows immediately from the fact that

$$|t| < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{2k-1} \right\}.$$

To see that $\frac{1}{2} \leq g_{L,k}(t)$, observe that, in the regime $0 < z < \frac{1}{2}$, we have $(1-z) \geq e^{-2z}$. Since

$$t < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2L}, \frac{1}{2(2k-1)} \right\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & g_{L,k}(t) \\ & \geq \exp \left(-2 \left(\sum_{c=1}^L Lct + \sum_{j=1}^{2k} L(j-1)t \right) \right) \\ & = \exp(-2Lt(1 + \dots + L + 1 + \dots + 2k-1)) \\ & = \exp \left(-2Lt \left(\frac{L(L+1)}{2} + \frac{(2k-1)2k}{2} \right) \right) \\ & = \exp(-t(L^2(L+1) + L(2k-1)(2k))) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the fact that

$$t \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{L^2(L+1) + L(2k-1)(2k)} < \frac{-\log(\frac{1}{2})}{L^2(L+1) + L(2k-1)(2k)}.$$

For Part 2, we begin by rewriting

$$g_{L,k}(t) = \prod_{z=1}^{L^2+2kL} (1 - b_z t)$$

and then differentiate using the Leibniz rule. The i^{th} derivative is a sum of terms in which some terms are derived once (so are equal to $-b_z$) and some are not derived. Each factor that is not derived is of the form $1 - b_z t$, which belongs to $(0, 1]$. So we can bound the derivative using only the terms that are derived:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| g_{L,k}^{(i)}(t) \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{s=0}^i \sum_{\substack{u_1, \dots, u_s \\ \text{distinct}}} \prod_{\alpha=1}^s b_{u_\alpha} \\
& \leq \sum_{s=0}^i \left(\sum_{z=1}^{L^2+2kL} b_z \right)^s \\
& = \sum_{s=0}^i \left(\sum_{c=1}^L Lc + \sum_{j=1}^{2k} L(j-1) \right)^s \\
& \leq \sum_{s=0}^i (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^s \\
& \leq (i+1) (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^i.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove Part 3, we use that the i^{th} derivative of $\frac{1}{g_{L,k}}$ can be written as a product of $(2i)!!$ terms of the form

$$\frac{\pm g_{L,k}^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots g_{L,k}^{(\alpha_i)}}{g_{L,k}^{i+1}},$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_i = i$.

By Part 2, each term is bounded by

$$\frac{\prod_j (\alpha_j + 1) (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^{\alpha_j}}{g_{L,k}^{i+1}}$$

and, by Part 1, this is bounded by

$$2^{i+1} \prod_j (\alpha_j + 1) (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^{\alpha_j},$$

which is then bounded by

$$2^{2i+1} (L^3 + L(2k-1)^2)^i,$$

from which Part 3 follows. \square

Each $w \in F_r$ defines a map $w \mapsto \phi_w$. We extend this by linearity to define a map $x \mapsto \phi_x$ for each

$$x = \sum_{w \in F_r} x(w)w \in \mathbb{C}[F_r].$$

Then we can prove the following.

Lemma 3.3. For any $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, for any $i \leq 2k$ and for $n \geq kq$,

$$\sup_{t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2D_q^2}\right]} \frac{|\phi_x^{(i)}(t)|}{i!} \leq h(i, q) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)},$$

where

$$h(i, q) = 4 \left(\frac{CD_q^4}{i^2} \right)^i.$$

Proof. Let $P = g_{q,k} \phi_x$. Then P is a polynomial of bounded degree $d \leq D_q$ and so we can bound its derivatives using Lemma 2.16 if we can bound P itself. For $n \geq kq$, we have $0 < g_{q,k} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) < 1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \phi_x \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right| \\ & = \frac{1}{n^k} |\mathbb{E}_x [\text{Tr}_{\Sigma_{n,k}}]| \\ & \stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n^k} \dim(\Sigma_{n,k}) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)} \\ & \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (\dagger) follows since the map $w \mapsto \Sigma_{n,k}(w(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r))$ is a unitary representation of F_r for every $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) \in S_n^r$. So we have

$$\|\Sigma_{n,k}(x(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r))\| \leq \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}$$

almost surely, from which we can bound

$$|\mathbb{E}_x [\text{Tr}_{\Sigma_{n,k}}]| \leq \dim(\Sigma_{n,k}) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}.$$

By Lemma 2.16 (and using Stirling's formula), for any integer j , we can bound

$$\sup_{t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2D_q^2}\right]} \frac{|P^{(j)}(t)|}{j!} \leq 2 \left(\frac{CD_q^4}{j^2} \right)^j \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}. \quad (9)$$

We have

$$\frac{\phi_x^{(i)}(t)}{i!} = \sum_{j=0}^{\min(i, D_q)} \binom{i}{j} \frac{j!}{i!} \frac{P^{(j)}(t)}{j!} \left(\frac{1}{g_{q,k}} \right)^{(i-j)}.$$

Note that $i \leq 2k \leq D_q = q^2 + 3kq$, so that $\min(i, D_q) = i$. With the bound (9) and Lemma 3.2 Part 3, for $t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2D_q^2}\right]$, each term (besides $j = i$) is smaller than $\frac{1}{i} 2 \left(\frac{CD_q^4}{i^2} \right)^i$, so that

$$\frac{|\phi_x^{(i)}(t)|}{i!} \leq 2 \left(\frac{CD_q^4}{i^2} \right)^i + \frac{i}{i} 2 \left(\frac{CD_q^4}{i^2} \right)^i,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

For each integer $i \geq 0$, we define a map

$$\psi_i : x \in \mathbb{C}[F_r] \mapsto \frac{\phi_x^{(k+i)}(0)}{(k+i)!} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

We want to show that ψ_i is tempered and satisfies the polynomial bound property in Proposition 2.20.

Lemma 3.4. *For every integer i with $0 \leq i \leq k$, there is a polynomial P of degree $4k + 4i + 1$ such that $|\psi_i(x)| \leq P_n(q)\|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}$ for every q and for every $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, for each q and for each $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\phi_x^{(k+i)}(0)}{(k+i)!} \right| \leq h(k+i, q)\|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{q \geq 1} \frac{h(k+i, q)}{(1+q)^{4k+4i+1}} < \infty,$$

from which the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For any $i < k$, the function ψ_i is tempered.*

Proof. We will use Proposition 2.21 by showing that, for any reasonable probability measure μ with associated random walk $(g_n)_n$,

$$\limsup_n (\mathbb{E}|\psi_i(g_n)|)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \rho(\mu).$$

So, let μ be a reasonable probability measure, $(g_n)_n$ the associated random walk on F_r . If μ is supported in $\mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, then $g_n \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq qn}[F_r]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|\psi_i(g_n)| \\ & \leq C_i(1+qn)^{4k+4i+1} \mathbb{P}(\psi_i(g_n) \neq 0) \\ & = C_i(1+qn)^{4k+4i+1} \mathbb{P}(g_n \text{ is a proper power}) \\ & \leq C_i C_\mu (1+qn)^{4k+4i+1} n^5 \rho(\mu)^n. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Lemma 3.4. Indeed, $g_n \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq qn}[F_r]$, so there is some constant C_i for which $|\psi(g_n)| \leq C_i(1+qn)^{4k+4i+1}$. The final inequality follows from Proposition 2.18. It follows that

$$\limsup_n (\mathbb{E}|\psi_i(g_n)|)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \rho(\mu),$$

so by Proposition 2.21, ψ_i is tempered. \square

The next step is showing that the second condition in Proposition 2.20 holds. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\sup_{q \geq 1} h(2k, q) \exp\left(-\frac{q}{\log(2+q)^2}\right) \leq (C^2 k^{12+\epsilon})^k$.*

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Given any $b > 1$, there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$\log(2+q)^2 \leq q^{1/b}$$

for all $q > a$.

So, for $q > a$, we have

$$4(CD_q^4)^{2k} \exp\left(\frac{-q}{\log(2+q)^2}\right) \leq 4\left(C(q^2 + 3kq)^4\right)^{2k} \exp\left(-q^{\frac{b-1}{b}}\right) \quad (11)$$

which is bounded above by

$$(C^2 k^{12+\epsilon})^k \quad (12)$$

for sufficiently large b .²

For $q \leq a$, we obtain the bound

$$(C' k^2)^{2k}$$

by substituting $q = a$ in to $h(2k, q)$ and ignoring the exponential term (since it is ≤ 1). This is less than (12) (when C is large enough) from which the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $w(q) = \exp\left(\frac{q}{\log(2+q)^2}\right)$. Then, for every $q \geq 1$, for every $n \geq kq$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, and any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\Sigma_{n,k}(x(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)) - \tau(x)\text{Id})] - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\psi_i(x)}{n^i} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{(C^2 k^{12+\epsilon})^k}{n^k} w(q) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Proof. Since $n \geq kq$, then by Part 1 of Theorem 3.1, the LHS of (13) is equal to

$$n^k \left| \phi_x\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) - \sum_{i=0}^{2k-1} \frac{\phi_x^{(i)}(0)}{i! n^i} \right|.$$

By Taylor's inequality, this is less than or equal to

$$\frac{n^k}{n^{2k}(2k)!} \left| \phi_x^{(2k)}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right|.$$

If we further assume that $n \geq 2D_q^2$, then by Lemma 3.3, this is bounded by

$$\frac{h(2k, i)}{n^k} \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}. \quad (14)$$

If $n \leq 2D_q^2$, then we can still bound the left hand side of (13) by

$$2 \dim(\Sigma_{n,k}) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{|\psi_i(x)|}{n^i}$$

²To see this, differentiate the RHS of (11) to see that the maximum is obtained around $q = Ck^{\frac{b}{b-1}}$ and substitute this in to $h(2k, q)$.

by using the triangle inequality. By (8) and Lemma 3.3, this is bounded above by

$$n^k \left[h(0, q) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{n^{k+i}} h(k+i, q) \right] \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}.$$

This is less than (14) whenever the constant C is large enough.

By Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\sup_{q \geq 1} h(2k, q) \exp\left(-\frac{q}{\log(2+q)^2}\right) \leq (C^2 k^{12+\epsilon})^k$$

and the lemma follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Fix $\alpha < \frac{1}{12}$, say $\alpha = \frac{1}{12} - \epsilon'$, with $0 < \epsilon' \leq \frac{1}{12}$. For each n , and for any $k \leq n^\alpha$, let $\Pi_{n,k}$ be a random representation of F_r given by

$$\Pi_{n,k}(w) = \Sigma_{n,k}(w(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)).$$

Then, by Lemma 3.7, for every q and every $x \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq q}[F_r]$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}\text{Tr}(\Pi_{n,k}(x)) - T_n(x)| \leq \epsilon_n w(q) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)},$$

where, for some ϵ satisfying $0 < \epsilon < \frac{12\epsilon'}{12-\epsilon'}$, we have

$$\epsilon_n = \frac{(C^2 k^{12+\epsilon})^k}{n^k} \leq \left(\frac{C^2}{n^{1-(12+\epsilon)\alpha}} \right)^k$$

and

$$T_n(x) = \dim(\Sigma_{n,k}) \tau(x) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\psi_i(x)}{n^i}.$$

By Lemma 3.5, T_n is tempered, since it is the finite sum of tempered functions. Additionally, T_n satisfies the polynomial bound

$$|T_n(x)| \leq P_n(q) \|x\|_{C^*(F_r)}.$$

So by Proposition 2.20, with T_n in place of u_n , $\forall \delta > 0$, and any $z \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\|\Pi_{n,k}(z)\| > \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} + \delta \right] \leq C(z, \delta) \left(\frac{C^2}{n^{1-(12+\epsilon)\alpha}} \right)^k.$$

For $k_n \leq n^\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[\|\pi_{n,k_n}(z)\| > \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} + \delta \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n^\alpha} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\Pi_{n,k}(z)\| > \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} + \delta \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Write $A = 1 - (12 + \epsilon)\alpha$, which is > 0 by our choice of ϵ . Then the RHS of (15) is equal to

$$C(x, \delta) \left(\frac{C^2}{n^A} \right) \left(\frac{1 - \left(\frac{C^2}{n^A} \right)^{n^\alpha - 1}}{1 - \left(\frac{C^2}{n^A} \right)} \right),$$

which $\rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So, for any $k_n \leq n^\alpha$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\|\pi_{n,k_n}(z)\| > \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} + \delta \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (16)$$

By [MS24, Lemma 5.14], there exist $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathbb{C}[F_r]$ and $\delta' = \delta'(\delta)$, such that if, for every i ,

$$\|\pi_{n,k_n}(y_i)\| \leq \|y_i\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} + \min(\delta, \delta'), \quad (17)$$

then

$$\|\pi_{n,k_n}(z)\| \geq \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} - \delta. \quad (18)$$

By (16), we know that (17) holds with probability $\rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so then (18) also holds with probability $\rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{k_n \leq n^\alpha} \left| \|\pi_{n,k_n}(z)\| - \|z\|_{C_\lambda^*(F_r)} \right| > \delta \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

□

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

4.1 Overview of proof

Rather than working directly with the character $\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}$, we use Corollary 2.11 so that instead our task is to compute the bitrace of $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n} \circ w(g_1, \dots, g_r)$ on $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$.

This amounts to counting the number of fixed points in $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$ of this map. Recall that $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n}^2 = \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n}$ and that, since it is a linear combination of p_π , the action of $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n}$ commutes with the action of any $g \in S_n$ on $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$. With this in mind, if $w = x_{i_1}^{\pm 1} \dots x_{i_{l(w)}}^{\pm 1}$, what we are actually interested in is

$$\text{btr}_{(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}} \left(g_{i_1}^{\pm 1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n} \circ \dots \circ g_{i_{l(w)}}^{\pm 1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n} \right),$$

where each $g_i \in S_n$ is a permutation substituted in for the generator x_i .

We compute the expected trace by using the Weingarten calculus for S_n . A key component is our refinement of the usual Weingarten calculus for S_n , which uses the fact that we are operating within $A_k(n)$ to show that the contribution to the trace from all but a specific family of partitions is zero.

We obtain a combinatorial formula for the trace in §4.3. In §4.4, we construct graphs from the combinatorial data formula for the expected character. From these graphs we construct new graphs in which the asymptotic bound for our trace formula is encoded by the Euler characteristic.

In §4.5, we prove a variant of a theorem of Louder and Wilton that relates the Euler characteristic of a graph with the number of immersed w -cycles (see [LW17, Theorem 1.2]) to obtain our final bound for the expected character.

4.2 Expected character as a ratio of polynomials in $\frac{1}{n}$

In addition to our main theorem on word maps, we give another formulation for the expected stable irreducible character of a w -random permutation as the ratio of two polynomials in $\frac{1}{n}$. This formulation is required for the methods in §3.

For any $L, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we define

$$g_{L,k}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{c=1}^L (1 - cx)^L \left[\prod_{j=1}^{2k} (1 - (j-1)x) \right]^L.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $w \in F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ be a word in the free group with r generators, $w \neq e$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\lambda \vdash k$. If $l(w) \leq q$, there is a polynomial $P_{w,\lambda,q} \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ such that, for $n \geq l(w)k$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = \frac{P_{w,\lambda,q} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)}{g_{q,k} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)},$$

with $\deg(P_{w,\lambda,q}) \leq 3kq + q^2$.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is given in §4.6 and it can be followed from (24).

4.3 Combinatorial integration

Fix a word $w \in F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$. We will assume that w is not the identity and that w is cyclically reduced. We will also assume that every generator appears in w . If this were not the case, then we can relabel the x_i that do appear in w and write $w \in F_m = \langle x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m} \rangle$ for some $m < r$ and then apply the exact same proof.

We will write

$$w = f_1^{\epsilon_1} f_2^{\epsilon_2} \dots f_{l(w)}^{\epsilon_{l(w)}},$$

where each $f_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ and each $\epsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$. We will write $|w|_{x_i}$ for the number of j such that $f_j = x_i$.

Suppose that $\{v_p\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n} \cong V^{\lambda^+(n)} \otimes V^\lambda$. Then, for any $(g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_r}) \in S_n^r$, we have

$$\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}(w(g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_r})) = d_\lambda \text{tr}_{\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n}}(w(g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_r})),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi^{\lambda^+(n)}(w(g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_r})) \\ &= d_\lambda \sum_{p_i} \left\langle g_{f_1}^{\epsilon_1} v_{p_2}, v_{p_1} \right\rangle \left\langle g_{f_2}^{\epsilon_2} v_{p_3}, v_{p_2} \right\rangle \dots \left\langle g_{f_{l(w)}}^{\epsilon_{l(w)}} v_{p_1}, v_{p_{l(w)}} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For each p , write v_p in the standard orthonormal basis of $(\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes k}$:

$$v_p = \sum_I \beta_{p,I} e_I.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n} \subset D_k(n)$, so that we may assume that the above sum is over all $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ with all indices distinct. This is an important observation.

We introduce some new notation to avoid the cumbersome general expression for $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$. For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, we will write

$$\sum_{I^f}$$

in place of

$$\sum_{I_f^1, \dots, I_f^{|w|_f}}.$$

For any pair I, J of multi-indices and $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, we define

$$(I/J)(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} J & \text{if } \epsilon = 1 \\ I & \text{if } \epsilon = -1. \end{cases}$$

In our expression, we will simply write (I/J) in place of $(I/J)(\epsilon)$ where it is clear which epsilon we are considering. To be even more clear, in the sum below, for each f_i , if $\epsilon_i = 1$, then the corresponding inner product has $e_{I_{f_i}^z}$ on the LHS, where $z \in \{1, \dots, |w|_{f_i}\}$ denotes the number of times f_i has appeared in the subword $f_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots f_i^{\epsilon_i}$. The corresponding pair of β -terms has $\beta_{p,I}$, with $\beta_{p,I}$ conjugated. If $\epsilon_i = -1$, we swap the positions of I and J .³

We will write

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{f,w} \beta \\ &= \left(\beta_{p_2, (I_{f_1}^1 / J_{f_1}^1)} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_1, (J_{f_1}^1 / I_{f_1}^1)} \right) \cdots \\ & \cdots \left(\beta_{p_1, \left(I_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} / J_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} \right)} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_{1(w)}, \left(J_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} / I_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} \right)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

With this notation, (19) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & d_\lambda \sum_{p_i} \sum_{I^f, J^f} \left(\prod_{f,w} \beta \right) \left\langle g_{f_1}^{\epsilon_1} e_{(I_{f_1}^1 / J_{f_1}^1)}, e_{(J_{f_1}^1 / I_{f_1}^1)} \right\rangle \cdots \\ & \cdots \left\langle g_{f_1(w)}^{\epsilon_{1(w)}} e_{\left(I_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} / J_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} \right)}, e_{\left(J_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} / I_{f_1(w)}^{|w|_{f_1(w)}} \right)} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

See the example below. *Without losing generality, we will always assume that $f_1 = x_1$ and that $\epsilon_1 = 1$.*

³We use this notation so that, in the graph construction detailed in Section 4.4, $(J_f^i)_j$ always represents the *initial* vertex of an f -edge and $(I_f^i)_j$ always represents the *terminal* vertex.

Example 4.2. Suppose $w = x_1 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1}$. Then $\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}(w(g_{x_1}, g_{x_2}))$ is equal to

$$d_\lambda \sum_{p_i} \sum_{\substack{I_{x_1}^1, I_{x_1}^2, I_{x_2}^1, I_{x_2}^2, \\ J_{x_1}^1, J_{x_1}^2, J_{x_2}^1, J_{x_2}^2}} \left(\beta_{p_2, I_{x_1}^1} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_1, J_{x_1}^1} \right) \left(\beta_{p_3, I_{x_2}^1} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_2, J_{x_2}^1} \right) \left(\beta_{p_4, J_{x_1}^2} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_3, I_{x_1}^2} \right) \\ \left(\beta_{p_1, J_{x_2}^2} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_4, I_{x_2}^2} \right) \left\langle g_{x_1} e_{J_{x_1}^1}, e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right\rangle \left\langle g_{x_2} e_{J_{x_2}^1}, e_{I_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle \left\langle g_{x_1}^{-1} e_{I_{x_1}^2}, e_{J_{x_1}^2} \right\rangle \left\langle g_{x_2}^{-1} e_{I_{x_2}^2}, e_{J_{x_2}^2} \right\rangle.$$

We rewrite the inner product terms as products of matrix coefficients – for example,

$$\left\langle g_{x_1} e_{J_{x_1}^1}, e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right\rangle = (g_{x_1})_{(I_{x_1}^1)_1, (J_{x_1}^1)_1} \cdots (g_{x_1})_{(I_{x_1}^1)_k, (J_{x_1}^1)_k}.$$

Rearranging and taking the expectation over $g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_r} \in S_n$, we obtain from (20) that $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$ is equal to

$$d_\lambda \sum_{p_i} \sum_{I^f, J^f} \left(\prod_{f, w} \beta \right) \prod_{f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}} \int_{g_{I^f, J^f}}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\int_{g_{I^f, J^f}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{S_n} \prod_{i=1}^{|w|_f} (g_f)_{(I_f^i)_1, (J_f^i)_1} \cdots (g_f)_{(I_f^i)_k, (J_f^i)_k} dg_f.$$

For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ and for each fixed collection of multi-indices $I_f^1, \dots, I_f^{|w|_f}, J_f^1, \dots, J_f^{|w|_f}$, this integral can be computed using the Weingarten calculus for the symmetric group. Using Theorem 2.14 with $m = |w|_f k$, we have

$$\int_{S_n} \prod_{i=1}^{|w|_f} (g_f)_{(I_f^i)_1, (J_f^i)_1} \cdots (g_f)_{(I_f^i)_k, (J_f^i)_k} dg_f \\ = \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}([|w|_f k])} \delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup J_f^{|w|_f} \right) \delta_{\tau_f} \left(I_f^1 \sqcup I_f^2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_f^{|w|_f} \right) \\ \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f).$$

Now we give an improvement over the usual Weingarten calculus that simplifies the above equation greatly. The benefit of the improvement is that, instead of summing over *all* set partitions $\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}([|w|_f k])$, we show that we need only sum over set partitions σ_f, τ_f that have a specific structure, since the contribution to (21) from the set partitions without this structure is zero.

To each partition we associate a diagram (in a similar way to §2.2) – the diagram has $|w|_f$ rows, each containing exactly k vertices. The vertices in row R are labeled from $(R-1)k+1$ to Rk , and two vertices are connected if and only if the corresponding vertex labels are in the same block of the partition.

We will also refer to the diagrams corresponding to σ_f and τ_f as σ_f and τ_f where this does not cause confusion.

Lemma 4.3. For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, if σ_f has any two vertices from the same row connected, then

$$\delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_f^{|w|f} \right) = 0.$$

The same is true for τ_f and $I_f^1 \sqcup I_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup I_f^{|w|f}$.

Proof. Since $e_{J_f^1} \in D_k(n) = \langle e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k} : |\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}| = k \rangle$, if any of the vertices in the top row of σ_f are in the same block, then

$$\delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_f^{|w|f} \right) = 0.$$

Repeating this argument for $J_f^2, \dots, J_f^{|w|f}$ proves the claim for σ_f and then repeating it for $I_f^1 \sqcup I_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup I_f^{|w|f}$ proves the claim for τ_f . \square

The next lemma asserts that every vertex must be connected to at least one other vertex

Lemma 4.4. For any $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, if σ_f has any singletons, then

$$d_\lambda \sum_{p_i} \sum_{I^f, J^f} \left(\prod_{f,w} \beta \right) \left[\sum_{\tau_f \in \text{Part}(|w|_f k)} \delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_f^{|w|f} \right) \delta_{\tau_f} \left(I_f^1 \sqcup I_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup I_f^{|w|f} \right) \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) \right] = 0.$$

The same is true when we swap σ_f and τ_f .

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that the vertex q in the first row of vertices of σ_f is a singleton. For all variables in the sum fixed except for $J_f^1, J_f^2, \dots, J_f^{|w|f}$, assuming

$$\delta_{\tau_f} \left(I_f^1 \sqcup I_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup I_f^{|w|f} \right) \neq 0,$$

then the sum is equal to

$$\sum_{J_f^1, \dots, J_f^{|w|f}} \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_1, J_f^1} \right) \dots \left(\beta_{p, J_f^{|w|f}} \right) \delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_f^{|w|f} \right),$$

multiplied by some constant coming from the other (fixed) β -terms and the Weingarten function $\text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f)$.

Then, for every fixed index $\left(J_f^1 \right)_1, \dots, \left(J_f^1 \right)_{q-1}, \left(J_f^1 \right)_{q+1}, \dots, \left(J_f^1 \right)_k$ and every fixed multi-index $J_f^2, \dots, J_f^{|w|f}$ satisfying σ_f , this is (some constant multiplied by)

$$\sum_{\left(J_f^1 \right)_q=1}^n \bar{\beta}_{p_1, J_f^1}.$$

This is exactly the conjugate of the coefficient of $e_{(J_f^1)_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{(J_f^1)_{q-1}} \otimes e_{(J_f^1)_{q+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{(J_f^1)_k}$ in $T_q(v_{p_1})$. But then, v_{p_1} belongs to an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda,n} \subset A_k(n)$. In particular, $v_p \in \text{Ker}(T_q)$, so that

$$\sum_{(J_f^1)_q=1}^n \bar{\beta}_{p_1, J_f^1} = 0.$$

□

Henceforth, we will denote by $\text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$ the set of set partitions of $[|w|_f k]$ for which the corresponding diagram has no singletons and has no two vertices in the same row in the same connected component.

We will write

$$\sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^*$$

to indicate that the sum is over $\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$.

Remark 4.5. It follows that if any of x_1, \dots, x_r appear only once in w , then there are no such set partitions in $\text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$, and so in these cases $\mathbb{E}_w[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}] = 0$. Such words are primitive and we know from [HP23] that the expected stable irreducible character for primitive words is zero, unless $k = 0$. From now on, we will only be considering non-primitive words.

For any given $\sigma_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$ (and similarly for τ_f), and any collection of multi-indices $J_f^1, \dots, J_f^{|w|_f}$, we will write

$$\sigma_f \leftrightarrow J_f^\Sigma$$

to indicate that

$$\delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup J_f^{|w|_f} \right) = 1.$$

Therefore, our new expression for $\mathbb{E}_w[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}]$ is

$$d_\lambda \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \left(\prod_{f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}} \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) \right) \sum_{p_1} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_f \leftrightarrow J_f^\Sigma \\ \tau_f \leftrightarrow I_f^\Sigma}} \left(\prod_{f, w} \beta \right). \quad (22)$$

This expression can be further simplified using the projection $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n}$. Consider Example 4.2. For all terms fixed in the expression except for, say, p_2 , the sum that follows is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p_2} \left(\beta_{p_2, I_{x_1}^1} \right) \left(\bar{\beta}_{p_2, J_{x_2}^1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{p_2} \left\langle e_{I_{x_1}^1}, v_{p_2} \right\rangle \left\langle v_{p_2}, e_{J_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,n} \left(e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right), e_{J_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \text{Part}([2k])} c(n, k, \lambda, \pi) \left\langle p_\pi \left(e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right), e_{J_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Repeating this and computing the sums over each p_i , the expression in Example 4.2 becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_\lambda \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_w} \left(\prod_{i=1}^4 c(n, k, \lambda, \pi_i) \right) \left(\prod_{f \in \{x_1, x_2\}} \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) \right) \\
& \sum_{\sigma_f \leftrightarrow J_f^\Sigma, \tau_f \leftrightarrow I_f^\Sigma} \left\langle p_{\pi_1} \left(e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right), e_{J_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle \left\langle p_{\pi_2} \left(e_{I_{x_2}^1} \right), e_{J_{x_1}^2} \right\rangle \\
& \left\langle p_{\pi_3} \left(e_{J_{x_1}^2} \right), e_{I_{x_2}^2} \right\rangle \left\langle p_{\pi_4} \left(e_{J_{x_2}^2} \right), e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right\rangle. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that the multi-indices in our sum must have all indices distinct. Therefore, if π_1 has any two vertices in the top row connected, or any two vertices in the bottom row connected, then the term

$$\left\langle p_{\pi_1} \left(e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right), e_{J_{x_2}^1} \right\rangle = 0$$

for any pair of multi-indices. Similarly for π_2 , π_3 and π_4 . So the only summands that contribute to (23) are those in which each $\pi_i \leq \hat{\pi}_i$, where $\hat{\pi}_i = \iota(\rho)$ for some permutation $\rho \in S_k$. In this case, we can replace the sum over the inner product terms in (23) by the number of multi-indices $I_{x_1}^1, I_{x_1}^2, I_{x_2}^1, I_{x_2}^2, J_{x_1}^1, J_{x_1}^2, J_{x_2}^1, J_{x_2}^2$ that simultaneously satisfy $\sigma_f \leftrightarrow J_f^\Sigma$, $\tau_f \leftrightarrow I_f^\Sigma$ as well as all of the inner product terms being equal to one.

We write

$$\text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k]) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \pi \in \text{Part}([2k]) : \pi \leq \iota(\rho), \rho \in S_k \}.$$

Additionally, we will write

$$\sum_{\pi}^{\leq S_k}$$

to indicate that we are summing over $\pi \in \text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k])$.

This argument applies for any non-identity, cyclically reduced, non-primitive word w . With this notation and the definition below, this proves Theorem 4.7.

Definition 4.6. Given, for each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, a collection of set partitions $\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$ and a collection of set partitions $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)} \in \text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k])$, we write

$$\mathcal{N}(\sigma_{x_1}, \tau_{x_1}, \dots, \sigma_{x_r}, \tau_{x_r}, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}) = \mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i),$$

for the number of multi-indices $I_f^1, \dots, I_f^{|w|_f}, J_f^1, \dots, J_f^{|w|_f}$, with all indices distinct, satisfying:

- $\sigma_f \leftrightarrow J_f^\Sigma$,
- $\tau_f \leftrightarrow I_f^\Sigma$,
- $\left\langle p_{\pi_1} \left(e_{I_{x_1}^1} \right), e_{(I/J)_{f_2}} \right\rangle = 1$,
- \vdots

$$\bullet \left\langle p_{\pi_{l(w)}} \left(e_{(I/J)_{f_{l(w)}}} \right), e_{J_{x_1}^1} \right\rangle = 1,$$

where (I/J) is used to denote the correct multi-index arising from the β -terms.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For any $\lambda \vdash k$ and every cyclically reduced, non-identity, non-primitive word $w \in F_r$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] \\ &= d_\lambda \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}}^{\leq S_k} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} c(n, k, \lambda, \pi_i) \right) \left(\prod_{f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}} \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) \right) \\ & \quad \mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Combining (24) with Remark 2.12 and Lemma 2.15, the following bound is immediate.

Corollary 4.8. *Suppose $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For any $\lambda \vdash k$ and every cyclically reduced, non-identity, non-primitive word $w \in F_r$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] \ll_{k, l(w)} \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}}^{\leq S_k} n^{-\sum_{i=1}^{l(w)} \text{del}(\pi_i)} n^{-\sum_f |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|} \mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i).$$

4.4 Graphical Interpretation

We construct a graph for each collection of set partitions $\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}$. This is similar to the construction of a surface from a matching datum by Magee in [Mag23]. Indeed, the graph is essentially the same as the 1-skeleton of the surfaces constructed there.

The graph we construct will be denoted $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. The information in (24) will be encoded in the properties of $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$, allowing us to simplify further by analyzing the graph rather than dealing with tricky combinatorial arguments. Ultimately, from $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ we will construct a new graph from which we derive Theorem 1.5.

$G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ is a graph with $2kl(w)$ vertices, separated into k distinct subsets, each containing exactly $2l(w)$ vertices. We number the subsets from 1 to k . For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the vertices in subset i are labeled

$$\left(I_f^1 \right)_i, \dots, \left(I_f^{|w|_f} \right)_i, \left(J_f^1 \right)_i, \dots, \left(J_f^{|w|_f} \right)_i \text{ for each } f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}.$$

Within each subset i , for each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ and for each $j \in \{1, \dots, |w|_f\}$, we draw a directed, f -labeled edge from the vertex labeled $\left(J_f^j \right)_i$ to the vertex labeled $\left(I_f^j \right)_i$. This gives a total of $kl(w)$ directed edges. We refer to the i^{th} subset of vertices as the i^{th} w -loop, see Figure 1.

For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, we add an undirected σ_f -edge between any two vertices $\left(J_f^j \right)_i$ and $\left(J_f^{j'} \right)_{i'}$ whenever σ_f dictates that the corresponding indices




Figure 1: Here we have shown how to begin constructing $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ with $w = x_1 x_1 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1}$ and $k = 2$. There are $2kl(w) = 20$ vertices, split into $k = 2$ distinct subsets, each containing $2l(w) = 10$ vertices each. The vertices on the left (ie with the outer subscript “1”) are the 1st w -loop and the vertices on the right are the 2nd w -loop. There are $k|w|_{x_1} = 6$ directed x_1 -edges and $k|w|_{x_2} = 4$ directed x_2 -edges.

must be equal in order for $\delta_{\sigma_f} \left(J_f^1 \sqcup J_f^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_f^{|w|_f} \right)$ to be non-zero. This is illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Here we continue the construction of the graph from Figure 1 by adding in the σ_{x_1} -edges (in red) and the σ_{x_2} -edges (in purple). In this example, we have $\sigma_{x_1} = \{\{1, 3, 6\}, \{2, 4, 5\}\} \in \text{Part}([3k])$ and $\sigma_{x_2} = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\} \in \text{Part}([2k])$.

For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, we add undirected τ_f -edges similarly, illustrated in Figure 3.

Finally, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, l(w)\}$, we add an undirected π_i -edge between any two vertices whenever π_i dictates that the corresponding indices must be equal in order for the corresponding inner product term in Definition 4.6 to be non-zero.

In short, for each collection of partitions $\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}$, we draw an undirected edge between any two vertices for which the indices with the same label are necessarily equal for the conditions in Definition 4.6 to hold.

Figure 4 shows a complete example of $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$, with each σ_f, τ_f and π_i as described in the examples throughout this section.

Definition 4.9. We will write $\hat{G}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ for the subgraph of $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ consisting of every vertex and *only the undirected edges*.




Figure 3: We continue the construction from Figures 1 and 2. We have added in the τ_{x_1} -edges (in dark blue) and the τ_{x_2} -edges (in light blue). In this example, $\tau_{x_1} = \{\{1, 3, 5\} \{2, 4, 6\}\}$ and $\tau_{x_2} = \{\{1, 4\} \{2, 3\}\}$.




Figure 4: This depicts $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$, where σ_f and τ_f are as described in Figures 2 and 3 and the π_i are as follows: $\pi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\} \{4\}\}$, $\pi_2 = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\}$, $\pi_3 = \{\{1, 4\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$, $\pi_4 = \{\{1\}, \{3\}, \{2, 4\}\}$ and $\pi_5 = \{\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}\}$.

4.5 Obtaining the bound

In the case of $\sigma_f = \tau_f$ and with all $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}$ corresponding to permutations (ie with $\sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i) = 0$), we can apply [LW17, Theorem 1.2] to obtain the bound of n^{-k} . For the other cases, we need to prove a variant of this theorem that applies in our case. This section is dedicated to this task.

4.5.1 Stackings

Given graph morphisms $\rho_1 : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow G$ and $\rho_2 : \Gamma_2 \rightarrow G$, the fibre product $\Gamma_1 \times_G \Gamma_2$ is the graph with vertex set

$$V(\Gamma_1 \times_G \Gamma_2) = \{(v_1, v_2) \in V(\Gamma_1) \times V(\Gamma_2) : \rho_1(v_1) = \rho_2(v_2)\}$$

and edge set

$$E(\Gamma_1 \times_G \Gamma_2) = \{(e_1, e_2) \in E(\Gamma_1) \times E(\Gamma_2) : \rho_1(e_1) = \rho_2(e_2)\},$$

where $t(e_1, e_2) = (t(e_1), t(e_2))$ and $h(e_1, e_2) = (h(e_1), h(e_2))$.

Louder and Wilton [LW17] develop the notion of a stacking of a graph immersion. We adapt their definitions slightly to suit our case.

Definition 4.10. Let Γ be a finite graph and \mathbb{S} a 1-complex, or an open subset of a 1-complex, with an immersion $\Lambda : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma$. A *stacking* is an embedding $\hat{\Lambda} : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $\pi \hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda$, where $\pi : \Gamma \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is the trivial \mathbb{R} -bundle.

Let $\eta : \Gamma \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the projection to \mathbb{R} .

Definition 4.11. Given a stacking $\hat{\Lambda} : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}$ of an immersion $\Lambda : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma$, define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{S} : \forall y \neq x, \text{ if } \Lambda(x) = \Lambda(y) \text{ then } \eta(\hat{\Lambda}(x)) > \eta(\hat{\Lambda}(y))\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{S} : \forall y \neq x, \text{ if } \Lambda(x) = \Lambda(y) \text{ then } \eta(\hat{\Lambda}(x)) < \eta(\hat{\Lambda}(y))\}.$$

4.5.2 Bounding expected character

By Remark 1.6, we only need to prove the bound in Theorem 1.5 in the case where w is not the identity or a proper power. *From now, assume that w is not a proper power.*

For each σ_f, τ_f, π_i , construct the graph $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ from Section 4.4, consisting of $kl(w)$ disjoint, directed f edges organised into k w -loops and then marking on the blocks of the partitions σ_f, τ_f, π_i using undirected edges.

We construct a new graph $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ by:

- gluing together any vertices that are connected by a σ_f, τ_f or π_i -edge,
- if σ_f and τ_f connect both the initial and terminal vertices of some collection of f -edges, we merge these in to a single f -edge.

Lemma 4.12. *Given $\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$ and $\pi_i \in \text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k])$,*

$$\sum_f |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f| = \left| E\left(\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)\right) \right|.$$

Proof. Every block of $\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f$ of size p corresponds to some collection of f -edges in $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ of size p , whose initial and terminal vertices have been glued together and whose edges have been merged in the construction of $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. Every f -edge in $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ then corresponds to a block of $\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f$. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Given $\sigma_f, \tau_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$ and $\pi_i \in \text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k])$,*

$$\mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i) \ll n^{|V(\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i))|}.$$

Proof. Each vertex of $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ corresponds to a connected component of $\hat{G}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. Any collection of indices must be equal if their corresponding vertices are in the same connected component of $\hat{G}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. Clearly, if there were no more restrictions, we would have

$$\mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i) = n^{|V(\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i))|}.$$

The lemma follows since we have the additional restriction that within each multi-index, each index must be distinct. \square

So (24) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] \ll_{k, l(w)} \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}}^{\leq S_k} n^{-\sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i)} n^{\chi(\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i))}. \quad (25)$$

We now construct $\Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ from $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ by:

- subdividing each f -edge in to three edges by adding in a vertex f_s between the two endpoints and then another vertex f_e between f_s and the terminal vertex of the f -edge. We call these vertices z -type vertices.
- If any collection of f -edges $f, f', \dots, f^{(m)}$ have the same initial vertex u but have different terminal vertices, we merge the respective z -type vertices $f_s, f'_s, \dots, f_s^{(m)}$ in to one vertex (still referred to as a z -type vertex) and merge the respective edges between u and $f_s, f'_s, \dots, f_s^{(m)}$ in to one edge as well.
- Then repeat the second step for f -edges with the same terminal vertex but different initial vertices, replacing f_s with f_e in the above.

Each connected component of $\hat{G}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ now corresponds to a vertex u that has a number of edges connecting u to a z -type vertex. We call these vertices o -type vertices. Each z -type vertex has exactly one edge connecting it to an o -type vertex and a number of others connecting it to other z -type vertices. We relabel the directed edges between z -type vertices as f -edges. and do not label the edges between o -type and z -type vertices.

It is easily verified that $\chi(\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)) = \chi(\Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i))$, so that (25) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] \ll_{k, l(w)} \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}}^{\leq S_k} n^{-\sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i)} n^{\chi(\Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i))}. \quad (26)$$

See Figure 5 below.





Figure 5: Above we show how to construct $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ from the graph $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ constructed in Figure 4. We have labeled one vertex to show which vertices of $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ have been glued together in the construction. Below, we construct $\Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ from $\tilde{\Gamma}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. The o -type vertices are marked by dots and the z -type vertices are marked by crosses. Both graphs have Euler characteristic -5 .



Define $\mathcal{B}_r^\times \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{i=1}^r S_i^1$, the bouquet of r oriented circles, labeled x_1, \dots, x_r with each circle being subdivided by two interior vertices labeled x_i^s and x_i^e , whereby when following the x_i -edge in the given orientation, we reach x_i^s first. We label the wedge point of the circles by o .

Define W to be the graph consisting of a single cycle of oriented f -labeled edges (subdivided as before by two interior z -type vertices) that, when traversed in the correct direction, reads out the word w . Then W comes equipped with an obvious primitive (since w is not a proper power) immersion

$$\Lambda : W \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_r^\times.$$

By [LW17, Lemma 3.4], this immersion has a stacking

$$\hat{\Lambda} : W \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_r^\times \times \mathbb{R}.$$

For each σ_f, τ_f, π_i , write $\Gamma = \Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$. We have a map

$$\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_r^\times$$

and we can form the fibre product graph

$$\Gamma \times_{\mathcal{B}_r^\times} W.$$

Remark 4.14. The map ρ maps o -type vertices to the wedge point o . It maps the z -type vertices formed by merging together f_s vertices to the corresponding f^s vertex in \mathcal{B}_r^\times and similarly for the z -type vertices formed by merging together f_e vertices.

We denote by $\bar{\mathbb{S}}$ the components of the fibre product graph defined by following the paths in $G(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ which alternate between f -edges and π_i -edges. This defines some partition of w^k .

The connected components of $\bar{\mathbb{S}}$ are either *circles* that read out w^{k_i} or *pieces*, which consist of two closed endpoints and a chain of vertices of valence two in between them. Each piece reads out some subword of w^k . The concatenation of the words spelled out by all the connected components of $\bar{\mathbb{S}}$ is exactly w^k .

We have an immersion

$$\bar{\Lambda}' : \bar{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow \Gamma$$

and an immersion

$$\bar{\delta} : \bar{\mathbb{S}} \rightarrow W.$$

It is clear from this construction that the vertices at the end of the pieces of $\bar{\mathbb{S}}$ can only be the preimages of o -type vertices in Γ .

Definition 4.15. We define \mathbb{S} to be the open subset of $\bar{\mathbb{S}}$ where the endpoints of every piece have been removed.

Then we have an immersion

$$\Lambda' : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma$$

and again, by the same argument as [LW17, Lemma 2.5], a stacking

$$\hat{\Lambda}' : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We also have an immersion

$$\delta : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow W.$$

Lemma 4.16. *Every z -type vertex in Γ is covered at least twice by $\Lambda' : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \Gamma$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that, for any f , neither σ_f or τ_f can have any singletons. \square

The connected components of \mathbb{S} are then one of the following:

- a circle
- an *open arc*: a connected and simply connected union of vertices and interiors of edges, with both endpoints open.

Lemma 4.17. *Every connected component of $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Lambda}'}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Lambda}'}$ is either a circle or an open arc.*

Proof. Immediate. \square

Lemma 4.18. *Neither $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Lambda}'}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Lambda}'}$ contain a circle or an open arc that reads out a word of length $> l(w)$.*

Proof. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ be a circle or an open arc that reads out a word of length $> l(w)$, which is contained inside $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$. Then the map

$$\delta|_C : C \rightarrow W$$

is surjective.

W must contain a z -type vertex x belonging to $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\lambda}}$. Then, the preimage $(\delta|_C)^{-1}(x)$ contains a vertex x' belonging to $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$, so that $x' \in \mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'} \cap \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\lambda}}$. This implies that $\Lambda'(x') \in V(\Gamma)$ is covered exactly once by Λ' . But $\Lambda'(x')$ is a z -type vertex in Γ , so this is a contradiction by Lemma 4.16.

To prove the lemma for $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$, we can swap $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ in the proof. \square

So the connected components of $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ are open arcs that read out words of length $\leq l(w)$. Write

$$\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\{\text{open ends of connected components of } A_k(n)\}$$

Lemma 4.19. *We have $\mathcal{M} \geq 2k$.*

Proof. Pick any edge $e \in \mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}}$. Then e has exactly k preimages $\delta^{-1}(e)$ in \mathbb{S} , all of which must be contained inside $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$. Suppose that two of these preimages are contained inside the same connected component C . Then C must read out a word of length $> l(w)$, which is a contradiction. So there are at least k connected components of $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$, so there are at least $2k$ open ends. \square

Lemma 4.20. *We have*

$$\mathcal{M} \leq 2 \left[-\chi(\Gamma) + \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i) \right].$$

Proof. If $v \in V(\Gamma)$ has a preimage in \mathbb{S} , then v must be covered by $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ by a connected component passing through one of v 's preimages. So then there must be

$$\text{deg}(v) - 2$$

open ends of $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ that end at the other preimages of v , to cover the other edges of Γ that are incident at v .

If a vertex u has no preimage in \mathbb{S} , then all edges of Γ that are incident at u must be covered in $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\lambda}'}$ by open arcs that end where u 's preimages were in \mathbb{S} before they were removed.

In total, we see that

$$M = \sum_v (\text{deg}(v) - 2) + \sum_u \text{deg}(u),$$

where the first sum is over $v \in V(\Gamma)$ that have preimages in \mathbb{S} and the second sum is over $u \in V(\Gamma)$ that have no preimages in \mathbb{S} .

This can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{v \in V(\Gamma)} (\text{deg}(v) - 2) + \sum_u 2 = -2\chi(\Gamma) + 2\#V_{\text{end}},$$

where

$$V_{\text{end}} = \{u \in V(\Gamma) : u \text{ has no preimage in } \mathbb{S}\}.$$

If $u \in V_{\text{end}}$, then u must be an o -type vertex. The number of preimages of u in \mathbb{S} is the number of vertices in the connected component of $\hat{G}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ that corresponds to u . This is at least 2, since neither σ_f or τ_f can have any singletons. Moreover, all of these preimages must be closed endpoints of pieces of \mathbb{S} .

So the maximum number of vertices $u \in V_{\text{end}}$ is at most half of the total number of closed ends in \mathbb{S} , which is at most $2 \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i)$.

It follows that

$$\mathcal{M} \leq -2\chi(\Gamma) + 2 \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i).$$

□

Combining Lemma 4.19 and Lemma 4.20 yields

$$\chi(\Gamma(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)) + \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i) \leq -k$$

for any collection σ_f, τ_f, π_i . Combining this with (26) proves Theorem 1.5.

4.6 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Let $w \in F_r = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ for r fixed. Let $m \leq r$ be the minimum number of generators x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m} such that w can be written using the alphabet $\{x_{i_1}, x_{i_1}^{-1}, \dots, x_{i_m}, x_{i_m}^{-1}\}$. So, up to relabeling the generators, $w \in F_m = \langle x_1, \dots, x_m \rangle$, with $m \leq r$.

Beginning with (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_w [\chi^{\lambda^+(n)}] \\ &= d_\lambda \sum_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)}}^{\leq S_k} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} c(n, k, \lambda, \pi_i) \right) \left(\prod_{f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}} \text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) \right) \\ & \quad \mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i). \end{aligned}$$

For each $f \in \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, for each $\sigma_f \in \text{Part}^*([|w|_f k])$,

$$\text{Wg}_{n, (|w|_f k)}(\sigma_f, \tau_f) = \sum_{\rho_f \leq \sigma_f \wedge \tau_f} \mu(\rho_f, \sigma_f) \mu(\rho_f, \tau_f) \frac{1}{(n)_{|\rho_f|}}.$$

This is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{C_1}{(n)_{|w|_f k}} + \frac{C_2}{(n)_{|w|_f k-1}} + \dots + \frac{C_{|w|_f k - |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f| + 1}}{(n)_{|\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|}} \\ &= \frac{g_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}(n)}{(n)_{|w|_f k}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $g_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}(n)$ is a polynomial in n of maximum degree $|w|_f k - |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|$.

For each $\pi \in \text{Part}_{\leq S_k}([2k])$, we have

$$c(n, k, \lambda, \pi) = \frac{(-1)^k d_\lambda^2(n)_{2k}}{(k!)^2 (n)_\lambda} \left[\sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \in S_k} \sum_{\pi' \leq l(\sigma^{-1} \sigma') \wedge \pi} \frac{\mu(\pi', \pi) (-1)^{|\pi'|} \chi^\lambda(\sigma) \chi^\lambda(\sigma')}{(n)_{|\pi'|}} \right],$$

where $(n)_\lambda = \prod_{j=1}^k (n - k + 1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j)$. The term inside the square bracket is equal to

$$\frac{\sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \in S_k} \chi^\lambda(\sigma) \chi^\lambda(\sigma') + \cdots + \kappa_\pi (n - |\pi|) \cdots (n - 2k + 1)}{(n)_{2k}},$$

with

$$\kappa_\pi = \left(\sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \text{ s.t. } \pi \leq \iota(\sigma^{-1}\sigma')} (-1)^{|\pi|} \chi^\lambda(\sigma) \chi^\lambda(\sigma') \right).$$

So then $c(n, k, \lambda, \pi)$ is equal to

$$\frac{h_{k, \lambda, \pi}(n)}{(n)_\lambda},$$

where

$$h_{k, \lambda, \pi} = \frac{(-1)^k d_\lambda^2}{(k!)^2} \left[\sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \in S_k} \chi^\lambda(\sigma) \chi^\lambda(\sigma') + \kappa_\pi (n - |\pi|) \cdots (n - 2k + 1) \right],$$

a polynomial in n of maximum degree $2k - |\pi| = k - \text{del}(\pi)$.

It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} c(n, k, \lambda, \pi_i) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} h_{k, \lambda, \pi_i}(n)}{(n)_\lambda^{l(w)}}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+}(n) \right] = \frac{p_{k, \lambda, w}(n)}{(n)_\lambda^{l(w)} \prod_f (n)_{|w|_f k}}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$p_{k, \lambda, w}(n) = d_\lambda \sum_{\sigma_f}^* \sum_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{l(w)} \leq S_k} \left(\prod_f g_{\sigma_f, \tau_f}(n) \right) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} h_{k, \lambda, \pi_i}(n) \right) \mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i).$$

For each collection of σ_f, τ_f, π_i :

- $\left(\prod_f g_f(n) \right)$ has maximum degree

$$\sum_f (|w|_f k - |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|) = kl(w) - \sum_f |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|,$$

- $\left(\prod_{i=1}^{l(w)} h_{k, \lambda, \pi_i}(n) \right)$ has maximum degree

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l(w)} k - \text{del}(\pi_i) = kl(w) - \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i),$$

- $\mathcal{N}(\sigma_f, \tau_f, \pi_i)$ has maximum degree

$$-k + \sum_i \text{del}(\pi_i) + \sum_f |\sigma_f \wedge \tau_f|,$$

so that the degree of $p_{k,\lambda,w}(n)$ is less than or equal to

$$2kl(w) - k.$$

We can rewrite the denominator of (27) using reciprocal polynomials. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_f (n)_{|w|_f k} \\ &= \prod_{d=1}^m \prod_{c=1}^{|w|_{x_d} k-1} (n-c) \\ &= n^{kl(w)} \prod_{d=1}^m \prod_{c=1}^{|w|_{x_d} k-1} \left(1 - c \cdot \frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(n)_{\lambda}^{l(w)} = n^{kl(w)} \left[\prod_{j=1}^k \left(1 + (1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j - k) \cdot \frac{1}{n}\right) \right]^{l(w)}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right] = \frac{\frac{1}{n^{2kl(w)}} p_{k,\lambda,w}(n)}{\tilde{g}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)} = \frac{\hat{P}_{w,k,\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)}{\tilde{g}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)},$$

where

$$\tilde{g}(x) = \prod_{d=1}^m \prod_{c=0}^{|w|_{x_d} k-1} (1-cx) \left[\prod_{j=1}^k (1 + (1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j - k)x) \right]^{l(w)}.$$

The numerator $\hat{P}_{w,k,\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ is clearly a polynomial in $\frac{1}{n}$ of maximum degree $2kl(w)$.

Now assume that $l(w) \leq q$, which also implies that $m \leq q$. Then $\tilde{g}(x)$ always divides

$$\hat{g}(x) = \prod_{c=1}^q (1-cx)^q \left[\prod_{j=1}^k (1 + (1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j - k)x) \right]^q.$$

The sequence $\check{\lambda}_1 - 1, \dots, \check{\lambda}_k - k$ is strictly decreasing. Moreover, for any $\lambda \vdash k$ and any $j \in [k]$,

$$1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j - k \in [1 - 2k, 0],$$

so that

$$\hat{g}(x) \left| \prod_{c=1}^q (1-cx)^q \left[\prod_{j=1}^{2k} (1 + (1-j)x) \right]^q \right. = g_{q,k}(x).$$

It follows that $\mathbb{E}_w \left[\chi^{\lambda^+(n)} \right]$ can be written

$$\frac{P_{w,k,\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)}{g_{q,k}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{w,k,\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \\
&= \hat{P}_{w,k,\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \frac{g_{q,k} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)}{\tilde{g} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)} \\
&= \hat{P}_{w,k,\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \frac{\left[\prod_{j=1}^{2k} \left(1 + (1-j) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \right) \right]^q}{\left[\prod_{j=1}^k \left(1 + (1 + \check{\lambda}_j - j - k) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \right) \right]^{l(w)}} \prod_{d=1}^m \prod_{c=|w|_{x_d} k}^q \left(1 - c \cdot \frac{1}{n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

This is a polynomial in $\frac{1}{n}$ of maximum degree

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2kl(w) + k(2q - l(w)) + \sum_{d=1}^m (q - |w|_{x_d} k + 1) \\
& \leq 2kq + mq + m \\
& \leq 3kq + q^2.
\end{aligned}$$

References

- [Alo86] Noga Alon. “Eigenvalues and expanders”. In: *Combinatorica* 6.2 (1986), pp. 83–96.
- [BC19] Charles Bordenave and Benoit Collins. “Eigenvalues of random lifts and polynomials of random permutation matrices”. In: *Ann. Math* 190 (Jan. 2019), pp. 811–875.
- [Bor20] Charles Bordenave. “A new proof of Friedman’s second eigenvalue theorem and its extension to random lifts”. In: *Annales Scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*. Vol. 4. 6. 2020, pp. 1393–1439.
- [Cas23] Ewan Cassidy. *Projection formulas and a refinement of Schur–Weyl–Jones duality for symmetric groups*. 2023. arXiv: 2312.01839 [math.RT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01839>.
- [Che+24] Chi-Fang Chen, Jorge Garza-Vargas, Joel A Tropp, and Ramon van Handel. “A new approach to strong convergence”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16026* (2024).
- [CMN21] Benoit Collins, Sho Matsumoto, and Jonathan Novak. “The Weingarten Calculus”. In: *Notices of the American Math. Soc* 69 (Sept. 2021), pp. 734–745.
- [Col03] Benoit Collins. “Moments and cumulants of polynomial random variables on unitary groups, the Itzykson-Zuber integral, and free probability”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2003 (2003), pp. 953–982.
- [CS06] Benoit Collins and Piotr Sniady. “Integration with Respect to the Haar Measure on Unitary, Orthogonal and Symplectic Group”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 264 (June 2006), pp. 773–795.
- [Fri03] Joel Friedman. “Relative expanders or weakly relatively Ramanujan graphs”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 118.1 (2003), pp. 19–35.

- [Fri08] Joel Friedman. *A proof of Alon’s second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems*. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [Fri+98] Joel Friedman, Antoine Joux, Yuval Roichman, Jacques Stern, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. “The action of a few permutations on r -tuples is quickly transitive”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 12.4 (1998), pp. 335–350.
- [Haa78] Uffe Haagerup. “An example of a non nuclear C^* -algebra, which has the metric approximation property”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 50.3 (1978), pp. 279–293.
- [HP23] Liam Hanany and Doron Puder. “Word Measures on Symmetric Groups”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 11 (2023), pp. 9221–9297.
- [HW16] Joseph Helfer and Daniel T Wise. “Counting cycles in labeled graphs: the nonpositive immersion property for one-relator groups”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2016.9 (2016), pp. 2813–2827.
- [Jon94] Vaughan Frederick Randal Jones. “The Potts Model and the symmetric group”. In: *Subfactors: Proceedings of the Taniguchi Symposium on Operator Algebras* (1994), pp. 259–267.
- [Kas05] Martin Kassabov. “Symmetric groups and expander graphs”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 170 (2005), pp. 327–354.
- [LP10] Nathan Linial and Doron Puder. “Word maps and spectra of random graph lifts”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 37 (2010).
- [LW17] Larsen Louder and Henry Wilton. “Stackings and the W -cycles Conjecture”. In: *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* 60.3 (2017), pp. 604–612.
- [Mag23] Michael Magee. “Random Unitary Representations of Surface Groups II: The large n limit”. In: *Geometry and Topology, to appear* (Jan. 2023).
- [Mar94] Paul Martin. “Temperley-Lieb Algebras for Non-Planar Statistical Mechanics - the Partition Algebra Construction”. In: *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications* 03 (1994), pp. 51–82.
- [MOP20] Sidhanth Mohanty, Ryan O’Donnell, and Pedro Paredes. “Explicit near-Ramanujan graphs of every degree”. In: *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2020, pp. 510–523.
- [MS24] Michael Magee and Mikael de la Salle. *Strong asymptotic freeness of Haar unitaries in quasi-exponential dimensional representations*. 2024. arXiv: 2409.03626 [math.PR].
- [MS93] P. Martin and Herbert Saleur. “On an algebraic approach to higher dimensional statistical mechanics”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 158 (Aug. 1993), pp. 155–190.
- [Nic94] Alexandru Nica. “On the number of cycles of given length of a free word in several random permutations”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 5.5 (1994), pp. 703–730. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.3240050506>.

- [Nil91] Alon Nilli. “On the second eigenvalue of a graph”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 91.2 (1991), pp. 207–210.
- [NS06] Alexandru Nica and Roland Speicher. *Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [PP15] Doron Puder and Ori Parzanchevski. “Measure Preserving Words are Primitive”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 28 (Feb. 2015), pp. 63–97.
- [PS23] Doron Puder and Yotam Shomroni. *Stable Invariants and Their Role in Word Measures on Groups*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.17733 [math.GR]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17733>.
- [Rot64] Gian-Carlo Rota. “On the foundations of combinatorial theory i. Theory of Möbius functions”. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 2 (1964), pp. 340–368.
- [VO05] Anatoly Vershik and Andrei Okounkov. “A New Approach to the Representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups. II”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* 131 (2005), pp. 5471–5494.
- [Wei78] Donald Weingarten. “Asymptotic behavior of group integrals in the limit of infinite rank”. In: *J. Math. Phys.* 19 (1978), pp. 999–1001.
- [Wil24] Henry Wilton. “Rational curvature invariants for 2-complexes”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 480.2296 (2024), p. 20240025.
- [Wis05] Daniel T Wise. “The coherence of one-relator groups with torsion and the Hanna Neumann conjecture”. In: *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 37.5 (2005), pp. 697–705.
- [Xu97] Feng Xu. “A random matrix model from two dimensional Yang-Mills theory”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 190 (1997), pp. 287–307.

Ewan Cassidy, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, Lower Mountjoy, DH1 3LE, Durham, United Kingdom
 ewan.g.cassidy@durham.ac.uk