

## SOLUTIONS TO ASSIGNMENT 6

**Exercise 1** (Random graphs are good expanders). In this exercise, we will show the existence of good expander through a probabilistic method. Recall that a bipartite graph with  $n$  left vertices,  $m$  right vertices, and left degree  $D$  is an  $(n, m, D, \gamma, D(1 - \varepsilon))$  expander if for all subsets  $\mathcal{S}$  of left vertices with  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \gamma n$ , we have  $|N(\mathcal{S})| > D(1 - \varepsilon)|\mathcal{S}|$  where  $N(\mathcal{S})$  denotes the set of neighbours of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

We will prove the following theorem:

**Theorem:** Fix  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  and  $n \geq m$  arbitrarily, let  $D$  be a large enough integer to satisfy ( $\log$  is to the base 2)

$$D \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \log\left(\frac{4e^2}{\varepsilon}\right) + \log D + \log\left(\frac{n}{m}\right) \right), \quad (1)$$

and let

$$\gamma = \frac{\varepsilon m}{2eDn}.$$

Then, there exist expander graphs with parameters  $(n, m, D, \gamma, (1 - \varepsilon)D)$ .

To prove the theorem, we pick a random bipartite graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E})$  as follows. We let  $|\mathcal{L}| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{R}| = m$  and choose the edges in  $\mathcal{E}$  randomly as follows. For every vertex  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  we pick  $D$  random vertices *with replacement* in  $\mathcal{R}$  and connect them to  $\ell$ . Note that this implies that we can have multi-edges and so technically the vertices in  $\mathcal{L}$  need not be  $D$ -regular. We will fix this at the end(\*). Let  $1 \leq s \leq \lfloor \gamma n \rfloor$  be an integer and let  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  be an arbitrary subset of size exactly  $s$ . We will argue that with the chosen parameters, the probability that  $|N(\mathcal{S})| < D(1 - \varepsilon)s$  is small enough so that even after taking a union bound over all choices of  $s$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ , the probability that all sufficiently small sets expand by a factor of  $D(1 - \varepsilon)$  is strictly larger than 0. This proves the existence of a graph with the desired properties.

Fix  $s$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  as above. Let  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S}) = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{sD}\}$  be the  $sD$  random choices of edges departing the  $s$  vertices in  $\mathcal{S}$ . It may be helpful for concreteness to choose here a particular labeling order for the  $e_i$ 's, with say  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_D$  corresponding to the edges of the top most vertex in  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $e_{D+1}, e_{D+2}, \dots, e_{2D}$  corresponding to the second vertex in  $\mathcal{S}$ , and so on. Further, let  $\{r_i\}$  denote the set of nodes in  $N(\mathcal{S})$ . Hence, each vertex in  $\mathcal{S}$  is connected through some edge  $e_i$  to some vertex  $r_{j(i)}$  in  $N(\mathcal{S})$ . We call an edge  $e_i$  (for  $i > 1$ ) a *repeat* if  $r_{j(i)} \in \{r_{j(1)}, \dots, r_{j(i-1)}\}$ . Note that if the total number of repeats is at most  $\varepsilon sD$ , then  $|N(\mathcal{S})| \geq D(1 - \varepsilon)s$ . Thus, it suffices to show that the probability of more than  $\varepsilon sD$  repeats is small.

1. Show that the probability that  $e_i$  ( $i \geq 2$ ) is a repeat is at most

$$\frac{i-1}{m} \leq \frac{sD}{m}. \quad (2)$$

2. Using the same argument argue that

$$\Pr[\{e_{a_1}, e_{a_2}, \dots, e_{a_k}\} \text{ are repeats}] = \prod_{t=1}^k \Pr[e_{a_t} \text{ is a repeat} | e_{a_1}, \dots, e_{a_{t-1}} \text{ are repeats}] \leq \left(\frac{sD}{m}\right)^k \quad (3)$$

(with indices  $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k \leq sD$ ).

3. Justify each step:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ contains at least } \varepsilon sD \text{ repeats}] &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ contains a subset of } \varepsilon sD \text{ repeats}] \\ &\leq \binom{Ds}{\varepsilon sD} \left(\frac{sD}{m}\right)^{\varepsilon sD} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{e}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\varepsilon sD} \left(\frac{sD}{m}\right)^{\varepsilon sD} \quad (5)$$

$$= \left(\frac{esD}{\varepsilon m}\right)^{\varepsilon sD} \quad (6)$$

$$= \left(\frac{s}{2\gamma n}\right)^{\varepsilon sD}. \quad (7)$$

4. By taking a union bound over all  $\binom{n}{s}$  choices for  $\mathcal{S}$ , show that the probability that there exists some set  $\mathcal{S}$  of size  $s$  that does not expand by a factor of  $D(1 - \varepsilon)$  is at most

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^s. \quad (8)$$

Hint: Use our bound on binomial, argue that  $D\varepsilon > 1$  by assumption on  $D$ , and that  $\left(\frac{en}{s}\right) \left(\frac{s}{2\gamma n}\right)^{\varepsilon D}$  is an increasing function of  $s$ , and thus that it suffices to check that this quantity is upper bounded by  $1/2$  for  $s = \gamma n$ .

5. Conclude that the probability that  $G$  is not an  $(n, m, D, \gamma, D(1 - \varepsilon))$  bipartite expander is strictly less than 1.

6. Recall that the random graph generation does not guarantee  $D$  regularity for left vertices since “for every vertex  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  we pick  $D$  random vertices *with replacement* in  $\mathcal{R}$  and connect them to  $\ell$ .” Consider now the slight variation in code generation where each left vertex is connected to a random subset of exactly  $D$  left vertices—in other words, each left vertex selects uniformly at random a subset of  $D$  right vertices as its neighbors. How does the analysis change?

**Exercise 2** (Minimum distance). Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $(n, m, D, \gamma, D(1 - \varepsilon))$  be an expander graph for some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ . Given any set of left vertices  $\mathcal{S}$ , a right vertex  $v$  is said to be a unique neighbour of  $\mathcal{S}$  if it is adjacent to exactly one vertex in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $U(\mathcal{S})$  denote the set of unique neighbours of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

1. Fix any set of left vertices  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \gamma n$ . How many edges leave  $\mathcal{S}$ ? Using this, compute an upper bound on the number of vertices in  $N(\mathcal{S})$  that have more than one incident edge from  $\mathcal{S}$ .
2. Use the above to argue that  $|U(\mathcal{S})| \geq D(1 - 2\varepsilon)|\mathcal{S}|$ .
3. Use the second part to argue that the minimum distance of the corresponding expander code is at least  $\gamma n$ .

Hint: Choose any nonzero codeword and label the left vertices by the codeword bits. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the support set of vertices labelled 1. What can you say about  $U(\mathcal{S})$ ?

4. Using similar arguments (in particular by showing that  $|U(\mathcal{S})| > 0$ ), conclude that the minimum distance is at least  $2\gamma(1 - \epsilon)n$ .

*Hint:* Assume that there exists  $T \subset \mathcal{S}$  with  $|T| = \gamma n$ . Show that

$$|U(\mathcal{S})| \geq |U(T) - N(\mathcal{S} \setminus T)| > 0.$$

**Exercise 3** (Encoding/decoding complexity of expander codes). Expander codes have low encoding and decoding complexity.

- What is the encoding complexity of an expander code?
- What is the computational complexity in each iteration of decoding an expander code? Justify first that it can be made  $O(n^2)$ , then improve your method to make it  $O(n)$ .