

Notes for Week 3/19/20 - 3/26/20

Alden Green

April 1, 2020

Let $G_0 = ([\mathcal{M}], E_0)$ be a graph on $\mathcal{M} \geq 1$ vertices. Let $N_1, \dots, N_{\mathcal{M}}$ each be positive integers. The (Alden product) graph H_0 on $n = \sum N_m$ nodes is defined as

$$H_0 = \left(\bigcup_{m=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_m} (m, i), \quad F_0 \right), \quad \text{where } (\ell, i) \sim (m, j) \text{ in } H_0 \text{ if } \ell \sim m \text{ in } G_0.$$

Let $\lambda_k(H_0)$ denote the k th smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian L_{H_0} , and let

$$N_{\min} = \min_{m \in [\mathcal{M}]} N_m, \quad N_{\max} = \max_{m \in [\mathcal{M}]} N_m$$

We wish to prove the following Lemma

Lemma 1. For $k \in [n]$,

$$\lambda_k(H_0) \geq \frac{\deg_{\min}(G_0) N_{\min}^3}{\deg_{\max}(G_0) N_{\max}^2} \cdot \begin{cases} \lambda_k(G_0), & \text{if } k \in [\mathcal{M}] \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Our proof will involve a series of matrix and graph comparisons. For a graph G on M vertices, let N_G be the normalized Laplacian matrix, with associated eigenvalues $\lambda_1(N_G) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_M(N_G)$. Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ be contractions from $[N_{\max}]$ to $[N_1], \dots, [N_{\mathcal{M}}]$, respectively, to be defined later. The mappings σ_m and the graph H_0 jointly induce a weighted graph

$$\bar{H}_0 = \left([\mathcal{M}] \times [N_{\max}], W_0 \right), \quad \text{where } W_0[(m, j), (m', j')] = \frac{\mathbf{1}\{(m, \sigma_m(j)) \sim (m', \sigma_{m'}(j')) \text{ in } H\}}{|\{\ell : \sigma_m(\ell) = \sigma_m(j)\}| \cdot |\{\ell' : \sigma_{m'}(\ell') = j'\}|} \quad (2)$$

(TODO): Define \bar{G}_0 here.

We shall proceed according to the following steps:

1. For each $k \in [n]$,

$$\lambda_k(H_0) \geq \deg_{\min}(H_0) \cdot \lambda_k(N_{H_0}) \quad (3)$$

2. For each $k \in [n]$,

$$\lambda_k(N_{H_0}) \geq \lambda_k(N_{\bar{H}_0}) \quad (4)$$

3. For each $k \in [\mathcal{M} N_{\max}]$,

$$\lambda_k(N_{\bar{H}_0}) \geq \frac{N_{\min}^2}{N_{\max}^2} \cdot \lambda_k(N_{\bar{G}_0}) \quad (5)$$

4. For each $k \in [\mathcal{M}]$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k(\bar{G}_0) = \tilde{\lambda}_k(G_0) \quad (6)$$

Otherwise if $k > \mathcal{M}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_k(\bar{G}_0) = 1$.

5. For each $k \in [\mathcal{M}]$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k(G_0) \geq \frac{\lambda_k(G_0)}{\deg_{\max}(G)}.$$

(TODO): Fill in proof.

Step 1: Moving to Normalized Laplacian. For simplicity, in this section we will deal with an arbitrary $G = ([n], E)$, and show

$$\lambda_k(G) \geq \deg_{\min}(G) \cdot \lambda_k(N_G)$$

for all $k \in [n]$. If $\deg_{\min}(G) = 0$, the statement is trivially obvious, and so we will suppose without loss of generality that $\deg_{\min}(G) > 0$.

Let $L = D - A$, where $A = A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix of G , $D := D(G)$ is the degree matrix associated with G , and L is therefore the Laplacian of G . Let $N = D^{-1/2}LD^{-1/2}$ be the normalized Laplacian of G . Using the Courant-Fischer min max theorem, and letting $D^{-1/2}V = \{D^{-1/2}v : v \in V\}$ for any subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(G) &= \min_V \left\{ \max_{v \in V} \frac{v^T L v}{v^T v} \right\} \\ &= \min_V \left\{ \max_{u \in D^{-1/2}V} \frac{u^T N u}{u^T D^{-1} u} \right\} \\ &\geq \deg_{\min}(G) \min_V \left\{ \max_{u \in D^{-1/2}V} \frac{u^T N u}{u^T u} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the minimum is always over all k dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n and the second line follows upon substituting $u = D^{1/2}v$. Since every vertex has non-zero degree, both $D^{1/2}$ and $D^{-1/2}$ are full rank matrices, and $\dim(D^{-1/2}V) = \dim(V)$ for all subspaces V . Hence, we have

$$\min_V \left\{ \max_{u \in D^{-1/2}V} \frac{u^T N u}{u^T u} \right\} = \min_U \left\{ \max_{u \in U} \frac{u^T N u}{u^T u} \right\} = \lambda_k(N_G).$$

Choosing $G = H_0$, we obtain (3).

Step 2: Moving to a weighted graph. By definition, the graph H_0 is a contraction of \bar{H}_0 . Moreover, for any vertices (m, j) and (m', j') which are contracted together, $m = m'$ and $\sigma_m(j) = \sigma_m(j')$, so the two vertices have all the same edge weights in \bar{H}_0 . The eigenvalue inequality (4) then follows from Lemma 2.

Step 3: Moving to unweighted tensor product graph. We first lower bound $N_{\bar{H}_0}$ by an unweighted tensor product graph $N_{\bar{G}_0}$, where \bar{G}_0 is defined as

$$\bar{G}_0 = ([\mathcal{M}] \times [N_{\max}], E(\bar{G}_0)), \text{ where } (m, j) \sim (m', j') \text{ in } \bar{G}_0 \text{ if } m \sim m' \text{ in } G_0.$$

The graph \bar{H}_0 has the same adjacency structure as \bar{G}_0 , but edges with weights between 0 and 1. To have our lower bound be sufficiently large, we would like to make the minimum of these weights large. We achieve by this ensuring the maps σ_m do not map too many vertices in $[\mathcal{M}] \times [N_{\max}]$ to the same vertex in $V(H_0)$. Formally, we let

$$\sigma_m(i) := i \mod N_m$$

Then, for any $(m, i) \in [\mathcal{M}] \times [N_{\max}]$, clearly $|\{\ell : \sigma_m(\ell) = \sigma_m(j)\}| \leq N_{\max}/N_{\min}$. Recalling the definition of the weight matrix W_0 in (2), by Lemma 3, we have that

$$\lambda_k(N_{\bar{H}_0}) \geq \frac{N_{\min}^2}{N_{\max}^2} \lambda_k(N_{\bar{G}_0}).$$

Step 4: Completing the proof. We have that $\bar{G}_0 = G_0 \otimes K_{N_{\max}}$, and we may therefore characterize the spectrum $\tilde{\Lambda}(\bar{G}_0)$ by $\tilde{\Lambda}(G_0)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}(K_{N_{\max}})$ using Lemma 4. The latter spectrum is simply

$$\lambda_1(N_{K_{N_{\max}}}) = 0, \lambda_2(N_{K_{N_{\max}}}), \dots, \lambda_N(N_{K_{N_{\max}}}) = 1,$$

and therefore by Lemma 4

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k(\bar{G}_0) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\lambda}_k(G_0), & \text{for } k = 1, \dots, \mathcal{M} \\ 1, & \text{for } k = \mathcal{M} + 1, \dots, \mathcal{M} \cdot N_{\max}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

1 Additional Theory

1.1 Contractions

Let $H = ([n + m], W_H)$ be an arbitrary weighted graph on $n + m$ vertices. Any mapping $\sigma : [n + m] \rightarrow [n]$ induces a graph $G = ([n], W_G)$ with weights

$$W_G[k, k'] = \sum_{\ell: \sigma(\ell)=k} \sum_{\ell': \sigma(\ell')=k'} W_H[\ell, \ell']$$

which we call the contraction of H induced by σ .

Lemma 2. *Suppose that the graph H and contraction σ satisfy the following property: for all ℓ, ℓ' such that $\sigma(\ell) = \sigma(\ell')$, $W_H[\ell, \cdot] = W_H[\ell', \cdot]$. Then,*

$$\lambda_k(N_G) \geq \lambda_k(N_H), \quad \text{for all } k \in [n].$$

Proof. The following two facts are key consequences of the assumption that $W_H[\ell, \cdot] = W_H[\ell', \cdot]$ for all $\sigma(\ell) = \sigma(\ell')$. First, for any i and $i' \in [n + m]$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_G[\sigma(i), \sigma(i')] &= \sum_{\ell: \sigma(\ell)=\sigma(i)} \sum_{\ell': \sigma(\ell')=\sigma(i')} W_H[\ell, \ell'] \\ &= \sum_{\ell: \sigma(\ell)=\sigma(i)} \sum_{\ell': \sigma(\ell')=\sigma(i')} W_H[i, i'] = W_H[i, i'] \cdot N_{\sigma(i)} N_{\sigma(i')}. \end{aligned}$$

Second, for any $\ell \in [n + m]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_H(\ell) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} W_H[i, \ell] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \frac{W_G[\sigma(i), \sigma(\ell)]}{N_{\sigma(i)} N_{\sigma(\ell)}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{W_G[j, \ell]}{N_{\sigma(\ell)}} \\ &= \frac{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell))}{N_{\sigma(\ell)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let v be an eigenvector of N_G , meaning there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$N_G v = \lambda v$$

Define $u : [n + m] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the vector

$$u(\ell) = \frac{v(\sigma(\ell))}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)}}, \quad \text{where } N_\sigma(\ell) = |\{\ell' : \sigma(\ell') = \sigma(\ell)\}|$$

The following manipulations show that u is an eigenvector of N_H , with eigenvalue λ .

$$\begin{aligned} (N_H u)(\ell) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ \frac{u(\ell)}{\deg_H(\ell)} - \frac{u(i)}{\sqrt{\deg_H(\ell) \deg_H(i)}} \right\} W_H[\ell, i] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ \frac{v(\sigma(\ell))}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell) \deg_H(\ell)}} - \frac{v(\sigma(i))}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(i) \deg_H(\ell) \deg_H(i)}} \right\} W_H[\ell, i] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)} v(\sigma(\ell))}{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell))} - \frac{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)} v(\sigma(i))}{\sqrt{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell) \deg_G(\sigma(i)))}} \right\} W_H[\ell, i] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)} v(\sigma(\ell))}{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell))} - \frac{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)} v(\sigma(i))}{\sqrt{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell) \deg_G(\sigma(i)))}} \right\} \frac{W_G[\sigma(\ell), \sigma(i)]}{N_\sigma(\ell) N_\sigma(i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ \frac{v(\sigma(\ell))}{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell))} - \frac{v(\sigma(i))}{\sqrt{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell) \deg_G(\sigma(i)))}} \right\} \frac{W_G[\sigma(\ell), \sigma(i)]}{N_\sigma(i)} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)}} \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \frac{v(\sigma(\ell))}{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell))} - \frac{v(j)}{\sqrt{\deg_G(\sigma(\ell) \deg_G(j))}} \right\} W_G[\sigma(\ell), j] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\sigma(\ell)}} \lambda v(\sigma(\ell)) = \lambda u(\ell), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from the substitution $j = \sigma(i)$.

Therefore every eigenvalue of G is also an eigenvalue of H . It follows immediately that the k th smallest eigenvalue of H must be no greater than the k th smallest eigenvalue of G . \square

1.2 Weighted graphs

Lemma 3. *Let $G = ([n], E)$ be an unweighted and connected graph, and let A be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix with entries $0 < A_{ij} < 1$. Let $H = ([n], W)$ be a weighted graph with weights*

$$W_{ij} = A_{ij} \times \mathbf{1}\{(i, j) \in G\}.$$

Then,

$$\lambda_k(N_H) \geq \min\{A_{ij}\} \cdot \lambda_k(N_G)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. Note that since A has strictly positive entries and G is connected, the degree of every vertex $i \in [n]$ is positive in both G and H ; thus D_H and D_G are full rank, and so is $D_G^{1/2} D_H^{-1/2}$. By the Courant-Fischer

Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_k(N_H) &= \min_V \left\{ \max_v \left\{ \frac{v^T N_H v}{v^T v} : v \in V \text{ and } v \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\
&= \min_V \left\{ \max_u \left\{ \frac{u^T L_H u}{u^T D_H u} : u \in D_H^{-1/2} V \text{ and } u \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \quad (\text{substituting } u = D_H^{-1/2} v) \\
&\geq \min\{A_{ij}\} \cdot \min_V \left\{ \max_u \left\{ \frac{u^T L_G u}{u^T D_G u} : u \in D_H^{-1/2} V \text{ and } u \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\
&= \min\{A_{ij}\} \cdot \min_V \left\{ \max_w \left\{ \frac{w^T N_G w}{w^T w} : w \in D_G^{1/2} D_H^{-1/2} V \text{ and } w \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\
&\quad (\text{substituting } w = D_G^{1/2} u) \\
&= \min\{A_{ij}\} \cdot \lambda_k(N_G),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 5. \square

1.3 Tensor product graphs

For an unweighted graph $G = ([n], E)$, the random walk matrix P_G has entries

$$(P_G)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\deg_G(i)} \mathbf{1}\{(i, j) \in E\}.$$

Recall that the spectrum $\Lambda(P_G) = 1 - \Lambda(N_G)$ (see, e.g. (von Luxburg)).

For graphs $G_1 = ([N], E_1)$ and $G_2 = ([M], E_2)$, the tensor $H = G_1 \otimes G_2$ is defined over the vertex set $[N] \times [M]$, with an edge between (i, k) and (j, l) if and only if i is connected to j in G_1 and k is connected to l in G_2 .

Lemma 4. *Let $G_1 = ([N], E_1)$ and $G_2 = ([M], E_2)$ be unweighted graphs, and let $H = G_1 \otimes G_2$. Then, the spectrum*

$$\Lambda(N_H) = \left\{ \lambda_k(N_{G_1}) + \lambda_\ell(N_{G_2}) - \lambda_k(N_{G_1}) \cdot \lambda_\ell(N_{G_1}) : (k, \ell) \in [N] \times [M] \right\}$$

Proof. We will abbreviate $P_1 := P_{G_1}$ and $P_2 := P_{G_2}$. Let v_k and u_ℓ satisfy

$$P_1 v_k = \lambda_k v_k, \quad P_2 u_\ell = \lambda_\ell u_\ell.$$

Let $w : \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ be defined by $w_{ij} = v_{k,i} u_{\ell,j}$. We will show that w is an eigenvector of P_H satisfying

$$P_H w = \lambda_k \lambda_\ell \cdot w.$$

To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg_H((i, j)) &= \sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \mathbf{1}\{(i, j) \sim (i', j') \text{ in } H\} \\
&= \sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \mathbf{1}\{i \sim i' \text{ in } G_1\} \mathbf{1}\{j \sim j' \text{ in } G_2\} \\
&= \deg_{G_1}(i) \deg_{G_2}(j),
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(P_H w)_{ij} &= \sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \frac{w_{i'j'}}{\deg_H(i', j')} \mathbf{1}\{(i, j) \sim (i', j') \text{ in } H\} \\
&= \sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \frac{v_{ki'} u_{\ell j'}}{\deg_{G_1}(i') \deg_{G_2}(j')} \mathbf{1}\{i \sim i' \text{ in } G_1\} \mathbf{1}\{j \sim j' \text{ in } G_2\} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \frac{v_{ki'}}{\deg_{G_1}(i')} \mathbf{1}\{i \sim i' \text{ in } G_1\} \right) \left(\sum_{i'=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^M \frac{u_{\ell j'}}{\deg_{G_2}(j')} \mathbf{1}\{j \sim j' \text{ in } G_2\} \right) \\
&= \lambda_k \lambda_\ell v_{ki} u_{\ell j}.
\end{aligned}$$

This characterizes the spectrum $\Lambda(P_H)$. The claim of Lemma 4 follows upon recalling that the spectrum $\Lambda(N_G) = 1 - \Lambda(N_G)$ for $G = H$, $G = G_1$ and $G = G_2$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{k,\ell}(N_H) &= 1 - \lambda_{k,\ell}(P_H) \\
&= 1 - \lambda_k(P_{G_1}) \lambda_\ell(P_{G_2}) \\
&= 1 - (1 - \lambda_k(N_{G_1})) (1 - \lambda_\ell(N_{G_2})) \\
&= \lambda_k(N_{G_1}) + \lambda_\ell(N_{G_2}) - \lambda_k(N_{G_1}) \lambda_\ell(N_{G_2}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

1.4 Variational lemmas

We will use the following fact repeatedly. We state and prove it formally as a sanity check. For a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix A , and a non-zero vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the Rayleigh quotient is

$$R_A(v) = \frac{v^T A v}{v^T v}$$

We let $\lambda_1(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(A)$ be the eigenvalues of A , sorted in ascending order. For a subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and operator $D : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, let $DV := \{Dv : v \in V\}$.

Lemma 5. *Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix, and let $D : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full rank linear operator. Then,*

$$\lambda_k(A) = \min_V \left\{ \max_v \{R_A(v) : v \in DV \text{ and } v \neq 0\} : \dim(V) = k \right\}$$

Proof. We know from the Courant-Fischer Theorem that

$$\lambda_k(A) = \min_V \left\{ \max_v \{R_A(v) : v \in V \text{ and } v \neq 0\} : \dim(V) = k \right\}$$

Let (v_k, V_k) satisfy

$$R_A(v_k) = \lambda_k(A), \text{ and } v_k = \operatorname{argmax}_v \{R_A(v) : v \in V_k \text{ and } v \neq 0\}$$

Now, let $U_* = D^{-1}V_k$; since D is a full rank operator U_* is well-defined and $\dim(U_*) = \dim(V_k) = k$. Clearly $V_k = DU_*$, and therefore $v_k \in DU_*$. As a result

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_V \left\{ \max_v \{R_A(v) : v \in DV \text{ and } v \neq 0\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} &\leq \max_v \{R_A(v) : v \in DU_* \text{ and } v \neq 0\} \\
&= \max_v \{R_A(v) : v \in V_k \text{ and } v \neq 0\} \\
&= R_A(v_k) \\
&= \lambda_k(A).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let

$$U_k := \operatorname{argmin}_U \left\{ \max_v \{ R_A(v) : v \in DU \text{ and } v \neq 0 \} : \dim(U) = k \right\}$$

and let $V_* = DU_k$. Since D is full rank $\dim(V_*) = \dim(U_*) = k$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(A) &= \min_V \left\{ \max \{ R_A(v) : v \in V \text{ and } v \neq 0 \} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\ &\leq \max \{ R_A(v) : v \in V_* \text{ and } v \neq 0 \} \\ &= \max \{ R_A(v) : v \in DU_k \text{ and } v \neq 0 \} \\ &= \min_U \left\{ \max_v \{ R_A(v) : v \in DU \text{ and } v \neq 0 \} : \dim(U) = k \right\} \end{aligned}$$

□

Among other things, Lemma 5 allows us to compare the spectrum of N_G and L_G , in terms of the minimum and maximum degree of G .

Lemma 6. *Let $G = ([N], E)$ be an unweighted connected graph. Then,*

$$\frac{\lambda_k(G)}{\deg_{\max}(G)} \leq \tilde{\lambda}_k(G) \leq \frac{\lambda_k(G)}{\deg_{\min}(G)}$$

Proof. The following manipulations establish the lower bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(N_G) &= \min_V \left\{ \max_v \left\{ \frac{v^T N_G v}{v^T v} : v \in V \text{ and } v \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\ &= \min_V \left\{ \max_u \left\{ \frac{u^T L_G u}{u^T D_G u} : u \in D^{-1/2} V \text{ and } u \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\deg_{\max}(G)} \cdot \min_V \left\{ \max_u \left\{ \frac{u^T L_G u}{u^T u} : u \in D^{-1/2} V \text{ and } u \neq 0 \right\} : \dim(V) = k \right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_k(G)}{\deg_{\max}(G)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by Lemma 5. The upper bound follows by similar steps, upon replacing $\deg_{\max}(G)$ by $\deg_{\min}(G)$ in the previous expression and reversing the inequality. □