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Abstract

In [9], the authors obtained an alternative characterization of characteristic vertices for trees with positive weights on its edges via Perron values and Perron branches. It was also shown that the algebraic connectivity of a tree with positive edge weights can be expressed in terms of Perron values.

In this article, we consider trees with matrix weights on its edges. In particular, we are interested in trees with the following classes of matrix edge weights:
1. positive definite matrix weights,
2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries.

For trees with above classes of matrix edge weights, we define Perron value and Perron branch. Further, building on the work of [9], we have shown the existence of vertices satisfying properties analogous to the properties of characteristic vertices of trees with positive edge weights in terms of Perron values and Perron branches, and we call such vertices as characteristic-like vertices. In this case, the eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix are nonnegative, and we obtain a lower bound for the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix in terms of Perron values. Furthermore, we also compute the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix for trees with nonsingular matrix weights on its edges.
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1 Introduction and Motivation

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph, with $V$ as the set of vertices and $E$ as the set of edges in $G$. For $u, v \in V$, we write $u \sim v$ if $u$ and $v$ are adjacent in $G$, and $u \sim v$ otherwise. We write, $\text{deg}(v)$ to denote the degree of the vertex $v$ and $\mathcal{P}(u, v)$ to denote the path joining vertices $u$ and $v$.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ on $n$ vertices if each edge $e \in E$ is associated with a positive number $W(e)$, called the weight of $e$, then the Laplacian matrix $L(G) = [l_{uv}]$ is an $n \times n$ matrix (we simply write $L$ if there is no scope of confusion), and is defined as follows: For $u, v \in V$, if $u \neq v$, then $l_{uv} = 0$ if $u \sim v$, and $l_{uv} = -W(e)$ if $u \sim v$ and $e$ is the edge between them; finally if $u = v$, $l_{vv}$ is the sum of the weights of the edges in $G$ which are incident with vertex $v$. It is well known that $L(G)$ is a symmetric and positive semidefinite matrix. The constant vector is an eigenvector of $L(G)$ corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue 0. In [6], Fiedler proved that the second smallest eigenvalue of $G$, say $\mu(G)$, is positive if and only if $G$ is connected. Since $\mu(G)$ provides an algebraic measure of the connectivity of $G$, it is named as algebraic connectivity of $G$. An eigenvector $y$ of
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Let \( L(G) \), corresponding to the algebraic connectivity \( \mu(G) \) is called Fiedler vector. Further, for any vertex \( v \in V \), we write \( y_v \) to represent the \( v^{th} \)-entry of \( y \).

In particular, for a given tree \( T \) with positive weights on its edges, there is an interesting result that gives some of the structure of the eigenvectors corresponding to the algebraic connectivity of \( T \). This result was first proved for trees where all of the edge weights are equal to 1 in [7], but the result is also valid for trees with positive weights.

**Proposition 1.1.** [7] Let \( T = (V,E) \) be a tree with positive weights on its edges. Let \( L \) be the Laplacian matrix of \( T \) with algebraic connectivity \( \mu(T) \) and \( y \) be an eigenvector of \( L \) corresponding to the algebraic connectivity \( \mu(T) \). Then, exactly one of the following cases occurs:

(a) No entry of \( y \) is 0. In this case, there is the unique pair of vertices \( u \) and \( v \) such that \( u \) and \( v \) are adjacent in \( T \), with \( y_u > 0 \) and \( y_v < 0 \). Further, the entries of \( y \) are increasing along any path in \( T \) which starts at \( u \) and does not contain \( v \), while the entries of \( y \) are decreasing along any path in \( T \) which starts at \( v \) and doesn't contain \( u \).

(b) Some entry of \( y \) is 0. In this case, the subgraph of \( T \) induced by the set of vertices corresponding to 0's in \( y \) is connected. Moreover, there is a unique vertex \( x \) such that \( y_x = 0 \), and \( x \) is adjacent to a vertex \( w \) with \( y_w \neq 0 \). The entries of \( y \) are either increasing, decreasing, or identically 0 along any path in \( T \) which starts at \( x \).

A tree with positive weights on its edges is said to be of Type I if (b) holds, and Type II if (a) holds. If \( T \) is Type I, Fiedler defines the characteristic vertex to be the special vertex \( x \) referred to in (b), while if \( T \) is Type II, he declares \( T \) to have two characteristic vertices, namely the special vertices \( u \) and \( v \) referred to in (a), and we call the edge between the vertices \( u \) and \( v \) as the characteristic edge of \( T \). In [12], it was shown that the characteristic vertex (or vertices) of \( T \) are independent of the choice of eigenvector \( y \) corresponding to the algebraic connectivity \( \mu(T) \).

Let \( T \) be a tree with positive weights on its edges and let \( C_T \) denote the set of characteristic vertices of \( T \). Then, \( |C_T| = 1 \) or \( 2 \), depending on whether \( T \) contains a characteristic vertex or characteristic edge, respectively.

Before proceeding further, we first introduce a few notations and recall a few results from matrix theory which will be used time and again throughout this article. Let \( 1, I \) and \( J \) denote the column vector of all ones, the identity matrix and matrix of all ones, respectively. We write \( 0_{m \times n} \) to represent zero matrix of order \( m \times n \) and simply write \( 0 \) if there is no scope of confusion with the order of the matrix. Given a matrix \( A \), we use \( A^T \), \( \text{Range}(A) \) and \( \text{Null}(A) \) to denote the transpose, range and null space of the matrix \( A \), respectively. If \( A \) is a square matrix, then the set of eigenvalues of \( A \) is called the spectrum of \( A \), denoted by \( \sigma(A) \) and the spectral radius of \( A \), denoted by \( \rho(A) \) is defined as \( \rho(A) = \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(A)} |\lambda| \). By Perron-Frobenius theory, if \( A \) is an entrywise positive square matrix, then \( \rho(A) \) is the largest eigenvalue of \( A \). Moreover, \( \rho(A) \) is a simple eigenvalue of \( A \) and called the Perron value of \( A \). Next, we state a result that compares spectral radius of two nonnegative matrices which is an application of Perron-Frobenius theory (for details see [13]).

**Theorem 1.2.** [13, Corollary 2.2] Let \( A \) be an entrywise positive square matrix and \( B \) be a nonnegative matrix is of same order as \( A \). If \( A - B \) is a nonnegative matrix with atleast one positive entry, then \( \rho(A) > \rho(B) \).

Finally, given a Hermitian matrix \( A \) of order \( n \times n \), using the convention that the eigenvalues of \( A \) are in increasing order as:

\[
\lambda_{\min} = \lambda_1(A) \leq \lambda_2(A) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{n-1}(A) \leq \lambda_n(A) = \lambda_{\max},
\]

and we now state a few results on matrix theory useful for subsequent results.
Theorem 1.3 (Min-max Theorem). [8] Let $A$ be a Hermitian matrix of order $n \times n$, and let the eigenvalues of $A$ be ordered as in Eqn. (1.1). Then

$$\lambda_{\max} = \lambda_n(A) = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^TAx}{x^Txx} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min} = \lambda_1(A) = \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^TAx}{x^Txx}.$$ 

Theorem 1.4 (Inclusion Principle). [8] Let $A$ be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix, let $r$ be an integer with $1 \leq r \leq n$, and let $A_r$ denote any $r \times r$ principal submatrix of $A$. For each integer $k$ such that $1 \leq k \leq r$, we have

$$\lambda_k(A) \leq \lambda_k(A_r) \leq \lambda_{k+n-r}(A).$$

Theorem 1.5. [8, Theorem 4.3.7, Page 184] Let $A$ and $B$ be Hermitian matrices of order $n \times n$ with eigenvalues ordered as in Eqn. (1.1). Then for every pair of integer $j,k$ such that $1 \leq j,k \leq n$ and $j+k \geq n+1$, we have

$$\lambda_{j+k-n}(A + B) \leq \lambda_j(A) + \lambda_k(B).$$

Let $T$ be a tree with positive weights on its edges. A branch at a vertex $v$ of $T$ is one of the connected components in the graph obtained from $T$ by deleting $v$ and all edges incident with $v$. Let $L_v$ be the principal submatrix of Laplacian matrix $L$ by deleting the row and column corresponding to the vertex $v$. It is easy to see that $L_v$ is a block diagonal invertible matrix. Hence $M_v = L_v^{-1}$ is a block diagonal matrix and each of its block corresponding to a branch at $v$, called the bottleneck matrix for that branch at $v$. To be precise, for a branch $B$ at $v$ consisting of $k$ vertices, the bottleneck matrix for $B$ based at $v$, denoted by $M_v(B)$, is an $k \times k$ matrix such that for $x,y \in B$, the entry at $(x,y)$ position of $M_v(B)$ is given by

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(x,y) \cap \mathcal{P}(y,v)} \frac{1}{W(e)}.$$ 

If $u$ and $v$ are distinct vertices of a weighted tree, we use $B_u(v)$ to denote the branch at vertex $u$ which contains vertex $v$ and for notational convenience, we will use $M_v(B_u(u)) = M_v(u)$. Note that, the bottleneck matrix for a branch $B$ at $v$ is a square entrywise positive matrix, and the Perron value of that bottleneck matrix $M_v(B)$ is $\rho(M_v(B))$, called the Perron value of $B$. Finally, a branch $B$ at $v$ is called a Perron branch if the Perron value of $B$ is the largest amongst all the branches at $v$ and hence $\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B))$.

The following result was proved in [9], which is a consequence of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, and we state the result using the above notations.

Proposition 1.6. [9] Let $T = (V,E)$ be a tree with positive weights on its edges. For any $u,v,w \in V$, if $B_u(w) \subsetneq B_v(w)$, then $\rho(M_u(w)) < \rho(M_v(w))$.

In [9], the authors characterized the characteristic vertex and characteristic edge for trees with positive edge weights in terms of Perron branches, bottleneck matrices, and as a consequence, they obtained a relation of Perron values with the algebraic connectivity. The results below summarize these characterizations and some of its consequences.

Proposition 1.7. [9] Let $T$ be a tree with positive weights on its edges. Then, the following statements are equivalent.

1. $T$ is Type II with the characteristic edge $e$ between the vertices $u$ and $v$.

2. There exists $0 < \gamma < 1$ such that $\rho(M_u(v) - \gamma(1/\theta)J) = \rho(M_v(u) - (1-\gamma)(1/\theta)J)$, where $\theta$ is the weight of the edge $e$ between the vertices $u$ and $v$. Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{\mu(T)} = \rho(M_u(v) - \gamma(1/\theta)J) = \rho(M_v(u) - (1-\gamma)(1/\theta)J),$$

where $\mu(T)$ is the algebraic connectivity of $T$. 

3
3. For adjacent vertices $u$ and $v$, let $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$, while $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T$.

**Proposition 1.8.** [9] Let $T$ be a tree with positive weights on its edges. Then, $T$ is Type I with the characteristic vertex $x$ if and only if there are two or more Perron branches of $T$ at $x$. Moreover, in that case, the algebraic connectivity of $T$ is $1/\rho(M_x)$.

**Proposition 1.9.** [9] Let $T$ be a tree with positive weights on its edges. If $x$ is not a characteristic vertex of $T$, then the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T$ is the branch which contains the characteristic vertex (or vertices) of $T$.

The above characterizations for trees provides a new direction to understand the structure of trees using the Laplacian matrix, and many interesting results are obtained by various researchers, for example see [10, 11, 14, 15]. In the last decade, some interesting results are obtained by considering graphs with matrix weights on its edges. For example, in [1], the authors defined the Laplacian matrix analogously for the graphs with matrix weights on its edges. As a special case if the weights are positive definite matrix, then the Laplacian matrix is a positive semidefinite matrix. They have also proved an interesting result: Let $G$ be a graph on $n$ vertices with nonsingular matrix weights of order $s \times s$ on its edges and $L$ be the Laplacian matrix of $G$. Then, the Laplacian matrix $L$ is of rank $(n - 1)s$ if the graph $G$ is a tree. But the result is not necessarily true if the graph $G$ is not a tree. These developments encourage us to study the Laplacian matrix of trees with matrix weights.

In this article, our objective is to consider trees with a suitable class of matrix edge weights, and establish the existence of some notion of the characteristic vertex (or vertices) using characterization in terms of Perron branches and Perron values analogous to trees with positive edge weights as presented in Propositions 1.7 - 1.9. We call such vertices as characteristic-like vertex (or vertices). Moreover, we also provide a lower bound for the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix. To be specific, we are interested in trees with the following classes of matrix weights on its edges:

1. positive definite matrix weights,
2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we consider the principal submatrix $L_v$ of the Laplacian matrix for trees with matrix weights on its edges. We compute the determinant of $L_v$ and show that $L_v$ is an invertible matrix if and only if the edge weights are nonsingular matrices. Then, we find the inverse of $L_v$ and define the bottleneck matrix for a branch of a tree with nonsingular matrix edge weights. Furthermore, using $L_v^{-1}$, we find the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix $L$. In Section 3, we consider trees with the above class of matrix weights on its edges and show the existence of vertices satisfying properties analogous to the properties of characteristic vertices of trees with positive edge weights in terms of Perron values and Perron branches. Finally, in Section 4, we obtain a lower bound for the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix of trees with above classes of matrix edge weights in terms of Perron values.

## 2 Laplacian Matrix and Bottleneck Matrix

In this section, we will consider the Laplacian matrix for trees with matrix weights on its edges and define the bottleneck matrix of a branch. Moreover, as an application, we compute the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix for trees with nonsingular matrix weights.

The Laplacian matrix for graphs with matrix weights on its edges is defined analogously, but for the sake of completeness we include its definition. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on $n$ vertices and for each edge $e \in E$ the associated matrix weight $W(e)$ is of order $s \times s$. The Laplacian matrix
\( L(G) = [l_{uv}] \) is a matrix of order \( ns \times ns \) and is defined as follows: For \( u, v \in V \), if \( u \neq v \), then \( l_{uv} \) is 0 if \( u \sim v \), and \( l_{uv} = -W(e) \) if \( u \sim v \) and \( e \) is the edge between them; finally if \( u = v \), \( l_{uv} \) is the sum of the weights of the edges in \( G \) which are incident with vertex \( v \). We also write \( L \) for the Laplacian matrix \( L(G) \) if there is no scope of confusion.

Before proceeding further we recall the definition of Kronecker product and some of its properties in the following remark.

**Remark 2.1.** The Kronecker product of matrices \( A = [a_{ij}] \) of order \( m \times n \) and \( B \) of order \( p \times q \), denoted by \( A \otimes B \), is defined to be the block matrix \([a_{ij}B]\). Then the following hold true.

1. Let \( A \) and \( B \) be two square matrices. Let \( \lambda \in \sigma(A) \) with corresponding eigenvector \( \mathbf{x} \), and let \( \mu \in \sigma(B) \) with corresponding eigenvector \( \mathbf{y} \). Then \( \lambda \mu \) is an eigenvalue of \( A \otimes B \) with corresponding eigenvector \( \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \). Moreover, any eigenvalue of \( A \otimes B \) is a product of eigenvalues of \( A \) and \( B \).

2. Let \( W \) be an \( s \times s \) invertible matrix and \( \mathbf{y}_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^s \); \( 1 \leq i \leq s \). Then, the vector \( \mathbf{\tilde{y}} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_n)^T \in \text{Null}(J_n \otimes W) \) if and only if \( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{0} \).

In [1], it was shown that if \( T \) is a tree on \( n \) vertices with nonsingular matrix weights of order \( s \times s \), then the rank of the Laplacian matrix \( L \) of \( T \) is \((n - 1)s\). Thus, it is natural to study the principal matrix \( L_v \) of \( L \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to a vertex \( v \in V \), and we begin with the determinant of \( L_v \) presented as a theorem below.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \( L \) be the Laplacian matrix of a tree \( T = (V, E) \) with matrix weights on its edges. Let \( L_v \) be the principal submatrix of \( L \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to the vertex \( v \in V \). Then

\[
\det L_v = \prod_{e \in E} \det W(e).
\]

**Proof.** We prove this result by using induction on the number of vertices \(|V| = n\). The result is vacuously true for \( n = 2 \). Assume that the result is true for trees with the number of vertices \( < n \).

Let \( v \in V \) and \( \text{deg}(v) = r \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq r \); let \( v \) be adjacent to vertex \( v_i \) via the edge \( e^{(i)} \). Thus, \( B_v(v_i) \); \( 1 \leq i \leq r \) represents all the branches at \( v \) and the block matrix \( L_v \) can be written as

\[
L_v = \left[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\tilde{L}(B_v(v_1)) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \tilde{L}(B_v(v_2)) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \tilde{L}(B_v(v_r))
\end{array} \right],
\]

(2.1)

where \( \tilde{L}(B_v(v_i)) \) is the principal submatrix of \( L \) corresponding to the branch \( B_v(v_i) \); \( 1 \leq i \leq r \).

Let \( L(B_v(v_i)) \) denote the Laplacian matrix of the branch \( B_v(v_i) \). Then

\[
\tilde{L}(B_v(v_i)) = L(B_v(v_i)) + \mathbf{e}_{v_i} \mathbf{e}_{v_i}^T \otimes W(e^{(i)}) \quad 1 \leq i \leq r,
\]

where \( \mathbf{e}_{v_i} \) is the column vector of conformal order with 1 at \( v_i^{th} \) entry and 0 otherwise.

For each \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), let \( L(B_v(v_i))_{v_i} \) denote the principal submatrix of \( L(B_v(v_i)) \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to vertex \( v_i \). Thus, using the induction hypothesis, we have

\[
\det L(B_v(v_i))_{v_i} = \prod_{e \in E(B_v(v_i))} \det W(e).
\]

(2.2)
Further, if we add all the column blocks of \( \tilde{L}(B_v(v_i)) \) to the column block corresponding to the vertex \( v_i \) and repeat the similar operation for row blocks, then the resulting matrix can be represented as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
L(B_v(v_i))_{v_i} & 0 \\
0 & W(e^{(i)})
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and using Eqn.\((2.2)\), we get

\[
\det \tilde{L}(B_v(v_i)) = \det W(e^{(i)}) \times \prod_{e \in E(B_v(v_i))} \det W(e).
\]

Hence the desired result follows from Eqn.\((2.1)\).

Under the hypothesis of the above theorem, if \( T \) is a tree with nonsingular matrix weights, then \( L_v \) is an invertible matrix. Our next objective is to find the inverse of \( L_v \), and we first consider the case where the edges are associated with positive definite matrix weights. Now we recall the definition of the incidence matrix of graphs with positive definite matrix weights.

Let \( G = (V, E) \) be a graph with \( n \) vertices and \( m \) edges such that the weights associated with each edge are positive definite matrices of order \( s \times s \). We assign an orientation to each edge of \( G \). Then, the vertex-edge incidence matrix \( Q \) is a block matrix such that the row blocks are indexed by the vertex set \( V \) and the column blocks are indexed by the edge set \( E \) and defined as follows: The vertex-edge incidence matrix \( Q = [q_{ue}] \) is a matrix of order \( ns \times ms \), where

\[
q_{ue} = \begin{cases} 
\sqrt{W(e)} & \text{if } u \text{ is the initial vertex of the edge } e, \\
-\sqrt{W(e)} & \text{if } u \text{ is the terminal vertex of the edge } e, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

\((2.3)\)

It can be seen that, given a graph \( G = (V, E) \) with positive definite weights on its edges, the Laplacian matrix \( L \) of \( G \) is given by \( L = QQ^T \). Then \( L_v = Q_vQ_v^T \), where \( Q_v \) is the block matrix obtained by deleting the row block of \( Q \) corresponding to the vertex \( v \in V \). Thus Theorem 2.2 yields that \( \det L_v = (\det Q_v)^2 \neq 0 \) which implies that \( Q_v \) is an invertible matrix and \( L_v^{-1} = (Q_v^{-1})^TQ_v^{-1} \).

Now we first compute the inverse of \( Q_v \), and the argument used to achieve this goal is analogous to the proof for trees with all the weights are equal to 1 (for details see [2]).

Given a path \( \mathcal{P} \) in \( G \), the incidence block vector of \( \mathcal{P} \) is an \( ms \times s \) matrix (a column block indexed by the edge set \( E \)) defined as follows: For any \( e \in E \), the entry corresponding to \( e \) is the matrix \( 0 \), if the path does not contain \( e \). If the path contains \( e \), then the entry corresponding to \( e \) is \( (\sqrt{W(e)})^{-1} \) or \( -((\sqrt{W(e)})^{-1}) \), depending on whether the direction of the path agrees or disagrees, respectively with \( e \).

Let \( T = (V, E) \) be a tree. For \( v \in V \), the path matrix \( P_v \) of \( T \) is an \( ms \times (n - 1)s \) matrix \( (P_v) \) is a block matrix such that rows are indexed by the edge set \( E \) and column blocks indexed by the vertex set \( V \) \( \setminus \{v\} \) defined as follows. For \( u \in V \setminus \{v\} \), the column block corresponding to vertex \( u \) of \( P_v \) is the incidence vector of the path from \( u \) to \( v \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( T = (V, E) \) be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. Let \( Q \) be the incidence matrix of \( T \) and let \( Q_v \) the block matrix obtained by deleting the row block of \( Q \) corresponding to the vertex \( v \in V \). Then \( Q_v^{-1} = P_v \).

**Proof.** Let \( G = (V, E) \) be a graph with \( n \) vertices and \( m \) edges. Let \( X = P_vQ_v \) be an \( ms \times ms \) matrix. For \( i \neq j \), let \( e_i \) be the edge from \( x \) to \( y \) and let \( e_j \) be the edge from \( w \) to \( z \). The \((u, e_j)\)-entry of the incidence matrix \( Q \) is \( Q_{ue_j} = 0 \) unless \( u = w \) or \( u = z \). Thus,

\[
X_{e_i,e_j} = \sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v\}} P_{e_i,u}Q_{ue_j} = P_{e_i,w}Q_{we_j} + P_{e_i,z}Q_{ze_j} = (P_{e_i,w} - P_{e_i,z})\sqrt{W(e_j)}.\]
Note that, the path from \( w \) to \( v \) contains \( e_i \) if and only if the path from \( z \) to \( v \) contains \( e_i \). Moreover, if \( P_{e_iw} \) and \( P_{e_iz} \) are non-zero, then they share same sign. Thus, \( X_{e_ie_j} = 0 \) whenever \( i \neq j \).

For \( i = j \), the path from \( x \) to \( v \) contains \( e_i \) if and only if the path from \( y \) to \( v \) does not contain \( e_i \). Thus, if \( e_i \) is in the path from \( x \) to \( v \), then \( X_{e_ie_i} = P_{e_iy}Q_{ye_i} = (\sqrt{W(e_j)})^{-1} \sqrt{W(e_j)} = I \). Similarly, if \( e_i \) is in the path from \( y \) to \( v \), then \( X_{e_ie_i} = P_{e_yn}Q_{yn} = (-(\sqrt{W(e_j)})^{-1})(-\sqrt{W(e_j)}) = I \). This completes the proof.

**Corollary 2.4.** Let \( T = (V, E) \) be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges and \( L \) be the Laplacian matrix of \( T \). Let \( L_v \) denote the principal submatrix of \( L \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to the vertex \( v \in V \). Then for \( u, w \in V - \{v\} \), the block at \((u, w)\) position of \( L_v^{-1} \) is given by

\[
(L_v^{-1})_{uw} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v)} W(e)^{-1},
\]

where \( \mathcal{P}(x, y) \) denotes the path joining vertices \( x \) and \( y \) in \( T \).

**Proof.** Using \( L_v = Q_vQ_v^T \) and by Theorem 2.3, we have \( L_v^{-1} = P_v^TP_v \). Thus

\[
(L_v^{-1})_{uw} = \sum_{e \in E} P_{eu}P_{ew}.
\]

Further, \( P_{eu}P_{ew} \) is non-zero if and only if edge \( e \) is in the paths \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \) and \( \mathcal{P}(w, v) \). In that case, the orientation of \( e \) agrees or disagrees simultaneously, for both paths. Thus, \( P_{eu}P_{ew} = W(e)^{-1} \), if \( e \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v) \) and \( 0 \) otherwise. Hence the result follows.

By Corollary 2.4, the matrix form of \( L_v^{-1} \) for trees with positive definite matrix weights on its edges is analogous to the case where trees have positive edge weights (for details see [9, Proposition 1]). Now we will show that the above matrix form is unchanged even if the weights assigned to the edges are nonsingular.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let \( L \) be the Laplacian matrix of a tree \( T = (V, E) \) with nonsingular matrix weights on its edges. Let \( L_v \) denote the principal submatrix of \( L \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to the vertex \( v \in V \). Then for \( u, w \in V - \{v\} \), the block at \((u, w)\) position of \( L_v^{-1} \) is given by

\[
(L_v^{-1})_{uw} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v)} W(e)^{-1},
\]

where \( \mathcal{P}(x, y) \) denotes the path joining vertices \( x \) and \( y \) in \( T \).

**Proof.** For \( u, w \in V - \{v\} \), let \( B = [B_{uw}] \) be an \((n - 1)s \times (n - 1)s\) block matrix, where

\[
B_{uw} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v)} W(e)^{-1}.
\]

Let \( L = [l_{xy}]_{x,y \in V} \) and \( X = L_v^{-1}B = [X_{uw}] \). Then, for \( u, w \in V - \{v\} \), we have

\[
X_{uw} = l_{uw}B_{uw} + \sum_{x \neq w} l_{ux}B_{xz}.
\]

(2.4)

For a given \( u \in V - \{v\} \), let \( deg(u) = r \). For \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), let \( u \) be adjacent to \( v_i \) via edges \( e^{(i)} \). We will consider the cases \( u = w \) and \( u \neq w \) separately as follows:
Case 1: For \( u = w \).

If \( u = w \) and \( u \sim v \), then the path \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \) contains exactly one vertex adjacent to \( u \). Without loss of generality, let \( v_r \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \). Then \( B_{v_ru} = B_{uu} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(u, v)} W(e)^{-1} ; 1 \leq i \leq r - 1 \), and \( B_{vr} = B_{uu} - W(e)^{-1} \). Using Eqn. (2.4), we have \( X_{uu} = l_{uu}B_{uu} + l_{uv}B_{vu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} l_{uv_i}B_{uvi} = (l_{uu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} l_{uv_i}) B_{uu} + l_{uv} (W(e)^{-1})^{-1} \). Since the row block sum of \( L \) is zero, i.e., \( l_{uu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} l_{uv_i} = 0 \) and \( l_{uv} = -W(e)^{-1} \), so \( X_{uu} = I \).

If \( u = w \) and \( u \sim v \), then \( v = v_r \) and \( B_{v_r} = B_{uu} = W(e)^{-1} ; 1 \leq i \leq r - 1 \). Using Eqn. (2.4), we have \( X_{uu} = l_{uu}B_{uu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} l_{uv_i}B_{uvi} = (l_{uu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} l_{uv_i}) W(e)^{-1} = (-l_{uv}) (W(e)^{-1})^{-1} = W(e)^{-1} W(e)^{-1} = I \).

Case 2: For \( u \neq w \). We consider the following sub cases to complete the proof.

Subcase 2.1: For \( u \neq w \) and \( u \sim v \). If \( u \in \mathcal{P}(w, v) \), then both paths \( \mathcal{P}(w, u) \) and \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \) contain exactly one vertex each, which are adjacent to \( u \). Without loss of generality, let \( v_1 \in \mathcal{P}(w, u) \) and \( v_r \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \). Then \( B_{v_1w} = B_{uu} + W(e(1))^{-1} \), \( B_{vr} = B_{uu} - W(e(r))^{-1} \) and \( B_{v_r} = B_{wu} ; 2 \leq i \leq r - 1 \). By Eqn. (2.4), we have \( X_{uu} = (l_{uu} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} l_{uv_i}) B_{uu} + l_{uw} (W(e)^{-1})^{-1} + l_{uv} (W(e(1)^{-1})^{-1} + (W(e(1)^{-1})^{-1} + (W(e(r)^{-1})^{-1} = I + I = 0 \).

If \( u \notin \mathcal{P}(w, v) \), then either \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v) = \emptyset \) or \( w \in \mathcal{P}(u, v) \). Note that, if \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v) = \emptyset \) and \( u \notin \mathcal{P}(w, v) \), we have \( B_{v_r} = B_{wu} = 0 ; 1 \leq i \leq r \), then \( X_{uw} = 0 \). \( u \notin \mathcal{P}(w, v) \), then \( \mathcal{P}(u, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(w, v) = \emptyset \), which implies that \( B_{v_r} = B_{wu} = 0 \); \( 1 \leq i \leq r - 1 \) and hence the result follows.

In view of Theorems 2.2 and 2.5, for trees with nonsingular matrix edge weights we define the bottleneck matrix of a branch as follows. Let \( L \) be the Laplacian matrix of a tree \( T = (V, E) \) with nonsingular matrix weights of order \( s \times s \) on its edges and \( L_v \) be the principal submatrix of \( L \) obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to a vertex \( v \in V \). Let \( \deg(v) = r \) and for \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), let \( B_i \) denote the branches of \( T \) at \( v \). By Theorem 2.2, \( L_v \) is an invertible matrix and let us denote \( M_v = L_v^{-1} \). Then

\[
L_v = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{L}(B_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \hat{L}(B_2) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \hat{L}(B_r)
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad
M_v = L_v^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
M_v(B_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & M_v(B_2) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & M_v(B_r)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( M_v(B_i) = \hat{L}(B_i)^{-1} \) is called the bottleneck matrix of branch \( B_i \) of \( T \) at \( v ; 1 \leq i \leq r \). Thus, by Theorem 2.5, for a branch \( B \) at \( v \) consisting of \( k \) vertices, the bottleneck matrix \( M_v(B) \) for \( B \) based at \( v \) is a \( ks \times ks \) matrix such that \( (M_v(B) \text{ as a block matrix}) \) for \( x, y \in B \), the block at \( (x, y) \) position of \( M_v(B) \) is given by

\[
\sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}(x, v) \cap \mathcal{P}(y, v)} \frac{1}{W(e)}.
\]

Similar to the case of trees with positive edge weights, for notational convenience we write \( M_v(B_v(u)) = M_v(u) \), whenever \( B_v(u) \) is the branch at \( v \) in \( T \) containing vertex \( u \).
In this manuscript, our aim is to consider a few classes of matrix weights on the edges of $T$ such that eigenvalues of $L_v$ are positive. Therefore, for each $1 \leq i \leq r$, all the eigenvalues of bottleneck matrices $M_v(B_i)$ are positive and the spectral radius of $M_v(B_i)$ is necessarily an eigenvalue. In this case, the spectral radius of $M_v(B_i)$ need not be a simple eigenvalue, but continuing with the terminology similar to the case of trees with positive weights on edges, we call the spectral radius $\rho(M_v(B_i))$ as the Perron value of the bottleneck matrix $M_v(B_i)$; $1 \leq i \leq r$. Thus, the spectrum of $M_v = L_v^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(M_v(B_i))$ and the spectral radius of $M_v$ is given by

$$\rho(M_v) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \rho(M_v(B_i)).$$  (2.5)

We also define the Perron value of a branch at $v$ in $T$ as the Perron value of the corresponding bottleneck matrix (or matrices) for which the maximum is attained and we call such a branch at $v$ as a Perron branch if the Perron value of that branch is the same as the spectral radius of $L_v^{-1}$.

Finally, we conclude this section with a few results that allows us to compute the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix for trees with nonsingular matrix edge weights. We obtained this result as an application of Theorem 2.5.

If $A$ is an $m \times n$ matrix, then an $n \times m$ matrix $\Gamma$ is called a generalized inverse of $A$ if $A\Gamma A = A$. The Moore-Penrose inverse of $A$, denoted by $A^+$, is an $n \times m$ matrix satisfying the following equations:

$$AA^+A = A, \quad A^+AA^+ = A^+, \quad (AA^+)^T = AA^+, \quad (A^+A)^T = A^+A.$$  

It is well known that any complex matrix admits a unique Moore-Penrose inverse and we refer to [3, 5] for basic properties of the Moore-Penrose inverse. One such property is the null space of $A^+$ is same as that of $A^T$ for any matrix $A$, and we present this result as a lemma without proof.

**Lemma 2.6.** If $A$ is an $m \times n$ matrix, then for an $n \times 1$ vector $x$, $Ax = 0$ if and only if $x^TA^+ = 0$.

Next, we prove a lemma useful to compute the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let $L$ be the Laplacian matrix of a tree $T = (V,E)$ on $n$ vertices with nonsingular matrix weights of order $s \times s$ on its edges. Then $I_{ns} - LL^+ = J_n \otimes \frac{1}{n} I_s$.

**Proof.** Let $I_{ns} - LL^+ = [X_{ij}]$, where each $X_{ij}$ is a matrix of order $s \times s$. Since $(I - LL^+)L = 0$, each row of $I - LL^+$ belongs to the left null space of $L$. Recall that, the row and column block sum of $L$ is zero and also the null space is of dimension $s$. Thus, the rows of $1_n^T \otimes I_s$ generate the left null space, which implies that, any row of $I_{ns} - LL^+$ is of the form $1_n^T \otimes x$, for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $I_{ns} - LL^+ = [X_{ij}]$ is symmetric, so by the above argument we get $X_{ij} = X; 1 \leq i,j \leq n$ and hence $I_{ns} - LL^+ = J_n \otimes X$.

Note that, $\text{Null}(L^+) \subseteq \text{Range}(I_{ns} - LL^+)$, which implies that $\text{rank}(I_{ns} - LL^+) \geq \text{nullity}(L^+) = \text{nullity}(L) = s$. Since $J_n$ is a rank one matrix, $\text{rank}(I_{ns} - LL^+) = \text{rank}(J_n \otimes X) = \text{rank}(X) \leq s$. Thus, $\text{rank}(I_{ns} - LL^+) = \text{rank}(J_n \otimes X) = \text{rank}(X) = s$, and hence $X$ is a nonsingular matrix. Since $I_{ns} - LL^+$ is idempotent,

$$I_{ns} - LL^+ = J_n \otimes X = (J_n \otimes X)^2 = J_n^2 \otimes X^2 = nJ_n \otimes X^2;$$

which implies that $X = nX^2$. Since $X$ is a nonsingular matrix, $X = \frac{1}{n} I_s$. This completes the proof. □

**Lemma 2.8.** If $M = I_{(n-1)s} - J_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n} I_s$, then $M^{-1} = I_{(n-1)s} + DDT^T$, where $D = 1_{n-1} \otimes I_s$. 
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Proof. Note that,
\[
(I_{(n-1)s} + DD^T)M = (I_{(n-1)s} + (\mathds{1}_{n-1} \otimes I_s)(\mathds{1}_{n-1}^T \otimes I_s)) (I_{(n-1)s} - J_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s)
\]
\[
= (I_{(n-1)s} + J_{n-1} \otimes I_s)(I_{(n-1)s} - J_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s)
\]
\[
= I_{(n-1)s} + J_{n-1} \otimes I_s - J_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s - J^2_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s = I_{(n-1)s}.
\]
This completes the proof. \(\Box\)

Now we compute the Moore-Penrose inverse \(L^+\) of the Laplacian matrix \(L\) for trees with nonsingular matrix weights.

**Theorem 2.9.** Let \(T = (V, E)\) be a tree on \(n\) vertices such that the weights associated with each edge are nonsingular matrix of order \(s \times s\) and \(L\) be the Laplacian matrix of a tree \(T\). Let \(L_v\) be the principal submatrix of \(L\) and \((L^+)_v\) be the principal submatrix of \(L^+\), obtained by deleting the row and column corresponding to vertex \(v \in V\). Then \((L^+)_v = ML_v^{-1}M\), where \(M = I_{(n-1)s} - J_{n-1} \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s\). Moreover, if \(V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}\) is the ordering of vertices in the Laplacian matrix \(L\) and \(v = v_n\), then
\[
L^+ = \begin{bmatrix} X & Y \end{bmatrix},
\]
where \(X = [(L^+)_v, (L^+)_v(I_{n-1} \otimes I_s)]\) and \(Y = (I_{n-1}^T \otimes I_s)X\).

**Proof.** Let \(V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}\) be the ordering of vertices in the Laplacian matrix \(L\) and without loss generality, let \(v = v_n\). Let us partition the Laplacian matrix as \(L = [\begin{bmatrix} U & V \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \mathds{V} \end{bmatrix}]\), where \(\mathds{V}\) represents the column block corresponding to vertex \(v_n\). Also partition the Moore-Penrose inverse \(L^+\) as \(L^+ = \begin{bmatrix} X & Y \end{bmatrix}\), where \(Y\) represents the row block corresponding to vertex \(v_n\). Since column block sum of \(L\) is zero, \(V = DU\), where \(D = \mathds{1}_{n-1} \otimes I_s\). Thus \(Y = D^TX\). Using Lemma 2.7, we have
\[
I_{ns} - J_n \otimes \frac{1}{n}I_s = LL^+ = UX + VY = U(I_{(n-1)s} + DD^T)X.
\]
Thus, \(M = U_n(I_{(n-1)s} + DD^T)X^n\), where \(U_n\) is the matrix formed by deleting the row block corresponding to vertex \(v_n\) and \(X^n\) is the matrix formed by deleting the column block corresponding to vertex \(v_n\). Since \(U_n = L_{v_n}\) and \(X^n = (L^+)_v\), so by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.8, we have
\[
(L^+)_v = X^n = (I_{(n-1)s} + DD^T)^{-1}U_n^{-1}M = ML_{v_n}^{-1}M.
\]
In view of Lemma 2.6, the column block corresponding to vertex \(v_n\) of \(X\) is \((L^+)_v D\) and \(Y = D^TX\). This completes the proof. \(\Box\)

## 3 Characteristic-like Vertices and Perron Values

In this section, we are interested in trees with the following classes of matrix weights on its edges:

1. positive definite matrix weights,
2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries,

and using Perron branches, we will show the existence of vertices with properties analogous to characteristic vertices of trees with positive edge weights as stated in Propositions 1.7 - 1.9. We call such vertices as characteristic-like vertices. To be precise, our objective of this section is to prove the following results.
Result 3.1. Let $T$ be a tree with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges: 1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. Then one of the following cases occurs:

1. There is a unique vertex $v$ such that there are two or more Perron branches at $v$ in $T$.

2. There is a unique pair of vertices $u$ and $v$ with $u \sim v$ such that the Perron branch at $u$ in $T$ is the branch containing $v$, while the Perron branch at $v$ in $T$ is the branch containing $u$.

It is easy to see that if Result 3.1 is true, then it allows us to define a notion analogous to characteristic vertex and the characteristic edge for trees with above classes of matrix edge weights using Perron branches. Now we formally define the characteristic-like vertex and the characteristic-like edge on trees with the above mentioned classes of matrix weights on its edges.

Definition 3.2. Let $T$ be a tree with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges: 1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. Then one of the following cases occurs:

1. There is a unique vertex $v$ such that there are two or more Perron branches at $v$ in $T$. In this case, the vertex $v$ is called the characteristic-like vertex of $T$.

2. There is a unique pair of vertices $u$ and $v$ with $u \sim v$ such that the Perron branch at $u$ in $T$ is the branch containing $v$, while the Perron branch at $v$ in $T$ is the branch containing $u$. In this case, we call the edge between vertices $u$ and $v$ as the characteristic-like edge of $T$.

It is easy to see that the notion of characteristic-like vertex and characteristic-like edge coincides with the notion of characteristic vertex and characteristic edge for trees with positive weights. Let $T$ be a tree with either of the above mentioned matrix weights on its edges and let $C_T$ denote the set of characteristic-like vertices of $T$. Then, $|C_T| = 1$ or $2$, depending on whether $T$ contains a characteristic-like vertex or characteristic-like edge, respectively. Now we state the second desired result.

Result 3.3. Let $T$ be a tree with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges: 1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. If $x$ is not a characteristic-like vertex of $T$, then the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T$ is the branch which contains the characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T$.

3.1 Results for Positive Definite Matrix Weights

In this section, we consider trees with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. Let $L$ be the Laplacian matrix of a tree $T$ with positive definite matrix weights on its edges and $L_v$ be the principal submatrix of $L$ formed by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to vertex $v$. By the previous section we know that $L = QQ^T$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. In view of Theorems 1.4 and 2.2, $L_v$ is a positive definite matrix. Therefore, the definition of Perron value and Perron branch (as defined in Section 2) is well-defined for trees with positive definite matrix edge weights. Before proceeding further, we begin with a lemma useful for our subsequent results.

Lemma 3.4. Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. For any $u, v, w \in V$, if $B_u(w) \subset B_v(w)$, then $\rho(M_u(w)) \leq \rho(M_v(w))$.

Proof. For $u, v, w \in V$, since $B_u(w) \subset B_v(w)$, so by renaming the vertices the matrix $M_v(w)$ can be written as

$$M_v(w) = \begin{bmatrix} M_u(w) + J \otimes W & * \\ * & * \end{bmatrix},$$
where \( W = \sum_{e \in E(T)} W(e)^{-1} \) is a positive definite matrix. Using Theorem 1.4, we have \( \rho(M_v(w)) \geq \rho(M_{x}(w)+J \otimes W) \). Further, note that \( J \otimes W \) is a positive semidefinite matrix, so by min-max theorem we get \( \rho(M_{x}(w)+J \otimes W) \geq \rho(M_{x}(w)) \). This completes the proof. 

Next, we establish the existence of vertices with properties analogous to characteristic vertices in terms of Perron branches. We first show the existence of a characteristic-like edge for trees with positive definite matrix weights.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let \( T \) be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges, and at each vertex of \( T \), there is a unique Perron branch. Then, there is a unique pair of vertices \( u \) and \( v \) with \( u \) adjacent to \( v \) such that the Perron branch at \( u \) is the branch containing \( v \), while the Perron branch at \( v \) is the branch containing \( u \). Moreover, the unique Perron branch at any vertex \( x \) in \( T \) is the branch which contains at least one of the vertices \( u \) or \( v \).

**Proof.** Let \( u_1 \in V \). Let \( u_2 \sim u_1 \) and \( B_{u_1}(v_2) \) be the unique Perron branch at \( u_1 \) in \( T \). Proceeding similarly there is a walk \( u_1 \sim u_2 \sim \cdots \) such that \( B_{u_i}(u_{i+1}) \) is the unique Perron branch at \( u_i \) in \( T \); \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \). Since \( V \) is a finite set and \( T \) is acyclic, there exists \( i_0 \) such that \( u_{i_0+1} = u_{i_0-1} \). Let us denote \( u = u_{i_0-1} \) and \( v = u_{i_0} \). Therefore, the Perron branch at \( u \) is the branch \( B_v(u) \) and the Perron branch at \( v \) is the branch \( B_u(v) \).

We prove the uniqueness of the vertices \( u \) and \( v \) as follows. Let \( x, y \) be any two vertices in \( B_v(u) \) such that \( x \sim y \) and \( y \notin B_x(u) \). Thus \( B_x(y) \subseteq B_v(y) \) and \( B_v(u) \subseteq B_x(u) \). Using Lemma 3.4, we get

\[
\rho(M_x(y)) \leq \rho(M_v(y)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_v(u)) \leq \rho(M_x(u)).
\] (3.1)

Since the unique Perron branch at \( v \) in \( T \) is \( B_v(u) \), we have \( \rho(M_x(y)) < \rho(M_v(u)) \). Therefore, by Eqn. (3.1) we have \( \rho(M_x(y)) < \rho(M_v(u)) \), which implies that the unique Perron branch at \( x \) in \( T \) is the branch that contains at least one of the vertices \( u \) or \( v \). Similar assertion can be made whenever we consider \( x, y \in B_v(u) \). Hence the result follows. 

Before proving the existence of characteristic-like vertex for trees with positive definite matrix weights, we first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let \( T \) be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. If there exists a vertex \( v \in V \) such that there are two or more Perron branches of \( T \) at \( v \), then for any vertex \( x \) other than \( v \) the branch \( B_x(v) \) is a Perron branch at \( x \) in \( T \), i.e., \( \rho(M_x(z)) \leq \rho(M_x(v)) \), whenever \( z \sim x \).

**Proof.** Let \( x \in V \) and \( x \neq v \). Let \( x \in B_v(u_1) \), where \( u_1 \sim v \). Since there are two or more Perron branches of \( T \) at \( v \), there exists a vertex \( u_2 \) other than \( u_1 \) such that \( u_2 \sim v \) and \( B_{v}(u_2) \) is a Perron branch at \( v \) in \( T \), i.e., \( \rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u_2)) \). Thus \( B_x(u_2) = B_x(v) \) and \( B_v(u_2) \subset B_x(v) \). Next, for any \( z \sim x \) with \( z \notin B_x(v) \), we have \( B_x(z) \subset B_v(z) \). By Lemma 3.4, we get

\[
\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u_2)) \leq \rho(M_x(v)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_x(z)) \leq \rho(M_v(z)) \leq \rho(M_v(u_2)),
\]

which implies that \( \rho(M_x(z)) \leq \rho(M_x(v)) \) and this completes the proof.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let \( T \) be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. If there exists a vertex \( v \in V \) such that there are two or more Perron branches at \( v \), then \( v \) is a unique vertex with such a property. Moreover, if \( x \) is a vertex other than \( v \), then the unique Perron branch at \( x \) in \( T \) is the branch which contains vertex \( v \).

**Proof.** Let \( v \in V \) such that there are two or more Perron branches at \( v \). We consider the following two cases to complete the proof.
Case 1: Suppose there is a unique Perron branch at \( u \) in \( T \), whenever \( u \) adjacent to \( v \).

Let \( x \in V \) and \( x \neq v \). Suppose \( x \in B_v(u_1) \) for some \( u_1 \sim v \). Then \( B_{u_1}(v) \cup B_{u_1}(v) \). For any \( y \sim x \) with \( y \notin B_x(v) \) we have \( B_x(y) \subseteq B_{u_1}(y) \). By Lemma 3.4, we get

\[
\rho(M_{u_1}(v)) \leq \rho(M_x(v)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_x(y)) \leq \rho(M_{u_1}(y)).
\] (3.2)

Lemma 3.6 yields that \( B_{u_1}(v) \) is a Perron branch at \( u_1 \) in \( T \) and by our assumption for this case \( B_{u_1}(v) \) is the unique Perron branch at \( u_1 \) in \( T \). Thus \( \rho(M_{u_1}(y)) < \rho(M_{u_1}(v)) \) and hence by Eqn. (3.2) we have \( \rho(M_x(y)) < \rho(M_x(v)) \). Therefore \( B_x(v) \) is the unique Perron branch at \( x \) in \( T \) and the result follows.

Case 2: Suppose there exists a vertex \( u_1 \) adjacent to \( v \) such that there are two or more Perron branches of \( T \) at \( u_1 \).

By the hypothesis and our assumption of this case, there are two or more Perron branches of \( T \) at both the vertices \( v \) and \( u_1 \), so Lemma 3.6 yields that \( B_v(u_1) \) and \( B_{u_1}(v) \) are Perron branches of \( T \) at \( v \) and \( u_1 \), respectively. Thus

\[
\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u_1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_{u_1}) = \rho(M_{u_1}(v)).
\] (3.3)

Since there are two or more Perron branches at \( v \) in \( T \), there exists \( w \sim v \) (\( w \neq u_1 \)) such that \( B_v(w) \) is a Perron branch at \( v \) in \( T \). Similarly, there exists \( u_2 \sim u_1 \) (\( u_2 \neq v \)) such that \( B_{u_1}(u_2) \) is a Perron branch at \( u_1 \) in \( T \). Thus

\[
B_v(w) \subseteq B_v(u_1) = B_{u_1}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{u_1}(u_2) \subseteq B_v(u_2) = B_v(u_1),
\]

and hence by the Lemma 3.4 and Eqn. (3.3), we get

\[
\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(w)) \leq \rho(M_v(u_1)) \leq \rho(M_{u_1}) = \rho(M_{u_1}(u_2)) \leq \rho(M_v(u_1)) = \rho(M_v).
\]

Therefore,

\[
\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u_1)) = \rho(M_{u_1}(u_2)) = \rho(M_{u_1}).
\] (3.4)

Next, we consider all the branches of \( T \) at \( u_2 \) except for \( B_{u_2}(u_1) \) and choose a branch such that the bottleneck matrix is with maximum spectral radius among them as follows. Let \( u_3 \sim u_2 \) and \( B_{u_2}(u_3) \) be a branch such that \( M_{u_2}(u_3) \) is with maximum spectral radius among all branches of \( T \) at \( u_2 \) except for \( B_{u_2}(u_1) \) and repeat the process until we reach at a pendant vertex. Thus, there exists a path \( v = u_0 \sim u_1 \sim \cdots \sim u_r \) such that \( u_r \) is a pendant vertex, and \( B_{u_1}(u_{i+1}) \) is a branch such that \( M_{u_i}(u_{i+1}) \) is with maximum spectral radius among all branches of \( T \) at \( u_i \) except for the branch \( B_{u_i}(u_{i-1}) \); \( 1 \leq i \leq r-1 \).

For \( 1 \leq i \leq r-1 \), let \( \hat{M}_{u_i} \) denote the principal submatrix of \( M_{u_i} \) obtained by deleting the block \( M_{u_i}(u_{i-1}) \) from \( M_{u_i} \), i.e.,

\[
M_{u_i} = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{M}_{u_i} & 0 \\
0 & M_{u_i}(u_{i-1})
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and let \( e_i \) denote the edge between vertices \( u_{i-1} \) and \( u_i \). Then

\[
\begin{align*}
M_{u_{i-1}}(u_i) &= \hat{M}_{u_i} + J \otimes [W(e_i)^{-1}]; \quad 1 \leq i \leq r-1, \\
M_{u_{r-1}}(u_r) &= W(e_r)^{-1},
\end{align*}
\] (3.5)
where \( \widehat{M}_{ui} = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{M}_{ui} & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{s \times s} \end{bmatrix} \) if the matrix weights on edges are of order \( s \times s \).

By our construction \( \widehat{M}_{ui} \) is a block diagonal matrix and \( M_{ui}(u_{i+1}) \) is of maximum spectral radius among all blocks of \( M_{ui} \) and hence

\[
\rho(\widehat{M}_{ui}) = \rho(M_{ui}) = \rho(M_{ui}(u_{i+1})); \quad 1 \leq i \leq r - 1.
\]

Thus, if \( x_{i+1} \) is an eigenvector of \( M_{ui}(u_{i+1}) \) corresponding to \( \rho(M_{ui}(u_{i+1})) \), then the vector \( \hat{x}_{i+1} = (x_{i+1}, 0, \ldots, 0) \) of conformal order, is an eigenvector of \( \widehat{M}_{ui} \) corresponding to \( \rho(\widehat{M}_{ui}) \).

For \( i = r - 1 \), \( \rho(\widehat{M}_{ur-1}) = \rho(M_{ur-1}(u_r)) = \rho(W(e_r)^{-1}) \). Let \( x_r \) be an eigenvector of \( W(e_r)^{-1} \) corresponding to \( \rho(W(e_r)^{-1}) \). Using \( x_r^T W(e_r)^{-1} x_r > 0 \), Eqns. (3.5) and (3.6), we have

\[
\hat{x}_r^T M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1}) \hat{x}_r = \hat{x}_r^T \widehat{M}_{ur-1} \hat{x}_r + \hat{x}_r^T (J \otimes [W(e_r)^{-1}]) \hat{x}_r \\
= x_r^T W(e_r)^{-1} x_r + x_r^T W(e_r)^{-1} x_r > \rho(W(e_r)^{-1}) \\
= \rho(M_{ur-1}(u_r)),
\]

which implies that \( \rho(M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1})) > \rho(M_{ur-1}(u_r)) \).

Further, suppose \( x_{r-1} \in \text{Null}(J \otimes [W(e_r)^{-1}]) \). Then by Eqn. (3.5), we have

\[
x_{r-1}^T M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1}) x_{r-1} = x_{r-1}^T \widehat{M}_{ur-1} x_{r-1} + x_{r-1}^T (J \otimes [W(e_r)^{-1}]) x_{r-1} \\
= x_{r-1}^T \widehat{M}_{ur-1} x_{r-1},
\]

and min-max theorem yields that \( \rho(M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1})) \leq \rho(M_{ur-1}(u_r)) \), which is a contradiction. Thus, \( x_{r-1} \notin \text{Null}(J \otimes [W(e_r)^{-1}]) \) and hence Remark 2.1 yields that \( \hat{x}_{r-1} \notin \text{Null}(J \otimes [W(e_r^{-2})^{-1}]) \), where \( \hat{x}_{r-1} = (x_{r-1}, 0, \ldots, 0) \) is an eigenvector of \( \widehat{M}_{ur-2} \) corresponding to \( \rho(\widehat{M}_{ur-2}) = \rho(M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1})) \). Then, using \( \hat{x}_{r-1}^T (J \otimes [W(e_r^{-2})^{-1}]) \hat{x}_{r-1} > 0 \), Eqns. (3.5) and (3.6), we have

\[
\hat{x}_{r-1}^T M_{ur-3}(u_{r-2}) \hat{x}_{r-1} = \hat{x}_{r-1}^T \widehat{M}_{ur-2} \hat{x}_{r-1} + \hat{x}_{r-1}^T (J \otimes [W(e_r^{-2})^{-1}]) \hat{x}_{r-1} \\
> \rho(M_{ur-1}(u_{r-1})),
\]

which implies that \( \rho(M_{ur-3}(u_{r-2})) > \rho(M_{ur-2}(u_{r-1})) \). Proceeding inductively we have

\[
\rho(M_{ui-1}(u_i)) > \rho(M_{ui}(u_{i+1})); \quad 1 \leq i \leq r - 1,
\]

which is a contradiction to Eqn. (3.4) as \( v = u_0 \).

Therefore, the assumption of Case 2 is not valid, which implies that for any adjacent vertex \( u \) of \( v \), there is a unique Perron branch at \( u \) in \( T \). Hence combining the conclusions of Case 1 and Lemma 3.6, the desired result follows.

In view of Lemma 3.4 and the results in Theorems 3.5 and 3.7, it is easy to see that Results 3.1 and 3.3 are true, if the edges of tree \( T \) are associated with positive definite matrix weights.
3.2 Results for Lower (or Upper) Triangular Matrix Weights

In this section, we consider trees where weights on the edges are lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. Since the arguments in the proofs for lower triangular matrix weights and upper triangular matrix weights are analogous, we only provide results for lower triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. We begin with the following observations.

**Observation 3.8.** 1. For $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, let $X_{ij}$ be matrices of order $s \times s$ and $X = [X_{ij}]$ be a block matrix of order $ms \times ms$. Further, for $1 \leq l, k \leq s$, let $\tilde{X}_{lk}$ be matrices of order $m \times m$ such that $(\tilde{X}_{lk})_{ij} = (X_{ij})_{lk}$, i.e., the $(i, j)^{th}$ entry of $\tilde{X}_{lk}$ is the $(l, k)^{th}$ entry of $X_{ij}$. Then, it can be seen that $X$ and $\tilde{X}$ are permutation equivalent, i.e., $X \simeq \tilde{X}$. Hence $\sigma(X) = \sigma(\tilde{X})$. In particular, if $X_{ij}$’s are lower triangular matrices, then $\tilde{X}$ is a lower triangular block matrix, i.e.,

$$
\tilde{X} = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{X}_{11} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\tilde{X}_{21} & \tilde{X}_{22} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\tilde{X}_{s1} & \tilde{X}_{s2} & \cdots & \tilde{X}_{ss}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Hence $\sigma(X) = \sigma(\tilde{X}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \sigma(\tilde{X}_{ii})$. It is easy to see a similar assertion can be made whenever $X_{ij}$’s are upper triangular matrices.

2. If $W = [W_{ij}]$ is an invertible lower (or upper) triangular matrix, then $W^{-1}$ is a lower (or upper) triangular matrix and the diagonal entries of $W^{-1}$ are given by $(W^{-1})_{ii} = \frac{1}{W_{ii}}$.

**Observation 3.9.** Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree such that the weights on edges of $T$ are $s \times s$ lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. Let $W(e) = [W_{ij}]$ denote the $(s \times s)$ lower triangular matrix weight on the edge $e \in E$ such that $W_{jj}(e) > 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s$. Then, the ordered pair $(T, \{W(e)\}_{e \in E})$ represents the tree $T = (V, E)$ with the matrix weights $\{W(e)\}_{e \in E}$ on its edges, simply written as $T$ if there is no scope of confusion. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $(T, \{W_{jj}(e)\}_{e \in E})$ represent the tree $T = (V, E)$ with positive weights $\{W_{jj}(e)\}_{e \in E}$, we denote it as $T^{(j)}$.

For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $L(T)$ and $L(T^{(j)})$ denote the Laplacian matrix of $T$ and $T^{(j)}$, respectively. Then, by Observation 3.8 for the Laplacian matrix $L(T)$ of $T$, we have

$$
L(T) \simeq \tilde{L}(T) = \begin{bmatrix}
L(T^{(1)}) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & L(T^{(2)}) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & * & \cdots & L(T^{(s)})
\end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(L(T)) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s} \sigma(L(T^{(j)})). \quad (3.7)
$$

and hence the eigenvalues of $L(T)$ are nonnegative.

Next, let $v \in V$ with $\deg(v) = r$ and let $B_i$ denote the branches at $v$; $1 \leq i \leq r$. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $M_v(B_i)$ and $M_v^{(j)}(B_i)$ denote the bottleneck matrix of the branch $B_i$ at $v$ in $T$ and $T^{(j)}$, respectively. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, using Observation 3.8 for the bottleneck matrix $M_v(B_i)$ of the branch $B_i$ at $v$ in $T$, we have

$$
M_v(B_i) \simeq \tilde{M}_v(B_i) = \begin{bmatrix}
M_v^{(1)}(B_i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & M_v^{(2)}(B_i) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & * & \cdots & M_v^{(s)}(B_i)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.8)
$$

and hence the eigenvalues of $M_v(B_i)$ are nonnegative.
\[
\sigma(M_v(B_i)) = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \sigma(M_v^{(j)}(B_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_v(B_i)) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} \rho(M_v^{(j)}(B_i)). \tag{3.9}
\]

Observe that, for \(1 \leq i \leq r \) and \(1 \leq j \leq s \), the eigenvalues of \(M_v^{(j)}(B_i)\) are positive and hence \(\rho(M_v^{(j)}(B_i))\) is necessarily eigenvalue of \(M_v^{(j)}(B_i)\). Therefore, by Eqn. (3.9), the definition of Perron value and Perron branch (as defined in Section 2) is well-defined for trees where weights on the edges are lower triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. Further, using Eqn. (2.5), the spectral radius of \(M_v\) is given by

\[
\rho(M_v) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \rho(M_v^{(i)}(B_i)) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} \rho(M_v^{(j)}).
\tag{3.10}
\]

Thus, if \(B\) is a (unique) Perron branch at \(v\) in \(T^{(j)}\) for all \(1 \leq j \leq s\), then \(B\) is a (unique) Perron branch at \(v\) in \(T\), and hence

\[
\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B)) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} \rho(M_v^{(j)}(B)).
\]

We first prove the results for trees where the edge weights are of order \(2 \times 2\). Let \(T\) be a tree such that the weights on edges of \(T\) are \(2 \times 2\) lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. By Observation 3.9, we find trees \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\) obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of \(T\). Let \(C_T^{(1)}\) and \(C_T^{(2)}\) denote the set of characteristic vertices of \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\), respectively. The strategy adopted to achieve our goal is as follows: We consider all possible cases for \(C_T^{(1)}\) and \(C_T^{(2)}\), and for each of these cases we will use Propositions 1.7 - 1.9 for trees \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\) to show Results 3.1 and 3.3 hold true. We begin by considering \(C_T^{(1)} \cap C_T^{(2)} \neq \emptyset\) and \(C_T^{(1)} \cap C_T^{(2)} = \emptyset\) as separate cases.

**Lemma 3.10.** Let \(T = (V, E)\) be a tree such that the weights on the edges of \(T\) are \(2 \times 2\) lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. Let \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\) be the trees obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of \(T\) as discussed in Observation 3.9 such that \(C_T^{(1)} \cap C_T^{(2)} \neq \emptyset\). Then Results 3.1 and 3.3 hold true.

**Proof.** We consider different choices of \(C_T^{(1)}\) and \(C_T^{(2)}\) with \(C_T^{(1)} \cap C_T^{(2)} \neq \emptyset\), and prove that the result is true for each of these cases.

**Case 1:** Let \(C_T^{(1)} = C_T^{(2)} = \{v\}\), i.e., the vertex \(v\) is the characteristic vertex of \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\). Then, there exist branches \(B_{i_1}\) and \(B_{i_2}\) at \(v\) such that \(\rho(M_v^{(1)}(B_{i_1})) = \rho(M_v^{(1)}(B_{i_2})) = \rho(M_v(B_{i_1}))\). Similarly, there exist branches \(B_{j_1}\) and \(B_{j_2}\) at \(v\) such that \(\rho(M_v^{(2)}(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M_v^{(2)}(B_{j_2})) = \rho(M_v(B_{j_1}))\). If \(\rho(M_v^{(1)}) \geq \rho(M_v^{(2)})\), then by Eqn. (3.9) the branches \(B_{i_1}\) and \(B_{i_2}\) are Perron branches at \(v\) for \(T\) and \(\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B_{i_1})) = \rho(M_v(B_{i_2}))\). Similarly, if \(\rho(M_v^{(1)}) \leq \rho(M_v^{(2)})\), then \(B_{j_1}\) and \(B_{j_2}\) are Perron branches at \(v\) for \(T\) and \(\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M_v(B_{j_2}))\). Further, if \(x \neq v\), then \(B_x(v)\) is the unique Perron branch at \(x\) in \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\). Thus, \(B_x(v)\) is the unique Perron branch at \(x\) in \(T\), whenever \(x \neq v\).

**Case 2:** Let \(C_T^{(1)} = C_T^{(2)} = \{u, v\}\), i.e., the edge between the vertices \(u\) and \(v\) is the characteristic edge of \(T^{(1)}\) and \(T^{(2)}\). Then, \(B_u(v)\) is the unique Perron branch at \(u\) in \(T^{(j)}\) and \(B_v(u)\) is the unique Perron branch at \(v\) in \(T^{(j)}\); \(j = 1, 2\). Thus

\[
\rho(M_u) = \rho(M_u(v)) = \max_{j=1,2} \rho(M_u^{(j)}(v)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u)) = \max_{j=1,2} \rho(M_v^{(j)}(u)).
\]
Hence, $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T$, while $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T$.

Next, let $x \in V$ other than $u$ and $v$, and let $B$ be the branch at $x$ containing $u$ and $v$. Then, $B$ is the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T^{(j)}; j = 1, 2$. Hence $B$ is the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T$.

**Case 3:** Let $C_{T(1)} = \{u, v\}$ and $C_{T(2)} = \{v\}$, i.e., the edge between the vertices $u$ and $v$ is the characteristic edge of $T^{(1)}$ and $v$ is the characteristic vertex of $T^{(2)}$. Thus, $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T^{(j)}; j = 1, 2$ and hence

$$\rho(M_u) = \rho(M_u(v)) = \max_{j=1,2} \rho(M_u^{(j)}(v)),$$

and $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T$. Furthermore, $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T^{(1)}$, i.e., $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_v^{(1)}(u))$ and there exist branches $B_{j_1}$ and $B_{j_2}$ at $v$ such that $\rho(M_v^{(2)}) = \rho(M_v^{(2)}(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M_v^{(2)}(B_{j_2}))$. Therefore the following scenarios arise:

- If $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) \leq \rho(M_v^{(2)})$, then $\rho(M_v^{(2)}) = \rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M_v(B_{j_2}))$. Thus, there are two or more Perron branches of $T$ at $v$ and the uniqueness of vertex $v$ follows from argument similar to Case 1.

- If $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) > \rho(M_v^{(2)})$, then $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u))$ and hence $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T$. By Eqn. (3.11), $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T$. The uniqueness of vertices $u$ and $v$ follows from argument similar to Case 2.

**Case 4:** Let $C_{T(1)} = \{u, v\}$ and $C_{T(2)} = \{v, w\}$, i.e., the edge between the vertices $u$ and $v$ is the characteristic edge of $T^{(1)}$ and the edge between the vertices $v$ and $w$ is the characteristic edge of $T^{(2)}$. Observe that, $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$. Similarly, $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$. Hence $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T$, while $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$ and

$$\rho(M_u) = \rho(M_u(v))$$ and $\rho(M_w) = \rho(M_w(v)).$

Furthermore, $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $B_v(w)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T^{(2)}$. Hence

$$\rho(M_v) = \max\{\rho(M_v(u)), \rho(M_v(w))\}.$$  

Therefore the following scenarios arise:

- If $\rho(M_v(u)) = \rho(M_v(w))$, then by Eqn. (3.13), $\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(u)) = \rho(M_v(w))$. Thus, there are two or more Perron branches at $v$ in $T$ and the uniqueness of vertex $v$ follows from argument similar to Case 1.

- If $\rho(M_v(u)) > \rho(M_v(w))$, then Eqns. (3.12) and (3.13) yield that $B_u(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $u$ in $T$ and $B_v(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v$ in $T$. The uniqueness of vertices $u$ and $v$ follows from argument similar to Case 2.

- If $\rho(M_v(u)) < \rho(M_v(w))$, then Eqns. (3.12) and (3.13) yield that $B_v(w)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$. The uniqueness of vertices $v$ and $w$ follows from argument similar to Case 2.

This completes the proof.
Lemma 3.11. Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree such that the weights on edges of $T$ are $2 \times 2$ lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal entries. Let $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ be the trees obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of $T$ as discussed in Observation 3.9 such that $\mathcal{C}_{T^{(1)}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{T^{(2)}} = \emptyset$. Then Results 3.1 and 3.3 hold true.

Proof. Let $C_{T^{(1)}} = \{v\}$ and $C_{T^{(2)}} = \{x, y\}$, where $v \neq x$ and $v \neq y$. Without loss of generality assume that $y \notin \mathcal{P}(v, x)$, the path joining vertices $v$ and $x$. Let $\mathcal{P}(v, w): v = v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \cdots \sim v_{p-1} \sim v_p = x$. Since $v$ is the characteristic vertex of $T^{(1)}$, so there exists a vertex $u$ adjacent to $v$ with $u \neq v_1$ such that $B_v(u)$ is a Perron branch at $v$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_v^{(1)}(u))$. Thus, $B_{v_i}(u)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_i$ in $T^{(1)}$, while $B_{v_i}(y)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_i$ in $T^{(2)}$; $1 \leq i \leq p$ and hence

$$\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_{v_i}^{(1)}(u)) \text{ and } \rho(M_{v_i}^{(2)}) = \rho(M_{v_i}^{(2)}(y)); \quad 1 \leq i \leq p. \quad (3.14)$$

Next, since $B_{v_i}(u) \subseteq B_{v_{i+1}}(u)$ and $B_{v_i}(y) \supseteq B_{v_{i+1}}(y); \quad 1 \leq i \leq p - 1$, so using Proposition 1.6 and Eqn. (3.14), we have

$$\begin{cases}
\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_{v_1}^{(1)}) < \rho(M_{v_2}^{(1)}) < \cdots < \rho(M_{v_{p-1}}^{(1)}) < \rho(M_{v_p}^{(1)}) = \rho(M_x^{(1)}), \\
\rho(M_v^{(2)}) = \rho(M_{v_1}^{(2)}) > \rho(M_{v_2}^{(2)}) > \cdots > \rho(M_{v_{p-1}}^{(2)}) > \rho(M_{v_p}^{(2)}) = \rho(M_x^{(2)}).
\end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Therefore the following scenario arises:

**Case 1:** Let $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) \geq \rho(M_v^{(2)})$. Then using Eqn. (3.15), we have

$$\rho(M_v) = \max\{\rho(M_v^{(1)}), \rho(M_v^{(2)})\} = \rho(M_v^{(1)}); \quad 1 \leq i \leq p. \quad (3.16)$$

Since $v$ is the characteristic vertex of $T^{(1)}$, there exist branches $B_{v_1}$ and $B_{v_2}$ at $v$ such that $\rho(M_v^{(1)}) = \rho(M_v^{(1)}(B_{v_1})) = \rho(M_v^{(1)}(B_{v_2}))$. By Eqn. (3.16), we have $\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v^{(1)})$ and hence

$$\rho(M_v) = \rho(M_v(B_{v_1})) = \rho(M_v(B_{v_2})).$$

To show the uniqueness of vertex $v$, let us consider the branch $B_w(v)$, where $w \neq v$. If $w \neq v_i; i = 2, 3, \ldots, p$, then $x \in B_w(v)$ and hence $B_w(v) = B_w(x)$. Thus, $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$, and hence $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$. Next, if $w = v_i; i = 2, 3, \ldots, p$, then using Eqn. (3.15) and the assumption for this case, we have

$$\rho(M_v^{(1)}) > \rho(M_v^{(1)}) \geq \rho(M_v^{(2)}) \geq \rho(M_v^{(2)}),$$

which implies that $\rho(M_w) = \max\{\rho(M_w^{(1)}), \rho(M_w^{(2)})\} = \rho(M_w^{(1)}) = \rho(M_w^{(1)}(v)) = \rho(M_w(v))$. Thus, $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$.

Therefore, $v$ is the unique vertex of $T$ such that there are two or more Perron branches at $v$ in $T$ and for any $w \neq v$, $B_w(v)$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$.

**Case 2:** Let $\rho(M_v^{(2)}) \geq \rho(M_v^{(1)})$. Then using Eqn. (3.15), we have

$$\rho(M_v) = \max\{\rho(M_v^{(1)}), \rho(M_v^{(2)})\} = \rho(M_v^{(2)}); \quad 1 \leq i \leq p. \quad (3.17)$$

Since the edge between the vertices $x$ and $y$ is the characteristic edge of $T^{(2)}$, so $B_x(y)$ is the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T^{(2)}$ and hence $\rho(M_x^{(2)}) = \rho(M_x^{(2)}(y))$. By Eqn. (3.17) $\rho(M_x) = \rho(M_x^{(2)}) = \rho(M_x^{(2)}(y))$ which implies that $B_x(y)$ is the unique Perron branch at $x$ in $T$. Since $v \in B_y(x)$, $B_y(x)$ is the unique Perron branch at $y$ in $T^{(2)}$ for $j = 1, 2$ and hence $B_y(x)$ is the Perron branch at $y$ in $T$. 18
Let $w$ be a vertex other than $x$ and $y$. If $B$ is a branch at $w$ in $T$ containing $x$ and $y$, then by argument similar to Case 1 it can be shown $B$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$.

**Case 3:** Let $\rho(M^{(1)}_v) < \rho(M^{(2)}_v)$ and $\rho(M^{(1)}_v) > \rho(M^{(2)}_v)$. By Eqn. (3.15), $\rho(M^{(1)}_v)$ is increasing and $\rho(M^{(1)}_v)$ is decreasing with respect to $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. Then, one of the following cases occurs:

(a) There exists a unique vertex $v_{i_0}$ for some $2 \leq i_0 \leq p - 1$ such that $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}})$.

(b) There exists a unique pair of vertices $v_{i_0}$ and $v_{i_0 + 1}$ for some $1 \leq i_0 \leq p - 1$ such that $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) < \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}})$ and $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0 + 1}}) > \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0 + 1}})$.

For case (a), let $B_{j_1} = B_{v_{i_0}}(v)$ and $B_{j_2} = B_{v_{i_0}}(x)$. Then $B_{j_1} \neq B_{j_2}$ and $B_{j_1}$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0}$ in $T^{(1)}$, while $B_{j_2}$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0}$ in $T^{(2)}$. Thus, $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_1}))$ and $\rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_2}))$ and hence by assumption, we get $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_2}))$. Therefore, by Eqn. (3.10), we have

$$\rho(M_{w}) = \rho(M_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_1})) = \rho(M_{v_{i_0}}(B_{j_2})).$$

Now we show that $B_{w}(v_{i_0})$ is the unique Perron branch of $T$ at $w$, whenever $w \neq v_{i_0}$. If $w \neq v_i; \ i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, p$, then $v, x \in B_{w}(v_{i_0})$. Thus, $B_{w}(v_{i_0})$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$, and hence $B_{w}(v_{i_0})$ is the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$. If $w = v_i; 1 \leq i < i_0$, then $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) < \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}})$. Thus $\rho(M_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}})$. Since $B_{v_{i}}(v_{i_0}) (= B_{v_{i}}(x))$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0}$ in $T^{(2)}$, so $\rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i}))$ and hence

$$\rho(M_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i})); \ 1 \leq i < i_0.$$ 

Therefore $B_{v_{i}}(v_{i_0})$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i}$ in $T; 1 \leq i < i_0$. It is easy to see that a similar assertion can be made for $w = v_i; i_0 < i \leq p$.

For case (b), using $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0}}) < \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}})$ and $B_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0} + 1) = B_{v_{i_0}}(x)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0}$ in $T^{(2)}$, we have

$$\rho(M_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}) = \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0} + 1)).$$

Hence $B_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0} + 1)$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0}$ in $T$. Similarly, using $\rho(M^{(1)}_{v_{i_0} + 1}) > \rho(M^{(2)}_{v_{i_0} + 1})$ and $B_{v_{i_0} + 1}(v_{i_0}) (= B_{v_{i_0} + 1}(v))$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0} + 1$ in $T^{(1)}$, we have $B_{v_{i_0} + 1}(v_{i_0})$ is the unique Perron branch at $v_{i_0} + 1$ in $T$. Further, if $w$ is a vertex other than $v_{i_0}$ and $v_{i_0} + 1$, then arguing similar to case (a), it can be seen that the unique Perron branch at $w$ in $T$ is the branch that contains $v_{i_0}$ and $v_{i_0} + 1$.

The other possible cases are (i) $C_{T^{(1)}} = \{v\}$ and $C_{T^{(2)}} = \{x\}$, (ii) $C_{T^{(1)}} = \{u, v\}$ and $C_{T^{(2)}} = \{x, y\}$. It can be seen that the proof follows analogously to the above case and hence we omit the details. Combining the conclusion of all the above cases the desired result follows.

Before proceeding further, we list out a few observations from the proof of Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 in the following remark.

**Remark 3.12.**

1. The Results 3.1 and 3.3 are valid, if the weights on edges of the tree $T$ are $2 \times 2$ lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries.

2. The characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T$ lie in the path joining characteristic vertices of $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$.

3. The arguments used to prove Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 are summarized as follows:
(a) For any \( v \in V \), if \( B \) is a branch of \( T \) at \( v \), then \( M_v(B) \) is an \( 2 \times 2 \) lower triangular block matrix, i.e.,

\[
M_v(B) = \begin{bmatrix}
M_v^{(1)}(B) & 0 \\
* & M_v^{(2)}(B)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and hence \( \rho(M_v(B)) = \max\{\rho(M_v^{(1)}(B)), \rho(M_v^{(2)}(B))\} \).

(b) The Results 3.1 and 3.3 are true for both \( T^{(1)} \) and \( T^{(2)} \).

(c) For any \( u, v, w \in V \), if \( B_u(w) \subseteq B_v(w) \), then \( \rho(M_u^{(j)}(w)) < \rho(M_v^{(j)}(w)) \) for \( j = 1, 2 \).

Before proving the results for the general case, we prove a lemma analogous to Proposition 1.6.

**Lemma 3.13.** Let \( T = (V, E) \) be a tree such that weights on edges of \( T \) are lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. For any \( u, v, w \in V \), if \( B_u(w) \subseteq B_v(w) \), then \( \rho(M_u(w)) < \rho(M_v(w)) \).

**Proof.** Let the weights on edges of \( T \) be \( s \times s \) lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. By Observation 3.9, for each \( 1 \leq j \leq s \), we find tree \( T^{(j)} \) obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of \( T \). For each \( 1 \leq j \leq s \), using Proposition 1.6 for tree \( T^{(j)} \) if \( B_u(w) \subseteq B_v(w) \) then \( \rho(M_u^{(j)}(w)) < \rho(M_v^{(j)}(w)) \). Hence the result follows from Eqn. \((3.10)\). \(\square\)

**Theorem 3.14.** Let \( T = (V, E) \) be a tree such that the weights on edges of \( T \) are lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. Then, the Results 3.1 and 3.3 hold true.

**Proof.** Let the edges of \( T \) be assigned with lower triangular matrix weights of order \( s \times s \) with positive diagonal entries. We prove this result using induction on \( s \). By Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11, the result is true for \( s = 2 \). We let assume the result is true whenever matrix weights are of order \( (s-1) \times (s-1) \).

Let \( \{W(e)\}_{e \in E} \) denote the lower triangular matrix weights on \( T \) of order \( s \times s \) with positive diagonal entries and let \( W^*(e) \) denote principal submatrix of \( W(e) \) corresponding to indices \( 1, 2, \ldots, s-1 \). Let \( T^* \) denote the tree \( T = (V, E) \) with the matrix weights \( \{W^*(e)\}_{e \in E} \) of order \( (s-1) \times (s-1) \). Then by the induction hypothesis Results 3.1 and 3.3 hold true for tree \( T^* \).

Now we consider matrix weights of order \( s \times s \). For \( v \in V \) with \( \deg(v) = r \) and for \( 1 \leq i \leq r \), let \( B_i \) denote the branches at \( v \). Then by Eqn. \((3.8)\), we have

\[
M^*_v(B_i) \simeq \tilde{M^*_v(B_i)} = \begin{bmatrix}
M^{(1)}_v(B_i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & M^{(2)}_v(B_i) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & * & \cdots & M^{(s-1)}_v(B_i)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and

\[
M_v(B_i) \simeq \tilde{M_v(B_i)} = \begin{bmatrix}
M^{(1)}_v(B_i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & M^{(2)}_v(B_i) & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & * & \cdots & M^{(s)}_v(B_i)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{M^*_v(B_i)} & 0 \\
* & M^{(s)}_v(B_i)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

which implies that \( \rho(M_v(B_i)) = \max\{\rho(M^*_v(B_i)), \rho(M^{(s)}_v(B_i))\} \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq r \). Therefore, in view of Remark 3.12, Lemma 3.13 and the induction hypothesis, proceeding similar to Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 the desired result follows. \(\square\)
Corollary 3.15. Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree such that the weights on edges of $T$ are $s \times s$ lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal entries. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $T^{(j)}$ be the trees obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of $T$ as discussed in Observation 3.9. Then, the characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T$ lies in the minimal sub tree of $T$ containing the characteristic vertices of $T^{(j)}$; $1 \leq j \leq s$.

Proof. We use induction on $s$ to prove the result. The result is true for $s = 2$ (see Remark 3.12). Let us assume the result is true whenever matrix weights are of order $(s - 1) \times (s - 1)$. Let $T^*$ be the tree $T$ with weights of order $(s - 1) \times (s - 1)$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 3.14. Then, by the induction hypothesis, characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T^*$ lie in the minimal sub tree of $T$ containing all the characteristic vertices of $T^{(j)}$; $1 \leq j \leq (s - 1)$. Thus, proceeding similar to Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 for trees $T^*$ and $T^{(s)}$, we get the characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T$ lie in the path joining the vertices characteristic-like vertex (or vertices) of $T^*$ and characteristic vertex (or vertices) of $T^{(s)}$. Hence the desired result follows.

From Propositions 1.7 and 1.8, we have seen that the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix (algebraic connectivity) of a tree with positive weights can be expressed in terms of Perron values. In the next section, we attempt to find a similar relation for trees with matrix weights. However, here we obtain an inequality instead.

4 Lower Bound on the First Non-zero Laplacian Eigenvalue

Let $T$ be a tree on $n$ vertices with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges: 1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. From the previous sections, we know that the eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix $L(T)$ are nonnegative. Moreover, if the matrix weights assigned to the edges of $T$ are of order $s \times s$, then by [1], we have $\text{rank}(L(T)) = (n - 1)s$. Therefore, if the eigenvalues of $L(T)$ are ordered as in Eqn. (1.1), then $\lambda_{s+1}(L(T))$ is the first non-zero eigenvalue of $L(T)$. For notational consistency, we denote the first non-zero eigenvalue $\lambda_{s+1}(L(T))$ as $\mu(T)$, similar to the case of trees with positive edge weights. In this section, we provide a lower bound for $\mu(T)$ in terms of Perron values. Before proceeding further, we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. Let $T$ be a tree with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges: 1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. If $T$ has a characteristic-like edge $e$ between the vertices $u$ and $v$, then $\exists 0 < \nu < 1$ such that

$$
\rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])) = \rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])),
$$

where $W(e)$ denotes the matrix weight on edge $e$.

Proof. Let $\widehat{M}_u$ denote the principal submatrix of $M_u$ obtained by deleting the block $M_u(v)$ (the block corresponding to the unique Perron branch $B_u(v)$ at $u$ in $T$) from $M_u$. Similarly, let $\widehat{M}_v$ denote the principal submatrix of $M_v$ obtained by deleting the block $M_v(u)$ (the block corresponding to the unique Perron branch $B_v(u)$ at $v$ in $T$) from $M_v$, i.e.,

$$
M_u = \begin{bmatrix} M_u(v) & 0 \\ 0 & \widehat{M}_u \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_v = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{M}_v & 0 \\ 0 & M_v(u) \end{bmatrix}.
$$

Then

$$
\rho(M_u(v)) > \rho(\widehat{M}_u) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_v(u)) > \rho(\widehat{M}_v).
$$

(4.1)
Further,
\[
\hat{M}_u = M_u(u) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{M}_v = M_u(v) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}],
\]  
where
\[
\hat{M}_u = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{s \times s} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{M}_u \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{M}_v = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{M}_v & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{s \times s} \end{bmatrix}
\]
if the matrix weights on edges are of order \(s \times s\). Thus \(\rho(\hat{M}_u) = \rho(\hat{M}_u)\) and \(\rho(\hat{M}_v) = \rho(\hat{M}_u)\). Using Eqns. (4.1) and (4.2), we have
\[
\rho(M_u(v)) > \rho(M_u(u) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_v(u)) > \rho(M_u(v) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]).
\]  
For \(0 \leq t \leq 1\), let
\[
\begin{cases} 
  f(t) = \rho(M_u(v) - t(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \\
  g(t) = \rho(M_v(u) - (1 - t)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]).
\end{cases}
\]
Then,

- For positive definite matrix weights, \(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]\) is a positive semidefinite matrix. Then using min-max theorem we get \(f(t)\) is a continuous decreasing function and \(g(t)\) is a continuous increasing function.

- For lower triangular matrix weights of order \(s \times s\) with positive diagonal entries, let \(W(e) = [W_{ij}(e)]\) and by Eqn. (3.10), we have

\[
f(t) = \rho(M_u(v) - t(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} \rho(M_{ij}^j(v) - t(1/W_{jj}(e)) J).
\]

Since \(\rho(M_{ij}^j(v) - t(1/W_{jj}(e)) J)\) is a decreasing function with respect to \(t\) for all \(0 \leq t \leq 1\) and \(1 \leq j \leq s\), so \(f(t)\) is a continuous decreasing function. Similarly, it can be seen that \(g(t)\) is a continuous increasing function.

Note that, in the above cases the continuity of functions \(f(t)\) and \(g(t)\); \(0 \leq t \leq 1\), follows from [4, Corollary VI.1.6]. Further, \(f(t)\) decreases from \(\rho(M_u(v))\) to \(\rho(M_u(u) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])\) and \(g(t)\) increases from \(\rho(M_v(u) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])\) to \(\rho(M_v(u)).\) By Eqn. (4.3), \(f(t)\) and \(g(t)\) must intersect, and hence the result follows.

In view of Result 3.1 and Lemma 4.1, we now define a constant in terms of Perron values for trees with a suitable class of matrix edge weights.

**Definition 4.2.** Let \(T\) be a tree with either of the following classes of matrix weights on its edges:
1. positive definite matrix weights, 2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. We define a constant \(\kappa(T)\) as follows:

(a) If \(T\) has a characteristic-like vertex \(v\), then \(\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_v)}\).

(b) If \(T\) has a characteristic-like edge \(e\) between vertices \(u\) and \(v\), then

\[
\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]))} = \frac{1}{\rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]))},
\]

where \(0 < \nu < 1\) as defined in Lemma 4.1 and \(W(e)\) denotes the matrix weight on edge \(e\).
To obtain a lower bound on $\mu(T)$ for any tree $T$ with positive definite matrix edge weights, we first prove the following lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $T$ be a tree with nonsingular matrix weights on its edges. If $e$ is an edge between vertices $u$ and $v$, then for $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have

$$
\left[ M_u(v) - \alpha (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \right]^{-1} = M_u(v)^{-1} + e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right),
$$

where $e_v$ is the column vector of conformal order with 1 at $v^{th}$ entry and 0 otherwise, and $W(e)$ is the weight on edge $e$.

**Proof.** Let $L(T)$ be the Laplacian matrix of $T$ and $\hat{L}(B_u(v))$ be the principal submatrix of $L(T)$ corresponding to the vertices in the branch $B_u(v)$. By Theorem 2.5 we know that $\hat{L}(B_u(v)) = M_u(v)^{-1}$. Let

$$
X = M_u(v)^{-1} + e_v e_v^T \otimes [-W(e)].
$$

Then, row and column block sums of $X$ are zero. Thus, by part (2) of Remark 2.1, we have

$$
X(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) = 0.
$$

(4.4)

Also note that, column block of $M_v(u)$ (by Theorem 2.5) and $J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]$ corresponding to the vertex $v$ is $1 \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]$ and hence

$$
\left\{ 
\begin{aligned}
(e_v e_v^T \otimes W(e)) M_v(u) &= e_v 1^T \otimes I, \\
(e_v e_v^T \otimes W(e)) (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) &= e_v 1^T \otimes I.
\end{aligned}
\right.
$$

(4.5)

Then,

$$
XM_u(v) = I + (e_v e_v^T \otimes [-W(e)]) M_v(u) = I + e_v e_v^T \otimes [-I].
$$

(4.6)

Now,

$$
\left( M_u(v)^{-1} + e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right) \right) \left( M_u(v) - \alpha (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \right)
= \left( X + e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right) \right) \left( M_u(v) - \alpha (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \right)
= XM_u(v) - \alpha X(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) + \left( e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right) \right) M_u(v)
\quad - \alpha \left( e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right) \right) (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]).
$$

Using Eqns. (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6), the above equation reduces to

$$
\left( M_u(v)^{-1} + e_v e_v^T \otimes \left( \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} W(e) \right) \right) \left( M_u(v) - \alpha (J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]) \right)
= I + \left( -1 + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} - \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right) e_v 1^T \otimes I = I,
$$

and hence the desired result follows.

□
Lemma 4.4. Let $T$ be a tree on $n$ vertices with nonsingular matrix weights on its edges and $L(T)$ be the Laplacian matrix of $T$. If $e$ is an edge between vertices $u$ and $v$, then for $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have

$$L(T) + E \otimes W(e) = \begin{bmatrix} \left[ M_u(v) - \alpha(J \otimes [W(e)]^{-1}) \right]^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \left[ M_v(u) - (1 - \alpha)(J \otimes [W(e)]^{-1}) \right]^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $W(e)$ is the weight on edge $e$ and $E = [E_{xy}]_{x,y \in V}$ is an $n \times n$ matrix with

$$E_{xy} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} & \text{if } x = y = v, \\ \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \alpha} & \text{if } x = y = u, \\ \frac{1}{\alpha} & \text{if } x = u, y = v \text{ and } x = v, y = u, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $B_u(v)$ be the branch consisting of $k$ vertices and $B_v(u)$ be the branch consisting of $(n - k)$ vertices. By suitable rearrangement of the vertex ordering and in view of Theorem 4.6, the Laplacian matrix $L(T)$ of $T$ can be written as

$$L(T) = \begin{bmatrix} M_u(v)^{-1} & E_{k1} \otimes [-W(e)] \\ E_{1k} \otimes [-W(e)] & M_v(u)^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $E_{k1}$ is the $k \times (n - k)$ matrix with $1$ at $(k, 1)$ position and $0$ otherwise, and $E_{1k}$ is its transpose. Observe that, here the partitioning is such that the last row of $M_u(v)^{-1}$ corresponds to vertex $v$, while the first row of $M_v(u)^{-1}$ corresponds to vertex $u$.

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, using Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{align*} M_u(v)^{-1} &= \left[ M_u(v) - \alpha(J \otimes [W(e)]^{-1}) \right]^{-1} - e_v e_v^T \otimes \left[ \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right] W(e), \\ M_v(u)^{-1} &= \left[ M_v(u) - (1 - \alpha)(J \otimes [W(e)]^{-1}) \right]^{-1} - e_v e_v^T \otimes \left[ \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \right] W(e). \end{align*}$$

Substituting the above values in Eqn. (4.8), the desired result follows. \hfill \square

Remark 4.5. 1. From the proofs of Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, it is easy to see that the results applies equally well for any real $\alpha$ such that $\alpha \neq 1$ and $\alpha \neq 0$.

2. In Lemma 4.4, the matrix $E$ is a rank one matrix, and for $0 < \alpha < 1$, its only non-zero eigenvalue is positive.

Now we prove the result that gives a lower bound on $\mu(T)$ whenever edges of the tree $T$ assigned with positive definite matrix weights.

Theorem 4.6. Let $T$ be a tree with positive definite matrix weights on its edges. Let $L(T)$ be the Laplacian matrix of $T$ and $\mu(T)$ be the first non-zero eigenvalue of $L(T)$. Then $\kappa(T) \leq \mu(T)$.

Proof. Let $T$ be a tree on $n$ vertices and the weights on edges of $T$ be $s \times s$ positive definite matrix. Then $L(T)$ is a symmetric matrix of order $ns \times ns$, and let the eigenvalues of $L(T)$ be ordered as in Eqn. (1.1). Thus $\mu(T) = \lambda_{s+1}(L(T))$. 
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If $T$ has a characteristic-like vertex, say $v$, then $\kappa(T) = 1/\rho(M_v)$. Let $L_v$ be the principal submatrix of $L(T)$ obtained by deleting the row block and column block corresponding to vertex $v$ and let the eigenvalues of $L_v$ be ordered as in Eqn. (1.1). Since $L_v = M_v^{-1}$, so $\lambda_1(L_v) = \kappa(T)$. Using Theorem 1.4, for the principal submatrix $L_v$ of order $(n - 1)s \times (n - 1)s$, we have

$$0 = \lambda_1(L(T)) \leq \lambda_1(L_v) \leq \lambda_{1+n_s-(n-1)s}(L(T)) = \lambda_{s+1}(L(T)),$$

and hence $\kappa(T) \leq \mu(T)$.

If $T$ has a characteristic-like edge $e$ between vertices $u$ and $v$, then $\exists 0 < \nu < 1$ such that

$$\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])}) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]))}. \quad (4.9)$$

By Lemma 4.4, Eqn. (4.7) holds true for $\alpha = \nu$. Since the edges of $T$ are assigned with positive definite matrices, so $L(T)$ and $E \otimes W(e)$ are Hermitian matrices. Then using Theorem 1.5, we have

$$\lambda_1(L(T) + E \otimes W(e)) \leq \lambda_{s+1}(L(T)) + \lambda_{(n-1)s}(E \otimes W(e)). \quad (4.10)$$

For $\alpha = \nu$, by Eqns. (4.7) and (4.9), we have $\lambda_1(L(T) + E \otimes W(e)) = \kappa(T)$. Furthermore, note that $E$ is a rank one matrix and since $0 < \nu < 1$, so Remark 2.1 yields that $E \otimes W(e)$ is a positive semidefinite matrix with rank$(E \otimes W(e)) = \text{rank}(W(e)) = s$. This implies that $\lambda_i(E \otimes W(e)) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq (n-1)s$. Hence Eqn. (4.10) reduces to $\kappa(T) \leq \mu(T)$ and this completes the proof. \[\square\]

Next, we prove the result that gives a lower bound on $\mu(T)$ whenever edges of the tree $T$ are assigned with lower triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let $T = (V,E)$ be a tree such that the weights on edges of $T$ are lower triangular matrix with positive diagonal entries. Let $L(T)$ be the Laplacian matrix of $T$ and $\mu(T)$ be the first non-zero eigenvalue of $L(T)$. Then $\kappa(T) \leq \mu(T)$.

**Proof.** Let the weights on edges of $T$ be $s \times s$ lower triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries. By Observation 3.9, for each $1 \leq j \leq s$, we find tree $T^{(j)}$ which are obtained by assigning positive weights to the edges of $T$. For $1 \leq j \leq s$, let $L(T^{(j)})$ denote the Laplacian matrix of $T^{(j)}$. Then using Eqn. (3.7), we have

$$\sigma(L(T)) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s} \sigma(L(T^{(j)})) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(T) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq s} \mu(T^{(j)}),$$

where $\mu(T^{(j)})$ denotes the algebraic connectivity of $T^{(j)}$.

Without loss of generality, let us assume $\mu(T) = \mu(T^{(1)})$ and we consider the following cases to complete the proof.

**Case 1:** Let $T$ have a characteristic-like vertex, say $v$. Then, $\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_v)}$.

**Subcase 1.1:** Let $T^{(1)}$ have a characteristic vertex, say $x$. By Proposition 1.8, there are two or more Perron branches at $x$ in $T^{(1)}$ and hence there exists a vertex $y$ adjacent to $x$ (and $y$ is not in the path $P(v,x)$ if $v \neq x$) such that $B_x(y)$ is a Perron branch of at $x$ in $T^{(1)}$. Thus,

$$B_x(y) \subseteq B_v(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(M_x^{(1)}) = \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)).$$

Then using Proposition 1.8, Lemma 3.13 and Eqn. (3.9), we have

$$\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = \rho(M_v) \geq \rho(M_v(y)) \geq \rho(M_x(y)) = \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)) = \rho(M_x^{(1)}) = \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})} = \frac{1}{\mu(T)}.$$
**Subcase 1.2:** Let $T^{(1)}$ have a characteristic edge $\hat{e}$ between the vertices $x$ and $y$. Using Proposition 1.7, $\exists 0 < \gamma < 1$ such that
\[
\frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})} = \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y) - \gamma(1/\theta)J) = \rho(M_y^{(1)}(x) - (1 - \gamma)(1/\theta)J), \tag{4.11}
\]
where $\theta$ is the positive weight assigned to the edge $\hat{e}$ in $T^{(1)}$. Further, without loss of generality, let $y$ not be in the path $\mathcal{P}(v, x)$ and hence $B_x(y) \subseteq B_v(y)$. Using Lemma 3.13, Eqns. (3.9) and (4.11), we have
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = \rho(M_v) \geq \rho(M_v(y)) \geq \rho(M_x(y)) \geq \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)) > \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)) - \gamma(1/\theta)J = \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})} = \frac{1}{\mu(T)}.
\]
**Case 2:** Let $T$ have a characteristic-like edge $e$ between the vertices $u$ and $v$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$, let
\[
\begin{align*}
    f(t) &= \rho(M_u(v) - t(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])], \\
    g(t) &= \rho(M_v(u) - (1-t)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])], \\
    h(t) &= \min\{f(t), g(t)\}. \tag{4.12}
\end{align*}
\]
From the proof of Lemma 4.1, we know that $f(t)$ is a continuous decreasing function and $g(t)$ is a continuous increasing function, and hence $\exists 0 < \nu < 1$ such that $f(\nu) = g(\nu)$, i.e.,
\[
\rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])]) = \rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])],
\]
where $W(e)$ is the matrix weight on edge $e$. Therefore,
\[
h(\nu) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} h(t) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \min\{f(t), g(t)\} = f(\nu) = g(\nu). \tag{4.13}
\]
By definition,
\[
\kappa(T) = \frac{1}{\rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])])} = \frac{1}{\rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])]},
\]
and hence by Eqn. (4.13), we have
\[
h(\nu) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} h(t) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \min\{f(t), g(t)\} = \frac{1}{\kappa(T)} \tag{4.14}
\]
Further, let $\hat{M}_v$ denote the the principal submatrix of $M_v$ obtained by deleting the block $M_v(u)$ (the block corresponding to the unique Perron branch $B_v(u)$ at $v$ in $T$) from $M_v$. Thus, Eqn. (4.2) yields that $\hat{M}_v = M_v(v) - J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}]$ and $\rho(\hat{M}_v) = \rho(\hat{M}_v)$. Hence
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = \rho(M_u(v) - \nu(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])]) \geq \rho(M_v(u) - (1 - \nu)(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])]) = \rho(\hat{M}_v). \tag{4.15}
\]
**Subcase 2.1:** Let $T^{(1)}$ have a characteristic vertex, say $x$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $x \in B_v(v)$. By Proposition 1.8, there are two or more Perron branches at $x$ in $T^{(1)}$ and hence there exists a vertex $y$ adjacent to $x$ (and $y$ is not in the path $\mathcal{P}(v, x)$ if $v \neq x$) such that $B_x(y)$ is a Perron branch at $x$ in $T^{(1)}$. Thus,
\[
B_x(y) \subseteq B_v(y) \text{ and } \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)) = \rho(M_x^{(1)}(y)).
\]
Note that, $\hat{M}_v$ is a block diagonal matrix and $M_v(y)$ is one of its block. Thus $\rho(\hat{M}_v) \geq \rho(M_v(y))$, and hence using Lemma 3.13, Eqns. (3.9) and (4.15), we have
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} \geq \rho(\hat{M}_v) \geq \rho(M_v(y)) \geq \rho(M_x(y)) \geq \rho(M^{(1)}_x(y)) = \rho(M^{(1)}_x) = \frac{1}{\mu(T)} = \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})}.
\]

**Subcase 2.2:** Let $T^{(1)}$ have a characteristic edge $\hat{e}$ between vertices $x$ and $y$, and hence Eqn. (4.11) is valid.

Let $e \neq \hat{e}$. Without loss of generality, let $x, y \in B_u(v)$ and $y$ not be in the path $P(v, x)$ if $v \neq x$, and hence $B_x(y) \subseteq B_v(y)$. Using Lemma 3.13, Eqns. (3.9), (4.11) and (4.15), we have
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} \geq \rho(\hat{M}_v) \geq \rho(M_v(y)) \geq \rho(M_x(y)) \geq \rho(M^{(1)}_x(y)) > \rho(M^{(1)}_x(y) - \gamma(1/\theta)J) = \frac{1}{\mu(T)} = \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})}.
\]

Let $e = \hat{e}$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $u = x$ and $v = y$. Thus, Eqn. (4.11) can be rewritten as
\[
\frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})} = \rho(M^{(1)}_u) - \gamma(1/\theta)J = \rho(M^{(1)}_v) - (1 - \gamma)(1/\theta)J; \text{ for some } 0 < \gamma < 1. \tag{4.16}
\]

Using Eqns. (4.12) and (4.16), we have
\[
f(\gamma) = \rho(M_u(v) - \gamma(J \otimes [W(e)^{-1}])) \geq \rho(M^{(1)}_u(v) - \gamma(1/\theta)J) = \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})},
\]
and similarly, $g(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})}$. Therefore, $h(\gamma) = \min\{f(\gamma), g(\gamma)\} \geq \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})}$ and hence using Eqn. (4.14), we have
\[
\frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = h(\nu) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} h(t) \geq h(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{\mu(T^{(1)})} = \frac{1}{\mu(T)}.
\]

This completes the proof.
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From Propositions 1.7 and 1.8, we know that for trees with positive weights on its edges, the equality is attained in Theorems 4.6 and 4.7, but in general it may not be true. We illustrate this in the following examples.

**Example 4.8.** Let $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ and $E = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5\}$. Consider the tree $T = (V, E)$, as shown in Figure (1a) with the matrix weights
\[
\mathcal{W} = \left\{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 \end{bmatrix}, W(e_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 \end{bmatrix}, W(e_4) = W(e_5) = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.
\]
Let
\[ W^{(1)} = \{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = 1, W(e_3) = 10, W(e_4) = W(e_5) = 10 \} , \]
\[ W^{(2)} = \{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = 10, W(e_3) = 10, W(e_4) = W(e_5) = 1 \} . \]

Let \( T^{(1)} = (T, W^{(1)}) \) and \( T^{(2)} = (T, W^{(2)}) \) be trees with positive weights \( W^{(1)} \) and \( W^{(2)} \), respectively. Then, \( v_3 \) is the characteristic vertex of \( T^{(1)} \) with \( \mu(T^{(1)}) = 1 \), while \( v_4 \) is the characteristic vertex of \( T^{(2)} \) with \( \mu(T^{(2)}) = 1 \). Whereas, \( e_3 \) is the characteristic-like edge of \( T \) with \( \mu(T) = 1 \). Thus,
\[ \frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = \rho(M_{v_3}(v_4) - 0.5(J \otimes [W(e_3)^{-1}])) = \rho(M_{v_4}(v_3) - 0.5(J \otimes [W(e_3)^{-1}])) = 1.104741, \]
and hence \( \kappa(T) < \mu(T) \).

**Example 4.9.** Let \( V = \{ v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 \} \) and \( E = \{ e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \} \). Consider the tree \( T = (V, E) \), as shown in Figure (1b) with the matrix weights
\[ W = \left\{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, W(e_3) = W(e_4) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 \end{bmatrix} \right\}. \]

Let
\[ W^{(1)} = \{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = 10, W(e_3) = W(e_4) = 1 \} , \]
\[ W^{(2)} = \{ W(e_1) = W(e_2) = 1, W(e_3) = W(e_4) = 10 \} . \]

Let \( T^{(1)} = (T, W^{(1)}) \) and \( T^{(2)} = (T, W^{(2)}) \) be trees with positive scalar weights \( W^{(1)} \) and \( W^{(2)} \), respectively. Then, \( e_3 \) is the characteristic edge of \( T^{(1)} \) with \( \mu(T^{(1)}) = 0.58963 \), while \( e_2 \) is the characteristic edge of \( T^{(2)} \) with \( \mu(T^{(2)}) = 0.58963 \). Whereas, \( v_3 \) is the characteristic-like vertex of \( T \) with \( \mu(T) = 0.58963 \). Thus, \( \frac{1}{\kappa(T)} = \rho(M_{v_3}) = 2.618034 \), and hence \( \kappa(T) < \mu(T) \).

### 5 Conclusion

In this manuscript, we have studied the Laplacian matrix for trees with matrix weights on its edges. We consider the principal submatrix \( L_v \) of the Laplacian matrix for trees with matrix weights on its edges. We first compute the determinant of \( L_v \) and prove that \( L_v \) is an invertible matrix if and only if the edge weights are nonsingular matrices. Then, we find the inverse of \( L_v \) and define the bottleneck matrix for a branch of a tree with nonsingular matrix edge weights. In this case, we define Perron values and Perron branches whenever the eigenvalues \( L_v \) are nonnegative. Furthermore, using \( L_v^{-1} \), we find the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix \( L \). Next, we consider trees with the following classes of matrix edge weights:

1. positive definite matrix weights,
2. lower (or upper) triangular matrix weights with positive diagonal entries.

For trees with above classes of matrix edge weights we found that the eigenvalues \( L_v \) are nonnegative and we have shown the existence of vertices satisfying properties analogous to the properties of characteristic vertices of trees with positive edge weights in terms of Perron values and Perron branches. We call such vertices as characteristic-like vertices.

For trees with positive edge weights, it is known that the algebraic connectivity (first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix) can be expressed in terms of Perron values. We attempted to find a similar relation for trees with the above class of matrix edge weights. However, here we
obtain an inequality instead and hence provide a lower bound for the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix.
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