

On resistance matrices of weighted balanced digraphs

R. Balaji, R.B. Bapat and Shivani Goel

November 4, 2021

Abstract

Let G be a connected graph with $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then the resistance distance between any two vertices i and j is given by $r_{ij} := l_{ii}^\dagger + l_{jj}^\dagger - 2l_{ij}^\dagger$, where l_{ij}^\dagger is the (i, j) th entry of the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix of G . For the resistance matrix $R := [r_{ij}]$, there is an elegant formula to compute the inverse of R . This says that

$$R^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}L + \frac{1}{\tau'R\tau}\tau\tau',$$

where

$$\tau := (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)' \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_i := 2 - \sum_{\{j \in V(G) : (i, j) \in E(G)\}} r_{ij} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

A far reaching generalization of this result that gives an inverse formula for a generalized resistance matrix of a strongly connected and matrix weighted balanced directed graph is obtained in this paper. When the weights are scalars, it is shown that the generalized resistance is a non-negative real number. We also obtain a perturbation result involving resistance matrices of connected graphs and Laplacians of digraphs.

Keywords. Balanced digraphs, Laplacian matrices, resistance matrices, row diagonally dominant matrices, Jacobi identity.

AMS CLASSIFICATION. 05C50

1 Introduction

Let G be a simple connected graph. Suppose x and y are any two vertices of G . The length of the shortest path connecting x and y in G is the natural way to define the distance between x and y . This classical distance has certain limitations. For instance, consider two graphs G_1 and G_2 such that

- (i) $V(G_1) = V(G_2) = \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- (ii) i and j are adjacent in both G_1 and G_2 .
- (iii) There is only path between i and j in G_1 and there are multiple paths connecting i and j in G_2 .

Then the shortest distance between i and j in both G_1 and G_2 is *one*. However, since there are multiple paths connecting i and j in G_2 , the communication between i and j in G_2 is better than in G_1 . This significance is not reflected in the shortest distance. Several applications require to overcome this limitation. Instead of the classical distance, the so-called resistance distance is used widely in many situations like in electrical networks, chemistry and random walks: see for example [1] and [2]. If there are multiple paths between two vertices, then the resistance distance is less than the shortest distance. The resistance matrix is now the matrix with $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ entry equal to the resistance distance between i and j . Resistance matrices are non-singular and the inverse is given by an elegant formula that can be computed directly from the graph. The main purpose of this paper is to deduce a formula for the inverse of a generalized resistance matrix of a simple digraph with some special properties. This new formula generalizes the following known results.

1.1 Inverse of the resistance matrix of a connected graph

Let G be a connected graph with $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let δ_i denote the degree of the vertex i and A be the adjacency matrix of G . Then the Laplacian matrix of G is $L = \text{Diag}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) - A$. Now the resistance between any two vertices i and j in G is

$$r_{ij} := l_{ii}^\dagger + l_{jj}^\dagger - 2l_{ij}^\dagger, \quad (1)$$

where l_{ij}^\dagger is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ entry of the Moore Penrose inverse of L . Define $R := [r_{ij}]$. Then the inverse of R is given by

$$R^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}L + \frac{1}{\tau'R\tau}\tau\tau', \quad (2)$$

where

$$\tau := (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)' \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_i := 2 - \sum_{\{j \in V(G) : (i,j) \in E\}} r_{ij} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The proof of (2) is given in Theorem 9.1.2 in [1].

1.2 Inverse of the distance matrix of a tree

Let T be a tree with $V(T) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and r_{ij} (defined in (1)) be the resistance distance between any two vertices i and j . If d_{ij} is the length of the shortest path connecting i and j in T , then by an induction argument, it can be shown that $d_{ij} = r_{ij}$. Define $D := [d_{ij}]$. Specializing formula (2) to T gives

$$D^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}L + \frac{(2 - \delta_1, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)'(2 - \delta_1, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)}{2(n - 1)}, \quad (3)$$

where δ_i is the degree of the vertex i and L is the Laplacian matrix of T . This formula is obtained by Graham and Lovász in [3].

1.3 Inverse of the distance matrix of a weighted tree

Formula (3) can be generalized to weighted trees. We first need to define the Laplacian matrix of a weighted tree. Consider a tree $G = (V, \Omega)$ with $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. To an edge $(i, j) \in \Omega$, we assign a positive real number w_{ij} . Define

$$l_{ij} := \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{w_{ij}} & (i, j) \in \Omega \\ 0 & i \neq j \text{ and } (i, j) \notin \Omega \\ \sum_{\{k:(i,k) \in \Omega\}} \frac{1}{w_{ik}} & i = j. \end{cases}$$

Then the Laplacian matrix of G is $L := [l_{ij}]$. The distance matrix of G is the symmetric matrix D with $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ entry equal to sum of all the weights that lie in the path connecting i and j . In this case, by an induction argument, it can be shown that $LDL + 2L = 0$ and from this identity it is easy to show that $d_{ij} = l_{ii}^\dagger + l_{jj}^\dagger - 2l_{ij}^\dagger$, where l_{ij}^\dagger is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ entry of the Moore Penrose inverse of L . Let δ_i be the degree of the vertex i . In this setting, the following inverse formula is obtained in [4]:

$$D^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(L + \frac{\tau\tau'}{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij}}\right), \quad (4)$$

where τ is the vector $(2 - \delta_1, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)'$.

1.4 Inverse of the distance matrix of a tree with matrix weights

Formula (4) can be generalized. Consider a tree on n vertices with vertex set $V(T) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $E(T)$. To an edge (i, j) in T , assign a positive definite matrix W_{ij} of some fixed order s . Define

$$L_{ij} := \begin{cases} -W_{ij}^{-1} & (i, j) \in E(T) \\ O_s & i \neq j \text{ and } (i, j) \notin E(T) \\ \sum_{\{k:(i,k) \in E(T)\}} W_{ik}^{-1} & i = j. \end{cases}$$

(Here O_s is the $s \times s$ matrix with all entries equal to zero.) The Laplacian matrix L of T is then the $ns \times ns$ matrix with $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block equal to L_{ij} . The distance between any two vertices i and j in T is the sum of all positive definite matrices that lie in the path connecting i and j . Let the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of the Moore-Penrose inverse of L be given by M_{ij} . Then, by induction it can be shown that

$$D_{ij} = M_{ii} + M_{jj} - 2M_{ij}.$$

The inverse of D is

$$D^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}(L + FS^{-1}F'), \quad (5)$$

where

$$S = \sum_i \sum_j W_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad F = (2 - \delta_1, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)' \otimes I_s.$$

Formula (5) is obtained in [5].

1.5 Inverse of the resistance matrix of a directed graph

Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a digraph with vertex set $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. A directed edge from a vertex i to a vertex j in G will be denoted by (i, j) . Recall that G is said to be strongly connected if there is a directed path between any two vertices i and j . A vertex i is said to be balanced if the outdegree of i and the indegree of i are equal. If all the vertices are balanced, then we say that G is balanced. We now assume that G is a strongly connected and balanced digraph. If i and j are any two vertices, define

$$a_{ij} := \begin{cases} 1 & (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The Laplacian matrix of G is the matrix $L = [l_{ij}]$ such that

$$l_{ij} := \begin{cases} -a_{ij} & i \neq j \\ \sum_{\{k:k \neq i\}} a_{ik} & i = j. \end{cases}$$

Now, let $L^\dagger := [l_{ij}^\dagger]$ be the Moore-Penrose inverse of L . Then the resistance between any two vertices i and j in G is given by

$$r_{ij} := l_{ii}^\dagger + l_{jj}^\dagger - 2l_{ij}^\dagger.$$

For the resistance matrix $R = [r_{ij}]$ of G , we have the following inverse formula from [6]:

$$R^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}L + \frac{1}{\tau'R\tau}(\tau(\tau' + \mathbf{1}' \text{diag}(L^\dagger)M)), \quad (6)$$

where

$$M := L - L', \quad \tau_i := 2 - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} r_{ji},$$

and $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector of all ones in \mathbb{R}^n .

We now ask if there is a formula that unifies (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6).

1.6 Results obtained

We consider a simple digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ with $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. An element in \mathcal{E} will be denoted by (i, j) . Precisely, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ means that there is a directed edge from a vertex i to a vertex j in \mathcal{G} . All edges are assigned a positive definite matrix of some fixed order s . These positive definite matrices will be called *weights*. Let W_{ij} be the weight of the edge (i, j) . In this set up, we define the following.

(i) **Laplacian of \mathcal{G} :** If i and j are any two distinct vertices in \mathcal{G} , define

$$L_{ij} := \begin{cases} -W_{ij}^{-1} & (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ O_s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(Here, O_s is the $s \times s$ matrix with all entries equal to zero.) The Laplacian of \mathcal{G} is then the $ns \times ns$ matrix

$$L(\mathcal{G}) := \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{\{j:j \neq 1\}} L_{1j} & L_{12} & \dots & L_{1n} \\ L_{21} & -\sum_{\{j:j \neq 2\}} L_{2j} & \dots & L_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ L_{n1} & L_{n2} & \dots & -\sum_{\{j:j \neq n\}} L_{nj} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We shall say that L_{ij} is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of $L(\mathcal{G})$. We note that since \mathcal{G} is a digraph, $L(\mathcal{G})$ is not symmetric in general.

(ii) **Resistance matrix of \mathcal{G} :** Let i and j be any two vertices in \mathcal{G} . Fix $a, b > 0$. Then, a *generalized resistance distance* between i and j is the $s \times s$ matrix

$$R_{ij} = a^2 K_{ii} + b^2 K_{jj} - 2ab K_{ij},$$

where K_{ij} is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of the Moore Penrose inverse of L . The resistance matrix corresponding to a and b is then the $ns \times ns$ matrix with $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block equal to R_{ij} .

(iii) **Balanced vertices:** We say that a vertex $j \in V$ is balanced if

$$\sum_{\{i \in V: (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1} = \sum_{\{i \in V: (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ji}^{-1}.$$

(iv) **Balanced digraphs:** If every vertex of \mathcal{G} is balanced, then we shall say that \mathcal{G} is balanced.

We obtain the following result in this paper.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a weighted, balanced and strongly connected digraph, where $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let W_{ij} be the weight of the edge (i, j) . Fix $a, b > 0$. If R is the resistance matrix of \mathcal{G} , L is the Laplacian of \mathcal{G} , and L^\dagger is the Moore-Penrose inverse of \mathcal{G} , then*

$$R^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2ab}L + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L),$$

where $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)'$ is given by

$$\tau_i := 2abI_s + L_{ii}R_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}R_{ji},$$

$U = \underbrace{[I_s, \dots, I_s]}_n$ and $\Delta(L^\dagger) = \text{Diag}(K_{11}, \dots, K_{nn})$, with K_{ii} being the i^{th} diagonal block of L^\dagger .

To illustrate, we give an example.

Example 1. Consider the following graph \mathcal{G} on four vertices. Let




Figure 1: Directed Graph \mathcal{G} .

$$W_{14} = W_{21} = \frac{1}{5} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -4 \\ -4 & 7 \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_{43} = W_{32} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$W_{42} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -3 \\ -3 & 5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The graph \mathcal{G} is balanced with the above matrix weights. The Laplacian of \mathcal{G} is

$$L = [L_{ij}] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 7 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -7 & -4 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -4 & -3 \\ \hline -7 & -4 & 7 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -4 & -3 & 4 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & -2 & -1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & -5 & -3 & -2 & -1 & 7 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & -3 & -2 & -1 & -1 & 4 & 3 \end{array} \right].$$

The Moore-Penrose inverse of L is the matrix

$$L^\dagger = [K_{ij}] = \frac{1}{80} \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 20 & -25 & -16 & 23 & -12 & 11 & 8 & -9 \\ -25 & 45 & 23 & -39 & 11 & -23 & -9 & 17 \\ \hline 8 & -9 & 20 & -25 & -24 & 27 & -4 & 7 \\ -9 & 17 & -25 & 45 & 27 & -51 & 7 & -11 \\ \hline -12 & 11 & 0 & -5 & 36 & -33 & -24 & 27 \\ 11 & -23 & -5 & 5 & -33 & 69 & 27 & -51 \\ \hline -16 & 23 & -4 & 7 & 0 & -5 & 20 & -25 \\ 23 & -39 & 7 & -11 & -5 & 5 & -25 & 45 \end{array} \right].$$

Suppose $a = 2$ and $b = 3$. The resistance matrix of \mathcal{G} is

$$R = [4K_{ii} + 9K_{jj} - 12K_{ij}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{80} \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 20 & -25 & 452 & -601 & 548 & -529 & 164 & -217 \\ -25 & 45 & -601 & 1053 & -529 & 1077 & -217 & 381 \\ \hline 164 & -217 & 20 & -25 & 692 & -721 & 308 & -409 \\ -217 & 381 & -25 & 45 & -721 & 1413 & -409 & 717 \\ \hline 468 & -489 & 324 & -297 & 36 & -33 & 612 & -681 \\ -489 & 957 & -297 & 621 & -33 & 69 & -681 & 1293 \\ \hline 452 & -601 & 308 & -409 & 404 & -337 & 20 & -25 \\ -601 & 1053 & -409 & 717 & -337 & 741 & -25 & 45 \end{array} \right].$$

Next, we compute $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4)'$. Recall that

$$\tau_i := 2abI_s + L_{ii}R_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in E\}} W_{ij}^{-1}R_{ji}.$$

Thus,

$$\tau = \frac{1}{5} \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 15 & 0 & 15 & 0 & 21 & 2 & 9 & -2 \\ 0 & 15 & 0 & 15 & 2 & 19 & -2 & 11 \end{array} \right]'$$

$$\tau'R\tau = \frac{1}{5} \left[\begin{array}{cc} 2916 & -3159 \\ -3159 & 6075 \end{array} \right],$$

and

$$\tau' - 4U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + 9U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L = \frac{1}{10} \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} 30 & 0 & 3 & -9 & 57 & 9 & 30 & 0 \\ 0 & 30 & -9 & 12 & 9 & 48 & 0 & 30 \end{array} \right].$$

Hence, we have

$$-\frac{1}{2ab}L + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - 4U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + 9U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)$$

$$= \frac{1}{42444} \begin{bmatrix} -23259 & -13368 & -84 & -138 & 3084 & 1698 & 26259 & 14928 \\ -13368 & -9891 & -138 & 54 & 1698 & 1386 & 14928 & 11331 \\ \hline 26259 & 14928 & -24843 & -14286 & 3084 & 1698 & 1500 & 780 \\ 14928 & 11331 & -14286 & -10557 & 1698 & 1386 & 780 & 720 \\ \hline 2204 & 1188 & 6938 & 3351 & -2530 & -975 & 2204 & 1188 \\ 1188 & 1016 & 3351 & 3587 & -975 & -1555 & 1188 & 1016 \\ \hline 796 & 372 & 17653 & 10521 & 8698 & 4371 & -23963 & -13776 \\ 372 & 424 & 10521 & 7132 & 4371 & 4327 & -13776 & -10187 \end{bmatrix}$$

which is equal to R^{-1} .

1.7 Other results

We obtain the following two results after proving Theorem 1.

- By numerical computations, we observe that for any $a, b > 0$,

$$R_{ij} = a^2K_{ii} + b^2K_{jj} - 2abK_{ij}$$

is positive semidefinite. We do not know how to prove this result in general. However, when the weights in \mathcal{G} of Theorem 1 are positive scalars, we show that R_{ij} is always a non-negative real number.

- Let T be a tree on n vertices. Suppose D and L are the distance and Laplacian matrices of T . Then, from (3) it can be deduced that

$$(D^{-1} - L)^{-1} = \frac{1}{3}D + \frac{1}{3}\left(\sum_{i,j} w_{ij}\right)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'.$$

In particular, this equation says that every entry in $(D^{-1} - L)^{-1}$ is non-negative. Suppose M is the Laplacian matrix of an arbitrary tree on n vertices. It can be shown that $D^{-1} - M$ is non-singular. We now say that $(D^{-1} - M)^{-1}$ is a perturbation of the distance matrix D . In [4], it is shown that all perturbations of D are non-negative matrices. We now assume that R is the resistance matrix of a connected graph (defined in Section 1.1) on n vertices. Now consider the Laplacian matrix L of \mathcal{G} in Theorem 1. Suppose all the weights in \mathcal{G} are positive scalars. It can be shown that $R^{-1} - L$ is always non-singular. We now say that $(R^{-1} - L)^{-1}$ is a perturbation of R . By performing certain numerical experiments, we observed that similar to the result in [4], all perturbations of R

are non-negative matrices. Since \mathcal{G} is a digraph, L is not symmetric in general and hence all perturbations of R are not symmetric matrices. Despite this difficulty, by using a argument different from [4], we show that all perturbations of R are non-negative. This result is proved in the final part of this paper.

2 Preliminaries

We mention the notation and some basic results that will be used in the paper.

- (i) We reserve \mathcal{G} to denote a simple, strongly connected, weighted, and balanced digraph with vertex set $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. A directed edge from i to j in \mathcal{G} will be denoted by (i, j) . We use \mathcal{E} to denote the edge set of \mathcal{G} . The weight of an edge (i, j) will be denoted by W_{ij} . All weights will be symmetric positive definite matrices and have fixed order s .
- (ii) Let B^{ns} be the set of all real $ns \times ns$ matrices. A matrix A in B^{ns} will be denoted by $[A_{ij}]$, where A_{ij} is an $s \times s$ matrix. We shall say that A_{ij} is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of A . There are n blocks in A . The null-space of a matrix A is denoted by $\text{null}(A)$ and the column space by $\text{col}(A)$.
- (iii) The vector of all ones in \mathbb{R}^n will be denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. The matrix $\mathbf{1}' \otimes I_s$ will be denoted by U' , i.e.

$$U := [I_s, \dots, I_s]',$$

where I_s appears n times. We use J to denote the matrix in B^{ns} with all blocks equal to I_s . Note that $J = UU'$.

- (iv) The Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} will be denoted by L and its Moore-Penrose by L^\dagger . We note that L and L^\dagger belong to B^{ns} . The $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of L^\dagger will be denoted by K_{ij} . We use $\Delta(L^\dagger)$ to denote the block diagonal matrix

$$\text{Diag}(K_{11}, \dots, K_{nn}).$$

Let \mathcal{G}' be the digraph such that $V(\mathcal{G}') := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and

$$E(\mathcal{G}') := \{(j, i) : (i, j) \in E(\mathcal{G})\}$$

To an edge (i, j) of \mathcal{G}' , we assign the weight W_{ji} . Again \mathcal{G}' will be strongly connected, and balanced. The Laplacian of \mathcal{G}' is clearly L' .

- (v) Fix $a, b > 0$. The generalized resistance matrix of \mathcal{G} corresponding to a and b will be denoted by $R_{a,b}$. Thus, $R_{a,b}$ is an element in B^{ns} with $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block equal to

$$a^2 K_{ii} + b^2 K_{jj} - 2ab K_{ij}.$$

(vi) Let A be an $m \times m$ matrix.

(a) We say that A is positive semidefinite if $x'Ax \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and positive definite if $x'Ax > 0$ for all $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. (To define positive semidefiniteness, we do not assume that A is symmetric.)

(b) Following [7], we say that A is almost positive definite if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, either $x'Ax > 0$ or $Ax = 0$. Suppose A is almost positive definite. Then the Moore-Penrose inverse of A is also almost positive definite: see Corollary 2 in [7].

(vii) Let $B = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$, where each A_i is an $s \times s$ matrix. As before, we say that A_j is the j^{th} block of B . Let $\text{Diag}(B)$ be the $ns \times ns$ block matrix

$$\text{Diag}(A_1, \dots, A_n).$$

(vii) We use $[n]$ for $\{1, \dots, n\}$. The zero matrix of order $s \times s$ ($s \geq 2$) will be denoted by O_s . The identity matrix of order k will be denoted by I_k .

(viii) Let $A = [a_{ij}]$ be an $m \times m$ matrix. We say that A is row diagonally dominant if

$$|a_{ii}| \geq \sum_{\{j:j \neq i\}} |a_{ij}|.$$

We shall use the following well known result on diagonally dominant matrices.

Theorem 2. *Let A be row diagonally dominant. Suppose A is non-singular. Let $B := A^{-1}$ and $B = [b_{ij}]$. Then,*

$$|b_{ii}| \geq |b_{ji}| \quad \forall j.$$

3 Results

To prove our main result, we need to show that the Laplacian of \mathcal{G} has certain properties.

3.1 Properties of the Laplacian

From the digraph $\mathcal{G} = (V, \mathcal{E})$, we define a simple undirected graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ as follows.

Definition 1. Let $V(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}) := \{1, \dots, n\}$. We say that any two vertices $i, j \in V(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})$ are adjacent in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if either $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ or $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Definition 2. To an edge (i, j) of \tilde{G} , define

$$\tilde{W}_{ij} := \begin{cases} (W_{ij}^{-1} + W_{ji}^{-1})^{-1} & (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \in \mathcal{E} \\ W_{ij} & (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \notin \mathcal{E} \\ W_{ji} & (i, j) \notin \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We now have the weighted graph \tilde{G} . Let E be the set of all edges of \tilde{G} .

Definition 3. The Laplacian of \tilde{G} is the matrix $L(\tilde{G}) = [M_{ij}] \in B^{ns}$, where the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block is defined as follows:

$$M_{ij} := \begin{cases} -\tilde{W}_{ij}^{-1} & (i, j) \in E \\ O_s & i \neq j \text{ and } (i, j) \notin E \\ \sum_{\{k:k \neq i\}} \tilde{W}_{ik}^{-1} & i = j. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

We now have the following proposition. Recall that L is the Laplacian of \mathcal{G} .

Proposition 1. $L(\tilde{G}) = L + L'$.

Proof. We shall write

$$A = L + L' \text{ and } M = L(\tilde{G}).$$

Let the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of A be A_{ij} and L be L_{ij} . We need to show that

$$A_{ij} = M_{ij} \text{ for all } i, j \in V,$$

where M_{ij} is defined in (8). Note that $A_{ij} = L_{ij} + L_{ji}$. Partition the set of all edges E of \tilde{G} as follows:

$$S_1 := \{(i, j) \in E : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \notin \mathcal{E}\}$$

$$S_2 := \{(i, j) \in E : (i, j) \notin \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$$

$$S_3 := \{(i, j) \in E : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Fix i and j in $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: Suppose i and j are not adjacent in \tilde{G} . This means $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $(j, i) \notin \mathcal{E}$. So, $L_{ij} = O_s$ and $L_{ji} = O_s$. By (8), $M_{ij} = O_s$. Therefore,

$$A_{ij} = L_{ij} + L_{ji} = O_s = M_{ij}.$$

Case 2: Suppose i and j are adjacent in \tilde{G} . We consider three possible sub-cases.

Case (i): Let $(i, j) \in S_1$. Then, by (7), $\tilde{W}_{ij} = W_{ij}$. So, $M_{ij} = -W_{ij}^{-1}$. Because the weight of the edge (i, j) in \mathcal{G} is W_{ij} , $L_{ij} = -W_{ij}^{-1}$. Since $(j, i) \notin \mathcal{E}$, $L_{ji} = O_s$ and therefore,

$$A_{ij} = L_{ij} + L_{ji} = -W_{ij}^{-1} = M_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

Case (ii): Let $(i, j) \in S_2$. Then, by (7), $\widetilde{W}_{ij} = W_{ji}$. So, $M_{ij} = -W_{ji}^{-1}$. As $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{E}$, $L_{ij} = O_s$. The weight of the edge (j, i) in \mathcal{G} is W_{ji}^{-1} . So, $L_{ji} = -W_{ji}^{-1}$; and hence

$$A_{ij} = L_{ij} + L_{ji} = -W_{ji}^{-1} = M_{ij}. \quad (10)$$

Case 3: Let $(i, j) \in S_3$. Then,

$$\widetilde{W}_{ij} = (W_{ij}^{-1} + W_{ji}^{-1})^{-1}.$$

So,

$$M_{ij} = -\widetilde{W}_{ij}^{-1} = -(W_{ij}^{-1} + W_{ji}^{-1}).$$

The weights of the edges (i, j) and (j, i) in \mathcal{G} are respectively, W_{ij} and W_{ji} . So,

$$L_{ij} = -W_{ij}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{ji} = -W_{ji}^{-1}.$$

Thus,

$$A_{ij} = L_{ij} + L_{ji} = -(W_{ij}^{-1} + W_{ji}^{-1}) = M_{ij}. \quad (11)$$

Since

$$(L + L')U = MU = O_s,$$

it follows that $A_{ii} = M_{ii}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. The proof is complete. \square

We now deduce some properties of the Laplacian matrix L of \mathcal{G} .

Proposition 2. *The following are true.*

- (i) L is positive semidefinite.
- (ii) $\text{null}(L) = \text{null}(L') = \text{col}(J)$.
- (iii) L^\dagger is almost positive definite.
- (iv) $LL^\dagger = L^\dagger L = I_{ns} - \frac{J}{n}$.

Proof. Consider the undirected graph $\widetilde{G} = (V, E)$ in Definition 1. Put $\widetilde{L} = L(\widetilde{G})$ and $S_{ij} = \widetilde{W}_{ij}^{-1}$, where \widetilde{W}_{ij} are defined in (7). Corresponding to an edge (p, q) in \widetilde{G} , we now define $\widetilde{S}(p, q) \in B^{ns}$ with (i, j) th block given by

$$\widetilde{S}(p, q)_{ij} := \begin{cases} -S_{pq} & (i, j) = (p, q) \quad \text{or} \quad (i, j) = (q, p) \\ S_{pq} & i = j = p \quad \text{or} \quad i = j = q \\ O_s & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Now,

$$\widetilde{L} = \sum_{(p,q) \in E} \widetilde{S}(p, q).$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{ns}$. Write

$$x = (x^1, \dots, x^j, \dots, x^n)', \quad \text{where each } x^i \in \mathbb{R}^s.$$

By an easy verification, we find that, if $(p, q) \in E$, then

$$x' \tilde{S}(p, q)x = \langle S_{pq}(x^p - x^q), x^p - x^q \rangle.$$

Thus,

$$x' \tilde{L}x = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \langle S_{ij}(x^i - x^j), x^i - x^j \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Each S_{ij} is a positive definite matrix. So, $x' \tilde{L}x \geq 0$. By Proposition 1, $\tilde{L} = L + L'$. Therefore, $x' \tilde{L}x = 2x' Lx$. So, $x' Lx \geq 0$. This proves (i).

Let $x \in \text{null}(L)$. As, $\tilde{L} = L + L'$, we see that $x' \tilde{L}x = 0$. By (12), if $(i, j) \in E$, then $x^i = x^j$. Because \mathcal{G} is strongly connected, $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is connected. So, $x^i = x^j$ for all i, j . Thus,

$$x \in \text{span}\{(w, \dots, w)' \in \mathbb{R}^{ns} : w \in \mathbb{R}^s\}.$$

Since, $\text{col}(J) = \text{span}\{(w, \dots, w) : w \in \mathbb{R}^s\}$, we see that $x = Jp$ for some $w \in \mathbb{R}^s$. So, $\text{null}(L) = \text{col}(J)$. Now, \mathcal{G}' is a strongly connected, and balanced digraph. Because L' is the Laplacian of \mathcal{G}' , we see that $\text{null}(L') = \text{col}(J)$. This proves (ii).

We now prove (iii). Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{ns}$. Since L is positive semidefinite, $y' Ly \geq 0$. Suppose $y' Ly = 0$. Then, $y' \tilde{L}y = 0$. By equation (12), it follows that $y \in \text{col}(J)$. Since $\text{col}(J) = \text{null}(L)$, we have $Ly = 0$. Thus, either $y' Ly > 0$ or $Ly = 0$. So, L is almost positive definite. By item (vi) in Section 2, L^\dagger is almost positive definite as well. This proves (iii).

To prove (iv), we show that

$$LL^\dagger v = v \quad \text{for all } v \in \text{null}(J).$$

Let $v \in \text{null}(J)$. Suppose $LL^\dagger v = w$. Then,

$$Jw = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L^\dagger LL^\dagger v = L^\dagger w.$$

Since $L^\dagger LL^\dagger = L^\dagger$, we get $L^\dagger v = L^\dagger w$ and hence $v - w \in \text{null}(L^\dagger)$. As $\text{null}(L^\dagger) = \text{col}(J)$, we get

$$v - w \in \text{col}(J).$$

Since $JLL^\dagger v = Jw$, and $JL = O_{ns}$, $Jw = 0$. As $v \in \text{null}(J)$, $Jv = 0$. So, $J(v - w) = 0$ and hence

$$v - w \in \text{null}(J).$$

We now have $v - w \in \text{null}(J) \cap \text{col}(J)$. So, $v = w$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 3. $\Delta(L^\dagger)$ is a positive definite matrix.

Proof. We recall that $\Delta(L^\dagger) = \text{Diag}(K_{11}, \dots, K_{nn})$. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We show that K_{ii} is positive definite. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^s$. Define $q := (q^1, \dots, q^n)' \in \mathbb{R}^{ns}$ by

$$q^j := \begin{cases} y & j = i \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In view of previous lemma, L^\dagger is almost positive definite. So, $q'L^\dagger q > 0$ or $L^\dagger q = 0$. We note that $q'L^\dagger q = y'K_{ii}y$. Hence, if $q'L^\dagger q > 0$, then $y'K_{ii}y > 0$. Suppose $L^\dagger q = 0$. Since $\text{null}(L^\dagger) = \text{null}(L')$ and $\text{null}(L') = \text{col}(J)$, $q = 0$. This means y is zero. So, K_{ii} is positive definite. The proof is complete. \square

3.2 Inverse formula

Recall that the generalized resistance matrix of \mathcal{G} corresponding to two positive real numbers a and b is

$$R_{a,b} := [R_{ij}] = [a^2 L_{ii}^\dagger + b^2 L_{jj}^\dagger - 2ab L_{ij}^\dagger].$$

Define

$$\tau_i := 2abI_s + L_{ii}R_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1} R_{ji} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (13)$$

Now, let τ be the $ns \times s$ matrix $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)'$. The inverse formula will be proved by using the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *The following are true.*

- (i) $\tau = a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U + \frac{2ab}{n} U$.
- (ii) $\tau' + a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) (L - L') = a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L + \frac{2ab}{n} U'$.
- (iii) $LR_{a,b} + 2abI_{ns} = \tau U'$.
- (iv) $R_{a,b}L + 2abI_{ns} = U\tau' - a^2 UU' \Delta(L^\dagger) L' + b^2 UU' \Delta(L^\dagger) L$.
- (v) $U'\tau = 2abI_s$.
- (vi) $\tau' R_{a,b} \tau = 2a^3 b^3 \tilde{X}' L \tilde{X} + \frac{1}{n} 4a^2 b^2 (a^2 + b^2) \sum_{i=1}^n K_{ii}$, where $\tilde{X} := \Delta(L^\dagger) U$.
- (vii) $\tau' R_{a,b} \tau$ is a positive definite matrix.

Proof. Fix $i \in [n]$. For simplicity, we shall use R for $R_{a,b}$. Since $L = [L_{ij}]$ and $L^\dagger = [K_{ij}]$, the (i, j) th block of LL^\dagger is the $s \times s$ matrix

$$L_{ii}K_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1} K_{ji}.$$

The $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of $I_{ns} - \frac{J}{n}$ is $(1 - \frac{1}{n})I_s$. Since $LL^\dagger = I_{ns} - \frac{1}{n}J$, we see that

$$L_{ii}K_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{ji} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})I_s.$$

Rewriting the above equation, we have

$$\sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{ji} = L_{ii}K_{ii} - (1 - \frac{1}{n})I_s. \quad (14)$$

By definition,

$$\tau_i = 2abI_s + L_{ii}R_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}R_{ji}.$$

Because

$$R_{ji} = a^2K_{jj} + b^2K_{ii} - 2abK_{ji} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{ii} = (a - b)^2K_{ii},$$

we have

$$\tau_i = 2abI_s + (a - b)^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}(a^2K_{jj} + b^2K_{ii} - 2abK_{ji}). \quad (15)$$

We recall that

$$L_{ii} = \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}.$$

So,

$$\sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{ii} = L_{ii}K_{ii}. \quad (16)$$

Substituting (16) in (15),

$$\tau_i = 2abI_s + (a - b)^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - b^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - a^2 \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{jj} + 2ab \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{ji}.$$

Using (14) in the above equation, we get

$$\tau_i = 2abI_s + (a - b)^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - b^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - a^2 \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{jj} + 2abL_{ii}K_{ii} - 2ab(1 - \frac{1}{n})I_s.$$

After simplification,

$$\tau_i = a^2L_{ii}K_{ii} - a^2 \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1}K_{jj} + \frac{2ab}{n}I_s. \quad (17)$$

Let $A := \text{Diag}(L) - L$. Write $A = [A_{ij}]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} W_{ij}^{-1} K_{jj} &= \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} K_{jj} \\ &= (A\Delta(L^\dagger)U)_i. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We now compute AU . Because

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} O_s & -L_{12} & -L_{13} & \dots & -L_{1n} \\ -L_{21} & O_s & -L_{23} & \dots & -L_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -L_{n1} & -L_{n2} & -L_{n3} & \dots & O_s \end{bmatrix},$$

it follows that

$$(AU)_i = - \sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} L_{ij}.$$

Put

$$P := \Delta(L^\dagger)U.$$

Then,

$$P_i = K_{ii}.$$

Thus,

$$(\text{Diag}(AU)P)_i = - \sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} L_{ij} K_{ii}.$$

As $\sum_{j=1}^n L_{ij} = O_s$, we get

$$(\text{Diag}(AU)P)_i = - \sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} L_{ij} K_{ii} = L_{ii} K_{ii}. \quad (19)$$

By (17), (18) and (19),

$$\tau_i = a^2(\text{Diag}(AU)P - AP)_i + \frac{2ab}{n} I_s. \quad (20)$$

Put

$$\tilde{A} := \text{Diag}(AU) - A.$$

In view of (20),

$$\tau_i = a^2(\tilde{A}P)_i + \frac{2ab}{n} I_s. \quad (21)$$

But a direct verification tells that

$$\tilde{A} = L.$$

Therefore by (21),

$$\tau = a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U + \frac{2ab}{n} U.$$

This proves (i).

We now prove (ii). Put $M := L - L'$. Then by (i),

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) M + \tau' &= a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L - a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L' + a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L' + \frac{2ab}{n} U' \\ &= a^2 U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L + \frac{2ab}{n} U'. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The proof of (ii) is complete.

We now prove (iii). Since

$$R_{ij} = a^2 L_{ii}^\dagger + b^2 L_{jj}^\dagger - 2ab L_{ij}^\dagger,$$

and $R = [R_{ij}]$, it is easy to see that

$$R = a^2 \Delta(L^\dagger) U U' + b^2 U U' \Delta(L^\dagger) - 2ab L^\dagger.$$

As $LL^\dagger = I_{ns} - \frac{1}{n} U U'$ and $LU = O_s$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} LR &= a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U U' - 2ab L L^\dagger \\ &= a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U U' + \frac{2ab}{n} U U' - 2ab I_{ns} \\ &= (a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U + \frac{2ab}{n} U) U' - 2ab I_{ns}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By (i),

$$\tau = a^2 L \Delta(L^\dagger) U + \frac{2ab}{n} U.$$

Hence,

$$LR = \tau U' - 2ab I_{ns}.$$

This completes the proof of (iii).

To prove (iv), first we observe that

$$RL = b^2 U U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L - 2ab L^\dagger L.$$

Since $L^\dagger L = I_{ns} - \frac{1}{n} U U'$, we get

$$RL + 2ab I_{ns} = b^2 U U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L + \frac{2ab}{n} U U'. \quad (24)$$

By (i),

$$U \tau' = a^2 U U' \Delta(L^\dagger) L' + \frac{2ab}{n} U U'. \quad (25)$$

From (24) and (25),

$$RL + 2abI_{ns} = U\tau' - a^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L.$$

The proof of (iv) is complete.

By item (i),

$$U'\tau = a^2U'LD(L^\dagger)U + \frac{2ab}{n}U'U.$$

As $U'U = I_{ns}$ and $U'L = O_s$, it follows that

$$U'\tau = 2abI_{ns}.$$

This proves (v).

Put $M = L - L'$. By (ii),

$$\tau'R\tau = (a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L + \frac{2ab}{n}U' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)M)R\tau. \quad (26)$$

Because $M = L - L'$,

$$a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L + \frac{2ab}{n}U' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)M = a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + \frac{2ab}{n}U'.$$

Substituting for τ from (i) in (26), we get

$$\tau'R\tau = (a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + \frac{2ab}{n}U')R(a^2L\Delta(L^\dagger)U + \frac{2ab}{n}U).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau'R\tau &= a^4U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U + \frac{2a^3b}{n}U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RU + \frac{2a^3b}{n}U'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U \\ &\quad + \frac{4a^2b^2}{n^2}U'RU. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

As

$$LU = L'U = O_s \quad \text{and} \quad R = a^2\Delta(L^\dagger)UU' + b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger) - 2abL^\dagger,$$

we have

$$U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U = -2abU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'L^\dagger L\Delta(L^\dagger)U.$$

Since $L^\dagger L = I_{ns} - \frac{1}{n}UU'$ and $L'U = O_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U &= -2abU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' \left(I_{ns} - \frac{1}{n}UU' \right) \Delta(L^\dagger)U \\ &= -2abU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'\Delta(L^\dagger)U. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Define

$$\tilde{X} := \Delta(L^\dagger)U.$$

Then,

$$\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X} = U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L\Delta(L^\dagger)U. \quad (29)$$

By (28),

$$U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U = -2ab\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X}.$$

In view of (iv) and (i), we have

$$RL + 2abI_{ns} = U\tau' - a^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L;$$

$$U\tau' = a^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + \frac{2ab}{n}UU'.$$

These two equations imply

$$RL = b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L + \frac{2ab}{n}UU' - 2abI_{ns}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} U'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U &= U'\left(b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L + \frac{2ab}{n}UU' - 2abI_{ns}\right)\Delta(L^\dagger)U \\ &= (b^2n)U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L\Delta(L^\dagger)U. \end{aligned}$$

By (29),

$$U'RL\Delta(L^\dagger)U = b^2n\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X}. \quad (30)$$

We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'RU &= U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'(a^2\Delta(L^\dagger)UU' + b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger) - 2abL^\dagger)U \\ &= a^2nU'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'\Delta(L^\dagger)U \\ &= a^2n\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the second equality follows from $L'U = L^\dagger U = O_s$ and the last one from (29). Since

$$R = a^2\Delta(L^\dagger)UU' + b^2UU'\Delta(L^\dagger) - 2abL^\dagger,$$

we see that

$$U'RU = n(a^2 + b^2) \sum_{i=1}^n K_{ii}. \quad (32)$$

Substituting (28), (30), (31) and (32) in (27), we get

$$\tau'R\tau = 2a^3b^3\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X} + \frac{4a^2b^2(a^2 + b^2)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{ii}.$$

The proof of (vi) is complete.

Since L is positive semidefinite, $\tilde{X}'L\tilde{X}$ is positive semidefinite. By Proposition (3), each K_{ii} is positive definite. So, $\tau'R\tau$ is positive definite. This proves (vii). The proof is complete. \square

We prove the inverse formula in Theorem 1.

Theorem 3.

$$R_{a,b}^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2ab}L + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L).$$

Proof. Again, as in the proof of above lemma, we shall use $R_{a,b}$ for R . By item (iii) of Lemma 1,

$$LR + 2abI_{ns} = \tau U'.$$

In view of item (v) of the previous Lemma, $U'\tau = 2abI_s$. So,

$$LR\tau + 2ab\tau = \tau U'\tau = 2ab\tau.$$

This implies

$$LR\tau = O_s.$$

We know that

$$\text{null}(L) = \text{span}\{(p, \dots, p)'\} : p \in \mathbb{R}^s\}.$$

So,

$$R\tau = UC,$$

where C is a $s \times s$ matrix. Since $\tau'R\tau$ is a positive definite matrix, $R\tau$ cannot be zero. Hence, $C \neq O_s$. As $\tau'U = 2abI_s$, we get

$$C = \frac{1}{2ab}\tau'R\tau.$$

Therefore,

$$R\tau = \frac{1}{2ab}U(\tau'R\tau). \quad (33)$$

Since $L'U = O_s$, from item (iv) of Lemma 1, we deduce that

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)(RL + 2abI_{ns}) = 2ab(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L).$$

Simplifying the above equation, we get

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)RL = O_s. \quad (34)$$

We now claim that

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)R \neq O_s.$$

If not, then

$$\tau'R\tau - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'R\tau + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L'R\tau = O_s. \quad (35)$$

By (33),

$$R\tau = \frac{1}{2ab}U\tau'R\tau.$$

So,

$$LR\tau = O_s \quad \text{and} \quad L'R\tau = O_s.$$

Hence (35) leads to $\tau'R\tau = O_s$. This contradicts that $\tau'R\tau$ is positive definite. Hence,

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)R \neq O_s.$$

Since nullity of L' is s and $L'U = O_s$, by (34), there exists an $s \times s$ matrix \tilde{C} such that

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)(L^\dagger)L)R = \tilde{C}U'.$$

We know that $U'\tau = 2abI_s$. So, from the previous equation,

$$\tilde{C} = \frac{1}{2ab}\tau'R\tau.$$

Thus,

$$(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)R = \frac{\tau'R\tau}{2ab}U'. \quad (36)$$

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} Q &:= \left(-\frac{1}{2ab}L + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L) \right) R \\ &= -\frac{1}{2ab}LR + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - a^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + b^2U'\Delta(L^\dagger)L)R. \end{aligned}$$

By (36), we have

$$Q = -\frac{1}{2ab}(LR - \tau U'). \quad (37)$$

Item (iii) of Lemma 1 says that

$$LR + 2abI_{ns} = \tau U'.$$

Substituting back in (37), we get $Q = I_{ns}$. The proof is complete. \square

3.3 Special cases

- (i) Suppose all the weights in \mathcal{G} are equal to 1. Choose $a = b = 1$. We shall denote R_{ij} by r_{ij} and define $R := [r_{ij}]$. Now by (13),

$$\tau_i = 2 - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\}} r_{ji}.$$

We note that $r_{ii} = 0$ and $U = \mathbf{1}$. Hence, by our formula in Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-1} &= -\frac{1}{2}L + \tau(\tau'R\tau)^{-1}(\tau' - \mathbf{1}'\Delta(L^\dagger)L' + \mathbf{1}'\Delta(L^\dagger)L) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}L + \frac{\tau}{\tau'R\tau}(\tau' - \mathbf{1}'\Delta(L^\dagger)(L - L')). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get (6).

(ii) Suppose T is a tree with $V(T) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. To denote an edge in T , we shall use the notation ij . Let the weight of an edge ij be W_{ij} . Assume that all weights are positive definite matrices of order s . Now, define a directed graph \tilde{T} as follows. Let $V(\tilde{T}) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We use the notation (i, j) to denote a directed edge from i to j . Now, we define $E(\tilde{T}) := \{(i, j), (j, i) : ij \in E(T)\}$. Now we assign the weight W_{pq} to an edge (p, q) in \tilde{T} . It is clear that \tilde{T} is strongly connected, weighted and balanced digraph. Now define the Laplacian matrix of T , say, $L(T)$ as given in 1.4 and the Laplacian of \tilde{T} , say, $L(\tilde{T})$ as given in item (i) of 1.6. We note that $L(T) = L(\tilde{T})$. Fix $a = b = 1$. Let R_{ij} be the resistance between i and j . Then,

$$R_{ij} = M_{ii} + M_{jj} - 2M_{ij},$$

where M_{ij} is the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ block of the Moore Penrose inverse of $L(\tilde{T})$. If D_{ij} is the shortest distance between i and j in T , then by the argument mentioned in 1.4, $D_{ij} = R_{ij}$. Define $D := [D_{ij}]$. Because $D_{ii} = O_s$, by Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &:= 2I_s - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in E\}} W_{ij}^{-1} R_{ji} \\ &= 2I_s - \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in E\}} W_{ij}^{-1} W_{ij} \\ &= (2 - \delta_i)I_s, \end{aligned}$$

where δ_i is the out-degree of the vertex i . We now define

$$\tau := (2 - \delta_1, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)' \otimes I_s.$$

By an induction argument it follows that if S is the sum of all the weights in T , then

$$D\tau = [S, \dots, S]'$$

(See Lemma 1 in [8]). Because T is a tree, $\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i = 2(n-1)$. Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i = 2I_s$ and hence $\tau' D \tau = 2S$. By our formula in Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} D^{-1} &= -\frac{1}{2}L(T) + \tau(\tau' D \tau)^{-1} \tau' \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}L(T) + \frac{1}{2}\tau S \tau'. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

This is formula (5).

In a similar manner, we get (2), (3), and (4).

3.4 Non-negativity of the resistance

From numerical computations, we observe that $R_{ij} = a^2 l_{ii}^\dagger + b^2 l_{jj}^\dagger - 2abl_{ij}^\dagger$ is always positive semidefinite. But at this stage, we do not know how to prove this. However, when all the weights in \mathcal{G} are positive scalars, we now show that the resistance is always non-negative. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let $A = [a_{ij}]$ be an $n \times n$ matrix with the following properties.*

- (i) *All the off-diagonal entries are non-positive.*
- (ii) $A\mathbf{1} = A'\mathbf{1} = 0$.
- (iii) $\text{rank}(A + A') = n - 1$.
- (iv) *A is positive semidefinite.*

Let $A^\dagger := [p_{ij}]$ be the Moore-Penrose inverse of A . Then,

$$p_{ii} \geq p_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{ii} \geq p_{ji} \quad \forall j.$$

Proof. By a permutation similarity argument, without loss of generality, we may assume that $i = 1$ and $j = n$. We now show that $p_{11} \geq p_{1n}$ and $p_{11} \geq p_{n1}$. By symmetry of our assumptions, it suffices to show that $p_{11} \geq p_{1n}$.

Let $\mathbf{1}_{n-1}$ be the vector of all ones in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . By (ii) we can partition A as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} B & -B\mathbf{1}_{n-1} \\ -\mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B & \mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B\mathbf{1}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

All the row sums of $A + A'$ are equal to zero. So, all the cofactors of $A + A'$ are equal. As $\text{rank}(A + A') = n - 1$, we now deduce that the common cofactor of $A + A'$ is non-zero. In particular, $\det(B + B') \neq 0$. Since A is positive semidefinite, $B + B'$ is positive semidefinite. Because $B + B'$ is non-singular, $B + B'$ is positive definite. So, B is positive definite. All the off-diagonal entries of B are non-positive. By a well-known theorem on \mathbf{Z} -matrices, B is non-singular and all entries of B^{-1} are non-negative. By a direct verification,

$$A^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_{n-1}\mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B^{-1} - \frac{1}{n}B^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{n-1}\mathbf{1}'_{n-1} & -\frac{1}{n}B^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{n-1} \\ -\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{n-1}}{n^2}(\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'). \quad (39)$$

Put

$$C = [c_{ij}] := B^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta := \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbf{1}'_{n-1}B^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{n-1}.$$

Then, $c_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j$ and

$$p_{11} = c_{11} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{j1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{1j} + \delta,$$

$$p_{1n} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{1j} + \delta.$$

Now,

$$p_{11} - p_{1n} = c_{11} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{i1}.$$

By Theorem 2,

$$c_{11} \geq c_{j1} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

So,

$$-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{i1} \geq -\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)c_{11}.$$

Hence,

$$c_{11} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{i1} \geq c_{11} - \frac{n-1}{n}c_{11} = \frac{1}{n}c_{11}.$$

Since $c_{11} \geq 0$, we conclude that

$$p_{11} - p_{1n} \geq 0.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Now it can be easily shown that any generalized resistance is non-negative.

Theorem 4. *Suppose all the weights in \mathcal{G} are positive scalars. Let $a, b > 0$. Let $L^\dagger = [k_{ij}]$ be the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian of \mathcal{G} . Then,*

$$r_{ij} := a^2 k_{ii} + b^2 k_{jj} - 2abk_{ij} \geq 0.$$

Proof. We note that the Laplacian matrix L of \mathcal{G} satisfies all the conditions of the previous lemma. Moreover, by Proposition 3, k_{ii} and k_{jj} are positive. As a consequence of Lemma 2, we deduce that

$$\min(k_{ii}, k_{jj}) \geq \max(k_{ij}, k_{ji}).$$

Now

$$a^2 k_{ii} + b^2 k_{jj} - 2abk_{ij} \geq 0,$$

follows from the arithmetic mean and geometric mean inequality. \square

3.5 A perturbation result

We now show that if R is the resistance matrix of a connected graph with n vertices, and if L is the Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} with positive scalar weights, then $(R^{-1} - L)^{-1}$ has all entries non-negative.

Theorem 5. *Let H be a simple (undirected) connected graph with n vertices and R be the resistance matrix of H . Assume that all the weights in \mathcal{G} are positive scalars. Then, $R^{-1} - L$ is non-singular and every entry in $(R^{-1} - L)^{-1}$ is non-negative.*

Proof. Let $M = [m_{ij}]$ be the Moore-Penrose inverse of the Laplacian matrix of H . Then the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ entry r_{ij} of R is given by

$$r_{ij} = m_{ii} + m_{jj} - 2m_{ij}.$$

Fix $\alpha \geq 0$. Define $S := \alpha L$. We complete the proof by using the following claims.

Claim 1: $R^{-1} - S$ is non-singular.

To prove this claim, we can assume that $S = \alpha L$, where $\alpha > 0$. By Proposition 2, $\text{rank}(S) = n - 1$, $S + S'$ is positive semidefinite and $S'\mathbf{1} = S\mathbf{1} = 0$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that

$$(R^{-1} - S)(x) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Put $u := R^{-1}x$. Assuming $u \neq 0$, we now get a contradiction. As $\mathbf{1}'S = 0$, it follows that $\mathbf{1}'R^{-1}x = 0$ and hence $u \in \mathbf{1}^\perp$. Writing

$$R = \text{Diag}(M)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}' + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'\text{Diag}(M) - 2M,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} u'Ru &= u'(\text{Diag}(M)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}' + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'\text{Diag}(M) - 2M)u \\ &= -2u'Mu. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{null}(M) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$, M is positive definite on $\mathbf{1}^\perp$. So, $u'Mu > 0$. Hence,

$$u'Ru < 0. \quad (41)$$

It is easy to see that

$$u'Ru = x'R^{-1}x \quad (42)$$

By (40),

$$x'R^{-1}x = x'Sx.$$

Since $S + S'$ is positive semidefinite, $x'Sx \geq 0$. So, $x'R^{-1}x \geq 0$. Hence by (42),

$$u'Ru \geq 0. \quad (43)$$

Thus, we get a contradiction from (41) and (43). Therefore, $u = R^{-1}x = 0$. This implies $x = 0$. So, $R^{-1} - S$ is non-singular. The claim is proved.

Claim 2: If C is a $k \times k$ proper principal submatrix of $S - R^{-1}$, then

$$q'Cq > 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 \neq q \in \mathbb{R}^k.$$

If A is an $n \times n$ matrix, we shall use the notation $A[i]$ to denote the principal submatrix of A obtained by deleting the i^{th} row and i^{th} column of A . Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$ and define

$$B := S[i] - R^{-1}[i].$$

Since R is negative definite on $\mathbf{1}^\perp$ and the diagonal entries are zero, R has exactly one positive eigenvalue. By an application of interlacing theorem, we see that $-R^{-1}[i]$ is positive semidefinite. Hence

$$-p'R^{-1}[i]p \geq 0 \text{ for all } w \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \quad (44)$$

As the row sums and the column sums of S are equal to zero, it follows that all the cofactors of S are equal. Because $S + S'$ is positive semidefinite and has rank $n - 1$, it follows that every proper principal submatrix of $S + S'$ is positive definite. So, we have

$$p'S[i]p > 0 \text{ for all } 0 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \quad (45)$$

By (44) and (45),

$$p'Bp > 0 \text{ for all } 0 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

The claim is proved.

In particular, we note that all principal minors of $S - R^{-1}$ with order less than n are positive.

Claim 3: $\det(S - R^{-1}) < 0$.

Because $\gamma L - R^{-1}$ is non-singular for every $\gamma \geq 0$,

$$\text{sgn } \det(\gamma L - R^{-1}) = \text{sgn } \det(-R^{-1}).$$

Since $-R$ has exactly one negative eigenvalue, $\det(-R^{-1}) < 0$. So,

$$\det(\gamma L - R^{-1}) < 0 \quad \forall \gamma \geq 0.$$

This proves the claim.

Claim 4: All principal minors of $(S - R^{-1})^{-1}$ are negative.

Put

$$G := (S - R^{-1})^{-1} \text{ and } H := S - R^{-1}.$$

Let $s < n$, and let \widehat{G} be a $s \times s$ principal submatrix of G . Suppose \widehat{H} is the complementary submatrix of \widehat{G} in H . By Jacobi identity,

$$\det(\widehat{G}) = \frac{\det(\widehat{H})}{\det(H)}.$$

By claim 2 and 3,

$$\text{sgn}(\det \widehat{H}) > 0 \text{ and } \text{sgn}(\det(H)) < 0.$$

So, $\det(\widehat{G}) < 0$. The claim is proved.

We now complete the proof of the theorem. Given $\beta \geq 0$, let

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{ii}(\beta) & y_{ij}(\beta) \\ y_{ji}(\beta) & y_{jj}(\beta) \end{bmatrix}$$

denote a 2×2 principal submatrix of $(\beta L - R^{-1})^{-1}$. By claim 4,

$$y_{ii}(\beta) < 0 \text{ and } y_{jj}(\beta) < 0 \text{ for all } \beta \geq 0. \quad (46)$$

We now show that $y_{ij}(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \geq 0$. Since $y_{ij}(0) = -r_{ij}$, $y_{ij}(0) < 0$. If $y_{ij}(\alpha) > 0$ for some $\alpha > 0$, then by continuity, $y_{ij}(\delta) = 0$ for some $\delta > 0$. Hence by (46),

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} y_{ii}(\delta) & y_{ij}(\delta) \\ y_{ji}(\delta) & y_{jj}(\delta) \end{pmatrix} = y_{ii}(\delta)y_{jj}(\delta) > 0.$$

However by claim 4,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} y_{ii}(\delta) & y_{ij}(\delta) \\ y_{ji}(\delta) & y_{jj}(\delta) \end{pmatrix} < 0.$$

Thus, we have a contradiction. So, $y_{ij}(\alpha) \leq 0$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$. We now conclude that every entry in $(L - R^{-1})^{-1}$ is negative. The proof is complete. \square

We illustrate the above result with an example.

Example 2. Consider the graphs H and \mathcal{G} given in Figure 2. Let the positive scalar




Figure 2: (a) Graph H , and (b) Graph \mathcal{G} .

weights w_{ij} assigned to each edge (i, j) of \mathcal{G} be

$$w_{14} = w_{21} = \frac{10}{7}, \quad w_{32} = w_{43} = 5 \text{ and } w_{42} = 2.$$

The Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} is

$$L = \frac{1}{10} \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 0 & 0 & -7 \\ -7 & 7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -5 & -2 & 7 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The resistance matrix R of H is

$$R = \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 0 & 3 & 4 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now,

$$(R^{-1} - L)^{-1} = \frac{1}{8612} \begin{bmatrix} 2335 & 6555 & 7515 & 5125 \\ 5125 & 2585 & 6905 & 6915 \\ 7515 & 5975 & 1135 & 6905 \\ 6555 & 6415 & 5975 & 2585 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is a non-negative matrix.

Funding

The second author acknowledges the support of the Indian National Science Academy under the INSA Senior Scientist scheme.

References

- [1] Bapat RB. Graphs and matrices. New Delhi: Hindustan Book Agency; 2018.
- [2] Klein DJ, Rándic M. Resistance distance. J Math Chem. 1993;12:81–95.
- [3] Graham RL, Lovasz L. Distance matrix polynomials of trees. Adv in Math. 1978;29(1):60–88.
- [4] Bapat R, Kirkland SJ, Neumann M. On distance matrices and Laplacians. Linear Algebra Appl. 2005;401:193–209.
- [5] Balaji R, Bapat RB. Block distance matrices. Electron J Linear Algebra. 2007;16:435-443.
- [6] Balaji R, Bapat RB and and Goel S. Resistance matrices of balanced directed graphs. Linear Multilinear Algebra. 2020;1–22. DOI:10.1080/03081087.2020.1748850
- [7] Lewis TO, Newman TG. Pseudoinverses of positive semidefinite matrices. SIAM J Appl Math. 1968;16:701-703.
- [8] Bapat RB. Determinant of the distance matrix of a tree with matrix weights. Linear Algebra Appl. 2006;416:2-7.