EXTREME VALUES OF THE FIEDLER VECTOR ON TREES

ROY R. LEDERMAN AND STEFAN STEINERBERGER

Abstract. Let $G$ be a tree on $n$ vertices and let $L = D - A$ denote the Laplacian matrix on $G$. The second-smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_2(G) > 0$, also known as the algebraic connectivity, as well as the associated eigenvector $\phi_2$ have been of substantial interest. We investigate the question of when the maxima and minima of $\phi_2$ are assumed at the endpoints of the longest path in $G$. Our results also apply to more general graphs that 'behave globally' like a tree but can exhibit more complicated local structure. The crucial new ingredient is a reproducing formula for the eigenvector $\phi_k$.

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple, undirected, unweighted, connected graph on $n$ vertices $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$. The adjacency $A$ encodes the connections between the vertices s.t. $A_{ij} = 1$ if the $i$ and $j$ are connected by an edge $(i, j) \in E$ (and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise). The degree matrix $D$ is the diagonal matrix $d_{ii} = \deg(v_i) = \sum_j A_{ij}$. The Laplacian matrix of the graph is defined as

$$L = D - A.$$ 

The Laplacian is symmetric and its quadratic form representation immediately implies that all its eigenvalues are nonnegative: if $f : V \to \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\langle f, Lf \rangle = \sum_{u \sim v} (f(u) - f(v))^2. \tag{1}$$

We order its eigenvalues by their size

$$\lambda_n(G) \geq \lambda_{n-1}(G) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \lambda_1(G) = 0.$$ 

We refer to [11][13][31] for an introduction to the spectral theory on graphs. It is not difficult to see that the unique eigenvector associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_1(G) = 0$ is the vector having constant entries and that

$$\lambda_2(G) = \min_{x \perp 1} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - x_j)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2}. \tag{2}$$

This shows that $\lambda_2(G) > 0$ if and only if $G$ is connected. Any eigenvector $\phi_2$ associated to the second smallest eigenvalue is also known as the Fiedler vector [16][17][18][19][41]. The following seminal result for the aforementioned graph $G$ and an associated eigenvector $\phi_2$, is due to Fiedler [18].
Theorem (Fiedler). The induced subgraph of $G = (V, E)$ on $\{v \in V : \phi_2(v) \geq 0\}$ is connected.

An induced subgraph $G' = (V', E')$ here means the graph with the nodes $V' = \{v \in V : \phi_2(v) \geq 0\}$, and the set of edges connecting vertices in this subset, i.e. $E' = \{(i,j) \in E : i,j \in V'\}$. Since $-\phi_2$ is also an eigenvector with eigenvalue $\lambda_2$, the same theorem implies that $\{v \in V : \phi_2(v) \leq 0\}$ is also connected. We will assume that the eigenvectors mentioned in this paper are normalized s.t. $\|\phi_k\|_2 = 1$.

Fiedler’s theorem, together with many other desirable properties, motivates the classical spectral cut whereby the sign of $\phi_2$ is used to decompose a graph. Overall, relatively little seems to be known about the actual behavior of the Fiedler vector:

However, apart from the original results from M. Fiedler, very few is known about the Fiedler vector and its connection to topological properties of the underlying graph ... (19), 2018

Simultaneously, these types of questions have become increasingly important in the framework of Graph Signal Processing we refer to [20, 22, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38] for an introduction into recent work. Many studies of the properties of graphs use the properties that are easier to demonstrate on special families of graphs, such as paths and trees; we present a general framework which is particularly effective on trees but is also useful in the more general setting.

1.2. The Problem. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a tree. It is compelling to interpret Equation (2) as suggesting that $\phi_2$ is the ‘smoothest’ vector that is orthogonal to the constants, and to further infer that the node(s) that attain the maximum (positive) value on $\phi_2$ are the furthest away from the node(s) that attain the minimum (negative) value on $\phi_2$. This was explicitly conjectured in [12], a counterexample was then produced by Evans [14] and is shown in Figure 1, where maximum and minimum are attained far away from one another but not at the two points of maximum distance from one another. A natural question that remains is to understand (1) the behavior of the Fiedler vector and, as discussed by Lefèvre [26] and Gernandt & Pade [19], (2) under which conditions such a result might still be true.

![Figure 1. The ‘Fiedler rose’ counterexample of Evans [14].](image)

Naturally, the spectral geometry of trees has attracted a lot of attention over the years: path monotonicity properties of the smallest eigenvector of the Graph Laplacian on trees have been studied since Fiedler [17], we also refer to work of Merris [28]. Kirkland, Neumann & Shader [24] extend these results to weighted trees (compare their Theorem 6 with our Corollary 1). Kirkland & Neumann [25] discuss the effect of local graph operations on trees on the global spectrum. Bapat, Kirkland &
Pati [1] extend classical monotonicity results to the perturbed Laplacian (see also Kirkland & Fallat [23] and Rocha & Trevisan [34]). A global spectral criterion characterizing trees was given by Band [3]. We also refer to a survey of Merris [29] and references therein. Our paper is specifically concerned with the question of maxima and minima and is thus closer to [12, 13, 19, 26] and our approach is more inspired by classical potential theory than algebra, however, we hope that our approach can also be helpful in other situations; we also raise a number of questions.

1.3. The Continuous Case. Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) be a domain and consider the second smallest eigenfunction of the Laplace operator \(-\Delta\) with Neumann boundary conditions, i.e. the equation

\[
-\Delta \phi_2 = \mu_2 \phi_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega.
\]

Rauch conjectured in 1974 that the maximum and the minimum are assumed at the boundary. This is known to fail at this level of generality [8, 9] but widely assumed to be true for convex domains \( \Omega \). The second author [39] showed that if \( x_1, x_2 \in \Omega \) satisfy \( \|x_1 - x_2\| = \text{diam}(\Omega) \), then every maximum and minimum is assumed within distance \( c \cdot \text{inrad}(\Omega) \) of \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), where \( \text{inrad}(\Omega) \) is the inradius of \( \Omega \) and \( c \) is a universal constant (which is the optimal scaling up to the value of \( c \)). Therefore, up to an inradius, the maximum and minimum are essentially assumed at maximum distance. There is no formulation of the Hot Spots conjecture on graphs (perhaps not surprising since there is no clear definition of what the boundary of a graph would be; nonetheless, similar types of phenomena do appear, see e.g. [40] and it would be interesting to understand them better).

2. Main Results

We present two main results: the first is a representation formula for an eigenvector \( \phi_k \) on a general graph \( G \) that is very useful in the investigation of the Fiedler vector \( \phi_2 \) of trees. It allows to quickly recover some of the existing results and gives a better understanding of the behavior of \( \phi_2 \). In particular, it will explain that for generic trees there is little to no reason to assume that the extrema of \( \phi_2 \) are assumed at vertices that are at distance \( \text{diam}(G) \). However, the second contribution is an explicit application of the representation formula to construct families of graphs on which the desired statement indeed holds: the extrema of the Fiedler vector are assumed at vertices which are distance \( \text{diam}(G) \) apart. We hope that the representation formula will also be useful in other settings.

2.1. A Representation Formula. Let us fix \( G = (V, E) \) to be a simple, undirected, connected graph on \( n \) vertices. Let \( v_s, v_t \) be two arbitrary vertices. In Algorithm [1] we introduce a game that results in a representation formula for any eigenvector \( \phi_k \) associated to the eigenvalue \( \lambda_k \).

**Theorem 1.** Let \( G = (V, E) \) to be a finite, simple, undirected, connected graph. The expected payoff of the game in Algorithm [1] satisfies

\[
E(\text{payoff}) = \phi_k(v_s) - \phi_k(v_t).
\]

The proof is presented in [3]. Analogues of the Algorithm [1] and Theorem [1] are easy to obtain for the random walk normalized Laplacian \( AD^{-1} \) (which, by its
very nature, is strongly tied to random walks); our theorem and game adjust for
the canonical Laplacian \( L = D - A \). The game could also be interpreted as a dis-
cretized version of the Feynman-Kac formula (see e.g. [42]).

Algorithm 1: “The Game”: informally, the game is a random walk through
the graph, starting with vertex \( v_s \) and terminating when the vertex \( v_t \) is
reached. A “payoff” of \( \lambda_k \cdot \phi_k(w)/\deg(w) \) is accumulated when we visit a
vertex \( w \).

**Input:** Graph \( G = (V, E) \), arbitrary vertices \( v_s, v_t \in V \),
eigenvalue \( \lambda_k \) and a corresponding normalized eigenvector \( \phi_k \) s.t.
\( (D - A)\phi_k = \lambda_k \phi_k \).
**Result:** payoff
payoff \( \leftarrow 0 \);
\( w \leftarrow v_s \);
**while** \( w \neq v_t \) **do**
  payoff \( \leftarrow \) payoff \( + \lambda_k \cdot \phi_k(w)/\deg(w) \);
  neighbors(\( w \)) \( \leftarrow \{ v \in V : (w, v) \in E \} \);
  \( w \leftarrow \) choose uniformly at random from neighbors(\( w \));
**end**

We believe that this representation theorem has a substantial amount of explana-
tory power. A simple example is the following (well known) Corollary: a simple
form of monotonicity of the second eigenvector along paths in a tree. We emphasize
that this type of result is not new and refer to [17, 19, 26, 24, 28] and references
therein; however, it is well suited to illustrate an application of the main idea.

**Corollary 1** (see also [17, 19, 26, 24, 28]). \( G = (V, E) \) to be a simple, undirected
tree. Let \( \Gamma \) be a path in the tree such that \( \phi_2 \) only assumes positive values on the
path. If \( v \neq w \in V \) are two vertices on the path and \( v \) is at a greater distance than
\( w \) from the closest vertex where \( \phi_2 \) is negative, then
\[
\phi_2(v) > \phi_2(w).
\]
In particular, maxima and minima are attained in vertices with degree 1.

**Proof.** The proof is a relatively short application of Theorem 1 and illustrates it
well which is why we discuss it here. Let \( z \) be the vertex where \( \phi_2 \) is negative but
where \( \phi_2 \) is positive for one of the neighbors. By Fiedler’s theorem, that vertex is
unique. Let us now assume \( w \) and \( v \) are vertices on a path and \( v \) is from a greater
distance from \( z \) than \( w \).

```
        w
       / \\
     /     \\
    /       \\
   /         \\
  z - - - - - - v
```

We consider an instance of the game starting at $v_s = v$ and terminating at $v_t = z$ assuming a local geometry as in Fig. 2.1. By Theorem 1, the expected value of this game is

\[ E(\text{payoff}(v \rightarrow z)) = \phi_k(v) - \phi_k(z). \]

Suppose that the sequence of traversed vertices is

\[ v = a_0, a_1, a_2, ..., a_{j-1}, a_j, a_{j+1}, ..., a_m, z \]

(where the number of steps $m+1$ is the number of steps in this particular instance). We note that the sequence of vertices must include $w$ which lies on the only path from $v$ to $z$ since $G$ is a tree ($w$ and $v$ may appear in the sequence multiple times). w.l.o.g., we assume that the $j$-th step is the first time the game visits $w$ s.t. $a_j = w$. By construction, the Fiedler eigenvector is non-negative at every step on the tree $\phi_2(a_i) \geq 0$ before the game is terminated upon arriving to the first negative node $z$. Therefore, at each step of the sequence we accumulate a non-negative payoff $\lambda_k \cdot \phi_k(w)/\deg(w) \geq 0$. It follows that

\[ E(\text{payoff}(v \rightarrow z)) = \phi_k(v) - \phi_k(z) > 0. \]

What happens if we truncate the instance of the game when we reach $w$? We obtain the truncated sequence $v = a_0, a_1, a_2, ..., a_{j-1}, a_j = w$. The truncated sequences are instances of the “truncated” game starting at $v_s = v$ and terminating at $v_t = w$ (and by construction, their distribution is the same as that of sequences from the truncated game). Therefore, by Theorem 1 the expected payoff is:

\[ E(\text{payoff}(v \rightarrow w)) = \phi_k(v) - \phi_k(w). \]

The truncated sequence is strictly shorter than the original sequence and therefore collects at most the same payoff. Therefore:

\[ \phi_k(v) - \phi_k(z) = E(\text{payoff}(v \rightarrow z)) \geq E(\text{payoff}(v \rightarrow w)) > 0. \]

\[ T \quad \text{tree that traps random walk} \]
\[ \text{and has diameter } \ll d \]
\[ d/4 \quad \text{path of length } d \]

\[ \text{Figure 2. A generic counterexample.} \]

2.2. Counterexamples to the “longest path hypothesis”. We now return to the original question from [12]: whether the second eigenvector assumes maximum and minimum at the endpoints of the longest path in the tree. This was disproven by Evans [14] by means of an explicit example. The question has also been studied in [19, 26]. The purpose of this subsection is to argue that our representation formula from Theorem 1 allows to heuristically explain why, generally, there is no reason the second eigenvector should assume extreme values at the endpoints of the longest path – it shows that Evans’ counterexample is actually representative of one
of the main driving forces behind localization of large values of the Fiedler vector in sub-structures. We are not making any precise claims at this point, this section tries to provide a good working heuristic that (a) allows to construct counterexamples quite easily and (b) will underlie all our formal arguments later in the paper.

\[
\text{height } \sim \frac{d}{3}
\]

\[
d/2 \quad \text{path of length } d
\]

**Figure 3.** Another type of counterexample: extrema are assumed at the end of the long path.

One of the crucial ingredients in the representation formula is the number of steps a typical random walk will need to reach another vertex: if the tree has a complicated structure (say, many vertices with large degree), then it will take a very long time for a random walk to reach a specific vertex (this principle is already embodied in Evans’ counterexample [13] shown in Figure 1): distance is not as crucial as complexity – this immediately implies a large family of counterexamples whose type is shown in Figure 2: we consider a graph composed of a path of length \(d\) attached to a tree \(T\) at vertex \(d/4\). We assume the tree \(T\) has diameter much smaller than \(d/4\) but has vertices of very large degree.

\[
\text{height } \sim \frac{d}{3}
\]

\[
d/2 \quad \text{path of length } d
\]

**Figure 4.** Another type of counterexample: adding little trees to the path in the middle leads to a counterexample.

The game then suggests that, if the tree has vertices of sufficiently large degree, one extremum is at the ‘most remote’ part off the path in the tree \(T\) — in particular, one of the two extrema would not be on the path and thus not at the endpoints of the longest path in the graph. The distance between the extrema would be

\[
d(v_{\max}, v_{\min}) \leq \frac{3d}{4} + \text{diam}(T) < d.
\]

A sketch of the argument to show that this type of construction works is as follows. There are two cases: either the sign change of the second eigenvector happens inside \(T\) or it happens on the path. If the diameter of \(T\) is sufficiently small compared to \(d\), known inequalities on the eigenvalue \(\lambda_2\) (which we use below) suggest that the first case cannot occur. This means that the sign change happens on the path. If the value of the eigenvector in the vertex \(v\) that connects to \(T\) is nonzero, we can play the game with vertices starting in \(T\) and ending in \(v\). Corollary 1 shows that the values of the eigenfunction inside \(T\) are (in absolute value) at least as big as
the value in \( v \). Then the game leads to a nonzero contribution for each step of the random walk that is not arbitrarily small. This means that in order to ensure large (absolute) values inside the tree, the quantity to maximize is the expected number of steps in the game – this, in turn, can be achieved by having vertices of large degree. We emphasize that this heuristic is non-rigorous but quickly motivates the construction of many counterexamples. All the positive results in our paper can be understood as ensuring the absence of such a structure.

To build further intuition, we quickly sketch another type of counterexample in Figures 3 and 4. Take a path graph of length \( d \) and add a path graph of length \( d/3 \) to the middle vertex as in Figure 3. What we observe is that the eigenvector changes along the long path, that it assumes extrema at its end and that the eigenvector is small and changes slowly on the little path in the middle. However, if we start adding paths of length 1 to the vertices of the short path in the middle (or short trees, even ones with bounded diameter) as in Figure 4 then after a while the eigenvector flips and assumes an extremum in the tip of short path in the middle. Perhaps the main contribution of our paper is a framework that clearly establishes why this happens. The theorems we give are one way of capturing the phenomenon but presumably there are many other possible formulations that could be proven by formalizing the same kind of mechanism that we use here. A particular consequence of these ideas is that a generic tree should not have the desired property of \( \phi_2 \) assuming its extrema at the endpoints of a path of length \( \text{diam}(G) \). We refer to numerical work done by Lefèvre [26] showing that all trees with \( n \leq 11 \) vertices do have the property but already 2% of trees with \( n = 20 \) vertices do not. Lefèvre specifically asks whether a typical tree on \( n \) vertices does not have the property as \( n \) becomes large and we also consider this to be an interesting problem.

2.3. An Admissible Class. The purpose of this section is to construct a large family of tree-like graphs for which the following statement is true: the second eigenvector of the graph Laplacian does indeed assume maximum and minimum at the endpoints of the longest path (which, for graphs of this type, will be unique). We assume that we are given a graph that can be constructed by taking a path of length \( \text{diam}(G) \) and then possibly adding to each vertex one or several attached graphs that are isolated from each other except for being connected to the path. Of course, trees have this property.

![Figure 5](image_url)

**Figure 5.** The class of admissible graphs: a long path whose attached graphs are connected to exactly one vertex on the path and do not have any connections between them.

We will now assign to each such graph \( G_{k,i} \) a natural quantity: for any vertex \( v \in G_{k,i} \), we can consider a random walk started in \( v \) that jumps uniformly at
random to an adjacent vertex until it hits the path. We can then, for each such vertex \( v \), compute the expected hitting time:

**Definition.** The hitting time \( \text{hit}(\tilde{G}, v_s, v_t) \) is the expected number of random walk steps on the graph \( \tilde{G} \) to get from \( v_s \) to \( v_t \) for the first time.

With a slight abuse of terminology, we define a hitting time \( \text{hit}(\tilde{G}, v_t) \) for a terminal point \( v_t \) as the maximum over starting points in a graph:

\[
\text{hit}(\tilde{G}, v_t) = \max_{v_s \in \tilde{G}} \text{hit}(\tilde{G}, v_s, v_t).
\]

Finally, we define a hitting time for our construction. In the context of this section, we are always interested in the terminal vertex being on the path, and it is therefore convenient to absorb the terminal node in a succinct notation. Let \( v_k \) be the vertex on the path which is attached to the subgraph \( G_{k,i} \), then

\[
(7) \quad \text{hit}(G_{k,i}) = \text{hit}(G_{k,i}, v_k)
\]

In other words, the hitting time \( \text{hit}(G_{k,i}) \) of the subgraph \( G_{k,i} \) in our construction in this section is the maximum expected time to get to the path from a vertex in the subgraph \( G_{k,i} \). We argue that this quantity captures an important aspect of the underlying dynamics. We refer to [10] for a paper where the same quantity has been used in a similar way. To get a feeling for the scaling of things, we observe that if \( G_{k,i} \) is itself a path, then

\[
(8) \quad \text{hit}(G_{k,i}) \sim \text{diam}(G_{k,i})^2.
\]

This scaling follows from observing that the problem is structurally similar to a random walk on the lattice \( \mathbb{Z} \) and that the standard random walk on \( \mathbb{Z} \) after \( \ell \) random steps has variance \( \ell \) (and thus standard deviation \( \sim \sqrt{\ell} \); see also [6]).

We can now state the main result of the section. We refer to Fig. 5 for a sketch of how these graphs look like.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( G \) be a graph which can be decomposed to a path of length \( \text{diam}(G) \) and subgraphs \( G_{k,i} = (V_{k,i}, E_{k,i}) \) s.t. each subgraph \( G_{k,i} \) is attached only to vertex \( k \) of the path and any path from \( G_{k,i} \) to the complement \( V \setminus V_{k,i} \) goes through the vertex \( k \). Suppose that each \( G_{k,i} \) satisfies

1. the attached subgraph \( G_{k,i} \) does not have too many vertices:

\[
|G_{k,i}| \leq \frac{\text{diam}(G)}{32}.
\]

2. and the hitting time is not too large:

\[
\text{hit}(G_{k,i}) \leq \frac{1}{50} \min \{k, \text{diam}(G) - k\}^2.
\]

Then any eigenvector corresponding to the second eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian of \( G \) assumes its extrema at the endpoints of the long path.

The proof is provided in §3.3. We point out that it would be of interest to obtain inverse results: explicit conditions under which one of the extrema is not attained at the endpoints of the path.

We give one sample application of Theorem 2 to Evans’ counterexample and consider what he called the Fiedler rose (see Fig. 6): let \( G \) denote the Fiedler rose...
with \( n + 2 \) vertices. If we start in an outermost vertex (one of the vertices at the bottom of Fig. 6), then one step of the random walk leads to the center and the next step leads to the path with likelihood \( p = 1/(n + 1) \). This means that the expected number of steps required until one hits the path is

\[
\text{hit}(\text{Rose}) = 2 \frac{1}{n + 1} + 4 \frac{1}{n + 1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n + 1} \right) + 6 \frac{1}{n + 1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n + 1} \right)^2 + \ldots
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{n + 1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k + 1) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n + 1} \right)^k = 2n + 2.
\]

This means that if we have a path graph of length \( \text{diam}(G) \) and attach a Fiedler rose with \( n \) vertices to the middle point of the path graph, then the rose can have up to \( n \leq \text{diam}(G)/120 \) vertices without violating the result. More precise asymptotics for this special case were given by Lefèvre [26].

2.4. A Hitting Time Bound. The purpose of this section is to establish bounds on hitting times under an assumption on the maximum degree. Let \( G \) be a connected graph and assume that vertex \( v_1 \) is marked (in the setting above, \( v_1 \) is the vertex that lies on the long path). We are interested in obtaining upper bounds on the expected hitting time \( \text{hit}(G, v_1) \). Evans’ counterexample shows that such bounds will depend maximum degree of \( G \) which we denote by \( \Delta = \max_{v \in G} \deg(v) \).

**Proposition.** Let \( G \) be a connected graph with maximum degree \( \Delta \) and a marked vertex \( v_1 \). The maximum expected time of a random walk started in a vertex in \( G \) until it hits \( v_1 \) can be bounded by

\[
\text{hit}(G, v_1) \leq \text{diam}(G) \cdot \Delta^{\text{diam}(G)}.
\]
The proof of is presented in §3.4. We can now apply the proposition in combination with Theorem 2 to construct a fairly general family of graphs for which the maximum is indeed assumed at the endpoints of the longest path. These graphs follow the same principle as the ones described in Fig. 5: there is a long underlying path of length diam($G$) whose vertices are enumerated by \{1, 2, \ldots, diam($G$)\}. If $k$ is a vertex on the path, then we are allowed to attach an arbitrary number of graphs $G_{k,1}, G_{k,2}, \ldots$ to the vertex as long as the only edges between $G_{k,i}$ and the path are adjacent to the vertex $k$. Moreover, no edges between $G_{k,i}$ and $G_{k,j}$ or more, generally, $G_{i,k}$ and $G_{k,\ell}$, are allowed (see Fig. 8).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8.** An explicit admissible family of graphs: as above, we are allowed to attach graphs $G_{k,i}$ to the vertex $i$ as long as the diameter of $G_{k,i}$ is short compared to the maximal degree of $G_{k,i}$.

Theorem 2 gives us concrete conditions under which the maximum and minimum are assumed at endpoints of the longest path, these are

1. $|G_{k,i}| \leq (1/32) \cdot \text{diam}(G)$
2. $\text{hit}(G_{k,i}) \leq (1/50) \cdot \min\{k, \text{diam}(G) - k\}^2$.

The second condition may be difficult to check and this is where the Proposition comes into play. If we denote the maximal degree of $G$ by $\Delta$, then we can use the Proposition to bound $\text{hit}(G_{k,i}) \leq \text{diam}(G_{k,i}) \cdot \Delta^\text{diam}(G_{k,i})$.

To ensure that Condition 2 holds, it thus suffices to assume that

$$\text{diam}(G_{k,i}) \cdot \Delta^\text{diam}(G_{k,i}) \leq \frac{1}{50} \cdot \min\{k, \text{diam}(G) - k\}^2.$$ 

In the middle of the path, $k \sim \text{diam}(G)/2$, this shows that we can attach an arbitrary graph as long its maximum degree is bounded by $\Delta$ and

$$\text{diam}(G_{k,i}) \leq c_\Delta \log \text{diam}(G),$$

where the constant $c_\Delta$ depends only on $\Delta$ – this suffices to ensure Condition 2 to be satisfied. This may, at first glance, seem like a rather restricted result: the graph may be arbitrary as long as its diameter is short. In light of Evans’ counterexample, this estimate is perhaps not surprising (one can attach Fiedler roses on top of Fiedler roses on top of Fiedler roses etc. to the desired effect). However, we also point out that if the graphs do not have a ‘labyrinth’ type structure where random walkers can easily get lost (in the sense of hitting time being large), then one could attach graphs of larger diameter without violating the conditions of Theorem 2. This will be investigated in §2.5.
2.5. **Caterpillar graphs.** We conclude with a simple example: a caterpillar graph \([5, 21]\) is path of length \(n\) where to each vertex we may add trees of size 1 (alternatively: after removing all vertices of degree 1, a path graph remains). Gernandt & Pade \([19]\) proved that the extrema of the second eigenvector are assumed at the endpoints of the longest path and established various generalizations of this result. We give another such result which will follow quickly from Theorem 2.

**Corollary 2.** Let \(G = P_n\) be a path with vertices \(1, 2, \ldots, n\). Suppose we attach to the vertex \(k\) an arbitrary number of paths of length at most \(f(k)\), where

\[
f(k) \leq \frac{1}{20} \min\{k, n - k\}.
\]

Then the global extrema are assumed at the endpoints of the longest path.

Stronger results should be true, maybe even \(f(k) = \min\{k, n - k\} - 1\).

2.6. **A Hitting Time Problem.** An interesting question is the following: suppose \(G = (V, E)\) is a connected graph with a marked vertex \(v_1\) and \(h: V \to \mathbb{R}\) is a function such that \(h(v)\) the expected number of steps a random walk started in \(v\) takes until it hits \(v_1\). What bounds (both from above and from below) can be proven on

\[
\text{hit}_{v_1}(G) = \max_{v \in V} h(v)\?
\]

A trivial bound is

\[
\text{hit}_{v_1}(G) \geq \max_{v \in V} d(v, v_1).
\]

Amusingly, this might be close to optimal. Fix a degree \(\Delta\) and consider the following type of graph where each vertex has the maximal number of children \((\Delta - 1)\) up to a certain level. Let us then connect all the vertices in the last level to the root of the tree. The induced random walk can be regarded as a biased random walk in terms of the level and will quickly lead to the root of the tree.

![Figure 9. An example with an induced drift on the random walk.](image)

A simple question is the following: what sort of hitting time bounds are possible and how do they depend on the graph. For example, if \(G\) is a tree, then we have \(\text{hit}_{v_1}(G) \gtrsim \text{diam}(G)^2\). What other results are possible?

3. **Proofs**

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.**
Proof. We first note that basic Markov Chain theory implies that for each vertex in the graph, the game has an expected value: the graph is finite and connected and therefore a random walk will eventually hit every vertex almost surely. More precise results would be possible: in particular, the likelihood of a random walk taking a very long time before hitting \( v_t \) decays exponentially (with a constant depending on the graph), see for example Levin, Peres & Wilmer [27], but this will not be needed here. Let us denote expected value of the game when starting in a vertex \( v \in V \) by \( \psi(v) \). Then, by definition of the game,

\[
\psi(v_t) = 0
\]

since the game stops in that vertex. Let now \( v \neq v_t \). By the structure of the game, we are able to relate \( \psi(v) \) to the value of \( \psi \) in all adjacent neighbors via the equation

\[
\psi(v) = \frac{\lambda_k \cdot \phi_k(v)}{\deg(v)} + \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} \psi(w). \tag{9}
\]

Figure 10. The idea behind the proof: relating everything to neighbors

We introduce the function \( h : V \to \mathbb{R} \) given by

\[
h(v) = \phi_k(v) - \psi(v).
\]

We conclude from equation (9) that \( h(v_t) = \phi_k(v_t) \). Rewriting the equation

\[
(D - A)\phi_k = \lambda_k \phi_k,
\]

we see that \( \phi_k \) satisfies, in all vertices \( v \),

\[
\phi_k(v) = \frac{\lambda_k \cdot \phi_k(v)}{\deg(v)} + \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} \phi_k(w).
\]

Using this equation in combination with (9), we see that \( h \) satisfies, for all vertices \( v \in V \setminus \{v_t\} \) that

\[
h(v) = \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} h(w).
\]

We will now prove that \( h \) is constant, \( h \equiv \phi_k(v_t) \) which establishes the result. Suppose now there exists \( v \in V \) such that \( h(v) > \phi_k(v_t) \) (the case \( h(v) < \phi_k(v_t) \) is analogous). Let us define

\[
m = \max_{v \in V} h(v) > \phi_k(v_t).
\]
Let $v$ be a vertex such that $h(v) = m$. Then

$$m = h(v) = \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} h(w) \leq \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} m = m$$

and necessarily $h(w) = m$ for all neighbors of $v$. The graph is connected, therefore $h \equiv m$ in $V \setminus \{v_t\}$ and 0 in $v_t$. However, then it is easy to see that $h$ does not satisfy the equation

$$h(v) = \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \sim w} h(w)$$

in all vertices adjacent to $v_t$. This contradiction establishes that $h \equiv \phi_k(v_t)$ and thus that

$$\psi(v) = \phi_k(v) - \phi_k(v_t).$$

This shows that if we start the game in an arbitrary vertex $v_s \neq v_t$, the expected payoff is $\psi(v_s) = \phi_k(v_s) - \phi_k(v_t)$. 

\[\Box\]

### 3.2. Some Preliminary Considerations.

Before embarking on the proof of Theorem 2, we recall several helpful statements and derive some basic facts for the graphs under consideration. Many of these facts are either well known (see e.g. Mohar [30, 31]) or folklore; we recall them for clarity of exposition.

**Lemma 1.** Let $G$ be a graph satisfying all the conditions in Theorem 2. Then

$$(10) \quad \lambda_2(G) \leq \frac{10}{\text{diam}(G)^2}.$$ 

**Proof.** We use the standard variational characterization of the second eigenvector of the Laplacian

$$(11) \quad \lambda_2(G) = \min_{\langle x, 1 \rangle = 0} \frac{\sum_{v_i \sim v_j} (x_i - x_j)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2},$$

where the minimum is taken with respect to all vectors $x \neq 0$ having mean value 0. Using $P_n$ to denote the path of length $n$, and $\varphi$ to denote its $\ell^2$-normalized second eigenvector, and using standard results from spectral graph theory [11, 15]:

$$\sum_{i,i+1 \text{ on long path}} (\varphi(i) - \varphi(i + 1))^2 = \lambda_2(P_{\text{diam}(G)})$$

$$= 2 \left(1 - \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{\text{diam}(G)}\right)\right) \leq \frac{10}{\text{diam}(G)^2}.$$ 

We define $p: V \to \mathbb{R}$ to be the $\ell^2$-normalized second eigenvector of the path graph defined on the long path (in particular, $p$ is 0 on vertices that do not lie on the path). Identifying the path in $G$ with $P_{\text{diam}(G)}$:

$$(12) \quad p(v) = \begin{cases} \varphi(v) & \text{if } v \text{ on path} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$ 

Away from the path, we define the vector $q: V \to \mathbb{R}$ to be 0 on the path and have the constant value corresponding to the value of $p$ in each bubble, i.e.

$$(13) \quad q(v) = \begin{cases} p(k) & \text{if } v \in G_{k,i} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$
We note that the supports of $q$ and $p$ do not overlap, and therefore $q$ is orthogonal to $p$. We start by considering the vector $z = p + q$.

We first note that when computing the quadratic form $\langle z, Lz \rangle$ (see Equation (1)), the only contribution comes from adjacent edges on the path graph: the function is constant between all other edges. Therefore,

$$\sum_{v_i \sim v_j} (z_i - z_j)^2 = \sum_{i, i+1 \text{ on long path}} (\varphi(i) - \varphi(i+1))^2 = \lambda_2(P_{\text{diam}(G)}) \leq \frac{10}{\text{diam}(G)^2}.$$ 

However, $z$ does not have mean value 0. We introduce the orthogonal projection onto vectors with mean value 0

$$y = z - \left\langle z, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and note that, since we subtract the constant vector,

$$\langle y, Ly \rangle = \langle z, Lz \rangle \leq \frac{10}{\text{diam}(G)^2}.$$ 

It remains to show that $\|y\|^2 \geq 1$ to conclude the result. Using, in that order, the Pythagorean theorem (twice: first for projections, then to evaluate the norm of $z = p + q$), the fact that $p$ has mean value 0, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the $\ell^2$-normalization of $p$, we arrive at

$$\|y\|^2 = \|z\|^2 - \left\langle z, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle^2$$

$$= \|p\|^2 + \|q\|^2 - \left\langle z, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle^2$$

$$= \|p\|^2 + \|q\|^2 - \left\langle q, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle^2$$

$$\geq \|p\|^2 + \|q\|^2 - \|q\|^2 = \|p\|^2 = 1.$$ 

Therefore,

$$\lambda_2(G) = \min_{(x, \lambda) = 0} \frac{\sum_{v_i \sim v_j} (x_i - x_j)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} \leq \frac{\langle z, Lz \rangle}{\langle z, z \rangle} \leq \frac{10}{\text{diam}(G)^2} \quad \square$$

We note that the proof only uses the “bubble” structure and the fixed diameter specified in Theorem 2, and therefore the Lemma applies to more general cases. Furthermore, we note that similar bounds on the eigenvalues of graphs to which isolated “bubbles” are added can be constructed using the original eigenvalues of the graphs without the bubbles, and the construction proposed in this proof.

This result is optimal up to constants which can be seen as follows: a result of McKay [30] states that

$$\lambda_2 \geq \frac{4}{|V| \cdot \text{diam}(G)}.$$
McKay’s bound shows that this upper bound using only the diameter is optimal up to constants for graphs for which |V| \sim \text{diam}(G). The next ingredient that we establish is an upper bound on the maximum size of \( \phi_2 \).

**Lemma 2.** Let \( G \) be a graph satisfying all the conditions in Theorem 2. Then

\[
\max_{v \in V} |\phi_2(v)| \leq \frac{4}{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}.
\]

**Proof.** We observe that \( \phi_2 \) has both positive and negative values because it is orthogonal to \( \phi_1 \) which is a constant vector. Since we can replace \( \phi_2 \) without loss of generality by \(-\phi_2\), it suffices to bound the maximum from above. Let \( \phi_2(v) > 0 \) be arbitrary. We use to \( \pi \) to denote a path from \( \phi_2 \) to the nearest vertex \( w \) where \( \phi_2(w) \leq 0 \). For a normalized eigenvector \( \phi_2 \), this shows that

\[
\max_{v \in V} |\phi_2(v)| \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \pi} |\phi_2(i) - \phi_2(j)|
\]

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

\[
\sum_{(i,j) \in \pi} |\phi_2(i) - \phi_2(j)|^2 \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \pi} |\phi_2(i)|^2 + \sum_{(i,j) \in \pi} |\phi_2(j)|^2
\]

where the second line uses the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the fourth line uses equation (2) and the fifth line uses equation (10). Since this holds for every vertex, we have

\[
\|\phi_2\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \frac{4}{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}.
\]

We use this inequality to derive a lower bound on \( \|\phi_2\|_{\ell_1(V)} \).

**Lemma 3.** Let \( G \) be a graph satisfying all the conditions in Theorem 2. Then

\[
\sum_{v \in V} |\phi_2(v)| \geq \frac{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}{4} \|\phi_2\|_{\ell^2}.
\]

**Proof.** Let us assume w.l.o.g. that \( \|\phi_2\|_{\ell^2} = 1 \). The normalization in \( \ell^2 \) of \( \phi_2 \) implies by the Hölder inequality that

\[
1 = \sum_{v \in V} \phi_2(v)^2 \leq \|\phi_2\|_{\ell^\infty} \|\phi_2\|_{\ell_1}
\]

and therefore, by equation (15):

\[
\|\phi_2\|_{\ell_1} \geq \frac{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}{4}.
\]
We note that since $\phi_2$ has mean value 0 (it is orthogonal to the constant $\phi_1$) and therefore the positive part and the negative part cancel out and therefore
\begin{equation}
\sum_{v \in V} \max \{ \phi_2(v), 0 \} \geq \frac{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}{8}.
\end{equation}
As the last ingredient, we refer to the known result (see e.g. [6]) about the hitting time of a path $P_k$
\begin{equation}
\text{hit}(P_k) = (k - 1)^2.
\end{equation}

3.3. Proof of Theorem 2.

Proof. The proof decouples into two parts: first, we show that there are vertices $v_1, v_2$ on the long path such that
\begin{equation}
\phi_2(v_1) < 0 < \phi_2(v_2).
\end{equation}
In the second part of the proof, we show that the maximum and minimum are attained at the endpoints. Both parts of the proof makes use of the Game Interpretation (Theorem 1). We assume throughout the proof that $\phi_2$ is a fixed $\ell^2$-normalized eigenvector associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_2 > 0$.

Part 1: The argument exploits the bounds derived in §3.2. Suppose the statement (18) is false. Then, for all vertices $v$ on the long path, we either have $\phi_2(v) \geq 0$ or $\phi_2(v) \leq 0$. Without loss of generality (after possibly replacing $\phi_2$ by $-\phi_2$) we can assume that for all vertices $v$ on the long path, we have $\phi_2(v) \leq 0$. However, since $\phi_2$ has mean value 0, it has to assume positive values somewhere. Naturally, this has to happen inside the bubbles $G_{k,i}$. By Fiedler’s theorem, we have that
\[ \{ v \in V : \phi_2(v) \geq 0 \} \text{ is connected.} \]
We first deal with the case where the positive values are all assumed within exactly one bubble $G_{k,i}$. Then, however, by Equation (16), we have
\begin{align*}
\frac{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}{8} & \leq \sum_{v \in V} \max \{ \phi_2(v), 0 \} \\
& = \sum_{v \in G_{k,i}} \max \{ \phi_2(v), 0 \} \\
& \leq |G_{k,i}| \cdot \|\phi_2\|_\infty \leq \frac{4 \cdot |G_{k,i}|}{\text{diam}(G)^{1/2}}
\end{align*}
and thus
\[ |G_{k,i}| \geq \frac{\text{diam}(G)}{32} \]
which is a contradiction to the assumption (1) in the Theorem. This shows that it is not possible for all the positive values to be assumed within one bubble $G_{k,i}$. Therefore the set $\{ v \in V : \phi_2(v) > 0 \}$ must have elements from at least two different bubbles. We first consider the case that both bubbles are associated to the same vertex $k$ on the long path, i.e. $G_{k,i}$ and $G_{k,j}$. Since $\phi_2(k) \leq 0$ and since $\{ v \in V : \phi_2(v) \geq 0 \}$ is connected, we infer that $\phi_2(k) = 0$. This observation generalizes: if $\{ v \in V : \phi_2(v) > 0 \}$ has elements from different bubbles that are connected to different vertices on the long path, $G_{k,i}$ and $G_{\ell,m}$, then we can again infer that
If \( \phi_2 \leq 0 \) on the long path, then the set of vertices 
\( \phi_2(v) = 0 \), if non-empty, has to be group of consecutive vertices.

\( \phi_2 \) vanishes on the segment of the long path connecting \( k \) and \( \ell \) (see Fig. 11).

In either case, we observe that each bubble containing vertices where \( \phi_2(v) > 0 \) is necessarily connected to a vertex \( k \) on the long path for which \( \phi_2(k) = 0 \). Let now \( G_{k,1} \) be an arbitrary bubble containing positive values: we can then apply the game (Theorem 1) starting in the vertex of \( G_{k,1} \) with the largest entry and ending in the vertex \( k \) to argue that

\[
\max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) - \phi_2(k) = E \text{ payoff}
\]

\[
\leq \lambda_2 \cdot \left( \max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) \right) \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})
\]

where \( k \) is the vertex on the path where \( G_{k,1} \) is connected to the path. Recall that, by Equation (10), \( \lambda_2(G) \leq 10 \cdot \text{diam}(G)^{-2} \) and, by assumption 2 of Theorem 2,

\[
\text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \leq \frac{\text{diam}(G)^2}{20}.
\]

These imply that

\[
\lambda_2(G) \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

and therefore, by Equation (23),

\[
\max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) \leq \frac{\phi(k)}{1 - \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})} \leq 0,
\]

with a positive denominator by Equation (25). Then, however, it is not possible for \( G_{k,i} \) to contain any positive entries. This contradiction concludes the first part of the argument.

**Part 2:** It remains to show that the maximum and the minimum occur at the endpoints of the path. By symmetry, it suffices to show this for the maximum, the case of the minimum is completely analogous. After possible changing the orientation of the path, we can assume that there are \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq \text{diam}(G) \) with

\( \phi_2(i) > 0 \geq \phi_2(i + 1) \).

Applying Fiedler’s theorem and Theorem 1, we see that this implies

\( \phi_2(1) \geq \phi_2(2) \geq \cdots \geq \phi_2(i) \).

This shows that the maximum on the long path is assumed at the end-point. It remains to exclude the case where the maximum is assumed inside a bubble. Let us assume that the maximum is assumed in \( G_{k,1} \). Then, again by Fiedler’s theorem,
we have $k \leq i$. We now play the game (Theorem 1) twice: first to obtain an upper bound on the maximum of $\phi_2$ (under the assumption that this maximum is assumed in $G_{k,1}$) and then to obtain a lower bound on $\phi_2(1)$. Applying the game once more, we have, as above,

\begin{equation}
\max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) - \phi_2(k) = E \text{ payoff}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq \lambda_2 \cdot \left( \max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) \right) \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})
\end{equation}

where $k$ is the vertex on the path where $G_{k,1}$ is connected to the path.

![Figure 12. Setup of part 2 of the proof](image)

Arguing as above, by Equation (10), $\lambda_2(G) \leq 10 \cdot \text{diam}(G)^{-2}$ and, by assumption 2 of Theorem 2,

\begin{equation}
\text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \leq \frac{\text{diam}(G)^2}{20}.
\end{equation}

These imply that

\begin{equation}
\lambda_2(G) \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}
\end{equation}

and therefore, by Equation (23),

\begin{equation}
\max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) \leq \frac{\phi(k)}{1 - \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})},
\end{equation}

with a positive denominator by Equation (25). We now start the game of Section 2.1 in the vertex 1 and obtain

$\phi_2(1) - \phi_2(k) = E \text{ payoff}$.

We jump around randomly and add

$$\lambda_2 \frac{\phi_2(v)}{\text{deg}(v)}$$

at every step.

Suppose we are on the path and $\text{deg}(v) \geq 3$. This means that there are graphs $G_v$, attached and there is a chance of going into these graphs: we will argue that this increases the expected payoff. We will obtain a lower bound on the expected number of times we encounter the vertex $1 < v < k$ before going towards the next one on the path. We have encountered this type of computation before when computing hitting times for the Fiedler rose. Introducing

$$p = \frac{\text{deg}(v) - 2}{\text{deg}(v)}$$
we can bound
\[
\mathbb{E} \# \text{ encounter} \geq 1(1 - p) + 2p(1 - p) + 3p^2(1 - p) + \ldots
\]
\[
= \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q(1 - p)p^{q-1} = \frac{1}{1 - p} = \frac{\deg(v)}{2}.
\]
This means that in expectation, a visit to a vertex along the path would contribute at least
\[
\frac{\phi_2(v)\deg(v)}{2 \cdot \deg(v)} \lambda_2 = \frac{\phi_2(v)}{2} \lambda_2
\]
before we continue to the next vertex on the path. For comparison, if \( \deg(v) = 2 \), so that the vertex is not connected to any additional graph, the vertex contributes \( \phi_2(v)\lambda_2/2 \) to the game and in the next step we move to one of the two vertices attached. Corollary 1 yields
\[
(27) \quad \lambda_2 \phi_2(v) \geq \lambda_2 \phi_2(k).
\]
Abbreviating the maximum hitting time on a path graph by \( \text{hit}(P_k) \), we have by Theorem 1 and Equation (27)
\[
\phi_2(1) - \phi_2(k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 \cdot \phi_2(k) \cdot \text{hit}(P_k),
\]
and thus the lower bound
\[
(28) \quad \phi_2(1) \geq \phi_2(k) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) \right).
\]
Putting together Equations (26) and (28) and the assumption of part 2 of this proof, we have
\[
(29) \quad \phi_2(k) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) \right) \leq \phi_2(1) < \max_{j \in G_{k,1}} \phi_2(j) \leq \frac{\phi_2(k)}{1 - \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})}
\]
and since we observed that \( \phi_2(k) > 0 \),
\[
(30) \quad \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) \right) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1})}.
\]
In other words, since the denominator is positive,
\[
(31) \quad 1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) - \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2^2 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) \leq 1,
\]
and therefore
\[
(32) \quad \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \geq \frac{\text{hit}(P_k)}{2} - \frac{\lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) \text{hit}(G_{k,1})}{2}.
\]
By Equation (10) and Equation (17),
\[
(33) \quad \lambda_2 \cdot \text{hit}(P_k) = \lambda_2 \cdot (k - 1)^2 \leq \lambda_2 \cdot \text{diam}(G)^2 \leq 10
\]
Therefore,
\[
(34) \quad \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \geq \frac{\text{hit}(P_k)}{2} - 5 \cdot \text{hit}(G_{k,1}).
\]
Thus,
\[
(35) \quad \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \geq \frac{\text{hit}(P_k)}{12}.
\]
Using the hitting time bound (17) and the second assumption of Theorem 2,
\[ \frac{k^2}{50} \geq \text{hit}(G_{k,1}) \geq \frac{\text{hit}(P_k)}{12} = \frac{(k - 1)^2}{12}, \]
which is a contradiction.

3.4. Proof of the Proposition.

Proof. We give a simple estimate that does not yield the sharp constant (for which we refer to Aldous & Fill [2]), however, the argument is very short and simple. Suppose we find ourselves in an arbitrary vertex \( v \in V \) and suppose \( v \neq v_1 \). Then there exists a shortest path from \( v \) to \( v_1 \) because the Graph is connected. This shortest path has length at most \( \text{diam}(G) \). Let us now consider the next \( \text{diam}(G) \) steps of the random walk. Every time we take a random step, there is a probability of at least \( 1/\deg(v) \geq \Delta^{-1} \) of decreasing the distance to \( v_1 \) (until \( v_1 \) is reached). This means the likelihood of hitting \( v_1 \) within \( \text{diam}(G) \) steps is at least
\[ p = \Delta^{-\text{diam}(T)}. \]

Naturally, we have a much stronger result: any conceivable path of length \( \text{diam}(G) \) in \( G \) occurs with at least that likelihood, but we will not need this. By considering the random walk along segments of length \( \text{diam}(T) \), the problem turns into that of a geometric distribution with likelihood \( p \). The mean of a geometric distribution is \( p^{-1} \) and thus we expect at most \( \Delta^{\text{diam}(T)} \) trials until hitting \( v_1 \). Each such trial is comprised of a random walk of length \( \text{diam}(G) \) and thus the total number of steps is bounded from above by
\[ \text{hit}(G, v_1) \leq \text{diam}(G) \cdot \Delta^{\text{diam}(G)}. \]
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