

On Squared Distance Matrix of Complete Multipartite Graphs

Joyentanuj Das* and Sumit Mohanty†

Abstract

Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ be a complete t -partite graph on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. The distance between vertices i and j in G , denoted by d_{ij} is defined to be the length of the shortest path between i and j . The squared distance matrix $\Delta(G)$ of G is the $n \times n$ matrix with $(i, j)^{th}$ entry equal to 0 if $i = j$ and equal to d_{ij}^2 if $i \neq j$. We define the squared distance energy $E_{\Delta}(G)$ of G to be the sum of the absolute values of its eigenvalues. We determine the inertia of $\Delta(G)$ and compute the squared distance energy $E_{\Delta}(G)$. More precisely, we prove that if $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$, then $E_{\Delta}(G) = 8(n-t)$ and if $h = |\{i : n_i = 1\}| \geq 1$, then

$$8(n-t) + 2(h-1) \leq E_{\Delta}(G) < 8(n-t) + 2h.$$

Furthermore, we show that for a fixed value of n and t , both the spectral radius of the squared distance matrix and the squared distance energy of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices are maximal for complete split graph $S_{n,t}$ and minimal for Turán graph $T_{n,t}$.

Keywords: Complete t -partite graphs, Squared distance matrix, Inertia, Energy, Spectral radius.

MSC: 05C12, 05C50

1 Introduction and Motivation

A simple connected graph G is a metric space with respect to the metric d , where $d(i, j)$ equals the length of the shortest path between the vertices i and j . We set $d(i, i) = 0$ for every vertex i in G . The distance matrix of a graph G on n vertices is an $n \times n$ matrix $D(G) = [d_{ij}]$, where $d_{ij} = d(i, j)$. The squared distance matrix $\Delta(G)$ of G is defined to be the Hadamard product $D(G) \circ D(G)$, and thus the squared distance matrix of G is an $n \times n$ matrix, defined as $\Delta(G) = [d_{ij}^2]$. Hence, $\Delta(G)$ is a real symmetric matrix and the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$ are real. Let $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ be the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$ and $\sigma(\Delta(G)) = \{\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)\}$ denote the spectrum of $\Delta(G)$. The spectral radius of $\Delta(G)$, denoted by $\rho(G)$ is defined as $\rho(G) = \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(\Delta(G))} |\lambda|$ and by

Perron-Frobenius theory, the spectral radius $\rho(G)$ is the largest eigenvalue of $\Delta(G)$, *i.e.*, $\rho(G) = \lambda_1(G)$. We define the squared distance energy of $\Delta(G)$ as $E_{\Delta}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(G)|$. Since the trace of $\Delta(G)$ is zero, so

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = 2 \sum_{\lambda_i(G) < 0} |\lambda_i(G)|.$$

Let T be a tree with n vertices. In [12], the authors proved that the determinant of the distance matrix $D(T)$ of T is given by $\det D(T) = (-1)^{n-1} (n-1) 2^{n-2}$. Note that, the determinant does

*School of Mathematics, IISER Thiruvananthapuram, Maruthamala P.O., Vithura, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala- 695 551, India. Email: joyentanuj16@iisertvm.ac.in

†Department of Mathematics, GITAM Institute of Science, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh- 530045, India. Email: sumitmath@gmail.com

not depend on the structure of the tree but the number of vertices. In [14], it was shown that the inverse of the distance matrix of tree T is given by $D(T)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2}L(T) + \frac{1}{2(n-1)}\tau\tau^t$, where $L(T)$ is Laplacian matrix of T and $\tau = (2 - \delta_1, 2 - \delta_2, \dots, 2 - \delta_n)^t$, δ_i denotes the degree of the vertex i . Several extensions and generalizations of these results has been proved (see, for example see [2, 13, 15, 16]). In [3], authors computed the determinant of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(T)$ of a tree T with no vertex of degree 2 and later in [4], find its inverse as a rank one perturbation of a Laplacian-like matrix. In [5], the author considered the squared distance matrix of weighted trees and under certain conditions found its inverse as a rank one perturbation of a Laplacian-like matrix. However, the results for distance matrix and squared distance matrix for trees are similar, but strategy adopted for the proofs are different due to the non-linearity of the Hadamard product. For the definition of Laplacian-like matrix and other related results see [6, 22]. Moreover, in [4], authors also determined the inertia of the squared distance matrix of a tree. These developments encourage us to study problems related to the squared distance matrix on other class of graphs. More precisely, we consider a few problems on the squared distance matrix of complete multipartite graphs.

Before proceeding further, we first introduce a few notations which will be used time and again throughout this article. We write $G \cong H$ to indicate that two graphs G and H are isomorphic. Let I_n denote the identity matrix, $J_{m \times n}$ denotes the $m \times n$ matrix of all ones and if $m = n$, we use the notation J_m . We write $\mathbf{0}_{m \times n}$ to represent zero matrix of order $m \times n$ and simply write $\mathbf{0}$ if there is no scope of confusion with the order of the matrix. For a symmetric matrix A , the inertia of A , denoted by $\text{In}(A)$ is the triplet $(\mathbf{n}_+(A), \mathbf{n}_0(A), \mathbf{n}_-(A))$, where $\mathbf{n}_+(A)$, $\mathbf{n}_0(A)$ and $\mathbf{n}_-(A)$ denote the number of positive eigenvalues of A , the multiplicity of 0 as an eigenvalue of A and the number of negative eigenvalues of A , respectively.

For $n \geq 2$, let the i^{th} largest component in a vector $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be denoted by $x_{[i]}$ and let $X_{\downarrow} = (x_{[1]}, x_{[2]}, \dots, x_{[n]})$ denote the decreasing rearrangement of x . For $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, we say that X is majorized by Y , and write $X \succeq Y$ if

$$\sum_{i=1}^k x_{[i]} \geq \sum_{i=1}^k y_{[i]} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

with equality for $k = n$. We write $X \succ Y$ if $X \succeq Y$ and $X_{\downarrow} \neq Y_{\downarrow}$.

For $t \geq 2$, let K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} denote the complete multipartite graph on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. The complete graph K_t ($t \geq 2$) can also be seen as complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} with $n_i = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Let us recall the definition of two special types of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices, namely complete split graph $S_{n,t}$ and Turán graph $T_{n,t}$:

1. Complete split graph $S_{n,t} \cong K_{n-t+1, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{t-1 \text{ times}}}$ consisting of an independent set of $n - t + 1$ vertices and a clique of $t - 1$ vertices, such that each vertex of the independent set is adjacent to each vertex of the clique.
2. Turán graph $T_{n,t} \cong K_{\lceil n/t \rceil, \dots, \lceil n/t \rceil, \lfloor n/t \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor n/t \rfloor}$, the $(t + 1)$ -clique-free graph with maximum number of edges.

In [7], the distance energy of a graph is defined as the sum of the absolute values of the distance eigenvalues. Subsequently, many interesting results were obtained related to distance energy (for example see [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] and [1, Section 8]). In particular, the distance energy of complete t -partite graph has been studied in [18, 19, 21]. More precisely, in [21], the author obtained the inertia of the distance matrix of K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} and also consider the extremization (maximization and minimization) problem for the distance energy of K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} .

In this manuscript, we find the inertia of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and using the inertia of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$, we compute the squared distance energy $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. Further, we prove the following: For fixed value of n and t , let $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$. Then $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) = 8(n-t)$ if $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and

$$8(n-t) + 2(h-1) \leq E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) < 8(n-t) + 2h \text{ if } h = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|.$$

Furthermore, we show that if $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$, then

$$E_\Delta(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) \geq E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) \text{ and } \rho(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) > \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}).$$

As a consequence, we can conclude that $S_{n,t}$ and $T_{n,t}$ are extremal graphs for which the squared distance energy and as well as the spectral radius of the squared distance matrix of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices attain its maxima and minima, respectively. Moreover, we found that in the case of the spectral radius, these extremal graphs are unique up to isomorphism, but for the squared distance energy, the maximal graph $S_{n,t}$ is unique up to isomorphism, whereas the minimal graph $T_{n,t}$ is unique up to isomorphism if and only if $n \leq 2t + 1$.

For fixed value of n , t and h , let $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ be the class of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices where the number of partitions of size 1 is h , *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{M}(n, t, h) = \left\{ K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} : n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \text{ and } h = |\{i : n_i = 1\}| \right\}.$$

In our investigation, we observe that the major distinction is in the spectral properties of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and $D(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ if K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$. For example, unlike the case of $D(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$, if 0 is an eigenvalue of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$, then it is of multiplicity one.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss a few preliminary results useful for this article. In Section 3, we compute the characteristic polynomial of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and also find some of its related results. In Section 4, we determine the inertia of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and compute the squared distance energy $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. Next, in Section 5, we consider problem related to maximization and minimization of $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ subject to different conditions and use majorization techniques to find the extremal graphs for which $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ attains its the maximum and minimum. In this case, we also obtain the requisite conditions under which these extremal graphs are unique upto isomorphism. Finally, in Section 6, using majorization techniques we show that for fixed value of n and t , if $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$, then the spectral radius $\rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ uniquely attains its maximum value at $S_{n,t}$ and minimum value at $T_{n,t}$. We also provide an alternative proof for the same.

2 Some Preliminary Results

In this section, we discuss a few preliminary results useful for our subsequent sections. We first recall some existing results on majorization and matrix theory.

Let $\mathcal{B}_n = \{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : z_1 \geq z_2 \geq \dots \geq z_n\}$. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, let E_j^n be the n -tuple with 1 at the j^{th} entry and for $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, we use $E_{j,k}^n$ to denote $E_k^n - E_j^n$. With these notations we now state the following results.

Theorem 2.1. [11] *Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}_n$ and $X \neq Y$. Then $Y \succ X$ if and only if there exists a sequence in \mathcal{B}_n such as $Y = Y_0 \succ Y_1 \succ \dots \succ Y_l = X$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq l$, $Y_i = Y_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^n$ for some $k_i > j_i$.*

Theorem 2.2. [9] Let $n_1, m_1, \dots, n_k, m_k$ and x_1, \dots, x_t be real numbers. Then

$$(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k) \succeq (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k) \iff (n_1, \dots, n_k, x_1, \dots, x_t) \succeq (m_1, \dots, m_k, x_1, \dots, x_t).$$

For every integer $t \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{C}_t = \{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \in \mathbb{Z}^t : n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t \geq 1\}$. Note that (\mathcal{C}_t, \succeq) is a partially ordered set.

Theorem 2.3. [11] Let (\mathcal{C}_t, \succeq) be the partially ordered set defined as above. Then for every $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \in \mathcal{C}_t$ with $n = n_1 + \dots + n_t$, we have

$$(n - t + 1, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{t-1}) \succeq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \succeq \left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{t} \right\rceil, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{n}{t} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \right\rfloor, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \right\rfloor \right).$$

Lemma 2.4. For $t \geq 1$ and let $(\mathcal{C}'_t, \succeq)$ be a partially ordered set, where $\mathcal{C}'_t = \{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \in \mathbb{Z}^t : n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t \geq 2\}$. Then for every $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \in \mathcal{C}'_t$ with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$, we have

$$(n - 2(t-1), \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{t-1}) \succeq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t).$$

Proof. Let $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t) \in \mathcal{C}'_t$. Then $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ and $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ yields that

$$n = n_1 + \dots + n_i + n_{i+1} + \dots + n_t \geq n_1 + \dots + n_i + 2(t-i).$$

Thus $n - 2(t-i) \geq n_1 + \dots + n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and hence $(n - 2(t-1), \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{t-1}) \succeq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$. \square

Now we state a well known result namely inclusion principle that gives an interlacing relation between the eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix and its principal minors.

Theorem 2.5. [8] Let A be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, let r be an integer with $1 \leq r \leq n$, and let B denote any $r \times r$ principal submatrix of A . Let $\lambda_1(A) \geq \lambda_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$ and $\lambda_1(B) \geq \lambda_2(B) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r(B)$ be the eigenvalues of A and B , respectively. For each integer i such that $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have

$$\lambda_i(A) \geq \lambda_i(B) \geq \lambda_{n-r+i}(A).$$

The next result is a consequence of the inclusion principle and Weyl's inequality that gives interlacing inequalities of a rank one perturbation to a real symmetric matrix.

Lemma 2.6. [18, Lemma 1] Let A be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix and $B = A + J_n$, where J_n is the matrix of all ones. Let $\lambda_1(A) \geq \lambda_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1}(A) \geq \lambda_n(A)$ and $\lambda_1(B) \geq \lambda_2(B) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1}(B) \geq \lambda_n(B)$ be the eigenvalues of A and B , respectively. Then the following interlacing inequalities holds:

$$\lambda_1(B) \geq \lambda_2(A) \geq \lambda_2(B) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1}(A) \geq \lambda_n(B) \geq \lambda_n(A).$$

Observe that, given a monic polynomial f with real coefficients we know that $f(x)$ is strictly positive for sufficiently large value x . The lemma below is an immediate consequence of the above observation.

Lemma 2.7. Let f and g be monic polynomials with real coefficients having real roots. Let $\lambda(f)$ and $\lambda(g)$ denote the largest real root of f and g , respectively. If $f(\lambda(g)) < 0$, then $\lambda(g) < \lambda(f)$.

We conclude this section with a lemma that gives two inequalities. These inequalities can be obtained with simple calculations, and hence we omit the proofs.

Lemma 2.8. Let n_p, n_q be positive integers and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$. Then the following inequalities hold.

(i) If $a > 0$ and $b > 3$, then

$$\frac{n_p}{a} + \frac{n_q}{b} > \frac{n_p - 1}{a + 3} + \frac{n_q + 1}{b - 3} \Leftrightarrow (3n_p + a)b(b - 3) > (3n_q + b)a(a + 3).$$

(ii) If $a > 3$ and $b > 0$, then

$$\frac{n_p}{a} + \frac{n_q}{b} > \frac{n_p - 1}{a - 3} + \frac{n_q + 1}{b + 3} \Leftrightarrow 3[n_q a(a - 3) - n_p b(b + 3)] > ab(a - b - 6).$$

In the next section, we compute the characteristic polynomial of the squared distance matrix of the complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} and discusses some of its consequences.

3 Characteristic Polynomial of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$

Let $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ be the squared distance matrix of the complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} . Thus, $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ can be expressed in the following block form

$$\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) = \begin{bmatrix} 4(J_{n_1} - I_{n_1}) & J_{n_1 \times n_2} & \cdots & J_{n_1 \times n_t} \\ J_{n_2 \times n_1} & 4(J_{n_2} - I_{n_2}) & \cdots & J_{n_2 \times n_t} \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ J_{n_t \times n_1} & J_{n_t \times n_2} & \cdots & 4(J_{n_t} - I_{n_t}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

We begin with a few lemmas which will be used to compute the characteristic polynomial of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and A_m be an $m \times m$ matrix of the following form

$$A_m = \begin{bmatrix} p_1 & p_1 & \cdots & p_1 \\ p_2 & 4(p_2 - 1) - x & \cdots & p_2 \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_m & p_m & \cdots & 4(p_m - 1) - x \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the determinant of A_m is given by

$$\det A_m = p_1 \prod_{j \neq 1} (3p_j - 4 - x).$$

Proof. By subtracting the first columns from all the other columns, the resulting matrix is of the following form

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ p_2 & 3p_2 - 4 - x & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_m & 0 & \cdots & 3p_m - 4 - x \end{bmatrix}$$

and hence the result follows. \square

Lemma 3.2. Let B_m be an $m \times m$ matrix of the following form

$$B_m = \begin{bmatrix} 4(n_1 - 1) & n_1 & \cdots & n_1 \\ n_2 & 4(n_2 - 1) & \cdots & n_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ n_m & n_m & \cdots & 4(n_m - 1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then,

$$\det(B_m - xI_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4 - x) \right) + \prod_{i=1}^m (3n_i - 4 - x).$$

Proof. We prove the lemma using induction on the order of the matrix. For $m = 1$, the result is true. Let us assume the result is true for matrix order $m - 1$ of similar form. Now expanding along the first row and using Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\det(B_m - xI_m) = 4(n_1 - 1) \det(B_{m-1} - xI_{m-1}) - n_1 \sum_{i=2}^m \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4 - x) \right)$$

and hence the result follows. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let G be a complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices and $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G . Then, the characteristics polynomial of $\Delta(G)$ is given by*

$$P_{\Delta}(G, x) = (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right]. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\Delta}(G) = \Delta(G) - xI_n$. We use elementary row and column operations to prove the result. For each partition of the vertex set we subtract the first column from the remaining columns and then add all the rows of each partition to the first row. Next, we move the first column of each partition to the first t -columns followed by the same operation on the rows. Then, the resulting matrix has the following block form

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} B_t - xI_t & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline * & -(x + 4)I_{n-t} \end{array} \right],$$

where B_t is the matrix as defined in Eqn (3.2). Thus,

$$\det(\Delta(G) - xI) = (-1)^{n-t} (x + 4)^{n-t} \det(B_t - xI_t)$$

and from Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\Delta(G) - xI_n) &= (-1)^{n-t} (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[\sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4 - x) \right) + \prod_{i=1}^t (3n_i - 4 - x) \right] \\ &= (-1)^{n-t} (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[(-1)^{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) + (-1)^t \prod_{i=1}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) \right] \\ &= (-1)^n (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and hence the result follows. \square

Remark 3.4. *From the proof of Proposition 3.3, it is easy to see that*

$$\det(xI_t - B_t) = \prod_{i=1}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right).$$

Corollary 3.5. Let G be a complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices and $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G . Then, the determinant of $\Delta(G)$ is given by

$$\det \Delta(G) = (-4)^{n-t} \left[\sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4) \right) + \prod_{i=1}^t (3n_i - 4) \right].$$

Corollary 3.6. Let $t = s + h \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_i = 1$ for $s + 1 \leq i \leq t = s + h$. Let $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of the complete t -partite graph $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. Then, the characteristic polynomial of $\Delta(G)$ is given by $P_\Delta(G, x) = (x + 4)^{n-t} (x + 1)^{h-1} p(G, x)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} p(G, x) &= (x + 1 - h) \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) - (x + 1) \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \\ &= (x + 1) \det(xI - B_s) - h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where B_s is the matrix defined in Eqn (3.2) with parameters n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s .

Proof. Substituting $n_i = 1$ for $s + 1 \leq i \leq t = s + h$ in Eqn. (3.3), the characteristic polynomial $P_\Delta(G, x)$ of $\Delta(G)$ reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} P_\Delta(G, x) &= (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right] \\ &= (x + 4)^{n-t} \left[(x + 1)^h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) - (x + 1)^h \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - h(x + 1)^{h-1} \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) \right] \\ &= (x + 4)^{n-t} (x + 1)^{h-1} \left[(x + 1) \left(\prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) \right] \\ &= (x + 4)^{n-t} (x + 1)^{h-1} \left[(x + 1 - h) \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) - (x + 1) \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Further, in view of Remark 3.4, Eqn. (3.5) can be written as

$$P_\Delta(G, x) = (x + 4)^{n-t} (x + 1)^{h-1} \left[(x + 1) \det(xI - B_s) - h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) \right].$$

This completes the proof. \square

4 Inertia and Energy of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$

In this section, we find the inertia of the squared distance matrix of the complete multipartite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} and compute the squared distance energy $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. We first consider the complete multipartite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} whenever $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $t \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. Let G be the complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices and $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G . Then, the inertia of $\Delta(G)$ is given by*

$$\text{In}(\Delta(G)) = (t, 0, n - t)$$

and the squared distance energy of K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} is given by

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = 8(n - t).$$

Proof. Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t \geq 2$. Using Eqn. (3.1), we have

$$\Delta(G) + 4I_n = \text{Diag}(3J_{n_1}, 3J_{n_2}, \dots, 3J_{n_t}) + J_n. \quad (4.1)$$

For $1 \leq i \leq t$, the eigenvalues of J_{n_i} are n_i with multiplicity 1 and 0 with multiplicity $n_i - 1$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of $\text{Diag}(3J_{n_1}, 3J_{n_2}, \dots, 3J_{n_t})$ are $3n_1, 3n_2, \dots, 3n_t$ each with multiplicity 1 and 0 with multiplicity $n - t$.

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G) + 4I_n$. From Eqn. (4.1), $\Delta(G) + 4I_n$ is a rank one perturbation of $\text{Diag}(J_{n_1}, J_{n_2}, \dots, J_{n_t})$. Then, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\lambda_1 \geq 3n_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq 3n_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_t \geq 3n_t \geq \lambda_{t+1} \geq 0 \geq \lambda_{t+2} \geq 0 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0.$$

Since $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$, so $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_t \geq 6$. Moreover, Eqn. (4.1) yields that the rank of $\Delta(G) + 4I_n$ is t and hence $\lambda_i = 0$ for $t + 1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$ are $\lambda_1 - 4, \lambda_2 - 4, \dots, \lambda_t - 4$ each with multiplicity 1 and -4 with multiplicity $n - t$. This implies that $\lambda_1 - 4, \lambda_2 - 4, \dots, \lambda_t - 4$ are all positive eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$, and the only negative eigenvalue of $\Delta(G)$ is -4 with multiplicity $n - t$. Hence, $\text{In}(\Delta(G)) = (t, 0, n - t)$ and the squared distance energy of G is given by

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = 2(4(n - t)) = 8(n - t).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let $t \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. If B_t is the matrix defined in Eqn (3.2) with parameters n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t , then the eigenvalues of B_t are positive.*

Proof. Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$. If $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ are the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$, then by Theorem 4.1, -4 is an eigenvalue of $\Delta(G)$ with multiplicity $n - t$ and $\lambda_i(G) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. Therefore, in view of Proposition 3.3 and Remark 3.4, we get $\lambda_i(G)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ are the roots of $\det(xI_t - B_t) = 0$ and hence the result follows. \square

Now we prove a few lemmas useful to find the inertia of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and $E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$, whenever K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} belongs to the class $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and h be a positive integer. Let B_s be the matrix defined in Eqn (3.2) with parameters n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s . If $f(x) = (x + 1) \det(xI_s - B_s) - h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i)$, then $f(x) \neq 0$ for $x \leq -1$.*

Proof. For $x \leq -1$ and $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, we have $x + 4 - 3n_i < 0$ and hence the sign of $-h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i)$ is $(-1)^{s+1}$. By Corollary 4.2, the eigenvalues of B_s are positive which implies that the sign of $(x + 1) \det(xI_s - B_s)$ is $(-1)^{s+1}$ for $x < -1$ and the value of $(x + 1) \det(xI_s - B_s)$ is zero for $x = 1$. Therefore, both $(x + 1) \det(xI_s - B_s)$ and $-h \prod_{i=1}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i)$ are of the same sign and hence $f(x) \neq 0$ for $x \leq -1$. \square

Lemma 4.4. Let $t = s + h \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_i = 1$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t = s+h$. Let G be the complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices and $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G . If $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ are the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$, then

(i) $\lambda_i(G) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$.

(ii) $\lambda_{s+1}(G) > 0$ if and only if $h-1 > \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4}$, $\lambda_{s+1}(G) = 0$ if and only if $h-1 = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4}$

and $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$ if and only if $h-1 < \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4}$.

Moreover, if $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$, then $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$.

(iii) $\lambda_i(G) = -1$ for $s+2 \leq i \leq s+h$ and $\lambda_i(G) = -4$ for $s+h+1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. Let $H = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s}$ be the complete s -partite graph on $n-h = \sum_{i=1}^s n_i$ vertices and $\Delta(H)$ be the squared distance matrix of H . Then, $\Delta(H)$ is a principal submatrix of $\Delta(G)$. If $\lambda_1(H) \geq \lambda_2(H) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-h}(H)$ denote the eigenvalues of $\Delta(H)$, then Theorem 4.1 yields that $\lambda_s(H) > 0$ and hence using Theorem 2.5, we have $\lambda_s(G) \geq \lambda_s(H) > 0$. This proves part (i).

Let B_s be the matrix defined in Eqn (3.2) with parameters $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_s \geq 2$. By Corollary 3.6, the characteristic polynomial of $\Delta(G)$ is given by

$$P_{\Delta}(G, x) = (x+4)^{n-t}(x+1)^{h-1}p(G, x),$$

where $p(G, x) = (x+1)\det(xI - B_s) - h \prod_{i=1}^s (x+4-3n_i)$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $p(G, x) \neq 0$ for $x \leq -1$, and hence the roots of the polynomial $p(G, x)$ are $\lambda_i(G)$ for $1 \leq i \leq s+1$. Therefore, $\lambda_i(G) = -1$ for $s+2 \leq i \leq s+h$ and $\lambda_i(G) = -4$ for $s+h+1 \leq i \leq n$. Since by part (i), we know that $\lambda_i(G) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, so if $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$, then $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$.

Now substituting $n_i = 1$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t = s+h$ in Corollary 3.5, the determinant of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(G)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \det \Delta(G) &= (-4)^{n-t} \left[\sum_{i=1}^t \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4) \right) + \prod_{i=1}^t (3n_i - 4) \right] \\ &= (-4)^{n-t} \left[(-1)^h \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4) \right) + (-1)^{h-1} h \prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4) + (-1)^h \prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4) \right] \\ &= (-4)^{n-t} (-1)^{h-1} \left[(h-1) \prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4) - \sum_{i=1}^s \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (3n_j - 4) \right) \right] \\ &= (-4)^{n-t} (-1)^{h-1} \left[(h-1) - \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4} \right] \prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Further, we also know that $\lambda_i(G) = -1$ for $s+2 \leq i \leq s+h$, i.e., -1 is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $h-1$ and $\lambda_i(G) = -4$ for $s+h+1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e., -4 is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $n-t$. Thus, using $\det \Delta(G) = \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(G)$, the Eqn. (4.2) yields that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{s+1} \lambda_i(G) = \left[(h-1) - \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4} \right] \prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4).$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^s (3n_i - 4) > 0$ as $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and by part (i), $\lambda_i(G) > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, so $\lambda_{s+1}(G) > 0$ if and only if $h - 1 > \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$, $\lambda_{s+1}(G) = 0$ if and only if $h - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$ and $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$ if and only if $h - 1 < \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$. This completes the proof. \square

The following result determines the inertia and the squared distance energy whenever complete t -partite graphs are in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$. This result is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.4, and hence we state the result without proof.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $t = s + h \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_i = 1$ for $s + 1 \leq i \leq t = s + h$. Let G be the complete t -partite graph K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. Let $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G and $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ are the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$. Then, the inertia of $\Delta(G)$ is given by*

$$\text{In}(\Delta(G)) = \begin{cases} (s + 1, 0, n - s - 1) & \text{if } h - 1 > \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}, \\ (s, 1, n - s - 1) & \text{if } h - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}, \\ (s, 0, n - s) & \text{if } h - 1 < \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}, \end{cases}$$

and the squared distance energy of G is given by

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = \begin{cases} 8(n - t) + 2(h - 1) & \text{if } h - 1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}, \\ 8(n - t) + 2[(h - 1) + \theta] & \text{if } h - 1 < \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$ and $\theta = -\lambda_{s+1}(G)$. Equivalently, the squared distance energy of G is given by

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = \begin{cases} 8(n - t) + 2(h - 1) & \text{if } \lambda_{s+1}(G) \geq 0, \\ 8(n - t) + 2[(h - 1) - \lambda_{s+1}(G)] & \text{if } \lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Corollary 4.6. *Let K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} be a complete t -partite graphs on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. If $h = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and $h \geq 1$, then*

$$8(n - t) + 2(h - 1) \leq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) < 8(n - t) + 2h.$$

Corollary 4.7. *Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$. Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ and $H = K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ be complete t -partite graphs on n vertices. Let $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and $h_H = |\{i : m_i = 1\}|$. If $h_H < h_G$, then $E_{\Delta}(H) < E_{\Delta}(G)$.*

Proof. For $h_G \geq 2$, using Theorem 4.5, it is easy to see that the result hold true. Next, let $h_G = 1$. Then $h_H = 0$ and hence $m_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. By Theorem 4.1, we have $E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n - t)$.

Without loss of generality, let us assume $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t$. Thus, using $h_G = 1$, we get $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq t - 1$ and therefore, $0 = h_G - 1 < \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$. By Theorem 4.5, we have $E_{\Delta}(G) = 8(n - t) + \theta$, where $0 < \theta < 1$. Hence $E_{\Delta}(H) < E_{\Delta}(G)$. \square

5 Extremal Graphs for Maxima and Minima of $E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$

In this section, we prove that if $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$, then $E_{\Delta}(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) \geq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. Furthermore, for fixed value of n and t , we find complete t -partite graphs for which the squared distance energy $E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ attain its maxima and minima, and discuss the uniqueness of these extremal graphs. We first prove a few lemmas useful to achieve the above goals.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $n_p, n_q \geq 2$ and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$. If $0 \leq x < 1$, then*

$$\frac{n_p}{x-4+3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x-4+3n_q} > \frac{n_p-1}{x-4+3(n_p-1)} + \frac{n_q+1}{x-4+3(n_q+1)}. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. Observe that, if $n_p, n_q \geq 2$ and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$, then $(x-4+3n_p), (x-4+3n_q), (x-4+3(n_p-1)), (x-4+3(n_q+1)) > 0$ for $0 \leq x < 1$. For a fix $x \in [0, 1]$, let $a = x-4+3n_p$ and $b = x-4+3n_q$. Then, in view of part (ii) of Lemma 2.8, to prove inequality Eqn. (5.1) it is enough to show that

$$3[n_q a(a-3) - n_p b(b+3)] - ab(a-b-6) > 0.$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} & 3[n_q a(a-3) - n_p b(b+3)] \\ &= 3[n_q(x-4+3n_p)(x-4+3(n_p-1)) - n_p(x-4+3n_q)(x-4+3(n_q+1))] \\ &= 3[n_q(x-4)^2 + 3(x-4)(2n_p n_q - n_q) + 9n_p(n_p-1)] \\ & \quad - 3[n_p(x-4)^2 + 3(x-4)(2n_p n_q + n_p) + 9n_p n_q(n_q+1)] \\ &= 3[(n_q - n_p)(x-4)^2 - 3(x-4)(n_p + n_q) + 9n_p n_q(n_p - n_q - 2)], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} ab(a-b-6) &= 3(x-4+3n_p)(x-4+3n_q)(n_p - n_q - 2) \\ &= 3[(n_p - n_q - 2)(x-4)^2 + 3(x-4)(n_p + n_q)(n_p - n_q - 2) + 9n_p n_q(n_p - n_q - 2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & 3[n_q a(a-3) - n_p b(b+3)] - ab(a-b-6) \\ &= 3[(n_q - n_p)(x-4)^2 - 3(x-4)(n_p + n_q)] \\ & \quad - 3[(n_p - n_q - 2)(x-4)^2 + 3(x-4)(n_p + n_q)(n_p - n_q - 2)] \\ &= 3[2(x-4)^2(n_q - n_p + 1) + 3(x-4)(n_p + n_q)(n_q - n_p + 1)] \\ &= (x-4)(n_q - n_p + 1)[2(x-4) + 3(n_p + n_q)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Further, for $0 \leq x < 1$, we have $-4 \leq x-4 < -3$, and using $n_p \geq n_q + 2$, we have $n_q - n_p + 1 \leq -1$, which implies that

$$(x-4)(n_q - n_p + 1) > 0. \quad (5.3)$$

Next, for $0 \leq x < 1$, we have $-8 \leq 2(x-4) < -6$ and for $n_p, n_q \geq 2$, we have $3(n_p + n_q) \geq 12$, which implies that

$$[2(x-4) + 3(n_p + n_q)] > 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Using Eqns. (5.2) - (5.4), we have $3[n_q a(a-3) - n_p b(b+3)] - ab(a-b-6) > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Assumption 5.2. Let $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let $t = s + h \geq 3$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_i = 1$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t = s+h$. Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ for $1 \leq p, q \leq s$. Let $G = K_{n_1, \dots, n_p, \dots, n_q, \dots, n_s, n_{s+1}, \dots, n_t}$ and $H = K_{n_1, \dots, n_{p-1}, \dots, n_q+1, \dots, n_s, n_{s+1}, \dots, n_t}$ be complete t -partite graphs on n vertices. Let $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ and $\lambda_1(H) \geq \lambda_2(H) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(H)$ be the eigenvalues of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(G)$ and $\Delta(H)$, respectively.

Lemma 5.3. Under the Assumption 5.2, if $\lambda_{s+1}(G) \geq 0$, then $\lambda_{s+1}(H) > 0$ and

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n-t) + 2(h-1).$$

Proof. By part (ii) of Lemma 4.4 we know that $\lambda_{s+1}(G) \geq 0$ only if $h-1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4}$. For $x = 0$,

Lemma 5.1 gives us

$$\frac{n_p}{3n_p-4} + \frac{n_q}{3n_q-4} > \frac{n_p-1}{3(n_p-1)-4} + \frac{n_q+1}{3(n_q+1)-4},$$

and hence

$$h-1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4} > \frac{n_p-1}{3(n_p-1)-4} + \frac{n_q+1}{3(n_q+1)-4} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i-4}.$$

Therefore, using part (ii) of Lemma 4.4, we get $\lambda_{s+1}(H) > 0$. Furthermore, by Theorem 4.5, we have $E_{\Delta}(G) = E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n-t) + 2(h-1)$. \square

Lemma 5.4. Under the Assumption 5.2, if $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$, then $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < \lambda_{s+1}(H)$ and

$$E_{\Delta}(G) > E_{\Delta}(H).$$

Proof. Since $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$, so by part (ii) of Lemma 4.4 we know that $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$ and by Theorem 4.5, we have

$$E_{\Delta}(G) = 8(n-t) + 2[(h-1) - \lambda_{s+1}(G)].$$

If $\lambda_{s+1}(H) \geq 0$, then by Theorem 4.5, we have $E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n-t) + 2(h-1)$ and the result holds true. Next, if $\lambda_{s+1}(H) < 0$, then by part (ii) of Lemma 4.4 we know that $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(H) < 0$ and by Theorem 4.5, we get $E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n-t) + 2[(h-1) - \lambda_{s+1}(H)]$. Therefore, in this case, to complete the proof we show that $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < \lambda_{s+1}(H) < 0$.

Let $p(G, x)$ and $p(H, x)$ be the monic polynomials defined in Eqn. (3.4) with parameters $n_1, \dots, n_p, \dots, n_q, \dots, n_s$ and $n_1, \dots, n_{p-1}, \dots, n_q+1, \dots, n_s$, respectively. Then, by Corollary 3.6, the characteristic polynomials of $\Delta(G)$ and $\Delta(H)$ are given by

$$P_{\Delta}(G, x) = (x+4)^{n-t}(x+1)^{h-1}p(G, x) \text{ and } P_{\Delta}(H, x) = (x+4)^{n-t}(x+1)^{h-1}p(H, x),$$

respectively. By our hypothesis $\lambda_{s+1}(G), \lambda_{s+1}(H) \in (-1, 0)$ and hence by Lemma 4.4 we know that $\lambda_{s+1}(G)$ and $\lambda_{s+1}(H)$ are the unique negative roots of $p(G, x)$ and $p(H, x)$, respectively. Let us define

$$f(x) = (-1)^{s+1}p(G, -x) \text{ and } g(x) = (-1)^{s+1}p(H, -x). \quad (5.5)$$

By construction, $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are monic polynomials. Furthermore, $-\lambda_{s+1}(G)$ and $-\lambda_{s+1}(H)$ are the largest roots of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, respectively and both of them lie in the interval $(0, 1)$. Therefore, in view of Lemma 2.7, to prove $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < \lambda_{s+1}(H) < 0$ or equivalently $0 < -\lambda_{s+1}(H) < -\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 1$, we show that $f(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) < 0$ and we proceed as follows.

Claim: $f(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) < 0$.

Observe that, using $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ for $1 \leq p, q \leq s$, we have $x + 4 - 3n_i < 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1) < 0$ and $x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1) < 0$ for $-1 < x < 0$ (i.e., $x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)$, $x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)$ and $x + 4 - 3n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ are non-zero, whenever $-1 < x < 0$). Therefore, for $x \in (-1, 0)$, the monic polynomials $p(G, x)$ and $p(H, x)$ as defined in Eqn. (3.4) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
p(G, x) &= (x + 4 - 3n_p)(x + 4 - 3n_q) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) \\
&\quad \times \left[(x + 1 - h) - (x + 1) \left(\frac{n_p}{x + 4 - 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x + 4 - 3n_q} \right) - (x + 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_i} \right] \text{ and} \\
p(H, x) &= (x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x + 4 - 3n_i) \\
&\quad \times \left[(x + 1 - h) - (x + 1) \left(\frac{n_p - 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)} \right) - (x + 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_i} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, for $x \in (0, 1)$, the monic polynomials $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ defined in Eqn. (5.5), can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= (x - 4 + 3n_p)(x - 4 + 3n_q) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x - 4 + 3n_i) \\
&\quad \times \left[(x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p}{x - 4 + 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x - 4 + 3n_q} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i} \right] \text{ and} \\
g(x) &= (x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1))(x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x - 4 + 3n_i) \\
&\quad \times \left[(x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p - 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_f(x) &= (x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p}{x - 4 + 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x - 4 + 3n_q} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i}, \\
\varphi_g(x) &= (x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p - 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $x \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} f(x) = \left[(x - 4 + 3n_p)(x - 4 + 3n_q) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x - 4 + 3n_i) \right] \varphi_f(x), \\ g(x) = \left[(x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1))(x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s (x - 4 + 3n_i) \right] \varphi_g(x). \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

Using $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ for $1 \leq p, q \leq s$, we have

$$x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1) > 0, x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1) > 0, x - 4 + 3n_i > 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s \text{ and } x \in (0, 1). \quad (5.7)$$

Therefore, in view of Eqns. (5.6) and (5.7), we get $f(x) = 0$ if and only if $\varphi_f(x) = 0$ and $g(x) = 0$ if and only if $\varphi_g(x) = 0$ for $x \in (0, 1)$. Further, for $x \in (0, 1)$, we have $(x - 1) < 0$ and Lemma 5.1 yields that

$$(x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p}{x - 4 + 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x - 4 + 3n_q} \right) < (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p - 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)} \right),$$

and hence for all $x \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[(x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p}{x - 4 + 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x - 4 + 3n_q} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i} \right] \\ & < \left[(x - 1 + h) + (x - 1) \left(\frac{n_p - 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x - 4 + 3(n_q + 1)} \right) + (x - 1) \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{x - 4 + 3n_i} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\varphi_f(x) < \varphi_g(x)$ for all $x \in (0, 1)$. In particular, $0 < -\lambda_{s+1}(H) < 1$ and $g(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) = 0$, which implies that $\varphi_f(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) < \varphi_g(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) = 0$. Furthermore, by Eqn. (5.7) we know that $x - 4 + 3n_i > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $x \in (0, 1)$, and hence using Eqn. (5.6), we get $f(-\lambda_{s+1}(H)) < 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Now we state the following result (without proof) which is obtained by combining the conclusions of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s be positive integers such that $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. If $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ for $1 \leq p, q \leq s$, then*

$$E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, \dots, n_p, \dots, n_q, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}) \geq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, \dots, n_p - 1, \dots, n_q + 1, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}).$$

Theorem 5.6. *Let $t = s + h$ with $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t and m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t be positive integers. Then the following results hold.*

(i) *Let $n_i \geq 2$ and $m_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. If $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}})$,*

then

$$E_{\Delta}(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}) \geq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}).$$

(ii) *If $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$, then $E_{\Delta}(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) \geq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$.*

Proof. Let $t = s + h$ and $s < t$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_s \geq 2$ and $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_s \geq 2$. Let $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}})$. Thus, if

we denote $Y = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s)$ and $X = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s)$, then by Theorem 2.2, we have $X \succ Y$.

Recall that, $\mathcal{B}_n = \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : z_1 \geq z_2 \geq \dots \geq z_n\}$. For $Z = (z_1, \dots, z_s) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, we denote $\tilde{Z} = (z_1, \dots, z_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \in \mathcal{B}_{s+h}$. Since $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}_s$ and $X \succ Y$, so by Theorem 2.1, there

exists a sequence in \mathcal{B}_s such as $Y = Y_0 \succ Y_1 \succ \dots \succ Y_l = X$ such that $Y_i = Y_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^s$ for some $k_i > j_i$, $1 \leq i \leq l$. Therefore, using Theorem 2.2, we have

$$(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) = \tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_0 \succ \tilde{Y}_1 \succ \dots \succ \tilde{Y}_l = \tilde{X} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}), \quad (5.8)$$

where $\tilde{Y}_i = \tilde{Y}_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^{s+h}$ for some $k_i > j_i; 1 \leq i \leq l$. Therefore, applying Lemma 5.5 inductively on Eqn. (5.8) yields that $E_{\Delta}(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}) \geq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}})$. This proves part (i).

Next, let $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$. Let $G = K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ and $H = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$. Let us denote $h_G = |\{i : m_i = 1\}|$ and $h_H = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$. Then $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$ implies that either $h_G = h_H$ or $h_G > h_H$. Thus, if $h_G = h_H$, then by part (i), we have $E_{\Delta}(G) \geq E_{\Delta}(H)$ and if $h_G > h_H$, then by Corollary 4.7, we have $E_{\Delta}(G) > E_{\Delta}(H)$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ be positive integers and $n = h + \sum_{i=1}^s n_i$. Let $H = K_{n_1, \dots, n_p, \dots, n_q, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$ and $H^* = K_{n_1, \dots, n_p+1, \dots, n_q-1, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$. Let $\lambda_1(H) \geq \lambda_2(H) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(H)$ and $\lambda_1(H^*) \geq \lambda_2(H^*) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(H^*)$ be the eigenvalues of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(H)$ and $\Delta(H^*)$, respectively. If $\lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$, then $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(H^*) < \lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$.*

Proof. For $\lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$, using part (ii) of Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4} \geq h - 1. \quad (5.9)$$

For $x = 0$ and suitable choices in Eqn. (5.1), we have the following inequality

$$\frac{n_p + 1}{3(n_p + 1) - 4} + \frac{n_q - 1}{3(n_q - 1) - 4} > \frac{n_p}{3n_p - 4} + \frac{n_q}{3n_q - 4},$$

and hence by Eqn. (5.9), we have

$$\frac{n_p + 1}{3(n_p + 1) - 4} + \frac{n_q - 1}{3(n_q - 1) - 4} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4} > \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4} \geq h - 1.$$

Therefore, by part (ii) of Lemma 4.4, we have $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(H^*) < 0$. Further, using Lemma 5.4, we have $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(H^*) < \lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$ and $E_{\Delta}(H^*) > E_{\Delta}(H)$. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let $n_i \geq 2, m_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ be a positive integers and $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s)$. Let $G = K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$ and $H = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$ be complete t -partite graphs on $n = h + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i = h + \sum_{i=1}^s n_i$ vertices. Let $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ and $\lambda_1(H) \geq \lambda_2(H) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(H)$ be the eigenvalues of the squared distance matrix $\Delta(G)$ and $\Delta(H)$, respectively. If $\lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$, then $-1 < \lambda_{s+1}(G) < \lambda_{s+1}(H) \leq 0$ and $E_{\Delta}(G) > E_{\Delta}(H)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_s \geq 2$ and $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_s \geq 2$. Let $Y = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s)$ and $X = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s)$. Then $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}_s$ and $X \succ Y$. By Theorem 2.1, there exists a sequence in \mathcal{B}_s such as $Y = Y_0 \succ Y_1 \succ \dots \succ Y_l = X$ such that $Y_i = Y_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^s$ for some $k_i > j_i, 1 \leq i \leq l$. Thus, using Lemma 5.7 inductively on the above sequence yields the result. \square

For fixed value of n, t and h , we define two graphs in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ which are similar to complete split graph and Turán graph as follows:

1. $S_{n, t, h} \cong K_{n-2(t-1)+h, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{t-h-1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$.

$$2. T_{n,t,h} \cong K_{\underbrace{[n-h/t-h], \dots, [n-h/t-h], [n-h/t-h], \dots, [n-h/t-h]}_{h \text{ times}}, 1, 1, \dots, 1}$$

Theorem 5.9. Let $s \geq 2$ and $h \geq 1$. Let $t = s + h$ and $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ be positive integers. Let $K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}$ be a complete t -partite graph on $n = h + \sum_{i=1}^s n_i$ vertices. Then

$$E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t,h}) \leq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}) \leq E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t,h}).$$

Moreover, in this case if $\lambda_{s+1}(T_{n,t,h}) \leq 0$, then the maximal graph $S_{n,t,h}$ and the minimal graph $T_{n,t,h}$ are unique upto isomorphism.

Proof. By Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (n - 2(t - 1) + h, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{t-h-1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \succeq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \text{ and} \\ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}) \succeq \left(\left\lceil \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rceil, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rfloor, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rfloor, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}} \right). \end{array} \right. \quad (5.10)$$

In view of Eqn. (5.10), using part (i) of Theorem 5.6, we have

$$E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t,h}) \leq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}}) \leq E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t,h}).$$

Further, under the assumption $\lambda_{s+1}(T_{n,t,h}) \leq 0$, the uniqueness of extremal graphs $T_{n,t,h}$ and $S_{n,t,h}$ follows from Lemma 5.8. \square

Remark 5.10. For fixed value of n, t and h , recall that $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ is the class of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices which has exactly h number of partitions of order 1, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(n, t, h) &= \left\{ K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} : n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \text{ and } h = |\{i : n_i = 1\}| \right\} \\ &= \left\{ K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{h \text{ times}}} : t = s + h, n_i \geq 2 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s \text{ and } n = h + \sum_{i=1}^s n_i \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, every complete t -partite graphs in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ is uniquely identified (upto isomorphism) with an s -tuple (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s) of positive integers such that $t = s + h$, $n - h = \sum_{i=1}^s n_i$ and $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_s \geq 2$.

Let G be a complete t -partite graphs in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ is uniquely identified with (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s) . Let $\Delta(G)$ be the squared distance matrix of G and $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$ be the eigenvalues of $\Delta(G)$. Then, by part (ii) of Lemma 4.4, we have $\lambda_{s+1}(G) > 0$ if and only if $h - 1 > \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$, $\lambda_{s+1}(G) = 0$ if and only if $h - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$ and $\lambda_{s+1}(G) < 0$ if and only if $h - 1 < \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{n_i}{3n_i - 4}$.

From the proof of Theorems 5.6 and 5.9, we can conclude the following: For fixed value of n, t and h , there exists a sequence of complete t -partite graphs $\{G_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, l$ with $G_0 = S_{n,t,h}$ and $G_l = T_{n,t,h}\}$ in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ such that

$$E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t,h}) = E_{\Delta}(G_0) \geq E_{\Delta}(G_1) \geq E_{\Delta}(G_2) \geq \dots \geq E_{\Delta}(G_l) = E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t,h}).$$

Furthermore, by Remark 5.10 and Theorem 2.1, each G_i is uniquely determine by s -tuple Y_i and $Y_i = Y_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^s$ for some $k_i > j_i$, $1 \leq i \leq l$ such that

$$(n - 2(t - 1) + h, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{t-h-1 \text{ times}}) = Y_0 \succ Y_1 \succ \dots \succ Y_l = \left(\left\lceil \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rceil, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rfloor, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n-h}{t-h} \right\rfloor \right).$$

Using the above notations, we provide a few examples that show in general the maximal and the minimal value of the squared distance energy of graphs in $\mathcal{M}(n, t, h)$ is not uniquely attained by $S_{n,t,h}$ and $T_{n,t,h}$, respectively.

Example 5.11. Let $n = 31, t = 15$ and $h = 7$. In this case $s = 8$ and by Remark 5.10, every complete 15-partite graphs in $\mathcal{M}(31, 15, 7)$ is uniquely identified with 8-tuple. Then $S_{31,15,7}$ is identified with $(10, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$ and $T_{31,15,7}$ is identified with $(3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3)$. Let us consider the chain

$$\begin{aligned} & (10, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (9, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (8, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (7, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \\ & \succ (6, 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (5, 4, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (4, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2) \\ & \succ (4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2) \succ (4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2) \succ (3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding sequence of complete 15-partite graphs in $\mathcal{M}(31, 15, 7)$ is given by

$$\{G_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, 10 \text{ with } G_0 = S_{31,15,7} \text{ and } G_{10} = T_{31,15,7}\}.$$

In this case $\lambda_{s+1} = \lambda_9$, and by Remark 5.10, we have $\lambda_9(G_i) < 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$, $\lambda_9(G_6) = 0$ and $\lambda_9(G_i) > 0$ for $i = 7, 8, 9, 10$. Thus, Theorem 4.5 yields that $E_\Delta(T_{31,15,7}) = E_\Delta(G_i) = 8(n - t) + 2(h - 1) = 140$ for $i = 7, 8, 9, 10$ and hence the minimal value of the squared distance energy is not uniquely attained by $T_{31,15,7}$. Furthermore, since $\lambda_9(S_{31,15,7}) = \lambda_9(G_0) < 0$, so by Lemma 5.4, the maximal value of the squared distance energy is uniquely attained by $S_{31,15,7}$.

Example 5.12. Let $n = 30, t = 15$ and $h = 7$. In this case $s = 8$ and by Remark 5.10, $S_{30,15,7}$ is identified with $(9, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$ and $T_{30,15,7}$ is identified with $(3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2)$. Let us consider the chain $(9, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (8, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (7, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (6, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (5, 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (4, 4, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2) \succ (4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2) \succ (4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2) \succ (3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2)$.

The corresponding sequence of complete 15-partite graphs in $\mathcal{M}(30, 15, 7)$ is given by

$$\{G_i : i = 0, 1, \dots, 8 \text{ with } G_0 = S_{30,15,7} \text{ and } G_8 = T_{30,15,7}\}.$$

In this case $\lambda_{s+1} = \lambda_9$, and by Remark 5.10, we have $\lambda_9(G_i) < 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$, and $\lambda_9(G_i) > 0$ for $i = 6, 7, 8$. Thus, Theorem 4.5 yields that $E_\Delta(T_{30,15,7}) = E_\Delta(G_i) = 132$ and hence the minimal value of the squared distance energy is not uniquely attained by $T_{30,15,7}$. Furthermore, since $\lambda_9(S_{30,15,7}) = \lambda_9(G_0) < 0$, so by Lemma 5.4, the maximal value of the squared distance energy is uniquely attained by $S_{30,15,7}$.

Example 5.13. Let $n = 17, t = 10$ and $h = 6$. In this case $s = 4$ and by Remark 5.10, $S_{17,10,6}$ is identified with $(5, 2, 2, 2)$. Since $\lambda_{s+1}(S_{17,10,6}) = \lambda_5(S_{17,10,6}) > 0$, so by Lemma 5.3, we have $E_\Delta(S_{17,10,6}) = E_\Delta(G)$ for every G in $\mathcal{M}(17, 10, 6)$. Therefore, neither the maximal nor the minimal value of the squared distance energy for graphs in $\mathcal{M}(17, 10, 6)$ are not uniquely attained by $S_{17,10,6}$ and $T_{17,10,6}$, respectively.

We conclude this section with the following result that finds the extremal graphs for maxima and minima of $E_\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. We first prove a lemma useful for determining the uniqueness of these extremal graphs.

Lemma 5.14. *Let t, n be positive integers and $t \geq 2$ such that $t + 2 \leq n < 2t$. Let $T_{n,t} \cong K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ and $h = |\{i : m_i = 1\}|$. Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ be a complete t -partite graph on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices and $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$. If G is not isomorphic to $T_{n,t}$, then $h < h_G$.*

Proof. Let $T_{n,t} \cong K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ with $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_t$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$, then $m_t = \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor = 1$. Let $h = |\{i : m_i = 1\}|$ and $s = n - t$. Then $m_i = 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $m_i = 1$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t = s+h$.

Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ with $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t$. Let $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and $s_G = t - h_G$. Then $n_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s_G$ and $n_i = 1$ for $s_G+1 \leq i \leq t = s_G+h_G$. Therefore, $n = h+2s = h_G + \sum_{i=1}^{s_G} n_i$ and hence $h + 2(s - s_G) = h_G + \sum_{i=1}^{s_G} (n_i - 2)$. Further, using $t = s + h = s_G + h_G$, we have $s - s_G = h_G - h$. Thus, $h + 2(h_G - h) = h_G + \sum_{i=1}^{s_G} (n_i - 2)$, which implies that $h_G - h = \sum_{i=1}^{s_G} (n_i - 2)$.

If G is not isomorphic to $T_{n,t}$, then $n_k > 2$ for some $1 \leq k \leq s_G$. Therefore, $h_G - h = \sum_{i=1}^{s_G} (n_i - 2) > 0$ and hence the result follows. \square

Theorem 5.15. *Let t, n be positive integers and $t \geq 2$. Let K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} be a complete t -partite graph on $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices. Then,*

$$E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) \leq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) \leq E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t}).$$

Moreover, in this case, the maximal graph $S_{n,t}$ is unique upto isomorphism, while the minimal graph $T_{n,t}$ is unique upto isomorphism if and only if $n \leq 2t + 1$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.3, we have $(n-t+1, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{t-1}) \succeq (n_1, \dots, n_t) \succeq (\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor)$,

and hence using part (ii) of Theorem 5.6 yields that $E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) \leq E_{\Delta}(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) \leq E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t})$. Now we proceed to prove the uniqueness of the extremal graphs $S_{n,t}$ and $T_{n,t}$.

Let $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ be a complete t -partite graph on n vertices and $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$. If G is not isomorphic to $S_{n,t}$, then $h_G < t - 1$. Therefore, Corollary 4.7 yields that $E_{\Delta}(G) < E_{\Delta}(S_{n,t})$ and hence the squared distance energy is attained maximum uniquely by $S_{n,t}$ upto isomorphism. Next, to prove the minimization part we consider the cases $n > 2t + 1$ and $n \leq 2t + 1$, separately.

Case 1: Let $n > 2t + 1$. Then $\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor \geq 2$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.1, we have $E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) = 8(n-t)$ and hence Corollary 4.7 yields that $E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) \leq E_{\Delta}(G)$, where $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$. Further, in this case, let $T_{n,t} = K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ with $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_t$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$. Then, $m_1 = m_2 = \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor > 2$ and $m_t = \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor \geq 2$. If $H = K_{m_1+1, m_2-1, \dots, m_t}$, then $m_1+1, m_2-1, \dots, m_t \geq 2$ and hence by Theorem 4.1, we have $E_{\Delta}(H) = 8(n-t)$. Therefore, in this case, there exists atleast two non isomorphic graphs for which the minimum attained.

Case 2: Let $n \leq 2t + 1$. Then $t \leq n \leq 2t + 1$.

Let $t \leq n < 2t$. For $n = t$, the class of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices consisting of a single element K_t and for $n = t + 1$, the class of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices consisting of a single element $K_{2,1,1,\dots,1}$ upto isomorphism. Thus, the result is vacuously true for $n = t$ and $n = t + 1$. For $t + 2 \leq n < 2t$, if $T_{n,t} \cong K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}$ with $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_t$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$, then $m_t = \lfloor \frac{n}{t} \rfloor = 1$. Let $h = |\{i : m_i = 1\}|$ and $s = n - t$. Then, $m_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $m_i = 1$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t = s+h$. If $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ is a complete t -partite graphs on n vertices with $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and G is not isomorphic to $T_{n,t}$, then by Lemma 5.14, we have $h < h_G$ and using Corollary 4.7, we get $E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) < E_{\Delta}(G)$. Hence, the result is hold true for $t + 2 \leq n < 2t$.

Next, if $n = 2t$, then $T_{n,t} = K_{2,2,\dots,2}$. If $G = K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}$ is a complete t -partite graph on n vertices with $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and $G \neq T_{n,t}$, then $h_G \geq 1$ and hence using Corollary 4.7, we get $E_{\Delta}(T_{n,t}) < E_{\Delta}(G)$.

Finally, if $n = 2t + 1$, then $T_{n,t} \cong K_{3,2,2,\dots,2}$. If $G = K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t}$ is a complete t -partite graph on n vertices with $h_G = |\{i : n_i = 1\}|$ and G is not isomorphic to $T_{n,t}$, then $h_G \geq 1$, and hence using Corollary 4.7, we get $E_\Delta(T_{n,t}) < E_\Delta(G)$. This completes the proof. \square

6 Spectral Radius of $\Delta(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t})$

In this section, we will show that $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$ implies that $\rho(K_{m_1,m_2,\dots,m_t}) > \rho(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t})$, and as consequence prove that $\rho(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t})$ with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ is uniquely attains its maximum value at $S_{n,t}$ and minimum value at $T_{n,t}$. We begin with a few lemmas that will be useful to prove the main results of the section.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $t \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t$. Then*

$$\rho(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t}) > 4(n_1 - 1).$$

Proof. Since $\Delta(K_{n_1,n_2})$ is a principal submatrix of $\Delta(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t})$, so using Theorem 2.5, we have $\rho(K_{n_1,n_2,\dots,n_t}) \geq \rho(K_{n_1,n_2})$. By Eqn. (3.3), the characteristic equation of $\Delta(K_{n_1,n_2})$ is given by

$$(x + 4)^{n_1+n_2-2} \left[\prod_{i=1}^2 (x + 4 - 3n_i) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(n_i \prod_{j \neq i} (x + 4 - 3n_j) \right) \right] = 0,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(K_{n_1,n_2}) &= 2(n_1 + n_2) + \sqrt{4(n_1 - n_2)^2 + n_1 n_2} - 4 \\ &> 2(n_1 + n_2) + \sqrt{4(n_1 - n_2)^2} - 4 \\ &= 4(n_1 - 1), \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let G and H be connected graphs. Let $P_\Delta(G, x)$ and $P_\Delta(H, x)$ be the characteristic polynomials of $\Delta(G)$ and $\Delta(H)$, respectively. Then the following results hold.*

(i) *If $x \geq \rho(G)$, then $P_\Delta(G, x) > 0$.*

(ii) *If $P_\Delta(H, x) > P_\Delta(G, x)$ for $x \geq \rho(G)$, then $\rho(H) < \rho(G)$.*

Proof. Let $P(G, y) < 0$ for some $y \geq \rho(G)$. Since $P_\Delta(G, x)$ is a monic polynomial, there exists sufficiently large z such that $P_\Delta(G, z) > 0$. Then, using Intermediate value theorem $P_\Delta(G, x)$ have a root w in the interval (y, z) . This implies that $w > \rho(G)$, which leads to a contradiction. This proves part (i).

Next, if $\rho(H) \geq \rho(G)$, then by part (i) we have $P_\Delta(G, \rho(H)) > 0$, but $P_\Delta(H, \rho(H)) = 0$, which is a contradiction to the hypothesis $P_\Delta(H, x) > P_\Delta(G, x)$ for $x \geq \rho(G)$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $t \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ for $1 \leq p, q \leq t$. Then*

$$\rho(K_{n_1,\dots,n_p,\dots,n_q,\dots,n_t}) > \rho(K_{n_1,\dots,n_p-1,\dots,n_q+1,\dots,n_t}).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us assume $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t$. Let $G = K_{n_1,\dots,n_p,\dots,n_q,\dots,n_t}$ and $H = K_{n_1,\dots,n_p-1,\dots,n_q+1,\dots,n_t}$. By Lemma 6.1, we have $\rho(G) > 4(n_1 - 1)$. If $x \geq \rho(G)$, then using $\rho(G) > 4(n_1 - 1)$, we have

$$x + 4 - 3n_i > 4(n_1 - 1) + 4 - 3n_s = 3(n_1 - n_i) + n_1 + 4 > n_1 > 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq t. \quad (6.1)$$

Using $n_p \geq n_q + 2$, we get $(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) - (x + 4 - 3n_p)(x + 4 - 3n_q) = 9(n_p - (n_q + 1)) > 0$. Thus, using Eqn. (6.1) for $x \geq \rho(G)$, we have

$$(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) > (x + 4 - 3n_p)(x + 4 - 3n_q) > 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Therefore, for $x \geq \rho(G)$, we have $(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))$, $(x + 4 - 3(n_j - 1))$ and $(x + 4 - 3n_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ are non-zero and hence the characteristic polynomials $P_\Delta(G, x)$ and $P_\Delta(H, x)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_\Delta(G, x) &= (x + 4)^{n-t}(x + 4 - 3n_p)(x + 4 - 3n_q) \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_p} - \frac{n_j}{x + 4 - 3n_q} - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t \frac{n_s}{x + 4 - 3n_i} \right) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i) \text{ and} \\ P_\Delta(H, x) &= (x + 4)^{n-t}(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{n_i - 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)} - \frac{n_j + 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)} - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t \frac{n_s}{x + 4 - 3n_i} \right) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t (x + 4 - 3n_i), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Further, $n_p \geq n_q + 2$ yields $3(n_p - 1) \geq 3(n_q + 1)$ and hence $(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) \geq (x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))$. Similarly, using $n_p \geq n_q + 2$, we get $(x + 4 - 3n_q) > (x + 4 - 3n_p)$. By Eqns. (6.1) and (6.2), for $x \geq \rho(G)$ we know that $(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1))$, $(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1))$, $(x + 4 - 3n_q)$, $(x + 4 - 3n_p) > 0$ and hence for $x \geq \rho(G)$, we have

$$(x + 4 - 3n_q)(x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)) > (x + 4 - 3n_p)(x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)). \quad (6.3)$$

For $a = (x + 4 - 3n_p)$ and $b = (x + 4 - 3n_q)$, we have $3m + a = 3n + b = x + 4$. Thus, in view of Eqn (6.3), substituting $a = (x + 4 - 3n_p)$ and $b = (x + 4 - 3n_q)$ in part (i) of Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\frac{n_p}{x + 4 - 3n_p} + \frac{n_q}{x + 4 - 3n_q} > \frac{n_p - 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)} + \frac{n_q + 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)} \text{ for } x \geq \rho(G). \quad (6.4)$$

Let

$$h(x) = 1 - \frac{n_p}{x + 4 - 3n_p} - \frac{n_q}{x + 4 - 3n_q} - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_i}.$$

We claim that $h(x) \geq 0$ for $x \geq \rho(G)$. Suppose on the contrary, let $h(y) < 0$ for some $y \geq \rho(G)$. Then, Eqn. (6.1) yields that $P_\Delta(G, y) < 0$, which is a contradiction to part (i) of Lemma 6.2. Thus, for $x \geq \rho(G)$, Eqn. (6.4) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \frac{n_p - 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_p - 1)} - \frac{n_q + 1}{x + 4 - 3(n_q + 1)} - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_i} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{n_p}{x + 4 - 3n_p} - \frac{n_q}{x + 4 - 3n_q} - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq p, q}}^t \frac{n_i}{x + 4 - 3n_i} = h(x) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using Eqns (6.1) and (6.2), we have $P_\Delta(H, x) > P_\Delta(G, x)$ for all $x \geq \rho(G)$ and hence by part (ii) of Lemma 6.2, the desired result follows. \square

Now we ready to prove the main result of the section that gives $S_{n,t}$ and $T_{n,t}$ are the extremal graphs for which the spectral radius of the squared distance matrix of K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ vertices uniquely attains its maxima and minima, respectively.

Theorem 6.4. For $t \geq 2$, let n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t and m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t be positive integers. Then the following results hold.

(i) If $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \succ (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$, then $\rho(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) > \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$.

(ii) If $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$, then $\rho(T_{n,t}) \leq \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) \leq \rho(S_{n,t})$. Moreover, the maximal graph $S_{n,t}$ and the minimal graph $T_{n,t}$ are unique upto isomorphism.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us assume $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t$ and $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_t$. Let $Y = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t)$ and $X = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t)$. Then $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}_t$ and $X \succ Y$. By Theorem 2.1, there exists a sequence in \mathcal{B}_t such as $Y = Y_0 \succ Y_1 \succ \dots \succ Y_l = X$ such that $Y_i = Y_{i-1} + E_{j_i, k_i}^t$ for some $k_i > j_i$, $1 \leq i \leq l$. Inductively applying Lemma 6.3 yields that $\rho(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) > \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$. This prove part (i).

Next, let $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$. By Theorem 2.3, we have

$$(n - t + 1, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{t-1}) \succeq (n_1, \dots, n_t) \succeq \left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{t} \right\rceil, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{n}{t} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \right\rfloor, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \right\rfloor \right),$$

and hence using part (i) yields that $\rho(T_{n,t}) \leq \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}) \leq \rho(S_{n,t})$. Since the inequality in part (i) is strict, the spectral radius $\rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ is maximum if $K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} \cong S_{n,t}$ and is minimum if $K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} \cong T_{n,t}$. \square

Next, we show that the part (ii) of the above theorem directly follows from Lemma 6.3 and hence provide an alternative proof for the same.

Theorem 6.5. Let $t \geq 2$ and n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t be positive integers and $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$. Then the following hold.

(i) The spectral radius of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ is maximal if $K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} \cong S_{n,t}$.

(ii) The spectral radius of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ is minimal if $K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} \cong T_{n,t}$.

Proof. Let K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} be a complete t -partite graph with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$ such that

$$\rho(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) = \max_{n=n_1+\dots+n_t} \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}).$$

If there exist $1 \leq p, q \leq t$ such that $m_p \geq m_q \geq 2$, then $(m_p + 1) - (m_q - 1) \geq 2$ and by Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\rho(K_{m_1, \dots, m_p, \dots, m_q, \dots, m_t}) < \rho(K_{m_1, \dots, m_p+1, \dots, m_q-1, \dots, m_t}),$$

which is a contradiction to the choice of K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} . Thus, all the m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t are equal to 1, except for one which is equal to $n - t + 1$ and hence $K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} \cong S_{n,t}$. This proves part (i).

Next, let K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} be a complete t -partite graph with $n = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$ such that

$$\rho(K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t}) = \min_{n=n_1+\dots+n_t} \rho(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t}).$$

Then, $|m_p - m_q| \leq 1$ for all $p \neq q$, otherwise there exist $1 \leq p, q \leq t$ such that $m_p - m_q \geq 2$ and hence by Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\rho(K_{m_1, \dots, m_p, \dots, m_q, \dots, m_t}) > \rho(K_{m_1, \dots, m_p-1, \dots, m_q+1, \dots, m_t}),$$

which is a contradiction to the choice of K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} . Thus, the condition $|m_p - m_q| \leq 1$ for all $p \neq q$ implies that for all $1 \leq i \leq t$ we have m_i equal to $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{t} \right\rfloor$ or $\left\lceil \frac{n}{t} \right\rceil$ and hence $K_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t} \cong T_{n,t}$. This completes the proof. \square

7 Conclusion

In this article, we have studied the squared distance matrix of complete multipartite graphs. We define the squared distance energy to be the sum of the modulus of the eigenvalues of the squared distance matrix. We determine the inertia of $\Delta(K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t})$ and using the result on inertia we compute the squared distance energy of K_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_t} . Furthermore, using majorization techniques we prove that for a fixed value of n and t , both the spectral radius of the squared distance matrix and the squared distance energy of complete t -partite graphs on n vertices are maximal for complete split graph $S_{n,t}$ and minimal for Turán graph $T_{n,t}$. We also discuss the uniqueness of these extremal graphs.

8 Declarations

Funding: Sumit Mohanty would like to thank the Department of Science and Technology, India, for financial support through the projects MATRICS (MTR/2017/000458).

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: Not applicable.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Code availability: Not applicable.

Authors' contributions: Both the authors have equal contribution.

Ethics approval: Not applicable.

Consent to participate: Not applicable.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

References

- [1] M. Aouchiche and P. Hansen, Distance spectra of graphs: a survey, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 458 (2014) 301-386.
- [2] R.B. Bapat and S. Sivasubramanian, Inverse of the distance matrix of a block graph, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 59(12) (2011) 1393-1397.
- [3] R.B. Bapat and S. Sivasubramanian, Product distance matrix of a graph and squared distance matrix of a tree, *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.*, 7(2) (2013) 285-301.
- [4] R.B. Bapat and S. Sivasubramanian, Squared distance matrix of a tree: Inverse and inertia, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 491 (2016) 328-342.
- [5] R.B. Bapat. Squared distance matrix of a weighted tree, *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl.*, 7(2) (2019) 301-313.
- [6] J. Das and S. Mohanty, Distance Matrix of Multi-block Graphs: Determinant and Inverse, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2020.1860886>
- [7] G. Indulal, I. Gutman and A. Vijayakumar, On distance energy of graphs, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 60 (2008) 461-472.
- [8] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis* (Corrected reprint of the 1985 original). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1990).

- [9] M.R. Oboudi, Majorization and the spectral radius of starlike trees, *J. Comb. Optim.* 36 (2018) 121–129.
- [10] M.R. Oboudi. Distance spectral radius of complete multipartite graphs and majorization, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 583 (2019) 134-145.
- [11] M.R. Oboudi, A relation between the signless Laplacian spectral radius of complete multipartite graphs and majorization, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 565 (2019) 225–238.
- [12] R.L. Graham and H.O. Pollak, On the addressing problem for loop switching. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 50 (1971) 2495-2519.
- [13] R. L. Graham, A. J. Hoffman and H. Hosoya, On the distance matrix of a directed graph, *J. Graph Theory*, 1 (1977) 85-88.
- [14] R.L. Graham and L. Lovász, Distance matrix polynomials of trees, *Adv. in Math.*, 29(1)(1978) 60-88.
- [15] Y. Hou and J. Chen, Inverse of the distance matrix of a cactoid digraph, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 475 (2015) 1-10.
- [16] Y. Hou, A. Fang and Y. Sun, Inverse of the distance matrix of a cycle-clique graph, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 485 (2015) 33-46.
- [17] S. Sun and K.C. Das, Proof of a conjecture on distance energy change of complete multipartite graph due to edge deletion. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 611 (2021), 253-259.
- [18] W. So, A shorter proof of the distance energy of complete multipartite graphs, *Spec. Matrices*, 5 (2017) 61-63.
- [19] D. Stevanović, M. Milošević, ; P. Híc, and M. Pokorný, Proof of a conjecture on distance energy of complete multipartite graphs. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 70(1) (2013), 157-162.
- [20] A. Varghese, W. So and A. Vijayakumar, Distance energy change of complete bipartite graph due to edge deletion. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 553 (2018), 211-222.
- [21] X. Zhang, The inertia and energy of distance matrices of complete k -partite graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 450 (2014) 108-120.
- [22] H. Zhou, The inverse of the distance matrix of a distance well-defined graph, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 517 (2017) 11-29.