

Petals and Books: The largest Laplacian spectral gap from 1

Jürgen Jost^{1,2}, Raffaella Mulas^{*1}, and Dong Zhang¹

¹*Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig,
Germany*

²*Santa Fe Institute for the Sciences of Complexity, Santa Fe, New
Mexico, USA*

Abstract

We prove that, for any graph on $N \geq 3$ vertices, the spectral gap from the value 1 with respect to the normalized Laplacian is at most $1/2$. Moreover, we show that inequality is achieved if and only if the graph is either a petal graph (for N odd) or a book graph (for N even).

Keywords: Spectral graph theory; Normalized Laplacian; Spectral gaps; Eigenvalue 1

1 Introduction

A spectral gap is the maximal difference between two eigenvalues for linear operators in some class. Here, we consider Laplace operators, more precisely, the normalized Laplacian of a finite graph. Such inequalities were first studied for the Laplace operator $\Delta = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial(x^i)^2}$ on a connected smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with Dirichlet conditions, that is,

$$\Delta u = \lambda u \text{ in } \Omega \tag{1}$$

$$u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \tag{2}$$

where a (smooth) solution u that does not vanish identically is called an eigenfunction, and the corresponding value λ an eigenvalue. We choose the sign in the definition of Δ to make it a non-negative operator. Since Ω is connected, the smallest eigenvalue λ_1 is positive, and the famous Faber-Krahn inequality [7, 11, 12] says that among all domains with the same

*Email address: raffaella.mulas@mis.mpg.de

volume, the smallest possible value is realized by a ball of that volume. By a result of Ashbaugh and Benguria [1], the ratio between the first two eigenvalues, $\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}$ is largest for the ball. In either case, equality is assumed precisely for the ball. When we replace the Dirichlet boundary condition (2) by the Neumann boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (3)$$

then the smallest eigenvalue is $\lambda_1 = 0$, with the constants being eigenfunctions, and Weinberger [13] proved that the second eigenvalue λ_2 now is always less or equal than that of the ball, again with equality only for the ball. While the proofs of such results can be difficult, there is a general pattern here, that the extremal cases occur only for a very particular class of domains, balls in this case. Similarly, for eigenvalue problems for the Laplace-Beltrami operator in Riemannian geometry, often the extremal case is realized by spheres (for the eigenvalue problem in Riemannian geometry, see for instance the references given in [4, 8]).

There are also discrete versions of those Laplacians, and naturally, their spectra have also been investigated. For the algebraic graph Laplacian, a systematic analysis of spectral gaps is presented in [10], and these authors have identified many beautiful classes of graphs with a particular structure of their spectra and spectral gaps. Here, we consider another discrete Laplacian, the normalized Laplace operator of a connected, finite, simple graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$ on $N \geq 3$ nodes. For a vertex $v \in V$, We denote by $\deg v$ its degree, that is, the number of its neighbors, i.e., the other vertices $w \sim v$ connected to v by an edge. Then the Laplacian for a function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\Delta f(v) = f(v) - \frac{1}{\deg v} \sum_{w \sim v} f(w), \quad (4)$$

that is, we subtract from the value of f at v the average of the values at its neighbors. This operator generates random walks and diffusion processes on graphs, and it was first systematically studied in [5]. Since its spectrum is that of an $(N \times N)$ -matrix with 1s in the diagonal, the eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N$ satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = N. \quad (5)$$

The first eigenvalue now is $\lambda_1 = 0$, but since Γ is connected, the second eigenvalue λ_2 is positive. There are several inequalities controlling λ_2 from below in terms of properties of the graph (see [5]), and the largest value among all graphs with N vertices is realized by the complete graph K_N where $\lambda_2 = \frac{N}{N-1}$; for all other graphs $\lambda_2 \leq 1$. The largest eigenvalue λ_N is always ≤ 2 , with equality if and only if Γ is bipartite. And the gap $2 - \lambda_2$

quantifies how different Γ is from being bipartite [3]. In fact, the smallest possible value $\lambda_N = \frac{N}{N-1}$ is again realized only for K_N . For all other graphs, $\lambda_N \geq \frac{N+1}{N-1}$ [6], and again, the extremal graphs, where equality is realized, can be characterized [9].

Thus, the situation for the spectral gaps at the ends of the spectrum, that is, at 0 and near 2 has been clarified. But we may also ask about gaps in the middle of the spectrum. In fact, besides 0 and 2, also the eigenvalue 1 plays a special role. It arises, in particular, from vertex duplications [2]. The extreme case is given by complete bipartite graphs $K_{n,m}$ with $n + m = N$. They have the eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity $N - 2$. In fact, if 1 occurs with this multiplicity, then by (5), 2 also has to be an eigenvalue, and the graph is bipartite. But like the eigenvalue 2, the eigenvalue 1 need not be present in a graph. Therefore, we can ask about the maximal spectral gap at 1, that is, we can ask what the maximal value of

$$\varepsilon := \min_i |1 - \lambda_i|$$

could be. In this paper, we show that for any graph with $N \geq 3$ vertices, $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (for the graph with two vertices, the eigenvalues are 0 and 2, therefore, in this particular case, the gap is 1), and as the title already reveals, we can identify the class of graphs for which the maximal possible value $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ is realized. In fact, in those cases, except for the triangle K_3 , which only has $\frac{3}{2}$, both values $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$ are eigenvalues.

2 Main result

Throughout the paper we fix a connected, finite, simple graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$ on $N \geq 3$ nodes. We let d denote the smallest vertex degree, we let $C(V)$ denote the space of functions $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and, given a vertex v , we let $\mathcal{N}(v) := \{w \in V : w \sim v\}$ denote the neighborhood of v . We let

$$\lambda_1 = 0 < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N$$

denote the eigenvalues of the Laplacian in (4), and we let

$$\varepsilon := \min_i |1 - \lambda_i|$$

be the spectral gap from 1. Clearly, $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and this inequality is sharp since, for instance, any graph with duplicate vertices has 1 as an eigenvalue. As anticipated in the introduction, here we prove that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and equality is achieved if and only if Γ belongs to one of the following two optimal classes.

Definition 1 (Petal graph, $N \geq 3$ odd). Given $m \geq 1$, the m -*petal graph* is the graph on $N = 2m + 1$ nodes such that (Figure 1):




Figure 1: The petal graph

- $V = \{x, v_1, \dots, v_m, w_1, \dots, w_m\}$;
- $E = \{(x, v_i)\}_{i=1}^m \cup \{(x, w_i)\}_{i=1}^m \cup \{(v_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^m$.

As shown in [5], for the petal graph on $N = 2m + 1$ vertices, the eigenvalues are 0 , $\frac{1}{2}$ (with multiplicity $m - 1$) and $\frac{3}{2}$ (with multiplicity $m + 1$). Therefore, $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ in this case.

In fact, the eigenfunctions are easily constructed. Putting $f(w_i) = -f(v_i)$ and $f(x) = 0$ produces m linearly independent eigenfunctions for the eigenvalue $\frac{3}{2}$. Letting $f(v_i) = f(w_i) = 1$ for all i and $f(x) = -2$ produces another eigenfunction for that eigenvalue. With $f(v_i) = f(w_i)$ for all i , $\sum_i f(v_i) = 0 = f(x)$ we get $m - 1$ linearly independent eigenfunctions for the eigenvalue $\frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 2 (Book graph, $N \geq 4$ even). Given $m \geq 1$, the m -book graph is the graph on $N = 2m + 2$ nodes such that (Figure 2):

- $V = \{x, y, v_1, \dots, v_m, w_1, \dots, w_m\}$;
- $E = \{(x, v_i)\}_{i=1}^m \cup \{(y, w_i)\}_{i=1}^m \cup \{(v_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^m$.




Figure 2: The book graph

Remark 1. For the book graph on $N = 2m + 2$ nodes, 0 and 2 are eigenvalues with multiplicity 1, since Γ is connected and bipartite. Moreover, one can check that $\lambda = 1 \pm \frac{1}{2}$ are eigenvalues with multiplicity m each. In fact, the corresponding eigenfunctions can be constructed as follows:

1. By letting $\sum_i f(v_i) = 0$, $f(x) = f(y) = 0$, $f(w_i) = \mp f(v_i)$, we obtain $m - 1$ linearly independent eigenfunctions;
2. By letting $f(v_i) = -f(w_i) = 1$ and $f(x) = -f(y) = 2$, we obtain one more eigenfunction for $\frac{1}{2}$ and similarly by letting $g(v_i) = g(w_i) = -1$ and $g(x) = g(y) = 2$, we obtain one more eigenfunction for $\frac{3}{2}$.

Hence, also in this case, $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

Our main result is that these, and only these, examples have the largest possible spectral gap $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ at 1.

Theorem 1. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes,*

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Moreover, equality is achieved if and only if Γ is either a petal graph (for N odd) or a book graph (for N even).

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 3. For completeness, we also state the following result on the value $\max_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i - 1|$.

Proposition 2. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 2$ nodes,*

$$\frac{1}{N-1} \leq \max_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i - 1| \leq 1.$$

Moreover, the lower bound is an equality if and only if Γ is the complete graph; the upper bound is an equality if and only if Γ is bipartite.

Proof. By (5), using the fact that $\lambda_1 = 0$, it follows that $\sum_{i=2}^N (\lambda_i - 1) = 1$. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{N-1} \leq \frac{1}{N-1} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=2}^N |\lambda_i - 1| \right) \leq \max_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i - 1|$$

and equality holds if and only if $\lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_N = \frac{N}{N-1}$, that is, if and only if Γ is the complete graph.

The other claim follows from the fact that

$$0 < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N \leq 2$$

and $\lambda_N = 2$ if and only if Γ is bipartite. □

We also prove the following lemma, which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 1 and which is an interesting result itself, since it allows us to characterize ε for any graph.

Lemma 3. *For any graph Γ ,*

$$\varepsilon^2 = \min_{f \in C(V) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2}{\sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2}.$$

Proof. We observe that the values $(1 - \lambda_1)^2, \dots, (1 - \lambda_n)^2$ are exactly the eigenvalues of the matrix $M := (\text{Id} - \Delta)^2$ whose entries are

$$M_{uv} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w \sqrt{\deg u \cdot \deg v}}, \quad \text{for } u, v \in V.$$

In particular, ε^2 is the smallest eigenvalue of M . Therefore, by the Courant–Fischer–Weyl min-max principle, it can be written as

$$\varepsilon^2 = \min_{f \in C(V) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\sum_{u, v \in V} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w \sqrt{\deg u \cdot \deg v}} f(u) \cdot f(v)}{\sum_{w \in V} f(w)^2}.$$

Now, observe that the numerator can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u, v \in V} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{f(u) \cdot f(v)}{\deg w \sqrt{\deg u \cdot \deg v}} &= \sum_{w \in V} \sum_{u, v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} \frac{f(u) \cdot f(v)}{\deg w \sqrt{\deg u \cdot \deg v}} \\ &= \sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} \frac{f(v)}{\sqrt{\deg v}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 &= \min_{f \in C(V) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} \frac{f(v)}{\sqrt{\deg v}} \right)^2}{\sum_{w \in V} f(w)^2} \\ &= \min_{f \in C(V) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2}{\sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

This lemma will play an important role for controlling ε , because we can derive inequalities on vertex degrees in case $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}$, by choosing suitable local functions f .

Remark 2. A *gap interval with respect to a family \mathcal{G}* of simple graphs is an open interval such that there are infinitely many graphs in \mathcal{G} whose Laplacian spectrum does not intersect the interval. Clearly, Theorem 1 trivially implies that, for $\mathcal{G} = \{\text{connected graphs}\}$, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$ is a maximal gap interval. This can be compared to a result by Kollar and Sarnak [10], which states that, for $\mathcal{G} = \{\text{connected regular graphs of degree 3}\}$, $(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{3})$ is a maximal gap interval. (The original result, Theorem 3 in [10], is formulated in terms of the adjacency matrix, but since these graphs are regular, the statement can be equivalently reformulated in terms of Δ .)

3 Proof of the main result

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1, that we split into two main parts. In particular, in Section 3.1 we prove that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes, while in Section 3.2 we prove that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if Γ is either a petal graph or a book graph.

3.1 Upper bound

In this section we prove the first claim of Theorem 1, namely

Theorem 4. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes,*

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Before proving it by contradiction, we show several properties that a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$ would have. We begin by observing that, by Lemma 3, such a graph should satisfy

$$\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 > \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2, \quad \forall f \in C(V) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (6)$$

Lemma 5. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for any $v \in V$, there exists $w \in \mathcal{N}(v)$ such that $\deg w \leq 3$.*

Proof. Let f be such that $f(v) := 1$ and $f(u) := 0$ for all $u \neq v$. Then, (6) implies

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w} > \frac{1}{4} \deg v.$$

Now, if $\deg w \geq 4$ for all $w \in \mathcal{N}(v)$, then

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w} \leq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \deg v,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Given two vertices u and v , we denote by $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)$ the symmetric difference of $\mathcal{N}(u)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v)$, i.e., the set of vertices that are neighbors of either u or v .

Lemma 6. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. If $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{1}{4} \right) > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Let f be such that $f(v) := 1$, $f(u) := -1$ and $f(w) := 0$ for all $w \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$. Then, by (6),

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w} > \frac{1}{4} (\deg v + \deg u),$$

which also implies $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, since

$$\deg v + \deg u = |\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)| + 2|\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)|,$$

the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{1}{4} \right) > \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2|\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)|.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $|\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)| \geq 1$, implying that

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{1}{4} \right) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

\square

Lemma 7. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$.*

1. *If $\deg u = \deg w = 1$, then there is no vertex v with $u \sim v \sim w$.*
2. *There are no vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ with*

$$1 \leq \deg u \leq 2, \quad 1 \leq \deg v \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \deg w \leq 2.$$

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.

We now prove the second statement. Assume the contrary, that is, there exist three vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ with $\{\deg u, \deg v, \deg w\} \subseteq \{1, 2\}$. We only need to check the following two cases.

Case 1: $\deg u = 1$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w = 2$.

Since $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(w) \neq \emptyset$, by (7), the vertex $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}$ has degree 1. Hence, Γ is a path of length 3 (Figure 3). But this is a contradiction, since $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ for the path of length 3, which is also the 1-book graph.



Figure 3: A graph arising in the proof of Lemma 7

Case 2: $\deg u = 2$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w = 2$.

Since $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(w) \neq \emptyset$, by (7), the vertices $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}$ and $u_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \setminus \{v\}$ have degree 1. Hence, Γ is a path of length 4. But this is also a contradiction, since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ in this case.

□

Lemma 8. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there are no vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ with*

$$2 \leq \deg u \leq 3, \quad 2 \leq \deg v \leq 3 \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \leq \deg w \leq 3.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is, there exist three vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ with $\{\deg u, \deg v, \deg w\} \subseteq \{2, 3\}$. We need to check five cases.

Case 1: $\deg u = 2$, $\deg v = 3$ and $\deg w = 2$.

By applying (7) three times, we have that:

- There exists $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ with $\deg w_1 = 1$, and without loss of generality, we may assume that $w_1 \sim w$;
- There exists $v_1 \in \mathcal{N}(v) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w_1) = \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{w\}$ with $\deg v_1 = 1$;
- There exists $u_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v_1) = \mathcal{N}(u) \setminus \{v\}$ with $\deg u_1 = 1$.

Hence, Γ is the graph in Figure 4.

By letting $f(u_1) := f(w_1) := -1$, $f(v) := 1$ and $f(v_1) := f(u) := f(w) := 0$, from (6) we derive a contradiction.




Figure 4: A graph arising in the proof of Lemma 8

Case 2: $\deg u = 2$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w = 3$.

If there is only one vertex x in $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$, then by (7), it must have degree 1. Also, by construction, it is clear that $x \sim w$. Moreover, by (7), the only vertex $y \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v, x\}$ has degree 1. But this is a contradiction, since we must also have $y \sim u$.

Otherwise, there are three vertices in $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ and at least two of them have degree 2. In this case, we reduce to Case 1.

Case 3: $\deg u = 2$, $\deg v = 3$ and $\deg w = 3$.

If $\deg x \geq 2$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$, then by (7), there are at least two vertices x and y in $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ with degree 2, and therefore we reduce to Case 1.

There are two sub-cases left:

- a) If there exists $u_1 \sim u$ with $\deg u_1 = 1$, then by (7) there exists $v_1 \sim v$ with $\deg v_1 = 1$ and there exists $w_1 \sim w$ with $\deg w_1 = 1$. Therefore, Γ has the same local structure as the graph in Figure 5. By letting $f(u_1) := f(w_1) := -1$, $f(v) := 1$ and $f|_{V \setminus \{v, u_1, w_1\}} := 0$, from (6) we get $1 > \frac{1}{4}(1 + 3 + 1)$, which is a contradiction.




Figure 5: A graph arising in the proof of Lemma 8

- b) If there exists $w_1 \sim w$ with $\deg w_1 = 1$, then there exists $v_1 \sim v$ with $\deg v_1 = 1$ and there exists $u_1 \sim u$ with $\deg u_1 = 1$. Hence, as in the previous sub-case, Γ has the same local structure as the graph in Figure 5, which brings to a contradiction.

Case 4: $\deg u = 3$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w = 3$.

If $\deg x \geq 2$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$, then by (7) there are at least two vertices x and y in $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ of degree 2, and thus we reduce to Case 1.

Otherwise, there exists $u_1 \sim u$ with $\deg u_1 = 1$. Applying Lemma 6 to the vertex pair u_1 and v , we derive a contradiction.

Case 5: $\deg u = 3$, $\deg v = 3$ and $\deg w = 3$.

Similar to the above cases, by repeatedly applying (7) we can see that there exist $v_1 \sim v$, $u_1 \sim u$ and $w_1 \sim w$ with $\deg v_1 = \deg u_1 = \deg w_1 = 1$. Therefore, Γ has the same local structure as the graph in Figure 6. Similarly to Case 3, also in this case we derive a contradiction.




Figure 6: A graph arising in the proof of Lemma 8

□

We now fix the following notations. Given a vertex v , we let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v) &:= \{w \sim v : 2 \leq \deg w \leq 3\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v) &:= \{w \sim v : \deg w \geq 4\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_2(v) &:= \{w \sim v : \deg w = 2\}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for each $v \in V$, $|\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Fix $v \in V$ and suppose the contrary, that is, $|\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)| \geq 2$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{N}(v) = \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v) \cup \mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)$.

In this case, for any two vertices $v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)$,

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v_i) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v_j)} \deg x = 1,$$

because otherwise, we can reduce to Lemma 8. Therefore, except for at most one vertex in $\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)$, any other vertex in $\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)$ is adjacent to a vertex of degree 1. Now, let $f(x) := -1$ if $\deg x = 1$ and x is adjacent to some vertex in $\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)$, let $f(v) := 1$ and let

$f(y) := 0$ otherwise. Then, by (6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}|\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v)| &\geq \sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 \\
&> \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4}(\deg v + |\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)| - 1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4}(|\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v)| + 3),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Case 2: There exists $w \in \mathcal{N}(v)$ with $\deg w = 1$. Then, by Lemma 7,

$$\mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{w\} = \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v) \cup \mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v).$$

Similarly to the previous case, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \frac{1}{4}|\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v)| &\geq \sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 \\
&> \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4}(\deg v + |\mathcal{N}_{2,3}(v)|) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4}(|\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(v)| + 4),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 10. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. If $w \sim v$ and $\deg w = 1$, then $\deg v \leq 2$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, i.e., $w \sim v$, $\deg w = 1$ and $\deg v \geq 3$. Then, similarly to the proof of Lemma 9, we have that for any $u \sim v$, there exists

$u_1 \sim u$ with $\deg u_1 = 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\geq \sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 \\
&> \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} (\deg v + |\mathcal{N}(v)| - 1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} (2 \deg v - 1) > 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 11. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there exist three vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ with $\deg u \leq 3$ and $\deg w \leq 3$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5, there exist $u_1 \sim u_2$ with $\deg u_1 \leq 3$ and $\deg u_2 \leq 3$. If $v \sim u_2$, then by (7) there exists $w \in \mathcal{N}(u_1) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)$ with $\deg w \leq 3$.

If $w \in \mathcal{N}(u_1) \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)$, then we have $w \sim u_1 \sim u_2$ with $\deg w \leq 3$ and $\deg u_2 \leq 3$; while if $w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \mathcal{N}(u_1)$, then we have $w \sim v \sim u_2$ with $\deg w \leq 3$ and $\deg u_2 \leq 3$. \square

Lemma 12. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there exist three vertices $u \sim v \sim w$ such that $\deg u = 1$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w \in \{2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Fix $u \sim v \sim w$ with $\deg u \leq 3$ and $\deg w \leq 3$ as in Lemma 11. By Lemma 7, at most one between u and w has degree 1, and by Lemma 9, at most one between u and w has degree 2 or 3. Therefore, we may assume that $\deg u = 1$ and $\deg w \in \{2, 3\}$. By Lemma 10, this implies that $\deg v = 2$. \square

We are now finally able to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. Assume by contradiction that there exists a connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, by Lemma 12, there exist $u \sim v \sim w$ such that $\deg u = 1$, $\deg v = 2$ and $\deg w \in \{2, 3\}$. By (7), there exists a vertex $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}$ satisfying $\deg w_1 = 1$, and by Lemma 10, $\deg w = 2$. Therefore Γ is the path of length 3 in Figure 3. But as we know this is a contradiction, since $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ for the path of length 3, which is also the 1-book graph. \square

3.2 Optimal cases

In the previous section we proved that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes. Hence, in order to prove Theorem 1, it is left to prove that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if Γ is either a petal graph or a book graph. We dedicate this section to the proof of this claim, that we further split into three parts:

1. In Section 3.2.1 we prove that, if the smallest vertex degree d is ≥ 3 , then $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. In fact, we prove an even stronger result, since we show that, in this case,

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

2. In Section 3.2.2 we show that, if $d = 2$, then $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if Γ is either a petal graph or a book graph.
3. In Section 3.2.3 we show that, if $d = 1$ and Γ is not the 1-book graph, then $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$.

Before, we observe that, by Lemma 3 and Theorem 4, if a connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes is such that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2, \quad \forall f \in C(V) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, with the same proof as Lemma 6, one can prove the following

Lemma 13. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes such that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. If $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (9)$$

3.2.1 The case $d \geq 3$

In this section we prove the following

Theorem 14. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$,*

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Before that theorem, we shall prove several preliminary results.

Lemma 15. Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. Then,

$$\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 > \frac{d-1}{d^2} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2, \quad \forall f \in C(V) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) > 2 \cdot \frac{d-1}{d^2}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. The first claim follows directly from Lemma 3, while the second claim can be proved as Lemma 6. \square

Lemma 16. Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. If $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) : \deg w \in \{d, d+1\}\}| \geq 2d-1.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) &\leq \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \\ \deg w \in \{d, d+1\}}} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) \\ &\leq (2d-2) \left(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) = 2 \cdot \frac{d-1}{d^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (11). \square

Lemma 17. Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. If $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) : \deg w \in \{d, d+1\}\}| \leq 2d,$$

then $|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) : \deg w = d\}| \geq 2d-3$.

Proof. If not, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \\ \deg w = d}} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) + \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v) \\ \deg w = d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) \\ &< (2d-4) \left(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) + 2d \left(\frac{1}{d+1} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{2d-4}{d^2} + \frac{2}{d(d+1)} < \frac{2d-4}{d^2} + \frac{2}{d^2} = 2 \cdot \frac{d-1}{d^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (11). \square

Lemma 18. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. Then, there exist u and v with $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and $\deg u, \deg v \in \{d, d+1\}$.*

Proof. Fix three vertices $u' \sim w' \sim v'$. By Lemma 16, we either have

$$|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(u') \setminus \mathcal{N}(v') : \deg w \in \{d, d+1\}\}| \geq d$$

or

$$|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(v') \setminus \mathcal{N}(u') : \deg w \in \{d, d+1\}\}| \geq d.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that there are two vertices u and v in $\mathcal{N}(u') \setminus \mathcal{N}(v')$ with $\deg u, \deg v \in \{d, d+1\}$. This implies that $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$, hence u and v satisfy the claim. \square

Lemma 19. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. Then, there exist u and v with $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and $\deg u = \deg v = d$.*

Proof. Fix u' and v' that satisfy Lemma 18. Then,

$$|\mathcal{N}(u') \Delta \mathcal{N}(v')| \leq \deg u' + \deg v' - 2 \leq 2d.$$

By Lemma 17, this implies that

$$|\{w \in \mathcal{N}(u') \Delta \mathcal{N}(v') : \deg w = d\}| \geq 2d - 3 \geq 3.$$

Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume that there are two vertices u and v in $\mathcal{N}(u') \setminus \mathcal{N}(v')$ with $\deg u = \deg v = d$. This proves the claim. \square

We can now prove Theorem 14.

Proof of Theorem 14. We first observe that the second inequality follows from the fact that the sequence

$$\left\{ \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d} \right\}_{d \geq 2} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}, \frac{2}{5}, \dots \right\}$$

is strictly decreasing. Hence, it is left to show that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. Assume, by contradiction, that $\varepsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$. By Lemma 19, there exist u and v such that $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and $\deg u = \deg v = d$. This implies that $|\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)| \leq 2d - 2$, but together with Lemma 16, this brings to a contradiction. \square

3.2.2 The case $d = 2$

Here we prove the following

Theorem 20. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$,*

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

with equality if and only if Γ is either a petal graph or a book graph.

Also in this section, we first prove several preliminary results. We start by showing that, if $\Gamma = C_N$ is the cycle graph on $N \geq 3$ vertices, then $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if either $N = 3$ (in which case $\Gamma = C_3$ is the 1-petal graph) or $N = 6$ (in which case $\Gamma = C_6$ is the 2-book graph).

Proposition 21. *If $\Gamma = C_N$ is the cycle graph on $N \geq 3$ vertices, then $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if $N \in \{3, 6\}$.*

Proof. As shown in [5], for the cycle graph C_N on $N \geq 3$ nodes, the eigenvalues are $1 - \cos(2\pi k/N)$, for $k = 0, \dots, N-1$. We already know that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ if $N \in \{3, 6\}$ since, in this case, Γ is either the 1-petal graph or the 2-book graph. Therefore, it is left to show that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ for $N \geq 4$, $N \neq 6$. We consider three cases.

1. If $N = 4$, then 1 is an eigenvalue, therefore $\varepsilon = 0$.
2. If $N = 5$, by letting $k = 1$ we can see that $1 - \cos(2\pi/5)$ is an eigenvalue that has distance $\cos(2\pi/5) \approx 0.3$ from 1. Hence, $\varepsilon < 1/2$.
3. Let $N > 6$ and let

$$k \in \left\{ \frac{N-2}{4}, \frac{N-1}{4}, \frac{N}{4}, \frac{N+1}{4} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{2k}{N} \leq \frac{2}{N} \cdot \frac{N+1}{4} = \frac{N+1}{2N} < \frac{2}{3},$$

since $N > 3$, and

$$\frac{2k}{N} \geq \frac{2}{N} \cdot \frac{N-2}{4} = \frac{N-2}{2N} > \frac{1}{3},$$

since $N > 6$. Hence,

$$\frac{2k}{N} \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3} \right),$$

implying that

$$\left| \cos \frac{2\pi k}{N} \right| < \frac{1}{2},$$

therefore $\varepsilon < 1/2$.

□

Proposition 22. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. If three vertices are such that $u \sim v \sim w$ and $\deg u = \deg v = \deg w = 2$, then $\Gamma = C_3$ or C_6 .*

Proof. If $u \sim w$, then clearly $\Gamma = C_3$. If $u \not\sim w$, then (9) applied to $\mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ implies that the vertices $u_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \setminus \{v\}$ and $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}$ are such that $\deg u_1 = \deg w_1 = 2$. If $u_1 = w_1$, then clearly $\Gamma = C_4$. Otherwise, we can repeat the process and obtain any cycle graph C_N . By Proposition 21, the claim follows. □

Lemma 23. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. Then, there exist two adjacent vertices $u \sim v$ such that $\deg u = \deg v = 2$.*

Proof. We illustrate this proof in Figure 7.

Fix $u \sim v \sim w$ such that $\deg v = 2$. Then, by (9), there exists $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$ with $\deg w_1 \in \{2, 3\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $w_1 \sim w$. Again by (9), there are at least two vertices in $\mathcal{N}(v) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w_1)$ of degree 2. If $\deg u = 2$, then we have done. If $\deg u \geq 3$, then $\deg w_1 = 3$, $\deg u \leq 4$ and $\deg x = 2$ for any $x \in \mathcal{N}(w_1) \setminus \{w\}$. Now, let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{N}(w_1) \setminus \{w\}$. By applying (9) to x_1 and x_2 , we infer that there exists a vertex adjacent to x_1 of degree 2. Since also $\deg x_1 = 2$, this proves the claim. □




Figure 7: The vertices in the proof of Lemma 23

Lemma 24. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. For any vertex v of degree 2, there exists $u \sim v$ with $\deg u = 2$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary, then there are $u \sim v \sim w$ with $\deg u, \deg w \geq 3$ and $\deg v = 2$.

Claim 1: For all $x \in \mathcal{N}(u) \Delta \mathcal{N}(w)$, $\deg x \geq 3$.

If not, without loss of generality we can assume that there exists $x \in \mathcal{N}(u) \setminus \mathcal{N}(w)$ with $\deg x = 2$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{N}(v) \Delta \mathcal{N}(x) = \{w, y\},$$

for some vertex y . By the assumption, $\deg y \geq 2$ and $\deg w \geq 3$. Hence, applying (9) to $\mathcal{N}(v)\Delta\mathcal{N}(x)$ implies

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{\deg y} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

which is a contradiction.

Claim 2: There are at least six vertices in $\mathcal{N}(u)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w)$ of degree 3, and thus $\deg u + \deg w \geq 8$.

If there are at most five vertices in $\mathcal{N}(u)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w)$ of degree 3, then the other vertices in $\mathcal{N}(u)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w)$ have degree at least 4. Applying (9) to $\mathcal{N}(u)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w)$, we then obtain

$$5 \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \geq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(u)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg x} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

which is a contradiction.

Claim 3: Assume that there exists $w_1 \sim w$ with $\deg w_1 = 3$. Then, $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{N}(w_1) \setminus \{w\}$ are such that $\deg x_1 = \deg x_2 = 2$.

If not, then without loss of generality we can assume that $\deg x_1 \geq 3$. Applying (9) to $\mathcal{N}(v)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w_1)$, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{5}{12} &= \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\deg u} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\deg x_1} - \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\deg x_2} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w_1)} \left(\frac{1}{\deg x} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Now, if $x_1 \sim x_2$, then by letting $f(x_1) := -1$, $f(w_1) := 1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, (9) brings to a contradiction. Hence, $x_1 \not\sim x_2$. By applying (9) again, we can infer that there exist $y_1 \sim x_1$ and $y_2 \sim x_2$ such that $\deg y_1 = \deg y_2 = 2$. If $y_1 = y_2$, then we reduce to Proposition 22. If $y_1 \neq y_2$, then a similar reasoning implies $y_1 \not\sim y_2$. By applying then (9) to $\mathcal{N}(y_1)\Delta\mathcal{N}(w_1)$, we infer that there exists $z_1 \sim y_1$ with $\deg z_1 = 2$, and therefore we again reduce to Proposition 22. In any case, we obtain a contradiction. \square

Proposition 25. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. If there exist $u \sim v \sim w$ such that $\deg u = \deg v = 2$ and $\deg w = 3$, then Γ is the book graph on $N = 8$ nodes.*

Proof. If $w \sim u$, by letting $f(w) := 1$, $f(u) := -1$, and $f := 0$ otherwise, (8) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{\deg w_1} \geq \frac{1}{4}(2 + 3),$$

therefore the vertex $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{u, v\}$ has degree 2. Similarly, there exists $x \sim w_1$ with $\deg x = 2$. By letting now $f(w) := 2$, $f(u) := f(v) := -1$, $f(w_1) := 1$, $f(x) := -1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, then (8) implies that

$$2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \geq \frac{1}{4}(2 + 2 + 3 \cdot 2^2 + 2 + 2),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $w \not\sim u$.

Now, if the vertex $u_1 \in \mathcal{N}(u) \setminus \{v\}$ has degree 2, then we reduce to Proposition 22. Thus, $\deg u_1 \geq 3$. Applying (9) to the vertices u and w , we infer that the two vertices $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}$ satisfy $\deg w_1 = \deg w_2 = 2$. Again, applying (9) to the vertex pairs (v, w_1) and (v, w_2) , we infer that the vertices $x_1 \sim w_1$ and $x_2 \sim w_2$ satisfy $\deg x_1 = \deg x_2 = 2$.

If $\mathcal{N}(x_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(x_2) = \emptyset$, then the vertices $y_1 \sim x_1$ and $y_2 \sim x_2$ have to satisfy $\deg y_1, \deg y_2 \geq 3$. By letting $f(w) := 1$, $f(x_1) := f(x_2) := -1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, (8) implies

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}(3 + 2 + 2),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{N}(x_1) \cap \mathcal{N}(x_2) \neq \emptyset$ and, similarly, also $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(x_1) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(x_2) \neq \emptyset$.

In particular, there exists z such that $z \sim u$, $z \sim x_1$ and $z \sim x_2$. By letting now $f(w) := 1$, $f(u) := f(x_1) := f(x_2) := -1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, by (8) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\deg z} \cdot 3^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}(3 + 2 + 2 + 2),$$

which implies that $\deg z \leq 4$.

We now claim that $\deg z = 3$. Suppose the contrary, then $\deg z = 4$. Let $z_1 \in \mathcal{N}(z) \setminus \{u, x_1, x_2\}$. If there exists $z_2 \sim z_1$ of degree 2, then $f(z_2) := f(u) := -1$, $f(z) := 1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise together with (8) gives

$$\frac{1}{3} + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}(2 + 4 + 2),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, for any $a \in \mathcal{N}(z_1)$, $\deg a \geq 3$. By (9) applied to z_2 and v , we infer that there exist at least three vertices of degree 3 in $\mathcal{N}(z_1)$, and $\deg z_1 \geq 4$. Let $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{N}(z_1)$ be such that $\deg b_1 = \deg b_2 = 3$. Then, (9) applied to b_1 and b_2 implies that there is at least one vertex of degree 2 in $\mathcal{N}(b_1) \triangle \mathcal{N}(b_2)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that there exists $b' \in \mathcal{N}(b_1) \setminus \mathcal{N}(b_2)$ such that $\deg b' = 2$. By Lemma 24, there exists $c' \sim b'$ with $\deg c' = 2$. But this is a contradiction,

since we proved that all vertices adjacent to b_1 must have degree 2.

This proves that $\deg z = 3$, which implies that Γ must be the book graph on $N = 8$ vertices. \square

Lemma 26. *Let Γ be a connected graph on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 2$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. If Γ is not in the classes described in Proposition 22 and Proposition 25, then there is no vertex of degree 3.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is, there exists a vertex u with $\deg u = 3$. We first claim that, for any $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$, $\deg v \geq 3$. This is true because, otherwise, there would be a vertex $v \sim u$ with $\deg v = 2$, and by Lemma 24, also a vertex $w \sim v$ with $\deg w = 2$. Hence, Γ would be in the class described in Proposition 25, but we are assuming that this is not the case. This shows that $\deg v \geq 3$ for any $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$.

Now, we prove that there are no vertices v and w such that $u \sim v \sim w$ and $\deg w \in \{2, 3\}$. This follows from the fact that, otherwise, applying (9) to u and w together with the above remarks implies that there exists $w_1 \sim w$ with $\deg w_1 = 2$, while $\deg w = 3$, which is a contradiction.

But on the other hand, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{N}(u)$, by (9) there exists $w \in \mathcal{N}(x) \Delta \mathcal{N}(y)$ with $\deg w \in \{2, 3\}$, which contradicts the above argument. \square

We are now able to prove Theorem 20.

Proof of Theorem 20. We shall illustrate this proof in Figure 8 below.

Observe that, if Γ is in one of the classes described in Proposition 22 and Proposition 25, then the claim follows. Therefore, we can assume that this is not the case. We can then apply Lemma 26 and infer that there is no vertex of degree 3. Also, if all vertices have degree < 3 , from the fact that $d = 2$ it follows that all vertices have degree 2, but this is not possible, since we are assuming that Γ does not satisfy the condition in Proposition 22. Therefore, we can assume that there exists a vertex with degree ≥ 4 .

Moreover, we can also assume that there exists one vertex u with $\deg u \geq 4$ such that $\mathcal{N}_2(u) \neq \emptyset$. This can be seen by the fact that, if not, then all vertices of degree 2 would only be adjacent to vertices of degree 2, contradicting the fact that Γ is connected.

Now, from the fact that $\mathcal{N}_2(u) \neq \emptyset$, we can infer two facts about $\mathcal{N}(u) = \mathcal{N}_2(u) \sqcup \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(u)$:

1. For any $v \in \mathcal{N}_2(u)$, there exists a unique $w \sim v$ with $\deg w = 2$. This follows immediately from Lemma 24 and from the fact that $\deg u \geq 4$.
2. If $\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(u) \neq \emptyset$, then for any $v \in \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(u)$ there exists $w \sim v$ with $\deg w = 2$. This can be shown by fixing $v' \in \mathcal{N}_2(u)$ and then applying (9) to $\mathcal{N}(v') \Delta \mathcal{N}(v)$.

As a consequence of the first fact, we can write

$$\mathcal{N}_2(u) = \{v_1, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+2l}\},$$

where:

- For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, there exists a unique $w_i \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}_2(u)$ such that $v_i \sim w_i$ and $\deg w_i = 2$;
- $v_{k+1} \sim v_{k+2}, \dots, v_{k+2l-1} \sim v_{k+2l}$.

Now, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, since $v_i \sim w_i$ and $\deg v_i = \deg w_i = 2$, we can infer that $x_i \in \mathcal{N}(w_i) \setminus \{v_i\}$ must have degree ≥ 4 , because otherwise, Γ would satisfy the assumption of Proposition 22, but we are assuming that this is not the case. Therefore, in particular, w_1, \dots, w_k must be pairwise distinct, while x_1, \dots, x_k do not need to be pairwise distinct.

Up to relabeling x_1, \dots, x_k , we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} x'_1 &:= x_1 = \dots = x_{k_1}, \\ x'_2 &:= x_{k_1+1} = \dots = x_{k_1+k_2}, \\ &\dots \\ x'_{p+q} &:= x_{k_1+\dots+k_{p+q-1}+1} = \dots = x_{k_1+\dots+k_{p+q}} = x_k, \end{aligned}$$

where:

- k_1, \dots, k_{p+q} are such that $k = k_1 + \dots + k_{p+q}$,
- x'_1, \dots, x'_{p+q} are pairwise distinct,
- $x'_1, \dots, x'_p \notin \mathcal{N}(u)$ while $x'_{p+1}, \dots, x'_{p+q} \in \mathcal{N}(u)$,
- q is such that $q \leq \deg u - k - 2l$.

Following the above notation, we also relabel the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k and w_1, \dots, w_k as

$$\begin{aligned} v_1, \dots, v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_1+\dots+k_{p+q}}, \\ w_1, \dots, w_{k_1}, \dots, w_{k_1+\dots+k_{p+q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we write

$$\mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(u) \setminus \{x'_{p+1}, \dots, x'_{p+q}\} = \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}.$$

Then, as observed above, for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ there exists $y'_i \sim y_i$ with $\deg y'_i = 2$. Furthermore, by Lemma 24, for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ there also exists $z_i \sim y'_i \sim y_i$ with $\deg z_i = \deg y'_i = 2$. Clearly, y'_1, \dots, y'_r are pairwise




Figure 8: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 20

distinct, while z_1, \dots, z_r may have some overlap with y'_1, \dots, y'_r . We illustrate the above vertices in Figure 8 and we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(u) &= \mathcal{N}_2(u) \sqcup \mathcal{N}_{\geq 4}(u) \\ &= \{v_1, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+2l}\} \sqcup \{x'_{p+1}, \dots, x'_{p+q}\} \sqcup \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the above vertices are all pairwise distinct, therefore

$$\deg u = k + 2l + q + r.$$

Now, by letting

$$\begin{aligned} f(u) &:= 2, \\ f(v_{k+1}) &:= \dots := f(v_{k+2l}) := f(w_1) := \dots := f(w_k) := -1, \\ f(v_1) &:= \dots := f(v_k) := 1 \quad \text{if } k \leq 2l, \\ f(v_1) &:= \dots := f(v_{2l}) := 1, \\ f(v_{2l+t}) &:= (-1)^t \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, k - 2l, \quad \text{if } 2l < k, \\ f(y'_1) &:= \dots := f(y'_r) := -1, \\ f &:= 0 \quad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$c_{k,l} := \begin{cases} (2l - k)^2, & \text{if } 2l \geq k, \\ 1, & \text{if } 2l < k \text{ and } k \text{ is odd,} \\ 0, & \text{if } 2l < k \text{ and } k \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

from (8) we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c_{k,l}}{\deg u} + \frac{2k+2l}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{k_i^2}{\deg x'_i} + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+q} \frac{(k_i-2)^2}{\deg x'_i} + r \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\deg y_i} \\
&= \sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(v) \right)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w \cdot f(w)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\deg u \cdot 2^2 + 2(2k+2l) + 2r) \\
&= \deg u + k + l + \frac{r}{2} = 2k + 3l + q + \frac{3}{2}r.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the following known facts:

- $\deg y_i \geq 4$, for each $i = 1, \dots, r$;
- $\deg x'_i \geq \max\{k_i, 4\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, p+q$;
- $(k_i-2)^2 \leq k_i^2$ (since $k_i \geq 1$), for $i = p+1, \dots, p+q$.

Putting everything together, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2k + 3l + q + \frac{3}{2}r \\
&\leq \frac{c_{k,l}}{\deg u} + k + l + \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} \frac{k_i^2}{\deg x'_i} + r \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{4} \\
&\leq \frac{c_{k,l}}{k+2l+q+r} + k + l + \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} \frac{k_i^2}{k_i} + \frac{3}{4}r,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$k + 2l + q + \frac{3}{4}r \leq \frac{c_{k,l}}{k+2l+q+r} + \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} k_i = k + \frac{c_{k,l}}{k+2l+q+r}.$$

Therefore,

$$2l + q + \frac{3}{4}r \leq \frac{c_{k,l}}{k+2l+q+r} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{(2l-k)^2}{k+2l} \leq 2l & \text{if } 2l \geq k, \\ \frac{1}{\deg u} \leq \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } 2l < k, \end{cases}$$

which implies that $r = q = 0$, either $l = 0$ or $k = 0$ (but they cannot be both zero), and $\deg x'_i = k_i \geq 4$, for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

We then have two cases:

1. If $k = 0$, then Γ is a petal graph with $2l + 1$ vertices.
2. If $l = 0$, then we can write

$$\Gamma = (\Gamma_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \Gamma_p) / \{u_1, \dots, u_p\},$$

where for $i = 1, \dots, p$, Γ_i as a k_i -book graph and u_i as one of its vertices of degree k_i , and the above notation means that Γ is given by the union of $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_p$ by identifying u_1, \dots, u_p as one vertex, which is u .

In this case, by letting $f(x'_1) := 2$, $f(w_i) := (-1)^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k_1$, $f(v_1) := \dots := f(v_k) := -1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, by (8) we can infer that $\deg u = k_1$ (with the same proof that we used for inferring that $\deg x'_1 = k_1$). As a consequence, $p = 1$, therefore Γ is a book graph on $N = 2k + 2$ vertices.

This proves the claim. □

3.2.3 The case $d = 1$

Given $N \geq 3$, we let P_N denote the path graph on N nodes, and we observe that P_4 coincides with the 1-book graph. It is left to prove the following

Theorem 27. *For any connected graph Γ on $N \geq 3$ nodes with smallest degree $d = 1$, if $\Gamma \neq P_4$ then*

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Suppose the contrary, then there exists a connected graph $\Gamma \neq P_4$ on $N \geq 3$ nodes with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and $d = 1$. We fix such $\Gamma = (V, E)$ so that it is the graph with these properties that has the smallest possible order, that is, if $\Gamma' \neq P_4$ is a connected graph with smallest degree 1 and $3 \leq N' < N$ vertices, then $\varepsilon(\Gamma') < \frac{1}{2}$. If we show that the existence of Γ brings to a contradiction, then we are done.

Fix $u \in V$ of degree 1, and let $v \sim u$ be its only neighbour. Then, by letting $f(u) := 1$ and $f := 0$ otherwise, (8) gives $\frac{1}{\deg v} \geq \frac{1}{4}$, i.e., $\deg v \leq 4$.

Now, assume first that $\deg v = 4$. Let $\hat{\Gamma} := \Gamma \setminus \{u\}$, let $\hat{\varepsilon} := \varepsilon(\hat{\Gamma})$ and let f be a function on $V(\hat{\Gamma}) = V \setminus \{u\}$ that is an eigenfunction for $(\text{Id} - \Delta(\hat{\Gamma}))^2$ with eigenvalue $\hat{\varepsilon}^2$. Then,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{\frac{1}{\deg v - 1} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(x) \right)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x) \right)^2}{(\deg v - 1)f(v)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \deg w f(w)^2}. \quad (12)$$

Moreover, since $\hat{\varepsilon}^2 = (1 - \hat{\lambda})^2$ for some eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$ of $\hat{\Gamma}$, from (4) it follows that

$$(1 - \hat{\lambda})f(v) = \frac{1}{\deg v - 1} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(x) \right),$$

therefore

$$\hat{\varepsilon} \cdot (\deg v - 1) \cdot |f(v)| = \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(x) \right|$$

and similarly, for all $w \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$,

$$\hat{\varepsilon} \cdot \deg w \cdot |f(w)| = \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x) \right|.$$

In particular, without loss of generality, we may assume

$$\hat{\varepsilon} \cdot (\deg v - 1) \cdot f(v) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(x)$$

and

$$\hat{\varepsilon} \cdot \deg w \cdot f(w) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x), \quad \forall w \in V \setminus \{u, v\},$$

as the proof can be easily adapted otherwise.

Now, since we are assuming that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2}$, we have that, independently of the value of $f(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ that we choose, (8) implies

$$\frac{\sum_{w \in V} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x) \right)^2}{\sum_{w \in V} \deg w f(w)^2} \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(v)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(v)} f(x) \right)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x) \right)^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V} \deg w f(w)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which by the above observations can also be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & f(v)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (f(u) + \hat{\varepsilon}(\deg v - 1)f(v))^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} (\hat{\varepsilon} \cdot \deg w \cdot f(w))^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(f(u)^2 + 4 \cdot f(v)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \deg w f(w)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now consider two cases.

Case 1. If $f(v) = 0$, then the above inequality becomes

$$\left(\hat{\varepsilon}^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \deg w f(w)^2\right) \geq 0.$$

Since $\hat{\varepsilon}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ by Theorem 4 and $f(v) = 0$ implies $f|_{V \setminus \{v, u\}} \neq 0$, we deduce that $\hat{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. But this brings to a contradiction. In fact, by construction, it is clear that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is a connected graph on $N - 1 \geq 4$ nodes, since v has degree 3 in $\hat{\Gamma}$. Hence, if $\hat{\Gamma}$ has vertices of degree 1, then by the assumption on the graphs with less than N vertices, $\hat{\Gamma}$ must be P_4 , but this is not possible because of the degree of v . Similarly, if $\hat{\Gamma}$ does not have vertices of degree 1, then by Theorem 20, $\hat{\Gamma}$ is either a petal graph or a book graph, and in particular, since v has degree 3 in $\hat{\Gamma}$, then $\hat{\Gamma}$ must be the book graph on 8 vertices. But in this case, one can directly check that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Gamma) < \frac{1}{2}$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. If $f(v) \neq 0$, then the above inequality becomes

$$\frac{3}{2} \cdot \hat{\varepsilon} f(u) f(v) + \frac{9}{4} \cdot \hat{\varepsilon}^2 f(v)^2 + \left(\hat{\varepsilon}^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \deg w f(w)^2\right) \geq 0.$$

If $\hat{\varepsilon} \neq 0$, we can always derive a contradiction from the above inequality by choosing an appropriate value of $f(u) \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\hat{\varepsilon} = 0$, implying that the inequality holds if and only if $f|_{V \setminus \{v, u\}} = 0$. But in this case, (12) is not satisfied, which is a contradiction.

Hence, $\deg v = 4$ always brings to a contradiction, implying that $\deg v \in \{2, 3\}$, since we already know that $\deg v \leq 4$.

Let now $\tilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma \setminus \{u, v\}$, let $\tilde{\varepsilon} := \varepsilon(\tilde{\Gamma})$ and let f be a function on $V(\tilde{\Gamma}) = V \setminus \{u, v\}$ that is an eigenfunction for $(\text{Id} - \Delta(\tilde{\Gamma}))^2$ with eigenvalue $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2$. Then,

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w - 1} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}} f(x)\right)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x)\right)^2}{\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} (\deg w - 1) f(w)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \deg w f(w)^2}$$

and, similarly to the first part of the proof, without loss of generality we can assume that

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w) \setminus \{v\}} f(x) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1) f(w), & \forall w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}, \\ \sum_{x \in \mathcal{N}(w)} f(x) = \tilde{\varepsilon} \deg w f(w), & \forall w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v). \end{cases}$$

In fact, the case in which $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ is replaced by $-\tilde{\varepsilon}$ is similar.

Since $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2}$, (8) holds for any value of $f(u)$ and $f(v)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(v)^2 + \frac{1}{\deg v} \left(f(u) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(w) \right)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\deg w} (\tilde{\varepsilon} \deg w f(w))^2 \\ & + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} (f(v) + \tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w))^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(f(u)^2 + \deg v f(v)^2 + \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{v, u\}} \deg w f(w)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & f(v)^2 + \frac{1}{\deg v} \left(f(u) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(w) \right)^2 + \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \deg w f(w)^2 \right) \\ & + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} (f(v) + \tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w))^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(f(u)^2 + \deg v f(v)^2 + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \deg w f(w)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which can be also rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \frac{1}{\deg w} - \frac{\deg v}{4} \right) f(v)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{\deg v} - \frac{1}{4} \right) f(u)^2 \\ & + \frac{2}{\deg v} \cdot f(u) \left(\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(w) \right) + f(v) \left(\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \frac{2}{\deg w} \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w) \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{\deg v} \left(\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(w) \right)^2 \\ & \geq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \cdot \deg w f(w)^2 - \frac{1}{\deg w} (\tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w))^2 \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 \right) \sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \deg w f(w)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\deg v \in \{2, 3\}$, we can finally complete the proof by considering the following three cases.

Case 1: $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$.

In this case, by letting

$$f(u) := - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} f(w)$$

and $f(v) := 0$, the above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \cdot \deg w f(w)^2 - \frac{1}{\deg w} (\tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w))^2 \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{w \in V \setminus \mathcal{N}(v)} \deg w f(w)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Since, for $w \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \cdot \deg w f(w)^2 - \frac{1}{\deg w} (\tilde{\varepsilon}(\deg w - 1)f(w))^2 \\ \geq & \frac{f(w)^2}{4} \cdot \left(\deg w - \frac{(\deg w - 1)^2}{\deg w} \right) \\ = & \frac{f(w)^2}{4} \cdot \frac{2 \deg w - 1}{\deg w} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

the inequality (13) must be an equality, implying that $f|_{\mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} = 0$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. Thus, we have two cases:

- (a) If $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is connected, then it is either a book graph or a petal graph.
- (b) If $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is not connected, then it has two connected components and at least one of them is either a book graph or a petal graph.

In both cases it is possible to find an eigenfunction f for $(\text{Id} - \Delta(\tilde{\Gamma}))^2$ with eigenvalue $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2$, such that $f|_{\mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{u\}} \neq 0$, which contradicts the above implication.

Case 2: $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 > \frac{1}{4}$ and $\deg v = 2$.

In this case, $\tilde{\Gamma} = P_2$ and $\Gamma = P_4$, which is a contradiction since we are assuming that $\Gamma \neq P_4$.

Case 3: $\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 > \frac{1}{4}$ and $\deg v = 3$.

In this case, since we cannot have $\tilde{\Gamma} = P_2$ (as shown in the previous case), $\tilde{\Gamma}$ must have exactly two connected components, each of them is either P_2 or a single vertex. But in any of these cases, one can show that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Gamma) < \frac{1}{2}$, which is a contradiction.

This proves the claim. \square

Acknowledgments

Raffaella Mulas was supported by the Max Planck Society's Minerva Grant.

References

- [1] M.S. Ashbaugh and R.D. Benguria. A sharp bound for the ratio of the first two eigenvalues of Dirichlet Laplacians and extensions. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 601–628, 1992.
- [2] A. Banerjee and J. Jost. On the spectrum of the normalized graph Laplacian. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 428(11-12):3015–3022, 2008.
- [3] F. Bauer and J. Jost. Bipartite and neighborhood graphs and the spectrum of the normalized graph Laplacian. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 21:787 – 845, 2013.
- [4] I. Chavel. *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry*. Academic Press, 1984.
- [5] F. Chung. *Spectral graph theory*. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
- [6] K. Das and S. Sun. Extremal graph on normalized Laplacian spectral radius and energy. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 29(1):237–253, 2016.
- [7] G. Faber. Beweis, dass unter allen homogenen Membranen von gleicher Fläche und gleicher Spannung die kreisförmige den tiefsten Grundton gibt. Verlag d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1923.
- [8] J. Jost. *Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis*. Springer, 2017.
- [9] J. Jost, R. Mulas, and F. Münch. Spectral gap of the largest eigenvalue of the normalized graph Laplacian. *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics*, 2021.
- [10] A.J. Kollár and P. Sarnak. Gap sets for the spectra of cubic graphs. arXiv:2005.05379.
- [11] E. Krahn. Über eine von Rayleigh formulierte Minimaleigenschaft des Kreises. *Mathematische Annalen*, 94(1):97–100, 1925.
- [12] E. Krahn. *Über Minimaleigenschaften der Kugel in drei und mehr Dimensionen*. Mattiesen, 1926.
- [13] H.F. Weinberger. An isoperimetric inequality for the N-dimensional free membrane problem. *Journal of Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 5(4):633–636, 1956.