

SPECTRAL MEASURES AND DOMINANT VERTICES IN GRAPHS OF BOUNDED DEGREE

CLAIRE BRUCHEZ, PIERRE DE LA HARPE, AND TATIANA NAGNIBEDA

ABSTRACT. A graph $G = (V, E)$ of bounded degree has an adjacency operator A which acts on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(V)$. Each vector $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ defines a scalar-valued spectral measure μ_ξ on the spectrum of A , and in particular each vertex $v \in V$ defines a characteristic function which is a vector $\delta_v \in \ell^2(V)$, and a scalar-valued spectral measure μ_v on the spectrum of A . The purpose of this note is to call attention to dominant vertices, i.e., to vertices $v \in V$ such that the measure μ_v dominates μ_w for all other vertices $w \in V$ (hence dominates μ_ξ for all $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$). In some classes of graphs, for example in vertex transitive graphs, all vertices are dominant. It is also shown that there are graphs with only some dominant vertices, and graphs with no dominant vertices at all.

1. INTRODUCTION

A **graph** G with set of vertices V is defined combinatorially by its set of edges E , which is a subset of the set of unordered pairs of vertices, and analytically by its **adjacency operator** A , which acts on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(V)$. We consider only countable graphs with bounded degree, i.e., graphs such that V is countable (finite or infinite) and such that the number of edges incident to one vertex v is bounded by some constant independent of v . In this case the Hilbert space $\ell^2(V)$ is separable and the operator A is bounded self-adjoint, defined by

$$(A\xi)(v) = \sum_{\substack{w \in V \text{ such that} \\ \{v, w\} \in E}} \xi(w) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \ell^2(V) \text{ and } v \in V.$$

Considerable attention has been given to the relations between the properties of G relevant to graph theory and random walks, and the spectral properties of A such as its spectrum or various natural measures on it; see for example [Kest–59] [Moha–82], [GoMo–88], [MoWo–89] for infinite graphs and [CvDS–80], [Bigg–93], [GoRo–01], [BrHa–12] for finite graphs.

Our initial motivation for this note was to emphasize that there are **several kinds of spectral measures** on the spectrum of an adjacency operator, and that they should not be confused with each other (see Compilation 3.6). Indeed,

Date: 25 May 2022.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C50.

Key words and phrases. Graph, adjacency operator, spectral measure, dominant vector, dominant vertex.

in the seminal paper by Kesten [Kest–59], the definition of the spectral measure which is used depends first on the choice of one vertex of the graph, even if the measure eventually does not depend on the choice because the graphs which are involved are vertex-transitive; but the choice can have important consequences for more general graphs which are not vertex-transitive. We focus attention to certain particular vertices, that we call **dominant vertices**¹, which are defined in terms of their associated spectral measures (Definition 3.3). When G is a finite graph, a vertex v is dominant if the measure defined by v on the spectrum of A charges all eigenvalues of A (see Proposition 4.4 for other characterizations of dominant vertices in finite graphs). The main point of what follows is to provide examples of graphs, both infinite and finite, which show the various possibilities: all vertices may be dominant, or only some of them, or just one of them, or none at all. In the literature on finite graphs, there is a conjecture on graphs with irreducible characteristic polynomials which, if true, would imply that, in “most finite graphs”, all vertices are dominant; see the end of Section 4.

Section 2 is a reminder of spectral analysis for bounded self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces. In Section 3, on adjacency operators of graphs of bounded degree, we define vertex spectral measures and dominant vertices; we indicate examples of graphs in which all vertices are dominant, in particular vertex transitive graphs (such as Cayley graphs, in particular square grids and regular trees); there is also in Section 7 an example of an infinite graph in which almost all vertices are not dominant (a minor modification of the infinite ray). In Section 4, on linear algebra, it is shown how the notions of vertex spectral measure and dominant vertices can be reformulated for finite graphs. Section 5 shows examples of connected finite graphs and their dominant vertices: finite paths, stars, finite graphs without dominant vertices at all, including trees and regular connected graphs, and distance-regular graphs. Section 7 is a continuation of Section 3, with other examples of infinite graphs (ray and stars) in which all vertices (or possibly all but one) are dominant. Section 6 is a technical interlude on a particular Jacobi matrix (its spectrum, its eigenvalues, and its cyclic vectors) which appears in the example of infinite stars (Theorem 7.3). For the reader interested essentially in finite graphs, the important parts are Sections 4 and 5.

2. SPECTRAL MEASURES, LOCAL SPECTRAL MEASURES, AND DOMINANT VECTORS FOR A BOUNDED SELF-ADJOINT OPERATOR

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space (here always over the complex numbers, and not $\{0\}$) and X a bounded self-adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} . The spectrum $\Sigma(X)$ is the set of complex numbers λ such that $\lambda - X$ is not invertible; it is a non-empty compact subset of \mathbf{R} , contained in the interval $[-\|X\|, \|X\|]$. The **spectral measure** of

¹The notion of a *dominant vertex* has nothing to do with that of a *dominating set* of vertices, which is a set of vertices such that any vertex in the graph is at distance at most 1 of the set.

X is the projection-valued measure $E_X : \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X)) \rightarrow \text{Proj}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$(1) \quad X = \int_{\Sigma(X)} t dE_X(t),$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$ is the σ -algebra of Borel sets on $\Sigma(X)$ and $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of orthogonal projections of \mathcal{H} onto closed subspaces. A **scalar-valued spectral measure** for X is a finite positive measure $\mu : \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X)) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $\mu(B) = 0$ (the zero number) if and only if $E_X(B) = 0$ (the zero projection on \mathcal{H}) for any Borel subset B of $\Sigma(X)$; this terminology is that of [Conw-07]. The existence of a scalar-valued spectral measure for X is guaranteed by Proposition 2.1; it follows from the definition that two scalar-valued spectral measures for X are equivalent to each other.

For any bounded Borel complex-valued function on the spectrum, $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$, functional calculus provides a bounded operator $f(X)$ on \mathcal{H} ; this holds in particular for any continuous function on the spectrum, $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma(X))$. The set of all operators of the form $f(X)$ for $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$ is the von Neumann algebra $W^*(X)$ generated by X , namely the smallest von Neumann algebra of operators on \mathcal{H} containing X . The local spectral measure of X at two vectors ξ and η in \mathcal{H} is the complex measure $\mu_{\xi,\eta}$ on $\Sigma(X)$ defined by

$$\int_{\Sigma(X)} f(t) d\mu_{\xi,\eta}(t) = \langle f(X)\xi | \eta \rangle \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma(X))$$

or equivalently by

$$\mu_{\xi,\eta}(B) = \langle E_X(B)\xi | \eta \rangle \quad \text{for all Borel subset } B \subset \Sigma(X).$$

In particular the **local spectral measure** of X at a vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is the positive measure on $\Sigma(X)$ denoted by μ_ξ (rather than $\mu_{\xi,\xi}$) defined by

$$(2) \quad \int_{\Sigma(X)} f(t) d\mu_\xi(t) = \langle f(X)\xi | \xi \rangle \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma(X)).$$

The norm of μ_ξ is $\mu_\xi(\Sigma(X)) = \|\xi\|^2$. It follows from the definitions that μ_ξ is absolutely continuous with respect to any scalar-valued spectral measure for X . Note that μ_ξ can equally be viewed as a positive measure on \mathbf{R} with closed support contained in $\Sigma(X)$.

A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is **dominant** for X if $\mu_\eta \ll \mu_\xi$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, in words if the measure μ_η is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_ξ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., if the measure μ_η is dominated by the measure μ_ξ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$.

For examples of dominant vectors, see Proposition 2.4 below. For an easy non-example, consider a self-adjoint operator X which has an eigenvalue λ and which is not λ times the identity; an eigenvector of eigenvalue λ is not a dominant vector for X .

Proposition 2.1 (existence and characterizations of dominant vectors for self-adjoint operators). *Let X be a bounded self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$, $W^*(X)$, and E_X be as above.*

- (1) *There exist dominant vectors for X . More precisely, for any $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a dominant vector ξ for X such that η is in the closed linear span of $\{X^n \xi\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$.*
- (2) *A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is dominant for X if and only if, for $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$, the equality $f(X)\xi = 0$ implies $f(X) = 0$.*
- (3) *A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is dominant for X if and only if the evaluation map $W^*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $Y \mapsto Y\xi$ is injective.*
- (4) *A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is dominant for X if and only if, for any Borel subset B of $\Sigma(X)$, we have $\mu_\xi(B) = 0$ if and only if $E_X(B) = 0$, i.e., if and only if μ_ξ is a scalar-valued spectral measure for X .*

References for the proof and terminology. For (1) and (2), see [Sim4–15], Lemma 5.4.7 and Problem 3 of § 5.4. Note that (2) and (3) are mere reformulations of each other. For (4), see [Conw–07], Theorem IX.8.9.

Terminology varies from one author to the other. A dominant vector for X is *maximal relative to X* in [DuSc–63, Chap. X, Section 5, Definition 6], it is a *vector of maximal type* in [BoSm–20], and a *separating vector* for the von Neumann algebra generated by X in [Dixm–69]. For ξ dominant, the measure μ_ξ is a scalar-valued spectral measure for X ; conversely, any scalar-valued spectral measure is a measure μ_ξ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ [Conw–07, Theorem IX.8.9 and Lemma IX.8.6]. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let \mathcal{H} , X , and E_X be as in Proposition 2.1. Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . Denote by μ_ξ and μ_i the local spectral measures of X at ξ and ε_i .*

Then the vector ξ is dominant for X if and only if the measure μ_ξ dominates μ_i for all $i \geq 1$.

Proof. If ξ is dominant, then $\mu_i \prec\prec \mu_\xi$ for all $i \geq 1$, by definition. Conversely, suppose that $\mu_i \prec\prec \mu_\xi$ for all $i \geq 1$. Let B be a Borel subset of $\Sigma(X)$. If $\mu_\xi(B) = 0$, then $\mu_i(B) = \langle E_X(B)\varepsilon_i | \varepsilon_i \rangle = \|E_X(B)\varepsilon_i\|^2 = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$, namely $E_X(B)\varepsilon_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$, hence $E_X(B) = 0$. It follows that ξ is dominant for X (see (4) in Proposition 2.1). \square

Let X be a bounded self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is **cyclic** for X if the closed linear span of $\{X^n \xi : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is the whole of \mathcal{H} . (Some authors choose another definition for more general operators, but all definitions agree in case X is self-adjoint; see [Sim4–15, Page 289, § 5.1].) To say that a vector \mathcal{H} is cyclic for the operator X is the same as to say it is cyclic for the von Neumann algebra $W^*(X)$. Note that, if X has any cyclic vector at all, then the space \mathcal{H} is separable.

The following proposition is well-known and straightforward:

Proposition 2.3. *For a self-adjoint operator X , any cyclic vector is dominant.*

Proof. Let ξ be a cyclic vector for X . Let f in $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma(X))$ be a bounded Borel function on the spectrum of X . If $f(X)\xi = 0$, then $f(X)X^n\xi = X^n f(X)\xi = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$, hence $f(X)\eta = 0$ for all η is the closed linear span of $\{X^n\xi : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, hence $f(X) = 0$. (We have used the characterization of dominant vectors given in (2) of Proposition 2.1). \square

There are dominant vectors which are not cyclic, for example when X is a self-adjoint operator on a finite-dimensional space which has multiple eigenvalues (more generally when X is a self-adjoint operator which is not multiplicity-free).

We will use the following facts on dominant vectors for simple multiplication operators. Let Σ be a nonempty compact subset of the real line, \mathcal{B}_Σ the Borel σ -algebra of Σ , and μ a finite Borel measure on $(\Sigma, \mathcal{B}_\Sigma)$, of closed support Σ . The **multiplication operator** M_μ is here the operator defined on $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ by

$$(M_\mu\xi)(t) = t\xi(t) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu) \text{ and } t \in \Sigma.$$

It is a bounded self-adjoint operator with norm $\max_{t \in \Sigma} |t|$ and with spectrum Σ . The function $1_\Sigma \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ of constant value 1 is a cyclic vector for M_μ . More is true:

Proposition 2.4 (cyclic and dominant vectors for multiplication operators). *Let M_μ be a multiplication operator as above and $\xi \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$. The following three properties are equivalent:*

- (i) ξ is cyclic for M_μ ,
- (ii) ξ is dominant for M_μ ,
- (iii) ξ is such that $\mu(\{t \in \Sigma : \xi(t) = 0\}) = 0$.

Proof. Property (i) implies Property (ii) by Proposition 2.3.

Suppose that (iii) does not hold. Define $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$ by $f(t) = 1$ when $\xi(t) = 0$ and $f(t) = 0$ when $\xi(t) \neq 0$; then $f(M_\mu) \neq 0$ and $f(M_\mu)\xi = 0$, hence (ii) does not hold. This shows that (ii) implies (iii).

Suppose that (iii) holds. Denote by L_ξ^2 the closed subspace of $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ spanned by $\{(M_\mu)^n\xi\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$. We have to show that $L_\xi^2 = L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$. For this we consider $\eta \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ orthogonal to L_ξ^2 , and we will show that $\eta = 0$. The condition $\eta \perp L_\xi^2$ reads

$$\int_{\Sigma} t^n \xi(t) \eta(t) d\mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0,$$

so that

$$\text{\#} \quad \int_{\Sigma} p(t) \xi(t) \eta(t) d\mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{P}(\Sigma),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ is the algebra of functions on Σ which are restrictions to Σ of polynomial functions on \mathbf{R} . Note that $\xi\eta$ is in $L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$ and that $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$ is the dual of the Banach space $L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$. Note also that $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ is w^* -dense in $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$,

because the algebra $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ is dense in the Banach space $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$, by the Stone–Weierstrass theorem, and because the natural image of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ in $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$ is w*-dense, see [Doug–72, Corollary 4.5.3]. Consequently, it follows from (#) that $\xi\eta = 0$ in $L^1(\Sigma, \mu)$, hence that $\xi(t)\eta(t) = 0$ for μ -almost all $t \in \Sigma$. The last equality and Condition (iii) imply that $\eta(t) = 0$ for μ -almost all $t \in \Sigma$, so that $\eta = 0$. This shows that (iii) implies (i).

Alternative proof for (i) \iff (ii). For $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$, denote by $M_{\mu, \varphi}$ the multiplication operator defined on $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ by

$$(M_{\mu, \varphi}\xi)(t) = \varphi(t)\xi(t) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu) \text{ and } t \in \Sigma.$$

The von Neumann algebra $W^*(M_\mu)$ generated by M_μ coincides with the algebra

$$\{M_{\mu, \varphi} \mid \varphi \in L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)\}$$

(see the argument above showing density for the inclusion $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma) \subset \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ and for the image of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ in $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mu)$). The algebra $W^*(M_\mu)$ is maximal abelian [Doug–72, Proposition 4.22], and therefore equal to its commutant. In general, a vector is cyclic for a von Neumann algebra if and only if it is separating for its commutant [Dixm–69, Chap. 1, § 1, Proposition 5]; in the present case, this shows that (i) and (ii) are equivalent. \square

Corollary 2.5. *Let X be a bounded self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Assume that there exists a cyclic vector for X .*

Then a vector in \mathcal{H} is dominant for X if and only if it is cyclic for X .

Proof. Let Σ denote the spectrum of X , let ξ_0 be a cyclic vector for X , and let μ denote the local spectral measure of X at ξ_0 . Then X is unitarily equivalent to the operator M_μ of Proposition 2.4, i.e., there exists a surjective isometry $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ such that $X = U^*M_\mu U$. This can be viewed as a form of the spectral theorem: see [Sim4–15, Theorem 5.1.7]. Note that the equality $UX = M_\mu U$ determines for each $n \geq 0$ the image of $X^n \xi_0$ by U ; indeed $(UX^n \xi_0)(t) = (M_\mu^n U \xi_0)(t) = t^n (U \xi_0)(t)$ for all $t \in \Sigma$, so that $UX^n \xi_0$ is the function $t \mapsto t^n$ in $L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$.

Since a vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is dominant [respectively cyclic] for X if and only if $U\xi \in L^2(\Sigma, \mu)$ is dominant [respectively cyclic] for M_μ , the corollary follows from Proposition 2.4. \square

The following proposition is again straightforward, but will play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 7.3.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}_i$ be a Hilbert space given as an orthogonal direct sum of a sequence of non-trivial subspaces, where $I = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ is countable, finite or infinite. For each $i \in I$, let ξ_i be a vector in \mathcal{H}_i ; assume that $\sum_{i \in I} \|\xi_i\|^2 < \infty$, and set $\xi = \sum_{i \in I} \xi_i \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Let X be a self-adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} . Assume that \mathcal{H}_i is invariant by X , and denote by X_i the restriction of X to \mathcal{H}_i , for all $i \in I$.

- (i) If ξ_i is dominant for X_i for all $i \in I$, then ξ is dominant for X .
(ii) If $|I| \geq 2$, then ξ_i is not cyclic for X , for all $i \in I$.

Proof. (i) Let f be a bounded Borel function on the spectrum of X such that $f(X)\xi = 0$. Note that $f(X)\xi = (f(X_i)\xi_i)_{i \in I}$. If ξ_i is dominant for X_i for all $i \in I$, then $f(X_i) = 0$ for all $i \in I$, hence $f(X) = 0$, therefore ξ is dominant for X .

(ii) Let $i \in I$. The closed linear span of $\{X^n \xi_i : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is contained in \mathcal{H}_i , hence is a proper subspace of \mathcal{H} . \square

3. VERTEX SPECTRAL MEASURES AND DOMINANT VERTICES FOR ADJACENCY OPERATORS OF GRAPHS

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, as above with V countable, and of bounded degree. Denote by A the adjacency operator of G and by $\Sigma(A)$ its spectrum. The Hilbert space $\ell^2(V)$ has a canonical basis $(\delta_v)_{v \in V}$ of characteristic functions of vertices, $\delta_v(v) = 1$ and $\delta_v(w) = 0$ for $w \in V \setminus \{v\}$. With respect to this basis, the adjacency operator A of G has matrix coefficients

$$\langle A\delta_w | \delta_v \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{v, w\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(we think of v as a row index and of w as a column index for the matrix of A). Observe that $A = 0$ if and only if G has no edge.

The next proposition describes the convex hull of the spectrum of A and the following one properties of some of the local spectral measures. Both propositions are well-known, but we found it convenient to write up complete proofs in one place. Parts and sketches of the proofs below can be found in [Moha-82] and [Woes-00, Lemmas 10.1 and 1.7].

Proposition 3.1 (smallest and largest spectral values). *Let $G = (V, E)$, A , and $\Sigma(A)$ be as above. We assume that $E \neq \emptyset$.*

- (i) We have $\|A\| \geq 1$ and

$$-\|A\| \leq \min\{t \in \Sigma(A)\} < 0 < \max\{t \in \Sigma(A)\} = \|A\|.$$

- (ii) If G is bipartite, then $\Sigma(A)$ is symmetric with respect to zero, so that in particular $\min\{t \in \Sigma(A)\} = -\|A\|$.

Proof. First a reminder. Let X be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

The **numerical range** of X is defined by

$$\text{NR}(X) = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid z = \langle X\xi | \xi \rangle \text{ for some } \xi \in \mathcal{H}, \|\xi\| = 1\}.$$

It is known that $\text{NR}(X)$ is a convex subset of \mathbf{C} , and that its closure $\overline{\text{NR}(X)}$ contains the spectrum $\Sigma(X)$. Moreover, when X is normal, $\overline{\text{NR}(X)}$ is the convex hull of $\Sigma(X)$; in particular, when X is self-adjoint,

$$\overline{\text{NR}(X)} = [\inf\{t \in \text{NR}(X)\}, \sup\{t \in \text{NR}(X)\}] = [\min\{t \in \Sigma(X)\}, \max\{t \in \Sigma(X)\}]$$

is the smallest interval of \mathbf{R} which contains $\Sigma(X)$. See [Halm-67, Chap. 17].

The **spectral radius** of a bounded operator X on \mathcal{H} is the non-negative number defined by

$$\rho(X) = \max\{r \in \mathbf{R}_+ \mid r = |z| \text{ for some } z \in \Sigma(X)\}.$$

It is known that $\rho(X) = \lim_n (\|X^n\|^{1/n})$. When X is self-adjoint, $\rho(X) = \|X\|$, and the spectrum $\Sigma(X)$ contains at least one of $\|X\|$, $-\|X\|$, but need not contain $\|X\|$. See for example [Sim4–15, Theorems 2.2.10 and 2.2.11].

(i) Let V_F be a finite subset of V such that the finite subgraph $F = (V_F, E_F)$ of G induced by V_F is connected, and with $E_F \neq \emptyset$. Let A_F be the adjacency operator of F ; set $M_F = \max\{t \in \Sigma(A_F)\} = \|A_F\|$, note that $M_F \geq 1$. There exists a Perron–Frobenius eigenvector $\xi_F \in \ell^2(V_F)$ of A_F such that $A_F \xi_F = M_F \xi_F$ and $\|\xi_F\| = 1$. Let $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ be defined by $\xi(v) = \xi_F(v)$ for $v \in V_F$ and $\xi(v) = 0$ for $v \in V \setminus V_F$. Then $M_F = \langle A_F \xi_F \mid \xi_F \rangle = \langle A \xi \mid \xi \rangle \in \text{NR}(A)$, hence

$$\|A\| \geq \sup\{t \in \text{NR}(A)\} \geq M_F \geq 1.$$

Similarly, there exist $m_F < 0$ and an eigenvector $\eta_F \in \ell^2(V_F)$ of A_F such that $A_F \eta_F = m_F \eta_F$ and $\|\eta_F\| = 1$. Let $\eta \in \ell^2(V)$ be defined by $\eta(v) = \eta_F(v)$ for $v \in V_F$ and $\eta(v) = 0$ for $v \in V \setminus V_F$. Then $m_F = \langle A \eta \mid \eta \rangle \in \text{NR}(A)$, hence

$$-\|A\| \leq \inf\{t \in \text{NR}(A)\} \leq m_F < 0.$$

Let $s \in \text{NR}(A)$; assume that $s < 0$. There exists a unit vector $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ such that $s = \langle A \xi \mid \xi \rangle$. Let $\eta \in \ell^2(V)$ be defined by $\eta(v) = |\xi(v)|$ for all $v \in V$; observe that $\|\eta\| = \|\xi\| = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |s| &= |\langle A \xi \mid \xi \rangle| = \left| \sum_{v,w \in V} \langle A \delta_v \mid \delta_w \rangle \xi(v) \overline{\xi(w)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{v,w \in V} \langle A \delta_v \mid \delta_w \rangle \eta(v) \eta(w) = \langle A \eta \mid \eta \rangle \in \text{NR}(A). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sup\{t \in \text{NR}(A)\} = \max\{t \in \Sigma(A)\} \geq |\inf\{t \in \text{NR}(A)\}| = |\min\{t \in \Sigma(A)\}|$$

and that $\sup\{t \in \text{NR}(A)\} = \rho(A) = \|A\|$.

Remark: When G is connected and not in a well-known list of graphs, the finite Coxeter graphs, we have moreover $\|A\| \geq 2$. The list is for example in [BrHa–12, Section 3.1.1].

(ii) Let $V = V' \sqcup V''$ be a disjoint union such that any edge in G connects a vertex in V' and a vertex in V'' . Then $\ell^2(V) = \ell^2(V') \oplus \ell^2(V'')$; for $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$, we write ξ' the component of ξ in $\ell^2(V')$, and similarly for $\xi'' \in \ell^2(V'')$. We have $(A\xi)' = A\xi''$ and $(A\xi)'' = A\xi'$. Let $t \in \Sigma(A)$; there exists a sequence $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of unit vectors in $\ell^2(V)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A\xi_n - t\xi_n\| = 0$. For all $n \geq 0$, set $\eta_n = \xi'_n - \xi''_n$; then $\|\eta_n\| = 1$ and $\|A\eta_n + t\eta_n\| = \|A\xi_n - t\xi_n\|$. It follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A\eta_n + t\eta_n\| = 0$, so that $-t \in \Sigma(A)$. \square

Let v, w be two vertices of G . We write $\mu_{v,w}$ instead of μ_{δ_v, δ_w} the local spectral measure on $\Sigma(A)$ at δ_v and δ_w ; in particular we write μ_v instead of μ_{δ_v} the local spectral measure on $\Sigma(A)$ at δ_v , defined as in Formula (2) of Section 2, and we call it the **vertex spectral measure** at v for A ; it is also called the **Kesten spectral measure** at v for A [Grig–11, Section 10]. The interest of the measures $\mu_{v,w}$ is that their moments count walks in G from v to w . We denote by $d(v, w)$ the combinatorial distance in G between v and w , if v and w are in the same connected component of G ; otherwise $d(v, w) = \infty$.

Proposition 3.2 (moments of vertex spectral measures and number of walks). *Let $G = (V, E)$, A , $\Sigma(A)$ be as above. We assume that G is connected, and is not the trivial graph with one vertex and no edge.*

- (i) *Let $v, w \in V$, and $\mu_{v,w}$ be as above; let n be a non-negative integer. The moment of order n of $\mu_{v,w}$ counts walks in G :*

$$\int_{\Sigma(A)} t^n d\mu_{v,w}(t) = \langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_w \rangle = \begin{cases} \text{number of walks in } G \\ \text{of length } n \text{ from } v \text{ to } w. \end{cases}$$

In particular $\int_{\Sigma(A)} t^n d\mu_v(t)$ is the number of loops in G of length n at v .

- (ii) *Let $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ be such that $\|\xi\| = 1$, $\xi(v) \geq 0$ for all $v \in V$, and $\xi(v) = 0$ for all v outside a finite subset F of V . Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle^{1/2n} = \|A\|$.*
- (iii) *For $v, w \in V$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^{2n} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle^{1/2n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[2n]{\begin{matrix} \text{number of loops in } G \\ \text{of length } 2n \text{ at } v \end{matrix}} = \|A\|$$

and $\max\{t \in \text{closed support of } \mu_v\} = \|A\|$.

Proof. The proof of Claim (i) is straightforward, using the definitions and the rule of multiplications of matrices.

On the limits in Claim (ii). Let $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ be such that $\|\xi\| = 1$ and $\xi(v) \geq 0$ for all $v \in V$. Let n be a non-negative integer. Observe that $\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle > 0$, because G does not have any isolated vertex. By the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle^2 = \langle A^{n+2} \xi | A^n \xi \rangle^2 \leq \langle A^{n+2} \xi | A^{n+2} \xi \rangle \langle A^n \xi | A^n \xi \rangle$$

hence

$$\frac{\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle} \leq \frac{\langle A^{2n+4} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle}.$$

It follows that there exists a limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle} = \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle}.$$

We denote by ρ_ξ the square root of this limit. Since $\langle A^0 \xi | \xi \rangle = 1$, we have

$$\frac{\langle A^2 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^0 \xi | \xi \rangle} \frac{\langle A^4 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^2 \xi | \xi \rangle} \frac{\langle A^6 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^4 \xi | \xi \rangle} \cdots \frac{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n-2} \xi | \xi \rangle} = \langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle^{1/2n} \right) = \sqrt{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\langle A^2 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^0 \xi | \xi \rangle} \frac{\langle A^4 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^2 \xi | \xi \rangle} \frac{\langle A^6 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^4 \xi | \xi \rangle} \cdots \frac{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n-2} \xi | \xi \rangle} \right)^{1/n}} = \rho_\xi.$$

Note that

$$(\text{sup}) \quad \rho_\xi = \sqrt{\sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{\langle A^{2n+2} \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\langle A^2 \xi | \xi \rangle}{\langle \xi | \xi \rangle}} = \|A\xi\|.$$

Since $\langle A^{2n} \xi | \xi \rangle \leq \|A^{2n}\| \leq \|A\|^{2n}$ for all $n \geq 0$, we have $\rho_\xi \leq \|A\|$.

When $\xi = \delta_v$, we write below $\rho_{v,v}$ for ρ_{δ_v} .

All limits in Claims (iii) and (ii) are equal. Let $v, w \in V$; set $k = d(v, w)$. On the one hand, $\langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle$ is for each $n \geq 0$ the number of loops in G of length n at v , and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle^{1/2n} = \rho_{v,v}$. On the other hand, for $n \geq k$, every loop of length $n - k$ at v is the beginning of a walk of length n from v to w , so that we have

$$\langle A^{n-k} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle \leq \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle, \quad \text{and similarly} \quad \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle \leq \langle A^{n+k} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle.$$

It follows that there exists a limit

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{v,w} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^{2n} \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle^{1/2n} \quad \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ \rho_{v,w} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^{2n+1} \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle^{1/(2n+1)} \quad \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \end{aligned}$$

and that $\rho_{v,w} = \rho_{v,v}$. Since walks from v to w are in bijection with walks from w to v , we have moreover $\rho_{v,w} = \rho_{w,v}$. It follows that $\rho_{v,w}$ is independent of the choices of v and w ; from now on, we write ρ_G for this number. In the next step, we will use

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle^{1/n} = \rho_G \quad \text{for all } v, w \in V.$$

Note that, for (iii), we still have to show that $\rho_G \geq \|A\|$.

Let now ξ be as in (ii). We have $\xi = \sum_{v \in F} \xi(v) \delta_v$ and

$$\langle A^n \xi | \xi \rangle = \sum_{v, w \in F} \xi(v) \xi(w) \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_v \rangle.$$

Whenever $\xi(v) \xi(w) > 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\xi(v) \xi(w) \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_v \rangle \right)^{1/n} = \rho_G$$

by the previous step, and it follows that

$$(\text{rho}) \quad \rho_\xi = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^n \xi | \xi \rangle^{1/n} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{v, w \in F} \xi(v) \xi(w) \langle A^n \delta_w | \delta_v \rangle \right)^{1/n} = \rho_G.$$

Final step: $\rho_G = \|A\|$ and $\max\{t \in \text{closed support of } \mu_v\} = \|A\|$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $\eta \in \ell^2(V)$ such that $\|\eta\| = 1$, and $\eta(v) = 0$ for all v outside

a finite subset F of V , and $\|A\eta\| \geq \|A\| - \varepsilon$. Let $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ be defined by $\xi(v) = |\eta(v)|$ for all $v \in V$. Then $\|\xi\| = 1$, and $\xi(v) = 0$ for all v outside G , and $\langle A^2\xi | \xi \rangle \geq \langle A^2\eta | \eta \rangle$. It follows from (sup) and (rho) above that

$$\rho_G \geq \|A\xi\| \geq \|A\eta\| \geq \|A\| - \varepsilon,$$

and this shows that $\rho_G = \|A\|$.

Let Σ_v denote the closed support of μ_v ; set $M_v = \max\{t \in \Sigma_v\}$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and let c be the positive number $\mu_v([M_v - \varepsilon, M_v])$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^{2n} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle^{1/2n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\int_{\Sigma_v} t^{2n} d\mu_v(t) \right)^{1/2n} \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\int_{M_v - \varepsilon}^{M_v} t^{2n} d\mu_v(t) \right)^{1/2n} \right) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(c(M_v - \varepsilon)^{2n} \right)^{1/2n} \right) = M_v - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\|A\| = M_v$, and this ends the proof. \square

The walk generating function for the number of walks between two vertices v and w is the formal power series defined by

$$W_{v,w}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_w \rangle z^n$$

and we have $W_{v,w}(z) = \int_{\Sigma(A)} (z - t)^{-1} d\mu_{v,w}(t)$, which is for example Formula (1.10) in [GoMo-88]. The radius of convergence of this series is $\|A\|^{-1}$, by (iii) of Proposition 3.2.

Definition 3.3. In a graph $G = (V, E)$, a vertex $v \in V$ is **dominant** if the vector $\delta_v \in \ell^2(V)$ is dominant for A , and **cyclic** if δ_v is cyclic for A .

By Proposition 2.2, a vertex v is dominant in G as soon as the vertex spectral measure μ_v dominates μ_w for all $w \in V$.

As examples below will show, the vertices of a graph need not be all dominant, indeed some graphs have no dominant vertex at all. In other terms, a vertex spectral measure need not be a scalar-valued spectral measure.

We provide in this section examples of graphs for which it is easy to check that all vertices are dominant. There are further examples in Section 7, for which the determination of dominant vertices is no so straightforward, and relies on the analysis of a Jacobi operator in Section 6.

Proposition 3.4 (all vertices are dominant in vertex-transitive graphs).

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of bounded degree and A its adjacency operator.

- (1) If $v, w \in V$ are two vertices such that there exists an automorphism of G mapping v to w , the vertex spectral measures μ_v and μ_w are equal.
- (2) If the group of automorphisms of G is transitive on V , then all vertex spectral measures are equal, and all vertices are dominant.

Proof. Preliminary step. An automorphism α of G induces a unitary operator U_α on $\ell^2(V)$, defined by $U_\alpha\delta_v = \delta_{\alpha(v)}$ for all $v \in V$. The operator U_α commutes with A ; indeed, for all $v, w \in V$,

$$\langle U_\alpha^*AU_\alpha\delta_v | \delta_w \rangle = \langle AU_\alpha\delta_v | U_\alpha\delta_w \rangle = \langle A\delta_{\alpha(v)} | \delta_{\alpha(w)} \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\alpha(v), \alpha(w)\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{if not,} \end{cases}$$

so that $\langle U_\alpha^*AU_\alpha\delta_v | \delta_w \rangle = \langle A\delta_v | \delta_w \rangle$; it follows that $U_\alpha^*AU_\alpha = A$, i.e., that U_α commutes with A . This implies in turn that U_α commutes with $f(A)$ for any function $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(A))$.

Proof of (1). Let α be an automorphism of G such that $\alpha(v) = w$. For all $n \geq 0$, we have

$$\langle A^n\delta_w | \delta_w \rangle = \langle A^nU_\alpha\delta_v | U_\alpha\delta_w \rangle = \langle U_\alpha A^n\delta_v | U_\alpha\delta_w \rangle = \langle A^n\delta_v | \delta_v \rangle$$

and therefore $\int_{\Sigma(A)} t^n d\mu_w(t) = \int_{\Sigma(A)} t^n d\mu_v(t)$. This implies that the measures μ_w and μ_v are equal.

Proof of (2). We use the characterization of dominant vectors given in (2) of Proposition 2.1. Let $v \in V$. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma(A))$ be such that $f(A)\delta_v = 0$. For $w \in V$, we can choose an automorphism α such that $w = \alpha(v)$. By the preliminary step, we have $f(A)\delta_w = f(A)U_\alpha\delta_v = U_\alpha(f(A)\delta_v) = 0$. As this holds for all $w \in V$, we have $f(A) = 0$. It follows that v is dominant. \square

Example 3.5 (all vertices are dominant in Cayley graphs, in particular in grids and regular trees). In a Cayley graph, all vertices are dominant, by Item (2) of Proposition 3.4. Here are three kinds of graphs which illustrate this.

(a) There are many well-known families of finite graphs which are Cayley graphs. We mention explicitly only three: connected circulant graphs, ladder graphs, and Paley graphs; see for example Chapter 17 in [Bigg–93]. In such a graph, all vertices are dominant.

(b) Let d be a positive integer. Denote by L^d the d -dimensional grid graph, with vertex set \mathbf{Z}^d and edge set

$$\{\{u, v\} : u, v \in \mathbf{Z}^d, v = u + e_j \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \dots, d\}\},$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ is the canonical basis of \mathbf{Z}^d . In other words, L^d is the Cayley graph of the group \mathbf{Z}^d and the generating set $\{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_d\}$. In L^d , all vertices are dominant.

(c) Let d be an integer, $d \geq 3$. Denote by T^d the regular tree of degree d . This tree can be seen as the Cayley graph of the free product of d copies of $\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$, each copy with its non-identity element s_j , and the generating set $\{s_1, \dots, s_d\}$. When d is even, T^d can be seen alternatively as the Cayley graph of the free group on $d/2$ generators and a free basis. In T^d , all vertices are dominant.

(The tree T^2 makes sense, but it is the same graph as L^1 , also known as the two-way infinite path. The tree T^1 is the graph with two vertices and one edge connecting them.)

Open: we haven't been able to find a bounded degree connected infinite graph without dominant vertex. There are examples of connected finite graphs without dominant vertices in Section 5, and of a connected infinite graph with only two dominant vertices in Example 7.2.

A graph G is **walk-regular** if the number of closed loops of length n at a vertex v of G is independent of v for all $n \geq 0$, equivalently if the measure μ_v is independent on the vertex v (the terminology is that of [GoMc-80]). When the graph G is walk-regular, and therefore regular of some degree d , the measure μ_v is sometimes called a **Plancherel measure** [FiPi-83, § 3.4], [MoWo-89, Page 219].

It's natural to ask if all vertices are dominant in walk-regular graphs. It is the case for finite graphs (Proposition 4.7 below), but we do not know in general.

Compilation of spectral measures 3.6. Here is a list of the various “spectral measures” introduced so far. For a bounded self-adjoint operator X on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , with spectrum Σ , the first three terms below are defined in Section 2 and the fourth appears in Section 4:

- (1) The operator-valued **spectral measure** E_X , a projection-valued measure such that $X = \int_{\Sigma} t dE_X(t)$.
- (2) The **scalar-valued spectral measures**, which are the finite positive measure on Σ which have the same Borel subsets of Σ of measure zero than E_X .
- (3) The **local spectral measure** of X at a vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, which is a scalar-valued spectral measure if and only if the vector ξ is dominant.
- (4) When \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional, and X has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ with multiplicities m_1, \dots, m_s respectively, the **counting measure** τ is defined by $\tau(\{\lambda_j\}) = \frac{m_j}{\dim \mathcal{H}}$; it is a scalar-valued spectral measure on Σ .

For the adjacency operator A of a graph $G = (V, E)$ of bounded degree, which is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(V)$, we have:

- (5) The **vertex spectral measure** μ_v at v also called the **Kesten spectral measure** at v , which is the local spectral measure of A at the vector $\delta_v \in \ell^2(V)$, and which is a scalar-valued spectral measure if and only if the vertex v is dominant (see just before Proposition 3.2). When the graph G is walk-regular, μ_v , which is independent of v , is also called the **Plancherel measure**.
- (6) When G is finite, so that A is as in (4) above, the counting measure on the spectrum of A is also called the **density of states**, as noted after Corollary 4.5 below.

4. THE CASE OF FINITE GRAPHS

It is convenient to recall here the following facts from linear algebra. Consider a linear endomorphism X of a finite dimensional vector space \mathcal{H} of positive dimension. For the next three definitions and for Proposition 4.1, X need not be self-adjoint, indeed \mathcal{H} can be a vector space over any field, say \mathbf{K} . Let $\mathbf{K}[T]$ denote the ring of polynomial in one variable over \mathbf{K} . The **minimal polynomial** $P_{\min} \in \mathbf{K}[T]$ of X is the monic polynomial which generates the ideal $\{Q \in \mathbf{K}[T] : Q(X) = 0\}$, equivalently the monic polynomial of minimal degree such that $P_{\min}(X) = 0$. For $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, the **minimal polynomial** $P_\xi \in \mathbf{K}[T]$ of (X, ξ) is the monic polynomial which generates the ideal $\{Q \in \mathbf{K}[T] : Q(X)\xi = 0\}$, equivalently the monic polynomial of minimal degree such that $P_\xi(X)\xi = 0$. Observe that P_ξ divides P_{\min} . A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is **dominant for X** if, for $Q \in \mathbf{K}[T]$, the equality $Q(X)\xi = 0$ implies $Q(X) = 0$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be an endomorphism of a finite dimensional vector space \mathcal{H} over a field \mathbf{K} . Let P_{\min} be the minimal polynomial of X , and let s be its degree.*

- (1) *There exist dominant vectors for X .*
- (2) *Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ and let P_ξ be the minimal polynomial of (X, ξ) . The following properties are equivalent:*
 - (i) *ξ is dominant for X ,*
 - (ii) *$P_\xi = P_{\min}$, i.e., the degree of P_ξ is s ,*
 - (iii) *the vectors $\xi, X\xi, X^2\xi, \dots, X^{s-1}\xi$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. (1) Let $P_{\min} = \prod_{j=1}^d (Q_j)^{\ell_j}$ be the decomposition of the minimal polynomial in product of powers of irreducible polynomials in $\mathbf{K}[T]$. There exists a direct sum decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^d V_j$ in X -invariant subspaces such that, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, the minimal polynomial of the restriction of X to V_j is $Q_j^{\ell_j}$. For appropriate choices of vectors $\xi_j \in V_j$, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j$ is dominant for X . For the details, see [Gant-77, § VII.2].

Note that Gantmacher does not have a specific terminology for the vectors which are called dominant here.

In the particular case of a diagonalisable operator, the V_j 's are the eigenspaces of X and $\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j$ is dominant for X for any choice of nonzero vectors $\xi_j \in V_j$.

(2) It follows from the definitions that (i) holds, i.e., that the ideals $\{Q \in \mathbf{K}[T] : Q(X) = 0\}$ and $\{Q \in \mathbf{K}[T] : Q(X)\xi = 0\}$ coincide, if and only if $P_\xi = P_{\min}$, i.e., if and only if (ii) holds. Also (ii) holds, i.e., $Q(X)\xi \neq 0$ for any polynomial $Q \neq 0$ of degree at most $s - 1$, if and only if $\xi, X\xi, X^2\xi, \dots, X^{s-1}\xi$ are linearly independent, i.e., if and only if (iii) holds. \square

We return now to the situation of a self-adjoint operator X acting on a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . A vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is dominant in the sense of

Proposition 4.1 if and only if it is dominant in the sense of Section 2, see (3) in Proposition 2.1. It is convenient to arrange the eigenvalues which constitute the spectrum $\Sigma(X)$ in decreasing order:

$$\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_s.$$

For $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, denote by E_j the eigenspace $\ker(\lambda_j - X)$. The space \mathcal{H} is an orthogonal direct sum of X -invariant subspaces: $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^s E_j$. For $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, let ξ_j be the orthogonal projection of ξ onto E_j , so that $\xi = \sum_{j=1}^s \xi_j$ and $X\xi = \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j \xi_j$. The moments of the local spectral measure μ_ξ of X at ξ , see Proposition 3.2, are now

$$(3) \quad \int_{\Sigma(X)} t^n d\mu_\xi(t) = \langle X^n \xi | \xi \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^n \xi_j \left| \sum_{k=1}^s \xi_k \right. \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^n \|\xi_j\|^2$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Thus the support of μ_ξ is contained in the finite set $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\}$, and

$$\mu_\xi(\{\lambda_j\}) = \|\xi_j\|^2 \quad \text{is } > 0 \text{ if and only if } \xi_j \neq 0.$$

This shows that Conditions (iv) and (v) of the following proposition are equivalent.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a self-adjoint operator on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ and let μ_ξ be the local spectral measure of X at ξ . The condition for ξ to be dominant (Condition (i) of Proposition 4.1) is moreover equivalent to*

- (iv) *the orthogonal projection of ξ on each eigenspace of X is not zero,*
- (v) *$\mu_\xi(\{\lambda\}) > 0$ for every eigenvalue λ of X .*

Proof. It suffices now to check that one of the conditions above is equivalent to one of the conditions of Proposition 4.1. This holds because Condition (v) holds if and only if ξ is dominant, see Proposition 2.1 (4). \square

More generally, the moments of the local spectral measure $\mu_{\xi,\eta}$ at two vectors ξ, η in \mathcal{H} are given by

$$(4) \quad \int_{\Sigma(X)} t^n d\mu_{\xi,\eta}(t) = \langle X^n \xi | \eta \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^n \xi_j \left| \sum_{k=1}^s \eta_k \right. \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^n \langle \xi_j | \eta_j \rangle$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

In particular, when X is the adjacency operator of a finite graph, we have the following

Proposition 4.3 (counting walks in terms of eigenvalues). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph, $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_s$ the eigenvalues of its adjacency operator A ,*

and $v \in V$ a vertex of G . For all $n \geq 0$, the number of closed walks in G of length n starting at v and ending at v is

$$(5) \quad \langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^s c_j^2 \lambda_j^n,$$

where the c_j 's are non-negative numbers, more precisely c_j is the norm of the orthogonal projection of δ_v on the eigenspace of A of eigenvalue λ_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$.

More generally, for two vertices v and w , there exist constants $d_1, \dots, d_s \in \mathbf{R}$ such that the number of walks in G of length n starting at v and ending at w is

$$(6) \quad \langle A^n \delta_v | \delta_w \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^s d_j \lambda_j^n.$$

Formulas (5) and (6) are of course well-known; see for example [CvRS–97, Formulas 2.2.1 and 4.2.5]. The number c_j is $\cos(\text{angle}(\delta_v, E_j))$; in the terminology of [CvRS–97, Page 75], c_j is the **angle** between the characteristic function of v and the eigenspace of λ_j (even though c_j is a cosine and not an actual angle). Note that, since δ_v has norm 1, we have $\sum_{j=1}^s c_j^2 = 1$. When G is connected, note also that $c_1^2 > 0$, because for the largest eigenvalue λ_1 there is a Perron–Frobenius eigenvector, of which all coordinates with respect to the basis $(\delta_v)_{v \in V}$ are positive. The number d_j is the product $\cos(\text{angle}(\delta_v, E_j)) \cos(\text{angle}(\delta_w, E_j))$. It can be positive, zero, or negative (all cases occur in formulas for the path P_3).

Proposition 4.4 (characterizations of dominant vertices in finite graphs).

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph, A its adjacency operator, and $\ell^2(V) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^s E_j$ the orthogonal decomposition of $\ell^2(V)$ in eigenspaces of A . For a vertex $v \in V$, the following properties are equivalent:

- (i) v is a dominant vertex for A ,
- (ii) the minimal polynomial of (A, δ_v) is equal to the minimal polynomial $\prod_{j=1}^s (T - \lambda_j)$ of A ,
- (iii) the vectors $\delta_v, A\delta_v, A^2\delta_v, \dots, A^{s-1}\delta_v$ in $\ell^2(V)$ are linearly independent,
- (iv) the orthogonal projection of δ_v on E_j is not zero for all $j = 1, \dots, s$,
i.e., $c_j^2 > 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$ in Formula (5) of Proposition 4.3.

Property (iv) and Formula (5) show that the numbers of closed walks starting and ending at a dominant vertex involve powers of all eigenvalues, while the corresponding numbers at a non-dominant vertex involve powers of some eigenvalues only. However the difference is rather subtle. For example, for $G = P_3$ the path with two end vertices v, v' , which are dominant, and one middle vertex w , which is not dominant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A^{2m+1} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle = 0 & \quad \text{and} & \quad \langle A^{2m+2} \delta_v | \delta_v \rangle = 2^m & \quad \text{for all} & \quad m \geq 1, \\ \langle A^{2m+1} \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle = 0 & \quad \text{and} & \quad \langle A^{2m+2} \delta_w | \delta_w \rangle = 2^{m+1} & \quad \text{for all} & \quad m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$ be an eigenvector of A of some eigenvalue λ . A vertex $v \in V$ is a **null vertex for the vector** ξ if $\xi(v) = 0$. A vertex $v \in V$ is a **null vertex for an eigenvalue** λ if it is a null vertex for any eigenvector of eigenvalue λ . Null vertices occur in the description of nodal domains for eigenvectors of A , see [BiLS–07]. The terminology is also used in [AkGM–13].

Corollary 4.5 (finite graphs without dominant vertices). *For a finite graph $G = (V, E)$ and its adjacency operator A , the following properties are equivalent:*

- (i) *the graph G does not have any dominant vertex,*
- (ii) *any vertex in V is a null vertex for at least one eigenvalue of A .*

Let \mathcal{H} be a finite dimensional Hilbert space, X a self-adjoint operator, on \mathcal{H} , and $\Sigma(X) = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s\}$ the spectrum of X . The **counting measure** for X is the probability measure τ on $\Sigma(X)$ defined by

$$\tau(\{\lambda_j\}) = \frac{m_j}{\dim \mathcal{H}} = \frac{\text{multiplicity of } \lambda_j}{\dim \mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, \dots, s\}.$$

The terminology “counting measure” is that of [Grig–11]; other authors use **density of states**, or DOS, a term which refers to solid state physics. Note that τ is in particular a scalar-valued spectral measure for X .

Lemma 4.6. *Let X be a self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of finite dimension n . Let $(\varepsilon_i)_1^n$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, denote by μ_i the local spectral measure of X at ε_i .*

Then $\tau = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i$ is the counting measure for X .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the algebra of all operators on \mathcal{H} ; it is isomorphic to the matrix algebra $M_n(\mathbf{C})$. Let $W^*(X)$ be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ generated by X ; any $Y \in W^*(X)$ is of the form $f(X)$ for some function $f : \Sigma(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the measure μ_i , viewed as a linear form on $W^*(X)$, extends to the linear form

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}, \quad Y \mapsto \langle Y\varepsilon_i | \varepsilon_i \rangle, \quad \text{again denoted by } \mu_i.$$

The linear form $\tau = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i$ is the normalized trace on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$.

Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s$ be the eigenvalues in $\Sigma(X)$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, let P_j denote the orthogonal projection of \mathcal{H} onto the eigenspace $\ker(\lambda_j - X)$. For any $Y \in W^*(X)$, of the form $f(X)$ for some function $f : \Sigma(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, we have

$$\tau(Y) = \tau(f(X)) = \tau\left(\sum_{j=1}^s f(\lambda_j)P_j\right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^s f(\lambda_j)m_j.$$

In particular $\tau(\{\lambda_j\}) = \frac{m_j}{n} > 0$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$; this ends the proof. \square

For the adjacency operator A of a finite graph $G = (V, E)$, the lemma states that $\frac{1}{n}$ times the sum of the vertex spectral measures at all vertices $v \in V$ is the counting measure on the spectrum of A . This is of course well-known, and explicit for example in [Grig–11, Proposition 10.2].

Proposition 4.7 (all vertices are dominant in finite walk-regular graphs).

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph which is walk-regular.

Then any vertex $v \in V$ is dominant.

Proof. Recall that $\ell^2(V)$ has an orthonormal basis $(\delta_v)_{v \in V}$. Let A be the adjacency operator of G . For $v \in V$, let μ_v be the vertex spectral measure of A at v . By hypothesis, μ_v is independent of v , and we can write μ instead of μ_v . By Lemma 4.6, the measure $\mu = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} \mu_v$ is the counting measure on $\Sigma(A)$. It follows that, for each $v \in V$, the vertex spectral measure $\mu_v = \mu$ is also a scalar-valued spectral measure for A , i.e., that v is dominant. \square

Let \mathcal{H} be a finite dimensional complex vector space, with a basis $\delta_* := (\delta_j)_{j=1}^n$, and let X be a linear operator on \mathcal{H} of which the matrix with respect to δ_* has its entries in \mathbf{Q} . Then X can also be seen as a linear operator on the \mathbf{Q} -vector space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Q}} := \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathbf{Q}\delta_j$, so that the characteristic polynomial of X , the minimal polynomial of X , and the minimal polynomial of X at any vector in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Q}}$, are polynomials in $\mathbf{Q}[T]$. This applies in particular to the adjacency operator A of a finite graph, so that the **characteristic polynomial of the graph** (i.e., of A) is a polynomial in $\mathbf{Q}[T]$; as such, it can be reducible or irreducible.

Proposition 4.8 (finite graphs with characteristic polynomials irreducible over \mathbf{Q}). Let G be a finite graph of which the characteristic polynomial is irreducible over \mathbf{Q} . Then all vertices of G are dominant.

Proof. Let A be the adjacency operator of G and P_A its characteristic polynomial, viewed in $\mathbf{Q}[T]$. Let v be a vertex of the graph and P_v the minimal polynomial of the pair (A, δ_v) . Then P_v divides P_A , and P_v is not a constant polynomial. If P_A is irreducible, $P_v = P_A$ and therefore v is dominant, by Proposition 4.1 (Note that, when P_A is irreducible, it coincides with the minimal polynomial of A .) \square




Figure 1. The graph E_8 of 4.8

For example, all vertices are dominant in the Coxeter graph of type E_8 (see Figure 1), of which the characteristic polynomial $T^8 - 7T^6 + 14T^4 - 8T^2 + 1$ is irreducible over \mathbf{Q} . (For a Coxeter graph of one of the types A_ℓ ($\ell \geq 2$), D_ℓ ($\ell \geq 4$), E_6 , E_7 , the characteristic polynomial is reducible over \mathbf{Q} .)

This and other examples of finite graphs with characteristic polynomial irreducible over \mathbf{Q} are shown in [YLZH–21] and [LiSi–22]. It has been conjectured that “most graphs” have characteristic polynomial irreducible over \mathbf{Q} ; see [RoWo–19] and [LiSi–22, Conjecture 7.3].

5. EXAMPLES OF FINITE GRAPHS

Example 5.1 (finite paths). Let $n \geq 2$. The path P_n has vertex set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $\{\{1, 2\}, \dots, \{n-1, n\}\}$. Denote by A its adjacency operator, which is a symmetric n -by- n matrix. For $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the vector ξ_k defined by $\xi_k(j) = \sin\left(\frac{jk}{n+1}\pi\right)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ is an eigenvector of A of eigenvalue $2 \cos\left(\frac{k}{n+1}\pi\right)$; all these eigenvalues are simple, and there are no other eigenvalues.

The vertex j is dominant if and only if j and $n+1$ are coprime. Indeed, suppose first that j and $n+1$ are coprime; then $n+1$ does not divide jk , and therefore $\langle \delta_j | \xi_k \rangle = \sin\left(\frac{jk}{n+1}\pi\right) \neq 0$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, hence j is dominant (see Proposition 4.4 (iv)). Suppose then that j and $n+1$ have a common divisor $\ell \geq 2$; then, with $k = (n+1)/\ell$, we have $\langle \delta_j | \xi_k \rangle = \sin\left(\frac{jk}{n+1}\pi\right) = \sin\left(\frac{j}{\ell}\pi\right) = 0$, hence j is not dominant.

In particular, the two end vertices 1 and n are always dominant. When $n+1$ is prime, all vertices are dominant. If n is odd and at least 3, the middle vertex $\frac{n+1}{2}$ is not dominant. If $n = 11$, the vertices 1, 5, 7, 11 are dominant and the other vertices are not.

Example 5.2 (complete bipartite graphs and stars). Let m and n be two positive integers, such that $1 \leq m \leq n$. The complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ has vertex set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_m, w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ and an edge $\{v_j, w_k\}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$. Its adjacency operator has two simple eigenvalues \sqrt{mn} , $-\sqrt{mn}$ and one eigenvalue 0 of multiplicity $m+n-2$. The function ξ^+ such that $\xi^+(v_j) = \sqrt{n}$ and $\xi^+(w_k) = \sqrt{m}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$ is an eigenvector of eigenvalue \sqrt{mn} , the function ξ^- such that $\xi^-(v_j) = \sqrt{n}$ and $\xi^-(w_k) = -\sqrt{m}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$ is an eigenvector of eigenvalue $-\sqrt{mn}$, and $\{\xi \in \ell^2(V) : \sum_{j=1}^m \xi(v_j) = 0, \sum_{k=1}^n \xi(w_k) = 0\}$ is the eigenspace of eigenvalue 0, of dimension $m+n-2$.

When $m = 1$ and $n \geq 2$, the star $K_{1,n}$ has a unique vertex v_1 which is not dominant, and all leaves w_1, \dots, w_n are dominant. When $2 \leq m \leq n$, all vertices of $K_{m,n}$ are dominant.

For $k \geq 3$ and $n \geq 1$, denote by $S_{k,n} = (V, E)$ the star with one core vertex v_0 of degree k and kn vertices $v_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq n$) arranged in k arms of length n around v_0 . Denote by δ_0 and $\delta_{i,j}$ the corresponding characteristic functions, which constitute an orthonormal basis of $\ell^2(V)$. In all cases, denote by A the adjacency operator of $S_{k,n}$; note that $S_{k,1} = K_{1,k}$. Easy computations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } n = 1 & \quad (A^2 - kI) \delta_0 = 0, \\ \text{for } n = 2 & \quad (A^3 - (k+1)A) \delta_0 = 0, \\ \text{for } n = 3 & \quad (A^4 - (k+2)A^2 + kI) \delta_0 = 0, \\ \text{for } n = 4 & \quad (A^5 - (k+3)A^3 + (2k+1)A) \delta_0 = 0, \\ \text{for } n = 5 & \quad (A^6 - (k+4)A^4 + (3k+3)A^2 - kI) \delta_0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the core vertex v_0 of $S_{k,n}$ is not dominant for $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Indeed, we claim that, for all $n \geq 1$, the core vertex v_0 of the graph $S_{k,n} = (V, E)$ is not dominant.

Let us show this claim. On the one hand, the diameter of $S_{k,n}$ is $2n$, so that $S_{k,n}$ has at least $2n + 1$ distinct eigenvalues [Bigg-93, Corollary 2.7]; hence $s - 1 \geq 2n$, with the notation of Proposition 4.4. On the other hand, in the matrix $W^{(v_0)} = (\langle A^t \delta_0 | \delta_v \rangle)_{v \in V, 0 \leq t \leq s-1}$, with rows indexed by the set V of vertices of $S_{k,n}$, the rows indexed by $v_{i,j}$ and $v_{i',j}$ are equal, for any $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$; hence the rank of the matrix $W^{(v_0)}$ is at most $|V| - (k - 1)n = (kn + 1) - (kn - n) = n + 1$. Since $n + 1 \leq 2n < s$, the claim follows by Proposition 4.4.

Nevertheless, we believe that cores are dominant in the infinite stars of Theorem 7.3 below.

Example 5.3 (first graphs without dominant vertices). It is easy to find graphs without dominant vertices. For example, let G' and G'' be two finite graphs such that at least one eigenvalue of G' is not an eigenvalue of G'' and at least one eigenvalue of G'' is not an eigenvalue of G' ; the non-connected graph $G' \sqcup G''$ does not have any dominant vertex, by Corollary 4.5. Other disconnected graphs without any dominant vertex appear in Remark 5.4 and Example 5.7.




Figure 2. The graph G_3 of 5.3

We describe now a sequence of connected finite graphs G_n without dominant vertices. For $n \geq 2$, let G_n be the graph with $n + 2$ vertices $v_0, v_0', v_1, \dots, v_n$ and $2n + 1$ edges $\{v_0, v_0'\}, \{v_0, v_1\}, \{v_0', v_1\}, \dots, \{v_0, v_n\}, \{v_0', v_n\}$. The eigenvalues of G_n are

$$\lambda_n^+ = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{8n + 1}) \quad \text{simple Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue}$$

$$\lambda_n^0 = 0 \quad \text{of multiplicity } n - 1$$

$$\lambda_n^{-1} = -1 \quad \text{simple eigenvalue}$$

$$\lambda_n^- = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{8n + 1}) \quad \text{simple eigenvalue}$$

respectively with eigenvectors given by

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_n^+(v_0) = \xi_n^+(v'_0) &= \frac{1}{4}(1 + \sqrt{8n+1}), & \xi_n^+(v_1) = \cdots = \xi_n^+(v_n) &= 1 \\ \xi_n^0(v_0) = \xi_n^0(v'_0) &= 0, & \xi_n^0(v_1) + \cdots + \xi_n^0(v_n) &= 0 \\ \xi_n^{-1}(v_0) = 1, \xi_n^{-1}(v'_0) &= -1, & \xi_n^+(v_1) = \cdots = \xi_n^+(v_n) &= 0 \\ \xi_n^-(v_0) = \xi_n^-(v'_0) &= \frac{1}{4}(1 - \sqrt{8n+1}), & \xi_n^-(v_1) = \cdots = \xi_n^-(v_n) &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that v_0 and v'_0 are null vertices for the multiple eigenvalue 0, and that the other v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n are null vertices for the simple eigenvalue -1 . It follows from Corollary 4.5 that G_n does not have any dominant vertex.

Note that G_n is an integral graph, i.e., that $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \sqrt{8n+1})$ are integers, for $n = 3, 6, 10, 15, 21, 28, \dots$

Remark 5.4. There are thirty connected graphs on 2, 3, 4 or 5 vertices. Five of them have no dominant vertex at all. Each of them is the complement of a non-connected graph without dominant vertex. The five graphs have numbers 5, 11, 15, 17, 23 in [CvRS–97, Appendix B], and can be described as follows.




Figure 3. The connected graphs on 5 or less vertices without dominant vertex

- (a) Graph 5, which is Graph G_2 of our Example 5.3. Its complement is the disjoint union of a path with two vertices and two isolated vertices.
- (b) Graph 11 is obtained from the complete graph on 5 vertices by erasing one edge. Its complement is the disjoint union of a path with two vertices and three isolated vertices.
- (c) Graph 15, which is Graph G_3 of our Example 5.3. Its complement is the disjoint union of a cycle with three vertices and two isolated vertices.
- (d) Graph 17 is obtained from a square by adding one vertex and one edge between this vertex and three of the vertices of the square. Its complement is the disjoint union of a path with two vertices and a path with three vertices.
- (e) Graph 23 is obtained from a star with 5 vertices by adding one edge between two of the leaves. Its complement is the disjoint union of Graph 5 and one isolated vertex.

We haven't tried to list connected graphs without dominant vertices for more vertices. The number of all connected graphs with n vertices is given

for $n = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ by $1, 1, 2, 6, 21, 112, 853, 11117, 261080, 11716571$.

For $n \leq 19$, see Sequence A001349 in [OEIS].

Example 5.5 (a tree without dominant vertices). For integers n, k such that $n \geq 4$ and $2 \leq k \leq (n+1)/2$, let $X_{n,k}$ denote the tree obtained from two paths P_n , respectively with sets of vertices v_1, \dots, v_n and v'_1, \dots, v'_n (in this order), by gluing v_k and v'_k . Thus $X_{n,k}$ has $2n-2$ edges and $2n-1$ vertices, one of them of degree 4, and $2n-6$ of degree 2, and four leaves of degree 1.




Figure 4. The graph $X_{4,2}$ of 5.5

The smallest of these graph $X_{4,2}$ has 6 edges and 7 vertices, 1 vertex of degree four, 2 vertices of degree two, and 4 leaves. We rather denote its vertices by r (the root), v_1, v_2 (the vertices of degree two), and l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4 (the leaves), and the edges are

$$\begin{aligned} & \{l_1, r\}, \{r, v_1\}, \{v_1, l_3\} \\ & \{l_2, r\}, \{r, v_2\}, \{v_2, l_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

The graph $X_{4,2}$ has seven eigenvalues, the four roots (all real) of $T^4 - 5T^2 + 2$, and the three values $-1, 0, 1$; in decreasing order:

$$\sqrt{\frac{5 + \sqrt{17}}{2}}, 1, \sqrt{\frac{5 - \sqrt{17}}{2}}, 0, -\sqrt{\frac{5 - \sqrt{17}}{2}}, -1, -\sqrt{\frac{5 + \sqrt{17}}{2}}$$

i.e., approximately, 2.4, 1, 0.6, 0, -0.6, -1, -2.4. An eigenvector ξ^λ for an eigenvalue λ which is a root of $T^4 - 5T^2 + 2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^\lambda(l_1) = \xi^\lambda(l_2) = 1, \quad \xi^\lambda(r) = \lambda, \\ \xi^\lambda(v_1) = \xi^\lambda(v_2) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2 - 1}, \quad \xi^\lambda(l_3) = \xi^\lambda(l_4) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Eigenvectors $\xi^{\pm 1}$ for the eigenvalues 1 and -1 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^{(\pm 1)}(l_1) = \xi^{(\pm 1)}(l_2) = \xi^{(\pm 1)}(r) = 0, \quad \xi^{(\pm 1)}(v_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \xi^{(\pm 1)}(l_3) = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \xi^{(\pm 1)}(v_2) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \xi^{(\pm 1)}(l_4) = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{aligned}$$

An eigenvector $\xi^{(0)}$ for the eigenvalue 0 is given by

$$\xi^{(0)}(\ell_1) = 1, \quad \xi^{(0)}(\ell_2) = -1, \quad \xi^{(0)}(\text{each of the five other vertices}) = 0.$$

It follows from Corollary 4.5 that $X_{4,2}$ does not have any dominant vertex.

This is a particular case of the fact established in the next proposition, with a different proof.

The following notion will be used in the proof of the next proposition. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph with $n = |V|$ vertices. For a vector $\xi \in \ell^2(V)$, denote by ξ_w its w^{th} coordinate with respect to the basis $(\delta_w)_{w \in V}$ of $\ell^2(V)$. Define the **walk matrix** $W^{(v)}$ of G at v to be the matrix with columns $\delta_v, A\delta_v, A^2\delta_v, \dots, A^{n-1}\delta_v$; it is a square matrix with n rows and n columns, with entries in \mathbf{N} . For indices $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $w \in V$, the (ℓ, w) -entry $(A^\ell \delta_v)_w$ or $W^{(v)}$ is the number of walks of length ℓ in G which start at v and end at w (see Proposition 4.3).

The first s column of $W^{(v)}$ appear in Condition (iii) of Proposition 4.4 and in Example 5.2. The matrix $W^{(v)}$ appears in the literature, for example as a particular case of the walk matrices at subsets of V , considered in [LiSi–22]. The matrix $\sum_{v \in V} W^{(v)}$ appears in various places, including [BrHa–12, Section 14.2], with the same name of walk matrix.

Proposition 5.6 (a sequence of trees without dominant vertices). *Consider two integers n, k such that $n \geq 4$ and $2 \leq k \leq (n+1)/2$, and let $X_{n,k}$ be the tree defined in Example 5.5. Suppose moreover that k and $n-k+1$ are coprime.*

Then the tree $X_{n,k}$ does not have any dominant vertex.




Figure 5. The graph $X_{7,3}$ of 5.6

Proof. Denote by A the adjacency operator of $X_{n,k}$. Claim: *all eigenvalues of A are simple.* To show this, we assume that A has an eigenvalue λ of multiplicity at least 2, and we will obtain a contradiction.

The following has been established by Godsil; see [Gods–84, Lemma 2] or [BrHa–12, Theorem 5.1.2]. *Let X be a tree, A_X its adjacency operator, and λ an eigenvalue of A_X of multiplicity $m \geq 2$. Let P be a subgraph of X which is a path, and $X \setminus P$ the graph obtained from X by deleting the vertices of P and the edges incident to them. Then λ is an eigenvalue of $X \setminus P$ of multiplicity at least $m - 1$.* We apply this to $X = X_{n,k}$. Consider first the path P' from v_n to v'_n (the notation is that of Example 5.5); since $X_{n,k} \setminus P'$ is the disjoint union of two copies of the path P_{k-1} with $k-1$ vertices, λ is an eigenvalue of P_{k-1} . Consider then the path P'' from v_1 to v'_1 ; since $X_{n,k} \setminus P''$ is the disjoint union

of two copies of the path P_{n-k} , λ is an eigenvalue of P_{n-k} . But the spectra of P_{k-1} and P_{n-k} are disjoint, because k and $n - k + 1$ are coprime, and this is the announced contradiction.

It follows that A has simple eigenvalues only, in other words that A has $2n - 1$ distinct eigenvalues.

It remains to show that any vertex v is not dominant. By Proposition 4.4, it suffices to show that the vectors $\delta_v, A\delta_v, A^2\delta_v, \dots, A^{2n-2}\delta_v$ are linearly dependent, i.e., that the rank of the walk matrix $W^{(v)}$ at v is strictly less than $2n - 1$. There are two cases to consider.

Suppose first that v is either v_i or v'_i for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For any $j \in \{k + 1, \dots, n\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 2\}$, the number of walks in $X_{n,k}$ of length ℓ starting at v and ending at v_j is equal to the number of such walks starting at v and ending at v'_j . Thus, with respect to the basis $(\delta_w)_w$ of $\ell^2(V)$, the coordinates along δ_{v_j} and $\delta_{v'_j}$ are equal. In other words, row v_j and row v'_j of the matrix $W^{(v)}$ coincide. Thus the matrix $W^{(v)}$ has $n - k$ pairs of equal rows, and consequently its rank is at most $(2n - 1) - (n - k) = n + k - 1$, in particular its rank is strictly less than $2n - 1$.

Suppose now that v is either v_i or v'_i for some $i \in \{k, \dots, n\}$. Similarly, the matrix $W^{(v)}$ has $k - 1$ pairs of equal rows, its rank is at most $(2n - 1) - (k - 1) = 2n - k$, in particular its rank is strictly less than $2n - 1$. \square

Example 5.7 (regular connected graphs without dominant vertices).


For $m \geq 3$, denote by C_m the cycle with m vertices. Denote by v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1} the vertices of C_m , such that the edges are $\{v_{k-1}, v_k\}$ for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m - 1\}$ (with $-1 = m - 1$). For $j = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$, define the vector $\xi_j \in \ell^2(C_m)$ by $\xi_j(v_k) = \zeta^{kj}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$. Then ξ_j is an eigenvector of the adjacency operator of C_m of eigenvalue $2 \cos\left(\frac{j}{m}\pi\right)$. This shows that the spectrum of C_m consists of 2 (a simple eigenvalue), $2 \cos\left(\frac{j}{m}\pi\right)$ for $1 \leq j \leq \frac{m}{2}$ (eigenvalues of multiplicity 2), and -2 when m is even (a simple eigenvalue). All vertices are dominant by Proposition 3.4.

Let m, n be two coprime integers, both ≥ 3 . The spectra of C_m and C_n contain 2, and are otherwise disjoint. The non-connected graph $C_m \sqcup C_n$ is 2-regular. All eigenvalues have multiplicity 2, except -2 which is an eigenvalue if one of m, n is even. Denote by $C'_{m,n}$ the complement of the graph $C_m \sqcup C_n$. It is well-known that the eigenvectors of $C'_{m,n}$ are the same as the eigenvectors of $C_m \sqcup C_n$, see for example [GoRo-01, Lemma 8.5.1]. In particular, any eigenvector of $C'_{m,n}$ for an eigenvalue $\neq 2$ has either all vertices of C_m or all vertices of C_n as null vertices. It follows that $C'_{m,n}$ does not have any dominant vertex.

The smallest of these graphs is $C'_{3,4}$. It has 7 vertices, it is 4-regular, its spectrum is

$$4, 1, 0, 0, -1, -1, -3$$

and it does not have any dominant vertex.

Figure 6. The graph $C'_{3,4}$ of 5.7

Proposition 5.8. *Let G be a connected finite graph of diameter $d \geq 1$. Assume that G has exactly $d + 1$ eigenvalues. Let $v_0, v_d \in V$ be a pair of vertices at distance d from one another.*

Then v_0 and v_d are dominant vertices in G .

Recall that a connected finite graph of diameter d has at least $d + 1$ eigenvalues [Bigg–93, Corollary 2.7].

Proof. Denote by $|v - w|$ the combinatorial distance between two vertices v, w of G . Choose vertices v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} such that $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{d-1}, v_d$ are the vertices (in this order) of a path connecting v_0 to v_d . Write δ_j for δ_{v_j} . For $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\langle A^k \delta_0 | \delta_j \rangle \begin{cases} \neq 0 & \text{if } j = k \\ = 0 & \text{if } j > k \end{cases} \quad \text{so that} \quad (A^k \delta_0)(v_j) \begin{cases} \neq 0 & \text{if } j = k \\ = 0 & \text{if } j > k \end{cases}$$

(when $k = d$, the two lines “ $= 0$ if $j > k$ ” should be ignored) and therefore $\delta_0, A\delta_0, \dots, A^d\delta_0$ are linearly independent. By Proposition 4.4, the vertex v_0 is dominant. Similarly, v_d is dominant. \square

Proposition 5.8 implies for example that the end vertices are dominant in a finite path or in a star (as already observed above in Examples 5.1 and 5.2), or that all vertices are dominant in a complete graph.

Example 5.9 (all vertices are dominant in distance-regular graphs). A distance-regular graph is a connected finite graph G of some diameter d such that, for two vertices v, w of G and two integers $j, h \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, the number of vertices u of G such that $|u - v| = j$ and $|u - w| = h$ depends only on $|w - v|$. For such a graph, the number of eigenvalues of the adjacency operator is exactly $d + 1$ [Bigg–93, Theorem 20.7] and, for any vertex v , there exists a vertex w at distance exactly d from v . It follows from Proposition 5.8 that all vertices are dominant in a distance-regular graph.

Remark 5.10. The distance-regular graphs of diameter 2 are the connected strongly regular graphs. Thus all vertices are dominant in a connected strongly regular graphs.

A graph is distance-transitive if its automorphism group is transitive on equidistant pairs of vertices. These graphs are clearly vertex-transitive hence all their

vertices are dominant by Proposition 3.4. However, as it is well-known, a distance-regular graph need not be distance transitive; see for example [Bigg–93, Additional result 20c].

A connected finite graph with two eigenvalues is a complete graph. A connected finite graph with three eigenvalues is a connected strongly regular graph. It is known that a connected finite regular graph with four eigenvalues is walk-regular [BrHa–12, Corollary 15.1.2], and therefore all its vertices are dominant by Proposition 4.7. A connected finite regular graph with four eigenvalues need not be distance regular [vDam–95].

Example 5.11. For integers $k \geq 2, r \geq 1$. Let $T_{k,r}$ denote the k -ary rooted tree of depth r . The tree $T_{k,1}$ is the star with one root of degree k and k leaves, for $r \geq 2$, the tree $T_{k,r}$ is obtained by attaching k new leaves to each leaf of $T_{k,r-1}$. Thus $T_{k,r}$ has first one root of degree k , then $k + k^2 + \dots + k^{r-1}$ vertices of degree $k + 1$, and finally k^r leaves at distance r from the root. Altogether $T_{k,r}$ has $1 + k + \dots + k^r = (k^{r+1} - 1)/(k - 1)$ vertices. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors of these trees have been computed in [DeRo–20]. In particular, there results imply:

In the k -ary rooted tree $T_{k,r}$, with $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$, a vertex is dominant if and only if it is a leaf.

Example 5.12 (Coxeter graphs). The Coxeter graphs of type A are the paths. Their dominant vertices have been described in Example 5.1.

For $\ell \geq 4$, the Coxeter graph of type D_ℓ has vertex set $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}$ and edge set $\{\{v_1, v_2\}, \dots, \{v_{\ell-3}, v_{\ell-2}\}, \{v_{\ell-2}, v_{\ell-1}\}, \{v_{\ell-2}, v_\ell\}\}$. The vector $\xi_0 \in \ell^2(V)$ defined by

$$\xi_0(v_1) = \dots = \xi_0(v_{\ell-2}) = 0, \quad \xi_0(v_{\ell-1}) = 1, \quad \xi_0(v_\ell) = -1,$$

is an eigenvector of eigenvalue 0. For $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1\}$, the vector ξ_k defined by

$$\xi_k(v_j) = 2 \cos \left(\frac{(2k-1)(\ell-j-1)\pi}{2\ell-2} \right) \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell-2\},$$

$$\xi(v_{\ell-1}) = \xi_k(v_\ell) = 1,$$

is an eigenvector of eigenvalue $2 \cos \left(\frac{(2k-1)\pi}{2\ell-2} \right)$.

If $\ell = 4$, we have $D_4 = K_{1,3}$, so that D_4 has three dominant vertices which are the three leaves, see Example 5.2.

If ℓ is odd and at least 5, all eigenvalues are simple, the vertices $v_{\ell-1}$ and v_ℓ are dominant, and the other vertices are not dominant.

If ℓ is even and at least 6, the eigenvalue 0 has multiplicity 2 (eigenvectors ξ_0 and $\xi_{\ell/2}$) and the dominant vertices are $v_1, v_3, \dots, v_{\ell-3}, v_{\ell-1}, v_\ell$.

Computations show that the graph E_6 has four dominant vertices, that the graph E_7 has three dominant vertices which are its three leaves, and we have

already noted just after Proposition 4.8 that all vertices are dominant in the graph E_8 .

Example 5.13 (A graph with exactly one dominant vertex). There is a so-called extended graph, often denoted by \widetilde{E}_8 , with nine vertices, obtained by gluing along one of their end-vertices three paths P_2 , P_3 , and P_6 ; see Figure 7.

A tedious but straightforward computation shows that \widetilde{E}_8 has the following remarkable property: it has a unique vertex which is dominant; this vertex is the leaf ℓ at distance 5 from the vertex of degree 3.




Figure 7. The graph \widetilde{E}_8 of 5.13

6. ON A PERTURBATION OF THE FREE JACOBI MATRIX

The object of this section is to determine the spectrum and the eigenvalues of the operator J_a defined below, and to show that all basis vectors δ_n are cyclic for J_a . This will be used for the proof of Theorem 7.3. The results are known, see for example [LeNy–15]. Proposition 6.7 is an observation that we haven't found in the literature.

Consider the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$, its standard orthonormal basis $\delta_* = (\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, a positive number $a > 0$, and the \mathbf{N} -by- \mathbf{N} matrix

$$(Jac_a) \quad J_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ a & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is the matrix with respect to the basis δ_* of a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ that we denote again by J_a and that we call a **Jacobi operator**. We may view J_a as a perturbation of the matrix J_1 , often called the **free Jacobi matrix**, for example in [Simo–11, Chapter 1].

Let S be operator defined on $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ by

$$S(\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4, \dots) = (a\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4, \dots).$$

Its adjoint is given by

$$S^*(\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4, \dots) = (0, a\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \dots).$$

(The operator S^* is an example of weighted shift.) We denote by P_0 the orthogonal projection of $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ onto the line generated by $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ and by 1 the

identity operator on $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$. We denote by $D_0(1)$ the closed disc $\{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z| \leq 1\}$ of radius 1 centred at the origin of \mathbf{C} .

The following lemma and its proof are partly inspired by Section 2 in [Swar–88].

Lemma 6.1. *The notation is as above.*

- (1) For $n \geq 1$, we have $\|S^n\| = \max\{1, a\}$.
- (2) The spectral radius of S is 1.
- (3) Any $z \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $|z| < 1$ is an eigenvalue of S .
- (4) The spectrum of S is the closed disc $D_0(1)$.
- (5) For $z \in \mathbf{C}$ is such that $|z| \geq 1$, the number z is not an eigenvalue of S (hence the inequality of (3) is sharp).
- (6) For $z \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $|z| = 1$, the operator $z - S$ is not surjective.
- (7) For $z \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $0 < |z| < 1$, the operators $1 - zS$ and $1 - zS^*$ are invertible.

Proof. (1) On the one hand, for $n \geq 1$, we have $S^n \delta_n = a \delta_0$. Since $\|\delta_n\| = \|\delta_0\| = 1$, this implies

$$a = \langle S^n \delta_n \mid \delta_0 \rangle \leq \|S^n\| \quad \text{and} \quad 1 = \langle S^n \delta_{n+1} \mid \delta_1 \rangle \leq \|S^n\|,$$

hence $\|S^n\| \geq \max\{1, a\}$. On the other hand, for all ξ in $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S^n \xi\|^2 &= |a \xi_n|^2 + |\xi_{n+1}|^2 + |\xi_{n+2}|^2 + \cdots = a^2 |\xi_n|^2 + |\xi_{n+1}|^2 + |\xi_{n+2}|^2 + \cdots \\ &\leq (\max\{1, a\})^2 \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |\xi_j|^2 \leq (\max\{1, a\})^2 \|\xi\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\|S^n\| \leq \max\{1, a\}$.

(2) This follows from (1) because, as for any bounded linear operator on a Banach space, the spectral radius of S is given by $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S^n\|^{1/n}$.

(3) Set $\xi = (a, z, z^2, z^3, \dots)$. Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |z|^{2n} < \infty$, the vector ξ is in $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$; it is not zero. The equation $S\xi = z\xi$ is straightforward.

(4) By (2), the spectrum of S is contained in $D_0(1)$. By (3), it contains the open disc of radius 1 around the origin, and therefore also its closure $D_0(1)$.

(5) Let $z \in \mathbf{C}$, $|z| \geq 1$, and $\xi \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ be such that $S\xi = z\xi$, namely such that

$$S\xi = (a\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{n+1}, \dots) = z\xi = (z\xi_0, z\xi_1, \dots, z\xi_n, \dots).$$

Then $\xi_1 = \frac{z}{a}\xi_0$ and $\xi_{n+1} = z\xi_n$ for $n \geq 1$, hence $|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{a}|\xi_0|$ and $|\xi_{n+1}| \geq |\xi_n|$ for $n \geq 1$. Since $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\xi_n|^2 < \infty$, this implies that $\xi_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$, i.e., $\xi = 0$, hence z is not an eigenvalue of S .

(6) When $|z| = 1$, the operator $z - S$ is injective by (5) and non invertible by (4), hence it is not surjective.

(7) If $0 < |z| < 1$, then z^{-1} is not in the spectrum of S by (4), i.e., $S - z^{-1}$ is invertible, and therefore $1 - zS = -z(S - z^{-1})$ is invertible. Similarly $(\bar{z})^{-1}$ is

not in the spectrum of S and $1 - \bar{z}S$ is invertible, so that $1 - zS^* = (1 - \bar{z}S)^*$ is invertible. \square

Lemma 6.2. *The notation is as above.*

- (1) We have $J_a = S + S^*$, $SP_0 = 0$, and $SS^* = 1 + (a^2 - 1)P_0$.
(2) For all $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$, we have

$$\frac{1}{z}(1 - zS) [(1 - z^2(a^2 - 1))P_0 + 1 - P_0] (1 - zS^*) = \frac{1}{z} + z - J_a.$$

- (3) For $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$ such that $|z| = 1$, the operator $\frac{1}{z} + 1z - J_a$ is not invertible.

We assume moreover that $a \leq \sqrt{2}$.

- (4) For $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$, the operator $\frac{1}{z} + z - J_a$ is invertible if and only if $|z| \neq 1$.
(5) The spectrum of J_a is $[-2, 2]$ and its norm is $\|J_a\| = 2$.

Proof. The equalities of Claim (1) are straightforward. Using them, we show (2):

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{z}(1 - zS) [(1 - z^2(a^2 - 1))P_0 + 1 - P_0] (1 - zS^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{z}(1 - zS) [-z^2(a^2 - 1)P_0 + 1] (1 - zS^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{z} [-z^2(a^2 - 1)P_0 + 1 + z^3(a^2 - 1)SP_0 - zS] (1 - zS^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{z} [-z^2(a^2 - 1)P_0 + 1 - zS] (1 - zS^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{z} [-z^2(a^2 - 1)P_0 + 1 - zS + z^3(a^2 - 1)P_0S^* - zS^* + z^2SS^*] \\ &= \frac{1}{z} [-z^2(a^2 - 1)P_0 + 1 - zJ_a + z^2(1 + (a^2 - 1)P_0)] \\ &= \frac{1}{z} [1 - zJ_a + z^2] = \frac{1}{z} + z - J_a. \end{aligned}$$

For (3), let $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$ be such that $|z| = 1$. The operator $1 - zS = z(z^{-1} - S)$ is not surjective by (6) of Lemma 6.1, and (2) implies that is not surjective, hence in particular is not invertible.

(4) When $a \leq \sqrt{2}$, it remains to show that, for $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$ such that $|z| \neq 1$, the operator $\frac{1}{z} + z - J_a$ is invertible. Since $z + \frac{1}{z}$ is invariant by the change $z \mapsto \frac{1}{z}$, we may assume that $|z| < 1$. The operators $1 - zS$ and $1 - zS^*$ are invertible by (7) of Lemma 6.1. Since $a \leq \sqrt{2}$, we have $|a^2 - 1| \leq 1$, hence $|z^2(a^2 - 1)| < 1$ and $1 - z^2(a^2 - 1) \neq 0$, so that the operator $(1 - z^2(a^2 - 1))P_0 + 1 - P_0$ is invertible. It follows from (2) that the operator $\frac{1}{z} + z - J_a$ is invertible.

(5) For $z \in \mathbf{C}^*$, we have $|z| = 1$ if and only if $\frac{1}{z} + z \in [-2, 2]$. Thus $\lambda - J_a$ is invertible if and only if $\lambda \notin [-2, 2]$. Claim (5) follows. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $a > 0$, let J_a be as above, let $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, and let $\xi \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ be such that $J_a \xi = \lambda \xi$.*

(1) *If $|\lambda| \leq 2$, then $\xi = 0$.*

(2) *If $|\lambda| > 2$ and $\xi \neq 0$, then $a > \sqrt{2}$ and $\lambda = \pm \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}$.*

Proof. The space $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ is naturally a subspace of the space $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{N}}$ of all sequences of complex numbers, and J_a has a natural extension to a linear operator on $\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{N}}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{N}}$ be such that $J_a \xi = \lambda \xi$, i.e., such that

$$\begin{aligned} (I) \quad & (J_a \xi_0 = \lambda \xi_0) & a \xi_1 &= \lambda \xi_0, \\ (II) \quad & (J_a \xi_1 = \lambda \xi_1) & a \xi_0 + \xi_2 &= \lambda \xi_1, \\ (III) \quad & (J_a \xi_n = \lambda \xi_n) & \xi_{n-1} + \xi_{n+1} &= \lambda \xi_n \text{ for all } n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The characteristic equation $r^2 - \lambda r + 1 = 0$ of the difference equation (III) has eigenvalues $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda \pm \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4})$, so that the general solution of (III) is, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \xi_n = K_1 \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) \right)^n + K_2 \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) \right)^n \text{ when } |\lambda| \neq 2, \\ (ii) \quad & \xi_n = K_1 + K_2 n \text{ when } \lambda = 2, \\ (iii) \quad & \xi_n = (-1)^n (K_1 + K_2 n) \text{ when } \lambda = -2, \end{aligned}$$

where K_1, K_2 are constants. Equation (II) provides the value of ξ_0 and Equation (I) provides a condition involving λ and a .

Proof of (1). When $|\lambda| < 2$, the roots $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda \pm i\sqrt{4 - \lambda^2})$ have absolute value 1, so that the solution ξ satisfying (i) is in $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ if and only if $K_1 = K_2 = 0$. Similarly, when $|\lambda| = 2$, the only solution of $J_a \xi = \lambda \xi$ in $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ is the zero vector.

Proof of (2). Suppose first that $\lambda > 2$. Since $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) > 1$, a solution $0 \neq \xi = (\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ of $J_a \xi = \lambda \xi$ satisfies $\xi_n = K \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) \right)^n$ for all $n \geq 1$, for some constant $K \neq 0$. By Equation (II), we have $\xi_0 = K \frac{1}{a}$. Equation (I) implies now $a^2(\lambda - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) = 2\lambda$, i.e., $(a^2 - 2)\lambda = a^2\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}$. First, this implies $a^2 > 2$. Second, we have $(a^4 - 4a^2 + 4)\lambda^2 = a^4\lambda^2 - 4a^4$, hence $(a^2 - 1)\lambda^2 = a^4$, hence $\lambda = a^2/\sqrt{a^2 - 1}$.

Suppose now that $\lambda < -2$. A solution $0 \neq \xi \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ of $J_a \xi = \lambda \xi$ satisfies $\xi_n = K \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) \right)^n$ for all $n \geq 1$, for some constant $K \neq 0$, and, as above, $\xi_0 = K \frac{1}{a}$. Equation (I) implies again $a^2(\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}) = 2\lambda$, i.e., $(a^2 - 2)\lambda = -a^2\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4}$, hence $a^2 > 2$ and $\lambda = -a^2/\sqrt{a^2 - 1}$. \square

Proposition 6.4. *Let $a > 0$ and let J_a be the Jacobi operator as above.*

(1) *When $a \leq \sqrt{2}$, the operator J_a has norm 2, spectrum $[-2, 2]$, and it has no eigenvalue.*

- (2) When $a > \sqrt{2}$, the operator J_a has norm $\frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}$,
spectrum $\left\{ -\frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}} \right\} \cup [-2, 2] \cup \left\{ \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}} \right\}$,
it has two simple eigenvalues $\pm \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}$, and no other eigenvalue.

For a third information concerning J_a , see Proposition 6.7 below.

Proof. Claim (1) is contained in Lemmas 6.2 (5) and 6.3 (1).

For (2), recall first that, for a bounded self-adjoint operator X on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , the *discrete spectrum* $\Sigma_{\text{disc}}(X)$ is the set of isolated points of the spectrum which are eigenvalues of finite multiplicity, and the *essential spectrum* $\Sigma_{\text{ess}}(X)$ is the complement $\Sigma(X) \setminus \Sigma_{\text{disc}}(X)$; the essential spectrum is a nonempty closed subset of the spectrum. It is a theorem of Weyl that, for a compact self-adjoint operator K on \mathcal{H} , the essential spectra of X and $X + K$ are the same [Sim4–15, Theorem 3.14.1].

Consider the free Jacobi matrix J_1 . By Lemma 6.2, we know that its spectrum is $[-2, 2]$, so that its essential spectrum coincides with its spectrum. For $a > 0$, the operator J_a is a compact perturbation of J_1 (indeed a finite rank perturbation). By Weyl's theorem, the essential spectrum of J_a is also $[-2, 2]$. It follows that the spectrum of J_c is the union of $[-2, 2]$ and of the eigenvalues of J_a , which are necessarily of finite multiplicity. Claim (2) now follows from Lemma 6.3 (2). \square

Before showing what we need on dominant vectors for J_a , we recall some general facts on orthogonal polynomials and Jacobi operators. Consider an infinite sequence $a_* = (a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of positive real numbers such that

$$(Fa) \quad \sup_{n \geq 0} a_n < \infty.$$

(Later we will need the case $a_* = (a, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$ of the subdiagonal entries of the matrix J_a .) Define a sequence $(Q_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of polynomials with real coefficients and positive leading coefficients by $Q_0(t) = 1$ and

$$(Rec) \quad \begin{aligned} tQ_0(t) &= a_0Q_1(t) \\ tQ_n(t) &= a_{n-1}Q_{n-1}(t) + a_nQ_{n+1}(t) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The main claim of the following proposition is the particular case needed below of a theorem of Favard. [In the general case, there is moreover a bounded sequence $(b_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of real numbers, and the recurrence relation is of the form $tQ_n(t) = a_{n-1}Q_{n-1}(t) + b_nQ_n(t) + a_nQ_{n+1}(t)$.] Here, a measure on \mathbf{R} is *nontrivial* if its closed support is not a finite set of points. For a nonzero measure μ on \mathbf{R} of which the closed support is compact, we denote by $\min \text{supp}_\mu$ the largest number and by $\max \text{supp}(\mu)$ the smallest number such that the closed support of μ is contained in the closed interval $[\min \text{supp}(\mu), \max \text{supp}(\mu)]$.

Proposition 6.5 (Favard). *Let $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(Q_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be as above, satisfying (Fa) and (Rec) respectively.*

Then there exists a nontrivial finite positive measure μ on \mathbf{R} , with closed support contained in $[-\sup_{n \geq 0} a_n, \sup_{n \geq 0} a_n]$, such that the Q_n 's are orthonormal polynomials with respect to μ , i.e., such that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} Q_m(t)Q_n(t)d\mu(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m = n \\ 0 & \text{if } m \neq n. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for each $n \geq 1$, the polynomial Q_n has n simple roots in the open interval $]\min \text{supp}(\mu), \max \text{supp}(\mu)[$.

Reference for the proof and remark. For the proof of the claim on μ , which is Favard Theorem, we refer to Section 4.1 in [Sim4–15], or alternatively to [Simo–11, Theorem 1.3.7]

We do not know an explicit form of μ . Note however that, at least when $a_n = 1$ for all n large enough, the kind of measures which would appear can be viewed as a perturbation of the measure $d\mu(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4-t^2} dt$ of (9) below; see Formula (20) in [DoNe–86].

For the proof of the fact that the roots of Q_n are all real and simple, see [Sim4–15, Proposition 4.1.4]. Since we have not found in [Sim4–15] a proof that these roots are all in $]\min \text{supp}(\mu), \max \text{supp}(\mu)[$, here is the argument of Szegő's book on orthogonal polynomials.

Let $n \geq 1$, and let ℓ denote the number of roots $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_\ell$ of Q_n in the open interval $]\min \text{supp}(\mu), \max \text{supp}(\mu)[$. Define a polynomial R_n by $R_n(t) = Q_n(t) \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (t - t_j)$. Assume by contradiction that $\ell < n$. On the one hand, R_n does not change sign on this interval, hence $\int_{\min \text{supp}(\mu)}^{\max \text{supp}(\mu)} R_n(t)d\mu(t) \neq 0$. On the other hand, Q_n is orthogonal to any polynomial of degree $< n$, hence $\int_{\min \text{supp}(\mu)}^{\max \text{supp}(\mu)} R_n(t)d\mu(t) = 0$. This is absurd, and therefore $\ell = n$. \square

Together with the infinite sequence of positive numbers $a_* = (a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying (Fa) above, consider now the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$, its standard orthonormal basis $\varepsilon_* = (\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 0}$, and the bounded self-adjoint operator $J = J_{a_*}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a_*} \varepsilon_0 &= a_0 \varepsilon_1 \\ J_{a_*} \varepsilon_n &= a_{n-1} \varepsilon_{n-1} + a_n \varepsilon_{n+1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

of matrix

$$(Jac_{a_*}) \quad J_{a_*} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ a_0 & 0 & a_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & a_1 & 0 & a_2 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to ε_* .

Proposition 6.6. *Let a_* and J_{a_*} be as above, let μ be the measure of Proposition 6.5, and let M_μ be the multiplication operator of multiplication by t on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mu)$, as in Proposition 2.4.*

Then the operators J_{a_} and M_μ are unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. Let $(Q_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of orthonormal polynomials defined above, which is an orthonormal basis of the space $L^2(\mu)$. Define an operator $W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(\mathbf{R}, \mu)$ by $W\varepsilon_n = Q_n$ for all $n \geq 0$; note that W is a surjective isometry. Then

$$WJ_{a_*}W^* = M_\mu,$$

as in the proof of Proposition 7.1. \square

For $n \geq 0$, the vector ε_n is cyclic for J_{a_*} if and only if the vector Q_n is cyclic for M_μ , and by Proposition 2.4 this is the case if and only if

$$\mu(\{t \in \Sigma : Q_n(t) = 0\}) = 0,$$

where Σ denotes the closed support of μ . As we do not know whether this is true or not, we come back to the special case of the sequence $(a, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$.

Proposition 6.7. *Let $a > 0$ and let J_a be the Jacobi operator defined on $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ by the matrix of (Jac_a) above, as in Proposition 6.4.*

Then, for all $n \geq 0$, the standard basis vector ε_n is cyclic for J_a .

Proof. For any $n \geq 0$, the zero set of the polynomial Q_n is a finite subset of $]\min \text{supp}(\mu), \max \text{supp}(\mu)[$, by Proposition 6.5, and the measure for μ of this finite set is zero by Proposition 6.4. It follows that Q_n is a cyclic vector for the multiplication operator M_μ .

Since $W\varepsilon_n = Q_n$ and $WJ_aW^* = M_\mu$, the basis vector ε_n is also a cyclic vector for the Jacobi operator J_a . \square

7. FURTHER EXAMPLES: THE INFINITE RAY, THE GRAPH D_∞ , AND THE STARS

Proposition 7.1 (in the infinite ray, all vertices are cyclic, and therefore dominant). *Let P be the one-way infinite path, or infinite ray, with vertex set $\mathbf{N} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and edge set $E = \{\{j, j+1\} : j \in \mathbf{N}\}$.*

All vertices of P are cyclic.

Remark. The proof will show more: any non-zero finite linear combination of the vectors δ_j (with $j \in \mathbf{N}$) is a cyclic vector for the adjacency operator of P .

Before this, we show the claim of Proposition 7.1 for the vertices $j = 0$, $j = 1$, and $j = 2$.

Proof for the three first vertices. The adjacency operator A of P acts on $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ by

$$(A\xi)(n) = \xi(n-1) + \xi(n+1) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N}) \text{ and } n \in \mathbf{N},$$

where $\xi(-1)$ should be read as 0. Equivalently, it acts on the canonical orthonormal basis $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ of $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ by

$$(7) \quad A\delta_n = \delta_{n-1} + \delta_{n+1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0,$$

where δ_{-1} should be read as 0.

We will show that the vector δ_j for $j = 0, 1, 2$ is cyclic for A , namely that the closed linear span \mathcal{H}_j of $\{A^n \delta_j\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is the whole of $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$.

Consider first the vector δ_0 in $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$. The space \mathcal{H}_0 contains δ_0 , hence $A\delta_0 = \delta_1$, hence $A\delta_1 = \delta_0 + \delta_2$ and therefore also δ_2 , hence $A\delta_2 = \delta_1 + \delta_3$ and therefore also δ_3 , and so on; thus \mathcal{H}_0 contains all δ_j and therefore coincides with $\ell^2(\mathbf{N})$.

The space \mathcal{H}_1 contains δ_1 , hence $A\delta_1 = \delta_0 + \delta_2$, hence $A(\delta_0 + \delta_2) - 2\delta_1 = \delta_3$, hence $A\delta_3 = \delta_2 + \delta_4$, and so on; thus \mathcal{H}_1 contains δ_{2n+1} and $\delta_{2n} + \delta_{2n+2}$ for all $n \geq 0$. To show that $\mathcal{H}_1 = \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$, it suffices to show that any $\eta = (\eta_j)_{j=0}^\infty \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ orthogonal to \mathcal{H}_1 is zero. On the one hand $\langle \eta | \delta_{2n+1} \rangle = \eta_{2n+1} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. On the other hand $\langle \eta | \delta_{2n} + \delta_{2n+2} \rangle = \eta_{2n} + \eta_{2n+2} = 0$ and therefore $|\eta_{2n}| = |\eta_{2n+2}|$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$; since $\sum_{n=0}^\infty |\eta_{2n}|^2 < \infty$, this implies $\eta_{2n} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Hence $\eta = 0$, as was to be shown.

The space \mathcal{H}_2 contains δ_2 , hence $A\delta_2 = \delta_1 + \delta_3$, hence $A(\delta_1 + \delta_3) - 2\delta_2 = \delta_0 + \delta_4$, hence $A(\delta_0 + \delta_4) - (\delta_1 + \delta_3) = \delta_5$, hence $A\delta_5 = \delta_4 + \delta_6$, hence $A(\delta_4 + \delta_6) - 2\delta_5 = \delta_3 + \delta_7$, hence $A(\delta_3 + \delta_7) - (\delta_4 + \delta_6) - \delta_2 = \delta_8$, and so on; thus \mathcal{H}_2 contains δ_{3n+2} , $\delta_{3n+1} + \delta_{3n+3}$, $\delta_{3n} + \delta_{3n+3}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. It follows that, for a vector $(\eta_j)_{j=0}^\infty \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ orthogonal to \mathcal{H}_2 , we have $\eta_{3n+2} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and $|\eta_1| = |\eta_3| = |\eta_7| = |\eta_9| = \dots$, and $|\eta_0| = |\eta_4| = |\eta_6| = |\eta_{10}| = \dots$, and therefore $\eta_j = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbf{N}$, so that $\mathcal{H}_2 = \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$.

It should be elementary to continue and show that $\mathcal{H}_j = \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ for all $j \geq 0$, but we find the combinatorics more and more complicated, and we will provide below a proof of a different style. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1. We first describe how A is unitarily equivalent to a multiplication operator closely related to the sequence of Chebycheff polynomials.

Consider the sequence $(P_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of functions defined on the interval $[-2, 2]$ of the real line by

$$P_n(2 \cos(\theta)) = \frac{\sin((n+1)\theta)}{\sin(\theta)}.$$

Note that $P_0(t) = 1$, $P_1(t) = t$, $P_2(t) = t^2 - 1$, for all $t \in [-2, 2]$. Define P_{-1} to be the zero function. From the trigonometric formula

$$\sin((n+1)\theta) + \sin((n-1)\theta) = 2 \cos(\theta) \sin(n\theta),$$

it follows that

$$(8) \quad tP_{n-1}(t) = P_n(t) + P_{n-2}(t) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1 \text{ and } t \in [-2, 2].$$

This implies, by induction on n , that P_n is a polynomial, of the form $P_n(t) = t^n + (\text{lower order terms})$, for all $n \geq 0$.

Define a probability measure μ on $[-2, 2]$ by

$$(9) \quad d\mu(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4-t^2} dt \quad \text{for } t \in [-2, 2].$$

For $m, n \geq 0$, using the change of variables $t = 2 \cos(\theta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-2}^2 P_m(t) P_n(t) d\mu(t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-2}^2 P_m(t) \sqrt{4-t^2} P_n(t) \sqrt{4-t^2} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{4-t^2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi P_m(2 \cos(\theta)) 2 \sin(\theta) P_n(2 \cos(\theta)) 2 \sin(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \frac{4}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \sin((m+1)\theta) \sin((n+1)\theta) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \left[\cos((m-n)\theta) - \cos((m+n+2)\theta) \right] d\theta \\ &= 0 \text{ if } m \neq n \text{ and } 1 \text{ if } m = n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(P_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2([-2, 2], \mu)$. If M_μ denotes the operator of multiplication by t on this space, we have by (8) above

$$(10) \quad M_\mu P_n = P_{n-1} + P_{n+1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

The P_n 's are Chebychev polynomials, up to a normalization. More precisely, if $U_n(t)$ denotes the Chebychev polynomial of the second kind of degree n , defined by $U_n(\cos \theta) = \sin((n+1)\theta) / \sin(\theta)$, then $P_n(t) = U_n(t/2)$.

Define now an operator $W : \ell^2(\mathbf{N}) \rightarrow L^2([-2, 2], \mu)$ by $W(\delta_n) = P_n$ for all $n \geq 0$; it is a surjective isometry. Then

$$WA(\delta_n) = W(\delta_{n-1} + \delta_{n+1}) = P_{n-1} + P_{n+1} = M_\mu(P_n) = M_\mu W(\delta_n)$$

for all $n \geq 0$, hence $WAW^* = M_\mu$, i.e., A and M_μ are unitarily equivalent.

For all $n \geq 0$ we have $\mu(\{t \in [-2, 2] : P_n(t) = 0\}) = 0$, because P_n has a finite set of roots. By Proposition 2.4, the vector $P_n \in L^2([-2, 2], \mu)$ is dominant for M_μ , and also cyclic for M_μ . It follows that the vector $\delta_n = W^{-1}(P_n) \in \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$ is dominant for A , and also cyclic for A .

Finally about the Remark which follows Proposition 7.1: for the same reason, any non-zero polynomial in $L^2([-2, 2], \mu)$ is a cyclic vector for M_μ , and therefore any non-zero finite linear combination of the δ_j 's is a cyclic vector for A . \square

Example 7.2 (an infinite graph with exactly two dominant vertices).

Consider the graph D_∞ , obtained from the infinite ray P of Proposition 7.1 by adding one vertex $0'$ and one edge $\{0', 1\}$. Then D_∞ has two cyclic vertices, which are 0 and $0'$, and all other vertices are not cyclic, and not dominant.

To prove that the vertices 0 and $0'$ are cyclic, the argument used in the proof of Proposition 7.1 for the vertex 0 of P applies with a minor adaptation. For the other vertices, consider the subspace \mathcal{K} of $\ell^2(D_\infty)$ spanned by the vector $\delta_0 - \delta_{0'}$, which is an eigenvector of eigenvalue 0 . The hyperplane \mathcal{K}^\perp is invariant by the

adjacency operator of D_∞ , and contains δ_j for all $j \geq 1$. It follows that δ_j is not a cyclic vector, i.e., that j is not a cyclic vertex, for all $j \geq 1$. By Corollary 2.5, j is not a dominant vertex for all $j \geq 1$.

Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let S_k be the star with k infinite rays. The vertex set V_k of S_k consists of vertices v_0 and $v_{j,n}$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}$. Whenever $v_{j,0}$ for some j appears below, it should be read as v_0 . The edge set E_k of S_k contains edges $\{v_{j,n}, v_{j,n+1}\}$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Note that the core vertex v_0 is of degree k , and that all other vertices in V are of degree 2. Note also that S_2 is the two-way infinite path, previously denoted by L^1 .

Theorem 7.3 (in the infinite stars, all vertices (but possibly the core) are dominant and are not cyclic). *Let $k \geq 3$ and let S_k be the star on k vertices, as above.*

All vertices in S_k other than the core are dominant, and non cyclic.

For $k = 2$, the “star” S_2 is L^1 , in which all vertices are dominant, see Example 3.5 (b). When $k \geq 3$, we have not been able to show that v_0 is dominant in S_k . (We tend to believe it is, even if the cores are not dominant in the finite stars of Example 5.2.)

The proof below uses general facts on orthogonal polynomials on the real line and related self-adjoint operators (compare with the proof of Proposition 7.1) which have been recalled in Section 6.

First part of the proof of Theorem 7.3: all vertices $\neq v_0$ are dominant. Denote by \mathcal{H} the Hilbert space $\ell^2(V_k)$. The space \mathcal{H} has an orthonormal basis consisting of

$$\delta_0 := \delta_{v_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{j,n} := \delta_{v_{j,n}} \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \text{ and } n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}.$$

The adjacency operator A of S_k acts on \mathcal{H} by

$$(*) \quad A\delta_0 = \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_{j,1} \quad \text{and} \quad A\delta_{j,n} = \delta_{j,n-1} + \delta_{j,n+1} \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \ \& \ n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}$$

(where $\delta_{j,0}$ stands for δ_0).

There is a natural action of the cyclic group of order k on V_k , by cyclic permutations of the rays of S_k , and a corresponding orthogonal decomposition of \mathcal{H} in isotypical components, which can be defined as follows. Set $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/k)$. For $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$, define

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell = \left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \left| \begin{array}{l} \xi(v_0) = 0 \text{ and, for all } n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}, \\ \omega^\ell \xi(v_{1,n}) = \dots = \omega^{j\ell} \xi(v_{j,n}) = \dots = \omega^{(k-1)\ell} \xi(v_{k-1,n}) = \xi(v_{k,n}) \end{array} \right. \right\};$$

this subspace of \mathcal{H} has an orthonormal basis $\varepsilon_{\ell,*} = (\varepsilon_{\ell,n})_{n \geq 1}$ defined by

$$\varepsilon_{\ell,n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k \omega^{-j\ell} \delta_{j,n} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Define also

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \left| \begin{array}{l} \xi(v_{1,n}) = \cdots = \xi(v_{j,n}) = \cdots = \xi(v_{k-1,n}) = \xi(v_{k,n}) \\ \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}, \end{array} \right. \right\};$$

this subspace has an orthonormal basis $\varepsilon_{k,*} = (\varepsilon_{k,n})_{n \geq 0}$ defined by

$$\varepsilon_{k,0} = \delta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{k,n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_{j,n} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Observe that

$$(**) \quad \delta_{j,n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \omega^{j,\ell} \varepsilon_{\ell,n} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1;$$

indeed

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \omega^{j,\ell} \varepsilon_{\ell,n} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \omega^{j,\ell} \sum_{m=1}^k \omega^{-m,\ell} \delta_{m,n} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=1}^k \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^k \omega^{(j-m)\ell} \right) \delta_{m,n} = \delta_{j,n}.$$

From (**), retain that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $n \geq 1$, the vector $\delta_{j,n}$ is a linear combination of $\varepsilon_{1,n}, \dots, \varepsilon_{k,n}$ in which all coefficients are non-zero. We leave it to the reader to check that the subspaces defined above are orthogonal with each other, that they provide an orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}_k,$$

and that each of them is invariant by A ; we denote by A_j the restriction of A to \mathcal{H}_j , and we have

$$A = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_k.$$

For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, the matrix of the operator A_ℓ with respect to the basis $(\varepsilon_{\ell,n})_{n \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{H}_ℓ is

$$J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

(independent on ℓ). It follows from Proposition 7.1 that, for all $n \geq 1$, the vector $\varepsilon_{\ell,n}$ is cyclic for A_ℓ (as well as all its nonzero scalar multiples). For $\ell = k$, the matrix of the operator A_k with respect to the basis $(\varepsilon_{k,n})_{n \geq 0}$ of \mathcal{H}_k is

$$J_{\sqrt{k}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{k} & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \sqrt{k} & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 6.7, the vector $\varepsilon_{k,0} = \delta_0$ and the vectors $\varepsilon_{k,n}$ for all $n \geq 1$ are cyclic for A_k .

It follows now from Proposition 2.6 (ii) and from (*) that $\delta_{j,n}$ is dominant for A for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $n \geq 1$. \square

Second part of the proof of Theorem 7.3: no vertex is cyclic. The vector δ_0 is contained in the subspace \mathcal{H}_1 , which is a A -invariant proper subspace of \mathcal{H} , hence the vector δ_0 is not cyclic for A , i.e., the vertex v_0 is not cyclic in S_k . In the case of the star S_2 with two branches, this argument applies to all vertices of $S_2 = L^1$.

Assume from now on that $k \geq 3$. Set

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \{ \xi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \xi(v_{2,n}) = \xi(v_{3,n}) = \dots = \xi(v_{k,n}) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1} \}.$$

It is a closed subspace of \mathcal{H} which is proper (because $k \geq 3$), contains $\delta_{1,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 1}$, and which is invariant by A (see (*)). It follows that $\delta_{1,n}$ ($n \geq 1$) is not a cyclic vector for A . With minor modifications, this argument shows that $\delta_{j,n}$ is not a cyclic vector for A , for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and all $n \geq 1$.

This ends the proof of Theorem 7.3. \square

REFERENCES

- [AkGM–13] S. Akbari, E. Ghorbani, and A. Mahmoodi, *Nowhere-zero eigenvectors of graphs*. Linear Multilinear Algebra **61** (2013), no. 2, 273–279.
- [Bigg–93] N. Biggs, *Algebraic graph theory*, Second edition. Cambridge University Press, 1993. [First edition 1974.]
- [BiLS–07] T. Biyikoglu, J. Leydold, and P.F. Stadler, *Laplacian eigenvectors on graphs*. Springer Lecture Notes in Math., **1915**, 2007.
- [BoSm–20] V.I. Bogachev and O.G. Smolyanov, *Real and functional analysis*. Moscow Lectures **4**, Springer, 2020.
- [BrHa–12] A.E. Brouwer and W.H. Haemers, *Spectra of graphs*. Universitext, Springer, 2012.
- [Conw–07] J.B. Conway, *A course in functional analysis*. Second Edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **96**, Springer, 2007.
- [CvDS–80] D.M. Cvetković, M. Doob, and H. Sachs, *Spectra of graphs. Theory and applications*. Academic Press, 1980.
- [CvRS–97] D.M. Cvetković, P. Rowlinson, and S. Simić, *Eigenspaces of graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [vDam–95] E.R. van Dam, *Regular graphs with four eigenvalues*. Linear Algebra Appl. **226/228** (1995), 139–162.
- [DeRo–20] D. DeFord and D.N. Rockmore, *On the spectrum of finite, rooted homogeneous trees*. Linear Algebra Appl. **598** (2020), 165–185.
- [Dixm–69] J. Dixmier, *Les algèbres d’opérateurs dans l’espace hilbertien (algèbres de von Neumann)*, deuxième édition, revue et augmentée. Gauthier-Villars, 1969. [First Edition 1957, English translation North-Holland 1981.]
- [DoNe–86] J. Dombrowski and P. Nevai, *Orthogonal polynomials, measures and recurrence relations*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. **17** (1986), no. 3, 752–759.
- [Doug–72] R.G. Douglas, *Banach algebra techniques in operator theory*. Academic Press, 1972 [Second Edition, Springer, 1998].
- [DuSc–63] N. Dunford and J.T. Schwartz, *Linear operators. Part II: Spectral theory. Self adjoint operators in Hilbert space*. Interscience, 1963.

- [FiPi–83] A. Figà-Talamanca and M.A. Picardello, *Harmonic analysis on free groups*. Marcel Dekker, 1983.
- [Gant–77] F.R. Gantmacher, *The theory of matrices*, Volume one. Chelsea 1977.
- [Gods–84] C. Godsil, *Spectra of trees*. In “Convexity and graph theory (Jerusalem, 1981)”, Ann. Discrete Math. **30**, North–Holland, 1984, pages 151–189.
- [GoMc–80] C.D. Godsil and B.D. McKay, *Feasibility conditions for the existence of walk-regular graphs*. Linear Algebra Appl. **30** (1980), 51–61.
- [GoMo–88] C.D. Godsil and B. Mohar, *Walk generating functions and spectral measures of infinite graphs*. Linear Algebra Appl. **107** (1988), 191–206.
- [GoRo–01] C.D. Godsil and C.D. Royle, *Algebraic graph theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **207**, Springer, 2001.
- [Grig–11] R. Grigorchuk, *Some problems of the dynamics of group actions on rooted trees*. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **273** (2011), no. 1, 64–175.
- [Halm–67] Paul R. HALMOS, *A Hilbert space problem book*, van Nostrand, 1967. [Second Ed.: Springer, 1982.]
- [Kest–59] H. Kesten, *Symmetric fadom walks on groups*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **92** (1959) no 2, 336–354.
- [LeNy–15] V.O. Lebid’ and L.O. Nyzhnyk, *Spectral analysis of some graphs with infinite rays* Ukrainian Math. J. **66** (2015), no. 9, 1333–1345.
- [LiSi–22] F. Liu and J. Simons, *Unlocking the walk matrix of a graph*. J. Algebraic Combin. **55** (2022), no. 3, 663–690.
- [Moha–82] B. Mohar, *The spectrum of an infinite graph*. Linear Algebra Appl. **48** (1982), 245–256.
- [MoWo–89] B. Mohar and W. Woess, *A survey on spectra of infinite graphs*. Bull. London Math. Soc. **21** (1989), no 3, 209–234.
- [OEIS] *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*. On line: <https://oeis.org>
- [RoWo–19] S. O’Rourke and P.M. Wood, *Low-degree factors of random polynomials*. J. Theoret. Probab. **32** (2019), no. 2, 1076–1104.
- [Simo–11] B. Simon, *Szegő’s theorem and its descendants*. Princeton Univ. Press, 2011.
- [Sim1–15] B. Simon, *Real analysis*. A comprehensive course in analysis, Part 1. Amer. Math. Soc., 2015.
- [Sim4–15] B. Simon, *Operator theory*. A comprehensive course in analysis, Part 4. Amer. Math. Soc., 2015.
- [Swar–88] R. Szwarc, *An analytic series of irreducible representations of the free group*. Ann. Inst. Fourier **38** (1988), no. 1, 87–110.
- [Woes–00] W. Woess, *Random walks on infinite graphs and groups*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [YLZH–21] Q. Yu, F. Liu, H. Zhang, and Z. Heng, *Note on graphs with irreducible characteristic polynomials*. Linear Algebra Appl. **629** (2021), 72–86.

CLAIRE BRUCHEZ, PIERRE DE LA HARPE, AND TATIANA NAGNIBEDA
 SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE, UNI DUFOUR,
 24 RUE DU GÉNÉRAL DUFOUR, CASE POSTALE 64, CH–1211 GENÈVE 4.

Email address: Claire.Bruchez@etu.unige.ch Pierre.delaHarpe@unige.ch
Tatiana.Smirnova-Nagnibeda@unige.ch