

LINEAR REPRESENTATIONS AND ISOSPECTRALITY WITH BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

ORI PARZANCHEVSKI¹ AND RAM BAND²

ABSTRACT. We present a method for constructing families of isospectral systems, using linear representations of finite groups. We focus on quantum graphs, for which we give a complete treatment. However, the method presented can be applied to other systems such as manifolds and two-dimensional drums. This is demonstrated by reproducing some known isospectral drums, and new examples are obtained as well. In particular, Sunada's method [1] is a special case of the one presented.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Can one hear the shape of a drum?” - This question was posed by Marc Kac in 1966 [2]. In other words, is it possible to determine the shape of a planar Euclidean domain from the spectrum of the Laplace operator on it? This question gave rise to fertile research, investigating it from various aspects. Two main approaches were, on the one hand, attempts to deal with the inverse question of reconstructing the shape from the spectrum, and on the other hand, trying to find systems whose shapes are different, yet have the same spectrum. Such examples are called isospectral. Although Kac's original question regarded two dimensional planar drums, the research on isospectrality expanded quickly to other types of systems. We will not go into detail, but refer the interested reader to [1]-[9] for a broader view of the field. However, we will mention here two milestones in the field of isospectrality. A theorem by Sunada gave an important machinery for the construction of isospectral Riemannian manifolds [1]. Later, this method was used by Gordon, Webb and Wolpert to construct the first pair of isospectral planar Euclidean domains [3, 4] thus negatively answering Kac's original question.

This paper starts with a presentation of the basic theory of quantum graphs and existing results on quantum graph isospectrality. We then present the algebraic part of our theory and its main theorem. This is followed by a section which explains the construction of the so called quotient graphs that lie in the heart of the theory. After the theory is fully presented, we apply it to obtain various examples of isospectral quantum graphs. We then demonstrate how to apply the method to other systems, explaining some known results, as well as obtaining new ones. In particular we discuss the relation to Sunada's method. We conclude by pointing out key elements of the theory that are to be investigated further and by presenting open questions.

Date: November 19, 2018.

2. QUANTUM GRAPHS

A *graph* Γ consists of a finite set of vertices $V = \{v_i\}$ and a finite set $E = \{e_j\}$ of edges connecting the vertices. We assume that there are no parallel edges (different edges with the same endpoints) or loops (edges connecting a vertex to itself), but we shall see that this inflicts only a small loss of generality. We denote by E_v the set of all edges incident to the vertex v . The degree (valency) of the vertex v is $d_v = |E_v|$. Γ becomes a *metric graph* if each edge $e \in E$ is assigned a finite length $l_e > 0$. It is then possible to identify the edge e with a finite segment $[0, l_e]$ of the real line, having the natural coordinate x_e along it. A function on the graph is a vector $f = (f|_{e_1}, \dots, f|_{e_{|E|}})$ of functions $f|_{e_j} : [0, l_{e_j}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on the edges. We shall usually consider smooth functions on the graph, meaning that $f|_e \in C^\infty([0, l_e])$ for all $e \in E$. Notice that in general it is not required that for $v \in V$ and $e, e' \in E_v$ the functions $f|_e$ and $f|_{e'}$ agree on v .

To obtain a *quantum graph*, we consider a differential operator on the graph, by default the negative Laplacian: $-\Delta f = (-f''|_{e_1}, \dots, -f''|_{e_{|E|}})$. In addition, we require the functions on the graph to obey certain boundary conditions stated a priori; for each vertex $v \in V$, we consider homogeneous boundary conditions which involve the values and derivatives of the function at the vertex, of the form $A_v \cdot f|_v + B_v \cdot f'|_v = 0$. Here A_v and B_v are $d_v \times d_v$ complex matrices, $f|_v$ is the vector $(f|_{e_{n_1}}(v) \ \dots \ f|_{e_{n_{d_v}}}(v))^T$ of the values of f on the edges in E_v at v , and $f'|_v = (f'|_{e_{n_1}}(v) \ \dots \ f'|_{e_{n_{d_v}}}(v))^T$ is the vector of outgoing derivatives of f taken at the vertex. To sum up, a quantum graph is a metric graph equipped with a differential operator and homogeneous differential boundary conditions at the vertices. Notice that before stating the boundary conditions, the graph is merely a collection of independent edges with functions defined separately on each edge. The connectivity of the graph is manifested through the boundary conditions. We denote by $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ the space of (smooth complex) functions on the graph which satisfy the boundary conditions at the vertices, and by $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ the subspace of $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ spanned by eigenfunctions of the Laplacian. The reader interested in more information about quantum graphs is referred to the reviews [10, 11, 12].

A standard choice of boundary conditions which we adopt is the so called *Neumann* boundary condition¹:

- f agrees on the vertices: $\forall v \in V \quad \forall e, e' \in E_v : f|_e(v) = f|_{e'}(v)$.
- The sum of outgoing derivatives at each vertex is zero: $\forall v \in V : \sum_{e \in E_v} f'|_e(v) = 0$.

The Neumann boundary condition can thus be represented by the matrices

$$A_v = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For a vertex of degree one the Neumann condition is expressed by the matrices $A_v = (0)$, $B_v = (1)$, and means that the derivative of the function is zero at the

¹This condition is also widely encountered under the name of *Kirchhoff* condition.

leaf v . Another natural boundary condition for leaves is the *Dirichlet* boundary condition: $A_v = (1)$, $B_v = (0)$, which means that the function vanishes at the vertex.

Neumann vertices of degree two deserve a special attention. They can be thought of as inner points along a single edge - the concatenation of the two edges incident to the vertex - and we would like to be able to add or remove such inner points, for reasons which will become clear later on. At such points, however, a function on the edge is only required (by the Neumann condition) to be continuously differentiable (C^1), rather than smooth (C^∞); therefore, adding a Neumann vertex of degree two at an inner point of an edge augments the space of allowed functions (by ones such as $|x| \cdot x$). The question of C^1 versus C^∞ is inherent to the modeling of one dimensional manifolds as quantum graphs. For example, in order to regard the circle S^1 as a quantum graph, we must place at least one vertex along it, and at this vertex functions on the resulting graph may have a non-differentiable derivative.

The good news is that adding or removing Neumann vertices of degree two does not change the **spectral** properties of the graph in question. For sums of eigenfunctions of the Laplacian, being C^1 and piecewise C^∞ is equivalent to being C^∞ altogether, so that if the graph Γ' is obtained from Γ by adding or removing such points, we have $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma') = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$. With this observation in mind, we will allow ourselves to make manipulations of degree two Neumann vertices, with no essential loss of generality (at least from the spectral viewpoint). For example, loops and parallel edges can be eliminated by the introduction of such “dummy” vertices, so that as mentioned, we shall assume that we are dealing with graphs with no such nuisances.

If for every $v \in V$ the $d_v \times 2d_v$ matrix $(A_v | B_v)$ is of full rank, we shall say that the quantum graph is *exact*. Non-exact quantum graphs are not very interesting from the spectral point of view, as their spectrum is all of \mathbb{C} . On the other hand, we shall later be led to consider the opposite phenomena, i.e., vertices at which there are “too many” boundary conditions. In this case we shall admit A_v and B_v to be of size $m \times d_v$, possibly with $m > d_v$, and we shall call the corresponding graphs *generalized quantum graphs*. From the spectral perspective these are much more interesting than non-exact quantum graphs. Consider for example a Y-shaped graph, with a Neumann condition at the center, Dirichlet conditions at two of the leaves, and the condition $A_v = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ at the third; its spectrum is nonempty if and only if the lengths of the two edges with Dirichlet leaves are commensurable.

There is a natural inner product on $C^\infty(\Gamma)$, given by $\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{e \in E} \int_0^{l_e} \overline{f|_e} \cdot g|_e dx_e$.

Kostrykin and Schrader [13] provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the Laplacian to be self-adjoint with respect to this product. These conditions can be stated in a number of equivalent forms (see [12]). We give two of them:

- (1) Γ is exact, and $A_v \cdot B_v^\dagger$ is self-adjoint for every $v \in V$.
- (2) For every $v \in V$ there exist a unitary matrix U such that $(A_v | B_v)$ is row-equivalent to $(i(U - I) | U + I)$ ².

In particular, Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions satisfy these requirements.

There are several known results concerning isospectrality of quantum graphs. Gutkin and Smilansky [15] show that under certain conditions a quantum graph

²(2) follows from (1) by taking $U = 2(-A + iB)^{-1}A + I$. The other direction is trivial.

can be heard, meaning that it can be recovered from the spectrum of its Laplacian. On the other hand, constructions of isospectral graphs were also established, by various means: by a trace formula for the heat kernel [16], by turning isospectral discrete graphs into equilateral quantum graphs [17], and weighted discrete graphs into non-equilateral ones [18]; in [15, 19] a wealth of examples is given by an analogy to the isospectral drums obtained by Buser et al. [5], and in [20] is presented an example, whose generalization has led to the theory presented in this paper.

3. ALGEBRA

For a quantum graph Γ we can regard $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ as a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module, where x acts as the (negative) Laplacian. For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we denote by $\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)$ the submodule

$$\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda) = \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)}(x - \lambda) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \mid -\Delta f = \lambda f\},$$

which as a vector space is merely the λ -eigenspace of the Laplacian. *The spectrum of Γ* is the function

$$\sigma_\Gamma : \lambda \mapsto \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda),$$

which assigns to each eigenvalue its multiplicity³. Two quantum graphs Γ and Γ' are said to be *isospectral* if their spectra coincide, that is $\sigma_\Gamma \equiv \sigma_{\Gamma'}$, and as noted in [21], this can follow from the stronger assumption that $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma')$ are isomorphic as $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -modules, which means that their Laplacians are conjugate.

A symmetry of a quantum graph is an invertible graph map that preserves both the lengths of edges and the boundary conditions at the vertices. The group of all such symmetries is denoted $\text{Aut } \Gamma$. A left action of a group G on a quantum graph Γ is equivalent to a group homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Aut } \Gamma$. Such action induces a left action of G on $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ (by $(gf)(x) = f(g^{-1}x)$ - the inversion accounts for the contravariantness of \mathcal{H}). This gives $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ a $\mathbb{C}G[x]$ -module structure, since the Laplacian commutes with all symmetries. The eigenspaces $\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda) = \text{Ann}(x - \lambda)$ are again submodules, and in particular they are $\mathbb{C}G$ -modules, that is, complex representations of G . Assuming that G is finite, with irreducible complex representations S_1, \dots, S_r , we can decompose each eigenspace to its isotypic components:

$$(3.1) \quad \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \Phi_\Gamma^{S_i}(\lambda),$$

where $\Phi_\Gamma^{S_i}(\lambda) \cong S_i \oplus \dots \oplus S_i$ as $\mathbb{C}G$ -modules.

We start by counting separately, for each irreducible representation S of G , only the λ -eigenfunctions which reside in $\Phi_\Gamma^S(\lambda)$. This means that we are restricting our attention to functions which under the action of $\mathbb{C}G$ span a space that is isomorphic, as a representation of G , to S . However, since $\dim S$ always divides $\dim \Phi_\Gamma^S(\lambda)$, we can already normalize by it. We thus define *the spectrum of S* as

$$(3.2) \quad \sigma_\Gamma^S : \lambda \mapsto \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Phi_\Gamma^S(\lambda) / \dim_{\mathbb{C}} S.$$

By the orthogonality relations of irreducible characters, we can rewrite this as $\sigma_\Gamma^S(\lambda) = \langle \chi_S, \chi_{\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)} \rangle_G$, and expanding this linearly, we define *the spectrum of R* , for every representation R of G , to be

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma_\Gamma^R : \lambda \mapsto \langle \chi_R, \chi_{\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)} \rangle_G.$$

³In effect we have $\sigma_\Gamma : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \{0..2|E|\}$, as the eigenvalue of a Laplacian eigenfunction, together with the values $\{f|_e(0), f'|_e(0)\}_{e \in E}$, determine the function.

$\sigma_\Gamma^S(\lambda)$ has an algebraic significance: it reflects the size of the S -isotypic part of $\Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)$. Looking for a parallel algebraic interpretation of $\sigma_\Gamma^R(\lambda)$, we find that

$$\sigma_\Gamma^R(\lambda) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)) .$$

Quite generally, if $A \hookrightarrow B$ is a ring extension and M and N are modules over A and B respectively, then for $C_B(A)$, the centralizer of A in B ⁴, $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ has a natural $C_B(A)$ -module structure (by $(bf)(m) = b \cdot f(m)$ for every $b \in C_B(A)$). For our purposes, since $\mathbb{C}[x]$ lies in the centralizer of $\mathbb{C}G$ in $\mathbb{C}G[x]$, we obtain that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$ has a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module structure:

$$x \cdot \tilde{f} : r \mapsto -\Delta(\tilde{f}(r)) \quad \left(\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \right) .$$

This allows us to make the following definition.

Definition 1. A Γ/R -graph is any quantum graph Γ' such that there is a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module isomorphism

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{H}(\Gamma') \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) .$$

We note, in particular, that for such Γ' , there is an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\Gamma'}(\lambda) &= \\ \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma')} (x - \lambda) &\cong \text{Ann}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))} (x - \lambda) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)) \end{aligned}$$

which by taking dimensions translates to equality of spectra:

$$(3.5) \quad \sigma_{\Gamma'} \equiv \sigma_\Gamma^R .$$

Since σ_Γ^R is not a spectrum in the classical sense, we cannot really call this isospectrality. However we do have from this that all Γ/R -graphs are isospectral to one another, and we will use this to speak non-rigorously about “the spectrum of Γ/R ”, $\sigma_{\Gamma/R} \equiv \sigma_\Gamma^R$. The following proposition exhibits another manifestation of isospectrality.

Proposition 2. *All $\Gamma/\mathbb{C}G$ -graphs are isospectral to Γ .*

Proof. By (3.1), (3.2), and linearity, the classical spectrum σ_Γ coincides with the spectrum of the regular representation of G :

$$(3.6) \quad \sigma_\Gamma^{\mathbb{C}G} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r \dim S_i \cdot \sigma_\Gamma^{S_i} \equiv \sigma_\Gamma .$$

This can also be deduced from the fact that for every R -module M there is an isomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(R, M) \cong M$, so that we have $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(\mathbb{C}G, \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)) \cong \Phi_\Gamma(\lambda)$ for every eigenvalue λ . \square

We can say even more:

Theorem 3. *Let Γ be a quantum graph equipped with an action of G , H a subgroup of G , and R a representation of H . Then Γ/R is isospectral to $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$.*

⁴That is, $C_B(A) = \{b \in B \mid \forall a \in A : ab = ba\}$.

Proof. This follows at once from the Frobenius Reciprocity Theorem, which states that there is an isomorphism $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(\text{Ind}_H^G R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$. It is straightforward to verify that this is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -modules. Note that from the formal point of view, we have actually shown that Γ/R and $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$ are identical (as classes of quantum graphs). \square

Remark. This gives yet another explanation for the equality of the classical spectrum with that of the regular representation (proposition 2): for $H = \{id\}$ and $\mathbf{1}_H$ its trivial representation, it is clear by the isotypic component perspective that $(\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{\mathbf{1}_H} = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$, so that (3.6) follows from $\text{Ind}_H^G \mathbf{1}_H \cong \mathbb{C}G$.

Corollary 4. *If G acts on Γ and H_1, H_2 are subgroups of G with corresponding representations R_1, R_2 , such that $\text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_2}^G R_2$, then Γ/R_1 and Γ/R_2 are isospectral.*

Remark. This corollary is in fact equivalent to the theorem, which follows by taking $H_2 = G, R_2 = \text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1$. It is presented for being of practical usefulness (it allows one to work with representations of lower dimension, as can be seen in section 5), but also since it indicates the bridge connecting our method with the classical one of Sunada. In section 6.3, we shall cross it.

The sharpest observations in this section would be mere algebraic tautologies, unless we can show that Γ/R -graphs do exist. The next section is devoted to this purpose.

4. BUILDING Γ/R -GRAPHS

In this section we prove the existence of the quotient graphs Γ/R . This is done by describing an explicit construction of Γ/R , given a graph Γ , a representation R of some group G acting on the graph, and various choices of bases for this representation. As the lengthy technical details of the construction might encloud the essence of the method, the reader may prefer to go over section 5 first, and obtain an intuition for the construction of the quotient graph from the examples presented there. More intuition for the construction can be gained from the examples in [14].

We summarize the main conclusions of this section in the following theorem:

Theorem 5. *For any representation R of a finite group G , which acts upon a quantum graph Γ , there exists a generalized Γ/R quantum graph. Furthermore, if Γ 's Laplacian is self-adjoint, then there exists a proper Γ/R quantum graph, and it is exact.*

4.1. Intuition. A motivation for the construction of our quotient graphs is given by thinking about it as an ‘‘encoding scheme’’⁵. An element \tilde{f} in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$ can be thought of as a family of functions on Γ , parametrized by R . To emphasize this view, we shall write \tilde{f}_r instead of $\tilde{f}(r)$ (where $r \in R$). Our goal is to build a new graph, each of whose complex functions encodes exactly one such family. The desired map $\Psi : \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R)$ (see definition 1) is in fact this encoding. An encoding scheme should always be injective (in order to allow decoding), but we have also required Ψ to be surjective: this can be translated

⁵In section 6 we show that the same construction and motivation can be applied analogously to other geometric systems.

to the idea that the encoding must be “as efficient as possible”⁶ - that Γ/R is to be a “minimal” graph allowing such an encoding, since it admits no Laplacian eigenfunctions apart from the ones used by the scheme.

First, we reduce the infinite family \tilde{f} to a finite one by choosing a basis $B = \{b_j\}_{j=1}^d$ for R , and restricting our attention to $\{\tilde{f}_{b_j}\}_{j=1}^d$. From these “basis functions” we can reconstruct \tilde{f} , since the $\mathbb{C}G$ -linearity of \tilde{f} implies in particular \mathbb{C} -linearity (i.e., $\tilde{f}_{\sum \alpha_j b_j} = \sum \alpha_j \tilde{f}_{b_j}$). As a first encoding attempt we could take a graph with d times each edge in Γ , and let the j^{th} copy of the edge e carry the j^{th} basis function restricted to e . That is, define $(\Psi \tilde{f})|_{e_j} \equiv \tilde{f}_{b_j}|_e$. However, this encoding is not efficient enough, since we have used only \mathbb{C} -linearity. For each $g \in G$, $\mathbb{C}G$ -linearity implies that $\{\tilde{f}_r|_e\}_{r \in R}$ determines $\{\tilde{f}_r|_{ge}\}_{r \in R}$, specifically by

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{f}_r|_{ge} \equiv (g^{-1}\tilde{f}_r)|_e \equiv \tilde{f}_{g^{-1}r}|_e$$

(the inversion occurs since G acts on $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ by $g \cdot f = f \circ g^{-1}$). Thus, it suffices to encode the basis functions on only **one** edge from each G -orbit of Γ 's edges.

It turns out that if the action of G on E is free, then apart from determining the appropriate boundary conditions at the vertices we are done: for $\{e^i\}$, a choice of representatives for E/G , setting $(\Psi \tilde{f})|_{e_j^i} \equiv \tilde{f}_{b_j}|_{e^i}$ (where $1 \leq j \leq d$) is indeed a “good” encoding (i.e., once the boundary conditions are correctly stated, Ψ is an isomorphism.)

If, however, some edge $e = \{v, v'\}$ has a non-trivial stabilizer $G_e = G_v \cap G_{v'}$, then greater efficiency can (and therefore must) be achieved. For example, assume that $\dim R = 1$ and that for some $g \in G_e$ we have $g \notin \ker \rho_R$, where ρ_R is the structure homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{GL}_1(\mathbb{C})$. We then have

$$\tilde{f}_r|_e \equiv \tilde{f}_r|_{g^{-1}e} \equiv \tilde{f}_{gr}|_e \equiv \tilde{f}_{\rho_R(g) \cdot r}|_e \equiv \rho_R(g) \cdot \tilde{f}_r|_e$$

which implies that $\tilde{f}_r|_e \equiv 0$ for all r , and as a result, the edge e need not have **any** representative in the quotient. We can “decode $\tilde{f}_r|_e$ from thin air”, since we know in advance that it can only be the zero function. The generalization of this observation is that for each edge e , the information in $\{\tilde{f}_r|_e\}_{r \in R}$ is encapsulated in R^{G_e} ⁷: if r belongs to a nontrivial component of $\text{Res}_{G_e}^G R$, then $\tilde{f}_r|_e \equiv 0$. Therefore, we need only $d_i = \dim R^{G_{e^i}}$ copies of each representative e^i in the quotient⁸. This further “compression” slightly complicates the determination of the boundary conditions. When G acted freely on the edges, we had d functions, \tilde{f}_{b_j} , each satisfying the boundary conditions at the vertices of Γ , and we could have translated this quite easily to boundary conditions on the quotient. Now, however, for each edge e^i we

⁶In a suitable sense, since better encoding may exist, but we want the encoding to be by another quantum graph, in a manner which intertwines the corresponding Laplacians.

⁷ R^H is the trivial component of $\text{Res}_H^G R$, i.e. $R^H = \{r \in R \mid \forall h \in H : hr = r\}$.

⁸However, we shall later find it convenient to think about $d = \dim R$ copies, where the $d_i + 1 \dots d$ copies are “dead”, meaning that whenever a function on them appears in a formula it is to be understood as zero.

need to encode a “function basis” $\left\{ \tilde{f}_{b_j^i} \Big|_{e^i} \right\}$, where $\{b_j^i\}$ is a basis for $R^{G_{e^i}}$. Since for different e^i 's the spaces $R^{G_{e^i}}$ need not even overlap, we now have only function-chunks, indexed by different R -elements for each edge, and no function on the whole of Γ to extract boundary conditions from. Fortunately, algebra is generous and this complication turns out to be solvable.

4.2. Method. We now present the actual construction procedure. Assume we have a representation R of a group G acting on the quantum graph $\Gamma = (E, V)$, and we have chosen representatives $\{\tilde{e}^i\}_{i=1}^I$ for the orbits E/G , and likewise $\{\tilde{v}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ for V/G . We have also chosen an ordered basis $B = (b_j)_{j=1}^d$ for R , and for each $i \in \{1..I\}$ another ordered basis for R , $B^i = (b_j^i)_{j=1}^{d_i}$, such that $\{b_j^i\}_{j=1}^{d_i}$ is a basis for $R^{G_{e^i}}$ and each b_j^i with $j > d_i = \dim R^{G_{e^i}}$ lies in a nontrivial component of $\text{Res}_{G_{e^i}}^G R$.

The quotient graph Γ/R obtained from these choices is defined to have $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^K$ as its set of vertices, and $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1..d_i}^{i=1..I}$ for edges, where each e_j^i is of length l_{e^i} . If \tilde{e}^i connects $g\tilde{v}_k$ to $g'\tilde{v}_{k'}$ in Γ , then, for all j , e_j^i connects v_k to $v_{k'}$ in Γ/R . We shall assume, by adding “dummy” vertices if needed, that G does not carry any vertex in V to one of its neighbors. This serves three purposes:

- (1) It means that Γ/R has no loops; i.e., that $k \neq k'$ in the notation above. This allows us to speak of $f \Big|_{e_j^i} (v)$, the value of e_j^i at v , without confusion regarding which end of e_j^i is meant.
- (2) It assures that an edge is not transformed onto itself in the opposite direction, in which case we would have had to take only half of the edge as a representative for its orbit.
- (3) It assures that the fixed points of each $g \in G$ are either entire edges, or vertices.

Note that in order that G still act on the graph, the dummy vertices are to be added in accordance with its action, i.e., if a vertex is placed at $x \in (0, l_{\tilde{e}})$ along \tilde{e} , one should also be placed at x along $g\tilde{e}$, for every $g \in G$.

We can now define Ψ on $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$:

$$\left(\Psi \tilde{f} \right) \Big|_{e_j^i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{f}_{b_j^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i},$$

and it is clear that Ψ does intertwine the Laplacians. We would like to determine vertex conditions on Γ/R that will ensure that Ψ is into and onto $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R)$. This will require nothing more than linear algebra, and we start by rephrasing (4.1) basis-wise. We make the following convention: an expression in bold is to be understood as a row vector of length d , where the $\#$ -symbol indicates the place of the index; e.g., $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b\#} \Big|_e$ stands for $(\tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_e, \dots, \tilde{f}_{b_d} \Big|_e)$.

Consider $\tilde{f}_r \Big|_{g\tilde{e}^i}$, an arbitrary function in the family \tilde{f} evaluated on an arbitrary edge. Write $r \in R$ as $\mathbf{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, where $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d) \in M_{1 \times d}(R)$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in M_{d \times 1}(\mathbb{C})$. $r = \mathbf{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ implies $gr = \mathbf{b}_{\#}^i \cdot [\rho_R(g)]_{B^i}^B \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and therefore, by (4.1) we have $\tilde{f}_r \Big|_{g\tilde{e}^i} =$

$\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{b}_{\#}^{i}[\rho_R(g^{-1})]_{B^i}^B \alpha} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i}$. Linearity now implies

$$\tilde{f}_r \Big|_{g\tilde{e}^i} \equiv \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{b}_{\#}^{i}[g^{-1}]_{B^i}^B \alpha} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i} \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}_{\#}^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i} \cdot [g^{-1}]_{B^i}^B \cdot \alpha \equiv (\Psi \tilde{\mathbf{f}}) \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g^{-1}]_{B^i}^B \cdot \alpha ,$$

where ρ_R is understood, $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}_{\#}^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i} = \left(\tilde{f}_{b_1^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i}, \dots, \tilde{f}_{b_d^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i} \right)$, and

$$(\Psi \tilde{\mathbf{f}}) \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} = \left((\Psi \tilde{f}) \Big|_{e_1^i}, \dots, (\Psi \tilde{f}) \Big|_{e_{d_i}^i}, 0, \dots, 0 \right) ,$$

since for $j > d_i$ we have seen that $\tilde{f}_{b_j^i} \Big|_{\tilde{e}^i} \equiv 0$, and we therefore did not include the corresponding e_j^i edge in Γ/R (it is “dead” - see footnote 8). We now see that for $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R)$ the inverse of Ψ must be given by:

$$(\Psi^{-1} f)_{\mathbf{b} \cdot \alpha} \Big|_{g\tilde{e}^i} \equiv \mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g^{-1}]_{B^i}^B \cdot \alpha ,$$

(again $[g^{-1}]_{B^i}^B$ stands for $[\rho_R(g^{-1})]_{B^i}^B$), so we need to establish that the r.h.s is independent in the choice of g . We observe that if g and g' are two possible choices then $g^{-1}g' \in G_{\tilde{e}^i}$, and by the construction of B^i we have $[g^{-1}g']_{B^i} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} I_{d_i} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & * \end{array} \right)$. As we have agreed that $\mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} = \left(f \Big|_{e_1^i}, \dots, f \Big|_{e_{d_i}^i}, 0, \dots, 0 \right)$, we have $\mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g^{-1}g']_{B^i} = \mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i}$ and thus

$$\mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g'^{-1}]_{B^i}^B = \mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g^{-1}g']_{B^i} \cdot [g'^{-1}]_{B^i}^B = \mathbf{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{e}_{\#}^i} \cdot [g'^{-1}]_{B^i}^B ,$$

establishing that Ψ^{-1} is well defined.

We can now determine matrices A_{v_k} and B_{v_k} for the vertex v_k from the matrices $A_{\tilde{v}_k}$, $B_{\tilde{v}_k}$ of the vertex \tilde{v}_k . Assume that the edges entering \tilde{v}_k are $g_1\tilde{e}^{\nu_1}, \dots, g_n\tilde{e}^{\nu_n}$ (where $n = d_{\tilde{v}_k}$), so that a function f on Γ satisfies the vertex conditions at \tilde{v}_k when

$$A_{\tilde{v}_k} \cdot f \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} + B_{\tilde{v}_k} \cdot f' \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} = 0 ,$$

where we recall from section 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} f \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} &= \left(f \Big|_{g_1\tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k) \quad \dots \quad f \Big|_{g_n\tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k) \right)^T \\ f' \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} &= \left(f' \Big|_{g_1\tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k) \quad \dots \quad f' \Big|_{g_n\tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k) \right)^T . \end{aligned}$$

$\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{CG}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$ means that \tilde{f}_r satisfies the conditions at \tilde{v}_k for all $r \in R$, which happens iff the basis functions $\left\{ \tilde{f}_{b_j} \right\}_{j=1}^d$ satisfy them. Thus, if we define the

$n \times d$ matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_{g_1 \tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k) & \cdots & \tilde{f}_{b_d} \Big|_{g_1 \tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_{g_n \tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k) & \cdots & \tilde{f}_{b_d} \Big|_{g_n \tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left(\tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} \quad \cdots \quad \tilde{f}_{b_d} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b_{\#}} \Big|_{g_1 \tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b_{\#}} \Big|_{g_n \tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and analogously $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k}$, then we need only check that

$$(4.2) \quad A_{\tilde{v}_k} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} + B_{\tilde{v}_k} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} = 0_{n \times d}.$$

In addition, we note that if the boundary conditions are met by \tilde{f} at \tilde{v}_k , then they are also met at any vertex in the orbit $G \cdot \tilde{v}_k$, since G is assumed to preserve boundary conditions.

For a $n \times m$ matrix $X = ((x_{ij}))$ we define its row-wise-vectorization to be the $nm \times 1$ matrix

$$\text{rv } X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} (x_{11}, \dots, x_{1m})^T \\ \vdots \\ (x_{n1}, \dots, x_{nm})^T \end{pmatrix} = (x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{1m}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{nm})^T.$$

Vectorization behaves quite nicely under multiplication. Specifically, $\text{rv}(A \cdot B \cdot C) = (A \otimes C^T) \cdot \text{rv } B$, which allows us to write (4.2) as

$$(4.3) \quad (A_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d) \cdot \text{rv } \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} + (B_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d) \cdot \text{rv } \tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} = 0_{nd \times 1}.$$

Recalling that $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b_{\#}} \Big|_{g_i \tilde{e}^{\nu_i}} = \Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_i}} \cdot [g_i^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_i}}^B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rv } \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k} &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b_{\#}} \Big|_{g_1 \tilde{e}^{\nu_1}}(\tilde{v}_k)^T \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{b_{\#}} \Big|_{g_n \tilde{e}^{\nu_n}}(\tilde{v}_k)^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} ([g_1^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_1}}^B)^T \cdot \left(\Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_1}}(\mathbf{v}_k) \right)^T \\ \vdots \\ ([g_n^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_n}}^B)^T \cdot \left(\Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_n}}(\mathbf{v}_k) \right)^T \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{diag} \left([g_1^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_1}}^B, \dots, [g_n^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_n}}^B \right)^T \cdot \text{rv} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_1}}(\mathbf{v}_k) \\ \vdots \\ \Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_n}}(\mathbf{v}_k) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for $\text{rv } \tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{\mathbf{b}} \Big|_{\tilde{v}_k}$. But now, the last vector is almost $\Psi \tilde{f} \Big|_{v_k}$, the vector of values of $(\Psi \tilde{f})$ at v_k ! Only two changes need to be made: first, if the edges entering v_k are $e_1^{\mu_1}, \dots, e_{d_{\mu_1}}^{\mu_1}, e_1^{\mu_2}, \dots, e_{d_{\mu_m}}^{\mu_m}$, then by definition $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^m = \{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as

sets; however, the μ_i are distinct, whereas in general, repetitions can occur among the ν_i (i.e., two edges in $E_{\tilde{v}_k}$ might belong to the same G -orbit). Second, as in all our expressions there might be “dead” edges, $e_j^{\mu_i}$ with $j > d_{\mu_i}$, which do not really appear in the quotient graph (note, however, that neither of the problems can occur when the action of G is free). We shall deal with these two inconveniences

at once: we define the $n \times m$ matrix $(\Theta')_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \nu_i = \mu_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, and then take

Θ to be the $nd \times d_{v_k}$ matrix obtained by removing from $(\Theta' \otimes I_d)$ the columns $\{(i-1) \cdot d + j\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ d_{\mu_i} < j \leq d}}$; these are the columns which would have been multiplied

by a “dead” edge in $(\Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_1^{\mu_1}} \dots \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_d^{\mu_1}} \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_1^{\mu_2}} \dots \dots \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_d^{\mu_m}})^T$. We now have

$$\text{rv} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_1}}(v_k) \\ \vdots \\ \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_{\#}^{\nu_n}}(v_k) \end{pmatrix} = \Theta \cdot (\Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_1^{\mu_1}}(v_k) \dots \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_{d_{\mu_1}}^{\mu_1}}(v_k) \dots \dots \Psi\tilde{f}|_{e_{d_{\mu_m}}^{\mu_m}}(v_k))^T = \Theta \cdot \Psi\tilde{f}|_{v_k},$$

and we can thus define

$$(4.4) \quad A_{v_k} = (A_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d) \cdot \mathfrak{G} \cdot \Theta$$

$$(4.5) \quad B_{v_k} = (B_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d) \cdot \mathfrak{G} \cdot \Theta$$

where $\mathfrak{G} = \text{diag} \left([g_1^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_1}}^B, \dots, [g_n^{-1}]_{B^{\nu_n}}^B \right)^T$, and finally rewrite (4.3) as

$$A_{v_k} \cdot \Psi\tilde{f}|_{v_k} + B_{v_k} \cdot \Psi\tilde{f}'|_{v_k} = 0.$$

These vertex conditions on $\Psi\tilde{f}$ at v_k are equivalent to \tilde{f}_r satisfying the vertex conditions at \tilde{v}_k for all $r \in R$, and therefore also on the entire orbit $G \cdot \tilde{v}_k$. If we repeat this process for each $k = 1 \dots K$, we indeed obtain boundary conditions on Γ/R which are satisfied by $\Psi\tilde{f}$ exactly when $\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$.

If the action of G is free, then Θ is just a permutation matrix (we can even order E_{v_k} so that $\Theta = I$), but in the general case Θ might be non-square (explicitly, it is of size $nd \times d_{v_k}$, where $d_{v_k} = \sum_{i=1}^m d_{\mu_i} \leq md \leq nd$). When this occurs, the matrices A_{v_k} and B_{v_k} we have obtained are not square matrices, and we therefore obtain a quotient which is only a generalized quantum graph. Nevertheless, as the matrices A_{v_k} and B_{v_k} serve only to represent the system of equations $A_{v_k} \cdot f|_{v_k} + B_{v_k} \cdot f'|_{v_k} = 0$, we can perform elementary row operations on the $nd \times 2d_{v_k}$ matrix $(A_{v_k} | B_{v_k})$ without changing the boundary conditions at v_k , and thus perhaps reduce the number of rows of $(A_{v_k} | B_{v_k})$. In the case that $\text{rank}(A_{v_k} | B_{v_k}) \leq d_{v_k}$, we can reduce the matrices A_{v_k} and B_{v_k} to squares ones, and if this holds for all k then we actually have a proper quantum graph. If it further happens that $\text{rank}(A_{v_k} | B_{v_k}) = d_{v_k}$ for all k , then the quotient graph is also exact. We now show sufficient conditions for this to happen.

Proposition 6. *If there exist $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $M \in \text{GL}_{d_{\tilde{v}_k}}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $(A_{\tilde{v}_k} | B_{\tilde{v}_k})$ is row-equivalent to $(\omega(M - I) | M + I)$, then $\text{rank}(A_{v_k} | B_{v_k}) = d_{v_k}$.*

Remark. We recall from section 2 that this condition holds for all k when Γ 's Laplacian is self-adjoint. Therefore, in this case Γ/R is exact, as stated in theorem 5.

Proof. Denote $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}_k$, $v = v_k$, and recall that $E_{\tilde{v}} = \{g_i \tilde{e}^{\nu_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ is the set of edges entering \tilde{v} . Assume, by reordering if necessary, that $\nu_i = \mu_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, i.e., that $\{g_i \tilde{e}^{\nu_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ are representatives for the $G_{\tilde{v}}$ -orbits in $E_{\tilde{v}}$. Denote $\tilde{\varepsilon}^i = g_i \tilde{e}^{\nu_i} = g_i \tilde{e}^{\mu_i}$ (where $1 \leq i \leq m$), and note that $G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}$ is conjugate to $G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mu_i}}$. The action of $G_{\tilde{v}}$ on $E_{\tilde{v}}$ gives rise to a representation $\mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}]$ of $G_{\tilde{v}}$, and the $G_{\tilde{v}}$ -set isomorphism $E_{\tilde{v}} = \coprod_{i=1}^m G_{\tilde{v}} \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^i \cong \coprod_{i=1}^m G_{\tilde{v}}/G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}$ translates to an isomorphism of $G_{\tilde{v}}$ -representations:

$$\mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}] \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{C}[G_{\tilde{v}}/G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}] \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ind}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}^{G_{\tilde{v}}} \mathbf{1}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}.$$

Here $\mathbf{1}_G$ denotes the trivial representation of a group G , but we shall also use it to denote its character. We now see that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \chi_{\mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}]}, \chi_R \rangle_{G_{\tilde{v}}} &= \left\langle \chi_{\bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ind}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}^{G_{\tilde{v}}} \mathbf{1}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}}, \chi_R \right\rangle_{G_{\tilde{v}}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left\langle \text{Ind}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}^{G_{\tilde{v}}} \mathbf{1}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}, \chi_R \right\rangle_{G_{\tilde{v}}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \langle \mathbf{1}_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}}, \chi_R \rangle_{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim R^{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim R^{G_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mu_i}}} = \sum_{i=1}^m d_{\mu_i} = d_v. \end{aligned}$$

We return to the matrices $(A_v | B_v) \in M_{nd \times 2d_v}(\mathbb{C})$ and $(A_{\tilde{v}} | B_{\tilde{v}}) \in M_{n \times 2n}(\mathbb{C})$. For $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$, the action of $G_{\tilde{v}}$ on $E_{\tilde{v}}$ induces a permutation action of $G_{\tilde{v}}$ on the entries of $f|_{\tilde{v}} = \left(f|_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(\tilde{v}) \right)_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \in E_{\tilde{v}}}$, and exactly the same action is induced on the entries of $f'|_{\tilde{v}}$. Thus, the space \mathbb{C}^{2n} of possible values and derivatives at \tilde{v} has naturally the structure of the $G_{\tilde{v}}$ -representation $\mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}]$. Furthermore, as by assumption G preserves the boundary conditions, $\ker(A_{\tilde{v}} | B_{\tilde{v}}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ is a sub- $G_{\tilde{v}}$ -representation of $\mathbb{C}^{2n} \cong \mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}]$. We observe that the encoding and decoding processes are ‘‘rigid’’, in the sense that for $x \in [0, l_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}]$ it suffices to know $\left\{ \tilde{f}_r|_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}(x) \right\}_{r \in R}$ to determine $\left\{ \Psi \tilde{f}|_{e_j^i}(x) \right\}_{j=1..d_i}$, and vice versa. Likewise, $\left\{ \tilde{f}_r|_{\tilde{v}} \right\}_{r \in R}$ and $\Psi \tilde{f}|_v$ determine one another, and the same goes for the corresponding derivatives. This means that in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G_{\tilde{v}}}(R, \ker(A_{\tilde{v}} | B_{\tilde{v}})) \\ \Psi \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi \\ \tilde{f} \longmapsto (r \mapsto (\tilde{f}_r|_{\tilde{v}}, \tilde{f}'_r|_{\tilde{v}})) & & \\ \Psi \tilde{f} \longmapsto (\Psi \tilde{f}|_v, (\Psi \tilde{f})'|_v) & & \\ \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \ker(A_v | B_v) \end{array}$$

the map ψ , which is this ‘‘local’’ encoding, is in fact an isomorphism. This gives us

$$(4.7) \quad \text{null}(A_v | B_v) = \langle \chi_R, \chi_{\ker(A_{\tilde{v}} | B_{\tilde{v}})} \rangle_{G_{\tilde{v}}},$$

so that by (4.6)

$$\text{rank}(A_v | B_v) = \langle 2\chi_{\mathbb{C}[E_{\tilde{v}}]} - \chi_{\ker(A_{\tilde{v}} | B_{\tilde{v}})}, \chi_R \rangle_{G_{\tilde{v}}}.$$

We therefore have

$$\text{rank}(A_v | B_v) = d_v \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle \chi_{\mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]} - \chi_{\ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})}, \chi_R \rangle_{G_{\bar{v}}} = 0,$$

and the last equality holds for all representations R of G if and only if $\text{Ind}_{G_{\bar{v}}}^G \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}] \cong \text{Ind}_{G_{\bar{v}}}^G \ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})$. In particular, this happens if $\mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]$ and $\ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})$ are isomorphic $G_{\bar{v}}$ -representations, which we now show to follow from our assumptions.

Observe that $\xi : \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]$, defined by $\xi(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) = \omega \underline{a} - \underline{b}$ is a homomorphism of $G_{\bar{v}}$ -representations, and recall that $\ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})$ is naturally embedded in $\mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]$. When restricting ξ to $\ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})$ we obtain the desired isomorphism onto $\mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]$, since $\dim \ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}}) = \text{null}(\omega(M - I) | (M + I)) = d_{\bar{v}} = \dim \mathbb{C}[E_{\bar{v}}]$, and

$$(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) \in \ker \left(\xi \Big|_{\ker(A_{\bar{v}} | B_{\bar{v}})} \right) \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \omega(M - I)\underline{a} + (M + I)\underline{b} = 0 \\ \omega \underline{a} - \underline{b} = 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow (\underline{a}, \underline{b}) = 0. \quad \square$$

4.3. Remarks.

4.3.1. It seems of some interest to point out that the encoding process we have described has actually nothing to do with eigenfunctions of the Laplacian. The assumption that $\tilde{f}_r \in \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ was not used during the construction of the quotient, and as a result, if no dummy vertices are introduced at the beginning of the construction, then we actually have

$$(4.8) \quad \Psi : \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G} \left(R, C^\infty(\Gamma) \right) \xrightarrow{\cong} C^\infty(\Gamma/R).$$

If dummy vertices are added, and Γ' is the graph obtained from Γ by their introduction, we obtain only $C^\infty(\Gamma/R) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G} \left(R, C^\infty(\Gamma') \right)$, and unfortunately $C^\infty(\Gamma') \neq C^\infty(\Gamma)$, as was remarked in section 2. We have introduced dummy vertices in order to avoid loops and parallel edges, and also to ensure that a subset of the edges can be taken as a fundamental domain for the graph. Of these causes, only the last is unavoidable; one can still carry out the construction (encumbering somewhat the notations), even with loops or parallel edges, both in the original graph and in the quotient. The only case in which the construction fails altogether, and a dummy point must be introduced, is when a group element inverts the direction of an edge, so that a fundamental domain must include only half of the edge. Thus, in order for it to be possible to construct by our method a “smooth quotient”, in the sense of (4.8), $\text{fix}_g \Gamma$ must be a subgraph of Γ for every $g \in G$. We shall return to these observations in section 6.1.

4.3.2. If G acts on Γ and R is a representation of $H \leq G$, we can consider the composition of isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R) \xrightarrow{\Psi^{-1}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H} \left(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G} \left(\text{Ind}_H^G R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \right) \xrightarrow{\Psi'} \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R)$$

where Ψ and Ψ' are the isomorphisms defined during the constructions of Γ/R and $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$, respectively, and \mathcal{F} is the Frobenius isomorphism⁹. We obtain what is known as a *transplantation* (see [24, 25]) between Γ/R and $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$, an operator

⁹Taking the induction to be the scalar extension $\text{Ind}_H^G R = \mathbb{C}G \otimes_{\mathbb{C}H} R$, \mathcal{F} is defined for decomposable tensors by $(\mathcal{F}\tilde{f})_{g \otimes r} = g \cdot \tilde{f}_r$ (where $\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H} \left(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \right)$, $g \in G$, $r \in R$), and extends linearly to all of the tensor product.

which construct functions on one graph as linear combinations of segments of functions on the second graph. This is developed in more details in [14].

4.3.3. It is natural to ask, for a graph Γ whose Laplacian is self-adjoint, whether the Laplacian on Γ/R is self-adjoint. This turns out to depend on both the action of G and the choices of bases in the construction, and it is addressed for some cases in [14].

4.3.4. Another natural question is the following: for a quantum graph Γ acted upon by G , when does an irreducible representation S of G appear in $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$?¹⁰ It is known that every quantum graph with edges whose Laplacian is self-adjoint has a nonempty spectrum (see for example [23]). Therefore, if Γ/S 's Laplacian is self-adjoint then S appears in $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ iff Γ/S has edges, and by the construction method this happens iff for at least one edge e in Γ the representation $\text{Res}_{G_e}^G S$ has a nonempty trivial component, i.e., $\langle \chi_S, \mathbf{1} \rangle_{G_e} \neq 0$. In particular, if Γ 's Laplacian is self adjoint, and G acts freely on Γ , then a self-adjoint quotient can always be obtained [14], and each stabilizer has only the trivial irreducible representation. Thus, every irreducible representation of G appears in $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$.

5. EXAMPLES OF ISOSPECTRAL QUANTUM GRAPHS

We now demonstrate several applications of the theory presented above which yield isospectral graphs. All the examples below are direct consequences of the theorem or the corollary presented in section 3.




FIGURE 5.1. A graph that obeys the dihedral symmetry of the square. The lengths of some edges are marked.

Let Γ be the graph given in figure 5.1. The lengths of the edges are determined by the parameters a, b, c and it has Neumann boundary conditions at all vertices. $G = D_4$, the dihedral group of the square, is a symmetry group of Γ . Denote by τ the reflection of Γ along the horizontal axis and by σ the rotation of Γ counterclockwise by $\pi/2$. Then we can describe G and some of its subgroups $H_1, H_2, H_3 \leq G$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \{e, \sigma, \sigma^2, \sigma^3, \tau, \tau\sigma, \tau\sigma^2, \tau\sigma^3\} \\ H_1 &= \{e, \tau, \tau\sigma^2, \sigma^2\} \\ H_2 &= \{e, \tau\sigma, \tau\sigma^3, \sigma^2\} \\ H_3 &= \{e, \sigma, \sigma^2, \sigma^3\} \end{aligned}$$

¹⁰This question, in the context of compact Lie groups acting on Riemannian manifolds, is addressed in [22].

Consider the following one dimensional representations of H_1 , H_2 and H_3 respectively:

$$(5.1) \quad R_1 : \{ e \mapsto (1), \tau \mapsto (-1), \tau\sigma^2 \mapsto (1), \sigma^2 \mapsto (-1) \}$$

$$(5.2) \quad R_2 : \{ e \mapsto (1), \tau\sigma \mapsto (1), \tau\sigma^3 \mapsto (-1), \sigma^2 \mapsto (-1) \}$$

$$(5.3) \quad R_3 : \{ e \mapsto (1), \sigma \mapsto (i), \sigma^2 \mapsto (-1), \sigma^3 \mapsto (-i) \}$$

These representations fulfill the condition in corollary 4: $\text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_2}^G R_2 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_3}^G R_3$ and thus we obtain that $\Gamma/R_1, \Gamma/R_2$ and Γ/R_3 are isospectral (figure 5.2).




FIGURE 5.2. The three isospectral graphs $\Gamma/R_1, \Gamma/R_2, \Gamma/R_3$. Neumann boundary conditions are assumed if nothing else is specified. D stands for Dirichlet boundary conditions and N for Neumann.

We now explain the process of building the graph Γ/R_1 . First we give an intuition which suffices to obtain the quotient in this case, and afterwards we strictly implement the method that is described in section 4.2. Going back to (3.4), we observe that the r.h.s. of it is

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H_1} (R_1, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \cong (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1},$$

where $(\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1}$ is the R_1 -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ (considered as a $\mathbb{C}H_1$ -module); the isomorphism is due to the fact that R_1 is one-dimensional, hence irreducible. Let us study the properties of $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1}$. We know (see (5.1)) that $\tau\tilde{f} = -\tilde{f}$, which means that \tilde{f} is an anti-symmetric function with respect to the horizontal reflection. We deduce that \tilde{f} vanishes on the fixed points of τ (marked with diamonds in figure 5.3(a)).




FIGURE 5.3. (a) The information we have on $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1}$. Diamonds mark the vertices on which the function vanishes and squares the vertices with zero derivative. (b) The quotient graph Γ/R_1 which encodes this information. D stands for Dirichlet boundary conditions and N for Neumann.

In a similar manner, we see that \tilde{f} is symmetric with respect to the vertical reflection since $\tau\sigma^2\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}$, and therefore the derivative of \tilde{f} must vanish at the corresponding points (the squares in figure 5.3(a)). Furthermore, it is enough to know the values of \tilde{f} restricted to the first quadrant (the bold subgraph in figure 5.3(a)) in order to deduce \tilde{f} on the whole graph, using the known action of the reflections, which follows from $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1}$:

$$(5.5) \quad \tau\tilde{f} = -\tilde{f}, \quad \tau\sigma^2\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}.$$

Our encoding is now complete and the quotient Γ/R_1 is the subgraph which lies in the first quadrant, with the boundary conditions of Dirichlet and Neumann in the appropriate locations as was found for \tilde{f} (figure 5.3(b)). The encoding is described by the map $\Psi : \text{Hom}_{CG}(R_1, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R_1)$ which is just the restriction map of functions in $\text{Hom}_{CG}(R_1, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) \cong \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)^{R_1}$ to the mentioned subgraph. An important observation is that given $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/R_1)$ it is possible to construct a unique function $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^{R_1}$ (using (5.5)), whose restriction to the first quadrant subgraph is f . It follows that Ψ is invertible and thus is an isomorphism. This ends the intuitive approach and we now proceed to the rigorous derivation.




FIGURE 5.4. (a) The graph Γ with the representatives of $E/H_1, V/H_1$ marked in bold. (b) The resulting quotient Γ/R_1 .

First, we add “dummy” vertices to the graph Γ so that no vertex is carried by the action of H_1 to one of its neighbors, and choose representatives $\{\tilde{e}^i\}_{i=1}^5$ for the orbits E/H_1 , and $\{\tilde{v}_k\}_{k=1}^6$ for the orbits V/H_1 . These representatives are marked in figure 5.4(a) by bold lines and points. The dummy vertices amongst the representatives are $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_5, \tilde{v}_6$. R_1 is one dimensional, and $d_i = 1$ for all i since the stabilizers of all edges are trivial. Therefore, the quotient graph is formed by taking one copy of each of the representative edges (figure 5.4(b)). Now, let us determine the boundary conditions using (4.4), (4.5). For all vertices we have $d = 1$ and therefore $A_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d = A_{\tilde{v}_k}$ and $B_{\tilde{v}_k} \otimes I_d = B_{\tilde{v}_k}$. Consider the vertex $v_k = v_3$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} n &= 3, & m &= 3, & d_{v_3} &= 3 \\ g_1 &= e, & \nu_1 &= \mu_1 = 1, & g_2 &= e, & \nu_2 &= \mu_2 = 2, & g_3 &= e, & \nu_3 &= \mu_3 = 3 \\ \mathfrak{G} &= I_3 & \Theta &= (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = \Theta' = I_3 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging all this into (4.4), (4.5) and using the boundary conditions on \tilde{v}_3 which are given by $A_{\tilde{v}_3} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_{\tilde{v}_3} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ gives Neumann boundary conditions for v_3 as well: $A_{v_3} = A_{\tilde{v}_3}$, $B_{v_3} = B_{\tilde{v}_3}$. Exactly the same treatment can be done for the vertex v_4 and the same boundary conditions are obtained. The case is different for the vertex v_5 :

$$\begin{aligned} n &= 2, & m &= 1, & d_{v_5} &= 1 \\ g_1 &= e, & \nu_1 &= \mu_1 = 4, & g_2 &= \tau, & \nu_2 &= \mu_2 = 4 \\ \mathfrak{G} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & \Theta &= (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = \Theta' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The boundary conditions on \tilde{v}_5 are of Neumann type as well: $A_{\tilde{v}_5} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_{\tilde{v}_5} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This time we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{v_5} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_{v_5} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

A_{v_5} and B_{v_5} are then reduced to square one dimensional matrices as expected, by removing the second row in both of them. We remain with $A_{v_5} = (2)$, $B_{v_5} = (0)$ which means Dirichlet boundary conditions on the vertex v_5 . The same boundary conditions are obtained for v_6 . Similar derivation for vertices v_1, v_2 gives Neumann boundary conditions for each one of them. The rigorous construction thus gives us the same quotient graph that was obtained by the intuitive method (figures 5.2(a), 5.3(b)).

The quotient Γ/R_2 can be constructed in a similar manner, and is shown in figure 5.2(b). We proceed to demonstrate the construction method for the quotient Γ/R_3 ¹¹. We first add the corners of the square as dummy vertices to Γ (\tilde{v}_1 in figure 5.5(a) is one of them). We are not obliged to do so, but it yields a quotient with simpler boundary conditions. The choice of representatives for the edges and the vertices is shown in figure 5.5(a) and the resulting quotient in figure 5.5(b).

The vertices v_2 and v_3 have Neumann boundary conditions exactly as their pre-




FIGURE 5.5. (a) The graph Γ with the representatives of $E/H_3, V/H_3$ marked in bold. (b) The resulting quotient Γ/R_3 . v_2, v_3 possess Neumann boundary conditions.

¹¹This result was obtained with G. Ben-Shach.

decessors, \tilde{v}_2 and \tilde{v}_3 . For v_1 we obtain more interesting boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\tilde{v}_1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & B_{\tilde{v}_1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ n &= 2, & m &= 2, & d_{v_1} &= 2, \\ g_1 &= e, & \nu_1 &= \mu_1 = 1, & g_2 &= \sigma, & \nu_2 &= \mu_2 = 4 \\ \mathfrak{G} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, & \Theta &= (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = \Theta' = I_2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(5.6) \quad A_{v_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{v_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Non-formally speaking, the vertex v_1 “applies a factor of i ” to the functions that cross it. The resulting graph is the one that was shown in figure 5.2(c).

In order to exhaust this example, we observe that $\text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_2}^G R_2 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_3}^G R_3$ is the two-dimensional irreducible representation of D_4 , which we denote by R . By theorem 3, the isospectral family of the three graphs given in figure 5.2 can be extended by adding any graph which is Γ/R . We therefore construct now such a graph. Let us use the intuitive approach first. Recall that (5.4) was the key for the intuitive construction of Γ/R_1 . Analogously to (5.4), we make the observation that encoding $\text{Hom}_{CG}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$, the r.h.s. of (3.4), is similar in nature to encoding $(\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^R$, the R -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$, as due to the simplicity of R as a CG -module the two are isomorphic. This can be understood as follows: making a choice of a basis $\{b_1, b_2\}$ for R , and given a function $\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{CG}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$, we have that $\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2} \in (\mathcal{H}(\Gamma))^R$ and furthermore $\{\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2}\}$ spans over \mathbb{C} a CG -module isomorphic to R . In order to exhibit the general behavior we avoid sparse matrices, and pick a basis $\{b_1, b_2\}$ for which the matrix representation of R is

$$(5.7) \quad \left\{ \tau\sigma^2 \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ -\sqrt{3} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tau\sigma^3 \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3} & -1 \\ -1 & -\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

It is enough to consider only the matrices of these two elements for the construction of the quotient.




FIGURE 5.6. (a) Two copies of the graph Γ with the representatives of $E/D_4, V/D_4$ marked in bold. These two copies are merely a visualization of the “basis functions” $\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2}$ on Γ . (b) The first stage in the formation of Γ/R is the gluing of both copies in the vertex v_4 , with the boundary conditions given in (5.12), (5.13) .

Examine the properties of $\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2}$ that follow from the above matrix representation (figure 5.6(a)). Since $\tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}_{CG}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$ we have $\tau\sigma^3 \tilde{f}_{b_1} = \tilde{f}_{(\tau\sigma^3)^{-1}b_1} = \tilde{f}_{\tau\sigma^3 b_1}$, and thus the first column of the matrix representing $\tau\sigma^3$ tells us that

$$(5.8) \quad \tau\sigma^3 \tilde{f}_{b_1} = \sqrt{3}/2 \tilde{f}_{b_1} - 1/2 \tilde{f}_{b_2}$$

$$(5.9) \quad \tau\sigma^3 \tilde{f}'_{b_1} = \sqrt{3}/2 \tilde{f}'_{b_1} - 1/2 \tilde{f}'_{b_2}$$

and enables us to relate the values and the derivatives of $\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2}$ on the vertex \tilde{v}_4 . Since \tilde{v}_4 is a fixed point under the action of $\tau\sigma^3$ and there are Neumann boundary conditions on it, we have that

$$(5.10) \quad \left(\tau\sigma^3 \tilde{f}_{b_1} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) = \tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4)$$

$$(5.11) \quad \left(\tau\sigma^3 \tilde{f}'_{b_1} \right) \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) = -\tilde{f}'_{b_1} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4).$$

Evaluating (5.8) on v_4 and combining this with (5.10) gives

$$(5.12) \quad (1 - \sqrt{3}/2) \tilde{f}_{b_1} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) + 1/2 \tilde{f}_{b_2} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) = 0.$$

Similarly, from (5.9) and (5.11) we obtain

$$(5.13) \quad (-1 - \sqrt{3}/2) \tilde{f}'_{b_1} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) + 1/2 \tilde{f}'_{b_2} \Big|_{\tilde{e}_3}(\tilde{v}_4) = 0.$$

We may therefore think of two copies of the graphs. Each of the basis functions $\tilde{f}_{b_1}, \tilde{f}_{b_2}$ resides on one of the copies, and the relations between the values and the derivatives of the functions allow us to take a subgraph out of each copy (marked in bold in figure 5.6(a)) and glue both of them together with the appropriate boundary conditions. The first stage in this gluing process, visualized in figure 5.6(b), is to identify the vertex \tilde{v}_4 in the two copies and turn it into the vertex v_4 of the quotient with the boundary conditions that were derived in (5.12), (5.13):

$$(5.14) \quad A_{v_4} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{v_4} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -1 - \sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

After treating similarly vertices \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2 we get the quotient Γ/R (figure 5.7) whose remaining boundary conditions are given by:

$$(5.15) \quad A_{v_1} = A_{v_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 3/2 & \sqrt{3}/2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{v_1} = B_{v_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -1/2 & \sqrt{3}/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$




FIGURE 5.7. The quotient graph Γ/R which is isospectral to the graphs in figure 5.2. The boundary conditions are as described in (5.14), (5.15).

We now use the rigorous approach for the same quotient, Γ/R . The representatives of the orbits E/G are $\{\tilde{e}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and the representatives of V/G are $\{\tilde{v}_k\}_{k=1}^4$ (figure 5.8(a)). This time the representation is not one dimensional ($d = 2$) so there are additional details to consider. First, note that we have two copies of each representative of E/G in the quotient and both of the copies survive since all edges have trivial stabilizers (figure 5.8(b)). This last observation ensures that we can take $B^i = B$ for all i (i.e., the same basis for all edges). We again take B to be the basis for which the matrix representation of R is (5.7).




FIGURE 5.8. (a) The graph Γ with the representatives of $E/D_4, V/D_4$ marked in bold. (b) The resulting quotient Γ/R .

We treat the boundary conditions at the vertices one by one:

- v_4 has the following data:

$$n = 2, \quad m = 1, \quad d_{v_4} = 2, \quad g_1 = e, \quad \nu_1 = \mu_1 = 3, \quad g_2 = \tau\sigma^3, \quad \nu_2 = \mu_1 = 3$$

$$\Theta = (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$A_{\tilde{v}_4}, B_{\tilde{v}_4}$ are the regular Neumann matrices and we therefore obtain

$$A_{v_4} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}/2 & -1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/2 & -\sqrt{3}/2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & 1+\sqrt{3}/2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$B_{v_4} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}/2 & -1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/2 & -\sqrt{3}/2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1+\sqrt{3}/2 & -1/2 \\ -1/2 & 1-\sqrt{3}/2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Noting that both A_{v_4} and B_{v_4} are of rank one, we see that they express the same boundary conditions as given in (5.14).

- v_1 obviously has the same boundary conditions as v_2 . We examine v_1 :

$$n = 2, \quad m = 1, \quad d_{v_1} = 2, \quad g_1 = e, \quad \nu_1 = \mu_1 = 1, \quad g_2 = \tau\sigma^2, \quad \nu_2 = \mu_1 = 1$$

$$\Theta = (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Again, $A_{\tilde{v}_1}$ and $B_{\tilde{v}_1}$ are the regular Neumann matrices and we get:

$$A_{v_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/2 & -\sqrt{3}/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3/2 & \sqrt{3}/2 \\ \sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$B_{v_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/2 & -\sqrt{3}/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{3}/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & -\sqrt{3}/2 \\ -\sqrt{3}/2 & 3/2 \end{pmatrix}$$

which are matrices of rank one and again we may reduce these matrices into two dimensional ones which are exactly those given in (5.15).

- The case of v_3 is a bit more interesting:

$$\begin{aligned} n &= 3, & m &= 3, & d_{v_3} &= 6, \\ g_1 &= e, & \nu_1 &= \mu_1 = 1, & g_2 &= e, & \nu_2 &= \mu_2 = 2, & g_3 &= e, & \nu_3 &= \mu_3 = 3 \\ \Theta &= (\Theta' \otimes I_d) = I_3 \otimes I_2 = I_6 \end{aligned}$$

As $A_{\bar{v}_3}$ and $B_{\bar{v}_3}$ are Neumann matrices, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{v_3} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot I_6 \cdot I_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ B_{v_3} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot I_6 \cdot I_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and we see that the above boundary conditions separate the edges into two sets, $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, e_1^3\}$ and $\{e_2^1, e_2^2, e_2^3\}$, each dominated by a regular Neumann condition. This enables us to split the vertex v_3 into two distinct vertices of degree 3, each connected to a different set of edges and possessing Neumann boundary conditions. We remark that this would happen for any choice of basis for R , as here $g_1 = g_2 = g_3 = e$.

Note that the resulting quotient is the same as was obtained previously (figure 5.7).

Finally, we repeat the construction for an arbitrary choice of basis which yields an orthogonal matrix representation for R . We can parametrize such a representation in the following way:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau\sigma^2 \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta & -2 \cos \theta \sin \theta \\ -2 \cos \theta \sin \theta & -\cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tau\sigma^3 \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 2 \cos \theta \sin \theta & \cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta \\ \cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta & -2 \cos \theta \sin \theta \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right\}.$$

For example, the basis we chose in (5.7) is obtained by $\theta = \pi/3$. As remarked, v_3 always splits into two vertices with Neumann conditions, so that figure 5.7 can describe the quotient with respect to any basis. For the parametrization above, we obtain the following boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{v_1} = A_{v_2} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 \sin^2 \theta & \sin 2\theta \\ \sin 2\theta & 2 - 2 \sin^2 \theta \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & A_{v_4} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \sin 2\theta & 2 \sin^2 \theta - 1 \\ 2 \sin^2 \theta - 1 & 1 + \sin 2\theta \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ B_{v_1} = B_{v_2} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 2 - 2 \sin^2 \theta & -\sin 2\theta \\ -\sin 2\theta & 2 \sin^2 \theta \end{pmatrix} & B_{v_4} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 + \sin 2\theta & 1 - 2 \sin^2 \theta \\ 1 - 2 \sin^2 \theta & 1 - \sin 2\theta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

All of these matrices are of rank one, and can therefore be reduced to square ones by deleting the appropriate rows¹². We thus get a continuous family of isospectral graphs. Examine two members of this family: $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 3\pi/4$. The boundary

¹²However, there is no a priori reduction which is valid for all θ !

conditions for the case $\theta = 0$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{v_1} = A_{v_2} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & A_{v_4} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ B_{v_1} = B_{v_2} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & B_{v_4} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

When applying this to figure 5.7, we notice that the vertices v_1, v_2 do not stay vertices of degree two, but rather, each of them splits into two vertices of degree one, one with Dirichlet boundary condition, and the other with Neumann. The vertex v_4 , however, stays connected and obtains Neumann boundary conditions. Observe that the resulting quotient is the one that we have already obtained as Γ/R_1 (figure 5.2(a)). In a similar manner, the quotient Γ/R_2 (figure 5.2(b)) is obtained from the choice $\theta = 3\pi/4$. We conclude by pointing out that the graph described in figure 5.7 is a good prototype for the mentioned isospectral family, yet it might also be misleading, since there are members of the family whose boundary conditions tear apart the edges connected to some of the vertices and thus change the connectivity of the graph. One should also pay attention to the fact that we have treated only orthogonal representations of D_4 . These are not the most general ones, and we may extend the isospectral family presented above by considering the broader case of all matrix representations of R . In particular, the quotient Γ/R_3 (figure 5.2(c)) is obtained from the unitary representation

$$\left\{ \sigma \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \tau \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

6. ISOSPECTRAL MANIFOLDS AND STRATIFOLDS

If Γ is a Riemannian manifold equipped with an action of a finite group G , then $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ is again a module over $\mathbb{C}G[x]$, with x acting as the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ . If however Γ has a boundary, at which differential boundary conditions are imposed on $C^\infty(\Gamma)$, then in general it is no longer closed under Δ . In order to treat this case as well, we limit our attention to the subspace of $C^\infty(\Gamma)$ spanned by Δ 's eigenfunctions, which we again denote by $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$. Assuming that the boundary conditions are linear, $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ is closed under Δ and is therefore a $\mathbb{C}G[x]$ -module as before. Section 3 is naturally generalized to these settings:

- For a representation R of G , we define a Γ/R -manifold to be a Riemannian manifold (possibly with boundary, at which homogeneous conditions are imposed) Γ' , such that there is an isomorphism

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{H}(\Gamma') \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(R, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))$$

intertwining the Laplace-Beltrami operator.

- For a representation R of $H \leq G$, Γ/R and $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$ are isospectral; therefore, $\Gamma/\mathbb{C}G$ is isospectral to Γ , and for representations R_1, R_2 of $H_1, H_2 \leq G$ satisfying $\text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_2}^G R_2$, Γ/R_1 and Γ/R_2 are isospectral.

The main advantage of quantum graphs for our purposes is that under fairly moderate assumptions (e.g., self-adjoint Laplacian or a free action) one can build a quotient for every representation, as is demonstrated in section 4.

Graphs are one-dimensional manifolds with singularities (at the vertices), and it is these singularities that we exploit, by endowing them with the appropriate boundary conditions, to encapsulate the restrictions arising from a choice of a representation. In higher dimensions, manifolds with a boundary, carrying Neumann, Dirichlet, or a more complicated boundary condition, are a generalization of this

idea, and one goal of this section is to demonstrate that some known isospectral examples of such objects can be understood using our theory. That is, we show that for some known isospectral pairs the manifold and boundary conditions are such that the objects are quotients (in the sense of definition 1) of a common manifold by two representations with isomorphic inductions in some supergroup of symmetries.

It turns out, however, that in order to form a quotient by a general representation we need more singularities than just boundaries (at least via our construction). A graph is a one dimensional manifold when all of its vertices are of degree two, and a manifold with boundary when all vertices are of degree at most two. Unfortunately, even if a graph has one of these properties, its quotient by a multidimensional representation (as constructed in section 4) need not have either, since the degrees of the vertices are multiplied, in general, by the dimension of the representation.

Carrying over the construction method of section 4 to general Riemannian manifolds (e.g., by replacing graphs with higher dimensional simplicial structures) yields objects we might call “quantum-stratifolds”. In general, these consist of several Riemannian manifolds of the same dimension “glued” along their boundaries by homogeneous boundary conditions (so in dimension one, we obtain the notion of quantum graphs). When a boundary condition involves the boundaries of more than two manifolds, the result is no longer a manifold, but rather a stratifold. Even though this is in general the case, by choosing an appropriate action, representation and bases, it is possible to obtain manifolds even when taking a quotient by a multidimensional representation.

6.1. Isospectral drums. In [26, 27], Jakobson et al., and Levitin et al., respectively, obtain several examples of isospectral domains with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions, all of which can be interpreted as quotients with respect to representations sharing a common induction. As a basic demonstration of the generalization of our theory to higher dimensions, we reconstruct an isospectral pair consisting of a square and a triangle with mixed boundary conditions (figure 1 in [27], 6.1 here).



FIGURE 6.1. The two isospectral domains presented in [27], obtained as quotients of the square \mathbb{S} (figure 6.2) by the representations in (5.1), (5.2). Solid lines indicate Dirichlet boundary conditions and dotted ones Neumann.

This example rests upon our acquaintance D_4 , so that we can reuse the definitions and results of section 5. In place of the graph in figure 5.1, we now consider the full square \mathbb{S} , with Dirichlet boundary conditions, and with $G = D_4$ acting as one would expect (figure 6.2).

The domains in figure 6.1 are quotients of the square \mathbb{S} (figure 6.2) by the representations R_1 and R_2 of $H_1, H_2 \leq G$, which are defined in (5.1), (5.2). Since $\text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1 \cong \text{Ind}_{H_2}^G R_2$, the two domains are isospectral.




FIGURE 6.2. The square \mathbb{S} , and the axes of reflection elements in D_4 .

We demonstrate the construction of \mathbb{S}/R_1 . Recalling that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H_1}(R_1, \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S})) \cong (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$, we have again that $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}/R_1)$ should encode the R_1 -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S})$. \mathbb{T} , the first quadrant of \mathbb{S} (figure 6.3(a)), is a fundamental domain for the action of H_1 , so that given $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{T})$ it is possible to construct at most one function in $(\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$ whose restriction to \mathbb{T} is f . Thus, the restriction map $\Psi : (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{T})$ is injective. In order for it to be surjective, we must impose suitable boundary conditions on \mathbb{T} . From (5.1) we obtain information on $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$. Since such \tilde{f} is anti-symmetric with respect to the action of τ , it must vanish at the horizontal axis of reflection, and therefore every $f \in \text{im } \Psi$ vanishes at the lower edge of \mathbb{T} . Similarly, every $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$ is symmetric with respect to $\tau\sigma^2$, so that its normal derivative at the vertical axis of reflection is zero, and thus all functions in $\text{im } \Psi$ have vanishing normal derivatives at the left edge of \mathbb{T} . This information, summarized in figure 6.3(a), suggests the domain presented in figure 6.3(b) as the quotient \mathbb{S}/R_1 : a square identical to \mathbb{T} , three of whose edges have Dirichlet boundary condition and one Neumann.




FIGURE 6.3. (a) The fundamental domain \mathbb{T} for \mathbb{S}/H_1 ; every $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$ vanishes along the dashed line and has zero normal derivative at the dotted line. (b) The quotient planar domain \mathbb{S}/R_1 which encodes this information. The solid lines represent Dirichlet boundary conditions and the dotted one Neumann. (c) The square \mathbb{S}' of which (b) is a smooth quotient; along the dashed lines functions need only be once continuously differentiable.

Once these boundary conditions are imposed on \mathbb{S}/R_1 , Ψ is indeed onto: for $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}/R_1)$ which obeys them, we define a function \tilde{f} on \mathbb{S} by $\tilde{f}|_{\mathbb{T}} = f$, $\tau\tilde{f} = -\tilde{f}$,

$\tau\sigma^2\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}$, $\sigma^2\tilde{f} = -\tilde{f}$. While \tilde{f} is well defined on the vertical $\tau\sigma^2$ -axis even if f does not obey any boundary conditions, it is the requisition that f vanish on the lower edge of \mathbb{T} that guarantees that \tilde{f} is well defined on the horizontal τ -axis. In a similar manner, while at the τ -axis the two one-sided normal derivatives of \tilde{f} agree a priori, it is the Neumann condition at the left edge of \mathbb{T} which ensures this at the $\tau\sigma^2$ -axis. The boundary conditions thus assure that \tilde{f} is well defined and continuously differentiable, and being piecewise smooth and a sum of Laplacian eigenfunctions, it is smooth, and therefore in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S})$, so that $f = \Psi\tilde{f} \in \text{im } \Psi$. As Ψ and its inverse are obviously $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -linear, we have established $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H_1}(R_1, \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S})) \cong (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1} \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}/R_1)$, as the definition of a \mathbb{S}/R_1 -domain in (6.1) calls for.

Analogously, from the properties of $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_2}$ we can deduce the corresponding quotient \mathbb{S}/R_2 . This process is summarized in the two parts of figure 6.4.




FIGURE 6.4. (a) The information we have on $\tilde{f} \in (\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}))^{R_2}$: it vanishes along the dashed line and has zero normal derivative at the dotted line. (b) The quotient planar domain \mathbb{S}/R_2 which encodes this information. The solid lines represent Dirichlet boundary conditions and the dotted one Neumann.

We return once more to the question of smooth quotients, which was raised in section 4.3.1. It turns out that even with the boundary conditions we have imposed on \mathbb{S}/R_1 , Ψ is not surjective as a function from $(C^\infty(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$ to $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}/R_1)$. Consider for example the smooth function x^2y^2 , when regarding the lower-left corner of \mathbb{T} as the origin¹³. It is not the restriction of any function in $(C^\infty(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$. It is the restriction of a function in $(C^1(\mathbb{S}))^{R_1}$, namely, $x^2y \cdot |y|$. Once again we encounter the problem of modeling smooth structures by differential boundary conditions of degree one, which was addressed in section 2. In fact, Ψ establishes an isomorphism $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}/R_1) \cong (C^\infty(\mathbb{S}'))^{R_1}$, where \mathbb{S}' is \mathbb{S} after the addition of two “Neumann lines of degree two” at the axes of reflection corresponding to τ and $\tau\sigma^2$ (figure 6.3(c)); it is a square divided into four, such that a smooth function on \mathbb{S}' is by definition a function which is smooth on each inner (closed) square, and satisfies the Neumann condition where two squares meet, or equivalently, is C^1 at the τ and $\tau\sigma^2$ axes. Had we proceeded by the rigorous method presented in section 4.2, we would have added these Neumann lines before the construction, in order to allow a fundamental

¹³It is not really a function on \mathbb{T} , since it does not vanish at the right and upper edges. This can be rectified by taking $x^2y^2(x^2-1)(y^2-1)$ instead, but it would clutter the argument.

domain which is a subcomplex¹⁴. Again, this could be justified by the preservation of spectral properties: we have, as for graphs, that $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}')$, so that a \mathbb{S}/R -quotient (now in the sense of definition 1) is the same thing as a \mathbb{S}'/R -quotient.

We remark that the various constructions demonstrated in section 5 can be applied analogously to \mathbb{S} , enriching the isospectral pair in figure 6.1. For example, \mathbb{S}/R_3 would be an orbifold with a line that applies a factor of i to functions crossing it. The other isospectral families in [26, 27] can be obtained from various representations of the general dihedral groups D_n , and of the product $D_4 \times D_4$. The interested reader will find some of these constructions in [14].

6.2. The Gordon-Webb-Wolpert drums. In a similar fashion, we can apply our method to the Gordon-Webb-Wolpert construction [3, 4], obtaining their isospectral planar domains with new boundary conditions. We follow the exposition of Buser et al. [5], who obtain the mentioned drums as follows: they consider G_0 , a group of motions of the hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H} (*444 in Conway's orbifold notation), and an epimorphism $\pi : G_0 \rightarrow G = \mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$. In G they exhibit two subgroups A and B , each isomorphic to S_4 , that satisfy the Sunada condition [1] with respect to G . The quotients of \mathbb{H} by $\pi^{-1}(A)$ and $\pi^{-1}(B)$ are isometric domains. Both are composed of seven copies of a hyperbolic triangle (which is a fundamental domain for the action of G_0), assembled in different configurations (which are determined by the coset structure of the pre-images). Finally, by replacing the fundamental hyperbolic triangle with a suitable Euclidean one, the non-isometric isospectral drums of Gordon et al. are obtained.

An elegant formulation of the Sunada condition for H_1 and H_2 in G is that the inductions of the trivial representations $\mathbf{1}_{H_1}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{H_2}$ to G are isomorphic, i.e.

$$(6.2) \quad \mathrm{Ind}_{H_1}^G \mathbf{1}_{H_1} \cong \mathrm{Ind}_{H_2}^G \mathbf{1}_{H_2}.$$

In fact, the connection between A and B is stronger than this (reflecting a line-point duality in the Fano plane): it turns out that for every representation R of S_4 , $\mathrm{Ind}_A^G R \cong \mathrm{Ind}_B^G R$. For each such R , we can thus construct an isospectral pair by taking the quotient of \mathbb{H} by the pullbacks of R to $\pi^{-1}(A)$ and $\pi^{-1}(B)$. Taking $R = \mathbf{1}_{S_4}$ will produce once again the planar drums of Gordon et al. In fact, we shall see in section 6.3 that taking quotient (in our sense) by the trivial representation of a group is equal to taking quotient (in the classical sense) by the group. Taking R to be the sign representation of S_4 , and again replacing the fundamental hyperbolic triangles with Euclidean ones, we obtain the same drums but with different boundary conditions (figure 6.5).

We conclude this example by pointing out that in [5] a wide variety of isospectral pairs is presented, using various symmetry groups of \mathbb{H} . All these examples can be exploited to construct other isospectral pairs, as isomorphic inductions may be found either from Sunada triples or by taking appropriate sums of irreducible representations.

¹⁴Each pair of opposite sides in \mathbb{S} is swapped by some element in H_1 , and as in dimension one we did not allow a vertex to be moved to a neighbor by a group element, neither should be lines allowed to, in dimension two. In a more general view, for $\mathrm{Fix}_7 \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathrm{Fix}_{\tau\sigma^2} \mathbb{S}$ to be each a subcomplex of \mathbb{S} , \mathbb{S} must be subdivided (by Neumann lines) into \mathbb{S}' .




FIGURE 6.5. The isospectral drums of Gordon et al. with new boundary conditions.

6.3. The Sunada method. We recall the classical theorem of Sunada [1]:

If G acts freely on a Riemannian manifold Γ , and $H_1, H_2 \leq G$ satisfy (6.2), then Γ/H_1 and Γ/H_2 are isospectral manifolds.

Sunada's theorem follows from the definition and corollary at the beginning of the current section, once we show that for a finite group G acting freely on a manifold Γ , the quotient manifold Γ/G is a $\Gamma/1_G$ -manifold, that is,

$$(6.3) \quad \mathcal{H}(\Gamma/G) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(\mathbf{1}_G, \mathcal{H}(\Gamma)) .$$

This follows from the observation that $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(\mathbf{1}_G, C^\infty(\Gamma))$ corresponds naturally to $C^\infty(\Gamma)^{1_G} = C^\infty(\Gamma)^G$, the trivial component of $C^\infty(\Gamma)$, and this is the space of functions on Γ which are stable under all elements of G . But these are exactly the functions which factor through Γ/G , hence $C^\infty(\Gamma/G) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}G}(\mathbf{1}_G, C^\infty(\Gamma))$, and in particular (6.3) follows.

Remark. We can view the preceding argument as yet another proof for Sunada's theorem, but this would be presumptuous. In fact, Pesce [28] uses Frobenius Reciprocity in exactly the same manner to reprove Sunada's theorem. A survey of different proofs for Sunada's theorem, among them Pesce's, can be found in [9].

7. SUMMARY AND OPEN QUESTIONS

The main construction presented in this paper is that of objects denoted Γ/R , where R is a complex representation of a finite group acting on a geometric object Γ . For such Γ and R there can be, in general, many objects so denoted, and they are all isospectral to one another. Furthermore, these objects are defined so that whenever $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H_1}(R_1, _) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}H_2}(R_2, _)$, where each R_i is a representation of a group H_i acting on Γ , there is also an isospectrality between Γ/R_1 and Γ/R_2 . The consequences of this are explored in section 3, and in particular we find two convenient means for the construction of isospectral objects:

Starting with a group G : take subgroups $H_1, H_2 \leq G$ and corresponding representations R_1, R_2 sharing a common induction in G ¹⁵. For any object Γ on which G acts by symmetries, Γ/R_1 and Γ/R_2 are isospectral.

Starting with an object Γ : find a group G acting on Γ and construct $\Gamma/\mathbb{C}G$ (by some choice of representatives and bases, as explained in section 4.2). Any quotient thus obtained is isospectral to Γ itself, by the analogue of proposition 2 for arbitrary geometric objects.

It is natural to ask to what extent the various methods for obtaining isospectral objects overlap. For example, in section 5, three isospectral graphs (figure 5.2) are obtained from representations with isomorphic inductions, but at the end of the same section it is demonstrated that all of them (together with others) could have also been obtained as Γ/R for a single R (by different choices of bases). Can one expect that given a basis for R , there is always a basis for $\text{Ind}_H^G R$ with respect to which Γ/R and $\Gamma/\text{Ind}_H^G R$ are isometric?

Even when limiting to the basic quotient construction, questions arise. For R and Γ as above, we have a family of isospectral objects Γ/R , varying as one moves between different choices of bases in the construction, as explained in section 4.2 and demonstrated in the last part of section 5. This family has the topology of a manifold, being parametrized by the action of a general linear group on the space of possible bases. Surveying this continuum of quotient objects, one might ask where along it occur changes in the shape of the objects (in contrast with only boundary condition changes), in the number of connected components, etc. One can look for certain types of objects in this continuum, such as manifolds, billiards, objects with real boundary conditions, or ones with a self-adjoint Laplacian. Such questions seem to lead to a deeper research in differential and algebraic geometry, investigating the critical points at which changes occur or the algebraic varieties at which certain conditions are fulfilled. Except for the basic demonstration of these phenomena in section 5, we have not treated these questions.

We list some more questions that seem interesting, and which we have not regarded:

- Γ is naturally a $\Gamma/\mathbb{C}G$ -graph. Does it occur by our construction? It seems that the answer is yes, by taking G as a basis for $\mathbb{C}G$, but we have not shown this.
- Given two isospectral objects, can it be decided algorithmically whether they are representation-quotients of a common object?
- What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the quotients constructed in section 4.2 to be proper quotient graphs (in contrast with generalized ones)? Exact quantum graphs? Graphs with a self-adjoint Laplacian?
- Can the isomorphism (3.4) be made natural, in a suitable category? This can be interpreted both as (contravariant) functoriality in R , or as functoriality in Γ , which would require a definition of quantum graph morphisms.

¹⁵This resembles the Sunada condition, but is dramatically easier to achieve, since we are free to take any representations of the subgroups (instead of only the trivial ones). A systematic approach would be to take all irreducible characters of subgroups of G , induce them to G , find linear dependencies, and sum the corresponding representations accordingly. Also, any H_1 and R_1 are usable with $H_2 = G$, by taking $R_2 = \text{Ind}_{H_1}^G R_1$.

- Can the theory presented in this paper be applied to discrete graphs? To representations of Lie groups acting on Riemannian manifolds?
- It is clear that $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma \amalg \Gamma') = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\Gamma')$, so that $\sigma_{\Gamma \amalg \Gamma'} \equiv \sigma_{\Gamma} + \sigma_{\Gamma'}$, and given bases for R and R' , their union is a basis for $R \oplus R'$ with respect to which $\Gamma/R \oplus R'$ is isometric to $\Gamma/R \amalg \Gamma'/R'$. Is there an operation \otimes on graphs, or general geometric object, which gives $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma \otimes \Gamma') = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{H}(\Gamma')$, so that $\sigma_{\Gamma \otimes \Gamma'} \equiv \sigma_{\Gamma} \cdot \sigma_{\Gamma'}$? What about convolution: $\sigma_{\Gamma \star \Gamma'} \equiv \sigma_{\Gamma} \star \sigma_{\Gamma'}$?
- A classical conjecture, originally aimed at Riemannian manifolds¹⁶ [29]: for $G = \text{Aut}\Gamma$, and $R = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i$, where $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^r$ are the irreducible representations of G , is $\sigma_{\Gamma}^R \leq 1$?

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is an honor to acknowledge U. Smilansky, who is the initiator of this work and an enthusiastic promoter of it, and a pleasure to thank Z. Sela for his support and encouragement. We are grateful to M. Sieber for sharing with us his notes, which led to the construction of the isospectral pair of dihedral graphs. We are indebted to I. Yaakov whose wise remark has led us to examine inductions of representations. It is a pleasure to acknowledge G. Ben-Shach for the fruitful discussions which promoted the research. We thank D. Schüth for the patient examination of the work and the generous support. The comments and suggestions offered by J. Brüning, L. Friedlander, O. Post, Z. Rudnick, and M. Solomyak are highly appreciated. The work was supported by the Minerva Center for non-linear Physics and the Einstein (Minerva) Center at the Weizmann Institute, by an ISF fellowship, and by grants from the GIF (grant I-808-228.14/2003), and BSF (grant 2006065).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Sunada, *Riemannian coverings and isospectral manifolds*, Ann. of math. **121** 169-186,(1985).
- [2] M. Kac, *Can one hear the shape of a drum?*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **73** (1966) 1-23.
- [3] C. Gordon, D. Webb and S. Wolpert, *One cannot hear the shape of a drum*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **27** 134-138 (1992).
- [4] C. Gordon, D. Webb and S. Wolpert, *Isospectral plane domains and surfaces via Riemannian orbifolds*, Invent. math. **110** 1-22 (1992).
- [5] P. Buser, J. Conway, P. Doyle and K.-D. Semmler, *Some Planar Isospectral Domains*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **9** (1994), 391-400.
- [6] J. Milnor, *Eigenvalues of the Laplace operator on certain manifolds*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, **51** (1964), 542.
- [7] C. Gordon, P. Perry and D. Schueth, *Isospectral and isoscattering manifolds: A survey of techniques and examples*. Contemp. Math. 387 (2005), 157-179.
- [8] R. Brooks, *Constructing isospectral manifolds*, Amer. Math. Monthly 95 823-39 (1988).
- [9] R. Brooks, *The Sunada method*, Contemp. Math **231** 25-35 (1999).
- [10] S. Gnutzmann and U. Smilansky, *Quantum Graphs: Applications to Quantum Chaos and Universal Spectral Statistics*, Advances in Physics **55** (2006) 527-625.
- [11] P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs: I. Some basic structures*, Waves in Random Media 14, S107 (2004).
- [12] P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs: an introduction and a brief survey*, Proc. Symp. Pure. Math., AMS (2008), pp. 291 - 314.
- [13] V. Kostykin and R. Schrader, *Neumann's rule for quantum wires*, J. Phys. A 32 (1999), 595-630.

¹⁶This question, in the context of quantum graphs, was suggested to us by L. Friedlander.

- [14] R. Band, O. Parzanchevski and G. Ben-Shach, *The Isospectral Fruits of Representation Theory: Quantum Graphs and Drums*, preprint arXiv:0812.2282.
- [15] B. Gutkin and U. Smilansky, *Can One Hear the Shape of a Graph?*, J. Phys A. **31** (2001), 6061-6068.
- [16] J. P. Roth, *Le spectre du Laplacien sur un graphe*, Proceedings of the Colloque J. Deny Orsay 1983, Lect. Not. Math. **1096**, 521-539 (1984).
- [17] J. von Below, *Can One Hear the Shape of a Network?*, "Partial Differential Equations on Multistructures" Lecture notes in pure and applied mathematics, **219**, Marcel Dekker Inc. New York, (2000) 19-36.
- [18] I. Oren, Private communication (2008).
- [19] T. Shapira and U. Smilansky, *Quantum graphs which sound the same*, Proceedings of the NATO advanced research workshop, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2004, In Press.
- [20] R. Band, T. Shapira and U. Smilansky, *Nodal domains on isospectral quantum graphs: the resolution of isospectrality?*, J. Phys. A.: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 13999-14014.
- [21] B. Webster, *A Mackey Functor Approach to Sunada's Theorem*, preprint.
- [22] J. Brüning and E. Heintze, *Représentations des groupes d'isométries dans les sous-espaces propres du laplacien*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris 286 (1978), pp. 921-923.
- [23] J. Bolte and S. Endres, *The trace formula for quantum graphs with general self-adjoint boundary conditions*, preprint arXiv:0805.3111.
- [24] P. Buser, *Isospectral Riemann Surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier XXXVI (1986), pp.167-192.
- [25] P. Berard, *Transplantation et Isospectralité I*, Math. Ann. 292 (1992), pp. 547-559.
- [26] D. Jakobson, M. Levitin, N. Nadirashvili, and I. Polterovich, *Spectral problems with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions: isospectrality and beyond*, J. Comp. and Appl. Math. **194** (2004), 141-155.
- [27] M. Levitin, L. Parnovski, and I. Polterovich, *Isospectral domains with mixed boundary conditions*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., **39** (2005), 2073-2082.
- [28] H. Pesce, *Variétés Isospectrales et Représentations des Groupes*, Contemp. Math. 173 (1994), pp. 231-240.
- [29] E.P. Wigner, *Group Theory and its Applications to the Quantum Mechanics of Atomic Spectra*, Academic Press, 1959.

¹ INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM 91904, ISRAEL
E-mail address: parzan@math.huji.ac.il

² DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS OF COMPLEX SYSTEMS, THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, REHOVOT 76100, ISRAEL
E-mail address: rami.band@weizmann.ac.il