

Hypergraph Automorphisms

Raffaella Mulas^{1,2}, Rubén J. Sánchez-García¹, and Ben D. MacArthur^{1,2}

¹Mathematical Sciences, University of Southampton, UK

²The Alan Turing Institute, London, UK

ABSTRACT

We outline a general theory of automorphisms for oriented hypergraphs and show how automorphism group structure affects the spectrum of the hypergraph normalised Laplacian.

1 Introduction

Many real-world complex systems can be modelled as networks in which vertices represent system elements and edges pairwise interactions between elements [1, 2]. This approach allows powerful tools from graph theory to be used to analyse complex systems in numerous domains – from technological networks such as power grids, the internet and world-wide-web to biological networks such as food webs and molecular interaction networks, and social networks such as those that arise in online social media – and has been tremendously successful in discerning important structural and dynamical properties of the complex systems they represent [3].

Notably, a number of features are common to many disparate real-world networks, yet are not observed in classical random graph ensembles. Examples include the presence of highly connected ‘hub’ vertices [4], over-representation of important sub-graphs or ‘motifs’ [5] and the presence of local clustering [6]. In recent years it has also become clear that many real-world networks also contain a large amount of structural redundancy (i.e. duplication of structural features), which is also not expected in classical random graphs and which, in turn, relates to robustness and resilience of the underlying system.

Mathematically, the presence of structural redundancy is quantified by the network automorphism group [7]. This association allows tools from group theory to be used in network analysis and has seen a number of fruitful applications most notably in studies of robustness and resilience, efficient communication, group consensus, anonymization, compression, and patterns of network collective dynamics such as synchronisation [7–11].

However, graph theory-based analyses necessarily only consider system elements and their *pairwise* interactions. In many cases, higher-order interactions are also important and can play a significant part in system function [12]. There is increasing interest in accounting for such higher-order structures, for example by encoding system structures either as simplicial complexes, which can be analysed using tools from algebraic topology, or, more generally, as hypergraphs. Both approaches have proven successful and are active areas of current research [13–15].

The role of higher-order interactions is particularly important when considering systems of chemical reactions. For example, proteins typically perform their functions in cells by via interacting physically to form chemical complexes. While protein-protein interaction networks enumerate possible pairwise interactions, they are not able to unambiguously capture the formation of higher order complexes involving three or more proteins. More generally, biochemical reactions typically involve more than two reactants and/or products. Thus, complex systems of biochemical reactions are not well described using the language of graph theory. Yet, they can be well modelled using hypergraphs which allow *hyperedges* involving more than two vertices.

Here we develop a general theory of automorphisms for *oriented hypergraphs*: a generalisation of classical hypergraphs




Figure 1. The chemical hypergraph in Example 2.2.

with the additional structure that each vertex in a hyperedge is either an input or an output. Oriented hypergraphs are a class of chemical hypergraphs, which were introduced in [14] with the aim of modelling chemical reaction networks, and Laplace operators for chemical hypergraphs have been established. Their spectral properties, as well as possible applications, have been widely studied, see [14, 16–22], yet a general framework to study chemical hypergraph automorphisms is still lacking.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide an overview of some required definitions related to chemical and oriented hypergraphs. In Section 3 we show how the classical theory of graph automorphisms can be extended to hypergraphs, and outline some key differences between graph and hypergraph automorphisms. In Section 4 we propose a further extension of this theory that takes hyperedge signs into account.

2 Preliminary definitions

Definition 2.1 ([14]). A **chemical hypergraph** is a pair $\Gamma = (V, H)$ where V is a finite set of **vertices** and H is a set such that every element $h \in H$ is a pair of non-empty subsets of vertices $h = (h_{in}, h_{out})$ (input and output, not necessarily disjoint), that is, $h_{in}, h_{out} \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. The elements of H are called the **oriented hyperedges** (or, simply, **hyperedges**). Changing the orientation of a hyperedge h means exchanging its input and output, leading to the pair (h_{out}, h_{in}) . The **vertices of a hyperedge** $h = (h_{out}, h_{in})$ are the elements of $h_{in} \cup h_{out} \subseteq V$. A **catalyst** in a hyperedge h is a vertex that is both an input and an output for h . Two vertices in $i, j \in h$ are called **co-oriented** if $i, j \in h_{in}$ or $i, j \in h_{out}$, and **anti-oriented** otherwise.

Remark 2.1. A general hypergraph can be seen as a chemical hypergraph with $h_{out} = \emptyset$ (or, alternatively, $h_{in} = \emptyset$) for all $h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H$. In this sense, chemical hypergraphs generalise the standard notion of a hypergraph [23].

Example 2.2. The chemical hypergraph in Figure 1 has five vertices v_1 to v_5 and two hyperedges h_1 and h_2 . The hyperedge h_1 has v_2 as input, v_3 as output and v_1 as a catalyst, and the hyperedge h_2 has v_3 and v_4 as inputs and v_5 as output.

This concept and terminology are motivated by biochemical networks [14]. Each vertex may be thought of as a chemical element and each hyperedge as a chemical reaction involving the elements that it contains as vertices (i.e. reactants and/or products of the reaction). The input-output structure then represents the reactant-product structure of chemical reactions, and catalysts are the analogue of chemical catalysts: elements that participate in a reaction but are not changed by it (see Fig. 1).

Definition 2.3 ([24]). Γ is an **oriented hypergraph** if there are no catalysts, that is, if $h_{in} \cap h_{out} = \emptyset$ for all hyperedges $h = (h_{in}, h_{out})$.

Definition 2.4 ([17]). The **degree** of a vertex i is the number of hyperedges containing i only as an input or only as an

output, that is,

$$\deg(i) := |\{h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H \mid i \in h_{in} \setminus h_{out} \text{ or } i \in h_{out} \setminus h_{in}\}|.$$

Definition 2.5 ([17]). The **cardinality** of a hyperedge h is the number of vertices in h that are not a catalyst

$$\text{card}(h) := |(h_{in} \setminus h_{out}) \cup (h_{out} \setminus h_{in})|.$$

For an oriented (catalyst-free) hypergraph, $\deg(i)$ is simply the number of hyperedges containing i , and $\text{card}(h)$ is the number of vertices in h . Note that both degree and cardinality ignore the presence of catalysts: we can remove a catalyst i from an hyperedge h without affecting the degree or cardinality of any vertex (including i) or hyperedge. In particular, adding or removing catalysts will not change the definitions in this article, including those of adjacency and Laplacian matrix (see below) and so, without loss of generality, we shall focus on oriented hypergraphs from now on.

For the rest of this article, let us fix such an oriented hypergraph $\Gamma = (V, H)$ on n vertices labelled $1, 2, \dots, n$ (that is, we assume $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$) and m hyperedges h_1, \dots, h_m . We also assume that Γ has no vertices of degree zero, that is, every vertex belongs to at least one hyperedge. We define the following matrices associated with Γ .

Definition 2.6 ([14]). The $n \times m$ **incidence matrix** of Γ is $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(\Gamma) = (\mathcal{I}_{ih})_{i \in V, h \in H}$, where

$$\mathcal{I}_{ih} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in h_{in} \\ -1 & \text{if } i \in h_{out} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We call \mathcal{I}_{ih} the **sign** of vertex i in hyperedge h , and use the ‘+’ or ‘−’ symbols to represent non-zero signs in a graphical representation of a hypergraph (e.g. Fig. 1).

Definition 2.7 ([24]). The $n \times n$ diagonal **degree matrix** of Γ is $D = D(\Gamma) = (D_{ij})$, where

$$D_{ij} := \begin{cases} \deg(i) & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given vertices $i, j \in V$, let us write $\deg^+(i, j)$ for the number of hyperedges in which i and j are co-oriented, and $\deg^-(i, j)$ for the number of hyperedges in which i and j are anti-oriented. Note that $\deg(i) = \deg^+(i, i)$ and $\deg^-(i, i) = 0$, as Γ is catalyst-free, and they are both symmetric functions: $\deg^\pm(i, j) = \deg^\pm(j, i)$ for all $i, j \in V$.

Definition 2.8 ([24]). The $n \times n$ **adjacency matrix** of Γ is the symmetric matrix $A = A(\Gamma) = (A_{ij})$, where $A_{ii} = 0$ for all i and

$$A_{ij} := \deg^-(i, j) - \deg^+(i, j) \tag{1}$$

for all $i \neq j$.

Definition 2.9 ([24]). The $n \times n$ **Laplacian matrix** of Γ is $\Delta = \Delta(\Gamma) = (\Delta_{ij})$, where $\Delta = D - A$. That is,

$$\Delta_{ij} := \deg^+(i, j) - \deg^-(i, j) \tag{2}$$

for all i, j .

Definition 2.10. The $n \times n$ **normalised Laplacian matrix** of Γ , $L = L(\Gamma) = (L_{ij})$, is $L = D^{-1}\Delta = I - D^{-1}A$, where I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. (Note that D is invertible as we have removed all vertices of degree 0.) The entries of L are

$$L_{ij} := \frac{\deg^+(i, j) - \deg^-(i, j)}{\deg(i)} \quad (3)$$

for all i, j .

The Laplacian matrix Δ is symmetric but the normalised Laplacian L is not. However, L is spectrally equivalent to the symmetric matrix

$$\mathcal{L} := D^{1/2}LD^{-1/2} \quad (4)$$

(see e.g. [18, Remark 2.14]) and thus has real spectrum.

Remark 2.2. The terminology and matrices introduced so far generalise the similar concepts in graph theory. A simple graph $G = (V, E)$ with a choice of edge orientations is the same as a chemical hypergraph $\Gamma = (V, H)$ with $|h_{in}| = |h_{out}| = 1$ for all $h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H$. The hypergraph Γ is oriented (catalyst-free) if and only if G does not have self-loops. In this case, the degree of a vertex in Γ is the same as in G , $d^+(i, j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and $d^-(i, j) = 1$ if i and j are connected by an edge, and 0 otherwise. In particular, the degree, adjacency and Laplacian matrices for Γ coincide with the usual definitions from graph theory for G .

Remark 2.3. Note that the incidence matrix \mathcal{I} uniquely determines the hypergraph, but, unlike graphs, this is *not* true for the adjacency or Laplacian matrices: two distinct hypergraphs may have the same adjacency, or Laplacian, matrix.

Example 2.11. Let $\Gamma = (V, H)$ and $\Gamma' = (V, H')$ be two hypergraphs with vertex set $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ and hyperedge sets $H = \{h_1, h_2\}$ and $H' = \{h'_1, h'_2\}$, where

- h_1 has v_1 as input and v_2 as output, and h_2 has v_1 and v_2 as inputs and v_3 as output;
- h'_1 has v_1 as input and v_3 as output, and h'_2 has v_2 as input and v_3 as output.

These two hypergraphs are distinct (Γ' is a graph but Γ is not), but have the same adjacency matrix,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(The cancellation $\deg^-(1, 2) - \deg^+(1, 2) = 1 - 1 = 0$ for Γ is undetected by this matrix.)

Each of the matrices above can be associated with a linear operator on the vertices and/or edges of Γ , obtained by left multiplication by the corresponding matrix.

We let $C(V)$ be the vector space of functions $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and we let $C(H)$ be the space of functions $\gamma: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Using this notation, the incidence, adjacency and Laplacian matrices can be seen as operators $\mathcal{I}: C(V) \rightarrow C(H)$, $A: C(V) \rightarrow C(V)$, $\Delta: C(V) \rightarrow C(V)$, and $L: C(V) \rightarrow C(V)$, respectively, given by left matrix multiplication. For example, the normalised Laplacian $L: C(V) \rightarrow C(V)$ is given by $f \mapsto \Delta \cdot f$ (left matrix multiplication by L), that is, for each $i \in V$,

$$Lf(i) := \frac{1}{\deg(i)} \left(\sum_{\substack{h \in H \text{ s.t.} \\ i \in h_{in}}} \left(\sum_{j \in h_{in}} f(j) - \sum_{k \in h_{out}} f(k) \right) - \sum_{\substack{h \in H \text{ s.t.} \\ i \in h_{out}}} \left(\sum_{j \in h_{in}} f(j) - \sum_{k \in h_{out}} f(k) \right) \right).$$

3 Hypergraph automorphisms

Recall that the spectrum of a matrix is the multiset of its eigenvalues. Throughout this paper, we will focus on the spectrum of the normalised Laplacian L (or, equivalently, on the spectrum of the matrix \mathcal{L} defined in (4)). Given Γ , we define the **spectrum of Γ** as the spectrum of $L(\Gamma)$; we define the **adjacency spectrum of Γ** as the spectrum of $A(\Gamma)$.

3.1 Motivation and Preliminary Results

In this section, we discuss the effect of various simple structural features of an oriented hypergraph on its spectrum following [18, 19], in order to motivate some general results later. We start with some definitions that are needed to understand these features.

Definition 3.1 ([18]). Two distinct vertices i and j are **duplicate** if the corresponding rows (equivalently, columns) of the adjacency matrix are the same, that is, if $A_{ik} = A_{jk}$ (or, equivalently, $A_{ki} = A_{kj}$) for all $k \in V$. In particular, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = A_{ii} = 0$.

Definition 3.2 ([19]). Two distinct vertices i and j are **twin** if they belong to exactly the same set of hyperedges, with the same orientations, that is,

$$i \in h_{in} \iff j \in h_{in} \text{ and } i \in h_{out} \iff j \in h_{out},$$

for all $h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H$.

Note that if i and j are twin then $\deg^\pm(i, k) = \deg^\pm(j, k)$, and hence $A_{ik} = A_{jk}$, for all $k \in V \setminus \{i, j\}$. Moreover, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = -\deg(i) = -\deg(j)$. Therefore, twin vertices cannot be duplicate vertices and vice versa.

Recall that, in oriented hypergraphs, every vertex has a sign for each hyperedge in which it is contained (Definition 2.6). By reversing signs, we can define anti-duplicate and anti-twin vertices, as follows.

Definition 3.3. Two vertices i and j are **anti-duplicate** if the corresponding rows (equivalently, columns) of the adjacency matrix have opposite sign, that is, if $A_{ik} = -A_{jk}$ (or, equivalently, $A_{ki} = -A_{kj}$) for all $k \in V$. In particular, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = A_{ii} = 0$.

Definition 3.4. Two vertices i and j are **anti-twin** if they belong exactly to the same set of hyperedges, with opposite orientations, that is,

$$i \in h_{in} \iff j \in h_{out} \text{ and } i \in h_{out} \iff j \in h_{in},$$

for all $h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H$.

Note that if i and j are anti-twin then $\deg^\pm(i, k) = \deg^\pm(j, k)$, and hence $A_{ik} = -A_{jk}$, for all $k \in V \setminus \{i, j\}$. Moreover, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = \deg(i) = \deg(j)$. Therefore, anti-twin vertices cannot be anti-duplicate vertices and vice versa.

In [18] it is shown that k duplicate vertices produce the eigenvalue 1 with multiplicity at least $k - 1$. Similarly, in [19] it is shown that k twin vertices produce the eigenvalue 0 with multiplicity at least $k - 1$. Our purpose here is to interpret these specific results in more general terms.

3.2 Hypergraph automorphism groups

The results of the previous section show that simple structural features can leave signatures in the hypergraph spectrum. In this section, we show that these results are specific instances that arise from a general theory of hypergraph automorphisms, adapting the work in [7, 8, 25] for hypergraphs and considering the normalised Laplacian instead of the adjacency matrix.

Definition 3.5. A **hypergraph automorphism** is a permutation p of the vertices of Γ that preserves hyperedges, that is,

$$p(h) = (p(h_{in}), p(h_{out})) \in H \quad \text{for all } h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H.$$

(We write $p(S) = \{p(s_1), \dots, p(s_k)\}$ whenever $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq V$.)

Note that, since p is invertible, it also induces a permutation on the hyperedges of Γ , $h \mapsto p(h)$.

Notably, hypergraph automorphisms induce automorphisms of the adjacency and Laplacian matrices, as follows.

Definition 3.6. An **adjacency automorphism** is a permutation p of the vertices of a hypergraph that preserves adjacency, that is, $A_{p(i)p(j)} = A_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, where $A = A(\Gamma)$. We can write this in matrix form as

$$AP = PA, \tag{5}$$

where $P = (P_{ij})$ is the permutation matrix representing p , that is, $P_{ij} = 1$ if $p(i) = j$, and 0 otherwise.

A **Laplacian-automorphism** is an adjacency-automorphism p that also preserves degrees, that is, $\deg(i) = \deg(p(i))$, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Remark 3.1. If p is a Laplacian-automorphism and P is the permutation matrix representing p , then $\Delta P = P\Delta$ and $LP = PL$, that is, p preserves both the Laplacian and the normalized Laplacian.

Proposition 3.7. *Every hypergraph automorphism is a Laplacian automorphism, and every Laplacian automorphism is an adjacency automorphism. The reciprocals of these statements hold if Γ is a graph, but not in general.*

Schematically, for graphs:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{adjacency automorphisms}\} &= \{\text{Laplacian automorphisms}\}, \\ &= \{\text{graph automorphisms}\}, \end{aligned}$$

while for hypergraphs:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{adjacency automorphisms}\} &\supseteq \{\text{Laplacian automorphisms}\}, \\ &\supseteq \{\text{hypergraph automorphisms}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If p is a hypergraph automorphism, then clearly $\deg^\pm(i, j) = \deg^\pm(p(i), p(j))$ for all $i, j \in V$ and, in particular, $\deg(i) = \deg^+(i, i) = \deg(p(i))$. From Eq. 1 it is clear that p is a Laplacian automorphism. Moreover, by definition, it is clear that any Laplacian automorphism is also an adjacency automorphism. The case when Γ is a graph is well-known and straightforward. \square

We can now describe duplicate and twin vertices in terms of automorphisms.

Proposition 3.8. *Let Γ be an oriented hypergraph.*

- (i) *If two vertices $i, j \in V$ are duplicate then the transposition $p = (i j)$ is an adjacency automorphism.*
- (ii) *If two vertices $i, j \in V$ are duplicate and $\deg(i) = \deg(j)$, then the transposition $p = (i j)$ is a Laplacian automorphism.*
- (iii) *If two vertices $i, j \in V$ are twin then the transposition $p = (i j)$ is a hypergraph automorphism.*

The converses of these statements are not necessarily true.

(For anti-duplicate and anti-twin vertices, see Proposition 4.5.)

Proof. (i) Let $A = A(\Gamma)$ and let P be the permutation matrix of the transposition $p = (i\ j)$ (see Definition 3.6). Clearly, AP is the matrix A with the i th and j th rows swapped, and PA is the matrix A with the i th and j th columns swapped. By Definition 3.1, the i th row, respectively column, of A equals the j th row, respectively column, of A . In particular, $AP = PA$ and p is an adjacency automorphism. The converse is not true: $AP = PA$ if and only if the i th row (and column) of A equals the j th row (and column) of A , except possibly $A_{ii} = A_{jj} \neq A_{ij} = A_{ji}$. In that situation, $p = (i\ j)$ is an adjacency automorphism but i and j are not duplicate.

(ii) This point follows easily from (i) and from the definition of Laplacian automorphism. The converse is not true: assume that $\deg(i) = \deg(j)$ and the i th row (and column) of A equals the j th row (and column) of A , except $A_{ii} = A_{jj} \neq A_{ij} = A_{ji}$. In that case, $p = (i\ j)$ is a Laplacian automorphism but i and j are not duplicate.

(iii) If i and j are twin and $h \in H$, then $i, j \in h_{in}$, or $i, j \in h_{out}$, or neither i nor j are vertices in h . In all cases, $p(h) = h$, that is, p acts trivially on hyperedges. In particular, $p(h) \in H$ for all $h \in H$ and p is a hypergraph automorphism. The converse is not true: it is easy to find a hypergraph automorphism of the form $p = (i\ j)$ not acting as trivially on hyperedges. \square

3.3 Spectral Results

In this section, we discuss the effects of the presence of automorphisms on the spectrum of the normalised Laplacian. We assume some familiarity with the results in [7], [25] or [8].

Definition 3.9. Given a permutation of the vertices p , its **support** is

$$\text{supp}(p) := \{i : p(i) \neq i\}.$$

Two permutations are **disjoint** if their supports are non-intersecting.

The set of Laplacian-automorphisms together with the composition forms a group, denoted $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Let $1 \notin S$ be a set of generators of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and let $S = S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_l$ be the (unique) irreducible partition of S into support-disjoint subsets. Let \mathcal{P}_j be the subgroup generated by S_j . Then,

$$\text{Aut}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_l \tag{6}$$

is the unique, irreducible direct product decomposition of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, analogous to the one in [7, Equation 1]. We call (6) the **geometric decomposition of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$** . Furthermore, for each $j = 1, \dots, l$ we let

$$M_j := \bigcup_{\tau \in S_j} \text{supp}(\tau)$$

and we let

$$V := V_0 \sqcup M_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup M_l$$

be the **geometric decomposition of Γ** , where V_0 is the set of fixed points that are not moved by any Laplacian-automorphism.

Definition 3.10. The **orbit** of $i \in V$ is

$$\mathcal{O}(i) := \{p(i) : p \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)\}$$

and, as in [7], the **network redundancy** is

$$r := \frac{\#\mathcal{O} - 1}{n},$$

where $\#\mathcal{O}$ is the number of orbits of Γ .

Remark 3.2. Since $1 \leq \#\mathcal{O} \leq n$,

$$0 \leq r \leq \frac{n}{n-1} < 1.$$

Also, $r = 0$ if and only if $\#\mathcal{O} = 1$ which happens if and only if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong S^n$ and therefore all vertices are strongly symmetric. On the other hand, $r = \frac{n}{n-1}$ if and only if $\#\mathcal{O} = n$, i.e. if and only if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is trivial and therefore there are no symmetries at all.

Definition 3.11. Given a partition of the vertex set $V = V_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup V_l$, the $l \times l$ **quotient matrix** of \mathcal{L} is $Q(\mathcal{L}) := (Q_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha\beta}$, where

$$Q_{\alpha\beta} := \frac{1}{|V_\alpha|} \cdot \sum_{i \in V_\alpha, j \in V_\beta} \mathcal{L}_{ij}.$$

Remark 3.3. Note that the quotient matrix can be written as follows. Let $K := \text{diag}(|V_1|, \dots, |V_l|)$ and let S be the $n \times l$ characteristic matrix of the partition, that is, each column K_j is the characteristic vector of the set V_j . Then,

$$Q(\mathcal{L}) = K^{-1} S^\top \mathcal{L} S.$$

Also, $Q(\mathcal{L})$ is not necessarily symmetric and this motivates us to give the following definition.

Definition 3.12. Given a partition of the vertex set $V = V_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup V_l$, the **symmetric quotient matrix** of \mathcal{L} as the $l \times l$ symmetric matrix $Q^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{L})$ with entries

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{sym}} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V_\alpha| \cdot |V_\beta|}} \cdot \sum_{i \in V_\alpha, j \in V_\beta} \mathcal{L}_{ij}.$$

Remark 3.4. The symmetric quotient matrix of \mathcal{L} can be written as

$$Q^{\text{sym}} = K^{-1/2} S^\top \mathcal{L} S K^{-1/2} = K^{1/2} Q K^{-1/2}.$$

Hence, Q^{sym} and Q are similar, which implies that they are isospectral. Also, f is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue λ for Q^{sym} if and only if $K^{-1/2} f$ is eigenfunction of λ for Q .

From here on, we shall always refer to the quotient matrix and to the symmetric quotient matrix of \mathcal{L} with respect to the partition of V into orbits, which is clearly equitable.

Proposition 3.13. *The spectrum of L consists of the spectrum of $Q^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{L})$ (with eigenvectors that are constant on each orbit) together with the eigenvalues belonging to eigenvectors that sum to zero on each orbit.*

Proof. Use the following facts:

- By [26, Lemma 2.3.1], the spectrum of \mathcal{L} consists of the spectrum of $Q(\mathcal{L})$ (with eigenvectors that are constant in the parts of the partition) together with the eigenvalues belonging to eigenvectors that sum to zero on each part of the partition.
- By Remark 3.4, $Q(\mathcal{L})$ is isospectral to $Q^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{L})$.
- By [18, Remark 2.14], L is isospectral to \mathcal{L} and f is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue λ for \mathcal{L} if and only if $D^{1/2} f$ is eigenfunction of λ for L .
- If f is either constant in the parts of the partition, or it sums to zero on each part of the partition, then the same holds for $D^{1/2} f$, since the vertices belonging to the same set of the partition have the same degree.

□




Figure 2. The 5-hyperflower with 3 twins on 25 nodes (left-hand side) and its quotient network (right-hand side). In the quotient network, the vertex α represents the core vertices of the hyperflower, while β represents the peripheral nodes.

Definition 3.14. The **quotient network** of Γ , denoted $Q(\Gamma)$, is the (unique) weighted, undirected graph with self-loops that has adjacency matrix $Q^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{L})$.

In view of the last definition, we can rewrite Proposition 3.13 as follows.

Corollary 3.15. *The spectrum of Γ consists of the adjacency spectrum of its quotient network (with eigenvectors that are constant on each orbit) together with the eigenvalues belonging to eigenvectors that sum to zero on each orbit.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.13, together with the fact that the adjacency matrix of $Q(\Gamma)$ is $Q^{\text{sym}}(\mathcal{L})$. □

Example 3.16 (Hyperflowers). Consider the l -hyperflower with t -twins introduced in [19] and shown in Figure 2(a). This is a hypergraph $\Gamma = (V, H)$ with only inputs whose vertex set can be written as $V = W \sqcup V_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup V_l$, where each V_j has cardinality l , and the hyperedge set is given by

$$H = \{h_j = W \cup V_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, l\}.$$

As shown in [19, Lemma 6.12], the spectrum of Γ is given by:

- 0, with multiplicity $n - l$.
- t , with multiplicity $l - 1$. As corresponding eigenfunctions one can choose the f_j 's, for $j \in \{2, \dots, l\}$, that are 1 on V_1 , -1 on V_j and 0 otherwise.
- $\lambda_n = n - tl + t$ and the constant functions are the corresponding eigenfunctions.

It's easy to see that Γ has two orbits and, in this case, the adjacency-automorphisms coincide with the Laplacian-automorphisms. In particular, the network redundancy is $r = 1/n$. Also, the quotient network has two vertices α and β

representing the core vertices and the peripheral vertices of Γ , respectively). Its adjacency matrix is Q^{sym} , where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{sym}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V_\alpha| \cdot |V_\beta|}} \cdot \sum_{i \in V_\alpha, j \in V_\beta} \left(-\frac{A_{ij}}{\sqrt{\deg(i) \deg(j)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-tl)(tl)}} \cdot (n-tl)(tl) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \\ &= \sqrt{(n-tl)t} \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\alpha\alpha}^{\text{sym}} &= \frac{1}{|V_\alpha|} \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,j): i \neq j \in V_\alpha} \left(-\frac{A_{ij}}{\deg(i)} \right) + \sum_{i \in V_\alpha} 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|V_\alpha|} \cdot \left(|V_\alpha| \cdot (|V_\alpha| - 1) + |V_\alpha| \right) \\ &= |V_\alpha| = n - tl \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\beta\beta}^{\text{sym}} &= \frac{1}{|V_\beta|} \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,j): i \neq j \in V_\beta} \left(-\frac{A_{ij}}{\deg(i)} \right) + \sum_{i \in V_\beta} 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{tl} (tl(t-1) + tl) = t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the quotient network has edges (α, β) , (α, α) and (β, β) with weights given by $\sqrt{(n-tl)t}$, $n-tl$ and t , respectively.

For the hyperflower in Figure 2(a), for instance, the edge (α, β) has weight $\sqrt{30}$, the loop (α, α) has weight $n-tl = 10$ and the loop (β, β) has weight $t = 3$ (Figure 2(b)). Therefore

$$Q^{\text{sym}} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & \sqrt{30} \\ \sqrt{30} & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It's easy to check that the eigenvalues of this matrix are 13 and 0. Therefore, in this case, Proposition 3.13 tells us that:

- 0 and 13 are eigenvalues for the hyperflower, with eigenvectors that are constant on the peripheral vertices and constant on the core vertices;
- The other eigenvalues of the hyperflower belong to eigenvectors that sum to zero on the peripheral nodes and also on the core vertices.

Indeed, already know by [19, Lemma 6.12] that both 13 and 0 are eigenvalues. We also know that the constants are eigenfunctions for 13 (and clearly these are constant on each orbit). Furthermore, we also know from [19, Lemma 6.12] that the eigenfunctions for t , an eigenvalue for Γ that does not belong to the spectrum of the quotient matrix, sum to zero on each orbit.

4 Signed Automorphisms

Oriented and, more generally, chemical hypergraphs have additional automorphisms induced by sign changes. In this section, we define signed automorphisms, and study their effect on the hypergraph spectrum.

As shown in [14, Lemma 49], if we reverse the role of a vertex v in all the hyperedges in which it is contained, i.e. if we let it become an input where it is an output and vice versa, the spectrum doesn't change, while the eigenfunctions differ by a change of sign on v . Hence, more generally, given an oriented hypergraph Γ we can reverse the role of r vertices v_1, \dots, v_r and obtain a hypergraph Γ' which is isospectral to Γ ; on Γ' we can then apply the theory of Laplacian automorphisms and we can translate the results on the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions for Γ' in terms of Γ . We formalize this idea as follows.

Definition 4.1. Let $\sigma : V = \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$ be a sign function. Given a permutation p of the vertices, we define $p^\sigma : V \rightarrow \{\pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}$ by letting

$$p^\sigma(i) := \sigma(i) \cdot p(i)$$

and we say that p^σ is a **signed permutation** of the vertices.

Definition 4.2. Given a sign function $\sigma : V = \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$, we let $\sigma(\Gamma)$ be the oriented hypergraph constructed from Γ by reversing the role of the vertices i such that $\sigma(i) = -1$, in all hyperedges in which they are contained. We say that the quotient network $\mathcal{Q}(\sigma(\Gamma))$ of $\sigma(\Gamma)$ is a **signed quotient network** of Γ .

Definition 4.3. A **signed hypergraph automorphism** is a signed permutation p^σ of the vertices of Γ such that

$$p(h) = (p(h_{in}), p(h_{out})) \in H(\sigma(\Gamma)) \quad \text{for all } h = (h_{in}, h_{out}) \in H(\Gamma).$$

A **signed adjacency automorphism** is a signed permutation p of the vertices of Γ such that $(A(\Gamma))_{p(i)p(j)} = (A(\sigma(\Gamma)))_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

A **signed Laplacian-automorphism** is a signed adjacency-automorphism p^σ that preserves also degrees, that is, $\deg(i) = \deg(p(i))$, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We denote by $\text{Aut}_{\text{signed}}(\Gamma)$ the group of signed Laplacian-automorphisms of Γ .

Definition 4.4. The **signed orbit** of $i \in V$ is

$$\mathcal{O}^\sigma(i) := \{p^\sigma(i) : p^\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\text{signed}}(\Gamma)\}.$$

In order to make functions on orbits well defined, given $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we let

$$f(-i) := -f(i), \quad \text{for } i \in V.$$

The following proposition is the analogue of Proposition 3.8 for anti-twin and anti-duplicate vertices.

Proposition 4.5. *Let Γ be an oriented hypergraph. Given $i, j \in V$, let p be the transposition $p = (i, j)$ and let σ be the sign function such that $\sigma(i) = -1$ and $\sigma(k) = +1$, for all $k \in V \setminus \{i\}$.*

- (i) *If i and j are anti-duplicate then p^σ is a signed adjacency automorphism.*
- (ii) *If i and j are anti-duplicate and $\deg(i) = \deg(j)$, then p^σ is a signed Laplacian automorphism.*
- (iii) *If i and j are anti-twin then p^σ is a signed hypergraph automorphism.*

The converses of these statements are not necessarily true.

Proof. Analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.8. □

Proposition 4.6. Let $\sigma : V \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$. The spectrum of Γ consists of the adjacency spectrum of $Q(\sigma(\Gamma))$ (with eigenvectors that are constant on each signed orbit) together with the eigenvalues belonging to eigenvectors that sum to zero on each signed orbit.

Proof. By [14, Lemma 49], it easily follows that λ is an eigenvalue for $\sigma(\Gamma)$ with eigenfunction f if and only if λ is an eigenvalue for Γ with eigenfunction $\sigma \cdot f$, where $\sigma f(i) := \sigma(i) \cdot f(i)$. Together with Corollary 3.15, this proves the claim. \square

Example 4.7 (Signed Hyperflower). If we consider again the hyperflowers in Example 3.16, in which all vertices are always inputs, and we let one vertex v become an output in all hyperedges in which it is contained, then the theory of (unsigned) Laplacian-automorphisms cannot detect the symmetries in the spectrum which come from v . However, by choosing the sign function $\sigma : V \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$ that has value -1 on v and value $+1$ otherwise, applying Proposition 4.6 we can indeed detect the symmetries coming from v .

The theory of signed automorphisms also allows us to define a more precise notion of redundancy, as follows.

Definition 4.8. The **signed network redundancy** is

$$r_{\text{signed}} := \min_{\sigma: V \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}} \frac{\#\mathcal{O}^\sigma - 1}{n}$$

Remark 4.1. By choosing $\sigma : V \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$ that has value $+1$ on all vertices, we have that $\mathcal{O}^\sigma(i) = \mathcal{O}(i)$ for each $i \in V$, therefore

$$r_{\text{signed}} = \min_{\sigma: V \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}} \frac{\#\mathcal{O}^\sigma - 1}{n} \leq \frac{\#\mathcal{O} - 1}{n} = r.$$

Hence, the signed redundancy is more precise than the unsigned one. In the case of Example 4.7, for instance, $r_{\text{signed}} = 1/n$ while $r = 2/n$.

References

1. M. Newman. *Networks*. Oxford university press, 2018.
2. A.-L. Barabási et al. *Network science*. Cambridge university press, 2016.
3. M. E.J. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM review*, 45(2):167–256, 2003.
4. A. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
5. R. Milo, S. Shen-Orr, S. Itzkovitz, N. Kashtan, D. Chklovskii, and U. Alon. Network motifs: simple building blocks of complex networks. *Science*, 298(5594):824–827, 2002.
6. D.J. Watts and S.H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.
7. B.D. MacArthur, R.J. Sánchez-García, and J.W. Anderson. Symmetry in complex networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(18):3525–3531, 2008.
8. R.J. Sánchez-García. Exploiting symmetry in network analysis. *Commun. Phys.*, 3(87), 2020.
9. L.M. Pecora, F. Sorrentino, A.M. Hagerstrom, T.E. Murphy, and R. Roy. Cluster synchronization and isolated desynchronization in complex networks with symmetries. *Nature communications*, 5(1):1–8, 2014.
10. I. Klickstein, L. Pecora, and F. Sorrentino. Symmetry induced group consensus. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 29(7):073101, 2019.

11. W. Wu, Y. Xiao, W. Wang, Z. He, and Z. Wang. K-symmetry model for identity anonymization in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on extending database technology*, pages 111–122, 2010.
12. G. Carlsson. Topology and data. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2):255–308, 2009.
13. A.J. Zomorodian. *Topology for computing*, volume 16. Cambridge university press, 2005.
14. J. Jost and R. Mulas. Hypergraph Laplace operators for chemical reaction networks. *Advances in Mathematics*, 351:870–896, 2019.
15. S. Klamt, U.U. Haus, and F. Theis. Hypergraphs and cellular networks. *PLoS Comput Biol.*, 5(5), 2009. 2009 May; 5(5): e1000385.
16. R. Mulas, C. Kuehn, and J. Jost. Coupled dynamics on hypergraphs: Master stability of steady states and synchronization. *Phys. Rev. E*, 101:062313, 2020.
17. R. Mulas. Sharp bounds for the largest eigenvalue of the normalized hypergraph Laplace Operator. *Mathematical Notes*, 2020. To appear.
18. R. Mulas and D. Zhang. Spectral theory of Laplace Operators on chemical hypergraphs. arXiv:2004.14671.
19. E. Andreotti and R. Mulas. Spectra of Signless Normalized Laplace Operators for Hypergraphs. arXiv:2005.14484.
20. J. Jost, R. Mulas, and D. Zhang. p-Laplace operators for chemical hypergraphs. arXiv:2007.00325.
21. R. Mulas. Spectral classes of hypergraphs. arXiv:2007.04273.
22. A. Abiad, R. Mulas, and D. Zhang. Coloring the normalized Laplacian for oriented hypergraphs. arXiv:2008.03269.
23. A. Bretto. Hypergraph theory. *An introduction. Mathematical Engineering. Cham: Springer*, 2013.
24. N. Reff and L. Rusnak. An oriented hypergraphic approach to algebraic graph theory. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 437:2262–2270, 2012.
25. B.D. MacArthur and R.J. Sánchez-García. Spectral characteristics of network redundancy. *Physical Review E*, 80(2), 2009.
26. A. E. Brouwer and W. H. Haemers. *Spectra of Graphs*. Springer, New York, NY, 2012.