

# Discrete-to-Continuous Extensions: piecewise multilinear extension, min-max theory and spectral theory

Jürgen Jost\*, Dong Zhang\*

## Abstract

We introduce the homogeneous and piecewise multilinear extensions and the eigenvalue problem for locally Lipschitz function pairs, in order to develop a systematic framework for relating discrete and continuous min-max problems. This also enables us to investigate spectral properties for pairs of  $p$ -homogeneous functions and to propose a critical point theory for zero-homogeneous functions. The main contributions are:

- (1) We provide several min-max relations between an original discrete formulation and its piecewise multilinear extension. We introduce the concept of perfect domain pairs to view comonotonicity on vectors as an extension of inclusion chains on sets. The piecewise multilinear extension is (slice-)rank preserving, which closely relates to Tao's lemma on diagonal tensors. More discrete-to-continuous equalities are obtained, including a general form involving log-concave polynomials. And by employing these fundamental correspondences, we get further results and applications on tensors, Turán's problem, signed (hyper-)graphs, etc.
- (2) We derive the mountain pass characterization, linking theorems, nodal domain inequalities, inertia bounds, duality theorems and distribution of eigenvalues for pairs of  $p$ -homogeneous functions. We establish a new property on the subderivative of a convex function which relates to the Gauss map of the graph of the convex function. Based on these fundamental results, we can analyze the structure of eigenspaces in depth. For example, we show a simple one-to-one correspondence between the nonzero eigenvalues of the vertex  $p$ -Laplacian and the edge  $p^*$ -Laplacian of a graph. We can also apply the theory to Cheeger inequalities and  $p$ -Laplacians on oriented hypergraphs and simplicial complexes. Also, the first nonlinear analog of Huang's approach for hypergraphs is provided.

**Keywords:** piecewise multilinear extension; combinatorial optimization; saddle point problem; min-max principle; critical point theory; inertia bound; Turán problems; adjacency tensors

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 90C47, 47J10, 34K08

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstrasse 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. Email addresses: [jost@mis.mpg.de](mailto:jost@mis.mpg.de) (Jürgen Jost), [dzhang@mis.mpg.de](mailto:dzhang@mis.mpg.de) and [13699289001@163.com](mailto:13699289001@163.com) (Dong Zhang).

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Spectral theory for homogeneous function pairs</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Characterization of the second eigenvalue . . . . .	16
2.2	Inertia bounds and a nodal domain inequality . . . . .	21
2.3	Collatz-Wielandt formula for the largest eigenvalue . . . . .	23
2.4	Structure of eigenspaces . . . . .	24
2.5	Duality and convex conjugate . . . . .	27
<b>3</b>	<b>Homogeneous and piecewise multilinear extensions</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1	Min-max relation on Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory . . . . .	40
3.2	Saddle point problems and von Neumann type min-max theorems . . . . .	44
<b>4</b>	<b>Applications in various areas</b>	<b>50</b>
4.1	Turán problem and Motzkin-Straus theorem . . . . .	50
4.2	$p$ -Laplacians generated by Lovász extension . . . . .	52
4.3	Tensors and their eigenvalues . . . . .	59
4.4	Signed (hyper-)graphs . . . . .	61
4.5	Spectral theory on simplicial complexes . . . . .	64
4.6	Other applications on extension and duality . . . . .	74

## 1 Introduction

In his millennium paper [58], Lovász wrote: *Connections between discrete and continuous may be the subject of mathematical study on their own right.* In fact, over the last few decades, many firm bridges between the discrete data world and the field of continuous mathematics have been established, and they are not only interesting in themselves, but also helpful and stimulating in both pure and applied mathematics.

A natural and important idea for connecting discrete and continuous problems is by considering the discrete space as a subset of some Euclidean space and then extending or interpolating discrete functions to continuous ones. A systematic scheme for such extension was provided in the fundamental works of Choquet and Lovász [13,57]. It was further developed in a series of works of the machine learning group of Hein [46,47], and in recent works by the authors [22,54,55]. For example, concerning optimization, there have been various schemes to solve combinatorial optimization problems by means of continuous optimization methods, including continuous reformulations [7,47,57,81] and continuous relaxations [10,39,63], which turn out to be powerful. In this work, we also present some results for both the reformulations and relaxations via our extension theory.

In the continuous case, the functions that are best suited for optimization are the convex ones. In fact, convex analysis has become a well developed and important subjects, with ramifications in most areas of mathematics. In the discrete case, a


role that is in some sense analogous to that of convex functions is played by the submodular functions [13, 57], and their analysis was systematically developed by many mathematicians (such as Fujishige [34], Murota [70, 71], Dress et al [28]) from different viewpoints. In fact, submodularity is a kind of ‘discrete convexity’, and the Lovász extension turns submodular functions into convex ones. This scheme has been applied in many areas like game theory, matroid theory, stochastic processes, electrical networks, computer vision and machine learning. In this direction, we have systematically investigated submodularity via multi-way Lovász extensions in [55].

Extension theory is useful, however, also beyond the convex or submodular setting. It can be more widely applied to optimization [46, 47, 55], critical point theory and Morse theory [54], to cite just some examples. It is therefore natural to systematically consider min-max theory from the perspective of extension theory. Such a min-max theory includes, for instance, saddle point problems, von Neumann’s min-max theorem [56, 73, 80] or Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory. A main contribution of this paper therefore is to reveal the connections between discrete min-max problems and continuous min-max reformulations from different viewpoints.

In particular, in graph theory and its extensions, many problems can be considered as saddle point problems. For example, eigenvalues are characterized as critical values of Rayleigh quotients, and more generally, problems related to eigenvectors, such as properties of nodal domains, can also be seen from that perspective. The same holds for other fundamental graph theoretical problems, like Cheeger cuts. Such problems find their natural place in nonlinear spectral theory. Previous research indicates that we can explore the corresponding nonlinear spectral graph theory with the help of the corresponding continuous objective function. Accordingly, besides the practical need of designing continuous optimization algorithms for combinatorial problems, these continuous versions enable us to reconsider the combinatorial problems from the viewpoint of spectral theory. Thus, we develop a systematic spectral theory for a pair of homogeneous and locally Lipschitz functions, as a solid foundation of extension methods.

Based on the extension theory and the spectral theory, we provide general, yet user-friendly tools that can be used when attacking discrete models arising in applications. More concretely, continuing the study in [55], we systematically develop further applications, such as the nodal domain theorem and inertia bounds involving adjacency tensors of uniform hypergraphs, inertia bounds for the graph  $p$ -Laplacian, the  $k$ -way Cheeger inequality on oriented hypergraphs, the eigenvalues of tensors, Cheeger-type inequalities for Hodge Laplacians on simplicial complexes, and spectral estimates for signed hypergraphs. These results indicate that the extension theory might be an excellent universal approach to understand the discrete problems via their continuous extensions.

The general structure that we are exploring can be compactly represented in the following diagram:



Some of the above relations are discussed and investigated in [54, 55], and in this paper, we will complete the above framework in particular by relating discrete and continuous saddle points and eigenvalue problems.

For simplicity, we begin with the following **piecewise bilinear extension**:

Given  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and its power set  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ , for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\sigma, \tau : V \cup \{0\} \rightarrow V \cup \{0\}$  be permutations such that  $x_{\sigma(1)} \leq x_{\sigma(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{\sigma(n)}$ ,  $y_{\tau(1)} \leq \dots \leq y_{\tau(n)}$  and  $\sigma(0) = \tau(0) = 0$  with  $x_0 := y_0 := 0$ .

For a discrete function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V) \times \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the *piecewise bilinear extension* of  $f$  at  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is

$$f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1} (x_{\sigma(i+1)} - x_{\sigma(i)})(y_{\tau(j+1)} - y_{\tau(j)}) f(V^{\sigma(i)}(\mathbf{x}), V^{\tau(j)}(\mathbf{y})), \quad (1)$$

where  $V^{\sigma(i)}(\mathbf{x}) := \{j \in V : x_j > x_{\sigma(i)}\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ ,  $V^0(\mathbf{x}) = V$ , and the definition of  $V^{\tau(j)}(\mathbf{y})$  is analogous. We can rewrite (1) in an integral form as

$$\begin{aligned} f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \int_{\min \mathbf{y}}^{\max \mathbf{y}} \int_{\min \mathbf{x}}^{\max \mathbf{x}} f(V^t(\mathbf{x}), V^s(\mathbf{y})) dt ds + \min \mathbf{x} \int_{\min \mathbf{y}}^{\max \mathbf{y}} f(V, V^s(\mathbf{y})) ds \\ &\quad + \min \mathbf{y} \int_{\min \mathbf{x}}^{\max \mathbf{x}} f(V^t(\mathbf{x}), V) dt + \min \mathbf{x} \min \mathbf{y} f(V, V), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\min \mathbf{x} := \min_{i=1, \dots, n} x_i$ ,  $\max \mathbf{x} := \max_{i=1, \dots, n} x_i$ , and  $V^t(\mathbf{x}) := \{i \in V : x_i > t\}$ . For a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \mathcal{P}(V_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one can define  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in the same way. It is therefore not necessary to write the details here.

Clearly, the piecewise bilinear extension is 2-homogeneous, and it constitutes a generalization of the original Lovász extension. In fact, taking  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}$ , we have  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}) = \tilde{f}^L(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\tilde{f}(A) := f(A, V)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{P}(V)$ . The bilinear extension and its generalizations (see Section 3) possess many connections with various fields like optimization, saddle point problems, critical point theory and spectral graph theory.

## Connections with saddle point problems

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 3.9). *Let  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \mathcal{P}(V_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \mathcal{P}(V_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $n = \#V_1$  and  $m = \#V_2$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{R}_+^m = (0, +\infty)^m$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = [0, +\infty)^n$ . Then*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \quad (2)$$

if either of the followings holds.

(a)  $g$  is positive, and

$$\min_{A \in \mathcal{P}(V_1) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \max_{B \in \mathcal{P}(V_2) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{B \in \mathcal{P}(V_2) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \min_{A \in \mathcal{P}(V_1) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} \quad (3)$$

And in this case, (3) and (2) coincide. Moreover,  $(A^*, B^*)$  is a saddle point of  $f/g$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})$  is a saddle point of  $f^Q/g^Q$ .

(b)  $g$  is modular on each component with  $g(\{i\}, V_2) > 0$  and  $g(V_1, \{j\}) > 0$  for any  $i \in V_1, j \in V_2$ , and  $f$  satisfies the following conditions:

- $f$  is submodular in its first component;
- $f$  is supermodular in its second component.

Theorem 1.1 also holds when we replace the piecewise bilinear extension by some other extensions (see Theorem 1.2 and similar results in Section 3). The condition (b) in Theorem 1.1 makes contact with Sion's min-max theorem, and it closely relates to the corresponding topics in game theory. Moreover, the formulation (2) allows us to deal with the Collatz-Wielandt formula (see Lemma 2.4 and Example 3.3) and von Neumann's minimax theorem for matrices (see Example 3.4) in a single, unifying mathematical framework.

As a systematic research on the extension theory, we introduce several homogeneous extensions of a discrete function (see Definitions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5). Below, we present the *piecewise multilinear extension*:

For a discrete function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have the piecewise multilinear function  $f^M : (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=0}^{n-1} \prod_{l=1}^k (x_{(i_l+1)}^l - x_{(i_l)}^l) f(V^{(i_1)}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{(i_k)}(\mathbf{x}^k)),$$

where  $V^{(i_l)}(\mathbf{x}^l) := \{j \in V : x_j^l > x_{(i_l)}^l\}$  and  $x_{(1)}^l \leq x_{(2)}^l \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}^l$  is a rearrangement of  $\mathbf{x}^l := (x_1^l, \dots, x_n^l)$  in non-decreasing order,  $x_{(0)}^l := 0$  and  $V^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}^l) := V$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $k = 2$ , this reduces of course to (1).

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 3.4). *Suppose  $f^M, g^M$  are piecewise multilinear extensions of  $f, g : \mathcal{P}^{k+l}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $k$  and  $l$  are positive integers. If*

$$\min_{B \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^l} \max_{A \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^k} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{A \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^k} \min_{B \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^l} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}, \quad (4)$$

then

$$\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{ln}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{kn}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{kn}} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{ln}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}$$

which coincides with (4). Moreover,  $(A^*, B^*)$  is a saddle point of  $f/g$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})$  is a saddle point of  $f^M/g^M$ .

It should be noted that Theorem 1.2 is a generalization of the equivalence between a combinatorial optimization and the fractional programming produced by the multi-way Lovász extension (Theorem A in [55]). The detailed reason is shown in Remark 13. On the other hand, Theorem 1.2 provides the first relation between a discrete saddle point problem and its homogeneous extension, which closely relates to von Neumann's minimax theorem.

### Connections with Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory

We set up a min-max relation in the style of Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory in Section 3.1. It is convenient to state the result in the context of the *multiple integral extension*:

For a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $f^M : (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \\ &= \int_0^{\|\mathbf{x}^k\|_\infty} \dots \int_0^{\|\mathbf{x}^1\|_\infty} f(V_+^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), V_-^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V_+^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k), V_-^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) dt_1 \dots dt_k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_2(V) = \{(A_+, A_-) : A_+, A_- \subset V, A_+ \cap A_- = \emptyset\}$ , and  $V_\pm^{t_l}(\mathbf{x}^l) = \{j \in V : \pm x_j^l > t_l\}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ .

**Remark 1.** The multiple integral extension  $f^M$  of a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the previous piecewise multilinear extension  $h^M$  of a function  $h : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  have the following relations:

- (a) If  $f(A_{1+}, A_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+}, A_{k-}) = h(A_{1+}, A_{2+}, \dots, A_{k+})$ ,  
 $\forall (A_{1+}, A_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+}, A_{k-}) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k$ , then  $f^M(\mathbf{x}) = h^M(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in [0, \infty)^{nk}$ .
- (b) If  $f(A_{1+}, A_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+}, A_{k-}) = h(A_{1+} \cup A_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+} \cup A_{k-})$ ,  
 $\forall (A_{1+}, A_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+}, A_{k-}) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k$ , then  $f^M(\mathbf{x}) = h^M(|\mathbf{x}|)$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ .

Moreover, given a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define  $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{P}(V \sqcup V')^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\tilde{f}(A_1, \dots, A_k) = f(A_1 \cap V \setminus \phi(A_1 \cap V'), \phi(A_1 \cap V') \setminus (A_1 \cap V), \dots, A_k \cap V \setminus \phi(A_k \cap V'), \phi(A_k \cap V') \setminus (A_k \cap V))$ , where  $V'$  is a copy of  $V$ , and  $\phi : V' \rightarrow V$  is the bijection satisfying  $i' \mapsto i$ ,  $\forall i' \in V'$ . Then,  $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \tilde{f}^M(\mathbf{x}_+^1, \mathbf{x}_-^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_+^k, \mathbf{x}_-^k)$ , where  $\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{x}_\pm := (\pm \mathbf{x}) \vee \mathbf{0} \in [0, +\infty)^n$ .

In summary, we can embed  $\mathcal{P}(V)^k$  into  $\mathcal{P}_2(V)^k$ , and embed  $\mathcal{P}_2(V)^k$  into  $\mathcal{P}(V \sqcup V')^k$ . The multiple integral extension agrees with the piecewise multilinear extension on the first quadrant, and their relations can be reduced to the correspondences between the original Lovász extension and the disjoint-pair version.

**Theorem 1.3** (Section 3.1). *Under the notions in Section 3, for  $f, g : \tilde{P}_1(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have*

$$\min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \max_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_{n+1-m}(V)} \min_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}. \quad (5)$$

If we further assume that  $f$  is submodular and symmetric as well as  $g$  is supermodular and symmetric, then

$$\min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^L(\mathbf{x})}{g^L(\mathbf{x})} := \lambda_m \geq \min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_{k_m}(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)}$$

where  $k_m$  is the largest number of nodal domains of eigenvectors w.r.t. the  $m$ -th min-max eigenvalue  $\lambda_m$  of the function pair  $(f^L, g^L)$ , and  $f^L$  represents the disjoint-pair Lovász extension of  $f$ .

This is a general version of higher-order Cheeger-type inequalities for the couple of  $f$  and  $g$ . And also, taking  $m \in \{1, n\}$  in (5), we get Theorem B in [55].

### Connections with combinatorial optimization

The piecewise multilinear extension also shows a way to get an equivalence between discrete and continuous optimizations, which enhances the corresponding results in [55]. Basically, in Section 3, we introduce the perfect domain pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$  w.r.t. a given homogeneous extension, denoted by ‘ $\sim$ ’ and defined by the property that

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x})} \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x})}$$

hold for all suitable functions  $f, g$  and their extensions  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}$  satisfying suitable properties. This is our main idea to realize a continuous reformulation of a discrete optimization. Both the piecewise multilinear extension and the multiple integral extension are investigated systematically along this direction. For example, we can get a new continuous representation of the maxcut problem on graphs:

$$\max_{S \subset V} |\partial S| = \max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n, \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} = 0} \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{ij} x_i y_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty},$$

where  $(w_{ij})$  is the weighted adjacency matrix of the graph. We also have a new equivalent optimization of the dual Cheeger constant:

$$\max_{S \cup T \subset V, S \cap T = \emptyset} \frac{\#E(S, T)}{\text{vol}(S) + \text{vol}(T)} = \max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n, \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} = 0} \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{ij} x_i y_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \sum_{i \in V} \text{deg}_i y_i + \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \sum_{i \in V} \text{deg}_i x_i}.$$

More interestingly, we obtain a more general equality with the help of log-concave polynomials [3, 6]:

**Proposition 1.1.** *For a log-concave polynomial  $P$  of degree  $d$  in  $n$  variables, and for  $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , we have*

$$\min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{P(f_1(A), \dots, f_n(A))}{(f_1(A) + \dots + f_n(A))^d} = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{P(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_n^M(\mathbf{x}))}{(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + f_n^M(\mathbf{x}))^d}$$

where  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$  forms a perfect domain pair.

In addition, based on the equivalence and the extension approach, we can obtain some useful continuous relaxations like Theorem 1.4 below.

### Connections with the Turán problem and spectral graph theory

For  $f^M : (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define  $f_\Delta^M : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x}) := f^M(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x})$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *Given  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , as well as their piecewise multilinear extensions  $f^M$  and  $g^M$ , denote by  $f_\Delta(A) = f(A, \dots, A)$  and  $g_\Delta(A) = g(A, \dots, A)$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{A \subset V} \frac{f_\Delta(A)}{g_\Delta(A)} &\leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n} \frac{f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x})}{g_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \max_{\text{chain } \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\}} \frac{f(A_1, \dots, A_k)}{g(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \\ &= \max_{\text{comonotonic } \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)} \end{aligned}$$

where the chain is in the sense of inclusion, and the vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are comonotonic if  $(x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j) \geq 0$ ,  $i, j \in V$ . All ' $\leq$ ' become ' $\geq$ ' if we change all 'max' to 'min'.

It is also a generalization of Theorem A in [55] by taking  $k = 1$ . In addition, it shows a way to rediscover the Motzkin-Straus theorem and the Lagrangian method on Turán's problem (see Section 4.1). Importantly, the identity in Theorem 1.4 indicates that the comonotonicity on vectors/functions can be regarded as an extension of the inclusion relation. Roughly speaking,

({inclusion chains}, {pairwise comonotonic vectors/functions}) is a perfect domain pair.

Next we give an example for the application of the above results to tensors.

**Example 1.1.** *An order- $k$   $n$ -dimensional tensor  $(c_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  is a set of  $n^k$  entries. It is nonnegative if  $c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \geq 0$ , and it is symmetric if  $c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = c_{\sigma(i_1), \dots, \sigma(i_k)}$  for any permutation  $\sigma \in S_k$ . Now we define a function  $f : \mathcal{P}^k(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f(V_1, \dots, V_k) = \sum_{i_1 \in V_1, \dots, i_k \in V_k} c_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$  for any  $V_1, \dots, V_k \subset V$ . Then  $f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in V} c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_k}$ . The tensor  $(c_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  is positive definite if  $f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Now, let  $(c_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  be a symmetric tensor and  $(d_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  be a symmetric and positive definite tensor. Then all the classical results on  $H$ -eigenvalues of tensors (see Qi [77], Lim [62], and Chang et al [23, 24]) can be obtained directly by our spectral extension theory. Moreover, we get some new relations on eigenvalues of symmetric tensors (see Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 4.4 for details), and we also apply Theorem 1.4 to the Turan problem (see Section 4.1).*

### Connections with inertia bounds

The inertia bound for independence numbers is a basic result in algebraic graph theory [38], which appeared first in Cvetkovic's PhD thesis [25]. Its stronger variants have been used to give a proof of the Sensitivity Conjecture [48]. We find that nodal domain theorems and inertia bounds for independence numbers can be absorbed into the following result. Indeed, they are essentially the estimates of the size of the eigenspace of the function pair  $(f_\Delta^M, g_\Delta^M)$  which relate to the distribution of the eigenvalues (see Section 2 for related concepts).



**Definition 1.1** (independence number). *The  $\lambda$ -level independence number of the function pair  $(f, g)$  is  $\alpha_\lambda := \max\{\#A : f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x})/g_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda, \forall \mathbf{x} \text{ satisfying } \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \subset A\}$ . For  $\lambda = 0$ , the definition is independent of  $g$ , and then we denote the independence number of  $f$  as  $\alpha_0 := \max\{\#A : f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \text{ satisfying } \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \subset A\}$ .*

For example, on a graph  $(V, E)$ , if we take  $f(A, B) = \#E(A, B)$ , then  $\alpha_0$  in Definition 1.1 is the usual independence number.

**Theorem 1.5** (Theorem 2.2). *Given  $f, g : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote by  $\lambda_i$  the  $i$ -th minimax eigenvalue of the function pair  $(f_\Delta^M, g_\Delta^M)$ , where we refer to Definitions 2.1 and 2.4 for related concepts. Then we have the inertia bound*

$$\alpha_\lambda \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda\}\}.$$

*For any eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t. the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , we have the nodal domain inequality (see Section 2.2 for the related definitions)*

$$N(\mathbf{x}) \leq \min\{k + r - 1, n - k + r\}.$$

Theorem 1.5 is the first nonlinear version of inertia bounds for the independence number, and it also shows the first strong nodal domain inequality for general function pairs. One can easily apply Theorem 1.5 to Examples 1.1 and 3.2 to get an inertia bound on  $k$ -uniform hypergraphs (hypergraphs where each hyperedge contains exactly  $k$  vertices):

**Proposition 1.2.** *The independence number of a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $(V, E)$  is defined as  $\alpha = \max\{\#U : U \subset V \text{ s.t. } U \text{ contains no hyperedge}\}$ . Let  $\lambda_i$  be the  $i$ -th minimax  $H$ -eigenvalue of the adjacency tensor of  $(V, E)$ . Then  $\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq 0\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq 0\}\}$ .*

*Moreover, for any  $H$ -eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $\lambda_i$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , the number of connected components of the support of  $\mathbf{x}$  is smaller than or equal to  $\min\{i + r - 1, n - i + r\}$ .*

The definition of  $H$ -eigenvalue and the proofs of Propositions 1.2 and 1.3 are given in Sections 4.3 and 4.2, respectively. By Theorem 2.2 (a slight variant of Theorem 1.5), we have<sup>1</sup>

**Proposition 1.3.** *For a graph, we have the inertia bound  $\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i(\Delta_p) \leq 1\}, \#\{\lambda_i(\Delta_p) \geq 1\}\}$ , where  $\lambda_i(\Delta_p)$  is the  $i$ -th minimax eigenvalue of the normalized graph  $p$ -Laplacian.*

*Besides, for any eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $\lambda_i(\Delta_p)$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , the number of connected components of the support of  $\mathbf{x}$  is smaller than or equal to  $\min\{i + r - 1, n - i + r\}$ .*

### Connections with a method by Huang

The following eigenvalue estimate shows a nonlinear generalization of the first ingredient of Huang's proof for the Sensitivity Conjecture [48], and it can be applied

---

<sup>1</sup>A generalized version of Proposition 1.3 in the setting of oriented hypergraphs is presented in Theorem 4.2.

to adjacency tensors on hypergraphs (the method proposed by Huang works for the case of matrices, and it is based on the Cauchy interlacing lemma, but as far as we know, there is no interlacing lemma for tensors).

**Theorem 1.6** (Theorems 2.3 and 4.3). *Given  $f, g : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , let  $S(f) = \{F : |F(\mathbf{x})| \leq f_{\Delta}^M(|\mathbf{x}|), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ , where  $|\mathbf{x}| := (|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$  for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Then, for any  $m = 1, \dots, n$ ,*

$$\min_{U \subset V, \#U=m} \max_{\text{chain } A_1, \dots, A_k \text{ in } U} \frac{f(A_1, \dots, A_k)}{g(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \geq \sup_{F \in S(f)} \max\{\lambda_m(F), -\lambda'_m(F)\},$$

where  $\lambda_m(F)$  (resp.  $\lambda'_m(F)$ ) indicates the  $m$ -th min-max (resp. max-min) eigenvalue of the function pair  $(F, g_{\Delta}^M(|\cdot|))$ .

The above result is stronger than the classical inertia bounds for independence numbers, and it also provides a nonlinear generalization of Huang's method. We refer to Sections 2.3 and 4.4 for details.

### Applications to $p$ -Laplacians on hypergraphs

Motivated by the total variation on hypergraphs, and its regularization functionals [46], we provide a general Lovász  $p$ -Laplacian eigenvalue problem, and we apply it to chemical hypergraphs (see Section 4.2). There is a direct way to define another  $p$ -Laplace operator induced by the incidence matrix of a chemical hypergraph [53], which is called the *incidence  $p$ -Laplacian* on hypergraphs.

The spectral theory for function pairs developed in Section 2 can be applied to both the Lovász  $p$ -Laplacian and the incidence  $p$ -Laplacian, by which we have established Cheeger inequalities, inertia bounds and nodal domain properties for Lovász  $p$ -Laplacian in Section 4.2, and a spectral duality theorem for incidence  $p$ -Laplacian in Section 2.5.

### Applications to Cheeger inequalities on simplicial complexes

By constructing the associated signed graph for a simplicial complex, we establish  $k$ -way Cheeger inequalities involving the eigenvalues of the  $d$ -th Hodge up-Laplacian in Section 4.5. Formally, these Cheeger inequalities can be written as

$$C_{k,d} h_k(S_d)^2 \leq d + 2 - \lambda_{n+1-k}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq 2h_k(S_d)$$

where  $h_k(S_d)$  is the so-called  $k$ -way Cheeger constant for  $d$ -simplices of a complex,  $\Delta_d^{up}$  is the normalized up Laplacian on  $d$ -simplices, and the constant  $C_{k,d}$  only depends on  $k \geq 1$  and  $d \geq 0$ .

These Cheeger bounds for the spectral gaps reveal that the multiplicity of the possible eigenvalue  $d+2$  equals the number of balanced components of the associated signed graph. We also introduce  $p$ -Laplacians on simplicial complexes, and based on the spectral theory for function pairs developed in Sections 2.5 and 2.4, we prove that the multiplicity of the possible eigenvalue  $(d+2)^{p-1}$  equals the number of balanced components of the associated signed graph if  $p > 1$ , and for  $p = 1$ , the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 1 for the up 1-Laplacian is bounded by some combinatorial quantities involving the balanced cliques of the associated signed graph. We then suggest a Cheeger constant  $h(S_d)$  defined as the smallest nontrivial eigenvalue of the 1-Laplacian on the  $d$ -faces of a simplicial complex, which is positive if and only if

the  $d$ -th reduced homology vanishes. If the simplicial complex is combinatorially equivalent to a uniform triangulation of a  $(d + 1)$ -dimensional, orientable, compact, closed Riemannian manifold, we prove the Cheeger inequality

$$\frac{h^2(S_d)}{C} \leq \lambda(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq Ch(S_d),$$

in which  $\lambda(\Delta_d^{up})$  is the smallest nontrivial eigenvalue of the  $d$ -th up Laplacian, and  $C > 1$  is a uniform constant. Such a Cheeger constant also closely relates to Gromov's filling profile [41]. This result may open up a new perspective on the long-standing open problem regarding Cheeger-type inequalities on simplicial complexes [31,42,43,76,83] (this open problem is a discrete version of Cheeger-Yau's open problem about building Cheeger-type inequalities on differential  $k$ -forms [14,90]).

## 2 Spectral theory for homogeneous function pairs

Spectral analysis has been widely used in recent decades in numerous fields like digital image analysis, signal processing, machine learning and spectral clustering. In the linear setting, the well-known discrete Laplacian attracts much attention [88]. Also, in smooth but nonlinear settings, there exists research on the  $p$ -Laplacian eigenvalue problem and its generalized version [12,66].

For more applications, some researchers turn to the non-smooth setting where variational methods in nonlinear analysis have been proved to be very powerful. For example, the study of the 1-Laplacian eigenvalue problem  $\mathbf{0} \in \Delta_1 \mathbf{x} - \lambda \text{Sgn}(\mathbf{x})$  and its signless analogue is of great help to find better Cheeger cuts and dual Cheeger solutions [17, 19, 20, 45]. In image science, many works [8, 9, 36, 37] focus on the eigenvalue problem in the form of  $\lambda \mathbf{u} \in \nabla J(\mathbf{u})$  where  $J(\cdot)$  is convex and (absolutely) one-homogeneous, which can also be formulated as  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla J(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda \nabla \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2$ , where  $\nabla$  represents the *Clarke derivative operator*.

All the above eigenvalue problems can be unified into the spectral theory for function pairs:

**Definition 2.1** (eigenpair). *Given a pair  $(F, G)$  of two locally Lipschitz functions  $F$  and  $G$ , we call  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$  if*

$$\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset, \tag{6}$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is called an eigenvector and  $\lambda$  is the corresponding eigenvalue. Using the notation of Minkowski summation, the eigenvalue problem (6) for  $(F, G)$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x}). \tag{7}$$

Moreover, it can be used in the variational analysis of functions on a convex body. Given  $p \geq 1$  and an  $n$ -dimensional convex body  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with the origin in its interior, it is easy to show that there exists a unique  $p$ -homogeneous function  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $P = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$  with its boundary  $\partial P = G^{-1}(1)$ . One way to study the variational properties of a given function  $F$  on  $\partial P$  is to analyse the function pair  $(F, G)$  via the eigenvalue problem  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ . In many

reasonable and valuable cases, the unit spheres of polyhedral Banach spaces (such as the polyhedrons determined by  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = 1$  or  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = 1$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) attracted much attention [29,32,33]. For example, the case of  $G(\mathbf{x}) := \|\mathbf{x}\|_{1,d}$  has been investigated in [17] and turns out to be effective in the study of Cheeger cuts and dual Cheeger problems, where  $\|\cdot\|_{1,d}$  is a weighted one-norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (see [18]).

Since the general eigenvalue problem (7) is representative and useful and in view of the lack of a general study, in this section, we consider the spectral theory for a pair  $(F, G)$  of Lipschitz functions  $F$  and  $G$ , which will be applied in the extension theory in Section 3.

**Unless otherwise stated, the functions  $F, G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  appearing in this section are at least *locally Lipschitz*.**

**Definition 2.2** (critical pair). *For a locally Lipschitz function  $\frac{F}{G} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ , we call  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  a critical pair of  $F/G$  if*

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}, \quad \text{and } \lambda = \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})},$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is said to be a critical point and  $\lambda$  is the corresponding critical value.

It is known that  $\{\text{critical points of } F/G\} \subset \{\text{eigenvectors of } (F, G)\}$ .

**Definition 2.3.** *Given  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ , a function  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $p$ -homogeneous if and only if*

$$F(t\mathbf{x}) = t^p F(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t > 0.$$

Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  be a compact symmetric set, i.e.,  $-A = A$ . The Krasnoselskii  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  genus of  $A$ , denoted by  $\text{genus}(A)$ , is defined to be

$$\text{genus}(A) = \begin{cases} \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \exists \text{ odd continuous } h : A \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{k-1}\}, & \text{if } A \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{if } A = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\Gamma_k = \{A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} : A \text{ is compact and symmetric with } \text{genus}(A) \geq k\}$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $(F, G)$  be a function pair such that  $F/G$  is even, zero-homogenous and locally Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Then, for any  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ,*

$$\lambda_k := \inf_{A \in \Gamma_k} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$$

is an eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$ . These eigenvalues satisfy  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$ , and if  $\lambda = \lambda_{k+1} = \dots = \lambda_{k+l}$  for  $0 \leq k < k+l \leq \dim X$ , then  $\text{genus}(\{\text{eigenvectors w.r.t. } \lambda\}) \geq l$ . Similar properties hold for  $\lambda'_k := \sup_{A \in \Gamma_k} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$ .

**Definition 2.4** (min-max critical pair). *Under the conditions in Proposition 2.1,  $(\lambda_k, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is called a min-max critical pair if  $\mathbf{x}$  is a critical point with the additional condition that  $\mathbf{x} \in S$  for some  $S \in \Gamma_k$  with*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in S} \frac{F(\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{y})} = \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \lambda_k.$$

A max-min critical pair  $(\lambda'_k, \mathbf{x})$  is defined in a similar way.

Some basic and important facts are:

- Critical pairs of  $F/G$  are eigenpairs of  $(F, G)$ .

Remark: The eigenvectors of  $(F, G)$  may not be the critical points of  $F/G$ , because for a critical pair, we look at  $\nabla$  of the quotient, whereas for an eigenpair, we require a relation between the gradients of the two functions involved. In fact, if  $F$  and  $G$  are smooth, then the eigenvalue problem  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  closely relates to the local bifurcation for the system of equations induced by  $\nabla F$  and  $\nabla G$ . For example, the eigenvalue problem of the pair  $(F, G)$  with  $F(x) := \sin x$  and  $G(x) := x$  is  $\cos x = \lambda$ ; while the nonzero critical points of  $F/G$  are determined by the equation  $\cos x = \sin x/x$ .

For homogeneous  $F$  and  $G$ , there is a counterexample involving the 1-Laplacian (see details in [18]).

- If  $F/G$  is even, then the min-max critical pairs of  $F/G$  are critical pairs of  $F/G$ .
- Assume that  $F$  is  $p$ -homogeneous, and  $G$  is  $q$ -homogeneous. If  $G(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ , and  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ , then  $F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q}{p}\lambda$ .

Proof: Since  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ , there exists  $\mathbf{u} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\lambda \mathbf{u} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$ . Hence, by the Euler identity for homogeneous Lipschitz functions, we have  $pF(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \lambda \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = qG(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ . Then, there is

$$\frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{q \langle \lambda \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{p \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle} = \frac{q\lambda}{p}.$$

- If  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ ,  $G(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ ,  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla F(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla G(\mathbf{y})$ , then  $(\lambda, \mathbf{y})$  is an eigenpair.

*Proof.* Since  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla F(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla G(\mathbf{y})$ , we deduce that  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{y})$  by the properties of Minkowski summation. Consequently,  $(\lambda, \mathbf{y})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ .  $\square$

- For smooth  $p$ -homogeneous functions  $F$  and  $G$ ,  $\{\text{critical pairs of } F/G\} = \{\text{eigenpairs of } (F, G)\}$ .

**From now on, we further assume that  $F$  and  $G$  are even and  $p$ -homogeneous.** In this setting, we have

$$\{\text{min-max critical pairs of } F/G\} \subset \{\text{critical pairs of } F/G\} \subset \{\text{eigenpairs of } (F, G)\}. \quad (8)$$

**Remark 2.** Let  $\widetilde{F/G} : \mathbb{RP}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $\widetilde{F/G}([x]) = F(tx)/G(tx)$  which is independent of  $t \neq 0$ . Then, the critical values of  $F/G$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  reduce to the critical values of  $\widetilde{F/G}$  on  $\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$ .

**Definition 2.5** (multiplicity). Denote by  $K_\lambda$  the set of critical points of  $\frac{F}{G}$  w.r.t. the critical value  $\lambda$ ,  $S_\lambda$  the set of eigenvectors w.r.t. the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $(F, G)$ , and  $\{\frac{F}{G} = \lambda\}$  the level set of  $\frac{F}{G}$  at the level  $\lambda$ . Clearly,  $K_\lambda \subset S_\lambda \subset \{\frac{F}{G} = \lambda\}$ ,  $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , and these three kinds of sets are all centrally symmetric. We use  $\text{genus}(S_\lambda)$  (resp.  $\text{genus}(K_\lambda)$ ) to denote the multiplicity of the eigenvalue (resp. critical value)  $\lambda$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** For an odd smooth homeomorphism  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $(F \circ \varphi, G \circ \varphi)$  if and only if it is an eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$ , and the multiplicities of  $\lambda$  for  $(F \circ \varphi, G \circ \varphi)$  and  $(F, G)$  coincide.

*Proof.* Let  $(\lambda, \varphi(\mathbf{x}))$  be an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\varphi) - \lambda \nabla G(\varphi)$ . Then

$$\mathbf{0} \in J_x(\varphi)(\nabla F(\varphi) - \lambda \nabla G(\varphi)) = \nabla(F \circ \varphi)(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla(G \circ \varphi)(\mathbf{x})$$

where  $J_x(\varphi)$  is the Jacobi matrix of  $\varphi$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ . Hence,  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F \circ \varphi, G \circ \varphi)$ . Therefore, it can be verified that  $S_\lambda$  is the eigenspace w.r.t.  $\lambda$  of  $(F, G)$  if and only if  $\varphi^{-1}(S_\lambda)$  is the eigenspace w.r.t.  $\lambda$  of  $(F \circ \varphi, G \circ \varphi)$ . Since  $\varphi$  is homeomorphism and odd (i.e.,  $\varphi(-\mathbf{x}) = -\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ), we have  $\text{genus}(\varphi^{-1}(S_\lambda)) = \text{genus}(S_\lambda)$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

Proposition 2.2 and the above statements could be widely applied to the analysis of homogeneous functions including some useful special cases, such as Lemma 2.1 in [18], Lemma 1 in [19] and Lemma 6.3 in [66].

One reason for us to work on a pair of  $p$ -homogeneous functions is the discrete-continuous equivalence of optimization and min-max relation:

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $H : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a zero-homogeneous continuous function, where  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is a cone<sup>2</sup>. If we further assume that  $X$  is topologically regular, i.e.,  $X \subset \overline{\text{int}(X)}$ , where  $\overline{\text{int}(X)}$  is the closure of the interior of  $X$ , then

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X} H(\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} H(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x})$$

and moreover,

$$\inf_{A \subset X, \text{cat}(A) \geq k} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A} H(\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{A \subset X, \text{cat}(A) \geq k} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{cone}(A) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x})$$

is the  $k$ -th min-max critical value of  $H$ , where  $\text{cat}(A)$  is the Lusternik–Schnirelmann category of  $A$ , and  $\text{cone}(A) := \{t\mathbf{x} : t > 0, \mathbf{x} \in A\}$  is the cone hull of  $A$ .

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is topologically regular, we have  $X \subset \overline{(X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)}$ . Then, by the continuity of  $H$ , we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X} H(\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n} H(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} H(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n} H(\mathbf{x}).$$

Note that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ , there exists a positive integer  $k$  such that  $k\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ , and by the zero-homogeneity of  $H$ , we have  $H(k\mathbf{x}) = H(\mathbf{x})$ . Hence, we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n} H(\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n} H(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The cone  $X$  doesn't need to be convex, but it should satisfy the condition for a cone, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x} \in X \Rightarrow t\mathbf{x} \in X$ ,  $\forall t > 0$ .

Denote by  $c_k = \inf_{A \in \text{Cat}_k(X)} \sup_{x \in A} H(\mathbf{x})$  the  $k$ -th min-max critical value of  $H$ , where  $\text{Cat}_k(X)$  collects all subsets in  $X$  with the Lusternik–Schnirelmann category at least  $k$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $A \in \text{Cat}_k(X)$  such that  $\text{cat}(A) \geq k$  and  $\sup_{x \in A} H(\mathbf{x}) < c_k + \epsilon$ , and there exists a neighborhood of  $A$ , denoted by  $U_A$ , such that  $\text{cat}(U_A) \geq k$  and  $\sup_{x \in U_A} H(\mathbf{x}) < \sup_{x \in A} H(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon < c_k + 2\epsilon$ . By the zero-homogeneity of  $H$ , we can replace  $U_A$  by its cone hull  $\text{cone}(U_A)$ , i.e.,  $\sup_{x \in \text{cone}(U_A)} H(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{x \in U_A} H(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus, by the arbitrariness of  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $c_k = \inf_{\text{open cone } A \in \text{Cat}_k(X)} \sup_{x \in A} H(\mathbf{x})$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** We can always replace  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  by any lattice  $\{\sum_{i=1}^m n_i \mathbf{v}_i : n_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  with  $\text{span}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m) = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Furthermore, if both the cone  $X$  and the zero-homogeneous function  $H$  in Lemma 2.1 are centrally symmetric (i.e., even), then we can replace  $\text{cat}(A)$  and  $\text{Cat}_k(X)$  by  $\text{genus}(A)$  and  $\Gamma_k(X)$ , respectively.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $H : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \times \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function which is zero-homogeneous on both components, and let  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  and  $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  be topologically regular cones. Then

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

if and only if

$$\inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}).$$

*Proof.* We shall prove that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

and

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}).$$

Indeed, by Lemma 2.1,  $\sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  for any  $\mathbf{x}$ . Since  $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is zero-homogeneous and continuous of  $\mathbf{y}$ ,

$$\sup_{y \in Y} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y \cap S^{m-1}} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \max_{y \in \bar{Y} \cap S^{m-1}} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}).$$

It follows from the continuity of  $H$  and the compactness of  $\bar{Y} \cap S^{m-1}$  that  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \max_{y \in \bar{Y} \cap S^{m-1}} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is continuous. We are able to apply Lemma 2.1 again to derive that  $\inf_{x \in X} \max_{y \in \bar{Y} \cap S^{m-1}} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \max_{y \in \bar{Y} \cap S^{m-1}} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . Thus,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

is proved. The proof of  $\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{y \in Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^m} \inf_{x \in X \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is similar.  $\square$

For  $p$ -homogeneous functions  $F$  and  $G$ , taking  $H = F/G$  in Lemma 2.1, we find that the continuous optimization can be transformed into a discrete optimization restricted on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ . If we want to replace ‘sup’ by ‘max’, some necessary conditions should be added, and at this time,  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  can be changed to a certain finite feasible set like  $\{-N, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, N\}^n$ . Based on the piecewise linear extension in [55] and the general extension theory developed in Section 3, we can further replace  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  by the simplest feasible set  $\{-1, 0, 1\}^n$  or  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . From this viewpoint, our extension theory makes progress on the converse of Lemma 2.1.

## 2.1 Characterization of the second eigenvalue

We show the following characterization of the second (i.e., the first non-trivial) eigenvalue of the function pair  $(F, G)$ , where we don’t count the multiplicity of the first eigenvalue.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be even and  $p$ -homogeneous nonnegative functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose that  $G$  is positive and convex, and  $\Pi := \{\text{zeros of } F/G\} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is a linear subspace, as well as  $F(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = F(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{y} \in \Pi, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp} \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} \frac{F(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})} = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})} = \min_{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \lambda_{\dim \Pi + 1} \quad (9)$$

is the second smallest eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$ .

**Example 2.1.** *For a weighted graph  $(V, W)$  with  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $W = (w_{ij})_{i,j \in V}$ , let  $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i,j \in V} w_{ij} |x_i - x_j|^p$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}) := \|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p$ . Suppose that the graph has  $k$  connected components  $U_1, \dots, U_k \subset V$ , and let  $\Pi = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{U_i} : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ . Then (9) in Theorem 2.1 reduces to*

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{x} \notin \text{span}(\mathbf{1}_{U_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{U_k})} \frac{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij} |x_i - x_j|^p}{\min_{t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{x} - t_1 \mathbf{1}_{U_1} - \dots - t_k \mathbf{1}_{U_k}\|_p^p} \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{x} : \langle \nabla \|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p, \mathbf{1}_{U_i} \rangle \geq 0, \forall i} \frac{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij} |x_i - x_j|^p}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p} = \lambda_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

which is a generalization of the characterization for the second eigenvalue of the graph  $p$ -Laplacian (see Chung [15], Hein et al [45] and Chang [17]).

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on the following auxiliary proposition:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Given a convex function  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a linear subspace  $\Pi$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the convex function  $G_\Pi$  defined by*

$$G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \quad (10)$$

is translation invariant along  $\Pi$ , i.e.,  $G_\Pi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \mathbf{z} \in \Pi$ . And for any  $\mathbf{x}$ ,

$$\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \subset \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset, \quad (11)$$



where  $x_\Pi$  is a minimizer (if exists) of  $G$  restricted on the affine plane  $\mathbf{x} + \Pi$ . Moreover, we have

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\text{minimizers of } G|_{\Pi + \mathbf{x}}\} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(\mathbf{x}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})\} \quad (12)$$

and it is closed (but might be empty<sup>3</sup>).

**Example 2.2.** Let  $G(\cdot) := \|\cdot\|_p^p$  and  $\Pi = \text{span}\{\mathbf{y}\}$  for some  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Then we get a new interpretation for the  $p$ -median (or  $p$ -mean). Indeed, the condition  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$  is equivalent to  $\langle \nabla \|\mathbf{x}\|_p^p, \mathbf{y} \rangle \ni 0$ ; while the term  $\underset{t \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{y}\|_p^p$  indicates the  $p$ -median along the direction  $\mathbf{y}$ .

In many practical situations, we set  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}$ . For example,  $\underset{t \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{1}\|_2^2$  is the average of  $\mathbf{x}$ ; while  $\underset{t \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{1}\|_1$  is the median of  $\mathbf{x}$ , w.r.t. a prescribed weight [45].

*Proof.* By the definition (10),  $G_\Pi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) = \inf_{\mathbf{z}' \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z}') = \inf_{\mathbf{z}'' \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}'') = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\mathbf{z}'' := \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z}'$ . This confirms the translating invariant property.

Convexity of  $G_\Pi$ : for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} tG_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)G_\Pi(\mathbf{y}) &= t \inf_{\mathbf{z}_1 \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}_1) + (1-t) \inf_{\mathbf{z}_2 \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}_2) \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \Pi} G(t(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}_1) + (1-t)(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}_2)) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \Pi} G(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{z}_1 + (1-t)\mathbf{z}_2) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \Pi} G(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}) = G_\Pi(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Closedness of  $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\}$ : Suppose  $\mathbf{x}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$  with  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}_n) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$ . By the u.s.c. of  $\nabla G(\cdot)$ , there exist a subsequence  $\{n_m\}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{n_m} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}_{n_m}) \cap \Pi^\perp$  such that  $\mathbf{y}_{n_m} \rightarrow \mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ . Since  $\Pi^\perp$  is closed, we have  $\mathbf{y} \in \Pi^\perp$ . This means  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$ .

The relation (11) is a combination of the following claims:

Claim 1.  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$ :

It is deduced by (12), which is proved in the next part.

Claim 2.  $\nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \subset \Pi^\perp$ :

Note that for any  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}), 0 = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) - G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \rangle, \forall \mathbf{z} \in \Pi$ . This implies that  $0 = \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \rangle, \forall \mathbf{z} \in \Pi$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{y} \perp \Pi$ . Hence,  $\nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \subset \Pi^\perp$ .

Claim 3.  $\nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi)$ :

For  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})$ , for any  $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n, G(\mathbf{x}') - G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi) \geq G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}') - G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}') - G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle$ , which derives  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi)$ . Thus,  $\nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla G(\mathbf{x}_\Pi)$ .

<sup>3</sup>For example, taking  $G(\mathbf{x}) = e^{x_1} + e^{x_2}, \forall \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and  $\Pi = \{(0, x_2) : x_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , one has  $G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) = e^{x_1}$  and  $\{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset$ . So, the set  $\{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\}$  might be empty, but in any cases it is closed.

Claim 4.  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \subset \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})$ :

For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp$ ,  $G(\mathbf{x}') - G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle$ . Thus, for any  $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \Pi$  satisfying  $G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \leq G(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $G(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{z}') - G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \geq G(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{z}') - G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle$ . Letting  $\mathbf{z}'$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  be such that  $G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \rightarrow G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{z}') \rightarrow G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}')$ , we immediately get  $G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}') - G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})$ .

We are ready to prove (12), that is,

$$\{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\} = \{\mathbf{y} : G(\mathbf{y}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x}) \text{ with } \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \in \Pi \text{ for some } \mathbf{x}\}.$$

Note that  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset \iff \exists \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbf{v} \perp \Pi \iff \exists \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  s.t.  $G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) - G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \rangle = 0, \forall \mathbf{z} \in \Pi \implies \mathbf{x}$  is a minimizer of  $G$  on  $\mathbf{x} + \Pi$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mathbf{x}$  is a minimizer of  $G$  restricted on  $\mathbf{x} + \Pi$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0 \text{ for some } \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})\} &= \mathbf{x} + \bigcup_{\mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{v}^\perp \\ &= \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbf{x} + N_{\mathbf{x}}^+ \cup N_{\mathbf{x}}^-) \end{aligned}$$

where  $N_{\mathbf{x}}^\pm = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \pm \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle > 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})\}$  and  $\mathbf{v}^\perp = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0\}$  is the orthogonal complement of  $\mathbf{v}$ .

**Statement.**  $\mathbf{x}$  is the minimizer of  $G$  restricted on the closed cone  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbf{x} + N_{\mathbf{x}}^-)$ , and  $\mathbf{x}$  is also the local maximizer of  $G$  restricted on the cone  $\mathbf{x} + N_{\mathbf{x}}^+$ .

**Proof.** For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbf{x} + N_{\mathbf{x}}^-)$ , there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0$ . Hence,  $G(\mathbf{y}) - G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0$ .

For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{x} + N_{\mathbf{x}}^+$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle < 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ . By the compactness of  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle < -\delta, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus, the directional derivative along the direction  $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  is

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+, \mathbf{x}' \rightarrow \mathbf{x}} \frac{G(\mathbf{x}' + t(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})) - G(\mathbf{x}')}{t} = \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})} \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle < -\frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Hence, there exists a neighborhood  $U_{\mathbf{x}}$  of  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $G(\mathbf{x}' + t(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})) - G(\mathbf{x}') < -\frac{\delta}{2}t$  for sufficiently small  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbf{x}' \in U_{\mathbf{x}}$ . Particularly,  $G(\mathbf{x} + t(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})) < G(\mathbf{x})$  for sufficiently small  $t > 0$ . Thus, we complete the proof.

By the above statement, if  $\mathbf{x}$  is a minimizer of  $G$  restricted on  $\mathbf{x} + \Pi$ , then  $\Pi \cap N_{\mathbf{x}}^- = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (N_{\mathbf{x}}^+ \cup N_{\mathbf{x}}^-) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{v}^\perp$ , which implies  $\Pi \subset \mathbf{v}^\perp$  for some  $\mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ , that is,  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let

$$\tilde{\lambda} := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \notin \Pi} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\lambda} := \min_{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (13)$$

We shall prove that both  $\tilde{\lambda}$  and  $\hat{\lambda}$  coincide with  $\lambda_{d+1}$ . Denote by  $d = \dim \Pi$ . Proposition 2.3 derives  $\{\mathbf{x} : \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset\} = \{\mathbf{x} : G(\mathbf{x}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})\}$ , and thus

$$\hat{\lambda} = \min_{\mathbf{x} : G(\mathbf{x}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \min_{\mathbf{x} : G(\mathbf{x}) = G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \notin \Pi} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} = \tilde{\lambda}.$$

Since  $\Pi \in \Gamma_d$  and  $\frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Pi$ , we have  $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_d = 0$ . According to the local compactness of  $\Pi^\perp$ , the zero-homogeneity of  $\frac{F}{G}$  and the fact that  $F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp \setminus \Pi$ , we obtain  $\tilde{\lambda} > 0$ . The remaining part of the proof is divided into the following steps:

(I)  $\lambda_{d+1} \geq \tilde{\lambda}$ :

It is clear that  $\dim \Pi^\perp = n - d$ . We first suppose that  $G$  is strictly convex and  $C^1$ -smooth. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x}$  there is a unique  $\mathbf{y}_x \in \Pi$  such that  $G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_x) = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$  and the map  $\varphi : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_x$  is  $C^1$ -smooth. Moreover,  $\varphi|_{\Pi^\perp} : \Pi^\perp \rightarrow \varphi(\Pi^\perp)$  is bicontinuous (i.e., homeomorphism). Clearly,  $\varphi$  satisfies  $-\mathbf{x} \mapsto -\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_{-\mathbf{x}} = -\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}_x$ , which implies that  $\varphi$  is odd. Hence, if we let  $\mathbf{x}'$  be the projection of  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\Pi^\perp$ , we get an odd homeomorphism  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_{x'}$  which is a natural extension of  $\varphi|_{\Pi^\perp}$ .

Thus, by the homotopy property of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -genus, for any  $S \in \Gamma_{d+1}$ ,  $\psi^{-1}(S) \in \Gamma_{d+1}$ . Moreover, by the intersection property of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -genus,  $\psi^{-1}(S) \cap \Pi^\perp \neq \emptyset$ , which implies  $S \cap \psi(\Pi^\perp) = \psi(\psi^{-1}(S) \cap \Pi^\perp) \neq \emptyset$ . Also note that  $\psi(\Pi^\perp) = \varphi(\Pi^\perp)$ . Hence for any  $S \in \Gamma_{d+1}$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in S} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \varphi(\Pi^\perp)} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \tilde{\lambda}.$$

This proves that  $\lambda_{d+1} \geq \tilde{\lambda}$ .

Now for general  $G$  that is  $p$ -homogeneous and convex, take a sequence  $\{G_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  of strictly convex and  $C^1$ -smooth  $p$ -homogeneous functions that converges to  $G$ . Then by the theory of Gamma-convergence [5, 30],  $\lambda_{d+1}(F, G_n) \rightarrow \lambda_{d+1}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}(F, G_n) \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}$ , where the constants  $\lambda_{d+1}(F, G_n)$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}(F, G_n)$  are the corresponding quantities for the function pair  $(F, G_n)$ .

(II)  $\lambda_{d+1} \leq \tilde{\lambda}$ :

For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp \setminus \Pi$ , let  $\Pi' := \text{span}(\Pi \cup \{\mathbf{x}\})$ . Then,  $\Pi' \in \Gamma_{d+1}$  and

$$\lambda_{d+1} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x}' \in \Pi'} \frac{F(\mathbf{x}')}{G(\mathbf{x}')} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})} = \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})}.$$

Since this holds for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi^\perp$ , we derive that  $\lambda_{d+1} \leq \tilde{\lambda}$ .

(III) There is no positive eigenvalue between  $\lambda_1 = 0$  and  $\lambda_{d+1} > 0$ :

Suppose the contrary and let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  be an eigenfunction corresponding to an eigenvalue  $\lambda \in (0, \tilde{\lambda})$ . Then,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \notin \Pi$ , and  $0 \in \nabla F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \lambda \nabla G(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ . If  $G(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = G_\Pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ , then

$$\lambda = \frac{F(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{G(\hat{\mathbf{x}})} = \frac{F(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{G_\Pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \notin \Pi} \frac{F_\Pi(\mathbf{x})}{G_\Pi(\mathbf{x})} = \tilde{\lambda},$$

which contradicts the assumption that  $\lambda < \tilde{\lambda}$ . So,  $G(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > G_\Pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ . And thus there exists a nonzero  $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \in \Pi$  satisfying  $G(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}) = G_\Pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ . Now, consider

a flow near  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  defined by  $\eta(\mathbf{x}, t) := \mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{y}_x$ , where  $t \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$  for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . Note that

$$F(\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{y}_x) - \lambda G(\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{y}_x) = F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda G(\mathbf{x} - t\mathbf{y}_x)$$

is an increasing function of  $t \in [0, 1]$ , since  $G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_x) < G(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G(\cdot)$  is convex. Consequently, with the help of the theory of weak slope [64], it is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{0} \notin \nabla(F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \lambda G(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))$ , which is a contradiction. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Similarly, the second eigenvalue (counting multiplicity) of  $(F, G)$  has a mountain pass characterization:

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be even and  $p$ -homogeneous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Given the first eigenpair  $(\lambda_1, \mathbf{x})$  of the function pair  $(F, G)$ , we have*

$$\lambda_2 = \inf_{\text{curve } \gamma: [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \gamma(\pm 1) = \pm \mathbf{x}} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \gamma([-1, 1])} \frac{F(\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{y})}. \quad (14)$$

If  $G$  is further assumed to be positive and convex, and  $F$  is further assumed to be nonnegative and  $F(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = F(\mathbf{y})$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$\lambda_2 = \min_{\mathbf{y} \perp \mathbf{x}} \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{F(\mathbf{y} - t\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{y} - t\mathbf{x})} = \min_{\mathbf{y} \perp \mathbf{x}} \frac{F(\mathbf{y})}{\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} G(\mathbf{y} - t\mathbf{x})}.$$

The RatioDCA method introduced in [45, 47] (see also Section 3.3 in [55]) can be applied directly to calculate the second smallest eigenvalue appearing in Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.4. In detail, these schemes can be rewritten in the following way:

Suppose that  $F$  and  $G$  satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2.1, and we additionally assume that  $F = F_1 - F_2$  with  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  being convex and  $p$ -homogeneous. Then, applying the Dinkelbach-type scheme to  $\min_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$ , and by Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}} \{F_1(\mathbf{x}) - (\langle \mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle + r^k \langle \mathbf{v}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle) + H_{\mathbf{x}^k}(\mathbf{x})\}, & (15a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{y}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{y} + \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}) & (15b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} r^{k+1} = F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})/G(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}), & (15c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \in \nabla F_2(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}), \mathbf{v}^{k+1} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \cap \Pi^\perp, & (15d) \end{cases}$$

and its modified version

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{F_1(\mathbf{x}) - (\langle \mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle + r^k \langle \mathbf{v}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle) + H_{\mathbf{x}^k}(\mathbf{x})\}, & (16a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{y}^{k+1}, \mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Pi} G(\mathbf{y} + \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1}) & (16b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \partial \mathbb{B} \cap \{t\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} : t \geq 0\}, r^{k+1} = F(\mathbf{x}^{k+1})/G(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) & (16c) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \in \nabla F_2(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}), \mathbf{v}^{k+1} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}^{k+1}) \cap \Pi^\perp, & (16d) \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the unit ball w.r.t. a given norm. This generalizes the inverse power method for the graph 1-Laplacian (see Algorithm 3 in [45])

## 2.2 Inertia bounds and a nodal domain inequality

We first provide the following technical lemma regarding the distribution of min-max eigenvalues. Given  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , we use  $\#\{\lambda_i = \lambda\}$  to denote the number of min-max eigenvalues that equals  $\lambda$ , i.e.,  $\#\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \lambda_i = \lambda\}$ . Other notions such as  $\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\}$  and  $\#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda\}$  are defined similarly. For a centrally symmetric set  $A$ , denote by  $\dim_{in} A := \max\{\dim X : \text{linear subspace } X \subset A \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\max\{\#\{\lambda_i = \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda'_i = \lambda\}\} \leq \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda\}$ , and*

$$\min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda'_i \leq \lambda\}\} \geq \dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\} \quad (17)$$

and (17) still holds when we replace all ' $\leq \lambda$ ' by ' $\geq \lambda$ '. In consequence, we have

$$\min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda'_i \leq \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda\}, \#\{\lambda'_i \geq \lambda\}\} \geq \dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda\}. \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof into several claims:

Claim 1.  $\#\{\lambda_i = \lambda\} \leq \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda\}$ .

Proof: It follows from the relation (8) and Proposition 2.1 that for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\#\{\lambda_i = \lambda\} \leq \text{genus}(K_\lambda) \leq \text{genus}(S_\lambda) \leq \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda G(\mathbf{x})\}. \quad (19)$$

Claim 2.  $\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\} = \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\}$ .

Proof: Let  $k = \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\}$ . Then taking  $A_0 = \{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\}$ , we have

$$\lambda_k = \inf_{A \in \Gamma_k} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A_0} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \leq \lambda,$$

which implies  $\#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda\} \geq k = \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\}$ . The inverse inequality is also true (see [75]).

Claim 3.  $\#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda\} \geq \text{genus}'\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda\}$  where

$$\text{genus}'(A) = \max\{k : A' \subset A, \text{cone}(A') \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \stackrel{\text{odd}}{\cong} \mathbb{S}^{k-1}\}$$

where  $\text{cone}(A') \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \stackrel{\text{odd}}{\cong} \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$  means that there is an odd homeomorphism between  $\text{cone}(A') \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and  $\mathbb{S}^{k-1}$ .

Proof: Suppose  $\text{genus}'\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda\} = n - k + 1$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then there exist  $A' \subset \{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda\}$  and an odd homeomorphism  $\psi : A' \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-k}$ . The intersection property of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -genus implies that  $A \cap \text{cone}(A') \neq \emptyset$  for any  $A \in \Gamma_k$ . Therefore,

$$\lambda_k = \inf_{A \in \Gamma_k} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{cone}(A')} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \geq \lambda,$$

and this yields  $\#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda\} \geq n - k + 1 = \text{genus}'\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda\}$ .

Claim 4.  $\#\{\lambda'_i = \lambda\} \leq \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda\}$ ,  $\#\{\lambda'_i \leq \lambda\} \geq \text{genus}'\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda\}$  and  $\#\{\lambda'_i \geq \lambda\} = \text{genus}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda\}$ .

We omit the proof because it is similar to Claims 1, 2 and 3.

Note that  $\text{genus}(A) \geq \text{genus}'(A) \geq \dim_{in}(A)$ . In consequence, (17) holds, and thus (18) can be verified directly.  $\square$

Based on Lemma 2.3, we can get the inertia bound of the independence number, and the nodal domain estimate of an eigenvector.

**Definition 2.6** (nodal domains). *Given  $(F, G)$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ , a family of up nodal domains of  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $(F, G)$  consists of  $k$  pairwise disjoint nonempty subsets  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  of the support  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  satisfying*

$$\frac{F(\sum_{i=1}^k t_i \mathbf{x}|_{U_i})}{G(\sum_{i=1}^k t_i \mathbf{x}|_{U_i})} \geq \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}, \forall t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (20)$$

Similarly, we can define the down nodal domain by instead ' $\geq$ ' in (20) of ' $\leq$ '. We call  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^k$  the family of nodal domains if ' $\geq$ ' in (20) is replaced by ' $\leq$ '.

Denote by  $N^+(\mathbf{x})$  (resp.  $N^-(\mathbf{x})$ ) the largest possible  $k$  such that there exists a family of  $k$  up (resp. down) nodal domains of  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $(F, G)$ . And let  $N(\mathbf{x})$  be the number of nodal domains of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

**Definition 2.7** (independence number). *The  $c$ -level independence number of  $(F, G)$  is  $\alpha_c := \max\{k : \exists \text{ pairwise disjoint } U_1, \dots, U_k \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ s.t. } F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = c, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{1}_{U_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{U_k})\}$ .*

**Example 2.3.** *For a simple graph determined by its adjacency matrix  $A$ , let  $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top A \mathbf{x}$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}$ . Then one can check that  $\alpha_0$  is the usual independence number of the graph.*

**Example 2.4.** *For a graph  $(V, E)$ , taking  $f(A) = |\partial A|$  and  $g(A) = \text{vol}(A)$ , considering the function pair  $(f^L, g^L)$ , then it is interesting that  $\alpha_0$  indicates the number of connected components; while  $\alpha_1$  is the standard independence number.*

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be even  $p$ -homogeneous Lipschitz functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then we have the inertia bound*

$$\alpha_c \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq c\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq c\}\}.$$

For any eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t. the eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , we have

$$N^-(\mathbf{x}) \leq k + r - 1 \text{ and } N^+(\mathbf{x}) \leq n - k + r.$$

*Proof.* By (18) in Lemma 2.3,  $\dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = c\} \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq c\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq c\}\}$ . And by the definition of independence number,  $\alpha_c \leq \dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) = c\}$ . Thus, the inertia bound is proved. Since  $(\lambda_k, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ , it follows from the definition of nodal domain that

$$N^+(\mathbf{x}) \leq \dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \geq \lambda_k\} \leq \#\{\lambda_i \geq \lambda_k\} \leq n - k + r,$$

$$N^-(\mathbf{x}) \leq \dim_{in}\{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x})/G(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda_k\} \leq \#\{\lambda_i \leq \lambda_k\} \leq k + r - 1.$$

Hence, the nodal domain inequality is proved.  $\square$

### 2.3 Collatz-Wielandt formula for the largest eigenvalue

As a generalization of Collatz-Wielandt formula, we give a min-max characterization for the maximal eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$ :

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be  $p$ -homogeneous Lipschitz functions such that  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$  achieves its maximum at some  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Then*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \rangle} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup \left\{ \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} \rangle} : \mathbf{u} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \right\}$$

is the maximum of  $F/G$ , and it is also the maximal eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $F/G$  achieves its maximum at some  $\mathbf{x}$ , we have  $\nabla \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} \ni 0$  and thus  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \ni \mathbf{0}$  with  $\lambda = \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$  being the maximum of  $F/G$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This implies that there exist  $\mathbf{u} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\mathbf{u} = \lambda \mathbf{v}$ , and thus

$$\sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla F(\mathbf{z}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla G(\mathbf{z}) \rangle} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \rangle} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} \rangle} = \lambda.$$

On the other hand, since  $F$  and  $G$  are  $p$ -homogeneous, by the Euler identity  $\langle \mathbf{x}, \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = pF(\mathbf{x})$ , we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \rangle} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{x}, \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \rangle} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{pF(\mathbf{x})}{pG(\mathbf{x})} = \lambda.$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

The condition of Lemma 2.4 is satisfied in most of the interesting cases. For example, if  $F(|\mathbf{x}|) \geq F(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G(|\mathbf{x}|) = G(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  for any  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , where  $|\mathbf{x}| := (|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$ , then  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})}$  can achieve its maximum at some  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ .

**Example 2.5.** *Let  $k$  be a positive even number, and let*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^n c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}$$

and  $G(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^n d_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}$  such that every monomial term of the polynomial  $G(\mathbf{x})$  is the square of some monomial, and  $G(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , where  $c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \geq 0$  and  $d_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \geq 0$ . Then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, C\mathbf{x}^{k-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{y}, D\mathbf{x}^{k-1} \rangle} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \min_i \frac{(C\mathbf{x}^{k-1})_i}{(D\mathbf{x}^{k-1})_i}$$

is the maximal  $H$ -eigenvalue of the tensor pair  $(C, D)$ , where  $C = (c_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  and  $D = (d_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  (see Section 4.3 for the definitions). This gives a Collatz-Wielandt formula for positive tensors.

As far as we know, all known generalizations of the Collatz-Wielandt formula are about homogeneous single valued maps [40]. Lemma 2.4 might be the first version for  $(k-1)$ -homogeneous set-valued maps  $\nabla F$  and  $\nabla G$ .

Next we show a spectral lower bound for the largest eigenvalue of  $(F, G)$  restricted on a subspace.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Given  $p$ -homogeneous functions  $F, G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , and a linear subspace  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we introduce the set of pairs of functions*

$$S(F, G; X) = \{(F', G') : |F'(\mathbf{x})| \leq F(|\mathbf{x}|) \text{ and } G'(\mathbf{x}) = G(|\mathbf{x}|), \forall \mathbf{x} \in X\},$$

where<sup>4</sup>  $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a map such that  $\dim |X| = \dim X = m$ , and  $|X| := \text{span}\{|\mathbf{x}| : \mathbf{x} \in X\}$ . Then

$$\lambda_{\max}(F, G)|_{|X|} \geq \sup_{(F', G') \in S(F, G; X)} \max\{\lambda_m(F', G'), -\lambda'_m(F', G')\}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $(F', G') \in S(F, G; X)$ ,  $\frac{F(|\mathbf{x}|)}{G(|\mathbf{x}|)} \geq \frac{F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})}$  and thus

$$\lambda_{\max}(F, G)|_{|X|} := \max_{\mathbf{y} \in |X|} \frac{F(\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{y})} = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{span}\{|\mathbf{x}| : \mathbf{x} \in X\}} \frac{F(\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{y})} \geq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{F(|\mathbf{x}|)}{G(|\mathbf{x}|)} \geq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Since  $\dim X = \dim |X| = m$ ,

$$\lambda_{\max}(F, G)|_{|X|} \geq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(A) \geq m} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})} = \lambda_m(F', G').$$

Changing  $F'$  to  $-F'$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}(F, G)|_{|X|} &\geq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{-F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(A) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{-F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= - \sup_{\text{genus}(A) \geq m} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \frac{F'(\mathbf{x})}{G'(\mathbf{x})} = -\lambda'_m(F', G'). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. □

## 2.4 Structure of eigenspaces

The eigenspace of an eigenvalue  $\lambda$  is the collection of all eigenvectors w.r.t.  $\lambda$ . We list below some useful observations:

- If both  $F$  and  $G$  are even, then each eigenspace is centrally symmetric w.r.t. the center  $\mathbf{0}$ .
- If both  $F$  and  $G$  are  $p$ -homogeneous, then each eigenspace is a cone.
- If both  $F$  and  $G$  are piecewise linear, then each eigenspace is piecewise linear.

---

<sup>4</sup>By  $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we mean the absolute value.



- However, there exist convex functions  $F$  and  $G$  such that not every eigenspace is convex.

Below, we show further results on piecewise linear function pairs and convex function pairs, which will be used in the analysis of several typical applications in Section 4.

Let  $F$  and  $G$  be continuous and piecewise linear functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We always assume that there are only finite pieces, i.e., there are convex polyhedral domains  $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$  with  $\cup_{i=1}^k \Omega_i = \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\Omega_i^o \cap \Omega_j^o = \emptyset \forall i \neq j$ , such that both  $F$  and  $G$  are linear restricted on each  $\Omega_i, \forall i$ . The extreme set of  $(F, G)$  is defined to be union of all extreme points of  $\Omega_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *There are finitely many eigenvalues of  $(F, G)$ , and every eigenvalue has an eigenvector in the extreme set.*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $F|_{\Omega_i}(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + c_i$  and  $G|_{\Omega_i}(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + c'_i, i = 1, \dots, k$ . If  $\mathbf{x}$  is a relative interior point of  $\cap_{i \in I} \overline{\Omega}_i$  for some index set  $I \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ , then by the properties of subderivative, we have  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{a}_i : i \in I\}$  and  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{b}_i : i \in I\}$ .

For any eigenpair  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ , we suppose  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_i$ . Then,  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla F(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla G(\mathbf{v})$ , where  $\mathbf{v}$  is a vertex of  $\Omega_i$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \subset \nabla F(\mathbf{v}) - \lambda \nabla G(\mathbf{v})$$

implying that  $(\lambda, \mathbf{v})$  is also an eigenpair. The proof is completed.  $\square$

Note that  $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^k$  gives  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the structure of a complex. And if we regard  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as the polyhedral complex  $\cup_{i=1}^k \Omega_i$ , every eigenspace should be a subcomplex.

Next, we show a result involving the subgradient of a convex function on an inner product space  $X$ , which is a useful tool on convexity:

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function. Then, given  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) = \nabla F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  whenever  $0 < t < 1$ ;
- (1')  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) = \nabla F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  for some  $0 < t < 1$ ;
- (2)  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) \neq \emptyset$ ;
- (3)  $tF(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)F(\mathbf{y}) = F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  whenever  $0 < t < 1$ ;
- (3')  $tF(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)F(\mathbf{y}) = F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  for some  $0 < t < 1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is organized in the following steps:

Claim 1. Denote by  $N_p := \{\mathbf{v} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0, \forall \mathbf{p}' \in \Omega\}$  the normal cone of a convex set  $\Omega$  at  $\mathbf{p}$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{v} \in N_p \cap N_q$ , there hold  $\mathbf{v} \perp (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})$ , and  $N_{tp+(1-t)q} = N_p \cap N_q$  whenever  $0 < t < 1$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\mathbf{v} \in N_p \cap N_q$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$  and  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{r} \in \Omega$ . Thus,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - t\mathbf{p} - (1-t)\mathbf{q} \rangle = t\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{p} \rangle + (1-t)\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$  for any  $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega$ , which means  $\mathbf{v} \in N_{tp+(1-t)q}$ . So,  $N_p \cap N_q \subset N_{tp+(1-t)q}$ .

Conversely, for every  $\mathbf{v} \in N_{tp+(1-t)q}$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, t\mathbf{r} + (1-t)\mathbf{r}' - t\mathbf{p} - (1-t)\mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' \in \Omega$ . Since  $0 < t < 1$ , taking  $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{q}$ , we have  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{p} \rangle = \frac{1}{t}\langle \mathbf{v}, t\mathbf{r} - t\mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{r} \in \Omega$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{v} \in N_p$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{v} \in N_q$ . Thus,  $N_{tp+(1-t)q} \subset N_p \cap N_q$ .

Taking  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{p}$ , we have  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$ . Similarly,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$ . Hence,  $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle = 0$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.**  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Proj}_X(N_p(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap (X \times \{-1\}))$ , where  $\mathbf{epi}(F) := \{(\mathbf{x}, c) \in X \times \mathbb{R} : \mathbf{x} \in X, c \geq F(\mathbf{x})\}$ ,  $\mathbf{p} := (\mathbf{x}, F(\mathbf{x}))$ , and  $\text{Proj}_X : X \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$  is the projection onto  $X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{x}, F(\mathbf{x}))$  and  $\Omega = \mathbf{epi}(F)$ . Since  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{u} : \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x})\}$ , we have<sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} N_p &= \{\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}', \xi) \in X \times \mathbb{R} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0, \forall \mathbf{p}' = (\mathbf{x}', c) \in \mathbf{epi}(F)\} \\ &= \{(\mathbf{v}', \xi) \in X \times (-\infty, 0) : \langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \xi(c - F(\mathbf{x})) \leq 0, \forall \mathbf{x}' \in X, \forall c \geq F(\mathbf{x}')\} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\} \\ &= \{(\mathbf{v}', \xi) \in X \times (-\infty, 0) : \langle \frac{\mathbf{v}'}{|\xi|}, \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x}' \in X\} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\} \\ &= \{t(\mathbf{u}, -1) : \mathbf{u} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), t \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The equality  $N_p(\mathbf{epi}(F)) = \{t(\mathbf{u}, -1) : \mathbf{u} \in \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), t \geq 0\}$  then implies Claim 2.  $\square$

**Claim 3.**  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } tF(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)F(\mathbf{y}) > F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}), \\ \nabla F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) & \text{if } tF(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)F(\mathbf{y}) = F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}). \end{cases}$

*Proof.* According to Claims 1 and 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \text{Proj}_X(N_p(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap N_q(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap (X \times \{-1\})) \\ &= \text{Proj}_X(N_{tp+(1-t)q}(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap (X \times \{-1\})) \\ &= \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } tp + (1-t)p \neq (t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}, F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})), \\ \nabla F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) & \text{if } tp + (1-t)p = (t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}, F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

We are also interested in the converse of Proposition 2.5.

**Conjecture 1.** *A Lipschitzian function  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex if and only if  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) = \nabla F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  whenever  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  and  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \cap \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) \neq \emptyset$ .*

<sup>5</sup>This fact is known to the experts [16].

In the proof of Proposition 2.5, we use the section  $N_p(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap (X \times \{-1\})$ , while we note that in [72], the authors investigate the spherical section  $N_p(\mathbf{epi}(F)) \cap \mathbb{S}^{\dim X}$ , i.e., the Gauss map of  $\mathbf{graph}(F)$  at  $p$ . By Proposition 2.5 and the results in [72], we have

**Proposition 2.6.** *If  $\dim X < \infty$ , then the range of the Gauss map of the graph of a convex function  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is open if and only if  $\{\mathbf{y} \in X : \nabla F(\mathbf{y}) = \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\}$  is bounded for any  $\mathbf{x} \in X$ , if and only if every convex subset  $\Omega$  with  $F|_{\Omega}$  being linear is bounded.*

**Proposition 2.7.** *For a convex function  $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\dim X < \infty$ , if  $F$  is one-homogeneous, then the range of the Gauss map of  $\mathbf{graph}(F)$  is closed; while, if  $F$  is  $p$ -homogeneous with  $p > 1$ , and  $F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , then the range of the Gauss map of  $\mathbf{graph}(F)$  is open.*

Based on Proposition 2.5, we obtain the following results on eigenpairs, which are very similar to Theorem 2.4.

**Corollary 2.1.** *For two convex functions  $F$  and  $G$ , if  $F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) = tF(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)F(\mathbf{y})$  and  $G(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) = tG(\mathbf{x}) + (1-t)G(\mathbf{y})$  and  $(\lambda, t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$  for some  $0 < t < 1$ , then both  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  and  $(\lambda, \mathbf{y})$  are eigenpairs.*

**Corollary 2.2.** *For two convex functions  $F$  and  $G$ , if  $F$  and  $G$  are linear on a convex polyhedron  $\Delta$ , and  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$  for some relative interior point  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\Delta$ , then for any vertex  $\mathbf{v}$  of  $\Delta$ ,  $(\lambda, \mathbf{v})$  is also an eigenpair.*

## 2.5 Duality and convex conjugate

**Definition 2.8** (conjugate). *The convex conjugate of a convex function  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as  $F^*(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle - F(\mathbf{y})\}$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .*

The convex conjugate is also known as Legendre transformation or Fenchel dual (see [93]). If we restrict ourselves to a convex  $p$ -homogeneous function  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the additional positive-definiteness condition that  $F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , then  $F^*$  is convex,  $p^*$ -homogeneous and positive-definite, where  $p, p^* > 1$  satisfy  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p^*} = 1$ . It should be noted that the convex conjugate is useless for the one-homogeneous case. For this case, we introduce the concept of convex duality as follows.

**Definition 2.9** (duality). *For a convex one-homogeneous function  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  with  $G(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , we define its dual function  $G^*(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}{G(\mathbf{y})}$ .*

It is clear that  $G^*$  is also a convex one-homogeneous function with the positive-definiteness property that  $G^*(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

**Definition 2.10** (projection). *For a function  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and a linear map  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\text{Range}(T) \neq \mathbf{0}$ , define the function  $G_{\text{inf}} : \text{Range}(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by*

$G_{\text{inf}}(\mathbf{y}) := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in T^{-1}(\mathbf{y})} G(\mathbf{x})$ , and define  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z})$ . We call  $G_{\text{inf}}$  the projection of  $G$  to  $\text{Range}(T)$ , and  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$  the projection of  $G$  to  $\text{Ker}(T)^\perp$ .

**Remark 4.** When we think of  $G$  as a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $G_{\text{inf}}$  is a norm on  $\text{Range}(T)$ , and  $T$  maps the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the norm  $G$  to the unit ball in  $\text{Range}(T)$  equipped with the norm  $G_{\text{inf}}$ . We note that  $G_{\text{inf}}$  is called the filling norm in [41] when  $G$  is a norm. Likewise,  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$  induces a norm on  $\text{Ker}(T)^\perp$ , and the unit ball in  $\text{Ker}(T)^\perp$  that has the norm  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$  is the projection of the  $G$ -norm unit ball to  $\text{Ker}(T)^\perp$ , in which the  $G$ -norm unit ball means the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  under the norm  $G$ . This is the reason why we call  $G_{\text{inf}}$  and  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$  the projections of  $G$ .

We have the following useful lemma which reveals the connections among the non-vanishing eigenvalues of function pairs involving duality and projection.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be positive-definite one-homogeneous convex functions. Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be a linear map (regarding as a matrix  $T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ). Then, the eigenvalue problems of the function pairs  $(F \circ T, G)$ ,  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ ,  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$ ,  $(G_{\text{inf}}^*, F^*)$ , and  $(F, G_{\text{inf}})$ , are equivalent in the sense that their nonzero eigenvalues are the same.

This lemma has many interesting applications. For example, taking  $F(\mathbf{y}) = \|\mathbf{y}\|_p$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_q$ , the positive eigenvalues of  $(\|T \cdot\|_p, \|\cdot\|_q)$  and  $(\|T^\top \cdot\|_{q^*}, \|\cdot\|_{p^*})$  coincide. In particular, we have

**Example 2.6.** For a real matrix  $T$  of the order  $m \times n$ , for  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ , we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|T\mathbf{x}\|_p}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_q} = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|T^\top \mathbf{y}\|_{q^*}}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_{p^*}},$$

where  $p^*, q^*$  are the Hölder conjugates of  $p, q$ . Taking  $p = 2$  and  $q = \infty$ , we immediately obtain the equality on the  $l^1$ -polarization constant (Proposition 3 in [4]).

Since a hypergraph is uniquely determined by its incidence matrix, we can directly define the eigenvalues of  $p$ -Laplacians on vertices (resp. hyperedges) as the spectrums of  $(\|T \cdot\|_p^p, \|\cdot\|_p^p)$  (resp.  $(\|T^\top \cdot\|_p^p, \|\cdot\|_p^p)$ ) by means of the incidence matrix  $T$ . More interestingly, we can prove that there is a simple one-to-one correspondence between the nonzero eigenvalues of the vertex  $p$ -Laplacian and the edge  $p^*$ -Laplacian on a (hyper-)graph. This is quite important because it offers us two alternative ways to estimate the nonvanishing eigenvalues, either through the  $p$ -Laplacian on vertices or through the  $p^*$ -Laplacian on edges.

**Proposition 2.8.** The nonzero eigenvalues of the vertex 1-Laplacian and the edge  $\infty$ -Laplacian coincide. For  $p > 1$ , denote by  $\Delta_p^V$  and  $\Delta_{p^*}^E$  the vertex  $p$ -Laplacian and edge  $p^*$ -Laplacian, respectively. Then

$$\{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} : \lambda \text{ is a positive eigenvalue of } \Delta_p^V\} = \{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p^*}} : \lambda \text{ is a positive eigenvalue of } \Delta_{p^*}^E\}. \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be the vertex-edge incidence matrix of the graph. According to Lemma 2.5, the positive eigenvalues of  $(\|T \cdot \|_1, \| \cdot \|_1)$  and  $(\|T^\top \cdot \|_\infty, \| \cdot \|_\infty)$  coincide. It is known that the unnormalized eigenvalue problem of the vertex 1-Laplacian (resp. the edge  $\infty$ -Laplacian) agrees with the eigenvalue problem of  $(\|T \cdot \|_1, \| \cdot \|_1)$  (resp.  $(\|T^\top \cdot \|_\infty, \| \cdot \|_\infty)$ ).

Next, we consider the case of  $p \in (1, +\infty)$ . By Lemma 2.5, the positive eigenvalues of  $(\|T \cdot \|_p, \| \cdot \|_p)$  and  $(\|T^\top \cdot \|_{p^*}, \| \cdot \|_{p^*})$  coincide. And it can be checked that the unnormalized eigenvalue problem of the vertex  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p^V$  is nothing but the eigenvalue problem of the  $p$ -homogeneous function pair  $(\|T \cdot \|_p^p, \| \cdot \|_p^p)$ . Also,

$$\{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } (\|T \cdot \|_p^p, \| \cdot \|_p^p)\} = \{\text{eigenvalues of } (\|T \cdot \|_p, \| \cdot \|_p)\}.$$

Similar statements hold for  $(\|T^\top \cdot \|_{p^*}^p, \| \cdot \|_{p^*}^p)$ . These facts deduce the desired relation (21).

For the normalized version, we need to consider  $(\|T \cdot \|_p, \| \cdot \|_{\text{deg},p})$  and  $(\|T^\top \cdot \|_{\text{deg},p^*}, \| \cdot \|_{p^*})$ , where  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\text{deg},p} = (\sum_{i \in V} \text{deg}_i |x_i|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ . The previous discussion still works. The proof is then completed. As a supplement, the case of  $p > 1$  can also be proved via Lemma 2.6.  $\square$

In the setting of convex conjugates, we have the following analog of Lemma 2.5.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be positive-definite  $p$ -homogeneous convex functions with  $p > 1$ . Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be a linear map (i.e., a matrix  $T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ). Then  $\lambda$  is a nonzero eigenvalue of  $(F \circ T, G)$  if and only if  $\lambda^{p^*-1}$  is a nonzero eigenvalue of  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ . Also, the nontrivial spectra of  $(F \circ T, G)$ ,  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$  and  $(F, G_{\text{inf}})$  coincide.*

Below, we present the proofs of Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6.

*Proof of Lemma 2.5.* We need two claims for positive-definite one-homogeneous convex functions:

Claim 1. If  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $G^*(\mathbf{y}) = 1$ . Similarly, for any  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \nabla G^*(\mathbf{y})$ ,  $G(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ .

Proof: For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ , the Euler identity for one-homogeneous functions gives  $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = G(\mathbf{x})$  and then the definition of the subgradient implies  $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle \leq G(\mathbf{x}')$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus,  $G^*(\mathbf{y}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle}{G(\mathbf{x}')} = 1$ . The other identity  $G(\nabla G^*(\mathbf{x})) = 1$  is similar.

Claim 2. If  $G^*(\mathbf{y}) = G(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ , then  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbf{x} \in \nabla G^*(\mathbf{y})$ .

Proof: Suppose that  $\mathbf{y} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  and  $G^*(\mathbf{y}) = G(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{x} \rangle - G(\mathbf{x}) \leq G^*(\mathbf{y}')G(\mathbf{x}) - G(\mathbf{x}) = G^*(\mathbf{y}') - G^*(\mathbf{y}),$$

which means  $\mathbf{x} \in \nabla G^*(\mathbf{y})$ . The other direction is similar.

Let  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$  be an eigenpair of  $(F \circ T, G)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} F(T\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} G(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus, there exists  $\mathbf{u} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\lambda \mathbf{u} \in \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} F(T\mathbf{x}) = T^\top \nabla F(T\mathbf{x})$ . Hence, there is a  $\mathbf{v} \in \nabla F(T\mathbf{x})$  satisfying  $\lambda \mathbf{u} = T^\top \mathbf{v}$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose  $G(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ , and then  $F(T\mathbf{x}) = \lambda$ . By Claim 1, we have  $G^*(\mathbf{u}) = 1$  and  $F^*(\mathbf{v}) = 1$ . Note that  $F(T\mathbf{x}/\lambda) = 1$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \nabla F(T\mathbf{x}) = \nabla F(T\mathbf{x}/\lambda)$ . Then, we could apply Claim 2 to derive that  $T\mathbf{x}/\lambda \in \nabla F^*(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \nabla G^*(\mathbf{u}) = \nabla G^*(\lambda \mathbf{u}) = \nabla G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v})$ . Therefore,  $T\mathbf{x} \in T \nabla G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v})$ . In consequence, we have

$$\mathbf{0} = T\mathbf{x} - \lambda \cdot T\mathbf{x}/\lambda \in \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v}) - \lambda \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} F^*(\mathbf{v}).$$

Consequently,  $(\lambda, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is an eigenpair of  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ . The other direction is similar. In summary, we have proved that the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(F \circ T, G)$  coincide with the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ .

Next we replace  $G$  by its projections,  $G_{\text{inf}}$  and  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$ , respectively. By Proposition 2.3,  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x})$  is a convex function of  $\mathbf{x}$ , and it satisfies  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) = G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)$ . It is easy to check that  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}$  is one-homogeneous and positive-definite on  $\text{Ker}(T)^\perp$ .

For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \text{Range}(T)$ , there exists a unique  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ker}(T)^\perp$  such that  $\mathbf{y} = T\mathbf{x}$ . Thus,

$$G_{\text{inf}}(\mathbf{y}) = G_{\text{inf}}(T\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x}' \in T^{-1}(T\mathbf{x})} G(\mathbf{x}') = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) = G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since  $T|_{\text{Ker}(T)^\perp} : \text{Ker}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{Range}(T)$  is a linear isomorphism,  $G_{\text{inf}}$  is convex, one-homogeneous and positive-definite on  $\text{Range}(T)$ . And it is clear that  $\{\mathbf{y} \in \text{Range}(T) : G_{\text{inf}}(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1\} = T\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$ . Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{x}) &= \sup_{G(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \langle T^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = \sup_{G(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{x}, T\mathbf{y} \rangle \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{y} : G_{\text{inf}}(T\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{x}, T\mathbf{y} \rangle = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Range}(T) : G_{\text{inf}}(\mathbf{z}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \rangle = G_{\text{inf}}^*(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{Ker}(T)}^*(T^\top \mathbf{y}) &= \sup_{G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{z}) \leq 1} \langle T^\top \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \rangle = \sup_{G_{\text{inf}}(T\mathbf{z}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{y}, T\mathbf{z} \rangle \\ &= \sup_{G_{\text{inf}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sup_{G(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = G_{\text{inf}}^*(\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)}^*(T^\top \mathbf{y}) = G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y})$ . In consequence, the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ ,  $(G_{\text{inf}}^*, F^*)$  and  $(G_{\text{Ker}(T)}^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$  are the same. By the previous results, the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$  and  $(G_{\text{Ker}(T)}^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$  coincide; while the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(G_{\text{inf}}^*, F^*)$  and  $(F, G_{\text{inf}})$  are the same. We then complete the proof by putting these statements together.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** The equality  $G^*(T^\top \mathbf{x}) = G_{\text{inf}}^*(\mathbf{x})$  in the above proof is useful and interesting. It implies that, roughly speaking, the section of the dual equals the dual of the projection, from which one can easily prove that every convex polytope is a section of a regular simplex, and every centrally symmetric convex polytope is a section of a crosspolytope ( $l^1$ -ball).

*Proof of Lemma 2.6.* Let  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$  be an eigenpair of  $(F \circ T, G)$ . Then, there exists  $\mathbf{u} \in \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $\lambda \mathbf{u} \in \nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}) = T^\top \nabla F(T\mathbf{x})$ . Hence, there is a  $\mathbf{v} \in \nabla F(T\mathbf{x})$  satisfying  $\lambda \mathbf{u} = T^\top \mathbf{v}$ . By the properties of the Fenchel conjugate,  $\mathbf{x} \in \nabla G^*(\mathbf{u})$  and  $T\mathbf{x} \in \nabla F^*(\mathbf{v})$ . Since  $G^*$  is  $p^*$ -homogeneous,  $\nabla G^*$  is  $(p^* - 1)$ -homogeneous. Accordingly,

$$T\mathbf{x} \in T\nabla G^*\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}T^\top \mathbf{v}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^{p^*-1}T\nabla G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v}) = \lambda^{1-p^*}\nabla_v G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v})$$

and hence,  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_v G^*(T^\top \mathbf{v}) - \lambda^{p^*-1}\nabla_v F^*(\mathbf{v})$ , meaning that  $\lambda^{p^*-1}$  is a nonzero eigenvalue of  $(G^* \circ T^\top, F^*)$ . The converse is similar.

Next, we focus on the function pair  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$ . By the fact that  $\nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}) = T^\top \nabla F(T\mathbf{x}) \subset \text{Range}(T^\top) = \text{Ker}(T)^\perp$  and  $\lambda \neq 0$ , in combination with (11) in Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}) \cap \text{Ker}(T)^\perp - \lambda \nabla_x G(\mathbf{x}) \cap \text{Ker}(T)^\perp \subset \nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla_x G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x})$$

implying that  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$ . The converse needs the following statement.

Argument: If  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  is continuous, positive-definite and  $p$ -homogeneous with  $p \geq 1$ , then for any  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z})$  can reach its minimum.

Proof: Suppose on the contrary that there exists  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z})$  cannot reach its infimum. Then  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and there exist  $\mathbf{x}^n$  with  $\mathbf{x}^n - \mathbf{x} \in \text{Ker}(T)$ , such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} G(\mathbf{x}^n) = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{Ker}(T)} G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\mathbf{x}^n\|_2 = +\infty.$$

Then  $\mathbf{x}^n / \|\mathbf{x}^n\|_2$  has a limit point  $\mathbf{x}^0$ . Clearly,  $\|\mathbf{x}^0\|_2 = 1$ . By the continuity of  $G$ ,  $G(\mathbf{x}^0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} G\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}^n}{\|\mathbf{x}^n\|_2}\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{G(\mathbf{x}^n)}{\|\mathbf{x}^n\|_2^p} = 0$ , which contradicts the condition that  $G$  is positive-definite.

Now, let  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  be an eigenpair of  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$ . The above argument yields that there exists  $\mathbf{x}'$  such that  $\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \in \text{Ker}(T)$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}') = G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x})$ . Then, in combination with (11) in Proposition 2.3, we derive

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla_x G_{\text{Ker}(T)}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_x F(T\mathbf{x}') - \lambda \nabla_x G(\mathbf{x}') \cap \text{Ker}(T)^\perp.$$

This implies that  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}')$  is an eigenvalue of  $(F \circ T, G)$ . Therefore, the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(F \circ T, G)$  and  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$  are the same.

Since  $G_{\text{Ker}(T)} = G_{\text{inf}} \circ T$  and  $T|_{\text{Ker}(T)^\perp} : \text{Ker}(T)^\perp \rightarrow \text{Range}(T)$  is a homeomorphism, we can write  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)}) = (F \circ T, G_{\text{inf}} \circ T)$ . Then, we can apply Proposition 2.2 to derive that the nonzero eigenvalues of  $(F \circ T, G_{\text{Ker}(T)})$  and  $(F, G_{\text{inf}})$  coincide.  $\square$

**Remark 6.** *The variational characterization of the second eigenvalue of graph  $p$ -Laplacian (see Example 2.1) is also a direct consequence of Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6.*

### 3 Homogeneous and piecewise multilinear extensions

First, we recall the definition of the *original Lovász extension*.

**Definition 3.1.** Given a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , its *original Lovász extension* is the function  $f^L : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$f^L(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_{(i+1)} - x_{(i)}) f(V_i(\mathbf{x})) + x_{(1)} f(V), \quad (22)$$

where  $V_i(\mathbf{x}) := \{j \in V : x_j > x_{(i)}\}$  and  $x_{(1)} \leq x_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$  is a rearrangement of  $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  in non-decreasing order.

The disjoint-pair Lovász extension is defined in a similar manner (see [55] for details), and we still use  $f^L$  to indicate the disjoint-pair Lovász extension of  $f$ .

**Definition 3.2** (piecewise multilinear extension). Given  $V_i = \{1, \dots, n_i\}$  and the power set  $\mathcal{P}(V_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , for a discrete function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the piecewise multilinear function on  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$  by

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \sum_{i_1 \in V_1, \dots, i_k \in V_k} \prod_{l=1}^k (x_{(i_l)}^l - x_{(i_{l-1})}^l) f(V^{(i_1)}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{(i_k)}(\mathbf{x}^k)),$$

where  $V^{(i)}(\mathbf{x}^l) := \{j \in V_l : x_j^l > x_{(i-1)}^l\}$  for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}^l) = V_l$ ,  $x_{(0)}^l := 0$ ,  $x_{(1)}^l \leq x_{(2)}^l \leq \dots \leq x_{(n_l)}^l$  is a rearrangement of  $\mathbf{x}^l := (x_1^l, \dots, x_{n_l}^l)$  in non-decreasing order, for any  $\mathbf{x}^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$ .

Since the definition of  $f^M$  doesn't involve the data on  $(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  if  $A_i = \emptyset$  for some  $i$ , we can set  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = 0$  whenever  $A_i = \emptyset$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** Under the notions in Definition 3.2, for fixed  $\mathbf{x}^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$ , let  $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as  $\tilde{f}(A) = f^M(\mathbf{1}_A, \mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$ . Then  $\tilde{f}^L(\mathbf{x}) = f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$  for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ .

Proposition 3.1 shows that the piecewise multilinear extension induces the Lovász extension by restricting  $f^M$  to each component  $\mathbf{x}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ ; while if we restrict the piecewise multilinear extension of a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to the diagonal  $\underbrace{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x})}_{k \text{ times}} \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ , we obtain the following

**Definition 3.3.** Given  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and its power set  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ , for a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the piecewise polynomial extension  $f_{\Delta}^M$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$f_{\Delta}^M(\mathbf{x}) := f^M(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Some special examples on graphs are presented in Table 1.

It is also useful to provide the multiple integral representation of the piecewise multilinear extension in Definition 3.2. For example, given a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$



Table 1: Piecewise bilinear extension of some objective functions on  $\mathcal{P}(V) \times \mathcal{P}(V)$ .

Objective function $f(A, B)$	Piecewise bilinear extension $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$
$\#E(A, B)$	$\sum_{i \sim j} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i)$
constant $c$	$c \max_i x_i \max_i y_i$
$\#A \cdot \#B$	$(\sum_i x_i)(\sum_i y_i)$
$\#(A \cap B)$	$\sum_i x_i y_i$

with the assumption that  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = 0$  whenever  $A_i \in \{V, \emptyset\}$  for some  $i$ , we have

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \int_{\min \mathbf{x}^k}^{\max \mathbf{x}^k} \dots \int_{\min \mathbf{x}^1}^{\max \mathbf{x}^1} f(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) dt_1 \dots dt_k, \quad (23)$$

where  $V^{t_l}(\mathbf{x}^l) = \{j \in V : x_j^l > t_l\}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ . For a general  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  without any additional assumptions, the definition (23) should be modified by adding some standard remainder terms to guarantee the condition  $f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_k}) = f(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ . Since these remainder terms are routine, we don't write down them explicitly for simplicity. Next, we show a simple formula for  $f^M$  when  $f$  is modular on each component.

**Definition 3.4.** Given a function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let  $f_{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_k} : \mathcal{P}(V_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as  $f_{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_k}(A_i) = f(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ . We say that  $f$  is modular on each component if  $f_{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_k}$  is modular for any  $i, A_1, \dots, A_k$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** A function  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is modular on each component if and only if  $f^M$  is multilinear. And at this time,  $f^M$  is determined by

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^k} \dots \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^1} f(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) dt_1 \dots dt_k \quad (24)$$

where  $V^{t_l}(\mathbf{x}^l) = \{j \in V_l : x_j^l > t_l\}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f$  is modular on each component. By Definition 3.2,  $f^M$  must be linear on each component. Thus,  $f^M$  is a  $k$ -homogeneous polynomial and it is linear on each variable  $x_i^l$ . Therefore, the explicit expression is uniquely determined by the data on the subset  $\{\mathbf{x}^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : \min \mathbf{x}^1 = 0\} \times \dots \times \{\mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k} : \min \mathbf{x}^k = 0\}$ . Note that on such a subset, the formula (24) can be derived directly from Definition 3.2.

For the converse, suppose  $f^M$  is multilinear and  $f$  is not modular on its first component. Then, as shown in Proposition 3.1, the restriction of  $f^M$  to its first component  $f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_{A_2}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_k}) = \tilde{f}^L(\mathbf{x})$  is the Lovász extension of a non-modular function, which implies that  $f^M$  is not linear on its first component, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Example 3.1.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph, i.e., every edge has cardinality  $k$ . Let  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \#E(A_1, \dots, A_k) := \#\{(i_1, \dots, i_k) : i_1 \in A_1, \dots, i_k \in A_k, \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E\}$ . Then we have  $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in V, \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E} x_{i_1}^1 \cdots x_{i_k}^k$ .

For  $g(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \prod_{j=1}^k \#A_j$ , one has  $g^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \prod_{j=1}^k \sum_{i \in V} x_i^j$ , where  $\mathbf{x}^j = (x_1^j, \dots, x_n^j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .

We can use the formula (24) to get the closed form of  $f^M$ . Note that  $\#E(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  is modular on each  $A_i$ . Thus, for  $\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k$  with  $\min \mathbf{x}^1 = \dots = \min \mathbf{x}^k = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) &= \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^k} \cdots \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^1} \#E(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) dt_1 \cdots dt_k \\ &= \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^k} \cdots \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^1} \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E} 1_{x_{i_1}^1 > t_1} \cdots 1_{x_{i_k}^k > t_k} dt_1 \cdots dt_k \\ &= \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E} \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^k} \cdots \int_0^{\max \mathbf{x}^1} 1_{x_{i_1}^1 > t_1} \cdots 1_{x_{i_k}^k > t_k} dt_1 \cdots dt_k \\ &= \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E} x_{i_1}^1 \cdots x_{i_k}^k. \end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 3.2, for any  $\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k$ ,

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in V, \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E} x_{i_1}^1 \cdots x_{i_k}^k.$$

One can do a similar calculation for  $\#A_1 \cdots \#A_k$  by employing Proposition 3.2, but it is more convenient to use Proposition 3.4 below.

We will see in Section 4.1 that Table 1 and Example 3.1 are closely related to the Motzkin-Straus theorem and the Lagrangian density of hypergraphs in the study of the Turán problems.

According to Theorem 3.10 in [6],  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(V)$  is the set of bases of a matroid on  $V$  if and only if the polynomial  $\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \prod_{i \in B} x_i$  is Lorentzian (i.e., strong log-concave). Combining this argument with Proposition 3.2, we immediately obtain

**Proposition 3.3.** Suppose that  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  satisfy  $f(\{i_1\}, \dots, \{i_k\}) = 0$  if  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  are not pairwise distinct. Then,  $f_{\Delta}^M$  is a Lorentzian polynomial if and only if  $f$  is modular and  $\{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset V : f(\{i_1\}, \dots, \{i_k\}) = 1\}$  is the set of bases of a matroid on  $V$ .

The following is a generalization of the disjoint-pair Lovász extension.

**Definition 3.5.** For a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the multiple integral extension on  $\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} &f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \\ &= \int_0^{\|\mathbf{x}^k\|_{\infty}} \cdots \int_0^{\|\mathbf{x}^1\|_{\infty}} f(V_+^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), V_-^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V_+^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k), V_-^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) dt_1 \cdots dt_k, \end{aligned}$$

Table 2: Multiple integral extension of typical objective functions.

Objective function $f(A_+^1, A_-^1, \dots, A_+^k, A_-^k)$	Multiple extension $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$
$\prod_{i=1}^k \#(A_+^i \cup A_-^i)$	$\prod_{i=1}^k \ \mathbf{x}^i\ _1$
1	$\prod_{i=1}^k \ \mathbf{x}^i\ _\infty$

where  $\mathcal{P}_2(V_l) = \{(A_+, A_-) : A_+, A_- \subset V_l, A_+ \cap A_- = \emptyset\}$ , and  $V_\pm^{t_l}(\mathbf{x}^l) = \{j \in V_l : \pm x_j^l > t_l\}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, k$ .

The property of the multiple integral extension in Definition 3.5 is very similar to the piecewise multilinear extension introduced in Definition 3.2, but its integral formulation is more concise and it is convenient for computation. As an analog to Table 1, we refer to Table 2 for some examples of Definition 3.5.

**Proposition 3.4.** For  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the form of multiplication  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) := \prod_{i=1}^k f_i(A_i)$ ,  $\forall (A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k)$ , we have  $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \prod_{i=1}^k f_i^L(\mathbf{x}^i)$ ,  $\forall (\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$ .

For  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the form  $f(A_1, B_1, \dots, A_k, B_k) := \prod_{i=1}^k f_i(A_i, B_i)$ ,  $\forall (A_1, B_1, \dots, A_k, B_k) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k)$ , there similarly holds  $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \prod_{i=1}^k f_i^L(\mathbf{x}^i)$ .

**Remark 7.** The original Lovász extension identifies  $A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  with  $\mathbf{1}_A \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , and then extends  $f$  from the set  $\{\mathbf{1}_A : A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}\}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^V$  in a piecewise linear way.

The disjoint-pair Lovász extension identifies  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$  with  $\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_B \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , and then extends  $f : \mathcal{P}_2(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  piecewise-linearly.

The piecewise bilinear extension identifies  $(A, B) \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^2$  with  $(\mathbf{1}_A, \mathbf{1}_B) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $n = \#V$ , and then extends  $f$  to a piecewise bilinear function.

In general settings, the piecewise multilinear extension identifies  $(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^k$  with  $(\mathbf{1}_{A_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_k}) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ , and then extends  $f$  to a  $k$ -homogeneous piecewise multilinear function. Moreover, the multiple integral extension identifies  $(A_+^1, A_-^1, \dots, A_+^k, A_-^k) \in (\mathcal{P}_2(V) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\})^k$  with  $(\mathbf{1}_{A_+^1} - \mathbf{1}_{A_-^1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_+^k} - \mathbf{1}_{A_-^k}) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ , and then extends  $f$  to a piecewise  $k$ -homogeneous polynomial.

**Definition 3.6** (rank of a function). Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be nonempty sets. A function  $F : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a basic function if  $F(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \prod_{i=1}^k F_i(\mathbf{x}^i)$  for some function  $F_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The rank of a function  $F : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denoted by  $\text{rank}(F)$ , is the minimum number of basic functions needed to sum to  $F$ . If there is no such a representation, we set  $\text{rank}(F) = \infty$ .

**Definition 3.7** (slice rank of a function). Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be nonempty sets. A function  $F : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a slice if it can be written as the product of a function on  $X_i$  and a function on  $\prod_{j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{i\}} X_j$ , for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . The slice rank of a function  $F : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denoted by  $\text{slice-rank}(F)$ , is the minimum number of slices needed to sum to  $F$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *The slice rank of  $f : \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  equals the slice rank of  $f^M : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , namely,  $\text{slice-rank}(f^M) = \text{slice-rank}(f)$ . Moreover,  $\text{rank}(f^M) = \text{rank}(f)$  and  $\text{slice-rank}(f) \leq \text{rank}(f) \leq \#\text{support}(f)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f$  is a slice, then by the definition of piecewise multilinear extension,  $f^M$  must be also a slice. If  $f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \hat{F}(\mathbf{x}^1)\tilde{F}(\mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$  is a slice, then taking  $\hat{f}(A_1) = \hat{F}(\mathbf{1}_{A_1})$  and  $\tilde{f}(A_2, \dots, A_k) = \tilde{F}(\mathbf{1}_{A_2}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_k})$ , we have  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A_1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_k}) = \hat{f}(A_1)\tilde{f}(A_2, \dots, A_k)$ , meaning that  $f$  is a slice. Then the equality  $\text{slice-rank}(f^M) = \text{slice-rank}(f)$  is proved by the equivalence of slices. The proof of  $\text{rank}(f^M) = \text{rank}(f)$  is similar.  $\square$

This implies that rank and slice rank are invariant under the piecewise multilinear extension.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Suppose that  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) \neq 0$  if and only if  $A_1 = \cdots = A_k \neq \emptyset$ . Then the slice rank of  $f^M$  is  $2^{\#V} - 1$ . Also, if  $f : \mathcal{P}(V)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is modular on each component, and  $f(\{i_1\}, \dots, \{i_k\}) \neq 0$  if and only if  $i_1 = \cdots = i_k$ , then  $\text{slice-rank}(f^M) = \#V$ .*

*Proof.* Regarding  $f$  as a  $\underbrace{2^{\#V} \times \cdots \times 2^{\#V}}_{k \text{ times}}$  tensor, the condition means that  $f$  is a diagonal tensor with only one zero diagonal element. Then, by Tao's lemma on diagonal tensors,  $f$  has the slice rank  $2^{\#V} - 1$ . By Proposition 3.5,  $f^M$  also has the slice rank  $2^{\#V} - 1$ .

For the modular case, Proposition 3.2 implies that  $f^M$  is multilinear and thus we can regard  $f^M$  (or  $f$ ) as a tensor. Then the result is equivalent to Tao's lemma on diagonal tensors.  $\square$

Both the piecewise multilinear extensions (Definition 3.2) and the multiple integral extension (Definition 3.5) are also called *homogeneous extensions*, and it should be noted that **we use the same notion  $f^M$  to express these extensions of a function  $f$** . Next, we introduce the novel concept of perfect domain pairs for studying incomplete data with the tools of extension methods.

For constraint sets  $\mathcal{A} \subset (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^k$  (or  $\mathcal{A} \subset (\mathcal{P}_2(V) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\})^k$ ) and  $\mathcal{D} \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ , we can define their dual feasible sets  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  as follows:

- $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$  is the maximal domain such that  $f^M$  is well-defined (resp. positive/nonnegative) on  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  whenever  $f$  is well-defined (resp. positive/nonnegative) on  $\mathcal{A}$ ;
- $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{P}(V)^k$  (or  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k$ ) is the minimal domain of discrete functions for defining their extensions on  $\mathcal{D}$ .

In concrete cases, it is defined by the following way:

For the piecewise multilinear extension introduced in Definition 3.2,  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) = \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^k : (V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) \in \mathcal{A}, \forall t_i < \max \mathbf{x}^i, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ . Conversely, given a subset  $\mathcal{D} \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ , we have  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) = \{(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) \in (\mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^k : (\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in \mathcal{D}, t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . We call  $(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k))$

the *multiple upper level set* of  $\mathbf{x} := (\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)$  at the multiple level  $(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

For the multiple integral extension introduced in Definition 3.5, we similarly have  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) = \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k : (V_+^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), V_-^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V_+^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k), V_-^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) \in \mathcal{A}, \forall t_i < \|\mathbf{x}^i\|_\infty\}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) = \{(V_+^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), V_-^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V_+^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k), V_-^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) \in (\mathcal{P}_2(V) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\})^k : (\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in \mathcal{D}, t_1, \dots, t_k \geq 0\}$ .

**Definition 3.8** (perfect domain pair). *Given an extension way like Definition 3.2 or 3.5, a pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$  is a perfect domain pair if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ .*

It can be verified that both  $\mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{D}$  are idempotent, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}))) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$  for any  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ . Thus, for  $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})), \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$  must be a perfect domain pair. Conversely, for  $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}), \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})))$  is a perfect domain pair. For example, taking

$$\mathcal{I}_k = \{(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \mathcal{P}(V)^k : \{A_i\}_{i=1}^k \text{ forms an inclusion chain}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_k = \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) : \mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n, \mathbf{x}^i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}^j \text{ are comonotonic}, \forall i, j\}$$

then  $(\mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{C}_k)$  is a perfect domain pair. This fact is shown in Proposition 3.7 and the proof of Theorem 1.4.

We provide the following fundamental theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given  $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , we have*

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \text{supp}(g)} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \sup_{A \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \quad (25)$$

whenever  $\{\mathbf{1}_A : A \in \mathcal{A}\} \subset \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ . The above inequality still holds when we replace all ‘sup’ and ‘≤’ by ‘inf’ and ‘≥’, respectively. If we further assume that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$  is a perfect domain pair, and  $\text{supp}(f) \subset \text{supp}(g)$ , then there hold the identities

$$\max_{A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \text{supp}(g)} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \text{supp}(g)} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (26)$$

*Proof.* Since  $g^M(\mathbf{1}_A) = g(A)$ , we have  $\mathbf{1}_A \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)$  whenever  $A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \text{supp}(g)$ . Thus, the first inequality in (25) is proved. Note that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)$ ,  $g^M(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ , and every multiple upper level set  $(V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k))$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence, an approach similar to the proof of Theorem A in [55] can derive the second inequality in (25). In fact, we also have

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \sup_{A \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}.$$

For a perfect domain pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ , taking  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{A}$ , we immediately get

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \quad \text{and similarly} \quad \inf_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})}.$$

The additional condition  $\text{supp}(f) \subset \text{supp}(g)$  implies that  $f(A) = 0$  whenever  $g(A) = 0$ . Thus, by the definition of piecewise multilinear extension, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \cap \text{supp}(g^M)$ ,

$$\frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \in \text{conv} \left\{ \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} : A \text{ is a multiple upper level set of } \mathbf{x}, \text{ and } g(A) > 0 \right\}.$$

The proof of (26) is completed.  $\square$

**Remark 8.** *If we take the  $k$ -way Lovász extension introduced in [55], such as the (disjoint-pair) Lovász extension, then  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$  is always a perfect domain pair, for any given  $\mathcal{A}$ . This is the reason why we don't use the Terminology 'perfect domain pair' in [55]. However, for  $k$ -homogeneous extensions with  $k \geq 2$ , such as the piecewise multilinear extension,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$  does not necessarily have to be a perfect domain pair, which leads to a subtle difference.*

**Proposition 3.7.** *We have the following properties and examples on perfect domain pairs:*

- $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}})$  are perfect domain pairs if and only if  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}} \times \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}})$  is a perfect domain pair;
- The sets  $\{(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \mathcal{P}(V)^k : A_{\sigma(1)} \subset \dots \subset A_{\sigma(k)} \text{ for some permutation } \sigma \in S_k\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^k : \text{pairwise comonotonic } \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k\}$  form a perfect domain pair w.r.t. the piecewise multilinear extension.
- $\{(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V)^k : A_{\sigma(1)} \subset \dots \subset A_{\sigma(k)} \text{ for some permutation } \sigma \in S_k\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k : \text{pairwise absolutely comonotonic } \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k\}$  form a perfect domain pair w.r.t. the multiple integral extension, where  $A \subset B$  for set-pairs  $A = (A_+, A_-)$  and  $B = (B_+, B_-)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(V)$  means  $A_+ \subset B_+$  and  $A_- \subset B_-$ . Here the concept of absolute comonotonicity is introduced in Definition 2.4 in [55].

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(A_1, \dots, A_k) \in \mathcal{P}(V)^k : A_1, \dots, A_k \text{ form an inclusion chain}\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) &= \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^k : V^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k) \text{ form an inclusion chain, } \forall t_1, \dots, t_k\} \\ &= \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^k : \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \overline{X_\sigma} \text{ for some } \sigma \in S_n\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\sigma \in S_n} (\overline{X_\sigma})^k = \{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^k : \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \text{ are pairwise comonotonic}\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $X_\sigma = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : x_{\sigma(1)} < \dots < x_{\sigma(n)}\}$ ,  $\sigma$  is a permutation and  $S_n$  is the finite symmetric group over  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})) = \mathcal{A}$ , and thus  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$  is a perfect pair. Thus, by Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\max_{\text{chain } \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\}} \frac{f(A_1, \dots, A_k)}{g(A_1, \dots, A_k)} = \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \max_{\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k \in \overline{X_\sigma}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)}$$

$$= \max_{\text{comonotonic } \mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k)}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}' = \{(A, \dots, A) : A \subset V\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}' = \{(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}') = \mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}')) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \supset \mathcal{D}'$ . Applying Theorem 3.1 to the pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}')$  and  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{D}')$ , respectively, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

**Example 3.2.** Given a simple graph  $(V, E)$ , let  $f(A, B) = \#E(A, B)$  and  $g(A, B) = \#(A \cap B)$  for  $A, B \subset V$ . Then  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i)$  and  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i \in V} x_i y_i$ . By Theorem 1.4 (or Proposition 4.1), we obtain

$$\max_A \frac{\#E(A, A)}{\#A} \leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq 0} \frac{2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} x_i x_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \leq \max_{A \subset B} \frac{\#E(A, B)}{\#A}. \quad (27)$$

Note that  $\max_{A \subset B} \frac{\#E(A, B)}{\#A} = \max_{i \in V} \deg(i)$ , and  $\max_{\{i,j\} \in E} \frac{2 \sum x_i x_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2} = \lambda_{\max}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of the graph  $(V, E)$ , and  $\frac{\#E(A, A)}{\#A}$  is the average degree of the subgraph induced on  $A$ . Therefore, (27) can be reformulated as

$$\max_{S \subset V} (\text{average degree of the induced subgraph on } S) \leq \lambda_{\max} \leq \max_{i \in V} \deg(i),$$

which leads to the standard upper bound and an interesting lower bound<sup>6</sup> for the classical graph spectral radius. Besides, by Theorem 3.1, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{A \subset B} \frac{|E(A, B)|}{|A|} &= \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \text{comonotonic}}} \frac{\sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i)}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}} \\ &\leq \max_{A \cap B \neq \emptyset} \frac{|E(A, B)|}{|A \cap B|} = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \text{comaximal}}} \frac{\sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i)}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}} \end{aligned}$$

where two vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are comaximal if there exists an index  $i$  such that  $x_i = \max_{j \in V} x_j$  and  $y_i = \max_{j \in V} y_j$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* For  $U \in \mathcal{P}(V)$  with  $\#U = m$ , taking  $X = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \subset U\}$ ,  $F = f_\Delta^M$  and  $G = g_\Delta^M$  in Theorem 2.3, we have  $\dim X = m$ , and by Theorem 1.4 as well as the proof of Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(F', G') \in S(F, G; X)} \max\{\lambda_m(F', G'), -\lambda'_m(F', G')\} &\leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x})}{g_\Delta^M(\mathbf{x})} \\ &\leq \max_{\text{chain } A_1, \dots, A_k \text{ in } U} \frac{f(A_1, \dots, A_k)}{g(A_1, \dots, A_k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let  $S(f, g) = \{(F', G') : f_\Delta^M(|\mathbf{x}|) \geq |F'(\mathbf{x})| \text{ and } g_\Delta^M(|\mathbf{x}|) = G'(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \{(F', g_\Delta^M(|\cdot|)) : F' \in S(f)\}$ , and note that  $S(f, g) \subset \bigcap_{U \subset V, \#U=m} S(F, G; \mathbb{R}^U)$ .

This completes the proof.  $\square$

<sup>6</sup>We don't know whether the lower bound for the spectral radius is new.

To state our general results, we shall recall the definition of log-concave polynomials and quasi-convex functions.

A  $d$ -homogeneous polynomial  $P$  in  $n$  real variables is *log-concave* if  $P$  is positive on  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  and  $\log P$  is concave on  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ .

Given a convex set  $\Omega$ , a function  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *quasi-convex* (resp., *quasi-concave*) if  $F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) \leq \max\{F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{y})\}$  (resp.,  $F(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}) \geq \min\{F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{y})\}$ ) for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $H : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be a zero-homogeneous and **quasi-concave** function. For any functions  $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we have*

$$\min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} H(f_1(A), \dots, f_n(A)) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} H(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_n^M(\mathbf{x})) \quad (28)$$

where  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$  forms a perfect domain pair w.r.t. the piecewise multilinear extension. In addition, if  $H : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is zero-homogeneous and **quasi-convex**, then

$$\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} H(f_1(A), \dots, f_n(A)) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} H(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_n^M(\mathbf{x})) \quad (29)$$

We omit the proof because it is a slight modification of Theorem 3.1 in [55].

According to the proof of Theorem 2.30 in [6], if a  $d$ -homogeneous polynomial  $P$  in  $n$  variables is log-concave, then  $P^{\frac{1}{d}}$  is concave on  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Thus, there is no difficulty to check that  $H(f_1, \dots, f_n) := \frac{P(f_1, \dots, f_n)}{(f_1 + \dots + f_n)^d}$  is zero-homogeneous and quasi-concave on  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ . We then derive Proposition 1.1 by employing Theorem 3.2.

In summary, if we want to solve a combinatorial optimization problem, we can consider the piecewise multilinear extension, and solve the corresponding continuous optimization problem first. Then, we can go back to the original combinatorial optimization problem, as in the following cases:

- Case 1. If we are working on a perfect domain pair, then the solution of the corresponding equivalent continuous reformulation provides a solution of the original combinatorial problem exactly as we expect.
- Case 2. If the domain pair is not perfect, then the solution of the corresponding continuous optimization problem may not be a solution of the original problem, but it provides a continuous relaxation and a reasonable estimate for the original combinatorial problem.

In Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we devote ourselves to min-max statements in the context of Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory, saddle point problem and von Neumann's min-max theorem.

### 3.1 Min-max relation on Lusternik-Schnirelmann theory

We will set up some new min-max arguments to construct the extension theory related to the critical point theory of Lusternik-Schnirelmann type.

Considering a tuple of finite sets  $V := (V_1, \dots, V_k)$ , we write  $A \subset V$  if  $A = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  with  $A_i = (A_{i+}, A_{i-}) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . For  $A, B \subset V$ , we have



the union  $A \vee B = (A_{1+} \cup B_{1+}, A_{1-} \cup B_{1-}, \dots, A_{k+} \cup B_{k+}, A_{k-} \cup B_{k-})$ , and the exchange  $A' = (A'_1, \dots, A'_k)$  with  $A'_i = (A_{i-}, A_{i+})$ . We say that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint if  $(A_{i+} \cup A_{i-}) \cap (B_{i+} \cup B_{i-}) = \emptyset, \forall i$ . Let

$$\tilde{P}_m(V) = \{\{A^j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k) : A^1, \dots, A^m \text{ are pairwise disjoint}\},$$

where  $A^j = (A_{1+}^j, \dots, A_{k+}^j) \in \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k)$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{P}_1(V) = \{A \subset V\} := \mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_2(V_k)$ . For given  $\{A^j\}_{j=1}^m \in \tilde{P}_m(V)$ , denote by  $\Sigma\{A^j\}$  the smallest family containing  $\{A^j\}$  which is closed under the union and the exchange operators.

**Definition 3.9** (subadditivity). *We say  $f : \tilde{P}_1(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is weakly sub-additive (resp., weakly super-additive) if  $f(A) + f(B) - f(A \vee B) \geq 0$  (resp.,  $\leq 0$ ), for any disjoint subsets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $V$ .*

**Definition 3.10.** *Given two functions  $F, G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a nodal domain decomposition of an eigenvector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  w.r.t. an eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of the function pair  $(F, G)$  is a family of pairwise disjoint sets  $A^1, \dots, A^m \subset V$  such that  $A^i \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  and every  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}|_{A^i})$  is an eigenpair of  $(F, G)$ ,  $\forall i$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Fix  $A^1, \dots, A^m$ , and consider the linear subspace  $X$  spanned by the corresponding characteristic functions  $\mathbf{1}_{A^1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A^m}$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_{A^j} := (\mathbf{1}_{A_{1+}^j} - \mathbf{1}_{A_{1-}^j}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A_{k+}^j} - \mathbf{1}_{A_{k-}^j})$ . Given  $\mathbf{x} \in X$ , there exist  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^m t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j}$ . Then it can be verified that  $(V_+^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), V_-^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^1), \dots, V_+^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k), V_-^{t_k}(\mathbf{x}^k)) \in \Sigma\{A^j\}, \forall (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$ . Thus, taking  $\mathcal{A} = \{A^1, \dots, A^m\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D} = X$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \Sigma\{A^j\}$  in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}.$$

Consequently,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}$ . Together with the fact that  $\text{genus}(X) = \dim X \geq m$ , we have

$$\inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \leq \min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}.$$

Thus, the first inequality in (5) is derived.

Similarly, fix  $A^1, \dots, A^{n+1-m}$ , and consider the linear subspace  $X'$  spanned by the characteristic functions  $\mathbf{1}_{A^1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{A^{n+1-m}}$ , where  $n = \#V_1 + \dots + \#V_k$ . According to the intersection theorem and the fact that  $\dim X' = n+1-m$ , we have  $X \cap X' \neq \emptyset$ , for any  $X \in \Gamma_m$ . Therefore,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X'} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (30)$$

For any  $\mathbf{x} \in X'$ , there exist  $t_1, \dots, t_{n+1-m} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1-m} t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j}$ . Similarly, by Theorem 3.1, we get

$$\frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \min_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}. \quad (31)$$

Together with (30) and (31),  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X'} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \min_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}$ . By the arbitrariness of  $X$  and  $X'$ , we have the second inequality in (5):

$$\inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})} \geq \max_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n+1-m}(V)} \min_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)}.$$

Now we turn to the additional cases. Since  $f$  is weakly subadditive and  $g$  is weakly super-additive, by the property of disjoint-pair Lovász extension, it can be checked that  $f^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m f^L(t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j})$  and  $g^L(\mathbf{x}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^m g^L(t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j})$ . Together with the symmetry assumption for  $f$  and  $g$ , for  $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j=1}^m t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j}$ ,

$$\frac{f^L(\mathbf{x})}{g^L(\mathbf{x})} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \frac{f^L(t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j})}{g^L(t_j \mathbf{1}_{A^j})} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \frac{f(A^j)}{g(A^j)}$$

and thus

$$\lambda_m := \inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^L(\mathbf{x})}{g^L(\mathbf{x})} \leq \min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_m(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)}.$$

Suppose  $(\lambda_m, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair of  $(f^L, g^L)$ , and  $\mathbf{x}$  has  $k_m$  nodal domains  $A^1, \dots, A^{k_m}$ . Taking  $X = \text{span}(\mathbf{x}|_{A^1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}|_{A^{k_m}})$ , we have  $\dim X = k_m$ . Let  $A^j_{\pm} = \{v \in A^j : \pm x_v > 0\}$  and denote by  $\mathbf{1}_{A^j} := \mathbf{1}_{A^j_+} - \mathbf{1}_{A^j_-}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k_m$ .

Define a pre-order relation  $\prec$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :  $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$  if  $\Delta(\mathbf{x}) \subset \overline{\Delta(\mathbf{y})}$  where

$$\Delta(\mathbf{x}) := \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n : x'_i < x'_j \Leftrightarrow x_i < x_j, \pm x_i > 0 \Leftrightarrow \pm x'_i > 0, \forall i, j \in V_l, \forall l = 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (32)$$

The pre-order induces an equivalence relation  $\approx$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :  $\mathbf{x} \approx \mathbf{y}$  if  $\Delta(\mathbf{x}) = \Delta(\mathbf{y})$ . It can be verified that:

- $\mathbf{x} \approx \mathbf{y}$  implies  $\nabla f^L(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla f^L(\mathbf{y})$ ;
- $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$  implies  $\nabla f^L(\mathbf{x}) \supset \nabla f^L(\mathbf{y})$ ;
- If  $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$  and  $(\lambda, \mathbf{y})$  is an eigenpair of  $(f^L, g^L)$ , then  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is also an eigenpair.

Proof: The condition  $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$  implies  $\nabla f^L(\mathbf{x}) \supset \nabla f^L(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\nabla g^L(\mathbf{x}) \supset \nabla g^L(\mathbf{y})$ . Together with the assumption that  $(\lambda, \mathbf{y})$  is an eigenpair of  $(f^L, g^L)$ , we have  $\mathbf{0} \in \nabla f^L(\mathbf{y}) - \lambda \nabla g^L(\mathbf{y}) \subset \nabla f^L(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda \nabla g^L(\mathbf{x})$  meaning that  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$  is also an eigenpair.

Since the sets  $A^1, \dots, A^{k_m}$  form a nodal domain decomposition of  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $(\lambda_m, \mathbf{x}|_{A^i})$  must be an eigenpair of  $(f^L, g^L)$ ,  $\forall i = 1, \dots, k_m$ . It is clear that  $\mathbf{1}_{A^i} \in \Delta(\mathbf{x}|_{A^i})$ , which implies  $\mathbf{1}_{A^i} \prec \mathbf{x}|_{A^i}$ . Thus  $(\lambda_m, \mathbf{1}_{A^i})$  is an eigenpair. Therefore,

$$\lambda_m = \max_{i=1, \dots, k_m} \frac{f^L(\mathbf{1}_{A^i})}{g^L(\mathbf{1}_{A^i})} = \max_{i=1, \dots, k_m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)} \geq \min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k_m}(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, k_m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)}.$$

□

Similar to Theorem 1.3, we have

$$\min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \geq \inf_{\text{cat}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x})}{g^M(\mathbf{x})}$$

where the min-max value on the right hand side indicates an eigenvalue of  $(f^M, g^M)$ .

**The setting under the piecewise multilinear extension introduced in Definition 3.2**

Considering a tuple of finite sets  $V := (V_1, \dots, V_k)$ , we rewrite  $A \subset V$  if  $A = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  with  $A_i \in \mathcal{P}(V_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . For  $A, B \subset V$ , we have the union  $A \vee B = (A_1 \cup B_1, \dots, A_k \cup B_k)$ . We say that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint if  $A_i \cap B_i = \emptyset$ ,  $\forall i$ . Redefine

$$\tilde{P}_m(V) = \{\{A^j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k) : A^1, \dots, A^m \text{ are pairwise disjoint}\},$$

where  $A^j = (A_1^j, \dots, A_k^j) \in \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k)$ . For given  $\{A^j\}_{j=1}^m \in \tilde{P}_m(V)$ , denote by  $\Sigma\{A^j\}$  the smallest family containing  $\{A^j\}$  and closed under the union.

**Theorem 3.3.** *For  $f, g : \tilde{P}_1(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have*

$$\min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^M(|\mathbf{x}|)}{g^M(|\mathbf{x}|)} \geq \max_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_{n+1-m}(V)} \min_{A \in \Sigma\{A^j\}} \frac{f(A)}{g(A)} \quad (33)$$

where the absolute value  $|\mathbf{x}|$  is taken component-wise. If we further assume that  $f$  is submodular and  $g$  is supermodular, then

$$\min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_m(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)} \geq \inf_{\text{genus}(X) \geq m} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \frac{f^L(|\mathbf{x}|)}{g^L(|\mathbf{x}|)} := \lambda_m \geq \min_{\{A^j\} \in \tilde{P}_{k_m}(V)} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{f(A^i)}{g(A^i)} \quad (34)$$

where  $k_m$  is the number of the nodal domains of an eigenvector w.r.t. the eigenvalue  $\lambda_m$  of the function pair  $(f^L(|\cdot|), g^L(|\cdot|))$ . Here  $f^L$  represents the original Lovász extension of  $f$ .

We can replace  $f^L(|\cdot|)$  by  $f^L$  in (34), when we further suppose that  $f$  is symmetric, i.e.,  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = f(V_1 \setminus A_1, \dots, V_k \setminus A_k)$ ,  $\forall A := (A_1, \dots, A_k) \subset V$ .

Theorem 3.3 is a variant analog of Theorem 1.3. By these results, we immediately obtain the  $k$ -way Cheeger inequality and the  $k$ -way dual Cheeger inequality for the graph 1-Laplacian.

For a graph  $(V, E)$ , the  $k$ -way Cheeger constant [59, 68]

$$h_k := \min_{\text{disjoint } S_1, \dots, S_k} \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{|\partial S_i|}{\text{vol}(S_i)}, \quad (35)$$

and the  $k$ -way dual Cheeger constant [60]

$$h_k^+ := \max_{\text{disjoint } (V_1, V_2), \dots, (V_{2k-1}, V_{2k})} \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \frac{2|E(V_{2i-1}, V_{2i})|}{\text{vol}(V_{2i-1} \cup V_{2i})}, \quad (36)$$

are investigated systematically. Both Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 3.3 imply:

**Corollary 3.1.** For an eigenpair  $(\lambda_k, \mathbf{x})$  of the graph 1-Laplacian [17], where  $\lambda_k$  is the  $k$ -th minimax eigenvalue,

$$h_{m(\mathbf{x})} \leq \lambda_k \leq h_k, \quad \forall k,$$

in which  $m(\mathbf{x})$  is the number of nodal domains of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

For an eigenpair  $(\lambda_k^+, \mathbf{x})$  of the signless 1-Laplacian [19], where  $\lambda_k^+$  is the  $k$ -th minimax eigenvalue,

$$1 - h_{m'(\mathbf{x})}^+ \leq \lambda_k^+ \leq 1 - h_k^+, \quad \forall k,$$

in which  $m'(\mathbf{x})$  is the number of connected components of the support set of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

**Remark 9.** It is known that  $\lambda_1 = h_1$  and  $\lambda_2 = h_2$ . However,  $\lambda_3$  can be strictly smaller than  $h_3$ . In fact, for the complete graph  $K_5$  on five vertices, by Proposition 8 in [20], the eigenvalues of the 1-Laplacian on  $K_5$  are  $0, \frac{3}{4}, 1$ . Note that the clique covering number of  $K_5$  is 1, and then we can apply Theorem 1 in [94] to derive that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 1 is 2. Thus,  $\lambda_4 = \lambda_5 = 1$ ,  $\lambda_3 = \lambda_2 = \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $\lambda_1 = 0$ . But it is easy to check that  $h_1 = 0$ ,  $h_2 = \frac{3}{4}$  and  $h_3 = h_4 = h_5 = 1$ . Altogether, we get  $\lambda_3 = \frac{3}{4} < h_3 = 1$ .

In addition, we have a result involving the  $p$ -Laplacian and its signless version:

**Proposition 3.8.** The spectrum of the  $p$ -Laplacian [87] and the spectrum of the signless  $p$ -Laplacian [11] on a graph coincide if and only if the graph is bipartite.

*Proof.* It is known that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 0 of the  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p$  equals the number of connected components of the graph. And it is not difficult to check that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 0 of the signless  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p^+$  equals the number of bipartite components of the graph. Therefore, if the spectra of  $\Delta_p$  and  $\Delta_p^+$  coincide, the graph must be bipartite.

Conversely, for a bipartite graph with the vertex parts  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , we take  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})_i = x_i$  if  $i \in V_1$  and  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})_i = -x_i$  if  $i \in V_2$ . Then  $\varphi$  is an odd homeomorphism, and we can apply Proposition 2.2 to obtain that the spectra (counting multiplicity) of  $\Delta_p$  and  $\Delta_p^+$  coincide.  $\square$

### 3.2 Saddle point problems and von Neumann type min-max theorems

We continue the study of the powerful min-max methods and saddle-point problems. As von Neumann's minimax theorem has been applied widely and investigated deeply in game theory, it should be helpful to establish some extension theory for it.

The saddle point problem for a function  $F : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is to find  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*) \in X \times Y$  such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

in which  $X$  and  $Y$  are continua like convex sets, while the discrete saddle point problem for  $f : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is to find  $(A^*, B^*) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  satisfying

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f(A, B) = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f(A, B)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are finite set-families. We will connect these two via extension approaches. The following result shows that the discrete saddle-point problem can be equivalently transformed to a continuous version by our extension method.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Given  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_k)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(V_l)$ , suppose that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}})$  are perfect domain pairs. If  $f : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfy*

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}, \quad (37)$$

then we have

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}. \quad (38)$$

Moreover,  $(A^*, B^*)$  is a saddle point of  $f/g$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})$  is a saddle point of  $f^M/g^M$ .

*Proof.* Note that for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $(\mathcal{A} \times \{B\}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}} \times \{\mathbf{1}_B\})$  is a perfect domain pair. Then, we are able to apply Theorem 3.1 to get

$$\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)}$$

and thus

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}. \quad (39)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}.$$

And together with the basic min-max inequality

$$\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \geq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})},$$

we obtain

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \geq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \geq \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)},$$

which confirms (38). By the definition of saddle points, we get  $\frac{f(A, B^*)}{g(A, B^*)} \leq \frac{f(A^*, B^*)}{g(A^*, B^*)} \leq \frac{f(A^*, B)}{g(A^*, B)}$ ,  $\forall (A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , and  $\frac{f(A^*, B^*)}{g(A^*, B^*)} = \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}$ . Then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_B)} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_B)}{g^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_B)} \leq \frac{f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})}{g^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})}$$

$$\leq \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_B)}{g^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_B)} = \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_B} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{y})},$$

and together with Eq. (38),  $(\mathbf{1}_{A^*}, \mathbf{1}_{B^*})$  is a saddle point of  $f^M/g^M$ . The other direction is similar.  $\square$

**Remark 10.** We note that the condition (37) is equivalent to that  $f/g$  possesses a saddle point. Indeed, for any finite families  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $h : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} h(A, B) = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} h(A, B)$  if and only if there exists  $(A^*, B^*) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  s.t.  $h(A, B^*) \leq h(A^*, B^*) \leq h(A^*, B)$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Remark 11.** We can take  $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{P}(V_1) \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{P}(V_k) \setminus \{\emptyset\})$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{P}(V_{k+1}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{P}(V_{k+l}) \setminus \{\emptyset\})$  in Theorem 3.4, and then  $\mathcal{D}_A = \mathbb{R}_+^{\#V_1 + \cdots + \#V_k}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_B = \mathbb{R}_+^{\#V_{k+1} + \cdots + \#V_{k+l}}$ . We can also take  $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{P}_2(V_1) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{P}_2(V_k) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\})$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{P}_2(V_{k+1}) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{P}_2(V_{k+l}) \setminus \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\})$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_A = (\mathbb{R}^{\#V_1} \setminus \mathbf{0}) \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{R}^{\#V_k} \setminus \mathbf{0})$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_B = (\mathbb{R}^{\#V_{k+1}} \setminus \mathbf{0}) \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{R}^{\#V_{k+l}} \setminus \mathbf{0})$ , and adopt the multiple integral extension (Definition 3.5) instead of the piecewise multilinear extension (Definition 3.2).

**Remark 12.** The converse of Theorem 3.4 is false, i.e.,

$$\inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_B} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_A} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_A} \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_B} \frac{f^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}$$

doesn't imply

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}.$$

It means that there is some discrete saddle point problem (with no discrete solution) possessing a continuous solution in the sense of piecewise multilinear extension. See the following examples.

**Example 3.3.** We continue the investigation of Example 3.2. Consider a path graph on three vertices, i.e.,  $V = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $E = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$ . Denote its adjacency matrix by  $W$ . Note that  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^\top W \mathbf{y}$  and  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}$ . On one hand, by the Krein-Rutman theorem<sup>7</sup> (or by Theorem 1.1),

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top W \mathbf{y}}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top W \mathbf{y}}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}} = \lambda_{\max}(W) = \sqrt{2}.$$

On the other hand,  $\inf_{A \subset V} \sup_{B \subset V} \frac{\#E(A, B)}{\#(A \cap B)} = 2 > 1 = \sup_{B \subset V} \inf_{A \subset V} \frac{\#E(A, B)}{\#(A \cap B)}$ .

**Example 3.4.** Given  $V_1 = \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{1, \dots, m\}$ , and a payoff matrix  $C = (c_{ij})_{n \times m}$ , let  $f(A, B) = \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} c_{ij}$  and  $g(A, B) = \#A \cdot \#B$ ,  $\forall A \subset V_1, B \subset V_2$ . Then  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m c_{ij} x_i y_j$  and  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)(\sum_{j=1}^m y_j)$ . It follows from von Neumann's minimax theorem that

$$\min_{\sum_i p_i = 1, p_i \geq 0} \max_{\sum_i q_i = 1, q_i \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m c_{ij} p_i q_j = \max_{\sum_i q_i = 1, q_i \geq 0} \min_{\sum_i p_i = 1, p_i \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m c_{ij} p_i q_j,$$

<sup>7</sup>It is also known as Birkhoff-Varga formula or Collatz-Wielandt theorem.

which can be reformulated as

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top C \mathbf{y}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)(\sum_{j=1}^m y_j)} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top C \mathbf{y}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)(\sum_{j=1}^m y_j)}. \quad (40)$$

This equality can be obtained from Theorem 1.1 directly. But according to the theory of two-person zero-sum games, it is easy to give a payoff matrix  $C$  such that  $\min_{A \subset V_1} \max_{B \subset V_2} \frac{f(A,B)}{g(A,B)} > \max_{B \subset V_2} \min_{A \subset V_1} \frac{f(A,B)}{g(A,B)}$ .

**Remark 13.** We show that Theorem 1.2 is also a generalization of Theorem B in [55]. Indeed, taking  $\mathcal{B} = \{V\}$  as a singleton, fixing  $\mathbf{y}$ , and restricting  $f$  and  $f^M$  to their first components, we can verify Theorem B in [55].

Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 3.4 indicate that when one wants to solve a combinatorial saddle point problem, it is better to consider its continuous extension. The extended solution of the continuous saddle point problem is more flexible than the pure solution of the original discrete saddle point problem. This suggests a new explanation why one considers also mixed strategies instead of only pure-strategy Nash equilibria.

### Piecewise bilinear extension and von Neumann's min-max theorem

In order to show von Neumann's convex-concave min-max theorem in its full generality, we slightly enlarge the scope of the piecewise bilinear extension:

For  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(V)$  or  $\mathcal{P}_2(V)$ , and  $f : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define  $f^Q : \mathcal{D}_A \times \mathcal{D}_B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as a composition of Lovász extensions in the following way:  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tilde{f}_y^L(\mathbf{x})$ , with  $\tilde{f}_y : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as  $\tilde{f}_y(A) := f_A^L(\mathbf{y})$ , where  $f_A : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by  $f_A(B) = f(A, B)$ . Here the Lovász extension refers to the original version or the disjoint-pair version.

**Remark 14.** Let the operator  $\mathcal{L}_i$  be the (disjoint-pair) Lovász extension acting on the  $i$ -th component, while we regard the other components as fixed parameters.

Precisely,  $\mathcal{L}_1 f(x, B)$  is the (disjoint-pair) Lovász extension of  $A \mapsto f(A, B)$ , for fixed  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Similarly,  $\mathcal{L}_2 f(A, y)$  is the (disjoint-pair) Lovász extension of  $B \mapsto f(A, B)$ , for fixed  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .

It is easy to check that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  are independent of each other, and thus we have the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f(A, B) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_1} & \mathcal{L}_1 f(x, B) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{L}_2 & & \downarrow \mathcal{L}_2 \\ \mathcal{L}_2 f(A, y) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_1} & f^Q(x, y) \end{array}$$

where

$$f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{L}_2 f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{L}_2 \mathcal{L}_1 f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}).$$

Therefore, the restriction of  $f^Q$  to each component is the (disjoint-pair) Lovász extension of some function. Similarly, we can define a slight generalization of the

piecewise multilinear extension of  $f : \mathcal{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f^M(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k) = \mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{L}_2 \cdots \mathcal{L}_k f(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k).$$

In summary, the piecewise multilinear extension can be seen as a composition of several (disjoint-pair) Lovász extensions.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Suppose that  $f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are piecewise bilinear extensions of  $f, g : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(V_1)$  (or  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V_1)$ ) and  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(V_2)$  (or  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V_2)$ ), where  $f$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- $f$  is submodular on its first component;
- $f$  is supermodular on its second component.

Then

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{cone}(\overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}})} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{cone}(C_{\mathcal{B}})} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{cone}(C_{\mathcal{B}})} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{cone}(\overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}})} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \quad (41)$$

but the discrete saddle point problem  $\min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}$  may have no solution, where  $C_{\mathcal{A}} \times C_{\mathcal{B}}$  is a bounded convex set such that  $g^Q$  is bilinear on  $\overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}} \times C_{\mathcal{B}}$  with no zeros.

*Proof.* Since  $g$  is modular on its first component and  $f$  is submodular on its first component, we obtain that  $g^Q$  is a linear function of  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $f^Q$  is convex with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) > 0$ ,  $\forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}} \times C_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Consequently, for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}}$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ ,

$$\frac{f^Q(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})} \leq \frac{tf^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + (1-t)f^Q(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})}{tg^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + (1-t)g^Q(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}, \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})} \right\}$$

meaning that  $f^Q/g^Q$  is quasi-convex on  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}}$ . Similarly,  $f^Q/g^Q$  is quasi-concave on  $\mathbf{y} \in C_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Also, it is clear that  $f^Q/g^Q$  is continuous on  $\overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}} \times C_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Sion's min-max theorem (Theorem 3.5) yields

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}}} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in C_{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in C_{\mathcal{B}}} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{C_{\mathcal{A}}}} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}$$

which is equivalent to (41) by the zero-homogeneity of  $f^Q/g^Q$ .

For the discrete saddle point problem, one can find many examples from two-person zero-sum games (see Example 3.4).  $\square$

The assumption in Proposition 3.9 is satisfied in most of the interesting cases. For example, if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(V)$ , we can always take  $\text{cone}(C_{\mathcal{A}})$  as  $X_{\sigma} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : x_{\sigma(1)} < \cdots < x_{\sigma(n)}\}$  for any permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ , and if we further assume that  $g$  is modular on its first component, then  $\text{cone}(C_{\mathcal{A}})$  can be chosen as the first quadrant  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ , where  $n = \#V$ .

Also, for  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}_2(V)$ , we can always take  $\text{cone}(C_{\mathcal{A}}) = \Delta(\mathbf{x})$  (see (32)) for any given  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ .



**Theorem 3.5** (Sion's min-max theorem [80]). *Let  $X$  be a compact convex set, and let  $Y$  be a convex set. Let  $F : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that:*

- *$F$  is upper semi-continuous and quasi-concave on  $Y$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in X$ ;*
- *$F$  is lower semi-continuous and quasi-convex on  $X$  for each  $\mathbf{y} \in Y$ .*

*Then  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in X} F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Theorem 1.1 under the condition (a) is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.4.

We prove Theorem 1.1 under the condition (b) by employing Proposition 3.9. Since  $g$  is modular on each component,  $g$  must be bilinear on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ . It follows from  $g \geq 0$  on  $\mathcal{P}(V_1) \times \mathcal{P}(V_2)$  that  $g^Q \geq 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ . Precisely,  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m g(i, j) x_i y_j$ , where  $g(i, j) := g(\{i\}, \{j\}) \geq 0$ . For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , there exists  $i \in V_1$  such that  $x_i > 0$ . By the assumption that  $g(\{i\}, \bar{V}_2) > 0$ , there exists  $j \in V_2$  satisfying  $g(i, j) > 0$ . Accordingly, for any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , we have  $g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq g(i, j) x_i y_j > 0$ . Therefore,  $g^Q$  is positive on  $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , and  $f^Q/g^Q$  is well-defined and continuous on  $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_+^m$ . Hence, by taking  $C_A = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : x_1 + \cdots + x_n = 1\}$  and  $C_B = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m : x_1 + \cdots + x_m = 1\}$ , we can apply Proposition 3.9 to derive (2).  $\square$

### A general min-max relation

Recall that a function is *quasi-linear* if it is quasi-convex and quasi-concave. As an extension of both Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.4, we present the following general min-max relation.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $H : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$  be a zero-homogeneous and **quasi-linear** function. For any functions  $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we have the min-max inequality:*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} H(f_1(A, B), \dots, f_n(A, B)) &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_A} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_B} H(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \dots, f_n^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \\ &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}_B} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_A} H(f_1^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \dots, f_n^M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \\ &\geq \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} H(f_1(A, B), \dots, f_n(A, B)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_A)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_B)$  are perfect domain pairs.

In summary, when we want to solve a combinatorial saddle point problem, it is better to work on the piecewise multilinear extension. In fact, suppose that the corresponding continuous saddle point problem has a solution, which we will call a *weak solution* of the original problem for convenience. Then, we can return to the original combinatorial saddle-point problem, as in the following cases:

- Case 1. If there is a solution to the original combinatorial saddle point problem, then we can construct such a solution based on a weak solution, which is of course good news.

Case 2. If the original combinatorial saddle-point problem has no solution, then we can accept a weak solution because it makes sense on its own. (For example, this suggests a new explanation why one considers also mixed strategies instead of only pure-strategy Nash equilibria in a two-person-zero-sum game.)

## 4 Applications in various areas

### 4.1 Turán problem and Motzkin-Straus theorem

The classical Turán theorem (weak version) states that for any  $K_{\omega+1}$ -free graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,

$$\#E \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega}\right) \frac{(\#V)^2}{2}, \quad (42)$$

where  $\omega$  is the maximal clique number of  $G$ . It has many combinatorial proofs, from which the extremal graph theory started its history.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be smooth functions such that  $\mathbf{g}$  is positive on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . For a maximizer (resp. minimizer)  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $\frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}}$  (if it exists), let  $\mathbf{v}$  be such that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ,  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v})$  is constant, and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ ,  $\forall i, j \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . If we further assume that  $\mathbf{f}$  is real analytic, then  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$  is also a maximizer (resp. minimizer) of  $\frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}}$ .*

*Proof.* Claim: Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a critical point of  $\frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}}$  and let  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be such that  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$  and  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ , then  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ .

Proof of the claim: By the assumption,  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x_i > 0\} \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ , we have  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})} = 0$ ,  $\forall i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ . By the condition that  $v_i = 0$  whenever  $i \notin \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})} v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})} v_i \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})} \langle \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove the lemma. It follows from  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$  that  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ , and thus by the above claim, we have  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{f}$  is a real analytic function,  $t \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v})$  must be real analytic. Note that  $\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v}) = \langle \nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ , and for any  $k \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dt^k}|_{t=0} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v}) &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^n v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_k} \frac{\partial^k \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_k}} \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{v})} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_k} \frac{\partial^k \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_k}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the condition that  $\partial_i \partial_j \mathbf{f} = 0, \forall i, j \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{v})$ .

Therefore, the real analytic function  $t \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{v})$  is constant. This implies that  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ , and hence  $\frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v})} = \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})}$ , meaning that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$  is also a maximizer of  $\frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}|_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}}$ .

The case of minimizer is similar.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.1.** *For  $f, g : \mathcal{P}(V)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , there holds*

$$\max_A \frac{f(A, A)}{g(A, A)} \leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^V} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} \leq \max_{A \subset B} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)} = \max_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^V \ni \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \text{ comonotonic}} \frac{f^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{g^Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}. \quad (43)$$

Now we further assume that  $g(A, B) = \tilde{g}(A)\tilde{g}(B)$  for some modular function  $\tilde{g} : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $f$  is modular on both components. Suppose that there exists  $C > 0$  satisfying  $f(\{i\}, \{i\}) = C(\tilde{g}^2(\{i\}) - \tilde{g}(\{i\}))$  and  $f(\{i\}, \{j\}) = Cg(\{i\}, \{j\})$  whenever  $f(\{i\}, \{j\}) > 0$ . Then the left inequality in (43) is indeed an equality.

*Proof.* The inequality (43) is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4. For the equality case, we set  $C = 1$ , because otherwise we can use  $Cf$  instead of  $f$ . Since  $g(A, B) = \tilde{g}(A)\tilde{g}(B)$  and  $\tilde{g}$  is modular, we have  $g_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^2$ , where  $\mathbf{u} = (\tilde{g}(\{1\}), \dots, \tilde{g}(\{n\})) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . By the assumption that  $f(A, B)$  is modular on each component, its piecewise bilinear extension  $f^Q$  must be multilinear, and thus  $f_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x}$  where  $M = (f(\{i\}, \{j\}))_{n \times n}$ .

For any  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfying  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ ,  $g_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}) = g_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a maximizer of  $f_{\Delta}^Q/g_{\Delta}^Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . If  $f(i, j) := f(\{i\}, \{j\}) = 0$  and  $x_i x_j > 0$  for some  $i \neq j$ , taking  $\mathbf{v}$  defined as  $v_i = -x_i, v_j = x_i \frac{u_i}{u_j}$  and  $v_l = 0$  for  $l \neq i, j$ , then Lemma 4.1 can be applied to deduce that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$  is also a maximizer of  $f_{\Delta}^Q/g_{\Delta}^Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Taking  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$  and repeating the process, we finally obtain a subset  $A \subset V$  satisfying  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) = A$  and  $f(i, j) > 0$  for  $i \neq j$  in  $A$ . Therefore,  $f_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x})/g_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x}}{(\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{u})^2} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i \in A} u_i x_i^2}{(\sum_{i \in A} x_i u_i)^2} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in A} u_i}$  and the equality holds if and only if  $x_i = \text{Const}$  for  $i \in A$ . In consequence,  $\mathbf{1}_A$  is a maximizer of  $f_{\Delta}^Q/g_{\Delta}^Q$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

According to Proposition 4.1 and Table 1, we get the identity

$$\max_{A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{\#E(A, A)}{(\#A)^2} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \frac{2 \sum_{i \sim j} x_i x_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2} = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\sum_{i, j \in V \text{ s.t. } \{i, j\} \in E} x_i x_j}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2}. \quad (44)$$

It is very interesting that (44) reduces to the Motzkin-Straus theorem immediately by the (weak) Turán theorem (42). In fact, applying (42) to the subgraph  $G|_A$  induced by  $A$  implies that  $\frac{\#E(A, A)}{(\#A)^2}$  achieves its maxima at some maximum clique, which means  $\max_{A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{\#E(A, A)}{(\#A)^2} = \frac{2 \binom{\omega}{2}}{\omega^2} = (1 - \frac{1}{\omega})$ . In consequence, the original Motzkin-Straus theorem

$$\max_{x_i \geq 0, \sum_i x_i = 1} 2 \sum_{\{i, j\} \in E} x_i x_j = 1 - \frac{1}{\omega}$$

is proved by virtue of (44).

In addition, since the maximum clique number of  $(V, E)$  equals the independence number of the complement graph  $(V, E^c)$ , one can see that the Motzkin-Straus identity is equivalent to the following representation of the independence number:

$$\alpha(G) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^V \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^2 - 2 \sum_{ij \in E^c} x_i x_j}. \quad (45)$$

Similarly, for a simple graph  $(V, E)$ , let  $H$  be the collection of all  $k$ -cliques in  $(V, E)$ . Then we obtain a special  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $(V, H)$ , and its Lagrangian satisfies<sup>8</sup>

$$\lambda(H) := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in H} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^k} = \max_{U \subset V, U \neq \emptyset} \frac{\#\{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in H : \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset U\}}{(\#U)^k}.$$

We employ Theorem 1.4 to give a proof here. First, by Theorem 1.4, the LHS is larger than or equal to the RHS. To show the converse, we let  $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\text{clique } \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}$  and  $G(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1 + \cdots + x_n)^k$  for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a maximizer of  $F/G$  on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Note that  $G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}) = G(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $\mathbf{v}$  with  $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$ . If there exist  $i, j \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  such that there is no clique  $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  containing both  $i$  and  $j$ , then taking  $\mathbf{v}$  defined by  $v_i = -x_i$ ,  $v_j = x_i$  and  $v_l = 0$  for  $l \neq i, j$ , we can apply Lemma 4.1 to derive that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$  is also a maximizer of  $F/G$ . Substituting  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$ , we have  $x_i = 0$ . Repeating the process, we can finally obtain that there is a clique  $U$  such that  $x_i = 0$  whenever  $i \in V \setminus U$ , and  $x_i > 0$  whenever  $i \in U$ . Since  $H$  collects all the  $k$ -cliques of a graph,  $H|_U := \{h \in H : h \subset U\}$  collects all the  $k$ -cliques in  $U$ . Putting everything together, it is easy to see that Maclaurin's inequality can be applied to get  $x_i = \text{const}$  for  $i \in U$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{1}_U$  is a maximizer of  $F/G$ . The proof is completed.

Similar to the above discussion, we can apply Lemma 4.1, the generalized mean inequality and Maclaurin's inequality, to derive the following equality

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in H} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k} - \tau \sum_{i \in V} |x_i|^k}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1^k} = \max_{U \subset V, U \neq \emptyset} \frac{\#\{h \in H : h \subset U\} - \tau \#U}{(\#U)^k}$$

where  $\tau$  is a nonnegative real number.

## 4.2 $p$ -Laplacians generated by Lovász extension

Given a family  $\{w_e\}_{e \in E}$  of positive numbers, and two families of functions

$$\{f_e : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}_{e \in E} \quad \text{and} \quad \{g_e : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}_{e \in E}$$

satisfying  $f_e(\emptyset) = f_e(V) = 0 = g_e(\emptyset)$  and  $g_e(A) = \sum_{i \in A} g_e(\{i\})$  for all  $A \subset V$ , let

$$f(A) := \sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e(A) \quad \text{and} \quad g(A) := \sum_{e \in E} g_e(A).$$

---

<sup>8</sup>This equality might be known to experts, although we didn't find a reference.

We define the **Cheeger constant** as

$$h := \min_{A \subset V, A \neq \emptyset, V} \frac{f(A)}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}}.$$

The following  $p$ -homogeneous eigenvalue problem

$$\mathbf{0} \in \nabla \sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p - \lambda \nabla \sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{x}|^p) \quad (46)$$

can unify many analogs of  $p$ -Laplacian eigenvalue problem for graphs or hyper-graphs (see Remark 15 for details), where each  $w_e$  is a positive constant, and  $|\mathbf{x}|^p = (|x_1|^p, \dots, |x_n|^p)$ .

According to Proposition 2.4, the second eigenvalue of the eigenvalue problem (46) can be characterized as

$$\lambda = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \text{ nonconstant}} \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p}{\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{x} - c\mathbf{1}|^p)}. \quad (47)$$

**Example 4.1.** Given a simple graph  $G = (V, E)$ , and taking  $w_e = 1$ , consider the discrete functions  $f_e, g_e : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$f_e(A) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e \text{ has one end point in } A \text{ and the other in } V \setminus A, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and  $g_e(A) = \#(e \cap A)$ . By the original Lovász extension, we have  $f_e^L(\mathbf{x}) = |x_i - x_j|$  and  $g_e^L(\mathbf{x}) = x_i + x_j$ , where  $\{i, j\} = e \in E$ . Then

$$\sum_{e \in E} (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p = \sum_{\{i, j\} \in E} |x_i - x_j|^p \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{x}|^p) = \sum_{\{i, j\} \in E} (|x_i|^p + |x_j|^p) = \sum_{i \in V} \deg(i) |x_i|^p.$$

So in this case, (46) reduces to the eigenvalue problem of the normalized  $p$ -Laplacian on a graph.

We may call  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \nabla \sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p$  the Lovász  $p$ -Laplacian induced by  $\{f_e : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}_{e \in E}$ , because it is based on Lovász extension, and it generalizes the graph  $p$ -Laplacian. Then, we may call (46) the eigenvalue problem of Lovász  $p$ -Laplacians for  $\{f_e\}_{e \in E}$  and  $\{g_e\}_{e \in E}$ . Assume that  $g(\{i\}) := \sum_{e \in E} g_e(\{i\}) > 0$  for any  $i \in V$ , then the following Cheeger inequality holds.

**Theorem 4.1.** Under the above setting, we have

$$\left(\frac{2}{c}\right)^{p-1} \frac{h^p}{p^p} \leq \lambda \leq 2^{p-1} C h, \quad (48)$$

where  $C := \max_{e, A} f_e(A)^{p-1}$  and

$$c = \max_{i \in V} \frac{\sum_{e \in E_i} w_e}{g(i)}, \quad \text{and } E_i := \{e \in E : \exists S \subset V \text{ s.t. } f_e(S \setminus \{i\}) \neq f_e(S)\}$$

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset, V\}$  be such that

$$h = \frac{f(A)}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}}.$$

By taking the nonconstant vector  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}_A$  in (47), we get

$$\lambda \leq \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{1}_A))^p}{\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{1}_A - c\mathbf{1}|^p)}.$$

Since  $g_e$  is modular and  $g = \sum_{e \in E} g_e$ , we have

$$\sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{1}_A - c\mathbf{1}|^p) = \sum_{i \in V} g(i) |(\mathbf{1}_A)_i - c|^p$$

and

$$\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in V} g(i) |(\mathbf{1}_A)_i - c|^p = \frac{g(A)g(V \setminus A)}{(g(A)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + g(V \setminus A)^{\frac{1}{p-1}})^{p-1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &\leq \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{1}_A))^p}{g(A)g(V \setminus A) / (g(A)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + g(V \setminus A)^{\frac{1}{p-1}})^{p-1}} \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e(A))^p \left( {}^{p-1}\sqrt{\frac{1}{g(A)}} + {}^{p-1}\sqrt{\frac{1}{g(V \setminus A)}} \right)^{p-1} \\ &\leq \max_{e, A} f_e(A)^{p-1} \sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e(A) 2^{p-1} \frac{1}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}} \\ &:= \frac{2^{p-1} C f(A)}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}} = 2^{p-1} C h. \end{aligned}$$

Let's move on to the lower bound of  $\lambda$ , i.e., the left hand side of the inequality (48). For simplicity, we identify a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^V$  with the function  $\mathbf{x} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Put  $\deg(j) = \sum_{e \in E_j} w_e$  for  $j \in V$ . Then  $\deg(j) \leq cg(j)$ ,  $\forall j$ .

Below we should adopt a new form of the original Lovász extension.

The Lovász extension (22) can be re-written as

$$f^L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (x_{(i+1)} - x_{(i)}) f(V_i(\mathbf{x})), \quad (49)$$

in which  $x_{(0)} := 0$  and  $V_0(\mathbf{x}) := V$ . Alternatively, we can also write

$$f^L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (x_{[i+1]} - x_{[i]}) f(V_{[i]}(\mathbf{x})),$$

where

$$k := 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{sign}(|f(V_i(\mathbf{x})) - f(V_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}))|)$$

and  $\{[1], \dots, [k]\} \subset V$  satisfy:

- $x_{[1]} < \dots < x_{[k]}, x_{[0]} = 0$ ,
- $V_{[i]}(\mathbf{x}) := \{j \in V : x_j > x_{[i]}\}$  for  $i \geq 1$ ,  $V_{[0]}(\mathbf{x}) := V$ ,
- $f(V_{[i]}(\mathbf{x})) \neq f(V_{[i+1]}(\mathbf{x}))$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ .

We call the set  $\{[1], \dots, [k]\}$  a **simple index set** for  $f$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ . For a fixed vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , let  $\text{si}(f) = \{i : f(V_{[i]}(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0\}$ . It is clear that

$$f^L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f)} (x_{[i+1]} - x_{[i]}) f(V_{[i]}(\mathbf{x})). \quad (50)$$

Given  $p \geq 1$ , for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , using (50), and noting that  $f_e$  is nonnegative, we have

$$\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(\mathbf{x}^p) \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f_e)} (x_{[i+1]_e}^p - x_{[i]_e}^p) f_e(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x}^p)) \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f_e)} p(x_{[i+1]_e} - x_{[i]_e}) \left( \frac{x_{[i+1]_e}^p + x_{[i]_e}^p}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} f_e(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\leq \frac{p}{2^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \left( \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f_e)} f_e(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x}))^p (x_{[i+1]_e} - x_{[i]_e})^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\times \left( \sum_{e \in E} w_e \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f_e)} (x_{[i+1]_e}^p + x_{[i]_e}^p) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\leq \frac{p}{2^{\frac{1}{p'}}} \left( \sum_{e \in E} w_e \left( \sum_{i \in \text{si}(f_e)} f_e(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x})) (x_{[i+1]_e} - x_{[i]_e}) \right)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{j \in V} \widetilde{\text{deg}}(j) x_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} p \left( \sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{j \in V} g(j) x_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where  $p'$  is the Hölder conjugate of  $p$ , i.e.,  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ , and  $\{[1]_e, \dots, [i]_e, \dots\}$  is a simple index set for  $f_e$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ , and

$$\widetilde{\text{deg}}(j) := \sum_{e \in \widetilde{E}_j} w_e, \text{ and } \widetilde{E}_j := \{e \in E : j = [i]_e \text{ or } j = [i+1]_e \text{ for some } i \in \text{si}(f_e)\}.$$

The first inequality (52) uses an inequality in [1], the second inequality (53) uses Hölder's inequality, and the last inequality (54) is according to the fact that

$$\sum_{j \in V : x_j \geq t} \widetilde{\text{deg}}(j) \leq \sum_{j \in V : x_j \geq t} \text{deg}(j) \leq c \sum_{j \in V : x_j \geq t} g(j) \text{ for any } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (55)$$

In fact, for any  $e \in \widetilde{E}_j$ , we may suppose that  $j = [i]_e$ , and then  $f_e(V_{[i-1]_e}(\mathbf{x})) \neq f_e(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x}))$ . Clearly, if  $j' \neq j$  and  $x_{[i]_e} \leq x_{j'} < x_{[i+1]_e}$ , then  $e \notin \widetilde{E}_{j'}$  because  $j' \neq [i']_e$  for any  $i'$ . That is,  $e$  is counted exactly once in  $\widetilde{E}_j$  over all  $j$  with  $x_j \in [x_{[i]_e}, x_{[i+1]_e})$ . We shall prove that there exists  $j'$  with  $x_{[i]_e} \leq x_{j'} < x_{[i+1]_e}$  such that  $e \in E_{j'}$ . Suppose the contrary, that for any  $j'$  with  $x_{[i]_e} \leq x_{j'} < x_{[i+1]_e}$ ,  $e \notin E_{j'}$ . Denote by  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} = \{j : x_{[i]_e} \leq x_j < x_{[i+1]_e}\} = V_{[i-1]_e} \setminus V_{[i]_e}$ . It follows from  $e \notin E_{j_1} \cup \dots \cup E_{j_l}$  that  $f(V_{[i-1]_e}(\mathbf{x})) = f(V_{[i-1]_e}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus \{j_1\}) = \dots = f(V_{[i-1]_e}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}) = f(V_{[i]_e}(\mathbf{x}))$ , which is a contradiction. In consequence,  $e$  is counted at least once in  $E_j$  over all  $j$  with  $x_j \in [x_{[i]_e}, x_{[i+1]_e})$ , and the inequality (55) is then proved. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j \in V} \widetilde{\deg}(j) x_j^p = \int_0^\infty \sum_{j \in V: x_j^p \geq t} \widetilde{\deg}(j) dt \leq c \int_0^\infty \sum_{j \in V: x_j^p \geq t} g(j) dt = c \sum_{j \in V} g(j) x_j^p,$$

which implies (54).

Consequently, for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ,

$$\frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(\mathbf{x}^p)}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p,g}^p} := \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(\mathbf{x}^p)}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) x_j^p} \leq p \left(\frac{c}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) x_j^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Similarly, for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , denoting by  $|\mathbf{x}| = (|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$ , and taking  $\tilde{f}_e(S) = f_e(V \setminus S)$ ,  $\forall S \subset V$ , we have

$$\frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e \tilde{f}_e^L(|\mathbf{x}|^p)}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p,g}^p} = \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(-|\mathbf{x}|^p)}{\| -|\mathbf{x}| \|_{p,g}^p} = \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(-|\mathbf{x}|^p)}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) |x_j|^p} \leq p \left(\frac{c}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) |x_j|^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \cup \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^n)$ , let  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_+ + \mathbf{x}_-$  be such that  $(x_+)_i = \max\{x_i, 0\}$  and  $(x_-)_i = \min\{x_i, 0\}$  for all  $i \in V$ . Accordingly, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) |x_j|^p} &= \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e |f_e^L(\mathbf{x}_+) + f_e^L(\mathbf{x}_-)|^p}{\sum_{j \in V} g(j) |x_{+,j}|^p + \sum_{j \in V} g(j) |x_{-,j}|^p} \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}_+))^p}{\|\mathbf{x}_+\|_{p,g}^p}, \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}_-))^p}{\|\mathbf{x}_-\|_{p,g}^p} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{p^p} \left(\frac{2}{c}\right)^{\frac{p}{p}} \min \left\{ \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e f_e^L(\mathbf{x}_+^p)}{\|\mathbf{x}_+^p\|_{1,g}}, \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e \tilde{f}_e^L(|\mathbf{x}_-^p|)}{\|\mathbf{x}_-^p\|_{1,g}} \right\}^p \\ &\geq \frac{(2/c)^{p-1}}{p^p} \min \left\{ \frac{f(A_+)}{g(A_+)}, \frac{\tilde{f}(A_-)}{g(A_-)} \right\}^p \\ &\geq \frac{(2/c)^{p-1}}{p^p} \min \left\{ \frac{\hat{f}(A_+)}{g(A_+)}, \frac{\hat{f}(A_-)}{g(A_-)} \right\}^p, \end{aligned}$$



for some nonempty subset  $A_{\pm} \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_{\pm})$  provided by Theorem A in [55] or Theorem 3.1, where  $\hat{f}(S) := \min\{f(S), f(V \setminus S)\} = \min\{f(S), \tilde{f}(S)\}$ .

For any nonconstant vector  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ , since  $g$  is a volume function, there exists  $c \in \{\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that the vector  $\mathbf{x} = \hat{\mathbf{x}} - c\mathbf{1}$  satisfies

$$g(\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_+)) \leq \frac{1}{2}g(V) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_-)) \leq \frac{1}{2}g(V).$$

Then,  $f_e^L(\mathbf{x}) = f_e^L(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - cf_e(V) = f_e^L(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$  provided by  $f_e(V) = 0$ . Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))^p}{\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - c\mathbf{1}|^p)} \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in E} w_e (f_e^L(\mathbf{x}))^p}{\sum_{e \in E} g_e^L(|\mathbf{x}|^p)} \geq \frac{(2/c)^{p-1}}{p^p} \cdot \frac{\hat{f}(A)^p}{g(A)^p}$$

for some nonempty subset  $A \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_+) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  or  $A \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x}_-) \subset \text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ . In consequence,  $g(A) \leq \frac{1}{2}g(V)$  (i.e.  $g(A) \leq g(V \setminus A)$ ). It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{A \neq \emptyset, V} \frac{\hat{f}(A)}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}} &= \min_{A \neq \emptyset, V} \frac{\min\{f(A), f(V \setminus A)\}}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}} \\ &= \min_{A \neq \emptyset, V} \frac{f(A)}{\min\{g(A), g(V \setminus A)\}} = h. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\lambda \geq \frac{(2/c)^{p-1}}{p^p} h^p$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Example 4.2.** Given a chemical hypergraph  $(V, E)$  (see [52] for the definition) satisfying  $e_{in} \neq \emptyset \neq e_{out}$  and  $\#(e_{in} \cup e_{out}) \geq 2$  for all  $e \in E$ , let  $f_e : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$f_e(A) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e_{in} \cap A \neq \emptyset \neq e_{out} \setminus A \quad \text{or} \quad e_{out} \subset A \subset V \setminus e_{in}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $e_{in} := \{\text{inputs of } e\}$  and  $e_{out} := \{\text{outputs of } e\}$ . Then the Lovász extension of  $f_e$  is determined by

$$f_e^L(\mathbf{x}) = \left| \max_{i \in e_{in}} x_i - \min_{j \in e_{out}} x_j \right|.$$

And the associated  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p$  induced by the Lovász extension is defined as

$$\Delta_p \mathbf{x} = \nabla \sum_{e \in E} \left| \max_{i \in e_{in}} x_i - \min_{j \in e_{out}} x_j \right|^p$$

which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{p} \langle \Delta_p \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_{e \in E} \left| \max_{i \in e_{in}} x_i - \min_{j \in e_{out}} x_j \right|^p.$$

The  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p$  introduced in Example 4.2 can be described and computed approximately by the following steps:

1. Given a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^V = \mathbb{R}^n$ , for each hyperedge  $e \in E$ , let  $i_e = \underset{i \in e_{in}}{\text{argmax}} x_i$  and  $j_e = \underset{j \in e_{out}}{\text{argmin}} x_j$ .

2. Construct the weighted graph  $G_{\mathbf{x}}$  on the vertex set  $V$  by adding edges  $\{i_e, j_e\}$  having weight  $w(i_e, j_e) = w(e) := 1$ .
3. The  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p$  is defined to be the usual  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_p[G_{\mathbf{x}}]$  w.r.t. the graph  $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ , and  $\Delta_p \mathbf{x} := \Delta_p[G_{\mathbf{x}}]\mathbf{x}$ .

Although the related energy function

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \frac{\sum_{e \in E} \left| \max_{i \in e_{in}} x_i - \min_{j \in e_{out}} x_j \right|^p}{\sum_{i \in V} \deg(i) |x_i|^p}$$

is not smooth in general, it has some features that are similar to the graph case. Amazingly, this eigenvalue problem is very similar to the graph case since we have a relative isoperimetric inequality for that. In detail, the second smallest eigenvalue of such a  $p$ -Laplacian and the Cheeger constant

$$h := \min_{A \in \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset, V\}} \frac{\#(\partial A)}{\min\{\text{vol}(A), \text{vol}(V \setminus A)\}}$$

satisfy Cheeger's inequality, where we adopt the volume  $\text{vol}(A) := \sum_{e \in E} \#(e \cap A) = \sum_{i \in A} \deg(i)$ , the degree  $\deg(i) := \#\{e \in E : i \in e\}$ , and the boundary set

$$\partial A := \{e \in E : e_{in} \cap A \neq \emptyset \neq e_{out} \setminus A \text{ or } e_{out} \subset A \subset V \setminus e_{in}\}.$$

Also, the  $p$ -Laplacian on chemical hypergraphs satisfies a nodal domain property, which is very similar to the graph case shown in Proposition 1.3.

*Proof of Proposition 1.3.* Let  $U \subset V$  be a maximal independent set. Then for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $x_i = 0 \forall i \in V \setminus U$ , we have  $|x_i - x_j|^p = |x_i|^p + |x_j|^p$  whenever  $\{i, j\} \in E$ . Therefore, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x}) \subset U$ , we get

$$\frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} := \frac{\sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} w_{ij} |x_i - x_j|^p}{\sum_{i \in V} \deg_i |x_i|^p} = \frac{\sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} w_{ij} (|x_i|^p + |x_j|^p)}{\sum_{i \in V} \deg_i |x_i|^p} = 1.$$

By Theorem 2.2, we obtain that  $\alpha \leq \alpha_1 \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq 1\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq 1\}\}$ .

It can be verified that the connected components of the support set of an eigenvector form a family of nodal domains in the sense of Definition 2.6. Hence, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 1.5 can be directly applied to  $p$ -Laplacian to get the upper bound  $\min\{k + r - 1, n - k + r\}$  for the number of nodal domains.  $\square$

As a consequence of Theorem 4.1, and as an analog of Proposition 1.3, we have

**Theorem 4.2.** *Under the above setting, we have the following Cheeger inequality*

$$2^{p-1} \frac{h^p}{p^p} \leq \lambda_2(\Delta_p) \leq 2^{p-1} h. \quad (56)$$

*Also, we have the inertia bound  $\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i(\Delta_p) \leq 1\}, \#\{\lambda_i(\Delta_p) \geq 1\}\}$ . And for any eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $\lambda_i(\Delta_p)$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , the number of connected components of the support set of  $\mathbf{x}$  is smaller than or equal to  $\min\{i + r - 1, n - i + r\}$ .*

Here the independence number  $\alpha$  and the connected components can be defined on the underlying graph<sup>9</sup> induced by the chemical hypergraph.

**Remark 15.** Theorem 4.1 generalizes and enhances the relevant results in the recent references [66, 91]. Moreover, Theorem 4.2 includes the following special cases:

- Taking  $p = 2$  and letting  $e_{in} = e_{out}$  for any  $e \in E$ , we get Louis hypergraph Laplacian [65] and the Cheeger inequality therein.
- Taking  $(V, E)$  as a graph (i.e.,  $e_{in} = e_{out}$  and  $\#e_{in} = 2$ ), Theorem 4.2 implies the Cheeger inequality for the graph  $p$ -Laplacian [87].
- Taking  $p = 1$  and letting  $e_{in} = e_{out}$  for any  $e \in E$ , we get the total variation on hypergraphs [46].

In general, letting  $e := e_{in} = e_{out}$ , one can obtain

$$\frac{\sum_{e \in E} \left| \max_{i \in e} x_i - \min_{j \in e} x_j \right|^p}{\sum_{i \in V} \deg(i) |x_i|^p} = \frac{\sum_{e \in E} \max_{i, j \in e} |x_i - x_j|^p}{\sum_{i \in V} \deg(i) |x_i|^p}.$$

If we further take  $p = 1$  and let the edge set be  $E = \{N(i) : i \in V\}$ , where  $N(i)$  is the 1-neighborhood of  $i$ , then we recover the equality of Cheeger constants w.r.t. the vertex-boundary [55].

Mulas [69] generalizes the graph Cheeger inequalities to the case of  $k$ -uniform hypergraphs, using the normalized Laplacian for hypergraphs [52]. From a different perspective, we indeed provide in this section a way of defining a  $p$ -Laplacian from a Lovász type extension of a Cheeger quantity so that the Cheeger inequality emerges automatically.

### 4.3 Tensors and their eigenvalues

Eigenvalues for tensors have been defined by Lim [62] and Qi [77] in different ways; see also the presentations in [78, 79]. Here, in line with our general procedure, we approach the eigenvalue problem of tensors through Rayleigh quotients. We consider  $d$ -dimensional  $n \times \cdots \times n$ -tensors, that is, arrays of the form  $A = (a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d})$  where each entry takes its values in  $\mathbb{R}$  and the indices  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d$  range from 1 to  $n$ . We assume that the tensor  $A$  is symmetric, that is, each entry  $a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d}$  is invariant under permutations of the indices. We write  $A(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$  for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and we can then also define  $A(\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(d))$ . We then consider the quotient

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \frac{\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}}{\sum_i x_i^d}. \quad (57)$$

Its critical points then satisfy the eigenvalue equation

$$\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_d} = \lambda x_i^{d-1} \quad (58)$$

---

<sup>9</sup>Two vertices are connected by an edge in the underlying graph if and only if there exists  $h \in H$  with  $h_{in} \cup h_{out} \supset \{i, j\}$ .

for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and some  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that the first index is excluded from the sum, but by symmetry of  $A$ , we could have as well taken any other index for that role. This is the eigenvalue equation of [77–79].

**Definition 4.1** (H-eigenvalue). *Continuing Example 1.1, for two order- $k$   $n$ -dimensional tensors  $C := (c_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$  and  $D := (d_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$ , the H-eigenvalue problem of  $(C, D)$  is to find a pair  $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$  satisfying  $C\mathbf{x}^{k-1} = \lambda D\mathbf{x}^{k-1}$ , where  $C\mathbf{x}^{k-1} := (\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_k=1}^n c_{i, i_2, \dots, i_k} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_k})_{i=1}^n$ .*

**Definition 4.2.** *The adjacency tensor  $A$  of a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $(V, E)$  is a non-negative symmetric tensor such that  $a_{i_1, \dots, i_k} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E$ . Denote the  $i$ -th eigenvalue w.r.t. a non-negative diagonal tensor  $D$  by  $\lambda_i := \inf_{\text{genus}(S) \geq i} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in S} \frac{\langle A\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{\langle D\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 1.2.* Let  $U$  be a maximal independent set with  $\#U = \alpha$ . For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^U$ ,  $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k} = 0$  whenever  $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  is a hyperedge. And  $a_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = 0$  if  $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  is not a hyperedge. Thus,

$$\frac{F(\mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x})} := \frac{\langle A\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}{\langle D\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle} = \frac{\sum a_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}}{\sum d_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}} = 0.$$

Applying Theorem 2.2 to the function pair  $(F, G)$ , we get  $\alpha \leq \alpha_0 \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq 0\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq 0\}\}$ .

We will check that the set of connected components of the support set of an eigenvector is a family of nodal domains in the sense of Definition 2.6. Indeed, for connected components  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  of the support set  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $a_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = 0$  if  $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  intersects two of these components. Thus it can be checked that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} F(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} F(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $v \in U_j$ . By the condition that  $D$  is a nonnegative diagonal matrix, the function  $G(\mathbf{x}) := \langle D\mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$  also possesses the property  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} G(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} G(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $v \in U_j$ . Since  $(\lambda_i, \mathbf{x})$  is an eigenpair, i.e.,  $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_i \nabla G(\mathbf{x})$ , we have  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} F(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j}) = \lambda_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_v} G(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j})$  for any  $v \in U_j$ . By the Euler identity for homogeneous functions, we immediately get  $F(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j}) = \lambda_i G(\mathbf{x}|_{U_j})$ . Finally, it is not difficult to show that for any  $t_1, \dots, t_k$ ,  $F(\sum_{j=1}^k t_j \mathbf{x}|_{U_j}) = \lambda_i G(\sum_{j=1}^k t_j \mathbf{x}|_{U_j})$ . Therefore, Theorem 2.2 can be applied to give the upper bound  $\min\{k + r - 1, n - k + r\}$  for the number of nodal domains.  $\square$

We can of course more generally take certain norms in the Rayleigh quotient. For instance, we could adopt the norm  $\|\mathbf{x}(j)\|_{p_j}$  for the  $j$ -th argument and consider as in [62]

$$(\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(d)) \mapsto \frac{|A(\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(d))|}{\|\mathbf{x}(1)\|_{p_1} \cdots \|\mathbf{x}(d)\|_{p_d}}. \quad (59)$$

and take its stationary points as eigenvectors. Also, there are many meaningful optimization problems for (59) with constraints. For example, by Theorem 3.1, we have an interesting equality for the graph maxcut problem:

$$\max_{S \subset V} \#\partial S = \max_{S \cap T = \emptyset} \#E(S, T) = \max_{|\mathbf{x}|^T |\mathbf{y}| = 0} \frac{A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty},$$

where  $|\mathbf{x}| := (|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$ , and  $A$  is the adjacency matrix of a graph  $(V, E)$  with  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

We now consider the case where all entries  $a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Such a tensor can be seen as representing a simplicial complex with vertex set  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and where the vertices  $i_1, \dots, i_d$  form a  $(d-1)$ -simplex iff  $a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} = 1$ . We can then define a tensor Laplacian

$$(\Delta \mathbf{x})_i = -\frac{1}{\deg_i} \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_d} + (x_i)^{d-1} \quad (60)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\deg_i$  is the number of entries  $a_{i i_2 \dots i_d} = 1$  when  $i_2, \dots, i_d = 1, \dots, n$ , or equivalently, the number of  $(d-1)$ -simplices containing  $i$ . The eigenvalue equation for this Laplacian then is

$$-\frac{1}{\deg_i} \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_d} + (x_i)^{d-1} = \lambda (x_i)^{d-1} \text{ for all } i \quad (61)$$

for some  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$  and some real eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Clearly,  $\lambda = 0$  is an eigenvalue for the constant eigenfunction.

Equivalently, we can write of course

$$\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_d} - (1 - \lambda) \deg_i (x_i)^{d-1} = 0 \text{ for all } i. \quad (62)$$

This comes from the Rayleigh quotient

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \frac{\sum_i \deg_i x_i^d - \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_d} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_d}}{\sum_i \deg_i x_i^d}. \quad (63)$$

This Laplace operator can be generalized to arbitrary symmetric tensors with non-negative entries when we put  $\deg_i = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d=1}^n a_{i i_2 \dots i_d}$ .

We then have the following analog of Proposition 1.2.

**Proposition 4.2.** *The independence number of a  $(d-1)$ -dim simplicial complex on  $V$  is defined as  $\alpha = \max\{\#U : U \subset V \text{ s.t. } U \text{ contains no } (d-1)\text{-dim simplex}\}$ . Let  $\lambda_i$  be the  $i$ -th minimax eigenvalue of the eigenvalue problem (62). Then  $\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq 1\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq 1\}\}$ . Moreover, for any eigenvector  $\mathbf{x}$  w.r.t.  $\lambda_i$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , the number of connected components of the support of  $\mathbf{x}$  is smaller than or equal to  $\min\{i + r - 1, n - i + r\}$ .*

#### 4.4 Signed (hyper-)graphs

Spectral theory for signed graphs has many important applications. A breakthrough of Huang [48] asserts that any induced subgraph of an  $n$ -dimensional hypercube on a set of  $2^{n-1} + 1$  vertices has maximum degree at least  $\sqrt{n}$ . This confirms the Sensitivity Conjecture in the field of computer science. In this section, we use Theorem 1.6 to obtain more results on signed graphs.

We first generalize the concept of a signed graph to allow for edge weights.

**Definition 4.3** (weighted signed graph). A weighted signed graph is a pair  $(V, W)$  of the vertex set  $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and the adjacency matrix  $W = (w_{ij})_{n \times n}$ , where  $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$  and  $w_{ii} = 0, \forall i, j \in V$ .

If  $w_{ij} \in \{0, 1, -1\}$  for any  $i, j \in V$ , we call such a  $(V, W)$  a signed graph.

If  $w_{ij} \geq 0, (V, W)$  is called a weighted graph. And if  $w_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ , we get a simple graph.

**Theorem 4.3.** For a weighted graph  $(V, W)$  with  $\#V = n$ , we put  $S(W) = \{W' = (w'_{ij})_{n \times n} : (V, W') \text{ is a weighted signed graph with } |w'_{ij}| = w_{ij}, \forall i, j \in V\}$ . Then we have

$$\min_{U \subset V, \#U=k} \max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i) \geq \max_{W' \in S(W)} \max\{\lambda_k(W'), -\lambda_{n-k+1}(W')\} \quad (64)$$

where  $\deg_U(i) := \sum_{j \in U} w_{ij}$  is the degree of the vertex  $i$  of the induced subgraph  $(U, W|_U)$ .

*Proof.* Taking  $f(A, B) = \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} w_{ij}$  and  $g(A, B) = \#(A \cap B)$  for  $A, B \subset V$  in Theorem 1.6, and by Example 3.2, we have  $\max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i) = \max_{A \subset B} \frac{f(A, B)}{g(A, B)}, f_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \langle W\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$  and  $g_{\Delta}^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ . For any  $W' \in S(W)$ , taking  $F'(\mathbf{x}) = \langle W'\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$  and  $G'(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ , we have  $\lambda_i(W') = \lambda_i(F', G')$  and  $\lambda_{n-i+1}(W') = \lambda'_i(W') = \lambda'_i(F', G')$  (by the classical min-max theorem). Therefore, the proof is completed by Theorem 1.6.  $\square$

**Remark 16.** Theorem 4.3 implies the inertia bound for the independent number. In fact, let  $d_k = \min_{U \subset V, \#U=k} \max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i)$  and  $s_k = \max_{W' \in S(W)} \max\{\lambda_k(W'), -\lambda_{n-k+1}(W')\}$ .

Then both  $(d_k)_{k \geq 1}$  and  $(s_k)_{k \geq 1}$  are non-decreasing sequences with  $s_k \leq d_k, \forall k$ .

Clearly,  $d_k = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  there is an independent set of  $k$  elements  $\Leftrightarrow \alpha \geq k$ . So, it follows from  $d_{\alpha} = 0$  that  $s_{\alpha} \leq 0$ , which means  $\max\{\lambda_{\alpha}(W), -\lambda_{n-\alpha+1}(W)\} \leq 0$ , i.e.,  $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{\alpha} \leq 0 \leq \lambda_{n-\alpha+1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ . Therefore, we get the inertia bound  $\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{\lambda_i \leq 0\}, \#\{\lambda_i \geq 0\}\}$ .

**Remark 17.** Following Huang's idea, we can use Theorem 4.3 to get a very slight generalization of Huang's theorem in the following way:

*Step 1.* Let  $(V, W)$  be a weighted graph such that there exists  $W' \in S(W)$  satisfying  $W'^2 = \lambda I$  with  $\lambda > 0$ . Then  $n := \#V$  is even, and  $\min_{U \subset V, \#U=\frac{n}{2}+1} \max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i) \geq \sqrt{\lambda}$ .

*Proof:* Note that the eigenvalues of  $W'$  are  $\pm\sqrt{\lambda}$ . Combining this with the fact that  $\text{trace}(W') = 0$ , we obtain that  $n$  is even and  $W'$  is similar to  $\text{diag}(\underbrace{\sqrt{\lambda}, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda}}_{n/2}, \underbrace{-\sqrt{\lambda}, \dots, -\sqrt{\lambda}}_{n/2})$ . Hence,  $\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}+1}(W') = \sqrt{\lambda}$  and  $\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}(W') = -\sqrt{\lambda}$ . By Theorem 4.3, we complete the proof of Step 1.

*Step 2.* Let  $(\tilde{V}, \tilde{W})$  be the Cartesian product of the weighted graph  $(V, W)$  and the path graph on two vertices with the edge weight  $w$ . Then there exists  $\tilde{W}' \in S(\tilde{W})$  satisfying  $\tilde{W}'^2 = (\lambda + w^2)I$ .

*Proof:* By the basic property of the Cartesian product, we have  $\tilde{W} = \begin{pmatrix} W & wI \\ wI & W \end{pmatrix}$ .

Now, let  $\tilde{W}' = \begin{pmatrix} W' & wI \\ wI & -W' \end{pmatrix}$ . Then

$$\tilde{W}'^2 = \begin{pmatrix} W'^2 + w^2I & O \\ O & W'^2 + w^2I \end{pmatrix} = (\lambda + w^2)I$$

and  $\tilde{W}' \in S(\tilde{W})$ .  $h$

*Step 3* An  $n$ -dimensional weighted hypercube is the Cartesian product of  $n$  path graphs on two vertices with edge weights  $w_1, \dots, w_n$ , respectively. Any induced subgraph of an  $n$ -dimensional weighted hypercube  $(V, W)$  on a set of  $2^{n-1} + 1$  vertices has maximum degree at least  $\sqrt{w_1^2 + \dots + w_n^2}$ .

*Proof:* By Step 2, it immediately follows from mathematical induction on  $n$  that there exists  $W' \in S(W)$  satisfying  $W'^2 = (w_1^2 + \dots + w_n^2)I$ . And then by Step 1, the proof is completed.

Furthermore, Theorem 1.6 implies a similar estimate for signed weighted hypergraphs.

**Definition 4.4** (signed weighted hypergraph). A signed weighted hypergraph is a pair  $(V, W)$  of the vertex set  $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and its adjacency  $k$ -order tensor  $W = (w_{i_1, \dots, i_k})_{n \times n}$ , where  $w_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = w_{\sigma(i_1), \dots, \sigma(i_k)}$  for any permutation  $\sigma \in S_k$ ,  $\forall i_1, \dots, i_k \in V$ . If  $w_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \geq 0$ , we call  $(V, W)$  a weighted hypergraph for simplicity.

**Theorem 4.4.** Given a weighted hypergraph  $(V, W)$  with  $\#V = n$ , denote by  $S(W) = \{W' = (w'_{i_1, \dots, i_k})_{n \times n} : (V, W') \text{ is a signed weighted hypergraph with } |w'_{i_1, \dots, i_k}| = w_{i_1, \dots, i_k}, \forall i_1, \dots, i_k \in V\}$ . Then we have

$$\min_{U \subset V, \#U=m} \max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i) \geq \max_{W' \in S(W)} \max\{\lambda_m(W'), -\lambda'_m(W')\} \quad (65)$$

where  $\deg_U(i) := \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} \in U} w_{i, i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}}$  is the degree of the vertex  $i$  of the subhypergraph  $(U, W|_U)$ .

*Proof.* Taking  $f(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \sum_{i_1 \in A_1, \dots, i_k \in A_k} w_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$  and  $g(A_1, \dots, A_k) = \#(A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_k)$  for  $A_1, \dots, A_k \subset V$ , it is not difficult to check that

$$\max_{i \in U} \deg_U(i) = \max_{A \subset U} \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \deg_U(i)}{\#A} = \max_{\text{chain } A_1, \dots, A_k \subset U} \frac{f(A_1, \dots, A_k)}{g(A_1, \dots, A_k)}.$$

Also, we have  $f_\Delta^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} w_{i_1, \dots, i_k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k}$  and  $g_\Delta^Q(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i x_i^k$ , and  $\lambda_i(W) = \lambda_i(f_\Delta^Q, g_\Delta^Q)$ . Finally, we are able to apply Theorem 1.6 to get (65), as the remaining part is similar to that of Theorem 4.3.  $\square$

## 4.5 Spectral theory on simplicial complexes

In this section, we use the extension theory and the spectral theory for function pairs to give some preliminary investigations on (nonlinear) eigenvalue problems for simplicial complexes.

We shall work on an abstract simplicial complex  $K$  with the vertex set  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For any  $\sigma = \{i_0, \dots, i_d\} \in K$ , we use  $[\sigma] := [i_0, \dots, i_d]$  to indicate the oriented  $d$ -dimensional simplex which is formed by  $\sigma$ . Let  $S_d$  be the collection of all simplexes in  $K$  of dimension  $d$ , and let  $[S_d] = \{[\sigma] : \sigma \in S_d\}$  be the set of all oriented  $d$ -simplexes.

The  $d$ -th chain group  $C_d(K)$  of  $K$  is a vector space with the basis  $[S_d]$ . The boundary map  $\partial_d : C_d(K) \rightarrow C_{d-1}(K)$  is a linear operator defined by  $\partial_d[i_0, \dots, i_d] = \sum_{j=0}^d (-1)^j [i_0, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_d]$ , which can also be represented by the incidence matrix  $B_d$  of dimension  $\#S_{d-1} \times \#S_d$ . Clearly, the elements of the matrix  $B_d$  belong to  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ .

The  $d$ -th cochain group  $C^d(K)$  is defined as the dual of the chain group  $C_d(K)$ . The simplicial coboundary map  $\delta_d : C^d(K) \rightarrow C^{d+1}(K)$  is a linear operator generated by  $(\delta_d f)([i_0, \dots, i_{d+1}]) = \sum_{j=0}^{d+1} (-1)^j f([i_0, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{d+1}])$  for any  $f \in C^d(K)$ . It is obvious that  $\delta_d = B_{d+1}^\top$ . We use both the **incidence matrices** and the **coboundary operators** to express the Laplace matrices/operators (see [50]):

- the  $d$ -th up Laplace operator  $L_d^{up} := \delta_d^* \delta_d = B_{d+1} B_{d+1}^\top$
- the  $d$ -th down Laplace operator  $L_d^{down} := \delta_{d-1} \delta_{d-1}^* = B_d^\top B_d$
- the  $d$ -th Hodge Laplace operator  $L_d := L_d^{up} + L_d^{down} = \delta_d^* \delta_d + \delta_{d-1} \delta_{d-1}^* = B_{d+1}^\top B_{d+1} + B_d^\top B_d$

It is known that the spectra of these matrices encode many qualitative properties of the associated simplicial complex. The overall aim of this section is to bring forward the study of the nonlinear eigenvalue problems on simplicial complexes. We introduce the following  $p$ -Laplace operators on  $C^d(K)$ :

- the  $d$ -th up Laplace operator  $L_{d,p}^{up} := \delta_d^* \alpha_p \delta_d$ , and for  $f \in C^d(K)$ ,  $L_{d,p}^{up} f = B_{d+1} \alpha_p (B_{d+1}^\top f)$ , where  $\alpha_p : (t_1, t_2, \dots) \mapsto (|t_1|^{p-2} t_1, |t_2|^{p-2} t_2, \dots)$  for  $p > 1$ , and  $\alpha_1 : (t_1, t_2, \dots) \mapsto \{(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots) : \xi_i \in \text{Sgn}(t_i)\}$ .
- the  $d$ -th down Laplace operator  $L_{d,p}^{down} := \delta_{d-1} \alpha_p \delta_{d-1}^*$ , and for  $f \in C^d(K)$ ,  $L_{d,p}^{down} f = B_d^\top \alpha_p (B_d f)$
- the  $d$ -th Laplace operator  $L_{d,p} := \delta_d^* \alpha_p \delta_d + \delta_{d-1} \alpha_p \delta_{d-1}^*$ , and for  $f \in C^d(K)$ ,  $L_{d,p} f = B_{d+1}^\top \alpha_p (B_{d+1} f) + B_d^\top \alpha_p (B_d f)$

**Proposition 4.3.** *The nonzero eigenvalues of the up  $p$ -Laplacians are in one-to-one correspondence with those of the down  $p^*$ -Laplacians:*

$$\{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} : \lambda \text{ is a nonzero eigenvalue of } L_{d,p}^{up}\} = \{\lambda^{\frac{1}{p^*}} : \lambda \text{ is a nonzero eigenvalue of } L_{d+1,p^*}^{down}\}$$



*Proof.* For  $p > 1$ , we have  $L_{d,p}^{up} f = \frac{1}{p} \nabla_f \|B_{d+1}^\top f\|_p^p$  and  $L_{d+1,p^*}^{down} g = \frac{1}{p^*} \nabla_g \|B_{d+1} g\|_{p^*}^{p^*}$ . Then, the eigenvalues of  $L_{d,p}^{up}$  coincide with those of  $(\|B_{d+1}^\top \cdot\|_p^p, \|\cdot\|_p^p)$ . We refer to the proof of Proposition 2.8 for the rest.  $\square$

By taking  $p = 2$ , it is easy to see that Proposition 4.3 generalizes the well-known relation between up and down Laplacians, that is, the nonzero eigenvalues of  $L_d^{up}$  and  $L_{d+1}^{down}$  coincide.

So, we can concentrate on the up  $p$ -Laplacian for investigating the spectra of simplicial complexes.

We construct the *underlying anti-signed graph*  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$  on  $S_d$  with the edge set

$$\{[\tau], [\tau']\} : [\tau], [\tau'] \in [S_d], \exists [\sigma] \in [S_{d+1}] \text{ s.t. } \tau, \tau' \subset \sigma\}$$

and the sign of an edge  $\{[\tau], [\tau']\}$  is  $\text{sgn}([\tau], [\tau']) := \text{sgn}([\tau], \partial[\sigma]) \cdot \text{sgn}([\tau'], \partial[\sigma])$ , where  $\sigma \in S_{d+1}$  and  $\tau, \tau' \subset \sigma$ .

**Remark 18.** *One can of course take  $\text{sgn}([\tau], [\tau']) = -\text{sgn}([\tau], \partial[\sigma]) \cdot \text{sgn}([\tau'], \partial[\sigma])$  to get the so-called underlying signed graph  $G_{up}(S_d)$  on  $S_d$ . But in the following results, we mostly use the underlying anti-signed graph  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ , since it is more convenient for proving a Cheeger-type inequality. This construction is very natural and can be observed from the definition of (up/down) combinatorial Laplacian matrices of a simplicial complex. A similar idea was already used to define the signed adjacency matrix of a triangulation on a surface [35].*

To get more concise and more useful results, we will work with the *normalized up  $p$ -Laplace operator*  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$ , whose eigenvalues are determined by the function pair  $(\|B_{d+1}^\top \cdot\|_p^p, \|\cdot\|_{p,\text{deg}}^p)$ , where  $\|f\|_{p,\text{deg}}^p = \sum_{\tau \in S_d} \text{deg}_\tau |f(\tau)|^p$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *The eigenvalues of  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$  lie in  $[0, (d+2)^{p-1}]$ . In addition, for  $p > 1$ , the spectrum of  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$  contains  $(d+2)^{p-1}$ , if and only if the underlying anti-signed graph on  $S_d$  has a balanced component. Moreover, the multiplicity of  $(d+2)^{p-1}$  equals the number of balanced components of the underlying anti-signed graph.*

*Proof.* The upper bound  $(d+2)^{p-1}$  of the eigenvalues of  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$  is provided by Hölder's inequality. For the equality case, it is not difficult to verify that there exists a subpartition  $[S_d]^+ \sqcup [S_d]^-$  of  $[S_d]$  such that for any  $[\tau], [\tau'] \in [S_d]^+ \sqcup [S_d]^-$ ,  $\text{sgn}([\tau], [\tau']) = -1$  if and only if  $\#(\{[\tau], [\tau']\} \cap [S_d]^+) = 1$ . Then, we can switch the set  $[S_d]^+$  to make all edges in  $[S_d]^+ \sqcup [S_d]^-$  positive, meaning that the induced subgraph  $[S_d]^+ \sqcup [S_d]^-$  of the underlying anti-signed graph is switching equivalent to an all-positive signed graph. On the multiplicity, we shall concentrate on  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ , and all the verifications are standard. The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Remark 19.** *It is clear that the underlying anti-signed graph on  $S_d$  is balanced if and only if the underlying signed graph on  $S_d$  is antibalanced. Moreover, a graph (i.e., the case of  $d = 0$ ) is antibalanced means that it is bipartite, and then, Proposition 4.4 is indeed an extension of the fact that the spectrum of the normalized  $p$ -Laplacian on a graph contains  $2^{p-1}$  if and only if the graph is bipartite.*

Several problems in spectral theory for simplicial complexes arise when trying to generalize the classical spectral results that are known for graphs, such as the Cheeger inequality. Inspired by the recent results on simplicial complexes, signed graphs and oriented hypergraphs [2, 67, 69, 83], we present the following Cheeger-type constants.

Given  $A, A' \subset S_d$  that are disjoint, let  $|E_+(A, A')| = \#\{\{[\tau], [\tau']\} : [\tau] \in A, [\tau'] \in A', \text{sgn}([\tau], [\tau']) = 1\}$  and  $|E_-(A, A')| = \#\{\{[\tau], [\tau']\} : [\tau], [\tau'] \in A, \text{sgn}([\tau], [\tau']) = -1\}$ . Let

$$\beta(A, A') = \frac{2(|E_-(A)| + |E_-(A')| + |E_+(A, A')|) + |\partial(A \sqcup A')|}{\text{vol}(A \sqcup A')}$$

where  $|\partial A|$  is the number of the edges of  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$  that cross  $A$  and  $S_d \setminus A$ ,  $\text{vol}(A) = \sum_{\tau \in A} \text{deg}_\tau$  and  $\text{deg}_\tau = \#\{\sigma \in S_{d+1} : \tau \subset \sigma\}$ .

Then we introduce the  $k$ -th Cheeger constant on  $S_d$ :

$$h_k(S_d) = \min_{\text{disjoint } A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{2k-1}, A_{2k} \text{ in } S_d} \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \beta(A_{2i-1}, A_{2i}).$$

It is interesting that  $h_k(S_d) = 0$  if and only if  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$  has  $k$  balanced components.

**Remark 20.** For  $d = 0$ , the constant  $h_k(S_0)$  reduces to the  $k$ -way Cheeger constant of a graph [59].

**Theorem 4.5.** For any simplicial complex and every  $d \geq 0$ ,

$$\frac{h_1(S_d)^2}{2(d+1)} \leq d+2 - \lambda_n(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq 2h_1(S_d), \quad (66)$$

where  $n = \#S_d$ . Moreover, there exists an absolute constant  $C$  such that for any simplicial complex, and any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{h_k(S_d)^2}{Ck^6(d+1)} \leq d+2 - \lambda_{n+1-k}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq 2h_k(S_d). \quad (67)$$

*Proof.* We first show that

$$d+2 - \lambda_{n-i+1}(\Delta_d^{up}) = (d+1)\lambda_i(\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d))), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

In fact, it can be immediately derived by the identity regarding the Rayleigh quotients:

$$d+2 - \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in S_{d+1}} \left( \sum_{\tau \in S_d, \tau \subset \sigma} \text{sgn}([\tau], \partial[\sigma]) f(\tau) \right)^2}{\sum_{\tau \in S_d} \text{deg}_\tau f(\tau)^2} = (d+1) \frac{\sum_{[\tau] \sim [\tau']} (f(\tau) - \text{sgn}(\tau, \tau') f(\tau'))^2}{\sum_{\tau \in S_d} \widetilde{\text{deg}}_\tau f(\tau)^2}$$

where  $[\tau] \sim [\tau']$  represents an edge in the underlying anti-signed graph  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ , and  $\widetilde{\text{deg}}_\tau = (d+1) \text{deg}_\tau$  is the degree of  $\tau$  in  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ .

Note that  $\frac{1}{d+1} h_k(S_d)$  also indicates the  $k$ -th Cheeger constant of the signed graph  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ . By the Cheeger inequality and the higher order Cheeger inequalities in [2], we have  $\frac{\lambda_1(\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d)))}{2} \leq \frac{h_1(S_d)}{d+1} \leq \sqrt{2\lambda_1(\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d)))}$ . And there exists an absolute

constant  $C$  such that for any signed graph and any  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\frac{\lambda_k(\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d)))}{2} \leq \frac{h_k(S_d)}{d+1} \leq Ck^3 \sqrt{\lambda_k(\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d)))}$ . In consequence, we obtain

$$\frac{d+2 - \lambda_n(\Delta_d^{up})}{2} \leq h_1(S_d) \leq \sqrt{2(d+1)(d+2 - \lambda_n(\Delta_d^{up}))}$$

and

$$\frac{d+2 - \lambda_{n+1-k}(\Delta_d^{up})}{2} \leq h_k(S_d) \leq Ck^3 \sqrt{(d+1)(d+2 - \lambda_{n+1-k}(\Delta_d^{up}))}.$$

Then, we have verified (66) and (67).  $\square$

By Theorem 4.5,  $\lambda_n(\Delta_d^{up}) = d+2$  if and only if  $h_1(S_d) = 0$ , if and only if the underlying anti-signed graph  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$  has a balanced component.

In contrast to Proposition 4.4 on the multiplicity of  $(d+2)^{p-1}$  for  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$ , the multiplicity of 1 for  $\Delta_{d,1}^{up}$  has a quite different characterization. To state this, we show the following concepts and results.

A balanced (resp. antibalanced) clique  $S$  is a subset of  $S_d$  such that  $S$  induces a balanced (resp. antibalanced) complete subgraph in  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ . Similar to Theorem 1 in [94], we can prove the following:

**Proposition 4.5.** *The maximum eigenvalue of  $\Delta_{d,1}^{up}$  is 1, and the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 1, denoted by  $m_1(S_d)$ , satisfies the sandwich inequality*

$$\tilde{\alpha}(S_d) \leq m_1(S_d) \leq \tilde{\kappa}(S_d)$$

where  $\tilde{\alpha}(S_d) = \max\{p+2q : \exists \text{ pairwise non-adjacent } p \text{ balanced cliques and } q \text{ antibalanced cliques}\}$ ,  $\tilde{\kappa}(S_d) = \min\{p+2q : \exists p \text{ balanced cliques and } q \text{ antibalanced cliques covering } S_d\}$ .

According to Theorem 2.2, we also have the inertia bound and the nodal domain theorem:

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\alpha$  be the independence number of  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ . Then,*

$$\alpha \leq \min\{\#\{i : \lambda_i(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) \leq 1\}, \#\{i : \lambda_i(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) \geq 1\}\}.$$

For any eigenfunction  $f$  w.r.t.  $\lambda_i(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$  whose multiplicity is  $r$ , the number of connected components of the support set of  $f$  is smaller than or equal to  $\min\{i+r-1, n-i+r\}$ .

Next, we show some results on the smallest non-trivial eigenvalue of  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *Given a simplicial complex  $K$ , for any  $0 \leq d < \dim K$ , and  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\lambda_{d+1}(L_{d,p}^{up}) = \lambda_{d+1}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue zero is larger than or equal to  $d+1$ .

By Theorem 3.1 in [50], we can derive that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue zero of  $L_d^{up}$  is  $\dim \text{Ker}(B_{d+1}^\top) = \dim \text{Image}(B_d^\top) + \dim \tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R}) = \text{rank}(B_d) + \text{rank}(\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R})) \geq \text{rank}(B_d)$ .

Since every  $(d+1)$ -simplex has  $(d+2)$  sub-simplices of dimension  $d$ , the incidence matrix  $B_d$  has at least  $(d+2)$  nonzero columns. And based on this fact, we can further verify that  $\text{rank}(B_d) \geq d+1$ . Finally, it is obvious that the multiplicities of the eigenvalue zero of  $L_{d,p}^{up}$ ,  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$  and  $L_d^{up}$  coincide. The proof is completed.  $\square$

It is well-known that  $\lambda_2(L_0^{up}) > 0$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(\tilde{H}^0(K, \mathbb{R})) = 0$ , i.e.,  $K$  is connected. For  $\lambda_{d+2}(L_d^{up})$  with  $d \geq 1$ , we have

**Proposition 4.8.** *Given a pure simplicial complex  $K$ ,  $1 \leq d < \dim K$  and  $p \geq 1$ , we have  $\lambda_{d+2}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) > 0$  (or  $\lambda_{d+2}(L_{d,p}^{up}) > 0$ ) if and only if  $K$  is a simplex of dimension  $(d+1)$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we only prove the case of  $p = 2$ . For any  $0 \leq d < \dim K$ ,  $\lambda_{d+2}(L_d^{up}) > 0$  if and only if  $\text{rank}(B_d) = d+1$  and  $\text{rank}(\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R})) = 0$ . If  $K$  is a simplex of dimension  $(d+1)$ , it is easy to check that  $\text{rank}(B_d) = d+1$ ,  $\text{rank}(\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R})) = 0$ , and  $\lambda_{d+2}(L_d^{up}) = d+2$ .

For the converse, by the proof of Proposition 4.7, we can verify that the number of  $(d+1)$ -simplexes in  $K$  is one. Since  $K$  is pure,  $K$  must be a simplex of dimension  $(d+1)$ .  $\square$

Let  $I_d = \dim \text{Image}(B_d^\top) + 1 = \text{rank}(B_d) + 1$  and let  $k_d = \dim \text{Ker}(B_{d+1}^\top) + 1$ . Then,

$$\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) = \min_{x \perp \text{Image}(B_d^\top)} \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top x\|_p^p}{\min_{y \in \text{Image}(B_d^\top)} \|x + y\|_{p, \text{deg}}^p}$$

and  $\lambda_{d+2}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) \leq \lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$ , where  $\|x\|_{p, \text{deg}}^p := \sum_{\tau \in S_d} \text{deg}_\tau |x_\tau|^p$ . Clearly,  $\lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$  is the smallest non-vanishing (nonzero) eigenvalue of the normalized  $d$ -th up  $p$ -Laplacian. We call  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$  the first (smallest) non-trivial eigenvalue of the  $p$ -Laplacian  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$ .

It is interesting that for any  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) = \lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$  if and only if  $\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ . Also, similar to Proposition 4.8, for a pure simplicial complex, the equality  $\lambda_{d+2}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) = \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up})$  holds if and only if  $K$  is a  $(d+1)$ -simplex or  $\text{rank}(\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R})) \neq 0$ .

**Remark 21.** *For the case of  $p = 2$ , the smallest non-trivial eigenvalue  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up})$  of the normalized up Laplacian has been used to derive a Cheeger inequality in [83].*

In the table below, we show the relations among the spectra of the normalized Laplacians on  $S_d$ , and on the underlying signed graphs  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$  as well as  $G_{up}(S_d)$  associated to  $S_d$ . It can be seen that their eigenvalues  $\lambda_n(G_{up}^-(S_d)) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_1(G_{up}^-(S_d))$ ,  $\lambda_1(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(\Delta_d^{up})$  and  $\lambda_1(G_{up}(S_d)) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(G_{up}(S_d))$  satisfy the simple equalities:  $\lambda_{n+1-k}(G_{up}^-(S_d)) = \frac{1}{d+1}(d+2 - \lambda_k(\Delta_d^{up}))$ ,  $\lambda_k(G_{up}(S_d)) = \frac{1}{d+1}(d + \lambda_k(\Delta_d^{up}))$ , and  $\lambda_{n+1-k}(G_{up}^-(S_d)) = 2 - \lambda_k(G_{up}(S_d))$ , where  $k = 1, \dots, n$  and  $n = \#S_d$ .

In summary, we use  $\Delta(G_{up}(S_d))$  (resp.,  $\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d))$ ) to denote the normalized Laplacians on the signed graph  $G_{up}(S_d)$  (resp., anti-signed graph  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ ). Then,

the eigenvalues of these operators have the relation:

Spectrum of $\Delta_d^{up}$	Spectrum of $\Delta(G_{up}(S_d))$	Spectrum of $\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d))$
0	$\frac{d}{d+1}$	$\frac{d+2}{d+1}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\lambda$	$\frac{\lambda+d}{d+1}$	$\frac{d+2-\lambda}{d+1}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$d+2$	2	0

that is,  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $\Delta_d^{up}$  if and only if  $\frac{\lambda+d}{d+1}$  is an eigenvalue of  $\Delta(G_{up}(S_d))$  if and only if  $\frac{d+2-\lambda}{d+1}$  is an eigenvalue of  $\Delta(G_{up}^-(S_d))$ . In addition, the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 0 of  $\Delta_d^{up}$  is larger than or equal to  $d+1$ , while the multiplicity of the eigenvalue  $d+2$  of  $\Delta_d^{up}$  agrees with the number of balanced components of  $G_{up}^-(S_d)$ .

By Theorem 2.4, there exists an extreme point  $\mathbf{x}$  which is also an eigenvector associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,1}^{up})$ . Indeed, based on the concepts and results in Section 2.4, one can check that the extreme points of the function pair  $(\|B_{d+1}^\top \cdot\|_1, \|\cdot\|_{1,\text{deg}})$  belong to  $\text{cone}\{-N, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, N\}^{\#S_d}$  for some positive integer  $N$  (if  $d=0$ , one can take  $N=1$ ). This means that  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,1}^{up})$  can be expressed as a combinatorial optimization, or equivalently, an integer programming with constraint on  $\{-N, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, N\}^n$ , and thus we would like to call

$$h(S_d) := \min_{\mathbf{x} \perp \text{Image}(B_d^\top)} \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{1,\text{deg}}} = \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,1}^{up})$$

the Cheeger constant on  $S_d$ , where  $\mathbf{x} \perp \mathbf{y}$  indicates that  $\mathbf{x}$  is  $\|\cdot\|_{1,\text{deg}}$ -orthogonal to  $\mathbf{y}$  (see Section 2.4 for the definition).

We have a combinatorial explanation of the Cheeger constant  $h(S_d)$  using the language of multi-sets in combinatorics. A multiset can be formally defined as a pair  $(S, m)$ , where  $S$  is the underlying set of the multiset, formed from its distinct elements, and  $m: S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is an integer-valued function, giving the *multiplicity*. For convenience, we usually write  $S$  instead of  $(S, m)$ , and we use  $|S| := \sum_{s \in S} |m(s)|$  to indicate the *size* of the multiset  $S$ .

Now we concentrate on the underlying set  $S_d$ . We use  $S \subset_N S_d$  to indicate that  $S$  is a multiset on the underlying set  $S_d$  with multiplicities in  $\{-N, \dots, 0, \dots, N\}$ . For such an  $S$ , let its coboundary  $\partial_{d+1}^* S$  be the multiset on the underlying set  $S_{d+1}$  such that each  $\sigma \in S_{d+1}$  has the multiplicity  $\sum_{\tau \in S_d} m(\tau) \text{sgn}([\tau], \partial[\sigma])$ , where  $m(\tau)$  is the multiplicity of  $\tau$  in  $S$ . Denote by  $\text{vol}(S) = \sum_{\tau \in S_d} \text{deg}_\tau |m(\tau)|$  the volume of the multiset  $S$ .

It should be noted that  $\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R}) \neq 0$  if and only if  $h(S_d) = 0$ . More precisely, according to Theorems 2.1 and 2.4, as well as the results in Section 2.4, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that

$$h(S_d) = \min_{\substack{S \subset_N S_d \\ S \neq \partial_d^*(T), \forall T \subset_N S_{d-1}}} \frac{|\partial_{d+1}^* S|}{\min_{S': \partial_{d+1}^* S' = \partial_{d+1}^* S} \text{vol}(S')} \quad (68)$$

$$\frac{\text{if } \tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R})=0}{\min_{\substack{S \subset_N S_d \\ \partial_{d+1}^* S \neq \emptyset}} \frac{|\partial_{d+1}^* S|}{\min_{S': \partial_{d+1}^* S' = \partial_{d+1}^* S} \text{vol}(S')}} > 0,$$

In order to further understand the formula (68), below we show an equivalent reformulation of (68) using the language of norms on cochain groups.

The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{1, \text{deg}}$  on  $C^d(K)$  induces a quotient norm on  $C^d(K)/\text{image}(\delta_{d-1})$ , which will be denoted by  $\|\cdot\|$  for simplicity. More precisely, for any equivalence class  $[\mathbf{x}] \in C^d(K)/\text{image}(\delta_{d-1})$ , let  $\|[\mathbf{x}]\| = \inf_{\mathbf{x}' \in [\mathbf{x}]} \|\mathbf{x}'\|_{1, \text{deg}}$ . Then

$$h(S_d) = \min_{0 \neq [\mathbf{x}] \in C^d(K)/\text{image}(\delta_{d-1})} \frac{\|\delta_d \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\|[\mathbf{x}]\|} = \min_{0 \neq [\mathbf{x}] \in C^d(K, \mathbb{Z})/\text{image}(\delta_{d-1})} \frac{\|\delta_d \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\|[\mathbf{x}]\|}$$

and it is interesting that in the case of  $\tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ ,

$$h(S_d) = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{image}(\delta_d)} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\text{fil}}} = \frac{1}{\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{image}(\delta_d)} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\text{fil}} / \|\mathbf{y}\|_1} = \frac{1}{\|\delta_d^{-1}\|_{\text{fil}}}$$

where  $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\text{fil}} := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \delta_d^{-1}(\mathbf{y})} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{1, \text{deg}}$  is the filling norm of  $\mathbf{y}$ , and  $\|\delta_d^{-1}\|_{\text{fil}}$  is called the filling profile by Gromov (see Section 2.3 in [41]).

**Remark 22.** *Steenbergen, Klivans and Mukherjee [83] introduced the following Cheeger constant*

$$h^d(K) := \min_{\varphi \in C^d(K, \mathbb{Z}_2) \setminus \text{Im } \delta} \frac{\|\delta \varphi\|}{\min_{\psi \in \text{Im } \delta} \|\varphi + \psi\|}$$

which satisfies

$$h^d(K) = 0 \iff \tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{Z}_2) \neq 0, \quad \forall d \geq 0,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Hamming norm on  $C^d(K, \mathbb{Z}_2)$  (i.e.  $l^1$ -norm on  $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$  with  $n = \#S_d$ ). According to the examples and theorems in [31, 42, 43, 76, 83], all the Cheeger constants defined using cohomology (or homology) with  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients cannot derive a general two-side Cheeger inequality like the graph setting. It is worth noting that our Cheeger constant can be reformulated as

$$h(S_d) = \min_{\varphi \in C^d(K, \mathbb{Z}) \setminus \text{Im } \delta} \frac{\|\delta \varphi\|_1}{\min_{\psi \in \text{Im } \delta} \|\varphi + \psi\|_{1, \text{deg}}}$$

where we use  $\mathbb{Z}$ -coefficients instead of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients, and we use the (weighted)  $l^1$ -norm instead of the Hamming norm. It is clear that

$$h(S_d) = 0 \iff \tilde{H}^d(K, \mathbb{R}) \neq 0, \quad \forall d \geq 0.$$

For the case of  $d = 0$ , we can take  $N = 1$ , and then  $h(S_0)$  reduces to the usual Cheeger constant on graphs. The following preliminary result indicates that such a constant  $h(S_d)$  is probably a good candidate for Cheeger-type inequalities.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Suppose that  $\deg_\tau > 0, \forall \tau \in S_d$ . Then,*

$$\frac{h^2(S_d)}{\#S_{d+1}} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq \text{vol}(S_d)h(S_d)$$

and for any  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{h^p(S_d)}{|\#S_{d+1}|^{p-1}} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_{d,p}^{up}) \leq \text{vol}(S_d)^{p-1}h(S_d).$$

*Proof.* For simplicity, we denote  $h = h(S_d)$  and take  $\lambda = \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up})$ . We shall prove  $\frac{\min_{\tau \in S_d} \deg_\tau}{\#S_{d+1}} h^2 \leq \lambda \leq \text{vol}(S_d)h^2$ .

Let  $k = \text{rank}(B_d)$ . Then  $\lambda$  and  $h$  are the  $(k+1)$ -th min-max eigenvalues of the  $d$ -th up Laplacian and the  $d$ -th up 1-Laplacian, respectively. We only need to prove that, for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{\tau \in S_d} \deg_\tau} \lambda_k} \leq h_k \leq \sqrt{\frac{\#S_{d+1}}{\min_{\tau \in S_d} \deg_\tau} \lambda_k}.$$

In fact, it is easy to see that

$$\min_{\tau} \deg_\tau \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{1,\text{deg}}^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\text{deg}}^2} \leq \sum_{\tau \in S_d} \deg_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_1^2}{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_2^2} \leq \#S_{d+1}.$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{\tau \in S_d} \deg_\tau} \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\text{deg}}^2} \leq \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{1,\text{deg}}^2} \leq \frac{\#S_{d+1}}{\min_{\tau} \deg_\tau} \frac{\|B_{d+1}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\text{deg}}^2}.$$

The proof of  $\frac{h^2(S_d)}{\#S_{d+1}} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq \text{vol}(S_d)h(S_d)$  is then completed by noting that  $h \leq 1 \leq \deg_\tau, \forall \tau \in S_d$ . The case of  $\Delta_{d,p}^{up}$  is similar.  $\square$

**Remark 23.** *We can also define the down Cheeger constant*

$$h_{\text{down}}(S_d) := \min_{x \perp \text{Image}(B_{d+1})} \frac{\|B_d \mathbf{x}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{1,\text{deg}}} = \lambda_{I_{d+1}}(\Delta_{d,1}^{\text{down}})$$

which possesses a combinatorial reformulation that is similar to (68).

Consider a  $d$ -dimensional combinatorial manifold  $K$ , that is, a  $d$ -dimensional topological manifold possessing a simplicial complex structure. As a manifold, we assume that  $K$  is connected and has no boundary. Then, the down adjacency relation induces a graph on  $S_d$ , and we have the Cheeger inequality:

$$\frac{h_{\text{down}}^2(S_d)}{2} \leq \lambda_2(\Delta_d^{\text{down}}) \leq 2h_{\text{down}}(S_d).$$

**Definition 4.5.** *Let  $M$  be a  $d$ -dimensional orientable compact closed Riemannian manifold. A triangulation  $T$  of  $M$  is  $C$ -uniform if there exists  $C > 1$  such that for any two  $d$ -simplexes  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$  in the triangulation  $T$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{C} < \frac{\text{diam}(\Delta)}{\text{diam}(\Delta')} < C \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{C} < \frac{\text{diam}(\Delta)}{\text{vol}(\Delta)^{\frac{1}{d}}} < C.$$

A triangulation  $T$  of  $M$  is uniform if there exist  $N > 1$  and  $C > 1$  such that either the number of vertices of  $T$  is smaller than  $N$ , or  $T$  is  $C$ -uniform. The constants  $N$  and  $C$  are called the uniform parameters of the triangulation.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $M$  be an orientable, compact, closed Riemannian manifold of dimension  $(d+1)$ . Let  $K$  be a simplicial complex which is combinatorially equivalent to a uniform triangulation of  $M$ . Then, there is a Cheeger inequality*

$$\frac{h^2(S_d)}{C} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq C \cdot h(S_d),$$

where  $C$  is a uniform constant which is independent of the choice of  $K$ . In addition,  $h(S_d) > 0$  if and only if  $H_1(K) = 0$  (or equivalently,  $H_1(M) = 0$ ).

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.9,  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) = 0$  if and only if  $h(S_d) = 0$ . So, it suffices to assume that  $h(S_d) > 0$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{H}^d(M) = \tilde{H}^d(K) = 0$ . Since  $M$  and  $K$  are of dimension  $(d+1)$ , Poincaré duality implies that  $\tilde{H}_1(M) = \tilde{H}^d(M) = 0$ .

We may assume without loss of generality that  $M$  is simply connected, and the triangulation is  $C$ -uniform for some  $C > 1$ , and  $S_d(K)$  has  $n$  elements, where  $n$  is a sufficiently large integer.

For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $N > 0$  such that any  $C$ -uniform triangulation with at least  $N$  facets satisfies  $\frac{1}{3C^2}\epsilon < \text{diam}(\Delta) < \epsilon$ ,  $\forall \Delta$ . Here, we also regard the uniform triangulation as a uniform  $\epsilon$ -net.

Claim 1 For the down Cheeger constant, we have

$$\frac{d+2}{4} h_{down}^2(S_{d+1}) \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq (d+2) h_{down}(S_{d+1}).$$

Proof: This is derived by the Cheeger inequality

$$\frac{h_{down}^2(S_{d+1})}{2} \leq \lambda_2(\Delta_{d+1}^{down}) \leq 2h_{down}(S_{d+1})$$

proposed in Remark 23, and the duality property  $\lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) = \frac{d+2}{2} \lambda_2(\Delta_{d+1}^{down})$ .

Claim 2 The Cheeger constant  $h(S_d)$  and the down Cheeger constant  $h_{down}(S_{d+1})$  satisfy  $h(S_d) \sim h_{down}(S_{d+1})$ , i.e., there exists a uniform constant  $C > 1$  such that  $\frac{1}{C} h_{down}(S_{d+1}) \leq h(S_d) \leq C h_{down}(S_{d+1})$ .

The proof is divided into the following two claims.

Claim 2.1  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} h_{down}(S_{d+1}) \sim h(M)$

Proof: Let  $G$  be the graph with  $n := \#S_{d+1}$  vertices located in the barycenters of all  $(d+1)$ -simplexes, such that two vertices form an edge in  $G$  if and only if these two  $d$ -simplexes are down adjacent. We may call  $G$  the underlying graph of the triangulation.

Note that  $h_{down}(S_{d+1})$  also indicates the Cheeger constant of the unweighted underlying graph  $G$ . An approximation approach developed in [84, 89] implies that the Cheeger constant of a uniform triangulation



should approximate the Cheeger constant of the manifold when we equip the edges of the underlying graph of the triangulation with appropriate weights (related to  $\epsilon$ ). In fact, since  $G$  is a underlying graph of the triangulation, we may assume that  $G$  is embedded in the manifold  $M$ , and the distribution of the vertices of  $G$  is uniform<sup>10</sup>. Then, according to the approximation theorems in [84, 89], by adding appropriate weights (related to  $\epsilon$ )<sup>11</sup> on  $G$ , the Cheeger constant of  $G$  (with appropriate edge weights) would approximate  $h(M)$  (i.e., the difference of  $h(M)$  and the Cheeger constant of the weighted graph  $G$  is bounded by  $h(M)/2$  whenever  $\epsilon$  is sufficiently small). We can then adopt the same approximation approach in [84, 89] (i.e., a slight modification of the approximation theorem in [84, 85, 89]) to derive that  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}h_{down}(S_{d+1}) \sim h(M)$ .

Claim 2.2  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}h(S_d) \sim h(M)$  whenever  $H_1(M) = 0$ .

Proof: It is well-known that  $H_1(M) = 0$  if and only if  $H^d(M) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{Ker}(\delta_d) = \text{Im}(\delta_{d-1})$ , since  $M$  is a compact closed manifold of dimension  $(d + 1)$ . Thus,

$$h(S_d) = \min_{x \notin \text{Ker}(\delta_d)} \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in S_{d+1}} \left| \sum_{\tau \in S_d} \text{sgn}(\tau, \partial\sigma) x_\tau \right|}{\min_{z \in \text{Ker}(\delta_d)} \sum_{\tau \in S_d} 2|x_\tau + z_\tau|}.$$

By the duality theorem (see Lemma 2.5 and Proposition 2.8), we further have

$$h(S_d) = \frac{\max_{\sigma \stackrel{\text{down}}{\sim} \sigma'} \frac{1}{2}|y_\sigma - y_{\sigma'}|}{\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{\sigma \in S_{d+1}} |y_\sigma + t|}$$

and by Theorem 2.4, there is no difficulty to check that the optimization in the right hand side coincides with

$$\min_{\sigma} \frac{\max_{\sigma \stackrel{\text{down}}{\sim} \sigma'} |y_\sigma - y_{\sigma'}|}{2 \max_{\sigma} |y_\sigma|} = \frac{1}{\text{diam}(G)}$$

where  $\text{diam}(G)$  indicates the combinatorial diameter of  $G$ . We remark here that we indeed rewrite  $h(S_d)$  as the smallest nontrivial eigenvalue of the  $\infty$ -Laplacian, which agrees with  $1/\text{diam}(G)$ . This argument is similar to a theorem in [51].

Finally, since the triangulation is  $C$ -uniform, it is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon}h(S_d) = \frac{1}{\epsilon \cdot \text{diam}(G)} \sim \frac{1}{\text{diam}(M)}.$$

Hence,  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}h(S_d) \sim h(M)$ .

<sup>10</sup>The vertices of  $G$  are well-distributed on  $M$ .

<sup>11</sup>The weight of an edge  $\{u, v\}$  is determined by the distance of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $M$ , which is about  $O(\epsilon)$ .

The proof is then completed by combining all the statements above.  $\square$

**Remark 24.** • *The constant  $C$  in Theorem 4.6 depends on the uniform parameters of the triangulation, and the ambient manifold. We hope that it is possible to find a new approach to get a uniform constant only depends on the dimension  $d$ .*

- *Under the same condition of Theorem 4.6, we further have  $\frac{\lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_{d,1}^{up})^2}{C} \leq \lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq C\lambda_{k_d}(\Delta_{d,1}^{up})$ . This inequality coincides with the Cheeger inequality in Theorem 4.6 if and only if  $H_1(M) = 0$ .*
- *A modification of the proof can deduce that  $\frac{1}{\text{diam}(G)} \sim \lambda_2(G)$  whenever  $G$  can be uniformly embedded into such a typical manifold, where  $\lambda_2(G)$  is the second smallest eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian on  $G$ . To some extent, this can be regarded as a higher dimensional analog of the main result in [61].*
- *Inspired by the approximation theory for Laplacians on triangulations of manifolds proposed by Dodziuk [26] and Dodziuk-Patodi [27], we hope that it is possible to develop an approximation theory for our Cheeger constants on triangulations of manifolds.*

Motivated by the above results and discussions, we then present the following open problem for Cheeger inequalities on simplicial complexes.

**Conjecture:** There exists  $C_d > 0$  which only depends on  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$\frac{h^2(S_d)}{C_d} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{up}) \leq C_d h(S_d), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{h_{down}^2(S_d)}{C_d} \leq \lambda_{I_d}(\Delta_d^{down}) \leq C_d h_{down}(S_d).$$

## 4.6 Other applications on extension and duality

We show new equalities based on the theory of duality in Section 2.5, and by employing these equalities, we immediately get the dual optimization of the inner problem in the Dinkelbach-type scheme [55], and the dual formulation of the  $l^p$ -polarization (Chebyshev) constant [4]. In addition, applying the dual principle to Lovász extension, we obtain new equivalent continuous representations of the Cheeger constant, maxcut, dual Cheeger quantity on a graph.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be a positive-definite and one-homogeneous convex function, and let  $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a linear transformation. For any convex body  $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  that contains  $\mathbf{0}$  as its inner point, and for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have*

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) = - \min_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} h_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) = \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} h_{\mathbb{B}}(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}),$$

where  $h_{\mathbb{B}}$  is the support function of  $\mathbb{B}$ , and  $F^*$  is the dual function of  $F$ .

*Proof.* We only need to prove the following equivalent statement:

Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be positive-definite and one-homogeneous convex functions. For any matrix of order  $m \times n$ , and for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have

$$\min_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) = - \min_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} G^*(\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y})$$

and

$$\max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) = \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}).$$

The proof is direct. In fact, by the definition of duality, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) &= \min_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \left( \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} T\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u} \right) = \min_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \mathbf{x} \cdot (T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}) \\ &= \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \min_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \mathbf{x} \cdot (T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}) = \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} (- \max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \mathbf{x} \cdot (\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y})) \\ &= \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} -G^*(\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y}) = - \min_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} G^*(\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} (F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}) &= \max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \left( \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} T\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u} \right) = \max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \mathbf{x} \cdot (T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}) \\ &= \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} \max_{G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1} \mathbf{x} \cdot (T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}) = \max_{F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Example 4.3.** In the Dinkelbach-type scheme, we work on a convex optimization

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}} \{F_1(\mathbf{x}) + r^k G_2(\mathbf{x}) - (\langle \mathbf{u}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle + r^k \langle \mathbf{v}^k, \mathbf{x} \rangle) + H_{\mathbf{x}^k}(\mathbf{x})\},$$

and by Proposition 4.10, the equivalent dual problem of this optimization is

$$\mathbf{y}^{k+1} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \Omega_k} \|\mathbf{u}^k + r^k \mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2, \quad \mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \frac{\mathbf{u}^k + r^k \mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{y}^{k+1}}{\|\mathbf{u}^k + r^k \mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{y}^{k+1}\|_2}$$

where we take  $\mathbb{B}$  as the  $l^2$ -ball, and  $\Omega_k$  is the dual convex body of  $\{\mathbf{x} : F_1(\mathbf{x}) + r^k G_2(\mathbf{x}) + H_{\mathbf{x}^k}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$ .

**Remark 25.** Another equivalent formulation of Proposition 4.10 can be written as

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}}{G(\mathbf{x})} = \max_{\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u})}{F^*(\mathbf{y})}, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \quad (69)$$

and

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}}{G(\mathbf{x})} = - \min_{\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{G^*(\mathbf{u} - T^\top \mathbf{y})}{F^*(\mathbf{y})} \quad \text{whenever } \mathbf{u} \notin \text{int}(T^\top \nabla F(\mathbf{0})).$$

Also, (69) can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}_G} F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u} &= \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ext}(\mathbb{B}_G)} F(T\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u} \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{B}_{F^*}} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}) = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{Ext}(\mathbb{B}_{F^*})} G^*(T^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}), \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Ext}(\mathbb{B}_G)$  and  $\text{Ext}(\mathbb{B}_{F^*})$  are extreme sets of the convex bodies  $\mathbb{B}_G := \{\mathbf{x} : G(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$  and  $\mathbb{B}_{F^*} := \{\mathbf{y} : F^*(\mathbf{y}) \leq 1\}$ , respectively. This allows us to prove many results in a short and elegant way.

**Example 4.4.** We may simply call the vertex  $p$ -Laplacian on an oriented hypergraph the hypergraph  $p$ -Laplacian, and we call the (hyper-)edge  $p$ -Laplacian on an oriented hypergraph the dual hypergraph  $p$ -Laplacian. By Proposition 2.8, we only need to concentrate on the hypergraph  $p$ -Laplacian for  $p \in [1, 2]$ .

**Example 4.5.** Given  $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $p \geq 1$  with  $p^*$  as its Hölder conjugate, we have

$$\max_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_p \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^m |\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}| = \max_{\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_{p^*}.$$

For  $p = 2$ , the above equality reveals a dual form of the  $l^1$ -Chebyshev constant (Proposition 3 in [4]). We can similar obtain a dual form of the  $l^p$ -polarization (Chebyshev) constant via the inequality

$$\max_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^m |\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}|^p = \max_{\sum_{i=1}^m |\varepsilon_i|^{p^*} = 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2^p.$$

**Example 4.6.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a simple graph without bipartite component, then the dual Cheeger constant of  $G$  possesses the new continuous representation:

$$h_1^+(G) = 1 - \min_{x \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{i \sim j} |x_i + x_j|}{\deg_i |x_i|} = 1 - \min_{\mathbf{y}: \exists i \text{ s.t. } \sum_{e \ni i} y_e \neq 0} \frac{\max_{i \in V} \frac{1}{\deg_i} |\sum_{e \ni i} y_e|}{\min_{\mathbf{z}: \sum_{e \ni i} z_e = 0, \forall i} \|\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}\|_\infty}.$$

**Example 4.7.** Given a simple graph  $G$ , for any edge  $e = \{i, j\}$ , we let  $\epsilon_{ie} \in \{-1, 1\}$  be such that  $\epsilon_{ie} = -\epsilon_{je}$ , which indeed assigns an orientation on  $G$ . Then, the maxcut of  $G$  has the following equivalent continuous formulation:

$$\max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{i \sim j} |x_i - x_j|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} = \max_{y \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{i \in V} |\sum_{e \ni i} \epsilon_{ie} y_e|}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty}.$$

**Example 4.8.** For a simple and connected graph  $G$ , its Cheeger constant equals

$$\min_{x \neq \text{const}} \frac{\sum_{i \sim j} |x_i - x_j|}{\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i \in V} \deg_i |x_i + t|} = \min_{\mathbf{y}: \exists i \text{ s.t. } \sum_{e \ni i} \epsilon_{ie} y_e \neq 0} \frac{\max_{i \in V} \frac{1}{\deg_i} |\sum_{e \ni i} \epsilon_{ie} y_e|}{\min_{\mathbf{z}: \sum_{e \ni i} \epsilon_{ie} z_e = 0, \forall i} \|\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}\|_\infty}.$$

## References

- [1] S. Amghibech. Eigenvalues of the discrete  $p$ -Laplacian for graphs. *Ars Comb.*, 67, 2003.
- [2] Fatihcan M. Atay and Shiping Liu, Cheeger constants, structural balance, and spectral clustering analysis for signed graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* 343 (2020), 111616.
- [3] N. Anari, S. Oveis Gharan, C. Vinzant, Log-Concave Polynomials I: Entropy and a Deterministic Approximation Algorithm for Counting Bases of Matroids, *FOCS* 2018.
- [4] G. Ambrus and S. Nietert, Polarization, sign sequences and isotropic vector systems, *Pacific J. Math.* 303 (2019), no. 2, 385–399.
- [5] Andrea Braides, *Gamma-convergence for Beginners*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

- [6] Petter Brändén, June Huh, Lorentzian polynomials, *Annals of Mathematics* 192 (2020), 821–891.
- [7] S. Burer, On the copositive representation of binary and continuous nonconvex quadratic programs, *Math. Program.*, 120(2):479–495, 2009
- [8] Martin Burger, Guy Gilboa, Michael Moeller, Lina Eckardt, and Daniel Cremers, Spectral Decompositions Using One-Homogeneous Functionals, *SIAM J. Imaging Sciences*, **9** (2014), 1374–1408.
- [9] Martin Burger, Lina Eckardt, Guy Gilboa, and Michael Moeller, Spectral Representations of One-Homogeneous Functionals, *SSVM 2015, LNCS 9087*, 16–27.
- [10] A. Billionnet, S. Elloumi, and A. Lambert, Extending the qcr method to general mixed-integer programs, *Math. Program.*, 131(1-2):381–401, 2012.
- [11] Elizandro Max Borba and Uwe Schwerdtfeger, Eigenvalue bounds for the signless  $p$ -Laplacian, *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 25 (2018), #P2.2
- [12] T. Bühler and M. Hein, Spectral clustering based on the graph  $p$ -Laplacian, In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Machine Learning (2009)*, 81–88.
- [13] Gustave Choquet. Theory of capacities. *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, 5:131–295, 1954.
- [14] Jeff Cheeger, A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian, In *Problems in analysis (Papers dedicated to Salomon Bochner, 1969)*, 195–199. 1970.
- [15] F. Chung, *Spectral graph theory*, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [16] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*, Wiley New York, 1983.
- [17] K. C. Chang, Spectrum of the 1-Laplacian and Cheeger’s constant on graphs, *J. Graph Theor.*, **81** (2016), 167–207.
- [18] K. C. Chang, S. Shao, and D. Zhang, The 1-Laplacian Cheeger cut: Theory and algorithms, *J. Comput. Math.*, **33** (2015), 443–467.
- [19] K. C. Chang, S. Shao, and D. Zhang, Spectrum of the signless 1-Laplacian and the dual Cheeger constant on graphs, *arXiv:1607.00489*.
- [20] K. C. Chang, S. Shao, and D. Zhang, Nodal domains of eigenvectors for 1-Laplacian on graphs, *Adv. Math.*, **308** (2017), 529–574.
- [21] K.C. Chang, S. Shao, D. Zhang, W. Zhang, Nonsmooth critical point theory and applications to the spectral graph theory, *Science China Mathematics* 64 (2021), 1–32.
- [22] K. C. Chang, S. Shao, D. Zhang and W. Zhang, Lovász extension and graph cut, *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* 19 (2021), 761–786.
- [23] K. C. Chang, K. Pearson, T. Zhang, Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative tensors, *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 6 (2008), 507–520.
- [24] K. C. Chang, K. Pearson, T. Zhang, On eigenvalue problems of real symmetric tensors, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 350 (2009), 416–422.
- [25] D. Cvetkovic, *Graphs and their spectra (Thesis)*, Univ. Beograd, Publ. Elektrotehn. Fak. Ser. Mat. Fiz., No. 354-No. 356(1971), 1–50.
- [26] Jozef Dodziuk, Finite-difference approach to the Hodge theory of harmonic forms, *American Journal of Mathematics*, 98 (1976), 79–104.
- [27] J. Dodziuk and V.K. Patodi, Riemannian structures and triangulations of manifolds, *J. of the Indian Math. Soc.*, 40 (1976), 1–52.
- [28] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel, Valuated matroids, *Advances in Mathematics*, 93 (1992), 214–250.
- [29] Robert Deville, Vladimir Fonf, Petr Hajek, Analytic and polyhedral approximation of convex bodies in separable polyhedral Banach spaces, *Israel J. Math.*, 105 (1998), 139–154.

- [30] Marco Degiovanni and Marco Marzocchi, Limit of minimax values under  $\Gamma$ -convergence, *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 2014, No. 266, 1–19.
- [31] D. Dotterrer and M. Kahle, Coboundary expanders, *Journal of Topology and Analysis* 4 (2012), 499–514.
- [32] V. P. Fonf, Polyhedral Banach spaces. (Russian) *Mat. Zametki*, 30 (1981), 627–634.
- [33] V. P. Fonf, Three characterizations of polyhedral Banach spaces. (Russian) *Ukrain. Mat. Zh.*, 42 (1990), 1286–1290.
- [34] Satoru Fujishige, Submodular functions and optimization. Second edition. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 58. Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2005.
- [35] Sergey Fomin, Michael Shapiro, Dylan Thurston, Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part I: Cluster complexes, *Acta Math.* 201 (2008), 83–146.
- [36] Guy Gilboa, A Total Variation Spectral Framework for Scale and Texture Analysis, *SIAM J. Imaging Sciences*, 7 (2012), 1937–1961.
- [37] Guy Gilboa, Michael Moeller, Martin Burger, Nonlinear Spectral Analysis via One-Homogeneous Functionals: Overview and Future Prospects, *J Math Imaging Vis*, 56 (2016), 300–319.
- [38] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer, New York (2001)
- [39] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson, Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming, *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 42:1115–1145, 1995.
- [40] Antoine Gautier, Francesco Tudisco and Matthias Hein, A Unifying Perron–Frobenius Theorem for Nonnegative Tensors via Multihomogeneous Maps, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 40 (2019), 1206–1231.
- [41] M. Gromov, Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. Part 2: from combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry, *Geom Funct Anal* 20 (2010) 416–526.
- [42] A. Gundert and M. Szedlak, Higher dimensional discrete cheeger inequalities, *Journal of Computational Geometry* 6 (2015), 54–71.
- [43] A. Gundert and U. Wagner, On eigenvalues of random complexes, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 216 (2016), 545–582.
- [44] F. Harary, On the notion of balance of a signed graph, *Michigan Math. J.* 2 (1955), no. 2, 143–146
- [45] M. Hein and T. Bühler, An inverse power method for nonlinear eigenproblems with applications in 1-spectral clustering and sparse PCA, In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 23* (2010), 847–855.
- [46] Matthias Hein, Simon Setzer, Leonardo Jost and Syama Sundar Rangapuram, The Total Variation on Hypergraphs - Learning on Hypergraphs Revisited, *NIPS 2013*.
- [47] M. Hein and S. Setzer, Beyond Spectral Clustering - Tight Relaxations of Balanced Graph Cuts, In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24* (NeurIPS 2011), 2366–2374, 2011.
- [48] Hao Huang, Induced subgraphs of hypercubes and a proof of the Sensitivity Conjecture, *Annals of Mathematics*, 190 (2019), 949–955.
- [49] F. Harary, On the measurement of structural balance, *Behav. Sci.* 4, 316–323 (1959).
- [50] Danijela Horak and Jürgen Jost, Spectra of combinatorial Laplace operators on simplicial complexes, *Advances in Mathematics*, 244 (2013), 303–336.
- [51] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist, and J. J. Manfredi, The  $\infty$ -eigenvalue problem, *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 148(2): 89–105, 1999.
- [52] J. Jost, R. Mulas, Hypergraph Laplace operators for chemical reaction networks, *Advances in mathematics*, 351 (2019), 870–896.

- [53] J. Jost, R. Mulas and D. Zhang,  $p$ -Laplace Operators for Chemical Hypergraphs, arXiv:2007.00325.
- [54] Jürgen Jost and Dong Zhang, Discrete-to-Continuous Extensions, I: Lovász extension and Morse theory, arXiv:2003.06021v3
- [55] Jürgen Jost and Dong Zhang, Discrete-to-Continuous Extensions: Lovász extension, optimizations and eigenvalue problems, arXiv:2106.03189.
- [56] Steven G. Krantz, *Convex Analysis*, Textbooks in Mathematics, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2014
- [57] L. Lovász. Submodular functions and convexity. In A.Bachem, M.Grotschel, and B.Korte, editors, *Mathematical Programming: the State of the Art*, pages 235-257. Springer, 1983.
- [58] L. Lovász, Discrete and continuous: two sides of the same? *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, Special Volume (2000), 359–382.
- [59] J. R. Lee, S. Oveis Gharan, L. Trevisan, Multi-way spectral partitioning and higher-order Cheeger inequalities STOC'12 - Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, New York (2012), 1117–1130.
- [60] Shiping Liu, Multi-way dual Cheeger constants and spectral bounds of graphs, *Advances in Mathematics* 268 (2015), 306–338.
- [61] L. Louder and J. Souto, Diameter and spectral gap for planar, arXiv:1204.4435
- [62] L.H. Lim, Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors, a variational approach, Proc. 1st IEEE International workshop on computational advances of multi-tensor adaptive processing, Dec., 13–15, 129–132, 2005.
- [63] E. Lawler and D. Wood, Branch-and-bound methods: A survey. *Oper. Res.*, 14(4):699–719, 1966.
- [64] Lusternik, Lazar; Schnirelmann, Lev (1930), Méthodes topologiques dans les problèmes variationnels
- [65] Anand Louis, Hypergraph Markov operators, eigenvalues and approximation algorithms. In Proceedings of the 47th Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC), pages 713–722, 2015.
- [66] P. Li and O. Milenkovic, Submodular Hypergraphs:  $p$ -Laplacians, Cheeger Inequalities and Spectral Clustering, arXiv:1803.03833, ICML 2018.
- [67] Carsten Lange, Shiping Liu, Norbert Peyerimhoff and Olaf Post, Frustration index and Cheeger inequalities for discrete and continuous magnetic Laplacians, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 54 (2015), 4165–4196.
- [68] L. Miclo, On eigenfunctions of Markov processes on trees, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 142 (2008), 561–594.
- [69] R. Mulas, A Cheeger Cut for Uniform Hypergraphs, *Graphs and Combinatorics*, To appear, DOI: 10.1007/s00373-021-02348-z (2021)
- [70] Kazuo Murota, Discrete convex analysis. *Math. Program.* 83, 313–371 (1998)
- [71] Kazuo Murota, *Discrete Convex Analysis*, SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications, vol. 10. (2003).
- [72] Juan Enrique Martínez-Legaz, Cornel Pinteá, Closed convex sets with an open or closed Gauss range, *Mathematical Programming* (2020)
- [73] John von Neumann, Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele, *Math. Annalen*, 100 (1928), 295–320.
- [74] Andre Neves, New applications of Min-max Theory, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Seoul 2014.

- [75] Kanishka Perera, Ravi P. Agarwal, and Donal O'Regan, *Morse Theoretic Aspects of  $p$ -Laplacian Type Operators*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 161, American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [76] O. Parzanchevski, R. Rosenthal, and R. J. Tessler, Isoperimetric inequalities in simplicial complexes, *Combinatorica*, 36 (2015), 195–227.
- [77] L. Qi, Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor, *J. Symbolic Computation*, 40, 1302–1324, 2005.
- [78] L. Qi, H. Chen and Y. Chen, *Tensor eigenvalues and their applications*, Springer, 2018
- [79] B. Sturmfels, Tensors and their eigenvalues, *Notices AMS* 63(6), 2016.
- [80] Maurice Sion, On general minimax theorems, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 8 (1958), 171–176.
- [81] H. D. Sherali and W. P. Adams, A hierarchy of relaxations between the continuous and convex hull representations for zero-one programming problems, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 3(3):411–430, 1990.
- [82] Ashwin Sah, Diagonal Ramsey via effective quasirandomness, arXiv:2005.09251.
- [83] John Steenbergen, Caroline Klivans, and Sayan Mukherjee, A Cheeger-type inequality on simplicial complexes, *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 56 (2014), 56–77.
- [84] Nicolás García Trillos and Dejan Slepcev, Continuum Limit of Total Variation on Point Clouds, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 220 (2016) 193–241.
- [85] Nicolás García Trillos and Dejan Slepcev, On the Rate of Convergence of Empirical Measures in  $\infty$ -transportation Distance, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 67 (2015), 1358–1383.
- [86] L. Trevisan, Max cut and the smallest eigenvalue, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41 (2012), 1769–1786.
- [87] Francesco Tudisco and Matthias Hein, A nodal domain theorem and a higher-order Cheeger inequality for the graph  $p$ -Laplacian, *Journal of Spectral Theory* (2018), 883–908.
- [88] Nicolás García Trillos, Moritz Gerlach, Matthias Hein and Dejan Slepcev, Error Estimates for Spectral Convergence of the Graph Laplacian on Random Geometric Graphs Toward the Laplace–Beltrami Operator, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20 (2020), 827–887.
- [89] Nicolás García Trillos, Ryan Murray, Matthew Thorpe, From graph cuts to isoperimetric inequalities: Convergence rates of Cheeger cuts on data clouds, arXiv:2004.09304
- [90] Shing Tung Yau, editor. *Seminar on Differential Geometry*, volume 102 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982.
- [91] Y. Yoshida, Cheeger Inequalities for Submodular Transformations, *Proceedings of the 2019 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2019.
- [92] T. Zaslavsky, Signed graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 4 (1982), 47–74.
- [93] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications, III: Variational methods and optimization*, Springer, 2nd ed., 2013
- [94] D. Zhang, Topological multiplicity of the maximum eigenvalue of graph 1-Laplacian, *Discrete Math.* 341 (2018), 25–32.