

Laplacian eigenvalues of equivalent cographs

J. Lazzarin, O.F. Márquez and F. C. Tura

Departamento de Matemática, UFSM, Santa Maria, RS, 97105-900, Brazil

lazzarin@smail.ufsm.br, oscar.f.marquez-sosa@ufsm.br, fernando.tura@ufsm.br

Abstract

Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H , and suppose the vertices of R_G and R_H are labeled by the twin numbers t_i of the k twin classes they represent. In this paper, we prove that G and H have at least $k + \sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1)$ Laplacian eigenvalues in common, where I is the indices of the twin classes whose types are identical in G and H . This confirms the conjecture proposed by T. Abrishami [1]. We also show that no two nonisomorphic equivalent cographs are L -cospectral.

keywords: Laplacian eigenvalues, twins numbers, cograph, L -cospectral graphs

AMS subject classification: 15A18, 05C50, 05C85.

1 Introduction

A cograph is a simple graph which contains no path on four vertices as induced subgraph, namely it is P_4 -free graph. An equivalent definition (see [8]) is that cographs can be obtained recursively by the following rules: (i) a graph on a single vertex is a cograph, (ii) a finite union and join of two cographs are cographs. This allow us to represent this class of graphs through an unique rooted tree T_G , called the cotree. For more details, see Section 2.

An important subclass of cographs are the threshold graphs. Threshold graphs also can be defined in terms of forbidden subgraphs, namely they are $\{P_4, 2K_2, C_4\}$ -free graphs. For an account on different characterizations and properties of threshold graphs, one can see [13] and the references therein.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, we say two vertices v and w are *twins* if $N(v) - w = N(w) - v$, where $N(v)$ denotes the neighborhood of v . A twin partition of a graph G is the partition of the vertices into their equivalence classes under the relation of being twins, denoted by $V(G) = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots \cup T_k$. The *twins numbers* t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k of a graph G are the size of twins classes.

Let G be a cograph with twin classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k . The *twin reduction* of graph G , denoted R_G , is the subgraph induced by $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$, where $u_i \in T_i$ is a representative of

class T_i . The Figure 1 shows a cograph G and its twin reduction R_G . The twins classes T_1, T_2, T_3 , and T_4 , where T_1 is the green vertices, T_2 is the gray vertices, T_3 is the white vertex and T_4 is the red vertices. We say two cographs G and H are equivalent, if their reduction R_G and R_H are isomorphic and if the twin numbers of the vertices $V(R_G)$ and $V(R_H)$ are identical.



Figure 1: A cograph and its reduction representation

Our motivation for considering cographs comes from spectral graph theory. There is a considerable body of knowledge on the spectral properties of cographs and threshold graphs related to adjacency matrix [2–7, 9–12, 15–17]. However, the literature does not seem to provide many articles about the Laplacian matrices of cographs. One of those sporadic works and very well known is the paper of Russel Merris [14] which shows that the nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues of threshold graphs are equal to Ferrer’s conjugate of its degree sequence.

A recent and interesting work about the Laplacian eigenvalues of cographs is the Master’s thesis presented by Tara Abrishami [1]. In this work, a characterization of cograph Laplacian eigenvalues is given. In particular, it was proposed the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H , and suppose the vertices of R_G and R_H are labeled by the twin numbers t_i of the k twin classes they represent. Then G and H have at least $k + \sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1)$ Laplacian eigenvalues in common, where I is the indices of the twin classes whose types are identical in G and H .*

In this paper, we prove that conjecture holds. As an immediate result, we show that no two equivalent cographs G and H are L -cospectral graphs. The main tool used to prove the conjecture, and some known results are reviewed in Section 2. In Section 3, we characterize equivalent cographs in terms of their cotrees. In Section 4, we confirm that

conjecture holds. In the final section, we show how to find the L -cospectral linear size families of cographs, from a pair of two nonisomorphic L -cospectral cographs.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with vertex set V and edge set E , without loops or multiple edges. For $v \in V$, $N(v)$ denotes the *open neighborhood* of v , that is, $\{w | \{v, w\} \in E\}$. The *closed neighborhood* $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. If $|V| = n$, the Laplacian matrix $L(G)$ of a graph G is given by $L(G) = \delta(G) - A(G)$, where $\delta(G)$ is the degree matrix of G and $A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix of G . A value $\mu(G)$ is a Laplacian eigenvalue of G if $\det(L(G) - \mu I_n) = 0$, and since $L(G)$ is real symmetric and positive defined, the Laplacian eigenvalues of G are real numbers non-negative.

2.1 Cotrees

A cotree T_G of a cograph G is a rooted tree in which any interior vertex w is either of \cup type (corresponds to union) or \otimes type (corresponds to join). The terminal vertices (leaves) are typeless and represent the vertices of the cograph G . We say that *depth* of the cotree is the number of edges of the longest path from the root to a leaf. To build a cotree for a connected cograph, we simply place a \otimes at the tree's root, placing \cup on interior vertices with odd depth, and placing \otimes on interior vertices with even depth. All interior vertices have at least two children. In [7] this structure is called *minimal cotree*, but throughout this paper we call it simply a cotree. The Figure 2 shows a cograph and its cotree with depth equals to 4.




Figure 2: A cograph $G = (((v_1 \cup v_2) \otimes v_3) \cup v_4) \otimes (((v_5 \otimes v_6) \otimes v_7) \cup v_8)) \otimes v_9$. and its cotree.

Two vertices u and v are *duplicate* if $N(u) = N(v)$ and *coduplicate* if $N[u] = N[v]$. In fact, any collection of mutually coduplicate (resp. duplicate) vertices, e.g. with the same neighbors and adjacent (resp. not adjacent), have a common parent of type \otimes (resp. \cup).

Remark: We note that vertices in a twin class T_i of G correspond to coduplicate (resp. duplicate) vertices in T_G , if they are pairwise adjacent (resp. nonadjacent) twins.

2.2 Diagonalization

For comparing the Laplacian eigenvalues of two cographs G and H , we use a straightforward translation of an algorithm due to Jacobs et al. [10] to the context of Laplacian matrices of cographs. The original algorithm constructs a *diagonal* matrix congruent to $A + xI_n$, where A is the adjacency matrix of a cograph, and x is an arbitrary scalar, using $O(n)$ time and space.

One of the advantages of this method is that it can be slightly modified in such a way that we can determine, for any $-x \in \mathbb{R}$, the number of Laplacian eigenvalues of a cograph G that are larger than x , equal to x and smaller than x , respectively. The algorithm's input is the cotree T_G and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Each leaf $v_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ have a value d_i that represents the diagonal element of $L(G) + xI_n$. It initializes all entries d_i with $\delta(v_i) + x$, where $\delta(v_i)$ denotes the degree of vertex v_i . Each iteration, a pair $\{v_k, v_l\}$ of the duplicate or coduplicate vertices with maximum depth is selected. Then they are processed, that is, assignments are given to d_k and d_l , such that either one or both rows (columns) are diagonalized. When a k row(column) corresponding to vertex v_k has been diagonalized then v_k is removed from the T_G , it means that d_k has a permanent final value. Then the algorithm moves to the cotree $T_G - v_k$. The algorithm is shown in Figure 3.

It is worth to mention that for each iteration, the algorithm executes one of the six subcases. It should be noted that **subcase 1a** and **subcase 2a** are the normal cases, and the other four subcases represent singularities. Executing **subcase 1b** requires $\beta = -1$, executing **subcase 2b** requires $\beta = 0$, executing **subcase 1c** requires $\alpha + \beta = -2$, and executing **subcase 2c** requires $\alpha + \beta = 0$.

Now, we will present a few results which the proofs are similar to work [10]. The following theorem is based on Sylvester's Law of Inertia.

Theorem 1 *Let G be a cograph and let $(d_v)_{v \in T_G}$ be the sequence produced by Diagonalize $(T_G, -x)$. Then the diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_v)_{v \in T_G}$ is congruent to $L(G) + xI_n$, so*

INPUT: cotree T_G , scalar x

OUTPUT: diagonal matrix $D = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n]$ congruent to $L(G) + xI_n$

Algorithm Diagonal (T_G, x)

initialize $d_i := \delta(v_i) + x$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$

while T_G has ≥ 2 leaves

select a pair (v_k, v_l) (co)duplicate of maximum depth with parent w

$\alpha \leftarrow d_k$ $\beta \leftarrow d_l$

if $w = \otimes$

if $\alpha + \beta \neq -2$ //subcase 1a

$d_l \leftarrow \frac{\alpha\beta-1}{\alpha+\beta+2}$; $d_k \leftarrow \alpha + \beta + 2$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$

else if $\beta = -1$ //subcase 1b

$d_l \leftarrow -1$ $d_k \leftarrow 0$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$

else //subcase 1c

$d_l \leftarrow -1$ $d_k \leftarrow (1 + \beta)^2$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$; $T_G = T_G - v_l$

else if $w = \cup$

if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$ //subcase 2a

$d_l \leftarrow \frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$; $d_k \leftarrow \alpha + \beta$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$

else if $\beta = 0$ //subcase 2b

$d_l \leftarrow 0$; $d_k \leftarrow 0$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$

else //subcase 2c

$d_l \leftarrow \beta$; $v_k \leftarrow -\beta$; $T_G = T_G - v_k$; $T_G = T_G - v_l$

end loop

Figure 3: Diagonalization algorithm

that the number of (positive - negative - zero) entries in $(d_v)_{v \in T_G}$ is equal to the number eigenvalues of $L(G)$ that are (greater than x - small than x - equal to x).

The following two lemmas show that if a vertex \otimes or \cup , in the cotree, have leaves with the same value, then, we can use the following routines.

Lemma 1 If v_1, \dots, v_m have parent $w = \otimes$, each with the same diagonal value $y \neq -1$, then the algorithm performs $m - 1$ iterations of **subcase 1a** assigning, during iteration j :

$$d_k \leftarrow \frac{j+1}{j}(y+1) \quad d_l \leftarrow \frac{y-(j-1)}{j+1} \quad (1)$$

Lemma 2 If v_1, \dots, v_m have parent $w = \cup$, each with the same diagonal value $y \neq 0$, then the algorithm performs $m - 1$ iterations of **subcase 2a** assigning, during iteration j :

$$d_k \leftarrow \frac{j+1}{j}y \quad d_l \leftarrow \frac{y}{j+1} \quad (2)$$

3 Equivalent Cographs and their cotrees

In this section, we characterize equivalent cographs in terms of their cotrees. Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H . If $R_G \cong R_H$ and fixed T_G , we will show how to get T_H from T_G .

Let G be a cograph and T_G its cotree. Let u, v be leaves in the cotree T_G which have the lowest common ancestor an interior vertex, represented by $\text{lca}(u, v)$. Clearly, they are adjacent if and only if $\text{lca}(u, v) = \otimes$. The following result can be verified immediatly.

Lemma 3 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their cotrees T_G and T_H . Let u, v be leaves in T_G which are neither coduplicate nor duplicate vertices, and let u', v' be their corresponding leaves in T_H . Then $\text{lca}(u, v)$ and $\text{lca}(u', v')$ are the same type.*

Definition 1 *Let G be a cograph and T_G its cotree. For any pair $u, v \in T_G$, we define the distance between u and v in T_G , denoted by $\text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v)$, as the shortest path of interior vertices between them.*

Definition 2 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H . Let u be a representative of the twin class $T_u \in G$, and let u' be its corresponding in $T_{u'} \in H$. We say $u = u'$, if T_u and $T_{u'}$ are twin classes of same type. Otherwise, we say $u \neq u'$.*

Lemma 4 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their cotrees T_G and T_H . Let u, v be the representatives of the twin classes $T_u, T_v \in G$, and let u', v' be their respective correspondents in $T_{u'}, T_{v'} \in H$.*

- (i) *If $u = u'$ and $v = v'$ then $\text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v) = \text{dist}_{T_H}(u', v')$.*
- (ii) *If $u = u'$ and $v \neq v'$ then $\text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v) = \text{dist}_{T_H}(u', v') \pm 1$.*
- (iii) *If $u \neq u'$ and $v \neq v'$ then $\text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v) = \text{dist}_{T_H}(u', v') \pm 2$.*

Proof: We prove the item (i). We assume that $\text{lca}(u, v) = \text{lca}(u', v') = \otimes$. By contradiction, we suppose that $\text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v) < \text{dist}_{T_H}(u', v')$. Since that $u = u'$ and $v = v'$, we have that

$$\text{dist}_{T_H}(u', v') = \text{dist}_{T_G}(u, v) + 2l \tag{3}$$

for some positive integer $l \geq 1$.




Figure 4: The partial cotrees T_G and T_H .

Without loss of generality, we assume that u and u' are in twin classes of type \otimes , while that v and v' are in twin classes of type \cup , and their partial cotrees T_G and T_H are represented in the Figure 4.

Now consider the respective reduction graphs R_G and R_H of cographs G and H . From equation (3) follows that there are vertices $t', w' \in R_H$ such that $w' \sim v'$ and $t' \approx v'$. Since R_G and R_H are isomorphic graphs, there are vertices $t, w \in R_G$ with the same properties.

We claim the leaf $t, w \in T_G$ are in the same branch that leaf v . Since $t \sim u$ and for any leaf in a different branch that v implies being adjacent to v , follows the statement. Now, if w is in a different branch that v it implies that $w \sim t$, what contradics $w \approx t$. If the leaf t is below to v and $w \sim v$, it implies $w \sim t$, a contradiction. Now, if the leaf t is above to v , and since $w \sim v, w \approx t$, it implies that w is between t and v , and therefore we must have $l = 0$, in the equation (3). If $lca(u, v) = lca(u', v') = \cup$, the proof is analogous.

The proof is similar for the items (ii) and (iii). \square

Given a cograph G , we note that its reduction R_G is obtained by taking only one representative of each twin classes of G . In terms of cotree, it means, if we remove all exceed leaves of T_G , we have a cotree which represents T_{R_G} . If R_G and R_H are isomorphic graphs by Lemma 4 we have $|dist_{T_G}(u, v) - dist_{T_H}(u', v')| \leq 2$, for any leaves $u, v \in T_G$ and their corresponding $u', v' \in T_H$. This allows us to claim that T_H can be obtained from T_G , as the following result:

Theorem 2 *Let G and H be cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H . If T_G and T_H are the cotrees of G and H , then $R_G \cong R_H$ if and only if fixed T_G and for some interior vertex $w_i \in T_G$, having leaves $t_i \geq 2$, then T_H is obtained from T_G by one of following operations:*

- (i) adding an interior vertex, one level below to w_i , and taking their leaves t_i .
- (ii) removing the interior vertex w_i which has no interior vertex as successor, whose father has no leaves and taking their leaves t_i .

Proof: Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reductions R_G and R_H . If T_G and T_H are the cotrees of G and H , respectively, according to Lemma 4, for each pair of leaves u and v in T_G which are neither coduplicate nor duplicate vertices and their corresponding u' and v' in T_H , we have

$$|dist_{T_G}(u, v) - dist_{T_H}(u', v')| \leq 2 \quad (4)$$

If the distance is preserved and since the $lca(u, v)$ and $lca(u', v')$ are the same type in both cotrees then T_G and T_H are the same. If the distance increased or decreased by one, and taking into account that the $lca(u, v) = w_i$ and $lca(u', v') = w'_i$ are the same type, we have two possibilities: was creating a new interior vertex below to w_i and taking their leaves t_i of w_i , or was removing the vertex w_i , which has no interior vertex as successor, whose father has no leaves and taking their leaves t_i . Finally, if the distance increase or decrease by two, then either of operations (i) or (ii) occurs twice.

Now, let T_G and T_H be the cotrees of equivalent cographs G and H , respectively. We just need to check that reductions R_G and R_H are isomorphic. Let T_G and T_H be the cotrees of G and H . We assume that T_H is obtained from T_G under the operations (i) and (ii). First, we note that the number of twin classes are preserved, since that the only operation allowed is to become a coduplicate vertices into duplicate vertices or vice versa. Second, from the operations (i) and (ii) the $lca(u, v)$ in T_G and its corresponding $lca(u', v')$ in T_H are the same type, which implies that the adjacencies of R_G and R_H are preserved. Therefore, thus R_G and R_H are isomorphic. \square

4 The proof of conjecture

The next lemmas will be used to prove the main results of this section:

Lemma 5 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs. Let u be a representative of twin class T_u of G with twin number t_u , and let u' be its corresponding in a twin class $T_{u'}$ of H . If $\delta(u)$ denotes the degree of vertex u then*

$$\delta(u') = \begin{cases} \delta(u) & \text{if } u' = u \\ \delta(u) + (t_u - 1) & \text{if } u \neq u' \text{ and } T_u \text{ is a clique set.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: Let u and u' be the representatives of twin classes T_u of G and $T_{u'}$ of H , respectively. If $u = u'$ then obvious we have that $\delta(u') = \delta(u)$. Now, we assume that $u \neq u'$, and T_u is a clique set. Taking into account that vertex u' will be disconnected only of the $t_u - 1$ vertices of same class $T_{u'}$, follows that $\delta(u') = \delta(u) + (t_u - 1)$, as desired. \square

Lemma 6 *Let G be a cograph with twin classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k , and twin numbers t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k . Let u_i be a representative of twin class T_i . If $\delta(u_i)$ denotes the degree of u_i , then*

$$\mu(G) = \begin{cases} \delta(u_i) & \text{if } T_{u_i} \text{ is a coclique set} \\ \delta(u_i) + 1 & \text{if } T_{u_i} \text{ is a clique set} \end{cases}$$

is a Laplacian eigenvalue of G with multiplicity at least $t_i - 1$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Proof: Let G be a cograph and let u_i be a representative of twin class T_{u_i} with twin number t_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Now, we consider Diagonalization of (T_G, x) , with $x = -\delta(u_i)$, if T_{u_i} is a coclique set and $x = -\delta(u_i) - 1$, if T_{u_i} is a clique set, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Since that coduplicate (respect. duplicate) vertices of T_G correspond to clique (respect. coclique) set in G , then after initialization ($d_i = \delta(u_i) + x$), we have the following values for the leaves of T_G

$$\begin{cases} -1 & \text{for coduplicate vertices} \\ 0 & \text{for duplicate vertices.} \end{cases}$$

From this, it is easy to see that for coduplicate vertices the **subcase 1b** occurs, while that for the duplicate vertices the **subcase 2b** occurs. In both cases, the algorithm assigns a zero as a permanent value. Since each twin class T_i have t_i vertices, follows for each iteration we have at least $t_i - 1$ zeros, as desired. \square

Theorem 3 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H , and suppose the vertices of R_G and R_H are labeled by the twin numbers t_i of the k twin classes they represent. Then G and H have at least $k + \sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1)$ Laplacian eigenvalues in common, where I is the indices of the twin classes whose types are identical in G and H .*

Proof: Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H , and suppose the vertices of R_G and R_H are labeled by the twin numbers t_i of the k twin classes they represent. Let I be the indices of the twin classes whose types are identical in G and H with cardinality $0 \leq |I| < k$.

In order for proving the conjecture, we note that a cograph G of order $n = \sum t_i$, each Laplacian eigenvalue $\mu(G)$ of G belongs one of following subsets

$$\sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{|I|} t_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-|I|} t_i \right) \quad (5)$$

We first will show that G and H have $\sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1)$ Laplacian eigenvalues in common. Let T_G and T_H be the cotrees of G and H , respectively. They have $\sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1) \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|I|} t_i)$ leaves in common. Since $R_G \cong R_H$, and u_i, u'_i are the respective representatives of twin classes which are identical in G and H having the same degree $\delta(u_i) = \delta(u'_i)$, hence by Lemma 6, we have at least

$$\sum_{i \in I} (t_i - 1) \tag{6}$$

Laplacian eigenvalues in common.

Now, let $\mu(G)$ be a Laplacian eigenvalue of G which $\mu(G) \in (\bigcup_{i=1}^{|I|} t_i) \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-|I|} t_i)$. We will show that $\mu(G)$ is also one of the k Laplacian eigenvalues of H . For this, we apply the Diagonalization algorithm simultaneously in both cotrees T_G and T_H with $x = -\mu(G)$. It is sufficient to show when the algorithm assigns a zero in $\text{Diag}(T_G, x)$, we also must have a zero in $\text{Diag}(T_H, x)$.

Let α_i and α'_i be the assignments given in the i -th iteration during execution of $\text{Diag}(T_G, x)$ and $\text{Diag}(T_H, x)$, respectively. Obviously, we have $\alpha_i = \alpha'_i$, if T_G and T_H are identical. It remains to be seen when T_G and T_H have different types of cotrees but R_G and R_H are isomorphic.

Suppose that T_G has an interior vertex w_i having $t_i \geq 2$ coduplicate vertices and a pendant vertex with assignment α_i , while that T_H has an interior vertex w'_i having no leaves but the same pendant vertex with same assignment α_i and an interior vertex as successor having $t_i \geq 2$ duplicate vertices, as the Figure 6 has shown.



Figure 5: The partial cotrees T_G and T_H .

Let v_i and v'_i be the respective representatives of twin classes which are not identical in G and H . Obviously, by Lemma 6, we can assume that $\mu(G)$ differs of $\delta(v_i) + 1$ and $\delta(v'_i)$. Applying the algorithm in the coduplicate vertices of T_G , since all t_i leaves have the same value $y = \delta(v_i) + x$, by Lemma 1, after $t_i - 1$ iterations, we have a pendant vertex

with value

$$d_l = \frac{y - (t_i - 1)}{t_i + 1} = \frac{\delta(v_i) - \mu(G) - (t_i - 1)}{t_i + 1} \quad (7)$$

Now, we apply the algorithm in the duplicate vertices of T_H , since all t_i leaves have the same value $y' = \delta(v'_i) + x$, by Lemma 2, after $t_i - 1$ iterations, we have a pendant vertex with value

$$d'_l = \frac{y'}{t_i + 1} = \frac{\delta(v'_i) - \mu(G)}{t_i + 1} \quad (8)$$

We claim that $d_l = d'_l$. From equations (7) and (8), follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta(v_i) - \mu(G) - (t_i - 1)}{t_i + 1} = \frac{\delta(v'_i) - \mu(G)}{t_i + 1} &\Leftrightarrow \delta(v_i) - \mu(G) - (t_i - 1) = \delta(v'_i) - \mu(G) \\ \delta(v'_i) &= \delta(v_i) + (t_i - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which accords with the Lemma 5. This shows that the algorithm will assign the same value to both T_G and T_H . Since $-x = \mu(G)$ is a Laplacian eigenvalue of G and a zero should be assigned during execution of $\text{Diag}(T_G, x)$ then either situations can occurs: a zero was assigned in the previous step to d_l , which correponds a leaf that belongs to $(\bigcup_{i=1}^{|I|} t_i)$, or a zero is assigned exactly after to process the values α_i and d_l . Thus, a zero must be assigned during execution of $\text{Diag}(T_H, x)$.

The proof is similar if the $\text{lca}(v_i, v'_i)$ is of \cup type. Therefore, thus follows the result as desired. \square

Corollary 1 *Let G and H be equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H having $k \geq 2$ vertices. If G and H are L -cospectral graphs then $G \cong H$.*

Proof: Let G and H equivalent cographs with their reduction R_G and R_H . We proceed by induction on the number $k \geq 2$ of vertices of R_G and R_H . The base case, $k = 2$ is trivial to verify.

We assume that the result holds for any two equivalent cographs G and H with their reduction R_G and R_H having $k - 1$ vertices. Now let G' and H' be equivalent cographs L -cospectral with their reduction $R_{G'}$ and $R_{H'}$ having k vertices.

We note that there is a vertex $u \in R_{G'}$ and its respective corresponding $v \in R_{H'}$ such that $\delta(u) = \delta(v)$, and T_u and T_v are twin classes of same type. Otherwise, we have two distinct Laplacian eigenvalues, according to Lemma 6. Then, the cographs $G' - T_u \cong G$ and $H' - T_v \cong H$ are L -cospectral graphs. By the induction hypothesis we have $G \cong H$ and therefore follows that $G' \cong H'$. \square

5 L -cospectral cographs

Two nonisomorphic graphs with the same L -spectrum are called L -cospectral. In this last section, we show how to find the L -cospectral linear size families of cographs, from a pair of two nonisomorphic L -cospectral cographs.

The next lemma is very well known and it will be used for our construction:

Lemma 7 *Let G and H be a graphs on n_1 and n_2 vertices, respectively. If $0 = \mu_1(G) \leq \mu_2(G) \leq \dots \leq \mu_{n_1}(G)$ and $0 = \mu_1(H) \leq \mu_2(H) \leq \dots \leq \mu_{n_2}(H)$ are the Laplacian eigenvalue of G and H , respectively. Then the Laplacian eigenvalues of $G \otimes H$ are*

$$0, n_2 + \mu_2(G), n_2 + \mu_3(G), \dots, n_2 + \mu_{n_1}(G),$$

$$n_1 + \mu_2(H), n_1 + \mu_3(H), \dots, n_1 + \mu_{n_2}(H), n_1 + n_2.$$

For each integer $n \geq 3$, we define the following cographs of order $2n + 1$

- $G_{2n+1} = nK_1 \otimes (K_n \cup K_1)$;
- $H_{2n+1} = (((n-1)K_1 \otimes K_1) \cup K_1) \otimes (K_{n-1} \cup K_1)$.

The Figure 6 shows the reduction representation of G_9 and H_9 .




Figure 6: The reduction representation of G_9 and H_9

Lemma 8 *The cographs G_{2n+1} and H_{2n+1} of order $2n+1$ defined above are nonisomorphic and L -cospectral graphs.*

Proof: It is obvious that G_{2n+1} and H_{2n+1} are nonisomorphic graphs. Since the L -eigenvalues of $K_n \cup K_1$ are n and 0 with multiplicity $n - 1$ and 2 , by Lemma 7, we have that the L -spectrum of G_{2n+1} is

$$0 + (n + 1), 0 + (n + 1), \dots, 0 + (n + 1), 0 + n, 0 + n, \dots, n + n, (n + 1) + n.$$

Therefore, the L -spectrum of G_{2n+1} is $2n + 1, 2n, n + 1, n, 0$ with their respective multiplicities $1, n - 1, n - 1, 1, 1$. By similar calculus, we have H_{2n+1} have the same L -spectrum. \square

Theorem 4 *Let G' be a cograph of order n . Then $G' \otimes G_{2n+1}$ and $G' \otimes H_{2n+1}$ are nonisomorphic and L -cospectral graphs.*

Proof: Let G' be a cograph of order n . Let G_{2n+1} be a cograph of order $2n + 1$. If $0 = \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n$ are the L -eigenvalues of G' , by Lemma 7 the L -eigenvalues of $G' \otimes G_{2n+1}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_1 + (2n + 1), \mu_2 + (2n + 1), \dots, \mu_n + (2n + 1), \\ &n + n, n + (n + 1), \dots, n + (2n), n + (2n + 1), n + (2n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since G_{2n+1} and H_{2n+1} are L -cospectral graphs, then the L -eigenvalues of $G' \otimes H_{2n+1}$ are obtained by same procedure above. Therefore, thus $G' \otimes G_{2n+1}$ and $G' \otimes H_{2n+1}$ are nonisomorphic and L -cospectral graphs. \square

References

- [1] T. Abrishami, *A combinatorial analysis of the eigenvalues of the laplacian matrices of cographs*, Johns Hopkins University, Master's thesis (2019), <http://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/61684/ABRISHAMI-THESIS-2019.p>
- [2] E. Allem, F. Tura, *Multiplicity of eigenvalue of cographs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **247** (2018) 43–52.
- [3] E. Allem, F. Tura, *Integral cographs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **283** (2020) 153–167.
- [4] M. Andelić, Z. Du, C. M. da Fonseca, S. K. Simić, *Tridiagonal matrices and spectral properties of some graph classes*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **70** (2020) 1125–1138.

- [5] C.O. Aguilar, M. Ficarra, N. Schurman, B. Sullivan, *The role of the anti-regular graph in the spectral analysis of threshold graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl., **588** (2020) 210–223.
- [6] R. B. Bapat, *On the adjacency matrix of a threshold graph*, Linear Algebra Appl. **439** (2013) 3008–3015.
- [7] T. Bıykođlu, S. K. Simić, Z. Stanić, *Some notes on spectra of cographs*, Ars Combinatoria **100** (2011) 421–434.
- [8] D.G. Corneil, H. Lerchs and L. Stewart Bhirmingham; *Complement reducible graphs*, Discrete. Appl. Math. **3** (1981) 163–174.
- [9] E. Ghorbani, *Eigenvalue-free interval for threshold graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **583** (2019) 300–305.
- [10] D. P. Jacobs, V. Trevisan, F. Tura, *Eigenvalue location in cographs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **245** (2018) 220–235.
- [11] J. Lazzarin, O.F. Márquez, F. C. Tura, *No threshold graphs are cospectral*, Linear Algebra Appl. **560** (2019) 133–145.
- [12] Z. Lou, J. Wang, Q. Huang, *On the eigenvalues distribution in threshold graphs*, Graphs and Combinatorics **35** (2019) 867–880.
- [13] N. V. R. Mahadev, U. N. Peled, *Threshold graphs and related topics*, Elsevier, 1995.
- [14] R. Merris, *Degree maximal graphs are Laplacian integral*, Linear Algebra Appl. **199** (1994) 381–389.
- [15] A. Mohammadian, V. Trevisan, *Some spectral properties of cographs*, Discrete Math. **339** (2016) 1261–1264.
- [16] G. F. Royle; *The rank of cographs*, Electron. J. Comb. **10** N_0 1. Research paper N 11:7 p.,(2003).
- [17] F. C. Tura, *A conjecture on the eigenvalues of threshold graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **612** (2021) 345–356.