

## ON SOME GENERAL OPERATORS OF HYPERGRAPHS

ANIRBAN BANERJEE AND SAMIRON PARUI

ABSTRACT. We introduce some general hypergraph connectivity operators which can incorporate most of the seemingly disparate but related notions of hypergraph connectivity matrices. Since most of the conventional conceptions of connectivity matrices related to hypergraphs turn out to be particular examples of them, our newly presented operators are generalized. In fact, incorporating the scope of manipulation of inner products on the set of all the function on the vertices and hyperedges enable us to study a large number of connectivity operators (including some conventional ones and many new ones) in a unified framework. The eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenspaces of the general connectivity operators associated with some classes of hypergraphs are computed. Our study reveals that some eigenvalues and their eigenspaces of the connectivity operators of some classes of hypergraphs can be determined simply by looking at the structures of the hypergraphs. To emphasise the importance of this study, some possible applications such as random walks on hypergraphs, dynamical networks, and disease transmission on hypergraphs are investigated in the light of newly introduced operators. We also derive some spectral bounds for the weak connectivity number, degree of vertices, maximum cut, bipartition width, and isoperimetric constant of hypergraphs.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Graph* is a well studied and widely used notion in the realm of mathematics. *Hypergraph*, a generalization of a graph, is also explored extensively. A hypergraph  $G$  is an order pair of sets  $(V, E)$ , where  $V(\neq \emptyset)$  is the set of vertices, and any element  $e \in E$ , called a hyperedge of  $G$ , is a nonempty subset of  $V$ . Thus a graph is a special case of hypergraph where  $|e| = 2$  for all  $e \in E$ . A singleton hyperedge is said to be a loop. In our work we consider hypergraphs without any loop, that is,  $|e| \geq 2, \forall e \in E$ . In this work, we are going to introduce some general notions of connectivity operators associated with hypergraphs. These notions are so exhaustive that can incorporate multiple conventional notions of connectivity matrices of hypergraphs. We provide constructions to determine eigenvectors and their eigenspaces of general connectivity operators associated with a class of hypergraphs. Since our approach pivot around some real-valued functions on the vertex set, using our methods, just looking at the structure of the hypergraphs one can determine the eigenvectors and eigenspace of the above-mentioned operators.

The last decade witnessed a revolution in hypergraph theory when different tensors or hypermatrices associated with hypergraphs are studied extensively in [3, 20, 21, 25] and references therein. Despite promising progress, some aspects of spectral graph theory cannot be generalised to spectral hypergraph theory using tensors. The high computational complexity of the tensors associated with hypergraphs is another challenge in studying many spectral aspects of hypergraphs. Most tensor-related problems are NP-hard, as shown in [14]. The alternative method for studying a hypergraph is to examine the underlying graph with appropriate weights. Different properties of a hypergraph are studied in terms of the spectra of different connectivity matrices associated with the underlying weighted graph of the hypergraph, see [2, 7, 22, 23]. Since many significant properties of a hypergraph are encrypted in the spectra of these matrices, they are generally referred to as the connectivity matrices of the hypergraph.

In this article, we introduce some linear operators associated with a hypergraph which are generalization of some conventional notion of apparently different connectivity matrices associated with that hypergraph. Here, we attempt to unify some apparently different but similar concepts of connectivity matrices. Moreover, keeping in mind some applications of their special cases, we can predict some possible real-world applications of our introduced operators. Now we summarise the content of this article in brief. Section 2 is devoted to introducing the general diffusion operator. In Section 2.1 we define some preliminary notions that we are going to use throughout the article. The general diffusion operator, one pivotal notion of this article, is introduced in Section 2.2. Some stimulating examples are included in this section. The spectra of the diffusion operator are

---

(Banerjee) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH KOLKATA, MOHANPUR-741246, INDIA

(Parui) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH KOLKATA, MOHANPUR-741246, INDIA

*E-mail addresses:* anirban.banerjee@iiserkol.ac.in, samironparui@gmail.com.

*Date:* March 2, 2022.

*Subject.* Primary 05C65, 05C50, ; Secondary 37C99, 39A12, 34D06, 92B25 .

*Key words and phrases.* Hypergraph, Graph, Adjacency matrix, Laplacian matrix, Eigenvalue and Eigenvector of Matrices related to hypergraph, Diffusion on hypergraphs, Matrices related to hypergraph.

studied in Section 3. We provide eigenvalues of diffusion operator of hypergraph having some special property in Corollary 3.7, Theorem 3.8, Theorem 3.11. We use one of the most natural approaches to analyze the eigenvalues of an operator. We exploit the eigenvectors of the operators in the above-mentioned theorems. We provide some results in Section 3 which facilitate us to find the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of some classes of diffusion operators of some types of hypergraphs simply from the structure of the hypergraphs. We calculate the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenspaces of diffusion operators of a class of hypergraphs in Section 3.1. We provide the complete spectra and corresponding eigenspaces of hyperflower hypergraph in Section 3.1. We show that the Laplacian operator is a constant multiple of the diffusion operator. Therefore, one can easily estimate the spectra of the Laplacian operator of hypergraphs from the same of the diffusion operators given in this section. In Section 4, we investigate the spectral bounds of several hypergraph properties in terms of the spectra of the diffusion operator. We also derive spectral bounds for weak connectivity number, degree of vertices, maximum cut, bipartition width, isoperimetric constant of hypergraphs. In Section 5, we introduce the general adjacency operator. Section 6 is devoted to the normalized Laplacian. Some potential applications of our study are presented in Section 7.

## 2. GENERAL DIFFUSION OPERATORS OF A HYPERGRAPH

Let  $\mathbb{R}^V$  be the set of all real-valued functions on the vertex set  $V$  and  $\mathbb{R}^E$  denote the set of all real-valued functions on the set of all the hyperedges  $E$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is defined by  $\mathbf{1}(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$ . Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be a collection of linear operators on  $\mathbb{R}^V$  such that for all  $M \in \mathfrak{M}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = c\mathbf{1}$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and where  $s : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is a solution of the differential equation  $\dot{x}(t) = M(x(t))$ . Diffusion processes end up with equality of concentration after the movement of substances from higher concentration to lower concentration. Therefore,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = c\mathbf{1}$  can be interpreted as a diffusion under the action of the operator  $M$  and we refer any  $M \in \mathfrak{M}$  as a diffusion operator. This section is devoted to finding a diffusion operator associated with a hypergraph. Now we recall some preliminaries related to hypergraphs.

The corank,  $cr(G)$  and rank,  $rk(G)$  of a hypergraph,  $G = (V, E)$ , is defined by  $cr(G) = \min_{e \in E} |e|$ , and  $rk(G) = \max_{e \in E} |e|$ . A hypergraph  $G$  is called  $m$ -uniform hypergraph if  $cr(G) = rk(G) = m$ . Suppose that  $v_0, v_l \in V$ . A path  $v_0 - v_l$  of length  $l$  connecting the vertices  $v_0$  and  $v_l$  in a hypergraph  $G = (V, E)$  is an alternating sequence  $v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 v_2 \dots v_{l-1} e_l v_l$  of distinct vertices  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{l-1}, v_l$  and distinct hyperedges  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_l$ , such that,  $v_{i-1}, v_i \in e_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . The distance,  $d(u, v)$ , between two vertices  $u, v \in V$  is the minimum among the length of all paths connecting the vertices  $u$  and  $v$ . The diameter,  $diam(G)$  of a hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  is defined by  $diam(G) = \max_{u, v \in V} d(u, v)$ . An weighted hypergraph  $G = (V, E, w)$  is a hypergraph with a function  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , called the weight of the hyperedges. For an weighted hypergraph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , the degree of a vertex  $v \in V$  is defined by,  $d(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} w(e)$ , where  $E_v$  is the collection of all the hyperedges containing the vertex  $v$ . In [7],  $E_v$  is referred as the star centered in  $v$ . If the hypergraph is unweighted then  $w(e) = 1$  for all  $e \in E$  and then  $d(v) = |E_v|$ .

**2.1. The average operator and general signless Laplacian operator.** We consider  $V$  and  $E$  are two finite sets. Let  $\delta_V : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\delta_E : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be two positive real-valued functions on the vertices and hyperedges, respectively. We define inner products on  $\mathbb{R}^V$  and  $\mathbb{R}^E$ .

**Definition 2.1.** (1) (Inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^V$ ) Given  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , let

$$(x, y)_V := \sum_{v \in V} \delta_V(v) x(v) y(v).$$

(2) (Inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^E$ ) Given  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^E$ , let

$$(\beta, \gamma)_E := \sum_{e \in E} \delta_E(e) \beta(e) \gamma(e).$$

Now we define a function from  $\mathbb{R}^V$  to  $\mathbb{R}^E$ , which will produce the average of any given real-valued function on  $V$  on a given hyperedge  $e$ .

**Definition 2.2** (Average operator). Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,  $e \in E$ , the function  $avg : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^E$  is defined by

$$(avg(x))(e) := \frac{\sum_{v \in e} x(v)}{|e|}.$$

where  $|e|$  is the cardinality of  $e$ .

Now we introduce the adjoint of  $avg$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Adjoint of the average operator). Given  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^E$ ,  $v \in V$  the function  $\text{avg}^* : \mathbb{R}^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is defined by

$$(\text{avg}^*(\beta))(v) := \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\beta(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)}.$$

Now we show that  $\text{avg}^* : \mathbb{R}^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is the unique choice for being the adjoint of the average operator.

**Proposition 2.4.** For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and any  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^E$ ,  $(\text{avg}(x), \beta)_E = (x, \text{avg}^*(\beta))_V$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{avg}(x), \beta)_E &= \sum_{e \in E} \delta_E(e) (\text{avg}(x))(e) \beta(e) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \delta_E(e) \beta(e) \frac{\sum_{v \in e} x(v)}{|e|} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \delta_V(v) x(v) \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\beta(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)} \\ &= (x, \text{avg}^*(\beta))_V. \end{aligned}$$

■

Clearly, For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $v \in V$  the expression of the function,  $\text{avg}^* \circ \text{avg} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is

$$(\text{avg}^* \circ \text{avg})(x)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{(\text{avg}(x))(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)}.$$

From now onward, we denote the operator  $\text{avg}^* \circ \text{avg}$  by  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Therefore, the operator  $\mathcal{Q} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}(x)(v) = (\text{avg}^* \circ \text{avg})(x)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{(\text{avg}(x))(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)}, \quad (2.1)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $v \in V$ .

**Remark 2.5.** Now we have the following observations on  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

- (1) Evidently,  $(x, \mathcal{Q}x)_V = (x, (\text{avg}^* \circ \text{avg})x)_V = ((\text{avg}(x), \text{avg}(x))_E) \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a positive semidefinite operator. Moreover,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is self-adjoint since  $(x, \mathcal{Q}y)_V = ((\text{avg}(x), \text{avg}(y))_E) = ((\text{avg}(y), \text{avg}(x))_E) = (y, \mathcal{Q}x)_V = (\mathcal{Q}x, y)_V$ .
- (2) From eq. (2.1) we have  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{1})(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{(\text{avg}(\mathbf{1}))(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)} = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{1}{|e|} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)}$ . If  $\sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{1}{|e|} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} = c$  for all  $v \in V$  then  $c$  is an eigenvalue with eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ . Moreover, if  $\delta_E(e) = |e|$  and  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v|$  for all  $e \in E$  and  $v \in V$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{1})(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{1}{|E_v|} = 1$ . Therefore, 1 is an eigenvalue with eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ .
- (3) Consider  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(x)(v) &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{(\text{avg}(x))(e) \delta_E(e)}{|e| \delta_V(v)} \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \sum_{u \in e} x(u) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} B_{ve} \sum_{u \in V} B_{ue} x(u) = ((BB^T)x)(v), \end{aligned}$$

where  $B = (B_{ue})_{u \in V, e \in E}$  and  $B_{ue} = 1$  if  $u \in e$  and otherwise  $B_{ue} = 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{Q}$  becomes the operator associated with the signless Laplacian matrix  $BB^T$ , described in [8, p. 1]. This motivates us to refer the operator  $\mathcal{Q}$  as the general signless Laplacian of hypergraphs.

**2.2. The general diffusion operator.** We define a function  $n \in \mathbb{R}^V$  by

$$n = \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{1}).$$

Now we define the general diffusion function  $L_G : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  by

$$(L_G(x))(v) = \mathcal{Q}(x)(v) - n(v)x(v),$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,  $v \in V$ . Now onward, we denote  $L_G$  by  $L$ , when there is no scope of confusion regarding the hypergraph  $G$ .

**Note 2.6.** Different concepts of diffusion operators and Laplacian operators are available in the literature [2, 4, 7, 22, 23]. In the following example, we show for the proper choices of  $\delta_V$  and  $\delta_E$ , our notion of diffusion

operator of hypergraph coincides with some existing notions of Laplacian operators and diffusion operators of hypergraphs.

**Example 2.7.** (1) If we take  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$ , then the operator  $L$  becomes the negative of the Laplacian matrix, described in [22, 23].

(2) If we choose  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\delta_E(e) = w(e) \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  then the operator  $L$  becomes equal with the diffusion operator described in [4] for weighted hypergraphs. Moreover, for unweighted hypergraphs, i.e., when  $w(e) = 1$  for all  $e \in E$ ,  $L$  becomes the negative of the Laplacian operator defined in [2].

(3) When  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v|$ , and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$ ,  $L$  becomes negative of the normalized Laplacian given in [2].

The above examples motivate us to defined the general Laplacian operator  $\mathfrak{L}$  associated with hypergraphs as,  $\mathfrak{L} = -L$ . Since, studying any one of the operators,  $L$  and  $\mathfrak{L}$ , do the same for the other, from now, we focus on  $L$ .

**Remark 2.8.** Any result of this article involving any conditions on  $\delta_E$  and  $\delta_V$  on the diffusion operator, Laplacian operator, adjacency operator can be converted to a result on the operators given in [2, 4, 22, 23] by choosing  $\delta_E, \delta_V$  accordingly. Similarly, if one choose other  $\delta_E$  and  $\delta_V$  to incorporate different situations then all the results of this article can be converted to their framework by appropriately choosing  $\delta_E$  and  $\delta_V$ .

### 3. EIGENVALUES OF THE GENERAL DIFFUSION OPERATORS OF HYPERGRAPHS

Since the map  $f : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$ , defined by  $(f(x))(v) = n(v)x(v)$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V, v \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , is self-adjoint, and the operator,  $\mathcal{Q}(x)$  is self-adjoint, thus  $L$  is also self-adjoint. From the definition of  $L$ , it follows that

$$(Lx)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e} (x(u) - x(v)), \quad (3.1)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V, v \in V$ . For each hyperedge  $e \in E$ , suppose  $Q_e$  is the incident matrix of a complete graph  $K_{|e|}$  involving all the vertices in  $e$  with a fixed orientation. So,  $Q_e = \{Q_{erv}\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}_{(|e|)}, v \in V}$ , where  $Q_{erv} = -1$  if  $v$  is the head of the  $r$ -th edge of the oriented  $K_{|e|}$ ,  $Q_{erv} = 1$  if  $v$  is the tail of the  $r$ -th edge of the oriented  $K_{|e|}$ , and  $Q_{erv} = 0$  otherwise. Here  $\mathbb{N}_r$  is the collection of all the natural numbers  $\leq r$ . It is easy to verify that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,  $Lx = -(\sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \Delta_V^{-1} Q_e^t Q_e)x$ , where  $\Delta_V$  is a diagonal matrix of order  $|V|$  such that  $\Delta_V(v, v) = \delta_V(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ .

**Proposition 3.1.**  $L$  is negative semidefinite.

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (L(x), x)_V &= \sum_{v \in V} \delta_V(v) [\mathcal{Q}(x)(v) - n(v)x(v)]x(v) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \delta_V(v) [(avg^* \circ avg)(x)(v) - n(v)x(v)]x(v) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} [(avg(x))(e) - x(v)]x(v). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The contribution of the hyperedge  $e = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  in the sum of the Equation (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{v \in e} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} [(avg(x))(e) - x(v)]x(v) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \left[ \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k x(v_j) \right\} - |e|x(v_i) \right] x(v_i) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^k (x(v_i) - x(v_j))^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the Equation (3.2) becomes,

$$(L(x), x)_V = - \sum_{e \in E} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u,v \in e} (x(u) - x(v))^2 \leq 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence the proof follows. ■

The Equation (3.3) can also be expressed as

$$(L(x), x)_V = - \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e} (x(u) - x(v))^2. \quad (3.4)$$

**Proposition 3.2.**  $0$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  and if the hypergraph is connected then the eigenspace of  $0$  is  $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ , the vector space generated by  $\mathbf{1}$ .

*Proof.* Since,  $L(\mathbf{1})(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$ ,  $0$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with an eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ .

If  $x$  belongs to the eigenspace of  $L$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $0$  and the hypergraph is connected, then by Equation (3.4) we have  $x(u) = x(v)$  for all  $u, v \in V$ . Thus the proof follows. ■

By Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, other than  $0$  all the eigenvalues of  $L$  are negative and for a connected hypergraph, the eigenspace of the eigenvalue  $0$  is  $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ . Hence, if  $x(t)$  is a solution of the differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = L(x(t))$$

then as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , among all the components of decomposed vector  $x(t)$  along the eigenvectors of  $L$  only the component along  $\mathbf{1}$  survives and rest of all tend to  $0$ . Thus, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , any solution of the given differential equation converge to the vector space  $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ . Hence  $L$  is a reasonable candidate for being the diffusion operator corresponding to a hypergraph on the space of all real-valued functions on the set of all the vertices,  $V$ .

Suppose  $|V| = N$ . By Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, there exists a collections of non-negative reals  $\{\lambda_i(G)\}_{i=1}^N$  (or simply  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^N$  if there is no scope of confusion regarding the hypergraph) such that  $-\lambda_i$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ . Suppose the indices  $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$  are chosen in such a way that  $\lambda_i \leq \lambda_{i+1}$ . By Proposition 3.2,  $\lambda_1 = 0$ . The Rayleigh quotient  $R(-L, x)$  of  $-L$  and nonzero  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is  $\frac{(-Lx, x)_V}{(x, x)_V}$ . Suppose  $\{\mathbf{1}, z_2, \dots, z_N\}$  is the orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{R}^V$  consisting of the eigenfunctions of  $L$  and  $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is the eigenfunction of  $L$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ . The Rayleigh quotient reaches its minimum value  $\lambda_1 = 0$  when  $x = \mathbf{1}$ , the eigenvector of  $L$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_1 = 0$ . Moreover,  $\lambda_2 = \inf_{x \in (1) - \{0\}} R(-L, x)$  and the Rayleigh quotient reaches the infimum value at  $x = z_2$ , the eigenvector of  $L$ , corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$ . The multiplicity of  $0$  as an eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian is equal to the number of connected components of the graph. This is an well known result for the graphs. One can conclude the same for hypergraph Laplacian. The proof for hypergraph is almost same that works for graphs.

**Proposition 3.3.** Multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue of the diffusion matrix  $L$  of a hypergraph  $G$  is equal to the number of connected components in  $G$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that the multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue is  $k$ . Let  $S$  be the eigenspace of the eigenvalue  $0$  of  $L$ . Let  $(V_1, E_1), (V_2, E_2), \dots, (V_k, E_k)$  be the  $k$  components of the hypergraph  $G$ . Evidently by eq. (3.4), for all  $z \in S$ ,

$$0 = (Lz, z)_V = - \sum_{e \in E} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (z(u) - z(v))^2. \quad (3.5)$$

It is evident from Equation (3.5) that for all  $z \in S$ ,  $z$  is constant within each connected component of the hypergraph. Therefore, for all  $z \in S$ , there exists  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $z(u) = z_i$  for all  $u \in V_i$  where  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . This association of each elements of  $S$  to  $k$  real numbers motivates us to define the linear map  $\mathbf{g} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  by  $\mathbf{g}(z) := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k)$ . Using Equation (3.5), one can easily verify that  $\mathbf{g}$  is an isomorphism. therefore, the geometric multiplicity of  $0$ , which is the dimension of the eigenspace  $S$  is exactly equal to  $k$ . Since  $L$  is a self-adjoint operator, for any eigenvalue of  $L$  the algebraic multiplicity is equal to the geometric multiplicity. Therefore, the number of components,  $k$  is equal to the multiplicity of  $0$  as an eigenvalue of  $L$ . ■

Now we provide some results on the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the diffusion operator of some classes of hypergraphs. The following results allow us to determine several eigenvalues of the same simply by looking at the hypergraphs. According to the definition of the diffusion operator, a hypergraph corresponds to a class of diffusion operator. More precisely, a hypergraph along with a particular choice of  $(\delta_V, \delta_E)$  induces a diffusion operator. Therefore, naturally the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the diffusion operator depends both on the structures of the hypergraphs and the choices of the inner products. In the following results, we determined the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the diffusion operator with two types of specifications- *i*) the conditions on the structure of the hypergraphs specify the class of hypergraphs, and *ii*) the conditions on  $\delta_E, \delta_V$  specify the subclass of the diffusion operators.

**Theorem 3.4.** If  $G = (V, E)$  is a hypergraph such that

- (i)  $E_k = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\} \subset E$  with  $W = \bigcap_{e \in E_k} e$  and  $|W| \geq 2$ , and  $e \cap W = \emptyset$  for all  $e \in E \setminus E_k$ ,
- (ii)  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in W$ , for some fixed  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

then  $-\frac{1}{c} \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|}$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion operator  $L$  and the dimension of the corresponding eigenspace is at least  $|W| - 1$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $W = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ . Corresponding to each  $v_i$ , for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , we define  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  as,

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v = v_0 \\ 1 & \text{if } v = v_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We enlist below some crucial observations on  $y_i$ , for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ .

- (a) If  $v \in V \setminus W$  then  $y_i(v) = 0$ .
- (b) If  $e \notin E_k$  then  $e \cap W = \emptyset$  and therefore,  $y_i(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in e$ . If  $e \in E_k$  then from the definition of  $y_i$  we have  $\sum_{v \in e} y_i(v) = 0$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{v \in e} y_i(v) = 0$  for all  $e \in E$ .
- (c) Therefore,  $(Ly_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) = - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|} y_i(v)$ .
- (d) Evidently  $E_v = E_k$  for all  $v \in W$ ,

Since  $\delta_V(v) = c$ , for all  $v \in W$ , then by the above observations we conclude that for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,

$$(Ly_i)(v) = \begin{cases} - \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{c} \frac{1}{|e|} y_i(v) & \text{if } v \in W, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus  $(Ly_i)(v) = -\frac{1}{c} \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} y_i(v)$ .

Therefore,  $-\frac{1}{c} \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|}$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with the eigenvectors  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s$ , respectively. Since

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^s c_i y_i \right)(v) = \begin{cases} - \sum_{i=1}^s c_i & \text{if } v = v_0, \\ c_i & \text{if } v = v_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\left( \sum_{i=1}^s c_i y_i \right) = 0$  implies  $c_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . Therefore,  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$  is linearly independent and the dimension of the eigenspace of the above mentioned eigenvalue is at least  $s$ .  $\blacksquare$

We include some examples related to the above result below.

**Note 3.5.** (1) Let us recall Example 2.7(1). If we put  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$ , then the diffusion operator  $L$  becomes the negative of the Laplacian matrix, described in [22, 23]. In this case,  $\delta_V$  is constant function and  $\sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} = \sum_{e \in E_k} |e|$  is always a constant and thus, the condition (ii) of Theorem 3.4 holds trivially and not required to be mentioned in this case. That is, in this case,  $-\sum_{e \in E_k} |e|$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion operator and  $\sum_{e \in E_k} |e|$  is an eigenvalue of the Laplacian operator with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .

(2) In Example 2.7(2) we have seen, for  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the Laplacian operator mentioned in [2]. In this case  $\sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} = \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{|e|}{|e|-1}$  is always a constant and therefore, also for this particular diffusion operator the condition (ii) always holds. Evidently, here the Laplacian eigenvalue is  $\sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{|e|}{|e|-1}$  with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .

(3) Recall Example 2.7(3). If  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v|$ , and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  then the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the normalized Laplacian described in [2, Equation-14]. Note that in Theorem 3.4,  $E_v = E_k$  for all  $v \in W$  and thus,  $\delta_V(v) = |E_k| = k$  for all  $v \in W$ . Therefore, by Theorem 3.4,  $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{|e|}{|e|-1}$  is an eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .

**Example 3.6.** Consider the hypergraph  $H(V, E)$  where  $V = [20] = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \leq 20\}$  and  $E = \{e_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, e_2 = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7\}, e_3 = \{1, 2, 8, 9, 10\}, e_4 = \{1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14\}, e_5 = \{1, 2, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20\}\}$ . Since  $|W| = \bigcap_{i=1}^5 e_i = \{1, 2\}$ , we have the followings.

- (1) In the framework of [2], one eigenvalue of the Laplacian of  $H$  is  $\sum_{i=1}^5 \frac{|e_i|}{|e_i|-1} = \frac{1297}{210}$  and an eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian matrix of  $H$  is  $\frac{1}{5} \sum_{e \in E_k} \frac{|e|}{|e|-1} = \frac{1297}{1050}$ .



(2) In the framework of [7, 22, 23], one eigenvalue of the Laplacian of  $H$  is  $\sum_{i=1}^5 |e_i| = 28$ .

**Corollary 3.7.** *If  $G = (V, E)$  is a hypergraph satisfying the following conditions*

(i) *the intersection of all the hyperedges contains at least two vertices, that is,  $|\bigcap_{e \in E} e| \geq 2$ ,*

(ii) *the function  $\delta_V$  is constant on  $\bigcap_{e \in E} e$ , that is, there exists  $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in \bigcap_{e \in E} e$ ,*

*then  $-\sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{c} \frac{1}{|e|}$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion operator  $L$  and the dimension of the corresponding eigenspace is at least  $|\bigcap_{e \in E} e| - 1$ .*

*Proof.* This result directly follows from the Theorem 3.4 ■

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph. Suppose that there exists an hyperedge,  $e_0 \in E$ , such that*

(i)  $e_0 = e_u \cup e_v$  where  $e_u \cap e_v = \emptyset$ ,

(ii)  $|e_u| \geq 2$ ,

(iii)  $e \cap e_u = \emptyset$  for all  $e (\neq e_0) \in E$ .

*If  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in e_u$  then  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|}$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion operator  $L$  of the hypergraph  $G$  with multiplicity at least  $|e_u| - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $e_u = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ . For each  $u_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , we define  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  by

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v = u_i, \\ -1 & \text{if } v = u_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now we have the following observations on  $y_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ .

(a) For any hyperedge  $e \neq e_0$ ,  $y_i(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in e$  and  $y_i \perp \mathbf{1}$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{u \in e} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E$  and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Thus, for all  $v \in V$ , one has by Equation (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} (Ly_i)(v) &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) \\ &= - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|} y_i(v). \end{aligned}$$

(b) For all  $v \in e_u$ ,  $E_v = \{e_0\}$ . Thus, for all  $v \in e_u$ , we have

$$(Ly_i)(v) = - \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_0|} y_i(v).$$

Since  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in e_u$ , by the above observations

$$\begin{aligned} (Ly_i)(v) &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) \\ &= \begin{cases} - \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|} y_i(v) & \text{if } v \in e_u, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $(Ly_i)(v) = - \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|} y_i(v)$ . Therefore,  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|}$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with the eigenvectors  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ , respectively. Note that,

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^k c_i y_i \right) (v) = \begin{cases} - \sum_{i=1}^k c_i & \text{if } v = u_0, \\ c_i & \text{if } v = v_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore,  $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i y_i = 0$  leads to  $c_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$  and  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$  is a linearly independent subset of the eigenspace of  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|}$ . This proves that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|}$  is at least  $k$ . ■

**Note 3.9.** (1) *Using conditions of Theorem 3.8, one has  $E_v = \{e_0\}$  for all  $v \in e_u$ . Recall Example 2.7(3). If  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v|$ , and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  then the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the normalized Laplacian described in [2, Equation 14]. Since  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v| = 1$  for all  $v \in e_u$ , by Theorem 3.8,  $\frac{|e_0|}{|e_0|-1}$  is an eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian with the multiplicity  $|e_u| - 1$ . Moreover, according to [2],*

the normalized Laplacian matrix described in [2, Equation-16] is similar to that of [2, Equation-14]. Therefore, both the matrices have an eigenvalue  $\frac{|e_0|}{|e_0|-1}$  with the multiplicity  $|e_u| - 1$ .

- (2) In Example 2.7(1), for  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$ , the diffusion operator  $L$  becomes the negative of the Laplacian matrix, described in [7, 22, 23]. In this case,  $\delta_V$  is constant function and  $\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c|e_0|} = |e_0|$  and thus, in this case the eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix becomes  $|e_0|$ .
- (3) In Example 2.7(2), we have seen, for  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the Laplacian operator mentioned in [2]. Since, here,  $\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c|e_0|} = \frac{|e_0|}{|e_0|-1}$ , thus, in this case the eigenvalue of the diffusion operator becomes  $-\frac{|e_0|}{|e_0|-1}$  and the eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix is  $\frac{|e_0|}{|e_0|-1}$ .

**Example 3.10.** Consider a hypergraph  $H(V, E)$  with  $V = [11] = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \leq 11\}$  and  $E = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \{4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11\}, \{6, 7, 8, 9\}, \{8, 9, 10, 11\}\}$ . Since  $W = \{1, 2, 3\} \subset e_1$  and  $W \cap e = \emptyset$  for all  $e(\neq e_1) \in E$ , we have the followings.

- (1) In the framework of [2], an eigenvalue of the Laplacian of  $H$  is  $\frac{|e_1|}{|e_1|-1} = \frac{5}{4}$ . Moreover, by Note 3.9(1),  $\frac{|e_1|}{|e_1|-1} = \frac{5}{4}$  is also an eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacians described in [2].
- (2) In the framework of [7, 22, 23], one eigenvalue of the Laplacian of  $H$  is  $|e_1| = 5$ .

**Theorem 3.11.** Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph such that  $E_0 = \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subset E$  with

- (i)  $W = \bigcap_{i=1}^k e_i \neq \emptyset$ , and  $W \cap e = \emptyset$  for all  $e \in E \setminus E_0$ ,
- (ii) for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$  there exists an  $F_i \subset V$  such that  $e_i = W \cup F_i$  with  $|F_i| = t$  and  $F_i \cap W = \emptyset$  for all  $i$ ,
- (iii)  $F_i \cap e = \emptyset$  for all  $e(\neq e_i) \in E$ .
- (iv) there exists  $c, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i$ , and  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} = \omega$  for all  $e \in E_0$ .

Then  $-\frac{\omega}{c}|W|$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with multiplicity at least  $|E_0| - 1$ .

*Proof.* We define  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , as

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v \in F_0 \\ 1 & \text{if } v \in F_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, we consider the following cases to prove the result.

- (a) For  $v \in F_j$ , one has  $E_v = \{e_j\}$  for any  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ . Therefore, Equation (3.1) becomes  $(Ly_i)(v) = \frac{\delta_E(e_j)}{c|e_j|^2} \sum_{u \in e_j} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) = \frac{\delta_E(e_j)}{c|e_j|^2} \sum_{u \in W} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) = -\frac{\omega}{c}|W|y_i(v)$ .
- (b) For  $v \in W$ , clearly  $E_v = E_0$  and  $y_i(v) = 0$ . Thus,  $(Ly_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)|e|^2} \frac{1}{|e|} \sum_{u \in e} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\delta_E(e_j)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_j|^2} \sum_{u \in e_j} y_i(u) = \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} t - \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} t = \frac{\omega}{c}(t - t) = 0$ .
- (c) For  $v \in V \setminus \left( W \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i \right) \right)$ , one has  $\sum_{u \in e} (y_i(u) - y_i(v)) = 0$  for all  $e \in E_v$ . Therefore,  $(Ly_i)(v) = 0$ .

Therefore,  $-\frac{\omega}{c}|W|$  is an eigenvalue of  $L$ .

Since

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^k c_i y_i \right)(v) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^k c_i & \text{if } v \in F_0, \\ c_i & \text{if } v \in F_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have  $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i y_i = 0$  if and only if  $c_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . So,  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$  are linearly independent and the dimension of the eigenspace of the eigenvalue  $-\frac{\omega}{c} \frac{|W|-1}{|W|}$  of  $L$  is at least  $k$ . Therefore, the multiplicity of the eigenvalue  $-\frac{\omega}{c}|W|$  is at least  $k = |W| - 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Note 3.12.** (1) In Example 2.7(1), for  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$ , the diffusion operator  $L$  becomes the negative of the Laplacian matrix, described in [22, 23]. In this case,  $\delta_V$  is a constant function and  $\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{|e|^2} = 1$ . Thus the condition (iv) of Theorem 3.11 holds trivially. Therefore,  $|W|$  becomes an eigenvalue with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .



(2) In Example 2.7(2) we have seen, for  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the Laplacian operator mentioned in [2]. Here one can also verify easily that the condition (iv) of Theorem 3.11 holds if all the hyperedges in  $E_0$  are of same cardinality. Therefore, in this case  $\frac{1}{|e|-1}|W|$  is an eigenvalue with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .

(3) Note that for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , if  $v \in F_i$  then  $E_v = \{e_i\}$ . Therefore,  $|E_v| = 1$  for all  $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i$ .

Let us recall Example 2.7(3). Now if  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v|$ , and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  then the diffusion operator becomes the negative of the normalized Laplacian described in [2, Equatioin-14]. In this framework,  $\delta_V(v) = |E_v| = 1$  for all  $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i$  and thus by Theorem 3.11, we get  $\frac{1}{|e|-1}|W|$  is an eigenvalue of the normalized Laplacian matrix with the multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .

We provide an application of the above result in Section 3.1.

**3.1. Spectra of Diffusion Operator of Some Specific Hypergraphs.** Now we recall some definitions of special type of hypergraphs from [1, 15] and derive the eigenvalues of their diffusion operators.

**Definition 3.13** (Cored vertex). [15, Definition 2.3] Suppose that  $G(V, E)$  is a hypergraph. If for all  $e \in E$ , there exists  $v_e \in e$  such that  $v_e \notin e_j$  for all  $e_j (\neq e) \in E$  then  $G$  is called a cored hypergraph. A vertex with degree one is referred to as a cored vertex, and a vertex with degree greater than one is referred to as an intersectional vertex.

According to [1], if a hyperedge has only one cored vertex then the core vertex is called a pendant vertex. Moreover, two vertices  $u, v$  of a hypergraph are twins if they belong to the exactly same hyperedge(s). Note that in Theorem 3.8, all the elements of  $e_u$  are cored vertex and any pair of vertices in  $e_u$  are twins. Moreover, Theorem 3.8 can be applied if there exists at least two cored vertex which are twins. In Theorem 3.11, each  $u_i$  is the only cored vertex in  $e_i$ , that is, each  $u_i$  is a pendant and other than  $u_i$ , all the vertices in  $e_i$  are intersectional. In Corollary 3.7, the condition (1) can be restated as there exists at least a pair of twin vertices belongs to all the hyperedges. Now we are going to apply our results to determine the eigenvalues of some classes of hypergraphs that have cored vertices, twin vertices, and intersectional vertices.

3.1.1. Complete Spectra of the Diffusion Operator of Hyperflowers.

**Definition 3.14** (Hyperflowers). [1] A  $(l, r)$ -hyperflower with  $t$ -twins is a hypergraph  $G = (V, E)$  where  $V$  can be expressed as the disjoint partition  $V = U \cup W$  with the following listed property.

- (a) The set  $U$  can be partitioned into disjoint  $t$ -element sets as  $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^l U_i$ . That is  $|U_i| = t$ ,  $U_i = \{u_{is}\}_{s=1}^t$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$  and  $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j = 1, \dots, l$ .
- (b) There exists  $r$ -disjoint set of vertices  $e_1, \dots, e_r \in \mathcal{P}(W)$ , the power set of  $W$ , such that,  $E = \{e_{ki} : e_{ki} = e_k \cup U_i, k = 1, 2, \dots, r; i = 1, 2, \dots, l\}$ .

If  $v \in U$ , then  $v$  is called a peripheral vertex.

Suppose that  $E_k = \{e_{ki}\}_{i=1}^l$  for any  $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . Evidently,  $e_k = \bigcap_{e \in E_k} e$  and  $e \cap e_k = \emptyset$  for all  $e \in E \setminus E_k$ .

Therefore, by Theorem 3.4, if  $\delta_V(v) = c_k$  and  $\sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|} = \mu_k$  for all  $v \in e_k$  then  $-\frac{\mu_k}{c_k}$  is an eigenvalue with eigenspace of dimension at least  $|e_k| - 1$  for all  $k$ .




FIGURE 1.  $(4, 1)$ -hyperflower with 9 twins.

In our study the hyperflowers with  $r = 1$  are interesting because, in this case, each peripheral vertex is a cored vertex of the hyperflower. We summarize below some crucial observation on  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower with  $t$  twins (see Figure 1). Since  $r = 1$ , one has  $W = e_1$  and  $\bigcap_{e \in E} e = W$ .

- (1) Note that  $e_1 = W = \bigcap_{e \in E} e$ . Therefore, if  $|e_1| \geq 2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = c_0$  for all  $v \in e_1$  then by Corollary 3.7, one can conclude that  $-\sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{c_0} \frac{1}{|e|}$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion operator  $L$  associated with the  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower with  $t$  twins of multiplicity at least  $|e_1| - 1 = |W| - 1$ .
- (2) Since, for any hyperedge, all the peripheral vertices belongs to the hyperedge are cored vertices and any two of them are twins to each other, by Theorem 3.8, if  $t \geq 2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = c_i$  for all  $v \in U_i$  then each hyperedge  $e_{1i}$  of the hyperflower corresponds to an eigenvalue  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_{1i})}{c_i} \frac{1}{|e_{1i}|}$  of  $L$  with multiplicity at least  $t - 1$ .
- (3) Note that if  $t \geq 2$  then the total number of vertices in  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower with  $t$  twins is  $|V| = lt + |e_1|$ . Evidently, there exists  $lt + |e_1|$  linearly eigenvectors of  $L$ , out of which,  $(|e_1| - 1) + l(t - 1) = lt + |e_1| - (l + 1)$  can be calculated by using Corollary 3.7 and Theorem 3.8. We, know  $\mathbf{1}$  is an eigenvector of  $L$  among the remaining  $l + 1$ .
- (4) Suppose that  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all the peripheral vertices  $v \in U$  and  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} = \omega$  for all the hyperedges  $e \in E$  then by Theorem 3.11 we have  $-\frac{\omega}{c}|e_1| = -\frac{\omega}{c}|W|$  is an eigenvalue of the diffusion matrix of dimension at least  $l - 1$ .
- (5) One can easily verify that the last remaining eigenvalue is  $-\frac{\omega}{c}(lt + |W|) = -\frac{\omega}{c}|V|$  with eigenvector  $y \in \mathbb{R}^V$  defined by

$$y(v) = \begin{cases} lt & \text{if } v \in W \\ -|W| & \text{if } v \in U. \end{cases}$$

- (6) Note that all the eigenvalues of  $(l, 1)$ - hyperflower with  $t$ -twins are the multiples of  $\frac{\omega}{c}$ . Therefore, if  $\frac{\omega}{c}$  is an integer then all the eigenvalues of  $L$  are integer.

In a  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower, when the central set  $W$  is a singleton set  $\{v_0\}$  then it becomes a sunflower.

**Definition 3.15** (Sunflower). [15, Definition 2.4] Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph. If there exists a disjoint partition of the vertex set  $V$  as  $V = V_0 \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$  such that

- (a)  $V_0 = \{v_0\}$  and  $|V_i| = k - 1$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,
- (b)  $E = \{e_i = V_0 \cup V_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, s\}$ ,

then  $G$  is called a  $k$ -uniform sunflower. Each hyperedges of sunflower is called leaf. The vertex  $v_0$  is referred as the heart of the sunflower. Note that the degree of the heart is the cardinality of the set  $E$ , which is also called the size of the sunflower.

Since the sunflower is a special case of the  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower. From the list of the eigenvalues of  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower one can determine the eigenvalues of the diffusion operator associated with sunflower.

### 3.1.2. Spectra of Diffusion Operators of Some More Hypergraphs.

**Definition 3.16** (Loose Path). [15, Definition-2.7] A  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $G = (V, E)$  is said to be a  $k$ -uniform loose path of size  $d$  if the set of all hyperedge  $E$  is such that

- (a)  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d\}$ ,
- (b)  $e_i \cap e_j = \emptyset$  if  $|i - j| > 1$  and  $|e_i \cap e_j| = 1$  if  $|i - j| = 1$ .

Note that if  $i \neq 1, d$  then each  $e_i$  contains  $k - 2$  cored vertices. Therefore, if  $\delta_V(v) = c_i$  for all cored vertices  $v \in e_i$ , then by Theorem 3.8,  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{c_i} \frac{1}{k}$  is an eigenvlue of  $L$  with multiplicity  $k - 3$ . If  $k = 1, d$  then  $e_i$  contains  $k - 1$  cored vertices hence the multiplicity is  $k - 2$ .

If for  $k \geq 3$ , a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $G = (V, E)$  is such that it satisfy all the conditions stated in Definition 3.16 with just one exception, which is  $|e_1 \cap e_d| = 2$  then  $G$  is called a  $k$ -uniform loose cycle of size  $d$ . Using Theorem 3.8 we can find the eigenvalues of  $L$  corresponding to the loose cycle as we have done in case of the loose path.

## 4. SPECTRAL BOUNDS FOR SOME HYPERGRAPH PROPERTY

Before going to the spectral bounds, we need to discuss the following notion.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $r \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be defined by  $r(v) := \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{|e| - 1}{|e|^2}$  and  $r_0 := \max_{v \in V} r(v)$ .

It is interesting to note the following observations on  $r$ .

- (1) if  $\delta_E(e) = w(e)\frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$ ,  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  then  $r(v) = d(v)$  and  $r_0 = d_{\max}$ , where  $d_{\max} := \max_{v \in V} d(v)$ . In case of unweighted graph,  $w(e) = 1$  for all  $e \in E$  and hence the degree  $d(v)$  of a vertex  $v \in V$ , is the number of hyperedge containing the vertex  $v$ . We denote the collection of all the hyperedge containing the vertex  $v$  by  $E_v$ . Clearly  $d(v) = |E_v|$ .
- (2) In an  $m$ -uniform hypergraph,  $r(v) = \frac{m-1}{|m|^2} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)}$ .

We calculate a bound for  $r(v)$  in terms of the spectra of the diffusion operator in the next result. Since for particular choices of inner products,  $r(v)$  becomes the degree of  $V$ , this bound gives a spectral bound for the vertex degree. We use the techniques described in [12, 3.5., p. 300] to prove the next result.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_N$  are respectively the second least and largest eigenvalue of  $-L$  then*

$$\delta_V(\min)\lambda_2 \leq \frac{|V|}{|V|-1} \min_{v \in V} r(v)\delta_V(v) \leq \frac{|V|}{|V|-1} \max_{v \in V} r(v)\delta_V(v) \leq \lambda_N \delta_V(\max).$$

*Proof.* It is easy to show  $\tilde{L} = -L - \lambda_2(I_{|V|} - \frac{1}{|V|}J)$  is positive semidefinite, where  $J$  is a square matrix of order  $|V|$  with all its entry equal to 1. Let, for all  $v \in V$ ,  $\chi_v \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be defined by  $\chi_v(u) = 1$  if  $u = v$  and otherwise  $\chi_v(u) = 0$ . Hence  $(\tilde{L}\chi_v, \chi_v)_V \geq 0$  for all  $v \in V$  and this leads us to  $\lambda_2 \leq \frac{|V|}{|V|-1} \frac{1}{\delta_V(\min)} \min_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} (|e| - 1)$ . Similarly instead of  $\tilde{L}$ , if we consider the positive semidefinite matrix  $\tilde{M} = \lambda_N(I - \frac{1}{n}J)_V - (-L)$ , then  $(\tilde{M}\chi_v, \chi_v)_V \geq 0$  leads us to  $\frac{|V|}{|V|-1} \max_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} (|e| - 1) \leq \lambda_N \delta_V(\max)$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

The maximum and minimum cardinality of hyperedge in a hypergraph are called *rank* ( $rk(G)$ ) and *corank* ( $cr(G)$ ) of the hypergraph respectively.

Removal of a vertex  $v \in V$  from each hyperedge containing it, is called *weak deletion of  $v$* . If weak deletion of a set of vertices increase the number of connected components of the hypergraph  $G$  then the set is called *weak vertex cut* of the hypergraph  $G$ . The *weak connectivity number*  $\kappa_w(G)$  (or simply  $\kappa_w$ , if there is no confusion about the hypergraph ) is the minimum size of the weak vertex cut in the hypergraph  $G$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph with  $|V|(\geq 3)$ , such that  $G$  contains at least one pair of non-adjacent vertices then there exists a constant  $\bar{k}$  such that  $\lambda_2 \leq \bar{k}(d_{\max} - 1)\kappa_w(G)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $W$  be the the weak vertex cut with  $|W| = \kappa_w$ . Clearly there exists a partition  $V = V_1 \cup W \cup V_2$  of  $V$  such that no vertex of  $V_1$  is adjacent to any vertex in  $V_2$ . Let us consider  $y \in \mathbb{R}^V$  defined by  $y(v) = |V_2|$  if  $v \in V_1$ ,  $y(v) = -|V_1|$  if  $v \in V_2$ , and  $y(v) = 0$  if  $v \in W$ . Operating  $L$  on  $y$  leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} (Ly)(v) &= (avg^* \circ avg)(y)(v) - n(v)y(v) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{avg(y)(e)}{|e|} - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|} y(v) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|} \sum_{u \in e} \frac{1}{|e|} (y(u) - y(v)) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Now we define a function  $k : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$k(v) := \sum_{e \in E_v} \sum_{u \in e \cap W} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2}.$$

Suppose  $\bar{k} := \sup_{e \in E, v \in V} \left\{ \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \right\}$ . It is easy to verify that, for all  $v \in V_1 \cup V_2$ ,  $k(v) \leq (d_{\max} - 1)|W|\bar{k}$ .

Clearly, for any  $v \in V_1$ , there exists no  $e \in E_v$  such that  $e \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Hence for any  $v \in V_1$ , Equation (4.1) leads us to the following.

$$\begin{aligned} (Ly)(v) &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|} \sum_{u \in e} \frac{1}{|e|} (y(u) - y(v)) \\ &= - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap W} |V_2| \\ &= -k(v)|V_2| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any  $v \in V_2$ ,  $(Ly)(v) = k(v)|V_1|$ . Hence,  $(-Ly, y)_V \leq \sum_{v \in V} \delta_V(v)k(v)(y(v))^2 \leq \bar{k}(d_{\max} - 1)|W|(y, y)_V$ . This leads us to  $\lambda_2 \leq \bar{k}(d_{\max} - 1)|W| = \bar{k}(d_{\max} - 1)\kappa_w(G)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 4.4.** In the above result if we put  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  for all  $e \in E$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$ , the diffusion operator  $L$  becomes the diffusion operator described in [4]. This operator is also the negative of the Laplacian matrix for hypergraph described in [2]. With the above choice of  $\delta_E$  and  $\delta_V$  we have  $\bar{k} = \frac{1}{cr(G)-1}$ . In the above theorem instead of the supremum  $\bar{k}$ , any upperbound of the set  $\left\{ \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \right\}_{e \in E, v \in V}$  yields an upperbound of  $\lambda_2$ , involving the weak connectivity number. Although we decided to go with the supremum to make the upperbound as sharp as possible.

**Corollary 4.5.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph with  $|V|(\geq 3)$  such that  $G$  contains at least one pair of non-adjacent vertices and  $d_{\max} \leq cr(G)$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $\delta_E(e) = w(e) \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  for all  $e \in E$ . Then  $\lambda_2 \leq \kappa_W(G)$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to verify  $\sum_{e \in E_V} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} = \sum_{e \in E_V} \frac{w(e)}{|e|} \leq \frac{d_{\max}}{cr(G)}$ . Hence,  $\bar{k} \leq \frac{d_{\max}}{cr(G)}$ . Thus the condition  $d_{\max} \leq cr(G)$  leads us to  $\bar{k} \leq 1$ . Hence the result follows.  $\blacksquare$

Corollary 4.5 is stated and proved in [2, Theorem 3.1] independently. Although we have proved this result as a corollary of Theorem 4.3.

For any  $S \subset V$ , the collection of all the hyperedges that contains vertices from both the sets  $S$  and  $V \setminus S$  are called the *edge boundary of the set  $S$* . The edge boundary of  $S$  is denoted by  $\partial S$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** Let  $G$  be a hypergraph. For any nonempty  $S \subset V$ , we have

$$4\lambda_2 \frac{\delta_V(\min)}{\delta_E(\max)} \leq \frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)} \leq \lambda_N \delta_V(\max) \max_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{|e|^2}{(|e|-1)\delta_E(e)} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We consider a function  $z_s \in \mathbb{R}^V$  defined by  $z_s(v) := \begin{cases} |V|-|S| & \text{if } v \in S \\ -|S| & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$  corresponding to the set  $S \neq \phi$ . Thus by  $A.M \geq G.M$  inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-Lz_s, z_s)_V &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (z_s(u) - z_s(v))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \partial S} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} 2|e - S||S \cap e||V|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \delta_E(\max) |\partial S||V|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, as  $(z_s, z_s)_V \geq \delta_V(\min) |S|(|V|-|S|)|V|$ , we have  $\lambda_2 \leq \frac{(-Lz_s, z_s)_V}{(z_s, z_s)_V} \leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{\delta_E(\max)}{\delta_V(\min)} \frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)}$ .

As for all  $e \in \partial S$ , and  $|e - S||S \cap e| \geq |e| - 1$  we have  $(-Lz_s, z_s)_V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \partial S} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} 2|e - S||S \cap e||V|^2 \geq |\partial S| \min_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} (|e| - 1) \right\} |V|^2$ . Thus,  $\frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)} \leq \lambda_N \delta_V(\max) \max_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{|e|^2}{(|e|-1)\delta_E(e)} \right\}$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 4.7.** If  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  then Theorem 4.6 leads us to  $4\lambda_2 \frac{cr(G)-1}{rk(G)^2} \leq \frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)} \leq \lambda_N$  and this implies the result given in [2, Theorem 3.2, p-12].

**Corollary 4.8.** Let  $G$  be a hypergraph. For any nonempty  $S \subset V$ , we have

$$4\lambda_2 \frac{\delta_V(\min)}{\delta_E(\max)} \leq \frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)} \leq \lambda_N \frac{\delta_V(\max)}{\delta_E(\min)} \frac{rk(G)^2}{cr(G)-1}.$$

The *maximum cut*,  $mc(G)$  of a hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  is defined by  $mc(G) := \max\{|\partial S| : \phi \neq S \subset V\}$ . The *bipartition width* of a hypergraph  $G$ ,  $bw(G)$  is defined by  $bw(G) := \min \left\{ |\partial S| : s \subset V, |S| = \left\lfloor \frac{|V|}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ .

**Corollary 4.9.** For any hypergraph  $G(V, E)$ ,

$$mc(G) \leq \frac{|V|}{4} \lambda_N \delta_V(\max) \max_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{|e|^2}{(|e|-1)\delta_E(e)} \right\}.$$

**Corollary 4.10.** For any hypergraph  $G(V, E)$ , if  $\alpha(|V|) = \frac{4}{|V|}$  when  $|V|$  is even and  $\alpha(|V|) = \frac{4|V|}{|V|^2-1}$  when  $|V|$  is odd, then

$$4\lambda_2 \frac{\delta_V(\min)}{\delta_E(\max)} \leq \alpha(|V|) bw(G) \leq \lambda_N \delta_V(\max) \max_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{|e|^2}{(|e|-1)\delta_E(e)} \right\}.$$

Now we recall the definition of Cheeger constant  $h(G)$  from [2].

$$h(G) := \min_{S(\neq \phi) \subset V} \left\{ \frac{|\partial S|}{\min(|S|, (|V|-|S|))} \right\}.$$

**Corollary 4.11.** *If  $G$  is a connected hypergraph then  $\lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_E(\max)}{\delta_V(\min)} h(G)$ .*

*Proof.* This result follows immediately from Theorem 4.6. Clearly there exists  $S \subset V$  such that  $h(G) = \frac{|\partial S|}{|S|}$  and  $|S| \leq \frac{1}{2}|V|$ . This leads us to  $\frac{|V|}{|V|-|S|} \leq 2$ . Hence by Theorem 4.6,  $\lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_E(\max)}{\delta_V(\min)} h(G)$ . ■

Recall that a  $m$ -uniform hypergraph is a hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  with  $|e| = m$  for all  $e \in E$ . For any  $m$ -uniform hypergraph, a little different version of Theorem 4.6 can be proved when  $m$  is odd.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $G$  be an  $m$ -uniform hypergraph. Suppose  $\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by  $\gamma(m) = 1$  if  $m$  is even and  $\gamma(m) = \frac{m^2}{m^2-1}$  if  $m$  is odd then for any nonempty  $S \subset V$ , we have*

$$\lambda_N \delta_V(\max) \max_{e \in E} \left\{ \frac{m^2}{(m-1)\delta_E(e)} \right\} \geq \frac{|\partial S||V|}{|S|(|V|-|S|)} \geq 4\lambda_2 \frac{\delta_V(\min)}{\delta_E(\max)} \gamma(m).$$

*Proof.* This result can be proved by same line of proof that of theorem 4.6 along with the fact that for any  $m$ -hyperedge with  $e \cap S = s$ , we have  $(m-s)s \leq \begin{cases} \frac{m^2}{4} & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \\ \frac{m^2-1}{4} & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$ . ■

**Remark 4.13.** *If  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\delta_E(e) = |e|$  then Proposition 4.12 becomes the result given in [22, Lemma-1, sec.2, p.917].*

Recall the definition of  $r \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is  $r(v) = \sum_{e \in E_V} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{|e|-1}{|e|^2}$  and  $r_0 = \max_{v \in V} r(v)$ . Next result is a generalization of [2, Theorem-4.2]. The proof of this result is also similar to [2, Theorem-4.2]. Thus we are going to skip the details of the proof and just give an outline of the proof.

**Theorem 4.14.** *If  $G$  be a hypergraph with  $\lambda_2 \leq r(v)$  for all  $v \in V$  then*

$$\sqrt{\lambda_2(2r_0 - \lambda_2)} \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{\delta_V(\max)(rk(G))^2} h(G).$$

*Proof.* Let  $z_2$  be the eigen function of  $-L$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$ . Suppose that  $V_1 = \{v \in V : z_2(v) \geq 0\}$  and  $V_2 = \{v \in V : z_2(v) < 0\}$ . Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be defined by  $y(v) = z_2(v)$  if  $v \in V_1$ , otherwise  $y(v) = 0$ . Since,

$$\lambda_2(y, y)_V \geq \left( \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} (y(u) - y(v))^2 \right) - \sum_{e \in \partial V_1} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap V_2; v \in e \cap V_1} z_2(u)z_2(v)$$

and

$$(2r_0 - \lambda_2)(y, y)_V \geq \left( \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} (y(u) + y(v))^2 \right) + \sum_{e \in \partial V_1} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap V_2; v \in e \cap V_1} z_2(u)z_2(v),$$

we can conclude the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(2r_0 - \lambda_2)(y, y)_V^2 &\geq \left( \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} (y(u) - y(v))^2 \right) \left( \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} (y(u) + y(v))^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \alpha \left( 4 \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} y(u)y(v) + \alpha \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\alpha = \sum_{e \in \partial V_1} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap V_2; v \in e \cap V_1} z_2(u)z_2(v)$ . Clearly  $\alpha \leq 0$  and Since  $\lambda_2 \leq r(v)$ , we have

$$\sum_{e \in \partial V_1} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap V_2; v \in e \cap V_1} z_2(u)z_2(v) = \sum_{v \in V_1} (r(v) - \lambda_2) \delta_v(v) \geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( 4 \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} y(u)y(v) + \alpha \right) \\ &= \left( 2 \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e \cap V_1} y(u)y(v) + \sum_{e \in \partial V_1} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e \cap V_2; v \in e \cap V_1} z_2(u)z_2(v) \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Since  $r(v) \geq \lambda_2$ , Equation (4.2) and Equation (4.3) leads us to

$$\lambda_2(2r_0 - \lambda_2)(y, y)_V^2$$

$$\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y(u) - y(v))^2 \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y(u) + y(v))^2 \right). \quad (4.4)$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y(u) - y(v))^2 \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y(u) + y(v))^2 \right) \\ & \geq \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y^2(u) - y^2(v)) \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Suppose  $t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k$  are all possible distinct values of  $y$  and  $V_i = \{v \in V : y(v) \geq t_i\}$ . Clearly  $V = V_0 \supseteq V_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq V_k$ . It can be easily verified that  $\left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{u, v \in e} (y^2(u) - y^2(v)) \right) \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{(rk(G))^2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_k} |\partial V_i| (t_i^2 - t_{i-1}^2) \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{(rk(G))^2} h(G) \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_k} |V_i| (t_i^2 - t_{i-1}^2) \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{(rk(G))^2} h(G) \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_k} (|V_i| - |V_{i+1}|) t_i^2 \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{\delta_V(\max)(rk(G))^2} h(G) (y, y)_V$ .

Hence Equation (4.4) and Equation (4.5) lead us to  $\sqrt{\lambda_2(2r_0 - \lambda_2)} \geq \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{\delta_V(\max)(rk(G))^2} h(G)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 4.15.** For any hypergraph  $G(V, E)$ ,  $4\lambda_N \frac{\delta_V(\max)}{\delta_E(\min)} \geq h(G)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $S \subset V$  be such that  $h(G) = \frac{|\partial S|}{|S|}$  and  $z_N \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be the eigenvector of  $L$  corresponding to the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda_N$ . If  $\chi_S \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be the characteristic function of the set  $S$  then  $\lambda_N = \frac{(-Lz_N, z_N)_V}{(z_N, z_N)_V} \geq \frac{(-L\chi_S, \chi_S)_V}{(\chi_S, \chi_S)_V} \geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{\delta_E(\min)}{\delta_V(\max)} h(G)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5. GENERAL ADJACENCY OPERATOR OF A HYPERGRAPH

Recall the Definition 4.1, where we have defined  $r \in \mathbb{R}^V$ . Since in case of graph, Adjacency matrix can be expressed as the difference of the degree matrix and the Laplacian matrix associated with the graph, we can define the general adjacency operator  $A_G : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  associated with hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  as

$$((A_G)x)(v) := (L(x))(v) + r(v)x(v), \quad (5.1)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ . By Definition 4.1, one has for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (L_G(x))(v) &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e} (x(u) - x(v)) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \left( \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(u) - \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(v) \right) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(u) - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{|e| - 1}{|e|^2} x(v) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(u) - r(v)x(v) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Equation (3.1)

$$(A_G x)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(u). \quad (5.2)$$

Henceforth we will use  $A$  to denote the general adjacency operator of hypergraph instead of  $A_G$ , if there is no confusion about the hypergraph  $G$ .

In next three results we compute some eigenvalues and their eigenspaces of the general adjacency operator associated with some classes of hypergraphs.

**Remark 5.1.** We have seen that for some specific values of  $\delta_E$  and  $\delta_V$ , the diffusion operator coincides with some conventional operators. Similarly, if we choose  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|E|^2}{|e|-1}$  for all  $e \in E$  then our adjacency operator becomes the adjacency operator described in [2]. Therefore, all the theorems on adjacency operator, we are going to state in this subsection, also valid for the adjacency operator of [2].

**Theorem 5.2.** Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph. If  $e_0 \in E$  such that

- (i)  $e_0 = e_u \cup e_v$ , with  $e_u \cap e_v = \emptyset$ , and  $|e_u| \geq 2$ ,
- (ii)  $e \cap e_u = \emptyset$  for all  $e (\neq e_0) \in E$ ,
- (iii)  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in e_u$ ,

then  $-\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c|e_0|^2}$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity  $|e_0| - 1$ .



*Proof.* Suppose that  $e_u = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ . Corresponding to each  $u_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we define  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v = u_0, \\ -1 & \text{if } v = u_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Equation (5.2) we have  $(Ay_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u)$ . Now we are in position to observe the following facts.

- (a) For  $v = u_0$ , one has  $E_v = \{e_0\}$ . Therefore,  $(Ay_i)(u_0) = \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(u_0)} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq u_0} y_i(u)$ . Since  $y_i(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$  with  $v \neq u_0$  and  $v \neq u_i$ , evidently  $(Ay_i)(u_0) = \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(u_0)} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} y_i(u_i) = -\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} y_i(u_0)$ .
- (b) Similarly, for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , we have  $(Ay_i)(u_i) = \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(u_0)} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} y_i(u_0) = -\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} y_i(u_i)$ .
- (c) For all  $j \neq i$  and  $j \neq 0$ , evidently  $\sum_{u \in e; u \neq u_j} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E_{u_j}$ . Therefore,  $(Ay_i)(u_j) = 0$  for  $j \neq 0$  and  $j \neq i$ .
- (d) For all  $v \notin e_u$ ,  $\sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E$  and therefore,  $(Ay_i)(v) = 0$ .

Therefore,  $Ay_i = -\frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} y_i$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$  and. Evidently,  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is a linearly independent set and this can be proved similarly as we have done in the proof of Theorem 3.8. This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  is a hypergraph. If*

- (i) *there exists  $E_0 = \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_s\} \subset E$  such that  $W = \bigcap_{i=1}^s e_i$  and  $e \cap W = \emptyset$  for all  $e \in E \setminus E_0$ ,*
- (ii)  *$|W| \geq 2$  and  $W = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ ,*
- (iii)  *$\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in W$ , and  $\sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{c} \frac{1}{|e|^2} = \nu$ .*

*then  $-\nu$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$  we define a function  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v = v_0, \\ -1 & \text{if } v = v_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Equation (5.2) we have  $(Ay_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u)$ . Considering different cases we have the following facts.

- (a) By the condition 5.3,  $E_v = E_0$  for all  $v \in W$ . Therefore,  $(Ay_i)(v_i) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v_i)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v_i} y_i(u) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{\delta_V(u_i)} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} y_i(v_0) = -\sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{\delta_V(u_i)} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} y_i(u_i) = -\nu y_i(v_i)$  and  $(Ay_i)(v_0) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v_0)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v_0} y_i(u) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} y_i(v_i) = -\sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{c} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} y_i(u_i) = -\nu y_i(v_0)$ .
- (b) For  $j \neq i$ , and  $j \neq 0$ , one always has  $\sum_{u \in e; u \neq v_j} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E$  and thus  $(Ay_i)(v_j) = 0$ .
- (c) Note that  $y_i(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V \setminus W$  and for any  $e \in E$ , either both  $v_0, v_i$  belongs to  $e$  or none of them belongs to  $e$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{u \in e; u \neq v_j} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E$  and this leads us to  $(Ay_i)(v) = 0$  for all  $v \notin W$ .

It is clear from the above observations that  $-\nu$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$ . Since,  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is a linearly independent set and this can be proved similarly as we have done in the proof of Theorem 3.8, the multiplicity of  $-\nu$  is  $k = |W| - 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph with  $E_0 = \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subset E$  such that*

- (1)  *$W = \bigcap_{i=0}^k e_i \neq \emptyset$ , and  $W \cap e = \emptyset$  for all  $e \in E \setminus E_0$ ,*
- (2) *for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$  there exists a  $F_i \subset V$  such that  $e_i = W \cup F_i$  with  $|F_i| = t$  and  $F_i \cap W = \emptyset$  for all  $i$ ,*
- (3)  *$F_i \cap e = \emptyset$  for all  $e (\neq e_i) \in E$ ,*
- (4) *there exists  $c, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in \bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i$  and  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} = \omega$  for all  $e \in E_0$ .*

*then  $\frac{\omega}{c}(t-1)$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity at least  $|E_0| - 1$ .*

*Proof.* We define  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^V$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , as

$$y_i(v) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v \in F_0 \\ 1 & \text{if } v \in F_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Equation (5.2) we have  $(Ay_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)|e|^2} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u)$ . We now consider the following cases to prove the result.

- (a) Since  $E_v = \{e_j\}$ , for  $v \in F_j$ . Thus,  $(Ay_i)(v) = \frac{\delta_E(e_j)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_j|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u) = \frac{\delta_E(e_j)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_j|^2} (|F_j| - 1)y_i(v)$ .
- (b) Since  $E_v = E_0$  for all  $v \in W$ , therefore,  $(Ay_i)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_0} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u) = \frac{\delta_E(e_0)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_0|^2} (|F_0| - 1)(-1) + \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e_i|^2} (|F_i| - 1)(1) = \frac{\omega}{c}(1 - 1) = 0$ .
- (c) For any  $v \in V \setminus (W \cup (\bigcup_{i=0}^k F_i))$ , one has  $\sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} y_i(u) = 0$  for all  $e \in E_v$ . Therefore,  $(Ly_i)(v) = 0$ .

it follows from the above facts that  $\frac{\omega}{c}(t - 1)$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$ . Since  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^k$  are linearly independent, multiplicity of the eigenvalue is at least  $k = |E_0| - 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

**5.1. Complete Adjacency Spectra of Hyperflowers.** We have discussed the  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower in Definition 3.14. We have already provided the complete list of eigenvalues and their eigenspaces of the diffusion operator (and hence the Laplacian operator) associated with  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower. Now we are in position to describe the complete list of eigenvalues of the adjacency operator associated with the  $(l, 1)$ -hyperflower  $G = (V, E)$  with  $t$ -twins.

- (1) Suppose that for some  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $y_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is defined by

$$y_\gamma(v) = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } v \in W, \\ 1 & \text{if } v \in U, \end{cases}$$

where,  $V = U \cup W$  is the partition of the set of vertices, as described in Definition 3.14. If  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)|e|^2} = \alpha$  for all  $v \in V$  and for all  $e \in E$  then

$$(Ay_\gamma)(v) = \begin{cases} l\alpha(\gamma(|W| - 1) + t) & \text{if } v \in W, \\ \alpha(|W|\gamma + (t - 1)) & \text{if } v \in U. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, if  $\gamma$  is a root of

$$|W|x^2 + (t + l - l|W| - 1)x - lt = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

then  $y_\gamma$  is an eigenvector of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\alpha(|W|\gamma + (t - 1))$ . The two roots of Equation (5.3) is going to give us two eigenvalues of  $A$ .

- (2) By Theorem 5.2, If  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)|e|^2} = \alpha$  for all  $v \in V$  and for all  $e \in E$  then corresponding to the  $t$  twins of each hyperedge  $e \in E$ , one has  $-\alpha$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity at least  $t - 1$ , where  $\delta_V(v) = c$ , for all  $v \in e$ . Evidently for  $l$  edges, there is total  $l(t - 1)$  eigenvalues at least.
- (3) If  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in U$  and  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} = \mu$  for all  $e \in E$  then by Theorem 5.4, we have  $\frac{\mu}{c}(t - 1)$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity  $l(t - 1)$ .
- (4) If  $\delta_V(v) = c$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $\sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{c|e|^2} = \nu$ , then by Theorem 5.3,  $-\nu$  is an eigenvalue of  $A$  with multiplicity  $|W| - 1$ .
- (5) Since,  $(2 + l(t - 1) + (l - 1) + |W| - 1) = |V|$ , we have given above the complete list of eigenvalues of  $A$ .
- (6) Evidently if  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)|e|^2} = \alpha$  for all  $v \in V$  and for all  $e \in E$  then From the above observations, we have the determinant of  $A_G$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A_G) &= (-1)^{|V|-l-1} [(t - 1)^2 - |W|lt - (t - 1)(t - 1 - |W|l + l)] \alpha^{|V|} (t - 1)^{(l-1)} |E|^{|W|-1} \\ &= (-1)^{|V|-l-1} l [1 - (t + w)] \alpha^{|V|} (t - 1)^{(l-1)} |E|^{|W|-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if  $\alpha$  is an integer then  $\det(A)$  is an integer. For example, recall Example 2.7(1) in the framework considered in [22, 23], one has  $\alpha = 1$ .

In the following remark we discuss some results, involving the the adjacency operator  $A$ , which can be derived without much effort. Most of the result can be proved just by incorporating the operator  $A$  with some pre-existing techniques.

**Remark 5.5.** (1) If  $r$  is a constant function with  $r(v) = c$  for all  $v \in V$  then  $\mathbf{1}$  is an eigenvector of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $c$ .

(2) For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , one has

$$(Ax, y)_V = \sum_{\substack{u, v \in V; \\ u \neq v}} x(u)y(v) \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2}. \quad (5.4)$$

Since the right hand side of Equation (5.4) remain unaltered if we interchange  $x$  and  $y$ , one has  $(Ax, y)_V = (Ay, x)_V = (x, Ay)_V$ . Therefore,  $A$  is a self-adjoint operator.

(3) Corresponding to each  $v \in V$ , we define  $\chi_v \in \mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$\chi_v(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u = v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Evidently, using Equation (5.4) one has  $(A\chi_u, \chi_v)_V = \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2}$ . Therefore, the operator  $A$  induces a matrix  $B = (B_{uv})_{u, v \in V}$  of order  $|V|$  defined by

$$B_{uv} := \begin{cases} (A\chi_u, \chi_v)_V = \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} & \text{if } u \neq v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(4) Since  $A$  is self-adjoint,  $B$  is symmetric matrix. It is evident from Equation (5.2) that  $(AGx)(v) = \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} x(u) = \sum_{u \in V} \frac{1}{\delta_V(v)} \sum_{e \in E_v \cap E_u} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} x(u) = \sum_{u \in V} \frac{1}{\delta_V(v)} b_{vu} x(u) = \frac{1}{\delta_V(v)} (Bx)(v)$ . Thus for the pre-assigned inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_V$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , the matrix  $B$  can be directly deduced from the general adjacency operator  $A$ . Therefore, from now on we refer  $B$  as the induced adjacency matrix associated with the hypergraph  $G$ . If there is any scope of confusion regarding the hypergraph  $G$  then instead of  $B$  we use  $B_G$  to denote the induced adjacency matrix.

(5) (a) If  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$ , then the matrix  $B$  becomes the adjacency matrix of hypergraph given in [22, 23].  
 (b) If  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$ , then the matrix  $B$  coincides with the concept of adjacency matrix of hypergraph introduced in [2].

These facts motivates us to refer  $B$  as the induced adjacency matrix of the hypergraph and to incorporate the techniques used in [2] with the matrix  $B$ .

(6) Suppose that  $\mathfrak{P}_{uv}^n$  is the set of all path of length  $n$  connecting  $u, v \in V$ . For all  $p = ue_1v_1e_2 \dots e_nv \in \mathfrak{P}_{uv}^n$ , we define  $\mathfrak{E}(p) := \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_E(e_i)}{|e_i|^2}$ . One can prove it by using mathematical induction that the  $uv$ -th entry of the matrix  $B^n$  is  $B_{uv}^n = \sum_{p \in \mathfrak{P}_{uv}^n} \mathfrak{E}(p)$ . Therefore,  $B_{uv}^n > 0$  if and only if there exists a path  $ue_1v_1e_2 \dots e_nv$  from  $u$  to  $v$  of length  $n$ .

(7) Evidently,  $B_{uv} > 0$  if there exists a hyperedge  $e \in E$  such that  $u, v \in e$ . The matrix  $B$  induces an  $1, 0$ -matrix  $B_0$  defined by  $B_{0uv} = 0$  if  $B_{uv} = 0$  and otherwise  $B_{0uv} = 1$ . Note that  $B$  is actually the adjacency matrix of an unweighted graph  $G_0 = (V, E_0)$  defined by, for  $u, v \in V$  with  $u \neq v$ , there exists an edge  $\{u, v\} \in E_0$  if and only if there exists at least one hyperedge  $e \in E$  such that  $u, v \in e$ . The hypergraph  $G$  and the the graph  $G_0$  have similarity in connectivity, graph colouring etc. Moreover, if we impose an weight  $w_0 : E_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on  $G_0$ , where  $w_0$  is defined by  $w_0(\{u, v\}) = B_{uv}$ , then the adjacency matrix  $B$  of the hypergraph  $G$  is also the adjacency matrix of the weighted graph  $G_w = (V, E_0, w_0)$ .

(8) Proceeding with the same approach described in [5, p.26, Lemma 3.2] one can prove that if there exists  $u, v \in V$  such that the distance  $d(u, v) = l$  then  $I, B, B^2, \dots, B^l$  are linearly independent. The reason behind this fact is the  $(u, v)$ -th entry of the matrix  $B^l$  is non-zero whereas the same for  $I, B, B^2, \dots, B^{l-1}$  are zero. Note that there exists  $u, v \in V$  such that the diameter of  $G$ ,  $\text{diam}(G) = d(u, v)$ . Thus if  $\text{diam}(G) = k$ , then  $I, B, B^2, \dots, B^k$  are linearly independent. If there exists  $r$  distinct eigenvalues of  $B$  then the degree of the minimal polynomial of  $B$  is  $r$ . Thus there exists  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_r \in \mathbb{R}$ , not all zero, such that  $c_0I + c_1B + c_2B^2 + \dots + c_rB^r = 0$ . Thus  $I, B, B^2, \dots, B^r$  are linearly dependent and this leads us to if  $k \geq r$  then  $I, B, B^2, \dots, B^k$  are linearly dependent, which is a contradiction. Therefore, the diameter of the hypergraph  $G$  is less than the number of distinct eigenvalues of  $B$ . Similar bounds for the diameter of hypergraph is provided in [2, p.6, Proposition 2.1.].

(9) Let  $G(V, E)$  be a connected hypergraph with the minimum edge cardinality 3. An upper bound for  $\text{diam}(G)$  is given in terms of the adjacency matrix is provided in [2, p. 6, Theorem 2.2]. Since  $B$  is a symmetric matrix, the result also holds If the adjacency matrix is replaced by induced adjacency matrix  $B$ .

## 6. NORMALIZED LAPLACIAN OPERATOR

In Note 2.6, (1), (2), (3), we have mentioned that many conventional concepts of graph and hypergraph Laplacians are actually special cases of the generalized laplacian operator  $\mathcal{L}$ . However, this generalized laplacian

fails to be the generalization of some symmetrically normalized Laplacians. For example, the normalized laplacian matrix of hypergraphs given in [2, section-4, Equation-16] and the Laplacian given in [10, section-1.2]. In this section we are going to introduce and study a general normalized Laplacian  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ . Suppose that  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is an operator defined by  $(\gamma(x))(v) = (r(v))^{-\frac{1}{2}}x(v)$ . We define the general normalized Laplacian operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \gamma \circ \mathcal{L} \circ \gamma.$$

We listed below some observations on  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ .

- (1) For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $v \in V$  one has,  $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x))(v) = x(v) - \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} \sum_{u \in e; u \neq v} (r(u)r(v))^{-\frac{1}{2}}x(u)$ .
- (2) Evidently, 0 is an eigenvalue of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  and the dimension of eigenspace of 0 is the number of connected components of the hypergraph. The function  $\gamma(\mathbf{1}) \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is an eigenvector belongs to the eigenspace of 0.
- (3) Since  $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}x, x)_V = \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset e} (\gamma(x)(u) - \gamma(x)(v))^2$ , the operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  is positive semidefinite. Therefore, the fact  $(a - b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$  leads us to

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}x, x)_V \leq 2(x, x)_V. \quad (6.1)$$

- (4) For  $\delta_E(e) = \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$ , the operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  becomes the normalized Laplacian operator described in [2, Section-4, Equation-15]. If the hypergraph is graph,  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  becomes similar to the Laplacian given in [10, Section-1.2].
- (5) Consider the matrix  $M = (M_{uv})_{u,v \in V}$  defined by

$$M_{uv} = \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(v)} \frac{|e| - 1}{|e|^2} (r(u)r(v))^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Evidently,  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x) = (I_{|V|} - M)(x)$ . Therefore, if  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_{|V|}$  are the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  then

- (a) if the hypergraph  $G$  has no isolated vertex then  $\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} \mu_i = |V|$ ,
- (b) since  $\mu_1 = 0$ , one has  $\mu_2 \leq \frac{|V|}{|V|-1} \leq \mu_{|V|}$ ,
- (c) Equation (6.1) leads us to  $\mu_i \leq 2$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |V|$ .

## 7. APPLICATIONS

Now we focus on the applications of the connectivity operators introduced in this work. In this section we study some application of our work in some conventional abstract classes of hypergraphs and some real-world situations. Use of the different Laplacian matrices associated with graphs in discrete dynamical network, diffusion, synchronization, random walk, image processing are common in literature, see [4, 11, 16, 17, 19, 24] and references therein. However, replacing the underlying graph by hypergraph may lead to better result sometimes. Besides the conventional graph topology, some real-world networks need multi-body framework for better explanation. Indeed, incorporating hypergraph in proper way can accomplish the need of multi-body framework in many real-world situations.

**7.1. Spectra of the Power of a Graph.** Suppose that  $G(V, E)$  is a graph (that is 2-uniform hypergraph). For any  $k (\geq 3) \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $k$ -th power of  $G$ , denoted by  $G^k = (U, F)$  is a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph, defined by

$$U := V \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{e \in E} W_e^k \right\} \text{ where, } W_e^k := \{v_{ei} : i \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq k - 2\}, \text{ and } F := \{e^{(k)} = e \cup W_e^k : e \in E\}.$$

We refer the readers [15, Definition 2.4] for more details about the power of a graph. In a graph, a vertex  $v$  is said to be a pendant vertex if  $|E_v| = 1$ . Suppose that  $e$  is an edge of the graph  $G$ . Since  $f \cap W_e^k = \emptyset$  for all  $f (\neq e^{(k)}) \in F$ , one can use Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 5.2 to determine eigenvalues of the Laplacian operator and adjacency operator of  $G^k$ . Thus, we have the following result.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Suppose that  $G(V, E)$  is a graph (a 2-uniform hypergraph). For all  $k \geq 4$  and  $e \in E$ , If  $\delta_V(v) = c_e$  for all  $v \in W_e^k$  then the eigenvalues of the Laplacian and adjacency matrix of  $G^k$  are given below.*

- (1)  $\frac{\delta_E(e)}{c_e} \frac{1}{k}$  is an eigenvalue of the Laplacian operator associated to  $G^k$  with multiplicity  $k - 3$ .
- (2)  $-\frac{\delta_E(e^{(k)})}{c_e k^2}$  is an eigenvalue of the general adjacency matrix of multiplicity  $k - 3$ .

If  $e \in E$  contains a pendant vertex then instead of  $k - 3$ , the multiplicity is  $k - 2$ .

Note that, like we have done for most of the results of this article, here also one can compute the eigenvalues in a particular framework by choosing  $\delta_E, \delta_V$  appropriately. Since, we have already demonstrated the conversion of eigenvalues from the general to a particular framework in multiple occasions, we skip that discussion in this application section.

**7.2. Spectra of Squid.** A squid is a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  such that

$$V := \{v_0\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right) \text{ where, } U_i = \{u_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j \leq k\},$$

$$\text{and } E := \{U_i\}_{i=1}^{k-1} \cup \{\{v_0\} \cup e_0\} \text{ where, } e_0 = \{u_{i1} : 1 \leq i \leq k-1\}.$$

We refer  $\{v_0\} \cup e_0$  as a central hyperedge and all other hyperedge of squid as peripheral hyperedges. See [15] for more details about squid. Note that  $e \cap (U_i \setminus \{u_{i1}\}) = \emptyset$  for all  $e (\neq U_i) \in E$ . Therefore, using Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 5.2 we have the following result.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Suppose that  $G(V, E)$  is a  $k$ -uniform squid. For any peripheral hyperedge  $U_i$ , if  $\delta_V(v) = c_i$  for all  $v \in U_i$  then the eigenvalues of the general adjacency and Laplacian matrix of the squid is given below.*

- (1)  $\frac{\delta_E(U_i)}{c_i} \frac{1}{k}$  is an eigenvalue of the Laplacian operator associated to  $G^k$  with multiplicity  $k - 2$ .
- (2)  $-\frac{\delta_E(U_i)}{c_i k^2}$  is an eigenvalue of the general adjacency matrix of multiplicity  $k - 2$ .

**7.3. The network of disease propagation.** Multi-body interactions are crucial in disease propagation. In Past few years, using of hypergraphs made the disease propagation models more realistic, see [13]. Here the vertices of the hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  represents the individuals and hyperedges are the collection of individuals who are known to interact as a group. We summarize below the applicability of our work in this context.

- (1) If we set  $\delta_E(e) = \beta|e|^2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$  then according to the general infection model, provided in [13, p.6, Section-3.2.], a susceptible node  $v$  becomes infectious with rate  $(A_G(\bar{f}(x_t)))(v)$ . Here,  $x : V \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is a function where  $T$  is the domain of time and for any  $(v, t) \in V \times T$ , the functional value  $x(v, t)$  is denoted by  $x_t(v)$ . That is  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{+V}$  is defined as  $x_t(v) := x(v, t)$ . In addition, the function  $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  regulates the overall level of infectiousness of the disease and  $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R}^{+V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+V}$  is defined as  $\bar{f}(x) = \{f(x(v))\}_{v \in V}$ . Similar infection rate is reported also in [6]. Later in partitioned hypergraph model [13, p.6, Section-3.3.], the hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  is partitioned into  $K$  disjoint hypergraphs  $\{G_i(V_i, E_i)\}_{i=1}^K$ . According to this model the infection rate of the node  $v$  at time  $t$  is  $\sum_{i=1}^K A_{G_i}(\bar{f}_i(x_t))(v)$ , where the function  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  regulates the overall level of infectiousness of the disease in the  $i$ -th partition.
- (2) To study random infection rates, in [13, p.6, Section-4.], the mean field approximation approach is considered. According to that approach, the infection rate of node  $v$  at time  $t$  is  $(A_G(\bar{f}(P_t)))(v)$ , where  $p_t(v)$  is the probability of being node  $v$  is infected at time  $t$  and  $P_t := \{p_t(v)\}_{v \in V}$ .

**7.4. Dynamical network.** A *dynamical network* is a network of evolving *dynamical systems*. More precisely, a dynamical system is a system in which a function describes the evolution of a point in a geometric space with the flow of time. In a dynamical network, several dynamical systems are coupled through an underlying network in such a way that its neighbouring dynamical systems influenced the dynamics of each dynamical system. The underlying network may be a graph[17] or hypergraph[4, 9, 18]. To discuss Coupled dynamics on hypergraphs the adjacency operator  $A_G$  is used in [18, equation-(24),(27)] with  $\delta_E(e) = |e|^2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$ . In [4], the diffusion operator  $L_G$  is used with  $\delta_E(e) = w(e) \frac{|e|^2}{|e|-1}$  in order to discuss synchronization in dynamical networks on hypergraph. In [9, p. 3, Equation-3], one variant of the general Laplacian operator of hypergraph,  $\mathcal{L}$  is used in the model of dynamical systems on hypergraphs with  $\delta_E(e) = (|e| - 1)|e|^2$  and  $\delta_V(v) = 1$ . Considering the use of different variant of the diffusion operator  $L_G$  in different dynamical network with hypergraph topology, we can define a general discrete dynamical network model as

$$x_{n+1} = f(x_n) + \epsilon(L_G(g(x_n))), \quad (7.1)$$

where for any discrete time  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_n \in (\mathbb{R}^V)$  is the function such that  $x_n(v)$  is the state of the  $n$ -th node. Both  $f : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  are differentiable functions, regulating the dynamics of all the node. The positive real,  $\epsilon$  is the coupling strength. Similarly the continuous model can be defined as

$$\dot{x}_t = f(x_t) + \epsilon(L_G(g(x_t))), \quad (7.2)$$

where  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is such that  $x_t(v)$  is the state of the  $v$ -th node at time  $t$  and  $\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is defined by  $\dot{x}_t(v) = \frac{dx_t(v)}{dt}$ .

**7.5. Random walk on hypergraphs.** A random walk is a sequence of randomly taken successive steps by a walker in a mathematical space. If the mathematical space is the set of all the vertices  $V$  of a hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  then the random walk is referred as the random walk on the hypergraph. That is, a random walk on a hypergraph  $G(V, E)$  is a sequence of vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$  such that  $v_i$  is the  $i$ -th step of the random walk. The whole theory pivot around the *Transition probability*,  $(P_G)_{uv} = \text{prob}(v_{i+1} = v | v_i = u)$ , which is independent of  $i$  and depends on the underlying hypergraph. Since,  $\bigcup_{v \in V} \{(v_{i+1} = v | v_i = u)\}$  is a certain event,  $\sum_{v \in V} (P_G)_{uv} = 1$



for all  $u \in V$ . We can define  $P_{Guv}$  as

$$P_{Guv} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r(u)} \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(u)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} & \text{if } u \neq v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We summarise below some crucial observations.

- (1) Since,  $\sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(u)} \frac{1}{|e|^2} = \sum_{e \in E_u} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{\delta_V(u)} \frac{|e|-1}{|e|^2} = r(u)$ , one has  $\sum_{v \in V} (P_G)_{uv} = 1$ .
- (2) Suppose that there exists no isolated vertex in  $G$ . That is  $E_v \neq \emptyset$  for all  $v \in V$ . Therefore,  $r(v) \neq 0$  for all  $v \in V$  and this allow us to define the inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_R$  on  $\mathbb{R}^V$  as  $(x, y)_R := \sum_{u \in V} r(u) \delta_V(u) x(u) y(u)$ .

If  $\Delta = \mathcal{I} - P_G$ , where  $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is the identity operator on  $\mathbb{R}^V$ , then 0 is an eigenvalue of  $\Delta$  with eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ . Moreover,  $(\Delta x, y)_R = \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset V} \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} (x(u) - x(v))^2 \leq 2(x, y)_R$ . Therefore,  $\Delta$  is a positive semidefinite operator and all the eigenvalues of  $\Delta$  lies in  $[0, 2)$ . Thus, all the absolute values of all the eigenvalues of  $P_G$  lies in  $[0, 1]$ . Moreover, if the hypergraph  $G$  is connected then except the eigenvalue 0 corresponding to the eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ , the absolute value of all the eigenvalues of  $P_G$  lie in  $(0, 1)$ .

- (3) Note that  $(\Delta x, y)_R = \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset V} \sum_{e \in E_u \cap E_v} \frac{\delta_E(e)}{|e|^2} (x(u) - x(v))^2 = (\Delta y, x)_R = (x, \Delta y)_R$ . Thus,  $\Delta$  is self-adjoint. Therefore,  $P_G$  is self-adjoint.
- (4) Suppose that  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^V$  such that  $x_{n+1} = P_G(x_n)$  and the underlying hypergraph is connected. Evidently,  $x_{n+1} = P_G^n(x_1)$ . Since except the eigenvalue 0 corresponding to the eigenvector  $\mathbf{1}$ , the absolute value of all the eigenvalues of  $P_G$  lie in  $(0, 1)$ , by spectral decomposition,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$  is the projection of the initial state  $x_1$  along the vector  $\mathbf{1}$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \frac{(x_1, \mathbf{1})_R}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})_R}} \mathbf{1}$ .

Note that, the properties of general normalized Laplacian operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  suggest that we can replace  $\Delta$  by  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ .

We end this article with the following Remark.

**Remark 7.3.** Since  $\delta_V \in \mathbb{R}^{+V}$  and  $\delta_E \in \mathbb{R}^{+E}$ , there exists uncountable choices for  $\delta_E, \delta_V$ . Each choice is going to give us a framework for the operators associated to a hypergraph. Although some results (see Theorem 3.4, Corollary 3.7, Theorem 5.3, Theorem 3.11) imposes such conditions on  $\delta_V$ , that very few choices left for  $\delta_V$  but since very few conditions are imposed on  $\delta_E$ , one still has uncountable choices for  $\delta_E$ . Therefore, our results are valid for uncountable number of frameworks of operators. Two of these frameworks are common in literature and considered in [2] and [7, 22, 23].

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work of the author PARUI is supported by University Grants Commission, India (Beneficiary Code/Flag: BININ00965055 A). PARUI is sincerely thankful to Rajiv Mishra, Gargi Ghosh for fruitful discussions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. ANDREOTTI AND R. MULAS, *Spectra of signless normalized laplace operators for hypergraphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14484, (2020). [9](#)
- [2] A. BANERJEE, *On the spectrum of hypergraphs*, Linear Algebra Appl., 614 (2021), pp. 82–110. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [17](#), [18](#), [20](#)
- [3] A. BANERJEE, A. CHAR, AND B. MONDAL, *Spectra of general hypergraphs*, Linear Algebra Appl., 518 (2017), pp. 14–30. [1](#)
- [4] A. BANERJEE AND S. PARUI, *On synchronization in coupled dynamical systems on hypergraphs*, arXiv e-prints, (2020), pp. arXiv–2008. [3](#), [4](#), [12](#), [18](#), [19](#)
- [5] R. B. BAPAT, *Graphs and matrices*, Universitext, Springer, London; Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2010. [17](#)
- [6] A. BODÓ, G. Y. KATONA, AND P. L. SIMON, *SIS epidemic propagation on hypergraphs*, Bull. Math. Biol., 78 (2016), pp. 713–735. [19](#)
- [7] A. BRETTO, *Hypergraph theory*, An introduction. Mathematical Engineering. Cham: Springer, (2013). [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [7](#), [8](#), [20](#)
- [8] K. CARDOSO AND V. TREVISAN, *The signless laplacian matrix of hypergraphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00246, (2019). [3](#)
- [9] T. CARLETTI, D. FANELLI, AND S. NICOLETTI, *Dynamical systems on hypergraphs*, Journal of Physics: Complexity, 1 (2020), p. 035006. [19](#)
- [10] F. R. CHUNG AND F. C. GRAHAM, *Spectral graph theory*, no. 92, American Mathematical Soc., 1997. [18](#)



- [11] E. ESTRADA, ‘Hubs-repelling’ Laplacian and related diffusion on graphs/networks, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 596 (2020), pp. 256–280. [18](#)
- [12] M. FIEDLER, *Algebraic connectivity of graphs*, *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 23(98) (1973), pp. 298–305. [11](#)
- [13] D. J. HIGHAM AND H.-L. DE KERGORLAY, *Epidemics on hypergraphs: Spectral thresholds for extinction*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07319, (2021). [19](#)
- [14] C. J. HILLAR AND L.-H. LIM, *Most tensor problems are NP-hard*, *J. ACM*, 60 (2013), pp. Art. 45, 39. [1](#)
- [15] S. HU, L. QI, AND J.-Y. SHAO, *Cored hypergraphs, power hypergraphs and their Laplacian H-eigenvalues*, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 439 (2013), pp. 2980–2998. [9](#), [10](#), [18](#), [19](#)
- [16] J. JOST AND M. P. JOY, *Spectral properties and synchronization in coupled map lattices*, *Phys. Rev. E* (3), 65 (2002), pp. 016201, 9. [18](#)
- [17] N. MASUDA, M. A. PORTER, AND R. LAMBIOTTE, *Random walks and diffusion on networks*, *Phys. Rep.*, 716/717 (2017), pp. 1–58. [18](#), [19](#)
- [18] R. MULAS, C. KUEHN, AND J. JOST, *Coupled dynamics on hypergraphs: master stability of steady states and synchronization*, *Phys. Rev. E*, 101 (2020), pp. 062313, 6. [19](#)
- [19] J. L. PALACIOS, *Bounds on expected hitting times for a random walk on a connected graph*, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 141 (1990), pp. 241–252. [18](#)
- [20] L. QI AND Z. LUO, *Tensor analysis: spectral theory and special tensors*, SIAM, 2017. [1](#)
- [21] E. ROBEVA AND A. SEIGAL, *Duality of graphical models and tensor networks*, *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 8 (2019), pp. 273–288. [1](#)
- [22] J. RODRIGUEZ, *Laplacian eigenvalues and partition problems in hypergraphs*, *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 22 (2009), pp. 916–921. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [13](#), [16](#), [17](#), [20](#)
- [23] J. A. RODRIGUEZ, *On the laplacian spectrum and walk-regular hypergraphs*, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 51 (2003), pp. 285–297. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [16](#), [17](#), [20](#)
- [24] D. WOBROCK, *Image processing using graph laplacian operator*, 2019. [18](#)
- [25] W. ZHANG, L. LIU, L. KANG, AND Y. BAI, *Some properties of the spectral radius for general hypergraphs*, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 513 (2017), pp. 103–119. [1](#)