

# Weak Kantorovich difference and associated Ricci curvature of hypergraphs

Tomoya Akamatsu\*

## Abstract

Ollivier and Lin–Lu–Yau established the theory of graph Ricci curvature (LLY curvature) via optimal transport on graphs. Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara introduced a new distance called the Kantorovich difference on hypergraphs and generalized the LLY curvature to hypergraphs (IKTU curvature). As the LLY curvature can be represented by the graph Laplacian by Münch–Wojciechowski, Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara conjectured that the IKTU curvature has a similar expression in terms of the hypergraph Laplacian. In this paper, we introduce a variant of the Kantorovich difference inspired by the above conjecture and study the Ricci curvature associated with this distance (wKKTU curvature). Moreover, for hypergraphs with a specific structure, we analyze a quantity  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  at two distinct vertices  $x, y$  defined by using the hypergraph Laplacian. If the resolvent operator converges uniformly to the identity, then  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  coincides with the wKKTU curvature along  $x, y$ .

## 1 Introduction

A hypergraph is a natural generalization of a graph. A graph describes binary relations by connecting two vertices with an edge, while in a hypergraph, one can connect three or more vertices with a hyperedge. It is meaningful to study analysis on hypergraphs because hypergraphs can model higher-dimensional relationships, such as co-author networks. However, many methods used for graph analysis are based on the fact that an edge is composed of two vertices and often do not work for hypergraphs. Even if one could generalize concepts defined for graphs to general hypergraphs, it is in many cases more difficult to analyze them on hypergraphs than the case of graphs. In this paper, we study a generalization of Ricci curvature to hypergraphs, which has been actively studied in recent years as a tool to develop analysis and geometry on graphs.

Ricci curvature is one of the most important quantities in Riemannian geometry, and its generalization to discrete spaces has been studied widely in recent years. Although several types of discrete Ricci curvature were studied, including Forman-type and Bakry–Émery-type Ricci curvatures, in this paper, we study the *LLY curvature* defined between two vertices of a graph introduced by Ollivier [OI] and Lin–Lu–Yau [LLY]. The LLY curvature of edges can be regarded as a quantity that expresses the relative ease of heat transfer in graphs, and its applications to data analysis are attracting growing interest these days ([CDR, NLGGS, NLLG, SGT, SJB], and so on). Since hypergraphs can describe more general relationships than graphs, such quantities would also be useful for hypergraphs. The LLY curvature  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(x, y)$  along two vertices  $x, y$  is defined by comparing the graph distance  $d(x, y)$  between  $x$  and  $y$  with the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$  between the transition probability measures  $m_x^\lambda$  and  $m_y^\lambda$  at  $x, y$ . We note that the key ingredients in the definition of the LLY curvature, the transition probability measures and the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance, depend on the adjacency relation of vertices. Therefore, if we directly generalize the LLY curvature to hypergraphs, then we cannot distinguish hypergraphs from their *clique expansion graphs* (see Definition 2.1 for the definition). For this reason, generalizations of the LLY curvature to hypergraphs from different perspectives have been studied, e.g. from modified optimal transport problem on undirected or directed hypergraphs ([Ak, EJ]), from the multi-marginal optimal transport problems ([AGE]) and from the hypergraph Laplacian ([IKTU]). Here, the *hypergraph Laplacian*  $\mathcal{L}$  is a multi-valued operator introduced in Yoshida [Yo]. This operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is derived from the heat diffusion on hypergraphs (see also [HLGZ, Lo, LM]) and is applied to community detection ([IMTY, TMIY]). Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara [IKTU] used this hypergraph Laplacian to introduce a new distance function on the vertex set with a parameter  $\lambda > 0$ , which is called the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference.

**Definition 1.1** ( $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference, see Definition 2.14). Let  $\lambda > 0$ . For two vertices  $x, y$ , the function  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$  is defined by

$$\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) := \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}},$$

where  $J_\lambda f$  is the *resolvent operator* associated with the hypergraph Laplacian,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is the *weighted inner product* and

$$\text{Lip}_w^1(V) := \left\{ f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq d(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in V \right\}.$$

\*Department of Mathematics, Osaka University, Osaka 560-0043, Japan (u149852g@ecs.osaka-u.ac.jp)

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 51F30; Secondary 05C65, 05C12, 47H04.

Key words and phrases: Ricci curvature of hypergraphs, set-valued hypergraph Laplacian, weak Kantorovich difference, weak Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara curvature.

Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara compared  $d(x, y)$  with  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$  instead of  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$  to generalize the LLY curvature. We call their curvature the *IKTU curvature*  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$ . Moreover, we can derive geometric and analytic properties of hypergraphs under suitable conditions on the IKTU curvature such as gradient estimate, Lichnerowicz-type estimate and Bonnet–Myers-type estimate ([IKTU, Theorems 5.2, 5.1 and 5.3]). Because of its relevance with the hypergraph Laplacian, the IKTU curvature is suitable for analyzing the strength of the relationship between vertices. For this reason, in this paper, we will focus on the IKTU curvature.

The  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference and the IKTU curvature are new notions and not yet well understood compared with the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance and the LLY curvature. For example, it is difficult to calculate the IKTU curvature even for simple concrete hypergraphs. The following conjecture by Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara is one of the main motivations of our study ([IKTU, Remark 6.3]).

**Conjecture 1.2** (see Conjecture 3.5). *The IKTU curvature  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$  along  $x, y \in V$  coincides with*

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) := \frac{1}{d(x, y)} \inf_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}},$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^0$  is the canonical restriction of the hypergraph Laplacian (see Definition 3.2), which is a single-valued operator, and

$$\text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) := \left\{ f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V) \mid \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = d(x, y) \right\}.$$

A similar formula for graphs, i.e., an alternative expression of the LLY curvature via the graph Laplacian, was proved by Münch–Wojciechowski ([MW, Theorem 2.1]). One can derive the inequality  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \leq \mathcal{C}(x, y)$  from a direct calculation (see [KM, Lemma 2.11] and Proposition 3.6). On the other hand, the converse inequality  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \geq \mathcal{C}(x, y)$  is still open. We divide one of the sufficient conditions for affirmatively resolving Conjecture 3.5 into the following two ingredients:

- Uniform convergence of a kind of difference function  $\psi_\lambda f$  (see Conjecture 3.11),
- Restriction of the range of the supremum in the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference (see (3.6)).

In this paper, inspired by the second condition, we introduce the  *$\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich difference* by restricting the supremum in the definition of the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference as follows.

**Definition 1.3** ( $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich difference, see Definition 3.15). Let  $\lambda > 0$ . For two vertices  $x, y$ , we define the function  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  by

$$\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) := \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

Although it is unclear whether the  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich difference is always a distance function on the vertex set, from calculations for concrete hypergraphs and a comparison with the case of graphs, we expect that  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  coincides with  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$  for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ . In addition, our modification seems natural also from the view of the complementary slackness (Fact 3.19). As with the IKTU curvature, we define the curvature along  $x, y$  by comparing  $d(x, y)$  and  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  (Definition 3.20). We call it the *wIKTU curvature*  $\kappa(x, y)$ , and then we have  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \leq \kappa(x, y) \leq \mathcal{C}(x, y)$ . Moreover, the following relationship is obtained.

**Theorem 1.4** (see Theorem 3.21). *If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then the wIKTU curvature coincides with  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ .*

By the proof of Theorem 3.21, we know that if Conjecture 3.11 is true, then  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potentials of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  are minimizers of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  (Corollary 3.22).

It is difficult to calculate the IKTU curvature, and there are only a few concrete examples where it has been calculated ([IKTU, Examples 6.1 and 6.4]). On the other hand, the calculation of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  can be somewhat simpler than that of the IKTU curvature thanks to the following property.

**Theorem 1.5** (see Theorem 4.10 and Corollary 4.11). *Let  $E = \{e_V, e\}$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices. In addition, let  $x, y \in V$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ . If  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  or  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  holds for every  $v \in V$ . In particular, we have*

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min_{f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}},$$

where

$$\text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y) := \left\{ f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \text{ or } \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \text{ holds for all } v \in V \right\}.$$

By Theorem 1.5, we can restrict the values of  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  at vertices other than  $x, y$  to two types in hypergraphs with this structure. Hence, Theorem 1.5 reduces the computation of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  to a simple minimization problem. Although we restrict ourselves to specific hypergraphs as in Theorem 1.5, the properties we establish in Section 4 would have some generalizations to general hypergraphs. We believe that our arguments will be helpful for the further development of the theory of hypergraph Laplacian as well as IKTU and wIKTU curvatures.

This paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we review two types of discrete Ricci curvature, the LLY curvature of graphs and the IKTU curvature of hypergraphs. In [Subsection 3.1](#), we discuss [Conjecture 3.5](#) and the associated analysis. In [Subsection 3.2](#) and [Subsection 3.3](#), we introduce the weak Kantorovich difference and the wIKTU curvature, respectively. In [Subsection 4.1](#), we discuss several useful properties for calculating  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ . In [Subsection 4.2](#) and [Subsection 4.3](#), we describe concrete values of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  of 1-regular hypergraphs and hypergraphs consisting of 2 hyperedges, respectively. In [Section 5](#), we compute  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  for hypergraphs in [Subsection 4.3](#).

**Acknowledgements.** I would like to thank my supervisor Shin-ichi Ohta for his fruitful advice and discussions. I also would like to thank Yu Kitabepu for his valuable comments. The author is supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2138.

**Convention.** We denote the set of all positive and non-negative integers by  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{N} := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , respectively. For  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , denote by  $\lfloor a \rfloor$  the largest integer less than or equal to  $a$ , and by  $\lceil a \rceil$  the smallest integer greater than or equal to  $a$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly review the Ricci curvature of graphs in [\[LLY\]](#) ([Subsection 2.2](#)) and of hypergraphs in [\[IKTU\]](#) ([Subsection 2.3](#)).

### 2.1 Hypergraphs

We first review hypergraphs. A (*weighted*) *hypergraph*  $H = (V, E, w)$  is a triplet of a *vertex set*  $V$ , a *hyperedge set*  $E$  and a (*hyperedge*) *weight*  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . A hyperedge  $e \in E$  is a subset of  $V$ , called a (*self*-) *loop* if  $\#e = 1$  and an *edge* if  $\#e = 2$ . In particular, we call  $H$  a *graph* if  $\#e = 2$  holds for any  $e \in E$ . We denote  $w_e = w(e)$  for a hyperedge  $e \in E$ . We say that  $H$  has *multi-hyperedges* if different hyperedges  $e_1, e_2$  coincide as subsets of  $V$ . Our hypergraphs will have no multi-hyperedges, unless otherwise noted. In addition, our hypergraphs will be *finite*, i.e. the number of vertices is finite, and let  $\#V = n$ . We denote the set of all functions on the vertex set  $V$  by  $\mathbb{R}^V$  and identify it with the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space. For this reason, we often consider  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$  as a  $1 \times n$  matrix.

**Definition 2.1.** For a hypergraph  $H = (V, E, w)$ , we define the following:

- $x, y \in V$  are *adjacent* if there exists a hyperedge  $e$  such that  $x, y \in e$ , and the adjacency of  $x, y$  is denoted by  $x \sim y$ .
- We define the function  $d : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  as

$$d(x, y) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid x = v_0 \sim \dots \sim v_n = y\}.$$

In this paper, we will deal only with *connected* hypergraphs, i.e.  $d(x, y) < \infty$  holds for all  $x, y \in V$ . Then,  $d$  is a distance function on the vertex set  $V$ , so that we can consider a hypergraph  $H$  as a metric space  $(V, d)$ . This distance  $d$  is called the (*hyper*)*graph distance*.

- For  $v \in V$ , define  $E_v := \{e \in E \mid v \in e\}$ .
- The *weighted degree*  $d_v$  of  $v \in V$  is defined as  $d_v := \sum_{e \in E_v} w_e$ .
- The *diameter*  $\text{diam}(H)$  of  $H$  is defined as  $\text{diam}(H) := \max_{x, y \in V} d(x, y)$ .
- The *volume*  $\text{vol}(H)$  of  $H$  is defined as  $\text{vol}(H) := \sum_{v \in V} d_v$ .
- The *clique expansion graph* associated with  $H$  is the graph  $G = (V, E_G)$ <sup>1</sup> such that  $(x, y) \in E_G$  if and only if  $x \neq y$  and  $(x, y) \in e$  for some  $e \in E$ . We remark that the clique expansion graphs of different hypergraphs can coincide.

### 2.2 Ricci curvature of graphs

Let  $G = (V, E, w)$  be a (weighted) finite graph<sup>2</sup>. We first define the transition probability measure at each vertex. We denote the set of all probability measures on  $V$  by  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ .

**Definition 2.2.** For each vertex  $x \in V$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , we define a probability measure  $m_x^\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(V)$  as follows:

$$m_x^\lambda(y) := \begin{cases} 1 - \lambda & (y = x), \\ \lambda \cdot \frac{w_{xy}}{d_x} & (y \sim x), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

<sup>1</sup>We do not define a weight of a clique expansion since its definition is not unique.

<sup>2</sup>Since we consider only finite hypergraphs in this paper, our graphs will also be finite throughout the discussion of graphs.

The LLY curvature along vertices  $x, y$  is defined by comparing the graph distance  $d(x, y)$  between  $x$  and  $y$  and the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance between the transition probability measures  $m_x^\lambda$  and  $m_y^\lambda$  at them.

**Definition 2.3** ( $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance). We define the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance  $W_1(\mu, \nu)$  between  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(V)$  as

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{v \in V} f(v)(\mu(v) - \nu(v)) \mid f \in \text{Lip}^1(V) \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\text{Lip}^1(V)$  is the set of all 1-Lipschitz functions on  $(V, d)$ .

**Remark 2.4.** The  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance  $W_1$  is originally defined by the minimization of the transport cost and equality (2.1) holds by the Kantorovich–Rubinstein duality of  $W_1$ . In this paper, we do not discuss optimal transport theory and will utilize the form of (2.1) later on, so we defined  $W_1$  by (2.1).

**Definition 2.5** (Lin–Lu–Yau curvature of graphs [LLY]). The LLY curvature  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(x, y)$  along two vertices  $x, y$  is defined as

$$\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(x, y) := \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( 1 - \frac{W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)}{d(x, y)} \right).$$

The limit in the right-hand side exists.

### 2.3 Ricci curvature of hypergraphs

In this subsection, we explain how to generalize the LLY curvature of graphs to hypergraphs. As discussed in Subsection 2.2, the definition of the LLY curvature of graphs uses  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$ , i.e. the transition probability measures and the optimal transport cost on graphs. However, on the one hand, random walks and optimal transport problem on hypergraphs are nontrivial; especially it is difficult to distinguish a hypergraph with its clique expansion from these respects. On the other hand, via the *graph Laplacian*

$$\Delta : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V; \quad \Delta f(x) := \frac{1}{d_x} \sum_{y \sim x} w_{xy}(f(x) - f(y)),$$

we have a deformation

$$W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda) = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}^1(V)} \langle (I - \lambda \Delta) f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}^1(V)} \langle (I + \lambda \Delta)^{-1} f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle + o(\lambda), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $I : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is the identity operator,  $\delta_x \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is the characteristic function at  $x \in V$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the canonical inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^V$ , i.e.

$$\delta_x(v) := \begin{cases} 1 & (v = x), \\ 0 & (v \neq x), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle := \sum_{v \in V} f_1(v) f_2(v).$$

We focus on the main term of (2.2) to consider the limit  $\lambda \downarrow 0$  in the study of the LLY curvature  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(x, y)$ . On a hypergraph, Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara [IKTU] utilized this idea to give an appropriate modification of  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$ , and the function on  $V \times V$  thus obtained is a distance function on a hypergraph. This new distance function on a hypergraph is called the *Kantorovich difference*. Then, the LLY curvature is generalized to hypergraphs by comparing the Kantorovich difference to the (hyper)graph distance.

#### 2.3.1 Kantorovich difference

First, we recall the definition of the hypergraph Laplacian and its basic properties to define the Kantorovich difference. We refer to [IKTU] for further details.

**Definition 2.6** (Weighted inner product). We define the *weighted inner product*  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D^{-1}} : \mathbb{R}^V \times \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the *norm*  $\| \cdot \|_{D^{-1}} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{D^{-1}} := \sum_{v \in V} \frac{f(v)g(v)}{d_v}, \quad \|f\|_{D^{-1}} := \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle_{D^{-1}}}.$$

Note that  $(\mathbb{R}^V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D^{-1}})$  is a Hilbert space. We define the base polytope of a hyperedge for the definition of the hypergraph Laplacian.

**Definition 2.7** (Base polytopes of hyperedges). For a hyperedge  $e$ , we define its *base polytope*  $B_e \subset \mathbb{R}^V$  as

$$B_e := \text{Conv}(\{\delta_x - \delta_y \mid x, y \in e\}),$$

where  $\text{Conv}(A)$  is the *convex hull* of  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^V$  in  $\mathbb{R}^V$ .

**Definition 2.8** (Hypergraph Laplacian). We define the (*normalized*) *hypergraph Laplacian* by the multi-valued operator

$$\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{R}^V}; \quad \mathcal{L}f = \mathcal{L}(f) := \left\{ \sum_{e \in E} w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e(f) \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_e(f) \mid \mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\}$$

on the Hilbert space  $(\mathbb{R}^V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D^{-1}})$ .

This hypergraph Laplacian is derived from the Laplacian introduced in a more general framework in [Yo] (see also [LM]).

**Remark 2.9** (Nonlinearity). Note that, on the one hand, we do not necessarily have  $\mathcal{L}(f_1 + f_2) = \mathcal{L}(f_1) + \mathcal{L}(f_2)$  for  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{R}^V$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{L}(cf) = c\mathcal{L}(f)$  holds for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$  from the definition.

It is known that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a *maximal monotone operator* on the Hilbert space  $(\mathbb{R}^V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D^{-1}})$ , which implies the following.

**Proposition 2.10** ([Mi, Lemma 2.15]). *For all  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ ,  $\mathcal{L}f \subset \mathbb{R}^V$  is closed and convex.*

**Definition 2.11** (Resolvent). For  $\lambda > 0$ , we define the *resolvent operator*  $J_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{R}^V}$  as

$$J_\lambda f = J_\lambda(f) := (I + \lambda \mathcal{L})^{-1}(f).$$

**Proposition 2.12** ([IKTU, Lemma 2.1]). *The operator  $J_\lambda$  is single-valued and continuous. Moreover,  $\mathcal{L}$  is the subdifferential of the convex function*

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \quad f \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} w_e \max_{x, y \in e} \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2,$$

and it follows that (see also [KM, Remark 2.4]):

$$J_\lambda f = \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^V} \left\{ \frac{\|f - g\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{2\lambda} + \mathcal{E}(g) \right\}.$$

**Definition 2.13** (Weighted 1-Lipschitz function). We say that  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$  is *weighted 1-Lipschitz* if it satisfies  $\langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq d(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in V$ . We denote the set of all weighted 1-Lipschitz functions on  $V$  by  $\text{Lip}_w^1(V)$  and define its subset  $\widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)$  as

$$\widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V) := \left\{ f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V) \mid \max_{v \in V} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq \text{diam}(H) \right\}.$$

**Definition 2.14** ( $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference). Let  $\lambda > 0$ . We define the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$  between two vertices  $x, y$  as

$$\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) := \sup_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}. \quad (2.3)$$

There exists  $f_\lambda \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)$  attaining the supremum in the right-hand side for any  $\lambda > 0$  ([IKTU, Proposition 3.7]). Then  $f_\lambda$  is called a  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich potential of  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$ . We remark that a  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich potential is not always unique.

**Proposition 2.15** ([IKTU, Propositions 3.5 and 3.3]). *For any  $\lambda > 0$ , the following hold:*

- (1) *The  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference is a distance function on  $V$ .*
- (2) *The supremum in the right-hand side of (2.3) is unchanged when we restrict  $\widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)$  to  $\widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)$ .*

### 2.3.2 Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara curvature

**Definition 2.16** (Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara curvature of hypergraphs [IKTU]). The *IKTU curvature*  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$  along two vertices  $x, y$  is defined as

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) := \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( 1 - \frac{\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)}{d(x, y)} \right).$$

The limit in the right-hand side exists ([IKTU, Theorem A.1]).

The LLY curvature and the IKTU curvature coincide for graphs.

**Theorem 2.17** ([IKTU, Proposition 4.1]). *When  $H$  is a graph,  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(x, y) = \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$  holds for any vertices  $x, y$ .*

### 3 Weak Kantorovich difference and associated Ricci curvature

In this section, we propose a restriction on the range of the supremum in the definition of the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich difference. We first introduce a conjectured alternative expression of the IKTU curvature.

#### 3.1 Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara’s conjecture

**Definition 3.1.** For  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , we define

$$\|\mathcal{L}f\|_{D^{-1}} := \inf_{f' \in \mathcal{L}f} \|f'\|_{D^{-1}}.$$

The above infimum is attained for any  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$  by [Proposition 2.10](#), and the minimizer is unique. This allows us to restrict  $\mathcal{L}$  into a single-valued operator.

**Definition 3.2** (Canonical restriction of  $\mathcal{L}$ ).  $\mathcal{L}^0 : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  defined by  $\mathcal{L}^0(f) = \mathcal{L}^0 f \in \mathcal{L}f$  and  $\|\mathcal{L}^0 f\|_{D^{-1}} = \|\mathcal{L}f\|_{D^{-1}}$  is called the *canonical restriction* of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Fact 3.3** ([\[Mi, Lemma 2.22 and Theorem 3.5\]](#)).  $\mathcal{L}^0 f$  can also be represented as

$$\mathcal{L}^0 f = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{f - J_\lambda f}{\lambda}. \quad (3.1)$$

**Definition 3.4.** For two vertices  $x, y$ , we define the subset  $\text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) \subset \text{Lip}_w^1(V)$  as

$$\text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) := \left\{ f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V) \mid \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = d(x, y) \right\}.$$

Furthermore, we also define

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) := \frac{1}{d(x, y)} \inf_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara conjectured that the following formula holds for the IKTU curvature.

**Conjecture 3.5** (Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara’s conjecture [\[IKTU, Remark 6.3\]](#)). *For any  $x, y \in V$ , it holds that*

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) = \mathcal{C}(x, y).$$

When  $H$  is a graph, we know that a similar relationship holds for the LLY curvature and the graph Laplacian ([\[MW, Theorem 2.1\]](#)).

One can see by direct computation the following.

**Proposition 3.6** (see also [\[KM, Lemma 2.11\]](#)). *For any  $x, y \in V$ , we have*

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \leq \mathcal{C}(x, y).$$

*Proof.* Notice that, by replacing  $f$  with  $f - f(y)$ , we can restrict the range of the infimum of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  to

$$\widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y) := \left\{ f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V) \mid \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = d(x, y) \right\}.$$

Combining this with [\(3.1\)](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y)\mathcal{C}(x, y) &= \inf_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \left\langle \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{f - J_\lambda f}{\lambda}, \delta_x - \delta_y \right\rangle_{D^{-1}} \\ &= \inf_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{d(x, y) - \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{d(x, y) - \langle J_\lambda g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \quad \left( g \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y) : \text{a minimizer} \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( d(x, y) - \sup_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \quad (3.3) \\ &\geq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( d(x, y) - \sup_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \\ &= d(x, y)\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that the limit in [\(3.3\)](#) exists (see [Subsection 3.3](#)). □



The other inequality

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \geq \mathcal{C}(x, y) \quad (3.4)$$

is open. Now, we have a closer look into (3.2) and (3.3).

**Definition 3.7.** For  $\lambda > 0$  and  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , we define  $\psi_\lambda f \in \mathbb{R}^V$  by  $\psi_\lambda f(v) := (f(v) - J_\lambda f(v)) - \mathcal{L}^0 f(v) \cdot \lambda$ .

Note that  $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \psi_\lambda f(v)/\lambda = 0$  holds by (3.1).

**Lemma 3.8.** Let  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V)$ . For any  $x, y \in V$ , we have

$$\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) = \sup_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \left\{ \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda - \langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* The claim follows from direct computations:

$$\langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \left\{ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda + \langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

□

Using (3.5), we can rewrite (3.2) and (3.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} (3.2) &= \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( d(x, y) - \left\{ \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda - \langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\} \right) \\ &= \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left\{ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \right\}, \\ (3.3) &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( d(x, y) - \sup_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \left\{ \langle f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda - \langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\} \right) \\ &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \left\{ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.9.** Let  $f_\lambda$  be a  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich potential of  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$ . Then,  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is a constant for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$  thanks to [IKTU, Proposition A.4].

**Notation 3.10.** We denote the constant given in Remark 3.9 by  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$ : For sufficiently  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) := \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

We expect the following to hold.

**Conjecture 3.11.** For any  $x, y \in V$ , it holds that

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} = \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \quad (= 0).$$

If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$  can be estimated from below by  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$ .

**Proposition 3.12.** If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then for any  $x, y \in V$ , we have

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \geq \frac{\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)}{d(x, y)}.$$

*Proof.* Using (3.5), we can estimate as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} &d(x, y) \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \\ &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left\{ d(x, y) - \left( \langle f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda - \langle \psi_\lambda f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \right\} \\ &\geq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \lambda + \langle \psi_\lambda f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left( \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) + \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V)} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \\ &= \mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Conjecture 3.11})$$

where  $f_\lambda$  is a  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich potential of  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$ . □

By combining this with [Proposition 3.6](#),  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$  is estimated from above and below as follows.

**Corollary 3.13.** *If [Conjecture 3.11](#) is true, then for any  $x, y \in V$ , we have*

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)}{d(x, y)} \leq \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \leq \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{d(x, y)} \quad \left( = \mathcal{C}(x, y) \right).$$

Hence, if  $f_\lambda \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ , then [Conjecture 3.5](#) is true.

**Theorem 3.14.** *If [Conjecture 3.11](#) is true and for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ ,*

$$\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) = \sup_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \quad (3.6)$$

*holds, then [Conjecture 3.5](#) is true.*

*Proof.* If (3.6) holds, then by the definition of  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)$ , we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y)}{d(x, y)} \geq \inf_{f \in \widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{d(x, y)}.$$

Thus, we conclude that [Conjecture 3.5](#) is true. □

### 3.2 Weak Kantorovich difference

Now, we consider a modification of the Kantorovich difference by restricting the range of the supremum as in (3.6), based on the discussion in [Subsection 3.1](#).

**Definition 3.15** ( $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich difference). Let  $\lambda > 0$ . We define the  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich difference  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  between two vertices  $x, y$  as

$$\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) := \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) \geq \text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  holds by definition. One can restrict the range of the supremum of the right-hand side of (3.7) to  $\widehat{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)$  from the same proof as that for [\[IKTU, Proposition 3.3\]](#).

**Proposition 3.16.** *The following hold:*

- (1)  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) \geq 0$  holds for any  $\lambda > 0$  and  $x, y \in V$ . Moreover, for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) = 0$  holds if and only if  $x = y$ .
- (2)  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) = \text{wKD}_\lambda(y, x)$  holds for any  $\lambda > 0$  and  $x, y \in V$ .
- (3)  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, z) \leq \text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) + \text{wKD}_\lambda(y, z)$  holds for any  $\lambda > 0$  and  $x, y, z \in V$  with  $d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ .

*Proof.*

- (1) By definition, we have  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) \geq 0$  and  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, x) = 0$  for any  $x, y \in V$ . Moreover, if  $x \neq y$ , then  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) > 0$  holds for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$  since  $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} J_\lambda f = f$  implies  $\langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} > 0$  for  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ . Since  $V$  is finite, we can choose  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) > 0$  for all  $x, y \in V$  with  $x \neq y$ .
- (2) This is trivial by the definition.
- (3) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a function  $f_{xz} \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, z)$  such that

$$\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, z) \leq \langle J_\lambda f_{xz}, \delta_x - \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \varepsilon = \langle J_\lambda f_{xz}, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \langle J_\lambda f_{xz}, \delta_y - \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \varepsilon.$$

Now, since  $f_{xz} \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) \cap \text{Lip}_w^1(V; y, z)$  by the assumption, we find

$$\langle J_\lambda f_{xz}, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq \text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y), \quad \langle J_\lambda f_{xz}, \delta_y - \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq \text{wKD}_\lambda(y, z).$$

Thus,  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, z) \leq \text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y) + \text{wKD}_\lambda(y, z)$  holds since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary. □

It is unclear whether the weak Kantorovich difference always satisfies the triangle inequality.

**Proposition 3.17.** *For any  $\lambda > 0$  and  $x, y \in V$ , there exists a function  $f_\lambda \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  which attains the supremum of the right-hand side of (3.7).*

*Proof.* This follows from the same proof as that for [\[IKTU, Proposition 3.7\]](#). □



We call this  $f_\lambda \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  a  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potential of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$ .

We finally discuss the validity of the definition of the weak Kantorovich difference in respect of its relation to the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance on graphs. Let us first recall the relation between the Kantorovich difference and the  $L^1$ -Wasserstein distance.

**Fact 3.18** (see (2.2), [IKTU, Equation (4.2)]). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. Then we have, as  $\lambda \downarrow 0$ ,

$$W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda) = \text{KD}_\lambda(x, y) + o(\lambda).$$

Furthermore, for the range of the supremum in the right-hand side in (2.1), the following is known.

**Fact 3.19** (The complementary slackness [BCLMP, Lemma 3.1]). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph,  $x, y \in V$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Then, any maximizer  $f_\lambda^{W_1} \in \text{Lip}^1(V)$  attaining  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$  satisfies

$$f_\lambda^{W_1}(x) - f_\lambda^{W_1}(y) = d(x, y).$$

Although there is not a clear relation between the potentials  $f_\lambda^{W_1}$  for  $W_1(m_x^\lambda, m_y^\lambda)$  and  $f_\lambda$  for  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$ , we expect that the  $\lambda$ -Kantorovich potential  $f_\lambda$  satisfies  $f_\lambda \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ , namely the Kantorovich difference and the weak Kantorovich difference coincide. This observation motivated our introduction of the weak Kantorovich difference  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$ . In addition, the weak Kantorovich difference has the merit of better computability than the Kantorovich difference.

### 3.3 wIKTU curvature

We conclude this section by defining the wIKTU curvature associated with the weak Kantorovich difference.

**Definition 3.20** (Weak Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara curvature of hypergraphs). We define the *weak Ikeda–Kitabeppu–Takai–Uehara curvature* (wIKTU curvature)  $\kappa(x, y)$  along two vertices  $x, y$  as

$$\kappa(x, y) := \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( 1 - \frac{\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)}{d(x, y)} \right).$$

The limit in the right-hand side exists by the same proof as that for [IKTU, Theorem A.1]. By the same discussion as [IKTU, Proposition 4.1], thanks to Fact 3.19, the LLY curvature and the wIKTU curvature coincide for graphs. Note that from the relation between  $\text{KD}_\lambda(x, y)$  and  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$ , for any two vertices  $x, y$ ,

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) \leq \kappa(x, y). \quad (3.8)$$

Notice that if (3.6) holds, then this inequality becomes equality, that is,  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(x, y) = \kappa(x, y)$  holds.

By the discussion in Subsection 3.1, we can show an analogue of Conjecture 3.5 provided that Conjecture 3.11 is true.

**Theorem 3.21.** *If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then for any  $x, y \in V$ , it holds that*

$$\kappa(x, y) = \mathcal{C}(x, y).$$

*Proof.* We note that  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potentials of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  have the same property as Remark 3.9. Thus, for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ , we can denote  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  by a constant  $\mathcal{K}(x, y)$  that does not depend on  $\lambda$  as with Notation 3.10. Then, on the one hand, in the same way as Proposition 3.12, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y)\kappa(x, y) &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left( \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left( \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \inf_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V)} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{K}(x, y) + \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \inf_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V)} \frac{\langle \psi_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \\ &= \mathcal{K}(x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Conjecture 3.11}) \quad (3.9)$$

where  $f_\lambda \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)$  is a  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potential of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$ .

On the other hand, by the same proof as that for Proposition 3.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y)\mathcal{C}(x, y) &= \inf_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{d(x, y) - \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \\ &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{d(x, y) - \langle J_\lambda g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\lambda} \quad \left( g \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y) : \text{a minimizer} \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( d(x, y) - \sup_{f \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle J_\lambda f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \\ &= d(x, y)\kappa(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}(x, y)}{d(x, y)} \stackrel{(3.9)}{\leq} \kappa(x, y) \stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} \mathcal{C}(x, y) = \inf_{f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)} \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{d(x, y)}$$

and these inequalities are in fact equality since  $f_\lambda \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.22.** *If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potentials of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  are minimizers of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ . Precisely, we have*

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \frac{\mathcal{K}(x, y)}{d(x, y)} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f_\lambda, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{d(x, y)},$$

where  $f_\lambda \in \widetilde{\text{Lip}}_w^1(V; x, y)$  is a  $\lambda$ -weak Kantorovich potential of  $\text{wKD}_\lambda(x, y)$  for sufficiently small  $\lambda > 0$ .

## 4 Calculations of $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ of some hypergraphs

In this section, we calculate  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  for several types of hypergraphs. Recall that as discussed in Theorem 3.21, if Conjecture 3.11 is true,  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  coincides with  $\kappa(x, y)$ .

We first review the LLY curvature and the IKTU curvature of some concrete examples. We adopt the following notation.

**Notation 4.1.** Let  $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . For a hypergraph  $H$ , we denote  $\kappa(H) = \kappa_0$  if  $\kappa(x, y) = \kappa_0$  holds for any two distinct vertices  $x, y$ . The same convention applies to  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}$ ,  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ .

First recall the LLY curvature of two simple graphs.

**Example 4.2** ([LLY, Examples 1 and 2]). For the unweighted complete graph  $K_n$  and the unweighted cycle graph  $C_n$  with  $n$  vertices, we have

$$\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(K_n) = \frac{n}{n-1}, \quad \kappa_{\text{LLY}}(C_n) = \begin{cases} 3 - \frac{n}{2} & (n = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), \\ 0 & (n \geq 6). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, when  $G$  is an unweighted graph,  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(G) > 1$  holds if and only if  $G$  is a complete graph.

As seen in Example 4.2,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LLY}}(K_n) = 1$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LLY}}(C_n) = 0$  hold. Thus, it is also expected that the curvature of a characteristic hypergraph converges as the number of vertices diverges. We will calculate  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  of 1-regular hypergraphs (while it seems difficult to calculate that of cycle hypergraphs).

**Definition 4.3.** A hypergraph  $H$  is 1-regular if every vertex has only one hyperedge including it. Notice that 1-regular hypergraphs are unique up to the difference of weights since our graphs are connected in this paper. We denote a 1-regular hypergraph with  $n$  vertices by  $R_{n,1}$ .

**Example 4.4** ([IKTU, Examples 6.1 and 6.4]). For the unweighted 1-regular hypergraph  $R_{3,1}$  and the unweighted complete hypergraph  $KH_3$  with 3 vertices, we have  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{3,1}) = \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(KH_3) = 3/2$ .

For the limit of unweighted complete hypergraphs, we know the following.

**Fact 4.5** ([IKTU, Example 6.5]). For an unweighted complete hypergraph  $KH_n$  with  $n$  vertices and its vertices  $x, y$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(x, y) \leq n/(n-1)$  holds. Therefore, we find  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(KH_n) \leq 1$ .

On the other hand, we show that the following holds for the limit of 1-regular hypergraphs.

**Proposition 4.6** (see Subsection 4.2).

- (1)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{n,1}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(R_{n,1}) \leq 0$ .
- (2) If Conjecture 3.11 is true, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(R_{n,1}) = 0$ .

For an unweighted hypergraph  $H$  and its vertices  $x, y$ , it seems reasonable to expect that heat can move from  $x$  to  $y$  most easily when  $H$  is complete, while it becomes harder as the number of vertices increases when  $H$  is 1-regular, i.e.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(KH_n) > \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{n,1})$ . Moreover, when  $H$  is 1-regular, it is unlikely that  $\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{n,1}) < 0$  even if the number of vertices is very large, and thus we expect  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{n,1}) = 0$  to hold.

In the rest of this paper, we focus on  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  of the following hypergraphs:

- 1-regular hypergraphs (Subsection 4.2),
- Hypergraphs satisfying  $e_V \in E$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices, with 2 hyperedges (Subsection 4.3).

#### 4.1 Preparations for calculation

We often use the following properties in our calculations.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Take  $e \in E$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V)$  satisfying  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} > 0$ . For  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e$ , we define  $\mathbf{b}^+, \mathbf{b}^- \subset V$  as*

$$\mathbf{b}^+ := \{v \in V \mid \mathbf{b}(v) > 0\}, \quad \mathbf{b}^- := \{v \in V \mid \mathbf{b}(v) < 0\},$$

*respectively. Then, for any  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , we have*

$$\sum_{v \in \mathbf{b}_e^+(f)} \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) = 1, \quad \sum_{v \in \mathbf{b}_e^-(f)} \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) = -1. \quad (4.1)$$

*In particular, if  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1$ , then we have*

$$\sum_{v \in \mathbf{b}_e^+(f)} w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e(f) \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) = w_e, \quad \sum_{v \in \mathbf{b}_e^-(f)} w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e(f) \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) = -w_e. \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* We represent  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  by  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) = \sum_i a_i (\delta_{p_i} - \delta_{q_i})$  where  $p_i, q_i \in V$ ,  $a_i > 0$  for any  $i$  and  $\sum_i a_i = 1$ . Then, we have

$$\langle f, \mathbf{b}_e(f) \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \sum_i a_i \left( \langle f, \delta_{p_i} \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \langle f, \delta_{q_i} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \leq \left( \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) \sum_i a_i = \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

Therefore, by  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , we obtain  $p_i \in \arg \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $q_i \in \arg \min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . Hence, (4.1) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $E = \{e_V, e\}$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices. In addition, let  $x, y, z \in V$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ .*

- (1) *If  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $E_z = E_x$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .*
- (2) *If  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $E_z = E_y$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .*
- (3) *If  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .*
- (4) *If  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .*

*Proof.* Notice the following:

- Since  $e_V$  includes all vertices and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ , we have

$$\langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \max_{v \in V} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \min_{v \in V} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}. \quad (4.3)$$

- By the definition of  $\mathcal{L}$ , for any  $f' \in \mathcal{L}f$ , there exists some  $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  such that  $f' = w_{e_V} \mathbf{b}_1 + w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_2 \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_2$ .

In the following discussion, we denote  $\mathcal{L}^0 f = w_{e_V} \mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) + w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e(f) \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_e(f)$ , where  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .

- (1) Assuming  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} \neq \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , we derive a contradiction to the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^0$  by showing that there exists  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{L}f$  such that

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{D^{-1}} < \|\mathcal{L}^0 f\|_{D^{-1}}. \quad (4.4)$$

We define  $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}_e(f)} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)}(v) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(x) + \mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(z)}{2} & (v = x, z), \\ \mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(v) & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}_e(f)}(v) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{b}_e(f)(x) + \mathbf{b}_e(f)(z)}{2} & (v = x, z), \\ \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

respectively. Then,  $\tilde{f} := w_{e_V} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)} + w_e \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e \rangle_{D^{-1}} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}_e(f)}$  satisfies  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{L}f$  by the hypotheses and

$$\langle \tilde{f}, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{2} & (v = x, z), \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the inequality (4.4) holds. Indeed,  $\|\mathcal{L}^0 f\|_{D^{-1}}^2 > \|\tilde{f}\|_{D^{-1}}^2$  holds since we have  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} \neq \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $a^2 + b^2 > 2\{(a+b)/2\}^2$  for any real numbers  $a \neq b$ .

(2) This follows from the same proof as that for (1).

(3) Since we proved the case of  $E_z = E_x$  in (1), we consider the case of  $E_z \neq E_x$ , in other words, either  $x \in e$  and  $z \notin e$  or  $x \notin e$  and  $z \in e$ .

**The case  $z \in e$  and  $x \notin e$ :** We set

$$\alpha := \min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \quad \beta := \langle f, \mathbf{b}_e \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \alpha \quad (\in [0, 1]).$$

By (4.3), it is sufficient to consider the following cases:

(A)  $y \in e$ .

(B)  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .

(C)  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha \in (\langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}})$ .

(D)  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .

(A) The case  $y \in e$ :

- **Step 1.** To illustrate the behavior of heat transfer, it is sufficient to consider the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} P_x &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\} \quad (\ni x), \\ Q &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\}, \\ R_z &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \in e \right\} \quad (\ni z), \\ S_y &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \in e \right\} \quad (\ni y). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and (1) and (2) above,  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  are represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(v) := \begin{cases} p & (v \in P_x), \\ -q & (v \in Q), \\ r & (v \in R_z), \\ -s & (v \in S_y), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) := \begin{cases} 0 & (v \in P_x), \\ 0 & (v \in Q), \\ t & (v \in R_z), \\ -u & (v \in S_y), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

where  $p, q, r, s, t, u \in [0, 1]$ . Note that we have

$$\begin{cases} \#P_x \cdot p + \#R_z \cdot r = 1, \\ \#Q \cdot q + \#S_y \cdot s = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \#R_z \cdot t = 1, \\ \#S_y \cdot u = 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

- **Step 2.** We calculate  $p$  and  $r$ . We have  $\beta = 1$  and

$$\mathcal{L}^0 f = w_{e_V} \mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) + w_e \mathbf{b}_e(f) = \begin{cases} w_{e_V} \cdot p & (v \in P_x), \\ -w_{e_V} \cdot q & (v \in Q), \\ w_{e_V} \cdot r + w_e \cdot t & (v \in R_z), \\ -w_{e_V} \cdot s - w_e \cdot u & (v \in S_y). \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2 := \sum_{v \in P_x \cup R_z} \frac{\mathcal{L}^0 f(v)^2}{d_v}, \quad \|\mathcal{L}^0 f^-\|_{D^{-1}}^2 := \sum_{v \in Q \cup S_y} \frac{\mathcal{L}^0 f(v)^2}{d_v}.$$

Since  $r = (1 - \#P_x \cdot p) / \#R_z$  and  $t = 1 / \#R_z$  by (4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2 &= \sum_{v \in P_x} w_{e_V} \cdot p^2 + \sum_{v \in R_z} \frac{(w_{e_V} \cdot r + w_e \cdot t)^2}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \\ &= \#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p^2 + \frac{\#R_z}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \left( w_{e_V} \cdot \frac{1 - \#P_x \cdot p}{\#R_z} + w_e \cdot \frac{1}{\#R_z} \right)^2 \\ &= \#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p^2 + \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \left\{ -\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p + (w_{e_V} + w_e) \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{dp} &= 2\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p + \frac{2}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \left\{ -\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p + (w_{e_V} + w_e) \right\} (-\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V}) \\
&= 2\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \left( p - \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \left\{ -\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \cdot p + (w_{e_V} + w_e) \right\} \right) \\
&= 2\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \left\{ \left( 1 + \frac{\#P_x}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{w_{e_V}}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \right) p - \frac{1}{\#R_z} \right\} \\
&= \frac{2\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V}}{\#R_z(w_{e_V} + w_e)} \left( \{ \#R_z(w_{e_V} + w_e) + \#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \} p - (w_{e_V} + w_e) \right) \\
&= \frac{2\#P_x \cdot w_{e_V} \{ (\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e \}}{\#R_z(w_{e_V} + w_e)} \left( p - \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \right). \tag{4.6}
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.5), we find  $p \in [0, 1/\#P_x]$ . Now, we consider the following cases separately:

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \leq \frac{1}{\#P_x} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#P_x \cdot w_e \leq \#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e \right), \tag{4.7}$$

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} > \frac{1}{\#P_x} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#P_x \cdot w_e > \#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e \right). \tag{4.8}$$

- **Step 3.** We show that if (4.7) holds, then  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . By (4.6) and (4.7),

$$p = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \quad \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#P_x} \right] \right).$$

Then, we obtain

$$r = \frac{1}{\#R_z} \left\{ 1 - \#P_x \cdot \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \right\} = \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{\#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#R_z - \#P_x)w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e}$$

and  $r \in [0, 1/\#R_z]$  by (4.5). Hence, we obtain  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  since

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} &= \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot r + w_e \cdot t}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \left\{ w_{e_V} \cdot \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{\#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#R_z - \#P_x)w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} + w_e \cdot \frac{1}{\#R_z} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \cdot \frac{\{ \#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#R_z - \#P_x)w_e \} w_{e_V} + \{ (\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e \} w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \\
&= \frac{1}{w_{e_V} + w_e} \cdot \frac{w_{e_V}^2 + 2w_{e_V}w_e + w_e^2}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} \\
&= p = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

- **Step 4.** We show that if  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then (4.8) cannot hold. Precisely, assuming (4.8), we shall show that there exists  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  such that

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}. \tag{4.9}$$

\* First, we calculate  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . In the case (4.8), since  $d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2/dp < 0$  by (4.6), we find  $(p, r) = (1/\#P_x, 0)$ .

– If  $Q = \emptyset$ , then we find  $(q, s) = (0, 1/\#S_y)$ . Moreover,  $u = 1/\#S_y$  holds by (4.5). Thus, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot s + w_e \cdot u}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{1}{\#S_y}. \tag{4.10}$$

– If  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then a similar calculation to **Step 2** yields

$$\frac{d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^-\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{dq} = \frac{2\#Q \cdot w_{e_V} \{ (\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e \}}{\#S_y(w_{e_V} + w_e)} \left( q - \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e} \right). \tag{4.11}$$

By (4.5), similarly to (4.7) and (4.8), we consider the following cases:

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e} \leq \frac{1}{\#Q} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#Q \cdot w_e \leq \#S_y \cdot w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e \right), \quad (4.12)$$

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e} > \frac{1}{\#Q} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#Q \cdot w_e > \#S_y \cdot w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e \right). \quad (4.13)$$

In the case (4.12), we observe

$$q = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e}, \quad s = \frac{1}{\#S_y} \cdot \frac{\#S_y \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#S_y - \#Q)w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e}, \quad u = \frac{1}{\#S_y}$$

by (4.11) and (4.5). Therefore, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot s + w_e \cdot u}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#S_y)w_{e_V} + \#S_y \cdot w_e}. \quad (4.14)$$

In the case (4.13), since  $d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2/dq < 0$  holds by (4.11), we have  $(q, s) = (1/\#Q, 0)$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + \frac{w_e \cdot u}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{1}{\#S_y} \cdot \frac{w_e}{w_{e_V} + w_e}. \quad (4.15)$$

\* Next, we construct  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  satisfying (4.9). We define  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  by

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(y) & (v \in e), \\ f(v) & (v \notin e). \end{cases}$$

By the definition of  $g$ , for any  $\mathbf{b}_e(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $v \in V$ , we have

$$\langle g, \mathbf{b}_e(g) \rangle_{D^{-1}} \mathbf{b}_e(g)(v) = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

By (1) and (2),  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_{e_V}} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g)(v) := \begin{cases} p' & (v \in P_x), \\ -q' & (v \in Q), \\ -s' & (v \in e), \end{cases}$$

where  $p', q', s' \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, we find  $p' = 1/\#P_x$ .

– If  $Q = \emptyset$ , then we have  $(q', s') = (0, 1/\#e)$ . Thus, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p' + \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot s'}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{\#e(w_{e_V} + w_e)}. \quad (4.17)$$

– If  $Q \neq \emptyset$ , then we have

$$q' = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#Q + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \quad \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#Q} \right] \right), \quad s' = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \quad \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#e} \right] \right)$$

in the same way as **Step 2**. Thus, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p' + \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot s'}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#Q + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e}. \quad (4.18)$$

\* Finally, we show that (4.9) holds.

– If  $Q = \emptyset$ , then (4.10) > (4.17) holds.

– If  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and (4.12) holds, then (4.14) > (4.18) holds by  $\#S_y < \#e$  since  $z \in e$ .

– If  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and (4.13) holds, then (4.15) > (4.18) holds. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & w_e \left\{ (\#Q + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e \right\} - w_{e_V} \cdot \#S_y(w_{e_V} + w_e) \\ &= (\#Q + \#e - \#S_y)w_{e_V}w_e + \#e \cdot w_e^2 - \#S_y \cdot w_{e_V}^2 \\ &\geq (\#Q + \#R_z)w_{e_V}w_e + \#e \cdot w_e^2 - \#S_y \cdot w_{e_V}^2 \\ &> \#S_y(w_{e_V} + w_e)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_{e_V}w_e + \#e \cdot w_e^2 - \#S_y \cdot w_{e_V}^2 \quad (\text{by (4.13)}) \\ &= (\#S_y + \#R_z)w_{e_V}w_e + \#e \cdot w_e^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$



Therefore, we obtain (4.9).

This completes the proof of the case of **(A)**. ■

**(B)** The case  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ : We discuss similarly to **(A)**. By  $\alpha = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , for any  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $v \in V$ , we have  $\beta = 0$ . Hence, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\} \quad (\ni x), \\ \mathbf{Q}_y &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\} \quad (\ni y), \end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(v) := \begin{cases} p & (v \in \mathbf{P}_x), \\ -q & (v \in \mathbf{Q}_y), \\ r & (v \in e), \end{cases}$$

where  $p, q, r \in [0, 1]$ . Thus, we have  $q = 1/\#\mathbf{Q}_y$ . Moreover, as in **(A)**, we observe

$$p = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \quad \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{P}_x} \right] \right), \quad r = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \quad \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#e} \right] \right).$$

This implies that

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V} \cdot r}{w_{e_V} + w_e} = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} = p = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

This completes the proof of the case of **(B)**. ■

**(C)** The case  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha \in \left( \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right)$ : In this case, we need to consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\} \quad (\ni x), \\ \mathbf{Q}_y &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \notin e \right\} \quad (\ni y), \\ \mathbf{R}_z &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}}, v \in e \right\} \quad (\ni z), \\ \mathbf{S} &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \alpha, v \in e \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  are represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f)(v) := \begin{cases} p & (v \in \mathbf{P}_x), \\ -q & (v \in \mathbf{Q}_y), \\ r & (v \in \mathbf{R}_z), \\ 0 & (v \in \mathbf{S}), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_e(f)(v) := \begin{cases} 0 & (v \in \mathbf{P}_x), \\ 0 & (v \in \mathbf{Q}_y), \\ t & (v \in \mathbf{R}_z), \\ -u & (v \in \mathbf{S}), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

where  $p, q, r, t, u \in [0, 1]$ . Note that  $q = 1/\#\mathbf{Q}_y$ ,  $t = 1/\#\mathbf{R}_z$ ,  $u = 1/\#\mathbf{S}$  and  $\beta = \langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Then, since we have  $\mathcal{L}^0 f = w_{e_V} \mathbf{b}_{e_V}(f) + \beta w_e \mathbf{b}_e(f)$ , by a similar calculation to **(A)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^+\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{dp} &= \frac{d}{dp} \sum_{v \in \mathbf{P}_x \cup \mathbf{R}_z} \frac{\mathcal{L}^0 f(v)^2}{d_v} \\ &= \frac{2\#\mathbf{P}_x \cdot w_{e_V} \{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#\mathbf{R}_z)w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e\}}{\#\mathbf{R}_z(w_{e_V} + w_e)} \left( p - \frac{w_{e_V} + \beta w_e}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#\mathbf{R}_z)w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Therefore, we consider the following cases:

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + \beta w_e}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#\mathbf{R}_z)w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e} \leq \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{P}_x} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \beta \#\mathbf{P}_x \cdot w_e \leq \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e \right), \quad (4.20)$$

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + \beta w_e}{(\#\mathbf{P}_x + \#\mathbf{R}_z)w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e} > \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{P}_x} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \beta \#\mathbf{P}_x \cdot w_e > \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_{e_V} + \#\mathbf{R}_z \cdot w_e \right). \quad (4.21)$$

We show that if (4.20) or (4.21) holds, then there exists  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  satisfying (4.9) to conclude that  $f$  cannot be a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ .

\* First, we calculate  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  in each case.

– If (4.20) holds, then by (4.19), we find

$$p = \frac{w_{e_V} + \beta w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e}, \quad r = \frac{1}{\#R_z} \cdot \frac{\#R_z \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#R_z - \beta \#P_x)w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + q = \frac{w_{e_V} + \beta w_e}{(\#P_x + \#R_z)w_{e_V} + \#R_z \cdot w_e} + \frac{1}{\#Q_y}. \quad (4.22)$$

– If (4.21) holds, then by (4.19), we find  $(p, r) = (1/\#P_x, 0)$ . Thus, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + q = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{1}{\#Q_y}. \quad (4.23)$$

\* Next, we define  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  by

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(z) & (v \in e), \\ f(v) & (v \notin e). \end{cases}$$

By the definition of  $g$ , for any  $\mathbf{b}_e(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in B_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $v \in V$ , we have (4.16). Moreover,  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in B_{e_V}} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g)(v) := \begin{cases} p' & (v \in P_x), \\ -q' & (v \in Q_y), \\ s' & (v \in e), \end{cases}$$

where  $p', q', s' \in [0, 1]$ . Then, by the same calculation as **Step 2** in **(B)**, we obtain  $q' = 1/\#Q_y$  and

$$p' = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#P_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#P_x} \right] \right), \quad s' = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#P_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#e} \right] \right).$$

Hence,

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p' + q' = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#P_x + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} + \frac{1}{\#Q_y}. \quad (4.24)$$

\* Finally, we show that (4.9) holds.

– In the case (4.20), we have (4.22) > (4.24) by  $\beta > 0$  and  $\#R_z < \#e$ .

– In the case (4.21), we have (4.23) > (4.24) by  $\#e > 0$ .

Therefore, we obtain (4.9).

This completes the proof of the case of **(C)**. ■

**(D)** The case  $y \notin e$  and  $\alpha = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ : We have  $\beta = 1$ . As in **(C)**, we consider  $P_x, Q_y, R_z, S$ . Therefore, as in **Step 4** of **(A)**, it is sufficient to show that assuming (4.8), there exists  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  satisfying (4.9).

\* First, we calculate  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . By a similar calculation to (4.11), we have

$$\frac{d\|\mathcal{L}^0 f^-\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{dq} = \frac{2\#Q_y \cdot w_{e_V} \{ (\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e \}}{\#S(w_{e_V} + w_e)} \left( q - \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e} \right).$$

Then, we consider the following cases:

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e} \leq \frac{1}{\#Q_y} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#Q_y \cdot w_e \leq \#S \cdot w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e \right), \quad (4.25)$$

$$\bullet \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e} > \frac{1}{\#Q_y} \quad \left( \Leftrightarrow \#Q_y \cdot w_e > \#S \cdot w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e \right). \quad (4.26)$$

– In the case (4.25), we observe

$$q = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e}, \quad s = \frac{1}{\#S} \cdot \frac{\#S \cdot w_{e_V} + (\#S - \#Q_y)w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e}.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + q = \frac{1}{\#P_x} + \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#Q_y + \#S)w_{e_V} + \#S \cdot w_e}. \quad (4.27)$$

– In the case (4.26), we find  $(q, s) = (1/\#\mathbf{Q}_y, 0)$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p + q = \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{P}_x} + \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{Q}_y}. \quad (4.28)$$

\* Next, we construct  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  satisfying (4.9). We define  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  by

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(y) & (v \in e), \\ f(v) & (v \notin e). \end{cases} \quad (4.29)$$

By the definition of  $g$ , for any  $\mathbf{b}_e(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $v \in V$ , we have (4.16). By (1) and (2),  $\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is represented by

$$\mathbf{b}_{e_V}(g)(v) := \begin{cases} p' & (v \in \mathbf{P}_x), \\ -q' & (v \in \mathbf{Q}_y), \\ -s' & (v \in e), \end{cases}$$

where  $p', q', s' \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, we have  $p' = 1/\#\mathbf{P}_x$  and

$$q' = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#\mathbf{Q}_y + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{Q}} \right] \right), \quad s' = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(\#\mathbf{Q}_y + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \left( \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{\#e} \right] \right)$$

in the same way as **Step 2** in **(A)**. Thus, we obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = p' + q' = \frac{1}{\#\mathbf{P}_x} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{(\#\mathbf{Q}_y + \#e)w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e}. \quad (4.30)$$

\* Finally, we show that (4.9) holds.

- In the case (4.25), it holds that (4.27) > (4.30) by  $\#\mathbf{S} < \#e$  since  $z \notin \mathbf{S}$ .
- In the case (4.26), it holds that (4.28) > (4.30) by  $\#e > 0$ .

Therefore, we obtain (4.9).

This completes the proof of the case of **(D)**. ■

**The case  $z \notin e$  and  $x \in e$ :** This follows from a similar proof to that of the case  $z \in e$  and  $x \notin e$ .

- (4) This case can be reduced to (3). Indeed, if  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then  $-f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(y, x) = \mathcal{C}(x, y)$ . □

Although it is unknown under what weight conditions [Theorem 4.8](#) holds for general hypergraphs, we expect it to be true for at least unweighted hypergraphs.

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $E = \{e_V, e\}$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices. In addition, let  $x, y \in V$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ . If  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then*

$$\min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{ \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{0, 1\}.$$

*Proof.* In the case  $x, y \in e$ , we clearly have the assertions with  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1$ .

Assume  $x \notin e$  or  $y \notin e$ . We remark that by the proof of [Theorem 4.8\(3\)](#), if  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  and there exists  $z \in e$  such that  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , then  $\min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \notin (\langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}})$ , in particular  $\min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{ \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \}$  and  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Similarly, if there exists  $z \in e$  such that  $\langle f, \delta_z \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , then  $\max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{ \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \}$  and  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that assuming  $\langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \leq \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , there exists  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . Note that by assumption and [Theorem 4.8\(1\)\(2\)](#), we have  $x, y \notin e$  and

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}\}} + \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}\}}.$$

We define  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  as in (4.29). Then, by a similar calculation to (4.30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} &= \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}\}} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{\left( \#\{v \in V \setminus e \mid \langle g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle g, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}\} + \#e \right) w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}\}} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{\left( \#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}\} + \#e \right) w_{e_V} + \#e \cdot w_e} \\ &< \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}\}} + \frac{1}{\#\{v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}\} + \#e}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  holds. □

**Theorem 4.10.** Let  $E = \{e_V, e\}$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices. In addition, let  $x, y \in V$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ . If  $f$  is a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ , then  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  or  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  holds for every  $v \in V$ .

*Proof.* For  $x, y \in V$  and  $f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$ , we consider the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} P_x(f) &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, E_v = E_x \right\} \quad (\ni x), \\ Q_y(f) &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, E_v = E_y \right\} \quad (\ni y), \\ R_x(f) &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, E_v \neq E_x \right\}, \\ S_y(f) &:= \left\{ v \in V \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, E_v \neq E_y \right\}, \\ V_0(f) &:= V \setminus (P_x(f) \cup Q_y(f) \cup R_x(f) \cup S_y(f)). \end{aligned}$$

We show that if  $V_0(f) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $f$  is not a minimizer of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ . Assume that  $V_0(f) \neq \emptyset$ . Then, we have  $\mathcal{L}^0 f(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V_0(f)$  by [Corollary 4.9](#). Therefore, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}^0 f\|_{D^{-1}}^2 &= \sum_{v \in V} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 = \sum_{v \in P_x(f) \cup R_x(f)} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \sum_{v \in Q_y(f) \cup S_y(f)} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \left( \sum_{v \in P_x(f) \cup R_x(f)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \left( \sum_{v \in Q_y(f) \cup S_y(f)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 \quad (\text{by Theorem 4.8}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that by [Lemma 4.7](#) and [Corollary 4.9](#), we have

$$\sum_{v \in P_x(f) \cup R_x(f)} \mathcal{L}^0 f(v) = w_{e_V} \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#P_x(f) \cdot d_x + \#R_x(f) \cdot d^x}, \quad \text{where } d^x := \begin{cases} w_{e_V} & (x \in e), \\ w_{e_V} + w_e & (x \notin e). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, notice that the following hold:

- $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0$  if and only if  $\min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} \in \{ \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \}$ .
- $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1$  if and only if  $\min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} < \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ .

We define  $g \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y)$  by

$$\langle g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} & (v \in V_0(f)), \\ \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} & (v \notin V_0(f)). \end{cases}$$

By the definition of  $g$ , we have  $P_x(g) \cup R_x(g) = P_x(f) \cup R_x(f) \cup V_0(f)$ ,  $Q_y(g) = Q_y(f)$ ,  $S_y(g) = S_y(f)$  and  $V_0(g) = \emptyset$ . Moreover, we have  $\max_{v \in e} \langle g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \max_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\min_{v \in e} \langle g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \min_{v \in e} \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . Note that by the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^0$ ,  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  holds for all  $v \in Q_y(g) \cup S_y(g)$ . In addition, by [Theorem 4.8\(1\)\(2\)](#),  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  is constant on  $P_x(g)$  and  $R_x(g)$ . We denote these values by  $\langle \mathcal{L}_{P_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  and  $\langle \mathcal{L}_{R_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ , respectively. Then, since we observe

$$\bullet \sum_{v \in P_x(g) \cup R_x(g)} \mathcal{L}^0 g(v) = w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \quad (4.31)$$

$$\bullet \sum_{v \in P_x(g) \cup R_x(g)} \mathcal{L}^0 g(v) = \sum_{v \in P_x(g) \cup R_x(g)} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \left( \sum_{v \in P_x(g)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}_{P_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \left( \sum_{v \in R_x(g)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}_{R_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \\ = \#P_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{P_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} + \#R_x(g) \cdot d^x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{R_x}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}, \quad (4.32)$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{L}^0 g\|_{D^{-1}}^2 &= \sum_{v \in \mathbb{P}_x(g) \cup \mathbb{R}_x(g)} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_y(g) \cup \mathbb{S}_y(g)} d_v \langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \left( \sum_{v \in \mathbb{P}_x(g)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \left( \sum_{v \in \mathbb{R}_x(g)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \left( \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_y(f) \cup \mathbb{S}_y(f)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2 + \#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x \cdot \left\{ \frac{\left( w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) - \#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \right\}^2 \\
&\quad + \left( \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Q}_y(f) \cup \mathbb{S}_y(f)} d_v \right) \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\|\mathcal{L}^0 g\|_{D^{-1}}^2}{d\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}} &= 2\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \frac{2\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x}{\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \cdot \left\{ \left( w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right) - \#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \right\} \\
&= 2\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \left\{ \left( 1 + \frac{\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x}{\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \right) \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \right\} \\
&= \frac{2\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x \cdot \left( \#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x + \#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x \right)}{\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \cdot \left\{ \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} - \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x + \#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \right\}. \tag{4.33}
\end{aligned}$$

**Claim.**

$$\mathbb{T} := \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x + \#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} \in [0, 1].$$

**Proof of Claim.** By  $\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \geq 1$  since  $x \in \mathbb{P}_x(g)$ , it is clear that if  $d_x = w_{e_V} + w_e$ , then  $\mathbb{T} \in [0, 1]$ . Assume that  $d^x = w_{e_V} + w_e$ . If  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0$ , then by  $\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{T} \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle g, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1$ , then by the definition of  $g$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_x(g) \geq 1$ , thus,  $\mathbb{T} \in [0, 1]$ . ■

By (4.33), **Claim** and the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^0 g$ , we find  $\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{P}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \mathbb{T}$ . Moreover, by (4.31) and (4.32), we also find  $\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \mathbb{T}$ . Hence, we have  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \mathbb{T}$  and  $\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ . Here, by  $\mathbb{V}_0(f) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) > \#\mathbb{P}_x(f)$  or  $\#\mathbb{R}_x(g) > \#\mathbb{R}_x(f)$  holds. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{L}^0 g, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} &= \mathbb{T} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{P}_x(g) \cdot d_x + \#\mathbb{R}_x(g) \cdot d^x} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \\
&< \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}}{\#\mathbb{P}_x(f) \cdot d_x + \#\mathbb{R}_x(f) \cdot d^x} - \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 4.11.** Let  $E = \{e_V, e\}$ , where  $e_V$  is a hyperedge including all vertices, and  $x, y \in V$ . Then, we have

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min_{f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}},$$

where

$$\text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y) := \left\{ f \in \text{Lip}_w^1(V; x, y) \mid \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} \text{ or } \langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} \text{ holds for all } v \in V \right\}.$$

For simplicity in the following discussion, we define as follows.

**Definition 4.12** (Flow). For given  $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , we call the steepest gradient  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  on each hyperedge  $e$  the *flow* on  $e$  induced by  $f$ .

**Notation 4.13.** In the following, we represent the flow of the steepest gradient  $\mathbf{b}_e(f)$  by the symbol of an arrow from  $\mathbf{b}_e^+(f)$  to  $\mathbf{b}_e^-(f)$ . For instance, in case we set  $\mathbf{b}_e(f) = (\delta_x + \delta_y)/2 - \delta_v$  in  $e = \{x, y, z, v\}$ , then this flow is represented by

$$\{x, y\} \rightarrow \{v\}.$$

## 4.2 1-regular hypergraphs

In this subsection, we calculate  $\mathcal{C}(R_{n,1})$ .

**Example 4.14.**

$$\mathcal{C}(R_{n,1}) = \frac{n}{\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor}. \quad (4.34)$$

*Proof.* Let  $V = \{x, y, v_1, \dots, v_{n-2}\}$  be the vertex set of  $R_{n,1}$ . Notice that since [Theorem 4.8](#) and [Corollary 4.9](#) also hold for hypergraphs with  $e = e_V$ , in particular, 1-regular hypergraphs, [Corollary 4.11](#) also holds for 1-regular hypergraphs.

Suppose that a flow of  $f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)$  on  $e_V$  is represented by

$$\{x, \underbrace{\dots, v_i, \dots}_{I \text{ times}}\} \rightarrow \{y, \underbrace{\dots, v_j, \dots}_{J \text{ times}}\},$$

where  $I, J \in \mathbb{N}_0$  satisfying  $I + J = n - 2$ . Then, by [\(4.2\)](#) and [Theorem 4.8](#), we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + I\mathcal{L}^0 f(v_i) = w_{e_V}, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + J\mathcal{L}^0 f(v_j) = -w_{e_V}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{1}{I+1}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = -\frac{1}{J+1}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we find

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min_{f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x - \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \min_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=n-2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{I+1} + \frac{1}{J+1} \right\} = \frac{n}{\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor}.$$

□

**Remark 4.15.** By [Example 4.14](#),  $\kappa(R_{2,1}) = 2$  holds. Moreover, since  $R_{2,1}$  is a (weighted) complete graph  $K_2$ ,  $\kappa_{\text{LLY}}(K_2) = \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{2,1})$  holds by [\[IKTU, Proposition 4.1\]](#). Therefore, we obtain  $\kappa(R_{2,1}) = \kappa_{\text{LLY}}(K_2) = \kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{2,1}) = 2$  by [Example 4.2](#). In addition, note that the (hyper)edge weight do not affect these curvatures in the case  $\#E = 1$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.6.*

(1) By the previous discussion, we obtain

$$\kappa_{\text{IKTU}}(R_{n,1}) \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} \kappa(R_{n,1}) \stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} \mathcal{C}(R_{n,1}) \stackrel{(4.34)}{=} \frac{n}{\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

(2) This follows from [Theorem 3.21](#) and (1).

□

## 4.3 Hypergraphs satisfying $e_V \in E$ with 2 hyperedges

In this subsection, we list the calculation results of  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  of hypergraphs obtained by adding one hyperedge to a 1-regular hypergraph. We denote the hyperedge that includes all vertices by  $e_V$ , and the other hyperedge by  $e$ . According to the relationship between the added hyperedge  $e$  and  $x, y \in V$ , we calculate  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  in the three types of hypergraphs [Figure 1](#), [Figure 2](#) and [Figure 3](#). Here, we set  $A, B \in \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $A + B \geq 1$ ,  $V = \{x, y, p_1, \dots, p_A, q_1, \dots, q_B\}$  with  $n = A + B + 2 (\geq 3)$  and  $A \geq 1$  in [Figure 3](#).




Figure 1:  $e = \{x, y, p_1, \dots, p_A\}$ .




Figure 2:  $e = \{x, p_1, \dots, p_A\}$ .




Figure 3:  $e = \{p_1, \dots, p_A\}$ .

**Example 4.16.**  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  in each of the hypergraphs in [Figure 1](#), [Figure 2](#) and [Figure 3](#) is as follows.



- **Figure 1:**

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A+2 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}L \right\}}. \quad (4.35)$$

- **Figure 2:**

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}K \right\} (L+1)}, \\ (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A+1 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4.36)$$

- **Figure 3:**

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} (L+1)}, \\ (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4.37)$$

The detailed computation of [Example 4.16](#) is deferred to [Section 5](#).

**Remark 4.17.** In each of the following situations, we can see that  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  in [Example 4.16](#) is reduced to that in [Example 4.14](#). We denote a hypergraph with  $n$  vertices having two different hyperedges that contain all vertices by  $R_{n,2}$ .

- In [Figure 1](#), set  $B = 0$ . Then, this hypergraph is  $R_{A+2,2}$  having multi-hyperedges with weights  $w_{e_V}$  and  $w_e$ . Substituting  $B = 0$  into [\(4.35\)](#) yields

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+2)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N} \\ I+J=A+2}} (w_{e_V} + w_e)I \cdot (w_{e_V} + w_e)J} = \frac{A+2}{\left\lfloor \frac{A+2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{A+2}{2} \right\rceil}.$$

This coincides with  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  of  $R_{A+2,1}$  having a single hyperedge with weight  $w_{e_V} + w_e$ .

- In [Figure 1](#), when the weight  $w_{e_V}$  approaches 0, in the limit we have  $R_{A+2,1}$  having a hyperedge  $e$  with weight  $w_e$ . Hence, we expect  $\lim_{w_{e_V} \downarrow 0} \mathcal{C}(x, y) = \mathcal{C}(R_{A+2,1})$ , and it is indeed the case by [\(4.35\)](#):

$$\lim_{w_{e_V} \downarrow 0} \mathcal{C}(x, y) = w_e \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N} \\ I+J=A+2}} w_e I \cdot w_e J} = \frac{A+2}{\left\lfloor \frac{A+2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{A+2}{2} \right\rceil}.$$

- In [Figure 3](#), set  $A = 0$ . Then this hypergraph is  $R_{B+2,1}$  having a single hyperedge with weight  $w_{e_V}$ . Substituting  $A = 0$  and  $w_e = 0$  into [\(4.37\)](#) yields

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min \left\{ \frac{w_{e_V}(B+2)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} w_{e_V}(K+1)(L+1)}, w_{e_V} \cdot \frac{w_{e_V}(B+2)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} w_{e_V}(K+1) \cdot w_{e_V}(L+1)} \right\} = \frac{B+2}{\left\lfloor \frac{B+2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{B+2}{2} \right\rceil}.$$

**Corollary 4.18.** For hypergraphs  $H_1 = (\{x, y, z\}, \{xyz\})$  ([Figure 4](#)) and  $H_2 = (\{x, y, z\}, \{xyz, xy\})$  ([Figure 5](#)), we have

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max\{d_x, d_y\} + d_z}, \quad \mathcal{C}(y, z) = \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max\{d_y, d_z\} + d_x}.$$

In particular, if the hypergraphs  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are unweighted, then we have

$$\text{Figure 4: } \mathcal{C}(x, y) = \mathcal{C}(y, z) = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \text{Figure 5: } \mathcal{C}(x, y) = \frac{5}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}(y, z) = \frac{5}{4}.$$




Figure 4: A hypergraph  $H_1$ .




Figure 5: A hypergraph  $H_2$ .

We can represent the formulae (4.35), (4.36) and (4.37) by the following single equation:

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \min_{f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)} \left\{ \sum_{e \in E} w_e \left( \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D-1} \right) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\mathbf{b}_e(f) \in \mathbf{B}_e} \left( \sum_{v^+ \in \mathbf{b}_e^+(f)} d_{v^+} \right) \left( \sum_{v^- \in \mathbf{b}_e^-(f)} d_{v^-} \right)} \right\},$$

where by Corollary 4.9, we have

$$\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_{e_V}} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D-1} = 1, \quad \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D-1} \in \{0, 1\}.$$

## 5 Appendix: Concrete computations of $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$

In this section, we calculate  $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$  in each hypergraph of Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3. Hereafter, we suppose that  $I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $I + J = A$  and  $K + L = B$  unless otherwise noted.

### 5.1 A hypergraph in Figure 1

Consider a flow on  $e_V$  induced from some  $f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)$  represented by

$$\{x, \underbrace{\dots, p_i, \dots}_{I \text{ times}}, \underbrace{\dots, q_k, \dots}_{K \text{ times}}\} \rightarrow \{y, \underbrace{\dots, p_j, \dots}_{J \text{ times}}, \underbrace{\dots, q_l, \dots}_{L \text{ times}}\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Then, the associated flow on  $e$  is represented by

$$\{x, \underbrace{\dots, p_i, \dots}_{I \text{ times}}\} \rightarrow \{y, \underbrace{\dots, p_j, \dots}_{J \text{ times}}\}.$$

By (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + I\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_i) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V} + w_e, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + J\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_j) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_l) = -(w_{e_V} + w_e), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D-1} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D-1} = -\frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(J+1) + w_{e_V}L}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, by Corollary 4.11, we obtain (4.35). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(x, y) &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K} + \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(J+1) + w_{e_V}L} \right\} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+2) + w_{e_V}B}{\left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(J+1) + w_{e_V}L \right\}} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A+2 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}L \right\}}. \end{aligned}$$

### 5.2 A hypergraph in Figure 2

Consider a flow of  $f \in \text{LIP}_w^1(V; x, y)$  on  $e_V$  represented by (5.1). By Corollary 4.9, it is sufficient to consider the following cases:

$$(A) \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0.$$

$$(B) \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1.$$

(A) The case  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0$ : Since there is no flow on  $e$  associated with the above flow, we find  $(I, J) = (A, 0)$ . Hence, by (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + A\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_i) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V}, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_\ell) = -w_{e_V}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}K}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = -\frac{1}{L+1}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}K} + \frac{1}{L+1} \right\} &= \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}(B+1)}{\left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}K \right\} (L+1)} \\ &= \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}K \right\} (L+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

(B) The case  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1$ : The flow on  $e$  associated with the flow (5.1) is represented by

$$\{x, \underbrace{\dots, p_i, \dots}_{I \text{ times}}\} \rightarrow \{\dots, \underbrace{p_j, \dots}_{J \text{ times}}\},$$

where  $J \geq 1$  and  $A \geq 1$ . Hence, by (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + I\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_i) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V} + w_e, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + J\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_j) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_\ell) = -(w_{e_V} + w_e), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = -\frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1)}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ J \geq 1, I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K} + \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1)} \right\} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ J \geq 1, I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)(A+1) + w_{e_V}(B+1)}{\left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)(I+1) + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A+1 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}K \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore, by Corollary 4.11, (5.2) and (5.3), we obtain (4.36).

### 5.3 A hypergraph in Figure 3

We again consider a flow on  $e_V$  represented by (5.1). Similarly to Subsection 5.2, we consider the following cases:

$$(A) \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0.$$

$$(B) \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 1.$$

(A) The case  $\max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}_e} \langle f, \mathbf{b} \rangle_{D^{-1}} = 0$ : Since there is no flow on  $e$  associated with the above flow, we have  $IJ = 0$ . Note that by Corollary 4.9,  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  or  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}}$  holds for all  $v \in e$ .

- The case  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \langle f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}}$ : We find  $(I, J) = (A, 0)$ . Hence, by (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + A\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_i) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V}, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_\ell) = -w_{e_V}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D^{-1}} = \frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(K+1)}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D^{-1}} = -\frac{1}{L+1}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(K+1)} + \frac{1}{L+1} \right\} &= \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(B+2)}{\left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} (L+1)} \\ &= \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} (L+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

- The case  $\langle f, \delta_v \rangle_{D-1} = \langle f, \delta_y \rangle_{D-1}$ : We find  $(I, J) = (0, A)$ . Hence, by (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V}, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + A\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_j) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_\ell) = -w_{e_V}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D-1} = \frac{1}{K+1}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D-1} = -\frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(L+1)}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{1}{K+1} + \frac{w_{e_V}}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(L+1)} \right\} &= \min_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(B+2)}{(K+1) \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \\ &= \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ K+L=B}} (K+1) \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \\ &= (5.4). \end{aligned}$$

- (B) The case  $\max_{b \in B_e} \langle f, b \rangle_{D-1} = 1$ : The flow on  $e$  associated with the flow (5.1) is represented by

$$\underbrace{\{\dots, p_i, \dots\}}_{I \text{ times}} \rightarrow \underbrace{\{\dots, p_j, \dots\}}_{J \text{ times}},$$

where  $I, J \geq 1$  and  $A \geq 2$ . Hence, by (4.2) and Theorem 4.8, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}^0 f(x) + I\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_i) + K\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_k) = w_{e_V} + w_e, \\ \mathcal{L}^0 f(y) + J\mathcal{L}^0 f(p_j) + L\mathcal{L}^0 f(q_\ell) = -(w_{e_V} + w_e), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_x \rangle_{D-1} = \frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}(K+1)}, \\ \langle \mathcal{L}^0 f, \delta_y \rangle_{D-1} = -\frac{w_{e_V} + w_e}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1)}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I, J \geq 1, I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}(K+1)} + \frac{1}{(w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1)} \right\} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \min_{\substack{I, J, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I, J \geq 1, I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \frac{(w_{e_V} + w_e)A + w_{e_V}(B+2)}{\left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}} \\ &= (w_{e_V} + w_e) \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(H)}{\max_{\substack{I, J \in \mathbb{N}, K, L \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ I+J=A \\ K+L=B}} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)I + w_{e_V}(K+1) \right\} \left\{ (w_{e_V} + w_e)J + w_{e_V}(L+1) \right\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Therefore, by Corollary 4.11, (5.4) and (5.5), we obtain (4.37).

## References

- [Ak] T. Akamatsu, *A new transport distance and its associated Ricci curvature of hypergraphs*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces. **10**(1) (2022), 90–108.
- [AGE] S. Asoodeh, T. Gao and J. Evans, *Curvature of hypergraphs via multi-marginal optimal transport*, In: IEEE Conference on Decision and Control. (2018), 1180–1185.
- [BCLMP] D. P. Bourne, D. Cushing, S. Liu, F. Münch and N. Peyerimhoff, *Ollivier-Ricci idleness functions of graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **32**(2) (2018), 1408–1424.

- [CDR] C. Coupette, S. Dalleiger and B. Rieck, *Ollivier–Ricci Curvature for Hypergraphs: A Unified Framework*, In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2023), 38pp.
- [EJ] M. Eidi and J. Jost, *Ollivier Ricci Curvature of Directed Hypergraphs*, Sci Rep **10**, 12466 (2020), 14pp.
- [HLGZ] T.-H. Hubert Chan, A. Louis, Z. Gavin Tang and C. Zhang, *Spectral properties of hypergraph Laplacian and approximation algorithms*, J. ACM **65**(3) (2018), 48pp.
- [IKTU] M. Ikeda, Y. Kitabepu, Y. Takai and T. Uehara, *Coarse Ricci curvature of hypergraphs and its generalization*, preprint (2021), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.00698>, 37pp.
- [IMTY] M. Ikeda, A. Miyauchi, Y. Takai and Y. Yoshida, *Finding Cheeger cuts in hypergraphs via heat equation*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **930** (2022), 1–23.
- [KM] Y. Kitabepu and E. Matsumoto, *Cheng maximal diameter theorem for hypergraphs*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **75**(1) (2023), 119–130.
- [LM] P. Li and O. Milenkovic, *Submodular hypergraphs:  $p$ -Laplacians, Cheeger inequalities and spectral clustering*, In Proceedings of the 35th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) (2018), 3014–3023.
- [LLY] Y. Lin, L. Lu and S.-T. Yau, *Ricci curvature of graphs*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **63**(4) (2011), 605–627.
- [Lo] A. Louis, *Hypergraph Markov operators, eigenvalues and approximation algorithms*, STOC’15–Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (2015), 713–722.
- [Mi] I. Miyadera, *Nonlinear semigroups*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. **109**, American Mathematical Society, 1992.
- [MW] F. Münch and R. K. Wojciechowski, *Ollivier Ricci curvature for general graph Laplacians: heat equation, Laplacian comparison, non-explosion and diameter bounds*, Adv. Math. **356** (2019), 106759, 45pp.
- [NLGGS] C.-C. Ni, Y.-Y. Lin, J. Gao, D. Gu and E. Saucan, *Ricci curvature of the Internet topology*, 2015 IEEE conference on computer communications (INFOCOM) (2015), 2758–2766.
- [NLLG] C.-C. Ni, Y.-Y. Lin, F. Luo and J. Gao, *Community Detection on Networks with Ricci Flow*, Sci Rep **9**, 9984 (2019), 12pp.
- [Ol] Y. Ollivier, *Ricci curvature of Markov chains on metric spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **256**(3) (2009), 810–864.
- [SGT] R.S. Sandhu, T.T. Georgiou and A.R. Tannenbaum, *Ricci curvature: An economic indicator for market fragility and systemic risk*, Sci. Adv. **2** (2016), 10pp.
- [SJB] J. Sia, E. Jonckheere and P. Bogdan, *Ollivier-Ricci Curvature-Based Method to Community Detection in Complex Networks*, Sci Rep **9**, 9800 (2019), 12pp.
- [TMIY] Y. Takai, A. Miyauchi, M. Ikeda and Y. Yoshida, *Hypergraph clustering based on Pagerank*, 26nd ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data mining (2020), 1970–1978.
- [Yo] Y. Yoshida, *Cheeger inequalities for submodular transformations*, In: Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. (2019), 2582–2601.