

ON STEINERBERGER CURVATURE AND GRAPH DISTANCE MATRICES

WEI-CHIA CHEN AND MAO-PEI TSUI

ABSTRACT. Steinerberger proposed a notion of curvature on graphs (J. Graph Theory, 2023). We show that nonnegative curvature is almost preserved under three graph operations. We characterize the distance matrix and its null space after adding an edge between two graphs. Let D be the graph distance matrix and $\mathbf{1}$ be the all-one vector. We provide a way to construct graphs so that the linear system $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ does not have a solution. Let η be the Perron eigenvector of D . We provide a lower bound to $\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ when the graph is a tree.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction. In recent years, the concept of curvature has been introduced to finite connected graphs [6, 7, 11]. In his paper [13], Steinerberger proposed a notion of curvature defined on the vertices of graphs. He shows that this notion of curvature satisfies several properties that a curvature would satisfy in differential geometry. These include a Bonnet–Myers theorem, a Cheng’s theorem, and a Lichnerowicz theorem. A necessary condition for the curvature to have these properties is that the linear system

$$Dx = \mathbf{1}$$

has a solution, where D is the graph distance matrix and $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one constant vector. Steinerberger investigated the 9059 graphs in the Mathematica database and reported there are only 5 graphs that the linear system does not have a solution [13]. This phenomenon leads to the intriguing question: why does the linear system of equations $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ tend to have a solution for most graphs?

In his subsequent work [14], Steinerberger gave a sufficient condition for $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ to have a solution, in terms of the Perron root and the Perron eigenvector η of D . A problem of this condition is that it degenerates to whether D is invertible or not. This condition still motivates the study of $\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle$.

In this paper, we extend the results in [13, 14]. The main results are as follows.

- (1) We simplify the proof of the invariance of total curvature ([13, Proposition 3]) without using von Neumann’s Minimax Theorem.
- (2) We show that nonnegative curvature will be preserved except for one or two vertices after adding an edge between two graphs, merging two graphs at a vertex, or removing a bridge from a graph.
- (3) We characterize the distance matrix and its null space after adding an edge between two graphs.
- (4) We show that if two graphs have the property that $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ has no solution, then after merging them at a vertex, the new graph has the same property.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C12, 05C50.

Key words and phrases. Graph Curvature, Distance Matrix, Perron–Frobenius.

- (5) We provide a lower bound to $\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ involving the number of leaves when the graph is a tree.

1.2. Definitions. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite, connected graph. The *distance* between two vertices u and v , denoted as $d(u, v)$, is the length of a shortest path from u to v . The *curvature* of graph G proposed by Steinerberger in [13] is a function $\mu : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that for every vertex $u \in V$, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V} d(u, v) \mu(v) = |V|.$$

Equivalently, if the vertices are $V = \{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, by considering the vector $(\mu(v_1), \dots, \mu(v_n))$, the curvature of a graph is a vector w satisfying

$$Dw = n \cdot \mathbf{1},$$

where $D_{ij} = d(v_i, v_j)$ is the distance matrix of the graph.

2. MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Invariance of Total Curvature and Bonnet–Myers Sharpness. The following property of the curvature was proved by Steinerberger as a consequence of von Neumann’s Minimax theorem. Inspired by his remarks, we simplify the proof by using linear algebra.

Theorem 1 ([13]). *Let G be a connected graph. Suppose there are $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ so that $Dw_1 = Dw_2 = n \cdot \mathbf{1}$. Then $\|w_1\|_1 = \|w_2\|_1$.*

Proof. We have

$$n \langle w_1, \mathbf{1} \rangle = w_1^T Dw_2 = n \langle w_2, \mathbf{1} \rangle.$$

□

Remark 1. *From the proof above, Theorem 1 can be relaxed without the assumption of nonnegative curvatures: Let G be a connected graph. If w_1 and w_2 are curvatures of G , then $\langle w_1, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \langle w_2, \mathbf{1} \rangle$.*

The discrete Bonnet–Myers theorem in [13] states that if G has a nonnegative curvature w so that $Dw = n \cdot \mathbf{1}$ with $K = \min_i w_i \geq 0$, then

$$\text{diam } G \leq \frac{2n}{\|w\|_1}.$$

In addition, if $\text{diam } G \cdot K = 2$, then G has a constant curvature. We say the graph G is *discrete Bonnet–Myers sharp* if $\text{diam } G \cdot K = 2$. Inspired by [3], we find that the discrete Bonnet–Myers sharpness will be preserved under the Cartesian product.

Proposition 1. *Let G_1, G_2 be connected graphs with curvatures bounded below by $K_1, K_2 \geq 0$, respectively. Suppose G_1, G_2 are discrete Bonnet–Myers sharp. Then the Cartesian product graph $G_1 \square G_2$ is discrete Bonnet–Myers sharp.*

Proof. The discrete Bonnet–Myers theorem above implies that G_1 and G_2 have constant curvature $K_1, K_2 > 0$. By [13, Proposition 2], $G_1 \square G_2$ has constant curvature $K > 0$ and

$$K = \left(\frac{1}{K_1} + \frac{1}{K_2} \right)^{-1} = \frac{K_1 K_2}{K_1 + K_2}.$$

Since $\text{diam}(G_1 \square G_2) = \text{diam } G_1 + \text{diam } G_2$, we have

$$\text{diam}(G_1 \square G_2) \cdot K = 2.$$

□

2.2. Bridging, Merging, and Cutting Graphs. Nonnegative curvature will be preserved except for at most two vertices under three basic graph operations. Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs whose distance matrices are D_1 and D_2 , respectively. Assume that G_i has n_i vertices for $i = 1, 2$. We can create a larger graph G by adding an edge e between them. We can also obtain a graph H by performing an edge contraction on e in G . We say that H is obtained by *merging* G_1 and G_2 at a vertex.

Theorem 2 (Bridging Graphs). *Suppose G_1 and G_2 have nonnegative curvature, namely, $D_i w_i = n_i \cdot \mathbf{1}$ holds for some $w_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then the graph G obtained by adding an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ between G_1 and G_2 has a curvature nonnegative everywhere except for the two vertices u and v .*




FIGURE 1. Adding an edge between the complete graph K_4 and the cycle C_6 .

As we will show, if w_1, w_2 are curvatures of G_1 and G_2 , respectively, then the curvature of G at u and at v are

$$\frac{\|w_2\|_1(n_1 + n_2)}{n_1\|w_2\|_1 + n_2\|w_1\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}\|w_1\|_1\|w_2\|_1} \cdot ((w_1)_{n_1} - \frac{1}{2}\|w_1\|_1) \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\frac{\|w_1\|_1(n_1 + n_2)}{n_1\|w_2\|_1 + n_2\|w_1\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}\|w_1\|_1\|w_2\|_1} \cdot ((w_2)_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|w_2\|_1), \quad (2.2)$$

respectively. The curvature of G at the two vertices u and v can be negative. For example, consider adding an edge between two cycles C_3 . The new graph has a unique curvature

$$w = \left(\frac{12}{11}, \frac{12}{11}, \frac{-6}{11}, \frac{-6}{11}, \frac{12}{11}, \frac{12}{11} \right).$$

It remains unclear to the authors whether the curvature of G at u and at v are always nonpositive. Is there a graph with nonnegative curvature w , i.e., $Dw = n \cdot \mathbf{1}$, such that $w_i > \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_1$ for some i ? More generally, is it true that if a graph with a bridge admits a curvature, then the curvature at the vertices of the bridge are always nonpositive?

Corollary 1. *Assume that G' has constant curvature $K > 0$ and $n = |V(G')|$. Let G be the graph obtained by adding an edge between two copies of G' . The curvature of G has value $\frac{(2-n)2K}{4+K} < 0$ at the vertices belonging to the edge and $\frac{4K}{4+K} > 0$ at all the other vertices.*




FIGURE 2. Adding an edge between two copies of K_5 .

The nonnegativeness of curvature will be preserved except for one vertex when we merge two graphs at this vertex.

Theorem 3 (Merging Graphs). *Suppose G_1 and G_2 have nonnegative curvature so that $D_i w_i = n_i \cdot \mathbf{1}$ for some $w_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n_i}$. Then the graph H obtained by adding an edge between G_1 and G_2 and performing an edge contraction on this edge has a curvature nonnegative everywhere except for the vertex of the contracted edge.*




FIGURE 3. Merging the complete graph K_4 and the cycle C_6 at a vertex.

The proofs of the above theorems are inspired by Bapat's work [1]. By using induction and decomposing the distance matrix into smaller ones, Bapat proves that for a tree, the distance matrix satisfies the equation

$$D\tau = (n - 1) \cdot \mathbf{1}.$$

where $\tau = \mathbf{2} - (\deg(v_1), \dots, \deg(v_n))^t$. We will relate the distance matrix of the larger graphs G and H to the distance matrices of G_1 and G_2 in our proof.

The following theorem states that nonnegative curvature will be preserved when we remove a bridge from a graph.

Theorem 4 (Cutting Graphs). *Suppose G is a connected graph containing a bridge e . Let G_1 and G_2 be the components after removing e from G . If G has a nonnegative curvature then G_1 and G_2 have a nonnegative curvature. If G has a constant curvature then G_i has a constant curvature except at the vertices belonging to e .*

2.3. Null Space of Graph Distance Matrix. In the previous section, we created a new graph G by adding an edge between two graphs G_1 and G_2 . In this section, we give a characterization of the null space of the distance matrix of G .

Theorem 5. Let G_1, G_2 be two connected graphs admitting curvatures. Suppose G_i has n_i vertices for $i = 1, 2$. Let G be the graph obtained by adding an edge between G_1 and G_2 . Let D_G, D_1, D_2 be the distance matrices of G, G_1 , and G_2 , respectively. Then we have

$$\text{null } D_G = \text{null } D_1 \oplus \text{null } D_2$$

and

$$\dim \text{null } D_G = \dim \text{null } D_1 + \dim \text{null } D_2,$$

where we canonically embed $\text{null } D_i$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$ by augmenting zeros.

This implies that

$$\text{rank } D_G = \text{rank } D_1 + \text{rank } D_2.$$

2.4. Nonexistence of Curvature. A necessary condition for the curvature to have desirable geometric properties is that the linear system $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ has a solution. Steinerberger raised the following problem.

Problem ([14]). It seems that for most graphs, the linear system $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ tends to have a solution. Why is that?

He gave a sufficient condition for $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ to have a solution.

Proposition 2 ([14]). Suppose $D \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 > 0 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and eigenvector $D\eta = \lambda_1\eta$ with $\|\eta\|_2 = 1$. If

$$1 - \left\langle \eta, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\rangle^2 < \frac{|\lambda_2|}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}, \quad (2.3)$$

then the linear system $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ has a solution.

The proof is correct. However, this condition degenerates to the trivial condition of whether D is invertible or not. Since if $\lambda_1 > 0 > \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$, then D is invertible. This implies that $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ has a solution. If $\lambda_1 > 0 = \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ then the right-hand side of inequality (2.3) is 0. The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality then implies that condition (2.3) will never satisfy.

By merging two graphs at a vertex, we can create graphs so that $Dx = \mathbf{1}$ does not have a solution.

Theorem 6. Let G_1 and G_2 be two connected graphs so that $D_i x = \mathbf{1}$ does not have a solution. Let H be obtained by adding an edge between G_1 and G_2 , then performing an edge contraction on this edge. If D_H is the distance matrix of H then

$$D_H x = \mathbf{1}$$

does not have a solution.

We use Matlab to generate 10000 Erdős–Rényi random graphs $G(n, p)$, with parameters $n = 50$ and $p = 1/2$. We find that for each graph we generated, both the adjacency matrix and the distance matrix have full rank. Let Q_n be the adjacency matrix of a random graph, where self-loops are allowed. In other words, the upper triangular entries and the diagonal entries of Q_n are independent Bernoulli random variables. In their work [2], Costello, Tao and Vu showed that Q_n is invertible with probability 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It was shown in [8] that with probability 1, the distance matrix of $G(n, p)$ is invertible as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

2.5. Perron Eigenvector of Distance Matrix. In his work [14], Steinerberger proves that if η is the Perron eigenvector of the distance matrix of a graph (the first eigenvector whose entries are nonnegative), then $\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 \geq \frac{n}{2}$, where n is the number of vertices. We provide a lower bound when the graph is a tree involving the number of leaves.

Proposition 3. *Let T be a tree with n vertices and l leaves. Let D be its distance matrix, λ be its largest positive eigenvalue (Perron root), and η be the Perron eigenvector of D with $\|\eta\|_2 = 1$. Then*

$$\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 > \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - l + 1} \right) + \frac{n - l - 1}{\lambda - l + 2}.$$

Example. The star graph with n vertices has $l = n - 1$ leaves. The eigenvalue estimate of the Perron root (see for example, [10, Theorem 8.1.22] and [16, Corollary 7]) gives

$$\frac{2(n-1)^2}{n} = \frac{\sum_{i,j} D_{ij}}{n} \leq \lambda \leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij} = 2n - 3.$$

Then the proposition above gives

$$\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 > \frac{(n-1)^2}{n-1} = n - 1.$$

3. PROOFS

3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.

Proof. Let $V(G_1) = \{u_i : 1 \leq i \leq n_1\}$ and $V(G_2) = \{v_j : 1 \leq j \leq n_2\}$. The main observation is that if $u_i \in V(G_1)$ and $v_j \in V(G_2)$, then the shortest path from u_i to v_j has to pass through the edge $\{u, v\}$. Relabel the vertices so that $u = u_{n_1}$ is the last vertex of G_1 and $v = v_1$ is the first vertex of G_2 . The observation implies

$$d_G(u_i, v_j) = d_{G_1}(u_i, u_{n_1}) + 1 + d_{G_2}(v_1, v_j)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n_1, 1 \leq j \leq n_2$. Let y be the last column of D_1 and z be the first column of D_2 . In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= d_{G_1}(u_i, u_{n_1}) \\ z_j &= d_{G_2}(v_1, v_j). \end{aligned}$$

If D_G is the distance matrix of G , we can write

$$D_G = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & y\mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1}z^t \\ \mathbf{1}y^t + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t + z\mathbf{1}^t & D_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\alpha, s \in \mathbb{R}$ be chosen later. Let $e_{n_1}, e_{n_1+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$ be the n_1 -th and the (n_1+1) -th standard coordinate vectors, respectively. Define

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} + s e_{n_1} + s e_{n_1+1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then

$$D_G w = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha n_1 \mathbf{1} + y \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + \mathbf{1} z^t w_2 \\ \alpha \mathbf{1} y^t w_1 + \alpha \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + \alpha z \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + n_2 \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s y \\ s(z + \mathbf{1}) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s(y + \mathbf{1}) \\ s z \end{bmatrix}$$

since $z_1 = y_{n_1} = 0$. By looking at the n_1 -th row and the first row of $D_i w_i = n_i \cdot \mathbf{1}$, we have $y^t w_1 = n_1$ and $z^t w_2 = n_2$. Therefore,

$$D_G w = \begin{bmatrix} (\alpha n_1 + \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + n_2 + s) \mathbf{1} + (2s + \mathbf{1}^t w_2) y \\ (\alpha n_1 + n_2 + \alpha \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + s) \mathbf{1} + (2s + \alpha \mathbf{1}^t w_1) z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Define

$$s = \frac{-\mathbf{1}^t w_2}{2}, \alpha = \frac{\mathbf{1}^t w_2}{\mathbf{1}^t w_1} > 0.$$

Note that since $\mathbf{1}^t w_1 > 0$, the number α is well-defined. Then $2s = -\mathbf{1}^t w_2 = -\alpha \mathbf{1}^t w_1$. Thus, we get

$$D_G w = (\alpha n_1 + \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + n_2 + s) \mathbf{1} = (\alpha n_1 + n_2 + \frac{\mathbf{1}^t w_2}{2}) \mathbf{1}.$$

This implies G admits a curvature after scaling. We have

$$\alpha n_1 + n_2 + \frac{\mathbf{1}^t w_2}{2} > 0.$$

Therefore, G admits a curvature nonnegative everywhere except at the vertices u_{n_1} and v_1 . \square

Equations (2.1) and (2.2) follow from our construction of w . The corollary can be proved by plugging in $\alpha = 1$ and $s = nK$ in equation (3.4).

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3. The idea is the same as the proof of Theorem 2. However, the analysis needs to be more careful.

Proof. Write $V(G_1) = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}\}$ and $V(G_2) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$ so that the edge added and then contracted is $\{u_{n_1}, v_1\}$. Thus, u_{n_1} and v_1 will be the identical vertex in H . Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ be the last column of D_1 and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2-1}$ be the first column of D_2 without the first entry. Namely,

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} d_{G_1}(u_1, u_{n_1}) \\ \vdots \\ d_{G_1}(u_{n_1}, u_{n_1}) \end{bmatrix}, z = \begin{bmatrix} d_{G_2}(v_1, v_2) \\ \vdots \\ d_{G_2}(v_1, v_{n_2}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let w and g be nonnegative vectors satisfying $D_1 w = n_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}$ and $D_2 g = n_2 \cdot \mathbf{1}$. Let $\bar{g} = (g_2, \dots, g_{n_2})$, and \bar{D}_2 be the matrix obtained by removing the first column and the first row of D_2 . Thus,

$$D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & z^t \\ z & \bar{D}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The equation $D_2 g = n_2 \cdot \mathbf{1}$ gives $z^t \bar{g} = n_2$ and $\bar{D}_2 \bar{g} = n_2 \mathbf{1} - g_1 z$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, the shortest path in H between u_i and v_j has to pass through the common vertex $u_{n_1} = v_1$. We thus have

$$d_H(u_i, v_j) = d_{G_1}(u_i, u_{n_1}) + d_{G_2}(v_1, v_j) = y_i + 1 + z_{j-1}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n_1$ and $2 \leq j \leq n_2$. In addition,

$$d_H(u_i, u_j) = d_{G_1}(u_i, u_j)$$

$$d_H(v_i, v_j) = d_{G_2}(v_i, v_j)$$

hold for all i, j . Therefore, we can write the distance matrix of H as

$$D_H = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & y \mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1} z^t \\ \mathbf{1} y^t + z \mathbf{1}^t & \bar{D}_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1+n_2-1) \times (n_1+n_2-1)}.$$

Let $\alpha, s \in \mathbb{R}$ be chosen later. Define the potential candidate of the curvature

$$w' = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha w \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \bar{g} \end{bmatrix} + (s + g_1)e_{n_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2-1},$$

where $e_{n_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2-1}$ is the n_1 -th standard coordinate vector. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_H w' &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha n_1 \mathbf{1} \\ \alpha \mathbf{1} y^t w + \alpha z \mathbf{1}^t w \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} y \mathbf{1}^t \bar{g} + \mathbf{1} z^t \bar{g} \\ n_2 \mathbf{1} - g_1 z \end{bmatrix} + (s + g_1) \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (\alpha n_1 + z^t \bar{g}) \mathbf{1} \\ (\alpha y^t w + n_2) \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{1}^t \bar{g} + s + g_1) y \\ (\alpha \mathbf{1}^t w + s) z \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $z^t \bar{g} = n_2$ and $y^t w = n_1$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} s &= -g_1 - \mathbf{1}^t \bar{g} = -\mathbf{1}^t g, \\ \alpha &= \frac{-s}{\mathbf{1}^t w} = \frac{\mathbf{1}^t g}{\mathbf{1}^t w}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that w, g are nonnegative curvature of G_1 and G_2 , respectively, implies $\mathbf{1}^t w > 0$ and $\mathbf{1}^t g > 0$. Thus, $\alpha > 0$ is well-defined. We then have

$$D_H w' = (\alpha n_1 + n_2) \mathbf{1}.$$

Thus, we have

$$D_H \left(\frac{n_1 + n_2 - 1}{\alpha n_1 + n_2} w' \right) = (n_1 + n_2 - 1) \cdot \mathbf{1}.$$

This implies H admits a curvature nonnegative everywhere except at the common vertex $u_{n_1} = v_1$. \square

From our construction, the curvature of H at the common vertex $u_{n_1} = v_1$ is

$$\frac{\|g\|_1(w)_{n_1} - \|w\|_1 \|\bar{g}\|_1}{\|g\|_1 n_1 + \|w\|_1 n_2} \cdot (n_1 + n_2 - 1).$$

3.3. Proof of Theorem 4.

Proof. Let D_i be the distance matrices of G_i for $i = 1, 2$. Write $V(G_1) = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}\}$ and $V(G_2) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$ so that the bridge is $e = \{u_{n_1}, v_1\}$. Since G has a nonnegative curvature, we have

$$D_G w = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}$$

for some $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n_1+n_2}$. Write

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n_i}$. Let y be the last column of D_1 and z be the first column of D_2 , as in the proof of Theorem 2. Then

$$D_G = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & y \mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1} z^t \\ \mathbf{1} y^t + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t + z \mathbf{1}^t & D_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $D_G w = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}$, we get

$$D_1 w_1 + y \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t w_2 + \mathbf{1} z^t w_2 = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \mathbf{1} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\mathbf{1} y^t w_1 + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + z \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + D_2 w_2 = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}. \quad (3.6)$$

The last row of equation (3.5), the first row of equation (3.6), together with $y_{n_1} = z_1 = 0$ give

$$y^t w_1 + (z + \mathbf{1})^t w_2 = n_1 + n_2 \quad (3.7)$$

$$(\mathbf{1} + y)^t w_1 + z^t w_2 = n_1 + n_2. \quad (3.8)$$

Define

$$\bar{w}_1 = w_1 + (\mathbf{1}^t w_2) e_{n_1}$$

$$\bar{w}_2 = w_2 + (\mathbf{1}^t w_1) e_1,$$

where e_{n_1}, e_1 are the n_1 -th and the first coordinate vectors in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} and \mathbb{R}^{n_2} , respectively. Then

$$D_1 \bar{w}_1 = D_1 w_1 + \mathbf{1}^t w_2 y = (n_1 + n_2 - \mathbf{1}^t w_2 - z^t w_2) \mathbf{1} = (y^t w_1) \mathbf{1}$$

$$D_2 \bar{w}_2 = D_2 w_2 + \mathbf{1}^t w_1 z = (n_1 + n_2 - y^t w_1 - \mathbf{1}^t w_1) \mathbf{1} = (z^t w_2) \mathbf{1},$$

by equations (3.5) to (3.8).

We claim that $y^t w_1, z^t w_2 > 0$. Suppose $y^t w_1 = 0$. Since $w = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}$ satisfies

$$D_G w = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}$$

and D_G is a nonnegative matrix, we have

$$\mathbf{1}^t w = \mathbf{1}^t w_1 + \mathbf{1}^t w_2 > 0.$$

Note that equations (3.7) and (3.8) implies $\mathbf{1}^t w_1 = \mathbf{1}^t w_2$. Therefore, $\mathbf{1}^t w_1 = \mathbf{1}^t w_2 > 0$. Since $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n_1}$ and $y_{n_1} = 0$, we have

$$0 < \mathbf{1}^t w_1 \leq y^t w_1 + (w_1)_{n_1} = (w_1)_{n_1}.$$

This implies $w_1 = c e_{n_1}$ for $c = (w_1)_{n_1} > 0$. Plugging this into equation (3.5), we get

$$2cy = (n_1 + n_2 - \mathbf{1}^t w_2 - z^t w_2) \cdot \mathbf{1} = (y^t w_1) \cdot \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0},$$

by equation (3.7). This implies $c = 0$ and $w_1 = \mathbf{0}$, contradicts to $\mathbf{1}^t w_1 > 0$. A similar argument shows that $z^t w_2 > 0$.

Consider

$$w'_1 = \frac{n_1}{y^t w_1} \bar{w}_1$$

$$w'_2 = \frac{n_2}{z^t w_2} \bar{w}_2.$$

Then $D_i w'_i = n_i \cdot \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, G_i has a nonnegative curvature for $i = 1, 2$. If both w_1 and w_2 are constant, then by construction, w'_1 and w'_2 are constant everywhere except at vertices u_{n_1} and v_1 , respectively. \square

3.4. Proof of Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. As in the proof of Theorem 2, we write

$$D_G = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & y\mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1}z^t \\ \mathbf{1}y^t + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^t + z\mathbf{1}^t & D_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where y is the last column of D_1 , and z is the first column of D_2 . Since G_1 and G_2 are nonnegatively curved, $\mathbf{1} \in \text{Im } D_i = (\text{null } D_i)^\perp$. In addition, by Theorem 2, G admits a curvature. This implies

$$\mathbf{1} \in \text{Im } D_G = (\text{null } D_G)^\perp.$$

If $\eta \in \text{null } D_1$, then $y^t \eta = \mathbf{1}^t \eta = 0$. This implies $D_G \begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$. Similarly, if $\xi \in \text{null } D_2$, then $\mathbf{1}^t \xi = z^t \xi = 0$. This implies $D_G \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, if $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{k_1}\}$ is a basis of $\text{null } D_1$ and $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k_2}\}$ is a basis of $\text{null } D_2$, then

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k_1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_1 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_{k_2} \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

is linearly independent in $\text{null } D_G$. This shows that

$$\dim \text{null } D_G \geq k_1 + k_2 = \dim \text{null } D_1 + \dim \text{null } D_2.$$

On the other hand, suppose $\begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} \in \text{null } D_G$. Our goal is to show that $\eta \in \text{null } D_1$ and $\xi \in \text{null } D_2$. We have

$$\mathbf{0}_{n_1} = D_1 \eta + y \mathbf{1}^t \xi + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t \xi + \mathbf{1} z^t \xi \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathbf{0}_{n_2} = \mathbf{1} y^t \eta + \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^t \eta + z \mathbf{1}^t \eta + D_2 \xi \quad (3.10)$$

$$0 = \mathbf{1}^t \begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.11)$$

By looking at the n_1 -th row of the first equation and using $y_{n_1} = 0$, we get

$$0 = y^t \eta + \mathbf{1}^t \xi + z^t \xi.$$

The first row of the second equation and $z_1 = 0$ gives

$$0 = y^t \eta + \mathbf{1}^t \eta + z^t \xi.$$

Combining these with the third equation, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{1}^t \eta = \mathbf{1}^t \xi = 0.$$

Therefore, equations (3.9) and (3.10) give

$$D_1 \eta = -(z^t \xi) \mathbf{1}$$

$$D_2 \xi = -(y^t \eta) \mathbf{1}.$$

Suppose that $z^t \xi \neq 0$. Since G_1 admits a nonnegative curvature w_1 and at least one of its entries is not zero, by Remark 1, we have $0 < \mathbf{1}^t w_1 = \mathbf{1}^t \frac{\eta}{-z^t \xi} = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, $z^t \xi = 0$ and $D_1 \eta = \mathbf{0}$. Similarly, we have $D_2 \xi = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, $\eta \in \text{null } D_1$ and $\xi \in \text{null } D_2$.

We can thus write $\eta = c_1 \eta_1 + \dots + c_{k_1} \eta_{k_1}$ and $\xi = d_1 v_1 + \dots + d_{k_2} v_{k_2}$ where $c_i, d_j \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} = c_1 \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} + \dots + c_{k_1} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k_1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} + d_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + d_{k_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_{k_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the vectors

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k_1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_1 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \xi_{k_2} \end{bmatrix}$$

form a basis of null D_G . This implies

$$\dim \text{null } D_G = \dim \text{null } D_1 + \dim \text{null } D_2,$$

as desired. \square

3.5. Proof of Theorem 6. As in the proof of Theorem 3, we assume $V(G_1) = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}\}$, $V(G_2) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$ and $\{u_{n_1}, v_1\}$ is the edge added and contracted. The condition that $D_1 x = \mathbf{1}$ has no solution is equivalent to $\mathbf{1} \notin \text{Im } D_1 = (\text{null } D_1)^\perp$. This is equivalent to that there is $\eta \in \text{null } D_1$ with $\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \neq 0$. Similarly, we can find a vector $\xi \in \text{null } D_2$ with $\langle \xi, \mathbf{1} \rangle \neq 0$. Our goal is to find a vector $\zeta \in \text{null } D_H$ with $\langle \zeta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \neq 0$.

Consider the vector

$$\zeta = \alpha \begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \bar{\xi} \end{bmatrix} + (s + \xi_1)e_{n_1},$$

where $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_2, \dots, \xi_{n_2})$, e_{n_1} is the n_1 -th coordinate vector in $\mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2-1}$, and $\alpha, s \in \mathbb{R}$ are to be chosen. As in the proof of Theorem 3, let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ be the last column of D_1 and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2-1}$ be the first column of D_2 without the first entry. Write

$$D_H = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & y\mathbf{1}^t + \mathbf{1}z^t \\ \mathbf{1}y^t + z\mathbf{1}^t & \bar{D}_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1+n_2-1) \times (n_1+n_2-1)},$$

where

$$D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & z^t \\ z & \bar{D}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $D_2 \xi = \mathbf{0}$ implies $z^t \bar{\xi} = 0$ and $\xi_1 z + \bar{D}_2 \bar{\xi} = \mathbf{0}_{n_2-1}$. Therefore,

$$D_H \zeta = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_1} \\ \alpha \mathbf{1} y^t \eta + \alpha z \mathbf{1}^t \eta \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} y \mathbf{1}^t \bar{\xi} \\ -\xi_1 z \end{bmatrix} + (s + \xi_1) \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that $D_1 \eta = \mathbf{0}_{n_1}$ gives $y^t \eta = 0$. Thus,

$$D_H \zeta = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{1}^t \xi + s)y \\ (\mathbf{1}^t \eta \alpha + s)z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Set $s = -\mathbf{1}^t \xi$ and $\alpha = \frac{\mathbf{1}^t \xi}{\mathbf{1}^t \eta}$. Note that α is well-defined since $\mathbf{1}^t \eta \neq 0$. Then

$$D_H \zeta = \mathbf{0}_{n_1+n_2-1}.$$

In addition, we have

$$\langle \zeta, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \alpha \mathbf{1}^t \eta + \mathbf{1}^t \xi + s = \mathbf{1}^t \xi \neq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{1} \notin (\text{null } D_H)^\perp = \text{Im } D_H.$$

This implies that $D_H x = \mathbf{1}$ does not have a solution.

3.6. Proof of Proposition 3. We follow the idea in the Theorem in [14] with some revision.

Proof. Let $V = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ be the vertices of the tree T . Let $L \subset V$ be the leaves of T . Assume u_k is not a leaf with k fixed. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n d(u_i, u_j) \eta_i \eta_j \\ &= \sum_{i \neq j} d(u_i, u_j) \eta_i \eta_j \\ &\leq \sum_{i \neq j} (d(u_i, u_k) + d(u_k, u_j)) \eta_i \eta_j \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n (d(u_i, u_k) + d(u_k, u_j)) \eta_i \eta_j - \sum_{i=1}^n 2d(u_i, u_k) \eta_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n d(u_i, u_k) \eta_i^2 \leq 2\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \lambda \eta_k.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d(u_i, u_k) \eta_i^2 = \sum_{i \neq k} d(u_i, u_k) \eta_i^2 \geq \sum_{i \neq k} \eta_i^2 = \|\eta\|_2^2 - \eta_k^2 = 1 - \eta_k^2.$$

Thus, we get

$$\lambda + 2 - 2\eta_k^2 \leq 2\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \lambda \eta_k.$$

Rearranging the terms and summing k over all non-leaves, we get

$$\lambda(n-l) \leq 2\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \lambda \sum_{k: u_k \notin L} \eta_k + 2 \sum_{k: u_k \notin L} \eta_k^2 - 2(n-l). \quad (3.12)$$

On the other hand, suppose $u_k \in L$ is a leaf with k fixed. If $i, j \neq k$ then

$$d(u_i, u_j) \leq d(u_i, u_k) + d(u_k, u_j) - 2.$$

To see this, assume that u_k is adjacent to the vertex $u_{k'}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(u_i, u_k) &= d(u_i, u_{k'}) + 1 \\ d(u_j, u_k) &= d(u_j, u_{k'}) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$d(u_i, u_j) \leq d(u_i, u_{k'}) + d(u_j, u_{k'}) = d(u_i, u_k) + d(u_j, u_k) - 2.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \sum_{i,j} \eta_i \eta_j d(u_i, u_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j \neq k} \eta_i \eta_j (d(u_i, u_k) + d(u_k, u_j) - 2) + 2 \sum_{i \neq k} \eta_i \eta_k d(u_i, u_k) + \eta_k^2 d(u_k, u_k) \\ &= 2(\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle - \eta_k) \lambda \eta_k - 2(\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle - \eta_k)^2 + 2\lambda \eta_k^2 \\ &= (2\lambda + 4) \eta_k \langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle - 2\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 - 2\eta_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

By summing k over all leaves, we get

$$\lambda l \leq (2\lambda + 4)\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k - 2\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 l - 2 \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k^2. \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, adding equations (3.12) and (3.13), we get

$$\lambda n \leq (2\lambda - 2l)\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 + 4\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k + 2\left(\sum_{k:u_k \notin L} \eta_k^2 - \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k^2 \right) - 2(n - l).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k:u_k \notin L} \eta_k^2 - \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k^2 &< \sum_{k:u_k \notin L} \eta_k^2 + \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k^2 = 1 \\ \sum_{k:u_k \in L} \eta_k &< \langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\lambda n < (2\lambda - 2l + 4)\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 + 2 - 2(n - l).$$

Note that $l \leq n - 1$ since T is a tree. The eigenvalue estimate [10, Theorem 8.1.22] gives

$$\lambda \geq \min_i \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij} \geq n - 1.$$

Therefore, $\lambda - l + 2 > 0$. Thus,

$$\langle \eta, \mathbf{1} \rangle^2 > \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - l + 2} \right) + \frac{n - l - 1}{\lambda - l + 2}.$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

W.-C. Chen and M.-P. Tsui are supported by NSTC grant 109-2115-M-002-006. The first author thanks Jephian C.-H. Lin for his comments on this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ravindra B. Bapat. *Distance Matrix of a Tree*, pages 95–109. Springer London, London, 2010.
- [2] Kevin P. Costello, Terence Tao, and Van Vu. Random symmetric matrices are almost surely nonsingular. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 135(2):395 – 413, 2006.
- [3] D. Cushing, S. Kamtue, J. Koolen, S. Liu, F. Münch, and N. Peyerimhoff. Rigidity of the bonnet-myers inequality for graphs with respect to ollivier ricci curvature. *Advances in Mathematics*, 369:107188, 2020.
- [4] David Cushing, Riikka Kangaslampi, Valtteri Lipiäinen, Shiping Liu, and George W Stagg. The graph curvature calculator and the curvatures of cubic graphs. *Experimental Mathematics*, 31(2):583–595, 2022.
- [5] Natalie Denny. Bounds on the largest eigenvalue of the distance matrix of connected graphs. Master thesis project., Portland State University, 2020.
- [6] Karel Devriendt and Renaud Lambiotte. Discrete curvature on graphs from the effective resistance. *Journal of Physics: Complexity*, 3(2):025008, jun 2022.
- [7] Karel Devriendt, Andrea Ottolini, and Stefan Steinerberger. Graph curvature via resistance distance. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 348:68–78, 2024.
- [8] William Dudarov, Noah Feinberg, Raymond Guo, Ansel Goh, Andrea Ottolini, Alicia Stepin, Raghavendra Tripathi, and Joia Zhang. On the image of graph distance matrices, 2023, arXiv:2307.04740.
- [9] Richard Hammack, Wilfried Imrich, and Sandi Klavzar. *Handbook of Product Graphs, Second Edition*, pages 49–51. CRC Press, Inc., USA, 2nd edition, 2011.

- [10] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [11] Yong Lin, Linyuan Lu, and Shing-Tung Yau. Ricci curvature of graphs. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 63(4):605 – 627, 2011.
- [12] Subhi N Ruzieh and David L Powers. The distance spectrum of the path p_n and the first distance eigenvector of connected graphs. *Linear and multilinear algebra*, 28(1-2):75–81, 1990.
- [13] Stefan Steinerberger. Curvature on graphs via equilibrium measures. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 103(3):415–436, 2023, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jgt.22925>.
- [14] Stefan Steinerberger. The first eigenvector of a distance matrix is nearly constant. *Discrete Mathematics*, 346(4):113291, 2023.
- [15] Van Vu. Recent progress in combinatorial random matrix theory, 2020, arXiv:2005.02797.
- [16] Bo Zhou and Nenad Trinajstić. On the largest eigenvalue of the distance matrix of a connected graph. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 447(4):384–387, 2007.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, MATHEMATICS DIVISION, TAIPEI, 106, TAIWAN
Email address: achia0329@ncts.ntu.edu.tw

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI, 106, TAIWAN;
NATIONAL CENTER FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, MATHEMATICS DIVISION, TAIPEI, 106, TAIWAN
Email address: maopei@math.ntu.edu.tw