

# COMPARISONS OF DIRICHLET, NEUMANN AND LAPLACIAN EIGENVALUES ON GRAPHS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

YONGJIE SHI<sup>1</sup> AND CHENGJIE YU<sup>2</sup>

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we obtain some comparisons of the Dirichlet, Neumann and Laplacian eigenvalues on graphs. We also discuss their rigidities and some of their applications including some Lichnerowicz-type, Fiedler-type and Friedman-type estimates for Dirichlet eigenvalues and Neumann eigenvalues. The comparisons on Neumann eigenvalues can be translated to comparisons on Steklov eigenvalues in our setting. So, some of the results can be viewed as extensions for parts of the works of [10] by Hua-Huang-Wang, and parts of our previous works [19, 20].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M^n, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with Ricci curvature bounded from below by a positive constant  $K$ . Then, the well-known Lichnerowicz estimate [14] tells us that the first positive Laplacian eigenvalue of  $(M^n, g)$  is no less than  $\frac{nK}{n-1}$ . This estimate was later extended to compact Riemannian manifolds with boundary by Reilly [17]. In recent years, Lichnerowicz estimate was extended to graphs in [2, 13, 15]. So, it is a natural problem to extend Reilly's Lichnerowicz estimate to graphs with boundary.

On the other hand, in the recent works [19, 20], the authors obtained Lichnerowicz estimates for Steklov eigenvalues on graphs which may be viewed as an extension of the works of Escobar [4] and Xia-Xiong [21] into discrete setting, by using a comparison of Steklov eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues on graphs that was also mentioned in [11] for graphs with normalized weights. It seems that such kinds of eigenvalue comparisons make a major difference of spectral theory on graphs with that on Riemannian manifolds. In this paper, motivated by our previous works, by further exploring comparisons of Dirichlet, Neumann and Laplacian eigenvalues on graphs, we obtain Lichnerowicz-type estimates for Dirichlet and Neumann eigenvalues on graphs extending the classical results of Reilly [17] into discrete setting.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05C50; Secondary 39A12.

*Key words and phrases.* Dirichlet eigenvalue, Neumann eigenvalue, eigenvalue comparison, Lichnerowicz estimate.

<sup>1</sup>Research partially supported by NNSF of China with contract no. 11701355.

<sup>2</sup> Research partially supported by GDNSF with contract no. 2021A1515010264 and NNSF of China with contract no. 11571215.

Firstly, we have the following comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues. We use  $\nu_i$  and  $\mu_i$  to denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  Neumann eigenvalue and  $i^{\text{th}}$  Laplacian eigenvalue of a weighted graph. For detailed definitions and other notations, see Section 2.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

$$(1.1) \quad \nu_i \geq \mu_i$$

for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . If  $\mu_i = \nu_i > 0$  for some  $i = 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , then there is a function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^V$  such that  $u|_B = \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0$  and  $u$  is simultaneously a Laplacian eigenfunction and a Neumann Laplacian eigenfunction of the eigenvalue  $\nu_i = \mu_i$ .

We next have the following rigidity for (1.1). For a weighted graph  $(G, m, w)$ , and  $S \subset V(G)$ , we use  $\mu_i(S)$  to denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  Laplacian eigenvalue of the induced subgraph on  $S$  inheriting vertex-measure and edge-weight from  $G$ . For detailed definitions and other notations, see Section 2.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a connected weighted finite graph with boundary. Then, the equalities of (1.1) hold for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if the following two statements are both true.*

(1) *There is a nonnegative function  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^B$ , such that  $w_{xy} = \rho_x m_x m_y$  for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ . In particular, each boundary vertex is either adjacent to every interior vertex or adjacent to no interior vertex.*

(2) *When  $\rho$  is constant,*

$$(1.2) \quad \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \min \{ \rho V_\Omega, \mu_2(B) + \rho(V_\Omega - V_B) \}.$$

When  $\rho$  is nonconstant,

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) < \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b,$$

and for any  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  with  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ ,

$$\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B \geq \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_\Omega \text{Deg}_b - V_B \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega)} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B^2.$$

Here

$$\text{Deg}_b := \langle \rho, 1 \rangle_B = \text{Deg}_B(y)$$

for any  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $V_B = \sum_{x \in B} m_x$ ,  $V_\Omega = \sum_{y \in \Omega} m_y$  and  $V_G = V_\Omega + V_B$ .

By Theorem 1.2, one can construct many nontrivial examples such that equality of (1.1) holds for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . For example, fix a graph  $(G, B)$  with boundary containing the complete bipartite graph  $K_{B, \Omega}$ . Set the weights of boundary edges and measures of interior vertices such that  $V_\Omega > V_B$ , and  $w_{xy} = \rho m_x m_y$  for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ . Finally, set the weights of interior edges small enough to make

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \rho(V_\Omega - V_B).$$

Then, by Theorem 1.2, equalities of (1.1) hold for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  on the graph constructed.

As an application of Theorem 1.2, we have the following rigidities of (1.1) for graphs equipped with the unit weight or a normalized weight.

**Corollary 1.1.** *Let  $(G, B)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with the unit weight such that each boundary vertex is adjacent to some interior vertex. Then, the equalities of (1.1) hold for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if*

- (1) *every boundary vertex is adjacent to any interior vertex, and*
- (2)  *$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \mu_2(B) + |\Omega| - |B|$  when  $|B| \geq 2$ , and  $\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq |\Omega|$  when  $|B| = 1$ .*

*In particular, if every boundary vertex is adjacent to any interior vertex and*

$$2\Delta(G|_{\Omega}) \leq |\Omega| - |B|,$$

*then the equalities of (1.1) hold for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . Here  $\Delta(G|_{\Omega})$  is the maximum degree of  $G|_{\Omega}$ .*

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with a normalized weight such that  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ . Then, the equalities of (1.1) hold for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if*

- (1) *for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $w_{xy} = \frac{1}{V_{\Omega}} m_x m_y$ , and*
- (2)  *$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \frac{V_{\Omega} - V_B}{V_{\Omega}}$  when  $|B| \geq 2$ , and  $\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq 1$  when  $|B| = 1$ .*

Secondly, we have the following comparisons of Dirichlet eigenvalues, Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph. We use  $\lambda_i$  to denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  Dirichlet eigenvalue of a weighted graph. For details of definitions and other notations, see Section 2.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

- (1) *for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  and  $j = 0, 1, \dots, |\Omega| - i$ ,*

$$\lambda_i \leq \mu_{i+j}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_B^{(|\Omega|-i)}$$

*with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega}$  such that  $\Delta^D u = \lambda_i u$ ,  $\Delta_{\Omega} u = \mu_{i+j}(\Omega) u$  and  $\text{Deg}_B \cdot u = \text{Deg}_B^{(|\Omega|-i)} \cdot u$ ;*

- (2) *for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$ ,*

$$\lambda_i \geq \mu_{i-j+1}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_B^{(j)}$$

*with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega}$  such that  $\Delta^D u = \lambda_i u$ ,  $\Delta_{\Omega} u = \mu_{i-j+1}(\Omega) u$  and  $\text{Deg}_B \cdot u = \text{Deg}_B^{(j)} \cdot u$ .*

Here

$$\text{Deg}_B^{(1)} \leq \text{Deg}_B^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \text{Deg}_B^{(|\Omega|)}$$

*is the rearrangement of  $\text{Deg}_B(x)$  with  $x$  going through  $\Omega$ .*

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then*

$$\nu_i \geq \mu_i(\Omega)$$

*for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , with equalities for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if each connected component of  $N_G(B)$  contains at most one interior vertex. Here*

$$N_G(B) = B \cup \{y \in V(G) \mid y \sim x \text{ for some } x \in B\}.$$

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

$$\lambda_i \geq \nu_i$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ .

Combining Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.5, we have the following comparison of Dirichlet eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

$$\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ .

Combining (1) of Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.3, we have the following comparison of the Laplacian eigenvalues and the Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

$$\mu_i \leq \mu_{i+j}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_B^{(|\Omega|-j)}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  and  $0, 1, \dots, |\Omega| - i$ .

Note that  $\mu_i$  is independent of the choices of  $B$ . Then, we have the following upper bound estimate for  $\mu_i$  by Corollary 1.4 and noting that  $\mu_i(\Omega) = 0$  if  $G|_\Omega$  has at least  $i$  connected components. It can be viewed as an extension of the vertex-connectivity upper bounds for Laplacian eigenvalues by Fiedler [7].

**Corollary 1.5.** *Let  $(G, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph. Then, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |V|$ ,*

$$\mu_i \leq \min \left\{ \text{Deg}_S^{(|S^c|-j)} \mid S \subset V, 0 \leq j \leq |S^c| - i, \text{ and } \pi_0(G - S) \geq i + j \right\}.$$

In particular, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |V|$ ,

$$\mu_i \leq \min \left\{ \max_{x \in S^c} \text{Deg}_S(x) \mid S \subset V \text{ such that } \pi_0(G - S) \geq i \right\}.$$

Especially, if  $G$  is equipped with the unit weight, then

$$\mu_i \leq \min \{ |S| \mid S \subset V \text{ such that } \pi_0(G - S) \geq i \},$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |V|$ . Here  $\pi_0(G - S)$  is the number of connected components of  $G - S$ , and

$$\text{Deg}_S^{(1)} \leq \text{Deg}_S^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \text{Deg}_S^{|S^c|}$$

is the rearrangement of  $\text{Deg}_S(x)$  with  $x$  going through  $S^c$ .

Note that the equalities in Theorem 1.5 can not hold. For example, when  $G$  is connected,  $\nu_1 = 0$ , but  $\lambda_1 > 0$ . This means that the comparison in Theorem 1.5 is not sharp. By comparing the Neumann Laplacian operator and the Dirichlet Laplacian operator, we have the following sharp comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component of  $G$  contains some interior vertices. Then*

$$(1.3) \quad \nu_i + \lambda_{\min}(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) \leq \lambda_i \leq \nu_i + \lambda_{\max}(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , with equalities for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if  $A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  is a scalar operator.

Here  $A_B$  and  $A_\Omega$  are the weighted adjacent operators relative to  $B$  and  $\Omega$  respectively (see Section 2 for details), and  $L_B : \mathbb{R}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^B$  is the Dirichlet Laplacian operator with Dirichlet boundary value on  $\Omega$  (see Section 3 for details). Moreover  $\lambda_{\min}(T)$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(T)$  denote the minimal eigenvalue and maximal eigenvalue of the linear transformation  $T$  respectively.

Because it is hard to get explicit expression of  $L_B^{-1}$  for general weighted graphs with boundary, we are not able to obtain a geometric characterization of graphs that the equalities of (1.3) all hold. However, when the boundary of the graph is simple in the sense that  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ , we have an explicit expression for  $L_B^{-1}$ . With the help of this expression, we are able to get a more geometric characterization of graphs that the equalities of (1.3) all hold.

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a connected weighted finite graph with boundary such that  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ . Then*

$$(1.4) \quad \nu_i + \lambda_{\min}(A_B \text{Deg}^{-1} A_\Omega) \leq \lambda_i \leq \nu_i + \lambda_{\max}(A_B \text{Deg}^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . Moreover, the equalities of (1.4) hold for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , if and only if

- (1) every boundary vertex is adjacent to only one interior vertex, and
- (2) the weighted degree  $\text{Deg}_B(x)$  relative to  $B$  is independent of  $x \in \Omega$ .

There are also comparisons between Dirichlet eigenvalues and Neumann eigenvalues, and comparisons between Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues for the interior subgraph similar to Theorem 1.3. See Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 in Section 5 for details.

Finally, by combining the comparison results above and some known lower bounds for Laplacian eigenvalues such as Lichnerowicz-type estimates in [2, 15, 13], Fielder's estimate [7] and Friedman's estimate [6], we can get some interesting estimates on Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues. For example, we have the following Lichnerowicz-type estimates for the first positive Neumann eigenvalue. For other estimates, see Section 6 for details.

**Theorem 1.8.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a connected weighted finite graph with boundary.*

- (1) *If  $(G, m, w)$  satisfies the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(K, n)$  with  $K > 0$  and  $n > 1$ , then  $\nu_2 \geq \frac{nK}{n-1}$ .*
- (2) *If the Ollivier curvature of  $(G, m, w)$  has a positive lower bound  $\kappa$ , then  $\nu_2 \geq \kappa$ .*

Note that in the Lichnerowicz estimates above, no analogue of boundary curvatures such as mean curvature or second fundamental form was involved. This is different with the Riemannian case.

At the end of this section, we would like to mention that we take the most general definition of graphs with boundary in this paper. That is, any pair  $(G, B)$  with  $B \subset V(G)$  is a graph with boundary (see [22] for example). For all the comparison results of eigenvalues, we don't need the assumption that  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$  (see [18, 10] for examples). However, when considering rigidities of the comparisons of eigenvalues, we sometimes need this assumption to obtain more geometric characterizations. See Corollary 1.1, Corollary 1.2 and Theorem 1.7 for examples.

Moreover, because in this most general notion of graphs with boundary, one can interchange the roles of the interior and boundary. So, Neumann eigenvalues and Steklov eigenvalues can be viewed as dual of each other in the sense that

$$\sigma_i(G, S) = \nu_i(G, S^c), \quad \forall S \subset V(G).$$

Therefore, the comparisons on Neumann eigenvalues in this paper also provide comparisons on Steklov eigenvalues on the most general graphs with boundary, and Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.8 are actually extensions of our previous works [19, 20] to the most general graphs with boundary. The comparisons on Neumann eigenvalues can then be translated as comparisons on Steklov eigenvalues. See Corollary 5.2, Corollary 5.3, Corollary 5.4 and Corollary 5.5 in Section 5 for examples.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce some notations and preliminaries. In Section 3, we obtain some simple but useful relations on the Dirichlet Laplacian operator, Neumann Laplacian operator and Laplacian operator of the interior subgraph. In Section 4, we obtain the comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues and its rigidity. In Section 5, we obtain some comparisons on Dirichlet eigenvalues, Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph. In Section 6, we obtain some applications of the comparisons of eigenvalues by combining them with some known lower bounds for Laplacian eigenvalues.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some preliminaries and notations on analysis of graphs. For more details about analysis on graphs, see [8] and [3].

Firstly, let's recall the notion of weighted graphs.

**Definition 2.1.** A weighted graph is a tripe  $(G, m, w)$  where

- (1)  $G$  is a simple graph;
- (2)  $m : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is called the vertex-measure;
- (3)  $w : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is called the edge-weight.

Here  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  are the sets of vertices and edges of the graph  $G$  respectively. We will simply write them as  $V$  and  $E$  respectively if no confusion was made.

When  $m \equiv 1$  and  $w \equiv 1$ , we say that  $G$  is equipped with the unit weight.

For simplicity, we also view  $w$  as a symmetric function on  $V \times V$  by zero extension. Throughout this paper, graphs are assumed to be simple and finite.

For each  $x \in V$ , define the weighted degree  $\text{Deg}(x)$  at  $x$  as

$$\text{Deg}(x) = \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} w_{xy}.$$

If  $\text{Deg}(x) = 1$  for any  $x \in V$ , we say that  $G$  is equipped with a normalized weight.

For any  $S \subset V$ , define the weighted degree  $\text{Deg}_S(x)$  relative to  $S$  at  $x$  as

$$\text{Deg}_S(x) = \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in S} w_{xy}.$$

Moreover, define the weighted adjacency operator  $A_S : \mathbb{R}^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{S^c}$  relative to  $S$  as

$$A_S u(x) = \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in S} u(y) w_{xy}, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^S \text{ and } x \in S^c.$$

It is clear that

$$\text{Deg}_S(x) = A_S(\mathbf{1})(x) \quad \forall x \in S^c.$$

Equip  $\mathbb{R}^V$  with the inner product:

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{x \in V} u(x)v(x)m_x, \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}^V.$$

For  $S \subset V$ , define

$$\langle u, v \rangle_S = \sum_{x \in S} u(x)v(x)m_x.$$

It is then clearly that  $A_S$  and  $A_{S^c}$  are the adjoint operator of each other:

$$\langle A_S u, v \rangle_{S^c} = \langle u, A_{S^c} v \rangle_S, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^S \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{R}^{S^c}.$$

Let  $A^1(G)$  be the space of skew-symmetric functions  $\alpha$  on  $V \times V$  such

$$\alpha(x, y) = 0 \text{ when } x \not\sim y.$$

In fact,  $\alpha$  is called a flow in [1]. Equip  $A^1(G)$  with the inner product:

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \sum_{\{x, y\} \in E} \alpha(x, y)\beta(x, y)w_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \in V} \alpha(x, y)\beta(x, y)w_{xy}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in A^1(G).$$

For  $S \subset E$ , define

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_S = \sum_{\{x, y\} \in S} \alpha(x, y)\beta(x, y)w_{xy}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in A^1(G).$$

For  $S \subset V$ , define

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_S = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{E(S, S)}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in A^1(G).$$

For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , define the differential  $du \in A^1(G)$  of  $u$  as

$$du(x, y) = \begin{cases} u(y) - u(x) & \{x, y\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From this definition, we know that  $du \equiv 0$  if and only if  $u$  is constant on each connected component of  $G$ .

Let  $d^* : A^1(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  be the adjoint operator of  $d : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow A^1(G)$ . The Laplacian operator on  $\mathbb{R}^V$  is defined as

$$\Delta = d^*d.$$

By direct computation,

$$\Delta u(x) = \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} (u(x) - u(y))w_{xy}$$

for any  $x \in V$ . Moreover, by the definition of  $\Delta$ , it is clear that

$$(2.1) \quad \langle \Delta u, v \rangle = \langle du, dv \rangle$$

for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^V$ . So  $\Delta$  is a nonnegative self-adjoint operator on  $\mathbb{R}^V$ . Let

$$0 = \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{|V|}$$

be the eigenvalues of  $\Delta$  on  $(G, m, w)$ . It is not hard to see from (2.1) that the multiplicity of eigenvalue 0 equals to the number of connected components of  $G$ . So, when  $G$  is connected,  $\mu_2 > 0$ .

We will also denote  $\Delta$  as  $\Delta_G$ , and denote  $\mu_i$  as  $\mu_i(G)$  or  $\mu_i(G, m, w)$  when it is necessary. For any nonempty subset  $S$  of  $V$ , the Laplacian operator of the induced subgraph  $G|_S$  (inherit the weights from  $G$ ) is denoted as  $\Delta_S$ . The eigenvalues of  $\Delta_S$  is denoted as

$$0 = \mu_1(S) \leq \mu_2(S) \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{|S|}(S).$$

For  $i > |S|$ , we take the convention that  $\mu_i(S) = +\infty$ .

Next, let's recall the notion of graphs with boundary.

**Definition 2.2.** A pair  $(G, B)$  is called a graph with boundary if  $G$  is a graph and  $B$  is a nonempty subset of  $V(G)$  which is called the boundary of the graph. The set  $\Omega := V \setminus B$  is called the interior of the graph. Edges in  $E(B, \Omega)$  are called boundary edges.

Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted graph with boundary. For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $x \in B$ , define the normal derivative of  $u$  at  $x$  as:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) := \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} (u(x) - u(y))w_{xy} = \Delta u(x).$$

Then, by (2.1), one has the following Green's formula:

$$\langle \Delta u, v \rangle_\Omega = \langle du, dv \rangle - \left\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}, v \right\rangle_B.$$

We now introduce Dirichlet eigenvalues, Neumann eigenvalues and Steklov eigenvalues on weighted graphs with boundary.



A real number  $\lambda$  is called a Dirichlet eigenvalue of  $(G, B, m, w)$  if the following Dirichlet boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) = \lambda u(x) & x \in \Omega \\ u(x) = 0 & x \in B \end{cases}$$

has a nontrivial solution. The corresponding operator for Dirichlet eigenvalues is the Dirichlet Laplacian operator introduced as follows.

Let  $E_0 : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  be defined as

$$E_0(u)(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & x \in \Omega \\ 0 & x \in B. \end{cases}$$

Then, the Dirichlet eigenvalues of  $(G, B, m, w)$  are the eigenvalues of the operator  $\Delta^D : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  with

$$\Delta^D u = \Delta E_0(u)|_\Omega$$

which is called the Dirichlet Laplacian operator. By (2.1), it is clear that

$$(2.2) \quad \langle \Delta^D u, v \rangle_\Omega = \langle \Delta E_0(u), E_0(v) \rangle = \langle dE_0(u), dE_0(v) \rangle$$

for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ . So,  $\Delta^D$  is a nonnegative self-adjoint operator on  $\mathbb{R}^\Omega$ . We denote its eigenvalues as

$$0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{|\Omega|}.$$

We also denote  $\Delta^D$  as  $\Delta_{G,B}^D$ , and denote  $\lambda_i$  as  $\lambda_i(G, B)$  or  $\lambda_i(G, B, m, w)$  when it is necessary. When  $i > |\Omega|$ , we take the convention that  $\lambda_i = +\infty$ .

By (2.2), we have the following conclusion for the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 0 for  $\Delta^D$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Let  $i(G, B)$  be the number of connected components of  $G$  that contains no boundary vertex. Then*

$$\dim \ker \Delta^D = i(G, B).$$

*In particular, if  $i(G, B) = 0$ , then  $\lambda_1 > 0$  which also implies that  $\Delta^D$  is invertible. Especially, when  $G$  is connected,  $\lambda_1 > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \ker \Delta^D$ . By (2.2), we have

$$\langle dE_0(u), dE_0(u) \rangle = 0.$$

So,  $E_0(u)$  is constant on each connected component of  $G$ . Because  $E_0(u)|_B = 0$ ,  $E_0(u) = 0$  on each connected component of  $G$  that contains some boundary vertices. On those connected components of  $G$  that contain no boundary vertex, the constant can be arbitrary. So,

$$\dim \ker \Delta^D = i(G, B).$$

□

A real number  $\nu$  is called a Neumann eigenvalue of  $(G, B, m, w)$  if the following Neumann boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) = \nu u(x) & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) = 0 & x \in B \end{cases}$$

has a nontrivial solution. The corresponding operator for Neumann eigenvalues is the Neumann Laplacian operator introduced as follows.

For each  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ , let  $N_0(u) \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be its harmonic extension. That is

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta N_0(u)(x) = 0 & x \in B \\ N_0(u)(x) = u(x) & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The Neumann eigenvalues of  $(G, B, m, w)$  are the eigenvalues of the operator  $\Delta^N : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  where

$$(2.4) \quad \Delta^N u = \Delta N_0(u)|_\Omega$$

is called the Neumann Laplacian operator.

Note that harmonic extension is not unique without any connectivity assumption on  $(G, B)$ . However, the definition (2.4) of  $\Delta^N : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  is independent of the choices of the harmonic extension  $N_0(u)$ . In fact, consider all the connected components of  $G$ , on those connected components containing some interior vertices, the harmonic extension is uniquely determined by  $u$  (see [8]). So,  $\Delta N_0(u)|_\Omega$  is uniquely determined by  $u$ . For simplicity, we also require that  $N_0(u) = 0$  on connected components of  $G$  that contain no interior vertices. With this requirement on  $N_0(u)$ ,  $N_0 : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is a well defined linear map.

Moreover, note that

$$(2.5) \quad \langle \Delta^N u, v \rangle_\Omega = \langle \Delta N_0(u), N_0(v) \rangle = \langle dN_0(u), dN_0(v) \rangle$$

by (2.1). So  $\Delta^N : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  is a nonnegative self-adjoint operator. Let

$$0 \leq \nu_1 < \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_{|\Omega|}$$

be its eigenvalues. We also denote  $\Delta^N$  as  $\Delta_{G,B}^N$ , and denote  $\nu_i$  as  $\nu_i(G, B)$  or  $\nu_i(G, B, m, w)$  when it is necessary. When  $i > |\Omega|$ , we take the convention that  $\nu_i = +\infty$ .

By (2.5), we have the following conclusion about the multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue for the Neumann Laplacian.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Let  $j(G, B)$  be the number of connected components of  $G$  that contain some interior vertices. Then,*

$$\dim \ker \Delta^N = j(G, B).$$

*In particular, if  $G$  is connected with nonempty interior, then  $\nu_2 > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \ker \Delta^N$ . Then, by (2.5),

$$\langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle = 0.$$

So,  $N_0(u)$  is constant on each connected components of  $G$ . Note that

$$N_0(u)|_\Omega = u$$

and the constants on each connected components are arbitrary. So,

$$\dim \ker \Delta^N = j(G, B).$$

□

A real number  $\sigma$  is called a Steklov eigenvalue of  $(G, B, m, w)$  if the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) = 0 & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) = \sigma u(x) & x \in B \end{cases}$$

has a nonzero solution. The Steklov eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of the Steklov operator introduced as follows.

For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^B$ , let  $H_0(u) \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be the harmonic extension of  $u$ . That is,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta H_0(u)(x) = 0 & x \in \Omega \\ H_0(u)(x) = u(x) & x \in B. \end{cases}$$

The Steklov eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of the Steklov operator  $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^B$  defined as

$$\Lambda(u) = \frac{\partial H_0(u)}{\partial n}.$$

The same as in the definition of Neumann operators, although harmonic extension is not unique in general, the Steklov operator is independent of the choices of harmonic extensions. Moreover, if we further require that  $H_0(u)$  is zero on those connected components contain no boundary vertex, then  $H_0 : \mathbb{R}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$  is a well defined linear map.

By (2.1), it is clear that

$$\langle \Lambda u, u \rangle_B = \langle \Delta H_0(u), H_0(u) \rangle = \langle dH_0(u), dH_0(u) \rangle.$$

So,  $\Lambda$  is a nonnegative self-adjoint operator, let

$$0 = \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \cdots \leq \sigma_{|B|}.$$

be its eigenvalues.

We also denote  $\Lambda$  as  $\Lambda_{G,B}$  and denote  $\sigma_i$  as  $\sigma_i(G, B)$  or  $\sigma_i(G, B, m, w)$  if necessary. We take the convention that  $\sigma_i = +\infty$  when  $i > |B|$ .

Note that in the general definition of graphs with boundary, one can interchange the roles of the interior and boundary. From this point of view, by the definition of Neumann eigenvalues and Steklov eigenvalues, one can see that they are dual of each other. More precisely, one has the following relation between Steklov operators and Neumann operators:

$$\Lambda_{G,B} = \Delta_{G,\Omega}^N,$$

and hence

$$\sigma_i(G, B) = \nu_i(G, \Omega)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ . So, any result on Neumann eigenvalues can be translated as a result on Steklov eigenvalues by interchanging the roles of  $\Omega$  and  $B$ . For example, Proposition 2.2 translated as a result on Steklov eigenvalues is as follows.

**Corollary 2.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary, let  $b(G, B)$  be the number of connected components of  $G$  containing some boundary vertices. Then*

$$\dim \ker \Lambda = b(G, B).$$

*In particular, if  $G$  is connected, then  $\sigma_2 > 0$ .*

*Remark 2.1.* The conclusion of Corollary 2.1 is slightly different with that of [10, Proposition 3.2]. This is because connected components that consist of only interior vertices were ignored in [10, Proposition 3.2].

Finally, recall the following theorem of Weyl (see Theorem 4.3.1 of [12]) on the spectrum of the sum of two self-adjoint linear transformations which will be frequently used in Section 5.

**Theorem 2.1** (Weyl). *Let  $V$  be an  $n$  dimensional vector space equipped with an inner product. Let  $A, B$  be two self-adjoint linear transformations of  $V$ . Then,*

- (1) *for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n - i$ ,*

$$\lambda_i(A + B) \leq \lambda_{i+j}(A) + \lambda_{n-j}(B)$$

*with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero vector  $x \in V$  such that  $(A + B)x = \lambda_i(A + B)x$ ,  $Ax = \lambda_{i+j}(A)x$  and  $Bx = \lambda_{n-j}(B)x$ ;*

- (2) *for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$ ,*

$$\lambda_i(A + B) \geq \lambda_{i-j+1}(A) + \lambda_j(B)$$

*with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero vector  $x \in V$  such that  $(A + B)x = \lambda_i(A + B)x$ ,  $Ax = \lambda_{i-j+1}(A)x$  and  $Bx = \lambda_j(B)x$ .*

Here  $\lambda_i(A)$  means the  $i^{\text{th}}$  eigenvalue of  $A$ .

### 3. RELATIONS OF $\Delta^D, \Delta^N$ AND $\Delta_\Omega$

In this section, we derive some simple but useful relations among  $\Delta_\Omega$ ,  $\Delta^D$  and  $\Delta^N$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ ,*

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta^D = \Delta_\Omega + \text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega$$

where  $I_\Omega : \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  is the identity map.

*Proof.* For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  and  $x \in \Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^D u(x) &= \Delta E_0(u)(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} (E_0(u)(x) - E_0(u)(y)) w_{xy} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega} (u(x) - u(y)) w_{xy} + \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in B} u(x) w_{xy} \\ &= \Delta_\Omega u(x) + \text{Deg}_B(x) u(x). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Note that removing connected components of  $G$  that contain no interior vertex will not influence the expression of  $\Delta_\Omega$ ,  $\Delta^D$  and  $\Delta^N$  by definition. So, we may assume that any connected components of  $G$  contain some interior vertex. By Proposition 2.1, this implies that  $\lambda_1(G, \Omega) > 0$  and that

$$L_B := \Delta_{G, \Omega}^D : \mathbb{R}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^B$$

is invertible. With the help of  $L_B^{-1}$ , we have the following expression of  $N_0(u)$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that every connected components of  $G$  contains some interior vertices. Then, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ ,*

$$N_0(u)|_B = L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u.$$

In particular, when  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ ,

$$N_0(u)|_B = \text{Deg}^{-1} \cdot A_\Omega u.$$

*Proof.* For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  and  $x \in B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Delta N_0(u)(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} (N_0(u)(x) - N_0(u)(y)) w_{xy} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in B} (N_0(u)(x) - N_0(u)(y)) w_{xy} + \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega} (N_0(u)(x) - u(y)) w_{xy} \\ &= \Delta_B N_0(u)(x) + \text{Deg}_\Omega(x) N_0(u)(x) - A_\Omega u(x). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.1), we have

$$L_B N_0(u) = \Delta_B N_0(u) + \text{Deg}_\Omega N_0(u).$$

So,

$$N_0(u)|_B = L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u.$$

Moreover, when  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ ,  $\Delta_B = 0$ . So, we have

$$N_0(u)(x) = \frac{1}{\text{Deg}_\Omega(x)} A_\Omega u(x) = \frac{1}{\text{Deg}(x)} A_\Omega u(x), \quad \forall x \in B$$

by that  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

By the help of the expression of  $N_0(u)$  in Proposition 3.2, we have the following relations among  $\Delta^N$ ,  $\Delta_\Omega$  and  $\Delta^D$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that every connected component of  $G$  contains some interior vertices. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^N &= \Delta_\Omega + \text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega \\ &= \Delta^D - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

In particular, when  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^N &= \Delta_\Omega + \text{Deg}_B \cdot u - A_B \text{Deg}^{-1} A_\Omega \\ &= \Delta^D - A_B \text{Deg}^{-1} A_\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

*Proof.* For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  and  $x \in \Omega$ , by Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^N u(x) &= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in V} (N_0(u)(x) - N_0(u)(y)) w_{xy} \\
&= \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega} (u(x) - u(y)) w_{xy} + \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in B} (u(x) - N_0(u)(y)) w_{xy} \\
&= \Delta_\Omega u + \text{Deg}_B(x) u(x) - \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in B} L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u(y) w_{xy} \\
&= \Delta_\Omega u + \text{Deg}_B(x) u(x) - (A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u(x) \\
&= (\Delta^D - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

Translating Proposition 3.3 into Steklov operators, we have the following conclusion.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that every connected component of  $G$  contains some boundary vertices. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.4) \quad \Lambda &= \Delta_B + \text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot I_B - A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B \\
&= L_B - A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, when  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ ,

$$(3.5) \quad \Lambda = \text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot I_B - A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B.$$

Here  $L_\Omega = \Delta^D$ .

*Remark 3.1.* The identity (3.5) is essentially Corollary 2.1 of [10]. So, the identity (3.4) can be viewed as an extension of [10, Corollary 2.1] for more general graphs with boundary.

#### 4. COMPARISON OF THE NEUMANN EIGENVALUES AND LAPLACIAN EIGENVALUES AND ITS RIGIDITY

In this section, we prove the the comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues and its rigidity.

We first prove Theorem 1.1, a comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $v_1 = 1, v_2, \dots, v_{|\Omega|} \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  be eigenfunctions of  $\nu_1 = 0, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_{|\Omega|}$  respectively such that

$$\langle v_i, v_j \rangle_\Omega = 0$$

for  $i \neq j$ . Let  $u_1 = 1, u_2, \dots, u_{|V|} \in \mathbb{R}^V$  be eigenfunctions of  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{|V|}$  respectively such that

$$\langle u_i, u_j \rangle = 0$$

for  $i \neq j$ . For each  $i \geq 2$ , let  $v = c_1v_1 + c_2v_2 + \cdots + c_iv_i$  with  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_i$  not all zero, such that

$$(4.1) \quad \langle N_0(v), u_j \rangle = 0$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$ . This can be done because (4.1) for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$  form a homogeneous linear system with  $i-1$  equations and  $i$  unknowns which will certainly have nonzero solutions. Then,

$$(4.2) \quad \nu_i \geq \frac{\langle dN_0(v), dN_0(v) \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle_\Omega} \geq \frac{\langle dN_0(v), dN_0(v) \rangle}{\langle N_0(v), N_0(v) \rangle} \geq \mu_i.$$

If  $\nu_i = \mu_i > 0$ , then all the inequalities become equalities in (4.2). Hence,  $N_0(v)$  is simultaneously a Neumann Laplacian eigenfunction and a Laplacian eigenfunction for  $\nu_i = \mu_i$ . Moreover, since  $\mu_i > 0$ ,

$$\langle dN_0(v), dN_0(v) \rangle > 0.$$

Thus,  $N_0(v)|_B = 0$ . Note that  $\frac{\partial N_0(v)}{\partial n} = 0$  by definition of  $N_0$ . This completes the proof of the theorem by letting  $u = N_0(v)$ .  $\square$

We next prove Theorem 1.2, a general rigidity for (1.1).

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* If the equality of (1.1) holds for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , we claim that *there are*  $\tilde{u}_1 = 1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_{|\Omega|} \in \mathbb{R}^V$  such that

- (1)  $\Delta \tilde{u}_i = \mu_i \tilde{u}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ;
- (2)  $\Delta^N(\tilde{u}_i|_\Omega) = \nu_i \tilde{u}_i|_\Omega$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ;
- (3)  $\tilde{u}_i|_B = \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_i}{\partial n} = 0$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ ;
- (4)  $\langle \tilde{u}_i, \tilde{u}_j \rangle_\Omega = \langle \tilde{u}_i, \tilde{u}_j \rangle = 0$  for  $1 \leq j < i \leq |\Omega|$ .

In fact, suppose that  $\tilde{u}_1 = 1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_{i-1}$  have been constructed for some  $i \geq 2$ . Let  $v = c_1v_1 + c_2v_2 + \cdots + c_iv_i$  with  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_i$  not all zero such that

$$\langle N_0(v), \tilde{u}_j \rangle = 0$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$ . Here  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|\Omega|}$  are the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Then, using the same argument as in (4.2), we know that  $\tilde{u}_i := N_0(v)$  will satisfy the requirements (1)-(4) above, since  $\nu_i = \mu_i > 0$  for  $i \geq 2$ .

Then, for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  with

$$(4.3) \quad 0 = \langle v, 1 \rangle_\Omega = \sum_{y \in \Omega} v(y)m_y.$$

We know that

$$v = c_2\tilde{u}_2|_\Omega + \cdots + c_{|\Omega|}\tilde{u}_{|\Omega|}|_\Omega$$

for some  $c_2, c_3, \dots, c_{|\Omega|} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, by (3) of the claim,

$$N_0(v) = c_2\tilde{u}_2 + \cdots + c_{|\Omega|}\tilde{u}_{|\Omega|}$$

which implies that  $N_0(v)|_B = 0$  by (3) of the claim again. By Proposition 3.2,

$$\frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega} v(y)w_{xy} = A_\Omega v(x) = (L_B N_0(v)|_B)(x) = 0$$

for any  $x \in B$ . By comparing this to (4.3), there is a nonnegative function  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^B$  such that

$$w_{xy} = \rho_x m_x m_y$$

for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ .

Conversely, if  $w_{xy} = \rho_x m_x m_y$  for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ , then for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  with  $\langle v, 1 \rangle_\Omega = 0$ , we have

$$A_\Omega v(x) = \rho_x \langle v, 1 \rangle_\Omega = 0, \quad \forall x \in B.$$

So, by Proposition 3.2,

$$N_0(v)|_B = L_B^{-1} A_\Omega v \equiv 0.$$

If  $v$  is further an eigenfunction of  $\Delta^N$  with eigenvalue  $\nu_i$ , then by that

$$\Delta N_0(v)|_\Omega = \Delta^N v = \nu_i v$$

and

$$\Delta N_0(v)|_B = 0 = \nu_i N_0(v)|_B,$$

we know that  $N_0(v)$  is also an eigenfunction of  $\Delta$  with the same eigenvalue  $\nu_i$ .

Moreover, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  with  $\langle u, 1 \rangle_\Omega = 0$ , since  $N_0(u)|_B = 0$ , by Proposition 3.1,

$$\Delta^N u = \Delta N_0(u) = \Delta E_0(u)|_\Omega = \Delta^D u = \Delta_\Omega u + \text{Deg}_b \cdot u.$$

So,

$$\mu_{|\Omega|} = \nu_{|\Omega|} = \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b.$$

Hence, the equality  $\nu_i = \mu_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  holds if and only if

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{\langle du, du \rangle}{\langle u, u \rangle} \geq \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b$$

for any nonzero  $u \in \mathbb{R}^V$  with  $\langle u, \tilde{u}_i \rangle = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . Because

$$\langle u, \tilde{u}_i \rangle_\Omega = \langle u, \tilde{u}_i \rangle = 0$$

for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ , we know that  $u|_\Omega$  must be a constant  $c$ .

When  $c = 0$ , let  $f = u|_B$ , then  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = \langle u, 1 \rangle = 0$  and by (4.4),

$$\frac{\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B}{\langle f, f \rangle_B} = \frac{\langle du, du \rangle}{\langle u, u \rangle} \geq \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b.$$

That is,

$$(4.5) \quad \langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B \geq 0$$

for any  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  with  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ .



When  $c \neq 0$ , we can assume that  $c = 1$ . Let  $f = u|_B + \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B}$ . Then, by that  $\langle u, 1 \rangle = 0$ , we have  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ . Moreover, by (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \left( \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - \frac{2V_G}{V_B} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B + \frac{V_G^2}{V_B^2} \text{Deg}_b \right)}{\langle f, f \rangle_B + \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B}} \\ &= \frac{\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \left\langle \rho \left( f - \frac{V_G}{V_B} \right), f - \frac{V_G}{V_B} \right\rangle_B}{V_\Omega + \left\langle f - \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B}, f - \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \right\rangle_B} \\ &= \frac{\langle du, du \rangle}{\langle u, u \rangle} \\ &\geq \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B \\ & - 2 \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B + \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \left( \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b - \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \right) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  with  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ . Let  $f = 0$  in (4.6). We get

$$(4.7) \quad \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b.$$

Moreover, replacing  $f$  by  $\lambda f$  in (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B) \lambda^2 \\ & - 2 \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B \lambda + \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \left( \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b - \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \right) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( 2 \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B \right)^2 \\ & \leq 4 \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} (\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B) \left( \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b - \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b - \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \right) (\langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B) \\ & - \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_B} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  with  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ .

Conversely, it is not hard to see that the combination of (4.5), (4.7) and (4.8) implies (4.4).

When  $\rho$  is constant, substituting this into (4.5), (4.7) and (4.8), we find that they are equivalent to that

$$(4.9) \quad \langle df, df \rangle_B + (\rho(V_\Omega - V_B) - \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega)) \langle f, f \rangle_B \geq 0$$

for all  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  with  $\langle f, 1 \rangle_B = 0$ , and

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \rho V_\Omega$$

by noting that  $\text{Deg}_b = \rho V_B$  in this case. Note that (4.9) is automatical true if  $|B| = 1$  and when  $|B| \geq 2$ , (4.9) is equivalent to that

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \mu_2(B) + \rho(V_\Omega - V_B).$$

So, when  $\rho$  is constant, the combination of (4.5), (4.7) and (4.8) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \min \{ \rho V_\Omega, \mu_2(B) + \rho(V_\Omega - V_B) \}.$$

When  $\rho$  is nonconstant, let  $f \in \mathbb{R}^B$  be such that  $\langle 1, f \rangle_B = 0$  and  $\langle \rho, f \rangle_B \neq 0$ . Substituting  $f$  into (4.8), we get

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) < \frac{V_\Omega}{V_B} \text{Deg}_b.$$

Moreover, (4.8) can be rewritten as

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle df, df \rangle_B + V_\Omega \langle \rho f, f \rangle_B - (\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_b) \langle f, f \rangle_B \\ & \geq \frac{V_\Omega V_G}{V_\Omega \text{Deg}_b - V_B \mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega)} \langle \rho, f \rangle_B^2. \end{aligned}$$

which is stronger than (4.5). So, we only need to require (4.10) in this case.

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We next come to prove Corollary 1.1 and Corollary 1.2, the rigidity of (1.1) when the graph is equipped with the unit weight or normalized weight.

*Proof of Corollary 1.1*. If the equalities of (1.1) holds for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ , by Theorem 1.2, there is a nonnegative function  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^B$ , such that

$$w_{xy} = \rho_x m_x m_y$$

for all  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ . Because  $x \in B$  is adjacent to some  $y \in \Omega$  and the graph is equipped with unit weight, we have

$$\rho \equiv 1.$$

So, any boundary vertex is adjacent to any interior vertex. Substituting  $\rho \equiv 1$  into (1.2), we get

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \min \{ |\Omega|, \mu_2(B) + |\Omega| - |B| \} = \mu_2(B) + |\Omega| - |B|$$

when  $|B| \geq 2$ , by noting that  $\mu_2(B) \leq |B|$  (see Fiedler [7]). When  $|B| = 1$ ,  $\mu_2(B) = +\infty$ , by (1.2),

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq |\Omega|.$$

Conversely, because every boundary vertex is adjacent to every interior vertex, we have

$$w_{xy} = m_x m_y$$

for any  $x \in B$  and  $y \in \Omega$ . So  $\rho \equiv 1$ . Then, note that (2) of Corollary 1.1 is equivalent to (1.2). So, by Theorem 1.2, the equalities of (1.2) hold for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ .

Moreover, recall the following estimate (see [7] for example):

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq 2\Delta(G|_{\Omega}).$$

So, if

$$2\Delta(G|_{\Omega}) \leq |\Omega| - |B|,$$

then (2) of Corollary 1.1 holds. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.2.* Suppose the equalities of (1.1) hold for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ . By Theorem 1.2, for any  $x \in B$ ,

$$1 = \text{Deg}(x) = \frac{1}{m_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega} w_{xy} = \rho_x V_{\Omega},$$

since  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ . So, for any  $x \in B$ ,  $\rho_x = \frac{1}{V_{\Omega}}$ . Substituting this into (1.2), we get

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq \frac{V_{\Omega} - V_B}{V_{\Omega}}$$

when  $|B| \geq 2$ , since  $\mu_2(B) = 0$  by  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ . When  $|B| = 1$ , since  $\mu_2(B) = +\infty$ , by (1.2),

$$\mu_{|\Omega|}(\Omega) \leq 1.$$

The converse is clearly true by Theorem 1.2. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.2.  $\square$

## 5. COMPARISONS OF THE EIGENVALUES FOR $\Delta^N, \Delta^D$ AND $\Delta_{\Omega}$

In this section, we obtain the comparisons of Dirichlet eigenvalues, Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph, and their rigidities.

We first prove Theorem 1.3, a comparison of the Dirichlet eigenvalues and the Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* By Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\Delta^D = \Delta_{\Omega} + \text{Deg}_B \cdot I_{\Omega}$$

Then, the conclusions come from Theorem 2.1 directly by noting that

$$\lambda_i(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_{\Omega}) = \text{Deg}_B^{(i)}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ .  $\square$

We next prove Theorem 1.4, a comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega}$ , by (2.5), we have

$$\langle \Delta^N u, u \rangle_{\Omega} = \langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle \geq \langle du, du \rangle_{\Omega} = \langle \Delta_{\Omega} u, u \rangle_{\Omega}.$$

So, for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,  $\nu_i \geq \mu_i(\Omega)$ .

Moreover,  $\nu_i = \mu_i(\Omega)$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ ,

$$\langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle = \langle du, du \rangle_\Omega.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle_B = \langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle_{E(B, \Omega)} = 0$$

and that  $N_0(u)$  is constant on each connected component of  $N_G(B)$  for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ . Because  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  is arbitrary, this is equivalent to that each connected component of  $N_G(B)$  contains at most one interior vertex.  $\square$

By Proposition 3.3, the identity on the Neumann Laplacian operator and the Laplacian operator on the interior subgraph, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component contains some interior vertices. Then,*

- (1)  $\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega$  is nonnegative;
- (2) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,

$$\lambda_i(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) \leq \text{Deg}_B^{(i)}$$

with equalities for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if each connected component of  $N_G(B)$  contains at most one interior vertex.

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.3, (2.1) and (2.5), for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Deg}_B \cdot u - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u, u \rangle_\Omega &= \langle \Delta^N u - \Delta_\Omega u, u \rangle_\Omega \\ &= \langle dN_0(u), N_0(u) \rangle - \langle du, du \rangle_\Omega \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega$  is nonnegative. This proves (1).

The inequalities in (2) comes directly from (1). When the equalities in (2) all hold, we know that  $\Delta^N = \Delta_\Omega$ . So, each connected components of  $N_G(B)$  contains at most one interior vertex. This completes the proof of the corollary.  $\square$

Translating Theorem 1.4 to Steklov eigenvalues, we have the following conclusion.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary. Then,*

$$\sigma_i(G, B) \geq \mu_i(B)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ , with equalities for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$  if and only if each connected components of  $N_G(\Omega)$  contains at most one boundary vertex.

We next prove Theorem 1.5, a comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* For any  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ , by the Dirichlet Principle (see [8]), we have

$$\langle dE_0(u), dE_0(u) \rangle \geq \langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle.$$

So, by (2.2) and (2.5), we have

$$\langle \Delta^D u, u \rangle_\Omega = \langle dE_0(u), dE_0(u) \rangle \geq \langle dN_0(u), dN_0(u) \rangle = \langle \Delta^N u, u \rangle_\Omega.$$

Thus,  $\lambda_i \geq \nu_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ .  $\square$

Translating Theorem 1.5 into Steklov eigenvalues will give us the following estimate on Steklov eigenvalues which can be viewed as an extension of the upper bound on Dirichlet-to-Neumann map in [10, Proposition 3.1].

**Corollary 5.3.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph. Then,*

$$\sigma_i(G, B) \leq \mu_{i+j}(B) + \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(|B|-j)}$$

for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$  and  $j = 0, 1, \dots, |B| - i$ . In particular, if  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ , then

$$\sigma_i(G, B) \leq \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(i)}.$$

Here

$$\text{Deg}_\Omega^{(1)} \leq \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(|B|)}$$

is the rearrangement of  $\text{Deg}_\Omega(x)$  with  $x$  going through  $B$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.5 and (1) of Theorem 1.3, we have

$$\sigma_i(G, B) = \nu_i(G, \Omega) \leq \lambda_i(G, \Omega) \leq \mu_{i+j}(B) + \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(|B|-j)}$$

for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$  and  $j = 0, 1, \dots, |B| - i$ .

When  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ , we have  $\mu_{|B|}(B) = 0$ . So, by letting  $j = |B| - i$  in the last inequality, we get the inequality  $\sigma_i(G, B) \leq \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(i)}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ .  $\square$

We next prove Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 1.7, sharp comparisons of Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues.

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* By Proposition 3.3,

$$\Delta^D = \Delta^N + A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega.$$

Then, the conclusion comes directly from this identity.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* The inequalities comes directly from Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 3.2. We only need to show the rigidity. The equalities of (1.4) hold for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$  if and only if  $A_B \text{Deg}^{-1} A_\Omega$  is a scalar operator. By direct computation, this is equivalent to the follows:

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{x \in B} \frac{w_{xz}^2}{m_z \sum_{y \in \Omega} w_{xy}} := s$$

is independent of  $z \in \Omega$ , and

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{x \in B} \frac{w_{xz} w_{xy}}{m_z \sum_{\xi \in \Omega} w_{x\xi}} = 0$$

for any  $y \neq z \in \Omega$ . Because  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$  and  $G$  is connected, each boundary vertex must be adjacent to some interior vertex. So,  $s > 0$ . Then, by (5.1), we know that each interior vertex must be adjacent to some boundary vertex. Finally, it is clear that (5.2) is equivalent to that each boundary vertex is adjacent to only

one interior vertex. So, there is a surjective map  $\varphi : B \rightarrow \Omega$  such that  $x \sim \varphi(x)$ . Then, by (5.1), for any  $z \in \Omega$ ,

$$s = \sum_{x \in B} \frac{w_{xz}^2}{m_z \sum_{y \in \Omega} w_{xy}} = \sum_{x \in \varphi^{-1}(z)} \frac{w_{xz}^2}{m_z \sum_{y \in \Omega} w_{xy}} = \sum_{x \in \varphi^{-1}(z)} \frac{w_{xz}^2}{m_z w_{xz}} = \text{Deg}_B(z).$$

So,  $\text{Deg}_B(z)$  is independent of  $z \in \Omega$ .

Conversely, it is not hard to show (5.1) and (5.2) assuming (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.7. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

In fact, by using Theorem 2.1 similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we can get the following comparison of Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues which is an extension of Theorem 1.7.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component of  $G$  contains some interior vertices. Then*

- (1) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, |\Omega| - i$ ,

$$\lambda_i \leq \nu_{i+j} + \lambda_{|\Omega|-j}(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  such that  $\Delta^D u = \lambda_i u$ ,  $\Delta^N u = \nu_{i+j} u$  and  $A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u = \lambda_{|\Omega|-j}(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u$ ;

- (2) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$ ,

$$\lambda_i \geq \nu_{i-j+1} + \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  such that  $\Delta^D u = \lambda_i u$ ,  $\Delta^N u = \nu_{i-j+1} u$  and  $A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u = \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\Delta^D = \Delta^N + A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega.$$

Then, the conclusions follow directly by using Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

Translating the last result into Steklov eigenvalues, we get the following estimate on Steklov eigenvalues.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component of  $G$  contains some boundary vertices. Then*

$$(5.3) \quad \lambda_{i-j}(G, \Omega) - \lambda_{|B|-j}(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) \leq \sigma_i(G, B) \leq \lambda_{i+k-1}(G, \Omega) - \lambda_k(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |B| - i + 1$ . In particular, when  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ , we have

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(i-j)} - \lambda_{|B|-j}(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) \leq \sigma_i(G, B) \leq \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(i+k-1)} - \lambda_k(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |B| - i + 1$ . Here  $L_\Omega = \Delta^D$ .

*Proof.* By (1) of Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\lambda_{i-j}(G, \Omega) \leq \nu_i(G, \Omega) + \lambda_{|B|-j}(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) = \sigma_i(G, B) + \lambda_{|B|-j}(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B).$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1$ . This gives us the lower bound in (5.3). The upper bound of 5.3 can be proved similarly by using (2) of Theorem 5.1.

When  $E(B, B) = \emptyset$ , by Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\Delta_{G, \Omega}^D u = \Delta_B u + \text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot u = \text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot u, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^B.$$

So,  $\lambda_i(G, \Omega) = \text{Deg}_\Omega^{(i)}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, B$ . Substituting this into (5.3), we get (5.4). This completes the proof of the corollary.  $\square$

*Remark 5.1.* Letting  $k = 1$  in the R.H.S. of (5.3) and (5.4), we know that Corollary 5.4 is stronger than Corollary 5.3 by the fact that  $\lambda_1(A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) \geq 0$ .

Furthermore, by applying Theorem 2.1 to

$$\Delta^N u = \Delta_\Omega u + \text{Deg}_B \cdot u - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u$$

in Proposition 3.3, we have the following comparison on Neumann eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues of the interior subgraph.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component of  $G$  contains some interior vertices. Then*

(1) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, |\Omega| - i$ ,

$$\nu_i \leq \mu_{i+j}(\Omega) + \lambda_{|\Omega|-j}(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  such that  $\Delta^N u = \nu_i u$ ,  $\Delta_\Omega u = \mu_{i+j} u$  and

$$\text{Deg}_B \cdot u - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u = \lambda_{|\Omega|-j}(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u;$$

(2) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$ ,

$$\nu_i \geq \mu_{i-j+1}(\Omega) + \lambda_j(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

with equality for some pair  $i, j$  if and only if there is a nonzero function  $u \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$  such that  $\Delta^N u = \lambda_i u$ ,  $\Delta_\Omega u = \mu_{i-j+1} u$  and

$$\text{Deg}_B \cdot u - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega u = \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) u.$$

*Remark 5.2.* By Corollary 5.1,  $\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega$  is nonnegative. So, Theorem 5.2 is stronger than Theorem 1.4.

Finally, translating the last result into Steklov eigenvalues, we can obtain the following estimate on Steklov eigenvalues which is stronger than Corollary 5.2.

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a weighted finite graph with boundary such that each connected component of  $G$  contains some boundary vertices. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i-j+1}(B) + \lambda_j(\text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot I_B - A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) &\leq \sigma_i(G, B) \\ &\leq \mu_{i+k}(B) + \lambda_{|B|-k}(\text{Deg}_\Omega \cdot I_B - A_\Omega L_\Omega^{-1} A_B) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$  and  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, |B| - i$ . Here  $L_\Omega = \Delta^D$ .

## 6. SOME APPLICATIONS

In this section, by combining the comparisons of eigenvalues in the last two sections and some known lower bounds on Laplacian eigenvalues, we get some interesting lower bounds for Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues.

First recall the Licherowicz estimates of Laplacian eigenvalues for graphs with positive curvature lower bounds.

**Theorem 6.1** ([2, 13, 15]). *Let  $(G, m, w)$  be a connected weighted finite graph with boundary.*

- (1) *If  $(G, m, w)$  satisfies the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(K, n)$  with  $K > 0$  and  $n > 1$ , then  $\mu_2 \geq \frac{nK}{n-1}$ .*
- (2) *If the Ollivier curvature of  $(G, m, w)$  has a positive lower bound  $\kappa$ , then  $\mu_2 \geq \kappa$ .*

*Remark 6.1.* The Ollivier curvature we used here the most general one introduced in [16] extending the definition introduced by Lin-Lu-Yau [15] to general weighted graphs.

*Proof of Theorem 1.8.* By combining Theorem 6.1 and the comparison of Neumann eigenvalue and Laplacian eigenvalues (1.1), we get Theorem 1.8 directly.  $\square$

Similarly, by combining (2) of Theorem 1.3, (2) of Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 6.1, we have the following Lichnerowicz-type estimates for the Dirichlet eigenvalues and Neumann eigenvalues directly.

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $(G, B, m, w)$  be a connected weighted finite graph with boundary.*

- (1) *If  $(G|_\Omega, m|_\Omega, w|_\Omega)$  is connected and satisfies the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(K, n)$  for some  $K > 0$  and  $n > 1$ , then*

$$\lambda_i \geq \frac{nK}{n-1} + \text{Deg}_B^{(i-1)}$$

and

$$\nu_i \geq \frac{nK}{n-1} + \lambda_{i-1}(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ .

- (2) *If  $G|_\Omega$  is connected and the Ollivier curvature of  $(G|_\Omega, m|_\Omega, w|_\Omega)$  has a positive lower bound  $\kappa$ , then,*

$$\lambda_i \geq \kappa + \text{Deg}_B^{(i-1)}$$

and

$$\nu_i \geq \kappa + \lambda_{i-1}(\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega)$$

for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ .

*Proof.* For  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ , let  $j = i - 1$  in (2) of Theorem 1.3 and (2) of Theorem 5.2 and use Theorem 6.1 for  $G|_\Omega$ . We get the conclusions.  $\square$



Next, recall the estimate of Fiedler which relate the connectivity of graphs and their first positive Laplacian eigenvalues which are called the algebraic connectivity of graphs in [7].

**Theorem 6.3** (Fiedler [7]). *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices equipped with the unit weight. Then,*

$$(6.1) \quad \mu_2 \geq 2e(G) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{n}\right).$$

Here  $e(G)$  is the edge connectivity of  $G$ . That is the least number of edges need to be deleted from  $G$  to make it disconnected.

By combining the comparisons of eigenvalues with Theorem 6.3, we have the following estimates relating the Neumann eigenvalues and Dirichlet eigenvalues to edge connectivity or edge connectivity of the interior subgraph.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $(G, B)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with the unit weight. Then, for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$*

- (1)  $\nu_2 \geq 2e(G) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|V|}\right);$
- (2)  $\nu_i \geq 2e(\Omega) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|\Omega|}\right) + \lambda_{i-1} (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega);$
- (3)  $\lambda_i \geq 2e(\Omega) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|\Omega|}\right) + \text{Deg}_B^{(i-1)};$
- (4)  $\lambda_i \geq 2e(G) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|V|}\right) + \lambda_{i-1} (A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega).$

Here  $e(\Omega)$  is the edge connectivity of  $G|_\Omega$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 6.3, we have

$$\nu_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq 2e(G) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|V|}\right).$$

This gives us (1).

In (2) of Theorem 5.2, letting  $j = i - 1$  and using Theorem 6.3 for  $G|_\Omega$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_i &\geq \mu_2(\Omega) + \lambda_{i-1} (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega) \\ &\geq 2e(\Omega) \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{|\Omega|}\right) + \lambda_{i-1} (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_\Omega - A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

This gives us (2).

Similarly, in (2) of Theorem 1.3, letting  $j = i - 1$  and using Theorem 6.3 for  $G|_\Omega$ , we get (3).

Finally, in (2) of Theorem 5.1, letting  $j = i - 1$  and using (1), we get (4). This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Finally, recall the following geometric estimate for Laplacian eigenvalues of Friedman [6].

**Theorem 6.5** (Friedman [6]). *Let  $G$  be a connected graph on  $n$  vertices equipped with the unit weight. For  $2 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{i} \rfloor$ . Then,*

(1) when  $i \nmid n$ ,

$$\mu_i \geq 2 \left( 1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2k+1} \right);$$

(2) when  $i | n$

$$\mu_i \geq \lambda_1(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w).$$

Here  $P_{k+1}$  is a path:  $0 \sim 1 \sim 2 \sim \dots \sim k$ ,  $m_j = 1$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , and  $w_{12} = w_{23} = \dots = w_{k-1,k} = 1$  and  $w_{01} = \mu_i(P_i)$  with  $P_i$  equipped with the unit weight.

By combining Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 6.5, we have the following geometric lower bounds for Neumann eigenvalues.

**Theorem 6.6.** *Let  $(G, B)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with the unit weight. For  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ , let  $k = \lfloor \frac{|V|}{i} \rfloor$ . We have*

(1) when  $i \nmid |V|$ ,

$$\nu_i \geq 2 \left( 1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2k+1} \right);$$

(2) when  $i | |V|$ ,

$$\nu_i \geq \lambda_1(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w).$$

Here  $(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w)$  is the same as in Theorem 6.5.

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\nu_i \geq \mu_i.$$

Then, by Theorem 6.5, we get the conclusion.  $\square$

By combining (2) of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 6.6, we have the following lower bounds for Dirichlet eigenvalues.

**Theorem 6.7.** *Let  $(G, B)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with the unit weight. For  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$ , let  $k = \lfloor \frac{|V|}{i-j+1} \rfloor$ . We have*

(1) when  $(i-j+1) \nmid |V|$ ,

$$\lambda_i \geq 2 \left( 1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2k+1} \right) + \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega);$$

(2) when  $(i-j+1) | |V|$ ,

$$\lambda_i \geq \lambda_1(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w) + \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega).$$

Here  $(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w)$  is the same as in Theorem 6.5.

*Proof.* By (2) of Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\lambda_i \geq \nu_{i-j+1} + \lambda_j(A_B L_B^{-1} A_\Omega).$$

Then, by Theorem 6.6, we get the conclusions.  $\square$

Moreover, by combining (2) of Theorem 1.3, (2) of Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 6.5 for the interior subgraph, we have the following lower bounds for Dirichlet eigenvalues and Neumann eigenvalues.

**Theorem 6.8.** *Let  $(G, B)$  be a connected finite graph with boundary equipped with the unit weight such that  $G|_{\Omega}$  is also connected. For  $i = 2, 3, \dots, |\Omega|$ , and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, i - 1$ , let  $k = \lfloor \frac{|\Omega|}{i-j+1} \rfloor$ . We have*

(1) *when  $(i - j + 1) \nmid |\Omega|$ ,*

$$\lambda_i \geq 2 \left( 1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2k+1} \right) + \text{Deg}_B^{(j)}$$

*and*

$$\nu_i \geq 2 \left( 1 - \cos \frac{\pi}{2k+1} \right) + \lambda_j (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_{\Omega} - A_B L_B^{-1} A_{\Omega});$$

(2) *when  $(i - j + 1) \mid |\Omega|$ ,*

$$\lambda_i \geq \lambda_1(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w) + \text{Deg}_B^{(i)}$$

*and*

$$\lambda_i \geq \lambda_1(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w) + \lambda_j (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_{\Omega} - A_B L_B^{-1} A_{\Omega}).$$

Here  $(P_{k+1}, \{0\}, m, w)$  is the same as in Theorem 6.5.

*Proof.* By (2) of Theorem 1.3 and (2) of Theorem 5.2, we have

$$\lambda_i \geq \mu_{i-j+1}(\Omega) + \text{Deg}_B^{(j)}$$

and

$$\mu_i \geq \mu_{i-j+1}(\Omega) + \lambda_j (\text{Deg}_B \cdot I_{\Omega} - A_B L_B^{-1} A_{\Omega}).$$

Then, by applying Theorem 6.5 on  $G|_{\Omega}$ , we get the conclusions.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Barlow M. T., *Random walks and heat kernels on graphs*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 438. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [2] Bauer F., Chung F., Lin Y., Liu Y., *Curvature aspects of graphs*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2017), no. 5, 2033–2042.
- [3] Chung F., *Spectral graph theory*. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, 92. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. xii+207 pp.
- [4] Escobar, J. F., *An isoperimetric inequality and the first Steklov eigenvalue*. J. Funct. Anal. 165 (1999), no. 1, 101–116.
- [5] Friedman J., *Some geometric aspects of graphs and their eigenfunctions*. Duke Math. J. 69 (1993), no. 3, 487–525.
- [6] Friedman J., *Minimum higher eigenvalues of Laplacians on graphs*. Duke Math. J. 83 (1996), no. 1, 1–18.
- [7] Fiedler M., *Algebraic connectivity of graphs*. Czechoslovak Math. J. 23(98) (1973), 298–305.
- [8] Grigor'yan A., *Introduction to analysis on graphs*. University Lecture Series, 71. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. viii+150 pp.

- [9] Hua Bobo, Huang Yan, *Neumann Cheeger constants on graphs*. J. Geom. Anal. 28 (2018), no. 3, 2166–2184.
- [10] Hua B., Huang Y., Wang Z., *First eigenvalue estimates of Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators on graphs*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 56 (2017), no. 6, Art. 178, 21 pp.
- [11] Hua B., Huang Y., Wang Z., *Cheeger estimates of Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators on infinite subgraphs of graphs*. J. Spectr. Theory 12 (2022), no. 3, 1079–1108.
- [12] Horn R. A., Johnson C. R., *Matrix analysis*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. xviii+643 pp.
- [13] Klartag B., Kozma G., Ralli P., Tetali P., *Discrete curvature and abelian groups*. Canad. J. Math. 68 (2016), no. 3, 655–674.
- [14] Lichnerowicz A., *Géométrie des groupes de transformations*. (French) Travaux et Recherches Mathématiques, III. Dunod, Paris 1958.
- [15] Lin Y., Lu L., Yau S.-T., *Ricci curvature of graphs*. Tohoku Math. J. (2) 63 (2011), no. 4, 605–627.
- [16] Münch F., Wojciechowski R. K. *Ollivier Ricci curvature for general graph Laplacians: heat equation, Laplacian comparison, non-explosion and diameter bounds*. Adv. Math. 356 (2019), 106759, 45 pp.
- [17] Reilly R. C., *Applications of the integral of an invariant of the Hessian*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1976), no. 4, 579–580.
- [18] Perrin, H., *Lower bounds for the first eigenvalue of the Steklov problem on graphs*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 58 (2019), no. 2, 58–67.
- [19] Shi Y., Yu C., *Comparison of Steklove eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues on graphs*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 150 (2022), no. 4, 1505–1517.
- [20] Shi Y., Yu C., *A Lichnerowicz-type estimate for Steklov eigenvalues on graphs and its rigidity*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 61 (2022), no. 3, Paper No. 98, 22 pp.
- [21] Xia C., Xiong C., *Escobar’s conjecture on a sharp lower bound for the first nonzero steklov eigenvalue*. Peking Math. J. 7 (2024), no. 2, 759–778.
- [22] Yu C., Yu Y., *Monotonicity of Steklov eigenvalues on graphs and applications*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 63 (2024), no.3, Paper No. 79.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, GUANGDONG, 515063, CHINA

*Email address:* yjshi@stu.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, GUANGDONG, 515063, CHINA

*Email address:* cjyu@stu.edu.cn