

STEKLOV FLOWS ON TREES AND APPLICATIONS

ZUNWU HE AND BOBO HUA

ABSTRACT. We introduce the Steklov flows on finite trees, i.e. the flows (or currents) associated with the Steklov problem. By constructing appropriate Steklov flows, we prove the monotonicity of the first nonzero Steklov eigenvalues on trees: for finite trees \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , the first nonzero Steklov eigenvalue of \mathcal{G}_1 is greater than or equal to that of \mathcal{G}_2 , provided that \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 .

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a compact orientable Riemannian manifold (M, g) with smooth boundary ∂M , the Steklov problem on (M, g) reads as

$$\begin{cases} \Delta f(x) = 0, & x \in M, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial n}(x) = \lambda f(x), & x \in \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on (M, g) and $\frac{\partial}{\partial n}$ is the outward normal derivative along ∂M . The spectrum of the Steklov problem on (M, g) coincides with that of the following Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator [KS14],

$$\Gamma : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M) \longrightarrow H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$$

$$f \longmapsto \Gamma f := \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial n},$$

where \hat{f} is the harmonic extension to M of f . It is well-known that the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator is a first-order elliptic pseudo-differential operator [Tay11], which is self-adjoint and non-negative. The spectrum of Γ is discrete, and can be ordered as

$$0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \cdots \nearrow \infty,$$

where λ_2 is called the first (nonzero) Steklov eigenvalue. See [Wei54, Bro01, FS11, GP12, Esc97, Esc99, Esc00, CESG11] for more results of Steklov eigenvalues on Riemannian manifolds.

In order to detect spectral properties of Riemannian manifolds, Colbois et al. investigated the Steklov problem on some discretizations of manifolds [CGR18]; see Section 2 for the definition of the Steklov problem on graphs. The second author, Huang and Wang [HHW17], and Hassannezhad and Miclo [HM17], studied the first Steklov eigenvalue on graphs using isoperimetric constants independently. Some lower bound estimates of the first Steklov eigenvalue on graphs were proved in [Per19, SY20a]. For subgraphs in Cayley

graphs of discrete groups of polynomial growth, the upper bound estimates were proved in [Per20]; see also [HH19]. In our previous paper [HH20], we obtained various upper bounds of Steklov eigenvalues on finite trees. Note that infinite trees are regarded as discrete counterparts of Hadamard manifolds. See [HHW18, SY19a, SY19b, SY20b] for other developments on Steklov eigenvalues of graphs.

In this paper, we study the Steklov eigenvalues for the Steklov problem on finite trees. For investigating the relation of the first Steklov eigenvalues of finite trees, we introduce a λ -flow to some interior vertex or some boundary vertex on a finite tree \mathcal{G} (see Definition 1.1), which can be regarded as a generalization of Steklov eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated with eigenvalue λ . For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, we denote by $\delta\mathcal{G}$ the boundary of \mathcal{G} , i.e. the set of pending vertices, and by $\Omega := V - \delta\mathcal{G}$ the set of interior vertices of G .

Definition 1.1. *For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$, if there is a nonzero function $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$, some $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in V$ such that*

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta f_\lambda(w) = 0, & w \in \Omega - \{x\}, \\ \frac{\partial f_\lambda}{\partial n}(w) = \lambda f(w), & w \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}, \end{cases}$$

then we say that f_λ is a λ -flow to x on \mathcal{G} , or simply a λ -flow to x . In the above, $\frac{\partial}{\partial n}$ is the discrete version of outward normal derivative; see Section 2.

Remark 1.2. (1) *For a λ -flow f_λ to x on \mathcal{G} , if $\sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}} f_\lambda(z) = 0$ in case*

of $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$, or $\Delta f_\lambda(x) = 0$ in case of $x \in \Omega$, then f_λ is a Steklov eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated with eigenvalue λ .

(2) *There are less constraint equations for a λ -flow than those for a Steklov eigenfunction. In fact, the λ -flow f_λ has one degree of freedom. This guarantees the existence of λ -flows on \mathcal{G} for λ in some interval, and these λ -flows are continuous in λ ; see Lemma 3.9.*

(3) *The flows (or currents) are well-studied in the literature of electrical networks; see e.g. [Bar17, Definition 2.1]. For f_λ defined above, we regard it as the potential in an electrical network, i.e. the voltage. In this paper, we would rather consider the flow induced by the potential in the proofs for convenience, and hence call f_λ the λ -flow.*

The main result is formulated as follows. For two graphs \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , we say that \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 if there is an injective graph homomorphism from \mathcal{G}_1 to \mathcal{G}_2 .

Theorem 1.3. *Given two finite trees \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 , if \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 , then*

$$(2) \quad \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_2) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_1),$$

where λ_2 is the first Steklov eigenvalue.

Remark 1.4. (1) *This result fails for general finite graphs; see Figure 1. Here \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 , but $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_1) = \frac{1}{2} < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_2) = \frac{2}{3}$.*
 (2) *The monotonicity for eigenvalues is important in the spectral theory. It is well-known that Dirichlet eigenvalues for subgraphs are monotone with respect to the inclusion of subgraphs, [Fri93, Theorem 2.3]; see interlacing inequalities for general setting [Hae95]. For the class of finite trees, we prove the monotonicity of the first Steklov eigenvalue, which is possibly a consequence by the combinatorics of trees.*




FIGURE 1. The counterexample for monotonicity of the Steklov eigenvalues on general graphs.

We sketch the proof strategy for Theorem 1.3. Since one graph is a subgraph of the other, it suffices to consider the case of that \mathcal{G}' is obtained from \mathcal{G} by adding one vertex y and directed edges $(x, y), (y, x)$. The basic idea is that we construct a λ -flow f_λ to y on \mathcal{G}' , which can be descended to a continuous “homotopy mapping” on $\mathcal{G} \times [0, \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})]$ between $f_0|_{\mathcal{G}}$ (the eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated to eigenvalue 0) and $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_{\mathcal{G}}$ (the eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated to eigenvalue $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$). This can be used to deduce that $\sum_{z \in \delta \mathcal{G}'} f_{\hat{\lambda}}(z) = 0$ with $0 < \hat{\lambda} \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and hence $f_{\hat{\lambda}}$ must be a Steklov eigenfunction on \mathcal{G}' associated with eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$. This proves the result.

In the following, we turn to the crucial construction of the λ -flow. Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.13 are two key ingredients to construct the above λ -flow f_λ . Lemma 3.13 implies that f_λ must take the same sign on the relative boundaries of some “sufficiently large” branches, as λ is small. Let z be a boundary vertex. Lemma 3.9 shows the existence, uniqueness (up to scaling) and continuity of some λ -flow g_λ to z on \mathcal{G} for sufficiently small λ , such that g_λ has the same sign on the relative boundary vertices except z . These λ -flows satisfying Lemma 3.9 are the fundamental blocks to construct the previous λ -flow to y on \mathcal{G}' .

The above λ -flow f_λ to y on \mathcal{G}' is constructed inductively by adding some λ -flows satisfying Lemma 3.9 on subtrees of \mathcal{G}' . In order to ensure that $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a Steklov eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated with $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, Lemma 3.13 indicates that we must find a “deepest” edge (u, v) in \mathcal{G} with two subtrees $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ obtained by removing (u, v) , such that $f_\lambda|_{\mathcal{G}}$ takes positive values on \mathcal{H}_1 containing u and non-positive values on \mathcal{H}_2 containing v .

This provides the first step of construction of the above f_λ . We may assume \mathcal{H}_2 contains x and there is a path $\alpha := v_0 = v \sim v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \dots \sim v_m = x \sim y$ connecting v and y in \mathcal{G}' . By induction and Lemma 3.9, it admits a λ -flow $f_{\lambda,i,j}$ ($f_{\lambda,i}$ resp.) to v_i on each subtree $\mathcal{H}_{i,j}(v_{i,j}, v_i)$ ($\mathcal{G}_i(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ resp.) with $d(v_{i,j}, v_i) = 1$, and $1 \leq j \leq \deg(v_i) - 2$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$, where $\mathcal{H}_{i,j}$ (\mathcal{G}_i resp.) is the branch from $(v_{i,j}, v_i)$ ((v_{i-1}, v_i) resp.) in \mathcal{G} (some notations see Definition 3.1); see Figure 2. Since (u, v) is “deepest”, the previous flow $f_{\lambda,i,j}$ takes nonzero value at v_i as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. This implies $f_{\lambda,i,j}$ can be used to assemble a λ -flow on a larger subtree. We go forth inductively to construct the λ -flow f_λ along the path α , and finish the construction.




FIGURE 2

In our previous paper [HH20], we prove the upper bound estimate of the first nonzero Steklov eigenvalue using the diameter of a finite tree; see [HH20, Theorem 1.4]. As an application of the main result, we characterize the equality case for the upper bound estimate; see Theorem 5.2. Moreover, we prove a lower bound on the first Steklov eigenvalue of finite trees, in terms of the bounds for the vertex degree and the diameter; see Theorem 5.3, and also characterize the equality case. These yield rigidity results for the estimates of the first Steklov eigenvalue via the diameter.

At the end of the introduction, we propose two open problems on the monotonicity of higher order Steklov eigenvalue of some finite trees and graphs.

Problem 1.5. Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ be two finite trees with boundaries $\delta\mathcal{G}_1, \delta\mathcal{G}_2$ such that \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 . Does it hold that $\lambda_k(\mathcal{G}_1) \geq \lambda_k(\mathcal{G}_2)$ for $3 \leq k \leq |\delta\mathcal{G}_1|$, where λ_k is the k -th Steklov eigenvalue?

Problem 1.6. Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ be two finite trees with boundaries $\delta\mathcal{G}_1, \delta\mathcal{G}_2$ such that \mathcal{G}_1 is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 . If $i_* : \pi_1(\mathcal{G}_1) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathcal{G}_2)$ is a group isomorphism, where the map i is the canonical inclusion from \mathcal{G}_1 to \mathcal{G}_2 and π_1 denotes the fundamental group, does it hold that $\lambda_k(\mathcal{G}_1) \geq \lambda_k(\mathcal{G}_2)$ for $2 \leq k \leq |\delta\mathcal{G}_1|$, where λ_k is the k -th Steklov eigenvalue?

Remark 1.7. Problem 1.6 is equivalent to the case that $\mathcal{G}_1 = (V_1, E_1), \mathcal{G}_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ with $V_2 = V_1 \cup \{y\}, E_2 = E_1 \cup \{(x, y)\}$, where $x \in V_1, y \notin V_1$ and $(x, y) \in E_2, E_1, E_2$ are sets of undirected edges.

The assumption on i_* can not be removed; see the counterexample in Figure 1.

The paper is organized as follows: In next section, we recall some basic facts on graphs. Section 3 is devoted to the Steklov flow. In Section 4, we prove the main result, Theorem 1.3. The last section contains some applications of the main result.

Acknowledgements. B.H. is supported by NSFC, grants no.11831004 and no. 11926313.

Data Available Statement. The data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

2. PRELIMINARIES

First, we introduce some basic concepts. Let (V, E) be a graph with the set of vertices V and the set of directed edges E . In this paper, we denote by $|\cdot|$ the cardinality of a set.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{G}_i = (V_i, E_i), i = 1, 2$, be graphs and $x_i \in V_i$. We say that the graph $\mathcal{G}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{G}_2 / x_1 \sim x_2 := (V, E)$ is the wedge sum of $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ at x_1, x_2 if $V = V_1 \sqcup V_2 / x_1 \sim x_2$ and $E = E_1 \sqcup E_2$. Here \sqcup means disjoint union, $x_1 \sim x_2$ means the identification of two vertices.

In particular, we denote by $(\mathcal{G})_x^2 = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ the wedge sum of $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}'$ at x, x' with $\mathcal{G} = (V, E), \mathcal{G}' = (V', E'), \hat{V} = V \sqcup V' / x \sim x', \hat{E} = E \sqcup E'$, where there is a map ϕ such that $x \in V \rightarrow \phi(x) = x' \in V'$ and $(x, y) \in E \rightarrow \phi((x, y)) = (x', y') \in E'$, and ϕ is a graph isomorphism.

Remark 2.2. We does not distinguish two graphs up to graph isomorphism. We regard \mathcal{G} as a subgraph of $(\mathcal{G})_x^2$ with $V \subset \hat{V}, E \subset \hat{E}$.

From now on, we always consider finite trees $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, and E is a set of directed edges. Denote by $(\mathcal{G}, \delta\mathcal{G})$ the graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with the boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ and the interior $\Omega := V \setminus \delta\mathcal{G}$.

For a subtree $\mathcal{G}_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ in \mathcal{G} , we define the relative boundary (boundary, resp.) of \mathcal{G}_1 to be $\delta\mathcal{G} \cap V_1$ (all the vertices in V_1 of degree one in \mathcal{G}_1 , resp.), denoted by $\delta(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G})$ ($\delta\mathcal{G}_1$, resp.).

Note that there is no edge connecting two boundary vertices and Ω is connected. For any subset $S \subset V$, we denote by \mathbb{R}^S the vector space of all real functions on S over \mathbb{R} . It can be equipped with ℓ^2 -inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_S$: for any $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^S$, set $(f, g)_S := \sum_{x \in S} f(x)g(x)$. Then $(\mathbb{R}^S, (\cdot, \cdot)_S)$ is a Hilbert space. For $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$, one can define the Laplace operate Δ on \mathbb{R}^V such that

$$(3) \quad (\Delta f)(x) := \sum_{y \in V: y \sim x} (f(x) - f(y)),$$

where $y \sim x$ means that they are neighbors. For convenience, we set $\nabla_{(u,v)} f := f(u) - f(v)$ for any $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$.

The outward normal derivative operator is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial n} : \mathbb{R}^V &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\delta\mathcal{G}} \\ f &\longmapsto \frac{\partial f}{\partial n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{\partial f}{\partial n}(x) = \sum_{y \in \Omega: y \sim x} (f(x) - f(y))$ for any $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$. Since there is no edge connecting two boundary vertices, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial n}(x) = (\Delta f)(x)$ for any $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$.

We introduce the Steklov problem on the pair $(\mathcal{G}, \delta\mathcal{G})$. For any nonzero function $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ and some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the following equations hold,

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta f(x) = 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial n}(x) = \lambda f(x), & x \in \delta\mathcal{G}. \end{cases}$$

The above λ is called the Steklov eigenvalue of the graph \mathcal{G} with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$, and f is a Steklov eigenfunction associated to eigenvalue λ .

In analogy to the Riemannian case, one can define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator in the discrete setting as

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda : \mathbb{R}^{\delta\mathcal{G}} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\delta\mathcal{G}} \\ f &\longmapsto \Lambda f := \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial n}, \end{aligned}$$

where \hat{f} is the harmonic extension of f . Namely, \hat{f} satisfies

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta \hat{f}(x) = 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ \hat{f}(x) = f(x), & x \in \delta\mathcal{G}. \end{cases}$$

It is well known that the Steklov eigenvalues in (4) are exactly the Dirichlet-to-Neumann eigenvalues in (5), and the Steklov eigenfunctions in (4) are the harmonic extensions of the corresponding eigenfunctions in (5). The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator is non-negative and self-adjoint. Since V is finite, there are $|\delta\mathcal{G}|$ Steklov eigenvalues. We may arrange the Steklov eigenvalues in the following way:

$$(7) \quad 0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{|\delta\mathcal{G}|}.$$

In fact, since Ω is connected, $\lambda_2 > 0$ and $\lambda_{|\delta\mathcal{G}|} \leq 1$. Moreover, $(f_i, f_j)_{\delta\mathcal{G}} = 0$ if $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$, where f_i and f_j are eigenfunctions with eigenvalues λ_i, λ_j respectively. Note that constant functions are the eigenfunctions of $\lambda_1 = 0$. The space $\mathbb{R}^{\delta\mathcal{G}}$ has an orthonormal basis consisting of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann eigenfunctions.

For any $0 \neq f \in \mathbb{R}^V$, recall that E is directed edge set, we define the Rayleigh quotient

$$(8) \quad R(f) = \frac{\sum_{(x,y) \in E} (f(x) - f(y))^2}{2 \sum_{x \in \delta\mathcal{G}} f^2(x)}.$$

The variational principles for λ_k read as

$$(9) \quad \lambda_k = \min_{W \subset \mathbb{R}^V, \dim W = k} \max_{0 \neq f \in W} R(f)$$

$$(10) \quad \lambda_k = \min_{\substack{W \subset \mathbb{R}^V, \dim W = k-1 \\ W \perp 1_{\delta\mathcal{G}}}} \max_{0 \neq f \in W} R(f),$$

where $1_{\delta\mathcal{G}}$ is the characteristic function on $\delta\mathcal{G}$, i.e. $f(x) = 1$ if $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$ and $f(x) = 0$, otherwise, and $W \perp 1_{\delta\mathcal{G}}$ means that any function in W is orthogonal to $1_{\delta\mathcal{G}}$.

3. THE STEKLOV FLOWS

In this section, we aim to introduce the Steklov flows, i.e. λ -flows, and study their properties.

Definition 3.1. *Given a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with $x, y \in V, (x, y) \in E$, we call the subtree \mathcal{H} is the branch from (x, y) if \mathcal{H} is the connected component containing x as one removes the edge (x, y) in \mathcal{G} . Denote by $\mathcal{H}(x, y)$ the subtree generated by $\mathcal{H} \cup \{y\}$ in \mathcal{G} .*

Remark 3.2. *Note that the other connected component which contains y is the branch from (y, x) .*

We give some useful properties for λ -flows.

Lemma 3.3. *For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , assume that $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x for some $\lambda \geq 0$ with $f_\lambda(x) = 0$. Then for any $c \neq 0$, we have*

$$\lambda = R(f_\lambda) = R(cf_\lambda).$$

Proof. Note that cf_λ is also a λ -flow to x . Since \mathcal{G} is finite and E is directed edge set, it always holds that for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^V$,

$$(11) \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} (g(u) - g(v))^2 = (\Delta g, g)_V.$$

Hence by (8), (11) and Definition 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(cf_\lambda) &= R(f_\lambda) = \frac{(\Delta f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_V}{(f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_{\delta\mathcal{G}}} = \frac{(\Delta f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_{\delta\mathcal{G}}}{(f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_{\delta\mathcal{G}}} \\ &= \frac{(\Delta f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_{\delta\mathcal{G}-\{x\}}}{(f_\lambda, f_\lambda)_{\delta\mathcal{G}-\{x\}}} = \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.4. *For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , assume that $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x for some $\lambda \geq 0$ and $(u, v) \in E$ with $d(x, u) > d(x, v)$. Then*

$$\nabla_{(u,v)} f_\lambda = \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{H}(u,v) - \{v\}} f_\lambda(z) \lambda,$$

where \mathcal{H} is the branch from (u, v) , $\delta\mathcal{H}(u, v)$ is the boundary of $\mathcal{H}(u, v)$.

Proof. Assume that v, u_j are all neighbours of u for $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ with $m = \deg(u)$. We argue by induction on $|V|$. The case of $|V| = 2$ is trivial.

By induction on $\mathcal{H}(u_j, u)$, we have $\nabla_{(u_j,u)} f_\lambda = \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{H}(u_j,u) - \{u\}} f_\lambda(z) \lambda$. Since $\Delta f_\lambda(u) = 0$ and $\delta\mathcal{H}(u, v) - \{v\}$ is the union of $\delta\mathcal{H}(u_j, u) - \{u\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m-1$, we deduce that

$$\nabla_{(u,v)} f_\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \nabla_{(u_j,u)} f_\lambda = \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{H}(u,v) - \{v\}} f_\lambda(z) \lambda.$$

□

Definition 3.5. *For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , if there exists a λ -flow to x , $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ with $\lambda \geq 0$ such that*

- (i) $f_\lambda(x) = 0$,
- (ii) $\nabla_{(y,z)} f_\lambda = f_\lambda(y) - f_\lambda(z) > 0$ if $(y, z) \in E$ and $d(x, y) > d(x, z)$.

Then we denote by $\Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$ ($\hat{\Sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)$, resp.) the set of such λ 's satisfying (i), (ii) ((i), resp.) and

$$\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) := \inf_{\lambda \in \Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)} \lambda \quad \left(\hat{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x) := \inf_{\lambda \in \hat{\Sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)} \lambda, \text{ resp.} \right).$$

Remark 3.6. *By the definition, it is clear that $\Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \subset \hat{\Sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)$, $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \geq \hat{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)$ if $\Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \neq \emptyset$.*

Now we give another equivalent description of λ -flow satisfying (ii) in Definition 3.5.

Lemma 3.7. *Given any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x . Then $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x with $\lambda > 0$ satisfying (ii) in Definition 3.5 if and only if $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x with $\lambda > 0$ satisfying $f_\lambda(z) > 0$ for any $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$.*

Proof. For any $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, there is a path $z_0 = z \sim z_1 \sim \cdots \sim z_i = x$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. If $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x satisfying Definition 3.5 with $\lambda \geq 0$, since $d(z, x) = i > i - 1 = d(z_1, x)$, we have $f_\lambda(z) - f_\lambda(z_1) = \lambda f_\lambda(z) > 0$. Thus we get $f_\lambda(z) > 0$ as $\lambda > 0$.

If $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a λ -flow to x with $\lambda > 0$ satisfying $f_\lambda(z) > 0$ for any $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, one easily checks that f_λ satisfies (ii) in Definition 3.5 by Lemma 3.4. □

Lemma 3.8. *For a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , there are finitely many λ satisfying (i) in Definition 3.5, whose cardinality is at most $(|\delta\mathcal{G}| - 1)$.*

As a consequence, we have $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) = \min_{\lambda \in \Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)} \lambda \geq \hat{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x) = \min_{\lambda \in \hat{\Sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)} \lambda \geq \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_x^2) > 0$, if $\Sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Assume λ and f_λ satisfy (i) in Definition 3.5. Then we can define a function g on the graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}} := (\mathcal{G})_x^2 = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ with boundary $\delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, $\hat{V} = V \sqcup V'/x \sim x'$, and $\hat{E} = E \sqcup E'$ as follows. Let $g : \hat{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $z \mapsto f_\lambda(z)$, if $z \in V$, $z' \mapsto -f_\lambda(z)$ if $z' \in V'$. Since $f_\lambda(x) = -f_\lambda(x) = 0$, the function g is well-defined.

One easily verifies that $\Delta g(x) = 0$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence g satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g(z) = 0, & z \in \hat{\Omega} := \hat{V} - \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}, \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial n}(z) = \lambda g(z), & z \in \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $f_\lambda = 0$ if $\lambda = 0$, which is impossible by the definition of λ -flow. Thus we complete the proof. □

We introduce the key lemma on the existence and the uniqueness (up to scaling) of some λ -flow, which is continuous in λ for sufficiently small λ .

Lemma 3.9. *For any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , assume $x_1, x_j \in V$ such that $x \sim x_1 \sim x_j$ with $2 \leq j \leq m := \deg x_1$. Choose any vertex $w \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$ and fix it. Then there exists the unique λ -flow to x , $f_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^V$ with $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1$ such that*

(1) *(uniform sign and normalization) $f_\lambda(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$ with $f_\lambda(w) = 1$,*

(2) *(continuity) f_λ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1$,*

(3) *(monotonicity) $0 < \min\{0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1 \mid f_\lambda(x) = 0\} = \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) < \sigma_1$,*

where $\sigma_1 := \min_{2 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1)$, $\mathcal{G}_j := \mathcal{H}_j(x_j, x_1) = (V_j, E_j)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_j$ and \mathcal{H}_j is the branch from (x_j, x_1) .

Moreover, f_λ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \sigma_1$ if there exists j_0 with $2 \leq j_0 \leq m$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j_0}, x_1)$, for any $2 \leq j \neq j_0 \leq m$.

Proof. Denote by $\Omega_j := V_j - \delta\mathcal{G}_j$ and $\Omega := V - \delta\mathcal{G}$. Note that $x_1 \in \delta\mathcal{G}_j \cap \Omega$ and (1) is equivalent to that $\nabla_{(y,z)} f_\lambda = f_\lambda(y) - f_\lambda(z) > 0$ if $\lambda > 0$, where

$(y, z) \in E$ with $d(x, y) > d(x, z)$ by Lemma 3.7. It is clear that such f_λ is a constant for $\lambda = 0$ and then $f_0 = f_0(w) = 1$. So that

$$\{0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1 | f_\lambda(x) = 0\} = \{0 < \lambda < \sigma_1 | f_\lambda(x) = 0\}.$$

We argue by induction on $|V|$. The case of $|V| = 2$ is trivial.

Since $x \notin V_j$, $|V_j| < |V|$. Suppose that $x_1, x_{j,l}$ are all neighbours of x_j for $2 \leq l \leq m_j$, where $m_j = \deg x_j$. By induction, we have a λ -flow $f_{\lambda,j}$ to x_1 on \mathcal{G}_j for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_{1,j}$ such that

- (i) $f_{\lambda,j}(w_j) = 1$ for fixed $w_j \in \delta\mathcal{G}_j - \{x_1\}$ and $f_{\lambda,j}(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \delta\mathcal{G}_j - \{x_1\}$,
- (ii) $f_{\lambda,j}$ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_{1,j}$,
- (iii) $\{0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_{1,j} | f_{\lambda,j}(x_1) = 0\} = \{0 < \lambda < \sigma_{1,j} | f_{\lambda,j}(x_1) = 0\} \neq \emptyset$, i.e $0 < \min\{0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_{1,j} | f_{\lambda,j}(x_1) = 0\} = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) < \sigma_{1,j}$,

where $\sigma_{1,j} := \min_{2 \leq l \leq m_j} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j,l}, x_j)$, $\mathcal{G}_{j,l} := \mathcal{H}_{j,l}(x_{j,l}, x_j) = (V_{j,l}, E_{j,l})$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j,l}$ is the branch from $(x_{j,l}, x_j)$.

First we will show $f_{\lambda,j}(x_1) > 0$ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1, 2 \leq j \leq m$. Otherwise, $f_{\lambda_0, j_0}(x_1) \leq 0$ with some $0 \leq \lambda_0 < \sigma_1$ and $2 \leq j_0 \leq m$ and $f_{0, j_0}(x_1) = f_{0, j_0}(z) = f_{0, j_0}(w_{j_0}) = 1 > 0$ for all $z \in \delta\mathcal{G}_{j_0} - \{x_1\}$. By (ii) in the above, there exists some $0 < \hat{\lambda}_0 \leq \lambda_0 < \sigma_1$ such that $f_{\hat{\lambda}_0, j_0}(x_1) = 0$. This is impossible by the definition of σ_1 .

Note that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) < \sigma_{1,j}$. Thanks to the finiteness of \mathcal{G} , we may assume $\sigma_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x_1)$. Then we construct f_λ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1$ as follows. Let

$$(12) \quad f_\lambda(z) := c \frac{f_{\lambda,2}(x_1)}{f_{\lambda,j}(x_1)} f_{\lambda,j}(z)$$

for $z \in V_j$ and some $c > 0$,

$$f_\lambda(x) := f_\lambda(x_1) - \sum_{j=2}^m \nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} f_\lambda = c f_{\lambda,2}(x_1) - c \frac{f_{\lambda,2}(x_1)}{f_{\lambda,j}(x_1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} f_{\lambda,j},$$

such that $f_\lambda(w) = 1$.

One easily checks that f_λ is well-defined and indeed it is a λ -flow to x on \mathcal{G} satisfying (1),(2) in Lemma 3.9. We need to show (3) in Lemma 3.9.

Claim 3.10. *There exists some $\lambda_{0,1} \in (0, \sigma_1)$ such that $f_{\lambda_{0,1}}(x) < 0$.*

Proof of Claim 3.10. Recall that $\sigma_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x_1)$ and for $\lambda \in [0, \sigma_1)$, $f_\lambda(x) = f_\lambda(x_1) - \sum_{j=2}^m \nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} f_\lambda$, $f_\lambda(x_1) = c f_{\lambda,2}(x_1)$ and $\nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} f_\lambda > 0$ by (1) in Lemma 3.9.

Then we have $f_\lambda(x) < c(f_{\lambda,2}(x_1) - \nabla_{(x_2, x_1)} f_{\lambda,2}) =: g_{\lambda,2}$. By induction $g_{\lambda,2}$ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_{1,2}$, and hence continuous in $\lambda = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x_1) = \sigma_1 < \sigma_{1,2}$. Thus we obtain $g_{\sigma_1,2} = -c \nabla_{(x_2, x_1)} f_{\sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x_1), 2} < 0$. The above discussion yields that $f_{\lambda_{0,1}}(x) < 0$ for some $\lambda_{0,1} \in (0, \sigma_1)$. □

Note that $f_0 = 1$, and then $f_0(x) > 0$. By Claim 3.10 and (2), there exists some $\lambda_{0,2}$ such that $f_{\lambda_{0,2}}(x) = 0$ with $0 < \lambda_{0,2} \leq \lambda_{0,1} < \sigma_1$. This gives $0 < \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \leq \min\{0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1 \mid f_\lambda(x) = 0\} < \sigma_1$.

It suffices to show for any g_λ satisfying conditions in Lemma 3.9, then $g_\lambda = f_\lambda$. We also argue by induction on $|V|$, the case of $|V| = 2$ is also trivial. By induction on $f_{\lambda,j}, g_{\lambda,j}$ on \mathcal{G}_j with $f_{\lambda,j}(w_j) = g_{\lambda,j}(w_j) = 1$, where $2 \leq j \leq m$, we have

$$(13) \quad f_{\lambda,j} = g_{\lambda,j},$$

$$(14) \quad f_\lambda|_{V_j} = c_1 \frac{f_{\lambda,2}(x_1)}{f_{\lambda,j}(x_1)} f_{\lambda,j},$$

$$(15) \quad g_\lambda|_{V_j} = c_2 \frac{g_{\lambda,2}(x_1)}{g_{\lambda,j}(x_1)} g_{\lambda,j}.$$

Suppose $w \in V_i$ for some i with $2 \leq i \leq m$. On the other hand, by induction on $f_\lambda|_{V_i}, g_\lambda|_{V_i}$ on \mathcal{G}_i with $f_\lambda|_{V_i}(w) = g_\lambda|_{V_i}(w) = 1$, we have $f_\lambda|_{V_i} = g_\lambda|_{V_i}$. Hence by (13), (14), (15) for $j = i$, we obtain $c_1 = c_2$. So we get $f_\lambda|_{V-\{x\}} = g_\lambda|_{V-\{x\}}$. Note that

$$f_\lambda(x) = f_\lambda(x_1) - \sum_{j=2}^m \nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} f_\lambda, \quad g_\lambda(x) = g_\lambda(x_1) - \sum_{j=2}^m \nabla_{(x_j, x_1)} g_\lambda.$$

It is clear that $f_\lambda(x) = g_\lambda(x)$.

This verifies (3) in Lemma 3.9.

Note that $\sigma_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j_0}, x_1)$ if there exists j_0 with $2 \leq j_0 \leq m$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j_0}, x_1)$, for any $2 \leq j \neq j_0 \leq m$. Similarly, we can construct f_λ by replacing $f_{\lambda,2}$ with f_{λ,j_0} and we claim that $f_{\sigma_1,j}(x_1) > 0$ for any $2 \leq j \neq j_0 \leq m$. Otherwise, $f_{\sigma_1,j}(x_1) \leq 0, f_{0,j}(x_1) = 1 > 0$, then there exists some $\hat{\sigma} \in [0, \sigma_1]$ such that $f_{\hat{\sigma},j}(x_1) = 0$, by the continuity for $\lambda \in [0, \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1))$. So $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) \leq \hat{\sigma} \leq \sigma_1$, which contradicts that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x_1) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j_0}, x_1) = \sigma_1$. Hence we can construct f_λ by replacing $f_{\lambda,2}$ with f_{λ,j_0} in (12).

Finally, we conclude the proof. □

As a consequence, we have the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Let \mathcal{H} with boundary $\delta\mathcal{H}$ be a subtree of $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x . Assume that $y \in \delta\mathcal{H} \cap (V - \delta\mathcal{G})$ and \mathcal{H} does not contain x . Then*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{H}, y) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x).$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.9. □

Corollary 3.12. *Let $f_\lambda(x)$ be as in Lemma 3.9 and $f_\gamma(x) < 0$ for some $0 \leq \gamma < \sigma_1$. Then $\gamma > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$.*

Proof. Note that $f_0 = f_0(x) = 1 > 0$ and $f_\gamma(x) < 0$. Since f_λ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda < \sigma_1$, one can deduce that $f_{\hat{\gamma}}(x) = 0$ for some $0 < \hat{\gamma} < \gamma$. Thus $0 < \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \leq \hat{\gamma} < \gamma$. \square

Next, we propose a very useful criterion, which is used to compare λ associated to some λ -flow on a finite tree \mathcal{G} with $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$, where x is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{G} .

Lemma 3.13. *Given any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x . Assume f_λ is a λ -flow to x on \mathcal{G} , then the following holds.*

If $f_\lambda(z) = 0$ for some $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$ or $f_\lambda(z_1)f_\lambda(z_2) < 0$ for some $z_1, z_2 \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, then there exists a proper subtree $\mathcal{G}_1 = (V_1, E_1) = \mathcal{H}(u, v)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_1$ such that $x \notin V_1$, $f_\lambda(v) \leq 0$, $f_\lambda(s) > 0$ or $f_\lambda(v) \geq 0$, $f_\lambda(s) < 0$ for any $s \in \delta\mathcal{G}_1 - \{v\}$, where \mathcal{H} is the branch from (u, v) in \mathcal{G} .

As a consequence, $\lambda > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$ if f_λ satisfies the above condition.

Proof. Recall that $f_\lambda|_{\delta\mathcal{G}-\{x\}} \neq 0$. Suppose that there is a path $\alpha := x \sim x_1 \sim x_2 \sim \dots \sim x_n$ with $x_n \in \delta\mathcal{G}$ and some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We argue by induction on $|V|$. The case of $|V| = 4$ is trivial.

Case 1. We assume $f_\lambda(z) = 0$ and $f_\lambda(s) \neq 0$ with $z \sim z_1 \sim z_2 \sim \dots \sim z_{n_1} = x_{i_1}$, $s \sim s_1 \sim s_2 \sim \dots \sim s_{n_2} = x_{i_2}$ for some $z, s \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, where $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq n$.

Subcase 1. $i_1 \leq i_2$. By Definition 1.1, $f_\lambda(z_1) = (1-\lambda)f_\lambda(z_1) = 0$. Assume that $z_{1,j} \sim z_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1,j}(z_{1,j}, z_1)$ does not contain x , where $1 \leq j \leq \deg(z_1) - 2$, and $\mathcal{H}_{1,j}$ is the branch from $(z_{1,j}, z_1)$ in \mathcal{G} . If $f_\lambda|_{\mathcal{H}_{1,j}(z_{1,j}, z_1)} \neq 0$, we finish the proof by induction. Hence by Definition 1.1, we have $f_\lambda(z_2) = 0$. Applying the same argument along the path, we get $f_\lambda(z_{n_1}) = f_\lambda(x_{i_1}) = 0$. If $i_1 = i_2$, since $f_\lambda(s) \neq 0$, we finish the proof by induction for $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(s_{n_2-1}, s_{n_2})$ which does not contain x , where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is the branch from (s_{n_2-1}, s_{n_2}) . If $i_1 < i_2$, we also finish the proof by induction for $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(x_{i_1+1}, x_{i_1})$ which does not contain x , where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is the branch from (x_{i_1+1}, x_{i_1}) .

Subcase 2. $i_1 > i_2$. We can extend $z \sim z_1 \sim z_2 \sim \dots \sim x_{i_1} \sim x_{i_1-1} \sim \dots \sim x_{i_2}$, similar to the proof of Subcase 1, so that we can assume $f_\lambda(x_{i_2}) = 0$ and finish the proof by induction for $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(s_{n_2-1}, s_{n_2})$ which does not contain x , where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is the branch from (s_{n_2-1}, s_{n_2}) .

Case 2. We assume $f_\lambda(p)f_\lambda(q) < 0$ and $p \sim p_1 \sim p_2 \sim \dots \sim p_{m_1} = x_{j_1}$, $q \sim q_1 \sim q_2 \sim \dots \sim q_{m_2} = x_{j_2}$ for some $p, q \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, where $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq n$. By Case 1, we may assume $f_\lambda(z) \neq 0$ for any $z \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$. By induction on $\mathcal{H}_1(p_{m_1-1}, p_{m_1}), \mathcal{H}_2(q_{m_2-1}, q_{m_2})$ with the relative boundaries $\delta\mathcal{H}_1, \delta\mathcal{H}_2$ in \mathcal{G} respectively, where $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ are the branches from $(p_{m_1-1}, p_{m_1}), (q_{m_2-1}, q_{m_2})$ in \mathcal{G} respectively, we may assume $f_\lambda(s_1)f_\lambda(p) > 0, f_\lambda(s_2)f_\lambda(q) > 0$ for any $s_1 \in \delta\mathcal{H}_1 - \{p_{m_1}\}, s_2 \in \delta\mathcal{H}_2 - \{q_{m_2}\}$.

If $j_1 = j_2$, then $p_{m_1} = q_{m_2} =: y$. Since $f_\lambda(p)f_\lambda(q) < 0$, we may assume $f_\lambda(p)f_\lambda(y) < 0$ and finish the proof for $\mathcal{H}_1(p_{m_1-1}, p_{m_1})$ by induction.

If $j_1 < j_2$, by induction on $\mathcal{H}_3(x_{j_1+1}, x_{j_1})$ which does not contain x , we have $f_\lambda(t)f_\lambda(q) > 0$ for any $t \in \mathcal{H}_3 - \{x_{j_1}\}$, where \mathcal{H}_3 is the branch from

(x_{j_1+1}, x_{j_1}) and $\delta\mathcal{G}_3$ is the relative boundary $\mathcal{H}_3(x_{j_1+1}, x_{j_1})$ in \mathcal{G} . Similar to the above, we may assume $f_\lambda(p)f_\lambda(y) \leq 0$ and finish the proof for $\mathcal{H}_1(p_{m_1-1}, p_{m_1})$.

Thus, we have $\lambda \geq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, v) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$ for such f_λ by Lemma 3.9, Corollary 3.11, and Corollary 3.12. \square

Corollary 3.14. *Given a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ containing x , then $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) = \hat{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}, x)$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.13. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Before giving the proof of Theorem 1.3, we show the following interesting result on the zeros of the Steklov eigenfunction associated with the first Steklov eigenvalue.

Theorem 4.1. *Given any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$, assume $x, x_j \in V$ such that $d(x, x_j) = 1$ with $1 \leq j \leq m := \deg(x)$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_j := \mathcal{H}_j(x_j, x) = (V_j, E_j)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_j$, where \mathcal{H}_j is the branch from (x_j, x) in \mathcal{G} . Let $\hat{\mathcal{G}} := (\mathcal{G})_x^2 = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ (see Definition 2.1) with boundary $\delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and $g_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{V}}$ be any Steklov eigenfunction associated to eigenvalue $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$, then $g_2(x) = 0$.*

Moreover, we have $\min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$.

Proof. First, we will show $\min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$. Assume that $\min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_t, x)$ for some $1 \leq t \leq m$. By Lemma 3.9, there exists a λ -flow f_λ to x on \mathcal{G}_t such that $\lambda = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_t, x)$ with $f_\lambda(x) = 0$.

We construct a nonzero function g on the graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ with boundary $\delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as follows, where $\hat{V} = V \sqcup V'/x \smile x'$ and $\hat{E} = E \sqcup E'$. Let $g : \hat{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = f_\lambda(z)$, if $z \in V_t$, $g(z) = 0$ if $z \in V - V_t$ and $g(z') = -g(z)$ if $z' \in V'$. Since $f_\lambda(x) = -f_\lambda(x) = 0$, the function g is well-defined.

One easily verifies that $\Delta g(x) = 0$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence g satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g(z) = 0, & z \in \hat{\Omega} := \hat{V} - \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}, \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial n}(z) = \lambda g(z), & z \in \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, it is clear that $\sum_{z \in \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}} g(z) = 0$. So g is a Steklov eigenfunction associated with eigenvalue λ . Then we have $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_t, x) = \lambda = R(g) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$.

Thus we have $\min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$.

If $g_2(x) \neq 0$ and $\sum_{z \in \delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}} g_2(z) = 0$, we may assume $g_2(x) < 0$ and $g_2(w) > 0$ for some $w \in \delta\mathcal{G}_i$ with some $1 \leq i \leq m$. Recall that g_2 is a $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$ -flow on $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$.

If g_2 has the same sign on $\delta\mathcal{G}_i - \{x\}$, applying Corollary 3.12, we have

$$\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_i, x) \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x).$$

If $g_2(z_1)g_2(z_2) < 0$ for some $z_1, z_2 \in \delta\mathcal{G}_i - \{x\}$, then using Lemma 3.13, we get

$$\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_i, x) \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x).$$

This is impossible. So we have $g_2(x) = 0$.

If $g_2(v_1)g_2(v_2) \leq 0$ for some $v_1, v_2 \in \delta\mathcal{G}_{j_0} - \{x\}$ with some j_0 such that $1 \leq j_0 \leq m$, by Lemma 3.13 again, we obtain

$$\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j_0}, x) \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x).$$

It is a contradiction.

Hence $g_2(v_1)g_2(v_2) > 0$ for any $v_1, v_2 \in \delta\mathcal{G}_j - \{x\}$, $g_2(x) = 0$. By Lemma 3.9, we have $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x)$.

Thus we get $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x)$.

□

Corollary 4.2. *Given any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}} := (\mathcal{G})_x^2 = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ with boundary $\delta\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, then the following hold.*

- 1) $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}, x) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ if $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$.
- 2) $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}, x) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ if $x \in V - \delta\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. Let $g_2 \in \mathbb{R}^V$ be a Steklov eigenfunction associated with $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. We also assume $x_j \in V$ such that $d(x, x_j) = 1$ with $1 \leq j \leq m := \deg(x)$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_j := \mathcal{H}_j(x_j, x)$ with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_j$, where \mathcal{H}_j is the branch from (x_j, x) in \mathcal{G} .

If $x \in \delta\mathcal{G}$, then $m = 1$. So $\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$ by Theorem 4.1. Since $\sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}} g_2(z) = 0$, we may assume that there exist $v_1, v_2 \in \delta\mathcal{G}$ such that $g_2(v_1) < 0, g_2(v_2) > 0$. If $x \notin \{v_1, v_2\}$, by Lemma 3.13, one can show that $\lambda_2(g) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$. Otherwise, suppose that $x = v_1$. If g_2 has the same sign on $\delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, applying Corollary 3.12, we have

$$\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}).$$

If $g_2(v_2)g_2(v_3) < 0$ for some $v_3 \in \delta\mathcal{G} - \{x\}$, via Lemma 3.13, we can also deduce

$$\lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}, x) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}).$$

Suppose that $x \in V - \delta\mathcal{G}$, and assume $g_2(x) \neq 0$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) > \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$. If $g_2(x) = 0$, similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get $\lambda_2(g) \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sigma(\mathcal{G}_j, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}})$.

□

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. It suffices to show that if two finite trees $\mathcal{G} = (V, E) \subset \mathcal{G}' = (V', E')$ such that $V' = V \cup \{y\}$, $E' = E \cup (x, y) \cup (y, x)$ for $x \in V, y \in V'$, then $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}')$.

Denote by $\delta\mathcal{G}, \delta\mathcal{G}'$ the boundary of $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}'$ respectively, and by $\Omega := V - \delta\mathcal{G}, \Omega' := V' - \delta\mathcal{G}'$ the set of interior vertices respectively. Let $h_2 \in \mathbb{R}^V$ be a Steklov eigenfunction associated with $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Assume $h_2(x_0) > 0$ for some $x_0 \in \delta\mathcal{G}$.

Claim 4.3. *For the finite tree \mathcal{G} , assume $z_j, z \in V$ with $d(z_j, z) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq \deg(z)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_j = (V_{j,z}, E_{j,z})$ ($\mathcal{F}'_j = (V'_{j,z}, E'_{j,z})$, resp.) be the branch from (z_j, z) ((z, z_j) , resp.) in \mathcal{G} . Then the following statements hold.*

- If $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, then $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), z) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ for any $2 \leq j \leq \deg(z)$.
- Suppose that $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq \deg(z)} \sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), z)$. Then $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ if and only if there is some $2 \leq j_0 \leq \deg(z)$ with $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_{j_0}(z_{j_0}, z), z) = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Furthermore, $h_2(z) = 0$ if the previous case holds.

Proof of Claim 4.3. Denote by $\delta\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), \delta\mathcal{F}'_j(z, z_j)$ the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), \mathcal{F}'_j(z, z_j)$ in \mathcal{G} respectively.

For the first part, if $\sigma_{1,z} := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $\sigma_{j_1,z} := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_{j_1}(z_{j_1}, z), z) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ for some $2 \leq j_1 \leq \deg(z)$. By Lemma 3.9, there exist functions $f_{\sigma_{1,z}}$ on $\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{j_1}(z_{j_1}, z)$ such that $f_{\sigma_{1,z}}(z) = f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}(z) = 0$, $f_{\sigma_{1,z}}(s_1) > 0$ if $s_1 \in V_{1,z}$ and $f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}(s_{j_1}) > 0$ if $s_{j_1} \in V_{j_1,z}$. By Lemma 3.3, we have $R(f_{\sigma_{1,z}}) = \sigma_{1,z}$ and $R(f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}) = \sigma_{j_1,z}$.

We construct a nonzero function $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f|_{V_{1,z}} &= \left(\sum_{s_{j_1} \in \delta\mathcal{F}_{j_1}(z_{j_1}, z) - \{z\}} f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}(s_{j_1}) \right) f_{\sigma_{1,z}}, \\ f|_{V_{j_1,z}} &= - \left(\sum_{s_1 \in \delta\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z) - \{z\}} f_{\sigma_{1,z}}(s_1) \right) f_{\sigma_{j_1,z}}, \\ f|_{V - V_{1,z} - V_{j_1,z}} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, one easily shows that $f \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is well-defined and $\sum_{s \in \delta\mathcal{G}} f(z) = 0$. A direct computation yields that $R(f) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, but $R(f) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Hence this is a contradiction.

For the second part, if $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, it follows from the first part that

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq \deg(z)} \sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), z) = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

If $h_2(z) \neq 0$ and $\sum_{s \in \delta\mathcal{G}} h_2(s) = 0$, we may assume $h_2(z) < 0, h_2(s_i) > 0$ with $s_i \in \delta\mathcal{F}_i(z_i, z)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \deg(z)$. Then using Lemma 3.13

and Corollary 3.12, we have $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) > \sigma(\mathcal{F}_i(z_i, z), z) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, which is a contradiction.

So that $h_2(z) = 0$.

If it holds that $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), z) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ for any $2 \leq j \leq \deg(z)$. Recall that $h_2 \in \mathbb{R}^V$ is a Steklov eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. It is a $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ -flow to z on \mathcal{G} .

Assume that $h_2|_{\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z)} \neq 0$ for some j with $2 \leq j \leq \deg(z)$. Note that $h_2(z) = 0$. Then $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z), z) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, which is a contradiction. So that $h_2|_{\mathcal{F}_j(z_j, z)} = 0$ for any j with $2 \leq j \leq \deg(z)$ and $h_2|_{f_{1,z}} \neq 0$. Recall that $\sum_{s \in \delta\mathcal{G}} h_2(s) = 0$, hence there exist two boundary vertices t_1, t_2 in

$\delta\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z)$ such that $h_2(t_1)h_2(t_2) < 0$. By Lemma 3.13, we get

$$\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) > \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(z_1, z), z) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

which is also a contradiction.

For the other direction of the second part, it is trivial and lengthy by a similar construction in the proof of the first part, and an argument same to that in the above for the second part. \square

Let $x_1 \in V$ with $d(x_0, x_1) = 1$. Note that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_0(x_0, x_1), x_1) \geq \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_{x_1}^2)$ by Corollary 4.2, where $\mathcal{G}_0 = (V_0, E_0)$ is the branch from (x_0, x_1) in \mathcal{G} , i.e. $\{x_0\}$.

If $1 = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_0(x_0, x_1), x_1) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, then $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_0(x_0, x_1), x_1) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = 1$ and this case is trivial.

If $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_0(x_0, x_1), x_1) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $\sigma(\mathcal{G}'_1(x_2, x_1), x_1) = \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_{x_1}^2)$ for some $x_2 \in V$ with $d(x_1, x_2) = 1$, where \mathcal{G}'_1 is the branch from (x_2, x_1) . Since \mathcal{G} is finite, using Corollary 3.11, Theorem 4.1, and Corollary 4.2, we can find $x_j \in V$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{j-1}(x_{j-1}, x_j)) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, $\sigma(\mathcal{G}'_j(x_{j+1}, x_j), x_j) = \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_{x_j}^2)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and

$$\sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_{x_{k+1}}^2) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

where $\mathcal{G}_j = (V_j, E_j)$ is the branch from (x_j, x_{j+1}) and $\mathcal{G}'_j = (V'_j, E'_j)$ is the branch from (x_{j+1}, x_j) , $k \geq 2$.

In summary, we have

$$(16) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}(x_{k-1}, x_k)) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

$$(17) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}'_k(x_{k+1}, x_k), x_k) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

$$(18) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

Let $x_{k,i}, x_{k+1,t} \in V$ such that $d(x_{k,i}, x_k) = d(x_{k+1,t}, x_{k+1}) = 1$ with $1 \leq i \leq \deg(x_k) - 2, 1 \leq t \leq \deg(x_{k+1}) - 1$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_{k,i}$ the branch from $(x_{k,i}, x_k)$ in \mathcal{G} , and by $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t} = (V_{k+1,t}, E_{k+1,t})$ the branch from $(x_{k+1,t}, x_{k+1})$ in \mathcal{G} .

Case 1. Subcase 1. $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. By Claim 4.3, we have

$$(19) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t}(x_{k+1,t}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

Subcase 2. $\sigma(\mathcal{G}'_k(x_{k+1}, x_k), x_k) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. By Claim 4.3, we have

$$(20) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k,i}(x_{k,i}, x_k), x_k) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

Note that Subcase 1 is dual to Subcase 2. So that it suffices to consider Subcase 1.

By Claim 4.3, there is $x_{k+1,t_0} \in V$ with $1 \leq t_0 \leq \deg(x_{k+1}) - 1$, such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_0}(x_{k+1,t_0}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$.

If there is $x_{k+1,t_1} \in V$ with $1 \leq t_0 \neq t_1 \leq \deg(x_{k+1}) - 1$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_1}(x_{k+1,t_1}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Suppose that $x \notin V_k \cup V_{k+1,t_0}$, recalling that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_k) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, similar to the proof of Claim 4.3, we can construct $g \in \mathbb{R}^V$ with $g(x_0) = 1$ such that

$$(21) \quad g(z) = \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \delta \mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_0}(x_{k+1,t_0}, x_{k+1}) - \{x_{k+1}\}} g_1(s)g_2(z), & z \in V_k, \\ - \sum_{s \in \delta \mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}) - \{x_{k+1}\}} g_2(s)g_1(z), & z \in V_{k+1,t_0}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where g_1, g_2 are $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ -flows to x_{k+1} on $\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_0}(x_{k+1,t_0}, x_{k+1})$ and $\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1})$ respectively. One easily verifies that g is a Steklov eigenfunction on \mathcal{G} associated with eigenvalue $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. It is clear that $g(x) = 0$ by $x \notin V_k \cup V_{k+1,t_0}$. Then we extend g to g' on \mathcal{G}' by setting $g'(y) = 0$. Note that $\sum_{s \in \delta \mathcal{G}'} g'(s) =$

$\sum_{s \in \delta \mathcal{G}} g(s) = 0$. Using the variational inequality (10) and Lemma 3.3, we get

$$\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}') \leq R(g') = R(g) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

If

$$(22) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t}(x_{k+1,t}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$$

for $1 \leq t \neq t_0 \leq \deg(x_{k+1}) - 1$ and $x \in V_{k+1,t_0}$, then there is a path $\alpha := x_{k+1} = v_0 \sim x_{k+1,t_0} = v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \cdots \sim v_n = x \sim y$ in \mathcal{G}' for some $n \geq 1$.

We will construct inductively a λ -flow to y on \mathcal{G}' along the path α , such that f_λ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_\lambda(x_0) = 1$.

By (22) and $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, it follows from Lemma 3.9 that there exists a λ -flow $f_{\lambda,1}$ to v_1 on $\mathcal{H}_1(v_0, v_1)$ such that $f_{\lambda,1}$ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_{\lambda,1}(x_0) = 1$, where $\mathcal{H}_1 = (\hat{V}_{1,0}, \hat{E}_{1,0})$ is the branch from (v_0, v_1) in \mathcal{G} . By induction, there is a λ -flow $f_{\lambda,i}$ to v_i on $\mathcal{H}_i(v_{i-1}, v_i)$, such that $f_{\lambda,i}$ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, where $\mathcal{H}_i = (\hat{V}_{i,i-1}, \hat{E}_{i,i-1})$ is the branch from (v_{i-1}, v_i) in \mathcal{G} for some $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Assume that $v_{i,j} \sim v_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq \deg(x_i) - 2$. Note that

$$(23) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{H}_{i,j}(v_{i,j}, v_i), v_i) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_0}(x_{k+1,t_0}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

which follows from $\mathcal{H}_{i,j}(v_{i,j}, v_i) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}_{k+1,t_0}(x_{k+1,t_0}, x_{k+1})$ and Lemma 3.9, where $\mathcal{H}_{i,j} = (\hat{V}_{i,j,i}, \hat{E}_{i,j,i})$ is the branch from $(v_{i,j}, v_i)$ in \mathcal{G} . Then by Lemma

3.9, there is a λ -flow $f_{\lambda,i,j}$ to v_i such that $f_{\lambda,i,j}$ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(v_i) > 0$. We define $f_{\lambda,i+1}$ as follows.

$$(24) \quad f_{\lambda,i+1}(z) = \begin{cases} f_{\lambda,i}(z), & z \in \hat{V}_{i,i-1}, \\ \frac{f_{\lambda,i}(v_i)}{f_{\lambda,i,j}(v_i)} f_{\lambda,i,j}(z), & z \in \hat{V}_{i,j,i}, \\ f_{\lambda,i}(v_i) - \nabla_{(v_{i-1},v_i)} f_{\lambda,i} - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(v_i)-2} \nabla_{(v_i,j,v_i)} \frac{f_{\lambda,i}(v_i)}{f_{\lambda,i,j}(v_i)} f_{\lambda,i,j}, & z = v_{i+1}. \end{cases}$$

One easily checks that $f_{\lambda,i+1}$ is a λ -flow to v_{i+1} on $\mathcal{H}_{i+1}(v_i, v_{i+1})$ such that $f_{\lambda,i+1}$ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_{\lambda,i+1}(x_0) = 1$.

Thus we construct a λ -flow to y on \mathcal{G}' along the path α , such that f_λ is continuous in λ as $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_\lambda(x_0) = 1$.

By the construction of f_λ , it is clear that $f_\lambda(v_0) > 0$ as $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(v_0) = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.4 or Lemma 3.7, $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(v_1) < 0$. Recalling (23) and by the construction of f_λ , we have

$$(25) \quad f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_{V_{k+1,t_0}} < 0.$$

Note that since $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(v_0) = 0$, $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_{V-V_k-\hat{V}_{1,0}} = 0$. It is not hard to see that $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_V = g$ by the construction of f_λ and Lemma 3.9, where g is defined in (21) and it is a Steklov eigenfunction associated with $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. So that we have

$$(26) \quad \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(z) = 0,$$

$$(27) \quad f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(y) = f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(x), \text{ if } x \in \Omega,$$

$$(28) \quad f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(y) = f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(x) - \nabla_{(x,y)} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}, \text{ if } x \in \delta\mathcal{G}.$$

Hence we have

$$(29) \quad \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}'} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(z) = f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(x), \text{ if } x \in \Omega,$$

$$(30) \quad \sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}'} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(z) = -\nabla_{(x,y)} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})} = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(x), \text{ if } x \in \delta\mathcal{G}.$$

Using (29), (30) and (25), we have $\sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}'} f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(z) < 0$. Note that $\sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}'} f_0(z) \geq f_0(x_0) > 0$ and f_λ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Thus there exists a $\hat{\lambda}$ such that $\sum_{z \in \delta\mathcal{G}'} f_{\hat{\lambda}}(z) = 0$ for $0 < \hat{\lambda} < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. Then $f_{\hat{\lambda}}$ is a Steklov

eigenfunction on \mathcal{G}' associated with eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$. By the inequality (10), we have

$$\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}') \leq R(f_{\hat{\lambda}}) = \hat{\lambda} < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}).$$

Case 2. $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}(x_{k-1}, x_k)) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, $\sigma(\mathcal{G}'_k(x_{k+1}, x_k), x_k) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$, and $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_k(x_k, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. By Claim 4.3, we have

$$\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k+1,t}(x_{k+1,t}, x_{k+1}), x_{k+1}) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}), \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{k,i}(x_{k,i}, x_k)) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}),$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq \deg(x_k) - 2$ and $1 \leq t \leq \deg(x_{k+1}) - 1$. We assume $x \in V_{k+1,t_0} \cup \{x_{k+1}\}$ and there is a path $\alpha := v_0 = x_{k+1} \sim x_{k+1,t_0} = v_1 \sim \dots \sim v_n = x \sim y$ or $x = x_{k+1} \sim y$. Similar to Case 1, we can construct a λ -flow f_λ to y on \mathcal{G}' with $f_\lambda(x_0) = 1$ along the path α , such that $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}$ is continuous in λ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$.

This case is similar to Case 1. It is easier than Case 1, since $f_\lambda(v_i) \neq 0$ for any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})]$ and v_i . One easily checks that $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}|_V$ is a Steklov eigenfunction associated with the eigenvalue $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$ and $f_{\lambda_2(\mathcal{G})}(x) < 0$. Thus we have $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}') < \lambda_2(\mathcal{G})$. □

Note that we can construct different λ -flows on a given finite tree along different paths in general, since such a λ -flow takes the same sign on each subtree (involved in the construction of the λ -flow along a path).

The subsequent result implies some strict monotonicity of $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, x)$ for finite trees, provided that x is a boundary vertex. It can be applied to deduce some rigidities of finite trees in the sequel.

Corollary 4.4. *Assume that $\mathcal{G}_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ is a finite tree with boundary $\delta\mathcal{G}_1$ containing x , $\mathcal{G}_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ is a proper subgraph of \mathcal{G}_1 (i.e. $V_2 \subsetneq V_1$) such that $x \in V_2$. Then*

$$(31) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) > \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, x).$$

Proof. It is clear that $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_2 := (\mathcal{G}_2)_x^2$ can be viewed as a subgraph of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_1 := (\mathcal{G}_1)_x^2$. By Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 1.3, we have

$$\sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}_2) \geq \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}_1) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, x).$$

So it suffices to show (31) holds for the case that $V_1 = V_2 \cup \{y\}, E_1 = E_2 \cup \{(z, y), (y, z)\}, x, z \in V_2$ and $y \notin V_2$.

Let $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{G}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{G}_2/x \smile x$. By Theorem 4.1 and Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have

$$(32) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) = \lambda_2(\hat{\mathcal{G}}_2) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{H}).$$

If $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, x)$, using the argument similar to that in the first part of Claim 4.3 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we deduce $\lambda_2(\mathcal{H}) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, x)$. It is a contradiction, which violates (32). Recall that we get $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_2, x) \geq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1, x)$, thus we conclude the proof. □

5. SOME APPLICATIONS

In the previous paper [HH20], we proved that the bound for the first non-zero Steklov eigenvalue on any finite tree, in terms of the diameter of the tree.

Theorem 5.1 (Theorem 1.4, [HH20]). *For any finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$,*

$$\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \leq \frac{2}{L},$$

where L is the diameter of \mathcal{G} .

Now we give a complete description for the case that attains the upper bound in Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.2. *Given a finite tree $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, assume there is a path $x_0 = x \sim x_1 \sim x_2 \cdots \sim x_L = y$ in \mathcal{G} , where L is the diameter of \mathcal{G} . For $1 \leq k \leq L - 1$, we remove the edges (x_{k-1}, x_k) and (x_k, x_{k+1}) from \mathcal{G} , and denote by $\mathcal{G}_k = (V_k, E_k)$ the connected component containing x_k , and by $\delta(\mathcal{G}_k, \mathcal{G}) := V_k \cap \delta\mathcal{G}$ the relative boundary. Set $n_k := |\delta(\mathcal{G}_k, \mathcal{G})| \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{2}{L}$ if and only if L is even, $n_k = 0$ for $1 \leq k \neq \frac{L}{2} \leq L - 1$, and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \mathcal{H}_2$ such that $\lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_2)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2) \geq \frac{2}{L}$, where the subgraph $\mathcal{H}_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ is generated by all vertices x_j with $0 \leq j \leq L$ in \mathcal{G} and the subgraph $\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{G}_{\frac{L}{2}}$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) For convenience, we adopt the notations in the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [HH20].

If $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{2}{L}$, it is clear that

$$(33) \quad \left(\sum_{k=1}^{L-1} n_k a_k \right)^2 = 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} n_k a_k^2 = 0.$$

Then

$$(34) \quad f(y_k) = a_0 - k \cdot \frac{2a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} n_i a_i}{L} = a_0 \left(1 - \frac{2k}{L}\right)$$

by the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [HH20], where $y_k \in V_k$, $f(x_k) = a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq k \leq L - 1$, and

$$(35) \quad f(x_L) = -a_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} n_k a_k.$$

If $a_0 = 0$, then $f(y_k) = 0$ by (34) for $1 \leq k \leq L - 1$ and $f(x_L) = 0$ by (35), which contradicts that $f \neq 0$. Hence $a_0 \neq 0$. If $n_k \neq 0$ for some k with $1 \leq k \leq L - 1$, then $f(x_k) = a_k = 0$ by (33). Using (34), we have $k = \frac{L}{2}$. It

implies that L is even and $n_k = 0$ for any k with $1 \leq k \neq \frac{L}{2} \leq L$.

Consider the branches from edges $(z, x_{\frac{L}{2}})$ in \mathcal{G} , where z runs over all neighbors of $x_{\frac{L}{2}}$. Since $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{2}{L}$, using Theorem 4.1, and Claim 4.3 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, it is easy to obtain $\lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_2)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2) \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{2}{L}$.

(\Leftarrow) Applying Theorem 5.2, Theorem 1.3, Theorem 4.1 and $\lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_2)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2) \geq \frac{2}{L} = \lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_1)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2)$, we deduce that

$$(36) \quad \frac{2}{L} \geq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \geq \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2) = \min\{\lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_1)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2), \lambda_2((\mathcal{H}_2)_{x_{\frac{L}{2}}}^2)\} = \frac{2}{L}.$$

Hence we finish the proof. \square

We denote by T_{n+1} the $(n+1)$ -regular tree for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We write $B_R(x)$ in a tree \mathcal{G} for the ball centered at the vertex x with radius R , with respect to the canonical combinatorial metric in \mathcal{G} .

Another interesting consequence is an explicit lower bound of the first Steklov eigenvalue for finite trees, with bounded vertex degree and bounded diameter. Moreover, we give the characterization for the cases attaining the lower bound.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ be a finite tree with diameter at most L and vertex degree at most $D+1$, i.e. $\deg(v) \leq D+1$ for any $v \in V$. Then the following hold.*

(i) *If $L = 2R$ for some positive integer R , then*

$$(37) \quad \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{R-1} D^i} = \frac{D-1}{D^R-1}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if \mathcal{G} contains a subgraph $\mathcal{G}_1 = (\mathcal{H}_1(y, x))_x^2$, where \mathcal{H}_1 is the branch from (y, x) in the subtree generated by the ball $B_R(x)$ in $T_{D+1} := (V^{D+1}, E^{D+1})$ with $(y, x) \in E^{D+1}$.

(ii) *If $L = 2R+1$ for some positive integer R , then*

$$(38) \quad \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{2}{2 \sum_{i=0}^{R-1} D^i + D^R} = \frac{2(D-1)}{D^{R+1} + D^R - 2}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} := (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$, where \mathcal{F} is exactly the subtree generated by $B_R(z) \cup B_R(w)$ in $T_{D+1} := (V^{D+1}, E^{D+1})$ with $(z, w) \in E^{D+1}$.

Proof. For (i), one easily shows that such \mathcal{G} can be viewed as a subgraph of the graph \mathcal{G}_2 generated by $B_R(x)$ in T_{D+1} . By Theorem 4.1, direct calculus shows that

$$(39) \quad \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_1) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_2) = \sigma(\mathcal{H}_1(y, x), x) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{R-1} D^i} = \frac{D-1}{D^R-1}.$$

Thus (37) follows from Theorem 1.3 and (39).

We proceed to discuss the remaining claim.

(\Leftarrow) Applying Theorem 1.3, we have $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_2) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \leq \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}_1)$. Hence we finish the proof by (39).

(\implies) Let $d(x, x_j) = 1$ with $1 \leq j \leq \deg(x)$ for \mathcal{G} . Note that $\mathcal{G}^j(x_j, x)$ can be viewed as a subgraph of $\mathcal{H}_1(y, x)$, where \mathcal{G}^j is the branch from (x_j, x) in \mathcal{G} . By Corollary 4.4, we have $\sigma(\mathcal{G}^j(x_j, x), x) \geq \sigma(\mathcal{H}_1(y, x), x)$. Using Theorem 1.3, Theorem 4.1 and the above result, we get

$$\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) \geq \lambda_2((\mathcal{G})_x^2) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq \deg(x)} \sigma(\mathcal{G}^j(x_j, x), x) \geq \sigma(\mathcal{H}_1(y, x), x).$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{D-1}{D^R-1} = \sigma(\mathcal{H}_1(y, x), x)$ by (39). Using Claim 4.3 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, there exist s, t such that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}^s(x_s, x), x) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}^t(x_t, x), x) = \sigma(\mathcal{H}_1(y, x), x)$ with $1 \leq s, t \leq \deg(x)$. Applying Corollary 4.4, we conclude the proof.

For (ii), it is similar to the proof of (i). Note that $\lambda_2(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{2(D-1)}{D^{R+1} + D^R - 2}$. It is clear that \mathcal{G} can be viewed as a subgraph of \mathcal{F} , hence we deduce (38). So we only need to show the equality case.

(\Leftarrow) This direction is trivial.

(\implies) By Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove that if $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}' := (V', E')$ is a proper subgraph of \mathcal{F} such that $\tilde{V} = V' \cup \{q\}$ and $\tilde{E} = E' \cup \{(p, q), (q, p)\}$ for some $p \in V_1, q \notin V'$, then $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) > \frac{2(D-1)}{D^{R+1} + D^R - 2}$.

Assume that $\mathcal{F}_2(w_2, w)$ contains p , where (w_2, w) is a directed edge of \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F}_2 is the branch from (w_2, w) in \mathcal{G} . Let $z_i (\neq w)$ be a neighbor of z in \mathcal{G} , and denote by \mathcal{F}^i the branch from (z_i, z) in \mathcal{G} for $2 \leq i \leq \deg z$. Using Theorem 4.1, Theorem 1.3 and Claim 4.3 in Theorem 1.3, one deduces that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathcal{F}^i(z_i, z), z) &= \sigma(\mathcal{F}^2(z_2, z), z) \\ &> \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) > \min_{1 \leq j \leq \deg w} \sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(w_j, w), w) = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1(w_1, w), w), \\ &\min_{2 \leq j \leq \deg w} \sigma(\mathcal{F}_j(w_j, w), w) > \lambda_2(\mathcal{G}), \end{aligned}$$

where $d(w_j, w) = 1$ with $w_1 = z$, and \mathcal{F}_j is the branch from (w_j, w) in \mathcal{G} for $1 \leq j \leq \deg(w)$.

By Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we get that $\lambda_2(\mathcal{G}) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{F}') > \lambda_2(\mathcal{F})$. □

REFERENCES

- [Bar17] Martin T. Barlow. *Random walks and heat kernels on graphs*, volume 438 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [Bro01] F. Brock. An isoperimetric inequality for eigenvalues of the Stekloff problem. *ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, 81(1):69–71, 2001.
- [CESG11] Bruno Colbois, Ahmad El Soufi, and Alexandre Girouard. Isoperimetric control of the Steklov spectrum. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(5):1384–1399, 2011.

- [CGR18] B. Colbois, A. Girouard, and B. Raveendran. The Steklov spectrum and coarse discretizations of manifolds with boundary. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 14(2):357–392, 2018.
- [Esc97] José F. Escobar. The geometry of the first non-zero Stekloff eigenvalue. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 150(2):544–556, 1997.
- [Esc99] José F. Escobar. An isoperimetric inequality and the first Steklov eigenvalue. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 165(1):101–116, 1999.
- [Esc00] José F. Escobar. A comparison theorem for the first non-zero Steklov eigenvalue. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 178(1):143–155, 2000.
- [Fri93] Joel Friedman. Some geometric aspects of graphs and their eigenfunctions. *Duke Math. J.*, 69(3):487–525, 1993.
- [FS11] A. Fraser and R. Schoen. The first Steklov eigenvalue, conformal geometry, and minimal surfaces. *Adv. Math.*, 226(5):4011–4030, 2011.
- [GP12] A. Girouard and I. Polterovich. Upper bounds for Steklov eigenvalues on surfaces. *Electron. Res. Announc. Math. Sci.*, 19:77–85, 2012.
- [Hae95] Willem H. Haemers. Interlacing eigenvalues and graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 226/228:593–616, 1995.
- [HH19] Wen Han and Bobo Hua. Steklov eigenvalue problem on subgraphs of integer lattices. *arXiv:1902.05831*, 2019.
- [HH20] Zunwu He and Bobo Hua. Bounds for the Steklov eigenvalues on trees. *arXiv:2011.11014*, 2020.
- [HHW17] Bobo Hua, Yan Huang, and Zuoqin Wang. First eigenvalue estimates of Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators on graphs. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 56(6):Paper No. 178, 21, 2017.
- [HHW18] Bobo Hua, Yan Huang, and Zuoqin Wang. Cheeger estimates of Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators on infinite subgraphs of graphs. *arXiv:1810.10763*, 2018.
- [HM17] A. Hassannezhad and L. Miclo. Higher order Cheeger inequalities for Steklov eigenvalues. *arXiv:1705.08643*, to appear in *Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.*, doi:10.24033/asens.2417, 2017.
- [KS14] Kuznetsov N. Kwaśnicki M. Nazarov A. Poborchi S. Polterovich I. Kulczycki, T. and B. Siudeja. The legacy of Vladimir Andreevich Steklov. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 61(1):9–22, 2014.
- [Per19] H. Perrin. Lower bounds for the first eigenvalue of the Steklov problem on graphs. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(2):Paper No. 67, 12, 2019.
- [Per20] H. Perrin. Isoperimetric upper bound for the first eigenvalue of discrete Steklov problems. *arXiv:2002.08751*, 2020.
- [SY19a] Yongjie Shi and Chengjie Yu. Higher order Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps on graphs and their eigenvalues. *arXiv:1904.03880*, 2019.
- [SY19b] Yongjie Shi and Chengjie Yu. Rigidity of a trace estimate for Steklov eigenvalues. *arXiv:1912.12785*, 2019.
- [SY20a] Yongjie Shi and Chengjie Yu. A Lichnerowicz-type estimate for Steklov eigenvalues on graphs and its rigidity. *arXiv:2010.13966*, 2020.
- [SY20b] Yongjie Shi and Chengjie Yu. Comparison of steklov eigenvalues and Laplacian eigenvalues on graphs. *arXiv:2010.13969*, 2020.
- [Tay11] M.E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations II. Qualitative studies of linear equations*, volume 116 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.
- [Wei54] R. Weinstock. Inequalities for a classical eigenvalue problem. *J. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 3:745–753, 1954.

ZUNWU HE: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA

Email address: `hzw@fudan.edu.cn`

BOBO HUA: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LMNS, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA; SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, JIANGWAN CAMPUS, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, NO. 2005 SONGHU ROAD, SHANGHAI 200438, CHINA.

Email address: `bobohua@fudan.edu.cn`