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#### Abstract

Any symmetric real matrix exhibits double orthogonality in its eigenstructure. While the mathematical foundations are crystal clear, the physical meaning of its application to graphs, the underlying topological structure of a network, is surprisingly opaque. This short letter is meant to provoke and inspire in order to understand; in the spirit of Hilbert, "wir müssen wissen".


## 1 Eigenstructure of a symmetric matrix

### 1.1 Double orthogonality

Following the notation of [1], we denote by $x_{k}$ the eigenvector of the symmetric matrix $A$ belonging to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{k}$, normalized so that $x_{k}^{T} x_{k}=1$. The eigenvalues of an $N \times N$ symmetric matrix $A=A^{T}$ are real and can be ordered as $\lambda_{1} \geq \lambda_{2} \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_{N}$. Let $X$ be the orthogonal matrix with eigenvectors of $A$ in the columns,

$$
X=\left[\begin{array}{lllll}
x_{1} & x_{2} & x_{3} & \cdots & x_{N}
\end{array}\right]
$$

or explicitly in terms of the $m$-th component $\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}$ of eigenvector $x_{j}$,

$$
X=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\left(x_{1}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{1} & \cdots & \left(x_{N}\right)_{1} \\
\left(x_{1}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{2} & \cdots & \left(x_{N}\right)_{2} \\
\left(x_{1}\right)_{3} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{3} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(x_{N}\right)_{3} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\left(x_{1}\right)_{N} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{N} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{N} & \cdots & \left(x_{N}\right)_{N}
\end{array}\right]
$$

The eigenvalue equation $A x_{k}=\lambda_{k} x_{k}$ translates to the matrix equation $A=X \Lambda X^{T}$, where $\Lambda=$ $\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{k}\right)$.

[^0]The relation $X^{T} X=I=X X^{T}$ (see e.g. [1, p. 223]) expresses, in fact, double orthogonality. The first equality $X^{T} X=I$ translates to the well-known orthogonality relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k}^{T} x_{m}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}\left(x_{m}\right)_{j}=\delta_{k m} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

stating that the eigenvector $x_{k}$ belonging to eigenvalue $\lambda_{k}$ is orthogonal to any other eigenvector belonging to a different eigenvalue. The second equality $X X^{T}=I$, which arises from the commutativity of the inverse matrix $X^{-1}=X^{T}$ with the matrix $X$ itself, can be written as $\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}=\delta_{m k}$ and suggests us to define the row vector in $X$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{m}=\left(\left(x_{1}\right)_{m},\left(x_{2}\right)_{m}, \ldots,\left(x_{N}\right)_{m}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, the second orthogonality condition $X X^{T}=I$ implies orthogonality of the vectors

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{k}^{T} y_{m}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}=\delta_{k m} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The third combination, namely $y_{k}^{T} x_{m}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}\left(x_{m}\right)_{j}$, does not seem to possess special properties (see Appendix B).

The sum over $j$ in (3) can be interpreted as the sum over all eigenvalues. Indeed, the eigenvalue equation is

$$
A x(\lambda)=\lambda x(\lambda)
$$

where a non-zero vector $x(\lambda)$ only satisfies this linear equation ${ }^{1}$ if $\lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ such that $x_{j}=x\left(\lambda_{j}\right)$. We have made the dependence on the parameter $\lambda$ explicit and can interpret $\lambda$ as a frequency that ranges continuously over all real numbers. Invoking the Dirac delta-function $\delta(t)$, we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k} & =\sum_{\lambda \in\left\{\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{N}\right\}}^{N}(x(\lambda))_{m}(x(\lambda))_{k} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta\left(\lambda-\lambda_{j}\right)(x(\lambda))_{m}(x(\lambda))_{k} d \lambda
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the non-negative weight function

$$
\left.w(\lambda)=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta\left(\lambda-\lambda_{j}\right)=\delta(\operatorname{det}(A-\lambda I))\left|\frac{d \operatorname{det}(A-x I)}{d x}\right|_{x=\lambda} \right\rvert\,
$$

shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\lambda)(x(\lambda))_{m}(x(\lambda))_{k} d \lambda=\delta_{m k} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^1]The right-hand side in (4) is the continuous variant of (3) that expresses orthogonality between functions with respect to the weight function $w$ (see e.g. [1, p. 313]). Specifically ${ }^{2}$, the orthogonality property (4) shows that the set $\left\{(x(\lambda))_{m}\right\}_{1 \leq m \leq N}$ is a set of $N$ orthogonal polynomials in $\lambda$.

### 1.2 Interpretations of the eigenstructure of a graph

The topology of a network can be represented by a graph $G$, consisting of a set of nodes connected by a set of links. Many matrices can be associated to a graph, such as the adjacency, Laplacian, signless and normalized Laplacian, modularity, incidence and distance matrix, etc.. We confine ourselves here to a simple, undirected graph $G$ and to its corresponding symmetric adjacency matrix $A$.

Surprisingly little is known [1, Chapter 1] about the "physical" meaning of the eigenvalue $\lambda_{k}$ and its corresponding eigenvector $x_{k}$ (for each $1 \leq k \leq N$ ) of the adjacency matrix $A$. One of the best interpretations follows from the probabilistic matrix, $P=\Delta^{-1} A$, where $\Delta=\operatorname{diag}\left(d_{j}\right)$ and the degree of node $j$ is $d_{j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{k j}$. The largest eigenvector component $\left(x_{1}(P)\right)_{j}$ of $P$, normalized as $u^{T} x_{1}(P)=1$, where $u$ is the all one vector, reflects the probability that a random walk on the graph $G$ visits node $j$ in the long run. Theorem 2.2.4 in Cvetković et al. [3] provides the explicit relation between the number $N_{k}(j)$ of walks of length $k$ starting at node $j$ in a non-bipartite graph and the eigenvector component $\left(x_{1}\right)_{j}$ of $A$ as

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{k}(j)}{\sum_{l=1}^{N} N_{k}(l)}=\left(x_{1}\right)_{j}
$$

The case of $k=1$ is studied most and the principal eigenvector $x_{1}$ corresponding to the spectral radius $\lambda_{1}$ can be regarded as a "dynamic" degree vector (see Appendix A), where each component $\left(x_{1}\right)_{j}$ reflects all possible walks passing through node $j$. Most insight and most relations in graph theory (see e.g. [1]) are based on the set $\left\{x_{k}\right\}_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ of eigenvectors. When studying spectral clustering, Von Luxburg et al. [4] show figures of several eigenvectors of the Laplacian as a function of the nodal components.

The vector $y_{m}$, defined in (2), reflects the role of the node $m$ over all eigenfrequencies or eigenvalues of $A$. From a graph metrics point of view, we may argue that $y_{m}$ specifies how important or "central" node $m$ is with respect to the important or characteristic frequencies (i.e. the eigenfrequencies) of the graph matrix $A$, that specifies links in $G$. Perhaps, the following geometric interpretation is daring. Imagine that the graph $G$ is embedded in some geometric structure with negligible mass compared to those of the nodes and links. For example, a planar graph on a large flexible sheet that can be brought into vibration by an external force. Thus, the force bends the sheet up and down so that waves travel over the sheet at certain frequency. The vector $y_{m}$ may be interpreted as the displacements of node $m$ on the sheet at the eigenfrequencies of the adjacency matrix of the graph $G$. Another view on the vector $y_{m}=\left(x\left(\lambda_{1}\right)_{m}, x\left(\lambda_{2}\right)_{m}, \ldots, x\left(\lambda_{N}\right)_{m}\right)$ or, more generally, on the set $\left\{(x(\lambda))_{m}\right\}_{1 \leq m \leq N}$ versus frequency $\lambda$, is inspired by our human vision: we perceive the real-world only via the frequency range of visible light, while we know (for example from Röntgen photographs) that additional information is revealed in other frequency bands of the spectrum.

[^2]Another thought is that, if the frequency interpretation of $\lambda$ is correct, then we may use Fourier analysis to rigorously define localization in space or in frequency. For example, if all components of $y_{m}$ are constant (or more or less of the same magnitude), then the Fourier (or Laplace) transform indicates that node $m$ is very localized in space ${ }^{3}$. The opposite is also true, if only a few components of $y_{m}$ in successive order are significant, hence localized in the frequency domain, then node $m$ is globally connected in the spacial domain.

The case $y_{m}^{T} y_{m}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}^{2}=1$ in second orthogonality relation (3) means that, considered over all eigenvalues (eigenfrequencies or eigenmodes) of a graph, each node in $G$ is equally important. In other words, the often associated importance to high-degree nodes seems only partially true, i.e. only for certain eigenfrequencies and certain types of graphs (the largest eigenvalue and graphs with large spectral gap; see Section A below).

The equations (1) and (3) constitute in total $N^{2}$ orthogonality conditions associated to the matrix $X$, whose rank is $N$ (since $|\operatorname{det} X|=1$ ). Although the $N^{2}$ elements of $X$ represent a set of independent row and/or column vectors, curiously, an equal number of additional conditions is embedded in them. The latter seems to indicate that considerable information condensation can be attained, raising the question how many bits are minimally needed to reconstruct $X$ exactly. Any orthogonal matrix describes a rotation of an orthogonal set of basis vectors in the $N$-dimensional space, which suggests that, beside $N$ bits (corresponding to the basis vectors $e_{j}$ ), $N$ rotation angles ( $N$ real numbers) are needed. Similar considerations have likely led Cvetkovic et al. [3] to define graph angles. The fundamental weight $w_{k}=u^{T} x_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}$ provides additional information to determine the eigenvector components, illustrating its important role ${ }^{4}$. The graph angle $\gamma_{k}$ is related to fundamental weight by $\cos \gamma_{k}=\frac{w_{k}}{\sqrt{N}}$. These considerations may hint that only $2 N$ real numbers (eigenvalues and fundamental weights or graph angles) are needed to construct the graph $G$ exactly. A rigorous proof of the minimum number of bits needed to construct a graph is currently an open problem.

## 2 Summary

The key relation $A=X \Lambda X^{T}$ shows that all "topological" information about the graph (left-hand side) is contained in the "spectral space" (right-hand side). While linear algebra, in particular eigenvalue decomposition, is a mature branch of mathematics, the physical meaning of its application to networks and graphs remains puzzling. Many articles have been written on graph metrics and many will still appear. Nearly all metrics are correlated and so far there is no generally accepted set that characterizes a graph without loosing too much information. The set of orthogonal - thus uncorrelated - vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$ mathematically reflects the complete information about the importance of each node in $G$ over all eigenfrequencies $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{N}$ and can thus be considered as an "ideal" nodal centrality set of metrics.

[^3]Let $A$ and $A_{G \backslash\{j\}}$ denote the adjacency matrix of the graph $G$ and of the graph $G_{\backslash\{j\}}$ in which node $j$ is removed from $G$, respectively. The square of the $j$-th component of eigenvector $x_{k}$ of $A$ belonging to eigenvalue $\lambda_{k}$ with multiplicity 1 equals [5]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2}=-\frac{1}{c_{A}^{\prime}\left(\lambda_{k}\right)} \operatorname{det}\left(A_{G \backslash\{j\}}-\lambda_{k} I\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{A}(\lambda)=\operatorname{det}(A-\lambda I)$ is the characteristic polynomial of $A$ and $c_{A}^{\prime}(\lambda)=\frac{d c_{A}(\lambda)}{d \lambda}$. Akin to sensitivity or robustness analyses on graphs [6], the elegant expression (5) associates $\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2}$ to the impact of the removal of node $j$ in the graph $G$ at the characteristic frequency $\lambda_{k}$ corresponding to eigenvector $x_{k}$ of a graph matrix.

Unfortunately, this positive view also has darker sides. First, each graph matrix (such as e.g. the Laplacian, adjacency and modularity matrix) possesses such doubly orthogonal eigenvectors. Thus, the $N$ nodal frequency centrality metrics for node $m$, i.e. the components or squared components of $y_{m}$, are also dependent on the specific graph matrix. Hence, there does not seem be a single ideal set of centrality metrics per graph. Still, we are confronted with the choice of the "ideal" centrality metrics over the space of all possible (symmetric) graph matrices. Second and as mentioned several times, the meaning of both the impact (or amplitude) and characteristic frequency are waiting for an explanation useful to networks. Third, from a practical point of view, the vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$, though complete and uncorrelated, require global information, i.e. the full knowledge of the adjacency matrix of $G$. Even if we would understand the meaning of each vector $y_{m}$ or of its squared components $\left(x_{k}\right)_{m}^{2}$, their complete use (i.e. all components over all frequencies $\lambda_{k}$ ) as a centrality metrics set is hardly feasible for large networks. Fourth, besides this computationally infeasibility objection, we can question the normalizations $x_{k}^{T} x_{k}=1$ for each $1 \leq k \leq N$ that consider each eigenvalue as equally important. Indeed, for a positive semi-definite symmetric matrix $A$ (whose eigenvalues are non-negative), we can write the spectral decomposition

$$
A=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k} x_{k} x_{k}^{T}=\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{k}} x_{k}\right)\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{k}} x_{k}\right)^{T}
$$

which suggests to scale the importance of an eigenvector as $v_{k}=\sqrt{\left|\lambda_{k}\right|} x_{k}$. Clearly, the eigenvectors corresponding to the larger (in absolute value) eigenvalues deserve more weight, as earlier was exploited in graph reconstructability [7] and only a few of the larger ones may be sufficient as centrality metrics.
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## A The degree vector $d$

Any vector in the $N$-dimensional space can be written as a linear combination of orthogonal vectors $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{N}$ that span that space. Hence, the degree vector $d=\left(d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{N}\right)$ of a graph $G$, where $d_{j}$ denotes the degree of node $j$, can be written as

$$
d=\sum_{j=1}^{N} r_{j} x_{j}
$$

where the scalars $r_{j}$ are computed using orthogonality of the vectors $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{N}$. Multiplying both sides by $x_{m}^{T}$ and using the orthogonality $x_{m}^{T} x_{j}=\delta_{m j}$ yields

$$
x_{m}^{T} d=r_{m}
$$

Further, $d=A u$ (see e.g. $[1$, p. 15]), where the vector $u=(1,1, \ldots, 1)$ is the all-one vector so that

$$
x_{m}^{T} d=x_{m}^{T} A u=\left(A x_{m}\right)^{T} u=\lambda_{m} x_{m}^{T} u=\lambda_{m} u^{T} x_{m}
$$

Hence, we find that ${ }^{5}$ the spectral decomposition of the degree vector,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{j}\left(u^{T} x_{j}\right) x_{j} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we call the real numbers

$$
w_{j}=u^{T} x_{j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}
$$

fundamental weights, that turn out to be equally important as the eigenvalues. Further (see e.g. [1, p. 33]), we have that

$$
N=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(u^{T} x_{j}\right)^{2} \text { and } 2 L=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{j}\left(u^{T} x_{j}\right)^{2}
$$

[^4]and, in general, the total number of walks with $k$ hops in the graph $G$ equals
$$
N_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left(u^{T} x_{j}\right)^{2}
$$

The general relation for diagonizable matrices, $f(A)=\sum_{k=1}^{N} f\left(\lambda_{k}\right) x_{k} x_{k}^{T}$, valid for a function $f$ defined on the eigenvalues $\left\{\lambda_{k}\right\}_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ (see e.g. [8, p. 526]), reduces for the element for node $j$ to

$$
(f(A))_{j j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} f\left(\lambda_{k}\right)\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2}
$$

illustrating that the squares of the eigenvector component arise as weights for $f\left(\lambda_{k}\right)$ to specify a function of the adjacency matrix $A$ at node $j$. In particular, for powers $f(z)=z^{n}$, nice formulae appear: for $n=0$, we find the second orthogonality relation (3) and for $n=1$ (since $A_{j j}=0$, from which $\left.\operatorname{trace}(A)=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}=0\right)$

$$
0=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2}
$$

while for $n=2\left(\right.$ since $\left.\left(A^{2}\right)_{j j}=d_{j}\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{2}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (6) and (7), we find that the degree $d_{j}$ of node $j$ can be expressed as

$$
d_{j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k} w_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}^{2}\left(x_{k}\right)_{j}^{2}
$$

Now, we rewrite (6) as

$$
d=\lambda_{1}\left(u^{T} x_{1}\right) x_{1}+c
$$

where the correction vector $c$ equals

$$
c=\sum_{j=2}^{N} \lambda_{j}\left(u^{T} x_{j}\right) x_{j}
$$

The correction vector is $c=0$ only for regular graphs, where the principal eigenvalue is $x_{1}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} u$ and $u^{T} x_{k}=0$ for each $2 \leq k \leq N$ because eigenvectors are orthogonal. If the correction vector $c$ is negligibly small (e.g. when the spectral gap is large $\left(\lambda_{1} \gg \lambda_{2}\right)$ or for almost regular graphs or in other cases that we still need to investigate), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \approx \lambda_{1}\left(u^{T} x_{1}\right) x_{1} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In simple dynamic processes on a network, such as SIS epidemics ${ }^{6}$, the vector $v$ with the nodal infection probabilities is proportional to $x_{1}$ close to the epidemic phase transition. Only in those graphs obeying (8) where the degree vector $d$ is (approximately) proportional to the principal eigenvector $x_{1}$, the dynamics (e.g. $v$ ) is directly proportional to the graph's topological structure.

[^5]
## B The set of orthogonal vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$ and the network's topology

We now proceed by writing the "classical" eigenvector $x_{j}$ as a linear combination of the set of orthogonal vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$ that span the $N$-dimensional space,

$$
x_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{k j} y_{j}
$$

where the real number

$$
b_{k m}=x_{k}^{T} y_{m}=\sum_{l=1}^{N}\left(x_{k}\right)_{l}\left(x_{l}\right)_{m}
$$

Written in matrix form

$$
\begin{equation*}
X=B Y \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the matrix $Y$ is

$$
Y=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\left(y_{1}\right)_{1} & \left(y_{2}\right)_{1} & \left(y_{3}\right)_{1} & \cdots & \left(y_{N}\right)_{1} \\
\left(y_{1}\right)_{2} & \left(y_{2}\right)_{2} & \left(y_{3}\right)_{2} & \cdots & \left(y_{N}\right)_{2} \\
\left(y_{1}\right)_{3} & \left(y_{2}\right)_{3} & \left(y_{3}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(y_{N}\right)_{3} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\left(y_{1}\right)_{N} & \left(y_{2}\right)_{N} & \left(y_{3}\right)_{N} & \cdots & \left(y_{N}\right)_{N}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\left(x_{1}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{1}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{1}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(x_{1}\right)_{N} \\
\left(x_{2}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{2}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(x_{2}\right)_{N} \\
\left(x_{3}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{3}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(x_{3}\right)_{N} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\left(x_{N}\right)_{1} & \left(x_{N}\right)_{2} & \left(x_{N}\right)_{3} & \cdots & \left(x_{N}\right)_{N}
\end{array}\right]=X^{T}
$$

Hence, we have that

$$
X=B X^{T}
$$

and, after right-multiplying by $X$ and using $X^{T} X=I$, we find that

$$
B=X^{2}
$$

Since the inverse $X^{-1}=X^{T}$, consistency is found by inverting (9),

$$
Y=B^{-1} X=\left(X^{T}\right)^{2} X=X^{T}
$$

We are now prepared to write the adjacency matrix $A$ in terms of the orthogonal vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$. Starting from (see e.g. [1, p. 2])

$$
A=X \Lambda X^{T}=B Y \Lambda(B Y)^{T}=B Y \Lambda Y^{T} B^{T}
$$

or from (see e.g. [1, p. 226])

$$
\begin{aligned}
A & =\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k} x_{k} x_{k}^{T}=\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{k j} y_{j}\right)\left(\sum_{l=1}^{N} b_{k l} y_{l}\right)^{T} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{l=1}^{N}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{k} b_{k j} b_{k l}\right) y_{j} y_{l}^{T}
\end{aligned}
$$

shows that the orthogonal vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$ are, by no means, naturally related to the topology of the graph $G$, because the expressions in terms of orthogonal vectors $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}$ are more complicated and less transparent than expressing $A$ in terms of its eigenvectors.


[^0]:    *Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, P.O Box 5031, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands; email: P.F.A.VanMieghem@tudelft.nl

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Differentiation with respect to $\lambda$ yields

    $$
    A x^{\prime}(\lambda)=\lambda x^{\prime}(\lambda)+x(\lambda)
    $$

    illustrating that no derivative (of any order) of $x(\lambda)$ can satisfy $A x(\lambda)=\lambda x(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \neq 0$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ The eigendecomposition of a general tri-diagonal stochastic matrix in [2, Appendix] exemplifies how orthogonal polynomials as a function of $\lambda$ enter.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Recall that $\sin (a r)=\frac{e^{i a r}-e^{-i a r}}{2 i}$ (broad in space) has a Fourier transform proportional to $\delta(f-a)-\delta(f+a)$ (peaked in frequency domain).
    ${ }^{4}$ We mention [1, p. 41] that the vector $w=\left(w_{1}^{2}, w_{2}^{2}, \ldots, w_{N}^{2}\right)$ satisfies $V_{N}(\lambda) w=\mathbf{N}$, where $V_{N}(\lambda)$ is the Vandermonde matrix of the vector with eigenvalues $\lambda=\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{N}\right)$ and where the vector $\mathbf{N}=\left(N_{1}, N_{2}, \ldots, N_{N}\right)$ has as components the total number of walks with $k$ hops, $N_{k}=u^{T} A^{k} u$. Since $V_{N}(\lambda)$ can be inverted when all eigenvalues are different, the fundamental weights $w$ can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues and the number of walks in the graph $G$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ When we write the spectral decomposition (6) of the $k$-th component of the degree vector as

    $$
    d_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(d^{T} x_{j}\right)\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} d_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}=\sum_{m=1}^{N} d_{m}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(x_{j}\right)_{m}\left(x_{j}\right)_{k}\right\}
    $$

    Since such a spectral decomposition holds for any $N$-dimensional vector, we naturally find the second type (3) of orthogonality.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ Also Kuramoto synchronization, see e.g. [9].

