MATH 401, Graph Laplacian, FALL 2015

Let us start by observing the following relationship pertaining to the 2 nd derivative on the realline.

Fact 0.1. Let $f$ be a twice differentiable function defined on $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $x \in(a, b)$. Then

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(x)=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h)-2 f(x)+f(x-h)}{h^{2}} .
$$

The limit on the right hand side is sometimes called the second symmetric derivative of $f$. Please note that the above fact asserts that the second symmetric derivative exists provided the 2nd derivative in the classical sense exists. The opposite statement is false (please find a counterexample).

## Proof:

First, consider the limit:

$$
\lim _{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h)-2 f(x)+f(x-h)}{h^{2}}
$$

We now fix $x$, and treat $h$ as variable. Apply Cauchy's mean value theorem to obtain that

$$
\frac{f(x+h)-2 f(x)+f(x-h)}{h^{2}}=\frac{f^{\prime}(x+k)-f^{\prime}(x-k)}{2 k}
$$

for some $0<k<h$. Now, however, note that

$$
\lim _{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{f^{\prime}(x+k)-f^{\prime}(x-k)}{2 k}=f^{\prime \prime}(x) .
$$

To show this last fact, observe that for any differentiable function $g$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{g(x+k)-g(x-k)}{2 k} & =\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{g(x+k)-g(x)}{k}+\frac{g(x)-g(x-k)}{k}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\left(g^{\prime}(x)+g^{\prime}(x)\right)=g^{\prime}(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, complete this argument by taking $g=f^{\prime}$.

Source of this proof: Antoni Zygmund, Trigonometric Series, Warszawa, 1935

## Another Proof:

We can also use de l'Hopital's Rule to verify the existence of the limit:

$$
\lim _{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h)-2 f(x)+f(x-h)}{h^{2}} .
$$

We start by noting that, both, numerator and denominator converge to 0 . (Since $f$ is differentiable, it must be in particular continuous.) Moreover, the derivative of the numerator and denominator with respect to $h$ exist. They are $f^{\prime}(x+h)-f^{\prime}(x-h)$ and $2 h$, respectively. This shows that the derivative of the denominator is different from 0 in the neighberhood of $h=0$. The last assumption of de l'Hopital's Rule that remains to be checkd is the existence of the limit

$$
\lim _{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f^{\prime}(x+h)-f^{\prime}(x-h)}{2 h}=\lim _{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f^{\prime}(x+h)-f(x)+f(x)-f^{\prime}(x-h)}{2 h}=f^{\prime \prime}(x),
$$

which follows from the existence of $f^{\prime \prime}(x)$.

Now, having defined this generalization of the 2nd derivative, we can use it to define the analog of the 2 nd derivative for a function defined on $\mathbb{Z}$. In such case we let $h=1$, note that the limit is no longer necessary for a discrete case, and we observe that

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(N)=f(N+1)+f(N-1)-2 f(N), \quad N \in \mathbb{Z}
$$

We shall now notice that both $N-1$ and $N+1$ can be viewed as neighbors of $N$. Denote the neighborhood of $N$ by $n b d(N)$. This leads us to the following interpretation of 2 nd derivative:

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(N)=\left(\sum_{j \in n b d(N)} f(j)\right)-\left(\sum_{j \in n b d(N)} f(N)\right) .
$$

Observe that this definition of 2nd derivative makes sense for a function on any graph. As such we shall call it the Graph Laplacian and denote by $\Delta$. Using textbook notation, we arrive at the following formula for the Graph Laplacian understood as a matrix acting on vectors which are functions on a (undirected) graph:

$$
\Delta=\underset{2}{A-D}
$$

where $A$ denotes the adjacency matrix and $D$ denotes the degree matrix. (Please note that this is different form typical CS texts, where $\Delta=D-A$, for no good reason :) )

We can also generalize now this notation to include weighted (undirected) graphs, i.e., graphs, where each edge $(i, j)$ is assigned a number (weight) $w_{i, j}$ :

$$
\Delta(f)(N)=\left(\sum_{j \in n b d(N)} w_{j, N} f(j)\right)-\left(\sum_{j \in n b d(N)} w_{j, N} f(N)\right)
$$

or, equivalently,

$$
\Delta(m, n)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
w_{m, n} & m \neq n, m \in n b d(n) \\
-\sum_{j \in n b d(n)} w_{j, n} & m=n \\
0 & m \notin n b d(n)
\end{array} .\right.
$$

Among some of the basic properties of the matrix $\Delta$ we find that it is symmetric, i.e.,

$$
\Delta^{T}=\Delta
$$

and, provided the weights are chosen to be non-negative, the Laplacian is negative semidefinite, i.e.,

$$
\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, \quad\langle\Delta v, v\rangle \leq 0
$$

These will come in handy when we shall want to compute eigendecompositions of $\Delta$.

