Random walks on graphs, and the Kirchhoff and Wiener Index

Agelos Georgakopoulos

University of Warwick

Joint with Stephan Wagner (Stellenbosch)

19/10/12



Problem 1: A mailman wants to deliver a letter to each vertex of a finite graph. If he performs a random walk, what is his expected number of steps until all letters are delivered?

Problem 1: A mailman wants to deliver a letter to each vertex of a finite graph. If he performs a random walk, what is his expected number of steps until all letters are delivered?

Problem 2: A truck-driver wants to distribute 1 ton of goods equally over all vertices of the graph. If she performs a random walk, what is the expected total weight she will carry?

Problem 1: A mailman wants to deliver a letter to each vertex of a finite graph. If he performs a random walk, what is his expected number of steps until all letters are delivered?

Problem 2: A truck-driver wants to distribute 1 ton of goods equally over all vertices of the graph. If she performs a random walk, what is the expected total weight she will carry?

Which problem is harder?

The Cover Time problem is hard

Theorem (Ding Lee & Peres, Ann. Math.'12)

There is a polynomial time algorithm approximating CT(G) up to a multiplicative factor.

The Cover Time problem is hard

Theorem (Ding Lee & Peres, Ann. Math.'12)

There is a polynomial time algorithm approximating CT(G) up to a multiplicative factor.

Theorem (G '12)

There is an $O(n^4)$ algorithm computing cc(G) (exactly).

The Cover Time problem is hard

Theorem (Ding Lee & Peres, Ann. Math.'12)

There is a polynomial time algorithm approximating CT(G) up to a multiplicative factor.

Theorem (G'12)

There is an $O(n^4)$ algorithm computing cc(G) (exactly).

Clearly, CT/n < cc < CT. How much larger than cc can CT be?



- many applications in computer science
 - -universal traversal sequences [Lovász et.al.]
 - -testing graph connectivity [Lovász et.al., Karlin & Raghavan]
 - -protocol testing [Mihail & Papadimitriou]

- many applications in computer science
 - -universal traversal sequences [Lovász et.al.]
 - -testing graph connectivity [Lovász et.al., Karlin & Raghavan]
 - -protocol testing [Mihail & Papadimitriou]
- physicists study the fractal structure of the uncovered set of a finite grid

- many applications in computer science
 - -universal traversal sequences [Lovász et.al.]
 - -testing graph connectivity [Lovász et.al., Karlin & Raghavan]
 - –protocol testing [Mihail & Papadimitriou]
- physicists study the fractal structure of the uncovered set of a finite grid
- cover time of Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds [Dembo, Peres, Rosen & Zeitouni]

The Cover Time of a graph is being studied in several disciplines:

- many applications in computer science
 - -universal traversal sequences [Lovász et.al.]
 - -testing graph connectivity [Lovász et.al., Karlin & Raghavan]
 - -protocol testing [Mihail & Papadimitriou]
- physicists study the fractal structure of the uncovered set of a finite grid
- cover time of Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds [Dembo, Peres, Rosen & Zeitouni]

Theorem (G & P. Winkler '11)

The cover time of a graph on L edges is at most $2L^2$. The cover time for Brownian motion on graph of total length L is at most $2L^2$.



Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\textstyle \sum_{y \in V(T)} \left(H_{ry} + d(r,y) \right) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x,y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\textstyle \sum_{y \in V(T)} \left(H_{ry} + d(r,y) \right) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x,y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

$$CC_r(G) = \sum_y H_{ry}$$

Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\textstyle \sum_{y \in V(T)} \left(H_{ry} + d(r,y) \right) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x,y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

$$CC_r(G) = \sum_{y} H_{ry} = \sum_{y} \sum_{x} \text{# visits to } x \text{before hitting } y$$



Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\sum_{y \in V(T)} (H_{ry} + d(r, y)) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x, y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

$$CC_r(G) = \sum_{y} H_{ry} = \sum_{y} \sum_{x} \text{# visits to } x = \sum_{x,y \in V(G)} \frac{p_r(x < y)}{p_{xy}}$$



Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\sum_{y \in V(T)} (H_{ry} + d(r, y)) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x, y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

$$CC_r(G) = \sum_{y} H_{ry} = \sum_{y} \sum_{x} \text{ # visits to } x = \sum_{x,y \in V(G)} \frac{p_r(x < y)}{p_{xy}} \dots$$



Theorem (G & S. Wagner '12+)

For every tree we have

$$\sum_{y \in V(T)} (H_{ry} + d(r, y)) = 2W(T) := \sum_{x,y \in V(T)} d(x, y).$$

in other words:

$$CC(r) + D(r) = 2W(T)$$

Corollary

The extremal rooted trees on n vertices for CC(r) are the path rooted at a midpoint (maximum) and the star rooted at a leaf (minimum).



Similarly to CC(r) we define the the reverse cover cost

$$RC(r) = \sum_{y \in V(G)} H_{yr}$$

Similarly to CC(r) we define the the reverse cover cost

$$RC(r) = \sum_{y \in V(G)} H_{yr}$$

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every tree T, the quantity

$$RC(r) + (2n-1)CC(r)$$

is independent of r.

Similarly to CC(r) we define the the reverse cover cost

$$RC(r) = \sum_{y \in V(G)} H_{yr}$$

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every tree T, the quantity

$$RC(r) + (2n-1)CC(r) = 4(n-1)W(T)$$

is independent of r.

Similarly to CC(r) we define the the reverse cover cost

$$RC(r) = \sum_{y \in V(G)} H_{yr}$$

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every tree T, the quantity

$$RC(r) + (2n-1)CC(r) = 4(n-1)W(T)$$

is independent of r. Thus a vertex r that maximizes CC(r) minimizes RC(r) and vice versa.

Similarly to CC(r) we define the the reverse cover cost

$$RC(r) = \sum_{y \in V(G)} H_{yr}$$

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every tree T, the quantity

$$RC(r) + (2n-1)CC(r) = 4(n-1)W(T)$$

is independent of r. Thus a vertex r that maximizes CC(r) minimizes RC(r) and vice versa.

Proof based on $H_{xy} + H_{yx} = T_{x \leftrightarrow y} = 2mr(x, y)$ (by the commute time formula of Chandra et. al.)



Vertex orderings - Trees

Theorem (classic)

the vertices of any graph can be put in a linear preorder so that for random walk on the graph vertices appearing earlier in the preorder are "easier to reach but more difficult to get out of" and the other way round.

Vertex orderings - Trees

Theorem (classic)

the vertices of any graph can be put in a linear preorder so that for random walk on the graph vertices appearing earlier in the preorder are "easier to reach but more difficult to get out of" and the other way round.

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every tree T, and every pair of vertices $x, y \in V(T)$, TFAE:

- $O(x) \leq D(y)$;

Vertex orderings - General graphs

The Kirchhoff index (or quasi-Wiener index) is defined as

$$K(G):=\sum_{\{x,y\}\subseteq V(G)}r(x,y)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in V(G)}\sum_{y\in V(G)}r(x,y).$$

Vertex orderings - General graphs

The Kirchhoff index (or quasi-Wiener index) is defined as

$$K(G) := \sum_{\{x,y\} \subseteq V(G)} r(x,y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in V(G)} \sum_{y \in V(G)} r(x,y).$$

Theorem (G & Wagner '12+)

For every graph G, and every vertex $x \in V(G)$, we have

$$CC(x) = mR(x) - \frac{n}{2}R_{\pi}(x) + K_{\pi}(G),$$

 $RC(x) = mR(x) + \frac{n}{2}R_{\pi}(x) - K_{\pi}(G),$
 $RC_{\pi}(x) = 2mR_{\pi}(x) - K_{\pi^{2}}(G),$ and
 $CC_{\pi}(x) = K_{\pi^{2}}(G).$

Eigenvalue formulas

The fact that $CC_{\pi}(x)$ is constant was already known; moreover, it can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix M of transition probabilities of G as $CC_{\pi}(x) = 2m\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{1}{1-\lambda_{k}}$

Eigenvalue formulas

The fact that $CC_{\pi}(x)$ is constant was already known; moreover, it can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix M of transition probabilities of G as $CC_{\pi}(x) = 2m\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{1}{1-\lambda_{k}}$

Combined with the last theorem, this yields

$$K_{\pi^2}(G) = 2m \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_k}.$$

Eigenvalue formulas

The fact that $CC_{\pi}(x)$ is constant was already known; moreover, it can be expressed in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix M of transition probabilities of G as $CC_{\pi}(x) = 2m\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{1}{1-\lambda_{k}}$

Combined with the last theorem, this yields

$$K_{\pi^2}(G) = 2m \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_k}.$$

Interestingly, a similar formula applies to the Kirchhoff index:

$$K(G) = n \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} \frac{1}{\lambda},$$

the sum being over all nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues of G



• Is every reversible graph regular? (A graph is *reversible* if R_{π} is constant)

• Is every reversible graph regular? (A graph is *reversible* if R_{π} is constant)

• Which numbers appear as R_{π} of some reversible graph?

• Is every reversible graph regular? (A graph is *reversible* if R_{π} is constant)

• Which numbers appear as R_{π} of some reversible graph?

• What are the extremal rooted n-vertex graphs for CC(r)?

• Is every reversible graph regular? (A graph is *reversible* if R_{π} is constant)

• Which numbers appear as R_{π} of some reversible graph?

• What are the extremal rooted n-vertex graphs for CC(r)?

• In a large graph, how can you change $R_{\pi}(x)$ a lot by attaching few new edges to x?

