



## The Parameters of Bipartite $Q$ -polynomial Distance-Regular Graphs

JOHN S. CAUGHMAN, IV

caughman@math.pdx.edu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751, USA

Received September 28, 1999; Revised November 26, 2001; Accepted December 6, 2001

**Abstract.** Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$  and valency  $k \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ . This sequence is known to satisfy the recurrence  $\theta_{i-1} - \beta\theta_i + \theta_{i+1} = 0$  ( $0 < i < D$ ), for some real scalar  $\beta$ . Let  $q$  denote a complex scalar such that  $q + q^{-1} = \beta$ . Bannai and Ito have conjectured that  $q$  is real if the diameter  $D$  is sufficiently large.

We settle this conjecture in the bipartite case by showing that  $q$  is real if the diameter  $D \geq 4$ . Moreover, if  $D = 3$ , then  $q$  is not real if and only if  $\theta_1$  is the second largest eigenvalue and the pair  $(\mu, k)$  is one of the following: (1, 3), (1, 4), (1, 5), (1, 6), (2, 4), or (2, 5). We observe that each of these pairs has a unique realization by a known bipartite distance-regular graph of diameter 3.

**Keywords:** distance-regular graph, bipartite, association scheme,  $P$ -polynomial,  $Q$ -polynomial

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$  and valency  $k \geq 3$  (definitions appear in Sections 2 and 3 below). Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ . By [3, p. 241], this eigenvalue sequence satisfies

$$\theta_{i-1} - \beta\theta_i + \theta_{i+1} = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq D - 1), \tag{1}$$

for some real scalar  $\beta$ . Let  $q$  denote a complex scalar such that  $q + q^{-1} = \beta$ . In [1, p. 381] Bannai and Ito conjectured that  $q$  is real if the diameter  $D$  is sufficiently large.

We settle this conjecture in the bipartite case by showing  $q$  is real if  $D \geq 4$ . Moreover, for the case  $D = 3$ , we describe the conditions under which  $q$  fails to be real. Precise statements of these theorems are given below. In future work, we intend to use these results to classify the bipartite  $Q$ -polynomial distance-regular graphs.

In stating and proving the present results, it will be convenient to work with the scalar  $\beta$  rather than with  $q$  itself. To interpret our results for  $q$ , we need only make the following observation.

**Lemma 1.1** *Let  $\beta$  be any real number and let  $q$  denote a complex scalar such that  $q + q^{-1} = \beta$ . Then the following hold.*

- (i) *Suppose  $\beta \leq -2$ . Then  $q$  is a negative real number.*
- (ii) *Suppose  $\beta \geq 2$ . Then  $q$  is a positive real number.*
- (iii) *Suppose  $-2 < \beta < 2$ . Then  $q$  is a complex (non real) number with norm  $|q| = 1$ .*

**Proof:** Observe  $q$  is a root of the polynomial  $x^2 - \beta x + 1$ . □

We now state our main results, beginning with the case  $D \geq 4$ .

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 4$  and valency  $k \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , and let  $\beta$  be as in (1). Then the following hold.*

- (i) *Suppose  $\theta_1 < -1$ . Then  $\beta \leq -2$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose  $\theta_1 > -1$ . Then  $\beta \geq 2$ .*

*We remark that  $\theta_1 \neq -1$  (cf. Lemma 3.2(i)).*

We point out that the conditions on  $\theta_1$  in Theorem 1.2(i) and (ii) are in fact sufficient to determine the full ordering of the eigenvalues. For more information on the possible  $Q$ -polynomial orderings for a bipartite distance-regular graph, we refer the reader to [4].

Before stating the result for  $D = 3$  we mention a few basic facts. Let  $\Gamma$  denote any bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D = 3$ , and let  $\lambda$  denote the positive square root of the intersection number  $b_2$ . Then  $k, \lambda, -\lambda$ , and  $-k$  are the distinct eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , and the sequence

$$k, \lambda, -\lambda, -k \tag{2}$$

is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering [3, p. 432]. If  $b_2 = 1$  then  $\Gamma$  has no further  $Q$ -polynomial orderings, but if  $b_2 > 1$  then  $\Gamma$  has a second  $Q$ -polynomial ordering:

$$k, -\lambda, \lambda, -k. \tag{3}$$

**Theorem 1.3** *Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D = 3$  and valency  $k \geq 3$ . Set  $\mu := c_2$ . Then the following hold.*

- (i) *For the ordering (2), we have  $\beta \geq 1$ . Furthermore,  $\beta < 2$  if and only if the pair  $(\mu, k)$  is one of the following:  $(1, 3)$ ,  $(1, 4)$ ,  $(1, 5)$ ,  $(1, 6)$ ,  $(2, 4)$ , or  $(2, 5)$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose  $b_2 > 1$ . For the ordering (3), we have  $\beta \leq -2$ .*

**Remark 1.4** Each of the pairs  $(\mu, k)$  listed in Theorem 1.3(i) above has a unique realization by a bipartite distance-regular graph of diameter 3. In particular, the pair  $(1, 3)$  is uniquely realized by the Heawood graph. For  $4 \leq k \leq 6$ , the pair  $(1, k)$  is uniquely realized by the incidence graph of the (unique) projective plane of order  $k - 1$ . The pair  $(2, 4)$  is uniquely realized by the distance 3 graph of the Heawood graph, and the pair  $(2, 5)$  is uniquely realized by the incidence graph of the (unique) 2-(11, 5, 2) design. For these facts and more about these graphs, we refer to the book of Brouwer et al. [3].

## 2. Distance-regular graphs and the $Q$ -polynomial property

In this article we consider only graphs which are finite, connected, undirected, and without loops or multiple edges. Let  $\Gamma = (X, R)$  denote a graph with vertex set  $X$  and edge set  $R$ . Let  $\partial$  denote the path length distance function for  $\Gamma$ , and recall the *diameter* of  $\Gamma$  is the scalar

$D := \max\{\partial(x, y) \mid x, y \in X\}$ .  $\Gamma$  is said to be *distance-regular*, with *intersection numbers*  $b_i, c_i (0 \leq i \leq D)$ , whenever for all integers  $i (0 \leq i \leq D)$  and for all  $x, y \in X$  with  $\partial(x, y) = i$ ,

$$b_i = |\{z \in X \mid \partial(x, z) = i + 1, \partial(y, z) = 1\}|,$$

$$c_i = |\{z \in X \mid \partial(x, z) = i - 1, \partial(y, z) = 1\}|.$$

Following convention, we abbreviate  $\mu := c_2$  and  $k := b_0$ . We refer to  $k$  as the *valency*.

Let  $\Gamma = (X, R)$  denote any distance-regular with diameter  $D \geq 3$ . By [3, Proposition 4.1.6], the intersection numbers must satisfy

$$c_i \leq b_j \text{ whenever } i + j \leq D. \tag{4}$$

We now recall the adjacency algebra of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathbb{R}$  denote the field of real numbers, and let  $\text{Mat}_X(\mathbb{R})$  denote the algebra of matrices over  $\mathbb{R}$  with rows and columns indexed by  $X$ . For  $0 \leq i \leq D$ , let  $A_i$  denote the matrix in  $\text{Mat}_X(\mathbb{R})$  with  $x, y$  entry

$$(A_i)_{xy} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \partial(x, y) = i, \\ 0 & \text{if } \partial(x, y) \neq i \end{cases} \quad (x, y \in X). \tag{5}$$

We abbreviate  $A = A_1$ ; this is the adjacency matrix for  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the subalgebra of  $\text{Mat}_X(\mathbb{R})$  generated by  $A$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  is known as the *adjacency algebra* of  $\Gamma$ . It is well known that  $A_0, \dots, A_D$  is a basis for  $\mathcal{A}$  [2, p. 160]. Also,  $\mathcal{A}$  is semisimple; in particular,  $\mathcal{A}$  has a basis  $E_0, \dots, E_D$  consisting of mutually orthogonal primitive idempotents [3, p. 132]. We refer to  $E_0, \dots, E_D$  as the *primitive idempotents* of  $\Gamma$ . Observe that for each  $i (0 \leq i \leq D)$ , there exists a real scalar  $\theta_i$  such that  $AE_i = \theta_i E_i$ . We refer to  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_D$  as the *eigenvalues* of  $\Gamma$ . Note that  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_D$  are distinct, since  $A$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We next recall the  $Q$ -polynomial property. Let  $\Gamma$  denote any distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the adjacency algebra for  $\Gamma$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  has a basis  $A_0, \dots, A_D$  of 0–1 matrices, we see  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under entry-wise matrix multiplication. Let  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_D$  denote an ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ . This ordering is said to be  *$Q$ -polynomial* whenever for each integer  $i (0 \leq i \leq D)$ , the primitive idempotent  $E_i$  is a polynomial of degree exactly  $i$  in  $E_1$ , in the  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{A}, \circ)$ , where  $\circ$  denotes entry-wise multiplication.

Fix any eigenvalue  $\theta$  of  $\Gamma$ , and let  $E$  denote the associated primitive idempotent. Write  $E = |X|^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^D \theta_i^* A_i$  for some scalars  $\theta_i^* (0 \leq i \leq D)$ . We refer to  $\theta_0^*, \theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_D^*$  as the *dual eigenvalue sequence* associated with  $\theta$ . Note  $\theta_0^*$  equals the rank of  $E$ , and is therefore nonzero [1, p. 62]. If  $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\theta_0 = k$  and the dual eigenvalues associated with  $\theta_1$  are distinct [1, pp. 193, 197].

**Lemma 2.1** ([3, p. 237]) *Let  $\Gamma$  denote any distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , and let  $\theta_0^*, \theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_D^*$  denote the dual eigenvalue sequence associated with  $\theta_1$ . Then there exists a unique  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

- (i)  $\theta_{i-1} - \beta\theta_i + \theta_{i+1}$  is independent of  $i (1 \leq i \leq D - 1)$ , and
- (ii)  $\theta_{i-1}^* - \beta\theta_i^* + \theta_{i+1}^*$  is independent of  $i (1 \leq i \leq D - 1)$ .

### 3. Bipartite distance-regular graphs

Recall that a graph  $\Gamma = (X, R)$  is *bipartite* whenever there exists a partition of the vertices  $X = X^+ \cup X^-$  such that  $X^+$  and  $X^-$  contain no edges. Let  $\Gamma$  denote a distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$ , and valency  $k \geq 3$ . Assume  $\Gamma$  is bipartite. Then it is easily shown that

$$c_i + b_i = k \quad (0 \leq i \leq D). \quad (6)$$

Since  $b_D = 0$ , it follows that  $c_D = k$ . By [8, p. 399], the valency  $k$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $\Gamma$ , and  $-k$  is the minimal eigenvalue. We refer to  $k$  and  $-k$  as the *trivial eigenvalues*.

Let  $\theta$  denote any nontrivial eigenvalue for  $\Gamma$  and set  $\mu := c_2$ . In [5, Theorem 18], Curtin gives the following bound:

$$\theta^2(\mu - 1) \leq (k - \mu)(k - 2). \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, by [5, Lemma 4], the dual eigenvalue sequence associated with  $\theta$  satisfies

$$c_i \times \theta_{i-1}^* + b_i \theta_{i+1}^* = \theta \theta_i^* \quad (0 \leq i \leq D), \quad (8)$$

where  $\theta_{-1}^*, \theta_{D+1}^*$  are indeterminates. When  $\Gamma$  is  $Q$ -polynomial, we have the following.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\beta$  be as in Lemma 2.1. Then the following hold.*

(i) [3, p. 241]

$$\theta_{i-1} - \beta \theta_i + \theta_{i+1} = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq D - 1). \quad (9)$$

(ii) [4, Theorem 9.6]

$$\theta_i = -\theta_{D-i} \quad (0 \leq i \leq D). \quad (10)$$

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $\Gamma$  denote a bipartite distance-regular graph with diameter  $D \geq 3$ . Suppose  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial ordering of the eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\beta$  be as in Lemma 2.1. Then the following hold.*

(i)  $\theta_1 \neq -1$ , and

$$\beta = \frac{\theta_1^2 + \mu \theta_1 + (k - \mu)(k - 2)}{(k - \mu)(\theta_1 + 1)}. \quad (11)$$

(ii)  $\theta_1^3(b_2 - b_3) + \theta_1^2(b_2 - \mu b_3) + \theta_1 b_2(2b_3 - \mu b_3 - b_2) + b_2^2(b_3 - 1) = 0$ . (12)

**Proof:** (i) If  $\theta_1 = -1$  then  $\theta_1^* = \theta_2^*$  by (8), contradicting the fact that the dual eigenvalues are distinct. Observe that by Lemma 2.1,

$$\theta_0^* - \beta\theta_1^* + \theta_2^* = \theta_1^* - \beta\theta_2^* + \theta_3^*. \tag{13}$$

Divide both sides of (13) by  $\theta_0^*$  and eliminate the dual eigenvalues using (8) and simplify to obtain (11).

(ii) First suppose  $D = 3$ . Then  $b_3 = 0$ , so the left side of (12) becomes  $b_2(\theta_1 + 1)(\theta_1^2 - b_2)$ , which is 0 since  $\theta_1^2 = b_2$  (cf., [3, p. 432]). Now assume  $D \geq 4$ . By Lemma 2.1,

$$\theta_0^* - \beta\theta_1^* + \theta_2^* = \theta_2^* - \beta\theta_3^* + \theta_4^*. \tag{14}$$

Divide both sides of (13) by  $\theta_0^*$  and eliminate the dual eigenvalues using (8). Eliminate  $\beta$  using (11). Then simplify, noting that  $(\theta_1^2 - k^2)$  is a factor, to obtain Eq. (12).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** *With the notation and assumptions of Theorem 1.2, the following hold.*

- (i) [6, Theorem 8.1.3] *Suppose  $D \geq 5$ . Then  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  are integers.*
- (ii) *Suppose  $D = 4$ . If  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_D$  are not all integers, then  $b_3 = 1$  and*

$$\beta^2 = \theta_1^2 = k = 2\mu. \tag{15}$$

**Proof:** (ii) Recall that  $\theta_0 = k$ . By Lemma 3.1(ii),  $\theta_4 = -k$  and  $\theta_2 = 0$ . The remaining eigenvalues can be computed directly from the intersection matrix (cf. [2, p. 165]) to obtain

$$\{\theta_1, \theta_3\} = \{\pm\sqrt{c_2(b_3 - 1) + k}\}. \tag{16}$$

First suppose  $b_3 \neq 1$ . Then (12) and (16) imply that  $\theta_1$  is rational, so (16) forces  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_3$  to be integers, as desired. Now suppose  $b_3 = 1$ . Then (16) implies  $\theta_1^2 = k$ . But  $\beta = k/\theta_1$  by (9) at  $i = 1$ . Substituting these values into (11), we find that  $k = 2\mu$ , as desired.  $\square$

#### 4. Proofs of the main results

**Proof of Theorem 1.2(i):** Let  $\theta := \theta_1$ . By assumption,  $\theta < -1$ . So by (11),

$$\beta + 2 = \frac{(\theta + k)(\theta + k - \mu)}{(k - \mu)(\theta + 1)}. \tag{17}$$

We distinguish two cases.

*Case  $\mu \geq 2$ .* Consider the expression on the right side of (17). Observe  $\theta + k$  is positive, and by assumption,  $\theta + 1$  is negative. Also,  $k - \mu = b_2$  is positive. Finally, since  $\mu \geq 2$ , line (7) implies that  $\theta + k - \mu$  is nonnegative. It now follows by (17) that  $\beta \leq -2$  as desired.

*Case  $\mu = 1$ .* Again consider the expression on the right side of (17). Since  $\mu = 1$  and  $k > 2$ ,  $\theta$  is an integer by Lemma 3.3, and the numerator of (17) is nonnegative. Also,  $k - \mu = b_2$  is positive, and by assumption,  $\theta + 1$  is negative. It now follows by (17) that  $\beta \leq -2$  as desired.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.2(ii):** Let  $\theta := \theta_1$ . By assumption,  $\theta > -1$ . So by (11),

$$\beta - 2 = \frac{(2\theta - 2k + 3\mu)^2 + 8(k - \mu)(\mu - 2) - \mu^2}{4(k - \mu)(\theta + 1)}. \quad (18)$$

We distinguish three cases.

*Case  $\mu \geq 3$ .* By (4),  $k - \mu = b_2 \geq \mu$ . Therefore, since  $\mu \geq 3$ ,

$$8(k - \mu)(\mu - 2) - \mu^2 \geq 0, \quad (19)$$

and the numerator in (18) is nonnegative. By our assumptions, the denominator is positive, so it follows that  $\beta \geq 2$  as desired.

*Case  $\mu = 2$ .* By way of contradiction, suppose  $\beta < 2$ . Then by (11),  $k - 4 < \theta < k - 2$ . Since  $\mu = 2$ , Lemma 3.3 implies  $\theta$  is an integer, so  $\theta = k - 3$ . So by (9) with  $i = 1$ , and (11) with  $\mu = 2$  and  $\theta = k - 3$ ,

$$\theta_2 = k - 6 - (k - 2)^{-1} + (k - 2)^{-2}. \quad (20)$$

It follows that  $(k - 2)^{-1} = 1 + (k - 2)(\theta_2 - k + 6)$ , which is an integer, so  $k = 3$ . Now (20) implies  $\theta_2 = -k = \theta_D$ , forcing  $D = 2$ , a contradiction.

*Case  $\mu = 1$ .* By (11), with  $\mu = 1$ ,

$$\beta - 2 = \frac{\theta^2 + (3 - 2k)\theta + (k - 4)(k - 1)}{(k - 1)(\theta + 1)}. \quad (21)$$

The denominator in (21) is positive, so  $\beta > 2$  whenever the numerator is positive. Now we consider (12). Setting  $b_2 = k - \mu$ ,  $b_3 = k - c_3$ , and  $\mu = 1$ , line (12) becomes

$$\theta^3(c_3 - 1) + \theta^2(c_3 - 1) - \theta(k - 1)(c_3 - 1) + (k - 1)^2(k - c_3 - 1) = 0. \quad (22)$$

Line (22) implies  $c_3 \neq 1$ , since  $k \geq 3$ . Also  $k > c_3$  since  $D \geq 4$ , so (22) implies

$$(k - 1)^2 + (k - 1)\theta - \theta^2 - \theta^3 = \frac{(k - 2)(k - 1)^2}{c_3 - 1} \geq (k - 1)^2. \quad (23)$$

Since the  $\theta_i$  are distinct, Lemma 3.1(ii) implies  $\theta_1 \neq 0$ . So by Lemma 3.3 and our assumptions,  $\theta$  is a positive integer. Now (23) implies  $\theta < \sqrt{k}$ . When  $k \geq 11$ ,

$$\frac{(k - 4)(k - 1)}{2k - 3} > \sqrt{k} > \theta. \quad (24)$$

Line (24) implies the numerator in (21) is positive, so  $\beta > 2$  as desired. It remains to consider the case  $k \leq 10$ . Recall  $\theta$  is a positive integer. The only pairs of integers  $\theta, k$  with  $1 \leq \theta < k \leq 10$  for which  $c_3 - 1$  as given in (22) is a positive integer less than  $k - 1$  are the pairs  $(\theta, k) = (2, 7)$  and  $(\theta, k) = (1, 3)$ . If  $(\theta, k) = (2, 7)$ , then  $\beta = 2$  by (11). And if

$(\theta, k) = (1, 3)$ , then (21) implies  $\beta = 1$ . But (9) implies  $\theta_3 = -k = \theta_D$ , forcing  $D = 3$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3(i):** By (9), (10) at  $i = 1$ , we find  $\beta = k\lambda^{-1} - 1$ . Since  $k \geq 3$  and  $\lambda = \sqrt{k - \mu}$ , it follows that  $\beta \geq 1$ . Moreover, when  $k \geq 8$ ,  $\beta$  is apparently greater than 2. It is readily verified that the only pairs of integers  $(\mu, k)$  which satisfy  $1 \leq \mu < k \leq 7$  and for which  $\beta < 2$  are  $(1, 3)$ ,  $(1, 4)$ ,  $(1, 5)$ ,  $(1, 6)$ ,  $(1, 7)$ ,  $(2, 4)$ , and  $(2, 5)$ . As noted in [3, p. 432], the existence of a graph with array  $(1, 7)$  is equivalent to the existence of a 2-(43, 7, 1) design, which is impossible by the Bruck-Ryser-Chowla Theorem [7, p. 391]. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3(ii):** By (9), (10) at  $i = 1$ , we find  $\beta = -k\lambda^{-1} - 1$ , which is clearly less than  $-2$ .  $\square$

## References

1. E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes*, Benjamin/Cummings, London, 1984.
2. N. Biggs, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1974.
3. A.E. Brouwer, A.M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
4. J.S. Caughman, IV, "Spectra of bipartite  $P$ - and  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes," *Graphs Combin.* **14** (1998), 321–343.
5. B. Curtin, "2-homogeneous bipartite distance-regular graphs," *Discrete Math.* **187** (1998), 39–70.
6. G. Dickie, "Q-polynomial structures for association schemes and distance-regular graphs," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1995.
7. F.S. Roberts, *Applied Combinatorics*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1984.
8. J.H. van Lint and R.M. Wilson, *A Course in Combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.