

# Bounds for the largest eigenvalue and sum of Laplacian eigenvalues of signed graphs

Linfeng Xie<sup>a,b</sup>, Xiaogang Liu<sup>a,b,c,\*,†</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics,  
Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710072, P.R. China

<sup>b</sup>Xi'an-Budapest Joint Research Center for Combinatorics,  
Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710129, P.R. China

<sup>c</sup>Research & Development Institute of Northwestern Polytechnical University in Shenzhen,  
Shenzhen, Guangdong 518063, P.R. China

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider the bounds for the largest eigenvalue and the sum of the  $k$  largest Laplacian eigenvalues of signed graphs. Firstly, we give an upper bound on the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of a signed graph and characterize the extremal graphs that attain this bound. Secondly, we prove that a non-bipartite signed graph  $\Gamma$  of order  $n$  and size  $m$  contains a balanced triangle if  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq \sqrt{m-1}$ ,  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq |\lambda_n(\Gamma)|$  and  $\Gamma \not\sim (C_5 \cup (n-5)K_1, +)$ , where  $\lambda_1(\Gamma)$  is the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of  $\Gamma$ . Thirdly, we confirm a conjecture proposed in [Linear Multilinear Algebra 51 (1) (2003) 21–30] that: if  $\Gamma$  is a connected signed graph, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(\Gamma) > \sum_{i=1}^k d_i(\Gamma) \quad (1 \leq k \leq n-1),$$

where  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \mu_n(\Gamma)$  are Laplacian eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , and  $d_1(\Gamma) \geq d_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq d_n(\Gamma)$  are vertex degrees of  $\Gamma$ . Finally, we give a lower bound for the sum of the  $k$  largest Laplacian eigenvalues of a connected signed graph.

*Keywords:* Laplacian eigenvalues; Eigenvalues; Signed graph; Vertex degree.

*Mathematics Subject Classification (2020):* 05C50, 05C22, 05C07

## 1 Introduction

A *signed graph*  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  consists of an unsigned graph  $G = (V(G), E(G))$  and a sign function  $\sigma : E \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$ , where  $G$  is called the *underlying graph* of  $\Gamma$ . In 1946, Heider first introduced the concept of signed graphs in his study of balance theory in social

---

\*Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12371358) and the Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (No. 2023A1515010986).

†Corresponding author. Email addresses: xielinfeng@mail.nwpu.edu.cn, xiaogliu@nwpu.edu.cn

psychology [11]. Heider sought to explain how friendly/hostile relationships in social networks influence group stability. In 1953, Harary formalized this theory and established the mathematical foundation of signed graphs [10]. For more information of signed graphs, please refer to [4, 32–34].

Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a signed graph with the vertex set  $V(\Gamma) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ . An edge  $uv$  labeled with “+1” (respectively, “−1”) is called a *positive edge* (respectively, *negative edge*), denoted by  $\sigma(uv) = +1$  (respectively,  $\sigma(uv) = -1$ ). All positive edges (respectively, negative edges) in  $\Gamma$  are denoted by  $E^+(\Gamma)$  (respectively,  $E^-(\Gamma)$ ). The *adjacency matrix* of  $\Gamma$  is denoted by  $A(\Gamma) = (a_{ij}^\sigma)$ , where  $a_{ij}^\sigma = \sigma(v_i v_j) a_{ij}$  and  $a_{ij} = 1$  if  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  are adjacent, and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. The *degree matrix* of  $\Gamma$  is the diagonal matrix  $D(\Gamma) = \text{diag}(d(v_1), d(v_2), \dots, d(v_n))$ , where  $d(v_i)$  denotes the number of edges incident to  $v_i$ . The *Laplacian matrix* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $L(\Gamma)$  or  $L(G, \sigma)$ , is defined as  $D(\Gamma) - A(\Gamma)$ . Let  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq \lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\Gamma)$  and  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \mu_n(\Gamma)$  denote the eigenvalues of  $A(\Gamma)$  and  $L(\Gamma)$ , which are called the *adjacency spectrum* and *Laplacian spectrum* of  $\Gamma$ , respectively. Until now, there are lots of results on the spectra of signed graphs [1–3, 13–15, 21, 24, 29].

Let  $\theta : V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \{+1, -1\}$  be a *sign function*. *Switching  $\Gamma$  by a sign function  $\theta$*  means forming a new signed graph  $\Gamma^\theta = (G, \sigma^\theta)$  whose underlying graph is the same as  $G$ , and the sign function on an edge  $e = v_i v_j$  is defined by  $\sigma^\theta(e) = \theta(v_i) \sigma(e) \theta(v_j)$ . Let  $S \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ . *Switching  $\Gamma$  at a vertex subset  $S$*  means changing the sign of every edge with exactly one end in  $S$ . In fact, switching  $\Gamma$  by a sign function  $\theta$  is equivalent to switching  $\Gamma$  at a vertex subset  $S = \{v \in V(\Gamma) \mid \theta(v) = -1\}$ . Let  $\Gamma_1 = (G, \sigma_1)$  and  $\Gamma_2 = (G, \sigma_2)$  be two signed graphs with the same underlying graph  $G$ . If there exists a sign function  $\theta$  such that  $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_1^\theta$ , then  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  are *switching equivalent*, denoted as  $\Gamma_1 \sim \Gamma_2$ . If not, then  $\Gamma_1 \not\sim \Gamma_2$ . Here,  $\theta$  is also called a *switching function*. A cycle is called *positive* or *balanced* if the number of its negative edges is even; otherwise, *negative* or *unbalanced*. A signed graph is called *balanced* if each of its cycles is positive; otherwise, *unbalanced*. Two  $n \times n$  matrices  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are called *signature similar*, if there exists a diagonal matrix  $S = \text{diag}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$  with diagonal entries  $s_i = \pm 1$  such that  $M_2 = S M_1 S^{-1}$ . Clearly, two signature similar matrices have the same eigenvalues.

Let  $G = (V(G), E(G))$  be a simple graph. Let  $\omega(G)$  denote the *clique number* of  $G$ , which is the order of the largest clique of  $G$  and  $\lambda_1(G)$  the largest adjacency eigenvalue of  $G$ . In [31], Wilf proved that

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq \frac{\omega(G) - 1}{\omega(G)} n,$$

where  $n$  is the order of  $G$ . In [22], Nikiforov proved that

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq \sqrt{2m \frac{\omega(G) - 1}{\omega(G)}},$$

where  $m$  is the size of  $G$ . Let  $c(e)$  denote the order of the largest clique containing an

edge  $e$  in  $G$ . Recently, Liu and Ning [20] proved that

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{e \in E(G)} \frac{c(e) - 1}{c(e)}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where the equality of (1.1) holds if and only if  $G$  is a complete bipartite graph for  $\omega = 2$ , or a complete regular  $\omega$ -partite graph for  $\omega \geq 3$  (possibly with some isolated vertices).

There are analogous results on signed graphs. Let  $\omega_b(\Gamma)$  denote the *balanced clique number* of a signed graph  $\Gamma$ , which is the order of the largest balanced clique of  $\Gamma$ . In [25], Sun, Liu and Lan proved that

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma) \leq \sqrt{2m \frac{\omega_b(\Gamma) - 1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)}},$$

where  $m$  is the size of a signed graph  $\Gamma$ . Subsequently, in [16], Kannan and Pragada proved that

$$\lambda_1^2(\Gamma) \leq 2(m - \epsilon(\Gamma)) \frac{\omega_b(\Gamma) - 1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\epsilon(\Gamma)$  denotes the *frustration index* of a signed graph  $\Gamma$ , which is the minimum number of edges to remove for balance.

In this paper, we firstly give an upper bound on  $\lambda_1(\Gamma)$ , as shown in Theorem 1.1, which is better than (1.2) (See Remark 1).

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a signed graph of order  $n$  with  $\omega_b(\Gamma) = \omega_b \geq 2$ . Let  $c_b(e)$  denote the order of the largest balanced clique containing an edge  $e$  in  $\Gamma$ . Then*

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma) \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)}}, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\Gamma' \sim \Gamma$  and  $\lambda_1(\Gamma')$  has a non-negative eigenvector. Equality holds if and only if  $\Gamma$  is a balanced complete bipartite graph for  $\omega_b = 2$ , or a balanced complete regular  $\omega_b$ -partite graph for  $\omega_b \geq 3$  (possibly with some isolated vertices).

Let  $G$  be a simple graph of size  $m$  and  $t(G)$  the number of triangles in  $G$ . In [22, Theorem 2.1], Nikiforov proved that if  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \sqrt{m}$ , then  $t(G) \geq 1$  unless  $G$  is a complete bipartite graph. In [19, Theorem 1.3], Lin, Ning and Wu confirmed that if  $G$  is a non-bipartite graph of size  $m$  and  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \sqrt{m-1}$ , then  $t(G) \geq 1$  unless  $G$  is  $C_5$  (possibly with isolated vertices). Let  $SK_{s,t}$  denote the graph obtained by subdividing an edge of the complete bipartite graph  $K_{s,t}$ . In [19, Theorem 1.4], Lin, Ning and Wu proved that if  $G$  is a non-bipartite graph of order  $n$  and  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(SK_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil})$ , then  $t(G) \geq 1$  unless  $G$  is  $SK_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil}$ . In [36, Theorem 1.4], Zhai and Shu proved that if  $G$  is a non-bipartite graph of size  $m$  and  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(SK_{2, \frac{m-1}{2}})$ , then  $t(G) \geq 1$  unless  $G$  is  $SK_{2, \frac{m-1}{2}}$ . For more results on this research, see [18, 23, 30].

Let  $(G, +)$  denote a signed graph with all positive edges. The signed graph  $\Gamma^{1,n-3}$  is obtained from a signed clique  $(K_{n-2}, +)$  with  $V(K_{n-2}) = \{u_1, v_1, \dots, v_{n-3}\}$  and two isolated vertices  $u$  and  $v$  by adding a negative edge  $uv$  and positive edges  $\{uu_1, vv_1, \dots, vv_{n-3}\}$ . In [27], Wang, Hou and Li proved that if  $\Gamma$  is a connected unbalanced signed graph of order  $n$  and  $\Gamma$  is  $C_3^-$ -free, then

$$\rho(\Gamma) \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{n^2 - 8} + n - 4,$$

with equality holding if and only if  $\Gamma \sim \Gamma^{1,n-3}$ , where  $C_3^-$  denotes the unbalanced triangle and  $\rho(\Gamma) = \max\{\lambda_1(\Gamma), -\lambda_n(\Gamma)\}$ .

In this paper, we secondly establish the existence of balanced triangle based on a lower bound on the largest eigenvalue of a signed graph, as shown in Theorem 1.2.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a non-bipartite signed graph of order  $n$  and size  $m$ . If  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq \sqrt{m-1}$  and  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq |\lambda_n(\Gamma)|$ , then  $\Gamma$  contains a balanced triangle unless  $\Gamma \sim (C_5 \cup (n-5)K_1, +)$ .*

Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n$  with Laplacian eigenvalues  $\mu_1(G) \geq \mu_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \mu_n(G)$  and vertex degrees  $d_1(G) \geq d_2(G) \geq \dots \geq d_n(G)$ . In 1994, Grone and Merris proposed the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.** (See [9]) *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$ . Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(G) \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k d_i(G) \quad (1 \leq k \leq n).$$

Subsequently, in 1995, Grone proved the following stronger result, which confirmed Conjecture 1.

**Theorem 1.3.** (See [8]) *Let  $G$  be a simple connected graph of order  $n$ . For each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , let  $t_k$  be the number of components of the graph induced by  $G$  on  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(G) \geq t_k + \sum_{i=1}^k d_i(G).$$

However, the above conclusion does not hold for signed graphs. In 2003, Hou, Li and Pan proposed the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 2.** (See [14]) *Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a connected signed graph of order  $n$ . Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(\Gamma) > \sum_{i=1}^k d_i(\Gamma) \quad (1 \leq k \leq n-1),$$

where  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \mu_n(\Gamma)$  are Laplacian eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$ , and  $d_1(\Gamma) \geq d_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq d_n(\Gamma)$  are vertex degrees of  $\Gamma$ .

In [14], Hou, Li and Pan proved that  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq 1 + d_1(\Gamma)$ , and so Conjecture 2 is true for  $k = 1$ . In 2015, Liu and Shen [21] proved that Conjecture 2 is also true for  $k = 2, n - 1$ .

In this paper, we thirdly confirm Conjecture 2.

Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a signed graph. For  $U \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ , let  $N_U(v)$  denote the set of neighbors of  $v$  in  $U$ , and  $d_U(v) = |N_U(v)|$ . In particular, if  $U = V(\Gamma)$ , we write  $N_\Gamma(v)$  and  $d_\Gamma(v)$  for simplicity. Let  $\Gamma[U]$  denote the signed subgraph of  $\Gamma$  induced by  $U$ , with edge signs inherited from  $\Gamma$ . Sometimes, we say that  $U$  induces  $\Gamma[U]$ .

Finally, we give another lower bound on the sum of the  $k$  largest Laplacian eigenvalues of a signed graph, as shown in Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a connected signed graph of order  $n > 2$  and size  $m$ . Suppose that  $R = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  is a subset of the vertex set of  $\Gamma$ . If  $E(\Gamma[R])$  consists of  $r$  pairwise disjoint edges, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(\Gamma) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k d_\Gamma(u_i) + k - r.$$

We will prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 2, Theorem 1.2 in Section 3, Conjecture 2 in Section 4 and Theorem 1.4 in Section 5, respectively.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

**Lemma 2.1.** (See [15]) *Let  $\Gamma_1 = (G, \sigma_1)$  and  $\Gamma_2 = (G, \sigma_2)$  be two signed graphs on the same underlying graph. The followings are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  are switching equivalent.
- (2)  $A(\Gamma_1)$  and  $A(\Gamma_2)$  are signature similar.
- (3)  $L(\Gamma_1)$  and  $L(\Gamma_2)$  are signature similar.

**Lemma 2.2.** (See [25]) *Let  $\Gamma$  be a signed graph with  $n$  vertices. Then there exists a signed graph  $\Gamma'$  switching equivalent to  $\Gamma$  such that  $\lambda_1(\Gamma')$  has a non-negative eigenvector.*

Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a signed graph with underlying graph  $G = (V(G), E(G))$ . Let  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq E(G)$ . Denote by  $\Gamma - S$  the signed graph obtained from  $\Gamma$  by deleting all signed edges of  $\Gamma$  whose underlying edges are in  $S$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** (See [17]) *Let  $\Gamma$  be an unbalanced signed graph with underlying graph  $G = (V(G), E(G))$ . Then there exists an edge  $e = v_k v_r \in E(G)$  such that  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \leq \lambda_1(\Gamma - e)$ . Furthermore, if  $\Gamma - e$  is balanced, then  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) < \lambda_1(\Gamma - e)$ .*

By refining the proof of Lemma 2.3, we can obtain the following result.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an unbalanced signed graph with underlying graph  $G = (V(G), E(G))$ . Then there exists a set  $S \subseteq E(G)$  such that  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \leq \lambda_1(\Gamma - S)$ . Furthermore, if  $\Gamma - S$  is balanced, then  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) < \lambda_1(\Gamma - S)$ .*

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Define

$$S_n^\pm = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum |x_i| = 1 \right\}.$$

By [28, Theorem 5], we have

$$\max \{ \mathbf{x}^T A(\Gamma) \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in S_n^\pm \} = 1 - \frac{1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)}. \quad (2.1)$$

Set  $V(\Gamma) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $W_\Gamma$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $(i, j)$ -entry is  $\sigma(ij) \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e)-1}$  if  $e = ij \in E(\Gamma)$ , and 0 otherwise. For  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T \in S_n^\pm$ , define

$$F_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{x}^T W_\Gamma \mathbf{x} = 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E(\Gamma)} \sigma(ij) \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e)-1} x_i x_j. \quad (2.2)$$

Let  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  denote the *support* of a vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , which is the set consisting of all indices corresponding to nonzero entries in  $\mathbf{x}$ .

**Claim 1.** Let  $\mathbf{x} \in S_n^\pm$  be a vector such that  $F_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \max \{ F_\Gamma(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in S_n^\pm \}$  with minimal supporting set. Then  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  induces a balanced clique in  $\Gamma$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T \in S_n^\pm$  such that  $\mathbf{x}$  has a minimal supporting set and  $F_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \max \{ F_\Gamma(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in S_n^\pm \}$ . Define  $S = \{i : x_i < 0\}$  and let  $\Gamma^S$  be the signed graph obtained from  $\Gamma$  by a switching at  $S$ . Let  $\mathbf{y} = (|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_n|)^T \in S_n^\pm$ . By (2.2), we have  $F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}) = F_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \max \{ F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in S_n^\pm \}$ . We assert that  $\mathbf{y}$  is also a vector such that  $F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}) = \max \{ F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in S_n^\pm \}$  with minimal supporting set. Otherwise, suppose that  $\mathbf{z}_1 = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T \in S_n^\pm$  such that  $F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{z}_1) = F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y})$  and  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}_1)| < |\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})|$ . Let  $\mathbf{z}_2 = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)^T$  where  $b_i = -a_i$  for  $i \in S$  and  $b_i = a_i$  for  $i \notin S$ . Then

$$F_\Gamma(\mathbf{z}_2) = F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{z}_1) = F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}) = F_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}),$$

but  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}_2)| = |\text{supp}(\mathbf{z}_1)| < |\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})| = |\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})|$ , a contradiction.

We assert that  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$  induces an all-positive complete subgraph in  $\Gamma^S$ , that is,  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{x})$  induces a balanced clique in  $\Gamma$ . Otherwise, there are two vertices in  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})$ , say  $i$  and  $j$ , such that  $ij \notin E(\Gamma^S)$  or  $\sigma^S(ij) = -1$ , where  $\sigma^S$  is a sign function of  $\Gamma^S$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_i$  be the  $i$ -th column of the identity matrix of order  $n$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathbf{y}^T W_{\Gamma^S} \mathbf{e}_i \geq \mathbf{y}^T W_{\Gamma^S} \mathbf{e}_j$ . Set  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y} + |x_j|(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{y}' \in S_n^\pm$ .

If  $ij \notin E(\Gamma)$ , then

$$F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}') - F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}) = 2|x_j| \mathbf{y}^T W_{\Gamma^S} (\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j) \geq 0.$$

If  $\sigma^S(ij) = -1$ , then

$$F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}') - F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}) = 2|x_j| \mathbf{y}^T W_{\Gamma^S} (\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j) + 2x_j^2 \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e)-1} > 0.$$

Note that  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{y}')| < |\text{supp}(\mathbf{y})|$  and  $F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y}') \geq F_{\Gamma^S}(\mathbf{y})$  in either case, contradictions.

This completes the proof of Claim 1.

**Claim 2.** For each  $\mathbf{z} \in S_n^\pm$ ,  $F_\Gamma(\mathbf{z}) \leq 1$ .

*Proof of Claim 2.* Let  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^T \in S_n^\pm$  be a vector satisfying  $F_\Gamma(\mathbf{w}) = \max\{F_\Gamma(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in S_n^\pm\}$  with minimal supporting set. By Claim 1,  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{w})$  forms a balanced clique  $(K, \sigma)$  in  $\Gamma$ . By (2.2),

$$F_\Gamma(\mathbf{w}) = 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E((K, \sigma))} \sigma(ij) \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e) - 1} w_i w_j.$$

Let  $r$  be the order of  $K$ , then  $c_b(e) \geq r$ . Observe that  $\frac{x}{x-1}$  is a decreasing function in  $x$ . Then we have  $\frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e)-1} \leq \frac{r}{r-1}$ . Since  $(K, \sigma)$  is balanced, there exists a sign function  $\theta$  such that  $\Gamma^\theta \sim \Gamma$  and  $(K, \sigma^\theta) = (K, +)$ . Assume that  $\theta(i) = -1$  for  $i \in A^-$  and  $\theta(i) = +1$  for  $i \in A^+$  with  $A^+ \cup A^- = V(\Gamma)$ . Let

$$\mathbf{w}' = \begin{cases} w'_i = -w_i, & i \in A^-, \\ w'_i = w_i, & i \in A^+. \end{cases}$$

By (2.1) and (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Gamma(\mathbf{w}) &= F_{\Gamma^\theta}(\mathbf{w}') = 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E((K, +))} \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e) - 1} w'_i w'_j \\ &\leq \frac{2r}{r-1} \sum_{e=ij \in E((K, +))} |w'_i| |w'_j| \\ &\leq \frac{2r}{r-1} \left( \frac{r-1}{2r} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 2.

Now, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, assume that  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)^T$  is a unit non-negative eigenvector of  $\lambda_1(\Gamma')$ . Let  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^T$  with  $y_i = z_i^2$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\Gamma) &= 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E(\Gamma')} \sigma(ij) z_i z_j \\ &= 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E^+(\Gamma')} \sqrt{y_i y_j} - 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E^-(\Gamma')} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E^+(\Gamma')} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \\ &= 2 \sum_{e=ij \in E^+(\Gamma')} \sqrt{\frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)}} \sqrt{\frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e) - 1}} y_i y_j. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\lambda_1^2(\Gamma) \leq 4 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)} \sum_{e=ij \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e)}{c_b(e) - 1} y_i y_j.$$

By Claim 2, we obtain

$$\lambda_1^2(\Gamma) \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)}.$$

Finally, we characterize the graphs attaining the upper bounds in (1.3). By the equality in (1.1), we only need to prove that the equality in (1.3) does not hold for any unbalanced signed graph. To the contrary, we assume that there exists an unbalanced signed graph  $\Gamma$  with  $\lambda_1(\Gamma)$  and  $\omega_b(\Gamma) = \omega_b$  such that

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma) = \sqrt{2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)}}.$$

Then  $E^-(\Gamma') \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $S$  be the set of underlying edges corresponding to  $E^-(\Gamma')$ . So  $\Gamma' - S$  is balanced and then  $\lambda_1(\Gamma' - S)$  has a non-negative eigenvector. By (1.3),  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) = \lambda_1(\Gamma')$ , and  $\lambda_1(\Gamma - S) = \lambda_1(\Gamma' - S)$ , we have

$$\lambda_1^2(\Gamma) \leq \lambda_1^2(\Gamma - S) \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma' - S)} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)} \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{c_b(e) - 1}{c_b(e)}.$$

This implies that

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma) = \lambda_1(\Gamma - S).$$

Note that  $\Gamma - S$  is balanced, since  $\Gamma' - S$  is balanced. By Lemma 2.4, we have  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) < \lambda_1(\Gamma - S)$ , a contradiction.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** It is known [16, Lemma 3.1] that if  $\Gamma$  be a signed graph with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  edges and frustration index  $\epsilon(\Gamma)$ , and  $\Gamma \sim \Gamma'$ , then  $|E^+(\Gamma')| \leq m - \epsilon(\Gamma)$ . By Theorem 1.1 and  $c_b(e) \leq \omega_b(\Gamma)$ , we get

$$\lambda_1^2(\Gamma) \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E^+(\Gamma')} \frac{\omega_b(\Gamma) - 1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)} = 2|E^+(\Gamma')| \frac{\omega_b(\Gamma) - 1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)} \leq 2(m - \epsilon(\Gamma)) \frac{\omega_b(\Gamma) - 1}{\omega_b(\Gamma)}.$$

Hence the bound of Theorem 1.1 is better than that of [16, Theorem 3.3].

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

**Lemma 3.1.** (See [16, Theorem 4.2]) *Let  $\Gamma$  be a signed graph with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges with  $n \geq 3$ , and  $\Gamma$  has no balanced triangles. If  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq \lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\Gamma)$  are eigenvalues of  $A(\Gamma)$  and  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq |\lambda_n(\Gamma)|$ , then*

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 \leq m.$$



**Lemma 3.2.** (See [19, Theorem 2.1]) Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^T$ , where  $x_i, y_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) are non-negative real numbers. If  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are in non-increasing order, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k y_i, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

then  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p \geq \|\mathbf{y}\|_p$  for every real number  $p > 1$ , where equality holds if and only if  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ .

A walk  $v_1 v_2 \dots v_k$  ( $k \geq 2$ ) in a graph  $G$  is called an *internal path* if these  $k$  vertices are distinct (except possibly  $v_1 = v_k$ ),  $d(v_1) \geq 3, d(v_k) \geq 3$  and  $d(v_2) = \dots = d(v_{k-1}) = 2$  (unless  $k = 2$ ). Let  $G_{uv}$  denote the graph obtained by subdividing the edge  $uv$  of  $G$ . Clearly, subdividing an edge introduces a new vertex on that edge. Let  $Y_n$  be the graph obtained from an induced path  $v_1 v_2 \dots v_{k-4}$  by attaching two pendant vertices to each of  $v_1$  and  $v_{k-4}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** (See [12]) Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$  with  $uv \in E(G)$ . If  $uv$  belongs to an internal path of  $G$  and  $G \not\cong Y_n$ , then  $\lambda_1(G_{uv}) < \lambda_1(G)$ .

Let  $C_n^{(r)}$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq n-1$ , denote a signed cycle of order  $n$  and size  $n$  with  $r$  negative edges, where the underlying graph is the cycle  $C_n$ . For an integer  $r$ , define

$$[r] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r \text{ is even,} \\ 1, & \text{if } r \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 3.4.** (See [7]) Eigenvalues of  $C_n^{(r)}$  are given by

$$\lambda_j(C_n^{(r)}) = 2 \cos \left( \frac{(2j - [r])\pi}{n} \right), \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

**Lemma 3.5.** (See [5]) Let  $\Gamma$  be a signed graph and  $U$  a subset of  $V(\Gamma)$  with  $|U| = k$ . Then

$$\lambda_i(\Gamma) \geq \lambda_i(\Gamma[V(\Gamma) \setminus U]) \geq \lambda_{i+k}(\Gamma), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n - k.$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Recall [19, Theorem 1.3] that the result is true if  $\Gamma$  is balanced.

In the following, we prove that the result is also true if  $\Gamma$  is unbalanced. By contradiction, we assume that  $\Gamma$  contains no balanced triangle. Consider the following two cases.

*Case 1.* Assume that  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq 1$ . Then  $\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 \geq m$ . Note that  $\Gamma$  contains no balanced triangle. By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 = m.$$

Let  $n_\Gamma^+$ ,  $n_\Gamma^-$  and  $n_\Gamma^0$  denote the numbers (with multiplicities) of positive, negative and zero eigenvalues of  $A(\Gamma)$ , respectively. Let

$$s^+ = \lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 + \dots + \lambda_{n_\Gamma^+}(\Gamma)^2$$

and

$$s^- = \lambda_{n-n_\Gamma^-+1}(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_{n-n_\Gamma^-+2}(\Gamma)^2 + \cdots + \lambda_n(\Gamma)^2.$$

Then

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 = m = \frac{s^+ + s^-}{2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2 \geq 2(\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2) - s^+ = s^- \geq 0.$$

Set  $\mathbf{x} = (\lambda_1(\Gamma)^2, \lambda_2(\Gamma)^2, 0, \dots, 0)^T$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (\lambda_n(\Gamma)^2, \lambda_{n-1}(\Gamma)^2, \dots, \lambda_{n-n_\Gamma^-+1}(\Gamma)^2)^T$ . By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{3}{2}} \geq \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

It implies that

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma)^3 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^3 \geq -(\lambda_n(\Gamma)^3 + \lambda_{n-1}(\Gamma)^3 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-n_\Gamma^-+1}(\Gamma)^3).$$

Let  $t_\Gamma^+$  (respectively,  $t_\Gamma^-$ ) denote the number of balanced (respectively, unbalanced) triangles. Recall that  $\Gamma$  contains no balanced triangle. Then  $t_\Gamma^+ = 0$ . So,

$$6(t_\Gamma^+ - t_\Gamma^-) \geq \lambda_1(\Gamma)^3 + \lambda_2(\Gamma)^3 + \lambda_n(\Gamma)^3 + \lambda_{n-1}(\Gamma)^3 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-n_\Gamma^-+1}(\Gamma)^3 \geq 0.$$

This indicates that  $t_\Gamma^- = 0$ . Hence  $\Gamma$  contains no triangle, that is,  $\Gamma$  is triangle-free.

By Lemma 2.2, let  $\Gamma'$  be a signed graph such that  $\Gamma' \sim \Gamma$  and  $\lambda_1(\Gamma')$  has a non-negative eigenvector. Let  $S$  be the set of underlying edges corresponding to  $E^-(\Gamma')$ . Then  $\Gamma' - S$  is balanced. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\lambda_1(\Gamma' - S) > \lambda_1(\Gamma') = \lambda_1(\Gamma) \geq \sqrt{m-1} \geq \sqrt{m_1}, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $m_1$  is the size of  $\Gamma' - S$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is triangle-free,  $\Gamma' - S$  is triangle-free. By [22, Theorem 2.1],  $\Gamma' - S$  is a complete bipartite graph. This implies that  $\Gamma$  contains at least one triangle, a contradiction.

*Case 2.* Assume that  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) < 1$ . This implies that if  $\Gamma$  is disconnected then its every component is an isolated vertex except for one component.

We assume that  $\Gamma$  is connected. Note that the adjacency eigenvalues of an unbalanced triangle are 1, 1, 2. If  $\Gamma$  has an unbalanced triangle, by Lemma 3.5,  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq 1$ , a contradiction. So,  $\Gamma$  is triangle-free.

Let  $s$  be the length of a shortest odd cycle of  $\Gamma$ . Then  $s \geq 5$ . If  $s \geq 6$ , by Lemma 3.4,  $\lambda_2(C_s^{(r)}) \geq 1$ . By Lemma 3.5,  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq \lambda_2(C_s^{(r)}) \geq 1$ , a contradiction. Thus  $s = 5$ .

**Claim 1.**  $\Gamma$  has no unbalanced  $C_5$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* If  $\Gamma$  has an unbalanced  $(C_5, \sigma_{C_5})$ , by Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we have

$$\lambda_2(\Gamma) \geq \lambda_2((C_5, \sigma_{C_5})) = 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{5}\right) > 1,$$

a contradiction.

**Claim 2.**  $\Gamma$  does not contain  $(H_i, \sigma_i)$  as an induced subgraph, that is,  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_i, \sigma_i)$ -free, where  $H_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are shown in Figure 1.

*Proof of Claim 2.* If  $(H_i, \sigma_i)$  is balanced, then  $\lambda_2((H_i, +)) = 1$ . By Lemma 3.5, this contradicts that  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) < 1$ . By Claim 1, we know that  $(H_1, \sigma_1)$  is balanced. So,  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_1, \sigma_1)$ -free. If  $(H_2, \sigma_2)$  is unbalanced, by equivalent switching,  $(H_2, \sigma_2)$  has only two cases, as shown in Figure 2. By a simple computation,  $\lambda_2((H_2, \sigma_2)) \approx 1.629$  or  $1.732$ . By Lemma 3.5, this contradicts that  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) < 1$ . So,  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_2, \sigma_2)$ -free. Similarly, if  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$  is unbalanced, then  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$  has only two cases, as shown in Figure 3, which also contradicts that  $\lambda_2(\Gamma) < 1$ . So,  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$ -free.




Figure 1: Three graphs  $H_1$ ,  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ .



Figure 2: Unbalanced  $(H_2, \sigma_2)$ 's, where blue edges represent positive edges and red edges represent negative edges.




Figure 3: Unbalanced  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$ 's, where blue edges represent positive edges and red edges represent negative edges.

Define

$$N(U) = \cup_{v \in U} N_{\Gamma}(v).$$

Let

$$T_1 = \{u_i : 1 \leq i \leq 5\}$$

denote the vertex set of  $(C_5, \sigma)$  in  $\Gamma$  with  $\Gamma[T_1] = u_1u_2u_3u_4u_5u_1$ , and

$$T_2 = N(T_1) \setminus T_1.$$

**Claim 3.**  $d_{T_1}(v) = 2$  for each  $v \in T_2$ .

*Proof of Claim 3.* For  $v \in T_2$ , without loss of generality, assume that  $v \in N_\Gamma(u_1)$ . If  $d_{T_1}(v) \geq 3$ , then  $\Gamma$  contains a triangle, a contradiction. If  $d_{T_1}(v) = 1$ , then  $N_{T_1}(v) = u_1$ . So,  $\{v, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\}$  induces  $(H_1, \sigma_1)$ , a contradiction to Claim 2. Thus,  $d_{T_1}(v) = 2$ .

**Claim 4.**  $V(\Gamma) = T_1 \cup T_2$ .

*Proof of Claim 4.* By contradiction, let  $v' \in V(\Gamma) \setminus (T_1 \cup T_2) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $v'u_i \notin E(\Gamma)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $v \in T_2$  and  $u_1v, v'v \in E(\Gamma)$ . Recall that  $d_{T_1}(v) = 2$  and  $\Gamma$  is triangle-free. Without loss of generality, assume that  $N_{T_1}(v) = \{u_1, u_3\}$ . So,  $\{v', v, u_3, u_4, u_5, u_1\}$  induces  $(H_1, \sigma_1)$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $V(\Gamma) = T_1 \cup T_2$ .

**Claim 5.**  $n \geq 7$ .

*Proof of Claim 5.* If  $n = 5$ , by Claim 1,  $\Gamma \sim (C_5, +)$ , which contradicts that  $\Gamma$  is unbalanced. If  $n = 6$ , by Claims 3 and 4, we have  $m = 7$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $v \in T_2$  and  $N_{T_1}(v) = \{u_1, u_4\}$ . By Claim 1, there are only two cases for  $\Gamma$ , as shown in Figure 4. Note that  $\Gamma_1$  is balanced, a contradiction to that  $\Gamma$  is unbalanced. For  $\Gamma_2$ , by a simple computation, we have  $\lambda_1(\Gamma_2) \approx 2.391$ . Clearly,  $\lambda_1(\Gamma_2) < \sqrt{m-1} = \sqrt{6}$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $n \geq 7$ .




Figure 4:  $\Gamma$ 's with  $n = 6$  and  $m = 7$ , where blue edges represent positive edges and red edges represent negative edges.

Let  $v \in T_2$  and  $N_{T_1}(v) = \{u_1, u_4\}$ . Recall that  $\Gamma$  is triangle-free. For any  $w \in T_2 \setminus \{v\}$ , if  $N_{T_1}(w) = N_{T_1}(v)$ , then  $wv \notin E(\Gamma)$ ; if  $N_{T_1}(w) \neq N_{T_1}(v)$ , then  $N_{T_1}(w) \cap N_{T_1}(v) = \emptyset$ , since  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$ -free. Define

$$A = \{w \in T_2 \mid N_{T_1}(w) = N_{T_1}(v)\}$$

and

$$B = \{w \in T_2 \mid N_{T_1}(w) \cap N_{T_1}(v) = \emptyset\}.$$

Recall that  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_2, \sigma_2)$ -free. If  $w \in B$ , then  $wv \in E(\Gamma)$ . Recall that  $\Gamma$  is  $(H_3, \sigma_3)$ -free. Then  $\cup_{w \in B} N_{T_1}(w) = \{u_2, u_5\}$  or  $\cup_{w \in B} N_{T_1}(w) = \{u_3, u_5\}$ .

Without loss of generality, assume that  $\cup_{w \in B} N_{T_1}(w) = \{u_2, u_5\}$ . Let  $C = N_\Gamma(u_1) \cap N_\Gamma(u_4)$  and  $D = N_\Gamma(u_2) \cap N_\Gamma(u_5)$ . Clearly,  $C$  and  $D$  are both independent sets and  $C \cup D = T_2 \cup \{u_1, u_5\}$ . Therefore,  $\Gamma[C \cup D]$  is signed complete bipartite subgraph. Let  $|C| = c$  and  $|D| = d$ . Then  $m = (c + 1)(d + 1) + 1$ . By Claim 1, there exists a signed graph  $\Gamma'' = (G, \sigma'')$  such that  $\Gamma'' \sim \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma''[T_1] = (C_5, +)$ . Let  $\sigma_K$  be a sign function such that  $(SK_{c+1, d+1}, \sigma_K) \sim \Gamma''$ . By Lemmas 2.1 and 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\Gamma) &= \lambda_1((SK_{c+1, d+1}, \sigma_K)) \leq \lambda_1((SK_{c+1, d+1}, +)) \\ &< \lambda_1((K_{c+1, d+1}, +)) \\ &= \sqrt{(c + 1)(d + 1)} \\ &= \sqrt{m - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Let  $\Gamma = (K_4, \sigma)$  be a complete graph of order 4 having exactly one negative edge. By a simple calculation,  $\lambda_1(\Gamma) = |\lambda_4(\Gamma)| = \sqrt{5} = \sqrt{|E(\Gamma)| - 1}$ , which satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.2. Since  $\Gamma$  is unbalanced, Theorem 1.2 is a signed version of [19, Theorem 1.3].

## 4 Proof of Conjecture 2

For a square matrix  $M$ , we define  $\det(M)$  as its determinant. A zero matrix is the matrix which all elements are zero.

**Lemma 4.1.** (See [14]) *Let  $\Gamma$  be a connected signed graph. Then  $\det(L(\Gamma)) = 0$  if and only if  $\Gamma$  is balanced.*

**Proof of Conjecture 2.** Let  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . Partition  $L(\Gamma)$  as

$$\begin{pmatrix} B & C \\ C^T & D \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $B$  is  $k$ -by- $k$ . Consider the following two cases.

*Case 1.* If  $B$  is not a positive definite matrix, then  $B$  has a zero eigenvalue, since  $B$  is a positive semi-definite matrix. We obtain  $\det(L(\Gamma)) = 0$ . By Lemma 4.1, we have  $\Gamma$  is balanced. By Theorem 1.3, we obtain Conjecture 2 is true.

*Case 2.* If  $B$  is a positive definite matrix, then  $B$  is invertible. Since  $G$  is connected,  $C$  is not zero matrix. Note that  $L(\Gamma) = FF^T$ , where

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} B^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ C^T B^{-\frac{1}{2}} & H \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $H = (D - C^T B^{-1} C)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Note also that  $L(\Gamma)$  and

$$K = F^T F = \begin{pmatrix} B + B^{-\frac{1}{2}} C C^T B^{-\frac{1}{2}} & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$$

have the same eigenvalues. Since  $B$  is a positive definite matrix, there exists an orthogonal matrix  $Q$  such that  $B = Q^T \text{diag}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) Q$ , where  $a_i > 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Notice that  $Q C C^T Q^T = (Q C)(Q C)^T$  is a positive semi-definite matrix. We assume that the non-negative diagonal elements are  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ . If there exists an  $i$  such that  $m_i = 0$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , then all the elements in the row and column corresponding to  $m_i$  are zero [35, P201]. So, if  $m_1 = m_2 = \dots = m_k = 0$ , then  $(Q C)(Q C)^T$  is zero matrix. Recall that  $(Q C)(Q C)^T$  is a positive semi-definite matrix. Then  $Q C$  is zero matrix. Recall that  $Q$  is an orthogonal matrix. Then  $C$  is zero matrix, a contradiction. Hence, there exists a  $m_j > 0$  for a certain  $j$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{trace} \left( B^{-\frac{1}{2}} C C^T B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) &= \text{trace} \left( B^{-1} C C^T \right) \\ &= \text{trace} \left( Q^T \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{a_k} \right) Q C C^T \right) \\ &= \text{trace} \left( \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{a_k} \right) Q C C^T Q^T \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{m_i}{a_i} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(\Gamma) = \text{trace} \left( B + B^{-\frac{1}{2}} C C^T B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) > \text{trace}(B) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i(\Gamma).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a signed graph. For each edge  $e_k = (v_i, v_j)$  of  $\Gamma$ , choose one of  $v_i$  or  $v_j$  to be the head of  $e_k$  and the other to be the tail. The vertex-edge *incidence matrix*  $P = P(\Gamma)$  afforded by a fixed orientation of  $\Gamma$  is the  $n$ -by- $m$  matrix  $P = (c_{ij})$  given by

$$c_{ij} = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } v_i \text{ is the head of } e_j; \\ -1, & \text{if } v_i \text{ is the tail of } e_j, \text{ and } \sigma(e_j) = +1; \\ +1, & \text{if } v_i \text{ is the tail end of } e_j, \text{ and } \sigma(e_j) = -1; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that  $P P^T$  is always the Laplacian matrix  $L(\Gamma)$ . In any event,  $P^T P$  and  $P P^T$  share the same nonzero eigenvalues [13].

**Lemma 5.1.** (See [6]) *Let  $M$  be a positive semi-definite matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ . Then, for  $r = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,*

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_r = \max \left\{ \mathbf{u}_1^T M \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2^T M \mathbf{u}_2 + \dots + \mathbf{u}_r^T M \mathbf{u}_r \right\},$$

*where the maximum is taken over all orthonormal vectors  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r$ . In particular,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_r$  is bounded below by the sum of the  $r$  largest diagonal entries of  $M$ .*

**Lemma 5.2.** (See [26]) *Let  $\Gamma$  be a signed graph with  $n$  vertices and let  $\Gamma'$  be a signed graph obtained from  $\Gamma$  by inserting a new edge into  $\Gamma$ . Then the Laplacian eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  interlace, that is,*

$$\mu_1(\Gamma') \geq \mu_1(\Gamma) \geq \mu_2(\Gamma') \geq \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq \dots \geq \mu_n(\Gamma') \geq \mu_n(\Gamma).$$

In the following, we give the proof of Theorem 1.4. We would like to mention that the proof of Theorem 1.4 is similar to that of [9, Theorem 2]. For the sake of completeness, we keep the proof of Theorem 1.4.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** By the previous definition,  $L(\Gamma) = PP^T$ , regardless of the orientation. The matrix  $K(\Gamma) = P^T P$  depends on the orientation. In any event,  $K(\Gamma)$  and  $L(\Gamma)$  share the same nonzero eigenvalues.

Suppose that  $\mathbf{x}$  is a real  $m$ -dimensional column vector. If  $e \in E(\Gamma)$  and  $v \in V(\Gamma)$ , define  $s(v, e) = +1$  if  $v$  is the head of  $e$ ,  $s(v, e) = -1$  if  $v$  is the tail of  $e$  and  $\sigma(e) = +1$ ,  $s(v, e) = +1$  if  $v$  is the tail of  $e$  and  $\sigma(e) = -1$ , and 0 otherwise. It is convenient to think of its components as indexed by  $E(\Gamma)$ , so the " $v$ -th component" of  $P\mathbf{x}$  is

$$\sum_{e \in E(\Gamma)} s(v, e) \mathbf{x}_e$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_e$  denotes the coordinate of  $\mathbf{x}$  corresponding to the edge  $e$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{x}^T K(\Gamma) \mathbf{x} = \sum_{v \in V(\Gamma)} \left( \sum_{e \in E(\Gamma)} s(v, e) \mathbf{x}_e \right)^2. \quad (5.1)$$

Choose an orientation of  $E(\Gamma)$  such that  $u_i$  is the head of each of the  $d_\Gamma(u_i)$  edges incident with it,  $1 \leq i \leq k - r$ . In addition, we may prescribe that  $u_i$  is the head of each of the  $d_\Gamma(u_i) - 1 > 0$  edges, other than  $e_{k-i+1}$ , incident with it,  $k - r < i \leq k$ .

For each  $u \in R$ , define a real  $m$ -tuple  $\mathbf{x}(u)$  as follows:  $\mathbf{x}(u)_e$ , the coordinate of  $\mathbf{x}(u)$  corresponding to the edge  $e \in E(\Gamma)$ , is 1 if  $u$  is the head of  $e$ , and 0 otherwise. Then  $\{\mathbf{x}(u) : u \in R\}$  is an orthogonal set of vectors. Moreover,  $\|\mathbf{x}(u)_i\|^2 = d_\Gamma(u_i)$  if  $i \leq k - r$  and  $d_\Gamma(u_i) - 1$  if  $i > k - r$ . Let  $\mathbf{y}(u) = \frac{\mathbf{x}(u)}{\|\mathbf{x}(u)\|}$  for  $u \in R$ .

Then, for  $1 \leq i \leq k - r$ ,

$$\sum_{e \in E(\Gamma)} s(v, e) \mathbf{y}(u_i)_e = \begin{cases} d_\Gamma(u_i)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } v = u_i, \\ -\frac{\delta_i}{d_\Gamma(u_i)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, & \text{if } vu_i \in E(\Gamma), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for  $i > k - r$ ,

$$\sum_{e \in E(\Gamma)} s(v, e) \mathbf{y}(u_i)_e = \begin{cases} (d_\Gamma(u_i) - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } v = u_i, \\ -\frac{\delta_i}{(d_\Gamma(u_i) - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, & \text{if } vu_i \in E(\Gamma) \setminus E(\Gamma[R]), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So, from (5.1),

$$\mathbf{y}^T(u_i) K(\Gamma) \mathbf{y}(u_i) = \begin{cases} d_\Gamma(u_i) + 1, & 1 \leq i \leq k - r, \\ d_\Gamma(u_i), & k - r < i \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\{\mathbf{y}(u_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$  is an orthogonal set of vectors, by Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i(\Gamma) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{y}^T(u_i) K(\Gamma) \mathbf{y}(u_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_\Gamma(u_i) + k - r.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.** (See [14]) *If  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  has an edge, then  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq d_1(\Gamma) + 1$ .*

**Proof.** If  $d_1(\Gamma) = 1$ , then every connected component of  $\Gamma$  is either an isolated vertex or a copy of  $K_2$ . In this case,  $\mu_1(\Gamma) = 2$  and  $d_1(\Gamma) = 1$ . So  $\mu_1(\Gamma) = d_1(\Gamma) + 1$ .

If  $d_1(\Gamma) > 1$ , let  $w$  be a vertex of  $\Gamma$  of degree  $d_1(\Gamma)$ . Let  $(Z, \sigma)$  be a connected component of  $\Gamma$  containing  $w$ . By Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 1.4,  $\mu_1(\Gamma) \geq \mu_1((Z, \sigma)) \geq d_1(\Gamma) + 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $\Gamma = (G, \sigma)$  be a connected signed graph with  $n > 2$  vertices. Then*

$$\mu_1(\Gamma) + \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq d_1(\Gamma) + d_2(\Gamma) + 1.$$

*If there are two nonadjacent vertices in  $\Gamma$  having degree  $d_1(\Gamma)$  and degree  $d_2(\Gamma)$ , then*

$$\mu_1(\Gamma) + \mu_2(\Gamma) \geq d_1(\Gamma) + d_2(\Gamma) + 2.$$

**Proof.** The proof is immediate from Theorem 1.4. Either  $r = 1$  or  $r = 0$ .  $\square$

## Statements and Declarations

**Competing interests** No potential competing interest was reported by the authors.

**Data availability statements** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.



## References

- [1] M. Andelić, T. Koledin, Z. Stanić, Inequalities for Laplacian eigenvalues of signed graphs with given frustration number, *Symmetry* 13 (10) (2021) 1902.
- [2] F. Belardo, Balancedness and the least eigenvalue of Laplacian of signed graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 446 (2014) 133–147.
- [3] F. Belardo, Y. Zhou, Signed graphs with extremal least Laplacian eigenvalue, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 497 (2016) 167–180.
- [4] P. J. Cameron, J. J. Seidel, S. V. Tsaranov, Signed graphs, root lattices, and Coxeter groups, *J. Algebra* 164(1) (1994) 173–209.
- [5] D. M. Cvetković, M. Doob, H. Sachs, *Spectra of Graphs*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [6] D. M. Cvetković, P. Rowlinson, S. Simić, *An Introduction to the Theory of Graph Spectra*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [7] K. A. Germina, S. K. Hameed, On signed paths, signed cycles and their energies, *Appl. Math. Sci.* 4 (2010) 69–72.
- [8] R. Grone, Eigenvalues and the degree sequences of graphs, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 39 (1-2) (1995) 133–136.
- [9] R. Grone, R. Merris, The Laplacian spectrum of a graph II, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 7 (2) (1994) 221–229.
- [10] F. Harary, On the notion of balance of a signed graph, *Michigan Math. J.* 2 (2) (1953) 143–146.
- [11] F. Heider, Attitudes and cognitive organization, *J. Psychol.* 21 (1) (1946) 107–112.
- [12] A. J. Hoffman, J. H. Smith, On the spectral radii of topologically equivalent graphs. In *Recent Advances in Graph Theory* (M. Fiedler, ed.), pp. 273–281. Academia Praha, 1975.
- [13] Y. Hou, Bounds for the least Laplacian eigenvalue of a signed graph, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 21 (4) (2005) 955–960.
- [14] Y. Hou, J. Li, Y. Pan, On the Laplacian eigenvalues of signed graphs, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 51 (1) (2003) 21–30.
- [15] Y. Hou, Z. Tang, D. Wang, On signed graphs with just two distinct Laplacian eigenvalues, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 351 (2019) 1–7.
- [16] M. R. Kannan, S. Pragada, Signed spectral Turañ type theorems, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 663 (2023) 62–79.
- [17] K. Lan, J. Li, F. Liu, Remarks on the largest eigenvalue of a signed graph, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* 46 (5) (2023) 157.
- [18] Y. Li, L. Feng, Y. Peng, A spectral extremal problem on non-bipartite triangle-free graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* 31 (1) (2024) P1.52.
- [19] H. Lin, B. Ning, B. Wu, Eigenvalues and triangles in graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 30 (2) (2021) 258–270.

- [20] L. Liu, B. Ning, Local properties of the spectral radius and Perron vector in graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 176 (2026) 241–253.
- [21] Y. Liu, J. Shen, The (normalized) Laplacian eigenvalue of signed graphs, *Taiwanese J. Math.* 19 (2) (2015) 505–517.
- [22] V. Nikiforov, Some inequalities for the largest eigenvalue of a graph, *Comb. Probab. Comput.* 11 (2) (2002) 179–189.
- [23] B. Ning, M. Zhai, Counting substructures and eigenvalues I: triangles, *European J. Combin.* 110 (2023) 103685.
- [24] N. Reff, New bounds for the Laplacian spectral radius of a signed graph, *arXiv:1103.4629* (2011).
- [25] G. Sun, F. Liu, K. Lan, A note on eigenvalues of signed graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 652 (2022) 125–131.
- [26] D. Wang, Y. Hou, On the sum of Laplacian eigenvalues of a signed graph, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 555(2018) 39–52.
- [27] D. Wang, Y. Hou, D. Li, Extremal results for  $C_3^-$ -free signed graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 681 (2024) 47–65.
- [28] W. Wang, Z. Yan, J. Qian, Eigenvalues and chromatic number of a signed graph, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 619 (2021) 137–145.
- [29] Y. Wang, H. Lin, The largest eigenvalue of  $C_k^-$ -free signed graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 372 (2025) 164–172.
- [30] Z. Wang, Generalizing theorems of Nosal and Nikiforov: triangles and quadrilaterals, *Discrete Math.* 345 (9) (2022) 112973.
- [31] H. S. Wilf, Spectral bounds for the clique and independence numbers of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 40 (1) (1986) 113–117.
- [32] T. Zaslavsky, Signed graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 4 (1) (1982) 47–74.
- [33] T. Zaslavsky, Matrices in the theory of signed simple graphs, in *Advances in Discrete Mathematics and Applications: Mysore, 2008*, 207–229, *Ramanujan Math. Soc. Lect. Notes Ser.*, 13, Ramanujan Math. Soc., Mysore, 2010.
- [34] T. Zaslavsky, A mathematical bibliography of signed and gain graphs and allied areas, *Electron. J. Combin.* 5 (2018), *Dynamic Surveys* 8, 524 pages.
- [35] F. Zhang, *Matrix Theory*, Second edition, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [36] M. Zhai, J. Shu, A spectral version of Mantel’s theorem, *Discrete Math.* 345 (1) (2022) 112630.