

NEW LINEAR INVARIANTS OF HYPERGRAPHS

PETER A. BROOKSBANK AND CLARA R. CHAPLIN

ABSTRACT. We introduce a parameterized family of invariants for ℓ -uniform hypergraphs. To each \mathbb{K} -linear transformation $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ we associate a function $\text{Sig}(-, T)$ that maps ℓ -uniform hypergraphs to \mathbb{K} -vector spaces. Given an ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, we use $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ to define an equivalence relation \equiv_T on V called T -fusion, which determines a quotient hypergraph $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ called the T -frame of \mathcal{H} . We show that the map $U : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, where $U(\lambda) = \lambda(1) + \cdots + \lambda(\ell)$, is universal in that $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ embeds in $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, and U -fusion refines T -fusion for any $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$. We further show that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}, U), U) = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ for any ℓ -uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} , so $\mathfrak{F}(-, U)$ is a closure function on the set of ℓ -uniform hypergraphs. We explore the properties of this one-time simplification of a hypergraph.

1. INTRODUCTION

Invariants of the adjacency matrix of a graph are commonly deployed to gain insight into the structure of the graph. Indeed spectral graph theory studies the properties of graphs through the lens of such invariants [7]. Recent works such as [8, 12] have sought to generalize spectral methods to hypergraphs. It has been helpful in such efforts to identify the given hypergraph with a multilinear product (*tensor*), and the origins of the current work lie in a recent spectral theory of tensors [9]. New families of linear invariants of tensors were introduced in [5] to detect, in a given tensor, hidden patterns belonging to a broad range of parameterized families. Our objective is to adapt those invariants to hypergraphs, and then use them to explore combinatorial features.

Our main contribution is to define an equivalence relation called *fusion* on the vertices of a hypergraph. In that sense our concern is similar to works such as [1, 2] that study hypergraph operators compatible with equivalence relations. However, our process works in reverse. Instead of starting with a *prescribed* equivalence on the vertices of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , to each linear transformation T we compute operators $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ called T -signals and use them to *define* an equivalence called T -fusion. We show that the transformation $U : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, where $U(\lambda) = \lambda(1) + \cdots + \lambda(\ell)$, is universal in that, for any $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$, the \mathbb{K} -space $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ embeds in $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$. As a consequence, U -fusion is the most refined of the fusion relations.

We then study the function that maps \mathcal{H} to the quotient $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$, called the U -frame of \mathcal{H} , defined by that equivalence. One outcome of this study is that $\mathfrak{F}(-)$ is a closure function on the set of finite connected ℓ -uniform hypergraphs (Theorem 6.4). Another outcome is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given such a hypergraph \mathcal{H} ,

Date: December 4, 2025.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C65, 15A69, 15-04, 15B30.

* Corresponding author.

computes the quotient $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus, our technique offers an efficiently computable, one-time simplification of a given hypergraph.

We have made a Python implementation of the techniques described in the paper publicly available on GitHub [6]. In Section 7 we report on some experiments carried out with our programs. The final section of the paper briefly discusses two families of hypergraphs whose members are distinguished by the full tensor invariants in [5], but not by our restricted invariants. This suggests there is much more to learn from and about this nascent spectral theory of hypergraphs.

2. HYPERGRAPHS

In this section we summarize just the hypergraph concepts and notation we need throughout, and refer to [3] for a thorough treatment of the subject.

Denote by Y^X the set of functions from X to Y . For $f \in Y^X$ and $x \in X$, we denote the image of x under f by $f(x)$. However, when Y is itself a set of functions, we find it convenient to adopt the notation $x \mapsto f_x$, so that $f_x(-)$ can be used for evaluation of f_x . Throughout the paper, $\ell \geq 3$ is a fixed integer, and

$$[\ell] = \{1, \dots, \ell\}.$$

Write $Y^{[\ell]}$ as Y^ℓ for short, and let $\text{Sym}(\ell)$ be the group of permutations of $[\ell]$. For $f \in Y^\ell$ and $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, define $f^\sigma \in Y^\ell$, where $f^\sigma(a) = f(a^\sigma)$ for $a \in [\ell]$. There is an equivalence relation on Y^ℓ where f is equivalent to g if there exists $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ such that $g = f^\sigma$. The equivalence class

$$[f] = \{f^\sigma \mid \sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)\}$$

of f is called the *orbit* of f under $\text{Sym}(\ell)$.

Definition 2.1 (Hypergraph). *An ℓ -uniform hypergraph is a pair $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ of finite sets, where V is the vertex set, and E is a set of orbits of V^ℓ , called (hyper)edges, under the natural action of $\text{Sym}(\ell)$.*

Our notational choices merit some explanation. First, we allow repetitions of vertices in an edge, which is why we consider tuples V^ℓ rather than ℓ -subsets $\binom{V}{\ell}$. Secondly, we consider *undirected* hypergraphs, so edges are really *multisets* rather than sequences since the order of the vertices does not matter. In contrast to other multiset notations, we account for symmetry using the action of $\text{Sym}(\ell)$ on tuples because this choice aligns better with the invariants upon which our methods rely. In particular, by choosing a representative, we regard $e \in E$ as an element of V^ℓ and obtain other elements of the equivalence class as e^σ for $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$.

Definition 2.2 (Connectedness). *A walk in an ℓ -uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} is an alternating sequence $x_1, e_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-1}, e_{m-1}, x_m$ of vertices and edges, where for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, there exist $a_i, b_i \in [\ell]$ such that $e_i(a_i) = x_i$ and $e_i(b_i) = x_{i+1}$. The reachability relation on V , where y is related to x if there is a walk in \mathcal{H} from x to y , is an equivalence relation; the connected components of \mathcal{H} are the equivalence classes. We say that \mathcal{H} is connected if it has just one connected component.*

The final hypergraph notion we need is that of a quotient. As in the theory of graphs, the quotient of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} provides a simplified view of \mathcal{H} .

Definition 2.3 (Quotients). *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be an ℓ -uniform hypergraph, and let \approx be an equivalence relation on V . Define:*

- $\bar{V} = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in V\}$, the set of \approx equivalence classes; and
- $\bar{E} = \{\bar{e} \mid e \in E\} \subseteq \bar{V}^\ell$, where $\bar{e}(a) = \overline{e(a)}$ for $a \in [\ell]$.

The ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\bar{\mathcal{H}} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ is called the quotient of \mathcal{H} by \approx .

Example 2.4. Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be any ℓ -uniform hypergraph. We have seen that equivalence classes of V under the reachability relation are the connected components of \mathcal{H} . Thus, in the quotient hypergraph $\bar{\mathcal{H}} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ for the reachability relation, \bar{V} contains one vertex for each connected component. For $e \in E$, there is a connected component $C \subseteq V$ such that $e(a) \in C$ for all $a \in [\ell]$, so it follows that $\bar{e}(a) = \overline{e(a)} = \bar{x}$, where $\bar{x} = C$. Thus, \bar{E} contains exactly one edge \bar{e} for each $\bar{x} \in \bar{V}$ with $\bar{e}(a) = \bar{x}$ for all $a \in [\ell]$.

Observe that \bar{E} may contain multisets that are not sets even when $E \subseteq \binom{V}{\ell}$.

Example 2.5. Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be the (connected) 3-uniform hypergraph where $V = \{u, v, w, x, y\}$ and $E = \{(u, v, w), (u, w, x), (u, x, y)\}$, as depicted in Figure 1.






FIGURE 1. A hypergraph on 5 vertices with 3 hyperedges.

Figure 2 shows quotients of \mathcal{H} by two different equivalence relations. Note, the generality of our edge notation means that quotients of ℓ -uniform hypergraphs remain ℓ -uniform hypergraphs. The relation on the right is the one obtained from the automorphism group of the hypergraph [2, Section 5].



(A) Quotient of \mathcal{H} with equivalence classes $\bar{u} = \{u\}$, $\bar{v} = \{v, x\}$, $\bar{w} = \{w, y\}$.



(B) Quotient of \mathcal{H} with equivalence classes $\bar{u} = \{u\}$, $\bar{v} = \{v, y\}$, $\bar{w} = \{w, x\}$.

FIGURE 2. Quotients of \mathcal{H} by two different equivalence relations.

3. SIGNALS

Since an edge e of an ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ is an orbit $[e] = \{e^\sigma \mid \sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)\}$, to each ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ one can associate an array $\Gamma : V^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where, for $f \in V^\ell$,

$$(1) \quad \Gamma(f) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } [f] \in E, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Each axis of Γ (labelled by $a \in [\ell]$) has the same number of coordinates (indexed by V), so Γ is a cubical array. It is also symmetric because $\Gamma(f) = \Gamma(f^\sigma)$ for all $f \in V^\ell$ and all $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$. The $5 \times 5 \times 5$ symmetric array Γ for the 5-vertex hypergraph in Example 2.5 is pictured in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. On the left is a 3-uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} on 5 vertices. On the right is the $5 \times 5 \times 5$ array Γ corresponding to \mathcal{H} , where the $3! = 6$ nonzero entries for each colored edge are represented as blocks of the same color. This helps to see the symmetry of Γ .

In this paper we work directly with the hypergraph \mathcal{H} rather than with the array $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$. The reason for mentioning $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$ at all is that arrays are representations of tensors, and it is from tensors that we get the invariants we shall use throughout the paper. Indeed, the following key definition is an adaption to hypergraphs of the notion of a *derivation* for tensors [5, Definition 5.1].

Remark 3.1. Throughout the paper, \mathbb{K} denotes an arbitrary field. The specific role of \mathbb{K} is inconsequential except that we shall eventually need it to contain enough distinct elements, so for convenience we henceforth assume that \mathbb{K} is infinite.

Definition 3.2 (*T-Signal*). *Given an ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ and a linear transformation $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$, where r is a positive integer, a T -signal of \mathcal{H} is a function $\delta : [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^V$ sending $a \mapsto (\delta_a : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K})$ satisfying*

$$(2) \quad \forall e \in E, \forall \sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell), \quad T(\delta * e^\sigma) = 0 \in \mathbb{K}^r,$$

where $\delta * e^\sigma : [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ maps $a \mapsto \delta_a(e^\sigma(a))$. Put

$$(3) \quad \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T) := \{ \delta \in (\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell \mid \delta \text{ is a } T\text{-signal of } \mathcal{H} \}.$$

Let $\mathbf{1} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be the constant function $\mathbf{1}(x) = 1$ for $x \in V$, and let $\mathbf{1}_a$ denote the function $\mathbf{1}$ operating on coordinate $a \in [\ell]$. Similarly, let $\mathbf{0} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$

be the zero function $\mathbf{0}(x) = 0$ for $x \in V$. Each $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ has a kernel $\ker(T) = \{\lambda : [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \mid T(\lambda) = 0\}$. Observe for $\lambda \in \ker(T)$ that the function

$$(4) \quad \delta(\lambda) : [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^V, \quad \delta(\lambda)_a = \lambda(a)\mathbf{1}_a$$

is a T -signal of any hypergraph \mathcal{H} . Such signals are constant on every axis, so we call them *constant signals* and put

$$(5) \quad \text{Sig}_0(T) = \{ \delta(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \ker(T) \}.$$

Constant signals clearly tell us nothing useful about the structure of a hypergraph. For $a \in [\ell]$, define $\hat{a} : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ where $\hat{a}(b) = 1$ if $a = b$ and $\hat{a}(b) = 0$ otherwise, so $\{\hat{a} \mid a \in [\ell]\}$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{K}^ℓ . Similarly, let $\{\hat{x} \mid x \in V\}$ be the standard basis of \mathbb{K}^V , where $\hat{x}(y) = 1$ if $x = y$ and $\hat{x}(y) = 0$ otherwise.

Example 3.3. Consider the ‘triangle’ hypergraph \mathcal{H} on vertex set $V = \{u, v, w\}$ with the single hyperedge $e = (u, v, w)$. Let $T : \mathbb{K}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be the linear transformation defined by $T(\lambda) = \lambda(1) - 2\lambda(2) + \lambda(3)$. Then $\ker(T)$ is spanned by the vectors $2 \cdot \hat{1} + \hat{2}$ and $\hat{1} - \hat{3}$, so $\text{Sig}_0(T)$ contains the (constant) signals

$$\delta(2\hat{1} + \hat{2}) = (2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_1, \mathbf{1}_2, \mathbf{0}_3), \quad \delta(\hat{1} - \hat{3}) = (\mathbf{1}_1, \mathbf{0}_2, -\mathbf{1}_3).$$

One can easily verify that $\delta : [3] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^V$ defined by $\delta_1 = 2\hat{w}$, $\delta_2 = \hat{u} + \hat{v}$, $\delta_3 = 2\hat{w}$ is a (non-constant) T -signal. For example, if $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ is the 3-cycle $(1, 2, 3)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T(\delta * e^\sigma) &= \delta_1(e(1^\sigma)) - 2\delta_2(e(2^\sigma)) + \delta_3(e(3^\sigma)) \\ &= \delta_1(e(2)) - 2\delta_2(e(3)) + \delta_3(e(1)) \\ &= 2\hat{w}(v) - 2(\hat{u}(w) + \hat{v}(w)) + 2\hat{w}(u) \\ &= 0 - 2(0 + 0) + 0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The next result establishes the linear nature of the invariants $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$, and let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be an ℓ -uniform hypergraph. Then $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ is a subspace of $(\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$, and $\text{Sig}_0(T)$ is a subspace of $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$.*

Proof. Evidently, $(\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$ is a \mathbb{K} -vector space under addition $(\delta + \delta')_a := \delta_a + \delta'_a$ and scalar product $(k\delta)_a := k\delta_a$. For $\delta, \delta' \in (\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$, $e \in E$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, $k \in \mathbb{K}$, $a \in [\ell]$,

$$\begin{aligned} [(\delta + k\delta') * e^\sigma](a) &= (\delta + k\delta')_a(e^\sigma(a)) && \text{(definition of } \delta * e^\sigma) \\ &= (\delta_a + k\delta'_a)(e^\sigma(a)) && \text{(operations on } (\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell) \\ &= \delta_a(e^\sigma(a)) + k\delta'_a(e^\sigma(a)) && \text{(operations on } \mathbb{K}^V) \\ &= (\delta * e^\sigma)(a) + k(\delta' * e^\sigma)(a) && \text{(definition of } \delta * e^\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\delta + k\delta') * e^\sigma = (\delta * e^\sigma) + k(\delta' * e^\sigma) \in \mathbb{K}^\ell$. Since $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ is a \mathbb{K} -linear transformation, for $\delta, \delta' \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T((\delta + k\delta') * e^\sigma) &= T((\delta * e^\sigma) + k(\delta' * e^\sigma)) \\ &= T(\delta * e^\sigma) + kT(\delta' * e^\sigma) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\delta + k\delta' \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$, so $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ is a subspace of $(\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$. Finally, let $\lambda \in \ker(T) \subseteq \mathbb{K}^\ell$. For $e \in E$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, we have

$$\forall a \in [\ell], \quad \delta(\lambda) * e^\sigma(a) = \delta(\lambda)_a(e^\sigma(a)) = \lambda(a),$$

so $\delta(\lambda) * e^\sigma = \lambda$. Hence, $T(\delta(\lambda) * e^\sigma) = T(\lambda) = 0$, so $\delta(\lambda) \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$. The map $\lambda \mapsto \delta(\lambda)$ is a \mathbb{K} -linear embedding of $\ker(T)$ into $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$. \square

Remark 3.5 (Signals versus derivations). The notion of T -derivation in [5, Definition 5.1] can be applied directly to the *array* Γ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , in which case each δ_a would be a linear operator on the vector space \mathbb{K}^V . The notion of signal in Definition 3.2, where each δ_a is a function $V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, is equivalent to requiring that δ_a is a *diagonal* operator. Thus, our derivations only *scale* vertices of \mathcal{H} , whereas the derivations in [5] involve arbitrary linear combinations. In this sense we consider our hypergraph signals to be ‘combinatorial’ analogues of tensor derivations.

Remark 3.6 (Computing signals). Using signals rather than derivations, we can push the range of practical applications of our linear invariants of hypergraphs. The unknown $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ can be written as linear combinations of a standard basis $(\varepsilon^{(a,x)} \mid a \in [\ell], x \in V)$ of $(\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$ where, if $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{(a,x)}$, then $\varepsilon_b(y) = 1$ if and only if $a = b$ and $x = y$, and $\varepsilon_b(y) = 0$ otherwise. Thus, we can represent $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ as a column vector $(\delta_a(x) \mid a \in [\ell], x \in V)$ of degree $\ell \cdot |V|$.

Similarly, T is represented as a $r \times \ell$ matrix $M = (M_{i,a} \mid i \in [r], a \in [\ell])$. Each $i \in [r]$, $e \in E$, $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ in condition (2) contributes one linear equation in the unknowns $\delta_a(x)$. Indeed, $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ is precisely the nullspace of a matrix with $r \cdot |E| \cdot \ell!$ rows and $\ell \cdot |V|$ columns, whose entry in the row labelled by (i, e, σ) and the column labelled by (a, x) is $M_{i,a}$.

For many applications the uniformity constant ℓ of the hypergraph \mathcal{H} will be quite small (say 3 or 4), and r will typically be smaller than ℓ . In such cases, if \mathcal{H} has n vertices and m edges, we can solve for $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ using $O(mn \cdot \min\{m, n\})$ operations. This is much better than the complexity for derivations in [5].

4. CENTROIDS

We focus now on a particular transformation C and explore the C -signals of a hypergraph. Define $C : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\ell-1}$ to be the map $\lambda \mapsto C(\lambda)$, where

$$(6) \quad C(\lambda)(i) = \lambda(i) - \lambda(i+1), \quad \text{for } i \in [\ell-1]$$

Note that $\lambda \in \ker(C)$ if, and only if, $\lambda(1) = \dots = \lambda(\ell) = k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{K}$, so $\text{Sig}_0(C) = \{k\mathbf{1}_a \mid a \in [\ell], k \in \mathbb{K}\}$ is 1-dimensional.

For general tensors, the transformation C parameterizes null patterns in which the nonzero entries cluster as blocks down the leading diagonal [5, Section 7.3]. Similarly, C -signals detect the connected components of a hypergraph.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be an ℓ -uniform hypergraph, and $\delta = (\delta_a \mid a \in [\ell])$ a C -signal of \mathcal{H} . If $x, y \in V$ are in the same connected component of \mathcal{H} , then*

$$(7) \quad \forall a, b \in [\ell], \quad \delta_a(x) = \delta_b(y).$$

Proof. Let δ be a C -signal of \mathcal{H} . For each $e \in E$ and $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, we have $\delta * e^\sigma \in \ker(C)$, so $\delta_1(e^\sigma(1)) = \dots = \delta_\ell(e^\sigma(\ell))$.

Suppose first that x and y belong to some edge $e \in E$. Then, for each distinct pair $a, b \in [\ell]$, there exists $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ such that $e^\sigma(a) = e(a^\sigma) = x$ and $e^\sigma(b) = y$, so it follows that $\delta_a(x) = \delta_b(y)$. If τ is the transposition of $\text{Sym}(\ell)$ interchanging a and b , then $e^{\tau\sigma}(a) = e^\sigma(b) = y$, $e^{\tau\sigma}(b) = e^\sigma(a) = x$, and $e^{\tau\sigma}(c) = e^\sigma(c)$ for all $c \in [\ell] - \{a, b\}$. Since $\ell \geq 3$, there exists $c \in [\ell] - \{a, b\}$, so we have

$$\delta_a(x) = \delta_a(e^\sigma(a)) = \delta_c(e^\sigma(c)) = \delta_c(e^{\tau\sigma}(c)) = \delta_a(e^{\tau\sigma}(a)) = \delta_a(y).$$

The lemma now follows by induction on the length of a walk in \mathcal{H} from x to y . \square

Remark 4.2. The bound $\ell \geq 3$ is important to note. The tensor invariants upon which our hypergraph invariants are based are defined only when the *valence* of the tensor is greater than 2. They are inherently *multi*-linear rather than linear invariants, and in particular cannot be applied to graphs. Indeed the $\ell \geq 3$ assumption was needed at the end of the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Theorem 4.3. *The number of connected components of an ℓ -uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} is equal to the dimension of $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, C)$.*

Proof. Let V_1, \dots, V_d be the connected components of \mathcal{H} . We exhibit a basis of $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, C)$ of size d . For $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, define $\mathbf{1}^{[i]} \in (\mathbb{K}^V)^\ell$, where for $x \in V$,

$$(8) \quad \forall a \in [\ell], \quad \mathbf{1}_a^{[i]}(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \in V_i \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

For $e \in E$ and $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, since $\mathbf{1}_a^{[i]}(e^\sigma(a)) = 1$ for $a \in [\ell]$ precisely when e contains vertices in V_i , it follows that $C(\mathbf{1}^{[i]} * e^\sigma) = 0$, and hence that $\mathbf{1}^{[i]}$ is a C -signal.

For scalars $k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{K}$ and $x \in V_i$, we have

$$\forall a \in [\ell], \quad (k_1 \mathbf{1}^{[1]} + \dots + k_d \mathbf{1}^{[d]})_a(x) = k_i.$$

Hence, $k_1 \mathbf{1}^{[1]} + \dots + k_d \mathbf{1}^{[d]} = \mathbf{0}$ if, and only if, $k_1 = \dots = k_d = 0$, so the signals $\mathbf{1}^{[i]}$ are linearly independent. Finally, if δ is a C -signal of \mathcal{H} , by Lemma 4.1 there exist scalars $k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $\delta = k_1 \mathbf{1}^{[1]} + \dots + k_d \mathbf{1}^{[d]}$. It follows that $\{\mathbf{1}^{[i]} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}$ is a basis for $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, C)$. \square

5. UNIVERSAL SIGNALS

In view of Theorem 4.3, we henceforth work just with connected hypergraphs:

$$(9) \quad \text{HYP}_\ell = \{ \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{H} \text{ is a connected } \ell\text{-uniform hypergraph} \}.$$

The previous section focused on signals of the transformation C . In this section we consider another transformation $U : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, where

$$(10) \quad U(\lambda) = \lambda(1) + \lambda(2) + \dots + \lambda(\ell).$$

For each $a \in [\ell - 1]$, define $\lambda^{(a)} \in \mathbb{K}^\ell$, where

$$\lambda^{(a)}(b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b = a \\ -1 & \text{if } b = a + 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Then $\{\lambda^{(a)} \mid a \in [\ell - 1]\}$ is a basis for $\ker(U)$, so $\{\delta(\lambda^{(a)}) \mid a \in [\ell - 1]\}$ is a basis for $\text{Sig}_0(U)$, which therefore has dimension $\ell - 1$.

Remark 5.1. If $T(\hat{a}) = 0 \in \mathbb{K}^r$ for some $a \in [\ell]$, then condition (2) imposes no constraint on δ_a . Although such T are used to decompose tensors relative to a fixed set of axes [5, Section 7.2], they provide no useful information for the symmetric tensors underlying hypergraphs. We therefore assume that $T(\hat{a}) \neq 0$ for all $a \in [\ell]$, which is evidently the case when $T = U$.

The following result is a special case of [5, Proposition 8.1], but we include a proof tailored to our notation. It tells us that, for any T , the \mathbb{K} -space of T -signals of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} embeds into its space of U -signals.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{H} \in \text{HYP}_\ell$, and let $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ be a linear map. There are nonzero scalars k_1, \dots, k_ℓ such that*

$$(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_\ell) \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T) \implies (k_1\delta_1, \dots, k_\ell\delta_\ell) \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U).$$

Proof. Let $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ with $T(\hat{a}) \neq 0$ for all $a \in [\ell]$ (cf. Remark 5.1). Then $\{v \in \mathbb{K}^r \mid v \cdot T(\hat{a}) = 0\}$, where \cdot is the usual dot product, is a subspace of \mathbb{K}^r of codimension 1. Since \mathbb{K} is infinite, \mathbb{K}^r is not a finite union of hyperplanes, so there exists $w \in \mathbb{K}^r$ such that

$$\forall a \in [\ell], \quad w \cdot T(\hat{a}) \neq 0.$$

Define $T_w : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, where $T_w(u) = w \cdot T(u) \in \mathbb{K}$. Since $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_\ell)$ is a T -signal, it is clear from (2) it is also a T_w -signal. Since $T_w(\hat{a}) = w \cdot T(\hat{a}) \neq 0$, putting $k_a = (w \cdot T(\hat{a}))^{-1}$, it follows that $(k_1\delta_1, \dots, k_\ell\delta_\ell)$ is a U -signal, as required. \square

Proposition 5.2 tells us that, under very mild conditions, the transformation U is universal among the various choices of T . We conclude this section with a useful analogue of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $\mathcal{H} \in \text{HYP}_\ell$ and $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, we have*

$$\forall a, b \in [\ell], \quad \delta_a - \delta_b \in \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle.$$

Proof. The claim holds if $a = b$, so let a and b be distinct. If $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, then

$$\forall e \in E, \forall \sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell), \quad U(\delta * e) = \sum_{c=1}^{\ell} \delta_c(e^\sigma(c)) = 0.$$

We must show, for distinct vertices $x, y \in V$, that $\delta_a(x) - \delta_b(x) = \delta_a(y) - \delta_b(y)$.

Suppose first that there is an edge $e \in E$ containing x and y . Then there exists $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ such that $e^\sigma(a) = x$ and $e^\sigma(b) = y$. Since δ is a U -signal of \mathcal{H} ,

$$(11) \quad 0 = \sum_{c \in [\ell]} \delta_c(e^\sigma(c)) = \delta_a(x) + \delta_b(y) + \sum_{c \notin \{a, b\}} \delta_c(e^\sigma(c)).$$

Let τ be the transposition of $\text{Sym}(\ell)$ that interchanges a and b . Then

$$e^{\tau\sigma}(a) = e^\sigma(b) = y, \quad e^{\tau\sigma}(b) = e^\sigma(a) = x, \quad e^{\tau\sigma}(c) = e^\sigma(c) \text{ for } c \notin \{a, b\},$$

so we have

$$(12) \quad 0 = \sum_{c \in [\ell]} \delta_c(e^{\tau\sigma}(c)) = \delta_a(y) + \delta_b(x) + \sum_{c \notin \{a, b\}} \delta_c(e^\sigma(c)).$$

Subtracting (12) from (11) we get $\delta_a(x) - \delta_b(x) = \delta_a(y) - \delta_b(y)$.

The result now follows by induction on the length of a path in \mathcal{H} from x to y . \square

6. FUSION AND FRAMES

We return now to a notion introduced in Section 2, namely quotients of hypergraphs. Given a connected ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, one can of course form a quotient $\bar{\mathcal{H}} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ using any equivalence relation on V , but doing so without reference to \mathcal{H} will tell us nothing useful about its structure. Our strategy is to use the T -signals of \mathcal{H} to define an equivalence relation on V .

Definition 6.1 (Fusion and Frame). *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ be a connected ℓ -uniform hypergraph, and let $T : \mathbb{K}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^r$ be a linear map. The equivalence relation*

$$(13) \quad x \equiv_T y \iff \forall \delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T), \quad \delta(x) = \delta(y)$$

on V is called the T -fusion relation. The quotient hypergraph $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ of \mathcal{H} under T -fusion is called the T -frame of \mathcal{H} .

The matter of which T to choose was effectively settled by Proposition 5.2. For any T and any $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, the \mathbb{K} -space $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, T)$ embeds in $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$. It follows immediately that U -fusion on V is always a refinement of T -fusion. Thus, we will detect the most subtle features of \mathcal{H} using U -fusion and computing the corresponding frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}, U)$.

Example 6.2. We revisit Example 2.5 and compute the U -frame of the now familiar 5-vertex hypergraph. A calculation using our Python implementation [6] shows that $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ is 4-dimensional. The subspace $\text{Sig}_0(U)$ is 2-dimensional, so $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)/\text{Sig}_0(U)$ is also 2-dimensional. By Lemma 5.3 we need only consider the projection of a signal onto the first coordinate. The space $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)/\text{Sig}_0(U)$ is spanned by the (images of the) U -signals \hat{u} and $\hat{w} + \hat{y}$. Thus, all U -signals of \mathcal{H} are constant on the partition $\{\{u\}, \{v, x\}, \{w, y\}\}$, so there are three U -fusion classes: $\bar{u} = \{u\}$, $\bar{v} = \{v, x\}$, $\bar{w} = \{w, y\}$. Thus, $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ consists of three vertices \bar{u} , \bar{v} , \bar{w} and a single hyperedge containing all three vertices, as depicted in Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. On the left is our hypergraph \mathcal{H} on 5 vertices with 3 hyperedges, and on the right is its derivation quotient $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$.

Consider the function $\mathfrak{F} : \text{HYP}_\ell \rightarrow \text{HYP}_\ell$ that sends a hypergraph \mathcal{H} to its frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$. In the rest of the paper we explore the properties of $\mathfrak{F}(-)$, and present and analyze an algorithm to compute images under this function. The next result helps with both objectives. It provides a constructive proof that there is always a single “generating” signal δ whose values determine the fusion classes.

Proposition 6.3. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given a connected ℓ -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$, finds $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ satisfying*

$$(14) \quad \forall x, y \in V, \quad x \equiv_U y \iff \delta(x) = \delta(y).$$

Proof. We prove that Algorithm 1 behaves as stated.

Given $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$, a basis for $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ can be computed using $O(mn \cdot \min\{m, n\})$ operations (Remark 3.6). We suppress the details of this computation and initialize a basis for $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ on Line 1.

Algorithm 1 (Generating Signal)**Input:** $\mathcal{H} = (V, E) \in \text{HYP}_\ell$.**Output:** $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ such that $x \equiv_U y$ for $x, y \in V$ if, and only if, $\delta(x) = \delta(y)$.

- 1: $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow$ basis for $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$
- 2: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{ \}$
- 3: $\delta \leftarrow 0$
- 4: **while** $\exists \beta \in \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{C}$ **do**
- 5: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{ \beta \}$
- 6: $k \leftarrow$ any scalar in $\mathbb{K} - \left\{ \frac{\delta(x) - \delta(y)}{\beta(y) - \beta(x)} \mid x, y \in V, \beta(x) \neq \beta(y) \right\}$
- 7: $\delta \leftarrow \delta + k\beta$
- 8: **return** δ

Observe that, trivially, the following predicate is true entering the first iteration of the **while** loop on Line 4:

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}, \delta) : \delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U) \wedge ((\forall x)(\forall y)[\delta(x) = \delta(y) \iff \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{C}, \alpha(x) = \alpha(y)])$$

Consider a fixed iteration of the loop, where the pair (δ, \mathcal{C}) has values $(\delta_0, \mathcal{C}_0)$ before the iteration and $(\delta_1, \mathcal{C}_1)$ at the end, so we have $\delta_1 = \delta_0 + k\beta$ and $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \{ \beta \}$.

Suppose that $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}_0, \delta_0)$ holds, and fix $x, y \in V$.

If $\delta_0(x) = \delta_0(y)$ and $\beta(x) = \beta(y)$, then $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \{ \beta \}$. But it also follows that

$$\delta_1(x) = \delta_0(x) + k\beta(x) = \delta_0(y) + k\beta(y) = \delta_1(y).$$

Conversely, if $\delta_1(x) = \delta_1(y)$, then

$$\delta_0(x) + k\beta(x) = \delta_1(x) = \delta_1(y) = \delta_0(y) + k\beta(y),$$

so that $\delta_0(x) - \delta_0(y) = k[\beta(y) - \beta(x)]$. If $\beta(x) \neq \beta(y)$, then $k = \frac{\delta_0(x) - \delta_0(y)}{\beta(y) - \beta(x)}$, but we chose k in Line 6 so that this does not occur. Hence, $\beta(x) = \beta(y)$ and $\delta_0(x) = \delta_0(y)$, so $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \{ \beta \}$.

Finally, since $\delta_0 \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ and $\delta_1 = \delta_0 + k\beta$ for $\beta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, it follows that $\delta_1 \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$.

We have shown that $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ is an invariant of the **while** loop that is true entering the loop. Hence $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ is true at the end of the loop when $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{B}$. It follows that δ returned by Algorithm 1 behaves as stated.

The polynomial complexity is clear, since the number of iterations is bounded by the dimension of $\text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, which is at most n . Observe that the scalar $k \in \mathbb{K}$ on Line 6 can always be found because we must avoid at most n^2 values and we assumed that \mathbb{K} is infinite (Remark 3.1). \square

The main purpose of a quotient is to simplify a complicated hypergraph. A well chosen quotient should both simplify and retain essential features of the original. Given a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , the quotient $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ in a sense captures features of \mathcal{H} that are detectable by linear invariants. It is natural to ask what those features are, and this is a topic we take up in Section 8. It is also natural to wonder about the dynamics of the function $\mathfrak{F}(-)$. For example, does repetition

$$\mathcal{H} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})) \rightsquigarrow \dots$$

yield further simplification? As it turns out, it does not: $\mathfrak{F}(-)$ is a closure function.

Theorem 6.4. *If \mathcal{H} is a connected ℓ -uniform hypergraph, then $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof. For $\mathcal{H} = (V, E) \in \text{HYP}_\ell$, recall that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) = (\overline{V}, \overline{E})$ for

$$\overline{V} = \{\overline{x} \mid x \in V\}, \quad \overline{E} = \{\overline{e} \mid e \in E\} \subset V^\ell,$$

where $\overline{x} = \{y \in V \mid \forall \delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U), \forall a \in [\ell], \delta_a(x) = \delta_a(y)\}$ and $\overline{e}(a) = \overline{e(a)}$ for $a \in [\ell]$. For $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, $a \in [\ell]$, and $x \in V$, δ_a is constant on the class \overline{x} . Hence, each $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ induces a function $\overline{\delta} \in (\mathbb{K}^{\overline{V}})^\ell$, where $\overline{\delta}_a(\overline{x}) := \delta_a(x)$. Furthermore, for $\overline{e} \in \overline{E}$ and $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$, we have

$$\overline{\delta}_a(\overline{e}^\sigma(a)) = \overline{\delta}_a(\overline{e(a^\sigma)}) = \delta_a(e(a^\sigma)),$$

so $U(\overline{\delta} * \overline{e}^\sigma) = U(\delta * e^\sigma) = 0$ and it follows that $\overline{\delta} \in \text{Sig}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}), U)$. In particular, if $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ is the element in Proposition 6.3 and $\overline{\delta} \in \text{Sig}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}), U)$, then each $\overline{\delta}_a$ is one-to-one. Hence, the U -fusion classes all have size 1, so $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$. \square

7. ALGORITHMS & EXPERIMENTS

The main goal of this research is to provide a systematic way to simplify hypergraphs using easily computable invariants. In this section we provide an illustration of our technique in practice. Our quotient algorithm is elementary, but we present it in Algorithm 2 for easy reference. A Python implementation of the algorithm is available on GitHub [6].

Algorithm 2 (Frame)



Input: $\mathcal{H} = (V, E) \in \text{HYP}_\ell$.

Output: The frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) \in \text{HYP}_\ell$ of \mathcal{H} .

- 1: $\delta \leftarrow$ generating signal of \mathcal{H} from Algorithm 1
 - 2: $\overline{V} \leftarrow \{\overline{x} \mid x \in V\}$, where $\overline{x} = \{y \in V \mid \delta(x) = \delta(y)\}$
 - 3: $\overline{E} \leftarrow \{\overline{e} \mid e \in E\}$, where $\overline{e}(a) = \overline{e(a)}$ for $a \in [\ell]$.
 - 4: **return** $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) = (\overline{V}, \overline{E})$
-

We tested the algorithm on a range of randomly generated 3-uniform hypergraphs to investigate what features of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} are detected by signals and preserved in the frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$. We also experimented with ℓ -uniform hypergraphs for $\ell > 3$, but 3-uniform hypergraphs already exhibit an interesting range of behaviors and are easier to visualize.

Example 7.1. The 3-uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} in Figure 5 was randomly generated subject to some sparsity constraints. Its frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is depicted in Figure 6. Informally, the frame identifies vertices whose *stars* (the set of hyperedges containing the vertex) are of the same general type.

FIGURE 5. A hypergraph \mathcal{H} on 15 vertices with 10 hyperedges.FIGURE 6. The frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ of the hypergraph \mathcal{H} in Figure 5.

For moderately sparse hypergraphs the frame provides a meaningful simplification. When a hypergraph is too dense, many vertices collapse into a single equivalence class in the quotient, often resulting in near-complete reduction. When it is too sparse, on the other hand, we tend to get very small fusion classes (often of size 1), yielding little to no reduction.




FIGURE 7. Reduction proportion as a function of average hyperedges per vertex for hypergraphs of various sizes.

To quantify this behavior, let us define the *reduction proportion* of hypergraph \mathcal{H} to be the ratio of the number of hyperedges in the frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ to the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H} . The hypergraphs we encounter in the wild are presumably not random, but it is still instructive to see how the reduction proportion behaves on randomly generated hypergraphs of varying sizes and sparsities. We generated random 3-uniform hypergraphs with vertex counts of 50, 100, 150, and 200, varying the number of hyperedges to achieve average hyperedge-per-vertex counts from 2.3 to 3.0. For each combination of vertex count and average hyperedges per vertex, we generated 50 random hypergraphs and computed the average reduction proportion. Figure 7 shows how this reduction proportion varies with the average number of hyperedges per vertex for hypergraphs of different sizes. The figure suggests that meaningful reduction occurs only within a narrow sparsity window.

8. PROPERTIES OF DERIVATION QUOTIENTS

We turn now to the question of what the function $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ does to a hypergraph \mathcal{H} . Let us start by revisiting our favorite 5-vertex hypergraph in Example 6.2. Physically, one can think of the hypergraph $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ on 3 vertices as being obtained from \mathcal{H} by a 2-step folding process: first fold vertex y onto vertex w along the join ux , and then fold x onto v along join uw . The process is depicted in Figure 8.




FIGURE 8. On the left is our familiar hypergraph \mathcal{H} , in the middle is \mathcal{H} folding along the “join” $u-x$, and on the right is $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ obtained from the intermediate hypergraph by folding along the “join” $u-w$.

It turns out that this folding mechanism in the frame of a hypergraph is the consequence of a general phenomenon:

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, E) \in \text{HYP}_\ell$. For distinct $x, y \in V$, suppose there are edges $e, f \in E$ and $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$ satisfying*

$$e^\sigma(1) = x, \quad f(1) = y, \quad e^\sigma(a) = f(a) \text{ for } a \in \{2, \dots, \ell\}.$$

Then $x \equiv_U y$, so $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ in the frame of \mathcal{H} .

Proof. This is immediate from the definition of signal. For $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$, since $U(\delta * e^\sigma) = 0 = U(\delta * f)$, we have $\sum_{a \in [\ell]} \delta_a(e^\sigma(a)) = \sum_{a \in [\ell]} \delta_a(f(a))$. It follows from our assumptions on e, f and σ that $\delta_1(x) = \delta_1(y)$ and hence that $\delta_a(x) = \delta_a(y)$ for all $a \in [\ell]$, so $x \equiv_U y$. \square

It is reasonable to ask whether $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ can always be obtained from \mathcal{H} using a folding process. On the one hand this would provide a neat characterization for what $\mathfrak{F}(-)$ is doing, but on the other hand it would also render the mechanics of

the frame function somewhat dull. Fortunately, this is not the whole story, even for 3-uniform hypergraphs, as Figure 9 demonstrates.




FIGURE 9. On the left is a 3-uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} on 6 vertices with 4 edges. On the right is its frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$. This shows that the operator $\mathfrak{F}(-)$ does not simply “fold up” a given 3-uniform hypergraph along the common “joins” of its edges.

The function \mathfrak{F} can be interpreted as a projection onto a subset STAB_ℓ of hypergraphs that are *stable* under \mathfrak{F} , namely

$$(15) \quad \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F}) := \{ \mathcal{H} \in \text{HYP}_\ell \mid \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{H} \}.$$

By Theorem 6.4, the set $\text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$ is characterized as the image of \mathfrak{F} , but can we recognize when a given \mathcal{H} belongs to $\text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$ without computing $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$? This seems a difficult task in general, but the following result shows how one can easily identify some stable hypergraphs.

Proposition 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, H) \in \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$ and let $z \in V$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = (\hat{V}, \hat{H})$ be any ℓ -uniform hypergraph, where $\hat{V} = V \sqcup W$ with $|W| > 1$ and $\hat{E} = E \sqcup \{\hat{e}\}$ with $\hat{e}(1) = z$ and $\hat{e}(a) \in W$ for $a \in \{2, \dots, \ell\}$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{H}} \in \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{H} = (V, H) \in \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$, by Proposition 6.3 there exists $\delta \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{H}, U)$ with each $\delta_a : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ a one-to-one function. By the converse of that same result it suffices to exhibit $\hat{\delta} \in \text{Sig}(\hat{\mathcal{H}}, U)$ with $\hat{\delta}_1$ one-to-one.

For each $a \in [\ell]$, define $\hat{\delta}_a : \hat{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ as follows. For $x \in V$, put $\hat{\delta}_a(x) = \delta_a(x)$. This ensures that $\hat{\delta}$ satisfies condition (2) for all $e \in E$.

We must now extend $\hat{\delta}_a$ to W so that condition (2) holds for the new edge \hat{e} , namely $\mathbb{C}(\hat{\delta} * \hat{e}^\sigma) = 0$ for each $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(\ell)$. By Lemma 5.3, for each $a \in [\ell]$ there exists $k_a \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $\delta_a(x) - \delta_1(x) = k_a$ for all $x \in V$, so

$$U(\hat{\delta} * \hat{e}^\sigma) = \sum_{a=1}^{\ell} \hat{\delta}_a(\hat{e}^\sigma(a)) = \sum_{a=1}^{\ell} k_a + \sum_{a=1}^{\ell} \hat{\delta}_1(\hat{e}^\sigma(a)).$$

Since the multiset of values $\hat{e}^\sigma(a)$ as a ranges over $[\ell]$ is independent of σ , we may assume that σ is the identity. Putting $k = \delta_a(1) + \sum_{a \in [\ell]} k_a$, we therefore require


$$(16) \quad k + \sum_{a=2}^{\ell} \hat{\delta}_1(\hat{e}(a)) = 0.$$

Fixing $w \in W$, we can freely choose the values of $\hat{\delta}_1(y)$ for all $y \in W - \{w\}$ and then assign $\hat{\delta}_1(w)$ so that equation (16) holds. Furthermore, since $W - \{w\}$ is nonempty and \mathbb{K} is infinite, the values of $\hat{\delta}_1$ on W can be chosen so they are not in $\{\delta_1(x) \mid x \in V\}$ and are distinct from each other.

We can therefore construct $\hat{\delta} \in \text{Sig}(\hat{\mathcal{H}}, U)$ with $\hat{\delta}_1$ a one-to-one function. It follows that $\hat{\mathcal{H}} \in \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$, as required. \square

Remark 8.3. Let us revisit the 3-uniform hypergraph \mathcal{H} and its frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ from Example 7.1. Since $\mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ by Theorem 6.4, we already know that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H}) \in \text{STAB}_\ell(\mathfrak{F})$. Proposition 8.2 provides another way to see this. Indeed, the “triangle” hypergraph on 3 vertices with a single edge containing all vertices is stable (cf. Example 3.3). Using Proposition 8.2 we can successively glue new triangles onto this hypergraph, adding two new vertices and one new hyperedge each time, to create stable “mountain range” hypergraphs of the sort depicted in Figure 6.

Remark 8.4. One can extend Proposition 8.2 in various ways when $\ell > 3$. For example, one can show that 4-uniform graphs \mathcal{H} such as



are stable by proving that new squares can be glued along an edge of an existing square in a stable hypergraph and remain stable.

9. CLOSING REMARKS

In Remark 3.5 we mentioned that signals are restricted versions of the derivations we could possibly use if we treated the given hypergraph as a tensor. Recall that there are two reasons for working with these restricted derivations. The first is that it is easier to interpret the outcomes from a combinatorial perspective. The second, as noted in Remark 3.6, is that it is much faster to compute signals than derivations. Indeed, the specific goal of this paper was to introduce linear invariants of a hypergraph that can be quickly computed, and which capture key features of the hypergraph. While there remain questions to be explored, the main results of the paper achieve the objectives that motivated the work.

However, the signals used in this paper do not detect features of the hypergraph that are detectable by derivations. The space of derivations of a tensor forms a Lie algebra [5, Theorem 8.2] and preliminary experiments with tensors associated to hypergraphs strongly suggest that in many cases the structure of this Lie algebra can be used to recover features of the hypergraph that our methods miss entirely [11]. We mention two such families of 3-uniform hypergraphs.

First, the hypergraph \mathcal{H} in Example 2.5 belongs to a family \mathcal{F}_n of “fans” parameterized by the number n of segments in the fan. Thus, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}_3$ because \mathcal{H} has 3 segments. From Proposition 8.1 we see that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{F}_n) = \mathcal{F}_1$ for all n (we just fold up all of the segments). Thus, our frame function $\mathfrak{F}(-)$ does not distinguish between individual members in the family \mathcal{F}_n , except insofar as the equivalence classes of vertices grow in size. On the other hand, the Lie algebra of derivations of \mathcal{F}_n grows in a predictable way as n increases. More precisely, the derivations of \mathcal{F}_n are representations of a family of simple Lie algebras.

Secondly, the frame $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{H})$ in Example 6 belongs to a family \mathcal{M}_n of “mountain ranges”. It follows from Proposition 8.2 that $\mathcal{M}_n \in \text{STAB}_3(\mathfrak{F})$. In particular, $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ does not distinguish the peaks of the mountains from their bases. On the other hand, these features can (with some effort) be recovered from the Lie algebra structure of its derivations.

Thus, the application of the *full* invariants introduced in [5] to the *tensors* representing hypergraphs provides a fertile area for future research.

Acknowledgments. P.A. Brooksbank was supported by National Science Foundation Grant DMS 2319372. The authors are grateful to Todd Schmid and Lucas Waddell at Bucknell University for fruitful discussions in the development of this work, and to James Wilson at Colorado State University for some helpful suggestions on an early draft of the article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anirban Banerjee and Samiron Parui, *Symmetries of hypergraphs and some invariant subspaces of matrices associated with hypergraphs*, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **726** (2025), 328–358, DOI 10.1016/j.laa.2025.07.030. MR4941857
- [2] ———, *On some building blocks of hypergraphs*, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **73** (2025), no. 7, 1369–1402, DOI 10.1080/03081087.2024.2417213. MR4898769
- [3] Claude Berge, *Hypergraphs*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 45, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989. Combinatorics of finite sets; Translated from the French. MR1013569
- [4] Peter A. Brooksbank, Martin D. Kassabov, and James B. Wilson, *OpenDleto: Algorithms for structure recovery in tensors*, <https://github.com/thetensor-space/OpenDleto>.
- [5] ———, *Detecting null patterns in tensor data*.
- [6] Peter A. Brooksbank and Clara R. Chaplin, *HyperQuotients: Quotients of hypergraphs from linear invariants*, <https://github.com/crc035/Hypergraph-Linear-Invariants>.
- [7] F. Chung, *Spectral Graph Theory*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 92, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [8] Joshua Cooper and Aaron Dutle, *Spectra of uniform hypergraphs*, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **436** (2012), no. 9, 3268–3292, DOI 10.1016/j.laa.2011.11.018. MR2900714
- [9] Uriya First, Joshua Maglione, and James B. Wilson, *A spectral theory for transverse tensor operators* (2020). arXiv:1911.02518.
- [10] Tamara G. Kolda and Brett W. Bader, *Tensor decompositions and applications*, *SIAM Rev.* **51** (2009), no. 3, 455–500, DOI 10.1137/07070111X. MR2535056
- [11] Amaury Miniño and James B. Wilson, *Private communication*.
- [12] Kelly J. Pearson and Tan Zhang, *On spectral hypergraph theory of the adjacency tensor*, *Graphs Combin.* **30** (2014), no. 5, 1233–1248, DOI 10.1007/s00373-013-1340-x. MR3248502

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, LEWISBURG, PA 17837, USA
Email address: pbrooksb@bucknell.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, LEWISBURG, PA 17837, USA
Email address: crc035@bucknell.edu