

A general formula for walk determinants of rooted products with applications to DGS-graph constructions

Wei Wang^{a*} Jie Shen^a Lihuan Mao^b

^aSchool of Mathematics, Physics and Finance, Anhui Polytechnic University, Wuhu 241000, China

^bSchool of Mathematics and Data Science, Shaanxi University of Science and Technology, Xi'an 710021, China

Abstract

For an n -vertex graph G , and a rooted graph $H^{(v)}$ with v as the root, the rooted product graph $G \circ H^{(v)}$ is obtained from G and n copies of H by identifying the root of the i th copy of H with the i th vertex of G for each i . As a refinement of the controllability criterion of $G \circ H^{(v)}$ obtained recently by Shan and Liu (2025), we obtain an explicit formula for the determinant of the walk matrix of $G \circ H^{(v)}$. Furthermore, for an important family of graphs \mathcal{F} that are determined by their generalized spectrum (DGS), we introduce the concept of \mathcal{F} -preservers and provide a sufficient condition for a rooted graph to be an \mathcal{F} -preserver. A list of \mathcal{F} -preservers of small order is provided, which leads to many new infinite families of DGS-graphs using rooted products.

Keywords: walk matrix; rooted product graph; generalized spectrum

Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C50

1 Introduction

Let G be a simple graph with n vertices, and let $M(G)$ be a real symmetric matrix associated with G . Throughout this paper, $M(G)$ may refer to adjacency matrix $A(G)$, signless Laplacian matrix $Q(G)$, and the A_α matrix $A_\alpha(G)$. The characteristic polynomial of $M(G)$, defined as $\det(xI - M(G))$, is called the M -characteristic polynomial of G and is denoted by $\phi(M(G); x)$. The M -walk matrix of G , denoted by $W_M(G)$, or $W(M(G))$, is defined to be the matrix

$$[e, M(G)e, \dots, (M(G))^{n-1}e],$$

where e is the all-ones vector. This particular kind of matrix has received increasing attention in spectral graph theory, as it has deep connection with many important properties of a graph. For example, a theorem of Wang [15] states that if $2^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \det(W_A(G))$ is odd and square-free, then G is determined by its generalized spectrum (DGS). In particular, all graphs G with

*Corresponding author. Email address: wangwei.math@gmail.com




Figure 1: The rooted product graph $C_4 \circ C_3$

$\det W_A(G) = \pm 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ are DGS. For more studies on the walk matrices of graphs, we refer to [2, 4, 8, 9, 14, 16].

Let $H^{(v)}$ be a rooted graph with a root vertex v . The *rooted product graph* of G and $H^{(v)}$, denoted by $G \circ H^{(v)}$ (or simply $G \circ H$ when no confusion arises) is defined as follows: Take n copies of $H^{(v)}$ and identify the root v of the i th copy of $H^{(v)}$ with the i th vertex of G for each i . See Fig. 1 for an illustration. We are interested in the determinant of the walk matrix of the rooted product graph $G \circ H$. We may assume that H is not the trivial graph K_1 as $G \circ K_1 = G$. The first nontrivial result on $\det W(G \circ H)$ is obtained by Mao, Liu and Wang [6], which we state as the following theorem.

Theorem 1 ([6]). *For any graph G ,*

$$\det W_A(G \circ P_2) = \pm(\det A(G))(\det W_A(G))^2.$$

Similar formulas for $\det W_A(G \circ P_3)$ and $\det W_A(G \circ P_4)$ were obtained later by Mao and Wang [7], where the end vertex of P_3 (or P_4) is taken as the root. The general formula for $\det W_A(G \circ P_m)$ was conjectured by Mao and Wang [7] and proved by Wang, Yan and Mao [13]. Recently, Yan and Wang [17] further extended these results to any $P_m^{(\ell)}$, where the vertices of P_m are labeled naturally as $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and the root ℓ can be arbitrary.

Theorem 2 ([17]). *For any graph G and integer $m \geq 2$,*

$$\det W_A(G \circ P_m^{(\ell)}) = \begin{cases} \pm(\det A(G))^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} (\det W_A(G))^m, & \text{if } \gcd(\ell, m+1) = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In [12], Tian et al. considered the Q -analog of the problem and proved that

$$\det W_Q(G \circ P_m) = \pm(\det Q(G))^{m-1}(\det W_Q(G))^2 \text{ for } m = 2, 3. \quad (1)$$

Yan, Wang and Mao [18] extended Eq. (1) for any $m \geq 2$.

Note that all the current results on $\det W(G \circ H^{(v)})$ are restricted to the case where H is the path graph. It seems natural to consider the general case, where H is an arbitrary graph. The main result of this paper is the following theorem, which establishes a general formula for $\det W_M(G \circ H^{(v)})$.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph of order n and $H^{(v)}$ be a rooted graph of order m . Let $B(\lambda) = M(H) + \lambda D_v$ where D_v is the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ with only*

nonzero entry (which is 1) corresponding to the root v . Let $M^{(v)}(H)$ be the matrix obtained from $M(H)$ by deleting the row and the column corresponding to v . Then we have

$$\det W_M(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \pm \left(\text{Res}(\phi(M(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)) \right)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \cdot \det h(M(G)) \cdot (\det W_M(G))^m,$$

where $h(\lambda) = \det W(B(\lambda)) = \det[e, B(\lambda)e, \dots, (B(\lambda))^{m-1}e]$.

A graph G is *M-controllable* if $\det W(M(G)) \neq 0$. Similarly, an $n \times n$ matrix B is *controllable* if $\det W(B) \neq 0$. Note that for two polynomials f and g , the resultant $\text{Res}(f, g)$ is nonzero if and only if $\gcd(f, g) = 1$. Also note that for any matrix M and any polynomial $h(x)$, it holds that $\det h(M) = \prod h(\lambda)$, where λ runs through all eigenvalues of M . An immediate consequence of Theorem 3 is the following necessary and sufficient condition for controllability of $G \circ H^{(v)}$, which was obtained by Shan and Liu [10].

Corollary 1. *The graph $G \circ H^{(v)}$ is M-controllable if and only if the following three conditions hold simultaneously:*

- (i) G is M-controllable;
- (ii) $\gcd(\phi(M(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)) = 1$; and
- (iii) for any eigenvalue λ of $M(G)$, the matrix $B(\lambda)$ is controllable.

We are most interested in Theorem 3 for the case where $M(G)$ refers to the adjacency matrix $A(G)$, as in this setting it gives a way to construct larger DGS-graphs from smaller ones, according to the aforementioned theorem of Wang [15]. It is worthwhile to mention that this construction fails in the setting of generalized Q spectrum; see [12].

For convenience, we introduce an important family of DGS-graphs.

Definition 1. *For an integer n , we define \mathcal{F}_n to be the collection of all n -vertex graphs G such that $\det A(G) = \pm 1$ and $\det W_A(G) = \pm 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$. Define $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup \mathcal{F}_n$.*

We note that \mathcal{F}_n is empty when n is odd, since in this case $\det A(G) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$, contradicting the requirement that $\det A(G) = \pm 1$. On the other hand, for all even $n \geq 6$, the families \mathcal{F}_n are nonempty; see [5, Fig. 1].

We call a rooted graph $H^{(v)}$ an \mathcal{F} -preserver if $G \circ H^{(v)} \in \mathcal{F}$ for any $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Since any graph in \mathcal{F} is DGS by the theorem of Wang [15], it is straightforward to use \mathcal{F} -preservers to construct an infinite family of DGS-graphs. Indeed, let G be any graph in \mathcal{F} and $\{H_i^{(v_i)}\}$ be a sequence of \mathcal{F} -preservers, not necessarily distinct. Then all graphs in the family

$$G, G \circ H_1^{(v_1)}, (G \circ H_1^{(v_1)}) \circ H_2^{(v_2)}, \dots$$

belong to the family \mathcal{F} and hence are DGS. The second main result of this paper is a sufficient condition for a rooted graph to be an \mathcal{F} -preserver, which we state as the following theorem using notation of Theorem 3.

Theorem 4. *A rooted graph $H^{(v)}$ is an \mathcal{F} -preserver if the following three conditions hold simultaneously:*

- (i) $\text{Res}(\phi(A(H); x), \phi(A^{(v)}(H); x)) = \pm 1$;
- (ii) $\det[e, B(\lambda)e, \dots, (B(\lambda))^{m-1}e] = \pm \lambda^k$ for some nonnegative integer k ; and
- (iii) either $\det A(H) = \pm 1$ and $\det A^{(v)}(H) = 0$, or $\det A(H) = 0$ and $\det A^{(v)}(H) = \pm 1$.

2 Proofs of Theorems 3 and 4

Let G be an n -vertex graph and $H^{(v)}$ be an m -vertex rooted graph with root v . We define $B(\lambda) = M(H) + \lambda D_v$, where D_v is the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ with the number 1 corresponding to the root v . Let $M^{(v)}(H)$ be the matrix obtained from $M(H)$ by deleting the row and the column corresponding to the root vertex v . We mention that for adjacency matrix $A(G)$, the matrix $A^{(v)}(H)$ equals $A(H - v)$, where $H - v$ is the vertex-deleted subgraph of H . However, the corresponding equality does not hold for $Q(H)$ in general.

It was observed that $M(G \circ H^{(v)}) = M(H) \otimes I_n + D_v \otimes M(G)$ [10], where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product of matrices. The following lemma characterizes the M -eigenvalues and M -eigenvectors of $G \circ H^{(v)}$, generalizing the well-known result for the A -eigenvalues of $G \circ H^{(v)}$; see [1, 3, 11].

Lemma 1 ([10]). *Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $M(G)$ with corresponding eigenvectors ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n . Let $\mu_i^{(j)}$ ($j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$) be the eigenvalues of $B(\lambda_i) = M(H) + \lambda_i D_v$ with corresponding eigenvectors $\zeta_i^{(j)}$. Denote $\tilde{M} = M(G \circ H^{(v)})$ and $\eta_i^{(j)} = \zeta_i^{(j)} \otimes \xi_i$. Then $\tilde{M} \eta_i^{(j)} = \mu_i^{(j)} \eta_i^{(j)}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.*

Proposition 1. $\det M(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \det((\det M(H)) \cdot I_n + (\det M^{(v)}(H)) \cdot M(G))$.

Proof. Using the notation of Lemma 1, we have

$$\det B(\lambda_i) = \det(M(H) + \lambda_i D_v) = \det M(H) + \lambda_i \det M^{(v)}(H)$$

by the multilinearity of the determinant. Since the determinant of a matrix equals the product of all its eigenvalues, we find that

$$\det M(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^m \mu_i^{(j)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \det B(\lambda_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\det M(H) + \lambda_i \det M^{(v)}(H)).$$

Let $M' = (\det M(H)) \cdot I_n + (\det M^{(v)}(H)) \cdot M(G)$. As $M(G)$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, we see that the eigenvalues of M' are exactly $\det M(H) + \lambda_i \det M^{(v)}(H)$. It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (\det M(H) + \lambda_i \det M^{(v)}(H)) = \det M'.$$

Thus, $\det M(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \det M'$, completing the proof. \square

The following corollary is immediate from Proposition 1.

Corollary 2. *If the rooted graph $H^{(v)}$ satisfies (i) $\det A(H) = \pm 1$ and $\det A^{(v)}(H) = 0$; or (ii) $\det A(H) = 0$ and $\det A^{(v)}(H) = \pm 1$, then $\det A(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \pm 1$ for any graph G with $\det A(G) = \pm 1$.*

Definition 2. Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 x + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_m x^m + b_{m-1} x^{m-1} + \dots + b_1 x + b_0$. The resultant of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, denoted by $\text{Res}(f(x), g(x))$, is defined to be

$$a_n^m b_m^n \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m} (\alpha_i - \beta_j), \quad (2)$$

where α_i 's and β_j 's are the roots (in complex field \mathbb{C}) of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, respectively.

We note that Eq. (2) can be rewritten as

$$a_n^m \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} g(\alpha_i), \text{ or } (-1)^{mn} b_m^n \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} f(\beta_j). \quad (3)$$

We shall use the following basic property of the resultant, which is clear from the second expression in Eq. (3).

Lemma 2. *Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_0 = a_n \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \alpha_i)$ and $g(x) = b_m x^m + \cdots + b_0 = b_m \prod_{j=1}^m (x - \beta_j)$. If $m < n$, then $\text{Res}(f(x) + tg(x), g(x)) = \text{Res}(f(x), g(x))$ for any $t \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Now we turn to the calculation of $\det W(G \circ H^{(v)})$. The basic tool is the following formula which gives the determinant of walk matrix $W(M)$ using the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of M .

Lemma 3 ([6]). *Let M be an $n \times n$ real symmetric matrix. Let λ_i be the eigenvalues of M with corresponding eigenvectors ξ_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then*

$$\det W(M) = \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n} (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1}) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (e_n^T \xi_i)}{\det[\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n]}.$$

Let $\Omega = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ with the colexicographical order: $(i_1, j_1) < (i_2, j_2)$ if either $j_1 < j_2$, or $j_1 = j_2$ and $i_1 < i_2$. The following formula for $\det W(G \circ H^{(v)})$ is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 1 and 3.

Corollary 3.

$$\det W(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \frac{\prod_{(i_1, j_1) < (i_2, j_2)} (\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)}) \prod_{(i, j) \in \Omega} (e_m^T \eta_i^{(j)})}{\det[\eta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(1)}; \dots; \eta_1^{(m)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(m)}]}.$$

Lemma 4 ([17]).

$$\prod_{(i_1, j_1) < (i_2, j_2)} (\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)}) = \pm \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m} \left(\mu_i^{(j_2)} - \mu_i^{(j_1)} \right) \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n} \prod_{j_2=1}^m \prod_{j_1=1}^m \left(\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)} \right) \right).$$

Lemma 5.

$$\prod_{j_2=1}^m \prod_{j_1=1}^m \left(\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)} \right) = (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1})^m \text{Res}(\phi(M(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)).$$

Proof. Note that $\phi(B(\lambda_i); x) = \det(xI - (M(H) + \lambda_i D_v)) = \phi(M(H); x) - \lambda_i \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)$, which is a monic polynomial with roots $\mu_i^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. We find that

$$\phi(M(H); x) - \lambda_i \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x) = \prod_{j_1=1}^m (x - \mu_i^{(j_1)}),$$

and hence

$$\phi(M(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) - \lambda_{i_1} \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) = \prod_{j_1=1}^m (\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)}). \quad (4)$$

As $\phi(M(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) - \lambda_{i_2} \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) = 0$, we see that the left-hand side of Eq. (4) equals

$$(\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1}) \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}),$$

implying

$$\prod_{j_2=1}^m \prod_{j_1=1}^m \left(\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)} \right) = \prod_{j_2=1}^m (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1}) \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) = (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1})^m \prod_{j_2=1}^m \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}). \quad (5)$$

Finally, by the definition of the resultant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j_2=1}^m \phi(M^{(v)}(H); \mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)}) &= \text{Res}(\phi(M(H); x) - \lambda_{i_2} \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)) \\ &= \text{Res}(\phi(M(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact $\deg \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x) < \deg \phi(M(H); x)$. This, together with Eq. (5), completes the proof of Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 6.

$$\det[\eta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(1)}; \dots; \eta_1^{(m)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(m)}] = (\det[\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n])^m \prod_{i=1}^n \det[\zeta_i^{(1)}, \zeta_i^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_i^{(m)}].$$

Proof. Let $E^{(j)} = [\eta_1^{(j)}, \eta_2^{(j)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(j)}]$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Write $\zeta_i^{(j)} = (z_{i,1}^{(j)}, z_{i,2}^{(j)}, \dots, z_{i,m}^{(j)})^T$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(j)} &= \left[\zeta_1^{(j)} \otimes \xi_1, \zeta_2^{(j)} \otimes \xi_2, \dots, \zeta_n^{(j)} \otimes \xi_n \right] \\ &= \left[\begin{bmatrix} z_{1,1}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_1 \\ z_{1,2}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_{1,m}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} z_{2,1}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_2 \\ z_{2,2}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_2 \\ \vdots \\ z_{2,m}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_2 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} z_{n,1}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_n \\ z_{n,2}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_n \\ \vdots \\ z_{n,m}^{(j)} \cdot \xi_n \end{bmatrix} \right] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n] \cdot \text{diag}[z_{1,1}^{(j)}, z_{2,1}^{(j)}, \dots, z_{n,1}^{(j)}] \\ [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n] \cdot \text{diag}[z_{1,2}^{(j)}, z_{2,2}^{(j)}, \dots, z_{n,2}^{(j)}] \\ \vdots \\ [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n] \cdot \text{diag}[z_{1,m}^{(j)}, z_{2,m}^{(j)}, \dots, z_{n,m}^{(j)}] \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

Let $U = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n]$ and $T_{k,j} = \text{diag}[z_{1,k}^{(j)}, z_{2,k}^{(j)}, \dots, z_{n,k}^{(j)}]$ for $k, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Then we can rewrite Eq. (6) as

$$E^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} U \cdot T_{1,j} \\ U \cdot T_{2,j} \\ \vdots \\ U \cdot T_{m,j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U & & & \\ & U & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & U \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_{1,j} \\ T_{2,j} \\ \vdots \\ T_{m,j} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This implies the following identity:

$$[E^{(1)}, E^{(2)}, \dots, E^{(m)}] = \begin{bmatrix} U & & & \\ & U & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & U \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_{1,1} & T_{1,2} & \cdots & T_{1,m} \\ T_{2,1} & T_{2,2} & \cdots & T_{2,m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ T_{m,1} & T_{m,2} & \cdots & T_{m,m} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Since each $T_{k,j}$ is a diagonal matrix, one easily sees that the block matrix $(T_{k,j})$ is permutationally similar to the following block diagonal matrix

$$\text{diag}[[\zeta_1^{(1)}, \zeta_1^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_1^{(m)}], [\zeta_2^{(1)}, \zeta_2^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_2^{(m)}], \dots, [\zeta_n^{(1)}, \zeta_n^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_n^{(m)}]].$$

Thus, taking determinants on both sides of Eq. (7) leads to

$$\det[E^{(1)}, E^{(2)}, \dots, E^{(m)}] = (\det U)^m \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \det[\zeta_i^{(1)}, \zeta_i^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_i^{(m)}].$$

This completes the proof. \square

Now we are in a position to present proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 3 Note that $e_{mn}^T = e_m^T \otimes e_n^T$ and $\eta_i^j = \zeta_i^{(j)} \otimes \xi_i$. By the mixed-product property of Kronecker products, we find that

$$e_{mn}^T \eta_i^j = (e_m^T \otimes e_n^T)(\zeta_i^{(j)} \otimes \xi_i) = (e_m^T \zeta_i^{(j)})(e_n^T \xi_i).$$

Let $\Delta_1 = \text{Res}(\phi(M(H); x), \phi(M^{(v)}(H); x))$. It follows from Corollary 3, Lemmas 4, 5 and 6 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det W_M(G \circ H^{(v)}) \\ &= \frac{\prod_{(i_1, j_1) < (i_2, j_2)} (\mu_{i_2}^{(j_2)} - \mu_{i_1}^{(j_1)}) \prod_{(i, j) \in \Omega} (e_{mn}^T \eta_i^j)}{\det[\eta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(1)}; \dots; \eta_1^{(m)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(m)}]} \\ &= \pm \frac{\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m} (\mu_i^{(j_2)} - \mu_i^{(j_1)}) \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n} (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1})^m \Delta_1 \right) \prod_{(i, j) \in \Omega} ((e_m^T \zeta_i^{(j)})(e_n^T \xi_i))}{(\det[\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n])^m \prod_{i=1}^n \det[\zeta_i^{(1)}, \zeta_i^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_i^{(m)}]} \\ &= \pm \Delta_1^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\prod_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m} (\mu_i^{(j_2)} - \mu_i^{(j_1)}) \prod_{j=1}^m (e_m^T \zeta_i^{(j)})}{\det[\zeta_i^{(1)}, \zeta_i^{(2)}, \dots, \zeta_i^{(m)}]} \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{\prod_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n} (\lambda_{i_2} - \lambda_{i_1}) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (e_n^T \xi_i)}{\det[\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n]} \right)^m. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Let Δ_2 and Δ_3 denote the last two factors of Eq. (8), respectively. Using Lemma 3 for both $W(B(\lambda_i))$ and $W(M(G))$, we find that

$$\Delta_2 = \prod_{i=1}^n \det W(B(\lambda_i)) \text{ and } \Delta_3 = (\det W(M(G)))^m.$$




Figure 2: A 4-vertex graph H

Let $h(\lambda) = \det W(B(\lambda))$. Noting that the eigenvalues of $h(M(G))$ are exactly $h(\lambda_1), \dots, h(\lambda_n)$, we obtain that

$$\Delta_2 = \prod_{i=1}^n h(\lambda_i) = \det h(M(G)).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

Proof of Theorem 4 Let n be even and G be any graph in \mathcal{F}_n . By the definition of \mathcal{F}_n , we know that $\det A(G) = \pm 1$ and $\det W_A(G) = \pm 2^{n/2}$. Suppose that $H^{(v)}$ satisfies all the three conditions of Theorem 4. Clearly, by Corollary 2, we have $\det A(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \pm 1$. Moreover, using Theorem 3, we find that

$$\det W_A(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \pm (\pm 1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \cdot \det(\pm(A(G))^k)(\pm 2^{n/2})^m = \pm 2^{mn/2}.$$

Thus, $G \circ H^{(v)} \in \mathcal{F}$, i.e., $H^{(v)}$ is an \mathcal{F} -preserver. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.

3 Some examples and a conjecture

As an illustration of our main results (Theorems 3 and 4), we consider a specific 4-vertex graph H as shown in Fig. 2 and take the vertex 1 as the root. Direct calculations show that $\phi(A(H); x) = x^4 - 4x^2 - 2x + 1$ and $\phi(A^{(1)}(H); x) = x^3 - 2x$. The resultant of these two polynomials is equal to the determinant of their Sylvester matrix:

$$\text{Res}(\phi(A(H); x), \phi(A^{(1)}(H); x)) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -4 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -4 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -4 & -2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 1.$$

As

$$B(\lambda) = A(H) + \lambda D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$




Figure 3: Graph H_{4t+1}

we obtain

$$W(B(\lambda)) = [e, B(\lambda)e, (B(\lambda))^2e, (B(\lambda))^3e] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda + 2 & \lambda^2 + 2\lambda + 5 & \lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2 + 7\lambda + 10 \\ 1 & 2 & \lambda + 5 & \lambda^2 + 3\lambda + 10 \\ 1 & 3 & \lambda + 5 & \lambda^2 + 3\lambda + 13 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 & \lambda + 5 \end{pmatrix}$$

and hence $\det W(B(\lambda)) = -\lambda^2$. It follows from Theorem 3 that, for this specific rooted graph $H^{(1)}$, we have

$$\det W_A(G \circ H^{(1)}) = \pm(\det A(G))^2(\det W_A(G))^4.$$

Furthermore, as $\det A(H) = 1$ and $\det A^{(1)}(H) = 0$, we find that all conditions of Theorem 4 are satisfied. This implies that the graph $H^{(1)}$ is an \mathcal{F} -preserver. Thus, if G is a graph in \mathcal{F} , then all graphs in the family

$$G, G \circ H^{(1)}, (G \circ H^{(1)}) \circ H^{(1)}, \dots$$

are in \mathcal{F} and hence are DGS by the theorem of Wang [15].

In [17], Yan and Wang consider a family of graphs H_{4t+1} of order $4t+1$, as illustrated in Fig. 3. They conjectured that for $\ell = 2t+1$ or $4t+1$, it holds that

$$\det W_A(G \circ H_{4t+1}^{(\ell)}) = \pm(\det A(G))^{2t}(\det W_A(G))^{4t+1}.$$

(The two cases $\ell = 2t+1$ and $\ell = 4t+1$ are essentially the same as the corresponding two rooted graphs are isomorphic.) Although a complete proof of this conjecture is not available, it can be verified computationally for any fixed integer t based on Theorem 3, through a procedure similar to the one described above.

In the Appendix, we list all \mathcal{F} -preservers with order at most 10 that are found by an exhaustive search based on Theorem 4. The SageMath code for this search is available at https://github.com/wangweiAHPU/walk_det. Remarkably, for all the listed \mathcal{F} -preservers $H^{(v)}$, the determinant of $W_A(G \circ H^{(v)})$ exhibits a unified form dependent solely on the order of H . We propose the following conjecture for future investigation.

Conjecture 1. *If $H^{(v)}$ is an \mathcal{F} -preserver of order m , then for any graph G ,*

$$\det W_A(G \circ H^{(v)}) = \pm(\det A(G))^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor}(\det W_A(G))^m.$$

Declaration of competing interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12001006 and 12101379) and Wuhu Science and Technology Project, China (Grant No. 2024kj015).

References


- [1] C. D. Godsil, B. D. McKay, A new graph product and its spectrum. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 18 (1978) 21–28.
- [2] C. D. Godsil, Controllable subsets in graphs, *Ann. Combin.* 16 (2012) 733–744.
- [3] I. Gutman, Spectral properties of some graphs derived from bipartite graphs. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* 8 (1980) 291–314.
- [4] F. Liu, J. Siemons, Unlocking the walk matrix of a graph, *J. Algebra Combin.* 55(2022) 663–690.
- [5] F. Liu, J. Siemons, W. Wang, New families of graphs determined by their generalized spectrum, *Discrete Math.* 342 (2019) 1108–1112.
- [6] L. Mao, F. Liu, W. Wang, A new method for constructing graphs determined by their generalized spectrum, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 477 (2015) 112–127.
- [7] L. Mao, W. Wang, Generalized spectral characterization of rooted product graphs, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 71 (14) (2023) 2310–2324.
- [8] L. Qiu, Y. Ji, W. Wang, A new arithmetic criterion for graphs being determined by their generalized Q -spectrum, *Discrete Math.* 342 (2019) 2770–2782.
- [9] S. O'Rourke, B. Touri, On a conjecture of Godsil concerning controllable random graphs, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 54 (2016) 3347–3378.
- [10] H. Shan, X. Liu, Exploring graphs with distinct M -eigenvalues: product operation, Wronskian vertices, and controllability, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 373 (2025) 125–136.
- [11] A. J. Schwenk, Computing the characteristic polynomial of a graph, in *Graphs and Combinatorics* (R. Bari and F. Harary, eds.), Springer, Berlin, (1974), pp. 153–172.
- [12] G. Tian, J. Wu, S. Cui, H. Sun, A note on the determinant of a special class of Q -walk matrices, *J. Math. Study* 58 (3) (2025) 275–285.
- [13] W. Wang, Z. Yan, L. Mao, Proof of a conjecture on the determinant of the walk matrix of rooted product with a path, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 72 (5) (2024) 828–840.
- [14] W. Wang, On the Smith normal form of walk matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 612 (2021) 30–41.
- [15] W. Wang, A simple arithmetic criterion for graphs being determined by their generalized spectra, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 122 (2017) 438–451.

- [16] W. Wang, W. Wang, F. Zhu, An improved condition for a graph to be determined by its generalized spectrum, European J. Combin. 108 (2023) 103638.
- [17] Z. Yan, W. Wang, On the determinant of the walk matrix of the rooted product graphs, Comput. Appl. Math. (in press) doi: 10.1007/s40314-025-03584-2.
- [18] Z. Yan, L. Mao, W. Wang, On the determinant of the Q -walk matrix of rooted product with a path, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc. (2024) 47: 174.

Appendix


Table 1: A list of \mathcal{F} -preservers of order ≤ 10

(Solid circles denote root vertices)



(To be continued on next page)

Table 1: A list of \mathcal{F} -preservers of order ≤ 10 (Continued)



(To be continued on next page)

Table 1: A list of \mathcal{F} -preservers of order ≤ 10 (Continued)

