Linear programming bounds for regular graphs

Hiroshi Nozaki

July 15, 2015

Abstract

Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel (1977) used the linear programming method in order to find bounds for the size of spherical codes endowed with prescribed inner products between distinct points in the code. In this paper, we develop the linear programming method to obtain bounds for the number of vertices of connected regular graphs endowed with given distinct eigenvalues. This method is proved by some "dual" technique of the spherical case, motivated from the theory of association scheme. As an application of this bound, we prove that a connected k-regular graph satisfying g > 2d - 1 has the minimum second-largest eigenvalue of all k-regular graphs of the same size, where d is the number of distinct non-trivial eigenvalues, and g is the girth. The known graphs satisfying g > 2d - 1 are Moore graphs, incidence graphs of regular generalized polygons of order (s, s), triangle-free strongly regular graphs, and the odd graph of degree 4.

Key words: linear programming bound, graph spectrum, expander graph, Ramanujan graph, distance-regular graph, Moore graph.

1 Introduction

Delsarte [19] has introduced the linear programming method to find bounds for the size of codes with prescribed distances over finite field. This is called Delsarte's method, and he stated it for codes in certain special association schemes, so called *Q*-polynomial schemes, including the Johnson scheme and the Hamming scheme. Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel [20] gave the linear programming method on the Euclidean sphere. This is naturally generalized to the compact two-point homogeneous spaces [35]. Delsarte's method is also extended to various situations like the permutation codes [49], the Grassmannian codes [4], or the ordered codes [8]. The linear programming is very powerful to solve optimization problems, for instance maximizing the size of codes for given distances [43, 41], or maximizing the minimum distance for a fixed cardinality [37, 15]. In the present paper, we develop the linear programming method is not based on Delsarte's but a kind of "dual" technique of the spherical case inspired from the theory of association schemes.

Let X be a finite set, and R_0, \ldots, R_d symmetric binary relations on X. The *i*-th adjacency matrix A_i is defined to be the matrix indexed by X whose (x, y)-entry is 1 if $(x, y) \in R_i$,

²⁰¹⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification: 90C05, (05D05).

Hiroshi Nozaki: Department of Mathematics, Aichi University of Education 1 Hirosawa, Igaya-cho, Kariya, Aichi 448-8542, Japan. hnozaki@auecc.aichi-edu.ac.jp

0 otherwise. A configuration $\mathfrak{X} = (X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$ is called a symmetric association scheme of class d if $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^d$ satisfies the following: (1) $A_0 = I$ (identity matrix), (2) $\sum_{i=0}^d A_i = J$ (all-ones matrix), (3) there exist real numbers p_{ij}^k such that $A_i A_j = \sum_{k=0}^d p_{ij}^k A_k$ for all $i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$. The vector space \mathfrak{A} spanned by $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^d$ over \mathbb{C} forms a commutative algebra, and it is called the *Bose–Mesner algebra* of \mathfrak{X} . It is well known that \mathfrak{A} is semi-simple [6, Section 2.3, II], hence it has the primitive idempotents $E_0 = (1/|X|)J, E_1, \ldots, E_d$, which form a basis of \mathfrak{A} .

We have two remarkable classes of association schemes so called *P*-polynomial association schemes and *Q*-polynomial association schemes. An association scheme is said to be *P*polynomial if for each $i \in \{0, 1, ..., d\}$ there exists a polynomial v_i of degree i such that $A_i = v_i(A_1)$. A *P*-polynomial scheme has the relations as the path distances of the graph (X, R_1) , and (X, R_1) becomes a distance-regular graph [11]. An association scheme is said to be *Q*-polynomial if for each $i \in \{0, 1, ..., d\}$ there exists a polynomial v_i^* of degree isuch that $|X| \mathbf{E}_i = v_i^*(|X| \mathbf{E}_1^\circ)$, where \circ means the multiplication is the entry-wise product. Roughly speaking, the *P*-polynomial schemes and the *Q*-polynomial schemes correspond to discrete cases of the concepts of two-point homogeneous spaces and rank 1 symmetric spaces, respectively [6, Section 3.6, III], [16, Chapter 9].

By swapping the matrix multiplication \cdot and the entry-wise multiplication \circ , the bases $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^d$ and $\{E_i\}_{i=0}^d$ very similarly behave in the Bose–Mesner algebra. The following are basic equations for the bases [6, Section 2.2, 2.3, II]:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d} \boldsymbol{A}_{i} = \boldsymbol{J} = |X|\boldsymbol{E}_{0}, \qquad \qquad \sum_{i=0}^{d} \boldsymbol{E}_{i} = \boldsymbol{I} = \boldsymbol{A}_{0}, \qquad (1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{i} \circ \boldsymbol{A}_{j} = \delta_{ij} \boldsymbol{A}_{i}, \qquad \qquad \boldsymbol{E}_{i} \cdot \boldsymbol{E}_{j} = \delta_{ij} \boldsymbol{E}_{i}, \qquad (2)$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{i} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}_{j} = \sum_{k=0}^{a} p_{ij}^{k} \boldsymbol{A}_{k}, \qquad \boldsymbol{E}_{i} \circ \boldsymbol{E}_{j} = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=0}^{a} q_{ij}^{k} \boldsymbol{E}_{k}, \qquad (3)$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{i} = \sum_{j=0}^{a} P_{i}(j) \boldsymbol{E}_{j}, \qquad \qquad \boldsymbol{E}_{i} = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{j=0}^{a} Q_{i}(j) \boldsymbol{A}_{j}, \qquad (4)$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{J} = k_i \boldsymbol{J}, \qquad |X| \boldsymbol{E}_i \circ \boldsymbol{I} = m_i \boldsymbol{I}, \qquad (5)$$

where δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta, $\tau(\mathbf{M})$ denotes the summation of all entries in \mathbf{M} , k_i is the degree of the graph (X, R_i) , and m_i is the rank of \mathbf{E}_i . Here p_{ij}^k is called the *intersection* number, and it is equal to the size of $\{z \in X \mid (x, z) \in R_i, (z, y) \in R_j\}$ with $(x, y) \in R_k$. Naturally p_{ij}^k is a non-negative integer. On the other hand, q_{ij}^k is called the *Krein number*, it can be proved that it is a non-negative real number [46]. Such a kind of similar properties obtained by swapping \mathbf{A}_i , \mathbf{E}_i , multiplications, and corresponding parameters is called a *dual* property. It is obviously seen that the dual concept of P-polynomial scheme is Q-polynomial scheme. There are a number of non-trivial dual properties between P-polynomial schemes and Q-polynomial schemes [39, 6], and several conjectures are still left [39].

regular graph	spherical set	reason
A: adjacency matrix	E: Gram matrix	bases
k: degree	m: dimension	(5),(7)
regular	spherical	(5)
eigenvalues	inner products	(4)
connected	constant weight	(9)
no loop	spherical 1-design	(6)
no multiple edge	spherical 2-design	(2)
au	tr	(7), (8)
Moore graph	tight spherical design	tightness
$F_i^{(k)}(x)$	$\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}(x)$	
$F_i^{(k)}(x)$ $\operatorname{tr}(F_i^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{A})) \ge 0$ $\operatorname{tr}(F_i^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{A})) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \le i \le g-1$	$ au(\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{E}^\circ)) \ge 0$	[48, 20]
$tr(F_i^{(k)}(A)) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \le i \le g - 1$	$\tau(\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{E}^\circ)) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \le i \le t$	
$\Leftrightarrow \text{girth } g$	\Leftrightarrow spherical <i>t</i> -design	[48, 20]

Table 1: Dual properties between regular graph and spherical set

The matrix A_i is regarded as a regular graph. The matrix E_i is positive semidefinite with equal diagonals, and it is interpreted as a spherical set. We can observe the dual relationship of A_i and E_i in the Bose–Mesner algebra, and it shows how properties of graphs dually correspond to those of spherical sets. For example, (4) says that eigenvalues of graphs dually correspond to inner products in spherical sets. Table 1 shows the dual correspondence of the properties of graphs and spherical sets.

We can interpret the Euclidean sphere S^{m-1} as a continuous case of Q-polynomial scheme. The polynomial v_i^* on a Q-polynomial scheme corresponds to the Gegenbauer polynomial $\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}$ on S^{m-1} [20]. We have fundamental parameters s and t for a finite subset X in S^{m-1} . The parameter s is just the number of the Euclidean distances between distinct points in X. If X has only s distances, then we have

$$|X| \le \binom{m+s-1}{s} + \binom{m+s-2}{s-1}.$$
(10)

The other parameter t is the strength in the sense of spherical design. We call X a spherical t-design if for any polynomial f in m variables of degree at most t the following equation holds:

$$\frac{1}{|S^{m-1}|} \int_{S^{m-1}} f(x) dx = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} f(x),$$

where $|S^{m-1}|$ is the volume of S^{m-1} . One of unexpected results is that if $t \ge 2s - 2$ holds, then X has the structure of a Q-polynomial scheme with the relations of distances [20]. For a spherical 2*e*-design X in S^{m-1} , we have an absolute bound [20]:

$$|X| \ge \binom{m+e-1}{e} + \binom{m+e-2}{e-1}.$$

A spherical design is said to be *tight* if it attains this equality. A tight design satisfies t = 2s [20], and hence it becomes a Q-polynomial scheme. A tight design also attains the bound (10). Moreover the polynomial v_i^* of a tight design coincides with $Q_i^{(m)}$.

For connected regular graph, we have a very similar situation to the above argument on the sphere. Let G be a connected k-regular graph with v vertices. Throughout this paper, we assume a graph is simple. Since a graph with d+1 distinct eigenvalues is of diameter at most d, we can change the assumption of the Moore bound to the number of eigenvalues. Namely if G has only d+1 distinct eigenvalues, then we have

$$v \le 1 + k \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (k-1)^j.$$

If equality holds, then G is called a *Moore graph*. Tutte [50] showed that if G is of girth 2e+1, then we have

$$v \ge 1 + k \sum_{j=0}^{e-1} (k-1)^j.$$

The graph that attains this equality becomes a Moore graph. It is well known that a Moore graph is distance-regular. Actually we can show that if $g \ge 2d - 1$ holds, then G is distance-regular (Theorem 6). Let $F_i^{(k)}$ be the polynomial of degree *i* defined by (11) and (12) in Section 2. The polynomial v_i of a k-regular Moore graph coincides with $F_i^{(k)}$. Apparently the dual concept of tight spherical design is Moore graph, and the polynomial $F_i^{(k)}$ dually corresponds to the Gegenbauer polynomial $\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}$. The linear programming method for spherical codes is essentially based on the positive

The linear programming method for spherical codes is essentially based on the positive definiteness of the Gegenbauer polynomials, namely $\tau(\mathcal{Q}_i^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{E}^\circ)) \geq 0$, where \boldsymbol{E} is the Gram matrix. In this paper, we dually show the linear programming method for connected regular graphs by using the property $\operatorname{tr}(F_i^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{A})) \geq 0$, where \boldsymbol{A} is the adjacency matrix.

We can apply the linear programming method for determining the graph maximizing the spectral gap. The spectral gap of a graph is the difference between the first and second largest eigenvalues of the graph. The edge expansion ratio h(G) of a k-regular graph G = (V, E) is defined as

$$h(G) = \min_{S \subset V, |S| \le |V|/2} \frac{|\partial S|}{|S|},$$

where $\partial S = \{\{u, v\} \mid u \in S, v \in V \setminus S, \{u, v\} \in E\}$. By the spectral gap τ of G, we have $\tau/2 \leq h(G) \leq \sqrt{2k\tau}$ [2, 3, 21]. This implies that a graph with large spectral gap has high connectivity. The second-largest eigenvalue cannot be much smaller than $2\sqrt{k-1}$ [2]. Ramanujan graphs have an asymptotically smallest possible second-largest eigenvalue (see [33]). Several regular graphs with very small second-largest eigenvalues are determined (see [36]).

The dual concept of the graphs maximizing the spectral gap is well known as optimal spherical code in the sense of maximizing the minimum distance. The optimal configurations of n points on S^2 are known only for $n \leq 13$, and n = 24 [22, Chapter 3], [42]. For higher dimensions, the linear or semidefinite programming bound determined many optimal codes [37, 15, 5]. In particular, we have a strong theorem using the parameters s and t, namely if $t \geq 2s - 1$ holds, then the set is optimal [37, 15]. In the present paper, as the dual theorem of it, we prove that a connected k-regular graph satisfying $g \geq 2d$ has the minimum second-largest eigenvalue of all k-regular graphs of the same size, where d is the number of distinct non-trivial eigenvalues, and g is the girth.

2 Linear programming method

In the present section, we give the linear programming bounds for connected regular graphs. First let us introduce certain polynomials $F_i^{(k)}(x)$ which play a key role in the linear programming method. Indeed $F_i^{(k)}(x)$ is the polynomial attached to the homogeneous tree of degree k, which is an infinite distance-regular graph.

A graph G = (V, E) is said to be *locally finite* if the degree of any vertex is finite. We also consider an infinite graph here. A *path* in a graph is a sequence of vertices, where any two consecutive vertices are connected. Let d(x, y) be the shortest path distance from $x \in V$ to $y \in V$. The *i*-th distance matrix A_i of G is defined to be the matrix indexed by V whose (x, y)-entry is 1 if d(x, y) = i, 0 otherwise. In particular A_1 is called the *adjacency matrix* of G.

A locally finite graph G = (V, E) is called a *distance-regular graph* if for any choice of $x, y \in V$ with d(x, y) = k, the number of vertices $z \in V$ such that d(x, z) = i, d(z, y) = j is independent of the choice x, y. For $x, y \in V$ with d(x, y) = k, the number $p_{ij}^k = |\{z \in V | d(x, z) = i, d(z, y) = j\}|$ is called the *intersection number* of a distance-regular graph. We use the notation $a_i = p_{1,i}^i$, $b_i = p_{1,i+1}^i$, and $c_i = p_{1,i-1}^i$. The *intersection array* of a distance-regular graph is defined to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & c_1 & c_2 & \cdots \\ a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots \\ b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & \cdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix A_i of a distance-regular graph can be written as the polynomial v_i in A_1 of degree i [11, page 127], where v_i is defined by

$$v_0(x) = 1,$$
 $v_1(x) = x,$
 $c_{i+1}v_{i+1}(x) = (x - a_i)v_i(x) - b_{i-1}v_{i-1}(x)$ $(i = 1, 2, ...).$

A homogeneous tree of degree k is an infinite distance-regular graph with intersection numbers

$$b_0 = k$$
, $b_i = k - 1(i = 1, 2, ...)$, $c_i = 1(i = 1, 2, ...)$, $a_i = 0(i = 0, 1, 2, ...)$.

Let $F_i^{(k)}$ denote a polynomial of degree *i* defined by:

$$F_0^{(k)}(x) = 1, \qquad F_1^{(k)}(x) = x, \qquad F_2^{(k)}(x) = x^2 - k,$$
 (11)

and

$$F_i^{(k)}(x) = x F_{i-1}^{(k)}(x) - (k-1) F_{i-2}^{(k)}(x)$$
(12)

for $i \geq 3$. Let $q = \sqrt{k-1}$. The polynomials $F_i^{(k)}$ form a sequence of orthogonal polynomials with respect to the weight

$$w(x) = \frac{\sqrt{4q^2 - x^2}}{k^2 - x^2} \tag{13}$$

on the interval [-2q, 2q] (see [34, Section 4]). Note that $F_i^{(k)}(k) = k(k-1)^{i-1}$ for any $i \ge 1$.

A path $u_0 \sim u_1 \sim \cdots \sim u_p$ is said to be *reducible* if any sequence $u_i \sim u_j \sim u_i$ appears [48]. A path is said to be *irreducible* if the path is not reducible.

Theorem 1 ([48]). Let G be a connected k-regular graph with adjacency matrix A. Then the (u, v)-entry of $F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A})$ is the number of irreducible paths of length i from u to v.

By Theorem 1, the following is obvious.

Corollary 1. Let G be a connected k-regular graph with adjacency matrix A. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1) $\operatorname{tr}(F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A})) = 0$ for each $1 \le i \le g 1$, and $\operatorname{tr}(F_g^{(k)}(\mathbf{A})) \ne 0$.
- (2) G is of girth g.

The following is the linear programming bound for connected regular graphs.

Theorem 2. Let G be a connected k-regular graph with v vertices. Let $\tau_0 = k, \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_d$ be the distinct eigenvalues of G. Suppose there exists a polynomial $f(x) = \sum_{i\geq 0} f_i F_i^{(k)}(x)$ such that f(k) > 0, $f(\tau_i) \leq 0$ for any $i \geq 1$, $f_0 > 0$, and $f_i \geq 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. Then we have

$$v \le \frac{f(k)}{f_0}.\tag{14}$$

Proof. Let **A** be the adjacency matrix of G. From the spectral decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=0}^{d} \tau_i \mathbf{E}_i$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{a} f(\tau_i) \mathbf{E}_i = f(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i \ge 0} f_i F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}) = f_0 \mathbf{I} + \sum_{i \ge 1} f_i F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}).$$
(15)

Taking the traces in (15), we have

$$f(k) = \operatorname{tr}(f(k)\boldsymbol{E}_0) \ge \operatorname{tr}(\sum_{i=0}^d f(\tau_i)\boldsymbol{E}_i) = \operatorname{tr}(f_0\boldsymbol{I} + \sum_{i\ge 1} f_i F_i^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{A})) \ge \operatorname{tr}(f_0\boldsymbol{I}) = vf_0.$$

fore we have $v \le f(k)/f_0.$

Therefore we have $v \leq f(k)/f_0$.

Remark 1. We can normalize $f_0 = 1$ in Theorem 2.

Remark 2. Let f be a polynomial which satisfies the condition in Theorem 2. The equality holds in (14) if and only if $f_i \operatorname{tr}(F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A})) = 0$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, \operatorname{deg}(f)$, and $f(\tau_i) = 0$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, d$. In particular, if $f_i > 0$ for any i, then the girth of G is at least $\operatorname{deg}(f) + 1$ by Corollary 1.

Remark 3. Theorem 2 can be expressed as the following linear programming problem and its dual.

$$v \le \max_{m_i} \left\{ 1 + m_1 + \dots + m_d \mid \begin{array}{c} -\sum_{i=1}^d m_i F_j^{(k)}(\tau_i) \le F_j^{(k)}(k), \quad j = 1, \dots, u, \\ m_i \ge 0, \qquad i = 1, \dots, d \end{array} \right\},$$
$$v \le \min_{f_j} \left\{ 1 + f_1 F_1^{(k)}(k) + \dots + f_u F_u^{(k)}(k) \mid \begin{array}{c} -\sum_{j=1}^u f_j F_j^{(k)}(\tau_i) \ge 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \\ f_j \ge 0, \qquad j = 1, \dots, u \end{array} \right\},$$

where u is the degree of f, m_i is the multiplicity of τ_i and $f_0 = 1$.

Remark 4. Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel [20] gave the linear programming bounds for spherical codes by using inner products and Gegenbauer polynomials, instead of eigenvalues and $F_i^{(k)}$. This is the dual version of Theorem 2.

3 Minimizing the second-largest eigenvalue

For fixed v and k, a graph G is said to be *extremal expander* if G has the minimum secondlargest eigenvalue in all k-regular graphs of order v. A disconnected graph is not extremal expander, because the first and second largest eigenvalues are equal. In the present section, we obtain extremal expander graphs for several v and k by applying the linear programming method. First we give several results related to $F_i^{(k)}(x)$.

Theorem 3. Let $F_i^{(k)}(x)F_j^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{i+j} p_l(i,j)F_l^{(k)}(x)$ for real numbers $p_l(i,j)$. Then we have $p_0(i,j) = F_i^{(k)}(k)\delta_{ij}$ and $p_l(i,j) \ge 0$ for all l, i, j. Moreover $p_l(i,j) > 0$ if and only if $|i-j| \le l \le i+j$ and $l \equiv i+j \pmod{2}$.

Proof. Let T_k be a homogeneous tree of degree k. Let A_i be the *i*-th distance matrix of T_k , and p_{ij}^k the intersection number of T_k . Since $F_i^{(k)}(x)$ is the polynomial attached to T_k , we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{i+j} p_l(i,j) \mathbf{A}_l = \sum_{l=0}^{i+j} p_l(i,j) F_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}_1) = F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}_1) F_j^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}_1) = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = \sum_{l=0}^{i+j} p_{ij}^l \mathbf{A}_l.$$
(16)

Clearly $p_l(i, j) = p_{ij}^l$ holds. This theorem now follows by a counting argument.

Since
$$F_{i+1}^{(k)}(k) - (k-1)F_i^{(k)}(k) = 0$$
 holds, let $G_i^{(k)}(x)$ denote the polynomial of degree i

$$G_i^{(k)}(x) = \frac{F_{i+1}^{(k)}(x) - (k-1)F_i^{(k)}(x)}{x-k}$$

for any $i \ge 1$, and $G_0^{(k)}(x) = 1$. By the three-term recurrence relation (12), it holds that

$$G_i^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^i F_j^{(k)}(x)$$

From Lemmas 3.3, 3.5 in [15], G_0, G_1, \ldots are monic orthogonal polynomials with respect to the positive weight u(x) = (k - x)w(x) on the interval [-2q, 2q], where w(x) is defined in (13).

Theorem 4 ([15, Theorem 3.1]). Let p_0, p_1, \ldots be monic orthogonal polynomials with $\deg(p_i) = i$. Then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the polynomial $p_n + \alpha p_{n-1}$ has n distinct real roots $r_1 < \cdots < r_n$. Moreover for k < n, $\prod_{i=1}^{k} (x - r_i)$ has positive coefficients in terms of $p_0(x), p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)$.

The following is a key theorem.

Theorem 5. Let G be a connected k-regular graph of girth g. Assume the number of distinct eigenvalues of G is d + 1. If $g \ge 2d$ holds, then G is an extremal expander graph.

Proof. Let $\tau_0 = k > \tau_1 > \ldots > \tau_d$ be the distinct eigenvalues of G. We show the polynomial

$$f(x) = (x - \tau_1) \prod_{i=2}^{d} (x - \tau_i)^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{2d-1} f_i F_i^{(k)}(x)$$

satisfies the condition in Theorem 2. It trivially holds that f(k) > 0, and $f(\tau_i) = 0$ for any $i=1,\ldots,d.$

Let A be the adjacency matrix of G. If the diameter of G is greater than d, then the number of distinct eigenvalues is greater than d+1. Thus the diameter of G is at most d. Since $q \geq 2d$ holds, the diameter is exactly d. Then G partially has the structure of a homogeneous tree around any vertex, namely $F_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}_i$ for any $i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$. Because the Hoffman polynomial [31] of G is of degree d, there exists a natural number e such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} F_i^{(k)}(A) + \frac{1}{e} F_d^{(k)}(A) = J,$$

where J is the all-ones matrix. Note that the roots of the Hoffman polynomial P(x) = $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} F_i^{(k)}(x) + (1/e)F_d^{(k)}(x)$ are the non-trivial distinct eigenvalues of G [31]. For some positive constant number c, the polynomial f(x) can be expressed as

$$f(x) = \frac{cP(x)^2}{x - \tau_1} = \frac{c}{e} \frac{G_d^{(k)}(x) - (1 - e)G_{d-1}^{(k)}(x)}{x - \tau_1} P(x).$$

By Theorem 4, $g(x) = (G_d^{(k)}(x) - (1-e)G_{d-1}^{(k)}(x))/(x-\tau_1)$ has positive coefficients in terms of $G_0^{(k)}(x), G_1^{(k)}(x), \dots, G_{d-1}^{(k)}(x)$. This implies that g(x) has positive coefficients in terms of $F_0^{(k)}(x), F_1^{(k)}(x), \ldots, F_{d-1}^{(k)}(x)$. By Theorem 3, it is shown that f(x) has positive coefficients in terms of $F_0^{(k)}(x), F_1^{(k)}(x), \ldots, F_{2d-1}^{(k)}(x)$. Thus f(x) satisfies the condition in Theorem 2.

By Remark 2, G attains the linear programming bound obtained from f(x). Assume there exists a graph G' such that its second-largest eigenvalue is smaller than τ_1 , and it has the same number of vertices as G. Then G' also attains the linear programming bound obtained from f(x). By Remark 2, G' has only d distinct eigenvalues, and the girth of G' is at least 2d. Therefore G' is of diameter at least d, it contradicts that the number of distinct eigenvalues of G' is greater than d. Thus G is an extremal expander graph.

Remark 5. Levenshtein [37] proved that a spherical s-distance set of strength t satisfying $t \geq 2s - 1$ is an optimal spherical code in the sense of maximizing the minimum distance. This result is the dual version of Theorem 5. Cohn and Kumar [15] extended this result to universally optimal codes.

We characterize connected regular graphs satisfying $g \ge 2d$ as follows.

Theorem 6. Let G be a connected k-regular graph of girth g, and with only d + 1 distinct eigenvalues. If $g \ge 2d - 1$ holds, then G is a distance-regular graph of diameter d.

Proof. Brouwer and Haemers [12] proved that a graph with the spectrum of a distance-regular graph with diameter D and girth at least 2D - 1, is such a graph. The proof in [12] used the fact that regularity, connectedness, girth, and diameter of a graph are determined by the spectrum. Therefore the theorem of Brouwer and Haemers is interpreted as that a connected regular graph with $g \ge 2D - 1$ is distance-regular. In general we have $d \ge D$. Therefore in our condition, $g \ge 2d - 1 \ge 2D - 1$ holds, and G is distance-regular. Since G is distance-regular, d is equal to the diameter [11, Section 4.1].

Abiad, Van Dam, and Fiol [1] proved Theorem 6 independently.

Table 2: Extremal expander graphs					
v	k	g	Eigenvalues	Name	
g	2	g	$2\cos(2k\pi/n); 1 \le k \le n-1$	g -cycle C_g	
k+1	k	3	0	complete K_{k+1}	
2k	k	4	0,-k	comp. bipartite $K_{k,k}$	
$\begin{array}{c} 2\sum_{i=0}^{2}q^{i} \\ 2\sum_{i=0}^{3}q^{i} \\ 2\sum_{i=0}^{5}q^{i} \end{array}$	q+1	6	$\pm\sqrt{q}, -(q+1)$	inc. graph of $PG(2,q)$ [48, 11]	
$2\sum_{i=0}^{3}q^{i}$	q+1	8	$\pm \sqrt{2q}, 0, -(q+1)$	inc. graph of $GQ(q,q)$ [9, 11]	
$2\sum_{i=0}^{5}q^{i}$	q+1	12	$\pm\sqrt{3q},\pm\sqrt{q},0,-(q+1)$	inc. graph of $GH(q,q)$ [9, 11]	
10	3	5	$1^5, (-2)^4$	Petersen [32]	
50	7	5	$2^{28}, (-3)^{21}$	Hoffman–Singleton [32]	
35	4	6	$2^{14}, (-1)^{14}, (-3)^{6}$	Odd graph [40]	
16	5	4	$1^{10}, (-3)^5$	Clebsch [47, 25]	
56	10	4	$2^{35}, (-4)^{20}$	Gewirtz [12, 25]	
77	16	4	$2^{55}, (-6)^{21}$	M_{22} [30, 25]	
100	22	4	$2^{77}, (-8)^{22}$	Higman–Sims $[30, 25]$	
DC(2, x), and institute allows $CO(x, x)$, and and the set of t					

PG(2,q): projective plane, GQ(q,q): generalized quadrangle, GH(q,q): generalized hexagon, q: prime power

Remark 6. Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel [20] proved that a spherical s-distance set of strength t satisfying $t \ge 2s - 2$ has the structure of a Q-polynomial association scheme. This result is the dual version of Theorem 6.

The distance-regular graph with $g \ge 2d$ is called a *Moore polygon* [18] and it has the following intersection array:

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & k-c \\ k & k-1 & k-1 & \cdots & k-1 & * \end{pmatrix},$$

where c is a natural number. If c = 1, then the graph is a Moore graph and it does not exist for $d \ge 3$ (with $k \ge 3$) [7, 17]. If c = k, then the graph is an incidence graph of a regular generalized polygon of order (s, s) [11, Section 6.9], and it does not exist for $d \ge 7$ (with $k \ge 3$) [23]. If $c \ne 1, k$, then the graph is called a *non-trivial* Moore polygon, and it does not exist for $d \ge 6$ [18]. Strongly regular graphs of girth 4 are non-trivial Moore polygons.

Table 2 shows known examples of extremal expander graphs satisfying $g \ge 2d$. The following graphs are unique: Petersen graph [32], Hoffman–Singleton graph [32], Odd graph [40], Clebsch graph [26, Theorem 10.6.4], Gewirtz graph [24], M_{22} graph [10], Higman–Sims graph [24], PG(2,q) for $q \le 8$ [38, 27, 29], GQ(q,q) for $q \le 4$ [44, 45], and GH(2,2) [14]. For PG(2,9), there are four non-isomorphic graphs [28, 51]. The uniqueness of other examples in Table 2 is open.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Noga Alon, Eiichi Bannai, Tatsuro Ito, Jack Koolen, Hajime Tanaka, Sho Suda, and Masato Mimura for useful information and comments. The author is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 25800011, 26400003.

References

- Abiad, A., Van Dam, E.R., Fiol, M.A.: Some spectral and quasi-spectral Characterizations of distance-regular graphs. arXiv:1404.3973.
- [2] Alon, N.: Eigenvalues and expanders. Combinatorica 6, 83–96 (1986).
- [3] Alon, N., Milman, V.D.: λ₁, isoperimetric inequalities for graphs, and superconcentrators.
 J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 38, 73–88 (1985).
- Bachoc, C.: Linear programming bounds for codes in Grassmannian spaces. IEEE Trans. Inf. Th. 52, 2111–2125 (2006).
- [5] Bachoc, C., Vallentin, F.: Optimality and uniqueness of the (4, 10, 1/6) spherical code. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 116 (1), 195–204 (2009).
- [6] Bannai, E., Ito, T.: Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, (1984).
- [7] Bannai, E., Ito, T.: On finite Moore graphs. J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Ser. A 20, 191–208 (1973).
- [8] Barg, A., Purkayastha, P.: Bounds on ordered codes and orthogonal arrays. Mosc. Math. J. 9, 211–243 (2009).
- [9] Benson, C.T.: Minimal regular graphs of girths eight and twelve. Canad. J. Math. 18, 1091–1094 (1966).
- [10] Brouwer, A.E.: The uniqueness of the strongly regular graph on 77 points. J. Graph Theory 7 (4), 455–461 (1983).
- [11] Brouwer, A.E., Cohen, A.M., Neumaier, A.: Distance-regular Graphs. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1989).
- [12] Brouwer, A.E., Haemers, W.H.: The Gewirtz graph: an exercise in the theory of graph spectra. European J. Combin. 14, 397–407 (1993).
- [13] Brouwer, A.E., Haemers, W.H.: Spectra of Graphs. Universitext, Springer, New York, (2012).
- [14] Cohen, A.M., Tits, J.: On generalized hexagons and a near octagon whose lines have three points. European J. Combin. 6, 13–27 (1985).
- [15] Cohn, H., Kumar, A.: Universally optimal distribution of points on spheres. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 20 (1), 99–184 (2007).
- [16] Conway, J.H., Sloane, N.J.A.: Sphere packings, lattices and groups, Third edition. Springer-Verlag, New York, (1999).
- [17] Damerell, R.M.: On Moore graphs. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 74, 227–236 (1973).
- [18] Damerell, R.M., Georgiacodis, M.A.: On the maximum diameter of a class of distanceregular graphs. Bull. London Math. Soc. 13, 316–322 (1981).

- [19] Delsarte, P.: An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory. Philips Research Repts Suppl. 10, 1–97 (1973).
- [20] Delsarte, P., Goethals, J.M., Seidel, J.J.: Spherical codes and designs. Geom. Dedicata 6 (3), 363–388 (1977).
- [21] Dodziuk, J.: Difference equations, isoperimetric inequality and transience of certain random walks. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 284, 787–794 (1984).
- [22] Ericson, T., Zinoviev, V.: Codes on Euclidean spheres. North-Holland Mathematical Library, 63. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, (2001).
- [23] Feit, W., Higman, G.: The nonexistence of certain generalized polygons. J. Algebra 1, 114–131 (1964).
- [24] Gewirtz, A.: Graphs with maximal even girth. Canad. J. Math. 21, 915–934 (1969).
- [25] Godsil, C.D.: Problems in algebraic combinatorics. Electron. J. Combin. 2 #F1, 20 pages (1995).
- [26] Godsil, C., Royle, G.: Algebraic graph theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 207, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2001).
- [27] Hall, M.Jr.: Uniqueness of the projective plane with 57 points. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 4, 912–916 (1953).
- [28] Hall, M.Jr., Swift, J.D., Killgrove, R.: On projective planes of order nine. Math. Tables Aids Comput. 13, 233–246 (1959).
- [29] Hall, M.Jr., Swift, J.D., Walker, R.J.: Uniqueness of the projective plane of order eight. Math. Tables Aids Comput. 10, 186–194 (1956).
- [30] Higman, D.G., Sims, C.C.: A simple group of order 44,352,000. Math. Z. 105, 110–113 (1968).
- [31] Hoffman, A.J.: On the polynomial of a graph. Amer. Math. Monthly **70**, 30–36 (1963).
- [32] Hoffman, A.J., Singleton, R.R.: On Moore graphs with diameters 2 and 3. IBM J. Res. Develop. 4, 497–504 (1960).
- [33] Hoory, S., Linial, N., Wigderson, A.: Expander graphs and their applications. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 43, 439–561 (2006).
- [34] Hora, A., Obata, N.: Quantum probability and spectral analysis of graphs. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, Springer, Berlin, (2007).
- [35] Kabatiansky, G.A., Levenshtein, V.I.: Bounds for packings on a sphere and in space. Probl. Peredachi Inf. 14, 3–25 (1978).
- [36] Koledin, T., Stanić, Z.: Regular graphs whose second largest eigenvalue is at most 1. Novi Sad J. Math. 43, 145–153 (2013).
- [37] Levenshtein, V.I.: Designs as maximum codes in polynomial metric spaces. Acta Appl. Math. 29, 1–82 (1992).

- [38] MacInnes, C.R.: Finite planes with less than eight points on a line. Amer. Math. Monthly 14, 171–174 (1907).
- [39] Martin, W.J., Tanaka, H.: Commutative association schemes. European J. Combin. 30, 1497–1525 (2009).
- [40] Moon, A.: Characterization of the odd graphs O_k by parameters. Discrete Math. **42** (1), 91–97 (1982).
- [41] Musin, O.R.: The kissing number in four dimensions. Ann. of Math. 168 (1), 1–32 (2008).
- [42] Musin, O.R., Tarasov, A.S.: The strong thirteen spheres problem. Discrete Comput. Geom. 48 (1), 128–141 (2012).
- [43] Odlyzko, A.M., Sloane, N.J.A.: New bounds on the number of unit spheres that can touch a unit sphere in *n* dimensions. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **26** (2), 210–214 (1979).
- [44] Payne, S.E.: All generalized quadrangles of order 3 are known. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 18, 203–206 (1975).
- [45] Payne, S.E.: Generalized quadrangles of order 4. I, II. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 22 (3), 267–279, 280–288 (1977).
- [46] Scott, L.L.: A conditions on Higman's parameters. Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 701, 20–45 (1973).
- [47] Seidel, J.J.: Strongly regular graphs with (-1,1,0) adjacency matrix having eigenvalue 3. Linear Algebra and Appl. 1, 281–298 (1968).
- [48] Singleton, R.: On minimal graphs of maximum even girth. J. Combin. Theory 1, 306–332 (1966).
- [49] Tarnanen, H.: Upper bounds on permutation codes via linear programming. European J. Combin. 20, 101–114 (1999).
- [50] Tutte, W.T.: Connectivity in Graphs. Toronto, Canada: Toronto University Press, (1967).
- [51] Veblen, O., Maclagan-Wedderburn, J.H.: Non-Desarguesian and non-Pascalian geometries. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 8 (3), 379–388 (1907).