

Lecture 3: Cheeger Inequality Continued

In which we finish the proof of Cheeger's inequalities and we discuss some generalizations.

1 Completing the Proof Cheeger's Inequality

It remains to prove the following statement.

Lemma 1 *Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^V$ be a vector with non-negative entries. Then there is a $0 < t \leq \max_v \{y_v\}$ such that*

$$\phi(\{v : y_v \geq t\}) \leq \sqrt{2R_L(\mathbf{y})}$$

We will provide a probabilistic proof. Without loss of generality (multiplication by a scalar does not affect the Rayleigh quotient of a vector) we may assume that $\max_v y_v = 1$. We consider the probabilistic process in which we pick $t > 0$ in such a way that t^2 is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$ and then define the non-empty set $S_t := \{v : y_v \geq t\}$.

We claim that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} E(S_t, V - S_t)}{\mathbb{E} d|S_t|} \leq \sqrt{2R_L(\mathbf{y})} \quad (1)$$

Notice that Lemma 1 follows from such a claim, because of the following useful fact.

Fact 2 *Let X and Y be random variables such that $\mathbb{P}[Y > 0] = 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{X}{Y} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} X}{\mathbb{E} Y} \right] > 0$$

PROOF: Call $r := \frac{\mathbb{E}X}{\mathbb{E}Y}$. Then, using linearity of expectation, we have $\mathbb{E}X - rY = 0$, from which it follows $\mathbb{P}[X - rY \leq 0] > 0$, but, whenever $Y > 0$, which we assumed to happen with probability 1, the conditions $X - rY \leq 0$ and $\frac{X}{Y} \leq r$ are equivalent. \square

It remains to prove (1).

To bound the denominator, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} d|S_t| = d \cdot \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{P}[v \in S_t] = d \sum_v y_v^2$$

because

$$\mathbb{P}[v \in S_t] = \mathbb{P}[y_v \geq t] = \mathbb{P}[y_v^2 \geq t^2] = y_v^2$$

To bound the numerator, we say that an edge is *cut* by S_t if one endpoint is in S_t and another is not. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} E(S_t, V - S_t) &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} \mathbb{P}[\{u,v\} \text{ is cut}] \\ &= \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_v^2 - y_u^2| = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_v - y_u| \cdot (y_u + y_v) \end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\mathbb{E} E(S_t, V - S_t) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (y_v - y_u)^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (y_v + y_u)^2}$$

and applying Cauchy-Schwarz again (in the form $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$) we get

$$\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (y_v + y_u)^2 \leq \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} 2y_v + 2y_u^2 = 2d \sum_v y_v^2$$

Putting everything together gives

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} E(S_t, V - S_t)}{\mathbb{E} d|S_t|} \leq \sqrt{2 \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (y_v - y_u)^2}{d \sum_v y_v^2}}$$

which is (1).

2 Cheeger-type Inequalities for λ_n

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph (not necessarily regular), D its diagonal matrix of degrees, A its adjacency matrix, $L = I - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$ its normalized

Laplacian matrix, and $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq 2$ be the eigenvalues of L , counted with multiplicities and listed in non-decreasing order.

In Handout 2, we proved that $\lambda_k = 0$ if and only if G has at least k connected component and $\lambda_n = 2$ if and only if there is a connected component of G (possibly, all of G) that is bipartite.

A special case of the former fact is that $\lambda_2 = 0$ if and only if the graph is disconnected, and the Cheeger inequalities give a “robust” version of this fact, showing that λ_2 can be small if and only if the expansion of the graph is small. In these notes we will see a robust version of the latter fact; we will identify a combinatorial parameter that is zero if and only if the graph has a bipartite connected component, and it is small if and only if the graph is “close” (in an appropriate sense) to having a bipartite connected components, and we will show that this parameter is small if and only if $2 - \lambda_n$ is small.

Recall that

$$2 - \lambda_n = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (x_u + x_v)^2}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v x_v^2}$$

We will study the following combinatorial problem, which formalizes the task of finding an “almost bipartite connected component:” we are looking for a non-empty subset of vertices $S \subseteq V$ (we allow $S = V$) and a bipartition (A, B) of S such that there is a small number of “violating edges” compared to the number of edges incident on S , where an edge $\{u, v\}$ is *violating* if it is in the cut $(S, V - S)$, if it has both endpoints in A , or if it has both endpoints in B . (Note that if there are no violating edges, then S is a bipartite connected component of G .)

It will be convenient to package the information about A, B, S as a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$, where the non-zero coordinates correspond to S , and the partition of S is given by the positive versus negative coordinates. We define the “bipartiteness ratio” of \mathbf{y} as

$$\beta(\mathbf{y}) := \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_u + y_v|}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v |y_v|}$$

Note that in the numerator we have the number of violating edges, with edges contained in A or in B counted with a weight of 2, and edges from S to $V - S$ counted with a weight of 1. In the denominator we have the sum of the degrees of the vertices of S (also called the *volume* of S , and written $vol(S)$) which is, up to a factor of 2, the number of edges incident on S .

(Other definitions would have been reasonable, for example in the numerator we could just count the number of violating edges without weights, or we could have the

expression $\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (y_u + y_v)^2$. Those choices would give similar bounds to the ones we will prove, with different multiplicative constants.)

We define the bipartiteness ratio of G as

$$\beta(G) = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \{-1,0,1\}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}} \beta(\mathbf{y})$$

We will prove the following analog of Cheeger's inequalities:

$$\frac{2 - \lambda_n}{2} \leq \beta(G) \leq \sqrt{2 \cdot (2 - \lambda_n)}$$

The first inequality is the easy direction

$$\begin{aligned} 2 - \lambda_n &= \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (x_u + x_v)^2}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v x_v^2} \\ &\leq \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \{-1,0,1\}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_u + y_v|^2}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v |y_v|^2} \\ &\leq \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \{-1,0,1\}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} 2 \cdot |y_u + y_v|}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v |y_v|} \end{aligned}$$

The other direction follows by applying the following lemma to the case in which \mathbf{x} is the eigenvector of λ_n .

Lemma 3 (Main) *For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{\mathbf{0}\}$ there is a threshold t , $0 < t \leq \max_v |x_v|$, such that, if we define $\mathbf{y}^{(t)} \in \{-1,0,1\}^n$ as*

$$y_v^{(t)} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x_v \leq -t \\ 0 & \text{if } -t < x_v < t \\ 1 & \text{if } x_v \geq t \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\beta(\mathbf{y}^{(t)}) \leq \sqrt{2 \cdot \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (x_u + x_v)^2}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v x_v^2}}$$

Note that the Lemma is giving the analysis of an algorithm that is the ‘‘bipartite analog’’ of Fiedler’s algorithm. We sort vertices according to $|x_v|$, and then we consider all sets S which are suffixes of the sorted order and cut S into (A, B) according to sign. We pick the solution, among those, with smallest bipartiteness ratio. Given \mathbf{x} , such a solution can be found in time $O(|E| + |V| \log |V|)$ as in the case of Fiedler’s algorithm.

2.1 Proof of Main Lemma

We will assume without loss of generality that $\max_v |x_v| = 1$. (Scaling \mathbf{x} by a multiplicative constant does not change the Rayleigh quotient and does not change the set of \mathbf{y} that can be obtained from \mathbf{x} over the possible choices of thresholds.)

Consider the following probabilistic experiment: we pick t at random in $[0, 1]$ such that t^2 is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$, and we define the vector $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ as in the statement of the lemma. We claim that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}|}{\mathbb{E} \sum_{v \in V} d_v |y_v^{(t)}|} \leq \sqrt{2 \cdot \frac{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (x_u + x_v)^2}{\sum_{v \in V} d_v x_v^2}} \quad (2)$$

and we note that the Main Lemma follows from the above claim and from the fact, which we have used before, that if X and Y are random variables such that $\mathbb{P}[Y > 0] = 1$, then there is a positive probability that $\frac{X}{Y} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}X}{\mathbb{E}Y}$.

We immediately see that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{v \in V} d_v |y_v^{(t)}| = \sum_v d_v \mathbb{P}[|x_v| \geq t] = \sum_v d_v x_v^2$$

To analyze the numerator, we distinguish two cases

1. If x_u and x_v have the same sign, and, let's say, $x_u^2 \leq x_v^2$ then there is a probability x_u^2 that both $y_u^{(t)}$ and $y_v^{(t)}$ are non-zero (and have the same sign), meaning that $|y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = 2$; and there is an additional probability $x_v^2 - x_u^2$ that $y_u^{(t)} = 0$ and $y_v^{(t)} = \pm 1$, so that $|y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = 1$. Overall we have

$$\mathbb{E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = 2x_u^2 + x_v^2 - x_u^2 = x_u^2 + x_v^2$$

since the last expression is symmetric with respect to u and v , the equation

$$\mathbb{E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = x_u^2 + x_v^2$$

holds also if $x_u^2 \geq x_v^2$;

2. If x_u and x_v have opposite signs, and, let's say, $x_u^2 \leq x_v^2$, there is probability $x_v^2 - x_u^2$ that $y_u^{(t)} = 0$ and $y_v^{(t)} = \pm 1$, in which case $|y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = 1$, and otherwise we have $|y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = 0$. If $x_u^2 \geq x_v^2$, then $|y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}|$ equals 1 with probability $x_u^2 - x_v^2$ and it equals zero otherwise. In either case, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| = |x_u^2 - x_v^2|$$

In both cases, the inequality

$$\mathbb{E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| \leq |x_u + x_v| \cdot (|x_u| + |x_v|)$$

is satisfied.

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz as in the proof of Cheeger's inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |y_u^{(t)} + y_v^{(t)}| &\leq \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} |x_u + x_v| \cdot (|x_u| + |x_v|) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (x_u + x_v)^2} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (|x_u| + |x_v|)^2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (|x_u| + |x_v|)^2 \leq \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} 2x_u^2 + x_v^2 = 2 \sum_v d_v x_v^2$$

and, combining all the bounds, we get (2).