

# Edge-Distance-Regular Graphs Are Distance-Regular

M. Cámara<sup>a</sup>, C. Dalfó<sup>b</sup>, C. Delorme<sup>c</sup>, M.A. Fiol<sup>b</sup>, H. Suzuki<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Tilburg University, Dept. of Econometrics and O.R.  
Tilburg, The Netherlands  
(e-mail: mcamara@ma4.upc.edu)

<sup>b</sup>Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, BarcelonaTech  
Dept. de Matemàtica Aplicada IV, Barcelona, Catalonia  
(e-mails: {cdalfo,fiol}@ma4.upc.edu)

<sup>c</sup>Université Paris Sud, LRI, Orsay CEDEX, France  
(e-mail: cd@lri.fr)

<sup>d</sup>International Christian University, Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science  
Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8585, Japan  
(e-mail: hsuzuki@ic.u.ac.jp)

November 13, 2021

## Abstract

A graph is edge-distance-regular when it is distance-regular around each of its edges and it has the same intersection numbers for any edge taken as a root. In this paper we give some (combinatorial and algebraic) proofs of the fact that every edge-distance-regular graph  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular and homogeneous. More precisely,  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular if and only if it is bipartite distance-regular or a generalized odd graph. Also, we obtain the relationships between some of their corresponding parameters, mainly, the distance polynomials and the intersection numbers.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we use standard concepts and results about distance-regular graphs (see, for example, Biggs [1], or Brouwer, Cohen, and Neumaier [2]), spectral graph theory (see Cvetković, Doob, and Sachs [4], or Godsil [15]), and spectral and algebraic characterizations of distance-regular graphs (see, for instance, Fiol [10]).

Edge-distance-regular graphs, introduced by Fiol and Garriga [13], are analogous to distance-regular graphs but considering the distance partitions induced by every edge instead

of each vertex. Thus, many known results for distance-regular graphs have their counterpart for edge-distance-regular graphs such as, for instance, the so-called spectral excess theorem. This theorem characterizes (vertex- or edge-)distance-regular graphs by their spectra and the (average) number of vertices at extremal distance (from every vertex or edge). See Fiol and Garriga [12] and Cámara, Dalfó, Fàbrega, Fiol, and Garriga [3] for the cases of distance-regular and edge-distance-regular graphs, respectively. Also, for short proofs, see Van Dam [7] and Fiol, Gago, and Garriga [11].

A distance-regular graph  $\Gamma$  with diameter  $d$  and odd-girth (that is, the shortest cycle of odd length)  $2d + 1$  is called a *generalized odd graph*, also known as an *almost-bipartite distance-regular graph* or a *regular thin near  $(2d + 1)$ -gon*. The first name is due to the fact that odd graphs  $O_k$  (see Biggs [1]) are distance-regular and have such an odd-girth. Notice that, in this case, the intersection parameters of  $\Gamma$  satisfy  $a_0 = \dots = a_{d-1} = 0$  and  $a_d \neq 0$ . Recently, Van Dam and Haemers [9] showed that any connected regular graph with  $d + 1$  distinct eigenvalues and odd-girth  $2d + 1$  is a generalized odd graph. Moreover, Lee and Weng [18] used a variation of the spectral excess theorem for nonregular graphs to show that, in fact, the regularity condition is not necessary, and Van Dam and Fiol [8] gave a more direct short proof of the same result.

Here, we provide some (combinatorial and algebraic) proofs that, in fact, any edge-distance-regular graph  $\Gamma$  is also distance-regular. Moreover, if this is the case,  $\Gamma$  is either bipartite or a generalized odd graph, and the relationship between the intersection numbers of the corresponding distance partitions, induced by a vertex and by an edge, is made explicit. Thus, a distance-regular graph  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular if and only if  $\Gamma$  is either bipartite or a generalized odd graph. In fact, the ‘only if’ part is also a consequence of a result by Martin [19], who proved that if a pair of vertices at distance  $h$  is a completely regular code in a distance-regular graph  $\Gamma$  with diameter  $d$ , then either  $h = 1$  and  $\Gamma$  has intersection numbers  $a_1 = \dots = a_{d-1} = 0$ , or  $h = d$  and  $\Gamma$  is antipodal.

In the rest of this section, we recall some concepts, terminology, and results involved. Throughout this paper,  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  denotes a connected graph on  $n = |V|$  vertices and  $m = |E|$  edges, having adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , and spectrum  $\text{sp}\Gamma = \{\lambda_0^{m_0}, \dots, \lambda_d^{m_d}\}$ , where  $\lambda_0 > \dots > \lambda_d$ , and the superscripts  $m_i$  stand for the multiplicities. The distance between two vertices  $u, v$  is denoted by  $\text{dist}(u, v)$ , so that the diameter of  $\Gamma$  is  $D = \max\{\text{dist}(u, v) : u, v \in V\}$ . Moreover, given  $C \subset V$ , the set  $C_i = \Gamma_i(C) = \{u \in V : \text{dist}(u, C) = i\}$  is called the  *$i$ -th subconstituent* with respect to  $C$ , where  $\text{dist}(u, C) = \min\{\text{dist}(u, v) : v \in C\}$  and  $C_0 = C$ . In particular, when  $C$  is a singleton,  $C = \{u\}$ , we write  $\Gamma_i(u)$  for  $\Gamma_i(\{u\})$  and set  $\Gamma(u)$  for  $\Gamma_1(u)$ . The *eccentricity* or *covering radius* of  $C$  is  $\text{ecc}(C) = \varepsilon_C = \max\{i : C_i \neq \emptyset\}$ , so that we have the partition  $V = C_0 \cup C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{\varepsilon_C}$ .

Given any two vertices  $w, u$  at distance  $\text{dist}(w, u) = i \geq 0$  of a graph  $\Gamma$ , we consider the numbers of neighbors of  $w$  at distance  $i - 1, i, i + 1$  from  $u$ , that is,

$$c_i(w, u) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(u)|, \quad a_i(w, u) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_i(u)|, \quad b_i(w, u) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i+1}(u)|,$$

and  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular if these numbers only depend on  $i$ . In this case we write  $c_i(w, u) = c_i$ ,  $a_i(w, u) = a_i$  and  $b_i(w, u) = b_i$  and say that these numbers are *well defined*. A useful

characterization of distance-regularity is the existence of the so-called *distance-polynomials*  $p_0, \dots, p_d$  of  $\Gamma$  satisfying

$$p_i(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, d, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is the  $i$ -th distance matrix of  $\Gamma$ , with entries  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{uv} = 1$  if  $\text{dist}(u, v) = i$ , and  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{uv} = 0$  otherwise. Recall also that, if  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular, the intersection parameters  $p_{ij}^k = |\Gamma_i(u) \cap \Gamma_j(v)|$ , with  $\text{dist}(u, v) = k$ , for  $i, j, k = 0, \dots, d$ , are the Fourier coefficients of the polynomial  $p_i p_j$  in terms of the basis constituted by the distance-polynomials of  $\Gamma$  with respect to the scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(f(\mathbf{A})g(\mathbf{A})) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^d m_i f(\lambda_i) g(\lambda_i).$$

Thus, with  $n_i = p_i(\lambda_0) = \|p_i\|^2$ , we have the well-known relations

$$n_k p_{ij}^k = \langle p_i p_j, p_k \rangle = \langle p_j, p_i p_k \rangle = n_j p_{ik}^j, \quad i, j, k = 0, \dots, d. \quad (2)$$

In particular, when  $k = 1$  and  $i = j$ , we have  $n_1 = \lambda_0 = \delta$  (the degree of  $\Gamma$ ) and  $p_{i1}^i = a_i$ . Thus,  $\delta p_{ii}^1 = n_i a_i$  and, hence,  $p_{ii}^1 = 0$  if and only if  $a_i = 0$ . In fact notice that, for a general graph, the condition  $V_{i,i}(u, v) = |\Gamma_i(u) \cap \Gamma_i(v)| = \emptyset$  for any two adjacent vertices  $u, v$  is equivalent to say that  $a_i$  is well defined and null.

In an edge-distance-regular graph  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  with diameter  $d$ , every pair of adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$  is a completely regular code. More precisely, the distance partition  $\tilde{V}_0, \dots, \tilde{V}_d$  of  $V$  induced by an edge  $uv \in E$ , where  $\tilde{V}_i = \tilde{V}_i(uv) = \Gamma_i(uv)$  is the set of vertices at distance  $i$  from  $\{u, v\}$  and  $\tilde{d} \in \{d-1, d\}$ , is regular and with the same edge-intersection numbers for any edge. That is, the numbers

$$\tilde{a}_i(uv) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i|, \quad \tilde{b}_i(uv) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i+1}|, \quad \tilde{c}_i(uv) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}|,$$

do not depend neither on the edge  $uv$  nor on the vertex  $w \in \tilde{V}_i$ , but only on the distance  $i$ , in which case we write them as  $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}_i$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \tilde{d}$  and say that they are well defined (see Cámara, Dalfó, Fàbrega, Fiol and Garriga [3] for more details).

## 2 The characterization

In the next result we show that every edge-distance-regular graph is either bipartite distance-regular or a generalized odd graph.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph with diameter  $d$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular;
- (b)  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular, either bipartite or a generalized odd graph.

Moreover, if this is the case and  $\Gamma$  has intersection array  $\iota(\Gamma) = \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{d-1}; c_1, c_2, \dots, c_d\}$  and it is bipartite, then its edge-intersection array is

$$\tilde{\iota}(\Gamma) = \{\tilde{b}_0, \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_{d-2}; \tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_{d-2}, \tilde{c}_{d-1}\} = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{d-1}; c_1, \dots, c_{d-2}, c_{d-1}\}, \quad (3)$$

whereas, if  $\Gamma$  is a generalized odd graph, its edge-intersection array is

$$\tilde{\iota}(\Gamma) = \{\tilde{b}_0, \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_{d-1}; \tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_{d-1}, \tilde{c}_d\} = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, a_d; c_1, \dots, c_{d-1}, 2c_d\}. \quad (4)$$

**Proof.** As the complete graphs clearly satisfy the result, we can assume that  $d > 1$ . Given two adjacent vertices  $u$  and  $v$  of  $\Gamma$ , let us consider the intersection numbers  $p_{ij}^k(u, v) = |\Gamma_i(u) \cap \Gamma_j(v)|$ , so that the vertex partition induced by the distances from  $u$  and  $v$  is shown in Fig. 1, where  $V_{i,j} = V_{i,j}(u, v) = \Gamma_i(u) \cap \Gamma_j(v)$ . (Notice that  $V_{i,j} = \emptyset$  when  $|i - j| > 1$ , as  $\text{dist}(u, v) = 1$ .) Let  $\tilde{V}_0, \dots, \tilde{V}_{\tilde{d}}$  be the distance partition induced by the edge  $uv$ , and define  $\tilde{a}_i(uv)$ ,  $\tilde{b}_i(uv)$  and  $\tilde{c}_i(uv)$  as above. Clearly,  $\tilde{a}_0(uv) = \tilde{a}_0 = c_1 = 1$ .




Figure 1: The distance partition induced by two adjacent vertices. (Every set  $V_{i,j}$  is represented by its subindices.)

We have the following facts:

- (i) For  $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ , all vertices adjacent to  $w \in V_{i,i-1} \subset \tilde{V}_{i-1}$  and at distance  $i + 1$  from  $u$  are in  $V_{i+1,i} \subset \tilde{V}_i$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| &= |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i+1}(u)| + |\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i}| \\ &= b_i(w, u) + |\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i}|, \quad i = 1, \dots, d - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

- (ii) For  $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ , all vertices adjacent to  $w \in V_{i,i+1} \subset \tilde{V}_i$  and at distance  $i - 1$  from  $u$  are in  $V_{i-1,i} \subset \tilde{V}_{i-1}$ . Thus,

$$|\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(u)| = c_i(w, u), \quad i = 1, \dots, d - 1. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, assuming that  $a_i$  is well defined with value  $a_i = 0$ , the vertices adjacent to vertex  $w$  but at distance  $i$  from  $v$  are in  $V_{i-1,i} \cup V_{i+1,i}$  since  $V_{i,i} = \emptyset$ , whereas

$|\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i+1}| = 0$  since  $w \in V_{i,i+1} \subset \Gamma_i(u)$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| + |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| &= |\Gamma(w) \cap (V_{i-1,i} \cup V_{i+1,i})| \\ &= |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_i(v)| = c_{i+1}(w, v), \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

(iii) For  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , all vertices adjacent to  $w \in V_{i,i} \subset \tilde{V}_i$  and at distance  $i-1$  from  $u$  are either in  $V_{i-1,i}$  or  $V_{i-1,i-1}$ . Thus,

$$|\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i-1,i}| + |\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i-1,i-1}| = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(u)| = c_i(w, u),$$

and, analogously,

$$|\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i-1}| + |\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i-1,i-1}| = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(w)| = c_i(w, v).$$

Therefore,

$$|\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| = c_i(w, u) + c_i(w, v) - |\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i-1,i-1}|, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (8)$$

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a):

Assume that  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular with intersection parameters  $a_i, b_i, c_i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, d$  (the parameters  $b_i$  and  $c_i$  are indicated in Fig. 1). If  $\Gamma$  is either bipartite or a generalized odd graph, then  $a_i = 0$  and  $V_{i,i} = \emptyset$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$  (in particular, as  $a_{d-1} = 0$ , the parameters  $a_d$  and  $c_d$  are those indicated in the same figure for the nonbipartite case; otherwise, we also have  $V_{d,d} = \emptyset$  and, hence,  $a_d = c_d = 0$ ). Thus, from the above reasonings we obtain:

(i) By Eq. (5) and for every vertex  $w \in \tilde{V}_{i-1}$ , we have

$$\tilde{b}_{i-1}(uw) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| = b_i.$$

Hence,  $\tilde{b}_i$  is well defined for  $i = 0, \dots, d-2$ . Moreover, if  $\Gamma$  is a generalized odd graph,  $\tilde{b}_{d-1} = a_d$ .

(ii) By Eq. (6) and for every vertex  $w \in \tilde{V}_i$ ,

$$\tilde{c}_i(uw) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| = c_i.$$

Consequently,  $\tilde{c}_i$  is well defined for  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ .

(iii) Moreover, if  $\Gamma$  is a generalized odd graph,  $\tilde{V}_{d,d} \neq \emptyset$ , and Eq. (8) yields that, for every vertex  $w \in \tilde{V}_{d,d}$ ,

$$\tilde{c}_d(uw) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{d-1}| = 2c_d.$$

Summarizing, all intersection numbers  $\tilde{b}_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, \tilde{d}-1$ , and  $\tilde{c}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{d}$  are well defined, and  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular. (Of course, the other intersection numbers are just  $\tilde{a}_i = \delta - \tilde{b}_i - \tilde{c}_i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, \tilde{d}$ .)

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b):

Assume that  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular with edge-intersection numbers  $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}_i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, \tilde{d}$ . Then, to show that the numbers  $c_i(w, u)$ ,  $a_i(w, u)$  and  $b_i(w, u)$  depend only on the distance  $i = \text{dist}(w, u)$ , we proceed by induction on  $i$ . To begin with, observe that  $b_0$ ,  $a_0$ , and  $c_1$  are well defined, with values  $b_0 = b_0(u, u) = \tilde{b}_0 + \tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{b}_0 + 1$ ,  $a_0 = a_0(u, u) = 0$ , and  $c_1 = c_1(w, u) = 1$ .

Now, assume that, for some  $i \leq d - 1$ ,  $c_i$  and  $a_{i-1}$  are well defined with  $a_{i-1} = 0$  or, equivalently,  $V_{i-1, i-1} = \emptyset$ . Thus, in order to show that  $c_{i+1}$  and  $a_i$  exist, consider a shortest path  $v, u, \dots, w$  of length  $i + 1 (\leq d)$ , so that  $w \in V_{i, i+1}(u, v)$ . Then, Eq. (6) gives

$$\tilde{c}_i = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| = c_i.$$

Now, suppose that  $u'v'$  is an arbitrary edge. If we assume that  $V_{i, i}(u', v') \neq \emptyset$ , there exists a vertex  $w' \in V_{i, i}(u', v')$  and Eq. (8) gives

$$\tilde{c}_i = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_{i-1}| = 2c_i,$$

which would be a contradiction. Thus  $V_{i, i}(u', v') = \emptyset$  and  $a_i$  exists, being  $a_i = 0$ . Moreover, coming back to the edge  $uv$ , Eqs. (6) and (7) yield

$$c_{i+1}(w, v) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(u)| + |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| = c_i + \tilde{a}_i,$$

and, since  $w$  and  $v$  are arbitrary vertices at distance  $i + 1$ ,  $c_{i+1}$  is well defined.

Thus, the numbers  $b_i = b_0 - c_i - a_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ , are also well defined; and the same holds for  $a_d = b_0 - c_d$  when  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite. Consequently,  $\Gamma$  is as claimed.  $\square$

## 2.1 Homogeneous graphs

As a consequence of the previous results, we next prove that the edge-distance-regular graphs are, in fact, a particular case of the so-called (1-)homogeneous graphs introduced by Nomura in [20]. A graph  $\Gamma$  is called *homogeneous* if for all nonnegative integers  $r, s, i, j$  and pairs of edges  $uv, u'v'$ ,

$$x \in V_{s, r}(u, v), x' \in V_{s, r}(u', v') \implies |\Gamma(x) \cap V_{i, j}(u, v)| = |\Gamma(x') \cap V_{i, j}(u', v')|,$$

where  $V_{s, r}(u, v)$  is defined as before. In other words,  $\Gamma$  is homogeneous if the partition of Fig. 1 is a regular (or equitable) partition with the same intersection numbers for every pair of adjacent vertices  $u, v$ . For a detailed study of regular partitions, see Godsil [15] and Godsil and McKay [16].

In [6, Lemma 5.3], Curtin and Nomura showed that every bipartite or almost bipartite distance-regular graph is homogeneous. Then, from Theorem 2.1 we have:

**Corollary 2.2.** *Every edge-distance-regular graph is homogeneous.*  $\square$

However, the converse is not true. A counterexample is, for instance, the Wells graph  $W$ , which is the unique distance-regular graph on  $n = 32$  vertices and intersection array  $\iota(W) = \{5, 4, 1, 1; 1, 1, 4, 5\}$  (see Brouwer, Cohen and Neumaier [2, Theorem 9.2.9]). Thus, since  $a_2 = 3$  and  $a_i = 0$  for every  $i \neq 2$ ,  $W$  is homogeneous (see Nomura [20, Lemma 2]) but not edge-distance-regular. The intersection diagrams induced by a vertex and two adjacent vertices, showing that  $W$  is homogeneous, are illustrated in Fig.2.




Figure 2: The intersection diagrams of the Wells graph as a distance-regular and homogeneous graph.

### 3 An algebraic approach

The matrix approach to the result of Theorem 2.1 is based on the relationship of orthogonal polynomials with (edge-)distance-regularity of graphs. Recall that every system of orthogonal polynomials of a discrete variable  $\{r_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq d}$  satisfies a three term recurrence of the form

$$xr_i = \beta_{i-1}r_{i-1} + \alpha_i r_i + \gamma_{i+1}r_{i+1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq d, \quad (9)$$

where the terms  $b_{-1}$  and  $c_{d+1}$  are zero.

In [14] Fiol, Garriga and Yebra gave the following characterization of distance-regularity.

**Theorem 3.1.** *A regular graph with  $d + 1$  distinct eigenvalues is distance-regular if its distance matrix  $\mathbf{A}_d$  is a polynomial of degree  $d$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ , that is,*

$$p_d(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}_d. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, such a polynomial is the highest degree member of the predistance polynomials  $\{p_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq d}$  of  $\Gamma$ —which are orthogonal with respect to the scalar product  $\langle p, q \rangle =$

$\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(p(\mathbf{A})q(\mathbf{A}))$ , and are normalized in such a way that  $\|p_i\|^2 = p_i(\lambda_0)$ . When the graph is distance-regular, these polynomials satisfy a three term recurrence as in Eq. (9) with  $\{\gamma_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i\} = \{c_i, a_i, b_i\}$ .

The first ingredient for the algebraic approach to our results is the following proposition from Camara, Dalfo, Fabrega, Fiol, and Garriga [3], which describes the different possibilities for the edge-diameter and the local spectra of edges in an edge-distance-regular graph. In a regular graph, the  $e$ -local spectrum of an edge  $e = uv$  is constituted by those eigenvalues  $\lambda_i \in \operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma$  such that the orthogonal projection of the characteristic vector of  $\{u, v\}$  on their corresponding  $\lambda_i$ -eigenspace is not null; see [3] for more details. The set of these  $e$ -local eigenvalues is denoted by  $\operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an edge-distance-regular graph with diameter  $D$  and  $d + 1$  distinct eigenvalues. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (a)  $\Gamma$  is regular.
- (b)  $\Gamma$  has spectrally maximum diameter ( $D = d$ ) and its edge-diameter satisfies:
  - (b1) If  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite, then  $\tilde{D} = d$ ;
  - (b2) If  $\Gamma$  is bipartite, then  $\tilde{D} = d - 1$ .
- (c)  $\Gamma$  is edge-spectrum regular and, for every  $e \in E$ , the  $e$ -spectrum satisfies:
  - (c1) If  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite, then  $\operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma = \operatorname{ev} \Gamma$ ;
  - (c2) If  $\Gamma$  is bipartite, then  $\operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma = \operatorname{ev} \Gamma \setminus \{-\lambda_0\}$ .

Let  $\operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma = \bigcup_{e \in E} \operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma$ ,  $\operatorname{ev}_E^* \Gamma = \operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma \setminus \{-\lambda_0\}$  and  $\tilde{d} = |\operatorname{ev}_E^* \Gamma|$ . Then, by using this notation, Proposition 3.2 establishes that, if  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular and nonbipartite, then  $\operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma = \operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma = \operatorname{ev} \Gamma$  for every edge  $e \in E$ , and  $\operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma = \operatorname{ev}_e \Gamma = \operatorname{ev} \Gamma \setminus \{-\lambda_0\}$  otherwise. In both cases all edges have the same local spectrum ( $\Gamma$  is said to be edge-spectrum regular), with  $\tilde{d} + 1 = |\operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma|$  distinct  $e$ -local eigenvalues.

The role of the distance matrices in the study of edge distance-regularity is played by the distance incidence matrices. More precisely, for a given graph  $\Gamma = (V, E)$ , let  $\tilde{D} = \max_{u,v \in E} \{\operatorname{ecc}(\{u, v\})\}$  be its *edge-diameter*. Then, for every  $i = 0, 1, \dots, \tilde{D}$ , the  $i$ -incidence matrix of  $\Gamma$  is the  $(|V| \times |E|)$ -matrix  $\mathbf{B}_i = (b_{ue})$  with entries  $b_{ue} = 1$  if  $\operatorname{dist}(u, e) = i$ , and  $b_{ue} = 0$  otherwise. The following result corresponds to Theorems 4.4 and 4.9 of [3].

**Theorem 3.3.** *A regular graph  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  with edge-diameter  $\tilde{D}$  and  $\tilde{d} + 1 = |\operatorname{ev}_E \Gamma|$  is edge-distance-regular if and only if any of the following conditions hold:*

- (a) There exists a polynomial  $\tilde{p}_i$  of degree  $i$  such that

$$\tilde{p}_i(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, \tilde{D}. \quad (11)$$

- (b)  $|\Gamma_{\tilde{d}}(e)| = 2\tilde{p}_{\tilde{d}}(\lambda_0)$  for every edge  $e \in E$ .



Moreover, if this is the case, these polynomials are the edge-predistance-polynomials,  $\{\tilde{p}_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq \tilde{d}}$ , with  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{D}$ , satisfying a three term recurrence as in Eq. (9) with  $\{\gamma_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i\} = \{\tilde{c}_i, \tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i\}$ . Here we use the following consequence, which can be seen as the analogue of Theorem 3.1 for edge-distance-regularity.

**Corollary 3.4.** *A regular graph  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  with  $\tilde{d} + 1 = |\text{ev}_E \Gamma|$  is edge-distance-regular if and only if*

$$\tilde{p}_{\tilde{d}}(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{d}}. \quad (12)$$

**Proof.** We only need to prove sufficiency, which is straightforward if we multiply both sides of Eq. (12) by the all-1 vector  $\mathbf{j}$  and apply Theorem 3.3(b).  $\square$

### 3.1 A matrix approach to Theorem 2.1

Now, we can rewrite Theorem 2.1 and prove it by showing that the distance polynomials exist if and only if the edge-distance-polynomials do.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph with diameter  $d$  and edge-diameter  $\tilde{d} \in \{d-1, d\}$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular with  $a_0 = \dots = a_{d-1} = 0$ ;
- (b)  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular.

Moreover, if this is the case, the relationships between the corresponding edge-distance-polynomials and distance polynomials are:

$$\tilde{p}_i = p_i - p_{i-1} + p_{i-2} - \dots + (-1)^i p_0, \quad (13)$$

$$p_i = \tilde{p}_i + \tilde{p}_{i-1}, \quad (14)$$

for  $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ , and, if  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite,

$$\tilde{p}_d = \frac{1}{2}(p_d - p_{d-1} + p_{d-2} - \dots + (-1)^d p_0); \quad (15)$$

$$p_d = 2\tilde{p}_d + \tilde{p}_{d-1}, \quad (16)$$

whereas, if  $\Gamma$  is bipartite,

$$p_d = H - \tilde{q}_{d-1} - \tilde{q}_{d-2}, \quad (17)$$

where  $H = p_0 + \dots + p_d$  is the Hoffman polynomial satisfying  $H(\lambda_i) = \delta_{ij}n$ , and  $\tilde{q}_i = \tilde{p}_0 + \dots + \tilde{p}_i$ , for  $i = d-2, d-1$ .

**Proof.** (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b):

Since  $a_i = 0$  we have that

$$\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}_i + \mathbf{B}_{i-1}, \quad i = 0, \dots, d-1. \quad (18)$$

Moreover, when  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite,  $a_d \neq 0$  and

$$\mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{B}_0 = 2\mathbf{B}_d + \mathbf{B}_{d-1}.$$

Then, multiplying both sides of Eq. (10) by  $\mathbf{B}_0$  (on the right) and using all the above equations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} p_d(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}_0 &= 2\mathbf{B}_d + \mathbf{B}_{d-1} \\ &= 2\mathbf{B}_d + \mathbf{A}_{d-1}\mathbf{B}_0 - \mathbf{B}_{d-2} \\ &= 2\mathbf{B}_d + \mathbf{A}_{d-1}\mathbf{B}_0 - \mathbf{A}_{d-2}\mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{B}_{d-3} \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &= 2\mathbf{B}_d + (\mathbf{A}_{d-1} - \mathbf{A}_{d-2} + \mathbf{A}_{d-3} - \cdots + (-1)^{d+1}\mathbf{A}_0)\mathbf{B}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Eq. (1), we get that  $\tilde{p}_d(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}_d$  with

$$\tilde{p}_d = \frac{1}{2}(p_d - p_{d-1} + p_{d-2} - \cdots + (-1)^d p_0),$$

as claimed in Eq. (15), and  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular by Corollary 3.4.

Similarly, by using again Eq. (18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbf{B}_i + \mathbf{B}_{i-1} \\ &= \mathbf{B}_i + \mathbf{A}_{i-1}\mathbf{B}_0 - \mathbf{B}_{i-2} \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &= \mathbf{B}_i + (\mathbf{A}_{i-1} - \mathbf{A}_{i-2} + \cdots + (-1)^i \mathbf{A}_0)\mathbf{B}_0, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\tilde{p}_i = p_i - p_{i-1} + \cdots + (-1)^i p_0, \quad i = 0, \dots, d-1,$$

as claimed in Eq. (13). Moreover, if  $\Gamma$  is bipartite, then  $a_d = 0$ ,  $\tilde{d} = d-1$ , and the existence of the edge-distance-polynomial  $\tilde{p}_{d-1}$  imply that  $\Gamma$  is edge-distance-regular, again by Corollary 3.4.

Eqs. (14) and (16) are immediate consequences from Eqs. (13) and (15). Finally, when  $\Gamma$  is bipartite, we can obtain  $p_d$  by adding all the equalities in Eq. (14) to get  $q_{d-1} = p_0 + \cdots + p_{d-1} = \tilde{q}_{d-1} + \tilde{q}_{d-2}$ , so that  $p_d = H - q_{d-1}$ , where  $H$  is the Hoffman polynomial (see Hoffman [17]), and we have Eq. (17).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a):

Note first that  $\mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{B}_0^\top = \mathbf{A} + \delta \mathbf{I}$ , where  $\delta$  is the degree of  $\Gamma$ . Now, we show that all distance-polynomials exist, in particular  $p_d(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}_d$ , and apply Theorem 3.1.

Suppose that  $\Gamma$  is nonbipartite. By Proposition 3.2 we know that  $\text{ev}_e \Gamma = \text{ev} \Gamma$  and, consequently,  $\tilde{d} = d$ . As in Theorem 2.1, the proof is by induction on  $i$ . First,  $a_1 = 0$  (as  $d > 1$ ),  $c_1 = 1$ , and the first two distance polynomials exist  $p_0 = 1$  and  $p_1 = x$ . Now, assume that, for some  $i < d-1$ ,  $a_i = 0$ ,  $c_i$  is well defined, and there exist the polynomials  $p_{i-1}$  and  $p_i$ .

To compute the product  $\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top$ , let us consider two vertices  $u, w$  at distance  $\text{dist}(u, w) = i < d - 1$  and take  $v \in \Gamma(u) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(w)$ . Then,  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = \sum_{e \in E} (\mathbf{B}_i)_{ue} (\mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{ew}$ . Each term of the sum equals 1 for every vertex  $w' \in \Gamma(w)$  such that the edge  $e = ww'$  is at distance  $i$  from  $u$  (since  $(\mathbf{B}_i)_{u,ww'} = (\mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{ww',w} = 1$ ); that is, for every vertex

$$w' \in \Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i-1}(u, v) \cup V_{i,i}(u, v) \cup V_{i+1,i}(u, v) = \Gamma(w) \cap V_{i+1,i}(u, v),$$

where we used that, since  $a_i = 0$ ,  $\Gamma(w) \cap V_{i,i-1}(u, v) = \emptyset$  (notice that if  $w' \in V_{i,i-1}(u, v)$ , then we would have  $a_i(w, u) \neq 0$ ) and  $V_{i,i}(u, v) = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = \tilde{b}_{i-1}$ . Reasoning similarly, for a vertex  $w$  such that  $\text{dist}(u, w) = i + 1$ , and  $v \in \Gamma(u) \cap \Gamma_i(w)$  (that is,  $w \in V_{i+1,i}(u, v) \subset \tilde{V}_i$ ), we have  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = \tilde{a}_i + c_i$ . Otherwise, if  $\text{dist}(u, w) \neq i, i + 1$ , then  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = 0$ . Consequently,

$$\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top = \tilde{b}_{i-1} \mathbf{A}_i + (\tilde{a}_i + c_i) \mathbf{A}_{i+1},$$

and, multiplying Eq. (11) by  $\mathbf{B}_0^\top$  on the right, we get

$$\tilde{p}_i(\mathbf{A})(\mathbf{A} + \delta \mathbf{I}) = \tilde{b}_{i-1} p_i(\mathbf{A}) + (\tilde{a}_i + c_i) \mathbf{A}_{i+1}.$$

Thus, the distance polynomial of degree  $i + 1$  is

$$p_{i+1} = \frac{1}{\tilde{a}_i + c_i} ((x + \delta) \tilde{p}_i - \tilde{b}_{i-1} p_i), \quad (19)$$

graph  $\Gamma$  is  $(i + 1)$ -*partially distance-regular* (that is,  $p_j(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, i + 1$ ), and  $c_{i+1}$  is well defined; see Dalfó, Van Dam, Fiol, Garriga, and Gorissen [5]. (Notice that this could also be derived from Eqs. (6) and (7) yielding  $c_{i+1}(w, u) = |\Gamma(w) \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(v)| + |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| = c_i + \tilde{a}_i$ , as in the proof of Theorem 2.1.) Now, let  $u, v$  be two arbitrary adjacent vertices. If  $w \in V_{i+1,i+1} \neq \emptyset$ , Eq. (8) yields  $\tilde{c}_{i+1} = |\Gamma(w) \cap \tilde{V}_i| = 2c_{i+1} > c_{i+1}$ . It follows that if a vertex is at distance at most  $i + 1$  from an end of an edge, it is at distance at most  $i$  from the other end. Thus, the diameter of  $\Gamma$  is  $i + 1 < d$ , which is a contradiction. Hence,  $V_{i+1,i+1}(u, v) = \emptyset$  and, since  $u, v$  are generic vertices,  $a_{i+1} = 0$  is well defined.

The induction above proves that there exist all the distance-polynomials  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{d-1}$  and, also, we have  $p_d = H - p_0 - p_1 - \dots - p_{d-1}$ . Then,  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular with  $a_0 = \dots = a_{d-1} = 0$ .

Suppose now that  $\Gamma$  is bipartite. Then  $\tilde{d} = d - 1$  and  $\text{ev}_e \Gamma = \text{ev} \Gamma \setminus \{-\lambda_0\}$ . Now, reasoning similarly as above from a shortest path  $u, v, \dots, w$  of length  $d$ , we have

$$\mathbf{B}_{d-1} \mathbf{B}_0^\top = \tilde{b}_{d-2} \mathbf{A}_{d-1} + (\tilde{a}_{d-1} + \tilde{c}_{d-1}) \mathbf{A}_d.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{A} \tilde{p}_{d-1}(\mathbf{A}) + \delta \tilde{p}_{d-1}(\mathbf{A}) = \tilde{b}_{d-2} \mathbf{A}_{d-1} + \delta \mathbf{A}_d.$$

Now, the key point is that the distance matrix  $\mathbf{A}_i$  of a bipartite graph can be thought as a  $2 \times 2$  block matrix such that when  $i$  is odd (respectively, even) the diagonal (respectively, off-diagonal) entries are the zero matrices. Indeed, the same happens with the powers of the adjacency matrix,  $\mathbf{A}^\ell$ . Assume that  $d$  is odd (respectively, even), the odd part

(respectively, even part) of  $x\tilde{p}_{d-1} + \delta\tilde{p}_{d-1}$  is a polynomial  $p$  satisfying  $p(\mathbf{A}) = \delta\mathbf{A}_d$  (the other part gives  $\tilde{b}_{d-2}\mathbf{A}_{d-1}$ ). Hence, from Theorem 3.1,  $\Gamma$  is distance-regular, with highest degree distance polynomial  $p_d = \frac{1}{\delta}p$ .  $\square$

To illustrate the above result, let us give two examples: one for the bipartite case and the other for the nonbipartite one. With respect to the former, consider the cube  $Q_3$ , which satisfies the conditions of the theorem and has the following parameters:

- $\iota(Q_3) = \{3, 2, 1; 1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $p_0 = 1$ ,  $p_1 = x$ ,  $p_2 = \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - 3)$ ,  $p_3 = \frac{1}{6}(x^3 - 7x)$ ;
- $\tilde{\iota}(Q_3) = \{2, 1; 1, 2\}$ ,  $\tilde{p}_0 = 1$ ,  $\tilde{p}_1 = x - 1$ ,  $\tilde{p}_2 = \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - 2x - 1)$ .

Then, as  $d = \delta = 3$  and  $\tilde{b}_1 = 1$ , we have

$$x\tilde{p}_2 + \delta\tilde{p}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(x^3 - 7x) + \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - 3) = \frac{1}{3}p_3 + p_2,$$

as it should be.

Now, for the nonbipartite case we consider the odd graph  $O_4$ , which also satisfies the conditions of the theorem, and has parameters:

- $\iota(O_4) = \{4, 3, 3; 1, 1, 2\}$ ,  $p_0 = 1$ ,  $p_1 = x$ ,  $p_2 = x^2 - 4$ ,  $p_3 = \frac{1}{2}(x^3 - 7x)$ ;
- $\tilde{\iota}(O_4) = \{3, 3, 2; 1, 1, 4\}$ ,  $\tilde{p}_0 = 1$ ,  $\tilde{p}_1 = x - 1$ ,  $\tilde{p}_2 = x^3 - x - 3$ ,  
 $\tilde{p}_3 = \frac{1}{4}(x^3 - 2x^2 - 5x + 6)$ .

Thus, with  $i = 2$  and since  $d = 3$  and  $\delta = 4$ , Eq. (19) gives

$$p_3 = \frac{1}{\tilde{a}_2 + c_2}((x + \delta)\tilde{p}_2 - \tilde{b}_1 p_2) = \frac{1}{2}((x + 4)(x^2 - x - 3) - 3(x^2 - 4)) = \frac{1}{2}(x^3 - 7x),$$

as claimed.

Using the algebraic approach, we can also derive some properties of the edge-intersection numbers, apart from the trivial one  $\tilde{a}_i + \tilde{b}_i + \tilde{c}_i = \delta$ . As an example, we have the following:

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a nonbipartite edge-distance-regular graph with diameter  $d$ . Then,*

$$\tilde{a}_i = \tilde{b}_{i-1} - \tilde{b}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d - 1. \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** In the proof of Theorem 3.5, we have already shown that, if  $w \in V_{i,i-1}$  then,  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = \tilde{b}_{i-1}$ . Similarly, one can prove that, if  $w \in V_{i,i+1}$ , then  $(\mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{B}_0^\top)_{uw} = \tilde{a}_i + \tilde{b}_i$ . Since, in both cases,  $\text{dist}(u, w) = i$ , the two values must be equal and the result follows.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** Research supported by the *Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación*, Spain, and the *European Regional Development Fund* under project MTM2011-28800-C02-01<sup>b</sup>, the *Catalan Research Council* under project 2009SGR1387<sup>b</sup>, and by the Netherlands Organization of Scientific Research (NWO)<sup>a</sup>. The authors are most grateful to Prof. E. Garriga for his helpful comments.

## References

- [1] N. Biggs, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1974, second edition, 1993.
- [2] A.E. Brouwer, A.M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1989.
- [3] M. Cámara, C. Dalfó, J. Fàbrega, M.A. Fiol, and E. Garriga, Edge-distance-regular graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **118** (2011), 2071–2091.
- [4] C.D. Cvetković, M. Doob, and H. Sachs, *Spectra of Graphs*, third edition, Johann Barth Verlag, 1995. First edition: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1980, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [5] C. Dalfó, E.R. van Dam, M.A. Fiol, E. Garriga, and B.L. Gorissen, On almost distance-regular graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **118** (2011), 1094–1113.
- [6] B. Curtin, and K. Nomura, 1-homogeneous, pseudo-1-homogeneous, and 1-thin distance-regular graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **93** (2005), 279–302.
- [7] E.R. van Dam, The spectral excess theorem for distance-regular graphs: a global (over)view, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15(1)** (2008), #R129.
- [8] E.R. van Dam, and M.A. Fiol, A short proof of the odd-girth theorem, *Electron. J. Combin.* **19(3)** (2012), #P12.
- [9] E.R. van Dam, and W.H. Haemers, An odd characterization of the generalized odd graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* **101** (2011), no. 6, 486–489.
- [10] M.A. Fiol, Algebraic characterizations of distance-regular graphs, *Discrete Math.* **246** (2002), 111–129.
- [11] M.A. Fiol, S. Gago, and E. Garriga, A simple proof of the spectral excess theorem for distance-regular graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **432** (2010), 2418–2422.
- [12] M.A. Fiol, and E. Garriga, From local adjacency polynomials to locally pseudo-distance-regular graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **71** (1997), 162–183.
- [13] M.A. Fiol, and E. Garriga, An algebraic characterization of completely regular codes in distance-regular graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **15** (2001), no. 1, 1–13.
- [14] M.A. Fiol, E. Garriga, and J.L.A. Yebra, Locally pseudo-distance-regular graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **68** (1996), 179–205.
- [15] C.D. Godsil, *Algebraic Combinatorics*, Chapman and Hall, New York, 1993.
- [16] C.D. Godsil, and B.D. McKay, Feasibility conditions for the existence of walk-regular graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **30** (1980), 51–61.

- [17] A.J. Hoffman, On the polynomial of a graph, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **70** (1963), 30–36.
- [18] G.-S. Lee and C.-w. Weng, The spectral excess theorem for general graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 119 (2012), 1427–1431.
- [19] W.J. Martin, *Completely Regular Subsets*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, 1992. (Available in <http://users.wpi.edu/~martin/RESEARCH/THESIS/>.)
- [20] K. Nomura, Homogeneous graphs and regular near polygons, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **60** (1994), 63–71.