Laplacian immanantal polynomials and the GTS poset on trees

Mukesh Kumar Nagar, Sivaramakrishnan Sivasubramanian

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, India

ABSTRACT

Let $T$ be a tree on $n$ vertices with Laplacian $L_T$ and let $GTS_n$ be the generalised tree shift poset on the set of unlabelled trees on $n$ vertices. Inequalities are known for coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of $L_T$ as we go up the poset $GTS_n$. In this work, we generalise these inequalities to the $q$-Laplacian $L_T^q$ of $T$ and to the coefficients of all immanantal polynomials.

1. Introduction

Csikvári in [10] defined a poset on the set of unlabelled trees with $n$ vertices that we denote in this paper as $GTS_n$ (see Definition 5). Among other results, he showed that going up on $GTS_n$ has the following effect: the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of the Laplacian $L_T$ of $T$ decrease in absolute value. Let $\mathbb{R}^+$ denote the set
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of non-negative real numbers and $\mathbb{R}^+[q]$ denote the set of polynomials in one variable $q$ with coefficients from $\mathbb{R}^+$. In this paper, we prove the following more general result about immanantal polynomials (see (3) for the definition of immanantal polynomial) of the $q$-Laplacian matrix of trees (see Definition 4).

**Theorem 1.** Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be trees with $n$ vertices and let $T_2$ cover $T_1$ in $\text{GTS}_n$. Let $\mathcal{L}^q_{T_1}$ and $\mathcal{L}^q_{T_2}$ be the $q$-Laplacians of $T_1$ and $T_2$ respectively. For $\lambda \vdash n$, let

\[
\begin{align*}
    f^\mathcal{L}^q_{T_1}(x) &= d_\lambda(xI - \mathcal{L}^q_{T_1}) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} (-1)^r c^\mathcal{L}^q_{\lambda,r}(q)x^{n-r} \quad \text{and} \\
    f^\mathcal{L}^q_{T_2}(x) &= d_\lambda(xI - \mathcal{L}^q_{T_2}) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} (-1)^r c^\mathcal{L}^q_{\lambda,r}(q)x^{n-r}.
\end{align*}
\]

Then, for all $\lambda \vdash n$ and for all $0 \leq r \leq n$, we assert that $c^\mathcal{L}^q_{\lambda,r}(q) - c^\mathcal{L}^q_{\lambda,r}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$.

For a positive integer $n$, let $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Let $\mathfrak{S}_n$ be the group of permutations of $[n]$. Let $\chi_\lambda$ be the irreducible character of the $\mathfrak{S}_n$ over $\mathbb{C}$ indexed by the partition $\lambda$ of $n$. We refer the reader to the book by Sagan [26] as a reference for results on representation theory that we use in this work. We denote partitions $\lambda$ of $n$ as $\lambda \vdash n$. This means we have $\lambda = \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_l$ where $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $i$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_l > 0$ and with $\sum_{i=1}^{l} \lambda_i = n$. We also write partitions using the exponential notation, with multiplicities of parts written as exponents. Since characters of $\mathfrak{S}_n$ are integer valued, we think of $\chi_\lambda$ as a function $\chi_\lambda : \mathfrak{S}_n \to \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and let $A = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. Define its immanant as $d_\lambda(A) = \sum_{\psi \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \chi_\lambda(\psi) \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{i,\psi_i}$. It is well known that $d_{1^n}(A) = \det(A)$ and $d_n(A) = \text{perm}(A)$ where $\text{perm}(A)$ is the permanent of $A$.

For an $n \times n$ matrix $A$, define $f^A(x) = d_\lambda(xI - A)$. The polynomial $f^A(x)$ is called the immanantal polynomial of $A$ corresponding to $\lambda \vdash n$. Thus, in this notation, $f^{1^n}_A(x)$ is the characteristic polynomial of $A$. Let $T$ be a tree with $n$ vertices with Laplacian matrix $L_T$ and define

\[
f^\mathcal{L}^T(x) = d_\lambda(xI - L_T) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} (-1)^r c^\mathcal{L}^T_{\lambda,r}x^{n-r} \tag{1}
\]

where the $c^\mathcal{L}^T_{\lambda,r}$’s are coefficients of the Laplacian immanantal polynomial of $T$ in absolute value. Immanantal polynomials were studied by Merris [21] where the Laplacian immanantal polynomial corresponding to the partition $\lambda = 2, 1^{n-2}$ (also called the second immanantal polynomial) of a tree $T$ was shown to have connections with the centroid of $T$. Botti and Merris [6] showed that almost all trees share a complete set of Laplacian immanantal polynomials. When $\lambda = 1^n$, Gutman and Pavlovic [16] conjectured the
following inequality which was proved by Gutman and Zhou [17] and independently by Mohar [24].

**Theorem 2 (Gutman and Zhou, Mohar).** Let $T$ be any tree on $n$ vertices and let $S_n$ and $P_n$ be the star and the path trees on $n$ vertices respectively. Then, for $0 \leq r \leq n$, we have

$$c_{1,n,r}^{L_S} \leq c_{1,n,r}^{L_T} \leq c_{1,n,r}^{L_P}.$$  

Thus, in absolute value, any tree $T$ has coefficients of its Laplacian characteristic polynomial sandwiched between the corresponding coefficients of the star and the path trees. Mohar actually proves stronger inequalities than this result, see Csikvári [11, Section 10] for information on Mohar’s stronger results. Much earlier, Chan, Lam and Yeo in their preprint [9], proved the following.

**Theorem 3 (Chan, Lam and Yeo).** Let $T$ be any tree on $n$ vertices with Laplacian $L_T$ and let $S_n$ and $P_n$ be the star and the path trees on $n$ vertices respectively. Then, for all $\lambda \vdash n$ and $0 \leq r \leq n$,

$$c_{\lambda,r}^{L_S} \leq c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T} \leq c_{\lambda,r}^{L_P}.$$  

(2)

In this work, we consider the $q$-Laplacian matrix $L_T^q$ of a tree $T$ on $n$ vertices.

**Definition 4.** Let $T$ be a tree on $n$ vertices with adjacency matrix $A$ and let $D$ be the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with degrees on the diagonal. Let $I$ denote the $n \times n$ identity matrix. For a variable $q$, define $L_T^q = I + q^2(D - I) - qA$ as the $q$-Laplacian of $T$.

$L_T^q$ can be defined for arbitrary graphs $G$ analogously and it is clear that when $q = 1$, $L^q_G = L_G$. The matrix $L^q_G$ has occurred previously in connection with the Ihara–Selberg zeta function of $G$ (see Bass [5] and Foata and Zeilberger [13]). For trees, $L_T^q$ has connections with the inverse of $T$’s exponential distance matrix (see Bapat, Lal and Pati [2]). As done in (1), define

$$f_{\lambda}^{L_T^q}(x) = d_{\lambda}(xI - L_T^q) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} (-1)^r c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q)x^{n-r}.  

(3)$$

We consider the following counterpart of inequalities like (2) when each coefficient is a polynomial in the variable $q$: we want the difference $c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q) - c_{\lambda,r}^{L_S^q}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$. That is, the difference polynomial has non-negative coefficients. This is the standard way to get $q$-analogue of inequalities. Similarly, we want $c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q) - c_{\lambda,r}^{L_P^q}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$.

We mention a few lines about our proof of Theorem 1. In [11, Theorem 5.1], Csikvári gives a “General Lemma” from which he infers properties about polynomials associated to trees. In that lemma, the following crucial property is needed when dealing with characteristic polynomials of matrices. Let $M = A \oplus B$ be an $n \times n$ matrix that can be
written as a direct sum of two square matrices. Then, clearly \( \det(M) = \det(A) \det(B) \). This property is sadly not true for other immanants. That is, \( d_\lambda(M) \neq d_\lambda(A)d_\lambda(B) \) (indeed, the definition of \( d_\lambda(A) \) is not clear when \( \lambda \vdash n \) and \( A \) is an \( m \times m \) matrix with \( m < n \)). We thus combinatorialise the immanant as done by Chan, Lam and Yeo \cite{9} and express the immanantal polynomial in terms of matchings and vertex orientations. Section 2 gives preliminaries on the \( \text{GTS}_n \) poset and Section 3 gives the necessary background on \( B \)-matchings, \( B \)-vertex orientations and their connection to coefficients of immanantal polynomials. We give our proof of Theorem 1 in Section 4 and draw several corollaries in Sections 5, 6 and 7 involving the \( q^2 \)-analogue of vertex moments in a tree, \( q,t \)-Laplacian matrices which include the Hermitian Laplacian of \( T \) and \( T \)'s exponential distance matrices.

2. The poset \( \text{GTS}_n \)

Though Csikvári in \cite{10} defined the poset on unlabelled trees with \( n \) vertices, we will label the vertices of the trees according to some convention (see Remark 17). We recall the definition of this poset.

**Definition 5.** Let \( T_1 \) be a tree on \( n \) vertices and \( x, y \) be two vertices of \( T_1 \). Let \( P_{x,y} \) be the unique path in \( T_1 \) between \( x \) and \( y \). Assume that \( x \) and \( y \) are such that all the interior vertices (if they exist) on \( P_{x,y} \) have degree 2. Let \( z \) be the neighbour of \( y \) on the path \( P_{x,y} \). Consider the tree \( T_2 \) obtained by moving all neighbours of \( y \) except \( z \) to the vertex \( x \). This is illustrated in Fig. 1. This move helps us to partially order the set of unlabelled trees on \( n \) vertices. We denote this poset on trees with \( n \) vertices as \( \text{GTS}_n \). We say \( T_2 \) is above \( T_1 \) in \( \text{GTS}_n \) or that \( T_1 \) is below \( T_2 \) in \( \text{GTS}_n \) and denote it as \( T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1 \). The poset \( \text{GTS}_6 \) is illustrated in Fig. 2.

If \( T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1 \) and there is no tree \( T \) with \( T \neq T_1, T_2 \) such that \( T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1 \), then we say \( T_2 \) covers \( T_1 \) (see Fig. 1). If either \( x \) or \( y \) is a leaf vertex in \( T_1 \), then it is easy to check that \( T_2 \) is isomorphic to \( T_1 \). If neither \( x \) nor \( y \) is a leaf in \( T_1 \), then \( T_2 \) is said to be obtained from \( T_1 \) by a proper generalised tree shift (PGTS henceforth). Clearly, if \( T_2 \) is obtained by a PGTS from \( T_1 \), then, the number of leaf vertices of \( T_2 \) is one more than the number of leaf vertices of \( T_1 \). Csikvári in \cite{10} showed the following.
Fig. 2. The poset $GTS_n$ on trees with 6 vertices.

**Lemma 6 (Csikvári).** Every tree $T$ with $n$ vertices other than the path, lies above some other tree $T'$ on $GTS_n$. The star tree on $n$ vertices is the maximal element and the path tree on $n$ vertices is the minimal element of $GTS_n$.

3. $B$-matchings and $B$-vertex orientations

As done in earlier work [25], we use matchings in $T$ to index terms that arise in the computation of the immanant $d_{\lambda}(L^q_T)$. A dual concept of vertex orientations was used to get a near positive expression for immanants of $L^q_T$.

In this work, we need to find $f_{\lambda T}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) = d_{\lambda}(xI - L^q_T)$. As done by Chan, Lam and Yeo [9], we index terms that occur in the computation of $f_{\lambda T}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ by partial matchings that we term as $B$-matchings. Let $T$ have vertex set $V$ and edge set $E$. Let $B \subseteq V$ with $|B| = r$ and let $F_B$ be the forest induced by $T$ on the set $B$. A $B$-matching of $T$ is a subset $M \subseteq E(F_B)$ of edges of $F_B$ such that each vertex $v \in B$ is incident to at most one edge in $M$. Alternatively, a $B$-matching is a matching in the graph induced by the vertices in $B$. If the number of edges in $M$ equals $j$, then $M$ is called a $j$-sized $B$-matching in $T$. Let $\mathcal{M}_j(B)$ denote the set of $j$-sized $B$-matchings in $T$. Note that we could have $B = [n]$ as well. For vertex $v$, we denote its degree $\deg_T(v)$ in $T$ alternatively as $d_v$. For $M \in \mathcal{M}_j(B)$, define a polynomial weight $\text{wt}_{B,M}(q) = q^{2j} \prod_{v \in B - M} [1 + q^2(d_v - 1)]$. Define

$$m_{B,j}(q) = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_j(B)} \text{wt}_{B,M}(q) \quad \text{and} \quad m_{r,j}(q) = \sum_{B \subseteq V, |B| = r} m_{B,j}(q).$$

Define $\chi_{\lambda}(j)$ to be the character $\chi_{\lambda}(-)$ evaluated at such a permutation with cycle type $2^j, 1^{n-2j}$. The following lemma is straightforward from the definition of immanants.
Lemma 7. Let $T$ be a tree on vertex set $[n]$ with $q$-Laplacian $L_T^q$. Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and let $0 \leq r \leq n$. Then, the coefficient $c_{\lambda,r}^q$ as defined in (3) equals

$$c_{\lambda,r}^q(q) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \chi_\lambda(j)m_{r,j}(q).$$

Proof. Let $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| = r$. Then, clearly $c_{\lambda,r}^q(q) = d_\lambda \begin{bmatrix} L_T^q[B|B] & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$, where $L_T^q[B|B]$ is the sub-matrix of $L_T^q$ induced on the rows and columns with indices in the set $B$ and $I$ is the $(n-r) \times (n-r)$ identity matrix. Further, it is clear that $c_{\lambda,r}^q(q) = \sum_{B \subseteq [n],|B|=r} c_{\lambda,B}^q(q)$.

Note that there is no cycle in $T$, and hence in the forest $F_B$. Thus, each permutation $\psi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ which in cycle notation has a cycle of length strictly greater than 2, will satisfy $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \ell_i,\psi_i = 0$. Therefore, only permutations $\psi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ which fix the set $[n] - B$ and have cycle type $2^j,1^{n-2j}$ contribute to $c_{\lambda,B}^q(q)$. It is easy to see that such permutations can be identified with $j$-sized $B$-matchings in $F_B$ and that this correspondence is reversible.

Recall $\mathcal{M}_j(B)$ is the set of $j$-sized $B$ matchings in $T$. Clearly, the contribution to $c_{\lambda,B}^q(q)$ from permutations which fix $[n] - B$ and have cycle-type $2^j,1^{n-2j}$ is $\chi_\lambda(j)m_{B,j}(q)$. Thus, we see that

$$c_{\lambda,B}^q(q) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \chi_\lambda(j)m_{B,j}(q).$$

(4)

Summing over various $B$’s of size $r$ completes the proof. □

3.1. $B$-vertex orientations

As done by Chan, Lam and Yeo [9], we next express coefficients of the immanantal polynomial as a sum of almost positive summands where the summands are indexed by partial vertex orientations that we term as $B$-vertex orientations.

Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $V = [n]$. For $B \subseteq [n]$, we orient each vertex $v \in B$ to one of its neighbours (which may or may not be in $B$). Such vertex orientations are termed as $B$-vertex orientations. Let $O$ be a $B$-vertex orientation. Each $v \in B$ has $d_v$ orientation choices. We depict the orientation $O$ in pictures by drawing an arrow on the edge from $v$ to its oriented neighbour and directing the arrow away from $v$. We do not distinguish between $O$ and its picture from now on. In $O$, edges thus get arrows and there may be edges which have two arrows, one in each direction (see Figs. 4, 6 and 7 for examples). We call such edges as bidirected arcs and let bidir($O$) denote the set of bidirected arcs in $O$. We extend this notation to vertices $v \in B$ and say $v \in \text{bidir}(O)$ if $\{u,v\} \in \text{bidir}(O)$ for some $u \in B$. We also say $v \in B$ is free in $O$ if $v \in B - \text{bidir}(O)$ and denote by free($O$) the set of free vertices of $O$. 
In $T$, let $\mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}$ be the set of $B$-orientations $O$, such that $O$ has $i$ bidirected arcs. We need to separate the case $B = V$ from the cases $B \neq V$. First, let $B \neq V$. For such a $B \subseteq V$, let $m = \min_{v \in [n] - B} v$ be the minimum numbered vertex outside $B$ and let $O \in \mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}$. For each $v \in \text{free}(O)$, as there is a unique path from $v$ to $m$ in $T$, we can tell if $v$ is oriented “towards” $m$ or if $v$ is oriented “away from” $m$. Formally, for $O \in \mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}$, define a 0/1 function $\text{away} : \text{free}(O) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by

$$\text{away}(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \text{ is oriented away from } m, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \text{ is oriented towards } m. \end{cases}$$

For each $O \in \mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}$ assign the following non-negative integer:

$$A_w^T(O) = 2i + 2 \sum_{v \in \text{free}(O)} \text{away}(v).$$

Define the generating function of the statistic $A_w^T(\cdot)$ in the variable $q$ as follows:

$$a^{T}_{B,i}(q) = \sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}} q^{A_w^T(O)}, \quad (5)$$

$$a^{T}_{r,i}(q) = \sum_{B \subseteq V, |B| = r} a^{T}_{B,i}(q) = \sum_{B \subseteq V, |B| = r} \sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}^T_{B,i}} q^{A_w^T(O)}. \quad (6)$$

**Example 8.** Let $T_2$ be the tree given in Fig. 3 and let $B = \{2, 4, 6, 7, 8\}$ with $|B| = r = 5$. Below we give $a^{T_{2,i}}_{B,i}(q)$ for $i$ from 0 to $\lfloor r/2 \rfloor$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$a^{T_{2,i}}_{B,i}(q)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1 + 2q^2 + q^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$q^2(1 + 2q^2 + q^4)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark 9.** For any tree $T$ and all $r, j$, it is easy to see from the definitions that both $m^{T}_{r,j}(q)$ and $a^{T}_{r,i}(q)$ are polynomials in $q^2$.

For the Laplacian $L_T$ of a tree $T$, Chan and Lam had in [8, Theorem 2.2] proved an identity involving numerical counterparts of $m^{T}_{B,j}(q)$‘s and $a^{T}_{B,i}(q)$’s for the special case when $B = [n]$. Later, Chan, Lam and Yeo in [9, Theorem 3.1] extended the same identity for all $B \subseteq [n]$. Earlier, we had in [25, Theorem 11] obtained a $q$-analogue of this identity when $B = [n]$. There, care had to be taken to define $a^{T}_{[n],0}(q) = 1 - q^2$. We give a $q$-analogue below in Lemma 10 when $B$ can be an arbitrary subset. In [25], since $B = [n]$, there was no vertex outside $B$ and hence the minimum vertex $m$ could not be defined. Thus, the lexicographically minimum edge of the matching $M$ was used in place of $m$ there. It is easy to see that we could have used the lexicographically minimum edge of $M$ when $B \neq [n]$ as well. Since the proof is identical to that of [25, Theorem 11], we omit it and merely state the result. From now onwards, we are free from this restriction $B \neq [n]$. 
Lemma 10. Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $[n]$ and $B$ be an $r$-subset of $[n]$. Then,
\[ m_{B,j}(q) = \sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \binom{i}{j} a^T_{B,i}(q). \]
Moreover, $m_{r,j}(q) = \sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \binom{i}{j} a^T_{r,i}(q)$.

Chan and Lam in [7] showed the following non-negativity result on characters summed with binomial coefficients as weights. Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\lambda \vdash n$. Recall $\chi_\lambda(j)$ is the character $\chi_\lambda$ evaluated at a permutation with cycle type $2^i,1^{n-2j}$.

Lemma 11 (Chan and Lam). Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and let $\chi_\lambda(j)$ be as defined above. Let $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then $\sum_{j=0}^{i} \chi_\lambda(j) \binom{i}{j} = \alpha_{\lambda,i} 2^i$, where $\alpha_{\lambda,i} \geq 0$. Further, if $\lambda = k,1^{n-k}$, then $\alpha_{\lambda,i} = \binom{n-i-1}{k-i-1}$.

Combining Lemmas 10 and 11 with Lemma 7 gives us the following Corollary whose proof we omit. This gives an interpretation of the coefficient $c^T_{\lambda,r}(q)$ in the immanantal polynomial as functions of the $a^T_{r,i}(q)$’s. Since all the $a^T_{r,i}(q)$’s except $a^T_{[n],0}(q)$ have positive coefficients, this is an almost positive expression.

Corollary 12. For $0 \leq r \leq n$, the coefficient of the immanantal polynomial of $\mathcal{L}^T_q$ in absolute value is given by
\[ c^T_{\lambda,r}(q) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \alpha_{\lambda,i} 2^i a^T_{r,i}(q), \text{ where } \alpha_{\lambda,i} \geq 0, \ \forall \ \lambda \vdash n, i. \]

Combining (4), Lemmas 11 and 10 gives us another corollary when the partition is $\lambda = 1^n$, which we again merely state.

Corollary 13. When $\lambda = 1^n$, we have $\alpha_{\lambda,i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$. Further, let $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| = r$. Then,
\[ \det(\mathcal{L}^T_q[B|B]) = a^T_{B,0}(q). \text{ Moreover, } c^T_{1^n,r}(q) = a^T_{r,0}(q). \]

Remark 14. Let tree $T$ have vertex set $[n]$ and let $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| = n - 1$. Then, for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $a^T_{B,0}(q) = 1$. This implies that $a^T_{n-1,0}(q) = n$.

Let $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| = r$. Let $\mathcal{L}^T_q[B|B]$ denote the $r \times r$ submatrix of $\mathcal{L}^T_q$ induced on the rows and columns indexed by $B$. From Corollary 13, we get $\det(\mathcal{L}^T_q[B|B]) \geq 0$ when $B \neq [n]$. When $B = [n]$, Bapat, Lal and Pati [2] have shown that $\det(\mathcal{L}^T_q) = 1 - q^2$. As remarked in Section 1, when $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|q| \leq 1$, the matrix $\mathcal{L}^T_q$ is positive semidefinite.

Remark 15. By Sturm’s Theorem (see [14]), the number of negative eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}^T_q$ equals the number of sign changes among the leading principal minors. When $|q| > 1$,
Fig. 3. Two labelled trees with $T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}} T_1$ and $T_2$ covering $T_1$.

the number of sign changes equals 1 by Corollary 13. This gives a short proof of a result of Bapat, Lal and Pati [2, Proposition 3.7] that the signature of $\mathcal{L}_T^n$ is $(n-1,1,0)$ when $|q| > 1$, where signature of a Hermitian matrix $A$ is the vector $(p,n,z)$ with $p,n$ being the number of positive, negative eigenvalues of $A$ respectively and $z$ being the nullity of $A$.

**Remark 16.** By (5), for any $T$, all $a_{T,i}^B(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$ when $B \neq [n]$. In [25, Corollary 13], it was shown that $a_{[n],i}^T(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$ when $i > 0$. By definition, $a_{[n],0}^T(q) = 1 - q^2$ has negative coefficients. In [25, Theorem 2.4], it was shown that $c_{\lambda,n}^{L_T^q} \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$ for all $\lambda \vdash n$ except $\lambda = 1^n$.

By these and Corollary 12, it is easy to see that barring $c_{\lambda,n}^{L_T^q}(q)$, which equals $1 - q^2$, $c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q]$ for all $\lambda \vdash n$ and for all $0 \leq r \leq n$. Thus all statements in this work can be made about $c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q)$ or alternatively about the absolute value of the coefficient of $x^{n-r}$ in $f_{\lambda}^{L_T^q}(x)$ (which equals $(-1)^r c_{\lambda,r}^{L_T^q}(q)$).

4. **Proof of Theorem 1**

We begin with a few preliminaries towards proving Theorem 1. Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be trees on $n$ vertices with $T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}} T_1$. We assume that both $T_1$ and $T_2$ have vertex set $V = [n]$.

**Remark 17.** Since immanants are invariant under a relabelling of vertices (see Littlewood’s book [19] or Merris [22]), without loss of generality, we label the vertices of $T_1$ as follows: first label the vertices on the path $P_k$ as $1,2,\ldots,k$ in order with 1 being the closest vertex to $X$ and $k$ being the closest vertex to $Y$. Then, label vertices in $X$ with labels $k+1,k+2,\ldots,k+|X|$ in increasing order of distance from vertex 1 (say in a breadth-first manner starting from vertex 1) and lastly, label vertices of $Y$ from $n-|Y| + 1$ to $n$ again in increasing order of distance from vertex 1. See Fig. 3 for an example.

Recall our notation $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q)$ and $a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q)$ for the trees $T_1$ and $T_2$ respectively. Also recall $\mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ denotes the set of $B$-orientations in $T_1$ with $i$ bidirected-arcs and let $\mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_1} = \bigcup_{B \subseteq V, |B|=r} \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$. Recall that $\mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_2}$ is defined analogously. It would have been nice if for
all $B \subseteq V$ with $|B| = r$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor r/2 \rfloor$, we could prove that $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) - a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$. Unfortunately, this is not true as the example below illustrates.

**Example 18.** Let $T_2$ and $T_1$ be the trees given in Fig. 3. Let $B = \{1, 4, 6, 7, 8\}$ and let $i = 2$. It can be checked that $a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) = 2q^4 + q^6$ and that $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) = q^4$.

Nonetheless, by combining all sets $B$ of size $r$, we will for all $r$, $i$ construct an injective map $\gamma: \mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_1}$ that preserves the “away” statistic. For each $r$, note that there are $\binom{n}{r}$ sets $B$ that contribute to $\mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_2}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{r,i}^{T_1}$. We partition the $r$-sized subsets $B$ into three disjoint families and apply three separate lemmas. Recall that vertices 1 and $k$ are the endpoints of the path $P_k$ used in the definition of the poset $\text{GTS}_n$. The first family consists of those sets $B$ with both 1, $k \notin B$.

**Lemma 19.** Let $B \subseteq [n]$, $|B| = r$ be such that both 1, $k \notin B$. Then, there is an injective map $\phi: \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ such that $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(\phi(O))$. Thus, for all $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor r/2 \rfloor$, we have $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) - a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$.

**Proof.** Let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$. Clearly, $1 = \min_{u \in [n]-B} u$ and for $O$, define $O' = \phi(O)$ as follows. In $O'$, for each vertex $v \in B$, assign the same orientation as in $O$. Clearly, $O' \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ and it is clear that $\phi$ is an injective map from $\mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$. Further, it is easy to see that $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(\phi(O))$, hence proving that $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) - a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$, completing the proof. □

We next consider those $B$ with $\{|1,k\} \cap B| = 1$. We use the notation $B$ for $r$-sized subsets with $1 \in B$, $k \notin B$ and $B'$ for $r$-sized subsets with $k \in B'$, $1 \notin B'$. The next lemma below considers such subsets $B'$ and those $B$-orientations $O$ with the orientation of vertex 1 in $X \cup P_k$, that is $O(1) \in X \cup P_k$. Note that for such $B$-orientations $O$, $\min_{v \in [n]-B} v \in P_k$.

**Lemma 20.** Let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$, where $1 \in B$, $k \notin B$ and let $O(1)$ denote the oriented neighbour of vertex 1 in $O$. If $O(1) \in X \cup P_k$, then there exists an injective map $\mu: \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ such that $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(\mu(O))$. Similarly, let $B' \subseteq V$ be such that $1 \notin B', k \in B'$. Then, there is an injective map $\nu: \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_1}$ such that for $P \in \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2}$, $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(P) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(\nu(P))$.

**Proof.** The proof for both cases are similar. Let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$ and let $O(1) \in X \cup P_k$. In this case, the same injection of Lemma 19 works. That is, we form $O'$ by assigning all vertices of $B$ the same orientation as in $O$. Clearly, $O' \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ and $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(O')$.

Similarly, let $P \in \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2}$. Form $P' \in \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_1}$ by assigning all vertices of $B'$ the same orientation as in $P$. Clearly, $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(P) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(P')$. Note that in both $P$ and $P'$, the orientation of $k$ equals $k-1$ as $k$ is a leaf vertex in $T_2$. The proof is complete. □
We continue to use the notation $B$ for an $r$-sized subset of $V$ with $1 \in B$. We now handle $B$-orientations $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$ with $O(1) \in Y$.

**Lemma 21.** Let $B$ be an $r$-sized subset of $[n]$ with $1 \in B$, $k \notin B$. Define $B' = (B - \{1\}) \cup \{k\}$. Let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$ with $O(1) \in Y$. There is an injective map $\delta : \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T'_1}$ such that $\text{Aw}_B^{T_2}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B'}^{T'_1}(\delta(O))$. Further, if $N = \delta(O)$, then we have $N(k) = O(1)$.

**Proof.** The proof is identical to the proof of [25, Lemma 7]. We hence only sketch our proof. In $T_1$, define $m' = \min_{v \in [n] - B'} v$ and recall that $m = \min_{v \in [n] - B} v$ in $T_2$. Since $1 \notin B'$, note that in $T_1$, we have $m' = 1$. Thus, we reverse the orientation of some vertices in $T_2$ on the subpath from $(1, m)$ of $P_k$. To decide the vertices whose orientations are to be reversed, we break the $(1, m)$ path into segments separated by bidirected arcs. In each segment, if the $\ell$-th closest vertex to $m$ in $T_2$ was oriented “towards $m$”, then in $T_1$, orient the $\ell$-th closest vertex to 1 “towards 1”. Likewise, if the $\ell$-th closest vertex to $m$ in $T_2$ was oriented “away from $m$”, then in $T_1$, orient the $\ell$-th closest vertex to 1 “away from 1”.

See Fig. 4 for an example, where the letter “t” is used to denote a vertex whose orientation is towards $m$ and “a” is used to denote a vertex whose orientation is away from $m$. This convention of “t” and “a” will be used in later figures as well. For the example in the Fig. 4, note that $k = 9$. If $\delta$ is the map described above, then it is clear that $\text{Aw}_B^{T_2}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B'}^{T'_1}(\delta(O))$ and that $(\delta(O))(k) = O(1)$. The proof is complete. \qed

**Corollary 22.** Let $B \subseteq V$ with $1 \in B$, $k \notin B$ and define $B' = (B - \{1\}) \cup \{k\}$. For all $i$, there is an injection $\omega : \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \cup \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1} \cup \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_1}$. Thus, $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) + a_{B',i}^{T_1}(q) - a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) - a_{B',i}^{T_2}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$.

**Proof.** If $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$ is such that $O(1) \in X \cup P_k$, use Lemma 20. On the other hand, if $O(1) \in Y$, then we use Lemma 21. Let $O' = \omega(O)$. Note that in this case, vertex $k$ is oriented with $O'(k) \in Y$.

Similarly, if $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2}$, then, we use Lemma 20. Note that in this case if $O' = \omega(O)$, then $O'(k) = k - 1 \in P_k$. Thus, the case mentioned in the earlier paragraph and this case are disjoint and hence $\omega$ is an injection. \qed

Our last family consists of subsets $B$ with both $1, k \in B$. Define another subset $B' \subseteq [n]$ using $B$ as follows: Let $B_{xy} = B \cap (X \cup Y)$ and let $B_p = B \cap P_k$. The set $B'$ will
be used when $m \in P_k$. In this case, $m = \min_{v \in P_k, v \notin B} v$ is the minimum vertex outside $B$ in $P_k$. Define $l = \max_{v \in P_k, v \notin B} v$ to be the maximum numbered vertex in $P_k$ not in $B$.

Define $m' = k + 1 - l$ and $l' = k + 1 - m$. Form $B_l'$ by taking the union of the three sets $A' = \{1, \ldots, m' - 1\}$, $C' = \{l' + 1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\{m' - m + x : x \in B \cap \{m + 1, \ldots, l - 1\}\}$. See Fig. 9 for an example. Define $B' = B_{xy} \cup B_l'$. Clearly, both $1, k \in B'$ and $(B')' = B$.

**Lemma 23.** Let $B \subseteq [n]$ be such that both $1, k \in B$ and let $B'$ be as defined above. For all $i$, there is an injective map $\theta : \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \cup \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1} \cup \mathcal{O}_{B',i}^{T_1}$ that preserves the away statistic. Thus, $a_{B,i}^{T_1}(q) + a_{B',i}^{T_1}(q) - a_{B,i}^{T_2}(q) - a_{B',i}^{T_2}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+[q^2]$.

**Proof.** We denote the orientation of vertex 1 in $O$ as $O(1)$. Given $B$, recall $m = \min_{v \notin B} v$ is the minimum vertex outside $B$ and that we have labelled vertices on the path $P_k$ first, vertices in $X$ next and vertices of $Y$ last. There are nine cases based on $m$ and $O(1)$. Only one of the nine cases will involve $B$ getting changed to $B'$. For now, let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$. Define a map $\theta : \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ as follows. Let $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_2}$. We construct a unique $O' \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ by using the algorithms tabulated below. Though it seems that there are a large number of cases, the underlying moves are very similar.

For vertices $u, v, a, b$, we explain an operation that we denote as reverse_on_path($u, v; a, b$) that will be needed when $m \in Y$. We will always have $d_{u,v} = d_{a,b}$ in $T_1$ where $d_{u,v}$ is the distance between vertices $u$ and $v$ in $T_1$. Further, all vertices $w$ on the $u, v$ path $P_{u,v}$ in $T_1$ will be in $B$ and hence be oriented. reverse_on_path($u, v; a, b$) will change orientations of all vertices on $P_{u,v}$. We will use this operation in all the three cases when $m \in Y$. Due to our labelling convention and the fact that $m \in Y$, all vertices of $P_k \cup X$ will be contained in $B$. In $T_2$, vertex $m$ has vertex 1 as its closest vertex among the vertices in $P_k$, whereas in $T_1$, vertex $m$ has vertex $k$ as its closest vertex among those in $P_k$. Denote vertices on $P_{u,v}$ as $u = u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_s = v$ and the vertices on the $(a, b)$ path as $a = a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s = b$. In $O$, if vertex $a_i$ is oriented “towards $m$”, then orient vertex $u_{s+1-i}$ “towards $m$” and likewise if vertex $a_i$ is oriented “away from $m$”, then orient vertex $u_{s+1-i}$ “away from $m$”. We give the map $\theta$ using several algorithms below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m \in P_k$</th>
<th>$m \in X$</th>
<th>$m \in Y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O(1) = 2 \in P_k$ Use algorithm 1</td>
<td>Use algorithm 1</td>
<td>Use algorithm 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O(1) = x \in X$ Use algorithm 1</td>
<td>Use algorithm 1</td>
<td>Use algorithm 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O(1) = y \in Y$ Use algorithm 5</td>
<td>Use algorithm 3</td>
<td>Use algorithm 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Algorithm 1:** This is a trivial copying algorithm. Define $O' = \theta(O)$ with $O' \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ as follows. In $O'$, retain the same orientation for all vertices $v \in B$. It is clear that $\text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_2}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B,i}^{T_1}(O')$.

**Algorithm 2:** Since $m \in Y$, by our labelling convention, this means all the vertices of $P_k$ and $X$ are in $B$. Form $O' = \theta(O)$ with $O' \in \mathcal{O}_{B,i}^{T_1}$ by first copying the orientation
$O$ for each vertex. Then perform $\text{reverse\_on\_path}(1, k; 1, k)$. This is illustrated in Fig. 5 when $O(1) = 2$ and $m \in Y$ and in Fig. 6 when both $O(1), m \in Y$. It is clear that $\text{Aw}^T_B(O) = \text{Aw}^T_B(O')$.

**Algorithm 3:** We have $m \in X$ and $O(1) \in Y$. Recall that we have labelled the vertices of $X$ in increasing order of distance from vertex 1. We claim that there exists a unique edge $e = \{x, y\}$ on the path from 1 to $m$ satisfying the following two conditions:

1. There is no arrow on $e$. That is, either both $x, y \in B$ with $O(x) \neq y$ and $O(y) \neq x$ or $x \in B$ and $y = m$.
2. Among such edges, $x$ is the closest vertex to 1 distance-wise (that is, $e$ is the unique closest edge to 1).

That there exists such an edge $e$ satisfying condition (1) above is easy to see. Condition (2) is just a labelling of vertices of such an edge. Further, we label the vertices on the path from 1 to $x$ in increasing order of distance from vertex 1 as $1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l = x$. (See Fig. 7 for an example.)

It is easy to see that $O(x_1) = 1$ and $O(x_i) = x_{i-1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq l$ and recall that $O(1) \in Y$. Form $O' = \theta(O)$ with $O' \in \mathcal{O}^T_B$ as follows. Vertices of $B$ not on the path from $x_l$ to $k$ in $T_1$ get the same orientation as in $O$. We orient the last $l + 1$ vertices in $T_1$ on the $x_l$ to $k$ path $P_{x_l, k}$ away from $m$, and then orient the first $k - 1$ vertices on $P_{x_l, k}$ as they were on $P_k$. See Fig. 7 for an example. As $k = 6$ and $l = 3$, the last $l + 1$ vertices on the $(x_3, 6)$ path means that the last 4 vertices are oriented away from $m$. The orientation of the remaining vertices is inherited from $T_2$. It is clear that $|\text{bidir}(O)| = |\text{bidir}(O')|$ and that $\text{Aw}^T_B(O) = \text{Aw}^T_B(O')$.

**Algorithm 4:** We have $O(1) \in X$ and $m \in Y$. As done in Algorithm 3, find the closest edge $e = \{x, y\}$ to vertex 1 with $e$ having no arrow on the 1 to $m$ path. As before, label
$e$ as $\{x, y\}$ with $x$ being closer to 1 than $y$, and label the vertices on the path from 1 to $x$ as $1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l = x$ (see Fig. 8).

It is easy to see that $O(x_1) = 1$ and $O(x_i) = x_{i-1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq l$. Note that there is a continuous string of $l + 1$ vertices that are oriented away from $m$. Form $O' = \theta(O)$ with $O' \in O_{B,i}^{T_1}$ as follows. Vertices of $B$ not on the path from $x_l$ to $k$ in $T_1$ get the same orientation as in $O$. The closest $l + 1$ vertices of $B$ on the path from 1 to $x_l$ in $T_1$ get oriented away from $m$. Denote the path comprising the last $k - 1$ vertices on the $(1, x_l)$-path as $P_k$. Let $\alpha, \beta$ be the first and last vertices of $P_k$. Perform $\text{reverse} \_ \text{on} \_ \text{path}(\alpha, \beta; 2, k)$. See Fig. 8 for an example. It is clear that $\text{Aw}_{B}^{T_1}(O) = \text{Aw}_{B}^{T_2}(O')$.

**Algorithm 5:** We have $O(1) = y \in Y$ and $m \in P_k$. Recall $B' = B_{xy} \cup B_{p}^{l}$. Recall $l = \max_{v \in P_k, v \notin B} v$. Note that the minimum vertex $m' \notin B'$ will be $m' = k + 1 - l$. Form $O' = \theta(O)$ with $O' \in O_{B,i}^{T_1}$ as follows. Note that in $T_2$, there is a continuous sequence $A$ of $m - 1$ oriented vertices from 1 to $m - 1$ and another continuous sequence $C$ of $k - l$ oriented vertices from $l + 1$ to $k$ in the path $P_k$ (see Fig. 9 for an example). Similarly, in $T_1$, there is a continuous sequence $A'$ of $m' - 1$ oriented vertices from 1 to $m' - 1$ and another continuous sequence $C'$ of $k - l'$ oriented vertices from $l' + 1$ to $k$ in the path $P_k$.

It is easy to see that $|A| = |C'|$ and $|C| = |A'|$. If vertex $s \in A$ is oriented away from (or towards) $m$ in $O$, then in $O'$ orient vertex $k + 1 - s$ away from (or towards respectively) $m'$. Likewise, if vertex $s \in C$ is oriented away from (or towards) $m$ in $O$, then in $O'$ orient vertex $k + 1 - s$ away from (or towards respectively) $m'$.

Lastly, in $O'$ copy the orientation of vertices in $B$ that lie between $m$ and $l$ in $T_2$ as they were to the vertices in $B'$ between $m'$ and $l'$ in $T_1$. Formally, if vertex $s \in P_k$ with $m < s < l$ is oriented away from (or towards) $m$ in $O$, then in $O'$ orient vertex $(m' - m) + s$ away from (or towards respectively) $m'$.
For vertices $s \in B_p$, see Fig. 9 for an example. Clearly, $|\text{bidir}(O)| = |\text{bidir}(O')|$ and $Aw_B^T(O) = Aw_{B'}^T(O')$. This completes Algorithm 5.

When $B = [n]$, note that all vertices are oriented and hence there exists at least one bidirected edge. In this case, we have $Aw_B(O) = \text{away}(O, e)$, where as defined in [25], $\text{away}(O, e)$ is found with respect to the lexicographic minimum bidirected edge $e \in O$. If the lexicographic edge is $e = \{u, v\}$, we let $m = \min(u, v)$ be the smaller numbered vertex among $u, v$. We find the statistic $\text{away}(O, e)$ with respect to $m$. It is simple to note that among the nine cases, the following will not occur when $B = [n]$ due to our labelling convention:

1. $m \in X$ and $O(1) \in P_k$,
2. $m \in Y$ and $O(1) \in P_k$ and
3. $m \in Y$ and $O(1) \in X$.

In the remaining cases, we follow the same algorithms. It is easy to see that the pair $(m, O(1))$ is different in all the nine cases. We do not change $B$ in eight cases, except in Algorithm 5. Thus, we get an injection in these eight cases. When Algorithm 5 is run, we get an injection from $O_{B,i}^{T_2}$ to $O_{B',i}^{T_1}$ and similarly we get an injection from $O_{B,i}^{T_2}$ to $O_{B',i}^{T_1}$. Thus, we get an injection from $O_{B,i}^{T_2} \cup O_{B,i}^{T_2}$ to $O_{B,i}^{T_1} \cup O_{B',i}^{T_1}$, completing the proof. □

With these Lemmas in place, we can now prove Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** We group the set of $r$-sized subsets $B$ into three categories: those without $1, k$, those with either $1$ or $k$ and those with both $1, k$. By Lemmas 19, 23 and Corollary 22 it is clear that there is an injective map from $O_{r,i}^{T_2}$ to $O_{r,i}^{T_1}$ for all $r$ and $i$. By Corollary 12, $c^{T_2}_{\lambda,r}(q) - c^{T_1}_{\lambda,r}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^+\{q^2\}$ for all $\lambda, r$. □

**Corollary 24.** Setting $q = 1$ in $\mathcal{L}_T^q$, we infer that for all $r$, the coefficient of $x^{n-r}$ in the immanantal polynomial of the Laplacian $L_T$ of $T$ decreases in absolute value as we go up $\text{GTS}_n$. Using Lemma 6, we thus get a more refined and hence stronger result than Theorem 3.
Corollary 25. Let $T_1, T_2$ be trees on $n$ vertices with respective $q$-Laplacians $\mathcal{L}_T^q, \mathcal{L}_T'^q$. Let $T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}} T_1$ and let $d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T^q)$ denote the immanant of $\mathcal{L}_T^q$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2$ corresponding to the partition $\lambda \vdash n$. By comparing the constant term of the immanantal polynomial, for all $\lambda \vdash n$, we infer $d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T'^q) \leq d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T^q)$. This refines the inequalities in Theorem 3.

5. $q^2$-analogue of vertex moments in a tree

Merris in [21] gave an alternate definition of the centroid of a tree $T$ through its vertex moments. He then showed that the sum of vertex moments appears as a coefficient of the immanantal polynomial of $L_T$ corresponding to the partition $\lambda = 2, 1^{n-2}$. In this section, we define a $q^2$-analogue of vertex moments and through it, the centroid of a tree.

We then show that the sum of the $q^2$-analogue of vertex moments of all vertices appears as a coefficient in the second immanantal polynomial of $L_T^q$. Thus, by Theorem 1, the sum of the $q^2$-analogue of vertex moments decreases as we go up on GTS$_n$. We further show that as we go up on GTS$_n$, the value of the minimum $q^2$-analogue of the vertex moments also decreases.

The following definition of vertex moments is from Merris [21]. Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $[n]$. For a vertex $i \in [n]$, define $\text{Moment}_T^q(i) = \sum_{j \in [n]} d_j d_{i,j}$ where $d_j$ is the degree of vertex $j$ in $T$ and $d_{i,j}$ is the distance between vertices $i$ and $j$ in $T$. Define the $q^2$-analogue of the distance $d_{i,j}$ between vertices $i$ and $j$ to be $[d_{i,j}]_{q^2} = 1 + q^2 + (q^2)^2 + \cdots + (q^2)^{d_{i,j}-1}$ and define for all $i \in [n], [d_{i,i}]_{q^2} = 0$. We define the $q^2$-analogue of the moment of vertex $i$ of $T$ as

$$\text{Moment}_T^{q^2}(i) = \sum_{j \in [n]} [1 + q^2(d_j - 1)] [d_{i,j}]_{q^2}. \quad (7)$$

Fix $q \in \mathbb{R}, q \neq 0$. Vertex $i$ is called the centroid of $T$ if $\text{Moment}_T^{q^2}(i) = \min_{j \in [n]} \text{Moment}_T^{q^2}(j)$. We clearly recover Merris’ definition of moments when we plug in $q = 1$ in (7). Merris showed that his definition of centroid coincides with the usual definition of the centroid of a tree $T$. In [4], Bapat and Sivasubramanian while studying the third immanant of $L_T^q$ proved a lemma that we need. The following lemma is obtained by setting $s = q^2$ in [4, Lemma 3].

Lemma 26 (Bapat and Sivasubramanian). Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $V = [n]$ and let $i \in [n]$. Then,

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} q^2(d_j - 1)[d_{i,j}]_{q^2} = \sum_{j \in [n]} [d_{i,j}]_{q^2} - (n - 1). \quad (8)$$

The following alternate expression for $\text{Moment}_T^{q^2}(i)$ is easy to derive using Lemma 26 and the definition (7). As the proof is a simple manipulation, we omit it.
Lemma 27. Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $[n]$ and let $i \in [n]$. Then,

$$\text{Moment}_{q^2}^T(i) = (n - 1) + 2q^2 \sum_{j \in [n]} (d_j - 1)[d_{i,j}]_{q^2}. \quad (9)$$

The following lemma gives an algebraic interpretation for the $q^2$-analogue of vertex moments in $T$.

Lemma 28. Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $[n]$. Let $i \in [n]$ be a vertex and let $B = [n] - \{i\}$. Then,

$$\text{Moment}_{q^2}^T(i) = (n - 1)a_{B,0}^T(q) + 2a_{B,1}^T(q). \quad (10)$$

Proof. Clearly for $B = [n] - \{i\}$, we have a unique $B$-orientation $O \in \mathcal{O}_{B,0}$ with $Aw_B^T(O) = 0$. This is the orientation where every vertex $j \in [n] - i$ gets oriented towards $i$. Thus $a_{B,0}^T(q) = 1$.

We will show that $a_{B,1}^T(q) = q^2 \sum_{j \in [n]} (d_j - 1)[d_{i,j}]_{q^2}$ and appeal to (9). By (8), equivalently, we need to show that

$$a_{B,1}^T(q) = \sum_{j \in [n]} [d_{i,j}]_{q^2} - (n - 1) = q^2 \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} [d_{i,j} - 1]_{q^2}.$$ 

Root the tree $T$ at the vertex $i$ and recall $B = [n] - \{i\}$. Thus $m = i$. Let $O$ be a $B$-orientation with one bidirected arc $e = \{u,v\}$ where we label the edge $e$ such that $d_{i,v} = d_{i,u} + 1$. That is, $u$ occurs on the path from $i$ to $v$ in $T$. Since $n - 1$ vertices are oriented and one edge is bidirected, there must be one edge without any arrows (when seen pictorially). It is easy to see that all edges $f \in T$ not on the path $P_{i,u}$ from $i$ to $u$ must be oriented towards $i$. Moreover, it is clear that the edge $f$ without arrows must be on the path $P_{i,u}$. Thus, our choice lies in orienting vertices in $P_{i,u}$ such that one edge does not get any arrows. Let $f = \{x,y\}$ with $x$ being on the path from $i$ to $y$ in $T$ ($x$ could be $i$ or $y$ could be $u$). Thus, there are $d_{i,u} - 1$ choices for the edge $f$. In $O$, clearly, all vertices from $y$ till $u$ on the path $P_{i,u}$ must be oriented away from $i$. Hence the contribution of all such orientations will be $q^2 + q^4 + \cdots + q^{2d_{i,u} - 2}$. Thus vertex $u$ contributes $q^2[d_{i,u} - 1]_{q^2}$ to $a_{B,1}(q)$. Summing over all vertices $u$ completes the proof. \[ \square \]

Theorem 29. Let $T$ be a tree with vertex set $[n]$ and $q$-Laplacian $L_q^T$. Let $\lambda = 2, 1^{n-2} \vdash n$. Then,

$$c_{\lambda, n-1}^{L_q^T} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^T(i).$$

Proof. Summing (10) over all $B$ with cardinality $n - 1$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^T(i) = (n - 1)a_{n-1,0}^T(q) + 2a_{n-1,1}^T(q) = c_{\lambda, n-1}^{L_q^T}(q).$$
where the last equality follows from Corollary 12 and Lemma 11 with \( k = 2 \). The proof is complete. \( \square \)

On setting \( q = 1 \) in Theorem 29, we recover Merris’ result [21, Theorem 6]. From Theorem 1 and Theorem 29, we get the following.

**Theorem 30.** Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be trees with \( n \) vertices and let \( T_2 \) cover \( T_1 \) in \( \text{GTS}_n \). Then,

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(i).
\]

Theorem 30 implies that the sum of the vertex moments decreases as we go up on the poset \( \text{GTS}_n \). We next show that the minimum value of the \( q^2 \)-analogue of vertex moments also decreases as we go up on \( \text{GTS}_n \).

**Lemma 31.** Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be two trees with vertex set \([n]\) such that \( T_2 \) covers \( T_1 \) in \( \text{GTS}_n \). Then, for all \( q \in \mathbb{R} \), we have \( \min_{i \in [n]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(i) \leq \min_{j \in [n]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(j) \).

**Proof.** Let \( l \in [n] \) be the vertex in \( T_1 \) with \( \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(l) = \min_{i \in [n]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(i) \). Let \( l \in X \cup Y \cup P_{[k/2]} \) (see Fig. 1 for \( X \), \( Y \) and \( P_k = P_{x,y} \)). Here \( P_{[k/2]} \) is the path \( P_k \) restricted to the vertices 1, 2, \ldots, \([k/2] \). Then, using the fact that the distance \( d_{x,y}^{T_1} \geq d_{x,y}^{T_2} \) for all pairs \((x, y) \in X \times Y\), we have

\[
\text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(l) \geq \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(l) \geq \min_{i \in [n]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(i).
\]

If \( l \geq [k/2] \) then \( \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(l) \geq \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(k + 1 - l) \geq \min_{i \in [n]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(i) \). Thus we can find a vertex \( i \) in \( T_2 \) such that \( \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(l) \geq \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(i) \), completing the proof. \( \square \)

**Corollary 32.** Let \( T_1, T_2 \) be two trees on \( n \) vertices with \( T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1 \). Then, for all \( q \in \mathbb{R} \), the minimum \( q^2 \)-analogue of the vertex moments of \( T_2 \) is less than the minimum \( q^2 \)-analogue of the vertex moments of \( T_1 \).

An identical statement about the maximum \( q^2 \)-analogue of vertex moments is not true as shown in the following example.

**Example 33.** Let \( T_1, T_2 \) be trees on the vertex set \([8]\) given in Fig. 10. Vertices 2 and 3 are both centroid vertices in \( T_1 \), while in \( T_2 \), the centroid is vertex 1. The \( q^2 \)-analogue of their vertex moments are as follows: \( \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(2) = \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_1}(3) = 9 + 2q^2(7 + 3q^2) \) and \( \text{Moment}_{q^2}^{T_2}(1) = 9 + 2q^2(2 + q^2) \). The \( q^2 \)-analogue of vertex moments of leaf vertices of \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are as follows.
\[ \text{Moment}_{q^2}(i) = 9 + 2q^2(8 + 5q^2 + 4q^4 + 3q^6) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. \]

\[ \text{Moment}_{q^2}(i) = 9 + 2q^2(8 + 2q^2 + q^4) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. \]

\[ \text{Moment}_{q^2}(4) = 9 + 2q^2(8 + 7q^2 + 6q^4). \]

When \( q = 1 \), the moments of vertices of \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are given in Fig. 10 alongside the vertices. Clearly, when \( q = 1 \), \( \max_{j \in [8]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}(j) = 51 \neq 49 = \max_{j \in [8]} \text{Moment}_{q^2}(j) \).

Associated to a tree are different notions of “median” and “generalised centers”, see the book [18]. It would be nice to see the behaviour of these parameters as one goes up \( GTS_n \).

6. \( q, t \)-Laplacian \( L_{q,t} \) and Hermitian Laplacian of a tree \( T \)

All our results work for the bivariate Laplacian matrix \( L_{q,t} \) of a tree \( T \) on \( n \) vertices defined as follows. Let \( T \) be a tree with edge set \( E \). Replace each edge \( e = \{u, v\} \) by two bidirected arcs, \( (u, v) \) and \( (v, u) \). Assign one of the arcs, say \( (u, v) \) a variable weight \( q \) and its reverse arc, a variable weight \( t \) and let \( A_{n \times n} = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \) be the matrix with \( a_{u,v} = q \) and \( a_{v,u} = t \). Assign \( a_{u,v} = 0 \) if \( \{u, v\} \notin E \). Let \( D_{n \times n} = (d_{i,j}) \) be the diagonal matrix with entries \( d_{i,i} = 1 + qt(\deg(i) - 1) \). Define \( L_{q,t} = D - A \). Note that when \( q = t, L_{q,t} = L_T^q \) and that when \( q = t = 1, L_{q,t} = L_T \) where \( L_T \) is the usual combinatorial Laplacian matrix of \( T \).

It is easy to see that our proof relies on the fact that the difference in the coefficients of the immanantal polynomial is a non-negative combination of the \( a_{i,j}^T(q) \)'s which are polynomials in \( q^2 \) and that \( q^2 \geq 0 \) for all \( q \in \mathbb{R} \). When \( B = [n] \), bivariate versions of \( m_{n,j}(q, t) \) and \( a_{n,i}^T(q, t) \) were defined in [25]. Define bivariate versions \( m_{r,j}(q, t) \) and \( a_{r,i}^T(q, t) \) as done in Section 3 but replace all occurrences of \( q^2 \) with \( qt \).

With this definition, it is simple to see that all results go through for \( L_{q,t} \), the \( q, t \)-Laplacian of \( T \) whenever \( q, t \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( qt \geq 0 \) or \( q, t \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( qt \geq 0 \). One special case of \( L_{q,t} \) is obtained when we set \( q = i \) and \( t = -i \) where \( i = \sqrt{-1} \). In this case, the weighted adjacency matrix becomes the Hermitian adjacency matrix of \( T \) with edges oriented in the direction of the arc labelled \( q \). The Hermitian adjacency matrix is a matrix defined and studied by Bapat, Pati and Kalita [1] and later independently by Liu and Li [20] and by Guo and Mohar [15]. With these complex numbers as weights,
\( \mathcal{L}_{q,t} \) reduces to what is defined as the Hermitian Laplacian of \( T \) by Yu and Qu [27]. We get the following corollary of Theorem 1.

**Corollary 34.** Let \( T_1, T_2 \) be trees on \( n \) vertices with \( T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1 \). Then, in absolute value, the coefficients of the immanantal polynomials of the Hermitian Laplacian of \( T_1 \) are larger than the corresponding coefficient of the immanantal polynomials of the Hermitian Laplacian of \( T_2 \).

Let \( T \) be a tree on \( n \) vertices with Laplacian \( L_T \) and \( q, t \)-Laplacian \( \mathcal{L}_{q,t} \). When \( q = z \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( z \neq 0 \), and \( t = 1/q \) then it is simple to see that the matrix \( \mathcal{L}_{q,t} \) need not be Hermitian. In this case, for all \( i \geq 0 \), we have \( a_{r,i}^T(q)_{q=1} = a_{r,i}^T(z, 1/z) \). This implies that for all \( \lambda \vdash n \) and for \( 0 \leq r \leq n \), \( c^{L_{q,t}}_{\lambda,r} = c^{L_T}_{\lambda,r} \). Thus, we obtain the following simple corollary.

**Corollary 35.** Let \( T \) be a tree on \( n \) vertices with Laplacian \( L_T \) and \( q, t \)-Laplacian \( \mathcal{L}_{q,t} \). Then, for all \( z \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( z \neq 0 \) and for all \( \lambda \vdash n \)

\[
\int_{\lambda}^{L_{q,t}, 1/z} (x) = \int_{\lambda}^{L_T} (x).
\]

### 7. Exponential distance matrices of a tree

In [2], Bapat, Lal and Pati introduced the exponential distance matrix \( \mathbf{ED}_T \) of a tree \( T \). In this section, we prove that when \( q \neq \pm 1 \), the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of \( \mathbf{ED}_T \), in absolute value decrease when we go up \( \text{GTS}_n \). We show a similar relation on immanants of \( \mathbf{ED}_T \) indexed by partitions with two columns. We recall the definition of \( \mathbf{ED}_T \) from [2]. Let \( T \) be a tree with \( n \) vertices. Then, its exponential distance matrix \( \mathbf{ED}_T = (e_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \) is defined as follows: the entry \( e_{i,j} = 1 \) if \( i = j \) and \( e_{i,j} = q^{d_{i,j}} \), if \( i \neq j \), where \( d_{i,j} \) is the distance between vertex \( i \) and vertex \( j \) in \( T \). For \( \lambda \vdash n \), define

\[
f_{\lambda}^{\mathbf{ED}_T}(x) = d_\lambda(xI - \mathbf{ED}_T) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} (-1)^r c^{\mathbf{ED}_T}_{\lambda,r}(q)x^{n-r}.
\]  

(11)

We need the following lemma of Bapat, Lal and Pati [2].

**Lemma 36 (Bapat, Lal and Pati).** Let \( T \) be a tree with \( n \) vertices. Let \( \mathcal{L}^q_T \) and \( \mathbf{ED}_T \) be the \( q \)-Laplacian and exponential distance matrix of \( T \) respectively. Then, \( \det(\mathbf{ED}_T) = (1 - q^2)^{n-1} \) and if \( q \neq \pm 1 \), then

\[
\mathbf{ED}_T^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - q^2} \mathcal{L}^q_T.
\]

Using Jacobi’s Theorem on minors of the inverse of a matrix (see DeAlba’s article [12, Section 4.2]), we get the following easy corollary, whose proof we omit.
Corollary 37. Let $T$ be a tree with $n$ vertices. Let $\mathcal{L}_T^q$ and $\text{ED}_T$ be the $q$-Laplacian and exponential distance matrix of $T$ respectively. Let $q \neq \pm 1$. Then, for $0 \leq r \leq n$

$$c_{1^n,r}^{\text{ED}_T}(q) = (1 - q^2)^{r-1} c_{1^n,n-r}^{\mathcal{L}_T^q}(q),$$

where $c_{1^n,n-r}^{\mathcal{L}_T^q}(q)$ is the coefficient of $(-1)^{n-r} x^r$ in $f_{1^n}^{\mathcal{L}_T^q}(x)$.

The following corollary is an easy consequence of Theorem 1 and Corollary 37, we omit its proof.

Corollary 38. Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be two trees with $n$ vertices such that $T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}_n} T_1$. Then, for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $q \neq \pm 1$ and for $0 \leq r \leq n$,

$$\left| c_{1^n,r}^{\text{ED}_{T_2}}(q) \right| \leq \left| c_{1^n,r}^{\text{ED}_{T_1}}(q) \right|.$$

In particular, for an arbitrary tree $T$ with $n$ vertices,

$$\left| c_{1^n,n-r}^{\text{ED}_{\mathcal{S}_n}}(q) \right| \leq \left| c_{1^n,n-r}^{\text{ED}_{T}}(q) \right| \leq \left| c_{1^n,n-r}^{\text{ED}_{\mathcal{T}_n}}(q) \right|.$$

We give some results for the immanant $d_\lambda(\text{ED}_T)$, when $\lambda \vdash n$ is a two column partition. That is $\lambda = 2^k, 1^{n-2k}$ with $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. When $\lambda$ is a two column partition of $n$, Merris and Watkins in [23] proved the following lemma for invertible matrices.

Lemma 39 (Merris, Watkins). Let $A$ be an invertible $n \times n$ matrix. Then $\lambda \vdash n$ is a two column partition if and only if

$$d_\lambda(A) \det(A^{-1}) = d_\lambda(A^{-1}) \det(A).$$

Lemma 40. Let $T$ be a tree with $n$ vertices with $q$-Laplacian and exponential distance matrices $\mathcal{L}_T^q$ and $\text{ED}_T$ respectively. Then for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $q \neq \pm 1$ and $\lambda = 2^k, 1^{n-2k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$

$$d_\lambda(\text{ED}_T) = d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T)(1 - q^2)^{n-2}.$$

Proof. For all $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $q \neq \pm 1$, $\text{ED}_T$ is invertible. By Lemma 39, we have

$$d_\lambda(\text{ED}_T) \det \left( \frac{1}{1 - q^2} \mathcal{L}_T^q \right) = d_\lambda \left( \frac{1}{1 - q^2} \mathcal{L}_T^q \right) \det(\text{ED}_T).$$

Thus, $d_\lambda(\text{ED}_T) \det(\mathcal{L}_T^q) = d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T^q) \det(\text{ED}_T)$.

Hence, $d_\lambda(\text{ED}_T) = d_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_T^q)(1 - q^2)^{n-2}$, completing the proof. □

Combining Lemma 40 and Theorem 1 gives us another corollary whose straightforward proof we again omit.
Corollary 41. Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be two trees on $n$ vertices with $T_2 \geq_{\text{GTS}} T_1$. Then, for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $q \neq \pm 1$ and for all $\lambda = 2^k, 1^{n-2k}$, we have

$$|d_\lambda(\text{ED}_{T_2})| \leq |d_\lambda(\text{ED}_{T_1})|.$$  

7.1. $q,t$-exponential distance matrix

We consider the bivariate exponential distance matrix in this subsection. Orient the tree $T$ as done above. Thus each directed arc $e$ of $E(T)$ has a unique reverse arc $e_{\text{rev}}$ and we assign a variable weight $w(e) = q$ and $w(e_{\text{rev}}) = t$ or vice versa. If the path $P_{i,j}$ from vertex $i$ to vertex $j$ has the sequence of edges $P_{i,j} = (e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_p)$, assign it weight

$$w_{i,j} = \prod_{e_k \in P_{i,j}} w(e_k).$$

Define $w_{i,i} = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Define the bivariate exponential distance matrix $\text{ED}^{q,t}_T = (w_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$. Clearly, when $q = t$, we have $\text{ED}^{q,t}_T = \text{ED}_T$. Bapat and Sivasubramanian in [3] showed the following bivariate counterpart of Lemma 36.

Lemma 42 (Bapat, Sivasubramanian). Let $T$ be a tree with $n$ vertices and let $\mathcal{L}^{q,t}_T$ and $\text{ED}^{q,t}_T$ be its $q,t$-Laplacian and $q,t$ exponential distance matrix respectively. Then,

$$\det(\text{ED}^{q,t}_T) = (1 - qt)^{n-1}$$

and if $qt \neq 1$, then

$$(\text{ED}^{q,t}_T)^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - qt} \mathcal{L}^{q,t}_T.$$  

It is easy to see that all results about $\text{ED}_T$ go through for the bivariate $q,t$-exponential distance matrix $\text{ED}^{q,t}_T$ when $q,t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $qt \neq 1$ or when $q,t \in \mathbb{C}$ with $qt \neq 1$. In particular, Corollary 41 goes through for the bivariate exponential distance matrix.
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