

# A Research on Some Approaches and Properties of Quantum Graphs: An Introduction

Mithleshwari Ghormare<sup>1\*</sup> Prof. Alok Kumar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar

**Abstract – The reason for this content is to set up a couple of essential thoughts concerning quantum graphs, to demonstrate a few regions tended to in the quantum graph look into, and to give a few pointers to the writing. The paper manages some spectral properties of (for the most part infinite) quantum and combinatorial graphs. Quantum graphs have been seriously considered of late because of their various applications to mesoscopic physics, nanotechnology, optics, and different territories.**

**A Schnol compose theorem is demonstrated that enables one to identify that a point  $\lambda$  has a place with the range when a summed up eigenfunction with a subexponential development fundamental gauge is accessible. A theorem on spectral hole opening for "enlivened" quantum graphs is set up (it's simple is known for the combinatorial case). It is additionally demonstrated that if an occasional combinatorial or quantum graph has a point range, it is produced by minimalistically bolstered eigenfunctions ("scars"). The arrangement of the discrete equations is examined in detail with regards to a (nonoverlapping) area deterioration approach. For model elliptic issues and a wide class of graphs, we demonstrate that a blend of Schur supplement decrease and corner to corner preconditioned conjugate inclinations results in ideal multifaceted nature.**

-----X-----

## INTRODUCTION

We utilize the name "quantum graph" for a graph considered as a one-dimensional solitary assortment and outfitted with a self-adjoint differential (now and again pseudo-differential) operator ("Hamiltonian"). There are complex purposes behind examining quantum graphs. They normally emerge as improved (because of diminished measurement) models in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and engineering (nanotechnology), when one thinks about proliferation of rushes of various nature (electromagnetic, acoustic, and so on.) through a "mesoscopic" semi onedimensional framework that resembles a thin neighborhood of a graph. One can make reference to specifically the free-electron hypothesis of conjugated atoms in chemistry, quantum chaos, quantum wires, dynamical frameworks, photonic precious stones, disseminating hypothesis, and an assortment of different applications. We won't talk about any points of interest of these roots of quantum graphs, alluding the peruser rather for an ongoing study and writing. The issues tended to in the quantum graph hypothesis incorporate legitimizations of quantum graphs as approximations for more reasonable (and complex) models of waves in complex structures, investigation of different immediate and reverse spectral issues (originating from quantum chaos, optics, disseminating

hypothesis, and different regions), and numerous others. This paper does not contain dialog of the vast majority of these points and the peruser is alluded to the study and to papers displayed in the current issue of Waves in Random Media for more data and references.

In this paper we address some essential thoughts and results concerning quantum graphs and their spectra. While the spectral hypothesis of combinatorial graphs is a somewhat entrenched subject, the relating hypothesis of quantum graphs is simply creating.

In this paper, we present a few outcomes concerning spectra of quantum graphs, and in addition of their combinatorial partners. While the (combinatorial) spectral graph hypothesis has been around for a long while, the spectral hypothesis of quantum graphs has not been created alright yet.

It is fascinating to note relations of the gave outcomes their partners for PDEs. The Schnol compose theorem is parallel to the established one known for PDEs, aside from the indispensable plan that we receive, which broadens its relevance. The resounding hole opening technique attempts to some degree for PDEs also, yet it is less clear and

less concentrated there. At long last, the exchange of the headed states for occasional issues does not bode well for PDEs, since intermittent second request elliptic operators with "sensible" coefficients have completely consistent range. The peruser should see that albeit all the basic elements of the proofs are exhibited, because of size constraints the proofs are dense and sometimes given under some extra limitations that can be evacuated. A more point by point article will show up somewhere else.

Examining quantum graphs as a framework comprising of point associations associated by bonds where the molecule moves openly, encourages us with understanding another wonders known as a quantum chaos. As is portrayed later in this paper in more points of interest, quantum chaos hypothesis is attempting to clarify how traditional disordered conduct emerges from quantum elements. It has been demonstrated that quantum frameworks with traditional clamorous breaking point have certain characteristics standard quantum frameworks don't. These characteristics which may be considered as seeds of the established chaos in quantum world are available in the wave work, vitality spectra and furthermore in dispersing properties of quantum riotous frameworks.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Abraham (1979) Algorithms that usage SVI have been proposed by: Fratta et al., Beichelt and Spross, and Locks and Wilson. It justifies indicating that Abraham's figuring and a framework point of reference that he displayed have thusly been used as a commence of relationship between's computations. One reason behind this is the Abraham figuring requires shorter computational time than the other beforehand mentioned counts.

Buntine (1992) proposed a Bayesian methodology as a stochastic look gadget for gathering trees, and Chipman, George, and McCulloch (1998) and Denison, Mallick, and Smith (1998) conveyed Bayesian estimations for CART trees.

Amit and Geman (1997) Other methodologies were proposed using the EM computation (Jordan and Jacobs 1994), bootstrapping based frameworks, for instance, sacking (Breiman 1996), thumping (Tibshirani and Knight 1999), and iterative reweighting plans, for instance, boosting (Freund and Schapire 1996), and randomized decision trees (Dietterich 1999).

Anthony (2001) This is particularly the circumstance when Boolean neural frameworks are the method of choice to find justification rules (Gray and Michel 1992; Thimm and Fiesler 1996; Lucek and Ott 1997).

Apte, Damerou and Weiss (1994) by a wide margin the greater part of counts circulated in the composing

are concerned just with gathering. Among the heretofore said are ID3, C4.5, CN2, SLIQ, RIPPER/SPLITTER, and SWAP. A bundle of various computations or acceptances of the past methods exist for a collection of usages.

Apte and Weiss (1997), Some makers proposed to solidify a bit of the more direct, existing standard based models into more mind boggling classifier (Liu, Hsu, Ma 1998; Meretakis and Wuthrich 1999). Similarly said should be the plain charming review article, which portrays the use of decision trees and control selection for a couple of data mining points of reference.

Bala, DeJong, Pachowicz (1991) starting late, other request methods have gotten noticeable quality. Much the same as the case for justification backslide, insatiable estimations don't generally and an overall perfect, and it has been seen that decisions should be considered if their computational cost isn't prohibitive. Among those decisions proposed are genetic counts (Vafaie and DeJong 1991).

Bayardo and Agrawal (1999) Other approaches to manage discovering perfect association rules have been starting late proposed for the data disclosure and data mining system by Webb (2000, 2001).

Breiman (1996), The continuous estimations composing has seen a wealth of alternatives rather than straight unquenchable tree looks. Buntine (1992) proposed a Bayesian methodology as a stochastic sweep instrument for portrayal trees, and Chipman, George, and McCulloch (1998) and Denison, Mallick, and Smith (1998) disseminated Bayesian computations for CART trees. Distinctive methodologies were proposed using the EM figuring (Jordan and Jacobs 1994), bootstrapping based frameworks, for instance, pressing.

Bryan et al. (1994) Up to five infarcts were perceived per subject, and each one of those infarcts was accessible in up to four of the 23 territories (i.e., a lone infarct was discernible in up to four regions). For every patient the infarcts were recorded as parallel variables (missing/present) in 23 locale. Table 3 records the 23 areas of the CHS outline and the amount of patients with infarcts in those districts.

### Noteworthy Contributions-

Buntine (2012) proposed a Bayesian methodology as a stochastic output instrument for request trees.

Chipman, George, and McCulloch (2002) Methods that don't change backslide into gathering are R2, which searches for clever conditions in IF THEN association to produce piece-wise backslide models, and M5, which fabricates tree based piece-wise direct models. These models, trees with direct

backslide fragments in the terminal center points, are alluded to in the quantifiable composition as treed models.

Clark and Niblett (2009) CART (Breiman et al. 1984) and SLIQ (Mehta, Agrawal, and Rissanen 1996) also have a place with that grouping. The administer based methods fuse the AQ family (Michalski et al. 1986), the CN2 estimation.

Kooperberg, Ruczinski, LeBlanc, and Hsu (2001) This fragment rapidly depicts an utilization of the method of reasoning backslide computation to inherited SNP data. This application was depicted in detail, Single base-coordinate differences, or single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), are one sort of normal plan assortment essential to all genomes, surveyed to occur about each 1,000 bases overall.

McClelland (2010) point by point redesigns in the wake of changing for sexual introduction, age, and whatnot. These elements were not open to us when we started separating the data, and we excluded those into our model.

Ruczinski (2011) It can be exhibited that Boolean enunciations and method of reasoning trees, and moreover other basis creates, for instance, Boolean explanations in DNF are proportionate as in the classes of justification verbalizations they address are the comparable. That infers, for example, that each Boolean enunciation can be addressed in DNF, and as a method of reasoning tree.

Webb (2010) Other approaches to manage discovering perfect connection rules have been starting late proposed for the learning disclosure and data mining system.

Zhang and Michalski (2009) proposed a method called SG-TRUNC, which they executed into AQ15 and released as variation AQ16. Cross-endorsement is furthermore typically used for model assurance.

## QUANTUM GRAPHS

As it was mentioned in the presentation, we will manage quantum graphs, i.e. graphs considered as one-dimensional solitary assortments as opposed to absolutely combinatorial articles and correspondingly outfitted with differential (or in some cases "pseudo-differential") operators (Hamiltonians) instead of discrete Laplace operators.

### Metric graphs-

A graph  $\Gamma$  consists of a finite or countably infinite set of vertices  $V = \{v_i\}$  and a set  $E = \{e_j\}$  of edges

connecting the vertices. Each edge  $e$  can be related to a couple  $(v_i, v_k)$  of vertices. In spite of the fact that in numerous quantum graph contemplations headings of the edges are unimportant and could be settled arbitrarily (we won't require them in this paper), it is once in a while more helpful to have them allotted. Circles and numerous edges between vertices are allowed, so we abstain from saying that  $E$  is a subset of  $V \times V$ . We likewise signify by  $E_v$  the arrangement of all edges episode to the vertex  $v$  (i.e., containing  $v$ ). It is expected that the degree (valence)  $d_v = |E_v|$  of any vertex  $v$  is finite and positive. We thus avoid vertices without any edges coming in or going out. This is normal, since for the quantum graph purposes such vertices are unimportant.

So far the entirety of our definitions have managed a combinatorial graph. Here we present a thought that makes  $V$  a topological and metric protest.

### Operators-

The operators of enthusiasm for the most straightforward cases are: the negative second subsidiary

$$f(x) \rightarrow -\frac{d^2 f}{dx^2}, \tag{1}$$

a more general Schrodinger operator

$$f(x) \rightarrow -\frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} + V(x)f(x), \tag{2}$$

or a magnetic Schrodinger operator

$$f(x) \rightarrow \left( \frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx} - A(x) \right)^2 + V(x)f(x). \tag{3}$$

Here  $x$  indicates the facilitate  $x_e$  along the edge  $e$ .

Higher request differential and even pseudo-differential operators emerge also (see, e.g. the study and references in that). We, notwithstanding, will focus here on second request differential operators, and for straightforwardness of composition particularly on (1). All together for the definition of the operators to be finished, one needs to portray their areas. The normal conditions necessitate that  $f$  has a place with the Sobolev space  $H^2(e)$  on each edge. One also obviously needs to force limit esteem conditions at the

vertices. These will be examined in the following area.

**SCLINOL-BLOCLI THEOREMS**

Schnol compose theorems in PDEs treat the accompanying inquiry. In the event that there exists a non-zero Lo-arrangement of the equation  $Hu = \lambda u$ , at that point unmistakably  $\lambda$  is a point of the point range of H. Is there a comparable test for distinguishing that  $\lambda$  has a place with the entire range? Envision that one has an answer (a summed up eigen work) of a self-adjoint equation  $Hu = \lambda u$  and that one has some control of the development of this arrangement (e.g., it is limited). At the point when would one be able to ensure that  $\lambda$  is a point of the range of H? For the Schrodinger equation in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a potential limited from beneath, the standard Schnol theorem, says that presence of a sub-exponentially developing arrangement suggests that  $\lambda \in \sigma(H)$ . A version of this theorem is referred to in strong state physics as the Bloch theorem: if H is an intermittent Schrodinger operator, at that point presence of a limited eigen function relating to a point  $\lambda$  ensures that  $\lambda \in \sigma(H)$ . On the other hand, for the hyperbolic plane Laplace-Beltrami operator  $\Delta_H$ , there is an infinite dimensional space of limited arrangements of  $\Delta_H u = 0$ . Indeed, using the Poincare unit plate model of the hyperbolic plane, one has  $\Delta_H = (1 - |z|^2)^{-2} \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  is the Euclidean Laplacian, or some other book on hyperbolic geometry). Along these lines, all limited consonant capacities u on the unit plate (which frame an infinite-dimensional space) fulfill the equation  $\Delta_H u = 0$ . However, the point 0 is still not in the spectrum of  $\Delta_H$ . This occurs because of the exponential development of the volume of the hyperbolic bundle of span r. A comparable Schnol compose theorem here would need to ask for some rot of the summed up eigen function. The motivation behind this segment is building up a Scimol-Bloch compose theorem for graphs.

Give  $\Gamma$  a chance to be an established associated infinite quantum graph fulfilling the condition An and outfitted with the Hamiltonian and any self-adjoint vertex conditions6.

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$$

Theorem. (A Schnol compose theorem) Let the graph.  $\Gamma$  fulfill the abovementioned conditions and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . If there exists a capacity  $\phi(x)$  on  $\Gamma$  that has a place with the Sobolev space H on each edge, fulfills all vertex conditions, the equation

$$-\frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} = \lambda \phi \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Gamma, \tag{4}$$

and the sub-exponential growth condition

$$\int_{B_r} |\phi(x)|^2 dx \leq C_\epsilon e^{\epsilon r} \tag{5}$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , then  $\lambda \in \sigma(H)$ .

**A FINITE ELEMENT METHOD FOR QUANTUM GRAPHS**

Differential equations presented on systems, or graphs, assume a vital job in the modeling and reproduction of a wide assortment of complex marvels. A vital precedent is the investigation of dispersion wonders on systems, which in the most straightforward cases lessens to the arrangement of beginning worth issues for direct frameworks of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). In spite of the fact that these models might be sufficient for concentrate basic circumstances, for example, those where the relations between the constituents of the framework (comparing to graph vertices) can be modeled by a straightforward parallel connection (associated or not associated), more refined models are essential when managing more mind boggling circumstances.

Metric and quantum graphs give helpful models to an assortment of physical frameworks including conjugated atoms, quantum wires, photonic gems, thin waveguides, carbon nanostructures, et cetera.

We allude to Berkolaiko and Kuchment (2013) for points of interest and references (see likewise Lagnese et al. (1994) for related issues not considered in Berkolaiko and Kuchment (2013)). A metric graph is a graph in which each edge is invested with a certain metric structure. Regularly (however not forever), its edges can be related to interims on the genuine line. In specialized terms, a metric graph is a case of one-dimensional topological complex, or one-dimensional simplicial complex. A quantum graph is a metric graph outfitted with a differential operator ('Hamiltonian') and appropriate vertex conditions (see the following segment for more exact definitions). This differential operator follows up on capacities characterized on the edges and vertices of the fundamental metric graph.

In physics and engineering applications, there is a solid enthusiasm for the spectral properties of the Hamiltonian, and additionally on associated wave proliferation, transport and dissemination marvels. The writing on quantum graphs is immense; most papers manage hypothetical issues, for example, spectral hypothesis, well posedness et cetera, or with physical applications. Then again, the writing committed to computational issues is relatively nonexistent, aside from a bunch of references managing rather uncommon circumstances (see, e.g., Hild and Leugering, 2012; Wybo et al., 2015;

Zlotnik et al., 2015), and the numerical perspectives are ordinarily not the fundamental core interest. Here, we venture out the precise investigation of numerical methods for the arrangement of differential issues including quantum graphs. We talk about a straightforward spatial discretization utilizing direct finite elements and procedures for the quick arrangement of the discrete equations, utilizing basic elliptic and explanatory model issues to delineate our methodology. We center around this kind of discretization since it enables us to feature fascinating relations associating the discretized Hamiltonian with the graph Laplacian of the hidden combinatorial graph. Notwithstanding equations presented on very organized graphs, which are of enthusiasm for physics, we additionally think about the instance of complex graphs with nontrivial topologies, in perspective of potential applications in fields, for example, physiology, science and engineering. Of course, we watch huge contrasts with the numerical arrangement of PDEs presented on more ordinary spatial spaces.

**Definitions and documentations -**

We give in succession the definitions, the documentations and the suppositions that we will use in the accompanying. We allude to Berkolaiko and Kuchment (2013) for a far reaching prologue to the hypothesis of quantum graphs.

DEFINITION 1 A combinatorial graph  $\Gamma = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is an accumulation of a finite number of vertices and of edges interfacing sets of unmistakable vertices. We will signify by  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  the arrangement of vertices and by  $\mathcal{E} = \{e_j = (v_i, v_k)\}_{j=1, \dots, M}$  the set of edges. Thus, an edge can be related to a couple of vertices. The graph is undirected if no introduction is appointed to the edges: for this situation, we don't recognize  $(v_i, v_j)$  and  $(v_j, v_i)$ . Something else, the graph is coordinated. For an undirected graph, we characterize for every vertex  $v_i$  its degree  $d_{v_i}$  as the quantity of edges  $e_k$  with the end goal that  $e_k = (v_i, v_j)$ . Since just a solitary edge (at most) is permitted between any two vertices,  $d_{v_i}$  is the quantity of vertices contiguous  $v_i$ , (i.e., the quantity of 'quick neighbors' of  $v_i$  in  $\Gamma$ ). We confine our consideration regarding graphs with no self-circles:  $(v_i, v_i) \notin \mathcal{E}$ , for all  $i$ . A graph is associated if from every vertex  $v_i$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  there exists a way  $(v_i, v_k), (v_k, v_j), \dots$  made by edges in  $\mathcal{E}$  interfacing it to any of alternate vertices.

In this work, we just think about inadequate graphs, which we characterize as those graphs with  $M = O(N)$ . We expect that the underlying graph  $\Gamma$  is undirected, yet we dole out an arbitrarily chosen course to each edge to characterize an incidence matrix of  $\Gamma$ . This is

a system  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  where each column corresponds to an edge and has only two nonzero segments identifying with the two vertices recognizing the edge. We will subjectively settle the principal nonzero section in the segment to the esteem 1 and the second nonzero passage to the esteem  $-1$  (this is proportional to doling out an introduction to the edges). We accentuate that the decision of the signs is immaterial for the reasons for this work. The benefit of utilizing  $E$  will turn out to be all the more clear after the presentation of the idea of quantum graph. Remark that  $E$  has an intriguing elucidation as a finite-dimensional operator mirroring the difference operator on differentiable capacities (Arioli and Manzini, 2003, 2006 for a comparable dialog identified with blended finite element issues). At long last, we review that  $E$  has rank  $N - 1$  on account of an associated graph.

The lattice  $E^T$  is likewise interpretable as the finite-dimensional likeness the angle operator following up on differentiable capacities. It is likewise essential to see that the traditional (combinatorial) graph Laplacian concurs with the network  $L_\Gamma = EE^T$ .

Note that  $L_\Gamma$  does not rely upon the decision of introduction utilized for the edges, since  $EQ(EQ)^T = EE^T$  for any  $M \times M$  slanting lattice  $Q$  with passages  $\pm 1$  on the fundamental corner to corner. The graph Laplacian is a symmetric positive semi-definite  $N \times N$  framework. The variety of 0 as an eigenvalue of  $L_\Gamma$  breaks even with the quantity of associated components of  $\Gamma$ ; if  $\Gamma$  is associated, the invalid space of  $L_\Gamma$  is one-dimensional and is crossed by the vector of every one of the ones.

Give the lattice  $l$  a chance to be the inclining of the grid  $L_\Gamma$ . The corner to corner sections of  $l$  are only the degrees of the comparing vertices. The lattice  $Ad = D - L_\Gamma$  is the contiguousness grid of the graph, i.e., the framework where the  $(ij)$  section is either 1 or 0 as indicated by whether  $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ .

DEFINITION 2 An associated graph  $\Gamma$  is said to be a metric graph if.

1. To each edge  $e$  is doled out a length  $\ell_e$  with the end goal that  $0 < \ell_e < \infty$ , and
2. Each edge is doled out a facilitate  $x^e \in [0, \ell_e]$ , which increases in a predefined (however generally self-assertive) bearing along the edge.

As a rule, the edges could be basic differentiable bends (i.e., no circles). Be that as it may, to improve the documentation, we expect that each edge is a

straight line joining the two vertices characterizing the edge. The bearing used to appoint directions to focuses on a given edge will be a similar one used to characterize the rate framework. In our definition of a metric graph, we accept that all lengths are finite. We allude to Berkolaiko and Kuchment (2013) for exchanges of infinite metric graphs with a few edges having infinite length. We characterize the volume of a metric graph  $\Gamma$  as  $\text{vol}(\Gamma) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \ell_e$ . In the accompanying, we will examine just finite graphs with all edge lengths finite, consequently with  $\text{vol}(\Gamma) < \infty$ . Note that we don't expect that metric graphs are inserted in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for some  $n$ . With the structure portrayed over, the metric graph  $\Gamma$  turns into a one-dimensional space, where for each edge  $e$  we have a variable  $x^e$  speaking to locally the worldwide facilitate variable  $x$ .

As noted before, a succession of coterminous vertices characterizes a way in  $\Gamma$  framed by  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^M$  and the related way length is basically  $\sum \ell_{e_j}$ . We characterize the separation  $d(v_i, v_j)$  between two vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  as the length of a most limited way in  $\Gamma$  between them. This idea of separation can be reached out normally to characterize the separation between any two (perhaps lying on various edges) in the one-dimensional simplicial complex. Enriched with this separation,  $\Gamma$  is promptly observed to be a metric space.

Next, we continue to present capacity spaces on a metric graph  $\Gamma$  and straight differential operators characterized on these spaces.

From this point forward, we characterize a quantum graph as pursues:

**DEFINITION 3** A quantum graph is a metric graph outfitted with the Hamiltonian operator  $\mathcal{H}$  characterized by the operator subject to the conditions at the vertices.

Despite the fact that this definition is more prohibitive than the one found, e.g., in Berkolaiko and Kuchment (2013), it is satisfactory for our motivations.

At last, among our objectives is the examination of allegorical issues on metric graphs. For this situation, we accept that the capacities we utilize likewise rely upon a second factor  $t$  speaking to time (Raviart et al., 1983), i.e.,

$$u(x, t) : \Gamma \times [0, T] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

furthermore, that they are elements of reasonable Bchner spaces, indicated underneath.

**DEFINITION 4** Let  $V$  mean either  $L^2(\Gamma)$  or  $H^1(\Gamma)$ . Let  $C^0([0, T]; V)$  be the space of function  $u(x, t)$  that are ceaseless in  $t$  with qualities in  $V$ , i.e., for each settled esteem  $t^*$  of  $t$  we have that  $u(\cdot, t^*) \in V$ . This space is furnished with the standard

$$\|u\|_{C^0([0, T]; V)} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_V.$$

Let  $L^2([0, T]; V)$  be the space of functions  $u(x, t)$  that are square integrable in  $t$  for the  $dt$  measure with qualities in  $V$ . i.e., for each settled esteem  $f^*$  of  $t$  we have that  $u(\cdot, t) \in V$ . This space is equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{L^2([0, T]; V)} = \left( \int_0^T \|u(\cdot, t)\|_V^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

what's more, scalar item

$$(u, g)_{L^2([0, T]; V)} = \int_0^T (u(\cdot, t), g(\cdot, t))_V dt.$$

We take note of that every one of these definitions can be effectively changed to manage self-adjoint operators following up on spaces of complex-esteemed capacities, as required, e.g., in quantum-mechanical applications.

## METHODOLOGY

Research Methodology is a way to deal with intentionally deal with the examination issue; it acknowledges the investigation methods and additionally ponders the basis behind the methods. The examination of research methodology for working up the assignment gives us the critical planning in get-together materials and engineering them, bolsters in the field work when required, and besides gives getting ready in frameworks to the social affair of data appropriate to particular issues. The examination methodology will be gotten test regularizing method. It joins:-

- Review of Literature: Various worldwide and national journals, book et cetera will be extensively considered on the most ideal approach to proceed on proposed consider and for its plan.
- Necessary examination will be done from the specific providers.
- Different makers work will be considered.
- The issues related to boolean polynomial math and parallel tree will be discussed.
- The distinctive components parameter and its applications will in like manner been considered.

## CONCLUSION

Quantum graphs are autonomous from the inserting space and his make them a decent possibility to model complex wonders relying upon numerous factors. In this article, we have presented and broke down Sclinol-Blocli theorems and furthermore break down a direct finite element method for the discretization of elliptic, allegorical and eigenvalue issues presented on graphs. The structure and primary properties of the subsequent solidness and mass lattices have been painstakingly portrayed, together with the related thought of expanded graph. Numerical direct variable based math angles have been examined, and in addition the numerical coordination of basic illustrative PDEs on graphs.

## REFERENCES

1. A.V. Borovskikh and K. P. Lazarev (2004). Fourth-order differential equations on geometric graphs, *Journal of Mathematical Science*, 119, No.6, pp. 719–738.
2. Albeverio S., Gesztesy F., Høegh-Krohn R. and Holden H. (2005). *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd edition with an appendix by Exner P. (AMS Chelsea).
3. Arioli, M. & Manzini, G. (2003). Null space algorithm and spanning trees in solving Darcy's equation. *BIT Numer. Math.*, 43, pp. 839–848.
4. Arioli, M. & Manzini, G. (2006). A network programming approach in solving Darcy's equations by mixed finiteelement methods. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 22, pp. 41–70.
5. Berkolaiko, G. & Kuchment, P. (2013). *Introduction to Quantum Graphs*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
6. D. Cvetkovic, M. Doob, and H. Sachs (1979). *Spectra of Graphs*, Acad. Press., NY 1979.
7. Hild, J. & Leugering, G. (2012). Real-Time control of urban drainage systems. *Mathematical Optimization of Water Networks*. International Series on Numerical Mathematics. Basel: Springer, pp. 129–150.
8. J. Bolte and S. Endres (2009). *The trace formula for quantum graphs with general self adjoint boundary conditions*, *Ann. H. Poincare*, 10, pp. 189-223.
9. Lagnese, J. E., Schmidt, E. J. & Leugering, G. (1994). *Modeling, Analysis and Control of Dynamic Elastic Multi-Link Structures*. Boston, MA: Birkh"auser.
10. P. Kuchment (2004). *Quantum graphs. I. Some basic structures*. *Special section on quantum graphs*, *Waves Random Media*, 14, pp. S107-S128.
11. R. Band, T. Shapira, and U. Smilansky (2006). *Nodal domains on isospectral quantum graphs: the resolution of isospectrality?*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 39, pp. 13999-14014.
12. Raviart, P., Thomas, J. & Ciarlet, P. (1983). *Introduction a` l'Analyse Numérique des Équations aux Dérivées Partielles*. Mathématiques appliquées pour la maîtrise. Paris, France: Masson.
13. S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn, and H. Holden (1988). *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
14. Wybo, W. A. M., Boccalini, D., Torben-Nielsen, B. & Gewaltig, M.-O. (2015). A sparse reformulation of the Green's function formalism allows efficient simulations of morphological neuron models. *Neural Computer*, 27, pp. 2587–2622.
15. Zlotnik, A., Chertkov, M. & Backhaus, S. (2015). Optimal control of transient flow in natural gas networks. *Decision and Control (CDC), 2015 IEEE 54th Annual Conference on*. New York: IEEE, pp. 4563-4570.

---

### Corresponding Author

#### Mithleshwari Ghormare\*

Research Scholar, Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar