

# A Family of Counter Examples to an Approach to Graph Isomorphism

Jin-Yi Cai\*      Pinyan Lu†      Mingji Xia‡

January 10, 2008

## Abstract

We give a family of counter examples showing that the two sequences of polytopes  $\Phi_{n,n}$  and  $\Psi_{n,n}$  are different. These polytopes were defined recently by S. Friedland in an attempt at a polynomial time algorithm for graph isomorphism.

## 1 Introduction

In a recent posting at arXiv (arXiv:0801.0398v1 [cs.CC] 2 Jan 2008 and arXiv:0801.0398v2 [cs.CC] 4 Jan 2008), S. Friedland defined two sequences of polytopes  $\Phi_{n,n}$  and  $\Psi_{n,n}$ .

Let  $\Omega_n \subset \mathbf{R}_+^{n \times n}$  denote the  $n \times n$  doubly stochastic matrices. Then  $\Psi_{n,n} \subset \Omega_{n^2}$  is the convex hull of the tensor products  $A \otimes B$ , where  $A, B \in \Omega_n$ . Meanwhile  $\Phi_{n,n}$  is defined to be the subset of  $\Omega_{n^2}$  defined by the following set of linear constraints.

$$\sum_{j,l=1}^{n,n} c_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \sum_{j,l=1}^{n,n} c_{(j,l),(i,k)} = 1, i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{(1,k),(j,l)}, \sum_{j=1}^n c_{(j,k),(i,l)} = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{(1,k),(j,l)},$$

where  $i = 2, \dots, n$ , and  $k, l = 1, \dots, n$ ,

---

\*University of Wisconsin-Madison, [jyc@cs.wisc.edu](mailto:jyc@cs.wisc.edu)

†Tsinghua University [lpy@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn](mailto:lpy@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn)

‡Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, [xmjljx@gmail.com](mailto:xmjljx@gmail.com)

$$\sum_{l=1}^n c_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \sum_{l=1}^n c_{(i,1),(j,l)}, \quad \sum_{l=1}^n c_{(i,l),(j,k)} = \sum_{l=1}^n c_{(i,1),(j,l)},$$

where  $i = 2, \dots, n$ , and  $k, l = 1, \dots, n$ .

It was shown that  $\Psi_{n,n} \subseteq \Phi_{n,n}$ . (In the earlier version it was claimed that  $\Psi_{n,n} = \Phi_{n,n}$ . If this were the case, then graph isomorphism would be in P, as one can reduce the problem to linear programming. In the Jan 4th version Friedland stated that the equality  $\Psi_{n,n} = \Phi_{n,n}$  “is probably wrong”.) In this note we give an explicit family of counter examples showing  $\Psi_{n,n} \neq \Phi_{n,n}$ . For every  $n \geq 4$ , our examples consist of an exponential number of matrices which are vertices of  $\Phi_{n,n}$ , but do not belong to  $\Psi_{n,n}$ .

## 2 Counter Examples

Let  $\rho \in S_n$  be the cyclic permutation  $(1\ 2\ 3\ \dots\ n)$ . Let  $\sigma \in S_n$  be any permutation.

**Lemma 2.1.** *There are exactly  $n! - n\phi(n)$  many permutations  $\sigma \in S_n$ , such that  $\sigma\rho\sigma^{-1}$  does not belong to the subgroup generated by  $\rho$ .*

*Proof.* A conjugate  $\sigma\rho\sigma^{-1}$  of  $\rho$  is also an  $n$ -cycle. To be in the subgroup generated by  $\rho$ , iff it is a power  $\rho^i$  for some  $i$  relatively prime to  $n$ . To be of this form, iff  $\sigma$  is of the form  $\sigma(i+1) - \sigma(i)$  (in a cyclic sense) is a constant relatively prime to  $n$ , which means there are exactly  $n\phi(n)$  many.  $\square$

Let  $A$  be the matrix whose first row is  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , and its  $i$ -th row is obtained by applying  $(i-1)$  times the cyclic permutation  $\rho$ . Let  $B$  be the matrix whose first row is  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  permuted by  $\sigma$ , and its  $i$ -th row is obtained by further applying  $(i-1)$  times the cyclic permutation  $\rho$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Whenever  $\sigma \in S_n$  satisfies Lemma 1, there does not exist a pair of permutation matrices  $P$  and  $Q$ , such that  $A = PBQ$ .*

*Proof.* The first two rows of  $B$  are  $\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and  $\rho\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . Assume for contradiction that there does exist a pair of permutation matrices  $P$  and  $Q$ , such that  $A = PBQ$ . The first two rows of  $BQ$  are  $q\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and  $q\rho\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , where  $q$  is the permutation corresponding to  $Q$ . They must be two rows of  $A$ , so there exist  $i$  and  $j$  ( $i \neq j$ ) such that  $q\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \rho^i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and  $q\rho\sigma(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \rho^j(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . We get  $\sigma^{-1}\rho\sigma = \rho^{j-i}$ , contradicting with lemma 1.  $\square$

Suppose  $A = (a_{ij})$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix. we use  $\widehat{A}$  to denotes the column vector  $(a_{11}, \dots, a_{1n}, a_{21}, \dots, a_{2n}, a_{3,1}, \dots, a_{nn})^T$  of length  $n^2$ .

Given  $A$  and  $B$ , define  $T$  to be the  $n^2 \times n^2$  matrix composed of 0 and  $1/n$  such that  $\widehat{A} = T\widehat{B}$ .

An example of this is shown as follows, for  $n = 4$  and  $\sigma = (3\ 4)$ :

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 & x_1 \\ x_3 & x_4 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_4 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_4 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_4 & x_3 & x_1 \\ x_4 & x_3 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_1 & x_2 & x_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$T = 1/4 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

**Theorem 2.1.** For any  $\sigma \in S_n$  satisfying Lemma 1.1, the matrix  $T$  is an extreme point of  $\Phi_{n,n}$ . However,  $T \notin \Psi_{n,n}$ .

*Proof.* By the definition of  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $T = (t_{(i,k),(j,l)})$ , for each fixed pair  $i, j$ ,  $(t_{(i,k),(j,l)})$  (respectively, for each fixed  $k, l$ ,  $(t_{(i,k),(j,l)})$ ) is a permutation matrix multiplied by  $1/n$ . Obviously,  $T \in \Phi_{n,n}$ . For each double row index  $(i, k)$ , either fix  $i$ , or fix  $k$ , and varying the other index, and for each double column index  $(j, l)$ , either fix  $j$ , or fix  $l$ , and varying the other index, we always get an  $n$  by  $n$  permutation matrix.

Suppose  $T = \sum_s w_s T_s$ , where  $T_s \in \Phi_{n,n}$ ,  $w_s > 0$ , and  $\sum_s w_s = 1$ . So within each block (fixed  $i, j$ , varying  $k$  and  $l$ , ) the non-zero entries of  $T_s$  are a subset of non-zero entries of  $T$  within that block, which form a permutation matrix. then by the equations for  $T_s$  within the block, it must be either

totally zero or a positive multiple of the same permutation matrix made up of non-zero entries of  $T$  within that block. For each block, the permutation matrix is the same for every  $T_s$ . The multipliers form a doubly stochastic matrix  $M_s \in \Omega_n$ , by the global sum  $\sum_{j,l=1}^{n,n} = 1$ . Therefore  $T_s$  is as follows: its  $(i, j)$  block is obtained by multiplying each entry of a doubly stochastic matrix  $M_s \in \Omega_n$  with the permutation matrix of  $T$  for each block.

Now if we consider the sum  $\sum_{j=1}^n c_{(i,k),(j,l)} = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{(1,k),(j,l)}$ , by the property of  $T$  each row of  $M_s$  is a constant. (Similarly each column of  $M_s$  is a constant.) Thus  $M_s$  is just the all  $1/n$  matrix  $1/nJ$ .

This implies that there is exactly one term in the sum  $T = \sum_s w_s T_s$ , and  $T$  is an extreme point.

Assume for a contradiction that  $T \in \Psi_{n,n}$  and  $T = \sum_s w_s P_s \otimes Q_s$ , where  $P_s, Q_s$  are permutation matrices,  $w_s > 0$ , and  $\sum_s w_s = 1$ . We get  $T \geq w_1 P_1 \otimes Q_1$  (Here the relation of  $\geq$  is entry-wise). For any  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \geq 0$ ,  $T\hat{B} \geq w_1 P_1 \otimes Q_1 \hat{B}$ , that is,  $A \geq w_1 P_1 B Q_1$ . By lemma 1.2,  $P_1 B Q_1$  is different from  $A$ , so there must be an entry  $(i, j)$  such that they are different at that entry. Notice that each entry of  $A$  or  $P_1 B Q_1$  is a single variable from  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . W.l.o.g, we can assume the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of  $A$  and  $P_1 B Q_1$  are  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . We can set  $x_1 = 0$  and  $x_2 = 1$  such that  $A_{ij} < (w_1 P_1 B Q_1)_{ij}$ , which is a contradiction. So  $T \notin \Psi_{n,n}$ .  $\square$

Before we posted this note, we note that Babai (<http://people.cs.uchicago.edu/~laci/polytope.pdf>) and Onn (arXiv:0801.1410) have both pointed out that the linear optimization problem over the polytope  $\Psi_{n,n}$  can solve NP-complete problems, and therefore it is unlikely that  $\Psi_{n,n}$  can be defined by a polynomial number of (in)equalities as  $\Phi_{n,n}$  can. In (<http://people.cs.uchicago.edu/~laci/polytope-correspondence.pdf>), Babai also mention that Joel Rosenberg already gave a counter example showing the two polytopes are different, for  $n = 4$ .

## References

- [1] L. Babai, The double permutation polytope is NP-hard.  
<http://people.cs.uchicago.edu/~laci/polytope.pdf>
- [2] L. Babai, Timeline of a correspondence.  
<http://people.cs.uchicago.edu/~laci/polytope-correspondence.pdf>
- [3] S. Friedland, Graph isomorphism is Polynomial.  
[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.0398v1.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.0398v1.pdf)

- [4] S. Friedland, On the graph isomorphism problem.  
[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.0398v2.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0801/0801.0398v2.pdf)
- [5] S. Onn, Two graph isomorphism polytopes.  
<http://arxiv.org/abs/0801.1410>