

Reduction of the graph isomorphism problem to equality checking of n -variables polynomials and the algorithms that use the reduction

Alexander Prolubnikov

Omsk State University, Omsk, Russian Federation
a.v.prolubnikov@mail.ru

Abstract. The graph isomorphism problem is considered. We assign modified characteristic polynomials for graphs and reduce the graph isomorphism problem to the following one. It is required to find out, is there such an enumeration of the graphs vertices that the polynomials of the graphs are equal. We present algorithms for the graph isomorphism problem that use the reduction. We prove the propositions that justify the possibility of a numerical realization of the algorithms for the general case of the graph isomorphism problem. The algorithms perform equality checking of graphs modified n -variables characteristic polynomials. We show that probability of obtaining a wrong solution of the graph isomorphism problem using recursive modification of the algorithm is negligible if the algorithm parameter is sufficiently large. In the course of its implementation, the algorithm checks the equality of the graphs modified characteristic polynomials in predefined points. For n -vertices graph, the polynomial has 2^n coefficients so its value in some point cannot be evaluated directly for large enough n . We show that we may check the equality of the polynomials in predefined points without direct evaluation of the polynomials values in these points. We prove that, for the graphs on n vertices, it is required $O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations and it is required machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n^2)$ to check equality of the graphs polynomials values in predefined points. In general, it needs an exponential time to solve the GI instance using the presented approach, but in practice, it is efficient even for computationally hard instances of the graph isomorphism problem.

Keywords: graph isomorphism, complete invariant, computational complexity

1 The graph isomorphism problem

In the graph isomorphism problem (GI), we have two simple graphs G and H . Let $V(G)$ and $V(H)$ denote the sets of vertices of the graphs and let $E(G)$ and $E(H)$ denote the sets of their edges. $V(G) = V(H) = [n]$. An isomorphism of the graphs G and H is a bijection $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ such that for all $i, j \in V(G)$

$$(i, j) \in E(G) \Leftrightarrow (\varphi(i), \varphi(j)) \in E(H).$$

II

If such a bijection exists, then the graphs G and H are isomorphic (we shall denote it as $G \simeq H$), else the graphs are not isomorphic. In the problem, it is required to present the bijection that is an isomorphism or we must show non-existence of such a bijection.

We may state GI using adjacency matrices of graphs. Let $(A)_{ij}$ denote the ij -th element of a matrix A . The adjacency matrix of a graph G is a matrix $A(G)$ which has dimension of $n \times n$. Elements of this matrix are defined as follows:

$$(A(G))_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (i, j) \in E(G), \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Let $A(G)$ and $A(H)$ be adjacency matrices of the graphs G and H . Then

$$G \simeq H \Leftrightarrow \exists \varphi \in S_n : A(H) = P_\varphi A(G) P_\varphi^\top,$$

where S_n is a symmetric group on $[n]$ and

$$(P_\varphi)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = \varphi(j), \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

By this formulation of the problem, the two graphs are isomorphic if and only if we can obtain adjacency matrix of the first graph from adjacency matrix of the second one by some permutation of its rows and columns.

GI is one of the fundamental problems of discrete mathematics and there are numerous applications where it arises. For example, without solving GI , we cannot practically solve the following problem. In the problem, we need to find an n -vertices graph that has some specified property. We may search the graph doing the exhaustive search on all labelled n -vertices graphs. But, since there are $n!$ of isomorphic labelled graphs, we must check the property only for nonisomorphic labeled graphs during this search. For this purpose, we need to efficiently solve GI . Else our memory expenses would be too high.

GI belongs to NP class since it takes $O(n^2)$ time to check whether some bijection of $V(G)$ onto $V(H)$ is an isomorphism. It is not proved that the problem is NP -complete and there is no any polynomial algorithm has been obtained for the general case of the problem.

GI is solvable in polynomial time for some classes of graphs: for trees [1], for graphs with bounded genus [2], for graphs with bounded multiplicity of their adjacency matrix eigenvalues [3], for graphs with bounded degree of their vertices [4] and for some other restricted classes of graphs. The more regular structure of the graphs, the harder to obtain solution of GI for them. Such classes as regular graphs, strongly regular graphs, isoregular graphs give the instances of GI that cannot be solved in polynomial time by existing algorithms.

For GI , the designed algorithms may be divided in two classes. The first class algorithms are designed to solve GI for some restricted cases and the second class algorithms are designed to solve the problem for the general case. The examples of the algorithms which belongs to the first class are the algorithms that solve GI for the mentioned above classes of graphs. The Ullman algorithm [5], the

Schmidt-Druffel algorithm [6], B. McKay's NAUTY algorithm [7] belong to the second class of the algorithms. These algorithms are exponential in the worst case.

To solve GI , the algorithms check graph invariants during their implementation. Graph invariants are properties of graphs which are invariant under graph isomorphisms, i.e., graph invariant is a function f such that $f(G) = f(H)$ if $G \simeq H$. The examples of graph invariants are such graph properties as connectivity, genus, degree sequence, the characteristic polynomial of adjacency matrix, its spectrum. A graph invariant $f(G)$ is called complete if the equality $f(G) = f(H)$ implies that $G \simeq H$. Let us consider some of the well-known graph invariants.

The Weisfeiler-Lehman method is an example of the approach to check invariant characteristics of graphs. Applying this method, we perform iterative classification of graphs vertices. As a result, we have such colourings of vertices that we may use it to distinguish non-isomorphic graphs. Using this method, we can solve GI for large class of graphs in polynomial time. But it is shown [8] that there exists such pairs of non-isomorphic graphs on n vertices that they are cannot be distinguished by k -dimensional Weisfeiler-Lehman algorithm in polynomial time for $k = \Omega(n)$. This implies that, for the general case, this method not solve GI in polynomial time.

The procedures of graph canonization give complete graph invariants. For a graph G , using some procedure of graph canonization, we obtain its canonical form that is some labeled graph. Two graphs are isomorphic if and only if they have the same canonical form. Using canonical form of the graph, we may compute its canonical code. Canonical code $c(G)$ of a graph G is a bit string such that $G \simeq H$ if and only if $c(G) = c(H)$. The example of a canonical code is the code $c_0(G)$:

$$c_0(G) = \max_{\pi \in S_n} \{(A)_{\pi(1)} \parallel (A)_{\pi(2)} \parallel \dots \parallel (A)_{\pi(n)}\},$$

where " \parallel " denotes concatenation of bit strings and $(A)_i$ denotes the i -th row of the adjacency matrix $A(G)$. For some classes of graphs, canonical codes may be computed in polynomial time [1], [9]. Every complete invariant gives a way for graph canonization.

In [10], complete invariant for hypergraphs is presented. This complete invariant is not a result of canonization. For the case of simple graphs, this invariant is a system of $n^2 + 1$ polynomials over a field of characteristic q , where q is a prime number or zero.

In our work, we assign modified characteristic polynomials for graphs and reduce the graph isomorphism problem to the following one. It is required to find out, is there such an enumeration of the graphs vertices that the modified characteristic polynomials of the graphs are equal. The modified characteristic polynomial of a graph is not a graph invariant in the sense of its immutability to different enumerations of the graph vertices. But the polynomial is complete invariant of a graph in the sense that there is no such enumeration that gives equal polynomials for non-isomorphic graphs.

Also, we present the algorithm that solve GI by checking equality of the polynomials coefficients and the algorithms that solve GI by checking equality

of the values of the polynomials in the predefined points. The first algorithm of the second kind is a polynomial-time test for isomorphism that may be mistaken for some instances of GI , such as, for example, GI for strongly-regular graphs. The second algorithm is a recursive modification of the first one. It is exponential in the worst case. For this algorithm, we show that the probability of making a mistake become negligible for large enough values of the algorithm parameter. We show how to check the equality of the polynomials values in some point without direct computation of the values. We prove that, for the graphs on n vertices, it is required $O(n^4)$ elementary operations and it is required machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n^2)$ to numerically check the equality of the graphs polynomials values in predefined points.

2 The modified characteristic polynomial of a graph

Characteristic polynomial of a graph and its modifications. Let us consider the characteristic polynomial of a graph and some of its modifications which have been used for characterization of graphs by their structural properties. The characteristic polynomial of a graph G is the polynomial

$$\chi_G(x) = \det(A(G) - xE),$$

where x is a variable and E is the identity matrix. Let $D(G) = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ be a diagonal matrix, where d_i is a degree of vertex $i \in V(G)$.

Some modifications of the characteristic polynomial are considered in [11]. The examples are the graph Laplacian $L(G)$ that is defined as

$$L(G) = D(G) - A(G),$$

the signless graph Laplacian $|L(G)|$ that is defined as

$$|L(G)| = D(G) + A(G),$$

and some other modifications which may be generalized by the polynomial $\xi_G(x, y)$:

$$\xi_G(x, y) = \det(xE - (A(G) - yD(G))).$$

Seidel polynomial [12] is another modification of the characteristic polynomial that is obtained by modification of a graph adjacency matrix. It is the polynomial $\zeta_G(x)$:

$$\zeta_G(x) = \det(xE - (F - E - 2A(G))),$$

where $(F)_{ij} = 1$ for $i, j = \overline{1, n}$.

A generalization of the characteristic polynomial is the polynomial that is presented in [13]. It is a polynomial $\psi_G(x, y, \lambda)$ of the form

$$\psi_G(x, y, \lambda) = \det(A(x, y) - \lambda E),$$

where $A(x, y)$ is the matrix, derived from A , in which the 1s are replaced by variable x and 0s (other than the diagonals) are replaced by variable y .

None of the presented modifications of the characteristic polynomial is a complete graph invariant.

The modified characteristic polynomial of a graph. Variables of the polynomials presented above have no connection with graph vertices. We modify the characteristic polynomial $\chi_G(x)$ of a graph G on n vertices assigning variable x_i to $i \in V(G)$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be independent variables and let $X = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Definition 1. For a graph G , $|V(G)| = n$, $\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a polynomial of the form

$$\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \det(A(G) + X). \quad (1)$$

For graphs on $n = 1, 2, 3$ vertices, the polynomials of the form (1) are the following ones:

- 1) $n = 1$: x_1 ;
- 2) $n = 2$: $x_1x_2, x_1x_2 - 1$;
- 3) $n = 3$: $x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2x_3 - x_1, x_1x_2x_3 - x_1 - x_3, x_1x_2x_3 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + 2$.

It is clear that we have different polynomials for non-isomorphic graphs no matter what enumeration of its vertices we use for $n = 1, 2, 3$.

For a subset c of $V(G)$, let x_c be a product of the form $\prod_{i \in c} x_i$ and $A(G)_c$ be the determinant of the submatrix of $A(G)$ that is obtained by deleting of the rows and columns of $A(G)$ where numbers are belong to the subset c . $A(G)_c$ is the coefficient of $\prod_{i \in c} x_i$ in the polynomial $\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Having c and $\varphi \in S_n$, let $\varphi(c)$ be the image of c : $\varphi(c) = \{\varphi(i) \mid i \in c\}$. For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $x_\varphi = (x_{\varphi(1)}, \dots, x_{\varphi(n)})$. The following theorem holds.

Theorem 1. $G \simeq H$ and $\varphi: V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ is an isomorphism of the graphs if and only if, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \eta_H(x_{\varphi(1)}, \dots, x_{\varphi(n)}). \quad (2)$$

The polynomials η_G and η_H are equal if the coefficient of x_c is equal to the coefficient of $x_{\varphi(c)}$ for every subset c of $V(G)$. Thus, the equality (2) holds if and only if $A(G)_c = A(H)_{\varphi(c)}$ for all subsets c of $V(G)$. Let us prove the Theorem 1.

Proof. If $G \simeq H$ and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs, then (2) holds since

$$A(H) = P_\varphi A(G) P_\varphi^\top, \quad (3)$$

and the coefficients of η_G and η_H , corresponded by φ , are equal to each other.

Let us show that if the equality (2) holds, then $G \simeq H$ and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs. Let us denote $A(G)$ as $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B(G)$ as $B = (b_{ij})$.

If (2) holds, then the coefficient of x_c is equal to the coefficient of $x_{\varphi(c)}$ for all subsets c of $V(G)$. Thus, if we take c such that $c = V(G) \setminus \{i, j\}$ for some pair of vertices $i, j \in V(G)$, we have $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$. This is equivalent to $\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{ij} \\ a_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)} \\ b_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. So $a_{ij} = b_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)}$ and $(i, j) \in E(G)$ if and only if $(\varphi(i), \varphi(j)) \in V(H)$, i.e., $G \simeq H$ and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs. \square

Remark. To check the equality (2) for some φ , it suffice to check equality of the coefficients that correspond to c such that $|c| = n - 2$. Since if $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$ for such c , then $A(H)$ may be obtained from $A(G)$ by permutation of its rows and columns. And, since the equality (3) holds, then $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$ for all subsets c of $V(G)$.

3 Equality checking of the modified characteristic polynomials by checking equality of their coefficients

Let G and H be two given graphs. To check wether these graphs are isomorphic, we try to find φ such that the equality (2) holds. If such φ exists, then the graphs are isomorphic, else they are not isomorphic.

For $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq V(G)$, let C_I^k be a set of all subsets with k elements of I , let $C_I = \bigcup_{k=1}^{|I|} C_I^k$. For $c \in C_I$, $e_c = \sum_{i \in c} e_i$, $\varepsilon_c = \varepsilon \cdot e_c$, where $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$. $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n .

The presented below ALGORITHM 1 compares coefficients of polynomials of the form (1) using the recursive procedure EQUALITY CHECKING OF COEFFICIENTS. The procedure checks equality of the coefficients using the fact that the polynomials are linear in every variable. In the course of implementation of the algorithm, we trying to set the correspondence φ . Set I contains such vertices of $V(G)$ that the correspondence φ is established for them. $J = \varphi(I)$. If the variable a takes the value b , we shall denote it as $a \leftarrow b$.

EQUALITY CHECKING OF COEFFICIENTS (i)

```

1  if  $i = n$ 
2       $flag \leftarrow true$ ;
3      exit
4  else
5      for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ 
6          if ( $j \notin J$  and  $\forall c \in C_I : \eta_c(\varepsilon_c + \varepsilon e_i) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_{\varphi(c)} + \varepsilon e_j)$ )
7               $\varphi(i) \leftarrow j$ ;
8               $I \leftarrow I \cup \{i\}$ ;
9               $J \leftarrow J \cup \{j\}$ ;
10             EQUALITY CHECKING OF COEFFICIENTS ( $i + 1$ );
11  $I \leftarrow I \setminus \{i\}$ ;
12  $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{\varphi(i)\}$ ;
13 the value  $\varphi(i)$  is not defined;
14  $flag \leftarrow false$ .
```

ALGORITHM 1 (G, H)

```

1   $I \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  $J \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; the values  $\varphi(i)$  is not defined for  $i = \overline{1, n}$ ;
2  EQUALITY CHECKING OF COEFFICIENTS(1);
3  if  $flag$ 
4      print " $G \simeq H$ ,  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism of  $G$  and  $H$ ";
5  else
6      print " $G \not\simeq H$ ".
```

Implementing EQUALITY CHECKING... procedure, we search for $j \in V(H) \setminus J$ such that

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon_c + \varepsilon e_i) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_{\varphi(c)} + \varepsilon e_j). \quad (4)$$

We check this equality for every $c \in C_I$. If there is no such j , then we exit from the procedure having $flag = false$. We have $flag = true$ if and only if we have set an isomorphism φ of the graphs G and H .

At the start of the algorithm, we have $I = \emptyset$, $C_I = \emptyset$, $J = \emptyset$. For $i = 1$, checking of the equality (4) is equivalent to checking of the equality

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon e_1) = \eta_H(\varepsilon e_j) \quad (5)$$

for $j \in V(H)$. (5) is equivalent to

$$\det A + A_{\{1\}}\varepsilon = \det B + B_{\{j\}}\varepsilon. \quad (6)$$

If (2.3) holds for $\varepsilon = 0$ and for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\det A = \det B$, $A_{\{1\}} = B_{\{j\}}$. If it is so, we set $\varphi(1) \leftarrow j$. Further, if it occurs that we exit from the procedure EQUALITY CHECKING... with $flag = false$, then the value of $\varphi(1)$ may become undefined again.

For $i = 2$, when we have $I = \{1\}$, $C_I = C_I^1 = \{\{1\}\}$, $J = \{\varphi(1)\}$, we need to find $j \in V(H) \setminus J$ such that

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon e_2) = \eta_H(\varepsilon e_j) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon e_1 + \varepsilon e_2) = \eta_H(\varepsilon e_{\varphi(1)} + \varepsilon e_j). \quad (8)$$

Checking of the equality (7) is equivalent to checking of the equality

$$\det A + A_{\{2\}}\varepsilon = \det B + B_{\{j\}}\varepsilon, \quad (9)$$

and checking of the equality (8) is equivalent to checking of the equality

$$\det A + A_{\{1\}}\varepsilon + A_{\{2\}}\varepsilon + A_{\{1,2\}}\varepsilon^2 = \det B + B_{\{\varphi(1)\}}\varepsilon + B_{\{j\}}\varepsilon + B_{\{\varphi(1),j\}}\varepsilon^2. \quad (10)$$

If (2.3) holds for $\varepsilon = 0$ and for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then, if (9) holds for some $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $A_{\{2\}} = B_{\{j\}}$, and, if (10) holds too, we have $A_{\{1,2\}} = B_{\{\varphi(1),j\}}$. If it is so, we set $\varphi(2) \leftarrow j$. Further, if it occurs that we exit from the procedure EQUALITY CHECKING... with $flag = false$, then the value of $\varphi(2)$ may become undefined again.

At the moment when we check equality of $A_{c \cup \{i\}}$ and $B_{\varphi(c) \cup \{j\}}$, we have $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$ for all $c \in C_I$ since otherwise there would be exit from the procedure EQUALITY CHECKING... with $flag = false$. So

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon_c + \varepsilon e_i) = \sum_{c' \in P(c)} \varepsilon^{|c'|} A_{c'} + \varepsilon^k A_{c \cup \{i\}}, \quad (11)$$

$$\eta_H(\varepsilon_{\varphi(c)} + \varepsilon e_j) = \sum_{\varphi(c') \in Q(c)} \varepsilon^{|c'|} B_{\varphi(c')} + \varepsilon^k B_{\varphi(c) \cup \{j\}}, \quad (12)$$

where $P(c) = \{c' \in C_{I \cup \{i\}} \mid c' \subset c\}$, $Q(c) = \{\varphi(c') \in C_{\varphi(I) \cup \{j\}} \mid c' \subset c\}$, $k = |c| + 1 > |c'|$ for all $c' \in P(c)$. Since, for all $c' \in P(c)$, we have $A_{c'} = B_{\varphi(c')}$ at the moment when we check the equality (4) for $\varphi(c') \in Q(c)$, if (4) holds for $c \in C_I$, then it follows by (11) and (12) that we have $A_{c \cup \{i\}} = B_{\varphi(c) \cup \{j\}}$. Setting $\varphi(i) \leftarrow j$ and $I \leftarrow I \cup \{i\}$, $J \leftarrow J \cup \{j\}$, we obtain $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$ for all $c \in C_I$.

As a result, if we exit from the procedure EQUALITY CHECKING... with $flag = true$, then we have find a bijection φ such that $A_c = B_{\varphi(c)}$ for all $c \in C_I$, where $I = [n]$. Thus, by Theorem 1, $G \simeq H$ and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs.

4 The algorithms for GI that check equality of the values of the modified characteristic polynomials in the predefined points

If we check equality of the polynomials using ALGORITHM 1, we need exponential time since $\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ has 2^n coefficients. Such algorithm has an exponential complexity no matter what instance of GI it solves. The algorithms we present below solve GI by comparing of the values that the modified characteristic polynomials take in the predefined points of \mathbb{R}^n . This approach make possible to significantly reduce the time that is needed to solve GI instance checking equality of the modified characteristic polynomials of graphs. We present two heuristic algorithms to implement the approach: the Direct algorithm for GI and its recursive modification.

4.1 The Direct algorithm for GI

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $S = \{k/10^N \mid 0 < k < 10^N, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, $S \subset (0, 1)$. For $i = \overline{1, n}$, let ε_i be selected at random independently and uniformly from S . Let $\varepsilon^{(i)}$ be the following points of \mathbb{R}^n : $\varepsilon^{(0)} := 0$, $\varepsilon^{(i)} := \varepsilon^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. I.e., $\varepsilon^{(1)} = (\varepsilon_1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\varepsilon^{(2)} = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $\varepsilon^{(n)} = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$.

In the course of implemetation of the algorithms we present below, we trying to set a bijection $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ such that $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})$. On the i -th iteration of the Direct algorithm, we searching for such $j \in V(H)$ that

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j). \quad (13)$$

If we have set up such φ for the graphs G and H n iterations of the algorithm, then we make a conclusion that the graphs are isomorphic and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs, else we make a conclusion that they are not isomorphic.

The Direct algorithm for GI is named below as ALGORITHM 2. It is a test for isomorphism that may be mistaken for some instances of GI . For any test for isomorphism, there are two kinds of mistakes it can make: 1) wrong conclusion that $G \simeq H$, when $G \not\simeq H$, 2) wrong conclusion that $G \not\simeq H$, when $G \simeq H$. As it shall be stated below, the probability of a mistake of the first kind may be considered as negligible for the Direct algorithm. The algorithm solves the GI instances that presented in [14] but it makes a mistake of the second kind for GI instances obtained for strongly-regular graphs from [15] when $n \geq 13$.

ALGORITHM 2 (G, H)

```

1   $J \leftarrow V(H)$ ;
2  for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ 
3      choose at random  $\varepsilon_i \in S$ ;
4      if ( $\exists j \in J : \eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j)$ )
5           $\varphi(i) \leftarrow j$ ;
6           $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{j\}$ ;
7      else print " $G \not\approx H$ ".
8  print " $G \simeq H$ ,  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism of  $G$  and  $H$ ".

```

4.2 Recursive modification of the Direct algorithm for GI

ALGORITHM 3 (further, we shall refer it as *the algorithm*) we present below is a recursive modification of the Direct algorithm for GI .

SET THE CORRESPONDENCE ($i \in V(G)$)

```

1  if  $i = n$ 
2       $flag \leftarrow true$ ;
3       $\varphi(n) \leftarrow k$ , where  $k$  such that  $J = \{k\}$ ;
4      exit.
5  else
6      for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ 
7          choose at random  $\varepsilon_i \in S$ ;
8          if ( $j \in J$  and  $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j)$ )
9               $\varphi(i) \leftarrow j$ ;
10              $J \leftarrow J \setminus \{j\}$ ;
11             SET THE CORRESPONDENCE ( $i + 1$ );
12             if  $flag = false$ 
13                  $J \leftarrow J \cup \{j\}$ ;
14                  $\varphi(i)$  is not defined;
15  exit.

```

ALGORITHM 3 (G, H)

```

1   $J \leftarrow V(H)$ ;
2   $flag \leftarrow false$ ;
3   $\forall i \in V(G) : \varphi(i)$  is not defined.
4  SET THE CORRESPONDENCE (1);
5  if  $flag$ 
6      print " $G \simeq H$ ,  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism of  $G$  and  $H$ ";
7  else
8      print " $G \not\approx H$ ".

```

The recursive procedure SET THE CORRESPONDENCE gets on input $i \in V(G)$ and set $\varphi(i) \leftarrow j$ for $j \in J \subseteq V(H)$ such that (13) holds. If there is no such $j \in J$,

X

then we modify the correspondence that was already set up for $i-1$: we use the next element of J for setting $\varphi(i-1)$.

In addition to the GI instances that presented in [14], in a reasonable time, it solves the GI instances obtained for strongly-regular graphs from [15] ($n \leq 64$). We substantially reduce running time of the algorithm for the instances using the following points $\varepsilon^{(i)}$:

$$\varepsilon^{(i)} = \varepsilon^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i(e_i + \alpha \sum_{j \in N(i)} e_j),$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $N(i)$ denotes the vertices that are adjacent to i . Using PC, it takes not more than few minutes to solve an instance.

The probability of mistake. Suppose that we have some numerical realizations of the algorithms presented above. Let $P[\cdot]$ denote a probability of the event that we specify in square brackets. The following theorem [16],[17] is known:

Theorem 2. *Let $f \in F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-zero polynomial of total degree $d \geq 0$ over a field F . Let S be a finite subset of F and let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ be selected at random independently and uniformly from S . Then*

$$P[f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) = 0] \leq \frac{d}{|S|}.$$

If we have set up φ for every $i=1, \dots, n$, then $\eta_G(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_{\varphi(1)}, \dots, \varepsilon_{\varphi(n)})$. Let

$$f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) = \eta_G(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_{\varphi(1)}, \dots, \varepsilon_{\varphi(n)}).$$

Total degree d of the polynomial f is equal to n , and $F = \mathbb{R}$ in this case. So, implementing ALGORITHM 2 or ALGORITHM 3, if we obtain a message that $G \simeq H$ and φ is an isomorphism of the graphs, we have $\eta_G \neq \eta_H$ with the probability $P[mistake] \leq n/10^N$. If we set $N = n$, then $P[mistake] \leq 1/10^{n-\lg n}$ and the message is correct with probability no less than $1 - 1/10^{n-\lg n}$. For the Direct algorithm, the message that the graphs are not isomorphic may be incorrect. The message is always correct for its recursive modification since in this case there is no such φ that (13) holds successively for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By the Theorem 1, it follows that the graphs are not isomorphic.

5 The numerical realization of the algorithm and its computational complexity

Modifications of adjacency matrices. Let d be the maximum degree of vertices of G and H : $d = \max\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$ (we suppose that G and H have the same degree sequences). Let A and B be modified graph adjacency matrices of the following form

$$A := A(G) + 2dE, \quad B := A(H) + 2dE. \quad (14)$$

$A(H) = P_\varphi A(G) P_\varphi^\top$ for some bijection φ if and only if $A = P_\varphi B P_\varphi^\top$. If $d > 0$, then A and B have the strong diagonal predominance:

$$(A)_{ii} = 2d \geq 2d_i > d_i = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n (A)_{ij},$$

so

$$(A)_{ii} - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n (A)_{ij} > 0,$$

$i = \overline{1, n}$. Thus, the matrices of the form (14) satisfy the Hadamard conditions, and we have $\det A \neq 0$, $\det B \neq 0$ [18]. For numerical realization of the algorithms that we have presented, we use modified characteristic polynomials of the following form:

$$\eta_G(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \det(A + X), \quad \eta_H(x_{\varphi(1)}, \dots, x_{\varphi(n)}) = \det(B + X_\varphi), \quad (15)$$

where $X_\varphi = P_\varphi X P_\varphi^\top$. This modification is equivalent to the change of variables: $x_i \rightarrow x_i + 2d$.

We may consider the ALGORITHM 3 as a try to perform series of consistent modifications of the matrices A and B :

$$A^{(i)} := A^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i E_i, \quad B^{(i)} := B^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i E_j, \quad (16)$$

where $A^{(0)} = A$, $B^{(0)} = B$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We call the modifications of the form (16) consistent, if we successively choose, for every $i \in V(G)$, such $j \in V(H)$ that holds

$$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{ii} = \frac{A_{\{i\}}^{(i)}}{\det A^{(i)}} = \frac{(B^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i E_j)_{\{j\}}}{\det(B^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i E_j)} = ((B^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i E_j)^{-1})_{jj}, \quad (17)$$

where E_i is $n \times n$ -matrix such that all of its elements are zeros except the i -th diagonal element, which is equal to 1. It follows from (17) that

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j) \quad (18)$$

since the equality (17) is equivalent to the equality

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} = \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j)}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j)}. \quad (19)$$

And, since the values $\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})$ and $\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i-1)} + \varepsilon_i e_j)$ not change when the value of ε_i is changing, if the equality (19) holds for $\varepsilon_i = 0$ and for some non-zero value of ε_i , then the equality (18) holds too. Thus, if we can perform series of consistent modifications for $i = 1, \dots, n$, then the values of the polynomials of the graphs are equal in the points $\varepsilon^{(i)}$ and $\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)}$. This idea belongs to R.T. Faizullin. It was presented in [19].

Precision and complexity of computations required for numerical realization of the algorithm. We obtain the values of $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{ii}$ by solving the linear system of equations $A^{(i)}y = e_i$. The value of $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{ii}$ is the i -th component of the vector y . In order to solve the systems of linear equations, we may use such iterative methods as the Gauss-Seidel method (*the GS-method*) or the simple iteration method. As we shall note further, these methods converge at the rate of geometric progression for any starting vector because the systems matrices have the strong diagonal predominance.

Using the standard numeric Double type, we can solve *GI* instances from [14] and the instances that we obtain for strongly regular graphs from [15]. We choose $\varepsilon_i \in [\delta, 1)$, $\delta \geq 0.001$ and use 10 iterations of the GS-method. Further, proving the Propositions 1, 2 and 3, we justify the numerical realization of the algorithm for the general case of *GI*. To do this, we must show that, for the input graphs G and H , if $G \simeq H$, then numerical realization of the algorithm terminates with message that the graphs are isomorphic, else it terminates with the message that they are not isomorphic. For this purpose, we must

- estimate the number of iterations that is needed to achieve precision that is sufficient to check the equality (13) using the GS-method,
- estimate mantissa's length of the machine numbers that is needed to fix the difference of the real values they are represent.

If $G \not\simeq H$, we have $\eta_G \neq \eta_H$. We have two possibilities:

- 1) $\eta_G(0, \dots, 0) \neq \eta_H(0, \dots, 0)$,
- 2) $\eta_G(0, \dots, 0) = \eta_H(0, \dots, 0)$.

The Proposition 1 justifies the numeric realization of the algorithm in the first case, the Proposition 2 justifies it in the second case. Also, it follows from the Proposition 2, that if $G \simeq H$, then the numerical realization of the algorithm terminates with the right message and the probability of mistake is negligible. Let us prove the Proposition 1.

Proposition 1. *Let $G \not\simeq H$ and $\eta_G(0, \dots, 0) \neq \eta_H(0, \dots, 0)$. Then, if $N = n$, for the numerical realization of the ALGORITHM 3, we have*

$$P(\text{mistake}) \leq \frac{1}{10^{n(n-\lg n)}}.$$

Proof. The ALGORITHM 3 sets a correspondence φ for $i = \overline{1, n}$ and gives the wrong message that $G \simeq H$ only if, for some subsequent n iterations of the algorithm, we have

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} = \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{\varphi(i)\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})},$$

and $\eta_G \neq \eta_H$. If $\eta_G(0, \dots, 0) \neq \eta_H(0, \dots, 0)$ and

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{1\}}(\varepsilon^{(1)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(1)})} = \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{\varphi(1)\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})}$$

holds, then, for $t = \eta_{G \setminus \{1\}}(\varepsilon^{(1)}) / \eta_{H \setminus \{\varphi(1)\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})$, we have

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(1)}) = t \cdot \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)}).$$

Since ε_1 is taken randomly from S , for polynomials η_G and η_H of degree 1 of x_1 and $x_{\varphi(1)}$ respectively, having $x_i = 0$, $x_{\varphi(i)} = 0$, $i \neq 1$, and using the Theorem 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{1\}}(\varepsilon^{(1)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(1)})} = \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{\varphi(1)\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})}\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(1)}) = t \cdot \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)})\right) = \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(1)}) - t \cdot \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(1)}) = 0\right) \leq \frac{1}{10^N}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $i = \overline{2, n}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} = \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{\varphi(i)\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})}\right) \leq \frac{i}{10^N}.$$

Thus, probability of the mistake may be estimated as

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{mistake}) \leq \frac{1}{10^N} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{i}{10^N} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{n}{10^N}.$$

If $N = n$, then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{mistake}) \leq \frac{1}{10^{n(n-\lg n)}}.$$

□

Remark. We prove the Proposition 1 supposing that we may check the equality (19) numerically, i.e., that we may check it using machine numbers with polynomially restricted mantissa's length and that we may obtain the values from (19) in polynomial time with respect to n with needed precision.

Computational complexity of equality checking of the graphs polynomials values in predefined points. We obtain element $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{ii}$ of the matrix $(A^{(i)})^{-1}$ by solving linear system of equations of the form

$$A^{(i)}y = e_i, \tag{20}$$

where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{ii}$ is a value of the i -th component of y .

Obtaining the values from (19) as components of solution vector of (20), we make possible to estimate the number of iterations of the numerical method (e.g., the GS-method, simple iteration method) that is needed to achieve needed precision of computations. The precision must be sufficient to tell the difference between exact real values using machine numbers with restricted mantissa's length. Let us estimate the computational complexity of solution of the system (20) with needed precision using the GS-method. Let $y^{(k)}$ be an approximation of the exact solution y of the system at k -th iteration of the GS-method. The following theorem is known [20]:

Theorem 3. *Let, for linear system of equations $Ay = b$, the matrix A is such that*

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \leq \gamma |a_{ii}|,$$

$\gamma < 1$, $i = \overline{1, n}$. Then

$$\|y - y^{(k)}\| \leq \gamma \|y - y^{(k-1)}\|,$$

where $\|x\| = \langle x, x \rangle$ for scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n .

For matrices of the form (14), $\gamma \leq 1/2$. Consequently,

$$|y_i - y_i^{(k)}| \leq \|y - y^{(k)}\| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2^k},$$

where δ_0 is an error of the initial approximation.

Let us consider the following problem. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be some exact values, and let $a^{(k)}, b^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}$ be their approximations which are obtained after the first k iterations of the GS-method. Suppose we have

$$|a - a^{(k)}| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2^k}, \quad |b - b^{(k)}| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2^k},$$

and suppose there is such $\Delta > 0$ that if $a \neq b$, then $|a - b| > \Delta$. We must estimate the number of iterations we need to perform to tell the difference of $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ using their approximations $a^{(k)}$ and $b^{(k)}$. If mantissa's length of the machine numbers is sufficient to fix the difference between the real values, then, having

$$|a - a^{(k)}| < \frac{\Delta}{4}, \quad |b - b^{(k)}| < \frac{\Delta}{4},$$

we have

$$|a^{(k)} - b^{(k)}| > \frac{\Delta}{2}$$

and the value of $|a^{(k)} - b^{(k)}|$ is grows as k grows. So we may state that $a \neq b$. Thus, if $|a - b| > \Delta > 0$, then, to check the equality $a = b$, we must perform such a number of iterations K that

$$\frac{\delta_0}{2^K} < \frac{\Delta}{4},$$

i.e., $K = O(\log \frac{1}{\Delta})$. With regard to the fact that computational complexity of one GS-method iteration is equal to $O(n^2)$, it takes $K \cdot O(n^2)$ elementary machine operations to obtain solution of the system (20) with needed precision.

5.1 Computational complexity of checking equality of the polynomials values in predefined points and needed machine numbers mantissa's length

As it was mentioned above, to realize the algorithm numerically, we must be able to check equalities of the form (13), or, we can say, we must be able to numerically check the inequalities

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) \neq \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)}) \tag{21}$$

at the time that is polynomial of n and using machine numbers with mantissa's length that is restricted polynomially of n . The Proposition 2 justify such ability. To prove Propositions 2 and 3 we use the known the Gershgorin circle theorem:

Theorem 4. *Every eigenvalue of a matrix A lies within at least one of the discs with centres a_{ii} and radii $\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$.*

The Proposition 2, that we shall prove further, states that if $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})$ for $i < k$ and, at k -th iteration, we have $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)}) \neq \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})$, this fact may be established numerically in the course of implementation of the ALGORITHM 3. Thus, by the Theorem 1, the algorithm sets up φ only if input graphs are isomorphic and the probability of mistake is negligible. To prove the Proposition 2, we need to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *If (21) holds, then $|\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})| = p/10^{iN} > 1/10^{iN}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let $A = A^{(i)}$. Then

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \det A = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \left(\sigma(\pi) \prod_{j=1}^n a_{j\pi(j)} \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\sigma(\pi) = 1$, if permutation π is even and $\sigma(\pi) = -1$ else. We have

$$\prod_{j=1}^n a_{j\pi(j)} = \frac{p}{10^{k(\pi)N}},$$

where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k(\pi)$ is a number of modified diagonal elements of $A^{(0)}$ that contained in the product for π in (22). Thus,

$$\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \left(\sigma(\pi) \cdot \frac{p}{10^{k(\pi)N}} \right).$$

Since A has the strong diagonal predominance, we have $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) > 0$, and, consequently, $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = p_1/10^{iN}$, $\eta_H(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = p_2/10^{iN}$ for some $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. We have

$$\left| \eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)}) \right| = \left| \frac{p_1}{10^{iN}} - \frac{p_2}{10^{iN}} \right|.$$

If $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) \neq \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})$, then $p_1 \neq p_2$ and, consequently, $|\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})| = p/10^{iN} \geq 1/10^{iN}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Proposition 2. *If, for some $\varphi \in S_n$, we have $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)})$ for $i < k$ and $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)}) \neq \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})$, then*

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} \neq \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})}, \quad (23)$$

and we may check the inequality (23) using $O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations and using machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n^2)$.

XVI

Proof. Let $a = \eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})$, $a' = \eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})$. It follows from the Lemma 1 that $\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)}) = a + p/10^{kN}$, $\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)}) = a' + q/10^{kN}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} - \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})} \right| = \left| \frac{a'}{a} - \frac{a' + q/10^{kN}}{a + p/10^{kN}} \right| = \frac{1}{10^{kN}} \cdot \frac{|a'p - aq|}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})}.$$

Taking into account the modifications of diagonal elements of $(A(G))_{ii}$ and $(A(H))_{\varphi(i)\varphi(i)}$ that we have made for $i < k$ where $\varepsilon_i < 1$, it follows from the Gershgorin theorem that $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)}) < (3(d+1))^n$ and $\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)}) < (3(d+1))^n$. Since $a = p_1/10^{kN}$, $a' = p_2/10^{(k-1)N}$ where $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, then if $a'p - aq \neq 0$, we have $|a'p - aq| \geq 1/10^{kN}$. Consequently,

$$\left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} - \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})} \right| > \frac{1}{10^{2kN}(3(d+1))^{2n}}. \quad (24)$$

Let us show that $a'p - aq \neq 0$. The equality $a'p - aq = 0$ is equivalent to $a'/a = q/p$ which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} &= \frac{\eta_{H \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)}) - \eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_H(\varepsilon^{(k)}) - \eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} = \\ &= \frac{p/10^{kN}}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})} = \frac{p/10^{kN}}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k)})} = \frac{p/10^{kN}}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k-1)}) - \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k-1)}) + \varepsilon_k p/10^{kN}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Since $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k-1)}) = \eta_H(\varepsilon_\varphi^{(k-1)})$, (25) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k)})} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k},$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k-1)}) + \varepsilon_k \eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k)})} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k}.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\frac{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k-1)})}{\eta_{G \setminus \{k\}}(\varepsilon^{(k-1)})} = 0.$$

But it is impossible, since, by definition (14), the matrix A has the strong diagonal predominance, and we have $\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(k-1)}) > 0$. Thus, $a'p - aq \neq 0$.

Let us show that we may check the inequality (21) using machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n^2)$ and that it takes $O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations. It follows from (24) that it takes such mantissa's length L to check (21) numerically that

$$\frac{1}{10^L} < \frac{1}{10^{2kN}(3d+1)^{2n}}.$$

If we set $N = n$, then, since $d \leq n$, $k \leq n$, it is equivalent that

$$L > 2n^2 + 2n \lg(3n + 1).$$

Thus, using such $L = O(n^2)$, we may check (21) numerically. It follows from (24) and from the Theorem 3 that it takes $O(\log(10^{2kn}(3d+1)^{2n})) \cdot O(n^2) = O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations to check (21) numerically, where the multiplier $O(n^2)$ is a computational complexity of one iteration of the GS-method. \square

6 Eliminating regularities of graphs and reducing the exhaustive search

The ALGORITHM 3 scheme differs from the scheme of exhaustive search on all bijections of $V(G)$ onto $V(H)$ only in step 8 of the procedure SET THE CORRESPONDENCE that it use. Here, in addition to check whether current $j \in V(H)$ is not already setted up as an image for some vertex in $V(G)$ with label less than i , we check equality of the polynomials values in predefined points $\varepsilon^{(i)}$ and $\varepsilon_\varphi^{(i)}$. The algorithm of the same form may be obtained for numerous graph invariant characteristics. For example, we may check the equality of adjacency matrices of the induced subgraphs on i vertices for both input graphs. These subgraphs include the vertices for which the correspondence is setted up and all of the edges whose endpoints are these vertices. We check the equality of the subgraphs adjacency matrices after enumerating vertices of the induced subgraph of H in according to φ that is setted up for vertices from $V(G)$ with labels less or equal than i .

The graph G has more regular structure if it has more symmetries, i.e., if there are such bijections of $V(G)$ onto $V(G)$ which are isomorphisms of G onto itself (graph automorphisms).

Definition 2. *The graph G automorphism group is a set of isomorphisms of the graphs onto itself, i.e.,*

$$Aut(G) = \{\psi \in S_n \mid a_{ij} = a_{\psi(i)\psi(j)}, i, j = \overline{1, n}\}.$$

Definition 3. *The orbit of the vertex $i \in V(G)$ is the set*

$$O_i(G) = \{\psi(i) \mid \psi \in Aut(G)\}.$$

The considered scheme of the algorithm for GI (exhaustive search on all bijections that is reduced by equality checking of some invariant characteristics for the input graphs) may be modified to be efficient for some restricted classes of graphs, or, using some invariant characteristics, we may obtain some partitions of the graphs vertices that we may use to reduce the exhaustive search, but the main problem stays the same for every algorithm for GI of that sort: the more cardinalities of $Aut(G)$ and $Aut(H)$ and the weaker the graph invariant (i.e., it's more easy to find two non-isomorphic graphs for which the values of

the invariant are the same) that we use to check at step 8 of the procedure SET THE CORRESPONDENCE, the more alternatives for setting of φ we shall obtain in the course of its implementation, and it is more hard to find among them such a bijection that is an isomorphism or to find out that there is no isomorphism for input graphs. Conversely, the graphs with less regular structure, such as, e.g., random graphs, give *GI* instances that are easy to solve using known algorithms since they have automorphism groups of low cardinalities.

The following lemma shows that, solving *GI* for the graphs G and H , we may have alternative variants for setting isomorphism of the graphs only if we have such $i \in V(G)$ that $|O_i(G)| > 1$.

Lemma 2. *Let $G \simeq H$, $i_1, i_2 \in V(H)$. $i_1 \in O_{i_2}(H)$ if and only if there exists a vertex $j \in V(G)$ and such isomorphisms $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ that $\varphi_1(j) = i_1$, $\varphi_2(j) = i_2$.*

Proof. Let $i_1 \in O_{i_2}(H)$. It follows that there is $\psi \in \text{Aut}(G)$ such that $\psi(i_1) = i_2$. Let φ_1 be an isomorphism of G onto H and let $j = \varphi_1^{-1}(i_1)$, $j \in V(H)$. Let $\varphi_2 = \psi \circ \varphi_1$. We have $\varphi_2(j) = (\psi \circ \varphi_1)(j) = \psi(i_1) = i_2$ and φ_2 is an isomorphism of G onto H . Conversely, suppose there are such $i_1, i_2 \in V(H)$, $j \in V(G)$ and isomorphisms φ_1, φ_2 that $\varphi_1(j) = i_1$, $\varphi_2(j) = i_2$. Then $\psi = \varphi_2 \circ \varphi_1^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(H)$ and $\psi(j) = i_2$, i.e., $i_1 \in O_{i_2}(H)$. \square

In the course of the transformations (16), we subsequently obtain the graphs with less regular structure than the input graphs have. The matrices $A^{(i)}$ and $B^{(i)}$ in (16) may be considered as adjacency matrices of the graphs $G^{(i)}$ and $H^{(i)}$. These graphs has weighted loops, i.e., edges of the form $(j, j) \in E(G)$. After the i -th iteration of the algorithm, we have $\psi(i) \neq j$ for all $\psi \in \text{Aut}(G^{(i)})$ since the i -th and the j -th diagonal elements of $A(G^{(i)})$ are not equal to each other with probability that negligibly close to 1 for all $j \in V(G)$, $i \neq j$. So we have $|O_i(G^{(i)})| = 1$. And, accordingly to the Lemma 2, we have no more than one way to set the value of $\varphi(i)$ on the i -th iteration of the algorithm. Performing transformations (16) and selecting unique values of the loops weights ε_i , we subsequently obtain such $G^{(i)}$ and $H^{(i)}$ that

$$|O_j(G^{(i)})| = 1, j \leq i, \quad |\text{Aut}(G^{(i+1)})| \leq |\text{Aut}(G^{(i-1)})|,$$

$$|O_{\varphi(j)}(H^{(i)})| = 1, j \leq i, \quad |\text{Aut}(H^{(i)})| \leq |\text{Aut}(H^{(i-1)})|$$

and finally we get

$$|O_j(G^{(t)})| = |O_{\varphi(j)}(H^{(t)})| = 1, j = \overline{1, n}, \quad |\text{Aut}(G^{(t)})| = |\text{Aut}(H^{(t)})| = 1$$

for $t \leq n-1$.

Let us consider an example of the algorithm operating that illustrates this reasoning. Let G and H be the input graphs shown on a picture below. Reduction of the number of variants to set φ is shown in table 1. After the 4-th iteration, we have $|\text{Aut}(G^{(4)})| = 1$.




Table 1. Reduction of the alternative variants of setting φ for G and H .

i	Variants of setting φ						$ Aut(G^{(i)}) $
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
0	3, 4	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	3, 4	16
1	3	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	1, 2, 5, 6	4	8
2	3	1	2	5, 6	5, 6	4	2
3	3	1	2	5, 6	5, 6	4	2
4	3	1	2	5	6	4	1

In the table 2, the values of $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{jj}$ are shown. For all $i = \overline{1, n}$, if the value of $\varphi(i)$ is setted up, then the multisets $\{((B^{(i)})^{-1})_{jj}\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{jj}\}_{j=1}^n$ are equal. To compute these values, we perform 10 iterations of the GS-method in order to solve the systems of equations of the form (20). The initial approximation that we use is $y^{(0)} = (1, \dots, 1)$.

Table 2. Computed values of $((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{jj}$, $i = \overline{1, 3}$.

i	ε_i	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{11}$	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{22}$	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{33}$	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{44}$	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{55}$	$((A^{(i)})^{-1})_{66}$
0	0	0.078	0.094	0.094	0.094	0.094	0.078
1	0.861	0.070	0.095	0.095	0.095	0.095	0.078
2	0.672	0.070	0.087	0.095	0.095	0.095	0.079
3	0.372	0.071	0.087	0.091	0.094	0.094	0.079
4	0.475	0.072	0.087	0.091	0.089	0.095	0.080

Let us show that the reduction of the variants of setting of φ may be realized numerically for the general case of GI , i.e., having the equality

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})} = \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})}, \tag{26}$$

after the $(i-1)$ -th iteration of the algorithm, we have

$$\frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \neq \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \tag{27}$$

after the i -th iteration. Let us show that (27) may be checked numerically using machine numbers with polynomially restricted mantissa's length and it takes polynomial time.

Proposition 3. *Let (26) holds. Then*

$$\left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} - \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \right| > \frac{1}{3^n 10^N d^2} \quad (28)$$

and we may check the inequality (27) using $O(n^3)$ elementary machine operations and using machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} - \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \right| &= \left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)}) - (\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)}) + \varepsilon_i \eta_{G \setminus \{ij\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)}))}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \right| = \\ &= \varepsilon_i \cdot \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{ij\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

since $\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})$ and since, as it follows from (26), $\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)}) = \eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)})$.

We have $\eta_{G \setminus \{ij\}}(\varepsilon^{(i-1)}) \geq d^{n-2}$ because Hadamard conditions are satisfied. On the other hand, by the Gershgorine theorem, for eigenvalues λ_t of $A(G^{(i)})$, we have $d \leq \lambda_t \leq 3d$, $t = \overline{1, n}$. Consequently, $d^n \leq \eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)}) = \prod_{r=1}^n \lambda_r \leq (3d)^n$. Taking this into account and using (29), we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{i\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} - \frac{\eta_{G \setminus \{j\}}(\varepsilon^{(i)})}{\eta_G(\varepsilon^{(i)})} \right| \geq \varepsilon_i \cdot \frac{d^{n-2}}{(3d)^n} > \frac{1}{3^n 10^N d^2}. \quad (30)$$

Let us estimate machine numbers mantissa's length L that is sufficient to numerically check the inequality (27). For this purpose, it is required that

$$\frac{1}{10^L} < \frac{1}{3^n 10^N d^2}.$$

This inequality is equivalent to the inequality

$$L > n \lg 3 + 2 \lg d + N.$$

Since $d \leq n$, if $N = n$, then, usnig machine numbers with mantissa's length L such that

$$L > n + n \lg 3 + 2 \lg n,$$

we may check the inequality (27) numerically, i.e., $L = O(n)$. It follows from (30) and from the Theorem 3 that it takes $O(\log(3^n 10^N d^2)) \cdot O(n^2) = O(n^3)$ elementary machine operations to check the inequality (27) numerically, where the multiplier $O(n^2)$ is a computational complexity of one iteration of the GS-method. \square

Thus, it follows from the Propositions 2 and 3, that in order to solve the *GI* numerically performing elimination of graph regularities, for the graphs on n vertices, it takes $\max\{O(n^4), O(n^2)\} = O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations and we need machine numbers with mantissa's length $\max\{O(n^2), O(n)\} = O(n^2)$.

7 Conclusions

In our work, we assign modified characteristic polynomials for graphs and reduce the graph isomorphism problem to the following one. It is required to find out, is there such an enumeration of the graphs vertices that the modified characteristic polynomials of the graphs are equal. The modified characteristic polynomial of a graph on n vertices is a polynomial of n variables. We prove that two graphs are isomorphic if and only if there is exists an enumeration of the graphs vertices such that the polynomials of the graphs are equal. We present algorithms for the graph isomorphism problem that use the reduction.

We prove the propositions that justify the numerical realization of the presented algorithms for the graph isomorphism problem. We show that we may check the equality of the polynomials in predefined points without direct evaluation of the polynomials values in these points. We prove that, for the graphs on n vertices, it is required $O(n^4)$ elementary machine operations and it is required machine numbers with mantissa's length $O(n^2)$ to check the equality of the polynomials values numerically.

References

1. Lindell, S.: A logspace algorithm for tree canonization. Proc. of the 24th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing. 400–404 (1992)
2. Filotti, I.S., Mayer, J.N.: A polynomial-time algorithm for determining the isomorphism of graphs of fixed genus. Proc. of the 12th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. 236–243 (1980)
3. Babai, L., Grigoryev, D.Yu., Mount, D.M.: Isomorphism of graphs with bounded eigenvalue multiplicity. Proc. of the 14-th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. 310–324 (1982)
4. Luks, E.M.: Isomorphism of graphs of bounded valence can be tested in polynomial time. Journal of Computer and System Sciences. 25. 42–65 (1982)
5. Ullman, J.R.: An algorithm for subgraph isomorphism. Journal of the ACM. 23. 31–42 (1976)
6. Schmidt, D.C., Druffel, L.E.: A fast backtracking algorithm to test directed graphs for isomorphism using distance matrices. Journal of the ACM. 23(3). 433–445 (1978)
7. McKay, B.D.: Practical graph isomorphism. Congr. Numer. 30. 45–87 (1981)
8. Cai, J-Y., Fürer, M., Immerman, N.: An optimal lower bound on the number of variables for graph identification. Combinatorica. 12 (4). 389–410 (1992)
9. Datta, S., Limaye, N., Nimbhorkar, P., Thierauf, T., Wagner, F.: Planar graph isomorphism is in log-space. 24th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity. Paris, France. 203–214 (2009)
10. Grigoriev, D.Yu.: Two Reductions of graph isomorphism problem for polynomials. J. Soviet Math. 20. 2296–2298 (1982) (in Russian)
11. Cvetkovic, D.M, Doob, M., Sachs, H.: Spectra of Graphs. Academic Press, New York (1980)
12. Seidel, J.J.: Strongly regular graphs with $(-1,1,0)$ adjacency matrix having eigenvalue 3. Lin. Alg. Appl. 1(2). 281–298 (1968)
13. Lipton, R.J., Vishnoi, N.K., Zalcstein, Z.: A generalization of the characteristic polynomial of a graph. CC Technical Report, GIT-CC-03-51. 2003. <https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/6511/GIT-CC-03-51.pdf>

14. Foggia, P., Sansone, C., Vento, M.: A database of graphs for isomorphism and sub-graph isomorphism benchmarking. Proc. of the 3rd IAPR TC-15 international workshop on graph-based representations. 157–168 (2001)
15. Strongly regular graphs on at most 64 vertices. <http://www.maths.gla.ac.uk/~es/srgraphs.php>
16. Schwartz, J.: Fast probabilistic algorithms for verification of polynomial identities. *Journal of the ACM*. 27. 701–717 (1980)
17. Zippel, R.: Probabilistic algorithms for sparse polynomials. Proc. of the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. 216–226 (1979)
18. Gantmaher, F.R.: *Teoria matritz*. Moskva: Izd-vo Nauka (1967) (in Russian)
19. Faizullin, R.T., Prolubnikov, A.V.: An algorithm of the spectral splitting for the double permutation cipher. *Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis*. 12(4). 365–375 (2002)
20. Bakhvalov, N.S. *Numerical methods: analysis, algebra, ordinary differential equations*. MIR Publishers (1977)