

On isomorphisms of m -Cayley digraphs

Xing Zhang, Yuan-Quan Feng*, Fu-Gang Yin, Jin-Xin Zhou

School of mathematics and statistics, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing, 100044, P.R. China

Abstract

The isomorphism problem for digraphs is a fundamental problem in graph theory. This problem for Cayley digraphs has been extensively investigated over the last half a century. In this paper, we consider this problem for m -Cayley digraphs which are generalization of Cayley digraphs. Let m be a positive integer. A digraph admitting a group G of automorphisms acting semiregularly on the vertices with exactly m orbits is called an m -Cayley digraph of G . In particular, 1-Cayley digraph is just the Cayley digraph. We first characterize the normalizer of G in the full automorphism group of an m -Cayley digraph of a finite group G . This generalizes a similar result for Cayley digraph achieved by Godsil in 1981. Then we use this to study the isomorphisms of m -Cayley digraphs. The CI-property of a Cayley digraph (CI stands for ‘Cayley isomorphism’) and the DCI-groups (whose Cayley digraphs are all CI-digraphs) are two key topics in the study of isomorphisms of Cayley digraphs. We generalize these concepts into m -Cayley digraphs by defining m CI- and m PCI-digraphs, and correspondingly, m DCI- and m PDGI-groups. Analogues to Babai’s criterion for CI-digraphs are given for m CI- and m PCI-digraphs, respectively. With these we then classify finite m DCI-groups for each $m \geq 2$, and finite m PDGI-groups for each $m \geq 4$. Similar results are also obtained for m -Cayley graphs. Note that 1DCI-groups are just DCI-groups, and the classification of finite DCI-groups is a long-standing open problem that has been worked on a lot.

Keywords: m -Cayley digraph, m -PCayley digraph, Cayley isomorphism, semiregular group.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C25, 20B25.

1 Introduction

A digraph Γ is an ordered pair $(V(\Gamma), \text{Arc}(\Gamma))$, where $V(\Gamma)$ is a non-empty set and $\text{Arc}(\Gamma)$, called the arc set of Γ , is a subset of $V(\Gamma) \times V(\Gamma)$. The digraph Γ is called a graph if $\text{Arc}(\Gamma)$ is symmetric, that is, $(u, v) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma)$ implies $(v, u) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma)$, where Γ has the edge set $E(\Gamma) = \{\{u, v\} : (u, v) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma)\}$. On the other way, a graph Σ is identified as a digraph by defining $\text{Arc}(\Sigma) = \{(u, v) : \{u, v\} \in E(\Sigma)\}$. The complement Γ^c of a digraph Γ is the digraph with vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ and arc set $\text{Arc}(\Gamma^c) = \{(u, v) : (u, v) \notin \text{Arc}(\Gamma)\}$. Denote by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ the automorphism group of Γ . Then $(\Gamma^c)^c = \Gamma$ and $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) = \text{Aut}(\Gamma^c)$. Clearly, one of Γ and Γ^c must be connected. Let U and V be subsets of $V(\Gamma)$. Denote by $[U]_\Gamma$ the induced subdigraph of Γ with vertex set U and arc set $\text{Arc}([U]_\Gamma) = \{(u_1, u_2) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma) : u_1, u_2 \in U\}$. Denote by $[U, V]_\Gamma$ the subdigraph of Γ

*Corresponding author. E-mails: 21118006@bjtu.edu.cn (X. Zhang), yqfeng@bjtu.edu.cn (Y.-Q. Feng), 18118010@bjtu.edu.cn (F.-G. Yin), jxzhou@bjtu.edu.cn (J.-X. Zhou)

with vertex set $U \cup V$ and arc set $\text{Arc}([U, V]_\Gamma) = \{(u, v) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma) : u \in U, v \in V\}$. If there is no confusion, we omit the subscript Γ for $[U]_\Gamma$ and $[U, V]_\Gamma$. Throughout this paper, all digraphs are finite and simple (no self-loop or multi-arc), and all groups are finite.

Let Γ be a digraph and let $G \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ be semiregular on $V(\Gamma)$ with m orbits (semiregular means that the stabilizer $G_u = 1$ for every $u \in V(\Gamma)$). Then Γ can be presented as an m -Cayley digraph $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ of G (see [16]) with respect to m^2 subsets S_{ij} of G such that

$$V(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} G_i, \text{ where } G_i = \{x_i : x \in G\},$$

$$\text{Arc}(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \{(x_i, (sx)_j) : s \in S_{i,j}, x \in G\}.$$

In particular, we may identify the semiregular automorphism group G with the right multiplication of G , namely $R_m(G) = \{R_m(g) : g \in G\}$, where $R_m(g)$ is the permutation on $V(\Gamma)$ defined by:

$$R_m(g) : x_i \mapsto (xg)_i, \text{ for all } x \in G \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

If $S_{ii} = \emptyset$ for all i , then Γ is called an m -PCayley digraph. Note that Γ is an m -Cayley graph if and only if $S_{ij} = S_{ji}^{-1}$ for each pair (i, j) , and the identity 1 of G is not in each S_{ii} because Γ has no self-loop. The m -Cayley digraphs contain several well-known families of digraphs, such as Cayley digraphs (1-Cayley digraphs), bi-Cayley graphs (2-Cayley digraphs), and Haar digraphs (2-PCayley digraphs) in the literature.

A Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is said to be *CI* (CI stands for Cayley isomorphism) if, for any Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, T)$, whenever $\text{Cay}(G, S) \cong \text{Cay}(G, T)$ we have $S^\alpha = T$ for some $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$. A group G is called a *DCI-group* or *CI-group* if any Cayley digraph or graph of G is CI, respectively. There are two long open questions for CI-problems:

- Which Cayley (di)graphs for a group G are CI?
- Which groups are DCI-groups or CI-groups?

Numerous papers have been published on these two questions, for which the reader may refer to the survey papers [30, 49]. One of the remarkable achievements on these questions is the classifications of cyclic DCI-groups and cyclic CI-groups, the study of which dates back to 1967 when Ádám conjectured in [1] that every cyclic group is a CI-group. In 1970, Elspas and Turner [20] disproved Ádám conjecture. Since then, a lot of work have been devoted to the classification of cyclic CI-groups. Based on contributions of many researchers like Elspas and Turner [20], Djoković [14], Turner [44], Babai [5], Alspach and Parsons [3], Godsil [22] and Pálffy [37], the cyclic DCI-groups and CI-groups were finally classified by Muzychuk [33, 35] in 1997. After this, many people have worked on seeking general DCI-groups and CI-groups, and a lot of work have been done over last fifty years (see for instance [2, 7, 15, 18, 21, 29, 34, 43, 36, 40, 41, 42, 47, 32]). In 2007, Li et al. in [31] gave an explicit list of candidates for finite CI-groups. However, it is very hard to determine whether a particular group in the list is a DCI-group or a CI-group. For example, the dihedral group is a group in the list, and the problem of classifying dihedral CI-groups is still widely open (see [5, 11, 18, 19, 46, 48, 26] for some progress on this problem).

In 2015, Arezoomand and Taeri [4] initiated the study of isomorphism problem for 2-Cayley graphs, and they introduced the following concept: a 2-Cayley graph $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, \{S_{11}, S_{12}, S_{21}, S_{22}\})$ is called a *SCI-graph* (SCI stands for semi-Cayley isomorphism) if, for any 2-Cayley graph Σ of G

isomorphic to Γ , there exists some $\alpha \in N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G))$ such that $\Gamma^\alpha = \Sigma$ (see [4, Lemma 1.1] and Proposition 2.4 for the definition of such an α). In particular, Γ is called a *0-type-SCI-graph* if Γ is a 2-PCayley graph that satisfies the above conditions.

In this paper, we shall study the isomorphism problem for the general m -Cayley digraphs. Similar to the concepts of CI-(di)graphs and SCI-graphs, we introduce the m CI-(di)graphs.

- An m -Cayley (di)graph Γ of G is said to be *mCI* (*mCI* stands for m -Cayley isomorphism) if, for any m -Cayley (di)graph Σ of G isomorphic to Γ , there exists some $\alpha \in N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G))$ such that $\Gamma^\alpha = \Sigma$.

Similarly, for m -PCayley (di)graphs, we define m PCI-(di)graphs.

- An m -PCayley (di)graph Γ of G is said to be *mPCI* if, for any m -PCayley (di)graph Σ of G such that there is an isomorphism from Γ to Σ keeping $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ invariant, there is some $n \in N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G))$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$.

Note that 1CI-(di)graph is exactly the same as CI-(di)graph, 2PCI-graph is the same as 0-type-SCI-graph in [4], and by Corollary 2.4 and Proposition 4.2, we shall see that 2CI-graph is exactly the same as SCI-graph.

In the study of isomorphism problem for (di)graphs, it is quite helpful to gain as much information as possible for the group of automorphisms of the (di)graph. This is particular true for Cayley (di)graphs. Let Γ be a Cayley (di)graph of a group G . In 1981, Godsil [23] determined the normalizer of $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. This result has been successfully used in the study of automorphisms and isomorphisms of Cayley digraphs (see for example [23, 24, 30, 49]). Another important tool in the study of isomorphisms of Cayley (di)graphs is Babai's criterion for CI-digraph: A Cayley (di)graph $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S)$ of a group G is CI if and only if all regular subgroups of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to G are conjugate. This was proved by Babai in [9], and plays a key role in the study of CI-digraphs. Considering the importance of the above two results, it is natural to generalize them to the general m -Cayley (di)graphs.

Let m be a positive integer and let Γ be an m -Cayley (di)graph of a group G . When $m = 1$, it is well-known that the normalizer $N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G))$ of $R(G)$ in $S_V(\Gamma)$ equals $R(G) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$, which is called the *holomorph* of G (see [38, pp.36-37]). In this paper, we first generalize this result to all $R_m(G)$ by determining the normalizer of $R_m(G)$ in the symmetric group $S_V(\Gamma)$ for all m (see Theorem 2.3). Applying this, we determine the normalizer of $R_m(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and some subgroups of the normalizer (see Theorem 3.1), which generalizes the above mentioned result of Godsil for Cayley (di)graphs in [23]. Then we generalize the Babai's criterion for CI-(di)graphs to all m CI-(di)graphs and m PCI-(di)graphs by using the characterization of the normalizer of $R_m(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ (see Theorems 4.3 and 4.5). The criteria for m CI-(di)graphs and m PCI-(di)graphs are then used to classify the m DGI-groups, m CI-groups, m PDGI-groups and m PCI-groups which are defined below.

A group G is called an *mDGI-group* or an *mCI-group* if every m -Cayley digraph or graph of G is m CI, respectively. Similarly, we can define m PDGI-groups and m PCI-groups. For $m \geq 2$, we shall prove that every m DGI-group (m CI-group, m PDGI-group and m PCI-groups, respectively) is $(m-1)$ DGI-group ($(m-1)$ CI-group, $(m-1)$ PDGI-group and $(m-1)$ PCI-groups, respectively) (see Theorem 5.3). This together with [4, Theorem B] enable us to obtain a classification of m DGI-groups and m CI-groups for every $m \geq 2$ (see Theorem 5.4):

- A group G is m CI if and only if either $m = 2$ and $G = 1$ or \mathbb{Z}_3 , or $m \geq 3$ and $G = 1$;

- A group G is m DCI if and only if $G = 1$.

Furthermore, we also give a classification of m PCI-groups and m PDCI-groups for every $m \geq 4$ (see Theorem 5.10):

- A group G is m PCI if and only if $G = 1$, \mathbb{Z}_2 , or $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 with $m = 4$ or 5 .
- A group G is m PDCI if and only if $G = 1$ or \mathbb{Z}_2 .

It is worthy to note that a subgroup of an m PCI-group with $m \geq 3$ is also m PCI, see Theorem 5.5. However, we do not know whether it is true for $m = 2$. It is well known that a subgroup of a CI-group is CI (see [5, Lemma 3.2]).

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we determine the normalizer $N_{S_\Omega}(G)$ of a semiregular permutation group G on a set Ω in the symmetric S_Ω , the centralizer $C_{S_\Omega}(G)$ of G in S_Ω , and the kernel of $N_{S_\Omega}(G)$ acting on the orbit set of G . In Section 3, based on the results in Section 2, we characterize the normalizer of $R(G)$ in the automorphism group of an m -Cayley digraph of a group G and some subgroups of the normalizer. In Section 4, we prove the criterions for m CI-(di)graphs and m PCI-(di)graphs, and in Section 5, we investigate the classifications of m DCI-groups, m CI-groups, m PCI-groups and m PDCI-groups.

To end this section we fix some notation used in this paper. The notation for groups in this paper is standard; see [13] for example. In particular, denote by \mathbb{Z}_m and \mathbb{Z}_m^* the additive group of integer numbers modulo m , and the multiplicative group of numbers coprime to m in \mathbb{Z}_m , by D_m the dihedral group of order m , and by S_m the symmetric group of degree m , respectively. Also, we denote by S_Ω the symmetric group on the set Ω . For a prime p , we use \mathbb{Z}_p^m to denote the elementary abelian group of order p^m . For two groups A and B , $A \times B$ stands for the direct product of A and B , and $A \rtimes B$ for a split extension or a semi-direct product of A by B .

2 Normalizer of a semiregular group

In this section we give an explicit construction of the normalizer of a semiregular permutation group on a set Ω in the symmetric group S_Ω , and study some subgroups of the normalizer. Recall that two permutation groups $X \leq S_\Delta$ and $X' \leq S_{\Delta'}$ are called *permutation isomorphic* if there exists a bijection $\lambda : \Delta \mapsto \Delta'$ and a group isomorphism $\varphi : X \mapsto X'$ such that $\alpha^{x\lambda} = \alpha^{\lambda x\varphi}$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $x \in X$.

Let G be a semiregular permutation group on a set Ω with m orbits for some positive integer m . Set

$$V = \cup_{i=1}^m G_i \text{ with } G_i = \{g_i : g \in G\}, \text{ and } R(G) = \{R(g) : g \in G\},$$

where $R(g)$ is the right multiplication of g on V , that is, $R(g) : x_i \mapsto (xg)_i$, for all $x \in G$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $R(G)$ is a semiregular permutation group on V with m orbits: G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m . For simplicity of notation, from now on and beyond, we write $R(G)$ instead of $R_m(G)$, as given in Section 1. The following lemma is standard, and for the integrity, we give a simple proof.

Lemma 2.1. *The permutation groups G (on Ω) and $R(G)$ (on V) are permutation isomorphic.*

Proof. Let $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_m$ be all orbits of G on Ω and assume that $\alpha_i \in \Omega_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since G is semiregular, the map

$$\lambda : \alpha_i^g \mapsto g_i, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \tag{2.1}$$

is a bijection from Ω to V , which indeed induces a bijection from every Ω_i to G_i . Let φ be the isomorphism from G to $R(G)$, defined by

$$\varphi : g \mapsto R(g), \forall g \in G. \quad (2.2)$$

Note that every element in Ω has the form α_i^h for some $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $h \in G$. Then for all $g \in G$ and $\alpha_i^h \in \Omega$, we have

$$(\alpha_i^h)^{g\lambda} = (\alpha_i^{hg})^\lambda = (hg)_i = (h_i)^{R(g)} = (\alpha_i^h)^{\lambda R(g)} = (\alpha_i^h)^{\lambda g^\varphi}.$$

This proves that G (on Ω) and $R(G)$ (on V) are permutation isomorphic. \square

Note that λ and φ , given in Eqs (2.1) and (2.2), induce the permutation isomorphism between G and $R(G)$, that is, $\alpha^{g\lambda} = \alpha^{\lambda g^\varphi}$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega$ and $g \in G$. It follows that $g = \lambda R(g)\lambda^{-1}$ for all $g \in G$, and then it is easy to check that

$$N_{S_\Omega}(G) = \lambda N_{S_V}(R(G))\lambda^{-1},$$

where $N_{S_\Omega}(G)$ and $N_{S_V}(R(G))$ are the normalizers of G and $R(G)$ in S_Ω and S_V , respectively.

Thus, to determine $N_{S_\Omega}(G)$, it suffices to determine the normalizer $N_{S_V}(R(G))$ of $R(G)$ in S_V . Denote by $C_{S_V}(R(G))$ the centralizer of $R(G)$ in S_V .

From now on, we consider $N_{S_V}(R(G))$ and its subgroups. For simplicity, set

$$N = N_{S_V}(R(G)), \quad C = C_{S_V}(R(G)), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G} := \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}.$$

Then \mathcal{G} is the orbit set of $R(G)$ on V . Since $R(G)$ is semiregular, N is transitive on V , and since $R(G) \trianglelefteq N$, \mathcal{G} is a complete imprimitive block system of N . Let K be the kernel of N on \mathcal{G} . Then

$$K = \{n \in N : G_i^n = G_i \text{ for every } 1 \leq i \leq m\}.$$

For $g \in G$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, define $L_i(g)$ by

$$L_i(g) : x_i \mapsto (g^{-1}x)_i, \text{ and } x_j \mapsto x_j \text{ for all } x \in G \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq m \text{ with } j \neq i.$$

Then $L_i(g)$ is a permutation on V . Set

$$L_i = \{L_i(g) : g \in G\} \text{ and } L = L_1 L_2 \cdots L_m.$$

Then L_i is a permutation group on V , which is regular on G_i and fixes $\bigcup_{j \neq i}^m G_j$ pointwise. It is easy to see that for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$, $L_i \cap L_j = 1$ and L_i and L_j commutes pointwise. Thus,

$$L = L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m.$$

Clearly, $|L_i| = |R(G)| = |G|$ and $|L| = |G|^m$.

Recall that S_m is the symmetric group on $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and $\text{Aut}(G)$ is the automorphism group of G . We view them as permutation groups on V as follows: for every $\sigma \in S_m$, $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $x \in G$:

$$\sigma : x_i \mapsto x_{i\sigma}, \quad \alpha : x_i \mapsto (x^\alpha)_i.$$

Theorem 2.2. $C = L \rtimes S_m$.

Proof. For $g, h \in G$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $x_i^{L_i(h)R(g)} = (h^{-1}xg)_i = x_i^{R(g)L_i(h)}$, and $x_j^{L_i(h)R(g)} = (xg)_j = x_j^{R(g)L_i(h)}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $j \neq i$. It follows that $L_i(h)R(g) = R(g)L_i(h)$, and hence $L = L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m \leq C$.

For $g \in G$ and $\sigma \in S_m$, we have $x_i^{\sigma R(g)} = (xg)_{i^\sigma} = x_i^{R(g)\sigma}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $x \in G$. This implies that $S_m \leq C$.

Note that S_m acts faithfully on $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$, and since L fixes G_i for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $L \cap S_m = 1$.

Take $g \in G$ and $\sigma \in S_m$. For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $x_j^{\sigma^{-1}L_i(g)\sigma} = (g^{-1}x)_j = x_j^{L_{i^\sigma}(g)}$ when $j = i^\sigma$, and $x_j^{\sigma^{-1}L_i(g)\sigma} = x_j = x_j^{L_{i^\sigma}(g)}$ when $j \neq i^\sigma$. Then we have:

$$\sigma^{-1}L_i(g)\sigma = L_{i^\sigma}(g), \text{ for all } g \in G, \sigma \in S_m \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, $(L_i)^\sigma = L_{i^\sigma}$, and hence S_m normalizes L . It follows $L \rtimes S_m \leq C$.

Let $H = K \cap C$, that is, the kernel of C on $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \dots, G_m\}$. Then $C/H \leq S_m$. Clearly, $L \leq H$. To prove $C = L \rtimes S_m$, it suffices to prove $H = L$.

For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, consider the constituent H^{G_i} of H on G_i , that is, the permutation group restricted by H on G_i . Let H_i be the kernel of H acting on G_i . Then $H/H_i \cong H^{G_i}$. Clearly, $H_1 \cap H_2 \cap \cdots \cap H_m = 1$. Since $R(G)$ is semiregular on V with orbit set \mathcal{G} , the constituent $R(G)^{G_i}$ of $R(G)$ on G_i is a regular permutation group on G_i . Note that G_i is an orbit of L_i and the constituent $L_i^{G_i}$ is also a regular permutation group on G_i , which centralizes $R(G)^{G_i}$. By [17, Lemma 4.2A], $C_{S_{G_i}}(R(G)^{G_i}) = L_i^{G_i}$, and so $|C_{S_{G_i}}(R(G)^{G_i})| = |L_i^{G_i}| = |G|$.

Since $H \leq C$, we have $H^{G_i} \leq C_{S_{G_i}}(R(G)^{G_i}) = L_i^{G_i}$ and hence $|H/H_i| = |H^{G_i}| \leq |G|$. Note that $H = H/(H_1 \cap H_2 \cap \cdots \cap H_m)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $H/H_1 \times H/H_2 \times \cdots \times H/H_m$. Thus, $|H| \leq |G|^m$. Then it follows from $L \leq H$ and $|L| = |G|^m$ that $H = L$, as required. \square

By Theorem 2.2, the centralizer of a semiregular permutation group on Ω in S_Ω is transitive (also see [17, Exercise 4.2.5]). In particular, Theorem 2.2 implies $C = L(G)$ for $m = 1$, which is well-known (see [17, Lemma 4.2A]).

Theorem 2.3. $N = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G))$.

Proof. Let $R(g) \in R(G)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$. Then we have

$$x_i^{\alpha^{-1}R(g)\alpha} = (x^{\alpha^{-1}}g)_i^\alpha = (xg^\alpha)_i = x_i^{R(g^\alpha)}, \text{ for all } x \in G \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

It follows

$$R(g)^\alpha = R(g^\alpha), \text{ for all } g \in G \text{ and } \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G). \quad (2.4)$$

This implies that $\text{Aut}(G)$ normalizes $R(G)$, that is, $\text{Aut}(G) \leq N$.

By Theorem 2.2, $C = L \rtimes S_m \leq N$. Let $\sigma \in S_m$ and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$. For every $x \in G$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $(x_i)^{\alpha\sigma} = (x^\alpha)_{i^\sigma} = (x_i)^{\sigma\alpha}$, and so S_m commutes with $\text{Aut}(G)$ pointwise. Assume $\sigma = \alpha \in S_m \cap \text{Aut}(G)$. Then $x_{i^\sigma} = (x_i)^\sigma = (x_i)^\alpha = (x^\alpha)_i$, forcing $i^\sigma = i$ and $x^\alpha = x$. It follows $\sigma = \alpha = 1$, and hence $S_m \text{Aut}(G) = S_m \times \text{Aut}(G) \leq N$.

Take $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ and $L_i(g) \in L_i$ with $g \in G$. For $x \in G$, we have $(x_j)^{\alpha^{-1}L_i(g)\alpha} = (g^{-\alpha}x)_j = x_j^{L_i(g^\alpha)}$ for $j = i$, and $(x_j)^{\alpha^{-1}L_i(g)\alpha} = x_j = x_j^{L_i(g^\alpha)}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $j \neq i$. It follows

$$\alpha^{-1}L_i(g)\alpha = L_i(g^\alpha), \text{ for all } g \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (2.5)$$

This means $(L_i)^\alpha = L_i$, and hence $\text{Aut}(G)$ normalizes every L_i . In particular, $\text{Aut}(G)$ normalizes L , and so by Theorem 2.2, $S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)$ normalizes L .

Assume that $L_1(g_1)L_2(g_2)\cdots L_m(g_m) = \sigma\alpha$ for some $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \in G$, $\sigma \in S_m$ and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$. For all $x \in G$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $(g_i^{-1}x)_i = x_i^{L_1(g_1)L_2(g_2)\cdots L_m(g_m)} = x_i^{\sigma\alpha} = (x^\alpha)_{i^\sigma}$. This implies $i^\sigma = i$ and $g_i^{-1}x = x^\alpha$. Since $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $\sigma = 1$, and by taking $x = 1$ we have $g_i = 1$. It follows $L_1(g_1)L_2(g_2)\cdots L_m(g_m) = 1$, and hence $L \cap (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)) = 1$. Thus, $L(S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)) = L \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)) \leq N$.

By the N/C Theorem (see [17]), $|N|/|C| \leq |\text{Aut}(R(G))| = |\text{Aut}(G)|$. Since $C = L \rtimes S_m$, we have $|N| \leq |C||\text{Aut}(G)| = |L| \cdot |S_m| \cdot |\text{Aut}(G)|$, and since $L \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)) \leq N$, we have $N = L \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)) = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G))$. \square

By Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, the group structures of $C = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes S_m$ and $N = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G))$ are completely determined by Eq (2.3) and Eq (2.5).

By Eqs (2.4) and (2.5), $\text{Aut}(G)$ normalizes $R(G)$ and L_i for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $1 \leq r \leq m$. It is easy to see that $R(G) \cap (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) = 1$ by considering its action on G_r , and by Theorem 2.2,

$$L_1 \cdots L_{r-1}R(G)L_{r+1} \cdots L_m \text{Aut}(G) = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times R(G) \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G).$$

For $g \in G$, let $\text{Inn}(g)$ be the inner automorphism of G induced by g , that is, $x^{\text{Inn}(g)} = x^g$ for all $x \in G$. It is easy to check that $L_1(g)L_2(g)\cdots L_m(g)R(g) = \text{Inn}(g) \in \text{Aut}(G)$, and hence $(L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G) = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times R(G) \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$ for every $1 \leq r \leq m$. Then Theorem 2.3 implies the following.

Corollary 2.4. $N = ((L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times R(G) \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)) \rtimes S_m$ for every $1 \leq r \leq m$.

By Corollary 2.4, if $m = 1$, then $N = R(G) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$, which is the well-known holomorph of G (see [17, Corollary 4.2B]). Recall that K is the kernel of N acting on $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$.

Corollary 2.5. The group $K = L \rtimes \text{Aut}(G) = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times R(G) \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$ for every $1 \leq r \leq m$.

For every $1 \leq r \leq m$, Let N_{1_r} and K_{1_r} be the stabilizers of 1_r in N and K respectively, and N_{G_r} the block stabilizer of G_r in N . The group S_m induces the symmetric group on $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$. Let $(S_m)_{G_r}$ be the setwise stabilizer of G_r in the group S_m . By the definition of S_m , $(S_m)_{G_r} \cong S_{m-1}$ fixes each point in G_r .

Corollary 2.6. For every $1 \leq r \leq m$, we have $N_{1_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$, $N_{G_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$, and $K_{1_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$.

Proof. By Eq (2.3) and Eq (2.5), $(S_m)_{G_r}$ and $\text{Aut}(G)$ normalize $(L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m)$, and by definitions of L_i and $\text{Aut}(G)$, both $(L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m)$ and $\text{Aut}(G)$ fix 1_r . Since $(S_m)_{G_r}$ fixes r , it also fixes 1_r , and by Theorem 2.3, $(L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G)) \leq N_{1_r}$. On the other hand, the transitivity of N on V implies $|N_{1_r}| = |N|/|V| = |G|^{m-1}(m-1)|\text{Aut}(G)|$, and hence $N_{1_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$.

Since G_r is an imprimitive block of N , we have $N_{1_r} \leq N_{G_r}$. Clearly, $L_r \leq N_{G_r}$ is transitive on G_r , and hence $N_{G_r} = L_r N_{1_r}$. Since $|L_r| = |G|$, we have $N_{G_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$.

Since $L_r \leq K$, K is transitive on G_r , and hence $K = L_r K_{1r}$. By Corollary 2.5, $K = L \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$, and since $L_r \cap K_{1r} = 1$, we have $|K_{1r}| = |K|/|G| = |G|^{m-1} |\text{Aut}(G)|$. Note that $(L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G) \leq K_{1r}$. Since $|(L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)| = |G|^{m-1} |\text{Aut}(G)| = |K_{1r}|$, we have $K_{1r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$. \square

Let $m \geq 2$. For convenience, we write $V_m = V = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_m$ and $V_{m-1} = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_{m-1}$. Recall that $R(G) \leq S_{V_m}$ is semiregular on V_m with orbits set $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$, and the constituent $R(G)^{V_{m-1}}$ of $R(G)$ on V_{m-1} is a semiregular group on V_{m-1} with orbits set $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{m-1}\}$. We still use $R(G)$ to denote this constituent, that is $R(G)^{V_{m-1}} = R(G)$, and this makes no confusion in the context. By Theorem 2.3, $N_{S_{V_{m-1}}}(R(G)) = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{m-1}) \rtimes (S_{m-1} \times \text{Aut}(G))$. By Corollary 2.6, $N_{G_m} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_m} \times \text{Aut}(G))$, and hence the kernel of N_{G_m} on V_{m-1} is L_m . It follows that $|N_{G_m}^{V_{m-1}}| = |G|^{m-1} |S_{m-1}| |\text{Aut}(G)| = |N_{S_{V_{m-1}}}(R(G))|$. Noting that $N_{G_m} = N_{V_{m-1}}$, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.7. $N_{S_{V_{m-1}}}(R(G)) = N_{G_m}^{V_{m-1}} = N_{V_{m-1}}$.

To end this section, we prove the following result for later use.

Theorem 2.8. *Let G and H are two isomorphic semiregular permutation groups on a finite set Ω . Then H and G are conjugate in S_Ω .*

Proof. Since G is semiregular, it has $|\Omega|/|G|$ orbits on Ω , and similarly, H has $|\Omega|/|H|$ orbits. Since $G \cong H$, we may write $m = |\Omega|/|G| = |\Omega|/|H|$. Let $\overline{\Omega} = \{\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_m\}$ and $\overline{\Delta} = \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_m\}$ be the orbit sets of G and H on Ω , respectively. Then $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\overline{\Delta}$ are partitions of Ω , that is, $\Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Omega_m = \Delta_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Delta_m$ with $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$ and $\Delta_i \cap \Delta_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, take $\alpha_i \in \Omega_i$ and $\beta_i \in \Delta_i$. Then $\Omega_i = \alpha_i^G$ and $\Delta_i = \beta_i^H$. Let α be an isomorphism from G to H . Then $G^\alpha = H$. Define a map σ on Ω as follows:

$$\sigma : \alpha_i^g \mapsto \beta_i^{g^\alpha}, \text{ for all } g \in G \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

Let $\alpha_i^{g_1} = \alpha_j^{g_2} \in \Omega$ with $g_1, g_2 \in G$. Then $i = j$ because $\Omega_k = \alpha_k^G$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $\overline{\Omega}$ is a partition of Ω , and hence $g_1 = g_2$ because G is semiregular. It follows that $\beta_i^{g_1^\alpha} = \beta_j^{g_2^\alpha}$, and so σ is well defined. On the other hand, let $\beta_i^{g_1^\alpha} = \beta_j^{g_2^\alpha}$. Since H is semiregular, a similar argument above gives rise to $i = j$ and $g_1^\alpha = g_2^\alpha$, and since α is an isomorphism from G to H , we have $g_1 = g_2$. It follows that $\alpha_i^{g_1} = \alpha_j^{g_2}$, that is, σ is injective. Since Ω is finite, σ is a bijection and hence $\sigma \in S_\Omega$.

Recall that G and H are semiregular subgroups of S_Ω . Let $g \in G$. Take an arbitrary $\beta_i^h \in \Omega$ with $h \in H$. Since $(\beta_i^h)^{\sigma^{-1}} = \alpha_i^{h^{\alpha^{-1}}}$, we have $(\beta_i^h)^{g^\sigma} = (\beta_i^h)^{\sigma^{-1}g^\sigma} = (\alpha_i^{h^{\alpha^{-1}}})^{g^\sigma} = \beta_i^{(h^{\alpha^{-1}}g)^\alpha} = (\beta_i^h)^{g^\alpha}$, and by the arbitrariness of β_i^h in Ω , we have $g^\sigma = g^\alpha$. By the arbitrariness of g in G , we have $G^\sigma = G^\alpha = H$, and hence G is conjugate to H in S_Ω . \square

3 m -Cayley digraph and its automorphisms

Let m be a positive integer. For every $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, let $S_{i,j}$ be subsets of G with $1 \notin S_{i,i}$. Let V be the vertex set of the m -Cayley digraph $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ of G . Then

$$V = V(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} G_i, \text{ where } G_i = \{x_i : x \in G\},$$

$$\text{Arc}(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \{(x_i, (sx)_j) : s \in S_{i,j}, x \in G\}.$$

It is easy to see that a digraph Γ is an m -Cayley digraph of G if and only if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has a subgroup isomorphic to G acting semiregularly on the vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ with m orbits (see [16]).

The notations in Section 2, like $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$, $R(G)$, $N = N_{S_V}(R(G))$, $C = C_{S_V}(R(G))$, L_i , S_m , $\text{Aut}(G)$, K (the kernel of N on \mathcal{G}), and vertex stabilizer and block stabilizer of N and K , will be used throughout the paper.

Now we describe the normalizer of $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and its subgroups. Write $R_1 = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \in G, \sigma \in S_m\}$ and $R_2 = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)\}$. In this section we set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{N} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma \mid R_2, \sigma \in S_m, S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma} = (g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \tilde{C} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \sigma \mid R_1, S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma} = g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \tilde{K} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \mid R_2, S_{i,j} = (g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \tilde{N}_{1_r} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma \mid R_2, g_r = 1, \sigma \in (S_m)_{G_r}, S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma} = (g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \tilde{N}_{G_r} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma \mid R_2, \sigma \in (S_m)_{G_r}, S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma} = (g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \tilde{K}_{1_r} &= \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \mid R_2, g_r = 1, S_{i,j} = (g_j^{-1} S_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}; \\ \bar{S}_m &= \{\sigma \in S_m \mid R_2, L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma \in \tilde{N}\}; \\ \overline{\text{Aut}}(G) &= \{\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \mid R_1, L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma \in \tilde{N}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ and $A = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Then $N_A(R(G)) = \tilde{N}$, $C_A(R(G)) = \tilde{C}$, and the kernel of \tilde{N} acting on $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ is \tilde{K} . As given above, \tilde{K}_{1_r} and \tilde{N}_{1_r} , for every $1 \leq r \leq m$, are stabilizers of 1_r in \tilde{K} and \tilde{N} , respectively, and \tilde{N}_{G_r} is the set-stabilizer of G_r in \tilde{N} . Furthermore, $\tilde{K} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{K}_{1_r}$, $\tilde{N}_{G_r} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{N}_{1_r}$ and $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \bar{S}_m = \tilde{C} \cdot \overline{\text{Aut}}(G)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.3, $N = N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G)) = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (\text{Aut}(G) \times S_m)$, the normalizer of $R(G)$ in $S_V(\Gamma)$. Clearly, $N_A(R(G)) = N \cap A$.

Let $n \in N$. Then $n = L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m) \alpha \sigma$ for some $g_1, \dots, g_m \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ and $\sigma \in S_m$. For any $(x_i, (s_{i,j} x_j)) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma)$, where $x \in G$, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and $s_{i,j} \in S_{i,j}$, we have

$$(x_i, (s_{i,j} x_j))^n = ((g_i^{-1} x)_{i^\sigma}^\alpha, (g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} x)_{j^\sigma}^\alpha) = ((g_i^{-1} x)_{i^\sigma}^\alpha, ((g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha (g_i^{-1} x)_{j^\sigma}^\alpha)). \quad (3.1)$$

If $n \in A$, by Eq (3.1) we have $(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha \in S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}$, and then $(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha \subseteq S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}$. Since n maps G_i to G_{i^σ} and G_j to G_{j^σ} , the number of out-neighbours of 1_i in G_j is equal to the number of out-neighbours of 1_{i^σ} in G_{j^σ} , implying that $|S_{i,j}| = |S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}|$. Thus, $|(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha| = |S_{i,j}| = |S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}|$, and therefore, $(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha = S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}$. On the other hand, if $(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha = S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}$ then Eq (3.1) implies that n maps an arc of Γ to an arc, forcing $n \in A$. It follows that $n \in N \cap A$ if and only if $(g_j^{-1} s_{i,j} g_i)^\alpha = S_{i^\sigma, j^\sigma}$, and by the definition of \tilde{N} , we have $N_A(R(G)) = N \cap A = \tilde{N}$.

By Theorems 2.2 and Corollary 2.5, $C = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes S_m$ and $K = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$ are the centralizer of $R(G)$ in $S_V(\Gamma)$ and the kernel of N acting on the orbit set $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ of $R(G)$, respectively. It follows that $C \cap A$ and $K \cap A$ are the centralizer of $R(G)$ in A and the kernel of $A \cap N$ acting on \mathcal{G} , respectively. By taking $\alpha = 1$ or $\sigma = 1$ in Eq (3.1), an argument similar to the above paragraph gives rise to $C_A(R(G)) = C \cap A = \tilde{C}$, and $K \cap A = \tilde{K}$ as $A \cap N = \tilde{N}$.

Let $1 \leq r \leq m$. By Corollary 2.6, $N_{1_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$, $N_{G_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes ((S_m)_{G_r} \times \text{Aut}(G))$, and $K_{1_r} = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_{r-1} \times L_{r+1} \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$. Then $N_{1_r} \cap A$ and $K_{1_r} \cap A$ are the stabilizers of 1_r in $N \cap A$ and $K \cap A$ respectively, and $N_{G_r} \cap A$ is the set stabilizer of G_r in $N \cap A$. Recall that $N \cap A = \tilde{N}$ and $K \cap A = \tilde{K}$.

Using Eq (3.1), an argument similar to the proof of $N_A(R(G)) = \tilde{N}$ gives rise to $\tilde{N}_{1_r} = N_{1_r} \cap A = \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma \mid g_1, \dots, g_m \in G, g_r = 1, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), \sigma \in (S_m)_{G_r}, S_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (g_j^{-1}S_{i,j}g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$, $\tilde{K}_{1_r} = K_{1_r} \cap A = \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha \mid g_1, \dots, g_m \in G, g_r = 1, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), S_{i,j} = (g_j^{-1}S_{i,j}g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$, and $\tilde{N}_{G_r} = N_{G_r} \cap A = \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma \mid g_1, \dots, g_m \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), \sigma \in (S_m)_{G_r}, S_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (g_j^{-1}S_{i,j}g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$.

Since $R(G) \leq A$ fixes \mathcal{G} pointwise, we have $R(G) \leq \tilde{K}$ and $R(G) \leq \tilde{N}_{G_r}$. Note that $R(G)$ is regular on G_r . By Frattini argument, $\tilde{K} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{K}_{1_r}$ and $\tilde{N}_{G_r} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{N}_{1_r}$.

Recall that $N = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (\text{Aut}(G) \times S_m)$. Take any two elements in N , say $L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma$ and $L_1(g'_1) \cdots L_m(g'_m)\alpha'\sigma'$, where $g_1, \dots, g_m, g'_1, \dots, g'_m \in G, \alpha, \alpha' \in \text{Aut}(G)$ and $\sigma, \sigma' \in S_m$. By Eqs (2.3) and (2.5), $L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma L_1(g'_1) \cdots L_m(g'_m)\alpha'\sigma' = L_1(g_1(g'_1\sigma)^{\alpha^{-1}}) \cdots L_m(g_m(g'_m\sigma')^{\alpha^{-1}})\alpha\alpha'\sigma\sigma'$. This implies that $f_A : L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma \mapsto \alpha$ and $f_S : L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma \mapsto \sigma$ are epimorphisms from N to $\text{Aut}(G)$ and from N to S_m , respectively. Clearly, f_A and f_S have kernels $\text{Ker}(f_A) = C = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes S_m$ and $\text{Ker}(f_S) = K = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G)$.

The restriction of f_A on $A \cap N$ is an epimorphism from $A \cap N = \tilde{N}$ to $\overline{\text{Aut}(G)}$ with kernel $C \cap A = \tilde{C}$ because $\text{Ker}(f_A) = C$. It follows that $\tilde{N} = \tilde{C} \cdot \overline{\text{Aut}(G)}$. Similarly, since $\text{Ker}(f_S) = K$ we have $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \overline{S_m}$. \square

Let $m = 1$. Then $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K}$. By Theorem 3.1, $\tilde{K}_{1_1} = \{\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), S_{1,1} = S_{1,1}^\alpha\} = \text{Aut}(G, S_{1,1})$ and $\tilde{N} = R(G) \rtimes \text{Aut}(G, S_{1,1})$, which was given in [23]. Let $m = 2$. Then $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K}$ or $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_2$. By Theorem 3.1, $\tilde{K}_{1_1} = \{L_2(g)\alpha \mid g \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), S_{1,1} = S_{1,1}^\alpha, S_{2,2} = (g^{-1}S_{2,2}g)^\alpha, S_{1,2} = (g^{-1}S_{1,2})^\alpha, S_{2,1} = (S_{2,1}g)^\alpha\} = \{L_2(g)\alpha^{-1} \mid g \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), S_{1,1} = S_{1,1}, S_{2,2} = g^{-1}S_{2,2}g, S_{1,2} = g^{-1}S_{1,2}, S_{2,1} = S_{2,1}g\}$ and $\tilde{K} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{K}_{1_1}$. Then [50, Theorem 1.1] follows from the fact $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K}$ or $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let $m \geq 2$. Then [25, Theorem 2.3] follows from $N_A(R(G)) = \tilde{N}$. Furthermore, [25, Lemma 2.4] follows from $\tilde{K} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{K}_{1_1}$, [25, Lemma 2.5] follows from $\tilde{N}_{1_1} = \{L_1(g_1) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma \mid g_1, \dots, g_m \in G, g_1 = 1, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G), \sigma \in S_{m-1}, S_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (g_j^{-1}S_{i,j}g_i)^\alpha, 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$, and [25, Theorem 2.6] follows from $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \overline{S_m}$ and $\tilde{N}_{G_1} = R(G) \rtimes \tilde{N}_{1_1}$.

Note that $N = K \rtimes S_m$ is a semiproduct, but $\tilde{N} = \tilde{K} \cdot \overline{S_m}$ may not. For example, let p be a prime and $r \geq 2$ an integer, and let $m = p^r$ and $G = \langle a \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. Take $S_{i, (i+1)} = \{1\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, $S_{m,1} = \{a\}$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ otherwise. Then $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ is a directed cycle of length p^{r+1} . Thus, $A = \text{Aut}(\Gamma) = \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}$ and $\tilde{N} = A$. Clearly, the kernel \tilde{K} of \tilde{N} is $R(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. However, \tilde{N} cannot be a semiproduct of $\tilde{K} = R(G)$ by a group because \tilde{N} is cyclic.

4 CI-properties related to m -Cayley digraphs

Recall that a Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is said to be CI if, for any Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, T) \cong \text{Cay}(G, S)$, there exists some $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ such that $T = S^\alpha$, and that a group G is said to be DCI or CI if all Cayley digraphs or Cayley graphs of G are CI, respectively. The following problems concerning CI-properties of Cayley digraphs have received considerable attention in the literature:

Problem (I): Which Cayley (di)graphs for a group G are CI?

Problem (II): Which groups are DCI-groups or CI-groups?

In this section, we study Problem (I) for m -Cayley (di)graphs, and in the next section, we study Problem (II) for m -Cayley (di)graphs.

We use the notations in Section 2, and in this section, the normalizer N of $R(G)$ in the symmetric group on $V = \cup_{i=1}^m G_i$ is important. By Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.5, we have

$$N = (L_1 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (S_m \times \text{Aut}(G)),$$

where L_i , S_m , and $\text{Aut}(G)$ are given in Section 2. To study problem (I), Babai's criterion is a useful tool, and in this section, we introduce some CI-properties of m -Cayley digraphs and give analogues to Babai's criterion for each kind of CI-property of m -Cayley digraphs.

4.1 mCI-(di)graphs

Definition 4.1. *An m -Cayley (di)graph Γ is called m CI, if for every m -Cayley (di)graph Σ of G isomorphic to Γ , there is $n \in N$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$.*

Recall that $V(\Gamma) = V = \cup_{i=1}^m G_i$. For $n \in N \leq S_V$, the (di)graph Γ^n has vertex set $V(\Gamma^n) = \{v^n : v \in V(\Gamma)\} = \{v^n : v \in V\} = V(\Gamma) = V$ and arc set $\text{Arc}(\Gamma^n) = \{(u^n, v^n) : (u, v) \in \text{Arc}(\Gamma)\}$.

Let $n \in N$ and $1 \leq r \leq m$. By Corollary 2.4, there exist $g, g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \in G$ with $g_r = 1$, $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$, and $\sigma \in S_m$, such that

$$n = L_1(g_1) \cdots L_{r-1}(g_{r-1})R(g)L_{r+1}(g_{r+1}) \cdots L_m(g_m)\alpha\sigma.$$

Note that $R(g)L_i(g_i) = L_i(g_i)R(g)$ and $\Gamma^{R(g)} = \Gamma$ as $R(g) \in R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. From Eq (3.1), it is easy to see that

$$\Gamma^n = \text{Cay}(G, L_{i\sigma, j\sigma} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m), \text{ where } L_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (g_j^{-1}S_{i,j}g_i)^\alpha. \quad (4.1)$$

From the above Equation we immediately have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $1 \leq r \leq m$. Then an m -Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ is m CI if and only if whenever $\text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ is isomorphic to an m -Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$, there exist $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$, $\sigma \in S_m$, $g_1, \dots, g_m \in G$ with $g_r = 1$, such that $T_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = g_j S_{i,j}^\alpha g_i^{-1}$.*

By Proposition 4.2, a 1-Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, S_{1,1})$ is 1CI if and only if, for any $\text{Cay}(G, T_{1,1}) \cong \text{Cay}(G, S_{1,1})$, there exists some $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ such that $T_{11} = S_{11}^\alpha$. Thus, the 1CI is exactly the CI for Cayley (di)graph.

Again by Proposition 4.2, a 2-Cayley (di)graph $\text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 2)$ is 2CI if and only if, for any $\text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 2)$ isomorphic to $\text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 2)$, there exists some $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$, $\sigma \in S_m$, and $g \in G$ such that either $T_{1,1} = S_{1,1}^\alpha$, $T_{2,2} = g^{-1}S_{2,2}^\alpha g$, $T_{1,2} = g^{-1}S_{1,2}^\alpha$, $T_{2,1} = S_{2,1}^\alpha g$, or $T_{2,2} = S_{1,1}^\alpha$, $T_{1,1} = g^{-1}S_{2,2}^\alpha g$, $T_{2,1} = g^{-1}S_{1,2}^\alpha$ and $T_{1,2} = S_{2,1}^\alpha g$. If $\text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 2)$ is a graph, then $T_{1,2} = g^{-1}S_{1,2}^\alpha$ if and only if $T_{2,1} = S_{2,1}^\alpha g$. Thus, the 2CI is exactly the SCI for 2-Cayley graph, as defined in Arezoomand and Taeri [4].

The following is a generalization of the well-know Babai criterion of Cayley (di)graph to m -Cayley (di)graph.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -Cayley (di)graph. Then Γ is m CI if and only if every semiregular group of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to G is conjugate to $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Recall that $V(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m G_i$ and $N = N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G)) = (L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_m) \rtimes (\text{Aut}(G) \times S_m)$. Set $A = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

To prove the necessity, assume that Γ is m CI and that $H \cong R(G)$ is an m -semiregular subgroup of automorphisms of Γ . By Lemma 2.8, $R(G) = H^\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in S_V(\Gamma)$. Note that σ is an isomorphism from Γ to Γ^σ . Since H is a semiregular subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, H^σ is a semiregular subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma^\sigma)$, and since $R(G) = H^\sigma$, we have $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma^\sigma)$. This implies that Γ^σ is an m -Cayley (di)graph of G . Since Γ is m CI, there is $n \in N$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Gamma^\sigma$. Thus, $n\sigma^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma) = A$ and $R(G)^{n\sigma^{-1}} = R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}} = H$, that is, H and $R(G)$ are conjugate in A .

To prove the sufficiency, assume that every semiregular group of automorphisms of Γ isomorphic to G is conjugate to $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Let $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -Cayley (di)graph of G , and let σ be an isomorphism from Γ to Σ . Then $\Gamma^\sigma = \Sigma$, and since $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ is semiregular on $V(\Sigma)$, $R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}}$ is a semiregular subgroup of A , which is isomorphic to $R(G)$. By assumption, there is $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $R(G)^\alpha = R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}}$. It follows that $\alpha\sigma \in N$ and $\Gamma^{\alpha\sigma} = \Gamma^\sigma = \Sigma$, that is, Γ is m CI. \square

For $m = 1$, Theorem 4.3 implies the well-known Babai criterion for Cayley (di)graph (see [8, Lemma 3.1]), and for 2-Cayley graph, Theorems 4.3 and 2.8 imply [4, Theorem A].

4.2 m PCI-(di)graphs

Let Γ and Σ be two m -PCayley (di)graphs of a group G . An isomorphism σ from Γ to Σ is called a p -isomorphism if $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ is σ -invariant, that is, σ maps every G_i for $1 \leq i \leq m$ to some G_j , and Γ and Σ are called p -isomorphic if there is a p -isomorphism from Γ and Σ , denoted by $\Gamma \cong_p \Sigma$. Now we state the definition of m PCI for m -PCayley (di)graph, which is also motivated from [4, 28, 27].

Definition 4.4. An m -PCayley (di)graph Γ of a group G is called m PCI, if for any m -PCayley (di)graph Σ p -isomorphic to Γ , there is $n \in N$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$.

It is worth mentioning that Arezoomand [4, Lemma 4.4] proved that if Γ and Σ are isomorphic 2-PCayley graphs on a group, then $\Gamma \cong_p \Sigma$. Since an m -PCayley (di)graph is an m -Cayley (di)graph, Proposition 4.2 implies that 2PCI-graph is exactly 0-type SCI-graph, as defined in [4, Definition 4.1(i)].

For m -PCayley (di)graphs, similar to Theorem 4.3 we have the following generalization of Babai criterion of Cayley (di)graph to m -PCayley (di)graph. Recall that $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$.

Theorem 4.5. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley (di)graph. Then Γ is m PCI if and only if every semiregular group of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to G , with the same orbit set \mathcal{G} as $R(G)$, is conjugate to $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. Write $N = N_{S_V(\Gamma)}(R(G))$ and $A = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

To prove the necessity, assume that Γ is m PCI and H is an m -semiregular subgroup of automorphisms of Γ with orbit set \mathcal{G} . By Lemma 2.8, $R(G) = H^\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in S_V(\Gamma)$, and since H has orbit set \mathcal{G} , H^σ has orbit set $\{G_1^\sigma, G_2^\sigma, \dots, G_m^\sigma\}$, forcing that $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1^\sigma, G_2^\sigma, \dots, G_m^\sigma\}$, that is, σ is a p -isomorphism from Γ to Γ^σ . This also implies that Γ^σ is an m -PCayley (di)graph of G , and since Γ is m PCI, there is $n \in N$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Gamma^\sigma$. It follows $n\sigma^{-1} \in A$ and $R(G)^{n\sigma^{-1}} = R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}} = H$.

To prove the sufficiency, assume that every semiregular group of automorphisms of Γ isomorphic to G , with orbit set \mathcal{G} , is conjugate to $R(G)$ in A . Let $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley (di)graph of G such that $\Gamma \cong_p \Sigma$. Then there is a p -isomorphism from Γ to Σ , say

σ , and so $\Gamma^\sigma = \Sigma$ and \mathcal{G} is σ -invariant. It follows that $R(G)$ and $R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}}$ are two isomorphic semiregular subgroups of A with the same orbit set \mathcal{G} , and by assumption, there is $\alpha \in A$ such that $R(G)^\alpha = R(G)^{\sigma^{-1}}$. Then $\alpha\sigma \in N$ and $\Gamma^{\alpha\sigma} = \Gamma^\sigma = \Sigma$. \square

To end this section, we prove that m PCI properties of an m -PCayley (di)graph and its multipartite complement are equivalent, which is important for classifying m (P)(D)CI-groups in Section 5. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley (di)graph. Then $S_{i,i} = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Set $T_{i,i} = \emptyset$ and $T_{i,j} = G \setminus S_{i,j}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$. Then $\text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ is called *the multipartite complement* of Γ , denoted by Γ^{mc} . It is easy to see that $(\Gamma^{mc})^{mc} = \Gamma$ and Γ^{mc} is an m -PCayley (di)graph. Recall that one of Γ and the component Γ^c of Γ must be connected. However, it is possible that both Γ and Γ^{mc} are disconnected.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer and let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ and $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be m -PCayley digraphs.*

(1) *For $n \in N = N_{S_{V(\Gamma)}}(R(G))$, we have $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$ if and only if $(\Gamma^{mc})^n = \Sigma^{mc}$.*

(2) *If both Γ and Γ^{mc} are not connected, then $m = 2$, $|G|$ is even and $\Gamma \cong 2K_{|G|/2, |G|/2}$.*

Proof. Let $n \in N = N_{S_{V(\Gamma)}}(R(G))$ and $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$. Since $(\Gamma^{mc})^{mc} = \Gamma$, to prove (1), it suffices to prove that $(\Gamma^{mc})^n = \Sigma^{mc}$. By Theorem 2.3, $n = L_1(h_1) \cdots L_m(h_m)\alpha\sigma$ for some $h_1, \dots, h_m \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ and $\sigma \in S_m$. Let $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$. By Proposition 4.2, $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$ implies that $T_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (h_j^{-1}S_{i,j}h_i)^\alpha$, and since $G^\alpha = G$, we have $G \setminus T_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = (h_j^{-1}(G \setminus S_{i,j})h_i)^\alpha$. Again by Proposition 4.2, $(\Gamma^{mc})^n = \Sigma^{mc}$, as required.

Now we prove (2). Assume that Γ has t components, say $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_t$, where $t \geq 2$. Then all $V(\Gamma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq t$, are blocks of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Set $G_i^j = G_i \cap V(\Gamma_j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq t$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, $G_i = \cup_{j=1}^t G_i^j$ is a disjoint union.

Claim: $G_i^j \neq \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq t$, and each G_i cannot be contained in a component of Γ or Γ^{mc} .

Suppose to the contrary that $G_i^j = \emptyset$ for some given i and j with $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq t$. Then we may let $G_i^k \neq \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, and $G_i^k = \emptyset$ for every $\ell + 1 \leq k \leq t$, where $1 \leq \ell < t$. It follows that $G_i = \cup_{j=1}^\ell G_i^j \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^\ell V(\Gamma_j)$. Since $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is transitive on every G_i and $V(\Gamma_j)$ is a block of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq t$, $R(G)$ fixes $\cup_{j=1}^\ell V(\Gamma_j)$ setwise, and hence $\cup_{j=1}^\ell V(\Gamma_j)$ is a union of some G_k with $1 \leq k \leq m$. Since $\ell < t$, Γ^{mc} is connected because every vertex in $\cup_{j=1}^\ell V(\Gamma_j)$ is adjacent to every vertex in $V(\Gamma) \setminus \cup_{j=1}^\ell V(\Gamma_j)$ in Γ^{mc} , a contradiction. Thus, $G_i^j \neq \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq t$, and $G_i = \cup_{j=1}^t G_i^j$ is a disjoint union.

Since $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, we have $|G_i^1| = |G_i^2| = \dots = |G_i^t|$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$, and since $|G_i| = |G|$, all $|G_i^j|$ are equal one another. Suppose that $G_i \subseteq V(\Gamma_j)$ for a given j with $1 \leq j \leq t$. Then $G_i = G_i^j$, and since $|G_i^1| = |G_i^2| = \dots = |G_i^t|$ and $G_i = \cup_{j=1}^t G_i^j$ is a disjoint union, we have $t = 1$, contradicting $t \geq 2$. Thus, G_i cannot be contained in a component of Γ . Since $(\Gamma^{mc})^{mc} = \Gamma$ and $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma^{mc})$, a similar argument above implies that G_i cannot be contained in a component of Γ^{mc} . This establishes the claim.

Suppose $t \geq 3$. For any $3 \leq j \leq t$, G_1^1 and G_1^j are in the same component of Γ^{mc} because every vertex in G_1^1 is adjacent to every vertex in G_2^2 and every vertex in G_2^2 is adjacent to every vertex in G_1^j , and G_1^1 and G_1^2 are in the same component of Γ^{mc} because every vertex in G_1^1 is adjacent to every vertex in G_2^2 and every vertex in G_2^2 is adjacent to every vertex in G_1^2 . It follows that G_1 is contained in one component of Γ^{mc} , contradicting Claim. Thus, $t = 2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$.

Suppose $m \geq 3$. Then G_1^1 and G_1^2 are contained in the same component of Γ^{mc} because every vertex in G_1^1 is adjacent to every vertex in G_2^2 , every vertex in G_2^2 is adjacent to G_m^1 , and every vertex in G_m^1 is adjacent to every vertex in G_1^2 . This implies that G_1 is contained in one component of Γ^{mc} as $t = 2$, contradicting Claim. Thus, $m = 2$ and both Γ_1 and Γ_2 are bipartite. Furthermore, it is easy to see that if Γ_1 is not a complete bipartite graph, then Γ^{mc} is connected, a contradiction. This yields that both Γ_1 and Γ_2 are complete bipartite graphs, of which each is isomorphic to $K_{|G|/2, |G|/2}$. This completes the proof. \square

From Lemma 4.6 (1), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $m \geq 2$ be integer and let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley digraph. Then Γ is m PCI if and only if Γ^{mc} is m PCI.*

5 CI- and DCI-groups related to m -Cayley digraphs

Similar to DCI-groups and CI-groups for Cayley (di)graphs, we have the following definitions.

Definition 5.1. *A finite group G is called m DCI (resp. m CI), if every m -Cayley digraph (resp. m -Cayley graph) of G is m CI. Furthermore, G is called m PDCI (resp. m PCI), if every m -PCayley digraph (resp. m -PCayley graph) of G is m PCI.*

In this section, our main purpose is to classify m DCI- and m CI-groups for each $m \geq 2$, and m PDCI- and m PCI-groups for each $m \geq 4$. Recall that a graph is viewed as a digraph, and an m -PCayley (di)graph is an m -Cayley (di)graph, which imply the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let G be a finite group. Then*

- (1) *If G is m DCI or m PDCI then G is m CI or m PCI, respectively;*
- (2) *If G is m DCI or m CI then G is m PDCI or m PCI, respectively.*

The following theorem is a reduction theorem, a key result to classify m (P)(D)CI-groups.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer and let G be a finite group. If G is m DCI, m CI, m PDCI or m PCI, then G is $(m - 1)$ DCI, $(m - 1)$ CI, $(m - 1)$ PDCI or $(m - 1)$ PCI, respectively.*

Proof. Write $V_m = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \dots \cup G_m$ and $V_{m-1} = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \dots \cup G_{m-1}$.

Assume that G is m DCI. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m - 1)$ and $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m - 1)$ be two isomorphic $(m - 1)$ -Cayley digraphs of G . To prove that G is $(m - 1)$ DCI, we only need to prove that there exists some $n \in N_{V_{m-1}}(R(G))$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$. By Eq. (4.1), $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$ if and only if $(\Gamma^c)^n = \Sigma^c$, and hence we may assume that Γ and Σ are connected.

Note that $S_{i,j}$ and $T_{i,j}$ are given for every $1 \leq i, j \leq m - 1$. We extend them to $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ by setting $S_{\ell,m} = S_{m,\ell} = S_{m,m} = T_{\ell,m} = T_{m,\ell} = T_{m,m} = \emptyset$ for each $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ and $\Sigma_1 = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$. Then $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \cup G_m$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma \cup G_m$, and so Γ_1 and Σ_1 are isomorphic m -Cayley digraphs. Set $N = N_{V_m}(R(G))$. Since G is an m DCI-group, there is $n_1 \in N$ such that $\Gamma_1^{n_1} = \Sigma_1$. Since Σ and Γ are connected, n_1 fixes G_m setwise, that is, $n_1 \in N_{G_m} = N_{V_{m-1}}$, and hence $\Gamma^{n_1} = \Sigma$. By Corollary 2.7, $N_{V_{m-1}}(R(G)) = N_{G_m}^{V_{m-1}} = N_{V_{m-1}}^{V_{m-1}}$. Let n be the restriction of n_1 on V_{m-1} . We have $n \in N_{V_{m-1}}(R(G))$ and $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$, as required.

Assume that G is m CI. Then a similar argument to m DCI implies that G is $(m - 1)$ CI.

Now assume that G is m PDCI. To prove that G is $(m-1)$ PDCI, let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m-1)$ and $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m-1)$ be two p -isomorphic $(m-1)$ -PCayley digraphs of G . It suffices to show that there is $n \in N_{V_{m-1}}(R(G))$ such that $\Gamma^n = \Sigma$. By Lemma 4.6 (2), we may assume that Γ is either connected, or $\Gamma \cong 2K_{|G|/2, |G|/2}$ where $m = 2$ and $|G|$ is even. Then the similar argument to the above m DCI implies that G is $(m-1)$ PDCI. Furthermore, if G is m PCI, then a similar argument to m PDCI implies that G is $(m-1)$ PCI. \square

5.1 m CI- and m DCI-groups

In this subsection, we classify m CI-, m DCI-groups for every $m \geq 2$. By definition, 1DCI-groups and 1CI-groups, which are the well-known DCI-groups and CI-groups for Cayley (di)graphs. The classifications of DCI-groups and CI-groups are long-standing open problems. Therefore, we assume that $m \geq 2$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer and let G be a finite group. Then*

- (1) G is m CI if and only if either $m = 2$ and $G = 1$ or \mathbb{Z}_3 , or $m \geq 3$ and $G = 1$;
- (2) G is m DCI if and only if $G = 1$.

Proof. We first prove part (1). For $m = 2$, it follows from [4, Theorem B] that G is 2CI if and only if $G = 1$ or \mathbb{Z}_3 . Let $m \geq 3$. If G is m CI, then, by Theorem 5.3, G is 2CI, implying that either $G = 1$ or $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$. On the other hand, Theorem 4.3 implies that $G = 1$ is an m CI-group.

Suppose $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 = \langle x \rangle$. For all $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ with $i \neq j$, take $S_{i,i} = \emptyset$ and $S_{i,j} = \{1\}$, and $T_{i,i} = \{x, x^2\}$ and $T_{i,j} = \emptyset$. Then $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 3)$ and $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, T_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 3)$ are union of three cycles of length 3, and hence $\Gamma \cong \Sigma$. Since $|S_{i,i}| \neq |T_{j,j}|$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, Proposition 4.2 implies that \mathbb{Z}_3 cannot be 3CI, and this, together with Theorem 5.3, implies that \mathbb{Z}_3 cannot be m CI for any $m \geq 3$. This completes the proof of part (1).

Assume that G is m DCI. By Proposition 5.2, G is m CI, and by part (1), either $m = 2$ and $G = 1$ or \mathbb{Z}_3 , or $m \geq 3$ and $G = 1$. On the other hand, Theorem 4.3 implies that $G = 1$ is an m DCI-group for every integer $m \geq 1$. Thus, we may let $m = 2$ and $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 = \langle x \rangle$. Then $V(\Gamma) = G_1 \cup G_2$. Take $S_{1,1} = S_{2,2} = \{x\}$, $S_{1,2} = \{1, x, x^2\}$ and $S_{2,1} = \emptyset$. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 2)$. Then every vertex in G_1 has in-valency 1 and out-valency 4, and every vertex in G_2 has in-valency 4 and out-valency 1. Each of the induced subgraph $[G_1]$ and $[G_2]$ is a directed cycle of length 3. Thus, $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) = \langle a \rangle \times \langle b \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, where $a = (1_1, x_1, x_1^2)$ and $b = (1_2, x_2, x_2^2)$. Clearly, $\langle ab \rangle$ and $\langle ab^{-1} \rangle$ are two semiregular subgroups of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, which are not conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. By Theorem 4.3, Γ is not 2CI, and hence \mathbb{Z}_3 is not a 2DCI-group. This completes the proof of part (2). \square

5.2 m PCI- and m PDCI-groups

In this subsection, we study m PCI- and m PDCI-groups. Since 1-PCayley digraph of a group G is the empty graph with $|G|$ vertices, all finite groups are 1PDCI- and 1PCI-groups. Thus, we assume $m \geq 2$. By Proposition 5.2, m PDCI-groups are m PCI-groups, and by Theorem 5.3, the main work is to classify m PCI-groups with m as small as possible. In this subsection, we classify m PDCI- and m PCI-groups for each $m \geq 4$.

It is well known that every subgroup of a CI-group is CI (see [5, Lemma 3.2]). We generalize this result to m PCI-group for $m \geq 3$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $m \geq 3$ be an integer. Then every subgroup of a finite m PCI-group is m PCI.*

Proof. Let G be a finite m PCI-group and let $H \leq G$. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(H, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be a m -PCayley graph of H . Then $V(\Gamma) = \cup_{i=1}^m H_i$ with $H_i = \{h_i \mid h \in H\}$. To prove that Γ is m PCI, by Lemma 4.6 and Corollary 4.7 we may assume that Γ is connected.

To avoid confusion of symbols, we write $R_\Gamma(H)$ as the right multiplication of H on $V(\Gamma)$ (similarly, $R_\Gamma(h)$ is the right multiplication of $h \in H$). Set $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$, the orbit set of $R_\Gamma(H)$, and denote by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ fixing \mathcal{H} pointwise. Let L be a semiregular automorphism group of Γ which is isomorphic to $R_\Gamma(H)$ and has the same orbit set \mathcal{H} . Then $R_\Gamma(H), L \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$. To finish the proof, by Theorem 4.5 we only need to show that L and $R_\Gamma(H)$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

Let $\Sigma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ and $t = |G : H|$. Let $g_1 = 1, g_2, \dots, g_t$ be a right transversal of H in G , that is, $G = \cup_{k=1}^t Hg_k$ with $Hg_i \neq Hg_j$ for all $i \neq j$. Then $V(\Sigma) = \cup_{i=1}^m G_i$ with $G_i = \cup_{k=1}^t (Hg_k)_i$, where $(Hg_k)_i = \{(hg_k)_i \mid h \in H\}$. Since Γ is connected, it is a component of Σ , and Σ has t components: $\Sigma_1 = \Gamma, \Sigma_2 = \Gamma^{R(g_1)}, \dots, \Sigma_t = \Gamma^{R(g_t)}$, where

$$V(\Sigma_k) = \cup_{i=1}^m (Hg_k)_i \text{ and } A(\Sigma_k) = \{((hg_k)_i, (h'g_k)_j) \mid h, h' \in H, (h_i, h'_j) \in A(\Gamma), 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}.$$

Then Σ is a disjoint union of $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_t$. Let

$$C\Sigma = \{V(\Sigma_1), V(\Sigma_2), \dots, V(\Sigma_t)\}.$$

Then $C\Sigma$ is a complete imprimitive block system of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ because Γ is connected. Recall that $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ is the orbit set of $R(G)$ on $V(\Sigma)$, and $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ fixing \mathcal{G} pointwise.

It is well known that $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is the wreath product $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \wr S_t$ of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ by S_t , as explained below for details. The symmetric group S_t on $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ is viewed as a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ by, for every $\sigma \in S_t$,

$$\sigma : (hg_k)_i \mapsto (hg_{k\sigma})_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq t \text{ and } h \in H.$$

Then $S_t \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and S_t induces the symmetric group on $\{V(\Sigma_1), V(\Sigma_2), \dots, V(\Sigma_t)\}$, which implies that S_t acts on $C\Sigma$ faithfully. Clearly, $R(G) \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Now we extend $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ as a permutation group on $V(\Sigma)$ such that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ fixes $V(\Sigma_k)$ pointwise for all $2 \leq k \leq t$. Then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and hence $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_k)} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, where $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_k)}$ fixes $V(\Sigma_i)$ pointwise for every $i \neq k$ as $R(g_k)$ maps Σ_1 to Σ_k .

Let $\sigma \in S_t$. Since $R(g_k)\sigma$ and $R(g_{k\sigma})$ map Σ_1 to $\Sigma_{k\sigma}$, both $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_k)\sigma}$ and $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_{k\sigma})}$ fix $V(\Sigma_i)$ pointwise for all $i \neq k\sigma$. For $\alpha^{R(g_k)\sigma} \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_k)\sigma}$ with $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ and for $(hg_{k\sigma})_i \in V(\Sigma_{k\sigma})$ with $h \in H$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $h_i^\alpha = h(i)_i$ for some $h(i) \in H$. Then $(hg_{k\sigma})_i^{\alpha^{R(g_k)\sigma}} = (hg_{k\sigma})_i^{\sigma^{-1}R(g_k^{-1})\alpha R(g_k)\sigma} = (h(i)g_{k\sigma})_i = (hg_{k\sigma})_i^{\alpha^{R(g_{k\sigma})}}$. It follows that

$$(\alpha^{R(g_k)})^\sigma = \alpha^{R(g_{k\sigma})}, \text{ for all } \alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}, 1 \leq k \leq t \text{ and } \sigma \in S_t.$$

This implies $(\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_k)})^\sigma = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_{k\sigma})}$ for every $\sigma \in S_t$ and $1 \leq k \leq t$, and then we have

$$\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \wr S_t := (\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \times \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_2)} \times \dots \times \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_t)}) \rtimes S_t = \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})},$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that the restriction of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ on Σ_1 is $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ and $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \times \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_2)} \times \dots \times \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}^{R(g_t)}$ is the kernel of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ acting on $C\Sigma$.

For $X \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ and $T \leq \text{S}_t$, we also have the wreath product

$$X \wr T := (X^{R(g_1)} \times X^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times X^{R(g_t)}) \rtimes T, \quad (5.1)$$

where $(\alpha^{R(g_k)})^\sigma = \alpha^{R(g_k\sigma)}$ for all $\alpha \in X$ and $\sigma \in T$. Furthermore, $X \times X^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times X^{R(g_t)}$ is the kernel of $X \wr T$ acting on $C\Sigma$.

Let M be the subgroup of S_t induced by $R(G)$ on $C\Sigma$. By the transitivity of $R(G)$, M is transitive on $C\Sigma$. Note that $R_\Gamma(H) \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ fixes $V(\Sigma_k)$ pointwise for all $2 \leq k \leq t$. Since g, g_2g, \dots, g_tg is also a right transversal of H in G for any $g \in G$, we conclude that $R(G)$ normalizes $R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}$. Hence, $R(G)(R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}) \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(G)}$, which induces the subgroup M of S_t on $C\Sigma$. Since $V(\Sigma_k) = \cup_{i=1}^m (Hg_k)_i$, the kernel of $R(G)$ acting on $C\Sigma$ is as the same as the kernel of $R(G)$ acting on the set of right cosets of H in G , which is $R(K)$ with K as the largest normal subgroup of G contained in H . Then $R(K) \leq R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}$ and hence we may write $R(G)(R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}) / (R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}) = M$. By Eq (5.1), $(R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)})M / (R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}) = M$. It follows that $R(G)(R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}) = (R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)})M$, forcing $R(G) \leq (R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)})M = R_\Gamma(H) \wr M$.

Recall that $L \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ is semiregular and isomorphic to $R_\Gamma(H)$ with the orbit set \mathcal{H} . By Eq (5.1), we have the wreath product $L \wr M = (L \times L^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times L^{R(g_t)}) \rtimes M$. Let β be an isomorphism from $R_\Gamma(H)$ to L . Then β can be extended to an isomorphism from $R_\Gamma(H) \wr M$ to $L \wr M$ by defining $m^\beta = m$ and $(R_\Gamma(h)^{R(g_k)})^\beta = (R_\Gamma(h)^\beta)^{R(g_k)}$ for all $h \in H$, $m \in M$ and $1 \leq k \leq t$, and for convenience, this extended automorphism is still denoted by β .

Set $I = R(G)^\beta$. Then $I \leq (R_\Gamma(H) \wr M)^\beta = L \wr M$ as $R(G) \leq R_\Gamma(H) \wr M$. Since $L \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ and $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \wr \text{S}_t = \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(G)} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$, we see that $L \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$. Now we claim that I is semiregular and has the same orbit set \mathcal{G} as $R(G)$.

For any given Σ_i and Σ_j with $1 \leq i, j \leq t$, there is $R(g) \in R(G)$ such that $V(\Sigma_i)^{R(g)} = V(\Sigma_j)$. Since $R(G) \leq R_\Gamma(H) \wr M$, we have $R(g) = xm$ for some $x \in R_\Gamma(H) \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times R_\Gamma(H)^{R(g_t)}$ and $m \in M$. Then $V(\Sigma_i)^m = V(\Sigma_i)^{xm} = V(\Sigma_j)$, and since $R(g)^\beta = x^\beta m$ with $x^\beta \in L \times L^{R(g_2)} \times \cdots \times L^{R(g_t)}$, we have $V(\Sigma_i)^{R(g)^\beta} = V(\Sigma_i)^{x^\beta m} = V(\Sigma_i)^m = V(\Sigma_j)$. Thus, I is transitive on $C\Sigma$.

Since $R(G)_{V(\Sigma_1)}^{V(\Sigma_1)} = R_\Gamma(H)$ and $R_\Gamma(H)^\beta = L$, we have $I_{V(\Sigma_1)}^{V(\Sigma_1)} = L$, which implies that $I_{V(\Sigma_1)}$ has m orbits on $V(\Sigma_1)$, that is, $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$. Since I is transitive on $C\Sigma$, every orbit of I has length $|G|$ as $|I| = |G| = |R(G)^\beta|$. Thus, I is semiregular, and since $L \wr M$ has orbit set \mathcal{G} , I has the orbit set \mathcal{G} , as claimed.

Since G is m PCI, there is $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ such that $R(G) = I^\alpha$. Since $C\Sigma$ is a complete imprimitive block system of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$, $V(\Sigma_1)^\alpha = V(\Sigma_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq t$. Since $R(G)$ is transitive on $C\Sigma$, there is $g \in G$ such that $V(\Sigma_1)^{R(g)} = V(\Sigma_i)$, and since $\Sigma_1 = \Gamma$, we have $V(\Gamma)^{\alpha R(g^{-1})} = V(\Gamma)$, that is, $\alpha R(g^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ fixes the component Γ . Write $\gamma = \alpha R(g^{-1})|_{V(\Gamma)}$, the restriction of $\alpha R(g^{-1})$ on $V(\Gamma)$. Then $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

Since $\alpha R(g^{-1})$ fixes the component Γ , we get $(I^{\alpha R(g^{-1})})_{V(\Gamma)} = (I_{V(\Gamma)})^{\alpha R(g^{-1})}$. Since $R(G) = I^\alpha$, we have $I^{\alpha R(g^{-1})} = R(G)$. It follows that $R(G)_{V(\Gamma)} = (I_{V(\Gamma)})^{\alpha R(g^{-1})}$ and hence $R_\Gamma(H) = R(G)_{V(\Gamma)}^{V(\Gamma)} = (I_{V(\Gamma)}^{\alpha R(g^{-1})})_{V(\Gamma)} = (I_{V(\Gamma)}^{V(\Gamma)})^\gamma = L^\gamma$, that is, $R_\Gamma(H)$ and L are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, as required. \square

The proof in Theorem 5.5 does not work for $m = 2$, because one cannot assume that Γ is always connected by Lemma 4.6.

The following result shows that the elements of an m PCI-group for $m \geq 4$ are very restrictive.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $m \geq 4$ be a positive integer and G a finite group. If G is m PCI, then every element of G has order 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6.*

Proof. Let G be a finite m PCI-group with $m \geq 4$. Suppose on the contradiction that there is an element $x \in G$ with $o(x) = 5$ or ≥ 7 , where $o(x)$ is the order of x in G . Let $\phi(k)$ be the number of elements coprime to k in \mathbb{Z}_k . Then $\phi(o(x)) \geq 3$, and hence $\langle x \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_k$ has $\phi(k)$ generators, that is x^ℓ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_k^*$, where \mathbb{Z}_k^* is the multiplicative group of numbers coprime to k in \mathbb{Z}_k .

Set $H = \langle x \rangle$. Take $S_{1,2} = S_{4,3} = \{1, x\}$, $S_{2,1} = S_{3,4} = \{1, x^{-1}\}$, $S_{2,3} = H = S_{3,2}$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(H, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 4)$. Then $V(\Gamma) = \cup_{i=1}^4 H_i$ with $H_i = \{x_i \mid x \in H\}$. Clearly, $\Gamma = [H_1 \cup H_2] \cup [H_3 \cup H_4] \cup [H_2 \cup H_3]$, where $[H_1 \cup H_2] = (1_1, x_2, x_1, x_2^2, x_1^2, \dots, x_2^{k-1}, x_1^{k-1}, 1_2)$ and $[H_3 \cup H_4] = (1_4, x_3, x_4, x_3^2, x_4^2, \dots, x_3^{k-1}, x_4^{k-1}, 1_3)$ are $2k$ -cycles, and $[H_2 \cup H_3] \cong K_{k,k}$ is the complete bipartite graph of order $2k$ with partite sets H_2 and H_3 , see below Figure 1. Recall that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})}$ is the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ fixing $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4\}$ pointwise.




Figure 1: 4-PCayley graph of $\mathbb{Z}_k = \langle x \rangle$

Then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1 \rangle \times \langle \alpha_2, \beta_2 \rangle \cong D_{2k} \times D_{2k}$ and $A := \text{Aut}(\Gamma) = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{H})} \rtimes \langle \gamma \rangle$, where

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 = (1_1, x_1, \dots, x_1^{k-1})(1_2, x_2, \dots, x_2^{k-1}), & \alpha_2 = (1_3, x_3, \dots, x_3^{k-1})(1_4, x_4, \dots, x_4^{k-1}), \\ \gamma = (1_2, 1_3)(x_2, x_3) \cdots (x_2^{k-1}, x_3^{k-1})(1_1, 1_4)(x_1, x_4) \cdots (x_1^{k-1}, x_4^{k-1}), \end{cases}$$

and for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$, β_1 interchanges x_1^i and x_1^{-i-1} and also x_2^i and x_2^{-i} , and β_2 interchanges x_4^i and x_4^{-i-1} and also x_3^i and x_3^{-i} . Note that β_1 fixes 1_2 and β_2 fixes 1_3 .

Clearly, $\langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2^\ell \rangle$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_k^*$ are distinct semiregular subgroups of A isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_k , of which all have the orbit set \mathcal{H} . Let $L = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \rangle$. Then $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2, \gamma \in N_A(L)$, the normalizer of L in A . Thus, $|N_A(L)| \geq 4k^2$, and since $|A| = 8k^2$, we have $|A : N_A(L)| \leq 2$, which implies that the conjugate class of L in A contains at most 2 subgroups. Since $\phi(k) \geq 3$, all semiregular subgroups of A isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_k , with orbit set \mathcal{H} , cannot be conjugate in A . By Theorem 4.5, Γ is not 4PCI, and hence H is not 4PCI. By Theorem 5.3, H cannot be m PCI for all $m \geq 4$, and by Theorem 5.5, G is not m PCI, contrary to assumption. It follows that $\phi(k) \leq 2$ for all $x \in G$ with $o(x) = k$, and hence x has order 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6. \square

Now we deal with some small non- m PCI-groups.

Lemma 5.7. *Each of \mathbb{Z}_2^2 , \mathbb{Z}_4 , \mathbb{Z}_6 and \mathbb{Z}_3^2 is not 4PCI, and each of \mathbb{Z}_3 and D_6 is not 6PCI.*

Proof. Assume $G = \langle x \rangle \times \langle y \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Take $S_{1,2} = S_{2,1} = S_{3,4} = S_{4,3} = \{1, x\}$, $S_{1,3} = S_{3,1} = S_{2,4} = S_{4,2} = \{1, y\}$, $S_{2,3} = S_{3,2} = G$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} :$

$1 \leq i, j \leq 4$). Then $V(\Gamma) = \cup_{i=1}^4 G_i$ with $G_i = \{x_i \mid x \in G\}$, and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4\}$. Clearly, $\Gamma = [G_1 \cup G_2] \cup [G_1 \cup G_3] \cup [G_2 \cup G_3] \cup [G_2 \cup G_4] \cup [G_3 \cup G_4]$, where the induced subgraphs $[G_1 \cup G_2]$, $[G_1 \cup G_3]$, $[G_2 \cup G_4]$ and $[G_3 \cup G_4]$ are union of two 4-cycles and $[G_2 \cup G_3]$ is the complete bipartite graph of order 8. It is easy to see that $|\text{Aut}(\Gamma) : \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}| = 4$, $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^4$ and $\alpha = (1_1, xy_1)(x_1, y_1)(1_2, xy_2)(x_2, y_2)(1_3, xy_3)(x_3, y_3)(1_4, xy_4)(x_4, y_4)$ lies in the center of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, that is, $\alpha \in Z(\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})})$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1 &= (1_1, y_1)(x_1, xy_1)(1_2, y_2)(x_2, xy_2), & \beta_4 &= (1_1, xy_1)(x_1, y_1)(1_2, xy_2)(x_2, y_2) \\ \gamma_1 &= (1_3, y_3)(x_3, xy_3)(1_4, y_4)(x_4, xy_4), & \gamma_4 &= (1_3, xy_3)(x_3, y_3)(1_4, xy_4)(x_4, y_4), \\ \gamma &= (1_3, x_3)(xy_3, y_3)(1_4, x_4)(xy_4, y_4).\end{aligned}$$

Let $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$. Since $\alpha \in Z(\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})})$, $R(G) = \langle \alpha, \beta_1 \gamma_1 \rangle = \langle \beta_4 \gamma_4, \beta_1 \gamma_1 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ is a semiregular normal subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ with orbit set \mathcal{G} , and $\langle \beta_1 \gamma_1, \beta_4 \gamma_4 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ is another semiregular subgroups of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ with orbit set \mathcal{G} , which cannot be conjugate with $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ because $R(G) \trianglelefteq A$. Also, this can be easily checked by MAGMA [6]. By Theorem 4.5, Γ is not 4PCI, and hence $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ is not 4PCI.

In what follows we construct a 4-PCayley graph $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 4)$ on each of the groups \mathbb{Z}_4 , \mathbb{Z}_6 and $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$. By MAGMA [6], we may have $R(G) \trianglelefteq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, and there is another semiregular subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to $R(G)$ with orbit set \mathcal{G} , which cannot be conjugate to $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. By Theorem 4.5, Γ is not 4PCI, and hence \mathbb{Z}_4 , \mathbb{Z}_6 and $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, are not 4PCI. These constructions are as follows: for $G = \mathbb{Z}_4 = \langle x \rangle$, take $S_{1,2} = S_{2,1} = S_{3,4} = S_{4,3} = \{x, x^3\}$, $S_{1,3} = S_{2,4} = \{1, x\}$, $S_{3,1} = S_{4,2} = \{1, x^3\}$, $S_{2,3} = S_{3,2} = G$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$; for $G = \mathbb{Z}_6 = \langle x \rangle$, take $S_{1,3} = \{x^2, x^4, x^5\}$, $S_{2,3} = S_{3,2} = \{1, x^2, x^4\}$, $S_{2,4} = \{1, x, x^4\}$, $S_{3,1} = \{x, x^2, x^4\}$, $S_{4,2} = \{1, x^2, x^5\}$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq m \leq 4$; for $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 = \langle x \rangle \times \langle y \rangle$, take $S_{1,3} = \{1, x, y, y^2, xy, x^2y\}$, $S_{1,4} = \{x, y^2, xy^2\}$, $S_{2,3} = \{y, x^2, y^2, xy, x^2y^2\}$, $S_{2,4} = \{x, y, xy^2, x^2y^2, x^2y\}$, $S_{3,1} = \{1, y, y^2, x^2, xy^2, x^2y^2\}$, $S_{3,2} = \{x, y, y^2, xy, x^2y^2\}$, $S_{3,4} = \{x, y, y^2, x^2y^2\}$, $S_{4,1} = \{y, x^2, x^2y\}$, $S_{4,2} = \{y^2, x^2, xy^2, xy, yx^2\}$, $S_{4,3} = \{y, y^2, x^2, xy\}$ and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for others $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$.

Assume $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 = \langle x \rangle$. Take $S_{1,2} = S_{1,3} = S_{2,1} = S_{3,1} = S_{4,5} = S_{4,6} = S_{5,4} = S_{6,4} = \{1\}$, $S_{1,4} = S_{2,4} = S_{2,5} = S_{4,1} = S_{4,2} = S_{5,2} = \{1, x, x^2\}$, $S_{2,3} = S_{5,6} = \{x\}$, $S_{3,2} = S_{6,5} = \{x^2\}$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 6$. Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 6)$. By MAGMA [6], $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, $R(G) \trianglelefteq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, and there is another semiregular subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ isomorphic to $R(G)$ with orbit set \mathcal{G} , which cannot be conjugate to $R(G)$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. By Theorem 4.5, Γ is not a 6PCI-graph, and hence \mathbb{Z}_3 is not 6PCI.

Assume $G = D_6$. By Theorem 5.5, D_6 is not 6PCI because \mathbb{Z}_3 is not 6PCI. \square

By Lemma 5.7, \mathbb{Z}_3 and D_6 are not 6PCI. However, it is much more difficult to prove that \mathbb{Z}_3 and D_6 are m PCI for every $m \leq 5$. This can be done for $m \leq 3$ by computation in MAGMA [6], but not for $m = 4$ and 5 because it is beyond the computing power of our computer. Our computation in MAGMA proceeds as follows: Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 and let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley graph of G . Each $S_{i,j}$ can be any subset of G , offering $2^{|G|}$ choices. Note that $S_{ji} = S_{ij}^{-1}$ as Γ is a graph. Then the set $\{S_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$ has $2^{\frac{|G|m(m-1)}{2}}$ choices. For each possible $S_{i,j}$, we construct the m -PCayley graph Γ in MAGMA and compute its full automorphism groups $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. If $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has a semiregular subgroup which has the same orbit set as $R(G)$ and is isomorphic but not conjugate to $R(G)$, then Γ is not m PCI by Theorem 4.5.

Notably, for $G = D_6$ and $m = 4$, there are $2^{36} \approx 6.8 \times 10^{10}$ choices for $\{S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$, making it challenging to verify that D_6 is 4PCI using the above approach. Therefore, for $m = 4$ and $m = 5$, we seek a theoretical proof.

Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley graph of a finite group G . Recall that $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$. For convenience of statement, we need more notations for Γ .

- Denote by $\Gamma(S_{i,j})$ the m -PCayley graph deduced from Γ by replacing $S_{i,j}$ by $G \setminus S_{i,j}$.
- An element in \mathcal{G} is called a *block* of Γ , and Γ is said to be *block connected* if for any two different blocks G_i and G_j in \mathcal{G} , there is a series of blocks $G_i = G_{m_1}, G_{m_2}, \dots, G_{m_t} = G_j$ such that $[G_{m_k}, G_{m_{k+1}}]_\Gamma$ has at least one edge for every $1 \leq k \leq t-1$.
- A subgraph Σ of Γ is called a *block subgraph* if $V(\Sigma)$ is a union of some blocks of Γ such that for any two distinct blocks G_i and G_j in $V(\Sigma)$, either $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Sigma = [G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma$ or $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Sigma$ has no edge. Write $\mathcal{G}(\Sigma) = \{G_i \mid G_i \subseteq V(\Sigma)\}$. Then $|\mathcal{G}(\Sigma)|$ is called the *length* of Σ .
- A block subgraph Σ of Γ is called *induced*, if Σ is an induced subgraph of Γ , and a maximal induced block connected subgraph is called a *block component* of Γ . For a block component Σ of Γ , $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ can be viewed as a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ by fixing $V(\Gamma)/V(\Sigma)$ pointwise.

From the above notation, it is easy to see the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley graph of a finite group G . Let $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ be the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ fixing \mathcal{G} pointwise. Then*

- (1) $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})} = \text{Aut}(\Gamma(S_{i,j}))_{(\mathcal{G})}$, for any $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$.
- (2) Let $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_t$ be all block components of Γ . Then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})} = \text{Aut}(\Sigma_1)_{(\mathcal{G})} \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma_2)_{(\mathcal{G})} \times \dots \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma_t)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Transitive permutation groups M of degree 6 containing a regular dihedral subgroup will be repeatedly used later. If M is primitive then it is 2-transitive (see [45, Theorem 25.6]), and then $M = S_6$ or S_5 (see [39]). If M is imprimitive, then all non-trivial imprimitive blocks of M have length 2 or 3, and hence $M \leq (S_3 \times S_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ or $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes S_3$. For the later, a Sylow 3-subgroup of M has order 3, and so all subgroups of order 3 are conjugate in M . Note that a semiregular subgroup of order 3 of S_6 uniquely determines a regular dihedral subgroup containing this subgroup of order 3, and hence two regular dihedral subgroups of M are conjugate if and only if their semiregular Sylow 3-subgroups are conjugate in M . This implies that if a Sylow 3-subgroup of M has order 3 then all regular dihedral subgroups of M are conjugate. Assume that $3^2 \mid |M|$. Then M can be listed in the following Table 1, and this can be checked by MAGMA [6].

M	Primitive	D_6 Conjugate	D_6 Normal	D_6 Unique
S_6	Yes	Yes	No	No
$(S_3 \times S_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$	No	Yes	No	No
$(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
$(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$	No	No	Yes	No

Table 1: Permutation groups M of degree 6 containing regular D_6 with $3^2 \mid |M|$

Lemma 5.9. \mathbb{Z}_3 and D_6 are m PCI for every $m \leq 5$.

Proof. Write $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 . Let $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m)$ be an m -PCayley graph of G with $m \leq 5$, and $L \cong G$ a semiregular subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ with the same orbit set $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$ as $R(G)$. Then $R(G), L \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and by Theorem 4.5, it suffices to show that $R(G)$ and L are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Since we only consider the group $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, by Proposition 5.8 (1), we may assume $|S_{i,j}| \leq |G|/2$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ with $i \neq j$. Let Σ be a block component of Γ with length r . Then Σ is a r -PCayley graph of G with $1 \leq r \leq m \leq 5$.

Case 1: $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Since $|S_{i,j}| \leq |G|/2 = 3/2$, the induced subgraph $[G_i, G_j]_\Gamma$ is either a matching or an empty graph, and since Σ is a block component of Γ , $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on each $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Sigma)$, forcing that $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ or S_3 as $|G_i| = 3$. Note that $R(G) \cong L \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$. Then $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)} = L^{V(\Sigma)}$, the unique normal Sylow 3-subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, where $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are the constituents of $R(G)$ and L on $V(\Sigma)$, respectively, that is, the restricted permutation groups of $R(G)$ and L on $V(\Sigma)$. In particular, if Γ is block connected, then $R(G) = L$ and we are done. Thus, we assume that Γ is not block connected, implying that $r \leq 4$ for Σ .

Claim 1: Let Δ be a union of some block components of Γ except Σ . Assume that $R(G)^{V(\Delta)}$ and $L^{V(\Delta)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and that $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong S_3$. Then $R(G)^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Delta \cup \Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Since $R(G) \cong L \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$, we may assume that $R(G)^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \rangle$, where $\alpha_1 \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\alpha_2 \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ have order 3. By Proposition 5.8 (2), we have $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta \cup \Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta \cup \Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, where $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ fixes $V(\Sigma)$ pointwise and $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ fixes $V(\Delta)$ pointwise. Since $R(G)^{V(\Delta)}$ and $L^{V(\Delta)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, there is $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta \cup \Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ such that $(R(G)^{V(\Delta)})^\gamma = L^{V(\Delta)}$, and then $(\alpha_1 \alpha_2)^\gamma = \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2$ and $L^{V(\Delta)} = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \rangle$. Since $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ has the unique Sylow 3-subgroup $\langle \alpha_2 \rangle$, we have $L^{V(\Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_2 \rangle$. It follows $L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2 \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2^2 \rangle$.

If $L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2 \rangle$ then $(R(G)^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)})^\gamma = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2 \rangle = L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)}$, and we are done. If $L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2^2 \rangle$, then $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong S_3$ implies that there is $\beta \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta \cup \Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ such that $\alpha_2^\beta = \alpha_2$ and $(\alpha_1^\gamma)^\beta = \alpha_1^\gamma$. Thus, $(R(G)^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)})^{\gamma\beta} = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2 \rangle^\beta = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2^\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha_1^\gamma \alpha_2 \rangle = L^{V(\Delta \cup \Sigma)}$, as claimed.

It is easy to see that if $r = 1$ or 2 then $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong S_3$. If every block component of Γ has length 1 or 2, applying Claim 1 repeatedly we have that $R(G)$ and L are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, as required. Thus, we may assume that Γ has a block component of length at least 3, say Σ . Recall that $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)} = L^{V(\Sigma)}$. Since $m \leq 5$, every component of Γ except Σ has length 1 or 2, and Claim 1 implies that $R(G)$ and L are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. This completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2: $G = D_6$.

Compared with Claim 1, the following is more general for D_6 .

Claim 2: Let Δ be a union of some block components of Γ except Σ . Assume $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and $R(G)^{V(\Delta)}$ and $L^{V(\Delta)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Then $R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma \cup \Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Note that $R(G) \cong L \cong D_6$. We may assume $R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)} = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2 \rangle$, where $\alpha_1, \beta_1 \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma \cup \Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\alpha_2, \beta_2 \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma \cup \Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Furthermore, $o(\alpha_1) = o(\alpha_2) = 3$ and $o(\beta_1) = o(\beta_2) = 2$ with $\alpha_1^{\beta_1} = \alpha_1^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2^{\beta_2} = \alpha_2^{-1}$. Clearly, $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1 \rangle$ and $R(G)^{V(\Delta)} = \langle \alpha_2, \beta_2 \rangle$. By Proposition 5.8 (2), $[\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}, \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}] = 1$, that is, $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ commutes with $\text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ pointwise.

By assumption, there are $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma \cup \Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\beta \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})} \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma \cup \Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ such that $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma)})^\alpha = L^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $(R(G)^{V(\Delta)})^\beta = L^{V(\Delta)}$. Note that $\alpha, \alpha_1, \beta_1 \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\beta, \alpha_2, \beta_2 \in \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Since $[\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}, \text{Aut}(\Delta)_{(\mathcal{G})}] = 1$, we have $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)})^\alpha = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2 \rangle^\alpha = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2 \rangle$ and $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)})^\beta = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2 \rangle^\beta = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1 \beta_2^\beta \rangle$. It follows

$$L^{V(\Sigma)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha \rangle \text{ and } L^{V(\Delta)} = \langle \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \rangle,$$

where $(\alpha_1^\alpha)^{\beta_1^\alpha} = (\alpha_1^2)^\alpha$ and $(\alpha_2^\beta)^{\beta_2^\beta} = (\alpha_2^2)^\beta$. Furthermore, $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)})^{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle$.

Note that $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)} \cong D_6$. Let $x \in L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$ be an involution. Then $x = ab$ with $a \in \{\beta_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha \alpha_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha (\alpha_1^2)^\alpha\}$ and $b \in \{\beta_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta\}$, and $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$ has a unique Sylow 3-subgroup L_3 with $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$. It follows that there is $y \in L_3$ such that $x^y = \beta_1^\alpha b^y \in L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$, where $b^y \in \{\beta_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta\}$, and $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)} = \langle L_3, x^y \rangle$. For $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$, we have $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle, \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, and by taking $\gamma = 1, (\alpha_2^2)^\beta$ or α_2^β respectively, we have $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)})^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle^\gamma = L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$. For $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, we have $L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle, \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, and by taking $\gamma = \beta_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta$ or $\beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta$ respectively, we have $(R(G)^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)})^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle^\gamma = L^{V(\Sigma \cup \Delta)}$, as claimed.

An edge in an induced subgraph $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma$ is called a $K_{3,3}$ -edge if $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma \cong 2K_{3,3}$, and a $K_{2,2}$ -edge if $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma \cong 3K_{2,2}$. Write $G = \langle a, b \mid a^3 = b^2 = 1, bab = a^2 \rangle$ and $H = \langle a \rangle$. Then $G_i = H_i \cup (bH)_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, where $H_i = \{1_i, a_i, a_i^2\}$ and $(bH)_i = \{b_i, (ba)_i, (ba^2)_i\}$.

Recall that $|S_{i,j}| \leq |G|/2 = 3$. It is easy to see that if $|S_{i,j}| = 1$ then $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma \cong 6K_2$; if $|S_{i,j}| = 2$ then $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma \cong 3K_{2,2}$ or $2(K_{3,3} - 3K_2)$ (two 6-cycles); if $|S_{i,j}| = 3$ then $[G_i \cup G_j]_\Gamma \cong 2K_{3,3}$ or $\text{Aut}([G_i \cup G_j])_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on each of G_i and G_j . These facts can be obtained from MAGMA [6] or the fact that there is no connected symmetric or semisymmetric cubic graphs of order 12 (see [10, 12]). Noting that $R(H)$ induces a group of automorphisms of $[G_i \cup G_j]$ fixing H_i and H_j , we have the following simple observation.

Observation: Assume that $[G_i \cup G_j] \not\cong 3K_{2,2}, 12K_1$. If $\alpha \in \text{Aut}([G_i \cup G_j])_{(\mathcal{G})}$ fixes H_i setwise then α fixes H_j setwise. If further $[G_i \cup G_j] \not\cong 2K_{3,3}$, then the restriction of $\text{Aut}([G_i \cup G_j])_{(\mathcal{G})}$ on each of G_i and G_j is faithful.

Let Λ be a block subgraph of Γ . Then $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}, L^{V(\Lambda)} \leq \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Write

$$L(H) = \{H_i \mid G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda), \{H_i, (bH)_i\} \text{ is an imprimitive block system of } L \text{ on } G_i\}.$$

Denote by $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ fixing H_i setwise for every $H_i \in L(H)$ and denote by R_3 and L_3 the unique Sylow 3-subgroups of $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$, respectively. Clearly, $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ are dependent on the choice of L and $L_3 \leq \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Since $R(G)$ has the block system $\{H_i, (bH)_i\}$ for every $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, we have $R_3 \leq \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$.

Denote by Λ^3 the block subgraph of Λ by deleting all $K_{3,3}$ -edges from Λ . Then Λ^3 is also a block subgraph of Γ . If $[G_i, G_j]_\Gamma \cong 2K_{3,3}$ with $G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, then $S_{i,j} = H$ or bH , and then H_i and H_j are blocks of L on G_i and G_j , respectively. Thus,

$$\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ = \text{Aut}(\Lambda^3)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+. \quad (5.2)$$

Claim 3: Assume that Λ^3 is block connected. Then $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and further in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, unless $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is isomorphic to S_6 and is faithful on every $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$.

First assume that Λ^3 contains no $K_{2,2}$ -edges. Since Λ^3 is block connected, Observation implies that $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on every $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, and hence $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \lesssim S_6$. Let S be a Sylow 3-subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Since $R_3, L_3 \leq \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, we have $|S| = 3$ or 9 .

Let $|S| = 3$. By Sylow theorem, there is $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ such that $R_3^\alpha = L_3$. Note that $|G_i| = 6$, and hence for a given semiregular subgroup of order 3 in the symmetric group S_{G_i} , there is a unique regular dihedral subgroup of S_{G_i} containing the semiregular subgroup. Thus, $(R(G)^{G_i})^\alpha = L^{G_i}$ as $R_3^\alpha = L_3$, and hence $(R(G)^{V(\Lambda)})^\alpha = L^{V(\Lambda)}$, because $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ has a faithful restriction on G_i .

Let $|S| = 9$. Since $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on G_i , by Table 1 we have $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong (\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})})^{G_i} \cong S_6, (S_3 \times S_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ or $(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \times (\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Suppose $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong S_6$. By Theorem 2.8, $R(G)^{G_i}$ and L^{G_i} are conjugate in $(\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})})^{G_i}$, and hence $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, but may not in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. In this case, $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on every $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$. Suppose $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong (S_3 \times S_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \cong S_3 \times S_3$ and so all semiregular subgroups of order 3 of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ are conjugate because all semiregular subgroups of order 3 of $(\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+)^{G_i}$ are conjugate. It follows that $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Suppose $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ and $(\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})})^{G_i}$ has a unique regular dihedrant on G_i . Thus, $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ has a unique semiregular dihedrant, and hence $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)} = L^{V(\Lambda)}$. At last suppose $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \times (\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $(\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})})^{G_i}$ has exactly two distinct normal regular subgroups isomorphic to D_6 on G_i . Suppose $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)} \neq L^{V(\Lambda)}$. Then $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$ are the two distinct normal semiregular subgroups isomorphic to D_6 in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Thus, $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} = R(G)^{V(\Lambda)} \times L^{V(\Lambda)}$. Let $\langle \alpha \rangle$ and $\langle \beta \rangle$ be the unique Sylow 3-subgroups of $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$, respectively. Then $\langle \alpha \rangle \times \langle \beta \rangle$ is the unique Sylow 3-subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Clearly, $\langle \alpha \rangle \leq R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ has orbit set $\{H_i, (bH)_i\}$ on G_i , which is also the orbit set of $\langle \beta \rangle$. Since $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on G_i , $\langle \alpha\beta \rangle$ is transitive on one of H_i and $(bH)_i$, say H_i , and hence fixes $(bH)_i$ pointwise. This forces that $\langle \alpha\beta^2 \rangle$ is transitive on $(bH)_i$, and fixes H_i pointwise. By the arbitrary of $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, we have $S_{i,j} = \emptyset, H$ or bH for any $G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ with $i \neq j$. It is easy to check that $\gamma : x_i \mapsto (x^{-1})_i$ for all $x_i \in G_i \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ is an automorphism of Λ , and hence $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Moreover, γ maps α to β or β^2 , contradicting that $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})} = R(G)^{V(\Lambda)} \times L^{V(\Lambda)}$. It follows that $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)} = L^{V(\Lambda)}$. This yields that Claim 3 is true when Λ^3 contains no $K_{2,2}$ -edges.

Now assume that Λ^3 contains $K_{2,2}$ -edges. Let $G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ such that $[G_i, G_j]_{\Lambda^3} = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cong 3K_{2,2}$ with $T_i \cong K_{2,2}$. Then $[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3$. Considering the kernel K of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ on $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$, we have $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}/K \lesssim S_3$. Every orbit of K on $G_i \cup G_j$ has length 1 or 2, and hence K/K_1 is a 2-group, where K_1 is the kernel of K on $G_i \cup G_j$, that is, the subgroup of K fixing every vertex in $G_i \cup G_j$. Further let $G_k \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ with $k \neq i, j$ such that $[G_i, G_k]_{\Lambda^3}$ has at least one edge. If $[G_i, G_k]_{\Lambda^3} \not\cong 3K_{2,2}$, then Observation implies that K_1 fixes G_k pointwise. If $[G_i, G_k]_{\Lambda^3} \cong 3K_{2,2}$, then the above argument implies that K_1/K_2 is a 2-group, where K_2 is the kernel of K_1 on G_k . This implies that K/K_3 is a 2-group, where K_3 fixes G_s pointwise for all $G_s \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ such that $[G_i, G_s]_{\Lambda^3}$ has at least one edge. Since Λ^3 is block connected, an induction on the distance between G_i and G_ℓ in Λ^3 with $G_\ell \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ implies that K is a 2-group. It follows that a Sylow 3-subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ has order 3. Since $R_3, L_3 \in \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, by the Sylow theorem there is $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ such that $R_3^\alpha = L_3$.

Recall that $[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cong 3K_{2,2}$. For not making the notation too cumbersome, we write $G_i = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $G_j = \{1', 2', 3', 4', 5', 6'\}$ with $V(T_1) = \{1, 4, 1', 4'\}$, $V(T_2) = \{2, 5, 2', 5'\}$ and $V(T_3) = \{3, 6, 3', 6'\}$. Then $[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda$ can be drawn as the following Figure 2.

Let $R_3^\alpha = L_3 = \langle \delta \rangle$. Then δ permutes the three $K_{2,2}$ -copies of $[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda$ cyclicly, and without loss of any generality, we may assume that $\delta^{G_i \cup G_j} = (1\ 2\ 3)(4\ 5\ 6)(1'\ 2'\ 3')(4'\ 5'\ 6')$. There is




Figure 2: $[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda$ of Λ^3 contains $K_{2,2}$ -edges

a unique dihedral subgroup of $\text{Aut}([G_i, G_j]_\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ that is regular on G_i and G_j , which in fact is $\langle \delta, (1\ 4)(2\ 6)(3\ 5)(1'\ 4')(2'\ 6')(3'\ 5') \rangle$. This implies that $(R(G)^{G_i \cup G_j})^\alpha = L^{G_i \cup G_j}$. Write $\mathfrak{R} = \cup_{[G_i, G_j]_\Lambda \cong 3K_{2,2}} G_i$. Then $(R(G)^\mathfrak{R})^\alpha = L^\mathfrak{R}$. Since Λ^3 is block connected, $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ is faithful on \mathfrak{R} by Observation, and then $(R(G)^{V(\Lambda)})^\alpha = L^{V(\Lambda)}$. This completes the proof of Claim 3.

Recall that Σ is a block component of Γ and has length r with $1 \leq r \leq m \leq 5$. Assume that Σ^3 is block connected. By Claim 3, $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

Now assume that Σ^3 is not block connected. Let $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_t$ be all block components of Σ^3 . Then $t \geq 2$. By Eq 5.2, $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ = \text{Aut}(\Sigma^3)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ = \text{Aut}(\Sigma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Sigma_t)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Clearly, $\text{Aut}(\Sigma_i)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ can be extended to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ by fixing $V(\Sigma_j)$ pointwise for every $j \neq i$, and then we have $\text{Aut}(\Sigma_i)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Similar to Proposition 5.8 (2), we have

$$\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ = \text{Aut}(\Sigma_1)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma_2)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \times \dots \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma_t)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+. \quad (5.3)$$

Let X be a block component of Σ^3 . Then X is the subgraph of $[V(X)]_\Gamma$ by deleting all $K_{3,3}$ -edges, and hence $\text{Aut}([V(X)]_\Gamma)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ = \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ by Eq (5.2). Since $t \geq 2$, there are $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ and $G_j \notin \mathcal{G}(X)$ with $G_j \in \mathcal{G}(\Sigma)$ such that $[G_i, G_j]_\Gamma \cong 2K_{3,3}$. Then $\{H_i, (bH)_i\}$ is an imprimitive block system of L on G_i and hence $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ cannot be primitive on G_i . In particular, $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ cannot be faithful on G_i and isomorphic to S_6 . By Claim 3, $R(G)^{V(X)}$ and $L^{V(X)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Similar to Claim 2, we have the following result.

Claim 4: Let Y be a union of some block components of Σ^3 except X . Assume that $R(G)^{V(Y)}$ and $L^{V(Y)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, and $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ has an involution δ normalizing $L^{V(X)}$ and inverting its elements of order 3. Then $R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)}$ and $L^{V(X \cup Y)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(X \cup Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$.

Since $R(G) \cong L \cong D_6$, we may assume $R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)} = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2 \rangle$, where $\alpha_1 \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, $\beta_1 \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, $\alpha_2 \in \text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, $\beta_2 \in \text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}$. Then $R(G)^{V(X)} = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1 \rangle$ and $R(G)^{V(Y)} = \langle \alpha_2, \beta_2 \rangle$. Furthermore, $o(\alpha_1) = o(\alpha_2) = 3$ and $o(\beta_1) = o(\beta_2) = 2$ with $\alpha_1^{\beta_1} = \alpha_1^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2^{\beta_2} = \alpha_2^{-1}$. Since $R(G)^{V(X)}$ and $L^{V(X)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$, there is $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ such that $(R(G)^{V(X)})^\alpha = L^{V(X)}$. Since $R(G)^{V(Y)}$ and $L^{V(Y)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ by assumption, there is $\beta \in \text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ such that $(R(G)^{V(Y)})^\beta = L^{V(Y)}$. Thus,

$$L^{V(X)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha \rangle \text{ and } L^{V(Y)} = \langle \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \rangle,$$

where $\beta_1^\alpha \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, $\beta_2^\beta \in \text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, $\alpha_1^\alpha \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ and $\alpha_2^\beta \in \text{Aut}(Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Since $L^{V(X \cup Y)} \cong D_6$, $L^{V(X \cup Y)}$ has a unique Sylow 3-subgroup, say L_3 . Then $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^\beta)^\beta \rangle$.

Since α fixes $V(Y)$ pointwise and β fixes $V(X)$ pointwise, we have

$$(R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)})^{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2, \beta_1 \beta_2 \rangle^{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2 \rangle^\beta = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle.$$

Let $x \in L^{V(X \cup Y)}$ be an involution. Then $x = ab$ with $a \in \{\beta_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha \alpha_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha (\alpha_1^2)^\alpha\}$ and $b \in \{\beta_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta\}$. Since $L^{V(X \cup Y)}$ has the unique Sylow 3-subgroup L_3 with $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, there is $y \in L_3$ such that $x^y = \beta_1^\alpha b^y \in L^{V(X \cup Y)}$ with $b^y \in \{\beta_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta\}$, and $L^{V(X \cup Y)} = \langle L_3, x^y \rangle$. For $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$, we have $L^{V(X \cup Y)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle, \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, and by taking $\gamma = 1, (\alpha_2^2)^\beta$ or α_2^β respectively, we have $(R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)})^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle^\gamma = L^{V(X \cup Y)}$. By Eq 5.3, $\alpha\beta\gamma \in \text{Aut}(X \cup Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. For $L_3 = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$, we have $L^{V(X \cup Y)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle, \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \alpha_2^\beta \rangle$ or $\langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta (\alpha_2^2)^\beta \rangle$. Recall that $L^{V(X)} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha, \beta_1^\alpha \rangle$. By assumption, $(\alpha_1^\alpha)^\delta = (\alpha_1^\alpha)^{-1}$ and $(L^{V(X)})^\delta = L^{V(X)}$, where $\delta \in \text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ is an involution. Since $L^{V(X)}$ has three involutions, δ fixes one of them, and we may let $(\beta_1^\alpha)^\delta = \beta_1^\alpha$. Since δ fixes $V(Y)$ pointwise, we have $(\beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta)^\delta = \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta$ and $(\alpha_2^\beta)^\delta = \alpha_2^\beta$. Then $(R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)})^{\alpha\beta\delta} = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle^\delta = \langle (\alpha_1^\alpha)^2 \alpha_2^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha_1^\alpha (\alpha_2^2)^\beta, \beta_1^\alpha \beta_2^\beta \rangle$. By taking $\gamma = 1, (\alpha_2^2)^\beta$ or α_2^β respectively, we have $(R(G)^{V(X \cup Y)})^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma} = L^{V(X \cup Y)}$, where $\alpha\beta\delta\gamma \in \text{Aut}(X \cup Y)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.

Now we are ready to finish the proof. If $R(G)^{V(\Lambda)}$ and $L^{V(\Lambda)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Lambda)_{(\mathcal{G})}$ for all components Λ of Γ , then Claim 2 implies that $R(G)$ and L are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and we are done. Recall that Σ is an arbitrary block component of Γ with length $1 \leq r \leq m \leq 5$. To finish the proof, by Claim 2 we only need to show that $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$.

If Σ^3 is block connected, then Claim 3 implies that $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and we are done. Thus, we may assume that Σ^3 is not block connected. Let X be a block component of Σ^3 . Then there exist $G_i \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ and $G_j \in \mathcal{G}(\Sigma)$ with $G_j \notin \mathcal{G}(X)$ such that $[G_i, G_j]_\Gamma \cong 2K_{3,3}$. Thus, $\{H_i, (bH)_i\}$ is an imprimitive block system of L on G_i . By Claim 3, $R(G)^{V(X)}$ and $L^{V(X)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$.

Suppose X has length 1. Then $\mathcal{G}(X) = \{G_i\}$, $V(X) = G_i$ and $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \cong S_3 \times S_3$. It is easy to see that $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ has an involution fixing $L^{V(X)}$ and inverting its elements of order 3. Suppose X has length 2. We may write $\mathcal{G}(X) = \{G_i, G_k\}$. If $X \cong 3K_{2,2}$, by Observation we have that $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ is faithful on G_i . Then it is easy to see that $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+ \cong S_3 \times S_3$, and $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ has an involution fixing $L^{V(X)}$ and inverting its elements of order 3. If $X \cong 3K_{2,2}$, by MAGMA [6] we have $\text{Aut}(X)_{\mathcal{G}}^+ \cong S_3$, and then it is easy to see that $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$ has an involution fixing $L^{V(X)}$ and inverting its elements of order 3 (note that H_k may not be a block of L on G_k).

If all block components of Σ^3 has length 1 or 2, then Claim 4, together with Claim 3 and the above paragraph, implies that $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, and we are done. Thus, we may assume that X has length at least 3. Recall that $R(G)^{V(X)}$ and $L^{V(X)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(X)_{(\mathcal{G})}^+$. Since $r \leq 5$, all other block components of Σ^3 except X have length 1 or 2. Again by Claim 4, $R(G)^{V(\Sigma)}$ and $L^{V(\Sigma)}$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)_{(\mathcal{G})}$, as required. \square

Now we are ready to classify m PCI- and m PDCI-groups for $m \geq 4$.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $m \geq 4$ be a positive integer and let G be a finite group. Then*

- (1) G is m PCI if and only if $G = \mathbb{Z}_1, \mathbb{Z}_2$, or $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 with $m = 4$ or 5;
- (2) G is m PDCI if and only if $G = \mathbb{Z}_1$ or \mathbb{Z}_2 .

Proof. Let Γ be an m -PCayley (di)graph of G , If $G = \mathbb{Z}_1$ or \mathbb{Z}_2 , then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has a unique semiregular subgroup with orbit set $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m\}$, and hence G is an m PCI-group and an m PDCI-group for any positive integer m . To prove parts (1) and (2), we may assume that $|G| \geq 3$.

The sufficiency of part (1) follows from Lemma 5.9, and to prove the necessity, let G be an m PCI-group. By Lemma 5.6, G is a $\{2, 3\}$ -group and so solvable. Let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G . Then $N \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^r$ or \mathbb{Z}_3^t for some positive integers r and t . By Theorem 5.5, N is m PCI, and by Theorem 5.3, any subgroup of G is 4PCI and so N is 4PCI.

Suppose $N \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^r$. If $r \geq 2$, then \mathbb{Z}_2^2 is 4PCI, contradicting Lemma 5.7. Thus, $N = \mathbb{Z}_2$ and hence $N \leq Z(G)$, the center of G . If G is a 2-group, then G has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2^2 or \mathbb{Z}_4 as $|G| \geq 3$, and hence \mathbb{Z}_2^2 or \mathbb{Z}_4 is 4PCI, contradicting Lemma 5.7. Thus, $3 \mid |G|$ and so G has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_6 , implying \mathbb{Z}_6 is 4PCI, contradicting Lemma 5.7.

Thus, $N \cong \mathbb{Z}_3^t$. If $t \geq 2$, then \mathbb{Z}_3^2 is 4PCI, contradicting Lemma 5.7. Thus, $N \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$. If the centralizer $C_G(N) \neq N$ then G has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_6 , \mathbb{Z}_3^2 or \mathbb{Z}_9 , which are impossible by Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.6. Thus, $C_G(N) = N$, and by the N/C -Theorem, G/N is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(N) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. It follows that $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 , and by Lemma 5.7, $4 \leq m \leq 5$. This completes the proof of part (1).

To prove part (2), we assume that G is m PDCI with $m \geq 4$. By Proposition 5.2, G is m PCI, and by part (1), either $G = \mathbb{Z}_1, \mathbb{Z}_2$, or $m = 4, 5$ and $G = \mathbb{Z}_3, D_6$. We have proved $G = \mathbb{Z}_1$ or \mathbb{Z}_2 is m PDCI-group for any positive integer m . To finish the proof, we only need to show that G is not 4PDCI for $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ or D_6 . First let $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 = \langle x \rangle$. Take $S_{1,2} = S_{3,2} = S_{4,1} = \{1, x, x^2\}$, $S_{1,3} = \{x\}$, $S_{2,4} = \{1, x\}$, $S_{3,1} = S_{4,2} = \{1\}$, and $S_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for all other $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$. With the help of MAGMA [6], $\Gamma = \text{Cay}(G, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 4)$ is a normal 4-PCayley digraph and $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ has a semiregular subgroup isomorphic to G with orbit set $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4\}$, but different from $R(G)$. By Theorem 4.5, Γ is not 4PDCI, and hence \mathbb{Z}_3 is not 4PDCI. Now let $G = D_6 = \langle x, y \mid x^3 = y^2 = 1, yxy = x^2 \rangle$ and take $S_{i,j}$ as the same as above for \mathbb{Z}_3 . Again by MAGMA, $\text{Cay}(D_6, S_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 4)$ is not 4PDCI and hence D_6 is not 4PDCI. \square

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12331013, 12311530692, 12271024, 12161141005, 12425111, 12301461) and the 111 Project of China (B16002).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare they have no financial interests.

Availability of data and materials

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- [1] A. Ádám, Research problems 2-10, *J. Combin. Theory* 2 (1967) 393, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01849790>.
- [2] B. Alspach, L. Nowitz, Elementary proofs that \mathbb{Z}_p^2 and \mathbb{Z}_p^3 are CI-groups, *European J. Combin.* 19 (1999) 607-617, <https://doi.org/10.1006/eujc.1999.0309>.
- [3] B. Alspach, T.D. Parsons, Isomorphism of circulant graphs and digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 25 (1979) 97-108, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(79\)90011-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(79)90011-6).
- [4] M. Arezoomand, B. Taeri, Isomorphisms of finite semi-Cayley graphs, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 31 (2015) 715-730, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10114-015-4356-8>.
- [5] L. Bafai, Isomorphism problem for a class of point-symmetric structures, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 29 (1977) 329-336, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01895854>.
- [6] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, C. Playoust, The Magma algebra system I: the user language, *J. Symb. Comput.* 24 (1997) 235-265, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jsco.1996.0125>.
- [7] S. Bhoomik, E. Dobson and J. Morris, On the automorphism groups of almost all circulant graphs and digraphs, *Ars Math. Contemp.* 7 (2014) 499-518, <https://doi.org/10.26493/1855-3974.315.868>.
- [8] L. Babai, P. Frankl, Isomorphisms of Cayley Graphs I, in: *Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai*, 18. Combinatorics, Keszthely, 1976; North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978, pp. 35-52.
- [9] L. Babai, Isomorphism problem for a class of point-symmetric structures, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* 29 (1977) 329-336, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01895854>.
- [10] M. Conder, P. Dobcsányi, Trivalent symmetric graphs on up to 768 vertices, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* 40 (2002) 41-63.
- [11] M. Conder, C.H. Li, On isomorphisms of finite Cayley graphs, *European J. Combin.* 19 (1998) 911-919, <https://doi.org/10.1006/eujc.1998.0243>.
- [12] M. Conder, A. Malnič, D. Marušič, P. Potočnik, A census of semisymmetric cubic graphs on up to 768 vertices, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 23 (2006) 255-294, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-006-7397-3>.
- [13] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker, R. A. Wilson, *Atlas of Finite Groups: Maximal Subgroups and Ordinary Characters for Simple Groups*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985.
- [14] D.Ž. Djoković, Isomorphism problem for a special class of graphs, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* 21 (1970) 267-270, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01894773>.
- [15] E. Dobson, Isomorphism problem for Cayley graphs of \mathbb{Z}_p^3 , *Discrete Math.* 147 (1995) 87-94, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(95\)00099-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(95)00099-I).
- [16] J.-L. Du, Y.-Q. Feng, P. Spiga, On n -partite digraphical representations of finite groups, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 189 (2022) 105606, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2022.105606>.

- [17] J.D. Dixon, B. Mortimer, *Permutation Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 163, Springer New York, New York, 1996. MR1409812.
- [18] E. Dobson, J. Morris, P. Spiga, Further restrictions on the structure of finite DCI-groups: an addendum, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 42 (2015) 959-969, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10801-015-0612-3>.
- [19] T. Dobson, M. Muzychuk, P. Spiga, Generalised dihedral CI-groups, *Ars Math. Contemp.* 22 (2022) #P2.07, <https://dx.doi.org/10.26493/1855-3974.2443.02e>.
- [20] B. Elspas, J. Turner, Graphs with circulant adjacency matrices, *J. Combin. Theory* 9 (1970) 297-307, [https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9800\(70\)80068-0](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9800(70)80068-0).
- [21] Y.-Q. Feng, I. Kovács, Elementary abelian groups of rank 5 are DCI-groups, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 157 (2018) 162-204, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9800\(70\)80068-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9800(70)80068-0).
- [22] C.D. Godsil, On Cayley graph isomorphisms, *Ars Combin.* 15 (1983) 231-246.
- [23] C.D. Godsil, On the full automorphism group of a graph, *Combinatorica* 1 (1981) 243-256, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02579330>.
- [24] C.D. Godsil, The automorphism group of some cubic Cayley graphs, *European J. Combin.* 4 (1983) 25-32, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698\(83\)80005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698(83)80005-5).
- [25] A. Hujdurović, K. Kutnar, D. Marušič, On normality of n -Cayley graphs, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 332 (2018) 469-476, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2018.03.054>.
- [26] I. Kovács, Arc-transitive dihedrants of odd prime-power order, *Graphs Combin.* 29 (2013) 569-583, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-012-1134-6>.
- [27] H. Koike, I. Kovács, A classification of nilpotent 3-BCI-groups, *Int. J. Group Theory* 8 (2019) 11-24, <https://doi.org/10.22108/ijgt.2017.100795.1404>.
- [28] H. Koike, I. Kovács, Arc-transitive cubic Abelian bi-Cayley graphs and BCI-graphs, *Filomat* 30 (2016) 321-331, <https://doi.org/10.2298/FIL1602321K>.
- [29] I. Kovács, G. Ryabov, The group $C_p^4 \times C_q$ is a DCI-group, *Discrete Math.* 345 (2022) 112705, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2021.112705>.
- [30] C.H. Li, On isomorphisms of finite Cayley graphs—a survey, *Discrete Math.* 256 (2002) 301-334, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(01\)00438-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(01)00438-1).
- [31] C.H. Li, Z.P. Lu, P.P. Pálffy, Further restriction on the structure of finite CI-groups, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 26 (2007) 161-181, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-006-0052-1>.
- [32] C.H. Li, B.Z. Xia, S.M. Zhou, An explicit characterization of arc-transitive circulants, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 150 (2021) 1-16, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2021.02.004>.
- [33] M. Muzychuk, *Ádám's conjecture is true in the square-free case*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 72 (1995) 118-134, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165\(95\)90031-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165(95)90031-4).
- [34] M. Muzychuk, An elementary abelian group of large rank is not a CI-group, *Discrete Math.* 264 (2003) 167-185, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(02\)00558-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(02)00558-7).

- [35] M. Muzychuk, On \acute{A} dam's conjecture for circulant graphs, *Discrete Math.* 176 (1997) 285-298, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(96\)00251-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(96)00251-8).
- [36] L.A. Nowitz, A non-Cayley-invariant Cayley graph of the elementary abelian group of order 64, *Discrete Math.* 110 (1992) 223-228, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365x\(92\)90711-n](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365x(92)90711-n).
- [37] P.P. Pálffy, Isomorphism problem for relational structures with a cyclic automorphism, *European J. Combin.* 8 (1987) 35-43, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698\(87\)80018-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6698(87)80018-5).
- [38] D.J.S. Robinson, *A Course in the Theory of Groups*, Second ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [39] C.M. Roney-Dougal, The primitive permutation groups of degree less than 2500, *J. Algebra* 292 (2005) 154-183, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2005.04.017>.
- [40] G. Somlai, Elementary abelian p -groups of rank $2p+3$ are not CI-groups, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 34 (2011) 323-335, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-011-0273-9>.
- [41] P. Spiga, Elementary abelian p -groups of rank greater than or equal to $4p-2$ are not CI-groups, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 26 (2007) 343-355, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-007-0059-2>.
- [42] P. Spiga, CI-property of elementary abelian 3-groups, *Discrete Math.* 309 (2009) 3393-3398, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2008.08.002>.
- [43] G. Somlai, M. Muzychuk, The Cayley isomorphism property for $Z_p^3 \times Z_q$, *Algebr. Comb.* 4 (2021) 289-299, <https://doi.org/10.5802/alco.154>.
- [44] J. Turner, Point-symmetric graphs with a prime number of points, *J. Combin. Theory* 3 (1967) 136-145, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9800\(67\)80003-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9800(67)80003-6).
- [45] H. Wielandt, *Finite Permutation Groups*, Academic Press, New York, 1964. MR0183775.
- [46] J.-H. Xie, Y.-Q. Feng, Y.S. Kwon, Dihedral groups with the m -DCI property, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 60 (2024) 73-86, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-024-01327-w>.
- [47] J.-H. Xie, Y.-Q. Feng, G. Ryabov, Y.L. Liu, Normal Cayley digraphs of cyclic groups with CI-property, *Comm. Algebra* 50 (2022) 2911-2920, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2021.2022156>.
- [48] J.-H. Xie, Y.-Q. Feng, J.-X. Zhou, Normal Cayley digraphs of dihedral groups with the CI-property, *Ars Math. Contemp.* 23 (2023) 1-15, <https://doi.org/10.26493/1855-3974.2688.2de>.
- [49] M.Y. Xu, Automorphism groups and isomorphisms of Cayley digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 182 (1998) 309-319, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(97\)00152-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(97)00152-0).
- [50] J.-X. Zhou, Y.-Q. Feng, The automorphisms of bi-Cayley graphs, *J. Combin. Theory B* 116 (2016) 504-532, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2015.10.004>.