

A CANONICAL FORM FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE MATRICES

MATHIEU DUTOUR SIKIRIĆ, ANNA HAENSCH, JOHN VOIGHT,
AND WESSEL P.J. VAN WOERDEN

ABSTRACT. We exhibit an algorithm for finding a canonical form for a positive definite matrix under unimodular integral transformations. The method uses characteristic sets of short vectors and partition-backtracking graph software, and it is much more efficient than canonical forms based on Minkowski reduction. We present an extension of this formalism to the symplectic group as well as finite index subgroups. We then present applications to a database of lattices, genus enumeration, algebraic modular forms, and perfect form enumeration.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. For n a positive integer, let \mathcal{S}^n denote the \mathbb{R} -vector space of symmetric real $n \times n$ -matrices and $\mathcal{S}_{>0}^n \subset \mathcal{S}^n$ denote the cone of positive definite symmetric $n \times n$ -matrices. For $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$, the map $x \mapsto x^T A x$ (where T denotes transpose) defines a positive definite quadratic form, with A its Gram matrix in the standard basis; for brevity, we refer to $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ as a *form*. The group $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ of unimodular matrices acts on $\mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ by the action $(U, A) \mapsto U^T A U$; the stabilizer of a form A under this action is the finite group

$$(1.1.1) \quad \mathrm{Stab}(A) := \{U \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}) : U^T A U = A\}.$$

Two forms $A, B \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ are said to be (*arithmetically*) *equivalent* if there exists a unimodular matrix $U \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$(1.1.2) \quad A = U^T B U.$$

In the Geometry of Numbers [38], forms arise naturally as Gram matrices of Euclidean lattices under a choice of basis; in this context, two forms are arithmetically equivalent if and only if they correspond to isometric lattices.

Plesken–Souvignier [33] exhibited algorithms to compute stabilizers and test for arithmetic equivalence among forms, and these have been used widely in practice [5, 12, 15, 23, 36]. In a more theoretical direction, Haviv–Regev [18] proposed algorithms based on the Shortest Vector Problem and an isolation lemma for these purposes as well, with a time complexity of $n^{O(n)}$.

While these algorithms have been sufficient for many tasks, they suffer from an unfortunate deficiency. Suppose we have many forms $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ and we wish to identify them up to equivalence. A naive application of the equivalence algorithms requires $O(m^2)$ equivalence tests (in the worst case). The number of tests can be somewhat mitigated if useful invariants are available, which might not be the case.

Our approach in this article is to compute a *canonical form* $\text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$. This canonical form should satisfy the following two basic requirements:

- (i) For every $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$, $\text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$ is equivalent to A ; and
- (ii) For every $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ and $U \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, $\text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(U^T A U) = \text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$.

Combining a canonical form with a hash table, the identification of equivalence classes in a list of m forms takes only m canonical form computations (and m hash table lookups) and so has the potential to be much faster.

1.2. Minkowski reduction and characteristic sets. The theory of Minkowski reduction provides one possible approach to obtaining a canonical form. The Minkowski reduction domain [31] is a polyhedral domain $P_n \subset S_{>0}^n$ with the property that there exists an algorithm for Minkowski reduction, taking as input a form A and returning as output an equivalent form in P_n . For example, for the special case $n = 2$ we recover the familiar Gaussian reduction of binary quadratic forms. An implementation of Minkowski reduction is available [7, 34, 35]; however, this reduction is quite slow in practice, and it is unsuitable for forms of large dimension n (say, $n \geq 12$).

For those forms whose Minkowski reduction lies in the *interior* of the domain P_n , the Minkowski reduction is unique [11, p. 203; 9, Chapter 12; 43], thereby providing a canonical form. Otherwise, when the reduction lies on the boundary of P_n , there are finitely many possible Minkowski reduced forms; one can then order the facets of the polyhedral domain P_n to choose a canonical form among them. This approach was carried out explicitly by Seeber [39] for $n = 3$ and possibly Zassenhaus [46] for $n = 4$. An extension to $n = 5, 6, 7$ is possible at least in principle, since the Minkowski domains are known in these cases [38]. However, the problem of determining the facets of the Minkowski reduction domain is hard in itself and so this strategy is not realistic in higher dimensions.

In contrast, the approach taken by Plesken–Souvignier [33] for computing the stabilizer and checking for equivalence of a form A uses the notion of *characteristic vector sets*.

Definition 1.2.1. A *characteristic vector set* function is a map that assigns to every form $A \in S_{>0}^n$ a finite subset of vectors $\mathcal{V}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that:

- (i) $\mathcal{V}(A)$ generates \mathbb{Z}^n (as a \mathbb{Z} -module); and
- (ii) For all $U \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, we have $U^{-1}\mathcal{V}(A) = \mathcal{V}(U^T A U)$.

The basic idea is then to define an edge-weighted graph on a characteristic vector set \mathcal{V} ; using this graph, equivalence and automorphisms of forms becomes a problem about isomorphism and automorphisms of graphs (see Lemma 3.1.1).

The graph isomorphism problem has recently been proved to be solvable in quasi-polynomial time by Babai [4]; however, the current approaches to computing characteristic vector sets use the Shortest Vector Problem which is known to be NP-hard [30], so it is difficult to take advantage of this complexity result in the general case. Nevertheless, we may hope to leverage some practical advantage from this approach.

1.3. Our approach. In this article, we adopt the approach of characteristic vector sets, using very efficient programs [19, 29] that compute a canonical form of a graph using partition backtrack.

Theorem 1.3.1. *There exists an explicit algorithm that, on input a (positive definite) form $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ with entries in a computable subfield of \mathbb{R} , computes a canonical form for A . For fixed $n \geq 1$, this algorithm runs in deterministic polynomial time in the input size.*

This theorem is proven by combining Proposition 3.3.3 for the first statement and Corollary 4.1.2 for the running time analysis. A subfield of \mathbb{R} is *computable* if it comes equipped with a way of encoding elements in bits along with deterministic algorithms to perform field operations: see e.g. Stoltenberg-Hansen–Tucker [40]. In light of the comments about Minkowski reduction in the previous section, the content of Theorem 1.3.1 is in the word *explicit*. We also find this algorithm performs fairly well in practice in many (but not all) cases: an implementation is available online [1].

1.4. Contents. We begin in section 2 by presenting the construction of some characteristic vector set functions. In section 3, we present how to construct a canonical form from a given characteristic set function. In section 4 we consider the time complexity of our algorithm. We then consider several extensions of this canonical form approach in other settings in section 5. In section 6, we conclude by presenting applications of our canonical form.

1.5. Acknowledgments. This work was advanced during the conference *Computational Challenges in the Theory of Lattices* at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics (ICERM) in April 2018 by Haensch, Dutour Sikirić, and Voight. Further advancements were made during a visit to the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing in February 2020 by Dutour Sikirić, Voight and van Woerden. The authors would like to thank ICERM and Simons for their hospitality and support. Voight was supported by a Simons Collaboration grant (550029) and Van Woerden was supported by the ERC Advanced Grant 740972 (ALGSTRONGCRYPTO). We also thank Achill Schürmann and Rainer Schulze-Pillot for help on Minkowski reduction theory.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF CHARACTERISTIC VECTOR SETS

In this section we build two characteristic vector set functions that can be used for the computation of the stabilizer, canonical form, and equivalence of forms.

2.1. Some vector sets. The sets of vectors that we use throughout this work are based on shortest or short vectors. Thus it is important to first consider some important properties of those sets of vectors.

Given a set of vectors $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ we define $\text{span}(\mathcal{V})$ to be the (not necessarily full) lattice spanned over \mathbb{Z} by \mathcal{V} . For $A \in \mathcal{S}^n$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write

$$(2.1.1) \quad A[x] := x^T A x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For a form $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ we define the *minimum*

$$(2.1.2) \quad \min(A) := \min_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} A[x],$$

the set of *shortest* (or *minimal*) *vectors*

$$(2.1.3) \quad \text{Min}(A) := \{v \in \mathbb{Z}^n : A[v] = \min(A)\},$$

and its span

$$(2.1.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\min}(A) := \text{span}(\text{Min}(A)).$$

The set of shortest vectors satisfies the desirable transformation property

$$(2.1.5) \quad \text{Min}(U^T A U) = U^{-1} \text{Min}(A)$$

for all $U \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$. If $\text{Min}(A)$ is full-dimensional, then A is called a *well-rounded* (quadratic) form.

However, two obstacles remain:

PB1. If $n \geq 2$, then $\text{span}(\text{Min}(A))$ may not have rank n .

PB2. If $n \geq 5$ and $\text{span}(\text{Min}(A))$ has rank n , then $\text{span}(\text{Min}(A))$ may not be all of \mathbb{Z}^n .

Thus we have to consider other vector sets.

For $\lambda > 0$, let

$$\text{Min}_A(\lambda) := \{v \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\} : A[v] \leq \lambda\}.$$

The vector set used for computing the stabilizer and automorphisms in the AUTO/ISOM programs of Plesken–Souvignier [33] is:

$$(2.1.6) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{PS}}(A) := \text{Min}_A(\text{maxdiag}(A)),$$

where $\text{maxdiag}(A) := \max\{A_{ii} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is the maximum of the diagonal elements of A . The vector set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{PS}}(A)$ contains the standard basis as a subset and as a result is adequate for computing the stabilizer. Typically LLL-reduction [27] is used, leading to a decrease in $\text{maxdiag}(A)$, to prevent large sets. However, when computing equivalence we have a potential problem since two forms A and B can be equivalent but satisfy $\text{maxdiag}(A) \neq \text{maxdiag}(B)$. This is a limitation of ISOM, which for equivalence can be resolved by taking the bound $\max\{\text{maxdiag}(A), \text{maxdiag}(B)\}$ (something we cannot do for our canonical form).

To prevent this problem we can use a more reliable vector set that consists of those vectors whose length is at most the minimal spanning length:

$$(2.1.7) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{ms}}(A) := \text{Min}_A(\lambda_{\min}), \text{ where}$$

$$(2.1.8) \quad \lambda_{\min} := \min\{\lambda > 0 : \text{span}(\text{Min}_A(\lambda)) = \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

This vector set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ms}}(A)$ is a characteristic vector set. However, $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ms}}(A)$ can still be very large, making it impractical to use.

Example 2.1.9. For example, the matrix $A_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda \geq 1$ gives

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{ms}}(A_\lambda) = \{\pm e_2\} \cup \{\pm e_1, \pm 2e_1, \dots, \pm \lfloor \sqrt{\lambda} \rfloor e_1\}.$$

while $\{\pm e_1, \pm e_2\}$ would be adequate. This problem is related to **PB1**.

2.2. An inductive characteristic vector set, using closest vectors. Building on the observations made in the previous section, we now present a construction that deals with **PB1** and allows us to build a suitable characteristic vector set.

For a set of vectors $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$, the saturated sublattice (of \mathbb{Z}^n) spanned by \mathcal{V} is

$$(2.2.1) \quad \text{satspan}(\mathcal{V}) := \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{V} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

Beyond shortest vectors, we use the *closest vector problem*: for $v \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, we define

$$(2.2.2) \quad \text{cvp}(A, v) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n} A[x - v]$$

as the minimum distance of the target to the form and

$$(2.2.3) \quad \text{CVP}(A, v) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n : A[x - v] = \text{cvp}(A, v)\}$$

the set of closest vectors achieving this minimum.

Before we give our construction, we prove a short lemma.

Lemma 2.2.4. *Let \mathcal{V} be a characteristic vector set, $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ a form, and $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a lattice of rank r . For a \mathbb{Z} -basis B of L and c in the real span of L , the sets*

$$(2.2.5) \quad B\mathcal{V}(B^t AB); \text{ and}$$

$$(2.2.6) \quad B \text{CVP}(B^t AB, B^{-1}c)$$

are independent of the choice of basis B .

Proof. Every basis is given by BU for some $U \in \text{GL}_r(\mathbb{Z})$ and thus the result follows immediately from property (ii) of the characteristic vector set and the similar property

$$(2.2.7) \quad \text{CVP}(U^t A_r U, U^{-1}c_r) = U^{-1} \text{CVP}(A_r, c_r)$$

of the closest vector set for $A_r \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^r$ and $c_r \in \mathbb{R}^r$. \square

Suppose that A is well-rounded. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of the full rank lattice $\mathcal{L}_{\min}(A)$ spanned by $\text{Min}(A)$ and let $B \in \text{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z})$ be the matrix with columns v_1, \dots, v_n . We then define

$$(2.2.8) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{wr-cvp}}(A) := \text{Min}(A) \cup \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{Z}^n / \mathcal{L}_{\min}(A)} (c - B \text{CVP}(B^t AB, B^{-1}c)).$$

The set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{wr-cvp}}(A)$ consists of the union of the shortest vectors together with the set of points in each coset closest to the origin. By Lemma 2.2.4 the definition $\mathcal{V}_{\text{wr-cvp}}(A)$ is well-defined, independent of the choice of basis. Furthermore it satisfies the necessary transformation property and spans \mathbb{Z}^n (as a \mathbb{Z} -module) because it contains at least one point from each coset in $\mathbb{Z}^n / \mathcal{L}_{\min}(A)$.

For a general form A , in geometrical terms we follow the filtration defined from the minimum [8]. We define a set of vectors $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A)$ inductively (described in an algorithmic fashion), as follows:

1. Compute the set $\text{Min}(A)$ of vectors of minimal length and compute the saturated sublattice $L_1 := \text{satspan}(\text{Min}(A))$ spanned by these vectors.
2. Compute a \mathbb{Z} -basis v_1, \dots, v_r of L_1 , where r is its rank. Let $B_1 \in \text{M}_{n,r}(\mathbb{R})$ be the matrix with columns v_1, \dots, v_r , and let $A_1 := B_1^T A B_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^r$. Note that A_1 is well-rounded by construction.
3. Let

$$\text{proj}: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

be the orthogonal projection with respect to A away from L_1 .

4. Compute a basis w_1, \dots, w_{n-r} of $L_2 := \text{proj}(\mathbb{Z}^n)$ and let $B_2 \in \text{M}_{n,(n-r)}(\mathbb{R})$ be the matrix with columns w_1, \dots, w_{n-r} . Let $A_2 = B_2^t A B_2$.
5. If $r = n$, let $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A_2) := \emptyset$; otherwise, compute $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A_2)$ recursively and then define

$$(2.2.9) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A) := B_1 \mathcal{V}_{\text{wr-cvp}}(A_1) \cup \bigcup_{v \in B_2 \mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A_2)} \text{CVP}(A, v).$$

Theorem 2.2.10. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) The set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A)$ is well-defined (independent of the choices of bases).
- (b) The association $A \mapsto \mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A)$ is a characteristic vector set function.
- (c) We have $\#\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A) = n^{O(n)}$.
- (d) Given input A , the set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A)$ is effectively computable with running time $n^{O(n)}s^{O(1)}$ where s is the input size.

Proof. We prove by induction in the dimension n that \mathcal{V}_{cvp} is a characteristic vector set. The base case $n = 0$ is trivial if we set $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A) := \emptyset$. For $n > 0$ note that A_1 is well rounded and A_2 has dimension at most $n - 1$ and thus $B_1\mathcal{V}_{\text{wr-cvp}}(A_1)$ and $B_2\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A_2)$ are independent of the choice of basis by induction and Lemma 2.2.4. The lattice L_2 is uniquely defined by the projection.

What remains to be checked is if the transformation property remains. By the previous note we can choose the bases ourself to ease the proof. Running the algorithm for A and $A' = U^t A U$ we can assume that $v'_i = U^{-1}v_i$ and $w'_i = U^{-1}w_i$ by using the transformation property of $\text{Min}(A)$. Then $A'_i = A_i$ and $B'_i = U^{-1}B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We can now conclude by noting that CVP also has the compatible transformation property:

$$(2.2.11) \quad \text{CVP}(U^t A U, U^{-1}v) = U^{-1}\text{CVP}(A, v).$$

By Keller–Martinet–Schürmann [22, Proposition 2.1] for a well-rounded lattice the index of the sublattice determined by the shortest vectors is at most $\lfloor \gamma_n^{n/2} \rfloor$ with γ_n the Hermite constant satisfying $\gamma_n^{n/2} \leq (2/\pi)^{n/2} \cdot \Gamma(2 + n/2) = n^{O(n)}$. The upper bound on \mathcal{V}_{cvp} follows by combining this with exponential upper bounds on the kissing number [20] and the trivial upper bound 2^n on $\#\text{CVP}$.

The running time estimate follows by combining exponential upper estimates on the computation of CVP and SVP problems. \square

Although the cost of computing many closest vector problems may make it quite expensive to compute $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A)$ in the worst case, we find in many cases that it gives a substantial improvement in comparison to other characteristic vector sets.

Example 2.2.12. Returning to Example 2.1.9, we find that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(A_\lambda) = \{\pm e_1, \pm e_2\}.$$

The construction of \mathcal{V}_{cvp} addresses **PB1**, but **PB2** remains as even for well rounded lattices $\#(\mathbb{Z}^n / \mathcal{L}_{\min}(A))$ can possibly be very large. There are some lattices for which this problem is especially acute.

Example 2.2.13. For example, the self-dual Niemeier lattice N_{23} [10, Chapter 18], whose root diagram is $24A_1$ has minimum 2 and 48 shortest vectors, has $\#\mathcal{V}_{\text{ms}}(N_{23}) = 194352$. Since the index of the lattice spanned by the shortest vectors in N_{23} is 2^{24} , the size of $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cvp}}(N_{23})$ is at least $48 + 2^{24}$.

We do not see how to resolve **PB2** efficiently in general within the framework of characteristic vector sets.

Remark 2.2.14. It may be possible to deal with some cases (but still not Example 2.2.13) by working with characteristic vector sets on forms attached in a canonical way to A : for example, one could work with the *dual* form attached to A , for it may sometimes happen that the dual does not have a large number of minimal vectors (even though A does).

3. CONSTRUCTION OF A CANONICAL FORM

In this section, we suppose that we have chosen a characteristic vector set function \mathcal{V} , such as the one defined in section 2.2. From this, we will construct a canonical form in a manner that depends on \mathcal{V} . We first review the computation of a stabilizer and how to do equivalence tests by using \mathcal{V} .

3.1. Graph construction. Given a form A , let $\mathcal{V}(A) = \{v_1, \dots, v_p\}$. We define G_A to be the edge- and vertex-weighted complete (undirected) graph on p vertices $1, \dots, p$ such that vertex i has weight $w_{i,i} = A[v_i]$ and the edge between i and j has weight $w_{i,j} = v_i^T A v_j = w_{j,i}$. In other words, G_A is the weighted complete graph whose adjacency matrix is $B^T A B$, where $B \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$ is the matrix whose columns are v_i . (The graph G_A depends on \mathcal{V} , but we do not include in the notation as we consider \mathcal{V} fixed in this section.)

Lemma 3.1.1. *For a form $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ and the graph G_A constructed from a characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$ we have a group isomorphism*

$$(3.1.2) \quad \text{Stab}(A) \simeq \text{Stab}(G_A) := \{\sigma \in S_p : w_{i,j} = w_{\sigma(i),\sigma(j)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq p\}.$$

Proof. We first define the map $\text{Stab}(A) \rightarrow \text{Stab}(G_A)$. Let $U \in \text{Stab}(A)$. Then by property (ii) of a characteristic vector set, we have $U\mathcal{V}(A) = \mathcal{V}(U^{-T}AU^{-1}) = \mathcal{V}(A)$; therefore, U permutes the set $\mathcal{V}(A)$, giving a permutation $\sigma_U \in S_p$ characterized by $\sigma_U(i) = j$ if and only if $Uv_i = v_j$. Accordingly, we have

$$(3.1.3) \quad w_{i,j} = v_i^T A v_j = v_i^T U^T A U v_j = v_{\sigma_U(i)}^T A v_{\sigma_U(j)}$$

so moreover $\sigma_U \in \text{Stab}(G_A)$. It is then straightforward to see that this map defines a group homomorphism. To show this map is an isomorphism, we use property (i) that $\mathcal{V}(A)$ spans \mathbb{Z}^n . Indeed, the map is injective because if σ_U is the identity, then $Uv_i = v_i$ for all i so U is the identity. Similarly, it is surjective: any $\sigma \in \text{Stab}(G_A)$ fixes pairwise inner products with respect to A , so we obtain a unique \mathbb{Q} -stabilizer $U \in \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $U^T A U = A$; however, because $\mathcal{V}(A)$ spans \mathbb{Z}^n , we obtain $U\mathbb{Z}^n = \mathbb{Z}^n$ so $U \in \text{Stab}(A)$. \square

3.2. Canonical graph. The existing programs only work with vertex weighted graphs. The vertex and edge weighted complete graph can be translated into a vertex weighted graphs by using graph transformations that were introduced in the manual of `nauty` [29].

Let us take a complete (undirected) graph G on p vertices of vertex weight $w_{i,i}$ and edge weight $w_{i,j}$. We construct a complete (undirected) graph $T_1(G)$ on $p+2$ vertices which is only edge weighted, as follows. Let a and b be two distinct weights that do not occur as $w_{i,j}$. We define the new edge weight w' to be

$$(3.2.1) \quad w'_{i,j} := \begin{cases} w_{i,j}, & \text{if } i < j \leq p; \\ w_{i,i}, & \text{if } i \leq p \text{ and } j = p+1; \\ a, & \text{if } i \leq p \text{ and } j = p+2; \\ b, & \text{if } i = p+1 \text{ and } j = p+2; \text{ and} \\ w'_{j,i}, & \text{if } j > i. \end{cases}$$

Visibly, any automorphism preserving $T_1(G)$ will preserve the vertices $p+1$ and $p+2$; and the automorphisms of $T_1(G)$ correspond to the automorphisms of G .

The next transformation takes a complete graph G with edge weights $w_{i,j}$ and returns a vertex weighted graph $T_2(G)$. Let us take S the set of possible edge weights and w the smallest integer such that $\#S \leq 2^w$. For an edge weight $s \in S$, denote $l_k(s)$ the k -th value in the binary expansion of the position of s in S . If G has p vertices then $T_2(G)$ will have pw vertices of the form (i, k) with $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $0 \leq k \leq w - 1$. The vertex (i, k) is set to the vertex weight k . Two vertices (i, k) and (i', k') are adjacent in the following cases:

- (1) $i = i'$ so that vertices of G correspond to cliques in $T_2(G)$; or
- (2) $k = k'$ and $l_k(w_{i,i'}) = 1$.

3.3. Canonical form. The software `nauty` [29] and `bliss` [19] allow to find the automorphism group and test equivalence of vertex weighted graphs. They also allow to find a canonical form of those graphs. From the automorphism group of the edge weighted graph $T_2(T_1(G_A))$ we can get back the automorphism group of G_A and thus of the form A . The equivalence works similarly.

Computation of the canonical form of A requires more work. The canonical form is computed for $T_2(G)$, which means that we have a canonical ordering of the vertices of G . A vertex in G correspond to a set S_i of w points in $T_2(G)$. If i, j are two vertices in G then we say that $i < j$ if the smallest element of S_i is smaller than the smallest element of S_j . This gives a canonical ordering of the vertices of G . So, there is a canonical ordering of the vertices of $T_1(G_A)$. Vertices in G_A correspond to vertices in $T_1(G_A)$. For two vertices i, j of G_A we say that $i < j$ if the image of i in $T_1(G_A)$ is smaller than the image of j . Thus the vertices of G_A are canonically ordered.

So, we obtain an ordering of the characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$, which we write as $\{v_1, \dots, v_p\}$. Note that there are $\# \text{Stab}(A)$ valid bijections between the canonically ordered vertices of G_A and the vectors of the characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$. So the obtained ordering is only canonical up to $\text{Stab}(A)$, i.e. we obtain some ordering of the form $\{Sv_1, \dots, Sv_p\}$ with $S \in \text{Stab}(A)$. We need to derive a canonical form from the vectors v_i .

The Hermite Normal Form (HNF) of a matrix $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ is the unique matrix $H \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ for which there exists $U \in \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $A = UH$ and moreover:

- (i) H is upper triangular with $H_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j$;
- (ii) Every pivot of H , the leading coefficient a row, is strictly to the right of the pivots above; and
- (iii) The elements below pivots are zero and elements above pivots are nonnegative and strictly smaller than the pivot.

In the cases that interest us, the matrix Q_A with columns v_1, \dots, v_p defined by the characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$ is of full rank and so the matrix U , obtained from the Hermite normal form $Q_A = UH$, is uniquely defined as well. Note that any other ordering Sv_1, \dots, Sv_p would lead to the matrix SU for some $S \in \text{Stab}(A)$. We denote the obtained representative by $U_{\mathcal{V}(A)} \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})/\text{Stab}(A)$.

We now define

$$(3.3.1) \quad \text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A) := U_{\mathcal{V}(A)}^T A U_{\mathcal{V}(A)} \in S_{>0}^n$$

and

$$(3.3.2) \quad \text{Red}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A) := U_{\mathcal{V}(A)} \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})/\text{Stab}(A).$$

Proposition 3.3.3. *The matrix $\text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$ is a canonical form for A .*

Proof. Property (i) is clear by definition. For (ii), given $P \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$(3.3.4) \quad U_{\mathcal{V}(P^T AP)} \equiv U_{P^{-1}\mathcal{V}(A)} \equiv P^{-1}U_{\mathcal{V}(A)} \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})/\text{Stab}(P^T AP).$$

Thus $\text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(P^T AP) = \text{Can}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$, as desired. \square

Proposition 3.3.3 proves the first statement of our main result, Theorem 1.3.1 (for any characteristic vector set function \mathcal{V}).

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Time complexity. We now analyze the complexity of our algorithm to compute a canonical form, with the characteristic vector set defined in section 2.2.

Theorem 4.1.1. *Given as input a positive definite symmetric matrix A and a corresponding characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$ we can compute a canonical form for A in time $\exp(O(\log(N)^c)) \cdot s^{O(1)}$ where N is the input size of $\mathcal{V}(A)$, s is the input size of A and $c > 1$ is some fixed constant.*

Proof. Given the characteristic vector set $\mathcal{V}(A)$ the corresponding graph can clearly be computed in time polynomial in the size of A and $\mathcal{V}(A)$ as this part is mostly dominated by the computation of $v_i^t A v_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \#\mathcal{V}(A)\}$. Computing a hermite normal form can be done in time polynomial in the matrix size which is the same as the size of $\mathcal{V}(A)$ [21, 41]. As the constructed graph is of polynomial size in $\mathcal{V}(A)$ and A we can conclude if we have a quasi-polynomial algorithm to find a canonical form of a graph. We refer to a recent report by Babai on this [3]. \square

Corollary 4.1.2. *For all $n \geq 1$ and $A \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}^n$ we can compute a canonical form in time at most $n^{O(n^c)} \cdot s^{O(1)}$ where s is the input size of A and $c > 1$ is some fixed constant.*

Proof. We combine Theorem 2.2.10 and Theorem 4.1.1. \square

5. EXTENSIONS

In this section we list some extensions of the formalism to other settings.

5.1. Extension to symplectic groups. Let $\text{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})_{\text{alt}}$ the set $(2n) \times (2n)$ integral alternating (or skew-symmetric) matrices. By a result due originally to Frobenius (see e.g. Lang [26, Lemma 1, p. 90]), for any $A \in \text{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})_{\text{alt}}$, there exists $U \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ and unique $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $a_1 \mid a_2 \mid \dots \mid a_n$ such that

$$(5.1.1) \quad U^T A U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D(a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ -D(a_1, \dots, a_n) & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: F(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

where $D(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is the diagonal $n \times n$ matrix with a_i on the diagonal, called the *Frobenius normal form*. The Frobenius normal form can be computed using a deterministic algorithm (see e.g. Veblen–Franklin [45, paragraph 14]), using simultaneous row and column operations.

Let $J_n = F(1, \dots, 1)$ represent the standard alternating pairing and

$$(5.1.2) \quad \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) := \{Q \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) : Q^T J_n Q = J_n\}.$$

The group $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ acts on $\mathcal{S}_{>0}^{2n}$ and this action was used by MacPherson–McConnell [28] to get a reduction theory for $\text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z})$.

A canonical representative under this action can also be computed using our canonical form as follows:

1. Compute the reduction matrix $U := \text{Red}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$, from (3.3.2).
2. Compute the product $B := U^T J_n U$.
3. Compute $U' \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ be such that $(U')^T B U' = F(1, \dots, 1) = J_n$ is in Frobenius normal form (5.1.1). Let $Q := U U' \in \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$.
4. The canonical form is then $\text{Can}_{\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})}(A) := Q^T A Q$, with reduction matrix $\text{Red}_{\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})}(A) := Q$.

The proof that this is a canonical form follows in a similar manner as in Proposition 3.3.3.

5.2. Extension to finite index subgroups. In many applications, there is interest in using finite index subgroups of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ in order to study number theoretic questions computationally [2].

For a finite index subgroup Γ of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, we indicate a method for finding the canonical form of the action on positive definite matrices. Consider the decomposition into cosets

$$\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^m \Gamma U_i,$$

then the canonical form can be computed in following way:

1. Compute the reduction matrix $U := \text{Red}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})}(A)$.
2. Find the index i and a matrix $Q \in \Gamma$ such that $U = Q U_i$.
3. The canonical form is then $\text{Can}_\Gamma(A) := Q^T A Q$, with reduction matrix $\text{Red}_\Gamma(A) := Q$.

This algorithm requires having explicit cosets and an efficient method to identify the coset to which a unimodular matrix belongs—this is possible by the Todd–Coxeter algorithm, but for some groups Γ this may be computationally expensive.

5.3. Extension to non-generating minimal vector sets. As noted in section 2, one significant problem with characteristic vector sets is that the restriction of spanning \mathbb{Z}^n is very strong and can force large vector sets. It is interesting to weaken this constraint by considering vector sets \mathcal{V} for which the saturation spans \mathbb{Z}^n (i.e., contains a basis for \mathbb{Q}^n). Such a set \mathcal{V} will span a sublattice of \mathbb{Z}^n and will be typically much smaller than a \mathbb{Z}^n spanning subset.

The computation of the graph G_A and then $T_2(T_1(G_A))$ works for those sets and we can get the automorphisms of G_A . The problem is that the corresponding linear transformations a priori belong to $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$ and so the stabilizer problem cannot be resolved by this.

Fortunately, there is an algorithm [6, Section 3.1] for computing the integral subgroup of such a group, based on partition backtrack algorithms for group actions. This allows to check automorphism and do equivalence test of positive definite quadratic forms even if the vector sets is not a \mathbb{Z} -basis.

Unfortunately, the existing implementations of partition backtrack for permutation groups [17] do not implement a canonical representation, so at the present time, one cannot have a canonical representation in case \mathcal{V} is not a \mathbb{Z} -basis.

6. APPLICATIONS

6.1. Lattice databases. A current project of interest in number theory is an extension of the L-functions and Modular Forms DataBase (LMFDB) [42] to include lattices. The goal of the database is to store computationally expensive lattice

data such as information about its local structure, theta series, minimal vectors, and other invariants. One current shortcoming of the database has been the lack of a deterministic naming scheme for lattices. Of course lattices can be narrowed down by a listing of dimension, determinant, level, class number but beyond that point many genera of such lattices can exist, and each genus can potentially contain multiple classes.

Finding a canonical form for lattices would be a way to establish a deterministic labeling. This has long been known to be a challenge: for example, it is exactly the problem of the boundary of a fundamental domain in Minkowski reduction (mentioned in the introduction) that is at issue. Up until now, an ad hoc enumeration has been applied to differentiate among the lattices with a shared dimension, determinant, level, and class number. This of course presents a challenge, since a crash in the database could result in a new and different enumeration. Therefore it has been of interest for some time to establish a canonical naming mechanism for lattices, and the algorithm in this paper does precisely that, returning canonical forms on a subcollection of 3 654 lattices.

6.2. Application to genera enumeration. Over the years, several efforts have been undertaken with the goal of enumerating lattice genera of either bounded discriminant or satisfying some arithmetic conditions such as small class number or spinor class number. For example, the Brandt–Intrau tables of reduced ternary forms with discriminant up to 1000 [13], Nipp’s tables of positive definite primitive quaternary quadratic forms with discriminant up to 1732 [32] and more recently the complete table of lattices with class number one due to Kirschmer–Lorch [24], to name a few.

The general strategy for generating these tables can take several forms. For example, a list of isometry class candidates can be generated by extending lattices of lower rank in some systematic way [14, 32]. Or, as in the algorithm of Schulze-Pillot [37], classes can be generated by Kneser’s method of neighboring lattices (for more on this, see section 6.4). In all instances, the completeness of the list of genus representatives can be verified using the Minkowski–Siegel mass formula, or some derivation thereof. However, one critical bottleneck in most of these schemes is eliminating redundancy in the lists generated. For lattices of small dimension and discriminant or lattices with small class number this obstruction can be overcome reasonably quickly by using existing isometry testing, but for lattices with high rank and class number this becomes quite difficult—it is here where we profit from a canonical form.

6.3. Application to enumeration of perfect forms. A canonical form really shows its strength compared to pairwise equivalence checks when the number of forms to be classified becomes very large. This is certainly the case during the enumeration of perfect forms using Voronoi’s algorithm in dimension 9 or higher. In dimension 9 already more than 20 million (inequivalent) perfect forms are found and the total number could be on the order of half a billion [44]. Even though there are some useful invariants such as the number of minimal vectors, the determinant and the size of the automorphism group, the number of remaining candidates for equivalence for each found perfect form can become quite large.

Removing equivalent forms is a large part of the computational cost during the enumeration. Efficiently finding a canonical form therefore seems to be a necessity in completing the full enumeration in dimensions 9 or higher. Luckily by the definition of a perfect form we always have that $\text{Min}(A)$ is full dimensional. Furthermore for all perfect forms found so far $\text{Min}(A)$ also spans \mathbb{Z}^n and therefore the function \mathcal{V}_{ms} seems to be an efficient way to obtain a small characteristic vector set. In practice computing a canonical perfect form in dimension 9 takes just a few milliseconds.

A canonical form is also useful when scaling the enumeration algorithm to a computational system with lots of nodes. One can do the computation of a canonical form on the node that found the form and then do an inexpensive database lookup to check for equivalence. This makes the computational and communication load on the storage nodes negligible, which is highly preferable for these systems.

6.4. Application to algebraic modular forms. Finally, we present an application to speed up computations of orthogonal modular forms.

Up until now, we have worked with the fixed lattice \mathbb{Z}^n and considered the matrix A as the Gram matrix in the standard basis of a (positive definite) quadratic form. We now shift our perspective slightly, varying lattices in a (fixed) quadratic space.

Let A be a form, and suppose that the entries of A belong to \mathbb{Z} —we then call A an *integral* form. Then \mathbb{Z}^n is a lattice in $V := \mathbb{Q}^n$. More generally, let $L \subset V$ be a (*full*) *lattice*, the \mathbb{Z} -span of a \mathbb{Q} -basis for V . (For purposes of exposition, we restrict our attention to lattices in \mathbb{Q}^n , leaving aside for example the case of positive definite lattices over the ring of integers of a totally real field.) We say L is *integral* if $x^T A y \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $x, y \in L$. We represent a lattice in bits by a basis $L = \mathbb{Z}v_1 \cdots + \mathbb{Z}v_n$; letting U_L be the change of basis matrix, we obtain a new form

$$A_L := (v_i^T A v_j)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = U_L^T A U_L.$$

(It is not necessarily the case that A_L is arithmetically equivalent to A : indeed, the change of basis of V from the standard basis to v_1, \dots, v_n need not belong to $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, only to $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$.) Associated to L is its *discriminant*

$$\text{disc}(L) := \det(A_L) / 2^{n \bmod 2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

In order to organize these lattices, we define the *orthogonal group*

$$(6.4.1) \quad \text{O}(V) := \{P \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}) : P^T A P = A\}$$

(thought of as isometries of \mathbb{R}^n under the metric provided by A). Lattices $L, L' \subset V$ are *isometric*, written $L \simeq L'$, if there exists $P \in \text{O}(V)$ such that $P^T A_L P = A_{L'}$.

We repeat these definitions replacing \mathbb{Q} (and \mathbb{Z}) by \mathbb{Q}_p (and \mathbb{Z}_p) for a prime p , abbreviating $L_p := L \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_p$. Then the *genus* of L is

$$(6.4.2) \quad \text{Gen}(L) := \{L' \subset V : L_p \simeq L'_p \text{ for all primes } p\}.$$

(the set of lattices that look *locally* like L). Finally, we define the *class set*

$$(6.4.3) \quad \text{Cls}(L) := \text{Gen}(L) / \simeq$$

as the set of (global) isometry classes in $\text{Gen}(L)$. By the geometry of numbers, we have $\#\text{Cls}(L) < \infty$.

The theory of p -neighbors, due originally to Kneser [25], gives an effective method to compute representatives of the class set $\text{Cls}(L)$, as follows. Let $p \nmid \text{disc}(L)$ be

prime (allowing $p = 2$). We say that a lattice $L' < V$ is a p -neighbor of L , and write $L' \sim_p L$, if L' is integral and

$$(6.4.4) \quad [L : L \cap L'] = [L' : L \cap L'] = p$$

(index as abelian groups). If $L \sim_p L'$, then $\text{disc}(L) = \text{disc}(L')$ and $L' \in \text{Gen}(L)$. There are as many p -neighbors as there are isotropic \mathbb{Z}_p -lines in L_p : accordingly, the number of p -neighbors is $O(p^m)$ where m is the *Witt index* of L/pL over \mathbb{F}_p , i.e., the maximum dimension of a totally isotropic \mathbb{F}_p -subspace (so $n = 2m, 2m+1, 2m+2$).

The set of p -neighbors can be computed in time $O(p^{m+\epsilon} H_n(s))$ where s is the input size and H_n is a polynomial depending on n (keeping track of the bit operations in computing a Hermite normal form). Moreover, there is an effectively computable finite set S of primes such that every $[L'] \in \text{Cls}(L)$ is an *iterated S -neighbor*

$$L \sim_{p_1} L_1 \sim_{p_2} \cdots \sim_{p_r} L_r \simeq L'$$

with $p_i \in S$. Typically (when there is only one spinor genus in the genus) we may take $S = \{p\}$ for any $p \nmid \text{disc}(L)$. In this way, we may compute a set of representatives for $\text{Cls}(L)$ from iterated S -neighbors.

The space of *orthogonal modular forms for L* (with trivial weight) is

$$M(\text{O}(L)) := \text{Map}(\text{Cls}(L), \mathbb{C}).$$

In the basis of characteristic functions for L we have $M(\text{O}(L)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^h$ where $h = \#\text{Cls}(L)$. For $p \nmid \text{disc}(L)$, define the *Hecke operator*

$$\begin{aligned} T_p : M(\text{O}(L)) &\rightarrow M(\text{O}(L)) \\ f &\mapsto T_p(f) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(6.4.5) \quad T_p(f)([M]) := \sum_{M' \sim_p M} f([M']).$$

The operators T_p commute and are self-adjoint with respect to a natural inner product. So there is a basis of simultaneous eigenvectors, called *eigenforms*. This is case of the orthogonal group for the theory of *algebraic modular forms*, as defined by Gross [16].

In this way, to compute the matrix representing the Hecke operator T_p , for each $[M] \in \text{Cls}(L)$, we need to identify the isometry classes of the p -neighbors of M . Here is where our canonical form algorithm applies, as we originally motivated in section 1.1: after computing canonical forms for $\text{Cls}(L)$, for each p -neighbor, we compute their canonical forms and then a hash table look up on $\text{Cls}(L)$. This reduces our computation from $O(h^2)$ *isometry tests* to $O(h)$ *hash table lookups*. For medium-sized values of n , we hope that the use of canonical forms will allow us to peer more deeply into the world of automorphic forms on orthogonal groups.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Polytopes, lattices and quadratic forms programs*, https://github.com/MathieuDutSik/polyhedral_common, 2018.
- [2] A. Ash, P. E. Gunnells, and M. McConnell, *Cohomology of congruence subgroups of $\text{SL}_4(\mathbb{Z})$. III*, Math. Comp. **79** (2010), no. 271, 1811–1831.

- [3] L. Babai, *Canonical form for graphs in quasipolynomial time: Preliminary report*, Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (New York, NY, USA), STOC 2019, Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 12371246, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316356>, doi:10.1145/3313276.3316356.
- [4] L. Babai, *Graph isomorphism in quasipolynomial time*, preprint at [arXiv:1512.03547](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03547), December 2015.
- [5] E. Bayer-Fluckiger and I. Suarez, *Modular lattices over cyclotomic fields*, J. Number Theory **114** (2005), no. 2, 394–411.
- [6] D. Bremner, M. Dutour Sikirić, D. V. Pasechnik, T. Rehn, and A. Schürmann, *Computing symmetry groups of polyhedra*, LMS J. Comput. Math. **17** (2014), no. 1, 565–581.
- [7] CARAT, *CARAT by W. Plesken et. al.*, 2008, ver.2.0., <https://wwwb.math.rwth-aachen.de/carat/>.
- [8] B. Casselman, *Stability of lattices and the partition of arithmetic quotients*, Asian J. Math. **8** (2004), no. 4, 607–637, URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ajm/1118669693>.
- [9] J. W. S. Cassels, *Rational quadratic forms*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 13, Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1978.
- [10] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere packings, lattices and groups*, third ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 290, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, With additional contributions by E. Bannai, R. E. Borcherds, J. Leech, S. P. Norton, A. M. Odlyzko, R. A. Parker, L. Queen and B. B. Venkov.
- [11] J. L. Donaldson, *Minkowski reduction of integral matrices*, Math. Comp. **33** (1979), no. 145, 201–216.
- [12] M. Dutour Sikirić, A. Schürmann, and F. Vallentin, *Classification of eight-dimensional perfect forms*, Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2007), 21–32 (electronic).
- [13] K. Germann, *Tabellen reduzierter, positiver quaternärer quadratischer Formen*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **38** (1963), no. 1, 56–83, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02566910>, doi:10.1007/BF02566910.
- [14] K. Germann, *Tabellen reduzierter, positiver quaternärer quadratischer Formen*, Comment. Math. Helv. **38** (1963), 56–83.
- [15] M. Greenberg and J. Voight, *Lattice methods for algebraic modular forms on classical groups*, Computations with modular forms, Contrib. Math. Comput. Sci., vol. 6, Springer, Cham, 2014, pp. 147–179.
- [16] B. H. Gross, *Algebraic modular forms*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **113** (1999), no. 1, 61–93.
- [17] T. G. group, *Gap — groups, algorithms, and permutations, version 4.4.6*, URL: <http://www.gap-system.org>.
- [18] I. Haviv and O. Regev, *On the lattice isomorphism problem*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, ACM, New York, 2014, pp. 391–404.
- [19] T. Junttila and P. Kaski, *bliss*, URL: <http://www.tcs.hut.fi/Software/bliss/>.
- [20] G. A. Kabatjanskiĭ and V. I. Levenšteĭn, *Bounds for packings on the sphere and in space*, Problemy Peredači Informacii **14** (1978), no. 1, 3–25.

- [21] R. Kannan and A. Bachem, *Polynomial algorithms for computing the smith and hermite normal forms of an integer matrix*, *siam Journal on Computing* **8** (1979), no. 4, 499–507.
- [22] W. Keller, J. Martinet, and A. Schürmann, *On classifying Minkowskian sublattices*, *Math. Comp.* **81** (2012), no. 278, 1063–1092, With an appendix by Mathieu Dutour Sikirić.
- [23] M. Kirschmer, *One-class genera of maximal integral quadratic forms*, *J. Number Theory* **136** (2014), 375–393.
- [24] M. Kirschmer and D. Lorch, *Ternary quadratic forms over number fields with small class number*, *J. Number Theory* **161** (2016), 343–361.
- [25] M. Kneser, *Klassenzahlen definiter quadratischer formen*, *Archiv der Mathematik* **8** (1957), no. 4, 241–250.
- [26] S. Lang, *Introduction to algebraic and abelian functions*, second ed., *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 89, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.
- [27] H. W. Lenstra, A. K. Lenstra, L. Lovfiasz, et al., *Factoring polynomials with rational coefficients*, (1982).
- [28] R. MacPherson and M. McConnell, *Explicit reduction theory for Siegel modular threefolds*, *Invent. Math.* **111** (1993), no. 3, 575–625.
- [29] B. D. McKay and A. Piperno, *nauty and traces*, URL: <http://cs.anu.edu.au/people/bdm/nauty/>.
- [30] D. Micciancio, *The shortest vector problem is np-hard to approximate to within some constant*, *SIAM J. Comput.* **30** (2001), 2008–2035.
- [31] H. Minkowski, *Diskontinuitätsbereich für arithmetische äquivalenz*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **129** (1905), 220–274.
- [32] G. L. Nipp, *Quaternary quadratic forms*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, Computer generated tables, With a 3.5" IBM PC floppy disk.
- [33] W. Plesken and B. Souvignier, *Computing isometries of lattices*, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **24** (1997), no. 3-4, 327–334, *Computational algebra and number theory* (London, 1993).
- [34] W. Plesken, J. Opgenorth, and T. Schulz, *Carat - a package for mathematical crystallography*, *J. Appl. Cryst.* **31** (1998), 827–828.
- [35] W. Plesken, J. Opgenorth, and T. Schulz, *Crystallographic algorithms and tables*, *Acta Cryst. A* **54** (1998), 517–531.
- [36] S. Schönnenbeck, *Simultaneous computation of Hecke operators*, *J. Algebra* **501** (2018), 571–597.
- [37] R. Schulze-Pillot, *An algorithm for computing genera of ternary and quaternary quadratic forms*, *Proceedings of the 1991 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation* (New York, NY, USA), ISSAC '91, ACM, 1991, pp. 134–143.
- [38] A. Schürmann, *Computational geometry of positive definite quadratic forms*, *University Lecture Series*, vol. 48, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009, *Polyhedral reduction theories, algorithms, and applications*.
- [39] L. A. Seeber, *Untersuchungen über die eigenschaften der positiven ternären quadratischen formen*, (1831).
- [40] V. Stoltenberg-Hansen and J. V. Tucker, *Computable rings and fields*, *Handbook of Computability Theory*, Elsevier (1999), 363–447.

- [41] A. Storjohann and G. Labahn, *Asymptotically fast computation of hermite normal forms of integer matrices*, Proceedings of the 1996 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ACM, New York, 1996, pp. 259–266.
- [42] The LMFDB Collaboration, *The l -functions and modular forms database*, <http://www.lmfdb.org>, 2013, [Online; accessed 4 October 2018].
- [43] B. L. van der Waerden, *Die Reduktionstheorie der positiven quadratischen Formen*, Acta Math. **96** (1956), 265–309.
- [44] W. P. J. van Woerden, *Perfect quadratic forms: an upper bound and challenges in enumeration*, Master’s thesis, Leiden University, 2018.
- [45] O. Veblen and P. Franklin, *On matrices whose elements are integers*, Ann. of Math. (2) **23** (1921), no. 1, 1–15.
- [46] H. Zassenhaus, *Bilinear spaces and reduction*, Unpublished manuscript.

MATHIEU DUTOIR SIKIRIĆ, RUDJER BOSKOVIĆ INSTITUTE, BIJENICKA 54, 10000 ZAGREB, CROATIA

E-mail address: `mathieu.dutour@gmail.com`

ANNA HAENSCH, DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA, USA

E-mail address: `annahaensch@gmail.com`

JOHN VOIGHT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, 6188 KEMENY HALL, HANOVER, NH 03755, USA

E-mail address: `jvoight@gmail.com`

WESSEL VAN WOERDEN, CENTRUM WISKUNDE & INFORMATICA, SCIENCE PARK 123, 1098 XG AMSTERDAM, NETHERLANDS

E-mail address: `wvw@cw.nl`