


DM561 – Linear Algebra with Applications

DM562 – Scientific Computing

Graph G	Graph H	An isomorphism between G and H
		$f(a) = 1$ $f(b) = 6$ $f(c) = 8$ $f(d) = 3$ $f(g) = 5$ $f(h) = 2$ $f(i) = 4$ $f(j) = 7$



Daniel Merkle

daniel@imada.sdu.dk

DM561 – Linear Algebra with Applications


DM562 – Scientific Computing

The Graph- (and the Subgraph)-Isomorphism Problem,
the Ullmann Algorithm,
and Applications in Chemistry

Daniel Merkle

daniel@imada.sdu.dk

What is a graph?



Vertices:

P, Q, R, S, T



Edges:

all the lines

Degree of a vertex:


number of edges with that vertex as an end-point

Two different graphs? No!



In the right graph we have removed the 'crossing' of the lines PS and QT by drawing the line PS outside the rectangle PQST.

The first scientific article using the term graph



8 cm. from the primary. Reverse the wires in the secondary circuit, reverse the wires in the primary circuit, how you please, the mercury always moves towards the point of the capillary.

8. Shouting or singing (excepting the above-mentioned note) produces no visible effect under the conditions mentioned in Experiments 5, 6, and 7.

9. If the secondary coil be now moved close up, so as to cover as completely as possible the primary, talking to the telephone with the ordinary voice, *i.e.* with moderate strength and at any pitch, produces a definite movement of the mercury column for each word, some sounds of course giving more movement than others, but the movement is always towards the end of the capillary. Singing the note mentioned in Experiments 5, 6, and 7 loudly, produces a movement too large to be measured with the electrometer.

Reversing the poles of the magnet in the telephone does not alter the results of Experiments 5, 6, 7, and 9.

On mentioning the above results to Dr. Burdon Sanderson, he suggested that the apparently anomalous behaviour of the electrometer might be accounted for, by supposing that the mercury moved *quicker* when a current passed towards the point of the capillary than when it flowed in the opposite direction; so that if a succession of rapidly alternating currents were passed through the instrument, the mercury will always move towards the point of the capillary, the movement away from the point being masked by the sluggishness of the instrument in that direction. That this explanation is the correct one is proved by the following experiment:—The current from two Grove's cells is sent through a metal reed vibrating 100 times a second, the contact being made and broken at each vibration, the primary wire of a Du Bois Reymond's induction-coil is also included in the circuit; on connecting the electrometer with the secondary coil placed at an appropriate distance the mercury always moves to the point of the tube whatever be the direction of the current.

F. J. M. PAGE

Physiological Laboratory, University College,
London, February 2

NOTE.—On February 4 Prof. Graham Bell kindly placed at my disposal a telephone much more powerful than any of those I had previously used. On speaking to this instrument, the electrometer being in the circuit, movements of the mercury column as considerable as those in Experiment 9 were observed.—F. J. M. P.

CHEMISTRY AND ALGEBRA

IT may not be wholly without interest to some of the readers of NATURE to be made acquainted with an analogy that has recently forcibly impressed me between branches of human knowledge apparently so dissimilar as modern chemistry and modern algebra. I have found it of great utility in explaining to non-mathematicians the nature of the investigations which algebraists are at present busily at work upon to make out the so-called *Grundformen* or irreducible forms appurtenant to binary quantics taken singly or in systems, and I have also found that it may be used as an instrument of investigation in purely algebraical inquiries. So much is this the case that I hardly ever take up Dr. Frankland's exceedingly valuable "Notes for Chemical Students," which are drawn up exclusively on the basis of Kekulé's exquisite conception of *valence*, without deriving suggestions for new researches in the theory of algebraical forms. I will confine myself to a statement of the grounds of the analogy, referring those who may feel an interest in the subject and are desirous for further information about it to a memoir which I have written upon it for the new American *Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, the first number of which will appear early in February.

The analogy is between atoms and binary quantics exclusively.

I compare every binary quantic with a chemical atom. The number of factors (or rays, as they may be regarded by an obvious geometrical interpretation) in a binary quantic is the analogue of the number of bonds, or the *valence*, as it is termed, of a chemical atom.

Thus a linear form may be regarded as a monad atom, a quadratic form as a duad, a cubic form as a triad, and so on.

An invariant of a system of binary quantics of various degrees is the analogue of a chemical substance composed of atoms of corresponding *valences*. The order of such invariant in each set of coefficients is the same as the number of atoms of the corresponding *valence* in the chemical compound.

A co-variant is the analogue of an (organic or inorganic) compound radical. The orders in the several sets of coefficients corresponding, as for invariants, to the respective valences of the atoms, the free valence of the compound radical then becomes identical with the degree of the co-variant in the variables.

The weight of an invariant is identical with the number of the bonds in the chemicograph of the analogous chemical substance, and the weight of the leading term (or basic differentiant) of a co-variant is the same as the number of bonds in the chemicograph of the analogous compound radical. Every invariant and covariant thus becomes expressible by a graph precisely identical with a Kekuléan diagram or chemicograph. But not every chemicograph is an algebraical one. I show that by an application of the algebraical law of reciprocity every algebraical graph of given invariant will represent the constitution in terms of the roots of a quantic of a type reciprocal to that of the given invariant of an invariant belonging to that reciprocal type. I give a rule for the geometrical multiplication of graphs, *i.e.* for constructing a graph to the product of in- or co-variants whose separate graphs are given. I have also ventured upon a hypothesis which, whilst in nowise interfering with existing chemico-graphical constructions, accounts for the seeming anomaly of the isolated existence as "monad molecules" of mercury, zinc, and arsenic—and gives a rational explanation of the "mutual saturation of bonds."

I have thus been led to see more clearly than ever I did before the existence of a common ground to the new mechanism, the new chemistry, and the new algebra. Underlying all these is the theory of pure colligation, which applies undistinguishably to the three great theories, all initiated within the last third of a century or thereabouts by Eisenstein, Kekulé, and Peaucellier.


Baltimore, January 1

J. J. SYLVESTER

PALMEN ON THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE TRACHEAL SYSTEM


DR. PALMEN, of Helsingfors, has recently published an interesting memoir on the tracheal system of insects. He observes that although the gills of certain aquatic larvæ are attached to the skin very near to the points at which the spiracles open in the mature insects, and though spiracles and gills do not co-exist in the same segment, yet the point of attachment of the gills never exactly coincides with the position of the future spiracle. Moreover, he shows that even during the larval condition, although the spiracles are not open, the structure of the stigmatic duct is present, and indeed that it opens temporarily at each moult, to permit the inner tracheal membrane to be cast, after which it closes again. In fact, then, he urges, the gills and spiracles do not correspond exactly, either in number or in position, and there can therefore be between them no genetic connection. He concludes that the insects with open tracheæ are not derived from ancestors provided with gills,

Directed Graphs (Digraphs)




The study of **directed graphs** (or **digraphs**, as we abbreviate them) arises when making the roads into one-way streets. An example of a digraph is given above, the directions of the one-way streets being indicated by arrows. (In this example, there would be chaos at T , but that does not stop us from studying such situations!)

Walks, Paths, and Cycles




Much of graph theory involves 'walks' of various kinds. A **walk** is a 'way of getting from one vertex to another', and consists of a sequence of edges, one following after another. For example, in the above figure $P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow R$ is a **walk of length 2**, and $P \rightarrow S \rightarrow Q \rightarrow T \rightarrow S \rightarrow R$ is a walk of length 5. A walk in which no vertex appears more than once is called a **path**; for example $P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow R \rightarrow S$ is a path. A walk in which you end where you started, for example $Q \rightarrow S \rightarrow T \rightarrow Q$, is called a **cycle**.

Connectedness




Some graphs are in two or more parts. A graph that is in one piece, so that **any two vertices are connected by a path**, is a **connected graph**; a graph in more than one piece is a **disconnected graph**.

Weighted Graphs



Consider the above graph: it is a connected graph in which a non-negative number is assigned to each edge. Such a graph is called a **weighted graph**, and the number assigned to each edge e is the **weight** of e , denoted by $w(e)$.


Shortest Path (between *one* pair of vertices)



What is the **length of the shortest path (=distance)** from A to L?

The problem is to find a path from A to L with minimum total weight. This problem is called the **Shortest Path Problem**. Note that, if we have a weighted graph in which each edge has weight 1, then the problem reduces to that of finding the number of edges in the shortest path from A to L.


All-Pairs Shortest Path



What is the length of the shortest path (=distances) from **any vertex to any vertex**?

This problem is called the **All-Pairs Shortest Path Problem**

All-Pairs Shortest Path : A Solution for Some Cities in Australia



One of the most decorative tables of distances (in Roman miles) between major European cities printed in the eighteenth century. Not only were the data extremely useful for traveling but also for sending a letter, because distance, not weight, determined the price.

(From the “Historic Maps Collection”,
Princeton University Library, link: [here](#)

http://libweb5.princeton.edu/visual_materials/maps/websites/thematic-maps/introduction/introduction.html

TABULA POLIOMETRICA GERMANIAE AC PRAECIPUORUM QUORUNDAM LOCORUM EUROPAE.

13

VII. Anna Bellaria	Danica
X. Hispania	Hannover
XI. Italia & Helvetia	Frankfurt
XII. Germania	Nürnberg
XIII. Hispania	Norimberg
XIV. Gallia & Belgica	Münster
XV. Anglia	Bremen
XVI. Italicis	Italia
CIV. Rhaetia	Wirt

Real World vs Model vs Representation vs Implementation

The Real World

That messy thing we are trying to study (with computers).

Model

Mathematical object in some class M.

$$G \cong H$$

Representation

An object of an abstract data type R used to store the model.

$$G \stackrel{r}{=} H$$


Implementation

An object of a concrete type used to store the model.

Any object from the real world might have different models.

Any model might have several representations (exact).

And representation might have different implementations (exact).




$$\underline{G = (V, E)}$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

```
>>> import scipy as sp  
>>> G = nx.Graph([(1,1)])  
>>> A = nx.adjacency_matrix(G)
```

Matrix Representations for Graphs




$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

If G is a graph with vertices labelled $\{1, 2, \dots\}$, its **adjacency matrix** \mathbf{A} is the $n \times n$ matrix whose ij -th entry is the number of edges joining vertex i and vertex j . Two nodes i and j are adjacent if the ij -th entry in the adjacency matrix is larger than 0.

If, in addition to the vertices, the edges are labelled $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, its **incidence matrix** \mathbf{M} is the $n \times m$ matrix whose ij -th entry is 1 if **vertex i is incident to edge j** and 0 otherwise. The figure above shows a labelled graph G with its adjacency and incidence matrices.

Adjacency Matrix for Weighted Graphs



$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Given a weighted graph G , the **adjacency matrix \mathbf{A}** is the matrix whose ij -th entry is the weight of the edge between vertex i and vertex j .

Graph Isomorphism

Graph G	Graph H	An isomorphism between G and H
		$f(a) = 1$ $f(b) = 6$ $f(c) = 8$ $f(d) = 3$ $f(g) = 5$ $f(h) = 2$ $f(i) = 4$ $f(j) = 7$

Are these 2 graphs isomorphic? YES!

[advanced comment]
Computational Complexity:
Probably “quasipolynomial”
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qYlhA3O9Nz0>
(to be confirmed)

Graph Isomorphism

Two graphs G and H are isomorphic if there is a one-one correspondence between the vertices of G and those of H such that structure is preserved (i.e., the number of edges joining any two vertices of G is equal to the number of edges joining the corresponding vertices of H .)

Checking Isomorphism always requires to compare representations of two graphs!

Note: we assume here unlabeled undirected graphs only. The vertices of a graph still have to be identified.

Permutation Matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

In mathematics a **permutation matrix** is a square binary matrix that has exactly one entry of 1 in each row and each column and 0s elsewhere. Each such matrix, say P , represents a permutation of m elements and, when used to multiply another matrix, say B , results in permuting the rows (when pre-multiplying, i.e., PB) or columns (when post-multiplying, BP) of the matrix B .

Multiplying a Matrix with a Permutation Matrix P (from the right)

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 6 & 11 & 16 & 21 \\ 2 & 7 & 12 & 17 & 22 \\ 3 & 8 & 13 & 18 & 23 \\ 4 & 9 & 14 & 19 & 24 \\ 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25 \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 11 & 21 & 6 & 16 \\ 2 & 12 & 22 & 7 & 17 \\ 3 & 13 & 23 & 8 & 18 \\ 4 & 14 & 24 & 9 & 19 \\ 5 & 15 & 25 & 10 & 20 \end{array} \right)$$

column 2 becomes column 4

Let B be a matrix and let P be a permutation matrix:

The multiplication PB (multiplying the permutation matrix **from the right**) permutes the columns of B

$$1 \leftarrow 1$$

$$4 \leftarrow 2$$

$$2 \leftarrow 3$$

$$5 \leftarrow 4$$

$$3 \leftarrow 5$$

Multiplying a Matrix with a Permutation Matrix P (from the left)

row 4 becomes row 2

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 11 & 16 & 21 \\ 2 & 7 & 12 & 17 & 22 \\ 3 & 8 & 13 & 18 & 23 \\ 4 & 9 & 14 & 19 & 24 \\ 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 6 & 11 & 16 & 21 \\ 4 & 9 & 14 & 19 & 24 \\ 2 & 7 & 12 & 17 & 22 \\ 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25 \\ 3 & 8 & 13 & 18 & 23 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let B be a matrix and let P be a permutation matrix:

The multiplication PB (multiplying the permutation matrix **from the left**) **permutes the rows** of B

$$1 \rightarrow 1$$

$$4 \rightarrow 2$$

$$2 \rightarrow 3$$

$$5 \rightarrow 4$$

$$3 \rightarrow 5$$


Changing the representation of a graph via $P(PB)^T$

$$\underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)}_P \times \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)}_P \times \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)}_B = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)^T$$


row permuted B
 transposed row permuted B
 row permuted column permuted B

$P(PB)^T$ re-labels the graph represented by adjacency matrix B

The mathematical object remains identical (the represented graphs are isomorphic), only the representation of the graph changes (the adjacency matrix representations are potentially different).




$1 \rightarrow 1$
 $4 \rightarrow 2$
 $2 \rightarrow 3$
 $5 \rightarrow 4$
 $3 \rightarrow 5$



Zero-Indexing

Zero-based numbering is a way of numbering in which the initial element of a sequence is assigned the index 0, rather than the index 1 as is typical in everyday non-mathematical/non-programming circumstances.

Make sure that it is clear what you mean, when you say, e.g., the “row with index 1” in a matrix.



(picture from xkcd.com)

Python

Using:

- matplotlib for plotting
- networkx for graph theory

More efficient solution in Exercises (and hopefully in lab submission)

Code provided :

graph-permutation.py

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import numpy as np
import networkx as nx

# Note, there is several
B=np.array([[ 0,  1,  1,  0,  0],
            [ 1,  0,  1,  1,  0],
            [ 1,  1,  0,  1,  0],
            [ 0,  1,  1,  0,  1],
            [ 0,  0,  0,  1,  0]])

P=np.array([[ 1,  0,  0,  0,  0],
            [ 0,  0,  0,  1,  0],
            [ 0,  1,  0,  0,  0],
            [ 0,  0,  0,  0,  1],
            [ 0,  0,  1,  0,  0]])

# for drawing the graph, only
G = nx.from_numpy_matrix(np.array(B))
plt.figure()
plt.subplot(211)

# the annoying of zero- and one- indexing let's us rename the depicted labels
mathLabels = {0: 1, 1:2, 2:3, 3:4, 4:5}
nx.draw(G, with_labels=True, labels=mathLabels)

# As taught in the lecture P*(P*A)^T
A = np.matmul(P,np.transpose(np.matmul(P,B)))

# Since python 3.5 the following also works (note the stronger binding of
# the transpose operator
A = P@(P@B).T

# More clever (see Appendix C or the numpy documentation)
# r = np.array([0, 3, 1, 4, 2])
# A = (B[np.array(r),:]).T[np.array(r),:]


H = nx.from_numpy_matrix(A)
plt.subplot(212)
nx.draw(H, with_labels=True, labels=mathLabels)
plt.show()
```

Brute Force Graph Isomorphism Check: $P(PB)^T$


Theorem:

Two undirected graphs G_A and G_B (with adjacency matrices A and B) are isomorphic, if and only if there exists a permutation matrix P , such that $A = P(PB)^T$.

$$\begin{aligned}1 &\rightarrow 1 \\4 &\rightarrow 2 \\2 &\rightarrow 3 \\5 &\rightarrow 4 \\3 &\rightarrow 5\end{aligned}$$




G_A



$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} (1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0) \\ (0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0) \\ (0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0) \\ (0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1) \\ (0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0) \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} (0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0) \\ (1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0) \\ (1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0) \\ (0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1) \\ (0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0) \end{pmatrix}^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Problem:
How to find P ?

Brute Force Graph Isomorphism Check: $A = P(PB)^T$



Naïve approach: enumerate **all possible permutation matrices**, and check for all of them if $A = P(PB)^T$ holds. If such a P is found, the 2 graphs are isomorphic.

Improvement(s)

Consider node degrees!


Does it make sense to consider a P which maps

- vertex 1 of G_B to vertex 2 of G_A ? **NO!**
- vertex 1 to vertex 1? **YES!**
- vertex 1 to vertex 3, 4, or 5? **NO!**
- vertex 2 to vertex 1 or 4? **NO!**
- vertex 2 to vertex 2, 3, or 5? **YES!**


Use as initial matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

G_B



G_A



Improved Graph Isomorphism Check: $A = P (PB)^T$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

No branching for first row!
Consider all (3) possibilities for row 2.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider all (3) possibilities for row 3.

Always a good idea:
Reduce the size of the search tree

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

vertex 4 of B cannot be mapped to vertex 2 of A
and to vertex 3 of A

Significantly smaller number of possible permutation matrices!

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Applications

[wikipedia]

Graphs are commonly used to encode structural information in many fields, including [computer vision](#) and [pattern recognition](#), and [graph matching](#), i.e., identification of similarities between graphs, is an important tools in these areas. In these areas graph isomorphism problem is known as the exact graph matching.^[39]

In [cheminformatics](#) and in [mathematical chemistry](#), graph isomorphism testing is used to identify a [chemical compound](#) within a [chemical database](#).^[40] Also, in organic mathematical chemistry graph isomorphism testing is useful for generation of [molecular graphs](#) and for [computer synthesis](#).

Chemical database search is an example of graphical [data mining](#), where the [graph canonization](#) approach is often used.^[41] In particular, a number of [identifiers for chemical substances](#), such as [SMILES](#) and [InChI](#), designed to provide a standard and human-readable way to encode molecular information and to facilitate the search for such information in databases and on the web, use canonization step in their computation, which is essentially the canonization of the graph which represents the molecule.

In [electronic design automation](#) graph isomorphism is the basis of the [Layout Versus Schematic](#) (LVS) circuit design step, which is a verification whether the [electric circuits](#) represented by a [circuit schematic](#) and an [integrated circuit layout](#) are the same.^[42]

State-of-the-Art Implementation for Checking for Graph Isomorphism

State-of-the-art approaches to test if two graphs are isomorphic can compute an answer for graphs with **thousands of nodes in milliseconds**. If you are interested, see for example here <https://pubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611975055.13> and for a very nice visualization accompanying this scientific paper, see https://jakobandersen.github.io/graph_canon_vis/

Advanced Comment: Find a **canonical representation**




Given a representation $G \in R$ find a new representation $C(G)$, a canonical form, such that:

- ▶ It represents the same model: $C(G) \cong G$
- ▶ All canonicalized isomorphic representations are the same:
 $\forall G' \in R, G' \cong G : C(G') = C(G)$

Example: Choose the “smallest” adjacency matrix representation As the canonical representation.

$$G = (V, E) \quad V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$$

Isomorphic graphs, different representations:



Adjacency matrix representation:

	1	2	3	4
1	1			
2		1	1	
3			1	1
4				1

	1	2	3	4
1	1	1	1	1
2		1	1	
3			1	1
4				1

	1	2	3	4
1	1			
2		1	1	
3			1	1
4				1

Subgraph Isomorphism

The formula $A = P(PB)^T$ can also be used to check if a graph H is a **subgraph** of graph G .

This will be discussed in the exercise session, the slides will be included in this document.

Applications

Approx. 70 mio. chemical compounds are known.

- How to find them in databases?
- How to name them?
- Where to buy them?
- How to curate databases of compounds?
- ...

See also

<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/120408/what-are-the-applications-of-the-isomorphic-graphs> for a nice list of the endless application scenarios of isomorphism checking.

Substructure Search Results

https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/catalog/search/substructure/SubstructureSearchPage

SIGMA-ALDRICH® is now MERCK

200,000+ PRODUCTS | 500+ SERVICES | Featured INDUSTRIES

Hello, Sign In | ACCOUNT | 24/7 SUPPORT | 0 Items ORDER

STRUCTURE CRITERIA

Double-Click on the diagram to Modify

New Search

Chemical structures and search results:

- Structure Criteria: Naphthalene
- Result 1: 1-methylnaphthalene (CH₃)
- Result 2: 2-methylnaphthalene (CH₃)
- Result 3: 3-methylnaphthalene (CH₃)
- Result 4: 1-amino-2-naphthalene (NH₂)
- Result 5: 1-methylnaphthalene (CH₃)
- Result 6: 1-nitro-2-naphthalene (NO₂)



Quick Info | View Products

Subgraph Isomorphism (-> Exercises)

Formally, let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph, and let $S \subset V$ be any subset of vertices of G .


The subgraph H is a graph whose vertex set is S and whose edge set consists of (not necessarily all) edges in E that have both endpoints in S .

The *induced* subgraph H is a graph whose vertex set is S and whose edge set consists of *all* the edges in E that have both endpoints in S .



Obviously H is a subgraph of G (see left figure). Is it also an induced subgraph of H ? Yes! (right)

Powers of the Adjacency Matrix



$$A = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$A^k = \underbrace{A \times A \dots \times A}_{k \text{ times}}$ is called the k-th power of the adjacency matrix


Theorem:

If G is a graph with adjacency matrix A , and vertices with indices $1, \dots, n$ then for each positive integer k

the ij -th entry of A^k
is

the number of different walks using exactly k edges
from node i to node j

$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad A^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 \\ 2 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 5 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 2 \\ 5 & 4 & 5 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 0 \\ 6 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad A^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 8 & 7 & 4 & 5 & 7 & 1 \\ 2 & 7 & 12 & 2 & 6 & 7 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 5 & 1 \\ 4 & 5 & 6 & 1 & 6 & 2 & 0 \\ 5 & 7 & 7 & 5 & 2 & 13 & 4 \\ 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 2^{33} \end{pmatrix}$$



$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Example :

Consider the two vertices with index 4 and 5 in A^4

Length 4 walks:

- 1) $4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 5$
- 2) $4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 5$

There are 2 walks of length 4.

Furthermore, $A_{45}^4=2$.



$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$A^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 5 \\ 3 & 1 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 \\ 5 & 4 & 5 & 1 & 4 & 2 \\ 6 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$A^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 8 & 7 & 4 & 5 & 7 \\ 2 & 7 & 12 & 2 & 6 & 7 \\ 3 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 5 \\ 4 & 5 & 6 & 1 & 6 & 0 \\ 5 & 7 & 7 & 5 & 2 & 13 \\ 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$


2^{34}

Algorithm for All-Pairs Shortest Path

Weighted Graph G with weights on edges:

- What is the **distance (=length of the shortest path)** between A and L ?


17



Generalization:

- What are **the distances of ALL paths (=lengths of ALL shortest paths)** between all pairs of nodes?

... and how can we find all these distances?



The Edge Weight Matrix W

Example:


$$W = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \infty & \infty & 2 & \infty \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & \infty & 4 & \infty \\ 3 & \infty & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty & 3 \\ 4 & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 5 & 2 & 4 & \infty & 6 & 0 & \infty \\ 6 & \infty & \infty & 3 & 1 & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition:

$$W_{ij} = \begin{cases} \text{the weight of the edge } (i, j) & \text{if the edge } (i, j) \text{ exists} \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j \\ \infty & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Interpretation:

W_{ij} is the distance from vertex i to vertex j using maximally 1 edge



Note: Matrix W has entries corresponding to infinity, as it might be impossible to reach vertex j from vertex i via 1 edge.

We assume all weights are not negative, i.e., larger or equal to 0.

A modified Matrix-Matrix Multiplication

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \odot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 4 & 5 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$M \odot N = R$$

Definition:

$$r_{ij} = \min_k \{m_{ik} + n_{kj}\}$$

Example:

$$r_{33} = \min\{3 + 3, 1 + 2, 2 + 5\} = 3$$

Note: this operation is very similar to the standard matrix-matrix multiplication: however, for computation of the ij -th entry the multiplication is replaced by addition, and addition is replaced by the minimum operation.


Theorem:

If G is a weighted graph with edge weight matrix W , and vertices with indices $1, \dots, n$ then for each positive integer k

the ij -th entry of $W^k = \underbrace{W \odot W \odot \dots \odot W}_{k \text{ times}}$

is

the length of the shortest path from i to j
using maximally k edges




$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \infty & \infty & 2 & \infty \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & \infty & 4 & \infty \\ 3 & \infty & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty & 3 \\ 4 & \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 5 & 2 & 4 & \infty & 6 & 0 & \infty \\ 6 & \infty & \infty & 3 & 1 & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Examples :

Consider the two vertices with index 4 and 1 in W^4
Shortest Path using **maximally 4 edges**:
 $4 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$ (distance 7)

Consider the two vertices with index 5 and 3 in W^4
Shortest Path using **maximally 4 edges**:
 $5 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ (distance 5)



$$W^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 2 & \infty \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 10 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 6 & 3 \\ 4 & 8 & 10 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 5 & 2 & 3 & 6 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & \infty & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 2 & 6 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\ 4 & 8 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 5 & 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 7 & 2 & 6 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\ 4 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 5 & 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$


$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & \infty & \infty & 2 & \infty \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & \infty & 4 & \infty \\ \infty & 2 & 0 & \infty & \infty & 3 \\ \infty & \infty & \infty & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 4 & \infty & 6 & 0 & \infty \\ \infty & \infty & 3 & 1 & \infty & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad W^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 2 & \infty \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 10 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 6 & 3 \\ 8 & 10 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 6 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ \infty & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad W^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 2 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\ 8 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad W^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 7 & 2 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad W^5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 7 & 2 & 6 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 3 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 0 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 7 \\ 6 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W \neq W^2 \neq W^3 \neq W^4 = W^5 = W^6 = \dots$$

Which value of k is necessary, in order to have W^k contain all the pairwise distances of all vertexes?

Answer: $n - 1$ (which is identical to $|V| - 1$)

Assume all edge weights are not negative. The number of edges needed for a shortest path can maximally be $n-1$, where n is the number of vertices in the graph. If the path would go via n edges, then you would have to visit at least one vertex twice, but then the path cannot be a shortest path anymore. Obviously $W^k = W^{n-1}$ for all $k > n-1$.



Lemma:

If G is a weighted graph with edge weight matrix W ,
and vertices with indices $1, \dots, n$ then

the ij -th entry of $W^{n-1} = \underbrace{W \odot W \odot \dots \odot W}_{n - 1 \text{ times}}$

is

the distance from i to j

$D := W^{n-1}$ is called the **distance matrix** of the graph G .

Computation of the Distance Matrix by Repeated Squaring

$$W^{n-1} = \left(\underbrace{\left(\underbrace{\left(\underbrace{(W \odot W) \odot W}_{W^2} \right) \odot W}_{W^3} \right) \odot W}_{W^4} \right) \odot \dots \odot W$$

W^{n-1}

$n-2$ matrix-matrix multiplication are needed in order to compute the distance matrix $D = W^{n-1}$

$$W^{(2^k)} = \left(\left(\left(\left(\underbrace{(W \odot W)}_{W^2} \right)^2 \right)^2 \dots \right)^2 \right)$$

$W^{(2^k)}$

k matrix-matrix multiplication are needed (namely squaring a matrix k times) in order to compute the matrix $W^{(2^k)}$

2^k has to be larger or equal to $n-1$, or equivalently, k has to be larger or equal to $\log_2(n - 1)$

Example: Consider a graph G with 101 vertices. In order to compute the distance matrix $D = W^{100}$, the left approach needs to make 99 matrix-matrix multiplications. The right approach (called repeated squaring) requires only 7 matrix-matrix multiplications, as $2^7 = 128$, and $D = W^{128} = W^{100}$

Another Application of the Distance Matrix: Predicting Boiling Points of Paraffins



In 1947 Harry Wiener defined the **Wiener-Index** of a graph G in order to predict the boiling point of different paraffins. He used the graph representation G of the carbon backbone of a molecule with n carbon atoms and calculated the Wiener-Index the sum of all distances between all pairs of vertexes, i.e.

$$\mathcal{W}(G) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij}$$

He predicted the boiling point t_B to be

$$t_B = t_0 - \left(\frac{98}{n^2} (w_0 - \mathcal{W}(G)) + 5.5 \cdot (p_0 - p) \right)$$

with $t_0 = 745.42 \cdot \log_{10}(n + 4.4) - 689.4$




$$w_0 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot (n + 1) \cdot n \cdot (n - 1)$$

$$p_0 = n - 3$$

p = the number of shortest paths $i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow j$ of length 3 in G with $i < j$

= half of the number of entries "3" in the distance matrix D

Wiener Index : Boiling Point Prediction, Example (2,2-dimethylbutan)



	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	0	∞	1	∞	∞	∞
2	∞	0	1	∞	∞	∞
3	1	1	0	1	1	∞
4	∞	∞	1	0	∞	1
5	∞	∞	1	∞	0	∞
6	∞	∞	∞	1	∞	0

Edge Weight Matrix

Note: Depending on how you chose to label your graph, the edge weight matrix might look different. This won't matter for the subsequent calculations.

$$D = W^{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Distance Matrix

$$\mathcal{W}(G) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij} = 28$$

$$t_0 = 68.72$$

$$w_0 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot 5 \cdot 6 \cdot 7 = 35$$

$$p_0 = 6 - 3 = 3$$


$$p = 3$$

$$t_B = t_0 - \left(\frac{98}{n^2} (w_0 - \mathcal{W}(G)) + 5.5 \cdot (p_0 - p) \right)$$

$$= 68.72 - \frac{98}{36} (35 - 28) + 5.5 \cdot (3 - 3) \\ = 49.66$$

Calculation of Wiener Index and other parameters, as well as the resulting boiling point prediction.

Wiener Index : Boiling Point Prediction, Example (2,2-dimethylbutan)



Predicted Boiling Point: $t_B = 49.66$

Real Boiling Point: $t_B^{\text{real}} \approx 49.7 - 50.0$

The prediction of boiling points of paraffins based on the Wiener-Index of the corresponding molecular graph is amazingly accurate. Try it yourself (see exercises)! Intuitively, the Wiener-Index quantifies the “compactness” of a graph (or molecule). Long single chained molecules with n carbons have a larger Wiener-Index than molecules that contain many branches. Long molecules are easier to break, and have usually a lower boiling point.

