Computational complexity for presentations of sofic shifts

Justin Cai

April 16, 2020

Abstract

Given an irreducible presentation of a sofic shift, it is well known that the shift it presents is irreducible and that there is a procedure that yields the unique vertex-minimal presentation for this shift in polynomial time. However, if one was given a reducible graph, there is not necessarily a unique vertex-minimal presentation, and a procedure for the construction of some minimal presentation in this case is unknown. It can be the case where the presentation still presents an irreducible shift, but the previous procedure will not produce the minimal presentation. In this thesis, we show complexity results around these problems.

1 Preliminaries

Definition 1.1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite set. The *full $\mathcal{A}$-shift* is the set $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of all bi-infinite sequences over $\mathcal{A}$ (i.e. functions from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, hence the usual notation for the set of all functions from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathcal{A}$).

A *block* (or *word*) is a finite sequence of letters over some alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. Let $x = (x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a bi-infinite sequence. For $i \leq j$, the block from the ith coordinate to the jth coordinate is denoted

$$x_{[i,j]} \triangleq x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_j.$$

Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of words over some alphabet. A *subshift* is a subset $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{F}}$ of some full shift $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that no word in $\mathcal{F}$ appears in any point of the subshift, defined as

$$\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{F}} \triangleq \Big\{ (x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}} \ : \ \forall i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, i \leq j \quad x_{[i,j]} \notin \mathcal{F} \Big\}.$$

Definition 1.3. A *graph* G is a 4-tuple $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, i, t)$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is a finite set of *vertices*, $\mathcal{E}$ is a finite set of *edges*, and $i : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{V}$ and $t : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{V}$ are functions assigning an *initial* and *terminating* vertex for each edge, respectivley. For an arbitrary graph G, let $\mathcal{V}_G$, $\mathcal{E}_G$, i_G,

and t_G denote the graph's vertices, edges, and intial and terminating vertex functions, respectivley. If the choice of G is understood, then the subscripts will be dropped for notational convenience.

For $I \in \mathcal{V}$, the *outgoing edges of* I is the set of edges starting at I, denoted

$$i^{-1}(I) \triangleq \{e \in \mathcal{E} : i(e) = I\}.$$

Similary, the *incoming edges of* I is the set of edges terminating at I, denoted

$$t^{-1}(I) \triangleq \{e \in \mathcal{E} : t(e) = I\}.$$

A graph is *essential* if all vertices have at least one incoming and outgoing edge; i.e. for all $I \in \mathcal{V}$, $i^{-1}(I) \neq \varnothing$ and $t^{-1}(I) \neq \varnothing$.

Definition 1.4. A *labeled graph* $\mathcal{G}$ is a pair $\mathcal{G} = (G, \mathcal{L})$, where G is a graph and $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{A}$ is the *labeling function* from the edges of G onto some finite alphabet $\mathcal{A}$.

A labeled graph is *deterministic* if for each vertex, the labels of the outgoing edges at that vertex are all distinct (i.e. $\mathcal{L}|_{i^{-1}(I)}$ is injective for all $I \in \mathcal{V}$).

Definition 1.5. Let G be a graph. The *edge shift of* G is the set $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G}$ of all bi-infinite paths on G, defined as

$$\mathsf{X}_G \triangleq \Big\{ (x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{E}^\mathbb{Z} \ : \ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad t(x_i) = i(x_{i+1}) \Big\}.$$

As a consequence of this definintion, $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_G)$ is the set of all finite paths on G, so elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_G)$ are called *paths on* G.

Definition 1.6. Let $\mathcal{G} = (G, \mathcal{L})$ be a labeled graph. The *presentation of* $\mathcal{G}$ is the set $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G}$ of the labels of all bi-infinite paths from X_G, defined as the image of X_G under $\mathcal{L}_\infty$:

$$\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G} \triangleq \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathsf{X}_G).$$

We say a word $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G})$ is *presented by a path* $\pi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_G)$ if $\mathcal{L}(\pi) = w$.

Definition 1.7. Let $\mathcal{G} = (G, L)$ be a labeled graph. For a vertex $I \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$, the *follower set of* I is the set

$$F(I) \triangleq \big\{\mathcal{L}(\pi) : \pi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_G), i(\pi) = I\big\}.$$

For a word $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G})$, the *follower set of* w is the set

$$F(w) \triangleq \big\{u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G}) : wu \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G})\big\}$$

Definition 1.8. Let $\mathcal{G} = (G, \mathcal{L})$ be a labeled graph, I be some vertex in $\mathcal{G}$, and $w \in B(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G})$. If every path π in $\mathcal{G}$ that presents w ends at I, then we say w *synchronizes to* I. We say that w is *synchronizing for* $\mathcal{G}$ if it synchronizes to some vertex in $\mathcal{G}$. If there is a word that synchronizes to I, then we say that the vertex I *is synchronizing*. Finally, we denote $S(\mathcal{G})$ as the set of all syncrhonizing words for $\mathcal{G}$.

2 Irreducibility

Consider the reducible graph $\mathcal{G}$:



The shift that subgraph induced by I and J is the even shift, and every word presented by a path starting from K is presented by some path starting at I and J. Hence, this graph presents the even shift. Additionly, it is also follower-separated as $01 \in F(K)\backslash F(I)$, $1 \in F(K)\backslash F(J)$, and $1 \in F(I)\backslash F(J)$.

When do follower-separated reducible graphs present irreducible shifts? We will first look at a simple class of reducible graphs.

Let $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$ be an essential, deterministic, follower-separated graph with two irreducible components that induce two subgraphs, namely $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, such that there is exactly one edge starting in $\mathcal{G}$ and ending in $\mathcal{H}$. Some properties of $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$ are that the vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ partition the vertices of $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$, both $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are essential, any vertex in $\mathcal{H}$ is reachable from any vertex in $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$, and no vertex in $\mathcal{G}$ is reachable from any vertex in $\mathcal{H}$.



Figure 1: Representation of $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$.

Related to a comment below, but this is just a corollary of [Lind and Marcus 3.3.16] and the nature of $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$

Theorem 2.1. Every word $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$ can be extended on the right to a word $uw \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$ that syncrhonizes to a vertex I in $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$. As $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$ is deterministic and follower-separated, then by [Lind and Marcus 3.3.16], we can extend u on the right to $uw \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$ so that uw synchronizes to some vertex J. As I is a vertex in $\mathcal{H}$, I can be reached from J, so let v be the label of a path from I to J. Then, $uwv \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$ and any path presenting uwv must end at J, so uwv synchornizes to I. □

Corollary 2.2. Every vertex in $\mathcal{H}$ is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. For a vertex I in $\mathcal{H}$, take any word $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}^{\rightarrow}\mathcal{H}})$ and use 2.1 to synchronize it to I. Hence, there is a word that synchronizes to I, so I is synchronizing. □

Lemma 2.3. Let $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$. If $u \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is reducible.

Proof. By 2.1, we can extend u on the right to a word $uw \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$ so that any path presenting uw ends at some vertex I in $\mathcal{H}$. Hence, for any word $v \in F(uw)$, a path presenting uwv ends at some vertex in $\mathcal{H}$, so $F(uwv) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$. As $u \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$, we have $u \notin F(uwv)$. Thus, there is no word in $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$ joining the word uw and u, so $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is reducible. □

Probably will expand this later. Argue that uwv is synchronizing, so $F(uwv) = F(J)$ for some vertex J in $\mathcal{H}$, so $F(uwv) = F(J) \subseteq \bigcup_{K\in\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{H}}} F(K) = \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$

Theorem 2.4. $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible if and only if $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, and let $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$. By 2.3, as $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, then $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$, so $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$. By construction of $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$, we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$ so $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Conversely, suppose $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. As $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, then so is $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$. □

Corollary 2.5. If $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. By 2.4, if $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. As $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. □

Theorem 2.6. If $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, then no vertex in $\mathcal{G}$ is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Suppose there were a vertex I in $\mathcal{G}$ that is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. Let v be a word that synchronizes to I in $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. By 2.2, every vertex in $\mathcal{H}$ is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$, so let J be some vertex in $\mathcal{H}$ and u be a word that synchronizes to J in $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. As $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}$ is irreducible, there is a word $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$ such that $uwv \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$. However, any path presenting uwv must first visit J (as u is synchronizing) and then visit I, implying that I is reachable from J. But this contradicts the structure of $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$, so no vertex in $\mathcal{G}$ can be synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. □

Theorem 2.7. $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ if and only if $S(\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let $w \in B(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$ synchronize to some vertex I in $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. If π is some path in $\mathcal{H}$ presenting w, then it must end at I. By 2.6, I cannot be a vertex in $\mathcal{G}$, so it must be a vertex in $\mathcal{H}$. Therefore, every path in $\mathcal{H}$ presenting w ends at I, so $S(\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{H})$.

Conversely, suppose $S(\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{H})$. Let $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$. By 2.1, we can extend u to a word $uw \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}})$ that synchronizes to some vertex I in $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$. Hence, uw is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$, so it is also synchronizing for $\mathcal{H}$. But if uw is synchronizing for $\mathcal{H}$, then by definition, $uw \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}})$, so $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{H}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. □

Theorem 2.8. If there is a word w that is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}^{\to}\mathcal{H}$ but not synchornizing for $\mathcal{H}$, then $|w| \leq$??.

3 Minimality

This section will probably hardness of sofic shift problems. As the one of the earlier sections that was written, this could be rewritten and streamlined a bit with the other sections. Other things to do: define "irreducible shift" decision problem. Give reduction from GI to irreducible shift, conclude irreducible shift is GI-hard. Give reduction from irreducible shift to minimality, conclude minimality is GI-hard.

Move this to an appropriate section.

Theorem 3.1. If $\mathcal{G} = (G, \mathcal{L})$ is the minimizing right resolving presentation of an irreducible sofic shift X and X is and N-step shift of finite type, then $\mathsf{X}_G \cong \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. Let x, y be walks in X_G. Suppose $\mathcal{L}_\infty(x) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(y)$, For any i, the paths $x_{[i-N,i-1]}$ and $y_{[i-N,i-1]}$ present the same word. Because that word is of length N, the word is synchronizing for $\mathcal{G}$ (from 3.4.17), so those paths end at the same vertex. Since $\mathcal{L}(x_{[i]}) = \mathcal{L}(y_{[i]})$, $\mathcal{G}$ is right resolving, and $x_{[i-N,i-1]}$ and $y_{[i-N,i-1]}$ end at the same vertex, then $x_{[i]} = y_{[i]}$ and hence $x = y$, so $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ is injective. By definition, $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ is surjective. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ is bijective and a conjugacy from X_G to $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$. □

Move this to an appropriate section.

Lemma 3.2. If X and Y are shift spaces, then $\mathcal{B}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(Y)$ if and only if $X \subseteq Y$.

Proof. Let x be a point in X. Then every word that appears in x is in $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(Y)$, then every word that appears in x is in $\mathcal{B}(Y)$, so $x \in Y$, hence $X \subseteq Y$.

Conversely, let w be a word in $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Then w occurs in some $x \in X$. Since $X \subseteq Y$, we have $x \in Y$, so w occurs in some $x \in Y$. Hence, $w \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$. □

Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be labeled graphs, I be a vertex from $\mathcal{G}$, and J be a vertex from $\mathcal{H}$. Define the *graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and J* as the disjoint union of the two graphs, adding an edge starting at I and ending at J, and adding a self loop on J. Label these two new edges with a symbol that does not appear in either graph. Since $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are subgraphs of a graph connecting the two, it follows that the presentations of the individual graphs are subshifts of a presentation of a graph connecting the two - any bi-infinite walk in one of the graphs is a x bi-infinite walk of the corresponding subgraph of the connected graphs. Additionally, observe that the graph is reducible, as any path starting in $\mathcal{H}$ cannot end in $\mathcal{G}$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be irreducible graphs, and $\mathcal{K}$ be the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and J. If $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is irreducible, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. First, suppose that $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is irreducible, and let $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}})$. There is a path in $\mathcal{G}$ that presents u, hence there is a path in the $\mathcal{G}$ subgraph of $\mathcal{K}$ that presents u. From the irreducibility of $\mathcal{G}$, there is a path from the terminating vertex of a path presenting u to



Figure 2: A graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$.

I. Let v be the word such path presents and l be the label of the edge connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$, so that we have $uvl \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K})$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K})$. As $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K}$ is irreducible, there exists a word $w \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K})$ such that $uvlwu \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K})$. A path presenting $uvlwu$ must have the subpath presenting wu visit vertices only from the $\mathcal{H}$ subgraph of $\mathcal{K}$. This implies that there is a path in $\mathcal{H}$ presenting u, so we have $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{H})$ and therefore $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_\mathcal{H}$ via Lemma 1. □

Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be irreducible, minimal, right-resolving presentations. If $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G} = \mathsf{X}_\mathcal{H}$, then there exists a pair of vertices $(I,J) \in (\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{H})$ such that both the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and J and the graph connecting $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{G}$ via J and I both present irreducible shifts.

Equivalently, if for every pair of vertices $(I,J) \in (\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{H})$ the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and J and the graph connecting $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{G}$ via J and I do not both present irreducible shifts.

Proof. Suppose $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{G} = \mathsf{X}_\mathcal{H}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are irreducible, minimal, right-resolving presentations of the same shift, they must be isomorphic. Let $(\partial\Phi, \Phi)$ be a graph isomorphism between them. Choose an arbitrary vertex I from $\mathcal{G}$, and then let $\mathcal{K}$ be the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and $\partial\Phi(I)$. Let f be the self loop on $\partial\Phi(I)$ added in the construction of $\mathcal{K}$, and $\mathcal{H}^+$ be the $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ subgraph plus f. As $\mathcal{H}$ is irreducible, then $\mathcal{H}^+$ is irreducible. It suffices to show that $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to show $\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K}$ is irreducible.

Let u be a word from $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K})$, and π be a path that presents it. Without loss of generality, assume u and π are nonempty. If π starts in $\mathcal{H}^+$, then $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$. Otherwise, it starts in $\mathcal{G}$ and either ends in $\mathcal{G}$ or ends in $\mathcal{H}^+$. For the case of π ending in $\mathcal{G}$, then $\Phi(\pi)$ is a path in $\mathcal{H}$ presenting u, as $(\partial\Phi, \Phi)$ is a graph isomorphism, so $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$. For the case of π ending in $\mathcal{H}^+$, we can split π into $\pi = \pi_1 e \pi_2$, where π_1 and π_2 are (possibly empty) paths from $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}^+$, respectivley, and e is the edge connecting $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$. Note that $\Phi(\pi_0)$ is a path in $\mathcal{H}$ and that it terminates at $\partial\Phi(I)$ as π_0 terminates at I, assuming π_0 is nonempty. From this, we have that $\Phi(\pi_0) f \pi_1$ is path in $\mathcal{H}^+$ that presents u, so $u \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$.

Hence, we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$, and from the construction of $\mathcal{K}$, we also have

$\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{K}})$, so $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{K}}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ and $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Thus, we have shown the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and $\partial\Phi(I)$ presents an irreducible shift. A similar argument can be made showing that the graph connecting $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{G}$ via $\partial\Phi(I)$ and I presents an irreducible shift (start from "...and then let $\mathcal{K}$", and replace $\mathcal{G} \mapsto \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H} \mapsto \mathcal{G}, I \mapsto \partial\Phi(I), \partial\Phi(I) \mapsto I, \mathcal{H}^+ \mapsto \mathcal{G}^+, \Phi(\pi_0) \mapsto \Phi^{-1}(\pi_0)$). □

Theorem 3.5. Given an oracle for minimizing a reducible presentation, deciding if two irreducible, minimal, right-resolving labeled graphs are isomorphic can be determined in polynomial time.

Proof. Let the decision procedure be as follows: for every pair of vertices $(I, J) \in (\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{H}})$ between the graphs, construct and set $\mathcal{G}_I \to \mathcal{H}_J$ as the graph connecting $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ via I and J, and similarly, construct and set $\mathcal{H}_J \to \mathcal{G}_I$ as the graph connecting $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{G}$ via J and I. Then, using the oracle, minimize $\mathcal{G}_I \to \mathcal{H}_J$ and check if it is strongly connected (that is, irreducible), and if so, then from Theorem 2, we know we can set $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ to be true. Similary, minimize $\mathcal{H}_J \to \mathcal{G}_I$ and check if it is strongly connected, and if so, set $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$ to be true. If at any point both $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$ are set to true, then $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and thus can conclude $\mathcal{G} \cong \mathcal{H}$ (as $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are unique, minimal, and irreducible presentations). If you find that after every pair of verticies that one or both of $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$ were not set to true, then we have that for all pairs of verticies, the presentations of the pair of graphs constructed were not both irreducible, as if they were, then both $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$ would be true, so via Theorem 3, we have that $\mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{G}} \neq \mathsf{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and can conclude $\mathcal{G} \ncong \mathcal{H}$ (as again, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are irreducible, minimal, right-resolving graphs).

The worst case runtime of the decision procedure is if $\mathcal{G} \ncong \mathcal{H}$, as we minimize and check strongly connected-ness twice (of a graph that is potentially the size of both $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$) for each pair of verticies, so the runtime is $O((V + E) \cdot V^2)$, where V is the number of verticies of one graph and E is the number of edges of one graph. □

4 Graph isomorphisms

Definition 4.1. An *undirected graph* is a pair $G = (V, E)$, where V is a finite set of vertices and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a symmetric and irreflexive relation on V.

Definition 4.2. Given undirected graphs $G = (V_G, E_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H)$, an isomorphism from G to H is a bijection $\varphi : V_G \to V_H$ such that for all $I, J \in V_G$, $(I, J) \in E_G$ if and only if $(\varphi(I), \varphi(J)) \in E_H$. If there is and isomorphism from G to H, then we say G and H are isomorphic.

Given labeled graphs $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, an isomorphism from $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ is a pair of bijections $\partial\Phi : \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{H}$ and $\Phi : \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{H}$ such that for all $e \in \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$, $i_\mathcal{H}(\Phi(e)) = \partial\Phi(i_\mathcal{G}(e))$, $t_\mathcal{H}(\Phi(e)) = \partial\Phi(t_\mathcal{G}(e))$, and $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{H}(\Phi(e)) = \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{G}(e)$.

Definition 4.3. Define the decision problem GI to be the set of all pairs of isomorphic undirected graphs:

$$\mathsf{GI} \triangleq \{\langle G, H\rangle : G \text{ and } H \text{ are isomorphic undirected graphs}\}$$

Similary, define the decision problem LGI to be the set of all pairs of isomorphic labeled graphs:

$$\mathsf{LGI} \triangleq \{\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}\rangle : \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \mathcal{H} \text{ are isomorphic labeled graphs}\}$$

Definition 4.4. Let A be some decision problem. We say A is *GI-hard* if GI is polynomial-time Turing reducible to A. We say A is *GI-complete* if A is GI-hard and A is polynomial-time Turing reducible to GI.

Theorem 4.5. LGI is GI-hard.

Proof. First, we will show that LGI is GI-hard. Let G and H be undirected graphs. Construct the labeled graph $\mathcal{G}$ with $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \triangleq V_G$, $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G} \triangleq E_G$ and for all $I, J \in \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$, $i_\mathcal{G}(I, J) \triangleq I$, $t_\mathcal{G}(I, J) \triangleq J$, and $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{G}(I, J) \triangleq \ell$. Construct the labeled graph $\mathcal{H}$ in a similar fashion. Obviously, this construction can be done in polynomial-time with respect to the size of G and H.

Suppose φ is an isomorphism from G to H. Define the map $\partial\Phi : \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{H}$ with $\partial\Phi(I) \triangleq \varphi(I)$ for $I \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$ and $\Phi : \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{H}$ with $\Phi(I, J) \triangleq (\varphi(I), \varphi(J))$ for $I, J \in \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$. Let $(I, J) \in \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\Phi(i_\mathcal{G}(I, J)) &= \partial\Phi(I) \\ &= \varphi(I) \\ &= i_\mathcal{H}(\varphi(I), \varphi(J)) \qquad (\star) \\ &= i_\mathcal{H}(\Phi(I, J)), \end{aligned}$$

and $(\star)$ is well-defined as $(I,J) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{G}} = E_G$ if and only if $(\varphi(I), \varphi(J)) \in E_H = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$. A similar deduction can be used to show $\partial\Phi(t_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J)) = t_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J))$. As φ is a bijection from V_G to V_H, then $\partial\Phi$ is a bijection from $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$ to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{H}}$. One can check that for $\Phi^{-1}(I,J) \triangleq (\varphi^{-1}(I), \varphi^{-1}(J))$, $\Phi^{-1} \circ \Phi = id_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{G}}}$ and $\Phi \circ \Phi^{-1} = id_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ so Φ is a bijection from $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$. Hence, $(\partial\Phi, \Phi)$ is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$.

Conversely, suppose $(\partial\Phi, \Phi)$ is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{H}$. Define $\varphi : V_G \to V_H$ with $\varphi(I) \triangleq \partial\Phi(I)$ for $I \in V_G$. Note that for $(I,J) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $(I,J) = (i_{\mathcal{H}}(I,J), t_{\mathcal{H}}(I,J))$. If $(I,J) \in E_G$, then

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J)) &= \partial\Phi(i_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J)) \\ &= \partial\Phi(I) \\ t_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J)) &= \partial\Phi(t_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J)) \\ &= \partial\Phi(J), \end{aligned}$$

so $\Phi(I,J) = (i_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J)), t_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J))) = (\partial\Phi(I), \partial\Phi(J)) = (\varphi(I), \varphi(J))$. Therefore, as $\Phi(I,J) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}} = E_H$, then $(\varphi(I), \varphi(J)) \in E_H$. Simlarly, note that for $I,J \in E_{\mathcal{G}}$, $(I,J) = (i_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J), t_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J))$. If $(\varphi(I), \varphi(J)) \in E_H$, then

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J)) &= \partial\Phi(i_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J)) \\ &= \partial\Phi(I) \\ t_{\mathcal{H}}(\Phi(I,J)) &= \partial\Phi(t_{\mathcal{G}}(I,J)) \\ &= \partial\Phi(J), \end{aligned}$$

□