

# Treewidth (III)

Yijia Chen

Shanghai Jiao Tong University

May 3, 2012

## Definition

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  be two graphs. A function  $f : V(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{H})$  is an **isomorphism** if

(G1)  $f$  is a bijection;

(G2) for every  $u, v \in V(\mathcal{G})$  we have  $\{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G})$  if and only if  $\{f(u), f(v)\} \in E(\mathcal{H})$ .

If such an  $f$  exists, then  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are **isomorphic**.

GI

*Input:* Two graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$ .

*Problem:* Decides whether  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are isomorphic.

## Remark.

1. GI is in **NP**.
2. GI is not **NP**-complete, unless *Polynomial Hierarchy collapses*.
3. We don't know whether GI is **P**-hard.
4. Some people believe GI is in **P**, but we don't even have a *quantum polynomial time algorithm*.

## Theorem (Bodlaender, 1990)

*Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there is a polynomial time algorithm which decides GI on graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $\text{tw}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$ .*

I will present an algorithm deciding the problem

*Input:* Two graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  and a smooth tree decomposition of  $\mathcal{G}$  of width  $k$ .

*Problem:* Decides whether  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are isomorphic.

in time

$$(|V(\mathcal{G})| + |V(\mathcal{H})|)^{O(k)}.$$

# Isomorphism via connected components

Let  $\mathcal{C}_G$  be the set of connected components of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{C}_H$  the set of connected components of  $H$ .

Then  $G$  and  $H$  are isomorphic if and only if there is a **bijection**  $h : \mathcal{C}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_H$  such that  $G[C]$  and  $H[h(C)]$  are isomorphic for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}_G$ .

This is equivalent to that there is a **perfect matching** in the following **bipartite graph**.

1. The left part is  $\mathcal{C}_G$  and the right part  $\mathcal{C}_H$ .
2. There is an edge between a  $C \in \mathcal{C}_G$  and a  $C' \in \mathcal{C}_H$  if  $G[C]$  and  $H[C']$  are isomorphic.

Let  $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{G})$  and

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus S} := \{C \mid C \text{ a connected component of } \mathcal{G} \setminus S\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are isomorphic if and only if there is a set  $S' \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ , a function  $h : \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H} \setminus S'}$  and functions  $f_C : S \cup C \rightarrow S' \cup h(C)$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus S}$  such that

1.  $|S| = |S'|$ ;
2.  $h$  is a bijection;
3.  $f_C$  is an isomorphism between  $\mathcal{G}[S \cup C]$  and  $\mathcal{H}[S' \cup h(C)]$  for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus S}$ , and  $f_C(S) = S'$ ;
4.  $f_{C_1} \upharpoonright S = f_{C_2} \upharpoonright S$  for every  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus S}$ .

## The sets $\mathcal{C}_t$

Let  $(\mathcal{T}, (B_t)_{t \in V(\mathcal{T})})$  be a smooth tree decomposition of width  $k$  for the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ . Again we choose an arbitrary root  $r$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

For every  $t \in V(\mathcal{T})$  we define

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}_t := \{C \mid C = \emptyset \text{ or } C \text{ a connected component of } \mathcal{G}_{\leq t} \setminus B_t\}.$$



## Connected components via tree decompositions (1)

### Lemma

*Every nonempty  $C \in \mathcal{C}_t$ , i.e., a connected component in  $\mathcal{G}_{\leq t} \setminus B_t$ , is a connected component of  $\mathcal{G} \setminus B_t$ .*

### Proof.

Clearly there is a connected component  $C'$  in  $\mathcal{G} \setminus B_t$  with  $C \subseteq C'$ .

Assume that  $C' \setminus C \neq \emptyset$ . Then there is an edge  $\{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G})$  with  $u \in V(\mathcal{G}_{\leq t}) \setminus B_t$  and  $v \in V(\mathcal{G}) \setminus V(\mathcal{G}_{\leq t})$ .

But then,  $\{u, v\}$  is not contained in any bag of the tree decomposition. □

### Lemma

Let  $t_1$  be a child of  $t$ . Then for every nonempty  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{t_1}$  there is a unique  $C \in \mathcal{C}_t$  with  $C_1 \subseteq C$ , and  $C_1 \cap C' = \emptyset$  for all other  $C' \in \mathcal{C}_t$ .

### Proof.

Let  $C_1$  be a connected component of  $\mathcal{G}_{\leq t_1} \setminus B_{t_1}$ .

Observe that

$$\mathcal{G}_{\leq t_1} \setminus B_{t_1} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\leq t} \setminus B_t,$$

so  $C_1$  is connected in  $\mathcal{G}_{\leq t} \setminus B_t$ , and the result follows. □

### Lemma

Let  $t$  be a node in  $\mathcal{T}$  with children  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ . And let  $C \in \mathcal{C}_t$  be nonempty. Then, there is a **unique**  $i \in [n]$  such that

$$C \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{t_i} \cup \{v\} \quad \text{where } \{v\} = B_{t_i} \setminus B_t.$$

*Intuitively,  $C$  is shattered, i.e., broken into several smaller connected components, by the bag of exactly one child of  $t$ .*

## Lemma

Let  $t_1, t_2$  be two distinct children of  $t$ . For every  $i \in [2]$ , let  $v_i$  be the vertex in  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $\{v_i\} = B_{t_i} \setminus B_t$ ; and  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{t_i}$ . Then for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}_t$

$$(C_1 \cup \{v_1\}) \cap C = \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad (C_2 \cup \{v_2\}) \cap C = \emptyset.$$

### Proof.

It is easy to see

$$(C_1 \cup \{v_1\}) \cap (C_2 \cup \{v_2\}) = \emptyset.$$

Assume  $(C_1 \cup \{v_1\}) \cap C \neq \emptyset \neq (C_2 \cup \{v_2\}) \cap C$ . Then there is a path  $P$  from  $C_1 \cup \{v_1\}$  to  $C_2 \cup \{v_2\}$  in  $C$ . **Without loss of generality**, we can assume that all vertices on  $P$  are in

$$(C_1 \cup \{v_1\}) \cup (C_2 \cup \{v_2\}).$$

Then there is an edge between  $C_1 \cup \{v_1\}$  and  $C_2 \cup \{v_2\}$ , which cannot be contained in any bag of the tree decomposition. □

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a second graph for which we want to decide whether  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are isomorphic.

We define (the set of pairs of separators and connected components)

$$\underline{\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{H})} := \{(S, C) \mid S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H}) \text{ with } |S| = k + 1 \\ \text{and } (C = \emptyset \text{ or } C \text{ a connected component of } \mathcal{H} \setminus S)\}$$

## Definition

Let  $t \in V(\mathcal{T})$ ,  $S_1 := B_t$ , and  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_t$ . Moreover, let  $(S_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{H})$ . We say  $(S_1, C_1)$  and  $(S_2, C_2)$  are  **$f$ -isomorphic** for a function  $f : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ , denoted by  $\underline{(S_1, C_1) \equiv^f (S_2, C_2)}$ , if there is a function  $F : S_1 \cup C_1 \rightarrow S_2 \cup C_2$  such that

$$(F1) \quad F \upharpoonright S_1 = f;$$

$$(F2) \quad \text{for every } u, v \in S_1 \cup C_1 \text{ we have } \{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G}) \text{ if and only if } \\ \{F(u), F(v)\} \in E(\mathcal{H}).$$

That is,  $F$  is an isomorphism between  $\mathcal{G}[S_1 \cup C_1]$  and  $\mathcal{H}[S_2 \cup C_2]$  which extends  $f$ .

Our goal is to compute for each  $t \in V(\mathcal{T})$  the set

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}}_t := \{(f, B_t, C_1, S_2, C_2) \mid (B_t, C_1) \equiv^f (S_2, C_2) \\ \text{where } C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_t \text{ and } (S_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

using dynamic programming.



Let  $t$  be a leaf of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Then  $\mathcal{C}_t = \{\emptyset\}$ . Hence,

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \{(f, B_t, \emptyset, S_2, \emptyset) \mid (B_t, \emptyset) \equiv^f (S, \emptyset) \\ \text{where } S_2 \subseteq V(\mathcal{H}) \text{ with } |S_2| = k + 1\}.$$

This can be computed in time

$$(k + 1)! \cdot |V(\mathcal{H})|^{O(k)}.$$

## Non-leaves (1)

Let  $t$  be a node in  $\mathcal{T}$  with children  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  for some  $m \geq 1$ .

Now let  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_t$ . By Lemma 3, there is a **unique**  $i \in [m]$  such that

$$C_1 \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{t_i} \cup \{v\} \quad \text{where } \{v\} = B_{t_i} \setminus B_t.$$

For every  $(S_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{H})$  and every  $f : B_t \rightarrow S_2$  we want to check whether  $(B_t, C_1) \equiv^f (S_2, C_2)$ .

## Non-leaves (2)

$(B_t, C_1) \equiv^f (S_2, C_2)$  if and only if for some  $v' \in V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus S_2$  and  $u \in S_2$  if we let

- $S'_2 := S_2 \cup \{v'\} \setminus \{u\}$ ,
- $\mathcal{C}_1^* := \{C^* \mid C^* \text{ a connected component of } \mathcal{G} \setminus B_{t_i} \text{ with } C^* \subseteq C_1\}$  and  
 $\mathcal{C}_2^* := \{C^* \mid C^* \text{ a connected component of } \mathcal{H} \setminus S'_2 \text{ with } C^* \subseteq C_2\}$ ,
- $f' : B_{t_i} \rightarrow S'_2$  defined by

$$f'(w) = \begin{cases} v' & \text{if } w = v \\ f(w) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then

- (N1) every connected component of  $\mathcal{H} \setminus S'_2$  is either contained in or disjoint with  $C_2$ ;
- (N2)  $C_2 \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{C}_2^* \cup \{v'\}$ ;
- (N3) there is a bijection  $h : \mathcal{C}_1^* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2^*$  such that for every  $C^* \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$

$$(B_{t_i}, C^*) \equiv^{f'} (S'_2, h(C^*)).$$

(N1) and (N2) can be checked in polynomial time.

To verify (N3) we create a **bipartite graph**  $\mathcal{B}$ :

1. the left part is  $\mathcal{C}_1^*$  and the right part  $\mathcal{C}_2^*$ ;
2. there is an edge between  $C_1^* \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$  and  $C_2^* \in \mathcal{C}_2^*$  if  $(B_{t_i}, C_1^*) \equiv^{f'} (S'_2, C_2^*)$ .

Then (N3) holds if and only if there is a **perfect matching** in  $\mathcal{B}$ , which can be decided in polynomial time.

$\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  are isomorphic if and only if for some  $S_2 \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  with  $|S_2| = k + 1$  and  $f : B_r \rightarrow S_2$  there is a perfect matching in the following bipartite graph.

1. The left part is  $\mathcal{C}_r$  and the right part  $\mathcal{C}^* := \{C_2 \mid (S_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{H})\}$ .
2. There is an edge between a  $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_r$  and a  $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}^*$  if  $(B_r, C_1) \equiv^f (S_2, C_2)$ .

# QUESTIONS

Without  $(\mathcal{T}, (B_t)_{t \in V(\mathcal{T})})$

Can we modify the algorithm so that it doesn't need a smooth tree decomposition as a part of the input? And even without computing such a tree decomposition inside the algorithm?

THANK YOU