

ISOMORPHISM PROBLEMS OF GRAPHS, F-ALGEBRAS AND CUBIC FORMS

Manindra Agrawal, Nitin Saxena

IIT Kanpur

IRISS, Jan 2006

MOTIVATION

- The **Graph Isomorphism** problem is to *efficiently* check whether two given graphs are isomorphic.
- This is a fundamental problem in computer science and not even a subexponential time algorithm is known yet.
- In this talk we will display connections of Graph Isomorphism to the isomorphism problems of basic algebraic structures like \mathbb{F} -algebras and cubic forms.
- The hope is that a better understanding of these algebraic structures might shed light on the graph isomorphism problem.

MOTIVATION

- The **Graph Isomorphism** problem is to *efficiently* check whether two given graphs are isomorphic.
- This is a fundamental problem in computer science and not even a subexponential time algorithm is known yet.
- In this talk we will display connections of Graph Isomorphism to the isomorphism problems of basic algebraic structures like \mathbb{F} -algebras and cubic forms.
- The hope is that a better understanding of these algebraic structures might shed light on the graph isomorphism problem.

MOTIVATION

- The **Graph Isomorphism** problem is to *efficiently* check whether two given graphs are isomorphic.
- This is a fundamental problem in computer science and not even a subexponential time algorithm is known yet.
- In this talk we will display connections of Graph Isomorphism to the isomorphism problems of basic algebraic structures like **F**-algebras and cubic forms.
- The hope is that a better understanding of these algebraic structures might shed light on the graph isomorphism problem.

MOTIVATION

- The **Graph Isomorphism** problem is to *efficiently* check whether two given graphs are isomorphic.
- This is a fundamental problem in computer science and not even a subexponential time algorithm is known yet.
- In this talk we will display connections of Graph Isomorphism to the isomorphism problems of basic algebraic structures like **F**-algebras and cubic forms.
- The hope is that a better understanding of these algebraic structures might shed light on the graph isomorphism problem.

GI IS IN NP

- Given two graphs G_1, G_2 and a map π , it is easy to check whether π is an isomorphism from $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$.
- Thus, GI can be **verified** in polynomial time or $GI \in NP$.
- Is graph non-isomorphism, *i.e.* \overline{GI} , in NP too?
- Whether $\overline{GI} \in NP$ is not known but it can be shown that \overline{GI} is verifiable in **randomized** polynomial time.

GI IS IN NP

- Given two graphs G_1, G_2 and a map π , it is easy to check whether π is an isomorphism from $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$.
- Thus, GI can be **verified** in polynomial time or $GI \in NP$.
- Is graph non-isomorphism, *i.e.* \overline{GI} , in NP too?
- Whether $\overline{GI} \in NP$ is not known but it can be shown that \overline{GI} is verifiable in **randomized** polynomial time.

GI IS IN NP

- Given two graphs G_1, G_2 and a map π , it is easy to check whether π is an isomorphism from $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$.
- Thus, GI can be **verified** in polynomial time or $GI \in NP$.
- Is graph non-isomorphism, *i.e.* \overline{GI} , in NP too?
- Whether $\overline{GI} \in NP$ is not known but it can be shown that \overline{GI} is verifiable in **randomized** polynomial time.

GI IS IN NP

- Given two graphs G_1, G_2 and a map π , it is easy to check whether π is an isomorphism from $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$.
- Thus, GI can be **verified** in polynomial time or $GI \in NP$.
- Is graph non-isomorphism, *i.e.* \overline{GI} , in NP too?
- Whether $\overline{GI} \in NP$ is not known but it can be shown that \overline{GI} is verifiable in **randomized** polynomial time.



$\overline{\text{GI}}$ IS IN AM

- Suppose the verifier has two graphs G_1, G_2 and he wants to verify whether the graphs are non-isomorphic by querying a prover.
- The verifier randomly chooses a permutation π on the vertex set and an $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- The verifier sends the graph $\pi(G_i)$ to the prover and asks the prover to send back a $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and an isomorphism $\sigma : G_j \rightarrow \pi(G_i)$. The verifier **accepts** iff $j = i$.
- Observe that:

$$G_1 \not\cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] = 1$$

$$G_1 \cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

$\overline{\text{GI}}$ IS IN AM

- Suppose the verifier has two graphs G_1, G_2 and he wants to verify whether the graphs are non-isomorphic by querying a prover.
- The verifier randomly chooses a permutation π on the vertex set and an $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- The verifier sends the graph $\pi(G_i)$ to the prover and asks the prover to send back a $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and an isomorphism $\sigma : G_j \rightarrow \pi(G_i)$. The verifier **accepts** iff $j = i$.
- Observe that:

$$G_1 \not\cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] = 1$$

$$G_1 \cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$



$\overline{\text{GI}}$ IS IN AM

- Suppose the verifier has two graphs G_1, G_2 and he wants to verify whether the graphs are non-isomorphic by querying a prover.
- The verifier randomly chooses a permutation π on the vertex set and an $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- The verifier sends the graph $\pi(G_i)$ to the prover and asks the prover to send back a $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and an isomorphism $\sigma : G_j \rightarrow \pi(G_i)$. The verifier **accepts** iff $j = i$.
- Observe that:

$$G_1 \not\cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] = 1$$

$$G_1 \cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$



$\overline{\text{GI}}$ IS IN AM

- Suppose the verifier has two graphs G_1, G_2 and he wants to verify whether the graphs are non-isomorphic by querying a prover.
- The verifier randomly chooses a permutation π on the vertex set and an $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- The verifier sends the graph $\pi(G_i)$ to the prover and asks the prover to send back a $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and an isomorphism $\sigma : G_j \rightarrow \pi(G_i)$. The verifier **accepts** iff $j = i$.
- Observe that:

$$G_1 \not\cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] = 1$$

$$G_1 \cong G_2 \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{Verifier accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$



GI “CANNOT BE” NP-HARD

- The previous two slides tell us that $GI \in NP \cap coAM$.
- This means that GI is unlikely to be NP-hard or else *polynomial hierarchy will collapse*.



GI “CANNOT BE” NP-HARD

- The previous two slides tell us that $GI \in NP \cap coAM$.
- This means that GI is unlikely to be NP-hard or else *polynomial hierarchy will collapse*.



OUTLINE

MOTIVATION

COMPLEXITY OF GI

F-ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

Definitions

The Complexity

CUBIC FORM EQUIVALENCE

Definitions

The Complexity

CONCLUSION



\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRAS

- Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. \mathbb{F} -algebra is a set of elements with operations of addition and multiplication *suitably* defined on the elements.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra with elements of the form $(a + bx)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Addition is natural while multiplication is defined as:

$$(a + bx)(c + dx) = ac + (ad + bc)x \pmod{p}.$$

- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra such that its elements look like:

$$(\alpha_1 b_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n b_n), \quad \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- b_1, \dots, b_n are called **basis** elements and R is completely defined by specifying the products $b_i \cdot b_j$.



\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRAS

- Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. \mathbb{F} -algebra is a set of elements with operations of addition and multiplication *suitably* defined on the elements.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra with elements of the form $(a + bx)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Addition is natural while multiplication is defined as:

$$(a + bx)(c + dx) = ac + (ad + bc)x \pmod{p}.$$

- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra such that its elements look like:

$$(\alpha_1 b_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n b_n), \quad \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- b_1, \dots, b_n are called **basis** elements and R is completely defined by specifying the products $b_i \cdot b_j$.



\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRAS

- Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. \mathbb{F} -algebra is a set of elements with operations of addition and multiplication *suitably* defined on the elements.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra with elements of the form $(a + bx)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Addition is natural while multiplication is defined as:

$$(a + bx)(c + dx) = ac + (ad + bc)x \pmod{p}.$$

- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra such that its elements look like:

$$(\alpha_1 b_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n b_n), \quad \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- b_1, \dots, b_n are called **basis** elements and R is completely defined by specifying the products $b_i \cdot b_j$.



\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRAS

- Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. \mathbb{F} -algebra is a set of elements with operations of addition and multiplication *suitably* defined on the elements.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra with elements of the form $(a + bx)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Addition is natural while multiplication is defined as:

$$(a + bx)(c + dx) = ac + (ad + bc)x \pmod{p}.$$

- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra such that its elements look like:

$$(\alpha_1 b_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n b_n), \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- b_1, \dots, b_n are called **basis** elements and R is completely defined by specifying the products $b_i \cdot b_j$.



\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRAS

- Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. \mathbb{F} -algebra is a set of elements with operations of addition and multiplication *suitably* defined on the elements.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra with elements of the form $(a + bx)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Addition is natural while multiplication is defined as:

$$(a + bx)(c + dx) = ac + (ad + bc)x \pmod{p}.$$

- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra such that its elements look like:

$$(\alpha_1 b_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n b_n), \quad \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}.$$

- b_1, \dots, b_n are called **basis** elements and R is completely defined by specifying the products $b_i \cdot b_j$.



PROBLEM STATEMENT

- The **F-algebra Isomorphism** problem is to check whether two given **F**-algebras R_1, R_2 are isomorphic,
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ and $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/((x-1)^2)$ are isomorphic **F**-algebras.
- Of course, we want to solve this problem in time polynomial in the size of the basis representations of R_1 and R_2 .



PROBLEM STATEMENT

- The **F-algebra Isomorphism** problem is to check whether two given \mathbb{F} -algebras R_1, R_2 are isomorphic, *i.e.* whether there is a bijective map from $R_1 \rightarrow R_2$ that preserves the addition and multiplication operations.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ and $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/((x-1)^2)$ are isomorphic \mathbb{F} -algebras.
- Of course, we want to solve this problem in time polynomial in the size of the basis representations of R_1 and R_2 .



PROBLEM STATEMENT

- The **F-algebra Isomorphism** problem is to check whether two given **F**-algebras R_1, R_2 are isomorphic, *i.e.* whether there is a bijective map from $R_1 \rightarrow R_2$ that preserves the addition and multiplication operations.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ and $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/((x-1)^2)$ are isomorphic **F**-algebras.
- Of course, we want to solve this problem in time polynomial in the size of the basis representations of R_1 and R_2 .



PROBLEM STATEMENT

- The **F-algebra Isomorphism** problem is to check whether two given **F**-algebras R_1, R_2 are isomorphic, *i.e.* whether there is a bijective map from $R_1 \rightarrow R_2$ that preserves the addition and multiplication operations.
- For example, $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x^2)$ and $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/((x-1)^2)$ are isomorphic **F**-algebras.
- Of course, we want to solve this problem in time polynomial in the size of the basis representations of R_1 and R_2 .



OUTLINE

MOTIVATION

COMPLEXITY OF GI

F-ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

Definitions

The Complexity

CUBIC FORM EQUIVALENCE

Definitions

The Complexity

CONCLUSION



UNLIKELY TO BE NP-HARD

- Clearly, **F**-algebra Isomorphism is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show **F**-algebra Isomorphism in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the basis b_1, \dots, b_n .
- Thus, **F**-algebra Isomorphism is in $NP \cap coAM$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP-HARD

- Clearly, **F**-algebra Isomorphism is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show **F**-algebra Isomorphism in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the basis b_1, \dots, b_n .
- Thus, **F**-algebra Isomorphism is in $NP \cap coAM$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP-HARD

- Clearly, \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the basis b_1, \dots, b_n .
- Thus, \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coAM}$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP-HARD

- Clearly, \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the basis b_1, \dots, b_n .
- Thus, \mathbb{F} -algebra Isomorphism is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coAM}$.



REDUCTION FROM GRAPH ISOMORPHISM

- We will now outline how a solution to \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism can solve the graph isomorphism problem too!
- Given a graph G with n vertices and edge set E we construct the \mathbb{F} -algebra: $R(G) := \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\mathcal{I}_G$ where, \mathcal{I}_G is an ideal generated by the polynomials:

$$\{x_i^2\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_i x_j \right\} \cup \{x_i x_j x_k\}_{i,j,k \in [n]}$$

- It can be shown that $G \cong G'$ iff $R(G) \cong R(G')$.



REDUCTION FROM GRAPH ISOMORPHISM

- We will now outline how a solution to \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism can solve the graph isomorphism problem too!
- Given a graph G with n vertices and edge set E we construct the \mathbb{F} -algebra: $R(G) := \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\mathcal{I}_G$ where, \mathcal{I}_G is an ideal generated by the polynomials:

$$\{x_i^2\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_i x_j \right\} \cup \{x_i x_j x_k\}_{i,j,k \in [n]}$$

- It can be shown that $G \cong G'$ iff $R(G) \cong R(G')$.



REDUCTION FROM GRAPH ISOMORPHISM

- We will now outline how a solution to \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism can solve the graph isomorphism problem too!
- Given a graph G with n vertices and edge set E we construct the \mathbb{F} -algebra: $R(G) := \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\mathcal{I}_G$ where, \mathcal{I}_G is an ideal generated by the polynomials:

$$\{x_i^2\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_i x_j \right\} \cup \{x_i x_j x_k\}_{i,j,k \in [n]}$$

- It can be shown that $G \cong G'$ iff $R(G) \cong R(G')$.



REDUCTION FROM GRAPH ISOMORPHISM

- We will now outline how a solution to \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism can solve the graph isomorphism problem too!
- Given a graph G with n vertices and edge set E we construct the \mathbb{F} -algebra: $R(G) := \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\mathcal{I}_G$ where, \mathcal{I}_G is an ideal generated by the polynomials:

$$\{x_i^2\}_{i \in [n]} \cup \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_i x_j \right\} \cup \{x_i x_j x_k\}_{i,j,k \in [n]}$$

- It can be shown that $G \cong G'$ iff $R(G) \cong R(G')$.

OUTLINE

MOTIVATION

COMPLEXITY OF GI

\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

Definitions

The Complexity

CUBIC FORM EQUIVALENCE

Definitions

The Complexity

CONCLUSION



CUBIC FORMS

- Cubic Forms are degree **3** homogeneous polynomials over a field \mathbb{F} .
- Given two cubic forms $f(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we say that f is **equivalent** to g if there is an invertible linear transformation τ such that:

$$f(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- For example, $x_1^3 + x_2^2 x_3$ is equivalent to $x_2^3 - (x_1 + x_2)^2 x_3$.
- **Cubic Form Equivalence** is the problem of checking whether two given cubic forms are equivalent in time polynomial in the size of the cubic forms.



CUBIC FORMS

- Cubic Forms are degree **3** homogeneous polynomials over a field \mathbb{F} . We assume that \mathbb{F} is a finite field.
- Given two cubic forms $f(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we say that f is **equivalent** to g if there is an invertible linear transformation τ such that:

$$f(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- For example, $x_1^3 + x_2^2 x_3$ is equivalent to $x_2^3 - (x_1 + x_2)^2 x_3$.
- **Cubic Form Equivalence** is the problem of checking whether two given cubic forms are equivalent in time polynomial in the size of the cubic forms.



CUBIC FORMS

- Cubic Forms are degree **3** homogeneous polynomials over a field \mathbb{F} . We assume that \mathbb{F} is a finite field.
- Given two cubic forms $f(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we say that f is **equivalent** to g if there is an invertible linear transformation τ such that:

$$f(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- For example, $x_1^3 + x_2^2 x_3$ is equivalent to $x_2^3 - (x_1 + x_2)^2 x_3$.
- **Cubic Form Equivalence** is the problem of checking whether two given cubic forms are equivalent in time polynomial in the size of the cubic forms.



CUBIC FORMS

- Cubic Forms are degree 3 homogeneous polynomials over a field \mathbb{F} . We assume that \mathbb{F} is a finite field.
- Given two cubic forms $f(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we say that f is **equivalent** to g if there is an invertible linear transformation τ such that:

$$f(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- For example, $x_1^3 + x_2^2 x_3$ is equivalent to $x_2^3 - (x_1 + x_2)^2 x_3$.
- **Cubic Form Equivalence** is the problem of checking whether two given cubic forms are equivalent in time polynomial in the size of the cubic forms.



CUBIC FORMS

- Cubic Forms are degree 3 homogeneous polynomials over a field \mathbb{F} . We assume that \mathbb{F} is a finite field.
- Given two cubic forms $f(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we say that f is **equivalent** to g if there is an invertible linear transformation τ such that:

$$f(\tau(x_1), \dots, \tau(x_n)) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- For example, $x_1^3 + x_2^2 x_3$ is equivalent to $x_2^3 - (x_1 + x_2)^2 x_3$.
- **Cubic Form Equivalence** is the problem of checking whether two given cubic forms are equivalent in time polynomial in the size of the cubic forms.

OUTLINE

MOTIVATION

COMPLEXITY OF GI

\mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

Definitions

The Complexity

CUBIC FORM EQUIVALENCE

Definitions

The Complexity

CONCLUSION



UNLIKELY TO BE NP HARD

- Clearly, Cubic Form Equivalence is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show Cubic Form Equivalence in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the variables x_1, \dots, x_n .
- Thus, Cubic Form Equivalence is in $NP \cap coAM$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP HARD

- Clearly, Cubic Form Equivalence is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show Cubic Form Equivalence in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the variables x_1, \dots, x_n .
- Thus, Cubic Form Equivalence is in $NP \cap coAM$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP HARD

- Clearly, Cubic Form Equivalence is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show Cubic Form Equivalence in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the variables x_1, \dots, x_n .
- Thus, Cubic Form Equivalence is in $NP \cap coAM$.



UNLIKELY TO BE NP HARD

- Clearly, Cubic Form Equivalence is in NP.
- The proof of GI in coAM can be modified to show Cubic Form Equivalence in coAM.
 - The verifier applies random invertible linear transformation on the variables x_1, \dots, x_n .
- Thus, Cubic Form Equivalence is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coAM}$.



REDUCTION FROM \mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

- Interestingly, \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism reduces to cubic form equivalence.
- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra given by its basis elements b_1, \dots, b_n and the multiplication defined as: $b_i \cdot b_j = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k$ where for all $i, j, k \in [n]$, $a_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{F}$.
- From R we construct a cubic form f_R as:

$$f_R(\bar{b}, \bar{z}, y) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} z_{i,j} \left(b_i \cdot b_j - y \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k \right)$$

- It can be shown that for two given \mathbb{F} -algebras R and R' we have: $R \cong R'$ iff $f_R \sim f_{R'}$.



REDUCTION FROM \mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

- Interestingly, \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism reduces to cubic form equivalence.
- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra given by its basis elements b_1, \dots, b_n and the multiplication defined as: $b_i \cdot b_j = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k$ where for all $i, j, k \in [n]$, $a_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{F}$.
- From R we construct a cubic form f_R as:

$$f_R(\bar{b}, \bar{z}, y) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} z_{i,j} \left(b_i \cdot b_j - y \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k \right)$$

- It can be shown that for two given \mathbb{F} -algebras R and R' we have: $R \cong R'$ iff $f_R \sim f_{R'}$.



REDUCTION FROM \mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

- Interestingly, \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism reduces to cubic form equivalence.
- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra given by its basis elements b_1, \dots, b_n and the multiplication defined as: $b_i \cdot b_j = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k$ where for all $i, j, k \in [n]$, $a_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{F}$.
- From R we construct a cubic form f_R as:

$$f_R(\bar{b}, \bar{z}, y) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} z_{i,j} \left(b_i \cdot b_j - y \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k \right)$$

- It can be shown that for two given \mathbb{F} -algebras R and R' we have: $R \cong R'$ iff $f_R \sim f_{R'}$.



REDUCTION FROM \mathbb{F} -ALGEBRA ISOMORPHISM

- Interestingly, \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism reduces to cubic form equivalence.
- Let R be an \mathbb{F} -algebra given by its basis elements b_1, \dots, b_n and the multiplication defined as: $b_i \cdot b_j = \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k$ where for all $i, j, k \in [n]$, $a_{i,j,k} \in \mathbb{F}$.
- From R we construct a cubic form f_R as:

$$f_R(\bar{b}, \bar{z}, y) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} z_{i,j} \left(b_i \cdot b_j - y \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n a_{i,j,k} b_k \right)$$

- It can be shown that for two given \mathbb{F} -algebras R and R' we have: $R \cong R'$ iff $f_R \sim f_{R'}$.

THE RESULTS

- The isomorphism problems of graphs, \mathbb{F} -algebras and \mathbb{F} -cubic forms are of **intermediate** complexity (for finite \mathbb{F}).
- These problems satisfy the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Graph Isomorphism} \\ & \leq \mathbb{F} - \text{algebra Isomorphism} \\ & \leq \text{Cubic Form Equivalence} \end{aligned}$$



THE RESULTS

- The isomorphism problems of graphs, \mathbb{F} -algebras and \mathbb{F} -cubic forms are of **intermediate** complexity (for finite \mathbb{F}).
- These problems satisfy the following relation:

Graph Isomorphism

\leq \mathbb{F} – algebra Isomorphism

\leq Cubic Form Equivalence



THE RESULTS

- The isomorphism problems of graphs, \mathbb{F} -algebras and \mathbb{F} -cubic forms are of **intermediate** complexity (for finite \mathbb{F}).
- These problems satisfy the following relation:

Graph Isomorphism

\leq \mathbb{F} – algebra Isomorphism

\leq Cubic Form Equivalence



THE RESULTS

- The isomorphism problems of graphs, \mathbb{F} -algebras and \mathbb{F} -cubic forms are of **intermediate** complexity (for finite \mathbb{F}).
- These problems satisfy the following relation:

Graph Isomorphism

\leq \mathbb{F} – algebra Isomorphism

\leq Cubic Form Equivalence

OPEN PROBLEMS

We find the following problems of interest:

- Is there a way to solve cubic form equivalence in subexponential time ?
- Is the cubic form equivalence problem over an infinite field \mathbb{F} decidable ?



OPEN PROBLEMS

We find the following problems of interest:

- Is there a way to solve cubic form equivalence in subexponential time ?
- Is the cubic form equivalence problem over an infinite field \mathbb{F} decidable ?



OPEN PROBLEMS

We find the following problems of interest:

- Is there a way to solve cubic form equivalence in subexponential time ?
- Is the cubic form equivalence problem over an infinite field \mathbb{F} decidable ?

○○○
○○○○○
○○○

THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?