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Abstract

A vertex coloring of a graph $G$ is called distinguishing if no non-identity automorphisms of $G$ can preserve it. The distinguishing number of $G$, denoted by $D(G)$, is the minimum number of colors required for such coloring. The distinguishing threshold of $G$, denoted by $\theta(G)$, is the minimum number $k$ of colors such that every $k$-coloring of $G$ is distinguishing. In this paper, we study $\theta(G)$, find its relation to the cycle structure of the automorphism group and prove that $\theta(G) = 2$ if and only if $G$ is isomorphic to $K_2$ or $\overline{K_2}$. Moreover, we study graphs that have the distinguishing threshold equal to 3 or more and prove that $\theta(G) = D(G)$ if and only if $G$ is asymmetric, $K_n$ or $\overline{K_n}$. Finally, we consider Johnson scheme graphs for their distinguishing number and threshold concludes the paper.
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1 Introduction

An automorphism of a graph is a symmetry of the graph in an abstract form, and is said to be broken by a vertex coloring if it maps some vertex to a vertex with different color. A vertex coloring of a graph $G$ is called distinguishing (or symmetry breaking) if it breaks all nontrivial automorphisms of $G$. The distinguishing number, shown by $D(G)$, is the smallest number of colors required for such a coloring. For a positive integer $d$, if there is a distinguishing coloring of $G$ with $d$ colors, we say that $G$ is $d$-distinguishable. One can easily verify that $D(K_n) = n$, $D(K_{n,n}) = n + 1$, $D(P_n) = 2$ for $n \geq 2$, $D(C_3) = D(C_4) = D(C_5) = 3$ while $D(C_n) = 2$ for $n \geq 6$ [3].
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The concept has its roots back in the 1970s, when Babai defined the asymmetric coloring in [7], but it was only after publication of [3] by Albertson and Collins in 1996, that the present terminology came to be widely used. Afterwards, the subject spawned a whole lot of wealth in results and newly defined graph theoretical indices. For many classes of graphs methods to efficiently break their symmetries were already devised, and where it was feasible, general bounds on their distinguishing number were also derived.

For a connected finite graph $G$, it was shown by Collins and Trenk [9], and independently by Klavžar, Wong and Zhu [25], that $D(G) \leq \Delta + 1$, where $\Delta$ is the largest vertex degree of $G$. We have $D(G) = \Delta + 1$ if and only if $G$ is isomorphic to $K_{\Delta+1}$, $K_{\Delta, \Delta}$, or $C_5$.

Many results are about finite graphs, but the literature has also been enriched with numerous results on infinite graphs, see e.g. [18, 29, 17]. It can be generalized to some other discrete structures and/or using other means of symmetry breaking. As instances, we can mention Imrich et al. [16] who considered breaking graphs’ endomorphisms by coloring, Ellingham and Schroeder [12] who considered symmetry breaking via partitioning and Laflamme, Nguyen Van Thê and Sauer [26] who considered the distinguishing number of some homogeneous structures such as directed graphs and posets.

There are also several generalizations to the distinguishing coloring. Collins and Trenk [9] mixed the concept with proper coloring and introduced the distinguishing chromatic number $\chi_G(G)$ of a graph $G$. Moreover, Kalinowski and Pilśniak [22] introduced the distinguishing index $D'(G)$ and the distinguishing chromatic index $\chi_G(G)$, while they, along with Woźniak, in [23] did a similar thing for the total coloring and defined the analogous $D''(G)$ and $\chi_G''(G)$.

The literature is also rich in results for product graphs. For example, Bogstad and Cowen [8] showed that for $k \geq 4$, every hypercube $Q_k$ of dimension $k$, which is the Cartesian product of $k$ copies of $K_2$, is 2-distinguishable, while Imrich and Klavžar in [19] showed that the distinguishing number of Cartesian powers of a connected graph $G$ is equal to two except for $K_2^2$, $K_3^2$, $K_2^3$. Furthermore, Imrich, Jerebic and Klavžar [15] showed that Cartesian products of relatively prime graphs whose sizes are close to each other can be distinguished with a small number of colors.

The lexicographic product was also a subject of symmetry breaking via vertex and edge coloring. Alikhani and Soltani in [4] showed that under some conditions on the automorphism group of a graph $G$, we have $D(G) \leq D(G^k) \leq D(G) + k - 1$, where $G^k$ is the $k$th lexicographic power of $G$. Meanwhile, they also showed that if $G$ and $H$ are connected graphs, then $D(H) \leq D(G \circ H) \leq |V(G)| \cdot D(H)$. Ahmadi, Alinaghipour and Shekarz [1] defined some indices such as $\varphi_k(G)$ (respectively, $\Phi_k(G)$), which stands for the number of non-equivalent distinguishing colorings of the graph $G$ with exactly $k$ (respectively, at most $k$) colors, and used them to refine findings on distinguishing lexicographic product. They proved that $D(X \circ Y) = k$ where $k$ is the least integer that $\Phi_k(Y) \geq D(X)$, when the automorphisms of $X \circ Y$ are all natural, i. e., keep the product’s skeleton [14].

It seems rather easy to calculate $\Phi_k(G)$ and $\varphi_k(G)$ when $G$ is a path or a cycle. However, the calculations are not easy in the general case and known algorithms have exponential running time so that for a computer algebra system, it might take a very long time to count the number
of non-equivalent distinguishing colorings of a symmetric graph $G$ on $n$ vertices, even when $n$ is relatively as small as 10. Anyhow, when $k$ is large enough, even when $n$ is quite large, the calculations are much easier. This motivated Ahmadi, Alinaghipour and Shekarriz [1] to define the distinguishing threshold $\theta(G)$ as the minimum number $k$ of colors such that any coloring of the graph $G$ with $k$ colors is distinguishing. Clearly we have $D(G) \leq \theta(G) \leq |V(G)|$. They also showed that $\theta(K_n) = \theta(K_{m,n}) = m + n$, $\theta(P_n) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1$ for $n \geq 2$ and $\theta(C_n) = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 2$ for $n \geq 3$. The main objective of this paper is to continue their study of this parameter.

We start our study by thoroughly looking at the distinguishing threshold in Section 2, where we first demonstrate the relationship between this parameter and the cycle structure of the automorphisms of the graph and, then, study graphs with small thresholds. It is shown while all asymmetric graphs have the distinguishing threshold equal to 1, the only graphs with $\theta(G) = 2$ are $K_2$ and $\overline{K}_2$. Moreover, a graph $G$ with $\theta(G) = 3$ is either one of the 4 graphs on 3 vertices or a bi-regular graph on $2p$ vertices where $p \neq 3, 5$ is a prime number. Meanwhile, we prove that $\theta(G) = D(G)$ if and only if $G$ is asymmetric, $K_n$ or $\overline{K}_n$. Furthermore, it is shown that the distinguishing threshold of an infinite graph is either 1 or infinity.

The relation between the distinguishing threshold and the cycle structure of the automorphism group motivates us to consider the graphs whose automorphism groups have been studied thoroughly. A rich family of such examples are the graphs in association schemes, particularly, the Johnson scheme. For detailed studies on this subject, we refer the reader to the texts such as [11] by Eiichi and Tatsuro. The interesting fact about the graphs in the Johnson scheme, i.e. the generalized Johnson graphs, is that any permutation on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ induces an automorphism of all the generalized Johnson graphs on the same set of vertices; that is, Sym($n$) is isomorphic to a subgroup of their automorphism groups. Jones [21] obtained the automorphism group of any merged Johnson graph from which the automorphism group of any generalized Johnson graph can be obtained. Furthermore, Jones’s result enabled Kim, Kwon and Lee [24] to obtain the distinguishing number of any merged Johnson graph, which in turn leads to the distinguishing number of any generalized Johnson graph.

An important sub-family of generalized Johnson graphs, is the family of Knéser graphs $K(n, k)$, to which the Petersen graph belongs. In [1], the authors have also addressed the problem of determining the distinguishing threshold of the Knéser graphs; in some special case; more specifically, for $n \geq 5$, they have proved that $\theta(K(n, 2)) = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 3n + 6)$. In Section 3, we continue this study and, along with listing the distinguishing number of all generalized Johnson graphs, we compute their distinguishing threshold.

All graphs in this paper are assume to be simple (undirected and loopless) and finite, unless otherwise stated. We use the standard notation in graph theory which can be found in [10] by Diestel.
2 Distinguishing threshold

Two colorings \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) of a graph \( G \) are called *equivalent* if there is an automorphism \( \alpha \) of \( G \) such that \( c_1(v) = c_2(\alpha(v)) \), for all \( v \in V(G) \). The number of non-equivalent distinguishing colorings of a graph \( G \) with \( \{1, \ldots, k\} \) as the set of admissible colors is shown by \( \Phi_k(G) \), while the number of non-equivalent \( k \)-distinguishing colorings of a graph \( G \) with \( \{1, \ldots, k\} \) as the set of colors is shown by \( \varphi_k(G) \) [1]. These two indices are related as

\[
\Phi_k(G) = \sum_{i=D(G)}^{k} \binom{k}{i} \varphi_i(G). \tag{2.1}
\]

By a simple counting argument, one observes that \( \Phi_k(P_n) = \frac{1}{2}(k^n - k^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}) \) when \( n, k \geq 1 \), and \( \Phi_k(K_n) = \binom{n}{k} \) when \( n \geq 2 \) and \( k \geq n \) [1].

Calculating \( \varphi_k(G) \) in general cases, contains counting the number of \( k \)-distinguishing colorings of \( G \), while when \( k \) is large enough, so that every \( k \)-coloring of \( G \) is distinguishing, i.e. when \( k \geq \theta(G) \), then we have

\[
\varphi_k(G) = \frac{k! \binom{n}{k}}{|\text{Aut}(G)|}, \tag{2.2}
\]

where \( \binom{n}{k} \) stands for the Stirling number of the second kind [1].

In what follows, we consider the distinguishing threshold for general graphs and prove some results which can provide useful machinery for this paper as well as future studies. Our default assumption is that the graphs are connected; one exception is the following theorem in which we consider the distinguishing threshold for disconnected graphs.

In order to state the theorem, we will make use of the following notation. Suppose that \( G \) is a graph with connected components \( G_1, \ldots, G_k \), where all the \( G_i \) are asymmetric. Then we consider the isomorphism congruence classes \( \mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_m \) of the graphs \( G_1, \ldots, G_k \), where we assume that the \( \mathcal{C}_j \)'s are ordered in an increasing order in the sense that if \( j < \ell \), and \( G_{i_j} \in \mathcal{C}_j \) and \( G_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_\ell \), then \( |V(G_{i_j})| \leq |V(G_{i_\ell})| \). We define \( \gamma(G) \) to be \( |V(G_{i_s})| \), where \( G_{i_s} \in \mathcal{C}_s \) and \( s \) is the smallest integer with the property that \( |\mathcal{C}_s| > 1 \); and if there is no such \( s \), then we define \( \gamma(G) \) to be \( |V(G)| \). Note that, for example, if \( k = 1 \) (i.e. if \( G \) is a connected asymmetric graph), then \( \gamma(G) = |V(G)| \).

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k \) be arbitrary connected graphs and let \( G = \cup_{i=1}^{k} G_i \).

(a) If \( \text{Aut}(G_i) \neq \{\text{id}\} \), for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then

\[
\theta(G) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \theta(G_i) + \sum_{j \neq i} |V(G_j)| \right\}.
\]

(b) If \( \text{Aut}(G_i) = \{\text{id}\} \), for all \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), then \( \theta(G) = |V(G)| - \gamma(G) + 1 \).
(c) If \(\{1, \ldots, k\} = A \cup B\) is a non-trivial partition, \(\text{Aut}(G_i) = \{\text{id}\}, \) for \(i \in A,\) and \(\text{Aut}(G_i) \neq \{\text{id}\}, \) for \(i \in B,\) then set \(G_A = \bigcup_{i \in A} G_i\) and \(G_B = \bigcup_{i \in B} G_i.\) In this case, we have
\[
\theta(G) = \max\{\theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)|, \theta(G_B) + |V(G_A)|\},
\]
unless \(G_B\) is asymmetric and \(\theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)| \leq \theta(G_B) + |V(G_A)|,\) in which case we have \(\theta(G) = \theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)|.\)

Proof. To prove (a), without loss of generality, we assume
\[
q = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{\theta(G_i) + \sum_{j \neq i} |V(G_j)|\right\} = \theta(G_1) + \sum_{j=2}^{k} |V(G_j)|.
\]
It is obvious that \(\theta(G) \geq q.\) Thus, it is enough to show that any arbitrary coloring of \(G\) with \(q\) colors is distinguishing. Suppose for contrary that \(c\) is a non-distinguishing coloring of \(G\) with \(q\) colors. Then, we may assume that the number of colors which are used in \(G_1\) is \(\theta(G_1) + r,\) where \(0 < r \leq |V(G_1)| - \theta(G_1),\) and that the components \(G_{i_1}, \ldots, G_{i_m}\) receive \(t_1, \ldots, t_m\) colors, respectively, where \(t_j < |V(G_{i_j})|,\) for \(1 \leq j \leq m,\) and \(t_1 + t_2 + \cdots + t_m = r.\) Since \(c\) is not distinguishing, we assume, without loss of generality, that \(|V(G_{i_1})| - t_1 < \theta(G_{i_1}).\) Hence,
\[
|V(G_{i_1})| + |V(G_{i_2})| + \cdots + |V(G_{i_m})| - (t_1 + \cdots + t_m) < \theta(G_{i_1}) + |V(G_{i_2})| + \cdots + |V(G_{i_m})|;
\]
thus, since \(r = t_1 + \cdots + t_m\) and \(r \leq |V(G_1)| - \theta(G_1),\) we have
\[
|V(G_{i_1})| + |V(G_{i_2})| + \cdots + |V(G_{i_m})| + \theta(G_1) < \theta(G_{i_1}) + |V(G_{i_2})| + \cdots + |V(G_{i_m})| + |V(G_1)|
\]
which contradicts the definition of \(q.\)

To show part (b), we note that if the \(G_i\)’s are mutually non-isomorphic, then by the definition, we have \(\gamma(G) = |V(G)|\) in which case the result follows since \(G\) is asymmetric. Otherwise, let \(\gamma(G) = |V(G_{i_1})|.\) Clearly, any coloring with \(|V(G)| - |V(G_{i_1})| + 1\) coloring breaks the symmetry of \(G;\) however, if we assign a distinct color to any vertex of \(G \setminus G_{i_1}\) and color the vertices of \(G_{i_1}\) in exactly the same way as another graph in the class \(\mathcal{C}_s,\) then we will obtain a coloring of \(G\) with \(|V(G)| - |V(G_{i_1})|\) colors which is not distinguishing. This completes the proof.

Finally, to prove (c), we first assume that
\[
q = \max\{\theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)|, \theta(G_B) + |V(G_A)|\} = \theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)|.
\]
It is easy to see that \(\theta(G) \geq q.\) On the other hand, suppose that there exists a non-distinguishing coloring \(c\) with \(q\) colors. Similar to the proof of (a), assume that \(G_A\) and \(G_B\) receive \(\theta(G_A) + r\) and \(|V(G_B)| - r\) colors, respectively, where \(0 < r \leq |V(G_A)| - \theta(G_A).\) Since \(c\) is not distinguishing, we have \(|V(G_B)| - r < \theta(G_B)\) which implies that
\[
|V(G_B)| - |V(G_A)| + \theta(G_A) < \theta(G_B).
\]
Hence,
\[ |V(G_B)| + \theta(G_A) < \theta(G_B) + |V(G_A)|, \]
which is a contradiction and shows that \( \theta(G) \leq q \).

Now, assume \( q = \theta(G_B) + |V(G_A)| \). If \( \theta(G_B) = 1 \), then it is obvious that \( \theta(G) = \theta(G_A) + |V(G_B)| \) and the case where \( \theta(G_B) > 1 \) follows using a similar argument as in part (a).

Since the action of the automorphism group of a graph on the vertex set is faithful, one can represent an automorphism of a graph by a product of cyclic permutations where this representation is unique up to a permutation of cycles. For an automorphism \( \alpha \) and a vertex \( v \in V(G) \), the ordered tuple \( \sigma = (v, \alpha(v), \alpha^2(v), \ldots, \alpha^{r-1}(v)) \) forms a cycle of length \( r \) provided that \( \alpha^r(v) = v \). Note that a length-one cycle \( (v) \) fixes the vertex \( v \) and that the order of a cycle \( \sigma \) in the automorphism group is the length of \( \sigma \). We define the support of the cycle \( \sigma \) in the automorphism group to be the subset \( \text{Supp}(\sigma) \) of the vertices which is set-wise stabilized by \( \sigma \). The number of cycles of an automorphism \( \alpha \) is denoted here by \( |\alpha| \). As an example, consider the graph depicted at Figure 1. Then
\[
\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 & 5 & 4 \end{pmatrix}
\]
is an automorphism which can be represented as \( \alpha = (1, 3)(2)(4, 5) \), and therefore \( |\alpha| = 3 \). Note that \( \text{Supp}((1, 3)) = \{1, 3\} \) and \( \text{Supp}((2)) = \{2\} \).

Figure 1: A graph whose automorphism \( \alpha \) has 3 cycles.

Using the cycle structures of the elements of the automorphism group of a graph, one can obtain the exact value of the distinguishing threshold. The following lemma seems to be one of the most essential statements that one can say about the distinguishing threshold of an arbitrary graph.

**Lemma 2.2.** For any graph \( G \), we have
\[ \theta(G) = \max \{|\alpha| : \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \setminus \{\text{id}\} \} + 1. \]

**Proof.** Let \( q = \max \{|\alpha| : \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \setminus \{\text{id}\} \} \) and \( \sigma \in \text{Aut}(G) \) such that \( \sigma \neq \text{id} \) and \( |\sigma| = q \). Consider a non-distinguishing \( q \)-coloring of \( G \) which uses a single color \( c_i \) to color the vertices in the support of the \( i \)-th cycle of \( \sigma \), \( i = 1, \ldots, q \). This shows that \( \theta(G) \geq q + 1 \).

Conversely, if \( \alpha \) is a non-identity automorphism of \( G \), then since \( |\alpha| \leq q \), by the pigeonhole principle, any \( (q+1) \)-coloring of \( G \) uses different colors on the vertices in the support of at
least one of the cycles of \( \alpha \), which means that \( \alpha \) cannot preserve this coloring. This proves that 

\[ \theta(G) \leq q + 1. \]

In the following lemma, we make use of the notion of motion, which is introduced by Russell and Sundaram in [28]. The motion \( m(\alpha) \) of an automorphism \( \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \) is the number of vertices of \( G \) that are not fixed by \( \alpha \), and the motion of \( G \) is defined as 

\[ m(G) = \min \{ m(\alpha) : \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \setminus \{\text{id}\} \}. \]

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( G \) be a graph on \( n \) vertices. Then, we have 

\[ \theta(G) \geq n - m(G) + 2. \]

**Proof.** Let \( \beta \in \text{Aut}(G) \) with \( m(\beta) = m(G) \) and consider a coloring with \( n - m(G) + 1 \) colors which assigns \( n - m(G) \) colors to the fixed vertices of \( \beta \) and another color to all the vertices moved by \( \beta \). This coloring is not distinguishing and, therefore, the statement follows.

Since for an asymmetric graph \( G \), we have \( \theta(G) = 1 \) [1], there are infinitely many graphs whose distinguishing threshold is 1. Therefore, it is a natural question to ask whether, for an integer \( k \geq 2 \), there are finitely or infinitely many graphs whose distinguishing threshold is \( k \). We first consider the case \( k = 2 \) in the following theorem which states that there are only two such graphs. To prove the result, we recall the notion of circulant graphs.

For any group \( (\Gamma, \cdot) \) and any non-empty subset \( S \subseteq \Gamma \) which is closed under inversion and \( 1_G \notin S \), the Cayley graph \( \text{Cay}(G, S) \) on \( G \) with the connection set \( S \) is defined to be the graph whose vertex are the elements of \( G \), and in which two vertices \( g, h \) are adjacent if \( g \cdot h^{-1} \in S \). The Cayley graphs are clearly vertex transitive. In the special case where \( \Gamma = (\mathbb{Z}_n, +) \) and \( S \) is a symmetric subset of \( \mathbb{Z}_n^* = \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \), \( G = \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, S) \) is called a circulant graph, see [27] by Morris or [13] by Godsil and Royle. An alternative way of describing a circulant graph \( G \) is that there is an automorphism \( \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \) such that \( |\alpha| = 1 \); that is, \( G \) is a circulant graph if and only if it has an automorphism which contains all the vertices of \( G \) in one cycle. Automorphism group of circulant graphs of prime orders has been studied by Alspauch [6]. He proved that for a prime \( p \), if \( S = \emptyset \) or \( S = \mathbb{Z}_p^* \), then \( \text{Aut}(G) = \text{Sym}(p) \); otherwise, \( \text{Aut}(G) = \{T_{a,b} : a \in E(S), b \in \mathbb{Z}_p\} \), where \( T_{a,b}(v_i) = v_{a_i+b} \), and \( E(S) \) is the largest even-order subgroup of \( \mathbb{Z}_p^* \) such that \( S \) is a union of cosets of \( E(S) \).

**Theorem 2.4.** The only graphs with the distinguishing threshold 2 are \( K_2 \) and \( \overline{K}_2 \).

**Proof.** The only graphs on 2 vertices are \( K_2 \) and its complement \( \overline{K}_2 \). Suppose \( G \) is a graph on more than 2 vertices, for which we have \( \theta(G) = 2 \). Then, \( G \) must have some nontrivial symmetries. According to Lemma 2.2, any automorphism \( \alpha \neq \text{id} \) must have at most one cycle of length \( n = |V(G)| \), which implies that \( G \) is circulant and, thus, vertex-transitive. Moreover, \( n \) must be a prime number greater than 2 (because, otherwise, there would be a nontrivial automorphism with more than one cycles in \( \text{Aut}(G) \)). Thus, for all \( v \in G \), \( \deg(v) \) must be an even number.
If $G$ has no edges, i.e. if $G$ is the empty graph on $n > 2$ vertices, we have $\theta(G) = n > 2$, a contradiction. Thus we assume that $G$ has some edges. Let $e = u_0u_1$ be an edge and $\beta \in \text{Aut}(G)$ be so that $\beta(u_0) = u_1$. There is such a $\beta$ because $G$ is vertex transitive. Consequently, by a re-labeling we may write $\beta = (u_0u_1 \ldots u_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}u_{-\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \ldots u_{-1})$ where $u_0 \sim u_1 \sim \ldots \sim \beta^{|\frac{n}{2}|}(u_0) = u_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sim \ldots \sim \beta^{n-1}(u_0) = u_{-1} \sim u_0$ which means that $(u_0u_1 \ldots u_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}u_{-\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \ldots u_{-1})$ forms a Hamiltonian cycle in $G$. Since $G$ is vertex-transitive, if $u_0 \sim u_k$, for some $k = 1, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then $u_{-k} \sim u_0$. For $i = -\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, \ldots, -1, 0, 1, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, we conclude that the map

$$
\gamma : V(G) \longrightarrow V(G)
$$

$$
\gamma(u_i) = u_{-i}
$$

is an automorphism of $G$, which has $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1 > 1$ cycles, a contradiction. \qed

The following observation is one of the features coming out from proof of Theorem 2.4.

**Remark 2.5.** The existence of the automorphism $\gamma$ in proof of Theorem 2.4 means that the dihedral group $D_{2p}$ is a subgroup of the automorphism group of a circulant graph of prime order $p$. This simple fact must have been appeared in the literature long ago, but we could not find an appropriate reference.

Characterizing the graphs, whose distinguishing threshold is 3, is a bit more complicated. There are infinitely many such graphs, but except for some small ones, all such graphs are of a special order. In Theorem 2.6 we consider such graphs.

Recall that a graph $G$ is called bi-regular if there are two (not necessarily distinct) positive integers $d_1$ and $d_2$ such that the degree of any vertex $v \in G$ is either $d_1$ or $d_2$. We denote the set of all vertices with vertex degree $d_1$ and $d_2$ by $A_1$ and $A_2$, respectively.

![Figure 2: Small graphs whose distinguishing threshold equal to 3. The first four graphs are mentioned in item 1 of Theorem 2.6 while the last graph, $P_4$, is a graph for which item 2 of Theorem 2.6 holds.](image)

Figure 2: Small graphs whose distinguishing threshold equal to 3. The first four graphs are mentioned in item 1 of Theorem 2.6 while the last graph, $P_4$, is a graph for which item 2 of Theorem 2.6 holds.

Now, we are ready to discuss graphs whose distinguishing threshold is 3.

**Theorem 2.6.** Let $G$ be a graph for which we have $\theta(G) = 3$. Then,
1. $|G| = 3$, or

2. $G$ is a connected bi-regular graph on $2p$ vertices with $A_1 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_p\}$ and $A_2 = \{u_1, \ldots, u_p\}$, where $p \neq 3, 5$ is a prime number, and the induced subgraphs $G[A_1]$ and $G[A_2]$ are non-isomorphic circulant graphs.

Proof. There are 4 graphs on 3 vertices. It is an easy task to check that all these graphs have the distinguishing threshold 3 which proves item 1. Moreover, there are 11 graphs on 4, of which only $P_3$ has the distinguishing threshold 3. It is straightforward to check that $P_3$ satisfies item 2 above. So, suppose that $G$ is a graph, $\theta(G) = 3$ and $n = |G| \geq 5$. We prove that the second statement is true for $G$.

Lemma 2.3 implies that $m(G) \geq n - 1$. This means that for an arbitrary $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G) \setminus \{\text{id}\}$ we have $m(\alpha) \geq n - 1$. Thus, we have the following two cases:

Case 1. $m(\alpha) = n - 1$. By Lemma 2.2 we know also that $|\alpha|$ is at most 2. Since $m(\alpha) \neq n$, we must have $|\alpha| = 2$. Consequently, the only vertex that is fixed by $\alpha$, say $v$, has to lay on a separate cycle from the rest of vertices. Then, either $v$ is on an edge, which means that it has to be adjacent to all other vertices, or $v$ is an isolated vertex. By Theorem 2.4, both cases require that $G \setminus v$ be isomorphic with $K_2$ or $\overline{K}_2$. This is a contradiction to our assumption that $n \geq 5$.

Case 2. $m(\alpha) = n$. Again by lemma 2.2, $\alpha$ must have at most 2 cycles.

Case 2.1 $\alpha$ is mono-cyclic. Then $\gamma$ from proof of Theorem 2.4 is a reflection $\gamma$ on $n \geq 5$ vertices which has at least 3 cycles. Existence of such an automorphism is a violation of Lemma 2.2.

Case 2.2 $|\alpha| = 2$, and both of these cycles are not of length of a prime number $p$. If one of these two cycles is made of a composite number of vertices, say $st$, then $\alpha^s$ and $\alpha^t$ are automorphisms with 3 or more cycles, which is again a violation of Lemma 2.2. Therefore, both cycles of $\alpha$ are on prime number of vertices. If these two prime numbers $p_1$ and $p_2$ were different, then at least one of them is smaller, say $p_1 < p_2$. It is quite straightforward to see that $\alpha^{p_1}$ is a non-identity automorphism whose number of cycles are strictly greater than 2, a contradiction to Lemma 2.2 and the fact that $\theta(G) = 3$.

Thus, we have $|\alpha| = 2$, and these two cycles are of the length of a prime number $p \geq 3$. Then without lose of generality we can assume that $\alpha = (v_1, \ldots, v_p)(u_1, \ldots, u_p)$. Put $A_1 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_p\}$ and $A_2 = \{u_1, \ldots, u_p\}$. Since $A_1 \cup A_2 = V(G)$, $G$ must be bi-regular because degrees of vertices in $A_1$ (as well as degrees in $A_2$) have to be the same. Moreover, since $\alpha$ has two cycles, we must have both induced subgraphs $G[A_1]$ and $G[A_2]$ are circulant graphs of prime order $p$.

Note that there are two circulant graphs on 3 vertices, namely $K_3$ and $\overline{K}_3$, and three circulant graphs on 5 vertices, say $K_5$, $\overline{K}_5$ and $C_5$. Since any combination of these graphs cannot generate a graph whose distinguishing threshold is 3, we have $p \neq 3, 5$. 
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Suppose that we have $G[A_1] \simeq G[A_2]$. For $j = 1, \ldots, p$, let $X_j = \{ u_i : v_j \sim u_i , i = 1, \ldots, p \}$. Then because of $\alpha$, we must have $u_1 \sim v_j$ whenever $u_{j-1} \in X_1$ (the minus is taken modulo $p$). This shows that there is another automorphism of $G$ as

$$\gamma : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$$

$$\gamma(x) = \begin{cases} u_i & x = v_i \in A_1 \\ v_i & x = u_i \in A_2. \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that $\gamma$ has $p \geq 3$ cycles, a contradiction to Lemma 2.2. This completes the proof.

According to Theorem 2.6, there exists numerous graphs whose distinguishing thresholds is 3. Indeed, we can construct an infinite family of such graphs. The following example demonstrate how this can be done.

**Example 2.7.** It is easy to show that every non-trivial automorphism of the graph $G$ in Figure 3 has only two cycles: one consisting of the 7 outer vertices and other consisting of the 7 inner ones. Moreover, it is not hard to show that $\text{Aut}(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}_7$. The way each outer vertex is adjacent to the inner ones induces a 2-distinguishing coloring on them. In a similar way and by replacing 7 by any prime $p > 7$, one can construct graphs with the similar property. Therefore, there are infinitely many graphs with the distinguishing threshold 3.

![Figure 3: A graph on 14 vertices whose distinguishing threshold equals 3.](image)

Furthermore, in the following example, we extend this argument to all thresholds $t \geq 4$.

**Example 2.8.** The graphs $G_1$ and $G_2$ in Figures 4 and 5, respectively, have the property that their automorphism group is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p$ where $p \geq 3$ is a prime number, and we have $\theta(G_1) = 4$ and $\theta(G_2) = 5$. Similar to $G_1$, one can construct infinitely many graphs with threshold equal to 4. Also, the graph $G_2$ can easily be used to generate a graph whose distinguishing threshold is $t \geq 5$. If we make the central vertex $o$ adjacent with an end vertex of a path of length $t$ to generate a new graph $G_{t+5}$, then we have $\theta(G_{t+5}) = t + 5$. 
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Figure 4: Graph $G_1$ with the distinguishing threshold of 4

Figure 5: Graph $G_2$ whose distinguishing threshold is 5

We recall that for any graph $G$, the threshold is bounded $D(G) \leq \theta(G) \leq |V(G)|$, where the second bound follows from the fact that any coloring which uses as many colors as $|V(G)|$ is trivially distinguishing. In what follows, we study the graphs for which the lower bound holds with equality. More specifically, as another consequence of Lemma 2.2, we prove that if for a graph $G$, the lower bound holds with equality only if the threshold is trivial.

**Theorem 2.9.** If for a graph $G$, we have $\theta(G) = D(G)$, then either $\theta(G) = 1$ or $\theta(G) = |V(G)|$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $G$ has some symmetries and in the contrary we have $\theta(G) < |V(G)|$. Let $\theta(G) = q$ and assume $\alpha$ is a non-identity automorphism of $G$ for which $|\alpha|$ is maximum and that $\alpha = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_r \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_s$ is the cycle decomposition of $\alpha$, where the cycles $\sigma_i$ are of lengths $\geq 2$ and the $\gamma_j$ have length 1. According to Lemma 2.2, we have $r + s = q - 1$. As $|\alpha|$ is maximum, with the same reason as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, the length of $\sigma_i$ is $p$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, where $p$ is a prime number. Since $q = D(G)$, every coloring of $G$ with $q - 1$ colors is non-distinguishing. We consider two cases.

**Case 1:** $r \geq 2$. In this case, we consider the following coloring $c$ with $q - 1$ colors. We color all the vertices in $\text{Supp}(\sigma_i)$, $i = 2, \ldots, r$, with the unique color $i$, and the vertex in $\text{Supp}(\gamma_j)$,
does not hold; for example, $K_{2,4}$ does not hold. As follows: for any graph $G$ which implies that $G$ is either the complete or the empty graph. Thus, we have a similar coloring argument, one deduces that this equality holds for any pair of vertices of $G$. The existence of a non-identity automorphism $\beta$ of $G$ which is not the identity and $|\beta^2| > |\alpha|$ which is a contradiction.

**Case 2:** $r = 1$. We split this case into the following two sub-cases.

**Case 2.1:** $s \geq 1$. Since $\theta(G) < |V(G)|$, according to Lemma 2.2, the length of $\sigma_1$ is at least 3. If its length is equal to 3, and $s = 1$, then $G$ has to be either $K_4$, $\overline{K_4}$, $K_{1,3}$ or $K_1 \cup K_3$, which is a contradiction.

On the other hand, if the length of $\sigma_1$ is equal to 3 and $s \geq 2$ or if the length of $\sigma_1$ is at least 5, then we consider the following coloring $c$ with $q - 1$ colors. We color the vertex in $\text{Supp}(\gamma_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$, with the color $j$; then, color a certain vertex $v \in \text{Supp}(\sigma_1)$ with color 1 and the other two vertices in $\text{Supp}(\sigma_1)$ with color $s + 1$. Then, since $c$ is not distinguishing, the existence of a non-identity automorphism $\beta$ of $G$, leads us to a similar contradiction as in Case 1.

**Case 2.2:** $s = 0$. In this case we have $\alpha = \sigma_1$ which, according to Lemma 2.2, implies that $\theta(G) = 2$. Now the assumption that $\theta(G) < |V(G)|$, contradicts Theorem 2.4. This completes the proof.

We note that the converse of Theorem 2.9 does not hold; for example $\theta(K_{n,n}) = |V(K_{n,n})|$ while $D(K_{n,n}) = n + 1$ (see [1]). Furthermore, in the light of Theorem 2.9, we can rephrase Theorem 2.4 as follows: for any graph $G$, $\theta(G) = D(G) = 2$ holds if and only if $G$ is either $K_2$ or $\overline{K_2}$. It turns out that we can generalize this result as follows.

**Corollary 2.10.** For a graph $G$ on $n$ vertices, we have $\theta(G) = D(G)$ if and only if $G$ is either asymmetric, the complete graph $K_n$ or the empty graph $\overline{K_n}$.

**Proof.** The “if” part is obvious. For the converse, suppose that $\text{Aut}(G)$ is not trivial. Note that according to Theorem 2.9, any coloring of $G$ with $n - 1$ colors is non-distinguishing. Consider two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ and color both of them with color 1 and assign a unique color $2, \ldots, n - 1$ to each of the other vertices of $G$. Since this coloring is not distinguishing, there is a non-identity automorphism $\beta$ of $G$ which swaps the vertices $u$ and $v$ and fixes all the other vertices. Thus $N(u) \setminus \{v\} = N(v) \setminus \{u\}$, where $N(u)$ is the set of neighbors of $u$. Using a similar coloring argument, one deduces that this equality holds for any pair of vertices of $G$, which implies that $G$ is either the complete or the empty graph.

As we noted in the introduction, the problem of distinguishing colorings of infinite graphs has been studied in many interesting research works. It is, therefore, an interesting problem to consider the distinguishing threshold for infinite graphs. We conclude this section with the following theorem which states that in order to guarantee that any coloring of an infinite graph breaks its non-trivial symmetries, one needs infinitely many colors.
Case 1. We have $|\alpha| = k < \infty$. In this case, there must be a cycle $\sigma_i$ in the cycle-representation of $\alpha = \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_k$, which contains infinitely many vertices. We assume that the set of moved points of $\sigma_i$ is countable and, hence, we can write

$$\sigma_i = (\ldots, v_{j_{-2}}, v_{j_{-1}}, v_{j_0}, v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \ldots).$$

We point out that if the set of moved points of $\sigma_i$ is not countable, then our proof is still valid but we must proceed into transfinite. Let $t < \infty$ be an arbitrary positive integer. Some cycles of $\alpha$ may contain finitely many vertices. Suppose that $\sigma_{w_1}, \sigma_{w_2}, \ldots, \sigma_{w_r}$ are all cycles of $\alpha$ which contain $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_r$ vertices, respectively, where $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_r$ are positive integers and $0 \leq r < k$. Then, let $q$ be the least common multiple of $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_r$ and $t$ if $r \geq 1$, or $q = t$ otherwise. Now, color all vertices of $\sigma_{w_1}, \sigma_{w_2}, \ldots, \sigma_{w_r}$ with color 1 and color the rest of vertices of $G$ as follows. Let $\gamma : \{0, 1, \ldots, q - 1\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$ be a surjective function. Such a function exists because $q \geq t$. Now, we choose a cycle $\sigma_i$, whose number of vertices is infinite, and color its vertex $v_{j_h}$ by $\gamma(h \mod q)$. We repeat this procedure until all infinite cycles of $\alpha$ are colored. The resulting coloring is a $t$-coloring for $G$ which is not distinguishing because $\alpha^q$ preserves it.

Case 2. We have $|\alpha| = \infty$. In this case, for any finite number $t$, there is a $t$-coloring that keeps every cycle of $\alpha$ mono-colored. Thus, again we have $\theta(G) > t$.

Therefore the result follows.

\[\square\]

3 Johnson Scheme

In this section we determine the distinguishing threshold of the graphs in the Johnson scheme. We assume that $n \geq 2k \geq 2$ are integers and denote the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ by $[n]$. For any $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we define the graph $J(n, k, i)$ to be the graph whose vertex set is the set of all $k$-subsets of $[n]$ and in which two vertices $A$ and $B$ are adjacent if $|A \cap B| = k - i$. It can be shown that the set $A = \{A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$, where $A_0$ is the identity matrix of order $\binom{n}{k}$ and, for any $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $A_i$ is the adjacency matrix of $J(n, k, k - i)$, constitutes an association scheme. (We refer the reader to, for example, [11] for detailed studies on association schemes.) This scheme is called the Johnson scheme, denoted by $J(n, k)$, and the classes $J(n, k, i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, are called the generalized Johnson graphs. The special cases of $J(n, k, k)$ and $J(n, k, 1)$ are called the Kneser graph, denoted by $K(n, k)$ and the Johnson graph, respectively.

The natural action of the symmetric group $\text{Sym}(n)$ on $[n]$, obviously preserves the adjacency-nonadjacency relations in $J(n, k, i)$, for any $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Therefore $\text{Sym}(n)$ is isomorphic to
a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i))$. The automorphism groups of the so-called “merged Johnson graphs” have been evaluated by Jones [21]. The merged Johnson graphs are, indeed, the unions of some graphs in the Johnson scheme. We re-state [21, Theorem 2] to suit our case, where we study the individual graphs in the scheme, i.e. the generalized Johnson graphs. We will use the notation $e = \binom{n}{2}$ and that given two groups $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$, the group $\Gamma_1 \wr \Gamma_2$ is their “wreath product”.

**Theorem 3.1.** Assume that $2 \leq k \leq n/2$.

(a) If $2 \leq k < \frac{n-1}{2}$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(n)$, for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

(b) If $k = \frac{n-1}{2}$ and $i \neq \frac{k+1}{2}$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(n)$.

(c) If $k = \frac{n-1}{2}$ and $i = \frac{k+1}{2}$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(n+1)$.

(d) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $k = 2$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(2) \wr \text{Sym}(3)$, for each $i = 1, 2$.

(e) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$, $k > 2$, $i < k$ and $i \neq \frac{k}{2}$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(2) \times \text{Sym}(n)$.

(f) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$, $k > 2$ and $i = \frac{k}{2}$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(2)^e : \text{Sym}(n)$.

(g) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$, $k > 2$ and $i = k$, then $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(2) \wr \text{Sym}(e)$.

Note that in the case (d), the Johnson scheme $J(n, k) = J(4, 2)$ has only two complementary graphs on 6 vertices, where $J(4, 2, 2) = K(4, 2)$ consists of 3 copies of $K_2$; hence the automorphism groups of $J(4, 2, 1)$ and $J(4, 2, 2)$ are isomorphic to $\text{Sym}(2) \wr \text{Sym}(3)$. Similarly, in the case (g), the generalize Johnson graph $J(2k, k, k)$, i.e. the Kneser graph $K(2k, k)$, consists of $e$ copies of $K_2$ resulting the mentioned automorphism group.

**Remark 3.2.** According to [21], the rather unusual action of $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i)) \cong \text{Sym}(n+1)$ mentioned in part (c) is as follows. We add an external object $\infty$ to $N = [n]$ to obtain a new set $N^* = \{1, \ldots, n, \infty\}$ and consider the natural action of $\text{Sym}(n+1)$ on $N^*$. If $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)$, in order to find the image of a vertex $X \in V(J(n, k, i))$ under the corresponding automorphism $\hat{\sigma}$ of $\text{Aut}(J(n, k, i))$, we construct the equipartition $(P_1, P_2) = (X \cup \{\infty\}, X \cup \{\infty, \infty\})$ of $N^*$. Then we make $\sigma$ act naturally on the pair $(P_1, P_2)$ to get $(P_1', P_2')$. The image $\hat{\sigma}(X)$ is, then, $P_j' \setminus \infty$, where $\infty \in P_j'$. Because of the adjacency condition on the generalized Johnson graph $J(n, k, i)$, this is indeed an automorphism. It is clear that of the stabilizer of $\infty$ in $\text{Sym}(n+1)$, which is equal to $\text{Sym}(n)$, acts naturally (as mentioned before Theorem 3.1) on the vertices of $J(n, k, i)$. Consider, for example, the case of $J(7, 3, 2)$ whose parameters satisfy the conditions in part (c). If $\sigma = (1 \ 2 \ \infty)(3 \ 4 \ 5)(6 \ 7) \in \text{Sym}(8)$ and $X = \{1, 2, 3\}, Y = \{3, 4, 5\} \in V(J(7, 3, 2))$, then $\hat{\sigma}(X) = \{2, 4, 1\}$ and $\hat{\sigma}(Y) = \{2, 7, 6\}$.

Using Theorem 3.1, one can evaluate the distinguishing number and the distinguishing threshold of the generalize Johnson graphs. We first note that the Kneser graph $K(n, 1) = J(n, 1, 1)$ is the complete graph $K_n$; hence $D(K(n, 1)) = K(n, 1) = n$. In addition, the Kneser
graph $K(5, 2) = J(5, 2, 2)$ is isomorphic to the Petersen graph. Albertson and Collins proved \cite{3} that the distinguishing number of the Petersen graph $K(5, 2)$ is equal to 3. It is surprising that for $k \geq 2$, the Petersen graph is the only Kneser graph which is not 2-distinguishable. In fact, Albertson and Boutin have proved \cite{2} that for any $n \neq 5$ and $k \geq 2$, it is the case that $D(K(n, k)) = 2$. Furthermore, based on Theorem 3.1, Kim et al. in \cite{24} evaluated the distinguishing number of all merged Johnson graphs which generalized the above results. Similar to Theorem 3.1, we rephrase their results in terms of single classes of the Johnson scheme as follows.

**Theorem 3.3.** Assume that $2 \leq k \leq n/2$.

(a) If $n = 5$ and $k = 2$, then $D(J(n, k, 1)) = D(J(n, k, 2)) = 3$.

(b) If $n \neq 5$ and $2 \leq k < \frac{n}{2}$, then $D(J(n, k, i)) = 2$, for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

(c) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $i \notin \{\frac{k}{2}, k\}$, then $D(J(n, k, i)) = 2$.

(d) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $i = \frac{k}{2}$, then $D(J(n, k, i)) = 3$.

(e) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $i = k$, then $D(J(n, k, i)) = \left\lceil \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 8k}}{2} \right\rceil$.

We now turn our attention to the problem of determining the distinguishing threshold of the graphs in the Johnson scheme. As mentioned above, $J(n, 1)$ consists only of the complete graph $K_n$; hence $\theta(J(n, 1, 1)) = n$. Thus we consider, only, the case where $k \geq 2$.

**Theorem 3.4.** Assume that $2 \leq k \leq n/2$.

(a) If $2 \leq k < n/2$, then $\theta(J(n, k, i)) = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-2}{k-1} + 1$, for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

(b) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $i \in \{\frac{k}{2}, k\}$, then $\theta(J(n, k, i)) = \binom{n}{k}$.

(c) If $k = \frac{n}{2}$ and $i \notin \{\frac{k}{2}, k\}$, then $\theta(J(n, k, i)) = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-2}{k-1} + 1$.

**Proof.** We denote $J(n, k, i)$ by $J$ and the number of vertices of $J$ by $v$. In order to show (a), first we note, according to Theorem 3.1, that $\text{Aut}(J) \cong \text{Sym}(n)$ or $\text{Sym}(n + 1)$. Consider the automorphism $\tilde{\alpha} \in \text{Aut}(J)$ defined as

$$\tilde{\alpha} = (X_1 \cup \{1\}, X_1 \cup \{2\}) (X_2 \cup \{1\}, X_2 \cup \{2\}) \cdots (X_r \cup \{1\}, X_r \cup \{2\}),$$

where $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ are all the $(k - 1)$-subsets of $\{3, 4, \ldots, n\}$ and, hence,

$$r = \binom{n-2}{k-1}.$$ 

Note that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the image of the transposition $\alpha = (1, 2) \in \text{Sym}(n)$ or $\alpha = (1, 2) \in \text{Sym}(n + 1)$ under action of $\text{Sym}(n)$ or $\text{Sym}(n + 1)$, respectively, on $J$. The number of cycles in $\tilde{\alpha}$ is

$$|\tilde{\alpha}| = v - r = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-2}{k-1}. \quad (3.1)$$
Hence, according to Lemma 2.2, it suffices to show that \(|\tilde{\alpha}|\) is maximum in \(\text{Aut}(J)\). Assume first that \(\text{Aut}(J) \cong \text{Sym}(n)\) and let \(\beta \in \text{Sym}(n)\) be any non-identity permutation and \(\tilde{\beta}\) be its image in \(\text{Aut}(J)\). Let \(M\) be the set of moved points of \(\beta\) acting on \([n]\) and that \(m = |M|\); hence \(1 < m \leq n\). A vertex \(X \in V(J)\) is fixed under the action of \(\beta\) on \(V(J)\) if and only if \(M \cap X = \emptyset\) or \(M \subseteq X\). Therefore the number of vertices in \(V(J)\) fixed by \(\tilde{\beta}\) is \(x = \binom{n-m}{k-m} + \binom{n-m}{k}\), and the number of vertices moved by \(\tilde{\beta}\) is \(\binom{n}{k} - x\). It then follows that

\[
|\tilde{\beta}| \leq x + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \binom{n}{k} - x \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \binom{n}{k} + x \right].
\]

On the other hand,

\[
x \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-2}{k}.
\]

Hence

\[
|\tilde{\beta}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[ \binom{n}{k} + \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-2}{k} \right] = |\tilde{\alpha}|.
\]

which proves the claim.

Now we assume that \(\text{Aut}(J) \cong \text{Sym}(n+1)\). Suppose \(\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)\). According to Remark 3.2, if \(\sigma\) fixes \(\infty\), then similar to the previous case, we have \(|\tilde{\sigma}| \leq |\tilde{\alpha}|\). Hence, we assume that \(\sigma(\infty) \neq \infty\). A vertex \(X\) of \(J\) is fixed by the automorphism \(\tilde{\sigma}\), if and only if \(X\) is set-wise stabilized under the action of \(\sigma\). Thus, in order to have the most number of fixed vertices, \(\sigma\) must have a largest fixed set. We conclude that \(|\tilde{\sigma}|\) is maximized when \(\sigma\) is a transposition. Without loss of generality, we assume that \(\sigma = (1 \infty)\). Then it is easy to see that

\[
\tilde{\sigma} = (X_1, X_1 \cup \{1\})(X_2, X_2 \cup \{1\}) \cdots (X_s, X_s \cup \{1\}),
\]

where \(X_i\) are all the \(k\)-subsets of \(\{2, 3, \ldots, n\}\). Hence

\[
|\tilde{\sigma}| = \binom{n}{k} - \frac{1}{2} \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \binom{n}{k} - \frac{k}{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-2}{k-1} = |\tilde{\alpha}|,
\]

which complete the proof of (a).

Part (b) follows from the fact that the map which swaps the two vertices \(\{1, \ldots, k\}\) and \(\{k+1, \ldots, n\}\) and fixes all the other vertices of \(J\), is indeed an automorphism of \(J\) having \(v-1\) cycles.

To show part (c), the map \(\tilde{\alpha}\) defined in part (a) is in \(\text{Aut}(J)\) in this case, as well. Hence it suffices to show that it, again, has the largest number of cycles in \(\text{Aut}(J)\). According to Theorem 3.1, \(\text{Aut}(J) \cong \text{Sym}(2) \times \text{Sym}(n)\). In fact, the complementation map \(\delta\) is an automorphism of \(J\) (of order two) and any automorphism \(\tilde{\gamma}\) of \(J\) is of the form \(\tilde{\gamma} = \delta^j \beta = \tilde{\beta} \delta^j\), where \(j = 0\) or \(1\) and \(\tilde{\beta}\) is the image of a permutation \(\beta \in \text{Sym}(n)\) under the natural action of \(\text{Sym}(n)\) on \([n]\). This implies that \(|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\tilde{\alpha}|\) and, hence, the result follows. \(\square\)

In [1], the distinguishing threshold of the Kneser graphs \(K(n, 2)\) has been determined. We point out that Theorem 3.4 generalizes this result to all Kneser graphs \(K(n, k)\).
4 Conclusion and future work

The problem of finding the distinguishing threshold of a graph seems an interesting problem and in this paper we considered it in more depth. Along with characterising the graphs with small thresholds, we established a strong connection between the threshold and the cycle structure of the automorphisms of the graph and, using this approach, we could completely evaluate the thresholds of generalized Johnson graphs.

We conclude the paper with consider a similar problem for the Cayley graphs Cay(Γ, S). While the distinguishing number and the distinguishing index of Cayley graphs are studied by Alikhani and Soltani [5], we propose the following problem in which the knowledge of the structures of the automorphism groups can play a key role.

Problem. Evaluate the distinguishing threshold of Cayley graphs.

We recall that for any g ∈ Γ, the action of Γ on itself by left multiplication by g, naturally induces an automorphism of Cay(Γ, S) (which, in turn, shows that Cayley graphs are vertex-transitive). Therefore, in this case, one already knows that Γ is isomorphic to a subgroup of Aut(Cay(Γ, S)). Indeed the family of Cayley graphs is another family of graphs whose automorphism groups have been studied extensively; see for example [20] by Jajcay. As mentioned in Section 2, we consider only the connected Cayley graphs, i.e. the graphs Cay(Γ, S) in which S generates the group Γ. Based on examples, the problem looks quite challenging. For instance, the complete graphs are Cayley graphs with trivial thresholds while the Cayley graphs Cay(Zn, {a, −a}), where 0 ̸= a is relatively prime to n, are cycles whose thresholds are ⌊n/2⌋ + 2 for n ≥ 3, which is not trivial. As another example where the group is abelian but not cyclic, consider G6 = Cay(Z2 ⊕ Z3, {(1, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2)}); see Figure 6.

![Figure 6: The graph G6.](image)

It is not hard to see that the map α which swaps the two vertices (0, 1) and (0, 2) and the two vertices (1, 1) and (1, 2), and fixes the other vertices, is an automorphism of G6 with |α| = 4 which is maximum. Thus, according to Lemma 2.2, we have θ(G6) = 5 which displays another non-trivial example. Further, as a non-abelian non-trivial example, one can consider G24 = Cay(S4, {(1, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4)}) on the symmetric group S4 which is a connected cubic bipartite graph. With an easy computer search, we observe that there is an α ∈ Aut(G24) which is the product of 8 transpositions and, hence, |α| = 16 which is maximum and so we have θ(G24) = 17 which is far less than the number of vertices.
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