

# Choiceless Polynomial Time with Witnessed Symmetric Choice

Moritz Lichter  
TU Darmstadt

`lichter@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

Pascal Schweitzer  
TU Darmstadt

`schweitzer@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`

August 2, 2022

## Abstract

We extend Choiceless Polynomial Time (CPT), the currently only remaining promising candidate in the quest for a logic capturing PTIME, so that this extended logic has the following property: for every class of structures for which isomorphism is definable, the logic automatically captures PTIME.

For the construction of this logic we extend CPT by a witnessed symmetric choice operator. This operator allows for choices from definable orbits. But, to ensure polynomial time evaluation, automorphisms have to be provided to certify that the choice set is indeed an orbit.

We argue that, in this logic, definable isomorphism implies definable canonization. Thereby, our construction removes the non-trivial step of extending isomorphism definability results to canonization. This step was a part of proofs that show that CPT or other logics capture PTIME on a particular class of structures. The step typically required substantial extra effort.

## 1 Introduction

One of the central open problems in descriptive complexity theory is the quest for a logic capturing PTIME [15]. This long-standing open problem [4] asks for a logic in which precisely all polynomial-time decidable properties can be expressed as a sentence and for which all formulas can be evaluated in polynomial time. The alternative would be to prove the nonexistence of such a logic, which would however imply a separation of PTIME and NPTIME [11].

---

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (EngageS: grant agreement No. 820148).

While the general quest for a PTIME-logic remains wide open, progress generally comes in one of two flavors: research results either show that some logic captures PTIME for an ever more extensive class of structures, or a logic is separated from PTIME, ruling it out as a candidate for a PTIME logic. In this paper we are concerned with a third flavor, namely with reducing the question to a presumably simpler one.

Historically, almost all results showing that PTIME is captured by some logic for some graph class exploit the Immerman-Vardi theorem [21] which states that inflationary fixed-point logic IFP captures PTIME on ordered graphs. To apply this theorem to a class of unordered graphs, one defines canonization of that class inside a logic (which at least captures IFP). Defining canonization is the task of defining an isomorphic, ordered copy of the input graph. In algorithmic contexts, canonization is closely related to the problem of isomorphism testing. While polynomial time canonization provides polynomial time isomorphism testing, a reduction the other way is unknown. Granted, for most graph classes for which a polynomial time isomorphism algorithm is known, a canonization algorithm is known as well (see [30]). However, we know of no reduction that is universally applicable. Studying the analogous relationship for logics, we are interested in the question of whether definability of the isomorphism problem within a PTIME logic for some graph class provides us with a logic for all of PTIME on that graph class.

Since we do not know that graph isomorphism is polynomial-time solvable in general, it is of course not clear that in a logic for PTIME the isomorphism problem needs to be definable. However, for all graphs on which a logic has been shown to capture PTIME, a polynomial time isomorphism testing algorithm is known [16, 17, 24, 31]. Crucially, in every PTIME-capturing logic for such graph classes, in particular isomorphism testing has to be definable. With a reduction from canonization we then obtain a necessary and sufficient condition, namely the definability of the isomorphism problem.

Regarding the issue of isomorphism versus canonization, we should highlight that defining canonization often appears to require considerably more effort than defining the isomorphism problem [16, 17].

In this paper we present a logic in which a definable isomorphism test automatically implies a definable canonization. After rank logic was recently eliminated as a candidate of a logic capturing PTIME [23], we consider an extension of the one major remaining candidate, namely Choiceless Polynomial Time (CPT) [1]. The logic CPT operates on hereditarily finite sets formed from the vertices of the input graph. The construction of these sets is isomorphism-invariant, which guarantees that every CPT term or formula evaluates to an isomorphism-invariant result. This is generally regarded as a requirement for a reasonable logic [19]. The requirement has an important consequence: while in algorithms it is common to make choices that are not necessarily isomorphism invariant (e.g., pick the first neighbor of a vertex within a DFS-transversal and then process it), this cannot be done in CPT – one has to process all possible choices in equal fashion. For algorithms making choices, we have to prove that they compute the correct (in particular isomorphism-invariant) result, but in a logic this property should be built-in. One possibility to overcome this problem was studied by Gire and Hoang [12] as well as by Dawar and Richerby [7]. They extended IFP with a symmetric choice construct, which allows that during a fixed-point computation in every step one element can be chosen from a set that has been defined. But, in order to ensure isomorphism-invariance, these choice sets have to be orbits of the graph. The output of such a fixed-point computation

with choices is not necessarily isomorphism-invariant. However, at least we are guaranteed that all possible outputs are related via automorphisms of the graph, independent of the choices that were made. Crucially, the logics are designed so that fixed-point computations are used only as “intermediate results” to overall define a property in the end. Since this property is either true or false, the output of a formula is isomorphism-invariant after all.

While this approach of introducing symmetric choices yields a reasonable logic, it is not clear whether its formulas can be evaluated in polynomial time. Indeed, when a choice is to be made, it has to be verified that the choice set is actually an orbit and it is not known that orbits can be computed in polynomial time. This is resolved in [12] by handing over the obligation to check that the choice sets are orbits to the formulas themselves. For this, the formulas, beside defining the choice set, also have to define automorphisms which can be used to check whether the choice set is indeed an orbit. That way, the logic can be evaluated in polynomial time. We apply a similar approach to CPT. A fixed-point operator is added, in which in every iteration a choice is made from a choice set. For each choice set, automorphisms certifying that the choice set is indeed an orbit have to be provided by the formula. We call this witnessed symmetric choice (WSC).

So why should witnessed symmetric choice in CPT suffice to show that isomorphism testing and canonization are equivalent? Here we build on two existing results. The first one [18] shows that in CPT a definable isomorphism test implies a definable complete invariant, that is, an ordered object can be defined which is equal for two input structures if and only if they are isomorphic. The second, more classical result is due to Gurevich [20]. It shows how an algorithm computing complete invariants can be turned into an algorithm computing a canonization. This algorithm requires that the class of graphs is closed under individualization, (that is, under coloring individual vertices). While being closed under individualization is a restriction in some contexts [22, Theorem 33], this is usually not the case [22, 25]. The canonization algorithm repeatedly uses the complete invariant to compute a canonical orbit, chooses and individualizes one vertex in that orbit, and proceeds until all vertices are individualized. Thereby, a total order on the vertices is defined. And indeed, this algorithm can be expressed in CPT extended by witnessed symmetric choice and a definable complete invariant can be turned into a definable canonization.

**Results.** We extend CPT with a fixed-point operator with witnessed symmetric choice and obtain the logic CPT+WSC. Here some small, but important formal changes to [12, 7] have to be made so that we can successfully implement a variant of Gurevich’s canonization algorithm in CPT+WSC. However, we prefer to have a logic so that definability of the isomorphism problem implies that the same logic captures PTIME rather than just an extension. To show precisely this property for CPT+WSC turns out to be rather difficult and formally intricate in several aspects. Indeed, we lift a result of [18] from CPT to CPT+WSC thereby showing the following: if CPT+WSC defines isomorphism of a class of structures closed under individualization, then it defines a complete invariant and using the mentioned canonization algorithm CPT+WSC defines a canonization, too. Overall, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 1.** *If CPT+WSC defines isomorphism of a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  (closed under individualization), then CPT+WSC defines a canonization of  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures and captures PTIME on  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures.*

Finally, we apply these results to the Cai-Fürer-Immerman query [3] and construct a class of base graphs, for which the CFI-query was not known to be definable in CPT.

**Our Technique.** To ensure that fixed-point operators with witnessed symmetric choice always yield isomorphism-invariant results, we follow the approach of [12, 7]. Every such fixed-point operator comes with a formula, called the output formula, which is evaluated on the (not necessarily isomorphism-invariantly) defined fixed-point. We use the formal techniques of [7] to define the semantics of this fixed-point operator. The most important difference is that the term producing witnessing automorphism also has access to the defined fixed-point. This turned out to be crucial to implement Gurevich’s canonization algorithm and in turn necessitates other minor formal differences to [7] and [12]. Equipped with these changes, extending Gurevich’s canonization algorithm to also provide witnessing automorphism becomes rather straightforward.

This shows that a definable isomorphism problem in CPT implies that CPT+WSC is a logic capturing PTIME. For our theorem however, we require that the statement is true whenever isomorphism is definable in CPT+WSC rather than CPT. Therefore, we require that a CPT+WSC-definable isomorphism test implies the existence of a CPT+WSC-definable complete invariant. We therefore extend the DeepWL computation model used in [18] to show the very same statement for CPT to deal with witnessed symmetric choices. The proof of [18] is based on a translation of CPT to DeepWL, a normalization procedure in DeepWL yielding the complete invariant, and a translation back into CPT. Unfortunately, it turned out that this normalization procedure cannot be easily adapted to DeepWL with witnessed symmetric choice. At multiple points we have to change small but essential parts of definitions and so cannot reuse as many results of [18] as one would have liked. The philosophical reason for this is that DeepWL is based on constructing everything in parallel (for all possible inputs), which is incompatible with choices. We cannot compute with different possible choices at the same time in the same graph, as these choices influence each other. This forced us to nest DeepWL-algorithms to, in some way, resemble nested fixed-point operators with witnessed symmetric choice.

**Related Work.** In the quest for a PTIME logic, IFP extended by counting quantifiers was shown not to capture PTIME [3], but used to capture PTIME on various graph classes. These include graphs with excluded minors [16] and graphs with bounded rank width [17]. Both results take the route via canonization. On the negative side, rank logic [23] and the more general linear algebraic logic [6] were separated from PTIME.

CPT was shown to capture PTIME on various classes of structures, for example on padded structures [2] (i.e. on disjoint unions of arbitrary structures and sufficiently large cliques), structures with bounded color class size whose automorphism groups are abelian [31], and on (some) structures with bounded color class size whose automorphism groups are dihedral groups [24]. Here also, each of the results is obtained via canonization. Philosophically, all these approaches are somewhat orthogonal to witnessed symmetric choice. They use the fact that some set of objects, for which it is not known whether they

form orbits, is small enough to try out all possible choices. The CFI-query on ordered base graphs was shown to be CPT-definable [9] using deeply nested sets invariant under all isomorphisms. These results were generalized to base graphs with logarithmic color class size and to graphs with linear maximal degree [28]. In CPT+WSC defining the CFI-query on ordered base graphs is comparatively easier similar to IFP with witnessed symmetric choice in [12]. While it is in general still open whether CPT captures PTIME, there are isomorphism invariant functions not definable in CPT [29], see also [26] for more recent work on limits of definability in CPT.

The extension of first order logic with non-witnessed symmetric choice was studied in [12, 7]. Whenever the choice set is not an orbit, nothing is chosen. The more general variant in [7] supports parameters for fixed-point operators with symmetric choice and as such allows fixed-point operators to be nested. We followed most of these approaches and generalized the usage of quantifiers to output formulas in order to wrap the calculated fixed-point in an isomorphism-invariant output. While in the first-order setting the fixed-point operators are tied to define relations, in the CPT setting we can of course define arbitrary hereditarily finite sets. For these sets output formulas seem more suitable than solely quantifiers. Dropping the requirement of choosing from orbits is also studied in [8], called nondeterministic choice. When only formulas are considered which always produce a deterministic result, one captures PTIME. But since it is not decidable whether a formula has this property, this does not yield a logic in which formulas can be evaluated in polynomial time and thus not a candidate for PTIME logic.

**Structure of the Paper.** After reviewing some preliminaries and in particular CPT in Section 2, we extend CPT with a fixed-point operator with witnessed symmetric choice in Section 3. In Section 4 we implement the canonization algorithm and show the equivalence between isomorphism and canonization, apart from the crucial point that definable isomorphism implies a definable complete invariant. This is shown in Section 5, which introduces and extends the DeepWL model. Finally, we apply these techniques in Section 6 to the CFI-query. We end with a discussion and open questions in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminaries

We denote with  $[k]$  the set  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  and the  $i$ -th entry of a tuple  $\bar{t} \in N^k$  (for some set  $N$ ) with  $t_i$ . The disjoint union of two sets  $N$  and  $M$  is  $N \uplus M$ .

A (relational) signature  $\tau = \{R_1, \dots, R_\ell\}$  consists of a set of relation symbols with associated arities  $r_i \in \mathbb{N}$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . A  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a tuple  $\mathfrak{A} = (A, R_1^{\mathfrak{A}}, \dots, R_\ell^{\mathfrak{A}})$  where  $R_i^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq A^{r_i}$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . We always denote the universe of  $\mathfrak{A}$  by  $A$  and call its elements atoms. The disjoint union of two structures  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  is  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$ . The reduct of a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  to a signature  $\tau' \subseteq \tau$  is  $\mathfrak{A} \upharpoonright \tau'$ . This paper only considers finite structures.

The *hereditarily finite sets over*  $A$ , denoted by  $\text{HF}(A)$ , for some set of atoms  $A$  is the inclusion-wise smallest set such that  $A \subseteq \text{HF}(A)$  and  $a \in \text{HF}(A)$  for every finite  $a \subseteq \text{HF}(A)$ . A set  $a \in \text{HF}(A)$  is transitive, if  $c \in b \in a$  for some  $b$  implies  $c \in a$ . The *transitive closure*  $\text{TC}(a)$  of  $a$  is the least (with respect to set inclusion) transitive set  $b$  with  $a \subseteq b$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure and  $\bar{a}$  be a tuple of  $\text{HF}(A)$ -sets. We write  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$  for the group

of automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  for the group of automorphisms  $\varphi$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  which stabilize each of the  $\text{HF}(A)$ -sets  $a_i$ , i.e.  $\varphi(a_i) = a_i$ , for all  $i \in [|\bar{a}|]$ . A set  $b \in \text{HF}(A)$  is an **orbit of**  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  if  $b = \{\varphi(c) \mid \varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))\}$  for one (and thus every)  $c \in b$ . We also use the orbit notion for other objects, e.g. tuples (which could of course be encoded as hereditarily finite sets): if  $b$  is a set of  $k$ -tuples of atoms, we call  $b$  a  **$k$ -orbit**. We write  $\text{orbs}_k(\mathfrak{A})$  for the set of  $k$ -orbits of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

## Choiceless Polynomial Time

The logic CPT was introduced by Blass, Gurevich, and Shelah [1] using a pseudocode-like syntax. Later there were “logical” definitions using iteration terms or fixed points. To give a concise definition of CPT, we follow [13] and use ideas of e.g. [27] to enforce polynomial bounds.

Let  $\tau$  be a signature and extend  $\tau$  by adding set-theoretic function symbols  $\tau^{\text{HF}} := \tau \uplus \{\emptyset, \text{Atoms}, \text{Pair}, \text{Union}, \text{Unique}, \text{Card}\}$ , where  $\emptyset$  and  $\text{Atoms}$  are constants,  $\text{Union}$ ,  $\text{Unique}$ , and  $\text{Card}$  are unary, and  $\text{Pair}$  is binary. The **hereditarily finite expansion**  $\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})$  of a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a  $\tau^{\text{HF}}$ -structure over the universe  $\text{HF}(A)$  defined as follows: all relations in  $\tau$  are interpreted as they are in  $\mathfrak{A}$ . The special function symbols have the expected set theoretic interpretation:

- $\emptyset^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})} = \emptyset$  and  $\text{Atoms}^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})} = A$ ,
- $\text{Pair}^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})}(a, b) = \{a, b\}$ ,
- $\text{Union}^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})}(a) = \{b \mid \exists c \in a. b \in c\}$ ,
- $\text{Unique}^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})}(a) = \begin{cases} b & \text{if } a = \{b\} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ , and
- $\text{Card}^{\text{HF}(\mathfrak{A})}(a) = \begin{cases} |a| & \text{if } a \notin A \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ ,

where the number  $|a|$  is encoded as a von Neumann ordinal.

Note that the  $\text{Unique}$  function is invariant under automorphisms because it only evaluates non-trivially when applied to singleton sets.

The logic CPT is obtained as the polynomial time fragment of the logic BGS (after Blass, Gurevich, and Shelah [1]): A **BGS term** is composed of variables and function symbols from  $\tau^{\text{HF}}$  and the two following constructs: if  $s(\bar{x}, y)$  and  $t(\bar{x})$  are terms with a sequence of free variables  $\bar{x}$  (and an additional free variable  $y$  in the case of  $s$ ) and  $\Phi(\bar{x}, y)$  is a formula with free variables  $\bar{x}$  and  $y$  then  $r(\bar{x}) = \{s(\bar{x}, y) \mid y \in t(\bar{x}), \Phi(\bar{x}, y)\}$  is a **comprehension term** with free variables  $\bar{x}$ . For a term  $s(\bar{x}, y)$  with free variables  $\bar{x}$  and  $y$  the **iteration term**  $s[y]^*(\bar{x})$  has free variables<sup>1</sup>  $\bar{x}$ . **BGS formulas** are obtained as  $R(t_1, \dots, t_k)$  (for  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $k$  and BGS terms  $t_1, \dots, t_k$ ), as  $t_1 = t_2$ , and as the usual Boolean connectives.

---

<sup>1</sup>Here we differ from the definition in [13], in which  $s$  is only allowed to have one free variable  $y$ . For CPT, allowing more free variables does not increase expressiveness, but for our extensions later it is useful to allow additional free variables in an iteration term.

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure. BGS terms and formulas are evaluated over  $\mathbf{HF}(A)$  by the denotation  $\llbracket t \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}: \mathbf{HF}(A)^k \rightarrow \mathbf{HF}(A)$  that maps values  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbf{HF}(A)^k$  for the free variables  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  of a term  $s$  to the value of  $s$  obtained if we replace  $x_i$  with  $a_i$  (for  $i \in [k]$ ). For a formula  $\Phi$  with free variables  $\bar{x}$ , the denotation  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is the set of all  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbf{HF}(A)^k$  satisfying  $\Phi$ .

The denotation of a comprehension term  $r$  as above is the following:  $\llbracket r \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}) = \{\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b) \mid b \in \llbracket t \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), (\bar{a}b) \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ , where  $\bar{a}b$  denotes the tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_k, b)$ . An iteration term  $s[y]^*(\bar{x})$  for a tuple  $\bar{b} \in \mathbf{HF}(A)^{|\bar{x}|}$  with sets for the free variables defines a sequence of sets via  $a_0 := \emptyset$  and  $a_{i+1} := \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}a_i)$ . Let  $\ell := \ell(s[y]^*, \mathfrak{A}, \bar{b})$  be the least number  $i$  such that  $a_{i+1} = a_i$ . If such an  $\ell$  exists we set  $\llbracket s[y]^* \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}) := a_\ell$  and we set  $\llbracket s[y]^* \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}) := \emptyset$  otherwise.

A CPT term (or formula, respectively) is a tuple  $(t, p)$  (or  $(\Phi, p)$ , respectively) of a BGS term (or formula) and a polynomial  $p(n)$ . The semantics of CPT is derived from BGS by replacing  $t$  with  $(t, p)$  everywhere (or  $\Phi$  with  $(\Phi, p)$ ) with the following exception for iteration terms: We define  $\llbracket (s[y]^*, p) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}) := \llbracket s[y]^* \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b})$  if  $\ell(s[y]^*, \mathfrak{A}, \bar{b}) \leq p(|A|)$  and  $|\mathbf{TC}(a_i)| \leq p(|A|)$  for all  $i$ , where the  $a_i$  are defined as above. Otherwise, we set  $\llbracket (s[y]^*, p) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}) := \emptyset$ . The size of  $a_i$  is measured by  $|\mathbf{TC}(a_i)|$  because by transitivity  $\mathbf{TC}(a_i)$  contains all sets  $b_k \in \dots \in b_1 \in a_i$  occurring somewhere in the structure of  $a_i$ . It suffices to put polynomial bounds on iteration terms, because all other terms increase the size of the defined sets only polynomially.

## Logical Interpretations

We use a simple notion of a CPT-interpretation in this paper. Let  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  be relational signatures and write  $\text{CPT}[\tau]$  respectively  $\text{CPT}[\sigma]$  for CPT formulas or terms over the signatures  $\tau$  or  $\sigma$ . A  $\text{CPT}[\tau, \sigma]$ -interpretation  $\Theta$  with parameters  $\bar{x}$  is a tuple  $\Theta = (s(\bar{x}), \Phi_1(\bar{x}\bar{y}_1), \dots, \Phi_k(\bar{x}\bar{y}_k))$  of a  $\text{CPT}[\tau]$ -term  $s$  and  $\text{CPT}[\tau]$ -formulas  $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_k$ , where  $\sigma = \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$  and if  $R_i$  is of arity  $j$ , then  $|\bar{y}_i| = j$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure and  $\bar{a} \in A^{|\bar{x}|}$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -structure  $\Theta(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  has atoms  $B := \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  and for every  $j \in [k]$  the relation  $R_i$  of arity  $j$  is defined by  $R_i^{\Theta(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})} := \{\bar{b} \in B^j \mid \bar{a}\bar{b} \in \llbracket \Phi_i \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ . Note that for CPT no equivalence or the notion of a dimension of an interpretation is needed as in the case of FO, because CPT can define the equivalence classes and tuples in terms of sets itself.

## 3 CPT with a Symmetric Choice Operator

We start by extending BGS with a fixed-point operator with witnessed symmetric choice (WSC-fixed-point operator). The logic BGS+WSC is the extension of BGS logic by the following operator to construct formulas:

$$\Psi(\bar{z}) = \text{WSC}^*xy. (s_{\text{step}}(\bar{z}xy), s_{\text{choice}}(\bar{z}x), s_{\text{wit}}(\bar{z}xy), \Phi_{\text{out}}(\bar{z}x)).$$

Here,  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ , and  $s_{\text{wit}}$  are BGS+WSC terms and  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$  is a BGS+WSC formula. The free variables of  $s_{\text{step}}$  and  $s_{\text{wit}}$  apart from  $x$  and  $y$  and the free variables of  $s_{\text{choice}}$  and  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$  apart from  $x$  are free in  $\Psi$ . In particular,  $y$  is only bound in  $s_{\text{step}}$  and  $s_{\text{wit}}$ . We call  $s_{\text{step}}$  the **step term**,  $s_{\text{choice}}$  the **choice term**,  $s_{\text{wit}}$  the **witnessing term**, and  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$

the *output formula*. Intuitively, we want to iterate the step term  $s_{\text{step}}(x, y)$  until we reach a fixed-point for the set  $x$ . However, we choose before each step an element  $y$  of the choice set defined by the choice term  $s_{\text{choice}}(x)$ . Once a fixed-point is reached, the witnessing term  $s_{\text{wit}}$  must provide automorphisms for every intermediate step witnessing that we indeed chose from orbits (details later). Finally,  $\Psi$  is satisfied if the output formula  $\Phi_{\text{out}}(a)$  is satisfied where  $a$  is the set computed through iteration with choice. Because we always choose from orbits,  $\Phi_{\text{out}}(a)$  is satisfied by some fixed-point  $a$  if and only if it is satisfied for every possible fixed-point  $a$  (details also later). In that way, the evaluation of BGS+WSC terms and formulas is still deterministic, so do not depend on any choices made in the fixed-point computation.

We remark that here it seems reasonable to allow free variables in iteration terms. Otherwise, they cannot be used in  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ ,  $s_{\text{wit}}$ , and  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$ . While in plain CPT or BGS it is clear that nested iteration terms can be eliminated, this is not immediately clear but at least convenient in BGS+WSC.

**An example.** To illustrate the definition we discuss an example. A *universal vertex* is a vertex adjacent to every other vertex. A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a *threshold graph* if we can reduce it to the empty graph by repeatedly removing a universal or an isolated vertex. Our example describes a CPT+WSC-sentence that defines the class of threshold graphs (which we only do for illustration as the class of threshold graphs is already IFP-definable). The idea is simple: the set of vertices that are universal or isolated form an orbit (note that a graph on more than one vertex cannot have a universal and an isolated vertex at the same time). Thus, we use a WSC-fixed-point operator to choose one such vertex, remove it, and repeat this, until no vertex can be removed anymore.

We start with the choice term  $s_{\text{choice}}(x)$ . For a set  $x \subseteq V$  the following term defines the set of vertices that are universal or isolated in  $G[V \setminus x]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} r &:= \mathbf{Atoms} \setminus x, \\ s_{\text{choice}}(x) &:= \{y \mid y \in r, (\forall z \in r. y = z \vee E(y, z)) \vee (\forall z \in r. y = z \vee \neg E(y, z))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the step term  $s_{\text{step}}(x, y)$  adds a chosen vertex  $y$  to those already removed:

$$s_{\text{step}}(x, y) := x \cup (\{y\} \cap \mathbf{Atoms}).$$

The intersection with  $\mathbf{Atoms}$  is needed to obtain a fixed-point when  $s_{\text{choice}}$  defines the empty set. As certification, the term  $t(z, z')$  defines the transposition of  $z$  and  $z'$  and the witnessing term  $s_{\text{wit}}(x)$  collects all transpositions of pairs of vertices in the choice set<sup>2</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} t(z, z') &:= \{(x, x) \mid x \in \mathbf{Atoms} \setminus \{z, z'\}\} \cup \{(z, z'), (z', z)\} \\ s_{\text{wit}}(x) &:= \{t(z, z') \mid (z, z') \in x^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the output formula  $\Phi_{\text{out}}(x) := x = \mathbf{Atoms}$  checks whether all vertices have been removed. Overall the following formula defines the class of threshold graphs:

$$\text{WSC}^*xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, \Phi_{\text{out}}).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Technically the witnessing term should have a second free variable, that we do not use here.

The WSC-fixed-point operator will compute the fixed-point of the variable  $x$  starting with  $x_0 = \emptyset$  as initial value for  $x$ . First, the term  $s_{\text{choice}}(a_0)$  is evaluated to define the first choice set  $y_0$  of all universal or isolated vertices of  $G$ . Then one such vertex  $u$  is chosen and the step term  $s_{\text{step}}(x_0, \{u\})$  is evaluated yielding  $x_1 = \{u\}$ .

Now inductively assume that  $x_i$  contains all vertices removed so far. Then  $y_i$  is the set of all universal or isolated vertices of  $G[V \setminus x_i]$ , this is now an orbit of  $(G, x_i)$  (in fact, an orbit of  $(G, x_0, \dots, x_i)$ ). So again, a vertex  $u \in y_i$  is chosen and added by  $s_{\text{step}}$  to  $x_i$  yielding the set  $x_{i+1}$ .

So finally assume the case that  $y_i$  is empty. Then nothing is chosen and the step term evaluated and yields  $s_{\text{step}}(x_i, \emptyset) = x_i$ , so a fixed-point is reached. Then the output formula defines whether it was possible to remove all vertices.

Now, the WSC-fixed-point operator evaluates the witnessing term to certify that indeed all choices were made from orbits. As argued before, all choice sets are indeed orbits and the term  $s_{\text{wit}}(y_i)$  outputs for every  $y_i$  a set of automorphisms, that for every  $u, v \in y_i$  contains an automorphism mapping  $u$  to  $v$  and so it is certified that the choice sets indeed are orbits.

### 3.1 Semantics of Symmetric Choice Operators

We now define the precise semantics. We define evaluation of WSC-fixed-point operators for general isomorphism-invariant functions. This makes the definition independent of the semantics of CPT and we can reuse it later in Section 5.

**Definition 2** (Isomorphism-Invariant Function). *For a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^*$ , a function  $f: \text{HF}(A)^k \rightarrow \text{HF}(A)$  is called  **$(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ -isomorphism-invariant** if every automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  satisfies  $f(\varphi(\bar{b})) = \varphi(f(\bar{b}))$  for every  $\bar{b} \in \text{HF}(A)^k$ .*

**Definition 3** (Witnessing an Orbit). *For a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^*$  a set  $M$  **witnesses** a set  $N$  as orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  if  $M \subseteq \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  and for every  $b, c \in N$  there is a  $\varphi \in M$  satisfying  $\varphi(b) = c$ .*

Note that this definition also allows witnessing proper subsets of orbits. However, the sets  $N$  of interest in the following will always be given by an isomorphism-invariant function and so  $N$  can never be a proper subset of an orbit.

Now fix an arbitrary  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^*$ . Let  $f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}: \text{HF}(A) \times \text{HF}(A) \rightarrow \text{HF}(A)$  and  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}: \text{HF}(A) \rightarrow \text{HF}(A)$  be  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ -isomorphism-invariant functions.

We define the (possibly infinite) unique least tree  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  whose vertices are labeled with  $\text{HF}(A)$ -sets (so two nodes in the tree can have the same label) and which satisfies the following:

- The root is labeled with  $\emptyset$ .
- A vertex labeled with  $c \in \text{HF}(A)$  has for every  $d \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(c)$  a child labeled with  $f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(c, d)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  be the set of tuples  $p = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$  of  $\text{HF}(A)$ -sets such that  $n \geq 2$ ,  $b_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $b_{n-1} = b_n$ ,  $b_{i-1} \neq b_i$  for all  $1 < i < n$ , and there is a path of length  $n$  in  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  starting at the root and the  $i$ -th vertex in the path is labeled with  $b_i$

for all  $i \in [n]$ . That is,  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  models the computation for all possible choices and  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is the set of all possible labels yielding a fixed-point. For sake of readability, we call the elements of  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  also paths.

We say that the function  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  **witnesses** a path  $p = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  if for every  $i \in [n - 1]$  it holds that  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_n, b_i)$  witnesses  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i)$  as an  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_1, \dots, b_i)$ -orbit. Finally, we define

$$\text{WSC}^*(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}) := \{b_n \mid (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})\}$$

if  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  witnesses all paths in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  and  $\text{WSC}^*(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}) := \emptyset$  otherwise.

**Lemma 4.** *If  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  witnesses some path in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ , then  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p^* = (b_1^*, \dots, b_k^*)$  be a witnessed path, let  $P_i$  be the set of prefixes of length  $i$  of the paths in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ , and let  $p_i^*$  be the prefix of length  $i$  of  $p^*$ . We prove by induction on  $i$  that  $P_i$  is an orbit. For the root  $\emptyset$  the claim trivially holds.

We show that  $p = (b_1, \dots, b_{i+1})$  is in  $P_{i+1}$  if and only if there is an automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  such that  $\varphi(p_{i+1}^*) = p$ . Let  $p_i$  be the prefix of length  $i$  of  $p$ .

First, let  $p \in P_{i+1}$ . By induction hypothesis there is an automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  such that  $\varphi(p_i^*) = p_i$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  for some  $c_i^* \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*)$  and some  $c_i \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i)$  it holds that  $b_i^* = f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*, c_i^*)$ , and  $b_i = f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i, c_i)$ . Because  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant, we have that  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i) = \varphi(f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*))$ . Because  $p^*$  is witnessed,  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*)$  is an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}p_i^*)$  and so  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i)$  is an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}p_i) = \varphi((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}p_i^*))$ . It follows that  $\varphi(c_i^*)$  and  $c_i$  are in the same orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}p_i)$ . So let  $\psi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}p_i))$  such that  $\psi(\varphi(c_i^*)) = c_i$ . We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\varphi(b_{i+1}^*)) &= \psi(\varphi(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*, c_i^*))) \\ &= f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(\psi(\varphi(b_i^*)), \psi(\varphi(c_i^*))) \\ &= f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i, c_i) = b_{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

because  $f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant. Because  $\psi$  fixes  $b_1, \dots, b_i$ , we finally have that  $(\psi \circ \varphi)(p_{i+1}^*) = p$ .

Second, let  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  such that  $p = \varphi(p_i^*)$ . Then by induction hypothesis  $p_i = \varphi(p_i^*) \in P_i$ . As before, let  $c_i^* \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*)$  such that  $b_{i+1}^* = f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*, c_i^*)$ . Because  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant, it holds that  $\varphi(c_{i+1}^*) \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(\varphi(b_i^*), \varphi(c_i^*))$ . Because  $f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant it holds that  $b_{i+1} = \varphi(b_{i+1}^*) = \varphi(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*, c_{i+1}^*)) = f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(\varphi(b_i^*), \varphi(c_{i+1}^*)) = f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i, \varphi(c_i^*))$ . That is, the vertex corresponding to  $b_i$  (when following the tree  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  starting at the root) has a child labeled with  $b_{i+1}$  and hence  $p \in P_{i+1}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.** *The function  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  either witnesses all paths in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  or none of them.*

*Proof.* If there is a witnessed path  $p^* = (b_1^*, \dots, b_k^*)$  in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ , then the set  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is an orbit. The claim follows because  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant:

So for every other path  $p$  there is a  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  such that  $p = \varphi(p^*)$  and in particular  $p = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$  (i.e.,  $p$  and  $p^*$  have the same length). Let  $i \in [n-1]$ . Then  $f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_n, b_i) = f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(\varphi(b_n^*), \varphi(b_i^*)) = \varphi(f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_n^*, b_i^*)) \subseteq \varphi(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_1^*, \dots, b_i^*)) = \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_1, \dots, b_i)$ . Let  $d, e \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i, c_i)$ . Then again because  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}$  is isomorphism-invariant,  $\varphi^{-1}(d), \varphi^{-1}(e) \in f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i^*, c_i^*)$ . Because  $p^*$  is witnessed, there is a  $\psi \in f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_n^*, c_i^*)$  such that  $\psi(\varphi^{-1}(d)) = \varphi^{-1}(e)$ . Hence,  $\psi \circ \varphi$  is in  $f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}(b_i, c_i)$  and maps  $d$  to  $e$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.**  $\text{WSC}^*(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is an  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ -orbit.

*Proof.* Assume that there is a non-witnessed path (or no path) in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ . In this case  $\text{WSC}^*(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}) = \emptyset$  trivially satisfies the claim. Otherwise, there is a witnessed path and  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is an orbit, all paths have the same length, and  $\text{WSC}^*(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is the set of all sets  $b$ , which are the last entry of some path in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ . Because  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  is an orbit, in particular the last vertices in every path (which are at the same depth) form an orbit and the claim follows.  $\square$

Now we can define the denotation of WSC-fixed-point operators: For a BGS+WCS term  $s$  with free variables  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  and a tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^\ell$  for  $\ell \leq k$  we write  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  for the “partial” application of the function  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , so for the function  $\text{HF}(A)^{k-\ell} \rightarrow \text{HF}(A)$  defined by  $\bar{b} \mapsto \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}\bar{b})$ .

Let  $s_{\text{step}}$  and  $s_{\text{wit}}$  be BGS+WCS terms with free variables  $\bar{z}xy$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$  be a BGS+WCS term with free variables  $\bar{z}x$ , and  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$  be a BGS+WCS formula with free variables  $\bar{z}x$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, \Phi_{\text{out}}) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}} := \\ \{ \bar{a} \mid \bar{a}\bar{b} \in \llbracket \Phi_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}} \text{ for every } \bar{b} \in \text{WSC}^*(\llbracket s_{\text{step}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{choice}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})) \}. \end{aligned}$$

In [7] the fixed-point operator with symmetric choice is not evaluated on  $\mathfrak{A}$ , but on the reduct  $\mathfrak{A} \upharpoonright \tau'$ , where  $\tau' \subseteq \tau$  is the subset of relations of the  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  used in the fixed-point operator. This ensures that adding unused relations to structures does not change the result of a formula (the additional relations potentially change the orbits of the structure and choices cannot be witnessed anymore), which is a desirable property [10]. We do not use the “reduct semantics” in this paper. We could in principle use it but then Section 5 would get even more technical without providing further insights.

**Failure on Non-Witnessed Choices.** While the denotation defined as above results in a reasonable logic, we want a special treatment of the case when choices cannot be witnessed. Whenever during the evaluation of a formula there is a path in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  that is not witnessed, we abort evaluation and output an error, indicating there was a non-witnessed choice. Formally, we extend the denotation by an error-marker  $\dagger$ . Then the denotation of a term becomes a function  $\text{HF}(A)^k \rightarrow \text{HF}(A) \cup \{\dagger\}$  and the denotation of a formula a function  $\text{HF}(A)^k \rightarrow \{\top, \perp, \dagger\}$ . Whenever a  $\dagger$  occurs, it is just propagated. We omit the formal definitions here. Note that there still might be tuples  $\bar{a}$ , such that there is a non-witnessed path in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ , but the corresponding WSC-fixed-point operator is never evaluated for the parameter tuple  $\bar{a}$ .

**Fixing Intermediate Steps.** We define the evaluation of choice terms similar to [7] using the tree  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$ . However, our definition is different in one crucial aspect: in the setting of Lemma 4, we require that  $f_{\text{choice}}(b_i)$  defines an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_1, \dots, b_i)$ , where in [7] an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_i, c_i)$  is required. That is, in BGS+WSC one has to respect in some sense all choices made in previous intermediate steps during the fixed-point computation. This is crucial to prove Lemma 4. In [7] this is not required, because the authors only need that the vertices in  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  on the same level are in the same orbit. We actually need that the paths in the tree in their entirety form an orbit to establish Corollary 5. Due to this corollary, we can give the witnessing term access to  $b_n$  when witnessing  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, b_1, \dots, b_i)$ -orbits. This plays a crucial role in the following. We do not require that the actual chosen elements  $c_i$  are fixed by the automorphisms, because in contrast to [7] the choice term only gets the  $b_i$  as input and not the  $c_i$ . So if two different  $c_i$  and  $c'_i$  result in the same next intermediate step  $b_{i+1}$ , the following computation will be the same for both choices. For the very same reason and again in contrast to [7] it is sufficient to label the vertices in the tree  $\mathcal{T}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  only with the intermediate steps  $b_i$  and not additionally with the chosen elements.

### 3.2 CPT+WSC

Similarly to how CPT is obtained from BGS, we obtain CPT+WSC by enforcing polynomial bounds on BGS+WSC formulas: A CPT+WSC term (formula) is a pair  $(s, p(n))$  ( $(\Phi, p(n))$ ) of a BGS+WSC term (formula) and a polynomial.

For BGS operators, we add the same restrictions as in CPT. For a WSC-fixed-point operator  $\text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, \Phi_{\text{out}})$ , a structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and a tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^*$ , we restrict  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  to paths  $(b_1, \dots, b_k)$  of length  $k \leq p(|A|)$  for which  $|\text{TC}(b_i)| \leq p(|A|)$  for all  $i \in [k]$ . If there is a path in  $\mathcal{P}(f_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}}, f_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}})$  of length greater than  $p(|A|)$  or in some such path there is a set not bounded by  $p$ , then the WSC-fixed-point operator has denotation  $\dagger$ .

It is important that we do not require that  $|\text{WSC}^*(\llbracket s_{\text{step}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{choice}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}))|$  is bounded by  $p(|A|)$ . In fact using WSC-fixed-point operators only makes sense if the set is allowed to be of superpolynomial size, as otherwise we could define it with a regular iteration term. It is also important to output  $\dagger$  and not  $\emptyset$  when the polynomial bound is exceeded because in that case we cannot validate whether all choice sets are orbits (and so it might depend on the choices whether the bound is exceeded or not). To evaluate the witnessing term we need access to the fixed-point, which cannot be computed if the polynomial bound gets exceeded.

Because the WSC-fixed-point operator can only choose from orbits, CPT+WSC is isomorphism invariant.

**Lemma 7.** *For every structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , every CPT+WSC term  $s$  and every CPT+WSC formula  $\Phi$  the denotations  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  are unions of  $\mathfrak{A}$ -orbits.*

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward by structural induction on terms and formulas using Corollary 6.  $\square$

While Lemma 7 only concerns automorphisms, it is easy to see that CPT+WSC also respects isomorphism between different structures. Using multiple structures would make Section 3.1 formally more complicated without providing new insights.

Using Lemma 7 we can show that model checking for CPT+WSC can be done in polynomial time. Naively computing the denotation is not possible, because as we have seen earlier, the sets  $\text{WSC}^*(\llbracket s_{\text{step}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{choice}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}))$  may not of polynomial size.

**Lemma 8.** *For every CPT+WSC term  $(s, p(n))$  or formula  $(\Phi, p(n))$  we can compute in polynomial time on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)^k$  the denotation  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  or  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  respectively.*

*Proof.* The proof is by structural induction on  $s$  or  $\Phi$ . We show that  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  or  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  can be computed in polynomial time for every tuple  $\bar{a} \in \text{HF}(A)$  of suitable length.

Assume by induction hypothesis that for CPT+WSC terms  $s$  and  $t$  and formulas  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$ , the denotation can be computed in polynomial time. Then we can surely do so for comprehension terms, iterations terms, and all formulas composed of  $s$ ,  $t$ ,  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  apart from WSC-fixed-point operators.

So we have to consider a WSC-fixed-point operator

$$\text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, \Phi_{\text{out}}).$$

Because  $M := \text{WSC}^*(\llbracket s_{\text{step}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{choice}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}))$  is an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  by Corollary 6, it suffices to compute one  $b \in M$  (or determine that none exists) and check whether  $\bar{a}b \in \llbracket \Phi_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  by Lemma 7. Given  $b$ , the check can be done in polynomial time by induction hypothesis. A  $b \in M$  can be computed by naively, iteratively evaluating  $s_{\text{choice}}$  to define a choice set, selecting one arbitrary element out of it, and then evaluating  $s_{\text{step}}$  with this choice until either a fixed-point  $b$  is reached or more than  $p(|A|)$  iterations are performed. In the later case output  $\dagger$ . If this is not the case, we check whether  $s_{\text{wit}}$  witnesses the computed path. If the path is not witnessed, then we abort with output  $\dagger$  and otherwise by Corollary 5 we computed one  $b \in M$ . If, at any point during the evaluation, we have to construct a set  $c$  with  $|\text{TC}(c)| > p(|A|)$ , then output  $\dagger$  as well. If we always chose from orbits we would have constructed such an excessively large set  $c$  for all possible choices. Otherwise, if some choice set would not be an orbit we would fail to witnessing the orbits and output  $\dagger$  as well.

We need to evaluate  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ , and  $s_{\text{wit}}$  at most  $p(|A|)$  times, so computing  $b$  is also done in polynomial time.  $\square$

### 3.3 Defining Sets

The WSC-fixed-point operator can only output truth values. These are, by design, isomorphism-invariant. We now discuss alternatives: Let  $f: \text{HF}(A)^k \mapsto \text{HF}(A)$  be some function which we want to compute with an iteration term which choice (the domain is the set of possible parameter values). To obtain a deterministic logic, we need that  $\varphi(f(\bar{a})) = f(\bar{a})$  for every  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$ . This clearly holds if  $f$  only returns truth values (e.g., encoded by  $\emptyset$  and  $\{\emptyset\}$ ). Because in general we do not know how to compute  $\text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  in polynomial time, and therefore cannot decide whether the condition  $\varphi(f(\bar{a})) = f(\bar{a})$  is satisfied for all  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  during the evaluation of the logic in polynomial time, we consider the case of functions  $f: \text{HF}(A)^k \mapsto \text{HF}(\emptyset)$ , which generalizes the case of truth values but still is syntactically isomorphism invariant. We define

an iteration term for this case:

$$\text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, s_{\text{out}}),$$

where  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ ,  $s_{\text{wit}}$ , and  $s_{\text{out}}$  are BGS+WSC terms. The only difference to the iteration term which choice seen so far is that the output formula is replaced with an **output term**. Its denotation is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, s_{\text{out}}) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}) \\ := & \begin{cases} \bigcup_{b \in W} \llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b) & \text{if } \llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b) \in \text{HF}(\emptyset) \text{ for all } b \in W \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where  $W := \text{WSC}^*(\llbracket s_{\text{step}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{choice}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}))$ . That is, if  $\llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b) \in \text{HF}(\emptyset)$  for all  $b \in W$ , then  $\llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b) = \llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b')$  for all  $b, b' \in W$  and the iteration term just evaluates to  $\llbracket s_{\text{out}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}b)$  for every  $b \in W$  if  $W \neq \emptyset$  and to  $\emptyset$  otherwise.

We now show that the extended WSC-fixed-point operator does not increase the expressive power of CPT+WSC:

**Lemma 9.** *For every choice of CPT+WSC terms  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ ,  $s_{\text{wit}}$ , and  $s_{\text{out}}$ , there is a CPT+WSC term  $t$  such that for all structures  $\mathfrak{A}$  it holds that*

$$\llbracket \text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, s_{\text{out}}) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}} = \llbracket t \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $p(n)$  be the polynomial of the CPT+WSC term and  $n := |A|$ . Let  $a$  be a set constructed during the evaluation. Because of the polynomial bounds, we have  $|\text{TC}(a)| \leq p(n)$ . The set  $a$  corresponds to a directed acyclic graph (DAG), where the leaves are either atoms or  $\emptyset$ . By the condition  $|\text{TC}(a)| \leq p(n)$  the DAG has at most  $p(n)$  many vertices. Note that  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$  can be totally ordered in CPT. In particular, if  $a \in \text{HF}(\emptyset)$ , the DAG corresponding to  $a$  can be totally ordered. Given the DAG, we can reconstruct  $a$  in CPT.

Let  $t_{\text{toDAG}}(z)$  be a CPT term, which given a set  $a \in \text{HF}(\emptyset)$  outputs the totally ordered DAG corresponding to  $a$  (that is, its vertices are numbers) as a set containing the edges of the DAG. If  $a \notin \text{HF}(\emptyset)$ , then  $t_{\text{toDAG}}$  outputs  $\emptyset$ . Furthermore, let  $t_{\text{fromDAG}}(z)$  be the term recovering  $a$  from this set.

First,  $\Phi := \text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, (s_{\text{out}} \neq \emptyset) \Rightarrow (t_{\text{toDAG}}(s_{\text{out}}) \neq \emptyset))$  defines whether  $s_{\text{out}}$  only outputs  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$ -sets. Second,

$$r := \{(i, j) \mid i, j \in [p(|\text{Atoms}|)], \text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, (i, j) \in t_{\text{toDAG}}(s_{\text{out}}))\}$$

defines the DAG given by  $t_{\text{toDAG}}$ . Finally,  $\text{Unique}(\{t_{\text{fromDAG}}(r) \mid \Phi\})$  is equivalent to  $\text{WSC}^* xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}, s_{\text{out}})$ , where we use  $p(n)^2$  as new polynomial bound (because we just try all pairs  $i, j$ ).  $\square$

With an easy inductive argument one sees that also nesting the extended iteration terms does not increase the expressive power.

## 4 Canonization in CPT+WSC

In the following we work with classes of relational  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ . We always assume that these classes are closed under isomorphisms and only contain connected structures, because we are interested in isomorphism testing and canonization. The case of unconnected structures reduces to connected ones.

The process of individualizing certain atoms in structures plays a crucial role and we only want to consider classes of structures closed under individualizing atoms. Conceptually, individualizing an atom means to give it a unique color. The formulas we are going to define in fact iteratively individualize atoms. So it will be convenient to capture the individualized atoms by CPT+WSC “internal” tuples, that is, many formulas will have a free variable  $\iota$  to which we can pass a tuple (encoded using sets) containing the sequence of individualized atoms. Thus, instead of assuming that the classes of structures are closed under individualization, we work with the free variable  $\iota$  to which all possible tuples can be passed and require in our definitions that certain properties hold for all possible tuples to pass into  $\iota$ . At crucial points we remind the reader that in that sense we work with individualization-closed classes of structures.

In what follows, we will always assume that tuples do not contain duplicates. Moreover, we will freely switch between the “internal” representation of tuples in CPT and the “external” sequence of individualized atoms whenever needed. For sake of shorter formulas, we introduce a slightly special concatenation operation for tuples of atoms in CPT+WSC. This operation is shorthand notation for a more complex but uninteresting CPT term. Let  $x$  and  $y$  be variables. We write  $xy$  for a CPT term satisfying the following equations:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \llbracket xy \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}, b) = \bar{a}b & \bar{a} \in A^*, b \in A, b \notin \bar{a}, \\
 \llbracket xy \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}, b) = \bar{a} & \bar{a} \in A^*, b \in A, b \in \bar{a}, \\
 \llbracket xy \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}, \{b\}) = \llbracket xy \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}, b) & \bar{a} \in A^*, b \in A, \\
 \llbracket xy \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}, \emptyset) = \bar{a} & \bar{a} \in A^*, b \in A.
 \end{array}$$

We also assume that  $xy$  concatenates two tuples by also removing duplicates. We write  $x_i$  for the term extracting the  $i$ -th position of a tuple or the empty set if  $i$  is larger than the length of the tuple ( $i$  is encoded as a von Neumann ordinal). We extend to notation from variables to arbitrary CPT+WSC terms  $s$  and  $t$  and write  $st$  for the CPT+WSC term appending the result of  $t$  to the result of  $s$  in the way defined above. Clearly, all these terms can be defined in CPT+WSC (or CPT if  $s$  and  $t$  are CPT terms, too).

We now introduce various notions related to defining isomorphism and canonization. In the end, we show that all of them are equivalent. As already mentioned, it will be important to not only consider all structures  $\mathfrak{A}$  of a given class of structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , but also to consider all pairs  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  for all  $\bar{a} \in A^*$ . In what follows, let  $L$  be one of the logics CPT or CPT+WSC.

**Definition 10** (Definable Isomorphism). *A logic  $L$  defines isomorphism for a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , if there is an  $L$ -formula  $\Phi(\iota_1, \iota_2)$ , such that, for every  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\bar{a} \in A^*, \bar{b} \in B^*$ , on the disjoint union  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  it holds that  $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}}$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong (\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$ .*

In the case that  $L$  is CPT+WSC, we require in the previous definition that  $\Phi$  never outputs  $\dagger$ . So we can write  $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}}$ , because as  $\dagger$  never occurs, we can regard  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}}$  again as the set of tuples satisfying  $\Phi$ . In all definitions that follow, we also require without further mentioning that  $\dagger$  never occurs for any input.

**Definition 11** (Distinguishable Orbits). *Way say that a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  has  **$L$ -distinguishable  $k$ -orbits** if there is an  $L$ -formula  $\Phi(\iota, x, y)$  such that for every  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  and every  $\bar{a} \in A^*$  the relation  $\preceq$  on  $k$ -tuples defined by  $\bar{b} \preceq \bar{c}$  if and only if  $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}) \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a total preorder and its equivalence classes are the  $k$ -orbits of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .*

Note that because  $\preceq$  is a total preorder and not just some equivalence relation, it defines a total order on the  $k$ -orbits.

**Definition 12** (Complete Invariant). *An  **$L$ -definable complete invariant** of a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  is an  $L$ -term  $s(\iota)$  which satisfies the following:  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}) = \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{B}}(\bar{b})$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong (\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  for every  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$  and every  $\bar{a} \in A^*, \bar{b} \in B^*$ .*

**Lemma 13.** *If an  $L$ -term  $s(\iota)$  is a complete invariant for a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , then there is a CPT term defining a total order on  $\{\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}) \mid \mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}, \bar{a} \in A^*\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ . Then there is another structure  $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  because  $\mathcal{K}$  is closed under isomorphism. Let  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  be an isomorphism. Then  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}} = \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{B}} = \varphi(\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}})$ , but that is  $\llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}} \in \text{HF}(\emptyset)$  for every  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ . Finally,  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$  can be ordered in CPT.  $\square$

**Lemma 14.** *If there is an  $L$ -definable complete invariant for a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , then  $\mathcal{K}$  has  $L$ -distinguishable  $k$ -orbits for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s_{\text{inv}}(\iota)$  define a complete invariant and let  $\Phi_{\text{inv}}(x, y)$  be a CPT formula defining a total order on the invariant by Lemma 13. We define

$$\Phi_{\text{orb}}(\iota, x, y) := \Phi_{\text{inv}}(s_{\text{inv}}(\iota x), s_{\text{inv}}(\iota y)).$$

The  $L$ -formula  $\Phi_{\text{orb}}(\iota, x, y)$  orders two  $k$ -tuples  $\bar{u}$  and  $\bar{v}$  according to the order of  $\Phi_{\text{inv}}(x, y)$  on the complete invariants when individualizing  $\bar{u}$  respectively  $\bar{v}$ . So  $\Phi_{\text{orb}}$  is a total preorder. For a structure  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  two  $k$ -tuples  $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in A$  are in the same  $k$ -orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}\bar{u}) \cong (\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}\bar{v})$ , which is the case if and only if  $\llbracket s_{\text{inv}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}\bar{u}) = \llbracket s_{\text{inv}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}\bar{v})$ , that is  $\Phi_{\text{orb}}$  induces the  $k$ -orbits of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .  $\square$

**Definition 15** (Ready for Individualization). *A class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  is **ready for individualization** in  $L$  if there is an  $L$ -term  $s(\iota)$  that for every structure  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  and every  $\bar{a} \in A^*$  defines a 1-orbit  $O$  of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ , that is  $O = \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}) \in \text{orbs}_1((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$ , such that if there is an orbit disjoint with  $\bar{a}$  then  $O$  is disjoint with  $\bar{a}$ .*

**Definition 16** (Canonization). *A logic  $L$  defines a **canonization** for a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , if there is an  $L[\tau, \tau \uplus \leq]$ -interpretation  $\Theta(\iota)$  mapping  $\tau$ -structures to  $(\tau \uplus \leq)$ -structures such that*

- $\leq$  is always a total order on the universe,
- $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong \Theta(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \upharpoonright \tau$  for every  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\bar{a} \in A^*$ , and

- $\Theta(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) = \Theta(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong (\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  for every  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\bar{a} \in A^*$ , and  $\bar{b} \in B^*$ .

We show that the algorithm of [20] is CPT+WSC definable. Intuitively, we iteratively individualize an atom of a non-trivial orbit which is minimal according to an isomorphism invariant total order on the orbits. We continue this procedure, until we individualized all atoms and thus defined a total order on the atoms. While the order itself is not unique, the isomorphism type of the ordered structure is, because we always chose from orbits. In that way, we obtain the canon by renaming the atoms to be just numbers. We now define this approach formally: Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of  $\tau$ -structures ready for individualization in CPT+WSC and let  $s_{\text{orb}}(\iota)$  be the corresponding CPT+WSC term defining a 1-orbit with the required properties.

We define for every  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\bar{a} \in A^*$  a set  $\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  as follows: If all atoms are individualized, i.e., every atom is contained in  $\bar{a}$ , we set

$$\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) := \{\bar{a}\}.$$

Otherwise, let  $O = \llbracket s_{\text{orb}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  be the 1-orbit given by  $s_{\text{orb}}$ . In particular this orbit is disjoint with  $\bar{a}$ . We define

$$\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) := \bigcup_{u \in O} \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}u).$$

For  $\bar{b} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  let  $\varphi_{\bar{b}}: A \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$  be defined via  $u \mapsto i$  if and only if  $u = b_i$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  is an  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ -orbit. Hence, the definition  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) := \varphi_{\bar{b}}(\llbracket \mathfrak{A} \rrbracket(\bar{a}))$  is well-defined and independent of the choice of  $\bar{b} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  because  $\varphi_{\bar{b}}(\llbracket \mathfrak{A} \rrbracket(\bar{a})) = \varphi_{\bar{c}}(\llbracket \mathfrak{A} \rrbracket(\bar{a}))$  for every  $\bar{b}, \bar{c} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .

**Lemma 17.**  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \upharpoonright \tau \cong (\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  and  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) = \text{canon}(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong (\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$ .

*Proof.* First, because the  $\varphi_{\bar{c}}$  are bijections for every  $\bar{c} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ , it follows that  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \upharpoonright \tau \cong (\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . Second, because the order on the 1-orbits defined by  $s_{\text{orb}}$  is isomorphism-invariant, it holds that  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) = \text{canon}(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  if and only if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \cong (\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$ . This is essentially the argument why Gurevich's canonization algorithm in [20] is correct.  $\square$

**Lemma 18.** If a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  is ready for individualization in CPT+WSC, then CPT+WSC defines a canonization for  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures.

*Proof.* To implement the former approach in CPT+WSC we first need some notation: we introduce a fixed-point operator with deterministic choice similar to the WSC-fixed-point operator, but which can be simulated just with plain iteration terms:

$$\text{DC}^*xy. (s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{order}}),$$

where  $s_{\text{step}}$ ,  $s_{\text{choice}}$ , and  $s_{\text{order}}$  are CPT+WSC terms. The first terms  $s_{\text{step}}(x, y)$  and  $s_{\text{choice}}(x)$  behave exactly as in the symmetric choice operator:  $s_{\text{step}}$  defines a step function and  $s_{\text{choice}}$  a choice set (of atoms). But the third term  $s_{\text{order}}$  defines a total order on the atoms and is used to resolve the choices deterministically by picking the minimal one.

We define a CPT+WSC interpretation  $\Theta(\iota)$  whose set of atoms is  $[|A|]$  and for every  $k$ -ary relation  $R \in \tau$  a formula  $\Psi_R(\iota, i_1, \dots, i_k)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{label}}(o, \iota) &:= \text{DC}^* xy. (\iota xy, s_{\text{orb}}(\iota x), o) \\ t_{\text{wit}}(o, \iota) &:= \{\{(t_{\text{label}}(o, \iota x)_j, t_{\text{label}}(o, \iota y)_j) \mid j \in [\text{Card}(\text{Atoms})]\} \mid x, y \in s_{\text{orb}}(\iota)\} \\ \Psi_R(\iota, i_1, \dots, i_k) &:= \text{WSC}^* xy. (\iota xy, s_{\text{orb}}(\iota x), t_{\text{wit}}(y, x), R(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k})) \end{aligned}$$

Fix an arbitrary structure  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ . Set  $A^<$  to be the set of all  $A$ -tuples of length  $|A|$  containing all atoms exactly once.

**Claim 1.** *If  $\bar{b} \in A^<$  then  $\llbracket t_{\text{label}}(o, \iota) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}, \bar{a}) \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  for every  $\bar{a} \in A^*$ .*

*Proof.* Recall here that the tuple operation  $\iota y$  discards duplicates from  $y$ . That is, in the first iteration we add  $\bar{a}$  and another atom to  $y$  (or just  $\bar{a}$ , if already all atoms are individualized). In every iteration we choose the minimal atom according to  $\bar{b}$  from the orbit given by  $s_{\text{orb}}$  until all atoms are individualized. Then nothing is added to  $y$  anymore and a fixed-point is reached. This follows exactly the definition of  $\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 2.** *If  $\bar{b} \in A^<$  then  $\llbracket t_{\text{wit}}(o, \iota) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{b}, \bar{a})$  witnesses that  $\llbracket s_{\text{orb}}(\iota) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  is an orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $O = \llbracket s_{\text{orb}}(\iota) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  and let  $u, v \in O$ . Furthermore, let  $\bar{c} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}u)$  and  $\bar{d} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}v)$ . Then  $\varphi_{\bar{c}}$  is an isomorphism  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}u) \rightarrow \text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}u)$  and also an isomorphism  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow \text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  because  $O$  is the orbit given by  $s_{\text{orb}}$ . Likewise,  $\varphi_{\bar{d}}$  is an isomorphism  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow \text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . Then  $\varphi_{\bar{d}}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{\bar{c}} = \{(c_j, d_j) \mid j \in |A|\} \in \text{Aut}((\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}))$  and satisfies  $(\varphi_{\bar{d}}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{\bar{c}})(u) = v$ . It is easy to see using Claim 1 that  $t_{\text{aut}}$  exactly defines such automorphisms for every pair of atoms in the orbit given by  $s_{\text{orb}}$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 3.**  $\text{WSC}^*(\llbracket \iota yz \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket s_{\text{orb}}(\iota y) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a}), \llbracket t_{\text{wit}} \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})) = \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .

*Proof.* As in Claim 1, the WSC-fixed-point operator expresses precisely the definition of  $\text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . By Claim 2 all choices are witnessed because every automorphism stabilizing some tuple  $\bar{c} \in \mathfrak{A}^*$  stabilizes all prefixes of  $\bar{c}$ , so all tuples defined earlier in the iteration. Because we consider the result under all possible choices, the claim follows.  $\dashv$

Now let  $\bar{a} \in A^<$  and we show that  $\Theta(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) = \text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . By Claim 3 we have  $(\bar{a}, i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in \llbracket \Psi_R \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}$  if and only if  $(i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in R^{\varphi_{\bar{b}}}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  for some (and thus every)  $\bar{b} \in \text{labels}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . This is exactly the definition of  $\text{canon}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  and hence we obtained a CPT+WSC-definable canonization (Lemma 17).  $\square$

**Lemma 19** ([18]). *If CPT defines isomorphism of a class of binary  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$  (closed under individualization), then there is a CPT term defining a complete invariant for  $\mathcal{K}$ .*

While this lemma is only for binary structures, it can also be applied to arbitrary structures. Every  $\tau$ -structure can be encoded by a binary structure using a CPT-interpretation  $\Theta$  (in fact, an FO-interpretation suffices) such that  $\Theta(\mathfrak{A}) \cong \Theta(\mathfrak{B})$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$  and given a definable isomorphism test for a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , we can define an isomorphism test on  $\Theta(\mathcal{K})$ .

**Corollary 20.** *If CPT defines isomorphism of a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , then CPT+WSC defines canonization of  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures and captures PTIME on  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures.*

This corollary is asymmetric in the sense that we convert an isomorphism-defining CPT formula into a CPT+WSC formula defining canonization. The next goal is to prove the symmetric version, which already starts with an isomorphism-defining CPT+WSC formula. We begin with the following theorem (which, similarly to Lemma 19 can also be used for non-binary structures).

**Theorem 21.** *If CPT+WSC defines isomorphism of a class of binary  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , then CPT+WSC defines a complete invariant for  $\mathcal{K}$ -structures.*

The long proof of this theorem is deferred to Section 5. Assuming Theorem 21 for now, we conclude:

**Theorem 22.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of  $\tau$ -structures (closed under individualization). The following are equivalent:*

1.  $\mathcal{K}$  is ready for individualization in CPT+WSC.
2.  $\mathcal{K}$  has CPT+WSC-distinguishable 1-orbits.
3.  $\mathcal{K}$  has CPT+WSC-distinguishable  $k$ -orbits for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
4. CPT+WSC defines isomorphism of  $\mathcal{K}$ .
5. CPT+WSC defines a complete invariant for  $\mathcal{K}$ .
6. CPT+WSC defines a canonization for  $\mathcal{K}$ .

*Proof.* We show  $4 \Rightarrow 5 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 1 \Rightarrow 6 \Rightarrow 4$ .

Theorem 21 proves  $4 \Rightarrow 5$ , Lemma 14 proves  $5 \Rightarrow 3$ ,  $3 \Rightarrow 2$  is trivial, and Lemma 18 proves  $1 \Rightarrow 6$ . To show  $2 \Rightarrow 1$  one can pick the minimal orbit according to the given preorder satisfying the requirement of ready for individualization, and finally  $6 \Rightarrow 4$  is done by comparing the two canons. This is done as follows: Let  $s_{\text{canon}}$  be a closed CPT+WSC term defining a canonization, that is it evaluates the interpretation defining the ordered copy as a HF( $\emptyset$ )-set using numbers as atoms. Further, let  $s_{\text{cc}}$  be a CPT+WSC term defining the set of connected components. To evaluate  $s_{\text{canon}}$  on a single component of the disjoint union, we need to forbid automorphisms exchanging the components (in the case that they are isomorphic), so  $s_{\text{canon}}$  indeed can ignore one component and just canonize the other. The idea is to add a free variable  $x$  to  $s_{\text{canon}}$  which will hold a set of atoms forming a component. Let  $s'_{\text{canon}}(x)$  be the CPT+WSC term with a free variable  $x$  (unused in  $s_{\text{canon}}$ ) obtained from  $s_{\text{cc}}$  in the following way: we replace every occurrence of **Atoms** in  $s_{\text{canon}}$  with  $x$  and in every WSC-fixed-point operator we add the tautology  $x = x$  in the step, choice, and witnessing term. In that way every WSC-fixed-point operator has  $x$  as free variable and in particular all witnessing automorphisms need to stabilize the component held by  $x$ . Then the formula  $\text{Card}(\{s'_{\text{canon}}(x) \mid x \in s_{\text{cc}}\}) = 1$  is satisfied if both components of the disjoint union are isomorphic.  $\square$

Finally, we can prove Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Canonization is definable in CPT+WSC by Theorem 22 for  $\mathcal{K}$  and so by the Immerman-Vardi Theorem [21] CPT+WSC captures PTIME.  $\square$

**Corollary 23.** *If graph isomorphism is in PTIME, then CPT+WSC defines isomorphism on all structures if and only if CPT+WSC captures PTIME.*

## 5 Isomorphism Testing in CPT+WSC

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 21. The proof of Lemma 19 in [18] uses the equivalence between CPT and the DeepWL computation model. For DeepWL, the authors show that on input  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  the machine never needs to “mix” atoms of the two structures. This then implies that if there is a DeepWL-algorithm to decide isomorphism, it essentially suffices not to compute on input  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  but to consider the output of another algorithm on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  and on input  $\mathfrak{B}$ . The run of the Turing machine in the latter DeepWL-algorithm turns out to be a complete invariant if the DeepWL-algorithm decides isomorphism. To prove Theorem 21 we extend DeepWL with witnessed symmetric choice. For a more elaborate introduction into DeepWL we refer to [18].

In the rest of this section, we assume that all structures are binary relational structures. Moreover, we see all relation symbols as binary strings, so Turing machines with a fixed alphabet can compute with relation symbols.

**Coherent Configurations.** Before introducing DeepWL, we need some background on coherent configuration.

We start with introducing terminology for general binary relational structures, which can be seen as edge-colored graphs. Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a binary  $\tau$ -structure. The inverse of a relation  $E^{\mathfrak{A}}$  (for some  $E \in \tau$ ) is  $(E^{\mathfrak{A}})^{-1} := \{(v, u) \mid (u, v) \in E^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ . We call  $E$  **undirected** if  $E^{\mathfrak{A}} = (E^{\mathfrak{A}})^{-1}$  and **directed** otherwise. Let  $\pi \subseteq \tau$ . Two atoms  $u, v \in A$  are  **$\pi$ -connected** if there is a path from  $u$  to  $v$  only using edges contained in a relation in  $\pi$ . Similarly, we define  $\pi$ -connected components and strongly  $\pi$ -connected components (SCCs).

We now turn to coherent configuration. Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be a  $\sigma$ -structure. A relation  $R \in \sigma$  is called **diagonal**, if  $R^{\mathfrak{H}} \subseteq \text{diag}(H) := \{(u, u) \mid u \in H\}$ . The structure  $\mathfrak{H}$  is a **coherent configuration** if it satisfies the following properties:

- The  $\sigma$ -relations partition  $H^2$ , that is  $\{R^{\mathfrak{H}} \mid R \in \sigma\}$  is a partition of  $H^2$ . In particular all relations  $R^{\mathfrak{H}}$  are nonempty.
- Every relation  $R \in \sigma$  is either disjoint from or a subset of  $\text{diag}(H)$ .
- Each relation  $R \in \sigma$  has an inverse  $R^{-1} \in \sigma$ , i.e.  $(R^{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} = (R^{-1})^{\mathfrak{H}}$ .
- For every triple  $(R, S, T) \in \sigma$  there is a number  $q(R, S, T) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that whenever  $(u, v) \in R^{\mathfrak{H}}$  there are exactly  $q(R, S, T)$  many  $w \in H$  such that  $(u, w) \in S^{\mathfrak{H}}$  and  $(w, v) \in T^{\mathfrak{H}}$ .

The number  $q(R, S, T)$  is called the **intersection number** of  $(R, S, T)$  and the function  $q: \sigma^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by  $(R, S, T) \mapsto q(R, S, T)$  is called the **intersection numbers** of  $\mathfrak{H}$ . The  $\sigma$ -relations are called **colors**. Diagonal  $\sigma$ -relations are called **fibers**. We say that a color  $R$  **has an**  $(S, T)$ -**colored triangle**, if  $q(R, S, T) \geq 1$ . This can be extended to paths. We say that a color  $R$  **has an**  $(S_1, \dots, S_k)$ -**colored path**, if for every  $(u, v) \in R^{\mathfrak{H}}$  there is a path  $(w_1, \dots, w_{k+1})$  such that  $w_1 = u$ ,  $w_{k+1} = v$  and for every  $i \in [k]$  it holds that  $(w_i, w_{i+1}) \in S_i^{\mathfrak{H}}$ . By the properties of coherent configuration this is either the case for every  $(u, v) \in R^{\mathfrak{H}}$  or for no such edge. We also say that a color has  $k$  colored edges or colored paths, if we want to specify the exact number of these paths.

The coherent configuration  $\mathfrak{H}$  *refines* a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  if  $H = A$  and for every  $\sigma$ -relation  $R$  and every  $\tau$ -relation  $E$  it holds that either  $R^\mathfrak{H} \subseteq E^\mathfrak{A}$  or  $R^\mathfrak{H} \cap E^\mathfrak{A} = \emptyset$ . A coherent configuration  $\mathfrak{H}$  refining a structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a *coarsest* coherent configuration refining  $\mathfrak{A}$  if every coherent configuration  $\mathfrak{H}'$  refining  $\mathfrak{A}$  also refines  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Given a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the coarsest coherent configuration refining  $\mathfrak{A}$  can be computed canonically with the two-dimensional Weisfeiler-Leman algorithm. We denote this configuration by  $C(\mathfrak{A})$ .

**Structures with Sets as Vertices,** In the following, relational structures in which some “atoms” are obtained as HF-sets of the “old” atoms play an important role. We formalize this as follows:

A finite binary  $\tau$ -**HF-structure**  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a tuple  $(A, M, E_1^\mathfrak{A}, \dots, E_k^\mathfrak{A})$ , where  $A$  is a set of atoms,  $M$  a finite set of HF( $A$ )-sets, and  $E_i^\mathfrak{A} \subseteq (A \cup M)^2$ , that is the universe of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a set of atoms  $A$  and some HF( $A$ )-sets  $M$ . We call  $A$  atoms, and  $\mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A}) := A \cup M$  vertices. In that sense, every  $\tau$ -HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  can be turned into a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$ , where the sets in  $M$  become fresh atoms, and every  $\tau$ -structure is also a  $\tau$ -HF-structure, where the set  $M$  is empty.

An automorphism of the  $\tau$ -HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a permutation  $\varphi$  of  $A$  such that  $\varphi(M) = M$  and  $(u, v) \in E_i^\mathfrak{A}$  if and only if  $\varphi(u, v) \in E_i^\mathfrak{A}$  for every  $i \in [k]$  and every  $u, v \in \mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A})$ . That is, an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{A}$  has to respect the HF-structure of the vertices. So a  $\tau$ -HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  has potentially fewer automorphisms than the  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$ . Using this notion of automorphisms,  $\mathfrak{A}$ -orbits and  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ -orbits (for a tuple  $\bar{a}$  of HF( $A$ )-sets) are defined as before.

We write  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  also for  $C(\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}})$  if unambiguous, that is coherent configurations are always computed with respect to  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$ .

## 5.1 DeepWL

We are going to introduce the notation of a DeepWL-algorithm from [18]: A **DeepWL-algorithm** is a two-tape Turing machine using the alphabet  $\{0, 1\}$  with three special states  $q_{\text{addPair}}$ ,  $q_{\text{scC}}$  and  $q_{\text{create}}$ . The first tape is called the *work-tape* and the second one the *interaction-tape*. The Turing machine computes on a binary relational  $\tau$ -HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , but it has no direct access to it. Instead, the structure is put in the so called “cloud” which maintains the pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, C(\mathfrak{A}))$ . The Turing machine only has access to the *algebraic sketch*  $D(\mathfrak{A}) = (\tau, \sigma, \subseteq_{\tau, \sigma}, q)$ , which gets written on the interaction tape. Here,  $\sigma$  is the signature of the canonical coarsest coherent configuration  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  refining  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$ . The *symbolic subset relation*  $\subseteq_{\tau, \sigma} = \{(R, E) \in \tau \times \sigma \mid R^{C(\mathfrak{A})} \subseteq E^\mathfrak{A}\} \subseteq \tau \times \sigma$  relates a  $\sigma$ -color  $R$  to the  $\tau$ -relation  $E$  which is refined by  $\sigma$ , i.e.,  $R^{C(\mathfrak{A})} \subseteq E^\mathfrak{A}$ . Finally,  $q$  encodes the intersection numbers of  $C(\mathfrak{A})$ .

In the following, the signature of the HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  in the cloud is (unless stated otherwise) always  $\tau$  and the signature of  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  is  $\sigma$ , which is always disjoint from  $\tau$ . We call relations  $R \in \sigma$  *colors* and relations  $E \in \tau$  just relations. If  $E$  (respectively  $R$ ) is a diagonal relation we identify  $E$  (or  $R$ ) with the set  $\{u \mid (u, u) \in E^\mathfrak{A}\}$  and call  $E$  a *vertex class* (or  $R$  a *fiber*). For relations we use the letters  $E$  and  $F$ , for vertex classes the letters  $C$  and  $D$ , for colors the letters  $R$ ,  $S$ , and  $T$ , and for fibers the letters  $U$  and  $V$ . Although the cloud contains the pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, C(\mathfrak{A}))$ , we will just say that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is in the cloud and interpret  $\sigma$ -colors  $R$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , i.e., just write  $R^\mathfrak{A}$  for  $R^{C(\mathfrak{A})}$ .

With the special states  $q_{\text{addPair}}$ ,  $q_{\text{scc}}$ , and  $q_{\text{create}}$  the Turing machine can modify the cloud in an isomorphism-invariant manner by adding vertices. If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the input structure to the DeepWL-algorithm, the vertices will be pairs  $\langle a, i \rangle$  of an  $\text{HF}(A)$ -set (or atom)  $a$  and a number  $i$  (the number is encoded as a  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$ -set and  $\langle a, i \rangle$  denotes the Kuratowski encoding of pairs<sup>3</sup>). The number allows us to create multiple vertices for the same set (or atom)  $a$ . In the following, if a vertex for the set  $a$  should be added and is the first vertex for the set  $a$ , we add the vertex  $\langle a, 0 \rangle$ . If vertices for  $a$  already exist and  $k$  is the maximal number, we add the vertex  $\langle a, k + 1 \rangle$ . So, when describing how vertices are added, we can identify them with its  $\text{HF}(A)$ -set and assume that the numbers are picked as described. To enter the states  $q_{\text{addPair}}$  and  $q_{\text{scc}}$  the Turing machine has to write a single relation symbol  $X \in \tau \cup \sigma$  on the interaction-tape. To enter  $q_{\text{create}}$ , a set  $\pi \subseteq \sigma$  has to be written on the interaction-tape. We say that the machine *executes*  $\text{addPair}(X)$ ,  $\text{scc}(X)$ , and  $\text{create}(\pi)$ :

- $\text{addPair}(X)$  adds for every  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  a fresh vertex  $\langle u, v \rangle$  to the structure. Additionally, new relations  $E_{\text{left}}$  and  $E_{\text{right}}$  are added to  $\tau$  containing the pairs  $(\langle u, v \rangle, u)$  and  $(\langle u, v \rangle, v)$  respectively. We call these relations *the component relations*.
- $\text{scc}(X)$ : For every strongly  $X$ -connected component  $c$ , a new vertex  $c$  is added (note that  $c$  is itself a  $\text{HF}(A)$ -set). A new membership relation symbol  $E_{\text{in}}$  is added to  $\tau$  containing the pairs  $(c, u)$  for every  $X$ -SCC  $c$  and every  $u \in c$ .
- $\text{create}(\pi)$ : A new relation symbol  $E$  is added to  $\tau$ , which is the union of all  $R \in \pi$ .

Whenever new relation symbols have to be picked, we choose the smallest unused one according to the lexicographical order (recall that relation symbols are binary strings). Each of these three operations modify the structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ . After that, the coherent configuration  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  is recomputed and the new algebraic sketch  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  is written on the interaction-tape. Then the Turing machine continues. A DeepWL-algorithm accepts  $\mathfrak{A}$ , if the head of the work-tape points to a 1 when the Turing machine halts and rejects otherwise. For a more detailed definition and description of a DeepWL-algorithm we refer to [18].

**Differences and Equivalence to [18].** Our definition of DeepWL differs at various places from the one given in [18], which we discuss now:

- We omit the **forget**-operation, which allows to remove a  $\tau$ -relation from the structure in the cloud. However, Theorem 22 in [18] proves that this operation is not needed because the algebraic sketch  $D(\mathfrak{A}')$  of the structure  $\mathfrak{A}'$  obtained from  $\mathfrak{A}$  by removing some relations can be computed from the sketch  $D(\mathfrak{A})$ . So it suffices to remember the sets of relations, which should be removed. In particular, for a DeepWL-algorithm deciding isomorphism an equivalent DeepWL-algorithm is constructed in Theorem 11 of [18] which does not use the **forget**-operation.
- Instead of the **scc**-operation a **contract**-operation is given in [18]. The **contract**-operation contracts the vertices of the SCCs and does not create a new one for each SCC. A structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  resulting from a  $\text{contract}(X)$  operation can be obtained

---

<sup>3</sup>While in the previous sections we only used the pair encoding implicitly, here we use the explicit  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  notation for sake of readability.

from the structure  $\mathfrak{A}'$  resulting from the  $\text{scc}(X)$  operation by removing the vertices incident to  $X$ . While our operations do not allow removing these vertices, they form a union of fibers and the algebraic sketch  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  can be computed from  $D(\mathfrak{A}')$  by Lemma 22 in [18]. The other way around, the  $\text{scc}$ -operation can be simulated by first copying the vertices incident to  $X$  (using an  $\text{addPair}$ -operation for the fibers incident to  $X$ ) and then executing a  $\text{contract}$ -operation on the copies.

- Our operations produce new component or membership relations, while in [18] a global component relation is maintained but the added vertices are put in a new vertex class. Surely, one is computable from the other.
- Our version of DeepWL computes on HF-structures, while [18] uses plain relational structures and new vertices are just added as fresh atoms. For now, this does not make a difference, because the coherent configuration  $C(\mathfrak{A}) = C(\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}})$  is computed on  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$ . However, seeing the vertices as hereditarily finite sets gets important when considering automorphism. But we will also show that with our altered operations actually the automorphisms of the cloud as HF-structure coincides with the automorphisms of the cloud as plain relational structure. That is one major reason why we use different operations: when it comes to symmetric choice we want to preserve the vertices as HF-sets, but DeepWL-algorithms do not need to know that they compute with HF-sets at all.

The following lemma justifies computing  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  on the  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$  and that DeepWL does not need to access the HF-structure of  $\mathfrak{A}$  if the original input was a  $\tau'$ -(non-HF)-structure.

**Lemma 24.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be a  $\tau'$ -structure and  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a  $\tau$ -HF-structure obtained by a DeepWL-algorithm in the cloud on input  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ . Then for every automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}})$  it holds that  $\varphi|_A \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ .*

*Proof sketch.* The constructed HF( $A_0$ )-sets are encoded by relations of the structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  as DAGs. An  $\text{scc}$ -operation creates for every SCC  $c$  a vertex for the HF-set  $c$ , and the created membership relation coincides with  $\in$  on the HF-sets. Similar, an  $\text{addPair}$  operation introduces (Kuratowski-encoded) pairs and the component relations identifies the single entries in the pairs. Because a DeepWL-algorithm cannot “forget” this structure, every automorphism of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}}$  has to respect the structure of the HF-sets in  $\mathfrak{A}$ .  $\square$

This lemma is in particular important when we extend DeepWL with a witnessed choice operator: to compute (HF-set respecting) orbits of  $\mathfrak{A}$  it suffices to consider  $C(\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}})$ . Note that the lemma does not hold if the  $\text{forget}$ -operation of [18] is available (which can forget e.g. the membership relation) or the  $\text{scc}$ -operation is replaced the by  $\text{contract}$ -operation (then also the membership-relation is lost).

## 5.2 DeepWL with Witnessed Symmetric Choices

We now extend the DeepWL computation model with witnessed symmetric choices. Here, we need two different notions: DeepWL+WSC-machines which are then composed to DeepWL+WSC-algorithms. A *DeepWL+WSC-machine*  $M$  is a DeepWL-algorithm,

whose Turing machine has two additional states  $q_{\text{choice}}$  and  $q_{\text{refine}}$ . To enter  $q_{\text{choice}}$ ,  $M$  has to write a relation symbol  $X \in \tau \cup \sigma$  on the interaction-tape. To enter  $q_{\text{refine}}$  it has to write a relation symbol  $X \in \tau \cup \sigma$  and a number on the interaction-tape. We say that the machine  $M$  executes  $\text{choice}(X)$  and  $\text{refine}(X, i)$ . The DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M$  is **choice-free**, if it never (syntactically) enters  $q_{\text{choice}}$ . That is,  $q_{\text{choice}}$  is not in the range of the transition function of the underlying Turing machine of  $M$ .

**Definition 25** (DeepWL+WSC-algorithm). *A **DeepWL+WSC-algorithm**  $\mathcal{M}$  is a tuple  $(M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  consisting of a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M^{\text{out}}$ , a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$ , and a (possibly empty) sequence of DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$ . The machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  is called the **output machine** and the machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  is called the **witnessing machine**.*

Note that the prior definition is an inductive definition. Before giving a formal description, we first discuss informally how a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is executed. Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. As first step, we consider how the DeepWL+WSC-machines  $M^{\text{out}}$  and  $M^{\text{wit}}$  are executed.

- If a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M \in \{M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}\}$  executes  $\text{refine}(X, j)$  and  $j > \ell$ , then  $M$  just continues. Otherwise, the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_j$  is used to refine the relation  $X$ : Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the content of the cloud of  $M$  when it executes the  $\text{refine}$ -operation. If  $X$  is directed, the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_j$  is executed on  $(\mathfrak{A}, uv)$  ( $u$  and  $v$  are individualized by putting them into singleton vertex classes) for every  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . If otherwise  $X$  is undirected, so  $X^{\mathfrak{A}} = (X^{\mathfrak{A}})^{-1}$ , for every  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_j$  is executed on  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{uv\})$  (the undirected edge is individualized by creating a new vertex class only containing  $u$  and  $v$ ). The algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_j$  modifies its own cloud independently of the cloud of  $M$ . If  $\mathcal{M}_j$  accepts all  $(\mathfrak{A}, uv)$  for all  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  (respectively all  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{uv\})$  for all  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ), then nothing happens. Otherwise, a new relation  $E'$  is added to the cloud of  $M$ , where  $E'$  consists of all  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  (respectively  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ), for which  $\mathcal{M}_j$  accepts the input.

We want to emphasize that when  $(\mathfrak{A}, uv)$  is given as input to the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_j$ , then  $\mathfrak{A}$  remains a  $\tau$ -HF-structure, in particular has the same set of atoms as  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

- If  $M$  executes  $\text{choice}(X)$  and  $X$  is a directed relation, an arbitrary  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is individualized and  $M$  continues. If otherwise  $X$  is undirected, then an undirected edge  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is individualized. The edges are individualized as described in the  $\text{refine}$ -operation.

The algebraic sketch is recomputed and written on the interaction tape whenever the structure in the cloud is modified by  $\text{refine}(X, j)$  or  $\text{choice}(X)$ . (Later, we formally define the choices with a tree, similar to the definition of the iterations terms with choice in CPT+WSC.) The machine  $M$  accepts the input, if the symbol under the head on the work-tape is a 1 when  $M$  halts and rejects otherwise.

We now turn to the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$ . To execute the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$ , the output machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  is executed. Let  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be the input to  $M^{\text{out}}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the content of the cloud when  $M^{\text{out}}$  halts. For every  $\text{choice}$ -operation executed by  $M^{\text{out}}$ , the

witnessing machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  is executed. Let  $k$  be a number,  $\text{choice}(X_i)$  be the  $i$ -th executed **choice**-operation (for some  $X_i$  in the current signature), and  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  be the content of the cloud, when the  $i$ -th **choice**-operation is executed for every  $i \in [k]$ . For the  $k$ -th **choice**-operation the machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  has to provide automorphisms witnessing that  $X^{\mathfrak{A}_k}$  is an  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_k)$ -orbit (details follow later), that is, similarly to the WSC-fixed-point operator all intermediate steps of the fixed-point computation have to be fixed by the witnessing automorphisms. Recall again that we are working with HF-structures with the same set of atoms, so all vertices are  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -sets, so the notion of an  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_k)$ -orbit is well-defined.

The input of  $M^{\text{wit}}$  is the **labeled union**  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}_k$ , which is the union  $\mathfrak{A} \cup \mathfrak{A}_k$  equipped with two fresh relation symbols  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  labeling the vertices of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_k$ , i.e.  $E_1^{\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}_k} = \mathbb{V}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $E_2^{\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}_k} = \mathbb{V}(\mathfrak{A}_k)$ . So  $M^{\text{wit}}$  can reconstruct  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_k$  and can also determine how  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_k$  relate to each other since common vertices are merged in the union<sup>4</sup>. When the witnessing machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  halts, it has to write a relation symbol on the interaction-tape. The relation has to encode the set of witnessing automorphisms (details on the encoding follow).

If all choices are successfully witnessed,  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts the input if  $M^{\text{out}}$  accepts the input and rejects otherwise. If some choice could not be witnessed, we abort the computation and output  $\dagger$ . If an executed subalgorithm  $\mathcal{M}_i$  outputs  $\dagger$ , then  $\mathcal{M}$  also outputs  $\dagger$ . We also say that  $\mathcal{M}$  **fails**.

**Semantics of the new Operations.** Both, the **refine**- and the **choice**-operation contain some special cases in its semantics, which seems odd at first. First, both operations treat directed and undirected relations differently. For undirected relations  $X$ , an undirected edge  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is individualized and not just a directed one. Second, a **refine**-operation does not create a new relation in the case that all  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  or all  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  are accepted by  $\mathcal{M}_j$  (instead of creating a new relation containing the same edges as  $X$ ).

For general DeepWL+WSC-algorithms these special cases do not change the expressive power. But later in Section 5.4 we will introduce the notion of a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which puts additional restrictions on e.g. **addPair** operations. Here the precise semantics of the **refine**- and **choice**-operations matter, in particular it is crucial to prove Lemma 52.

**Encoding Automorphisms.** We now discuss how sets of automorphisms are encoded. Let  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be the input structure and  $\mathfrak{A}$  the current content of the cloud, such that  $\mathfrak{A}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ . A tuple of relations  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  and a vertex  $w_\varphi$  encode the partial map  $\varphi: A \rightarrow A$  as follows: we have  $\varphi(u) = v$  in case  $v$  is the only vertex for which there exists exactly one  $w$  such that  $(w_\varphi, w) \in E_{\text{aut}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ,  $(w, u) \in E_{\text{dom}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , and  $(w, v) \in E_{\text{img}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . A tuple of relations  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  encodes the set of partial maps  $N := \{\varphi \mid (w_\varphi, w) \in E_{\text{aut}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \text{ for some } w\}$ . The tuple  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  witnesses a relation  $E_{\text{orb}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  as  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ -orbit, if the set  $N$  witnesses  $E_{\text{orb}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  as  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ -orbit.

---

<sup>4</sup>Because all the vertices of the cloud are  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -sets or atoms the union of two such structures actually merges the same vertices.

**Execution with Choices.** Intuitively, we have to combine multiple DeepWL+WSC-algorithms, to ensure that DeepWL+WSC-algorithms “return” an isomorphism-invariant result (accept or reject). This corresponds to the output formula in a WSC-fixed-point operator, which ensures that it defines an isomorphism-invariant property. We now define the execution of a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm formally, because we need to deal with choices to obtain a well-defined notion. In the following we will assume that all Turing machines that we consider always terminate. We can do so, because we will be only interested in polynomial time Turing machines in this paper.

A **configuration**  $c$  of a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M$  is a tuple of a state  $q(c)$  of the Turing machine contained in  $M$  and the content of the two tapes. Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm and  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be the input structure of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\delta^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  be the function, which maps a tuple  $(c, \mathfrak{A})$  consisting of a configuration  $c$  of the Turing machine of  $M^{\text{out}}$  and the structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  (obtained from  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ ) in the cloud, to the tuple  $(c', \mathfrak{A}')$  in which  $M^{\text{out}}$  halts or executes the first **choice**-operation. If all DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$  are deterministic, all executed **refine**-operations are deterministic and so  $\delta$  is indeed a well-defined function, because  $M^{\text{out}}$  does not execute a **choice**-operation (because  $\delta$  stops, when a **choice**-operation occurs).

We interpret a tuple  $(c, \mathfrak{A})$  as an  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -set ( $c$  is a  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$ -set and the vertices of  $\mathfrak{A}$  itself are  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -sets and numbers, which are encoded by  $\text{HF}(\emptyset)$ -sets).

To define the run of the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  in the presence of choices, we reuse the  $\text{WSC}^*$ -operator from Section 3.1. The set of possible runs of  $\mathcal{M}$  is the set

$$\text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}),$$

where we define the functions  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ , and  $\delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  using  $\delta^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  as follows. In the beginning, the function  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  does not choose anything and the function  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  starts the output machine in the initial configuration  $c_0^{\text{out}}$  (initial state, empty work-tape, and  $D(\mathfrak{A}_0)$  on the interaction-tape) and the initial input structure  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}(\emptyset, \emptyset) &:= (c_0^{\text{out}}, \mathfrak{A}_0), \\ \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}(\emptyset) &:= \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Then, whenever a **choice**( $X$ ) operation is executed,  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  outputs the relation  $\tilde{X}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  in the current content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}$ , where  $\tilde{X}^{\mathfrak{A}} := X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  if  $X$  is directed and  $\tilde{X}^{\mathfrak{A}} := \{\{u, v\} \mid (u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$  if  $X$  is undirected.

$$\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}((c^{\text{out}}, \mathfrak{A})) := \begin{cases} \tilde{X}^{\mathfrak{A}} & \text{if } q(c^{\text{out}}) = q_{\text{choice}} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

After choosing  $a$  (a set of size at most 1 encoding a directed or undirected edge),  $a$  is individualized as described earlier and the resulting structure denoted by  $(\mathfrak{A}, a)$ . Then  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  continues with the next configuration  $\hat{c}^{\text{out}}$  according to the transition function of  $M^{\text{out}}$  in the structure (and the new algebraic sketch on the interaction-tape).

$$\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}((c^{\text{out}}, \mathfrak{A}), a) := \begin{cases} \delta^{\mathfrak{A}_0}(\hat{c}^{\text{out}}, (\mathfrak{A}, a)) & \text{if } q(c^{\text{out}}) = q_{\text{choice}} \\ (c^{\text{out}}, \mathfrak{A}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If in the end of the computation a halting state is reached (so  $q(c^{\text{out}}) \neq q_{\text{choice}}$ ),  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  returns the empty set, nothing is chosen and  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  reaches a fixed-point.

The function  $\delta_{\text{wit},E}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  maps a structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  obtained from  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  put in the cloud of  $M^{\text{wit}}$  to the relation  $E^{\mathfrak{B}}$  written on the interaction-tape when  $M^{\text{wit}}$  halts which structure  $\mathfrak{B}$  in the cloud ( $M^{\text{wit}}$  is started in its initial configuration). Because  $M^{\text{wit}}$  is choice-free, we do not have to deal with choices here.

$$\delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}((c, \mathfrak{A}), (c', \mathfrak{A}_k)) := \delta_{\text{wit},E}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}(\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}_k).$$

Recall from the definition of the  $\text{WSC}^*$ -operator, that for a  $\text{choice}(X)$  operation the relation  $X$  does not only have to be an orbit, but also fix all intermediate steps: Let the sequence of all already executed  $\text{choice}$ -operations be  $\text{choice}(X_1), \dots, \text{choice}(X_k)$  and let  $\mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_k$  be the contents of the cloud, when the corresponding  $\text{choice}$ -operation is executed. Then the set  $E_k^{\mathfrak{A}_k}$  has to be an  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_k)$ -orbit<sup>5</sup> (recall again, that all structures  $\mathfrak{A}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_k$  have the atom set  $A_0$ ), which  $\delta_{\text{wit}}$  has to witness. Also recall from the definition of the  $\text{WSC}^*$ -operator that the input to  $\delta_{\text{wit},E}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  is the input of the final content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}$  and the content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}_k$ , when the  $\text{choice}$ -operation is executed.

The algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ , if there is a  $(c, \mathfrak{A}) \in \text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}) =: W$ , such that the head of the work-tape in  $c$  points to a 1, fails if  $W = \emptyset$ , and rejects otherwise (note here that  $W = \emptyset$  if and only if there are non-witnessed choices because we assumed that our DeepWL+WSC-algorithms always terminate and so a non-empty fixed-point is always reached).

**Lemma 26.** *For the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  the following holds:*

1. *The class of structures accepted by  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under isomorphisms.*
2. *The algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  always accepts (or respectively rejects or fails) independent of the choices made in the execution of  $M^{\text{out}}$ .*
3. *If all choices were witnessed, the series of configurations of  $M^{\text{out}}$  is the same for all possible choices.*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on the nesting depth of the algorithm. Assume by induction that the claim holds for  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$ . That is, as assumed above, the function  $\delta^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  is well-defined (i.e. deterministic) and isomorphism-invariant because every **refine** operation is isomorphism-invariant by induction hypothesis, all other operations apart from **choice** modify the cloud in an isomorphism-invariant manner, and the algebraic sketch itself is isomorphism-invariant (see also [18]), and finally  $\delta^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  “stops” when a **choice** operation is encountered. Likewise, the function  $\delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  is isomorphism-invariant because  $M^{\text{wit}}$  is choice-free.

Then  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  is isomorphism-invariant because  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  is isomorphism-invariant, which is the case because the relation used as choice set only depends on the configuration

---

<sup>5</sup>Formally by the definition of the  $\text{WSC}^*$ -operator,  $E_k^{\mathfrak{A}_k}$  has to be an  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, (c_1, \mathfrak{A}_1), \dots, (c_k, \mathfrak{A}_k))$ -orbit, where the  $c_i$  are the configurations of the Turing machine when the  $i$ -th choice operation is executed – but since the  $c_i$  are encoded as HF( $\emptyset$ )-set, they are irrelevant for automorphisms or orbits.

returned by  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ . That is, we can apply the lemmas in Section 3.1. By Corollary 6 the set  $\text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0})$  is an orbit of  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ . The configurations of the Turing machine are fixed by every automorphism. If  $\text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}) = \emptyset$ , then some choice could not be witnessed, which by Corollary 5 is either the case for all possible choices or never occurs. Otherwise, the configuration  $c$  is the same for all tuples  $(c, \mathfrak{A}) \in \text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0})$ . So the routine either accepts or rejects for all possible choices (and Parts 1 and 2 are proven).

To see Part 3, note that we can replace the configuration  $c$  of the Turing machine in the tuples  $(c, \mathfrak{A})$  with the sequence of all visited configurations so far. Then not only the last configuration is an orbit, but also the sequence of visited configurations which is thus invariant under all automorphisms (given that all choices were witnessed).  $\square$

**Internal Run.** The *internal run* of a DeepWL-algorithm is the sequence of configurations of the Turing machine (the state and the content of the two tapes) during the run. As we have already seen, the internal run of a DeepWL-algorithm is isomorphism-invariant [18]. Note that in particular the algebraic sketches computed during the computations are part of the internal run, as they are written on the interaction-tape.

To define the internal run of a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, we have to take the internal runs of the machines producing witnessing isomorphisms and the runs of algorithms used to refine relations into account as follows.

Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. The internal run  $\text{run}(M, \mathfrak{A})$  of a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M \in \{M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}\}$  on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the following: Let  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  be the sequence of configurations of the Turing machine of  $M$  (by Lemma 26 the sequence is unique if all choices will be witnessed, which we assume for now). Furthermore, let  $k_1 < \dots < k_m$  be all indices such that  $q(c_{k_j}) = q_{\text{refine}}$  and  $M$  executes  $\text{refine}(X_j, i_j)$  such that  $i_j \leq \ell$ . Assume the content of the cloud is  $\mathfrak{A}_j$  for all  $j \in [m]$ . We set  $r_j := \{\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}_{i_j}, (\mathfrak{A}_j, x)) \mid x \in \tilde{X}_j^{\mathfrak{A}_j}\}\}$  for every  $j \in [m]$  and

$$\text{run}(M, \mathfrak{A}) = \begin{cases} \dagger & \text{if } \dagger \in r_i \text{ for some } i \in [m], \\ c_1, \dots, c_{k_1}, r_1, c_{k_1+1}, \dots, c_{k_m}, r_m, c_{k_m+1}, \dots, c_\ell & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The internal run  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A})$  of the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  is defined as follows: Let  $c_1, \dots, c_\ell$  be the sequence of configurations of the output Turing machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  and  $k_1 < \dots < k_m$  be all indices such that  $q(c_{k_j}) = c_{\text{choice}}$ . Assume  $M^{\text{out}}$  executes  $\text{choice}(X_j)$ , and the current content of the cloud is  $\mathfrak{A}_j$  for all  $j \in [m]$ . Let  $\mathfrak{A}_{m+1}$  be the final content of the cloud. We set  $r_j := \text{run}(M^{\text{wit}}, \mathfrak{A}_j \uplus \mathfrak{A}_{m+1})$  for all  $j \in [m]$  and

$$\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A}) := \begin{cases} \text{run}(M^{\text{out}}, \mathfrak{A}), r_1, \dots, r_m & \text{if all choices are witnessed,} \\ \dagger & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 26 it is easy to see that  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A})$  is isomorphism-invariant and so it can be canonically encoded as a 0/1-string.

**Computability.** Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. It *decides a property*  $P$  of a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , if  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  if  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies  $P$  and rejects otherwise (and in particular never fails). The algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  *computes a*

**function**  $f: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ , if for every  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  the machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  has written  $f(\mathfrak{A})$  on the work-tape when it halts on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  never fails.

Definitions 10 and 12 of definable isomorphism and complete invariant are easily adapted to DeepWL+WSC: for this, for a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , a tuple  $\bar{a} \in A^*$  and a fresh relation symbol  $\leq$ , the structure  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$  is encoded by the  $(\tau \cup \leq)$ -structure  $(\mathfrak{A}, \leq)$  such that  $u \leq v$  if and only if  $u = a_i$  and  $v = a_j$  for some  $i \leq j$ .

We define the **runtime** of a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M \in \{M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}\}$  on input  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ . Every transition taken by the Turing machine counts as one time step. Whenever the cloud is changed and becomes  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the new algebraic sketch  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  is written on the interaction-tape. For this, we count as many time steps, as the encoding length  $|D(\mathfrak{A})|$  is large. Following [18] the encoding of  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  is unary and so the runtime of  $M$  is at least  $|A_0|$ . When  $M$  executes  $\text{refine}(X, i)$  for  $i \leq \ell$  and the current content of the cloud is  $\mathfrak{A}$ , we count the sum of runtimes of  $\mathcal{M}_i$  on input  $(\mathfrak{A}, u)$  for every  $u \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . The runtime of  $\mathcal{M}$  is the sum of the runtime of the output machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  and the runtimes of the witnessing machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  to witness all choices. A DeepWL+WSC-algorithm (or machine) runs in **polynomial time**, if there exists a polynomial  $p(n)$ , such that  $p(|A_0|)$  bounds the runtime on input  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ .

Note that if  $M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$  run in polynomial time, then  $\mathcal{M}$  runs in polynomial time: the size of the structure in the cloud is polynomially bounded and the machines  $M^{\text{out}}$  and  $M^{\text{wit}}$  can execute only polynomially bounded many **refine**-operations.

### 5.2.1 Derived Operations

From the special operations **addPair**, **scc**, and **choice** we can derive additional operations, which then can be used for convenience. These are:

1. **Ordered input**: Currently, the structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  put in the cloud is the only input to a DeepWL+WSC-machine or algorithm. We allow a pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, z)$  of a structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a binary string  $\bar{z} \in \{0, 1\}^*$  placed on the working tape as input.
2. **Ordered input for refine operations**: We similarly extend **refine** operations to support  $\text{refine}(C, i, \bar{z})$  executions, where  $\bar{z} \in \{0, 1\}^*$  is an additional binary string initially put on the working tape.
3. **rename( $E, F$ )**: If  $F$  is an unused relation symbol in the signature  $\tau$ , the machine exchanges a relation symbol  $E$  with  $F$ . Otherwise, no change is made.
4. **addUPair( $X$ )**: This operation creates *unordered pairs*, i.e. sets of size at most two for the  $X$ -edges: Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the current structure in the cloud. For every  $\{u, v\}$  such that  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  a new vertex is added and the following membership relation  $\bigcup_{(u,v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}} \{(\{u, v\}, u), (\{u, v\}, v)\}$  is created.

While adding the ability to rename relations seems useless, it simplifies proofs, because we do not have to maintain bijections between relation symbols of different structures but just can rename them accordingly.

**Lemma 27.** *Ordered input to DeepWL+WSC-algorithms and the operations **addUPair**, **rename**, and **refine**( $C, i, z$ ) can be simulated with the existing operations with only a polynomial overhead.*

*Proof Sketch.* We describe how the new operations can be simulated.

1. **Ordered input:** This can be simulated in the original DeepWL+WSC model as follows: Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be an input structure and  $\bar{z} \in \{0, 1\}^*$ . We extend the structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  by  $k := |\bar{z}|$  many fresh atoms  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ , add a new relation  $E_{\text{path}}$  containing  $\{(u_i, u_{i+1}) \mid i \in [k-1]\}$ , add another relation  $E_1$  containing  $\{(u_i, u_i) \mid i \in [k], z_i = 1\}$ , and a total preorder  $E_{\leq}$ , such that it has two equivalence classes, namely the “old” atoms  $A$  and the new atoms  $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  and sets  $A$  to be less than  $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ .

Note that all the fresh atoms end up in a singleton fiber. Using  $E_{\leq}$  the algorithm can determine which fibers are the fibers corresponding to the new atoms  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ . Then the string  $\bar{z}$  can be read off the algebraic sketch (using the colors refining  $E_{\text{path}}$  and  $E_1$ ). Surely, the new atoms do not change the orbits or automorphisms of the structure, the witnessing machines just have to fix the new atoms. Using Lemma 22 of [18] we can always compute the algebraic sketch of the structure without the new atoms.

2. **refine( $C, i, \bar{z}$ ):** We proceed in the very similar way and encode  $\bar{z}$  using additional vertices. We pick some fiber  $U$ , create a relation  $E_U$  containing all pairs of  $U$ -vertices and execute  $k := |\bar{z}|$  many times  $\text{scc}(E_U)$ , and in that way obtain  $k$  many additional vertices in singleton fibers  $V_1, \dots, V_k$ . We create a vertex class  $C_1$  containing the vertices of the  $V_i$  for which  $z_i = 1$ . Finally, we create a relation  $E_{\text{path}}$  inducing a directed path on the  $V_i$ . Then **refine( $C, i$ )** is executed. The DeepWL+WSC-algorithm used to refine  $C$  is altered as follows: It can determine the fibers  $V_i$  using the relation  $E_{\text{path}}$ . The relation  $E_{\text{path}}$  itself is the lexicographical greatest relation symbol, as it was created last. Then it determines  $\bar{z}$ .

As in the case before, the new vertices are fixed by any automorphism since the fiber  $U$  has to be fixed. Again using Lemma 22 of [18] we can always compute the algebraic sketch of the structure without the fibers  $V_1, \dots, V_k$ .

3. **rename( $E, F$ ):** The DeepWL+WSC-machine maintains the bijection between current and renamed relation symbols on its tape. The bijection can be passed through **refine**-operations using ordered input.
4. **addUPair( $X$ ):** We first execute **addPair( $X$ )**, so we obtain vertices  $\langle u, v \rangle$  for every  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and component relations  $E_{\text{left}}$  and  $E_{\text{right}}$ . Let  $\pi$  be the set of colors, which have a  $(E_{\text{left}}, E_{\text{right}}^{-1})$ - and a  $(E_{\text{right}}, E_{\text{left}}^{-1})$ -colored triangle. Then **create( $\pi$ )** is executed and a relation  $F$  obtained. The relation  $F$  contains precisely all pairs  $(\langle u, v \rangle, \langle v, u \rangle)$  for every  $\{u, v\} \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . We execute  $\text{scc}(E)$  and obtain for each  $F$ -SCC a new vertex and a membership relation  $E_{\text{in}}$ . Although the new vertices are created for the sets  $\{\langle u, v \rangle, \langle v, u \rangle\}$ , they resemble the sets  $\{u, v\}$ . The membership relation  $F_{\text{in}}$  for these sets is obtained as the union of colors, which have a  $(E_{\text{in}}, E_{\text{left}})$ - and a  $(E_{\text{in}}, E_{\text{right}})$ -colored triangle. Finally, for the pairs  $(u, v) \in X^{\mathfrak{A}}$  such that  $(u, v) \notin X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , we have not created an  $F$ -SCC vertex because these pair vertices are not incident to  $F$ . Here we can just use the pair vertices itself (no automorphism can map  $u$  to  $v$  or vice versa in this case). We can define the relations refining  $E_{\text{left}}$  and  $E_{\text{right}}$  incident to such pair vertices and also include them in  $F_{\text{in}}$ .

As before, the sketch with the additional created pair vertices can be computed using Lemma 22 of [18].

It is also easy to see that the simulations run in polynomial time, where the size of a tuple  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{z})$  is  $|\mathfrak{A}| + |\bar{z}|$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 From CPT+WSC to DeepWL+WSC

In this section we translate a CPT+WSC formula into an equivalent polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. The following translation is based on the translation of CPT into interpretation logic in [14] and the translation of interpretation logic in DeepWL in [18]. However, we avoid the route through interpretation logic by directly implementing the ideas of [14] in DeepWL+WSC. To avoid case distinctions, we in the following we assume that all occurring CPT+WSC terms or formulas never output  $\dagger$ . Although a  $\dagger$ -respecting translation can be given, it is not needed for our purpose (all isomorphism-defining CPT+WSC formulas never output  $\dagger$ ).

We simulate the evaluation of a BGS+WSC term (or formula) with a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. For the simulation on input structure  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ , we encode two types of objects:

- A hereditarily finite set  $a \in \mathbf{HF}(A_0)$  is encoded by a vertex  $\langle a, i \rangle$  for some  $i$ . There is an exception for the empty set: because a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm cannot create a vertex for the empty set, we encode  $\emptyset$  by  $\langle A_0, i \rangle$  for some  $i$ , where  $A_0$  is the set of initial atoms.

We maintain a relation  $E_\in$ , which serves as membership relation  $E_\in$  between the vertices, that is it corresponds to the  $\in$  relation of the encoded sets.

- Tuples are encoded as vertex classes, too. A tuple  $\bar{a} \in \mathbf{HF}(A_0)^k$  of hereditarily finite sets is encoded by a vertex  $\langle \bar{a}, i \rangle$  for some  $i$  (for an appropriate encoding of tuples as hereditarily finite sets) and a sequence of incident relations  $E_1, \dots, E_k$ , such that every  $E_j$  has outdegree 1 and associates to  $\langle \bar{a}, i \rangle$  a vertex  $\langle a_j, \ell \rangle$  for some  $\ell$ . We call these relations the *tuple relations*<sup>6</sup>.

We now introduce an intermediate version of DeepWL+WSC-algorithms, which is needed for the recursive translation of CPT+WSC terms and formulas. A **choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm** is a tuple  $(M^{\text{out}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  consisting of a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  and DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$ . The computation of a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is exactly the same as the one of a regular DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, but as the output machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  is choice-free, no witnessing machine is needed. Note here that for a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm the subalgorithms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$  are not choice-free. The benefit of a choice-free algorithm is that two choice-free algorithms can e.g. easily be executed one after the other without worrying about witnessing choices.

We say that a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  *simulates* a term  $s(\bar{x})$ , if, given a vertex class  $C$  in the current cloud  $\mathfrak{A}$  encoding  $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples of sets, the algorithm defines a new vertex class  $C_s$  encoding the image of  $C$  under the map  $\bar{a} \mapsto \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(\bar{a})$  and

---

<sup>6</sup>We remark that the tuple relations are in general different from the component relation of the `addPair`-operation.

a relation  $E_{\text{io}}$  associating a  $u \in C^{\mathfrak{A}}$  with the  $v \in C_s^{\mathfrak{B}}$  such that “ $v = \llbracket s \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}}(u)$ ” (where  $\mathfrak{B}$  is the content of the cloud after the execution of  $\mathcal{M}$ ). The relation  $E_{\text{io}}$  is called the **input-output relation**. Likewise, a choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm simulates a formula  $\Phi(\bar{x})$  which is not a WSC-fixed-point operator (but may contain such operators as subformulas) if, given a vertex class  $C$  encoding  $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples of sets, the algorithm refines the vertex classes  $C$  and outputs a vertex class  $C_{\Phi}^{\mathfrak{B}} \subseteq C^{\mathfrak{B}}$  corresponding to the  $C$ -vertices satisfying  $\Phi$ .

Finally, a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm simulates a WSC-fixed-point operator  $\Phi(\bar{x})$ , if, given a singleton vertex class representing a value  $\bar{a}$  for the free variables  $\bar{x}$ , the algorithm accepts if and only if  $\bar{a}$  satisfies  $\Phi$ . The definition for WSC-fixed-point operators is different from the ones of other formulas/terms because we use these DeepWL+WSC-algorithms only for **refine**-executions.

We will show that CPT+WSC can be translated to DeepWL+WSC by induction on the nesting structure of the WSC-fixed-point operators. Let  $\Phi$  be a CPT+WSC formula (or a term) and  $\Psi$  be a WSC-fixed-point operator, such that  $\Psi$  is a subformula of  $\Phi$ . We call  $\Psi$  **directly nested** in  $\Phi$ , if there is no WSC-fixed-point operator  $\Phi'$ , such that  $\Psi$  is a subformula of  $\Phi'$  and  $\Phi'$  is a subformula of  $\Phi$ .

In the following lemma, we use relation symbols  $X \in \tau \cup \sigma$  as the sets  $X^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the current content of the cloud of the DeepWL+WSC-machine we are going to define. So for example  $X \setminus Y$  has a well-defined notion. This simplifies notation because we do not have to introduce the current structure in the cloud at all places.

**Lemma 28.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a CPT+WSC formula (or term), which is not a WSC-fixed-point operator and does not output  $\dagger$ , and assume that for every WSC-fixed-point operator  $\Phi'$  directly nested in  $\Phi$  a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-machine simulating  $\Phi'$  is given. Then there is a choice-free polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm simulating  $\Phi$ .*

*Proof.* Let the directly nested WSC-fixed-point operators of  $\Phi$  be  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Phi}_\ell$  and let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$  be DeepWL+WSC-algorithms, such that  $\mathcal{M}_i$  simulates  $\hat{\Phi}_i$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . We now define a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  such that the choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $(M^{\text{out}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  simulates  $\Phi$ .

The construction is recursive on the structure of the terms and formulas. We start with a vertex class  $C$  representing the values for the free variables. Then we perform the computations to simulate the terms. During the simulation we want to ensure that for every encoded set  $a$  there is exactly only one vertex  $\langle a, i \rangle$  and no others, so we want to avoid duplicates (with the exception for the empty set). So whenever we want to execute an **addPair**-, **addUPair**- or **scc**-operation, we actually have to check whether the resulting sets already exist. This can be done using the relation  $E_\in$  (and for **scc** due to the fact that SCCs can be computed by DeepWL [18, Lemma 4]). From now, we implicitly assume that these checks are always done and just write that we execute the **addPair**-, **addUPair**- or **scc**-operations.

- $\Psi = E_{\text{CPT}}(x, y)$ : Here  $E_{\text{CPT}}$  is a relation of the signature of the CPT+WSC formula, which is contained in the current structure in the cloud. Given a vertex class  $C$  representing the values of the pair  $xy$ , we return the vertex class  $C'$  consisting of  $C$ -vertices for which the tuple relations are adjacent to atoms  $A_0$  and refine the relation  $E_{\text{CPT}}$  in the structure: Let  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  be the tuple relations for first

and second component of  $C$ . Then we want to return the vertex class containing the vertices which have an  $(E_1, E_{CPT}, E_2^{-1})$ -colored cycle. So there is a union of fibers  $\pi \subseteq \sigma$ , which contains precisely these vertices. We execute `create`( $\pi$ ) and output the resulting relation. In the following, we will not mention the needed `create` operations or that we can find the union of fibers  $\pi$ .

- $\Psi = s(\bar{x}) = t(\bar{y})$ : Given a vertex class  $C$  corresponding to the free variables  $\bar{x} \cup \bar{y}$ , we can use  $C$  for the free variables  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  by only using a subset of the tuple relations. Then we use the algorithms for  $s$  and  $t$  to obtain vertex classes  $C_s$  and  $C_t$  together with the input-output relations  $E_{i_o,s}$  and  $E_{i_o,t}$ . Then precisely the  $C_s$ -vertices  $u$  and the  $C_t$ -vertices  $v$  are obtained from the same  $C$ -vertex  $w$  if the edge  $(u, v)$  has an  $(E_{i_o,s}^{-1}, E_{i_o,t})$ -colored triangle. We now create a vertex class  $C'$  from the fibers refining  $C$  which have an  $(E_{i_o,s}^{-1}, E_{i_o,t})$ -colored cycle, that is the two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are actually the same. This is exactly then the case when the outputs of  $s$  and  $t$  are equal. Note that here it is crucial to perform the cleanup steps unifying vertices representing the same set after every step.
- $\Psi = \neg\Phi$ : Given a vertex class  $C$ , we obtain by induction a vertex class  $C_\Phi$ . Then we return  $C \setminus C_\Phi$ .
- $\Psi = \Phi_1(\bar{x}) \wedge \Phi_2(\bar{y})$ : Given a vertex class  $C$ , we obtain by induction vertex classes  $C_{\Phi_1}$  and  $C_{\Phi_2}$  and we just return  $C_{\Phi_1} \cap C_{\Phi_2}$ .
- $\Psi = \hat{\Phi}_i(\bar{x})$ : Let  $C$  be a vertex class representing the values for the variables  $\bar{x}$ . The machine executes `refine`( $C, i$ ) and returns the resulting vertex class (note that  $C$  is a vertex class and so the fact that `refine`-operations treat directed and directed relations differently does not matter here). By induction hypothesis this vertex class contains precisely the vertices representing the tuples satisfying  $\hat{\Phi}_i$ .
- $r = \text{Atoms}$ : We create relation  $E$  connecting all atoms of the input structure (all vertices, which have no outgoing  $E_\infty$ -edge) and execute `scc`( $E$ ). This way we obtain a single additional vertex in a vertex class  $C_{\text{Atoms}}$  and a membership relation connecting it to the atoms, which is merged into  $E_\infty$ . (Of course, as described before, we create the vertex class  $C_{\text{Atoms}}$  only once.)
- $r = \emptyset$ : In the same way as in the `Atoms` case, we obtain a single vertex in its own vertex class  $C_\emptyset$ , but now we do not merge the created membership relation into  $E_\infty$ . While  $\emptyset$  is encoded by a vertex for the atoms, with respect to automorphism this does not make a difference because every automorphism fixes the set of all atoms and  $C_\emptyset$  and  $C_{\text{Atoms}}$  contain different vertices  $\langle A_0, i \rangle$  and  $\langle A_0, j \rangle$  for  $i \neq j$ . So no automorphism can exchange these two vertices.
- $r = \text{Pair}(s(\bar{x}), t(\bar{y}))$ : Given a vertex class  $C$  corresponding to the free variables  $\bar{x} \cup \bar{y}$ , we can use  $C$  for the free variables  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  by only using a subset of the tuple relations. Then we use the algorithms for  $s$  and  $t$  to obtain (possibly equal) vertex classes  $C_s$  and  $C_t$  together with the input-output relations  $E_{i_o,s}$  and  $E_{i_o,t}$ . Then precisely the  $C_s$ -vertices  $u$  and  $C_t$ -vertices  $v$  are obtained for the same  $C$ -vertex  $w$  if the pair  $(u, v)$  has an  $(E_{i_o,s}^{-1}, E_{i_o,t})$ -colored triangle. That is, there is a union of




Figure 1: On the left, the translation of the comprehension term  $r = \{s(\bar{x}y) \mid y \in t(\bar{x}), \Phi(\bar{x}y)\}$  in DeepWL. The figure is drawn for a single vertex  $u$  in the input vertex class  $C$  and contains all vertices created for  $u$ . On the right, the translation of the iteration term  $r = s(x)^*$ .

colors  $E_=_$ , which precisely contains all such pairs  $(u, v)$ . Then the machine executes  $\text{addUPair}(E_=_)$  and obtains the vertex class  $C_r$  and a new membership relation  $F$  (so we actually encode the set  $\{a, b\}$  with the set  $\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ ). The membership relation  $F$  connects  $C_r$ -vertices to  $C_s$ - and  $C_t$ -vertices. The input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},r}$  is the union of colors which have an  $(E_{\text{io},s}, F^{-1})$ - and an  $(E_{\text{io},t}, F^{-1})$ -colored triangle. Finally, the machine merges  $F$  into  $E_{\infty}$ .

- $r = \text{Unique}(s(\bar{x}))$ : Given a vertex class  $C$  we define the vertex class  $C_s$  with input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},s}$  and membership relation  $E_{\infty}$  using the induction hypothesis. The vertex class  $C_s$  can be partitioned into  $C^1$  and  $C^{\neq 1}$ , where  $C^1$ -vertices precisely have one outgoing  $E_{\infty}$ -edge and  $C^{\neq 1}$ -vertices do not. Let  $E_{\text{io},s}^1 := E_{\text{io},s} \cap (C^1 \times C_s)$  be the subset of  $E_{\text{io},s}$  leading to a  $C_s$ -vertex representing a singleton set (which is DeepWL-definable). Then the  $C$ -vertices which are adjacent to  $C^1$  via  $E_{\text{io},s}$  form a union of vertex classes  $C'_r$ . The machine makes the following case distinction: If  $|C^{\neq 1}| = 0$  set  $C_r := C'_r$  and otherwise  $C_r := C'_r \cup C_{\emptyset}$ . For the  $C$ -vertices leading to singleton sets, we obtain  $E'_{\text{io},r}$  as the relation with an  $(E_{\text{io},s}^1, E_{\infty})$ -colored triangle. For the other  $C$ -vertices, let  $F := C^{\neq 1} \times C_{\emptyset}$  be the relation containing all edges between  $C^{\neq 1}$  and the singleton vertex class  $C_{\emptyset}$ . Finally, set  $E_{\text{io},r} := E'_{\text{io},r} \cup F$ .
- $r = \text{Card}(s(\bar{x}))$ : Define for a given vertex class  $C$  the vertex class  $C_s$ , the input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},s}$ , and the membership relation  $E_{\infty}$ . We can partition  $C_s$  into  $C_s^1, \dots, C_s^k$ , such that  $C_s^i$ -vertices have  $i$ -many outgoing  $E_{\infty}$  edges. Then the machine defines for all  $i \in k$  with  $C_s^i \neq \emptyset$  the  $i$ -th von Neumann ordinal, outputs  $C_r$  as the union of these ordinals and  $E_{\text{io},r}$  accordingly.
- $r = \{s(\bar{x}y) \mid y \in t(\bar{x}), \Phi(\bar{x}y)\}$ : We start with the vertex class  $C$  and define by induction the vertex class  $C_t$ , the input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},t}$ , and the membership relation  $E_{\infty}$  (cf. Figure 1). Then the machine defines vertex classes encoding the tuples for the variables  $\bar{x}y$ : Let  $E_{\bar{x}y}$  be the relations with a  $(E_{\text{io},t}, E_{\infty})$ -colored triangle. These relations associate an input tuple with an element contained in the output set of  $t$ . The machine executes  $\text{addPair}(E_{\bar{x}y})$  and obtains a vertex class  $C_{\bar{x}y}$  with pair relations  $E_{\bar{x}} := E_{\text{left}}$  and  $E_y := E_{\text{right}}$ .

Using induction we obtain the vertex classes  $C_\Phi \subseteq C_{\bar{x}y}$  of  $C_{\bar{x}y}$ -vertices satisfying  $\Phi$ . With  $C_\Phi$  as input vertex class, the machine obtains  $C_s$  again by induction and obtains the input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},s}$ .

We define a relation  $F$  connecting  $C_s$ -vertices which are obtained from  $C_\Phi$  and originate from the same  $C_t$ -vertex. This relation is given by the union of colors  $R$ , such that every  $R$  has an  $(E_{\text{io},s}^{-1}, E_y, E_\epsilon^{-1}, E_\epsilon, E_y^{-1}, E_{\text{io},s})$ -colored path. We then execute  $\text{scc}(F)$  to obtain a color class  $C_r$  and a new membership relation  $E'_\epsilon$ . Finally, the input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},r}$  consists of the edges with an  $(E_{\text{io},t}, E_\epsilon, E_y^{-1}, E_{\text{io},s}, E_\epsilon^{-1})$ -colored path and the machine merges  $E'_\epsilon$  into  $E_\epsilon$ .

- $r = s(x)^*$ : Let  $s$  have free variables  $(\bar{y}x)$ . We start with the vertex class  $C$  for the free variables  $\bar{y}$  (cf. Figure 1). We then execute  $\text{addPair}(E_\emptyset)$  for the relation  $E_\emptyset$  between  $C$  and  $C_\emptyset$ . We obtain a vertex class  $C^0$  and the pair relations  $E^0 := E_{\text{left}}^{-1}$  between a  $C$ -vertex and the corresponding  $C^0$ -vertex and  $F_x^0 := E_{\text{right}}$  defining the tuple relation to the entry for  $x$ .

Let  $C^i$  be the vertex class containing the current input values after the  $i$ -th iteration. Let the relation  $E^i$  relate the values for  $\bar{y}$  with the extended tuples  $\bar{y}x$  in  $C^i$  (maybe not all  $\bar{y}$  are related, because a fixed-point for them is already computed). If  $i$  exceeds the maximal number of iterations (given by the polynomial of the CPT term/formula), set  $C_*^{i+1} := \emptyset$  and  $E_*^{i+1}$  to be the relations with an  $(E^i, F)$ -colored triangle, where  $F$  are all relations between  $C^i$  and  $C_\emptyset$ .

Otherwise, the machine defines, starting with  $C^i$ , a vertex class  $C_s^i$  and the input-output relation  $E_{\text{io},s}^i$  using induction. Let  $F_x^i$  be the tuple relation of  $C^i$  for  $x$ . We partition  $E_s^i$  into  $E_{\text{fix}}^i := E_s^i \cap F_x^i$  and the rest  $E_{\text{continue}}^i := E_s^i \setminus F_x^i$ . In  $E_{\text{fix}}^i$  the set for the variable  $x$  contained in  $C^i$  is equal to the output after applying  $s$  once more, so we reached a fixed-point. Set  $C_*^i$  to be the subset of  $C_s^i$  which is incident to  $E_{\text{fix}}^i$  and set  $E_*^i$  to be the relation with an  $(E^i, E_{\text{fix}}^i)$ -colored triangle incident (so  $E_*^i$  associates the input values of  $y$  with the computed fixed-point).

If  $E_{\text{continue}}^i = \emptyset$  the machine stops looping. Otherwise, the machine executes the operation  $\text{addPair}(F^i)$ , where  $F^i$  are the edges with an  $(E^i, E_{\text{continue}}^i)$ -colored triangle, and obtains the vertex class  $C^{i+1}$ , the relation  $E^{i+1}$  relating a  $C$ -vertex with the corresponding  $C^{i+1}$ -vertex and the relation  $F_x^i$  for the value of  $x$ . That is, the machine combines the input variables for  $\bar{y}$  with the new set for  $x$ . Now the machine continues looping.

When the loop is finished, the machine outputs the union of the  $C_*^i$ , where the union of the  $C_*^i$  is the input-output relation.

We finally have to argue that the constructed choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithm runs in polynomial time. We omit a formal proof but only give a sketch here: Let  $p$  be the polynomial given with the CPT+WSC term or formula. In every translation step, the machine needs a polynomial number of steps because the number of iterations in the iteration term is bounded by  $p$ . Also, the size of the structure in the cloud is bounded by a polynomial in the size of the transitive closure of all sets simulated so far, which itself is bounded by  $p$  (or, to be precise, by a polynomial of  $p$ , because  $p$  only bounds the number of sets in one iteration, but as there are only polynomially many iterations in an iteration

term, there are in total only polynomially many sets). Whenever a directly nested WSC-fixed-point operator is simulated, one of the simulating DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is called a polynomial number of times. Because all the  $\mathcal{M}_i$  run in polynomial time, the whole simulation runs in polynomial time.  $\square$

**Lemma 29.** *Let  $\Phi(\bar{w}) = \text{WSC}^*xy$ . ( $s_{\text{step}}(xy), s_{\text{choice}}(x), s_{\text{wit}}(xy), \Phi_{\text{out}}(x)$ ) be a WSC-fixed-point operator not outputting  $\dagger$  and assume that for every WSC-fixed-point operator  $\Phi'$  directly nested in  $\Phi$  a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm simulating  $\Phi'$  is given. Then there is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm simulating  $\Phi$ .*

*Proof.* We will construct DeepWL+WSC-machines  $M^{\text{out}}$  and  $M^{\text{wit}}$  in a way such that the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $(M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  simulates  $\Phi$ . The DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_i$  are the ones simulating the directly nested WSC-fixed-point operators and will be used by choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithms simulating  $s_{\text{step}}, s_{\text{choice}}, s_{\text{wit}}$ , and  $\Phi$  (for the latter we can for technical reasons assume that  $\Phi$  is not a WSC-fixed-point operator by considering  $\Phi \wedge \Phi$ ).

The machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  proceeds similarly to the plain iteration term in Lemma 28: For two singleton color classes  $C$  and  $D$  we say that  $M^{\text{out}}$  **creates a pair of**  $C$  and  $D$  when  $M^{\text{out}}$  executes `addPair` for the single edge between the  $C$ - and the  $D$ -vertex.

Given a singleton vertex class  $C$  and the step term  $s_{\text{step}}$ , the machine first creates a pair of  $C$  and  $C_\emptyset$  resulting in the singleton color class  $C^0$ .

Now, in the  $i$ -th iteration, let  $C^i$  be the singleton vertex class encoding the current set in the fixed-point computation. The machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  first checks whether  $i$  exceeds the maximal number of iterations. If so, it remembers  $C_{\text{out}} := C_0$  (the input values paired with the empty set). Otherwise, it simulates using Lemma 28 the choice term  $s_{\text{choice}}$  on input  $C^i$  yielding a singleton vertex class  $C_{s_{\text{choice}}}^i$  encoding the choice set. Let  $C_{\text{orb}}^i$  be the vertex class incident via the membership relation to the  $C_{s_{\text{choice}}}^i$  vertex. Then the machine executes `choice`( $C_{\text{orb}}^i$ ) yielding a singleton vertex class  $C_{\text{ind}}^i$  (because we choose from a vertex class, we do not have to deal with the difference of the `choice`-operation for directed or undirected relations). Now  $M^{\text{out}}$  creates a pair of  $C^i$  and  $C_{\text{ind}}^i$  and simulates the step term  $s_{\text{step}}$  (Lemma 28) with the newly created tuple vertex as input. This results in a singleton color class  $C_{s_{\text{step}}}^i$ . Then the machine creates again a pair of  $C$  and  $C_{s_{\text{step}}}^i$  resulting in the singleton color class  $C^{i+1}$ . If  $C^i = C^{i+1}$  (again it is important that vertices representing the same set are not created twice), a fixed-point is reached and the machine remembers  $C_{\text{out}} := C^{i+1}$ . Otherwise, it starts the next iteration. Once  $C_{\text{out}}$  is computed (note that  $C_{\text{out}}$  is always a singleton color class because  $C$  is),  $M^{\text{out}}$  simulates  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$  on input  $C_{\text{out}}$  (again using Lemma 28). If the simulation outputs  $C_{\text{out}}$  (so  $\Phi_{\text{out}}$  is satisfied),  $M^{\text{out}}$  halts and accepts. Otherwise,  $M^{\text{out}}$  halts and does not accept.

The machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  just simulates the term  $s_{\text{wit}}$  (again Lemma 28) given the vertex classes  $C^i$  and  $C^n$ , where  $n$  is the last iteration of the loop. Here is some subtle difference between CPT+WSC and DeepWL+WSC. The CPT+WSC term  $s_{\text{wit}}$  gets the  $i$ -th and  $n$ -th step of the fixed-point computation as input to witness the choices. In DeepWL+WSC we get the labeled union  $\mathfrak{A}_n \uplus \mathfrak{A}_i$  of the final content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}_n$  and the content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  of the `choice` execution, which should be witnessed. In our setting this means that  $\mathfrak{A}_n \uplus \mathfrak{A}_i$  contains the vertex classes  $C^i$  and  $C^n$  but also the vertex class  $C_{s_{\text{choice}}}^i$  encoding the choice set<sup>7</sup>. The witnessing term  $s_{\text{wit}}$  defines automorphisms

<sup>7</sup>If a relation named  $C^i$  is also present in  $\mathfrak{A}_n$ , then  $C^i$  is not a singleton vertex class in  $\mathfrak{A}_n \uplus \mathfrak{A}_i$ , but

witnessing that  $C_{s_{\text{choice}}}^i$  is an orbit of  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  and fix the  $C^j$  for all  $j \in [i]$ . By Lemma 7 the CPT+WSC term  $s_{\text{choice}}$  is isomorphism-invariant, so all the  $C_{s_{\text{choice}}}^j$  are fixed for all  $j \in [i]$ , too. That is, exactly the orbits are witnessed in the computation of the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which are witnessed in the evaluation of the WSC-fixed-point operator. In particular, we do not have to care about failing. The rest is done by the semantics of DeepWL+WSC-algorithms: it fails if some choice was not witnessed, which happens if and only if some choice in the evaluation of the CPT+WSC formula was not witnessed.

The argument, that the constructed DeepWL+WSC-algorithm runs in polynomial time is similar to the one in Lemma 28.  $\square$

**Lemma 30.** *If a property  $P$  is CPT+WSC definable, then there is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm deciding  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi$  be a CPT+WSC formula defining the property  $P$ . Then in particular  $\Phi$  never outputs  $\dagger$ . Using Lemmas 28 and 29 we can translate  $\Phi$  into a polynomial time and (possibly choice-free) DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  simulating  $\Phi$ . Whenever needed, we extend choice-free DeepWL+WSC-algorithms to DeepWL+WSC-algorithms by adding a witnessing machine which immediately halts.  $\square$

## 5.4 Normalized DeepWL+WSC

In the following we are interested in DeepWL+WSC-algorithms deciding isomorphism, that is, in DeepWL+WSC-algorithms computing on a disjoint union of two structures. The ultimate goal is to show that every DeepWL+WSC algorithm computing on a disjoint union of two structures can be simulated by a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which only computes on the two components without mixing them. Then we just compute on each component on its own and in that way obtain a complete invariant to prove Lemma 19.

We follow the idea of [18] and show that it suffices never to “mix” vertices of the two components in the cloud. However, we have to differ from the construction at many points and some of our changes are crucial in the presence of choices.

### 5.4.1 Pure DeepWL+WSC

In this section we make some first steps for simulating a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm with another DeepWL+WSC-algorithm by putting additional restrictions on the algorithm to simulate. We adapt the notion of a pure DeepWL-algorithm from [18] to DeepWL+WSC-algorithms.

**Definition 31** (Pure DeepWL+WSC-algorithm). *A DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is called **pure** if  $\text{addPair}(R)$  and  $\text{scc}(R)$  are only executed for colors (or fibers) and  $\text{refine}(U, i)$  and  $\text{choice}(U)$  are only executed for fibers.*

**Lemma 32.** *For every DeepWL+WSC-algorithm deciding a property  $P$  or computing a function  $f$  in polynomial time there is a pure DeepWL+WSC-algorithm deciding  $P$  or computing  $f$  in polynomial time.*

---

we can obtain the correct one by taking the  $C^i$  vertex which is also contained in the special  $E_2$  relation given by the labeled union. We similarly process the other vertex classes.

*Proof sketch.* We show that  $\text{addPair}(X)$ ,  $\text{scc}(X)$ ,  $\text{refine}(X, i)$  and  $\text{choice}(X)$  executions can be simulated by respective executions only for colors and fibers. The case for  $\text{addPair}(X)$  and  $\text{scc}(X)$  is similar to the proof in Lemma 7 [18]:

**addPair( $X$ )** First decompose  $X$  into its colors  $R_1, \dots, R_k$  using the symbolic subset relation. Then execute  $\text{addPair}(R_i)$  for every  $i \in [k]$ , obtain membership relations  $E_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$  and create a new relation as the union of all  $E_i$ . In that way, we create the same vertices  $\langle a, i \rangle$  in the cloud as the  $\text{addPair}(X)$ -execution would do.

**scc( $X$ )** Using Lemma 4 of [18] we can compute a relation relating precisely the vertices in the same  $X$ -SCC using a pure DeepWL-algorithm (and this algorithm only executes **create** and no other operations, so can be directly transferred into our DeepWL definition).

Now, if there is a  $X$ -SCC which is not discrete, i.e. contains vertices in the same fiber, we can identify a color  $R$  contained in  $X$ , such that the  $R$ -SCCs are non-trivial. We execute  $\text{scc}(R)$  and obtain new vertices and a new membership relation  $F$ . Now we consider  $X'$ -SCCs, where  $X'$  contains the edges of  $X$  not incident to an  $R$ -SCC and for every edge  $(u, v)$  such that (w.l.o.g.)  $v$  is in an  $R$ -SCC the edge  $(u, w)$ , where  $w$  is the  $R$ -SCC vertex for  $v$  (so incident via the membership relation to  $v$ ). Then  $X'$  can be defined using **create** for an appropriate set of colors. If the  $X'$ -SCCs are still not all discrete, we repeat the procedure.

So consider the case that all  $X$ -SCCs are discrete. Conceptually, we want to pick from every  $X$ -SCC the vertex in the minimal fiber as a representative of that SCC. Apart from that we have to copy these vertices, this can be done exactly as in Lemma 7 [18].

So for  $\text{scc}(X)$  we do not create precisely the same vertex  $\langle a, i \rangle$  when simulating it, because we pick the minimal fibers as representative. Regarding automorphisms, this does not make a difference because  $X$ -SCCs have to be mapped to  $X$ -SCCs and if they are discrete, there is only one possible mapping.

**refine( $X, k$ )** Let  $X$  consist of the colors  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  (these colors can be found using the symbolic subset relation). The machine then executes  $\text{refine}(R_1, k), \dots, \text{refine}(R_m, k)$  and obtains new relations  $F_1, \dots, F_m$ . The union of these relations precisely corresponds to the relation outputted by  $\text{refine}(X, k)$ . So we can assume that  $X$  is a color  $R$ .

If  $R$  is not a fiber, we do the following: If  $R$  is an undirected color, the machine executes  $\text{addUPair}(R)$ , obtains a new color class  $C$  and a membership relation  $F$ , and executes  $\text{refine}(C, k)$ . From this we can create a relation  $R'$  refining  $R$  containing exactly the edges corresponding to the  $C$ -vertices. (Namely the ones with an  $(F^{-1}, C, F)$ -colored path).

If  $R$  is a directed color, the machine executes  $\text{addPair}(R)$ , obtains the vertex class  $C$  and the pair relations  $F_{\text{left}}$  and  $F_{\text{right}}$ , and executes  $\text{refine}(C, k)$  (which, in the case  $C$  is not a fiber but a union of fibers, is again simulated by multiple **refine**-operations). Now we proceed similarly: A vertex class  $D$  containing the  $C$ -vertices accepted by the  $\text{refine}(C, k)$  is obtained and the machine defines a relation  $E$  refining  $R$  containing exactly the edges corresponding to the  $D$ -vertices. (Namely the one with an  $(F_{\text{left}}^{-1}, D, F_{\text{right}})$ -colored path).

The algorithm used to refine has to be altered to also perform the same operations to first create a new relation corresponding to the individualized  $D$ -vertex.

**choice( $X$ )** If **choice( $X$ )** is executed for a relation  $E$  consisting of more than one color, then  $E$  is not an orbit and the given algorithm does not decide a property or computes a function (recall that it is never allowed to fail).

So assume that  $X$  is a color  $R$ . Similarly to the **refine**-case, the machine executes **addUPair( $R$ )** or **addPair( $R$ )**, depending on whether  $R$  is undirected or not, and obtains a color class  $C$ . Now the machine executes **choice( $C$ )** yielding a singleton vertex class containing a  $C$ -vertex  $u$ . Using the vertex  $u$  we can define a relation containing a single (directed or undirected) edge of  $R$  similarly to the **refine**-case.

It is easy to see that a set of automorphisms witnesses  $R$  (seen as directed or undirected edges depending on whether  $R$  is directed or not) as orbit if and only if it witnesses  $C$  as orbit.  $\square$

### 5.4.2 Normalized DeepWL+WSC

We adapt the notion of a normalized DeepWL algorithm from [18] to DeepWL+WSC. We assume that in the input structure  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  each  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  consists of a single connected component. For the aim of testing isomorphism, we could otherwise just check component-wise. In the following, we call the  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  just **components**. During the execution of a DeepWL+WSC-machine on input  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  a vertex  $w$  **belongs to**  $\mathfrak{A}_i$  if  $w \in \text{HF}(A_i)$ , that is  $w \in V(\mathfrak{A}_i)$ ,  $w$  was added by an **addPair** execution for the pair  $(u, v)$  where  $u$  and  $v$  belong to  $\mathfrak{A}_i$ , or  $w$  is obtained as a vertex for an SCC  $c$  during a **scc** execution, where  $c$  only contains vertices belonging to  $\mathfrak{A}_i$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the content of the cloud and set  $V_i(\mathfrak{A}) := \{u \in V(\mathfrak{A}) \mid u \text{ belongs to } \mathfrak{A}_i\}$ . The vertices  $V_{\text{plain}}(\mathfrak{A}) := V_1(\mathfrak{A}) \cup V_2(\mathfrak{A})$  are called **plain**. The edges  $E_{\text{plain}}(\mathfrak{A}) := V_1(\mathfrak{A})^2 \cup V_2(\mathfrak{A})^2$  are called **plain** and the edges  $E_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}) := V_1(\mathfrak{A}) \times V_2(\mathfrak{A}) \cup V_2(\mathfrak{A}) \times V_1(\mathfrak{A})$  are called **crossing**. A relation or color is called plain (respectively crossing) if it only contains plain (respectively crossing) edges.

Note that during **refine**-operations the input of a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  is not necessarily a disjoint union of two structures. But in that case, we know for the input which vertices/relations were plain and crossing before and so the notion of plain and crossing is also well-defined for  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Lemma 33** ([18]). *The relation containing all plain (respectively crossing) edges is DeepWL-definable.*

**Definition 34** (Normalized DeepWL+WSC). *A structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  obtained from a structure  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  by a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is called **normalized** if*

(N1) *every vertex of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is plain and*

(N2)  *$\mathfrak{A}$  consists of the two connected components  $\mathfrak{A}[V_1(\mathfrak{A})]$  and  $\mathfrak{A}[V_2(\mathfrak{A})]$ .*

*A DeepWL+WSC-machine is **normalized** if on input  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  the content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}$  at any time is normalized. A DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is **normalized**, if all contained DeepWL+WSC-machines are normalized.*

Following the given definition, normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms are proper but restricted DeepWL+WSC-algorithms. The current definition has a severe issue, namely constructing witnessing automorphisms. With the current encoding, a set of automorphisms can only be encoded by non-plain vertices. So normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms need to use a different encoding of automorphisms to witness choices. For the moment, we do not define this encoding, as it is irrelevant for the following lemmas and define it later in Section 5.4.6 once we have established the required formalisms. Note that maintaining the two connected components is needed for the notion of plain vertices to be well-defined.

Normalized structures have the important property that every crossing color is actually a “product” of two fibers. That is, crossing colors do not provide additional information and that is the reason why general DeepWL+WSC algorithms can ultimately be simulated by normalized ones.

**Lemma 35** (Lemma 8 [18]). *For every normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  it holds that for every crossing color  $R$  there are two plain fibers  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $R^\mathfrak{A} = (U^\mathfrak{A} \times V^\mathfrak{A}) \cap E_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$ . The two sketches  $D(\mathfrak{A}_1)$  and  $D(\mathfrak{A}_2)$  determine  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  and in particular satisfy  $D(\mathfrak{A}_i) = D(\mathfrak{A})[\sigma_i, V_i(\mathfrak{A})]$  (where  $\sigma_i \subseteq \sigma$  is the set of relation symbols containing at least one pair of  $V_i(\mathfrak{A})^2$ ).*

### 5.4.3 The “Direct Product” Property and refine-Operations

We now develop some tools to deal with normalized DeepWL+WSC-machines. First, we investigate properties related to `refine`-operations. In some sense, it is our goal to preserve the “direct product” property for crossing colors as stated in Lemma 35. In principle, if we only create plain vertices, this property is preserved, but a `refine`-operation can violate it.

We give an illustrating example: Assume we are given a normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ , both components of the same size, where all atoms are in the same fiber and consequently all crossing edges are in the same color  $R$ . Further, assume that some DeepWL+WSC-algorithm can linearly order the atoms in each component. Then we can define an algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  with the following property. For  $\{u, v\} \subseteq R^\mathfrak{A}$  the algorithm accepts  $(\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2, \{u, v\})$  if and only if  $u$  and  $v$  are each the  $i$ -th vertex in their component for some  $i$ . If we refine  $R$  with  $\mathcal{M}$ , a relation  $E$  containing a perfect matching between the components is added. But the information, that the atoms can be ordered, is not “returned”. The result is again a coherent configuration without refined fibers and so the “direct product” property is violated. To fix this, we can instead distinguish the atoms before executing the `refine`-operation avoiding the problem.

We are now going to show that this strategy works somehow in general, which requires the following (technical) lemmas. The first lemma states that if we can compute on  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ , then we can also compute on the structure  $(\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_1)$  where we artificially distinguish the two components, i.e., remove automorphisms exchanging the components.

**Lemma 36.** *For every normalized DeepWL+WSC algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  there is a normalized algorithm  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts (or respectively rejects)  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  if and only if  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  accepts  $(\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_1)$  (that is, we add a vertex class containing all vertices of  $\mathfrak{A}_1$ ). Polynomial running time is preserved. If  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2) \neq \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A}'_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}'_2)$ , then  $\text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2, \mathfrak{A}_1)) \neq \text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}'_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}'_2, \mathfrak{A}'_1))$*

*Proof sketch.* The translation is done recursively. Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell$  be normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms satisfying the claim for the algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell$ .

We construct DeepWL+WSC-machines  $\hat{M}^{\text{out}}$  and  $\hat{M}^{\text{wit}}$ . Let  $M \in \{M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}\}$  and we construct an equivalent DeepWL+WSC-machine  $\hat{M}$ . By Lemma 22 of [18],  $\hat{M}$  can compute the algebraic sketch without the additional vertex class and so track the run of  $M$ . Note that by Lemma 35 the sketches of the individual components are equal up to renaming of the colors. Additionally, the crossing colors are now always directed.

If  $M$  executes `create`( $\pi$ ) and  $\pi$  contains a color  $R$  occurring in both components then  $\hat{M}$  uses the two colors  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , each occurring in one component, whose union is equal to  $R$ . Every `addPair`-, `scc`-, and `refine`-operation executed by  $M$  is executed in the same way by  $\hat{M}$  respecting the renamed colors: whenever  $M$  uses a color or relation, which is now split into two (one in each component),  $\hat{M}$  creates the union of these colors/relations and uses them. Executing the `refine`-operation is valid by the induction hypothesis.

If  $M$  executes `choice`( $E$ ), then we make the following case distinction. If  $E$  is a crossing and undirected relation,  $\hat{M}$  executes `choice`( $E'$ ), where  $E'$  contains the directed  $E$ -edges connecting an  $A_1$ -vertex to an  $A_2$ -vertex. Now a directed edge  $(u, v)$  instead of an undirected  $\{u, v\}$  is individualized. But because the two components are already distinguished, this does not matter and we still can use Lemma 22 of [18] to compute the algebraic sketch where both components are not distinguished.

If  $E$  is a plain relation containing edges of both components,  $\hat{M}$  executes `choice`( $E'$ ), where  $E'$  contains only the edges of  $E$  of the first component.

Otherwise,  $E$  is a plain relation containing only edges of one component and  $\hat{M}$  simply executes `choice`( $E$ ).

It is easy to see that if  $E$  was an orbit in the structure, where the components were not artificially distinguished, then  $E'$  is an orbit now.

We finally have to modify the witnessing machine  $\hat{M}^{\text{wit}}$ . Ignoring that we have yet to formally define how normalized DeepWL+WSC machines encode sets of witnessing automorphisms,  $\hat{M}^{\text{wit}}$  first computes the set of automorphisms given by  $M^{\text{wit}}$ . Then it removes the automorphisms exchanging the two components and outputs the set of remaining automorphisms. In this way, all choices are witnessed if all choices in the execution of  $\mathcal{M}$  are witnessed.

It is easy to see that the runs of  $\hat{M}$  differ if the runs of  $M$  differ because the run of  $\hat{M}$  contains the run of  $M$  because  $\hat{M}$  tracks the Turing machines in  $M$  and computes the sketches with Lemma 22 of [18].  $\square$

We now identify sets of runs as a possibility to distinguish vertices, such that executing a `refine`-operation on a crossing relation preserves the “direct product” property.

**Lemma 37.** *For every normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  on input  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ , every crossing color  $R^{\mathfrak{A}} = (U^{\mathfrak{A}} \times V^{\mathfrak{A}}) \cap \mathbf{E}_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$ , and every  $\{u, v\}, \{u, v'\} \in R^{\mathfrak{A}} \cup (R^{-1})^{\mathfrak{A}}$  it holds that if  $u \in U \cap \mathbf{V}_i(\mathfrak{A})$  for some  $i \in [2]$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v\})$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  does not accept  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v'\})$  then*

$$\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\})) \mid w \in U \cap \mathbf{V}_i(\mathfrak{A})\} \neq \{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v'\})) \mid w \in U \cap \mathbf{V}_i(\mathfrak{A})\}.$$

*Proof sketch.* We show  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v\})) \notin \{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v'\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$ . Assume for sake of contradiction that there is a vertex  $u' \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})$  such that  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v\})) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u', v'\}))$ . At some point  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u', v'\}))$  has to differ from  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v'\}))$  because  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v\})) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u', v'\}))$  is accepting and  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v'\}))$  is not accepting. Because  $\mathcal{M}$  is normalized, at every point in time the current content of the cloud  $\mathfrak{B}$  satisfies  $V(\mathfrak{B}) = V_1(\mathfrak{B}) \cup V_2(\mathfrak{B})$ . Before the first moment where the two runs differ, the component of  $v'$  is equal in both clouds because the same operations were executed and the initial components of  $v'$  were equal (in  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v'\})$  and in  $(\mathfrak{A}, \{u', v'\})$  the same vertex is individualized in this component). In particular, the components have the same sketches. So  $\mathcal{M}$  can only have a run on  $\{u', v'\}$  that is different from its run on  $\{u, v'\}$  if the sketches of the components of  $u$  and  $u'$  differ (Lemma 35). But this contradicts that  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u, v\})) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{u', v'\}))$ , because the sketches are contained in the run.  $\square$

We considered undirected edges  $\{u, v\}, \{u, v'\} \in R^{\mathfrak{A}} \cup (R^{-1})^{\mathfrak{A}}$  in the previous lemma to unify the case when  $R$  is directed or not. If  $R$  is directed, then  $(u, v) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$  implies that  $(v, u) \notin R^{\mathfrak{A}}$  because  $R$  is a color. Thus, the ordered tuple  $(u, v)$  can be reconstructed from the set  $\{u, v\}$ . Note that the set  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$  can be canonically encoded as a binary string because each run can be encoded as binary string.

Now we want to compute the sets  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$  with a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. In fact, we only compute something with the same “distinguishing power”. We start with the case where a directed edge  $(w, v)$  instead of the undirected one  $\{w, v\}$  is individualized (which we justify using Lemma 36). The only difference is, that we now can distinguish the two components, because one contains  $w$  and the other one does not. This has the benefit, that we can more easily create plain vertex classes.

**Lemma 38.** *In the setting of Lemma 37 assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  does not fail on input  $(\mathfrak{A}, uv)$  for every  $uv \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Then there is a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm computing the set  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, uv)) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$  given the vertex  $w$  as singleton color class. Polynomial runtime of the algorithm is preserved.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M}'$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which on input  $i, v$ , and  $w$  (given as singleton vertex classes) simulates  $\mathcal{M}$  and decides whether the  $i$ -th position of the run  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, uv))$  is a 1. Let  $\mathcal{M}''$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which on input  $i, v$ , and  $w$  decides whether  $|\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, uv))| \leq i$ .

We construct a machine which computes the runs  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, uv))$  in parallel for all  $w \in U$ . The runs are encoded as binary 0/1-strings, which are encoded by vertex classes  $C_1, \dots, C_m$ , and  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , where  $C_i$  contains all vertices of  $U$  for which the  $i$ -th bit of the run is 1, and  $D_i$  contains all vertices of  $U$  for which the run has length at least  $i$ .

Initialize  $i := -1$  and  $D_{-1} := U$ . We first use  $\mathcal{M}''$  to determine the vertex class  $D_{i+1} \subseteq D_i$  by executing  $\text{refine}(D_{i+1}, \mathcal{M}'', i+1)$  (of course, we have to replace  $\mathcal{M}'$  with the index  $k$  of  $\mathcal{M}'$  in the list of DeepWL+WSC-algorithms which can be used for  $\text{refine}$  executions). If  $D_{i+1} = \emptyset$  we stop. Otherwise, we determine  $C_{i+1}$  as a subset of  $D_{i+1}$  by executing  $\text{refine}(D_{i+1}, \mathcal{M}', i+1)$ . Finally, we increment  $i$  and repeat.

We now have encoded the runs  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, uv))$  with the vertex classes  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  and  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ . So we can determine which runs occur. Now it is easy to compute

the set  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, wv)) \mid w \in U\}$  and to write it on the tape because the runs can be ordered lexicographically.

Regarding the runtime, its easy to see that  $\mathcal{M}'$  and  $\mathcal{M}''$  run in polynomial time as they just simulate  $\mathcal{M}$  and check the run of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Because the length of the run of  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded by a polynomial, so is the number of iterations and the number of needed relations  $m$ . That is, also the size of the algebraic sketch is bounded by a polynomial.  $\square$

**Lemma 39.** *In the setting of Lemma 37 assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  does not fail on input  $(\mathfrak{A}, uv)$  for every  $uv \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Then there is a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm computing a function  $f$  such that  $f(v) \neq f(v')$  whenever  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\} \neq \{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v'\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$  for every  $v, v' \in U^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})$ . The input vertex to  $f$  is given as singleton color class. Polynomial runtime is preserved.*

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  be the normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm given by Lemma 36 for  $\mathcal{M}$ . We then compute using Lemma 38 the set  $f(v) := \{\text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}, wv)) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$ . From Lemma 36 it follows that if

$$\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\} \neq \{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v'\})) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\} \text{ then}$$

$$\{\text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}, (w, v))) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\} \neq \{\text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}, (w, v'))) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}.$$

Here note that inputting a directed crossing edge immediately distinguishes the two components of the structure. Thus, we can omit creating vertices for  $A_1$ . By Lemma 38 we successfully compute the sets  $\{\text{run}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, (\mathfrak{A}, (w, v))) \mid w \in U \cap V_i(\mathfrak{A})\}$  and so the function  $f$  satisfies the claim of this lemma.  $\square$

We finally want to use this function  $f$  to refine vertex classes. That is, we want to execute a  $\text{refine}(C, f)$ -operation, which splits a vertex class  $C$  such that two  $C$ -vertices  $u$  and  $v$  end up in different classes if and only if  $f(u) \neq f(v)$ .

**Lemma 40.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a normalized and polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  computes a function  $f$ . Then we can simulate a  $\text{refine}(C, f)$ -execution using a normalized and polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm.*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 38. We use relations encoding the values of  $f$ . We create a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}'$  which takes an additional number  $i$  as input. It decides the property, whether the  $i$ -th bit of  $f$  is 1. We create another algorithm  $\mathcal{M}''$ , which takes a number  $i$  and decides whether the output of  $f$  has up to  $i$  bits. We then execute  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}')$  (with an appropriate index  $k$  for  $\mathcal{M}'$ ) for all  $i$  starting from zero until  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}'')$  returns  $\emptyset$ . We again obtain a relation collecting the  $C$ -vertices at which the  $i$ -th bit of  $f$  is 1.

Now, two vertices  $u, v \in C^{\mathfrak{A}}$  in different such relations are in different fibers in the underlying coherent configuration. We create vertex classes for all these fibers.

Because  $f$  is computed by a polynomial time machine, the length of  $f$  is bounded by a polynomial and so again is the number of iterations and created relations.  $\square$

In Section 5.4.6 we will use the lemmas of this section to simulate a  $\text{refine}$ -operation as already discussed: first split the vertex classes properly and then execute the  $\text{refine}$ -operation.

#### 5.4.4 Building Plans

Almost normalized structures are used as an intermediate step in [18] to construct normalized algorithms. We use them in a slightly different way: we do not construct these structures explicitly but describe them implicitly with so-called building plans.

**Definition 41** (Building Plan). *Let  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  be a normalized structure. A **vertex plan** for  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a set  $\{C, D\}$  of (plain) vertex classes  $C, D \in \tau$ . A **relation plan** for  $\mathfrak{A}$  defining a relation symbol  $E \notin \tau$  is a pair  $(E, \{\{F_{1,i}, F_{2,i}\} \mid i \in [k]\})$ , where all  $F_{j,i} \in \tau$  are (plain) relation symbols. A **building plan** for  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a pair  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$ , where  $\omega$  is a finite set of vertex plans and  $\kappa$  is a finite set of relation plans where each relation plan defines a different relation symbol.*

Intuitively, a building plan  $\Omega$  describes a non-normalized HF-structure  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  in terms of a normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a recipe to construct vertices mixing the two components of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . A vertex plan  $\{C, D\}$  says that for every  $u \in C^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $v \in D^{\mathfrak{A}}$  in different components the vertex  $\{u, v\}$  is added to the structure (recall that we are defining an HF-structure). A relation plan  $(E, \{\{F_{1,i}, F_{2,i}\} \mid i \in [k]\})$  specifies a new relation  $E$  between the created vertices: a pair  $(\{u, v\}, \{u', v'\})$  is contained in  $E^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  if and only if there is some  $i \in [k]$  such that the corresponding plain edges satisfy  $(u, u') \in F_{1,i}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $(v, v') \in F_{2,i}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Lastly, a special relation  $E_p$  relating every created vertex  $\{u, v\}$  to the original vertices  $u$  and  $v$  is added.

Formally, the structure  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  is defined as follows: For a vertex plan  $\{C, D\}$  define the undirected crossing relation  $E_{\{C,D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}} := (C^{\mathfrak{A}} \times D^{\mathfrak{A}} \cup D^{\mathfrak{A}} \times C^{\mathfrak{A}}) \cap E_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$  and the set  $\tilde{E}_{\{C,D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}} := \{\{u, v\} \mid (u, v) \in E_{\{C,D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$  containing the undirected edges as sets. We define  $\tilde{E}_{\omega}^{\mathfrak{A}} := \bigcup_{\{C,D\} \in \omega} \tilde{E}_{\{C,D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . The atoms of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  are the ones of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the vertices are  $V(\Omega(\mathfrak{A})) := V(\mathfrak{A}) \cup \tilde{E}_{\omega}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , and the signature of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  is  $\tau \uplus \{E_p\} \uplus \{E \mid (E, M) \in \kappa\}$ . The relations are defined as follows:

$$E_p^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})} := \bigcup_{\{u,v\} \in \tilde{E}_{\omega}^{\mathfrak{A}}} \{(\{u, v\}, u), (\{u, v\}, v)\},$$

$$E^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})} := \{(\{u, v\}, \{u', v'\}) \mid (u, u') \in F_{1,i}^{\mathfrak{A}}, (v, v') \in F_{2,i}^{\mathfrak{A}}, i \in [k]\}$$

for every  $(E, \{\{F_{1,i}, F_{2,i}\} \mid i \in [k]\}) \in \kappa$ .

The added vertices  $\{u, v\}$  are called **crossing**. The set of all crossing vertices is  $V_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$ . We call edges  $(w, w') \in V_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})^2$  **inter-crossing**. A relation or color is inter-crossing if it only contains inter-crossing edges. A vertex class or fiber is called crossing, if it only contains crossing vertices. Later, we are interested only in the substructure of  $\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$  induced by the crossing vertices. But for HF-structures, this is actually ill-defined because the crossing vertices do not contain the atoms of  $\mathfrak{A}$  (in contrast to  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})[V_{\text{plain}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))]$ , which is well-defined because the plain vertices include the atoms). So we turn to the non-HF-structure  $\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{flat}}$  and define

$$\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}) := \Omega(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{flat}}[V_{\text{cross}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{flat}})].$$

We refer with  $V_{\text{cross}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{flat}})$  to the set of atoms in  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{flat}}$  which are crossing vertices in  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ . However, using the non-HF-structure suffices to compute the algebraic sketch because  $D(\mathfrak{A})$  was defined via  $C(\mathfrak{A}) = C(\mathfrak{A}^{\text{flat}})$ .

We now show that the fibers of crossing vertices, respectively the colors of inter-crossing edges, are already determined by plain fibers and plain relations.

**Lemma 42.** *For every normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and every building plan  $\Omega$  for  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the structure  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies the following:*

- (A1) *Every vertex of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  is either plain or crossing.*
- (A2)  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{V}_{\text{plain}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))] = \mathfrak{A}$ .
- (A3) *Every relation of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  is either plain or inter-crossing or the special relation  $E_p$ .*
- (A4) *For every vertex  $u \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$  there are exactly two vertices  $u^{(1)} \in \mathbf{V}_1(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $u^{(2)} \in \mathbf{V}_2(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfying  $\{(u, u^{(1)}), (u, u^{(2)})\} \subseteq E_p^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Moreover,  $\{u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}\} \neq \{v^{(1)}, v^{(2)}\}$  for every different  $u, v \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$ .*
- (A5) *For every crossing vertex  $u \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$  its fiber  $U_u$  is uniquely determined by the set of fibers  $\{U_{u^{(1)}}, U_{u^{(2)}}\}$  of the plain vertices  $u^{(1)}$  and  $u^{(2)}$ : Whenever  $\{U_{u^{(1)}}, U_{u^{(2)}}\} = \{U_{v^{(1)}}, U_{v^{(2)}}\}$ , then  $U_u = U_v$ . Additionally, whenever we are given two other vertices of the same plain fibers  $v_1 \in U_{u^{(1)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \mathbf{V}_1(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $v_2 \in U_{u^{(2)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \mathbf{V}_2(\mathfrak{A})$  then there is a crossing vertex  $w$  (in the fiber  $U_u$ ) such that  $w^{(1)} = v_1$  and  $w^{(2)} = v_2$ .*
- (A6) *In the same sense, the color  $R_{(u,v)}$  of every inter-crossing edge  $(u, v)$  is uniquely determined by the set of plain colors  $\{R_{(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})}, R_{(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})}\}$ .*

*Proof Sketch.* Properties (A1) to (A4) immediately follow from the construction of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ . Let  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$ . For Property (A5), first consider the claim that if  $v_1 \in R_{u^{(1)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \mathbf{V}_1(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $v_2 \in R_{u^{(2)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \mathbf{V}_2(\mathfrak{A})$  then there is a crossing vertex  $w$  such that  $w^{(1)} = v_1$  and  $w^{(2)} = v_2$ . Because the crossing vertex  $u$  exists, there is a vertex plan  $\{C, D\} \in \omega$  such that  $\{u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}\} \in \tilde{E}_{\{C, D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Assume w.l.o.g. that  $u^{(1)} \in C^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $u^{(2)} \in D^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Because  $v_1 \in R_{u^{(1)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq C^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $v_2 \in R_{u^{(2)}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq D^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , it follows that  $\{v_1, v_2\} \in \tilde{E}_{\{C, D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and so by definition of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  there is a crossing vertex  $w$  such that  $w^{(1)} = v_1$  and  $w^{(2)} = v_2$ . Now note that the rest of Property (A5) follows from Property (A6) when considering loop colors.

So we prove Property (A6). For the first direction, let  $(u', v')$  be a crossing edge such that  $R_{(u', v')} = R_{(u, v)}$ . Because every crossing vertex is adjacent with  $E_p$  to exactly one plain vertex in each component, every inter-crossing edge has exactly two  $(E_p, S_i, E_p^{-1})$ -colored path, where  $S_i$  for  $i \in [2]$  is a plain color. For  $(u, v)$  we have that  $\{S_1, S_2\} = \{R_{(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})}, R_{(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})}\}$ . Because  $(u', v')$  is in the same color, the same holds for  $(u', v')$ .

For the remaining direction let  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ . We show that there is a coherent configuration  $\mathfrak{H}$  refining  $C(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))$  such that  $\mathfrak{H}[\mathbf{V}_i(\mathfrak{A})] = C(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))[\mathbf{V}_i(\mathfrak{A})]$  for every  $i \in [2]$  and  $\mathfrak{H}$  satisfies the required property. Then any coarser coherent configuration satisfies it, too. We only sketch the construction, the idea is based on the proof of Lemma 10 in [18]. The main difference is that [18] gives the construction for the  $E_\omega$  relation and not the  $\tilde{E}_\omega$  relation (cf. the proof of Lemma 43). Essentially, we replace ordered pairs of two colors with a set of at most two colors.

The coherent configuration is defined as follows: The plain edges are colored according to  $C(\mathfrak{A})$ . An inter-crossing edge  $(u, v)$  is colored with the set of colors of its edges  $\{R_{(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})}, R_{(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})}\}$ . Note that by Lemma 35 this also determines the color of the

edges  $(u'^{(i)}, v'^{(j)})$  whenever  $u', v' \in \{u, v\}$  and  $\{i, j\} = [2]$ , i.e.,  $u'^{(i)}$  and  $v'^{(j)}$  are in different components, because the color of an edge determines the fiber of its endpoints. Similarly, an edge  $(u, v)$  of a crossing vertex  $u$  and a plain vertex  $v$  is colored with the fiber of  $u$  (which is defined in the inter-crossing case for loops), the fiber of  $v$ , and whether  $(u, v)$  is contained in  $E_p$ . Clearly, the sketched coherent configuration has the required property by construction.  $\square$

We say that the plain vertices  $u^{(1)}$  and  $u^{(2)}$  are the vertices **corresponding to** the crossing vertex  $u$ . Likewise, the plain edges  $(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})$  and  $(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})$  correspond to the inter-crossing edge  $(u, v)$ . The set of colors  $\{E_{(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})}, E_{(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})}\}$  corresponds to the color  $E_{(u, v)}$  (and similarly for crossing vertices).

The structures obtained from building plans differ at some points from the almost normalized structures of [18]:

- Our notion of crossing vertices is defined only for building plans and not for general DeepWL-algorithms (and is for *undirected* crossing edges).
- Our relation  $E_p$  does not distinguish between  $u^{(1)}$  and  $u^{(2)}$ . This is needed so that a **choice**-operation on crossing vertices does not necessarily distinguish the two components.
- The relation  $E_p$  assigns to every crossing vertex exactly one plain vertex in each component. This ensures that choice sets can still be witnessed.
- Properties similar to (A5) and (A6) are implicitly always satisfied for almost normalized structures in [18]. In combination with **refine**- and **choice**-operations this would not be the case anymore for the more general notion of almost normalized structures.

In some sense, Properties (A5) and (A6) mean that we actually do not need to construct the crossing vertices, because all information is determined by the corresponding plain vertices and edges. We now show this formally.

**Lemma 43.** *There is a DeepWL-algorithm that for every normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and every building plan  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$  for  $\mathfrak{A}$  computes  $D(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))$  in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* Note that  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  can also be constructed with a DeepWL-algorithm: The relation  $E_{\{C, D\}}$  for a vertex plan  $\{C, D\}$  is DeepWL-computable. So also the relation  $E_\omega^{\mathfrak{A}} := \bigcup_{\{C, D\} \in \omega} E_{\{C, D\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is DeepWL-computable. Then execute **addUPair**( $E_\omega$ ) and obtain the relation  $E_p$  as membership relation. For every relation plan  $(E, \{\{F_1^i, F_2^i\} \mid i \in [k]\}) \in \kappa$  we can define  $E^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  as follows. For every  $i \in [k]$  define the relation  $E_i$  as the relation with an  $(E_p, F_1^i, E_p^{-1})$ - and an  $(E_p, F_2^i, E_p^{-1})$ -colored path.

As seen, our **addUPair** can be simulated in the DeepWL-model from [18] by first an **addPair**-execution and then an **scc**-executions (which itself in the DeepWL-model of [18] can be simulated by first an **addPair**-execution and a **contract**-execution). Using Lemma 10 of [18] we can compute the sketches after the **addPair**-execution in polynomial time and using Lemma 9 [18] the sketch after the **contract**-execution.

Now, we created some additional vertex classes (to simulate **addUPair**) and relations (the  $E_i$  above). By Lemma 22 [18] we can compute the sketch without these vertex classes and relations.

Finally, the inter-crossing relations described by  $\kappa$  are unions of inter-crossing colors and the subset-relation can be computed in polynomial time.  $\square$

**Definition 44** (Efficient Building Plan). *A building plan  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$  for a normalized  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  is called **efficient**, if every vertex  $u$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is contained in a vertex class used in  $\omega$ .*

Intuitively, an efficient building plan makes use of all plain vertices and all relations of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , which means that  $\mathfrak{A}$  does not contain unnecessary vertices to construct  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ .

**Lemma 45.** *If  $\Omega$  is an efficient building plan for a normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A}$ , then  $|\mathfrak{A}| \leq 2|V_{\text{cross}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))|$ .*

*Proof.* Every crossing vertex in  $V_{\text{cross}}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))$  is by Property (A4) incident to exactly two plain vertices. So there are at most twice as many plain as crossing vertices.  $\square$

**Lemma 46.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a normalized structure and  $\Omega$  a building plan for  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Then  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}) = \text{Aut}(\Omega(\mathfrak{A}))$  (note that both structures are HF-structures with atom set  $A$ ). If a crossing fiber  $U^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  is an  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ -orbit, then for the corresponding plain fibers  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  the set  $\tilde{E}_{\{U_1, U_2\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$  is an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -orbit.*

*Proof.* The structure  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  is defined in an isomorphism-invariant manner. Whenever a vertex or relation is added, it is done for all vertices/edges of a given vertex class/relation (cf. the proof of Lemma 43 that shows that  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  can be obtained from  $\mathfrak{A}$  by a DeepWL-algorithm (without choice)). So every automorphism of  $\mathfrak{A}$  extends to an automorphism of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ . For the other direction note that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is contained in  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ . Also note that all relations added in  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  are new ones and no relation of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is changed. It is never possible that an automorphism maps a crossing vertex to a plain vertex because the  $E_p$  relation is directed from crossing to plain vertices. So every automorphism of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  induces an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

For the second part, let  $U^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  be an  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ -orbit. By construction of the  $E_p$  relation, an automorphism  $\varphi$  satisfies  $\varphi(u) = v$  for  $u, v \in U^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  if and only if  $\varphi(\{u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}\}) = \{v^{(1)}, v^{(2)}\}$  (cf. Property (A4)).  $\square$

#### 5.4.5 Building Plans and scc-Operations

Before we can start to construct normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms, we have to investigate scc-operations. Assume that for an inter-crossing relation  $E$  the  $\text{scc}(E)$  operation should be executed and we want to find a building plan simulating this. The challenge is to construct new plain vertices so that we find plain vertex classes which correspond to the vertex class obtained by  $\text{scc}(E)$ . The first step is to analyze the SCCs of the corresponding plain colors of  $E$  in the components. In a second step we show how we can define a building plan to simulate the  $\text{scc}(E)$  operation. We need to start with a lemma regarding SCCs in coherent configurations.

**Lemma 47.** *Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be a coherent configuration with signature  $\sigma$  and  $R, S \in \sigma$  be colors connecting vertices of the same fiber, i.e.  $R^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq (U^{\mathfrak{A}})^2$  and  $S^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq (U^{\mathfrak{A}})^2$  for some fiber  $U \in \sigma$ . Then*

1. every  $R$ -connected component is strongly  $R$ -connected and

2. every  $\{R, S\}$ -connected component is strongly  $\{R, S\}$ -connected.

*Proof.* We start with Claim 1: If  $R$  is itself a fiber, all connected components are trivial and the claim follows. Otherwise, let  $c$  be an  $R$ -connected component. Then we can assume that  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  is a primitive coherent configuration, otherwise we can restrict  $C(\mathfrak{A})$  to  $c$  (all edges leaving  $c$  have different colors than edges contained in  $c$ ). Finally, it follows from Theorem 3.1.5. in [5] that  $c$  is strongly  $R$ -connected because  $R$  is not a fiber.

To show Claim 2, let  $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  be an  $\{R, S\}$ -path. We show that there is an  $\{R, S\}$ -path  $(v_1, \dots, v_m)$  such that  $v_1 = u_k$  and  $v_m = u_1$ . To do so, it suffices to show that for every  $i \in [k-1]$  there is a  $\{R, S\}$ -path from  $u_{i+1}$  to  $u_i$ . So let  $i \in [k-1]$  and w.l.o.g. assume that  $(u_i, u_{i+1}) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Then by Claim 1 the vertices  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  are in the same  $R$ -SCC and in particular there is an  $R$ -path and so also an  $\{R, S\}$ -path from  $u_{i+1}$  to  $u_i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 48.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$  be a normalized structure,  $\Omega$  be a building plan for  $\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ ,  $R \in \sigma$  be an inter-crossing color of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2)$  such that  $R$ -edges connect vertices of the same fiber  $U_R$ , i.e.  $R^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq (U_R^{\mathfrak{A}})^2$ , and  $S, T \in \sigma$  be the corresponding plain colors of  $R$ . If  $c$  is an  $R$ -SCC, then  $\{u^{(i)} \mid u \in c\}$  is an  $\{S, T\}$ -SCC for every  $i \in [2]$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $\mathfrak{A} := \Omega(\mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2)$  and define

$$K_i := \{(u, v) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}} \mid (u^{(i)}, v^{(i)}) \in S^{\mathfrak{A}}\}.$$

That is, if  $S \neq T$ , we partition  $R^{\mathfrak{A}}$  into  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  depending on whether the corresponding  $S$ -edge is in  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  or in  $\mathfrak{A}_2$ . If  $S = T$ , we just have  $K_1 = K_2 = R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . For a set  $c$  of crossing vertices we define  $c^{(i)} := \{u^{(i)} \mid u \in c\}$ . We start to analyze the SCCs formed by the  $K_i$ -edges.

**Claim 1.** *Let  $i \in [2]$  and  $c$  be a  $K_i$ -SCC. Then the set  $c^{(i)}$  is an  $S$ -SCC. For  $j \in [2]$  such that  $\{i, j\} = [2]$  the set  $c^{(j)}$  is an  $T$ -SCC.*

*Proof.* We consider the part of the claim regarding  $S$ -SCCs. The part regarding  $T$ -SCCs is symmetric. It is clear that if  $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  is a  $K_i$ -path, then  $(u_1^{(i)}, \dots, u_k^{(i)})$  is an  $S$ -path. So  $c^{(i)}$  is contained in an  $S$ -SCC. If  $S$ -edges connect vertices in different fibers, then all  $S$ -SCCs are singletons. That is  $c^{(i)}$  cannot be strictly contained in an  $S$ -SCC.

So it remains to consider the case when  $S$  connects vertices in the same fiber. Then also  $T$  has to connect vertices in the same fiber. Let  $\{U, V\}$  be the fibers corresponding to  $U_R$ . If  $U$  has an incident  $S$ -edge, then  $V$  has an incident  $T$ -edge (because otherwise  $R$  would be empty, which is not allowed for colors).

We show that  $c^{(i)}$  is an  $S$ -connected component. This implies by Lemma 47 that  $c^{(j)}$  is an  $S$ -SCC. Let  $(u_1, u_2) \in S^{\mathfrak{A}}$  such that  $u_1 \in c^{(i)}$ . We show that there is an  $R$ -edge  $(v_1, v_2)$  such that  $(v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(i)}) = (u_1, u_2)$  and  $v_1, v_2 \in c$ , which implies that  $u_2 \in c^{(i)}$  and by induction that  $c^{(i)}$  is an  $S$ -connected component. Because  $u_1 \in c^{(i)}$ , there is a vertex  $v_1 \in c$  such that  $v_1^{(i)} = u_1$ . Assume w.l.o.g. that  $u_1 \in U^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Then  $v_1^{(j)} \in V^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , where  $\{i, j\} = [2]$ . Because  $u_1$  has an incident  $S$ -edge (namely  $(u_1, u_2)$ ),  $v_1^{(j)}$  has an incident  $T$ -edge  $(v_1^{(j)}, w)$ . Because  $S$  and  $T$  connect the same fiber,  $u_2 \in U^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $w \in V^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Then by Property (A5) there is a vertex  $v_2$  such that  $v_2^{(i)} = u_2$  and  $v_2^{(j)} = w$ . Now, we have that  $(v_1, v_2) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$  using Property (A6), that  $(v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(i)}) = (u_1, u_2) \in S^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , and that  $(v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}) = (v_1^{(j)}, w) \in T^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . That is  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same  $R$ -connected component. This, by Lemma 47, implies that  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same  $R$ -SCC and thus  $v_2 \in c$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 2.** Let  $S$  connect vertices of different fibers  $U$  and  $V$  and let  $T$  connect vertices of the same different fibers but in the other direction, i.e.  $S^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq U^{\mathfrak{A}} \times V^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $T^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq V^{\mathfrak{A}} \times U^{\mathfrak{A}}$  for  $U \neq V$ . Let  $i \in [2]$  and  $c$  be an  $R$ -SCC. Then the set  $c^{(i)}$  is a  $\{S, T\}$ -SCC.

*Proof.* If  $(u_1, \dots, u_k)$  is an  $R$ -path, then  $(u_1^{(i)}, \dots, u_k^{(i)})$  is an  $\{S, T\}$ -path. So  $c^{(i)}$  is contained in an  $\{S, T\}$ -SCC  $d$ . For a sake of contradiction, assume that  $c^{(i)}$  is strictly contained in  $d$ . Then there is an  $\{S, T\}$ -path  $(v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$  with  $\ell \geq 3$ ,  $v_1 \in c^{(i)}$ ,  $v_\ell \in c^{(i)}$ , and  $v_j \notin c^{(i)}$  for every  $1 < j < \ell$ . We observe the following:

- There is a (possibly empty)  $\{S, T\}$ -path  $(v_\ell, \dots, v_{\ell'+1})$  contained in  $d$  such that  $v_{\ell'+1} = v_1$ , because  $d$  is an  $\{S, T\}$ -SCC.
- In every  $\{S, T\}$ -path the edge colors  $S$  and  $T$  alternate. Likewise, the fibers of the vertices alternate. Thus, every cycle consists of an even number of vertices.

Let  $(u_1, \dots, u_{m'})$  be a non-empty  $R$ -cycle (which possibly uses vertices multiple times) such that  $u_1^{(i)} = v_1$ ,  $1 < m \leq m'$ , and  $u_m^{(i)} = v_\ell$ . Such a cycle exists because  $c$  is an  $R$ -SCC. Consider the two following sequences  $\bar{\beta} := (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)^{m'}$  and  $\bar{\alpha} := (u_1^{(j)}, \dots, u_{m'}^{(j)})^{\ell'}$  of plain vertices of length  $\ell' \cdot m'$ , where  $j$  is chosen such that  $\{i, j\} = [2]$ .

We observe that  $\{U_{\beta_k}^{\mathfrak{A}}, U_{\alpha_k}^{\mathfrak{A}}\} = \{U, V\}$  for every  $k \in [\ell' \cdot m']$ : First, consider the case  $k = 1$ . By construction  $(\beta_1, \alpha_1) = (v_1, u_1^{(j)}) = (u_1^{(i)}, u_1^{(j)})$ . Because  $R$  connects vertices in the same fiber, the corresponding fibers of  $U_E$  must be  $\{U, V\}$  and because  $u_1 \in U_E^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , it follows that  $\{U_{\beta_1}^{\mathfrak{A}}, U_{\alpha_1}^{\mathfrak{A}}\} = \{U, V\}$ . Second, we already have seen that the fibers  $U$  and  $V$  alternate on  $\{S, T\}$ -paths, so in particular on the cycles  $(v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$  and  $(u_1^{(j)}, \dots, u_{m'}^{(j)})$ . Because the length is even, the fibers  $U$  and  $V$  also alternate in the tuples  $\bar{\alpha}$  and  $\bar{\beta}$ . So, by induction on  $k$  with base case  $k = 1$  the claim follows.

Using Property (A5) we obtain a tuple of crossing vertices  $(w_1, \dots, w_{\ell' \cdot m'})$  such that  $w_k^{(i)} = \beta_k$  and  $w_k^{(j)} = \alpha_k$  for all  $k \in [\ell' \cdot m']$ .

We prove that  $(w_1, \dots, w_{\ell' \cdot m'})$  is an  $R$ -cycle. We consider the sequences of colors

$$R_{(w_1^{(i)}, w_2^{(i)})}^{\mathfrak{A}}, \dots, R_{(w_{\ell' \cdot m'}^{(i)}, w_1^{(i)})}^{\mathfrak{A}} \text{ and} \\ R_{(w_1^{(j)}, w_2^{(j)})}^{\mathfrak{A}}, \dots, R_{(w_{\ell' \cdot m'}^{(j)}, w_1^{(j)})}^{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Similar to the case of the fibers, the colors  $S$  and  $T$  alternate and if the  $k$ -th color in one sequence is  $S$ , then the  $k$ -th color in the other one is  $T$ . Because  $S$  and  $T$  are the corresponding colors of  $R$  and by Property (A6),  $(w_1, \dots, w_{\ell' \cdot m'})$  is indeed an  $R$ -cycle.

We note that  $w_1 = u_1 \in c$  and thus the cycle  $(w_1, \dots, w_{\ell' \cdot m'})$  contains a vertex in  $c$ . Now, let  $1 < k < \ell$ . Then  $w_k^{(i)} = v_k$  by construction and in particular  $v_k \notin c^{(i)}$  and thus  $w_k \notin c$ . But this means there is an  $R$ -cycle containing a vertex in the  $E$ -SCC  $c$  and a vertex not in  $c$ , which is a contradiction.  $\dashv$

Now first consider the case that  $S = T$ . Then  $K_1 = K_2 = R^{\mathfrak{A}}$  and the claim of the lemma follows immediately from Claim 1.

So consider the case that  $S \neq T$ . Let  $S^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq U_S^{\mathfrak{A}} \times V_S^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ,  $T^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq U_T^{\mathfrak{A}} \times V_T^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , and recall that  $R^{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq (U_R^{\mathfrak{A}})^2$ . Then by Property (A5) it follows that the corresponding fibers for  $U_R$  are  $\{U_S, U_T\} = \{V_S, V_T\}$ . We make the following case distinction:

- $U_S \neq V_S$  or  $U_T \neq V_T$ : Then because  $\{U_S, U_T\} = \{V_S, V_T\}$  we have that  $U_S = V_T \neq V_S = U_T$ . The claim follows immediately from Claim 2.
- $U_S = V_S = U_T = V_T$ : Let  $c$  be an  $R$ -SCC. By Lemma 47 it suffices to show that  $c^{(i)}$  is an  $\{S, T\}$ -connected component. So let  $(u, v)$  be an  $\{S, T\}$ -edge and let  $u \in c^{(i)}$ . We show that then also  $v \in c^{(i)}$  which by induction shows that  $c^{(i)}$  is an  $\{S, T\}$ -connected component. Assume w.l.o.g. that  $(u, v) \in S^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Now for some  $K_i$ -SCC  $c'$  we have that  $u \in c'^{(i)}$  and by Claim 1 we also have that  $v \in c'^{(i)}$  because by Lemma 47 the vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are in the same  $S$ -SCC. Because  $c' \subseteq c$  we have that  $c'^{(i)} \subseteq c^{(i)}$  and that  $v \in c^{(i)}$ .  $\square$

Now that we know that the SCCs of inter-crossing relations correspond to SCCs of the corresponding plain relations, we show that **scc**-operations on inter-crossing relations can be simulated using building plan.

**Lemma 49.** *There is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm that given the normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ , a building plan  $\Omega$  for  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and an inter-crossing color  $R \in \sigma$  of  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  halts with the normalized structure  $\mathfrak{B}$  in the cloud and writes a building plan  $\Omega_R$  for  $\mathfrak{B}$  on the tape which satisfies  $\Omega_R^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{B}) \cong \Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})_R$ , where  $\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})_R$  denotes the structure obtained by executing **scc**( $R$ ) on  $\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A})$ . If  $\Omega$  is efficient, then  $\Omega_R$  is efficient, too.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$ . We distinguish the following two cases: The color  $R$  connects vertices in different fibers  $U$  and  $V$ , that is  $R^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})} \subseteq U^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})} \times V^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ . Here clearly all  $R$ -SCCs are trivial and the **scc**-operation would create a new vertex for every  $U$ - and every  $V$ -vertex. To create these vertices with the building plan, let the corresponding fibers of  $U$  and  $V$  be  $U_1, U_2, V_1$ , and  $V_2$ . We create copies of these fibers by executing **addPair** for the loops and obtain component relations  $E_{\text{left}}$  and  $E_{\text{right}}$ , which coincide. The new vertices end up in new fibers  $U'_1, U'_2, V'_1$ , and  $V'_2$ . The algorithm updates

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &\leftarrow \omega \cup \{\{U'_1, U'_2\}, \{V'_1, V'_2\}\} \text{ and} \\ \kappa &\leftarrow \kappa \cup \{(F, \{E_{\text{left}}, E_{\text{right}}\})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $F$  serves as new membership relation (and just relates a  $U$ -vertex to its copy).

Otherwise,  $R$  connects vertices in the same fiber. Let this fiber be  $U$  and let  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  be the fibers corresponding to  $U$  and  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  be the colors corresponding to  $R$ . Note that in this case every  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCCs is nontrivial: w.l.o.g.  $R_1$  has to connect  $U_1$  to  $U_2$  and  $R_2$  has to connect  $U_2$  to  $U_1$ . Because  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are fibers, every  $U_1$ - and every  $U_2$ -vertex has one outgoing and one incoming  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -edge, so there must be a cycle and in particular one nontrivial  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCCs. But because this is in a coherent-configuration, every  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCCs has the same size and is thus nontrivial.

By Lemma 48 we can construct vertices for SCCs of the corresponding plain vertices such that for every  $R$ -SCC there is a corresponding pair of  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCCs. So we start with executing **scc**( $\{R_1, R_2\}$ ) (formally we have to create a relation as the union of  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ ) and obtain a new plain vertex class  $C$  containing the new SCC-vertices and a plain membership relation  $E$ . We then create for each pair of  $C$ -vertices in different

components, so for such a pair of  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCCs, new crossing vertices and the inter-crossing membership relation  $F$  by updating

$$\begin{aligned}\omega &\leftarrow \omega \cup \{\{C, C\}\} \text{ and} \\ \kappa &\leftarrow \kappa \cup \{(F, \{E, E\})\}.\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, every newly created vertex by  $\omega$  corresponds to an  $R$ -SCC: Because the  $R$ -SCCs are nontrivial, every  $C$  was obtained from an SCC containing at least one  $U_1$ - and at least one  $U_2$ -vertex (if  $U_1 = U_2$  this is trivial and if  $U_1 \neq U_2$  every nontrivial  $\{R_1, R_2\}$ -SCC has to contain one  $U_1$ - and one  $U_2$ -vertex because  $R_1$  has to connect  $U_1$  to  $U_2$  and  $R_2$  the other way around). So for every pair of  $C$ -vertices in different components, we can find a  $U_1$ -vertex  $u \in \mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A}_1)$  in one component and a  $U_2$ -vertex  $v \in \mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A}_2)$  in the other component. By Property (A5) there is a  $U$ -vertex  $w$  such that  $w^{(1)} = u$  and  $w^{(2)} = v$ . But this means there is an  $R$ -SCC, which corresponds to the two  $C$ -vertices, namely the one containing  $w$ . In the same manner,  $F$  correctly defines the inter-crossing membership relation for the new  $R$ -SCC vertices.

Finally, to see that  $\mathfrak{B}$  is normalized, note that we only executed a single `addPair` or a single `scc`-operation for a plain relation. It is also clear that the property of being efficient is preserved, because every newly created vertex is in a fiber  $U'_1, U'_2, V'_1,$  and  $V'_2$  or in the color class  $C$  and all of them are used in the building plan.  $\square$

#### 5.4.6 Simulation

Now, we finally want to simulate arbitrary DeepWL+WSC-algorithms with normalized ones. Recall that we still have to define how normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms encode sets of witnessing automorphisms. We do this now:

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a normalized structure and  $\Omega$  be a building plan for  $\mathfrak{A}$ . A tuple of crossing relations  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  and a crossing vertex  $w_\varphi$  encode the partial map  $\varphi: A \rightarrow A$  as follows: we have  $\varphi(u) = v$  in case  $v$  is the only crossing vertex in  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  for which there exists exactly one crossing vertex  $w$  such that  $(w_\varphi, w) \in E_{\text{aut}}^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ ,  $(w, u') \in E_{\text{dom}}^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ , and  $(w, v') \in E_{\text{img}}^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ , where  $u'$  and  $v'$  are crossing vertices and  $u$  and  $v$  the only atoms such that  $(u', u) \in E_p^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  and  $(v', v) \in E_p^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ . Recall here that while for every crossing vertex there are exactly two vertices related via  $E_p$ , not both of them have to be atoms. While introducing the vertices  $u'$  and  $v'$  into the definition seems odd at first, this will simplify technical aspects in the following. As before, a tuple of relations  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  encodes the set of partial maps  $N := \{\varphi \mid (w_\varphi, w) \in E_{\text{aut}}^{\mathfrak{A}} \text{ for some } w\}$ .

The witnessing machine  $M^{\text{wit}}$  of a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm on input  $\mathfrak{A}$  outputs a set of witnessing automorphisms by writing a tuple  $(\Omega, E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  of a building plan  $\Omega$  for the final content of the cloud of  $M^{\text{wit}}$  and three relations, for which  $\Omega$  contains a relation plan, on the interaction-tape.

Note that with this definition, a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm is formally not a (non-normalized) DeepWL+WSC-algorithm anymore, because it encodes witnessing automorphisms differently. But clearly, a DeepWL+WSC-machine just constructs  $\Omega(\mathfrak{B})$  (where  $\mathfrak{B}$  is the final content of the cloud of  $M^{\text{wit}}$ ), adjusts the relations  $E_{\text{dom}}$  and  $E_{\text{img}}$  to directly point to the plain vertices, and then writes  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  on the interaction-tape.

Finally, we are ready to simulate an arbitrary DeepWL+WSC-algorithm with a normalized one.

**Definition 50** (Simulating a Structure). *A pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, \Omega)$  of a normalized structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a building plan  $\Omega = (\omega, \kappa)$  for  $\mathfrak{A}$  **simulates** a structure  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  with the same atoms as  $\mathfrak{A}$  if*

$$(S1) \quad \Omega^{cross}(\mathfrak{A}) \cong \hat{\mathfrak{A}}^{flat}$$

(S2)  $\Omega$  is efficient,

(S3) *there is a relation plan  $(C, \{D_1, D_2\}) \in \kappa$  defining a crossing vertex class  $C$ , such that every isomorphism  $\varphi: \hat{\mathfrak{A}}^{flat} \rightarrow \Omega^{cross}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies  $\varphi(\hat{A}) = C^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ , i.e., the atoms of  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  are mapped precisely onto the  $C$ -vertices,*

(S4) *the  $E_p$ -relation is a perfect matching between the atoms  $A$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $C^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$ , and*

(S5) *via this bijection between  $A$  and  $C^{\Omega(\mathfrak{A})}$  we have that  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A}^{flat}) = \text{Aut}(\Omega^{cross}(\mathfrak{A}))$ .*

To simplify the following proofs, only the crossing vertices are relevant to simulate a structure (apart from the connection between the atoms). Later in Corollary 53 we will as first step create a copy of the initial plain vertices so that the copy consists of crossing vertices. We then continue to operate on these vertices and modify the plain vertices just as needed to perform the required changes on the crossing vertices. Now that we have a notion of simulating a structure, we can also simulate DeepWL+WSC algorithms:

**Definition 51** (Simulating an Algorithm). *Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{out}, M^{wit}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{M}} = (\hat{M}^{out}, \hat{M}^{wit}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell)$  be DeepWL+WSC-algorithms. The algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  **simulates**  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  if  $\mathcal{M}_i$  simulates  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$  and for every structure  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  and every pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, \Omega)$  simulating  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  on input  $(\mathfrak{A}, \Omega)$  accepts (or respectively rejects) whenever  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  on input  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  accepts (or respectively rejects).*

We do not care about the case when  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  fails, because in the following we will always assume that this is not the case.

**Lemma 52.** *For every polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  there is a polynomial time and normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  simulating  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ .*

*Proof.* We will construct a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, which uses the additional operations simulated in Lemma 27. However, to actually obtain a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm from the reduction of Lemma 27 we need to adapt the technique in Lemma 27 to simulate ordered input. To create vertices in singleton fibers, `scc` was executed for a relation connecting all vertices of some fiber  $U$ . This might create crossing vertices, so we execute `scc` only for the relation connecting  $U$ -vertices in the same component. In that way, we create two copies of the directed path encoding ordered input, one for each connected component. Because the additional operations are simulated with only polynomial overhead, we can ignore the vertices created in the simulation. That is, in the following we regard a building plan is efficient, if all plain vertices apart from the one used in the simulation are used.

The proof is by induction of nesting DeepWL+WSC-algorithms. For this, suppose  $\hat{M} = (\hat{M}^{\text{out}}, \hat{M}^{\text{wit}}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell)$  and assume by induction hypothesis that there are normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms  $\mathcal{M}_i$  simulating  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_i$  for every  $i \in [\ell]$ . Using Lemma 32 we can assume that  $\hat{M}$  is pure.

Let  $\hat{M} \in \{\hat{M}^{\text{out}}, \hat{M}^{\text{wit}}\}$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_0$  be the input structure of  $\hat{M}$ . We will now construct a DeepWL+WSC-machine  $M$  simulating it. Let  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_0, \dots, \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_k$  be the sequence of structures in the cloud of  $\hat{M}$  and let  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \Omega_0)$  simulate  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_0$ . We construct the machine  $M$  inductively. We say that the machine  $M$  on input  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \Omega_0)$  **simulates the  $t$ -th step** for  $t \in [k]$  if when  $M$  halts the content of the cloud is  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  and there is a building plan  $\Omega_t = (\omega_t, \kappa_t)$  for  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  written onto the working tape such that  $(\mathfrak{A}_t, \Omega_t)$  simulates  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$ . Assume that we constructed a machine  $M$  simulating the  $k$ -th step, then the content of the cloud does not change anymore and we can just track the run of the Turing machine of  $\hat{M}$  until it halts.

We construct by induction on  $t$  a machine  $M$  simulating the  $t$ -th step for every  $t \leq k$ . For  $t = 0$  the claim holds by assumption that  $(\mathfrak{A}_0, \Omega_0)$  simulates  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_0$ . Now assume that  $M$  simulates the  $t$ -th step and that  $(\mathfrak{A}_t, \Omega_t)$  simulates  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$ .

Using Lemma 43 the machine  $M$  computes  $D(\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t))$  in polynomial time. From this sketch, it computes  $D(\Omega_t^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_t))$  using Lemma 22 from [18].

Because  $(\mathfrak{A}_t, \Omega_t)$  simulates  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$ , by Property (S1) it holds that  $\Omega_t^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_t) \cong \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t^{\text{flat}}$  and the computed sketch is equal to the sketch of  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$ . So  $M$  can track the run of  $\hat{M}$  until  $\hat{M}$  executes an operation modifying the cloud. We make a case distinction on this operation:

**addPair( $R$ ):** The color  $R$  is an inter-crossing color in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ , because  $\Omega_t^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_t) \cong \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t^{\text{flat}}$ . Let  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  be the two plain colors corresponding to  $R$ .

The machine  $M$  executes **addPair( $R_1$ )** and **addPair( $R_2$ )** (if  $R_1 = R_2$ , only one operation is executed) and obtains vertex classes  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  and component relations  $E_{i,d}$  for every  $i \in [2]$  and  $d \in \{\text{left}, \text{right}\}$  (here if  $R_1 = R_2$ , we have  $E_{1,d} = E_{2,d}$ ). We set

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{t+1} &:= \omega_t \cup \{\{C_1, C_2\}\} \text{ and} \\ \kappa_{t+1} &:= \kappa_t \cup \{(R_d, \{\{E_{1,d}, E_{2,d}\}\}) \mid d \in \{\text{left}, \text{right}\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, precisely for every set  $\{u, v\}$  of vertices  $u \in C_1^{\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}}$  and  $v \in C_2^{\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}}$ , which means by construction for every set  $\{e_1, e_2\}$  of edges  $e_1 \in R_1^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$  and  $e_2 \in R_2^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$ , which again means by Property (A6) for every edge  $e \in R^{\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)}$ , a vertex is added in  $\Omega_{t+1}(\mathfrak{A}_{t+1})$ .

Consequently, we create the component relations from the  $E_{i,d}$ . That is,  $\Omega_{t+1}^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}) \cong \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{t+1}^{\text{flat}}$  and so we maintained (S1). Property (S2) is satisfied because all newly created plain vertices are either in  $C_1$  or  $C_2$ . Properties (S3) and (S4) will always be maintained if they initially hold (and we do not remove entries from the building plan). Finally, property (S5) is maintained because we did not make any choices (and all other DeepWL+WSC operations are isomorphism-invariant) and thus the automorphism of both structures stay exactly the same (note that by Lemma 24 both  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}^{\text{flat}}$  have the same automorphisms). So we simulated the  $(t + 1)$ -th step.

**scc( $R$ )** Again,  $R$  is an inter-crossing color in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ . The machine  $M$  simulates the scc-operation using Lemma 49: Properties (S1) and (S2) are ensured by the lemma,

all other properties hold by the same reasons as for the `addPair`-operation, and so the  $(t + 1)$ -th step is simulated.

**create**( $\pi$ ) Let  $\pi = \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$ , where all  $R_i$  are inter-crossing colors in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ , and  $E$  be the relation to create. Let  $S_i$  and  $T_i$  be the corresponding colors for  $R_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$  (Property (A6)). We update

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{t+1} &:= \omega_t \text{ and} \\ \kappa_{t+1} &:= \kappa_t \cup \{(E, \{\{S_i, T_i\} \mid i \in [k]\})\}.\end{aligned}$$

Because the cloud is not modified, we have that  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1} = \mathfrak{A}_t$  is still normalized. In particular, Property (S2) is maintained because no new vertices are created. By construction Property (S1) is satisfied. Again by the same reasons as before, the  $(t + 1)$ -th step is simulated.

**refine**( $U, k$ ) Because  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  is pure, **refine** is only executed for fibers. Let  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  be the plain fibers corresponding to  $U$  and let  $E_U$  be the crossing color such that  $E_U^{\mathfrak{A}} = E_{\{U_1, U_2\}}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , that is  $E_U$  precisely connects all the pairs of vertices corresponding to a  $U$ -vertex.

We cannot simply execute **refine**( $E_U, k, \Omega_t$ ), because this might create a relation which connects the two components of  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  (and so the content of the cloud would not be normalized anymore). Recall the example in Section 5.4.2. We are going to refine  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ , then decompose  $E_U$  into multiple colors, such that either all edges of a color are accepted by  $\mathcal{M}_k$  or no edge of the color is. This results in the structure  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}$ . We then refine one (crossing) color after the other. In that way, for every color, either no new relation or an empty relation is created and the structure stays normalized.

Let  $v, v' \in U_2^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$ . Then by Lemma 37 we can distinguish  $v$  and  $v'$  using the sets  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}_k, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v\}) \mid w \in U_1^{\mathfrak{A}_t} \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A}_1))\}$  and  $\{\text{run}(\mathcal{M}_k, (\mathfrak{A}, \{w, v'\}) \mid w \in U_1^{\mathfrak{A}_t} \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathfrak{A}_1))\}$  if for some  $u \in U_1^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$  we have that  $(\mathfrak{A}_t, \{u, v\})$  is accepted by  $\mathcal{M}_k$  but  $(\mathfrak{A}_t, \{u, v'\})$  is not. There is a normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithm computing a function distinguishing the same (or more) vertices as these sets according to Lemma 39 (note that because we input all  $(u, v)$  or  $\{u, v\}$  during the **refine**-operation,  $\mathcal{M}_k$  indeed never fails). We can refine  $U_2$  according to these sets by Lemma 40. The same procedure is performed for  $U_1$ . After that, we obtain the structure  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}$  in the cloud.

Before we can use  $\mathcal{M}_k$  to refine the edges, we have to slightly modify it: The input of  $\mathcal{M}_k$  is  $\mathfrak{A}'_t := ((\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}, \{u, v\}), \Omega_t)$  where some  $\{u, v\} \in E_U^{\mathfrak{A}_t}$  is individualized, i.e., there is a new vertex class  $C_{\{u, v\}}$  only containing  $u$  and  $v$ . (If  $E_U$  is directed the arguments still apply, cf. the discussion after Lemma 37). This corresponds to individualizing one vertex of  $U$  (recall that  $E_p$  does not distinguish the two components of  $\mathfrak{A}'_t$ ). In order to represent this individualization of the  $U$ -vertex, the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_k$  modifies the building plan as follows:  $\kappa'_t := \kappa_t \cup \{(F', \{C_{\{u, v\}}, C_{\{u, v\}}\})\}$  and  $\Omega'_t := (\omega_t, \kappa'_t)$ . In that way, the vertex corresponding to  $\{u, v\}$  in  $\Omega'_t(\mathfrak{A}'_t)$  gets individualized in the relation  $F'$ . Now  $(\mathfrak{A}'_t, \Omega'_t)$  simulates the structure  $(\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t, w)$ , where the corresponding  $U$ -vertex  $w$  is individualized. Now, all conditions for the induction hypothesis are satisfied and we can actually run the algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_k$  by induction hypothesis.

So we decompose  $E$  into colors  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  and execute **refine**( $R_i, k, \Omega_t$ ) for every  $i \in [m]$ . By Lemma 37 either all edges in a color are accepted or none of them. So the

machine can compute the set  $I := \{i \in [m] \mid \mathcal{M}_k \text{ accepts } R_i\text{-edges}\}$  by distinguishing for every  $i$  whether no relation is created (so  $i \in I$ ) or an empty relation is created (so  $i \notin I$ ). In particular,  $\mathfrak{A}_{t+1}$  and all intermediate steps are normalized. Let  $\{S_i, T_i\}$  be the corresponding colors for  $R_i$  for every  $i \in [m]$ . We create the vertex class  $D$  in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ , which is the result of the  $\mathbf{refine}(U, k)$ -operation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{t+1} &:= \omega_t, \\ \kappa_{t+1} &:= \kappa_t \cup \{(D, \{\{S_i, T_i\} \mid i \in I\})\}.\end{aligned}$$

In that way we established Property (S1). The other properties still hold for the same reasons as before and the  $(t + 1)$ -th step is simulated.

**choice( $U$ )** Recall that in this case  $\hat{M} = \hat{M}^{\text{out}}$  because  $\hat{M}^{\text{wit}}$  is choice-free. Again by Lemma 32,  $U$  is a crossing fiber in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ .

The machine defines the undirected relation  $E_U$  as in the  $\mathbf{refine}$ -case and executes  $\mathbf{choice}(E_U)$ . By the semantics of the  $\mathbf{choice}$ -operator, this individualizes an undirected  $E_U$ -edge (recall that, to individualize this edge, we obtain a vertex class containing both endpoints of the edge and the two components of  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  are not connected). Using this edge we can individualize the corresponding crossing vertex in  $\Omega_t(\mathfrak{A}_t)$  by defining a singleton fiber  $V$  similar to the  $\mathbf{refine}$ -case. This shows Property (S1). Properties (S2), (S3) and (S4) still hold as seen before. To show Property (S5), observe that every automorphism of  $\Omega_{t+1}^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_{t+1})$  is an automorphism of  $\Omega_t^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}_t)$ , which additionally fixes the singleton crossing vertex in  $V$ . Thus, such an automorphism has also to fix the corresponding undirected  $E_U$  edge and so it is an automorphism of  $\Omega_{t+1}(\mathfrak{A})$ . Vice versa, every automorphism fixing this edge also fixes the crossing vertex and the  $(t + 1)$ -th step is simulated.

To show that  $(M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\ell)$  indeed simulates  $(\hat{M}^{\text{out}}, \hat{M}^{\text{wit}}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell)$ , it remains to show that all choices are witnessed. First, the machine  $M^{\text{out}}$  only executes a  $\mathbf{choice}(E_U)$ -operation when  $\hat{M}^{\text{out}}$  executes the operation  $\mathbf{choice}(U)$ . Because  $E_U$  is undirected and due to the semantics of the choice operator for undirected edges, we have to witness that  $\tilde{E}_U := \tilde{E}_{\{U_1, U_2\}}$  is an orbit, where  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  are the corresponding plain fibers of  $U$  (cf. the definition of  $E_U = E_{\{U_1, U_2\}}$ ). Let  $N$  be a set of automorphisms which witnesses  $U$  as orbit fixing all previous steps  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{j_1}, \dots, \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{j_\ell}$  (where  $j_1 < \dots < j_\ell$ ), in which  $\mathbf{choice}$ -operations were executed by  $\hat{M}^{\text{out}}$ .

We finally have to alter  $M^{\text{wit}}$ : when  $\hat{M}^{\text{wit}}$  writes the automorphism encoding set  $(E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  on the interaction-tape,  $M^{\text{wit}}$  only constructed relation plans for these relations. Now it writes  $(\Omega_k, E_{\text{aut}}, E_{\text{dom}}, E_{\text{img}})$  on the interaction-tape. The perfect matching between the atoms of  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$  (Properties (S3) and (S4)) precisely then defines the same set of automorphisms  $N$  for  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  (recall the extended definition of encoding automorphisms for normalized DeepWL+WSC-algorithms) and by Property (S5) and Lemma 24 the automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{A}_t$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t$  are equal. By Lemma 46,  $N$  witnesses  $\tilde{E}_U$  as orbit fixing  $\tilde{E}_{U_1}^{\mathfrak{A}_{j_1}}, \dots, \tilde{E}_{U_\ell}^{\mathfrak{A}_{j_\ell}}$  in the simulation.

Finally, to see that the algorithm runs in polynomial time, we note that every step that is simulated needs a polynomial number of steps. So it remains to argue that the

structure in the cloud is of polynomial size. By Property (S2) the building plans are always efficient. Then by Lemma 45 we have that  $|\mathfrak{A}_t| \leq 2|\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_t|$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 53.** *If a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm decides isomorphism for a class of binary  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{K}$ , then some normalized polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm decides isomorphism for  $\mathcal{K}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathfrak{A}_2 \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{A}_1 \uplus \mathfrak{A}_2$ . To apply Lemma 52, we have to provide a building plan  $\Omega$  such that  $(\mathfrak{A}, \Omega)$  simulates  $\mathfrak{A}$ , that is  $\Omega^{\text{cross}}(\mathfrak{A}) \cong \mathfrak{A}$ . First, we define the vertex class  $D$  of all atoms. Second, we create a plain vertex  $u_i$  for both components  $\mathfrak{A}_i$ , and a vertex class  $D'$  only containing  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ . To do so, we define a relation  $F$  connecting all atoms in the same component. We execute  $\text{scc}(F)$  and obtain a vertex class  $D'$  containing one vertex per component. Then we rename every relation  $E \in \tau$  to a fresh relation symbol  $E'$ . We then set  $\Omega := (\omega, \kappa)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &:= \{\{D, D'\}\} \text{ and} \\ \kappa &:= \{(C, \{D, D'\})\} \cup \{(E, \{\{E', D'\})\} \mid E \in \tau\}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that  $(\mathfrak{A}, \Omega)$  simulates  $\mathfrak{A}$ . With  $\omega$  we create for every atom  $u \in A_i$  in  $D$  a single crossing vertex, because  $D'$  contains exactly one vertex in  $\mathfrak{A}_j$  (where  $\{i, j\} = [2]$ ). Two such crossing vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are in the relation  $E$  if between the corresponding vertices there is a  $D'$ -edge (the  $D'$ -loop) and an  $E'$ -edge. That is,  $u^{(i)} = v^{(i)}$  is a  $D'$ -vertex, so  $u$  and  $v$  are copies of plain vertices of the same component  $\mathfrak{A}_j$ , and  $(u^{(j)}, v^{(j)}) \in E^{\mathfrak{A}}$ , where  $E$  was renamed to  $E'$ . So we have established Property (S1). Clearly, every vertex is used in the building plan because every vertex is either in  $D$  or in  $D'$ , that is Property (S2) is satisfied. Every crossing vertex is adjacent via  $E_p$  to exactly one atom in  $A$  because the  $D'$ -vertices are not atoms. The relation plan  $(C, \{D, D'\})$  creates a vertex class  $C$  containing all crossing vertices. Because each crossing vertex is  $E_p$ -connected to an atom and every atom to a  $C$ -vertex, we established Properties (S3) and (S4). Lastly, we also established Property (S5) because  $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$  consists essentially of two copies of  $\mathfrak{A}$  connected by a perfect matching. A similar construction (but without building plans) can be found in the proof of Lemma 11 in [18].  $\square$

**Theorem 54.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of binary  $\tau$ -structures. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *There is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm deciding isomorphism on  $\mathcal{K}$ .*
2. *There is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm computing some complete invariant for  $\mathcal{K}$ .*

*Proof.* To prove that 2. implies 1., we simulate on input  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  the algorithm computing some complete invariant in parallel on both components and accept if the invariants are equal. Here we are faced with a similar issue as in Theorem 22: we cannot simulate the computation on one component in the disjoint union if the components are not distinguished because we then cannot witness orbits. In the DeepWL+WSC setting, a complete invariant is a function  $f: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ . We first create a relation  $E$  connecting every atom in the same component and then execute  $\text{scc}(E)$ . In that way, we obtain to vertices  $u_{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $v_{\mathfrak{B}}$  related to all  $\mathfrak{A}$  respectively  $\mathfrak{B}$  atoms in a vertex class  $C$ .

We can define a DeepWL+WSC algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  which on input  $(\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}, u_{\mathfrak{H}}, i)$ , where  $\mathfrak{H} \in \{\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}\}$ , decides whether the  $i$ -th position in  $f(\mathfrak{H})$  is 1. Because in  $(\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}, u_{\mathfrak{H}}, i)$  the two components are distinguished, we indeed can simulate the DeepWL+WSC algorithm computing the complete invariant. Similarly, we can define a DeepWL+WSC algorithm  $\mathcal{M}'$  deciding whether  $|f(\mathfrak{H})| \leq i$ .

Using  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}'$  we can similarly to Lemma 38 compute  $f(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $f(\mathfrak{B})$  in parallel by executing  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}, i)$  and  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}', i)$ . Note that by the `refine` semantics the algorithms  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}'$  are indeed executed on structures where one of  $u_{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $v_{\mathfrak{B}}$  is individualized. We use  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}', i)$  to check whether we have to execute  $\text{refine}(C, \mathcal{M}, i)$ . We obtain vertex classes  $C_i$  refining  $C$  for the positions where  $\mathcal{M}$  accepted. If some  $C_i$  properly refines  $C$ , the invariants differ for  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{A} \not\cong \mathfrak{B}$ . Otherwise, the complete invariants are equal and  $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$ .

To prove that 1. implies 2., let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the algorithm deciding isomorphism. This proof follows the proof of the same theorem for DeepWL [18]. By Corollary 53, we can assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is normalized. We show that  $I(\mathfrak{A}) := \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A})$  is a complete invariant for all  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ . Clearly, if  $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$ , then  $I(\mathfrak{A}) = I(\mathfrak{B})$  (runs are isomorphism-invariant). For the other direction, assume that  $I(\mathfrak{A}) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{B} \uplus \mathfrak{B}) = I(\mathfrak{B})$ . From Lemma 35 it follows that two normalized structures  $\mathfrak{A}'$  and  $\mathfrak{B}'$  satisfy  $D(\mathfrak{A}') = D(\mathfrak{B}')$  if and only if  $\{D(\mathfrak{A}'[V_i(\mathfrak{A}')]) \mid i \in [2]\} = \{D(\mathfrak{B}'[V_i(\mathfrak{B}')]) \mid i \in [2]\}$ . From the same lemma it follows that  $D(\mathfrak{A}'[V_i(\mathfrak{A}')]) = D(\mathfrak{A}')[\sigma_i, V_i(\mathfrak{A}')]$ , i.e.  $D(\mathfrak{A}'[V_i(\mathfrak{A}')])$  is contained in the internal run for both  $i \in [2]$ . So, because  $I(\mathfrak{A}) = I(\mathfrak{B})$ , the two structures in the cloud  $\mathfrak{A}'$  and  $\mathfrak{B}'$  on input  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  always satisfy  $\{D(\mathfrak{A}'[V_i(\mathfrak{A}')]) \mid i \in [2]\} = \{D(\mathfrak{B}'[V_i(\mathfrak{B}')]) \mid i \in [2]\}$ . But that is, we also have  $\text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{B} \uplus \mathfrak{B}) = \text{run}(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B})$ . Because  $\mathcal{M}$  decides isomorphism,  $\mathcal{M}$  accepts  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{A}$ . So it also accepts  $\mathfrak{A} \uplus \mathfrak{B}$  and we finally conclude  $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$ .  $\square$

## 5.5 From DeepWL+WSC to CPT+WSC

To finally prove Theorem 21, it remains to show that CPT+WSC can simulate polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithms.

**Lemma 55.** *If a function  $f$  is computable or property  $P$  is decidable by a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, then  $f$  or  $P$  is CPT+WSC computable respectively definable.*

*Proof.* We follow the same strategy as [18] (Lemma 17): Polynomial time DeepWL-algorithms can be simulated in CPT, because CPT can execute the two-dimensional Weisfeiler-Leman algorithm to compute the needed coherent configurations and because `addPair` and `scc` operations (the only ones modifying the vertex set of cloud) can easily be simulated by set operations. So CPT can maintain a set representing the vertices of the structure in the cloud and so also sets representing the relations and colors.

To extend this proof for DeepWL+WSC, we again proceed by induction on the nesting depth of the algorithm. Let  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  be the initial input structure. We represent an HF-structure  $\mathfrak{A} = (A, M, E_1^{\mathfrak{A}}, \dots, E_k^{\mathfrak{A}})$  such that  $A = A_0$  as an  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -set itself (using the tuple encoding; we omit here for simplicity that we actually have to store the relation symbols, which is straightforward). Let  $\mathcal{M} = (M^{\text{out}}, M^{\text{wit}}, \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k)$  be a DeepWL+WSC-algorithm and let  $\Phi_1(x), \dots, \Phi_k(x)$  be CPT+WSC formulas such that  $\mathfrak{A} \in \llbracket \Phi_i \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  ( $\mathfrak{A}$  seen as  $\text{HF}(A_0)$ -set) if and only if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is accepted by  $\mathcal{M}_i$  for all  $i \in [k]$

(again, because  $\mathcal{M}$  defines a property or computes a function, it never fails). Then a  $\text{refine}(E, i)$  operation can easily be simulated: Let  $M$  be the current set of vertices (apart the  $A_0$  atoms) of the current state of the cloud as maintained by the formula, let  $F_1, \dots, F_\ell$  be all current relation symbols and for every  $j \in [\ell]$  let  $b_j \subseteq (A_0 \cup M)^2$  be the set containing all pairs of the relation  $F_j$  (also maintained by the formula). First assume that  $E = F_i$  is directed. We then obtain with  $\{x \mid x \in b_i, \Phi_i((\text{Atoms}, M, b_1, \dots, b_\ell, \{x_1\}, \{x_2\}))\}$  the output of the  $\text{refine}$  operation, where  $x_i$  defines the  $i$ -th entry of the pair  $x$ . Here, we individualize  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  by putting them into new singleton relations. In the case that  $E$  is undirected, we proceed similarly but only create one new relation  $\{x_1, x_2\}$ .

Recall that the possible runs of a DeepWL+WSC-machine were defined in Section 5.2 as  $\text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0})$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  is the input of the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm containing the machine. Also note that  $\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ , and  $\delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}$  are deterministic because they do not execute  $\text{choice}$ -operations. So we can define CPT+WSC terms simulating these functions as argued above. Hence, we can define a CPT+WSC WSC-fixed-point operator which is equivalent to  $\text{WSC}^*(\delta_{\text{step}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{choice}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0}, \delta_{\text{wit}}^{\mathfrak{A}_0})$ . Because the elements of the structure are obtained in the same way as by the DeepWL+WSC-algorithm, all orbits are witnessed successfully.  $\square$

**Corollary 56.** *A function  $f$  is computable or a property is  $P$  decidable by a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm if and only if  $f$  or  $P$ , respectively, are definable in CPT+WSC.*

We can finally prove Theorem 21.

*Proof of Theorem 21.* Let  $\Phi$  be a CPT+WSC formula defining isomorphism of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then there is a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm deciding isomorphism of  $\mathcal{K}$  by Lemma 30. By Theorem 54 there is a complete invariant computable by a polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithm. Finally, from Lemma 55 it follows that this complete invariant is CPT+WSC definable.  $\square$

We note that the translation from polynomial time DeepWL+WSC-algorithms into CPT formulas cannot be effective, because the polynomial bounding the running time of the DeepWL+WSC-algorithms is not given explicitly, but CPT formulas have to provide them explicitly. However, this could be achieved by equipping DeepWL+WSC-algorithms with explicit polynomials.

## 6 The CFI-Query

Fixed-point logic (IFP) was shown not to capture PTIME by Cai, Fürer, and Immerman [3] using the so-called CFI graphs. These graphs come with the problem to decide whether a given CFI graph is even or not. This is called the CFI-query. CFI graphs and their generalizations turned out to be useful to separate various logics from PTIME, most recently rank logic [23].

Already defining restricted versions of the CFI-query is rather difficult in CPT: the best current result is that the CFI-query for base graphs of logarithmic color class size or base graphs with linear maximal degree is CPT-definable [28]. The technique for logarithmic color class size is based on constructing deeply-nested sets which are invariant

under isomorphisms of the CFI graphs, but can be used to determine the parity of the graph. For general base graphs it is not clear how such sets can be constructed while still satisfying polynomial bounds. However, in the presence of symmetric choice, solving CFI graphs becomes easier.

For totally ordered base graphs it was shown by Gire and Hoang [12] that IFP extended with a suitable fixed-point operator with witnessed symmetric choice defines the CFI-query. While the choice operator in [12] has slightly different semantics than the one in CPT+WSC, the same approach can be formulated in CPT+WSC, which is not surprising as CPT captures IFP.

To construct a class of base graphs for which the CFI-query it is not known to be definable in CPT we consider not necessarily totally ordered base graphs. Because every automorphism of the base graph translates to automorphisms of the CFI graph and because we need to choose from orbits, we assume that the base graphs have CPT distinguishable orbits. This turns out to be sufficient to define the CFI-query.

**The CFI Construction.** We first review the CFI construction and its crucial properties and the procedure to define the CFI-query on totally ordered base graph as given by [12]. We then show that the CFI-query is definable for base graphs with definable orbits via canonization of the CFI graphs using the techniques from Section 4.

A **base graph** is a simple, undirected, and connected graph. For a base graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a function  $g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  we define the CFI graph  $\text{CFI}(G, g)$  as follows. For every directed base edge  $e = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in E$  there is a pair of **edge vertices**  $u_{e,0}$  and  $u_{e,1}$  (note that, since  $G$  is undirected, we have these edge vertex pairs for every direction). For every base vertex  $\mathbf{u} \in V$  of degree  $d$  we add the degree- $d$  CFI gadget: the vertex set is  $C_{\mathbf{u}} := \{v_{\mathbf{u},\bar{a}} \mid \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{N_G(\mathbf{u})}, \sum \bar{a} = 0\}$ . For every base vertex  $\mathbf{u} \in V$  and every  $\mathbf{v} \in N_G(\mathbf{u})$  we add the edges  $\{u_{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}),i}, v_{\mathbf{u},\bar{a}}\}$  whenever  $\bar{a}(\mathbf{v}) = i$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{F}_2$ . Finally, for every edge  $\{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\} \in E$  we add the edges  $\{\{u_{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}),i}, u_{(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{u}),j}\} \mid i + j = g(\{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\})\}$ .

We say that a **gadget vertex**  $v_{\mathbf{u},\bar{a}}$  has **origin**  $\mathbf{u}$  and write  $\text{orig}(v_{\mathbf{u},\bar{a}}) = \mathbf{u}$  and similar for edge vertices  $\text{orig}(u_{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ . We extend the notation to tuples of vertices  $\text{orig}(\bar{w}) = (\text{orig}(w_1), \dots, \text{orig}(w_{|\bar{w}|}))$ .

The gadgets have the property that every local automorphism of a gadget  $C_{\mathbf{u}}$  (and its adjacent edge vertices) swaps an even number of the edge vertex pairs, that is,  $u_{e,0}$  is mapped to  $u_{e,1}$  and vice versa for an even number of edges  $e$  incident to  $\mathbf{u}$ . It is well-known [3] that up to isomorphism there are exactly two CFI graphs for a given base graph  $G$ , namely the one with  $\sum g = 0$  called *even* and the one with  $\sum g = 1$  called *odd*. The **CFI-query** is to decide whether a given CFI graph is even.

We also allow colored base graphs: If the base graph is colored (that is, a structure  $G = (V, E, \preceq)$  equipped with a total preorder), then the gadgets are colored according to their base vertices. The color class size of  $G$  is the size of its largest  $\preceq$ -equivalence class. For a class of base graphs  $\mathcal{K}$  we denote with  $\text{CFI}(\mathcal{K}) := \{\text{CFI}(G, g) \mid G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{K}, g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2\}$  the class of CFI graphs over  $\mathcal{K}$ .

We recall some well-known facts on the automorphisms of CFI graphs. Let  $G = (V, E, \preceq)$  be a totally ordered base graph,  $g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  be arbitrary,  $\mathfrak{A} = \text{CFI}(G, g)$ , and  $\bar{u} \in A^*$ . All automorphisms of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{u})$  are composed out of cycles in the base graph. Let  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k$  with  $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_k$  be a cycle in  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$ . Then there is an automorphism that swaps the edge vertex pairs for exactly the edges  $\{\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_{i+1}\}$  for all  $i \in [k-1]$  and the edge

$\{\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{u}_1\}$  and maps the gadget vertices  $C_{\mathbf{u}_i}$  accordingly. It holds that the two edge vertices  $u_{e,0}$  and  $u_{e,1}$  are in the same 1-orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{u})$  if and only if there is a cycle in  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$  containing  $e$ .

Another property is that if  $\mathbf{u} \in V$  is a base vertex of degree  $d$  and for  $d - 1$  edge vertex pairs incident to  $C_{\mathbf{u}}$  an edge vertex is contained in  $\bar{u}$ , that then we can define in IFP (and so in CPT) a total order on  $C_{\mathbf{u}}$  and the edge vertices of the single remaining incident edge.

Gire and Hoang [12] showed that IFP extended with a fixed-point operator with witnessed symmetric choice defines the CFI-query for totally ordered base graphs. Although the semantics of the choice operator is slightly different from the one presented in the paper, the same arguments also work in CPT+WSC: Maintain a tuple  $\bar{u}$  of individualized edge vertices and check whether there is still a base edge  $e$  contained in a cycle in  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$ . If this is the case, use  $\{u_{e,0}, u_{e,1}\}$  as choice set and extend  $\bar{u}$  by the chosen vertex. Once no such edge exists, we can define a total order on the CFI graph and e.g. by the Immerman-Vardi Theorem decide whether it is even. Finally, to define the necessary automorphisms for the edge vertices of the edge  $e$ , we pick a minimal (with respect to the total order in the base graph) cycle in  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$ , swap the edge vertices and permute the gadget vertices accordingly.

**Unordered Base Graphs.** We now consider unordered base graphs. Let  $G = (V, E, \preceq)$  be a base graph and  $g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ . Given that  $G$  contains a vertex of degree at least 3, every automorphism of  $\text{CFI}(G, g)$  is composed of automorphism of the base graph  $G$  and a “CFI-automorphism” from the CFI construction (which does not permute the base graph). If  $\varphi$  is an automorphism of  $G$ , it is easy to see that there is an isomorphism  $\text{CFI}(G, g) \rightarrow \text{CFI}(\varphi(G), g \circ \varphi) = \text{CFI}(G, g \circ \varphi)$ . Because  $\sum g \circ \varphi = \sum g$ , there is, as seen above, an isomorphism  $\psi$  (which does not permute the base graph) such that  $\psi \circ \varphi$  is an automorphism of  $\text{CFI}(G, g)$ .

When we want to define the CFI-query for a class of base graphs  $\mathcal{K}$  using the choice operator, we need to assume that  $\mathcal{K}$  has definable orbits. Indeed, as we have seen, computing orbits of CFI graphs is at least as hard as computing orbits of the base graph, the choice operator is useless if we cannot define orbits of  $\mathcal{K}$ . We now show that assuming that  $\mathcal{K}$  has CPT-definable orbits suffices to define the CFI-query.

**Lemma 57.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of (colored) base graphs with CPT-distinguishable 2-orbits. Then  $\text{CFI}(\mathcal{K})$  is ready for individualization in CPT.*

*Proof.* Let  $G = (V, E, \preceq) \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathfrak{A} = \text{CFI}(G, g)$  for some  $g: E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ , and  $\bar{u} \in A$ . On input  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\bar{u}$ , we first define the base graph  $(G, \text{orig}(\bar{u}))$  and define its 2-orbits (note here that  $\text{orig}(\bar{u})$  is a tuple containing vertices or pairs of vertices of  $G$ , so it can be encoded by a tuple of vertices of  $G$ ). This is done as follows: A base vertex  $\mathbf{u}$  of the base graph  $(G, \text{orig}(\bar{u}))$  is encoded by the set of vertices of  $\text{CFI}(G, g)$  with origin  $\mathbf{u}$ . We then use the CPT formula  $\Phi_{\text{orb}}$  to define a total preorder on the base graph. Note that, because  $\Phi_{\text{orb}}$  is only a CPT formula, we do not have to care about choices here.

We now check whether there is a 2-orbit containing a directed edge  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  as part of a cycle of  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$ . If that is the case, we can canonically choose the minimal such 2-orbit  $O$ . Then the set  $\{u_{(u,v),i} \mid (u, v) \in O, i \in \mathbb{Z}_2\}$  is a 1-orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{u})$ . In particular, it is nontrivial and so disjoint with  $\text{orig}(\bar{u})$ .

In the other case that there is no such cycle, we can use the properties of CFI graphs to order the vertices of each gadget and each edge vertex pair. This does not necessarily define a total order on all vertices, because the base graph may have non-trivial orbits (but no cycles, e.g. a tree). So we check whether there is a nontrivial 2-orbit in the base graph. If that is the case, we again choose the minimal such orbit  $O$ . Now the set  $\{u_{(u,v),i} \mid (u,v) \in O, u_{(u,v),i} \text{ is minimal among } u_{(u,v),0} \text{ and } u_{(u,v),1}\}$  is a nontrivial 1-orbit of  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{u})$  and so again disjoint with  $\text{orig}(\bar{u})$ .

Finally, if there is neither a cycle in  $G - \text{orig}(\bar{u})$  nor a nontrivial orbit in  $(G, \text{orig}(\bar{u}))$ , then the ordering of the vertices per gadget and edge vertex pairs extends to a total order of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and we output the minimal vertex not contained in  $\bar{u}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 58.** *For every class of (colored) base graphs  $\mathcal{K}$  with CPT-distinguishable orbits CPT+WSC defines the CFI-query.*

*Proof.* Because  $\text{CFI}(\mathcal{K})$  is ready for individualization in CPT (and so in particular in CPT+WSC), CPT+WSC defines a canonization for  $\text{CFI}(\mathcal{K})$  by Theorem 22. Then by the Immerman-Vardi Theorem IFP (and so CPT and so CPT+WSC) captures PTIME on  $\text{CFI}(\mathcal{K})$  and so in particular defines the CFI-query.  $\square$

Note here that we do not have to construct automorphisms of uncolored CFI graphs explicitly, because we use Theorem 22.

We finally show that Corollary 58 covers graph classes for which it is not known that the CFI-query is CPT-definable. The best known results due to [28] are classes of base graph with logarithmic color class size or where the maximum degree in the graphs is linear in the graph size.

**Corollary 59.** *There is a class of (colored) base graphs  $\mathcal{K} = \{G_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , such that CPT+WSC defines the CFI-query for  $\mathcal{K}$  and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the graph  $G_n$  is  $O(\sqrt{|G_n|})$ -regular and every color class of  $G_n$  has size  $\Omega(\sqrt{|G_n|})$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to construct a class  $\mathcal{K} = \{G_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of colored base graphs  $\mathcal{K}$  with the desired regularity and color-class size properties and which has CPT-definable 2-orbits by Corollary 58.

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. We define  $G_n = (V, E, \preceq)$  as follows: start with  $n$  disjoint cliques  $K_1, \dots, K_n$  of size  $n$ . Then connect every  $K_i$  to  $K_{i+1}$  (and  $K_n$  to  $K_1$ ) with a complete bipartite graph. Finally, color the graph such that each  $K_i$  is a color class. We now consider the 2-orbits of  $(G_n, \bar{u})$  for some arbitrary  $\bar{u} \in V^*$ . For a vertex  $v \in V$  it is easy to see that the 1-orbit  $O(v)$  containing  $v$  is  $O(v) = \{v\}$  if  $v \in \bar{u}$  and otherwise  $O(v) = \{w \mid v \in K_i, w \in K_i, w \notin \bar{u}\}$ . Then the 2-orbit of a tuple  $(u, v)$  is  $O(u, v) = \{(w, w') \mid w \in O(u), w' \in O(v), \text{ and } w \neq w' \text{ if and only if } u \neq v\}$ .

Clearly, this graph has order  $n^2$ , is  $(3n-1)$ -regular, and has color class size  $n$ , satisfying the assertion of the lemma. Its also easy to see that CPT defines the partition of 2-orbits shown above and can order it using the total order on the cliques.  $\square$

## 7 Discussion

We extended CPT with a witnessed symmetric choice operator and obtained the logic CPT+WSC. We proved that defining isomorphism in CPT+WSC is equivalent to defining

canonization. A crucial point was to extend the DeepWL computing model to show that a CPT+WSC-definable isomorphism test yields a CPT+WSC-definable complete-invariant.

Thereby, CPT+WSC can be viewed as a simplification step in the quest for a logic capturing PTIME as now only isomorphism needs to be defined to be able to apply the Immerman-Vardi theorem.

To turn a complete invariant into a canonization within CPT+WSC we used the canonization algorithm of Gurevich. To implement it in CPT+WSC, we have to extend it to provide witnessing automorphisms. For this to work, we needed to give to the witnessing terms the defined fixed-points as input. This is different in other extensions of first order logic with symmetric choice [7, 12]. We actually require that choice sets are orbits when respecting all previous intermediate steps in the fixed-point computation. It appears that this is only relevant if a formula actively forgets previous choices. But how could forgetting these be beneficial? In any case we are not sure whether the modification changes the expressiveness of the logic.

Another question is the relation of CPT+WSC to other logics. Is CPT+WSC more expressive than CPT? Do nested WSC-fixed-point operators increase the expressiveness of CPT+WSC? In [7] it is proven that for fixed-point logic extended with (unwitnessed) symmetric choice, the ability to nest increases expressiveness.

We should remark that any positive answer to our questions separates CPT from PTIME and hence all questions might be difficult to answer.

Finally, extending DeepWL with witnessed symmetric choice turned out to be extremely tedious. While proofs for DeepWL without choice are already complicated [18] for our extensions the proofs got even more involved. We would like to see more elegant techniques to prove Theorem 21 for CPT+WSC (or even for CPT).

## References

- [1] Andreas Blass, Yuri Gurevich, and Saharon Shelah. Choiceless polynomial time. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 100(1-3):141–187, 1999.
- [2] Andreas Blass, Yuri Gurevich, and Saharon Shelah. On polynomial time computation over unordered structures. *J. Symb. Log.*, 67(3):1093–1125, 2002.
- [3] Jin-yi Cai, Martin Fürer, and Neil Immerman. An optimal lower bound on the number of variables for graph identification. *Combinatorica*, 12(4):389–410, 1992.
- [4] Ashok K. Chandra and David Harel. Structure and complexity of relational queries. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 25(1):99–128, 1982.
- [5] Gang Chen and Iliia Ponomarenko. *Lectures on coherent configurations*. Central China Normal University Press, Wuhan, 2019. a draft is available at [www.pdmi.ras.ru/~inp/ccNOTES.pdf](http://www.pdmi.ras.ru/~inp/ccNOTES.pdf).
- [6] Anuj Dawar, Erich Grädel, and Moritz Lichter. Limitations of the invertible-map equivalences. *CoRR*, abs/2109.07218, 2021.

- [7] Anuj Dawar and David Richerby. A fixed-point logic with symmetric choice. In Matthias Baaz and Johann A. Makowsky, editors, *Computer Science Logic, 17th International Workshop, CSL 2003, 12th Annual Conference of the EACSL, and 8th Kurt Gödel Colloquium, KGC 2003, Vienna, Austria, August 25-30, 2003, Proceedings*, volume 2803 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 169–182. Springer, 2003.
- [8] Anuj Dawar and David Richerby. Fixed-point logics with nondeterministic choice. *J. Log. Comput.*, 13(4):503–530, 2003.
- [9] Anuj Dawar, David Richerby, and Benjamin Rossman. Choiceless polynomial time, counting and the Cai-Fürer-Immerman graphs. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 152(1-3):31–50, 2008.
- [10] Heinz-Dieter Ebbinghaus. Extended logics: the general framework. In Jon Barwise and Solomon Feferman, editors, *Model-Theoretic Logics*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, pages 25–76. Association for Symbolic Logic, 1985.
- [11] Ronald Fagin. Generalized first-order spectra and polynomial-time recognizable sets. In *Complexity of computation (Proc. SIAM-AMS Sympos. Appl. Math., New York, 1973)*, pages 43–73. SIAM-AMS Proc., Vol. VII, 1974.
- [12] Françoise Gire and H. Khanh Hoang. An extension of fixpoint logic with a symmetry-based choice construct. *Inf. Comput.*, 144(1):40–65, 1998.
- [13] Erich Grädel and Martin Grohe. Is polynomial time choiceless? In Lev D. Beklemishev, Andreas Blass, Nachum Dershowitz, Bernd Finkbeiner, and Wolfram Schulte, editors, *Fields of Logic and Computation II - Essays Dedicated to Yuri Gurevich on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday*, volume 9300 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 193–209. Springer, 2015.
- [14] Erich Grädel, Wied Pakusa, Svenja Schalthöfer, and Lukasz Kaiser. Characterising choiceless polynomial time with first-order interpretations. In *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015*, pages 677–688. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [15] Martin Grohe. The quest for a logic capturing PTIME. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2008, 24-27 June 2008, Pittsburgh, PA, USA*, pages 267–271. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [16] Martin Grohe. *Descriptive Complexity, Canonization, and Definable Graph Structure Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [17] Martin Grohe and Daniel Neuen. Canonisation and definability for graphs of bounded rank width. In *34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-27, 2019*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2019.

- [18] Martin Grohe, Pascal Schweitzer, and Daniel Wiebking. Deep Weisfeiler Leman. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 2600–2614. SIAM, 2021.
- [19] Yuri Gurevich. Logic and the challenge of computer science. In Egon Boerger, editor, *Current Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 1–57. Computer Science Press, 1988.
- [20] Yuri Gurevich. From invariants to canonization. *Bull. EATCS*, 63, 1997.
- [21] Neil Immerman. Languages that capture complexity classes. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16(4):760–778, 1987.
- [22] Sandra Kiefer, Pascal Schweitzer, and Erkal Selman. Graphs identified by logics with counting. In Giuseppe F. Italiano, Giovanni Pighizzini, and Donald Sannella, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2015 - 40th International Symposium, MFCS 2015, Milan, Italy, August 24-28, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9234 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 319–330. Springer, 2015.
- [23] Moritz Lichter. Separating rank logic from polynomial time. In *36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2021, Rome, Italy, June 29 - July 2, 2021*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021.
- [24] Moritz Lichter and Pascal Schweitzer. Canonization for bounded and dihedral color classes in choiceless polynomial time. In Christel Baier and Jean Goubault-Larrecq, editors, *29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2021, January 25-28, 2021, Ljubljana, Slovenia (Virtual Conference)*, volume 183 of *LIPICs*, pages 31:1–31:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [25] Rudolf Mathon. A note on the graph isomorphism counting problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 8(3):131–132, 1979.
- [26] Benedikt Pago. Choiceless computation and symmetry: Limitations of definability. In Christel Baier and Jean Goubault-Larrecq, editors, *29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2021, January 25-28, 2021, Ljubljana, Slovenia (Virtual Conference)*, volume 183 of *LIPICs*, pages 33:1–33:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [27] Wied Pakusa. *Linear Equation Systems and the Search for a Logical Characterisation of Polynomial Time*. PhD thesis, RWTH Aachen, 2015.
- [28] Wied Pakusa, Svenja Schalthöfer, and Erkal Selman. Definability of Cai-Fürer-Immerman problems in choiceless polynomial time. In Jean-Marc Talbot and Laurent Regnier, editors, *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2016, August 29 - September 1, 2016, Marseille, France*, volume 62 of *LIPICs*, pages 19:1–19:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.

- [29] Benjamin Rossman. Choiceless computation and symmetry. In Andreas Blass, Nachum Dershowitz, and Wolfgang Reisig, editors, *Fields of Logic and Computation, Essays Dedicated to Yuri Gurevich on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, volume 6300 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 565–580. Springer, 2010.
- [30] Pascal Schweitzer and Daniel Wiebking. A unifying method for the design of algorithms canonizing combinatorial objects. In Moses Charikar and Edith Cohen, editors, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23-26, 2019*, pages 1247–1258. ACM, 2019.
- [31] Faried Abu Zaid, Erich Grädel, Martin Grohe, and Wied Pakusa. Choiceless polynomial time on structures with small abelian colour classes. In Erzsébet Csuhaj-Varjú, Martin Dietzfelbinger, and Zoltán Ésik, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2014 - 39th International Symposium, MFCS 2014, Budapest, Hungary, August 25-29, 2014. Proceedings, Part I*, volume 8634 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–62. Springer, 2014.