



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Combinatorial Theory,  
Series A[www.elsevier.com/locate/jcta](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jcta)Critical group structure from the parameters of  
a strongly regular graph

Joshua E. Ducey<sup>a,\*</sup>, David L. Duncan<sup>a</sup>, Wesley J. Engelbrecht<sup>a</sup>,  
Jawahar V. Madan<sup>b</sup>, Eric Piato<sup>c</sup>, Christina S. Shatford<sup>d</sup>,  
Angela Vichitbandha<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics, James Madison University,  
Harrisonburg, VA 22807, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA 91711, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Mathematics, SUNY College at Geneseo, Geneseo, NY 14454,  
USA

<sup>d</sup> Mathematics and Statistics Department, Connecticut College, New London,  
CT 06320, USA

<sup>e</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 16 October 2019

Received in revised form 31

December 2020

Accepted 25 January 2021

Available online 1 February 2021

## Keywords:

Invariant factors

Elementary divisors

Smith normal form

Critical group

Jacobian group

Sandpile group

Laplacian matrix

Strongly regular graph

## ABSTRACT

We give simple arithmetic conditions that force the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of the critical group of a strongly regular graph to take a specific form. These conditions depend only on the parameters  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  of the strongly regular graph under consideration. We give many examples, including how the theory can be used to compute the critical group of Conway's 99-graph and to give an elementary argument that no  $\text{srg}(28, 9, 0, 4)$  exists.

© 2021 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [duceyje@jmu.edu](mailto:duceyje@jmu.edu) (J.E. Ducey), [duncandl@jmu.edu](mailto:duncandl@jmu.edu) (D.L. Duncan), [engelber@dukes.jmu.edu](mailto:engelber@dukes.jmu.edu) (W.J. Engelbrecht), [jmadan@g.hmc.edu](mailto:jmadan@g.hmc.edu) (J.V. Madan), [esp6@geneseo.edu](mailto:esp6@geneseo.edu) (E. Piato), [cshatfor@conncoll.edu](mailto:cshatfor@conncoll.edu) (C.S. Shatford), [aavichitbandha@uky.edu](mailto:aavichitbandha@uky.edu) (A. Vichitbandha).

## 1. Introduction

Given a finite, connected graph  $\Gamma$ , one can construct an interesting graph invariant  $K(\Gamma)$  called the *critical group*. This is a finite abelian group that captures nontrivial graph-theoretic information of  $\Gamma$ , such as the number of spanning trees of  $\Gamma$ ; precise definitions are given in Section 2. This group  $K(\Gamma)$  goes by several other names in the literature (e.g., the *Jacobian group* and the *sandpile group*), reflecting its appearance in several different areas of mathematics and physics; see [14] for a good introduction and [12] for a recent survey. Correspondingly, the critical group can be presented and studied by various methods. These methods include analysis of chip-firing games on the vertices of  $\Gamma$  [13], framing the critical group in terms of the free group on the directed edges of  $\Gamma$  subject to some natural relations [7], computing (e.g., via unimodular row/column operators) the Smith normal form of a Laplacian matrix of the graph, and considering the underlying matroid of  $\Gamma$  [19].

Despite the variety of tools available, computing the critical group of an arbitrarily chosen graph can be computationally expensive. Instead, one often searches for families of graphs for which specific graph-theoretic knowledge can be used to streamline the computations involved. From this perspective, the *strongly regular graphs* (srgs) are a particularly interesting family. To paraphrase Peter Cameron, srgs lie on the boundary of the highly structured yet seemingly random. Computations have born witness to this, in that the critical groups of many subfamilies of srgs have been computed, while many more remain unknown. Examples of interesting subfamilies of srgs that have proven to be amenable to critical group computation include the Paley graphs [5], the  $n \times n$  rook graphs [9], Grassmann graphs on lines in projective space [11], and Kneser graphs on 2-element subsets [10] (and the complements of all these). Some very recent progress deals with polar graphs [17] and the van Lint-Schrijver cyclotomic srgs [16].

To each srg, one can associate parameters  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  describing the number and valence of the vertices, as well as adjacency information. The families of srgs listed above are each such that these parameters vary over the family. An alternative approach for studying srgs is to fix the parameters  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  and explore what can be deduced about an srg with these parameters. It is this technique that is taken here; see also [15, Section 3] and [1, Section 10] for similar approaches. More specifically, we show that the parameter set  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  determines arithmetic conditions that constrain the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $K(\Gamma)$  for any strongly regular graph  $\Gamma$  having these parameters.

The aforementioned Sylow  $p$ -subgroup constraints arise through an extension of the analysis in [4] of the  $p$ -ranks of the Laplacian matrix  $L$ . The need for such an extension stems from the observation that, though knowing the critical group of  $\Gamma$  gives you the  $p$ -rank of  $L$  for any prime  $p$ , the converse need not hold. That is, the  $p$ -rank of  $L$  may not uniquely determine the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $K(\Gamma)$ . The smallest counterexample is

the  $4 \times 4$  rook graph and the Shrikhande graph. These are both strongly regular graphs with parameters  $(16, 6, 2, 2)$  and both of their Laplacian matrices have 2-rank equal to 6. However the critical group of the rook graph is

$$(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^5 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/32\mathbb{Z})^4$$

while the Shrikhande graph has critical group

$$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z})^2 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/32\mathbb{Z})^4.$$

Nevertheless, the critical groups of these graphs can be distinguished by considering their Sylow 2-subgroups (it happens to be the case in these examples that the Sylow 2-subgroup equals the full critical group).

The approach we take here may be of limited use in distinguishing nonisomorphic srgs with the same parameter set. However, as we demonstrate in Example 3.8, our approach can be applied to show that there cannot exist srgs with certain parameter sets.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Strongly regular graphs

Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  denote a connected, finite undirected graph, as in the introduction. If every vertex in  $\mathcal{V}$  is adjacent to  $k$  other vertices, we say that  $\Gamma$  is  $k$ -regular. Fix an ordering of the vertices. Then the *adjacency matrix*  $A = (a_{i,j})$  of  $\Gamma$  is defined

$$a_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if vertex } i \text{ and vertex } j \text{ are adjacent} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $D$  denote the  $|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|$  diagonal matrix with  $(i, i)$ -entry equal to the degree of vertex  $i$ . The *Laplacian matrix* of  $\Gamma$  is  $L = D - A$ . We use  $I$  and  $J$  to denote, respectively, the identity matrix and the all-ones matrix of the appropriate size. Note that when  $\Gamma$  is  $k$ -regular, we have  $L = kI - A$ .

A graph  $\Gamma$  is *strongly regular with parameters*  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  if:

- $\Gamma$  has  $v$  vertices,
- $\Gamma$  is  $k$ -regular,
- any two adjacent vertices have exactly  $\lambda$  common neighbors, and,
- any two non-adjacent vertices have exactly  $\mu$  common neighbors.

We sometimes abbreviate this by writing that  $\Gamma$  is an  $srg(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$ .

We now recall several formulas and standard facts about the Laplacian  $L$  of an  $srg(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$ ; for more details, see, e.g., [3, Chapter 9]. The all-ones vector spans the

kernel of  $L$ , so 0 is an eigenvalue of  $L$  with multiplicity one. Aside from this 0 eigenvalue,  $L$  has exactly two other distinct eigenvalues that we denote by  $r$  and  $s$ . These can be computed directly from the parameters  $(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$ , and can be shown to satisfy the quadratic matrix equation

$$(L - rI)(L - sI) = \mu J. \quad (2.1)$$

Example 3.8 in the next section shows how Equation (2.1) can be a powerful tool for probing a particular graph. We will write  $f$  and  $g$  for the multiplicities of  $r$  and  $s$ , respectively.

Of great interest is the existence question for strongly regular graphs. The Handbook of Combinatorial Designs [6, Chapter 11] has a large list of feasible parameter sets, along with adjacency spectra and known graph constructions. An up to date version of this list, with more information, is available at Andries Brouwer's website [2]. On Brouwer's list, the graph parameters are color coded green for those for which examples exist, red for those for which it is known that no graph exists, and yellow if the question is not yet decided. Excluded from these lists are the "boring" strongly regular graphs, which are the disjoint unions of complete graphs or the complements of these. The disjoint unions of multiple complete graphs are excluded for us as well, by our connectedness assumption.

## 2.2. Critical groups

The Laplacian  $L$  can be viewed as defining a homomorphism of free abelian groups  $L: \mathbb{Z}^v \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^v$ . Since  $L$  has a kernel of rank one, it follows that the cokernel has (free) rank one as well. In particular, we have a decomposition of the form

$$\mathbb{Z}^v / \text{Im}(L) \cong K(\Gamma) \oplus \mathbb{Z},$$

with  $K(\Gamma)$  a finite abelian group called the *critical group* of  $\Gamma$ . (If  $\Gamma$  were not connected there would be more copies of  $\mathbb{Z}$ .) The order of  $K(\Gamma)$  is the number of spanning trees of the graph. Isomorphic graphs have isomorphic critical groups; so the critical group is a graph invariant.

From the matrix-tree theorem [3, Prop. 1.3.4], we have that the order of the critical group is the product of the nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues, divided by the number of vertices. In the case that  $\Gamma$  is an  $\text{sg}(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$ , this becomes the identity

$$|K(\Gamma)| = \frac{r^f \cdot s^g}{v}.$$

Moreover, one can use Equation (2.1) to show that the product  $rs$  kills  $K(\Gamma)$ . (It is a remarkable fact, proved by Lorenzini [15, Prop. 2.6], that the product of the distinct nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues kills the critical group of *any* graph.)

Let  $p$  be a prime and write  $K_p(\Gamma)$  for the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $K(\Gamma)$ . By the structure theorem for finitely generated abelian groups, to determine  $K(\Gamma)$ , it suffices to determine  $K_p(\Gamma)$  for each  $p$  dividing the order of  $K(\Gamma)$ . A popular approach for identifying  $K_p(\Gamma)$  is to make use of the Smith normal form of  $L$ , which we review now: There is a unique integer diagonal matrix  $S = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_v)$  with (i) nonnegative diagonal entries  $s_i$  satisfying  $s_i | s_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i < v$ , and (ii) so that there exist unimodular matrices  $U, V$  satisfying

$$ULV = S. \quad (2.2)$$

Then  $S$  is the *Smith normal form* of  $L$  and the  $s_i$  are the *invariant factors*. The name is appropriate since the cokernel of  $L$  has invariant factor decomposition

$$\text{coker}(L) \cong \mathbb{Z}/s_1\mathbb{Z} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}/s_v\mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.3)$$

It follows from our connectedness assumption that  $s_v = 0$ , while  $s_i \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < v$ ; in particular, the critical group can be read off from ((2.3)) by taking the first  $v - 1$  terms.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $\Gamma$  denote the Petersen graph. There is an ordering of the vertices so that the Laplacian matrix for  $\Gamma$  is

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 & & & -1 & -1 & & & \\ -1 & 3 & -1 & & & & -1 & & \\ & -1 & 3 & -1 & & & & -1 & \\ & & -1 & 3 & -1 & & & & -1 \\ -1 & & & -1 & 3 & & & & \\ -1 & & & & & 3 & -1 & -1 & \\ & -1 & & & & & 3 & -1 & -1 \\ & & -1 & & & -1 & & 3 & -1 \\ & & & -1 & & -1 & -1 & & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This matrix has Smith normal form

$$\text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 10, 10, 10, 0)$$

from which it follows that  $K(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z})^3$ . Equivalently, the critical group can be written relative to its elementary divisor decomposition as  $K(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^4 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^3$ , which is easily read off by looking at the invariant factors. The two summands appearing in this latter description are the Sylow 2- and 5-subgroups of  $K(\Gamma)$ , respectively.

We will repeatedly use the following notation: For a fixed graph  $\Gamma$  and prime  $p$ , we define  $e_i$  to be the number of invariant factors of  $L$  that are divisible by  $p^i$  but not

divisible by  $p^{i+1}$ . Notice that  $e_0$  is the  $p$ -rank of  $L$  (the rank when viewed as a matrix over the field of  $p$  elements). For  $i > 0$ , the integer  $e_i$  is the multiplicity of  $\mathbb{Z}/p^i\mathbb{Z}$  in the elementary divisor decomposition of the critical group. We will refer to the  $e_i$  as the ( $p$ -elementary divisor) multiplicities, and note that they uniquely determine  $K_p(\Gamma)$ .

To compute these multiplicities we can use the following construction. For fixed  $p$  and  $i \geq 0$ , define

$$M_i = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^\vee \mid Lx \text{ is divisible by } p^i\}$$

and

$$N_i = \{p^{-i}Lx \mid x \in M_i\}.$$

We use bar notation to denote entry-wise reduction modulo  $p$  of vectors and matrices. By considering the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bases of  $\mathbb{Z}^\vee$  defined by the unimodular matrices  $U, V$  in Equation (2.2) one sees that

$$\dim_p \overline{M_i} = 1 + \sum_{j \geq i} e_j \quad (2.4)$$

$$\dim_p \overline{N_i} = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i} e_j. \quad (2.5)$$

For a reference, see [3, Prop. 13.8.2, 13.8.3].

Our main tool is the following lemma, which relates the spectrum of  $L$  to the critical group  $K(\Gamma)$ . Recall that  $p^i \parallel n$  means that  $p^i \mid n$  and  $p^{i+1} \nmid n$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a connected graph, fix a prime  $p$ , and let  $e_i$  be the multiplicity of  $p^i$  as an elementary divisor of the Laplacian  $L$ . Let  $\eta$  be an eigenvalue of  $L$  with multiplicity  $m$ , and assume that  $\eta$  is an integer.*

- (1) *If  $p^i \mid \eta$ , then  $m \leq 1 + \sum_{j \geq i} e_j$ .*
- (2) *If  $p^i \parallel \eta$ , then  $m \leq \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i} e_j$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $V_\eta$  denote the  $\eta$ -eigenspace of  $L$ , when viewed as a matrix over the rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The intersection  $V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee$  is a pure  $\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{Z}^\vee$  of rank  $m$ , and so  $\dim_p \overline{V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee} = m$ . Since  $p^i$  divides  $\eta$ , we have  $V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee \subseteq M_i$  and hence  $\overline{V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee} \subseteq \overline{M_i}$ . It follows that

$$m = \dim_p \overline{V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee} \leq \dim_p \overline{M_i} = 1 + \sum_{j \geq i} e_j.$$

For the second claim, write  $\eta = xp^i$  for some integer  $x$ . Then  $V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee \subseteq M_i$  implies  $x(V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee) \subseteq N_i$ , and so  $\overline{x(V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee)} \subseteq \overline{N_i}$ . The assumption that  $p^i \parallel \eta$  implies that  $x$  is invertible mod  $p$ . Thus

$$m = \dim_p \overline{V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee} = \dim_p \overline{x(V_\eta \cap \mathbb{Z}^\vee)} \leq \dim_p \overline{N_i} = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i} e_j. \quad \square$$

### 3. Sylow $p$ -subgroup structure

Throughout this section,  $\Gamma$  denotes a connected  $\text{srg}(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$  with Laplacian matrix  $L$ . As we have discussed,  $L$  has two non-zero eigenvalues  $r$  and  $s$ , and we denote by  $f$  and  $g$  their respective multiplicities. We assume that  $r$  and  $s$  are *integers*, which is the case for any  $\text{srg}$  unless it is a conference graph [3, Theorem 9.1.3]. We fix a prime  $p$  dividing  $|K(\Gamma)|$  and we write  $K_p(\Gamma)$  for the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $K(\Gamma)$ . Recall that  $e_i$  denotes the multiplicity of  $p^i$  as an elementary divisor of  $L$ ; in particular,  $e_0$  is the  $p$ -rank of  $L$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose  $p \nmid r$ , and let  $a, \gamma$  be the (unique) nonnegative integers so that  $p^a \parallel s$  and  $p^\gamma \parallel v$ . Then*

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^{a-\gamma}\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{g-1}.$$

*The same statement holds if the roles of  $r$  and  $s$  are interchanged, and the roles of  $f$  and  $g$  are interchanged.*

**Proof.** We have assumed that  $p$  divides  $|K(\Gamma)| = r^f s^g / v$ , so the hypotheses imply that  $a \geq 1$ . Similarly, since  $rs$  kills the critical group and  $p^a \parallel rs$  we have

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^{e_1} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^{e_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{e_a}.$$

From the Smith normal form of  $L$ , we see that  $e_0 + e_1 + \cdots + e_a + 1 = v$  is the number of diagonal entries in the Smith normal form. Similarly, by diagonalizing  $L$ , we see  $f + g + 1 = v$ . This gives

$$e_0 + e_1 + \cdots + e_a = f + g. \quad (3.1)$$

The order of  $K_p(\Gamma)$  we get from the matrix-tree theorem:

$$|K_p(\Gamma)| = \frac{(p^a)^g}{p^\gamma}.$$

This order can be alternatively expressed in terms of the elementary divisor multiplicities, from which we obtain

$$e_1 + 2e_2 + \cdots + ae_a = ag - \gamma. \quad (3.2)$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 part 1 to the  $s$ -eigenspace of  $L$  we have

$$g \leq e_a + 1.$$

In fact, we always have

$$g - 1 \leq e_a \leq g. \quad (3.3)$$

For suppose that  $e_a > g$ . Then  $ae_a > ag \geq ag - \gamma \geq ae_a$ , where the last inequality follows from Equation (3.2). This is impossible; therefore the bound (3.3) holds.

Next we will see that the  $p$ -rank  $e_0$  must equal  $f$  or  $f + 1$ . In the case that  $e_a = g$ , Equation (3.1) gives

$$e_0 + \cdots + e_{a-1} = f$$

and so  $e_0 \leq f$ . By Lemma 2.1 part 2 applied to the  $r$ -eigenspace, we have  $f \leq \dim \overline{N_0} = e_0$ . Thus  $e_0 = f$  and we see  $e_i = 0$  for  $i \neq 0, a$  by Equation (3.1). So in this case

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^g,$$

which agrees with the statement of the theorem since Equation (3.2) forces  $\gamma$  to be zero.

Now consider the case  $e_a = g - 1$ . From Equation (3.1) we get

$$e_0 + \cdots + e_{a-1} = f + 1$$

and so  $e_0 \leq f + 1$ . As before we also have  $f \leq e_0$ . It turns out that both  $e_0 = f$  and  $e_0 = f + 1$  are possible (more about this in the next corollary). In the case that  $e_0 = f + 1$ , we are forced to have  $e_i = 0$  for  $i \neq 0, a$  and we get

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{g-1}$$

which agrees with the statement of the theorem, since now Equation (3.2) forces  $\gamma = a$ .

Finally, if  $e_a = g - 1$  and  $e_0 = f$ , we see that Equation (3.1) becomes

$$e_1 + \cdots + e_{a-1} = 1.$$

This means that there is some  $i \neq 0, a$  with  $e_i = 1$  and  $e_j = 0$  for  $j \neq 0, i, a$ . We can identify the distinguished subscript  $i$  by looking carefully at Equation (3.2):

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 + 2e_2 + \cdots + (a-1)e_{a-1} &= ag - \gamma - ae_a \\ &= ag - \gamma - a(g-1) \\ &= a - \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that  $i = a - \gamma$ . We have shown in this case that

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^{a-\gamma}\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{g-1},$$

as desired.  $\square$



The statement of Theorem 3.1 is simple, but as the proof shows, the distinguished summand  $\mathbb{Z}/p^{a-\gamma}\mathbb{Z}$  can be absorbed into the others (when  $\gamma = 0$ ) or can disappear entirely (when  $\gamma = a$ ). We also saw that  $\gamma$  is forced by the values of  $e_a$  and  $e_0$ . In [4, Section 3], the authors calculate the  $p$ -ranks of matrices in a class that includes our  $L$  (under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1) and they show that  $e_0$  is determined by whether or not  $p$  divides  $\mu$ . We record this information in case it is of organizational value to the reader.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Suppose  $p \nmid r$  and let  $a, \gamma$  be the (unique) nonnegative integers so that  $p^a \parallel s$  and  $p^\gamma \parallel v$ . Then exactly one of the following holds:*

- (1)  $\gamma = 0$ ,  $p \mid \mu$ ,  $e_0 = f$  and  $K(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^g$ ,
- (2)  $0 < \gamma < a$ ,  $p \mid \mu$ ,  $e_0 = f$  and  $K(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^{a-\gamma}\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{g-1}$ ,
- (3)  $\gamma = a$ ,  $p \nmid \mu$ ,  $e_0 = f + 1$  and  $K(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z})^{g-1}$ .

*The same statement holds if the roles of  $r$  and  $s$  are interchanged, and the roles of  $f$  and  $g$  are interchanged.*

Let's apply these theorems with a few examples.

**Example 3.1.** It is unknown whether there exists a strongly regular graph  $\Gamma$  with parameters  $(190, 84, 33, 40)$ . If such a graph exists then its nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues and multiplicities would have to be  $r^f = 80^{133}$  and  $s^g = 95^{56}$  (we are writing the multiplicities as exponents, as is custom in much of the literature). Since  $r = 16 \cdot 5$  and  $s = 5 \cdot 19$ , we can use the theorem above to compute the Sylow 2- and 19-subgroups of  $K(\Gamma)$  (though it is easy to see that  $K_{19}(\Gamma)$  is elementary abelian). Let's compute  $K_2(\Gamma)$ :

$$K_2(\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2^{4-1}\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2^4\mathbb{Z})^{133-1} = \mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z})^{132}.$$

**Example 3.2.** Conway's 99-graph problem asks whether there exists a strongly regular graph  $\Gamma$  with parameters  $(99, 14, 1, 2)$ . The nonzero Laplacian eigenvalues and multiplicities of such a graph would have to be  $r^f = 11^{54}$  and  $s^g = 18^{44}$ . Since  $r$  and  $s$  are relatively prime, we can apply our theorems to obtain the complete critical group. We find

$$K(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/11\mathbb{Z})^{53} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{44} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z})^{43}.$$

When  $p$  divides both  $r$  and  $s$ , it can occur that the critical group depends on the structure of the graph. Our next theorem shows that, in the simplest such case, this dependence is encoded entirely in the value of  $e_0$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Suppose  $p \parallel r$  and  $p \parallel s$ , and let  $\gamma$  be the (unique) nonnegative integer so that  $p^\gamma \parallel v$ . Then*



$$K_5(\Gamma_2) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^8 \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/25\mathbb{Z})^7 \quad (\text{so } e_0 = 9).$$

Our Theorem 3.2 predicts

$$K_5(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^{26-2e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/25\mathbb{Z})^{e_0-2},$$

which agrees with these computations.

**Example 3.4.** It is unknown whether there exists a strongly regular graph  $\Gamma$  with parameters  $(88, 27, 6, 9)$ . By the results above, the critical group would be specified uniquely by 3-rank. Indeed, if such a graph existed, we would have  $r^f = 24^{55}$  and  $s^g = 33^{32}$ . Theorem 3.1 specifies the Sylow 2- and 11-subgroups, so the only mystery in knowing  $K(\Gamma)$  is knowing  $K_3(\Gamma)$ , which is given in terms of the 3-rank by Theorem 3.2:

$$K_3(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^{87-2e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z})^{e_0}.$$

To summarize thus far: under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 the structure of  $K_p(\Gamma)$  is forced, and under the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 the  $p$ -rank of  $L$  determines  $K_p(\Gamma)$ . Under the hypotheses of the next theorem, the  $p$ -rank of  $L$  determines  $K_p(\Gamma)$  to within two possibilities.

**Theorem 3.3.** Suppose  $p \parallel r$  and  $p^2 \parallel s$ , and let  $\gamma$  be the (unique) nonnegative integer so that  $p^\gamma \parallel v$ . Then either:

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^{f-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^{g+\gamma-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^3\mathbb{Z})^{e_0-\gamma}$$

or

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^{f+1-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^{g+\gamma-2-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^3\mathbb{Z})^{e_0-\gamma+1}.$$

Furthermore, if  $\gamma = 0$  then

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^{f-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^{g-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^3\mathbb{Z})^{e_0}.$$

The same statement holds if the roles of  $r$  and  $s$  are interchanged, and the roles of  $f$  and  $g$  are interchanged.

**Proof.** Since  $p \parallel r$  and  $p^2 \parallel s$ , we have  $p^3 \parallel rs$  and so

$$K_p(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^{e_1} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^{e_2} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/p^3\mathbb{Z})^{e_3}.$$

From this general form and the matrix-tree theorem we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 + e_1 + e_2 + e_3 &= f + g \\ e_1 + 2e_2 + 3e_3 &= f + 2g - \gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, we have the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} f &\leq \dim \overline{N_1} = e_0 + e_1 \\ g &\leq \dim \overline{M_2} = e_2 + e_3 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The left sides of the above inequalities sum to  $f + g$ , while the right sides sum to  $f + g + 1$ . Thus we have our two possibilities:

$$f = e_0 + e_1 \text{ and } g + 1 = e_2 + e_3 + 1$$

or

$$f + 1 = e_0 + e_1 \text{ and } g = e_2 + e_3 + 1.$$

In either case, with these two equations and Equation (3.4) we see that knowing one of  $e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3$  forces the values of the others. The first part of the theorem follows.

Now assume that  $\gamma = 0$ . We just want to show that  $K_p(\Gamma)$  must be the first possibility in the statement of the theorem. Let  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  be the ring of  $p$ -local integers, i.e. rational numbers that can be written as fractions with denominators coprime to  $p$ . We can view  $L$  as having entries coming from  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  and if we do this, then  $L$  defines a homomorphism of free  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ -modules

$$L: \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}^{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}^{\mathcal{V}}.$$

The Smith normal form of  $L$  over this ring is the same as over the integers, but as primes different from  $p$  are now units we may ignore them. One advantage of this point of view is the following. Since the number of vertices is not divisible by  $p$ , we have the decomposition

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}^{\mathcal{V}} = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)} \mathbf{1} \oplus Y,$$

where  $Y = \{ \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} a_v v \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}^{\mathcal{V}} \mid \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} a_v = 0 \}$ . The Laplacian map respects this decomposition and this means that the  $p$ -elementary divisor multiplicities are the same for both  $L$  and the restricted map

$$L|_Y: Y \rightarrow Y.$$

The transformation defined by the all-ones matrix  $J$  is zero on  $Y$ ; therefore we get from Equation (2.1)

$$L|_Y (L|_Y - (r + s)I) = -rsI.$$

Since  $p^3 \parallel rs$ , the equation above shows a symmetry of Smith normal forms: the multiplicity of  $p^i$  as an elementary divisor of  $L|_Y$  is equal to the multiplicity of  $p^{3-i}$  as an elementary divisor of  $L|_Y - (r + s)I$ . Since  $L|_Y$  and  $L|_Y - (r + s)I$  are congruent modulo  $p$ , they must have the same  $p$ -rank. The last two sentences imply that  $e_0 = e_3$  for our Laplacian  $L$ ; so  $K_p(\Gamma)$  must take the first form in the statement of the theorem.  $\square$

**Example 3.5.** The famous missing Moore graph would have to be an  $srg(3250, 57, 0, 1)$ , if it exists. From these parameters, we have  $r^f = 50^{1729}$  and  $s^g = 65^{1520}$ , and the interesting prime is  $p = 5$ . From Theorem 3.3, we get

$$K_5(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^{1520-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/25\mathbb{Z})^{1732-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/125\mathbb{Z})^{e_0-3}$$

or

$$K_5(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z})^{1521-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/25\mathbb{Z})^{1730-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/125\mathbb{Z})^{e_0-2}.$$

(Note  $\gamma = 3$ .) This example first appeared in [8].

**Example 3.6.** The Schläfli graph is the unique  $srg(27, 16, 10, 8)$ ; denote it by  $\Gamma$ . We have  $r^f = 12^6$  and  $s^g = 18^{20}$ . We can apply Theorem 3.3 to the prime  $p = 2$ , and since  $\gamma = 0$  we must have

$$K_2(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{20-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{6-e_0} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^{e_0}.$$

Using SAGE we find that the 2-rank of  $L$  is 6 and also that

$$K_2(\Gamma) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{14} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^6$$

which matches our prediction.

**Example 3.7.** Let  $\Gamma_1$  denote the complement of any one of the three Chang graphs. Let  $\Gamma_2$  denote the Kneser graph on the 2-subsets of an 8-element set (so adjacent when disjoint). Both of these graphs are examples of an  $srg(28, 15, 6, 10)$ . We have  $r^f = 14^{20}$  and  $s^g = 20^7$ , and so Theorem 3.3 applies to the prime  $p = 2$  (note  $\gamma = 2$ ).

According to SAGE, the Laplacian of  $\Gamma_1$  has 2-rank equal to 8 and

$$K_2(\Gamma_1) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{12} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^6.$$

Similarly, for  $\Gamma_2$ , the computer tells us that the Laplacian 2-rank is 7 and

$$K_2(\Gamma_2) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{14} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^6.$$

This illustrates that both of the cases described in Theorem 3.3 can occur.

**Remark.** Checking many strongly regular graphs on up to 36 vertices (we did not check all of the 32548 graphs with parameters  $(36, 15, 6, 6)$ ) the authors have not found a pair of graphs with the same parameters, the same  $p$ -rank, and demonstrating the separate cases of Theorem 3.3 (note the 2-ranks are different in Example 3.7). So maybe, even under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.3, the  $p$ -rank does determine  $K_p(\Gamma)$ .

Our final example applies the theory to give an elementary proof that no  $srg(28, 9, 0, 4)$  exists.

**Example 3.8.** Suppose that a strongly regular graph with parameters  $(28, 9, 0, 4)$  exists. Denote it by  $\Gamma$ , and let  $L$  be its Laplacian, which we may view as a matrix by ordering the vertices. We must have  $r^f = 8^{21}$  and  $s^g = 14^6$ . The matrix equation (2.1) reads

$$(L - 14I)(L - 8I) = 4J, \quad (3.5)$$

where  $J$  is the matrix of all-ones.

To motivate our choices below, we note that this graph is red on Brouwer's list. We know it does not actually exist since it contradicts the 'absolute bound'  $28 \leq 6(6+3)/2$  (it also contradicts one of the Krein inequalities). If we are looking for a Smith normal form or  $p$ -rank argument, this suggests that we might look at the prime 7, which divides the eigenvalue with multiplicity that is too small according to this bound.

Returning to our argument, let  $F = \mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$  be the field of 7 elements, and write  $\overline{L}$  for the matrix  $L$  with entries viewed as coming from  $F$ . From Corollary 3.1, the rank of  $\overline{L}$  is 22, and so the dimension of  $\ker \overline{L}$  is 6. We can thus arrive at a contradiction if we exhibit more than 6 independent vectors in  $\ker \overline{L}$ .

Fix two adjacent vertices, call them  $x$  and  $y$ . Let  $X$  denote the 8 vertices other than  $y$  that are adjacent to  $x$ , and let  $Y$  denote the 8 vertices other than  $x$  adjacent to  $y$ . Since  $\lambda = 0$ , the sets  $X$  and  $Y$  have empty intersection. Let  $Z$  consist of the ten other vertices not in  $\{x\} \cup \{y\} \cup X \cup Y$ . Let  $z$  be a vertex in  $Z$ . Since  $\mu = 4$ , four edges from  $z$  must enter  $X$  and four edges must enter  $Y$ . This leaves one edge to connect  $z$  to another vertex in  $Z$ . It follows that the induced subgraph on  $Z$  is five disjoint copies of  $P_2$ , the path graph on two vertices (i.e., an edge between two vertices). Adding in vertices  $x$  and  $y$ , the induced subgraph is then six copies of  $P_2$ .

Each of these copies of  $P_2$  can be used to build a vector in  $\ker \overline{L}$ . The matrix equation (3.5) shows us how: Working modulo 7, the equation reads:  $\overline{L}(\overline{L} - I) = 4J$ . Thus  $\overline{L}$  maps any column of  $\overline{L} - I$  to  $4\mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the vector of all-ones. Thus, the difference of any two columns of  $\overline{L} - I$  will be in  $\ker \overline{L}$ . To be concrete, supposed we built our Laplacian matrix by ordering the vertices as follows:  $x, y$ , then the vertices in  $Z$ , then the vertices in  $X$ , then the vertices in  $Y$ . Take the column of  $\overline{L} - I$  that is indexed by  $x$  and the column that is indexed by  $y$  and subtract them. The result, still working modulo 7, is expressed in the first column of the following matrix (we discuss the remaining columns momentarily).

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ -\mathbf{1}_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 \\ \mathbf{1}_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 & ?_8 \end{bmatrix}$$

Here  $\mathbf{k}_8$  denotes 8 repeated vertical entries of the number  $k$ , and  $?_8$  denotes 8 vertical entries with unknown value.

Suppose further that we ordered the vertices so that the next two vertices (which are in  $Z$ ) are adjacent, and the two vertices after that (still in  $Z$ ) are adjacent, etc. Then as we just considered the difference between the first and second columns of  $\overline{L} - I$ , also consider the difference between the third and fourth, fifth and sixth,  $\dots$ , eleventh and twelfth. If we throw all of these six columns into a matrix, we obtain the matrix  $C$  above.

Clearly these six columns are independent and so form a basis for  $\ker \overline{L}$ . But don't forget that  $\mathbf{1}$  is also in  $\ker \overline{L}$ , and (as is not hard to check) is not an  $F$ -linear combination of these six vectors. Thus we have seven vectors in the kernel, which is a contradiction to our dimension count above.

In the example above, all that was really used was the 7-rank of  $L$  (which can be obtained from [4]); we did not need the full information given by the critical group. Perhaps a more sophisticated use of these strategies can employ the other information in the Smith normal form to eliminate further parameter sets.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful for support from the National Science Foundation (grant number NSF-DMS 1560151).

## Appendix A

We include in this appendix feasible parameter sets for strongly regular graphs with nonzero integer Laplacian eigenvalues  $r_L$  and  $s_L$ , for graphs with less than 200 vertices, so that the reader may easily apply the results of the paper. See Andries Brouwer's website [2] or the Handbook of Combinatorial Designs [6] for more detailed information, including graph constructions and existence data. Note that in those sources,  $r$  and  $s$  refer to eigenvalues of an adjacency matrix of such a graph.

<i>v</i>	<i>k</i>	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	<i>f</i>	$s_L$	<i>g</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>k</i>	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	<i>f</i>	$s_L$	<i>g</i>
9	4	1	2	3	4	6	4	63	22	1	11	21	55	33	7
10	3	0	1	2	5	5	4	63	40	28	20	30	7	42	55
10	6	3	4	5	4	8	5	63	30	13	15	27	35	35	27
15	6	1	3	5	9	9	5	63	32	16	16	28	27	36	35
15	8	4	4	6	5	10	9	64	14	6	2	8	14	16	49
16	5	0	2	4	10	8	5	64	49	36	42	48	49	56	14
16	10	6	6	8	5	12	10	64	18	2	6	16	45	24	18
16	6	2	2	4	6	8	9	64	45	32	30	40	18	48	45
16	9	4	6	8	9	12	6	64	21	0	10	20	56	32	7
21	10	3	6	9	14	14	6	64	42	30	22	32	7	44	56
21	10	5	4	7	6	12	14	64	21	8	6	16	21	24	42
25	8	3	2	5	8	10	16	64	42	26	30	40	42	48	21
25	16	9	12	15	16	20	8	64	27	10	12	24	36	32	27
25	12	5	6	10	12	15	12	64	36	20	20	32	27	40	36
26	10	3	4	8	13	13	12	64	28	12	12	24	28	32	35
26	15	8	9	13	12	18	13	64	35	18	20	32	35	40	28
27	10	1	5	9	20	15	6	64	30	18	10	20	8	32	55
27	16	10	8	12	6	18	20	64	33	12	22	32	55	44	8
28	9	0	4	8	21	14	6	66	20	10	4	12	11	22	54
28	18	12	10	14	6	20	21	66	45	28	36	44	54	54	11
28	12	6	4	8	7	14	20	69	20	7	5	15	23	23	45
28	15	6	10	14	20	20	7	69	48	32	36	46	45	54	23
35	16	6	8	14	20	20	14	70	27	12	9	21	20	30	49
35	18	9	9	15	14	21	20	70	42	23	28	40	49	49	20
36	10	4	2	6	10	12	25	75	32	10	16	30	56	40	18
36	25	16	20	24	25	30	10	75	42	25	21	35	18	45	56
36	14	4	6	12	21	18	14	76	21	2	7	19	56	28	19
36	21	12	12	18	14	24	21	76	54	39	36	48	19	57	56
36	14	7	4	9	8	16	27	76	30	8	14	28	57	38	18
36	21	10	15	20	27	27	8	76	45	28	24	38	18	48	57
36	15	6	6	12	15	18	20	76	35	18	14	28	19	38	56
36	20	10	12	18	20	24	15	76	40	18	24	38	56	48	19
40	12	2	4	10	24	16	15	77	16	0	4	14	55	22	21
40	27	18	18	24	15	30	24	77	60	47	45	55	21	63	55
45	12	3	3	9	20	15	24	78	22	11	4	13	12	24	65
45	32	22	24	30	24	36	20	78	55	36	45	54	65	65	12
45	16	8	4	10	9	18	35	81	16	7	2	9	16	18	64
45	28	15	21	27	35	35	9	81	64	49	56	63	64	72	16
49	12	5	2	7	12	14	36	81	20	1	6	18	60	27	20
49	36	25	30	35	36	42	12	81	60	45	42	54	20	63	60
49	16	3	6	14	32	21	16	81	24	9	6	18	24	27	56
49	32	21	20	28	16	35	32	81	56	37	42	54	56	63	24
49	18	7	6	14	18	21	30	81	30	9	12	27	50	36	30
49	30	17	20	28	30	35	18	81	50	31	30	45	30	54	50
49	24	11	12	21	24	28	24	81	32	13	12	27	32	36	48
50	7	0	1	5	28	10	21	81	48	27	30	45	48	54	32
50	42	35	36	40	21	45	28	81	40	13	26	39	72	54	8
50	21	4	12	20	42	30	7	81	40	25	14	27	8	42	72
50	28	18	12	20	7	30	42	81	40	19	20	36	40	45	40
50	21	8	9	18	25	25	24	82	36	15	16	32	41	41	40
50	28	15	16	25	24	32	25	82	45	24	25	41	40	50	41
55	18	9	4	11	10	20	44	85	14	3	2	10	34	17	50
55	36	21	28	35	44	44	10	85	70	57	60	68	50	75	34
56	10	0	2	8	35	14	20	85	20	3	5	17	50	25	34
56	45	36	36	42	20	48	35	85	64	48	48	60	34	68	50
56	22	3	12	21	48	32	7	85	30	11	10	25	34	34	50
56	33	22	15	24	7	35	48	85	54	33	36	51	50	60	34
57	14	1	4	12	38	19	18	88	27	6	9	24	55	33	32
57	42	31	30	38	18	45	38	88	60	41	40	55	32	64	55
57	24	11	9	19	18	27	38	91	24	12	4	14	13	26	77
57	32	16	20	30	38	38	18	91	66	45	55	65	77	77	13



$v$	$k$	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	$f$	$s_L$	$g$	$v$	$k$	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	$f$	$s_L$	$g$
95	40	12	20	38	75	50	19	120	85	60	60	80	51	90	68
95	54	33	27	45	19	57	75	120	35	10	10	30	56	40	63
96	19	2	4	16	57	24	38	120	84	58	60	80	63	90	56
96	76	60	60	72	38	80	57	120	42	8	18	40	99	54	20
96	20	4	4	16	45	24	50	120	77	52	44	66	20	80	99
96	75	58	60	72	50	80	45	120	51	18	24	48	85	60	34
96	35	10	14	32	63	42	32	120	68	40	36	60	34	72	85
96	60	38	36	54	32	64	63	120	56	28	24	48	35	60	84
96	38	10	18	36	76	48	19	120	63	30	36	60	84	72	35
96	57	36	30	48	19	60	76	121	20	9	2	11	20	22	100
96	45	24	18	36	20	48	75	121	100	81	90	99	100	110	20
96	50	22	30	48	75	60	20	121	30	11	6	22	30	33	90
99	14	1	2	11	54	18	44	121	90	65	72	88	90	99	30
99	84	71	72	81	44	88	54	121	36	7	12	33	84	44	36
99	42	21	15	33	21	45	77	121	84	59	56	77	36	88	84
99	56	28	36	54	77	66	21	121	40	15	12	33	40	44	80
99	48	22	24	44	54	54	44	121	80	51	56	77	80	88	40
99	50	25	25	45	44	55	54	121	48	17	20	44	72	55	48
100	18	8	2	10	18	20	81	121	72	43	42	66	48	77	72
100	81	64	72	80	81	90	18	121	50	21	20	44	50	55	70
100	22	0	6	20	77	30	22	121	70	39	42	66	70	77	50
100	77	60	56	70	22	80	77	121	56	15	35	55	112	77	8
100	27	10	6	20	27	30	72	121	64	42	24	44	8	66	112
100	72	50	56	70	72	80	27	121	60	29	30	55	60	66	60
100	33	8	12	30	66	40	33	122	55	24	25	50	61	61	60
100	66	44	42	60	33	70	66	122	66	35	36	61	60	72	61
100	33	14	9	25	24	36	75	125	28	3	7	25	84	35	40
100	66	41	48	64	75	75	24	125	96	74	72	90	40	100	84
100	33	18	7	20	11	35	88	125	48	28	12	30	10	50	114
100	66	39	52	65	88	80	11	125	76	39	57	75	114	95	10
100	36	14	12	30	36	40	63	125	52	15	26	50	104	65	20
100	63	38	42	60	63	70	36	125	72	45	36	60	20	75	104
100	44	18	20	40	55	50	44	126	25	8	4	18	35	28	90
100	55	30	30	50	44	60	55	126	100	78	84	98	90	108	35
100	45	20	20	40	45	50	54	126	45	12	18	42	90	54	35
100	54	28	30	50	54	60	45	126	80	52	48	72	35	84	90
105	26	13	4	15	14	28	90	126	50	13	24	48	105	63	20
105	78	55	66	77	90	90	14	126	75	48	39	63	20	78	105
105	32	4	12	30	84	42	20	126	60	33	24	48	21	63	104
105	72	51	45	63	20	75	84	126	65	28	39	63	104	78	21
105	40	15	15	35	48	45	56	130	48	20	16	40	39	52	90
105	64	38	40	60	56	70	48	130	81	48	54	78	90	90	39
105	52	21	30	50	84	63	20	133	24	5	4	19	56	28	76
105	52	29	22	42	20	55	84	133	108	87	90	105	76	114	56
111	30	5	9	27	74	37	36	133	32	6	8	28	76	38	56
111	80	58	56	74	36	84	74	133	100	75	75	95	56	105	76
111	44	19	16	37	36	48	74	133	44	15	14	38	56	49	76
111	66	37	42	63	74	74	36	133	88	57	60	84	76	95	56
112	30	2	10	28	90	40	21	135	64	28	32	60	84	72	50
112	81	60	54	72	21	84	90	135	70	37	35	63	50	75	84
112	36	10	12	32	63	42	48	136	30	8	6	24	51	34	84
112	75	50	50	70	48	80	63	136	105	80	84	102	84	112	51
115	18	1	3	15	69	23	45	136	30	15	4	17	16	32	119
115	96	80	80	92	45	100	69	136	105	78	91	104	119	119	16
117	36	15	9	27	26	39	90	136	60	24	28	56	85	68	50
117	80	52	60	78	90	90	26	136	75	42	40	68	50	80	85
119	54	21	27	51	84	63	34	136	63	30	28	56	51	68	84
119	64	36	32	56	34	68	84	136	72	36	40	68	84	80	51
120	28	14	4	16	15	30	104	143	70	33	35	65	77	77	65
120	91	66	78	90	104	104	15	143	72	36	36	66	65	78	77
120	34	8	10	30	68	40	51	144	22	10	2	12	22	24	121

(continued on next page)

<i>v</i>	<i>k</i>	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	$f$	$s_L$	$g$	<i>v</i>	<i>k</i>	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	$f$	$s_L$	$g$
144	121	100	110	120	121	132	22	169	60	23	20	52	60	65	108
144	33	12	6	24	33	36	110	169	108	67	72	104	108	117	60
144	110	82	90	108	110	120	33	169	70	27	30	65	98	78	70
144	39	6	12	36	104	48	39	169	98	57	56	91	70	104	98
144	104	76	72	96	39	108	104	169	72	31	30	65	72	78	96
144	44	16	12	36	44	48	99	169	96	53	56	91	96	104	72
144	99	66	72	96	99	108	44	169	84	41	42	78	84	91	84
144	52	16	20	48	91	60	52	170	78	35	36	72	85	85	84
144	91	58	56	84	52	96	91	170	91	48	49	85	84	98	85
144	55	22	20	48	55	60	88	171	34	17	4	19	18	36	152
144	88	52	56	84	88	96	55	171	136	105	120	135	152	152	18
144	65	16	40	64	135	90	8	171	50	13	15	45	95	57	75
144	78	52	30	54	8	80	135	171	120	84	84	114	75	126	95
144	65	28	30	60	78	72	65	171	60	15	24	57	132	72	38
144	78	42	42	72	65	84	78	171	110	73	66	99	38	114	132
144	66	30	30	60	66	72	77	175	30	5	5	25	84	35	90
144	77	40	42	72	77	84	66	175	144	118	120	140	90	150	84
147	66	25	33	63	110	77	36	175	66	29	22	55	42	70	132
147	80	46	40	70	36	84	110	175	108	63	72	105	132	120	42
148	63	22	30	60	111	74	36	175	72	20	36	70	153	90	21
148	84	50	44	74	36	88	111	175	102	65	51	85	21	105	153
148	70	36	30	60	37	74	110	176	25	0	4	22	120	32	55
148	77	36	44	74	110	88	37	176	150	128	126	144	55	154	120
153	32	16	4	18	17	34	135	176	40	12	8	32	55	44	120
153	120	91	105	119	135	135	17	176	135	102	108	132	120	144	55
153	56	19	21	51	84	63	68	176	45	18	9	33	32	48	143
153	96	60	60	90	68	102	84	176	130	93	104	128	143	143	32
154	48	12	16	44	98	56	55	176	49	12	14	44	98	56	77
154	105	72	70	98	55	110	98	176	126	90	90	120	77	132	98
154	51	8	21	49	132	66	21	176	70	18	34	68	154	88	21
154	102	71	60	88	21	105	132	176	105	68	54	88	21	108	154
154	72	26	40	70	132	88	21	176	70	24	30	66	120	80	55
154	81	48	36	66	21	84	132	176	105	64	60	96	55	110	120
155	42	17	9	31	30	45	124	176	70	42	18	44	10	72	165
155	112	78	88	110	124	124	30	176	105	52	78	104	165	132	10
156	30	4	6	26	90	36	65	176	85	48	34	68	22	88	153
156	125	100	100	120	65	130	90	176	90	38	54	88	153	108	22
160	54	18	18	48	75	60	84	183	52	11	16	48	122	61	60
160	105	68	70	100	84	112	75	183	130	93	90	122	60	135	122
162	21	0	3	18	105	27	56	183	70	29	25	61	60	75	122
162	140	121	120	135	56	144	105	183	112	66	72	108	122	122	60
162	23	4	3	18	69	27	92	184	48	2	16	46	160	64	23
162	138	117	120	135	92	144	69	184	135	102	90	120	23	138	160
162	49	16	14	42	63	54	98	189	48	12	12	42	90	54	98
162	112	76	80	108	98	120	63	189	140	103	105	135	98	147	90
162	56	10	24	54	140	72	21	189	60	27	15	45	28	63	160
162	105	72	60	90	21	108	140	189	128	82	96	126	160	144	28
162	69	36	24	54	23	72	138	189	88	37	44	84	132	99	56
162	92	46	60	90	138	108	23	189	100	55	50	90	56	105	132
165	36	3	9	33	120	45	44	190	36	18	4	20	19	38	170
165	128	100	96	120	44	132	120	190	153	120	136	152	170	170	19
169	24	11	2	13	24	26	144	190	45	12	10	38	75	50	114
169	144	121	132	143	144	156	24	190	144	108	112	140	114	152	75
169	36	13	6	26	36	39	132	190	84	33	40	80	133	95	56
169	132	101	110	130	132	143	36	190	105	60	55	95	56	110	133
169	42	5	12	39	126	52	42	190	84	38	36	76	75	90	114
169	126	95	90	117	42	130	126	190	105	56	60	100	114	114	75
169	48	17	12	39	48	52	120	190	90	45	40	80	57	95	132
169	120	83	90	117	120	130	48	190	99	48	55	95	132	110	57
169	56	15	20	52	112	65	56	195	96	46	48	90	104	104	90
169	112	75	72	104	56	117	112	195	98	49	49	91	90	105	104

$v$	$k$	$\lambda$	$\mu$	$r_L$	$f$	$s_L$	$g$
196	26	12	2	14	26	28	169
196	169	144	156	168	169	182	26
196	39	2	9	36	147	49	48
196	156	125	120	147	48	160	147
196	39	14	6	28	39	42	156
196	156	122	132	154	156	168	39
196	45	4	12	42	150	56	45
196	150	116	110	140	45	154	150
196	52	18	12	42	52	56	143
196	143	102	110	140	143	154	52
196	60	14	20	56	135	70	60
196	135	94	90	126	60	140	135
196	60	23	16	49	48	64	147
196	135	90	99	132	147	147	48
196	65	24	20	56	65	70	130
196	130	84	90	126	130	140	65
196	75	26	30	70	120	84	75
196	120	74	72	112	75	126	120
196	78	32	30	70	78	84	117
196	117	68	72	112	117	126	78
196	81	42	27	63	24	84	171
196	114	59	76	112	171	133	24
196	85	18	51	84	187	119	8
196	110	75	44	77	8	112	187
196	90	40	42	84	105	98	90
196	105	56	56	98	90	112	105
196	91	42	42	84	91	98	104
196	104	54	56	98	104	112	91

## References

- [1] N.L. Biggs, Chip-firing and the critical group of a graph, *J. Algebraic Comb.* 9 (1) (1999) 25–45, MR 1676732.
- [2] Andries E. Brouwer, Parameters of strongly regular graphs, <https://www.win.tue.nl/~aeb/graphs/srg/srgtab.html>, 2019.
- [3] Andries E. Brouwer, Willem H. Haemers, *Spectra of Graphs*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2012, MR 2882891.
- [4] A.E. Brouwer, C.A. van Eijl, On the  $p$ -rank of the adjacency matrices of strongly regular graphs, *J. Algebraic Comb.* 1 (4) (1992) 329–346, MR 1203680.
- [5] David B. Chandler, Peter Sin, Qing Xiang, The Smith and critical groups of Paley graphs, *J. Algebraic Comb.* 41 (4) (2015) 1013–1022, MR 3342710.
- [6] Charles J. Colbourn, Jeffrey H. Dinitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, second ed., Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications (Boca Raton), Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2007, MR 2246267.
- [7] Madina Deryagina, Ilia Mednykh, On the Jacobian group for Möbius ladder and prism graphs, in: *Geometry, Integrability and Quantization XV*, Avangard Prima, Sofia, 2014, pp. 117–126, MR 3287752.
- [8] Joshua E. Ducey, On the critical group of the missing Moore graph, *Discrete Math.* 340 (5) (2017) 1104–1109, MR 3612450.
- [9] Joshua E. Ducey, Jonathan Gerhard, Noah Watson, The Smith and critical groups of the square rook’s graph and its complement, *Electron. J. Comb.* 23 (4) (2016) 4.9, MR 3577656.
- [10] Joshua E. Ducey, Ian Hill, Peter Sin, The critical group of the Kneser graph on 2-subsets of an  $n$ -element set, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 546 (2018) 154–168, MR 3771877.
- [11] Joshua E. Ducey, Peter Sin, The Smith group and the critical group of the Grassmann graph of lines in finite projective space and of its complement, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)* 13 (4) (2018) 411–442, MR 3888880.
- [12] Darren B. Glass, Nathan Kaplan, Chip firing games and critical groups, in: Pamela Harris, Erik Insko, Aaron Wootton (Eds.), *A Project-Based Guide to Undergraduate Research in Mathematics*, Birkhäuser Basel, Cham, 2020, pp. 107–152.

- [13] Alexander E. Holroyd, Lionel Levine, Karola Mészáros, Yuval Peres, James Propp, David B. Wilson, Chip-firing and rotor-routing on directed graphs, in: *In and Out of Equilibrium. 2*, in: *Progr. Probab.*, vol. 60, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008, pp. 331–364, MR 2477390.
- [14] Dino J. Lorenzini, A finite group attached to the Laplacian of a graph, *Discrete Math.* 91 (3) (1991) 277–282, MR 1129991.
- [15] Dino Lorenzini, Smith normal form and Laplacians, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B* 98 (6) (2008) 1271–1300, MR 2462319.
- [16] Venkata Raghu Tej Pantangi, Critical groups of van Lint–Schrijver cyclotomic strongly regular graphs, *Finite Fields Appl.* 59 (2019) 32–56, MR 3957505.
- [17] Venkata Raghu Tej Pantangi, Peter Sin, Smith and critical groups of polar graphs, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 167 (2019) 460–498, MR 3959750.
- [18] Ted Spence, Strongly regular graphs on at most 64 vertices, <http://www.maths.gla.ac.uk/~es/srgraphs.php>, 2019.
- [19] A. Vince, Elementary divisors of graphs and matroids, *Eur. J. Comb.* 12 (5) (1991) 445–453, MR 1129815.