

PROBLEMS POSED AT THE NOVI SAD ALGEBRAIC CONFERENCE '03¹

Problem 1 (*I. Dolinka*) *The random graph R is the unique (up to isomorphism) countable graph which satisfies the following property: for any two finite disjoint sets A and B of vertices of R there exists a vertex v which is connected by an edge to each vertex of A and no vertex of B . The partial order of principal ideals (i.e., of the \mathcal{J} -classes) of the endomorphism monoid $\text{End}(R)$ was studied in [1]. The following question remains:*

Is there an uncountable well-ordered chain in the partial order of (principal) ideals of $\text{End}(R)$?

REFERENCES

- [1] D. DeliĆ and I. Dolinka, The monoid of the random graph has uncountably many ideals, *Semigroup Forum* **69** (2004) 75–79.

Problem 2 (*M. Ern e*) *If a finite lattice is representable as an interval of topologies (ordered by inclusion), is it representable as an interval of topologies on a finite set?*

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Reinhold, Finite intervals in the lattice of topologies, Papers in honour of Bernhard Banaschewski (Cape Town, 1996.) *Appl. Categ. Structures* **8**, no. 1-2 (2000), 367–376.
- [2] M. Ern e and J. Reinhold, Lattices of closed quasiorders, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **21** (1996), 41–64.
- [3] M. Ern e and J. Reinhold, Ordered one-point compactifications, stably continuous frames and tensors. *Quaest. Math.* **22** (1999), 63–81.

Problem 3 (*M. Ern e*) *From a finite lattice \mathbf{L} form the \mathbf{L} -context $\langle \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}, \leq \rangle$, with \mathcal{J} the set of join-irreducible, and \mathcal{M} the set of meet-irreducible elements. Then build the concept lattice of the complementary context $\langle \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}, \not\leq \rangle$. This gives a kind of negation \mathbf{CL} . It is known that the sequence $(\mathbf{C}^n \mathbf{L})_{n \in \omega}$ ends with a self-negated lattice \mathbf{N} , i.e. $\mathbf{N} \cong \mathbf{CN}$, or a pair of mutual negations. Is there a short, intrinsic characterization of self-negated lattices?*

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Deiters and M. Ern e, Negations and contrapositions of complete lattices, *Discrete Math.* **181** (1998), 91–111.

¹Collected by N. Mudrinski, prepared for publication by P. Markovi c.

Problem 4 (*M. Goldstern*) Let \mathbf{L} be a lattice. We will say it is 1-order polynomially complete if for all f , $f : L \rightarrow L$ is a monotone map, then f is a polynomial function.

Are there infinite 1-order polynomially complete lattices?

Background: A lattice \mathbf{L} is *order polynomially complete* when every monotone function $f : L^n \rightarrow L$ is a polynomial function.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Goldstern and S. Shelah, Order-polynomially complete lattices must be LARGE, *Algebra Universalis* **39** (1998), 197–209.
- [2] M. Goldstern and S. Shelah, There are no order-polynomially complete lattices, after all, *Algebra Universalis* **42** (1999), 49–57.
- [3] M. Goldstern, Unary opc, To appear in *Contributions to General Algebra* **16**, (eds. Dorfer, Pöschel, Chajda, Halas, Eigenthaler, Müller).

Problem 5 (*L. Kwuida*) A weakly dicomplemented lattice is an algebra $\langle L; \wedge, \vee, \Delta, \nabla, 0, 1 \rangle$ of type $(2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$ such that $\langle L; \wedge, \vee, 0, 1 \rangle$ is a bounded lattice and the unary operations satisfy

$$1 \quad x^{\Delta\Delta} \leq x$$

$$1' \quad x \leq x^{\nabla\nabla}$$

$$2 \quad x \leq y \Rightarrow x^\Delta \geq y^\Delta$$

$$2' \quad x \leq y \Rightarrow x^\nabla \geq y^\nabla$$

$$3 \quad (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge y^\Delta) = x$$

$$3' \quad (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee y^\nabla) = x$$

This structure arises in Contextual Logic. A primary filter of a weakly dicomplemented lattice is a proper filter containing x or x^Δ for every element x . The notion of primary ideal is dually defined. The “Prime Ideal Theorem” holds, namely, if F is a filter which does not intersect an ideal I , then there is a primary filter G containing F such that $G \cap I = \emptyset$. This is unfortunately not enough to get a representation theorem. So we pose the following problem.

Let I be an ideal of a weakly dicomplemented lattice and $x \notin I$. Is there any primary filter G such that $x \notin G$ and $G \cap I = \emptyset$?

Problem 6 (*L. Kwuida*) The skeleton of a weakly dicomplemented lattice L is the

$$S(L) := \{x \in L \mid x^{\nabla\nabla} = x\}.$$

From axioms 2' and 3' it follows that

$$(x \vee x^\nabla) \wedge (x \vee x^{\nabla\nabla}) = x \quad \text{and} \quad (x \vee x^\nabla)^\nabla = 0.$$

The skeleton $S(L)$ is an ortholattice (cf. [4]). The idea is to describe congruences of weakly dicomplemented lattices by mean of congruences of their skeleton (cf. [1]). Is there any description of ortholattice congruences?

More details can be found in [2] and [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Katriňák, The structure of distributive double p-algebras. Regularity and congruences, *Algebra Universalis* **3** (1973), 238-246.
- [2] R. Wille, Boolean Concept Logic, Proceedings of the Linguistic on Conceptual Structures: Logical Linguistic, and Computational Issues, 317-331, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **1867** (2000), Springer-Verlag.
- [3] L. Kwuida, Dicomplemented lattices. A Contextual generalization of Boolean algebras (2004), Shaker Verlag.
- [4] L. Kwuida, A. Tepavčević, B. Šešelja, Negation in contextual logic, Conceptual Structures at Work: 12th International Conference on Conceptual Structures, Proceedings, 227-241 em *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **3127** (2004), Springer-Verlag.

Problem 7 (*P. Marković*) *This is the problem of P. Frankl, posed in 1979. The reference list on this famous question is too long to cite, but it still remains open today.*

Given a finite family \mathcal{F} of finite sets, closed under taking unions, $\mathcal{F} \neq \{\emptyset\}$, does there always exist an element $a \in \bigcup \mathcal{F}$ such that a is an element of at least half of the sets in \mathcal{F} ?

An equivalent, alternative statement of this problem is:

Given a finite lattice \mathbf{L} , does there always exist a meet-irreducible element $a \in L$ such that $|a \downarrow| \leq 0.5|L|$?

Problem 8 (*Péter Pál Pálffy*) *Is there a minimal clone that contains infinitely many binary operations?*

Background: A clone of operations is minimal if it is generated by each non-trivial operation in this clone. (The trivial operations are the projections.) An essentially minimal clone with infinitely many binary operations has been constructed by H. Machida and I. Rosenberg [1].

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Machida and I. G. Rosenberg, A "large" essentially minimal clone over an infinite set, Proc. Int. Conf. on Algebra (Novosibirsk, 1989), Part 3, 159-167, *Contemporary Math.* **131**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.

Problem 9 (*M. Ploščica*) *Let \mathbf{L} be a distributive algebraic lattice. The set $F = \{x \in L \mid 1 \text{ is compact in } \uparrow x\}$ is a filter. Let us define a lattice $\mathbf{L}' \leq \mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{2}$ with the universe $L' = \{\langle x, i \rangle \mid i = 0 \text{ or } x \in F\}$. Must \mathbf{L}' be algebraic?*

Remark: The problem is connected with the relationship between congruence lattices of bounded and unbounded lattices. The topological version of this problem is as follows: Let S be a space having a basis of compact open sets. Let S' be the one-point compactification of S . Does S' have a basis of compact open sets?

Problem 10 (*M. Ploščica*) *Let \mathcal{V} be a finitely generated, congruence distributive variety. Is it true that for an infinite $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$, the number of compact elements of the lattice $\mathbf{Con}(\mathbf{A})$ is equal to $|A|$?*

Remark: The conjecture is easily seen to be true for $|A| = \aleph_0$.

Problem 11 (*C. Szabó and V. Vértési*) Consider the following algorithmic question:

Input: Two group terms, t_1 and t_2 .

Question: Are they equal over the symmetric group \mathbf{S}_4 , namely do they agree at every substitution of elements for variables?

What is the computational complexity of the above question?

Background: Questions of this kind are always in coNP. For the non-solvable groups the question is coNP-complete, while for nilpotent groups and for some metacyclic group, particularly \mathbf{A}_4 , it is in P.