

THE CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION PROBLEM FOR BOUNDED WIDTH AND MALTSEV ALGEBRAS

Miklós Maróti
University of Szeged

CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION PROBLEM (CSP)

Definition. For a finite relational structure $\mathbb{B} = (B; \mathcal{R})$ we define

$$\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}) = \{ \mathbb{A} \mid \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B} \}.$$

Example. $\text{CSP}(\triangle)$ is the class of three-colorable (directed) graphs.

Example. $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{I})$ is the class of (directed) bipartite graphs.

The membership problem for $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is always decidable in nondeterministic polynomial time (**NP**, intractable), sometimes in polynomial time (**P**, tractable).

Dichotomy Conjecture (Feder, Vardi, 1999). *For every finite structure \mathbb{B} the membership problem for $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is either in **P** or **NP**-complete.*

Has been verified in many special cases (2-element structures, undirected graphs, smooth directed graphs, etc.) and yielded structure theorems in the tractable cases. Open for directed graphs.

CSP REDUCTIONS

Lemma. *We may assume, that*

- \mathbb{B} is a **core**, i.e., every endomorphism is an automorphism,
- every unary constraint relation $\{b\}$ is in \mathbb{B} ,
- all relations are at most binary (or directed graph).

Definition. A **polymorphism** of \mathbb{B} is a homomorphism $p : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ (edge preserving operation).

$$\text{Pol}(\mathbb{B}) = \{ p \mid p : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B} \}.$$

Lemma. $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{B})$ is a clone, and all polymorphisms are idempotent under our assumptions

$$p(x, \dots, x) \approx x.$$

Lemma. $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\mathbb{B}) \implies \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is polynomial time reducible to $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$.

- \mathbb{B} has nice polymorphisms $\implies \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in **P**.
- \mathbb{B} has no nice polymorphisms $\implies \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is **NP**-complete.

NICE POLYMORPHISMS

Theorem. $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in \mathbf{P} if $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{B})$ contains one of the following:

- a semilattice operation (Jevons et. al.)
- a near-unanimity operation

$$p(y, x, \dots, x) \approx p(x, y, x, \dots, x) \approx \dots \approx p(x, \dots, x, y) \approx x,$$

- a totally symmetric idempotent operation (Dalmau, Pearson, 1999),
- a Maltsev operation: $p(x, y, y) \approx p(y, y, x) \approx x$ (Bulatov, 2002; Dalmau, 2004),
- Generalized majority-minority operation (Dalmau, 2005),
- Edge operations (Idziak, Marković, McKenzie, Valeriote, Willard, 2007),
- CD Jónsson operations (Barto, Kozik, 2008),
- $SD(\wedge)$ Willard operations (Barto, Kozik, 2009),

WEAK NEAR-UNANIMITY

Theorem (McKenzie, Maróti, 2006). *For a locally finite variety \mathcal{V} the followings are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{V} omits type **1**,
- (2) \mathcal{V} has a Taylor term,
- (3) \mathcal{V} has a **weak near-unanimity** operation:

$$p(y, x, \dots, x) \approx \dots \approx p(x, \dots, x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad p(x, \dots, x) \approx x.$$

Theorem (Larose, Zádori, 2006). *If \mathbb{B} is a core and does not have a Taylor (or weak near-unanimity) polymorphism, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is **NP**-complete.*


Dichotomy Conjecture. *If \mathbb{B} is a core and has a weak near-unanimity polymorphism, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in **P**.*

APPLICATIONS OF CSP TO UNIVERSAL ALGEBRA

Theorem (Siggers, 2008). *A locally finite variety \mathcal{V} omits type 1 iff it has a 4-ary term t satisfying the equations*

$$t(x, y, z, x) \approx t(y, z, x, z) \quad \text{and} \quad t(x, x, x, x) \approx x.$$

Proof. Consider the directed graph \mathbb{G} defined on the 3-generated free algebra $\mathbf{F}_3(\mathcal{V})$ whose edges are generated by (x, y) , (y, z) , (z, x) , (x, z) . It is smooth, and its core must be a loop. That loop edge is $t((x, y), (y, z), (z, x), (x, z))$.




□

Theorem (Barto, Kozik, 2009). *A locally finite variety \mathcal{V} omits type 1 iff it has a cyclic term p satisfying the equations*


$$p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \approx \dots \approx p(x_2, \dots, x_n, x_1) \quad \text{and} \quad p(x, \dots, x) \approx x.$$

Theorem (Barto, 2009). *A finite relational structure has a near-unanimity polymorphism if and only if it has Jónsson polymorphisms.*

CONSISTENCY ALGORITHM



$\mathbb{A} \stackrel{?}{\in} \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$



$\exists x, y, z, u \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{B} \wedge (y, z) \in \mathbb{B} \wedge (z, u) \in \mathbb{B} \wedge (u, x) \in \mathbb{B}$

STRATEGIES

Definition. A is a set, $\mathbb{B} = (B; \mathcal{R})$ is relational structure, \mathcal{R} has at most binary relations and is closed under primitive positive formulas. A collection

$$\mathcal{B} = \{ B_{ij} \in \mathcal{R} \mid i, j \in A \}$$

of relations is a

- **strategy** if $B_{ji} = B_{ij}^{-1}$ and $B_{ii} \subseteq \{ (b, b) \mid b \in B \}$,
- **(1,2)-strategy** if $\pi_1(B_{ij}) = \pi_1(B_{ii})$ and $\pi_2(B_{ij}) = \pi_2(B_{jj})$,
- **(2,3)-strategy** if $B_{ik} \subseteq B_{ij} \circ B_{jk}$.

Definition. A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a **solution** of the strategy \mathcal{B} if $(f(i), f(j)) \in B_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in A$.

Definition. The **local consistency algorithm** turns a strategy (or an instance of the CSP) into a (2,3)-strategy without losing solutions:

$$B'_{ik} = B_{ik} \cap (B_{ij} \circ B_{jk}).$$

BOUNDED WIDTH

Lemma. *The local consistency algorithm*

- *runs in polynomial time (in the size of \mathbb{A}),*
- *the output is independent of the choices made,*
- *if the output strategy is empty, then $\mathbb{A} \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$.*

Definition. \mathbb{B} has **width** $(2, 3)$ if every nonempty $(2, 3)$ -strategy has a solution. The notion of **bounded width** is slightly more general.

Lemma. *If \mathbb{B} has bounded width, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in \mathbf{P} , but not conversely.*

Theorem (Larose, Zádori, 2006). *If \mathbb{B} has bounded width, then the variety generated by the algebra $\mathbf{B} = (B; \text{Pol}(\mathbb{B}))$ omits types **1** and **2**, i.e., \mathbb{B} has Willard polymorphisms.*

Theorem (Barto, Kozik, 2009). *\mathbb{B} has bounded width if and only if the variety generated by the algebra $\mathbf{B} = (B; \text{Pol}(\mathbb{B}))$ omits types **1** and **2**.*

If \mathbb{B} has at most binary relations, then the $(2, 3)$ local consistency algorithm works.

MALTSEV ALGORITHM

Definition. \mathbf{B} is Maltsev if it has a term t satisfying the equations

$$t(x, y, y) \approx t(y, y, x) \approx x.$$

Definition. Let $\mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{B}^n$.

- **index** is $(i, a, b) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times B \times B$,
- **witness** is $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in P^2$ such that $a_1 = b_1, \dots, a_{i-1} = b_{i-1}$ and $a_i = a$ and $b_i = b$.
- **compact representation** is a collection of witnesses for each index that can be witnessed.

Given an element $\bar{d} \in \mathbf{B}^n$ and an approximation $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{P}$:

$$c_1 = d_1, \dots, c_{i-1} = d_{i-1} \quad \text{and} \quad c_i \neq d_i.$$

Take a witness (\bar{a}, \bar{b}) for (i, c_i, d_i) . Then $t(\bar{c}, \bar{a}, \bar{b})$ is a better approximation.

Corollary. *The compact representation of \mathbf{P} generates \mathbf{P} as a subalgebra.*

MALTSEV RELATIONAL CLONES

Corollary. \mathbf{B}^n has at most exponentially many subalgebras (few subpowers).

Lemma (Dalmau, 2004). Given the compact representations of \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{S} , then the compact representation of

- $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{S}$, and
- $\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{S}$

can be computed in polynomial time.

Lemma. Given the compact representations of $\mathbf{P}_1, \dots, \mathbf{P}_k$, and assume that $P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_k$ is a subuniverse of \mathbf{B}^n , then the compact representation of \mathbf{P} can be computed in polynomial time.

Corollary. Given the compact representation of the relations in \mathcal{R} , then the compact representation of any relation defined by a primitive positive formula with relations in \mathcal{R} can be computed in polynomial time.

Problem. Can the compact representation of $\text{Sg}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_k)$ be computed in polynomial time?

FEW SUBPOWERS

Definition. An algebra \mathbf{B} has **few subpowers**, if there exists a polynomial $p(n)$ such that $|S(\mathbf{P}^n)| \leq 2^{p(n)}$ for all n .

- algebras with a Maltsev term $t(y, y, x) \approx t(x, y, y) \approx x$
- algebras with a near-unanimity term $t(y, x, \dots, x) \approx \dots \approx t(x, \dots, x, y) \approx x$.

Theorem (Idziak, Marković, McKenzie, Valeriote, Willard, 2007). *An algebra \mathbf{B} has few subpowers if and only if it has an **edge** term t satisfying the equations*

$$\begin{aligned}t(y, y, x, x, x, \dots, x, x) &\approx x \\t(x, y, y, x, x, \dots, x, x) &\approx x \\t(x, x, x, y, x, \dots, x, x) &\approx x \\&\vdots \\t(x, x, x, x, x, \dots, x, y) &\approx x.\end{aligned}$$

We have compact representations and similar algorithms for few subpower algebras.

COMBINED ALGORITHM

Theorem. *Let \mathbb{B} be a finite relational structure, \mathbf{B} be the corresponding algebra on the same universe with all polymorphisms of \mathbb{B} as basic operations, and β be a congruence of \mathbf{B} . If \mathbf{B}/β has few subpowers and the induced algebras on the β -blocks generate $\text{SD}(\wedge)$ varieties, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in \mathbf{P} .*

“Few subpowers above β and bounded width below β .”

Definition. \mathbf{B} is an algebra, \mathbf{B}/β is Maltsev. The system

$$\mathcal{M} = \{ M_{ij} \leq \mathbf{B}^2 \times (\mathbf{B}/\beta)^n \mid i, j \in A \}$$

is a **Maltsev strategy**, if

- if $(a, b, \bar{c}) \in M_{ij}$ then $a/\beta = c_i$ and $b/\beta = c_j$,
- if $i = j$ then $a = b$,
- $M_{ik} \subseteq \underbrace{\{ (a, b, \bar{c}) \mid \exists d (a, d, \bar{c}) \in M_{ij}, (b, d, \bar{c}) \in M_{jk} \}}_{M_{ij} \circ M_{jk}}$.

Consistency algorithm: $M'_{ik} = M_{ik} \cap (M_{ij} \circ M_{jk})$.

TRACTABLE ALGEBRAS

- bounded width
- few subpowers
- any finite product of bounded width and few subpower algebras
- subuniverses of tractable algebras
- homomorphic images of tractable algebras

Corollary. *Let \mathcal{V} be an idempotent variety. Then every member of the subpseudovariety generated by the bounded width and few subpowers algebras in \mathcal{V} is tractable.*

The “few subpowers below β and bounded width above β ” case is still open.

Theorem (Markovic, McKenzie, 2009). *If \mathbf{B}/β is a semilattice with*

- *a chain order, or*
- *a flat semilattice order,*

and every β -block is Maltsev, then \mathbf{B} is tractable.

THANK YOU!