

Digraph homomorphism problems and weak near unanimity polymorphisms

Tomás Feder^{*} Jeff Kinne[†] Ashwin Murali[‡] Arash Rafiey[§]

Abstract

We consider the problem of finding a homomorphism from an input digraph G to a fixed digraph H . We show that if H admits a weak near unanimity polymorphism ϕ then deciding whether G admits a homomorphism to H ($\text{HOM}(H)$) is polynomial time solvable. This gives a proof of the dichotomy conjecture (now dichotomy theorem) by Feder and Vardi [29]. Our approach is combinatorial, and it is simpler than the two algorithms found by Bulatov [9] and Zhuk [50] in 2017. We have implemented our algorithm and show some experimental results. We use our algorithm together with the recent result [38] for recognition of Maltsev polymorphisms and decide in polynomial time if a given relational structure \mathcal{R} admits a weak near unanimity polymorphism.

1 Introduction

For a digraph G , let $V(G)$ denote the vertex set of G and let $A(G)$ denote the arcs (aka edges) of G . An arc (u, v) is often written as simply uv to shorten expressions. Let $|G|$ denote the number of vertices in G .

A *homomorphism* of a digraph G to a digraph H is a mapping g of the vertex set of G to the vertex set of H so that for every arc uv of G the image $g(u)g(v)$ is an arc of H . A natural decision problem is whether for given digraphs G and H there is a homomorphism of G to H . If we view (undirected) graphs as digraphs in which each edge is replaced by the two opposite directed arcs, we may apply the definition to graphs as well. An easy reduction from the k -coloring problem shows that this decision problem is *NP*-hard: a graph G admits a 3-coloring if and only if there is a homomorphism from G to K_3 , the complete graph on 3 vertices. As a homomorphism is easily verified if the mapping is given, the homomorphism problem is contained in *NP* and is thus *NP*-complete.

The following version of the problem has attracted much recent attention. For a fixed digraph H the problem $\text{HOM}(H)$ asks if a given input digraph G admits a homomorphism to H . Note that while the 3-coloring reduction shows $\text{HOM}(K_3)$ is *NP*-complete, $\text{HOM}(H)$ can be easy (in *P*) for some graphs H : for instance if H contains a vertex with a self-loop, then every graph G admits a homomorphism to H . Less trivially, for $H = K_2$ (or more generally, for any bipartite

^{*}268 Waverley Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301, United States, tomas@theory.stanford.edu

[†]Indiana State University, IN, USA, jkinne@cs.indstate.edu, Supported by NSF grant 1751765

[‡]Indiana State University, IN, USA, amurali1@sycamores.indstate.edu, supported by NSF 1751765

[§]Indiana State University, IN, USA arash.rafiy@indstate.edu and Simon Fraser University, BC, Canada, arashr@sfu.ca, Supported by NSF grant 1751765

graph H), there is a homomorphism from G to K_2 if and only if G is bipartite. A very natural goal is to identify precisely for which digraphs H the problem $HOM(H)$ is easy. In the special case of graphs the classification has turned out to be this: if H contains a vertex with a self-loop or is bipartite, then $HOM(H)$ is in P , otherwise it is NP -complete [31] (see [46] for shorter proofs). This classification result implies a *dichotomy* of possibilities for the problems $HOM(H)$ when H is a graph, each problem being NP -complete or in P . However, the dichotomy of $HOM(H)$ remained open for general digraphs H for a long time. It was observed by Feder and Vardi [29] that this problem is equivalent to the dichotomy of a much larger class of problems in NP , in which \mathcal{H} is a fixed finite relational structure. These problems can be viewed as *constraint satisfaction problems* with a fixed template \mathcal{H} [29], written as $CSP(\mathcal{H})$.

The $CSP(\mathcal{H})$ involves deciding, given a set of variables and a set of constraints on the variables, whether or not there is an assignment (form the element of H) to the variables satisfying all of the constraints.

This problem can be formulated in terms of homomorphisms as follows. Given a pair $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ of *relational structures*, decide whether or not there is a homomorphism from the first structure to the second structure.

3SAT is a prototypical instance of CSP, where each variable takes values of *true* or *false* (a domain size of two) and the clauses are the constraints. Digraph homomorphism problems can also easily be converted into CSPs: the variables V are the vertices of G , each must be assigned a vertex in H (meaning a domain size of $|V(H)|$), and the constraints encode that each arc of G must be mapped to an arc in H .

Feder and Vardi argued in [29] that in a well defined sense the class of problems $CSP(H)$ would be the largest subclass of NP in which a dichotomy holds. A fundamental result of Ladner [42] asserts that if $P \neq NP$ then there exist NP -intermediate problems (problems neither in P nor NP -complete), which implies that there is no such dichotomy theorem for the class of *all* NP problems. Non-trivial and natural sub-classes which do have dichotomy theorems are of great interest. Feder and Vardi made the following *Dichotomy Conjecture*: every problem $CSP(H)$ is NP -complete or is in P . This problem has animated much research in theoretical computer science. For instance the conjecture has been verified when H is a conservative relational structure [8], or a digraph with all in-degrees and all-out-degrees at least one [4]. Numerous special cases of this conjecture have been verified [1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 18, 21, 22, 28, 43, 45].

Bulatov gave an algebraic proof for the conjecture in 2017 [9] and later Zhuk [50] also announced another algebraic proof of the conjecture.

It should be remarked that constraint satisfaction problems encompass many well known computational problems, in scheduling, planning, database, artificial intelligence, and constitute an important area of applications, in addition to their interest in theoretical computer science [15, 17, 40, 48].

While the paper of Feder and Vardi [29] did identify some likely candidates for the boundary between easy and hard CSP -s, it was the development of algebraic techniques by Jeavons [41] that lead to the first proposed classification [11]. The algebraic approach depends on the observation that the complexity of $CSP(H)$ only depends on certain symmetries of H , the so-called *polymorphisms* of H . For a digraph H a polymorphism ϕ of arity k on H is a homomorphism from H^k to H . Here H^k is a digraph with vertex set $\{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \mid a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in V(H)\}$ and arc set $\{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) \mid a_i b_i \in A(H) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. For a polymorphism ϕ , $\phi(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)\phi(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ is an arc of H whenever $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ is an arc of H^k .

Over time, one concrete classification has emerged as the likely candidate for the dichotomy. It is expressible in many equivalent ways, including the first one proposed in [11]. There were thus a number of equivalent conditions on H that were postulated to describe which problems $CSP(H)$ are in P . For each, it was shown that if the condition is not satisfied then the problem $CSP(H)$ is NP -complete (see also the survey [33]). One such condition is the existence of a weak near unanimity polymorphism (Maroti and McKenzie [44]). A polymorphism ϕ of H of arity k is a *k-near unanimity function* (k -NU) on H , if $\phi(a, a, \dots, a) = a$ for every $a \in V(H)$, and $\phi(a, a, \dots, a, b) = \phi(a, a, \dots, b, a) = \dots = \phi(b, a, \dots, a) = a$ for every $a, b \in V(H)$. If we only have $\phi(a, a, \dots, a) = a$ for every $a \in V(H)$ and $\phi(a, a, \dots, a, b) = \phi(a, a, \dots, b, a) = \dots = \phi(b, a, \dots, a)$ [not necessarily a] for every $a, b \in V(H)$, then ϕ is a *weak k-near unanimity function* (weak k -NU). A polymorphism ϕ on H is *Siggers* if $\phi(a, r, e, a) = \phi(r, a, r, e)$ for every $a, r, e \in H$ [47]. It has been shown by Siggers [47] that if digraph H admits a Sigger polymorphism it also admits a weak k -NU for some $k \geq 3$.

Given the NP -completeness proofs that are known, the proof of the Dichotomy Conjecture reduces to the claim that a relational structure \mathcal{H} which admits a weak near unanimity polymorphism has a polynomial time algorithm for $CSP(\mathcal{H})$. As mentioned earlier, Feder and Vardi have shown that it suffices to prove this for $HOM(H)$ when H is a digraph. This is the main result of our paper.

Note that the real difficulty in the proof of the *graph* dichotomy theorem in [31] lies in proving the NP -completeness. By contrast, in the *digraph* dichotomy theorem proved here it is the polynomial-time algorithm that has proven more difficult.

While the main approach in attacking the conjecture has mostly been to use the highly developed techniques from logic and algebra, and to obtain an algebraic proof, we go in the opposite direction and develop a combinatorial algorithm. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1 *Let H be a digraph that admits a weak near unanimity function. Then $HOM(H)$ is in P . Deciding whether an input digraph G admits a homomorphism to H can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|^4 |H|^{k+4})$.*

Very High Level View We start with a general digraph H and a weak k -NU ϕ of H . We turn the problem $HOM(H)$ into a related problem of seeking a homomorphism with lists of allowed images. The *list homomorphism problem* for a fixed digraph H , denoted $LHOM(H)$, has as input a digraph G , and for each vertex x of G an associated list (set) of vertices $L(x) \subseteq V(H)$, and asks whether there is a homomorphism g of G to H such that for each $x \in V(G)$, the image of x ; $g(x)$, is in $L(x)$. Such a homomorphism is called a *list homomorphism* of G to H with respect to the lists L . List homomorphism problems have been extensively studied, and are known to have nice dichotomies [23, 26, 35]. However, we can not use the algorithms for finding list homomorphism from G to H , because in the $HOM(H)$ problem, for every vertex x of G , $L(x) = V(H)$.

Preprocessing One of the common ingredients in CSP algorithms is the use of consistency checks to reduce the set of possible values for each variable (see, for example the algorithm outlined in [32] for $CSP(H)$ when H admits a near unanimity function). Our algorithm includes such a consistency check (also known as (2,3)-consistency check [29]) as a first step which we call *PreProcessing*. PreProcessing procedure begins by performing arc and pair consistency check on the list of vertices in the input digraph G . For each pair (x, y) of $V(G) \times V(G)$ we consider a list of possible pairs (a, b) , $a \in L(x)$ (the list in H associated with $x \in V(G)$) and $b \in L(y)$. Note

that if xy is an arc of G and ab is not an arc of H then we remove (a, b) from the list of (x, y) . Moreover, if $(a, b) \in L(x, y)$ and there exists z such that there is no c for which $(a, c) \in L(x, z)$ and $(c, b) \in L(z, y)$ then we remove (a, b) from the list of (x, y) . We continue this process until no list can be modified. If there are empty lists then clearly there is no list homomorphism from G to H .

After PreProcessing The main structure of the algorithm is to perform *pairwise elimination*, which focuses on two vertices a, b of H that occur together in some list $L(x), x \in V(G)$, and finds a way to eliminate a or b from $L(x)$ without changing a feasible problem into an unfeasible one. In other words if there was a list homomorphism with respect to the old lists L , there will still be one with respect to the updated lists L . This process continues until either a list becomes empty, certifying that there is no homomorphism with respect to L (and hence no homomorphism at all), or until all lists become singletons specifying a concrete homomorphism of G to H or we reach an instance that has much simpler structure and can be solved by the existing CSP algorithms. This method has been successfully used in other papers [20, 35, 36].

In this paper, the choice of which a or b is eliminated, and how, is governed by the given weak near unanimity polymorphism ϕ . The heart of the algorithm is a delicate procedure for updating the lists $L(x)$ in such a way that (i) feasibility is maintained, and the polymorphism f keep its initial property (which is key to maintaining feasibility).

Meta-Question An interesting question arising from the study of CSP Dichotomy theorem is known as the *meta-question*. Given a relational structure \mathcal{H} , decide whether or not \mathcal{H} admits a polymorphism from a class—for various classes of polymorphisms. For many cases hardness results are known. Semilattice, majority, Maltsev, NU, and weak NU, are among the popular polymorphisms when it comes to study of CSP. Having one or more of these polymorphisms on relation \mathcal{H} , would make the $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{H})$ (or variation) instance tractable. Therefore, knowing structural characterization and polynomial time recognition for these polymorphisms would help in designing efficient algorithms for solving CSP. A binary polymorphism f on \mathcal{H} is called *semilattice* if $f(a, b) = f(b, a)$, and $f(a, a) = a$, $f(a, f(a, c)) = f(f(a, b), c)$ for every $a, b, c \in V(\mathcal{H})$. A ternary polymorphism g on \mathcal{H} is *majority* if $g(a, a, a) = g(a, a, b) = g(a, b, a) = g(b, a, a) = a$. A polymorphism h of arity three on \mathcal{H} is called *Maltsev* if for every $a, b \in V(\mathcal{H})$, $h(a, a, a) = h(a, b, b) = h(b, b, a) = a$.

It was shown in [14] that deciding if a relational structure admits any of the following polymorphism is NP-complete; a semilattice polymorphism, a conservative semilattice polymorphism, a commutative, associative polymorphism (that is, a commutative semigroup polymorphism). However, when \mathcal{H} is a single binary relation (digraph) then deciding whether \mathcal{H} admits a conservative semilattice is polynomial time solvable [34]. Relational structure and digraphs with majority/near unanimity polymorphism have studied in [5, 14, 27, 35, 37, 44].

One remaining open question is whether the existence of a weak NU polymorphism for a given relational structure can be decided in polynomial time [6]. We transform this problem into a graph list homomorphism problem from an input graph G to a target graph H , in which $G \times H^4$ admits a Siggers polymorphism (i.e. a weak NU polymorphism of arity k for some $k \geq 3$) with respect to the lists. To solve this problem, we need some modules of our algorithm for finding a homomorphism from G to H when H admits a weak NU. Moreover, we also need an algorithm for solving the list homomorphism problem from an input graph G to a target graph H where $G \times H^3$ admits a Maltsev polymorphism with respect to the lists; such an algorithm would only assume the existence of a Maltsev polymorphism without knowing the actual values. The later algorithm has been designed

in [38]. Deciding whether a relational structure admits a Malstve polymorphisms has been an open problem [6, 47]. We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 *Let \mathcal{R} be a relational structure. Then the problem of deciding whether \mathcal{R} admits a weak NU polymorphism is polynomial time solvable.*

1.1 Addressing the issue with the 2017 manuscript

Our algorithm (in manuscript 2017) makes a decision based on the output of a test $T_{x,b,a}$ on a smaller instance of the digraph homomorphism problem. Here a, b are possible images for $x \in V(G)$, of a homomorphism from G to H .

The algorithm assumes that the test $T_{x,b,a}$ outputs “yes” and based on the correctness of the test, a is removed from further consideration for x . The test $T_{x,b,a}$ uses the properties of the weak NU polymorphism ϕ . However, it is conceivable that the test $T_{x,b,a}$ fails, and this means we should not remove a from the list of possible images of x . We had incorrectly claimed in the manuscript that the properties of ϕ and pre-tests in the algorithm guarantee the test always passes. But we can construct such an example where the test must fail in the algorithm as follows. Let H be a digraph with two weakly connected components H_1, H_2 . The weak NU polymorphism ϕ could be of arity three and such that for every $a \in H_1$ and every $b \in H_2$, $\phi(a, b, b) = \phi(b, b, a) = \phi(b, a, b) = c$ for some $c \in H_2$. Suppose there exists a homomorphism from G (weakly connected) to H that maps x to a and hence the entire graph G must be mapped to H_1 . Moreover, suppose there is no homomorphism from G to H_2 . The algorithm does consider the test $T_{x,b,a}$ eventually for such G and H . According to the test $T_{x,b,a}$, we remove a from further consideration for x which leads us to remove the possible homomorphism from G to H .

Note that one can assume H is weakly connected as follows. Suppose H_1, H_2 are balanced digraphs with ℓ levels (we can partitioned the vertices of H_i , $i = 1, 2$, into ℓ parts where all the arcs of H_i go from a vertex in some part j to part $j+1$). An extra vertex a' can be added and connected to all the vertices of H_1, H_2 on the lowest level. This way we obtain the weakly connected digraph $H = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \{a'\}$ with $\ell + 1$ levels. We may assume G is also balanced and has ℓ levels. An extra vertex x' can be added to G with arcs to every vertex of G on the lowest level. Now $G' = G \cup \{x'\}$ is also a balanced digraph with $\ell + 1$ levels. Note that in any homomorphism from G' to H , x' must be mapped to a' and any other vertex of G' must map to $H - \{a'\}$.

We note that Ross Willard has posted a concrete counter-example (and further discussion of his example) for which H contains 197 vertices in H . The example inspired by instances of the CSP, so-called Semi-lattice block Maltsev. In Subsection 3.1 and Section 6, we discuss these kinds of examples in detail and show how our new algorithm handles these examples.

2 Necessary Definitions

An *oriented walk (path)* is obtained from a walk (path) by orienting each of its edges. The *net-length* of a walk W , is the number of forward arcs minus the number of backward arcs following W from the beginning to the end. An *oriented cycle* is obtained from a cycle by orienting each of its edges. We say two oriented walks X, Y are congruent if they follow the same patterns of forward and backward arcs.

For k digraphs G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k , let $G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_k$ be the digraph with vertex set $\{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) | x_i \in V(G_i), 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ and arc set $\{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)(x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_k) | x_i x'_i \in A(G_i), 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Let $H^k = H \times H \times \dots \times H$, k times.

Given digraphs G and H , and $L : G \rightarrow 2^H$, let $G \times_L H^k$ be the induced sub-digraph of $G \times H^k$ with the vertices $(y; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ where $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in L(y)$.

Definition 2.1 (Homomorphism consistent with Lists) *Let G and H be digraphs and list function $L : V(G) \rightarrow 2^H$, i.e. list of $x \in V(G)$, $L(x) \subseteq V(H)$. Let $k > 1$ be an integer.*

A function $f : G \times_L H^k \rightarrow H$ is a list homomorphism with respect to lists L if the following hold.

- List property : *for every $(x; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in G \times_L H^k$, $f(x; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in L(x)$*
- Adjacency property: *if $(x; a_1, \dots, a_k)(y; b_1, \dots, b_k)$ is an arc of $G \times_L H^k$ then $f(x; a_1, \dots, a_k)f(y; b_1, \dots, b_k)$ is an arc of H .*

In addition if f has the following property then we say f has the *weak k -NU property*.

- for every $x \in V(G)$, $\{a, b\} \subseteq L(x)$, we have $f(x; a, b, b, \dots, b) = f(x; b, a, b, \dots, b) = \dots = f(x; b, b, b, \dots, a)$.
- for every $x \in V(G)$, $a \in L(x)$, we have $f(x; a, a, \dots, a) = a$.

We note that this definition is tailored to our purposes and in particular differs from the standard definition of weak k -NU as follows. f is based on two digraphs G and H rather than just H (we think of this as starting with a traditional weak k -NU on H and then allowing it to vary somewhat for each $x \in V(G)$).

Notation For simplicity let $(b^k, a) = (b, b, \dots, b, a)$ be a k -tuple of all b 's but with an a in the k^{th} coordinate. Let $(x; b^k, a)$ be a $(k+1)$ -tuple of x , $(k-1)$ b 's and a in the $(k+1)^{th}$ coordinate.

Definition 2.2 (f -closure of a list) *We say a set $S \subseteq L(y)$ is closed under f if for every k -tuple $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_k) \in S^k$ we have $f(y; a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_k) \in S$. For set $S \subseteq L(y)$, let $\hat{f}_{y,S} \subseteq L(y)$ be a minimal set that includes all the elements of S and it is closed under f .*

Let $X : x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ be an oriented path in G . Let $X[x_i, x_j]$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, denote the induced sub-path of X from x_i to x_j . Let $L(X)$ denote the vertices of H that lie in the list of the vertices of X .

Definition 2.3 (induced bi-clique) *We say two vertices x, y induced a bi-clique if there exist vertices $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r \in L(x)$, $r > 1$ and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s \in L(y)$ such that $(a_i, b_j) \in L(x, y)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq s$.*

Let $a_1, a_2 \in L(x)$ and suppose there exist $b_1, b_2 \in L(y)$ such that $(a_1, b_1), (a_1, b_2), (a_2, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \in L(x, y)$. Then it follows from the property of f , that $\hat{f}_{x, \{a_1, a_2\}}$ and $\hat{f}_{y, \{b_1, b_2\}}$ induce a bi-clique on x, y .




Figure 1: An example of a Bi-clique

Definition 2.4 (weakly connected component in lists L) By connected component of $G \times_L H$ we mean a weakly connected component C of digraph $G \times_L H$ (i.e. a connected component of $G \times_L H$ when we ignore the direction of the arcs) which is closed under (2,3)-consistency. That means, for every $(x, a), (y, b) \in C$, and every $z \in V(G)$ there is some $c \in L(z)$ such that $(a, c) \in L(x, z)$, $(b, c) \in L(y, z)$.

Observation 2.5 If there exists a homomorphism $g : G \rightarrow H$ then all the vertices $(y, g(y))$, $y \in V(G)$ belong to the same connected component of $G \times_L H$.

Definition 2.6 For $a, b \in L(x)$ we say (b, a) is a non-minority pair if $f(x; b^k, a) \neq a$. Otherwise, we say (b, a) is a minority pair.

Definition 2.7 For $x \in V(G)$, $a \in L(x)$, let $L_{x,a}$ be the subset of lists L that are consistent with x and a . In other words, for every $y \in V(G)$, $L_{x,a}(y) = \{b \in L(y) \mid (a, b) \in L(x, y)\}$. Note that by definition $L_{x,a}(x) = \{a\}$. In general for $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t \in V(G)$, let $L_{x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, x_t, a_t}$ be the subset of lists L that are consistent with all the $a_i \in L(x_i)$'s, $1 \leq i \leq t$. In other words, for every $y \in V(G)$, $L_{x_1, a_1, x_2, a_2, \dots, x_t, a_t}(y) = \{b \in L(y) \mid (a_i, b) \in L(x_i, y), i = 1, 2, \dots, t\}$.

3 Algorithm

The main algorithm starts with applying the Preprocessing procedure on the instance G, H, L, ϕ , where ϕ is a weak NU polymorphism of arity k on H . If we encounter some empty (pair) lists then there is no homomorphism from G to H , and the output is no. Otherwise, it defines the weak NU list homomomorphism $f : G \times_L H^k \rightarrow H$, by setting $f(x; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = \phi(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ for every $x \in G$ and every $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in L(x)$. Then it proceeds with the NOT-MINORITY algorithm (Algorithm 2). Inside the NOT-MINORITY algorithm we look for the special cases, the so-called minority cases which are turned into a Maltsev instances, and can be handled using the existing Maltsev algorithms.

Minority Instances Inside function NOT-MINORITY we first check whether the instance is Maltsev or *Minority* instance – in which we have a homomorphism f consistent with L such that for every $a, b \in L(x)$, (b, a) is a minority pair, i.e. $f(x; b^k, a) = a$, and in particular when $a = b$ we have $f(x; a, a, \dots, a) = a$ (idempotent property).

In our setting a homomorphism $h : G \times_L H^3 \rightarrow H$ is called Maltsev list homomorphism if $h(x; a, a, b) = h(x; b, a, a) = b$ for every $a, b \in L(x)$, $x \in V(G)$.

Algorithm 1 The main algorithm for solving the digraph homomorphism problem

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G, H$ , and, a weak NU homomorphism  $\phi : H^k \rightarrow H$ 
2: function DIGRAPHHOM( $G, H, \phi$ )
3:   for all  $x \in V(G)$ , let  $L(x) = V(H)$ 
4:   if PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ ) is false then return "no homomorphism"
5:   for all  $x \in V(G)$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in L(x)$ , let  $f(x; a_1, \dots, a_k) = \phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ 
6:    $g = \text{NOT-MINORITY}(G, H, L, f)$ 
7:   if  $g$  is not empty then return true
8:   else return false

```

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G, H$ , lists  $L$  and, a weak NU homomorphism  $f : G \times_L H^k \rightarrow H$  which is
   minority
2: function REMOVEMINORITY( $G, H, L, f$ )
3:   for all  $x \in V(G)$ , and  $a, b, c \in L(x)$  do
4:     Set  $h(x; a, b, c) = f(x; a, b, b, \dots, b, c)$ 
5:    $g = \text{MALTSEV-ALGORITHM}(G, H, L, h)$ 
6:   return  $g$ 

```

Let G, H, L, f be an input to our algorithm, and suppose all the pairs are minority pairs. We define a homomorphism $h : G \times_L H^3 \rightarrow H$ (consistent with L) by setting $h(x; a, b, c) = f(x; a, b, b, \dots, b, c)$ for $a, b, c \in L(x)$. Note that since f has the minority property for all $x \in V(G)$, $a, b \in L(x)$, h is a Maltsev homomorphism consistent with the lists L . This is because when $b = c$ then $h(x; a, b, b) = f(x; a, b, \dots, b) = a$, and when $a = b$, $h(x; a, a, c) = f(x; b, b, \dots, b, c) = c$, for every a, c , and hence, $h(x; b, b, a) = a$.

The Maltsev/Minority instances can be solved using the algorithm in [10]. Although the algorithm in [10] assumes there is a global Maltsev, it is straightforward to adopt that algorithm to work in our setting. We can also use the Algorithm in [38].

Not-Minority Instances NOT-MINORITY algorithm (Algorithm 2) first checks whether the instance is a minority instance, and if the answer is yes then it calls REMOVEMINORITY function. Otherwise, it starts with a not-minority pair (b, a) in $L(x)$, i.e., $w = (x; b^k, a)$ with $f(w) = c \neq a$. Roughly speaking, the goal is not to use f on vertices $w_1 = (x; e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$ with $f(w_1) = a$; which essentially means setting $f(w_1) = f(w)$. In order to make this assumption, it recursively solves a smaller instance of the problem (smaller test), say $G' \subseteq G$, and $L' \subset L$, and if the test is successful then that particular information about f is no longer needed. More precisely, let $w = (x; b^k, a) \in G' \times_{L'} H^k$ so that $f(w) = c \neq a$ and where $(x, a), (x, c)$ are in the same connected component of $G' \times_{L'} H$. The test $T_{x,c}$ is performed to see whether there exists an L' -homomorphism g from G' to H with $g(x) = c$. If $T_{x,c}$ for G', L' succeeds then the algorithms no longer uses f for $w' = (x; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in G' \times_{L'} H^k$ with $f(w') = a$. We often use a more restricted test, say $T_{x,c,y,d}$ on G', L' in which the goal is to see whether there exists an L' -homomorphism g , from G' to H with $g(x) = c, g(y) = d$.

The Algorithm 2 is recursive, and we use induction on $\sum_{x \in V(G)} |L(x)|$ to show its correctness. In what follows we give an insight of why the weak k -NU ($k > 2$) property of H is necessary for our algorithm. For contradiction, suppose $w_1 = (x; b^k, a)$ with $f(w_1) = c$ and $w_2 = (x; a, b, b, \dots, b)$

with $f(w_2) = d$. If $d = a$ then in NOT-MINORITY algorithm we try to remove a from $L(x)$ (not to use a in $L(x)$) if we start with w_1 while we do need to keep a in $L(x)$ because we later need a in $L(x)$ for the Maltsev algorithm. It might be the case that $d \neq a$ but during the execution of Algorithm 2 for some $w_3 = (x; b^k, e)$ with $f(w_3) \neq e$ we assume $f(w_3)$ is e . So we need to have $f(w_1) = f(w_2)$, the weak NU property, to start in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 ruling out not-minority pairs, f remains a homomorphism of $G \times_L H^k$ to H and for every $x \in V(G)$, $a', b' \in L(x)$, we have $f(x; a'^k, b') = b'$

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G, H$ , lists  $L$  and, a weak NU homomorphism  $f : G \times_L H^k \rightarrow H$ 
2: function NOT-MINORITY( $G, H, L, f$ )
3:   if  $\forall x \in V(G), |L(x)| = 1$  then  $\forall x \in V(G)$  set  $g(x) = L(x)$ 
4:   return  $g$ 
5:   If  $G \times_L H$  is not connected then consider each connected component separately
6:   if all the pairs are minority then
7:      $g = \text{REMOVEDMINORITY}(G, H, L, f)$ 
8:     return  $g$ 
9:   for all  $y, z \in V(G), d_1, d_2 \in L(y), e_1 \in L(z)$  s.t.  $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$  do
10:     $(G', L') = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ 
11:     $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z} = \text{NOT-MINORITY}(G', H, L', f)$ 
12:    if  $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$  is empty then
13:      Remove  $(d_1, e_1)$  from  $L(y, z)$ , and remove  $(e_1, d_1)$  from  $L(z, y)$ 
14:      if  $L(y, z)$  is empty then return  $\emptyset$ 
15:    else
16:      if  $G' = G$  then return  $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$ 
17:   $(L, f) = \text{BI-CLIQUE-INSTANCES}(G, H, L, f)$ 
18:   $\text{PREPROCESSING}(G, H, L)$ 
19:  if  $\exists$  empty list or  $\exists$  empty pair list then return  $\emptyset$ 
20:  else
21:     $g = \text{REMOVEDMINORITY}(G, H, L, f)$ 
22:  return  $g$ 

```

For implementation, we update the lists L as well as the pair lists, depending on the output of $T_{x,c}$. If $T_{x,c}$ fails (no L -homomorphism from G to H that maps x to c) then we remove c from $L(x)$ and if $T_{x,c,y,d}$ fails (no L -homomorphism from G to H that maps x to c and y to d) then we remove (c, d) from $L(x, y)$. The NOT-MINORITY takes G, L, f and checks whether all the lists are singleton, and in this case the decision is clear. It also handles each connected component of $G \times_L H$ separately. If all the pairs are minority then it calls REMOVEDMINORITY which is essentially checking for a homomorphism when the instance admits a Maltsev polymorphism. Otherwise, it proceeds with function SYM-DIFF.

Sym-Diff function Let $y, z \in V(G)$ and $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ and $e_1 \in L(z)$ such that $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$. Let $L_1 = L_{z, e_1}$. We consider the instances G', H, L', f of the problem as follows. The induced sub-digraph G' consists of vertices v of G such that for every $(d_1, j) \in L_1(y, v)$ we have $(d_2, j) \notin L_1(y, v)$. Now for each $v \in G'$, $L'(v) = \{i \mid (d_1, i) \in L_1(y, v)\}$. Such an instance is

constructed by function $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$.

Let $B(G')$ denote a set of vertices u in $G \setminus G'$ that are adjacent (via an out-going or in-coming arc) to some vertex v in G' . $B(G')$ is called the boundary of G' . We do not add $B(G')$ into G' which makes it easier to argue about running time. However, we some extra care it is also possible to have an algorithm that include the boundary vertices. Note that for every $v \in V(G')$, $|L'(v)| < |L(v)|$. Moreover, $L'(z) = \{e_1\}$, and $L'(y) = \{d_1\}$.

For $y, z \in V(G)$ and $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ and $e_1 \in L(z)$ we solve the instance G', H, L', f , by calling the $\text{NOT-MINORITY}(G', H, L', f)$ function. The output of this function call is either a non-empty L' -homomorphism $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$ from G' to H or there is no such homomorphism. If $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$ does not exist then there is no homomorphism from G to H that maps y to d_1 , and z to e_1 . In this case we remove (d_1, e_1) from $L(y, z)$, and remove (e_1, d_1) from $L(z, y)$. This should be clear because G' is an induced sub-digraph of G , and for every vertex $v \in V(G') \setminus \{y, z\}$, $L'(v, z) = L(v, z)$, $L'(v, y) = L(v, y)$. Moreover, it is easy to see (will be shown later) that L' is closed under f . The homomorphism $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$ is used in the correctness proof of the Algorithm 2.

Implementation Remark: In order to avoid several redundant tests, when a sub-digraph G' constructed by $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ is the same as G ; and the test returns true, then we no longer need to run the test for any other sub-instance (G'', L'') because we just need to return yes to the parent sub-routine calling the current sub-routine.

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$  and,  $y, z \in V(G)$ ,  $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ ,  $e_1 \in L(z)$ 
2: function  $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ 
3:   Create new empty lists  $L'$  and let  $L_1 = L_{z, e_1}$ , and construct the pair lists  $L_1 \times L_1$  from  $L_1$ 
4:   Set  $L'(z) = e_1$ ,  $L'(y) = d_1$ , and set  $G' = \emptyset$ 
5:   for all  $v \in V(G)$  s.t.  $\forall i$  with  $(i, d_1) \in L_1(v, y)$  we have  $(i, d_2) \notin L_1(v, y)$  do
6:     add  $v$  into set  $G'$ 
7:   Let  $G'$  be the induced sub-digraph of  $G$ 
8:   Let  $B(G') = \{u \in V(G \setminus G') \mid u \text{ is adjacent (in-neighbor or out-neighbor) to some } v \in V(G')\}$ 
9:   for all  $u \in V(G')$  do
10:     $L'(u) = \{i \mid (d_1, i) \in L_1(y, u)\}$ 
11:   for all  $u, v \in V(G')$  do
12:     $L'(u, v) = \{(a, b) \in L_1(u, v) \mid (a, b) \text{ is consistent in } G'\}$ .
13:   return  $(G', L')$ 

```

Bi-clique Instances When instance $I = G \times_L H$ has more than one connected component we consider each connected component separately. Otherwise, there exists a vertex y and two elements $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ along with $z \in V(G)$, $e_1 \in L(z)$ such that $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$. Let $d = f(y; d_2^k, d_1) \neq d_1$. Suppose $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$ after running NOT-MINORITY on the instances from $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ and $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_2, d_1, z, e_1)$. Then we remove (d_1, e_1) from $L(y, z)$ (see Figure 2). We continue this until all the pairs are minority.

After the $\text{BI-CLIQUE-INSTANCES}$ function, we update the lists L by calling PreProcessing , because reducing the pair lists may imply to remove some elements from the lists of some elements of G . At this point, if $a \in L(x)$ then $f(x; a, a, \dots, a) = a$. This is because when a is in $L(x)$ then

it means the NOT-MINORITY procedure did not consider a to be excluded from further consideration. Notice that in order to feed this instance to REMOVEMINORITY we only need the idempotent property for those vertices that are in $L(x)$, $x \in V(G)$.




Figure 2: Explanation of how to reduce the pair lists.

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$  and, a weak NU homomorphism  $f : G \times_L H^k \rightarrow H$ 
2: function BI-CLIQUE-INSTANCES( $G, H, L, f$  )
3:   update=true
4:   while update do
5:     update=false
6:     Let  $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ , and  $e_1 \in L(z)$  such that  $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$  and  $f(y; d_2^k, d_1) \neq d_1$ 
7:     if there is such  $y, z, d_1, d_2, e_1$  then
8:       Remove  $(d_1, e_1)$  from  $L(y, z)$  and remove  $(e_1, d_1)$  from  $L(z, y)$ 
9:       PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
10:    update=true
11:  return ( $L$ )

```




Figure 4: The input digraph G

3.1 Examples

We refer the reader to the example in [49]. The digraph H (depicted in Figure 3) admits a weak NU of arity 3. The input digraph G (depicted in Figure 4). This digraph contains the original digraph used in [49] as an induced sub-digraph. So, our example here combines both examples used in [49].




Figure 3: There are oriented paths from 0, 1, 2 to any of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma, \tau$

The lists in $G \times H$ are depicted in Figure 5. Clearly the $G \times_L H$ has only one weakly connected component.




Figure 5: Vertices in the ovals show the elements of H that are in the list of the vertices in G , the oriented path between them are according to path Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 in G . For example, if x_1 is mapped to 0 then t_1 can be mapped to α, β .

Now consider the $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, t_0, \sigma, \tau, x'_1, 1)$. According to the construction of SYM-DIFF we have, $V(G') = \{x'_1, t_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$. This is because $(\tau, 1), (\sigma, 1) \in L(t_0, x'_1)$, and hence, G' is not extended to the vertices $\{x'_2, x'_3, x'_4, x'_5, x'_6, t'_1, t'_2, t'_3, t'_4\}$. The list of the vertices in the new instance (L' lists) are as follows. $L'(x'_1) = \{1\}$, $L'(t_0) = \{\sigma\}$, $L'(t_1) = \{\sigma, \gamma\}$, $L'(t_2) = \{\sigma, \gamma\}$, $L'(x_1) = \{1\}$, $L'(x_2) = L'(x_3) = L'(x_4) = L'(x_5) = L'(x_6) = \{0, 1\}$, and $L'(t_3) = L'(t_4) = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma\}$ (See Figure 6).




Figure 6: Applying Sym-Diff function on $G, L, t_0, \alpha, \tau, x'_1, 1$ and get lists L'

Now suppose we want to solve the instance G', L' . At this point one could say this instance is Minority and according to Algorithm 2 we should call a Maltsev algorithm. However, we may further apply Algorithm 2 on instances constructed in SYM-DIFF and use the "no" output to decide whether there exists a homomorphism or not. Now consider $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G', L', t_4, \alpha, \beta, x_4, 0)$ (see Figure 7), we would get the digraph $G'' = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}$ and lists L'' as follows. $L''(t_4) = \{\alpha\}$, $L''(x_4) = \{0\}$. By following Q_4 from t_4 to x_3 we would have $L''(x_3) = \{1\}$ (because $(0, \alpha) \notin L'(x_3, t_4)$), and then following Q_1 to t_1 we would have $L''(t_1) = \{\gamma\}$ (because $(1, \sigma) \notin L'(x_3, t_1)$). By similar reasoning and following Q_2 from t_1 to x_2 we have $L''(x_2) = \{0\}$, and consequently from x_2 to t_3 alongside Q_2 we have $L''(t_3) = \{\alpha, \gamma\}$. By following Q_2 from t_4 to x_5 we would have $L''(x_5) = \{0\}$, and consequently $L''(t_2) = \{\gamma\}$. By following Q_3 from t_2 to x_6 we have $L''(x_6) = \{1\}$, and continuing along Q_3 to t_3 we would have $L''(t_3) = \{\gamma\}$.




Figure 7: Applying Sym-Diff function on $G', L', t_4, \alpha, \beta, x_4, 0$

Finally we see the pair lists $L''(x_4, x_6) = \emptyset$ because $(0, 1) \notin L''(x_4, x_6)$. Therefore, there is no L'' -homomorphism from G'' to H . This means in the algorithm we remove $(\alpha, 0)$ from $L'(t_4, x_4)$. Moreover, $L'(\alpha, 1) \notin L'(t_4, x_4)$ and hence α is removed from $L''(t_4)$. Similarly we conclude that there is no homomorphism for the instance $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G', L', t_4, \beta, \alpha, x_4, 0)$, and hence, we should remove β from $L'(t_4)$.

Again suppose we call, $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G', L', t_4, \gamma, \sigma, x_4, 1)$. We would get digraph D_1 with vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}$ and lists L_1 as follows. $L_1(t_4) = \{\alpha\}$, $L_1(x_4) = \{1\}$, $L_1(x_3) = \{0\}$, $L_1(t_1) = \{\sigma\}$, $L_1(x_2) = \{1\}$, $L_1(x_5) = \{0\}$, $L_1(t_2) = \{\gamma\}$, $L_1(x_6) = \{1\}$, and $L_1(t_3) = \{\beta\}$. Now we see the pairs lists $L_1(t_3, x_4) = \emptyset$ because $(\beta, 1) \notin L'(t_3, x_4)$. Therefore, we conclude γ should be removed from $L'(t_4)$. By similar argument, we conclude that σ is removed from $L'(t_4)$.

In conclusion, there is no L -homomorphism that maps x_1 to 1. By symmetry we conclude that there is no L -homomorphisms that maps x_1 to zero. This means $L(x_1) = L(x_2) = L(x_3) = L(x_4) = L(x_5) = L(x_6) = \{2\}$. $L(t_1) = L(t_2) = L(t_3) = L(t_4) = \{\tau\}$. So any homomorphism ϕ from G to H maps x_i , $1 \leq i \leq 6$ to 2 and it maps t_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$ to τ .

It is easy to verify that ϕ may map all the vertices $x'_1, x'_2, x'_3, x'_4, x'_5, x'_6$ to 2, and there also exists a homomorphism ϕ' where the image of $x'_1, x'_2, x'_3, x'_4, x'_5, x'_6$ is in $\{0, 1\}$.

Generalization Let R be a relation of arity k on set A , and suppose R admits a weak NU polymorphism ϕ of arity 3 (for simplicity). Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m$ be the tuples in R . Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be the elements of A . Let $\alpha_j = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$ be the j -tuple, $1 \leq j \leq m$ of R . Let $P_{i,j}$ be an oriented path that is constructed by concatenating $k+2$ smaller pieces (oriented path) where each piece is either a forward arc or a forward-backward-forward arc. The first piece of $P_{i,j}$ is a forward

arc and the $k + 2$ -piece is also a forward arc. The r -th piece, $2 \leq r \leq k$, is a forward arc if $a_i = c_r$, otherwise, the r -th piece is a forward-backward-forward arc; and in this case we say the r -th piece has two internal vertices. Note that $(r + 1)$ -th piece is attached to the end of the r -th piece. For example, if $a_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$ then $P_{1,1}$ looks like :




Figure 8: The oriented path corresponding to $(0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$

Now H is constructed as follows. $V(H)$ consists of b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n corresponding to a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , together with vertices $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m$ corresponding to $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m$. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, we put a copy of $P_{i,j}$ between the vertices b_i and β_j ; identifying the beginning of $P_{i,j}$ with b_i and end of $P_{i,j}$ with β_j .

Now it is easy to show that the resulting digraph H is a balanced digraph and admits a weak NU polymorphism. For every triple (b_i, b_j, b_ℓ) from b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n set $\psi(b_i, b_j, b_\ell) = b_s$ where $a_s = \phi(a_i, a_j, a_\ell)$. For every $\beta_i, \beta_j, \beta_\ell$ from $\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m\}$, set $\psi(\beta_i, \beta_j, \beta_\ell) = \beta_s$ where $\alpha_s = \phi(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_\ell)$ where ϕ is applied coordinate wise on $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_\ell)$. We give level to the vertices of H . All the vertices, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n gets level zero. If uv is an arc of H then $level(v) = 1 + level(u)$. All the $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m$ vertices gets level $k + 2$. For every $a, b, c \in V(H)$, set $\psi(a, b, c) = a$ when a, b, c are not on the same level of H . Otherwise, for $a \in P_{i,i'}$ and $b \in P_{j,j'}$, and $c \in P_{\ell,\ell'}$ where all on level h of H , set $\psi(a, b, c) = d$ where d has the following properties:

- d is a vertex on the same level as a, b, c ,
- d lies on $P_{s,s'}$ where $\phi(a_i, a_j, a_\ell) = a_s$ and $\phi(\alpha_{i'}, \alpha_{j'}, \alpha_{\ell'}) = \alpha_{s'}$,
- if any of the $a \in P_{i,i'}$, $b \in P_{j,j'}$, and $c \in P_{\ell,\ell'}$ is an interval vertex (referring to the r -th piece of P) then d is also an interval vertex of $P_{s,s'}$ when exists. Otherwise d should not be an interval.
- if $i = j = \ell$ and $i' = j' = \ell'$, then $\psi(a, b, c) = a$ if $a = b$ or $a = c$, otherwise, $\psi(a, b, c) = b$ (i.e., the majority function).

Suppose aa', bb', cc' are arcs of H . By the following observation, it is easy to see that $\psi(a, b, c)\psi(a', b', c')$ is an arc of H .

Observation. Suppose a, b, c are at the beginning (end) of the r -th piece of $P_{i,i'}$ and $b \in P_{j,j'}$, and $c \in P_{\ell,\ell'}$ (respectively) and none of these three pieces has an interval vertex. Then, the r -th piece of $P_{s,s'}$ does not an interval vertex.

By definition a_i appears in the r -th coordinate of $\alpha_{i'}$, and a_j appear in the r -th coordinate of $\alpha_{j'}$, and a_ℓ appears in the r -th coordinate of $\alpha_{\ell'}$. Since ϕ is applied coordinate wise on $(\alpha_{i'}, \alpha_{j'}, \alpha_{\ell'})$, the r -th coordinate of $\alpha_{s'}$ is $\phi(a_i, a_j, a_\ell) = a_s$, and hence, the r -th coordinate of $\alpha_{s'}$ is a_s . Therefore, the r -th piece of $P_{s,s'}$ doesn't have an interval vertex.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

By Lemma 4.3, we preserve the existence of a homomorphism from G to H after Algorithm. We observe that the running time of PreProcessing function is $\mathcal{O}(|G|^3|H|^3)$. According to the proof of

Lemma 4.3 (2) the running time of Algorithm 2 is $\mathcal{O}(|G|^4|H|^{k+4})$. Therefore, the running time of the Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(|G|^4|H|^{k+4})$.

4.1 PreProcessing and List Update

We first show that the standard properties of consistency checking remain true in our setting – namely, that if the Preprocessing algorithm succeeds then f remains a homomorphism consistent with the lists L if it was before the Preprocessing.

Lemma 4.1 *If f is a homomorphism of $G \times H^k \rightarrow H$ consistent with L then f is a homomorphism consistent with L after running the Preprocessing.*

Proof: We need to show that if a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k are in $L(y)$ after the Preprocessing then $f(y; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in L(y)$ after the Preprocessing. By definition vertex a is in $L(y)$ after the Preprocessing because for every oriented path Y (of some length m) in G from y to a fixed vertex $z \in V(G)$ there is a vertex $a' \in L(z)$ and there exists a walk B in H from a to a' and congruent with Y that lies in $L(Y)$; list of the vertices of Y . Let $a'_1, a'_2, a'_3, \dots, a'_k \in L(z)$. Let A_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$ be a walk from a_i to a'_i in $L(Y)$ and congruent to Y . Let $A_i = a_i, a_i^1, a_i^2, \dots, a_i^m, a'_i$ and let $Y = y, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m, z$. Since f is a homomorphism consistent with L before the Preprocessing, $f(y; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k), f(y_1; a_1^1, a_2^1, \dots, a_k^1), \dots, f(y_i; a_1^i, a_2^i, \dots, a_k^i), \dots, f(y_m; a_1^m, a_2^m, \dots, a_k^m), f(z; a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_k)$ is a walk congruent with Y . This would imply that there is a walk from $f(y; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ to $f(z; a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_k)$ congruent with Y in $L(Y)$, and hence, $f(y; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in L(y)$. \diamond

By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2 *If f is a homomorphism of $G \times H^k \rightarrow H$, consistent with L and $(a_i, b_i) \in L(x, y)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, after Preprocessing then $(f(x; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k), f(y; b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)) \in L(x, y)$ after the Preprocessing.*

4.2 Correctness Proof for Not-Minority Algorithm

The main argument is proving that after NOT-MINORITY algorithm (Algorithm 2), there still exists a homomorphism from G to H if there was one before NOT-MINORITY .

Lemma 4.3 *If $(d_1, e_1) \in L(y, z)$ after calling NOT-MINORITY(G_1, H, L_1, f) where $(G_1, L_1) = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$, then set $\text{test}_1 = \text{true}$, otherwise, set $\text{test}_1 = \text{false}$. If $(d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$ after calling NOT-MINORITY(G_2, H, L_2, f) where $(G_2, L_2) = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_2, d_1, z, e_1)$, then set $\text{test}_2 = \text{true}$, otherwise, set $\text{test}_2 = \text{false}$. Then the following hold.*

- α . *If test_1 is false then there is no homomorphism from G to H that maps y to d_1 and z to e_1 .*
- β . *If test_2 is false then there is no homomorphism from G to H that maps y to d_2 and z to e_1 .*
- γ . *If both $\text{test}_1, \text{test}_2$ are true then there exists an L -homomorphism from $G_1 = G_2$ to H , that maps y to d and z to e_1 where $f(y; d_2^k, d_1) = d \neq d_1$. Moreover, NOT-MINORITY returns an L' - homomorphism from G' to H where $(G', L') = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d, d_1, z, e_1)$.*

- λ . Suppose both $test_1, test_2$ are true, and $f(y; d_2^k, d_1) = d \neq d_1$. Suppose there exists a homomorphism g from G to H with $g(y) = d_1$ and $g(z) = e_1$. Then there exists a homomorphism h from G to H with $h(y) = d$ and $h(z) = e_1$.

Proof: We use induction on the $\sum_{x \in V(G)} |L(x)|$. The base case of the induction is when all the lists are singleton, or when all the pairs are minority. If the lists are singleton then at the beginning of NOT-MINORITY algorithm we check whether the singleton lists form a homomorphism from G to H . If all the pairs are minority ($f(x, a_1^k, a_2) = a_2$ for every $x \in V(G)$, $a_1, a_2 \in L(x)$) then the function REMOVEMINORITY inside NOT-MINORITY algorithm, correctly returns a homomorphism from G to H if there exists one (see lines 6–8 of Algorithm REMOVEMINORITY 2).

Therefore, we continue by assuming the existence of some not-minority pairs. Consider the instance G_1, L_1 constructed by SYM-DIFF($G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1$) in which $L_1(y) = \{d_1\}$ and $L_1(z) = \{e_1\}$.

Proof of (α) We first notice that f is closed under L_1 . Let $v \in G_1$ and suppose $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k \in L_1(v)$. Thus, we have $(c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_1), \dots, (c_k, d_1) \in L(v, y)$, and $(c_1, e_1), (c_2, e_1), \dots, (c_k, e_1) \in L(v, z)$. Let $P_1 = v, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t, y$ (or z) be an arbitrary oriented path from v to y (z) in G_1 . Now $c_0 = f(v; c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k), f(v_1; c_1^1, c_2^1, \dots, c_k^1), \dots, f(v_t; c_1^t, c_2^t, \dots, c_k^t), f(y; d_1, d_1, \dots, d_1) = d_1$ where $c_1^i, c_2^i, \dots, c_k^i \in L_1(v_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, implies a path from c_0 to d_1 , and hence, there exists an oriented path from c_0 to d_1 in $L(P_1)$ and congruent to P_1 . This would mean $c_0 \in L_1(v)$, according to SYM-DIFF construction. Observe that G_1 is an induced sub-digraph of G , and $\sum_{x \in V(G_1)} |L_1(x)| < \sum_{x \in V(G)} |L(x)|$. Thus, by induction hypothesis (assuming NOT-MINORITY returns the right answer on smaller instance) for instance G_1, L_1, H, f , there is no homomorphism from G_1 to H that maps, y to d_1 and z to e_1 .

For contradiction, suppose there exists an L -homomorphism g from G to H (with $g(y) = d_1, g(z) = e_1$). Then, for every vertex $v \in V(G_1)$ we have $g(v) \in L(v)$, and $(g(v), d_1) \in L(v, y)$, and $(g(v), e_1) \in L(v, z)$. On the other hand, by the construction in function SYM-DIFF, $L_1(v)$ contains every element $i \in L(v)$ when $(i, d_1) \in L(v, y)$ and $(i, e_1) \in L(v, z)$, and consequently $g(v) \in L_1(v)$. However, $g_1 : G_1 \rightarrow H$, with $g_1(u) = g(u)$ for every $u \in V(G_1)$ is a homomorphism, a contradiction to nonexistence of such a homomorphism.

Notice that $(d_1, i) \in L(y, v)$ and $(e_1, i) \in L(z, v)$, in the first call to SYM-DIFF. But, if at some earlier call to SYM-DIFF, we removed (d_1, i) from $L(y, v)$ then by induction hypothesis this decision was a right decision, and hence, $i \neq g(v)$, and consequently is not used for g .

Proof of (β) is analogous to proof of (α).

Proof of (γ) Suppose $test_1, test_2$ are true. Let g_1 be the homomorphism returned by NOT-MINORITY function for the instance G_1, H, L_1, f , and g_2 be the homomorphism returned by NOT-MINORITY function for instance G_2, H, L_2, f . (i.e. from SYM-DIFF($G, L, y, d_2, d_1, z, e_1$)). By definition $G_1 = G_2$. Let G' be the digraph constructed in SYM-DIFF(G, L, y, d, d_1, z, e_1). Notice that G' is an induced sub-digraph of G_1 . This is because when z_1 is in $B(G_1)$ then there exists some $r \in L(v)$ such that $(d_1, r), (d_2, r) \in L(y, v)$, and since f is closed under L , we have $(f(v, d_1^k, d_2), r) \in L(y, v)$. Therefore, v is either inside $B(G')$ or $v \in V(G) \setminus V(G')$; meaning that G' does not expand beyond $B(G_1)$, and hence, G' is an induced sub-digraph of G_1 .

Now for every vertex $y \in V(G')$, set $g_3(y) = f(y; g_1^k(y), g_2(y))$. Since g_1, g_2 are also L -homomorphism from $G_1 = G_2$ to H and f is a polymorphism, it is easy to see that g_3 is an L -homomorphism from G_1 to H , and hence, also an L -homomorphism from G' to H .

Proof of (λ) Suppose there exists an L -homomorphism $g : G \rightarrow H$ with $g(y) = d_1$, $g(z) = e_1$. Then we show that there exists an L -homomorphism $h : G \rightarrow H$ with $h(y) = d$, $h(z) = e_1$.

Remark: The structure of the proof is as follows. In order to prove the statement of the Lemma 4.3(λ) we use Claim 4.4. The proof of Claim 4.4 is based on the induction on the size of the lists.

Let g_1 be an L -homomorphism from G_1 to H with $g_1(y) = d_1$ and $g_1(z) = e_1$, and g_2 be an L -homomorphism from G_2 to H with $g_2(y) = d_2$, and $g_2(z) = e_1$. According to γ , there exists an L -homomorphism $g_3 = g_{d,e_1}^{y,z}$ from $G' = G_1 = G_2$ to H , that maps y to d and z to e_1 . As argued in the proof of γ , g_3 is constructed based on g_1, g_2 and polymorphism f . We also assume that g_1 agrees with g in G_1 .

If $G' = G$, then we return the homomorphism g_3 as the desired homomorphism. Otherwise, consider a vertex z_1 which is on the boundary of G' , $B(G')$. Recall that $B(G')$ is the set of vertices $u \in V(G)$ with some $i \in L_{z,e_1}(u)$, such that $(i, d_1), (i, d_2) \in L_{z,e_1}(u, y)$. Let P be an oriented path in $G' \cup B(G')$ from y to z , and let P_1 be an oriented path in $G' \cup B(G')$ from y to z_1 . We may assume P and P_1 meet at some vertex v (v could be y , see Figure 9). We may assume z_1 is chosen such that $\ell_1 = g(z_1)$, and $g_3(v_1)\ell_1 \notin A(H)$ ($\ell_1 g_3(v_1) \notin A(H)$) where v_1 is last vertex before z_1 on P_1 , and $v_1 z_1 \in A(G)$ ($z_1 v_1 \in A(G)$) ($g_3(v_1)$ must have a neighbor inside $L(z_1)$ because of the Preprocessing). Notice that if $g_3(v_1)\ell_1 \in A(G)$ for every such path P_1 then we can extend g_3 to z_1 as well. Moreover, if there is no such z_1 then we can extend g_3 to $B(G')$, and define $h(y) = g_3(y)$ for every $y \in V(G')$, and $h(y) = g(y)$ for every $y \in V(G) \setminus V(G')$. It is easy to see that h is an L -homomorphism from G to H with $h(y) = d$. Thus, we proceed by assuming the existence of such z_1 . Let $L_1 = L_{y,d_1,z,e_1}$, and $L_2 = L_{y,d_2,z,e_1}$. Now we look at G' , and the aim is the following.

- First, modify g on the boundary vertices, $B(G')$, so that the image of every $z_i \in B(G')$, $g(z_i) \in L_{y,d,z,e_1}(z_i)$, i.e. $(d, g(z_i)) \in L(y, z_i)$.
- Second, having a homomorphism g_3 (i.e. $g_3(y) = d$, $g_3(z) = e_1$) from $G' \cup B(G')$ to H that agrees with g on $B(G')$.

Maybe the second goal is not possible on $B(G')$, and hence, we look beyond $B(G')$ and look for differences between g_3 and g inside an induced sub-digraph of G containing G' . We construct the next part of homomorphism h using g_3 and homomorphism g'_3 (obtained from $g, g_{\ell_i,e_1}^{z_i,z}$ for some $\ell_i \in L(z_i)$), and homomorphism f . Let $b_1 = g(v)$ and let $b_2 = g_2(v)$, and $b = f(v; b_2^k, b_1)$. Let $\ell_1 = g(z_1)$, and $\ell'_1 \in L(z_1)$ such that $g_2(v_1)\ell'_1 \in A(H)$ (recall that $v_1 z_1$ is the last arc on P_1 ; the path from y to z).

First scenario. There exists $\ell'_1 \in L_1(z_1) \cap L_2(z_1)$ such that $(b_1, \ell'_1), (b_2, \ell'_1) \in L(v, z_1)$ (see Figure 9). Note that since g is a homomorphism, we have $(d_1, b_1) \in L(y, v)$ and $(b_1, e_1) \in L(v, z)$. Set $e_2 = f(z_1; (\ell'_1)^k, \ell_1)$.

Case 1. Suppose $e_2 \neq \ell_1$. Let $P_1[v, z_1] = v, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t, z_1$, and let walk $b_2, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_t, \ell'_1$, and walk $b_1, d_1, \dots, d_t, \ell_1$ be inside $L(P_1[v, z_1])$ and congruent with it. Observe that the walk $f(v, b_2^k, b_1), f(v_1, c_1^k, d_1), \dots, f(v_t, c_t^k, d_t), f(z_1, (\ell'_1)^k, \ell_1)$ inside $L(P_1[v, z_1])$ is from $b = f(v, b_2^k, b_1)$ to e_2 . Therefore, $(b, e_2) \in L(v, z_1)$ (Figure 9), and consequently $(d, e_2) \in L(y, z_1)$.




Figure 9: $z_1 \in B(G')$, and $\ell_1, \ell'_1 \in L_{z,e_1}(z_1)$, $(b_2, \ell'_1) \in L_{z,e_1,y,d_1}(v, z_1)$, . Thus, there is a walk from $b = f(v; b_2^k, b_1)$ to $e_2 = f(z_1; \ell'_1{}^k, \ell_1)$ in $L(P_1[v, z_1])$

Case 2. Suppose $e_2 = \ell_1$. Note that in this case again by following the oriented path $P_1[v, z_1]$ and applying the polymorphism f in $L(P_1)$, we conclude that there exists a walk from b to e_2 in $L(P_1[v, z_1])$, congruent to $P_1[v, z_1]$, and hence, $(b, \ell_1) \in L(v, z_1)$ and consequently $(d, e_2) \in L(y, z_1)$

Since G, L_1 is smaller than the original instance, by Claim 4.4, the small tests pass for G, L_1 , and hence, by induction hypothesis, we may assume that there exists another L_1 -homomorphism from G to H that maps y to d_1 and z to e_1 , and z_1 to e_2 . Thus, for the sake of less notations we may assume g is such a homomorphism. This means we may reduce the lists L_1 by identifying ℓ_1 and e_2 when $e_2 \neq \ell_1$ in $L_1(z_1)$, and hence, we restrict the lists L_1 to $L_1(z_1, e_2)$. Observe that according to Cases 1,2, $(d, e_2) \in L(y, z_1)$.

We continue this procedure as follows: Let z_2 be the next vertex in $B(G')$ with $g(z_2) = \ell_2$. Again if the First scenario occurs, meaning that there exists $\ell'_2 \in L_2(z_2)$ such that $(b_2, \ell'_2) \in L(v, z_2)$ and $(b_1, \ell'_2) \in L_1(v, z_2)$ then we continue as follows. Let $e_3 = f(z_2; (\ell'_2)^k, \ell_2)$ (see Figure 10).




Figure 10: $z_2 \in B(G')$, and $\ell_2, \ell'_2 \in L_{z,e_1}(z_2)$ where $\ell_2 = g(z_2)$. There is a walk from b to $e_3 = f(z_2; (\ell'_2)^k, \ell_2)$

If $e_3 = \ell_2$ then we have $(b, \ell_2) \in L_1(v, z_2)$ (this is because of the definition of the polymorphism f), and hence, as in Case 2 we don't modify g . Otherwise, we proceed as in Case 1. In other words, we may assume that there exists an L_1 -homomorphism from G to H that maps y_1 to d_1 , z to e_1 and z_1 to e_2 , and z_2 to e_3 . We may assume g is such a homomorphism. Again this means we further restrict g on the boundary vertices of G' ; $B(G')$, so they are simultaneously reachable from b . If all the vertices in $B(G')$ fit into the First scenario then we return homomorphism h from G to H where inside G' , h agrees with g_3 and outside G' , h agrees with g . Otherwise, we go on to the Second scenario.

Second scenario. There is **no** $\ell'_1 \in L_1(z_1) \cap L_2(z_1)$ such that $(b_1, \ell'_1), (b_2, \ell'_1) \in L(v, z_1)$ (see Figure 11). At this point we need to start from vertex $v, b_1, b_2, b \in L(v)$. We consider the digraph $(G^2, L^2) = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L_2, v, b_1, b_2, z, e_1)$ and follow homomorphism g inside G^2 , by considering $B(G^2)$, and further modifying g so that its images are reachable from b simultaneously. For example, let $\ell_1 = g(z_1)$, $\ell'_1 \in L(z_1)$ with $g_2(v_1)\ell'_1 \in A(H)$, where $v_1 z_1$ is the last arc of P_1 , and $b' \in L(z_1)$ with $b' = f(z_1; (\ell'_1)^k, \ell_1)$. Notice that here we may g_2 is an L_2 -homomorphism obtained by calling $\text{NOT-MINORITY}(G_2, H, L_2, f)$. This homomorphism should exist because of Claim 4.4 for L_2 .




Figure 11: $z_1 \in B(G')$, and $\ell_1, \ell'_1 \in L_{z, e_1}(z_1)$. There is a walk from b to $b' = f(z_1; (\ell'_1)^k, \ell_1)$

Now as depicted in Figure 11, let w_1 be a vertex in $B(G^2)$, and suppose there exists $a'_1 \in L_2(w_1) \cap L_1(w_1)$ such that $(\ell_1, a'_1) \in L_1(z_1, w_1)$ and $(\ell'_1, a'_1) \in L_2(z_1, w_1)$. Let $a_1 = g(w_1)$. Now as in Case 1,2, we conclude that there exists a path from b' to $a_2 = f(w_1; (a'_1)^k, a_1)$, and hence, we can further modify g so that its image on w_1 is a_2 . If there is no such a'_1 then we will be back in the Second scenario.

This process goes on as long as for all the boundary vertices the first scenario occur or we may reach to entire G . In any case, we would have a homomorphism that maps y to d and z to e_1 .

Claim 4.4 Suppose all the small tests pass for instance (G, L, H) . Let x_1 be an arbitrary vertex of G and let $c_1 \in L(x_1)$. Let $L_1 = L_{x_1, c_1}$. Then all the small tests pass for G, L_1 .

Proof: Let G_1 be the sub-digraph constructed in $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, x_1, c_1)$. Note that there exists, an L_1 -homomorphism, $g_1 : G_1 \rightarrow H$ with $g_1(x_1) = c_1$, $g_1(y) = d_1$. Let $L_2 = (L_1)_{y, d_1}$, and let $L_3 = (L_2)_{x_2, c_2}$. The goal is to build a homomorphism ψ , piece by piece, that maps x_1 to c_1 ,

x_2 to c_2 , and y to d_1 where its image lies in L_3 . In order to do that we use *induction on the size of $\sum_{z_1 \in V(G_1)} |L_3(z_1)|$* . First suppose there exists x_3 on the oriented path from x_2 to y , and let $a_1, a_2 \in L_2(x_3)$ so that any oriented path from $a_1 \in L_1(x_3)$ inside $L_1(Y[x_3, x_2])$ ends at c_2 . Since $d_1 \neq d_2$, it is easy to assume that $a_1 \neq a_2$. Now consider the sub-digraph, G_2 constructed in $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L_1, x_3, a_1, a_2, x_1, c_1)$ ($a_1, a_2 \in L_2(x_3)$) and let g_2 be a homomorphism from G_2 to H . We may assume $g_2(y) = d'_1 \neq d_1$ (see Figure 12). The other case; $d'_1 = d_1$, is a special case of $d'_1 \neq d_1$. Notice that by the choice of x_3 , $g_2(x_2) = c_2$. Thus, $(c_2, d'_1) \in L_1(x_2, y)$. Let $L'_2 = (L_1)_{x_2, c_2, x_3, a_1}$




Figure 12: Proof of Claim 4.4

and notice that $d_1 \in L'_2(y)$. The total size of all the lists of L'_2 is less than the total size of the lists in L_1 because $L'(x_3) = \{a_1\}$. Thus, by induction hypothesis for the lists L'_2 we may assume that all the tests inside L'_2 pass, and hence, there exists an L'_2 , homomorphism g'_2 from G'_2 to H , in which $g'_2(y) = d_1$. Here G'_2 is the sub-digraph constructed in $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L_1, y, d_1, d'_1, x_3, a_1)$. Notice that x_3 is in $B(G'_2)$.

Case 1. There exists a vertex of $z_1 \in B(G_2) \cap V(G'_2)$ (see Figure 12). In this case, the homomorphism ψ agrees with g'_2 on the path Z from y to $z \in B(G'_2)$ (where z is also a vertex in $B(G_1)$) that goes through vertex z_1 .




Figure 13: The homomorphism on G'_2 shown by green color

Case 2. There exists a vertex of $z_1 \in B(G'_2)$, $z_1 \in V(G_2) \setminus B(G_2)$ (see Figure 13). Let

$g'_2(z_1) = b_1$. Let $b_2 \in (L_1)_{x,c_2,y,d_2}(z_1)$. Now we consider the sub-digraph G_3 constructed in $\text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L_1, z_1, b_1, b_2, z, e_1)$ where z is a vertex in $B(G_1)$. There exists, a homomorphism g_3 from G_3 to H . We need to obtain g'_3 (using g_3 and induction hypothesis) so that its image on some part of $G_1 \cap (G_3 \cap G_2)$ lies inside L_3 , and then ψ would follow g'_3 on that part. To do so, we end with one of the cases 1, 2. If case 2 occurs we need to continue considering other partial homomorphisms.

Now consider the case where x_3 does not exist, in other words, x_3 is a vertex neighbor to x_2 , and consider $a_1 \in L_3(x_3)$. In this case c_2 is adjacent to a_1 , and we can extend the homomorphism g_2 to vertex x_2 where $g_2(x_2) = c_2$. \diamond

Lemma 4.5 *The running time of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(|G|^4|H|^{k+4})$ (here $|G|$ is the number of arcs plus the number of vertices of G).*

Proof: At the first glance, the algorithm 2 looks exponential because we make polynomially many recursive calls. However, it is easy to see that the depth of the recursion is at most $|H|$. This is based according to the construction of $(G', L') = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$; for each $v \in V(G')$, $|L'(v)| < |L(v)|$. This simply would guarantee that the running time of the algorithm is of $|G|^{\mathcal{O}(|H|)}$.

However, it is more than just that, as the list becomes disjoint. Our implementation of algorithm would also support that the algorithm would perform much faster than $|G|^{\mathcal{O}(|H|)}$.

According to Observation 2.5, we consider each connected component of $G \times_L H$ separately. The connected component partitioned the $G \times_L H$, and hence, the overall running time would be the sum of the running time of each connected components. We go through all the pairs and look for not-minority ones, which takes $\mathcal{O}(|G||H|^k)$ because we search for each k -tuple inside the list of each vertex v of G . We also observe that the running time of the Preprocessing is $\mathcal{O}(|G|^3|H|^3)$. Note that at the end, we need to apply REMOVEMINORITY algorithm which we assume there exists one with running time $\mathcal{O}(|G|^3|H|^3)$ (see [10]).

Now suppose Algorithm 2 starts calling function SYM-DIFF where it considers two distinct vertices $y, z \in V(G)$ and $e_1 \in L(z)$, $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$. The constructed instances are $T_1 = (G_1, L_1) = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ and $T_2 = (G_2, L_2) = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_2, d_1, z, e_1)$. The lists L_1, L_2 (respectively) are disjoint because we exclude the boundary vertices into G_1, G_2 . Therefore, the running time of T_1 (T_2) is a polynomial of $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}_1(|G_1|) * \text{poly}_2(|L_1|))$ ($\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}_1(|G_2|) * \text{poly}_2(|L_2|))$) then the overall running time would be $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}_1(|G|) * \text{poly}_2(|L|))$ for G and L . Here $|L|$ denote the maximum size of a list and notice that $|L| \leq |V(H)|$.

Let $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_t \in L(z)$ and $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r \in L(y)$ such that they induce a bi-clique in L . We may assume there exists at least one pair d_1, d_2 which is not minority. According to function $\text{BI-CLIQUE-INSTANCES}$ instead of (d_1, e_1) we use only (d, e_1) where $d = f(y; d_2^k, d_1)$ and continue making the pair lists $L \times L$ smaller. Eventually each Bi-clique turns to a single path or the instance becomes Minority instance. Therefore, this step of the algorithm is a polynomial process with a overall running time $\mathcal{O}(|G|^2|H|^{k+1})$ because we need to consider each pair of vertices of G and find a bi-clique. This means the degree of the poly_1 is three and the degree of poly_2 is $k+1$ (we have of order $|G|^3$ from Preprocessing or from REMOVEMINORITY algorithm, and of order $|H|^{k+1}$ for finding bi-cliques). Therefore, the entire algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}(|G|^4|H|^{k+4})$. This is because we consider every pair x, y , and $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$, and $e_1 \in L(z)$. \diamond

5 Weak near unanimity recognition algorithm

Let A be a finite set. By a k -ary relation R on set A we mean a subset of the k -th cartesian power A^k ; k is said to be the *arity* of the relation. A constraint language (relational structure) Γ over A is a set of relations over A . A constraint language is finite if it contains finitely many relations.

A hypergraph \mathcal{G} on set X , consists of a set of hyperedges where each hyperedge e is an *ordered* tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) , $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in X$. Here k is called the size of the hyperedge e . Notice that different hyperedges could have different sizes. A hypergraph is called uniform if all its hyperedges have the same size. We denote the vertices of the hypergraph \mathcal{G} by $V(\mathcal{G})$.

For two hypergraphs \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} , a homomorphism $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, is a mapping from $V(\mathcal{G})$ to $V(\mathcal{H})$ such that for every hyperedge $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{G}$, $(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_k))$ is an hyperedge in \mathcal{H} .

An instance of the constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) can be viewed as an instance of the hypergraph list homomorphism problem. We are given two hypergraphs \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} together with lists \mathcal{L} where each hyperedge $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}$ has a list of possible hyperedges (all with the same size as α) in \mathcal{H} , denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. The goal is to find a homomorphism $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that for every hyperedge $\alpha = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{G}$, $(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_k)) \in \mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. In other words, if we look at the vertices of \mathcal{G} as variables, the vertices of \mathcal{H} as values, and hyperedges $\alpha' \in \mathcal{G}$ as constraints then the existence of homomorphism f illuminates a way of giving each variable a value, so that all constraints are satisfied simultaneously. A constraint is of form $(\alpha, \mathcal{L}(\alpha))$, and a constraint is satisfied if tuple α is mapped by f into one of the tuples in its list.

Definition 5.1 (Signature) *For every two hyperedges α_1, α_2 from \mathcal{G} (or \mathcal{H}) we associate a signature $S_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} = \{(i, j) \mid \alpha_1[i] = \alpha_2[j]\}$ ($\alpha_1[i]$ is the element in coordinate i -th of α_1).*

Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph on set A . Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_t$ be a partition of \mathcal{H} into t uniform hypergraphs. A mapping $h : A^r \rightarrow A$ is a polymorphism of arity r on \mathcal{H} if h is closed under each \mathcal{H}_i , $1 \leq i \leq t$. In other words, for every r hyperedges $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_r \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $h(\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_r) \in \mathcal{H}_i$. Notice that here h is applied coordinate wise (e.g. if $(a_1, a_2, a_3), (b_1, b_2, b_3), (c_1, c_2, c_3)$ are hyperedges in \mathcal{H}_i then $(h(a_1, b_1, c_1), h(a_2, b_2, c_2), h(a_3, b_3, c_3))$ is a hyperedge in \mathcal{H}_i).

In order to prove Theorem 1.2 it is enough to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2 *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph. Then the problem of deciding whether \mathcal{H} admits a weak NU polymorphism is polynomial time solvable.*

The proof of the Theorem 5.2 consists of several lemmas and an algorithm as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_t$ be a partitioned of \mathcal{H} into uniform hypergraphs. We construct graph G, H and lists L .

Vertices of G, H and lists L : The vertices of G are four tuples $\bar{x} = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$ where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda \in \mathcal{H}_l$, $1 \leq l \leq t$. The vertices of H are $\bar{\tau}$ where τ is a hyperedge of \mathcal{H} . For $\bar{x} = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, $L(\bar{x})$, consists of all $\bar{\tau}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{H}_l$ with the following property:

- If $\alpha[i] = \beta[j] = \lambda[i]$, $\alpha[j] = \gamma[j] = \beta[i]$, and $\gamma[i] = \lambda[j]$ then $\tau[i] = \tau[j]$.

Adjacency in G : Two vertices $\bar{x} = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, and $\bar{y} = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda')$ from G with $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda \in \mathcal{H}_l$, $\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda' \in \mathcal{H}_{l'}$ are adjacent if at least one of the following occurs.

- $S_{\alpha,\alpha'} \cap S_{\beta,\beta'} \cap S_{\gamma,\gamma'} \cap S_{\lambda,\lambda'} \neq \emptyset$.
- $\alpha[i] = \beta'[j] = \lambda[i]$, $\alpha'[j] = \gamma'[j] = \beta[i]$, and $\gamma[i] = \lambda'[j]$

Adjacency in H : Two vertices $\bar{\tau} \in L(\bar{x})$ and $\bar{\omega} \in L(\bar{y})$ in H where $\bar{x} = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, and $\bar{y} = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda')$ are adjacent if the following occurs :

- $S_{\alpha,\alpha'} \cap S_{\beta,\beta'} \cap S_{\gamma,\gamma'} \cap S_{\lambda,\lambda'} \subseteq S_{\tau,\omega}$
- If $\alpha[i] = \beta'[j] = \lambda[i]$, $\alpha'[j] = \gamma'[j] = \beta[i]$, and $\gamma[i] = \lambda'[j]$ then $\tau[i] = \omega[j]$.

Lemma 5.3 \mathcal{H} admits a Siggers polymorphism if and only if there is an L -homomorphism from G to H .

Proof: Suppose \mathcal{H} admits a Siggers polymorphism ϕ . For every vertex $\bar{x} = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda) \in G$ where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda \in \mathcal{H}_l$, define mapping $g : G \rightarrow H$ with $g(\bar{x}) = \phi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, where ϕ is applied coordinate wise. Let $\bar{y} = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda')$ and suppose $\bar{x}\bar{y}$ is an edge of G . By definition, $\bar{\tau} \in L(\bar{x})$ where $\tau = \phi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$ and $\bar{\omega} \in L(\bar{y})$ where $\omega = \phi(\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda')$. Notice that if $(i, j) \in S_{\alpha,\alpha'} \cap S_{\beta,\beta'} \cap S_{\gamma,\gamma'}$ then the value of i -th coordinate of τ is $\phi(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are the i -th coordinates of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda$ respectively) and the value of the j -th coordinate of ω is $\phi(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are the j -th coordinate of $\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda'$ respectively). Therefore, $(i, j) \in S_{\tau,\omega}$, and hence, there is an edge from $\bar{\tau}$ to $\bar{\omega}$ in H . Moreover, if \bar{x}, \bar{y} are adjacent because $\alpha[i] = \beta'[j] = \lambda[i]$, $\alpha'[j] = \gamma'[j] = \beta[i]$ then by definition $\tau[i] = \omega[j]$ and, and hence, $\bar{\tau}, \bar{\omega}$ are adjacent in H . Therefore, g is a homomorphism from G to H .

Conversely, suppose g is an L -homomorphism from G to H . Suppose $\bar{\tau} = g(\bar{x})$ for $x = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$. Then, for every a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 that are the i -th coordinate of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda$, respectively, set $\phi(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = a_5$ where a_5 is the i -th coordinate of τ (recall τ is a ordered hyperedge corresponding to $\bar{\tau} = g(\bar{x})$).

Consider a vertex $\bar{y} \in G$ with $\bar{y} = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda')$. Suppose the j -coordinate of $\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \lambda'$ are a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 respectively. Let $\bar{\omega} = g(\bar{y})$. By definition, $\phi(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ is a'_5 where a'_5 is the j -th coordinate of ω . We show that $a_5 = a'_5$. Observe that $(i, j) \in S_{\alpha,\alpha'} \cap S_{\beta,\beta'} \cap S_{\gamma,\gamma'} \cap S_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ where a_1 appears in i -th coordinate of α and in the j -th coordinate of α' ; a_2 is an element appearing in i -th coordinate of β and in the j -th coordinate of β' ; a_3 appears in the i -th coordinate of γ and in the j -th coordinate of γ' ; and finally a_4 appears in the i -th coordinate of λ and in the j -th coordinate of λ' . Therefore, \bar{x}, \bar{y} are adjacent in G , and since g is a homomorphism, $\bar{\tau}$ and $\bar{\omega}$ must be adjacent in H . By the construction of the lists, the i -th coordinate of τ is the same as the j -th coordinate of ω , i.e. $a_5 = a'_5$. Notice that since g is a list homomorphism, $\bar{\tau} \in L(\bar{x})$ where $\tau = h(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \lambda)$, and hence, τ belongs to \mathcal{H} . \diamond

Lemma 5.4 If \mathcal{H} admits a Siggers polymorphism then $G \times_L H^4$ admits a Siggers list polymorphism.

Lemma 5.5 If \mathcal{H} admits a Siggers polymorphism then it also admits a weak k -NU for some k and $G \times_L H^k$ admits a weak k -NU list polymorphism.

Proof: It has been shown by Siggers [47] that if \mathcal{H} admits a Sigger polymorphism it is also admit a weak NU of arity k for some $k \geq 3$. It is easy to see that $G \times_L H^k$ admits a weak NU list polymorphis when \mathcal{H} admits a weak k -NU. \diamond

Recall that for $a, b \in L(x)$, we say (a, b) (with respect to x) is a minority pair if $f(x; a^k, b) = b$, otherwise, we call (a, b) a non-minority pair.

Lemma 5.6 *Let $x \in G$, $a, b \in L(x)$. Suppose there exists $y \in G$, $c, d \in L(y)$ such that $(a, c), (a, d) \in L(x, y)$ and $(b, d) \in L(x, y)$ but $(b, c) \notin L(x, y)$. Then at least one of the (d, c) , (a, b) is not a minority pair.*

Proof: By contradiction suppose, $f(y; d^k, c) = c$. Now by applying the polymorphism f on the $L(Y)$, where Y is a path from x to y , we conclude that $f(x; b, a^k) \neq b$ (because $(c, b) \notin L(x, y)$), and hence, $f(x; a^k, b) \neq b$. \diamond

5.1 Algorithm for weak NU polymorphisms

Removing non-minority pairs Algorithm 3 performs a test (with respect to $y, z \in G$ and $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$, $e_1 \in L(z)$) on a sub-digraph G' with the lists L' which are constructed this way. Let $L_1 = L_{z, e_1}$. First G' includes vertices v of G such that for every $(d_1, j) \in L_1(y, v)$ we have $(d_2, j) \notin L_1(y, v)$. Next, we further prune the lists L' as follows; for each $v \in G'$, $L'(v) = \{i \mid (d_1, i) \in L_1(y, v)\}$. We ask whether there exists an L' -homomorphism from G' to H . If there is no such homomorphism then we remove (d_1, e_1) from the pair list (y, z) .

Algorithm 3 Finding a homomorphism from G to H

```

1: Input:  $G, H$ , lists  $L$ 
2: function WEAK-NU( $G, H, L$ )
3:   if  $\forall x \in V(G), |L(x)| \leq 1$  then  $\forall x \in V(G)$  set  $g(x) = L(x)$ 
4:   return  $g$   $\triangleright g$  is a homomorphism from  $G$  to  $H$ 
5:   If  $G \times_L H$  is not connected then consider each connected component separately
6:   for all  $y, z \in V(G)$ ,  $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ ,  $e_1 \in L(z)$  s.t.  $(d_1, e_1), (d_2, e_1) \in L(y, z)$  do
7:      $(G', L') = \text{SYM-DIFF}(G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1)$ 
8:      $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z} = \text{WEAK-NU}(G', H, L')$ 
9:     if  $g_{d_1, e_1}^{y, z}$  is empty then
10:       Remove  $(d_1, e_1)$  from  $L(y, z)$ , and remove  $(e_1, d_1)$  from  $L(z, y)$ 
11:    $g = \text{GETTING-TO-MINORTIY}(G, H, L)$ 
12:   return  $g$   $\triangleright g$  is a homomorphism from  $G$  to  $H$ 

```

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$  and,  $y, z \in V(G)$ ,  $d_1, d_2 \in L(y)$ ,  $e_1 \in L(z)$ 
2: function SYM-DIFF( $G, L, y, d_1, d_2, z, e_1$ )
3:   Create new lists  $L'$  and let  $L_1 = L_{z, e_1}$ , and construct the pair lists  $L_1 \times L_1$  from  $L_1$ 
4:   Set  $L'(z) = e_1$ ,  $L'(y) = d_1$ , and set  $G' = \emptyset$ 
5:   for all  $v \in V(G)$  s.t.  $\forall i$  with  $(i, d_1) \in L_1(y, v)$  we have  $(i, d_2) \notin L_1(y, v)$  do
6:     add  $v$  into set  $G'$ 
7:   Let  $G'$  be the induced sub-digraph of  $G$ 
8:   for all  $u \in V(G')$  do
9:      $L'(u) = \{i \mid (d_1, i) \in L_1(y, u)\}$ 
10:  for all  $u, v \in V(G')$  do
11:     $L'(u, v) = \{(a, b) \in L_1(u, v) \mid (a, b) \text{ is consistent in } G'\}$ .
12:  return  $(G', L')$ 

```

Getting into minority pairs For $x \in G$ and $a, b \in L(x)$, let $G_{a,b}^{L,x}$ be the set of vertices $y \in G$ such that for every $i \in L(y)$, $(a, i) \in L(x, y)$ and $(b, i) \notin L(x, y)$. Let $B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ be the vertices of G outside $G_{a,b}^{L,x}$ that are adjacent (via out-going, in-going arc) to a vertex in $G_{a,b}^{L,x}$.

Making Rectangles Suppose for $a, b \in L(x)$, both $(a, b), (b, a)$ are minority pairs. We look at every vertex $y \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and two vertices $c_1, c_2 \in L(y)$. Suppose $(a, c_1), (a, c_2), (b, c_2) \in L(x, y)$. Now by Lemma 5.6 if $(b, c_1) \notin L(x, y)$ then (c_1, c_2) is not a minority pair and according to Algorithm 2 (proof of correctness Lemma 4.3 (λ)) we can remove, (a, c_1) from $L(x, y)$. Therefore, as long as there exist such y and $c_1, c_2 \in L(y)$ we continue doing so. At the end, we end up with an instance $G_{a,b}^{L,x} \cup B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ in which the rectangle property preserved for $x \in G$ and $a, b \in L(x)$ and any $y \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and $c, d \in L(y)$. In other words, if $(a, c), (b, c), (a, d) \in L(x, y)$ then $(b, d) \in L(x, y)$.

Removing other non minority pairs Suppose for $a, b \in L(x)$, both $(a, b), (b, a)$ are minority pairs. Now for every $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ either $L_{x,a}(y, z) = L_{x,b}(y, z)$ or $L_{x,a}(y, z) \cap L_{x,b}(y, z) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, according to Lemma 5.7, we would have a non minority pair (b_1, b_2) in $L(w)$, $w \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and we can handle such non minority pairs according to function CLEAN-UP in Algorithm 3 (also according Algorithm 2). The proof of correctness of the function CLEAN-UP appears in Lemma 5.7 (3). Suppose we have removed non minority pairs (b_1, b_2) with $b_1, b_2 \in L(w)$. Now we consider vertex $y \in G_{a,b}^{L,x}$, and two elements $c_1, c_2 \in L_{x,a}(y)$. Since, $(a, c_1), (a, c_2), (b, c_1), (b, c_2)$ are still in $L_{x,a}(x, y)$, $(c_1, c_2), (c_2, c_1)$ are still minority pairs, and hence we further consider $G_{c_1, c_2}^{L_{x,a}, y}$, and $L_{x,a}$ and further remove other non minority pairs. We continue this process, until we reach the entire G , with the lists $L_{x,a}$. At this point ask the REMOVEMINORITY($G, H, L_{x,a}$). If there is an answer then we have a homomorphism from G to H that maps x to a and we return such a homomorphism.

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$ 
2: function GETTING-TO-MINORITY( $G, H, L$ )
3:   Let  $x$  be a vertex in  $G$  with  $|L(x)| > 1$ 
4:   for every two distinct  $a, b \in L(x)$  do
5:      $L_1 = L$ 
6:      $L' = \text{CLEAN-UP}(G, H, L_1, x, a, b)$ 
7:      $g = \text{REMOVEMINORITY}(G, H, L')$ 
8:     if  $g \neq \emptyset$  then
9:       return  $g$ 
10:   $g = \text{GETTING-TO-MINORITY}(G, H, L_{x,a})$ 
11:  return  $g$ 

```

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$ ,  $x \in V(G)$ ,  $a, b \in L(x)$ 
2: function MAKE-RECTANGLE( $G, H, L, x, a, b$ )
3:   for  $y \in G$ ,  $c, d \in L(y)$  do
4:     if  $(a, c), (a, d), (b, d) \in L(x, y)$  and  $(b, c) \notin L(x, y)$  then
5:       remove  $(a, c)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
6:     if  $(a, c), (b, c), (b, d) \in L(x, y)$  and  $(a, d) \notin L(x, y)$  then
7:       remove  $(a, c)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
8:   PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
9:   return ( $L$ )

```

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G, H$ , and lists  $L$ 
2: function CLEAN-UP( $G, H, L, x', a', b'$ )
3:   Let  $St$  be an empty Stack.
4:   push( $x', a', b'$ ) into  $St$ .
5:   while  $St$  is not empty do
6:      $(x, a, b) = \text{pop}(St)$  and set  $\text{Visit}[x, a, b] = \text{true}$ 
7:     MAKE-RECTANGLE( $G, H, L, x, a, b$ )
8:     for  $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$  do
9:       Let  $c, d \in L(y)$  and  $e, l \in L(z)$  s.t.  $x, a, b, y, c, d$  and  $x, a, b, z, e, l$  are rectangles.
10:      Let  $v$  be a vertex at the intersection of  $Y$  from  $x$  to  $Y$  and  $Z$  from  $x$  to  $z$  in  $G$ .
11:      Let  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in L(v)$  such that  $(a, a_1), (a, a_3), (b, a_2), (b, a_4) \in L(x, v)$ .
12:      if  $(a_1, e), (a_4, e), (a_2, l), (a_3, l) \in L(v, z)$  then
13:        Let  $a_5 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(b, a_5) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_5, c) \in L_{x,b}(v, y)$  and  $(a_5, e) \in L_{x,b}(y, z)$ .
14:        if  $\nexists a_6 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(a, a_6) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_6, e) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$ ,  $(a_6, d) \notin L_{x,a}(v, y)$  then
15:          remove  $(a, d), (b, d)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
16:          PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
17:        if  $\nexists a_7 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(b, a_7) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_7, c) \in L_{x,b}(v, y)$ ,  $(a_7, l) \notin L_{x,b}(v, z)$  then
18:          remove  $(a, l), (b, l)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
19:          PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
20:        if  $(a_1, e), (a_2, e), (a_3, l), (a_4, l) \in L(v, z)$  then
21:          Let  $a_5 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(a, a_5) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_5, c) \in L_{x,a}(v, y)$ ,  $(a_5, l) \in L_{x,a}(y, z)$ .
22:          if  $\nexists a_6 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(a, a_6) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_6, l) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$ ,  $(a_6, d) \notin L_{x,a}(v, y)$  then
23:            remove  $(a, d), (b, d)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
24:            PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
25:          if  $\nexists a_7 \in L(v)$  s.t.  $(a, a_7) \in L(x, v)$ ,  $(a_7, c) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$ ,  $(a_7, l) \notin L_{x,a}(v, y)$  then
26:            remove  $(a, l), (b, l)$  from  $L(x, y)$ 
27:            PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ )
28:          if  $(a, d), (a, d), (b, c), (b, d) \in L(x, y)$  and  $\text{Visit}[y, c, d] = \text{false}$  then push( $y, c, d$ ) into  $St$ 
29:          if  $(a, e), (a, l), (b, e), (b, l) \in L(x, z)$  and  $\text{Visit}[z, e, l] = \text{false}$  then push( $z, e, l$ ) into  $St$ 
30:   return ( $L$ )

```

Deploying Maltsev algorithm Now we can deploy the procedure REMOVEMINORITY similar to Algorithm 1 in [38]. The goal is to eliminate one of the a, b from the list of x . We construct a sub-digraph of G which is initially $G' = G_{a,b}^{L,x} \setminus B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ in function G-XAB (similar to Algorithm 1 in [38]). If there are vertices $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ so that $L_{x,a}(y, z) \cap L_{x,b}(y, z) = \emptyset$, then we say a, b are *not identical* on the boundary. In this case sub-digraph G' will be extended from a vertex y and two elements $c_1, c_2 \in L_{x,a}(y)$. This is done by adding $G_{c_1,c_2}^{L,y} \setminus B(G_{c_1,c_2}^{L,y})$ into G' and the boundary vertices of G' are updated by the vertices of $B(G_{c_1,c_2}^{L,y})$ that are not already in G' . If the procedure REMOVEMINORITY finds a homomorphism that maps x to a in the sub-digraph G' then we remove b from $L(x)$, otherwise, we remove a from $L(x)$. Following the proof of correctness of the Algorithm 1 in [38] and Algorithm 2 we obtain the correctness of this procedure.

For every $a, b \in L(x)$, one of the $(a, b), (b, a)$ is not minority Let $a \in L(x)$ and let $L'_{x,a}$ be the subset of lists $L_{x,a}$ in which for every $y \in G$, and every $c_1, c_2 \in L(y)$, (c_1, c_2) is a minority pair. We get to this point because there is no $L'_{x,a}$ -homomorphism from G to H that maps x to a . One reason is because at least one of the $(a, b), (b, a)$ is not a minority pair for $a, b \in L(x)$. If for every $c \in L(x)$, (a, c) is not a minority pair then at the end we should see whether there exists an $L_{x,a}$ -homomorphism from G to H .

Algorithm 4 RemoveMinority – Using Maltsev Property

```

1: function REMOVEMINORITY( $G, H, L$ )
2:   PREPROCESSING( $G, H, L$ ) and if a list becomes empty then return  $\emptyset$ 
3:   Consider each connected component of  $G \times_L H$  separately
                                     ▷ we assume  $G \times_L H$  is connected
4:    $\forall x \in V(G)$  and  $\forall a, b \in L(x)$ , if  $a, b$  are twins then remove  $b$  from  $L(x)$ .
5:   for all  $x \in V(G), a, b \in L(x)$  with  $a \neq b$  do
6:      $(G', L') = \text{G-XAB}(G, L, x, a, b)$ 
7:      $g_{a,b}^x = \text{REMOVEMINORITY}(G', H, L')$ 
8:     if  $g_{a,b}^x$  is empty then remove  $a$  from  $L(x)$ 
9:     else remove  $b$  from  $L(x)$ 
10:   Preprocessing ( $G, H, L$ )
11:   Set  $\psi$  to be an empty homomorphism.
12:   if  $\exists x \in V(G)$  with  $L(x)$  is empty then return  $\emptyset$ .
13:   else
14:     for all  $x \in V(G)$  do
15:        $\psi(x) = L(x)$                                      ▷ in this case the lists are singletons
16:   return  $\psi$ 

```

```

1: Input: Digraphs  $G$ , lists  $L$  and,  $x \in V(G)$ ,  $a, b \in L(x)$ 
2: function G-XAB( $G, L, x, a, b$ )
3:   Set  $\widehat{G_{a,b}^{L,x}} = G_{a,b}^{L,x} \setminus B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ , and  $B' = B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ 
4:   Set stack  $S$  to be empty and set  $L_1 = L_{x,a}$ 
5:   push  $x, a, b$  into  $S$ 
6:   while  $S$  is not empty do
7:     pop  $(x', a', b')$  from  $S$ 
8:     for all  $y \in B'$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in L_1(y)$  s.t.  $y, c_1, c_2$  witness  $x', a', b'$  at  $z, d_1, d_2$  do
9:       Add new vertices from  $G_{c_1, c_2}^{L_1, y} \setminus B(G_{c_1, c_2}^{L_1, y})$  into  $\widehat{G_{a,b}^{L,x}}$ 
10:      Update  $B'$  by adding new boundary vertices from  $B(G_{c_1, c_2}^{L_1, y})$  and removing the old
          boundary vertices from  $B'$  that become internal vertices
11:      push  $(y, c_1, c_2)$  into  $S$ 
12:   Initialize new lists  $L'$  and  $\forall y \in \widehat{G_{a,b}^{L,x}}$ , set  $L'(y) = L_1(y)$ 
13:   return  $(\widehat{G_{a,b}^{L,x}}, L')$ 

```

▷ L' lists should be $(2, 3)$ -consistent

Lemma 5.7 *Suppose $a, b \in L(x)$ and both (a, b) , (b, a) are minority pairs. Then one of the following occurs.*

1. *For every $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, $L_{x,a}(y, z) = L_{x,b}(y, z)$, and $\forall w \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, $c_1, c_2 \in L_{x,a}(w)$, (c_1, c_2) is minority.*
2. *For every $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, $L_{x,a}(y, z) \cap L_{x,b}(y, z) = \emptyset$, and $\forall w \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, $c_1, c_2 \in L_{x,a}(w)$, (c_1, c_2) is minority.*
3. *There is $w \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and vertices $b_1, b_2 \in L_{x,a}(w)$ such that (b_1, b_2) is not a minority pair.*

Proof: First assume for every $y \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and every $c, d \in L_{x,a}(y)$, (c, d) is a minority pair and every $c, d \in L_{x,b}(y)$, (c, d) is a minority pair. Let $e, l \in L(z)$ such that $(a_1, e) \in L(v, z)$ and $(a_3, l) \in L(v, z)$. Notice that since $z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, we must have a rectangle forming with x, a, b and z, c, d . Without loss of generality we may assume that the internal vertices of this rectangle in $L(v)$ are a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 (see Figure 14).





Figure 14: The pair lists on boundary vertices are the same.

Second, suppose $(a_4, e), (a_2, l) \in L(v, z)$ (see Figure 15). Let $a'_1 \in L(v)$ such that $(a, a'_1) \in L(x, v)$ and $(a'_1, c) \in L(v, y)$ and suppose $(a'_1, t) \in L(v, z)$. Notice that $(t, c) \in L_{x,a}(z, y)$. Let $f(v; a'_1, a_1^{k-2}, a_4) = a'_4$. By applying f on $L(Y[v, x])[a'_1, a], L(Y[v, x])[a_1, a], L(Y[v, x])[a_1, b], L(Y[v, z])[a_1, e], L(Y[v, z])[a_4, e], L(Y[v, z])[a'_1, t], L(Y[v, y])[a'_1, c], L(Y[v, y])[a_1, c], L(Y[v, x])[a_4, d]$, we conclude that $(a'_4, b) \in L(v, x)$, $(a'_4, d) \in L(v, y)$, $(a'_4, t) \in L(v, z)$, and hence, $(t, d) \in L_{x,b}(y, z)$. By symmetry, when $(b, a'_2) \in L(x, v)$, $(a'_2, c) \in L(v, y)$, and $(a'_2, r) \in L(v, z)$, then there exists $a'_3 \in L(v)$ such that $(a, a'_3) \in L(x, v)$, $(a'_3, b) \in L(v, y)$, and $(a'_3, r) \in L(v, z)$. We also observe that if $(a_3, e) \in L(v, z)$ then by rectangle property we have $(a_1, l), (a_2, e), (a_4, l) \in L(v, z)$ and now it is easy to see that $L_{x,a}(y, z) = L_{x,b}(y, z)$ and (1) holds. Thus we assume that $(a_3, e) \notin L(y, z)$ and it also follows that $(a_2, e), (a_1, l), (a_4, l) \notin L(v, z)$. Since, the choice of a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are arbitrary, it is easy to see that $L_{x,a}(y, z) \cap L_{x,b}(y, z) = \emptyset$.



Proof of 3. Suppose none of the (2,3) occurs. Let $y, z \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$, and let Y be an oriented path from x to y in $G_{a,b}^{L,x}$ and Z be an oriented path from x to z . Let v be a vertex in the intersection of Z, Y . Consider vertices $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in L(v)$ such that $(a, a_1), (a, a_3), (b, a_2), (b, a_4) \in L(x, v)$ and $(a_1, c), (a_2, c), (a_3, d), (a_4, d) \in L(v, y)$. First assume that there exist $e, l \in L(z)$ such that $(a_1, e), (a_4, e) \in L(v, z)$, and $(a_2, l), (a_3, l) \in L(v, z)$. In this case, we have $(e, c), (l, d) \in L_{x,a}(y, z)$, and $(e, d), (l, c) \in L_{x,b}(y, z)$. We may assume that $L_{x,a}(y, z), L_{x,b}(y, z)$ has an intersection. Without loss of generality, assume that there exists some $a_5 \in L_{x,b}(v)$ such that $(a_5, e) \in L_{x,b}(v, y)$, $(a_5, c) \in L_{x,b}(v, y)$, and $(e, c) \in L_{x,b}(z, y)$ (see Figure 16).




Figure 16: Finding a non minority pair .

Let $a_6 = f(v; a_1, a_5^{k-2}, a_4)$. Notice that by applying f on $Y[x, y]$, and $L(Y[x, y])$, starting at $(x; a^k, b)$ to $(v; a_1, a_5^{k-2}, a_4)$, we conclude that there is a path in $L(Y[x, v])$ from a to a_6 . Moreover, by applying f on $Y[v, z]$, and $L(Y[v, z])$, starting at $(x; a_1, a_5^{k-2}, a_4)$ to $(z; e^k)$, we conclude that there is a path in $L(Y[v, z])$ from a_6 to e so $(a_6, e) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$. Finally, by applying the f on $Y[v, y]$, $L(Y[v, y])$, we would get a path in $L(Y[v, y])$ from a_6 to $f(y; c^k, d)$. If $(a_6, d) \notin L(v, y)$, then (c, d) is not a minority pair, and hence, $w = z$, and $(b_1, b_2) = (c, d)$. Notice that if there exists at least one $a_6 \in L(v)$ so that $(a_6, e) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$, $(a, a_6) \in L_{x,a}(x, v)$, $(a_6, d) \in L_{x,a}(v, y)$ then we can't conclude that (c, d) is not a minority pair. So we may assume such a_6 exists, and we continue. Let $a_7 = f(v; a_3, a_6^{k-2}, a_1)$. Notice that since f is a polymorphism, $(a, a_7) \in L_{x,a}(x, v)$. Now if $(a_7, c) \notin L_{x,a}(v, y)$ then $f(x; d^k, c) \neq c$, and hence, (d, c) is not a minority pair, and we set $w = y$, and $(b_1, b_2) = (d, c)$. Thus, we continue by assuming $(a_7, c) \in L_{x,a}(v, y)$. Now by following, f on $Z[v, z]$, $L(Z[v, z])$ we conclude that $(a_7, f(v; e^k, l)) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$. Therefore, if $(a_7, l) \notin L_{x,a}(z, v)$ then (e, l) is not a minority pair and we can set $w = z$, and $(b_1, b_2) = (e, l)$. Thus, we continue by assuming that $(a_7, l) \in L_{x,a}(v, z)$, and hence, $(l, c) \in L_{x,a}(z, y) \cap L_{x,b}(z, y)$.

Next, let $f(v; a_2, a_5^k, a_4) = a_8$. Now by applying f , we conclude that $(b, a_8) \in L(x, v)$. By following, f on $Z[v, z]$, $L(Z[v, z])$ we conclude that $(a_8, l) \in L_{x,b}(v, z)$, otherwise, (e, l) is not minority pair and we are done. By following, f on $Z[v, y]$, $L(Y[v, y])$, we conclude that $(a_8, d) \in L_{x,b}(v, y)$, otherwise, (c, d) is not a minority pair. Therefore, $(l, d) \in L_{x,a}(z, y) \cap L_{x,b}(z, y)$. Since a_5 was an arbitrary vertex, we conclude that $L_{x,a}(y, z) = L_{x,b}(y, z)$, a contradiction to our assumption. The argument when $(a_1, e), (a_2, e) \in L(v, z)$ and $(a_3, l), (a_4, l) \in L(v, z)$ is similar. Note that when one of the (1,2) occurs on $B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and (3) does happened and (3) does not happened then it is not difficult that we can assume that for every $y \in B(G_{a,b}^{L,x})$ and every $c_1, c_2 \in L_{x,a}(y)$, (c_1, c_2) is a minority pair. \diamond

Lemma 5.8 *The Algorithm 3 correctly finds a homomorphism from G to H if one exists, and runs in polynomial time of $|G||H|$ and a polynomial of $|\mathcal{H}|$.*

Proof: The correctness of the algorithm follows from the correctness of the Algorithm 2 and the algorithm in [38]. Moreover, as we argue in the text before the algorithm, Lemma 5.6, and Lemma 5.7 justify the way we handle the minority pairs. The Algorithm in [38] and Algorithm 2 are

polynomial of $(poly(|G|) * poly(|H|))$. By the construction of G, H, L , the size of each list L is a polynomial of \mathcal{H} . Therefore, it is not difficult to see that the Algorithm 3 runs in polynomial of $|\mathcal{H}|$. \diamond

6 Experiment

We have implemented our algorithm and have tested it on some inputs. The instances are mainly constructed according to the construction in subsection 3.1.






Figure 17: Oriented paths of height 7

1	Graph G		
	VERTICES	178	
	EDGES	180	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	198	
	EDGES	205	
Running Time		Relation H 00010 01100 10100 11010 22220	
2.66 SECONDS			

2	Graph G		
	VERTICES	178	
	EDGES	180	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	198	
	EDGES	205	
Running Time		Relation H 00010 01100 10100 11010 22220	
2.73 SECONDS			



3	Graph G		
	VERTICES	387	
	EDGES	392	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	198	
	EDGES	205	
Running Time		Relation H 00010 01100 10100 11010 22220	
42.16 SECONDS			

Figure 18: H is constructed from a relation of 5-tuples and of arity 5. G is constructed from a bipartite graph where each edge in G is replaced by one of the oriented paths depicted in Figure 17.

4	<i>Graph G</i>		
	VERTICES	178	
	EDGES	180	
	<i>Graph H</i>		
	VERTICES	789	
	EDGES	828	
<i>Running Time</i>			
<u>31.36 SECONDS</u>			

Relation H		
1 1 2 4 2	2 4 5 3 3	1 5 2 1 5
1 1 2 3 2	1 1 2 1 2	1 1 2 3 3
1 1 2 1 3	1 5 2 1 3	1 4 2 1 3


5	*Graph G*		
VERTICES	387		
EDGES	392		
Graph H			
VERTICES	789		
EDGES	828		
Running Time			
405.65 SECONDS			

Relation H		
1 1 2 4 2	2 4 5 3 3	1 5 2 1 5
1 1 2 3 2	1 1 2 1 2	1 1 2 3 3
1 1 2 1 3	1 5 2 1 3	1 4 2 1 3

6	*Graph G*		Relation G 0 6 1 3 2 8 1 3 4 2 7 4 5 9 10 0 10 4 1 7 Relation H 0 4 1 1 2 0 1 1 1 2 1 1 0 0 2 0 3 1 1 2 0 3 1 1 2 3 1 5 3 3 1 3 0 0 2 0 1 1 1 3 1 3 0 0 3 1 1 0 0 3
VERTICES	679		
EDGES	708		
Graph H			
VERTICES	876		
EDGES	920		
Running Time			
256.52 SECONDS			

Figure 19: First two H digraphs constructed by a relation of 9-tuples and of arity 5 (which is closed under a semmi-lattice block Maltsev polymorphism, 01, 23, 45). The first two G digraphs constructed from bipartite graphs by replacing their edges with oriented paths. The last instance, G and H are constructed from two relations according to the construction in Subsection 3.1

7	Graph G		<div>Relation G</div> <div>0 6 1 3 2 8 1 3 4 2 7 4 5 9 10 0 10 4 1 7 8 9 4 1 2</div> <div>Relation H</div> <div>0 4 1 1 2 3 1 5 3 3 0 1 1 1 2 1 3 0 0 2 1 1 0 0 2 0 1 1 1 3 0 3 1 1 2 1 3 0 0 3 0 3 1 1 2 1 1 0 0 3</div>
	VERTICES	846	
	EDGES	885	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	876	
	EDGES	920	
Running Time			
500.40 SECONDS			

8	Graph G		<div></div> <div>Relation H</div> <div>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 2 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 2 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 2 2 2 2 2 0 2 2 2 2 1</div>
	VERTICES	178	
	EDGES	180	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	549	
	EDGES	574	
Running Time			
46.69 SECONDS			


9	Graph G		<div></div> <div>Relation H</div> <div>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 2 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 2 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 2 2 2 2 2 0 2 2 2 2 1</div>
	VERTICES	387	
	EDGES	392	
	Graph H		
	VERTICES	549	
	EDGES	574	
Running Time			
636.02 SECONDS			

Figure 20: In the first instance, G and H are constructed from two relations according to the construction in Subsection 3.1. In the last two instances, H is based on relation of 14-tuples and arity 5. G is constructed from a bipartite graph using the oriented paths depicted in Figure 17.

10	<i>Graph G</i>		<i>Graph H</i>	
	VERTICES	50	VERTICES	10800
	EDGES	1850	EDGES	38071800
	NUMBER OF TUPLES	50	NUMBER OF TUPLES	216
	ARITY OF RELATION	4	ARITY OF RELATION	4
	ALPHABET OF RELATION	15	ALPHABET OF RELATION	6
	<i>Running Time</i>	<u>292.22 SECONDS</u>		
11	<i>Graph G</i>		<i>Graph H</i>	
	VERTICES	100	VERTICES	12500
	EDGES	6192	EDGES	73311500
	NUMBER OF TUPLES	100	NUMBER OF TUPLES	125
	ARITY OF RELATION	4	ARITY OF RELATION	4
	ALPHABET OF RELATION	20	ALPHABET OF RELATION	5
	<i>Running Time</i>	<u>184.69 SECONDS</u>		
12	<i>Graph G</i>		<i>Graph H</i>	
	VERTICES	400	VERTICES	20000
	EDGES	99826	EDGES	193050572
	NUMBER OF TUPLES	400	NUMBER OF TUPLES	50
	ARITY OF RELATION	4	ARITY OF RELATION	4
	ALPHABET OF RELATION	20	ALPHABET OF RELATION	5
	<i>Running Time</i>	<u>103.42 SECONDS</u>		
13	<i>Graph G</i>		<i>Graph H</i>	
	VERTICES	750	VERTICES	37500
	EDGES	350672	EDGES	680731180
	NUMBER OF TUPLES	750	NUMBER OF TUPLES	50
	ARITY OF RELATION	4	ARITY OF RELATION	4
	ALPHABET OF RELATION	20	ALPHABET OF RELATION	5
	<i>Running Time</i>	<u>550.48 SECONDS</u>		

Figure 21: The examples constructed from random relations G and random target relations H . The H relations are closed under a weak NU polymorphisms of arity 3 which are not semilattice-block-Maltsev.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Víctor Dalmau, Ross Willard, Pavol Hell, and Akbar Rafiey for so many helpful discussions and useful comments.

References

- [1] E. Allender, M. Bauland, N. Immerman, H. Schnoor, and H. Vollmer. The complexity of satisfiability problems: refining schaefer’s theorem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 75(4): 245–254 (2009).
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, P. Hell, and G. MacGillivray. The complexity of colouring by semicomplete digraphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 1 : 281–298, 1988.
- [3] J. Bang-Jensen and P. Hell. The effect of two cycles on the complexity of colourings by directed graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 26 : 1–23, 1990.
- [4] L. Barto, M. Kozik, and T. Niven. The CSP dichotomy holds for digraphs with no sources and no sinks (a Positive answer to a conjecture of Bang-Jensen and Hell). *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(5) : 1782–1802, 2009.
- [5] R. Brewster, T. Feder, P. Hell, J. Huang, and G. MacGillivray. Near-unanimity functions and varieties of reflexive graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 22(3) :938–960, 2008.
- [6] L. Barto, A. Krokhin, and R. Willard. Polymorphisms, and how to use them. *Dagstuhl Follow-Ups*, 7, Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- [7] A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraints on a three-elements sets. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1): 66–120, 2006.
- [8] A. Bulatov. Complexity of conservative constraint satisfaction problem. *Journal of ACM Trans. Comput. Logic*, 12(4) : 24–66, 2011.
- [9] A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniforms CSPs. In *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS* 319–330, 2017.
- [10] A. Bulatov and V. Dalmau. A simple algorithm for Maltsev constraint. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(1): 16–27, 2006.
- [11] A. Bulatov, P. Jeavons, and A. Krokhin. Classifying the complexity of constraint using finite algebras. *SIAM journal on computing*, 34(3): 720–742, 2005.
- [12] J.Y. Cai, X. Chen, and P. Lu. Graph homomorphisms with complex values: A dichotomy theorem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(3): 924–1029, 2013.
- [13] C. Carvalho, V. Dalmau, and A. Krokhin. CSP duality and trees of bounded pathwidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(34–36): 3188–3208, 2010.
- [14] H. Chen, B. Larose. Asking the metaquestions in constraint tractability. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 9 (3), 2017.
- [15] N. Creignou, S. Khanna, and M. Sudan. Complexity classifications of boolean constraint satisfaction problems. *SIAM Monographs on Discrete Math. and Applications*, vol. 7, 2001.
- [16] P. Csikvári and Z. Lin. Graph homomorphisms between trees. *Elec. J. Combin.*, 21 : 4–9 ,2014.
- [17] R. Dechter. Constraint networks. *Encyclopedia of Artificial Intelligence* 276–285 , 1992.
- [18] V. Dalmau. A new tractable class of constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings 6th International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics*, 2000.

- [19] V. Dalmau, D. Ford. Generalized satisfiability with k occurrences per variable: A study through delta-matroid parity. In *Proceedings of MFCS 2003, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2747 : 358–367, 2003.
- [20] L.Egri, P.Hell, B.Larose, and A.Rafiey. Space complexity of list H-coloring : a dichotomy. In *Proceedings of SODA*, 2014.
- [21] T. Feder. Homomorphisms to oriented cycles and k -partite satisfiability. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 14 : 471–480, 2001.
- [22] T. Feder A dichotomy theorem on fixed points of several nonexpansive mappings. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 20 : 291–301, 2006.
- [23] T. Feder and P. Hell. List homomorphisms to reflexive graphs. *J. Comb. Theory Ser.*, B 72 : 236–250, 1998.
- [24] T.Feder, P.Hell, and J.Huang. Bi-arc graphs and the complexity of list homomorphisms. *J. Graph Theory*, 42 : 61–80, 1999.
- [25] T. Feder, P. Hell, J. Huang. List homomorphisms and circular arc graphs. *Combinatorica*, 19 : 487–505 (1999).
- [26] T. Feder, P. Hell, and J. Huang. Bi-arc graphs and the complexity of list homomorphisms. *J. Graph Theory*, 42 : 61–80 ,2003.
- [27] T. Feder, P. Hell, B. Larose, C. Loten, M. Siggers, C. Tardif. Graphs admitting k-NU operations. Part 1: The reflexive case. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27 (4) : 1940–1963 (2013).
- [28] T. Feder, F. Madelaine, and I.A. Stewart. Dichotomies for classes of homomorphism problems involving unary functions. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 314 : 1–43, 2004.
- [29] T.Feder and M.Vardi. Monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction. In *Proceedings of STOC*, 612–622, 1993.
- [30] T. Feder and M.Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP constraint satisfaction: A study through Datalog and group theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1): 57–104, 1998.
- [31] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. On the complexity of H -colouring. *J. Combin. Theory B*, 48 : 92–110, 1990.
- [32] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. *Graphs and Homomorphisms*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [33] P.Hell and J.Nešetřil. Colouring, constraint satisfaction, and complexity. *Computer Science Review* , 2(3): 143–163, 2008.
- [34] P.Hell, A.Rafiey, A.Rafiey. Bi-arc digraphs and conservative polymorphisms. *CoRR*, arxiv.org/abs/1608.03368v5, 2020.
- [35] P.Hell and A.Rafiey. The dichotomy of list homomorphisms for digraphs. In *Proceedings of SODA* 1703–1713, 2011.
- [36] P. Hell and A. Rafiey. The dichotomy of minimum cost homomorphism problems for digraphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 26(4): 1597–1608, 2012.
- [37] A. Kazda. Maltsev digraphs have a majority polymorphism. *Eur. J. Comb*, 32(3): 390-397, 2011.
- [38] J. Kinne, A. Murali, and A. Rafiey. Digraphs homomorphism problems with Maltsev condition. *CoRR*, arxiv.org/abs/2008.09921, 2020.

- [39] L.G. Kroon, A. Sen, H. Deng, A. Roy. The optimal cost chromatic partition problem for trees and interval graphs. In *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (Cadenabbia, 1996)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 1197 : 279–292, 1997.
- [40] V. Kumar. Algorithms for constraint-satisfaction problems. *AI Magazine*, 13 :32–44, 1992.
- [41] P. Jeavons. On the algebraic structure of combinatorial problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 200(1-2): 185-204 , 1998.
- [42] R. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 22(1): 155–171, 1975.
- [43] B. Larose, L. Zádori. The complexity of the extendibility problem for finite posets. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 17 : 114–121, 2003.
- [44] M. Maroti, and R. McKenzie. Existence theorems for weakly symmetric operations. *Algebra Universalis*, 59 : 463–489, 2008.
- [45] T.J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of STOC*, 216–226 (1978).
- [46] M.H.Siggers. A new proof of the H-coloring dichotomy. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 23 (4) : 2204–2210, 2010.
- [47] M.H.Siggers. A strong Maltsev condition for locally finite varieties omitting the unary type. *Algebra universalis*, 64(1-2):15–20, 2010.
- [48] M.Y. Vardi. Constraint satisfaction and database theory: a tutorial. *Proceedings of the 19th Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, 76–85, 2000.
- [49] R.Willard. Refuting Feder, Kinne, and Rafiey. In *CoRR*, [arXiv:1707.09440](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.09440)v1, 2017.
- [50] D.Zhuk. A proof of CSPs conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS* 331–342, 2017.