

A modification of the CSP algorithm for infinite languages

Dmitriy Zhuk

Department of Mechanics and Mathematics
Moscow State University
Moscow, Russia

Abstract

Constraint Satisfaction Problem on finite sets is known to be NP-complete in general but certain restrictions on the constraint language can ensure tractability. It was proved [4, 18] that if a constraint language has a weak near unanimity polymorphism then the corresponding constraint satisfaction problem is tractable, otherwise it is NP-complete. In the paper we present a modification of the algorithm from [18] that works in polynomial time even for infinite constraint languages.

1 Introduction

Formally, the *Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP)* is defined as a triple $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C} \rangle$, where

- $\mathbf{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a set of variables,
- $\mathbf{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$ is a set of the respective domains,
- $\mathbf{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ is a set of constraints,

where each variable x_i can take on values in the nonempty domain D_i , every *constraint* $C_j \in \mathbf{C}$ is a pair (t_j, ρ_j) where t_j is a tuple of variables of length m_j , called the *constraint scope*, and ρ_j is an m_j -ary relation on the corresponding domains, called the *constraint relation*.

The question is whether there exists a *solution* to $\langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C} \rangle$, that is a mapping that assigns a value from D_i to every variable x_i such that for each constraints C_j the image of the constraint scope is a member of the constraint relation.

In this paper we consider only CSP over finite domains. The general CSP is known to be NP-complete [11, 13]; however, certain restrictions on the allowed form of constraints involved may ensure tractability (solvable in polynomial time) [6, 8, 9, 10, 3, 5]. Below we provide a formalization to this idea.

To simplify the presentation we assume that all the domains D_1, \dots, D_n are subsets of a finite set A . By R_A we denote the set of all finitary relations on A , that is, subsets of A^m for some m . Then all constraint relations can be viewed as relations from R_A .

For a set of relations $\Gamma \subseteq R_A$ by $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ we denote the Constraint Satisfaction Problem where all the constraint relations are from Γ . The set Γ is called a *constraint language*. Another way to formalize the Constraint Satisfaction Problem is via conjunctive formulas. Every h -ary relation on A can be viewed as a predicate, that is, a mapping $A^h \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Suppose $\Gamma \subseteq R_A$, then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is the following decision problem: given a formula

$$\rho_1(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n_1}) \wedge \dots \wedge \rho_s(x_{s,1}, \dots, x_{1,n_s})$$

where $\rho_i \in \Gamma$ for every i ; decide whether this formula is satisfiable.

It is well known that many combinatorial problems can be expressed as $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for some constraint language Γ . Moreover, for some sets Γ the corresponding decision problem can be solved in polynomial time; while for others it is NP-complete. It was conjectured that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is either in P, or NP-complete [7].

An operation f is called *idempotent* if $f(x, x, \dots, x) = x$. An operation f is called a *weak near-unanimity operation (WNU)* if $f(y, x, \dots, x) = f(x, y, x, \dots, x) = \dots = f(x, x, \dots, x, y)$.

In the paper we present a modification of the algorithm from [18] that works in polynomial time for infinite constraint languages and therefore prove CSP dichotomy conjecture for infinite constraint languages.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $\Gamma \subseteq R_A$ is a set of relations. Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be solved in polynomial time if there exists a WNU preserving Γ ; $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is NP-complete otherwise.*

Note that the algorithm presented in [4] also works for infinite constraint languages.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give all necessary definitions, in Section 3 we explain the algorithm starting with the new ideas. In Section 4 we prove statements that show the correctness of the algorithm.

2 Definitions

A set of operations is called a *clone* if it is closed under composition and contains all projections. For a set of operations M by $\text{Clo}(M)$ we denote the clone generated by M .

An idempotent WNU w is called *special* if $x \circ (x \circ y) = x \circ y$, where $x \circ y = w(x, \dots, x, y)$. It is not hard to show that for any idempotent WNU w on a finite set there exists a special WNU $w' \in \text{Clo}(w)$ (see Lemma 4.7 in [12]).

A relation $\rho \subseteq A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ is called *subdirect* if for every i the projection of ρ onto the i -th coordinate is A_i . For a relation ρ by $\text{pr}_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\rho)$ we denote the projection of ρ onto the coordinates i_1, \dots, i_s .

Algebras. An *algebra* is a pair $\mathbf{A} := (A; F)$, where A is a finite set, called *universe*, and F is a family of operations on A , called *basic operations of \mathbf{A}* . In the paper we always assume that we have a special WNU preserving all constraint relations. Therefore, every domain D can be viewed as an algebra $(D; w)$. By $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ we denote the clone generated by all basic operations of \mathbf{A} .

Congruences. An equivalence relation σ on the universe of an algebra \mathbf{A} is called a *congruence* if it is preserved by every operation of the algebra. A congruence (an equivalence relation) is called *proper*, if it is not equal to the full relation $A \times A$. We use standard universal algebraic notions of term operation, subalgebra, factor algebra, product of algebras, see [2]. We say that a subalgebra $\mathbf{R} = (R; F_R)$ is a *subdirect subalgebra* of $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ if R is a subdirect relation in $A \times B$.

We say that the i -th variable of a relation ρ is *compatible with an equivalence relation σ* if $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$ and $(a_i, b_i) \in \sigma$ implies $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$. We say that a relation is *compatible with σ* if every variable of this relation is compatible with σ .

For a relation ρ by $\text{Con}(\rho, i)$ we denote the binary relation $\sigma(y, y')$ defined by

$$\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_{i-1} \exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_n \rho(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \wedge \rho(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y', x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n).$$

For a constraint $C = ((x_1, \dots, x_n), \rho)$, by $\text{Con}(C, x_i)$ we denote $\text{Con}(\rho, i)$.

Essential and critical relations. A relation ρ is called *essential* if it cannot be represented as a conjunction of relations with smaller arities. It is easy to see that any relation ρ

can be represented as a conjunction of essential relations. A relation $\rho \subseteq A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$ is called *critical* if it cannot be represented as an intersection of other subalgebras of $\mathbf{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbf{A}_n$ and it has no dummy variables.

A tuple (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) is called *essential for an n -ary relation ρ* if $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \notin \rho$ and there exist b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n such that $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

It is not hard to check the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. [15, 16, 17] *Suppose $\rho \subseteq A^n$, where $n \geq 1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. ρ is an essential relation;
2. there exists an essential tuple for ρ .

Parallelogram property. We say that a relation ρ has the *parallelogram property* if any permutation of its variables gives a relation ρ' satisfying

$$\forall \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2: (\alpha_1\beta_2, \beta_1\alpha_2, \beta_1\beta_2 \in \rho' \Rightarrow \alpha_1\alpha_2 \in \rho').$$

We say that *the i -th variable of a relation ρ is rectangular* if for every $(a_i, b_i) \in \text{Con}(\rho, i)$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$ we have $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$. We say that a relation is *rectangular* if all of its variables are rectangular. The following facts can be easily seen: if the i -th variable of ρ is rectangular then $\text{Con}(\rho, i)$ is a congruence; if a relation has the parallelogram property then it is rectangular.

Polynomially complete algebras. An algebra $(A; F_A)$ is called *polynomially complete (PC)* if the clone generated by F_A and all constants on A is the clone of all operations on A .

Linear algebra. A finite algebra $(A; w_A)$ is called *linear* if it is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_s}; x_1 + \dots + x_n)$ for prime numbers p_1, \dots, p_s . It is not hard to show that for every algebra $(B; w_B)$ there exists a minimal congruence σ , called *the minimal linear congruence*, such that $(B; w_B)/\sigma$ is linear.

Absorption. Let $\mathbf{B} = (B; F_B)$ be a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A} = (A; F_A)$. We say that B absorbs A if there exists $t \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ such that $t(B, B, \dots, B, A, B, \dots, B) \subseteq B$ for any position of A . In this case we also say that B is an absorbing subuniverse of \mathbf{A} . If the operation t can be chosen binary or ternary then B is called a *binary or ternary absorbing subuniverse* of \mathbf{A} .

Center. Suppose $\mathbf{A} = (A; w_A)$ is a finite algebra with a special WNU operation. $C \subseteq A$ is called a *center* if there exists an algebra $\mathbf{B} = (B; w_B)$ with a special WNU operation of the same arity and a subdirect subalgebra $(R; w_R)$ of $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ such that there is no binary absorbing subuniverse in \mathbf{B} and $C = \{a \in A \mid \forall b \in B: (a, b) \in R\}$.

CSP instance. An instance of the constraint satisfaction problem is called a *CSP instance*. Sometimes we use the same letter for a CSP instance and for the set of all constraints of this instance. For a variable z by D_z we denote the domain of the variable z .

We say that $z_1 - C_1 - z_2 - \cdots - C_{l-1} - z_l$ is a *path* in Θ if z_i, z_{i+1} are in the scope of C_i for every i . We say that a path $z_1 - C_1 - z_2 - \dots - C_{l-1} - z_l$ connects b and c if there exists $a_i \in D_{z_i}$ for every i such that $a_1 = b$, $a_l = c$, and the projection of C_i onto z_i, z_{i+1} contains the tuple (a_i, a_{i+1}) .

A CSP instance is called *1-consistent* if every constraint of the instance is subdirect. A CSP instance is called *cycle-consistent* if for every variable z and $a \in D_z$ any path starting and ending with z in Θ connects a and a . A CSP instance Θ is called *linked* if for every variable z appearing in Θ and every $a, b \in D_z$ there exists a path starting and ending with z in Θ that connects a and b .

Suppose $\mathbf{X}' \subseteq \mathbf{X}$. Then we can define a projection of Θ onto \mathbf{X}' , that is a CSP instance where variables are elements of \mathbf{X}' and constraints are projections of the constraints of Θ

onto \mathbf{X}' . We say that an instance Θ is *fragmented* if the set of variables \mathbf{X} can be divided into 2 nonempty disjoint sets \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 such that the constraint scope of any constraint of Θ either has variables only from \mathbf{X}_1 , or only from \mathbf{X}_2 .

A CSP instance Θ is called *irreducible* if any instance Θ' such that every constraint of Θ' is a projection of a constraint from Θ on some set of variables is fragmented, linked, or its solution set is subdirect.

Weaker constraints. We say that a constraint $((y_1, \dots, y_t), \rho_1)$ is *weaker than* a constraint $((z_1, \dots, z_s), \rho_2)$ if $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\} \subseteq \{z_1, \dots, z_s\}$, $\rho_2(z_1, \dots, z_s) \rightarrow \rho_1(y_1, \dots, y_t)$, and, additionally, $\rho_1(y_1, \dots, y_t) \not\rightarrow \rho_2(z_1, \dots, z_s)$ or $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\} \neq \{z_1, \dots, z_s\}$. Suppose $((y_1, \dots, y_t), \rho)$ is a constraint and $\rho'(y_1, \dots, y_t) = \exists z \rho(z, y_2, \dots, y_t) \wedge \sigma(z, y_1)$, where σ is a minimal congruence such that $\sigma \supsetneq \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$. Then $((y_1, \dots, y_t), \rho')$ is called a *congruence-weakened constraint*.

Minimal linear reduction. Suppose the domain set of the instance Θ is $D = (D_1, \dots, D_n)$. The domain set $D^{(1)} = (D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ is called a *minimal linear reduction* if $D_i^{(1)}$ is an equivalence class of the minimal linear congruence of D_i for every i . The reduction $D^{(1)} = (D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ is called *1-consistent* if the instance obtained after the reduction of every domain is 1-consistent.

Crucial instances. Let $D_i^{(1)} \subseteq D_i$ for every i . A constraint C of Θ is called *crucial in* $(D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ if Θ has no solutions in $(D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ but the replacement of $C \in \Theta$ by all weaker constraints gives an instance with a solution in $(D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$. A CSP instance Θ is called *crucial in* $(D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ if every constraint of Θ is crucial in $(D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$. To simplify, instead of “crucial in (D_1, \dots, D_n) ” we say “crucial”

3 Algorithm

In this section we present a modified algorithm from [18]. The main problem that does not allow to use the original algorithm for infinite languages is in Steps 3 and 11, where we replace a constraint by all weaker constraints. If Γ is infinite, we do not have a polynomial upper bound on the number of such replacements. To fix this problem, instead of replacing a constraint by all weaker constraints we replace it by all congruence-weakened constraints. Moreover, to restrict the depth of the recursion we additionally transform our instance to ensure that all the constraint relations are essential relations with the parallelogram property.

We start with the new procedures, then we explain auxiliary procedures from [18], and finish with the modified main part of the algorithm.

We have made only the following modifications of the algorithm.

1. We added Step 3 to work only with essential relations. This property is important because, by Lemma 4.1, any essential relation preserved by an idempotent WNU operation has exponentially many tuples.
2. We added Step 4 to ensure that every relation has the parallelogram property.
3. We added Step 5 to ensure that $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is an irreducible congruence for every constraint relation ρ .
4. We changed Step 6 (Step 3 in [18]). Instead of replacing every constraint by all weaker constraints we replace it by all congruence-weakened constraints, and therefore we increase the congruence $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ for every constraint relation ρ .
5. Similarly, we replaced Step 11 in [18] by Steps 13 and 14. In Step 13, instead of replacing a constraint by all weaker constraints we replace it by all congruence-weakened

constraints. In Step 14, we try to replace a constraint by all projections onto all variables but one appearing in the constraint.

6. Instead of considering a center we consider a ternary absorption, thus we replace Steps 4 and 5 in [18] by Step 7.

3.1 New parts

Finding an appropriate projection. Suppose $\rho \subseteq A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$, $\alpha = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \notin \rho$. Here we explain how to find a minimal subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\text{pr}_I(\alpha) \notin \text{pr}_I(\rho)$. Note that $\text{pr}_I(\rho)$ is always an essential relation.

1. Put $I := \emptyset$.
2. Put $k := 1$.
3. While $\text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \cup I}(\alpha) \in \text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \cup I}(\rho)$ do $k := k + 1$.
4. Put $I := I \cup \{k\}$
5. If $\text{pr}_I(\alpha) \in \text{pr}_I(\rho)$, go to step 2.

Essential Representation. Suppose $\rho \subseteq A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$. An essential representation of ρ is the following formula

$$\rho(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \delta_1(z_{1,1}, \dots, z_{1,n_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \delta_s(z_{s,1}, \dots, z_{s,n_s}),$$

where δ_i is an essential relation from Γ , $z_{i,j} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, $z_{i,j} \neq z_{i,k}$ for every i and $j \neq k$. Below we explain how to find a set $G = \{I_1, \dots, I_s\}$, where $I_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ for every i , such that $\text{pr}_{I_1}(\rho), \dots, \text{pr}_{I_s}(\rho)$ form an essential representation of ρ . To guarantee this property we require that every $\text{pr}_{I_i}(\rho)$ is essential and for every $\alpha \in (A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n) \setminus \rho$ there exists i such that $\alpha \notin \text{pr}_{I_i}(\rho)$.

1. Put $G := \emptyset$.
2. Choose a tuple $\alpha = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \notin \rho$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, b_n) \in \rho$ for some b_n (we have at most $|\rho| \cdot |A_n|$ such tuples).
3. Find a minimal subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\text{pr}_I(\alpha) \notin \text{pr}_I(\rho)$. Put $G := G \cup \{I\}$.
4. Go to the next tuple in 2).
5. Put $\rho' = \text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, n-1\}}(\rho)$.
6. By recursive call we calculate the essential representation G' corresponding to ρ' .
7. Put $G := G' \cup G$.
8. Remove from G all sets that are not maximal in G by inclusion.

Note that the obtained essential representation of an essential relation consists of the original relation. Therefore, the above procedure can also be used to check whether a relation is essential.

Providing the Parallelogram Property. In this section we explain how to find the minimal relation $\rho' \supseteq \rho$ having the parallelogram property. We say that tuples $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$

form a rectangle if there exists $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\text{pr}_I(\alpha_1) = \text{pr}_I(\alpha_2)$, $\text{pr}_I(\alpha_3) = \text{pr}_I(\alpha_4)$, $\text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I}(\alpha_1) = \text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I}(\alpha_3)$, $\text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I}(\alpha_2) = \text{pr}_{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I}(\alpha_4)$. To find the minimal relation with the parallelogram property it is sufficient to close the relation under adding the forth tuple of a rectangle. This can be done in the following way.

For each $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \rho$.

1. Put $I_1 := \{i \mid \alpha_1(i) = \alpha_2(i)\}$, $I_2 := \{i \mid \alpha_1(i) = \alpha_3(i)\}$.
2. If $I_1 \cup I_2 = \{1, \dots, n\}$ then find the forth tuple α_4 of the corresponding rectangle.
3. If $\alpha_4 \notin \rho$, add α_4 to ρ .

By Lemma 4.1, every essential relation has exponentially many tuples, therefore, this procedure works in polynomial time on the size of ρ if ρ is an essential.

3.2 Cycle-consistency, non-linked instances, and irreducibility

Provide cycle-consistency. To provide cycle-consistency it is sufficient to use constraint propagation providing (2,3)-consistency. Formally, it can be done in the following way. First, for every pair of variables (x_i, x_j) we consider the intersections of projections of all constraints onto these variables. The corresponding relation we denote by $\rho_{i,j}$. For every $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we replace $\rho_{i,j}$ by $\rho'_{i,j}$ where $\rho'_{i,j}(x, y) = \exists z \rho_{i,j}(x, y) \wedge \rho_{i,k}(x, z) \wedge \rho_{k,j}(z, y)$. It is not hard to see that this replacement does not change the solution set.

We repeat this procedure while we can change some $\rho_{i,j}$. If at some moment we get a relation $\rho_{i,j}$ that is not subdirect in $D_i \times D_j$, then we can either reduce D_i or D_j , or, if $\rho_{i,j}$ is empty, state that there are no solutions. If we cannot change any relation $\rho_{i,j}$ and every $\rho_{i,j}$ is subdirect in $D_i \times D_j$, then the original CSP instance is cycle-consistent.

Solve the instance that is not linked. Suppose the instance Θ is not linked and not fragmented, then it can be solved in the following way. We say that an element $d_i \in D_i$ and an element $d_j \in D_j$ are *linked* if there exists a path that connects d_i and d_j . Let P be the set of pairs $(i; a)$ such that $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $a \in D_i$. Then P can be divided into the linked components.

It is easy to see that it is sufficient to solve the problem for every linked component and join the results. Precisely, for a linked component by D'_i we denote the set of all elements d such that (i, d) is in the component. It is easy to see that $\emptyset \subsetneq D'_i \subsetneq D_i$ for every i . Therefore, the reduction to (D'_1, \dots, D'_n) is a CSP instance on smaller domains.

Check irreducibility. For every $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and every maximal congruence σ_k on D_k we do the following.

1. Put $I = \{k\}$.
2. Choose a constraint C having the variable x_i in the scope for some $i \in I$, choose another variable x_j from the scope such that $j \notin I$.
3. Denote the projection of C onto (x_i, x_j) by δ .
4. Put $\sigma_j(x, y) = \exists x' \exists y' \delta(x', x) \wedge \delta(y', y) \wedge \sigma_i(x', y')$. If σ_j is a proper equivalence relation, then add j to I .
5. go to the next C , x_i , and x_j in 2.

As a result we get a set I and a congruence σ_i on D_i for every $i \in I$. Put $\mathbf{X}' = \{x_i \mid i \in I\}$. It follows from the construction that for every equivalence class E_k of σ_k and every $i \in I$ there exists a unique equivalence class E_i of σ_i such that there can be a solution with $x_k \in E_k$ and $x_i \in E_i$. Thus, for every equivalence class of σ_k we have a reduction to the instance on smaller domains. Then for every i and $a \in E_i$ we consider the corresponding reduction and check whether there exists a solution with $x_i = a$.

Thus, we can check whether the solution set of the projection of the instance onto \mathbf{X}' is subdirect or empty. If it is empty then we state that there are no solutions. If it is not subdirect, then we can reduce the corresponding domain. If it is subdirect, then we go to the next $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and next maximal congruence σ_k on D_k , and repeat the procedure.

3.3 Main part

In this section we provide an algorithm that solves $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ in polynomial time for constraint languages Γ (finite or infinite) that are preserved by an idempotent WNU operation. We know that Γ is also preserved by a special WNU operation w . We extend Γ to the set of all relations preserved by w . Let the arity of the WNU w be equal to m . Suppose we have a CSP instance $\Theta = \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{C} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a set of variables, $\mathbf{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$ is a set of the respective domains, $\mathbf{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_q\}$ is a set of constraints.

The algorithm is recursive, the list of all possible recursive calls is given in the end of this subsection. One of the recursive calls is the reduction of a subuniverse D_i to D'_i such that either Θ has a solution with $x_i \in D'_i$, or it has no solutions at all.

Step 1. *Check whether Θ is cycle-consistent. If not then we reduce a domain D_i for some i or state that there are no solutions.*

Step 2. *Check whether Θ is irreducible. If not then we reduce a domain D_i for some i or state that there are no solutions.*

Step 3. *Replace every constraint by its essential representation.*

By Theorem 4.13, if Θ has no solutions then we cannot get a solution while doing the following step.

Step 4. *Replace every constraint relation by the corresponding constraint relation having the parallelogram property. If one of the obtained constraint relation is not essential, go to Step 3.*

By Lemma 4.18, if Θ has no solutions then we cannot get a solution in the following step.

Step 5. *If the congruence $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is not irreducible for some constraint relation ρ , then replace the constraint by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints and go to Step 3.*

At the moment all constraint relations ρ have the parallelogram property and $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is an irreducible congruence, therefore for every constraint there exists a unique congruence-weakened constraint.

Step 6. *Replace every constraint of Θ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraint, then replace every constraint relation by the corresponding constraint relation having the parallelogram property. Recursively calling the algorithm, check that the obtained instance has a solution with $x_i = b$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $b \in D_i$. If not, reduce D_i to the projection onto x_i of the solution set of the obtained instance.*

By Theorems 4.8 and 4.11 we cannot loose the only solution while doing the following step.

Step 7. If D_i has a binary or ternary absorbing subuniverse $B_i \subsetneq D_i$ for some i , then we reduce D_i to B_i .

By Theorem 4.10 we can do the following step.

Step 8. If there exists a congruence σ on D_i such that the algebra $(D_i; w)/\sigma$ is polynomially complete, then we reduce D_i to any equivalence class of σ .

By Theorem 4.5, it remains to consider the case when for every domain D_i there exists a congruence σ_i on D_i such that $(D_i; w)/\sigma_i$ is linear, i.e. it is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_l}; x_1 + \cdots + x_m)$ for prime numbers p_1, \dots, p_l . Moreover, σ_i is proper if $|D_i| > 1$.

We denote D_i/σ_i by L_i . We define a new CSP instance Θ_L with domains L_1, \dots, L_n . To every constraint $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}), \rho) \in \Theta$ we assign a constraint $((x'_{i_1}, \dots, x'_{i_s}), \rho')$, where $\rho' \subseteq L_{i_1} \times \cdots \times L_{i_s}$ and $(E_1, \dots, E_s) \in \rho' \Leftrightarrow (E_1 \times \cdots \times E_s) \cap \rho \neq \emptyset$. The constraints of Θ_L are all constraints that are assigned to the constraints of Θ .

Since every relation on $\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_l}$ preserved by $x_1 + \dots + x_m$ is known to be a conjunction of linear equations, the instance Θ_L can be viewed as a system of linear equations in \mathbb{Z}_p for different p .

Our general idea is to add some linear equations to Θ_L so that for any solution of Θ_L there exists the corresponding solution of Θ . We start with the empty set of equations Eq , which is a set of constraints on L_1, \dots, L_n .

Step 9. Put $Eq := \emptyset$.

Step 10. Solve the system of linear equations $\Theta_L \cup Eq$ and choose independent variables y_1, \dots, y_k . If it has no solutions then Θ has no solutions. If it has just one solution, then, recursively calling the algorithm, solve the reduction of Θ to this solution. Either we get a solution of Θ , or Θ has no solutions.

Then there exist $Z = \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_k}$ and a linear mapping $\phi: Z \rightarrow L_1 \times \cdots \times L_n$ such that any solution of $\Theta_L \cup Eq$ can be obtained as $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for some $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$.

Note that for any tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$ we can check recursively whether Θ has a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$. To do this, we just need to solve an easier CSP instance (on smaller domains). Similarly, we can check whether Θ has a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for every $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$. To do this, we just need to check the existence of a solution in $\phi(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\phi(0, \dots, 0)$ for any position of 1.

Step 11. Check whether Θ has a solution in $\phi(0, \dots, 0)$. If it has then stop the algorithm.

Step 12. Put $\Theta' := \Theta$. Iteratively remove from Θ' all constraints that are weaker than some other constraints of Θ' .

In the following two steps we try to weaken the instance so that it still does not have a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for some $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$.

Step 13. For every constraint $C \in \Theta'$

1. Let Ω be obtained from Θ' by replacing the constraint $C \in \Theta'$ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints.
2. Replace every new constraint of Ω by its essential representation and remove from Ω all constraints that are weaker than some other constraints of Ω .
3. If Ω has no solutions in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for some $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$, then put $\Theta' := \Omega$ and repeat Step 13.

Step 14. For every constraint $C \in \Theta'$

1. Let Ω be obtained from Θ' by replacing the constraint $C \in \Theta'$ by its projections onto all variables but one appearing in C .
2. Replace the new constraints by its essential representation and remove from Ω all constraints that are weaker than some other constraints of Ω .
3. If Ω has no solutions in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for some $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$, then put $\Theta' := \Omega$ and go to Step 13.

At this moment, the CSP instance Θ' has the following property. Θ' has no solutions in $\phi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$ for some $(b_1, \dots, b_k) \in Z$ but if we replace any constraint $C \in \Theta'$ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints then we get an instance that has a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for every $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$. Unlike the original algorithm, we cannot claim that Θ' is crucial in $\phi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$. Nevertheless, Theorem 4.19 proves that we can finish the algorithm in the same way as in the original paper.

In the remaining steps we will find a new linear equation that can be added to Θ_L . Suppose V is an affine subspace of \mathbb{Z}_p^h of dimension $h-1$, thus V is the solution set of a linear equation $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_hx_h = c_0$. Then the coefficients c_0, c_1, \dots, c_h can be learned (up to a multiplicative constant) by $(p \cdot h + 1)$ queries of the form “ $(a_1, \dots, a_h) \in V?$ ” as follows. First, we need at most $(h+1)$ queries to find a tuple $(d_1, \dots, d_h) \notin V$. Then, to find this equation it is sufficient to check for every a and every i whether the tuple $(d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}, a, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_h)$ satisfies this equation.

Step 15. Suppose Θ' is not linked. For each i from 1 to k

1. Check that for every $(a_1, \dots, a_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_i}$ there exist $(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_{i+1}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_k}$ and a solution of Θ' in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$.
2. If yes, go to the next i .
3. If no, then find an equation $c_1y_1 + \dots + c_iy_i = c_0$ such that for every $(a_1, \dots, a_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_i}$ satisfying $c_1a_1 + \dots + c_ia_i = c_0$ there exist $(a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_{i+1}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_k}$ and a solution of Θ' in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$.
4. Add the equation $c_1y_1 + \dots + c_iy_i = c_0$ to Eq.
5. Go to Step 10.

It is not hard to see that Θ' satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.19. Then there exists a constraint $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}), \rho)$ in Θ' and a relation $\xi \subseteq D_{i_1} \times D_{i_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $(x_1, x_2, 0) \in \xi \Leftrightarrow (x_1, x_2) \in \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$, $\text{pr}_{1,2}(\xi) \supseteq \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$, and $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is a congruence. We add a new variable z with domain \mathbb{Z}_p and a variable x'_{i_1} with the same domain as x_{i_1} . Then we replace $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}), \rho)$ by $((x'_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_s}), \rho)$ and add the constraint $((x_{i_1}, x'_{i_1}, z), \xi)$. We denote the obtained instance by Υ . Let L be the set of all tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_k, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_k} \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that Υ has a solution with $z = b$ in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$. By Theorem 4.14, if we replace the constraint relation ρ in Θ' by the minimal relation $\rho' \supseteq \rho$ having the parallelogram property then a minimal linear reduction cannot get a solution after the replacement. Therefore, L has no tuple $(b_1, \dots, b_k, 0)$. Similarly, if we replace ρ in Θ' by ρ'' defined by

$$\rho''(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_s}) = \exists x'_{i_1} \rho(x'_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_s}) \wedge \sigma(x_{i_1}, x'_{i_1}),$$

where $\sigma = \text{pr}_{1,2}(\xi)$, then we get a solution in $\phi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$. Otherwise, Theorem 4.14 implies that the replacement of ρ'' by the minimal relation $\rho''' \supseteq \rho''$ having the parallelogram property

still does not give a solution in $\phi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$. This contradicts the fact that if we replace any constraint $C \in \Theta'$ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints then we get an instance that has a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ for every $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Z$. Thus, we know that the projection of L onto the first k coordinates is a full relation.

Therefore, L is defined by one linear equation. If this equation is $z = b$ for some $b \neq 0$, then both Θ' and Θ have no solutions. Otherwise, we put $z = 0$ in this equation and get an equation that describes all (a_1, \dots, a_k) such that Θ' has a solution in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$. It remains to find this equation.

Step 16. *Suppose Θ' is linked.*

1. Find an equation $c_1y_1 + \dots + c_ky_k = c_0$ such that for every $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{q_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{q_k})$ satisfying $c_1a_1 + \dots + c_ka_k = c_0$ there exists a solution of Θ' in $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$.
2. If the equation was not found then Θ has no solutions.
3. Add the equation $c_1a_1 + \dots + c_ka_k = c_0$ to Eq.
4. Go to Step 10.

Note that every time we reduce our domains, we get constraint relations that are still from Γ .

We have four types of recursive calls of the algorithm:

1. we reduce one domain D_i , for example to a binary absorbing subuniverse (Steps 1, 7, 8).
2. we solve an instance that is not linked. In this case we divide the instance into the linked parts and solve each of them independently (Steps 2, 15).
3. we replace every constraint by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraint and solve an easier CSP instance (Step 6).
4. we reduce every domain D_i such that $|D_i| > 1$ (Steps 10, 11, 13, 14, 16).

Lemma 4.3 states that the depth of the recursive calls of type 3 is at most $2^{|A|^2}$. It is easy to see that the depth of the recursive calls of type 2 and 4 is at most $|A|$.

4 Correctness of the Algorithm

4.1 The size of an essential relation and depth of the recursion

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $\rho \subseteq A^n$ is an essential relation preserved by a special WNU w of arity $m < n$. Then $|\rho| \geq 2^{n-m+1}$*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, there exists an essential tuple (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) for ρ . For every i choose b_i such that

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho.$$

Put $b'_i = w(b_i, a_i, \dots, a_i)$ for every i . Without loss of generality assume that $b'_i = a_i$ for every $i \leq k$ and $b'_i \neq a_i$ for every $i > k$. Since w preserves ρ , we can show that $(b'_1, \dots, b'_m, a_{m+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$. Hence, $k < m$. Consider the projection of ρ onto the last $n-m+1$ variables, which we denote by ρ' . It is not hard to check that $\alpha = (a_m, \dots, a_n) \in \rho'$ and $(a_m, \dots, a_{i-1}, b'_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in \rho'$ for every $i \in \{m, \dots, n\}$.

For any subset $I \subseteq \{m, \dots, n\}$ put $\alpha_I = (c_m, \dots, c_n) \in \rho$, where $c_i = b'_i$ if $i \in I$ and $c_i = a_i$ otherwise. We know that $\alpha_{\{i\}} \in \rho'$ for every $i \in \{m, \dots, n\}$. Since w is a special WNU, $w(b'_i, a_i, \dots, a_i) = b'_i$. Then we can check that for any disjoint subsets $I_1, I_2 \subseteq \{m, \dots, n\}$ we have $w(\alpha_{I_1}, \alpha_{I_2}, \alpha, \dots, \alpha) = \alpha_{I_1 \cup I_2}$. Thus, ρ' contains the tuple α_I for any $I \subseteq \{m, \dots, n\}$. Therefore, both ρ and ρ' contain at least 2^{n-m+1} tuples. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose ρ is an essential relation with the parallelogram property, $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is an irreducible congruence, $\sigma = \text{Con}(\rho, 1)^*$, $\rho'(y_1, \dots, y_t) = \exists z \rho(z, y_2, \dots, y_t) \wedge \sigma(z, y_1)$. Then $\text{Con}(\rho', i) \supseteq \text{Con}(\rho, i)$ for every i .*

Proof. Put $\sigma_i(y_1, y'_1) = \exists y'_i \exists y_2 \dots \exists y_t \rho(y'_1, y_2, \dots, y_t) \wedge \rho(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y'_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_t)$. Since ρ is an essential relation with the parallelogram property, we have $\sigma_i \supseteq \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$. Since $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is irreducible, $\sigma_i \supseteq \sigma$. Therefore, for any $(a_1, a'_1) \in \sigma \setminus \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ there exist $a'_i, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_t$ such that $(a'_1, a_2, \dots, a_t), (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a'_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_t) \in \rho$. Hence $(a_i, a'_i) \in \text{Con}(\rho', i) \setminus \text{Con}(\rho, i)$ and $\text{Con}(\rho', i) \supsetneq \text{Con}(\rho, i)$. \square

Lemma 4.3. *The depth of the recursive calls of type 3 in the algorithm is less than $2^{|A|^2}$.*

Proof. First, we introduce a partial order on variables of instances. For a constraint C and a variable x by $\text{MaxComp}(C, x)$ we denote the maximal equivalence relation σ such that the variable x of C is compatible with σ . We say that x in Θ is *weaker than* x' in Θ' if one of the following conditions holds:

1. the domain of x is a proper subset of the domain of x' ;
2. the domain of x is equal to the domain of x' , for every $C \in \Theta$ there exists $C' \in \Theta'$ such that $\text{MaxComp}(C, x) \supseteq \text{MaxComp}(C', x')$.

Since every constraint relation ρ we have in Step 6 is an essential relation with the parallelogram property and $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is an irreducible congruence, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that $\text{Con}(C', x) \supseteq \text{Con}(C, x)$ for every new constraint C' we generate from C in Step 6. Since we provide the parallelogram property after the replacement in Step 6, we have $\text{MaxComp}(C', x) \supseteq \text{MaxComp}(C, x)$. Thus, every variable is getting weaker. It is easy to see that any other reduction makes all variables weaker or does not change them. Therefore, the depth of the recursive calls of type 3 is less than the number of binary relations on the set A , that is $2^{|A|^2}$. \square

4.2 Properties of a ternary absorption

In [18] we proved the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. [18] *Suppose $\mathbf{A} = (A; w)$ is an algebra, w is a special WNU of arity m . Then one of the following conditions hold:*

1. *there exists a binary absorbing set $B \subsetneq A$,*
2. *there exists a center $C \subsetneq A$,*
3. *there exists a proper congruence σ on A such that $(A; w)/\sigma$ is polynomially complete,*
4. *there exists a proper congruence σ on A such that $(A; w)/\sigma$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_p; x_1 + \dots + x_m)$.*

Using Corollary 7.9.2 from [18], this theorem can be rewritten in the following form.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose $\mathbf{A} = (A; w)$ is an algebra, w is a special WNU of arity m . Then one of the following conditions hold:*

1. *there exists a binary or ternary absorbing set $B \subsetneq A$,*
2. *there exists a proper congruence σ on A such that $(A; w)/\sigma$ is polynomially complete,*
3. *there exists a proper congruence σ on A such that $(A; w)/\sigma$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_p; x_1 + \dots + x_m)$.*

An operation is called *cyclic* if $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = f(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n, x_1)$. We know from [1] (see Theorem 4.1) that the existence of a cyclic term is equivalent to the existence of a WNU term.

Theorem 4.6. *[1] An idempotent algebra $(A; F)$ has a WNU term operation if and only if it has a cyclic term operation of arity p for every prime number $p > |A|$.*

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose B absorbs D with a ternary idempotent operation f , u is an idempotent cyclic operation. Then there exists a cyclic operation $v \in \text{Clo}(\{u, f\})$ preserving the relation $(B \times D) \cup (D \times B)$. Moreover, B is a center for the algebra $(D; v)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.6 there exists a cyclic operation $u' \in \text{Clo}(u)$ of an odd arity. Let n be the arity of u' . Let us consider a ternary majority operation m on 2-element set. We know from [14] that the n -ary majority operation belongs to $\text{Clo}(m)$. Consider a term t over m that defines the n -ary majority operation. Replace every operation m in it by f to define an operation g of arity n . It is not hard to see that the operation $g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ satisfies the following property: if more than half of the variables are from B then the result is from B . Put

$$v(x_1, \dots, x_n) = u'(g(x_1, \dots, x_n), g(x_2, \dots, x_n, x_1), \dots, g(x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})).$$

It is not hard to see that v is a cyclic operation preserving the relation $(B \times D) \cup (D \times B)$.

Let us show that B is a center for the algebra $(D; v)$. Put $E = \{0, 1\}$. Let v be defined on E as a majority operation. Put $R = (B \times \{0, 1\}) \cup (D \times \{1\})$. It is not hard to see that v preserves R , hence B is a center. \square

The following three theorems are proved in [18].

Theorem 4.8. *[18] Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance, B is a binary absorbing set of D_i . Then Θ has a solution if and only if Θ has a solution with $x_i \in B$.*

Theorem 4.9. *[18] Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance, C is a center of D_i . Then Θ has a solution if and only if Θ has a solution with $x_i \in C$.*

Theorem 4.10. *[18] Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance, there does not exist a binary absorbing subuniverse or a center on D_j for every j , $(D_i; w)/\sigma$ is a polynomially complete algebra, E is an equivalence class of σ . Then Θ has a solution if and only if Θ has a solution with $x_i \in E$.*

Combining Theorem 4.9 and Lemma 4.7 we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance, B is a ternary absorbing set of D_i . Then Θ has a solution if and only if Θ has a solution with $x_i \in B$.*

4.3 Adding a new linear variable

To prove the main result of this section we will need the following definitions from [18].

For an instance Ω by $\text{ExpCov}(\Omega)$ (*Expanded Coverings*) we denote the set of all instances Ω' such that there exists a mapping S from the set of all variables of Ω' to the set of all variables of Ω satisfying the following conditions:

1. for every constraint $((x_1, \dots, x_n), \rho)$ of Ω' either the variables $S(x_1), \dots, S(x_n)$ are different and the constraint $((S(x_1), \dots, S(x_n)), \rho)$ is weaker than or equal to some constraint of Ω , or ρ is a binary reflexive relation and $S(x_1) = S(x_2)$;
2. if a variable x appears in Ω and Ω' then $S(x) = x$.

We say that a congruence σ is *irreducible* if it cannot be represented as an intersection of other binary relations $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_s$ compatible with σ . For an irreducible congruence σ on a set A by σ^* we denote the minimal binary relation $\delta \supseteq \sigma$ compatible with σ .

Suppose σ_1 and σ_2 are congruences on D_1 and D_2 , correspondingly. A relation $\rho \subseteq D_1^2 \times D_2^2$ is called a *bridge* from σ_1 to σ_2 if the first two variables of ρ are compatible with σ_1 , the last two variables of ρ are compatible with σ_2 , $\text{pr}_{1,2}(\rho) \supseteq \sigma_1$, $\text{pr}_{3,4}(\rho) \supseteq \sigma_2$, and $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in \rho$ implies $(a_1, a_2) \in \sigma_1 \Leftrightarrow (a_3, a_4) \in \sigma_2$. A bridge $\rho \subseteq D^4$ is called *reflexive* if $(a, a, a, a) \in \rho$ for every $a \in D$.

We say that two congruences σ_1 and σ_2 on a set D are *adjacent* if there exists a reflexive bridge from σ_1 to σ_2 . We say that two constraints C_1 and C_2 are *adjacent* in a common variable x if $\text{Con}(C_1, x)$ and $\text{Con}(C_2, x)$ are adjacent. An instance is called *connected* if every constraint in it is rectangular and for every two constraints there exists a path that connects them.

We will need the following statements from [18].

Lemma 4.12. [Lemma 8.3 in [18]] *Suppose ρ is a critical subdirect relation, the i -th variable of ρ is rectangular. Then $\text{Con}(\rho, i)$ is an irreducible congruence.*

Theorem 4.13. [Theorem 9.5 in [18]] *Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance, its constraint $((x_1, \dots, x_n), \rho)$ is crucial. Then ρ is a critical relation with the parallelogram property.*

Theorem 4.14. [Theorem 9.5 in [18]] *Suppose $D^{(1)}$ is a 1-consistent minimal linear reduction for a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance Θ , the constraint $((x_1, \dots, x_n), \rho)$ is crucial in $D^{(1)}$. Then ρ is a critical relation with the parallelogram property.*

Theorem 4.15. [Theorem 9.8 in [18]] *Suppose $D^{(1)}$ is a 1-consistent minimal linear reduction of a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance Θ , Θ is crucial in $D^{(1)}$ and not connected. Then there exists an instance $\Theta' \in \text{ExpCov}(\Theta)$ that is crucial in $D^{(1)}$ and contains a linked connected component whose solution set is not subdirect.*

Lemma 4.16. [Corollary 8.15.1 in [18]] *Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent linked connected instance whose constraint relations are critical rectangular relations. Then for every constraint C and its variable x there exists a bridge δ from $\text{Con}(C, x)$ to $\text{Con}(C, x)$ such that $\delta(x, x, y, y)$ defines a full relation.*

Lemma 4.17. [Corollary 8.10.1 in [18]] *Suppose $\sigma \subseteq A^2$ is an irreducible congruence, $\rho(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$ is a bridge from σ to σ such that $\rho(x, x, y, y)$ defines a full relation. Then there exists a prime number p and a relation $\zeta \subseteq A \times A \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $(x_1, x_2, 0) \in \zeta \Leftrightarrow (x_1, x_2) \in \sigma$ and $\text{pr}_{1,2}\zeta = \sigma^*$.*

Lemma 4.18. *Suppose Θ is a cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance without a solution, every constraint relation of Θ has the parallelogram property, the congruence $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is not irreducible for some constraint relation $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}), \rho)$, Θ' is obtained from Θ by replacement of $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}), \rho)$ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints. Then Θ' has no solutions.*

Proof. Consider binary relations $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_s$ compatible with $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ such that $\delta_1 \cap \dots \cap \delta_s = \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$. Put $\rho_i(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}) = \exists z \rho(z, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_t}) \wedge \delta_i(z, x_{i_1})$, and replace the constraint $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}), \rho)$ by the constraints $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}), \rho_1), \dots, ((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}), \rho_s)$. Since ρ has the parallelogram property, the obtained instance still does not have a solution. By Theorem 4.13, if we replace every new constraint relation by the corresponding relation having the parallelogram property, then we cannot get a solution. Therefore, Θ' has no solutions. \square

Similarly to Theorem 9.8 from [18], we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.19. *Suppose the following conditions hold:*

1. Θ is a linked cycle-consistent irreducible CSP instance with domain set (D_1, \dots, D_n) ;
2. there does not exist a binary absorbing subuniverse or a center on D_j for every j ;
3. suppose we replace every constraint of Θ by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints, then replace every constraint relation ρ by the minimal constraint relation $\rho' \supseteq \rho$ having the parallelogram property; then the obtained instance has a solution with $x_i = b$ for every i and $b \in D_i$;
4. $D^{(1)} = (D_1^{(1)}, \dots, D_n^{(1)})$ is a minimal linear reduction of Θ ;
5. Θ has no solutions in $D^{(1)}$;
6. if we replace any constraint by the corresponding congruence-weakened constraints then the obtained instance has a solution in $D^{(1)}$;
7. if we replace any constraint by its projections onto all variables but one appearing in the constraint then the obtained instance has a solution in $D^{(1)}$.

Then there exists a constraint $((x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}), \rho)$ of Θ and a relation $\xi \subseteq D_{i_1} \times D_{i_2} \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $(x_1, x_2, 0) \in \xi \Leftrightarrow (x_1, x_2) \in \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$, $\text{pr}_{1,2}(\xi) \supsetneq \text{Con}(\rho, 1)$, and $\text{Con}(\rho, 1)$ is a congruence.

Proof. Assume the contrary. First, we want to make our instance crucial in $D^{(1)}$. To do this we replace our constraints by all weaker constraints while we still do not have a solution in $D^{(1)}$. The obtained instance we denote by Θ' . Since Θ is linked, condition 7 guarantees that Θ' is also linked. By Theorem 4.14, every constraint in Θ' has the parallelogram property. Suppose Θ' is not connected. Then by Theorem 4.15 there exists an instance $\Theta'' \in \text{ExpCov}(\Theta')$ that is crucial in $D^{(1)}$ and contains a linked connected component Ω such that the solution set of Ω is not subdirect. By condition 3, there exists a constraint relation ρ' from Ω such that for their ancestor ρ from Θ we have $\text{Con}(\rho, 1) = \text{Con}(\rho', 1)$.

If Θ' is connected, then Θ' is a linked connected component itself and we choose a constraint relation ρ' from Θ' such that $\text{Con}(\rho, 1) = \text{Con}(\rho', 1)$, where ρ is the ancestor of ρ' in Θ . The relations ρ' and ρ can be found because of condition 6.

By Theorem 4.14 and Lemma 4.12, $\text{Con}(\rho', 1)$ is an irreducible congruence. By Lemma 4.16, there exists a bridge δ from $\text{Con}(\rho', 1)$ to $\text{Con}(\rho', 1)$ such that $\delta(x, x, y, y)$ defines a full relation. By Lemma 4.17, there exists a relation $\xi \subseteq D_{i_1} \times D_{i_2} \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $(x_1, x_2, 0) \in \xi \Leftrightarrow (x_1, x_2) \in \text{Con}(\rho', 1)$ and $\text{pr}_{1,2}(\xi) = \text{Con}(\rho', 1)^*$. \square

References

- [1] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms, and the constraint satisfaction problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.0557*, 2012.
- [2] Clifford Bergman. *Universal algebra: Fundamentals and selected topics*. CRC Press, 2011.
- [3] Andrei Bulatov, Peter Jeavons, and Andrei Krokhin. Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(3):720–742, March 2005.
- [4] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform csp. *CoRR*, abs/1703.03021, 2017.
- [5] Andrei A. Bulatov and Matthew A. Valeriote. Recent results on the algebraic approach to the csp. In Nadia Creignou, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Heribert Vollmer, editors, *Complexity of Constraints*, volume 5250 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 68–92. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [6] Martin C. Cooper. Characterising tractable constraints. *Artificial Intelligence*, 65(2):347–361, 1994.
- [7] Tomás Feder and Moshe Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic snp and constraint satisfaction: A study through datalog and group theory. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(1):57–104, February 1999.
- [8] Peter Jeavons, David Cohen, and Marc Gyssens. Closure properties of constraints. *J. ACM*, 44(4):527–548, July 1997.
- [9] Peter G. Jeavons and Martin C. Cooper. Tractable constraints on ordered domains. *Artificial Intelligence*, 79(2):327–339, 1995.
- [10] Lefteris M. Kirousis. Fast parallel constraint satisfaction. *Artificial Intelligence*, 64(1):147–160, 1993.
- [11] A. K. Mackworth. Consistency in networks of relations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 8(1):99–118, 1977.
- [12] M. Maróti and R. McKenzie. Existence theorems for weakly symmetric operations. *Algebra universalis*, 59(3–4):463–489, 2008.
- [13] U. Montanari. Networks of constraints: Fundamental properties and applications to picture processing. *Information Sciences*, 7:95–132, 1974.
- [14] E. L. Post. *The Two-Valued Iterative Systems of Mathematical Logic*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 5. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941.
- [15] D. Zhuk. The predicate method to construct the Post lattice. *Discrete Mathematics and Applications*, 21(3):329–344, 2011.
- [16] D. Zhuk. The cardinality of the set of all clones containing a given minimal clone on three elements. *Algebra Universalis*, 68(3–4):295–320, 2012.
- [17] D. Zhuk. The lattice of all clones of self-dual functions in three-valued logic. *Journal of Multiple-Valued Logic and Soft Computing*, 24(1–4):251–316, 2015.
- [18] Dmitriy Zhuk. The proof of csp dichotomy conjecture. *CoRR*, abs/1704.01914, 2017.