

# GRAPHS FOR WHICH THE HOMOMORPHISM EXTENSION RECONFIGURATION PROBLEM IS TRIVIAL

MARK SIGGERS

**ABSTRACT.** Brightwell and Winkler showed in 2000 that the so-called Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  is connected for all graphs  $G$  if and only if the graph  $H$  is dismantlable. This characterised the graphs  $H$  for which the reconfiguration version of the  $H$ -colouring problem is trivial.

We do the same for the reconfiguration version of the  $H$ -extension problem. We consider a relative version  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  of the Hom-graph, the subgraph of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  induced by  $H$ -colourings that extend a partial  $H$ -colouring  $p$  of  $G$ , and show that the graphs  $H$  for which  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is connected for every choice of  $(G, p)$ , where  $p$  must be non-null if  $H$  is bipartite, are exactly the graphs that admit NU polymorphisms. Thus the reconfiguration version of the  $H$ -extension problem is trivial if and only if  $H$  is an NU-graph. We further give bounds on the diameter of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  in this case and show that the shortest path between two vertices can be found in polynomial time.

Specializing our results to the shortest path reconfiguration problem, we get that it is trivial for the class of graphs that can be made into NU-graphs by adding loops to some subset of the vertices. This class contains such graphs as chordal graphs and hypercubes for which the shortest path reconfiguration problem has previously been shown to be trivial.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of combinatorial reconfiguration has seen a fair bit of attention in the last 10-15 years. For a combinatorial problem, one looks properties of a reconfiguration graph for the problem defined on the set of solutions to the problem by making solutions adjacent if they satisfy some condition of closeness.

In this paper graphs are finite and undirected, but loops are allowed. If every vertex has a loop the graph is *reflexive* and if no vertices have loops then it is *irreflexive*. Bipartite graphs are necessarily irreflexive. The graphs  $G$  and  $H$  will always be connected and their orders will be  $n_G$  and  $n_H$  respectively.

One prominent problem considered from the point of view of reconfiguration is the  $H$ -colouring problem  $\mathbf{Hom}(H)$  in which one must decide, for an instance graph  $G$ , if there is an  $H$ -colouring of  $G$ : a homomorphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  from  $G$  to  $H$ . In this situation, the reconfiguration graph can be taken to be the well known Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  for  $G$  and  $H$ . This is the graph whose vertex set is the set of homomorphisms from  $G$  to  $H$ , in which two homomorphisms  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  are adjacent

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C15; 05C60; 05C85.

*Key words and phrases.* Graph homomorphism extension; Recolouring; Reconfiguration; Shortest path reconfiguration; Near-unanimity polymorphism; Dismantlability.

The author was supported by Korean NRF Basic Science Research Program (NRF-2018R1D1A1A09083741) funded by the Korean government (MEST) and the Kyungpook National University Research Fund.

if they satisfy the following for all pairs of vertices  $u$  and  $v$  of  $G$ :

$$u \sim v \Rightarrow \phi(u) \sim \psi(v).$$

While the basic problem  $\text{Hom}(H)$  asks if  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  is non-empty for an instance  $G$ , in the area of combinatorial reconfiguration, one considers the other properties it might have, such as its connectivity and its diameter. The  $H$ -recoloring problem  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Hom}}(H)$ , asks for an instance  $(G, \phi, \psi)$  with  $\phi$  and  $\psi \in \mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  if  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are in the same component of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ . The  $H$ -mixing problem  $\text{Mix}_{\text{Hom}}(H)$  asks, for instance graphs  $G$ , if  $\text{Hom}(G, H)$  is connected.

In [5], Brightwell and Winkler showed that that the graphs  $H$  for which the Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  is connected for all  $G$  are exactly the dismantlable graphs. Thus the graphs  $H$  for which the problems  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Hom}}(H)$  and  $\text{Mix}_{\text{Hom}}(H)$  are trivial in the sense that every instance is a YES instance, is exactly the class of dismantlable graphs.

Under the notion of dismantlable used in [5], defined in the next section, any dismantlable graph has a loop. Often, such as in [1], an irreflexive graph is called dismantlable if it dismantles to an edge. An irreflexive graph  $H$  that dismantles to an edge  $H$  is necessarily bipartite, and so we refer to such graphs as *bipartite dismantlable*.

A bipartite graph always comes with a partition into two partite sets, the members of which we refer to as *black* and *white vertices*. If the graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  is not empty, then  $G$  is bipartite, and  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  must have at least two components, one in which the black vertices of  $G$  map to black vertices, and one in which they map to white vertices. Let  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H)$  be the subgraph of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  induced on vertices in which black vertices of  $G$  are mapped to black vertices of  $H$ . It follows from [5] that graph  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H)$  is connected if and only if it is empty, or  $H$  is bipartite dismantlable. In this case  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Hom}}(H)$  is not trivial, but close to it. To determine if two maps  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are in the same component of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  one only has to determine if black vertices of  $G$  map to the same coloured vertices under both maps. This can be done in constant time by keeping a list of the black vertices of  $H$ .

Our first result is to characterise the graphs  $H$  for which the mixing and reconfigurations versions of the homomorphism extension problem are trivial.

A *partial  $H$ -colouring* of a graph  $G$  is a map  $p : S \rightarrow V(H)$  for some subset  $S \subset V(G)$ . A homomorphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  *extends* or *is an extension* of  $p$  if it restricts on  $S$  to  $p$ . In the problem  $\text{Ext}(H)$  one must decide for an instance  $(G, p)$  where  $p$  is a partial  $H$ -colouring of the graph  $G$ , if there is a homomorphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  that extends  $p$ . We omit explicit mention of  $S$  by writing  $v \in p$  for  $v \in S$  and  $|p|$  for  $|S|$ . The reconfiguration graph for  $H$ -colouring extension is a relative version of the Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ .

**Definition 1.1.** For a partial  $H$ -colouring  $p$  of  $G$ , the Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  of  $G$  and  $H$  relative to  $p$ , is the subgraph of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  induced on vertices that extend  $p$ .

The problem  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  asks, for an instance  $(G, p, \phi, \psi)$  with  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  if  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are in the same component. The problem  $\text{Mix}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  asks, for an instance  $(G, p)$ , if  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is connected.

Both of these decision problems are known to be in the complexity class of PSPACE. The belief is that, depending on  $H$ ,  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  will be polynomial

time solvable or PSPACE-complete; and that  $\text{Mix}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  will be polynomial time solvable or coNP-complete when  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  is polynomial time solvable, and will otherwise be PSPACE-complete. An underlying goal is to prove this, and to characterise those graphs  $H$  for which the problems falls into each of these complexity classes. Towards this goal we characterise the graphs  $H$  for which these problems are trivial.

**Definition 1.2.** A graph  $H$  is *Ext-trivial* if for all graphs  $G$  and partial  $H$ -colourings  $p$  of  $G$  the relative hom-graph  $\text{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is connected.

If  $H$  is disconnected, then it cannot be Ext-trivial, thus we have assumed that  $H$  is connected. As observed above,  $\text{Hom}(G, H; p)$  has at least two components if  $H$  is bipartite and  $p$  is empty, so bipartite graphs cannot be Ext-trivial. We define a different version of trivial for bipartite graphs. When  $H$  is bipartite, a partial  $H$ -colouring  $p$  of  $G$  is always assumed to map black vertices to black vertices, and  $\text{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  is the subgraph of  $\text{Hom}(G, H; p)$  on the vertices of  $\text{Hom}_B(G, H)$ .

**Definition 1.3.** An irreflexive graph  $H$  is *bipartite Ext-trivial* if it is bipartite, and for all graphs  $G$  and partial  $H$ -colourings  $p$  of  $G$ , the graph  $\text{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  is connected.

Again,  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  is almost trivial when  $H$  is bipartite Ext-trivial. We discussed its linear time solution above for instances  $(G, p, \phi, \psi)$  with  $|p| = 0$ . If  $|p| > 0$ , then any  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  extending  $p$  are in the same component of  $\text{Hom}(G, H; p)$  so the instance is a YES instance.

Recall that a *k-ary polymorphism* of  $H$  is a homomorphism  $\phi : H^k \rightarrow H$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  categorical power (defined in Section 2) of  $H$  to  $H$ . A polymorphism  $\phi : H^k \rightarrow H$  is *idempotent* if  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_k) = v$  whenever all of the  $x_i$  are  $v$ , and if  $k \geq 3$ , is *near unanimity*, or NU, if  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_k) = v$  whenever at least  $k - 1$  of the  $x_i$  are  $v$ . If  $H$  admits a k-NU polymorphism, we call it an NU graph, or more specifically a k-NU graph.

Graphs admitting k-NU polymorphisms are well studied and have many characterisations, especially in the case that  $k = 3$ . In this case they are also known as majority functions, and the graphs that have such functions have been characterised as median graphs, or absolute retracts (with respect to isometry) of products of paths, or in terms of various other nice metric properties. What makes NU polymorphisms so important to the study of complexity is the following theorem, which is proved in [6] for all relational structures.

**Theorem 1.4.** [6] *Let  $H$  be a graph admitting a k-NU polymorphism. The homomorphism problem  $\text{Hom}(H)$  can be solved in polynomial time.*

We show the following in the form of the more detailed Theorem 3.1 which combines it with an alternate characterisation from [10] and [8] that is used in its proof.

**Theorem 1.5.** *A graph is Ext-trivial if and only if it is an NU graph with a loop. An irreflexive graph is bipartite Ext-trivial if and only if it is an NU graph.*

From the proof of this theorem, we get, in Corollaries 3.6 and 3.9, a bound of

$$2n_H \cdot \min(k - 2, n_H)$$

on the diameter of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  for a k-NU graph  $H$ . This allows us, in Corollary 3.10, to show that for Ext-trivial  $H$ , one can find the shortest path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  for an instance  $(G, p, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$ , in polynomial time.

Many authors, in fact most, when considering the reconfiguration version of the problem  $\text{Hom}(H)$ , use as their reconfiguration graph for an instance  $(G, \phi, \psi)$  the subgraph of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  of edges whose endpoints differ on only one vertex. It is easy to check that if there is an edge  $\phi\phi'$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  the endpoints of which differ on  $w$  vertices, then it resolves into a path from  $\phi$  to  $\phi'$  of length  $w$  consisting only of such edges<sup>1</sup>. So while this change of definition does not effect the existence of paths in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ , it does effect their length. The same holds for  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ . We call a path from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  a *reconfiguration path* if it uses only edges whose endpoints differ on exactly one vertex. If there is a path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  of length  $\ell$ , then there is a reconfiguration path of length at most  $\ell \cdot n_G$ .

From Theorem 3.1 it follows that an Ext-trivial graph dismantles to any looped vertex (see Lemma 3.7). We show that an Ext-trivial graph with a 3-NU polymorphism is not only dismantlable to any looped vertex, but is what we call 'efficiently dismantlable' to any vertex. With this we get the following.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $H$  be a (biparite) Ext-trivial graph with a 3-NU polymorphism. For any instance  $(G, p, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$ , the shortest reconfigurations path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  has length at most*

$$d = \sum_{v \in V(G)} (d_H(\phi(v), \psi(v)) + 1).$$

We also give examples showing that this bound cannot be reduced any multiplicative constant.

A path in a graph  $H$  between vertices  $u$  and  $v$  is called a  $uv$ -path. The Shortest Path problem SP asks, for an instance  $(H, u, v)$  where  $H$  is a irreflexive graph, and  $u$  and  $v$  are vertices of  $H$ , for a shortest  $uv$ -path in  $H$ . This problem is well known to be solvable in linear time using a breadth-first search, but the corresponding reconfiguration variations are not so easy. For two vertices at distance  $d$  in a graph  $H$ , let  $p$  be a partial  $H$ -colouring of the path  $P_d$  that maps the first vertex of the path  $P_d$  to  $u$  and the last to  $v$ . Elements of  $\text{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$  are shortest  $uv$ -paths in  $H$ . The problem  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  asks, for an instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  with  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\text{Hom}(P_d, G; p)$ , if there is a path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\text{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$ . In [3] it was shown that  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  is PSPACE-complete, but when restricted to instances with chordal  $H$  the problem is trivial. In [9] the problem  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  was shown to be polynomial time solvable for several classes of graphs, and their proofs show, in particular that the problem is trivial for hypercubes and bridged graphs. In our last section, Section 5, we observe how our results recover the triviality of the problem for hypercubes and chordal graphs, and extend it to all graphs that can be made into k-NU graphs by adding loops to some subset of their vertices.

## 2. BACKGROUND RESULTS AND DEFINITIONS

We recall many of the known results about the Hom-graph, NU polymorphisms, and dismantlability.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is only true for symmetric graphs, and does not hold for directed graphs.

The categorical product  $H_1 \times H_2$  of two graphs  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  is the graph with vertex set  $V(H_1) \times V(H_2)$  in which  $(v_1, v_2) \sim (v'_1, v'_2)$  if  $v_i \sim v'_i$  for each  $i$ . It is well known and easy to check that the projections  $\pi_i : H_1 \times H_2 \rightarrow H_i : (v_1, v_2) \mapsto v_i$  are homomorphisms. The product is clearly commutative and associative, so one can write  $H^2$  for  $H \times H$  and  $H^n$  for  $H \times H^{n-1}$ .

A homomorphism  $r : H \rightarrow H'$  of  $H$  to a subgraph  $H'$  is a retraction if it restricts to the identity map  $\text{id}$  on  $V(H')$ . The following is well known, showing that the class of  $k$ -NU graphs is what is called a graph variety. See, for example, [8].

**Fact 2.1.** *The class of  $k$ -NU graphs is closed under products and retractions.*

**2.1. Alternate definition of the Hom-graph.** The Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  defined in the introduction has an alternate and equivalent definition that is useful for topological arguments. Let  $I_\ell$  be a reflexive path  $P_\ell$  on the vertex set  $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ . For a homomorphism  $h : I_\ell \times G \rightarrow H$  and  $i \in V(I_\ell)$  the  $i^{\text{th}}$  step of  $r$  is the restriction  $h_i$  of  $h$  to the copy  $i \times G$  of  $G$  in  $I_\ell \times G$  which is induced on the vertex set  $\{(i, g) \mid g \in V(G)\}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** For  $H$  and  $(G, p)$ , the Hom-graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is the graph on the  $H$ -colourings of  $G$  extending  $p$  in which two extensions  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are adjacent if there is a homomorphism  $h : I_1 \times G \rightarrow H$  such that each  $h_i$  extends  $p$ , and  $h_0 = \phi$  and  $h_1 = \psi$ .

A walk from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  corresponds exactly to a homomorphism  $h : I_\ell \times G \rightarrow H$  such that  $h_0 = \phi$  and  $h_\ell = \psi$ . From this it is easy to see such things as the following fact.

For homomorphisms  $\phi, \phi' : G \rightarrow H$  it is easy to verify that the map

$$\phi \times \phi' : G \rightarrow H^2 : (a, b) \mapsto (\phi(a), \phi(b))$$

is a homomorphism.

**Fact 2.3.** *For walks  $h, h' : I_\ell \times G \rightarrow H$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  we get that*

$$h \times h' = (h_0 \times h'_0) \sim (h_1 \times h'_1) \sim \dots \sim (h_\ell \times h'_\ell)$$

*is a walk in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H^2; p)$ .*

**2.2. Dismantling and the bipartite resolution.** Recall that a vertex  $v'$  dominates a vertex  $v$  in a graph  $H$  if  $N(v) \subset N(v')$ . If  $v$  is reflexive, then  $v \in N(v)$ . If  $v'$  dominates  $v$  then there is a retraction  $d : H \rightarrow H \setminus \{v\}$  taking  $v$  to  $v'$ . This is a *dismantling retraction* and we say it *dismantles*  $v$ . A graph  $H$  dismantles to  $H'$  if there is a sequence of dismantling retractions  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell$ , called a *dismantling*, whose composition  $\bar{d}_\ell := d_\ell \circ d_{\ell-1} \circ \dots \circ d_1$  is a retraction of  $H$  to  $H'$ .

The following is clear. It is proved in more generality as Lemma 5.1 of [11].

**Fact 2.4.** *If  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell$  is a dismantling of  $H$  to  $H'$ , such that  $d_i$  dismantles the vertex  $v_i$ , then  $d', d_1, \dots, d_{i-1}, d_{i+1}, \dots, d_\ell$  is also a dismantling of  $H$  to  $H'$ .*

For a graph  $H$ , the *bipartite resolution* of  $H$  is the bipartite (so irreflexive) graph  $B(H) := K_2 \times H$ . As  $K_2$  has  $k$ -NU polymorphisms of any arity, the following is immediate from Fact 2.1.

**Fact 2.5.** *If  $H$  is a  $k$ -NU graph then so is  $B(H)$ .*

The following was proved for reflexive graphs  $H$  dismantling to vertices in [1]. We use their proof, exactly.

**Lemma 2.6.** *A graph  $H$  dismantles to a subgraph  $H'$  if and only if  $B(H)$  dismantles to  $B(H')$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell$  be a dismantling of  $H$  to  $H'$  where  $d_i$  dismantles the vertex  $v_i$ . and let  $R_i = \bar{d}_i(H)$ . Let  $a_i : B(R_i) \rightarrow B(R_i)$  be the map that dismantles  $(0, v_i)$  to  $(0, d_i(v_i))$ , and  $b_i$  the map that dismantles  $(1, v_i)$  to  $(1, d_i(v_i))$ . Their composition takes  $B(R_i)$  to  $B(R_{i+1})$ , and so

$$a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \dots, a_\ell, b_\ell$$

is a dismantling of  $B(H)$  to  $B(H')$ .

On the other hand let  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{2\ell}$  be a dismantling of  $B(H)$  to  $B(H')$ . Half of these maps dismantle vertices of the form  $(0, v)$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ , let  $a_i$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  such map, dismantling  $(0, v_i)$  to  $(0, v'_i)$ , and let  $d_i$  be the map defined on  $\bar{d}_{i-1}(H)$  that dismantles  $v_i$  to  $v'_i$ . Then  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_\ell$  is a dismantling of  $H$  to  $H'$ .  $\square$

Given a dismantling  $d_1, \dots, d_\ell$  of  $H$  to  $H'$  we call the constructed dismantling  $a_1, b_1, \dots, a_\ell, b_\ell$  its *bipartite resolution*. Given a dismantling  $D_1, \dots, D_{2\ell}$  of  $B(H)$  to  $B(H')$  we call the constructed dismantling  $d_1, \dots, d_\ell$  of  $H$  to  $H'$  its *symmetric shadow*.

Basic to [5] was the observation that a dismantling  $d_1, \dots, d_\ell$  of  $H$  to  $H'$  induces a path

$$\text{id}, d_1, \bar{d}_2, \dots, \bar{d}_\ell$$

from the identity  $\text{id} : H \rightarrow H$  to the retraction  $\bar{d}_\ell$  to  $H'$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(H, H)$ . The following extension of this idea for reflexive graphs is Lemma 2.5 of [10] and for more general graphs is Lemma 5.3 of [11].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $H'$  be a subgraph of a graph  $H$  and  $\text{id}_{H'}$  be the partial  $H$ -colouring of  $H$  that is the restriction, to  $H'$ , of the identity map  $\text{id} : H \rightarrow H$ . The graph  $H$  dismantles to  $H'$  if and only if there is a path from  $\text{id}$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(H, H; \text{id}_{H'})$  from  $\text{id}$  to a retraction  $r : H \rightarrow H'$ .*

This yields the following useful corollary by observing that a graph  $H$  retracts to any looped vertex, an a bipartite graph  $H$  retracts to any edge.

**Fact 2.8.** *If  $H$  is Ext-trivial, then it dismantles to any looped vertex. If  $H$  is bipartite Ext-trivial, then it dismantles to any edge.*

**2.3. Critical tree obstructions.** A *critical obstruction*  $(T, p)$  for a graph  $H$  consists of a graph  $T$  and a partial  $H$ -colouring  $p$  defined such that there exists no homomorphism  $\phi : T \rightarrow H$  extending  $p$ , but for any proper subgraph  $T'$  of  $T$  there exists a homomorphism  $\phi : T' \rightarrow H$  extending  $p$  (or its restriction to  $T'$ ).

It is well known (see [12]) that a graph has a k-NU polymorphism if and only if it has no critical obstructions  $(T, p)$  with  $|p| = k$ . A critical obstruction  $(T, p)$  is a *critical tree obstruction* if  $T$  is a tree and  $p$  is defined on its set of leaves. In [10] it was shown for reflexive graphs that  $H$  has a k-NU polymorphism if and only if it has no critical tree obstructions with  $k$  leaves. The same was shown for irreflexive graphs in [8] using a the characterisation of structures with tree duality from [11]. We will extend this to general graphs.

### 3. CHARACTERISATION OF Ext-TRIVIAL AND BIPARTITE Ext-TRIVIAL GRAPHS

The *diagonal*  $\Delta(H^2)$  of  $H^2$  is the subgraph isomorphic to  $H$  induced on the vertex set  $\{(x, x) \mid x \in V(H)\}$ . We write  $\Delta$  for  $\Delta(H^2)$  as this will not cause confusion. The notion of  $H^2$  dismantling to the diagonal seems to appear first in [10] where it was shown in a list of characterisations of reflexive NU graphs  $H$ . If  $H$  is bipartite then  $H^2$  is disconnected, (having two isomorphic components) and cannot dismantle to  $\Delta$ . The *diagonal component*  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  of  $H^2$  is the component of  $H^2$  containing  $\Delta$ . Where  $p_\Delta$  is the partial  $H$ -colouring of  $H^2$  taking the vertex  $(x, x)$  to  $x$  for each  $x \in V(H)$ , it is clear that  $\mathbf{Hom}(H^2, H; p_\Delta)$  is the subgraph of  $\mathbf{Hom}(H^2, H)$  induced by the idempotent 2-ary polymorphisms of  $H$ .

Note that unless  $H$  is bipartite,  $C_\Delta(H^2) = H^2$ . In this section we show the following.

**Theorem 3.1.** *For a finite connected graph  $H$  with the following are equivalent.<sup>2</sup>*

- (1) *The graph  $H$  admits an NU polymorphism.*
- (2) *The graph  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  dismantles to  $\Delta(H^2)$ .*
- (3) *The graph  $H$  is Ext-trivial or bipartite Ext-trivial.*

We break the proof of Theorem 3.1 into two subsections. The equivalence of items (2) and (3) is proved in Subsection 3.1. The proof essentially follows the proof in [10] for reflexive graphs. Our contribution in this case is using item (3) in place of the similar statement in that paper that ‘all idempotent  $k$ -subalgebras of  $H$  are connected’. Our other contribution is the verification that their proof holds for more general structures, using  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  for bipartite graphs where they used  $H^2$ . Though standard, we give these proofs in detail as the length of the involved dismantlings and paths will be important to us later.

In Subsection 3.2 we prove the equivalence of (1) to the other items. That item (2) implies item (1) comes essentially from [11]. The implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) holds for reflexive and irreflexive graphs by [10] and [8]. Our contribution is that it holds in general. We show for any graph that the existence of an NU polymorphism and (bipartite) dismantlability go together to imply Ext-triviality. So one needs to show that the existence of an NU polymorphism implies dismantlability. This proof, though of the flavour of proofs in [10] and [11], does not seem to appear in them and seems to clarify an essential connection in the theory.

Before proving Theorem 3.1 we observe some useful corollaries.

In [11] it was shown that finite tree duality for a structure  $H$  is characterised by the fact that  $H^2$  dismantles to a retraction of its diagonal. Thus we get the following from Theorem 3.1, extending the same for reflexive graphs in [10] and irreflexive graphs in [8].

**Corollary 3.2.** *A graph  $H$  admits a  $k$ -NU polymorphism if and only if it has no critical tree obstructions with  $k$  or more leaves.*

Observing for a non-bipartite graph that a critical tree obstruction in  $B(H)$  translates to a critical tree obstruction in  $H$ , we get the following converse of Fact

---

<sup>2</sup>In [4], the authors give another a generalisation of [5] to general structures using [11] and relating dismantling properties of  $H$  to mixing properties. The notion of mixing is different than our Ext-trivial, and is characterised by the dismantling of  $H^2$  to a substructure of the diagonal. This is a demonstrably more general condition than the dismantling of  $H^2$  to its diagonal.

**2.5.** This fact, for conservative NU polymorphisms, is known to follow from [7], but is far from trivial.

**Corollary 3.3.** *A non-bipartite graph  $H$  has an NU-polymorphism if and only if  $B(H)$  does.*

**3.1. Characterisation of Ext-trivial graphs by dismantling.** We give the relatively standard proof of equivalence of items (2) and (3) of Theorem 3.1. The length of a path is the number of edges.

**Lemma 3.4.** *If  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  dismantles to  $\Delta(H^2)$  then for any  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  there is a walk of length less than  $2n_H^2$  from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ , and so  $H$  is Ext-trivial or bipartite Ext-trivial.*

*Proof.* Assume that there is a dismantling of  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  to  $\Delta = \Delta(H^2)$ . By Lemma 2.7 this corresponds to a walk  $r_0, \dots, r_d$  from the identity  $r_0 = \text{id}$  to a retraction  $r_d$  to  $\Delta$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(C_\Delta(H^2), C_\Delta(H^2); \text{id}_\Delta) \leq \mathbf{Hom}(H^2, H^2; \text{id}_\Delta)$ . Defining the map  $a_i$  from  $G$  to  $H$  by

$$a_i = \pi_1 \circ r_i \circ (\phi \times \psi),$$

the sequence  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d$  is a walk in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  from  $\phi$  to  $a_d$ . For a vertex  $v$  in the domain of  $p$  we get

$$a_i(v) = \pi_1 \circ r_i \circ (\phi \times \psi)(v) = \pi_1 \circ r_i((p(v), p(v))) = \pi_1((p(v), p(v))) = p(v)$$

showing that this walk is indeed in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ .

Similarly the sequence  $b_d, \dots, b_0$  defined by

$$b_i = \pi_2 \circ r_i \circ (\phi \times \psi)$$

is a walk in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  from  $b_d$  to  $\psi$ .

But  $a_d = b_d$ , as  $r_d$  maps to  $\Delta$  so maps under  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  to the same place. Thus we have a walk

$$a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d, b_{d-1}, \dots, b_0 \tag{1}$$

of length  $2d$  from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ .

As  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  has at most  $n_H^2$  vertices (indeed exactly this if  $H^2$  is non-bipartite and half of this if  $H$  is bipartite) it dismantles to  $\Delta$  in at most  $n_H^2 - n^H < n_H^2$ . This gives the claimed length calculation.  $\square$

For the converse implication, we do the proof only in the case of bipartite  $H$ . The general proof comes from replacing  $\mathbf{Hom}_B$  with  $\mathbf{Hom}^3$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *If  $H$  is (bipartite) Ext-trivial then  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  dismantles to  $\Delta(H^2)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $H$  is bipartite Ext-trivial, so  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  is connected for all  $(G, p)$ . Where  $\pi_1 : C_\Delta(H^2) \rightarrow H$  is the restriction of the first projection and  $i : H \rightarrow H \times H : v \mapsto (v, v)$  is the diagonal injection, let  $p$  be the restriction of  $i \circ \pi_1$  to  $\Delta(H)$ . There is a path in  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(C_\Delta(H^2), \Delta(H); p)$  from  $\text{id}$  to  $i \circ \pi_1$ , which by Lemma 2.7 gives a dismantling of  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  to  $\Delta(H)$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>3</sup>Alternately one could redefine  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  as being  $\mathbf{Hom}(G^*, H; p^*)$  where  $G^*$  is  $G$  with a path  $P$  longer than the diameter of  $H$  with one endpoint identified with a vertex of  $G$ ; and  $p^*$  is  $p$  but also maps the other endpoint of  $P$  to some vertex  $h$  in  $H$ . Then  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  is unchanged when  $H$  is bipartite, and is just  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  otherwise. As  $C_\Delta(H^2) = H^2$  when  $H$  is not bipartite our proof for the bipartite case works in the non-bipartite case too.

We have proved, with these lemma, the equivalence of items (2) and (3) of Theorem 3.1. The proof of Lemma 3.4 also gave us the following.

**Corollary 3.6.** *If  $H$  is (bipartite) Ext-trivial then the diameter of  $(\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p))$   $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is at most  $2n_H^2$  for any  $(G, p)$ .*

**3.2. Characterisation of Ext-trivial graphs by NU-polymorphisms.** In this subsection we finish the proof of Theorem 3.1 by showing the implications (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) and (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3).

We start with (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). As it already holds for bipartite graphs by [10], we need to show that if  $H^2$  dismantles to its diagonal, then  $H$  has an NU polymorphism. This is essentially Theorem 5.7 and Corollary 4.5 of [11]. Indeed Theorem 5.7 of [11] tells us that if  $H^2$  dismantles to its diagonal, then it has a first order definable CSP, and Corollary 4.5 tells us that if it is a core with a first order definable CSP, then it has an NU polymorphism. The implication thus follows by the well known fact, stated for example in Lemma 4.3 of [8], that a graph has an NU polymorphism if and only if the core structure one gets from it by adding all unary singleton relations does.

Before we show the implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) we first show that general NU graphs are (bipartite) dismantlable.

**Lemma 3.7.** *A graph with an NU polymorphism dismantles to any looped vertex. An irreflexive graph with an NU polymorphism dismantles to any edge.*

*Proof.* Let  $H$  have an NU polymorphism. Then so does  $B(H)$  by Fact 2.5. By Theorem 3.1 for bipartite graphs, which we have observed already follows by [8],  $B(H)$  is bipartite Ext-trivial, and so by Fact 2.8 it dismantles to any edge, in particular it dismantles to the edge  $(0, v)(1, v)$  for any looped vertex  $v$ . By Lemma 2.6 we get that  $H$  dismantles to  $v$ .  $\square$

We now prove (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3), and so complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $H$  be a connected graph admitting a  $k$ -NU polymorphism, and let  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  be vertices of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  for some partial  $H$ -colouring  $p$  of  $G$ . If there is a walk of length  $\ell$  between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ , then there is a walk of length  $(k - 2)\ell$  between them in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ , let  $h^* = h_1, h_2, \dots, h_\ell$  be a walk from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ . We construct a walk  $h$  from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ . Indeed, where  $f : H^k \rightarrow H$  is the  $k$ -NU polymorphism, for each  $i \in [\ell]_0$ , let

$$h_i = f \circ (\psi \times h_i^* \times \phi \times \phi \times \dots \times \phi \times \phi).$$

Similarly, for  $j = 1, \dots, k - 2$  and  $i \in [\ell]$  let

$$h_{j*\ell+i} = f \circ \underbrace{(\psi \times \psi \times \dots \times \psi)}_{j \text{ times}} \times h_i^* \times \phi \times \dots \times \phi).$$

As  $h_0^* = \phi$  and  $h_\ell^* = \psi$  this is a walk in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$ , as  $f$  is  $k$ -NU, it goes from

$$f \circ (\psi \times \phi \times \dots \times \phi) = \phi \quad \text{to} \quad f \circ (\psi \times \dots \times \psi \times \phi) = \psi.$$

On vertices  $v$  in the domain of  $p$ ,  $\phi(v) = \psi(v) = p(v)$ , so all of these functions map  $v$  to  $p(v)$  by the fact that  $f$  is  $k$ -NU. So this is a homotopy of length  $(k - 2)\ell$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ , as needed.  $\square$

Not only does this prove Theorem 3.1, but it gives an alternate bound on the diameter of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ . If  $H$  dismantles to a vertex or edge it does so in  $n_H - 1$  steps, so we get the following.

**Corollary 3.9.** *For a  $k$ -NU graph  $H$ , the graph  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ , or  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$  if  $H$  is irreflexive, has diameter at most  $2(k - 2)n_H$ .*

While this beats the bound of  $2n_H^2$  from Corollary 3.6 for small  $k$ , it is shown in [2], see also [13], that there are digraphs on  $n$  vertices for which the smallest NU polymorphism have arity  $k = 2^{2^{n^3}}$ . We do not know if such symmetric graphs exist.

**3.3. Finding the shortest path in polynomial time.** It is known from [6] that for a graph  $H$  admitting a  $k$ -NU polymorphism, an instance  $G$  of the problem  $\mathbf{Hom}(H)$  can be solved in time polynomial in time  $O(n_G^k n_H^k)$ . For fixed  $k$ , this polynomial in order  $n_G$  of the instance. A list version of the problem can be solved in this time, too. This, with Corollary 3.9, allows us to find a shortest path in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  between two vertices  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  as follows.

For  $\ell = 2, \dots, 2(k - 2)n_H =: L$  solve the instance  $\mathbf{Hom}(I_\ell \times G, H; q^{(\ell)})$  where the partial  $H$ -colouring  $q = q^{(\ell)}$  of  $I_\ell \times G$  is defined so that  $q_0 = \phi$ ,  $q_\ell = \psi$ , and for all  $i \in [\ell - 1]$  and all vertices  $g$  of  $G$  for which  $p$  is defined,  $q((i, g)) = p(g)$ . A solution, the existence of which we can determine in time polynomial in  $n_G \cdot \ell$ , so polynomial in  $n_G$ , yields a path from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$ . If there is no solution, there is no such path of length  $\ell$  or shorter. By Corollary 3.9 we will find a path by the time  $\ell$  reaches (the constant)  $L$ . This is polynomial in  $n_G$ . We record this.

**Corollary 3.10.** *For any (bipartite) Ext-trivial graph  $H$ , there is a polynomial time algorithm for finding the shortest path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  for any instance  $(G, p, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\mathbf{Recon}_{\text{Ext}} H$ .*

Though this algorithm is polynomial in  $n_G$  for fixed parameter  $k$ , it is exponential in  $k$ , and  $k$  can grow exponentially in the size of  $n_H$ . A polynomial algorithm independent of  $k$  would be quite interesting.

#### 4. BOUNDS ON RECONFIGURATION LENGTH

As mentioned in the introduction, the shortest reconfiguration path between vertices of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is at most  $n_G$  times as long as the shortest path, so with Corollaries 3.6 and 3.9 we get that for a reflexive  $k$ -NU graph  $H$  the shortest reconfiguration path between maps  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  is at most the minimum of

$$2(k - 2)n_G n_H \quad \text{and} \quad 2n_G n_H^2. \quad (2)$$

These upper bounds, which we get from dismantlings of  $H$ , are fairly weak though, as they assume that images, under  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , of all the vertices of  $G$  are moved by every step of the dismantling. This is clearly impossible, and so we can improve these bounds, significantly.

First observe that in the case of reflexive graphs a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  must be moved at least  $d_H(\psi(v), \phi(v))$  times as we reconfigure  $\phi$  to  $\psi$ , so we get the following lower bound the the length of a reconfiguration from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$ .

For  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H)$  let

$$|\psi - \phi| := \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_H(\phi(v), \psi(v)). \quad (3)$$

**Fact 4.1.** *For a non-empty connected graph  $G$  no reconfiguration path between maps between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H, p)$  can be shorter than  $1/2(|\psi - \phi|)$ . If  $G$  is reflexive then no reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  can be shorter than  $|\psi - \phi|$ .*

We show that if  $H$  has a 3-NU polymorphism, then for any maps  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$  there is a reconfiguration path between them of length at most twice this.

**4.1. Efficient Dismantlings.** A dismantling of a reflexive graph  $H$  to a retract  $r(H)$  is *efficient* if at every step, the dismantled vertex  $v$  moves closer to  $r(H)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *If a bipartite connected graph  $H$  has a 3-NU polymorphism then there is an efficient dismantling to any edge  $e$ . If a connected graph  $H$  has a 3-NU polymorphism then there is an efficient dismantling to any looped vertex  $v$ .*

*Proof.* The statement for bipartite graphs is immediate by induction using the following claim.

**Claim 4.3.** *Let  $H$  be a connected bipartite graph with a 3-NU polymorphism, and let  $e = vv'$  be a fixed edge of  $H$ . Let  $u$  be a vertex of  $H$  with maximum distance from  $e$ , without loss of generality assume it is closer to  $v$  than to  $v'$ . There is a dismantling retraction of  $u$  to some vertex  $u'$  that is closer to  $v'$  than  $u$  is to  $v$ .*

*Proof of claim.* Let  $u$  have distance  $d$  from  $v$  and let  $U_d$  be the set of neighbours of  $u$ . Every vertex of  $U_d$  clearly has a walk of length  $d + 2$  to  $v'$ , and by the choice of  $u$  we get that they in fact have walks of length  $d$  to  $v'$ .

If we can show that the vertices in  $U_d$  have a common neighbour  $u'$  at distance  $d - 1$  from  $v'$ , then  $u$  can dismantle to this, and we are done.

A subset  $U$  of  $U_d$  is good if its vertices share a neighbour at distance  $d - 1$  from  $v'$ . We show that all subsets  $U$  of  $U_d$  are good. Towards contradiction, let  $U$  be an inclusion minimal subset of  $U_d$  that is not good. It must contain at least two vertices, so  $k = |U| + 1$  is at least 3.

As  $H$  has a 3-NU polymorphism, by Corollary 3.2 it has no critical trees with 3 or more leaves. In particular let  $T$  be the tree with  $k$  branches, the first having length  $d - 1$  and the others having length 1. Let  $p$  take the leaf of the long branch to  $v'$  and biject the leaves of the other branches to  $U$ . The tree  $(T, p)$  is not critical, however, using the fact that any subset of  $U$  is good, and that the elements of  $U$  have a common neighbour  $u$ , one sees that upon removing any edge,  $(T, p)$  admits a homomorphism to  $H$  extending  $p$ . So there must be a homomorphism  $\phi : T \rightarrow H$  extending  $p$ . The target  $\phi(c)$  of the vertex  $c$  of degree  $k$  is a common neighbour of the vertices of  $U$  and has distance  $d - 1$  from  $v'$ . This is our contradiction.  $\diamond$

Having completed the proof for bipartite  $H$ , the proof for general graphs follows by Lemma 2.6 by observing that if a dismantling step of  $K_2 \times H$  is efficient, then the symmetric shadow dismantling step of  $H$  is efficient. Indeed, the distance of a vertex  $u$  from  $v$  in  $H$  is exactly the distance of a vertex  $(i, u)$  from  $(0, v)(1, v)$  in  $K_2 \times H$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** *If connected graph  $H$  has a 3-NU polymorphism then there is an efficient dismantling of  $H^2$ , or  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  if  $H$  is irreflexive, to  $\Delta(H^2)$ . Such a dismantling can be found in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* We give the proof of the statement about irreflexive graphs. The general statement follows, as in Lemma 4.2, by taking a symmetric shadow dismantling.

Let  $H$  be a connected bipartite graph with a 3-NU polymorphism. It is enough to show that for any retract  $R = r(H)$  of  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  containing  $\Delta = \Delta(H^2)$  there is a vertex  $u$  of  $R$  that dismantles to some vertex closer to  $\Delta$ .

As any vertex  $(u_1, u_2)$  of  $R$  is in  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  the vertices  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  have distance  $2d$  for some  $d$ , and the closest vertices to them in  $\Delta$  are vertices  $(v, v)$  where  $v$  is the middle vertex of a path  $P$  of length  $2d$  from  $u_1$  to  $u_2$ . In particular  $d(v, u_1) = d = d(v, u_2)$ .

Let  $(u_1, u_2)$  be a vertex of  $R$  that maximises this distance  $d$ , and let  $P$  and  $v$  be as above. The subgraph  $H'$  of  $H$  consisting of vertices of distance at most  $d$  from  $v$  is a retraction of  $H$  (this follows by Claim 4.3 as one can retract any vertex at distance more than  $d$  from  $v$  by choosing an appropriate edge containing  $v$ ) so has a 3-NU polymorphism.  $R$  is a retract of  $(H')^2$ , so also has a 3-NU polymorphism by Fact 2.1.

Where  $u'_2$  is the neighbor of  $u_2$  on the path  $P$ ,  $v_1$  is a vertex in  $R$  having maximum distance from the edge  $u'_2 u_2$ , and so by Lemma 4.2 dismantles to a vertex  $u'$  closer to it.

It follows that  $(u_1, u_2)$  dismantles to  $(u', u_2)$  in  $(H')^2$  and so to  $r((u', u_2))$  in  $R$ . As  $u'$  is closer to the edge  $u'_2 u_2$  than  $u_1$  is in  $H'$ ,  $(u', u_2)$  is closer to the diagonal than  $(u_1, u_2)$  is in  $R$ , as needed.

To find an efficient dismantling, Claim 4.3 tells us we can simply order the vertices by their distance from the diagonal, and then processing the vertices farthest from the diagonal first, find a dominating neighbour closer to the diagonal and retract to it. This can be done in time  $O(n_H^3)$ . □

We wonder if a similar result can be shown for  $H$  admitting a  $k$ -NU polymorphism for any  $k$ .

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $H$  be a bipartite 3-NU graph and  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  be elements of  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ . There is a reconfiguration path of length at most  $|\psi - \phi| - 1$  between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(G, H; p)$ .*

*Proof.* For any vertex  $v$  of  $G$ , the distance  $d_H(\phi(v), \psi(v))$  is even, say it is  $2d$ . Then where  $m$  is a middle vertex of a  $P_v$  path between them in  $H$ , the vertex  $(\phi(v), \phi(v))$  has distance  $d$  from  $(m, m) \in \Delta$  in  $C_\Delta(H^2)$ .

Using an efficient dismantling  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_d$  of  $C_\Delta(H^2)$  to  $\Delta$  in Lemma 3.4, the constructed path

$$a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d, b_{d-1}, \dots, b_1, b_0$$

between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  moves  $v$  exactly  $2d$  times. Thus when resolving it to a reconfiguration path it has length  $|\psi - \phi|$ .

To get the ‘ $-1$ ’, observe by Fact 2.4 and Lemma 4.2, we can choose the dismantling  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_d$  to the diagonal in the proof of Lemma 3.4 so that the vertex dismantled by  $r_d$  is any vertex that has distance 1 from the diagonal. Let this be  $(a, b)$  where, for some vertex  $v$  of  $G$ ,  $a$  is the neighbour of  $m$  on  $P_v$  closer to  $\phi(v)$




FIGURE 1. Paths  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  with minimum reconfiguration length  $|\psi - \phi| + O(\phi, \psi) - 1$

and  $b$  is the neighbour of  $m$  on  $P_v$  closer to  $\psi(v)$ . As all neighbours are on the diagonal,  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, a)$  have the same neighbourhoods, so in the path

$$a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}, a_d, b_{d-1}, \dots, b_1$$

we can skip  $a_d$  which takes  $(a, b)$  to  $(m, m)$ , and go straight from  $a_{d-1}$  to  $b_{d-1}$ . On resoving this to a reconfiguration path from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$ , it has length at most  $|\psi - \phi| - 1$ .  $\square$

For an non-bipartite 3-NU graph  $H$  we can apply this to the bipartite resolution  $B(H)$  and the symmetric shadow dismantling gives a path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . However, if  $d(\phi(v), \psi(v))$  is odd, then the distance of  $(\phi(v), \psi(v))$  to the diagonal in  $H^2$ , and so in  $C_\Delta(B(H))$ , is  $1/2(d(\phi(v), \psi(v)) + 1)$ . Thus path from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  moves  $v$  through  $d(\phi(v), \psi(v)) + 1$  steps. This gives the following.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $H$  be a non-bipartite 3-NU graph and  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  be in  $\mathbf{Hom}_B(G, H; p)$ . There is a reconfiguration path of length at most  $|\psi - \phi| + O(\phi, \psi) - 1$  between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , where  $O(\phi, \psi)$  is the number of vertices  $v$  of  $G$  for which  $d(\phi(v), \psi(v))$  is odd.*

The reason we got fiddly with the ‘-1’ while we were rough with our bounds in Corollary 3.9 is that this is, in a sense, tight. We give an infinite family of examples of  $(H, G, p, \phi, \psi)$  for which the shortest reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  has length exactly  $|\psi - \phi| + O(\phi, \psi) - 1$ .

**Example 4.7.** Let  $H$  be the product of two reflexive paths of length  $n$ . It has vertex set  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}^2$ , and  $(i, j) \sim (i', j')$  if  $|i' - i| \leq a$  and  $|j' - j| \leq 1$ . (See Figure 1 for the case  $n = 5$ .)  $H$  is a 3-NU graph. Where  $G$  is an irreflexive path of length  $n + 1$ , let  $\phi$  map it to the path

$$(0, 0), (1, 0), (2, 1), \dots, (n, n - 1), (n, n)$$

and  $\psi$  map it to

$$(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (n - 1, n), (n, n).$$

Both are extensions of  $p$  mapping the endpoints of  $G$  to  $(0, 0)$  and  $(n, n)$ . One can check that  $|\psi - \phi| = n - 1$  and that  $O(\phi, \psi) = n - 1$ . The only vertices of  $\phi(G)$  that can move are  $(1, 0)$  and  $(n, n - 1)$ , and they can only move to  $(1, 1)$  and  $(n - 1, n - 1)$  respectively. Without loss of generality, move  $(1, 0)$  to  $(1, 1)$ . The vertex  $(2, 1)$  now becomes free to move to  $(2, 2)$ . One can check that no vertex of  $\phi(G)$  can move below the line

$$(0, 0), (1, 1), \dots, (n - 1, n - 1), (n, n)$$

until all but one of them have moved onto it, and then that last vertex,  $v$  can move directly from  $\phi(v)$  to  $\psi(v)$ . This takes  $n - 1$  moves, and it then takes  $n - 2$  more to move the rest of the vertices to  $\psi(G)$ .

The shortest reconfiguration path from  $\phi$  to  $\psi$  has length  $2n - 3 = |\psi - \phi| + O(\phi, \psi) - 1$ , meeting the bound of Corollary 4.6.

## 5. SHORTEST PATH RECONFIGURATION

Recall that an instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of the shortest path reconfiguration problem  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  is an instance  $(P_d, p, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$  with  $P_d$  being a path whose length is the distance  $d$  between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $H$ , and  $p$  maps its endpoints to  $u$  and  $v$  respectively. The problem is usually only considered for irreflexive instances  $H$ , as shortest paths would never use a loop. We say an irreflexive graph  $H$  is SP-trivial if  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$  is connected for all instances  $(P_d, p, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{Ext}}(H)$ .

As  $P_d$  is bipartite and  $p$  is non-empty,  $H$  is SP-trivial if it is bipartite Ext-trivial. Moreover, as loops on  $H$  do not effect the connectedness of  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$ , we get that  $H$  is SP-trivial if upon adding any number of loops it is Ext-trivial.

Thus the following is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.5.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Any irreflexive graph  $H$  that we get by removing the loops from a graph  $H'$  which admits a  $k$ -NU polymorphism, is SP-trivial.*

Corollary 5.1 is not a characterisation, as odd cycles are SP-trivial while for an odd cycle of length at least 5, no addition of loops can make it admit a  $k$ -NU polymorphism. A full characterisation of the SP-trivial graphs would be interesting. It would have to deal with the following example which produces many SP-trivial graphs that do not have NU polymorphisms.

**Example 5.2.** If  $H$  is bipartite and SP-trivial, and we add one edge  $e$  making an odd cycle, then it remains SP-trivial. For any two vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , all shortest paths either use  $e$  or all shortest paths do not use  $e$ . If they do not, then they reconfigure, if they do, then we can reconfigure the paths from  $u$  to  $e$  and then reconfigure the paths from  $e$  to  $v$ .

We compare Corollary 5.1 with related results from [3] and [9].

- In [3] it was shown that chordal graphs are SP-trivial. Any chordal graph, with loops added to every vertex, is a  $k$ -NU graph. So we recover this result.
- In [9] it was shown that a hypercube is SP-trivial. (It was shown that  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  can be solved in polynomial time, but the algorithm shows the graph is SP-trivial.) A hypercube is a 3-NU graph, so we recover this result.

- In [9] it was shown, more generally, that any graph with a so-called triangle property is SP-trivial. The triangle property is equivalent to the omission of certain critical tree obstructions with three leaves. So their proof actually shows that 3-NU graphs are SP-trivial. This class of graphs is incomparable with the class of NU graphs.

All results mentioned from [3] and [9] come with polynomial time algorithms for finding the the shortest reconfiguration path between two shortest paths. Though we find the shortest path between two shortest paths in an NU graph in polynomial time in Corollary 3.10, this does not find a shortest reconfiguraton path. Likley the path can be greedily resolved to find one. A proof of this would be interesting.

**5.1. Reconfiguration length for shortest paths.** An an instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  is a  $d$ -instance where  $d = d_H(u, v)$ . Given a  $d$ -instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$ , what is the length of the shortest reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$ . From Proposition 3.8 we get the following.

**Corollary 5.3.** *For any graph  $H$  admitting a  $k$ -NU polymorphism, any  $d$ -instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  admits a reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  of length at most  $(k - 2) \binom{d+1}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* The irreflexive path  $\phi(P_d)$  on  $d + 1$  vertices dismantles to its intitial edge in a sequence of  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor \lceil d/2 \rceil$  dismantling retractions. Moving the  $\lceil d/2 \rceil$  vertices at the second vertex of  $\phi(P_d)$  to the second vertex of  $\psi(P_d)$  in  $\lceil d/2 \rceil$  reconfiguration steps, and then reconfiguring back to  $\psi(P_d)$  in another  $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor \lceil d/2 \rceil$  steps, we get a reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  in  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H)$  of length

$$2 \lfloor d/2 \rfloor \lceil d/2 \rceil + \lceil d/2 \rceil = d(d + 1)/2.$$

Observing that in the proof of Proposition 3.8 a reconfiguration path in  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H)$  yields a reconfiguration path in  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H; p)$  of the claimed length.  $\square$

In the case that  $H$  has a 3-NU we improve this a bit more using Corollary 4.6.

**Corollary 5.4.** *For any graph  $H$  admitting a 3-NU polymorphism and any  $d$ -instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$  there is a reconfiguration path between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  of length at most  $d^2/2 - 1$ .*

*Proof.* In a path  $P_d = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_d$  of length  $d$ , the distance between  $\phi(v_i)$  and  $\psi(v_i)$  is at most  $2 \cdot \min(i, d - i)$ . Computing

$$|\psi - \phi| \leq 2 \lfloor d/2 \rfloor \lceil d/2 \rceil \leq d^2/2$$

the result follows by Corollary 4.6 by observing that all of these distances are even.  $\square$

The following example, while showing that the bound in Corollary 5.4 can be improved for a reflexive 3-NU graph  $H$  by considering its embedding into a hypercube, also shows that it cannot, in general, be improved by any multiplicative constant.

**Example 5.5.** In [9], it was shown that for any  $d$ -instance  $(H, u, v, \phi, \psi)$  of  $\text{Recon}_{\text{SP}}$ , the shortest  $uv$ -paths, elements of  $\mathbf{Hom}(P_d, H, p)$ , can be represented by permutations of the set  $[d - 1] = 1, 2, \dots, d - 1$ . Two paths are a reconfiguration step apart if and only if they differ by a transposition (permutation of order 2), and so the shortest reconfiguration path between them is the number of transpositions one

must compose one with to get the other. This number is the greatest when the two shortest paths are inverse cyclic permutations of  $[d - 1]$ . In this case they differ by  $\binom{d-1}{2}$  transpositions. This is greater than  $(1 - 3/d)|\phi - \psi|$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bandelt, M. Farber, and P. Hell. Absolute reflexive retracts and absolute bipartite retracts. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 44(1-3):9–20, 1993. DOI:10.1016/0166-218X(93)90219-E.
- [2] L. Barto and O. Draganov. The minimal arity of near unanimity polymorphisms. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 69(2):297–310, 2019. DOI:10.1515/ms-2017-0223.
- [3] P. Bonsma. The complexity of rerouting shortest paths. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 510:1–12, 10 2013. ISSN 0304-3975. DOI:10.1016/J.TCS.2013.09.012.
- [4] R. Briceño, A. Bulatov, V. Dalmau, and B. Larose. Dismantlability, connect-edness, and mixing in relational structures. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 147: 37–70, 2021. DOI:10.1016/j.jctb.2020.10.001.
- [5] G. Brightwell and P. Winkler. Gibbs measures and dismantlable graphs. *JTCB*, 78(1):141–166, 2000. DOI:10.1006/jctb.1999.1935.
- [6] T. Feder and M. 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, 1999. DOI:10.1137/S0097539794266766.
- [7] T. Feder, P. Hell, and J. Huang. Bi-arc graphs and the complexity of list homomorphisms. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 42(1):61–80, 2003. DOI:10.1002/jgt.10073.
- [8] T. Feder, P. Hell, B. Larose, C. Loten, M. Siggers, and C. Tardif. Graphs ad-mitting k-nu operations. part 1: The reflexive case. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27, 2013. ISSN 08954801. DOI:10.1137/120894312.
- [9] K. Gajjar, A. V. Jha, M. Kumar, and A. Lahiri. Reconfiguring shortest paths in graphs, 2021. arXiv:2112.07499.
- [10] B. Larose, C. Loten, and L. Zádori. A polynomial-time algo-rithm for near-unanimity graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 55(2):177–191, 2005. DOI:10.1016/j.jalgor.2004.04.011.
- [11] B. Larose, C. Loten, and C. Tardif. A characterisation of first-order constraint satisfaction problems. *Log. Meth-ods Comput. Sci.*, 3(4), 2007. DOI:10.2168/LMCS-3(4:6)2007. arXiv:https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3(4:6)2007.
- [12] L. Zádori. Relational sets and categorical equivalence of algebras. *Int J Algebra Comput*, 07(05):561–576, 1997. DOI:10.1142/S0218196797000253.
- [13] D. Zhuk. The existence of a near-unanimity function is decidable. *Algebra Universalis*, 71(1):31–54, 2014. DOI:10.1007/s00012-013-0259-7.

KYUNGPOOK NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, REPUBLIC OF KOREA  
 Email address: mhsiggers@knu.ac.kr