

Coarse classification of binary minimal clones

Zarathustra Brady

Abstract

We classify binary minimal clones into seven categories: affine algebras, rectangular bands, p -cyclic groupoids, spirals, non-Taylor partial semilattices, melds, and dispersive algebras. Each category has nice enough properties to guarantee that any clone of one of these types contains a minimal clone of the same type.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Concepts and techniques used throughout the paper	5
3	Descriptions of the different types of binary minimal clones	11
3.1	p -cyclic groupoids	12
3.2	Partial semilattice operations	14
3.3	Melds	18
3.4	Dispersive algebras	22
4	Proof of the classification	31
5	Acknowledgments	45
A	Partial semilattices with few strongly connected components	46
B	Inert dispersive algebras with small right orbits	50

1 Introduction

The classification of minimal clones on a finite set is a very old problem, studied by many authors. For a survey of previous results, the reader is directed to the papers of Quackenbush [14] and Csákány [6]. First we review a few of the basic definitions and results. All algebras which occur throughout this paper will be assumed to be finite unless explicitly stated otherwise.

Definition 1. A clone \mathcal{C} is *minimal* if $f \in \mathcal{C}$ nontrivial implies $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(f)$. An algebra \mathbb{A} will be called *clone-minimal* (equivalently: $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a *minimal clone*) if \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial proper reduct.

Proposition 1. *If $\text{Clo}(f)$ is minimal and $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$ nontrivial, then $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$.*

Definition 2. \mathbb{A} is called a *projection algebra* if all of its operations are projections. Otherwise, we say that \mathbb{A} is *nontrivial* (note that this is a nonstandard definition of what it means for an algebra to be nontrivial).

Proposition 2. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is minimal and $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ nontrivial, then $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{B})$ is minimal.*

Theorem 1 (Rosenberg [16]). *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a finite clone-minimal algebra, and f has minimal arity among nontrivial elements of $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$. Then one of the following is true:*

1. f is a unary operation which is either a permutation of prime order or satisfies $f(f(x)) \approx f(x)$,
2. f is ternary, and \mathbb{A} is the idempotent reduct of a vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 ,
3. f is a ternary majority operation,
4. f is a semiprojection of arity at least 3,
5. f is an idempotent binary operation.

Rosenberg's classification is not fully satisfactory: it can be very difficult to check whether a given majority operation, semiprojection, or idempotent binary operation generates a minimal clone. This paper is mainly concerned with the binary case. Previous authors have proven classifications of binary minimal clones under additional assumptions, such as the assumption that the binary operation is *entropic* [10], or the assumption that the associated algebra is *weakly abelian* [18], or the assumption that the number of binary operations in the clone is small [11]. In this paper, we consider the general case of binary minimal clones.

Definition 3. We say a property \mathcal{P} of functions f , or algebras (A, f) , is *nice* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- Given f as input, we can verify in polynomial time whether f has property \mathcal{P} ,
- If f has property \mathcal{P} and $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$ is nontrivial, then there is a nontrivial $f' \in \text{Clo}(g)$ such that f' has property \mathcal{P} .
- There exists a fixed nontrivial algebra $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ such that for any nontrivial algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ where f has the property \mathcal{P} , the algebra $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is in the variety generated by \mathbb{A} .
- The collection of finite algebras (A, f) such that f has the property \mathcal{P} is closed under finite products, homomorphic images, and subalgebras, that is, it forms a pseudovariety.

The first three cases in Rosenberg's classification are given by nice properties (with the caveat that in the case of unary permutations of prime order, we actually get an infinite family of nice properties indexed by the primes). As an example, we'll check that being a ternary majority operation is a nice property. The first, third, and fourth conditions are straightforward to verify. For the second condition, we use the following result from [20], which is used in that paper to simplify the study of minimal majority clones.

Proposition 3 (Waldhauser [20]). *If f is a majority operation and $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$ is nontrivial, then g is a near-unanimity operation. In this case, g has a majority term as an identification minor.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the construction of g in terms of f . If $g = f(g_1, g_2, g_3)$, then by the inductive hypothesis each g_i is either a near-unanimity term or a projection. If two of the g_i s are equal to the same projection, then so is g . Otherwise, if we identify all but one of the inputs to g with x , then by the inductive hypothesis at least two of g_1, g_2, g_3 evaluate to x , so g is a near-unanimity operation.

Since any near-unanimity operation is not a semiprojection, by Świerczkowski's Lemma from [17] if g is not already majority we can identify two of the inputs to g to get a nontrivial $g' \in \text{Clo}(g)$ of smaller arity. Thus g has a majority term as an identification minor. \square

The fact that being a majority operation is a nice property implies that in order to check whether a majority clone $\text{Clo}(f)$ is minimal, one only needs to enumerate the ternary majority operations $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$ and check that $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$ for each one. While this may be difficult, we are at the very least assured that if f is a majority operation, then $\text{Clo}(f)$ contains *some* minimal majority clone (in fact every minimal clone contained in $\text{Clo}(f)$ will be a majority clone).

On the other hand, if one is given a binary idempotent operation f , then it can be difficult to rule out the possibility that $\text{Clo}(f)$ might contain a semiprojection of very large arity. As a result, checking whether a binary operation generates a minimal clone could in principle be an enormous undertaking. The goal of

the present paper is to provide a *coarse classification* of binary minimal clones, that is, a list $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots$ of nice properties such that every binary minimal clone contains an operation satisfying exactly one of the nice properties \mathcal{P}_i .

We briefly recall a few standard results about Taylor algebras. A Taylor operation is an idempotent operation which satisfies a collection of height 1 identities which cannot be simultaneously satisfied by any particular projection operation. More concretely, an operation t is Taylor if it satisfies a system of identities of the form

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

where the ?s are filled in somehow with x s and y s.

Proposition 4 (Proposition 4.14 of [5], Proposition 2.1 of [7], or Corollary 4.2.1 of [21]). *If an algebra \mathbb{A} is finite and idempotent, then \mathbb{A} has a Taylor term operation if and only if there is no two-element projection algebra in $HS(\mathbb{A})$, where $HS(\mathbb{A})$ is the collection of homomorphic images of subalgebras of \mathbb{A} .*

As a starting point, a previous paper by the present author has given a coarse classification of minimal clones which have a Taylor operation, into just three cases. Two of these cases are defined by nice properties, while the remaining case (vector spaces over a prime field) is given in terms of an infinite family of nice properties, one for each prime p .

Theorem 2 (Clone-minimal Taylor algebras [2]). *Suppose \mathbb{A} is a finite algebra which is both clone-minimal and Taylor. Then one of the following is true:*

1. \mathbb{A} is the idempotent reduct of a vector space over \mathbb{F}_p for some prime p ,
2. \mathbb{A} is a majority algebra,
3. \mathbb{A} is a spiral.

The last case above was one of the author's main motivations for introducing the concept of nice properties. Spirals are defined below. We use the following standard notation: for S a subset of an algebra \mathbb{A} , the *subalgebra generated* by S , written $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}(S)$, is the smallest subset of \mathbb{A} which contains S and is closed under the operations of \mathbb{A} .

Definition 4. An algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a spiral if f is binary, idempotent, commutative, and for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ either $\{a, b\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , or $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$ has a surjective homomorphism to the free semilattice on two generators.

The reader may find it instructive to check that being a spiral is a nice property. While this follows from the results of [2], it is simple enough to give a direct argument. For now, we just note that it is possible to test whether a given algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a spiral in time polynomial in $|A|$: for any a, b with $\{a, b\}$ not a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , if $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\} = \{a, b\} \cup S$ with $a, b \notin S$, then any surjective homomorphism from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$ to the free semilattice on two generators x, y must map a to one generator, say x , map b to the other generator y , and map every element of S to xy . Thus, the existence of such a surjective homomorphism is equivalent to S being a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} such that $f(a, S) \subseteq S$ and $f(b, S) \subseteq S$.

The main classification result of this paper is the following coarse classification of the non-Taylor binary minimal algebras. To save space when writing out identities, sometimes we will abbreviate the basic binary operation f of the algebras we study with the infix \cdot , or with simple juxtaposition, as is common in the study of groupoids.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a binary clone-minimal algebra which is not Taylor. Then, after possibly replacing $f(x, y)$ by $f(y, x)$, one of the following is true:*

1. \mathbb{A} is a rectangular band, i.e. an idempotent groupoid satisfying $(xy)(zw) \approx xw$,
2. \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid for some prime p ,
3. there is a nontrivial $s \in \text{Clo}(f)$ which is a “partial semilattice operation”:

$$s(x, s(x, y)) \approx s(s(x, y), x) \approx s(x, y),$$

4. \mathbb{A} is an idempotent groupoid satisfying $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$ (a “meld”),
5. \mathbb{A} is a “dispersive algebra” (see Definition 5).

Furthermore, each of these cases is defined by a nice property, other than the case of p -cyclic groupoids, which consists of an infinite family of nice properties indexed by the primes.

Most of the cases appearing in the classification have been described by previous authors. Rectangular bands are well-known in the theory of bands. The structure of p -cyclic groupoids was described by Płonka [13] (see also [15]). Partial semilattice operations were isolated by Bulatov [3] in his study of colored graphs attached to finite Taylor algebras, but they were not named there or studied for their own sake (in the more recent paper [4], Bulatov refers to the partial semilattice identities as the “Semilattice Shift Condition”). Melds were described by Lévai and Pálffy in Theorem 5.2(e) of [11], which classifies binary minimal clones having exactly four binary operations, but melds were not given a name there, and no structure theory for them was given.

The last case of the above theorem - the case of dispersive algebras - has a definition which has a similar flavour to the definition of spirals, but which is somewhat harder to work with in practice. The author has struggled for some time to give a structure theory for this case, but was ultimately unsuccessful. Several difficult conjectures about the structure of dispersive algebras are given at the end of the next section.

To define the dispersive algebras, we first define the variety \mathcal{D} of idempotent groupoids satisfying

$$x(yx) \approx (xy)x \approx (xy)y \approx (xy)(yx) \approx xy, \tag{D1}$$

$$\forall n \geq 0 \quad x(\dots((xy_1)y_2) \cdots y_n) \approx x. \tag{D2}$$

This variety of minimal clones appears in Lévai and Pálffy [11], and the notation \mathcal{D} for this variety is from Waldhauser’s thesis [19]. We use the notation $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(x, y)$ to denote the *free algebra* on two generators in any variety \mathcal{V} .

Proposition 5 (Lévai, Pálffy [11]). *If $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{D}$, then $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a minimal clone. Also, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ has exactly four elements: x, y, xy, yx .*

Definition 5. An idempotent groupoid \mathbb{A} is *dispersive* if it satisfies (D2) and if for all $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, either $\{a, b\}$ is a two element subalgebra of \mathbb{A} or there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y).$$

The name “dispersive” for such algebras was chosen in order to reflect the fact that they satisfy very few *absorption identities*. Absorption identities are a crucial tool in the study of minimal clones. (There is an unfortunate naming collision here: absorption identities have nothing to do with the theory of absorbing subalgebras from [1] which recently found many applications in the study of Taylor algebras.)

Definition 6. An *absorption identity* is an identity of the form

$$t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_i.$$

Proposition 6 (Kearnes [9], Lévai, Pálffy [11]). *If \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal and $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ is nontrivial, then any absorption identity which holds in \mathbb{B} must also hold in \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. Suppose that the absorption identity $t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_i$ holds in \mathbb{B} but not in \mathbb{A} . Then t generates a nontrivial proper subclone of $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$: the reduct of \mathbb{B} with basic operation t is a projection algebra, so $\text{Clo}(t)$ must be proper, and $\text{Clo}(t)$ is nontrivial on \mathbb{A} since (by assumption) t cannot act as any projection on \mathbb{A} . \square

As a consequence of the third condition for being a nice property (i.e. that the fixed algebra $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$ can be found in $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$), if \mathcal{P} is a nice property and f generates a minimal clone and has property \mathcal{P} , then the set of absorption identities that hold in $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is the same as the set of absorption identities that hold on $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{P}}$, which depends only on \mathcal{P} . Thus the coarse classification of binary minimal clones given in this paper is also a classification of the possible collections of absorption identities which can be satisfied in a binary minimal clone.

In the case of partial semilattice operations, Corollary 5 shows that no absorption identities hold at all (other than those following from idempotence), for the simple reason that every nontrivial partial semilattice contains a two-element semilattice subalgebra by Proposition 20. In the case of melds, every absorption identity follows from idempotence and the identity

$$x((yx)z) \approx x,$$

and in fact Proposition 25 shows that this identity is equivalent to the defining identity $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$ of melds (modulo idempotence). In the case of dispersive algebras, Proposition 33 shows that all absorption identities follow from idempotence and the absorption identity (D2).

In light of the coarse classification of binary minimal clones provided in this paper, it is natural to ask whether a coarse classification of semiprojections can be found. Such a classification would, in a certain sense, complete the classification of minimal clones which was started by Rosenberg [16]. The author has not made any attempt at classifying semiprojections, but the main result of [8] which classifies *conservative* semiprojections indicates that the problem is not hopeless.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we go over several basic techniques that are widely applicable throughout the paper, as well as several ways of visualizing small groupoids which the author has found to be more helpful than simply writing out operation tables. Many of the results in Section 2 encapsulate various ways to take advantage of the finiteness of the relevant algebras. In Section 3 we go over each of the five types of non-Taylor binary minimal clone in more detail, proving basic results and bit of structure theory about each of them. We also verify that each of these types is described by a nice property in Section 3. In Section 4, which is the meat of the paper, we prove Theorem 3.

Appendices A and B prove some more technical results about clone-minimal partial semilattices and dispersive algebras which are mentioned in Section 3, but which would have disrupted the flow of the paper due to their length. These results are not necessary for the proof of our main result (Theorem 3), but they may be useful to any reader who wishes to use the results of this paper to assist in classifying binary minimal clones on a small domain.

2 Concepts and techniques used throughout the paper

There are a few basic ideas which we will use repeatedly. One fact which we will frequently exploit is that in any algebra \mathbb{A} , there is a bijection between the set $\text{Clo}_n(\mathbb{A})$ of n -ary term operations of \mathbb{A} and the free algebra on n generators $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in the variety $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$, which sends the i th projection π_i to x_i . We will often implicitly identify $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ with the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ throughout the paper, identifying π_1 with x and π_2 with y .

The following well-known iteration argument is one of the main ways in which we exploit finiteness.

Proposition 7. *If f is a unary operation on a finite set A , then for every $a \in A$ there is some $1 \leq m_a \leq |A|$ such that*

$$f^{km_a}(a) = f^{m_a}(a)$$

for all $k \geq 1$. In particular, the sequence

$$f^{1!}(a), f^{2!}(a), \dots, f^{n!}(a), \dots$$

is eventually constant with eventual value $f^{|A|!}(a) = f^{m_a}(a)$, and if we define a unary operation f^∞ by

$$f^\infty(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{n!}(a) = f^{m_a}(a),$$

where the limit is taken in the discrete topology on A , then $f^\infty = f^{|A|!} \in \text{Clo}(f)$, the operation f^∞ satisfies the identity

$$f^\infty(f^\infty(x)) \approx f^\infty(x),$$

and $f^\infty(A) \subseteq f(A)$, so f^∞ is nontrivial if f is not a permutation of A .

Proof. By the Pigeonhole Principle, for any given a there are $1 \leq i < j \leq |A| + 1$ such that $f^i(a) = f^j(a)$. We then have $f^{i+k}(a) = f^{j+k}(a)$ for all $k \geq 0$, so

$$f^{k+j-i}(a) = f^k(a)$$

as long as $k \geq i$. Taking m_a to be the multiple of $j - i$ which is in the half-open interval $[i, j)$, we see that $1 \leq m_a \leq |A|$ and

$$f^{km_a+m_a}(a) = f^{km_a}(a)$$

for all $k \geq 1$, since $km_a \geq m_a \geq i$.

That the sequence $f^{n!}(a)$ is eventually equal to $f^{m_a}(a)$ follows from the fact that $n!$ is a multiple of m_a for $n \geq m_a$. To check the identity $f^\infty(f^\infty(x)) \approx f^\infty(x)$, we note that for any particular $a \in A$ we have

$$f^\infty(f^\infty(a)) = f^{|A|!}(f^{|A|!}(a)) = f^{2|A|!}(a) = f^{m_a}(a) = f^\infty(a).$$

Finally, if f is not a permutation of A , then by the finiteness of A the image $f(A)$ must be a strict subset of A , and each $f^{n!}$ has image $f^{n!}(A) = f(f^{n!-1}(A)) \subseteq f(A)$, so $f^\infty = \lim_n f^{n!}$ has $f^\infty(A) \subseteq f(A) \neq A$. \square

The same argument shows that if f is an element of a finite semigroup, then the sequence $f^{1!}, f^{2!}, \dots$ is eventually constant with eventual value equal to some idempotent element e , and in a monoid this e will not be the identity iff f is not invertible. In particular, any finite monoid which is not a group contains some non-identity idempotent elements. We will apply this fact to monoids built out of the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$, which is finite as long as \mathbb{A} is finite.

There are three natural ways to compose binary functions in an associative way. The first way is based on viewing a binary function $f(x, y)$ as a family of unary functions $f_y(x)$ indexed by a parameter y . This leads us to the associative operation $*_1$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ given by

$$(f *_1 g)(x, y) = f(g(x, y), y). \tag{*1}$$

Similarly, if we view f as a family of unary functions indexed by a parameter x , we are led to define the associative operation $*_2$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ given by

$$(f *_2 g)(x, y) = f(x, g(x, y)). \tag{*2}$$

The third associative operation comes from viewing f as a function ϕ on pairs of elements, which takes the pair (a, b) to the pair $(f(a, b), f(b, a))$. Note that any map on pairs $\phi : A^2 \rightarrow A^2$ which commutes with reversing the order of the pairs, i.e. such that

$$\phi(a, b) = (c, d) \iff \phi(b, a) = (d, c),$$

has the form

$$\phi(x, y) = (f(x, y), f(y, x))$$

for $f = \pi_1 \circ \phi$, and the collection of such maps ϕ is closed under composition. This leads us to the *circular composition* operation $*_c$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ which is given by

$$(f *_c g)(x, y) = f(g(x, y), g(y, x)). \quad (*_c)$$

Definition 7. For any binary operation f on a finite set, we define the binary operations $f^{\infty_1}, f^{\infty_2}, f^{\infty_c} \in \text{Clo}(f)$ by

$$f^{\infty_1}(a, b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x \mapsto f(x, b))^{n!}(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{*1 n!}(a, b),$$

similarly

$$f^{\infty_2}(a, b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (y \mapsto f(a, y))^{n!}(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{*2 n!}(a, b),$$

and finally

$$f^{\infty_c}(a, b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_1 \left(((x, y) \mapsto (f(x, y), f(y, x)))^{n!}(a, b) \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{*c n!}(a, b).$$

Corollary 1. For any binary operation f on a finite set, the operations $f^{\infty_1}, f^{\infty_2}, f^{\infty_c}$ are well-defined elements of $\text{Clo}(f)$ which satisfy the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\infty_1}(f^{\infty_1}(x, y), y) &\approx f^{\infty_1}(x, y), \\ f^{\infty_2}(x, f^{\infty_2}(x, y)) &\approx f^{\infty_2}(x, y), \\ f^{\infty_c}(f^{\infty_c}(x, y), f^{\infty_c}(y, x)) &\approx f^{\infty_c}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the operation f^{∞_1} is first projection iff the map $x \mapsto f(x, y)$ is a permutation for all y , the operation f^{∞_2} is second projection iff the map $y \mapsto f(x, y)$ is a permutation for all x , and f^{∞_c} is first projection iff the map $(x, y) \mapsto (f(x, y), f(y, x))$ is a permutation on the collection of ordered pairs.

Since we mainly study algebras $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ which are not Taylor, it will be useful to know how f acts on projection algebras \mathbb{B} in the variety generated by \mathbb{A} . We will generally focus on functions f which restrict to the first projection on such an algebra \mathbb{B} .

Definition 8. If f is a binary operation, then we define $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ to be the smallest set of binary operations g which contains π_1 and contains $f(g(x, y), h(x, y))$ for all $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ and $h \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ (note that we do not require $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$).

An alternative characterization of $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is the set of operations $g(x, y)$ which can be written as a term in f whose tree representation has an x as its leftmost leaf. Note that the operations $f^{\infty_1}, f^{\infty_2}, f^{\infty_c}$ all belong to $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, and that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is closed under $*_1, *_2, *_c$.

Proposition 8. If a term operation f of \mathbb{A} acts as first projection on some algebra $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ of size at least two, then $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is exactly the set of binary operations $g \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ which also act as first projection on \mathbb{B} .

Proof. We prove by induction on the definition of a term $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ that if f is first projection on \mathbb{B} then so is g . The base case is $g = \pi_1$, which certainly acts as first projection on \mathbb{B} . For the inductive step, if we have already proved that some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ acts as first projection on \mathbb{B} , then for any $h \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ we have

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \approx g(x, y) \approx x$$

on \mathbb{B} .

Since $\pi_2(y, x) = \pi_1 \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, an inductive argument shows that for any $g \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ we either have $g(x, y) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ or $g(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$. If $g(x, y) \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, then from $g(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ we see that $g(y, x)$ acts as first projection on \mathbb{B} , so $g(x, y)$ acts as second projection on \mathbb{B} , and first and second projection are not the same on \mathbb{B} as long as $|\mathbb{B}| \geq 2$. \square

Definition 9. For any algebra \mathbb{A} , let $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ be the set of binary terms of \mathbb{A} which restrict to the first projection on some algebra $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ of size at least 2.

Proposition 9. *If $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ and $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, then $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$.*

Proof. If f acts as first projection on some $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$, then by Proposition 8 so does g . \square

For operations $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, the following definition is convenient.

Definition 10. If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is an algebra with a binary operation f and $a \in \mathbb{A}$, then the *right orbit* of a (under f) is the smallest set $O(a)$ such that

- $a \in O(a)$, and
- for $b \in O(a)$ and $c \in \mathbb{A}$, we have $f(b, c) \in O(a)$.

Equivalently, we have $b \in O(a)$ iff there is a sequence of elements $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$b = f(\cdots f(f(a, c_1), c_2) \cdots, c_k).$$

We say that a set O is a right orbit of \mathbb{A} if $O = O(a)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{A}$.

Proposition 10. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is generated by two elements $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, then the right orbit $O(a)$ is exactly the set of elements that can be written as $g(a, b)$ for some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$.*

Proof. If $d \in O(a)$, then by the definition of $O(a)$ there are $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$d = f(\cdots f(f(a, c_1), c_2) \cdots, c_k).$$

Since \mathbb{A} is generated by a and b , for each c_i there is some binary term $t_i \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ such that $t_i(a, b) = c_i$. Defining g by

$$g(x, y) = f(\cdots f(f(x, t_1(x, y)), t_2(x, y)) \cdots, t_k(x, y)),$$

we see that $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ and $g(a, b) = a$. The converse follows directly from the definition of a right orbit. \square

Corollary 2. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$, then $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ can be canonically identified with the right orbit of x in the free algebra on two generators $\mathcal{F}_{\text{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$.*

Proposition 11. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is generated by a_1, \dots, a_n , then $A = \bigcup_i O(a_i)$.*

Proof. Let $S = \bigcup_i O(a_i)$. Since each $a_i \in O(a_i) \subseteq S$, we just need to check that S is closed under f . If $b, c \in S$, then $b \in O(a_i)$ for some i , so by the definition of a right orbit we have $f(b, c) \in O(a_i) \subseteq S$ as well. \square

There is a useful way to visualize binary operations f which makes it easy to keep track of the right orbits.

Definition 11. If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$, we define the digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ to have a directed edge from a to $f(a, b)$ for all pairs $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ with $f(a, b) \neq a$. We think of this as a labeled digraph, where the label of an edge $a \rightarrow c$ is the set of all elements b such that $f(a, b) = c$.

We define the preorder \preceq on \mathbb{A} by $a \preceq b$ iff $b \in O(a)$, and we consider \preceq to be a partial order on the strongly connected components of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ in the usual way. (This is a special case of what is usually called the *reachability* partial order on the strongly connected components of a digraph.)

Note that while the labeled digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ is *not* a clone-invariant of \mathbb{A} (that is, the labeled digraph depends on the choice of a particular binary operation f rather than the set of all binary terms of \mathbb{A}), the collection of right orbits $O(a)$ and the partial order \preceq are clone-invariants if \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal, at least if we stick to operations in $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$.

Proposition 12. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a clone-minimal algebra such that $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, then for any nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, the digraphs $D_{(A,f)}$ and $D_{(A,g)}$ have the same collection of strongly connected components and the same partial ordering \preceq .*

Proof. First we check that for every nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, we have $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$. Since \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal, we automatically have $f \in \text{Clo}_2(g)$. By the definition of $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, f acts as first projection on some $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ of size at least two. By Proposition 8 we see that g also acts as first projection on \mathbb{B} , and then by Proposition 8 applied to g we see that in fact we have $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$.

Now if $b = f(a, c)$, then Proposition 10 applied to (A, g) implies that b is in the right orbit of a with respect to g . Applying this repeatedly, we see that right orbits with respect to f are the same as right orbits with respect to g . \square

The next result is often useful when classifying minimal binary clones on a small domain.

Proposition 13. *For any finite idempotent algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$, there are binary operations $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that as elements of the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ we have $f(x, y) \preceq g_i(x, y)$ and each $g_i(x, y)$ is contained in a maximal strongly connected component of the digraph $D_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)}$, and such that the g_i satisfy the identities*

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(g_1(x, y), y) &\approx g_1(x, y), \\ g_2(g_2(x, y), g_2(y, x)) &\approx g_2(x, y), \\ g_3(g_3(x, y), x) &\approx g_3(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First pick any \preceq -maximal $g_0(x, y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ with $f(x, y) \preceq g_0(x, y)$ (that such a g_0 exists follows from the finiteness of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$). We will construct g_1, g_2, g_3 such that $g_i(x, y) \in O(g_0(x, y))$, which will guarantee that each $g_i(x, y)$ is also \preceq -maximal and satisfies $f(x, y) \preceq g_i(x, y)$.

The construction of g_1 and g_2 from g_0 is straightforward: we just take $g_1 = g_0^{\infty_1}$ and $g_2 = g_0^{\infty_c}$ and note that this construction ensures $g_0 \preceq g_1, g_2$ by Proposition 10 and the identities

$$g_1(x, y) \approx g_0^{*1(|A|-1)}(g_0(x, y), y)$$

and

$$g_2(x, y) \approx g_0^{*c(|A^2|-1)}(g_0(x, y), g_0(y, x)).$$

Note, however, that we do not generally have $g_0 \preceq g_0^{\infty_2}$.

In order to construct g_3 , we set

$$g_3(x, y) := g_1(g_1(x, y), x).$$

Then we have $g_1 \preceq g_3$ by Proposition 10, and

$$\begin{aligned} g_3(g_3(x, y), x) &\approx g_1(g_1(g_3(x, y), x), g_3(x, y)) \\ &\approx g_1(g_1(g_1(g_1(x, y), x), x), g_3(x, y)) \\ &\approx g_1(g_1(g_1(x, y), x), g_3(x, y)) \\ &\approx g_1(g_3(x, y), g_3(x, y)) \\ &\approx g_3(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

In some cases it will be convenient to work with a different, undirected graph which we attach to the algebra \mathbb{A} .

Definition 12. For any algebra \mathbb{A} , we let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ be the graph of two-element subalgebras of \mathbb{A} .

Note that every projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} will become a clique in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$. In many of the cases we will consider, every two-element subalgebra of \mathbb{A} will automatically be a projection subalgebra.

Proposition 14. *If \mathbb{A} is a finite nontrivial algebra, then there is some subquotient $\mathbb{B} \in HS(\mathbb{A})$ which is also nontrivial, such that every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} is a projection algebra. If \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal, then the set of absorption identities which hold in \mathbb{A} is the same as the set of absorption identities which hold in \mathbb{B} .*

Proof. Take \mathbb{B} to be a nontrivial subquotient of \mathbb{A} of minimal cardinality, and note that any subquotient of \mathbb{B} is also a subquotient of \mathbb{A} . The second sentence follows immediately from Proposition 6. \square

This lets us reduce most questions about absorption identities in minimal clones to the case where every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{A} is a projection algebra. In particular, if f is the basic binary operation of such an algebra \mathbb{A} , then for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $(\{a, b\}, f)$ does not form a projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , we must have $Sg_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\} = \mathbb{A}$. We will exploit this when studying binary relations on \mathbb{A} .

Definition 13. If $\mathbb{R} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ is a subdirect product, and if π_1, π_2 are the projections from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , then the *linking congruence* of \mathbb{R} can refer to any of the following three congruences:

- the congruence $\rho = \ker \pi_1 \vee \ker \pi_2$ on \mathbb{R} ,
- the congruence $\alpha = \pi_1(\ker \pi_1 \vee \ker \pi_2)$ on \mathbb{A} , or
- the congruence $\beta = \pi_2(\ker \pi_1 \vee \ker \pi_2)$ on \mathbb{B} .

Concretely, the linking congruence of \mathbb{R} relates two elements of \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{A} , or \mathbb{B} , respectively, if they are in the same connected component of \mathbb{R} considered as a bipartite graph on $\mathbb{A} \sqcup \mathbb{B}$.

We say that \mathbb{R} is *linked* if the linking congruence of \mathbb{R} is the full congruence.

The following standard result is useful when the linking congruence is not full.

Proposition 15. *If $\mathbb{R} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ is subdirect, and if ρ, α, β are the linking congruence of \mathbb{R} as congruences on $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$ respectively, then \mathbb{R}/ρ is the graph of an isomorphism between \mathbb{A}/α and \mathbb{B}/β .*

To handle more complex arguments involving binary relations, the following “additive” notation is very convenient.

Definition 14. If $\mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{C} \leq \mathbb{A}$, then we define the subalgebra $\mathbb{C} + \mathbb{R}$ of \mathbb{B} by

$$\mathbb{C} + \mathbb{R} = \{b \in \mathbb{B} \mid \exists c \in \mathbb{C} \text{ s.t. } (c, b) \in \mathbb{R}\} = \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(\mathbb{C}) \cap \mathbb{R}),$$

and for $\mathbb{D} \leq \mathbb{B}$ we define the subalgebra $\mathbb{D} - \mathbb{R}$ of \mathbb{A} by

$$\mathbb{D} - \mathbb{R} = \{a \in \mathbb{A} \mid \exists d \in \mathbb{D} \text{ s.t. } (a, d) \in \mathbb{R}\} = \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(\mathbb{D}) \cap \mathbb{R}).$$

The main trick we use when we find a linked subdirect relation is the following result.

Proposition 16. *If $\mathbb{R} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ is a linked subdirect product of finite algebras such that at least one of \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} has a proper subalgebra, then there is either a proper subalgebra $\mathbb{C} < \mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{C} + \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{B}$, or there is a proper subalgebra $\mathbb{D} < \mathbb{B}$ such that $\mathbb{D} - \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{A}$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathbb{C}_0 is a proper subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , and inductively define the sequence of subalgebras $\mathbb{C}_i \leq \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{D}_i \leq \mathbb{B}$ by

$$\mathbb{D}_i = \mathbb{C}_i + \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbb{C}_{i+1} = \mathbb{D}_i - \mathbb{R}.$$

Then each \mathbb{C}_{i+1} contains \mathbb{C}_i and similarly \mathbb{D}_{i+1} contains \mathbb{D}_i , and $\mathbb{C}_i \cup \mathbb{D}_i$ can be concretely understood as the set of elements of \mathbb{A} that have distance at most $2i + 1$ from \mathbb{C}_0 in \mathbb{R} considered as a bipartite graph on $\mathbb{A} \sqcup \mathbb{B}$. Since \mathbb{R} is linked, for sufficiently large i we must have $\mathbb{C}_i = \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{D}_i = \mathbb{B}$, so we just need to find the last place in the sequence $\mathbb{C}_0, \mathbb{D}_0, \mathbb{C}_1, \dots$ where we had a proper subalgebra of \mathbb{A} or \mathbb{B} to get the required $\mathbb{C} < \mathbb{A}$ or $\mathbb{D} < \mathbb{B}$. \square

Corollary 3. *If $\mathbb{S} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$ is a symmetric and linked subdirect relation on a finite algebra \mathbb{A} , and if \mathbb{A} has a proper subalgebra, then \mathbb{A} has a proper subalgebra $\mathbb{C} < \mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{C} + \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{A}$.*

The last trick we will use allows us to exploit the fact that a binary minimal clone may not contain any semiprojections of arity at least 3. Recall that a function f is a *semiprojection* if it is not a projection, but there is some index i such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$ whenever two of the inputs to f are equal.

Proposition 17. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ does not contain any nontrivial semiprojections of arity at least 3, then for any term t of \mathbb{A} , any absorption equation*

$$t(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$$

which holds whenever at most two distinct values occur among x_1, \dots, x_n must hold for all tuples x_1, \dots, x_n .

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \not\approx x_i$ in \mathbb{A} , and suppose that the arity n of t is minimal among counterexamples to the proposition. If $n = 3$, then t is a semiprojection, contradicting our assumption on $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$. If $n \geq 4$ and t is not a semiprojection, then Świerczkowski's Lemma from [17] shows that there is some pair of inputs x_j, x_k such that the term t' which we obtain by identifying x_k with x_j in t is not a projection. Then t' is a counterexample of arity $n - 1$, contradicting our assumption that n was minimal among counterexamples. \square

3 Descriptions of the different types of binary minimal clones

Before diving into the proof of the classification of non-Taylor binary minimal clones in the next section, we will discuss each of the five cases in more detail, verifying that each of them really is a nice property. We'll start with a very quick discussion of rectangular bands. The following result is standard.

Proposition 18. *A rectangular band $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ can always be written as a direct product $\mathbb{A} \cong \mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ such that the basic binary operation f acts as first projection on \mathbb{A}_1 and acts as second projection on \mathbb{A}_2 .*

The free rectangular band on two generators is a four element algebra, with the multiplication table, labeled digraph, and undirected graph of two-element subalgebras displayed below.

\cdot	x	y	xy	yx
x	x	xy	xy	x
y	yx	y	y	yx
xy	x	xy	xy	x
yx	yx	y	y	yx

$y, xy \begin{pmatrix} \nearrow xy \\ \searrow x \end{pmatrix} x, yx$
 $y, xy \begin{pmatrix} \nearrow y \\ \searrow yx \end{pmatrix} x, yx$

xy	---	y
\mid	---	\mid
x	---	yx

We also have the following elementary characterization of rectangular bands in terms of absorption identities.

Proposition 19. *An idempotent binary operation \cdot defines a rectangular band iff it satisfies the absorption identity*

$$((ux)y)(z(wu)) \approx u. \tag{1}$$

Proof. First suppose that \cdot is a rectangular band. Then we have

$$((ux)y)(z(wu)) \approx (ux)(wu) \approx uu \approx u,$$

which is (1).

Now suppose that \cdot satisfies (1). Substituting $u = x = w = z$ in (1), we have

$$(xy)x \approx ((xx)y)(x(xx)) \approx x$$

and similarly we have

$$x(yx) \approx ((xx)x)(y(xx)) \approx x,$$

so by substituting $u = xw$ in (1) we have

$$(xy)(zw) \approx (((xw)x)y)(z(w(xw))) \approx xw,$$

so \cdot is a rectangular band. □

Theorem 4. *Being a rectangular band is a nice property, and every rectangular band is clone-minimal.*

Proof. Since rectangular bands form a variety defined by finitely many identities, it is easy to check that a given operation f is a rectangular band. If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a nontrivial rectangular band, then by Proposition 18 there is some pair $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $\{a, b\}$ is not a projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , and the subalgebra generated by a and b is isomorphic to the four-element free rectangular band on two generators. Finally, it's easy to check that every nontrivial operation $t \in \text{Clo}(f)$ which depends on all of its inputs is binary, and is in fact either $f(x, y)$ or $f(y, x)$. □

3.1 p -cyclic groupoids

Definition 15. We say that an idempotent binary operation f is a p -cyclic groupoid if it satisfies the identities

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, f(y, z)) &\approx f(x, y), \\ f(f(x, y), z) &\approx f(f(x, z), y), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f(\cdots f(f(x, y), y) \cdots, y) \approx x,$$

where there are exactly p copies of the variable y in the last identity.

The free 2-cyclic groupoid on two generators is a four element algebra, with the multiplication table, labeled digraph, and undirected graph of two-element subalgebras displayed below.

\cdot	x	y	xy	yx
x	x	xy	x	xy
y	yx	y	yx	y
xy	xy	x	xy	x
yx	y	yx	y	yx

The structure of p -cyclic groupoids was described by Płonka [13] (see the discussion right after Example 2 of [13]) and elaborated on in Section 2 of [15]. The structure theorem is most conveniently stated in terms of right orbits.

Theorem 5 (Płonka [13], Romanowska, Roszkowska [15]). *Suppose $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a p -cyclic groupoid. Then the right orbits O_1, \dots, O_k of elements of \mathbb{A} form a partition of \mathbb{A} , and there exist auxiliary affine structures on the O_i such that the following hold:*

- if we define an equivalence relation Θ on \mathbb{A} with equivalence classes given by the O_i , then Θ is a congruence of \mathbb{A} such that f acts as first projection on \mathbb{A}/Θ ,
- the restriction of f to any O_i is the first projection,
- the auxiliary affine structure on O_i is an affine space over \mathbb{Z}/p , so the number of elements of O_i is a power of p ,
- for each $i \neq j$ there exists a vector v_{ij} in the vector space associated to O_i such that for all $a \in O_i, b \in O_j$, we have

$$a \in O_i, b \in O_j \implies f(a, b) = a + v_{ij},$$

- for each O_i , the associated vector space is generated by the set of vectors v_{ij} with $j \neq i$.

Conversely, given a collection of affine spaces O_i and vectors v_{ij} over \mathbb{Z}/p satisfying the above conditions, there is a p -cyclic groupoid \mathbb{A} with $f(a, b) = a + v_{ij}$ for $a \in O_i, b \in O_j$.

Proof. To see that the right orbits form a partition of \mathbb{A} , we just note that the identity

$$f(\cdots f(f(x, y), y) \cdots, y) \approx x,$$

implies that for any $a, c \in \mathbb{A}$, we have $a \in O(f(a, c))$, so $c \in O(a) \iff a \in O(c)$. By the definition of a right orbit, we have

$$f(O(a), O(b)) \subseteq O(a),$$

so the first bullet point follows automatically from the fact that the right orbits partition \mathbb{A} .

Repeated application of the identity

$$f(x, f(y, z)) \approx f(x, y)$$

shows that

$$c \in O(b) \implies f(a, c) = f(a, b).$$

In particular, since f is idempotent we have

$$b \in O(a) \implies f(a, b) = f(a, a) = a,$$

so the restriction of f to any right orbit O_i is the first projection. For $i \neq j$, we let $\alpha_{ij} : O_i \rightarrow O_i$ be the map

$$\alpha_{ij} : a \in O_i \mapsto f(a, b), \quad b \in O_j.$$

The identity

$$f(f(x, y), z) \approx f(f(x, z), y)$$

shows that α_{ij} commutes with α_{ik} for all j, k , and the identity

$$f(\cdots f(f(x, y), y) \cdots, y) \approx x$$

shows that α_{ij}^p is the identity for all j . Thus for any fixed i the maps α_{ij} generate a vector space over \mathbb{Z}/p which acts transitively on O_i , granting each O_i the structure of an affine space over \mathbb{Z}/p in which each α_{ij} corresponds to a translation by some vector v_{ij} . \square

Corollary 4 (Corollary 1 of Płonka [13]). *The free p -cyclic groupoid on n generators has size np^{n-1} .*

Remark 1. The fact that the size of the free p -cyclic groupoid on n generators looks like a formal derivative of the size of the free vector space over \mathbb{F}_p on n generators is quite striking. This may be morally explained by the fact that the free p -cyclic groupoid on n generators is isomorphic to the subalgebra of the quasiaffine algebra

$$(\mathbb{Z}/p^2, (1-p)x + py)^n$$

which is generated by the basis vectors $e_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$: the operation

$$(1-p)x + py = x + p(y-x)$$

can be thought of as an infinitesimal deformation of first projection, since $p^2 \equiv 0$ in \mathbb{Z}/p^2 . This representation was essentially studied in Płonka's paper [12] which first introduced p -cyclic groupoids, and it appears again in Lemma 3.5 of [9].

Although the free p -cyclic groupoids are quasiaffine, most p -cyclic groupoids are not even abelian (in the sense of universal algebra), so free p -cyclic groupoids are natural examples of abelian algebras with non-abelian quotients.

The fact that p -cyclic groupoids form minimal clones is attributed to Płonka [12] - we include a proof below.

Theorem 6. *For any fixed prime p , being a p -cyclic groupoid is a nice property, and every nontrivial p -cyclic groupoid is clone-minimal.*

Proof. Since p -cyclic groupoids form a variety defined by finitely many identities, it is easy to check that a given operation f is a p -cyclic groupoid. If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a nontrivial p -cyclic groupoid, and if $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ have $f(a, b) \neq a$, then the subalgebra of \mathbb{A} generated by a and b is a p -cyclic groupoid with two right orbits, and either has size $p + 1$ or $2p$. If the subalgebra generated by a and b has size $p + 1$, then the algebra $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ will have size $2p$. Either way, we see that the free p -cyclic groupoid on two generators is in the variety generated by \mathbb{A} . (In fact, any nontrivial p -cyclic groupoid generates the full variety of all p -cyclic groupoids.)

If f defines a p -cyclic groupoid, then we can use Theorem 5 to see that each of the $p - 1$ operations f_1, \dots, f_{p-1} defined by $f_1 = f$ and

$$f_{k+1}(x, y) = f(f_k(x, y), y)$$

also defines a p -cyclic groupoid operation with the same decomposition into right orbits O_i , with the operation f_k given by

$$a \in O_i, b \in O_j \implies f_k(a, b) = a + kv_{ij}.$$

So for every nontrivial binary operation $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$, either $g(x, y)$ or $g(y, x)$ defines a p -cyclic groupoid as well, and $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$.

More generally, suppose g is any nontrivial term in $\text{Clo}(f)$. We may assume without loss of generality that g is in the same right orbit of the free p -cyclic groupoid on n -generators as the first projection, and that g depends on its last input. Then using the explicit description of the free p -cyclic groupoid on n generators as a disjoint union of n affine spaces of size p^{n-1} , we see that there are $k_2, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ such that

$$a \in O_i, b_m \in O_{j_m} \implies g(a, b_2, \dots, b_n) = a + k_2v_{ij_2} + \dots + k_nv_{ij_n},$$

and that $k_n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ if g depends on its last input. Thus the binary operation

$$g(x, \dots, x, y)$$

is the same as the (nontrivial) binary operation $f_{k_n}(x, y)$, and so $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$. □

3.2 Partial semilattice operations

Definition 16. An idempotent binary operation s is called a *partial semilattice operation* if it satisfies the identities

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

Proposition 20. *The algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a partial semilattice if and only if $\{a, s(a, b)\}$ is a semilattice subalgebra of \mathbb{A} with absorbing element $s(a, b)$ for every pair of elements $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$.*

In particular, if s is a partial semilattice operation which is not identically equal to first projection, then \mathbb{A} contains at least one nontrivial semilattice subalgebra.

Corollary 5. *A nontrivial partial semilattice operation does not satisfy any absorption identities other than those following from idempotence.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that a semilattice operation on a two element set does not satisfy any absorption identities other than those following from idempotence. □

It is often helpful to visualize partial semilattice operations via the directed graph of two element semilattice subalgebras, with $a \rightarrow b$ when $s(a, b) = b$. The next result shows that this is the same as the digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ from Definition 11.

Proposition 21. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a partial semilattice which defines a minimal clone, then for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $\{a, b\}$ is a semilattice subalgebra of \mathbb{A} with $s(a, b) = s(b, a) = b$,
- (b) $s(a, b) = b$,
- (c) there exists $c \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $s(a, c) = b$,
- (d) $(b, b) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$.

If $\{a, b\}$ is not a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , then there is a surjective homomorphism from $\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ to the free semilattice on two generators.


Proof. That (a), (b), (c) are equivalent follows directly from the definition of a partial semilattice. That (a) implies (d) is clear. To see that (d) implies (a), let t be any term with $t(a, b) = t(b, a) = b$. Then t is not a projection, and in order for \mathbb{A} to be a minimal clone, we must have $s \in \text{Clo}(t)$. Since $\{a, b\}$ forms a semilattice subalgebra under t , it must also form a semilattice subalgebra under s .

For the last statement, suppose t is any nontrivial binary term of \mathbb{A} . Then if $\{a, b\}$ is not a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , it must not be closed under t (as $s \in \text{Clo}(t)$), so we must have at least one of $t(a, b), t(b, a) \notin \{a, b\}$. Thus, for any nontrivial binary term t of \mathbb{A} we have

$$t\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \notin \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

so the equivalence relation on $\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ with equivalence classes $\{(a, b)\}, \{(b, a)\}, \mathbb{S} \setminus \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ defines a congruence with quotient isomorphic to the free semilattice on two generators. \square

There are two possible types of two-element subalgebras of a partial semilattice: semilattice subalgebras, and projection subalgebras. If \mathbb{A} is a nontrivial partial semilattice which is not Taylor, then both types of two element subalgebra must appear in the variety generated by \mathbb{A} . The free algebra in the subvariety of $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ which is generated by these two types of two-element partial semilattices has four elements, and its multiplication table, labeled digraph, and undirected graph of two-element subalgebras are displayed below.



In order to check that being a partial semilattice is a nice property, we need a way to construct a nontrivial partial semilattice operation s out of a binary operation t which acts as a semilattice on some two-element set $\{a, b\}$. That this is possible is originally a result of Bulatov [3], and a more algorithmic construction based on Bulatov’s technique was given in the “Semilattice Iteration Lemma” of [2]. We include the proof here since it is short and the proof technique is useful elsewhere. The first step is to apply Corollary 1 to construct $f = t^{\infty_2}$ satisfying the identity $f(x, f(x, y)) \approx f(x, y)$.

Proposition 22. *If f is an idempotent binary operation which satisfies the identity*

$$f(x, f(x, y)) \approx f(x, y),$$

and if we define a binary operation u by

$$u(x, y) := f(x, f(y, x)),$$

then u satisfies the identity

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

Similarly, if an idempotent operation g satisfies the identity $g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y)$, then $g(g(x, y), x)$ is a binary operation satisfying the above identity.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
u(u(x, y), x) &\approx f(u(x, y), f(x, u(x, y))) \\
&\approx f(u(x, y), f(x, f(x, f(y, x)))) \\
&\approx f(u(x, y), f(x, f(y, x))) \\
&\approx f(u(x, y), u(x, y)) \\
&\approx u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

For the last claim, take $f(x, y) = g(y, x)$. □

Proposition 23. *If u is a binary operation on a finite set which satisfies the identity*

$$u(u(x, y), x) \approx u(x, y),$$

then $s = u^{\infty 2}$ satisfies the identities

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

In particular, if u is idempotent then s is a partial semilattice operation.

Proof. First, note that even if u is not idempotent we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u(u(x, y), u(x, y)) &\approx u(u(u(x, y), x), u(x, y)) \\
&\approx u(u(x, y), x) \\
&\approx u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Define u^{*2^n} as a shorthand for $u *_2 \cdots *_2 u$, as in the definition of $u^{\infty 2}$. Then since the unary operation

$$z \mapsto u(u(x, y), z)$$

takes x to $u(x, y)$ and takes $u(x, y)$ to $u(x, y)$, we see that for any m we have

$$u^{*2^m}(u(x, y), x) \approx u(x, y).$$

Replacing y by $u^{*2^{m-1}}(x, y)$, we get

$$u^{*2^m}(u^{*2^m}(x, y), x) \approx u^{*2^m}(x, y)$$

for all $m \geq 1$.

Since $s = u^{\infty 2}$ is a pointwise limit of a subsequence of the u^{*2^m} s, we have

$$s(s(x, y), x) \approx s(x, y),$$

and the identity $s(x, s(x, y)) \approx s(x, y)$ follows from Corollary 1. □

Lemma 1 (Proposition 10 of Bulatov [3], Semilattice Iteration Lemma of [2]). *If an idempotent algebra \mathbb{A} has $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{B}$ with*

$$\begin{bmatrix} b \\ b \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{B}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

then \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial partial semilattice term operation s satisfying $s(a, b) = s(b, a) = b$ in \mathbb{B} .

Proof. Choose $t \in \text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $t(a, b) = t(b, a) = b$ in \mathbb{B} . Let $u(x, y) = t^{\infty 2}(x, t^{\infty 2}(y, x))$ and let $s = u^{\infty 2}$. Then s is a partial semilattice by Corollary 1 and Propositions 22, 23. Explicit computation shows that we have $s(a, b) = s(b, a) = b$, so in particular s is nontrivial. □

Theorem 7. *Being a partial semilattice operation is a nice property.*

Proof. Since partial semilattices form a variety defined by finitely many identities, it is easy to check that a given operation f is a partial semilattice. By Proposition 21, if $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a nontrivial partial semilattice, then there is at least one two-element semilattice subalgebra $\{a, s(a, b)\}$ contained in \mathbb{A} .

Now suppose that $g \in \text{Clo}(s)$ is a nontrivial n -ary operation. We may assume without loss of generality that g depends on all of its arguments, in which case g acts on the semilattice subalgebra $\{a, s(a, b)\}$ as an n -ary semilattice operation. In particular, we see that the binary operation $t(x, y) = g(x, y, \dots, y)$ acts as a semilattice operation on $\{a, s(a, b)\}$. To finish the proof we apply Lemma 1 to see that there is a partial semilattice operation $s' \in \text{Clo}(t)$ which also acts as a semilattice operation on $\{a, s(a, b)\}$. \square

It is hard to say much more about the structure of partial semilattices which define minimal clones, but the following general result about partial semilattices can be used to rule out cases where the digraph of semilattice subalgebras of $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$ has very few strongly connected components. We say that a strongly connected component U of a digraph is *maximal* (with respect to the reachability order \preceq on strongly connected components) if $a \in U$ and $a \rightarrow b$ implies $b \in U$.

Theorem 8 (Theorem 2(c) from [2], generalizing a result from [3]). *Fix a partial semilattice term s on $\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$. Suppose $\mathbb{R} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ is subdirect and U, V are maximal strongly connected components of the labeled digraphs of \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} , respectively, with respect to s . If U is contained in a linked component of \mathbb{R} , $(U \times V) \cap \mathbb{R} \neq \emptyset$, and U, V are finite, then $U \times V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.*

Proposition 24. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice, and if \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b , then the directed graph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ of semilattice subalgebras of \mathbb{A} is not strongly connected.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} is a counterexample. Since any quotient of a strongly connected algebra is strongly connected, we may assume without loss of generality that \mathbb{A} is simple. Consider the algebra

$$\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Since \mathbb{A} is simple, the linking congruence of \mathbb{S} on \mathbb{A} is either trivial or full, so either \mathbb{S} is the graph of an isomorphism or \mathbb{S} is linked. If \mathbb{S} is the graph of an isomorphism, then $\mathbb{S} \cong \mathbb{A}$, so Proposition 21 implies that \mathbb{A} has a surjective homomorphism to the free semilattice on two generators, which contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} is strongly connected, and also contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} is simple.

Thus \mathbb{S} must be linked. By Theorem 8, this implies that $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$, so in particular we have $(b, b) \in \mathbb{S}$. But then Proposition 21 implies that $\{a, b\}$ is a semilattice subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , which is again a contradiction. \square

More results along these lines can be found in Appendix A.

Remark 2. The definition of a spiral implies that every nontrivial spiral \mathbb{A} has a two-element semilattice subquotient. By Lemma 1, this implies that every nontrivial spiral has a nontrivial partial semilattice term operation. However, it seems helpful to keep the non-Taylor case separate from the Taylor case, since clone-minimal spirals are significantly easier to classify than non-Taylor clone-minimal partial semilattices. Part of the reason for this is that commutativity significantly reduces the amount of casework, and part of it is that the definition of a spiral can be used to directly prove a recursive structure theorem for spirals, in the sense that every spiral can be thought of as being built out of an overlapping arrangement of strictly smaller spirals.

Remark 3. The phrase “partial semilattice operation” is a bit of a mouthful, which the author has unfortunately committed to. Perhaps a better name would have been “arrow operation”, as a reference to the fact that such an operation produces “arrows” $a \rightarrow s(a, b)$.

3.3 Melds

Now we consider the case of melds.

Definition 17. An idempotent groupoid $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is called a *meld* if it satisfies the identity

$$(xy)(zx) \approx xy.$$

Proposition 25. *An idempotent groupoid is a meld if and only if it satisfies the absorption identity*

$$x((yx)z) \approx x. \quad (*)$$

Proof. First we show that any idempotent groupoid which satisfies $x((yx)z) \approx x$ is a meld. Note first that if we make the substitution $y \mapsto x$ in $(*)$ (and apply idempotence), we get

$$x(xz) \approx x((xx)z) \approx x. \quad (2)$$

Similarly, if we first apply idempotence to see that $yx \approx (yx)(yx)$ and then substitute $z \mapsto yx$ in $(*)$, then we get

$$x(yx) \approx x((yx)(yx)) \approx x. \quad (3)$$

Applying (2) with $z \mapsto y$ and (3) with $x \mapsto xy, y \mapsto x$, we see that

$$(xy)x \approx (xy)(x(xy)) \approx xy. \quad (4)$$

Substituting x with xy in $x \approx x((yx)z)$ and applying (3) with x and y reversed, we see that

$$xy \approx (xy)((y(xy))z) \approx (xy)(yz), \quad (5)$$

and similarly if we substitute x with xy and y with zx in $(*)$ and apply (5) and (4) with x, y, z permuted cyclically then we get

$$xy \approx (xy)((zx)(xy))z \approx (xy)((zx)z) \approx (xy)(zx). \quad (6)$$

Thus, the identity $x((yx)z) \approx x$ implies the identity $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$.

For the converse direction, suppose $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is a meld. Substituting $y \mapsto x$ in $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$, we get

$$x(zx) \approx (xx)(zx) \approx xx \approx x,$$

so (3) holds in every meld. Applying (3), followed by substituting $x \mapsto yx, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto x$ into the meld equation $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$, we get

$$((yx)z)x \approx ((yx)z)(x(yx)) \approx (yx)z, \quad (7)$$

and if we first apply (7) and then apply (3) with y replaced by $(yx)z$, then we get

$$x((yx)z) \approx x(((yx)z)x) \approx x,$$

which is $(*)$. □

Proposition 26. *Suppose $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is a meld. Whenever we have $ab = a$, we also have $ba = b$.*

Proof. Supposing that $ab = a$, we have

$$ba = b(ab) = b,$$

where the second equality follows from equation (3) from the proof of Proposition 25. □

Corollary 6. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is a meld, then the undirected graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ from Definition 12 has an edge connecting a to b iff $ab = a$ iff $ba = b$. In particular, \cdot acts as first projection on every edge of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$.*

Proposition 27. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is a meld, then for any $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$, the element xy is adjacent to x , to y , and to every neighbor of x in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$.*

Proof. By equation (4) from the proof of Proposition 25, we have $(xy)x = xy$, so xy is adjacent to x . By swapping x and y in equation (3), we have $y(xy) = y$, so xy is adjacent to y . Finally, for any z with $zx = z$ we have

$$(xy)z = (xy)(zx) = xy,$$

so xy is adjacent to z . □

Corollary 7. *If \mathbb{A} is a finite meld, then the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ has a vertex which connects to all other vertices.*

Conversely, we have the following result.

Proposition 28. *Suppose \mathcal{G} is a graph with vertex set A such that some vertex of \mathcal{G} is connected to all other vertices. Then for any idempotent binary function $\cdot : A^2 \rightarrow A$ which restricts to the first projection on every edge of \mathcal{G} , and which has the property that xy connects to x , y , and every neighbor of x , the algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ will be a meld with $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}} = \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. We need to verify the meld equation $(xy)(zx) \approx xy$. By our assumption on \cdot , zx is adjacent to x , and therefore xy is adjacent to zx as well, so $(xy)(zx) = xy$ since \cdot restricts to first projection on the edge from xy to zx . □

Proposition 29. *If \mathbb{A} is a nontrivial meld, then the free algebra on two generators $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ has exactly four elements: x, y, xy, yx . The undirected graph associated to this free algebra has only one non-edge (between x and y).*

Proof. Since yx is connected to x , we see that xy is connected to all three of x, y, yx , so $\{x, y, xy, yx\}$ is closed under \cdot . To see that $xy \notin \{y, yx\}$ in the free algebra, note that every meld of size at least two has at least one edge, so there is a projection algebra in $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$. Since \cdot must act like first projection on any projection algebra, we see that the right orbits $O(x), O(y)$ must be disjoint in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ by Proposition 8 and Proposition 10. That $xy \not\approx x$ follows from the assumption that \mathbb{A} is nontrivial. Thus the elements x, y, xy, yx of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ are pairwise distinct, which completes the proof. □

The multiplication table, labeled digraph, and undirected graph of two-element subalgebras of the free meld on two generators are displayed below.

\cdot	x	y	xy	yx
x	x	xy	x	x
y	yx	y	y	y
xy	xy	xy	xy	xy
yx	yx	yx	yx	yx

xy	yx
↑	↑
x	y

xy	—	yx
	X	
x		y

Proposition 29 gets us most of the way to verifying that being a meld is a nice property. In fact, it turns out that every nontrivial meld is clone-minimal. The only tricky part of verifying this is checking that a meld has no semiprojections of arity at least 3 in its clone.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a nontrivial meld. If a term $t \in \text{Clo}(f)$ satisfies*

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

then t is first projection, and if

$$t(x, y, \dots, y) \not\approx y$$

then $t(x, y, z, \dots)$ must be adjacent to x in the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{F}}$ associated to the free algebra $\mathbb{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y, z, \dots)$.

Proof. We induct on the construction of t as a term in $\text{Clo}(f)$. Suppose that $t = f(u, v)$, where u, v are simpler terms. From the explicit description of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ in Proposition 29, we see that

$$t(x, y, \dots, y) \not\approx y$$

is equivalent to

$$u(x, y, \dots, y) \not\approx y \quad \text{or} \quad v(x, y, \dots, y) \approx x.$$

In the first case, the induction hypothesis shows that u is adjacent to x , so t is also adjacent to x by Proposition 27. In the second case, the induction hypothesis shows that v is first projection, so t is adjacent to $v \approx x$ by Proposition 27.

Now suppose that

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

Then from the explicit description of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ in Proposition 29, we see that

$$u(x, y, \dots, y) \approx x \quad \text{and} \quad v(x, y, \dots, y) \not\approx y.$$

By the induction hypothesis, in this case u is first projection and $v(x, y, z, \dots)$ is adjacent to x , so $f(u, v) \approx f(x, v) \approx x$. \square

Corollary 8. *If an absorption identity holds in some nontrivial meld \mathbb{A} , then it is a consequence of the absorption identity $x((yx)z) \approx x$.*

Theorem 9. *Being a meld is a nice property, and every nontrivial meld is clone-minimal.*

Proof. Since melds form a variety defined by finitely many identities, it is easy to check that a given operation f defines a meld. By Proposition 29, for any nontrivial meld \mathbb{A} the four-element algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ is in the variety generated by \mathbb{A} and is isomorphic to the free meld on two generators. The only thing left to check is that every nontrivial meld $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is clone-minimal.

Suppose that g is any nontrivial term in $\text{Clo}(f)$. By Rosenberg's Theorem 1, there is some nontrivial $t \in \text{Clo}(g)$ which is either a unary operation, a majority operation, an affine operation, a binary operation, or a semiprojection. It's easy to see that t can't be unary (since f is idempotent) and that t can't be majority or affine (since there is a two-element projection algebra in the variety generated by \mathbb{A}). If t is binary, then by the explicit description of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ we see that t is either $f(x, y)$ or $f(y, x)$, in which case $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$. The only remaining case is the case where t is a semiprojection of arity at least 3, but in this case Lemma 2 shows that t must in fact be a projection, contradicting the assumption that t is nontrivial. \square

Although the free meld on two generators was easy to describe, free melds on more than two generators are significantly more complex.

Proposition 30. *The free meld on three generators has infinitely many elements.*

Proof. We will prove this by constructing an infinite meld \mathbb{A} which is generated by three elements, using the approach of Proposition 28. The underlying set of \mathbb{A} will be

$$A = \{x_i, y_i, z_i \mid i \geq 0\} \cup \{x_i y_i, y_i z_i, z_i x_i \mid i \geq 0\} \cup \{t\}.$$

We will arrange the construction so that \mathbb{A} has an automorphism σ of order three which cyclically permutes x_i, y_i, z_i and cyclically permutes $x_i y_i, y_i z_i, z_i x_i$ for all i , and which fixes t . To ensure that \mathbb{A} is generated by the three elements x_0, y_0, z_0 , we will arrange our construction to satisfy the equations

$$x_{i+1} = x_i(y_i z_i), \quad y_{i+1} = y_i(z_i x_i), \quad z_{i+1} = z_i(x_i y_i).$$

We start by defining a graph \mathcal{G} on the underlying set of \mathbb{A} which is compatible with the equations above.

First, we connect t by an edge to every other vertex in \mathcal{G} . We take x_i adjacent to x_j and $x_j y_j$ for all j , while x_i is never adjacent to y_j or z_j for any j (and similarly for y_i, z_i , by cyclically permuting the variables

via σ). Additionally, every pair of elements contained in the three sequences $x_i y_i, y_j z_j, z_k x_k$ will be adjacent. For the remaining pairs, we take x_i adjacent to $y_j z_j$ iff $i > j$, while x_i is adjacent to $z_j x_j$ iff $i \geq j$.

To finish the construction we need to define a multiplication \cdot on A which is compatible with \mathcal{G} in the sense of Proposition 28. On the edges of \mathcal{G} , \cdot must restrict to first projection, so we just need to describe the operation \cdot on the non-edges of \mathcal{G} .

For the non-edges of \mathcal{G} involving the vertex x_i , the operation \cdot is defined as follows. We set $y_j \cdot x_i = t$ for all i, j , $x_i \cdot y_j = t$ for $i \neq j$, and $x_i \cdot y_i = x_i y_i$. For $i < j$, we set $x_i \cdot (y_j z_j) = (y_j z_j) \cdot x_i = t$ and $x_i \cdot (z_j x_j) = (z_j x_j) \cdot x_i = t$. Finally, we set $x_i \cdot (y_i z_i) = x_{i+1}$ and $(y_i z_i) \cdot x_i = t$. (The values of \cdot on the remaining non-edges of \mathcal{G} are determined by our desire for the permutation σ to be an automorphism of \mathbb{A} .) \square

The previous result shows that the variety of melds is not locally finite, but the next result shows that it is nevertheless quite easy to answer questions about finitely presented melds.

Theorem 10. *The word problem can be solved efficiently in the variety of melds.*

More concretely, suppose we are given a finite list of generators x_i , and a finite list of relations $u_i = v_i$, where u_i, v_i are terms built out of the generators x_i . Then we can determine whether the relations $u_i = v_i$ (together with the meld identities) imply that $r = s$ for any given terms r, s , in time polynomial in the total length of the descriptions of u_i, v_i, r, s .

Proof. Let \mathcal{W} be the set of all subterms of any of the u_i, v_i or of r, s . The main idea is to keep track of all of the equations which can be easily proved between various elements of \mathcal{W} , and to use Proposition 28 at the end to see that no other equations between elements of \mathcal{W} can be proved. To this end, we construct the minimal equivalence relation \sim on \mathcal{W} and graph \mathcal{G}/\sim on \mathcal{W}/\sim (which we think of as a graph \mathcal{G} on \mathcal{W} which is compatible with the equivalence relation \sim) which have the following closure properties:

- the relation \sim is an equivalence relation on \mathcal{W} ,
- for each given relation $u_i = v_i$, we have $u_i \sim v_i$,
- the graph \mathcal{G} on \mathcal{W} is compatible with \sim , in the sense that if (a, b) is an edge of \mathcal{G} and $a \sim a', b \sim b'$, then (a', b') is also an edge of \mathcal{G} ,
- for every vertex $w \in \mathcal{W}$, the loop (w, w) is an edge of \mathcal{G} ,
- the graph \mathcal{G} is undirected, that is, for every edge (a, b) of \mathcal{G} , the reversed edge (b, a) is also an edge of \mathcal{G} ,
- for any $a, b \in \mathcal{W}$ such that ab is also in \mathcal{W} , the edges (ab, a) and (ab, b) are in \mathcal{G} , and additionally for any c such that (a, c) is an edge of \mathcal{G} , (ab, c) is also an edge of \mathcal{G} ,
- for any $a, b \in \mathcal{W}$ such that ab is also in \mathcal{W} , if (a, b) is an edge of \mathcal{G} , then we have $a \sim ab$,
- for any $a, b, a', b' \in \mathcal{W}$ such that ab and $a'b'$ are also in \mathcal{W} , if $a \sim a'$ and $b \sim b'$ then $ab \sim a'b'$.

By Propositions 26 and 27, if we have $r \sim s$ then the equation $r = s$ follows from the relations $u_i = v_i$.

To finish the proof, suppose that $r \not\sim s$. Then we will construct a meld \mathbb{A} in which the relations $u_i = v_i$ hold, but in which $r \neq s$. The underlying set of \mathbb{A} will be $\mathcal{W}/\sim \cup \{t\}$, where t is a new symbol. We extend the graph \mathcal{G}/\sim to a graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ on $\mathcal{W}/\sim \cup \{t\}$ by connecting the vertex t to all other vertices.

We define the multiplication on \mathbb{A} as follows. For $a, b \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $ab \in \mathcal{W}$, we set $(a/\sim) \cdot (b/\sim) = ab/\sim$ (to see this is well-defined, we use the last bullet point above). For every pair of elements $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ connected by an edge of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$, we set $a \cdot b = a$ and $b \cdot a = b$. Finally, for any pair $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ which are not connected by an edge of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and which have not had a value assigned to $a \cdot b$ already, we set $a \cdot b = t$. Then by the closure properties of \sim and \mathcal{G} , Proposition 28 shows that \mathbb{A} is a meld, and by construction each relation $u_i/\sim = v_i/\sim$ holds in \mathbb{A} but $r/\sim \neq s/\sim$. \square

3.4 Dispersive algebras

Now we come to the most difficult case, which I call the *dispersive* case. We repeat the definition of the variety \mathcal{D} from [19] below.

Definition 18. We define the variety \mathcal{D} of idempotent groupoids with basic operation f satisfying

$$f(x, f(y, x)) \approx f(f(x, y), x) \approx f(f(x, y), y) \approx f(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y) \quad (\mathcal{D}1)$$

and

$$\forall n \geq 0 \quad f(x, f(\cdots f(f(x, y_1), y_2) \cdots, y_n)) \approx x. \quad (\mathcal{D}2)$$

The free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ is a four element algebra, with the multiplication table, labeled digraph, and undirected graph of two-element subalgebras displayed below.

$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$	x	y	xy	yx
x	x	xy	x	xy
y	yx	y	yx	y
xy	xy	xy	xy	xy
yx	yx	yx	yx	yx

xy	yx
\uparrow	\uparrow
y, yx	x, xy
\uparrow	\uparrow
x	y

xy	—	yx
\downarrow		\downarrow
x		y

The equation $(\mathcal{D}2)$ can be restated in terms of right orbits:

$$b \in O(a) \implies a \cdot b = a.$$

More succinctly, this can be written as

$$a \cdot O(a) = \{a\},$$

and this can be expressed in terms of the labeled digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ as requiring that any edge which leaves a must not be labeled by any element of $O(a)$.

Proposition 31. *If f satisfies $(\mathcal{D}2)$, then any $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ also satisfies $(\mathcal{D}2)$.*

Proof. Let $O_f(a)$ and $O_g(a)$ be the right orbits of a with respect to f and g , respectively. By Proposition 10, we have $O_g(a) \subseteq O_f(a)$ for any $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$. We will prove by induction on the definition of g in terms of f that $g(a, b) = a$ for all $b \in O_f(a)$. The base case $g = \pi_1$ is trivial. For the inductive step, suppose that we have already verified this for g and that h is any binary operation in $\text{Clo}_2(f)$. Then for $b \in O_f(a)$ we have

$$h(a, b) \in O_f(a) \cup O_f(b) \subseteq O_f(a),$$

so

$$f(g(a, b), h(a, b)) \in f(a, O_f(a)) = \{a\}$$

by $(\mathcal{D}2)$. □

Checking whether a two-generated algebra which satisfies $(\mathcal{D}2)$ has a surjective homomorphism to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ is surprisingly natural in terms of the associated directed graph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$.

Proposition 32. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ and f is a binary operation satisfying $(\mathcal{D}2)$, and if \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b , then any surjective homomorphism $\alpha : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ must send a and b to x and y , in some order. If such an α exists, then*

- the right orbits $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are disjoint,
- for any $c \in O(a)$ and $d \in O(b)$ we have $f(a, d) \neq a$ and $f(b, c) \neq b$, and
- there is no directed edge from $O(a) \setminus \{a\}$ to a or from $O(b) \setminus \{b\}$ to b in the directed graph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$.

Conversely, if \mathbb{A} satisfies the three bullet points above, then there is a unique surjective homomorphism from \mathbb{A} to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ with $\alpha(a) = x$ and $\alpha(b) = y$. This α satisfies $\alpha(c) = xy$ iff $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$ and $\alpha(d) = yx$ iff $d \in O(b) \setminus \{b\}$.

Proof. First suppose that such an α exists. Since x is not generated by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y) \setminus \{x\}$ and similarly for y , α must send one of the generators a, b to x and one to y . Suppose without loss of generality that $\alpha(a) = x$ and $\alpha(b) = y$. By Proposition 10, for any $c \in O(a)$ there is some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that $g(a, b) = c$, so

$$\alpha(c) = \alpha(g(a, b)) = g(x, y) \in O(x),$$

and similarly $d \in O(b)$ implies that $\alpha(d) \in O(y)$. Since $O(x)$ and $O(y)$ are disjoint in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, we see that $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ must be disjoint in \mathbb{A} .

For the second bullet point, just note that for any $d \in O(b)$ we have

$$\alpha(f(a, d)) \in f(x, O(y)) = \{xy\},$$

so $f(a, d) \neq a$, and similarly for any $c \in O(a)$ we have $f(b, c) \neq b$.

Next we check that for any $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$, we have $\alpha(c) = xy$. We will prove this by induction on the length of the shortest directed path from a to c in $D_{\mathbb{A}}$. For the base case, if $c = f(a, d)$ for some $d \in \mathbb{A}$, then since $c \neq a$ we must have $d \notin O(a)$ by (D2), so $d \in O(b)$ and we have

$$\alpha(c) = \alpha(f(a, d)) \in f(x, O(y)) = \{xy\}.$$

For the inductive step, if we already know that $\alpha(c) = xy$ for some c , then for any $d \in \mathbb{A}$ we have

$$\alpha(f(c, d)) \in f(xy, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)) = \{xy\}.$$

The proof of the inductive step also shows that there is no directed edge from $O(a) \setminus \{a\}$ to a , since $\alpha(a) \neq xy$. Symmetric arguments show that for any $d \in O(b) \setminus \{b\}$ we have $\alpha(d) = yx$, and that there is no directed edge from $O(b) \setminus \{b\}$ to b .

Now suppose that \mathbb{A} satisfies all three bullet points, and define α as in the theorem statement (that α is well-defined follows from the first bullet point in the theorem statement). We just need to verify that α is a homomorphism - the uniqueness will follow from the fact that any homomorphism is determined by where it sends the generators a, b . We just need to check that

- for $\alpha(c) \in O(x)$ we have $\alpha(f(a, c)) \in f(x, O(x)) = \{x\}$,
- for $\alpha(d) \in O(y)$ we have $\alpha(f(a, d)) \in f(x, O(y)) = \{xy\}$, and
- for $\alpha(c) = xy$ and any d we have $\alpha(f(c, d)) \in f(xy, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)) = \{xy\}$,

as well as the corresponding statements with x and y reversed. The first of these conditions follows directly from (D2), and by the definition of α the other two conditions correspond exactly to the last two bullet points from the theorem statement. \square

Proposition 33. *If t is any term which satisfies*

$$t(x, y, \dots, y) = x$$

when interpreted in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, then the identity $t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_1$ follows from (D2). In particular, every absorption identity which holds in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ is a consequence of (D2).

Proof. We will prove this by induction on the definition of t . We see that either t is the first projection, or we can write $t = s \cdot u$ for terms s and u which satisfy

$$s(x, y, \dots, y) = x, \quad u(x, y, \dots, y) \in \{x, xy\}$$

in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Since x, xy are not contained in the right orbit $O(y)$, any term u such that

$$u(x, y, \dots, y) \in \{x, xy\}$$

must have the form

$$u(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\dots((x_1 \cdot v_1) \cdot v_2) \dots \cdot v_k)$$

for some terms v_1, \dots, v_k . Inductively, we see that the identity $s(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_1$ follows from (D2), and since the identity

$$x_1 \cdot u(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_1$$

is an instance of (D2), we see that $t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \approx x_1$ follows from (D2) as well. \square

Proposition 34. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ and f is a binary operation satisfying (D2), then for $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, the following are equivalent:*

- *there exists a surjective homomorphism $\alpha : \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$,*
- *for every binary term g of \mathbb{A} such that $g(a, b) = a$ and $g(b, a) = b$, the identity $g(x, y) \approx x$ follows from (D2).*

Proof. To make things easier to read, we write $a_2 = (a, b)$ and $b_2 = (b, a)$. Suppose first that such an α exists. By Proposition 32, α must send a_2 and b_2 to x and y in some order, say $\alpha(a_2) = x, \alpha(b_2) = y$. Then if $g(a, b) = a$ and $g(b, a) = b$, that is if $g(a_2, b_2) = a_2$, then we must have

$$g(x, y) = \alpha(g(a_2, b_2)) = \alpha(a_2) = x$$

in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Since all absorption identities which hold in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ are consequences of (D2), we see that $g(x, y) \approx x$ follows from (D2).

Now suppose that the second bullet point holds. We just need to check that the algebra $\mathbb{A}_2 = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{a_2, b_2\}$ satisfies the three conditions of Proposition 32. We will frequently use the fact that any identity which does not hold in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ also can't be a consequence of (D2).

To see that the right orbits of a_2 and b_2 in \mathbb{A}_2 are disjoint, note that by Proposition 10 $c \in O(a_2)$ if and only if there is some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that $g(a_2, b_2) = c$, and since the identity $f(y, g(x, y)) \approx y$ does not hold in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ for $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, we have $f(b_2, g(a_2, b_2)) \neq b_2$, so by (D2) we have $c = g(a_2, b_2) \notin O(b_2)$.

Next we need to check that $f(a_2, d) \neq a_2$ for any $d \in O(b_2)$. If $d \in O(b_2)$, then there is some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that $d = g(b_2, a_2)$, and since the identity $f(x, g(y, x)) \approx x$ does not hold in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ for $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ we see that $f(a_2, g(b_2, a_2)) \neq a_2$.

Finally, we check that for any $c \in O(a_2) \setminus \{a_2\}$ and any $d \in \mathbb{A}_2$ we have $f(c, d) \neq a_2$. Suppose otherwise, for the sake of contradiction - then there would be $c \in O(a_2) \setminus \{a_2\}$ and $d \in \text{Sg}\{a_2, b_2\}$ such that $a_2 = f(c, d)$. Then by Proposition 10 there are $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ and $h \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ such that $g(a_2, b_2) = c$ and $h(a_2, b_2) = d$, so from

$$a_2 = f(g(a_2, b_2), h(a_2, b_2)),$$

we see that $f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \approx x$ follows from (D2). This can only occur if $g(x, y) = x$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, in which case we have $c = g(a_2, b_2) = a_2$, which contradicts the assumption $c \in O(a_2) \setminus \{a_2\}$. \square

Proposition 34 is a big part of the reason that dispersive algebras are defined the way they are in Definition 5: the existence of a surjective homomorphism $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ ensures that there is no nontrivial binary reduct of \mathbb{A} such that $\{a, b\}$ becomes a projection subalgebra of the reduct.

Proposition 35. *If f is dispersive, then any binary operation $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is also dispersive.*

Proof. By Proposition 31, any such g automatically satisfies (D2). Now suppose that $\{a, b\}$ does not form a subalgebra of (A, g) , in which case g must be nontrivial. Then since f is dispersive, there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\alpha : \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$$

which maps (a, b) to x . Let α_g be the restriction of α to the subreduct $\text{Sg}_{(A, g)^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, which defines a homomorphism to the reduct $(\{x, y, xy, yx\}, g)$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Then by Proposition 34 and the fact that g is nontrivial we see that $g((a, b), (b, a)) \neq (a, b)$, so after applying α_g we see that $g(x, y) \neq x$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Since $g(x, y) \in O(x)$ by Proposition 10, we see that $g(x, y) = xy$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, so α_g is surjective and the reduct $(\{x, y, xy, yx\}, g)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. \square

Proposition 36. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a nontrivial dispersive algebra, then each of the three operations $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ from Proposition 13 is necessarily nontrivial.*

Proof. We just need to check that we do not have $f(x, y) \preceq x$ in the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$. By the definition of a dispersive algebra and the assumption that \mathbb{A} is nontrivial, there is some surjective homomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Therefore any hypothetical directed path from $f(x, y)$ to x in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ would be mapped by α to a directed path from xy to x in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, which is impossible. \square

Note that the definition of a dispersive algebra makes sense even for infinite algebras. The class of dispersive algebras is very close to forming a variety.

Theorem 11. *The class of (possibly infinite) dispersive algebras is closed under the following constructions.*

- Any subalgebra of a dispersive algebra is dispersive.
- Any product $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{A}_i$ of dispersive algebras \mathbb{A}_i is dispersive.
- If \mathbb{A} is a dispersive algebra and θ is a congruence on \mathbb{A} such that the intersection of any finitely generated subalgebra of \mathbb{A} with any congruence class of θ is finite, then \mathbb{A}/θ is a dispersive algebra.

In particular, the finite dispersive algebras form a pseudovariety.

Proof. The claim about subalgebras follows directly from the definition of a dispersive algebra. For the claim about products, suppose that $\mathbb{A} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{A}_i$ and that $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ generate a nontrivial subalgebra of \mathbb{A} . Since f acts as first projection on every two-element dispersive algebra (by the identity $f(x, f(x, y)) \approx x$, which follows from (D2)), there must be at least one $i \in I$ such that $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is not a subalgebra of \mathbb{A}_i . Then $\pi_{(i, i)}$ defines a surjective homomorphism from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ to $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}_i^2} \{(a_i, b_i), (b_i, a_i)\}$, and since \mathbb{A}_i is assumed to be dispersive this has a surjective homomorphism to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$.

Now we handle the claim about quotients. So suppose $\mathbb{A} = (A, f), \theta$ are as in the last bullet point, and let C, D be a pair of congruence classes of θ . By Proposition 34, checking the existence of a surjective homomorphism

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}/\theta} \{(C, D), (D, C)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$$

is equivalent to checking that for every binary term g such that $g(C, D) \subseteq C$ and $g(D, C) \subseteq D$, the identity $g(x, y) \approx x$ follows from (D2). Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial term g such that $g(C, D) \subseteq C$ and $g(D, C) \subseteq D$, but that $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}/\theta} \{C, D\} \neq \{C, D\}$. Pick $a \in C$ and $b \in D$ such that

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\} \cap \begin{bmatrix} C \\ D \end{bmatrix}$$

has minimal cardinality (using the finiteness assumption on intersections of finitely generated subalgebras and congruence classes of θ).

Since g is nontrivial and \mathbb{A} is dispersive, either $\{a, b\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , or the pairs $(g(a, b), g(b, a))$ and $(g(b, a), g(a, b))$ generate a proper subalgebra of $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, which is contained in the preimage of the

subalgebra $\{xy, yx\} \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ under the surjective homomorphism $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Since $a, g(a, b) \in C$ and $b, g(b, a) \in D$, the second case contradicts the choice of a, b (otherwise $(a, b) \in C \times D$ is in the subalgebra generated by $(g(a, b), g(b, a))$ and $(g(b, a), g(a, b))$, in which case (b, a) is as well). Therefore $\{a, b\}$ must be a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} . Since θ is a congruence and $a \in C, b \in D$, this implies that $\{C, D\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathbb{A}/θ , which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 4. Not every quotient of an infinite dispersive algebra is dispersive. In fact, there is an infinite dispersive algebra \mathbb{A}_{∞} which is a subproduct of a sequence of finite dispersive algebras \mathbb{A}_n , such that \mathbb{A}_{∞} has a four-element quotient which is not dispersive (and is instead a meld). The algebra \mathbb{A}_n has underlying set $\{a_0, \dots, a_n, b_0, \dots, b_n\}$, with the basic operation given by

\mathbb{A}_n	a_j	a_n	b_j	b_n
a_i	a_i	a_i	a_n	a_{i+1}
a_n	a_n	a_n	a_n	a_n
b_i	b_n	b_{i+1}	b_i	b_i
b_n	b_n	b_n	b_n	b_n

for any $i, j < n$. To check that \mathbb{A}_n is dispersive, note that

$$O(a_i) = \{a_j \mid j \geq i\},$$

so \mathbb{A}_n satisfies (D2) since $a_i \cdot a_j = a_i$ for all i, j . Furthermore, for $i < n$ we have

$$a_i \cdot b_j \in O(a_{i+1})$$

for all $j \leq n$, so as long as either $i < n$ or $j < n$ we have a map from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}_n^2}\{(a_i, b_j), (b_j, a_i)\}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ which sends (a_i, b_j) to x , sends (b_j, a_i) to y , and sends all other elements to $x \cdot y$ or $y \cdot x$ based on whether the first coordinate is in $O(a_i)$ or $O(b_j)$. (The reader may check that for $n \geq 2$, the clone of the dispersive algebra \mathbb{A}_n is *not* a minimal clone, by applying Proposition 13.)

We can now define the infinite algebra \mathbb{A}_{∞} to be the subalgebra of the product $\prod_n \mathbb{A}_n$ which is generated by the elements (a_0, a_0, \dots) and (b_0, b_0, \dots) . First define a congruence \sim on \mathbb{A}_{∞} which identifies sequences c and d whenever $c_i = d_i$ for all sufficiently large i . Then each element of \mathbb{A}_{∞}/\sim is either of the form a^i or b^i for some $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, where

$$a^i = (a_{\max(i,1)}, a_{\max(i,2)}, \dots)/\sim$$

and b^i is defined similarly. Then the equivalence relation θ which has equivalence classes $\bigcup_{i < \infty} a^i, \bigcup_{i < \infty} b^i, a^{\infty}, b^{\infty}$ is easily checked to be a congruence of \mathbb{A}_{∞} , and $\mathbb{A}_{\infty}/\theta$ is isomorphic to the free meld on two generators.

Theorem 12. *Being dispersive is a nice property.*

Proof. First we verify that we can efficiently check whether or not a given algebra $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is dispersive. Although (D2) is an infinite family of identities, we can check whether it holds by computing the right orbit $O(a)$ and verifying that $f(a, O(a)) = \{a\}$ for each $a \in \mathbb{A}$. Once we have checked that (D2) holds in \mathbb{A} , we examine each pair $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $\{a, b\}$ is not a two-element subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , compute the labeled digraph associated to the algebra $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, and check whether or not there is a surjective homomorphism from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ using Proposition 32.

The next step is to check that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ appears in the variety generated by any nontrivial dispersive algebra \mathbb{A} . To see this, note that by the definition of a dispersive algebra, if $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ is not a subquotient of \mathbb{A}^2 , then every pair of elements $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ forms a two-element subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , and f must act as first projection on each of these subalgebras as a consequence of (D2), in which case \mathbb{A} is a projection algebra.

That the finite dispersive algebras form a pseudovariety was proved in Theorem 11. All that is left is to check that if \mathbb{A} is nontrivial, then for any nontrivial term $g \in \text{Clo}(f)$, there is some nontrivial $f' \in \text{Clo}(g)$ such that f' is also dispersive.

By Rosenberg's Theorem 1, there is some nontrivial $t \in \text{Clo}(g)$ which is either a unary operation, a majority operation, an affine operation, a binary operation, or a semiprojection. It's easy to see that t

can't be unary (since f is idempotent) and that t can't be majority or affine (since there is a two-element projection algebra in the variety generated by \mathbb{A}). Proposition 33 shows that t can't be a semiprojection of arity at least 3. Thus t is binary, and Proposition 35 shows that either $t(x, y)$ or $t(y, x)$ is dispersive. \square

Now we will investigate the structure of the digraphs $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ attached to clone-minimal dispersive algebras.

Proposition 37. *If \mathbb{A} is a dispersive algebra, then every strongly connected component of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ is a projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. If a, b are in the same strongly connected component of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$, then $b \in O(a)$ and $a \in O(b)$, so (D2) implies that $ab = a$ and $ba = b$. \square

Proposition 38. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a dispersive algebra, then for any $a \neq b \in \mathbb{A}$ and any $c \in \mathbb{A}$, we have $(c, c) \notin \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$. In particular, we have $f(a, b) \neq f(b, a)$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} has a term $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ with $g(a, b) = g(b, a) = c$. Then the binary term $h(x, y) = f(x, g(y, x))$ is nontrivial in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, but $h(a, b) = f(a, c) = a$ and $h(b, a) = f(b, c) = b$ since $c \in O(a) \cap O(b)$, which is a contradiction to Proposition 34. \square

Proposition 39. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, f) = \text{Sg}\{a, b\}$ is a dispersive algebra with $a \neq b$, then $b \notin O(a)$, that is, $a \not\leq b$. In particular, $f(a, b) \neq b$.*

Proof. If $b \in O(a)$, then $\mathbb{A} = O(a) \cup O(b) = O(a)$. But then $f(a, c) = a$ for all c in \mathbb{A} , so $O(a) = \{a\}$, a contradiction. \square

Definition 19. For every $n \geq 1$, we define the clone-minimal dispersive hoop algebras $\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}'_n$ on the set


$$H_n = \{a, b, c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{n-1}\}$$

by the multiplication tables

\mathbb{H}_n	a	b	c_j	d_j		\mathbb{H}'_n	a	b	c_j	d_j
a	a	c_0	a	a		a	a	d_0	a	a
b	b	b	b	b		b	b	b	b	b
c_i	d_i	c_i	c_i	c_i		c_i	d_i	c_i	c_i	c_i
d_i	d_i	c_{i+1}	d_i	d_i		d_i	d_i	c_{i+1}	d_i	d_i

where the indices are considered cyclically modulo n .

For $n = 2$, the labeled digraphs associated to the hoop algebras $\mathbb{H}_2, \mathbb{H}'_2$ are pictured side by side below.



Visual inspection shows that the hoop algebras satisfy (D2). To check that they are dispersive, first note that every pair of elements other than the pair a, b generates a proper subalgebra of size two or three which is isomorphic to a subalgebra of the dispersive algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. So we only need to check that $\text{Sg}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ has a surjective homomorphism to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, which follows from Propositions 32, 34 as a consequence of $O(b) = \{b\}$, $ab \neq a$, and the fact that there is no directed path from ab back to a .

Note that the algebras $\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}'_n$ are term-equivalent: if f is the basic operation of \mathbb{H}_n , then the basic operation f' of \mathbb{H}'_n is given by

$$f'(x, y) = f(f(x, y), x).$$

The basic operation of \mathbb{H}_n satisfies the identities $f(f(x, y), y) \approx f(x, y) \approx f(f(x, y), f(y, x))$, while the basic operation of \mathbb{H}'_n satisfies the identity $f'(f'(x, y), x) \approx f'(x, y)$, but the next result shows that no nontrivial term of either algebra satisfies all of these identities simultaneously.

Proposition 40. *If $\mathbb{H}_n = (H_n, f)$ is one of the hoop algebras, then for any nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ the reduct (H_n, g) is either isomorphic to \mathbb{H}_n or to \mathbb{H}'_n .*

In particular, $\text{Clo}(g)$ has the same size as $\text{Clo}(f)$ for any nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, so $\text{Clo}(f)$ is a minimal clone.

Proof. Since every pair of elements other than a, b generates a subalgebra isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, g agrees with f on any such pair. Since $g(b, a) \in O(b) = \{b\}$ by Proposition 10, the operation g is completely determined by the value of $g(a, b) \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$. If $g(a, b) = c_i$ for some i , then (H_n, g) is isomorphic to \mathbb{H}_n by cyclically permuting the c s and d s, and similarly if $g(a, b) = d_i$ for some i then (H_n, g) is isomorphic to \mathbb{H}'_n . \square

Proposition 41. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is a dispersive clone-minimal algebra, with \mathbb{A} generated by a, b such that $O(b) = \{b\}$. Then either $|\mathbb{A}| \leq 3$ or \mathbb{A} is isomorphic to one of the hoop algebras $\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}'_n$ for some $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Propositions 13 and 36 we can find a nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that $g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y)$ and such that $g(a, b)$ is contained in a maximal strongly connected component of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$. Let $c = g(a, b)$, and note that $a \preceq c$ since $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$. Then since $a \preceq c$, we have $g(a, x) = a$ for all $x \in O(c)$. Additionally, from $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ and the assumption $O(b) = \{b\}$, we see that $g(b, x) = b$ for all x .

Thus $O(c) \cup \{a, b\}$ is closed under g , and must therefore be equal to \mathbb{A} since $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$. Furthermore, since $O(c)$ is strongly connected it must be a projection subalgebra by Proposition 37. If we consider the digraph $D_{(A, g)}$, we see that the edge labels are subsets of $\{a, b\}$, and the identity $g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y)$ implies that no two consecutive edges can share a label.

Assume now that $|\mathbb{A}| > 3$, so $|O(c)| \geq 2$. Since every element of $O(c)$ has indegree and outdegree at least one, we see that no edge in $O(c)$ is labelled $\{a, b\}$, and that in fact each element of $O(c)$ must have outdegree exactly one. Thus $O(c)$ is a directed cycle, with edge labels alternating between $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$, so (A, g) is isomorphic to the hoop algebra \mathbb{H}_n for $n = |O(c)|/2$. To finish the argument, note that $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$ and Proposition 40 imply that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is also isomorphic to a hoop algebra. \square

Corollary 9. *If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal dispersive algebra and $b \preceq a$ in \mathbb{A} , then $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$ either has size at most 3, or is isomorphic to one of the hoop algebras $\mathbb{H}_n, \mathbb{H}'_n$ for some $n \geq 1$.*

The previous result puts a constraint on the ways an element a can interact with its right orbit $O(a)$. In some cases we can put an even stronger constraint on how the right orbits can behave.

Definition 20. We say that a dispersive algebra \mathbb{A} is *inert* if $O(a)$ is a projection subalgebra for each $a \in \mathbb{A}$.

Proposition 42. *If \mathbb{A} is a dispersive algebra, then the union of all of the maximal strongly connected components of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ forms an inert subalgebra of \mathbb{A} .*

The next result will be proved in Appendix B.

Theorem 13. *If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal inert dispersive algebra which is generated by two elements a, b , and if $|O(b)| \leq 2$, then $|O(a)| \leq 2$ and \mathbb{A} is isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$.*


As soon as both right orbits have size at least 3, it is possible to find interesting examples of minimal inert dispersive algebras which are generated by two elements.

Definition 21. For every $n \geq 1$ and every $0 \leq k < n$, we define the minimal inert dispersive *wheel* algebras $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a, \mathbb{W}_n^s$ on the set $\{a, b, c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{n-1}\}$ by the multiplication tables

$\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$	a	b	c_j	d_j	\mathbb{W}_n^s	a	b	c_j	d_j
a	a	c_0	a	c_{j+1}	a	a	c_0	a	c_{j+1}
b	d_k	b	d_j	b	b	d_0	b	d_{j+1}	b
c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i	c_i
d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i	d_i

where the indices are considered cyclically modulo n . We define \mathbb{W}_n^a to be $\mathbb{W}_{n,0}^a$.

For $n = 2$, the labeled digraphs of the wheel algebras $\mathbb{W}_2^a, \mathbb{W}_2^s$ are pictured side by side below (to understand why they are named “wheel” algebras, the reader should try to draw \mathbb{W}_6^s as symmetrically as possible).



The argument which shows that the wheel algebras are dispersive is almost identical to the argument for the hoop algebras: (D2) follows by visual inspection, and every pair of elements other than a, b generates a subalgebra of size at most 3 which is isomorphic to a subalgebra of the dispersive algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. That $\text{Sg}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ maps surjectively onto $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ follows from Propositions 32, 34 as a consequence of $a \notin a \cdot O(b)$ and the fact that there is no edge from any element to a .

To check that the wheel algebras are inert, we just need to check that the right orbits $O(a) = \{a, c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}\}$ and $O(b) = \{b, d_0, \dots, d_{n-1}\}$ are projection subalgebras, since every right orbit is contained in one of $O(a), O(b)$. The next result implies that the wheel algebras are clone-minimal.

Proposition 43. *The wheel algebra $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{W}_{n,n-1-k}^a$. If n is odd, then \mathbb{W}_n^s is isomorphic to $\mathbb{W}_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^s$. For every $n \geq 2$ and every $k \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$, $\text{Sg}_{(\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a)^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{W}_{2n}^s .*

Finally, if $\mathbb{A} = (A, f) \in \{\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a, \mathbb{W}_n^s\}$, then any nontrivial term $g \in \text{Clo}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\pi_1}(f)$ defines an algebra (A, g) which is isomorphic to \mathbb{A} .

Proof. Note that since the wheel algebras are inert and since the elements c_i, d_i have no outgoing edges, the only values of the multiplication which are not determined by the digraph structure (ignoring the labels) are those of the form $a \cdot d$ with $d \in O(b)$ and $b \cdot c$ with $c \in O(a)$. So it's enough to check a candidate isomorphism between wheel algebras by checking that it preserves the digraph structure and that it is compatible with the multiplication on pairs in $\{a\} \times O(b) \cup \{b\} \times O(a)$.

An isomorphism α from $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$ to $\mathbb{W}_{n,n-1-k}^a$ is given by taking

$$\alpha(a) = b, \quad \alpha(b) = a, \quad \alpha(c_i) = d_{i-k-1}, \quad \alpha(d_i) = c_{i-k},$$

where the indices are taken modulo n . To check that α is compatible with the multiplications $f_{n,k}^a, f_{n,n-k-1}^a$ of $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$ and $\mathbb{W}_{n,n-1-k}^a$, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(f_{n,k}^a(a, b)) &= \alpha(c_0) = d_{n-k-1} = f_{n,n-k-1}^a(b, a), \\ \alpha(f_{n,k}^a(b, a)) &= \alpha(d_k) = c_0 = f_{n,n-k-1}^a(a, b), \\ \alpha(f_{n,k}^a(a, d_i)) &= \alpha(c_{i+1}) = d_{i-k} = f_{n,n-k-1}^a(b, c_{i-k}), \\ \alpha(f_{n,k}^a(b, c_i)) &= \alpha(d_i) = c_{i-k} = f_{n,n-k-1}^a(a, d_{i-k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

If n is odd, then 2 is invertible in \mathbb{Z}/n , and we can define an isomorphism β from \mathbb{W}_n^s to $\mathbb{W}_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a$ by taking

$$\beta(a) = a, \quad \beta(b) = b, \quad \beta(c_i) = c_{\frac{i}{2}}, \quad \beta(d_i) = d_{\frac{i-1}{2}}.$$

To check that β is compatible with the multiplications $f_n^s, f_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a$ of \mathbb{W}_n^s and $\mathbb{W}_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a$, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(f_n^s(a, b)) &= \beta(c_0) = c_0 = f_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a(a, b), \\ \beta(f_n^s(b, a)) &= \beta(d_0) = d_{\frac{n-1}{2}} = f_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a(b, a), \\ \beta(f_n^s(a, d_i)) &= \beta(c_{i+1}) = c_{\frac{i+1}{2}} = f_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a(a, d_{\frac{i-1}{2}}), \\ \beta(f_n^s(b, c_i)) &= \beta(d_{i+1}) = d_{\frac{i}{2}} = f_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a(b, c_{\frac{i}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

For the third isomorphism, for any n, k with $k \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$ we define γ from \mathbb{W}_{2n}^s to $\text{Sg}_{(\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a)^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(a) &= (a, b), \quad \gamma(c_{2i}) = (c_i, d_{i+k}), \quad \gamma(c_{2i+1}) = (c_{i+k+1}, d_i), \\ \gamma(b) &= (b, a), \quad \gamma(d_{2i}) = (d_{i+k}, c_i), \quad \gamma(d_{2i+1}) = (d_i, c_{i+k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We use the assumption $k \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$ in order to ensure that γ is injective: if $\gamma(c_{2i}) = \gamma(c_{2j+1})$ for some i, j , then $c_i = c_{j+k+1}$ and $d_{i+k} = d_j$, which can only happen if $i - j \equiv k + 1 \equiv -k \pmod{n}$.

To check that γ is compatible with the multiplications $f_{2n}^s, f_{n,k}^a$ of \mathbb{W}_{2n}^s and $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(f_{2n}^s(a, b)) &= \gamma(c_0) = (c_0, d_k) = f_{n,k}^a((a, b), (b, a)), \\ \gamma(f_{2n}^s(a, d_{2i})) &= \gamma(c_{2i+1}) = (c_{i+k+1}, d_i) = f_{n,k}^a((a, b), (d_{i+k}, c_i)), \\ \gamma(f_{2n}^s(a, d_{2i+1})) &= \gamma(c_{2i+2}) = (c_{i+1}, d_{i+k+1}) = f_{n,k}^a((a, b), (d_i, c_{i+k+1})). \end{aligned}$$

Now we turn to the last claim. Since every pair of elements of \mathbb{A} other than a, b generates a subalgebra isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, any nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ agrees with f on any such pair. Thus any such g is completely determined by the values of $g(a, b) \in O(a)$ and $g(b, a) \in O(b)$. As a consequence, we see that the natural map from $\text{Clo}_2(f) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ to the algebra $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ is an isomorphism.

If \mathbb{A} has an automorphism that swaps a and b - that is, if \mathbb{A} is \mathbb{W}_n^s or $\mathbb{W}_{n, \frac{n-1}{2}}^a$ - then $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{A} and every nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is determined by the j such that $g(a, b) = c_j$. In this case, (A, f) is isomorphic to (A, g) by the map which sends a, b to themselves, and increases the index in each c_i, d_i by j modulo n .

Now suppose that \mathbb{A} is $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}^a$ for some $k \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Making use of the automorphism γ from \mathbb{W}_{2n}^s to $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, we see that every nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ is determined by the $j \in \mathbb{Z}/2n$ such that

$$(g(a, b), g(b, a)) = g(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) = \gamma(c_j).$$

If j is even, say $j = 2i$, then by the definition of γ we have $g(a, b) = c_i$ and $g(b, a) = d_{i+k}$, so (A, f) is isomorphic to (A, g) by shifting the indices on the c s and d s forward by i modulo n . If j is odd, say $j = 2i + 1$, then we have $g(a, b) = c_{i+k+1}$ and $g(b, a) = d_i$, so $\mathbb{W}_{n, n-1-k}^a$ is isomorphic to (A, g) by shifting the indices forward by $i + k + 1$ modulo n , and composing this isomorphism with α gives us an isomorphism between (A, f) and (A, g) . \square

Remark 5. The author has become convinced, through a process of exhaustive (and exhausting) casework, of the following claim: up to isomorphism, the only clone-minimal inert dispersive algebras generated by two elements with size ≤ 6 are $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, its three element subalgebra $\{x, xy, yx\}$, and the wheel algebras $\mathbb{W}_2^a, \mathbb{W}_2^s$. It would be wonderful to have a formal proof of this claim that was less than infinitely long.

We'll end this subsection with a few conjectures about clone-minimal dispersive algebras which seem to be fiendishly difficult to either prove or construct counterexamples to. Recall that a *weakly connected component* of a directed graph is just a connected component of the undirected graph which we get by forgetting the directions of the edges.

Conjecture 1. If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal dispersive algebra, then for any $a \neq b \in \mathbb{A}$, there is a surjective homomorphism from $\text{Sg}\{a, b\}$ to a two element projection algebra. Equivalently, the digraph $D_{\text{Sg}\{a, b\}}$ has exactly two weakly connected components, that is, $O(a) \cap O(b) = \emptyset$ in $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$.

Conjecture 2. If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal dispersive algebra, and if there is some $c \in \text{Sg}\{a, b\}$ such that $\{c, d\}$ is a two element projection subalgebra for all $d \in \text{Sg}\{a, b\}$, then $\text{Sg}\{a, b\} = \{a, b, c\}$. It's enough to show that at least one of $(a, c), (b, c)$ is contained in $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$.

Conjecture 3. If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal dispersive algebra which is generated by two elements, then $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ has at least three strongly connected components.

4 Proof of the classification

Since the proof is long, we outline the main ideas below.

- First we prove that if a clone-minimal algebra \mathbb{A} is not Taylor and not a rectangular band, then $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ becomes a robust concept (Proposition 45 and Corollary 10).
- Next we show that if $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ also does not contain a nontrivial partial semilattice operation, then (D2) holds in the free algebra on two generators (Theorem 14). The core of the argument (Lemma 3) is based on Proposition 14 and Corollary 3.
- We then consider the case where either of the composition operators $*_c, *_1$ gives $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ a group structure, and prove that in this case \mathbb{A} must be a p -cyclic groupoid (Theorem 15, Corollary 12). Finiteness is used in an unexpected way in Lemma 5, which is proved by a counting argument involving the orbit-stabilizer theorem.
- If $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ does not form a group under $*_c, *_1$, then we can apply Corollary 1 to find nontrivial operations satisfying $g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y)$ or $t(t(x, y), t(y, x)) \approx t(x, y)$. We show that in this case, any deviation from being dispersive forces \mathbb{A} to be a meld (Theorem 17, Lemmas 7, 8). The proof technique relies heavily on Proposition 14.
- We complete the proof by showing that if \mathbb{A} is not Taylor, not a rectangular band, has no nontrivial partial semilattice operation, is not a p -cyclic groupoid, and is not a meld, then \mathbb{A} must be a dispersive algebra (Theorem 18).

Proposition 44. *If a clone-minimal algebra \mathbb{A} has a term f such that there are algebras $\mathbb{B}_1, \mathbb{B}_2 \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$, each with at least two elements, such that $f^{\mathbb{B}_1}$ is first projection and $f^{\mathbb{B}_2}$ is second projection, then \mathbb{A} is a rectangular band.*

Proof. Since f acts as different projections on \mathbb{B}_1 and \mathbb{B}_2 , f must be nontrivial, so $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Clo}(f)$. Assume without loss of generality that $|\mathbb{B}_1| = |\mathbb{B}_2| = 2$, and let $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}_1 \times \mathbb{B}_2$. Also, assume that f is binary (otherwise replace it with $f(x, y, \dots, y)$). On \mathbb{B} , f satisfies the identity

$$f(f(f(u, x), y), f(z, f(w, u))) \approx u,$$

so this identity must hold on \mathbb{A} as well, by Proposition 6. By Proposition 19, this identity implies that \mathbb{A} is a rectangular band. \square

Proposition 45. *If \mathbb{A} is a binary clone-minimal algebra which is not Taylor and is not a rectangular band, then for every $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$, exactly one of $f(x, y) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ or $f(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ is true.*

In this case, under the isomorphism between $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ and the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ which sends π_1 to x and π_2 to y , $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ is a congruence class of the unique congruence \sim on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)/\sim$ is a two-element projection algebra.

Proof. If \mathbb{A} is not Taylor, then there must be a two-element projection algebra \mathbb{B} in $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$, so for every $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$, at least one of $f(x, y) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ or $f(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ is true. By Proposition 44, they can't both be true unless \mathbb{A} is a rectangular band.

For the second statement, since \mathbb{B} is generated by two elements, there is a surjective homomorphism α from $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ to \mathbb{B} . Then for $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, we have $\alpha(f(x, y)) = f(\alpha(x), \alpha(y)) = \alpha(x)$ since f restricts to first projection on \mathbb{B} , so $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}) = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha(x))$ is a congruence class of $\ker \alpha$. \square

Corollary 10. *If \mathbb{A} is a binary clone-minimal algebra which is not a rectangular band, then every $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ acts as first projection on every projection algebra $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$.*

It is now finally time to apply Proposition 14 and Corollary 3.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Clo}(f)$ is a binary minimal clone which does not contain any nontrivial partial semilattice operations, and assume further that f acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{A} . Then for any $a \neq b \in \mathbb{A}$ we have*

$$f(a, b) \neq b.$$

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $a \neq b$ and $f(a, b) = b$. Since f acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , we must have $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\} = \mathbb{A}$.

Define $\mathbb{S} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A}^2$ by

$$\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

If \mathbb{S} is the graph of an automorphism of \mathbb{A} then we must have $f(b, a) = a$, so $\{a, b\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} on which f acts as the second projection, contradicting our assumption on f .

If \mathbb{S} is not linked, then the linking congruence of \mathbb{S} defines a nontrivial congruence \sim on \mathbb{A} . Since f acts as first projection on \mathbb{A}/\sim , we have $f(a/\sim, b/\sim) = a/\sim$. But then $b = f(a, b) \sim a$ and since a, b generate \mathbb{A} we see that every element of \mathbb{A} is in the same congruence class of \sim , which contradicts the assumption that \sim is nontrivial.

Thus \mathbb{S} must be linked. Then by Corollary 3 and the fact that \mathbb{A} has a proper singleton subalgebra (since \mathbb{A} is idempotent and nontrivial), we see that \mathbb{A} has a proper subalgebra $\mathbb{B} < \mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{B} + \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{A}$.

Choose $c, d \in \mathbb{B}$ with $a \in c + \mathbb{S}$ and $b \in d + \mathbb{S}$, that is, with $(a, c), (b, d) \in \mathbb{S}$. Since f acts as first projection on \mathbb{B} , we have $f(c, d) = c$, so

$$\begin{bmatrix} b \\ c \end{bmatrix} = f \left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ c \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ d \end{bmatrix} \right) \in \mathbb{S}.$$

If b, c generate \mathbb{A} , then from $(a, b), (a, c) \in \mathbb{S}$ we see that $(a, a) \in \mathbb{S}$, and by Lemma 1 this contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial partial semilattice terms. Otherwise f acts as first projection on $\{b, c\}$, so

$$\begin{bmatrix} b \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f \left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ c \end{bmatrix} \right) \in \mathbb{S},$$

and again by Lemma 1 this contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial partial semilattice terms. \square

Corollary 11. *Suppose that $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Clo}(f)$ is a binary minimal clone which does not contain any nontrivial partial semilattice operations, and assume further that f acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{A} . If $\pi_2 \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, then for any $g, h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ we have*

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \approx g(x, y).$$

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there are $g, h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ such that $f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \not\approx g(x, y)$. In particular, there must be some $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$f(g(a, b), h(a, b)) \neq g(a, b).$$

Since f acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , the elements $g(a, b)$ and $h(a, b)$ must generate \mathbb{A} . Thus there is some $t \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$ such that

$$t(g(a, b), h(a, b)) = b.$$

Since $t \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$, either $t(x, y) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ or $t(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, and either way we see that the term u defined by

$$u(x, y) = t(g(x, y), h(x, y))$$

has $u \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ and $u(a, b) = b$. Then u is nontrivial since $\pi_2 \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, so Lemma 3 applied to u gives us a contradiction. \square

Theorem 14. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a binary minimal clone which is not a rectangular band and which does not contain any nontrivial partial semilattice operations, then for any $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have*

$$f(x, g(x, y)) \approx x.$$

If f, g are nontrivial, then we also have $f(g(x, y), x) \not\approx x$, and more generally for any $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \not\approx x.$$

Proof. By the assumption $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, we have $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f) \subseteq \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, so $\pi_2 \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$.

By Proposition 14 we can choose some $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ such that \mathbb{B} is not a projection algebra, but such that every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} is a projection algebra. By Lemma 1 \mathbb{B} can't have any partial semilattice terms if \mathbb{A} doesn't have any partial semilattice terms, and by Corollary 10 f and g act as first projection on every projection subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} if \mathbb{A} isn't a rectangular band. By Proposition 6, the terms f, g are nontrivial in \mathbb{B} if and only if they are nontrivial in \mathbb{A} , and for every $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ we see that t can't restrict to π_2 on \mathbb{B} .

By Corollary 11 applied to \mathbb{B} , the absorption identity $f(x, g(x, y)) \approx x$ holds in \mathbb{B} , so by Proposition 6 it also holds in \mathbb{A} . Additionally, by Corollary 11 the identity

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \approx g(x, y)$$

holds in \mathbb{B} , so

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \not\approx x$$

on \mathbb{B} , since g is nontrivial on \mathbb{B} . Thus we also have

$$f(g(x, y), h(x, y)) \not\approx x$$

on \mathbb{A} . \square

Recall from Definition 15 that we say that an idempotent binary operation f is a *p-cyclic groupoid* if it satisfies the identities

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, f(y, z)) &\approx f(x, y), \\ f(f(x, y), z) &\approx f(f(x, z), y), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f(\cdots f(f(x, y), y) \cdots, y) \approx x,$$

where there are p y s in the last identity.

Theorem 15. *If a binary minimal clone on a finite set is not a rectangular band and does not have any nontrivial term f satisfying the identity*

$$f(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y),$$

then it is a p-cyclic groupoid for some prime p .

We will prove this in a series of lemmas, all using the following assumption:

- (*) $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a binary minimal clone which is not a rectangular band and \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial term operation satisfying the identity $f(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y)$.

We will make use of the circular composition operator $*_c$, which we defined in equation $(*_c)$ by

$$(f *_c g)(x, y) = f(g(x, y), g(y, x)).$$

Proposition 46. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies (*), then $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ and $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ form groups under $*_c$. In particular, for any binary term $f \in \text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ there exists a binary term $f^- \in \text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ such that*

$$f^-(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(f^-(x, y), f^-(y, x)) \approx x.$$

Proof. First we check that the circular composition $*_c$ is associative:

$$\begin{aligned} (f *_c (g *_c h))(x, y) &\approx f((g *_c h)(x, y), (g *_c h)(y, x)) \\ &\approx f\left(g(h(x, y), h(y, x)), g(h(y, x), h(x, y))\right) \\ &\approx (f *_c g)(h(x, y), h(y, x)) \\ &\approx ((f *_c g) *_c h)(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ and $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ are closed under $*_c$, we see that $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ and $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ form semigroups under $*_c$, with π_1 as the identity. To see that they form groups, note that by the finiteness of $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ we can apply Proposition 7 to see that there is some $N > 0$ such that $f^{*N} = f^{*2N}$ for all f in $\text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$. If $f^{*N} \neq \pi_1$ for any $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$, then f^{*N} contradicts the assumption (*). Otherwise, if we take $f^- = f^{*(N-1)}$ then we have $f *_c f^- = f^- *_c f = f^{*N} = \pi_1$ for all $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$. \square

Proposition 47. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies (*), then \mathbb{A} is not a Taylor algebra and \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial partial semilattice operations.*

Proof. That \mathbb{A} is not Taylor follows from the fact that every binary minimal clone which is also Taylor has a term f such that $f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)$, by Theorem 2.

Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial partial semilattice operation s , then by the Proposition 46 there is a term $s^- \in \text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ such that

$$s^-(s(x, y), s(y, x)) \approx x.$$

Replacing y with $s(x, y)$ in the identity above, we see that

$$x \approx s^-(s(x, s(x, y)), s(s(x, y), x)) \approx s^-(s(x, y), s(x, y)) \approx s(x, y),$$

contradicting the assumption that s is nontrivial. \square

Proposition 48. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies (*), $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ is not a projection algebra, and $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ satisfy $f^{\mathbb{B}} = g^{\mathbb{B}}$, then $f(x, y) \approx g(x, y)$.*

Proof. We have

$$f^-(g(x, y), g(y, x)) = x$$

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{B}$, so by Proposition 6 this absorption identity also holds in \mathbb{A} . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &\approx f(f^-(g(x, y), g(y, x)), f^-(g(y, x), g(x, y))) \\ &\approx g(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proposition 49. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies $(*)$ and $t \in \text{Clo}_3(\mathbb{A})$, $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ satisfy*

$$t(x, y, z) = f(x, y)$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal, then $t(x, y, z) \approx f(x, y)$.

Proof. Note that the assumption of clone-minimality implies that \mathbb{A} has no ternary semiprojections. We can then apply Proposition 17 to conclude that the identities

$$f^-(t(x, y, z), f(y, x)) \approx x$$

and

$$f^-(f(y, x), t(x, y, z)) \approx y$$

must hold, since otherwise the terms on the left hand sides would be semiprojections. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} t(x, y, z) &\approx f(f^-(t(x, y, z), f(y, x)), f^-(f(y, x), t(x, y, z))) \\ &\approx f(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 4. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies $(*)$ and there are nontrivial terms $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying*

$$f(x, g(y, x)) \approx f(x, y),$$

then \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid for some prime p .

Proof. By Theorem 14 and Proposition 47, we have

$$f(x, g(x, y)) \approx x,$$

so

$$f(x, g(y, z)) = f(x, y)$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal. Thus, by Proposition 49 we have

$$f(x, g(y, z)) \approx f(x, y).$$

By iteratively applying the above identity we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, g(g(\cdots g(y, z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1}), z_n)) &\approx f(x, g(\cdots g(y, z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1})) \\ &\dots \\ &\approx f(x, g(y, z_1)) \\ &\approx f(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

for any sequence z_1, \dots, z_n . Since g is nontrivial and \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal, for any $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$, so

$$h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}) \implies f(x, h(y, z)) \approx f(x, y). \quad (8)$$

Then for any $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we also have

$$f(x, h^-(y, z)) \approx f(x, y)$$

by (8) since $h^- \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, so

$$\begin{aligned} f(h(x, y), x) &\approx f(h(x, y), (h^- *_c h)(x, y)) \\ &\approx f\left(h(x, y), h^-(h(x, y), h(y, x))\right) \\ &\approx f(h(x, y), h(x, y)) \\ &\approx h(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

and in particular we have

$$f(f(x, y), z) = f(f(x, z), y)$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal. Since $f^- \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, we have

$$f(z, f^-(y, x)) \approx f(z, y)$$

by (8), and plugging in $z = f^-(x, y)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(f^-(x, y), y) &\approx f(f^-(x, y), f^-(y, x)) \\ &\approx (f *_c f^-)(x, y) \\ &\approx x. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbb{A} is finite, for any $y \in \mathbb{A}$ the unary polynomials $x \mapsto f(x, y)$ and $x \mapsto f^-(x, y)$ must therefore be inverse to each other, so we also have

$$f^-(f(x, y), y) \approx x.$$

Then the equation $f(f(x, y), z) = f(f(x, z), y)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} f^-(f^-(f(f(x, y), z), y), z) &= f^-(f^-(f(f(x, z), y), y), z) \\ &= f^-(f(x, z), z) \\ &= x \end{aligned}$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal. Since \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial semiprojections, the equation above holds identically by Proposition 17. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(f(x, y), z) &\approx f(f^-(f(f(x, y), z), y), y) \\ &\approx f(f(f^-(f^-(f(f(x, y), z), y), z), z), y) \\ &\approx f(f(x, z), y). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the identity

$$f(f(x, y), z) \approx f(f(x, z), y). \tag{9}$$

Now define a sequence of functions f_n by $f_0 = \pi_1$, $f_1 = f$, and

$$f_{n+1}(x, y) = f(f_n(x, y), y),$$

so that $f_n = f^{*1^n}$. In fact, we also have $f_n = f^{*c^n}$, since $f_n \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ implies

$$f(f_n(x, y), y) \approx f(f_n(x, y), f_n(y, x))$$

by (8).

We claim that every $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ can be written as f_n for some n . We prove this by induction on the construction of t as a term in $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$. For the inductive step, there are two cases: either $t(x, y) \approx f(f_i(x, y), f_j(x, y))$ for some i, j , or $t(x, y) \approx f(f_i(x, y), f_j(y, x))$ for some i, j . In the first case, we can apply (8) and (9) to see

$$\begin{aligned} f(f_i(x, y), f_j(x, y)) &\approx f(f_i(x, y), x) \\ &\approx f(f(f_{i-1}(x, y), x), y) \\ &\approx f_2(f(f_{i-2}(x, y), x), y) \\ &\dots \\ &\approx f_i(f(x, x), y) \\ &\approx f_i(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

In the second case, we can apply (8) to see

$$f(f_i(x, y), f_j(y, x)) \approx f(f_i(x, y), y) \approx f_{i+1}(x, y).$$

Letting $p = |\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})|$, we see that $f^- \approx f_{p-1}$ and $f_p(x, y) \approx x$, so together with (8) and (9) we see that (A, f) is a p -cyclic groupoid.

To finish the proof, we just need to check that p is prime. If d is a nontrivial divisor of p then the p -cyclic groupoid identities for f imply that f_d is nontrivial and (A, f_d) forms a (p/d) -cyclic groupoid - but in this case, $f \notin \text{Clo}(f_d)$, contradicting the assumption that \mathbb{A} is a minimal clone. \square

Lemma 5. *If \mathbb{A} satisfies $(*)$ and doesn't have any nontrivial term $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ which satisfies the identity*

$$f(f(x, y), y) \approx f(x, y),$$

then \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid.

Proof. We will make use of the composition operator $*_1$, which we defined in equation $(*_1)$ by

$$(f *_1 g)(x, y) = f(g(x, y), y).$$

The assumption implies that $G = (\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}), *_1)$ is a group, by Proposition 7.

Now we define a right action \cdot of G on $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ by

$$(f \cdot g)(x, y) = f(x, g(y, x)).$$

First we verify that this is a right action:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \cdot (g *_1 h))(x, y) &= f(x, (g *_1 h)(y, x)) \\ &= f(x, g(h(y, x), x)) \\ &= (f \cdot g)(x, h(y, x)) \\ &= ((f \cdot g) \cdot h)(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{\pi_1\}$ is an orbit of this action, so every nontrivial orbit has size at most $|G| - 1$. Thus, by the orbit-stabilizer theorem there must be some nontrivial $g \in G$ and $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $f \cdot g = f$, i.e.

$$f(x, g(y, x)) \approx f(x, y).$$

Now we can apply Lemma 4 to finish the argument. \square

Lemma 6. *There is no \mathbb{A} which satisfies $(*)$ and has a nontrivial term $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ which satisfies the identity*

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

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that such \mathbb{A} and f existed. Note that such an \mathbb{A} can't be a p -cyclic groupoid, by the explicit description of the free p -cyclic groupoid on two generators.

Define a term $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ by

$$t(x, y) = f(x, f(y, x)).$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} t(x, f(y, x)) &\approx f(x, f(f(y, x), x)) \\ &\approx f(x, f(y, x)) \\ &\approx t(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

so by Lemma 4 t must be trivial since \mathbb{A} is not a p -cyclic groupoid. Thus we have

$$f(x, f(y, x)) \approx x,$$

so we have

$$f(f(x, z), f(y, z)) = f(x, z)$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal, hence this equality holds identically by Proposition 49.

Also, by Theorem 14 (which applies by Proposition 47) we have

$$f(x, f(x, y)) \approx x,$$

but these identities imply that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &\approx f(f(x, f(x, y)), f(y, f(x, y))) \\ &\approx f(x, f(x, y)) \\ &\approx x, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the assumption that f was nontrivial. \square

Proof of Theorem 15. Suppose that $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a binary minimal clone which is not a rectangular band and which has no nontrivial $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ which satisfies the identity $f(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y)$, that is, suppose that \mathbb{A} satisfies (*). By Lemma 6, there is also no nontrivial $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying $f(f(x, y), y) \approx f(x, y)$. Then by Lemma 5 \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid for some prime p . \square

Corollary 12. *If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal binary algebra which is not Taylor, not a rectangular band, and has no nontrivial term $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying the identity*

$$g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y),$$

then \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid.

Proof. As in Lemma 5, the assumption implies that $G = (\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}), *_1)$ is a group.

We will show that the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ has a large automorphism group: for any $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, the fact that f has an inverse in G implies that x is in the subalgebra generated by $f(x, y)$ and y , so

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)}\{f(x, y), y\} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y).$$

Thus the homomorphism $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ which sends x to $f(x, y)$ and y to y is surjective, so it must be an automorphism (by the finiteness of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$). Symmetrically, the homomorphism which sends x to x and y to $f(y, x)$ is also an automorphism.

We claim that for any $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ the homomorphism sending (x, y) to $(f(x, y), g(y, x))$ is an automorphism. For this, note that since x and $g(y, x)$ generate $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ we have

$$f(x, y) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)}\{x, g(y, x)\}.$$

Thus there is a binary term h such that

$$f(x, y) \approx h(x, g(y, x)),$$

and any such h must be in $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ if $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$. Composing the automorphism α which sends x to $h(x, y)$ and y to y with the automorphism β which sends x to x and y to $g(y, x)$, we find

$$\beta(\alpha(x)) \approx \beta(h(x, y)) \approx h(\beta(x), \beta(y)) \approx h(x, g(y, x)) \approx f(x, y)$$

and

$$\beta(\alpha(y)) \approx \beta(y) \approx g(y, x),$$

so $\beta \circ \alpha$ sends (x, y) to $(f(x, y), g(y, x))$.

In particular, for any $f \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ there is an automorphism $\gamma : \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ such that

$$\gamma(x) = f(x, y), \quad \gamma(y) = f(y, x).$$

Then we see that f cannot satisfy the identity $f(f(x, y), f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y)$ unless f also satisfies the identity

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &\approx f(\gamma^{-1}(f(x, y)), \gamma^{-1}(f(y, x))) \\ &\approx \gamma^{-1}(f(f(x, y), f(y, x))) \\ &\approx \gamma^{-1}(f(x, y)) \\ &\approx x, \end{aligned}$$

in which case f is trivial. Now we can apply Theorem 15 to see that \mathbb{A} is a p -cyclic groupoid. \square

A cute application of what we have proved so far is the following connectivity result about the undirected graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ of two-element subalgebras of \mathbb{A} .

Theorem 16. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is an idempotent minimal clone which is neither an affine algebra over \mathbb{F}_p nor a p -cyclic groupoid, then the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is connected.*

Proof. First suppose that \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial binary term operations. In this case every two-element subset $\{a, b\}$ must be a projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , so $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is a clique. So from here on we assume that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial binary term operation.

Next suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, \cdot)$ is a rectangular band. By Proposition 18 we can write $\mathbb{A} \cong \mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$, where \mathbb{A}_i are projection algebras such that \cdot acts as π_i on \mathbb{A}_i , so graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is what is known as the ‘‘Cartesian product’’ of the cliques $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}_1}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}_2}$. More concretely, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, we see that \cdot acts as second projection on $\{a, a \cdot b\}$ and \cdot acts as first projection on $\{a \cdot b, b\}$, so a and b have distance at most two in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$.

From here on we assume that \mathbb{A} is not a rectangular band. By Theorem 15 and the assumption that \mathbb{A} is not a p -cyclic groupoid, we see that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial term f satisfying the identity

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

Then f acts as first projection on the set $\{f(x, y), f(y, x)\}$. Since f generates $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$, the set $\{f(x, y), f(y, x)\}$ therefore forms a projection subalgebra of the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$.

If \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial partial semilattice operation s , then the set $\{x, s(x, y)\}$ is a two-element semilattice subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ by Proposition 20. Since $f \in \text{Clo}(s)$, we see that in this case $f(x, y)$ is connected by a path in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)}$ (consisting of two-element semilattice subalgebras) to at least one of x, y . Then since $f(x, y)$ is adjacent or equal to $f(y, x)$ we see that x and y must be connected to each other in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)}$. Thus every pair of elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ are connected within the subalgebra $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, b\}$ which they generate.

If \mathbb{A} is Taylor, then we must have $f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)$, since otherwise f acts as first projection on some two-element set $\{f(a, b), f(b, a)\}$. In fact, by Theorem 2 and the assumption that \mathbb{A} is not affine, in this case \mathbb{A} is a spiral. Then by the definition of a spiral (Definition 4), there is some two element semilattice in $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$, so by Lemma 1 we see that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial partial semilattice term s , so $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is connected by the previous paragraph.

Now suppose that \mathbb{A} has no nontrivial partial semilattice operations, and is not Taylor. By Corollary 12, \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying

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

Define a term $u \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ by

$$u(x, y) = g(g(x, y), x).$$

Then u is a nontrivial term (by Theorem 14 and the fact that g is nontrivial) which satisfies the identity

$$u(u(x, y), x) \approx u(x, y)$$

by Proposition 22. By Theorem 14 we have

$$u(x, u(x, y)) \approx x,$$

so $\{x, u(x, y)\}$ is a two-element projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$. Since $f \in \text{Clo}(u)$, we can finish the proof with the same argument we used in the partial semilattice case. \square

Theorem 17. *Suppose \mathbb{A} has no ternary semiprojections and has a nontrivial idempotent term f which satisfies the identities*

$$f(x, f(x, y)) \approx f(x, f(y, x)) \approx x. \quad (10)$$

Then f satisfies the identity

$$f(f(x, y), f(z, x)) \approx f(x, y),$$

that is, the reduct (\mathbb{A}, f) is a meld.

Proof. The identities (10) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} f(f(x, y), y) &\approx f(f(x, y), f(y, f(x, y))) \\ &\approx f(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(f(x, y), x) &\approx f(f(x, y), f(x, f(x, y))) \\ &\approx f(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$f(f(y, x), z) = f(y, x)$$

whenever z is equal to one of x or y , so by (10) we have

$$f(x, f(f(y, x), z)) = x \quad (11)$$

whenever two of x, y, z are equal. Since \mathbb{A} has no ternary semiprojections, (11) must hold identically by Proposition 17. By Proposition 25, the identity (11) implies that f is a meld. \square

Proposition 50. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a minimal clone and some nontrivial $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ is a meld, then so is \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. By Proposition 6, this follows from Proposition 25, which shows that the variety of melds can be defined by absorption identities. \square

Lemma 7. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a binary minimal clone, not a rectangular band, such that there are nontrivial terms $f, g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying the identity*

$$f(x, g(y, x)) \approx x, \quad (12)$$

then \mathbb{A} is a meld.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that \mathbb{A} is not a meld. By Proposition 14, there is some nontrivial subquotient $\mathbb{B} \in \text{HS}(\mathbb{A})$ such that every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} is a projection algebra. Note that f, g act as first projection on every projection algebra in $\text{Var}(\mathbb{A})$ by Corollary 10, and that f, g are nontrivial on \mathbb{B} by Proposition 6. By Proposition 50, if \mathbb{A} is not a meld then \mathbb{B} is not a meld either.

Note that \mathbb{B} can't have any two-element semilattice subalgebra $\{a, b\}$ with absorbing element b , since every nontrivial binary operation must act as the semilattice operation on $\{a, b\}$ if $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a minimal clone, which would imply that

$$a = f(a, g(b, a)) = f(a, b) = b.$$

In particular, \mathbb{B} has no nontrivial partial semilattice terms by Proposition 20. Since $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have $\pi_2 \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, and by Proposition 6 we see that there is no $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ which restricts to π_2 on \mathbb{B} . Thus we can apply Corollary 11 to see that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$.

Next we prove that for any $n \geq 0$ and any z_1, \dots, z_n , we have

$$f(x, g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_n)) \approx x. \quad (13)$$

We prove this by induction on n . It's enough to prove that this absorption identity holds on \mathbb{B} by Proposition 6. Since \mathbb{A} has no semiprojections of arity at least 3, \mathbb{B} also has no semiprojections of arity at least 3 by Proposition 6, so we can apply Proposition 17 to see that we just have to check (13) when at most two distinct values occur among $x, y, z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{B}$. If $x = y$, then (13) follows from the fact that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$. If $z_n = x$, then (13) follows from (12) with y replaced by $g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1})$. If $z_n = y$, then we have

$$g(g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1}), y) = g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1})$$

by the fact that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$, so

$$f(x, g(g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1}), y)) = f(x, g(\cdots g(g(y, x), z_1) \cdots, z_{n-1})) = x$$

by the inductive hypothesis. This completes the proof of (13).

Since g generates $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$, we see that for any $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$, so we can apply (13) to see that

$$h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}) \implies f(x, h(g(y, x), x)) \approx x. \quad (14)$$

Since \mathbb{B} is not a meld, \mathbb{B} must not satisfy the conditions of Theorem 17, so there are $a, b \in \mathbb{B}$ with

$$g(a, g(b, a)) \neq a.$$

Then $\{a, g(b, a)\}$ is not a projection subalgebra of \mathbb{B} by Corollary 10, so a and $g(b, a)$ generate \mathbb{B} . In particular, for any $c \in \mathbb{B}$ there is some $h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that either $h(a, g(b, a)) = c$ or $h(g(b, a), a) = c$. By (14) and the fact that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$, we have

$$f(a, h(g(b, a), a)) = a = f(a, h(a, g(b, a))),$$

so for all $c \in \mathbb{B}$ we have $f(a, c) = a$, that is, $O(a) = \{a\}$. Since $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, we can apply Proposition 10 to see that for all $c \in \mathbb{B}$ we have $g(a, c) = a$, but taking $c = g(b, a)$ contradicts $g(a, g(b, a)) \neq a$. \square

Lemma 8. *If $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a binary minimal clone, not a rectangular band, such that there are $f, g, h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ with f, g nontrivial satisfying the identities*

$$f(h(x, y), g(y, x)) \approx x, \quad (15)$$

$$g(g(x, y), y) \approx g(x, y), \quad (16)$$

then \mathbb{A} is a meld.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that \mathbb{A} is not a meld. By Proposition 14, there is some nontrivial subquotient $\mathbb{B} \in HS(\mathbb{A})$ such that every proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} is a projection algebra. As in the proof of Lemma 7, \mathbb{B} is not a meld by Proposition 50, and f, g are nontrivial on \mathbb{B} by Proposition 6 and act as first projection on any proper subalgebra or quotient of \mathbb{B} by Corollary 10.

To see that \mathbb{B} has no nontrivial partial semilattice term operations, suppose for a contradiction that $\{a, b\}$ was a two-element semilattice subalgebra of \mathbb{B} with absorbing element b , and note that in this case f, g would need to act as the semilattice operation on $\{a, b\}$, so

$$a = f(h(a, b), g(b, a)) = f(h(a, b), b) \in f(\{a, b\}, b) = \{b\},$$

which is impossible. Since $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ we have $\pi_2 \notin \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$, and by Proposition 6 we see that there is no $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ which restricts to π_2 on \mathbb{B} . Thus we can apply Corollary 11 to see that $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(f)$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$. In particular, the identity

$$g(g(x, y), x) \approx g(x, y)$$

holds on \mathbb{B} , and together with (16) we see that

$$z_1, \dots, z_n \in \{x, y\} \implies g(\dots g(g(x, y), z_1) \dots, z_n) \approx g(x, y) \quad (17)$$

holds on \mathbb{B} .

Now we will show that

$$f(h(x, y), g(\dots g(g(y, x), z_1) \dots, z_n)) \approx x. \quad (18)$$

Since this is an absorption identity, we only need to check (18) on \mathbb{B} by Proposition 6, and since \mathbb{B} has no nontrivial semiprojections of arity at least 3 we only need to check (18) when at most two distinct values occur among $x, y, z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{B}$. If $x = y$, then (18) follows from Theorem 14. If $x \neq y$, then we must have $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \{x, y\}$, so we can apply (17) and (15) to see that

$$f(h(x, y), g(\dots g(g(g(y, x), z_1), z_2) \dots, z_n)) \approx f(h(x, y), g(y, x)) \approx x$$

on \mathbb{B} . This completes the proof of (18).

Since g generates $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$, we can apply Proposition 10 to see that (18) implies

$$f(h(x, y), O(g(y, x))) = \{x\} \quad (19)$$

in the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$. Additionally, since $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ maps to a projection subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$, we have

$$f(h(x, y), O(x)) = \{h(x, y)\} \quad (20)$$

in the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{B})}(x, y)$.

Since \mathbb{B} is not a meld, \mathbb{B} must not satisfy the conditions of Theorem 17, so there are $a, b \in \mathbb{B}$ with

$$g(a, g(b, a)) \neq a.$$

Since g acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra of \mathbb{B} , we see that a and $g(b, a)$ generate \mathbb{B} , so

$$\mathbb{B} = O(a) \cup O(g(b, a)).$$

Then by (19) and (20) we see that for all $c \in \mathbb{B}$ we have

$$f(h(a, b), c) = \begin{cases} h(a, b) & c \in O(a), \\ a & c \in O(g(b, a)). \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

If $h(a, b) = a$ then as in Lemma 7 we have $O(a) = \{a\}$, so by Proposition 10 we have $a \neq g(a, g(b, a)) \in O(a) = \{a\}$, which is a contradiction.

Otherwise, if $h(a, b) \neq a$, then (21) implies that $O(a)$ and $O(g(b, a))$ must be disjoint, so \mathbb{B} has a congruence \sim with congruence classes $O(a)$ and $O(g(b, a))$ such that \mathbb{B}/\sim is a two element projection algebra. From $g(b, a) \in O(b)$, we see that $b \sim g(b, a)$, so we have

$$c \sim b \implies f(h(a, b), c) = a \neq h(a, b),$$

which implies

$$c \sim b \implies \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{B}}\{h(a, b), c\} = \mathbb{B} \quad (22)$$

since f acts as first projection on every proper subalgebra of \mathbb{B} .

By (16) and the assumption that g is nontrivial we see that \mathbb{A} can't be a p -cyclic groupoid, so by Theorem 15 \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial term t satisfying

$$t(t(x, y), t(y, x)) \approx t(x, y). \quad (23)$$

From $h \in \text{Clo}(t)$ and $h(a, b) \neq a, b$, we see that there are $u, v \in \mathbb{B} \setminus \{h(a, b)\}$ with $t(u, v) = h(a, b)$. Since each \sim -class of \mathbb{B} is a projection subalgebra, we have $u \not\sim v$, so since t acts as some projection on \mathbb{B}/\sim and $t(u, v) = h(a, b) \sim a$, we must have

$$t(v, u) \sim b.$$

But then we have

$$\mathbb{B} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{B}}\{h(a, b), t(v, u)\} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{B}}\{t(u, v), t(v, u)\} = \{t(u, v), t(v, u)\} \neq \mathbb{B},$$

where the first equation follows from $t(v, u) \sim b$ and (22), and the last equation follows from the fact that $\{t(u, v), t(v, u)\}$ is closed under t by (23). This contradiction completes the proof. \square

Theorem 18. *If \mathbb{A} is a binary clone-minimal algebra which is not Taylor, has no partial semilattice operations, is not a rectangular band or a p -cyclic groupoid, and is not a meld, then \mathbb{A} is term-equivalent to a dispersive algebra.*

Proof. Since \mathbb{A} is not Taylor, $\text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ contains some nontrivial operation f . First we will show that any $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfies (D2), that is, that

$$f(x, f(\cdots f(f(x, y_1), y_2) \cdots, y_n)) \approx x.$$

Since \mathbb{A} has no semiprojections of arity at least 3, we can apply Proposition 17 to see that it's enough to check (D2) when at most two distinct values occur among x, y_1, \dots, y_n . Supposing that $x, y_1, \dots, y_n \in \{x, y\}$ and setting $g(x, y) = f(\cdots f(f(x, y_1), y_2) \cdots, y_n)$, we can apply Theorem 14 (since \mathbb{A} is not a rectangular band and has no partial semilattice operation) to see that

$$f(x, f(\cdots f(f(x, y_1), y_2) \cdots, y_n)) \approx f(x, g(x, y)) \approx x,$$

which completes the proof of (D2) for f . Pick any nontrivial $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ and assume without loss of generality that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$.

Next we show that the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ over \mathbb{A} has a surjective homomorphism to the four-element free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ from Definition 5. Since f satisfies (D2), we can apply Proposition 32 to see that we just need to check three properties of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$:

- (a) we need to check that the right orbits $O(x)$ and $O(y)$ are disjoint in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$,
- (b) we need to check that for any $h(x, y) \in O(x)$ and $g(y, x) \in O(y)$ we have $f(x, g(y, x)) \neq x$ and $f(y, h(x, y)) \neq y$, and
- (c) we need to check that there is no directed edge from $O(x) \setminus \{x\}$ to x or from $O(y) \setminus \{y\}$ to y in the directed graph associated to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$.

Property (a) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ has a surjective homomorphism to a projection algebra on which f acts as first projection, by the assumption $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$. Since \mathbb{A} is neither a rectangular band nor a meld, Lemma 7 implies property (b). All that remains is to verify property (c), which states that for any nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ and for any (possibly trivial) $u \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ we have

$$f(g(x, y), u(x, y)) \not\approx x. \quad (24)$$

By Theorem 14, the non-identity (24) holds if $u(x, y) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$, so we just need to verify it when $u(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$.

Now we handle the case $u = \pi_2$ in (24). Suppose for a contradiction that there is a (possibly trivial) $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that

$$f(g(x, y), y) \approx x. \quad (25)$$

Since \mathbb{A} is not Taylor, not a rectangular band, and not a p -cyclic groupoid, we can apply Corollary 12 to see that \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial term $t \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying

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

Substituting $t(y, x)$ for y in (25), we have

$$f(g(x, t(y, x)), t(y, x)) \approx x,$$

and taking $h(x, y) = g(x, t(y, x))$ we see that this contradicts Lemma 8 since \mathbb{A} is not a rectangular band or a meld.

To finish verifying (24), we just need to handle the case where $u(y, x) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ is nontrivial. So suppose for the sake of contradiction that there are nontrivial $g, h \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that

$$f(h(x, y), g(y, x)) \approx x. \quad (26)$$

Define $g_n(x, y)$ inductively by $g_0 = \pi_1, g_1 = g$, and

$$g_{n+1}(x, y) = g(g_n(x, y), y),$$

that is, $g_n = g^{*1n}$. Then for any $n \geq 1$ we can substitute $g_{n-1}(y, x)$ for y in (26) to get

$$f(h(x, g_{n-1}(y, x)), g_n(y, x)) \approx x. \quad (27)$$

By Corollary 1, there is some $N > 0$ such that g_N satisfies the identity

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

If g_N is nontrivial, then plugging $n = N$ into (27) gives us a contradiction with Lemma 8 since \mathbb{A} is not a rectangular band or a meld. Thus g_N is trivial, and since $g_N \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ and \mathbb{A} is not a rectangular band, Corollary 10 shows that we must have $g_N = \pi_1$. Then plugging $n = N$ into (27) gives us the identity

$$f(h(x, g_{N-1}(y, x)), y) \approx x,$$

that is,

$$f(g'(x, y), y) \approx x,$$

where $g'(x, y) = h(x, g_{N-1}(y, x)) \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$. But this is just another form of (25), which we have already checked leads to a contradiction.

Having verified properties (a), (b), (c), we can apply Proposition 32 to see that there is a surjective homomorphism from $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. To finish the proof, let $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ be any pair such that $\{a, b\}$ is not a two element subalgebra of \mathbb{A} . Since \mathbb{A} is clone-minimal, for any binary term g of \mathbb{A} such that $g(a, b) = a$ and $g(b, a) = b$, we have $g(x, y) \approx x$ (otherwise g would generate a strictly smaller clone). By Proposition 34, the existence of a surjective homomorphism $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ implies that the identity $g(x, y) \approx x$ must follow from (D2). Since the identity $g(x, y) \approx x$ follows from (D2) for any binary term g such that $g(a, b) = a$ and $g(b, a) = b$, we can apply Proposition 34 again to see that there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y). \quad \square$$

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. By Theorem 18, every binary clone-minimal $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ which is not Taylor is term equivalent to either a rectangular band, a p -cyclic groupoid, a partial semilattice, a meld, or a dispersive algebra. By swapping the variables of f if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$. By the explicit descriptions of the free rectangular band, p -cyclic groupoid, or meld on two generators, we see that in each of these three cases $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$ is not just term equivalent to, but instead is actually equal to, one of a rectangular band, p -cyclic groupoid, or meld.

In the dispersive case, there is some nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ which is dispersive. Swapping the variables of f if necessary, we have $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$ since $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is a minimal clone. Then by Proposition 35 we see that f is dispersive as well. Thus \mathbb{A} is not just term-equivalent to a dispersive algebra, but is in fact dispersive itself.

That each of these five cases defines a nice property is verified in Theorem 4 for rectangular bands, Theorem 6 for p -cyclic groupoids, Theorem 7 for algebras with a partial semilattice operation, Theorem 9 for melds, and Theorem 12 for dispersive algebras. \square

5 Acknowledgments

The author worked on this problem due to the encouragement of Dmitriy Zhuk. Thanks are also due to the anonymous reviewer who suffered through a poorly written first draft of this paper and provided many suggestions to improve the exposition. This material is based upon work supported by the NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship under Grant No. (DMS-1705177).

References

- [1] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms, and the constraint satisfaction problem. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 8(1):1:07, 27, 2012.
- [2] Zarathustra Brady. Examples, counterexamples, and structure in bounded width algebras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05901*, 2019.
- [3] Andrei A. Bulatov. Graphs of finite algebras, edges, and connectivity. *CoRR*, abs/1601.07403, 2016.
- [4] Andrei A Bulatov. Local structure of idempotent algebras I. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09599*, 2020.
- [5] Andrei A. Bulatov and Peter G. Jeavons. Algebraic structures in combinatorial problems. Technical Report MATH-AL-4-2001, Technische universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany, 2001.
- [6] Béla Csákovány. Minimal clones—a minicourse. *Algebra Universalis*, 54(1):73–89, 2005.
- [7] Ralph Freese and Matthew A Valeriote. On the complexity of some Maltsev conditions. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 19(01):41–77, 2009.
- [8] J. Ježek and R. Quackenbush. Minimal clones of conservative functions. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 5(6):615–630, 1995.
- [9] Keith A. Kearnes. Minimal clones with abelian representations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 61(1-4):59–76, 1995.
- [10] Keith A. Kearnes and Ágnes Szendrei. The classification of commutative minimal clones. *Discuss. Math. Algebra Stochastic Methods*, 19(1):147–178, 1999. Modes, modals, related structures and applications (Warsaw, 1997).
- [11] L. Lévai and P. P. Pálffy. On binary minimal clones. *Acta Cybernet.*, 12(3):279–294, 1996.
- [12] J. Płonka. On groups in which idempotent reducts form a chain. *Colloquium Mathematicae*, 29(1):87–91, 1974.

- [13] J. Płonka. On k -cyclic groupoids. *Math. Japon.*, 30(3):371–382, 1985.
- [14] Robert W. Quackenbush. A survey of minimal clones. *Aequationes Math.*, 50(1-2):3–16, 1995.
- [15] Anna B. Romanowska and Barbara Roszkowska. Representations of n -cyclic groupoids. *Algebra Universalis*, 26:7–15, 1989.
- [16] I. G. Rosenberg. Minimal clones. I. The five types. In *Lectures in universal algebra (Szeged, 1983)*, volume 43 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 405–427. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [17] S. Świerczkowski. Algebras which are independently generated by every n elements. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 49:93–104, 1960.
- [18] Tamás Waldhauser. Minimal clones with weakly abelian representations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 69(3-4):505–521, 2003.
- [19] Tamás Waldhauser. *Minimal clones*. PhD thesis, szte, 2007.
- [20] Tamás Waldhauser. Minimal clones with few majority operations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 73(3-4):471–486, 2007.
- [21] Dmitriy Zhuk. Strong subalgebras and the constraint satisfaction problem. *J. Multiple Valued Log. Soft Comput.*, 36(4-5):455–504, 2021.

A Partial semilattices with few strongly connected components

In this appendix we continue the analysis of the labeled digraphs attached to clone-minimal partial semilattices that we began in Proposition 24.

Proposition 51. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice, and that \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b . If the directed graph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ of two-element semilattice subalgebras of \mathbb{A} has just two strongly connected components, one containing a and the other containing b , then we must have $A = \{a, b\}$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} is a counterexample of minimal cardinality. Let U, V be the strongly connected components of \mathbb{A} containing a, b , respectively, so that the underlying set of \mathbb{A} is $U \sqcup V$. Since at least one of U, V is a maximal strongly connected component of \mathbb{A} , we may assume without loss of generality that V is a maximal strongly connected component of \mathbb{A} . As in Proposition 24, we consider the algebra

$$\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

If V is not contained in a linked component of \mathbb{S} , then if we let θ be the linking congruence of \mathbb{S} (considered as a congruence on \mathbb{A}), we find that $|V/\theta| > 1$. In this case we find that \mathbb{A}/θ is generated by the two elements a/θ and b/θ , has at most two strongly connected components (each of which contains either a/θ or b/θ), and at least one of those strongly connected components has at least two elements, which either contradicts Proposition 24 or contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} is a minimal counterexample if θ is nontrivial. Thus we may assume that either the linking congruence θ of \mathbb{S} is trivial, or that V is contained in a linked component of \mathbb{S} .

If θ is trivial, then \mathbb{S} is the graph of an isomorphism. Thus (a, b) is contained in a maximal strongly connected component of \mathbb{S} , contradicting the last sentence of Proposition 21.

If V is contained in a linked component of \mathbb{S} , then we have two cases: either U and V are both maximal strongly connected components of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$, or $U \preceq V$, i.e. there is some semilattice subalgebra from U to V . In the first case, by Theorem 8 we have $U \times V \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, so once again (a, b) is contained in a maximal strongly

connected component of \mathbb{S} and we have a contradiction to Proposition 21. In the second case, we have $b \in O(a)$, so there is some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(s)$ with

$$g(a, b) = b$$

by Proposition 10. Then we have

$$g\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \begin{bmatrix} b \\ O(b) \end{bmatrix} \cap \mathbb{S},$$

so $(V \times V) \cap \mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset$. Applying Theorem 8 we see that $V \times V \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, so $(b, b) \in \mathbb{S}$, which implies $a \rightarrow b$ by Proposition 21. \square

Corollary 13. *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice, and if \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b with $|\mathbb{A}| \geq 3$, then at least one of a, b is not contained in a maximal strongly connected component of the digraph of semilattice subalgebras of \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that a and b are both contained in maximal strongly connected components, that is, that $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are strongly connected. Since $\mathbb{A} = O(a) \cup O(b)$ by Proposition 11, if $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are both strongly connected then \mathbb{A} has either one or two strongly connected components, each containing a or b . If $O(a) = O(b)$ we get a contradiction to Proposition 24, and if $O(a) \neq O(b)$ then we get a contradiction to Proposition 51. \square

There is still one way for a 2-generated minimal partial semilattice clone to have just two strongly connected components which we have not ruled out: it could plausibly be the case that the generators a, b are both contained in a minimal strongly connected component U , which has a semilattice edge to a maximal strongly connected component V which contains neither a nor b . This possibility is a bit tricky to rule out. We will need a few preliminary results.

Proposition 52. *If $\mathbb{R} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ is subdirect and $\mathbb{A} = (A, s), \mathbb{B} = (B, s)$ are binary algebras, then for any $a \in \mathbb{A}$ the set $O(a) + \mathbb{R}$ is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{B} , that is, if $b \in O(a) + \mathbb{R}$ and $b \rightarrow c$ in $D_{\mathbb{B}}$, then $c \in O(a) + \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(a', b) \in \mathbb{R}$ for some $a' \in O(a)$. If $b \rightarrow c$ is a directed edge of $D_{\mathbb{B}}$, then we must have $c = s(b, d)$ for some $d \in \mathbb{B}$. Since \mathbb{R} is subdirect, there is some $e \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $(e, d) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$s\left(\begin{bmatrix} a' \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} e \\ d \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \begin{bmatrix} O(a) \\ c \end{bmatrix} \cap \mathbb{R},$$

so $c \in O(a) + \mathbb{R}$. \square

Proposition 53. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice. Then the binary term $f = s^{\infty c} \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(s)$ is nontrivial, has $a \preceq f(a, b)$ in $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ for all a, b , and for all a, b either $f(a, b) = f(b, a)$ or the set $\{f(a, b), f(b, a)\}$ forms a 2-element projection subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , with s acting as first projection.*

Proof. That $a \preceq f(a, b)$ follows from Proposition 10. Since f is defined nontrivially from s and s satisfies no nontrivial absorption identities by Corollary 5, f must not be a projection, so we have $s \in \text{Clo}(f)$. Then since f acts as first projection on $\{f(a, b), f(b, a)\}$, s must also act as a projection on $\{f(a, b), f(b, a)\}$, and the partial semilattice identities imply that s can't act as second projection on any two element set. \square

Proposition 54. *If $\mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{A} = (A, s), \mathbb{B} = (B, s)$ are binary algebras, then for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that s acts as first projection on $\{a, b\}$ and $\{b\} + \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{B}$, the set $\{a\} + \mathbb{R}$ is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{B} , that is, if $c \in \{a\} + \mathbb{R}$ and $c \rightarrow d$ in $D_{\mathbb{B}}$, then $d \in \{a\} + \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(a, c) \in \mathbb{R}$. If $c \rightarrow d$ is a directed edge of $D_{\mathbb{B}}$, then we must have $d = s(c, e)$ for some $e \in \mathbb{B}$. Since $\{b\} + \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{B}$, we have $(b, e) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$s\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ c \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ e \end{bmatrix}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R},$$

so $c \in \{a\} + \mathbb{R}$. \square

Definition 22. We say that a subalgebra $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}$ *absorbs* an element $a \in \mathbb{A}$ with respect to a binary operation f if

$$f(a, \mathbb{B}), f(\mathbb{B}, a) \subseteq \mathbb{B}.$$

Proposition 55. *If $\mathbb{B} \leq \mathbb{A}$ absorbs $a \in \mathbb{A}$ with respect to a binary idempotent operation f , then for every nontrivial $g \in \text{Clo}_2(f)$, \mathbb{B} absorbs a with respect to g as well.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on the construction of g as a term built out of f . Write $g(x, y) = f(u(x, y), v(x, y))$. If both u and v are trivial, then they must be different projections, since otherwise g is trivial (by idempotence), and so g is $f(x, y)$ or $f(y, x)$. Otherwise, if say u is nontrivial, then by the inductive hypothesis applied to u we have

$$g(a, \mathbb{B}) \subseteq f(u(a, \mathbb{B}), v(a, \mathbb{B})) \subseteq f(\mathbb{B}, \{a\} \cup \mathbb{B}) \subseteq \mathbb{B}$$

since \mathbb{B} is closed under f and absorbs a with respect to f . □

Proposition 56. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice which is generated by two elements a, b . If there is some proper subalgebra $\mathbb{B} < \mathbb{A}$ which absorbs a and b with respect to s such that*

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\} \cap \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{B} \\ \mathbb{B} \end{bmatrix} \neq \emptyset,$$

then $\mathbb{A} = \{a, b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ and \mathbb{A} has a two-element semilattice as a quotient.

Proof. Let $t \in \text{Clo}_2(s)$ be a term such that

$$t \left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right) \in \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{B} \\ \mathbb{B} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since \mathbb{B} is a proper subalgebra of \mathbb{A} it can't contain both a and b , so t must be nontrivial. In particular, by Proposition 55 we see that \mathbb{B} absorbs a and b with respect to t . Since $\{a\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ and $\{b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ are closed under t and since $t(a, b), t(b, a) \in \mathbb{B}$, we see that $\{a, b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ is closed under t . Since t is nontrivial, we have $s \in \text{Clo}(t)$, so in fact we have $\mathbb{A} = \{a, b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$.

If $a \notin \mathbb{B}$, then the equivalence relation θ on \mathbb{A} with equivalence classes $\{a\}$ and $\{b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ is a congruence of t such that $(A, t)/\theta$ is a two-element semilattice with absorbing element $\{b\} \cup \mathbb{B}$, and since $s \in \text{Clo}_2(t)$ is nontrivial the same is true for s . If $b \notin \mathbb{B}$ then we instead use the equivalence relation with classes $\{a\} \cup \mathbb{B}$ and $\{b\}$. □

Definition 23. If $\mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{S} \leq \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{C}$, then we define their *relational composition* $\mathbb{R} \circ \mathbb{S} \leq \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\mathbb{R} \circ \mathbb{S} = \{(a, c) \mid \exists b \in \mathbb{B} \text{ s.t. } (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \wedge (b, c) \in \mathbb{S}\}.$$

If $\mathbb{R} \leq \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$, then we write $\mathbb{R}^{\circ k}$ as shorthand for $\mathbb{R} \circ \dots \circ \mathbb{R}$, with k copies of \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 57. *If $\mathbb{S} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$ is subdirect, symmetric, and linked, and if \mathbb{A} is finite, then there is some $n \geq 1$ such that $\mathbb{S}^{\circ n} = \mathbb{A}^2$. Additionally, for any such n we have $\mathbb{S}^{\circ m} = \mathbb{A}^2$ for every $m \geq n$ as well.*

Proof. Since \mathbb{S} is symmetric, $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 2}$ is the set of pairs (a, b) such that there is some $c \in \mathbb{A}$ with $(a, c) \in \mathbb{S}$ and $(b, c) \in \mathbb{S}$. As a consequence, the linking congruence of \mathbb{S} , considered as a congruence θ on \mathbb{A} , is given by

$$\theta = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k},$$

where we interpret $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 0}$ as the diagonal $\{(a, a) \mid a \in \mathbb{A}\}$. Since \mathbb{S} is subdirect, for every $a \in \mathbb{A}$ there is some $b \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $(a, b), (b, a) \in \mathbb{S}$, so the diagonal $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 0}$ is contained in $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 2}$, so for all k we have

$$\mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k} = \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k} \circ \mathbb{S}^{\circ 0} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k} \circ \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2} = \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2(k+1)}.$$

Since \mathbb{A}^2 is finite, there is some k such that $\theta = \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k}$. Since $\theta = \mathbb{A}^2$ by the assumption that \mathbb{S} is linked, we see that $\mathbb{A}^2 = \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k}$.

For the last statement, suppose that $\mathbb{S}^{\circ n} = \mathbb{A}^2$ for some n . Then since \mathbb{S} is subdirect, we have

$$\mathbb{S}^{\circ(n+1)} \supseteq \mathbb{A}^2 \circ \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{A}^2. \quad \square$$

Theorem 19. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice, and that \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b . Then it is not possible for a and b to be in the same strongly connected component of the digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ of semilattice subalgebras of \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{A} is a counterexample with $|\mathbb{A}|$ minimal. If \mathbb{A} has a nontrivial quotient \mathbb{A}/θ , then $a/\theta, b/\theta$ are in the same strongly connected component of \mathbb{A}/θ and generate \mathbb{A}/θ , so \mathbb{A}/θ is a smaller counterexample, contradicting the choice of \mathbb{A} . Thus we may assume that \mathbb{A} is simple.

Define $\mathbb{S} \leq_{sd} \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$ by

$$\mathbb{S} = \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{A}^2$ - otherwise, we have $(b, b) \in \mathbb{S}$, so $a \rightarrow b$ by Proposition 21, which implies $\mathbb{A} = \{a, b\}$, a contradiction.

First we show that \mathbb{S} is linked. Suppose for a contradiction that \mathbb{S} is not linked. Then since \mathbb{A} is simple, the linking congruence of \mathbb{S} on \mathbb{A} must be the trivial congruence, so \mathbb{S} is the graph of an isomorphism. In this case, we find that (a, b) and (b, a) are in the same strongly connected component of \mathbb{S} (since \mathbb{S} is isomorphic to \mathbb{A}), contradicting the last sentence of Proposition 21.

By Proposition 57, there is some $k \geq 1$ such that $\mathbb{S}^{\circ k} \neq \mathbb{A}^2$ and $\mathbb{S}^{\circ(k+1)} = \mathbb{A}^2$. Since $2k \geq k+1$, we then have $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k} = \mathbb{A}^2$ as well, so $(a, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2k}$, which implies that there is some c such that $(a, c), (c, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$. Since $\mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$ is symmetric, we then have

$$a, b \in \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k},$$

so in fact $\{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$. Let \mathbb{C} be the set of all elements c' such that $\{c'\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$ - this is automatically a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} , since

$$\mathbb{C} = (\{a\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}) \cap (\{b\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}).$$

Note that by our choice of k we have $\mathbb{C} \neq \mathbb{A}$. Our goal is to apply Proposition 56 to \mathbb{C} .

First we check that $(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}) \cap \mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset$. If $k = 1$, this follows from

$$\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{A} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{S}.$$

If $k = 2$, then by the choice of k we have $(a, a) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ 3}$, so there are c, d such that $(a, c), (c, d), (d, a) \in \mathbb{S}$, and since $(a, b) \in \mathbb{S}$, we see that

$$a \in \{d\} + \mathbb{S} \subseteq \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2}$$

and

$$b \in \{a\} + \mathbb{S} \subseteq \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2},$$

so $c \in \mathbb{C}$, and similarly $d \in \mathbb{C}$, that is, $(c, d) \in (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}) \cap \mathbb{S}$. If $k \geq 3$, then from $2(k-1) \geq k+1$ we see that $\mathbb{S}^{\circ 2(k-1)} = \mathbb{A}^2$, so $(a, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ 2(k-1)}$, so there is some c such that $(a, c), (c, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ(k-1)}$. For this c , we have

$$a \in \{b\} + \mathbb{S} \subseteq \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$$

and similarly $b \in \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$, so $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Picking any d such that $(c, d) \in \mathbb{S}$, we also have

$$a \in \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ(k-1)} \subseteq \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$$

and similarly $b \in \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$, so we have $(c, d) \in (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}) \cap \mathbb{S}$. Thus we have

$$(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}) \cap \mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset \quad (28)$$

regardless of the value of k .

Next we show that \mathbb{C} is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{A} , i.e. that for any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and any d with $c \rightarrow d$, we have $d \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$, we have

$$s(\mathbb{A}, \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}) = s(\{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}, \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}) \subseteq \{s(c, d)\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k},$$

and similarly

$$s(\{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}, \mathbb{A}) \subseteq \{s(d, c)\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}.$$

Thus the subalgebra $\mathbb{B} = \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$ absorbs every element of \mathbb{A} with respect to s . Since

$$(d, d) \in \mathbb{A}^2 = \mathbb{S}^{\circ(2k+1)},$$

we have $(\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B}) \cap \mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset$. Then if $\mathbb{B} \neq \mathbb{A}$ then we can apply Proposition 56 to see that \mathbb{A} has a quotient which is a two-element semilattice, which is a contradiction to the assumption that \mathbb{A} is simple and that a, b are in the same strongly connected component of \mathbb{A} . Thus we must have $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{A}$, so $d \in \mathbb{C}$. Since this was true for any $c \rightarrow d$ with $c \in \mathbb{C}$, we see that \mathbb{C} is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{A} .

Now let $f = s^{\circ c} \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(s)$ as in Proposition 53. We will show that we have $f(a, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $f(b, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $c \in \mathbb{C}$, and let $f(a, c) = d, f(c, a) = e$. Since \mathbb{C} is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{A} , we have

$$e = f(c, a) \in O(c) \subseteq \mathbb{C},$$

so $\{e\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$. Since s acts as first projection on $\{d, e\}$ by Proposition 53 and since $\{e\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$, we can apply Proposition 54 to see that $\{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$ is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{A} . Since $O(a) = O(b) = \mathbb{A}$ by Proposition 11 and the fact that a, b are in the same strongly connected component of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$, we just need to check that one of a or b is in $\{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$ to confirm that $\{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$. If k is odd, then we have $(a, b) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$, so

$$b = f(b, b) \in f(\{a\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}, \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}) \subseteq \{f(a, c)\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k},$$

and similarly if k is even we have $(a, a) \in \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}$, so

$$a = f(a, a) \in f(\{a\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}, \{c\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}) \subseteq \{f(a, c)\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k}.$$

Either way, we see that $\{d\} + \mathbb{S}^{\circ k} = \mathbb{A}$, so

$$d = f(a, c) \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The argument showing that $f(b, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is the same, but with a, b swapped throughout.

Since we've already verified that \mathbb{C} is a union of right orbits of \mathbb{A} and that $f(a, \mathbb{C}), f(b, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we see that \mathbb{C} absorbs a and b with respect to f . Since f is nontrivial by Proposition 53, we have $s \in \text{Clo}(f)$, so we can apply Proposition 55 to see that \mathbb{C} absorbs a and b with respect to s as well. Then by (28) we can apply Proposition 56 to \mathbb{C} to see that \mathbb{A} has a quotient which is a two-element semilattice, which is a contradiction to the assumption that \mathbb{A} is simple and that a, b are in the same strongly connected component of \mathbb{A} . This contradiction completes the proof. \square

Corollary 14. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A} = (A, s)$ is a clone-minimal partial semilattice, and that \mathbb{A} is generated by two elements a, b . If $|\mathbb{A}| \geq 3$, then the digraph $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ of semilattice subalgebras of \mathbb{A} has at least three strongly connected components.*

B Inert dispersive algebras with small right orbits

In this appendix we will prove Theorem 13. Recall that we say that a dispersive algebra is *inert* if every right orbit forms a projection subalgebra.

Theorem 13. *If \mathbb{A} is a clone-minimal inert dispersive algebra which is generated by two elements a, b , and if $|O(b)| \leq 2$, then we also have $|O(a)| \leq 2$ and \mathbb{A} is isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$.*

Proof. We will prove this by induction on $|\mathbb{A}|$. By Proposition 36, we may choose a nontrivial $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that

$$f(f(x, y), y) \approx f(x, y) \quad (29)$$

and $f(x, y)$ is contained in a maximal strongly connected component of the labeled digraph attached to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$.

Claim 0. In the case where $O(a)$ is strongly connected, we can choose f as above so that we additionally have $f(a, b) = a$.

Proof of claim 0. Assume that $O(a)$ is strongly connected. We will verify this claim by slightly modifying the construction of g_1 from Proposition 13. As in Proposition 13, we start by picking some nontrivial $g_0 \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $g_0(x, y)$ is maximal in the labeled digraph attached to the free algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$. Since $g_0(a, b) \in O(a)$ by Proposition 10 and since $O(a)$ is strongly connected, we have $a \in O(g_0(a, b))$, so there are some $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$a = g_0(\dots g_0(g_0(a, b), c_1) \dots, c_n).$$

Choosing terms $t_i \in \text{Clo}_2(\mathbb{A})$ such that $t_i(b, a) = c_i$, define the term g'_0 by

$$g'_0(x, y) = g_0(\dots g_0(g_0(x, y), t_1(y, x)) \dots, t_n(y, x)).$$

Then we have $g_0(x, y) \preceq g'_0(x, y)$, so $g'_0(x, y)$ is still maximal in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$, and we have

$$g'_0(a, b) = a$$

by construction. Now define $g'_1 = g'^{\infty_1}$ as in Proposition 13, and note that we have $g'_1(a, b) = a$ and $g'_1(g'_1(x, y), y) \approx g'_1(x, y)$. That g'_1 is nontrivial is verified as in Proposition 36, so taking $f = g'_1$ proves Claim 0.

We assume from here on that $\mathbb{A} = (A, f)$, with f is chosen as in claim 0 in the case where $O(a)$ is strongly connected. We now divide into many cases.

Case 1. Suppose that $|O(b)| = 1$, i.e. that $O(b) = \{b\}$. Since $O(a)$ is a projection algebra, the directed edges of $O(a)$ must all be labeled by elements of $O(b) = \{b\}$, and the identity (29) implies that no pair of consecutive edges can both be labeled by b . Therefore there is at most one edge in $D_{\mathbb{A}}$, and if \mathbb{A} is nontrivial we see that $O(a) = \{a, f(a, b)\}$ and that \mathbb{A} is isomorphic to the three-element subalgebra $\{x, xy, yx\}$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$.

Case 2. Suppose that $|O(b)| = 2$, with $O(b) = \{b, d\}$. Then every edge of $D_{\mathbb{A}}$ between elements of $O(a)$ is either labeled with b or d or both, and no pair of consecutive edges can both have the same label. Thus every vertex of $O(a)$ other than a has outdegree at most one, and a can only have outdegree two if $O(a)$ is not strongly connected. In particular, we see that $O(a)$ is strongly connected if and only if it is a directed cycle with edge labels alternating between b and d . After proving that $O(a) \cap O(b) = \emptyset$ below, we will divide into subcases based on whether or not $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are strongly connected.

Claim 1. We have $O(a) \cap O(b) = \emptyset$.

Proof of claim 1. Suppose for contradiction that $O(a) \cap O(b) \neq \emptyset$. We can't have a or b in $O(a) \cap O(b)$, since in that case $\{a, b\}$ would be a two-element projection algebra by the assumption that \mathbb{A} is inert. Then we must have $d \in O(a)$, so since $O(a)$ is a projection subalgebra we see that no edge between elements of $O(a)$ can be labeled with d . In this case we see that $O(a)$ contains at most one edge, necessarily going from a to d and labeled by b .

Similarly, since $|O(a)| = 2$ and no edge of $O(b)$ can be labeled by d , we see that $O(b)$ contains just one edge, necessarily from b to d and labeled by a . This completely describes $\mathbb{A} = (\{a, b, d\}, f)$, and we find that f satisfies the identity

$$f(x, f(y, x)) \approx x,$$

so in fact \mathbb{A} is a three-element meld, contradicting our assumption that \mathbb{A} is dispersive. This contradiction proves Claim 1.

Subcase 2.1. Suppose that $O(a)$ is not a cycle. Then for every $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$, we have $a \notin \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c, d\}$, so by the inductive hypothesis we see that $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\}$ and $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\}$ are isomorphic to subalgebras of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. In particular, if one of $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\}$ or $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\}$ has size 4, then c must have an outgoing edge labeled by both b and d , which contradicts the fact that c must have an incoming edge labeled by either b or d (since $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$).

Claim 2. If $O(a)$ is not a cycle and there is some $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$ such that any edge of $O(b)$ is labeled by c , then c must have no outgoing edges.

Proof of Claim 2. If there is a directed edge from b to d labeled by c , then $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\}$ contains b, c, d and $f(c, b), f(c, d)$, so in order to have $|\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\}| < 4$ we must have $f(c, b) = f(c, d) = c$. A similar argument applies to $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\}$ if there is a directed edge from d to b labeled by c .

Thus at most three edge labels can occur in $O(b)$: there are at most two elements of $O(a)$ with no outgoing edges (one per directed edge leaving a), and together with a itself these are the possible labels of edges of $O(b)$. This information reduces the case where $O(a)$ is not a cycle to just a few subcases. In many of these subcases, $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ will fail to be minimal by the following claim.

Claim 3. If $|O(b)| = 2$ and there is some $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$ such that $(c, b) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$ with $f(c, b) = c$ and $f(b, c) = b$, then we have a contradiction to the assumption that $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is minimal.

Proof of Claim 3. Pick some $g \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ satisfying $g(a, b) = c$ and $g(b, a) = b$. Then $\{a, b, c\}$ is closed under g : $\{b, c\}$ is closed under g since it is closed under f , and $\{a, c\} \subseteq O(a)$ is closed under g since it is a projection subalgebra. Since $g(a, b) \neq a, b$, we see that g is nontrivial, so if $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$ is minimal then $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$ and $\mathbb{A} = \{a, b, c\}$. But then $O(b) = \{b\}$, contradicting our assumption that $|O(b)| = 2$.

Subsubcase 2.1.0. If $|O(a)| = 1$, then by swapping a and b we are in Case 1.

Subsubcase 2.1.1. Suppose there is a directed edge leaving a labeled by both b and d . In this case, we have $O(a) = \{a, c\}$ where $c = f(a, b) = f(a, d)$. If $f(b, c) = b$, then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, f\left(\begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right\},$$

which gives us a contradiction by Claim 3. Thus we must have $f(b, c) = d$, and in this case the identity (29) implies that $f(d, c) = d$ as well. Then if we define the operation

$$g(x, y) = f(x, f(y, x)),$$

we see from $f(O(a), O(b)) = \{c\}$ and $f(O(b), c) = \{d\}$ that

$$g(O(a), O(b)) \subseteq f(O(a), O(b)) \subseteq \{c\}$$

and

$$g(O(b), O(a)) \subseteq f(O(b), f(O(a), O(b))) \subseteq f(O(b), \{c\}) = \{d\},$$

so $(\{a, b, c, d\}, g)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$. Since g is nontrivial, we have $f \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(g)$, so in fact $f = g$.

Subsubcase 2.1.2. Suppose that there is only one directed edge leaving a , labeled only by d , so that $f(a, b) = a$. Let $c = f(a, d)$. Since $\{a, b\}$ is not closed under f , we must have $f(b, a) = d$. If $f(b, c) = d$, then there are no outgoing edges from c by Claim 2, so $|O(a)| = 2$, and since the edge from b to d is labeled by both a and c we can swap a with b and c with d to find ourselves in Subsubcase 2.1.1, which we have already handled.

Thus we may assume that $f(b, c) = b$. Then if we define g by

$$g(x, y) = f(x, f(y, f(x, f(y, x))))),$$

we find that

$$g(a, b) = f(a, f(b, f(a, f(b, a)))) = f(a, f(b, f(a, d))) = f(a, f(b, c)) = f(a, b) = a$$

and

$$g(b, a) = f(b, f(a, f(b, f(a, b)))) = f(b, f(a, f(b, a))) = f(b, f(a, d)) = f(b, c) = b,$$

while $g(x, y) \approx x$ does not follow from (D2) since $x(y(x(yx))) = xy$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, and by Proposition 34 this contradicts the assumption that \mathbb{A} dispersive.

Subsubcase 2.1.3. Suppose that $f(a, b) = c \neq a$ and $f(b, c) = b$. By (29) we have $f(c, b) = c$, so in this case f acts as first projection on $\{b, c\}$. If we had $f(b, a) = b$, then we would have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

which would give us a contradiction by Claim 3. Thus we must have $f(b, a) = d$, and $f(d, a) = d$ by (29).

Set $e = f(a, d)$. Defining $g(x, y) = f(x, f(y, x))$, we have

$$g(b, a) = f(b, f(a, b)) = f(b, c) = b$$

and

$$g(a, b) = f(a, f(b, a)) = f(a, d) = e.$$

Then by Proposition 34 we see that if \mathbb{A} is dispersive then we must have $g(a, b) \neq a$, so $e \neq a$. Additionally, we have

$$g(a, d) = f(a, f(d, a)) = f(a, d) = e,$$

so if e had no outgoing edges then $\{a, b, d, e\}$ would be closed under g , contradicting the minimality of $\text{Clo}(f)$.

Thus by Claim 2 we must have $f(b, e) = b$ and $f(d, e) = d$. Setting $i = f(e, b)$, we have $f(i, b) = i$ by (29) and

$$\begin{bmatrix} i \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(g\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right), g\left(\begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

so if we had $f(b, i) = b$ then we would get a contradiction by Claim 3. Thus we must have $f(b, i) = d$ and $i \neq e$. Now we have

$$\{b, d, e, i\} \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, e\} \subseteq \mathbb{A} \setminus \{a\},$$

so by the inductive hypothesis $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, e\}$ must be isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, which gives us a contradiction since e does not have an outgoing edge with two labels.

Subsubcase 2.1.4. Since we are not in one of the previous subsubcases, we must have $f(a, b) = c \neq a$ and $f(b, c) = d$. By Claim 2, $c = f(a, b)$ must not have any outgoing edges. If $f(a, d) = c$, then we are in Subsubcase 2.1.1.

Suppose now that $f(a, d) = a$, then $O(a) = \{a, c\}$ and $\mathbb{A} = \{a, b, c, d\}$. Then since $f(a, d) = a$ we see that $c \notin \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{a, d\}$ by the assumption that $f(x, y)$ is maximal in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A})}(x, y)$, so we must have $f(d, a) = d$, and d has no outgoing edges. Swapping a with b and c with d , we find ourselves in Subsubcase 2.1.2 or 2.1.3 depending on whether or not $f(b, a) = b$.

Thus we may assume that $e = f(a, d) \notin \{a, c\}$. Regardless of whether we have $f(b, a) = b$ or $f(b, a) = d$, either way we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} = f\left(f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right), f\left(\begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

so

$$\begin{bmatrix} e \\ d \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} d \\ c \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Suppose first that we have $f(b, e) = b$, and let $f(e, b) = i$ (in which case we also have $f(i, b) = i$ by (29)). Then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} i \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} d \\ e \end{bmatrix}\right), f\left(\begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} e \\ d \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

so if $f(b, i) = b$ then we would get a contradiction to Claim 3. Thus we must have $f(b, i) = d$ and $i \neq e$, so we have

$$\{b, d, e, i\} \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, e\} \subseteq \mathbb{A} \setminus \{a\},$$

so by the inductive hypothesis $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, e\}$ must be isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, which gives us a contradiction since e does not have an outgoing edge with two labels.

Thus we must have $f(b, e) = d$ and by Claim 2 we see that e has no outgoing edges. Then we see that \mathbb{A} has a congruence θ with congruence classes $\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c, e\}, \{d\}$, so by the induction hypothesis applied to \mathbb{A}/θ we see that \mathbb{A}/θ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, so $f(b, a) = f(d, a) = d$. Then if we let $g(x, y) = f(x, f(y, x))$, we have

$$g(a, b) = f(a, f(b, a)) = f(a, d) = e$$

and

$$g(a, d) = f(a, f(d, a)) = f(a, d) = e,$$

so $\{a, b, d, e\}$ is closed under the nontrivial operation g , contradicting the minimality of $\text{Clo}(\mathbb{A})$.

Subcase 2.2. Now suppose that $O(a)$ is a cycle and $O(b)$ is not. In this case, for every $c \in O(a) \setminus \{a\}$, we have

$$\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\} \subseteq \mathbb{A} \setminus \{b\},$$

so $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\}$ is isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$ size at most 3 by the inductive hypothesis. From the extra assumption $f(a, b) = a$ in this case, we see there must be some $c \neq a$ such that $f(c, b) = a$. Then we have $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$ and $\{c, d\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathbb{A} since the incoming edge to c must be labeled by d .

Letting $e \in O(a)$ be such that $f(e, d) = c$, from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$ we see that there are some terms $t, u \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $t(c, b) = e$ and $u(b, c) = d$. Writing

$$g(x, y) = f(t(x, y), u(y, x)),$$

we see that $g(x, y) = xy$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$, so by Proposition 34 g must be nontrivial, so $f \in \text{Clo}(g)$. Since we have

$$g(c, b) = c,$$

we see that $\{b, c, d\}$ is closed under g and hence also closed under f , contradicting $f(c, b) = a$.

Subcase 2.3. The only remaining possibility is that $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are both cycles.

Claim 4. If $O(a)$ and $O(b)$ are both cycles, then for any $c \in O(a)$, we can't have both $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$ and $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\} = \mathbb{A}$.

Proof of Claim 4. Note that if $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$, then since $O(a)$ is a cycle, there must be a nontrivial binary term g such that $g(c, b) = c$, and from $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} \neq \{b, c\}$ we must then have $g(b, c) = d$. A similar argument shows that there is a nontrivial binary term h such that $h(c, d) = c$ and $h(d, c) = b$, but then the term $h(g(x, y), g(y, x))$ is also nontrivial and $\{b, c\}$ is closed under it, a contradiction.

The strategy now is to show that for strictly more than half of the elements $c \in O(a)$, we have $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$, and similarly for d , which will give us a contradiction to Claim 4.

Recall that since $O(a)$ is a cycle, we can use Claim 0 to make the further assumption that $f(a, b) = a$. Then we must have $f(b, a) = d$, and then by (29) we also have $f(d, a) = d$. If we label the elements of $O(a)$ in cyclic order as $c_0 = a, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$, then we see that for each i we have an edge from c_i to c_{i+1} in $D_{\mathbb{A}}$, labeled by d if i is even and labeled by b if i is odd. Then we can see that

$$\begin{bmatrix} a \\ d \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right\}.$$

We prove by induction on i that we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ d \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right\}.$$

For even i , we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{i+1} \\ d \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ d \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} d \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\left\{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right\},$$

while for odd i we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{i+1} \\ d \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ d \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Also, since $O(b)$ is strongly connected, there must be some j such that $f(d, c_j) = b$. But then from

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_j \\ d \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

for any odd i we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ d \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} d \\ c_j \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

Suppose for a contradiction that there is any odd k such that $f(b, c_k) = b$. Then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{i+1} \\ b \end{bmatrix} = f\left(\begin{bmatrix} c_i \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ c_k \end{bmatrix}\right) \in \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} b \\ a \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

for every odd i , so in fact we have $O(a) \times O(b) \subseteq \text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}^2}\{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, so there is a nontrivial term g with $g(a, b) = a$ and $g(b, a) = b$, a contradiction.

Thus for every odd i we must have $f(b, c_i) = d$, so $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c_i, b\} = \mathbb{A}$ for every odd i as well as for $i = 0$. This shows that strictly more than half of the elements $c \in O(a)$ have $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{b, c\} = \mathbb{A}$.

To see that a least half of the c s in $O(a)$ satisfy $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c, d\} = \mathbb{A}$, first note that by $f(d, c_j) = b$ we have $\text{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}\{c_j, d\} = \mathbb{A}$. Then we can swap c_j for a and d for b , and apply Claim 0 to find a nontrivial $f' \in \text{Clo}_2^{\pi_1}$ such that $f'(f'(x, y), y) \approx f'(x, y)$ and $f'(c_j, d) = c_j$, and then we use the previous argument to see that more than half of the c s in $O_{f'}(c_j)$ satisfy $\text{Sg}_{(A, f')}\{c, d\} = (A, f')$. Since $\text{Clo}(f) = \text{Clo}(f')$, this completes the proof. \square