

Tractable Set Constraints

Manuel Bodirsky*

École Polytechnique, LIX
(UMR 7161 du CNRS),
91128 Palaiseau, France

Martin Hils

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu
(UMR 7586 du CNRS),
Université Paris Diderot Paris 7, UFR de Mathématiques,
75205 Paris Cedex 13, France

November 16, 2021

Abstract

Many fundamental problems in artificial intelligence, knowledge representation, and verification involve reasoning about sets and relations between sets and can be modeled as *set constraint satisfaction problems (set CSPs)*. Such problems are frequently intractable, but there are several important set CSPs that are known to be polynomial-time tractable. We introduce a large class of set CSPs that can be solved in quadratic time. Our class, which we call \mathcal{EI} , contains all previously known tractable set CSPs, but also some new ones that are of crucial importance for example in description logics. The class of \mathcal{EI} set constraints has an elegant universal-algebraic characterization, which we use to show that every set constraint language that properly contains all \mathcal{EI} set constraints already has a finite sublanguage with an NP-hard constraint satisfaction problem.

An extended abstract of the content of this article appeared in the proceedings of IJCAI'11 [BHK11].

1 Introduction

Constraint satisfaction problems are computational problems where, informally, the input consists of a finite set of variables and a finite set of constraints imposed on those variables; the task is to decide whether there is an assignment of values to the variables such that all the constraints are simultaneously satisfied. *Set constraint satisfaction problems* are special constraint satisfaction problems where the values are sets, and the constraints might, for instance, force that one set y includes another set x , or that one set x is disjoint to another set y . The constraints might also

*Manuel Bodirsky has received funding from the ERC under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013 Grant Agreement no. 257039).

be ternary, such as the constraint that the intersection of two sets x and y is contained in z , in symbols $(x \cap y) \subseteq z$.

To systematically study the computational complexity of constraint satisfaction problems, it has turned out to be a fruitful approach to consider constraint satisfaction problems $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ where the set of allowed constraints is formed from a fixed set Γ of relations $R \subseteq D^k$ over a common domain D . This way of parametrizing the constraint satisfaction problem by a *constraint language* Γ has led to many strong algorithmic results [BD06, IMM⁺10, BK09a, BK07, BK09b], and to many powerful hardness conditions for large classes of constraint satisfaction problems [Sch78, BKJ05, Bul03, Bul06, BK09b].

A *set constraint language* Γ is a set of relations $R \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^k$ where the common domain $D = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is the set of all subsets of the natural numbers; moreover, we require that each relation R can be defined by a Boolean combination of equations over the signature $\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, which are function symbols for intersection, union, complementation, the empty and full set, respectively. Details of the formal definition and many examples of set constraint languages can be found in Section 3. The choice of \mathbb{N} is just for notational convenience; as we will see, we could have selected any infinite set for our purposes. In the following, a *set constraint satisfaction problem (set CSP)* is a problem of the form $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for a set constraint language Γ . It has been shown by Marriott and Odersky [MO96] that all set CSPs are contained in NP; they also showed that the largest set constraint language, which consists of *all* relations that can be defined as described above, has an NP-hard set CSP.

Drakengren and Jonsson [DJ98] initiated the search for set CSPs that can be solved in polynomial time. They showed that $\text{CSP}(\{\subseteq, \parallel, \neq\})$ can be solved in polynomial time, where

- $x \subseteq y$ holds iff x is a subset of or equal to y ;
- $x \parallel y$ holds iff x and y are disjoint sets; and
- $x \neq y$ holds iff x and y are distinct sets.

They also showed that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be solved in polynomial time if all relations in Γ can be defined by formulas of the form

$$x_1 \neq y_1 \vee \cdots \vee x_k \neq y_k \vee x_0 \subseteq y_0$$

or of the form

$$x_1 \neq y_1 \vee \cdots \vee x_k \neq y_k \vee x_0 \parallel y_0$$

where $x_0, \dots, x_k, y_0, \dots, y_k$ are not necessarily distinct variables. We will call the set of all relations that can be defined in this way *Drakengren and Jonsson's set constraint language*. It is easy to see that the algorithm they present runs in time quadratic in the size of the input.

On the other hand, Drakengren and Jonsson [DJ98] show that if Γ contains the relations defined by formulas of the form

$$x_1 \neq y_1 \vee \cdots \vee x_k \neq y_k \vee u_1 \parallel v_1 \vee \cdots \vee u_k \parallel v_k$$

the problem $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is NP-hard.

Contributions and Outline. We present a significant extension of Drakengren and Jonsson's set constraint language (Section 3) whose CSP can still be solved in quadratic time in the input size (Section 6); we call this set constraint language $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}$. Unlike Drakengren and Jonsson's set

constraint language, our language also contains the ternary relation defined by $(x \cap y) \subseteq z$, which is a relation that is of particular interest in description logics – we will discuss this below. Moreover, we show that any further extension of \mathcal{EL} contains a finite sublanguage with an NP-hard set CSP (Section 7), using concepts from model theory and universal algebra. In this sense, we present a *maximal* tractable class of set constraint satisfaction problems.

Our algorithm is based on the concept of *independence* in constraint languages which was discovered several times independently in the 90’s [Kou01, JB98, MO96] – see also [BJR02, CJK00]; however, we apply this concept *twice* in a novel, nested way, which leads to a two level resolution procedure that can be implemented to run in quadratic time. The technique we use to prove the correctness of the algorithm is also an important contribution of our paper, and we believe that a similar approach can be applied in many other contexts; our technique is inspired by the already mentioned connection to universal algebra.

Application Areas and Related Literature

Set Constraints for Programming Languages. Set constraints find applications in program analysis; here, a set constraint is of the form $X \subseteq Y$, where X and Y are set expressions. Examples of set expressions are $\mathbf{0}$ (denoting the empty set), set-valued variables, and union and intersection of sets, but also expressions of the form $f(Z_1, Z_2)$ where f is a function symbol and Z_1, Z_2 are again set expressions. Unfortunately, the worst-case complexity of most of the reasoning tasks considered in this setting is *very* high, often EXPTIME-hard; see [Aik94] for a survey. More recently, it has been shown that the quantifier-free combination of set constraints (without function symbols) and cardinality constraints (quantifier-free Pressburger arithmetic) has a satisfiability problem in NP [KR07]. This logic (called QFBAPA) is interesting for program verification [KNR06].

Tractable Description Logics. Description logics are a family of knowledge representation formalisms that can be used to formalize and reason with concept definitions. The computational complexity of most of the computational tasks that have been studied for the various formalisms is usually quite high. However, in the last years a series of description logics (for example \mathcal{EL} , \mathcal{EL}^{++} , Horn- \mathcal{FL}_0 , and various extensions and fragments [KM02, Baa03, BBL05, KRH06]) has been discovered where crucial tasks such as e.g. entailment, concept satisfiability and knowledge base satisfiability can be decided in polynomial time.

Two of the basic assertions that can be made in \mathcal{EL}^{++} and Horn- \mathcal{FL}_0 are $C_1 \parallel C_2$ (*there is no C_1 that is also C_2*) and $C_1 \cap C_2 \subseteq C_3$ (*every C_1 that is C_2 is also C_3*), for concept names C_1, C_2, C_3 . These are \mathcal{EL} set constraints, and the latter has not been treated in the framework of Drakengren and Jonsson. None of the description logics with a tractable knowledge base satisfiability problem contains all \mathcal{EL} set constraints.

Spatial Reasoning. Several spatial reasoning formalisms (like RCC-5 and RCC-8) are closely related to set constraint satisfaction problems. These formalisms allow to reason about relations between *regions*; in the fundamental formalism RCC-5 (see e.g. [JD97]), one can think of a region as a non-empty set, and possible (binary) relationships are containment, disjointness, equality, overlap, and disjunctive combinations thereof. Thus, the exclusion of the empty set is the most prominent difference between the set constraint languages studied by Drakengren and Jonsson in [DJ98] (which are contained in the class of set constraint languages considered here), and RCC-5 and its fragments.

2 Constraint Satisfaction Problems

To use existing terminology in logic and model theory, it will be convenient to formalize constraint languages as (relational) *structures* (see e.g. [Hod93]). A *structure* Γ is a tuple $(D; f_1^\Gamma, f_2^\Gamma, \dots, R_1^\Gamma, R_2^\Gamma, \dots)$ where D is a set (the *domain* of Γ), each f_i^Γ is a function from $D^{k_i} \rightarrow D$ (where k_i is called the *arity* of f_i^Γ), and each R_i^Γ is a relation over D , i.e., a subset of D^{l_i} (where l_i is called the *arity* of R_i^Γ). For each function f_i^Γ we assume that there is a *function symbol* which we denote by f_i , and for each relation R_i^Γ we have a *relation symbol* which we denote by R_i . Constant symbols will be treated as 0-ary function symbols. The set τ of all relation and function symbols for some structure Γ is called the *signature* of Γ , and we also say that Γ is a τ -*structure*. If the signature of Γ only contains relation symbols and no function symbols, we also say that Γ is a *relational structure*. In the context of constraint satisfaction, relational structures Γ are also called *constraint languages*, and a constraint language Γ' is called a *sublanguage* (or *reduct*) of a constraint language Γ if the relations in Γ' are a subset of the relations in Γ (and Γ is called an *expansion* of Γ').

Let Γ be a relational structure with domain D and a *finite* signature τ . The *constraint satisfaction problem* for Γ is the following computational problem, also denoted by $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$: given a finite set of variables V and a conjunction Φ of atomic formulas of the form $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$, where $x_1, \dots, x_k \in V$ and $R \in \tau$, does there exist an assignment $s: V \rightarrow D$ such that for every constraint $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ in the input we have that $(s(x_1), \dots, s(x_k)) \in R^\Gamma$?

The mapping s is also called a *solution* to the *instance* Φ of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$, and the conjuncts of Φ are called *constraints*. Note that we only introduce constraint satisfaction problems $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ for *finite constraint languages*, i.e., relational structures Γ with a *finite* relational signature.

3 Set Constraint Languages

In this section, we give formal definitions of set constraint languages. Let \mathfrak{S} be the structure with domain $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, the set of all subsets of natural numbers, and with signature $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$, where

- \sqcap is a binary function symbol that denotes intersection, i.e., $\sqcap^\mathfrak{S} = \cap$;
- \sqcup is a binary function symbol for union, i.e., $\sqcup^\mathfrak{S} = \cup$;
- c is a unary function symbol for complementation, i.e., $c^\mathfrak{S}$ is the function that maps $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$;
- $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are constants (treated as 0-ary function symbols) denoting the empty set \emptyset and the full set \mathbb{N} , respectively.

Sometimes, we simply write \sqcap for the function $\sqcap^\mathfrak{S}$ and \sqcup for the function $\sqcup^\mathfrak{S}$, i.e., we do not distinguish between a function symbol and the respective function. We use the symbols \sqcap, \sqcup and not the symbols \cap, \cup to prevent confusion with meta-mathematical usages of \cap and \cup in the text.

A *set constraint language* is a relational structure with a set of relations with a quantifier-free first-order definition in \mathfrak{S} . We always allow equality in first-order formulas, and the equality symbol $=$ is always interpreted to be the true equality relation on the domain of the structure.

Example 1. *The ternary relation $\{(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^3 \mid x \sqcap y \sqsubseteq z\}$ has the quantifier-free first-order definition $z \sqcap (x \sqcap y) = x \sqcap y$ over \mathfrak{S} .*

Theorem 2 (Follows from Proposition 5.8 in [MO96]). *Let Γ be a set constraint language with a finite signature. Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in NP.*

It is well-known that the structure $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); \sqcup, \sqcap, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ is a Boolean algebra, with

- $\mathbf{0}$ playing the role of false, and $\mathbf{1}$ playing the role of true;
- c playing the role of \neg ;
- \sqcap and \sqcup playing the role of \wedge and \vee , respectively.

To not confuse logical connectives with the connectives of Boolean algebras, we always use the symbols \sqcap , \sqcup , and c instead of the usual function symbols \wedge , \vee , and \neg in Boolean algebras. To facilitate the notation, we also write \bar{x} instead of $c(x)$, and $x \neq y$ instead of $\neg(x = y)$.

We assume that all terms t over the functional signature $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ are written in (*inner*) *conjunctive normal form (CNF)*, i.e., as $t = \prod_{i=1}^n \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_i} l_{ij}$ where l_{ij} is either of the form \bar{x} or of the form x for a variable x (every term over $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ can be re-written into an equivalent term of this form, using the usual laws of Boolean algebras [Boo47]). We allow the special case $n = 0$ (in which case t becomes $\mathbf{1}$), and the special case $n_i = 0$ (in which case $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_i} l_{ij}$ becomes $\mathbf{0}$). We refer to $c_i := \{l_{ij} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$ as an (*inner*) *clause* of t , and to l_{ij} as an (*inner*) *literal* of c_i . We say that a set of inner clauses is *satisfiable* if there exists an assignment from $V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ such that for all inner clauses, the union of the evaluation of all literals equals \mathbb{N} (this is the case if and only if the formula $t = \mathbf{1}$ has a satisfying assignment).

We assume that all quantifier-free first-order formulas ϕ over the signature $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ are written in (*outer*) *conjunctive normal form (CNF)*, i.e., as $\phi = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \bigvee_{j=1}^{m_i} L_{ij}$ where L_{ij} is either of the form $t = \mathbf{1}$ (a *positive (outer) literal*) or of the form $t \neq \mathbf{1}$ (a *negative (outer) literal*). Again, it is well-known and easy to see that we can for every quantifier-free formula find a formula in this form which is equivalent to it in every Boolean algebra. We refer to $C_i := \{L_{ij} \mid 1 \leq j \leq m_i\}$ as an (*outer*) *clause* of ϕ , and to L_{ij} as an (*outer*) *literal* of C_i . Whenever convenient, we identify ϕ with its set of clauses.

4 \mathcal{EI} Set Constraints

To define \mathcal{EI} set constraints, we need to introduce a series of important functions defined on the set of subsets of natural numbers.

Definition 3. Let

- $i: (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be the function that maps (S_1, S_2) to the set $\{2x \mid x \in S_1\} \cup \{2x + 1 \mid x \in S_2\}$;
- F be the function that maps $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to the set of finite non-empty subsets of S ;
- $G: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow F(\mathbb{N})$ be a bijection between \mathbb{N} and the set of finite non-empty subsets of \mathbb{N} (since both sets are countable, such a bijection exists);
- $e: \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be defined by

$$e(S) = \{G^{-1}(T) \mid T \in F(S)\};$$

- ei be the function defined by $ei(x, y) \mapsto e(i(x, y))$.

Definition 4. Let $f: (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^k \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be a function, and $R \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^l$ be a relation. Then we say that f *preserves* R if the following holds: for all $a^1, \dots, a^k \in (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^l$ we have that $(f(a_1^1, \dots, a_1^k), \dots, f(a_l^1, \dots, a_l^k)) \in R$ if $a^i \in R$ for all $i \leq k$. If f does not preserve R , we also say that f *violates* R . We say that f *strongly preserves* R if for all $a^1, \dots, a^k \in (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^l$ we have that $(f(a_1^1, \dots, a_1^k), \dots, f(a_l^1, \dots, a_l^k)) \in R$ if and only if $a^i \in R$ for all $i \leq k$. If ϕ is a first-order formula that defines a relation R over \mathfrak{S} , and f preserves (strongly preserves) R , then we also say that f *preserves* (strongly preserves) ϕ . Finally, if $g: (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))^l \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is a function, we say that f *preserves* (strongly preserves) g if it preserves (strongly preserves) the graph of g , i.e., the relation $\{(x_1, \dots, x_l, g(x_1, \dots, x_l)) \mid x_1, \dots, x_l \subseteq \mathbb{N}\}$.

Note that if an injective function f preserves a function g , then it must also strongly preserve g .

Definition 5. The set of all relations with a quantifier-free first-order definition over \mathfrak{S} that are preserved by the operation ei is denoted by \mathcal{EI} .

Remark. We will see later (Proposition 35 and Proposition 36) that the class \mathcal{EI} is independent from the precise choice of the operations e and i .

Proposition 12 shows that \mathcal{EI} has a large subclass, called Horn-Horn, which has an intuitive syntactic description. In Section 5 we also present many examples of relations that are from \mathcal{EI} and of relations that are not from \mathcal{EI} . Before, we will establish some properties of the functions i and e .

Fact 6. *The mapping i is an isomorphism between \mathfrak{S}^2 and \mathfrak{S} .*

Proof. The mapping i can be inverted by the mapping that sends $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to $(\{x \mid 2x \in S\}, \{x \mid 2x+1 \in S\})$. It is straightforward to verify that i strongly preserves $\mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{1}$, c , \sqcup , \sqcap . \square

We write $x \sqsubseteq y$ as an abbreviation for $x \sqcap y = x$.

Proposition 7. *The function e has the following properties.*

- e is injective,
- e strongly preserves $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{0}$, and \sqcap , and
- for $x, y, z \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $x \sqcup y = z$, not $x \sqsubseteq y$, and not $y \sqsubseteq x$, we have that $e(x) \sqcup e(y) \not\sqsubseteq e(z)$.

Proof. We verify the properties one by one. Since G is bijective, $e(x) = e(y)$ if and only if x and y have the same finite subsets. This is the case if and only if $x = y$, and hence e is injective. Thus, to prove that e strongly preserves $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{0}$, and \sqcap , it suffices to check that e preserves $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{0}$, and \sqcap .

Since G is bijective, we have that $G(\mathbb{N})$ equals the set of all finite subsets of \mathbb{N} , and hence $e(\mathbb{N}) = \mathbb{N}$, which shows that e preserves $\mathbf{1}$. We also compute $e(\emptyset) = G^{-1}(F(\emptyset)) = G^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Next, we verify that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ we have $e(x) \sqcap e(y) = e(x \sqcap y)$. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. We have $a \in e(x) \sqcap e(y)$ if and only if $G(a) \in F(x) \cap F(y)$. By definition of F and since $G(a)$ is a finite subset of \mathbb{N} , this is the case if and only if $G(a) \in F(x \sqcap y)$. This is the case if and only if $a \in e(x \sqcap y)$, which concludes the proof that e preserves \sqcap .

We verify that if $x \sqcup y = z$, not $x \sqsubseteq y$, and not $y \sqsubseteq x$, then $e(x) \sqcup e(y) \not\sqsubseteq e(z)$. First observe that for all $u, v \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $u \sqsubseteq v$ we have $e(u) \sqsubseteq e(v)$ since e preserves \sqcap . This implies that $e(x) \sqcup e(y) \sqsubseteq e(z)$. Since $x \not\sqsubseteq y$ and $y \not\sqsubseteq x$, there are a, b such that $a \in x$, $a \notin y$, $b \in y$, $b \notin x$. Then we have that $\{a, b\} \in F(z)$, but $\{a, b\} \notin F(x) \cup F(y)$. Hence, $G^{-1}(\{a, b\}) \in e(z)$, but $G^{-1}(\{a, b\}) \notin e(x) \sqcup e(y)$. This shows that $e(z) \neq e(x) \sqcup e(y)$. \square

Note that in particular e preserves \sqsubset , \sqsubseteq , and \parallel . Moreover, $e(c(x)) \sqsubseteq c(e(x))$: this follows from preservation of \parallel , since $x \parallel c(x)$, and therefore $e(x) \parallel e(c(x))$, which is equivalent to the inclusion above. Both e and i strongly preserve \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, and therefore also ei strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$.

5 Horn-Horn Set Constraints

A large and important subclass of \mathcal{EI} set constraints is the class of Horn-Horn set constraints.

Definition 8. A quantifier-free first-order formula is called *Horn-Horn* if

1. every outer clause is *outer Horn*, i.e., contains at most one positive outer literal, and
2. every inner clause of positive outer literals is *inner Horn*, i.e., contains at most one positive inner literal.

A relation $R \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^k$ is called

- *outer Horn* if it can be defined over \mathfrak{S} by a conjunction of outer Horn clauses;
- *inner Horn* if it can be defined over \mathfrak{S} by a formula of the form $(c_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap c_k) = \mathbf{1}$ where each c_i is inner Horn;
- *Horn-Horn* if it can be defined by a Horn-Horn formula over \mathfrak{S} .

The following is a direct consequence of the fact that isomorphisms between Γ^k and Γ preserve Horn formulas over Γ ; since the simple proof is instructive for what follows, we give it here for the special case that is relevant here.

Fact 9. *Outer Horn relations are preserved by i .*

Proof. Let ϕ be a conjunction of outer Horn clauses with variables V . Let $\{t_0 = \mathbf{1}, t_1 \neq \mathbf{1}, \dots, t_k \neq \mathbf{1}\}$ be an outer clause of ϕ . Let $u, v: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be two assignments that satisfy this clause. Let $w: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be given by $x \mapsto i(u(x), v(x))$. Suppose that w satisfies $t_j = \mathbf{1}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. Since i is injective we must have that $t_j = \mathbf{1}$ for both u and v for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and therefore neither assignment satisfies the negative literals. Hence, u and v must satisfy $t_0 = \mathbf{1}$. Since i is an isomorphism between \mathfrak{S}^2 and \mathfrak{S} , it preserves in particular $t_0 = \mathbf{1}$, and hence w also satisfies $t_0 = \mathbf{1}$. \square

Proposition 10. *Inner Horn relations are strongly preserved by e .*

Proof. Observe that $x \sqcup (\bigsqcup_j \bar{y}_j) = \mathbf{1}$ is equivalent to $x \sqcap (\prod_j y_j) = \prod_j y_j$, which is strongly preserved by e since e strongly preserves \sqcap . This clearly implies the statement. \square

Note that Fact 9 and Proposition 10 imply that e strongly preserves inner Horn relations. We later also need the following.

Lemma 11. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, where $k \geq 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. $e(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup e(x_k) \sqcup \overline{e(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{e(y_l)} = \mathbf{1}$.
2. *there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $x_i \sqcup (\bigsqcup_j \overline{y_j}) = \mathbf{1}$.*
3. *there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $e(x_i) \sqcup (\bigsqcup_j \overline{e(y_j)}) = \mathbf{1}$.*

For $k = 0$, we have that $\bigsqcup_j \overline{y_j} = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\bigsqcup_{j \leq l} \overline{e(y_j)} = \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. For the implication from (1) to (2), suppose that there is for every $i \leq k$ an $a_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_i \notin X_i := x_i \sqcup (\bigsqcup_j \overline{y_j})$. Let c be $G^{-1}(\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\})$. Then for each $i \leq k$, we have that $c \notin e(x_i) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j \leq l} \overline{e(y_j)}$. To see this, first observe that $a_i \in \prod_{j \leq l} y_j \cap \overline{x_i}$. Therefore, $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \in \prod_{j \leq l} F(y_j) \cap \overline{F(x_i)}$ for all $i \leq k$. We conclude that $c \notin e(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup e(x_k) \sqcup \overline{e(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{e(y_l)}$.

The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) follows directly from Proposition 10. The implication (3) \Rightarrow (1) is trivial. The second statement is a direct consequence of Proposition 10. \square

Proposition 12. *Every Horn-Horn relation is preserved by e and i ; in particular, it is from \mathcal{EI} .*

Proof. Suppose that R has a Horn-Horn definition ϕ over \mathfrak{S} with variables V . Since R is in particular outer Horn, it is preserved by i by Fact 9.

Now we verify that R is preserved by e . Let $u: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be an assignment that satisfies ϕ . That is, u satisfies at least one literal in each outer clause of ϕ . It suffices to show that the assignment $v: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ defined by $x \mapsto e(u(x))$ satisfies the same outer literal. Suppose first that the outer literal is positive; because ϕ is Horn-Horn, it is of the form $x \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} = \mathbf{1}$ or of the form $\overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} = \mathbf{1}$, which is preserved by e by Lemma 11.

Now, suppose that the outer literal is negative, that is, of the form $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \neq \mathbf{1}$ for some $k \geq 0$. We will treat the case $k \geq 1$, the other case being similar. Suppose for contradiction that $v(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup v(x_k) \sqcup \overline{v(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{v(y_l)} = \mathbf{1}$. By Lemma 11, there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $u(x_i) \sqcup (\bigsqcup_j \overline{u(y_j)}) = \mathbf{1}$. But then we have in particular that $u(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup u(x_k) \sqcup u(\overline{y_1}) \sqcup \dots \sqcup u(\overline{y_l}) = \mathbf{1}$, in contradiction to the assumption that u satisfies ϕ . \square

Examples.

1. The disjointness relation \parallel is Horn-Horn: it has the definition $\overline{x} \sqcup \overline{y} = \mathbf{1}$.
2. The inequality relation \neq is inner Horn: it has the definition $(y \sqcup \overline{x}) \cap (x \sqcup \overline{y}) \neq \mathbf{1}$.
3. Using the previous example, the relation $\{(x, y, u, v) \mid x \neq y \vee u = v\}$ can easily be seen to be Horn-Horn.
4. The ternary relation $\{(x, y, z) \mid x \cap y \subseteq z\}$, which we have encountered above, has the Horn-Horn definition $\overline{x} \sqcup \overline{y} \sqcup z = \mathbf{1}$.
5. Examples of relations that are clearly *not* Horn-Horn: $\{(x, y) \mid x \sqcup y = \mathbf{1}\}$ is violated by e , and $\{(x, y, z) \mid (x = y) \vee (y = z)\}$ is violated by i .

6. The formula

$$\begin{aligned} & (x \sqcap y \neq x) \\ & \wedge (x \sqcap y \neq y) \\ & \wedge (v = \mathbf{1} \vee u = \mathbf{1} \vee x \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$$

is clearly not Horn-Horn. However, the relation defined by the formula is from $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}$: if (x_1, y_1, u_1, u_2) and (x_2, y_2, u_2, v_2) are from that relation, then neither $i(x_1, x_2) \sqsubseteq i(y_1, y_2)$ nor $i(y_1, y_2) \sqsubseteq i(x_1, x_2)$. By Proposition 7, $(ei(x_1, x_2), ei(y_1, y_1), ei(u_1, u_2), ei(v_1, v_2))$ satisfies the formula.

There is no equivalent Horn-Horn formula, since the formula is not preserved by i .

7. The formula $((x \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}) \vee (u \sqcup v = \mathbf{1})) \wedge (\bar{x} \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}) \wedge (x \sqcup \bar{y} \neq \mathbf{1})$ is not Horn-Horn. However, it is preserved by e and by i : the reason is that one of its clauses has the negative literal $x \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}$, and the conjuncts $\{\bar{x} \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}\}$ and $\{x \sqcup \bar{y} \neq \mathbf{1}\}$. Therefore, for every tuple $t \in R$ the tuple $e(t)$ satisfies $x \sqcup y \neq \mathbf{1}$ and is in R as well. By Fact 9, R is preserved by i .

In this case, the authors suspect that there is no equivalent Horn-Horn formula. More generally, it is an open problem whether there exist formulas that are preserved by e and i , but that are *not* equivalent to a Horn-Horn formula.

Proposition 13. *Drakengren and Jonsson's set constraint language only contains Horn-Horn relations.*

Proof. For inclusion $x \subseteq y$, disjointness $\|$, and inequality \neq this has been discussed in the examples. Horn-Horn is preserved under adding additional outer disequality literals to the outer clauses, so all relations considered in Drakengren and Jonsson's language are Horn-Horn. \square

We prepare now some results that can be viewed as a partial converse of Proposition 12.

Definition 14. A quantifier-free first-order formula ϕ (in the syntactic form described at the end of Section 3) is called *reduced* if every formula obtained from ϕ by removing an outer literal is not equivalent to ϕ over \mathfrak{S} .

Lemma 15. *Every quantifier-free formula is over \mathfrak{S} equivalent to a reduced formula.*

Proof. It is clear that every quantifier-free formula can be written as a formula ϕ in CNF and in the form as we have discussed it after Theorem 2. We now remove successively outer literals as long as this results in an equivalent formula. \square

We first prove the converse of Fact 9.

Proposition 16. *Let ϕ be a reduced formula that is preserved by i . Then each outer clause of ϕ is Horn.*

Proof. Let V be the set of variables of ϕ . Assume for contradiction that ϕ contains an outer clause with two positive literals, $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ and $t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. If we remove the literal $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ from its clause C , the resulting formula is inequivalent to ϕ , and hence there is an assignment $s_1: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ that satisfies none of the literals of C except for $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$. Similarly, there is an assignment $s_2: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ that satisfies none of the literals of C except for $t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. By injectivity of i , and since i strongly preserves

c, \sqcap, \sqcup , and $\mathbf{1}$, the assignment $s: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ defined by $x \mapsto i(s_1(x), s_2(x))$ does not satisfy the two literals $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ and $t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. Since i strongly preserves c, \sqcup, \sqcap , none of the other literals in C is satisfied by those mappings as well, in contradiction to the assumption that ϕ is preserved by i . \square

Definition 17. Let V be a set of variables, and $s: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be a mapping. Then a function from $V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ of the form $x \mapsto e(s(x))$ is called a *core assignment*.

Lemma 18. For every quantifier-free formula ϕ there exists a formula ψ such that all inner clauses are inner Horn, and such that ϕ and ψ have the same satisfying core assignments. If ϕ is preserved by ei , then the set of all satisfying core assignments of ψ is closed under ei .

Proof. Suppose that ϕ has an outer clause C with a positive outer literal $t = \mathbf{1}$ such that t contains an inner clause $c := x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l}$ that is not Horn, i.e., $k \geq 2$. Then we replace the outer literal $t = \mathbf{1}$ in ϕ by k literals $t_1 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, t_k = \mathbf{1}$ where t_i is obtained from t by replacing c by $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l}$.

We claim that the resulting formula ϕ' has the same set of satisfying core assignments. Observe that $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \sqsubseteq c$, and hence $t_i = \mathbf{1}$ implies $t = \mathbf{1}$. An arbitrary satisfying assignment of ϕ' satisfies either one of the positive outer literals $t_i = \mathbf{1}$, in which case that observation shows that it also satisfies ϕ , or it satisfies one of the other outer literals of C , in which case it also satisfies this literal in ϕ . Hence, ϕ' implies ϕ . Conversely, let s be a satisfying core assignment of ϕ . If s satisfies a literal from C other than $t = \mathbf{1}$, then it also satisfies this literal in ϕ' , and s satisfies ϕ' . Otherwise, s must satisfy $t = \mathbf{1}$, and hence $s(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup s(x_k) \sqcup \overline{s(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{s(y_l)} = \mathbf{1}$. Since s is a core assignment, Lemma 11 implies that there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $s(x_i) \sqcup \overline{s(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{s(y_l)} = \mathbf{1}$. So s satisfies ϕ' .

Suppose that ϕ has an outer clause C with a negative outer literal $t \neq \mathbf{1}$ such that t contains an inner clause $c := x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l}$ that is not Horn, i.e., $k \geq 2$. Then we replace the clause C in ϕ by k clauses C_1, \dots, C_k where C_k is obtained from C by replacing c with $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l}$.

We claim that the resulting formula ϕ' has the same set of satisfying core assignments. Observe that $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \neq \mathbf{1}$ implies that $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \neq \mathbf{1}$, for every $i \leq k$. The observation shows that an arbitrary assignment of ϕ is also an assignment of ϕ' . Conversely, let s be a satisfying core assignment of ϕ' . If s satisfies one of the other literals of C other than $t \neq \mathbf{1}$, then s satisfies ϕ . Otherwise, s must satisfy $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \neq \mathbf{1}$ for all $i \leq k$, and by Lemma 11 we have that s also satisfies $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} \neq \mathbf{1}$.

We perform these replacements until we obtain a formula ϕ' where all inner clauses are Horn; this formula satisfies the requirements of the first statement of the lemma.

To prove the second statement, let $u, v: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ be two satisfying core assignments of ϕ' . Since ϕ' and ϕ have the same satisfying core assignments, u and v also satisfy ϕ . Then the mapping $w: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ given by $x \mapsto ei(u(x), v(x))$ is a core assignment, and because ei preserves ϕ , the mapping w satisfies ϕ . Since ϕ and ϕ' have the same core assignments, w is also a satisfying assignment of ϕ' , which proves the statement. \square

Definition 19. A quantifier-free first-order formula ϕ (in the syntactic form described at the end of Section 3) is called *strongly reduced* if every formula obtained from ϕ by removing an outer literal does not have the same set of satisfying core assignments over \mathfrak{S} .

Proposition 20. Let ϕ be a strongly reduced formula all of whose inner clauses are Horn. If the set of satisfying core assignments of ϕ is closed under ei , then ϕ is Horn-Horn.

Proof. Let V be the set of variables of ϕ . It suffices to show that all clauses of ϕ are outer Horn. Assume for contradiction that ϕ contains an outer clause with two positive literals, $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ and $t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. If we remove the literal $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ from its clause C , the resulting formula has strictly less satisfying core assignments; this shows the existence of a core assignment $s_1: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ that satisfies none of the literals of C except for $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$. Similarly, there exists a core assignment $s_2: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ that satisfies none of the literals of C except for $t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. By assumption, the inner clauses of t_1 and t_2 are Horn. We claim that the assignment $s: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ defined by $x \mapsto ei(s_1(x), s_2(x))$ does not satisfy the clause C . Since ei strongly preserves inner Horn clauses, we have that s does not satisfy $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \vee t_2 = \mathbf{1}$. For the same reasons s does not satisfy any other literals in C ; this contradicts the assumption that the satisfying core assignments for ϕ are preserved by ei . \square

Proposition 21. *Let Γ be a finite set constraint language from \mathcal{EI} . Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be reduced in linear time to the problem to find a satisfying assignment for a given set of Horn-Horn clauses.*

Proof. Let Φ be an instance of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$, and let V be the set of variables that appear in Φ . For each constraint $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ from Φ , let ϕ_R be the definition of R over \mathfrak{S} . By Lemma 18, there exists a formula ψ_R that has the same satisfying core assignments as ϕ_R and where all inner clauses are Horn; moreover, since ϕ_R is preserved by ei , the lemma asserts that the set of all satisfying core assignments of ψ_R is preserved by ei . We can assume without loss of generality that ψ_R is strongly reduced; this can be seen similarly to Lemma 15. By Proposition 20, the formula ψ_R is Horn-Horn.

Let Ψ be the set of all Horn-Horn clauses of formulas $\psi_R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ obtained from constraints $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ in Φ in the described manner. We claim that Φ is a satisfiable instance of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ if and only if Ψ is satisfiable. This follows from the fact that for each constraint $R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ in Φ , the formulas ϕ_R and ψ_R have the same satisfying core assignments, and that both ϕ_R and ψ_R are preserved by ei (for ψ_R this follows from Proposition 12), so in particular by the function $x \mapsto ei(x, x)$. \square

Note that in Proposition 21 we reduce satisfiability for \mathcal{EI} to satisfiability for a proper subclass of Horn-Horn set constraints: while for general Horn-Horn set constraints we allow that inner clauses of negative outer literals are not Horn, the reduction only produces Horn-Horn clauses where *all* inner clauses are Horn.

6 Algorithm for Horn-Horn Set Constraints

We present an algorithm that takes as input a set Φ of Horn-Horn clauses and decides satisfiability of Φ over $\mathfrak{S} = (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); \sqcup, \sqcap, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ in time quadratic to the length of the input. By Proposition 21, this section will therefore conclude the proof that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is tractable when all relations in Γ are from \mathcal{EI} .

We first discuss an important sub-routine of our algorithm, which we call the *inner resolution algorithm*. As in the case of Boolean positive unit resolution [DG84] one can implement the procedure Inner-Res such that it runs in linear time in the input size.

Lemma 22. *Let Φ be a finite set of inner Horn clauses. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. $\sqcap \Phi = \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over \mathfrak{S} .
2. Inner-Res(Φ) from Figure 1 accepts.

```

Inner-Res( $\Phi$ )
// Input: A finite set  $\Phi$  of inner Horn clauses
// Accepts iff  $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$  is satisfiable
During the entire algorithm:
    if  $\Phi$  contains an empty clause, then reject.
Repeat := true
While Repeat = true do
    Repeat := false
    If  $\Phi$  contains a positive unit clause  $\{x\}$  then
        Repeat := true
        Remove all clauses where the literal  $x$  occurs.
        Remove the literal  $\bar{x}$  from all clauses.
    End if
Loop
Accept

```

Figure 1: Inner Resolution Algorithm.

3. $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$ has a solution whose image is contained in $\{\emptyset, \mathbb{N}\}$.

Proof. It is obvious that $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$ is unsatisfiable when Inner-Res(Φ) rejects; in fact, for all inner clauses c derived by Inner-Res from Φ , the formula $c = \mathbf{1}$ is logically implied by $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$. Conversely, if the algorithm accepts then we can set all eliminated variables to \mathbb{N} and all remaining variables to \emptyset , which satisfies all clauses: in the removed clauses the positive literal is satisfied, and in the remaining clauses we have at least one negative literal at the final stage of the algorithm, and all clauses with negative literals at the final stage of the algorithm are satisfied. \square

The proof of the previous lemma shows that $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over \mathfrak{S} if and only if $\prod \Phi = \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over the two-element Boolean algebra. As we will see in the following, this holds more generally (and not only for inner Horn clauses). The following should be well-known, and can be shown with the same proof as given in [Kop89] for the weaker Proposition 2.19 there. We repeat the proof here for the convenience of the reader (for definitions of the notions appearing in the proof, however, we refer to [Kop89]).

Fact 23. *Let t_1, t_2 be terms over $\{\square, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over the two-element Boolean algebra;
2. $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over all Boolean algebras;
3. $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable in a Boolean algebra.

Proof. Obviously, 1 implies 2, and 2 implies 3. For 3 implies 1, assume that $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ has a satisfying assignment in some Boolean algebra \mathfrak{C} . Let c be the element denoted by t_2 in \mathfrak{C} under this assignment. It is well-known that every element $a \neq \mathbf{0}$ of a Boolean algebra is contained in an ultrafilter (see e.g. Corollary 2.17 in [Kop89]). So let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter of \mathfrak{C} that contains \bar{c} , and let $f: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ be the characteristic function of \mathcal{U} . Then f is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{C} to the two-element Boolean algebra that maps c to $\mathbf{0}$; thus $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ is satisfiable over $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$. \square

The same statement for $t_1 = \mathbf{1}$ instead of $t_1 = \mathbf{1} \wedge t_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ is Proposition 2.19. in [Kop89]. Fact 23 has the following consequence that is crucial for the way how we use the inner resolution procedure in our algorithm.

Lemma 24. *Let Ψ be a finite set of inner Horn clauses. Then $\text{Inner-Res}(\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_k, y_0, \dots, y_l\})$ rejects if and only if $\prod \Psi = \mathbf{1}$ implies that $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l = \mathbf{1}$ over \mathfrak{S} .*

Proof. $\prod \Psi = \mathbf{1}$ implies that $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\prod \Psi = \mathbf{1} \wedge x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l \neq \mathbf{1}$ is unsatisfiable over \mathfrak{S} . By Fact 23, this is the case if and only if $\prod \Psi = \mathbf{1} \wedge x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l \neq \mathbf{1}$ is unsatisfiable over the 2-element Boolean algebra, which is the case if and only if $\prod \Psi = \mathbf{1} \wedge x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l = \mathbf{0}$ is unsatisfiable over the two-element Boolean algebra. As we have seen in Lemma 22, this is turn holds if and only if $\text{Inner-Res}(\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_k, y_1, \dots, y_l\})$ rejects. \square

```

Outer-Res( $\Phi$ )
// Input: A finite set  $\Phi$  of Horn-Horn clauses
// Accepts iff  $\Phi$  is satisfiable over  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); \sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ 
During the entire algorithm:
  if  $\Phi$  contains an empty clause, then reject.
Repeat := true
While Repeat = true do
  Repeat := false
  Let  $\Psi$  be the set of all inner Horn clauses of terms  $t$ 
  from positive unit clauses  $\{t = \mathbf{1}\}$  in  $\Phi$ .
  If Inner-Res rejects  $\Psi$ , then reject.
  For each negative literal  $t \neq \mathbf{1}$  in clauses from  $\Phi$ 
  For each inner clause  $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_l\}$  of  $t$ 
  Call Inner-Res on
     $\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, \bar{x}_k = \mathbf{1}, y_0 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, y_l = \mathbf{1}\}$ 
  If Inner-Res rejects then remove clause  $D$  from  $t$ 
  End for
  If all clauses in  $t$  have been removed, then
  Remove outer literal  $t \neq \mathbf{1}$  from its clause
  Repeat := true
End for
Loop
Accept

```

Figure 2: Outer Resolution Algorithm.

Theorem 25. *The algorithm ‘Outer-Res’ in Figure 2 decides satisfiability for sets of Horn-Horn clauses in quadratic time.*

Proof. We first argue that if the algorithm rejects Φ , then Φ has indeed no solution. First note that during the whole argument, the set of clauses Φ has the same satisfying tuples (i.e. the corresponding formulas are equivalent): Observe that only negative literals get removed from clauses, and that a negative literal $t \neq \mathbf{1}$ only gets removed from a clause when Inner-Res rejects $\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, \bar{x}_k =$

$\mathbf{1}, y_0 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, y_l = \mathbf{1}\}$ for each inner clause $\{x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_l\}$ of t . By Lemma 24, if Inner-Res rejects $\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, \bar{x}_k = \mathbf{1}, y_0 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, y_l = \mathbf{1}\}$ then Ψ implies that $x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l = \mathbf{1}$. Hence, the positive unit clauses imply that $t = \mathbf{1}$ and therefore the literal $t \neq \mathbf{1}$ can be removed from the clause without changing the set of satisfying tuples. Now the algorithm rejects if either Inner-Res rejects Ψ or if it derives the empty clause. In both cases it is clear that Φ is not satisfiable.

Thus, it suffices to construct a solution when the algorithm accepts. Let Ψ be the set of all inner clauses of terms from positive unit clauses at the final stage, when the algorithm accepts. For each remaining negative outer literal $\{t \neq \mathbf{1}\}$ and each remaining inner clause $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_l\}$ of t there exists an assignment α_D from $V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ that satisfies $\Psi \cup \{x_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup x_k \sqcup \bar{y}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{y}_l \neq \mathbf{1}\}$: otherwise, by Lemma 24, the inner resolution algorithm would have rejected $\Psi \cup \{\bar{x}_1 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, \bar{x}_k = \mathbf{1}, y_0 = \mathbf{1}, \dots, y_l = \mathbf{1}\}$, and would have removed the inner clause D from t . Let D_1, \dots, D_s be an enumeration of all remaining inner clauses D that appear in all remaining negative outer literals.

Write i_s for the s -ary operation defined by $(x_1, \dots, x_s) \mapsto i(x_1, i(x_2, \dots, i(x_{s-1}, x_s) \dots))$ (where i is as in Fact 6). We claim that $s: V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ given by

$$x \mapsto i_s(\alpha_{D_1}(x), \dots, \alpha_{D_s}(x))$$

satisfies all clauses in Φ . Let C be a clause from Φ . By assumption, at the final stage of the algorithm, the clause C is still non-empty. Also note that since all formulas in the input were Horn-Horn, they contain at most one positive literal. This holds in particular for C , and we therefore only have to distinguish the following cases:

- At the final state of the algorithm, C still contains a negative literal $t \neq \mathbf{1}$. Since $t \neq \mathbf{1}$ has not been removed, there must be a remaining inner clause $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_l\}$ of t . Observe that $s(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup s(x_k) \sqcup s(\bar{y}_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup s(\bar{y}_l) = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\alpha_{D_j}(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \alpha_{D_j}(x_k) \sqcup \alpha_{D_j}(\bar{y}_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \alpha_{D_j}(\bar{y}_l) = \mathbf{1}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s$. Hence, and since $\alpha_D(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \alpha_D(x_k) \sqcup \alpha_D(\bar{y}_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \alpha_D(\bar{y}_l) \neq \mathbf{1}$, s satisfies $t \neq \mathbf{1}$. This shows that s satisfies C .
- All negative literals have been removed from C during the algorithm. The positive literal $t_0 = \mathbf{1}$ of C is such that the inner clauses of t_0 are Horn. They will be part of Ψ , and therefore $t_0 = \mathbf{1}$ is satisfied by s . Indeed, by assumption the assignments α_{D_j} satisfy Ψ , and Ψ is preserved by i .

We conclude that s is a solution to Φ . The inner resolution algorithm has a linear time complexity; the outer resolution algorithm performs at most a linear number of calls to the inner resolution algorithm, and it is straightforward to implement all necessary data structures for outer resolution to obtain a running time that is quadratic in the input size. \square

Combining Proposition 21 with Theorem 25, we obtain the following.

Theorem 26. *Let Γ be a finite set constraint language from \mathcal{EI} . Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ can be solved in quadratic time.*

7 Maximality

In this section we show that the class \mathcal{EI} is a maximal tractable set constraint language. More specifically, let Γ be a set constraint language that strictly contains all \mathcal{EI} relations. We then

show that Γ contains a finite set of relations Γ' such that already the problem $\text{CSP}(\Gamma')$ is NP-hard (Theorem 40).

In our proof we use the so-called *universal-algebraic approach* to the complexity of constraint satisfaction problems, which requires that we re-formulate set CSPs as constraint satisfaction problems for ω -categorical structures. For a more detailed introduction to the universal-algebraic approach for ω -categorical structures, see [Bod12]. A structure Γ with a countable domain is called ω -categorical if all countable structures that satisfy the same first-order sentences as Γ are isomorphic to Γ (see e.g. [Hod93]). By the theorem of Ryll-Nardzewski, and for countable signatures, this is equivalent to requiring that every relation that is preserved by the automorphisms¹ of Γ is first-order definable in Γ (see e.g. [Hod93]). The set of all automorphisms of Γ is denoted by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

It is well-known that all countable atomless² Boolean algebras are isomorphic (Corollary 5.16 in [Kop89]; also see Example 4 on page 100 in [Hod93]); let \mathfrak{A} denote such a countable atomless Boolean algebra. Let \mathbb{A} denote the domain of \mathfrak{A} . Again, we use \sqcap and \sqcup to denote join and meet in \mathfrak{A} , respectively. Since the axioms of Boolean algebras and the property of not having atoms can all be written as first-order sentences, it follows that \mathfrak{A} is ω -categorical. A structure \mathfrak{B} has *quantifier elimination* if every first-order formula is over \mathfrak{B} equivalent to a quantifier-free formula. It is well-known that \mathfrak{A} has quantifier elimination (see Exercise 17 on Page 391 in [Hod93]). We will also make use of the following.

Theorem 27 (Corollary 5.7 in [MO96]). *A quantifier-free formula is satisfiable in some infinite Boolean algebra if and only if it is satisfiable in all infinite Boolean algebras.*

A fundamental concept in the complexity theory of constraint satisfaction problems is the notion of *primitive positive definitions*. A first-order formula is called *primitive positive (pp)* if it is of the form

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_n (\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m)$$

where for each $i \leq m$ the formula ψ_i is of the form $R(y_1, \dots, y_l)$ or of the form $y_1 = y_2$, and where R is a relation symbol and y_1, y_2, \dots, y_l are either free variables or from $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We say that a k -ary relation $R \subseteq D^k$ is *primitive positive definable (pp definable)* over a τ -structure Γ with domain D iff there exists a primitive positive formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with the k free variables x_1, \dots, x_k such that a tuple (b_1, \dots, b_k) is in R if and only if $\phi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$ is true in Γ .

Example. The relation $\{(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^2 \mid x \sqsubset y\}$ is pp definable in $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); S, \neq)$ where $S = \{(x, y, z) \mid x \sqcap y \sqsubseteq z\}$. The pp definition is $S(x, x, y) \wedge x \neq y$ (the definition is even quantifier-free). \square

Example. The relation $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3, y) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^4 \mid x_1 \sqcap x_2 \sqcap x_3 \sqsubseteq y\}$ is pp definable in $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); S)$ where $S = \{(x, y, z) \mid x \sqcap y \sqsubseteq z\}$. The pp definition is $\exists u (S(x_1, x_2, u) \wedge S(u, x_3, y))$. \square

When every relation of a structure Γ is preserved by an operation f , then f is called a *polymorphism* of Γ . Note that polymorphisms of Γ also preserve all relations that have a pp definition in Γ . The following has been shown for finite domain constraint satisfaction in [BKJ05]; the easy proof also works for infinite domain constraint satisfaction.

Lemma 28. *Let R be a relation with a primitive positive definition in a structure Γ . Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ and the CSP for the expansion of Γ by the relation R are polynomial-time equivalent.*

¹An isomorphism of a structure Γ with itself is called an *automorphism* of Γ .

²An *atom* in a Boolean algebra is an element $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ such that for all y with $x \cap y = y$ and $x \neq y$ we have $y = \mathbf{0}$. If a Boolean algebra does not contain atoms, it is called *atomless*.

The following theorem is one of the reasons why it is useful to work with ω -categorical templates (when this is possible).

Theorem 29 (from [BN06]). *Let Γ be an ω -categorical structure. Then R is primitive positive definable in Γ if and only if R is preserved by all polymorphisms of Γ .*

The previous and the next result together can be used to translate questions about primitive positive definability into purely operational questions. Let D be a set, let $\mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ be $D^n \rightarrow D$, and let \mathcal{O} be $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ the set of operations on D of finite arity. An operation $\pi \in \mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ is called a *projection* if for some fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and for all n -tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in D^n$ we have the identity $\pi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$. The *composition* of a k -ary operation f and k operations g_1, \dots, g_k of arity n is the n -ary operation defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & (f(g_1, \dots, g_k))(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &= f(g_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, g_k(x_1, \dots, x_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 30. We say that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ *locally generates* $f: D^n \rightarrow D$ if for every finite subset A of D^n there is an operation $g: D^n \rightarrow D$ that can be obtained from the operations in \mathcal{F} and projection maps by composition such that $f(a) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

Theorem 31 (see [Sze86]). *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ be a set of operations with domain D . Then an operation $f: D^k \rightarrow D$ preserves all finitary relations that are preserved by all operations in \mathcal{F} if and only if \mathcal{F} locally generates f .*

In the following, we always consider sets of operations \mathcal{F} that contain $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$, and therefore make the following convention. For $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, we say that \mathcal{F} *generates* $f \in \mathcal{O}$ if $\mathcal{F} \cup \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ locally generates f . We now define analogs of the operations e and i , defined on \mathbb{A} instead of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$.

Proposition 32. *There is an isomorphism \tilde{i} between \mathfrak{A}^2 and \mathfrak{A} .*

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that \mathfrak{A}^2 is again a countable atomless Boolean algebra. \square

Motivated by the properties of e described in Lemma 11, we make the following definition.

Definition 33. Let \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{B}' be two arbitrary Boolean algebras with domains B and B' , respectively, and let $g: B \rightarrow B'$ be a function that strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$. We say that g *forgets unions* if for all $k \geq 1$, $l \geq 0$, and $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l \in B$ we have

$$e(x_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup e(x_k) \sqcup \overline{e(y_1)} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{e(y_l)} = \mathbf{1}$$

if and only if there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $x_i \sqcup \overline{y_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup \overline{y_l} = \mathbf{1}$.

Proposition 34. *There exists an injection $\tilde{e}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ that strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$ in \mathfrak{A} , and that forgets unions.*

Proof. The construction of \tilde{e} is by a standard application of König's tree lemma for ω -categorical structures (see e.g. [Bod12]); it suffices to show that there is an injection f from every finite induced substructure \mathfrak{B} of \mathfrak{A} to \mathfrak{A} such that f strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, and forgets unions.

So let \mathfrak{B} be such a finite substructure of \mathfrak{A} , and let B be the domain of \mathfrak{B} . Let $\mathfrak{C} = (\mathcal{P}(B); \sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ be the Boolean algebra of the subsets of B . We claim that $g: B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$ given by $g(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ and $g(x) = \{z \mid z \neq \mathbf{0} \wedge z \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} x\}$ for $x \neq \mathbf{1}$

- preserves $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$: this is by definition;
- preserves \sqcap : for $x, y \in B$ (including the case that $x = \mathbf{1}$ or $y = \mathbf{1}$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) \sqcap^{\mathfrak{C}} g(y) &= \{z \mid z \neq \mathbf{0} \wedge z \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} x \wedge z \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} y\} \\ &= \{z \mid z \neq \mathbf{0} \wedge z \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} (x \sqcap^{\mathfrak{B}} y)\} \\ &= g(x \sqcap^{\mathfrak{B}} y); \end{aligned}$$

- is injective: if $x, y \in B$ such that $g(x) = g(y)$, then $x \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} y$ and $y \sqsubseteq^{\mathfrak{B}} x$, and hence $x = y$;
- strongly preserves \sqcap : this follows from the previous two items;
- forgets unions: This can be shown analogously to the proof of Lemma 11.

Clearly, there is an embedding h from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{A} . Then $f := h(g)$ is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{B} to \mathfrak{A} that forgets unions. \square

Proposition 35. *Let ϕ be a quantifier-free first-order formula over the signature $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$. Then e preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{S} if and only if \tilde{e} preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{A} . Moreover, every operation from $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ that strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$ and forgets unions generates \tilde{e} , and is generated by \tilde{e} .*

Proof. Let \bar{a} be a tuple of elements from \mathbb{A} . Clearly, there exists a tuple \bar{b} of elements from $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ such that \bar{a} and \bar{b} satisfy the same set ψ of quantifier-free first-order formulas; this follows from the fact that every finite Boolean algebra is the Boolean algebra of subsets of a finite set. Now observe that whether or not the tuple $e(\bar{b})$ satisfies a quantifier-free first-order formula ϕ only depends on ψ , by Lemma 11. Since \tilde{e} strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, and forgets unions, the same is true for the quantifier-free first-order formulas that hold on $\tilde{e}(\bar{a})$. Hence, \tilde{e} preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{A} if and only if e preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{S} .

To prove the second part of the statement, we use Theorem 31. Suppose that \bar{c} and \bar{d} are tuples of elements from \mathbb{A} that satisfy the same quantifier-free first-order formulas. By the equivalent characterization of ω -categoricity mentioned above, and the fact that \mathfrak{A} has quantifier-elimination, there exists an automorphism α of \mathfrak{A} that maps \bar{c} to \bar{d} . By the above observations and Theorem 31, this implies that all operations that strongly preserve \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, and forget unions generate each other. \square

Let $\tilde{e}i$ be the operation $(x, y) \mapsto \tilde{e}(\tilde{i}(x, y))$. The following can be shown similarly to Proposition 35.

Proposition 36. *Let ϕ be a quantifier-free first-order formula over the signature $\{\sqcap, \sqcup, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$. Then ei preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{S} if and only if $\tilde{e}i$ preserves ϕ over \mathfrak{A} . Moreover, every binary operation g that strongly preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{1}$, and forgets unions generates $\tilde{e}i$, and is generated by $\tilde{e}i$. \square*

We now give the central argument for the maximal tractability of \mathcal{EI} , stated in universal-algebraic language. We say that an operation from $\mathbb{A}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ depends on the argument $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ if there is no $(k-1)$ -ary operation f' such that for all $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{A}$

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = f'(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k).$$

We can equivalently characterize k -ary operations that depend on the i -th argument by requiring that there are $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{A}$ and $x'_i \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \neq f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x'_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k).$$

Theorem 37. *Let f be an operation generated by $\{\tilde{e}i\}$. Then either $\{f\}$ generates $\tilde{e}i$, or f is generated by $\{\tilde{e}\}$.*

Proof. To show the statement of the theorem, let f be a k -ary operation generated by $\{\tilde{e}i\}$. For the sake of notation, let x_1, \dots, x_l be the arguments on which f depends, for $l \leq k$. Let $f': \mathbb{A}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be the operation given by $f'(x_1, \dots, x_l) = f(x_1, \dots, x_l, \dots, x_l)$. Clearly, f' must be injective (since it is generated from an injective operation and depends on all arguments). Since f' is generated by $\tilde{e}i$ it preserves \sqcap , $\mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{1}$, and since f' is injective, it also *strongly* preserves those functions.

Consider first the case that $l = 1$, i.e., f' is unary. If for all finite subsets of \mathbb{A} , the operation f' equals an automorphism of \mathfrak{A} , then f is generated by $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ and there is nothing to show. So assume otherwise; that is, assume that there is a finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ such that there is no $a \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $f'(x) = a(x)$ for all $x \in S$. We claim that f' forgets unions. To see this, let $u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n$ be from \mathbb{A} such that $f'(u_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup f'(u_m) \sqcup f'(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup f'(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$. Since f' is generated by $\{\tilde{e}i\}$, there is a term composed from automorphisms of \mathfrak{A} and $\tilde{e}i$ such that $f'(x) = T(x)$ for all $x \in S \cup \{u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. By the choice of S , this term cannot be composed of automorphisms alone, and hence there must be $a \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ and operational terms T_1, T_2 composed from automorphisms of \mathfrak{A} and $\tilde{e}i$ such that $f'(x) = a(\tilde{e}i(T_1(x), T_2(x)))$ for all $x \in S$. As $\tilde{e}i$ forgets unions, there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $T_1(u_i) \sqcup T_1(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup T_1(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$. Since T_1 strongly preserves \sqcap we conclude that there exists an i such that $u_i \sqcup \bar{v}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{v}_n = \mathbf{1}$ (see the proof of Proposition 10), which is what we wanted to show. By Proposition 35 it follows that f' is generated by \tilde{e} . But then f is generated by \tilde{e} as well.

Next, consider the case that $l > 1$. Let g be the binary operation defined by $g(x, y) = f'(x, y, \dots, y)$; since f' is injective, the operation g will also be injective, and in particular depends on both arguments, and strongly preserves $\mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{1}$, and \sqcap . We claim that g forgets unions. Let $u_1 = (u_1^1, u_1^2), \dots, u_m = (u_m^1, u_m^2), v_1 = (v_1^1, v_1^2), \dots, v_n = (v_n^1, v_n^2)$ be from \mathbb{A}^2 such that $g(u_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup g(u_m) \sqcup g(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup g(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$. Since g is generated by $\tilde{e}i$ and cannot be generated by the automorphisms of \mathfrak{A} alone, there is a term of the form $T(x, y) = a(\tilde{e}i(T_1(x, y), T_2(x, y)))$ where

- $a \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$,
- T_1 and T_2 are operational terms composed from automorphisms of \mathfrak{A} and $\tilde{e}i$,
- $g(x, y) = T(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \{u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$.

Since $\tilde{e}i$ forgets unions, there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $T_1(u_i) \sqcup T_1(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup T_1(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$ and $T_2(u_i) \sqcup T_2(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup T_2(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$. Suppose first that T_1 depends on both arguments. Then T_1 defines an injective operation and strongly preserves \sqcap . It follows that $u_i \sqcup \bar{v}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{v}_n = \mathbf{1}$ in \mathfrak{A}^2 since these equations are inner Horn. We can argue similarly if T_2 depends on both arguments, and in those cases we have established that g forgets unions. Suppose now that each of T_1 and T_2 does *not* depend on both arguments. Consider first the case that T_1 only depends on the first argument. Then the function $x \mapsto T_1(x, x)$ is injective and strongly preserves \sqcap , and from $T_1(u_i) \sqcup T_1(v_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup T_1(v_n) = \mathbf{1}$ we derive as above that $u_i^1 \sqcup \bar{v}_1^1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{v}_n^1 = \mathbf{1}$ holds in \mathfrak{A} . In this case, T_2 must depend on the second argument, since T depends on both arguments. We therefore also have that $u_i^2 \sqcup \bar{v}_1^2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \bar{v}_n^2 = \mathbf{1}$ holds in \mathfrak{A} . The situation that T_1 only depends on the second argument and T_2 only depends on the first argument is analogous. So g forgets unions. By Proposition 36, g generates $\tilde{e}i$. Consequently, also f generates $\tilde{e}i$. \square

Definition 38. Let $U, I \subseteq \mathbb{A}^3$ be the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} U &:= \{(x, y, z) \mid (x \sqcup y = z)\} \\ I &:= \{(x, y, z) \mid (x \sqcap y = z)\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that both U and I are preserved by \tilde{i} . The following demonstrates that when Γ has the polymorphism \tilde{i} , this does not suffice for tractability of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$.

Proposition 39. *Let Γ be the structure with domain \mathbb{A} and three relations U , I , and \neq . Then $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. The proof is by reduction from 3SAT. We compute from a given 3SAT instance Φ with variable set V an instance Ψ of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ (in polynomial time) as follows. There are distinguished variables t and f in Ψ . For each variable x of Φ there are two variables x_t and x_f in Ψ . For a clause $C := \{l_1, l_2, l_3\}$ of Φ (with literals l_i either of the form x or of the form $\neg x$) we create a fresh variable u_C , and add the constraints $U(v_1, v_2, u_C)$ and $U(u_C, v_3, t)$ where $v_i := x_f$ if $l_i = \neg x$, and $v_i := x_t$ if $l_i = x$. Moreover, we add for each variable $x \in V$ the constraints $U(x_t, x_f, t)$ and $I(x_t, x_f, f)$. Finally, add the constraint $t \neq f$ and $I(t, f, f)$.

It is clear that if Φ has the satisfying assignment $\alpha: V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ then the following assignment β satisfies all constraints in Ψ . Choose $S_f \subsetneq S_t$ arbitrarily. Then β maps t to S_t and f to S_f , it maps $x_t \in V$ to S_t if $\alpha(x) = 1$ and to S_f otherwise, it maps $x_f \in V$ to S_f if $\alpha(x) = 1$ and to S_t otherwise, and for every clause $C = \{l_1, l_2, l_3\}$ of Φ it maps u_C to S_t if $\alpha(l_1) = 1$ or $\alpha(l_2) = 1$, and to S_f otherwise.

Conversely, suppose that β maps the variables of Ψ to the elements of Γ satisfying all constraints of Ψ . Let \mathfrak{B} be the finite Boolean algebra that is generated by $\beta(V)$ in Γ . Since $\beta(f) \subsetneq \beta(t)$, we have that $\beta(t)$ is non-empty. Select an arbitrary atom a of \mathfrak{B} that is contained in $\beta(t)$. Then we set $\alpha(x)$ for $x \in V$ to 1 if $a \subseteq \beta(x_t)$ and to 0 otherwise. In this way all clauses $\{l_1, l_2, l_3\}$ of Φ are satisfied. To see this, assume for simplicity of presentation that $l_1 = \neg x$ is negative and $l_2 = y$ and $l_3 = z$ are positive; the general case is analogous. Since we have the constraints $U(x_f, y_t, u_C)$ and $U(u_C, z_t, t)$, and since a is an atom of \mathfrak{B} , one of $\beta(x_f), \beta(y_t), \beta(z_t)$ must contain a . If a is in $\beta(y_t)$ or $\beta(z_t)$ then $\alpha(y)$ or $\alpha(z)$ is set to 1. If a is in $\beta(x_f)$, then the clause $I(x_t, x_f, f)$ forces that a is not in $\beta(x_t)$, and hence $\alpha(x)$ is set to 0. Thus, α sets at least one of $\neg x, y, z$ to 1, and the clause C is satisfied. \square

Theorem 40. *Let Γ be a set constraint language. Suppose that Γ contains all relations from \mathcal{EI} , and also contains a relation that is not from \mathcal{EI} . Then there is a finite sublanguage Γ' of Γ such that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma')$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. When R_1, R_2, \dots are the relations of Γ , let ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots be quantifier-free first-order formulas that define $R_1^\Gamma, R_2^\Gamma, \dots$ over $\mathfrak{S} = (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}); \sqcup, \sqcap, c, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$. Let $R_1^{\mathfrak{A}}, R_2^{\mathfrak{A}}, \dots$ be the relations defined by ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots over \mathfrak{A} , and let Δ be the relational structure with domain \mathbb{A} and exactly those relations. By Proposition 36, Δ contains a relation that is not preserved by $\tilde{e}i$, and contains all relations that are preserved by $\tilde{e}i$. Consider the set \mathcal{F} of all polymorphisms of Δ .

The set \mathcal{F} does not contain $\tilde{e}i$, since this would contradict by Theorem 31 the fact that Δ contains a relation that is not preserved by $\tilde{e}i$. Since \mathcal{F} is locally closed, it follows from Theorem 37 that all operations $f \in \mathcal{F}$ are generated by \tilde{e} . But then the relation $\{(x, y, z) \mid x = y \neq z \vee x \neq y = z\}$ is preserved by all operations in \mathcal{F} , and hence pp definable in Γ by Theorem 29. This relation has an NP-complete CSP [BK08]. Let Δ' be the reduct of Δ that contains exactly the relations

that appear in those pp definitions. Clearly, there are finitely many such relations; we denote the corresponding relation symbols by $\tau' \subset \tau$. By Lemma 28, $\text{CSP}(\Delta')$ is NP-hard.

This establishes also the hardness of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$: let Γ' be the τ' -reduct of Γ . We claim that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma')$ and $\text{CSP}(\Delta')$ are the same computational problem. We have to show that a conjunction of atomic τ' -formulas Φ is satisfiable in Γ' if and only if it is true in Δ' . Replacing each atomic τ' -formula in Φ by its quantifier-free first-order definition, this follows from Theorem 27. \square

8 Concluding Remarks

We have introduced the powerful set constraint language of \mathcal{EI} set constraints, which in particular contains all Horn-Horn set constraints and all previously studied tractable set constraint languages. Constraint satisfaction problems over \mathcal{EI} can be solved in polynomial – even quadratic – time. Our tractability result is complemented by a complexity result which shows that tractability of \mathcal{EI} set constraints is best-possible within a large class of set constraint languages.

It is not hard to see from the properties we prove for \mathcal{EI} set constraints that there is an algorithm to test whether a given finite set constraint language (where relations in the language are given by quantifier-free formulas over the signature $\{\sqcup, \sqcap, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$) is contained in \mathcal{EI} . This means that the so-called *meta-problem* for \mathcal{EI} set constraints can be decided effectively.

We would also like to remark that one can analogously obtain tractability for the class of constraints where the inner clauses of the positive outer literals are *dual Horn* (i.e., have at most one *negative* literal).

Acknowledgements We want to thank François Bossière who pointed out mistakes in the conference version of the paper.

References

- [Aik94] Alexander Aiken. Set constraints: Results, applications, and future directions. In *PPCP*, pages 326–335, 1994.
- [Baa03] Franz Baader. Least common subsumers and most specific concepts in a description logic with existential restrictions and terminological cycles. In *IJCAI*, pages 319–324, 2003.
- [BBL05] Franz Baader, Sebastian Brandt, and Carsten Lutz. Pushing the EL envelope. In *IJCAI*, pages 364–369, 2005.
- [BD06] Andrei A. Bulatov and Víctor Dalmau. A simple algorithm for Mal'tsev constraints. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(1):16–27, 2006.
- [BHK11] Manuel Bodirsky, Martin Hils, and Alex Krimkevitch. Tractable set constraints. In *Proceedings of IJCAI*, pages 510–515, 2011.
- [BJR02] M. Broxvall, P. Jonsson, and J. Renz. Disjunctions, independence, refinements. *Artificial Intelligence*, 140(1/2):153–173, 2002.

- [BK07] Manuel Bodirsky and Martin Kutz. Determining the consistency of partial tree descriptions. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171:185–196, 2007.
- [BK08] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of equality constraint languages. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 3(2):136–158, 2008. A conference version appeared in the proceedings of CSR’06.
- [BK09a] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Constraint satisfaction problems of bounded width. In *Proceedings of FOCS*, pages 595–603, 2009.
- [BK09b] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):41 pp, 2009. An extended abstract appeared in the proceedings of STOC’08.
- [BKJ05] Andrei A. Bulatov, Andrei A. Krokhin, and Peter G. Jeavons. Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34:720–742, 2005.
- [BN06] Manuel Bodirsky and Jaroslav Nešetřil. Constraint satisfaction with countable homogeneous templates. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 16(3):359–373, 2006.
- [Bod12] Manuel Bodirsky. Complexity classification in infinite-domain constraint satisfaction. Memoire d’habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Diderot – Paris 7. Available at arXiv:1201.0856, 2012.
- [Boo47] G. Boole. *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought*. Walton, London, 1847. Reprinted by Philisophical Library, New York, 1954.
- [Bul03] Andrei A. Bulatov. Tractable conservative constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of LICS’03*, pages 321–330, Ottawa, Canada, 2003.
- [Bul06] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1):66–120, 2006.
- [CJJK00] David Cohen, Peter Jeavons, Peter Jonsson, and Manolis Koubarakis. Building tractable disjunctive constraints. *Journal of the ACM*, 47(5):826–853, 2000.
- [DG84] William F. Dowling and Jean H. Gallier. Linear-time algorithms for testing the satisfiability of propositional horn formulae. *The Journal of Logic Programming*, 1(3):267–284, 1984.
- [DJ98] Thomas Drakengren and Peter Jonsson. Reasoning about set constraints applied to tractable inference in intuitionistic logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 8(6):855–875, 1998.
- [Hod93] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [IMM⁺10] Pawel M. Idziak, Petar Markovic, Ralph McKenzie, Matthew Valeriote, and Ross Willard. Tractability and learnability arising from algebras with few subpowers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(7):3023–3037, 2010.
- [JB98] Peter Jonsson and Christer Bäckström. A unifying approach to temporal constraint reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 102(1):143–155, 1998.

- [JD97] Peter Jonsson and Thomas Drakengren. A complete classification of tractability in RCC-5. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 6:211–221, 1997.
- [KM02] Ralf Küsters and Ralf Molitor. Approximating most specific concepts in description logics with existential restrictions. *AI Commun.*, 15(1):47–59, 2002.
- [KNR06] Viktor Kuncak, Huu Hai Nguyen, and Martin C. Rinard. Deciding boolean algebra with presburger arithmetic. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 36(3):213–239, 2006.
- [Kop89] S. Koppelberg. Projective boolean algebras. In *Handbook of Boolean Algebras*, volume 3, pages 741–773. North Holland, Amsterdam-New York-Oxford- Tokyo, 1989.
- [Kou01] M. Koubarakis. Tractable disjunctions of linear constraints: Basic results and applications to temporal reasoning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 266:311–339, 2001.
- [KR07] Viktor Kuncak and Martin C. Rinard. Towards efficient satisfiability checking for boolean algebra with presburger arithmetic. In *CADE*, pages 215–230, 2007.
- [KRH06] Markus Krötzsch, Sebastian Rudolph, and Pascal Hitzler. On the complexity of Horn description logics. In *OWLED*, 2006.
- [MO96] Kim Marriott and Martin Odersky. Negative Boolean constraints. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 160(1&2):365–380, 1996.
- [Sch78] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of STOC*, pages 216–226, 1978.
- [Sze86] Ágnes Szendrei. *Clones in universal Algebra*. Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures. Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1986.