

CSP FOR BINARY CONSERVATIVE RELATIONAL STRUCTURES

ALEXANDR KAZDA

ABSTRACT. We prove that whenever \mathbb{A} is a 3-conservative relational structure with only binary and unary relations, then the algebra of polymorphisms of \mathbb{A} either has no Taylor operation (i.e. $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is NP-complete), or it generates an $\text{SD}(\wedge)$ variety (i.e. $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ has bounded width).

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, the study of the complexity of the constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) has produced several major results due to universal algebraic methods (see e.g. [5], [13] and [3]).

In this paper, we continue in this direction and look at clones of polymorphisms of finite 3-conservative relational structures with relations of arity at most two (a generalization of conservative digraphs). We show that whenever such a structure admits a Taylor operation, its operational clone actually generates a meet semidistributive ($\text{SD}(\wedge)$) variety, so the corresponding CSP problem is solvable by local consistency checking (also known as the bounded width algorithm). Since relational structures without Taylor operations yield NP-complete CSPs, we obtain a rather simple dichotomy of CSP complexity in this case.

There have been numerous papers published on the behavior of conservative relational structures. We have been mostly building on three previous results: First, Andrei Bulatov proved in [6] the dichotomy of CSP complexity for 3-conservative relational structures, for which Libor Barto recently offered a simpler proof in [2]. Meanwhile, Pavol Hell and Arash Rafiey obtained a combinatorial characterization of all tractable conservative digraphs [9], and have observed that all tractable digraphs must have bounded width.

2. PRELIMINARIES

A *relational structure* \mathbb{A} is any set A together with a family of *basic relations* $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i : i \in I\}$ where $R_i \subset A^{n_i}$. We will call the number n_i the *arity* of R_i . As usual, we will consider only finite structures (and finitary relations) in this paper.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 08A02, 03C05, 68R05.

Key words and phrases. Meet semidistributivity, clone, constraint satisfaction problem, weak near unanimity.

The author would like to thank Libor Barto for motivating him, and the reviewer for pointing out how the final part of the proof can be simplified. Supported by the Czech-Polish cooperation grant 7AMB13PL013 “General algebra and applications” and the GAČR project 13-01832S.

Let R be an m -ary relation and $f : A^n \rightarrow A$ an n -ary operation. We say that f *preserves* R if whenever we have elements $a_{ij} \in A$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1m}) &\in R, \\ (a_{21}, a_{22}, \dots, a_{2m}) &\in R, \\ &\vdots \\ (a_{n1}, a_{n2}, \dots, a_{nm}) &\in R, \end{aligned}$$

then we also have

$$(f(a_{11}, \dots, a_{n1}), \dots, f(a_{1m}, \dots, a_{nm})) \in R.$$

If \mathcal{R} is a set of relations, then we denote by $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{R})$ the set of all operations on A that preserve all $R \in \mathcal{R}$. On the other hand, if Γ is a set of operations on A , then we denote by $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ the set of all relations that are preserved by each operation $f \in \Gamma$.

One of the most important notions in CSP is the primitive positive definition. If we have relations R_1, \dots, R_k on A , then a relation S on A is *primitively positively defined* using R_1, \dots, R_k if there exists a logical formula defining S that uses only conjunction, existential quantification, symbols for variables, predicates R_1, \dots, R_k , and the symbol for equality “=”.

Observe that the set $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{R})$ is closed under composition and contains all the projections, therefore it is an *operational clone*. If $\mathbb{A} = (A, \mathcal{R})$ is a relational structure, then $\text{Inv}(\text{Pol}(\mathcal{R}))$ consists of precisely all the relations that can be primitively positively defined using the relations from \mathcal{R} (see the original works of Bodnarchuk [4] and Geiger [8], or the survey [14] for proof of this statement, as well as a more detailed discussion of the correspondence between Pol and Inv). We will call $\text{Inv}(\text{Pol}(\mathcal{R}))$ the *relational clone* of \mathbb{A} .

Given an algebra \mathbb{A} , an instance of the *constraint satisfaction problem* $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ consists of a set of variables V and a set of constraints \mathcal{C} where each constraint $C = (S, R)$ has a *scope* $S \subset V$ and a *relation* $R \subset A^S$ such that R (after a suitable renaming of variables) is either equality, or one of the basic relations of \mathbb{A} . A *solution* of this instance is any mapping $f : V \rightarrow A$ such that $f|_S \in R$ for each constraint $(S, R) \in \mathcal{C}$. In this paper we will only consider CSP instances where all relations have scopes of size at most two.

We can draw a CSP instance as a constraint network (also known as potato diagram): For each variable x we have the potato $B_x \subset A$ equal to the intersection of all the unary constraints on x . For each constraint $(\{x, y\}, R)$ of arity two we draw lines from elements of B_x to elements of B_y that correspond to the relation R .

To solve the instance now means to choose in each potato B_x a vertex b_x so that whenever $C = (\{x, y\}, R)$ is a constraint, there is a line in R from b_x to b_y (i.e. $(b_x, b_y) \in R$). See Figure 1 for an example.

If we mark some variables in the CSP instance I as free variables and print out values of these variables in all solutions of I , we obtain a relation on A . It turns out that there is a straightforward correspondence between CSP instances with free variables and primitive positive definitions. See Figure 2 for an example of such a correspondence.




FIGURE 1. An example of a potato diagram with three variables x, y, z and three binary relations (instance solution in bold)




FIGURE 2. Constraint network with the free variables x, y which defines the relation $S = \{(x, y) : \exists s, (s) \in R_1 \wedge (x, s) \in R_2 \wedge (y, s) \in R_2\}$.

Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra. We say that the variety generated by \mathbf{A} is *congruence meet semidistributive* ($\text{SD}(\wedge)$ for short) if for any algebra \mathbf{B} in the variety generated by \mathbf{A} and any congruences α, β, γ in \mathbf{B} we have

$$\alpha \wedge \beta = \alpha \wedge \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge (\beta \vee \gamma) = \alpha \wedge \beta.$$

Given \mathbf{A} , if the (2,3)-consistency checking algorithm as defined in [3] always returns a correct answer to any instance of $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ (i.e. if there are no false positives), we say that \mathbf{A} has *bounded width*. The following result shows a deep connection between bounded width and congruence meet semidistributivity.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathbf{A} be a finite relational structure containing all the one-element unary relations (constants). Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{A} has bounded width,
- (2) the variety generated by $(A, \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}))$ is congruence meet semidistributive,
- (3) $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ contains ternary and quaternary weak near unanimity (WNU) operations with the same polymer, i.e. there exist idempotent $u, v \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ such that for all $x, y \in A$ we have:

$$u(x, x, y) = u(x, y, x) = u(y, x, x) = v(y, x, x, x) = \cdots = v(x, x, x, y)$$

Proof. For “1 \Rightarrow 3”, see the upcoming survey [12], while “2 \Rightarrow 1” is the main result of [3].

To prove “3 \Rightarrow 2”, it is enough to observe that the equations for idempotent ternary and quaternary WNU operations with the same polymer fail in any non-trivial variety of modules. Therefore, as shown in [10, Theorem 9.10], the third condition implies congruence meet semidistributivity (this is true even in the case of infinite algebras, as shown in [11]). \square

We say that an n -ary operation t is *Taylor* if for every $1 \leq k \leq n$ the operation t satisfies some equation of the form

$$t(u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, x, u_{k+1}, \dots, u_n) \approx t(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, y, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_n),$$

where the (different) variables x and y are both on the k -th place (this is the weakest set of equations that no projection can satisfy). An algebra \mathbf{A} (resp. a relational structure \mathbb{A}) admits a Taylor operation if there is a Taylor operation in the operational clone of \mathbf{A} (resp. in $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$). If \mathbb{A} is a relational structure with all the constants (one-element unary relations) that does not admit any Taylor operation, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is known to be NP-complete (see [5, Corollary 7.3] together with [10, Lemma 9.4]).

A relational structure \mathbb{A} is *conservative* if \mathbb{A} contains all the possible unary relations on A . We will call a relational structure \mathbb{A} *3-conservative* if \mathbb{A} contains all the one, two and three-element unary relations.

3. RED, YELLOW, AND BLUE PAIRS

Assume that \mathbb{A} is a 3-conservative relational structure that admits a Taylor operation. Then for every pair of vertices $a, b \in A$ there must exist a polymorphism of \mathbb{A} that, when restricted to $\{a, b\}$, is a semilattice, majority, or minority. If there was a pair without such a polymorphism, then a result by Schaefer [15] implies that all the operations in $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ restricted to $\{a, b\}$ are projections, and so $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ can not contain a Taylor term.

We will color each pair $\{a, b\} \subset A$ as follows:

- (1) If there exists $f \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ semilattice on $\{a, b\}$, we color $\{a, b\}$ *red*, else
- (2) if there exists $g \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ majority on $\{a, b\}$, we color $\{a, b\}$ *yellow*, else
- (3) if there exists $h \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ minority operation on $\{a, b\}$, we color $\{a, b\}$ *blue*.

In [6], Andrei Bulatov proves the Three Operations Proposition (we change the notation to be compatible with ours and omit the last part of the proposition which we will not need):

Theorem 2. *Let \mathbb{A} be a 3-conservative relational structure. There are polymorphisms $f(x, y)$, $g(x, y, z)$, and $h(x, y, z)$ of \mathbb{A} such that for every two-element subset $B \subset A$:*

- $f|_B$ is a semilattice operation whenever B is red, and $f|_B(x, y) = x$ otherwise,
- $g|_B$ is a majority operation if B is yellow; $g|_B(x, y, z) = x$ if B is blue, and $g|_B(x, y, z) = f|_B(f|_B(x, y), z)$ if B is red
- $h|_B$ is a minority operation if B is blue; $g|_B(x, y, z) = x$ if B is yellow, and $g|_B(x, y, z) = f|_B(f|_B(x, y), z)$ if B is red.

We omit the proof of the theorem here, but we note that it turns out that the operations f , g , and h can be obtained in a straightforward way by patiently composing terms (also, one actually does not need the full power of 3-conservativity here; 2-conservativity would suffice).

Corollary 3. *If \mathbb{A} is such that all its pairs are red or yellow, then \mathbb{A} has bounded width since the operations*

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

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

are a pair of ternary and quaternary WNUs with the same polymer. If x, y are red then $u(x, x, y) = v(x, x, x, y) = f(x, y)$, and if x, y are yellow, then $u(x, x, y) = v(x, x, x, y) = x$.

By Theorem 1, it is enough to show that if $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is not NP-complete, then \mathbb{A} does not have any blue pair of vertices.

We could end our paper at this point and refer the reader to the article [9] which, among other things, shows by combinatorial methods that if G is a conservative digraph and $\text{CSP}(G)$ is not NP-complete, then all pairs of vertices of G are either yellow or red. However, we would like to present a short algebraic proof of this statement and generalize it beyond digraphs.

4. MAIN PROOF

We proceed by contradiction. Let us for the remainder of this section fix a 3-conservative relational structure \mathbb{A} (with unary and binary relations only) that admits a Taylor term, yet there exists a blue pair $\{a, b\} \subset A$.

Proposition 4. *The relational clone of \mathbb{A} contains the relation*

$$R = \{(b, b, b), (a, a, b), (a, b, a), (b, a, a)\}.$$

Proof. Consider the ternary relation

$$R = \{(t(a, a, b), t(a, b, a), t(b, a, a)) : t \in \text{Pol}_3(\mathbb{A})\},$$

where $\text{Pol}_3(\mathbb{A})$ denotes all the ternary polymorphisms of \mathbb{A} . It is easy to see that the relation R lies in $\text{Inv}(\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}))$. Since the projections π_1, π_2, π_3 , and the minority h belong to $\text{Pol}_3(\mathbb{A})$, substituting these polymorphisms for t yields that (a, a, b) , (a, b, a) , (b, a, a) , and (b, b, b) lie in R .

Since $\{a, b\} \leq \mathbf{A}$, we have $R \subset \{a, b\}^3$. Assume now that R contains more than the four elements given above. If $(a, a, a) \in R$, then there exists $t \in \text{Pol}_3(\mathbb{A})$ that acts as a majority on $\{a, b\}$, and a, b should have been yellow. If $(b, b, a) \in R$, then there exists some t such that

$$t(a, a, b) = t(a, b, a) = b$$

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

Since $\{a, b\}$ is not red, $t(b, b, a) = t(b, a, b) = a$ and $t(a, b, b) = b$ (otherwise one of $t(x, x, y)$, $t(x, y, x)$, or $t(y, x, x)$ would be a semilattice operation). But then $f(x, y, z) = h(t(x, y, z), t(y, z, x), t(z, x, y))$ is a majority operation on $\{a, b\}$, a contradiction.

We can handle the cases $(b, a, b), (a, b, b) \in R$ in a similar fashion. \square

If (x, y, z) is a triple of free variables of the CSP instance I and s is a solution of I , then we say that s realizes the triple $(c, d, e) \in A^3$ if $s(x) = c$, $s(y) = d$, and $s(z) = e$. We say that I realizes some triple of elements if there exists a solution s of I that realizes this triple.

Since R lies in the relational clone of \mathbb{A} , it follows that R lies in the relational clone of the structure $\overline{\mathbb{A}}$ obtained from \mathbb{A} by adding all the unary and binary relations in the relational clone of \mathbb{A} as basic relations. (We will need to use these relations to make our induction work.) Hence, there is a CSP($\overline{\mathbb{A}}$) instance I and three variables x, y, z such that I with free variables x, y, z realizes precisely all the triples in R . Let $\{B_j : j \in J\}$ be the potatoes in the constraint network of I . Choose I so that the sum of the sizes of its potatoes is minimal among all possible CSP($\overline{\mathbb{A}}$) instances realizing R .

Observe that if s_1, s_2, s_3 are solutions of I and p is a ternary operation preserving all the relations used in I , then $p(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ is also a solution of I .

Observation 5. *For every $j \in J$, we have $|B_j|$ equal to 2 or 3.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the potatoes for x, y , and z are all equal to $\{a, b\}$.

Assume that there is a potato B_j with at least four distinct elements. Let s_{aab}, s_{aba} , and s_{baa} be solutions of I realizing the triples (a, a, b) , (a, b, a) , and (b, a, a) .

Now let $B'_j = \{s_{aab}(j), s_{aba}(j), s_{baa}(j)\}$. If we replace B_j by B'_j (using a unary constraint), we get a smaller instance I' which keeps the solutions s_{aab}, s_{aba} and s_{baa} . We know that $\overline{\mathbb{A}}$ has a polymorphism h which is the minority on $\{a, b\}$. Therefore, $h(s_{aab}, s_{aba}, s_{baa})$ is a solution of I' that realizes the triple (b, b, b) . The instance I' then realizes precisely all the elements of R , a contradiction with the minimality of I .

If some B_j was a singleton, we could simply remove the variable j from I . The potatoes that were connected with B_j by binary constraints might need to become smaller, but that is easy to achieve using unary constraints. We would obtain in this way a smaller instance that still realizes R . \square

Observation 6. *The pair $\{c, d\}$ is blue for every distinct $c, d \in B_j$, $j \in J$*

Proof. Assume first that $\{c, d\}$ is red. Let without loss of generality $f(c, d) = d$, where f is the semilattice-like polymorphism from Theorem 2. We know that there exists a solution s of I such that $s(j) = d$ (otherwise, we could just delete d from B_j). If now r is a solution such that $r(j) = c$, then $f(r, s)$ is also a solution of I , and $f(r, s)(j) = d$. What is more, since $f = \pi_1$ on $\{a, b\}$, the solution $f(r, s)$ realizes the same triple as r . Therefore, we can remove c from B_j without losing anything in R .

The situation for $\{c, d\}$ yellow is similar. Again, let s, r be solutions such that $s(j) = d$ and $r(j) = c$. Then $g(r, s, s)$ is a solution that realizes the same triple as r and satisfies $g(r, s, s)(j) = d$. We can thus eliminate c from B_j . \square




FIGURE 3. Proving Observation 7

We note that one of the main ingredients in the above proof was the fact that the algebra $\{d\}$ absorbs $\{c, d\}$ in the sense of [3].

Observation 7. *For every $j \in J$, we have $|B_j| = 2$.*

Proof. Assume that we have a j such that $B_j = \{c, d, e\}$. As in the proof of Observation 5, let $s_{aab}, s_{aba}, s_{baa}$ be some solutions of I realizing (a, a, b) , (a, b, a) , (b, a, a) .

If $\{s_{aab}(j), s_{aba}(j), s_{baa}(j)\} \neq B_j$, then we can make B_j (and therefore I) smaller like in the proof of Observation 5. Without loss of generality assume that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{baa}(j) &= c, \\ s_{aba}(j) &= d, \\ s_{aab}(j) &= e, \\ s_{bbb}(j) &= c. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the solution $r = h(s_{baa}, s_{aba}, s_{bbb})$ where h again comes from Theorem 2. Since all the pairs in B_j are blue, r is a realization of (a, a, b) such that $r(j) = h(c, d, c) = d$. This means that we can safely delete e from B_j and again get a smaller instance that realizes R . \square

Let us put together what we know about I : We have two-element potatoes everywhere, connected by binary constraints. Now observe that every binary relation on a two element set is invariant under the majority map m . Therefore, I must realize the triple

$$m((b, a, a), (a, b, a), (a, a, b)) = (a, a, a),$$

a contradiction.

We state our result as a theorem:

Theorem 8. *If \mathbb{A} is a finite 3-conservative relational structure that admits a Taylor term and all of its basic relations are binary or unary, then the variety generated by $(A, \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}))$ is $\text{SD}(\wedge)$.*

Translating our result to the CSP complexity setting, we obtain:

Corollary 9 (Dichotomy for 3-conservative CSPs with binary relations). *If $\mathbb{A} = (A, R_1, \dots, R_k)$ is a finite 3-conservative relational structure that admits a Taylor*

term and all of its basic relations are binary or unary, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ has bounded width. If \mathbb{A} does not admit a Taylor polymorphism, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is NP-complete.

Note, however, that our result can not be generalized to relational structures with ternary basic relations. For example the structure \mathbb{A} on $\{0, 1\}$ with all the unary relations together with the relation $S = \{(x, y, z) : x + y + z = 0 \pmod{2}\}$ has $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ consisting of all the idempotent linear mappings over \mathbb{Z}_2 , so $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ can not contain any quaternary WNU.

Our result is also false for 2-conservative relational structures with arity of all relations at most two. Let \mathbb{A} be the relational structure on $\{0, 1\}^2$ with all unary relations of size one and two, plus the three equivalence relations α , β , and γ . These three equivalences correspond to the following partitions of $\{0, 1\}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha \dots & \{\{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}, \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}\}, \\ \beta \dots & \{\{(0, 0), (0, 1)\}, \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}\}, \\ \gamma \dots & \{\{(0, 0), (1, 0)\}, \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ contains the idempotent Taylor term $p(x, y, z) = x + y + z$, where addition is taken componentwise and modulo 2 (i.e. like in \mathbb{Z}_2^2). However, the variety generated by $\mathbf{A} = (\{0, 1\}^2, \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}))$ is definitely not $\text{SD}(\wedge)$ since α, β, γ are congruences of \mathbf{A} such that $\alpha \wedge \beta = \alpha \wedge \gamma = 0_{\mathbf{A}}$, while $\alpha \wedge (\beta \vee \gamma) = \alpha$.

5. CLOSING REMARKS

It is remarkably difficult to obtain a digraph that would have a tractable CSP, yet it would not have bounded width (though such beasts do exist; see the original argument in [1], or the construction in [7]). We give a partial explanation for this phenomenon: such digraphs needs to admit some nonconservative binary or ternary operation, while avoiding ternary and quaternary WNUs.

As we have seen, our result about 3-conservative binary structures is quite tight. However, some generalizations might still be possible. At the moment, we do not know if our result holds for 2-conservative digraphs and if Theorem 8 holds when we drop the finiteness condition. We suspect that the answer to both questions will be negative, but the counterexamples might turn out to be illuminating.

REFERENCES

- [1] Atserias, A.: On digraph coloring problems and treewidth duality. *European Journal of Combinatorics* **29**(4), 796–820 (2008). DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2007.11.004>
- [2] Barto, L.: The dichotomy for conservative constraint satisfaction problems revisited. In: 26th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), pp. 301–310. IEEE, Washington (2011). DOI 10.1109/LICS.2011.25
- [3] Barto, L., Kozik, M.: Constraint satisfaction problems of bounded width. In: Proceedings of the 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS’09, pp. 595–603. IEEE, Atlanta (2009). DOI 10.1109/FOCS.2009.32
- [4] Bodnarchuk, V., Kaluzhnin, L., Kotov, V., Romov, B.: Galois theory for Post algebras. I. *Cybernetics* **5**(3), 243–252 (1969). DOI 10.1007/BF01070906. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01070906>
- [5] Bulatov, A., Jeavons, P., Krokhin, A.: Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **34**(3), 720–742 (2005). DOI 10.1137/S0097539700376676
- [6] Bulatov, A.A.: Complexity of conservative constraint satisfaction problems. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* **12**, 24:1–24:66 (2011). DOI 10.1145/1970398.1970400

- [7] Bulín, J., Delić, D., Jackson, M., Niven, T.: On the reduction of the CSP dichotomy conjecture to digraphs. In: C. Schulte (ed.) *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8124, pp. 184–199. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2013). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-40627-0_17. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40627-0_17
 - [8] Geiger, D.: Closed systems of functions and predicates. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*. **27**(1), 95–100 (1968)
 - [9] Hell, P., Rafiey, A.: The dichotomy of list homomorphisms for digraphs. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pp. 1703–1713. SIAM (2011)
 - [10] Hobby, D., McKenzie, R.: *The Structure of Finite Algebras*, chap. 9. American Mathematical Society (1988)
 - [11] Kearnes, K.A., Kiss, E.W.: The shape of congruence lattices. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* **222** (2013). DOI 10.1090/S0065-9266-2012-00667-8
 - [12] Kozik, M., Krokhin, A., Valeriote, M., Willard, R.: Characterizations of several Maltsev conditions (manuscript)
 - [13] Larose, B., Tesson, P.: Universal algebra and hardness results for constraint satisfaction problems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **410**(18), 1629–1647 (2009). DOI 10.1016/j.tcs.2008.12.048
 - [14] Pöschel, R.: A general Galois theory for operations and relations and concrete characterization of related algebraic structures, *Report*, vol. R-01/80. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Institut für Mathematik u. Mechanik, Berlin (1980)
 - [15] Schaefer, T.J.: The complexity of satisfiability problems. In: *Proceedings of the tenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '78*, pp. 216–226. ACM, New York (1978). DOI 10.1145/800133.804350
- E-mail address:* alex.kazda@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 1326 STEVENSON CENTER, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA