

Three-element Min-Sol and Conservative Min-Cost-Hom

Hannes Uppman*

Department of Computer and Information Science,
Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
`hannes.uppman@liu.se`

Abstract. Thapper and Živný [STOC'13] recently classified the complexity of VCSP for all finite-valued constraint languages. However, the complexity of VCSPs for constraint languages that are not finite-valued remains poorly understood. In this paper we study the complexity of two such VCSPs, namely Min-Cost-Hom and Min-Sol. We obtain a full classification for the complexity of Min-Sol on domains that contain at most three elements and for the complexity of conservative Min-Cost-Hom on arbitrary finite domains. Our results answer a question raised by Takhanov [STACS'10, COCOON'10].

1 Introduction

The *valued constraint satisfaction problem* (VCSP) is a very broad framework in which many combinatorial optimisation problems can be expressed. A *valued constraint language* is a fixed set of cost functions from powers of a *finite domain*. An instance of VCSP for some give constraint language is then a weighted sum of cost functions from the language. The goal is to minimise this sum. On the two-element domain the complexity of the problem is known for every constraint language [4]. Also for every language containing all $\{0, 1\}$ -valued unary cost functions the complexity is known [15]. In a recent paper Thapper and Živný [21] managed to classify the complexity of VCSP for all finite-valued constraint languages. However, VCSPs with other types of languages remains poorly understood.

In this paper we study the complexity of the *(extended) minimum cost homomorphism problem* (Min-Cost-Hom) and the *minimum solution problem* (Min-Sol). These problems are both VCSPs with special types of languages in which all non-unary cost-functions are crisp ($\{0, \infty\}$ -valued). Despite this rather severe restriction the frameworks allow many natural combinatorial optimisation problems to be expressed. Min-Sol does e.g. generalise a large class of bounded integer linear programs. It may also be viewed as a generalisation of the problem Min-Ones [14] to larger domains. The problem Min-Cost-Hom is even more general and contains Min-Sol as a special case.

* Partially supported by the National Graduate School in Computer Science (CUGS), Sweden.

The problem Min-Sol has received a fair bit of attention in the literature and has e.g. had its complexity fully classified for all graphs of size three [13] and for all so-called homogeneous languages [9]. For more information about Min-Sol see [11] and the references therein. The “unextended version” of Min-Cost-Hom was introduced in [6] motivated by a problem in defence logistics. It was studied in a series of papers before it was completely solved in [18]. The more general version of the problem which we are interested in was introduced in [19].¹

Methods and Results. We obtain a full classification of the complexity of Min-Sol on domains that contain at most three elements. The tractable cases are given by languages that can be solved by a certain linear programming formulation [20] and a new class that is inspired by, and generalises, languages described in [18,19]. A precise classification is given by Theorem 16. For conservative Min-Cost-Hom (i.e. Min-Cost-Hom with languages containing all unary crisp cost functions) an almost complete classification (for arbitrary finite domains) was obtained by Takhanov [19]. We are able to remove the extra conditions needed in [19] and provide a full classification for this problem. This answers a question raised in [18,19]. The main mathematical tools used throughout the paper are from the so-called algebraic approach, see e.g. [2,7], and its extensions to optimisation problems [3,5]. Following [21] we also make use of Motzkin’s Transposition Theorem from the theory of linear equations.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 contains needed concepts and results from the literature and Sect. 3 holds the description of our results. Proofs of theorems in Sect. 3 are given in Sects. 4, 5 and 6. One of our theorems is proved with the help of a fairly lengthy case analysis. The proofs of this result and two supporting lemmas are collected in three appendices.

2 Preliminaries

For a set Γ of finitary relations on a finite set D (the domain), and a finite set Δ (referred to as the domain valuations) of functions $D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, we define $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ as the following optimisation problem.

Instance: A triple (V, C, w) where

- V is a set of variables,
- C is a set of Γ -allowed constraints, i.e. a set of pairs (s, R) where the constraint-scope s is a tuple of variables, and the constraint-relation R is a member of Γ of the same arity as s , and
- w is a weight function $V \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$.

Solution: A function $\varphi : V \rightarrow D$ s.t. for every $(s, R) \in C$ it holds that $\varphi(s) \in R$, where φ is applied component-wise.

Measure: The measure of a solution φ is $m(\varphi) = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta} w(v, \nu) \nu(\varphi(v))$.

¹ The definition in [19] is slightly more restrictive than the one we use. Also the notation differs; what we denote $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is in [19] referred to as $\text{MinHom}_{\Delta}(\Gamma)$.

The objective is to find a solution φ that minimises $m(\varphi)$.

The problem $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$, which we define only for injective functions $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$, is the problem $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \{\nu\})$. The “regular” *constraint satisfaction problem* (CSP) can also be defined through Min-Cost-Hom ; an instance of $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is an instance of $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \emptyset)$, and the objective is to determine if any solution exists.

We will call the pair (Γ, Δ) a *language* (or a Min-Cost-Hom -language). The language $(\Gamma, \{\nu\})$ is written (Γ, ν) . For an instance I we use $\text{Opt}(I)$ for the measure of an optimal solution (defined only if a solution exists), $\text{Sol}(I)$ denotes the set of all solutions and $\text{Optsol}(I)$ the set of all optimal solutions. We define $0\infty = \infty 0 = 0$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, $x \leq \infty$ and $x + \infty = \infty + x = \infty$. The i :th projection operation will be denoted pr_i . We define $\binom{A}{2} = \{\{x, y\} \subseteq A : x \neq y\}$. $\mathcal{O}_D^{(m)}$ is used for the set of all m -ary operations on D . For binary operations f, g and h we define \bar{f} through $\bar{f}(x, y) = f(y, x)$ and $f[g, h]$ through $f[g, h](x, y) = f(g(x, y), h(x, y))$. A k -ary operation f on D is called *conservative* if $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ for every $x_1, \dots, x_k \in D$. A ternary operation m on D is called *arithmetical* on $B \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$ if for every $\{a, b\} \in B$ the function m satisfies $m(a, b, b) = m(a, b, a) = m(b, b, a) = a$.

Polymorphisms. Let (Γ, Δ) be a language on the domain D . By Γ^c we denote Γ enriched with all constants, i.e. $\Gamma \cup \{\{c\} : c \in D\}$. An operation $f : D^m \rightarrow D$ is called a *polymorphism* of Γ if for every $R \in \Gamma$ and every sequence $t^1, \dots, t^m \in R$ it holds that $f(t^1, \dots, t^m) \in R$ where f is applied component-wise. The set of all polymorphisms of Γ is denoted $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$. A function $\omega : \mathcal{O}_D^{(k)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ is a k -ary *fractional polymorphism* [3] of (Γ, Δ) if

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(k)}} \omega(g) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(k)}} \omega(g) \nu(g(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \nu(x_i)$$

holds for every $\nu \in \Delta$ and every $x_1, \dots, x_k \in D$, and $\omega(g) = 0$ if $g \notin \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$. For a k -ary fractional polymorphism ω we let $\text{supp}(\omega) = \{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(k)} : \omega(g) > 0\}$. The set of all fractional polymorphisms of (Γ, Δ) is denoted $\text{fPol}(\Gamma, \Delta)$.

Min-cores. The language (Γ, Δ) is called a *min-core* [12] if there is no non-surjective unary $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ for which $\nu(f(x)) \leq \nu(x)$ holds for every $x \in D$ and $\nu \in \Delta$. The language (Γ', Δ') is a min-core of (Γ, Δ) if (Γ', Δ') is a min-core and $(\Gamma, \Delta)|_{f(D)} = (\Gamma', \Delta')$ for some unary $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $\nu(f(x)) \leq \nu(x)$ for every $x \in D$ and $\nu \in \Delta$. The reason why we care about min-cores is the following result [12].²

Theorem 1. *Let (Γ', Δ') be a min-core of (Γ, Δ) . If $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma', \Delta')$ is NP-hard (in PO), then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP-hard (in PO).*

Expressive Power and Polynomial-time Reductions. A relation R is said to be *weighted pp-definable* in (Γ, Δ) if there is an instance $I = (V, C, w)$ of

² The results in [12] are stated for a slightly more restricted problem than ours. It is however not hard to see that the results transfer to our setting.

Min-Cost-Hom(Γ, Δ) s.t. $R = \{(\varphi(v_1), \dots, \varphi(v_n)) : \varphi \in \text{OptSol}(I)\}$ for some $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$. We use $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$ to denote the set of all relations that is weighted pp-definable in (Γ, Δ) . Similarly R is said to be *pp-definable* in Γ if there is an instance $I = (V, C)$ of CSP(Γ) s.t. $R = \{(\varphi(v_1), \dots, \varphi(v_n)) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I)\}$ for some $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$. $\langle \Gamma \rangle$ is used to denote the set of all relations that are pp-definable in Γ . A cost function $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ is called *expressible* in (Γ, Δ) if there is an instance $I = (V, C, w)$ of Min-Cost-Hom(Γ, Δ) and $v \in V$ s.t. $\nu(x) = \min\{m(\varphi) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I), \varphi(v) = x\}$ if $\nu(x) < \infty$ and $\min\{m(\varphi) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I), \varphi(v) = x\} = \infty$ or $\{\varphi \in \text{Sol}(I) : \varphi(v) = x\} = \emptyset$ if $\nu(x) = \infty$. The set of all cost functions expressible in (Γ, Δ) is denoted $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$. What makes all these closure operators interesting is the following result, see e.g. [3,4,10].

Theorem 2. *Let $\Gamma' \subseteq \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$ and $\Delta' \subseteq \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ be finite sets. Then, Min-Cost-Hom(Γ', Δ') is polynomial-time reducible to Min-Cost-Hom(Γ, Δ).*

This of course also means that if $\Gamma' \subseteq \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$ is finite, then Min-Cost-Hom($\Gamma' \cup \Gamma, \Delta$) is polynomial-time reducible to Min-Cost-Hom(Γ, Δ).

We will often use bipartite-graph-representations for relations, e.g. $\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \times \\ b \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ \\ c \end{smallmatrix} = \{(a, b), (a, c), (b, b)\}$. Finally we recall a classic result, see e.g. [17, p. 94], about systems of linear equations that will be of great assistance.

Theorem 3 (Motzkin's Transposition Theorem). *For any $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{Q}^{p \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ and $c \in \mathbb{Q}^p$, exactly one of the following holds:*

- $Ax \leq b$, $Bx < c$ for some $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$
- $A^T y + B^T z = 0$ and $(b^T y + c^T z < 0$ or $b^T y + c^T z = 0$ and $z \neq 0)$ for some $y \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^m$ and $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^p$

3 Contributions

We let D denote the finite domain over which the language (Γ, Δ) is defined. To describe our results we need to introduce some definitions.

Definition 4 ((a, b)-dominating). *Let $a, b \in D$. A binary fractional polymorphism ω of (Γ, Δ) is called (a, b)-dominating if*

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) \delta_{a, g(a, b)} \geq \frac{1}{2} > \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) \delta_{b, g(a, b)}.$$

The following is a generalisation of the concept of weak tournament pairs that was introduced in [19].

Definition 5 (generalised weak tournament pair). *Let $A \subseteq B \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$. A language (Γ, Δ) is said to admit a generalised weak tournament pair on (A, B) if there is a pair of binary functions $f_1, f_2 \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. the following holds.*

³ Here δ denotes the Kronecker delta function, i.e. $\delta_{i,j} = 1$ if $i = j$, otherwise $\delta_{i,j} = 0$.

- For every $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D}{2}$;
 1. if $\{a, b\} \notin B$ then $f_1|_{\{a,b\}}$ and $f_2|_{\{a,b\}}$ are projections, and
 2. if $\{a, b\} \in B \setminus A$ then $f_1|_{\{a,b\}}$ and $f_2|_{\{a,b\}}$ are different idempotent, conservative and commutative operations.
- For any $U \subseteq D$ s.t. $U \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$ either no $\{x, y\} \in A$ satisfies $\{x, y\} \subseteq U$, or there is $\{a, b\} \in A$ s.t. $U \setminus \{b\} \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$ and (Γ, Δ) admits an (a, b) -dominating binary fractional polymorphism.

The following definition is inspired by notation used in [18].

Definition 6. For $a, b \in D$ we define $\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \uparrow \\ b \end{smallmatrix} = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} : f(a, b) = f(b, a) = a\}$ and $\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \downarrow \\ b \end{smallmatrix} = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} : f(a, b) = f(b, a) = b\}$. For $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m \in D$ and $\diamond_1, \dots, \diamond_m \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ we define $\begin{smallmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_m \\ \diamond_1 & \diamond_2 & \dots & \diamond_m \end{smallmatrix} = \begin{smallmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_m \\ \diamond_1 & \diamond_2 & \dots & \diamond_m \end{smallmatrix} \cap \begin{smallmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_m \\ \diamond_1 & \diamond_2 & \dots & \diamond_m \end{smallmatrix} \cap \dots \cap \begin{smallmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_m \\ \diamond_1 & \diamond_2 & \dots & \diamond_m \end{smallmatrix}$, e.g. $\begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \uparrow \downarrow \\ b & d \end{smallmatrix} = \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \uparrow \\ b & d \end{smallmatrix} \cap \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \downarrow \\ b & d \end{smallmatrix}$.

We can now give names to some classes of languages that will be important.

Definition 7. We say that a language (Γ, Δ) over D is of type

- **GWTP** (generalised weak tournament pair) if there is $A, B \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$ s.t. (Γ, Δ) admits a generalised weak tournament pair on (A, B) and, $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ contains an idempotent ternary function m that is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$ and satisfies $m(x, y, z) \in \{x, y, z\}$ for every $x, y, z \in D$ s.t. $|\{x, y, z\}| = 3$,
- **BSM** (bisubmodular, see e.g. [4]) if $D = \{a, b, c\}$, $2\nu(b) \leq \nu(a) + \nu(c)$ for every $\nu \in \Delta$, and there are binary idempotent commutative operations $\sqcap, \sqcup \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $\sqcap \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \downarrow \downarrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}, \sqcup \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \uparrow \uparrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}$ and $a \sqcup c = a \sqcap c = b$,
- **GMC** (generalised min-closed, see [9]) if there is $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. for every $\nu \in \Delta$ the following is true. For all $a, b \in D$ s.t. $a \neq b$ it holds that if $\nu(f(a, b)) \geq \max(\nu(a), \nu(b))$, then $\nu(f(b, a)) < \min(\nu(a), \nu(b))$, and for all $a \in D$ it holds that $\nu(f(a, a)) \leq \nu(a)$.

Solving instances of Min-Cost-Hom expressed in languages of type **GWTP**, **BSM** and **GMC** can be done in polynomial time. This is demonstrated by the following results. We note that the first result describes a new tractable class while the following two are known cases.⁴ A proof of Theorem 8 is given in Sect. 4.

Theorem 8. If there is $S \subseteq 2^D$ s.t. $\text{CSP}(\Gamma^c \cup S)$ is in P and $(\Gamma \cup S, \Delta)$ is of type **GWTP**, then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma \cup S, \Delta)$ (and therefore also $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$) is in PO .

Theorem 9 ([20, Corollary 6.1]). If (Γ, Δ) is of type **BSM**, then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is in PO .

Theorem 10 ([9, Theorem 5.10]). If (Γ, Δ) is of type **GMC**, then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is in PO .

⁴ [9, Theorem 5.10] is stated for a slightly more restricted problem than ours. It is however not hard to see that the results transfer to our setting.

Instances expressed using languages of type **BSM** can, as proved in [20], be solved through a certain linear programming formulation. We note that this also holds for languages of type **GMC**. It is known that any language of type **GMC** must admit a min-set-function [16, Theorem 5.18]. From this it follows that also a symmetric fractional polymorphism of every arity must be admitted, and the claim follows from [20].

The tractability of languages of type **GWTP** on the other hand can not directly be explained by the results in [20]. It can e.g. be checked that the language $(\{a \times_a^b\}, \{a \mapsto 0, b \mapsto 1\})$ is of type **GWTP**. This language does not admit any symmetric fractional polymorphism and is therefore not covered by the results in [20].

Often (as e.g. demonstrated by Theorem 8) the fact that a language admits an (a, b) -dominating binary fractional polymorphism can be useful for tractability arguments. Also the converse fact, that a language does not admit such a fractional polymorphism, can have useful consequences. An example of this is the following proposition, which will be used in the proofs of our main results.

Proposition 11. *Let $a, b \in D$, $a \neq b$. If (Γ, Δ) does not admit a binary fractional polymorphism that is (a, b) -dominating, then $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ contains a unary function ν that satisfies $\infty > \nu(a) > \nu(b)$.*

The proof is given in Sect. 5.

3.1 Conservative Languages

We call (Γ, Δ) *conservative* if $2^D \subseteq \Gamma$, i.e. if the crisp language contains all unary relations. The complexity of $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ for conservative languages (Γ, Δ) was classified in [19] under the restriction that Δ contains only finite-valued functions, and that for each pair $a, b \in D$ there exists some $\nu \in \Delta$ s.t. either $\nu(a) < \nu(b)$ or $\nu(a) > \nu(b)$. It was posted in [18,19] as an open problem to classify the complexity of the problem also without restrictions on Δ . The following theorem does just that.

Theorem 12. *Let (Γ, Δ) be a conservative language on a finite domain. If $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P and (Γ, Δ) is of type **GWTP**, then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is in PO , otherwise $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP -hard.*

We prove the theorem in Sect. 6.

Kolmogorov and Živný [15] completely classified the complexity of conservative VCSPs. Since every Min-Cost-Hom can be stated as a VCSP, one might think that the classification provided here is implied by the results in [15]. This is not the case. A VCSP-language is called conservative if it contains all unary $\{0, 1\}$ -valued cost functions. The conservative Min-Cost-Hom -languages on the other hand correspond to VCSP-languages that contain every unary $\{0, \infty\}$ -valued cost function. (Note however that far from all VCSP-languages that contain every unary $\{0, \infty\}$ -valued cost function correspond to a Min-Cost-Hom -language.)

3.2 Min-Sol on the Three-element Domain

In this section we fully classify the complexity of Min-Sol on the three-element domain.

Theorem 13. *Let (Γ, ν) be a language over a three-element domain D and $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be injective. If (Γ, ν) is a min-core and there is no $S \subseteq 2^D$ s.t. $(\Gamma \cup S, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP**, **BSM** or **GMC**, then $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is NP-hard.*

The following two lemmas provide key assistance in the proof of Theorem 13. The first of the two is a variation of Lemma 3.5 in [21]. The lemmas are proved in Sects. B and C.

Lemma 14. *If $f \times_b^a \notin \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$, then for every $\sigma \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ with $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $\{f(a, b), f(b, a)\} \neq \{a, b\}$ and $\sigma(f(a, b)) + \sigma(f(b, a)) \leq \sigma(a) + \sigma(b)$.*

Lemma 15. *Let (Γ, ν) be a language over a three-element domain D and $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be injective. If (Γ, ν) is a min-core and not of type **GMC**, then $\Gamma^c \subseteq \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w$.*

The proof of Theorem 13 contains a somewhat lengthy case-analysis and is deferred to Sect. A. The case-analysis splits the proof into cases depending on what unary relations that are weighted pp-definable in (Γ, ν) . In each case it is essentially shown that, unless a two-element subset $\{x, y\} \subseteq D$ is definable s.t. $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma \cup \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w \cap \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}, \nu)|_{\{x, y\}}$ is NP-hard, in which case also $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is NP-hard, the language $(\Gamma \cup S, \nu)$ is of type **GMC**, **BSM** or **GWTP** for some $S \subseteq 2^D$.

If $(\Gamma \cup S, \nu)$ is a min-core and of type **GWTP** (and not of type **GMC**), then from Lemma 15 it follows that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma^c \cup S) \leq_p \text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma^c \cup S, \nu) \leq_p \text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma \cup S, \nu)$. Since $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is a restricted variant of $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$, we therefore, from Theorems 8, 9 10 and 13, obtain the following.

Theorem 16. *Let (Γ, ν) be a language over a three-element domain D and $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be injective. $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is in PO if (Γ, ν) has a min-core (Γ', ν') that is of type **BSM** or **GMC**, or if there is $S \subseteq 2^D$ s.t. $\text{CSP}((\Gamma')^c \cup S)$ is in P and $(\Gamma' \cup S, \nu')$ is of type **GWTP**. Otherwise $\text{Min-Sol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is NP-hard.*

The following provides an example of use of the classification. Jonsson, Nordh and Thapper [13] classified the complexity of $\text{Min-Sol}(\{R\}, \nu)$ for all valuations ν and binary symmetric relations R (i.e. graphs) on the three-element domain. One relation stood out among the others, namely: $H_5 = \{(a, c), (c, a), (b, b), (b, c), (c, b), (c, c)\}$, where $\nu(a) < \nu(b) < \nu(c)$. If $\nu(a) + \nu(c) < 2\nu(b)$ then $\text{pr}_1(\arg \min_{(x, y) \in H_5} (\nu(x) + \nu(y))) = \{a, c\}$ which means that the relation $f \times_a^c \in \langle \{H_5\}, \nu \rangle_w$, and $\text{Min-Sol}(\{H_5\}, \nu)$ is NP-hard by a reduction from the maximum independent set problem. Otherwise the problem is in PO. This was determined in [13] by linking the problem with, and generalising algorithms for, the critical independent set problem [22]. We note that $\sqcup, \sqcap \in \text{Pol}(\{H_5\})$, where \sqcup, \sqcap are commutative idempotent binary operations s.t. $\sqcap \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}$, $\sqcup \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}$ and $a \sqcap c = a \sqcup c = b$. This means that $(\{H_5\}, \nu)$ is of type **BSM**.

4 Proof of Theorem 8

Let $I = (V, C, w)$ be an instance of Min-Cost-Hom(Γ, Δ) with measure m . Since $\text{CSP}(\Gamma^c)$ is in P we can, in polynomial-time, compute the reduced domain $D_v = \{\varphi(v) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I)\}$ for every $v \in V$. Note that $D_v \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$.

Let f_1, f_2 be a generalised weak tournament pair on (A, B) . If there for some $v \in V$ is some $\{x, y\} \in A$ s.t. $\{x, y\} \subseteq D_v$, then we know that there is $\{a, b\} \in A$ so that $D_v \setminus \{b\} \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$ and (Γ, Δ) admits an (a, b) -dominating binary fractional polymorphism ω . Assume that φ_a and φ_b are s.t. $m(\varphi_a) = \min\{m(\varphi) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I), \varphi(v) = a\}$ and $m(\varphi_b) = \min\{m(\varphi) : \varphi \in \text{Sol}(I), \varphi(v) = b\}$.

Certainly $g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b) \in \text{Sol}(I)$ for every $g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$. Because $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) m(g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b)) &= \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) \sum_{x \in V, \nu \in \Delta} w(x, \nu) \nu(g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b)(x)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in V, \nu \in \Delta} w(x, \nu) \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) \nu(g(\varphi_a(x), \varphi_b(x))) \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in V, \nu \in \Delta} w(x, \nu) \frac{1}{2} (\nu(\varphi_a(x)) + \nu(\varphi_b(x))) = \frac{1}{2} (m(\varphi_a) + m(\varphi_b)). \end{aligned}$$

Since ω is (a, b) -dominating there are functions $\varrho, \sigma : \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ s.t. $\omega = \varrho + \sigma$, $\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \varrho(g) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \sigma(g) = \frac{1}{2}$, $g(a, b) = a$ for every $g \in \text{supp}(\varrho)$, and $f(a, b) \neq b$ for some $f \in \text{supp}(\sigma)$. This implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} m(\varphi_a) + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \sigma(g) m(g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b)) \leq \sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) m(g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b)),$$

so
$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} 2\sigma(g) m(g(\varphi_a, \varphi_b)) \leq m(\varphi_b),$$

which in turn (since $\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} 2\sigma(g) = 1$ and $f(a, b) \neq b$ for some $f \in \text{supp}(\sigma)$) implies that there is $\varphi^* \in \text{Sol}(I)$ s.t. $m(\varphi^*) \leq m(\varphi_b)$ and $\varphi^*(v) \neq b$. Hence b can be removed from D_v without increasing the measure of an optimal solution. To accomplish this the constraint $(v, D_v \setminus \{b\})$ is added.

We repeat this procedure until $\binom{D_v}{2} \cap A = \emptyset$ for every $v \in V$. Clearly this takes at most $|D| \cdot |V|$ iterations.

Let $f'_1 = f_1[f_1, \overline{f_1}]$ and $f'_2 = f_2[f_2, \overline{f_2}]$. Note that $f'_1|_{\{x, y\}}$ and $f'_2|_{\{x, y\}}$ are different conservative, idempotent and commutative operations if $\{x, y\} \in B \setminus A$ and projections if $\{x, y\} \in \binom{D}{2} \setminus B$. If $f_1|_{\{x, y\}} = \text{pr}_1$ for some $\{x, y\}$, then $f'_1|_{\{x, y\}} = f_1|_{\{x, y\}} = \text{pr}_1$, and if $f_1|_{\{x, y\}} = \text{pr}_2$, then $f'_1|_{\{x, y\}} = \overline{f_1}|_{\{x, y\}} = \overline{\text{pr}_2} = \text{pr}_1$. So $f'_1|_{\{x, y\}} = \text{pr}_1$ for every $\{x, y\} \in \binom{D}{2} \setminus B$. The same arguments apply also for f'_2 .

Clearly $f'_1|_{D_v}$ and $f'_2|_{D_v}$ are conservative operations for every $v \in V$. Let $g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ be a ternary idempotent operation that is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$. Define g' through $g'(x, y, z) = g(f'_1(x, f'_1(y, z)), f'_1(y, f'_1(x, z)), f'_1(z, f'_1(x, y)))$. Since

$f'_1 = \text{pr}_1$ on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$ also g' is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$. Since f'_1 is conservative, commutative and idempotent on $B \setminus A$ we have $f'_1(x, f'_1(x, y)) = f'_1(x, f'_1(y, x)) = f'_1(y, f'_1(x, x)) \in \{x, y\}$ for every $\{x, y\} \in B \setminus A$, so g' is conservative on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus A$. Note that $f'_1, f'_2, g' \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma^+)$ where $\Gamma^+ = \Gamma \cup \{S : S \subseteq D_v \text{ for some } v \in V\}$. This together with the fact that only a constant number of subsets of D exists means that the modified instance I is easily turned into an instance of the multi-sorted version of Min-Cost-Hom(Γ^+, ∇_D), where ∇_D is the set of all functions $D \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and is solvable in polynomial time [19, Theorem 23].

5 Proof of Proposition 11

For $\nu \in \Delta$ let $D_\nu = \{x \in D : \nu(x) < \infty\}$. Let $\Omega = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \cap \text{Pol}(\Gamma) : \nu(f(x, y)) < \infty \text{ for every } \nu \in \Delta \text{ and } x, y \in D_\nu\}$, $\Omega_1 = \{f \in \Omega : f(a, b) = a\}$, $\Omega_2 = \{f \in \Omega : f(a, b) = b\}$ and $\Omega_3 = \Omega \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$. The language (Γ, Δ) admits a binary fractional polymorphism that is (a, b) -dominating if the following system has a solution $u_g \in \mathbb{Q}$, $g \in \Omega$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{g \in \Omega} u_g \nu(g(x, y)) &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\nu(x) + \nu(y)) \text{ for } \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2, \quad -u_g \leq 0 \text{ for } g \in \Omega, \\
 \sum_{g \in \Omega} u_g &\leq 1, \quad -\sum_{g \in \Omega} u_g \leq -1, \quad -\sum_{g \in \Omega_1} u_g \leq -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{g \in \Omega_2} u_g < \frac{1}{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

If the system is unsatisfiable, then, by Theorem 3, there are $v_{\nu, (x, y)}$, o_g , w_1 , w_2 , w_3 , $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ for $\nu \in \Delta$, $(x, y) \in D_\nu^2$, $g \in \Omega$ s.t.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(g(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} - o_g + w_1 - w_2 - w_3 &= 0, \quad g \in \Omega_1, \\
 \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(g(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} - o_g + w_1 - w_2 + z &= 0, \quad g \in \Omega_2, \\
 \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(g(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} - o_g + w_1 - w_2 &= 0, \quad g \in \Omega_3,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \frac{1}{2}(\nu(x) + \nu(y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} + w_1 - w_2 - \frac{1}{2}w_3 + \frac{1}{2}z = \alpha,$$

where either $\alpha < 0$ or $\alpha = 0$ and $z > 0$. Hence, for every $g \in \Omega_1$ and $h \in \Omega_2$,

$$\sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} (\nu(x) + \nu(y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} + o_g + o_h = \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} (\nu(g(x, y)) + \nu(h(x, y))) v_{(x, y), \nu} + \alpha.$$

Note that since $\text{pr}_1 \in \Omega_1$ and $\text{pr}_2 \in \Omega_2$ we must have $\alpha = 0$, $o_{\text{pr}_1} = o_{\text{pr}_2} = 0$, and $z > 0$. This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{\substack{g \in \Omega_1 \\ \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2}} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(g(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} &= \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(\text{pr}_1(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} = -w_1 + w_2 + w_3 \\
 &> -w_1 + w_2 - z = \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(\text{pr}_2(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)} = \min_{\substack{g \in \Omega_2 \\ \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2}} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(g(x, y)) v_{\nu, (x, y)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Create an instance I of $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ with variables D^2 , and objective

$$m(\varphi) = \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} v_{\nu, (x,y)} \nu(\varphi(x, y)) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(\varphi(x, y)),$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen small enough so that $\varphi \in \arg \min_{\varphi' \in \Omega_1} m(\varphi')$ implies $\varphi \in \arg \min_{\varphi' \in \Omega_1} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} v_{\nu, (x,y)} \nu(\varphi(x, y))$. Such a number ε can always be found. Note that a solution φ to I with finite measure is a function $D^2 \rightarrow D$ s.t. $\nu(\varphi(x, y)) < \infty$ for every $\nu \in \Delta$ and $(x, y) \in D_\nu^2$.

Pick, for every $g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \setminus \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$, a relation $R_g \in \Gamma$ s.t. g does not preserve R_g . Add for each pair of tuples $t^1, t^2 \in R_g$ the constraint $((t_1^1, t_1^2), \dots, (t_{\text{ar}(R_g)}^1, t_{\text{ar}(R_g)}^2)), R_g$. This construction is essentially the second order indicator problem [8]. Now a solution to I is a binary polymorphism of Γ . Hence, if φ is a solution to I with finite measure, then $\varphi \in \Omega$. Clearly pr_1 and pr_2 satisfies all constraints and are solutions to I with finite measures. Let $\nu(x) = \min_{g \in \text{Sol}(I): g(a,b)=x} m(g)$. Note that $\nu \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ and $\infty > \nu(a) > \nu(b)$. This completes the proof.

6 Proof of Theorem 12

The proof follows the basic structure of the arguments given in [18]. A key ingredient of our proof will be the use of Theorem 8 and Proposition 11.

Let $\Gamma^+ = \Gamma \cup (2^D \cup 2^{D^2}) \cap \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$. Note that if (Γ^+, Δ) is of type **GWTP**, then so is also $(\Gamma \cup S, \Delta)$, for some $S \subseteq 2^D$. Since $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma^+, \Delta)$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ we therefore assume that $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Gamma$. We also assume $\Gamma^c \subseteq \Gamma$. Obviously $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$. In what follows we therefore assume that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in **P**.

Let $B \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$ be a minimal set s.t. all binary operations in $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ are projections on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$ and for every $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D}{2} \setminus B$ there is a ternary operation in $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ that is arithmetical on $\{\{a, b\}\}$. Then, let A be a maximal subset of B s.t. for every $\{a, b\} \in A$ there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ s.t. ω is either (a, b) -dominating or (b, a) -dominating. Let T be the undirected graph (M, P) , where $M = \{(a, b) : \{a, b\} \in \Gamma \cap B \setminus A\}$ and $P = \{((a, b), (c, d)) \in M^2 : \text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \downarrow_{\substack{a \ c \\ b \ d}}^{\substack{a \ c \\ b \ d}} = \emptyset\}$.

By Proposition 11 we know that for every $(a, b) \in M$, there are $\nu, \tau \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ s.t. $\nu(b) < \nu(a) < \infty$ and $\tau(a) < \tau(b) < \infty$. By the classification of Min-Cost-Hom on two-element domains, see e.g. [18, Theorem 3.1], and by the fact that if $f, m \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ are idempotent, m is arithmetical on $\{\{x, y\}\}$ and $f \in \uparrow_{\substack{x \\ y}}$, then $m'(u, v) = m(u, f(u, v), v)$ satisfies $m' \in \downarrow_{\substack{x \\ y}}$, we have the following.

Lemma 17. *Either; for every $(a, b) \in M$ there are binary operations $f, g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $f|_{\{a,b\}}$ and $g|_{\{a,b\}}$ are two different idempotent, conservative and commutative operations, or $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP-hard.*

Lemma 18 ([18, Theorem 5.3]). *If T is bipartite, then there are binary operations $f, g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. for every $(a, b) \in M$, $f|_{\{a,b\}}$ and $g|_{\{a,b\}}$ are different*

idempotent conservative and commutative operations, or $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP-hard.

Lemma 19 ([18, Theorem 5.4]). *Let $C \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$. If $C \subseteq \Gamma$ and for each $\{a, b\} \in C$ there is a ternary operation $m^{\{a,b\}} \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ that is arithmetical on $\{\{a, b\}\}$, then there is $m \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ that is arithmetical on C .*

So, if T is bipartite and (Γ, Δ) is conservative, there is a generalised weak tournament pair on (A, B) and an arithmetical polymorphism on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$. Here (Γ, Δ) is of type **GWTP**, and by Theorem 8, we can conclude that $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is polynomial-time solvable.

This following lemma finishes the proof of Theorem 12. A corresponding result, for the case when Δ is the set of all functions $D \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, is also achieved in [18]. Our proof strategy is somewhat different from that in [18], though.

Lemma 20. *If T is not bipartite, then $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. We will show that if T is not bipartite, then ${}^b \times_a^b \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$ for some $(a, b) \in M$. From this it follows, using Lemma 17, that $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is NP-hard. We will make use of the following result.

Lemma 21 ([18, Lemma 4.2]). *If $((a, b), (c, d)) \in P$, then either ${}^a \times_b^c \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$ or ${}^a \times_b^c \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$.*

Since $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Gamma$, and since there are functions $\nu, \tau \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ s.t. $\nu(b) < \nu(a) < \infty$ and $\tau(d) < \tau(c) < \infty$, we immediately get the following.

Corollary 22. *If $((a, b), (c, d)) \in P$, then ${}^a \times_b^c \in \Gamma$.*

Since T is not bipartite it must contain an odd cycle $(a_0, b_0), (a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_{2k}, b_{2k}), (a_0, b_0)$. This means, according to Corollary 22, that Γ contains relations $\varrho_{0,1}, \varrho_{1,2}, \dots, \varrho_{2k-1,2k}, \varrho_{2k,0}$ where $\varrho_{i,j} = {}^{a_i} \times_{b_i}^{a_j}$. Since the cycle is odd this means that $\varrho_{0,1} \circ \varrho_{1,2} \circ \dots \circ \varrho_{2k-1,2k} \circ \varrho_{2k,0} = {}^{a_0} \times_{b_0}^{a_0} \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$. \square

7 Concluding Remarks

We have fully classified the complexity of Min-Sol on domains that contain at most three elements and the complexity of conservative Min-Cost-Hom on arbitrary finite domains.

Unlike for CSP there is no widely accepted conjecture for the complexity of VCSP. This makes the study of small-domain VCSPs an exciting and important task. We believe that a promising approach for this project is to study Min-Cost-Hom — it is interesting for its own sake and likely easier to analyse than the general VCSP.

A natural continuation of the work presented in this paper would be to classify Min-Cost-Hom on domains of size three. This probably is a result within reach using known techniques. Another interesting question is what the complexity of three-element Min-Sol is when the domain valuation is not injective (we note that

if the valuation is constant the problem collapses to a CSP whose complexity has been classified by Bulatov [1], but situations where e.g. $\nu(a) = \nu(b) < \nu(c)$ are not yet understood).

Acknowledgements. I am thankful to Peter Jonsson for rewarding discussions and to Magnus Wahlström for helpful comments regarding the presentation of the results. I am also grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their useful feedback.

References

1. Bulatov, A.: A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *J ACM* **53**(1) (2006) 66–120
2. Bulatov, A., Jeavons, P., Krokhin, A.: Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM J Comput* **34**(3) (2005) 720–742
3. Cohen, D., Cooper, M., Jeavons, P.: An algebraic characterisation of complexity for valued constraint. In: *Proc. 12th CP.* (2006) 107–121
4. Cohen, D., Cooper, M., Jeavons, P., Krokhin, A.: The complexity of soft constraint satisfaction. *Artif Intell* **170**(11) (2006) 983–1016
5. Cohen, D., Creed, P., Jeavons, P., Živný, S.: An algebraic theory of complexity for valued constraints: Establishing a galois connection. In: *Proc. 36th MFCS.* (2011) 231–242
6. Gutin, G., Rafiey, A., Yeo, A., Tso, M.: Level of repair analysis and minimum cost homomorphisms of graphs. *Discrete Appl Math* **154**(6) (2006) 881–889
7. Jeavons, P., Cohen, D., Gyssens, M.: Closure properties of constraints. *J ACM* **44**(4) (1997) 527–548
8. Jeavons, P., Cohen, D., Gyssens, M.: How to determine the expressive power of constraints. *Constraints* **4** (1999) 113–131
9. Jonsson, P., Kuivinen, F., Nordh, G.: MAX ONES generalized to larger domains. *SIAM J Comput* **38**(1) (2008) 329–365
10. Jonsson, P., Kuivinen, F., Thapper, J.: Min CSP on four elements: Moving beyond submodularity. In: *Proc. 17th CP.* (2011) 438–453
11. Jonsson, P., Nordh, G.: Introduction to the maximum solution problem. In Creignou, N., Kolaitis, P.G., Vollmer, H., eds.: *Complexity of Constraints*. Volume 5250 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2008) 255–282
12. Jonsson, P., Nordh, G.: Approximability of clausal constraints. *Theor Comput Syst* **46**(2) (2010) 370–395
13. Jonsson, P., Nordh, G., Thapper, J.: The maximum solution problem on graphs. In: *Proc. 32nd MFCS.* (2007) 228–239
14. Khanna, S., Sudan, M., Trevisan, L., Williamson, D.P.: The approximability of constraint satisfaction problems. *SIAM J Comput* **30**(6) (2001) 1863–1920
15. Kolmogorov, V., Živný, S.: The complexity of conservative valued CSPs. In: *Proc. 23rd SODA.* (2012) 750–759 Full version: [arXiv:1110.2809](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.2809) [cs.CC].
16. Kuivinen, F.: *Algorithms and Hardness Results for Some Valued CSPs*. PhD thesis, Linköping University, The Institute of Technology (2009)
17. Schrijver, A.: *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA (1986)

18. Takhanov, R.: A dichotomy theorem for the general minimum cost homomorphism problem. In: Proc. 27th STACS. (2010) 657–668 Full version: [arXiv:0708.3226](#) [cs.LG].
19. Takhanov, R.: Extensions of the minimum cost homomorphism problem. In: Proc. 16th COCOON. (2010) 328–337 Full version: [arXiv:1210.2260](#) [cs.CC].
20. Thapper, J., Živný, S.: The power of linear programming for valued CSPs. In: Proc. 53rd FOCS. (2012) Preprint: [arXiv:1204.1079](#) [cs.CC]. To appear.
21. Thapper, J., Živný, S.: The complexity of finite-valued CSPs. In: Proc. 45th STOC. (2013) Preprint: [arXiv:1210.2987](#) [cs.CC]. To appear.
22. Zhang, C.Q.: Finding critical independent sets and critical vertex subsets are polynomial problems. *SIAM J Discrete Math* **3**(3) (1990) 431–438

A Proof of Theorem 13

We will in this section use $x \triangleright_\omega y$ to denote that the binary fractional polymorphism ω is (x, y) -dominating. For binary operations f and g the notation $\{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, g \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\}$ is used for the fractional polymorphism mapping f and g to $\frac{1}{2}$, and all other binary operations to 0. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 23. *Let Γ be a set of finitary relations on $D = \{a, b, c\}$. If there exists a binary operation $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ and a ternary operation $m \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. f and m are idempotent, $f|_{\{a,b\}}$ and $f|_{\{b,c\}}$ are projections, $f(a, c) = f(c, a) = b$, and m is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus \{\{a, c\}\}$, then there is an idempotent ternary operation $m' \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. m' is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2}$.*

Proof. Assume wlog that $f|_{\{a,b\}} = f|_{\{b,c\}} = \text{pr}_1$. If this does not hold, then $f' = f[f, \bar{f}]$ is another polymorphism that does satisfy the condition.

Let $g(x, y, z) = m(f(m(x, y, z), z), f(m(y, x, z), z), z)$. It can be checked that g is arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus \{\{a, c\}\}$ and additionally satisfies $g(a, a, c) = c$ and $g(c, c, a) = a$. Define $h(x, y, z) = g(z, f(y, z), g(x, f(x, y), f(x, z)))$ and $m'(x, y, z) = g(f(x, y), f(y, x), h(x, y, z))$. It is straightforward to verify that m' is indeed arithmetical on $\binom{D}{2}$. \square

Let (Γ, ν) be a min-core language on the domain $D = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\nu(a) < \nu(b) < \nu(c) < \infty$. Let $\Gamma^+ = \Gamma \cup (2^D \cup 2^{D^2}) \cap \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w$. Note that if (Γ^+, ν) is of type **GWTP** (**GMC**, **BSM**), then there is $S \subseteq 2^D$ s.t. also $(\Gamma \cup S, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP** (**GMC**, **BSM**). Since $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma^+, \nu)$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \nu)$ we therefore assume that $\Gamma^+ \subseteq \Gamma$. By Lemma 15 we can assume that $\Gamma^c \subseteq \Gamma$ since otherwise Γ is of type **GMC**.

In the following we will assume that $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is not NP-hard and show that this implies that (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**, **GMC** or **BSM**.

Let $B \subseteq \binom{D}{2}$ be a minimal set s.t. for every $\{a, b\} \in \binom{D}{2} \setminus B$ there is a ternary operation in $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ that is arithmetical on $\{a, b\}$ and all binary operations in $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ are projections on $\{a, b\}$. Then, let A be a maximal subset of B s.t. for every $\{a, b\} \in A$ there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ s.t. ω is either (a, b) -dominating or (b, a) -dominating. We can assume that there are $f_1, f_2, m \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. for every $\{x, y\} \in \Gamma \cap B \setminus A$ it holds that $f_1|_{\{x,y\}}$ and $f_2|_{\{x,y\}}$ are different idempotent, commutative and conservative operations, and on $\binom{D}{2} \setminus B$, m is arithmetical while f, g are projections. Otherwise, by Lemmas 17, 18, 19 and 20, $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is NP-hard. This means, unless $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \nu)$ is NP-hard, that if there is any $\{x, y\} \subseteq D$ s.t. (Γ, ν) admits a fractional polymorphism that is (x, y) -dominating and $D \setminus \{y\} \in \Gamma$, or if Γ is conservative, then (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**. In the following we therefore assume that this is not the case.

We split the rest of the proof in seven cases depending on which unary relations Γ contains.

A.1 $\{a, b\} \notin \Gamma, \{a, c\} \in \Gamma, \{b, c\} \in \Gamma$

By Lemma 14, there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ s.t. some $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ satisfies $f \in \downarrow_a^b$. This means, unless $a \triangleright_\omega b$, that every $g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ is conservative and that there is $f' \in \text{supp}(\omega) \cap \uparrow_a^b$.

1. If ${}^c_a \times_a^c \notin \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \notin \Gamma$, then by Lemma 14 we may assume that there is $g, h \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $g \in \downarrow_a^c$ and $h \in \downarrow_b^c$. If there is any $i \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $i \in \downarrow_a^b$ and $i \notin \uparrow_a^c$, then $i' = g[i, \bar{i}] \in \downarrow_a^{bc}$. In this case $\psi = \{i' \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{i}' \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, h \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{h} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$, so unless $a \triangleright_\psi b$ we have $h \in \uparrow_a^b$. Note that $h, i' \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}\})$ and unless $a \triangleright_\psi c$ or $b \triangleright_\psi c$ it must hold that i', h are complementary and $(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}\}, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP**.
Otherwise it follows by symmetry that $\text{supp}(\omega) \cap \downarrow_a^b \subseteq \uparrow_a^c$, $\text{supp}(\omega) \cap \downarrow_b^c \subseteq \uparrow_a^c$ and $\text{supp}(\omega) \cap \downarrow_a^c \subseteq \uparrow_a^b$, this contradicts that $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$.
2. If ${}^c_a \times_a^c \in \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \notin \Gamma$, then by Lemma 14 we can assume $g \in \downarrow_b^c$ for some $g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$. Here $\psi = \{g \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{g} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, f \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$. Unless $a \triangleright_\psi b$ we have $g \in \uparrow_a^b$. Note that $f, g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}\})$ and unless $b \triangleright_\psi c$ it must hold that g, f are complementary, so $(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}\}, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP**.
3. If ${}^c_a \times_a^c \notin \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \in \Gamma$, then by symmetry to the case above, (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.
4. If ${}^c_a \times_a^c \in \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \in \Gamma$, then by f, f' , (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.

A.2 $\{a, b\} \in \Gamma, \{a, c\} \in \Gamma, \{b, c\} \notin \Gamma$

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(b, c) \notin {}^c_b \times_b^c$ for some $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$.

1. If ${}^b_a \times_a^b \notin \Gamma$ and ${}^c_a \times_a^c \notin \Gamma$, then, by Lemma 14, we may assume $g \in \downarrow_a^b$, $h \in \downarrow_a^c$ for some $g, h \in \text{supp}(\omega)$.
 - (a) If there is $i \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $i \in \downarrow_a^{bc}$, then $\psi = \{i \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{i} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi b$, or $i \in \uparrow_a^c$. Note that $f' = i[f, \bar{f}]$ is commutative and satisfies $f'(b, c) \in \{a, b\}$. So $\psi = \{f' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, i \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and f', i must be complementary unless $a \triangleright_\psi b$, $a \triangleright_\psi c$ or $c \triangleright_\psi b$. This means that (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.
 - (b) Otherwise $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \downarrow_a^b \subseteq \uparrow_a^c$ and $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \downarrow_a^c \subseteq \uparrow_a^b$.
 - If there is $r \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \notin {}^c_b \times_b^c$ and r is a projection on both $\{a, b\}$ and $\{a, c\}$, then
 - if $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \in {}^c_a \times_a^c$ we have $\psi = \{r \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{r} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $c \triangleright_\psi b$,
 - if $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) = {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{g[r, \bar{r}] \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, h[r, \bar{r}] \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $b \triangleright_\psi c$,

- otherwise $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) = (a, a)$. Let $g' = g[r, \bar{r}]$, $h' = h[r, \bar{r}]$ and $f' = g'[\text{pr}_1, h']$. Is is easy to check that $\psi = \{f' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f}' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $c \triangleright_\psi b$.
 - If there is $r \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \notin {}_b^c \times_b^c$ and $r \in \downarrow \uparrow \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$:
 - If $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \in {}_a^c \times_a^c$, consider the following.
 - * If $(h, \bar{h})(b, c) \in {}_a^c \times_a^c$, let $r' = h[r, \bar{r}]$ and $h' = g[h, \bar{h}]$. Now $\psi = \{r' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, h' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $c \triangleright_\psi b$.
 - * If $(h, \bar{h})(b, c) \in {}_b^b \times_a^b$, let $r' = h[r, \bar{r}]$ and $h' = h[h, \bar{h}]$. Now $\psi = \{r' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, h' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $b \triangleright_\psi c$.
 - * If $(h, \bar{h})(b, c) = (a, a)$, let $h' = h[\text{pr}_1, h]$. Here $h' \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$ and $(h', \bar{h}')(b, c) \in {}_a^b \times_a^b$, so the previous case applies.
 - * If $(h, \bar{h})(b, c) \in {}_b^c \times_b^c$, let $h' = r[h, \bar{h}]$. Here $h' \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$ and also $(h', \bar{h}')(b, c) \in {}_a^c \times_a^c$, so other cases can be used.
 - If $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \in {}_a^b \times_a^b$, let $r' = h[r, \bar{r}]$. Here either $r', h' = r'[h, \bar{h}]$ are complementary and (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**, or $\psi = \{r' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, h' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $b \triangleright_\psi c$.
 - If there is $r \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \notin {}_b^c \times_b^c$ and $r \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, then by arguments symmetric to the ones above, (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.
 - Otherwise, every $r \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(r, \bar{r})(b, c) \notin {}_b^c \times_b^c$ satisfies $r \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$. This contradicts that $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$.
2. If ${}_a^b \times_a^b \notin \Gamma$ and ${}_a^c \times_a^c \in \Gamma$, then, by Lemma 14, we may assume $h \in \downarrow \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ for some $h \in \text{supp}(\omega)$.
 If there is $f' \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f', \bar{f}')(a, b) \in {}_a^b \times_a^b$ and $(f', \bar{f}')(b, c) \notin {}_b^c \times_b^c$, then $\psi = \{h[f', \bar{f}'] \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{h}[f', \bar{f}'] \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi b$. And, if there is $i \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $i \in \downarrow \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ and $i \notin \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ b \end{smallmatrix} \uparrow$, then $\psi = \{i \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{i} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi b$. Since we can assume that no operation in $\text{supp}(\omega)$ is a projection on both $\{a, b\}$ and $\{b, c\}$, this means that if $j \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ and $j \notin \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ a \end{smallmatrix} \uparrow$, then $j \in \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ b \end{smallmatrix} \uparrow$.
 So, unless ω is s.t. $a \triangleright_\omega b$ or $c \triangleright_\omega b$, it must hold that f, h are complementary, and (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.
3. If ${}_a^b \times_a^b \in \Gamma$ and ${}_a^c \times_a^c \notin \Gamma$, then, arguments symmetric to those in the case above establishes that (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.
4. If ${}_a^b \times_a^b \in \Gamma$ and ${}_a^c \times_a^c \in \Gamma$, the following holds. If $(f, \bar{f})(b, c) \neq (a, a)$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and either $b \triangleright_\psi c$ or $c \triangleright_\psi b$. Otherwise $(f, \bar{f})(b, c) = (a, a)$ and, by Lemma 23, (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.

A.3 $\{a, b\} \in \Gamma$, $\{a, c\} \notin \Gamma$, $\{b, c\} \in \Gamma$

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}_a^b \times_a^b$ and $\nu(f(a, c)) + \nu(f(c, a)) \leq \nu(a) + \nu(c)$.

1. If ${}_a^b \times_a^b \notin \Gamma$ and ${}_b^c \times_b^c \notin \Gamma$, then, by Lemma 14, we may assume that there is $g, h \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $g \in \downarrow \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ and $h \in \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ b \end{smallmatrix} \uparrow$. Since $\{a, c\} \notin \langle \Gamma \rangle$ there is $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$

s.t. $f(c, a) = b$. We can assume $f(a, c) \in \{a, b\}$ since otherwise $f' = h[f, \bar{f}]$ satisfies the property.

If there is $i \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma, \nu) \cap \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ a & b \end{smallmatrix}$, then $h' = i[i[\text{pr}_1, f], \overline{i[\text{pr}_1, f]}] \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c & c \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ a & a & b \end{smallmatrix}$. Here $\psi = \{h' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{h}' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$.

Otherwise $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ \downarrow \\ b \end{smallmatrix} \subseteq \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ \uparrow \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ and $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ \downarrow \\ a \end{smallmatrix} \subseteq \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ \uparrow \\ b \end{smallmatrix}$. In the following we assume $f(a, c) = f(c, a) = b$ since if this does not hold, then $g[f, \bar{f}]$ satisfies the property.

- If there is $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ that is a projection on $\{a, b\}$, $\{b, c\}$ and satisfies $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, then
 - if $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$,
 - otherwise $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) = (b, b)$. Note that we might assume $2\nu(b) \leq \nu(a) + \nu(c)$, since otherwise we can modify ω by setting $\omega(f) = 0$ and rescaling the function so that $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(f) = 1$. This gives another fractional polymorphism that satisfies our conditions. Since $h' = h[f, \bar{f}] \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}$, $g' = g[f, \bar{f}] \in \begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix}$ and $h'(a, c) = h'(c, a) = g'(a, c) = g'(c, a) = b$, this means that (Γ, ν) is of type **BSM**.
- Otherwise we can assume that $\text{supp}(\omega) = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$, where $\Omega_1 = \text{supp}(\omega) \cap \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \downarrow & \uparrow \\ a & b \end{smallmatrix}$ and $\Omega_2 = \text{supp}(\omega) \cap \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \uparrow & \downarrow \\ a & b \end{smallmatrix}$.
 - If there is $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, then $f' = g[f, \bar{f}] \in \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ \downarrow \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ and $f \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \downarrow & \uparrow \\ a & b \end{smallmatrix}$ or $f \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \uparrow & \downarrow \\ a & b \end{smallmatrix}$. Assume wlog the latter holds, then $f', g' = f'[g, \bar{g}]$ are complementary and (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**, or $\psi = \{f' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, g' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$.
 - Otherwise every $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$ is commutative and satisfies $f(a, c) = b$. If there is any $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ \times \\ b \end{smallmatrix}$, then ω can be modified by changing f to $h[f, \bar{f}]$. We therefore assume that every $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ that is not a projection on $\{a, c\}$ is commutative on $\{a, c\}$ and satisfies $f(a, c) \in \{b, c\}$.
 - * If $\nu(a) + \nu(c) < 2\nu(b)$, then since not all operations in $\text{supp}(\omega)$ are projection on $\{a, c\}$ it is impossible that $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$.
 - * If $\nu(a) + \nu(c) \geq 2\nu(b)$, then since $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $\nu(a) < \nu(b)$ there must be $f_1 \in \Omega_1, f_2 \in \Omega_2$ s.t. $f_1(a, c) = f_2(a, c) = b$. So (Γ, ν) is in this case of type **BSM**.
- 2. If $\begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix} \notin \Gamma$ and $\begin{smallmatrix} c & c \\ \times \\ b & b \end{smallmatrix} \in \Gamma$, then, by Lemma 14, we may assume $g \in \begin{smallmatrix} b \\ \downarrow \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$ for some $g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$. Assume wlog that $g|_{\{b, c\}} = \text{pr}_1$.
 - If $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in \begin{smallmatrix} b & c \\ \times \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, set $f' = g[f, \bar{f}]$. Note that $\psi = \{f' \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{f}' \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, g \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{g} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$. Unless $a \triangleright_\psi c$ it holds that $g \in \begin{smallmatrix} c \\ \uparrow \\ a \end{smallmatrix}$. This means that $f', g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, c\}\})$, so either $a \triangleright_\psi b$ or f', g are complementary and $(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, c\}\}, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP**.
 - Otherwise $f(a, c) = f(c, a) = b$, and $g' = g[g[f, \text{pr}_1], \overline{g[f, \text{pr}_1]}] \in \begin{smallmatrix} c & b \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ a & a \end{smallmatrix}$, so $\psi = \{g' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{g}' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$.

3. If ${}^b_a \times_a^b \in \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \notin \Gamma$, then, by Lemma 14, we may assume $h \in \overset{c}{\downarrow}_b$ for some $h \in \text{supp}(\omega)$. Assume wlog that $h|_{\{a,b\}} = \text{pr}_1$. Since $\{a, c\} \notin \langle \Gamma \rangle$ there is a binary operation $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $f(a, c) = b$. Let $f' = h[f, \bar{f}]$ and note that $(f', \bar{f}')(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$.
- If $(h, \bar{h})(a, c) \in {}^c_a \times_a^c \cup {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{h \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{h} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $b \triangleright_\psi c$.
 - If $(h, \bar{h})(a, c) = (b, b)$, then let $h' = h[\text{pr}_1, h]$ and note that $\psi = \{h' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{h}' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $b \triangleright_\psi c$.
 - If $(h, \bar{h})(a, c) \in {}^c_b \times_b^c$, then $h' = h[h, \bar{h}] \in \overset{c}{\downarrow}_b$, $h'|_{\{a,b\}} = \text{pr}_1$ and $(h, \bar{h})(a, c) = (b, b)$, so the previous case is applicable.
 - If $(h, \bar{h})(a, c) = (c, c)$, then $h' = h[f', h] \in \overset{c}{\downarrow}_b$, $(h', \bar{h}')(a, c) \in {}^c_b \times_b^c$ and h' is a projection. So one of the previous cases apply.
4. If ${}^b_a \times_a^b \in \Gamma$ and ${}^c_b \times_b^c \in \Gamma$, then,
- if $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$,
 - otherwise $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) = (b, b)$ and, by Lemma 23, (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**.

A.4 $\{a, b\} \in \Gamma$, $\{a, c\} \notin \Gamma$, $\{b, c\} \notin \Gamma$

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $f \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$. By Lemma 25, ${}^b_a \times_a^b \in \Gamma$, or (Γ, ν) is of type **GMC**. Since $\{b, c\} \notin \langle \Gamma \rangle$ we have $g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(g, \bar{g})(b, c) \in {}^c_b \times_b^c$. Let $g' = f[g, \bar{g}]$, now $(g', \bar{g}')(b, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$.

- If $(f, \bar{f})(c, b) \in {}^c_b \times_b^c$, then
 - if $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$,
 - otherwise $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) = (b, b)$. Let $f' = f[f, \bar{f}]$ and note that $f'|_{\{a,b\}} = \text{pr}_1$, $f'|_{\{b,c\}} = \text{pr}_1$ and $f'(a, c) = f'(c, a) = b$. With $g'' = g'[g', \bar{g}']$ and $f'' = g''[\text{pr}_1, f']$ it holds that $\psi = \{f'' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f}'' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$.
- If $(f, \bar{f})(c, b) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then
 - if $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$,
 - otherwise $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) = (b, b)$. Let $f' = f[f, \bar{f}]$ and note that $f'|_{\{a,b\}} = \text{pr}_1$, $f'(b, c), f'(c, b) \in \{a, b\}$ and $f'(a, c) = f'(c, a) = b$. With $f'' = f'[\text{pr}_1, f']$ it holds that $\psi = \{f'' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{f}'' \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi c$.
- If $(f, \bar{f})(c, b) \in {}^c_a \times_a^c$, then $f' = f[f, \bar{f}]$ satisfies $f'|_{\{a,b\}} = \text{pr}_1$, $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$ and $(f, \bar{f})(b, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, so the previous case applies.
- Otherwise $f \in \overset{c}{\uparrow}_b$.
 - If $(f, \bar{f})(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then assume wlog $f(c, a) = b$. Let $f' = g'[\text{pr}_1, f]$. Now $f'|_{\{a,b\}}$ is a projection, $(f', \bar{f}')(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$ and $f' \notin \overset{c}{\uparrow}_b$, so we may use one of the previous cases.
 - Otherwise $f \in \overset{c}{\downarrow}_a$. Since $\{a, c\} \notin \Gamma$, there is $i \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $i(c, a) = b$. Note that $f' = i(\text{pr}_1, f)$ satisfies $(f', \bar{f}')(a, c) = (a, b)$. This takes us to the previous case.

A.5 $\{a, b\} \notin \Gamma, \{a, c\} \in \Gamma, \{b, c\} \notin \Gamma$

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $g \in \downarrow_a^b$. By Lemma 25, ${}^c_a \times_a^c \in \Gamma$, or (Γ, ν) is of type **GMC**. Unless $a \triangleright_\omega b$ every $i \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ is conservative on $\{a, b\}$. Since $\{b, c\} \notin \Gamma$ we also have $h \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $h(b, c) = a$.

Let R be the relation generated by $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ from ${}^c_b \times_b^c$. Since $h(b, c) = a$, R can not equal ${}^c_b \times_b^c$ or ${}^c_b \times_b^c$. Neither does R equal ${}^c_b \times_b^c$ or ${}^c_b \times_b^c$. To see this note that; in the first case, since $\{c\} \in \Gamma$, it follows that $\{a, b\} \in \langle \Gamma \rangle$, a contradiction, and, in the second case there can not be a ternary operation $m \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ that is arithmetic on $\{a, c\}$, this contradicts that $\{a, c\}$ is a cross-pair. Hence, there must be $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $(f, \bar{f})(b, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$.

If $g \notin \uparrow_b^c$, then $\psi = \{g \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, \bar{g} \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $a \triangleright_\psi b$. We therefore assume $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \downarrow_a^b \subseteq \uparrow_b^c$. This means that $\psi = \{g \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{g} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, f \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$. So either f, g are complementary and (Γ, ν) is of type **GWTP**, or $a \triangleright_\psi b$ or $c \triangleright_\psi b$.

A.6 $\{a, b\} \notin \Gamma, \{a, c\} \notin \Gamma, \{b, c\} \in \Gamma$

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $f', g \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(f', \bar{f}')(a, c) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$ and $g \in \downarrow_a^b$. By Lemma 25, ${}^c_b \times_b^c \in \Gamma$, or (Γ, ν) is of type **GMC**. Assume wlog that $g|_{\{b, c\}} = \text{pr}_2$. Let f be any operation in $\text{Pol}(\Gamma) \cap \downarrow_a^c$. Such an operation must exist. Note that $h = g[f', \bar{f}']$ satisfies $h(a, c) = h(c, a) \in \{a, b\}$. If $h \notin \downarrow_a^c$, then $g[g[\text{pr}_1, h], \overline{g[\text{pr}_1, h]}] \in \downarrow_a^c$.

- If $(f, \bar{f})(a, b) \in {}^b_a \times_a^b$, then $\psi = \{f \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{f} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, g \mapsto \frac{1}{4}, \bar{g} \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\} \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}\}, \nu)$. Unless $a \triangleright_\psi c$ we have $g \in \uparrow_b^c$, this means that $f, g \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}\})$, so either f, g are complementary and $(\Gamma \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}\}, \nu)$ is of type **GWTP**, or $a \triangleright_\psi b$.
- If $(f, \bar{f})(a, b) \in {}^c_a \times_a^c$, then $f' = f[f, \bar{f}] \in \downarrow_a^b$, so the previous case applies.
- If $(f, \bar{f})(a, b) \in {}^c_b \times_b^c$, then assume wlog that $f(a, b) = c$. It is easily checked that $g[f[\text{pr}_1, f], \overline{f[\text{pr}_1, f]}] \in \downarrow_a^c$, so the first case applies.
- If $(f, \bar{f})(a, b) = (c, c)$, then assume wlog $f|_{\{b, c\}} = \text{pr}_1$. Once more we have $g[f[\text{pr}_1, f], \overline{f[\text{pr}_1, f]}] \in \downarrow_a^c$, so again the first case applies.

A.7 $\{a, b\} \notin \Gamma, \{a, c\} \notin \Gamma, \{b, c\} \notin \Gamma$

By Lemma 25, $R = {}^c_b \times_b^c \in \Gamma$, or (Γ, ν) is of type **GMC**. In what follows we assume that (Γ, ν) is not of type **GMC**. A consequence of this is that, for every

binary function $f \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$, it holds that $f(a, c) = f(c, a) = b$ or $f|_{\{a, c\}} = \text{pr}_1$ or $f|_{\{a, c\}} = \text{pr}_2$.

By Lemma 14 there is $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \nu)$ and $g, h, i \in \text{supp}(\omega)$ s.t. $(g, \bar{g})(a, c) \in {}^b \sum_a^b$, $h \in \downarrow_a^b$ and $(i, \bar{i})(b, c) \in {}^b \sum_a^b \cup {}^c \times_a^c$. Since $R \in \Gamma$ this means that $g(a, c) = g(c, a) = b$, $2\nu(b) \leq \nu(a) + \nu(c)$ and $h \in \uparrow_b^c$. Hence, $h' = g[h, \bar{h}] \in \uparrow_b^{\frac{a}{c}}$ and $h'(a, c) = h'(c, a) = b$.

- If $(i, \bar{i})(b, c) \in {}^c \times_a^c$, then $i' = h'[i, \bar{i}] \in \downarrow_b^c$ and $i'(a, c) = i'(c, a) = b$.
- If $(i, \bar{i})(b, c) \in {}^b \times_a^b$, then $i'' = h'[i, \bar{i}]$ satisfies $i''(b, c) = i''(c, b) = a$ and $i''(a, c) = i''(c, a) = b$. Since $\{a, c\} \notin \Gamma$ there is some binary $p \in \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $p(a, c) = b$. This means that $i' = p[i'', h'] \in \downarrow_b^c$ and $i'(a, c) = i'(c, a) = b$.
- Otherwise $i \in \downarrow_a^c$. Here $i' = g[i, \bar{i}]$ satisfies $i' \in \downarrow_b^c$ and $i'(a, c) = i'(c, a) = b$.

Since i' must preserve R it also holds that $i' \in \uparrow_a^b$. By i', h' we see that (Γ, ν) is of type **BSM**.

B Proof of Lemma 14

We need the following variant of Motzkin's Transposition Theorem that is easy to derive from Theorem 3.

Theorem 24. *For any $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{Q}^{p \times n}$, exactly one of the following holds:*

- $Ax \leq 0, Bx < 0$ for some $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$
- $A^T y + B^T z \geq 0$ and $z \neq 0$ for some $y \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^m$ and $z \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^p$

Let $\sigma : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a function in $\langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_e$ and for $\nu \in \Delta$ let $D_\nu = \{x \in D : \nu(x) < \infty\}$. Let $\Omega_1 = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \cap \text{Pol}(\Gamma) : \nu(f(x, y)) < \infty \text{ for every } \nu \in \Delta \text{ and } x, y \in D_\nu\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{f \in \Omega_1 : \{f(a, b), f(b, a)\} \neq \{a, b\} \text{ and } \sigma(f(a, b)) + \sigma(f(b, a)) \leq \sigma(a) + \sigma(b)\}$. Assume there are $p_{\nu, (x, y)} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ for $\nu \in \Delta$ and $(x, y) \in D_\nu^2$ s.t.

$$\sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x, y)} \nu(g(x, y)) \geq \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x, y)} \nu(\text{pr}_i(x, y)), \quad g \in \Omega_1, i \in [2], \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x, y)} \nu(g(x, y)) > \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x, y)} \nu(\text{pr}_i(x, y)), \quad g \in \Omega_2, i \in [2]. \quad (2)$$

We will show that in this case we have ${}^a \times_b^a \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$. Create an instance I of $\text{Min-Cost-Hom}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ with variables D^2 , and objective

$$m(\varphi) = \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x, y)} \nu(\varphi(x, y)) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2} \nu(\varphi(x, y)),$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen small enough so that $\varphi \in \arg \min_{\varphi' \in \Omega_1} m(\varphi')$ implies $\varphi \in \arg \min_{\varphi' \in \Omega_1} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x,y)} \nu(\varphi(x, y))$. Such a number ε can always be found. Note that a solution φ to I with finite measure is a function $D^2 \rightarrow D$ s.t. $\nu(\varphi(x, y)) < \infty$ for every $\nu \in \Delta$ and $(x, y) \in D_\nu^2$.

Pick, for every $g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \setminus \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$, a relation $R_g \in \Gamma$ s.t. g does not preserve R_g . Add for each pair of tuples $t^1, t^2 \in R_g$ the constraint $((t^1, t^2), \dots, (t^1_{\text{ar } R_g}, t^2_{\text{ar } R_g}), R_g)$. Now a solution to I is a binary polymorphism of Γ . Hence, if φ is a solution to I with finite measure, then $\varphi \in \Omega_1$. Clearly pr_1 and pr_2 satisfies all constraints and are solutions to I with finite measure. By (1) the projections are also optimal solutions. By (2) any function in Ω_2 has a larger measure than pr_1 or pr_2 . Hence, if $P = \{(\varphi(a, b), \varphi(b, a)) : \varphi \in \text{OptSol}(I)\}$ we have $\arg \min_{(x,y) \in P} (\sigma(x) + \sigma(y)) = {}^a \times_b^a$, and therefore ${}^a \times_b^a \in \langle \Gamma, \Delta \rangle_w$.

This of course means that the system (1)+(2) can not be satisfied. We can write (1)+(2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x,y)} (\nu(\text{pr}_i(x, y)) - \nu(g(x, y))) &\leq 0, & g \in \Omega_1, i \in [2], \\ \sum_{\nu \in \Delta, (x,y) \in D_\nu^2} p_{\nu, (x,y)} (\nu(\text{pr}_i(x, y)) - \nu(g(x, y))) &< 0, & g \in \Omega_2, i \in [2]. \end{aligned}$$

If this system lacks a solution $p_{\nu, (x,y)} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ for $\nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2$, then by Theorem 24, there are $z_{i,j,g} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ for $i, j \in [2], g \in \Omega_1$ s.t.

$$\sum_{i \in [2], j \in [2], g \in \Omega_j} (\nu(\text{pr}_i(x, y)) - \nu(g(x, y))) z_{i,j,g} \geq 0, \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

where $z_{i,2,g} > 0$ for some $i \in [2], g \in \Omega_2$. So

$$\sum_{i \in [2], j \in [2], g \in \Omega_j} (\nu(x) + \nu(y) - \nu(g(x, y)) - \nu(g(y, x))) z_{i,j,g} \geq 0, \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

and with $z_{j,g} = z_{1,j,g} + z_{2,j,g}$ we have

$$\sum_{j \in [2], g \in \Omega_j} (\nu(x) + \nu(y) - \nu(g(x, y)) - \nu(g(y, x))) z_{j,g} \geq 0, \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

Let $z'_{j,g} = z_{j,g} + z_{j,\bar{g}}$ and note that

$$\sum_{j \in [2], g \in \Omega_j} (\nu(x) + \nu(y) - \nu(g(x, y)) - \nu(g(y, x))) z'_{j,g} \geq 0, \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

and therefore, since $z'_{j,g} = z'_{j,\bar{g}}$ for $j \in [2]$,

$$\sum_{j \in [2], g \in \Omega_j} (\nu(x) + \nu(y) - 2\nu(g(x, y))) z'_{j,g} \geq 0, \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

Note that by construction $z'_{2,g} > 0$ for some $g \in \Omega_2$. We can rewrite this system into

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} \omega(g) \nu(g(x, y)) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\nu(x) + \nu(y)), \quad \nu \in \Delta, (x, y) \in D_\nu^2,$$

by defining $\omega : \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ as

$$\omega(g) = \frac{\chi_{\Omega_1}(g)2z'_{1,g} + \chi_{\Omega_2}(g)2z'_{2,g}}{\sum_{g \in \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)}} (\chi_{\Omega_1}(g)2z'_{1,g} + \chi_{\Omega_2}(g)2z'_{2,g})}.^5$$

Clearly $\omega \in \text{fPol}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ and $\omega(g) > 0$ for some $g \in \Omega_2$.

C Proof of Lemma 15

Let $D = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\nu : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be s.t. $\nu(a) < \nu(b) < \nu(c)$. We assume that (Γ, ν) is a min-core. Let:

$$\gamma_1 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagup \\ b \\ \diagdown \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_2 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagup \\ b \\ \diagdown \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_3 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_4 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagup \\ b \\ \diagdown \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagup \\ b \\ \diagdown \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_5 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_6 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array}, \quad \gamma_7 = \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ \diagdown \\ b \\ \diagup \\ a \end{array}.$$

Lemma 25. *If (Γ, ν) is not of type **GMC**, then $\gamma_i \in \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w$, for some $i \in [7]$.*

Proof. We will make use of the following fact [9, Lemma 5.6]: If (Γ, ν) is of type **GMC**, then for every $R \in \Gamma$ we have $(\min_\nu \text{pr}_1(R), \dots, \min_\nu \text{pr}_{\text{ar}(R)}(R)) \in R$. We say that a relation R is generalised min-closed if this property is satisfied.

If Γ is not of type **GMC**, then there is $R \in \Gamma$ that is not generalised min-closed. Consider first the case when $\text{ar}(R) = 2$. Let w_1 be the ν -minimal element in $\text{pr}_1(R)$, and w_2 be the ν -minimal element in $\text{pr}_2(R)$. Let q_1 be the ν -minimal element in $\{x : (x, w_2) \in R\}$, and q_2 be the ν -minimal element in $\{y : (w_1, y) \in R\}$. Set $\alpha = \frac{\nu(q_2) - \nu(w_2)}{\nu(q_1) - \nu(w_1)}$. Now either $\arg \min_{(x,y) \in R} \alpha \nu(x) + \nu(y)$ or its inverse is one of $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_7$. This establishes the claim for $\text{ar}(R) = 2$. Assume it holds also for every relation R with $\text{ar}(R) < m$. Let $R_i = \{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in R : x_i \text{ is } \nu\text{-minimal in } \text{pr}_i(R)\}$. If R_i is not generalised min-closed for some $i \in [m]$, then $\text{pr}_{[m]-i}(R)$ is not generalised min-closed, so the result follows from the inductive hypothesis. Otherwise $(q, w_2, \dots, w_m), (w_1, r, w_3, \dots, w_m) \in R$ where w_i is the ν -minimal element in $\text{pr}_i(R)$ and q, r are not ν -minimal elements in $\text{pr}_1(R)$ respective $\text{pr}_2(R)$. This means that $P = \{(x, y) : (x, y, z_3, \dots, z_m) \in R \text{ and } z_i \text{ is } \nu\text{-minimal in } \text{pr}_i(R)\}$ is not generalised min-closed, so again, the result follows from the inductive hypothesis. \square

By Lemma 25 we know that $\gamma_k \in \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w$, for some $k \in [7]$. This immediately yields two constants: $\text{pr}_1(\arg \min_{(x,y) \in \gamma_k} \nu(x))$ and $\text{pr}_1(\arg \min_{(x,y) \in \gamma_k} \nu(y))$.

We may wlog assume that one of these constants is a since we always have $\arg \min_{x \in D} \nu(x) = \{a\} \in \langle \Gamma, \nu \rangle_w$. Assume that the second constant is c (the

⁵ Here $\chi_\Omega : \mathcal{O}_D^{(2)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the indicator function for the set Ω .

arguments for the other case is analogous). Let $f = \{a \mapsto a, b \mapsto a, c \mapsto c\}$. Since Γ is a min-core, we have $f \notin \text{Pol}(\Gamma)$. We must therefore have a witness $P \in \Gamma$ s.t. $t \in P$ but $f(t) \notin P$. Let $P' = \{x : (z_1, \dots, z_{\text{ar}(P)}) \in P\}$ where $z_i = c$ if $t_i = c$, $z_i = a$ if $t_i = a$ and $z_i = x$ otherwise. Clearly $\{b\} = \arg \min_{x \in P'} \nu(x)$.