CSP FAST TRACK

ARTURO

ABSTRACT. In this note

1. Introduction

Let R be a set of relation symbols. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a relational structure over R. Let X be a countable set of variables. By the **constraint satisfaction problem** $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$[1] we mean the following decision problem: given a finite set Σ of atomic formulas over R, decide whether there is an assignment $(-)^{\mathcal{A}} : X \to A$ such that $\mathcal{A} \models \Sigma$; i.e. for all $r \in R_n$ and for all $x, y, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X$

$$r(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \Sigma \implies (x_1^{\mathcal{A}}, \ldots, x_n^{\mathcal{A}}) \in r^{\mathcal{A}} \tag{1}$$

$$x \equiv y \in \Sigma \implies x^{\mathcal{A}} = y^{\mathcal{A}} \tag{2}$$

Clearly, it is enough to find an assignment only for those variables that appear in Σ.

Remark 1.1. Usually we deal with *indexed* relational structures, that is we fix a set of relation symbols R and we consider a set A with a set P of relations on A indexed by the elements of R. Sometimes is useful to deal with *non-indexed* relational structures (A, P). In this case P will serve as the index set as well. The same applies to algebraic structures (i.e. algebras) and function symbols.

Definition 1.2. Let $\rho \in A^k$, and $\varphi : A^n \to A$. We say that φ **preserves** ρ if given a matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1^1 & \cdots & a_n^1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_1^k & \cdots & a_n^k \end{bmatrix}$$

with $(a_1^1, \ldots, a_1^k) \in \rho, \ldots, (a_1^n, \ldots, a_n^k) \in \rho$,

$$(\varphi(a_1^1, \ldots, a_n^1), \ldots, \varphi(a_1^k, \ldots, a_n^k)) \in \rho$$

Definition 1.3. If Γ is a set of relations on A and Φ is a set of operations on A we denote by

(1) $\mathrm{Inv}(\Phi)$ the set of relations on A that are preserved by all the elements of Φ;

(2) $\mathrm{Pol}(\Gamma)$ the set of operations on A that preserve all the elements of Γ.

Moreover, if $\mathbf{A}$ is an algebra and $\mathcal{A}$ a relational structure on the same set A:

[1] More often denoted by $\mathrm{CSP}(P)$.

(1) $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$ is the set of relations that are preserved by all the $f^{\mathbf{A}}$;

(2) $\mathrm{Pol}(\mathcal{A})$ is the set of operations that preserve all the $r^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra. Let $\mathcal{A} := (A, \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A}))$. By $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ we mean the decision problem $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 1.4. Let F be a set of function symbols and $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra over F. We denote by $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ the smallest set containing

$$\{f^{\mathbf{A}} : f \in F\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\pi_i^n : A^n \to A, 1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \omega\}$$

and closed under composition.

Goal: prove

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable;*

(2) $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ *contains a weak near-unanimity operation;*

(3) *for every $\mathbf{B} \in HS(\mathbf{A})$, $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{B}) \neq \{\pi_i^n : 1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \omega\}$.*

Otherwise, $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is* NP*-complete.*

2. Kinds of Operations

Definition 2.1. An operation $\varphi : A^n \to A$ is called

(1) **essentially unary** if there is an index i and a non-constant function $\psi : A \to A$ such that

$$\varphi(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = \psi(a_i)$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A$.

(2) **idempotent** if $\varphi(a, \ldots, a) = a$ for all $a \in A$.

(3) a **near unanimity** operation if for all $a, b \in A$

$$\varphi(b, a, \ldots, a) = \varphi(a, b, \ldots, a) = \cdots = \varphi(a, \ldots, a, b) = b$$

Example 2.2. A ternary near unanimity operation is called a **majority** operation. For instance the ternary function defined as

$$\delta(a, b, c) = \begin{cases} b & \text{if } b = c \\ a & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a majority operation called **dual discriminator**.

3. Relational Clones

Definition 3.1. Let R be a set of relation symbols and $\mathcal{A}$ be a relational structure over R. We denote by $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$ the smallest set containing

$$\{r^{\mathcal{A}} : r \in R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\Delta^{(n)} : n \in \omega\}$$

and closed under

(1) **permutation**: if $\rho \in \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$, then also

$$\{(a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)}) : \sigma \in S_n, (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \rho\} \in \mathrm{Clo}\,\mathcal{A}$$

(2) **extension**: if $\rho \in \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$, then also

$$\{(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}) : (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \rho, a_{n+1} \in A\} \in \mathrm{Clo}\,\mathcal{A}$$

(3) **truncation**: if $\rho \in \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$, then also

$$\{(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) : (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n) \in \rho, \text{ for some } a_n \in A\} \in \mathrm{Clo}\,\mathcal{A}$$

(4) intersection.

Remark 3.2. Observe that $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$ is given by all the relations ρ of A definable by a first-order primitive positive formula (that is, involving only conjunctions and existential quantifications). Recall that $\rho \subseteq A^n$ is definable if there is a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \iff (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \rho$$

Theorem 3.3 ([2])**.** *For any pair of relational structures $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (A, H)$ such that H is finite and $H \subseteq \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Let Σ be a set of atomic formulas over H. Let $\eta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Sigma$. Then there is $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of the form

$$\exists y_1, \dots, y_m \,(\gamma_1(z_1^1, \dots, z_{n_1}^1) \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_k(z_1^k, \dots, z_{n_k}^k))$$

(where $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \in \Gamma$ and $z_j^i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m\}$) such that for $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$

$$\mathcal{B} \models \eta(a_1, \dots, a_n) \iff \mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \tag{3}$$

We can assume (up to renaming of variables) that $y_1, \dots, y_m$ do not appear in any formula of Σ.

Now, for each $\eta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Sigma$ perform the following steps:

- add $\{\gamma_1(z_1^1, \dots, z_{n_1}^1), \dots, \gamma_k(z_1^k, \dots, z_{n_k}^k)\}$ to Σ;
- remove $\eta(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ from Σ.

At the the end we obtain a set of equations T over G. This is a polynomial-time reduction. By (3) it is clear that we can find an assignment $X \to A$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models \Sigma$ iff we can find an assignment such that $\mathcal{A} \models T$. □

Remark 3.4. We observe that in the above result it is not necessary that A is a finite set.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a relational structure and $\mathcal{B} = (A, \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A}))$. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ *is.*

(2) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ *is* NP-*complete iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ *is.*

4. Surjective Algebras

Definition 4.1. An algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is **surjective** if all the element of $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ are surjective.

Remark 4.2. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra over F. Every element of $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ is surjective iff every element of $\mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ is. In this case $\mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ is a group. It is enough to show that for every $f \in F$, there is $\varphi \in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ such that $f^{\mathbf{A}}\varphi = 1_{\mathbf{A}}$. Let $m := |A|$. Then $(f^{\mathbf{A}})^{m!} = 1_{\mathbf{A}}$. Let n_f be the least n such that $(f^{\mathbf{A}})^{n_f} = 1_{\mathbf{A}}$. Let $\varphi := (f^{\mathbf{A}})^{n_f - 1}$.

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra and let B be a subset of A. Let

$$\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})|B := \{\varphi \in \mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) : \varphi|B \in O_{\mathbf{B}}\}$$

We denote by $\mathbf{A}|B$ the algebra $(B, \mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})|B)$.

Lemma 4.3 ([2]). *Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, P)$ be a relational structure. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Pol}_1(\mathcal{A})$. For $\rho \in P_n$ let*

$$\varphi(\rho) := \{(\varphi(a_1), \ldots, \varphi(a_n)) : (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \rho\}$$

Let $\mathcal{B} := (A, \varphi(P))$ where $\varphi(P) := \{\varphi(\rho) : \rho \in P\}$. Then

(1) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ *is;*

(2) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ *is* NP-*complete iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ *is.*

Proof. We show that $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is polynomial-time equivalent to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$. Let Σ be a finite set of atomic formulas over P. Replace every occurrence of $\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with $\varphi(\rho)(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, obtaining a set of formulas T over $\varphi(P)$. Given any assignment $(-)^{\mathcal{B}} : X \to A$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models T$, define $(x)^{\mathcal{A}} := (x)^{\mathcal{B}}$; then $\mathcal{A} \models \Sigma$. Indeed, given $\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \Sigma$, since $\varphi \in \mathrm{Pol}_1(\mathcal{A})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(\rho)(x_1, \ldots, x_n) &\implies (x_1^{\mathcal{B}}, \ldots, x_n^{\mathcal{B}}) \in \varphi(\rho) \\
&\implies (x_1^{\mathcal{B}}, \ldots, x_n^{\mathcal{B}}) \in \rho \\
&\implies (x_1^{\mathcal{A}}, \ldots, x_n^{\mathcal{A}}) \in \rho \\
&\implies \mathcal{A} \models \rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n)
\end{aligned}$$

Conversely, given any assignment $(-)^{\mathcal{A}} : X \to A$ such that $\mathcal{A} \models \Sigma$, defining $(x)^{\mathcal{B}} := \varphi(x^{\mathcal{A}})$ is enough to have $\mathcal{B} \models T$. Indeed, given $\varphi(\rho)(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in T$, by definition of $\varphi(P)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} \models \rho(x_1, \dots, x_n) &\implies (x_1^{\mathcal{A}}, \dots, x_n^{\mathcal{A}}) \in \rho \\ &\implies (\varphi(x_1^{\mathcal{A}}), \dots, \varphi(x_n^{\mathcal{A}}) \in \varphi(\rho) \\ &\implies (x_1^{\mathcal{B}}, \dots, x_n^{\mathcal{B}}) \in \varphi(\rho) \\ &\implies \mathcal{B} \models \varphi(\rho)(x_1, \dots, x_n)\end{aligned}$$ □

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be a finite algebra. Then there is* $B \subseteq A$ *such that* $\mathbf{A}|B$ *is surjective and*

(1) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A}|B)$ *is;*

(2) $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is* NP*-complete iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A}|B)$*.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{A}$ is not surjective. Then by Remark 4.2 there is $\psi \in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ not surjective. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ such that φ is not surjective and $\varphi[A]$ has minimal cardinality. Define $B := \varphi[A]$. We show that $\mathbf{A}|B$ is surjective. Let $\psi \in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A}|B) = \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})|B$; if, towards a contradiction, $\psi[B] \subset B$, then $\psi\varphi[A] \subset \varphi[A] \subset A$ contradicting the minimality. The last part of the statement follows immediately from Lemma 4.3. □

Definition 4.5. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra. Let $\mathrm{id}(A)$ be the set of idempotent operations on A. We define $\mathrm{Clo}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{A}) := \mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathrm{id}(A)$.

Remark 4.6. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra. Observe that an operation $\varphi \in \mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ is idempotent iff it preserves the relations in $\Delta^{(1)} = \{\{a\} : a \in A\}$. Hence $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathrm{Clo}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{A})) = \mathrm{Clo}(\mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{A} = (A, \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A}) \cup \Delta^{(1)})$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let* $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ *be a finite set. Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be an algebra over* F*. Then the relation*

$$\sigma := \{(\psi(a_1), \dots, \psi(a_k)) : \psi \in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})\} \tag{4}$$

belongs to $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$*.*

Proof. We show that for every $f \in F_n$ and for every matrix M

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1^1 & \cdots & a_n^1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_1^k & \cdots & a_n^k \end{bmatrix}$$

such that $(a_1^1, \dots, a_1^k) \in \sigma, \dots, (a_1^n, \dots, a_n^k) \in \sigma$ we have

$$(f^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1^1, \dots, a_n^1), \dots, f^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1^k, \dots, a_n^k)) \in \sigma$$

By hypothesis we can write M as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \psi_1(a_1) & \cdots & \psi_n(a_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_1(a_k) & \cdots & \psi_n(a_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

but then

$$\begin{aligned}(f^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1^1,\dots,a_n^1),\dots,f^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1^k,\dots,a_n^k))\\ =(f^{\mathbf{A}}(\psi_1(a_1),\dots,\psi_n(a_1)),\dots,f^{\mathbf{A}}(\psi_1(a_k),\dots,\psi_n(a_k)))\\ =(f^{\mathbf{A}}[\psi_1,\dots,\psi_n](a_1),\dots,f^{\mathbf{A}}[\psi_1,\dots,\psi_n](a_k))\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude since $f^{\mathbf{A}}[\psi_1,\dots,\psi_n]\in \mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$. □

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\mathbf{A}=A$ be a finite surjective algebra. Let $\mathbf{B}:=(A,\mathrm{Clo}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{A}))$. Then*

1. $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *is.*
2. $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is* NP*-complete iff* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *is.*

Proof. Let $A=\{a_1,\dots,a_k\}$ and let $\Gamma:=\Delta^{(1)}$. Let $\mathcal{A}:=(A,\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A}))$ and $\mathcal{B}:=(A,\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})\cup\Gamma)$.

By definition and by Remark 4.6 $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ is polynomial-time equivalent to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ iff $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial-time equivalent to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$.

That $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is obvious. Let Σ be a finite set of atomic formulas over $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})\cup\Gamma$ and let $\{x_1,\dots,x_k\}$ be variables that do not appear in Σ. By Remark 4.2, since $\mathbf{A}$ is surjective, $\mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ forms a group. Moreover, the relation σ of Lemma 4.7 belongs to $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$. Now, perform the following steps:

- replace every formula $\gamma_i(x)$ with $x\equiv x_i$;
- add the formula $\sigma(x_1,\dots,x_k)$.

At the the end we obtain a set of equations T over $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$. This is a polynomial-time reduction. We finally show that we can find an assignment such that $\mathcal{A}\models T$ iff we can find an assignment such that $\mathcal{B}\models\Sigma$. Let $(-)^{\mathcal{B}}:X\to A$ be an assignment such that $\mathcal{B}\models\Sigma$. Consider the assignment

$$x^{\mathcal{A}}=\begin{cases}x^{\mathcal{B}} & \text{if } x\neq x_i\\ a_i & \text{if } x=x_i\end{cases}$$

Then $(-)^{\mathcal{A}}$ is such that $\mathcal{A}\models T$. Conversely, assume that there is an assignment $(-)^{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\mathcal{A}\models T$. By definition of σ, there is $\psi\in\mathrm{Clo}_1(\mathbf{A})$ such that $x_i^{\mathcal{A}}=\psi(a_i)$ for all i. Consider $(-)'^{\mathcal{A}}:=\psi^{-1}\circ(-)^{\mathcal{A}}$. Define $(x)^{\mathcal{B}}:=(x)'^{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $\rho(y_1,\dots,y_n),\gamma_i(x)\in\Sigma$. Every relation in $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$ is invariant under ψ^{-1}, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}\models\rho(y_1,\dots,y_n) &\implies (y_1^{\mathcal{A}},\dots,y_n^{\mathcal{A}})\in\rho & \mathcal{A}\models x\equiv x_i &\implies x^{\mathcal{A}}=x_i^{\mathcal{A}}\\ &\implies (\psi^{-1}(y_1^{\mathcal{A}}),\dots,\psi^{-1}(y_n^{\mathcal{A}}))\in\rho & &\implies x^{\mathcal{A}}=\psi(a_i)\\ &\implies (y_1^{\mathcal{B}},\dots,y_n^{\mathcal{B}})\in\rho & &\implies \psi^{-1}(x^{\mathcal{A}})=a_i\\ &\implies \mathcal{B}\models\rho(y_1,\dots,y_n) & &\implies x^{\mathcal{B}}=a_i\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathcal{B}\models\Sigma$. □

5. Subalgebras and Images

Theorem 5.1. *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be a finite algebra.*

(1) *if* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable, so is* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *for every* $\mathbf{B} \leq \mathbf{A}$*;*

(2) *if there is* $\mathbf{B} \leq \mathbf{A}$ *such that* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *is* NP*-complete, so is* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A}))$ and $\mathcal{B} = (A, \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B}))$. By definition $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ iff $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$. But that $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is obvious since $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let* $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$ *be two finite algebras of the same type.*

(1) *if* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is polynomial-time decidable, so is* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *for every surjective homomorphism* $\alpha : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$*;*

(2) *if there is a surjective homomorphism* $\alpha : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$ *such that* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ *is* NP*-complete, so is* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B} = (B, \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B}))$. We show that there is $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B})$ such that, defining $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Gamma)$, $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial-time reducible to $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$. For every $\rho \in \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B})_n$ let

$$\alpha^{-1}(\rho) := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n : (\alpha(a_1), \dots, \alpha(a_n)) \in \rho\}$$

Clearly, $\alpha^{-1}(\rho) \in \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})_n$ and therefore, letting $\Gamma := \{\alpha^{-1}(\rho) : \rho \in \Gamma\}$, $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{A})$. Let Σ be a set of atomic formulas over $\mathrm{Inv}(\mathbf{B})$. Replace every formula $\rho(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $\alpha^{-1}(\rho)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We obtain a set of equations T over Γ by a polynomial-time reduction. Let β be a section of α.

$$\begin{tikzcd} & X \arrow[dl, "(-)^{\mathcal{A}}"'] \arrow[dr, "(-)^{\mathcal{B}}"] & \\ A \arrow[rr, bend right, "\alpha"'] & & B \arrow[ll, dotted, bend right, "\beta"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

Referring to the assignments in the picture, each defined in terms of the other so that the diagram commute, it is clear that $\mathcal{A} \models T$ iff $\mathcal{B} \models \Sigma$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be a relational structure. If* $\mathrm{Pol}(\mathcal{A})$ *contains essentially unary operations only,* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ *is* NP*-complete.*

Corollary 5.4. *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be a finite algebra. If there is* $\mathbf{B} \in HS(\mathbf{A})$ *such that* $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{B}) = \{\pi_i^n : 1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \omega\}$*, then* $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ *is* NP*-complete.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{B}$ is such that $\mathrm{Clo}(\mathbf{B}) = \{\pi_i^n : 1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \omega\}$, then $\mathrm{CSP}(\mathbf{B})$ is NP-complete by Lemma 5.3. We conclude using the second cluases of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2. □

6. Simple and Stricltty Simple Algebras

Definition 6.1. An algebra **A** is called **simple** if the lattice of congruences on **A** is $\{\Delta, \nabla\}$. An algebra **A** is **strictly simple** if it is simple and has no nontrivial subalgebras.

Remark 6.2. Since the lattice of congruence of **A** is in bijection with the set of surjective homomorphisms from **A**, **A** is simple if whenever there is a surjective homomorphism $\mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$ such that $|B| < |A|$, then **B** is the trivial algebra.

6.1. **Group actions.**

Let **G** be a group acting on a set A.

There is a well-defined function

$$G \times A \to A \times A, (g, a) \mapsto (a, g \cdot a)$$

Definition 6.3. The action is called

(1) **transitive** if the above map is surjective;
(2) **free** if the above map is injective;
(3) **regular** if the above map is bijective.

We say that the group **G** is **regular** if the action is.

Definition 6.4. We say that **G** is (or, more accurately, that the action is) **primitive** if $\{A\}$ and $\{\{a\} : a \in A\}$ are the only partitions invariant under **G**.

Remark 6.5. Each $g \in G$ induces

(1) a relation $\rho_g := \{(a, g \cdot a) : a \in A\} \subseteq A^2$. Let $P_{\mathbf{G}} := \{\rho_g : g \in G\}$.
(2) an operation $\varphi_g : A \to A$ given by $\varphi_g(a) = g \cdot a$. Let $\Phi_{\mathbf{G}} := \{\varphi_g : g \in G\}$.

Thus a **G**-set can be seen as an algebra $(A, \Phi_{\mathbf{G}})$. The action is primitive iff this algebra is simple.

6.2. **The classification theorem.**

References

[1] Bulatov, A. A., Jeavons, P., Krokhin, A. A. (2005). Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM Journal of Computation* 34(3), 720– 742.
[2] Jeavons, P. (1998). On the algebraic structure of combinatorial problems, *Theoretical Computer Science* 200, 185–204.
[3] Szendrei, Á. (1990). Simple surjective algebras having no proper subalgebras. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 48(3), 434-454.