

Algebraic Algorithms for the Inference Problem in Propositional Circumscription

Michał Wrona

Linköping University
SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
`michal.wrona@liu.se`

Algebraic and Model Theoretical Methods in Constraint Satisfaction,
Banff 2014

Outline

- 1 Introduction to the Inference Problem and Circumscription

Outline

- 1 Introduction to the Inference Problem and Circumscription
- 2 The Complexity, Schaefer's Framework and Our Contribution

Outline

- 1 Introduction to the Inference Problem and Circumscription
- 2 The Complexity, Schaefer's Framework and Our Contribution
- 3 Future Work

Circumscription: Origins and Motivation

- **Circumscription** is a form of nonmonotonic reasoning introduced by McCarthy in *Circumscription — A Form of Nonmonotonic Reasoning*. *Artif. Intell.* 1980.
- In Google Scholar the paper has 2500 citations, the Schaefer's paper *The Complexity of Satisfiability Problems* — 1480.
- **Circumscription** was introduced in order to assure a common sense assumption that things are as expected unless otherwise specified
 - for instance by looking at **minimal models**.
- Used to solve frame problem in artificial intelligence.
- Closely related **closed world reasoning**, another nonmonotonic formalism.

Orders on Solutions to the CSP

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order; $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of the CSP with V part. into P, Z, Q .

Orders on Solutions to the CSP

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order; $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of the CSP with V part. into P, Z, Q .

Let $\alpha, \beta : V \rightarrow D$ solutions to \mathcal{I} .

- $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $\alpha(v) \leq \beta(v)$ for all $v \in V$;

Orders on Solutions to the CSP

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order; $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of the CSP with V part. into P, Z, Q .

Let $\alpha, \beta : V \rightarrow D$ solutions to \mathcal{I} .

- $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $\alpha(v) \leq \beta(v)$ for all $v \in V$;
- $\alpha \leq_{(P,Z)} \beta$ if
 - $\alpha(v) = \beta(v)$ for all $v \in Q$, and
 - $\alpha(v) \leq \beta(v)$ for all $v \in P$.

Orders on Solutions to the CSP

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order; $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of the CSP with V part. into P, Z, Q .

Let $\alpha, \beta : V \rightarrow D$ solutions to \mathcal{I} .

- $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $\alpha(v) \leq \beta(v)$ for all $v \in V$;
- $\alpha \leq_{(P,Z)} \beta$ if
 - $\alpha(v) = \beta(v)$ for all $v \in Q$, and
 - $\alpha(v) \leq \beta(v)$ for all $v \in P$.

Example

assignment	$p_1 \in P$	$p_2 \in P$	$z_1 \in Z$	$z_2 \in Z$	$q_1 \in Q$	$q_2 \in Q$
α	0	0	5	6	1	1
β	0	1	4	4	1	1
γ	0	0	7	7	0	0

We have: $\alpha <_{(P,Z)} \beta$, and γ incomparable to both α and β .

General Minimal Inference Problem

GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: (V, P, Z, Q, D, C, ψ) , where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ;
- ψ a constraint over var. in V .

Question: Is every $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} a solution to ψ ?

General Minimal Inference Problem

GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: (V, P, Z, Q, D, C, ψ) , where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ;
- ψ a constraint over var. in V .

Question: Is every $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} a solution to ψ ?

GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) is always in $\Pi_2^P = \text{coNP}^{\text{NP}}$:

- We ask a counterexample: a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -min. sol. α to \mathcal{I} which is not a sol. to ψ .
- We use the oracle to check if α is $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -min.

General Minimal Inference Problem

GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: (V, P, Z, Q, D, C, ψ) , where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ;
- ψ a constraint over var. in V .

Question: Is every $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} a solution to ψ ?

GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) is always in $\Pi_2^P = \text{coNP}^{\text{NP}}$:

- We ask a counterexample: a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -min. sol. α to \mathcal{I} which is not a sol. to ψ .
- We use the oracle to check if α is $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -min.

The complexity classified for $\{0, 1\}$ and $|_0^1$. Depend. on Γ :

GMININF($\Gamma, |_0^1$) is Π_2^P -comp, coNP-comp, or in P. (many authors. the final step made by Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012.)

Versions of $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$

- $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z and Q are unrestricted,
- $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z unrestricted and $Q = \emptyset$,
- $\text{CMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = \emptyset$ and Q unrestricted,
- $\text{MININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = Q = \emptyset$.

Versions of $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$

- $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z and Q are unrestricted,
- $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z unrestricted and $Q = \emptyset$,
- $\text{CMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = \emptyset$ and Q unrestricted,
- $\text{MININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = Q = \emptyset$.

Complexity and polymorphisms. (Nordh, Jonsson, 2004.)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order. Γ_1, Γ_2 over D such that Γ_2 has a pp-definition in Γ_1 (or equiv. $\text{Pol}(\Gamma_1) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\Gamma_2)$). Then we have that $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$) is polynomially time reducible to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$).

Versions of $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$

- $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z and Q are unrestricted,
- $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z unrestricted and $Q = \emptyset$,
- $\text{CMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = \emptyset$ and Q unrestricted,
- $\text{MININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = Q = \emptyset$.

Complexity and polymorphisms. (Nordh, Jonsson, 2004.)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order. Γ_1, Γ_2 over D such that Γ_2 has a pp-definition in Γ_1 (or equiv. $\text{Pol}(\Gamma_1) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\Gamma_2)$). Then we have that $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$) is polynomially time reducible to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$).

- For CMININF and MININF , one has to turn to partial clones.
- We concentrate on GMININF and VMININF .

Versions of $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$

- $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z and Q are unrestricted,
- $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with Z unrestricted and $Q = \emptyset$,
- $\text{CMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = \emptyset$ and Q unrestricted,
- $\text{MININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ with $Z = Q = \emptyset$.

Complexity and polymorphisms. (Nordh, Jonsson, 2004.)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order. Γ_1, Γ_2 over D such that Γ_2 has a pp-definition in Γ_1 (or equiv. $\text{Pol}(\Gamma_1) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\Gamma_2)$). Then we have that $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_2, (D; \leq))$) is polynomially time reducible to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$ ($\text{VMININF}(\Gamma_1, (D; \leq))$).

- For CMININF and MININF , one has to turn to partial clones.
- We concentrate on GMININF and VMININF .

All the versions classified for $\{0, 1\}$.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

What we can learn for our setting?

- $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is polynomial time equivalent to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma \cup \{\{(d_1)\}, \dots, \{(d_{|D|})\}\}, (D; \leq))$.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

What we can learn for our setting?

- 1 $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is polynomial time equivalent to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma \cup \{\{(d_1)\}, \dots, \{(d_{|D|})\}\}, (D; \leq))$.
- 2 If Γ is conservative and $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP for any $(D; \leq)$.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

What we can learn for our setting?

- 1 $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is polynomial time equivalent to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma \cup \{\{(d_1)\}, \dots, \{(d_{|D|})\}\}, (D; \leq))$.
- 2 If Γ is conservative and $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP for any $(D; \leq)$.
- 3 If $(D; \leq)$ is linear and $\text{Alg}(\Gamma)$ has a subalgebra with a two-element factor with projections only, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is Π_2^P -complete.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

What we can learn for our setting?

- 1 $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is polynomial time equivalent to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma \cup \{\{(d_1)\}, \dots, \{(d_{|D|})\}\}, (D; \leq))$.
- 2 If Γ is conservative and $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP for any $(D; \leq)$.
- 3 If $(D; \leq)$ is linear and $\text{Alg}(\Gamma)$ has a subalgebra with a two-element factor with projections only, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is Π_2^P -complete.

Corollary: If $(D; \leq)$ is linear and Γ is conservative, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is Π_2^P -comp. or in coNP.

GMININF over arbitrary finite domains

Nordh, Jonsson, *An Algebraic Approach to the Complexity of Propositional Circumscription*, LICS 2004.

- The authors consider $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma)$, i.e., $(D; \leq)$ is a part of an input.

What we can learn for our setting?

- 1 $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is polynomial time equivalent to $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma \cup \{\{(d_1)\}, \dots, \{(d_{|D|})\}\}, (D; \leq))$.
- 2 If Γ is conservative and $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP for any $(D; \leq)$.
- 3 If $(D; \leq)$ is linear and $\text{Alg}(\Gamma)$ has a subalgebra with a two-element factor with projections only, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is Π_2^P -complete.

Corollary: If $(D; \leq)$ is linear and Γ is conservative, then $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is Π_2^P -comp. or in coNP.

Question:

- **What about polynomial cases?**

GMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 both \vee and \wedge (clone M_2),
- 2 both \wedge and $(x \wedge (\neg y \vee z))$ (clone S_{12}),
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$ (clone D_1).

Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is coNP-hard.

GMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \lfloor_0^1)$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 both \vee and \wedge (clone M_2),
- 2 both \wedge and $(x \wedge (\neg y \vee z))$ (clone S_{12}),
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$ (clone D_1).

Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \lfloor_0^1)$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a lattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup and the meet \sqcap .

GMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \lfloor_0^1)$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 both \vee and \wedge (clone M_2),
- 2 both \wedge and $(x \wedge (\neg y \vee z))$ (clone S_{12}),
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$ (clone D_1).

Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \lfloor_0^1)$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a lattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup and the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap and an S_{12} -operations, i.e., satisfying $f(y, x, x) = y$ and $f(y, y, x) = x$ for all $x \leq y$ in D .

GMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, |_0^1)$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 both \vee and \wedge (clone M_2),
- 2 both \wedge and $(x \wedge (\neg y \vee z))$ (clone S_{12}),
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$ (clone D_1).

Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, |_0^1)$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a lattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup and the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap and an S_{12} -operations, i.e., satisfying $f(y, x, x) = y$ and $f(y, y, x) = x$ for all $x \leq y$ in D .
- 3 $(D; \leq)$ is any order and Γ is preserved by a discriminator operation.

General Minimal Extension Problem

GMINEXT($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$, where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ,
- $V_1 \subseteq V$ and $\alpha : V_1 \rightarrow D$.

Question: Is there a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} extending α ?

General Minimal Extension Problem

GMINEXT($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

$(D; \leq)$ a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$, where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ,
- $V_1 \subseteq V$ and $\alpha : V_1 \rightarrow D$.

Question: Is there a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} extending α ?

If GMINEXT($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) in P , then GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) in P . (Durand, Hermann, 2003.)

General Minimal Extension Problem

GMINEXT($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$)

($D; \leq$) a partial order and Γ a constraint language over D .

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$, where:

- $\mathcal{I} = (V, D, C)$ an instance of CSP(Γ) with V part. into P, Z, Q ,
- $V_1 \subseteq V$ and $\alpha : V_1 \rightarrow D$.

Question: Is there a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} extending α ?

If GMINEXT($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) in P , then GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$) in P . (Durand, Hermann, 2003.)

Algorithm for GMININF:

- Let (V, P, Z, Q, D, C, ψ) be an instance of GMININF($\Gamma, (D; \leq)$).
- If there is an assignment to $\text{Var}(\psi)$ not satisfying ψ that can be extended to a $(\leq_{(P,Z)})$ -minimal solution to \mathcal{I} , then return NO, else return YES.

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $\text{GMINEXT}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $\text{GMINEXT}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $\text{GMINEXT}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.
- 4 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of β to V .

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.
- 4 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of β to V .
- 5 If γ does not exist return false.

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.
- 4 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of β to V .
- 5 If γ does not exist return false.
- 6 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $\text{GMINEXT}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.
- 4 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of β to V .
- 5 If γ does not exist return false.
- 6 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .
- 7 If $\gamma|_P = \theta|_P$ return true
- 8 else return false.

Lattice, polymorphisms: \sqcup and \sqcap .

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcup and \sqcap , then $\text{GMINEXT}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 Let $Q_2 := Q \setminus V_1$.
- 2 $\beta :=$ the greatest extension of α to $V_1 \cup Q_2$. (wrt. (\leq))
- 3 If β does not exist return false.
- 4 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of β to V .
- 5 If γ does not exist return false.
- 6 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .
- 7 If $\gamma|_P = \theta|_P$ return true
- 8 else return false.

$(D; \leq)$ lattice. Relation preserved by both \sqcap and \sqcup iff definable by a conjunction of clauses of the form: $(x \leq d_1 \vee y \geq d_2)$.

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

($D; \leq$) a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of α to V .
- 2 If γ does not exist return false.

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of α to V .
- 2 If γ does not exist return false.
- 3 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .
- 4 If $\gamma|_P = \theta|_P$ return true
- 5 else return false.

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of α to V .
- 2 If γ does not exist return false.
- 3 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .
- 4 If $\gamma|_P = \theta|_P$ return true
- 5 else return false.

We use an S_{12} -operation in the proof.

Meet-semilattice, polymorphisms: \sqcap , S_{12} -operation

Theorem

$(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice, Γ preserv. by \sqcap and an S_{12} -operation, then $GMINEXT(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ in P .

Algorithm.

Instance: $(V, P, Z, Q, D, C, V_1, \alpha)$.

- 1 $\gamma :=$ the least extension of α to V .
- 2 If γ does not exist return false.
- 3 $\theta :=$ the least extension of $\gamma|_Q$ to V .
- 4 If $\gamma|_P = \theta|_P$ return true
- 5 else return false.

We use an S_{12} -operation in the proof.

Some relations preserv. by a S_{12} -op and \sqcap

$(D; \leq)$ a lattice. Every relation definable by a conjunction of clauses of the form $(x \geq d)$ and $(x_1 \leq d_1 \vee \dots \vee x_k \leq d_k)$ is preserved by a S_{12} -operation and \sqcap .

VMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 \wedge ,
- 2 constant operation 0 and one of: \vee , minority or majority,
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$.

Otherwise, the problem $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is coNP-hard.

VMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 \wedge ,
- 2 constant operation 0 and one of: \vee , minority or majority,
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$.

Otherwise, the problem $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

VMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \left|_0^1\right.)$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 \wedge ,
- 2 constant operation 0 and one of: \vee , minority or majority,
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$.

Otherwise, the problem $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \left|_0^1\right.)$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .

VMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 \wedge ,
- 2 constant operation 0 and one of: \vee , minority or majority,
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$.

Otherwise, the problem $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ with the least element \perp and Γ preserved by a constant operation \perp and an idempotent operation f such that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P whenever Γ preserved by f .

VMININF in Boolean Case

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix})$ is in P if Γ is preserved by

- 1 \wedge ,
- 2 constant operation 0 and one of: \vee , minority or majority,
- 3 $((x \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (z \wedge \neg y))$.

Otherwise, the problem $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix})$ is coNP-hard.

Our contributions. $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in P if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ with the least element \perp and Γ preserved by a constant operation \perp and an idempotent operation f such that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P whenever Γ preserved by f .
- 3 $(D; \leq)$ is any order and Γ is preserved by a discriminator operation.

Conditions for coNP Containment

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in coNP if Γ is preserved by one of the following: \wedge , \vee , majority, or minority. Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is Π_2^P -hard.

Conditions for coNP Containment

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in coNP if Γ is preserved by one of the following: \wedge , \vee , majority, or minority. Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is Π_2^P -hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a join-semilattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup .

Conditions for coNP Containment

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in coNP if Γ is preserved by one of the following: \wedge , \vee , majority, or minority. Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is Π_2^P -hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a join-semilattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup .

But we do not know what happens for near-unanimity and Maltsev operations.

Conditions for coNP Containment

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is in coNP if Γ is preserved by one of the following: \wedge , \vee , majority, or minority. Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is Π_2^P -hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a join-semilattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup .

But we do not know what happens for near-unanimity and Maltsev operations.

$\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \frac{1}{0})$ is also in coNP if Γ is preserved by the constant operation 0.

Conditions for coNP Containment

Theorem (Durand, Hermann, Nordh, 2012)

Γ over $\{0, 1\}$. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is in coNP if Γ is preserved by one of the following: \wedge , \vee , majority, or minority. Otherwise the problem $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is Π_2^P -hard.

Our contributions. $\text{GMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP if

- 1 $(D; \leq)$ a meet-semilattice and Γ preserved by the meet \sqcap .
- 2 $(D; \leq)$ a join-semilattice and Γ preserved by the join \sqcup .

But we do not know what happens for near-unanimity and Maltsev operations.

$\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, \binom{1}{0})$ is also in coNP if Γ is preserved by the constant operation 0.

We can prove: $\text{VMININF}(\Gamma, (D; \leq))$ is in coNP if $(D; \leq)$ has the least element \perp and Γ is preserved by the constant operation \perp .

Future Work

- Further generalizations of tractable cases.

Future Work

- Further generalizations of tractable cases.
- Conditions for coNP containment.

Future Work

- Further generalizations of tractable cases.
- Conditions for coNP containment.
- Conditions for hardness.

Future Work

- Further generalizations of tractable cases.
- Conditions for coNP containment.
- Conditions for hardness.
- Partial classifications: conservative case, three element case.

Future Work

- Further generalizations of tractable cases.
- Conditions for coNP containment.
- Conditions for hardness.
- Partial classifications: conservative case, three element case.

Thank you for your attention.