

# A Dichotomy for 2-Constraint Forbidden CSP Patterns\*

Martin C. Cooper    Guillaume Escamocher  
IRIT, University of Toulouse, France (cooper@irit.fr)

## Abstract

Although the CSP (constraint satisfaction problem) is NP-complete, even in the case when all constraints are binary, certain classes of instances are tractable. We study classes of instances defined by excluding subproblems. This approach has recently led to the discovery of novel tractable classes. The complete characterisation of all tractable classes defined by forbidding patterns (where a pattern is simply a compact representation of a set of subproblems) is a challenging problem. We demonstrate a dichotomy in the case of forbidden patterns consisting of either one or two constraints. This has allowed us to discover new tractable classes including, for example, a novel generalisation of 2SAT.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we study the generic combinatorial problem known as the binary constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) in which the aim is to determine the existence of an assignment of values to  $n$  variables such that a set of constraints on pairs of variables are simultaneously satisfied. The generic nature of the CSP has led to diverse applications, notably in the fields of Artificial Intelligence and Operations Research.

A fundamental research question in complexity theory is the identification of tractable subproblems of NP-complete problems. Classical approaches have consisted in identifying types of constraints which imply the existence of a polynomial-time algorithm. Among the most well-known examples, we can cite linear constraints and Horn clauses. In an orthogonal approach, restrictions are placed solely on the (hyper)graph of constraint scopes. In some cases, dichotomies have even been proved characterising all tractable classes definable by placing restrictions either on the constraint relations [2, 3] or on the (hyper)graph of constraint scopes [12, 13, 14].

Recently, a new avenue of research has been investigated: the identification of tractable classes of CSP instances defined by forbidding a specific (set of) subproblems. Novel tractable classes have been discovered by forbidding simple 3-variable subproblems [8, 9]. This paper presents an essential first step towards the identification of all such tractable classes, namely a dichotomy for the special case of forbidden 2-constraint subproblems.

We first define the notion of a CSP pattern. A pattern can be seen as a generalisation of a binary CSP instance; it represents a *set* of subproblems by leaving the consistency of some tuples undefined. We use the term *point* to denote an assignment of a value to a variable, i.e. a pair  $a = \langle v, d \rangle$  where  $d$  is in the domain of variable  $v$ . A pattern is a graph in which vertices correspond to points and both vertices and edges are labelled. The label of a vertex corresponding to an assignment  $\langle v, d \rangle$  is simply the variable  $v$  and the label of an edge between two vertices describes the compatibility of the pair of assignments corresponding to the pair of vertices.

**Definition 1.** A pattern is a quintuplet  $\langle V, A, var, E, cpt \rangle$  comprising:

- a set  $V$  of variables,
- a set  $A$  of points (assignments),

---

\*supported by ANR Project ANR-10-BLAN-0210.

- a variable function  $var : A \rightarrow V$ ,
- a set  $E \subseteq \binom{A}{2}$  of edges (unordered pairs of elements of  $A$ ) such that  $\{a, b\} \in E \Rightarrow var(a) \neq var(b)$ ,
- a Boolean-valued compatibility function  $cpt : E \rightarrow \{F, T\}$ , where for notational simplicity, we write  $cpt(a, b)$  instead of  $cpt(\{a, b\})$ .


**Definition 2.** A binary CSP instance is a pattern  $\langle V, A, var, E, cpt \rangle$  such that  $E = \{(a, b) \mid var(a) \neq var(b)\}$  (i.e. the compatibility of each pair of assignments to distinct variables is specified by the compatibility function). The question corresponding to the instance is: does there exist a consistent set of assignments to all the variables, that is a solution  $\bar{A} \subseteq A$  such that  $|\bar{A}| = |V|$ ,  $(\forall a, b \in \bar{A}, var(a) \neq var(b))$  and  $(\forall e \in \binom{\bar{A}}{2}, cpt(e) = T)$ ?

For a pattern  $P = \langle V, A, var, E, cpt \rangle$  and a variable  $v \in V$ , we use  $A_v$  to denote the set of assignments  $\{a \in A \mid var(a) = v\}$ . The constraint on variables  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  is the pattern  $\langle \{v_1, v_2\}, A_{12}, var|_{A_{12}}, E_{12}, cpt|_{E_{12}} \rangle$  where  $A_{12} = A_{v_1} \cup A_{v_2}$  and  $E_{12} = \{\{a, b\} \mid a \in A_{v_1}, b \in A_{v_2}\}$ . If  $cpt(a, b) = T$  then the two assignments (points)  $a, b$  are compatible and  $\{a, b\}$  is a compatibility edge; if  $cpt(a, b) = F$  then the two assignments  $a, b$  are incompatible and  $\{a, b\}$  is a incompatibility edge. In a pattern, the compatibility of a pair of points  $a, b$  such that  $var(a) \neq var(b)$  and  $(a, b) \notin E$  is undefined. A pattern can be viewed as a means of representing the set of all instances obtained by arbitrarily specifying the compatibility of such pairs. Two patterns  $P$  and  $Q$  are isomorphic if they are identical except for a possible renaming of variables and assignments.


In a CSP instance  $\langle V, A, var, E, cpt \rangle$ , we call the set  $\{d \mid (v, d) \in A\}$  of values that can be assigned to variable  $v$  the domain of  $v$  and the set  $\{(a, b) \in A_{v_1} \times A_{v_2} \mid cpt(a, b) = T\}$  of compatible pairs of values that can be assigned to two variables  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  the constraint relation on  $v_1, v_2$ . The constraint between variables  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  in an instance is non-trivial if there is at least one incompatible pair of assignments, i.e.  $a \in A_{v_1}$  and  $b \in A_{v_2}$  such that  $cpt(a, b) = F$ . The constraint graph of an instance  $\langle V, A, var, E, cpt \rangle$  is  $\langle V, H \rangle$ , where  $H$  is the set of pairs of variables  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  such that the constraint on  $v_1, v_2$  is non-trivial.

**Definition 3.** We say that a pattern  $P$  occurs in a pattern  $P'$  (or that  $P'$  contains  $P$ ) if  $P'$  is isomorphic to a pattern  $Q$  in the transitive closure of the following two operations (extension and merging) applied to  $P$ :

**extension**  $P$  is a sub-pattern of  $Q$  (and  $Q$  an extension of  $P$ ): if  $P = \langle V_P, A_P, var_P, E_P, cpt_P \rangle$  and  $Q = \langle V_Q, A_Q, var_Q, E_Q, cpt_Q \rangle$ , then  $V_P \subseteq V_Q$ ,  $A_P \subseteq A_Q$ ,  $var_P = var_Q|_{A_P}$ ,  $E_P \subseteq E_Q$ ,  $cpt_P = cpt_Q|_{E_P}$ . Example:



**merging** Merging two points in  $P$  transforms  $P$  into  $Q$ : if  $P = \langle V_P, A_P, var_P, E_P, cpt_P \rangle$  and  $Q = \langle V_Q, A_Q, var_Q, E_Q, cpt_Q \rangle$ , then  $\exists a, b \in A_P$  such that  $var_P(a) = var_P(b)$  and  $\forall c \in A_P$  such that  $\{a, c\}, \{b, c\} \in E_P$ ,  $cpt_P(a, c) = cpt_P(b, c)$ . Furthermore,  $V_P = V_Q$ ,  $A_Q = A_P \setminus \{b\}$ ,  $var_Q = var_P|_{A_Q}$ ,  $E_Q = E_P \cup \{\{a, x\} \mid \{b, x\} \in E_P\}$  and  $cpt_Q(a, x) = cpt_Q(b, x)$  if  $\{b, x\} \in E_P$ ,  $cpt_Q(e) = cpt_P(e)$  otherwise. Example:



**Notation:** Let  $P$  be a CSP pattern. We use  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  to denote the set of binary CSP instances  $Q$  in which  $P$  does not occur.

**Definition 4.** A pattern  $P$  is intractable if  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  is NP-complete. It is tractable if there is a polynomial-time algorithm to solve  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ .

In this paper we characterise all tractable two-constraint patterns. It is worth observing that, in a class of CSP instances defined by forbidding a pattern, there is no bound on the size of domains. Recall, however, that CSP instances have finite domains since the set of all possible assignments is assumed to be given in extension as part of the input.

Clearly, all classes of CSP instances  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  defined by forbidding a pattern are hereditary:  $I \in \text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  and  $I' \subseteq I$  (in the sense that  $I$  is an extension of  $I'$ , according to Definition 3) together imply that  $I' \in \text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ . Furthermore, if  $I \in \text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  and  $I'$  is isomorphic to  $I$ , then  $I' \in \text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ . Forbidding a pattern therefore only allows us to define hereditary classes closed under arbitrary permutations of variable domains.

## 2 Preprocessing operations on CSP instances

This section describes polynomial-time simplification operations on CSP instances. Assuming that these operations have been applied facilitates the proof of tractability of many patterns.

Let  $\langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$  be a CSP instance. If for some variable  $v$ ,  $A_v$  is a singleton  $\{a\}$ , then the *elimination of a single-valued variable* corresponds to making the assignment  $a$  and consists of eliminating  $v$  from  $V$  and eliminating  $a$  from  $A$  as well as all assignments  $b$  which are incompatible with  $a$ .

Given a CSP instance  $\langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$ , *arc consistency* consists in eliminating from  $A$  all assignments  $a$  for which there is some variable  $v \neq \text{var}(a)$  in  $V$  such that  $\forall b \in A_v, \text{cpt}(a, b) = F$  [1].

Given a CSP instance  $\langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$ , if for  $\text{var}(a) = \text{var}(b)$  and for all variables  $v \neq \text{var}(a)$ ,  $\forall c \in A_v, \text{cpt}(a, c) = T \Rightarrow \text{cpt}(b, c) = T$ , then we can eliminate  $a$  from  $A$  by *neighbourhood substitution*, since in any solution in which  $a$  appears, we can replace  $a$  by  $b$  [10]. Establishing arc consistency and eliminating single-valued variables until convergence produces a unique result, and the result of applying neighbourhood substitution operations until convergence is unique modulo isomorphism [5]. None of these three operations when applied to an instance in  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$  can introduce the forbidden pattern  $P$ .

We now consider two new simplification operations. They are simplification operations that can be applied to certain CSP instances. We can always perform the fusion of two variables  $v_1, v_2$  in a CSP instance into a single variable  $v$  whose set of assignments is the cartesian product of the sets of assignments to  $v_1$  and to  $v_2$ . Under certain conditions, we do not need to keep all elements of this cartesian product and, indeed, the total number of assignments actually decreases.

**Definition 5.** Consider a CSP instance  $\langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$  with  $v_1, v_2 \in V$ . Suppose that there is a fusion function  $f : A_{v_1} \rightarrow A_{v_2}$ , such that  $\forall u \in A_{v_1}$ , whenever  $u$  is in a solution  $S$ , there is a solution  $S'$  containing both  $u$  and  $f(u)$ . Then we can perform the *simple fusion* of  $v_2$  and  $v_1$  to create a new fused variable  $v$ . The resulting instance is  $\langle V', A', \text{var}', E', \text{cpt}' \rangle$  defined by  $V' = (V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}) \cup \{v\}$ ,  $A' = A \setminus A_{v_2}$ ,  $\text{var}'(u) = \text{var}(u)$  for all  $u \in A' \setminus A_{v_1}$  and  $\text{var}'(u) = v$  for all  $u \in A_{v_1}$ ,  $E' = \{(p, q) \in \binom{A'}{2} \mid \text{var}'(p) \neq \text{var}'(q)\}$ ,  $\text{cpt}'(p, q) = \text{cpt}(p, q)$  if  $p, q \in A' \setminus A_{v_1}$ ,  $\text{cpt}'(u, q) = \text{cpt}(u, q) \wedge \text{cpt}(f(u), q)$  for all  $u \in A_{v_1}$  and all  $q \in A' \setminus A_{v_1}$ .

**Definition 6.** Consider a CSP instance  $\langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$  with  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  and a hinge value  $a \in A_{v_1}$ . Suppose that there is a fusion function  $f : A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\} \rightarrow A_{v_2}$ , such that  $\forall u \in A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\}$ , whenever  $u$  is in a solution  $S$ , there is a solution  $S'$  containing both  $u$  and  $f(u)$ . Then we can perform the *complex fusion* of  $v_2$  and  $v_1$  to create a new fused variable  $v$ . The resulting instance is  $\langle V', A', \text{var}', E', \text{cpt}' \rangle$  defined by  $V' = (V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}) \cup \{v\}$ ,  $A' = A \setminus \{a\}$ ,  $\text{var}'(u) = \text{var}(u)$  for all  $u \in A' \setminus (A_{v_1} \cup A_{v_2})$  and  $\text{var}'(u) = v$  for all  $u \in (A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\}) \cup A_{v_2}$ ,  $E' = \{(p, q) \in \binom{A'}{2} \mid \text{var}'(p) \neq \text{var}'(q)\}$ ,  $\text{cpt}'(p, q) = \text{cpt}(p, q)$  if  $p, q \in$

$A' \setminus (A_{v_1} \cup A_{v_2})$ ,  $cpt'(u, q) = cpt(u, q) \wedge cpt(f(u), q)$  for all  $u \in A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\}$  and all  $q \in A' \setminus (A_{v_1} \cup A_{v_2})$ ,  $cpt'(p, q) = cpt(a, q) \wedge cpt(p, q)$  for all  $p \in A_{v_2}$  and all  $q \in A' \setminus (A_{v_1} \cup A_{v_2})$ .

**Lemma 1.** *If  $I$  is a CSP instance and  $I'$  the result of a (simple or complex) fusion of two variables in  $I$ , then  $I'$  is solvable iff  $I$  is solvable.*

*Proof.* We give the proof only for the case of a complex fusion, since a simple fusion can be considered as a special case. Among the assignments in the cartesian product of  $A_{v_1}$  and  $A_{v_2}$ , it is sufficient, in order to preserve solvability, to keep only those of the form  $(a, q)$  where  $q \in A_{v_2}$  or of the form  $(u, f(u))$  where  $u \in A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\}$ . To complete the proof, it suffices to observe that in  $A'$  we use  $q \in A_{v_2}$  to represent the pair of assignments  $(a, q)$  and  $u \in A_{v_1} \setminus \{a\}$  to represent  $(u, f(u))$ .  $\square$


Fusion preserves solvability and the total number of assignments decreases by at least 1 (in fact, by  $|A_{v_2}|$  in the case of a simple fusion). However, when solving instances  $I \in \text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ , for some pattern  $P$ , a fusion operation will only be useful if it does not introduce the forbidden pattern  $P$ .

### 3 Reduction

In a pattern  $P$ , a point  $a$  which is linked by a single compatibility edge to the rest of  $P$  is known as a *dangling point*. If an arc consistent instance  $I$  does not contain the pattern  $P$  then it does not contain the pattern  $P'$  which is equivalent to  $P$  in which the dangling point  $a$  and the corresponding compatibility edge have been deleted. Thus, since arc consistency is a polynomial-time operation which cannot introduce a forbidden pattern, to decide tractability we only need consider patterns without dangling points.

**Definition 7.** *We say that a pattern  $P$  can be reduced to a pattern  $Q$ , and that  $Q$  is a reduction of  $P$ , if  $Q$  is in the transitive closure of the three operations extension, merging and dp-elimination applied to  $P$ , where dp-elimination is the following operation:*

**dp-elimination** *Eliminating a dangling point and its corresponding compatibility edge from  $P$  transforms  $P$  into  $Q$ . Example:*



**Lemma 2.** *Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be two patterns, such that  $P$  can be reduced to  $Q$ . Let  $I$  be a CSP instance satisfying arc consistency. If  $Q$  occurs in  $I$ , then  $P$  also occurs in  $I$ .*

*Proof.* By definition, reduction is a transitive relation. Therefore, by induction, it suffices to prove the result for each of the individual operations: extension, merging and dp-elimination. We suppose  $Q$  occurs in  $I$ . If  $Q$  is an extension of  $P$ , then  $P$  is a sub-pattern of  $Q$  and the result is immediate. If merging two points  $a$  and  $b$  in  $P$  transforms it into  $Q$ , then  $P$  actually covers two different patterns: the one where  $a$  and  $b$  are different points, and the one where  $a$  and  $b$  are the same point. The latter pattern is  $Q$ . So the set of instances containing  $Q$  is a subset of the set of instances containing (at least one of the two versions of)  $P$  and we have the result. If adding a dangling point and its corresponding compatibility edge to  $Q$  transforms it into  $P$ , then since  $I$  satisfies arc consistency  $P$  also occurs in  $I$ .  $\square$

The following corollary follows immediately from the fact that arc consistency can be established in polynomial time.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be two patterns, such that  $P$  can be reduced to  $Q$ . Then*

- *If  $Q$  is tractable, then  $P$  is tractable.*
- *If  $P$  is intractable, then  $Q$  is intractable.*

It follows that we only need to study those patterns that cannot be reduced to a known tractable pattern and that are not the reduction of a known intractable pattern.

## 4 One-constraint patterns

In this section we prove a dichotomy for patterns composed of a single constraint. We also prove some results concerning 1-constraint patterns that are essential for the proof of the 2-constraint dichotomy given in Section 5.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $P$  be a pattern such that a constraint in  $P$  contains two distinct incompatibility edges that cannot be merged. Then  $P$  is intractable.*

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a pattern such that a constraint in  $P$  contains two non-mergeable incompatibility edges. Let SAT1 be the set of SAT instances with at most one occurrence of each variable in each clause. SAT1 is trivially equivalent to SAT which is well known to be NP-complete [4]. It suffices to give a polynomial reduction from SAT1 to  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ . We suppose that we have a SAT1 instance  $I = \{V, S\}$  with  $V$  a set of variables  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  and  $S$  a set of clauses  $\{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  such that each clause  $C_i$  is a disjunction of  $c_i$  literals  $l_i^1 \vee \dots \vee l_i^{c_i}$ . We create the following CSP instance  $I'$ :

- $n + k$  variables  $v'_1, \dots, v'_{n+k}$ .
- $\forall v'_i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , two points " $v_i$ " and " $\overline{v_i}$ " in  $A_{v'_i}$ .
- $\forall v'_i$  with  $n + 1 \leq i \leq n + k$ ,  $c_{i-n}$  points  $l_{i-n}^1, \dots, l_{i-n}^{c_{i-n}}$  in  $A_{v'_i}$ .
- $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k, \forall 1 \leq j \leq c_i$ , an incompatibility edge between the point  $l_i^j \in A_{v'_{n+i}}$  and the occurrence in  $A_{v'_1}, \dots, A_{v'_n}$  of the literal  $\overline{l_i^j}$ .

By construction,  $I'$  has a solution if and only if  $I$  has a solution. Furthermore, each time an incompatibility edge occurs in a constraint  $C$ , this constraint  $C$  is between a CSP variable  $v'_i$  representing the SAT1 variable  $v_i$  and another CSP variable  $v'_{n+j}$  representing the SAT1 clause  $C_j$ . Since  $v_i$  occurs at most once in  $C_j$ , then there is only one incompatibility edge in  $C$ . So  $I'$  does not contain the pattern  $P$ . So we have reduced SAT1 to  $\text{CSP}(\overline{P})$ .  $\square$

**Definition 8.** *Given a pattern  $P = \langle V, A, \text{var}, E, \text{cpt} \rangle$ , a variable  $v \in V$ , and a point  $a \in A_v$ , we say that  $a$  is explicitly compatible (respectively explicitly incompatible) if there is a point  $b \in A$  such that  $a$  is compatible with  $b$  (respectively such that  $a$  is incompatible with  $b$ ).*

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $P$  be a non-mergeable pattern. Then for every variable  $v$  in  $P$ , there is at most one point in  $A_v$  which is not explicitly incompatible.*

*Proof.* We suppose we have a pattern  $P$  such that there are two points  $a$  and  $b$  with  $\text{var}(a) = \text{var}(b)$  such that neither  $a$  nor  $b$  is explicitly incompatible. So no point in the pattern is incompatible with either  $a$  or  $b$ . Hence, we can merge  $a$  and  $b$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $Z$  be the pattern on two variables  $v$  and  $v'$ , with points  $a, b \in A_v$  and points  $c, d \in A_{v'}$  such that  $a$  is compatible with both  $c$  and  $d$ ,  $b$  is compatible with  $c$  and incompatible with  $d$ .

**Lemma 5.**  *$Z$  is intractable.*

*Proof.* Since 3-COLOURING is NP-complete [11], it suffices to give a polynomial reduction from 3-COLOURING to  $\text{CSP}(\overline{Z})$ , the set of CSP instances in which the pattern  $Z$  does not occur.

Define the relation  $R_{s,t} \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}^2$  by

$$R_{s,t} = \{(u, v) \mid (u = s \wedge v = t) \vee (u \neq s \wedge v \neq t)\}$$

It is easy to verify that  $R_{s,t}$  does not contain the pattern  $Z$ . Consider the 5-variable gadget with variables  $v_i, v_j, u_1, u_2, u_3$ , each with domain  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , and with constraints  $R_{k,k}$  on variables  $(v_i, u_k)$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ) and constraints  $R_{1+(k \bmod 3), k}$  on variables  $(u_k, v_j)$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ). The joint effect of these six constraints is simply to impose the constraint  $v_i \neq v_j$ . Any instance  $\langle V, E \rangle$  of 3-COLOURING, with  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , can be reduced to an instance of  $\text{CSP}(\overline{Z})$  with variables  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  by placing a copy of this gadget between every pair of variables  $(v_i, v_j)$  such that  $\{i, j\} \in E$ . This reduction is clearly polynomial.  $\square$

Let  $1I$  be the pattern on two variables  $v$  and  $v'$  with points  $a \in A_v$  and  $b \in A_{v'}$  such that  $a$  and  $b$  are incompatible.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $P$  be a pattern on one constraint. Then either  $P$  is reducible to the trivial tractable pattern  $1I$ , and thus is tractable, or  $P$  is intractable.*

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a pattern on one constraint between two variables  $v$  and  $v'$ . From Lemma 3, we know that if  $P$  has two distinct incompatibility edges, then  $P$  is intractable. If there is no incompatibility edge at all in  $P$ , then  $P$  is reducible by merging and/or dp-elimination to the empty pattern, which is itself reducible by sub-pattern to  $1I$ . We suppose there is exactly one incompatibility edge in  $P$ . We label  $a \in A_v$  and  $b \in A_{v'}$  the points defining that edge. From Lemma 4, we know that we only need to consider at most one other point  $c \neq a$  in  $A_v$  and at most one other point  $d \neq b$  in  $A_{v'}$ . If all three edges  $\{a, d\}$ ,  $\{c, b\}$  and  $\{c, d\}$  are compatibility edges, then  $P$  is intractable from Lemma 5. If only two or less of these edges are compatibility edges, then  $P$  is reducible by merging and/or dp-elimination to  $1I$ . So we have the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $P$  be a pattern composed of two separate one-constraint patterns:  $P_1$  on variables  $v_0, v_1$  and  $P_2$  on variables  $v_2, v_3$ , where all four variables are distinct. Then*

1. *If either  $P_1$  or  $P_2$  is intractable, then  $P$  is intractable too.*
2. *If both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are tractable, then  $P$  is tractable.*

*Proof.* 1.  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are sub-patterns of  $P$ , so they are both reducible to  $P$ . So if one of them is intractable, then  $P$  is intractable too, by Corollary 1.

2. Suppose that both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are tractable. So there are two polynomial algorithms  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  which solve  $\text{CSP}(P_1)$  and  $\text{CSP}(P_2)$ , respectively. Let  $I$  be a CSP instance such that  $P$  does not occur in  $I$ . So either  $P_1$  or  $P_2$  does not occur in  $I$ . So  $I$  can be solved by either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$ . So any CSP instance in  $\text{CSP}(P)$  can be solved by one of two polynomial algorithms. So  $P$  is tractable.  $\square$

The following lemma concerns a pattern in which some structure is imposed on domain elements. It is essential for our two-constraint dichotomy.

Let  $2V$  be pattern on three variables  $v_0, v_1$  and  $v_2$  with three points  $a, b, c \in A_{v_1}$ , three points  $d, e, f \in A_{v_2}$  and six points  $g, h, i, j, k, l \in A_{v_0}$ , such that  $a$  is compatible with  $h$ ,  $b$  is compatible with  $g$  and  $h$ ,  $c$  is incompatible with  $i$ ,  $d$  is incompatible with  $j$ ,  $e$  is compatible with  $k$  and  $l$ ,  $f$  is compatible with  $l$ . The pattern  $2V$  also has the associated structure  $(a \neq b \text{ or } g \neq h)$  and  $(e \neq f \text{ or } k \neq l)$ . When a pattern has an associated structure given by a property  $\mathcal{P}$ , the property  $\mathcal{P}$  must be preserved by reduction operations. For example, if  $\mathcal{P}$  is  $a \neq b$  then the points  $a$  and  $b$  cannot be merged during a reduction. It is worth pointing out that in a CSP instance, all points are assumed to be distinct and hence a property such as  $a \neq b$  is necessarily satisfied.

**Lemma 8.**  $2V$  is intractable.

*Proof.* Let the gadget  $V^+$  be the pattern on two variables  $v_0, v_1$  with points  $a \in A_{v_0}$  and  $b, c \in A_{v_1}$  such that  $a$  is compatible with both  $b$  and  $c$ , together with the structure  $b \neq c$ . In the pattern  $2V$ , either  $b$  is compatible with two different points  $g$  and  $h$ , or  $h$  is compatible with two different points  $a$  and  $b$ . So, if  $2V$  occurs in a CSP instance on variables  $v'_0, v'_1, v'_2$ , then the gadget  $V^+$  necessarily occurs in the constraint between  $v'_0$  and  $v'_1$ . By an identical argument, the gadget  $V^+$  must also occur in the constraint between  $v'_0$  and  $v'_2$ .


We define an equality constraint between two variables  $v$  and  $v'$  with the same domain as the constraint consisting of compatibility edges between identical values in  $A_v$  and  $A_{v'}$  and incompatibility edges between all other couples of points. Thus, by definition, a point in an equality constraint is compatible with one and only one point. Since the gadget  $V^+$  contains a point  $a$  compatible with two different points,  $V^+$  does not occur in an equality constraint.

We will reduce CSP to  $\text{CSP}(\overline{2V})$ . Let  $I$  be a CSP instance. For each  $(v, w)$  in  $I$  such that there is a non-trivial constraint between  $v$  and  $w$ , we introduce two new variables  $v'$  and  $w'$  such that the domain of  $v'$  is the same as the domain of  $v$ , the domain of  $w'$  is the same as the domain of  $w$ . We add equality constraints between  $v$  and  $v'$ , and between  $w$  and  $w'$ , and we add between  $v'$  and  $w'$  the same constraint as there was between  $v$  and  $w$ . All other constraints involving  $v'$  or  $w'$  are trivial. We also replace the constraint between  $v$  and  $w$  by a trivial constraint. After this transformation,  $v$  and  $w'$  are the only variables which share a constraint with  $v'$ . Let  $I'$  be the instance obtained after all such transformations have been performed on  $I$ . By construction,  $I'$  has a solution if and only if  $I$  has a solution.

We now suppose that we have three variables  $v_0, v_1$  and  $v_2$  in  $I'$  such that there are non-trivial constraints between  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  and between  $v_0$  and  $v_2$ . By construction, at least one of these constraints is an equality constraint. Hence, the gadget  $V^+$  cannot occur in both of these constraints. It follows that  $2V$  cannot occur in  $I'$ . So we have reduced  $I$  to an instance without any occurrence of the pattern  $2V$ . This polynomial reduction from CSP to  $\text{CSP}(\overline{2V})$  shows that  $2V$  is intractable.  $\square$

## 5 Two-Constraint patterns

Let  $T$  be the following set  $\{T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5\}$ :



No pattern in  $T$  can be reduced to a different pattern in  $T$ . As we will show, each  $T_i$  defines a tractable class of binary CSP instances. For example,  $T_4$  defines a class of instances which includes as a proper subset all instances with zero-one-all constraints [7]. Zero-one-all constraints can be seen as a generalisation of 2SAT clauses to multi-valued logics.

Let  $2I$  represent the pattern composed of two separate copies of  $1I$ , i.e. four points  $a, b, c, d$  such that  $\text{var}(a), \text{var}(b), \text{var}(c), \text{var}(d)$  are all distinct and both  $a, b$  and  $c, d$  are pairs of incompatible points.


**Theorem 1.** *Let  $P$  be a pattern on two constraints. Then  $P$  is tractable if and only if  $P$  is reducible to one of the patterns in  $T \cup \{2I\}$ .*

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$ : A two-constraint pattern involves either three or four distinct variables. Consider first the latter case, in which  $P$  is composed of two separate one-constraint patterns  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  on four distinct variables. By Lemma 7,  $P$  is tractable if and only if both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are tractable. Furthermore, by Lemma 6, all tractable one-constraint patterns are reducible to  $1I$ . Thus, if  $P$  is tractable, then it is reducible to  $2I$ , by a combination of the two reductions of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  to  $1I$ . It only remains to study two-constraint patterns on *three* variables.

From Lemma 3, we know that we only have to study patterns with at most one incompatibility edge in each constraint. If one of the constraints does not contain any incompatibility edge at all, then the pattern is reducible by merging and/or dp-elimination to a pattern with only one constraint. So we can assume from now on that there is exactly one incompatibility edge ( $a \in A_{v_0}, b \in A_{v_1}$ ) between  $v_0$  and  $v_1$ , and also exactly one incompatibility edge ( $c \in A_{v_0}, d \in A_{v_2}$ ) between  $v_0$  and  $v_2$ . The “skeleton” of incompatibility edges of an irreducible tractable pattern can thus take two forms according to whether  $a = c$  or  $a \neq c$ .

From Lemma 4 we know that  $|A_v| \leq 2$  for each variable  $v$  with only one explicitly incompatible point, and that  $|A_v| \leq 3$  for each variable  $v$  with two explicitly incompatible points. We know from Lemmas 5 and 8 that both  $Z$  and  $2V$  are intractable, so we must look for patterns in which neither one occurs. We know that we have two possible incompatibility skeletons to study, each one implying a maximum number of points appearing in the pattern.


First incompatibility skeleton:



Suppose first that  $a$  is a point in the pattern. Then there must be a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $e$ , otherwise we could merge  $a$  and  $b$ . There also must be a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $f$ , otherwise  $a$  would be a dangling point. Similarly, if  $d$  is a point in the pattern, then there must be compatibility edges between  $d$  and  $e$ , and between  $d$  and  $f$ . So if both  $a$  and  $d$  are points in the pattern, then the pattern  $2V$  occurs. So  $a$  and  $d$  cannot be both points of the pattern. Since they play symmetric roles, we only have two cases to consider: either  $a$  is a point in the pattern and not  $d$ , or neither  $a$  nor  $d$  is a point in the pattern.

If  $a$  is a point in the pattern, then the only remaining edges are  $\{f, b\}$  and  $\{f, c\}$ .  $\{f, b\}$  cannot be a compatibility edge, because otherwise the pattern  $Z$  would occur.  $\{f, c\}$  must be a compatibility edge, otherwise we could merge  $f$  and  $e$ . On the other hand, if neither  $a$  nor  $d$  is a point in the pattern, then the only remaining edges are  $\{f, b\}$  and  $\{f, c\}$ . If one of them is a compatibility edge but not the other, then  $f$  would be a dangling point. So either both  $\{f, b\}$  and  $\{f, c\}$  are compatibility edges, or neither of them is. However, the latter case is reducible to the former one. So the only possible irreducible tractable patterns are  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .

Second incompatibility skeleton:



If  $g$  is a point in the pattern, then there must be a compatibility edge between  $g$  and  $b$ , otherwise we could merge  $g$  and  $e$ . There also must be a compatibility edge between  $g$  and  $c$ , otherwise we could merge  $g$  and  $f$ . We suppose  $a$  is a point in the pattern. Then there is a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $e$ , otherwise we could merge  $a$  and  $b$ . There is also a compatibility edge either between  $a$  and  $f$  or between  $a$  and  $g$ , otherwise  $a$  would be a dangling point. We cannot have a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $g$ , otherwise the pattern  $Z$  would occur. So there is a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $f$ . There is a compatibility edge either between  $b$  and  $f$  or between  $c$  and  $e$ , otherwise we could merge  $e$  and  $f$ . We cannot have a compatibility edge between  $b$  and  $f$ , otherwise the pattern  $Z$  would occur. We cannot have a compatibility edge between  $c$  and  $e$ , otherwise the pattern  $2V$  would occur. So  $a$  cannot be a point in the pattern. Since  $a$  and  $d$  play symmetric roles, we can also deduce that  $d$  cannot be a point in the pattern. So the only remaining edges are  $\{b, f\}$  and  $\{c, e\}$ . At least one of them is a compatibility edge, otherwise we could merge  $e$  and  $f$ . If both of them are compatibility edges, the pattern  $2V$  occurs. So exactly one of them is a compatibility edge. Since they play symmetric roles, we can assume for instance that  $\{b, f\}$  is a compatibility edge while  $\{c, e\}$  is an unknown edge.

If  $g$  is not a point in the pattern, then we suppose that  $a$  is a point in the pattern. There is a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $e$ , otherwise we could merge  $a$  and  $b$ . There is also a compatibility edge between  $a$  and  $f$ , otherwise  $a$  would be a dangling point. Similarly, if  $d$  is a point in the pattern, then there must be compatibility edges between  $d$  and  $e$ , and between  $d$  and  $f$ . So  $a$  and  $d$  cannot be both points of the pattern. Since they play symmetric roles, we only have two cases to consider: either  $a$  is a point in the pattern and not  $d$ , or neither  $a$  nor  $d$  is a point in the pattern.

If  $a$  is a point in the pattern, then the only remaining edges are  $\{b, f\}$  and  $\{c, e\}$ . At least one of them is a compatibility edge, otherwise we could merge  $e$  and  $f$ . There is no compatibility edge between  $b$  and  $f$ , otherwise the pattern  $Z$  would occur. So there is a compatibility edge between  $c$  and  $e$ .

If neither  $a$  nor  $d$  is a point in the pattern, then the only remaining edges are  $\{b, f\}$  and  $\{c, e\}$ . At least one of them is a compatibility edge, otherwise we could merge  $e$  and  $f$ . So either exactly one of them is a compatibility edge, or they both are. However, the former case is reducible to the latter. So the only possible patterns are  $T_3, T_4$  or  $T_5$ .

So if  $P$  is a tractable pattern on two constraints, then  $P$  is reducible to one of the patterns in  $T$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : We now give the tractability proofs for all patterns in  $T$ . We assume throughout that we have applied until convergence the preprocessing operations: arc consistency, neighbourhood substitution and single-valued variable elimination.

**Proof of tractability of  $T_1$**  : We suppose we forbid the pattern  $T_1$ . Let the gadget  $X$  be the pattern on two variables  $v_0, v_1$  with points  $a, b \in A_{v_0}$  and  $c, d \in A_{v_1}$  such that  $a$  is incompatible with  $c$  and compatible with  $d$ , and  $b$  is compatible with  $c$  and incompatible with  $d$ .


Suppose that the gadget  $X$  occurs in an instance. Suppose  $a$  is in a solution  $S$ . Let  $e \in A_{v_2}$  be such that  $v_2 \neq v_0, v_2 \neq v_1$  and  $e \in S$ . Let  $f$  be the point of  $S$  in  $v_1$ .

If  $b$  is incompatible with  $e$  then  $a, b, d$  and  $e$  form the forbidden pattern. So  $b$  is compatible with  $e$ . Similarly, if  $c$  is incompatible with  $e$ , then  $a, c, f$  and  $e$  form the forbidden pattern. So  $c$  is compatible with  $e$ . So if we replace  $a$  by  $b$  and  $f$  by  $c$  in  $S$ , then we have another solution. So if  $a$  is in a solution, then  $b$  is also in a solution. So we can remove  $a$  while preserving the solvability of the instance.

So we can assume from now on that the gadget  $X$  doesn't occur in the instance. The following lemma indicates when we can perform fusion operations.

**Lemma 9.** Consider a (simple or complex) fusion of two variables  $v, v'$  in an instance in  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$ . Suppose that whenever  $(a, a')$  and  $(b, b')$  are pairs of fused points during this fusion, such that  $a \neq b \in A_v$  and  $a' \neq b' \in A_{v'}$ , then either  $a$  and  $b'$  are incompatible or  $b$  and  $a'$  are incompatible. Then the pattern  $T_1$  cannot be introduced by this fusion.

*Proof.* By the definition of (simple or complex) fusion, the only way that  $T_1$  could be introduced is when the two points in the central variable of  $T_1$  are created by the fusion of pairs of points  $(a, a')$  and  $(b, b')$  such that the compatibility of the points  $a, b \in A_v$  and  $a', b' \in A_{v'}$  with the two other points  $a_1, a_2$  of  $T_1$  are as shown:



Now, if  $a$  and  $b'$  were incompatible, then  $T_1$  was already present on points  $a_1, a, b, b'$  in the original instance, and hence cannot be introduced by the fusion. Similarly, if  $b$  and  $a'$  were incompatible, then  $T_1$  was already present on points  $b, a', b', a_2$  in the original instance.  $\square$

**Definition 9.**  $\forall v, v', \forall a, b \in A_v$ , we say that  $b$  is better than  $a$  with respect to  $v'$ , which we denote by  $a \leq b$  for  $(v, v')$  (or for  $v'$ ), if every point in  $A_{v'}$  compatible with  $a$  is also compatible with  $b$ .

It is easy to see that  $\leq$  is a partial order.

**Remark 1.** We also have the relations  $\geq, <, >$  and  $=$ , derived in the obvious way from  $\leq$ .

**Lemma 10.** 1.  $\forall (v, v')$ , the order  $\leq$  on  $A_v$  with respect to  $v'$  is total.

2.  $\forall v, \forall a, b \in A_v$ , there is  $v'$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v'$ .
3.  $\forall v, \forall a, b \in A_v$ , there is only one  $v'$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v'$ .

*Proof.* 1. Because the gadget  $X$  cannot occur.

2. Otherwise  $b$  is dominated by  $a$  and we can remove it by neighbourhood substitution.
3. Because of the initial forbidden pattern.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** If  $a < b < c$  for  $(v_0, v_1)$ , then there exists  $v_2 \neq v_1$  such that  $c < b < a$  for  $(v_0, v_2)$ .

*Proof.* Since we have  $a < b$  for  $(v_0, v_1)$ , from Lemma 10.2 there is some  $v_2$  such that  $b < a$  for  $(v_0, v_2)$ . Since  $b < c$  for  $(v_0, v_1)$ ,  $c \leq b$  for  $(v_0, v_2)$  by Lemma 10.3. If  $c < b$  for  $v_2$ , then we have the lemma. Otherwise, we have  $c = b < a$  for  $v_2$ . Since  $b < c$  for  $v_1$ , there exists  $v_3 \neq v_1, v_2$  such that  $c < b$  for  $v_3$ . Since  $a < b$  for  $v_1$ ,  $b \leq a$  for  $v_3$ . So  $c < b \leq a$  for  $v_3$ . So we have  $c < a$  for both  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ , which is not possible. So we must have  $c < b < a$  in  $v_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 12.**  $\forall a, b, c, d \in A_{v_0}$ , for all  $v_1 \neq v_0$  none of the following is true:

1.  $a = b < c < d$  for  $v_1$ .
2.  $a < b = c < d$  for  $v_1$ .
3.  $a < b < c = d$  for  $v_1$ .

*Proof.* We give the proof only for the case 1, since the proofs of cases 2 and 3 are almost identical. Since we have  $a < c < d$  for  $v_1$ , from Lemma 11 there exists  $v_2$  such that  $d < c < a$  for  $v_2$ . Likewise, since  $b < c < d$  for  $v_1$ , there exists  $v'_2$  such that  $d < c < b$  for  $v'_2$ . Since  $d < c$  for both  $v_2$  and  $v'_2$ ,  $v_2 = v'_2$  by Lemma 10.3. This leaves three possibilities:

1.  $d < c < b < a$  for  $v_2$ : from Lemma 11 we know there is  $v_3$  such that  $a < b < c$  for  $v_3$ . So we have  $a < c$  for both  $v_1$  and  $v_3$  with  $v_1 \neq v_3$  (since  $a = b$  for  $v_1$ ), which is not possible by Lemma 10.3. So we cannot have this possibility.
2.  $d < c < b = a$  for  $v_2$ : since  $a = b$  for both  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , by Lemma 10.2 there is a different  $v_3$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v_3$ . Since  $c < b$  for  $v_2$  and  $v_3 \neq v_2$ ,  $b \leq c$  for  $v_3$ . So  $a < c$  for  $v_3$ . But we also have  $a < c$  for  $v_1$  and  $v_1 \neq v_3$ . So by Lemma 10.3 we cannot have this possibility.
3.  $d < c < a < b$  for  $v_2$ : equivalent to the case  $d < c < b < a$  after interchanging  $a$  and  $b$ .

□

**Corollary 2.** If for some  $(v_0, v_1)$ , we have at least three equivalence classes in the order on  $A_{v_0}$  with respect to  $v_1$  then:

1. The order on  $A_{v_0}$  with respect to  $v_1$  is strict.
2. There is  $v_2$  such that the order on  $A_{v_0}$  with respect to  $v_2$  is the exact opposite to the order on  $A_{v_0}$  with respect to  $v_1$ .
3.  $\forall v_3$  such that  $v_3 \neq v_0, v_1, v_2$ , there is only one equivalence class in the order on  $A_{v_0}$  with respect to  $v_3$ .

*Proof.* Points 1,2 and 3 follow respectively from Lemma 12, Lemma 11 and Lemma 10. □

**Lemma 13.**  $\forall a, b, c, d \in A_{v_0}$ , there is no  $v_1$  such that  $a = b < c = d$  for  $v_1$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 10.2, we know there is some  $v_2$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v_2$ . Since we have  $a < c$  and  $a < d$  for  $v_1$ , by Lemma 10.3, we have  $c \leq a$  and  $d \leq a$  for  $v_2$ . From Corollary 2, we cannot have  $c < a < b$  or  $d < a < b$  for  $v_2$ , so we have  $d = c = a < b$  for  $v_2$ . Since we have  $c = d$  for both  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , we have a different variable  $v_3$  such that  $c < d$  for  $v_3$ . Since  $c < b$  for  $v_2$  and  $v_3 \neq v_2$ ,  $b \leq c$  for  $v_3$ . So  $b < d$  for  $v_3$ . But we also have  $b < d$  for  $v_1$  and  $v_1 \neq v_3$ . So, by Lemma 10.3, we cannot have this possibility. □

**Lemma 14.** If for some  $(v, v')$  there are at least three equivalence classes in the order on  $A_v$  with respect to  $v'$ , then there are the same number of points in both  $A_v$  and  $A_{v'}$  and both the order on  $A_v$  with respect to  $v'$  and the order on  $A_{v'}$  with respect to  $v$  are strict.

*Proof.* Let  $d$  be the number of points in  $A_v$  and  $d'$  the number of points in  $A_{v'}$ . From Lemma 12 we know that the order on  $A_v$  with respect to  $v'$  is strict. So we have  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_d$  for  $(v, v')$ . So we have  $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{d-1})$  such that  $\forall 1 \leq i < d$ ,  $a_i$  and  $a'_i$  are incompatible but  $a_{i+1}$  and  $a'_i$  are compatible. So  $\forall 2 \leq i < d$  we have  $a_i$  and  $a'_i$  which are incompatible but  $a_i$  and  $a'_{i-1}$  are compatible. So, by Lemma 10.1 we have  $a'_1 > a'_2 > \dots > a'_{d-1}$  for  $v$ . Moreover, since  $a_1$  is incompatible with  $a'_1$ ,  $a_1$  is incompatible with all  $a'_i$  for  $1 \leq i < d$ . By arc consistency, we have  $a'_0$  such that  $a_1$  and  $a'_0$  are compatible. So we have  $a'_0 > a'_1 > a'_2 > \dots > a'_{d-1}$ . So we have  $d \leq d'$  and at least three equivalence classes in the order on  $A_{v'}$  with respect to  $v$ . By switching  $v$  and  $v'$  in the proof, we can prove the remaining claims of the Lemma. □

We say that the pair of variables  $(v, v')$  is a *3-tiers pair* if there are at least 3 classes of equivalence in the order on  $A_v$  with respect to  $v'$ ; we say that it is a *2-tiers pair* otherwise.

We suppose we have  $v$  and  $v'$  such that  $(v, v')$  is a 3-tiers pair. Let  $d$  be the number of points in  $A_v$ . From Lemma 14 we know that the points in  $A_v$  can be denoted  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_d$  for  $v'$  and the points in  $A_{v'}$  can be denoted  $b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_d$  for  $v$ . We will show that we can perform a simple fusion of  $v$  and  $v'$  with fusion function  $f$  given by  $f(a_i) = b_{d+1-i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, d$ ).

**Lemma 15.**  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq d, \{b_{d+1-i}, b_{d+1-i+1}, \dots, b_d\}$  is the exact set of points compatible with  $a_i$ .

*Proof.* If we have  $a_i < a_j$  for  $v'$ , it means  $a_i$  is compatible with strictly less points in  $A_{v'}$  than  $a_j$ . By arc consistency, every point in  $A_v$  is compatible with a point in  $A_{v'}$ . So  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq d$ , we have  $d$  possibilities  $(1, 2, \dots, d)$  for the number of points compatible with  $a_i$ . Since we have  $d$  points in  $A_v$ , it means that  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq d, a_i$  is compatible with  $i$  points in  $A_{v'}$ . By definition of the order on a variable with respect to another variable, the points in  $A_{v'}$  compatible with a point  $a_i \in A_v$  are the greatest points for  $v$ . So we have the Lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.**  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq d$ , if  $a_i$  is in a solution  $S$ , then there is a solution  $S'$  such that both  $b_{d+1-i}$  and  $a_i$  are in  $S'$ .

*Proof.* Let  $b$  be the point of  $S$  in  $v'$ . If  $b_{d+1-i} = b$ , then we have the result. Otherwise, let  $c \neq b$  be a point of  $S$ . If  $c = a_i$ , then from Lemma 15 we know that  $c$  is compatible with  $b_{d+1-i}$ . Otherwise, let  $v_c = \text{var}(c)$ . So  $v_c \neq v$ . From Lemma 15 we have  $b_{d+1-i} < b$  for  $v$ . So  $b \leq b_{d+1-i}$  for  $v_c$ . So  $b_{d+1-i}$  is compatible with  $c$ . So  $b_{d+1-i}$  is compatible with all the points in  $S$ . So we have a solution  $S'$  obtained by replacing  $b$  by  $b_{d+1-i}$  in  $S$  which contains both  $a_i$  and  $b_{d+1-i}$ .  $\square$

We now perform the simple fusion of  $v$  and  $v'$  by with fusion function  $f(a_i) = b_{d+1-i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . By Lemma 16, this is a valid simple fusion and by Lemma 1 and the following lemma the resulting instance is in  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$  and solvable if and only if the original instance was solvable.

**Lemma 17.** The simple fusion of  $v$  and  $v'$  in an instance in  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$ , where  $(v, v')$  is a 3-tiers pair, does not create the forbidden pattern.

*Proof.* Let  $a, b$  be two distinct points in  $A_v$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $a < b$  for  $v'$ . By choice of the fusion function  $f$ ,  $b$  is the smallest (according to the order  $<$  for  $v'$ ) of the points in  $A_v$  compatible with  $f(b)$ . Therefore,  $a$  and  $f(b)$  are incompatible. The result then follows from Lemma 9.  $\square$

From now on,  $\forall (v, v')$ , we can assume that each pair  $(v, v')$  is a 2-tiers pair. We call *winner* for  $(v, v')$  the points in the greater equivalence class in the order for  $(v, v')$ . The other points are called *losers* for this order. A same point can (and actually will) be a winner for a given order and a loser for another order. If for a given order there is only one equivalence class, then all the points are considered winners.

The winners for  $(v, v')$  are compatible with all the points in  $A_{v'}$ . The losers for  $(v, v')$  are only compatible with the winners for  $(v', v)$ .

We say that a variable  $v$  is *one-winner* if  $\forall v' \neq v$ , either only one point of  $A_v$  is a winner for  $(v, v')$  or all the points in  $A_v$  are. Similarly, we say that a variable  $v$  is *one-loser* if  $\forall v' \neq v$ , either only one point of  $A_v$  is a loser for  $(v, v')$  or all the points of  $A_v$  are winners for  $(v, v')$ .

**Lemma 18.**  $\forall v$ , if there is  $v'$  such that there is only one winner for  $(v, v')$ , then  $v$  is one-winner. Similarly, if there is  $v'$  such that there is only one loser for  $(v, v')$ , then  $v$  is one-loser.

*Proof.* Let  $a, b, c, d, e, f \in A_v$  be such that there are  $v_1 \neq v_2$  with  $a = b < c$  for  $v_1, d < e = f$  for  $v_2, a \neq b$  and  $e \neq f$ . If  $d \neq c$ , then from Lemma 13, we have  $a = b = d < c$  for  $v_1$  and  $d < e = f = c$  for  $v_2$ . So  $d < c$  for both  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  with  $v_1 \neq v_2$  (which is a contradiction by Lemma 10.3). So we cannot have  $d \neq c$ . So  $d = c$ . So we have  $c < e = f$  for  $v_2$ . From Lemma 13 we have  $c < e = f = a = b$  for  $v_2$ . Since we have  $a = b$  for both  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , by Lemma 10.2 there is a different variable  $v_3$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v_3$ . Since  $a < c$  for  $v_1, c \leq a$  for  $v_3$ . So  $c < b$  for

$v_3$ . So  $c < b$  for both  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  with  $v_2 \neq v_3$ . This is impossible by Lemma 10.3. So we have the Lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.**  $\forall v$ , either  $v$  is one-winner or  $v$  is one-loser.

*Proof.* Lemma 10.2 tells us that there exists  $v'$  and  $a, b \in A_v$  such that  $a < b$  for  $v'$ . By Lemma 13, either there is only one winner for  $(v, v')$  or only one loser. The result follows directly from Lemma 18.  $\square$

Let  $E$  be the set of one-winner variables and  $F = V \setminus E$  with  $V$  being the set of all variables. From Corollary 3, the variables in  $F$  are one-loser. Let  $v_a, v_b \in E$  be such that there is a non-trivial constraint between  $v_a$  and  $v_b$ . Since  $v_a \in E$ , there is only one winner  $a$  for  $v_b$  in  $v_a$ . Similarly, there is only one winner  $b$  for  $v_a$  in  $v_b$ . We can perform a complex fusion of  $v_a$  and  $v_b$  with hinge value  $a$  and fusion function the constant function  $f = b$ .

By Lemma 1, the instance resulting from this fusion is solvable if and only if the original instance was solvable.

**Lemma 19.** *The complex fusion of two one-winner variables  $v_a$  and  $v_b$  in an instance of  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$  does not create the forbidden pattern.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(c, c')$  and  $(d, d')$  are corresponding pairs of points during this fusion, with  $c \neq d \in A_{v_a}$  and  $c' \neq d' \in A_{v_b}$ . Since  $v_a$  only has one winner for  $v_b$ , we know that either  $c$  or  $d$  is a loser for  $v_b$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $d$  is a loser for  $v_b$ . Since  $v_b$  only has one winner for  $v_a$ , and losers are only compatible with winners, we know that  $d$  is incompatible with  $c'$  (since it is necessarily compatible with  $d'$  for the fusion to take place). The result now follows directly from Lemma 9.  $\square$

We have shown that we can fusion any pair of variables in  $E$  between which there is a non-trivial constraint. We now do the same for  $F$ .

Let  $E$  be the set of one-winner variables and  $F = V \setminus E$  with  $V$  being the set of all variables. From Corollary 3, we know all variables in  $F$  are one-loser. Let  $v_a, v_b \in F$  be such that there is a non-trivial constraint between  $v_a$  and  $v_b$ . Since there is a non-trivial constraint between  $v_a$  and  $v_b$ , there is some  $a \in A_{v_a}$  and some  $b \in A_{v_b}$  such that  $a$  is incompatible with  $b$ .

**Lemma 20.** *If  $a' \in A_{v_a}$  is in a solution  $S$  and  $a' \neq a$ , then  $b$  is in a solution  $S'$  containing  $a'$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $b'$  be the point of  $S$  in  $v_b$ . If  $b' = b$ , then we have the result. Since  $v_a$  is a one-loser variable, we know that all points in  $A_{v_a}$  other than  $a$  are winners. Thus  $a'$  is compatible with  $b$ . By a symmetric argument,  $b'$  is compatible with  $a$ . If we have  $c \in S$  such that  $b$  is incompatible with  $c$ , then  $a, b', c$  and  $b$  form the forbidden pattern. So  $b$  is compatible with all the points in  $S$ . So if we replace  $b'$  by  $b$  in  $S$  we get a solution  $S'$  containing both  $a'$  and  $b$ .  $\square$

It follows from Lemma 20 that we only need to consider solutions containing  $a$  or  $b$ . We can therefore perform a complex fusion of  $v_a$  and  $v_b$  with hinge value  $a$  and fusion function the constant function  $f = b$ .


**Lemma 21.** *The complex fusion of  $v_a$  and  $v_b$  in an instance of  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$  does not create the forbidden pattern.*

*Proof.* In all pairs  $(c, c')$  of corresponding points in this fusion, we must have either  $c = a$  or  $c' = b$ . Suppose that  $(c, c')$  and  $(d, d')$  are corresponding pairs of points during the fusion, with  $c \neq d \in A_{v_a}$  and  $c' \neq d' \in A_{v_b}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $c = a$  and  $d' = b$ . But we know that  $a$  was incompatible with  $b$ . The result now follows directly from Lemma 9.  $\square$

We say a point  $a$  is *weakly incompatible* with a variable  $v$  if there exists some  $b \in A_v$  such that  $a$  is incompatible with  $b$ .

The total number of assignments decreases when we fuse variables, so the total number of (simple or complex) fusions that can be performed is linear in the size of the original instance. After all possible fusions of pairs of variables, we have two sets of variables  $E$  and  $F = V \setminus E$  such that:

- $\forall v, v' \in E$ , there is no non-trivial constraint between  $v$  and  $v'$ .
- $\forall v, v' \in F$ , there is no non-trivial constraint between  $v$  and  $v'$ .
- $\forall f$  a point in  $A_v$  for some  $v \in F$ ,  $f$  is weakly incompatible with one and only one variable  $v' \in E$ . Furthermore,  $f$  is incompatible with all points of  $A_{v'}$  but one (since  $v' \in E$  is a one-winner variable).
- The only possible non-trivial constraint between a variable  $v_1 \in E$  and another variable  $v_2 \in F$  is the following with  $d_1$  being the size of the domain of  $v_1$ :
  - There is a point  $b \in A_{v_2}$  incompatible with exactly  $d_1 - 1$  points in  $A_{v_1}$ .
  - $\forall b' \in A_{v_2}$  with  $b' \neq b$ ,  $b'$  is compatible with all the points in  $A_{v_1}$ .



We call NOOSAT (for Non-binary Only Once Sat) the following problem:

- A set of variables  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_e\}$ .
- A set of values  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ .
- A set of clauses  $C = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_f\}$  such that:
  - Each clause is a disjunction of literals, with a literal being in this case of the form  $v_i = a_j$ .
  - $\forall i, j, p, q ((v_i = a_j) \in C_p) \wedge ((v_i = a_j) \in C_q) \Rightarrow p = q$ .


**Lemma 22.**  $CSP(\overline{T_1})$  can be reduced to NOOSAT in polynomial time.

*Proof.* We suppose we have a binary CSP instance in  $CSP(\overline{T_1})$  and preprocessed as described above. We have shown that the non-trivial constraints between variables  $v \in F$  and  $v' \in E$  are all of the form  $v = b \Rightarrow v' = a$ . Furthermore, each variable-value assignment  $v = b$  occurs in exactly one such constraint. For any  $v \in F$ , we can replace the set of such constraints  $v = b_i \Rightarrow v_i = a_i$ , for all values  $b_i$  in the domain of  $v$ , by the clause  $(v_1 = a_1) \vee \dots \vee (v_d = a_d)$ . It only remains to

prove that no literal appears in two distinct clauses. Suppose that we have a literal  $v_1 = a$  which occurs in two distinct clauses. Then there must have been two constraints  $v_2 = b \Rightarrow v_1 = a$  and  $v_3 = c \Rightarrow v_1 = a$  and with  $v_1 \in E, v_2 \neq v_3 \in F$ . Let  $a' \neq a$  be a point in  $A_{v_1}$ . Then  $b$  and  $c$  are both incompatible with  $a'$  but compatible with  $a$ . But this is precisely the forbidden pattern. This contradiction shows that  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_1})$  can be reduced to NOOSAT.  $\square$

The constraints in NOOSAT are convex when viewed as  $\{0, \infty\}$ -valued cost functions, and the clauses are non overlapping. So, from [6], it is solvable in polynomial time. So the forbidden pattern  $T_1$  is tractable.

**Proof of tractability of  $T_2$  :** Let the gadget  $N$  be the following pattern: two variables  $v_0, v_1$  with points  $a, b \in A_{v_0}$  and  $c, d \in A_{v_1}$ , such that  $a$  and  $b$  compatible with  $d$ ,  $b$  incompatible with  $c$  and with the structure  $a \neq b$ .



Suppose we have the gadget  $N$ . Let  $v_2$  be a variable with  $v_2 \neq v_0, v_2 \neq v_1$  and let  $e$  be a point in  $A_{v_2}$  such that  $a$  and  $e$  are compatible. If  $b$  is incompatible with  $e$ , then we have the forbidden pattern  $T_2$  on  $d, c, b, a, e$ . So  $b$  is compatible with  $e$ . If all the points in  $A_{v_1}$  which are compatible with  $a$  are also compatible with  $b$ , then we can remove  $a$  by neighbourhood substitution. So, assuming that neighbourhood substitution operations have been applied until convergence, if we have the gadget  $N$ , then there is a point  $g \in A_{v_1}$  compatible with  $a$  and incompatible with  $b$ .

Let  $v_3 \neq v_1$ . By arc consistency, there is  $h \in A_{v_3}$  such that  $h$  is compatible with  $a$ . If  $b$  and  $h$  are incompatible, then we have the forbidden pattern  $T_2$  on  $d, g, b, a, h$ . So  $b$  and  $h$  are compatible. If there is  $i \in A_{v_3}$  such that  $b$  and  $i$  are incompatible, then we have the forbidden pattern on  $h, i, b, a, g$ . So  $b$  is compatible with all the points in  $A_{v_3}$ . So, if we have the gadget  $N$ , then  $b$  is compatible with all the points of the instance outside  $v_0, v_1$ .

**Definition 10.** A constraint  $C$  between two variables  $v$  and  $v'$  is functional from  $v$  to  $v'$  if  $\forall a \in A_v$ , there is one and only one point in  $A_{v'}$  compatible with  $a$ .


Let the gadget  $V^-$  be the pattern comprising three variables  $v_4, v_5, v_6$  and points  $a \in A_{v_4}$ ,  $b \in A_{v_5}$ ,  $c \in A_{v_6}$  such that  $a$  incompatible with both  $b$  and  $c$ .

From now on, since  $V^-$  is a tractable pattern [9], we only need to consider the connected components of the constraint graph which contain  $V^-$ .

**Lemma 23.** If in an instance from  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_2})$ , we have the gadget  $V^-$ , then the constraint between  $v_5$  and  $v_4$  is functional from  $v_5$  to  $v_4$  and the constraint between  $v_4$  and  $v_6$  is functional from  $v_6$  to  $v_4$ .

*Proof.* By symmetry, it suffices to prove functionality from  $v_5$  to  $v_4$ . We suppose we have the gadget  $V^-$ . Let  $d \in A_{v_5}$  be compatible with  $a$ . Since  $a$  is weakly incompatible with two different variables,  $a, b$  and  $d$  cannot be part of the gadget  $N$ . So the only point in  $A_{v_4}$  compatible with  $d$  is  $a$ . So if a point in  $A_{v_4}$  is compatible with  $a$ , then it is only compatible with  $a$ . Likewise, if a point in  $A_{v_6}$  is compatible with  $a$ , then it is only compatible with  $a$ .

Let  $f \neq a$  be a point in  $A_{v_4}$ . By arc consistency, we have  $d \in A_{v_5}$  and  $e \in A_{v_6}$  such that  $a$  is compatible with  $d$  and with  $e$ . From the previous paragraph, we know that both  $d$  and  $e$  are incompatible with  $f$ .



So  $d, e$  and  $f$  form the gadget  $V^-$ . So each point in  $A_{v_5}$  and  $A_{v_6}$  compatible with  $f$  is compatible with only one point of  $A_{v_4}$ . So each point in  $A_{v_5}$  and  $A_{v_6}$  compatible with a point in  $A_{v_4}$  is compatible with only one point of  $A_{v_4}$ . By arc consistency, each point of  $A_{v_5}$  and  $A_{v_6}$  is compatible with exactly one point of  $A_{v_4}$ . So the constraint between  $v_4$  and  $v_5$  is functional from  $v_5$  to  $v_4$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 24.** *In a connected component of the constraint graph containing  $V^-$  of an instance from  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_2})$ , all constraints are either functional or trivial.*

*Proof.* Let  $P(V)$  be the following property: " $V$  is a connected subgraph of size at least two of the constraint graph and all constraints in  $V$  are either functional or trivial".

$P(\{v_4, v_5\})$  is true from Lemma 23.

Let  $V_{\text{all}}$  be the set of all variables of the connected subgraph of the constraint graph containing  $V^-$ . Let  $V$  be a maximum (with respect to inclusion) subset of  $V_{\text{all}}$  for which  $P(V)$ . Let  $V' = V_{\text{all}} \setminus V$ . Let  $v' \in V'$ . Let  $v \in V$  be such that  $C(v, v')$  (the constraint on  $v, v'$ ) is non-trivial. So there is  $d \in A_v$  and  $e \in A_{v'}$  such that  $d$  and  $e$  are incompatible. Since  $V$  is connected and of cardinality at least two, then there is  $v'' \in V$  such that  $C(v, v'')$  is functional. By arc consistency and elimination of single-valued variables, there is necessarily a point  $f \in A_{v''}$  such that  $d$  and  $f$  are incompatible. So  $d, e$  and  $f$  form the gadget  $V^-$ . From Lemma 23 we know  $C(v, v')$  is functional. So  $P(V)$  is true for all subsets of  $V_{\text{all}}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 25.**  $\forall v$ , all points in  $A_v$  are weakly incompatible with the exact same set of variables.

*Proof.* Let  $a \in A_v$  be weakly incompatible with  $v'$ . So  $C(v, v')$  is non trivial. So  $C(v, v')$  is functional.

If  $C(v, v')$  is functional from  $v$  to  $v'$ , then a point in  $A_v$  can be compatible with only one point in  $A_{v'}$ . We can assume, by elimination of single-valued variables, that there are at least two points in  $A_{v'}$ , so every point in  $A_v$  is weakly incompatible with  $v'$ .

If  $C(v, v')$  is functional from  $v'$  to  $v$ , then let  $b \neq a$  in  $v$ . By arc consistency, we know there is  $c \in A_{v'}$  such that  $a$  and  $c$  are compatible. Since  $C(v, v')$  is functional from  $v'$  to  $v$ , then  $c$  is compatible with only one point in  $A_v$ , in that case  $a$ , so  $b$  is incompatible with  $c$ . So every point in  $A_v$  is weakly incompatible with  $v'$ .

So  $\forall(v, v'), a \in A_v$  weakly incompatible with  $v' \Rightarrow \forall b \in A_v, b$  weakly incompatible with  $v'$ .  $\square$

**Definition 11.** A sequence of variables  $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$  is a path of functionality if  $\forall 0 \leq i \leq k-1 : C(v_i, v_{i+1})$  is functional from  $v_i$  to  $v_{i+1}$ .

**Lemma 26.**  $\forall v, v'$ , either  $v'$  is a leaf in the constraint graph, or there is a path of functionality from  $v$  to  $v'$ .

*Proof.* Since we are in a connected component, there is a path of incompatibility  $(v_0 = v, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k = v')$  with all  $v_i$  different. If  $v'$  is not a leaf, then we have a path of incompatibility  $(v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1}, v_k, v_{k+1})$  with  $v_{k+1} \neq v_{k-1}$ . From Lemma 25 we have a path of incompatibility  $(a_0 \in A_{v_0}, a_1 \in A_{v_1}, \dots, a_k \in A_{v_k}, a_{k+1} \in A_{v_{k+1}})$ . So  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $a_{i-1}, a_i$  and  $a_{i+1}$  form the gadget  $V^-$ . So from Lemma 23,  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $C(v_{i-1}, v_i)$  is functional from  $v_{i-1}$  to  $v_i$ . So we have a path of functionality from  $v$  to  $v'$ .  $\square$

Leaves can be added to an existing solution by arc consistency. So once we have removed all the points we can (from the gadget  $N$ ) we only have to set an initial variable  $v_0$  and see if the  $q$  chains of implications (with  $q$  being the number of points in  $A_{v_0}$ ) lead to a solution. So the pattern  $T_2$  is tractable.

**Proof of tractability of  $T_3$  :** Consider an instance from  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_3})$ .

Let  $N$  be the following gadget: two variables  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  such that we have  $a$  in  $A_{v_0}$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  in  $A_{v_1}$ , with  $b \neq c$ ,  $a$  compatible with both  $b$  and  $c$  and  $c$  incompatible with a point in  $A_{v_0}$ .

Let  $d$  be a point in  $A_{v_2}$ , with  $v_2 \neq v_0, v_1$ . If  $d$  is compatible with  $c$  but not with  $b$ , then we have the forbidden pattern  $T_3$ . So if  $c$  is compatible with a point outside of  $A_{v_0}$ , then  $b$  is also compatible with the same point.


Let  $S$  be a solution containing  $c$ . Let  $e$  be the point of  $S$  in  $A_{v_0}$ . If  $e$  is compatible with  $b$ , then we can replace  $c$  by  $b$  in  $S$  while maintaining the correctness of the solution, since all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  which are compatible with  $c$  are also compatible with  $b$ .

If  $e$  is not compatible with  $b$ , then edges  $\{b, e\}$ ,  $\{e, c\}$  and  $\{c, a\}$  form the gadget  $N$ . So, by our previous argument, if  $e$  is compatible with a point outside of  $A_{v_1}$ , then  $a$  is also compatible with the same point. We can then replace  $c$  by  $b$  and  $e$  by  $a$  in  $S$  while maintaining the correctness of the solution, since all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  which are compatible with  $c$  are also compatible with  $b$  and all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_1}$  which are compatible with  $e$  are also compatible with  $a$ . So if a solution contains  $c$ , then there is another solution containing  $b$ . Thus we can remove  $c$  while preserving solvability.

So each time the gadget  $N$  is present, we can remove one of its points and hence eliminate  $N$ . The gadget  $N$  is a known tractable pattern since forbidding  $N$  is equivalent to saying that all constraints are either trivial or bijections. So if it is not present, then the instance is tractable. It follows that the pattern  $T_3$  is tractable.

**Proof of tractability of  $T_4$  :** Consider an instance from  $\text{CSP}(\overline{T_4})$ .

Let  $W$  be the following gadget: two variables  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  such that we have  $a$  in  $A_{v_0}$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  in  $A_{v_1}$ , with  $b \neq c$ ,  $a$  compatible with both  $b$  and  $c$ , and  $a$  incompatible with a point in  $A_{v_1}$ .



Let  $f$  be a point in  $A_{v_2}$ , with  $v_2 \neq v_0, v_1$ . If  $f$  is compatible with  $b$  but not with  $c$ , then we have the forbidden pattern  $T_4$ . Likewise, if  $f$  is compatible with  $c$  but not with  $b$ , then we have the forbidden pattern  $T_4$ . So all the points of the instance not in  $A_{v_0}$  or  $A_{v_1}$  have the same compatibility towards  $b$  and  $c$ .

If all points in  $A_{v_0}$  compatible with  $b$  are also compatible with  $c$ , then all the points in the instance compatible with  $b$  are also compatible with  $c$  and by neighborhood substitution we can remove  $b$ . Thus we can assume there is  $d$  in  $A_{v_0}$  such that  $d$  is compatible with  $b$  but not with  $c$ .

Let  $S$  be a solution containing  $c$ . Let  $e$  be the point of  $S$  in  $v_0$ . If  $e$  is compatible with  $b$ , then we can replace  $c$  by  $b$  in  $S$  while maintaining the correctness of the solution, since  $b$  and  $c$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$ . If  $e$  is not compatible with  $b$ , then edges  $\{b, e\}$ ,  $\{b, a\}$  and  $\{b, d\}$  form the gadget  $W$ . So, by our argument above,  $a$  and  $d$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$ . Similarly, edges  $\{c, d\}$ ,  $\{c, a\}$  and  $\{c, e\}$  form the gadget  $W$ . So  $a$  and  $e$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$ . So  $d$  and  $e$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$ . Thus we can replace  $c$  by  $b$  and  $e$  by  $d$  in  $S$  while maintaining the correctness of the solution, since  $b$  and  $c$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$  and  $e$  and  $d$  have the same compatibility towards all the points in the instance outside of  $A_{v_0}$  and  $A_{v_1}$ . So if a solution contains  $c$ , then there is another solution containing  $b$ . Thus we can remove  $c$ .

Therefore, each time the gadget  $W$  is present, we can remove one of its points. The gadget  $W$  is a known tractable pattern since forbidding  $W$  is equivalent to saying that all constraints are zero-one-all [7]. So if it is not present, the instance is tractable. Hence pattern  $T_4$  is tractable.

**Proof of tractability of  $T_5$  :** The pattern  $T_5$  is a sub-pattern of the broken-triangle pattern  $BTP$ , a known tractable pattern [8] on three constraints. So the pattern  $T_5$  is tractable. □

## 6 Conclusion

An avenue for future research is to investigate the possible generalisations of the five tractable classes defined by forbidding patterns  $T_1, \dots, T_5$ . Possible generalisations include the addition of costs, replacing binary constraints by  $k$ -ary constraints ( $k > 2$ ) and adding extra constraints to the patterns.

## References

- [1] Bessière, C., Régin, J.-C., Yap, R. H. C. and Zhang, Y., An optimal coarse-grained arc consistency algorithm, *Artificial Intelligence*, 165 (2) (2005) 165–185.
- [2] Bulatov, A., Jeavons, P. and Krokhin, A., Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34 (3) (2005) 720–742.
- [3] Bulatov, A. A., A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set, *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1) (2006) 66–120.
- [4] Cook, S. A., The Complexity of Theorem-Proving Procedures, *STOC* (1971) 151–158.
- [5] Cooper, M. C. Fundamental properties of neighbourhood substitution in constraint satisfaction problems, *Artificial Intelligence* 90 (1997) 1–24.
- [6] Cooper, M. C. and Živný, S., Hierarchically nested convex VCSP, *Proc. CP 2011*, LNCS 6876 (2011) 187–194.
- [7] Cooper, M. C., Cohen, D. A. and Jeavons, P. G. Characterising tractable constraints, *Artificial Intelligence* 65 (2) (1994) 347–361.
- [8] Cooper, M. C., Jeavons, P. G., and Salamon, A. Z., Generalizing constraint satisfaction on trees: Hybrid tractability and variable elimination, *Artificial Intelligence*, 174 (9–10) (2010) 570–584.

- [9] Cooper, M. C. and Živný, S., Hybrid tractability of valued constraint problems, *Artificial Intelligence*, 175 (9-10) (2011) 1555–1569.
- [10] Freuder, E. C., Eliminating interchangeable values in constraint satisfaction problems, *Proceedings AAAI-91*, Anaheim, CA (1991) 227–233.
- [11] Garey, M. R. and Johnson, D. S., *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman (1979).
- [12] Grohe, M., The complexity of homomorphism and constraint satisfaction problems seen from the other side, *Journal of the ACM*, 54 (1) (2007) 1–24.
- [13] Marx, D., Can You Beat Treewidth?, *Theory of Computing*, 6 (1) (2010) 85–112.
- [14] Marx, D., Tractable hypergraph properties for constraint satisfaction and conjunctive queries, *STOC '10* (2010) 735–744.