

# Enumerating Tarski fixed points on lattices of binary relations\*

Julian Müller

Social Networks Lab, ETH Zürich  
 Institute of Computing, Università della Svizzera italiana  
 julian.mueller@gess.ethz.ch

## Abstract

We study the problem of enumerating Tarski fixed points, focusing on the relational lattices of equivalences, quasiorders and binary relations. We present a polynomial space enumeration algorithm for Tarski fixed points on these lattices and other lattices of polynomial height. It achieves polynomial delay when enumerating fixed points of increasing isotone maps on all three lattices, as well as decreasing isotone maps on the lattice of binary relations. In those cases in which the enumeration algorithm does not guarantee polynomial delay on the three relational lattices on the other hand, we prove exponential lower bounds for deciding the existence of three fixed points when the isotone map is given as an oracle, and that it is NP-hard to find three or more Tarski fixed points. More generally, we show that any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm must perform a number of queries asymptotically at least as large as the lattice width to decide the existence of three fixed points when the isotone map is given as an oracle. Finally, we demonstrate that our findings yield a polynomial delay and space algorithm for listing bisimulations and instances of some related models of behavioral or role equivalence.

## 1 Introduction

Models of behavioral or role equivalence, like the linked concepts of bisimulation [27, 31], structural relatedness [34] and regular equivalence [38], have been used to describe alike states in labeled transition systems or compare the structural similarity of actors in social networks. Since information on empirically collected networks is generally incomplete, the maximum bisimulation or regular equivalence, however, can be too coarse to be useful for analysis and interpretation; notably, it is well-known that this maximum is trivial on undirected graphs [5]. Thus, social scientists have also shown interest in the finer instances of these models that networks admit [1, 4, 5].

Models of behavioral or role equivalence can commonly be described as fixed points of an efficiently computable isotone map on the underlying lattice [27, 29, 35]. Thus, the existence of minimum or maximum instances as well as the lattice structure of instances follow from the renowned fixed point theorem of Tarski [37].

Hence, listing behavioral or role equivalences can be reduced to enumerating so-called Tarski fixed points, i.e., the fixed points of isotone maps defined on underlying lattices. With this motivation, this paper studies the problem of listing Tarski fixed points with particular focus on the lattices of equivalences, quasiorders and binary relations, since they commonly underlie models of behavioral or role equivalence (cf. Table 1). In the following, we refer to these three lattices as *relational lattices*.

---

\*A Java implementation of the discussed enumeration algorithm is available in the `ch.ethz.sn.visone3.roles.lattice` package of the `netroles` library [28].

Table 1: Exemplary models of behavioral or role equivalence, broken down by the lattices they are defined on and the structure of associated isotone maps.

lattices \ maps	decreasing isotone	isotone	increasing isotone
equivalences	regular equivalence [38]	perfect equivalence [7]	ecological equivalence [6, 7]
quasiorders	simulations restricted to quasiorders [9]		
binary relations	bisimulation [27]		

Procedures for listing all solutions to a problem are known as enumeration algorithms. Since the number of solutions can be several magnitudes larger than the input size, the runtime of an enumeration algorithm is usually measured in reference to its produced output as well. Two important complexity notions for enumeration were introduced by Johnson et al. [25]: An enumeration algorithm runs in *incremental polynomial time* if the next solution is produced in time polynomial in the size of the input and previously produced outputs. An even stronger requirement is obtained by measuring an algorithm’s *delay*, the time spent between two listed solutions: An algorithm runs with *polynomial delay* if the delay is polynomial in the input size. Observe that polynomial delay implies incremental polynomial time, but not vice versa.

Echenique [18] proposed an algorithm for listing Tarski fixed points of a particular type on a specific lattice, namely Nash equilibria of supermodular games. A straightforward adaption of this algorithm to arbitrary Tarski fixed point problems, however, generally requires space exponential in the input size.

**Contributions.** In this paper, we make substantial improvements to Echenique’s algorithm such that it requires only polynomial space on polynomial-height lattices and runs with polynomial delay in some scenarios. Conversely, we prove hardness results on searching at least three fixed points, and finally we discuss the application to the enumeration of bisimulations and other notions of behavioral or role equivalence. Specifically, we make the following contributions:

- In Section 4, we generalize and improve Echenique’s algorithm [18] such that it stays within polynomial space on the relational lattices or any fixed point lattice of polynomial height. Moreover, we show that the improved algorithm runs with polynomial delay for increasing isotone maps on the relational lattices and for decreasing isotone maps on the lattice of binary relations, scenarios in which the straightforward adaptation of Echenique’s algorithm only achieves incremental polynomial time.
- In Section 5, we rather focus on the hardness of finding several fixed points of classes of isotone maps. When arbitrary isotone maps are given as an oracle, we show that any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm will have to perform  $\Omega(w(L, \preceq))$  queries to decide the existence of three or more fixed points in the worst case, where  $w(L, \preceq)$  denotes the width of the lattice. This implies exponential lower bounds on the relational lattices, but also all other lattices of exponential width. In the same setting, we also prove exponential lower bounds to decide on three or more fixed points for decreasing isotone maps on the lattices of equivalences and quasiorders.

Restricting the set of isotone maps to those representable in polynomial space and computable in polynomial time, we also show that it is NP-hard to find three or more fixed points for isotone maps on all relational lattices and for decreasing isotone maps on the lattices of equivalences and quasiorders.

These exponential lower bounds on query complexity and the NP-hardness results apply exactly to those cases in which we only derived exponential delay bounds for the presented enumeration algorithm on the relational lattices.

- Finally, we turn to the application to models of behavioral equivalence, and show that this leads to a polynomial space and delay enumeration algorithm for bisimulations in Section 6. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first such algorithm described in the literature. This result also generalizes to some related models of behavioral and role equivalence.

## 2 Related research

Besides the algorithm of Echenique [18] we already mentioned in the previous section, this paper relates to two directions of prior work: On the one hand, there has been recent activity in establishing computational complexity results on the Tarski fixed point problem in settings like  $d$ -dimensional grids, and on the other hand there are prior efforts on enumerating the lattice of regular equivalences in particular as a concrete model of role equivalence.

Computational problems related to Tarski fixed points have been studied in recent years, typically on the  $d$ -dimensional grid  $[N]^d$  with  $N, d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . Notably, various algorithms to find Tarski fixed points on these grids have been described [12, 14, 21], the asymptotically fastest one requiring  $\mathcal{O}(\log^{\lceil (d+1)/2 \rceil} N)$  queries to the isotone map [12]. In turn, a  $\Omega(\log^2 N)$  lower bound was shown for the two-dimensional grid in [19], and any lower bounds must also apply if only isotone maps with unique fixed points are considered [13]. Moreover, deciding the uniqueness of a fixed point on a  $d$ -dimensional grid is known to be coNP-hard [14, 15]. Additionally, the Tarski fixed point problem has also been examined in the case where the partial order of the underlying lattice is given as an oracle [11].

Note that there is a major structural difference between grid lattices and the three relational lattices we mainly consider here. The  $d$ -dimensional grid  $[N]^d$  has exponential height in the size of a lattice element, while the relational lattices only have polynomial height. Hence, the least and greatest fixed points of polynomial-time computable isotone maps are found in polynomial time on the relational lattices (see Proposition 12), while this is an NP-hard problem on the  $d$ -dimensional grid [19].

For regular equivalence, a heuristic lattice exploration method [4] and a combinatorial optimization approach (generalized blockmodeling [1, 17]) have been proposed to find instances between the maximum and minimum instance. However, neither approach is guaranteed to find such equivalences, even if some exist. Moreover, the former approach needs to repeatedly solve graph isomorphism problems, while it has been shown for the latter that the underlying  $k$ -role assignment problem about finding regular equivalences with exactly  $k$  equivalence classes is NP-hard [22, 33]. Note that this hardness result does not immediately imply that enumeration of regular equivalences is hard as well.

Related are also role-primitive graphs [20] that admit exactly two trivial regular equivalences, the single-class equivalence and the singletons-only equivalence. While it is obvious that enumeration is easy on known role-primitive graphs, no efficient algorithm appears known to recognize role-primitive graphs in the first place.

## 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly introduce the concepts and notation used throughout this paper. For further reading on orderings and lattices, we suggest [16, 23] to the reader.

**Quasiorders and equivalences.** A *quasiorder* is a reflexive and transitive binary relation. An *equivalence* is a symmetric quasiorder. For an equivalence relation  $\approx \subseteq A \times A$ , the *equivalence class* of  $x \in A$  is the set  $[x]_{\approx} := \{y \in A : y \approx x\}$ . An *indifference class* of a quasiorder  $\preceq$  is an equivalence class of equivalence  $\preceq \cap \preceq^{-1}$ , where  $\preceq^{-1}$  is the inverted quasiorder  $x \preceq^{-1} y \iff y \preceq x$ .

**Lattices.** A *partial order* is an antisymmetric quasiorder. A *lattice*  $(L, \preceq)$  is a set  $L$  with a partial order  $\preceq \subseteq L \times L$  which is closed under two binary operations, the *meet*  $x \sqcap y$  and the *join*  $x \sqcup y$ , that yield the unique greatest lower bound and least upper bound of  $x, y \in L$ . All

considered lattices are finite, and we write  $\perp$  and  $\top$  for the minimum and maximum lattice elements. The amount of space required to represent a lattice element is denoted by  $\text{size}(L)$ .

A *chain* is a subset  $C \subseteq L$  such that  $x \preceq y$  or  $y \preceq x$  for all  $x, y \in C$  and has *length*  $|C| - 1$ . An *antichain* is a subset  $A \subseteq L$  such that any elements  $x, y \in A$  with  $x \neq y$  are incomparable. The *height*  $h(L, \preceq)$  of the lattice is the maximum length of any contained chain, while the *width*  $w(L, \preceq)$  is the maximum size  $|A|$  of any contained antichain  $A$ .

If  $x \preceq y$  for some  $x, y \in L$ , we say that  $x$  *precedes*  $y$  and  $y$  *succeeds*  $x$ . For  $x \prec y$ , we say  $x$  is *covered by*  $y$ , written  $x < y$ , if  $x \preceq z \preceq y$  implies  $x = z$  or  $y = z$  for all elements  $z \in L$ ;  $x$  is then a *lower cover* of  $y$  and  $y$  an *upper cover* of  $x$ . The maximum number of lower (lcv) or upper (ucv) covers of an element in the lattice are given by

$$\text{lcv}(L, \preceq) := \max_{x \in L} |\{y \in L : y < x\}| \quad \text{ucv}(L, \preceq) := \max_{x \in L} |\{y \in L : x < y\}|$$

**Relational lattices.** Given a base set  $A$  of size  $n$ , we write  $\mathcal{P}$  for the set of equivalences,  $\mathcal{Q}$  for the set of quasiorders, and  $\mathcal{R}$  for the set of binary relations on this set. These sets form lattices under the refinement ordering  $\subseteq$ . The meets are given by the set intersection of the elements and the joins by the set union for binary relations and the transitive closure of the set union for equivalences and binary relations. We observe the following bounds on height, lower and upper covers for these lattices:

- Lemma 1.** *1. The lattice of equivalence has height  $h(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq) = n - 1$  and there are at most  $\text{lcv}(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(2^n)$  lower and  $\text{ucv}(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(n^2)$  upper covers.*
- 2. The lattice of quasiorders has height  $h(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(n^2)$  and there are at most  $\text{lcv}(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(2^n)$  lower and  $\text{ucv}(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(n^2)$  upper covers.*
- 3. The lattice of binary relations has height  $h(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq) = n^2 - 1$  and there are at most  $\text{lcv}(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(n^2)$  lower and  $\text{ucv}(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq) \in \Theta(n^2)$  upper covers.*

A proof is contained in Appendix B.

**Isotone maps.** A map  $f : L \rightarrow L$  on a lattice  $(L, \preceq)$  is *isotone* if  $x \preceq y$  implies  $f(x) \preceq f(y)$ , *decreasing* if  $f(x) \preceq x$ , and *increasing* if  $x \preceq f(x)$  for all  $x, y \in L$ . We respectively mark decreasing maps with subscript  $\nabla$  and increasing maps with  $\Delta$  to allude to the direction which such maps move along in the lattice. We define the class of isotone and the subclasses of decreasing or increasing isotone maps as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}(L, \preceq) &:= \{f \in (L \rightarrow L) : x \preceq y \rightarrow f(x) \preceq f(y) \text{ for all } x, y \in L\} \\ \mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}(L, \preceq) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}(L, \preceq) : f(x) \preceq x \text{ for all } x \in L\} \\ \mathcal{F}_{\text{inc-iso}}(L, \preceq) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}(L, \preceq) : f(x) \succeq x \text{ for all } x \in L\} \end{aligned}$$

**Fixed points.** An element  $x \in L$  is a *fixed point* of map  $f : L \rightarrow L$  if  $x = f(x)$ . We write  $\text{Fix}(f)$  for the set of fixed points. Tarski's theorem then states for finite lattices:

**Theorem 2** ([37]). *For an isotone map  $f : L \rightarrow L$  on finite lattice  $(L, \preceq)$ ,  $(\text{Fix}(f), \preceq)$  is a lattice such that  $\bigsqcup\{x : x \preceq f(x)\} \in \text{Fix}(f)$  and  $\bigsqcap\{x : f(x) \preceq x\} \in \text{Fix}(f)$ .*

## 4 Enumeration algorithm

In this section, we present the enumeration algorithm, which operates in polynomial space on relational lattices and more generally on fixed point lattices of polynomial height. Additionally, we assess its runtime properties in terms of delay.

### 4.1 Algorithmic principle

Before describing the procedure, we first introduce the notion of a limit under an isotone map as a central element of the algorithm.

**Limits.** For a given map  $f : L \rightarrow L$ , we write  $f^{(t)}$  for the  $t$ -th composition of  $f$ , i.e.,  $f^{(t)}(x) := f(f^{(t-1)}(x))$  and  $f^{(0)}(x) := x$ . We also write  $f^*(x)$  for the *limit of  $x$  under  $f$* , i.e.,  $f^*(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f^{(t)}(x)$ . This limit is guaranteed to exist for decreasing and increasing maps on finite lattices; to be precise, it is equal to the maximum or minimum fixed point preceding or succeeding  $x$  and reached within a polynomial number of queries to  $f$  on the relational and other polynomial-height lattices.

**Lemma 3.** 1. For a decreasing isotone map  $f_{\nabla} : L \rightarrow L$  on a finite lattice  $(L, \preceq)$ ,  $f_{\nabla}^*(x) = f_{\nabla}^{(h(L, \preceq))}(x)$  is the greatest fixed point of  $f_{\nabla}$  preceding  $x$ .

2. For an increasing isotone map  $f_{\Delta} : L \rightarrow L$  on a finite lattice  $(L, \preceq)$ ,  $f_{\Delta}^*(x) = f_{\Delta}^{(h(L, \preceq))}(x)$  is the least fixed point of  $f_{\Delta}$  succeeding  $x$ .

*Proof.* We only prove the first case, because a symmetric argument applies to the other.

The limit  $f_{\nabla}^*(x)$  of  $x \in L$  must be a fixed point of  $f$  and must have been reached after  $h(L, \preceq)$  iterations, since each iteration must yield predecessors. Finally, any fixed point  $y \preceq x$  precedes  $f_{\nabla}^*(x)$ : Since  $y \preceq x$ , isotonicity implies  $y = f_{\nabla}(y) \preceq f_{\nabla}(x)$ , so  $y \preceq f_{\nabla}(x)$ . Repeating this argument, we obtain  $y \preceq f_{\nabla}^{(t)}(x)$  for any  $t \geq 1$ , hence  $y \preceq f_{\nabla}^{(h(L, \preceq))}(x) = f_{\nabla}^*(x)$ .  $\square$

While limits under decreasing or increasing isotone maps can be found through such naive iteration, we note that this is not necessarily optimal. For example, much more efficient algorithms are known for some models of role or behavioral equivalence; e.g., see [30] for regular or bisimulation equivalence, [10, 30] for equitable partitions, [24] for simulations and bisimulations, or [3] for ready simulations.

**Basic procedure.** For decreasing and increasing isotone maps, we can exploit the existence of limits under such maps to find Tarski fixed points. This procedure operates for a decreasing map  $f_{\nabla} : L \rightarrow L$  as follows:

1. The maximum fixed point  $f_{\nabla}^*(s)$  preceding a starting element  $s \in L$  is marked as discovered.
2. While there is still a fixed point that is marked as discovered but has not been output yet, we choose one such fixed point  $x$  and output it. For each lower cover  $y \prec x$  in the underlying lattice  $(L, \preceq)$ , we identify its limit  $f_{\nabla}^*(y)$  (i.e., the maximum fixed point preceding  $y$ ), and mark it discovered if it has not been marked before.

A symmetric version can be applied on increasing isotone maps.

This approach can be used to enumerate fixed points on finite lattices in general. It forms the basis of Echenique's enumeration algorithm for Nash equilibria of supermodular games [18], where it is applied to an increasing isotone map derived from the best-response function and fixed points are processed in breadth-first-search-like fashion. Note, however, that this procedure will discover all fixed points of a decreasing or increasing isotone map no matter the specific processing order of fixed points.

## 4.2 Implementation in polynomial space

In order to avoid repeated processing of fixed points, the algorithm needs to maintain information on the set of discovered or output fixed points. While this can be done by explicitly storing discovered fixed points, such a strategy can require a superpolynomial amount of memory as more fixed points are enumerated. Specifically, Echenique's enumeration algorithm [18] is subject to this memory issue.

However, finding fixed points in depth-first manner permits a more compact representation of discovered or processed fixed points. This traversal order has two major benefits:

1. Depth-first search ensures that the number of discovered but not completely processed fixed points is bounded by the height of the fixed point lattice, which is polynomial for the three relational lattices.

2. The set of discovered and processed fixed points can be implicitly described by the previously searched regions in the underlying lattice, which in turn can be compactly represented using the active path of the depth-first search.

More precisely, a compact and efficient representation of searched regions can be achieved by listing lower and upper covers in lexicographic or some other imposed and easily testable total order; for brevity, we just refer to this order as lexicographic and denote it by  $\sqsubseteq_{\text{lex}}$  in the following. Searched regions can then be described by the fixed points along the currently active path in the depth-first search plus the last processed lower or upper covers of these fixed points.

**Algorithm for fixed points of decreasing isotone maps.** The enumeration procedure is given in more detail as Algorithm 1, and an example application of the algorithm, in this case to list regular equivalences, is included in Appendix A. The algorithm's properties are summarized in Theorem 4. Note that the delay bounds assume that lower covers of a lattice element can be listed in lexicographic order in  $\mathcal{O}(\text{lcv}(L, \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  time, and that we can test for lattice elements  $x, y, \in L, z \preceq y$  in  $\mathcal{O}(\text{size}(L))$  time whether there is  $w \preceq y$  such that  $x \preceq w \sqsubseteq_{\text{lex}} z$ . We also assume that these operations need at most  $\mathcal{O}(\text{size}(L))$  additional space. All these bounds can be met on the relational lattices.

---

**Algorithm 1** Fixed point enumeration algorithm

---

**Input:** Decreasing isotone map  $f_{\nabla} : L \rightarrow L$  defined on lattice  $(L, \preceq)$

Upper bound  $s \in L$  on fixed points to enumerate  
(e.g.,  $\top$  for enumerating all fixed points)

**Output:** Fixed points of  $f_{\nabla}$  preceding  $s$

```

1: start enumeration by calling SEARCH( $f_{\nabla}^*(s), \emptyset, \emptyset$ )
2: function SEARCH(fixed point  $x$ , active path  $P$ , previously searched regions  $D$ )
3:   output  $x$ 
4:    $E \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5:   for  $y \preceq x$  in lexicographic order do
6:      $z \leftarrow f_{\nabla}^*(y)$ 
7:     if for all  $(u, v) \in D \cup E$  and all  $w \preceq u$  with  $w \sqsubseteq_{\text{lex}} v$  we have  $z \not\preceq w$  then
8:       SEARCH( $z, P \cup \{x\}, D \cup E$ )
9:     end if
10:     $E \leftarrow \{(x, y)\}$ 
11:  end for
12: end function

```

---

**Theorem 4.** *Algorithm 1 enumerates all fixed points of a decreasing isotone map  $f_{\nabla}$  preceding  $s \in L$  with a delay of at most  $h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq) \text{lcv}(L, \preceq)$  queries for limits under  $f_{\nabla}$  plus  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq)^2 \text{lcv}(L, \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  additional steps, and requires  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  space.*

*Proof. Correctness:* We use the formula  $I(p, P, D)$  to express if the algorithm has already output fixed point  $p$  when it is on active path  $P$  and has previously searched the regions described by  $D$ :

$$I(p, P, D) := p \in P \text{ or there exist } (u, v) \in D \text{ and } w \preceq u \text{ s.t. } p \preceq w \sqsubseteq_{\text{lex}} v$$

The algorithm then obeys the following invariants:

1. Before a call to search(), a fixed point  $p$  has been output if and only if  $I(p, P, D)$ .
2. After an iteration of the for loop in line 5, a fixed point  $p$  has been output if and only if  $I(p, P \cup \{x\}, D \cup E)$ .
3. After a call to search(), a fixed point  $p$  has been output if and only if  $p \preceq x$  or  $I(p, P, D)$ .

We prove by induction on the number of predecessors of  $x$  that the first invariant implies the third. Clearly, this is the case if  $x$  is the minimum fixed point  $\perp$ .

Observe that the second invariant is satisfied before the first iteration of the for loop in line 5. Suppose it still is before the current iteration. Then fixed point  $z = f_{\nabla}^*(y)$  and its predecessors have been output before if there exist  $(u, v) \in D \cup E$  and  $w \triangleleft u$  such that  $z \preceq w \sqsubseteq_{\text{lex}} v$ . In the other cases, `search()` is called in line 8. Since the first invariant is fulfilled for this recursive call, we have by induction that a fixed point  $p$  has been output after this call to `search()` if  $p \preceq z$  or  $I(p, P \cup \{x\}, D \cup E)$ . Since  $z$  is the greatest fixed point preceding  $y$  (Lemma 3) and  $E$  contains the pair of  $x$  plus the lexicographically greatest lower cover less than  $y$  before line 10, the second invariant is satisfied after the update to  $E$  in that line.

After the for loop has ended, fixed points  $p$  have been output if and only if  $I(p, P \cup \{x\}, D \cup E)$  according to the second invariant. Since  $E = \{(x, y)\}$  where  $y$  is the lexicographically last lower cover of  $x$  after the for loop has ended, we conclude that the third invariant is satisfied at the end of a call to `search()`.

The first invariant is clearly satisfied when `search()` is called in line 3, as no fixed point has been output yet while  $D$  and  $P$  are empty. The third invariant thus holds after the call, which means that the call to `search()` in line 1 has output all fixed points preceding  $s$ .

*Space and running time:* `search()` is called in line 8 for a fixed point preceding  $x$ , so the call tree has at most depth  $h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq) + 1$ . Hence, Algorithm 1 requires  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  space, provided that memory to represent searched regions  $D$  is shared among recursive calls.

Observe that each call leads to at most  $\text{lc}_v(L, \preceq)$  queries for limits under  $f_{\nabla}$ , and a fixed point is output at the beginning of a call to `search()`. Hence, there are at most  $h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq) \text{lc}_v(L, \preceq)$  queries for limits under  $f_{\nabla}$  between outputs due to backtracking. The remaining running time is dominated by the tests in line 7. Since at most  $h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq)$  checks are required per processed lower cover, at most  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}), \preceq)^2 \text{lc}_v(L, \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  time is spent between outputs.  $\square$

**Fixed points of increasing isotone maps.** Algorithm 1 can also be adapted to fixed point enumeration of increasing isotone maps. This requires only two simple changes:

- The increasing isotone map  $f_{\Delta}$  and limit  $f_{\Delta}^*$  replace decreasing map  $f_{\nabla}$  and limit  $f_{\nabla}^*$ .
- The for loop in line 5 iterates over upper covers  $y \triangleright x$  of  $x$  instead of lower covers.

We report the analogous algorithm properties in Theorem 4, but omit the straightforward symmetric proof.

**Theorem 5.** *The adaption of Algorithm 1 enumerates fixed points of an increasing isotone map  $f_{\Delta}$  succeeding  $s \in L$  with a delay of up to  $h(\text{Fix}(f_{\Delta}), \preceq) \text{uc}_v(L, \preceq)$  queries for limits under  $f_{\Delta}$  plus  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\Delta}), \preceq)^2 \text{uc}_v(L, \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  additional steps, and requires  $\mathcal{O}(h(\text{Fix}(f_{\Delta}), \preceq) \text{size}(L))$  space.*

**Fixed points of general isotone maps.** The enumeration algorithm is not immediately applicable for isotone maps which are neither decreasing nor increasing. However, we can associate an isotone map  $f : L \rightarrow L$  with decreasing isotone map  $f_{\nabla} : x \mapsto f(x) \sqcap x$  and increasing isotone map  $f_{\Delta} : x \mapsto f(x) \sqcup x$ . Since  $\text{Fix}(f) = \text{Fix}(f_{\nabla}) \cap \text{Fix}(f_{\Delta})$ , we can find all fixed points by applying the enumeration algorithm to the associated maps and selecting only fixed points of  $f$  in the output. This filtering approach is also used by Echenique's Nash equilibria enumeration algorithm [18].

However, any number of fixed points of the map associated with  $f$  might be found between actual fixed points of  $f$ . Hence, delay bounds of Algorithm 1 do not have to translate into similar bounds for fixed point enumeration of general isotone maps.

**Delay and space bounds on relational lattices.** The enumeration algorithm runs with worst-case delay and space bounds for decreasing or increasing isotone maps on the relational lattices as listed in Table 2. We use the observation that equivalences are representable as maps of type  $A \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ , i.e.,  $\text{size}(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathcal{O}(n)$ , and quasiorders as well as binary relations can be

Table 2: Upper bounds on space as well as delay of Algorithm 1 in terms of the number of queries for limits under an isotone map  $f$ ,  $f^*$ , and additional delay on the relational lattices.

lattice	decreasing isotone map		increasing isotone map		space
	queries to $f_{\nabla}^*$	other delay	queries to $f_{\Delta}^*$	other delay	
equivalences $(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq)$	$\mathcal{O}(2^n n)$	$\mathcal{O}(2^n n^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^5)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$
quasiorders $(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq)$	$\mathcal{O}(2^n n^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(2^n n^6)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^4)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^8)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^4)$
binary relations $(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^4)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^8)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^4)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^8)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^4)$

stored in quadratic space ( $\text{size}(\mathcal{Q}), \text{size}(\mathcal{R}) \in \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ ). Apart from that, the bounds are implied by structural properties of the lattices.

We see that the algorithm runs in polynomial space, and generally enumerates with polynomial delay except for decreasing isotone maps on equivalences and quasiorders. Note that it has much better worst-case bounds on delay than a brute force approach for decreasing or increasing isotone maps.

We remark that the delay bounds overstate the overall runtime of Algorithm 1 because of backtracking: Upper bounds on the running time per produced output are smaller by a factor of  $1/n$  for equivalences and  $1/n^2$  for quasiorders and binary relations than the respective delay bounds.

## 5 Computational hardness

We now investigate the hardness of finding Tarski fixed points in those cases where the presented enumeration algorithm does not run with polynomial delay on the relational lattices.

**Decision problem.** We analyze the complexity of deciding whether an isotone map has  $k$  or more fixed points on the relational lattices.

$k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L(n), \mathcal{F}$ ): Parameters: $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , Lattice type $L(n)$ , function class $\mathcal{F}(L(n)) \subseteq (L(n) \rightarrow L(n))$ Problem: Does a given map $f \in \mathcal{F}(L(n))$ have at least $k$ fixed points?
---

Note that the parameterization of the lattices  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$ , and  $\mathcal{R}$  and function classes  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inc-iso}}$  by the number of elements  $n$  of the base set  $A$  is implicit in their definition.

**Settings.** In the following, we examine the complexity of this problem in two settings:

- In the *query complexity setting*, the isotone maps are given to the algorithm as *oracles*, i.e., the structure of the map can only be discerned by performing queries for function values  $f(x)$  of the supplied map  $f$  for inputs  $x$ . We show worst-case lower (and upper) bounds on *the number of queries* to the isotone map for deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithms solving the fixed point decision problem. A bounded-error randomized algorithm is an algorithm that must output the correct result for each input with at least probability  $\frac{2}{3}$ .
- In the *polynomial map setting*, we investigate the NP-hardness of the problem by restricting the analysis to *succinctly represented maps*  $f$ , by which we mean that  $f$ 's representation must have size polynomial in  $n$  and  $f(x)$  is computable in polynomial time for each input  $x$ . Here, the solving algorithm is not constrained to querying function values only, as it can access the representation of  $f$ .

## 5.1 Query complexity

In this setting, an algorithm solves the  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L(n), \mathcal{F}$ ) only by performing queries for images  $f(x)$  for inputs  $x$  to a given isotone map  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  or exploiting the general properties of lattice  $L$  and function class  $\mathcal{F}$ . For example, the fixed point enumeration algorithm presented in Section 4 finds fixed points only by querying for images of a decreasing or increasing isotone map. We now investigate how many queries are necessary in the worst case to decide that an isotone map has  $k$  fixed points or not.

**Up to two fixed points.** By Tarski's theorem (Theorem 2), we immediately have:

**Proposition 6.** *There is a deterministic algorithm that requires*

- 0 queries to solve the 1-FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}_{iso}$ ) problem.
- $\mathcal{O}(h(L, \preceq))$  queries to find a fixed point of  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{iso}(L)$ .

*Proof.* By Tarski's theorem, any isotone map on a finite lattice has a fixed point. Moreover, Tarski's theorem states that the maximum fixed point of  $f$  is also the maximum fixed point of  $f_{\nabla} : x \mapsto x \sqcap f(x)$ . By Lemma 3, we find this maximum fixed point  $f_{\nabla}^*(\top)$  after at most  $h(L, \preceq)$  applications of  $f_{\nabla}$ .  $\square$

Two fixed points, namely the maximum and minimum, can also be found by performing a similar number of queries.

**Proposition 7.** *There is a deterministic algorithm that solves the 2-FIXEDPOINTS( $L(n), \mathcal{F}_{iso}$ ) problem in  $\mathcal{O}(h(L, \preceq))$  queries.*

*Proof.* We can find the maximum fixed point with  $\mathcal{O}(h(L, \preceq))$  queries as described in the proof of Proposition 6. By a symmetric procedure, we can also search the minimum fixed point. Finally, we decide on the number of fixed points: If the maximum and minimum fixed points are equal, then there is only one fixed point, otherwise there are at least two.  $\square$

**Three or more fixed points.** The necessary number of queries increases drastically when testing for three or more fixed points. We first show a lower bound for the class of arbitrary isotone maps on a lattice  $L$ :

**Theorem 8.** *Any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm needs  $\Omega(w(L, \preceq))$  queries in the worst case to solve the  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}_{iso}$ ) problem for  $k \geq 3$ , where  $w(L, \preceq)$  is the width of lattice  $(L, \preceq)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be a largest antichain in lattice  $L$ . We now describe a class of suitable isotone maps with two or three fixed points; a proof for  $k > 3$  fixed points can be obtained by adding trivial fixed points in the constructed map close to the lattice maximum  $\top$  or minimum  $\perp$  or by choosing  $k - 3$  elements of  $A$  as trivial fixed points. Note that selecting elements of  $A$  as trivial fixed points does not affect the asymptotics, since  $k$  is a constant.

Since  $A$  is maximal, any lattice element  $x \in L \setminus A$  must either precede or succeed some elements in the antichain. Now consider the set of isotone maps of the following form:

- Lattice maximum  $\top$  and minimum  $\perp$  are fixed points.
- If  $x \in L \setminus A$  precedes some  $y \in A$ , then map it to  $\perp$ , else map it to  $\top$ .
- At most one element  $x \in L$  in the antichain is mapped to itself, all other antichain elements are mapped to  $\perp$ .

It is easy to verify that all maps of this form are isotone. Furthermore, these maps are identical everywhere except for the existence and position of a third fixed point among the antichain elements. Thus, deciding the fixed point problem for maps of the constructed form is equivalent to performing an unstructured search on the antichain. Since any deterministic and bounded-error randomized algorithm requires a linear number of queries to perform an unstructured search, this establishes a lower bound of  $\Omega(|A|) = \Omega(w(L, \preceq))$ .  $\square$

Table 3: Worst-case lower bounds on the number of queries for any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm deciding the 3-FIXEDPOINTS problem when maps are given as oracles.

maps \ lattice	decreasing isotone $\mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}$	isotone $\mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$	increasing isotone $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inc-iso}}$
equivalences $(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq)$	$\Omega(2^n)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)	$\Omega((n/(\log(n) \cdot e))^n)$ (Thm. 8, [32])	$\Omega(n^2)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)
quasiorders $(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq)$	$\Omega(2^n)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)	$\Omega((n/(\log(n) \cdot e))^n)$ (Thm. 8, [32])	$\Omega(n^2)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)
binary relations $(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq)$	$\Omega(n^2)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)	$\Omega(2^{n^2}/n)$ (Thm. 8, [36])	$\Omega(n^2)$ (Thm. 9, Lemma 1)

This establishes the lattice width as a lower bound for deciding the existence of three fixed points. This result implies exponential lower bounds on many lattices, such as  $\Omega((n/(\ln(n) \cdot e))^n)$  on the lattices of equivalences and quasiorders [32] or  $\Omega\left(\binom{n^2}{\lfloor n^2/2 \rfloor}\right) = \Omega(2^{n^2}/n)$  on the lattice of binary relations [36].

By adapting this proof to other suitable antichains, we also obtain lower bounds for increasing and decreasing isotone maps on the relational lattices.

**Theorem 9.** *On one of the relational lattices  $(L, \preceq)$ , any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm to find three fixed points of a decreasing (increasing) isotone map requires  $\Omega(\text{lcv}(L, \preceq))$  (respectively  $\Omega(\text{ucv}(L, \preceq))$ ) queries in the worst case.*

*Proof.* Since the proofs are symmetrical, we show the bound for decreasing isotone maps only.

We construct a set of maps analogously to the proof of Theorem 8, but choose the set of lower covers of the lattice maximum  $\top$  as the antichain  $A$  instead of the largest antichain. The resulting maps are isotone and decreasing, and deciding the fixed point problem requires an unstructured search among the lower covers of  $\top$ . Since  $\top$  has  $\text{lcv}(L, \preceq)$  lower covers, this proves a lower bound of  $\Omega(\text{lcv}(L, \preceq))$ .  $\square$

**Summary.** Table 3 lists the worst-case lower bounds on the number of queries necessary to decide the existence of three or more fixed points on the relational lattices. Comparison with Table 2 shows that we have established exponential lower bounds whenever we found super-polynomial upper bounds on the delay of Algorithm 1.

We note that there is some gap between the lower bounds in Table 3 for decreasing or increasing isotone maps on relational lattices and upper bounds established by the enumeration algorithm in Section 4 when it is used to decide the existence of three fixed points of such maps: Algorithm 1 will have output at least three fixed points or terminated after  $\mathcal{O}(\text{lcv}(L, \preceq))$  or  $\mathcal{O}(\text{ucv}(L, \preceq))$  computations of limits under the map, however, each of these limit computations can in turn involve up to  $h(L, \preceq)$  queries to  $f_{\nabla}$ . Thus, the upper bound on the number of queries to decreasing or increasing isotone maps performed by Algorithm 1 is larger than the lower bound in Theorem 9 by a factor of at most  $h(L, \preceq) = n$  on the equivalence lattice and  $n^2$  on the lattices of quasiorders and binary relations.

## 5.2 NP-hardness

In the polynomial map setting, the  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}$ ) problem is clearly in NP, since we can check in polynomial time for a succinctly represented map if a lattice element is a fixed point or not. Additionally, we also immediately obtain the following structural property of this decision problem:

**Proposition 10.** *For two function classes  $\mathcal{F}(L(n)) \subseteq \mathcal{F}'(L(n))$ ,  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}'$ ) is NP-hard if  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}$ ) is NP-hard.*

*Proof.*  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}$ ) is reducible to  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS( $L, \mathcal{F}'$ ) via the identity mapping.  $\square$

Tarski's theorem (Theorem 2) immediately establishes:

**Proposition 11.** *For any (finite) lattice type  $L(n)$ ,  $1\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(L, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$  is in  $P$ .*

Since the deterministic algorithms described in the proofs of Propositions 6 and 7 complete in polynomial time when applied to succinctly represented maps on the relational lattices, we also have:

**Proposition 12.**  *$2\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$ ,  $2\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$  and  $2\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$  are in  $P$ .*

**Three or more fixed points.** The following NP-hardness results are obtained by reducing the 3SAT problem to the fixed point problem on the relational lattices. These reductions adapt the construction we also used to establish lower bounds in the query complexity setting: Choosing a suitable antichain in a relational lattice, an instance of the 3SAT problem is encoded into an isotone or a decreasing isotone map, placing a fixed point on the antichain if and only if the formula is satisfiable.

**Theorem 13.**  *$k\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$  is NP-complete for  $k \geq 3$ .*

*Proof.* To show NP-hardness, we reduce 3SAT to  $3\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}_{iso})$ ; a reduction for more than three fixed points can be obtained by artificially introducing  $k - 3$  additional trivial fixed points in the constructed map close to the minimum fixed point  $\perp$ .

Suppose we are given a formula  $B$  with  $m \geq 1$  variables. We choose a base set  $A$  of size  $n$  such that  $n^2 \geq 2m$ . Let  $i_1, \dots, i_{n^2}$  be all possible pairs of elements on  $A$ . We define a polynomial-time computable map  $f \in F_{iso}(\mathcal{R})$  by mapping a binary relation  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  as follows:

1. If  $\{i_{2m+1}, \dots, i_{n^2}\} \cap R \neq \emptyset$ , then map  $R$  to  $\top$ .
2. Otherwise, if  $i_\ell \in R$  and  $i_{\ell+m} \in R$  for some  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , then map  $R$  to  $\top$ .
3. Otherwise, if  $i_\ell \notin R$  and  $i_{\ell+m} \notin R$  for some  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , then map  $R$  to  $\perp$ .
4. Otherwise, if  $I = (i_1 \in R, \dots, i_m \in R)$  is a satisfying assignment of formula  $B$ , then map  $R$  to  $R$ , else map  $R$  to  $\perp$ .

It is easy to verify that  $f$  is isotone, can be succinctly represented (since  $B$  has at most  $n^3$  distinct clauses) and has the trivial fixed points  $\perp$  and  $\top$ . We now show that  $f$  has at least three fixed points if and only if formula  $B$  is satisfiable.

Let  $I = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \{0, 1\}^m$  be a satisfying assignment of  $B$ . Then, the relation

$$R = \{i_\ell : x_\ell = 1, \ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}\} \cup \{i_{m+\ell} : x_\ell = 0, \ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$$

is a fixed point of  $f$ . This fixed point is necessarily different from the trivial minimum and maximum fixed points, as  $R$  contains exactly  $m$  pairs, while the trivial ones contain 0 or  $n^2$ .

Conversely, assume that  $f$  has three fixed points. Then let  $R$  be a fixed point different from the trivial fixed points  $\top$  and  $\perp$ . By construction of  $f$ ,  $R$  must fall into the first case of step 4 above. Thus,  $I = (i_1 \in R, \dots, i_m \in R)$  is a satisfying assignment of formula  $B$ .  $\square$

By encoding non-trivial fixed point into the lower covers of the lattice maximum as the antichain, we similarly obtain:

**Theorem 14.**  *$k\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}_{dec-iso})$  and  $k\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}_{dec-iso})$  are NP-complete for  $k \geq 3$ .*

The proof of Theorem 14 detailing the concrete construction of the encoding maps is included in Appendix B.

**Summary.** The NP-hardness results on the  $k\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}$  problem for  $k \geq 3$  are summarized in Table 4. In combination with Table 2, we see that we have proven the  $k\text{-FIXEDPOINTS}$  problem NP-hard in those cases where we derived a super-polynomial delay bound for Algorithm 1.

Table 4: Complexity of the  $k$ -FIXEDPOINTS problem for  $k \geq 3$  in the polynomial map setting.

maps	decreasing isotone	isotone	increasing isotone
lattice	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}$	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{inc-iso}}$
equivalences $(\mathcal{P}, \subseteq)$	NP-complete (Thm. 14)	NP-complete (Thm. 14, Prop. 10)	P (Table 2)
quasiorders $(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq)$	NP-complete (Thm. 14)	NP-complete (Thm. 14, Prop. 10)	P (Table 2)
binary relations $(\mathcal{R}, \subseteq)$	P (Table 2)	NP-complete (Thm. 13)	P (Table 2)

## 6 Listing bisimulations and behavioral equivalences

Algorithm 1 can be employed to efficiently list instances of some models of behavioral and role equivalence. In this section, we mainly focus on the case of listing bisimulations.

A labeled transition system is a triple  $(S, \Lambda, \rightarrow)$  of states  $S$ , labels  $\Lambda$  and labeled transitions  $\rightarrow \subseteq S \times \Lambda \times S$ ; we write  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} q$  to mean  $(p, \alpha, q) \in \rightarrow$ .

A binary relation  $R \subseteq S \times S$  is called a *bisimulation* [27, p. 88] if  $(p, q) \in R$  implies that

- whenever  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'$ , then there is  $q \xrightarrow{\alpha} q'$  such that  $(p', q') \in R$ , and
- whenever  $q \xrightarrow{\alpha} q'$ , then there is  $p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p'$  such that  $(p', q') \in R$ .

Equivalently, bisimulations can also be described as the fixed points of the decreasing isotone map  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  given by

$$(p, q) \in f(R) \iff \begin{cases} (p, q) \in R, \text{ and} \\ \text{for each } p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p' \text{ there exists } p \xrightarrow{\alpha} q' \text{ s.t. } (p', q') \in R, \text{ and} \\ \text{for each } q \xrightarrow{\alpha} q' \text{ there exists } p \xrightarrow{\alpha} p' \text{ s.t. } (p', q') \in R \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

By applying Algorithm 1 to the isotone map above, we can thus enumerate bisimulations with polynomial delay and space, as the following theorem shows.

**Theorem 15.** *Let  $(S, \Lambda, \rightarrow)$  be a finite labeled transition system with  $n = |S|$  states. Then Algorithm 1 can enumerate bisimulations with a delay of  $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$  and requires  $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$  space.*

*Proof.* Using the algorithm in [24], the limit of a binary relation  $R$  under the decreasing isotone map in Equation (1) can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(nm)$  time and  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  space, where  $m = |\rightarrow| \in \mathcal{O}(n^2)$  denotes the number of transitions in the labeled transition system. The bounds on delay and space follow using Table 2.  $\square$

In the same way, we can also obtain polynomial space and delay algorithms for related models of behavioral equivalence like simulation [26] or ready simulation [2, 3], and some role equivalences such as ecological equivalence [6, 7], as well as their extensions to more complex network structures.

However, this enumeration algorithm runs with exponential delay when listing regular equivalences; nevertheless, it still constitutes a major improvement over a naive brute force approach with a worst-case delay that is super-exponential in  $n$ .

## 7 Conclusion

We presented a polynomial space algorithm for enumerating Tarski fixed points on the relational lattices of equivalences, quasiorders and binary relations, or any other fixed point lattice of polynomial height. This algorithm achieves polynomial delay when enumerating fixed points of increasing isotone maps on all three relational lattices and of decreasing isotone maps on a lattice of binary relations, or more generally whenever the upper or lower covers of any lattice element can be listed in polynomial time.

When fixed points of arbitrary isotone maps on the three relational lattices, or of decreasing isotone maps on the lattices of equivalences or quasiorders are searched, however, the algorithm’s delay bounds are not polynomial. In all these cases, we proved exponential lower bounds for deterministic and bounded-error randomized algorithms deciding the existence of three or more fixed points when the isotone or decreasing isotone map is given as an oracle. Moreover, we showed that is generally NP-hard to find three or more fixed points for these combinations of lattices and map properties.

When isotone maps are given as oracles, we also established a worst-case lower bound of  $\Omega(w(L, \preceq))$  for any deterministic or bounded-error randomized algorithm deciding the existence of three or more fixed points on any finite lattice  $(L, \preceq)$  where  $w(L, \preceq)$  denotes the width of the lattice.

The presented enumeration algorithm generalizes a prior algorithm of Echenique for Nash equilibria [18] to Tarski fixed points. However, the presented algorithm improves on Echenique’s by employing a depth-first search approach. This enhancement drastically reduces the memory requirements from an exponential to a polynomial bound on polynomial height lattices, and yields polynomial delay bounds in some scenarios.

Our findings give rise to a polynomial delay and space algorithm for listing bisimulations. To be specific, it runs with  $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$  delay and in  $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$  space. Similarly, we can also obtain polynomial delay and space algorithms for enumerating instances of some related concepts of behavioral equivalence, such as simulations [26] and ready simulations [2, 3], but also some models of role equivalence like ecological equivalence [6], for which no polynomial enumeration algorithms appear to have been described in the literature before.

However, the presented algorithm does not guarantee polynomial delay enumeration for certain other models of behavioral or role equivalence, including the important case of regular equivalence. Yet even in these cases, it usually represents a major improvement in asymptotic delay bounds over the conventional brute force approach.

Our hardness results imply that there is no general polynomial time algorithm for listing fixed points of some types of isotone maps on the relational lattices when the isotone map is given as an oracle to the algorithm. Unless  $P = NP$ , this finding persists even if we restrict the passed isotone maps to those representable in polynomial space and computable in polynomial time and give the algorithm access to the internal representation of the map. However, this does not preclude that enumeration of fixed points is possible for a specific isotone map of such a type by, e.g., exploiting additional structural features of this map.

Notably, this leaves open the complexity of some problems related to regular equivalences as fixed points of one specific decreasing isotone map on the lattice of equivalences. While finding instances of some subclasses of regular equivalences is NP-hard [22, 33], these and our findings do not necessarily imply that the problems of enumerating arbitrary regular equivalences or recognizing role-primitive graphs [20] are hard as well.

## Appendix A Example: listing regular equivalences

We illustrate the inner workings of Algorithm 1 in an application to list regular equivalences [38]. In a regular equivalence on a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , two equivalent vertices must have neighbors in the same equivalence classes; formally, an equivalence  $\approx \subseteq V \times V$  is regular if and only if  $i \approx j$  implies that for each neighbor  $k \in N(i)$  of  $i$  there is a neighbor  $\ell \in N(j)$  of  $j$  such that  $k \approx \ell$ .

It can be shown that the regular equivalences on graph  $G = (V, E)$  are the fixed points of a decreasing isotone map  $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  given by

$$(x, y) \in f(\sim) \iff \begin{cases} x \sim y, \text{ and} \\ \text{for each } u \in N(x) \text{ there is } v \in N(y) \text{ s.t. } u \sim v, \text{ and} \\ \text{for each } u \in N(y) \text{ there is } v \in N(x) \text{ s.t. } u \sim v. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we can apply Algorithm 1 on the map  $f$  to list the regular equivalences on the cycle graph  $C_{33}$  with 33 vertices and edges. The limit  $f^*$  of this map, sometimes called the regular interior [8], can be found efficiently using the algorithm of Paige and Tarjan [30] in  $\mathcal{O}(|E| \log |V|)$  time.

Figure 1 depicts one possible enumeration of the regular equivalence lattice on the graph  $C_{33}$  (drawn using dashed gray links) and shows how it overlays the lattice's Hasse diagram (shown as solid black lines). The algorithm design ensures that finer regular equivalences are found by moving down the lattice. While this movement always can follow along lines of the Hasse diagram, observe that it does not necessarily have to: The algorithm can also move along some transitively implied orderings  $p \preceq q$  between fixed points  $p$  and  $q$ , as long as there is a cover  $x \prec q$  such that  $p = f^*(x)$ . In the enumeration in Figure 1, this occurs when the algorithm follows the central vertical dashed link from the maximum regular equivalence to the regular equivalences with 17 equivalence classes: The bipartitions are the lower covers of the single-class equivalence, and the finer regular equivalences with 17 classes can be obtained as the limits of bipartitions with one singleton class.

## Appendix B Proofs

**Proof of Lemma 1.** We briefly prove the claims for the most complex case of quasiorders only. Similar arguments also apply to equivalences and binary relations.

The maximum quasiorder  $\top$  has  $2^n - 2$  lower covers, and the minimum quasiorder  $\perp$  has  $n(n-1)$  upper covers. Furthermore, consider any quasiorder with  $k$  indifference classes of sizes  $s_1, \dots, s_k$ . Any upper cover must order one pair of indifference classes in some additional way, giving an upper bound of  $k(k-1) \leq n^2$  for upper covers. Similarly, any lower cover must either remove the strict ordering between a pair of indifference classes, or split an indifference class into two strictly ordered classes. We thus have at most  $k(k-1) + \sum_{i=1}^k (2^{s_i} - 2) \leq k(k-2) + \prod_{i=1}^k 2^{s_i} \leq 2^n + n(n-2)$  lower covers.

A chain must consist of quasiorders with mutually distinct numbers of contained pairs, so it can have at most size  $n^2$ . Furthermore, consider the following way to construct a chain: Starting from the quasiorder with only incomparable elements, we first successively make one element less than all others, then a second element less than all others except the first one, and so on. This yields a chain consisting of  $n(n-1)/2$  quasiorders.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 14 for quasiorders.** We reduce 3SAT to 3-FIXEDPOINTS( $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}$ ) similar to the proof of Theorem 13. For a given formula  $B$  with  $m \geq 1$  variables, we choose a base set  $A = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+1}\}$  and size  $n = m + 1$ . We construct a map  $f_{\nabla} : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  by mapping a quasiorder  $\lesssim \in \mathcal{Q}$  as follows:

1. If  $\lesssim = \top$ , map it to itself.
2. Otherwise, if  $\lesssim$  does not consist of two ordered indifference classes, map  $\lesssim$  to  $\perp$ .
3. Otherwise, let  $X$  be the only maximal indifference class in  $\lesssim$ . If  $I = (v_1 \in X, \dots, v_m \in X)$  is a satisfying assignment of  $B$ , then map  $\lesssim$  to itself, else map it to  $\perp$ .

It is easy to verify that  $f_{\nabla}$  is decreasing isotone and can be succinctly represented. Furthermore, it can be shown that  $f_{\nabla}$  has three or more fixed points if and only if  $B$  is satisfiable with the same strategy as for Theorem 13.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 14 for equivalences.** We reduce 3SAT to 3-FIXEDPOINTS( $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{dec-iso}}$ ) similar to the proof of Theorem 13. For a given formula  $B$  with  $m \geq 1$  variables, we choose base set  $A = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+2}\}$  of size  $n = m + 2$ . The reduction is based on a map  $f_{\nabla} \in F_{\text{dec-iso}}(\mathcal{P})$ , which maps equivalence  $\approx \in \mathcal{P}$  as follows:

1. If  $\approx = \top$ , then map  $\approx$  to itself.
2. If  $\approx$  has three or more equivalence classes, then map it to  $\perp$ .
3. Otherwise, if  $I = (v_1 \in [v_n]_{\approx}, \dots, v_m \in [v_n]_{\approx})$  is a satisfying assignment of  $B$ , then map  $\approx$  to itself, else map it to  $\perp$ .

$f_{\nabla}$  is decreasing isotone and can be succinctly represented. Finally, it can be shown that  $f_{\nabla}$  has three or more fixed points if and only if formula  $B$  is satisfiable.  $\square$




Figure 1: Hasse diagram of the lattice of regular equivalences (solid black lines) on the cycle graph  $C_{33}$  with 33 vertices, overlaid with one possible search graph produced by an application of the enumeration algorithm (dashed gray links). For each regular equivalence, the vertex labels in each cycle graph represent the equivalence classes of the vertices. Isomorphic regular equivalences are represented by a single representative; the numbers in the cycle centers indicate how many isomorphic equivalences there are. The dashed gray links represent the tree edges of the search graph produced by the enumeration algorithm, while the numbers next to them describe one possible order in which these links were followed (i.e., in which the link targets were listed).

## References

- [1] Vladimir Batagelj, Patrick Doreian, and Anuška Ferligoj. An optimizational approach to regular equivalence. *Social Networks*, 14(1-2):121–135, 1992. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(92)90016-Z.
- [2] Bard Bloom, Sorin Istrail, and Albert R. Meyer. Bisimulation can't be traced. *Journal of the ACM*, 42(1):232–268, January 1995. doi:10.1145/200836.200876.
- [3] Bard Bloom and Robert Paige. Transformational design and implementation of a new efficient solution to the ready simulation problem. *Science of Computer Programming*, 24(3):189–220, 1995. doi:10.1016/0167-6423(95)00003-B.
- [4] Stephen P. Borgatti, John P. Boyd, and Martin G. Everett. Iterated roles: Mathematics and application. *Social Networks*, 11(2):159–172, 1989. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(89)90010-5.
- [5] Stephen P. Borgatti and Martin G. Everett. The class of all regular equivalences: Algebraic structure and computation. *Social Networks*, 11(1):65–88, 1989. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(89)90018-X.
- [6] Stephen P. Borgatti and Martin G. Everett. Graph colorings and power in experimental exchange networks. *Social Networks*, 14(3-4):287–308, 1992. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(92)90006-S.
- [7] Stephen P. Borgatti and Martin G. Everett. Ecological and perfect colorings. *Social Networks*, 16(1):43–55, 1994. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(94)90010-8.
- [8] John P. Boyd and Martin G. Everett. Relations, residuals, regular interiors, and relative regular equivalence. *Social Networks*, 21(2):147–165, 1999. doi:10.1016/S0378-8733(99)00006-4.
- [9] Joel Brynielsson, Lisa Kaati, and Pontus Svenson. Social positions and simulation relations. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 2(1):39–52, 2012. doi:10.1007/s13278-011-0032-x.
- [10] Alain Cardon and Maxime Crochemore. Partitioning a graph in  $\mathcal{O}(|A| \log_2 |V|)$ . *Theoretical Computer Science*, 19(1):85–98, 1982. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(82)90016-0.
- [11] Ching-Lueh Chang, Yuh-Dauh Lyuu, and Yen-Wu Ti. The complexity of Tarski's fixed point theorem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 401(1-3):228–235, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2008.05.005.
- [12] Xi Chen and Yuhao Li. Improved upper bounds for finding Tarski fixed points. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 1108–1118, Boulder CO USA, 2022. ACM. doi:10.1145/3490486.3538297.
- [13] Xi Chen, Yuhao Li, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Reducing Tarski to unique Tarski (in the black-box model). In Amnon Ta-Shma, editor, *38th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2023)*, volume 264 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 21:1–21:23, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2023.21.
- [14] Chuangyin Dang, Qi Qi, and Yinyu Ye. Computations and complexities of Tarski's fixed points and supermodular games. *arXiv*, 2005.09836 [cs, econ], 2020. arXiv:2005.09836, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2005.09836.
- [15] Chuangyin Dang and Yinyu Ye. The complexity of determining the uniqueness of Tarski's fixed point under the lexicographic ordering. In Amin Saberi, editor, *Internet and Network Economics*, volume 6484 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 455–461. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17572-5\_38.

- [16] Brian A. Davey and Hilary A. Priestley. *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2 edition, 2002. doi:10.1017/CB09780511809088.
- [17] Patrick Doreian, Vladimir Batagelj, and Anuška Ferligoj. *Generalized Blockmodeling*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1 edition, 2005. doi:10.1017/CB09780511584176.
- [18] Federico Echenique. Finding all equilibria in games of strategic complements. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 135(1):514–532, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.jet.2006.06.001.
- [19] Kousha Etessami, Christos Papadimitriou, Aviad Rubinfeld, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Tarski’s theorem, supermodular games, and the complexity of equilibria. In Thomas Vidick, editor, *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*, volume 151 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 18:1–18:19, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2020.18.
- [20] Martin G. Everett and Stephen P. Borgatti. Role colouring a graph. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 21(2):183–188, 1991. doi:10.1016/0165-4896(91)90080-B.
- [21] John Fearnley, Dömötör Pálvölgyi, and Rahul Savani. A faster algorithm for finding Tarski fixed points. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, page 3524044, 2022. doi:10.1145/3524044.
- [22] Jiří Fiala and Daniël Paulusma. A complete complexity classification of the role assignment problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 349(1):67–81, 2005. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2005.09.029.
- [23] George Grätzer. *General Lattice Theory*. Birkhäuser, Basel Berlin, 2. ed edition, 2003.
- [24] Monika R. Henzinger, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Peter W. Kopke. Computing simulations on finite and infinite graphs. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 453–462, Milwaukee, WI, USA, 1995. IEEE Computer Society Press. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1995.492576.
- [25] David S. Johnson, Mihalis Yannakakis, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Information Processing Letters*, 27(3):119–123, 1988. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(88)90065-8.
- [26] Robin Milner. An algebraic definition of simulation between programs. In *Proceedings of the Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 1971)*, pages 481–489, London, 1971.
- [27] Robin Milner. *Communication and Concurrency*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989.
- [28] Julian Müller. netroles library for role equivalence analysis in networks version 0.1. Zenodo, 2023. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.8199503.
- [29] Julian Müller and Ulrik Brandes. The evolution of roles. *Social Networks*, 68:195–208, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2021.02.001.
- [30] Robert Paige and Robert E. Tarjan. Three partition refinement algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(6):973–989, 1987. doi:10.1137/0216062.
- [31] David Park. Concurrency and automata on infinite sequences. In Peter Deussen, editor, *Proceedings of the 5th GI-Conference on Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 104 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 167–183, Berlin/Heidelberg, 1981. Springer-Verlag. doi:10.1007/BFb0017309.
- [32] B.C. Rennie and A.J. Dobson. On Stirling numbers of the second kind. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 7(2):116–121, 1969. doi:10.1016/S0021-9800(69)80045-1.

- [33] Fred S. Roberts and Li Sheng. How hard is it to determine if a graph has a 2-role assignment? *Networks*, 37(2):67–73, 2001. doi:10.1002/1097-0037(200103)37:2<67::AID-NET1>3.0.CO;2-9.
- [34] Lee D. Sailer. Structural equivalence: Meaning and definition, computation and application. *Social Networks*, 1(1):73–90, 1978. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(78)90014-X.
- [35] Davide Sangiorgi. On the origins of bisimulation and coinduction. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 31(4):1–41, 2009. doi:10.1145/1516507.1516510.
- [36] Emanuel Sperner. Ein Satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menge. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 27(1):544–548, 1928. doi:10.1007/BF01171114.
- [37] Alfred Tarski. A lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 5(2):285–309, June 1955. doi:10.2140/pjm.1955.5.285.
- [38] Douglas R. White and Karl P. Reitz. Graph and semigroup homomorphisms on networks of relations. *Social Networks*, 5(2):193–234, 1983. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(83)90025-4.