

Aggregation of evaluations without unanimity

Yuval Filmus*

March 3, 2025

Abstract

Dokow and Holzman determined which predicates over $\{0, 1\}$ satisfy an analog of Arrow’s theorem: all unanimous aggregators are dictatorial. Szegedy and Xu, extending earlier work of Dokow and Holzman, extended this to predicates over arbitrary finite alphabets.

Mossel extended Arrow’s theorem in an orthogonal direction, determining all aggregators without the assumption of unanimity. We bring together both threads of research by extending the results of Dokow–Holzman and Szegedy–Xu to the setting of Mossel. As an application, we determine which symmetric predicates over $\{0, 1\}$ are such that all aggregators are dictatorial.

1 Introduction

Arrow’s impossibility theorem [Arr50, Arr63] is a classical result in social choice theory. There are n voters who rank $m \geq 3$ candidates. Their votes are aggregated by a social choice function to produce a consensus ordering of the candidates. The theorem states that the only social choice function satisfying two natural properties, independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA) and Pareto efficiency, is a dictatorship.

Concretely, in the case of $m = 3$ candidates A, B, C , we can represent voter i ’s vote as a binary vector $(x_i, y_i, z_i) \in \{0, 1\}^3$, where x_i encodes whether the voter prefers A or B (1 or 0, respectively), y_i encodes whether they prefer B or C , and z_i encodes whether they prefer C or A . Since x_i, y_i, z_i correspond to an actual ordering, they must satisfy the following property:

$$(x_i, y_i, z_i) \in P_{3\text{NAE}} := \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}.$$

The aggregated ordering should satisfy the same property. (Here NAE stands for Not-All-Equal.)

The IIA assumption states that the votes are aggregated “item by item”, using three functions $f, g, h: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. If $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ represent the individual votes, then the aggregated ordering is $(f(x), g(y), h(z))$. Pareto efficiency states that if all voters agree on an item, then the aggregated ordering concurs. This means that $f(0, \dots, 0) = g(0, \dots, 0) = h(0, \dots, 0) = 0$ and $f(1, \dots, 1) = g(1, \dots, 1) = h(1, \dots, 1) = 1$.

We can now state Arrow’s theorem in the case of three candidates:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $f, g, h: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfy the following two conditions:*

- *Polymorphicity:*¹ *Whenever $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ are such that $(x_i, y_i, z_i) \in P_{3\text{NAE}}$ for all i then $(f(x), g(y), h(z)) \in P_{3\text{NAE}}$.*
- *Pareto efficiency:*² *$f(b, \dots, b) = g(b, \dots, b) = h(b, \dots, b) = b$ for $b \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Then there is a coordinate j such that $f(x) = g(x) = h(x) = x_j$.

*Technion Israel Institute of Technology. Research supported by ISF grant 507/24.

¹In the literature on social choice theory, the functions f, g, h are considered as a single function $(P_{3\text{NAE}})^n \rightarrow P_{3\text{NAE}}$ called an *aggregator*.

²In the literature many other names are used, such as unanimity, idempotence, constancy, faithfulness, systematicity.

Rubinstein and Fishburn [RF86] asked what happens for other predicates P , possibly over non-binary domains. The first step in answering this question was taken by Nehring and Puppe [NP02], who determined all binary predicates for which all monotone polymorphisms are dictatorial. Dokow and Holzman [DH10a] completely resolved the problem for binary predicates by determining all binary predicates for which all Pareto efficient polymorphisms are dictatorial (they called such predicates *impossibility domains*). They also made progress on the problem for predicates over arbitrary finite alphabets [DH10c]. Szegedy and Xu [SX15] completely resolved the problem (for both supportiveness and unanimity) using methods of universal algebra. In contrast to the work of Dokow and Holzman, which gave explicit criteria, Szegedy and Xu showed that the case of arbitrary n follows from an appropriate base case. Other relevant results include [Wil72, FR86, LP02, DL07, DH09, DH10b, DL13, Gib14].

In universal algebra [Gei68], a function $f: \Sigma^n \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a polymorphism of a predicate $P \subseteq \Sigma^m$ if whenever $(x_i^{(1)}, \dots, x_i^{(m)}) \in P$ for all i , we have $(f(x^{(1)}), \dots, f(x^{(m)})) \in P$. This differs from the definition in Theorem 1.1, which allows different functions for different coordinates. We can recover the more general definition by assigning each coordinate a different *sort*, and asking for *multi-sorted* polymorphisms [BJ03]. We adopt the term *polymorphism*, which for us always signifies a multi-sorted polymorphism.

The universal algebra definition does not require the functions to be Pareto efficient. Mossel [Mos09, Mos12] proved a version of Arrow’s theorem in this setting.³

Theorem 1.2 (Mossel). *Suppose that $f, g, h: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ are a polymorphism of P_{3NAE} . Then one of the following cases holds:*

- *There exists j such that $f(x) = g(x) = h(x) = x_j$.*
- *There exists j such that $f(x) = g(x) = h(x) = \bar{x}_j$ (i.e., $1 - x_j$).*
- *One of f, g, h is the constant 0 function, and another one is the constant 1 function.*

In words, every polymorphism of P_{3NAE} is either dictatorial (all functions depend on a single coordinate) or a “certificate”, meaning that the polymorphism fixes a subset of the coordinates to certain values which guarantee that P_{3NAE} is satisfied.

In this paper, our goal is to prove an analog of the results of Dokow–Holzman and Szegedy–Xu in the setting of Mossel’s result, that is, without assuming Pareto efficiency.

A formalization of our main results in Lean4 can be found at <https://github.com/YuvalFilmus/Polymorphisms/>.

Setup

Predicates We will consider predicates $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$, where $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_m$ are finite sets of size at least 2.

We assume that P is *non-degenerate*:

- For each $i \in [m]$ and each $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ there is $y \in P$ such that $y_i = \sigma$.
Equivalently, the projection of P to the i ’th coordinate is Σ_i .
- P depends on all coordinates, meaning that for all $i \in [m]$ there exist $y \in P$ and $z \notin P$ that differ only in the i ’th coordinate.

Polymorphisms Functions $f_i: \Sigma_i^n \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ constitute a *polymorphism* of P if whenever $x^{(i)} \in \Sigma_i^n$ are such that $(x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_j^{(m)}) \in P$ for all $j \in [n]$, then also $(f_1(x^{(1)}), \dots, f_m(x^{(m)})) \in P$.

³Mossel states his result for any number of candidates, but his more general result simply states that if we restrict attention to any three candidates, then the corresponding social choice functions behave as in the theorem.

Triviality Dokow and Holzman [DH10a, DH10c] define an m -ary predicate P to be an *impossibility domain* if whenever f_1, \dots, f_m is a Pareto efficient polymorphism of P , there is a coordinate j such that $f_i(x) = x_j$ for all $i \in [m]$. If we allow polymorphisms that are not Pareto efficient then we need to allow other “trivial” types of polymorphisms, such as certificates.

There are many possible definitions of trivial polymorphisms. We will use the following quite general one. Let Φ be a collection of tuples (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_m) , where $\phi_i: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$. A non-degenerate predicate P is Φ -trivial if every n -ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m of P has one of the following two types:

- Dictatorial type: There exist $j \in [n]$ and $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $f_i(x) = \phi_i(x_j)$.
- Certificate type: There exists a subset $S \subseteq [m]$ and an assignment $\rho_i \in \Sigma_i$ for each $i \in S$ such that:
 - ρ is a *certificate* for P : every $y \in \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ which agrees with ρ on S belongs to P .
 - f_1, \dots, f_m conform to ρ : f_i is the constant ρ_i function for every $i \in S$.

We think of ρ as a partial function, and so identify S with its domain $\text{dom } \rho$.

Here are several illustrative examples of the definition:

1. $\Phi = \{(\text{id}_{\Sigma_1}, \dots, \text{id}_{\Sigma_m})\}$, where id_{Σ} is the identity function on Σ .

In this case, the only dictators we allow are $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_j$.

For the remaining examples, we assume that all coordinates are binary: $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$.

2. $\Phi = \{(\text{id}, \dots, \text{id}), (\text{neg}, \dots, \text{neg})\}$, where $\text{neg}(x) = \bar{x}$.

In this case, we also allow dictators of the form $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = \bar{x}_j$.

3. $\Phi = \{\text{id}, \text{neg}\}^m$.

In this case, we allow dictators of the form $f_i(x) = x_j \oplus b_i$ for any $b \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

4. $\Phi = \{0, 1, \text{id}, \text{neg}\}^m$.

In this case, we allow dictators of the form $f_i(x) \in \{0, 1, x_j, \bar{x}_j\}$.

We say that P is Φ -trivial for $n = n_0$ if the definition above holds for n_0 -ary polymorphisms.

Results

Our main result is a reduction to the case $n = 2$, which echoes one of the main results of Szegedy and Xu [SX15].

Theorem 1.3. *A non-degenerate predicate P is Φ -trivial iff it is Φ -trivial for $n = 2$.*

We prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 2 by a simple induction.

The case $n = 2$ could be hard to check by hand. In order to facilitate this, we prove a further reduction to the case $n = 1$, under an additional assumption on Φ .

Theorem 1.4. *Let $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ be a non-degenerate predicate, where $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$ for all i . Let Φ be such that for all $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ and for all i , the function ϕ_i is a permutation of Σ_i .*

If P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$ then it is also Φ -trivial for $n = 2$, unless one of the following cases holds:

1. *There is a coordinate $i \in [m]$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ such that P is closed under setting i to σ , meaning that whenever $y \in P$ then also $y|_{i \leftarrow \sigma} \in P$, where $y|_{i \leftarrow \sigma}$ is obtained from y by changing y_i to σ .*

2. P has a non-dictatorial AND/OR polymorphism.

An AND/OR polymorphism is a polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ is as follows. If $|\Sigma_i| > 2$ then $f_i(x) = x_1$. If $|\Sigma_i| = 2$, without loss of generality $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$, then either $f_i(x) = x_1 \wedge x_2$ or $f_i(x) = x_1 \vee x_2$.

3. P has a Latin square polymorphism conforming to Φ .

A Latin square polymorphism is a polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where each $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ is a Latin square: if we view it as a $\Sigma_i \times \Sigma_i$ matrix, then each row and each column is a permutation of Σ_i .

The functions f_1, \dots, f_m conform to Φ if for all $y \in P$ we have

$$(f_1(y_1, \cdot), \dots, f_m(y_m, \cdot)), (f_1(\cdot, y_1), \dots, f_m(\cdot, y_m))) \in \Phi.$$

Here $f_i(y_i, \cdot)$ is the function that takes σ to $f_i(y_i, \sigma)$.

Furthermore, if $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_m = \{0, 1\}$ and P is not Φ -trivial for $n = 1$ then this is witnessed either by a polymorphism $f_1, \dots, f_m: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $f_i(x) \in \{0, 1, x\}$ for all i , or by a polymorphism $f_1, \dots, f_m: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $f_i(x) \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$ for all i .

Let us demystify Latin square polymorphisms. First, if $\Phi = \{(\text{id}, \dots, \text{id})\}$ then there are no Latin square polymorphisms conforming to Φ . Second, when $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$, the only Latin square polymorphisms are $f_i(x) \in \{x_1 \oplus x_2, x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus 1\}$. A predicate $P \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ has such a polymorphism iff it is an affine subspace.

We prove Theorem 1.4 in Section 3.

As an application of the previous results, we study *symmetric* predicates over $\{0, 1\}$. These are predicates $P \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ such that whether y belongs to P depends only on the Hamming weight of y . We consider two notions of triviality, corresponding to the following two collections:

- $\Phi_{\text{id}} = \{(\text{id}, \dots, \text{id})\}$.
- $\Phi_{\text{neg}} = \{\text{id}, \text{neg}\}^m$.

Theorem 1.5. *A non-degenerate symmetric predicate $P \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ is Φ_{neg} -trivial if and only if P is not one of the following predicates:*

- All vectors of even parity.
- All vectors of odd parity.
- All vectors of weight at least w , for some $w \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$.
- All vectors of weight at least w together with the all-zero vector, for some $w \in \{2, \dots, m\}$.
- All vectors of weight at most w , for some $w \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$.
- All vectors of weight at most w together with the all-one vector, for some $w \in \{0, \dots, m-2\}$.

Furthermore, if P is Φ_{neg} -trivial then all dictatorial polymorphisms f_1, \dots, f_m of P are such that $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_j$ or (possibly) $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = \bar{x}_j$, for some $j \in [n]$.

The predicate P is Φ_{id} -trivial if and only if P is not one of the predicates listed above, and also P is not closed under complementation (i.e., flipping all bits).

We prove Theorem 1.5 in Section 4. Theorem 1.2, which states that the symmetric predicate $P_{3\text{NAE}}$ is Φ_{neg} -trivial, immediately follows.

Finally, we relate the notion of Φ -triviality to the notion of impossibility domains studied by Dokow and Holzman [DH10a, DH10c].

A non-degenerate predicate $P \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ is an *impossibility domain* according to Dokow and Holzman [DH10a] if the only Pareto efficient polymorphisms of P are dictators. Spelled out in full, P is an impossibility domain if whenever $f_1, \dots, f_m: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a polymorphism of P satisfying $f_i(b, \dots, b) = b$ for all $i \in [m]$ and all $b \in \{0, 1\}$, then there exists $j \in [n]$ such that $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_j$.

Dokow and Holzman [DH10c] extended this definition to arbitrary alphabets. In fact, they gave two different definitions using two different extensions of Pareto efficiency to arbitrary alphabets, *supportiveness* and *unanimity*, both of which we define below. They focused on supportiveness. Later, Szegedy and Xu [SX15] studied both definitions (they used the term *idempotence* instead of unanimity).

A function $f: \Sigma^n \rightarrow \Sigma$ is *unanimous* if $f(\sigma, \dots, \sigma) = \sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$. It is *supportive* if $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \Sigma$. We can use these two notions to define two notions of impossibility domains: impossibility domains with respect to supportiveness, and impossibility domains with respect to unanimity. We relate the latter notion to Φ -triviality.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ be a non-degenerate predicate, where $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$ for all i . Let Φ be such that for all $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$, the function ϕ_i is a permutation of Σ_i .*

Suppose that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$. Then P is Φ -trivial if and only if it is an impossibility domain with respect to unanimity.

We prove Theorem 1.6 in Section 5.

Open questions

Post [Pos20, Pos42] classified all uni-sorted polymorphisms of predicates over $\{0, 1\}$. The case of larger alphabets is significantly more complicated [JM59], though some partial results were proven for $\{0, 1, 2\}$ [Yab54, Zhu15]. Classifying all multi-sorted polymorphisms appears daunting even for predicates over $\{0, 1\}$ [BK25]. Nevertheless, our results demonstrate that it is possible to determine which predicates support only simple polymorphisms.

Our notion of triviality is motivated by Mossel's extension of Arrow's theorem for three candidates, which shows that every polymorphism of $P_{3\text{NAE}}$ is either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. When there are four or more candidates, a new kind of simple polymorphism arises. Abstracting away the details, define an n -ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m of $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ to be of *dictatorial-certificate type* if there exists a set $S \subseteq [m]$ such that:

- For each $i \in S$, the function f_i depends on at most one coordinate (not necessarily the same coordinate for all $i \in S$).
- Let $x^{(i)} \in \Sigma_i^n$ be such that $(x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_j^{(m)}) \in P$ for all $j \in [n]$. Then $\rho := (f_i(x^{(i)}))_{i \in S}$ is a certificate for P , meaning that if $y \in \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ agrees with ρ on S then $y \in P$.

It would be interesting to extend our results to this setting.

Another generalization is to the setting in which instead of a single predicate we have two predicates $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ and $Q \subseteq \Delta_1 \times \dots \times \Delta_m$. In this case functions f_1, \dots, f_m , where $f_i: \Sigma_i^n \rightarrow \Delta_i$, are a polymorphism if whenever $x^{(i)} \in \Sigma_i^n$ are such that $(x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_j^{(m)}) \in P$ for all $j \in [n]$, then $(f_1(x^{(1)}), \dots, f_m(x^{(m)})) \in Q$. This setting arose independently in universal algebra [Pip02, LPW18], social choice theory [DH10b], and complexity theory [AGH17, BG16, BG21, BBKO21].

The simplest setting is when $\Delta_i = \Sigma_i$ and $P \subseteq Q$, and the notion of simplicity depends on the context. Dokow and Holzman [DH10b] describe a particular scenario arising from social choice theory, and determine which predicates over $\{0, 1\}$ are impossibility domains in their setting. It would be interesting to extend their results to our setting, as well as to larger alphabets.

Other interesting open questions include removing the assumption on Φ from Theorems 1.4 and 1.6, extending Theorem 1.6 to supportiveness, and generalizing Theorem 1.1 to arbitrary finite alphabets.

2 Main result

In this section we prove our main result:

Theorem 1.3. *A non-degenerate predicate P is Φ -trivial iff it is Φ -trivial for $n = 2$.*

Let $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ be a non-degenerate predicate. If P is Φ -trivial then it is clearly Φ -trivial for $n = 2$.

For the other direction, we first observe that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 0$ and $n = 1$. The case $n = 0$ is trivial, since all polymorphisms are constant in this case, and so they conform to a certificate. In the case $n = 1$, we can extend the given unary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m to a binary polymorphism F_1, \dots, F_m in which each function depends only on the first argument. Applying the case $n = 2$, there are three cases:

- There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $F_i(x) = \phi_i(x_1)$ for all i .
In this case $f_i(x) = \phi_i(x)$, as needed.
- There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $F_i(x) = \phi_i(x_2)$ for all i .
Since F_i doesn't depend on x_2 , in this case all f_i are constant, and so they conform to a certificate.
- The functions F_1, \dots, F_m conform to a certificate ρ .
In this case f_1, \dots, f_m also conform to ρ .

We prove that P is Φ -trivial for all $n > 2$ by induction. Assuming that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 2$ and for a given value of $n \geq 2$, we prove that it is also Φ -trivial for $n + 1$.

From here on, we assume that we are given an $(n + 1)$ -ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m . Our goal is to show that it is either of dictatorial type or of certificate type.

The idea of the proof is to consider the functions $f_i|_\sigma$ obtained by fixing the final argument to $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$. For each $y \in P$, the functions $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ are an n -ary polymorphism of P , and we can apply the inductive hypothesis to them. In order to complete the proof, we need to aggregate the structure of the $f_i|_\sigma$ to conclude a structure of the f_i . This will be accomplished by applying the Φ -triviality of 2-ary polymorphisms to a specially constructed function which abstracts the salient structure of the $f_i|_\sigma$ in a usable way, as described by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *There are functions g_1, \dots, g_m , where $g_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$, such that the following properties hold:*

1. g_1, \dots, g_m is a polymorphism of P .
2. If $g_i(x) = \phi(x_1)$ for some $\phi: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ then $f_i(x) = \phi(x_{n+1})$.
3. If $g_i(x) = \phi(x_2)$ for some $\phi: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ then there are coordinates $s(i, \sigma) \in [n]$ such that $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi(x_{s(i, \sigma)})$.

Proof. We first define for every i a function h_i which takes as input $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ and returns either a function $\Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ or \perp . The definition is as follows: if $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi(x_s)$ for some (possibly constant) $\phi: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ then $h_i(\sigma) = \phi$, and otherwise $h_i(\sigma) = \perp$.

We can now define g_i , considering two cases:

- There exists $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_i$ such that $h_i(\sigma_0) \neq \perp$.

Let $\psi: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ be any non-constant function which is different from $h_i(\sigma_0)$; such a function exists since $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$, and so there are at least two non-constant functions on Σ_i .

We define $g_i(\sigma, a) = h_i(\sigma)(a)$ if $h_i(\sigma) \neq \perp$, and $g_i(\sigma, a) = \psi(a)$ otherwise.

- $h_i(\sigma) = \perp$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$.

Let $\psi', \psi'': \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ be two different non-constant functions. Single out some $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_i$. We let $g_i(\sigma_0, a) = \psi'(a)$ and $g_i(\sigma, a) = \psi''(a)$ for $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$.

Let us now verify the stated properties one by one:

1. Suppose that $y, z \in P$. We need to show that $(g_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, g_m(y_m, z_m)) \in P$.

Since $y \in P$, the functions $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ are a polymorphism of P . We now consider two cases, according to whether this polymorphism is of dictatorial type or of certificate type.

Suppose first that $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ is of dictatorial type: there exist $j \in [n]$ and $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $f_i|_{y_i}(x) = \phi_i(x_j)$. Then $h_i(y_i) = \phi_i$, and so $g_i(y_i, a) = \phi_i(a)$.

Define vectors $x^{(i)} \in \Sigma_i^{n+1}$ as follows: $x_1^{(i)} = \dots = x_n^{(i)} = z_i$ and $x_{n+1}^{(i)} = y_i$. By construction, $(x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_j^{(m)}) \in P$ for all j , and so $(f_1(x^{(1)}), \dots, f_m(x^{(m)})) \in P$. Now $f_i(x^{(i)}) = f_i|_{y_i}(z_i, \dots, z_i) = \phi_i(z_i) = g_i(y_i, z_i)$, and so $(g_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, g_m(y_m, z_m)) \in P$.

Suppose next that $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ conform to some certificate ρ . For every $i \in \text{dom } \rho$, the function $f_i|_{y_i}$ is the constant ρ_i function. Hence $h_i(y_i)$ is the constant ρ_i function, and so $g_i(y_i, z_i) = \rho_i$. Since ρ is a certificate, this shows that $(g_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, g_m(y_m, z_m)) \in P$.

2. Suppose that $g_i(x) = \phi(x_1)$ for some $\phi: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$. We need to show that $f_i(x) = \phi(x_{n+1})$.

The definition of g_i shows that $h_i(\sigma) \neq \perp$ for all σ (since otherwise the function $a \mapsto g_i(\sigma, a)$ would not be constant), and so $h_i(\sigma)$ is the constant $\phi(\sigma)$ function. This implies that $f_i|_\sigma$ is the constant $\phi(\sigma)$ function, and so $f_i(x) = \phi(x_{n+1})$.

3. Suppose that $g_i(x) = \phi(x_2)$ for some function $\phi: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$. We need to show that for all σ we have $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi(x_s)$ for some $s \in [n]$ which could depend on σ .

If $h_i(\sigma) = \perp$ for some $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ then the definition of g_i guarantees that the functions $a \mapsto g_i(\sigma, a)$ are not all the same, and so it is not the case that $g_i(x)$ depends only on x_2 . Hence $h_i(\sigma) \neq \perp$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$, implying that $g_i(x) = h_i(x_1)(x_2)$. Thus $h_i(\sigma) = \phi$ for all σ , and so for each σ we have $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi(x_s)$ for some $s \in [n]$. \square

Since g_1, \dots, g_m is a polymorphism of P and P is Φ -trivial for $n = 2$, we conclude that g_1, \dots, g_m is either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, we consider three cases:

1. All functions g_1, \dots, g_m depend on x_1 .
2. All functions g_1, \dots, g_m depend on x_2 .
3. All functions g_1, \dots, g_m are of certificate type.

There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $g_i(x) = \phi_i(x_1)$ for all i . Applying Item 2 of Lemma 2.1, we see that $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi_i(\sigma)$ for all i, σ , and so $f_i(x) = \phi_i(x_{n+1})$ for all i . Therefore f_1, \dots, f_m is of dictatorial type, where the dictator is x_{n+1} .

There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $g_i(x) = \phi_i(x_2)$ for all i . Applying Item 3 of Lemma 2.1, we conclude that there are coordinates $s(i, \sigma) \in [n]$ such that $f_i|_\sigma(x) = \phi_i(x_{s(i, \sigma)})$.

Let $A \subseteq [m]$ consist of those coordinates for which ϕ_i is not constant. If there exists $s \in [n]$ such that $s(i, \sigma) = s$ whenever $i \in A$ then we can set $s(i, \sigma) = s$ for $i \notin A$ to obtain that f_1, \dots, f_m are of dictatorial type, where the dictator is x_s . So suppose that $\{s(i, \sigma) : i \in A, \sigma \in \Sigma_i\}$ contains at least two different coordinates; in particular, A is non-empty.

Recall that for every $y \in P$, the n -ary functions $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ are a polymorphism of P . Suppose first that there is some $y \in P$ such that $s(i', y_{i'}) \neq s(i'', y_{i''})$ for some $i', i'' \in A$. This implies that $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ cannot be of dictatorial type. Applying the induction hypothesis, we see that $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ must conform to some certificate ρ , where necessarily $\text{dom } \rho \subseteq \bar{A}$. In this case, the functions f_1, \dots, f_m also conform to ρ .

Suppose next that for every $y \in P$ there exists s_y such that $s(i, y_i) = s_y$ for all $i \in A$. We would like to show that in this case as well f_1, \dots, f_m are of certificate type.

Single out some arbitrary $y_0 \in P$ and let $s_0 = s_{y_0}$. For $i \in A$, we partition Σ_i into two parts $\Sigma_{i,0}, \Sigma_{i,1}$, where $\Sigma_{i,0}$ consists of those $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ such that $s(i, \sigma) = s_0$. Thus for every $y \in P$, either $y_i \in \Sigma_{i,0}$ for all $i \in A$, or $y_i \in \Sigma_{i,1}$ for all $i \in A$. We will use this to construct a 2-ary polymorphism χ_1, \dots, χ_m which is not of dictatorial type, and deduce that f_1, \dots, f_m are of certificate type.

The definition of χ_i is quite simple. If $i \notin A$, we define $\chi_i(x) = \phi_i$. If $i \in A$, we define $\chi_i(x) = \phi_i(x_1)$ if $x_1 \in \Sigma_{i,0}$ and $\chi_i(x) = \phi_i(x_2)$ if $x_1 \in \Sigma_{i,1}$. Since g_1, \dots, g_m are a polymorphism of P , so are ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_m . This immediately implies that χ_1, \dots, χ_m is a polymorphism.

Applying the case $n = 2$, we deduce that χ_1, \dots, χ_m are either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. We claim that they cannot be of dictatorial type. It is clear that they cannot depend only on x_1 . If they depended only on x_2 , then considering y_0 as the first argument, we see that χ_1, \dots, χ_m have to be constant, contradicting the non-emptiness of A .

Thus χ_1, \dots, χ_m must conform to some certificate ρ . By construction, $\text{dom } \rho \subseteq \bar{A}$ and $\rho_i = \phi_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Hence f_1, \dots, f_m also conform to ρ .

The functions g_1, \dots, g_m conform to some certificate ρ . Applying Item 2 of Lemma 2.1, we see that $f_i|_\sigma$ is the constant ρ_i function whenever $i \in \text{dom } \rho$, and so f_i is the constant ρ_i function whenever $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Hence f_1, \dots, f_m also conform to ρ .

3 Reduction to $n = 1$

In this section we prove the reduction from $n = 2$ to $n = 1$:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ be a non-degenerate predicate, where $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$ for all i . Let Φ be such that for all $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ and for all i , the function ϕ_i is a permutation of Σ_i .*

If P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$ then it is also Φ -trivial for $n = 2$, unless one of the following cases holds:

1. *There is a coordinate $i \in [m]$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ such that P is closed under setting i to σ , meaning that whenever $y \in P$ then also $y|_{i \leftarrow \sigma} \in P$, where $y|_{i \leftarrow \sigma}$ is obtained from y by changing y_i to σ .*

2. *P has a non-dictatorial AND/OR polymorphism.*

An AND/OR polymorphism is a polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ is as follows. If $|\Sigma_i| > 2$ then $f_i(x) = x_1$. If $|\Sigma_i| = 2$, without loss of generality $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$, then either $f_i(x) = x_1 \wedge x_2$ or $f_i(x) = x_1 \vee x_2$.

3. *P has a Latin square polymorphism conforming to Φ .*

A Latin square polymorphism is a polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where each $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ is a Latin square: if we view it as a $\Sigma_i \times \Sigma_i$ matrix, then each row and each column is a permutation of Σ_i .

The functions f_1, \dots, f_m conform to Φ if for all $y \in P$ we have

$$(f_1(y_1, \cdot), \dots, f_m(y_m, \cdot)), (f_1(\cdot, y_1), \dots, f_m(\cdot, y_m)) \in \Phi.$$

Here $f_i(y_i, \cdot)$ is the function that takes σ to $f_i(y_i, \sigma)$.

Furthermore, if $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_m = \{0, 1\}$ and P is not Φ -trivial for $n = 1$ then this is witnessed either by a polymorphism $f_1, \dots, f_m: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $f_i(x) \in \{0, 1, x\}$ for all i , or by a polymorphism $f_1, \dots, f_m: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $f_i(x) \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$ for all i .

Suppose that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$, and let f_1, \dots, f_m be a 2-ary polymorphism of P . We will attempt to show that f_1, \dots, f_m are of dictatorial type or of certificate type. The proof will fail in certain cases, and each of these cases will be covered by one of the cases in the statement of the theorem. Later on, we will prove the ‘‘furthermore’’ part.

As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we define $f_i|_\sigma$ to be the function obtained by fixing the final argument to $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$. Thus for every $y \in P$, the functions $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ are a 1-ary polymorphism of P .

As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we capitalize on this observation by considering auxiliary functions $h_i: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i \cup \{*\}$ (where $*$ is a symbol not in Σ_i) which abstract the situation: if $f_i|_\sigma$ is the constant τ function then we define $h_i(\sigma) = \tau$, and otherwise we define $h_i(\sigma) = *$. The idea is that in certain cases we can fill in the stars to obtain a 1-ary polymorphism of P , gaining insight on f_1, \dots, f_m by applying Φ -triviality for $n = 1$.

We start with a simple observation which follows immediately from the observation that $f_1|_{y_1}, \dots, f_m|_{y_m}$ is a polymorphism for every $y \in P$, coupled with Φ -triviality for $n = 1$.

Lemma 3.1. *For every $y \in P$, one of the following cases holds:*

1. *Dictatorial case: $h_i(y_i) = *$ for all i .*
In this case there exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $f_i|_{y_i} = \phi_i$ for all i .
2. *Certificate case: There is a certificate ρ such that $h_i(y_i) = \rho_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$.*

We now consider several cases:

1. The certificate case holds for all $y \in P$.
2. There is $\eta \in P$ for which the dictatorial case holds, and furthermore, $h_{i_0}(\sigma_0) \neq *$ for some i_0, σ_0 .
3. $h_i(\sigma) = *$ for all i, σ .

Each case will involve a different argument. The first two cases will involve various ways of *completing* each h_i to a function $g_i: \Sigma_i \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ so that g_1, \dots, g_m is a polymorphism of P . This means that $g_i(\sigma) = h_i(\sigma)$ whenever $h_i(\sigma) \neq *$.

The certificate case holds for all $y \in P$

We start with the completion process.

Lemma 3.2. *We can complete h_1, \dots, h_m to a polymorphism g_1, \dots, g_m such that for each i , if g_i is the constant τ function then h_i is also the constant τ function.*

Proof. The definition of g_i is quite simple. If $h_i(\sigma) = *$ for all σ then we define $g_i(\sigma) = \sigma$ for all σ . Otherwise, suppose $h_i(\sigma) \neq *$. Since $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$, we can find $\tau \in \Sigma_i$ which is different from $h_i(\sigma)$. We let $g_i(\sigma) = h_i(\sigma)$ if $h_i(\sigma) \neq *$, and $g_i(\sigma) = \tau$ otherwise.

The construction guarantees that g_i can be constant only if $g_i = h_i$. It remains to check that g_1, \dots, g_m is a polymorphism of P . Let $y \in P$. Since the certificate case holds for all $y \in P$, there is a certificate ρ such that $g_i(y_i) = h_i(y_i) = \rho_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Since ρ is a certificate, this means that $(g_1(y_1), \dots, g_m(y_m)) \in P$. \square

Since g_1, \dots, g_m is a 1-ary polymorphism of P and P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$, the functions g_1, \dots, g_m are either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. We consider the two cases separately.

There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $g_i = \phi_i$ for all i . We first observe that $\phi_1^{-1}, \dots, \phi_m^{-1}$ is also a polymorphism of P . Indeed, $\phi_1^r, \dots, \phi_m^r$ is a polymorphism of P for every $r \geq 0$, and if we take $r = \prod_{i=1}^m |\Sigma_i| - 1$, then $\phi_i^r = \phi_i^{-1}$.

Suppose first that $h_{i_0}(\sigma_0) = *$ for some i_0, σ_0 . Consider any $y \in P$ satisfying $y_{i_0} = \sigma_0$. By assumption, there is a certificate ρ such that $\rho_i = h_i(y_i) = g_i(y_i) = \phi_i(y_i)$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Since $\phi_1^{-1}, \dots, \phi_m^{-1}$ is a polymorphism of P , the assignment λ defined by $\lambda_i = \phi_i^{-1}(\rho_i) = y_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$ is also a certificate. Observe that $i_0 \notin \text{dom } \rho$. This means that $y|_{i_0 \leftarrow \tau} \in P$ for all $\tau \in \Sigma_{i_0}$. Let us record this:

$$y \in P \text{ and } y_{i_0} = \sigma_0 \implies y|_{i_0 \leftarrow \tau} \in P \text{ for all } \tau. \quad (1)$$

We now consider two cases: $|\Sigma_{i_0}| = 2$ and $|\Sigma_{i_0}| > 2$. If $|\Sigma_{i_0}| = 2$ then P is closed under setting i_0 to $\bar{\sigma}_0$, which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem. Indeed, if $y \in P$ satisfies $y_{i_0} = \bar{\sigma}_0$ then $y|_{i_0 \leftarrow \bar{\sigma}_0} = y \in P$, and otherwise $y_{i_0} = \sigma_0$, and so Equation (1) shows that $y_{i_0 \leftarrow \bar{\sigma}_0} \in P$.

The other case, $|\Sigma_{i_0}| > 2$, contradicts the assumption that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$. To see this, consider the functions e_1, \dots, e_m defined as follows. If $i \neq i_0$ then $e_i = \text{id}$. We let $e_{i_0}(\sigma) = \sigma$ for $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$, and $e_{i_0}(\sigma_0) = \sigma_1$ for some $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_0$. Equation (1) implies that e_1, \dots, e_m are a polymorphism of P , and so are of either dictatorial type or certificate type. However, by construction, no e_i is constant, and so e_1, \dots, e_m cannot be of certificate type; and e_{i_0} is not a permutation, and so e_1, \dots, e_m cannot be of dictatorial type.

Finally, suppose that $h_i(\sigma) \neq *$ for all i, σ . In this case $f_i|_\sigma$ is the constant $h_i(\sigma)$ function, and so $f_i(x) = h_i(x_2) = g_i(x_2) = \phi_i(x_2)$. Hence f_1, \dots, f_m is of dictatorial type.

The functions g_1, \dots, g_m conform to some certificate ρ . Lemma 3.2 implies that h_i is the constant ρ_i function for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. The definition of h_1, \dots, h_m implies that f_i is the constant ρ_i function for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Hence f_1, \dots, f_m also conform to ρ .

There is $\eta \in P$ for which the dictatorial case holds, and furthermore, $h_{i_0}(\sigma_0) \neq *$ for some i_0, σ_0

Rephrasing the first assumption, $h_i(\eta_i) = *$ for all i . We start with the completion process.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $z \in P$. Consider the completion g_1^z, \dots, g_m^z of h_1, \dots, h_m defined as follows: $g_i^z(\sigma) = h_i^z(\sigma)$ if $h_i^z(\sigma) \neq *$, and $g_i^z(\sigma) = z_i$ if $h_i^z(\sigma) = *$.*

The functions g_1^z, \dots, g_m^z are a polymorphism of P .

Proof. Let $y \in P$. If $h_i(y_i) = *$ for all i then $(g_1^z(y_1), \dots, g_m^z(y_m)) = z \in P$. Otherwise, invoking Lemma 3.1, there is a certificate ρ such that $g_i^z(y_i) = h_i(y_i) = \rho_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom } \rho$. Hence $(g_1^z(y_1), \dots, g_m^z(y_m)) \in P$ since ρ is a certificate. \square

Invoking the lemma, $g_1^\eta, \dots, g_m^\eta$ are a 1-ary polymorphism of P , and so either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. We consider the two cases separately.

There exists $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$ such that $g_i^\eta = \phi_i$ for all i . Since each ϕ_i is a permutation, this can only happen if $h_i(\sigma) \neq *$ for all $\sigma \neq \eta_i$.

Consider any $\zeta \in P$ which is different from η . Invoking Lemma 3.3 again, the functions $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ are a polymorphism of P , and so either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. Since $\zeta \neq \eta$, there must be a coordinate i_1 such that $\zeta_{i_1} \neq \eta_{i_1}$. Since $g_{i_1}^\eta$ is a permutation and $g_{i_1}^\zeta$ differs from $g_{i_1}^\eta$ only on input η_{i_1} , we see that $g_{i_1}^\zeta$ cannot be a permutation. Hence $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ must conform to some certificate ρ .

If $i \in \text{dom } \rho$ then g_i^ζ must be constant. Since g_i^η is a permutation and g_i^ζ differs from it only on input η_i , necessarily $|\Sigma_i| = 2$ and $\zeta_i = \bar{\eta}_i$. Letting $B = \{i : |\Sigma_i| = 2\}$, this shows that:

$$\zeta \in P \text{ and } \zeta \neq \eta \implies w \in P \text{ whenever } w_i = \zeta_i \text{ for all } i \in B \text{ such that } \zeta_i = \bar{\eta}_i. \quad (2)$$

This property allows us to construct a polymorphism e_1, \dots, e_m of AND/OR type, which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem. If $i \notin B$, we let $e_i(x) = x_1$. If $i \in B$ then $e_i(x) = \eta_i$ if $x_1 = x_2 = \eta_i$, and $e_i(x) = \bar{\eta}_i$ otherwise. When $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$, the function e_i is the OR function if $\eta_i = 0$ and the AND function if $\eta_i = 1$.

To see that this is a polymorphism, let $y, z \in P$. If $y = z = \eta$ then $(e_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, e_m(y_m, z_m)) = \eta \in P$. Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that $z \neq \eta$. Applying Equation (2) with $\zeta = z$, it suffices to show that $e_i(y_i, z_i) = z_i$ for all $i \in B$ such that $z_i = \bar{\eta}_i$. This follows directly from the definition of e_i .

To see that e is non-dictatorial, take any $\zeta \in P$ other than η . The argument about shows that $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ must conform to some certificate ρ , and furthermore, if $i \in \text{dom } \rho$ then $i \in B$, and so e_i is not a dictator.

The functions $g_1^\eta, \dots, g_m^\eta$ conform to some certificate ρ . Suppose first that $\tau := h_{i_1}(\sigma_1) \notin \{\eta_{i_1}, *\}$ for some i_1, σ_1 . This means that $g_{i_1}^\eta$ is not constant, and so $i_1 \notin \text{dom } \rho$. Thus $\zeta := \eta|_{i_1 \leftarrow \sigma_1} \in P$. Observe that $h_{i_1}(\zeta_{i_1}) = \tau \neq *$ whereas $h_i(\zeta_i) = h_i(\eta_i) = *$ for all $i \neq i_1$. In view of Lemma 3.1, this shows that P contains all z such that $z_{i_1} = \tau$. In particular, P is closed under setting i_1 to τ , which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem.

We can thus assume that $h_i(\sigma) \in \{\eta_i, *\}$ for all i, σ . Let C consist of i such that $h_i(\sigma) = *$ for all σ . By assumption, $i_0 \notin C$.

Suppose first that $C \neq \emptyset$ or $|\Sigma_i| > 2$ for some i . Consider any $\zeta \in P$. Invoking Lemma 3.3, the functions $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ are a polymorphism, and so either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. We claim that one of these functions is not a permutation, and so $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ must be of certificate type.

Indeed, if $C \neq \emptyset$, say $i \in C$, then g_i^ζ is constant. Similarly, if $|\Sigma_i| > 2$ then g_i^ζ cannot be a permutation: either h_i^ζ has at least two $*$ -inputs, both of which are set to ζ_i in g_i^ζ ; or it has at least two η_i -inputs.

Thus $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ conform to some certificate ρ^ζ . If $i \in \text{dom } \rho^\zeta$ then g_i^ζ is constant, and so either $i \in C$ or $\zeta_i = \eta_i$; in both cases, $\rho_i^\zeta = \zeta_i$. In particular, if $\zeta_{i_0} \neq \eta_{i_0}$ then $i_0 \notin \text{dom } \rho^\zeta$. Since ρ^ζ agrees with ζ on its domain, this implies that $\zeta|_{i_0 \leftarrow \eta_{i_0}} \in P$. Therefore P is closed under setting i_0 to η_{i_0} , which is one of the cases in the theorem.

Suppose now that $C = \emptyset$ and $|\Sigma_i| = 2$ for all i . This means that $h_i(\bar{\eta}_i) = \eta_i$ for all i .

Consider any $\zeta \in P$. As before, the functions $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ are a polymorphism and so either of dictatorial type or of certificate type. If $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ are of dictatorial type then g_i^ζ is a permutation for all i , and so $\zeta_i = \bar{\eta}_i$ for all i ; in short, $\zeta = \bar{\eta}$. In all other cases, $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ is of certificate type.

Suppose therefore that $\zeta \in P$ is different from $\bar{\eta}$. Then $g_1^\zeta, \dots, g_m^\zeta$ conform to a certificate ρ^ζ . If $i \in \text{dom } \rho^\zeta$ then $\zeta_i = \eta_i$. Equivalently, if $\zeta_i \neq \eta_i$ then $i \notin \text{dom } \rho^\zeta$. Since ρ^ζ agrees with ζ on its domain, this shows that:

$$\zeta \in P \text{ and } \zeta \neq \bar{\eta} \implies \zeta|_{i \leftarrow \eta_i} \in P \text{ for all } i. \quad (3)$$

This property allows us to construct a polymorphism e_1, \dots, e_m of AND/OR type, which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem: $e_i(x) = \bar{\eta}_i$ if $x_1 = x_2 = \bar{\eta}_i$, and $e_i(x) = \eta_i$ otherwise. To see that this is indeed a polymorphism, let $y, z \in P$. If $y = z = \bar{\eta}$ then $(e_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, e_m(y_m, z_m)) = \bar{\eta} \in P$. Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that $z \neq \bar{\eta}$. Observe that $(e_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, e_m(y_m, z_m))$ is obtained from z by setting to η_i coordinates i such that $y_i = \eta_i$. Therefore Equation (3) implies that $(e_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, e_m(y_m, z_m)) \in P$.

For all i, σ we have $h_i(\sigma) = *$

The dictatorial case of Lemma 3.1 applies for all $y \in P$. Since P is non-degenerate, for every i, σ we can find $y \in P$ such that $y_i = \sigma$, and so $f_i|_\sigma$ is a permutation.

So far we have restricted f_1, \dots, f_m to a 1-ary polymorphism according to the second argument. We can do the same, but according to the first argument. Running the argument so far, one of the following happens:

- The argument shows that f_1, \dots, f_m is of dictatorial type or of certificate type.
- The argument shows that one of the cases in the statement of the theorem holds.
- The argument reaches the current case ($h_i(\sigma) = *$ for all i, σ). In this case we immediately conclude that f_1, \dots, f_m is a Latin square polymorphism conforming to Φ .

Furthermore part

Suppose that $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_m = \{0, 1\}$ and P is not Φ -trivial for $n = 1$. Then there is a 1-ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m of P which is neither of dictatorial type nor of certificate type.

Since $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_m = \{0, 1\}$, each f_i is one of the functions $0, 1, x, \bar{x}$. Let $g_i(x) = f_i(f_i(x)) \in \{0, 1, x\}$. Clearly g_1, \dots, g_m is a polymorphism of P . We now consider two cases, according to whether g_1, \dots, g_m are of dictatorial type or not.

If g_1, \dots, g_m are of dictatorial type then $g_1 = \dots = g_m = x$ and so $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$, hence f_1, \dots, f_m are the claimed polymorphism.

Suppose next that g_1, \dots, g_m are not of dictatorial type. They cannot conform to any certificate since f_1, \dots, f_m would conform to the same certificate. Hence g_1, \dots, g_m are the claimed polymorphism.

4 Symmetric binary predicates

In this section we determine which non-degenerate symmetric predicates over $\{0, 1\}$ are trivial:

Theorem 1.5. *A non-degenerate symmetric predicate $P \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ is Φ_{neg} -trivial if and only if P is not one of the following predicates:*

- All vectors of even parity.
- All vectors of odd parity.
- All vectors of weight at least w , for some $w \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$.
- All vectors of weight at least w together with the all-zero vector, for some $w \in \{2, \dots, m\}$.
- All vectors of weight at most w , for some $w \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$.
- All vectors of weight at most w together with the all-one vector, for some $w \in \{0, \dots, m-2\}$.

Furthermore, if P is Φ_{neg} -trivial then all dictatorial polymorphisms f_1, \dots, f_m of P are such that $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_j$ or (possibly) $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = \bar{x}_j$, for some $j \in [n]$.

The predicate P is Φ_{id} -trivial if and only if P is not one of the predicates listed above, and also P is not closed under complementation (i.e., flipping all bits).

We remind the reader that $\Phi_{\text{id}} = \{(\text{id}, \dots, \text{id})\}$ and $\Phi_{\text{neg}} = \{\text{id}, \text{neg}\}^m$ (where m is the arity of P). Here $\text{id}(x) = x$ and $\text{neg}(x) = \bar{x}$.

Necessity

The easy part of the proof is showing that P is not Φ_{neg} -trivial or not Φ_{id} -trivial in the stated cases. In the cases listed for Φ_{neg} , we exhibit a 2-ary polymorphism in which all functions depend on both coordinates:

- P consists of all vectors of even parity.

The polymorphism is $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_1 \oplus x_2$.

- P consists of all vectors of odd parity.

The polymorphism is $f_1(x) = \dots = f_{m-1}(x) = x_1 \oplus x_2$ and $f_m(x) = \overline{x_1 \oplus x_2}$.

We could also take the 3-ary polymorphism $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus x_3$, which has the advantage that all functions are the same.

- P consists of all vectors of weight at least w , possibly with the addition of the all-zero vector.

The polymorphism is $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_1 \vee x_2$.

- P consists of all vectors of weight at most w , possibly with the addition of the all-one vector.

The polymorphism is $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_1 \wedge x_2$.

Finally, if P is closed under complementation, then it is not Φ_{id} -trivial due to the 1-ary polymorphism $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = \bar{x}$.

Sufficiency

Let $\Phi \in \{\Phi_{\text{id}}, \Phi_{\text{neg}}\}$, and suppose that P is not Φ -trivial. Our goal is to show that one of the cases in the statement of the theorem holds. It will be useful to represent P by the set W of Hamming weights of vectors in P .

Applying Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, one of the following cases must hold:

1. There exists a 1-ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where $f_i(x) \in \{0, 1, x\}$, other than $f_1 = \dots = f_m = x$, which is not of certificate type.
2. When $\Phi = \Phi_{\text{id}}$: There exists a 1-ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where $f_i(x) \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$, other than $f_1 = \dots = f_m = x$.
3. P is closed under setting i to b , for some i, b .
4. P has an AND/OR polymorphism.
5. P has a Latin square polymorphism.

We consider each of these cases below. The argument for the second case also proves the ‘‘furthermore’’ clause of the theorem.

P is closed under setting some coordinates to constants, and the constant coordinates do not constitute a certificate. Suppose that for all $y \in P$, if we set the first a_0 coordinates to 0 and the last a_1 coordinates to 1 then the resulting vector is also in P , where $a_0 + a_1 > 0$. We denote this operation by $\mathcal{O}(y)$. Since the constant coordinates do not constitute a certificate, there is some $y_0 \notin P$ such that $\mathcal{O}(y_0) \notin P$.

For any $y \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the weight of $\mathcal{O}(y)$ is always in the range $\{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$. Therefore $W \cap \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\} \neq \emptyset$. Considering the vector $\mathcal{O}(y_0)$, also $W \cap \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\} \neq \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$. These properties will lead to a contradiction if $a_0, a_1 > 0$, and will allow us to uncover the structure of W if $a_0 = 0$ or $a_1 = 0$.

The main observation is the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $w \in W$ be such that $w = a_1 + b_1$ and $m - w = a_0 + b_0$, where $b_0, b_1 \geq 0$ (equivalently, $w \in \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$).*

If $a_0, b_1 > 0$ then $w - 1 \in W$. If $a_1, b_0 > 0$ then $w + 1 \in W$.

Proof. If $a_0, b_1 > 0$ then consider $y = 0^{a_0-1} 1 0^{b_0+1} 1^{b_1-1} 1^{a_1} \in P$. We have $\mathcal{O}(y) = 0^{a_0} 0^{b_0+1} 1^{b_1-1} 1^{a_1} \in P$, and so $w - 1 \in W$.

The argument in the case $a_1, b_0 > 0$ is completely analogous. □

Suppose first that $a_0, a_1 > 0$. The lemma implies that if $w - 1, w \in \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$ and $w \in W$ then $w - 1 \in W$; and that if $w, w + 1 \in \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$ and $w \in W$ then $w + 1 \in W$. It follows that $W \cap \{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$ is either empty or contains all of $\{a_1, \dots, m - a_0\}$, and so we reach a contradiction.

Suppose next that $a_1 = 0$. In this case the lemma still implies that if $w \in \{1, \dots, m - a_0\}$ and $w \in W$ then $w - 1 \in W$. Therefore $W \cap \{0, \dots, m - a_0\} = \{0, \dots, \hat{w}\}$, where $0 \leq \hat{w} < m - a_0$. In particular, $m - a_0 \notin W$.

We claim that $W = \{0, \dots, \hat{w}\}$, which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem (note that $\hat{w} \neq 0$ due to non-degeneracy). Indeed, suppose that $w \in W$ for some $w > m - a_0$. Then $y = 0^{m-w} 1^{a_0-(m-w)} 1^{m-a_0} \in P$, and so $\mathcal{O}(y) = 0^{a_0} 1^{m-a_0} \in P$. However, this implies that $m - a_0 \in W$, and we reach a contradiction.

Similarly, if $a_0 = 0$ then $W = \{\hat{w}, \dots, m\}$ for some $a_1 < \hat{w} < m$.

When $\Phi = \Phi_{\text{id}}$: P is closed under XORing with some $v \neq 0$. If $v = 1^m$ then P is closed under complementation, which is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem. Therefore we can assume that $0 < |v| < m$ (where $|v|$ is the Hamming weight of v).

By symmetry, P is closed under XORing with any vector of Hamming weight $|v|$. In particular, it is invariant under XORing with both $011^{|v|-1}0^{m-|v|-1}$ and $101^{|v|-1}0^{m-|v|-1}$, and so under XORing with their XOR, which is 110^{m-2} . This implies that if $w \in W$ satisfies $w \geq 2$ then $w - 2 \in W$: we get this by considering $1^w 0^{m-w} \in P$. Similarly, if $w \in W$ satisfies $w \leq m - 2$ then $w + 2 \in W$, considering $0^{m-w} 1^w \in P$.

Thus W either contains all odd numbers in $\{0, \dots, m\}$ or none of them, and similarly it either contains all even numbers in $\{0, \dots, m\}$ or none of them. Since P is non-degenerate, this implies that P consists of either all vectors of even parity or of all vectors of odd parity, both of which are cases in the statement of the theorem.

This argument shows that if P is closed under XORing with $v \neq 0$ then either $v = 1^m$ or P consists of all vectors of even parity or of all vectors of odd parity, and consequently it is not Φ_{neg} -trivial. This proves the “furthermore” clause of the theorem.

P is closed under setting a single coordinate to a constant. Suppose first that P is closed under setting a single coordinate to 0. This implies that if $w \in W$ is positive then also $w - 1 \in W$, and so $W = \{0, \dots, \hat{w}\}$ for some \hat{w} .

Similarly, if P is closed under setting a single coordinate to 1 then $W = \{\hat{w}, \dots, m\}$ for some \hat{w} .

P has an AND/OR polymorphism. Recall that an AND/OR polymorphism is a 2-ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m where for every i , either $f_i(x) = x_1 \wedge x_2$ or $f_i(x) = x_1 \vee x_2$.

Suppose first that there are two different coordinates i_1, i_2 such that $f_{i_1}(x) = f_{i_2}(x) = x_1 \wedge x_2$. If $w \in W$ is such that $0 < w < m$ then we can find a vector $y \in P$ of weight w such that $(y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}) = (0, 1)$. Let $z \in P$ be obtained from w by switching coordinates i_1 and i_2 . Then $(f_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, f_m(y_m, z_m)) = y|_{i_2 \leftarrow 0}$ has weight $w - 1$, showing that $w - 1 \in P$. Thus either $W = \{0, \dots, \hat{w}\}$ or $W = \{0, \dots, \hat{w}\} \cup \{m\}$, for some \hat{w} , both of which are cases in the statement of the theorem.

Similarly, if there are two different coordinates i_1, i_2 such that $f_{i_1}(x) = f_{i_2}(x) = x_1 \vee x_2$ then either $W = \{\hat{w}, \dots, m\}$ or $W = \{0\} \cup \{\hat{w}, \dots, m\}$ for some \hat{w} .

If none of these cases happens then $m \leq 2$. There are no non-degenerate predicates for $m = 1$. When $m = 2$, the non-degenerate predicates are:

- $W = \{0, 1\}$: weight at most 1.
- $W = \{0, 2\}$: weight at most 0 together with the all-one vector, or weight at least 2 together with the all-one vector.
- $W = \{1, 2\}$: weight at least 1.

Each of these is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem.

P has a Latin square polymorphism. Recall that a Latin square polymorphism is a 2-ary polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m such that if we view f_i as a 2×2 square then it is a Latin square. Thus $f_i(x) = x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus v_i$ for some vector $v \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

In this case P is closed under the operation $(y, z) \mapsto y \oplus z \oplus v$. If $W = \{0, m\}$ then we are done since this is one of the cases in the statement of the theorem. Otherwise, P contains some $z_0 \neq v, \bar{v}$. Thus P is closed under XORing with $z_0 \oplus v \neq 0^m, 1^m$, and so as shown above, P consists of all vectors of some fixed parity.

5 Relation to impossibility domains

In this section we relate Φ -triviality to the notion of impossibility domain.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $P \subseteq \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_m$ be a non-degenerate predicate, where $|\Sigma_i| \geq 2$ for all i . Let Φ be such that for all $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) \in \Phi$, the function ϕ_i is a permutation of Σ_i .*

Suppose that P is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$. Then P is Φ -trivial if and only if it is an impossibility domain with respect to unanimity.

One direction of the theorem is almost immediate: if P is Φ -trivial then it is an impossibility domain with respect to unanimity. We show this by proving the contrapositive: if P is a possibility domain with respect to unanimity then it is not Φ -trivial.

Suppose that P is a possibility domain with respect to unanimity. Then there is a unanimous polymorphism f_1, \dots, f_m which is not of the form $f_1(x) = \dots = f_m(x) = x_j$.

We claim that f_1, \dots, f_m is of neither dictatorial type nor certificate type, and so P is not Φ -trivial. We prove this by considering both cases.

Suppose first that f_1, \dots, f_m are of dictatorial type: there exists $j \in [n]$ such that $f_i(x) = \phi_i(x_j)$. Since f_i is unanimous, we have $\phi_i(b) = f_i(b, \dots, b) = b$, and so $f_i(x) = x_j$. This contradicts the assumption on f_1, \dots, f_m .

If f_1, \dots, f_m conform to a certificate ρ then $\text{dom } \rho = \emptyset$, since no f_i is constant (by unanimity). The empty certificate cannot be a certificate since P is non-degenerate.

The other direction is an application of our main theorems. We show that if P is not Φ -trivial then it is a possibility domain with respect to unanimity.

Since P is not Φ -trivial, according to Theorem 1.3 it is not Φ -trivial for $n = 2$. Since it is Φ -trivial for $n = 1$, one of the three cases in Theorem 1.4 must hold. In each of these cases we will show that P is a possibility domain with respect to unanimity by constructing a unanimous non-dictatorial polymorphism.

1. There is a coordinate $i_0 \in [m]$ and $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_{i_0}$ such that P is closed under setting i_0 to σ_0 .

We construct unanimous functions $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ as follows. If $i \neq i_0$ then $f_i(x) = x_1$. The function f_{i_0} is defined as follows: $f_{i_0}(x) = x_1$ if $x_2 \neq \sigma_0$, and $f_{i_0}(x) = \sigma_0$ if $x_2 = \sigma_0$. Since f_i depends on both arguments, f_1, \dots, f_m is non-dictatorial. It remains to prove that f_1, \dots, f_m is a polymorphism of P .

Suppose that $y, z \in P$. If $z_{i_0} \neq \sigma_0$ then $(f_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, f_m(y_m, z_m)) = y \in P$, and if $z_{i_0} = \sigma_0$ then $(f_1(y_1, z_1), \dots, f_m(y_m, z_m)) = y|_{i_0 \leftarrow \sigma_0} \in P$.

2. P has a non-dictatorial AND/OR polymorphism. That is, there are functions $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ such that (i) if $|\Sigma_i| > 2$ then $f_i(x) = x_1$, (ii) if $|\Sigma_i| = 2$ then $f_i \in \{x_1 \wedge x_2, x_1 \vee x_2\}$, where we assume without loss of generality that $\Sigma_i = \{0, 1\}$ in this case.

Since AND/OR polymorphisms are unanimous, we are immediately done.

3. P has a Latin square polymorphism. That is, there are functions $f_i: \Sigma_i^2 \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ where each f_i is a Latin square (viewed as a matrix, each row and each column is a permutation).

Let $f_i(x) = \pi_{i, x_1}(x_2)$, where π_{i, x_1} is some permutation of Σ_i . Then $f_i^{\circ 2}(x_1, x_2, x_3) := f_i(x_1, f_i(x_2, x_3)) = \pi_{i, x_1}(\pi_{i, x_2}(x_3))$. Observe that $f_1^{\circ 2}, \dots, f_m^{\circ 2}$ is also a polymorphism of P . Indeed, if $y, z, w \in P$ then $(f_1(z_1, w_1), \dots, f_m(z_m, w_m)) \in P$, and so $(f_1(y_1, f_1(z_1, w_1)), \dots, f_m(y_m, f_m(z_m, w_m))) \in P$.

More generally, we can define $f_i^{\circ r}: \Sigma_i^{r+1} \rightarrow \Sigma_i$ by the recursive formula $f_i^{\circ 1}(x) = f_i(x)$ and $f_i^{\circ r+1}(x) = f_i(x_1, f_i^{\circ r}(x_2, \dots, x_{r+1}))$. For every r , $f_1^{\circ r}, \dots, f_m^{\circ r}$ is a polymorphism of P which is not dictatorial. In order to complete the proof, we need to find r for which the functions $f_i^{\circ r}$ are unanimous.

Observe that $f_i^{\circ r}(\sigma, \dots, \sigma) = \pi_{i, \sigma}^r(\sigma)$, where the power is taken in the group of symmetries of Σ_i . Taking $r = \prod_{i=1}^m |\Sigma_i|!$, we have $\pi_{i, \sigma}^r = \text{id}$ and so f_i is unanimous.

References

- [AGH17] Per Austrin, Venkatesan Guruswami, and Johan Håstad. $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -Sat is NP-hard. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(5):1554–1573, 2017. doi:10.1137/15M1006507.
- [Arr50] Kenneth J. Arrow. A difficulty in the theory of social welfare. *J. of Political Economy*, 58:328–346, 1950.
- [Arr63] Kenneth J. Arrow. *Social choice and individual values*. John Wiley and Sons, 1963.
- [BBKO21] Libor Barto, Jakub Bulín, Andrei Krokhin, and Jakub Opršal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *J. ACM*, 68(4):Art. 28, 66, 2021. doi:10.1145/3457606.
- [BG16] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. New hardness results for graph and hypergraph colorings. In *31st Conference on Computational Complexity*, volume 50 of *LIPICs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 14, 27. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2016.
- [BG21] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. Promise constraint satisfaction: algebraic structure and a symmetric Boolean dichotomy. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(6):1663–1700, 2021. doi:10.1137/19M128212X.
- [BJ03] Andrei A. Bulatov and Peter Jeavons. An algebraic approach to multi-sorted constraints. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, 2003. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:990270>.
- [BK25] Libor Barto and Maryia Kapytka. Multisorted Boolean clones determined by binary relations up to minion homomorphisms. *Algebra Universalis*, 86(1):Paper No. 1, 36, 2025. doi:10.1007/s00012-024-00878-0.
- [DH09] Elad Dokow and Ron Holzman. Aggregation of binary evaluations for truth-functional agendas. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 32(2):221–241, 2009. doi:10.1007/s00355-008-0320-1.
- [DH10a] Elad Dokow and Ron Holzman. Aggregation of binary evaluations. *J. Econom. Theory*, 145(2):495–511, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jet.2007.10.004.
- [DH10b] Elad Dokow and Ron Holzman. Aggregation of binary evaluations with abstentions. *J. Econom. Theory*, 145(2):544–561, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jet.2009.10.015.
- [DH10c] Elad Dokow and Ron Holzman. Aggregation of non-binary evaluations. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 45(4):487–504, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.aam.2010.02.005.
- [DL07] Franz Dietrich and Christian List. Arrow’s theorem in judgment aggregation. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 29(1):19–33, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00355-006-0196-x.
- [DL13] Franz Dietrich and Christian List. Propositionwise judgment aggregation: the general case. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 40(4):1067–1095, 2013. doi:10.1007/s00355-012-0661-7.
- [FR86] Peter C. Fishburn and Ariel Rubinstein. Aggregation of equivalence relations. *J. Classification*, 3:61–65, 1986.
- [Gei68] David Geiger. Closed systems of functions and predicates. *Pacific J. Math.*, 27:95–100, 1968. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.pjm/1102985564>.
- [Gib14] Allan F. Gibbard. Intransitive social indifference and the Arrow dilemma. *Review of Economic Design*, 18:3–10, 2014.
- [JM59] Ju. I. Janov and A. A. Mučnik. Existence of k -valued closed classes without a finite basis. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 127:44–46, 1959.

- [LP02] Christian List and Philip Pettit. Aggregating sets of judgments: An impossibility result. *Econ. Philos.*, 18:89–110, 2002.
- [LPW18] Erkkö Lehtonen, Reinhard Pöschel, and Tamás Waldhauser. Reflections on and of minor-closed classes of multisorted operations. *Algebra Universalis*, 79(3):Paper No. 71, 19, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00012-018-0549-1.
- [Mos09] Elchanan Mossel. Arrow’s impossibility theorem without unanimity, 2009. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0901.4727>, arXiv:0901.4727.
- [Mos12] Elchanan Mossel. A quantitative Arrow theorem. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 154(1-2):49–88, 2012. doi:10.1007/s00440-011-0362-7.
- [NP02] Klaus Nehring and Clemens Puppe. Strategy-proof social choice on single-peaked domains: possibility, impossibility and the space between. Mimeo, 2002.
- [Pip02] Nicholas Pippenger. Galois theory for minors of finite functions. *Discrete Math.*, 254(1-3):405–419, 2002. doi:10.1016/S0012-365X(01)00297-7.
- [Pos20] Emil L. Post. Determination of all closed systems of truth tables. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26:437, 1920.
- [Pos42] Emil L. Post. *The Two-Valued Iterative Systems of Mathematical Logic*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1942. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400882366> [cited 2025-02-07], doi:doi:10.1515/9781400882366.
- [RF86] Ariel Rubinstein and Peter C. Fishburn. Algebraic aggregation theory. *J. Economic Theory*, 38(1):63–77, February 1986.
- [SX15] Mario Szegedy and Yixin Xu. Impossibility theorems and the universal algebraic toolkit. Papers 1506.01315, arXiv.org, June 2015. URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/arx/papers/1506.01315.html>.
- [Wil72] Robert Wilson. Social choice theory without the Pareto principle. *J. of Economic Theory*, 5:478–486, 1972.
- [Yab54] S. V. Yablonskiĭ. On functional completeness in a three-valued calculus. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 95:1153–1155, 1954.
- [Zhu15] Dmitriy Zhuk. The lattice of all clones of self-dual functions in three-valued logic. *J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput.*, 24(1-4):251–316, 2015.