

# Limitations of Affine Integer Relaxations for Solving Constraint Satisfaction Problems

Moritz Lichter\*  
RWTH Aachen University  
lichter@lics.rwth-aachen.de

Benedikt Pago†  
University of Cambridge  
benedikt.pago@cl.cam.ac.uk

## Abstract

We show that various known algorithms for finite-domain constraint satisfaction problems (CSP), which are based on solving systems of linear equations over the integers, fail to solve all tractable CSPs correctly. The algorithms include  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency, BLP+AIP, every fixed level of the  $\text{BA}^k$ -hierarchy, and the CLAP algorithm. In particular, we refute the conjecture by Dalmau and Opršal [19] that there is a fixed constant  $k$  such that the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency algorithm solves all tractable finite domain CSPs.

## 1 Introduction

Constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs) provide a general framework that encompasses a huge variety of different problems, from solving systems of linear equations over Boolean satisfiability to variants of the graph isomorphism problem. We view CSPs as homomorphism problems. A CSP is defined by its template structure  $\mathbf{A}$ . An instance is a structure  $\mathbf{B}$  of matching vocabulary and the question is whether there is a homomorphism from  $\mathbf{B}$  to  $\mathbf{A}$ . We are only concerned with finite-domain CSPs, i.e., the template  $\mathbf{A}$  is always finite. It had long been conjectured by Feder and Vardi [20] that every finite-domain CSP is either NP-complete or in P. In 2017, the conjecture was confirmed independently by Bulatov [12] and Zhuk [27] who both presented sophisticated universal algorithms that run in polynomial time and solve every CSP which is not NP-complete. These tractable CSPs are precisely the ones whose template admits a polymorphism that is a so-called *weak near-unanimity* operation. A simpler algorithm had been known earlier for templates with a *Mal'tsev* polymorphism [11].

Even though this dichotomy gives us a complete complexity classification in a coarse sense, one may still wonder about the more fine-grained structure of the tractable, i.e., polynomial-time solvable, case. For instance, there is a well-known subclass of the tractable CSPs called *bounded width* CSPs (see e.g. [20, 4, 2]). These are solvable by the *k-consistency* method, for a fixed constant  $k$ : This is a simple algorithm that can even be implemented in Datalog. Essentially, it checks for inconsistencies between local solutions to subinstances of size at most  $k$  and propagates these in a fixed-point computation. This method provably fails to solve all tractable CSPs [1], so we can at least subdivide the tractable case into bounded and unbounded width. But what can be said about tractable CSPs of unbounded width? Can this class be refined further along a different algorithmic technique? Is it perhaps even the case that some

---

\*The author received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (SymSim: grant agreement No. 101054974). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

†Funded by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) under the UK government's Horizon Europe funding guarantee: grant number EP/X028259/1.

more natural and straightforward technique (this can arguably not be said about Bulatov-Zhuk) suffices to solve all tractable CSPs?

What we are concerned with is solving systems of linear Diophantine equations, that is, systems of linear equations over the integers. We show that this is insufficient to solve all tractable finite-domain CSPs – at least in the way it is used in various algorithms from the literature, that we outline below. The counterexample we provide has a Mal'tsev template and thus separates the affine algorithms even from the algorithm for Mal'tsev CSPs [11]. This also refutes a conjecture by Dalmau and Opršal [19], that we expand upon below.

Let us briefly introduce the algorithms that are addressed by our construction. All of them involve solving a system of linear Diophantine equations that approximates the solvability of the CSP, which is also referred to as *affine (IP) relaxations* of the CSP [10, 9, 17, 19]. Different algorithms make use of (slightly) different equation systems, which all can be reduced to the formulation we present in Section 2.1. Given a template structure  $\mathbf{A}$ , an instance  $\mathbf{B}$ , and a width  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the variables of the equation system are indexed with partial homomorphisms from substructures of size at most  $k$  of  $\mathbf{B}$  to  $\mathbf{A}$ . A solution to the width- $k$  system is thus an assignment of numerical values to partial homomorphisms. The equations enforce a consistency condition, i.e., express that partial homomorphisms with overlapping domains receive values that fit together in a certain sense. In contrast to the  $k$ -consistency method, a solution of the width- $k$  system requires a certain global notion of consistency. The power of this equation system has been studied over different numerical domains. It is not hard to verify that it has a  $\{0, 1\}$ -solution if and only if there is a global homomorphism from  $\mathbf{B}$  to  $\mathbf{A}$ , i.e., the CSP instance is satisfiable. Moreover, the existence of rational solutions in  $[0, 1]$  to the width- $k$  system corresponds to feasibility of the  $k$ -th level of the well-known Sherali-Adams linear programming relaxation [19, 25].

The algorithms we are dealing with here compute solutions in  $\mathbb{Z}$  – without the  $\{0, 1\}$ -restriction. Solving systems of linear Diophantine equations is possible in polynomial time (see [24]) but, as we show, even for tractable template structures, the existence of an integral solution to the width- $k$  system is not equivalent to the satisfiability of the CSP instance. More precisely, for any fixed width  $k$ , there are instances where there is no homomorphism from  $\mathbf{B}$  to  $\mathbf{A}$  but the width- $k$  system admits an integral solution. Thus, integral feasibility of the width- $k$  system is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for satisfiability of the CSP instance. The algorithms that fail to solve our counterexample are the following:

**$\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency** [19], Section 5: Run the  $k$ -consistency procedure first. Remove all non- $k$ -consistent partial homomorphisms from the formulation of the width- $k$  equation system. Then accept the instance  $\mathbf{B}$  if and only if this modified version of the width- $k$  system has an integral solution. Dalmau and Opršal [19] conjectured that each tractable finite-domain CSP is Datalog-reducible to a CSP over  $\mathbb{Z}$  and is thus solved by  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency for a fixed  $k$ .

**BLP+AIP** [10], Section 6: This algorithm by Brakensiek, Guruswami, Wrochna, and Živný solves the width- $k$  system first over the non-negative rationals and then over the integers, where  $k$  is the arity of the template structure. The width- $k$  equation system is refined by forcing every variable to 0 which is set to 0 in every rational solution and then checked for an integral solution.

**$\mathbf{BA}^k$**  [16], Section 6: Ciardo and Živný proposed this generalization of BLP+AIP, in which the width  $k$  is not fixed to be the arity of the constraint relations but is a parameter of the algorithm, like in  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency.

**CLAP** [17], Section 7: This algorithm, also due to Ciardo and Živný, combines non-negative rational solutions with integral ones. In the first step, it is tested for every partial homomorphism  $f$  whether this  $f$  can receive weight exactly 1 in a non-negative rational

solution of the width- $k$  system, where  $k$  is again the arity of the template. If not, it is discarded. This step is repeated, where all discarded partial homomorphisms are set to 0 in the system. When this process stabilizes, the width- $k$  system is solved over the integers, where all discarded partial homomorphisms are forced to 0.

## 1.1 Results

**Theorem 1.** *The following algorithms fail to solve all finite domain CSPs with Mal'tsev polymorphisms and hence do not solve all tractable CSPs.*

- $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency, for every constant  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- BLP + AIP.
- The  $k$ -th level of the  $\text{BA}^k$ -hierarchy, for every constant  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- The CLAP algorithm.

In particular, this refutes the aforementioned conjecture regarding the power of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency [19]. Our counterexample is the same for all these algorithms. The universe of its template structure is  $S_d$ , the symmetric group on a  $d$ -element set, where  $d$  is some fixed constant. The relations of the template structure are cosets of (powers of) subgroups of  $S_d$ . We call such CSPs with coset constraints *group CSPs* [8] (see Section 3). It is crucial that the group is non-Abelian, since group CSPs over Abelian groups are known to be solved by affine-relaxation-based techniques [18].

We are aware of at least two more affine CSP algorithms whose power with respect to our counterexample we have not determined as of yet. One of them is a variation of CLAP called  $\text{C}(\text{BLP} + \text{AIP})$ , which is suggested in [17]. The other is the *cohomological  $k$ -consistency* algorithm due to Ó Conghaile [18]. We suspect that both these algorithms correctly solve our example but we currently lack a proof. The feature that we think enables them to accomplish this is the fixing of a partial homomorphism in the integer equation system: Both algorithms check for every partial homomorphism  $f : \mathbf{B}[X] \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$  whether there is an integral solution in which the variable for  $f$  is set to 1. This seems to be a stronger requirement than just the existence of *any* solution (also it seems stronger than setting this variable to 1 in a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -solution). We are currently investigating this question. In any way, we aim to address the power of these two algorithms – or the lack thereof – in future work.

### Open questions:

- Is our counterexample solved by the  $\text{C}(\text{BLP} + \text{AIP})$  algorithm or by the cohomological  $k$ -consistency algorithm for a fixed value of  $k$ ?
- Does  $\text{C}(\text{BLP} + \text{AIP})$  or cohomological  $k$ -consistency solve all Mal'tsev/all tractable CSPs?

## 1.2 Summary of the Construction

Our counterexample and its analysis are quite technical in the details, so we give an overview here. The starting point for our instances is a variation of the *Tseitin contradictions* [26] that is due to Berkholz and Grohe [8] (see Section 4). It is a system of linear equations over an Abelian group  $\Gamma$  and a 3-regular directed base graph  $H$ . It has a variable  $y_e$  for every edge  $e$ . Every vertex  $v$  comes with a weight  $\lambda(v) \in \Gamma$ , and has an associated constraint saying that the sum over the incoming edges minus the sum over the outgoing edges is equal to  $\lambda(v)$ . The equation system is satisfiable if and only if  $\sum_{v \in V(H)} \lambda(v) = 0$ . But if, for example,  $\lambda$  is zero everywhere except at one vertex  $v$ , then the equation system has no solution because the non-zero sum at  $v$  needs to be “balanced” with a non-zero sum at some other vertex. It is known

that discovering the unsatisfiability of such a Tseitin system is impossible for algorithms that are in a sense local, e.g., the  $k$ -consistency algorithm [1]. This is the case specifically if the base graphs of the instances are connected *expander graphs*. These have the property that removing a constant number of edges will at most split off a constant number of vertices, so the largest part of the graph will remain a connected component. Roughly speaking, this means that by fixing partial solutions for a constant number of edges, one cannot make any progress towards ruling out a global solution – the unsatisfiability is a global property of the equation system that is not localized in any small subinstance. This type of argument shows that for no fixed  $k$ , the  $k$ -consistency method can solve such systems of Abelian linear equations.

**Extended Tseitin-CSPs.** However, Tseitin alone cannot beat algorithms that involve affine relaxations over the integers. This has the simple reason that algorithms based on them solve all systems of linear equations, whether they are over fields, rings, or Abelian groups [18]. This is where the idea from [8] comes in. Berkholtz and Grohe considered the Tseitin equations over  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$  but added one extra constraint that is not an affine equation: It says that for one fixed special vertex  $v^*$ , the weight  $\lambda(v^*)$  is either  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ , so this vertex weight is itself a variable now. All other vertex weights  $\lambda(v)$  are zero. No matter which of the two possibilities for  $\lambda(v^*)$  is chosen, the remaining linear equations form an unsatisfiable Tseitin instance. If we set  $\lambda(v^*) = (1, 0)$ , then it can be seen as an unsatisfiable Tseiting instance over the group  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , and if  $\lambda(v^*) = (0, 1)$ , then it behaves like Tseitin over  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . So in a sense, the special constraint  $\lambda(v^*) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  plays the role of a disjunction between these two groups. We call such instances *extended Tseitin CSPs*. This “disjunction” enables us to construct an integral solution for the width- $k$  system, for every constant  $k$  [8]. The trick is to obtain this solution as a linear combination of two non-integral solutions. Let  $\mathbf{B}$  denote the extended Tseitin CSP, and let  $\mathbf{B}_{(1,0)}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{(0,1)}$  denote the instance where  $\lambda(v^*)$  is substituted with  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ , respectively. Then the width- $k$  system for  $\mathbf{B}_{(1,0)}$  has a rational solution in which every variable is assigned 0 or a power of 2 (with a negative exponent), and the width- $k$  system for  $\mathbf{B}_{(0,1)}$  has a rational solution in which every variable is 0 or a power of 3. Because 2 and 3 are coprime, an integral solution can be obtained as a suitable linear combination of these rational solutions. The rational solutions that we start with are constructed using again the expander properties of the underlying graphs. The idea is roughly that the weight in the rational solutions can be distributed uniformly among partial homomorphisms with the same domain: Suppose for example we are considering Tseitin equations over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , and a subdomain  $X$  such that all maps  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$  are partial homomorphisms. Then we can simply assign weight  $\frac{1}{p^{|X|}}$  to each of these, and the sum will be equal to 1, as required. (Essentially) this approach indeed gives a solution to the width- $k$  system [8]. So in total, by combining the rational solutions for  $p = 2$  and  $p = 3$ , the equation system for the extended Tseitin CSP  $\mathbf{B}$  has an integral solution despite the fact that  $\mathbf{B}$  is not a satisfiable instance.

Although this example proves that for every constant width  $k$ , the system can have an integral solution even though the CSP instance is unsatisfiable, there is still a problem: The question was whether affine-relaxation-based algorithms solve all *tractable* CSPs, and the template of the extended Tseitin CSPs is unfortunately NP-complete, due to the non-affine constraint  $\lambda(v^*) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  (Lemma 8). The particular family of instances, however, is polynomial-time solvable because the non-affine constraint appears only once in every instance. Indeed, it turns out that the very same problem can be reformulated as a CSP over a different template, which is tractable, as desired. The analysis of this reformulation is the main technical contribution of this note.

**Encoding Solvability into Graph Isomorphism.** It is known that solving the Tseitin equations over any Abelian group  $\Gamma$  can be reduced to the graph isomorphism problem [6]. The pair of graphs that comes out of this reduction are (generalizations of) the famous *Cai-Fürer-*

*Immerman* (CFI) graphs [14]. This reduction to graph isomorphism also works for the Tseitin instances with the special constraint  $\lambda(v^*) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  [8]. In this case, the resulting graphs consist of several copies of CFI graphs over the group  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ , some of which have their “twist” in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and some in  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . These are combined in a so-called “isomorphism-or-construction”. This is a standard construction which admits an isomorphism if and only if the involved  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -CFI-graphs *or* the  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -CFI-graphs are isomorphic. So our original extended Tseitin instance is unsatisfiable if and only if the two graphs given by this isomorphism-or-construction are not isomorphic to each other. It is not known whether graph isomorphism in general can be formulated as a CSP-instance of a tractable template structure. But in the special case that we have here, we are considering vertex-colored graphs of *bounded color class size*, that is, at most a constant number of vertices have the same color. For such graphs, graph isomorphism is known to be polynomial-time solvable [21] and there is also a known CSP encoding of this isomorphism problem [6]: For colored graphs, the sought isomorphism must preserve colors. Thus, an isomorphism can be thought of as an assignment  $f$  that maps each color class to a permutation in the symmetric group  $S_d$ , where  $d$  is the size of the color class. These permutations must satisfy the constraint that for every pair of colors  $c_1, c_2$ , the assigned permutations  $f(c_1)$  and  $f(c_2)$  correctly preserve edges and non-edges between the vertices in these color classes. Every such  $f$  satisfying this defines an isomorphism. Hence, we can in fact write the bounded color class isomorphism problem as a CSP over the *non-Abelian group*  $S_d$ . Note that its constraints are not linear equations but cosets of subgroups. So this template is indeed tractable and actually even Mal’tsev. We describe all these constructions related to graph isomorphism in Section 3.

To sum up, we start with the Tseitin instance over  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$  with the “disjunction constraint”  $\lambda(v^*) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . This is transformed into an instance of bounded color class size graph isomorphism, which consists of isomorphism-or-construction applied to CFI graphs over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . This is then expressed as a Mal’tsev CSP over the symmetric group. Thus, we go through various intermediate constructions from specific instances of an NP-complete CSP over the Abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$  (including a non-affine constraint) to an instance of a tractable CSP over the non-Abelian group  $S_d$ . Note that this is only possible because we are dealing with *specific* instances of the NP-complete CSP – we are not translating *all* instances. For the original Tseitin instance, the proof from [8] yields an integral solution to the width- $k$  system associated with the Tseitin instance. We show in Sections 3 and 4 that this solution can be pulled through the constructions and also gives an integral solution for the width- $k$  system associated with the bounded color class size graph isomorphism CSP over  $S_d$ . A particular strength of this construction is its robustness with respect to the width  $k$  of the equation system. Because the arguments ultimately make use of the expansion properties of the underlying graphs, no constant value of  $k$  suffices to solve our example. A weakness seems to be that setting the value of a particular partial homomorphism to 1 in the integral solution suffices to determine how the disjunction between  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  is resolved. Thus, the linear combination that we use to generate the integral solution is no longer available then. This is the reason why we believe – as already noted earlier – that C(BLP+AIP) and the cohomological  $k$ -consistency algorithm may be able to solve our example correctly.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank a number of people for helpful discussions and valuable input at various stages of this work, especially also for acquainting us with the problem: We are grateful to Anuj Dawar, Martin Grohe, Adam Ó Conghaile, Jakub Opršal, and Standa Živný.

## 2 Preliminaries

We write  $[k]$  for the set  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and a set  $N$ , we write  $\binom{N}{\leq k}$  for the set of all subsets of  $A$  of size at most  $k$ .

A **relational vocabulary**  $\tau$  is a set of relation symbols  $\{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$  with associated arities  $\text{ar}(R_i)$ . A **relational  $\tau$ -structure** is a tuple  $\mathbf{A} = (A, R_1^{\mathbf{A}}, \dots, R_k^{\mathbf{A}})$  of a **universe**  $A$  and interpretations of the relation symbols such that  $R_i^{\mathbf{A}} \subseteq A^{\text{ar}(R_i)}$  for all  $i \in [k]$ . We use letters  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}$  for finite relational structures. Their universes will be denoted  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ , respectively. A **colored relational structure** is a pair  $(\mathbf{A}, \chi_{\mathbf{A}})$  of a relational structure  $\mathbf{A}$  and a function  $\chi_{\mathbf{A}}: A \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ , for some finite set of colors  $\mathfrak{C}$ . A **color class** of  $\mathbf{A}$  is a maximal set  $V \subseteq A$  of elements of the same color. The **color class size** of  $\mathbf{A}$  is the maximal size of the color classes of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For a color  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , denote by  $\mathbf{A}[c]$  the substructure induced on the vertices in the  $c$ -color class. For a set of colors  $C \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ , write  $\mathbf{A}[C]$  for  $\mathbf{A}[\cup C]$ .

For two  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , we write  $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  for the set of **homomorphisms**  $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  and  $\text{Iso}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  for the set of **isomorphisms**  $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ . An isomorphism between colored structures has to preserve colors, that is, it maps vertices of one color to vertices of the same color.

For a finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbf{A}$ , denote by  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  the **CSP with template  $\mathbf{A}$** , i.e., the class of finite  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbf{B}$  such that there is a homomorphism  $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ . We call a structure  $\mathbf{B}$  a  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ -instance if  $\mathbf{B}$  has the same vocabulary as  $\mathbf{A}$ .

A **graph**  $G = (V, E)$  is a binary  $\{E\}$ -structure, where we denote its **vertex set** by  $V(G)$  and its **edge set** by  $E(G)$ . The graph  $G$  is undirected if  $E(G)$  is a symmetric relation and we write  $uv$  for an edge incident to vertices  $u$  and  $v$ . Unless specified otherwise, we consider undirected graphs.

We use the letters  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$  for **finite groups** and usually use letters  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , and  $\delta$  for group elements. For arbitrary groups, we write the group operation as multiplication. If we specifically consider Abelian groups, we write the group operation as addition. For the **symmetric group** on  $d$  elements, we write  $S_d$ .

For an **equation system**  $L$  over  $K$  (where  $K$  can be a finite group,  $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}$ , or the-like and is specified in the context), we denote the set of its **variables** by  $\text{Var}(L)$ . We use the letters  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  for **assignments**  $\text{Var}(L) \rightarrow K$ . By a system of linear equations we refer to, unless stated otherwise, a system over the rationals or integers.

**The  $k$ -Consistency Algorithm.** A well-known heuristic to solve CSPs is the  $k$ -consistency algorithm. For a template structure  $\mathbf{A}$  and an instance  $\mathbf{B}$ , the  $k$ -consistency algorithm computes a map  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}]$ , which assigns to every  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$  a set of partial homomorphisms  $\mathbf{B}[X] \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ , as follows:

**$k$ -consistency algorithm** for template  $\mathbf{A}$ : input a  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ -instance  $\mathbf{B}$

1. For all  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ , initialize  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}]$  to be  $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A})$ .
2. For all  $Y \subset X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ , ensure that  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](Y)$  and  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](X)$  are consistent:
  - Forth-Condition:** Every  $f \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](Y)$  extends to some  $g \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](X)$ , that is,  $g|_Y = f$ .
  - Down-Closure:** For every  $g \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](X)$ , we have  $g|_Y \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](Y)$ .

Remove all partial homomorphisms violating at least one of the two conditions.
3. Repeat the prior step until nothing changes anymore.
4. If, for some  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ , we have  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}](X) = \emptyset$ , then reject, and otherwise accept.

The algorithm computes a greatest fixed-point of such partial homomorphisms that satisfy the forth-condition and the down-closure. We remark that there are different versions of the  $k$ -consistency algorithm in the literature, in particular there are ones in which the  $k$ -consistency

algorithm considers partial homomorphisms whose domain have size  $k + 1$  [1]. We follow the one given in [19].

**Expanders.** We call a family of 2-connected 3-regular graphs  $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a family of **expander graphs** if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that for every  $G_n$  and every  $X \subseteq E(G_n)$ , there is a set  $\hat{X} \supseteq X$  of size  $|\hat{X}| \leq c|X|$  such that  $E(G) \setminus \hat{X}$  is either empty or the edge set of a 2-connected subgraph of  $G$ . The existence of such graph families is a folklore fact. For a reference, see the appendix and Lemma 4.2 in [7]. We will also need the following property of expanders.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a family of expander graphs with expansion constant  $c$ . Fix a set  $X_n \in \binom{E(G_n)}{\leq k}$  for every  $n$ . Let  $G'_n$  be the 2-connected subgraph of  $G_n$  that remains after removing the edges  $\hat{X}_n \supseteq X_n$  (and potentially isolated vertices) from  $G_n$ . Then  $(G'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is also a family of expander graphs (with a different expansion constant that depends on  $k$  and  $c$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $Y \subseteq E(G'_n)$ . Then  $Y \cup \hat{X}_n \subseteq E(G_n)$  and  $|Y \cup \hat{X}| \leq ck + |Y|$ . Because  $G$  is an expander, there exists  $\hat{Y} \supseteq Y \cup \hat{X}$  such that  $E(G) - \hat{Y} = E(G') - (\hat{Y} \setminus \hat{X})$  is the edge set of a 2-connected subgraph. Moreover,  $|\hat{Y}| \leq c \cdot |Y \cup \hat{X}| = c^2k + c|Y|$ . Thus  $\hat{Y} \setminus \hat{X}$  is the superset of  $Y$  that witnesses the expansion property for  $G'$ .  $\square$

## 2.1 System of Linear Equations for CSPs

We now introduce a system of linear equations, which will be used to (approximately) solve CSPs. The system presented here is due to Berkholz and Grohe [6]. We will transfer hardness results for this system to other systems used in the different algorithms. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a template structure and  $\mathbf{B}$  be a  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ -instance. We define the system of linear equations  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  with the aim to encode (approximately) whether  $\mathbf{B}$  is in  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ .

$\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ : variables $x_{X, f}$ for all $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ and all $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A})$
$\sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A}), \\ f _{X \setminus \{b\}} = g}} x_{X, f} = x_{X \setminus \{b\}, g} \quad \text{for all } X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}, b \in X, g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X \setminus \{b\}], \mathbf{A}) \quad (\text{L1})$
$x_{\emptyset, \emptyset} = 1 \quad (\text{L2})$

In Equation L2,  $\emptyset$  denotes the unique homomorphism  $\mathbf{B}[\emptyset] \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ . If  $k$  is at least the arity of  $\mathbf{A}$ , then  $\mathbf{B} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  has a nonnegative integral solution (and actual a  $\{0, 1\}$ -solution) [6]. We will be mainly interested in integral solutions of  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ , so without the non-negativity restriction. Such solutions can be computed in polynomial time. To show the existence of these solutions, we will also consider special rational solutions:

**Definition 3** (*p*-Solution). For an integer  $p$  and a system of linear equations  $\mathbb{L}$ , a *p*-**solution** is a solution  $\Phi: \text{Var}(\mathbb{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  of  $\mathbb{L}$  satisfying for each variable  $x \in \text{Var}(\mathbb{L})$  that  $\Phi(x) = 0$  or  $\Phi(x) = p^i$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Lemma 4** ([6]). *If  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime integers and a system  $\mathbb{L}$  of linear equations has a  $p$ -solution and a  $q$ -solution, then  $\mathbb{L}$  has an integral solution, which is only non-zero for variables on which the  $p$ -solution or the  $q$ -solution is non-zero.*

**Lemma 5.** *All solutions  $\Phi$  of  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  satisfy for all  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ ,  $Y \subseteq X$ , and  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[Y], \mathbf{A})$  that*

$$\sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A}), \\ f|_Y = g}} \Phi(x_{X, f}) = \Phi(x_{Y, g}).$$

In particular, for all  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ , we have

$$\sum_{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A})} \Phi(x_{X,f}) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $X = \{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}$  and  $Y = \{v_1, \dots, v_j\}$  for some  $j \leq k$ . The first claim is proven inductively on  $\ell - j$  using equation of Type L1. The second claim follows as special case for  $Y = \emptyset$  and Equation L2.  $\square$

### 3 Extended Group CSPs, CFI Graphs, and Graph Isomorphism

This section introduces general notions and constructions that are applied in Section 4 to the extended Tseitin CSP from [8].

**Group CSPs.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group. We now define  $\Gamma$ -CSPs, a class of CSPs, in which variables range over  $\Gamma$  and the constraints are of the following form [6]. For an  $r$ -tuple of variables  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ , an  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -**constraint** is the constraint  $\bar{x} \in \Delta\delta$ , where  $\Delta \leq \Gamma^r$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma^r$  and  $\delta \in \Gamma^r$ . Hence,  $\Delta\delta$  is a right coset of  $\Gamma^r$ .

It is known that, for each fixed  $\Gamma$  and each fixed arity  $r$ , every  $r$  ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP is polynomial-time solvable by reducing it to graph isomorphism for graphs of bounded color class size [6]. For every finite group  $\Gamma$  and every arity  $r$ , there is a structure  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_r$  such that every  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP can be seen as a  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_r$ -instance and  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_r)$  contains all solvable  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSPs. The tractability of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_r)$  can also be seen from the fact that  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_r$  admits a Mal'tsev polymorphism [13] (whose existence was already noted, but not made explicit, in [6]).

**Lemma 6.** *For every finite group  $\Gamma$ , there is a Mal'tsev polymorphism for  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_r$  for all arities  $r$ . In particular,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_r)$  is tractable.*

*Proof.* For all  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$ , define  $f(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) := \alpha\beta^{-1}\gamma$ . Let  $\Delta\delta$  be a right coset of  $\Gamma^r$  and consider  $r$ -tuples  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r), (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r), (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r) \in \Delta\delta$ . Then  $(f(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1), \dots, f(\alpha_r, \beta_r, \gamma_r)) = (\alpha_1\beta_1^{-1}\gamma_1, \dots, \alpha_r\beta_r^{-1}\gamma_r) \in \Delta\delta\delta^{-1}\Delta\delta = \Delta\delta$  because  $\Delta$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma^r$ . Hence,  $f$  is a polymorphism. Because  $f(\alpha, \beta, \beta) = f(\beta, \beta, \alpha) = \alpha$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ , the function  $f$  is indeed a Mal'tsev polymorphism.  $\square$

It should be emphasized that Lemma 6 implies tractability even if the group  $\Gamma$  is *non-Abelian*. When we use the term **group CSP**, we refer to a  $\Gamma$ -CSP in the sense defined here. In particular, group CSPs are not necessarily *equation systems* over groups. Such equation systems are tractable if and only if the group is Abelian, so equation systems over non-Abelian groups are NP-complete [22]. However, systems of equations over an *Abelian* group  $\Gamma$  can also be viewed as a  $\Gamma$ -CSP: A linear equation  $x_1 + \dots + x_k = \alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \Gamma$  is equivalent to the  $\Gamma$ -constraint  $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \Delta\delta_\alpha$ , where  $\Delta = \{(b_1, \dots, b_k) \mid b_1 + \dots + b_k = 0\}$ , and  $\delta_\alpha = (\alpha, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Hence, when we consider equation systems over finite Abelian groups in Section 4, we can treat them uniformly as group CSPs.

**Extended Group CSPs.** We now introduce a slightly more general version of group CSPs. For a finite group  $\Gamma$ , an  $r$ -ary  $e$ -**extended  $\Gamma$ -CSP** is an equation system, in which all apart from at most one equation are  $\Gamma$ -constraints [8]. The possibly remaining one equation is of the form  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta$  for a subset  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma^r$  of size at most  $e$ . Note that  $\Delta$  does not have to be a subgroup or coset. Since there is at most one non-group equation, such instances are solvable in polynomial time by trying out all possible assignments for the non-group constraint and then solving the resulting group CSP. In general, the class of  $r$ -ary  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSPs cannot be formulated as a homomorphism problem since we cannot restrict the number of non- $\Gamma$ -constraints. For every  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma^r$ , there is a template structure  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_r^*$  such that all  $r$ -ary  $e$ -extended



$\Gamma$ -CSPs with the non-group constraint  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta$  are instances of  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_r^*)$ . But not every instance of this CSP is an extended  $\Gamma$ -CSP because they may contain more than one occurrence of the constraint  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta$ . Unfortunately for our approach,  $\Gamma_r^*$  is in general not a tractable CSP, as shown by the following two lemmas, which apply to the concrete template that we use for our counterexample later on.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_3$ . Let  $\Gamma'_3$  denote the structure  $\Gamma_3$ , but with universe  $\{0, 1\}$  instead of  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . Every polymorphism  $f$  of  $\Gamma'_3$  is either a projection or a “negated projection”, i.e.,  $f(\bar{x}) = 1 - x_i$  for some  $i$ . Hence,  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma'_3)$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Let  $k \geq 2$  and let  $f$  be a  $k$ -ary polymorphism of  $\Gamma'_3$ . It is known that all polymorphisms of ternary affine equations are themselves affine, so  $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i x_i + c \pmod 3$  for coefficients  $a_i, c \in \mathbb{Z}_3$ . This is also true if the universe of the structure is not  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  but just  $\{0, 1\}$ . For completeness, we give a proof of this fact. Since  $f$  preserves the relation

$$R_0 = \left\{ (b_1, b_2, b_3) \in \{0, 1\}^3 \mid b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = 0 \pmod p \right\},$$

we conclude  $f(\bar{x}) + f(\bar{y}) = -f(-\bar{x} - \bar{y})$  for all  $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \{0, 1\}^k$ . Let  $c := f(\bar{0})$ . The above equation for  $\bar{y} = \bar{0}$  implies  $f(\bar{x}) + c = -f(-\bar{x})$ . In total,  $f(\bar{x}) + f(\bar{y}) = -f(-\bar{x} - \bar{y}) = f(\bar{x} + \bar{y}) + c$  follows. Hence indeed,  $f$  is affine. Because  $f$  maps to  $\{0, 1\}$ , we must have  $c = 0$  or  $c = 1$ , and at most one of the  $a_i$  can be non-zero. The only possible  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -affine functions  $f$  which map all  $\{0, 1\}$ -tuples to a value in  $\{0, 1\}$  are those which have  $c = 0$ , and  $a_i = 1$  for exactly one  $i$ , or that have  $c = 1$  and  $a_i = 2$  for exactly one  $i$  (or  $f$  is constant 0, but this does not preserve the non-homogeneous equations in the template). In the first case,  $f$  is a projection to the  $i$ -th coordinate and in the latter case, it is of the form  $f(\bar{x}) = 1 - x_i$ . These polymorphisms are not weak near unanimity operations, so  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma'_3)$  is NP-complete [5].  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *For  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ ,  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_4^*)$  is NP-complete even if we restrict the non-group constraints to arity one and the set  $\Delta = \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\} \subseteq \Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 7 implies that the problem of solving affine equations in  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  with 3 variables per equation is NP-complete when only  $\{0, 1\}$ -assignments to the variables are allowed. This problem reduces to  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_4^*)$ , as we now show: Let  $L$  of a system of  $\{0, 1\}$  linear equations over  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . We construct a  $\text{CSP}(\Gamma_4^*)$ -instance  $L'$ , seen as equation system over  $\Gamma$ , as follows. For every equation  $e$  of  $L$ , introduce a new variable  $x_e^*$ . Each equation  $e : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = a$  in  $L$  is then translated into the equation  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_e^* = (0, a)$ . Furthermore, we add the equation  $\tilde{x}_e + \tilde{x}_e + \tilde{x}_e = x_e^*$ . Finally, for every variable  $x \in \text{Var}(L) \cup \{\tilde{x}_e \mid e \in L\}$  (so for all variables except the  $x_e^*$ ), we add the constraint  $x \in \Delta$ . Now assume that  $L$  has a  $\{0, 1\}$ -solution  $\Phi : \text{Var}(L) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Then we can extend  $\Phi$  to a solution  $\Phi'$  of  $L'$ : For every  $x \in \text{Var}(L)$ , let  $\Phi'(x) = (1 - \Phi(x), \Phi(x))$ . This is in  $\Delta$  because  $\Phi(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ . For every equation  $e : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = a$  in  $L$ , let  $j_e \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  denote the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -entry of  $\Phi'(x_1) + \Phi'(x_2) + \Phi'(x_3)$ . Define  $\Phi'(x_e^*) := (j_e, 0)$ , and let

$$\Phi'(\tilde{x}_e) := \begin{cases} (0, 1) & \text{if } j_e = 0, \\ (1, 0) & \text{if } j_e = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is easily seen that if  $\Phi$  is a solution for  $L$ , then  $\Phi'$  is a solution to  $L'$ . Conversely, let us start with a solution  $\Psi$  for  $L'$ . Then for every equation  $e \in L$ , either  $\Psi(x_e^*) = (0, 0)$  or  $\Psi(x_e^*) = (1, 0)$  (because of the equations  $\tilde{x}_e \in \Delta$  and  $3\tilde{x}_e = x_e^*$ ). This means that the  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -entry of  $x_e^*$  is always 0. Thus,  $\Psi$  on  $\text{Var}(L)$ , projected to the  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -entries, is a solution to the original instance  $L$ . Since each variable also satisfies  $x \in \Delta$ , it is a  $\{0, 1\}$ -solution.  $\square$

To regard  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSPs as CSPs for a tractable template structure, we will first encode  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSPs into instances of bounded color class size graph isomorphism [8]. The color class size of these graphs will be exponential in  $e$ . Hence, when we bound the color class size, we

can only encode  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSPs for some constant  $e$ . Finally, we will encode bounded color class size graph isomorphism back into group CSPs over permutation groups [6]. For technical reasons, we start with graph isomorphism for colored graphs.

### 3.1 Colored Graph Isomorphism as Group CSP

Recall that  $S_d$  denotes the symmetric group on  $d$  elements. The corresponding template structure for  $r$ -ary  $S_d$ -CSPs is  $\mathbf{S}_{d,r}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  be two colored  $r$ -ary relational structures of color class size at most  $d$ . We encode isomorphisms between  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  as solutions of the following  $S_d$ -CSP. Denote the set of colors  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  by  $\mathfrak{C}$ . We also assume that  $\ell_c := |\mathbf{A}[c]| = |\mathbf{B}[c]|$  for each color  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ . Otherwise,  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are trivially not isomorphic. For every  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , we add a variable  $y_c$ . First, we add constraints that ensure that  $y_c$  is actually a variable over  $S_{\ell_c}$ :

$$y_c \in \{ \gamma \in S_d \mid \gamma(j) = j \text{ for all } \ell_c \leq j \leq d \}.$$

It is clear that this set is a subgroup of  $S_d$  and hence we indeed added  $S_d$ -constraints. Next, for every  $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ , we assume that the vertices of  $\mathbf{A}[c]$  are  $u_{c,1}, \dots, u_{c,\ell_c}$  and the ones of  $\mathbf{B}[c]$  are  $v_{c,1}, \dots, v_{c,\ell_c}$ . We pick, for every set  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_{r'}\}$  of  $r' \leq r$  color classes, an isomorphism  $\varphi_C: \mathbf{A}[C] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}[C]$  if it exists. We identify  $\varphi_C$  with a permutation in  $\times_{i \in [r']} S_{\ell_{c_i}}$ : The  $i$ -th component of this tuple of permutations maps  $j$  to  $k$  if  $\varphi_C(u_{c_i,j}) = v_{c_i,k}$ . Similarly, we can identify an automorphism  $\psi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}[C])$  with a permutation in  $\times_{i \in [r']} S_{\ell_{c_i}}$ . If for some  $C$  such an isomorphism  $\varphi_C$  does not exist, then  $\mathbf{A} \not\cong \mathbf{B}$  and we just add some unsatisfiable constraints and are done (e.g., use two cosets  $\{1\}\gamma, \{1\}\delta$  for  $\gamma \neq \delta$ ). Via these identifications, we add the  $r'$ -ary  $S_d$ -constraint

$$(y_{c_1}, \dots, y_{c_{r'}}) \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}[C])\varphi_C.$$

We denote the resulting  $S_d$ -CSP by  $\mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B})$ . For a set  $C$  of colors of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B})[C]$  the subsystem induced by all variables  $y_c$  for which  $c \in C$ .

**Lemma 9** ([6, 23]). *For all colored structures  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  of color class size  $d$  and arity  $r$ , the CSP  $\mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B})$  is an  $r$ -ary  $S_d$ -CSP. It is solvable if and only if  $\mathbf{A} \cong \mathbf{B}$ .*

### 3.2 Isomorphism-Or-Construction on Structures

For a sequence of colored structures  $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j$ , we write  $\langle \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j \rangle$  for the structure that encodes this sequence and which is defined as follows: Assume  $\mathbf{A}_i$  uses  $\mathfrak{C}_i = [\ell_i]$  as set of colors. First, we increment each color of the vertices of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  by  $m_i := \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \ell_k$ . Next, we extend each  $\mathbf{A}_i$  by a new binary relation that is interpreted as  $A_i^2$ . We now start with the disjoint union of all  $\mathbf{A}_i$ , where we call vertices of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  **entry- $i$  vertices**. We add a new binary relation symbol such that for all  $i < j$  we add an edge between all entry- $i$  and entry- $j$  vertices to this relation.

Now let  $\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^1$  be two sequences of colored structures. We define a pair of structures  $(\mathbf{B}^0, \mathbf{B}^1) = \bigvee_{i \in [j]} (\mathbf{A}_i^0, \mathbf{A}_i^1)$  as follows. For each  $k \in \{0, 1\}$ , define

$$\mathbf{B}^k := \bigsqcup \left\{ \langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle \mid a_1 + \dots + a_j \equiv k \pmod{2} \right\},$$

where we call the  $\langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle$  **components**.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^1$  be two sequences of colored structures of color class size at most  $d$ . Then for  $(\mathbf{B}^0, \mathbf{B}^1) = \bigvee_{i \in [j]} (\mathbf{A}_i^0, \mathbf{A}_i^1)$  we have*

1.  $\mathbf{B}^0 \cong \mathbf{B}^1$  if and only if there exists an  $i \in [j]$  such that  $\mathbf{A}_i^0 \cong \mathbf{A}_i^1$ , and
2.  $\mathbf{B}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^1$  have color class size at most  $2^{j-1}d$ .

*Proof.* The first claim was (for a slightly different encoding of sequences of graphs) shown in [8]. For the second claim, we note that the encoding of a sequence does not increase the color class size and that there are  $2^{j-1}$  such sequences in the disjoint union.  $\square$

We extend the notion of entry- $\ell$  vertices from the encoding of sequences to the or-construction: For  $\ell \in [j]$ , we call a vertex of  $\mathbf{B}^0$  or  $\mathbf{B}^1$  an entry- $\ell$  vertex if it is an entry- $\ell$  vertex of some component  $\langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle$ .

For the following, fix an  $i \in [j]$ . We now describe how partial isomorphisms between  $\mathbf{A}_i^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i^1$  can be extended to partial isomorphisms of  $\mathbf{B}_0$  and  $\mathbf{B}_1$ . We fix a bijection  $b$  between the components of  $\mathbf{B}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^1$ , that is, between the structures  $\langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle$  with even and odd sum of the  $a_\ell$ , such that identified components only differ in entry  $i$ :

$$b(\langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_i^{a_i}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle) = \langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_i^{1-a_i}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^{a_j} \rangle.$$

Using the identity map on  $\mathbf{A}_\ell^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_\ell^1$  for all  $\ell \neq i$ , the bijection  $b$  induces a bijection  $\hat{b}$  between the vertices of these components apart from the entry- $i$  vertices.

Let  $X$  be a set of colors of  $\mathbf{B}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^1$  and denote by  $X|_i$  the set of colors of  $\mathbf{A}_i^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i^1$  that occur (after the possible renaming to encode sequences) in  $X$ . We now define the function  $\iota_i^X: \text{Iso}(\mathbf{A}_i^0[X|_i], \mathbf{A}_i^1[X|_i]) \rightarrow \text{Iso}(\mathbf{B}^0[X], \mathbf{B}^1[X])$  for every set of colors  $X$  as follows: For a partial isomorphism  $f \in \text{Iso}(\mathbf{A}_i^0[X|_i], \mathbf{A}_i^1[X|_i])$ , the function  $\iota_i^X(f)$  is defined as follows:

- Let  $v$  be an entry- $i$  vertex of a component  $D = \langle \mathbf{A}_1^{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_i^{a_i} \rangle$ . If  $a_i = 0$ , then  $\iota_i^X(f)$  maps  $v$  to an entry- $i$  vertex of  $b(D)$  according to  $f$  (when seeing  $v$  as a vertex of  $\mathbf{A}_i^0$ ). If  $a_i = 1$ , then we proceed as in the previous case using  $f^{-1}$  instead of  $f$ .
- Otherwise,  $\iota_i^X(f)$  maps  $v$  to  $\hat{b}(v)$ .

Intuitively,  $\iota_i^X(f)$  maps all components in  $\mathbf{B}^0[X]$  to the corresponding ones in  $\mathbf{B}^1[X]$  according to  $b$  and uses  $f$  or  $f^{-1}$ , respectively, for the  $i$ -th entry.

**Lemma 11.** Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^1$  be two sequences of colored structures of arity at most  $r$  and color class size at most  $d$ , and let  $(\mathbf{B}^0, \mathbf{B}^1) = \bigvee_{i \in [j]} (\mathbf{A}_i^0, \mathbf{A}_i^1)$ . Assume  $\mathfrak{C}$  is the set of colors of  $\mathbf{B}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^1$ ,  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{B}^0; \mathbf{B}^1)$ , and  $\mathbf{L}_i = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{A}_i^0; \mathbf{A}_i^1)$  for all  $i \in [j]$ . If, for some  $i \in [j]$ , the equation system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$  has a  $p$ -solution  $\Phi$ , then the equation system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L})$  has the  $p$ -solution  $\Psi$  defined, for all  $X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  and  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[X], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$ , via

$$\Psi(x_{X,g}) := \begin{cases} \Phi(x_{X|_i, f}) & \text{if } \iota_i^X(f(X|_i)) = g(X) \text{ for some } f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}_i[X|_i], \mathbf{S}_{d,r}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We say that the **partial homomorphism  $g$  corresponds to  $f$**  in the equation above and that the **variable  $x_{X,g}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L})$  corresponds to the variable  $x_{X|_i, f}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ .**

*Proof.* First consider the equations of Type **L1**: Recall that  $\mathbf{L}$  has a variable for every color class. Let  $X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  be a set of at most  $k$  colors, let  $c \in X$  be a color, and  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[X \setminus \{c\}], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$ . First assume that there is an  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}_i[X|_i], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$  such that  $\iota_i^X(f) = g$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{h \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[X], \mathbf{S}_{d,r}), \\ h|_{X \setminus \{c\}} = g}} \Psi(x_{X,h}) &= \sum_{\substack{h \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}_i[X|_i], \mathbf{S}_{d,r}), \\ \iota_i^X(h)|_{X \setminus \{c\}} = g}} \Phi(x_{X|_i, h}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{h \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}_i[X|_i], \mathbf{S}_{d,r}), \\ h|_{X \setminus \{c\}} = f}} \Phi(x_{X|_i, h}) \\ &= \Phi(x_{X|_i, f}) = \Psi(x_{X,g}). \end{aligned}$$

Assume otherwise that there is no such  $f$ . Then  $\Psi(x_{X,g}) = 0$ . But in this case, every partial homomorphism  $h \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[X], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$  is not in the image of  $\iota_i$ , which means that both sides of Equation L1 are zero. It remains to check Equation L2. Since the empty homomorphism is the image of the empty homomorphism under  $\iota_k^i$ , Equation L2 for  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L})$  follows from Equation L2 for  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,r}}(\mathbf{L}_i)$ . It is clear that the solution is a  $p$ -solution.  $\square$

The former lemma showed that  $p$ -solutions for one entry translate to a  $p$ -solution of the or-construction. We now show a similar statement for the  $k$ -consistency algorithm.

**Lemma 12.** *Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_j^1$  be two sequences of colored structures of arity at most  $r$  and color class size at most  $d$ , and let  $(\mathbf{B}^0, \mathbf{B}^1) = \bigvee_{i \in [j]} (\mathbf{A}_i^0, \mathbf{A}_i^1)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be the set of colors of  $\mathbf{B}^0$  and  $\mathbf{B}^1$ , and let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{B}^0; \mathbf{B}^1)$ . For every  $i \in [j]$ , let  $\mathfrak{C}_i$  be the set of colors of  $\mathbf{A}^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}^1$ , and let  $\mathbf{L}_i = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{A}_i^0; \mathbf{A}_i^1)$ . Let  $i \in [j]$ ,  $X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}_i}{\leq k}$ , and  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}_i[X], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$ . If  $f \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i]$ , then for every  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,r})$  (for some  $Y \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$ ) such that  $f$  corresponds to  $g$ , we have that  $g \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}]$ .*

*Proof.* We show that the sets of partial homomorphisms  $\iota_i^X(\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}](X|_i))$  for all  $X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  satisfy the down-closure and forth-condition property. Then they have to be included in the greatest fixed-point computed by the  $k$ -consistency algorithm.

The down-closure is inherited from  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i]$ : Let  $Y \subset X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  and  $f \in \iota_i^X(\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}](X|_i))$ . Then there is a  $g \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](X|_i)$  such that  $\iota_i^X(g) = f$ . By the forth-condition for  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i]$ , we have that  $g|_{Y|_i} \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](Y|_i)$ . Hence  $h = \iota_i^Y(g|_{Y|_i}) \in \iota_i^Y(\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](Y|_i))$ . Because  $\hat{b}$  is a bijection and by the definition of  $\iota_i^X$ , it follows  $f|_Y = h$ .

To show the forth-condition, let  $Y \subset X \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  and  $g \in \iota_i^Y(\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](Y|_i))$ . Now there is an  $f \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](Y|_i)$  such that  $\iota_i^Y(f) = g$ . Because  $Y|_i \subset X|_i$  (and both sets are of size at most  $k$ ), there is an  $h \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](X|_i)$  that extends  $f$ . But then  $\iota_i^X(h) \in \iota_i^X(\kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,r}}[\mathbf{L}_i](X|_i))$  and  $\iota_i^X(h)$  extends  $g$  by the definition of  $\iota_i^X$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 Encoding $\Gamma$ -CSPs as CFI Graphs

Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group and  $\mathbf{A}$  be an  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP. We encode  $\mathbf{A}$  into a colored graph  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  as follows: For every variable  $x$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ , we add a vertex  $(x, \gamma)$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . We call  $x$  the origin of  $(x, \gamma)$  and color all vertices with origin  $x$  with a fresh color  $c_x$ . For every constraint  $C: (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta\delta$  we add a vertex  $(C, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)$  for all  $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r) \in \Delta\delta$ . We call  $C$  the origin of these vertices and color all vertices with origin  $C$  with a fresh color  $c_C$ . We then add edges  $\{(x_i, \gamma_i), (C, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)\}$ , which we color with fresh colors  $c'_i$ , for all  $i \in [r]$  (which formally is encoded in a fresh binary relation symbol). Note that, since  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  is a graph, its arity is always 2 independent of the arity of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

We now derive the homogeneous  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$  from  $\mathbf{A}$  as follows: we replace every constraint  $C: (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta\delta$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  with the constraint  $\tilde{C}: (x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta$  in  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ . For  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ , we obtain the graph  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  by the construction before, where we identify the colors  $c_C$  and  $c_{\tilde{C}}$  for every constraint  $C$ . The graphs  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  are the **CFI graphs** over  $\Gamma$  for  $\mathbf{A}$ . If  $\mathbf{A}$  is the Tseitin equation system over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , the obtained CFI graphs correspond to the known CFI graphs introduced by Cai, Fürer, and Immerman [14], which have found many applications in finite model theory and other areas since then.

**Lemma 13** ([6]). *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group and  $\mathbf{A}$  an  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP instance.*

1.  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  have color class size at most  $|\Gamma|^r$ .
2.  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}} \cong \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{A} \in \text{CSP}(\Gamma_r)$ .

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group,  $\mathbf{A}$  an  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP, and  $d$  be the maximum color class size of  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$ . If  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A})$  has a  $p$ -solution, then  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}))$  has a  $p$ -solution.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}})$  and let  $\Phi$  be a  $p$ -solution of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kd, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A})$ . We define a  $p$ -solution  $\Psi$  for  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  as follows. Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be the colors of  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$ . Assign with a set of colors  $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  the set  $\hat{Y}$  of the corresponding elements of  $\mathbf{A}$ : If  $Y$  contains a color of a variable vertex  $(x, \gamma)$ , add  $x$  to  $\hat{Y}$ . If  $Y$  contains a color of a constraint vertex  $(C, (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{r'}))$  for  $C: (x_1, \dots, x_{r'}) \in \Delta\delta$ , add  $x_1, \dots, x_{r'}$  to  $\hat{Y}$ . Note that  $|\hat{Y}| \leq r|Y|$  because variables vertices for different variables, or constraint vertices for different constraints, have different colors, respectively.

Let  $Y \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$  and  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\hat{Y}], \Gamma_r)$ . We define a bijection  $f': V(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y]) \rightarrow V(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y])$  via

$$\begin{aligned} f'((x, \gamma)) &:= (x, \gamma f(x)^{-1}) && \text{for all } (x, \gamma) \in V(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y]), \\ f'((C, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)) &:= (C, \gamma_1 f(x_1)^{-1}, \dots, \gamma_r f(x_r)^{-1}) && \text{for all } (C, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r) \in V(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y]). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f$  is a partial homomorphism, the map  $f'$  indeed maps to vertices of  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y]$  and moreover is a partial isomorphism: If  $f$  satisfies a constraint  $C$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ , then  $(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_r)) \in \Delta\delta$ . So for all  $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r) \in \Delta\delta$ , we have  $(\gamma_1 f(x_1)^{-1}, \dots, \gamma_r f(x_r)^{-1}) \in \Delta$ . This is exactly the homogeneous version of the constraint, which occurs in  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$ . Thus,  $f' \in \text{Iso}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y], \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}[Y])$ . Hence,  $f'$  induces a partial homomorphism  $\hat{f} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$ . For all  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$ , define

$$\Psi(x_{Y,g}) := \begin{cases} \Phi(x_{\hat{Y},f}) & \text{if } g = \hat{f} \text{ for some } f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\hat{Y}], \Gamma_r), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We say that the **partial homomorphism  $g$  corresponds to  $f$**  in the equation above. Likewise, that **variable  $x_{Y,g}$  of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}))$  corresponds to the variable  $x_{\hat{Y},f}$  of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A})$ .**

We show that  $\Psi$  is a solution to  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$ , which then is obviously a  $p$ -solution. We first consider the equations of Type **L1**. Let  $Y \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{\leq k}$ ,  $c \in Y$ , and  $g' \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y \setminus \{c\}], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$ . First assume that there is a  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\widehat{Y \setminus \{c\}}], \Gamma_r)$  such that  $g' = \hat{g}$ . Then, possibly exploiting Lemma 5,

$$\sum_{\substack{f' \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2}), \\ f'|_{Y \setminus \{c\}} = \hat{g}}} \Psi(x_{Y,f'}) = \sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\hat{Y}], \Gamma_r), \\ f|_{\widehat{Y \setminus \{c\}}} = g}} \Phi(x_{\hat{Y},f}) = \Phi(x_{\hat{Y},g}) = \Psi(y_{Y,\hat{g}}).$$

Second assume that there is no  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\widehat{Y \setminus \{c\}}], \Gamma_r)$  such that  $g' = \hat{g}$ . Then for every partial homomorphism  $f' \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  (via the identification of permutation on each color class with the  $S_d$ -variables) such that  $f'|_{Y \setminus \{c\}} = g'$ , there is also no  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[\hat{Y}], \Gamma_r)$  such that  $f' = \hat{f}$ . Hence both sides of Equation **L1** are 0.

Finally, consider Equation **L2**: we have  $\Psi(x_{\emptyset, \emptyset}) = \Psi(\emptyset_{\emptyset, \hat{\emptyset}}) = \Phi(x_{\emptyset, \emptyset}) = 1$  because the empty homomorphism  $\emptyset: \mathbf{A}[\emptyset] \rightarrow \Gamma_r$  induces the empty homomorphism  $\hat{\emptyset}: \mathbf{L}[\emptyset] \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ .  $\square$

We show that if a partial homomorphism of  $\mathbf{A}$  is not discarded by the  $k$ -consistency algorithm, then the corresponding one of  $\mathbf{L}$  is not discarded, too.

**Lemma 15.** *Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group and  $\mathbf{A}$  an  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP, and let  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}})$ . Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be the set of colors of  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$ . For all  $X \in \binom{\mathfrak{A}}{rk}$ ,  $Y \in \binom{\mathfrak{C}}{k}$ ,  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}[X], \Gamma_r)$ , and  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \Gamma_r)$  such that  $f$  corresponds to  $g$  (in the sense of the proof of Lemma 14), if  $f \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_r}[\mathbf{A}](X)$  then  $g \in \kappa_k^{\mathbf{S}_{d,2}}[\mathbf{L}](Y)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that if  $f$  corresponds to  $g$ , we have  $\hat{Y} = X$  and  $g = \hat{f}$ . We consider the sets of partial homomorphisms  $\{\hat{f} \mid f \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_t}[\mathbf{A}](\hat{X})\}$  for every  $X \in \binom{\mathcal{C}}{\leq k}$  and show that they satisfy the down-closure and forth-condition property.

Let  $Y \subseteq X \in \binom{\mathcal{C}}{\leq k}$ . To show the down-closure, let  $f \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_t}[\mathbf{A}](\hat{X})$ . Because  $Y \subseteq X$ , we have  $\hat{Y} \subseteq \hat{X}$ . From the down-closure of  $\kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_r}[\mathbf{A}]$  follows that  $f|_{\hat{Y}} \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_t}[\mathbf{A}](\hat{Y})$ . By the construction of the corresponding homomorphisms, we have  $\hat{f}|_Y = \widehat{f|_{\hat{Y}}}$ .

The forth-condition is similarly inherited from  $\kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_r}[\mathbf{A}]$ : Let  $g \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_t}[\mathbf{A}](\hat{Y})$ . Then  $g$  extends to some  $f \in \kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_t}[\mathbf{A}](\hat{H})$  by the forth-condition of  $\kappa_{rk}^{\Gamma_r}[\mathbf{A}]$ . Again be the construction of corresponding homomorphisms, we have that  $\hat{h}$  extends  $\hat{g}$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Encoding Extended $\Gamma$ -CSPs

Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an  $r$ -ary  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSP and let  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \Delta$  be the non- $\Gamma$ -constraint of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For every  $\delta \in \Delta$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_\delta$  be the  $r$ -ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP obtained from  $\mathbf{A}$ , in which we replace the non- $\Gamma$ -constraint by  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \delta$ . Let  $(\mathbf{B}_0, \mathbf{B}_1) = \bigvee_{\delta \in \Delta} (\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}_\delta}, \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}_\delta})$  (note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\delta = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\delta'}$  for every  $\delta, \delta' \in \Gamma$ ). Then define  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}} := \mathbf{B}_0$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}} := \mathbf{B}_1$ . In summary, Lemmas 14 and 11 tell us that we can start with a  $p$ -solution for  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$  and turn it into a  $p$ -solution of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  where  $\mathbf{L} := \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}})$ . Moreover, we also transitively get a notion of correspondence between partial homomorphisms of  $\mathbf{A}_\delta$  and partial homomorphisms of  $\mathbf{L}$ , and likewise for the variables of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$  and variables of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$ .

Note that the correspondence relation is injective: For every partial homomorphism of  $\mathbf{L}$  or variable of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$ , there is at most one (but possibly none) corresponding partial homomorphism of  $\mathbf{A}_\delta$  or variable of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$ , respectively.

**Lemma 16.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite abelian group, let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an  $r$ -ary  $e$ -extended  $\Gamma$ -CSP, where  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  is the set of the non- $\Gamma$ -constraint, and let  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}})$ .*

1. *The system  $\mathbf{A}$  is satisfiable if and only if there is a  $\delta \in \Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{A}_\delta$  is satisfiable.*
2. *The system  $\mathbf{A}$  is satisfiable if and only if  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}} \cong \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$ .*
3. *The graphs  $\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{A}}$  have color class size at most  $d := |\Gamma|^r \cdot 2^{e-1}$ .*
4. *If, for some  $\delta \in \Delta$ , the system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$  has a  $p$ -solution  $\Phi$ , then the system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  has a  $p$ -solution  $\Psi$ , and  $\Psi(x_{Y,g}) \neq 0$  if and only if  $\Phi(x_{Z,f}) \neq 0$ , where  $x_{Z,f}$  is the variable of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$  that corresponds to  $x_{Y,g}$ .*
5. *If, for some  $\delta \in \Delta$ , the system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{kr, \Gamma_r}(\mathbf{A}_\delta)$  has a  $p$ -solution that is only non-zero for partial homomorphisms not discarded by  $kr$ -consistency, then the system  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  has a  $p$ -solution that is only non-zero for partial homomorphisms not discarded by  $k$ -consistency.*

*Proof.* 1. Trivially holds.

2. Follows from Assertion 1. and Lemmas 10 and 13.

3. Follows from Lemmas 10 and 13.

4. Follows from Lemmas 11 and 14. The statement about the non-zero entries from the solutions is directly obvious from the proofs of these lemmas.

5. Follows from Lemmas 11 and 14 together with Lemmas 12 and 15.  $\square$

## 4 The Berkholtz-Grohe Construction

We review a construction due to Berkholtz and Grohe [8] to construct a CSP that is hard for approaches to solve CSPs using systems of linear equations over the integers.

In this section, fix a positive integer  $k$  and a 2-connected 3-regular expander graph  $G$  whose order  $n$  is sufficiently larger than  $k$ . Fix an arbitrary orientation  $H$  of  $G$ , i.e., some directed graph with one direction of each undirected edge of  $G$ . For a set  $W \subseteq V(G)$ , we denote by  $\delta_-(W) \subseteq E(G)$  the set of all edges  $uv$  that are incoming edges of  $W$  in  $H$  or formally the set of all  $uv \in E(G)$  such that  $(u, v) \in E(H) \cap (V(H) \setminus W) \times W$ . We analogously define the set  $\delta_+(W) \subseteq E(G)$  of all outgoing edges of  $W$ , and  $\delta(W) := \delta_+(W) \cup \delta_-(W)$ . For a single vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , we write  $\delta_-(v)$  and  $\delta_+(v)$  for  $\delta_-(\{v\})$  and  $\delta_+(\{v\})$ , respectively. For the sake of readability, set  $E := E(G)$  and  $V := V(G)$  in this section.

### 4.1 Tseitin Formulas over Abelian Groups

Fix a finite Abelian group  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$ . We define the  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\mathcal{C}^{H, \Gamma, \lambda}$  with variable set  $\{y_e \mid e \in E\}$  and linear equations

$$\sum_{e \in \delta_+(v)} y_e - \sum_{e \in \delta_-(v)} y_e = \lambda(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in V.$$

In case  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2$ , we obtain the classic Tseitin tautologies [26]. Since we fix  $\Gamma$ ,  $G$ , and  $H$  in this section, we will omit the superscripts and write  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  for  $\mathcal{C}^{H, \Gamma, \lambda}$ . We will also identify the variables with the edges and view  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  as a CSP with variable set  $E$ . The CSP  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  is solvable if and only if  $\sum_{v \in V} \lambda(v) = 0$  [8]. For every set  $W \subseteq V$ , the CSP  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  implies the constraint  $C(W)$  defined via

$$\sum_{e \in \delta_+(W)} y_e - \sum_{e \in \delta_-(W)} y_e = \sum_{v \in W} \lambda(v).$$

**Definition 17** (Robustly Consistent Assignments [6]). For  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$  and a set  $X \subseteq E$ , a partial assignment  $f: X \rightarrow \Gamma$  for  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  is  $\ell$ -**consistent**, if for every  $W \in \binom{V}{\leq \ell}$  such that  $\delta(W) \subseteq X$ , the assignment  $f$  satisfies the constraint  $C(W)$ . Note that  $f$  is a partial solution if it is 1-consistent. We call  $f$  **robustly consistent** if it is  $n/3$ -consistent.

**Lemma 18.** *For all  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$  and  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$ , there is a robustly consistent partial assignment  $f: X \rightarrow \Gamma$  for  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$ . If  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$  is a direct product and there is an  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that, for all  $v \in V$ , the group element  $\lambda(v)$  is zero in the  $\Gamma_i$ -entry, then  $f(e)$  can be taken to be zero in the  $\Gamma_i$ -entry for all  $e \in X$ .*

*Proof.* For  $|X| = 1$ , it is clear that there are robustly consistent partial solutions. It then follows from Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 in [8] that such a robustly consistent partial solution can always be extended while maintaining robust consistency, as long as the domain size is constant. It is also clear (and can be seen from the proofs of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 in [8]) that  $f$  can be defined such that  $f(e)$  is always zero in the  $\Gamma_i$ -entry if  $\lambda$  is zero in  $\Gamma_i$ .  $\square$

When we view  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  as a homomorphism problem, then for every  $X \subseteq E$ , a partial solution  $f: X \rightarrow \Gamma$  of  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  (so in particular a robustly consistent partial assignment) is a homomorphism in  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda, \Gamma_3)$  and vice versa (recall that  $\Gamma_3$  is the template structure for 3-ary  $\Gamma$ -CSPs).

**Lemma 19.** *For every  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$ , the  $k$ -consistency algorithm does not rule out any robustly consistent partial assignments. This means that, for every  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$ , every robustly consistent assignment contained in  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)$  is contained in  $\kappa_k^{\Gamma_3}[\mathcal{C}^\lambda](X)$ .*

*Proof.* For a set  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$ , denote by  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)_{n/3} \subseteq \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)$  the set of robustly consistent homomorphisms in  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)$ . In order to prove the lemma, we show that the collection

$$\left\{ \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)_{n/3} \mid X \in \binom{E}{\leq k} \right\}$$

of robustly consistent partial homomorphisms satisfies the down-closure and the forth-condition of  $k$ -consistency. For the down-closure, let  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)_{n/3}$ . By robust consistency, the partial solution  $f$  satisfies  $C(W)$  for every  $W \in \binom{V}{\leq n/3}$  such that  $\delta(W) \subseteq X$ . Then the restriction of  $f$  to any subset of  $X$  still satisfies  $C(W)$  for every  $W \in \binom{V}{\leq n/3}$  such that  $\delta(W)$  is in its domain. So this restriction is also robustly consistent. For the forth-condition, let  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X], \Gamma_3)_{n/3}$ , for some  $|X| < k$ . Let  $y \in E \setminus X$ . We need to show that there exists an  $f' \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda[X \cup \{y\}], \Gamma_3)_{n/3}$  that extends  $f$ . This is again proven in Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 in [8].  $\square$

**Corollary 20.** *For all  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$  and  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$ , we have  $\kappa_k^{\Gamma_3}[\mathcal{C}^\lambda](X) \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Combine Lemmas 18 and 19.  $\square$

For a prime  $p$ , a  $p$ -**group** is a group in which the order of every element is a power of  $p$ . For instance,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  is a 2-group and  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  a 3-group.

**Lemma 21.** *If  $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma$  is a  $p$ -group, and  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma'$ , then there is a  $p$ -solution of  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \Gamma_3}(\mathcal{C}^\lambda)$  such that*

- *non-robustly consistent partial assignments are mapped to 0,*
- *each robustly consistent partial solution is mapped to  $1/p^\ell$  for some  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , and*
- *each partial assignment whose image is not in  $\Gamma'$  is mapped to 0.*

*Proof.* Stated in Lemma 4.6 and Corollary 4.2 in [8].  $\square$

## 4.2 Extended Tseitin CSP

Now also fix a map  $\lambda: V \rightarrow \Gamma$ . We now turn the  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$  into a 2-extended  $\Gamma$ -CSP. We fix an arbitrary vertex  $v^* \in V$ , introduce a special variable  $y^*$ , and let  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  be an arbitrary 2-element set. We define the CSP  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta^{H, \Gamma, \lambda}$  by replacing the equation for  $v^*$  with

$$\sum_{e \in \delta_+(v^*)} y_e - \sum_{e \in \delta_-(v^*)} y_e = y^*$$

and adding the non- $\Gamma$ -constraint

$$y^* \in \Delta.$$

Note that the new constraint increased the arity of the CSP by one to 4. We set  $E^* := E \cup \{y^*\}$ . Again, we will write  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda$  for  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta^{H, \Gamma, \lambda}$  in this section. Recall that when we encode this extended CSP  $\mathbf{C} := \mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda$  as an instance of bounded color class size graph isomorphism, we obtain different pairs of CFI graphs  $(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{C}_\delta}, \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{C}_\delta})$  for all possible values  $\delta$  of  $y^*$  (note that  $\mathbf{C}_\delta = \mathcal{C}_{\{\delta\}}^\lambda$ ), and then apply the graph isomorphism or-construction to these. The resulting CSP is  $\mathbf{L} := \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{C}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_\Gamma^{\mathbf{C}})$ .

So far, the notion of robust consistency has been used for partial solutions of  $\mathcal{C}^\lambda$ . We also want to speak about robustly consistent partial solutions of the extended group CSP  $\mathbf{C} = \mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda$  and of the corresponding graph isomorphism CSP  $\mathbf{L}$ .

**Definition 22** (Robustly Consistent Assignments for Extended Group-CSPs). For a set  $X \subseteq E^*$ , a partial assignment  $f: X \rightarrow \Gamma$  is **robustly consistent** for  $\mathbf{C}$



1. if  $y^* \in X$  and  $f$  is robustly consistent for the group CSP instance  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$  where  $\delta = f(y^*)$ , or
2. if  $y^* \notin X$  and, for some  $\delta \in \Delta$ , the assignment  $f$  can be extended to  $f(y^*) = \delta$  such that it is robustly consistent for  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$ .

**Definition 23** (Robustly Consistent Partial Homomorphisms of the GI-CSP).

If  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  is a partial homomorphism of the graph isomorphism CSP  $\mathbf{L}$  that has a *corresponding* partial homomorphism  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[Z], \mathbf{\Gamma}_r)$  for some  $\delta \in \Delta$ , then  $g$  is **robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta$**  if  $f$  is robustly consistent. Otherwise,  $g$  is not robustly consistent.

From now on, we consider extended group-CSP instances over a direct product  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$  where each  $\Gamma_i$  is a  $p_i$ -group, for two coprime numbers  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . The non- $\Gamma$ -constraint is defined in such a way that  $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ , where each  $\delta_i$  is zero in the  $\Gamma_j$  entry, for the  $j \neq i$ .

**Lemma 24.** *The  $k$ -consistency algorithm does not rule out any robustly consistent partial solutions of  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda$ . This means that, for every  $X \in \binom{E^*}{\leq k}$ , every robustly consistent homomorphism contained in  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)$  is contained in  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*}[\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda](X)$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 19, let  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$  denote the robustly consistent homomorphisms in  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)$ . Again we show that the collection

$$\left\{ \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3} \mid X \in \binom{E}{\leq k} \right\}$$

of robustly consistent partial homomorphisms satisfies the down-closure and the forth-condition of  $k$ -consistency. For the down-closure, let  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$ . Suppose first that  $f$  is defined on  $y^*$ . Then for every subset  $Y \subseteq X$  that includes  $y^*$ , it is immediate that  $f|_Y \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$ , just like in Lemma 19. If  $Y$  does not include  $y^*$ , then  $f|_{Y \cup \{y^*\}}$  is a restriction of the robustly consistent partial homomorphism  $f$ , and thus is itself robustly consistent. So  $f|_Y$  can be extended to  $y^*$  to a robustly consistent partial solution; by our definition of robust consistency for  $\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda$ , this means that  $f|_Y$  is robustly consistent. For the forth-condition, let  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$ , for some  $|X| < k$ . Let  $y \in E \setminus X$ . We need to show that there exists an  $f' \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda[X \cup \{y\}], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$  that extends  $f$ . If  $y^* \in X$ , then this works exactly as in the proof of Lemma 19. If  $y^* \notin X$ , then by our definition of robust consistency, there is some  $\delta \in \Delta$  such that  $f$  is robustly consistent for  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$ . Suppose first that  $y \neq y^*$ . Then we know with the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 19 that there exists an  $f' \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta^{\lambda[v^* \mapsto \delta]}[X \cup \{y\}], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*)_{n/3}$ . Hence,  $f'$  is robustly consistent as witnessed by this choice of  $\delta \in \Delta$ . In the case that  $y = y^*$ , we set  $f'(y^*) = \delta$ . This is robustly consistent by definition.  $\square$

**Corollary 25.** *For all  $X \in \binom{E^*}{\leq k}$ , we have  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{\Gamma}_4^*}[\mathcal{C}_\Delta^\lambda](X) \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 24, robustly consistent partial solutions survive  $k$ -consistency. It remains to argue that for every  $X \in \binom{E^*}{\leq k}$ , there is a robustly consistent assignment with domain  $X$ . But this follows immediately from Lemma 18 because it holds for every  $\lambda$ ; so in particular for every  $\delta \in \Delta$  that can be assigned to  $y^*$ .  $\square$

We now need to consider the case when one robustly consistent partial solution is fixed. We show that in this case the system  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  has still an integral solution. Let  $Y \subseteq \binom{E^*}{\leq k}$  and  $\hat{g} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  be robustly consistent with respect to some  $\delta \in \Delta$ . This is the partial solution that we want to treat as fixed. Let  $\hat{f} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[Z], \mathbf{\Gamma}_4)$  be the corresponding partial solution of  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$ . Fix a set  $\hat{Z} \supseteq Z$  such that  $E \setminus \hat{Z}$  is the edge set of a 2-connected subgraph of  $G$ . By the expansion property, we can choose it such that  $|\hat{Z}| \leq c \cdot |Z|$ , where  $c$  is the expansion constant.

**Lemma 26.** *There is an assignment  $\hat{h} : \hat{Z} \rightarrow \Gamma$  such that  $\hat{h}|_Z = \hat{f}$ , and  $\hat{h} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[\hat{Z}], \Gamma_3)$  is robustly consistent.*

*Proof.* Since  $|\hat{Z}| \leq c \cdot |Z| \leq c \cdot 4 \cdot |Y| = 4ck$ , we can use Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 in [8] to extend  $\hat{f}$  to a robustly consistent  $\hat{h}$  with domain  $\hat{Z}$ . This is in particular a partial solution.  $\square$

Fix this partial solution  $\hat{h} : \hat{Z} \rightarrow \Gamma$  for  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$  given by Lemma 26 in the following. Let  $G' = (V', E')$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by deleting all edges in  $\hat{Z}$  and all vertices that are not in the 2-connected component of  $G - \hat{Z}$ . Similarly, obtain the directed graph  $H'$  from  $H$  by deleting the same (directed) edges and vertices. Let  $\lambda' : V' \rightarrow \Gamma$  be defined as follows. For every  $v \in V'$ , set

$$\lambda'(v) := \lambda(v) - \sum_{e \in \delta_+(v) \cap \hat{Z}} \hat{h}(y_e) + \sum_{e \in \delta_-(v) \cap \hat{Z}} \hat{h}(y_e).$$

With this definition,  $\mathcal{C}^{H', \Gamma, \lambda'}$  is the CSP that we obtain from  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$  by fixing values for the variables in  $\hat{Z}$  according to  $\hat{h}$  from Lemma 26.

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}_\delta = \mathcal{C}_{\{\delta\}}^{H, \Gamma, \lambda}$  and  $\mathbf{C}' = \mathcal{C}^{H', \Gamma, \lambda'}$ . If  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{4k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}')$  has a  $p$ -solution  $\Phi$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{4k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}_\delta)$  has a  $p$ -solution  $\Psi$  such that*

1. *if  $\Phi(e) = 0$ , then  $\Psi(e) = 0$ , for every  $e \in E'$ , and*
2. *for all sets of variables  $X \in \binom{E \setminus E'}{\leq 4k}$  of the system  $\mathbf{C}_\delta$  and for all partial homomorphisms  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[X], \Gamma_4)$ , we have  $\Psi(y_{X,f}) = 1$  if  $f$  agrees with  $\hat{h}$ , and  $\Psi(y_{X,f}) = 0$ , otherwise.*

*Proof.* Define  $\Psi$  as follows. Let  $\mathbf{C}' = \mathcal{C}^{H', \Gamma, \lambda'}$  with variables  $E'$ . For all  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$  and  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[X], \Gamma_4)$ , we have

$$\Psi(x_{X,f}) := \begin{cases} \Phi(x_{X \cap E', f|_{E'}}) & \text{if } f|_{X \setminus E'} = \hat{h}|_{X \setminus E'} \text{ or if } X \subseteq E', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It remains to show that  $\Psi$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{4k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}_\delta)$ . For Equation L2, this is clear. Now consider equation of Type L1: Let  $X \in \binom{E}{\leq k}$ ,  $b \in X$ , and  $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta, \Gamma_4)$ . We need to show

$$\sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[X], \Gamma_4), \\ f|_{X \setminus \{b\}} = g}} \Psi(x_{X,f}) = \Psi(x_{X \setminus \{b\}, g}).$$

If  $g|_{(X \setminus b) \setminus C}$  does not agree with  $\hat{h}$ , then both sides of the equation are mapped to zero by  $\Psi$ . Hence it remains the case that  $g|_{(X \setminus b) \setminus E'}$  does agree with  $\hat{h}$ . For every  $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[X], \Gamma_4)$ , it holds: If  $f|_{X \setminus E'} = \hat{h}|_{X \setminus E'}$ , then  $f|_{E'} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}'[X \cap E'], \Gamma_4)$ . This is due to the definition of  $\lambda'$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[X], \Gamma_4), \\ f|_{X \setminus \{b\}} = g}} \Psi(x_{X,f}) &= \sum_{\substack{f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}'[X \cap E'], \Gamma_4), \\ f|_{X \cap E' \setminus \{b\}} = g}} \Phi(x_{X \cap E', f|_{E'}}) \\ &= \Phi(x_{(X \cap E') \setminus \{b\}, g|_{E'}}) = \Psi(x_{X \setminus \{b\}, g}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\Psi$  is a solution of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{4k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}_\delta)$ . For every  $X \in E \setminus E'$ , we have  $\Psi(x_{X,f}) = 0$  if  $f$  disagrees with  $\hat{h}$ , and  $\Psi(x_{X,f}) = \Phi(x_{X \cap C, f|_C}) = \Phi(x_{\emptyset, \emptyset}) = 1$ , otherwise.  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** *If  $\hat{g} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  is robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_i \in \Delta$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  has a  $p_i$ -solution  $\Psi$  such that*

- $\Psi$  is 0 for partial assignments that are not robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta$ , and
- $\Psi(x_{Y,\hat{g}}) = 1$ .

*Proof.* Because  $\hat{g}$  is robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta$ , its corresponding partial solution  $\hat{f} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[Z], \Gamma_4)$  is robustly consistent. With Lemma 26, we extend  $f$  to  $\Phi \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{C}_\delta[\hat{Z}], \Gamma_4)$ . The graph  $G'$  is still an expander graph (follows from Lemma 2). Hence Lemma 21 can be applied and gives us a  $p_i$ -solution for  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}')$ , to which we can apply Lemma 27 to get a  $p_i$ -solution for  $\mathbb{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{4k, \Gamma_4}(\mathbf{C}_\delta)$ . This has the property that it is zero for assignments which are not robustly consistent and it is 1 for  $x_{Z,\hat{f}}$ . To this solution, we apply Lemmas 14 and 11, yielding the desired solution  $\Psi$ .  $\square$

## 5 $\mathbb{Z}$ -Affine $k$ -Consistency Relaxation

We will now turn to algorithms based on solving systems of affine linear equations that try to solve tractable CSPs. They all run in polynomial time for a fixed template structure  $\mathbf{A}$  (and possibly a fixed dimension  $k$ ). Let  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  be a tractable CSP. The considered algorithms will be sound, which means that they accept every  $\mathbf{B} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ . We say that such an algorithm **solves**  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  if it is also complete, that is, it only accepts the  $\mathbf{B}$  in  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ . The rest of this paper analyses different such algorithms and shows that there is a template structure  $\mathbf{A}$  for which they do not solve  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ .

We first consider the  **$\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation** [19], an algorithm proposed by Dalmau and Opršal [19]. To introduce it, we first introduce the system of affine linear equations used by the algorithm. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a template structure,  $\mathbf{B}$  be an instance, and  $\kappa$  be a map that assigns to every set  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$  a set of partial homomorphisms  $\mathbf{B}[X] \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ . We define the following affine linear equation system  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{Z}\text{-aff}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B}, \kappa)$ :

$\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{Z}\text{-aff}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B}, \kappa)$ : variables $z_{X,f}$ for all $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ and $f \in \kappa(X)$		
$z_{X,f} \in \mathbb{Z}$	for all $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ and $f \in \kappa(X)$	(Z1)
$\sum_{f \in \kappa(X)} z_{X,f} = 1$	for all $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$	(Z2)
$\sum_{f \in \kappa(X), f _Y = g} z_{X,f} = z_{Y,g}$	for all $Y \subset X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ and $g \in \kappa(Y)$	(Z3)

Recall that  $\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}]$  denotes the output of the  $k$ -consistency algorithm, which is a function that assigns partial homomorphisms to each set  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$ . The algorithm runs, for a fixed positive integer  $k$  and a template structure  $\mathbf{A}$ , as follows:

<b><math>\mathbb{Z}</math>-affine <math>k</math>-consistency relaxation for template <math>\mathbf{A}</math>: input a <math>\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})</math>-instance <math>\mathbf{B}</math></b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compute <math>\kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}]</math> using the <math>k</math>-consistency algorithm.</li> <li>2. Accept if the system <math>\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{Z}\text{-aff}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B}, \kappa_k^{\mathbf{A}}[\mathbf{B}])</math> is solvable and reject otherwise.</li> </ol>

**Theorem 29.** *There is a constant  $d$  such that, for every  $k \geq 1$ , the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation does not solve  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{S}_{d,2})$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the group  $\Gamma := \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ . Set  $p_1 = 2$ ,  $p_2 = 3$ ,  $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ ,  $\delta_1 = (1, 0)$ , and  $\delta_2 = (0, 1)$ . Let  $G$  be a 3-regular 2-connected expander graph whose order is sufficiently larger than  $k$ , let  $H$  be an orientation of  $G$ , and consider the 2-extended 4-ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\mathbf{A} := \mathcal{C}_{\Delta}^{H, \Gamma, 0}$ . By Lemma 24, the  $k$ -consistency algorithm does not rule out robustly consistent partial solutions.

In particular,  $k$ -consistency does not reject  $\mathbf{A}$  (Corollary 25), although it is not solvable. By Lemma 21, for both  $i \in [2]$ , the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \Gamma^4}(\mathbf{A}_{\delta_i})$  has a  $p_i$ -solution that is only non-zero for partial homomorphisms that are robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_i$ . Now consider the reconstruction of CFI graphs  $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$ . These have bounded color class size by Lemma 16. Thus we can consider the bounded color class size isomorphism CSP  $\mathbf{L} := \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}})$ , which is a 2-ary  $S_d$ -CSP. Because  $\mathbf{A}$  is not solvable, we have  $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}} \not\cong \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$  by Lemma 16, and from Lemma 9 it follows that  $\mathbf{L} \notin \text{CSP}(S_d)$ .

It also follows from Lemma 16 that, for both  $i \in [2]$ , the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, S_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  has a  $p_i$ -solution that is only non-zero for partial solutions not discarded by  $k$ -consistency (more precisely, only for partial solutions that are robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_i$ ). By Lemma 4, the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, S_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  also has an integral solution  $\Phi$  which is only non-zero for partial solutions not discarded by  $k$ -consistency. This solution yields a solution  $\Psi$ , via  $\Psi(z_{X,f}) := \Phi(x_{X,f})$  for all  $X \in \binom{\mathcal{C}}{\leq k}$  and  $f \in \kappa_k^{S_{d,2}}[\mathbf{L}]$ , for the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\mathbb{Z}\text{-aff}}^{k, S_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L}, \kappa_k^{S_{d,2}}[\mathbf{L}])$ : Lemma 5 implies that equations of Type Z2 are satisfied and Equation L1 is equivalent to Equation Z3.  $\square$

Together with Lemma 6, Theorem 29 disproves the conjecture by Dalmau and Opršal [19] that, for every finite template structure  $\mathbf{A}$ , there is some  $k$  such that the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation solves  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  or  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  is NP-complete.

## 6 BLP+AIP and $\mathbf{BA}^k$

We consider another algorithm that tries to solve tractable CSPs. We first introduce a well-studied system of equations for CSPs [3, 10], or, more precisely, a variant of it parameterized by the size of partial solutions [15]. Let  $k$  be a positive integer,  $\mathbf{A}$  a template  $\tau$ -structure and  $\mathbf{B}$  a  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ -instance. We introduce the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{IP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  with variable set  $\mathcal{V}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ .

$\mathsf{L}_{\text{IP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ : variables  $\lambda_{X,f}$  for all  $X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}$  and  $f: X \rightarrow A$ , and  
variables  $\mu_{R, \bar{b}, \bar{a}}$  for all  $R \in \tau$ ,  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ , and  $\bar{a} \in R^{\mathbf{A}}$

$$\sum_{f: X \rightarrow A} \lambda_{X,f} = 1 \quad \text{for all } X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$\sum_{\substack{f: X \rightarrow A, \\ f|_Y = g}} \lambda_{X,f} = \lambda_{Y,g} \quad \text{for all } Y \subset X \in \binom{B}{\leq k}, g: Y \rightarrow A, \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\sum_{\bar{a} \in R^{\mathbf{A}}, a_i = a} \mu_{R, \bar{b}, \bar{a}} = \lambda_{\{b_i\}, b_i \mapsto a} \quad \text{for all } R \in \tau, a \in A, \bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}, i \in [\text{ar}(R)], \quad (\text{B3})$$

where  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  denote the  $i$ -th entry of the tuples  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$ , respectively.

We consider different domains of the variables (see [10]):

- If we restrict the variables to  $\{0, 1\}$ , then  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{IP}}^{1, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  is solvable if and only if  $\mathbf{B} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ .
- The relaxation of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{IP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  to nonnegative rationals is the **basic linear programming (BLP)** relaxation  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ .
- The affine relaxation of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{IP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  to all integers is the **affine integer programming (AIP)** relaxation  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{k, \mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ .

By increasing the parameter  $k$ , the BLP and AIP relaxations result in the Sherali-Adams LP hierarchy and the affine integer programming hierarchy of the  $\{0, 1\}$ -system, respectively.

Brakensiek, Guruswami, Wrochna, and Živný [10] use a certain combination of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  to formulate the BLP+AIP algorithm. Similar to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation, the BLP+AIP algorithm tries to solve  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$  in the sense that it is sound, that is, it never outputs wrongly that  $\mathbf{B} \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ . However, it may wrongly answer  $\mathbf{B} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ . The question is whether the BLP+AIP algorithm is also complete for tractable CSPs. In contrast to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation, the BLP+AIP algorithm is not parameterized by the size of partial solutions  $k$ . This parameterized version was proposed by Ciardo and Živný [16] and called  $\text{BA}^k$ , where  $\text{BA}^1$  is just the BLP+AIP algorithm.

We now formally introduce this parameterized algorithm. Let  $k$  be a positive integer.

$\text{BA}^k(\mathbf{A})$ -algorithm: input a  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ -instance  $\mathbf{B}$

1. Compute a relative interior point  $\Phi: \mathcal{V}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  in the polytope defined by  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ . The solution  $\Phi$  has in particular the property that for each variable  $x \in \mathcal{V}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  there is a solution  $\Psi$  to  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  such that  $\Psi(x) \neq 0$  if and only if  $\Phi(x) \neq 0$ . If such a point does not exist, reject.

2. Refine  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  by adding the constraints

$$x = 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \Phi(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{V}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B}).$$

3. If the refined system is feasible (over  $\mathbb{Z}$ ), then accept, otherwise reject.

We want to show that  $\text{BA}^k$  fails on the counterexample provided for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency. To do so, we first relate solutions of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  to solutions of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  or  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ .

**Lemma 30.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  be  $\tau$ -structures and  $k \geq \text{ar}(\tau)$ . If  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  has a solution  $\Phi$  over the non-negative rationals or the integers, then the following map  $\Psi$  is a solution to  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  or  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$ , respectively:*

$$\Psi(\lambda_{X,f}) := \begin{cases} \Phi(x_{X,f}) & \text{if } f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{B}[X], \mathbf{A}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } X \in \binom{\mathbf{B}}{\leq k}, f: X \rightarrow A,$$

$$\Psi(\mu_{R,\bar{b},\bar{a}}) := \Phi(x_{X_{\bar{b}},f_{\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{b}}}) \quad \text{for all } R \in \tau, \bar{a} \in R^{\mathbf{A}}, \bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}},$$

where  $X_{\bar{b}}$  denotes the set of elements appearing in the tuple  $\bar{b}$  and  $f_{\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{b}}$  denotes the partial homomorphism sending  $\bar{b}$  to  $\bar{a}$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 5 implies that equations of Type B1 and B2 are satisfied. For  $R \in \tau$ ,  $a \in A$ ,  $\bar{a} \in R^{\mathbf{A}}$ , and  $i \in [\text{ar}(R)]$ , we consider the set  $Y = \{b_i\}$  and the homomorphism  $b_i \mapsto a$ , Lemma 5 also implies that equations of Type B3 are satisfied. It is clear that non-negativity or integrality, respectively, of the solution is not changed.  $\square$

**Theorem 31.** *There is a constant  $d$  such that, for every positive integer  $k$ , the algorithm  $\text{BA}^k(\mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  does not solve  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{S}_{d,2})$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Theorem 29, let  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ ,  $p_1 = 2$ ,  $p_2 = 3$ , and  $\Delta = \{(1,0), (0,1)\}$ . Also set  $\delta_1 = (1,0)$  and  $\delta_2 = (0,1)$ . Let  $G$  be a 3-regular 2-connected expander graph whose order is sufficiently larger than  $k$ , let  $H$  be an orientation of  $G$ , and consider the 2-extended 4-ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\mathbf{A} := C_{\Delta}^{H,\Gamma,0}$ , which is not solvable. By Lemma 21, there is a  $p_1$ -solution for  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k,\Gamma_4}(\mathbf{A}_{(1,0)})$ , which sets every robustly consistent partial solution to a non-zero value. Likewise, there is a  $p_2$ -solution for  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k,\Gamma_4}(\mathbf{A}_{(0,1)})$ , which sets every robustly consistent partial solution to a non-zero value. Consider again the encoding as bounded color class size isomorphism  $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}})$ , where  $d := 8|\Gamma|^4$  is again the color class size of  $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$  (Lemma 16). Also by Lemma 16, for

both  $i \in [2]$ , the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathsf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  has a  $p_i$ -solution that is only non-zero for robustly consistent partial solutions with respect to  $\delta_i$ . By Lemma 30, these  $p_i$ -solutions also imply  $p_i$ -solutions of  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k, \mathsf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  that are only non-zero for robustly consistent partial solutions with respect to  $\delta_i$ . Therefore, the relative interior point  $\Phi$  computed in Step 1 of the  $\text{BA}^k$ -algorithm exists and is non-zero for every partial solution that is robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_1$  or  $\delta_2$ .

By Lemma 4, the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathsf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  has an integral solution that is only non-zero for robustly consistent partial solutions with respect to  $\delta_1$  or  $\delta_2$ . Therefore by Lemma 30, the system  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{k, \mathsf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{B})$  also has such an integral solution. This solution satisfies the refined constraints from Step 2 of the  $\text{BA}^k$ -algorithm. Hence, the algorithm wrongly accepts  $\mathbf{B}$  because  $\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}} \not\cong \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}$  by Lemma 16 and Lemma 9.  $\square$

## 7 The CLAP Algorithm

We turn to the next CSP-algorithm CLAP, introduced by Ciardo and Živný [17]. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a template  $\tau$ -structure.

CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ )-algorithm: input a CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ )-instance  $\mathbf{B}$

1. Maintain, for each pair of a relation symbol  $R \in \tau$  and a tuple  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ , a set  $S_{\bar{b},R} \subseteq R^{\mathbf{A}}$  of possible images of  $\bar{b}$  under a homomorphism. Initialize  $S_{\bar{b},R} := R^{\mathbf{A}}$  for all  $R \in \tau$  and  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ .

2. Repeat until no set  $S_{\bar{b},R}$  changes anymore: For each  $R \in \tau$ ,  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ , and  $\bar{a} \in S_{\bar{b},R}$ , solve  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  together with the following additional constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{R,\bar{b},\bar{a}} &= 1, \\ \mu_{R,\bar{b}',\bar{a}'} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } R' \in \tau, \bar{b}' \in R'^{\mathbf{B}}, \bar{a}' \notin S_{\bar{b}',R'}. \end{aligned}$$

If this system is not feasible, remove  $\bar{a}$  from  $S_{\bar{b},R}$ .

3. If there are  $R \in \tau$  and  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$  such that  $S_{\bar{b},R} = \emptyset$ , then reject.
4. For each  $R \in \tau$ ,  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ , and  $\bar{a} \in S_{\bar{b},R}$ , execute  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  (which is BLP+AIP) on  $\mathbf{B}$ , where we additionally fix

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{R,\bar{b},\bar{a}} &= 1, \\ \mu_{R,\bar{b}',\bar{a}'} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } R' \in \tau, \bar{b}' \in R'^{\mathbf{B}}, \bar{a}' \notin S_{\bar{b}',R'}. \end{aligned}$$

in Step 1 of  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  (and thus also implicitly in  $\mathsf{L}_{\text{AIP}}^{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  in Step 2 of  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$ ). If  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  accepts, then accept.

5. If  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  rejects all inputs in the step before, then reject.

To simplify the analysis, we first consider a variant of the CLAP algorithm, which we call CLAP'.

CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ )-algorithm: input a CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ )-instance  $\mathbf{B}$

Execute Steps 1 to 3 of CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ). Then execute

4'. Execute  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  on  $\mathbf{B}$  where we additionally fix

$$\mu_{R, \bar{b}', \bar{a}'} = 0 \quad \text{for all } R' \in \tau, \bar{b}' \in R'^{\mathbf{B}}, \bar{a}' \notin S_{\bar{b}', R'}.$$

Accept if  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  accepts this input and reject otherwise.

It is immediate that CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ ) does not solve more CSPs than CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ). We show that it actually solves the same:

**Lemma 32.** *For every structure  $\mathbf{A}$ , CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) solves CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) if and only if CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ ) solves CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a template  $\tau$ -structure. It is clear that if CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ ) solves CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ), then also CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) solves CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ). We show that if CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ ) does not solve CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ), then CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) does not solve CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ), either. Let  $\mathbf{B}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure such that  $\mathbf{B} \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ , but CLAP'( $\mathbf{A}$ ) accepts CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ). We create a modified variant of  $\mathbf{B}$  as follows. Let  $T \in \tau$  be some relation symbol of arity  $r$  that is non-empty in  $\mathbf{A}$ . Let  $\mathbf{B}'$  be the disjoint union of  $\mathbf{B}$  and the  $r$ -element  $\tau$ -structure, for which one  $r$ -tuple of distinct elements  $\bar{x}$  is contained in  $T$ . Obviously, we have  $\mathbf{B}' \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbf{A})$ . We show that CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) accepts  $\mathbf{B}'$ . Since  $\mathbf{B}'$  is a disjoint union, after Steps 1 to 3, the sets  $S_{\bar{b}, R}$  on input  $\mathbf{B}'$  will contain at least the elements as on input  $\mathbf{B}$ . The set  $S_{\bar{x}, T}$  will be equal to  $T^{\mathbf{A}}$  because fixing the assignment of  $\bar{x}$  does not restrict any other partial homomorphisms, and since CLAP' accepts  $\mathbf{B}$ , the system  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{B})$  is solvable when an image of  $\bar{x}$  is fixed. In particular, no set  $S_{\bar{b}, R}$  will be empty after Step 2. Hence, Step 3 is passed successfully. Now for Step 4, we consider the relation  $T$  and the tuple  $\bar{x}$ . We consider the execution of  $\text{BA}^1$ , where an arbitrary image of  $\bar{x}$  contained in  $T$  is fixed. Because  $\mathbf{B}'$  is a disjoint union and the mapping of  $\bar{x}$  is a valid homomorphism from the attached structure to  $\mathbf{A}$  and because  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  accepts in Step 4',  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  will accept in Step 4 for the tuple  $\bar{x}$ . Hence, CLAP( $\mathbf{A}$ ) wrongly accepts  $\mathbf{B}'$ , which means that it does not solve CSP( $\mathbf{A}$ ).  $\square$

**Theorem 33.** *There is a constant  $d$  such that CLAP( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ) does not solve CSP( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ).*

*Proof.* We prove the result for CLAP'( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ), which is sufficient by Lemma 32. We consider the same set-up as in the proof of Theorem 31: Let  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ ,  $p_1 = 2$ ,  $p_2 = 3$ , and  $\Delta = \{(1,0), (0,1)\}$ . Let  $\delta_1 = (1,0)$  and  $\delta_2 = (0,1)$ . Let  $G$  be a 3-regular 2-connected expander graph whose order is sufficiently large, let  $H$  be an orientation of  $G$ , and consider the 2-extended 4-ary  $\Gamma$ -CSP  $\mathbf{A} := \mathcal{C}_{\Delta}^{H, \Gamma, 0}$ , and the corresponding instance of bounded color class size isomorphism  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{BI}(\mathbf{G}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}}; \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{A}})$  of CSP( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ), which is again not in CSP( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ), where  $d := 8|\Gamma|^4$  is the color class size. Let  $k = 2$ . By Lemma 28, for every partial solution  $\hat{g} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{L}[Y], \mathbf{S}_{d,2})$  that is robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_i$ , there exists a  $p_i$ -solution to  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{CSP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  which sets  $x_{Y, \hat{g}}$  to 1 and every partial solution not robustly consistent with respect to  $\delta_i$  to 0. By Lemma 30, this is also a solution for  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{BLP}}^{k, \mathbf{S}_{d,2}}(\mathbf{L})$  with the same values. Therefore, after Step 2 of CLAP, every relation  $S_{\bar{b}, R}$  will at least still contain those tuples  $\bar{a}$  such that the partial homomorphism  $\bar{b} \mapsto \bar{a}$  is robustly consistent with respect to some  $\delta_i \in \Delta$ . By Lemma 18, this means that none of the relations  $S_{\bar{b}, R}$  is empty. In Step 4', CLAP'( $\mathbf{S}_{d,2}$ ) will then accept: The proof of Theorem 31 shows that  $\text{BA}^1(\mathbf{A})$  accepts  $\mathbf{L}$ , and it can be seen that this proof also goes through if we set  $\mu_{R, \bar{b}', \bar{a}'} = 0$  for all assignments  $\bar{b}' \mapsto \bar{a}'$  that are not robustly consistent with respect to any  $\delta_i \in \Delta$ .  $\square$

In contrast to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -affine  $k$ -consistency relaxation and the  $\text{BA}^k$  algorithms, CLAP is not

parameterized by a dimension  $k$ . We do however not exploit this and our techniques can also be applied to a version of CLAP parameterized by a dimension.

We can prove Lemma 32 because CLAP immediately accepts if Step 4 is passed successfully for at least one tuple. One could modify CLAP so that Step 4 has to find one possible image for all  $R \in \tau$  and all  $\bar{b} \in R^{\mathbf{B}}$ . This would still be a sound algorithm. Ciardo and Živný [17] already noted this possibility when introducing CLAP, and moreover suggested a possibly even stronger version: replace BLP with  $\text{BA}^1$  in Step 2, which in turn would make Steps 4 and 5 unnecessary. The authors refer to this algorithm as  $\text{C}(\text{BLP}+\text{AIP})$  but considered CLAP because it allows to characterize the CSPs solved by CLAP in terms of the polymorphisms of the template structure  $\mathbf{A}$ . Whether a similar characterization for  $\text{C}(\text{BLP}+\text{AIP})$  is possible is an open question. We also leave it as an open problem whether  $\text{C}(\text{BLP}+\text{AIP})$  solves  $\text{CSP}(\mathbf{S}_{d,r})$  for all  $d$  and  $r$ .

## References

- [1] Albert Atserias, Andrei A. Bulatov, and Víctor Dalmau. On the power of  $k$ -consistency. In Lars Arge, Christian Cachin, Tomasz Jurdzinski, and Andrzej Tarlecki, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 34th International Colloquium, ICALP 2007, Wrocław, Poland, July 9-13, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4596 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 279–290. Springer, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-73420-8\\_26.
- [2] Libor Barto. The collapse of the bounded width hierarchy. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 26(3):923–943, 11 2014. doi:10.1093/logcom/exu070.
- [3] Libor Barto, Jakub Bulín, Andrei A. Krokhin, and Jakub Opršal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *J. ACM*, 68(4):28:1–28:66, 2021. doi:10.1145/3457606.
- [4] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Constraint satisfaction problems of bounded width. In *2009 50th Annual IEEE symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 595–603. IEEE, 2009.
- [5] Libor Barto, Andrei Krokhin, and Ross Willard. Polymorphisms, and how to use them. In *Dagstuhl Follow-Ups*, volume 7. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- [6] Christoph Berkholz and Martin Grohe. Limitations of algebraic approaches to graph isomorphism testing. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9134 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 155–166. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-47672-7\\_13.
- [7] Christoph Berkholz and Martin Grohe. Linear Diophantine equations, group CSPs, and graph isomorphism. *CoRR*, abs/1607.04287, 2016. arXiv:1607.04287.
- [8] Christoph Berkholz and Martin Grohe. Linear Diophantine equations, group CSPs, and graph isomorphism. In Philip N. Klein, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 327–339. SIAM, 2017. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974782.21.
- [9] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. An algorithmic blend of lps and ring equations for promise csps. In Timothy M. Chan, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 436–455. SIAM, 2019. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.28.



- [10] Joshua Brakensiek, Venkatesan Guruswami, Marcin Wrochna, and Stanislav Živný. The power of the combined basic LP and affine relaxation for promise CSPs. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, TR20-004, 2020. URL: <https://eccc.weizmann.ac.il/report/2020/004>, arXiv:TR20-004.
- [11] Andrei Bulatov and Víctor Dalmau. A simple algorithm for Mal'tsev constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36:16–27, 01 2006. doi:10.1137/050628957.
- [12] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 319–330, 2017. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.37.
- [13] Andrei A. Bulatov and Víctor Dalmau. A simple algorithm for Mal'tsev constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(1):16–27, 2006. doi:10.1137/050628957.
- [14] Jin-yi Cai, Martin Fürer, and Neil Immerman. An optimal lower bound on the number of variables for graph identification. *Combinatorica*, 12(4):389–410, 1992. doi:10.1007/BF01305232.
- [15] Lorenzo Ciardo and Stanislav Živný. Approximate graph colouring and crystals. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, pages 2256–2267. SIAM, 2023. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977554.CH86.
- [16] Lorenzo Ciardo and Stanislav Živný. Approximate graph colouring and the hollow shadow. In Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 623–631. ACM, 2023. doi:10.1145/3564246.3585112.
- [17] Lorenzo Ciardo and Stanislav Živný. CLAP: A new algorithm for promise CSPs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 52(1):1–37, 2023. doi:10.1137/22M1476435.
- [18] Adam Ó Conghaile. Cohomology in constraint satisfaction and structure isomorphism. In Stefan Szeider, Robert Ganian, and Alexandra Silva, editors, *47th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2022, August 22-26, 2022, Vienna, Austria*, volume 241 of *LIPICs*, pages 75:1–75:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2022.75.
- [19] Víctor Dalmau and Jakub Opršal. Local consistency as a reduction between constraint satisfaction problems. In Paweł Sobocinski, Ugo Dal Lago, and Javier Esparza, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2024, Tallinn, Estonia, July 8-11, 2024*, pages 29:1–29:15. ACM, 2024. doi:10.1145/3661814.3662068.
- [20] Tomás Feder and Moshe Y. Vardi. Monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 612–622, 1993.
- [21] Merrick L. Furst, John E. Hopcroft, and Eugene M. Luks. Polynomial-time algorithms for permutation groups. In *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Syracuse, New York, USA, 13-15 October 1980*, pages 36–41. IEEE Computer Society, 1980. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1980.34.
- [22] Mikael Goldmann and Alexander Russell. The complexity of solving equations over finite groups. *Information and Computation*, 178(1):253–262, 2002. doi:https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.2002.3173.

- [23] Bartek Klin, Sławomir Lasota, Joanna Ochremiak, and Szymon Torunczyk. Turing machines with atoms, constraint satisfaction problems, and descriptive complexity. In Thomas A. Henzinger and Dale Miller, editors, *Joint Meeting of the Twenty-Third EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), CSL-LICS '14, Vienna, Austria, July 14 - 18, 2014*, pages 58:1–58:10. ACM, 2014. doi:[10.1145/2603088.2603135](https://doi.org/10.1145/2603088.2603135).
- [24] Alexander Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. Wiley, 1986.
- [25] Hanif D. Sherali and Warren P. Adams. A hierarchy of relaxations between the continuous and convex hull representations for zero-one programming problems. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 3(3):411–430, 1990.
- [26] Grigori Samuilovitsch Tseitin. *On the Complexity of Derivation in Propositional Calculus*, pages 466–483. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1983. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-81955-1\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-81955-1_28).
- [27] Dmitriy Zhuk. The proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture. *Journal of the ACM*, 67, 04 2017. doi:[10.1145/3402029](https://doi.org/10.1145/3402029).