

# Hereditary First-Order Model Checking\*

Manuel Bodirsky<sup>†1</sup> and Santiago Guzmán-Pro<sup>‡1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut für Algebra, TU Dresden, Germany

## Abstract

Many computational problems can be modelled as the class of all finite relational structures  $\mathbb{A}$  that satisfy a fixed first-order sentence  $\phi$  *hereditarily*, i.e., we require that every substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . In this case, we say that the class is in HerFO. The problems in HerFO are always in coNP, and sometimes coNP-complete. HerFO also contains many interesting computational problems in P, including many constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs). We show that HerFO captures the class of *complements* of CSPs for reducts of finitely bounded structures, i.e., every such CSP is polynomial-time equivalent to the complement of a problem in Her-FO. However, we also prove that Her-FO does not have the full computational power of coNP: there are problems in coNP that are not polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in HerFO, unless E=NE. Another main result is a description of the quantifier-prefixes for  $\phi$  such that hereditarily checking  $\phi$  is in P; we show that for every other quantifier-prefix there exists a formula  $\phi$  with this prefix such that hereditarily checking  $\phi$  is coNP-complete.

**Keywords.** Finite model theory, constraint satisfaction problems, existential second-order logic, computational complexity

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Hereditary first-order logic . . . . .	1
1.2	Our contributions . . . . .	2
1.3	Outline . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	(First-order) structures . . . . .	3
2.2	Diagrams and finitely bounded classes . . . . .	4
2.3	SNP and its fragments . . . . .	4
2.4	Polynomial-time reductions and subclasses of NP . . . . .	5

---

\*This project has received funding from the European Union (Project POCOCOP, ERC Synergy Grant 101071674). 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 Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

<sup>†</sup>manuel.bodirsky@tu-dresden.de

<sup>‡</sup>santiago.guzman\_pro@tu-dresden.de

<b>3</b>	<b>Hereditary model checking and CSPs</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Polynomial-time solvable examples . . . . .	6
3.2	HerFO and Datalog . . . . .	8
3.3	CoNP-complete examples . . . . .	8
3.4	Inexpressible examples . . . . .	10
3.5	HerFO and primitive positive definitions . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Extensional ESO</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Extension problems and extensional ESO . . . . .	12
4.2	CSPs and Surjective CSPs . . . . .	12
4.3	Extensional ESO captures HerFO . . . . .	13
4.4	HerFO captures extensional ESO . . . . .	13
4.5	The expressive power of ESO and Her-FO . . . . .	16
4.6	A remark concerning the definition of extensional ESO . . . . .	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Monotone extensional SNP</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	Finitely bounded structures and full homomorphisms . . . . .	18
5.2	Monotone extensional SNP and CSPs . . . . .	19
5.3	CSPs of finitely bounded structures . . . . .	20
<b>6</b>	<b>Limitations of the computational power</b>	<b>22</b>
6.1	Disjunctive self-reducible sets . . . . .	22
6.2	Search reduces to decision . . . . .	24
6.3	Promise problems . . . . .	25
6.4	Failure of NP-richness . . . . .	26
<b>7</b>	<b>Hereditary model checking and quantifier prefixes</b>	<b>26</b>
7.1	The $\forall^*\exists^*$ fragment . . . . .	27
7.2	The $\forall^*\exists\forall^*$ fragment . . . . .	27
7.3	$\exists\forall\exists$ - and $\exists^2\forall$ -sentences . . . . .	30
7.4	Quantifier prefix classification . . . . .	30
7.5	Restriction to CSPs . . . . .	31
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion and Open Problems</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Monotone connected extensional SNP captures finite-domain CSPs</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>CSPs of reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Hardness of <math>\text{Her}(\eta)</math> (Equation 1)</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>The Henson digraphs</b>	<b>41</b>

# 1 Introduction

*First-order logic (FO)* has good computational properties: given a fixed first-order sentence  $\phi$  it can be verified in deterministic logarithmic space whether an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . However, it has been realized long ago that FO has a very limited expressive power when it comes to describing classes of finite structures. For instance, there is no first-order sentence which holds on a finite graph if and only if the graph does not contain cycles (i.e., is a forest). In contrast, second-order logic is very powerful and captures the entire polynomial-time hierarchy [42]. Even restricted fragments of second-order logic can be very expressive. For instance, Fagin [35] showed that *existential second-order logic (ESO)* captures the complexity class NP. Taking complements, *universal second-order logic (USO)* captures coNP.

Further restrictions of ESO might no longer have the full expressive power, but still the full *computational* power of NP, in the sense that every problem in NP is polynomial-time equivalent to a problem that can be expressed in the restricted logic; we will call such classes *NP-rich*.<sup>1</sup> A prominent example of an NP-rich ESO fragment is *SNP* (for *strict NP*), which is defined as the restriction of ESO to sentences with a universal first-order part. SNP is quite expressive, and contains for instance all of Datalog [36]. Feder and Vardi [36] proved that SNP is NP-rich (see [4] for some of the missing details of the proof given in [36]). Of course, there is a corresponding fragment of USO which captures the computational power of coNP.

The fine-grained study of the computational complexity of fragments of ESO is closely related to the study of *constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs)*. If  $\mathbb{B}$  is a structure with a finite relational signature  $\tau$ , then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  denotes the class of all finite  $\tau$ -structures that homomorphically map to  $\mathbb{B}$ ; this might be viewed as a decision problem, namely the task of deciding membership in  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . It can be shown that SNP is conjunctive NP-rich if two further strong restrictions are imposed: *monotonicity* and *connectedness* [13] (see Section 2.3 for definitions). The significance of monotone connected SNP is that every problem described in this logic is the constraint satisfaction problem of a *reduct* of a *finitely bounded* structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , and conversely every such CSP can be expressed in monotone connected SNP. A structure  $\mathbb{B}$  is called *finitely bounded* if there exists a finite set  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite structures such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}$  if and only if no structure from  $\mathcal{F}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{A}$ . The problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  might be undecidable in general [13], but if  $\mathbb{B}$  is finitely bounded, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in NP.

A *reduct* of a structure  $\mathbb{B}$  is a structure obtained from  $\mathbb{B}$  by dropping some of the relations. Reducts of finitely bounded structures need not be finitely bounded, but their CSP obviously remains in NP. The conjunctive NP-richness of the class of CSPs for reducts of finitely bounded structures contrasts nicely with the famous *complexity dichotomy* for finite structures  $\mathbb{B}$ : in this case,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in P or NP-complete [51] (the result has been announced independently by Bulatov [30] and by Zhuk [53]). Using earlier results of Feder and Vardi [36] and Kun [44], this shows that the ESO fragment of *monotone monadic SNP* has a complexity dichotomy as well (an alternative proof can be found in [23]).

## 1.1 Hereditary first-order logic

Here, we introduce *hereditary first-order logic*. We say that a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  *hereditarily satisfies*  $\phi$  if every substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . We denote by  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  the class of finite structures that hereditarily satisfy  $\phi$ , and the *hereditary model checking problem* for  $\phi$  consists of deciding whether an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ . Since verifying whether a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  models a fixed first-order formula  $\phi$  can be done in polynomial time, it follows that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is in coNP. Moreover, it is straightforward to observe that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  can be expressed in universal monadic second-order logic.

**Observation 1.1.** *Consider a first-order  $\tau$ -formula  $\phi := Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n.\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$ . If  $S$  is a unary predicate not in  $\tau$ , then  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  models*

$$\forall S Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n \left( \bigwedge_{i \in U} S(x_i) \implies \bigwedge_{i \in E} S(x_i) \wedge \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right),$$

where  $U$  (respectively,  $E$ ) is the set of indices  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $Q_i$  is a universal (respectively, existential) quantifier.

---

<sup>1</sup>If we consider disjunctive, conjunctive, or Turing reductions, we call such classes *conjunctive*, *disjunctive*, or *Turing NP-rich*, respectively.

We say that a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of finite  $\tau$ -structures is *hereditarily first-order definable* if there is a first-order sentence  $\phi$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Her}(\phi)$ . In this case, we also say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is in Her-FO. Clearly, every class in Her-FO is *hereditary*, i.e., closed under taking substructures. The following example shows a simple example which is in Her-FO, but not in FO.

**Example 1** (Forests). Consider a first-order formula  $\phi$  stating that “there is a loopless vertex of degree at most 1”. Clearly, every forest hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{G}$  is a finite graph that hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ . Then  $\mathbb{G}$  has a loopless vertex  $v$  of degree at most 1. We inductively see that the subgraph with vertex set  $(G \setminus \{v\})$  is a forest, i.e., has no cycles, and since  $x$  has degree at most 1 and does not have a loop, we conclude that  $\mathbb{G}$  is a forest. The fact that this property is not expressible in FO is well-known, and can for example be shown using Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games; see [32].

Her-FO even contains problems that are coNP-complete. To see this, let  $R$  be a ternary and  $E$  a binary relation symbol and consider the formula

$$\eta := \exists x, y, z \forall a (\neg E(x, a) \vee R(x, y, z)). \quad (1)$$

On a high level, an  $\{E, R\}$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\eta$  if and only if for every directed cycle  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  in  $(A, E)$  there is a triple  $(a_i, a_j, a_k) \in R(\mathbb{A})$  for some  $i, j, k \in [n]$ . In Lemma C.1 we reduce the complement of 3-SAT to  $\text{Her}(\eta)$ .

Her-FO is a particularly natural formalism when it comes to the description of constraint satisfaction problems. In Section 3 we will give natural syntactic restrictions of first-order sentences  $\phi$  that imply that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  describes a CSP. The mentioned dichotomy result for CSPs for finite structures  $\mathbb{B}$  relies on concepts and results from universal algebra (see, e.g., [7]). The universal-algebraic approach can also be applied if the structure  $\mathbb{B}$  is countably infinite and  $\omega$ -categorical (see, e.g., [13]). If a CSP is in Her-FO, then a result from [22] implies that there exists an  $\omega$ -categorical structure  $\mathbb{B}$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi) = \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ .

In order to describe the computational power of HerFO, we introduce a logic which is closely related to ESO: *extensional ESO*. The idea is that each of the existentially quantified relation symbols is evaluated over a relation that extends a corresponding input relation. For instance, the *precoloured 3-coloring problem* from graph theory can naturally be expressed by the extensional ESO sentence

$$\begin{aligned} \exists R, G, B \forall x, y & ((R'(x) \Rightarrow R(x)) \wedge (G'(x) \Rightarrow G(x)) \wedge (B'(x) \Rightarrow B(x)) \\ & \wedge (E(x, y) \Rightarrow \neg(R(x) \wedge R(y)) \wedge \neg(G(x) \wedge G(y)) \wedge \neg(B(x) \wedge B(y))) \\ & \wedge (R(x) \vee G(x) \vee B(x))). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $R, G,$  and  $B$  denote the color classes of the graph, and must denote extensions of input predicates  $R', G',$  and  $B'$  which might enforce that some variables are colored by a specific color.

## 1.2 Our contributions

Our first main result is that extensional ESO and the complement of Her-FO have the same computational power, in the sense that for every sentence  $\Phi$  in extensional ESO there exists a first-order formula  $\phi$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is polynomial-time (in fact, log-space) equivalent to the problem described by the negation of  $\Phi$ , and vice versa. In particular, this implies that for every CSP of a finitely bounded structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , there exists a first-order sentence  $\phi$  such that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  and the complement of  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  are polynomial-time equivalent. Note that we wrote ‘a finitely bounded structure’ rather than ‘a reduct of a finitely bounded structure’, so our result does not imply that Her-FO is NP-rich. In fact, our next result implies that Her-FO cannot be NP-rich (actually, not even disjunctive NP-rich), unless  $\text{E} = \text{NE}$  (exponential time equals non-deterministic exponential time). The assumption that  $\text{E} \neq \text{NE}$  is stronger than the usual assumption that  $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$ , but still a common assumption in complexity theory [10, 39, 50]. To prove this result, we show that every problem in extensional ESO is *disjunctively self-reducible*; we also show that the class of disjunctively self-reducible sets does not exhibit a complexity dichotomy (Theorem 6.3).

The question whether a given ESO sentence describes a polynomial-time solvable problem is easily seen to be undecidable (see, e.g., Theorem 1.4.2 in [13]). This motivates quantifier-prefix dichotomy results for existential second-order logic [33, 38]. For instance, the classification for monadic ESO is as follows (see Figure 1 (a) in [38] for the full classification). For every quantifier-prefix  $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}^*$  the following holds:

- either  $Q$  is of the form  $\exists^*\forall$ , and in this case every monadic ESO sentence  $\Phi$  whose first-order part has a quantifier-free prefix  $Q$  is polynomial-time decidable, or
- $Q$  contains  $\forall\forall$  or  $\forall\exists$  as subwords, and in this case there is an ESO sentence  $\Phi$  whose first-order part has quantifier-prefix  $Q$  and deciding  $\Phi$  is NP-complete.

Another main contribution of the present paper is the following classification of the computational complexity of problems in Her-FO based on the quantifier prefix  $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}^*$  of the fixed first-order formula:

- either  $Q$  is of the form  $\forall^*\exists^*$  or the form  $\forall^*\exists\forall^*$ , and in this case  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is polynomial-time decidable for every first-order formula  $\phi$  with quantifier-prefix  $Q$ , or
- $Q$  contains  $\exists\exists\forall$  or some subword of the form  $\exists\forall\forall^*\exists$ , and in this case there are first-order formulas with quantifier prefix  $Q$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is coNP-complete.

*Remark 1.* The prefix classes that appear in our result turn out to be the duals of the prefix classes that are relevant for the famous *decision problem* (the classical ‘*Entscheidungsproblem*’); we refer to the monographs [28, 48]. The satisfiability problem is decidable for first-order formulas whose quantifier prefix is

- in  $\exists^*\forall^*$  (due to Bernays and Schönfinkel [11]; they prove that if a model exists, then we may even find a finite model),
- in  $\exists^*\forall\exists^*$  (Ackermann [1]; again, satisfiability in the finite and the infinite is equivalent),

and undecidable otherwise [48]. We are not aware of a deeper reason of this curious coincidence.

### 1.3 Outline

After recalling some basic concepts from finite model theory (Section 2), we introduce hereditary model checking, provide many examples, and also prove that certain problems cannot be expressed in Her-FO (Section 3); it will also become clear why hereditary model checking is quite natural in the context of constraint satisfaction. Then we introduce extensional ESO (Section 4); see Figure 4 for an illustration of the fragments of existential second-order logic studied in this paper. Here we prove in particular that the complements of problems in Her-FO have the same computational power as extensional ESO (Theorem 4.6). An important restriction of extensional ESO is monotone extensional SNP (Section 5), which we show has the same computational power as CSPs of finitely bounded structures (Theorem 5.9). We discuss the limitations of the computational power of Her-FO in Section 6, and in particular we prove that the complements of problems in Her-FO are not NP-rich, unless  $E = NE$  (Corollary 6.8). Our final main result, the classification of the complexity of Her-FO depending on the allowed quantifier prefix (Theorem 7.10), can be found in Section 7. We close with a series of problems that are left open (Section 8).

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume basic familiarity with first-order logic and we follow standard notation from model theory, as, e.g., in [41]. We also use standard notions from complexity theory.

### 2.1 (First-order) structures

Given a relational signature  $\tau$  and a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , we denote by  $R^{\mathbb{A}}$  the interpretation in  $\mathbb{A}$  of a relation symbol  $R \in \tau$ . Also, we denote relational structures with letters  $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{C}, \dots$ , and their domains by  $A, B, C, \dots$ . In this article, structures have non-empty domains.

If  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  are  $\tau$ -structures, then a *homomorphism* from  $\mathbb{A}$  to  $\mathbb{B}$  is a map  $f: A \rightarrow B$  such that for all  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$  and  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $k$ , if  $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$ , then  $R(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_k)) \in R^{\mathbb{B}}$ . We write  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  if there exists a homomorphism from  $\mathbb{A}$  to  $\mathbb{B}$ , and we denote by  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  the class of all finite structures  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of finite  $\tau$ -structures. We say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is

- *closed under homomorphisms* if for every  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ , if  $\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ , then  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$  as well.

- *closed under inverse homomorphisms* if for every  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ , if  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ , then  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$  as well (i.e., the complement of  $\mathcal{C}$  in the class of all finite  $\tau$ -structures is closed under homomorphisms).

Note that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is closed under inverse homomorphisms.

If  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  are  $\tau$ -structures with disjoint domains  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively, then the *disjoint union*  $\mathbb{A} \uplus \mathbb{B}$  is the  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{C}$  with domain  $A \cup B$  and the relation  $R^{\mathbb{C}} = R^{\mathbb{A}} \cup R^{\mathbb{B}}$  for every  $R \in \tau$ . Note that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is *closed under disjoint unions*, i.e., if  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathbb{A} \uplus \mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

For examples, we will often recur to graphs and digraphs. Since this paper is deeply involved with logic and finite model theory, we will think of digraphs as binary structures with signature  $\{E\}$ , following and adapting standard notions from graph theory [27] to this setting. In particular, given a digraph  $\mathbb{D}$ , we call  $E^{\mathbb{D}}$  the *edge set* of  $\mathbb{D}$ , and its elements we call *edges* or *arcs*. Also, a *graph* is a digraph whose edge set is a symmetric relation, and an *oriented graph* is a digraph whose edge set is an anti-symmetric relation. Given a positive integer  $n$ , we denote by  $K_n$  the complete graph on  $n$  vertices, i.e., the graph with vertex set  $[n]$  and edge set  $(i, j)$  where  $i \neq j$ . A *tournament* is an oriented graph whose symmetric closure is a complete graph, and an *oriented path* is an oriented graph whose symmetric closure is a path. We denote by  $\vec{P}_n$  the *directed path* on  $n$  vertices, i.e., the oriented path with vertex set  $[n]$  and edges  $(i, i + 1)$  for  $i \in [n - 1]$ .

## 2.2 Diagrams and finitely bounded classes

Given a finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , the *diagram* of  $\mathbb{A}$  is the  $\tau$ -formula  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}$  defined as follows.

- $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}$  has a free variable  $x_a$  for every  $a \in A$ ,
- for every  $R \in \tau \cup \{\neq\}$  of arity  $r$  and each tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_r)$  of  $A$ , the formula  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}$  contains the conjunct  $R(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_r})$  if  $\mathbb{A} \models R(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ ,
- for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$  and each tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_r)$  of  $A$ , the formula  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}$  contains the conjunct  $\neg R(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_r})$  if  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg R(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ .

It is easy to see that a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}$ .

A class of finite structures  $\mathcal{C}$  is *finitely bounded* if there is a finite set  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite structures such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free. Notice that a structure  $\mathbb{B}$  is finitely bounded if and only if the class of finite substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$  is finitely bounded. The following is well-known and straightforward to prove, e.g., using diagram formulas.

**Observation 2.1.** *A class  $\mathcal{C}$  of finite structures is finitely bounded if and only if there is a universal sentence  $\phi$  such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ .*

## 2.3 SNP and its fragments

Let  $\tau$  be a finite set of relation symbols. An *SNP  $\tau$ -sentence* (short for *strict non-deterministic polynomial-time*) is a sentence of the form

$$\exists R_1, \dots, R_k \forall x_1, \dots, x_n. \psi$$

where  $\psi$  is a quantifier free  $\tau \cup \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$ -formula. If the structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies the sentence  $\Psi$ , we write  $\mathbb{A} \models \Psi$ . We say that a class of finite  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{C}$  is in *SNP* if there exists an SNP  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ . Note that the class of (finite) models of an SNP sentence is closed under substructures.

*Datalog* can be seen as the subclass of SNP where we require that the first-order part  $\psi$  of the SNP sentence

- is *Horn*, i.e., written in conjunctive normal form such that each clause contains at most one positive literal, and
- is such that every positive literal in  $\psi$  is existentially quantified.

A class  $\mathcal{C}$  of finite models is *in Datalog* if there exists an SNP sentence  $\Phi$  of the form described above such that a finite structure is in  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if it does *not* satisfy  $\Phi$ . Note that if a class is in Datalog, then it is closed under homomorphisms<sup>2</sup> and in P.

A first-order  $\tau$ -formula  $\phi$  is called *positive* if it does not use the negation symbol  $\neg$  (so it just uses the logical symbols  $\forall, \exists, \wedge, \vee, =$ , variables and symbols from  $\tau$ ). The negation of a positive formula is called *negative*; note that every negative formula is equivalent to a formula in prenex conjunctive normal form where every atomic formula appears in negated form, and all negation symbols are in front of atomic formulas; such formulas will also be called negative.

Consider a first-order sentence  $\phi$  in prenex conjunctive normal form without (positive) literals of the form  $x = y$ . Let  $\psi$  be a clause of  $\phi$ , and let  $\mathbb{C}$  be the structure whose vertex set is the set of variables appearing in  $\psi$ , and the interpretation of  $R \in \tau$  consists of those tuples  $\bar{x}$  such that  $\psi$  contains the negative literal  $\neg R(\bar{x})$ . We say  $\psi$  is *connected* if  $\mathbb{C}$  is connected, and that  $\phi$  is *connected* if every clause of  $\phi$  is connected — notice that in particular, the notion of connectedness is well-defined for negative first-order logic. Given an SNP  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$  with first-order part  $\phi$  in conjunctive normal form (CNF), we say that  $\Phi$  is

- *connected* if  $\phi$  is connected (so  $\phi$  does not contain (positive) literals of the form  $x = y$ ),
- *monotone* if every symbol from  $\tau \cup \{=\}$  is negative in  $\phi$ ,
- *monadic* if every existentially quantifier symbol is monadic (i.e., unary), and
- *without equalities* if  $\phi$  does not use the equality symbol (so it just uses the logical symbols  $\forall, \exists, \wedge, \vee, \neg$ , variables and symbols from  $\tau$ ).

Notice that for every SNP sentence  $\Phi$  we may assume that it does not contain literals of the form  $\neg(x = y)$ ; otherwise, we obtain an equivalent formula by deleting every such literal and replacing each appearance of the variable  $y$  in the same clause by the variable  $x$ . Hence, in this paper we assume without loss of generality that if  $\Phi$  is in monotone SNP, then it is in SNP without equalities.<sup>3</sup> Connected monotone SNP is closely related to CSPs in the following sense.

**Theorem 2.2** (Corollary 1.4.12 in [13]). *An SNP sentence  $\Phi$  describes a problem of the form  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  for some (infinite) structure  $\mathbb{A}$  if and only if  $\Phi$  is equivalent to a connected monotone SNP sentence.*

## 2.4 Polynomial-time reductions and subclasses of NP

We consider three kinds of polynomial-time reductions which we specify now. We say that a set  $L$  *reduces in polynomial time* to a set  $L'$  if there is a polynomial-time computable function  $f$  such that  $x \in L$  if and only if  $f(x) \in L'$ ; we also say that  $f$  is a *polynomial-time many-one reduction*. More generally, we say that there is a *disjunctive polynomial-time reduction* from  $L$  to  $L'$  if there is a polynomial-time computable function  $g$  which computes a set of queries  $g(x)$  such that  $g(x) \cap L' \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $x \in L$ . Similarly, if  $g$  satisfies that  $g(x) \subseteq L'$  if and only if  $x \in L$ , we say that there is a *conjunctive polynomial-time reduction* from  $L$  to  $L'$ . Finally, we say that there is a *polynomial-time Turing-reduction* from  $L$  to  $L'$ , if there is a polynomial-time deterministic oracle machine  $M$  that accepts  $L$  using  $L'$  as an oracle. Clearly, if there exists a polynomial-time reduction from  $L$  to  $L'$ , then there are also disjunctive and conjunctive polynomial-time reductions, and, in turn, if there exists a disjunctive or a conjunctive polynomial-time reduction from  $L$  to  $L'$ , then there is also a Turing-reduction from  $L$  to  $L'$ . We say that  $L$  and  $L'$  are *polynomial-time equivalent* (*disjunctive-*, *conjunctive-*, and *Turing-equivalent*, respectively) if there are polynomial-time reductions (disjunctive-, conjunctive-, and Turing-reductions, respectively) from  $L$  to  $L'$  and from  $L'$  to  $L$ . All of these notions of reducibility also exist in the variant with *log-space* instead of *polynomial-time*; in this case we require the existence of a Turing machine which has access to a (read-only) input tape, a (write-only) output tape, and a work tape whose size is logarithmic in the size of the input. Note that any function which is log-space computable in this sense is also polynomial-time computable.

<sup>2</sup>Our definition is standard, but different from the terminology of Feder and Vardi [36, 37], who defined that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in Datalog if its complement is in Datalog in the standard sense.

<sup>3</sup>We deviate from the notation from [36]: they call this fragment SNP without inequalities since they assume negation normal form and we do not.

### 3 Hereditary model checking and CSPs

In this section we see that hereditary model checking naturally arises in the context of constraint satisfaction problems. We do so by providing several examples of CSPs in Her-FO. We also include inexpressible examples of Her-FO which help build intuition about hereditary model checking. Besides Remark 2, this section is purely example-based; the reader interested in the main results of this paper may safely skip to Section 4, and return to this section if needed.

It is well-known that a universal first-order sentence  $\phi$  in conjunctive normal form describes a CSP if  $\phi$  is monotone and connected (this follows from Theorem 2.2). The following observation claims that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  describes a CSP even if we drop the assumption that  $\phi$  is a universal sentence — in the case of universal sentences,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  equals the class of finite models of  $\phi$ .

**Observation 3.1.** *The following statements hold for every first-order formula  $\phi$  in prenex conjunctive normal form.*

- *If  $\phi$  is negative, then  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is closed under inverse homomorphisms.*
- *If  $\phi$  is negative and connected, then there is a structure  $\mathbb{S}$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi) = \text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$ .*

*Proof.* To prove the first itemized statement, suppose that there is a homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ . Let  $\mathbb{A}'$  be a substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$ . The substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  with vertex set  $f[A']$  models  $\phi$ . Since surjective homomorphisms preserve positive first-order formulas, we conclude that  $\mathbb{A}'$  models  $\phi$ .

It is straightforward to observe that if  $\phi$  is negative and connected, then the class of finite models of  $\phi$  is closed under disjoint unions. Hence, if every substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  and every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfy  $\phi$ , then every substructure of  $\mathbb{A} \uplus \mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi$ , i.e.,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is closed under disjoint unions. By the first claim,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is also closed under inverse homomorphisms, and it thus follows that there is a structure  $\mathbb{S}$  such that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S}) = \text{Her}(\phi)$  — for any class  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\tau$ -structures there exists a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{S}$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$  if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under disjoint unions and inverse homomorphisms (see, e.g., [13]).  $\square$

*Remark 2.* Every CSP in Her-FO is the CSP of an  $\omega$ -categorical structure. This follows from a result in [22], which states that every CSP in monadic second-order logic (MSO) is the CSP for an  $\omega$ -categorical structure; clearly, Her-FO is a fragment of monadic second-order logic (see, e.g., Observation 1.1).

#### 3.1 Polynomial-time solvable examples

We begin with a simple example which in particular shows that there are CSPs in Her-FO that are not in FO.

**Example 2.** The problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$  is in Her-FO. Indeed, it suffices to consider the first-order formula  $\exists x \forall y. \neg E(x, y)$ , i.e., the first order formula that states that there exists a *sink*, i.e., a vertex without outgoing edges.

There are also CSPs for structures with a finite domain that are in Her-FO, but not in FO, as the following examples show. First, recall that the *algebraic length* of an oriented path  $P$  is the absolute value of the difference between forward edges and backward edges in  $P$ . It is well-known (and straightforward to observe) that a digraph  $D$  homomorphically maps to the directed path of length 2 if and only if every oriented path in  $D$  has algebraic length at most 2.

**Example 3.** The problem  $\text{CSP}(\vec{P}_3)$  is in Her-FO. Consider a first-order formula  $\phi$  saying that there is a loop, or there are (directed) edges  $(x, y)$  and  $(a, b)$  such that the following hold:

- $y$  has exactly one out-neighbour different from  $b$ ,
- $a$  has exactly one in-neighbour different from  $x$ , and
- every  $z \notin \{x, y, a, b\}$  has exactly two out-neighbours different from  $b$  and no in-neighbours, or  $v$  has exactly two in-neighbours different from  $x$  and no out-neighbours.



Suppose that a loopless digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . It is not hard to observe that if  $u$  and  $v$  are witnessing vertices for  $x$  and  $b$ , then there is an oriented path from  $u$  to  $v$  of algebraic length 3. Hence, if  $\mathbb{D} \notin \text{Her}(\neg\phi)$ , then either  $\mathbb{D}$  contains a loop or a path of algebraic length 3, and so  $\mathbb{D} \not\vdash \vec{P}_3$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbb{D} \not\vdash \vec{P}_3$ , then either  $\mathbb{D}$  contains a loop or it has an oriented path of algebraic length 3. In the former case,  $\mathbb{D}$  clearly satisfies  $\phi$ , and in the latter, by choosing the shortest such path  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  we find a substructure of  $\mathbb{D}$  that models  $\phi$ ; namely, the substructure with vertex set  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ . Therefore, if  $\mathbb{D} \not\vdash \vec{P}_3$ , then  $\mathbb{D} \notin \text{Her}(\neg\phi)$ .

The following is another example of a natural class of digraphs expressible in Her-FO that corresponds to the CSP of an infinite digraph. The *cover relation* of a strict poset  $(X, <)$  is the binary relation  $(x, y)$  where  $x < y$  and there is no  $z$  such that  $x < z < y$ . It is not hard to see that the class of finite digraphs that correspond to the cover relation of some strict poset is a CSP. It turns out that this class of digraphs is also in Her-FO.

**Example 4.** For  $n \geq 3$ , denote by  $\mathbb{A}_n$  the oriented cycle obtained from the directed cycle  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  by reversing the orientation of exactly one arc. We consider the CSP defined by homomorphically forbidding for every  $n \geq 3$  the oriented cycle  $\mathbb{A}_n$  and the directed cycle  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$ . Equivalently, a digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  belongs to this CSP if and only if it is the cover relation of a partially ordered set. Consider the sentence

$$\phi := \exists x, y \forall z \exists a. E(x, y) \wedge (E(z, a) \vee (z = x \wedge a \neq y \wedge E(x, a)) \vee (z = y)).$$

If  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  or  $\mathbb{A}_n$ , for some  $n \geq 3$ , homomorphically maps to  $\mathbb{D}$ , then  $\mathbb{D}$  contains a substructure satisfying  $\phi$ : if  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  homomorphically maps to  $\mathbb{D}$ , then in the image of the homomorphism, there is an edge  $(u, v)$  and every vertex  $z$  has an out-neighbour  $a$ . Otherwise, there is a homomorphism from  $\mathbb{A}_n$  to  $\mathbb{D}$ , and  $\mathbb{D}$  contains an edge  $(u, v)$  for which there is a directed  $uv$ -path  $u, u_1, \dots, u_k, v$  where  $k \geq 1$  (so  $u_1 \neq v$ ). Notice that the digraph induced by  $\{u, u_1, \dots, u_k, v\}$  in  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$ , where  $u$  and  $v$  are witnesses for  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively.

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . We will show that then there is a homomorphism from  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  or from  $\mathbb{A}_n$ , for  $n \geq 3$ , to  $\mathbb{D}$ . This implies the statement, because if some substructure of  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$ , there is a homomorphism from  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  or  $\mathbb{A}_n$  to this substructure, and hence in particular to  $\mathbb{D}$ . Observe that if  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$  there are  $u, v \in D$  such that  $(u, v)$  is an edge of  $\mathbb{D}$ , and  $u$  has an out-neighbour  $w_1 \neq v$ . Let  $u, w_1, \dots, w_k$  be the largest directed path starting in  $u$ . If  $w_k = v$ , it follows that there is a homomorphism from the oriented cycle  $\mathbb{A}_{k+1}$  to  $\mathbb{D}$ . Else,  $w_k \neq v$ , and since  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfies  $\phi$ ,  $w_k$  must have an out-neighbour  $a$  and  $a \in \{u, w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ . Hence, there is a homomorphism from  $\vec{\mathbb{C}}_n$  to  $\mathbb{D}$  (and we can choose  $n \geq 3$ ). Therefore, the CSP considered in this example is hereditarily defined by the sentence  $\neg\phi$ .

We conclude this first series of examples with an example of a CSP for a structure with two binary symbols; the expressibility in Her-FO might be surprising, because, as we will see shortly, a characterisation of unsatisfiable subinstances involves graph reachability, which is not expressible in first-order logic.

**Example 5.** Let  $\tau = \{N, EQ\}$  be the signature where  $N$  and  $EQ$  are two binary relational symbols which will encode “equal” and “not equal”. Note that a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{N}, =, \neq)$  if and only if it contains no loop  $N(x, x)$  and no *contradicting cycle*, i.e., vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  such that  $EQ(x_i, x_{i+1})$  for all  $i \in [n-1]$  and  $N(x_1, x_n)$ . Despite the fact that the existence of such a cycle is not a first-order property, the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{N}, =, \neq)$  is in Her-FO. For a positive integer  $k$  we write  $d_{EQ}(x) = k$  to denote the first-order formula stating “ $x$  has exactly  $k$  neighbours in the relation  $EQ$  (different from  $x$ )”, and  $d_{EQ}(x) \neq k$  for its negation. Now, consider the formula

$$\phi := \forall x, y \exists z (\neg N(x, y) \vee d_{EQ}(x) \neq 1 \vee d_{EQ}(y) \neq 1 \vee d_{EQ}(z) \neq 2).$$

If  $\mathbb{A}$  does not hereditarily model  $\phi$ , then there is a subset  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  such that  $N(a_1, a_n)$  and every  $a_i$  has degree exactly 2 in the relation  $EQ$  except for  $a_1$  and  $a_n$ , and so  $\mathbb{A}$  contains a contradicting cycle. Conversely, if  $\mathbb{A}$  has a contradicting cycle one can find a substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  that does not model  $\phi$ , namely, any shortest contradicting cycle. Therefore,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{N}, =, \neq)$  is hereditarily defined by the first-order sentence  $\phi \wedge \forall x \neg N(x, x)$ .

### 3.2 HerFO and Datalog

A simple example of a CSP which is solved by a Datalog program is  $\text{CSP}(K_2)$ . In Example 7 below we show that this class is not in Her-FO. Our next example shows that there are CSPs in Her-FO and in P, but not in Datalog.

**Example 6.** For any positive integer  $k$  consider a  $(k+1)$ -ary relation symbol  $R$ . The problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, \{(x, y_1, \dots, y_k) : x < \max\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}\})$  is in P, but not in Datalog [20]. Notice that the problem is in Her-FO: consider the formula

$$\exists x \forall y_1, \dots, y_k. \neg R(x, y_1, \dots, y_k).$$

**Corollary 3.2.** *The classes of CSPs in Datalog and in  $P \cap \text{Her-FO}$  are incomparable.*

### 3.3 CoNP-complete examples

We already mentioned that there are coNP-complete examples of problems in Her-FO. We now present a coNP-complete CSP in Her-FO; this example will also be important in the proof of Theorem 6.3 later. Contrary to the examples considered so far, we need some work to prove that it belongs to Her-FO; the whole subsection deals with the proof<sup>4</sup>. In Theorem 7.12 below, we propose another example of a coNP-complete CSP in Her-FO.

The *Henson set* is the set  $\mathcal{T}$  of tournaments  $\mathbb{T}_n$  defined for positive integer  $n \geq 6$  as follows. The vertex set of  $\mathbb{T}_n$  is  $[n]$  and it contains the edges

- $(1, n)$ ,
- $(i, i+1)$  for  $i \in [n-1]$ , and
- $(j, i)$  for  $j > i+1$  and  $(j, i) \neq (n, 1)$ .

The remarkable property of this family is that it forms an antichain with respect to the embeddability order. It is straightforward to observe that, for any fixed (possibly infinite) set of tournaments  $\mathcal{F}$  (such as  $\mathcal{T}$ ), the class of oriented graphs that do not embed any tournament from  $\mathcal{F}$  is of the form  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}})$  for some countably infinite structure  $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$  (we may even choose  $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$  to be homogeneous, i.e., every isomorphism between finite substructures of  $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$  can be extended to an automorphism). In the concrete situation of the class  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$  is an example of coNP-complete CSP (see, e.g., [14, Proposition 13.3.1]). Moreover, it was shown in [22] that this CSP is in monadic second order logic. We strengthen this result by showing that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$  is in Her-FO — and so, there is a monadic second order sentence with only one existentially quantified unary predicate describing it (Observation 1.1).

We prove that the Henson set is first-order definable. We use  $\text{Cyc}(x, y, z)$  as shorthand writing for

$$\neg E(x, x) \wedge \neg E(y, y) \wedge \neg E(z, z) \wedge E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z) \wedge E(z, x) \wedge \neg E(y, x) \wedge \neg E(z, y) \wedge \neg E(x, z),$$

i.e.,  $x, y, z$  is a directed 3-cycle. We will also use standard set-theoretic notation to simplify our writing, e.g., for variables  $x, y_1, \dots, y_m$  we write  $x \in \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$  instead of  $\bigvee_{i \in [m]} (x = y_i)$ , and similarly, we write  $|\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}| = k$  (resp.  $\leq k$ ) for the quantifier-free formula stating that the cardinality of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  is  $k$  (resp. at most  $k$ ). Consider the following first-order sentence.

$$\phi_{\mathcal{T}} := \exists x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3 \forall z, a, b, c, d, e, f \exists g_1, g_2. \text{Cyc}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \wedge \text{Cyc}(y_1, y_2, y_3) \quad (2)$$

$$\bigwedge z \in \{x_1, x_2, y_2, y_3\} \vee \text{Cyc}(y_3, z, x_1) \quad (3)$$

$$\bigwedge (z \in \{y_1, y_2\} \vee E(y_2, z)) \wedge (z \in \{x_2, x_3\} \vee E(z, x_2)) \quad (4)$$

$$\bigwedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, c) \wedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, d) \wedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, e) \Rightarrow (|\{c, d, e\}| \leq 2 \vee (x_1 = a \wedge y_3 = b)) \quad (5)$$

$$\bigwedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, c) \wedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, d) \wedge \text{Cyc}(b, c, e) \wedge \text{Cyc}(c, a, f) \Rightarrow (|\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}| \leq 5) \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge \text{Cyc}(a, b, c) \wedge \{x_1, y_3\} \not\subseteq \{a, b, c\} \Rightarrow & [(\text{Cyc}(a, b, g_1) \wedge \text{Cyc}(b, c, g_2)) \\ & \vee (\text{Cyc}(b, c, g_1) \wedge \text{Cyc}(c, a, g_2)) \vee (\text{Cyc}(c, a, g_1) \vee \text{Cyc}(a, b, g_2))] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

<sup>4</sup>We propose a shorter proof that this CSP is in Her-FO in Appendix D; here we present a slightly longer proof which proves a stronger statement (Theorem 3.5).

It is straightforward to translate  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  to plain English, we do so in the following remark. We also depict the first three lines (the conjuncts in (1), (2), and (3)) of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  in Figure 1.

*Remark 3.* A finite tournament  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfies  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  if and only if there are vertices  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  (witnesses for  $x_1, x_2, x_3$ ) and  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  (witnesses for  $y_1, y_2, y_3$ ) such that the following items hold (for the first three items also see Figure 1).

1.  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  and  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  are directed cycles in  $\mathbb{T}$ .
2.  $t_3, t, s_1$  is a directed cycle for every  $t \in T \setminus \{s_1, s_2, t_2, t_3\}$ .
3. There are edges  $(t_2, t)$  and  $(s, s_2)$  for every  $t \in T \setminus \{t_1, t_2\}$  and every  $s \in T \setminus \{s_2, s_3\}$ .
4. Every edge  $(s, t) \neq (s_1, t_3)$  belongs to at most 2 directed 3-cycles.
5. At most 2 edges of every directed 3-cycle belong to 2 different directed 3-cycles.
6. Every directed 3-cycle that does not contain the edge  $(s_1, t_3)$  contains exactly 2 edges that belong to 2 different directed 3-cycles.




Figure 1: A partial depiction of the first three lines of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  if  $z \notin \{x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ .


**Lemma 3.3.** *If a tournament  $\mathbb{T}$  belongs to the Henson set, then  $\mathbb{T} \models \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{T}_n$  be a tournament in the Henson set for a positive integer  $n \geq 6$ . Clearly, every directed cycle of  $\mathbb{T}_n$  must contain some edge  $(i, j)$  where  $i < j$ . It follows from the definition of  $\mathbb{T}_n$  that the only such edges are  $(1, n)$  and  $(i, i+1)$  for  $i \in [n-1]$ . Every directed cycle in  $\mathbb{T}_n$  is of the form  $n, i, 1$  for some  $i \in \{3, \dots, n-2\}$  or  $i-1, i, i+1$  for  $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$ . It thus follows that every edge other than  $(1, n)$  belongs to at most 2 different directed 3-cycles, and that at most two edges of every directed 3-cycle belongs to at most 2 different directed 3-cycles. Moreover, every 3-cycle not containing  $(1, n)$  has exactly two different edges belonging to two different directed cycles. Therefore, by evaluating  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3) \mapsto (1, 2, 3, n-2, n-1, n)$  we conclude that  $\mathbb{T}_n \models \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *A finite tournament  $\mathbb{T}$  belongs to the Henson set if and only if  $\mathbb{T} \models \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 3.3 that if  $\mathbb{T}$  is a tournament in the Henson set, then  $\mathbb{T} \models \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Suppose that a tournament  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfies  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Notice that  $\mathbb{T}$  must have at least six vertices. Let  $s_1, s_2, s_3, t_1, t_2, t_3 \in T$  be witnesses for the existentially quantified variables of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  showing that  $\mathbb{T} \models \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Let  $\mathbb{C}_0$  be the directed 3-cycle with vertex set  $s_1, s_2, s_3$ , let  $v_1$  be a vertex such that  $\text{Cyc}(s_2, s_3, v_1)$  (such a vertex exists because  $(s_1, s_2)$  only belongs to  $\mathbb{C}_0$ , and  $\mathbb{C}_0$  must contain two edges that belong to two different triangles). Let  $\mathbb{C}_1$  be the directed 3-cycle with vertex set  $s_2, s_3, v_1$ . For  $n \geq 2$ , if there is a directed 3-cycle  $\mathbb{C}$  different from  $\mathbb{C}_{n-2}$  and having a common edge with  $\mathbb{C}_{n-1}$ , let  $\mathbb{C}_n = \mathbb{C}$ ; otherwise, let  $\mathbb{C}_n = \mathbb{C}_{n-1}$ . Notice that if  $t_3 \notin \mathbb{C}_{n-1}$ , then  $\mathbb{C}_n \neq \mathbb{C}_{n-1}$  (this follows from line (6) of definition of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ , equiv. from the sixth item of Remark 3). If there is some integer  $n$  such that  $t_3 \in \mathbb{C}_n$ , let  $M$  be the minimum such that  $t_3 \in \mathbb{C}_M$  otherwise, let  $M = \omega$ . So, for every  $n \leq M$  there is exactly one vertex  $v_n \in \mathbb{C}_n \setminus \mathbb{C}_{n-1}$ . We prove that  $\mathbb{C}_{n+1} = \{v_{n-1}, v_n, v_{n+1}\}$  for  $2 \leq n < M$ . Proceeding by contradiction, let  $N+1$  be a minimum counterexample. It follows by finite induction that for

$n \leq N$  the directed cycle  $\mathbb{C}_n$  has vertex set  $\{v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}, v_n\}$  and edges  $(v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}), (v_{n-1}, v_n), (v_n, v_{n-2})$  — it can be convenient to have the following picture in mind.



Since  $E(v_N, s_2)$  holds (by the second line of the definition of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ ) and every edge other than  $(s_1, t_3)$  belongs to at most 2 triangles, it follows by finite induction that  $E(v_N, v_{N-3})$ . With similar arguments we see that  $E(v_{N+1}, s_2)$  and  $E(v_{N+1}, v_{N-3})$ . The latter implies that the edge  $(v_{N-3}, v_{N-2})$  belongs to three different directed triangles, contradicting the fact that  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfies  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . To conclude the proof let  $m$  be the minimum integer such that  $v_n \in \{s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ . If  $m = 1$ , then  $v_1 \in \{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ , and since  $E(s_3, t_1)$  it follows that  $v_1 = t_1$ , so  $\{s_1, s_2, s_3, t_1, t_2, t_3\}$  induces a Henson tournament on 6 vertices. Otherwise, if  $m > 1$ , it follows similarly as before that  $E(v_m, s_1)$ ,  $E(v_m, s_2)$ ,  $E(v_m, s_3)$  and  $E(v_m, v_i)$  for  $i < m - 1$ . In particular,  $v_m \notin \{s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, t_3\}$ , and since  $E(t_3, v_m)$  then  $v_m \neq t_2$ , and thus  $v_m = t_1$ . Again, it is straightforward to observe that  $\mathbb{T}[\{s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, t_1, t_2, t_3\}]$  induces a tournament of the Henson set. Finally, we show that  $T = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ . On the contrary, suppose that there is some  $t \in T \setminus \{s_1, s_2, s_3, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ . By the second line of the definition of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  there are edges  $(t, s_1)$  and  $(t_3, t)$ . Let  $v$  be the maximum vertex with respect to the ordering  $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq v_1 \leq \dots \leq t_3$  such that  $E(t, v)$ . Hence, if  $u$  is the successor of  $v$  (according to the previous linear ordering), then  $\text{Cyc}(v, u, t)$ , and thus the edge  $E(v, u)$  belongs to three different directed triangles, contradicting the definition of  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{T}$  is a tournament in the Henson set.  $\square$

The following theorem is a direct consequence of the previous lemma, because the class of tournaments is universally definable.

**Theorem 3.5.** *The Henson set is first-order definable.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi$  be any universal formula that axiomatizes the class of tournaments. Then,  $\varphi \wedge \phi_{\mathcal{T}}$  axiomatizes the Henson set (Lemma 3.4).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *If  $\mathcal{T}$  is the Henson set, then the class of  $\mathcal{T}$ -free oriented graphs is a coNP-complete CSP in Her-FO.*

### 3.4 Inexpressible examples

We conclude this section by considering some simple examples of CSPs that do not belong to Her-FO. To begin with, we propose the following simple characterization of Her-FO. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a hereditary class of finite  $\tau$ -structures. A *minimal obstruction* of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \notin \mathcal{C}$  but every proper substructure  $\mathbb{A}'$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a hereditary class of finite  $\tau$ -structures, and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the class of minimal obstructions of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is hereditarily first-order definable if and only if there is a first-order sentence  $\psi$  such that*

- if  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\mathbb{F} \models \psi$ , and
- if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a finite  $\tau$ -structure such that  $\mathbb{A} \models \psi$ , then there is an embedding  $\mathbb{F} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}$  for some  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Her}(\phi)$  for some first-order formula  $\phi$ . We claim that  $\psi := \neg\phi$  satisfies both itemized statements. Firstly, note that if  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\mathbb{F} \notin \text{Her}(\phi)$ , so some substructure of  $\mathbb{F}$  does not satisfy  $\phi$ . Moreover, all substructures of  $\mathbb{F}$  belong to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ , so we have that  $\mathbb{F}$  itself does not satisfy  $\phi$ , and hence satisfies  $\psi$ . If  $\mathbb{A}$  is a finite  $\tau$ -structure such that  $\mathbb{A} \models \psi$ , then  $\mathbb{A} \notin \mathcal{C}$ , and hence there exists  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$  which embeds into  $\mathbb{A}$ . This shows the forward implication of the statement. Conversely, if there exists a formula  $\psi$  that satisfies both items of the statement, then it is similarly straightforward to show that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Her}(\neg\psi)$ .  $\square$

We use this simple lemma to argue that the class of bipartite graphs is not hereditarily first-order definable. If  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{A}'$  are  $\tau$ -structures, we write  $\mathbb{A} \equiv_k \mathbb{A}'$  if  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{A}'$  satisfy the same first-order sentences with at most  $k$  variables.

**Example 7** (Bipartite graphs not in Her-FO). It is well known that the minimal obstructions of the class of bipartite graphs are all odd symmetric cycles and the non-symmetric edge. For every positive integer  $k$ , there is a large enough odd cycle  $\mathbb{C}$  and a large enough even cycle  $\mathbb{C}'$  such that  $\mathbb{C} \equiv_k \mathbb{C}'$  (this can be shown by an Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé argument; see, e.g., [32]). Hence, we conclude via Lemma 3.7 that the class of bipartite graphs is not in Her-FO. Moreover, note that  $\text{CSP}(K_2)$  is the class of bipartite digraphs. So it also follows from the existence of such cycles  $\mathbb{C} \equiv_k \mathbb{C}'$  and Lemma 3.7 that  $\text{CSP}(K_2)$  is not in Her-FO.


### 3.5 HerFO and primitive positive definitions

*Primitive positive definitions* are one of the central concepts of the theory on constraint satisfaction problems. A relation  $R \subseteq A^k$  is *primitive positive definable* in a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  if there is an existential formula  $\phi(\bar{x})$  whose quantifier-free part is a conjunction of positive atoms such that a  $k$ -tuple  $\bar{a}$  belongs to  $R$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \models \phi(\bar{a})$ . In particular, the equality on  $A$  relation is primitively positively definable in every structure  $\mathbb{A}$ . The following example shows that CSPs in Her-FO are not preserved by primitive positive definitions, specifically,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$  is in Her-FO (Example 2) but  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <, =)$  is not.

**Example 8.** The problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <, =)$  is not hereditarily definable. Consider the family of structures  $\mathbb{C}_n$  and  $\mathbb{D}_n$  illustrated below (where undirected blue edges represent the (symmetric) binary relation  $=$ , and directed black edges represent the binary relation  $<$ ). It is not hard to see that for every positive integer  $n$ ,

- $\mathbb{C}_n$  is a minimal obstruction of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <, =)$ , and
- $\mathbb{D}_n \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <, =)$ .

But again, for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  one can choose  $n, m$  appropriately so that  $\mathbb{C}_n \equiv_k \mathbb{D}_m$ .



## 4 Extensional ESO

In this section we introduce *extensional ESO* and its fragment *extensional SNP*. The main result is that complements of extensional ESO problems and problems in Her-FO have the same computational power up to polynomial-time equivalence. In particular, for every extensional ESO sentence  $\Psi$ , there is a polynomial-time equivalent extensional monadic ESO sentence  $\Phi$  (with a unique existentially quantified symbol).

An ESO  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Psi$  is called *extensional* if for every existentially quantified predicate  $R$  there is a distinct symbol  $R' \in \tau$  of the same arity such that  $\Psi$  contains a conjunct  $\forall \bar{x}. R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ , and  $R'$  does not appear anywhere else in  $\Psi$ . In this case we say that  $R$  *extends*  $R'$ . We begin by illustrating extensional ESO with the following class of problems.

## 4.1 Extension problems and extensional ESO

Given a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\tau$ -structures, the *extension problem* for  $\mathcal{C}$  is the following decision problem. On a given input  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , the task is to decide if there is a structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$  on the same domain as  $\mathbb{A}$  such that for each  $R \in \tau$  the interpretation of  $R$  in  $\mathbb{B}$  *extends* the interpretation of  $R$  in  $\mathbb{A}$ , i.e.,  $A = B$  and  $R^{\mathbb{A}} \subseteq R^{\mathbb{B}}$  for every  $R \in \tau$ .

**Example 9.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the class of linear orders. In this case, the extension problem for  $\mathcal{C}$  is the same problem as deciding if an input binary structure  $\mathbb{A}$  (on the same signature as  $\mathcal{C}$ ) is a partial order. Equivalently, the extension problem for  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ .

Notice that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is first-order definable, then the extension problem for  $\mathcal{C}$  is in extensional ESO: let  $\phi$  be obtained from a first-order formula defining  $\mathcal{C}$  by replacing every symbol  $R$  for  $R^*$ , so the extension problem for  $\mathcal{C}$  is described by the following extensional ESO  $\tau$ -sentence

$$\exists_{R \in \tau} R^* \left( \phi \wedge \bigwedge_{R \in \tau} \forall \bar{x} (R(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R^*(\bar{x})) \right).$$

**Example 10.** Let  $E$  and  $E'$  be binary relational symbols. For every positive integer  $n$ , denote by  $\phi_n$  the universal  $\{E\}$ -formula stating that  $(V; E)$  is a loopless symmetric graph with no induced  $K_1 + K_2$  and no  $K_{n+1}$ . Hence,  $(V; E) \models \phi_n$  if and only if  $(V; E)$  is a complete  $n$ -partite graph, i.e., there is partition  $P$  of  $V$  with at most  $n$  parts such that there is an edge  $uv \in E$  if and only if  $u$  and  $v$  lie in different parts of  $P$ . Now, consider the uniform SNP  $\{E'\}$ -sentence

$$\Phi := \exists E \left( \phi_n \wedge \forall x, y (E'(x, y) \Rightarrow E(x, y)) \right)$$

Then a digraph  $(V; E')$  satisfies  $\Phi$  if and only if there is an edge set  $E \supseteq E'$  such that  $(V; E)$  is a complete  $n$ -partite graph. It thus follows that  $(V; E') \models \Phi$  if and only if  $(V; E') \in \text{CSP}(K_n)$ .

## 4.2 CSPs and Surjective CSPs

Lemma 4.1 below implies that extensional ESO can express  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  for every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$ ; this will later be strengthened in Corollary 5.6. Another family of examples expressible in extensional ESO are surjective CSPs. The *surjective CSP* of a finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , denoted by  $\text{SCSP}(\mathbb{B})$ , is the class of all finite structures  $\mathbb{A}$  that has a surjective homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$ . There are many partial results on how the computational complexity of  $\text{SCSP}(\mathbb{B})$  depends on  $\mathbb{B}$ , but no P versus NP-complete dichotomy is known [21, 52]. In the following lemma we show that  $\text{SCSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is for every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  expressible in extensional ESO.

**Lemma 4.1.** *For every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  there is an extensional ESO sentence  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  such that the following statements hold for every finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$ .*

- $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ .
- $\mathbb{A} \models \Psi$  if and only if there is a surjective homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ .

*Proof.* A homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  is called *full* if  $f$  preserves  $R$  and preserves  $\neg R$  for every  $R \in \tau$ . It was proved in [3, Theorem 3.3] that for every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  the class  $\mathcal{B}$  of finite structures that admit a full homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$  is finitely bounded. Hence, there is a universal sentence  $\phi_{\mathbb{B}}$  such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi_{\mathbb{B}}$  if and only if there is a full homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  (Observation 2.1). Observe that a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  admits a surjective full homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$  if and only if there is a full homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{A}$ . Recall that  $\mathbb{A} \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{B}}(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{A}$ . Therefore, the class of structure that admit a surjective full homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$  is defined by the sentence

$$\phi_{\mathbb{B}} \wedge \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{B}}(\bar{x}).$$

Finally, it is straightforward to observe that the (surjective) CSP for  $\mathbb{B}$  is the same problem as the extension problem for the class of structures that admit a (surjective) full homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$ . Since these classes are in first-order logic, it follows with similar arguments as in the previous subsection that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  and  $\text{SCSP}(\mathbb{B})$  are in extensional ESO.  $\square$

### 4.3 Extensional ESO captures HerFO

Recall that Observation 1.1 asserts that hereditary model checking problems are captured by universal monadic second-order logic. Hence, every problem in Her-FO is the complement of a problem described by a monadic ESO sentence. Every problem in Her-FO is polynomial-time equivalent to the complement of a problem described by monadic extensional ESO. This follows from a fact that also implies Observation 1.1, namely, the following observation.

**Observation 4.2.** *Consider a first-order  $\tau$ -formula  $\phi := Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n.\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . If  $\psi(x)$  is a first-order  $\tau$ -formula, then there is a  $\tau$ -formula  $\phi_\psi$  such that a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi_\psi$  if and only if the substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $\{a \in A : \mathbb{A} \models \psi(a)\}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . Namely,*

$$\phi_\psi := Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n \left( \bigwedge_{i \in U} \psi(x_i) \implies \bigwedge_{i \in E} \psi(x_i) \wedge \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right),$$

where  $U$  (respectively,  $E$ ) is the set of indices  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $Q_i$  is a universal (respectively, existential) quantifier.

We will use the formula  $\phi_\psi$  from Observation 4.2 in the following lemma and in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Consider a first-order  $\tau$ -formula  $\phi := Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n.\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Then,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  and the complement of the problem described by the monadic extensional  $(\tau \cup \{S\})$ -sentence  $\Psi$  are log-space equivalent, where*

$$\Psi := \exists \bar{S}. Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n \forall y. S(y) \implies \bar{S}(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in E} \neg \bar{S}(x_i) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i \in U} \neg \bar{S}(x_i) \implies \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right).$$

*Proof.* First notice that if an expansion  $\mathbb{A}' := (\mathbb{A}, \bar{S})$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\Phi$  and  $\psi(x) := \neg \bar{S}(x)$ , then  $(\mathbb{A}, \bar{S}) \models \phi_\psi$  (see Observation 4.2 for the definition of  $\phi_\psi$ ). Moreover,  $(\mathbb{A}, \bar{S})$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\Phi$  if and only if  $S^{\mathbb{A}} \subseteq \bar{S}^{\mathbb{A}'}$ ,  $A \not\subseteq \bar{S}^{\mathbb{A}'}$ , and  $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi_\psi$ . Hence, the log-space reduction from  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  to  $\neg \Psi$  is straightforward: every  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  is a  $(\tau \cup \{S\})$ -structure, and it thus follows via Observation 4.2 and the definition of  $\phi_\psi$  that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg \Psi$  if and only if every non-empty substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$ , i.e., if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ . The converse reduction follows with similar arguments. Indeed, if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a  $(\tau \cup \{S\})$ -structure, then  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg \Psi$  if and only if  $S^{\mathbb{A}} \neq A$  and the substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A \setminus S^{\mathbb{A}}$  models  $\neg \Psi$ . Similarly as above,  $\mathbb{B} \models \neg \Psi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ . Clearly,  $\mathbb{B}$  can be computed from  $\mathbb{A}$  in polynomial-time, and thus  $\neg \Psi$  reduces in polynomial time (and in logarithmic space) to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.4.** *For every first-order formula  $\phi$ , there is an extensional monadic ESO sentence  $\Psi$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  and the problem described by  $\neg \Psi$  are log-space equivalent.*

### 4.4 HerFO captures extensional ESO

Now we see that for every problem in extensional ESO, there is a polynomial-time equivalent problem in Her-FO. That is, for every extensional ESO  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Psi$  we propose a first-order  $\sigma$ -formula  $\phi$  such that  $\neg \Psi$  is polynomial-time equivalent to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ . First note that  $\neg \Psi$  can be viewed as a universal second-order sentence. The idea for one reduction is that given a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , we construct a  $\sigma$ -structure  $\mathbb{B}$  such that every expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  is encoded by some substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$ , and every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  either encodes an expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$ , or it trivially satisfies  $\phi$ . We illustrate a construction of  $\mathbb{B}$  in Figure 2. Naturally, we will define  $\phi$  in such a way that a substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  encoding an expansion  $\mathbb{A}'$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}'$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\neg \Psi$ . Hence, we obtain a polynomial-time reduction from  $\neg \Psi$  to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ . For the remaining reduction we need to know how to handle  $\sigma$ -structures that are not in the image of the previous construction. This will also be taken care of by  $\phi$ : we will include some clauses in  $\phi$  that will allow us to find a substructure  $\mathbb{B}_1$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  such that  $\mathbb{B}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_1$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ , and  $\mathbb{B}_1$  is constructed (as before) from some  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ . This will yield a polynomial-time reduction from  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  to  $\neg \Psi$ .




Figure 2: Let  $R$  be a binary and  $U'$  be a unary relation symbol. Consider an extensional ESO  $\{R, U'\}$ -formula  $\Phi$  of the form  $\exists U \forall x ((U'(x) \Rightarrow U(x)) \wedge \phi)$  where  $\phi$  is a first-order  $\{R, U\}$ -formula. On the left, we depict an  $\{R, U'\}$ -structure where the interpretation of  $U'$  is indicated by black vertices, and the interpretation of  $R$  is indicated by undirected edges. On the right, we depict the structure  $\mathbb{B}$  with signature  $\{R, D, E, <, S_U\}$ , where  $D^{\mathbb{B}}$  is indicated by the vertices inside the rectangle,  $E^{\mathbb{B}}$  is indicated by bended dashed directed edges,  $<^{\mathbb{B}}$  is the strict left-to-right linear order on  $A \times \{0\}$ , and the interpretation of  $S_U$  is indicated by straight dotted arcs. Notice that every substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  either does not contain a directed  $E$ -cycle, or it encodes an expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  by a unary predicate  $U$  where  $U(x)$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}' \models \neg \exists y. S_U(x, y)$ . Moreover, this expansion satisfies the clause  $\forall x (U'(x) \Rightarrow U(x))$ . We use these facts in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

**Theorem 4.5.** *For every sentence  $\Psi$  in extensional ESO there exists a first-order formula  $\phi$  such that the problem described by  $\neg \Psi$  is log-space equivalent to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be the input signature of  $\Psi$ . We may assume that  $\Psi$  is of the form

$$\exists R_1, \dots, R_n Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_m x_m. \psi$$

for some quantifier-free prefix  $Q = (Q_1 \dots Q_m)$  and quantifier-free formula  $\psi$  in conjunctive normal form. For each  $i \in [n]$  let  $R'_i$  be an  $r_i$ -ary predicate in  $\tau$  such that  $\psi$  contains the clause  $R'_i(y_1, \dots, y_{r_i}) \Rightarrow R_i(y_1, \dots, y_{r_i})$  where each  $y_i$  is a universally quantified variable, and the symbol  $R'$  does not appear in any other clause of  $\psi$ . We denote by  $\tau'$  the subset of  $\tau$  consisting of  $R'_i$  for every  $i \in [n]$ .

We first consider the trivial cases where either all finite structures satisfy  $\Psi$ , or no finite structure satisfies  $\Psi$ . In the former case, we may pick  $\phi$  to be the formula that is always false, and in the latter, we pick the formula that is always true. Then we have a trivial reduction from  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  to  $\neg \Psi$  and vice versa.

Let  $\rho$  be the signature that contains  $\tau$ , a unary symbol  $D$ , two binary symbols  $E$  and  $<$ , and for each  $i \in [n]$  a symbol  $S_i$  of arity  $r_i + 1$  (as we will see below, these symbols  $S_i$  will encode the existentially quantified symbol  $R_i$ ). Let  $\phi$  be the formula  $(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \wedge \phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$  defined as follows.

1. We define  $\phi_1$  as follows: first, let  $\chi := \neg(Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_m x_m. \psi)$  and  $\delta(x) := D(x)$ ; secondly, let  $\chi' := \chi \delta$  (see Observation 4.2); finally, let  $\phi_1$  be the formula obtained from  $\chi'$  by replacing occurrences of  $R_i(y_1, \dots, y_r)$  by  $\forall z. \neg S_i(y_1, \dots, y_r, z)$ . It will also be convenient to denote by  $\phi'_1(x_1, \dots, x_m)$  the formula where the bounded variables  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  are now free variables (but the universally quantified variables  $z$  remain bounded).
2. Let  $\phi_2$  be the formula stating that there is some  $y$  such that for all  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  the formulas  $\neg E(x_1, y)$  and  $\neg S_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}, y)$  hold for all  $i \in [n]$ .
3. Let  $\phi_3$  be the formula that asserts that if  $S_i(\bar{x}, y)$  holds, then  $y$  does not appear in any other tuple of the structure.
4. Let  $\phi_4$  be the formula stating that if  $E(x, y)$  holds, then  $D(x)$  and  $D(y)$  hold.
5. Let  $\phi_5$  be the formula stating that the in-degree and out-degree of every vertex with respect to the relation  $E$  is at most 1.



6. Let  $\phi_6$  be the formula stating that  $<$  is a strict linear order on the subset  $D$  such that there is at most one edge (of  $E$ ) going backwards with respect to  $<$ , i.e.,

$$\forall x, y, z, w \in D. (x < y \wedge z < w \wedge E(y, x) \wedge E(w, z)) \Rightarrow (x = z \wedge y = w).$$

We claim that  $\neg\Psi$  and  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  are polynomial-time equivalent.

For the polynomial-time reduction from  $\neg\Psi$  to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  consider a finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A = \{a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1}\}$ . We first construct an auxiliary structure  $\mathbb{F}$  with domain

$$A \times \{0\} \cup A^{\tau_1} \times \{1\} \cup \dots \cup A^{\tau_n} \times \{n\}$$

such that

- the map  $a \mapsto (a, 0)$  is an isomorphism between  $\mathbb{A}$  and the  $(\tau \setminus \tau')$ -reduct of the substructure of  $\mathbb{F}$  with domain  $A \times \{0\}$ ,
- $D(x)$  holds for every  $x \in A \times \{0\}$ ,
- $E((a_{i-1}, 0), (a_i, 0))$  holds for every  $i \in [\ell]$  (where indices are modulo  $\ell$ ),
- $(a_i, 0) < (a_j, 0)$  if and only if  $i < j$ , for every  $i, j \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ ,
- $S_i((a_{j_1}, 0), \dots, (a_{j_{r_i}}, 0), (a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_{r_i}}, i))$  holds for all  $i \in [n]$  and all  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_{r_i}} \in A$ , and
- no other relations hold in  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Now, we consider the substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{F}$  with domain

$$B := \{(a, 0) \mid a \in A\} \cup \{(\bar{a}, i) \mid \mathbb{A} \models \neg R'_i(\bar{a})\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathbb{B}$  can be computed from  $\mathbb{A}$  in polynomial time and logarithmic space — we provide an illustration of this construction in Figure 2. We have to argue that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only if all substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfy  $\phi$ . Note that  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_3, \phi_4, \phi_5$ , and  $\phi_6$  by construction. Since  $\phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$  is a universal sentence, all substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfy  $\phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$ . Now, suppose that a substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  does not contain  $(a_i, 0)$  for some  $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ . First consider the case that  $(a_j, 0) \in B'$  for some  $j \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{B}'$  satisfies  $\phi_2$ , because the vertex  $(a_k, 0)$  where  $k$  is the first index  $i'$  from  $i, i + 1, \dots, j$  (where indices are modulo  $\ell$ ) such that  $(a_{i'}, 0)$  belongs to the domain of  $\mathbb{B}'$  provides a witness for the existentially quantified variable  $y$  in  $\phi_2$  (the conjuncts  $\neg S_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}, y)$  are satisfied by  $(a_k, 0)$  because no element from  $A \times \{0\}$  is the last coordinate of some tuple in  $S_i^{\mathbb{B}}$ ). If  $B' \cap (A \times \{0\}) = \emptyset$ , then any element  $b \in B'$  is a witness for the existentially quantified variable  $y$  in  $\phi_2$ . This proves that if  $A \times \{0\} \not\subseteq B'$ , then  $\mathbb{B}'$  satisfies  $\phi_2$ . Conversely, if  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$ , then  $\mathbb{B}'$  does not satisfy  $\phi_2$ . Therefore, we have to argue that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only if all substructures  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  with  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$  satisfy  $\phi_1$ .

To see this, consider the following mapping  $e$  from substructures  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  with  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$  to expansions of  $\mathbb{A}$ . For such a  $\mathbb{B}'$ , let  $\mathbb{C} := e(\mathbb{B}')$  be the expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  where  $R'_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i})$  holds if  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}, i) \notin B'$ , equivalently, if  $\neg S_i((x_1, 0), \dots, (x_{r_i}, 0), y)$  holds in  $\mathbb{B}'$  for all  $y \in B'$ . It is straightforward to verify that  $e$  is injective. Since  $\mathbb{B}'$  is a substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$ , then  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfies the clause  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$  for every  $R \in \tau$ . Moreover, the image of  $e$  is exactly the set of expansions of  $\mathbb{A}$  that satisfy  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$  for every  $R \in \tau$ . Hence, we regard  $e$  as a bijection between substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$  containing  $A \times \{0\}$  and the expansions of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfying  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$  for every  $R \in \tau$ .

It follows from the definition of  $\phi_1$  and of  $\mathbb{C}$  that for every  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_m} \in A$

$$\mathbb{C} \models \neg\psi(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_m}) \text{ if and only if } \mathbb{B}' \models \phi'_1((a_{j_1}, 0), \dots, (a_{j_m}, 0)).$$

Then, since  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$ , it follows that  $\mathbb{B}' \models \phi_1$  if and only if  $\mathbb{C} \models \neg(Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_m x_m \cdot \psi)$ . Therefore, if  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  and  $\mathbb{B}'$  is a substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  with  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$ , then  $\mathbb{C} \models \neg(Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_m x_m \cdot \psi)$  and thus  $\mathbb{B}' \models \neg\phi_1$ . This implies that if  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$ , then  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ . Conversely, suppose  $\mathbb{A} \models \Psi$ , and let  $\mathbb{C}$  be an  $\{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$ -expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\mathbb{C} \models Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_m x_m \cdot \psi$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfies  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ . Hence, there is a substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  such that  $e(\mathbb{B}') = \mathbb{C}$ . By the previous arguments we conclude that  $\mathbb{B}' \models \neg\phi_1$ , and since  $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$ , we see that  $\mathbb{B}' \models \neg\phi_2$ , and so  $\mathbb{B}' \models \neg\phi$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only

if  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ , and since  $\mathbb{B}$  can be constructed in logarithmic space from  $\mathbb{A}$ , we have a log-space reduction from  $\neg\Psi$  to  $\text{Her}(\phi)$ .

We now present a log-space reduction from  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  to  $\neg\Psi$ . Recall that there are structures  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathbb{D} \models \Psi$  and  $\mathbb{F} \models \neg\Psi$  — we fix  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  for this reduction. Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be a finite  $\rho$ -structure. If  $\mathbb{B}$  does not satisfy  $\phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$ , then the reduction returns  $\mathbb{D}$ . Otherwise, let  $X \subseteq B$  be the set of elements  $x$  for which there is no  $\bar{w}$  such that  $S_i(\bar{w}, x)$  holds for some  $i \in [n]$ . In particular, for every element  $b$  in  $B \setminus X$ , there is some tuple  $\bar{w}$  such that  $\mathbb{B} \models S_i(\bar{w}, b)$  for some  $i \in [n]$ , and since  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_3$ , it follows that every element of  $\mathbb{B}$  that belongs to some tuple of  $E$  belongs to  $X$ . Also, since  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_5$ , the  $\{E\}$ -reduct of the substructure  $\mathbb{X}$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  with domain  $X$  is a disjoint union of directed paths and directed cycles. Similarly as above, one can note that if there is no directed cycle, then all substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfy  $\phi_2$ , and hence  $\mathbb{B}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ . In this case, the reduction returns the fixed  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{F}$  that does not model  $\Psi$ . Otherwise, let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be the subsets of  $X$  inducing a directed cycle in the  $\{E\}$ -reduct of  $\mathbb{X}$ . We claim that  $k = 1$ . First note that if  $x \in X_i$  for some  $i \in [k]$ , then  $\mathbb{B} \models D(x)$ , because  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_4$ . Hence, the union  $\bigcup_{i \in [k]} X_i \subseteq D$  is linearly ordered by  $<$ , because  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_6$ . Moreover,  $\phi_6$  also guarantees that there is at most one edge going backwards, i.e., an edge  $(y, x) \in E$  such that  $x < y$ . Clearly, for every linearly ordered directed cycle  $X_i$  there is at least one edge going backwards, and so  $k = 1$ . We construct a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $X_1$  as follows.

- We start from the substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  with domain  $X_1$ .
- For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , add  $(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i})$  to the relation  $R'_i$  whenever there is no  $y \in B$  such that  $S_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}, y)$ .
- Finally,  $\mathbb{A}$  is the  $\tau$ -reduct of the resulting structure.

Clearly,  $\mathbb{A}$  can be computed from  $\mathbb{B}$  in logarithmic space. Now, we argue that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only if every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi$ . Since  $\mathbb{B} \models \phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$  and  $\phi_3 \wedge \phi_4 \wedge \phi_5 \wedge \phi_6$  is a universal sentence, we have to argue that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only if every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_1 \vee \phi_2$ . Similarly as above, notice that a substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi_2$  if and only if  $B' \cap X$  is not  $X_1$ .

Let  $\mathbb{B}_1$  be the substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  with vertex set  $(B \setminus X) \cup X_1$ . As explained above,  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$  if and only if all substructures  $\mathbb{B}'_1$  of  $\mathbb{B}_1$  with  $X_1 \subseteq B'_1$  satisfy  $\phi_1$ . Similarly as above, we define a mapping  $e$  from substructures of  $\mathbb{B}_1$  containing  $X_1$  to expansions of  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfying  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ . In this case,  $e(\mathbb{B}'_1)$  is the expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  where  $R_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i})$  holds whenever there is no  $y \in B'_1$  such that  $S_i(x_1, \dots, x_{r_i}, y)$ . Notice that in this case, the mapping  $e$  is surjective but need not be injective. However, it follows with similar arguments as before that  $\mathbb{B}'_1 \models \phi_1$  if and only if  $e(\mathbb{B}'_1) \models \neg(Q_1x_1 \dots Q_mx_m.\psi)$ . We thus conclude (via the mapping  $e$ ) that  $\mathbb{B}_1$  contains a structure that does not model  $\phi_1$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  has an expansion that satisfies  $Q_1x_1 \dots Q_mx_m.\psi$ . It now follows that  $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\psi)$ . Thus,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  reduces in logarithmic space to  $\neg\Psi$ .  $\square$

## 4.5 The expressive power of ESO and Her-FO

Putting together the results of this section we prove our first main result.

**Theorem 4.6.** *The following classes have the same computational power up to log-space equivalence, i.e., for every problem  $P$  in any of the following classes, there exists a log-space equivalent problem in each of the other ones.*

- *Monadic extensional ESO,*
- *extensional ESO, and*
- *complements of problems in Her-FO.*

*Proof.* This statement is an immediate consequence of the fact that monadic extensional ESO is a fragment of extensional ESO, of Corollary 4.4, and of Theorem 4.5.  $\square$

## 4.6 A remark concerning the definition of extensional ESO

Before moving onward, we point out that if we remove the condition “and  $R'$  does not appear anywhere else in  $\Psi$ ” in the definition of extensional ESO, we obtain essentially the same logic as ESO.

**Observation 4.7.** *For every ESO  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$ , there are a signature  $\tau^* \supseteq \tau$  and an ESO  $\tau^*$ -sentence  $\Psi$  such that*

- *a  $\tau^*$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Psi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a  $\tau$ -structure and  $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$ ,*
- *if  $\Phi$  is monotone (resp. in SNP), then  $\Psi$  is monotone (resp. in SNP), and*
- *for every existentially quantified symbol  $R$  of  $\Psi$ , there is a distinct symbol  $R' \in \tau^*$  such that  $\Psi$  contains the clause  $\forall \bar{x}. R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi$  be the first-order part of  $\Phi$ ; we assume  $\phi$  is in conjunctive normal form. We first consider the case where  $\Phi$  holds on every finite  $\tau$ -structure. In this case, let  $\psi$  be the first-order  $\tau$ -sentence obtained from  $\phi$  by removing all clauses that contain an existentially quantified symbol from  $\Phi$ . Since  $\Phi$  holds on all finite  $\tau$ -structures,  $\psi$  does as well. Hence,  $\Phi$  and  $\psi$  are equivalent on finite structures. Moreover, if  $\Phi$  is monotone (resp. universal) then so is  $\psi$ , and  $\psi$  satisfies the third itemized statement because  $\psi$  has no quantified symbols.

Let  $\sigma$  be the set of existentially quantified symbols in  $\Phi$ . Consider the relational signature  $\tau^*$  that contains  $\tau$  and additionally a symbol  $R'$  of arity  $r$  for every  $R \in \sigma$  of arity  $r$ . Let  $m$  be the maximum arity of the quantified symbols of  $\Phi$ , and define  $\psi$  as

$$\psi := \phi \wedge \forall x_1, \dots, x_m \left( \bigwedge_{R \in \sigma} \neg R'(x_1, \dots, x_r) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{R \in \sigma} R'(x_1, \dots, x_r) \Rightarrow R(x_1, \dots, x_r) \right) \right).$$

Note that this formula can be simplified; the purpose of writing it in the given redundant form is to make sure that the formula  $\Psi$  that we define next meets the syntactic requirements from the observation. We now define  $\Psi$  as the ESO  $\tau^*$ -formula obtained from  $\Phi$  by replacing  $\phi$  by  $\psi$ . Since  $\tau \subseteq \tau^*$ , every  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  is a  $\tau^*$ -structure. It is also straightforward to observe that  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$  if and only if it satisfies  $\Psi$ . Hence, the forward implication of the first itemized statement holds for  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$ . To see that the converse also holds consider a  $\tau^*$ -structure  $\mathbb{B}$ . Notice that if the interpretation of  $R'$  in  $\mathbb{B}$  is not empty for some  $R \in \sigma$ , then  $\mathbb{B} \not\models \Psi$ . Otherwise,  $\mathbb{B}$  is a  $\tau$ -structure, and it follows from the definition of  $\Psi$  that  $\mathbb{B} \models \Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B} \models \Psi$ . We thus conclude that the first itemized statement holds for  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$ . The second and third itemized statement hold by the definition of  $\Psi$ .  $\square$

## 5 Monotone extensional SNP

Naturally, *extensional SNP* is the fragment of extensional ESO sentences whose first-order part is universal. Equivalently, an SNP sentence  $\Psi$  with first-order part  $\psi$  in conjunctive normal form is extensional if and only if for every existentially quantified symbol  $R$  there is a distinct symbol  $R' \in R$  such that  $\psi$  contains the clause  $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ , and  $R'$  does not appear in any other clause of  $\psi$ .

In this paper we introduced constraint satisfaction problem by means of homomorphisms, but CSPs can be equivalently described from different perspectives (see, e.g., [13, Chapter 1]). One of these being the *satisfiability perspective*: here, the template is described by a first-order formula  $\phi$  (and more generally a theory  $T$ ), the instance is an existential positive formula  $\psi$ , and the task is to decide whether  $\phi \wedge \psi$  (resp.  $T \cup \{\psi\}$ ) is satisfiable. Equivalently, the instance is a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  and the task is to decide whether there is a (possibly infinite) model  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\phi$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . In particular, finite domain CSPs can be described from the satisfiability perspective where the template  $\phi$  is a universal sentence.

In the main result of this section we characterize monotone extensional SNP in terms of constraint satisfaction problems of universal formulas (Theorem 5.4). As an application of this result we show that the CSPs of finitely bounded structures are captured by extensional SNP (Corollary 5.5), and in particular, so are finite-domain CSPs (Corollary 5.6).

## 5.1 Finitely bounded structures and full homomorphisms

This subsection contains a technical lemma that we use to characterize the expressive power of monotone extensional SNP in terms of CSPs of universal sentences (Theorem 5.4). On the way, we obtain a new (and simpler) proof of a theorem proved by Ball, Nešetřil, and Pultr [3, Theorem 3.3]. The reader interested in the main statements of this section may skip this subsection.

Consider a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ . We say that two distinct vertices  $a, b \in A$  are *twins* if for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$ , for  $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in A^r$  and every  $i \in [r]$ , it is the case that  $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_r) \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$  if and only if  $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_r) \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$ . Following graph theoretic nomenclature, we say that  $\mathbb{A}$  is *point-determining* if  $\mathbb{A}$  contains no twins.

Notice that for every finite relational signature  $\tau$ , there is an existential first-order  $\tau$ -formula  $\text{NT}(x, y)$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \models \text{NT}(a, b)$  if and only if  $a$  and  $b$  are not twins in  $\mathbb{A}$ . Indeed, one can construct such a formula by considering the disjunction  $\bigvee_{R \in \tau} \psi_R(x, y)$  where for each  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$ , the formula  $\psi_R(x, y)$  equals

$$\exists z_1, \dots, z_r ((R(x, z_2, \dots, z_r) \Leftrightarrow \neg R(y, z_2, \dots, z_r)) \vee \dots \vee (R(z_1, \dots, z_{r-1}, x) \Leftrightarrow \neg R(z_1, \dots, z_{r-1}, y))).$$

In particular,  $\text{NT}(x, y)$  implies the inequality  $x \neq y$ , and if  $\mathbb{A}$  is point-determining, then  $\mathbb{A} \models \text{NT}(a, b)$  if and only if  $a \neq b$ .

We say that a structure  $\mathbb{A}^*$  is a *blow-up* of a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$ , and every  $b \in B \setminus A$  has a twin  $a$  in  $A$ . We extend this notion to a class of structures  $\mathcal{C}$ , and call the class  $\mathcal{C}^*$  of structures  $\mathbb{B}$  that are a blow-up of some  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$  the *blow-up of  $\mathcal{C}$* .

Recall that a homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  is called *full* (sometimes also *strong*) if it also preserves the relation  $\neg R$  for each  $R \in \tau$ . Notice that blow-ups and full homomorphisms are naturally related: there is a surjective full homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is isomorphic to a blow-up of  $\mathbb{B}$ . It is straightforward to observe that for every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , there is (up to isomorphism) a unique point-determining structure  $\mathbb{B}_0$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_0$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  is isomorphic to a blow-up of  $\mathbb{B}_0$  — such a structure can be obtained by repeatedly removing twins from  $\mathbb{B}$ . It follows that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a hereditary class, then  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}^*$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a hereditary class of relational structures with a finite domain and signature. If  $\mathcal{C}$  is finitely bounded, then the blow-up  $\mathcal{C}^*$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is finitely bounded. Moreover, there is a universal sentence  $\phi$  without equalities such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}^*$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  has a set of connected bounds, then  $\phi$  can be chosen to be connected.*

*Proof.* Building on the concept of the diagram of  $\mathbb{A}$  (Section 4.2), we construct the *point-determining diagram* of  $\mathbb{A}$ , which is the formula  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}$  obtained from  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}$  by replacing each conjunct  $x_a \neq x_b$  by the formula  $\text{NT}(x_a, x_b)$ . We claim that the following statements are equivalent.

- $\mathbb{B} \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{x})$ ,
- $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{x})$ , and
- $\mathbb{A}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}_0$ .

Since  $\mathbb{B}_0$  is a point-determining structure,  $\mathbb{B}_0$  satisfies  $\text{NT}(a, b) \Leftrightarrow a \neq b$  for every pair  $a, b \in B_0$ . Hence, for every tuple  $\bar{b}$  of  $\mathbb{B}_0$  it is the case that  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{b})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}(\bar{b})$ , and so,  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}(\bar{x})$ , and the latter holds if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}_0$ . Therefore, the last two itemized statements are equivalent. Since  $\mathbb{B}_0$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}$ , it follows that the second itemized statement implies the first one. Now we show that if there is a tuple  $\bar{b}$  such that  $\mathbb{B} \models \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{b})$ , then  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \exists \bar{x}. \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{x})$ . Let  $f: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_0$  be the full homomorphism such that  $f(a) = f(b)$  if and only if  $a = b$  or if  $a$  and  $b$  are twins. It follows from the definition of  $f$  that  $\mathbb{B} \models \text{NT}(a, b)$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \text{NT}(f(a), f(b))$ , and since  $f$  is a full homomorphism for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$  and each  $r$ -tuple  $\bar{x}$  of  $B$  it is the case that  $\mathbb{B} \models R(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models R(f(\bar{x}))$ . Therefore, since  $\mathbb{B} \models \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(\bar{b})$ , we conclude that  $\mathbb{B}_0 \models \text{diam}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\text{pd}}(f(\bar{b}))$ .

To show the statement of the lemma, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finite set of bounds of  $\mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\phi$  be the disjunction of the point-determining diagrams  $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{pd}}$  ranging over all  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ . It follows from the claim above that a finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  models  $\exists \bar{x}. \phi(\bar{x})$  if and only if there is a structure  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathbb{F}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{B}_0$ . Equivalently,  $\mathbb{B} \models \exists \bar{x}. \phi(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Since  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}^*$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ , we

conclude that  $\mathbb{B} \models \forall x. \neg \phi(\bar{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}^*$ . Notice that all bounded variables of  $\phi$  belong to a clause  $\psi_R$  of a subformula  $\text{NT}(x, y)$ . Since all these variables are existentially quantified, it follows that  $\forall x. \neg \phi(\bar{x})$  is a universal formula without equalities that axiomatizes  $\mathcal{C}^*$ . This proves the moreover statement of this lemma. In particular,  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}^*$  if and only if every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  with at most  $|x|$  vertices belongs to  $\mathcal{C}^*$ . It thus follows that  $\mathcal{C}^*$  is finitely bounded. Also note that if all structures in  $\mathcal{F}$  are connected, then  $\phi$  is connected as well.  $\square$

Before stating our intended application of this lemma, we state two implications of Lemma 5.1 of independent interest. We denote by  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$  the class of finite structures that admit a full homomorphism to  $\mathbb{B}$ . *Closure under inverse full homomorphisms* is defined analogously to closure under homomorphisms.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be a relational structure with finite signature. If  $\mathbb{B}$  is finitely bounded, then  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$  is finitely bounded.*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 5.1, because  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$  is the blow-up of the age of  $\mathbb{B}$ .  $\square$

The second application of Lemma 5.1 is a new proof of the following theorem proved by Ball, Nešetřil, and Pultr [3, Theorem 3.3]. Using their notation, given a set of structures  $\mathcal{B}$ , we denote the union  $\bigcup_{\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}} \text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$  by  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

**Corollary 5.3.** *For every finite set  $\mathcal{B}$  of finite relational structures with finite signature, there is a finite set of structures  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\text{Forb}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{B})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the union of the ages of  $\mathbb{B}$  over all  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}$ . Notice that if  $m$  is the size of the largest structure in  $\mathcal{B}$ , then no structure on at least  $m + 1$  vertices belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{C}$  is finitely bounded. Since  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{B})$  is the blow-up of  $\mathcal{C}$ , there is a finite set of bounds  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{B})$  (Lemma 5.1).

Moreover, since  $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathcal{B})$  is preserved under inverse full homomorphisms, we may assume that every structure in  $\mathcal{A}$  is point-determining, and thus, a structure  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{A}$  embeds into a structure  $\mathbb{C}$  if and only if there is a full homomorphism  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . The claim now follows.  $\square$

## 5.2 Monotone extensional SNP and CSPs

Given a finite relational signature  $\tau$  and a first-order  $\tau$ -sentence  $\phi$ , we denote by  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  the class of finite  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbb{A}$  for which there is a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{B}$  such that  $\mathbb{B} \models \phi$  and  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . There are first-order sentences such that  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  is undecidable.<sup>5</sup> If one restricts to a universal sentence  $\phi$ , then  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  is in NP. Indeed, suppose that for input  $\mathbb{A}$  there is a structure  $\mathbb{B}$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{B} \models \phi$ . Since  $\phi$  is universal, it follows that any substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  also models  $\phi$ , and thus, by guessing a structure on at most  $|\mathbb{A}|$  vertices, one can verify in polynomial time whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ . We propose the following characterization of monotone extensional SNP.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of finite relational structures with finite signature  $\tau$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- $\mathcal{C}$  is in monotone extensional SNP.
- There is a universal  $\tau$ -sentence  $\phi$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{CSP}(\phi)$ .

Moreover, the following two statements are equivalent as well.

- $\mathcal{C}$  is in connected monotone extensional SNP.
- There is a connected universal  $\tau$ -sentence  $\phi$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{CSP}(\phi)$ .

<sup>5</sup>To see this, suppose for contradiction that  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  is decidable for every first-order formula  $\phi$ . Notice that the structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with one-element domain and empty interpretation of every  $R \in \tau$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  if and only if there is a non-empty model of  $\phi$ . Hence, given a first-order formula  $\phi$  we can check whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$  to decide whether  $\phi$  is satisfied in a non-empty structure, contradicting the undecidability of first-order logic [28].

*Proof.* We show both statements simultaneously. First, suppose that there is a monotone extensional SNP  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$  describing  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\sigma$  be the signature containing exactly the existentially quantified symbols from  $\Phi$  and let  $\tau' \subseteq \tau$  be the signature that contains the symbols  $R'$  that are extended by some  $R \in \sigma$ . Let  $\nu \wedge \psi$  be the first-order part of  $\Phi$  where  $\nu$  is the conjunction of the clauses  $R' \Rightarrow R$  for every  $R \in \sigma$  and  $\psi$  is a universal  $(\sigma \cup \tau \setminus \tau')$ -formula. Let  $\phi$  be the  $\tau$ -formula obtained from  $\psi$  by replacing each existentially quantified symbol  $R$  by  $R'$ . Clearly,  $\phi$  is connected if and only if  $\psi$  is connected, which is the case if and only if  $\Phi$  is connected. We claim that a finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ .

Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be an expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  witnessing that  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$ . Consider the structure  $\mathbb{A}'$  with domain  $A$  where  $R^{\mathbb{A}'} = R^{\mathbb{A}}$  for every  $R \in \tau \setminus \tau'$ , and where  $(R')^{\mathbb{A}'} = R^{\mathbb{B}}$  for every  $R' \in \tau'$ . Clearly,  $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi$  because  $\mathbb{B} \models \psi$ . Since  $\mathbb{B} \models \nu$ , it follows that the identity on  $A$  defines a homomorphism  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}'$ , and thus  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ , and let  $\mathbb{B}$  be a model of  $\phi$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . Since  $\phi$  is a universal sentence, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathbb{B}$  is a finite structure. Moreover, since  $\Phi$  is in monotone (extensional) SNP, it is preserved under inverse homomorphisms (see, e.g., [13, Theorem 1.4.9]). Thus, in order to show that  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$ , it suffices to show that every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  that models  $\phi$  also models  $\Phi$ . This is immediate: consider the  $\sigma \cup \tau$ -expansion  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  where the interpretation of each  $R \in \sigma$  coincides with the interpretation of  $R'$  in  $\mathbb{B}$ ; clearly,  $\mathbb{B}' \models \nu$ , and since  $\mathbb{B} \models \phi$ , it follows that  $\mathbb{B}' \models \psi$ . This proves that the first item implies the second one.

Now, suppose that the second itemized statement holds, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the class of finite structures that model  $\phi$ . Since  $\phi$  is a universal  $\tau$ -sentence,  $\mathcal{B}$  is finitely bounded (Observation 2.1), and a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  if and only if there is a structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . In particular, every blow-up  $\mathbb{B}^*$  of a structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  (see Section 5.1). In turn, this implies that a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  if and only if there is an injective homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  for some structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}^*$ . Let  $\psi'$  be a universal  $\tau$ -sentence without equalities that defines  $\mathcal{B}^*$  (see Lemma 5.1). Consider a signature  $\sigma$  containing a relation symbol  $R^*$  for each  $R \in \tau$ , and the formula  $\psi$  obtained from  $\psi'$  by replacing each occurrence of a symbol  $R \in \tau$  by  $R^*$ . Finally, let  $\Phi$  be the SNP  $\tau$ -sentence with existentially quantified symbols from  $\sigma$  and first-order part  $\nu \wedge \psi$ , where  $\nu$  is the conjunction of clauses  $R \Rightarrow R^*$  ranging over  $R \in \tau$ . Note that  $\Phi$  is connected if and only if  $\psi$  is connected, which is the case if and only if  $\phi$  is connected. Similarly as above one can notice that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ : every  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}^*$  satisfies  $\Phi$  (indeed, define an expansion of  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfying  $\nu \wedge \psi$  by letting  $R^* = R$  for each  $R^* \in \sigma$ ), and since  $\Phi$  is in monotone SNP, we conclude that every structure  $\mathbb{A}$  in  $\text{CSP}(\phi)$  satisfies  $\Phi$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\Phi$ , then by considering the structure  $\mathbb{B}'$  where  $R^{\mathbb{B}'} = (R^*)^{\mathbb{B}}$  for each  $R \in \tau$ , we obtain a structure  $\mathbb{B}'$  that satisfies  $\phi$ , and such that  $\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}'$ . Clearly,  $\Phi$  is in monotone extensional SNP, and therefore, the second itemized statement implies the first one.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be a relational structure in a finite signature. If  $\mathbb{S}$  is finitely bounded, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$  is in monotone extensional SNP. Moreover, if  $\mathbb{S}$  has a finite set of connected bounds, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{S}$  is finitely bounded, there is a universal sentence  $\phi$  such that a finite structure models  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{S}$ . Clearly,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S}) \subseteq \text{CSP}(\phi)$ . We briefly argue that this inclusion is actually an equality. Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be a model of  $\phi$  such that there is homomorphism  $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . Since  $\phi$  is universal, it follows that the substructure  $\mathbb{B}'$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  with vertex set  $f[A]$  is a finite model of  $\phi$  such that  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}'$ . We can conclude that  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$ , because  $\mathbb{B}'$  is a finite structure satisfying  $\phi$ , so  $\mathbb{B}'$  embeds into  $\mathbb{S}$ , and thus  $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ . The claim of the corollary now follows from Theorem 5.4.  $\square$

Since every structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with finite domain and finite signature is finitely bounded (as bounds, we may take all structures  $\mathbb{B}$  of size at most  $|A| + 1$  such that  $\mathbb{B}$  does not embed into  $\mathbb{A}$ ), the following corollary is a particular instance of the previous one.

**Corollary 5.6.** *For every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in monotone extensional SNP.*

### 5.3 CSPs of finitely bounded structures

Corollary 5.5 asserts that CSPs of finitely bounded structures are in monotone extensional SNP. However, there are monotone extensional SNP sentences that do not describe the CSP of a finitely bounded structure,

because the class of finite models of such a sentence need not be preserved under disjoint unions. In this section we show that nonetheless, CSPs of finitely bounded structures capture the computational power of monotone extensional SNP, up to polynomial-time conjunctive-equivalence.

Theorem 2.2 guarantees that every monotone connected extensional SNP sentence  $\Phi$  describes the CSP of some structure. Moreover, it follows from the proof of Theorem 5.4 that  $\Phi$  describes the CSP of a finitely bounded structure.

**Corollary 5.7.** *Every monotone connected extensional SNP sentence  $\Phi$  describes a problem of the form  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  for some finitely bounded structure  $\mathbb{B}$ .*

In Appendix A, we show that every finite domain CSP is described by a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence (Corollary A.3), and we leave as an open question whether for every finitely bounded structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , there is a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence describing  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . However, the following lemma implies that for every such  $\mathbb{B}$  the CSP of the trivial expansion  $(\mathbb{B}, B^2)$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP.

**Lemma 5.8.** *For every extensional SNP  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$  and a binary symbol  $E'$  not in  $\tau$  there is a connected extensional SNP  $(\tau \cup \{E'\})$ -sentence  $\Psi$  such that the following statements hold.*

- *There is a polynomial-time reduction from  $\Phi$  to  $\Psi$ , and a polynomial-time conjunctive reduction from  $\Psi$  to  $\Phi$ .*
- *If  $\Phi$  is preserved under disjoint unions, then  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are log-space equivalent.*
- *If  $\Phi$  is in monotone SNP, then  $\Psi$  is in monotone SNP.*

*Proof.* We follow almost the same proof as the one for Proposition 1.4.11 in [13] — we thus choose to refer the reader to that proof for any missing details in this one. Let  $\tau$  be a finite relational signature and let  $\Phi$  be an extensional SNP  $\tau$ -sentence of the form

$$\exists R_1, \dots, R_k \forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\nu \wedge \phi)$$

where  $\nu$  consists of the conjuncts  $R'_i \Rightarrow R_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$  and  $\phi$  is a quantifier-free  $(\tau \cup \{R_1, \dots, R_k\})$ -formula in conjunctive normal form. We consider two new binary relation symbols  $E'$  and  $E$  and the signature  $\tau' := \tau \cup \{E'\}$ . We define the uniform SNP  $\tau'$ -sentence

$$\Psi := \exists R_1, \dots, R_k, E \forall x_1, \dots, x_n, z_1, z_2, z_3 (\nu \wedge E'(z_1, z_2) \Rightarrow E(z_1, z_2) \wedge \psi)$$

where  $\psi$  is the conjunction of the following clauses:

- $\neg E(z_1, z_2) \vee \neg E(z_2, z_3) \vee E(z_1, z_3)$  (i.e.,  $E$  is a transitive relation),
- $\neg E(z_1, z_2) \vee E(z_2, z_1)$  (i.e.,  $E$  is a symmetric relation),
- for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$  and all  $i, j \in [r]$  where  $i \neq j$ , the formula  $\psi$  contains the conjunct  $R(x_1, \dots, x_r) \Rightarrow E(x_i, x_j)$ , and
- for each clause  $\phi'$  of  $\phi$  with free variables  $y_1, \dots, y_m \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , the formula  $\psi$  contains the conjunct

$$\phi' \vee \bigvee_{i, j \in [m]} \neg E(y_i, y_j).$$

Clearly,  $\Psi$  is connected. Since  $\Phi$  is in extensional SNP,  $\Psi$  is in extensional SNP as well. It is not hard to verify that a  $\tau'$ -structure  $(\mathbb{B}, E')$  satisfies  $\Psi$  if and only if the  $\tau$ -reduct  $\mathbb{C}$  of every connected component  $(\mathbb{C}, E')$  of  $(\mathbb{B}, E')$  satisfies  $\Phi$ . Thus, there is a polynomial-time conjunctive reduction from  $\Psi$  to  $\Phi$ . If  $\Phi$  is preserved under disjoint unions, then  $(\mathbb{B}, E') \mapsto \mathbb{B}$  is a log-space (and polynomial-time) reduction from  $\Psi$  to  $\Phi$ . For the converse reduction, on input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  consider the  $(\tau \cup \{E'\})$ -structure  $\mathbb{B} := (\mathbb{A}, A^2)$  and notice that  $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B} \models \Psi$ . Hence,  $\Phi$  reduces in logarithmic space to  $\Psi$ . Finally, it follows from the definition of  $\Psi$  that if  $\Phi$  is monotone, then  $\Psi$  is monotone as well.  $\square$

It follows from Lemma 5.8 that if  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in monotone extensional SNP, then there is a connected monotone extensional SNP sentence  $\Phi$  which is log-space equivalent to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . We point out that if  $\Phi$  is obtained as in the proof of Lemma 5.8, then  $\Phi$  describes the CSP of  $(\mathbb{B}, B^2)$ . We conclude this section by applying Lemma 5.8 to show the following collapse up to polynomial-time conjunctive reducibility.

**Theorem 5.9.** *The following classes have the same computational power up to polynomial-time conjunctive-equivalence, i.e., for every problem  $P$  in any of the following classes, there are polynomial-time conjunctive-equivalent problems in each of the other ones.*

- Monotone extensional SNP.
- Monotone connected extensional SNP.
- CSPs of finitely bounded structures.

Moreover, the last two classes have the same computational power up to log-space equivalence.

*Proof.* It follows from Corollary 5.7 that every problem in the second itemized class belongs to the third one. It follows from Corollary 5.5 that if  $\mathbb{B}$  is a finitely bounded structure, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is in monotone extensional SNP. By the arguments in the paragraph above,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}, B^2)$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP, and clearly it is log-space equivalent to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . This proves that the “moreover” statement holds. Clearly, every problem in the second itemized class belongs to the first itemized class of problems. Finally, by Lemma 5.8 we know that for every monotone extensional SNP sentence  $\Phi$  there is a polynomial-time conjunctive-equivalent monotone extensional SNP.  $\square$

## 6 Limitations of the computational power

In previous sections we showed that complements of problems in Her-FO capture (up to polynomial-time equivalence) CSPs of finitely bounded structures, and more generally, extensional ESO. In this section we show that complements of problems in Her-FO are not disjunctive NP-rich unless  $E = NE$ , i.e., that there are sets  $L$  in NP which are not polynomial-time disjunctive-equivalent to the complement of a problem in Her-FO, unless  $E = NE$ .

### 6.1 Disjunctive self-reducible sets

Intuitively speaking, a set  $L$  is *self-reducible* if deciding whether  $x$  belongs to  $L$  reduces in polynomial-time to deciding  $L$  for “smaller” instances than  $x$ . Moreover, it is *disjunctive self-reducible* if there is a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm that for input  $x$  computes smaller instances  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  such that  $x \in L$  if and only if  $x_i \in L$  for some  $i \in [n]$ . A typical example of a disjunctive self-reducible set is SAT: a boolean formula  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is satisfiable if and only if at least one of the two smaller formulas  $\phi(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and  $\phi(1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  is satisfiable. This concept has played a major role in the complexity theory literature on the class NP, see, e.g., [2, 40].

Let us formally define disjunctive self-reducible sets. The following definitions trace back to [45, 49]. A polynomial-time computable strict partial order  $<$  on  $\{0, 1\}^*$  is *OK* if and only if there is a polynomial  $p$  such that

- every decreasing chain  $x_1 < \dots < x_n$  of words from  $\{0, 1\}^*$  is shorter than  $p(x_n)$ , i.e.,  $n \leq p(x_n)$ .
- for all  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^*$ ,  $x < y$  implies  $|x| \leq p(|y|)$ .

A set  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  is *self-reducible* if there are an OK partial order  $<$  on  $\{0, 1\}^*$  and a deterministic polynomial-time oracle machine  $M$  that accepts  $L$  and asks its oracle queries about words smaller than the input  $x$ , i.e., on input  $x$ , if  $M$  asks a query to its oracle for  $L$  about  $y$ , then  $y < x$ . We say that  $L$  is *disjunctive self-reducible* if on every input  $x$  the machine  $M$  either

- decides whether  $x \in L$  without calling the oracle, or
- computes queries  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}^*$  (strictly) smaller than  $x$  (with respect to  $<$ ) such that

$$x \in L \text{ if and only if } \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cap L \neq \emptyset.$$



Clearly, every set in P is disjunctive self-reducible, and it follows from [43] that every disjunctive self-reducible set is in NP.

*Remark 4.* It was proved in [39] that there are sets in NP which are self-reducible but not disjunctive self-reducible under the assumption  $\text{UE} \cap \text{coUE} \neq \text{E}$  (the intersection of unambiguous exponential time and co-unambiguous exponential time is not exponential time).

**Lemma 6.1.** *If a class of structures  $\mathcal{C}$  is expressible in extensional ESO, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is disjunctive self-reducible. In particular, CSPs of finitely bounded structures are disjunctive-self-reducible.*

*Proof.* We prove the claim for the case that  $\Phi$  has one existentially quantified relation symbol  $R$  of arity  $r$  — the general case follows with similar arguments. Let  $R'$  be the input symbol such that  $\Phi$  contains the clause  $R'(x) \Rightarrow R(x)$  and  $R'$  does not appear in any other clause of  $\Phi$ . Given an input  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , we first test whether the expansion  $\mathbb{A}'$  with  $R^{\mathbb{A}'} = R'$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\Phi$ . If yes, we accept, and otherwise we return the structures obtained from  $\mathbb{A}$  by adding one new tuple to the interpretation of  $R'$ . It is clear that the order  $\mathbb{B} < \mathbb{A}$  if  $A = B$ ,  $S^{\mathbb{A}} = S^{\mathbb{B}}$  for every  $S \in \tau \setminus \{R'\}$ , and  $(R')^{\mathbb{A}'} \subseteq (R')^{\mathbb{B}'}$  is an OK poset witnessing that the previous reduction is a disjunctive self-reduction.  $\square$

*Remark 5.* Not every disjunctive self-reducible class of structures is expressible in ESO. In fact, for every finite relational signature  $\tau$ , there is a class of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{C}$  in P and not expressible in extensional ESO (recall that every class in P is disjunctive self-reducible). See, for instance, Example 11 below.

**Example 11.** Let  $\tau$  be a finite relational signature and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the class of structures  $\mathbb{A}$  with an even number of vertices such that  $R^{\mathbb{A}} = A^r$  for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{C}$  is not in extensional ESO. On the contrary, suppose that there is an extensional ESO  $\tau$ -sentence  $\Phi$  describing  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\phi$  be the first-order  $\tau$ -formula obtained from the first-order part of  $\Phi$  by replacing each existentially quantified symbol  $S$  by  $S'$ . Let  $\psi$  be a universal formula stating that for every  $R \in \tau$  of arity  $r$  every  $r$ -tuple belongs to the interpretation of  $R$ . Then the first-order formula  $\phi \wedge \psi$  is a first-order definition of  $\mathcal{C}$ . This contradicts the well-known fact that no such first-order formula exists (which can be shown easily using Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games; see [32]).

Similarly to Lemma 6.1, it is also not hard to observe that the complement of a problem in Her-FO is a disjunctive self-reducible set. We consider a stronger version of this observation which we will also use to prove that there are NP-intermediate disjunctive self-reducible sets (unless  $\text{P} = \text{NP}$ ).

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\tau$  be a finite relational signature and  $\mathcal{F}$  a (not necessarily finite) class of finite  $\tau$ -structures. If  $\mathcal{F}$  is in P, then the class of structures  $\mathbb{A}$  that contain some substructure  $\mathbb{F}$  from  $\mathcal{F}$  is disjunctive self-reducible. In particular, the every complement of a problem in Her-FO is disjunctive self-reducible.*

*Proof.* Given an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , we first test whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{F}$ . If yes, we accept, otherwise, we return the substructures obtained from  $\mathbb{A}$  by removing exactly one element from the domain. Here, the order  $\mathbb{A} < \mathbb{B}$  defined by  $\mathbb{A}$  being a substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  is clearly an OK poset for which the previous reduction is a disjunctive self-reduction. This proves the first claim. The second claim follows because if  $\mathcal{F}$  is the class of finite models of  $\phi$ , then the complement of  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is the class of structures  $\mathbb{A}$  that contain some substructure  $\mathbb{F}$  from  $\mathcal{F}$  (and clearly  $\mathcal{F}$  is in P).  $\square$

**Theorem 6.3.** *There is no P versus NP-complete dichotomy for disjunctive self-reducible sets.*

*Proof.* We use that there exist coNP-intermediate CSPs, unless  $\text{P} = \text{coNP}$  [16, Theorem 4] (clearly, these CSPs are *not* finitely bounded). More specifically, we use that there exists a subset  $\mathcal{T}_0$  of the Henson class  $\mathcal{T}$  of tournaments introduced in Section 3.3 such that there exists a linear-time Turing machine  $G$  computing a function  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  (where the input to  $G$  is represented in unary) with

- $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{\mathbb{T}_n \mid g(n) \text{ is even}\}$ ,
- $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}_0})$  is not in P and not coNP-hard, unless  $\text{P} = \text{coNP}$  [16].

Clearly,  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is in P: given an input digraph  $D$  verify whether  $g(|D|)$  is even (if not, reject), and if this is the case, verify whether  $D$  belongs to the Henson set  $\mathcal{T}$  — which is even in first-order logic (Theorem 3.5). Since  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}_0})$  is the class of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ -free loopless oriented graphs, it follows from Lemma 6.2 that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}_0})$  is disjunctive self-reducible. Note that this implies the unconditional non-dichotomy result stated in the theorem: if  $P = NP$ , then there is no dichotomy, and if  $P$  is different from  $NP$ , then there are NP-intermediate disjunctive self-reducible sets.  $\square$

## 6.2 Search reduces to decision

For a polynomial-time computable  $R \subseteq (\{0, 1\}^*)^2$ , the *search problem for  $R$*  is the computational problem to compute for a given  $u \in \{0, 1\}^*$  some  $v \in \{0, 1\}^*$  such that  $(u, v) \in R$ ; if there is no such  $v$ , the output can be arbitrary (even undefined). Clearly, the search problem for  $R$  is at least as hard as deciding the language

$$L_R := \{u \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid \text{there is } v \in \{0, 1\}^* \text{ such that } (u, v) \in R\}.$$

For a given  $R$ , we say that *search for  $R$  reduces to decision* if the search problem for  $R$  can be solved in polynomial time given an oracle for the decision of  $L$ . For a given language  $L$  in NP, we say that *search for  $L$  reduces to decision* if there exists a polynomial-time computable  $R \subseteq (\{0, 1\}^*)^2$  such that  $L = L_R$  and search for  $R$  reduces to decision.

In particular, for every disjunctive self-reducible set  $L$  search for  $L$  reduces to decision. Indeed, suppose that  $M$  is a Turing machine witnessing that  $L$  is disjunctive self-reducible and  $<$  is the corresponding OK poset. For each  $u \in L$  consider witnesses of the form  $v_1 \dots v_k$  where  $u = v_1$ ,  $v_i < v_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in [k-1]$ ,  $v_k$  is accepted by  $M$  without calling the oracle, and  $v_{i+1}$  is one of the queries that  $M$  computes on input  $v_i$  before calling the oracle. Clearly, the set  $R$  of such tuples  $(u, v_1 \dots v_k)$  is decidable in polynomial-time, and search reduces to decision for  $R$ .

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $L$  and  $L'$  be sets such that search reduces to decision for  $L$ . If there is a polynomial-time disjunctive reduction from  $L'$  to  $L$ , and a polynomial-time Turing reduction from  $L$  to  $L'$ , then search reduces to decision for  $L'$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be a binary relation such that  $L = L_R$  and search reduces to decision for  $R$ , and let  $f$  be a polynomial-time computable function proving that there is a disjunctive polynomial-time reduction from  $L'$  to  $L$ , i.e.,  $x \in L'$  if and only if  $f(x) \cap L \neq \emptyset$ . Note that a witness for  $x \in L'$  is a pair  $(u, v)$  such that  $u \in f(x)$  and  $(u, v) \in R$ . Since there is a polynomial-time Turing reduction from  $L = L_R$  to  $L'$ , and search reduces to decision for  $R$ , there is a polynomial-time deterministic oracle machine  $M$  that solves the search problem for  $R$  using  $L'$  as an oracle. Let  $M'$  be the deterministic polynomial-time oracle machine that on input  $x$  does the following:

- it first computes  $f(x)$ ;
- for each  $u \in f(x)$  it simulates  $M$  to find a witness  $v$  such that  $(u, v) \in R$ ;
- if it finds such a  $v$  for some  $u \in f(x)$ , then  $M'$  outputs  $(u, v)$ ;
- otherwise it rejects.

It clearly follows that  $M'$  is an oracle machine proving that search reduces to decision for  $L'$ .  $\square$

It is now straightforward to observe that search reduces to decision for every problem in any of the classes considered so far.

**Theorem 6.5.** *Search reduces to decision for every problem  $P$  in any of the following classes.*

- CSPs of finitely bounded structures.
- Monotone extensional SNP.
- Extensional ESO.
- Complements of Her-FO.

- *Surjective CSPs (of finite structures).*

In particular, neither of these classes is disjunctive NP-rich unless  $EE = NEE$ .

*Proof.* We already argued that search reduces to decision for every disjunctive self-reducible sets, and it follows from Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 that any problem in these classes is disjunctive self-reducible. To see that the last claim of this theorem holds, we use Lemma 6.4 to note that if  $L$  is polynomial-time disjunctive equivalent to  $L'$  where  $L'$  belongs to one of the itemized classes, then search reduces to decision for  $L$ . The claim now follows, because Bellare and Goldwasser [10] proved that there exists a language  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  in NP such that search does not reduce to decision for  $L$  unless  $EE = NEE$ .  $\square$

### 6.3 Promise problems

Several NP-complete problems become tractable given a strong enough promise. For instance,  $k$ -colourability is decidable in polynomial time, given the promise that the input graph  $G$  is *perfect*, i.e., the chromatic number of  $H$  equals the largest complete subgraph of  $H$  for every induced subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ . Hence, to decide whether  $G$  is  $k$ -colourable it suffices to verify whether  $G$  is  $K_{k+1}$ -free, which is clearly in P. In this example, the promise is even verifiable in polynomial-time [31], but this need not be the case in general. A prominent example being the problem 1-in-3 SAT, which is tractable given the promise that the input formula  $\phi$  either has a 1-in-3 solution, or does not even have a not-all-equal solution [29]. In contrast, some problems remain hard even given some non-trivial promise. A typical example is 3-colourability which is NP-hard given the promise that the input graph  $G$  is either 3-colourable or not even 5-colourable [5].

A general framework for studying hard promises was introduced in [50]. Formally, a (decidable) *promise problem* is a pair of decidable sets  $(Q, R)$  where  $Q$  is the *promise*, and  $R$  is the *property* that needs to be decided given the promise  $Q$ . A deterministic Turing machine  $M$  *solves* the promise problem  $(Q, R)$  if for every input  $x$  the following holds

$$\text{if } x \in Q, \text{ then } M \text{ accepts } x \text{ if and only if } x \in R.$$

In this case, we say that the language  $L$  accepted by  $M$  is a *solution* to  $(Q, R)$ . In particular, notice that  $R$  and  $Q \cap R$  are solutions to  $(Q, R)$ . Going back to our previous examples, if  $Q$  is the class of perfect graphs, and  $R$  the class of  $k$ -colourable graphs, then the class of  $K_{k+1}$ -free graphs is a polynomial-time solution to  $(Q, R)$ .

A promise problem  $(Q, R)$  is in P if  $(Q, R)$  has a solution  $L$  in P, and  $(Q, R)$  is *NP-hard* if every solution to  $(Q, R)$  is NP-hard. Note that for every promise problem  $(Q, R)$ , we have that  $R$  is a solution to  $(Q, R)$ , and hence if  $R$  is in P, then  $(Q, R)$  is in P. A promise problem  $(Q, R)$  is *polynomial-time Turing-reducible*<sup>6</sup> to a promise problem  $(S, T)$  if for every solution  $A$  of  $(S, T)$  there is a solution  $B$  of  $(Q, T)$  such that  $B$  is polynomial-time Turing-reducible to  $A$ . Notice that if  $L$  is a decidable set, then the only solution to  $(\{0, 1\}^*, L)$  is  $L$ , and hence, we say that a set  $L$  is polynomial-time Turing-reducible to a promise problem  $(Q, R)$  if  $(\{0, 1\}^*, L)$  is polynomial-time Turing-reducible to  $(Q, R)$ .

*Natural promise problems* trace back to at least 1984, and they arise in the context of public-key cryptography [34]. Given a decidable set  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ , for some finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the *natural promise problem* for  $L$  is the promise problem

$$(L \times (\Sigma^* \setminus L) \uplus (\Sigma^* \setminus L) \times L, L \times \Sigma^*).$$

That is, an instance to the problem is a pair  $(x, y)$ , the promise is that exactly one of  $x$  or  $y$  belongs to  $L$ , and the property to decide is whether  $x \in L$ . Clearly, the natural promise problem for  $L$  is at most as hard as  $L$ , and thus, if  $L$  is in P then  $L$  and the natural promise problem for  $L$  are trivially polynomial-time equivalent. In [34], the authors prove that the natural promise problem for SAT is NP-hard, and it follows from [50] that  $L$  and its natural promise problem are polynomial-time Turing-equivalent for every NP-complete set  $L$ . In particular, it follows from the finite domain dichotomy conjecture [30, 53] that every finite domain CSP is polynomial-time Turing-equivalent to its natural promise problem – this will also follow from our next theorem without using the finite domain dichotomy. The graph isomorphism problem (which is not known to belong to P and most likely not NP-complete) is polynomial-time equivalent to its natural promise problem [50].

<sup>6</sup>Many-one, disjunctive, and conjunctive reductions are defined analogously, but are not needed for this paper.

**Theorem 6.6.** *For every  $L$  in any of the following classes, the natural promise problem for  $L$  is polynomial-time Turing equivalent to  $L$ .*

- CSPs of finitely bounded structures.
- Monotone extensional SNP.
- Extensional ESO.
- Complements of Her-FO.

*Proof.* Clearly, every set  $L$  is at least as hard as its natural promise problem. On the other hand, Theorem 3 in [50] asserts that if  $L$  is disjunctive self-reducible, then there is a polynomial-time Turing-reduction from  $L$  to the natural promise problem  $L$ . By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 we know that any problem in  $L$  in any of the itemized classes is disjunctive self-reducible, and so, the natural promise problem for  $L$  is polynomial-time Turing equivalent to  $L$ .  $\square$

## 6.4 Failure of NP-richness

It is known that, under certain complexity theoretic assumption, there are problems in NP that are not disjunctive self-reducible (see, e.g., Remark 4). Moreover, it follows from results in [50] that there are problems in NP which are not polynomial-time disjunctive-equivalent to any disjunctive self-reducible set, unless  $E = NE$ .

**Theorem 6.7** (essentially in [50]). *The class of disjunctive self-reducible sets is not disjunctive NP-rich, unless  $E = NE$ .*

*Proof.* Theorem 3 in [50] asserts that if  $L$  is disjunctive self-reducible, then the natural promise problem for  $L$  is polynomial-time Turing-equivalent to  $L$ , and Theorem 4 in [50] asserts that the property “ $L$  and the natural promise problem for  $L$  are polynomial-time Turing equivalent” is preserved under polynomial time disjunctive-equivalence. Finally, Theorem 7 in [50] guarantees that if  $E \neq NE$ , then there is a set  $L \in NP \setminus P$  such that the natural promise problem for  $L$  is in P, i.e.,  $L$  and its natural promise problem are not polynomial-time Turing-equivalent.  $\square$

The following statement is an immediate consequence of Theorems 6.6 and 6.7.

**Corollary 6.8.** *None of the following classes is disjunctive NP-rich, unless  $E = NE$ .*

- CSPs of finitely bounded structures.
- Monotone extensional SNP.
- Extensional ESO.
- Complements of Her-FO.
- Surjective CSPs (of finite structures).

## 7 Hereditary model checking and quantifier prefixes

A *quantifier prefix* is a word  $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}^*$ , and we say that a first-order formula  $\phi$  in prenex normal form has quantifier prefix  $Q$  if  $\phi = Q_1x_1 \dots Q_nx_n.\psi$  where  $Q = Q_1 \dots Q_n$  and  $\psi$  is a quantifier-free formula. In this section we prove the following dichotomy for quantifier prefixes: for every quantifier prefix  $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}^*$  either,

- $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is in P for every first-order formula  $\phi$  with quantifier prefix  $Q$ , or
- there exists a first-order formula  $\phi$  with quantifier prefix  $Q$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is coNP-complete.

Moreover, we show that in the former case,  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is also contained in SNP.

## 7.1 The $\forall^*\exists^*$ fragment

In this subsection we prove that for every  $\forall^*\exists^*$ -formula  $\phi$  there is a universal formula  $\phi'$  such that a structure  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \models \phi'$ .

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $\phi$  be a  $\forall^*\exists^*$ -formula with  $k$  universally quantified variables. Then a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily models  $\phi$  if and only if every  $k$ -element substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  models  $\phi$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the non-trivial (but straightforward) implication. Suppose that every substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  with  $|B| \leq k$  models  $\phi$ , and let  $\mathbb{A}'$  be a substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$ . If  $|A'| \leq k$ , then  $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi$ ; otherwise, for a  $k$ -tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in (A')^k$ , let  $\bar{b}$  be a tuple such that the quantifier-free part  $\psi$  of  $\phi$  is true of  $(a_1, \dots, a_k, \bar{b})$  in the substructure of  $\mathbb{A}'$  with vertex set  $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{A}' \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, \bar{b})$ , and since such a  $\bar{b}$  exists for every  $\bar{a} \in (A')^k$ , we conclude that  $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi$ , and therefore  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.2.** *If  $\phi$  is a  $\forall^*\exists^*$ -sentence, then  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is universally definable and hence polynomial-time solvable.*

*Proof.* If  $\phi = \forall x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y_1, \dots, y_l. \psi$  where  $\psi$  is quantifier-free, let  $\phi'$  be the formula

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y_1 \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}, \dots, y_l \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}. \psi.$$

It follows from Lemma 7.1 that a structure hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if it satisfies  $\phi'$ .  $\square$

## 7.2 The $\forall^*\exists\forall^*$ fragment

For this subsection we consider a fixed  $\forall^*\exists\forall^*$ -formula

$$\phi = \forall x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y \forall x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n. \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

where  $\psi$  is a quantifier-free  $\tau$ -formula. We expand  $\tau$  with an  $(l+2)$ -ary relation symbol  $L$ . We will interpret  $L$  as a reflexive linear order with  $l$  parameters. It is straightforward to observe that there is a universal  $\{L\}$ -formula  $\text{Lin}(x_1, \dots, x_l)$  such that  $\text{Lin}$  is true of an  $l$ -tuple  $\bar{a}$  in an  $\{L\}$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  if and only if the binary relation  $L(\bar{a}, x, y)$  defines a reflexive linear order  $x \leq_{\bar{a}} y$  on  $A$ . Consider now the SNP sentence defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi := & \exists L \forall x_1, \dots, x_k, y, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n. \text{Lin}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ & \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} L(x_1, \dots, x_k, y, x_i) \right) \Rightarrow \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 7.3.** *A finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily models  $\phi$  if and only if it models  $\Phi$ .*

*Proof.* For the easy direction, suppose that  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  models the first-order part of  $\Phi$ . For all  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$ , let  $b \in A$  be the minimum with respect to the linear order  $\leq_{a_1, \dots, a_k}$ , i.e., the element  $b \in A$  such that  $L(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, c)$  for all  $c \in A$ . In particular, for all  $a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n \in A$  and  $i \in [n]$  the atomic formula  $L(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, a_i)$  holds in  $\mathbb{A}$ , and thus  $\mathbb{A} \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n)$ . Since  $\Phi$  is an SNP sentence, every substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  also models  $\Phi$ , and by the previous argument we conclude that  $\mathbb{B}$  models  $\phi$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily models  $\phi$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ . For every  $k$ -tuple  $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$  of  $A$  we define a reflexive linear order  $\leq_{\bar{a}}$  such that the expansion

$$(\mathbb{A}, \{(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, c) : b \leq_{(a_1, \dots, a_k)} c\})$$

models the first-order part of  $\Phi$ . Let  $b_1 \in A$  be any element witnessing that  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies

$$\exists y \forall x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n. \psi(\bar{a}, y, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n).$$

For  $l > 1$ , if no  $b_i$  is a coordinate of  $\bar{a}$  for  $i < l$ , choose  $b_l$  to be any element witnessing that the substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_{l-1}\}$  satisfies  $\exists y \forall x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n. \psi(\bar{a}, y, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$  (such a vertex  $b_l$  exists

since  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ ). Otherwise, if some  $b_i$  equals some coordinate of  $\bar{a}$ , then let  $b_l$  be an arbitrary element of  $A \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_{l-1}\}$ . We define the linear ordering  $b_i \leq_{\bar{a}} b_j$  if and only if  $i \leq j$ , and let  $L := \{(\bar{a}, b, c) \in A^{k+2} : b \leq_{\bar{a}} c\}$ . It follows from the definition of  $L$  and of  $\text{Lin}$  that  $(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \forall a_1, \dots, a_k. \text{Lin}(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ .

Suppose that  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  satisfies  $\bigwedge_{i \in [n]} L(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, a_i)$  for some  $a_1, \dots, a_k, b, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n \in A$ . Let  $b_1, \dots, b_m$  be the enumeration of  $A$  corresponding to the linear ordering  $\leq_{(a_1, \dots, a_k)}$ , and suppose that  $b = b_l$ . Since  $(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} L(a_1, \dots, a_k, b, a_i)$ , i.e.,  $b \leq_{(a_1, \dots, a_k)} a_i$  for every  $i \in [n]$ , it must be the case that every  $a_i$  belongs to  $A \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_{l-1}\}$ . It thus follows from the definition of  $b_l$  that the substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  with vertex set  $A \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_{l-1}\}$  models  $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, b_l, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n)$ , and thus  $(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_k, b_l, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n)$ . This shows that  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 7.3 suggests a polynomial-time algorithm that on input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  finds parameterized linear orderings proving that  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi$ , or finds a substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  that does not model  $\phi$  (which certifies that  $\mathbb{A}$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\phi$ ).

**Certifying polynomial-time algorithm.** Consider a fixed first-order sentence

$$\phi := \forall x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y. \phi'(x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$$

where  $\phi'$  is a universal formula.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Cert-Her- $\forall^* \exists \forall^*$

---

**input:** a finite  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ .  
**foreach**  $\bar{a} \in A^k$  **do**  
     $S := \emptyset$  and  $\leq := \emptyset$ .  
    **repeat**  
        Let  $\mathbb{A}'$  be the substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A' := A \setminus S$ .  
        **if**  $\mathbb{A}'$  satisfies  $\forall y. \neg \phi'(\bar{a}, y)$  **then**  
             $\perp$  Return  $\mathbb{A}'$   
        Let  $s \in A'$  be such that  $\mathbb{A}'$  satisfies  $\phi'(\bar{a}, s)$ .  
        Update  $S := S \cup \{s\}$  and  $\leq := \leq \cup \{(x, s) \mid x \in S\}$ .  
    **until**  $s$  equals some coordinate of  $\bar{a}$   
    Let  $\leq_{\bar{a}} := \leq \cup S \times (A \setminus S) \cup \{(a_i, a_j) \in (A \setminus S)^2 \mid i \leq j\}$ .  
Let  $L := \{(\bar{a}, b, c) \in A^{k+2} : \bar{a} \in A^k, b \leq_{\bar{a}} c\}$ .  
Return  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$

---

**Lemma 7.4.** For every first-order formula  $\phi := \forall x_1, \dots, x_k \exists y. \phi'(x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$  where  $\phi'$  is a universal formula  $\forall x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n. \psi$  for some quantifier-free formula  $\psi$ , and for every  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with domain  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$  the following statements hold.

- If Algorithm 1 returns a substructure  $\mathbb{A}'$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ , then  $\mathbb{A}' \models \neg \phi$ , and  $\mathbb{A} \notin \text{Her}(\phi)$ .
- If Algorithm 1 returns an expansion  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ , then  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\Phi$ , and  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first claim, notice that (by finite induction) at the **if** statement in the **repeat-until** loop of the algorithm, the set  $A'$  contains all entries of  $\bar{a}$ . Hence, if the algorithm returns  $\mathbb{A}'$ , then  $\mathbb{A}'$  does not satisfy  $\exists y. \phi'(\bar{a}, y)$  and hence  $\mathbb{A}$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\phi$ . Now we argue that the second itemized statement holds. It is straightforward to observe that  $\leq_{\bar{a}}$  is a reflexive linear order for every  $\bar{a} \in A^k$ . Hence, it follows from the definition of  $L$  that  $(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \forall x_1, \dots, x_k. \text{Lin}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ . To see that  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  models the second conjunct of  $\Phi$ , let  $\bar{b} \in A^k$ ,  $c \in A$ , and  $b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n \in A$  (so  $(\bar{b}, c, b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n)$  is an evaluation of the universally quantified variables of  $\Phi$  in  $A$ ). Further, suppose that

$$(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} L(b_1, \dots, b_k, c, b_i);$$

otherwise the second conjunct in the definition of  $\Phi$  is vacuously true for  $(b_1, \dots, b_k, c, b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n)$ . By the definition of  $L$ , this means that  $c \leq_{\bar{b}} b_i$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . Hence, there is some iteration of the **repeat-until** loop such that  $c \in S$ . Let  $S_i$  be the set  $S$  at the end of this iteration  $i$  of the loop, and  $S_0 := \emptyset$ . It follows from the definition of  $\leq_{\bar{b}}$  and the assumption that  $c \leq_{\bar{b}} b_j$  for each  $j \in [n]$ , that if  $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{c\}$ , then  $(\{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \cap S_{i-1}) = \emptyset$ . Since  $c$  was added to  $S$  in the  $i$ -th iteration, it must be the case that in the  $i$ -th iteration the **if** statement is not true for  $s := c$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{A}' \models \forall x_1, \dots, x_k. \phi'(x_1, \dots, x_k, c)$ . Since  $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \subseteq A \setminus S_{i-1}$ , we conclude that in particular  $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi'(\bar{b}, c)$  where the universally quantified variables from  $\phi'$  are interpreted as  $(b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n)$ . This means that

$$(\mathbb{A}, L) \models \left( \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} L(b_1, \dots, b_k, c, b_i) \right) \Rightarrow \psi(b_1, \dots, b_k, c, b_{k+1}, \dots, b_n).$$

Since this is true for any choice of elements  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  and  $c$  in  $A$ , we conclude that  $(\mathbb{A}, L)$  satisfies the first-order part of  $\Phi$ , and by Lemma 7.3 we conclude that  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ .  $\square$

Clearly, Algorithm 1 runs in polynomial time in the representation size of  $\mathbb{A}$ . Hence, the following statement is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.4.

**Theorem 7.5.** *If  $\phi$  is a  $\forall^* \exists \forall^*$ -sentence, then there is an SNP sentence  $\Phi$  such that a finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  satisfies  $\Phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$ . Moreover,  $\Phi$  can be efficiently computed from  $\phi$ , and there is a polynomial-time algorithm that either finds an expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  proving that  $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$ , or finds a substructure  $\mathbb{A}'$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\mathbb{A}' \models \neg \phi$ .*

Note that this theorem covers the first-order sentences that show that Example 1, Example 2, and Example 6 are in Her-FO, because they are  $\exists \forall^*$  sentences. A natural example of a  $\forall \forall \exists \forall^*$ -sentence is given in Example 4 (the class of digraphs that corresponds to the cover relation of some poset).




Figure 3: Consider a first-order  $\{E\}$ -sentence  $\phi$  that states that  $E$  is a symmetric relation, and that for every vertex  $x$  there is a vertex  $y$  not adjacent to  $x$  such that the neighbourhood of  $y$  induces a clique. Clearly,  $\phi$  can be chosen to be an  $\forall \exists \forall^*$  formula. On the top, we depict a graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with two distinguished vertices  $a$  and  $b$ . In the middle, we depict the linear order  $\leq_a$  (from left to right) of  $G$  obtained via Algorithm 1 (where the linear order between the vertices greater than  $a$  can be arbitrary), and that proves that  $(\mathbb{G}, a)$  hereditarily satisfies  $\phi(a, y, \bar{z})$ . At the bottom, we depict the partial linear order  $<$  and the subgraph  $\mathbb{H}$  (depicted with black vertices) of  $\mathbb{G}$  that Algorithm 1 finds when running the loop for  $x = b$ , and hence, proving that  $(\mathbb{G}, b)$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\phi$ .

### 7.3 $\exists\forall\exists$ - and $\exists^2\forall$ -sentences

Consider the class of digraphs  $\mathbb{D}$  such that for every directed cycle  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  of  $\mathbb{D}$  there exist  $i, j \in [n]$  such that  $d_i d_j$  is a symmetric edge of  $\mathbb{D}$ , i.e.,  $(d_i, d_j), (d_j, d_i) \in \mathbb{D}$ . In this case, we say that every directed cycle of  $\mathbb{D}$  ‘induces a symmetric edge’.

**Lemma 7.6.** *Every directed cycle of a finite digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  induces a symmetric edge if and only if  $\mathbb{D}$  hereditarily satisfies the sentence*

$$\exists x, y \forall a (\neg E(x, a) \vee [E(x, y) \wedge E(y, x)]). \quad (8)$$

*Proof.* Suppose there is a directed cycle  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  of  $\mathbb{D}$  that does not induce a symmetric edge. Then the substructure of  $\mathbb{D}$  with vertex set  $\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$  satisfies the formula

$$\forall x, y \exists a (E(x, a) \wedge [\neg E(x, y) \vee \neg E(y, x)]),$$

and so  $\mathbb{D}$  does not hereditarily satisfy (8).

Conversely, suppose that every directed cycle of  $\mathbb{D}$  induces a symmetric edge and let  $B \subseteq D$ . If  $\mathbb{B}$  contains a sink  $b$ , then  $\mathbb{B} \models \forall a \neg E(b, a)$ , and so  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies (8). Otherwise,  $\mathbb{B}$  contains a directed cycle, and by assumption this directed cycle induces a symmetric edge  $uv$ , so by letting  $x = u$  and  $y = v$  we conclude that  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\exists x, y (E(x, y) \wedge E(y, x))$ . Again,  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies (8).  $\square$

Now, we prove that deciding whether every directed cycle of an input digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  induces a symmetric edge is coNP-complete.

**Theorem 7.7.** *The problem of deciding if every directed cycle in an input digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  induces a symmetric edge is coNP-complete.*

*Proof.* We consider an instance  $\psi$  of 3SAT with variables  $V$ , clauses  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  where each  $C_i = (c_i^1, c_i^2, c_i^3)$  and  $c_i^k \in \{v, \neg v\}$  for some  $v \in V$ . We construct a digraph  $\mathbb{D}$  with vertices  $s, t$  and  $d_i^j$  for each  $i \in [m]$  and  $j \in [3]$ . The edges of  $\mathbb{D}$  consists of all pairs  $(s, d_1^k), (d_m^j, d_{i+1}^k), (d_m^j, t)$ , and  $(t, s)$  for  $i \in [m-1]$  and  $j, k \in [3]$ , and for each  $i, j \in [m]$  and  $k, l \in [3]$  such that  $c_i^k = \neg c_j^l$  we add symmetric edges  $(d_i^k, d_j^l)$  and  $(d_j^l, d_i^k)$ . We claim that  $\psi$  is unsatisfiable if and only if every directed cycle in  $\mathbb{D}$  contains a symmetric edge. Equivalently,  $\psi$  is satisfiable if and only if there is a directed cycle in  $\mathbb{D}$  that induce no symmetric edge. For a evaluation making  $\psi$  a true statement, consider the vertices  $d_i^{k_i}$  where  $c_i^{k_i}$  is true in the clause  $C_i$ . Hence, the sequence  $s, d_1^{k_1}, \dots, d_m^{k_m}, t, s$  is a directed cycle that induces no symmetric edge. Conversely, notice that any directed cycle in  $\mathbb{D}$  that induces no directed edge must contain the edge  $(t, s)$ , and so there is a directed path  $P$  from  $s$  to  $t$  that induces no directed edge must contain a vertex  $d \in \{d_i^1, d_i^2, d_i^3\}$  (otherwise, the directed path already uses a symmetric edge). Consider the evaluation  $f: V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined by  $f(v) = 1$  if there is some clause  $C_i$  such that  $v = c_i^k$  and  $d_i^k$  is in this directed path  $P$ , and otherwise  $f(v) = 0$ . This is a well defined function because  $P$  has no symmetric edges, and it makes  $\psi$  a true statement from construction of  $\mathbb{D}$  and because for each clause  $C_j$  there the path  $P$  intersects  $\{d_i^1, d_i^2, d_i^3\}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.8.** *There are  $\exists^2\forall$  and  $\exists\forall\exists$  (digraph) formulas  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  and  $\text{Her}(\psi)$  are coNP-complete.*

*Proof.* For  $\phi$  consider the formula from Lemma 7.6 and for  $\psi$  consider the quantifier reordering  $\exists x \forall a \exists y$  of  $\phi$ , and notice that  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are logically equivalent. The claim now follows from Lemma 7.6 and Theorem 7.7.  $\square$

### 7.4 Quantifier prefix classification

We first consider the case where  $\tau$  is a monadic signature, and show that in this case hereditary model checking is always in first-order logic and hence polynomial-time solvable.

**Theorem 7.9.** *Let  $\tau$  be a finite monadic relational signature. For every first-order formula  $\phi$  the class  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is universally definable and hence in P.*



*Proof.* We claim that  $\mathbb{A}$  hereditarily models  $\phi$  if and only if every substructure of  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  with at most  $2^{|\tau|}$  many elements satisfies  $\phi$ . One direction follows from definition of hereditary satisfiability. For the converse implication, let  $\mathbb{B}$  be a substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  and consider a minimal subset  $C \subseteq B$  such that for every  $b \in B$  there is a  $c \in C$  such that  $U(b) \Leftrightarrow U(c)$  for all  $U \in \tau$ . Clearly,  $|C| \leq 2^{|\tau|}$  and it is straightforward to observe that  $\mathbb{B} \models \phi$  if and only if  $\mathbb{C} \models \phi$ , and the claim follows.  $\square$

The classification for general relational signatures follows from the lemmas in this section.

**Theorem 7.10.** *Let  $\tau$  be a non-monic relational signature. For every quantifier prefix  $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}^*$  one of the following statements hold:*

- *$Q$  is of the form  $\forall^*\exists^*$ , or of the form  $\forall^*\exists\forall^*$ , and in this case  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is in  $\text{P}$  for every first-order  $\tau$ -sentence  $\phi$  with quantifier-prefix  $Q$ , or*
- *$Q$  contains a subword  $\exists\exists\forall$  or a subword of the form  $\exists\forall\forall^*\exists$ , and in this case there is a first-order  $\tau$ -sentence  $\phi$  with quantifier-prefix  $Q$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  is  $\text{coNP}$ -complete.*

*Proof.* Clearly, both items describe disjoint and complementary cases. The claim in the first item follows from Corollary 7.2 and Theorem 7.5. If  $\tau$  contains a binary relation symbol, then the claim in the second item follows from Corollary 7.8. Otherwise,  $\tau$  must contain a relation  $R$  of arity at least three; however, we can use  $R$  to model a binary relation, so the claim also holds in this case.  $\square$

## 7.5 Restriction to CSPs

In this section we will show that Her-FO restricted to CSPs has a similar classification result to Theorem 7.10. To begin with, the following is a direct implication of Theorem 7.10.

**Corollary 7.11.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  be a relational structure such that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S}) = \text{Her}(\phi)$  for some first-order formula  $\phi$ . If the quantifier-free prefix of  $\phi$  belongs to  $\{\forall^*\exists^*, \forall^*\exists\forall^*\}$ , then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{S})$  is in  $\text{P} \cap \text{SNP}$ .*

For instance, this corollary captures Example 2, Example 4, and Example 6. The following example of a hereditarily first-order definable binary CSP shows that Corollary 7.11 cannot be pushed further in terms of quantifier prefixes (unless  $\text{P} = \text{coNP}$ ). Let  $\tau$  consist of two binary symbols  $E_b$  and  $E_r$ , and for a positive integer  $n$  denote by  $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{D}_n$  the structure with vertex set  $[n]$  such that  $([n], E_b)$  is a Hamiltonian directed cycle  $1, \dots, n$ , and  $([n], E_r)$  is a tournament.

**Theorem 7.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{D}_n \mid n \geq 2\}$  and let  $\mathbb{B}$  be the Fraïssé limit of the class of loopless  $\{E_b, E_r\}$ -structures in  $\text{Forb}(\mathcal{F})$ . Then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is hereditarily definable by an  $\exists\exists\forall$ - and by an  $\exists\forall\exists$ -formula, and  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is  $\text{coNP}$ -complete.*

*Proof.* Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 7.6, one can show that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is hereditarily defined by the formula “there are no loops and  $\phi$ ” where  $\phi := \exists x, y \forall a (\neg E_b(x, a) \vee \neg E_r(x, y))$ . Then, with a similar proof as in Theorem 7.7, one can show that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  is  $\text{coNP}$ -complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.13.** *For every quantifier prefix  $Q$  containing a subword  $\exists\exists\forall$  or a subword of the form  $\exists\forall\forall^*\exists$ , there is a first-order sentence with quantifier-prefix  $Q$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  defines a  $\text{coNP}$ -complete CSP.*

In particular, this shows that the same quantifier prefix classification from Theorem 7.10 holds even for the intersection of Her-FO and CSPs. We further believe that the intersection of CSP and Her-FO captures the full complexity of Her-FO up to polynomial-time equivalence. Via Observation 3.1, this follows from the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 7.14.** *For every first-order sentence  $\phi$  there exists a negative and connected first-order sentence  $\psi$  such that  $\text{Her}(\phi)$  and  $\text{Her}(\psi)$  are polynomial-time equivalent.*




Figure 4: Classes of computational problems studied in this paper. Solid black arcs indicate inclusions, and a dashed blue arc from  $A$  to  $B$  indicates that every problem in  $A$  is polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in  $B$ . Polynomial-time conjunctive reductions are indicated by dotted red arcs. Obvious arcs between the bottom (green) and the top (orange) layer are omitted for readability.

## 8 Conclusion and Open Problems

We introduced the hereditary first-order model checking problem Her-FO, and proved that the complement of every problem in extensional ESO is polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in Her-FO. We presented a complexity classification for Her-FO based on allowed quantifier prefixes, and showed that there are problems in coNP that are not polynomial-time equivalent to problems in Her-FO, unless NE=E. See Figure 4. Besides Conjecture 7.14, a number of open problems are left for future research.

1. Is every finite-domain CSP which is in Her-FO also in P? Prove this without complexity-theoretic assumptions.
2. Characterize the finite-domain CSPs in Her-FO.
3. Is every CSP in Her-FO also of the form Her( $\phi$ ) for some negative connected sentence  $\phi$ ?
4. Is every CSP of a finitely bounded structure in connected monotone extensional SNP? (Compare with Corollary 5.7 and the moreover statement in Theorem 5.9).
5. Are there NP-intermediate CSPs of finitely bounded structures (assuming  $P \neq NP$ )?
6. Is it true that for every finitely bounded structure  $\mathbb{B}$  there is an  $\omega$ -categorical finitely bounded structure  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  and  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$  are polynomial-time equivalent?
7. Is it true that for every monotone (extensional) SNP sentence  $\Phi$ , there is a polynomial-time equivalent connected monotone (extensional) SNP sentence  $\Phi'$ ? (Compare with Theorem 5.9 and with [13, Proposition 13.2.2]).
8. Is it true that for every disjunctive self-reducible set  $L$  there is a polynomial-time equivalent extensional ESO sentence  $\Phi$ ? (Compare with Remark 5)
9. Is it true that every CSP of a reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure is disjunctive self-reducible? (Compare with Theorem B.1.)
10. Is it true that for every reduct  $\mathbb{C}$  of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , there is a homogeneous structure  $\mathbb{B}'$  with a finite set of bounds  $\mathcal{F}$  such that finding an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  is polynomial-time equivalent to deciding whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ ? (Compare with Corollary B.4.)

## 9 References

- [1] W. Ackermann. Beiträge zum Entscheidungsproblem der mathematischen Logik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 112(1):419–432, 1936.
- [2] K. Ambos-Spies and J. Kämper. On disjunctive self-reducibility. In E. Börger, H. K. Büning, and M. M. Richter, editors, *CSL '88, 2nd Workshop on Computer Science Logic, Duisburg, Germany, October 3-7, 1988, Proceedings*, volume 385 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–13. Springer, 1988.
- [3] R. N. Ball, J. Nešetřil, and A. Pultr. Dualities in full homomorphisms. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 31:106–199, 2010.
- [4] A. Barsukov and F. R. Madelaine. On guarded extensions of MMSNP. In G. D. Vedova, B. Dundua, S. Lempp, and F. Manea, editors, *Unity of Logic and Computation - 19th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2023, Batumi, Georgia, July 24-28, 2023, Proceedings*, volume 13967 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 202–213. Springer, 2023.
- [5] L. Barto, J. Bulín, A. Krokhin, and J. Opršal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *J. ACM*, 68(4), July 2021.
- [6] L. Barto, M. Kompatscher, M. Olšák, T. V. Pham, and M. Pinsker. The equivalence of two dichotomy conjectures for infinite domain constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science – LICS'17*, 2017. Preprint arXiv:1612.07551.

- [7] L. Barto, A. A. Krokhin, and R. Willard. Polymorphisms, and how to use them. In *The Constraint Satisfaction Problem: Complexity and Approximability*, pages 1–44. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- [8] L. Barto, J. Opršal, and M. Pinsker. The wonderland of reflections. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 223(1):363–398, 2018.
- [9] L. Barto and M. Pinsker. Topology is irrelevant. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(2):365–393, 2020.
- [10] M. Bellare and S. Goldwasser. The complexity of decision versus search. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 23(1):97–119, 1994.
- [11] P. Bernays and M. Schönfinkel. Zum Entscheidungsproblem der mathematischen Logik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 99:342–372, 1928.
- [12] M. Bodirsky. Cores of countably categorical structures. *Logical Methods in Computer Science (LMCS)*, 3(1):1–16, 2007.
- [13] M. Bodirsky. *Complexity of Infinite-Domain Constraint Satisfaction*. Lecture Notes in Logic (52). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, 2021.
- [14] M. Bodirsky. *Complexity of Infinite-Domain Constraint Satisfaction*. Lecture Notes in Logic (52). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, 2021.
- [15] M. Bodirsky and B. Bodor. A complexity dichotomy in spatial reasoning via ramsey theory. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, mar 2024. Just Accepted.
- [16] M. Bodirsky and M. Grohe. Non-dichotomies in constraint satisfaction complexity. pages 184–196. Springer Verlag, July 2008.
- [17] M. Bodirsky, M. Hils, and B. Martin. On the scope of the universal-algebraic approach to constraint satisfaction. *Logical Methods in Computer Science (LMCS)*, 8(3):1–30, 2012. An extended abstract that announced some of the results appeared in the proceedings of Logic in Computer Science (LICS’10).
- [18] M. Bodirsky, P. Jonsson, B. Martin, A. Mottet, and Z. Semanisinová. Complexity classification transfer for cpsps via algebraic products. *Siam Journal on Computing*, abs/2211.03340, 2024.
- [19] M. Bodirsky and J. Kára. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):1–41, 2009. An extended abstract appeared in the Proceedings of the Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC).
- [20] M. Bodirsky and J. Kára. A fast algorithm and Datalog inexpressibility for temporal reasoning. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 11(3), 2010.
- [21] M. Bodirsky, J. Kára, and B. Martin. The complexity of surjective homomorphism problems - a survey. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(12):1680–1690, 2012.
- [22] M. Bodirsky, S. Knäuer, and S. Rudolph. Datalog-expressibility for monadic and guarded second-order logic. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, pages 120:1–120:17, 2021. Preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.05677>.
- [23] M. Bodirsky, F. R. Madelaine, and A. Mottet. A proof of the algebraic tractability conjecture for monotone monadic SNP. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(4):1359–1409, 2021.
- [24] M. Bodirsky, B. Martin, M. Pinsker, and A. Pongrácz. Constraint satisfaction problems for reducts of homogeneous graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 48(4):1224–1264, 2019. A conference version appeared in the Proceedings of the 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, pages 119:1–119:14.
- [25] M. Bodirsky, M. Pinsker, and A. Pongrácz. Projective clone homomorphisms. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 86(1):148–161, 2021.

- [26] B. Bodor. CSP dichotomy for  $\omega$ -categorical monadically stable structures. TU Dresden, <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-qucosa2-774379>, 2022. PhD dissertation, Institute of Algebra.
- [27] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. *Graph Theory*. Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [28] E. Börger, E. Grädel, and Y. Gurevich. *The Classical Decision Problem*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1997.
- [29] J. Brakensiek and V. Guruswami. Promise constraint satisfaction: Algebraic structure and a symmetric boolean dichotomy. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(6):1663–1700, 2021.
- [30] A. A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17*, pages 319–330, 2017.
- [31] M. Chudnovsky, N. Roberston, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas. The strong perfect graph theorem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 164:51–229, 2006.
- [32] H.-D. Ebbinghaus and J. Flum. *Finite Model Theory*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1999. Second edition.
- [33] T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, and T. Schwentick. *The Model Checking Problem for Prefix Classes of Second-Order Logic: A Survey*, pages 227–250. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [34] S. Even, A. L. Selman, and Y. Yacobi. The complexity of promise problems with applications to public-key cryptography. *Information and Control*, 61(2):159–173, 1984.
- [35] R. Fagin. Generalized first-order spectra and polynomial-time recognizable sets. *Complexity of Computation*, 7:43–73, 1974.
- [36] T. Feder and M. Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: a study through Datalog and group theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1):57–104, 1999.
- [37] T. Feder and M. Y. Vardi. Homomorphism closed vs. existential positive. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 311–320, 2003.
- [38] G. Gottlob, P. G. Kolaitis, and T. Schwentick. Existential second-order logic over graphs: Charting the tractability frontier. *Journal of the ACM*, 51:312–362, 2004.
- [39] E. Hemaspaandra, A. V. Naik, M. Ogihara, and A. L. Selman. P-selective sets and reducing search to decision vs self-reducibility. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 5:194–209, 1996.
- [40] L. A. Hemaspaandra. *The Power of Self-Reducibility: Selectivity, Information, and Approximation*, pages 19–47. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
- [41] W. Hodges. *A shorter model theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [42] N. Immerman. *Descriptive Complexity*. Graduate Texts in Computer Science, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [43] K.-I. Ko. On self-reducibility and weak p-selectivity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 26:209–221, 1983.
- [44] G. Kun. Constraints, MMSNP, and expander relational structures. *Combinatorica*, 33(3):335–347, 2013.
- [45] A. Meyer and M. Patersons. With what frequency are apparently intractable problems difficult?, 1979. Tech. Report MIT/LCS/TM-126, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- [46] A. Mottet and M. Pinsker. Cores over Ramsey structures. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 86(1):352–361, 2021.
- [47] A. Mottet and M. Pinsker. Smooth approximations and CSPs over finitely bounded homogeneous structures. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2022. Preprint arXiv:2011.03978.

- [48] I. Pratt-Hartmann. *Fragments of First-Order Logic*. Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, 2023. 672 pages.
- [49] C.-P. Schnorr. Optimal Algorithms for Self-Reducible Problems. In *Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 322–337, 1976.
- [50] A. L. Selman. Promise problems for complexity classes. *Information and Computation*, 78:87–98, 1988.
- [51] D. Zhuk. A proof of the CSP dichotomy conjecture. *Journal of the ACM*, 67:1–78, 2020.
- [52] D. Zhuk. No-rainbow problem and the surjective constraint satisfaction problem. In *36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2021, Rome, Italy, June 29 - July 2, 2021*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2021.
- [53] D. N. Zhuk. A proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17*, pages 331–342, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.01914>.

# A Monotone connected extensional SNP captures finite-domain CSPs

This appendix contains a lemma which in particular implies that every finite domain CSP is expressible in connected monotone extensional SNP. Given a relational  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , we denote by  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  the class of finite structures that embed into  $\mathbb{A}$ ; equivalently, the class of finite substructures of  $\mathbb{A}$ , up to isomorphism. A set of finite structures  $\mathcal{F}$  is called a set of *bounds* of  $\mathbb{A}$ , if for every finite structure  $\mathbb{B}$  it is the case that  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  if and only if  $\mathbb{B}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free. We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a set of *connected* bounds if every structure in  $\mathcal{F}$  is connected. The *Gaifman graph* of  $\mathbb{A}$  is the undirected graph  $G(\mathbb{A})$  with vertex set  $A$  and there is an edge  $ab$  if  $a$  and  $b$  belong to some common tuple in  $R^{\mathbb{A}}$  for some  $R \in \tau$ . An *induced path* in  $\mathbb{A}$  is a sequence of vertices  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  that induce a path in the Gaifman graph of  $\mathbb{A}$ . In this case, we say that the path is an  $a_1 a_n$ -*path*, and that the *length* of this path is  $n$ . It is straightforward to observe that for every finite relational signature  $\tau$  and every positive integer  $N$ , there is a finite set of  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathcal{P}_N$  such that a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  has no induced path of length  $N$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $\mathcal{P}_N$ -free.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a finitely bounded structure. If there is a positive integer  $N$  such that every induced path in  $\mathbb{A}$  has length strictly less than  $N$ , then there is a structure  $\mathbb{B}$  such that*

- $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A}) \subseteq \text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$ ,
- a structure  $\mathbb{C}$  belongs to  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$  if and only if every connected component of  $\mathbb{C}$  belongs to  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$ , and
- there is a finite set of connected bounds for  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finite set of bounds of  $\mathbb{A}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_N$  be as in the paragraph above. Let  $\mathcal{F}_C$  be the set of connected structures in  $\mathcal{F}$ , and for every disconnected structure  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$  where  $\mathbb{F} := \biguplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{F}_n$  and each  $\mathbb{F}_n$  is a connected structure, let  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})$  be the class of finite  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbb{C}$  such that

- $\mathbb{F}$  embeds into  $\mathbb{C}$ , and
- for all distinct  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $a \in F_i$ , and  $b \in F_j$ , there is an induced  $ab$ -path in  $\mathbb{C}$  of length strictly less than  $N$ .

Notice that  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})$  has, up to isomorphism, a finite set of minimal structures  $\mathbb{M}$  with respect to the embedding order. Indeed, let  $\mathbb{M}$  be such a minimal structure, and identify  $\mathbb{F}$  with a substructure of  $\mathbb{M}$  (isomorphic to  $\mathbb{F}$ ). For every  $a, b \in F$  that belong to different components of  $\mathbb{F}$ , let  $P_{ab}$  be the set of vertices witnessing that there is an induced  $ab$ -path of length less than  $N$  in  $\mathbb{M}$ . By the minimality of  $\mathbb{M}$ , it must be the case that every element of  $\mathbb{M}$  belongs to  $F$  or to  $P_{ab}$  for some  $a, b \in F$  (that belong to different components of  $\mathbb{F}$ ). Hence, the cardinality of  $\mathbb{M}$  is bounded by  $|F|$ , plus  $|F|^2$  times the maximum number  $m$  of vertices in an induced path of length  $N - 1$  — notice that the last  $m$  only depends on the signature of  $\mathbb{M}$  and on  $N$ , so it does not depend on  $\mathbb{M}$ .

We denote this finite set of minimal structures in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})$  by  $\min(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F}))$ . Finally, let

$$\mathcal{F}^* := \mathcal{F}_C \cup \mathcal{P}_N \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_C} \min(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})).$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}^*$  consists of connected structures, the class of  $\mathcal{F}^*$ -free structures is closed under disjoint unions, and so, there is a structure  $\mathbb{B}$  whose age is the class of finite  $\mathcal{F}^*$ -free structures (see, e.g., [13, Proposition 2.3.1]). We claim that  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfies the itemized statements of the lemma. By construction, it satisfies the third one. To show the first one, let  $\mathbb{C}$  be a finite  $\tau$ -structure that embeds into  $\mathbb{A}$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{C}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free. Moreover,  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $\mathcal{P}_N$ -free because  $\mathbb{A}$  has no induced path of length  $N$ , and thus  $\mathbb{C}$  is also  $\mathcal{P}_N$ -free. Hence,  $\mathbb{C}$  is  $\mathcal{F}^*$ -free, and so  $\mathbb{C} \in \text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$ .

To show the second itemized statement, first observe that if every connected component of a finite structure  $\mathbb{C}$  belongs to  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$ , then  $\mathbb{C}$  is a disjoint unions of structures that belong to  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A}) \subseteq \text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$ . Since  $\mathbb{B}$  has a set of connected bounds, its age is closed under disjoint unions, and so  $\mathbb{C} \in \text{Age}(\mathbb{B})$ . For the converse implication, it suffices to prove that every connected structure  $\mathbb{C}$  in the age of  $\mathbb{B}$  belongs to the age of  $\mathbb{A}$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}^*$ -free structure, it contains no induced path of length larger than  $N$ . Now, suppose for contradiction that  $\mathbb{C} \notin \text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$ , so there is an embedding of some  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$  into  $\mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{F}_C \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$ , it

must be the case that  $\mathbb{F}$  is not connected. But since  $\mathbb{C}$  is connected and has no path of length larger than  $N$ , we must have  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})$ . This implies that  $\mathbb{C}$  contains some structure from  $\min(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{F})) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\mathbb{C}$  is  $\mathcal{F}^*$ -free. The claim now follows.  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a finitely bounded structure. If there is a positive integer  $N$  such that every induced path in  $\mathbb{A}$  has length strictly less than  $N$ , then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be the structure from Lemma A.1 for  $\mathbb{A}$ . It follows from the second itemized property of  $\mathbb{B}$  that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A}) = \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . Since  $\mathbb{B}$  has a finite set of connected bounds by the third itemized property of  $\mathbb{B}$ , the claim of the lemma follows from Corollary 5.5.  $\square$

**Corollary A.3.** *If  $\mathbb{A}$  is a finite structure, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP.*

**Lemma A.4.** *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a structure such that  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  is closed under disjoint unions. If  $\mathbb{A}$  is finitely bounded, then  $\mathbb{A}$  has a finite set of connected bounds.*

*Proof.* For a finite set of bounds  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ , we construct a finite set of connected bounds  $\mathcal{F}'$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ . To do so, consider a bound  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ . We claim that there is a connected component  $\mathbb{F}'$  of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that every structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  is  $\mathbb{F}'$ -free. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that for every connected component of  $\mathbb{F}$  there is a structure  $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  that is not  $\mathbb{F}'$ -free. It is straightforward to observe that the disjoint union of these structures contains a copy of  $\mathbb{F}$ , and hence does not belong to  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$ . This contradicts assumption that  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  is closed under disjoint unions. Let  $\mathcal{F}'$  be the set of connected components  $\mathbb{F}'$  of  $\mathbb{F}$  ranging over all  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Clearly, every  $\mathcal{F}'$ -free structure is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free, and by the definition of  $\mathcal{F}'$ , every structure in  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$  is  $\mathcal{F}'$ -free. Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}'$  is a finite set of connected bounds for  $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary A.5.** *If  $\biguplus_{n=1}^{\omega} \mathbb{A}$  is a finitely bounded structure, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP.*

## B CSPs of reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures

The Feder-Vardi P versus NP-complete conjecture has been generalised from finite structures to a large class of infinite structures, namely to reducts of finitely bounded *homogeneous* structures [25]. A relational structure  $\mathbb{B}$  is *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finite substructures can be extended to an automorphism of  $\mathbb{B}$ . Homogeneous structures with a finite relational signature are always  $\omega$ -categorical, which is an important property from model theory, and which implies that the universal-algebraic approach can be applied to study the complexity of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ . Unlike homogeneity,  $\omega$ -categoricity is inherited by taking reducts. Also, every  $\omega$ -categorical structure is homomorphically equivalent to a *model-complete core*, which is unique up to isomorphism and also  $\omega$ -categorical. A structure  $\mathbb{C}$  is a *model-complete core* if every first-order formula over  $\mathbb{C}$  equivalent to an existential positive formula [12, 17]. Under fairly weak assumptions, the transition to the model-complete core is also well-behaved with respect to being the reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure [46].

There are numerous complexity classification results that fully fall into the scope of this conjecture (for a small sample, we mention [19, 24, 18, 26, 23]). The conjecture, however, remains wide open despite a number of general results [47, 15] and various characterisations of the conjectured border between polynomial-time tractability and NP-hardness [9, 6, 8]; also see [13].

Unfortunately, we do not know at the moment whether every CSP for a reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure is disjunctive self-reducible. This would show that, at least, the respective class of CSPs is not NP-rich. However, we are able to show a weaker form of this statement in Theorem B.1 below, which has a series of consequences. We say that two relational structures are *interdefinable* if every relation of one structure is first-order definable in the other, and vice versa. Note that interdefinability preserves neither homogeneity, nor finite boundedness, nor the model-complete core property. For  $\omega$ -categorical structures, first-order interdefinability is equivalent to having the same automorphism group.

**Theorem B.1.** *Let  $\mathbb{C}$  be a structure which is*

- *interdefinable with a finitely bounded homogeneous structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , and*



- a model-complete core.

Then,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  is log-space equivalent to a problem in extensional monotone connected SNP.

*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be the signature of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be the expansion of  $\mathbb{C}$  by all the orbits of  $k$ -tuples of  $\mathbb{B}$ , for every  $k$  bounded by the maximum arity  $m$  of the relations in  $\mathbb{B}$ . Let  $\tau \cup \rho$  be the signature of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Every relation of  $\mathbb{D}$  is primitively positively definable in  $\mathbb{C}$ , because orbits of  $k$ -tuples in a model-complete core are primitively positively definable [13, Theorem 4.5.1]. Since every relation of  $\mathbb{D}$  is primitively positively definable in  $\mathbb{C}$ , we have that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$  are log-space equivalent [13, Lemma 1.2.6]. So it suffices to prove that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$  is in extensional monotone connected SNP.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finite set of finite bounds of  $\mathbb{B}$ . Note that  $\mathbb{D}$  is homogeneous: to see this, let  $i$  be an isomorphism between finite substructures of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Then  $i$  is also an isomorphism between finite substructures of  $\mathbb{B}$ , since every relation of  $\mathbb{B}$  is a union of relations of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Hence,  $i$  extends to an automorphism  $\alpha$  of  $\mathbb{B}$ . Note that every automorphism of  $\mathbb{B}$  is also an automorphism of  $\mathbb{D}$ , and hence  $\mathbb{D}$  is homogeneous. Therefore, the homogeneous structures  $\mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{D}$  are interdefinable via quantifier-free formulas, and hence  $\mathbb{D}$  is finitely bounded as well (with a set of bounds of size at most the maximal size of the bounds in  $\mathcal{F}$ ).

By the definition of  $\mathbb{D}$ , for every  $k$ -tuple  $\bar{d}$  of  $\mathbb{D}$  there is some  $R \in \tau \cup \rho$  such that  $\mathbb{D} \models R(\bar{d})$ , and hence, the Gaifman graph of  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete graph. This means that the largest induced path in  $\mathbb{D}$  has at most two vertices, and thus Lemma A.2 implies that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$  is in monotone connected extensional SNP. Therefore,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  is log-space equivalent to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$ , which is in monotone connected extensional SNP, and so the claim of this theorem follows.  $\square$

**Corollary B.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{C}$  be a structure which is*

- interdefinable with a finitely bounded homogeneous structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , and
- a model-complete core.

Then,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  and the natural promise problem for  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  are polynomial-time Turing equivalent.

*Proof.* By Theorem B.1,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  is polynomial-time equivalent to a monotone connected SNP sentence  $\Phi$ . Hence, the statement follows from Theorem 6.6.  $\square$

**Corollary B.3.** *If  $E \neq \text{NE}$ , then there are problems in NP which are not polynomial-time disjunctive-equivalent to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  where  $\mathbb{C}$  is a structure which is*

- interdefinable with a finitely bounded homogeneous structure  $\mathbb{B}$ , and
- a model-complete core.

We conclude this section with one more application of (the proof of) Theorem B.1. First, notice that since for every structure  $\mathbb{C}$  in the scope of Theorem B.1 there is a (monotone connected) extensional SNP sentence  $\Phi$  such that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\Phi$  are polynomial-time equivalent, it follows from Theorem 6.5 and Lemma 6.4 that search reduces to decision for  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ . In general, the search problem witnessing this fact might be somewhat meaningless. However, it follows from the proof of Theorem B.1 that finding an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a finite set of bounds for an expansion of  $\mathbb{C}$ , reduces to deciding whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ .

**Corollary B.4.** *Let  $\mathbb{C}$  be a structure which is*

- a model-complete core, and
- interdefinable with a finitely bounded homogeneous structure.

Then, there is a (first-order) expansion  $\mathbb{D}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  with a finite set of bounds  $\mathcal{F}$  such that finding an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of an input structure  $\mathbb{A}$  is polynomial-time Turing-equivalent to deciding whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be the expansion of  $\mathbb{C}$  from the proof of Theorem B.1, that is, the expansion of  $\mathbb{C}$  by all the orbits of  $k$ -tuples of  $\mathbb{B}$ , for every  $k$  bounded by the maximum arity  $m$  of the relations in  $\mathbb{C}$  (which are the same as the orbits of  $\mathbb{B}$ ). Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the finite set of bounds of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Clearly, deciding whether  $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  reduces in polynomial-time to finding an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$ . Also, by Theorem B.1,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$  are

polynomial-time equivalent, so it suffices to show that finding an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$  reduces (via Turing reductions) to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ . Let  $\tau$  be the signature of  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $\sigma$  the signature of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Consider the following subroutine that runs on a finite  $\sigma$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , a  $k$ -tuple  $\bar{a}$  of  $A$ , and a  $k$ -ary relation symbol  $R \in \sigma \setminus \tau$ .

1. Test whether the structure  $\mathbb{A}'$  obtained from  $\mathbb{A}$  by adding  $\bar{a}$  to the interpretation of  $R$  belongs to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$ .
  - if yes, return  $\mathbb{A}'$ ;
  - else, if 1. has been repeated for every  $R \in \sigma \setminus \tau$  of arity  $k$ , then reject;
  - otherwise, repeat 1 with a new symbol  $S \in \sigma \setminus \tau$  of arity  $k$ .

To find an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of an input  $\mathbb{A}$  we do the following. First, let  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}} := \mathbb{A}$ , and

2. if for every  $k \leq m$ , every  $k$ -tuple  $\bar{a}$  of  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$  belongs to the interpretation of some  $R \in \sigma \setminus \tau$ , return  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$ ;
3. otherwise, run subroutine 1. on  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$  and  $\bar{a}$  where  $\bar{a}$  is a  $k$ -tuple that does not belong to the interpretation of any  $R \in \sigma \setminus \tau$ .
  - if subroutine 1. rejects on input  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$ ,  $\bar{a}$ , and a  $k$ -ary  $R \in \sigma \setminus \tau$ , then reject;
  - if subroutine 1. returns a structure  $\mathbb{A}'$ , let  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}} := \mathbb{A}'$ , and repeat 2.

Clearly, this algorithm runs in polynomial-time given an oracle to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{D})$ . It is also straightforward to observe that if the algorithm returns a structure  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$ , then  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion of  $\mathbb{A}$ ; and otherwise,  $\mathbb{A}_{\text{aux}}$  has no  $\mathcal{F}$ -free expansion.  $\square$

## C Hardness of $\text{Her}(\eta)$ (Equation 1)

In the introduction we claimed that  $\text{Her}(\eta)$  (see Equation 1) an example of a coNP-complete problem in Her-FO. We prove this claim in the following lemma.

**Lemma C.1.**  *$\text{Her}(\eta)$  is coNP-complete.*

*Proof.* Consider an instance  $\psi$  of 3-SAT with variables  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . We construct an  $\{E, R\}$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$  with vertex set  $v_1, \dots, v_n, u_1, \dots, u_n$ . The interpretation of  $E$  consists of all pairs  $(a_i, b_{i+1})$  and  $(a_n, b_1)$  for  $a, b \in \{u, v\}$  and  $i \in [n-1]$ . Finally, for each clause  $C$  with variables  $v_i, v_j, v_k$  we add a tuple  $R_C = (C_i, C_j, C_k)$  to the interpretation of  $R$  where  $C_i = v_i$  if  $v_i$  is negated in  $C$  and  $C_i = u_i$  if  $v_i$  appears positively in  $C$ . We claim that  $\psi$  is satisfiable if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\eta$ .

First, suppose that  $\psi$  is satisfiable and let  $f$  be such a truth assignment of the variables  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . Consider the substructure  $\mathbb{A}_f$  with vertex set  $\{v_i : f(v_i) = 1\}$  and  $\{u_i : f(v_i) = 0\}$ . In particular, for every  $i \in [n]$  (exactly) one of  $u_i, v_i$  belongs to  $\mathbb{A}_f$ , and this implies that  $\mathbb{A}_f$  models  $\forall x \exists a. E(x, a)$ . Also, since  $f$  makes the formula  $\psi$  true, it means that every clause  $C$  of  $\psi$  is satisfied, i.e., there is some variable  $v_i$  in  $C$  such that  $f(v_i) = 1$  and  $v_i$  is positive in  $C$  or  $f(v_i) = 0$  and  $v_i$  is negative in  $C$ . Thus,  $R_C \notin (\mathbb{A}_f)^3$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{A}$  contains a substructure that does not satisfy  $\eta$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{A}$  contains a substructure  $\mathbb{B}$  that does not satisfy  $\eta$ . Consider the function  $f: \{v_1, \dots, v_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined as the indicator function of  $B$ . Let  $C$  be a clause of  $\psi$  and suppose that  $C = (\neg v_i \vee v_j \vee v_k)$ . Then there is a tuple  $R_C = (v_i, u_j, u_k)$  in  $\mathbb{A}$ . Since  $\mathbb{B}$  does not satisfy  $\eta$ , it follows that  $(v_i, u_j, u_k) \notin B^3$ . Thus,  $v_i \notin B$  and hence  $f(v_i) = 0$ , so  $C$  is satisfied, or one of  $u_j$  or  $u_k$  is not in  $B$ , so one of  $v_j$  or  $v_k$  belongs to  $B$ , again proving that  $C$  is satisfied. The remaining possible clauses, i.e., clauses of the form  $(v_i, v_j, v_k), (\neg v_i, \neg v_j, v_k), \dots$  can be handled analogously.  $\square$

The following is an example of a CSP which is hereditarily definable by a  $\forall^* \exists \forall^*$ -formula, and hence in P by Theorem 7.5.

## D The Henson digraphs

As promised, we present a simpler proof of Corollary 3.6; however, the first-order formula given below has more quantifier alternations, and does not show that the Henson set is first-order definable (i.e., it does not prove Theorem 3.5 which we use to prove Theorem 6.3) and we therefore decided to only present it in the appendix. We introduce one auxiliary formula

$$\text{WD}(x, y) := E(y, x) \wedge \forall u(E(y, u) \wedge u \neq x \Rightarrow E(x, u)),$$

in words, we say that  $x$  *weakly dominates*  $y$ . We also denote by  $\text{D}(x, y)$  the formula that says  $x$  *dominates*  $y$ , i.e.,  $\text{D}(x, y) := E(x, y) \wedge \forall u(E(y, u) \Rightarrow E(x, u))$ . Consider the following first-order sentence.

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_H := \exists x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \forall z \exists w \forall v. & |\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}| = 6 \\ & \bigwedge E(x_1, x_2) \wedge E(x_1, y_2) \wedge E(y_1, x_1) \wedge E(y_1, x_2) \wedge E(y_1, y_2) \wedge E(y_2, x_2) \\ & \bigwedge z \notin \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\} \Rightarrow E(y_2, z) \wedge E(z, x_1) \\ & \bigwedge z \notin \{x_1, y_1, y_2\} \Rightarrow (\text{WD}(w, z) \wedge (\text{WD}(z, v) \Rightarrow \text{D}(w, v))) \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to notice that the tournament  $\mathbb{T}_n$  from the Henson set models  $\phi_H$ : witnesses for  $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4$  are  $1, 2, n-1, n, 3$ , and  $4$ , respectively. Clearly, for every  $j \in [n] \setminus \{1, 2, n-1, n\}$  there are edges  $(n, j)$  and  $(j, 1)$  in  $\mathbb{T}_n$ , i.e., the formula on the fourth line of the definition of  $\phi_H$  holds. Finally, to see that the last conjunct also holds, it suffices to verify that for each  $i \in [n] \setminus \{1, n-1, n\}$  there is some  $w \in [n]$  that weakly dominates  $i$  such that if  $i$  weakly dominates  $v \in [n]$ , then  $w$  dominates  $v$ . It is straightforward to verify that  $i-1$  is the unique vertex weakly dominated by  $i$ , and that  $i+1$  weakly dominates  $i$  and dominates  $i-1$ . Hence, by letting  $w = i+1$  we conclude that  $\mathbb{T}_n \models \phi_H$  for every  $n \geq 6$ .

**Lemma D.1.** *If a finite tournament  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfies  $\phi_H$ , then there is a subtournament  $\mathbb{T}'$  of  $\mathbb{T}$  such that  $\mathbb{T}'$  belongs to the Henson set.*

*Proof.* Let  $t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2$  be witnesses for  $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$  respectively. For  $n \geq 3$ , let  $t_n$  be witness of  $w$  for  $z = t_{n-1}$ . Consider the maximum integer  $k$  such that  $t_j \notin \{t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, s_1, s_2\}$  for every  $j \leq k$ . We will show that  $t_{k+1} = s_1$ . First, it is straightforward to observe that for each  $i \in [k]$  there are edges  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$  and  $(t_{i+1}, t_{i-1})$  in  $\mathbb{T}$ . It also follows inductively that for  $j < i \leq k$  there is an edge  $(t_{i+1}, t_j)$ . In particular,  $t_{k+1}$  is not weakly dominated by  $t_j$  for  $j \in \{2, \dots, i\}$ , because there is an edge  $(t_{k+1}, t_{j-1})$  but no edge  $(t_j, t_{j-1})$ , because  $t_j$  weakly dominates  $t_{j-1}$  (in particular,  $(t_{j-1}, t_j) \in E(\mathbb{T})$ ). This implies that  $t_{k+1} \notin \{t_2, \dots, t_k\}$ , so  $t_{k+1} \in \{t_1, s_2, s_3\}$ . Also, notice that  $t_k$  is not weakly dominated by  $t_1$  since  $(t_k, t_1) \in E(\mathbb{T})$ , and for the same reason together with the fact that  $(t_1, s_2) \in E(\mathbb{T})$ , we conclude that  $t_k$  is not dominated by  $s_2$ . Hence,  $t_{k+1} = s_1$ . The previous arguments also show that the function defined by  $i \mapsto t_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ , by  $k+1 \mapsto s_1 = t_{k+1}$ , and by  $k+2 \mapsto s_2$ , defines an embedding of the tournament  $\mathbb{T}_n$  into  $\mathbb{T}$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

**Theorem D.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the Henson set. If  $\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$  is the Fraïssé-limit of  $\mathcal{T}$ -free oriented graphs, then  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$  is in Her-FO. In particular,  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$  is hereditarily defined by the formula*

$$\neg[\forall x, y(\neg E(x, y) \vee \neg E(y, x)) \wedge (x \neq y \Rightarrow E(x, y) \vee E(y, x)) \wedge \phi_H].$$

*Proof.* Let  $\psi$  be the formula described above, and suppose that  $\mathbb{B}$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\psi$ . So, there is a substructure  $\mathbb{A}$  of  $\mathbb{B}$  that models  $\neg\psi$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{A}$  is a tournament, and since  $\mathbb{A} \models \phi_H$  it follows from Lemma D.1 that  $\mathbb{A}$  embeds a tournament  $\mathbb{T}_n \in \mathcal{T}$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{B}$  embeds  $\mathbb{T}_n$  so  $\mathbb{B} \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbb{B} \notin \text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$ , so  $\mathbb{B}$  embeds a tournament  $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ . We already remarked that every tournament in the Henson set models  $\phi_H$ , so  $\mathbb{T} \models \neg\psi$ , and thus  $\mathbb{B}$  does not hereditarily satisfy  $\psi$ .  $\square$

Since  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$  is precisely the class of all finite  $\mathcal{F}$ -free oriented graphs, Theorem D.2 implies Corollary 3.6.