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- Relation Algebras
- Intensively studied algebraic object (Tarski, Hodkinson, Maddux, ...).
- Tool to model temporal and spatial reasoning problems in AI.
- The Really Big Complexity Problem (RBCP)
- Classification problem for relation algebras.
- Introduced by Robin Hirsch in 1996.
- Result: Partial Solution of RBCP.
- A model theory perspective on relation algebras.
- Labeled homogeneous graphs (Cherlin).
- Translation of RBCP into a classification question about CSPs.


## Proper Relation Algebras

## Definition

Let $D$ be a set and $E \subseteq D^{2}$ an equivalence relation. Then ( $\left.\mathcal{P}(E) ; \cup,-0,1,1^{\prime},{ }^{-}, \circ\right)$ is a relation algebra for the following interpretation of function symbols:
(1) $A \cup B:=A \cup B$,
(2) $\bar{A}:=E \backslash A$,
(3) $0:=\varnothing$,
(1) $1:=E$,
(1) $1^{\prime}:=\{(x, x) \mid x \in D\}$,
(-) $A^{\sim}:=\{(x, y) \mid(y, x) \in A\}$,
(1) $A \circ B:=\{(x, z) \mid \exists y \in D:(x, y) \in A$ and $(y, z) \in B\}$.

A subalgebra of $\left(\mathcal{P}(E) ; \cup,-0,1,1^{\prime}, \check{\sim}, \circ\right)$ is called proper relation algebra.
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(1) $1^{\prime}:=\{(x, x) \mid x \in D\}$,
(-) $A^{\wedge}:=\{(x, y) \mid(y, x) \in A\}$,
(1) $A \circ B:=\{(x, z) \mid \exists y \in D:(x, y) \in A$ and $(y, z) \in B\}$.

A subalgebra of $\left(\mathcal{P}(E) ; \cup,-, 0,1,1^{\prime}, \check{\sim}, \circ\right)$ is called proper relation algebra.
For model theorists:
For a proper relation algebra $\mathcal{R}$ we view $\mathbb{R}=(D ; \mathcal{R})$ as a relational structure.

## Relation Algebras

## Definition

A relation algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra ( $A ; \cup,,^{\prime}, 0,1,1^{\prime}, \sim, \circ$ ) of type ( $2,1,0,0,0,1,2$ ) satisfying the following laws:
(3) $(A ; \cup,, 0,1)$ is a boolean algebra,
(2) $(x \circ y) \circ z=x \circ(y \circ z)$,
(3) $(x \cup y) \circ z=x \circ z \cup y \circ z$,
(1) $x \circ 1^{\prime}=x$,
(0) $\left(x^{\smile}\right)^{乞}=x$,

- $(x \cup y)^{\llcorner }=x^{\wedge} \cup y^{\wedge}$,
(1) $(x \circ y)^{-}=y^{-} \circ x^{-}$
( ( $\left(x^{-} \circ \overline{(x \circ y)}\right) \cup \bar{y}=\bar{y}$.
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Define a relation algebra on $\mathcal{P}(\{=, 1,2,3,4\})$ with the following multiplication table.

| $\circ$ | $=$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $=$ | $=$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | $1 \cup 2 \cup=$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3$ | $3 \cup 4$ | $3 \cup 4$ |
| 2 | 2 | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4 \cup=$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ | $2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ |
| 3 | 3 | $2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4 \cup=$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ |
| 4 | 4 | $3 \cup 4$ | $2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4$ | $1 \cup 2 \cup 3 \cup 4 \cup=$ |
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## Examples

- $\left(\mathbb{Q} ;=,<,>, \leq, \geq, \varnothing, \neq, \mathbb{Q}^{2}\right)$ is a representation of the Point Algebra.
- The countable, universal, homogeneous, triangle-free graph

$$
\mathbb{H}=\left(V ;=, E, N, E \cup=, E \cup N, N \cup=, \varnothing, V^{2}\right)
$$

is a representation of the Henson Algebra.
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## Definitions

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a relation algebra. An $\mathcal{A}$-network $(V ; f)$ is a finite set of nodes $V$ together with a function $f: V \times V \rightarrow A$.
Let $\mathbb{B}$ be a representation of $\mathcal{A}$. An $\mathcal{A}$-network $(V ; f)$ is satisfiable in $\mathbb{B}$ if there exists an assignment $s: V \rightarrow B$ such that for all $x, y \in V$ :

$$
(s(x), s(y)) \in f(x, y)^{\mathbb{B}}
$$

An $\mathcal{A}$-network $(V ; f)$ is satisfiable if there exists some representation $\mathbb{C}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $(V ; f)$ is satisfiable in $\mathbb{C}$.

Point Algebra Network:


Henson Algebra Network:
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## Theorem (Partial RBCP)

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite relation algebra with a flexible atom.
Then $\operatorname{NSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is in P or NP-complete.
Moreover, it is decidable which of the two cases holds.

## Definition

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite relation algebra. An atom $S \in A$ is flexible if for all
$B, C \in A \backslash\left\{1^{\prime}\right\}$ it holds that $S \leq B \circ C$.
$\rightarrow$ "All triangles that contain a $S$ are allowed."
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Cherlin: Classification is open.
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## Normal Representations

## Definition

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a relation algebra. An $\mathcal{A}$-network $(V ; f)$ is called atomic if the image of $f$ only contains atoms and if

$$
f(a, c) \leq f(a, b) \circ f(b, c)
$$

## Definitions

A representation $\mathbb{B}$ of a relation algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called

- fully universal if every atomic $\mathcal{A}$-network is satisfiable in $\mathbb{B}$;
- square if $1^{\mathbb{B}}=B^{2}$;
- homogeneous if every isomorphism of finite substructures of $\mathbb{B}$ can be extended to an automorphism;
- normal if it is fully universal, square and homogeneous.
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## Definition

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a $\tau$-structure. The Constraint Satisfaction Problem of $\mathbb{A}$ is to decide for a given finite $\tau$-structure $\mathbb{C}$ whether there exists a homomorphism from $\mathbb{C}$ to $\mathbb{A}$.

Proposition
Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite relation algebra with normal representation $\mathbb{A}$.
Then $\mathbb{A}$ is finitely bounded and $\operatorname{NSP}(\mathcal{A})$ equals $\operatorname{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ (up to some cosmetic differences in the formalisation) and is therefore in NP.

Remark: There exists a finite relation algebra with undecidable NSP (Hirsch 1999)!
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## Result restated

## Theorem

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite relation algebra with a flexible atom. Then $\mathcal{A}$ has a normal representation $\Gamma$ and $\operatorname{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P or NP-complete. Moreover, it is decidable which of the two cases holds.

Comments on the Proof:

- Fraisse's Theorem: $\Gamma$ exists, because of free amalgamation.
- Universal algebra: Study homomorphisms $\Gamma^{n} \rightarrow \Gamma$.
- Important result by Hubička and Nešetřil: $\Gamma$ with a generic linear order is a Ramsey structure.
- Use of the Bulatov-Zhuk Dichotomy Theorem for finite-domain CSPs.
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Henson Algebra:
The Boolean algebra on $\left\{=, E, N, E \cup=, E \cup N, N \cup=, \varnothing, V^{2}\right\}$ with the multiplication specified by the forbidden triangle:


NSP of the Hensen Algebra is NP-complete!

Metric space $+F$ :
The Boolean algebra on $\mathcal{P}(\{=, 1,2,3,4, F\})$ with the multiplication specified by the forbidden triangles:


NSP of the "Metric $+F$ Algebra" is polynomial-time solvable!

Thank you for your attention!

## Result

Theorem
Let $\Gamma$ be a normal representation of a finite integral relation algebra with a flexible atom. One of the following holds:
(1) There exists for every two atoms $A$ and $B$ of the algebra a polymorphism $f_{A, B}$ of $\Gamma$ that is canonical and the induced function on $\{A, B\}$ is of Schaefer-type, then $\Gamma$ has a canonical pseudo-Siggers polymorphism. Then $\operatorname{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is in P .
(3) $\operatorname{CSP}(\Gamma)$ is NP-complete.

