

On the Computational Power of Extensional ESO

Manuel Bodirsky 

Institut für Algebra, TU Dresden, Germany

Santiago Guzmán-Pro 

Institut für Algebra, TU Dresden, Germany

Abstract

Extensional ESO is a fragment of existential second-order logic (ESO) that captures the following family of problems. Given a fixed ESO sentence Ψ and an input structure $\mathbb{A}$ the task is to decide whether there is an *extension* $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ that satisfies the first-order part of Ψ , i.e., a structure $\mathbb{B}$ such that $R^{\mathbb{A}} \subseteq R^{\mathbb{B}}$ for every existentially quantified predicate R of Ψ , and $R^{\mathbb{A}} = R^{\mathbb{B}}$ for every non-quantified predicate R of Ψ . In particular, extensional ESO describes all pre-coloured finite-domain constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs).

In this paper we study the computational power of extensional ESO; we ask, *for which problems in NP is there a polynomial-time equivalent problem in extensional ESO?* One of our main results states that extensional ESO has the same computational power as *hereditary first-order logic*. We also characterize the computational power of the fragment of extensional ESO with monotone universal first-order part in terms of finitely bounded CSPs. These results suggest a rich computational power of this logic, and we conjecture that extensional ESO captures NP-intermediate problems. We further support this conjecture by showing that extensional ESO can express current candidate NP-intermediate problems such as Graph Isomorphism, and Monotone Dualization (up to polynomial-time equivalence). On the other hand, another main result proves that extensional ESO does not have the full computational power of NP: there are problems in NP that are not polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in extensional ESP (unless $E=NE$).

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation $\rightarrow$ Complexity theory and logic; Theory of computation $\rightarrow$ Finite Model Theory; Theory of computation $\rightarrow$ Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases Existential second-order logic, constraint satisfaction problem, complexity classification, Hereditary first-order logic, NP-intermediate problems

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.LICS.2026.20

Related Version *Full Version:* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.08515> [16]

Funding 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.

Acknowledgements The authors are thankful to Antoine Amarilli for a guided tour through Constrained Topological Sorting.

1 Introduction

First-order logic (FO) has good computational properties: given a fixed first-order sentence ϕ it can be verified in deterministic logarithmic space whether an input structure $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies ϕ . 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



© Manuel Bodirsky and Santiago Guzmán-Pro;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

41st Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2026).

Editors: Claudia Faggian and Joost-Pieter Katoen; Article No. 20; pp. 20:1–20:26

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

hierarchy [38]. Even restricted fragments of second-order logic can be very expressive. For instance, Fagin [29] 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*.¹ 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 [30], but clearly it cannot express every class of finite structures in NP, because SNP can only describe *hereditary classes*, i.e., classes $\mathcal{C}$ closed under taking induced substructures. However, Feder and Vardi [30] proved that SNP is NP-rich (see [8] for some of the missing details of the proof given in [30]). In particular, it follows from Ladner’s theorem [42] that whenever a fragment $\mathcal{L}$ of ESO is NP-rich, then $\mathcal{L}$ does not exhibit a P versus NP-complete dichotomy.

On the dichotomy side, Feder and Vardi showed that a fragment of ESO called *monotone monadic SNP (MMSNP)* has the same computational power as finite-domain CSPs. Hence, it follows from the finite-domain CSP dichotomy [21, 49] that MMSNP exhibits a P vs. NP-complete dichotomy. Bienvenu, ten Cate, Lutz, and Wolter [11] asked whether the dichotomy for MMSNP extends to a broader fragment called *guarded monotone SNP (GMSNP)*. In this direction, Bodirsky, Knäuer, and Starke [12] showed that GMSNP should indeed exhibit a dichotomy according to the Bodirsky–Pinsker conjecture [13, Conjecture 3.7.1] – yet, the GMSNP (conjectured) dichotomy seems elusive. It is worth mentioning that so far, the main technique to show that a fragment of ESO does not exhibit a P versus NP-complete dichotomy is by showing that it is NP-rich [40].

In this paper we initiate the study of the computational power of fragments of ESO beyond complexity dichotomies and NP-richness. We propose to find a *natural* and *decidable* syntactic fragment of ESO that is neither NP-rich nor exhibits a P vs. NP-complete dichotomy. To this end, we introduce *extensional ESO*, and we exhibit several families of problems that can be expressed in extensional ESO, ranging from the world of CSPs to graph theory and to language theory. We then address the question “what is the computational power of extensional ESO?”. We show that extensional ESO has the same computational power as the recently introduced formalism *hereditary first-order logic*. We also show that extensional ESO is not NP-rich, unless $E = NE$.² However, we conjecture that extensional ESO captures NP-intermediate problems. We support this conjecture by showing that some examples of candidate NP-intermediate problems such as Graph Isomorphism and Monotone Dualization are expressible in extensional ESO. We also show that a very large class of CSPs, namely the class of CSPs for *finitely bounded structures*, can be expressed in extensional ESO; we believe that this class contains NP-intermediate problems.

In Figure 1 we present an illustration of this story, and we now present a brief description of *emphasized characters* (all missing details will be carefully introduced later in the paper).

The central role of this paper is played by *extensional ESO*. An ESO τ -sentence Ψ is called *extensional* if for every existentially quantified predicate R there is a distinct symbol $R' \in \tau$ of the same arity such that Ψ contains a conjunct $\forall \bar{x} (R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x}))$, and R' does

¹ If we consider disjunctive, conjunctive, or Turing reductions, we call such classes *conjunctive*, *disjunctive*, or *Turing NP-rich*, respectively. These reductions are defined in Section 2.

² The class E is the class of problems computable in exponential time with linear exponent; NE is its non-deterministic pendant. The assumption that $E \neq NE$ is stronger than the usual assumption that $P \neq NP$, but still a common assumption in complexity theory [10, 35, 47].

not appear anywhere else in Ψ . In this case we say that R *extends* R' . Clearly, every problem described by an ESO sentence Φ is in NP. To present two simple examples, we consider *digraph acyclicity*, and *precoloured 3-coloring problem* from graph theory; further examples can be found in Section 3.

► **Example 1** (Acyclic digraphs). The class of strict linear orders can be easily axiomatized in universal first-order logic with a binary relation symbol $<$. Let ϕ be such a sentence, and notice that a digraph $\mathbb{D}$ is acyclic if and only if it is a spanning subdigraph of a transitive tournament, in other words, of a strict linear order. Hence, the class of acyclic digraphs is described by the extensional ESO sentence

$$\exists < \forall x, y ((E(x, y) \Rightarrow <(x, y)) \wedge \phi).$$

► **Example 2** (Pre-coloured 3-colourability). Given an input graph G with a partial colouring $c: U \subseteq V \rightarrow \{R, G, B\}$, the task is to decide whether there is a 3-colouring of G such that its restriction to U coincides with c . This problem can be expressed by the extensional ESO sentence

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


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

As a supporting character we have *hereditary first-order logic*. This is a recently introduced logic that can naturally model several computational problems such as digraph acyclicity, graph chordality, and several infinite-domain CSPs [15] – parametrized variants of this problem were previously studied, e.g., in [7, 31]. A structure $\mathbb{A}$ *hereditarily* satisfies an FO sentence ϕ if all (non-empty) substructures of $\mathbb{A}$ satisfy ϕ . We denote by $\text{Her}(\phi)$ the class of finite substructures that hereditarily satisfy ϕ , and we say that a class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures is in hereditary first-order logic (HerFO) if $\mathcal{C} = \text{Her}(\psi)$ for some FO sentence ψ . HerFO can be naturally defined as a fragment of universal monadic second-order logic [15, Observation 4.1].

The *tractability problem* for second-order logic asks whether a given SO sentence Φ describes a polynomial-time solvable problem. The tractability problem is already undecidable for ESO (and thus, for USO as well); see, e.g., [13]. As a rule of thumb, we expect that if a fragment $\mathcal{L}$ of ESO (or of USO) has a rich computational power, e.g., is NP-rich, then the tractability problem is undecidable for $\mathcal{L}$. It is still open whether HerFO captures coNP-intermediate problems, nonetheless, it is known that the tractability problem is already undecidable for HerFO [15].

Our secondary character is the family of CSPs of finitely bounded structures. A class of finite structures $\mathcal{C}$ is *finitely bounded* if there if there exists a finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of structures such that a finite structure $\mathbb{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if no structure from $\mathcal{F}$ embeds into $\mathbb{A}$. We say that a structure $\mathbb{B}$ is called *finitely bounded* if the class of finite structures that embed into $\mathbb{B}$ is finitely bounded. In particular, every finite structure is finitely bounded, but also the countable homogeneous linear order $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ is finitely bounded, as well as the generic partial order and the generic semilinear order [43]. Examples from graph theory include the universal homogeneous K_k -free graphs [41] and the generic circular triangle-free graph [17].

CSPs of finitely bounded structures are closely related to the previously introduced logic SNP. In particular, there is a syntactic fragment of SNP that captures CSPs of *reducts* of finitely bounded structures [13, Corollary 1.4.12] – a reduct of a structure A is a structure obtained A' by forgetting some relations in A . Actually, this family of CSPs (and the corresponding fragment of SNP) has the full computational power of NP [13, Proposition 13.2.2]. This has lead some people (including us) to believe that CSPs of finitely bounded structures also capture NP-intermediate problems. It would be an amazing surprise if CSPs of finitely bounded structures exhibit a P vs. NP-complete dichotomy, but as soon as one considered their reducts, we obtain the full computational power of NP!



■ **Figure 1** Classes of computational problems studied in this paper. Solid arcs indicate inclusions, and a dashed arc from A to B indicates that every problem in A is polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in B – for a cleaner picture we omit the solid arc from extensional EMSO to EMSO. GI stands for the Graph Isomorphism problem, and MD for the Monotone Dualization problem.

1.1 Our contributions

Our first main result is a characterization of the computational power of extensional ESO in terms of hereditary first-order logic (Theorem 10): we show that for every sentence Ψ in extensional ESO there exists a first-order formula ϕ such that $\text{Her}(\phi)$ is polynomial-time (in fact, log-space) equivalent to the problem described by the negation of Ψ , and vice versa. As a byproduct of this connection, we get that the tractability problem for extensional ESO is undecidable (Corollary 8).

We then look at fragments of extensional ESO defined by restrictions on the quantification and on the polarity of atoms of the first-order part. In particular, our second main result characterizes the computational power of *monotone extensional SNP* (introduced below) in

terms of CSPs of finitely bounded structures (Theorem 14). We also show that extensional ESO captures surjective CSPs, as well as several graph sandwich problems, orientation completion problems, and constrained topological sorting problems. We further present examples of candidate NP-intermediate problems expressible in extensional ESO; namely, Graph Isomorphism and Monotone Dualization (Section 6).

These results point towards a rich computational power of extensional ESO, and we thus conjecture that extensional ESO does not exhibit a P vs. NP-complete dichotomy (Conjecture 15). However, our last main result shows that extensional ESO cannot be NP-rich (Corollary 20): there are problems in NP that are not polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in extensional ESO, unless $E = NE$. To prove this result, we show that every problem in extensional ESO is *disjunctively self-reducible*, and that this class is not NP-rich, unless $E = NE$ (Theorem 19); we complement this result by showing that disjunctive self-reducible sets do not exhibit a P versus NP-complete complexity dichotomy (Theorem 22). It also follows from this result that CSPs of finitely bounded structures do not capture the full computational power of NP, and that HerFO cannot be coNP-rich.

1.2 Outline

We begin by recalling some basic concepts from finite model theory (Section 2) and continue to present several families of examples captured by extensional ESO in Section 3. In Section 4 we show that extensional ESO and HerFO have the same computational power. 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 14). In Section 6 we prove that Graph Isomorphism and Monotone Dualization are captured by extensional ESO (up-to polynomial-time equivalence). We discuss the limitations of the computational power of extensional ESO in Section 7, and in particular we prove that extensional ESO is not NP-rich, unless $E = NE$ (Corollary 20). 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 [37]. We also use standard notions from complexity theory.

2.1 (First-order) structures

Given a relational signature τ and a τ -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 τ -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 finite structures $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of finite τ -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 τ -structures is closed under homomorphisms).

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

If $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$ are τ -structures with disjoint domains A and B , respectively, then the *disjoint union* $\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{B}$ is the τ -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 $\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$.

For examples we will often use 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 [18] 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 SNP and its fragments

Let τ be a finite set of relation symbols. An *SNP τ -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 ψ is a quantifier free $\tau \cup \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$ -formula. If the structure $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies the sentence Ψ , we write $\mathbb{A} \models \Psi$. We say that a class of finite τ -structures $\mathcal{C}$ is in *SNP* if there exists an SNP τ -sentence Φ such that $\mathbb{A} \models \Phi$ if and only if $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$. Since the first-order part of an SNP sentence is universal, the class of (finite) models of an SNP sentence is closed under substructures.

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

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

Notice that for every SNP sentence Φ 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 Φ is in monotone SNP, then it is in SNP without equalities.³ Connected monotone SNP is closely related to CSPs in the following sense.

► **Theorem 3** (Corollary 1.4.12 in [13]). *An SNP sentence Φ describes a problem of the form $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ for some (infinite) structure $\mathbb{A}$ if and only if Φ is equivalent to a connected monotone SNP sentence.*

2.3 Polynomial-time reductions

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 $x \in L$ if and only if $y \in L'$ for some $y \in g(x)$. Similarly, if g satisfies that $x \in L$ if and only if $y \in L'$ for all $y \in g(x)$, 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.

3 Extensional ESO

The aim of this section is to present several families of computational problems considered in the literature that are in extensional ESO. First, we formally define extensional ESO.

► **Definition 4.** *An ESO τ -sentence Ψ is called extensional if for every existentially quantified predicate R there is a distinct symbol $R' \in \tau$ of the same arity such that Ψ contains a conjunct $\forall \bar{x}(R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x}))$, and R' does not appear anywhere else in Ψ . In this case we say that R extends R' .*

Actually, one can reinterpret extensional ESO as follows. Consider a signature σ which is the disjoint union of two signatures τ_1 and τ_2 , and let ϕ be a first-order σ -sentence. On an input σ -structure, the task is to decide whether there is an extension $\mathbb{A}'$ of $\mathbb{A}$ where $\mathbb{A}' \models \phi$ and we are not allowed to modify the interpretation of symbols $R \in \tau_1$, i.e., $A' = A$, $R(\mathbb{A}') = R(\mathbb{A})$ for each $R \in \tau_1$, and $R(\mathbb{A}) \subseteq R(\mathbb{A}')$ for each $R \in \tau_2$. Clearly, these problems can be expressed with extensional ESO sentences.

³ We deviate from the notation from [30]: they call this fragment SNP without inequalities since they assume negation normal form and we do not.

3.1 Surjective CSPs

Arguably, the most natural ESO sentence describing k -colourability has k unary quantified predicates $U_1, \dots, U_k$, and the first-order part states that every vertex belongs to exactly one U_i , and that each U_i is an independent set. Such a sentence is not in extensional ESO, but k -colourability can be expressed in extensional ESO as follows.

► **Example 5** (k -colouring problem). Let E_1 be a binary relational symbol. For every positive integer k , denote by ϕ_k the universal $\{E_1\}$ -formula stating that $(V; E_1)$ is a loopless symmetric graph with no induced clique on $k+1$ vertices K_{k+1} and no induced $K_1 + K_2$ (the three-element graph which is formed as the disjoint union of an isolated vertex and an edge). Hence, $(V; E_1) \models \phi_k$ if and only if $(V; E_1)$ is a *complete k -partite* graph, i.e., there is partition P of V with at most k parts such that there is an edge $uv \in E_1$ if and only if u and v lie in different parts of P . Now, consider the extensional ESO sentence

$$\Phi := \exists E_1 (\phi_k \wedge \forall x, y (E(x, y) \Rightarrow E_1(x, y)))$$

Then a graph $(V; E)$ satisfies Φ if and only if there is an edge set $E_1 \supseteq E$ such that $(V; E_1)$ is a complete k -partite graph. It thus follows that $(V; E) \models \Phi$ if and only if $(V; E)$ is k -colourable.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$ be relational τ -structures. A *full-homomorphism* is a homomorphism $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ such that for every r -ary relation symbol R and every r -tuple $\bar{a}$ of A it is the case that $\bar{a} \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$ if and only if $f(\bar{a}) \in R^{\mathbb{B}}$. In the following, will assume that τ is finite. We denote by $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$ the class of finite structure $\mathbb{A}$ that admit a full homomorphism to $\mathbb{B}$.

It is straightforward to observe that $\mathbb{A}$ maps homomorphically to $\mathbb{B}$ if and only if there is an extension $\mathbb{A}'$ of $\mathbb{A}$ that admits a full-homomorphism to $\mathbb{B}$. It was proved in [5] that for every finite τ -structure $\mathbb{B}$ there is a finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of finite τ -structures such that $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$ is the class of $\mathcal{F}$ -free finite structures, i.e., the class of all finite structures that do not contain any substructure from $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, there is a first-order sentence ϕ such that $\text{CSP}_{\text{full}}(\mathbb{B})$ coincides with the finite models of ϕ . Hence, if $\tau = \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$ is the signature of $\mathbb{B}$, and ϕ' is obtained from ϕ by replacing each symbol R_i by R'_i , the CSP of $\mathbb{B}$ is described by the extensional ESO sentence

$$\exists R'_1, \dots, R'_k \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \tau} \forall \bar{x} (R(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R'(\bar{x})) \wedge \phi' \right).$$

Surjective CSPs are the variant of CSPs where the task is to decide whether there exists a surjective homomorphism $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ from a given input structure $\mathbb{A}$ to a fixed template structure $\mathbb{B}$. Similarly as for CSPs one can show that for every finite structure $\mathbb{B}$ the surjective CSP for $\mathbb{B}$ is in extensional ESO as follows. For a finite τ -structure $\mathbb{B}$, let $\delta_{\mathbb{B}}$ denote the *diagram* of $\mathbb{B}$, that is, the conjunctive quantifier-free formula whose variables x_b are indexed by elements $b \in B$ and such that for each symbol $R \in \tau$ of arity r , the formula $\delta_{\mathbb{B}}$ contains the conjunct $R(x_{b_1}, \dots, x_{b_r})$ if $(b_1, \dots, b_r) \in R(\mathbb{B})$, and contains the conjunct $\neg R(x_{b_1}, \dots, x_{b_r})$ otherwise. We denote by $\delta'_{\mathbb{B}}$ the existential sentence obtained from the diagram $\delta_{\mathbb{B}}$ by existentially quantifying each variable and replacing each occurrence of $R \in \tau$ by R' . Now, using the arguments above, it follows that there is a surjective homomorphism from $\mathbb{A}$ to $\mathbb{B}$ if and only if $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies the extensional ESO sentence

$$\exists R'_1, \dots, R'_k \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \tau} \forall \bar{x} (R(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R'(\bar{x})) \wedge \phi' \wedge \delta'_{\mathbb{B}} \right).$$

3.2 Graph Sandwich Problems

Graph Sandwich Problems were introduced by Golumbic, Kaplan, and Shamir in [33]. The *sandwich problem* (SP) for a graph class $\mathcal{C}$ is the following computational problem. The input is a pair of graphs $((V, E_1), (V, E_2))$ where $E_1 \subseteq E_2$, and the task is to decide whether there is an edge set E such that $E_1 \subseteq E \subseteq E_2$ and the graph (V, E) belongs to $\mathcal{C}$. Equivalently, the SP for $\mathcal{C}$ can receive as an input a triple (V, E, N) where V is a set of vertices, E is a set of edges, and N is a set of non-edges. The task is to determine whether there is a graph $(V, E') \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $E \subseteq E'$ and $E' \cap N = \emptyset$.

Considerable attention has been placed on the SP for $\mathcal{F}$ -free graphs for finite sets of graphs $\mathcal{F}$ [1, 23, 24, 25]. In particular, for every such finite set $\mathcal{F}$, there is a universal sentence ϕ such that a $\{E\}$ -structure $\mathbb{G}$ satisfies ϕ if and only if $\mathbb{G}$ is an $\mathcal{F}$ -free graph. Consider the binary signature $\{E, N\}$, and let ϕ' be the universal sentence obtained by replacing each occurrence of E by E' , and every occurrence of $\neg E$ by N' . It is now straightforward to verify that the SP for $\mathcal{F}$ -free graphs is described by the extensional ESO sentence

$$\begin{aligned} \exists E', N' \forall x, y ((E(x, y) \Rightarrow E'(x, y)) \wedge (N(x, y) \Rightarrow N'(x, y)) \\ \wedge (N'(x, y) \Leftrightarrow \neg E'(x, y)) \wedge \phi'). \end{aligned}$$

3.3 Orientation Completion Problems

An *oriented graph* is a digraph $\mathbb{D} = (V, A)$ with no symmetric pair of edges, i.e., there are no $x, y \in V$ such that $(x, y) \in A$ and $(y, x) \in A$. Orientation completion problems were introduced by Bang-Jensen, Huang, and Zhu [6]. Given a finite set of oriented graphs $\mathcal{F}$, the orientation completion to $\mathcal{F}$ -free graphs is the following. The input is a partially oriented graph $(\mathbb{G}, A')$, i.e., a graph $\mathbb{G}$ together with a set of edges $A' \subseteq E(\mathbb{G})$ such that $(V(\mathbb{G}), A')$ is an oriented graph. The task is to decide whether there exists an $\mathcal{F}$ -free *orientation completion* of $(\mathbb{G}, A)$, i.e., an edge set A such that

- $A' \subseteq A$,
- $(\mathbb{G}, A)$ is an oriented graph that does not embed any $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{F}$, and
- the symmetric closure of A equals $E(\mathbb{G})$.

Clearly, for every finite set of oriented graphs $\mathcal{F}$ there is a universal $\{A\}$ -sentence ϕ that describes the class of $\mathcal{F}$ -free oriented graphs. Hence, the $\mathcal{F}$ -free orientation problem is captured by

$$\exists A \forall x, y ((A'(x, y) \Rightarrow A(x, y)) \wedge ((A(x, y) \vee A(y, x)) \Leftrightarrow E(x, y)) \wedge \phi).$$

3.4 Constrained Topological Sorting

A *topological sort* of a directed acyclic graph $\mathbb{D}$ is a linear ordering $<$ of D such that if $(x, y) \in E(\mathbb{D})$, then $x < y$. *Constrained topological sorting problems (CTSs)* arise in the context of automata theory and regular languages [2]. These problems are described by a regular language L ; the input is a directed acyclic graph $\mathbb{D}$ whose vertices are labeled with letters of some alphabet Σ and the task is to decide whether there exists a topological sort of $\mathbb{D}$ where the word obtained by reading the label of the vertices according to the order $<$ belongs to the language L . Amarilli and Paperman conjecture that CTS for regular languages exhibit an NL vs. NP-complete dichotomy [2, Conjecture 2.3]. By considering a slight modification on the problem, they show that such a dichotomy holds for aperiodic regular languages [2, Theorem 5.2]. Aperiodic regular languages correspond to regular languages

20:10 On the Computational Power of Extensional ESO

expressible in first-order logic [48] where the signature consists of a unary relation symbol for each letter of the alphabet Σ and a binary relation symbol s encoding the successor relation. Clearly, the successor relation can be first-order defined from the order relation, e.g.,

$$s(x, y) := (x < y) \wedge (\forall z. (x < z < y \Rightarrow (z = x \vee z = y))).$$

Hence, for every aperiodic regular language L there is a first-order $\Sigma \cup \{<\}$ -sentence ϕ that describes the language L . Therefore, the CTS for L is expressible in extensional ESO by

$$\exists < (\forall x, y (E(x, y) \Rightarrow x < y) \wedge \phi).$$

4 Extensional ESO and HerFO

Every problem in HerFO is polynomial-time equivalent to the complement of a problem described by monadic extensional ESO. This follows from the following observation [15].

► **Observation 6.** *Let $\phi := Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_n x_n. \xi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a first-order τ -formula, where ξ is a quantifier-free formula. If $\psi(x)$ is a first-order τ -formula, then there is a τ -formula ϕ_ψ such that a τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies ϕ_ψ if and only if the substructure of $\mathbb{A}$ with domain $\{a \in A : \mathbb{A} \models \psi(a)\}$ satisfies ϕ . Namely,*

$$\phi_\psi := Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_n x_n \left(\bigwedge_{i \in U} \psi(x_i) \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{i \in E} \psi(x_i) \wedge \xi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right),$$

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 ϕ_ψ from Observation 6 in the following lemma and in the proof of Theorem 9.

► **Lemma 7.** *Let ϕ be a first-order τ -formula. Then, $\text{Her}(\phi)$ and the complement of the problem described by the monadic extensional $(\tau \cup \{S\})$ -sentence Ψ are log-space equivalent, where*

$$\Psi := \exists \bar{S} (\forall x. S(x) \Rightarrow \bar{S}(x)) \wedge (\exists y. \neg \bar{S}(y)) \wedge (\neg \phi)_\psi$$

with $\psi(x) = \neg \bar{S}(x)$.

Proof. Notice that an expansion $\mathbb{A}' := (\mathbb{A}, \bar{S})$ of $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies the first-order part of Φ 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 τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ is a $(\tau \cup \{S\})$ -structure, and it thus follows via Observation 6 and the definition of ϕ_ψ that $\mathbb{A} \models \neg \Psi$ if and only if every non-empty substructure of $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies ϕ , 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 ϕ . 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 $\text{Her}(\phi)$. ◀

Using the fact that the tractability problem for HerFO is undecidable [15] to conclude that the tractability problem for extensional ESO is also undecidable (via Lemma 7).

► **Corollary 8.** *The tractability problem for (monadic) extensional ESO is undecidable.*

4.1 HerFO captures extensional ESO

Now we see that for every problem in extensional ESO, there is a polynomial-time equivalent problem in HerFO. That is, for every extensional ESO τ -sentence Ψ we propose a first-order σ -formula ϕ 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 τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$, we construct a σ -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 ϕ . We illustrate a construction of $\mathbb{B}$ in Figure 2. Naturally, we will define ϕ in such a way that a substructure $\mathbb{B}'$ of $\mathbb{B}$ encoding an expansion $\mathbb{A}'$ of $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies ϕ 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 σ -structures that are not in the image of the previous construction. This will also be taken care of by ϕ : we will include some clauses in ϕ that will allow us to find a substructure $\mathbb{B}_1$ of $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\mathbb{B}$ hereditarily satisfies ϕ if and only if $\mathbb{B}_1$ hereditarily satisfies ϕ , and $\mathbb{B}_1$ is constructed (as before) from some τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$. This will yield a polynomial-time reduction from $\text{Her}(\phi)$ to $\neg\Psi$.

► **Theorem 9.** *For every sentence Ψ in extensional ESO there exists a first-order formula ϕ such that the problem described by $\neg\Psi$ is log-space equivalent to $\text{Her}(\phi)$.*

Proof. Let τ be the input signature of Ψ . We may assume that Ψ 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 ψ in conjunctive normal form. For each $i \in [n]$ let R'_i be an r_i -ary predicate in τ such that ψ 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 ψ . We denote by τ' the subset of τ consisting of R'_i for every $i \in [n]$.

We first consider the trivial cases where either all finite structures satisfy Ψ , or no finite structure satisfies Ψ . In the former case, we may pick ϕ 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 ρ be the signature that contains τ , 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 ϕ 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 ϕ_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 6); finally, let ϕ_1 be the formula obtained from χ' by replacing occurrences of $R_i(y_1, \dots, y_{r_i})$ by $\forall z. \neg S_i(y_1, \dots, y_{r_i}, z)$. 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 ϕ_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 ϕ_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 ϕ_4 be the formula stating that if $E(x, y)$ holds, then $D(x)$ and $D(y)$ hold.
5. Let ϕ_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 ϕ_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.

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

$$A \times \{0\} \cup A^{r_1} \times \{1\} \cup \dots \cup A^{r_n} \times \{n\}$$

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 ℓ),
- $(a_i, 0) < (a_j, 0)$ 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 ϕ . Note that $\mathbb{B}$ satisfies ϕ_3, ϕ_4, ϕ_5 , and ϕ_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 ϕ_2 , because the vertex $(a_k, 0)$ where k is the first index i' from $i, i + 1, \dots, j$ (where indices are modulo ℓ) such that $(a_{i'}, 0)$ belongs to the domain of $\mathbb{B}'$ provides a witness for the existentially quantified variable y in ϕ_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 ϕ_2 . This proves that if $A \times \{0\} \not\subseteq B'$, then $\mathbb{B}'$ satisfies ϕ_2 . Conversely, if $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$, then $\mathbb{B}'$ does not satisfy ϕ_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 ϕ_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 $R'_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ for every $R \in \tau$. Moreover, the image of e is exactly the set of expansions of $\mathbb{A}$ that satisfy $R'_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ 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 $R'_i(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$ for every $R \in \tau$.

It follows from the definition of ϕ_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 $\mathbb{C} \models \neg(Q_1x_1 \dots Q_mx_m.\psi)$. Therefore, if $\mathbb{A} \models \neg\Psi$ and $\mathbb{B}'$ is a substructure of $\mathbb{B}$ with $A \times \{0\} \subseteq B'$, then $\mathbb{C} \models \neg(Q_1x_1 \dots Q_mx_m.\psi)$ 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 $\mathbb{C} \models Q_1x_1 \dots Q_mx_m.\psi$. 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 $\text{Her}(\phi)$.


Backward reduction. 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 ρ -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 ϕ_3 , it follows that every element of $\mathbb{B}$ that belongs to some tuple of E belongs to X . Also, since $\mathbb{B}$ satisfies ϕ_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 ϕ_2 , and hence $\mathbb{B}$ hereditarily satisfies ϕ . In this case, the reduction returns the fixed τ -structure $\mathbb{F}$ that does not model Ψ . 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 ϕ_4 . Hence, the union $\bigcup_{i \in [k]} X_i \subseteq D$ is linearly ordered by $<$, because $\mathbb{B}$ satisfies ϕ_6 . Moreover, ϕ_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 τ -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 τ -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 ϕ . 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 ϕ_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 ϕ_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 ϕ_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 $\mathbb{B} \in \text{Her}(\phi)$. Thus, $\text{Her}(\phi)$ reduces in logarithmic space to $\neg\Psi$. ◀

Figure 2 illustrates one of the polynomial-time reductions from Theorem 9.



■ **Figure 2** Let R be a binary and U' be a unary relation symbol. Consider an extensional ESO $\{R, U'\}$ -formula Φ of the form $\exists U \forall x ((U'(x) \Rightarrow U(x)) \wedge \phi)$ where ϕ 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 9.

► **Theorem 10.** *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 HerFO.*

Proof. This statement is an immediate consequence of the fact that monadic extensional ESO is a fragment of extensional ESO, of Lemma 7, and of Theorem 9. ◀

5 Monotone extensional SNP

Naturally, *extensional SNP* is the fragment of extensional ESO sentences whose first-order part is universal. Equivalently, an SNP sentence Ψ with first-order part ψ 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 ψ contains the clause $R'(\bar{x}) \Rightarrow R(\bar{x})$, and R' does not appear in any other clause of ψ .

5.1 Monotone extensional SNP and CSPs

Given a finite relational signature τ and a first-order τ -sentence ϕ , we denote by $\text{CSP}(\phi)$ the class of finite τ -structures $\mathbb{A}$ for which there is a τ -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.⁴ Nonetheless, if one restricts to a universal sentence ϕ , 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 ϕ is universal, it follows

⁴ To see this, suppose for contradiction that $\text{CSP}(\phi)$ is decidable for every first-order formula ϕ . 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 ϕ . Hence, given a first-order formula ϕ we can check whether $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$ to decide whether ϕ is satisfied in a non-empty structure, contradicting the undecidability of first-order logic [19].

that any substructure of $\mathbb{B}$ also models ϕ , and thus, by guessing a structure on at most $|A|$ vertices, one can verify in polynomial time whether $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$. We propose the following characterization of monotone extensional SNP.

First, we introduce some definitions. Consider a τ -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 $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_r) \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$. We say that a structure $\mathbb{B}$ 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 definition to a class of structures $\mathcal{C}$: the *blow-up* $\mathcal{C}^*$ of $\mathcal{C}$ consists of all finite blow-ups of structures $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{C}$. In the full version of this paper, we show that if $\mathcal{C}$ is finitely bounded, then $\mathcal{C}^*$ is finitely bounded [16, Lemma 5.1]; we use this in the following proof.

► **Theorem 11.** *For a class $\mathcal{C}$ of relational structures with finite signature, the following statements are equivalent.*

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

Proof. Let τ be a finite relational signature and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of finite τ -structures. First, suppose that there is a monotone extensional SNP τ -sentence Φ describing the class $\mathcal{C}$. Let σ be the signature containing exactly the existentially quantified symbols from Φ 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 Φ where ν is the conjunction of the clauses $R' \Rightarrow R$ for every $R \in \sigma$ and ψ is a universal $(\sigma \cup \tau \setminus \tau')$ -formula. Let ψ' be the τ -formula obtained from ψ by replacing each existentially quantified symbol R by R' . We claim that a finite τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies Φ if and only if $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\psi')$.

Let $\mathbb{B}$ be an expansion of $\mathbb{A}$ witnessing that $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies Φ . 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, $\mathbb{A}' \models \psi'$ because $\mathbb{B} \models \psi$, and since $\mathbb{B} \models \nu$, it follows that the identity on A defines a homomorphism $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}'$, and thus $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\psi')$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\psi')$, and let $\mathbb{B}$ be a model of ψ' such that $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. Since ψ' is a universal sentence, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathbb{B}$ is a finite structure. Moreover, since Φ is in monotone extensional SNP, it is preserved under inverse homomorphisms (see, e.g., Theorem 3). Thus, in order to show that $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies Φ , it suffices to show that every finite structure $\mathbb{B}$ that models ψ' also models Φ . 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 $\mathbb{B} \models \psi'$, 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 ϕ . Again, since ϕ is a universal τ -sentence, a τ -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 [16, 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 ψ' be a universal τ -sentence without equalities that defines $\mathcal{B}^*$ (see [16, Lemma 5.1]). Consider a signature σ containing a relation symbol R^* for each $R \in \tau$, and the formula ψ obtained from ψ' by replacing each occurrence of a symbol $R \in \tau$ by R^* . Finally, let Ψ be the SNP τ -sentence with existentially quantified symbols from σ and first-order part $\nu \wedge \psi$, where ν is the conjunction of clauses $R \Rightarrow R^*$ ranging over $R \in \tau$. Similarly as above one can notice that a finite structure $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies Φ if and only if $\mathbb{A} \in \text{CSP}(\phi)$: every $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{B}^*$ satisfies Ψ (indeed, define an expansion of $\mathbb{B}$ satisfying $\nu \wedge \psi$

by letting $R^* = R$ for each $R^* \in \sigma$), and since Ψ is in monotone SNP, we conclude that every structure $\mathbb{A}$ in $\text{CSP}(\phi)$ satisfies Ψ . Conversely, if $\mathbb{B}$ satisfies Φ , 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 ϕ , and such that $\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}'$. Clearly, Φ is in monotone extensional SNP, and therefore, the second itemized statement implies the first one. $\blacktriangleleft$

Recall from the introduction that a class of finite structures is finitely bounded if there is a finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of structures such that a finite structure $\mathbb{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if it does not embed any structure from $\mathcal{F}$. We call the elements of such a set $\mathcal{F}$ *bounds* of $\mathcal{C}$. We also say that a structure $\mathbb{B}$ is finitely bounded if and only if the class of finite structures that embed into $\mathbb{B}$ is finitely bounded. Note that CSPs of finitely bounded structures are in NP.

► **Corollary 12.** *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 ϕ such that a finite structure models ϕ 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 ϕ such that there is homomorphism $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. Since ϕ is universal, it follows that the substructure $\mathbb{B}'$ of $\mathbb{B}$ with vertex set $f[A]$ is a finite model of ϕ 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 ϕ , so $\mathbb{B}'$ embeds into $\mathbb{S}$, and thus $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. The claim of the corollary now follows from Theorem 11. Finally, the moreover statement follows analogously by noticing that the construction of the formula ϕ from [16, Lemma 5.1] satisfies that if the finite bounds of $\mathcal{C}$ are connected, then ϕ is a connected universal formula defining $\mathcal{C}^*$. $\blacktriangleleft$

5.2 CSPs of finitely bounded structures

Corollary 12 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 3 guarantees that every monotone connected extensional SNP sentence Φ describes the CSP of some structure. Moreover, it follows from the proof of Theorem 11 that Φ describes the CSP of a finitely bounded structure.

► **Corollary 13.** *Every monotone connected extensional SNP sentence Φ describes a problem of the form $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ for some finitely bounded structure $\mathbb{B}$.*

In the full version of this paper [16], we include some results regarding the connected fragment of monotone extensional SNP. In particular, we show that every finite domain CSP is described by a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence [16, Corollary B.4], and we leave as an open question whether for every finitely bounded structure $\mathbb{B}$, there is a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence describing $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$. We also show that for every finitely bounded CSP there is a polynomial-time equivalent problem described by a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence [16, Lemma B.1]; we use this fact in our next proof.

► **Theorem 14.** *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 13 that every problem in the second itemized class belongs to the third one. It follows from Corollary 12 that if $\mathbb{B}$ is a finitely bounded structure, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in monotone extensional SNP. By [16, Lemma B.1]; we see that if $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ is in monotone extensional SNP, then there is a monotone connected extensional SNP sentence Φ which 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 [16, Lemma B.1]; we know that for every monotone extensional SNP sentence Φ there is a polynomial-time conjunctive-equivalent monotone extensional SNP. ◀

6 Candidate NP-intermediate problems in extensional ESO

Here we consider the well-known computational problems of Graph Isomorphism [34] and Monotone Dualization [27]. Both of these problems are in NP and the question whether these problems are in P has been open for more than 50 years, which makes them natural candidate NP-intermediate problems (see, for instance, the Wikipedia entry for candidate NP-intermediate problems). We show that for each of these problems there is an extensional ESO sentence Φ such that Φ is polynomial-time equivalent to the corresponding problem.

6.1 Graph Isomorphism

The graph isomorphism problem (GI) is one of the most studied problems in algorithmic graph theory (see, e.g., [34] for an overview on this problem). One of the major breakthroughs in this area is the quasipolynomial-time algorithm presented by Babai [4]. Despite intensive research over the past decades, the complexity of the graph isomorphism problem remains one of the problems in NP that is not known to be in P, and thus, it is considered a candidate NP-intermediate problem.

It is well known that the graph isomorphism problem is polynomial-time equivalent to the graph isomorphism completion problem. The latter takes as an input a pair of graphs $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{H})$ and a partial function $f': U \subseteq G \rightarrow H$, and the task is to decide if there is an isomorphism $f: \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ such that $f|_U = f'$. We now show that the graph isomorphism completion problem is in extensional ESO.

Let U_1 and U_2 be unary relation symbols, E a binary relation symbol, and I and I' binary relation symbols that will encode isomorphisms and partial isomorphisms, respectively. Here, the input signature is $\tau := \{U_1, U_2, E, I'\}$. Let $\text{ISO}(I)$ be a first-order $\{U_1, U_2, E\}$ -formula stating that I defines an isomorphism from the graph with vertices in U_1 to the graph with vertex set U_2 , e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ISO}(I) := & \forall x, y (I(x, y) \Rightarrow U_1(x) \wedge U_2(y)) \\ & \wedge \forall x, y, z ((I(x, y) \wedge I(x, z) \Rightarrow y = z) \\ & \quad \wedge (I(y, z) \wedge I(y, x) \Rightarrow x = z)) \\ & \wedge \forall x \exists y ((U_1(x) \Rightarrow I(x, y)) \wedge (U_2(y) \Rightarrow I(y, x))) \\ & \wedge \forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 ((E(x_1, x_2) \wedge I(x_1, y_1) \wedge I(x_2, y_2)) \Rightarrow E(y_1, y_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if ϕ is a first-order $\{U_1, U_2, E\}$ -sentence stating that E is a symmetric irreflexive relation that connects only vertices within U_1 or within U_2 , we get that Graph Isomorphism Completion can be expressed by the extensional ESO sentence

$$\Psi := \exists I. \forall x, y. (I'(x, y) \Rightarrow I(x, y)) \wedge \text{Iso}(I) \wedge \phi.$$

Clearly, every GI completion instance X can be encoded as a τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{A} \models \Psi$ if and only if X is a yes-instance. Also notice that if an input τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ is such that I' does not define a partial isomorphism from the graph with vertex set $U_1(\mathbb{A})$ to the graph with vertex set $U_2(\mathbb{A})$, then $\mathbb{A} \not\models \Psi$. In this way, we obtain a polynomial-time equivalence between the graph isomorphism completion problem and deciding Ψ .

6.2 Monotone Dualization

We assume basic familiarity with propositional logic (see, e.g., [26, Section 2]). Our presentation of the monotone dualization problem is similar to the presentation given in [27], and we refer to that survey for a detailed exposition. The *dual* of a boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the function $f^d(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \bar{f}(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$. In particular, if ϕ is a CNF formula representing f (where the constant 0 is represented by an empty clause, and the constant 1 is represented by an empty set of clauses), then the dual f^d of f can be easily obtained by interchanging the symbols $\wedge$ and $\vee$. Computing the CNF of the dual of a boolean function f presented in CNF traces back to the middle of the last century (see, e.g., [44]), and it is one of few problems whose complexity remains unclassified [27].

A boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is *monotone* if $f(\bar{x}) \leq f(\bar{y})$ whenever $x_i \leq y_i$ for each argument $i \in [n]$. Equivalently, a boolean function is monotone if it can be represented by a boolean formula ϕ in CNF with no negative literals.

Monotone Dual

INPUT: Functions f and g represented by formulas ϕ and ψ in CNF without negative literals.

QUESTION: Is g the dual of f ?

Clearly, this problem is in coNP: if there is an evaluation $v_1, \dots, v_n$ of the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ such that $\phi^d(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is true, and $\psi(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ is false, then g is not the dual of f (here, ϕ^d is the boolean formula in DNF obtained by swapping the symbols $\wedge$ and $\vee$ in ϕ). This problem can be solved in quasi-polynomial time [32], and according to [27] it has been open for over 40 years now, whether it can be solved in polynomial time. We construct an extensional ESO sentence Φ such that deciding Φ is polynomial-time equivalent to the complement of Monotone Dual, i.e., deciding whether g and f are not duals.

To begin with, we will consider a boolean formula ϕ in CNF or DNF, and without negative literals, empty clauses, and empty monomials. We will encode such formulas as structures $F(\phi)$ with the binary signature $\{C, EQ\}$ as follows. The vertices are occurrences of variables (i.e., for each clause c and each variable x in c , there is a vertex $v_{x,c}$), and the interpretations of C and EQ are equivalence relations where

- each class of C consists of all occurrences of a variable appearing in the same clause, and
- each class of EQ consists of the occurrences of the same variable.

In symbols, $(v_{x,c}, v_{y,c'}) \in C$ iff $c = c'$, and $(v_{x,c}, v_{y,c'}) \in EQ$ iff $x = y$. In particular, if ϕ is in CNF and ϕ^d is the dual DNF formula, then $F(\phi) = F(\phi^d)$. Also, for every $\{C, EQ\}$ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ where C and EQ are equivalence relations, there is a monotone CNF formula ϕ such that $F(\phi) = \mathbb{A} = F(\phi^d)$.

We now consider a unary predicate U_1 that will encode an evaluation of the variables in the formula ϕ . In order for U_1 to encode a valid evaluation we must impose the first-order restriction stating that if $(x, y) \in EQ$, then $x \in U_1$ if and only if $y \in U_1$ (i.e., different occurrence of the same variable must receive the same value). So let δ be the (universal) first-order $\{U_1, C, EQ\}$ -sentence stating that C and EQ are equivalence relations and that U_1 is preserved by the relation EQ in the sense explained above. Clearly, structures that satisfy δ are in one-to-one correspondence with evaluations of formulas in CNF (and in DNF) without negative literals, empty clauses, and empty monomials.

Consider the following first-order $\{U_1, C, EQ\}$ -sentences

$$\mathbf{true}_C := \forall x \exists y (C(x, y) \wedge U_1(y)), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{true}_D := \exists x \forall y (C(x, y) \Rightarrow U_1(y)).$$

Observe that if ϕ is a monotone CNF formula with variables X , then an evaluation $e: X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ makes ϕ true if and only if the structure $(F(\phi), U_1)$, for $U_1 := e^{-1}(1)$, satisfies $\mathbf{true}_C$. Similarly, e makes the dual formula ϕ^d in DNF true if and only if $(F(\phi), U_1) \models \mathbf{true}_D$. In fact, the $\{U_1, C, EQ\}$ -expansions of $F(\phi)$ that satisfy $\mathbf{true}_C$ (resp. $\mathbf{true}_D$) are in one-to-one correspondence with the satisfying evaluations of ϕ (resp. of ϕ^d).

To obtain an extensional ESO sentence that is polynomial-time equivalent to the problem Monotone Dual, we need three more unary symbols U_f, U_g , and U'_1 . Let ρ be a first-order sentence stating the following:

- the interpretations of U_f and U_g are total and disjoint, i.e., every vertex belongs to exactly one of U_f and U_g ,
- if a pair of vertices x and y are connected by an edge in C , then x and y both belong to U_f or both to U_g , and
- for each vertex $x \in U_f$ there is a vertex $y \in U_g$ such that $xy \in EQ$, and vice versa.

Given a pair of CNF formulas ϕ and ψ on the same set of variables without negative literals and empty clauses, we construct a structure $F(\phi, \psi)$ with signature $\{U_f, U_g, U'_1, C, EQ\}$ as follows. This structure is obtained from the disjoint union $F(\phi) + F(\psi)$ where we colour the vertices in $F(\phi)$ with U_f and the vertices in $F(\psi)$ with U_g , the interpretation of U'_1 is empty, and we modify the interpretation of EQ by connecting all pairs of vertices x and y that represent the same variable (in particular, $EQ(F(\phi)) \cup EQ(F(\psi)) \subseteq EQ(F(\phi, \psi))$). Clearly, $F(\phi, \psi) \models \rho \wedge \delta$.

Finally, for $\mathbf{X} \in \{C, D\}$ and $h \in \{f, g\}$, we denote by $\mathbf{true}_{\mathbf{X}}(U_h)$ the restriction of $\mathbf{true}_{\mathbf{X}}$ to the substructure with domain U_h (which can be written as a first-order sentence with symbols in $\{C, EQ, U_1, U_h\}$). With these sentences we define the extensional ESO sentence

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma := & \exists U_1 ((U'_1 \Rightarrow U_1) \wedge \rho \wedge \delta \\ & \wedge ((\mathbf{true}_D(U_f) \wedge \neg \mathbf{true}_C(U_g)) \\ & \vee (\neg \mathbf{true}_D(U_f) \wedge \mathbf{true}_C(U_g))). \end{aligned}$$

A structure of the form $F(\phi, \psi)$ satisfies Γ if and only if there is an evaluation of the variables that make exactly one of ϕ^d or ψ true, and the other one false. Therefore, on an input (ϕ, ψ) to Monotone Dual, where ϕ and ψ are formulas CNF formulas without negative literals and empty clauses that represent the Boolean functions f and g , respectively, we have that g is not the dual of f if and only if $F(\phi, \psi)$ satisfies Γ . This gives us a polynomial-time reduction from Monotone Dual to deciding $\neg \Gamma$.

Now we show that conversely, deciding $\neg \Gamma$ reduces in polynomial time to Monotone Dual. First, fix a pair of formulas ϕ_X and ψ_X in monotone CNF over the same set of variable such that ψ_X is not the dual of ϕ_X . The reduction works as follows. Given a $\{U'_1, U_f, U_g, C, EQ\}$ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ we first first verify whether $\mathbb{A} \models \rho \wedge \delta$, and if not, the reduction returns the pair

(ϕ_X, ψ_X) . Otherwise, we construct ϕ and ψ as follows. The variables of ϕ and of ψ are the EQ -equivalence classes, and for each C -equivalence class Y in $U_f(\mathbb{A})$ (resp. in $U_g(\mathbb{A})$) we add a clause in ϕ (resp. in ψ) containing the EQ -equivalence classes that intersect Y . Finally, if some vertex v is colored with U'_1 , then we remove all clauses from ϕ and ψ that contain v . It readily follows from the arguments above that $\mathbb{A} \models \Gamma$ if and only if ϕ is not the dual of ψ . Hence, the reduction that maps $\mathbb{A}$ to (ϕ_X, ψ_X) if $\mathbb{A} \not\models \delta \wedge \rho$, and to (ϕ, ψ) otherwise, is a polynomial-time reduction from deciding $\neg\Gamma$ to the Monotone Dual problem. Both reductions together show that Monotone Dual is polynomial-time equivalent to deciding $\neg\Gamma$.

6.3 A conjecture

We have seen that surjective finite-domain CSPs (Section 3.1) and CSPs of finitely bounded structures (Corollary 12) are expressible in ESO. Moreover, we proved that extensional ESO has the same computational power as HerFO (Theorem 10), and so, the tractability meta-problem for extensional ESO is undecidable (Corollary 8). Finally, we argued in this section that extensional ESO can express problems that are polynomial-time equivalent to Graph Isomorphism, and to the complement of Monotone Dualization. These observations make us believe that the following is true.

► **Conjecture 15.** *There is an extensional ESO sentence Φ such that deciding Φ is NP-intermediate.*

7 Limitations of the computational power

In this section we show that extensional ESO is not NP-rich (unless $E = NE$). To do so, we study disjunctive self-reducibility; a notion in computational complexity that traces back to [45, 46].

7.1 Disjunctive self-reducible sets

Intuitively speaking, a set L is *disjunctive self-reducible* if deciding whether x belongs to L reduces to deciding if one of polynomially-many “smaller” instances than x belongs to L . 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 $\phi(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ 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., [3, 36].

Let us formally define disjunctive self-reducible sets (also see also [45, 46]).

► **Definition 16** (disjunctive self-reducibility). *A polynomial-time computable partial order $<$ on $\{0, 1\}^*$ is OK if and only if there is a polynomial p such that*

- *every strictly 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 [39] that every disjunctive self-reducible set is in NP.

► **Lemma 17.** *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 Φ 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 Φ contains the clause $R'(x) \Rightarrow R(x)$ and R' does not appear in any other clause of Φ . Given an input τ -structure $\mathbb{A}$ we first test whether the expansion $\mathbb{A}'$ with $R^{\mathbb{A}'} = R'$ satisfies the first-order part of Φ . 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. ◀

7.2 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 [22], but this need not be the case in general. A prominent example being the problem positive 1-in-3 SAT, which is tractable given the promise that the input formula ϕ either has a 1-in-3 solution, or does not even have a not-all-equal solution [20]. 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 [9].

A general framework for studying hard promises was introduced in [47]. 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

if $x \in Q$, then M accepts x 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*⁵ 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) .

⁵ Many-one, disjunctive, and conjunctive reductions are defined analogously, but are not needed for this paper.

Natural promise problems trace back to at least 1984, and they arise in the context of public-key cryptography [28]. Given a decidable set $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, for some finite alphabet Σ , the *natural promise problem* for L is the promise problem

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

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 [28], the authors prove that the natural promise problem for SAT is NP-hard, and it follows from [47] 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 [21, 49] 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 [47].

► **Theorem 18.** *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.

Proof. Every disjunctive self-reducible is a polynomial-time Turing-equivalent to its natural promise problem [47, Theorem 3]. The claim follows via Lemmas 17 and 21, which assert that any such problem L is disjunctive self-reducible. ◀

7.3 Failure of NP-richness

It follows from results in [47] that there are problems in NP which are not polynomial-time disjunctive-equivalent to any disjunctive self-reducible set, unless $E = NE$.

► **Theorem 19** (essentially in [47]). *The class of disjunctive self-reducible sets is not disjunctive NP-rich, unless $E = NE$.*

Proof. Theorem 3 in [47] 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 [47] 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 [47] 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. ◀

► **Corollary 20.** *None of the following classes is NP-rich, unless $E = NE$.*

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

7.4 NP-intermediate disjunctive self-reducible sets

We conclude this section by showing that, even though disjunctive-self reducible sets do not have the full computational power of NP, they still capture NP-intermediate problems. To do so, we consider the following family of disjunctive self-reducible sets.

► **Lemma 21.** *Let τ be a finite relational signature and $\mathcal{F}$ a (not necessarily finite) class of finite τ -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.*

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 (Definition 16) for which the previous reduction is a disjunctive self-reduction. ◀

For our next result we will use a construction of coNP-intermediate CSPs from Bodirsky and Grohe [14] which uses the following set of tournaments. The *Henson set* is the set $\mathcal{T}$ of tournaments $\mathbb{T}_n$ defined for positive integer $n \geq 5$ 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 $(j, i) \neq (n, 1)$.

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). In the concrete situation of the class $\mathcal{T}$ defined above, $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}})$ is an example of coNP-complete CSP (see, e.g., [13, Proposition 13.3.1]).

► **Theorem 22.** *There is no P- versus NP-complete dichotomy for disjunctive self-reducible sets.*

Proof. We use that there exists a subset $\mathcal{T}_0$ of the Henson set $\mathcal{T}$ 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 $P = \text{coNP}$ [14].

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 [15]. Since $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B}_{\mathcal{T}_0})$ is the class of $\mathcal{T}_0$ -free loopless oriented graphs, it follows from Lemma 21 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 $P = \text{NP}$, then there is no dichotomy, and if P is different from NP, then there are NP-intermediate disjunctive self-reducible sets. ◀

8 Conclusion and Open Problems

We proved that the complement of every problem in extensional ESO is polynomial-time equivalent to a problem in HerFO, and vice versa (Theorem 10). We also showed that there are problems in NP that are not polynomial-time equivalent to problems in Extensional ESO, unless $\text{NE} = \text{E}$ (Corollary 20). In particular, this shows that in order to prove that there are NP-intermediate finitely bounded CSPs, we need a different approach than proving that this class is NP-rich, because Extensional ESO captures finitely bounded CSPs.

Besides Conjecture 15, a number of open problems are left for future research.

1. Is every disjunctive self-reducible set polynomial-time equivalent to an extensional ESO sentence (see Figure 1)?
2. Is every problem in extensional ESO polynomial-time equivalent to a finitely bounded CSP (see Figure 1)?
3. Are there NP-intermediate CSPs of finitely bounded structures (assuming $P \neq NP$)?
4. Is there a finitely bounded structure $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is polynomial-time equivalent to GI?
5. Is every CSP of a finitely bounded structure in connected monotone extensional SNP? (Compare with Corollary 13 and the moreover statement in Theorem 14).
6. Is it true that if $\mathbb{A}$ is a reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure, then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is disjunctive self-reducible?

References

- 1 J.D. Alvarado, Simone Dantas, and Dietrich Rautenbach. Sandwiches missing two ingredients of order four. *Annals of Operations Research*, 280:47–63, 2019. doi:10.1007/s10479-019-03174-6.
- 2 Antoine Amarilli and Charles Paperman. Topological Sorting with Regular Constraints. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Christos Kaklamanis, Dániel Marx, and Donald Sannella, editors, *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018)*, volume 107 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 115:1–115:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.115.
- 3 Klaus Ambos-Spies and Jürgen Kämper. On disjunctive self-reducibility. In Egon Börger, Hans Kleine Büning, and Michael 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. doi:10.1007/BFB0026292.
- 4 László Babai. Graph isomorphism in quasipolynomial time. *arXiv:1512.03547*, 2015.
- 5 Richard N. Ball, Jaroslav Nešetřil, and Aleš Pultr. Dualities in full homomorphisms. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 31:106–199, 2010.
- 6 J. Bang-Jensen, J. Huang, and X. Zhu. Completing orientations of partially oriented graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 87(3):285–304, 2017. doi:10.1002/jgt.22157.
- 7 Max Bannach, Florian Chudigiewitsch, and Till Tantau. On the Descriptive Complexity of Vertex Deletion Problems. In Rastislav Kráľovič and Antonín Kučera, editors, *49th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2024)*, volume 306 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 17:1–17:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2024.17.
- 8 Alexey Barsukov and Florent R. Madelaine. On guarded extensions of MMSNP. In Gianluca Della Vedova, Besik Dundua, Steffen Lempp, and Florin 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. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-36978-0_17.
- 9 Libor Barto, Jakub Bulín, Andrei Krokhin, and Jakub Opršal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *J. ACM*, 68(4), July 2021. doi:10.1145/3457606.
- 10 Mihir Bellare and Shafi Goldwasser. The complexity of decision versus search. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 23(1):97–119, 1994. doi:10.1137/S0097539792228289.
- 11 M. Bienvenu, B. ten Cate, C. Lutz, and F. Wolter. Ontology-Based Data Access: A Study through Disjunctive Datalog, CSP, and MMSNP. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 39(4):33:1–33:44, 2014. doi:10.1145/2661643.

- 12 M. Bodirsky, S. Knäuer, and F. Starke. ASNP: A tame fragment of existential second-order logic. In *CiE 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12098 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 149–162. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-51466-2_13.
- 13 Manuel Bodirsky. *Complexity of Infinite-Domain Constraint Satisfaction*. Lecture Notes in Logic (52). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, 2021. doi:10.1017/9781107337534.
- 14 Manuel Bodirsky and Martin Grohe. Non-dichotomies in constraint satisfaction complexity. In Luca Aceto, Ivan Damgard, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Anna Ingólfssdóttir, and Igor Walukiewicz, editors, *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2008)*, pages 184–196. Springer Verlag, July 2008. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-70583-3_16.
- 15 Manuel Bodirsky and Santiago Guzmán-Pro. Hereditary first-order logic: the tractable quantifier prefixes. *arXiv preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2411.10860.
- 16 Manuel Bodirsky and Santiago Guzmán-Pro. On the computational power of eso. *arXiv preprint*, 2025. arXiv:2511.08515.
- 17 Manuel Bodirsky and Santiago Guzmán-Pro. The generic circular triangle-free graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 109(4):426–445, 2025. doi:10.1002/jgt.23235.
- 18 John Adrian Bondy and Uppaluri Siva Ramachandra Murty. *Graph Theory*. Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- 19 Egon Börger, Erich Grädel, and Yuri Gurevich. *The Classical Decision Problem*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1997.
- 20 Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. Promise constraint satisfaction: Algebraic structure and a symmetric boolean dichotomy. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(6):1663–1700, 2021. doi:10.1137/19M128212X.
- 21 Andrei 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. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.37.
- 22 Maria Chudnovsky, Neil Roberston, Paul Seymour, and Robin Thomas. The strong perfect graph theorem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 164:51–229, 2006.
- 23 Simone Dantas, Celina M.H. de Figueiredo, Murilo V.G. da Silva, and Rafael B. Teixeira. On the forbidden induced subgraph sandwich problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 159:1717–1725, 2015.
- 24 Simone Dantas, Celina M.H. de Figueiredo, Priscila Petito, and Rafael B. Teixeira. A general method for forbidden induced subgraph sandwich problem np-completeness. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 346:393–400, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2019.08.035.
- 25 Celina M.H. de Figueiredo and Sophie Spirkl. Sandwich and probe problems for excluding paths. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 251:146–154, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2018.05.054.
- 26 Thomas Eiter, Georg Gottlob, and Kazuhisa Makino. New results on monotone dualization and generating hypergraph transversals. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(2):514–537, 2003. doi:10.1137/S009753970240639X.
- 27 Thomas Eiter, Kazuhisa Makino, and Georg Gottlob. Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 156(11):2035–2049, 2008. In Memory of Leonid Khachiyan (1952 - 2005). doi:10.1016/j.dam.2007.04.017.
- 28 Shimon Even, Alan L. Selman, and Yacov Yacobi. The complexity of promise problems with applications to public-key cryptography. *Information and Control*, 61(2):159–173, 1984. doi:10.1016/S0019-9958(84)80056-X.
- 29 R. Fagin. Generalized first-order spectra and polynomial-time recognizable sets. *Complexity of Computation*, 7:43–73, 1974.
- 30 Tomás Feder and Moshe 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. doi:10.1137/S0097539794266766.

- 31 F.V. Fomin, P.A. Golovach, and D.M. Thilikos. On the parameterized complexity of graph modification to first-order logic properties. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 64:251–271, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00224-019-09938-8.
- 32 Michael L. Fredman and Leonid Khachiyan. On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 21(3):618–628, 1996. doi:10.1006/jagm.1996.0062.
- 33 M.C. Golumbic, H. Kaplan, and R. Shamir. Graph Sandwich Problems. *Journal of Algorithms*, 19:449–473, 1995. doi:10.1006/jagm.1995.1047.
- 34 Martin Grohe and Pascal Schweitzer. The graph isomorphism problem. *Commun. ACM*, 63(11):128–134, 2020. doi:10.1145/3372123.
- 35 Edith Hemaspaandra, Ashish V. Naik, Mitsunori Ogihara, and Alan L. Selman. P-selective sets and reducing search to decision vs self-reducibility. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 5:194–209, 1996. doi:10.1006/JCSS.1996.0061.
- 36 Lane A. Hemaspaandra. *The Power of Self-Reducibility: Selectivity, Information, and Approximation*, pages 19–47. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-41672-0_3.
- 37 Wilfrid Hodges. *A shorter model theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- 38 N. Immerman. *Descriptive Complexity*. Graduate Texts in Computer Science, Springer, New York, 1998.
- 39 Ker-I Ko. On self-reducibility and weak p-selectivity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 26:209–221, 1983. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(83)90013-2.
- 40 Gábor Kun and Jaroslav Nešetřil. Dichotomy for orderings?, 2025. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2504.13268.
- 41 Alistair H. Lachlan and Robert E. Woodrow. Countable ultrahomogeneous undirected graphs. *Transactions of the AMS*, 262(1):51–94, 1980.
- 42 Richard E. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. *J. ACM*, 22(1):155–171, January 1975. doi:10.1145/321864.321877.
- 43 Dugald Macpherson. A survey of homogeneous structures. *Discrete Mathematics*, 311(15):1599–1634, 2011. Infinite Graphs: Introductions, Connections, Surveys. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2011.01.024.
- 44 Khaled Maghout. Sur la détermination des nombres de stabilité et du nombre chromatique d'un graphe. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences*, 248(25):3522–3523, 1959.
- 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 Claus-Peter Schnorr. Optimal Algorithms for Self-Reducible Problems. In *Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 322–337, 1976.
- 47 Alan L. Selman. Promise problems for complexity classes. *Information and Computation*, 78:87–98, 1988.
- 48 Howard Straubing. First-order logic and aperiodic languages: a revisionist history. *ACM SIGLOG News*, 5(3):4–20, 2018. doi:10.1145/3242953.3242956.
- 49 Dmitriy 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. arXiv:1704.01914.