On the Interval of Boolean Strong Partial Clones Containing Only Projections as Total Operations
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Abstract

A strong partial clone is a set of partial operations closed under composition and containing all partial projections. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the set of all Boolean strong partial clones whose total operations are the projections. This set is of practical interest since it induces a partial order on the complexity of NP-complete constraint satisfaction problems. In this paper we study $\mathcal{X}$ from the algebraic point of view, and prove that there exists two intervals in $\mathcal{X}$, corresponding to natural constraint satisfaction problems, such that one is at least countably infinite and the other has the cardinality of the continuum.

1 Introduction

A $k$-ary polymorphism of a relation $R$ is a homomorphism from the $k$th power of $R$ to $R$. It is well-known that the set of all polymorphisms of a set of relations $\Gamma$ form a clone, that is a set of operations closed under composition
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and containing all projections. The notion of a clone easily generalizes to partial operations, and it is known that the set of all partial polymorphisms of a set of relations $\Gamma$, $pPol(\Gamma)$, form a strong partial clone, which is a set of partial operations closed under composition and containing all partial projections. Clone theory is not only a well-studied topic in universal algebra, but has many practical applications in computational complexity. One such example is the constraint satisfaction problem over a set of relations $\Gamma$ ($CSP(\Gamma)$), which can be viewed as the problem of deciding whether an existentially quantified conjunctive formula over $\Gamma$ admits at least one model. For example, the NP-complete problem 1-in-3-SAT can be seen as a CSP problem over the ternary relation $R_{1/3} = \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0)\}$. It has been proven that the polymorphisms of $\Gamma$ determine the complexity of the CSP problem over $\Gamma$ up to polynomial-time many-one reductions \cite{5}, while the partial polymorphisms of $\Gamma$ can be used to study the complexity of the CSP problem over $\Gamma$ with respect to stronger notions of reductions \cite{6, 14}. More specifically, Jonsson et al. \cite{6} proved that if $pPol(\Gamma) \subseteq pPol(\Delta)$ then $CSP(\Delta)$ is solvable in $O(c^n)$ time whenever $CSP(\Gamma)$ is solvable in $O(c^n)$ time (if $\Gamma$ and $\Delta$ are both finite sets of relations). Hence, the partial polymorphisms of finite sets of relations induce a partial order on the complexity of NP-complete CSPs. Moreover, if $\Gamma$ is a Boolean set of relations such that each operation in $Pol(\Gamma)$ is idempotent, then $CSP(\Gamma)$ is NP-complete if and only if $Pol(\Gamma)$ consists only of projections \cite{11, 13}. Put together, this implies that the set of strong partial clones containing only projections as total operations is a particularly interesting object of study, due to its relationship with NP-complete CSP problems. With these observation Jonsson et al. \cite{6} then proved that there exists a relation $R_{1/3}^{\#\#01}$ such that (1) the CSP problem over $R_{1/3}^{\#\#01}$ is NP-complete but (2) there does not exist any NP-complete Boolean CSP problem with a strictly lower worst-case time-complexity. It is worth noting that the relation $R_{1/3}^{\#\#01}$ is also interesting from a purely algebraic point of view since it is known that $pPol(R_{1/3}^{\#\#01})$ is the largest set of Boolean partial operations which does not contain any total operations (except the projections) \cite{6, 14}. Jonsson et al. \cite{6} then conjectured that the set of strong partial clones between $pPol(R_{1/3})$ and $pPol(R_{1/3}^{\#\#01})$ had a particularly simple structure consisting of only five elements. This conjecture turned out to be incorrect, and Lagerkvist & Roy \cite{8} proved that the cardinality of this set is at least countably infinite.

In this paper we continue the investigation of $pPol(R_{1/3}^{\#\#01})$, with a particular focus on the strong partial clones between $pPol(R_{1/3})$ and $pPol(R_{1/3}^{\#\#01})$. After having introduced the basic notions in Section 2, we begin (in Section 3.2) by proving that there exists at least countably many strong partial...
clones between pPol(R_{1/3}) and pPol(R_{1/3}^{01}), where R_{1/3}^{01} = R_{1/3} × \{(0)\} × \{(1)\}. To prove this, we find a class of relations \(σ^k\) with the property that \(pPol(R_{1/3}) \subseteq pPol(σ^k) \subseteq pPol(R_{1/3}^{01})\), \(pPol(σ^k) \subseteq pPol(σ^{k+1})\), \(pPol(σ^{k+1}) \subseteq pPol(σ^{k+1})\), for each \(k \geq 4\). In Section 3.3 we study the strong partial clones between \(pPol(R_{1/3})\) and \(pPol(R_{1/3}^{01})\), and prove that this set is of continuum cardinality, and therefore strengthen the results from Lagerkvist & Roy [8].

### 2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce the basic terminology that will be used throughout the paper.

#### 2.1 Operations and Relations

Let \(X\) be a finite and non-empty set of values. Without loss of generality we may assume that \(X \subseteq \mathbb{N}\). In the particular case when \(|X| = 2\) we assume that \(X = \{0, 1\}\) and denote this set by \(\mathbb{B}\). A \(k\)-ary operation over \(X\), \(k \geq 1\), is a function \(X^k \to X\). We write \(\text{OP}_X\) for the set consisting of all operations over the set \(X\). We will sometimes denote Boolean operations by their defining logical formulas, and for example write \(\overline{x}\) for the operation \(1 - x\), and we use \(x + y\) to denote addition modulo 2. A \(k\)-ary partial operation over \(X\) is a map \(D \to X\) where \(D \subseteq X^k\), and we write \(\text{PAR}_X\) for the set of all partial operations over \(X\). The set \(D\) is called the domain of the partial operation \(f\) and we let \(\text{dom}(f) = D\). For both total and partial operations we let \(\text{ar}(f)\) denote the arity of \(f\). If \(f\) and \(g\) are two \(k\)-ary partial operations \(g\) is said to be a suboperation of \(f\) if \(\text{dom}(g) \subseteq \text{dom}(f)\) and \(f(x) = g(x)\) for all \(x \in \text{dom}(g)\). We write \(f^D\), for the suboperation obtained by restricting \(f\) to a set \(D' \subseteq \text{dom}(f)\).

A \(k\)-ary relation over \(X\) is a subset of \(X^k\). The set of all relations over \(X\) is denoted by \(\text{Rel}_X\). For \(R_1, R_2 \in \text{Rel}_X\) of arity \(n\) and \(m\), we let \(R_1 \times R_2 = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+m}) \mid (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R_1, (x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_{n+m}) \in R_2\}\) denote their Cartesian product. Given a \(k\)-ary tuple \(t = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in X^k\) we let \(t[i] = x_i\) denote the \(i\)th component of \(t\), and we let \(\text{Proj}_{i_1, \ldots, i_k}(t) = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k})\), \(1 \leq k' \leq k\), denote the projection of \(t\) on the coordinates \(i_1, \ldots, i_{k'} \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\). Similarly, if \(R\) is a \(k\)-ary relation we let \(\text{Proj}_{i_1, \ldots, i_k}(R) = \{\text{Proj}_{i_1, \ldots, i_k}(t) \mid t \in R\}\). As a notational shorthand we let \(\bar{0}^k\) and \(\bar{1}^k\) denote the \(k\)-ary tuples \((0, \ldots, 0)\) and \((1, \ldots, 1)\).

It will be convenient to view a sequence of tuples \(t_1, \ldots, t_n\) from a \(k\)-ary
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relation \( R \) as a \( k \times n \) matrix where the \( i \)th column consists of the tuple \( t_i \). We let

\[
Rows(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = ((t_1[1], \ldots, t_n[1]), \ldots, (t_n[k], \ldots, t_n[k]))
\]
denote the tuple consisting of all rows of this matrix. When the exact ordering is not important we instead write

\[
RowSet(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \{(t_1[1], \ldots, t_n[1]), \ldots, (t_n[k], \ldots, t_n[k])\}
\]
to denote the set consisting of all rows. For example, if \( t_1 = (0, 0, 0), t_2 = (0, 1, 0), \) and \( t_3 = (1, 1, 0) \) then

\[
Rows(t_1, t_2, t_3) = ((0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1), (0, 0, 1))
\]
while

\[
RowSet(t_1, t_2, t_3) = \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)\}.
\]

We will sometimes represent a relation as the set of models of a first-order formula, and if \( \Gamma \) is a set of relations we use the notation \( R(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \equiv \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \), where \( \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \) is a first-order formula over \( \Gamma \) with the free variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \), to define the relation

\[
R = \{(f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_k)) \mid f \text{ is a model of } \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\}.
\]

2.2 Clones

Let \( \Pi_X \) be the set of all projections over \( X \subseteq \mathbb{N} \), i.e. all operations \( \pi^n_i \) of the form \( \pi^n_i(x_1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_n) = x_i \). A clone over \( X \) is a set of operations \( \mathbb{C} \subseteq \text{OP}_X \) such that (1) \( \mathbb{C} \supseteq \Pi_X \) and (2) \( \mathbb{C} \) is closed under functional composition. More formally, the latter condition means that if \( f, g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \mathbb{C} \), where \( f \) has arity \( m \) and the functions \( g_1, \ldots, g_m \) all have the same arity \( n \), then the composition \( f \circ (g_1, \ldots, g_m)(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f(g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, g_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \) for all \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X \), is included in \( \mathbb{C} \). For a set of total operations \( F \) we let \([F]\) be the smallest clone containing \( F \), and call \( F \) a basis of \([F]\). A clone \( \mathbb{C} \) is said to be finitely generated if there exists a finite set \( F \) such that \([F] = \mathbb{C} \), and is said to be infinitely generated otherwise. Every Boolean clone is known to be finitely generated, and the lattice of Boolean clones, Post’s lattice, is countably infinite \([11]\).
2.3 Strong Partial Clones

A partial projection is a suboperation of a projection. Let \( \Pi^p_X \) be the set of all partial projections over a set \( X \). A set of partial operations \( C \) is a strong partial clone if (1) \( C \supseteq \Pi^p_X \) and (2) \( C \) is closed under composition of partial operations. It is well-known that this definition implies that \( C \) is closed under taking suboperations [12]. Composition of partial operations is defined analogously to the total case, i.e., if \( f, g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \text{PAR}_X \), \( \text{ar}(f) = m \), and \( \text{ar}(g_1) = \ldots = \text{ar}(g_m) = n \), then \( f \circ (g_1, \ldots, g_m)(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f(g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, g_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \), and the resulting function is defined for every tuple \( (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \text{dom}(g_i) \) such that \( (g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, g_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \in \text{dom}(f) \).

For a set of partial operations \( F \) we let \( [F]_s \) be the smallest strong partial clone containing \( F \), and similar to the total case the set \( F \) is said to be a basis of \( [F]_s \). A strong partial clone \( C \) is said to be finitely generated if there exists a finite set of partial operations \( F \) such that \( [F]_s = C \), and is infinitely generated otherwise.

2.4 Galois Connections

It is known that clones and strong partial clones admit relational representations. As a shorthand we let

\[
\text{for every sequence } t_1, \ldots, t_n \in R, \text{ we also say that } f \text{ is a polymorphism of } R \text{ and let } \text{Pol}(R) \text{ denote the set of all polymorphisms of the relation } R. \text{ A relation } R \text{ with } \text{Pol}(R) = \Pi_X \text{ is said to be strongly rigid. Similarly, for a set of relations } \Gamma \text{ we let } \text{Pol}(\Gamma) = \bigcap_{R \in \Gamma} \text{Pol}(R), \text{ and it is readily verified that } f \text{ is a polymorphism of } \Gamma \text{ if it preserves every relation in } \Gamma. \text{ These notions can be generalized to partial operations, and we say that the } n \text{-ary partial operation } f \text{ is a partial polymorphism of a } k \text{-ary relation } R \text{ if } f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in R \text{ for every sequence } t_1, \ldots, t_n \in R \text{ such that } (t_1[1], \ldots, t_n[1]), \ldots, (t_1[k], \ldots, t_n[k]) \in \text{dom}(f). \text{ We then let } \text{pPol}(R) \text{ denote the set of all partial polymorphisms of the relation } R, \text{ and let } \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \text{ denote the set of all partial polymorphisms of the set of relations } \Gamma. \text{ It is not difficult}
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to verify that sets of the form \( \text{Pol}(\Gamma) \) and \( \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \) form clones and strong partial clones, respectively. Moreover, if we let \( \text{Inv}(F) \) be the set of all invariant relations under the set of (partial) operations \( F \), it is well-known (cf. Chapter 2.9 in Lau [10]) that \( \text{Pol}(\cdot) \) and \( \text{Inv}(\cdot) \) give rise to a Galois connection.

**Theorem 1** ([1], [2], [4], [12]). Let \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma' \) be two sets of relations. Then \( \Gamma \subseteq \text{Inv}(\text{Pol}(\Gamma')) \) if and only if \( \text{Pol}(\Gamma') \subseteq \text{Pol}(\Gamma) \).

An analogous result is known for \( \text{Inv}(\cdot) \) and \( \text{pPol}(\cdot) \), due to Geiger [4] and Romov [12].

**Theorem 2** ([4], [12]). Let \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma' \) be two sets of relations. Then \( \Gamma \subseteq \text{Inv}(\text{pPol}(\Gamma')) \) if and only if \( \text{pPol}(\Gamma') \subseteq \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \).

As a shorthand we let \( \langle \Gamma \rangle \not\exists = \text{Inv}(\text{pPol}(\Gamma)) \). It is known that \( \langle \Gamma \rangle \not\exists \) is a set of relations closed under quantifier-free primitive positive definitions, (qfpp-definitions) over \( \Gamma \), i.e., logical formulas of the form

\[
\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \equiv R_1(x_1) \land \ldots \land R_m(x_m)
\]

where each \( R_i \in \Gamma \cup \{\text{Eq}\} \) and each \( x_i \) is a tuple of variables over \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). Here, \( \text{Eq} \) denotes the equality relation \( \{(x, x) \mid x \in X\} \) over \( X \). Hence, we can prove that \( \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{pPol}(\Gamma') \) by proving that each relation in \( \Gamma' \) admits a qfpp-definition over \( \Gamma \).

2.5 Weak Bases

It turned out that the lattice of partial clones on a set with at least two elements is very complex, and significant efforts were made by several authors to study parts of it. The question of describing the general position of the lattice of all total clones within the lattice of partial clones was raised by D. Lau. For example, given a total clone \( C \), determine cardinality of the set of partial clones on \( X \) whose total component is \( C \). For \( \mathbb{B} \), this problem was completely solved in [3] and the corresponding problem for strong partial clones was solved in [15]. We need the following definition:

**Definition 3.** Let \( C \) be a clone over \( X \). We let

\[
\text{Int}(C) = \{ \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \mid \Gamma \subseteq \text{Rel}_X, \text{Pol}(\Gamma) = C \}.
\]
We will sometimes be concerned with even more fine-grained sets of strong partial clones and, given two strong partial clones $C_1$ and $C_2$, write $\text{Int}(C_1, C_2)$ to denote the set
\[ \{ \text{pPol} (\Gamma) \mid \Gamma \subseteq \text{Rel}_X, C_1 \subseteq \text{pPol} (\Gamma) \subseteq C_2 \}. \]
It is worth noting that the smallest element in the set $\text{Int}(C)$ is simply $[C]_s$, the strong partial clone obtained by closing $C$ under suboperations, but it is also known that each such set admits a largest element.

**Theorem 4.** [14] Let $C$ be a finitely generated clone. Then
\[ \bigcup_{\text{pPol}(\Gamma) \in \text{Int}(C)} \text{pPol}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{Int}(C) . \]
It is also known that whenever $\text{Inv}(C)$ is finitely generated, there exists a relation $R$ over $X$ such that $\text{pPol}(R) = \bigcup_{\text{pPol}(\Gamma) \in \text{Int}(C)} \text{pPol}(\Gamma)$. Using the terminology of Schnoor and Schnoor [14] we call a relation satisfying this condition a *weak basis* of $\text{Inv}(C)$. Moreover, for the Boolean domain, all weak bases have been fully described [7]. In this paper we have a particular interest in the weak basis
\[ R_{1/3}^{#01} = \{(0,0,1,1,0,0,1), (0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1), (1,0,0,0,1,1,0,1)\} \]
of $\text{Rel}_B$. Note that $\text{Proj}_{1,2,3}(R_{1/3}^{#01}) = R_{1/3}$, that the third, fourth, and fifth arguments are complement of the three first, and that the two last arguments are constant 0 and 1, respectively. As remarked in Section [1] $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{#01})$ can be viewed as the set of all Boolean partial operations $f$ such that $[\{f\}]_s \cap \text{OP}_B = \Pi_B$. Hence, it is the largest Boolean strong partial clone whose only total operations are the projections. Somewhat surprisingly, it is known that this strong partial clone is not finitely generated, in contrast to the strong partial clone consisting of all Boolean partial operations (which can be generated by a partial Sheffer operation).

**Theorem 5.** [9] Let $\Gamma$ be a finite set of relations over a finite domain such that $\text{Pol}(\Gamma)$ has a basis consisting of unary operations. Then $\text{pPol}(\Gamma)$ is infinitely generated.

Since $\text{Pol}(\{R_{1/3}^{#01}\}) = \Pi_B$, it can be generated by a single projection, and so by Theorem [9] we have that $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{#01})$ is infinitely generated.
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Jonsson et al. conjectured that \(\text{Int}(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#01}))\) consisted of \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#01}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#01}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#01})\), and \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#\#01})\), where \(R_{1/3}^{\#}\) = \(\text{Proj}_{1,2,3,4,5,7,8}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#01})\), \(R_{1/3}^{01}\) = \(\text{Proj}_{1,2,3,4,6,7}(R_{1/3}^{\#01})\), and \(R_{1/3}^{01} = R_{1/3} \times R^0 \times R^1\). This was disproven by Lagerkvist & Roy who proved that \(\text{Int}(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#01}))\) is at least countably infinite. However, the questions of whether \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3})\) is covered by \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01})\), and whether \(\text{Int}(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{\#\#\#01}))\) is in fact of continuum cardinality, were left open. After introducing some simplifying notation in Section 3.1, we answer both of these questions in Section 3.2 and Section 3.3. Before reading these sections in greater detail, the reader may first consult Figure 1 for a visualization of the main results.

3.1 Partial Polymorphisms of Strongly Rigid Relations

In order to describe the partial polymorphisms of strongly rigid relations we make the following definition.

**Definition 6.** Let \(R\) be a relation and \(f\) a \(k\)-ary partial operation. We let

\[
\text{Cover}_R(\text{dom}(f)) = \{ \text{RowSet}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \mid t_1, \ldots, t_k \in R, \text{RowSet}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \subseteq \text{dom}(f) \}.
\]

This immediately gives rise to the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** Let \(R\) be a strongly rigid relation and \(f\) a partial operation over a finite set \(X\). If \(f|_C \in \Pi_k R\) for every \(C \in \text{Cover}_R(\text{dom}(f))\) then \(f \in \text{pPol}(R)\).

For \(R_{1/3}\) and related relations the following concept can be used to characterize \(\text{Cover}_{R_{1/3}}(\text{dom}(f))\). For \(k, k' \geq 1\), a set \(\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{k'}\} \subseteq \mathbb{B}^k\) is an exact \(k'\)-cover if \(\omega_1[i] + \ldots + \omega_{k'}[i] = 1\) for every \(i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\).

3.2 \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3})\) and \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01})\)

In this section we study the structure of the set \(\text{Int}(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}), \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01}))\) and prove that it is at least countably infinite. First we define a useful class of relations.

**Definition 8.** For each \(k \geq 4\) let \(\sigma^k\) denote the relation

\[
\{(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_k}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}, \overline{y_1}, \ldots, \overline{y_{k-3}}, 0) \mid \sum_{i=1}^k x_i = 1, y_1 + x_1 + x_2 = 1, \ldots, y_{k-3} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i = 1\}.
\]
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Figure 1: A visualization of Int(pPol($R_{1/3}$), pPol($R^p_{1/3}$)). A directed arrow from $\Gamma$ to $\Delta$ means that pPol($\Gamma$) $\subset$ pPol($\Delta$). Some inclusions are omitted.
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Hence, if \(t_1, \ldots, t_{k'} \in \sigma^k\) then \(\text{RowSet}(t_1, \ldots, t_{k'})\) contains an exact \(k'\)-cover, the complement of these tuples, \(2(k - 3)\) tuples determined by the exact \(k'\)-cover, and a constant 0 tuple. For example, the relation \(\sigma^5\) may be visualized as

\[
\sigma^5 = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

We first claim that \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}) \subseteq \text{pPol}(\sigma^4)\). To see this, note that \(\sigma^4\) can be qfpp-defined as

\[
\sigma^4(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, y_1, z_1, v_0) \equiv \sigma^4(x_1, x_2, y_1) \land \sigma^4(x_3, x_4, z_1) \land \sigma^4(y_1, z_1, v_0) \land \bigwedge_{i=1}^4 (x_i, x_{i+4}, v_0).
\]

It is then not difficult to see that the partial operation \(f(0, 0, 1) = f(0, 1, 0) = f(1, 0, 0) = 0\) preserves \(\sigma^4\) and \(R_{1/3}^{01}\) but not \(R_{1/3}\). Since \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}) \subset \text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{01})\) it therefore follows that \(\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}) \subset \text{pPol}(\{\sigma^4, R_{1/3}^{01}\})\). More generally it also holds that \(\text{pPol}(\{\sigma^k, R_{1/3}^{01}\}) \subset \text{pPol}(\{\sigma^{k+1}, R_{1/3}^{01}\})\).

**Lemma 9.** \(\text{pPol}(\{\sigma^k, R_{1/3}^{01}\}) \supset \text{pPol}(\{\sigma^{k-1}, R_{1/3}^{01}\})\) for each \(k \geq 5\).

**Proof.** To prove the inclusion \(\text{pPol}(\{\sigma^k, R_{1/3}^{01}\}) \supset \text{pPol}(\{\sigma^{k-1}, R_{1/3}^{01}\})\) we show that \(\sigma^k \in \langle \{\sigma^{k-1}\} \rangle_\mathcal{F}\), via the qfpp-definition

\[
\sigma^k(x_1, \ldots, x_{2k}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}, z_1, \ldots, z_{k-3}, v_0) \equiv \\
\sigma^{k-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}, y_{k-3}, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{2k-2}, z_{k-3}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k-4}, z_{1}, \ldots, z_{k-4}, v_0) \land \sigma^{k-1}(x_{k}, x_{k-1}, \ldots, x_3, z_1, x_{2k}, \ldots, x_{2k-1}, \ldots, x_{k-3}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k-4}, \ldots, y_{1}, v_0).
\]
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For the proper inclusion, define the $(k - 1)$-ary partial operation $f$ such that dom($f$) = RowSet($\sigma^{k-1}$), and let $f(\bar{0}^{k-1}) = 1$ and $f(x) = \pi_1^{k-1}(x)$ otherwise. By definition $f$ does not preserve $\sigma^{k-1}$, and it directly follows from Theorem 10 in Lagerkvist & Roy that $f$ preserves $R_{1/3}^{01}$. Hence, all that remains is to prove that $f$ preserves $\sigma^k$, which we do by showing that Cover$_{\sigma^k}$(dom($f$)) = $\emptyset$. Assume there exists $t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1} \in \sigma^k$ such that RowSet($t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1}$) $\subseteq$ dom($f$). Since $\sum_{j=1}^k t_i[j] = 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $k > k-1$, there exists $l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $t_1[l] = \ldots = t_{k-1}[l] = 0$. But due to Definition 8, $t_1[l + k] = \ldots = t_k[l + k] = 1$, implying that RowSet($t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1}$) $\not\subseteq$ Cover$_{\sigma^k}$(dom($f$)) since $\bar{1}^{k-1} \not\in$ dom($f$).

We have thus proved the following.

**Theorem 10.** The set Int(pPol($R_{1/3}$), pPol($R_{01}^{01/3}$)) is at least countably infinite.

3.3 pPol($R_{01}^{01/3}$) and pPol($R_{1/3}^{01/3}$)

Following Lagerkvist & Roy [3] we define the following class of relations.

**Definition 11.** Let $k \geq 5$. The relation $\alpha^k$ is defined as

$$\alpha^k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}, z_1, \ldots, z_{k-3}, w_1, \ldots, w_{k-4}, v_0, v_1)$$

$$\equiv \exists x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{2k}. \bigwedge_{i=3}^{k-2} R_{1/3}(x_1, x_i, w_{i-2}) \land R^1(v_1) \land$$

$$\sigma^k(x_1, \ldots, x_{2k}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}, z_1, \ldots, z_{k-3}, v_0).$$

For each $k \geq 5$, let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ be an enumeration of the tuples in $\alpha^k$ such that $\alpha_1[k] = 1, \alpha_2[k-1] = 1, \ldots, \alpha_k[1] = 1$. Under this enumeration of tuples we for example see that the matrix corresponding to $\alpha^6$ can be
visualized as:

$$\alpha^6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Let $\mathcal{V}_k = \text{Rows}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)[2(k-2) + 2(k-3)]$, and define the $k$-ary partial operation $f^k$ as $\text{dom}(f^k) = \text{RowSet}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ and $f^k(x) = \pi_1^k(x)$ for every $x \in \text{dom}(f^k) \setminus \{\mathcal{V}_k\}$ and $f^k(\mathcal{V}_k) = \alpha_1[2(k-2) + 2(k-3)] \oplus 1$. For example, we have that $\mathcal{V}_6 = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$ and therefore that $f(\mathcal{V}_6) = 0$. We then have the following result from Lagerkvist & Roy [8].

**Theorem 12** (Lagerkvist & Roy [8]). Let $k \geq 5$. Then (1) $\text{pPol}(R_{\frac{11}{3}}) \subset \text{pPol}(\alpha^k) \subset \text{pPol}(R_{\frac{11}{3}}^{\# \neq 01})$ and (2) $f^k \notin \text{pPol}(\alpha^k)$ but $f^k \in \text{pPol}(\alpha^k')$ for every $5 \leq k < k'$.

We will shortly see that $f^k$ preserves $\alpha^k'$ whenever $k' \geq 5$ and $k' \neq k$. First we state the following lemma, whose proof is trivial due to the fact that $f^k$ is defined as a projection on the first argument whenever its arguments are distinct from $\mathcal{V}_k$.

**Lemma 13.** Let $k, k' \geq 5$. Then $f_{|C}^k \in \Pi_2^k$ for every $C \in \text{Cover}_{\alpha^k'}(\text{dom}(f^k))$ such that $\mathcal{V}_k \notin C$.

Before the proof of the following lemma we make a few observations regarding the domain of the function $f^k$. Due to Definition [11] this set consists of

1. $k$ tuples $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ such that $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ forms an exact $k$-cover,

2. $k-3$ tuples $y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}$ such that $\{x_1, \ldots, x_i, y_{i-1}\}, 2 \leq i \leq k-2$, forms an exact $k$-cover,
3. $k - 3$ tuples $y_1, \ldots, y_{k-3}$ such that $\{x_k, \ldots, x_{i+1}, y_{i-1}\}$, $2 \leq i \leq k - 2$, forms an exact $k$-cover,

4. $k - 4$ tuples $z_1, \ldots, z_{k-4}$ such that $\{x_1, x_i, z_{i-2}\}$ forms an exact $k$-cover for $3 \leq i \leq k - 2$, and

5. two constant tuples $\tilde{y}^k$ and $\tilde{t}^k$.

It is also worth remarking that each $y_i$ satisfies the condition that $y_i[j] = 1$ if $1 \leq j \leq k - i + 1$ and $y_i[j] = 0$ if $k - i + 1 < j \leq k$, and that $z_i[k] = 0$, $z_i[i + 2] = 0$, and $z_i[j] = 1$ otherwise. In particular, $\text{dom}(f^k)$ contains the tuple $\mathcal{V}_k$, which satisfies $\mathcal{V}_k[3] = 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_k[k] = 0$, and $\mathcal{V}_k[i] = 1$ otherwise. We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

**Lemma 14.** Let $k \geq 5$. Then $f^k \notin \text{pPol}(\alpha^k)$ but $f^k \in \text{pPol}(\alpha^{k'})$ for every $k' \geq 5$ such that $k' \neq k$.

**Proof.** Assume first that $k' > k$. Then the result follows from Theorem 12. Hence, in the forthcoming proof, assume that $k' < k$. We will prove that whenever $C \in \text{Cover}_{\alpha^k}(\text{dom}(f^k))$ then $\mathcal{V}_k \notin C$, which by combining Lemma 7 and Lemma 13 proves that $f^k \in \text{pPol}(\alpha^{k'})$. Hence, for $t_1, \ldots, t_k \in \alpha^{k'}$ let

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_{k'}, b_1, \ldots, b_{k'-3}, c_1, \ldots, c_{k'-3}, d_1, \ldots, d_{k'-4}, \tilde{y}^k, \tilde{t}^k)$$

denote the tuples in $\text{Rows}(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$. There are now a few cases to consider. However, if $\mathcal{V}_k = a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k'$, or if $\mathcal{V}_k = b_i$, $\mathcal{V}_k = c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k' - 3$, then the proof follows the same argument as Lemma 13 in Lägerkvist & Roy [5].

Therefore, assume there exists some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k' - 4\}$ such that $d_i = \mathcal{V}_k$. This implies that $\{a_1, a_{i+2}, d_i\}$ forms an exact $k$-cover, and we may without loss of generality assume that $\tilde{y}^k \notin \{a_1, a_{i+2}, d_i\}$ as otherwise $\mathcal{V}_k \in \{a_1, a_{i+2}, d_i\}$, which is impossible since $\mathcal{V}_k \notin \text{dom}(f^k)$. Note in particular that this implies that $a_1$ and $a_{i+2}$ both contain exactly one entry equal to 1. Assume without loss of generality that $a_1[k] = 1$ and that $a_{i+2}[3] = 1$.

We will first prove that $\sum a_j = 1$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, k' - 2\}$, where $\Sigma a_j = a_j[1] + \ldots + a_j[k]$.

First, assume that $a_j = \tilde{y}^k$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, k' - 2\}$. The case when $j = 1$ cannot occur since we have already established that $\Sigma a_1 = 1$, and $j = 2$ is impossible since it implies that $b_1 = \tilde{t}^k \notin \text{dom}(f)$, due to the fact that $\{a_1, a_2, b_1\}$ must be an exact $k$-cover. Similarly, we see that $d_{j-2} = \tilde{t}^k \notin \text{dom}(f)$ if $\Sigma a_j = 0$ for $j \in \{3, \ldots, k' - 2\}$, since $\{a_1, a_j, d_{j-2}\}$ must be an exact $k$-cover.

Second, assume that $\Sigma a_j > 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq k' - 2$. Since the cases when $j = 1$ or $j = i + 2$ are impossible we assume that $j \neq 1$ and
that \( j \neq i + 2 \). Since \( a_1 = (0,0,\ldots,0,1) \) and \( a_{i-2} = (0,0,1,0,\ldots,0) \), this implies that \( a_j = (1,1,0,\ldots,0) \), as otherwise \( a_j \notin \text{dom}(f^k) \). But then, since \( \{a_1,a_j,d_{j-2}\} \) must form an exact \( k \)-cover, \( f^k \) cannot be defined on \( d_{j-2} \).

Hence, \( \Sigma a_j = 1 \) for each \( 1 \leq j \leq k' - 2 \), but since \( k' < k \) this implies that \( \Sigma a_{k'-1} > 1 \) or that \( \Sigma a_{k'} > 1 \). We assume that \( \Sigma a_{k'-1} > 1 \) since the case when \( \Sigma a_{k'} > 1 \) is entirely symmetric. Due to the assumption that \( a_{k'-1} \in \text{dom}(f^k) \), \( a_1 = (0,\ldots,0,1) \) and \( a_{i-2} = (0,0,1,0,\ldots,0) \), this in fact implies that \( a_{k'-1} = (1,1,0,\ldots,0) \). Now, since \( \{a_{k'-1},a_{k'},c_{k'-2}\} \) must form an exact \( k \)-cover, either \( a_{k'} = 0\vec{k} \) or \( c_{k'-2} = 0\vec{k} \), as otherwise \( a_{k'} \notin \text{dom}(f^k) \) or \( c_{k'-2} \notin \text{dom}(f^k) \). However, the latter case is impossible since it implies that \( a_{k'-1} = 0\vec{k} \), which cannot happen since \( \{a_1,\ldots,a_k\} \) is an exact \( k \)-cover, and since \( \Sigma a_j = 1 \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq k' - 2 \). Hence, \( a_{k'} = 0\vec{k} \), and \( c_{k'-2} = 0\vec{k} \). Now, since \( \Sigma a_j = 1 \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq k' - 2 \), it follows that \( |\{t_3,\ldots,t_k\}| = k - 2 \), i.e., the tuples \( t_3,\ldots,t_k \) do not contain any repetitions. However, since \( t_1 \notin \{t_3,\ldots,t_k\} \), and there cannot exist \( t_j \) such that \( t_j[k'] = 1 \), there are only \( k' - 2 \) tuples to choose from. This is impossible since \( k' < k \), and we conclude that \( \forall k \notin \text{RowSet}(t_1,\ldots,t_k) \).

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 15.** The set \( \text{Int}(pPol(R_{1/3}^{01}),pPol(R_{1/3}^{\neq01})) \) is of continuum cardinality.

**Proof.** Let \( \mathbb{N}_{\geq 5} = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0,1,2,3,4\} \). We will prove that there exists an injective function \( h \) from \( \{X \mid X \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 5}\} \) to \( \text{Int}(pPol(R_{1/3}^{01}),pPol(R_{1/3}^{\neq01})) \). Define \( h(X) = pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in X\}) \) for every \( X \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 5} \). We claim that \( pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in X\}) \neq pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in Y\}) \) whenever \( X,Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 5} \) and \( X \neq Y \). Indeed, if \( X \neq Y \) then there exist \( i_1 \in X \) or \( i_2 \in Y \) such that \( i_1 \notin X \) or \( i_2 \notin X \). But then \( f_{i_1} \notin pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in X\}) \) and \( f_{i_1} \in pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in Y\}) \), or \( f_{i_2} \notin pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in X\}) \) and \( f_{i_2} \in pPol(\{\alpha^i \mid i \in Y\}) \), due to Lemma 14. \( \square \)

# 4 Concluding Remarks

We have studied the set \( \text{Int}(\Pi_3) \), with a particular focus on describing the strong partial clones between \( pPol(R_{1/3}) \) and \( pPol(R_{1/3}^{\neq01}) \). By generalizing the results from Lagerkvist & Roy \([8]\) we have proven that \( \text{Int}(pPol(R_{1/3}),pPol(R_{1/3}^{01})) \) is at least countably infinite and that \( \text{Int}(pPol(R_{1/3}^{01}),pPol(R_{1/3}^{\neq01})) \) is of continuum cardinality. These results open up a few distinct directions for future research. First, note that Lemma \([9]\) raises the possibility that \( pPol(\{R_{1/3}^{01},\sigma^k\}) \) is covered by \( pPol(\{R_{1/3},\sigma^{k+1}\}) \), i.e., that there does not exist any strong partial clone inbetween. If this is indeed the case then the cardinality of \( \text{Int}(pPol(R_{1/3}),pPol(R_{1/3}^{01})) \) might be countably infinite. Second, it would be
interesting to determine the strong partial clones covered by $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{1/3})$. Since $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{1/3})$ is infinitely generated (by Theorem 5) a good starting point is to determine whether every strong partial subclone of $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{1/3})$ is contained in a maximal strong partial subclone of $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{1/3})$, or if there exists a countably infinite chain of strong partial clones in $\text{Int}(\Pi_B)$ such that the union of this chain equals $\text{pPol}(R_{1/3}^{1/3})$.
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