

## ADJUSTED INTERVAL DIGRAPHS

TOMÁS FEDER<sup>1</sup> AND PAVOL HELL<sup>2</sup> AND JING HUANG<sup>3</sup> AND ARASH RAFIEY<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 268 Waverley St., Palo Alto, CA 94301, USA  
*E-mail address:* tomas@theory.stanford.edu

<sup>2</sup> School of Computing Science, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., Canada V5A 1S6  
*E-mail address:* pavol@cs.sfu.ca

<sup>3</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistic, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada, V8W 3P4  
*E-mail address:* jing@math.uvic.ca

<sup>4</sup> School of Computing Science, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., Canada, V5A 1S6  
*E-mail address:* arashr@cs.sfu.ca

---

ABSTRACT. Interval digraphs were introduced by West et al. They can be recognized in polynomial time and admit a characterization in terms of incidence matrices. Nevertheless, they do not have a forbidden structure characterization nor a low-degree polynomial recognition algorithm.

We introduce a new class of ‘adjusted interval digraphs’, obtained by a slight change in the definition. By contrast, these digraphs have a natural forbidden structure characterization, parallel to a characterization for undirected graphs, and admit an easy recognition algorithm.

We relate adjusted interval digraphs to a list homomorphism problem. Each digraph  $H$  defines a corresponding list homomorphism problem  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$ . We observe that if  $H$  is an adjusted interval digraph, then the problem  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is polynomial time solvable, and conjecture that for all other reflexive digraphs  $H$  the problem  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is NP-complete. We present some preliminary evidence for the conjecture.

### Introduction

An *interval graph* [11] is a graph  $H$  which admits an *interval representation*, i.e., a family of intervals  $I_v, v \in V(H)$ , such that  $uv \in E(H)$  if and only if  $I_u$  and  $I_v$  intersect. An *interval digraph* [4] is a digraph  $H$  which admits an *interval pair representation*, which is a family of pairs of intervals  $I_v, J_v, v \in V(H)$ , such that  $uv \in E(H)$  if and only if  $I_u$  intersects  $J_v$ . Note that an interval graph must be reflexive (each vertex has a loop), but an interval digraph may lack loops. If the intervals  $I_v, J_v, v \in V(H)$ , can be chosen so that for each  $v$

---

1998 ACM Subject Classification: G.2.2.

*Key words and phrases:* Interval graph, interval digraph, forbidden subgraph, list homomorphism, polynomial algorithm, NP-completeness, dichotomy.

Thanks: `stacs.cls` and this sample file are derived from the files `lmcs.cls` and `lmcs-smp.cls`.

the intervals  $I_v$  and  $J_v$  have the same left endpoint, we say that  $H$  is an *adjusted interval digraph*. It is again clear that an adjusted interval digraph must be reflexive.

In [3] we have studied the special case of adjusted interval digraphs  $H$  representable by intervals  $I_v, J_v, v \in V(H)$ , in which each interval  $J_v$  is just one point. These are called *chronological interval digraphs* [3], and we have shown that they can be characterized by the absence of certain special forbidden structures. In [20], a related class of *interval catch digraphs* has been characterized by the absence of certain other forbidden structures. Here we provide a forbidden structure characterization of adjusted interval digraphs, very similar to a recent forbidden structure characterization of interval graphs, and other structures [15]. The characterization allows a direct polynomial time recognition algorithm of adjusted interval digraphs.

We apply adjusted interval digraphs to the complexity of list homomorphisms. A *homomorphism*  $f$  of a digraph  $G$  to a digraph  $H$  is a mapping  $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$  in which  $f(u)f(v) \in E(H)$  whenever  $uv \in E(G)$  [17]. If  $L(v), v \in V(G)$ , are *lists* (subsets of  $V(H)$ ), then a *list homomorphism* of  $G$  to  $H$  (with respect to the lists  $L$ ) is a homomorphism satisfying  $f(v) \in L(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . The *list homomorphism problem*  $L - HOM(H)$  asks whether or not an input digraph  $G$  equipped with lists  $L$  admits a list homomorphism  $f : G \rightarrow H$  with respect to  $L$ . The complexity of the list homomorphism problem  $L - HOM(H)$  for undirected graphs  $H$  has been classified in [5, 6, 7]. Of particular interest for this paper is the classification in the special case of reflexive graphs: if  $H$  is a reflexive graph, then the problem  $L - HOM(H)$  is polynomial time solvable if  $H$  is an interval graph, and is NP-complete otherwise [5]. The complexity of  $L - HOM(H)$  for any digraph (and more general relational system) has been classified in [1] (see Theorem 3.1). For reflexive digraphs  $H$ , we propose a simpler classification. Specifically, we observe that each adjusted interval digraph  $H$  has polynomial time solvable list homomorphism problem  $L - HOM(H)$ , and conjecture that for any other reflexive digraph  $H$  the problem  $L - HOM(H)$  is NP-complete. We offer some evidence for the conjecture here (and more in a full version of this paper).

## 1. Invertible Pairs

The *underlying graph* of  $H$  has an edge  $uv$  whenever  $uv \in E(H)$  or  $vu \in E(H)$ . If  $u, v$  are adjacent in the underlying graph of  $H$ , the pair  $uv$  is a *forward edge* if  $uv \in E(H)$ , and a *backward edge* if  $vu \in E(H)$ . Note that a loop is both a forward edge and a backward edge. If  $uv \in E(H)$ , we say that  $u$  *dominates*  $v$  in  $H$ .

We define two walks  $P = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $Q = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n$  in  $H$  to be *congruent*, if they follow the same pattern of forward and backward edges, i.e., if  $x_i x_{i+1}$  is a forward (backward) edge if and only if  $y_i y_{i+1}$  is a forward (backward) edge, respectively. If  $P$  and  $Q$  as above are congruent walks, we say that  $P$  *avoids*  $Q$ , if there is no edge  $x_i y_{i+1}$  in the same direction (forward or backward) as  $x_i x_{i+1}$ .

An *invertible pair* in  $H$  is a pair of vertices  $u, v$  such that

- there exist congruent walks  $P$  from  $u$  to  $v$  and  $Q$  from  $v$  to  $u$ , and such that  $P$  avoids  $Q$ ,
- there exist congruent walks  $P'$  from  $v$  to  $u$  and  $Q'$  from  $u$  to  $v$ , such that  $P'$  avoids  $Q'$ .

It will turn out to be useful to reformulate these definitions in terms of an auxiliary digraph. The *pair-digraph*  $H^+$  associated with  $H$  has vertices  $V(H^+) = \{(u, v) : u \neq v\}$ , and edges  $(u, v)(u', v')$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} uu', vv' \in E(H) \text{ and } uv' \notin E(H), \text{ or} \\ u'u, v'v \in E(H) \text{ and } v'u \notin E(H). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 1.1.** *If  $H$  has an invertible pair  $(u, v)$ , then  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$  belong to the same strong component  $C$  of the pair-digraph  $H^+$ ; moreover, for any  $(x, y)$  in  $C$  the reversed pair  $(y, x)$  also belongs to  $C$ , i.e., each pair in  $C$  is invertible.*

*If  $H$  has no invertible pair, then for each strong component  $C$  of  $H^+$  there exists a reversed strong component  $C'$  such that  $(x, y) \in C$  if and only if  $(y, x) \in C'$ .*

*Proof.* These properties follow from the definition of a strong component and the observation that  $(u, v)(u'v') \in E(H^+)$  implies  $(v', u')(v, u) \in E(H^+)$ . For instance, if  $(u, v), (v, u), (x, y) \in C$ , then the directed closed walk containing  $(u, v), (x, y)$  yields by reversal a directed closed walk containing  $(v, u), (y, x)$ , and by concatenation with the directed closed walk containing  $(u, v), (v, u)$ , we obtain a directed closed walk containing  $(x, y), (y, x)$ . ■

An ordering  $<$  of the vertices of  $H$  is a *min ordering* of  $H$  if it satisfies the following property: if  $uv \in E(H)$  and  $u'v' \in E(H)$ , then  $\min(u, u') \min(v, v') \in E(H)$ . (A min ordering was also called an *X-underbar enumeration* [12, 17]). The following result relates min orderings to adjusted interval digraphs.

**Theorem 1.2.** *A reflexive digraph is an adjusted interval digraph if and only if it admits a min ordering.*

*Proof.* Given a min ordering, we can arrange the common starting points of  $I_v, J_v$  in the same order as the vertices  $v$  appear in the min ordering, and define intervals  $I_v$  and  $J_v$  as follows. If  $v$  has no forward edges towards later vertices, we end the interval  $I_v$  at the last vertex  $w$  such that  $vw$  is a double edge, and end the interval  $J_v$  at the last vertex  $w$  such that  $vw$  is a backward edge. If  $v$  has no backward edges towards later vertices, we end the interval  $J_v$  at the last vertex  $w$  such that  $vw$  is a double edge, and end the interval  $I_v$  at the last vertex  $w$  such that  $vw$  is a forward edge. Conversely, given an adjusted interval pair representation  $I_v, J_v, v \in V(H)$  we obtain a min ordering of  $H$  according to the left to right order of the common left endpoints of the intervals. ■

Min orderings also play an important role for list homomorphism problems, cf. [17].

**Theorem 1.3.** [12] *If  $H$  admits a min ordering, then the problem  $L - HOM(H)$  is polynomial time solvable.*

Finally, we observe that an invertible pair is an obstruction to the existence of a min ordering.

**Lemma 1.4.** *If  $H$  has an invertible pair, then  $H$  does not admit a min ordering.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $(u, v)(u', v')$  is an edge of the pair-digraph  $H^+$ . Suppose  $<$  is a min ordering of  $H$ , and suppose  $u < v$ . Then we must also have  $u' < v'$ . Following the directed closed walk in  $H^+$  which contains  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$ , we obtain a contradiction. ■

## 2. Adjusted Interval Digraphs

We now strengthen Lemma 1.4.

**Theorem 2.1.** *A reflexive digraph  $H$  admits a min ordering if and only if it has no invertible pair.*

In fact, we shall prove the following stronger result.

**Theorem 2.2.** *The following statements are equivalent for a reflexive digraph  $H$ :*

- (1)  $H$  is an adjusted interval digraph
- (2)  $H$  has a min ordering
- (3)  $H$  has no invertible pairs
- (4) The vertices of  $H^+$  can be partitioned into sets  $D, D'$  such that
  - $(x, y) \in D$  if and only if  $(y, x) \in D'$
  - $(x, y) \in D$  and  $(x, y)$  dominates  $(x', y')$  in  $H^+$  implies  $(x', y') \in D$
  - $(x, y), (y, z) \in D$  implies  $(x, z) \in D$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence of 1 and 2 is proved in Theorem 1.2. Furthermore, Lemma 1.4 shows that 2 implies 3. It is also quite straightforward to see that 4 implies 2; it suffices to define  $a < b$  if  $(x, y) \in D$ . Thus it remains to show that 3 implies 4.

Therefore, we assume that  $H$  has no invertible pair. Note that we may assume that  $H$  is weakly connected, otherwise we can order each weak component separately. We also note that for each strong component  $C$  of  $H^+$ , there is a corresponding reversed strong component  $C'$  whose pairs are precisely the reversed pairs of the pairs in  $C$ ; we shall say that  $C, C'$  are *coupled* strong components.

The partition of  $V(H^+)$  into  $D, D'$  will correspond to separating each pair of coupled strong components  $C, C'$  of  $H^+$ . The vertices of one strong components will be placed in the set  $D$ , their reversed pairs will go to  $D'$ . We wish to make these choices in such a way as to avoid creating a *circular chain* in  $D$ , i.e., a sequence of pairs  $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_n, x_0) \in D$ .

We shall proceed as follows. Initially the sets  $D$  and  $D'$  are empty. We say that a strong component  $C$  of  $H^+$  is *ripe* when it has no edge *to* another strong component in  $H^+ - D$ . In the general step, we shall take a ripe component  $C$  and place it in  $D$ , and simultaneously place  $C'$  in  $D'$ . (Note that  $C'$  need not be ripe, but has no edge *from* another strong component.) We will show that there is always at least one ripe strong component which can be added to  $D$  without creating a circular chain.

The sets  $D, D'$  will always have the following properties (which are true initially). There is no circular chain in  $D$ ; each strong component of  $H^+$  belongs entirely to  $D, D'$ , or to  $V(H^+) - D - D'$ ; the pairs in  $D'$  are precisely the reversed pairs of the pairs in  $D$ ; there is no edge of  $H^+$  from  $D$  to a vertex outside of  $D$ ; and there is no edge of  $H^+$  from a vertex outside of  $D'$  to a vertex in  $D'$ . At the end of the algorithm each pair  $(x, y)$  with  $x \neq y$  will belong either to  $D$  or to  $D'$ , and hence the final  $D$  will have no circular chain and hence satisfy the transitivity property of 4.

We now prove that the algorithm maintains these properties.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that the current  $D$  has no circular chain but the addition of  $C$  to  $D$  creates a circular chain in  $C \cup D$ . Suppose  $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_n, x_0)$  is a circular chain that has occurred for the first time during the execution of the algorithm, and also suppose that at that time no shorter circular chain has occurred. Since there are no invertible pairs, and since we never place both an edge and its reverse in  $D$ , we must

have  $n \geq 2$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $(x_n, x_0) \in C$ ; note that other pairs of the circular chain could also be in  $C$ .

**Case 1.** Assume that in  $H$ , there is at least one edge between the vertices  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , say an edge  $x_a x_b$ .

We claim that this implies that  $H$  is complete on  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ . We make the following elementary observations, assuming  $j \neq i$ .

- (1) If  $x_j$  dominates  $x_i$  then  $x_{j-1}$  dominates  $x_i$  in  $H$ .
- (2) If  $x_j$  dominates  $x_i$  then  $x_j$  dominates  $x_{i-1}$  in  $H$ .

To prove the first observation, we note that if  $x_j$  dominates  $x_i$  but  $x_{j-1}$  not dominate  $x_i$  in  $H$ , then  $(x_{j-1}, x_j)$  dominates  $(x_{j-1}, x_i)$  in  $H^+$ . Since  $(x_{j-1}, x_j)$  is in  $C \cup D$ , the pair  $(x_{j-1}, x_i)$  must belong to  $C \cup D$ , implying a shorter circular chain in  $C \cup D$ .

To prove the second observation, we similarly note that if  $x_j$  dominates  $x_i$  but  $x_j$  does not dominate  $x_{i-1}$  in  $H$ , then  $(x_{i-1}, x_i)$  dominates  $(x_{i-1}, x_j)$  in  $H^+$ , also implying a shorter circular chain.

Consider now the fact that  $x_a$  dominates  $x_b$  in  $H$ . Property 1 implies that  $x_{a-1}, x_{a-2}, \dots, x_{b+1}$  all dominate  $x_b$ . Since  $x_{b+1}$  dominates  $x_b$ , property 2 implies that  $x_{b+1}$  dominates  $x_{b-1}, x_{b-2}, \dots, x_{b+2}$ , i.e., dominates all other vertices. At this point we use 1 again to derive that  $x_b$  dominates  $x_{b-1}$ , and repeated application of 2 as before implies that  $x_b$  dominates all other vertices. Continuing this way, we see that each  $x_j$  dominates all other vertices, i.e., the vertices  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$  induce a complete graph in  $H$ .

We conclude the proof of Case 1 by showing that  $C$  is a trivial component (with a single vertex). If  $C$  has more than one vertex, then so does its corresponding coupled component  $C'$ , which contains the vertex  $(x_0, x_n)$ . Hence we assume for contradiction that  $(x_0, x_n)$  dominates some  $(a, b)$  not in  $C \cup D$ . Up to symmetry, we may assume that  $x_0$  dominates  $a$  in  $H$ ,  $x_n$  dominates  $b$  in  $H$  and  $x_0$  does not dominate  $b$  in  $H$ . Let  $i$  be the greatest subscript such that  $x_i$  does not dominate  $b$ . Then  $(x_i, x_{i+1}), (x_{i-1}, b), (x_{i-2}, b), \dots, (x_0, b), (a, b)$  is a directed path in  $H^+$ , and since its first vertex  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$  is in  $C \cup D$ , all of its vertices must be in  $C \cup D$ , contradicting  $(a, b) \notin C \cup D$ .

Thus we have  $C = \{(x_n, x_0)\}, C' = \{(x_0, x_n)\}$ . The same proof also shows that  $C'$  is ripe, as no  $(a, b)$  dominated by  $(x_0, x_n)$  can exist outside of  $C \cup D$ . It is now easy to see that if both  $(x_n, x_0)$  and  $(x_0, x_n)$  complete a circular chain with  $D$ , then  $D$  already had a circular chain.

**Case 2.** Assume that vertices  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$  are independent in  $H$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose  $p$  is a vertex of  $H$ , distinct from  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , which dominates  $x_{i+1}$  but not  $x_i$  (or which is dominated by  $x_{i+1}$  but not by  $x_i$ ).*

*Then  $(x_0, x_1), \dots, (x_i, p), (p, x_{i+2}), \dots, (x_n, x_0)$  is also a circular chain created at the same time.*

*Proof.* We conclude from the assumption that  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$  dominates  $(x_i, p)$  in  $H^+$ , and since  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$  is in  $C \cup D$ , we must also have  $(x_i, p)$  in  $C \cup D$ . Furthermore, since  $x_{i+1}$  does not dominate or is dominated by  $x_{i+2}$  in  $H$ , we also have  $(x_{i+1}, x_{i+2})$  dominating  $(p, x_{i+2})$ , whence  $(p, x_{i+2})$  is in  $C \cup D$ . In conclusion, we see that any such vertex  $p$  can replace  $x_{i+1}$  in the circular chain  $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_n, x_0)$ . ■

**Lemma 2.4.** • *If  $p$  is a vertex of  $H$ , distinct from  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , which dominates  $x_j$  and  $x_k$  with  $j \neq k$ , then  $p$  dominates each  $x_i$ .*

- If  $p$  is a vertex of  $H$ , distinct from  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , which is dominated by  $x_j$  and  $x_k$  with  $j \neq k$ , then  $p$  is dominated by each  $x_i$ .
- If  $p$ , distinct from  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , dominates  $x_j$  and is dominated by  $x_k$  with  $j \neq k$ , then  $p$  both dominates and is dominated by each  $x_i, i \neq j, k$ .

*Proof.* If  $p$  dominates  $x_{i+1}$  but not  $x_i$ , then Lemma 2.3 implies that  $p$  can replace  $x_{i+1}$  in the circular chain; however at least one of  $x_j, x_k$  is not equal to  $x_{i+1}$ , whence the vertices of the chain are not independent and we conclude by Case 1. The other items are proved similarly. ■

We now claim that the circular chain  $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_n, x_0)$  has at most one pair, say  $(x_n, x_0)$ , in  $C$  (with all other pairs in  $D$ ). Otherwise, assume some  $(x_i, x_{i+1}), i \neq n$  is also in the strong component  $C$ , and let  $P$  be a directed path in  $C$  from  $(x_n, x_0)$  to  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$ . Let the penultimate pair on this path be  $(p, q)$ , and, without loss of generality, assume that  $px_i, qx_{i+1} \in E(H), px_{i+1} \notin E(H)$ . (In the case  $x_ip, x_{i+1}q \in E(H), x_{i+1}p \notin E(H)$ , the argument is symmetric.) By Lemma 2.3,  $p$  does not dominate any  $x_j$  with  $j \neq i$ . Next we claim that  $q$  does not dominate  $x_i$ . Indeed, if  $q$  dominates  $x_i$ , then Lemma 2.4 implies that  $q$  dominates all  $x_j$ . This is a contradiction, since it would mean that  $(p, q)$  dominates  $(x_i, x_{i+2})$  in  $H^+$ , implying that  $(x_i, x_{i+2})$  is in  $C \cup D$  and thus there is a shorter circular chain in  $H$ . Therefore  $q$  does not dominate  $x_i$ . By a double application of Lemma 2.3, we conclude that we can replace  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  by  $p$  and  $q$  in the circular chain in  $H$ . Continuing this way, we replace  $(p, q)$  by the previous pair on the path  $P$ , until we obtain the pair  $(p', q')$  which is the first pair after  $(x_n, x_0)$ . Since  $x_0$  is adjacent to  $q'$ , we are back in Case 1.

Thus the circular chain  $(x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_n, x_0)$  has only the pair  $(x_n, x_0)$  in  $C$ , and any circular chain in  $C \cup D$  has exactly one pair in  $C$ . We now suppose, in addition to the previous assumptions, that our circular chain minimizes the sum of the lengths of all distances amongst the vertices  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , in the underlying graph of  $H$ .

The digraph  $H$  turns out to have a very special structure. We claim that in this situation there exists a non-empty set  $K$  of vertices of  $H$  such that  $H \setminus K$  has weak components  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m$ , where  $x_i \in C_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and such that if  $p \in K$  dominates (respectively is dominated by) a vertex in  $C_i$ , then  $p$  dominates (respectively is dominated by) all vertices in  $C_i$ ; moreover, if  $x'_0, x'_1, \dots, x'_n$  are any vertices with  $x'_i \in C_i$ , then  $(x'_0, x'_1), (x'_1, x'_2), \dots, (x'_n, x'_0)$  is also a circular chain.

Indeed, we let  $K$  consist of all vertices of  $H$  that dominate each  $x_i$ , or are dominated by each  $x_i$ . It is easy to see that  $K$  must be non-empty, as Lemma 2.4 implies that any  $p$  dominated by  $x_j, x_k, j \neq k$  belongs to  $K$ . Such a  $p$  must exist by our new minimality assumption, as otherwise we could replace  $x_j$  by its neighbour  $p$  on a path joining  $x_j$  to  $x_k$  by Lemma 2.3.

The same argument shows that two different  $x_j, x_k$  cannot lie in the same weak component  $C_i$  of  $H \setminus K$ , as any path joining  $x_j$  to  $x_k$  was shown to contain a vertex of  $K$ . Therefore we can number the components so that  $C_i$  contains  $x_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . (There may be additional components  $C_i$  with  $i = n+1, \dots, m$ .) Now Lemma 2.3 implies that each  $x_i$  can be replaced by any neighbour in  $C_i$ , thus any vertex of  $C_i$  can be taken as  $x_i$ . Thus each  $p \in K$  that dominates a vertex in  $C_i$  also dominates all vertices in  $C_i$ , and similarly for vertices  $p$  dominated by a vertex in  $C_i$ .

This creates a situation where any pair  $(y, y')$  in the strong component  $C$  of  $H^+$  containing  $(x_n, x_0)$  must satisfy  $y \in C_n, y' \in C_0$ . This easily implies that the strong component

$C$  does not have any arcs entering it from the outside, and hence the strong component  $C'$  coupled with  $C$  is also ripe. We claim that  $C'$  cannot complete a circular chain with  $D$ . Otherwise, the pair  $(x_0, x_n)$  would also complete a circular chain by the same argument. Thus both  $(x_0, x_n)$  and  $(x_n, x_0)$  complete a circular chain with  $D$ , whence  $D$  must already contain a circular chain, a contradiction.

Of course, if the addition of  $C'$  does not create a circular chain, then we add  $C'$  to  $D$  and  $C$  to  $D'$ . ■

This gives us a polynomially verifiable forbidden subgraph characterization of adjusted interval digraphs. As noted above, checking for invertible pairs amounts to computing the strong components of  $H^+$  and checking for the existence of a pair  $(u, v), (v, u)$  in one strong component.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $H$  be a reflexive digraph. Then  $H$  is an adjusted interval digraph if and only if it has no invertible pair.* ■

### 3. Polymorphisms

The min orderings defined above are a particular case of the following general concept. Let  $k$  be a positive integer. The  $k$ -th power of  $H$  is the digraph  $H^k$  with vertex set  $V(H)^k$  in which  $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$  is an edge just if each  $u_i v_i$  is an edge of  $H$ . A *polymorphism of order  $k$*  is a homomorphism of  $H^k$  to  $H$ . A polymorphism  $f$  is *conservative* if  $f(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k)$  always is one of  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k$ . From now on we shall use the word *polymorphism* to mean a conservative polymorphism.

A polymorphism  $f$  of order two is *commutative* if  $f(u, v) = f(v, u)$  for any  $u, v$ . If  $H$  admits a min ordering  $<$ , then clearly defining  $f(u, v) = \min(u, v)$  is a polymorphism, which is commutative.

Two ternary polymorphisms also play a role in the problems L-HOM( $H$ ) [1]. A polymorphism  $f : H^3 \rightarrow H$  is called a *majority polymorphism* if  $f(u, u, v) = f(u, v, u) = f(v, u, u) = u$  for any  $u, v$ . A ternary polymorphism  $f : H^3 \rightarrow H$  is called a *Maltsev polymorphism* if  $f(u, u, v) = f(v, u, u) = v$  for any  $u, v$ . A ternary polymorphism  $f : H^3 \rightarrow H$  is *majority (respectively Maltsev) over  $a, b$* , if  $f(a, a, b) = f(a, b, a) = f(b, a, a) = a, f(b, b, a) = f(b, a, b) = f(a, b, b) = b$  (respectively if  $f(a, a, b) = f(b, a, a) = b, f(a, b, b) = f(b, b, a) = a$ ).

At this point, we can state the classification of L-HOM( $H$ ) due to Bulatov. The theorem applies to any relational structure  $H$ , but for our purposes we only need to state it for reflexive digraphs. Recall that by our definition each polymorphism is conservative. Also, we formulate the result in a language of binary commutative polymorphisms in place of the more usual semi-lattice operations [1], since it is equivalent and is more convenient in our context.

**Theorem 3.1.** [1] *Let  $H$  be a reflexive digraph.*

*If for every pair of vertices  $a, b$  of  $H$  there exists a polymorphism of  $H$  which is either ternary and majority, or Maltsev, over  $a, b$ , or is binary and commutative over  $a, b$ , then L-HOM( $H$ ) is polynomial time solvable.*

*Otherwise, if some pair of vertices  $a, b$  does not admit any of these polymorphisms, then the problem L-HOM( $H$ ) is NP-complete.*

#### 4. List Homomorphism Problems

The following fact follows directly from Theorems 1.3 (or Theorem 3.1) and 1.2.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $H$  is an adjusted interval digraph, then  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is polynomial time solvable.*

Here is an equivalent form of the conjecture from [9, 13].

**Conjecture 4.2.** *If  $H$  is an adjusted interval digraph, then  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is polynomial time solvable.*

(We also had a similar conjecture for irreflexive digraphs [9, 13]. However, that conjecture has turned out to be false [14, 2], and we shall discuss the case of irreflexive digraphs in a companion paper [14].)

We now provide some preliminary evidence to support our conjecture. In the full version of the paper we will offer additional results to this end. A digraph is semi-complete if its underlying graph is complete.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose  $H$  is a reflexive semi-complete digraph. If  $H$  contains an invertible pair, then  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* We will appeal to Bulatov's characterization, Theorem 3.1, showing that if there exist invertible pairs in  $H$ , then some invertible pair  $a, b$  admits no polymorphism as prescribed by Theorem 3.1.

It turns out that some structures in  $H$  limit our choices of polymorphisms from the theorem. Let  $R$  be the reflexive digraph  $V(R) = \{a, b, c\}$  and  $E(R) = \{aa, bb, cc, ab, bc, ac, ca\}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *There is no polymorphism  $g$  on the digraph  $R$  which is a majority over  $a, b$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $g$  is a polymorphism of  $R$  which is a majority over  $a, b$ , i.e.,  $g(a, a, b) = g(a, b, a) = g(b, a, a) = a$ , and  $g(a, b, b) = g(b, a, b) = g(b, b, a) = b$ . We claim that  $g$  must also be a majority over  $b, c$ . Note that  $g(c, c, b)g(a, a, b) = g(c, c, b)a \in E(R)$ . Hence  $g(c, c, b) = c$ , as  $b$  does not dominate  $a$  in  $R$ . Similarly,  $g(c, b, c) = g(b, c, c) = c$ . Also  $g(b, b, c)g(b, b, a) = g(b, b, c)b \in E(R)$  thus  $g(b, b, c) = b$  and similarly  $g(b, c, b) = g(c, b, b) = b$ . Now we can conclude that  $g$  is also majority over  $a, c$ , using the fact that  $g(a, a, c)g(b, b, c) \in E(R)$  and  $g(b, b, c)g(c, c, a) \in E(R)$ .

Now we note that we have  $g(a, b, c)g(b, b, c) = g(a, b, c)b \in E(R)$ , which implies that  $g(a, b, c) \in \{a, b\}$  (since  $c$  doesn't dominate  $b$  in  $R$ ); we have  $g(a, b, b)g(a, b, c) \in E(R)$ , which similarly implies that  $g(a, b, c) \in \{b, c\}$ ; and we have  $g(c, a, c)g(a, b, c) \in E(R)$ , which similarly implies that  $g(a, b, c) \in \{a, c\}$ , which is impossible. ■

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose  $H$  is a reflexive digraph with  $ab \in E(H)$ ,  $ba \notin E(H)$ . There is no polymorphism  $h$  over the digraph  $H$  which is a Maltsev operation over  $a, b$ .*

*Proof.* If  $h$  is Maltsev over  $a, b$ , then  $h(a, a, b)h(a, b, b) = ba \in E(H)$ , a contradiction. ■

Thus let us assume  $H$  contains invertible pairs. If  $H$  also contains an induced reflexive directed three-cycle  $\vec{C}_3$ , then  $L\text{-HOM}(H)$  is known to be NP-complete [9]. Thus we may assume for the proof that  $H$  does not contain  $\vec{C}_3$ . By a similar argument, we may assume that  $S(H)$  is an interval graph, and in particular,  $S(H)$  does not contain an induced four-cycle [8, 19].

If  $H$  contains invertible pairs, then there exist directed closed walks  $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n), (x_0, y_0)$  in  $H^+$  which contains both  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, a)$  for some  $a, b \in V(H)$ . We say

that such a closed walk  $C$  is an *inverting walk* for the pair  $a, b$ . As noted in Lemma 1.1, each vertex  $(x_i, y_i)$  of  $C$  is itself invertible.

An inverting walk  $C$  in  $H^+$  consists of forward edges only. Recall that, in  $H$ , these edges could correspond to pairs of edges  $x_i x_{i+1}, y_i y_{i+1}$ , which are either forward or backward.

We first assume that for some  $C$  and some  $i$  we have the edges  $x_i x_{i+1}, x_{i+2} x_{i+1} \in E(H)$  and  $y_i y_{i+1}, y_{i+2} y_{i+1} \in E(H)$ . Without loss of generality, let us assume  $i = 0$ , i.e., that  $x_0 x_1, x_2 x_1, y_0 y_1, y_2 y_1 \in E(H)$  and  $x_0 y_1, y_2 x_1 \notin E(H)$ . Therefore, the pair  $(x_0, y_1)$  dominates  $(x_1, y_1)$  and is dominated by  $(x_0, y_0)$ . If  $y_0 \neq y_1$ , then we can insert  $(x_0, y_1)$  in  $C$ ; similarly, if  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , we can insert  $(x_1, y_2)$  in  $C$ . Then we focus on the subpath  $(x_0, y_1), (x_1, y_1), (x_1, y_2)$  of  $C$ , and the subgraph of  $H$  induced by the four vertices  $x_0, x_1, y_1, y_2$ . Thus we may assume that  $(x_0, y_1)$  is also in  $C$ , and hence is invertible. The same argument shows that  $(x_1, y_2)$  is also invertible.

Since  $H$  is semi-complete, we must have  $y_1 x_0, x_1 y_2 \in E(H)$ . If  $y_1 x_1 \notin E(H)$ , then  $y_1, x_0, x_1$  are all distinct and must induce  $R$ , since there is no induced  $\vec{C}_3$ . Then over  $y_1, x_0$  there is no majority by Lemma 4.4, no Maltsev by Lemma 4.5, and no commutative binary polymorphism by Lemma 1.4. Hence  $\text{L-HOM}(H)$  is NP-complete by Theorem 3.1.

If  $y_1 x_1 \in E(H)$ , then  $y_1, x_1, y_2$  must be distinct and the same argument as above implies that  $x_1 y_1 \in E(H)$ . Then the same argument again applied to the triple  $y_1, x_0, x_1$  implies that  $x_1 x_0 \in E(H)$ , and applied to the triple  $y_1, x_1, y_2$  implies that  $y_1 y_2 \in E(H)$ . Note that  $x_0 \neq y_2$  because  $x_0 y_1 \notin E(H)$  but  $y_2 y_1 \in E(H)$ . If  $y_2 x_0 \notin E(H)$  then we have a copy of  $R$  over  $x_0, y_1, y_2$ ; if  $x_0 y_2 \notin E(H)$  then we have a copy of  $R$  over  $x_0, x_1, y_2$ . This yields an induced four-cycle  $x_0, x_1, y_1, y_2, x_0$  in  $S(H)$ , contrary to our assumption.

Thus we may assume that on any inverting walk all edges go in the same direction, forward or backward. Without loss of generality, assume that on  $C$  all edges  $x_i x_{i+1}$  in  $H$  are forward (and similarly for  $y_i y_{i+1}$ ). If there is a copy of  $\vec{C}_3$  or  $R$ , the problem  $\text{L-HOM}(H)$  is NP-complete as above. Otherwise, we claim that all  $x_i y_i \in E(H)$  and  $y_i x_i \in E(H)$ . Indeed if  $y_i x_i \notin E(H)$ , then a copy of  $\vec{C}_3$  or  $R$  exists on  $x_{i-1}, x_i, y_i$ , unless  $x_i = x_{i-1}$ . Note that if  $x_i = x_{i-1}$  would mean that  $x_i y_i \notin E(H)$  also holds, contrary to the fact that  $H$  is semi-complete. If  $x_i y_i \notin E(H)$ , then on some inverting walk involving the invertible pair  $x_i, y_i$ , the same argument would show the existence of  $\vec{C}_3$  or  $R$ . ■

Thus the conjecture holds for semi-complete digraphs. In the full version of this paper we also prove the conjecture for oriented trees, and other digraphs.

## References

- [1] A. Bulatov. Tractable conservative constraint satisfaction problems. to appear in *ACM Trans. Comput. Logic*
- [2] C.A. Carvalho. personal communication, 2008.
- [3] S. Das, P. Hell, and J. Huang. Chronological interval digraphs. Manuscript 2007.
- [4] M. Sen, S. Das, A.B. Roy, and D.B. West. Interval digraphs: an analogue of interval graphs. *em J. Graph Theory* 13: 581–592, 1989.
- [5] T. Feder and P. Hell. List homomorphisms to reflexive graphs. *J. Combinatorial Theory B.* 72: 236–250, 1998.
- [6] T. Feder, P. Hell, and J. Huang. List homomorphisms and circular arc graphs. *Combinatorica* 19: 487–505, 1999.
- [7] T. Feder, P. Hell, and J. Huang. Bi-arc graphs and the complexity of list homomorphisms. *J. Graph Theory* 42: 61–80, 2003.

- [8] T. Feder and P. Hell. The retraction and subretraction problems for reflexive digraphs. Manuscript 2007.
- [9] T. Feder, P. Hell, and K. Tucker-Nally. Digraph matrix partitions and trigraph homomorphisms. *Discrete Applied Math.* 154: 2458 – 2469, 2006.
- [10] T. Feder and M. Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: a study through Datalog and group theory, *SIAM J. Computing* 28 : 57–104, 1998.
- [11] M. C. Golumbic. **Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs**. Academic Press, New York (1980).
- [12] W. Gutjahr, E. Welzl and G. Woeginger. Polynomial graph-colorings. *Discrete Applied Math.* 35: 29–45, 1992.
- [13] P. Hell. From graph colouring to constraint satisfaction: there and back again. in Topics in Discrete Mathematics, Springer Verlag *Algorithms and Combinatorics Series* 26: 407–432, 2006.
- [14] P. Hell and A. Rafiey, List homomorphisms to irreflexive digraphs. Manuscript 2007.
- [15] P. Hell and A. Rafiey, A new characterization of interval graphs, Manuscript 2008.
- [16] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil, On the complexity of  $H$ -colouring, *J. Combin. Theory B.* 48 : 92–110, 1990.
- [17] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. **Graphs and Homomorphisms** Oxford University Press 2004.
- [18] P. Hell, J. Nešetřil, and X. Zhu. Complexity of tree homomorphisms. *Discrete Applied Math.* 70: 23–36, 1996
- [19] B. Larose Taylor operations on finite reflexive structures, *International Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science.* 1: 1–26, 2006.
- [20] E. Prisner. A characterization of interval catch digraphs. *Discrete Math.* 73: 285–289, 1989.