On Finite Maximal Antichains in the Homomorphism Order

Jan Foniok* Jaroslav Nešetřil* Claude Tardif†

1 Introduction

The relation of existence of a homomorphism on the class of all relational structures of a fixed type is reflexive and transitive; it is a quasiorder. There are standard ways to transform a quasiorder into a partial order – by identifying equivalent objects, or by choosing a particular representative for each equivalence class. The resulting partial order is identical in both cases.

Properties of this partial order (the *homomorphism order*) have been intensively studied in algebraic, category theory, random and combinatorial context, see [5]. Particular interest has been paid to density and universality. Here, we are interested in the characterisation of all *finite maximal antichains* in the homomorphism order.

We show that for structures with at most two relations all finite maximal antichains correspond to what is known as finite homomorphism dualities (see [4, 8]). In addition, we examine the *splitting property* of finite maximal antichains in the homomorphism order (see [2]). We derive a structural condition which implies that most finite maximal antichains split. This was previously known for digraphs [3] and structures with at most one relation [4].

*Department of Applied Mathematics and Institute of Theoretical Computer Science (ITI), Charles University, Malostranské nám. 25, 118 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic. ITI is supported as project 1M0021620808 of the Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic.

†Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Royal Military College of Canada, PO Box 17000, Station 'Forces', Kingston, Ontario K7K 7B4, Canada. Supported by grants from NSERC and ARP.

2 Definitions

2.1 Relational structures

A *type* Δ is a sequence $(\delta_i : i \in I)$ of positive integers; I is a finite set of indices. A (finite) *relational structure* A of type Δ is a pair $\big(X, (R_i : i \in I)\big)$, where X is a finite nonempty set and $R_i \subseteq X^{\delta_i}$; that is, R_i is a δ_i-ary relation on X.

In this abstract, we are interested only in relational structures with no unary relations, i.e. $\delta_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in I$.

If $A = \big(X, (R_i : i \in I)\big)$, the *base set* X is denoted by $\underline{A}$ and the relation R_i by $R_i(A)$. We often refer to a relational structure of type Δ as Δ-structure. The elements of the base set are called *vertices* and the elements of the R_i's are called *edges*.

The *shadow* of a Δ-structure A is the undirected multigraph $\mathrm{Sh}(A)$ whose vertices are the elements of $\underline{A}$ and there is one edge from a to b for each edge in some $R_i(A)$ of arity $\delta_i \geq 2$ such that $(a_1, \ldots, a_{\delta_i}) \in R_i(A)$ with $a_j = a$, $a_{j+1} = b$ for some $1 \leq j < \delta_i$.

A Δ-structure A is called *connected* if its shadow $\mathrm{Sh}(A)$ is connected.

A Δ-structure A is called a Δ-*tree* or simply a *tree* if $\mathrm{Sh}(A)$ is a tree; it is called a Δ-*forest* or just a *forest* if $\mathrm{Sh}(A)$ is a forest. A Δ-tree P is called a Δ-*path* if every edge of P intersects at most two other edges.

2.2 Homomorphisms

Let A and A' be two relational structures of the same type Δ. A mapping $f : \underline{A} \to \underline{A'}$ is a *homomorphism* from A to A' if for every $i \in I$ and for every $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{\delta_i} \in \underline{A}$ the following implication holds:

$$(m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{\delta_i}) \in R_i(A) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \big(f(m_1), f(m_2), \ldots, f(m_{\delta_i})\big) \in R_i(A').$$

The fact that f is a homomorphism from A to A' is denoted by $f : A \to A'$. If there exists a homomorphism from A to A', we say that A is *homomorphic* to A' and write $A \to A'$; otherwise we write $A \nrightarrow A'$. If A is homomorphic to A' and at the same time A' is homomorphic to A, we say that A and A' are *homomorphically equivalent* and write $A \sim A'$. If on the other hand there exists no homomorphism from A to A' and no homomorphism from A' to A, we say that A and A' are *incomparable*. Note that the composition of homomorphisms is a homomorphism as well and that homomorphic equivalence is indeed an equivalence relation on the class of all Δ-structures.

A finite Δ-structure C is called a *core* if it is not homomorphic to any proper substructure of C. A substructure C of A is called the *core of A* if it is a core and A and C are homomorphically equivalent.

For a fixed type $\Delta = (\delta_i : i \in I)$, all Δ-structures (objects) and their homomorphisms (morphisms) form a category. Finite products and finite sums exist in this category; sums are disjoint unions of structures. (See [5] for a general introduction to relational structures and their homomorphisms.)

2.3 Height labelling and balanced structures

We say that a Δ-structure A is *balanced* if A is homomorphic to a Δ-forest.

Let A be a Δ-structure and let $\daleth$ be a labelling of its vertices with $(\sum_{i\in I} \delta_i - |I|)$-tuples of integers, indexed by $(i,1), (i,2), \ldots, (i, \delta_i - 1)$, $i \in I$.

We say that $\daleth$ is a *height labelling* of A if whenever $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\delta_i}) \in R_i(A)$ and $1 \leq j < \delta_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\daleth(x_{j+1})\big)_{(i,j)} &= \big(\daleth(x_j)\big)_{(i,j)} + 1, \quad \text{and} \\ \big(\daleth(x_{j+1})\big)_{(i',j')} &= \big(\daleth(x_j)\big)_{(i',j')} \quad \text{for } (i',j') \neq (i,j). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.1. *If A is a balanced Δ-structure, then A has a height labelling. If a height labelling of a connected structure exists, then it is unique up to an additive constant vector.*

2.4 Homomorphism duality

Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be two finite sets of Δ-structures such that no homomorphisms exist among the structures in $\mathcal{F}$ and among the structures in $\mathcal{D}$. We say that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is a *finite homomorphism duality* (often just a *finite duality*) if for every Δ-structure A we have

$$\exists F \in \mathcal{F} : F \to A \Leftrightarrow \forall D \in \mathcal{D} : A \nrightarrow D.$$

Theorem 2.2 ([8]). *If $\big(\{F\}, \{D\}\big)$ is a finite homomorphism duality, then F is homomorphically equivalent to a Δ-tree. Conversely, if F is a Δ-tree with more than one vertex, then there exists a unique (up to homomorphic equivalence) structure D such that $\big(\{F\}, \{D\}\big)$ is a finite homomorphism duality.*

Theorem 2.3 ([4]). *If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is a finite homomorphism duality, then all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ are homomorphically equivalent to Δ-forests and $\mathcal{D}$ is determined by $\mathcal{F}$ uniquely up to homomorphic equivalence. Conversely, for any* *finite collection $\mathcal{F}$ of Δ-forests there exists $\mathcal{D}$ such that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is a finite homomorphism duality.*

3 Finite maximal antichains

The set of all (non-isomorphic) cores with the relation $\to$ is a partially ordered set, denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$; we speak of the *homomorphism order* of relational structures.

We use the slightly unusual notation $A \to B$ instead of the more common $A \leq B$ for the homomorphism partial order. Where convenient, however, we use $A < B$ to denote that $A \to B$ and at the same time $B \nrightarrow A$.

A set $\mathcal{Q}$ of Δ-structures is an *antichain* if any two distinct elements of $\mathcal{Q}$ are incomparable; it is a *maximal antichain* if moreover for any Δ-structure A there exists $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $A \to Q$ or $Q \to A$. A finite maximal antichain $\mathcal{Q}$ *splits* if there are disjoint sets $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{Q}$ and for any Δ-structure A there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \to A$ or there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ with $A \to D$.

We are going to investigate which finite maximal antichains in the homomorphism order split.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\}$ be a finite maximal antichain in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$. Recursively, define the sets $\mathcal{F}_0$, $\mathcal{F}_1$, …, $\mathcal{F}_n$ in this way:

1. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset$.
2. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$: check whether there exists a Δ-structure X satisfying
   (i) $Q_i < X$,
   (ii) $F \nrightarrow X$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, and
   (iii) $Q_j \nrightarrow X$ for any $j > i$.

   If such a structure X exists, let $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \cup \{Q_i\}$, otherwise let $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$.
3. Finally, let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_n$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{F}$.

The definition directly implies the following two properties of the partition of $\mathcal{Q}$ into $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{D}$:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain and $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{D}$ be defined in 3.1. If $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, X is a Δ-structure, and $Q < X$, then there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F < X$.*

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain and $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{D}$ be defined in 3.1. For every F in $\mathcal{F}$ there exists a Δ-structure $\check{F}$ such that $F < \check{F}$ and moreover F is the only element of $\mathcal{F}$ that is homomorphic to $\check{F}$.*

Next, we examine the properties of the structures in $\mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain and $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{D}$ be defined in 3.1. If $F \in \mathcal{F}$, then F is balanced.*

Sketch of proof. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$ be arbitrary. We use a tool called the "sparse incomparability lemma" (the concept is based on [1, 7]). In particular, there exists a Δ-structure H that is locally a tree (any substructure with at most $|\underline{F}|$ vertices is a forest) and with prescribed existence of homomorphisms to a finite number of structures. Specifically, we want that $H \to \check{F}$ and $H \nrightarrow Q$ for any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then $F \to H$ because the antichain is maximal and because of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, and the image of F by this homomorphism is a forest. □

The following lemma describes "obstacles to splitting".

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain and $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{D}$ be defined in 3.1. Then exactly one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) The pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is a finite duality and $\mathcal{Q}$ splits.

(2) There exists a structure Y such that $Q \nrightarrow Y$ for any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $Y \nrightarrow D$ for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

We will now investigate those maximal antichains that satisfy (2). The structure Y has to be comparable with some element of the maximal antichain $\mathcal{Q}$, and because of the condition (2) there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Y < F$.

Every Δ-path has a height labelling; we say that a core Δ-path P is a *forbidden path* if it has two edges of the same kind whose vertices are not labelled the same. (This property does not depend on what height labelling we choose, see Proposition 2.1.)

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$ and let $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{D}$ be defined in 3.1. If Y is a Δ-structure such that $Y \nrightarrow D$ for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $Y < F$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$, and P is a forbidden path, then $P \nrightarrow Y$.*

Sketch of proof. Construct an unbalanced structure W with the property that if any sufficiently small (in terms of the number of vertices) structure maps to W then it maps to P. This can be done by taking a long cycle-like structure that contains P.

Then consider the sum $W+Y$. It is comparable with some some element of the maximal antichain $\mathcal{Q}$. However, $W+Y \nrightarrow D$ for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$ because of Y, and $W+Y \nrightarrow F$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ because W is not balanced. Therefore $F \rightarrow W+Y$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$, and the construction of W is such that $F \rightarrow P+Y$. As $F \nrightarrow Y$ (by the definition of Y), necessarily $P \nrightarrow Y$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let C be a connected Δ-structure. If no forbidden path is homomorphic to C, then C is homomorphic to a tree with at most one edge of each kind.*

Sketch of proof. First we observe that if no forbidden path is homomorphic to C, then C has a height labelling. In this labelling, any two edges of the same kind get identical labels. We construct a tree that contains vertices with exactly the same labels as are those used for vertices of C; the height labelling of C is then a homomorphism to this tree. □

Let D^* be the sum of all Δ-trees with at most one edge of each kind.

As a direct consequence of the two preceding lemmas we get:

Proposition 3.8. *If Y satisfies the condition (2) of 3.5, then $Y \rightarrow D^*$.*

This shows that the cases when the antichain does not split are very specific (and one would like to say they are rather rare):

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite maximal antichain in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$. Suppose that every element $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ has the property that whenever $Y < Q$ and $Y \rightarrow D^*$ then there exists a Δ-structure X such that $Y < X < Q$ and $X \nrightarrow D^*$. Then the antichain $\mathcal{Q}$ splits.*

Further examination reveals that in the case of structures with at most two relations there are no infinite increasing chains below D^*. From that we can conclude that all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ are Δ-forests and thus we get the following theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\Delta = (\delta_i : i \in I)$ be a type such that $|I| \leq 2$. Then all finite maximal antichains in the homomorphism order $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$ are exactly the sets*

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{F} \cup \{D \in \mathcal{D} : D \nrightarrow F \text{ for any } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

where $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D})$ is a finite homomorphism duality.

The case of three or more relations ($|I| \geq 3$) is presently open. There may be a "quantum leap" here as indicated by the following result, which can be deduced from [6].

Proposition 3.11. *Let* $\Delta = (2, 2, 2)$. *Then the suborder of* $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$ *induced by all structures homomorphic to* D^* *is a universal countable partial order; that is, any countable partial order is an induced suborder of this order.*

References

[1] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal. On chromatic number of graphs and set-systems. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 17(1–2):61–99, 1966.

[2] P. L. Erdős and L. Soukup. How to split antichains in infinite posets. *Combinatorica*, to appear.

[3] J. Foniok, J. Nešetřil, and C. Tardif. Generalised dualities and finite maximal antichains. In F. V. Fomin, editor, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (Proceedings of WG 2006)*, volume 4271 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 27–36. Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[4] J. Foniok, J. Nešetřil, and C. Tardif. Generalised dualities and maximal finite antichains in the homomorphism order of relational structures. *European J. Combin.*, to appear.

[5] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil. *Graphs and Homomorphisms*, volume 28 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications.* Oxford University Press, 2004.

[6] J. Hubička and J. Nešetřil. Finite paths are universal. *Order*, 22(1):21–40, 2005.

[7] J. Nešetřil and V. Rödl. Chromatically optimal rigid graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 46(2):133–141, 1989.

[8] J. Nešetřil and C. Tardif. Duality theorems for finite structures (characterising gaps and good characterisations). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 80(1):80–97, 2000.