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Abstract

An instance of a constraint satisfaction problem is $l$-consistent if any $l$ constraints of it can be simultaneously satisfied. For a set $\Pi$ of constraint types, $\rho_l(\Pi)$ denotes the largest ratio of constraints which can be satisfied in any $l$-consistent instance composed by constraints of types from $\Pi$. In the case of sets $\Pi$ consisting of finitely many Boolean predicates, we express the limit $\rho_\infty(\Pi):=\lim_{l\to\infty} \rho_l(\Pi)$ as the minimum of a certain functional on a convex set of polynomials. Our results yield a robust deterministic algorithm (for a fixed set $\Pi$) running in time linear in the size of the input and $1/\epsilon$ which finds either an inconsistent set of constraints (of size bounded by the function of $\epsilon$) or a truth assignment which satisfies the fraction of at least $\rho_\infty(\Pi) - \epsilon$ of the given constraints. We also compute the values of $\rho_l(\{P\})$ for several specific predicates $P$.
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1. Introduction

Constraint satisfaction problems (CSP) form an important abstract computational model for a lot of problems arising in practice. This is witnessed by an enormous recent interest in the computational complexity of various constraint satisfaction problems [5,7,8,22]. Some instances of real problems do not require all the constraints to be satisfied but it is enough to satisfy a large fraction of them. In order to maximize the fraction of satisfied constraints, the input can usually be pruned by removing small sets of contradictory constraints in such a way that the input instance is “locally” consistent. Formally, an instance of a constraint satisfaction problem is $l$-consistent if any $l$ constraints of it can be simultaneously satisfied.

In this paper, we focus on constraint satisfaction problems whose constraints are Boolean predicates. In this setting, the parameters of the constraints can be both input variables and their negations. Note that in most of the papers on CSPs the parameters of the constraints can usually be only input variables. Since we consider only CSPs with Boolean predicates in this work, we decided to enhance the model by allowing negations.

If $\Pi$ is a set of Boolean predicates, then $\rho_l(\Pi)$ denotes the fraction of the constraints which can be satisfied in each $l$-consistent instance of the problem. If $\Pi$ consists of only a single predicate $P$, we simply use $\rho_l(P)$ instead.
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of $\rho_l(\{P\})$. Similarly, $\rho_l^w(\Pi)$ denotes this ratio for the weighted version of the problem (see Section 2 for formal definitions). The limits of $\rho_l(\Pi)$ and $\rho_l^w(\Pi)$ are denoted by $\rho_\infty(\Pi)$ and $\rho_\infty^w(\Pi)$, i.e., $\rho_\infty(\Pi) = \lim_{l \to \infty} \rho_l(\Pi)$ and $\rho_\infty^w(\Pi) = \lim_{l \to \infty} \rho_l^w(\Pi)$.

We study both the asymptotic behavior of $\rho_l(\Pi)$ for finite sets of predicates $\Pi$ and the exact values of $\rho_l(\Pi)$ for some low-arity predicates $P$. In the following subsections, we discuss our results in more detail as well as their relation to previous work. Most of our results hold both for the weighted and unweighted case. Some of the results even extend to the case when the set $\Pi$ is infinite (see Section 7 for more details).

### 1.1. Asymptotic results

We express $\rho_\infty^w(\Pi)$ for all finite sets of predicates $\Pi$ and $\rho_\infty(\Pi)$ for all such sets of predicates $\Pi$ of arities at least two as the minimum of a certain functional $\Psi$ on a convex hull of a finite set $\pi(\Pi)$ of polynomials derived from $\Pi$ (Corollary 13). The formal definitions of the functional $\Psi$ and the set $\pi(\Pi)$ are postponed to Section 2. Let us remark that it is indeed necessary to consider the convex hull of the polynomials contained in $\pi(\Pi)$ since it is not hard to construct an example of a set $\Pi$ such that the minimum of $\Psi$ on the convex hull of $\pi(\Pi)$ is strictly smaller than the minimum of the values of $\Psi$ for each individual polynomial of $\pi(\Pi)$.

One of our algorithmic results (Theorem 7) is designing, for any fixed set $\Pi$ of Boolean predicates, a deterministic algorithm which given $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sufficiently locally consistent instance of the weighted constraint satisfaction problem with total weight $w_0$ finds a truth assignment which satisfies the constraints with total weight at least $(\rho_\infty^w(\Pi) - \varepsilon)w_0$. The running time of the algorithm is, for a fixed set $\Pi$, linear in the number of the input constraints and $1/\varepsilon$. The algorithm is robust in the sense that if it fails to find the desired truth assignment, then it outputs an inconsistent set of input constraints with size bounded by the function of $\varepsilon$. However, it might find a good truth assignment even if the input instance is not sufficiently locally consistent (in particular, the algorithm does not determine the local consistency of the input instance). Finally, the presented algorithm is asymptotically optimal in the sense that the ratio of the weights of satisfied constraints can be made arbitrarily close to $\rho_\infty^w(\Pi)$ by the choice of the input parameter $\varepsilon$.

### 1.2. Single-element sets $\Pi$

We determine the values of $\rho_l(\Pi)$ for every $l \geq 1$ and every Boolean predicate $P$ that has arity at most three (see Tables 1 and 2) or that is 1-extendable. A predicate $P$ is said to be 1-extendable if it has the following property: if one of its arguments is fixed, the remaining ones can be chosen in such a way that the predicate is satisfied. In particular, the 0-ary Boolean predicate which is constantly true is 1-extendable. Let us remark that all these results hold both for the unweighted and weighted versions of the studied problems, i.e., the instances witnessing the upper bounds contain each constraint at most once and our lower bound proofs work smoothly for instances with weighted constraints. From the algorithmic point of view, our results can be interpreted in the following way: the simplest probabilistic algorithms (of the kind used in [15,20,23]) are approximation algorithms for locally consistent CSPs with optimum worst-case performance.

Let us comment a somewhat exceptional case of the predicate $P(x,y,z) = x \land (y \lor z)$ which is not 1-extendable (fix $x$ to be false). Therefore, Theorem 17 does not apply. In Section 6, we show that the values $\rho_l(\Pi)$ are closely related to the corresponding values for locally consistent 2-SATs.
The problem. Schaefer [19] established the dichotomy result for the computational complexity of the decision problem whether a random CSPs of this kind were established by Flaxman [9]. However, even if the decision problem can be solved for random CNF formulas somewhat surprisingly differs from the previous ones: first, the algorithm from Theorem 7 achieves the best possible ratio.

Similarly, Lieberherr and Specker [16] showed that there is no \( (2 - \epsilon) \)-approximation algorithm for the set \( P \) containing a single predicate \( P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3) \mod 2 \) unless \( P = \text{NP} \). Note that \( \rho_1(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \) for every \( l \geq 1 \) in this case. In particular, \( \rho_\infty(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \) and the algorithm from Theorem 7 achieves the best possible ratio.

One of the most studied variants of locally consistent constraint satisfaction problem are locally consistent CNF formulas. The interest in this case is witnessed by a separate section (20.6) devoted to this concept in a recent monograph on extremal combinatorics by Jukna [14]. The corresponding set \( \Pi_{\text{CNF}} \) of the predicates is just the set of all the disjunctions. Similarly, \( \Pi_{2\text{-SAT}} \) denotes the set \( \{ (x_1), (x_1 \lor x_2) \} \) of the predicates corresponding to clauses of a 2-SAT formula. The exact values of \( \rho_1^w(\Pi_{\text{CNF}}) \) and \( \rho_\infty^w(\Pi_{2\text{-SAT}}) \) are known only for small values of \( l \): clearly, \( \rho_1^w(\Pi_{\text{CNF}}) = \rho_1^w(\Pi_{2\text{-SAT}}) = \frac{1}{2} \).

1.3. Previous work

Constraint satisfaction problems whose constraints are Boolean predicates can be traced back to the late 1970s. Schaefer [19] established the dichotomy result for the computational complexity of the decision problem whether a given set of predicates (with allowed negations in their arguments) from a set \( \Pi \) is satisfiable. Phase transition results for random CSPs of this kind were established by Flaxman [9]. However, even if the decision problem can be solved in a polynomial time, the problem to maximize the number of satisfied predicates can still be hard, e.g., Håstad [12] showed that there is no \( (2 - \epsilon) \)-approximation algorithm for the set \( P \) containing a single predicate \( P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3) \mod 2 \) unless \( P = \text{NP} \). Note that \( \rho_1(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \) for every \( l \geq 1 \) in this case. In particular, \( \rho_\infty(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \) and the algorithm from Theorem 7 achieves the best possible ratio.

The asymptotic behavior of \( \rho_\infty^w(\Pi_{\text{CNF}}) \) was first addressed by Huang and Lieberherr [13] who showed \( \rho_\infty^w(\Pi_{\text{CNF}}) < \frac{3}{4} \). The limit was settled by Trevisan [20] by establishing that \( \rho_\infty^w(\Pi_{\text{CNF}}) = \frac{1}{2} \). Trevisan’s result also yields that...
\( \rho^u_\infty(II_{2-SAT}) = \frac{3}{4} \). The latter result can be easily derived from our general expression for \( \rho^u_\infty(II) \) as demonstrated in Examples 4 and 14. Locally consistent CSPs with non-Boolean binary constraints have been addressed in [2].

Let us remark that other notions of local consistency have also been considered: the notion of \( k \)-consistency of Freuder [10] (and also the notion of relational \( k \)-consistency of Dechter and van Beek [6]), where a CSP instance is \( k \)-consistent if every solution for the constraints on \( k-1 \) variables (constraints) can be extended to another variable (constraint).

2. Notation and preliminaries

Throughout the paper, we only deal with constraints which are Boolean predicates and so we prefer to call them predicates to emphasize their kind. For a fixed set \( II \) of (types of) Boolean predicates, \( \Sigma \) is a set of predicates whose types are contained in the set \( II \). The arguments of the predicates of \( \Sigma \) may be both positive and negative literals, but a single variable cannot be contained in two distinct arguments of the same predicate. If a single variable is allowed to be contained in several distinct arguments of a single predicate, it is possible to enhance the set \( II \) by Boolean predicates obtained from the predicates of \( II \) by identifying some of their arguments. Hence, all the results we obtain translate to this setting.

The goal is to find a truth assignment which satisfies the largest fraction \( \rho(\Sigma) \) of the predicates of \( \Sigma \). Hence, \( \rho_l(II) = \inf \rho(\Sigma) \) where the infimum is taken over all \( l \)-consistent sets \( \Sigma \) of (unweighted) predicates whose types are from the set \( II \). Similarly, if \( \Sigma \) is a set of weighted predicates, \( \rho(\Sigma) \) denotes the ratio between the weights of the predicates which can simultaneously be satisfied and the total weight of all the predicates of \( \Sigma \) and \( \rho_l^w(II) = \inf \rho(\Sigma) \) where the infimum is taken over all \( l \)-consistent sets \( \Sigma \) of weighted predicates. Note that in the unweighted case, \( \Sigma \) is a set, not a multiset (otherwise, the ratios \( \rho_{\infty} \) and \( \rho^w_{\infty} \) would coincide).

If \( P \) is a Boolean predicate, \( \sigma(P) \) denotes the number of choices of arguments that satisfy \( P \). Two Boolean predicates \( P \) and \( P' \) are isomorphic if they differ only by a permutation of the arguments and negations of some of them, e.g., if \( P(x_1, x_2) = P'(x_2, \neg x_1) \), then the predicates \( P \) and \( P' \) are isomorphic. Clearly, if \( P \) and \( P' \) are two isomorphic predicates, then \( \rho_l(P) = \rho_l(P') \) for all \( l \geq 1 \). A \( k \)-ary predicate is essentially \( k \)-ary if it depends on all its \( k \) arguments. If the predicate \( P \) is not essentially \( k \)-ary, it is isomorphic to a predicate \( P' \) such that \( P'(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = P''(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}) \) for some \((k-1)\)-ary Boolean predicate \( P'' \). It is not hard to see that \( \rho_l(P) = \rho_l(P') = \rho_l(P'') \) for all \( l \geq 1 \) in such a case. Hence, in order to determine \( \rho_l(P) \) for all Boolean predicates \( P \) of arity at most three, it is enough to consider representatives of isomorphism classes of unary, binary and ternary essentially Boolean predicates.

The following three simple observations will be useful later:

**Lemma 1.** Let \( P \) be a \( k \)-ary Boolean predicate \( P \). It holds that \( \rho_l(P) \geq \rho^w_l(P) \geq \sigma(P)/2^k \) for all \( l \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** Let \( \Sigma \) be a set of weighted predicates of type \( P \) with total weight \( W \) whose arguments are the variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). Choose each of the variables \( x_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), randomly and independently to be true with the probability \( \frac{1}{2} \). Each predicate of the set \( \Sigma \) is satisfied by the constructed random truth assignment with probability \( \sigma(P)/2^k \). Hence, the expected weight of satisfied predicates is \( W \cdot \sigma(P)/2^k \). Consequently, there is a truth assignment which satisfies predicates of weight at least \( W \cdot \sigma(P)/2^k \) of \( \Sigma \) predicates and \( \rho(\Sigma) \geq \sigma(P)/2^k \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.** It holds that \( \rho_l(P) = \rho^w_l(P) = \sigma(P)/2^k \) for each \( k \)-ary Boolean predicate \( P \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 1, \( \rho_l(P) \geq \rho^w_l(P) \geq \sigma(P)/2^k \). We construct a set \( \Sigma \) of predicates of type \( P \) with variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) and with \( \rho(\Sigma) = \sigma(P)/2^k \). Let \( \Sigma \) be the set consisting of all \( P(x^{a_1}_{i_1}, \ldots, x^{a_k}_{i_k}) \) where \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k \) and \( x^0_i \) is \( \neg x_i \) and \( x^1_i \) is \( x_i \). Clearly, each truth assignment satisfies exactly \( \sigma(P) \) predicates out of all the \( 2^k \) predicates of \( \Sigma \). Therefore, \( \rho(\Sigma) = \sigma(P)/2^k \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.** If \( P \) be a \( k \)-ary predicate with \( \sigma(P) = 1 \), then \( \rho_l(P) = \rho^w_l(P) = 2^{-k} \) and \( \rho_l(P) = \rho^w_l(P) = 1 \) for every \( l \geq 2 \).
Proof. The equality \( \rho_1(P) = 2^{-k} \) follows from Lemma 2. Let us consider a 2-consistent set \( \Sigma \) of predicates of type \( P \). Since \( \sigma(P) = 1 \), each predicate of \( \Sigma \) forces the values to all its arguments. However, all the predicates must force the same value to a single variable because \( \Sigma \) is 2-consistent. Therefore, the “forced” truth assignment satisfies all the predicates of \( \Sigma \) and \( \rho(\Sigma) = 1 \). This immediately yields that \( \rho_1(P) = 1 \) for every \( l \geq 2 \).

A restriction of a predicate \( P \) is a predicate \( P' \) obtained from \( P \) by fixing values of some of its arguments, e.g., \( P'(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 \land x_2) \) is a restriction of the predicate \( P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1 \land x_2 \land x_3) \lor (\neg x_3) \) obtained by fixing the value of \( x_3 \) to be true. A restriction \( P' \) of a \( k \)-ary predicate \( P \) can be described by a vector \( \tau \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}^k \) where 0 and 1 denote an argument which is fixed to be false and true, respectively, and \( \star \) denotes an unfixed argument. Let \( \pi_{P, \tau}(p) : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \) be the probability that the \( k \)-ary predicate \( P \) with arguments \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) is satisfied if each \( x_i \) is set to be true randomly and independently with the probability \( 1 - p \), \( p \) or \( \frac{1}{2} \), if \( \tau_i \) is 0, 1 or \( \star \). Note that \( \pi_{P, \tau}(p) \) is a polynomial of degree at most \( k \). For a set \( \mathcal{P} \) of predicates, let \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \) be the set of all the functions \( \pi_{P, \tau} \) where \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) and the restriction of \( P \) corresponding to \( \tau \) is 1-extendable.

Example 4. Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be the set consisting of two predicates \( P_1(x_1) = (x_1) \) and \( P_2(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 \lor x_2) \). There is a single restriction of the predicate \( P_1 \) which is 1-extendable and this restriction corresponds to the vector \( 1 \). There are four restrictions of the predicate \( P_2 \) which are 1-extendable, those corresponding to \( 11, 1\star, \star 1 \) and \( \star \star \). Hence, the set \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \) consists of the following four functions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_{P_1,1}(p) &= p, & \pi_{P_1,11}(p) &= 2p - p^2; \\
\pi_{P_2,1}(p) &= (p + 1)/2, & \pi_{P_2,\star}(p) &= 3/4.
\end{align*}
\]

Example 5. Consider a set \( \mathcal{P} \) containing the predicate \( P(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) = (x_1 \land (x_2 \lor x_3 \lor x_4 \lor x_5)) \). There are several restrictions of \( P \) which are 1-extendable, but each such restriction is isomorphic to a restriction corresponding to one of the following vectors: \( 1\star\star\star\star, 10\star\star\star, 11\star\star, 100\star, 110\star, 111\star, 1100\star, 1100\star, 1110\star, 1111\star, 11000, 11110 \) and \( 11111 \).

Let \( \Psi \) be the functional which assigns a continuous function \( f : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \), its maximum on the interval \( \{0, 1\} \). If \( F \) is a finite family of functions \( f : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \), then \( \Psi(F) \) is defined to be the infimum \( \Psi(g) \), where \( g \) ranges over all convex combinations of the functions of \( F \). Note that the infimum is attained if the set \( \mathcal{F} \) is a set of polynomials (which is the case of \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \)). As mentioned in Section 1, one of our results is that the limit \( \rho_\infty(\mathcal{P}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \rho_l(\mathcal{P}) \) is equal to \( \Psi(\pi(\mathcal{P})) \) for any set \( \mathcal{P} \) of Boolean predicates with arities at least two and \( \rho_\infty^W(\mathcal{P}) \) is equal to \( \Psi(\pi(\mathcal{P})) \) for any set \( \mathcal{P} \) of Boolean predicates (see Corollary 13 and Examples 14–16 following it).

3. Lower bound for the asymptotic case

Before we can design the algorithm for the asymptotic case, we first establish the following auxiliary lemma on the derivatives of convex combinations of the functions contained in \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \):

Lemma 6. Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be a set of predicates of arity at most \( K \) and let \( f(p) \) be any convex combination of functions contained in \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \). The derivative of the function \( f(p) \) for \( p \in \{0, 1\} \) takes values from the interval \( (-K, +K) \).

Proof. Since the derivative of a convex combination of some functions is a convex combination of their derivatives, it is enough to prove the statement of the lemma for the functions contained in the set \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \) only. Let \( f \) be a function contained in \( \pi(\mathcal{P}) \) corresponding to a predicate \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) and a vector \( \tau \). Let \( k \) be the arity of \( P \) (which is also the length of \( \tau \)) and \( k' \) the number of 0’s and 1’s contained in \( \tau \). The function \( f \) can be expressed as the following linear combination:

\[
f(p) = \sum_{i_1=0}^{1} \cdots \sum_{i_{k'}=0}^{1} a_{i_1, \ldots, i_{k'}} \prod_{j=1}^{k'} f_{i_j}(p),
\]
where $0 \leq x_{i_1, \ldots, i_{k'}} \leq 1$, $f_0(p) = (1 - p)$ and $f_1(p) = p$ (the coefficients $x_{i_1, \ldots, i_{k'}}$ depend on the structure of $\Pi$ and the choice of $\tau$). The derivative $f'$ of $f$ is the following:

$$f'(p) = \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i_j=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{j_0}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{j_{0-1}}=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{j_{0+1}}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{k'}=0}^{k'} (-1)^{i_{j_0}} \prod_{j=1, j \neq j_0}^{k'} f_{ij}(p)$$

$$= \frac{k'}{j_0=1} \sum_{i_{j_0}=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{j_0-1}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{j_{0+1}}=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{k'}=0}^{k'} x_{i_1, \ldots, i_{k'}} \prod_{j=1, j \neq j_0}^{k'} f_{ij}(p).$$

It remains to estimate the absolute value of $f'(p)$ for $p \in (0, 1)$:

$$|f'(p)| \leq \frac{k'}{j_0=1} \sum_{i_{j_0}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{j_{0-1}}=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{j_{0+1}}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{k'}=0}^{k'} \prod_{j=1, j \neq j_0}^{k'} f_{ij}(p) = 1$$

for all $p \in (0, 1)$ and $j_0 = 1, \ldots, k'$. Since both the function $f_0$ and $f_1$ are non-negative, the value of the function

$$\frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i_1=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{j_0-1}=0}^{k'} \sum_{i_{j_0+1}=0}^{k'} \cdots \sum_{i_{k'}=0}^{k'} x_{i_1, \ldots, i_{k'}} \prod_{j=1, j \neq j_0}^{k'} f_{ij}(p)$$

is always between 0 and 1 for $p \in (0, 1), j_0 = 1, \ldots, k'$ and $i_{j_0} = 0, 1$. Since the absolute value of the difference of two numbers between 0 and 1 does not exceed 1, the inequality follows. \(\square\)

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section:

**Theorem 7.** Let $\Pi$ be a fixed set of Boolean predicates and let $K$ be the maximum arity of a predicate contained in $\Pi$. There exists an algorithm which given $\varepsilon > 0$ and a set of weighted predicates $\Sigma$ of total weight $w_0$ either finds a truth assignment which satisfies predicates of total weight at least $(\Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon)w_0$ or finds a set of at most $2K[2K/\varepsilon]^{-1}$ inconsistent predicates. Moreover, the algorithm runs in time linear in $|\Sigma|$ and $1/\varepsilon$.

**Proof.** The algorithm consists of three steps:

1. Labeling variables according to the depth of “forcing” their values by the input predicates (or finding an inconsistent set of at most $2K[2K/\varepsilon]^{-1}$ predicates).
2. Finding a probability distribution on truth assignments such that the expected weight of the satisfied predicates is at least $(\Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon)w_0$.
3. Construction of a truth assignment which satisfies predicates whose weight is at least $(\Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon)w_0$.

The third step is an easy application of a standard linear-time derandomization technique proposed by Yannakakis [23] for locally consistent formulas (see also [15]) nowadays known as the method of conditional expectations (the reader is referred to [1,3,18] for additional details). So, we focus on the first two steps of the algorithm in the rest of the proof.

In the first step, we construct a sequence of $1 + [2K/\varepsilon]$ partial truth assignments $\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_{[2K/\varepsilon]}$ and subsets $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_{[2K/\varepsilon]}$ of $\Sigma$. The partial truth assignment $\mu_0$ is the empty one, i.e., the value of no variable is fixed by $\mu_0$. Let $i$ be an integer between 1 and $[2K/\varepsilon]$ and assume that the partial truth assignments $\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_{i-1}$ have been constructed. Let $\Sigma_i$ be the set of all the predicates of $\Sigma$ whose restrictions with respect to $\mu_{i-1}$ are not 1-extendable. If there is a predicate whose restriction with respect to $\mu_{i-1}$ is constantly false, we stop. Otherwise, the partial truth assignment $\mu_{i-1}$ is extended to the partial truth assignment $\mu_i$ by setting the values of the variables forced by the restrictions of the predicates contained in $\Sigma_i$. The value of a variable $x$ is forced if there exists a predicate which can be satisfied only if either $x$ is false or $x$ is true. If the value of a single variable is forced to be both true and false, we also stop.
Let us make few comments on the actual implementation of the first step of the algorithm. Each variable \( x \) will be labeled by the smallest \( i \) such that \( \mu_i \) assigns the value to \( x \). The variables whose values are forced by previously fixed variables are stored in a FIFO queue. When a variable is dequeued, the algorithm checks whether there are some new variables forced after fixing the value of the dequeued variable. If so, the newly forced variables are added to the end of the queue. In addition, in order to be able to quickly find inconsistent sets of clauses, we store for each variable which of the predicates forced its value and include this predicate to the corresponding set \( \Sigma_i \). Note that the labels of the variables correspond to “depths” of derivations forcing their values and that each predicate is included to at most \( \kappa \) of the sets \( \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil} \).

If we stop because we find an unsatisfied predicate or a variable which is forced to two different values, we can easily construct an inconsistent set of at most \( 2K^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 1} \) predicates: if an unsatisfied predicate is found, consider a set \( A \) consisting of this predicate, all the (at most \( K \)) predicates forcing the values of the variables contained in its arguments, all the (at most \( K(K - 1) \)) predicates forcing the values of the variables contained in the previous level predicates, etc. Since there are at most \( \lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil \) levels, the number of the predicates included to the set \( A \) does not exceed:

\[
1 + K + K(K - 1) + \cdots + K(K - 1)^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 2} \leq K^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 1} + 1.
\]

If we stop because there is a variable which is forced to two different values, we include to the set \( A \) the two predicates which force it to have opposite values, all the (at most \( 2(K - 1) \)) predicates forcing the values of the variables contained in their arguments, etc. The number of the predicates included to the set \( A \) does not exceed in this case:

\[
2 + 2(K - 1) + 2(K - 1)^2 + \cdots + 2(K - 1)^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 2} \leq 2K^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 1}.
\]

In either of the cases, the number of the predicates contained in the set \( A \) is at most \( 2K^{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil - 1} \) and the set \( A \) can be constructed in time linear in \( |A|K \leq |\Sigma|K \).

If for each variable \( x \), a list of predicates which contain \( x \) is formed at the beginning of the computation (which can be simultaneously done for all the variables in linear time), the entire first step of the algorithm can be performed in time \( O(|\Sigma|K) \) including the construction of an inconsistent set. Let us recall at this point that \( K \) is a constant since the set \( \Pi \) is fixed.

We now focus on the second step of the algorithm. Since each predicate of \( \Sigma \) can be contained in at most \( K \) sets \( \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil} \), the total weight of all the predicates contained in the sets \( \Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_{\lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil} \) (counting multiplicities) does not exceed \( Kw_0 \). By an averaging argument, there exists \( 1 \leq i \leq \lceil 2K/\varepsilon \rceil \) such that the weight of the predicates of \( \Sigma_i \) is at most \( eKw_0/2 \). Let \( w'_i \) be the total weight of the predicates contained in \( \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_i \). Note that \( w'_i \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)w_0 \) by the choice of \( i \).

Let \( f(p) \) be the expected weight of the satisfied predicates of \( \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_i \) divided by \( w'_i \) when each of the variables fixed by \( \mu_{i-1} \) gets the value assigned to it by \( \mu_{i-1} \) with the probability \( p \) and the remaining variables are set to be true with the probability \( \frac{1}{2} \) (the values of all the variables are set mutually independently). Clearly, the coefficients of the polynomial \( f(p) \) (of degree at most \( K \)) can be computed in time linear in \( |\Sigma| \). Since the restriction of each predicate of \( \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_i \) with respect to \( \mu_{i-1} \) is 1-extendable, the function \( f(p) \) is a convex combination of the functions from \( \pi(\Pi) \). In particular, the absolute value of the derivative of \( f(p) \) does not exceed \( K \) by Lemma 6.

Compute the value of the function \( f(p) \) for each of the following values of \( p \): \( 0, \varepsilon/K, 2\varepsilon/K, \ldots, [K/\varepsilon]\varepsilon/K, 1 \). Let \( p_0 \) be the value for which the maximum is attained. Note that \( f(p_0) \) differs from the maximum of the function \( f(p) \) for \( p \in (0, 1) \) by at most \( \varepsilon/2 \) because the absolute value of the derivative of \( f \) does not exceed \( K \) for \( p \in (0, 1) \). Since for each of the \( [K/\varepsilon] + 2 \) values of \( p \), the function \( f(p) \) can be evaluated in time \( O(K) \), the algorithm needs time linear in \( O(1/\varepsilon) \) to determine \( p_0 \).

We claim that the following probability distribution on truth assignment is the desired one: set each variable that is fixed by \( \mu_{i-1} \) the value assigned to it by \( \mu_{i-1} \) with the probability \( p_0 \), and set each of the remaining variables to be true with the probability \( \frac{1}{2} \). The expected weight of the satisfied clauses is clearly at least \( f(p_0)w'_i \). We further estimate this quantity:

\[
f(p_0)w'_i \geq \max_{p \in (0, 1)} f(p) - \varepsilon/2 \geq (\Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon/2)(1 - \varepsilon/2)w_0 \geq (\Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon)w_0.
\]

This finishes the second step of the algorithm. Note that the algorithm does not need to compute any estimate on \( \Psi(\pi(\Pi)) \) in order to run correctly. □
An immediate corollary of Theorem 7 is the following:

**Corollary 8.** Let \( \Pi \) be a set of Boolean predicates. For each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists an integer \( l \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\rho_l(\Pi) \geq \rho_l^w(\Pi) \geq \Psi(\pi(\Pi)) - \varepsilon.
\]

### 4. General upper bound

First, we introduce notation used throughout this section. If \( \Sigma \) is a set of predicates and \( \mu \) is a partial truth assignment, then the restriction of \( \Sigma \) with respect to \( \mu \) is the set \( \Sigma' \) of the predicates obtained from \( \Sigma \) by fixing the values of variables set by \( \mu \). The dependence graph \( G(\Sigma') \) of a \( \Sigma' \) is the loopless multigraph whose vertices are predicates of \( \Sigma \) and the number of edges between two predicates \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) is equal to the number of variables which appear in arguments of both the predicates \( P'_1 \) and \( P'_2 \) of \( \Sigma' \) corresponding to \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) (regardless whether they appear as positive or negative literals). In this way, each edge corresponds to a single variable. Note that the predicates whose arguments contain only the variables fixed by \( \mu \) are isolated vertices in \( G(\Sigma') \). A semicycle of length \( l \) of \( \Sigma \) with respect to \( \mu \) is a set \( \Gamma \) of \( l \) predicates such that the vertices corresponding to the predicates of \( \Gamma \) form a cycle of length \( l \) in \( G(\Sigma') \) such that each edge of the cycle corresponds to a different variable. The following lemma relates the girth of the graph \( G(\Sigma') \) and the local consistency of \( \Sigma \) for a suitable partial truth assignment \( \mu \):

**Lemma 9.** Let \( \Sigma \) be a set of predicates, \( \mu \) a partial truth assignment, \( \Sigma' \) the restriction of \( \Sigma \) with respect to \( \mu \) and \( l \geq 2 \) an integer. If each predicate of \( \Sigma' \) is \( 1 \)-extendable and \( \Sigma \) contains no semicycle of length at most \( l \) with respect to \( \mu \), then the set \( \Sigma \) is \( l \)-consistent.

**Proof.** We prove by induction on \( i \) that any \( i = 1, \ldots, l \) predicates of \( \Sigma' \) can be simultaneously satisfied. This clearly implies the statement of the lemma because a truth assignment for \( \Sigma' \) can be viewed as an extension of the truth assignment \( \mu \) to \( \Sigma \).

The claim trivially holds for \( i = 1 \). Assume now that \( i > 1 \) and let \( P_1, \ldots, P_i \) be any \( i \) predicates of \( \Sigma \). Since \( \Sigma' \) contains no semicycle of length at most \( l \), there is a predicate that shares at most a single variable with the remaining predicates. We can assume without loss of generality that \( P_i \) is such a predicate. Let \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) be the variables contained in the first \( i - 1 \) predicates which are not set by \( \mu \). By the induction hypothesis, there is a truth assignment for the variables \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) which satisfies all the predicates \( P_1, \ldots, P_{i-1} \). Since \( P_i \) has at most one variable in common with the predicates \( P_1, \ldots, P_{i-1} \), the truth assignment for \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) can be extended to a truth assignment which satisfies all the predicates \( P_1, \ldots, P_i \) because the restriction of the predicate \( P_i \) with respect to \( \mu \) is \( 1 \)-extendable. \( \square \)

In the proof of the lower bound, Markov’s inequality and Chernoff’s inequality are used to bound the probability of large deviations from the expected value. The reader is referred to [11] for a more detailed exposition.

**Proposition 10.** Let \( X \) be a non-negative random variable with the expected value \( E \). The following holds for every \( \alpha \geq 1 \):

\[
\Pr(X \geq \alpha) \leq \frac{E}{\alpha}.
\]

**Proposition 11.** Let \( X \) be a random variable equal to the sum of \( N \) zero-one independent random variables such that each of them is equal to 1 with the probability \( p \). Then, the following holds for every \( 0 < \delta \leq 1 \):

\[
\Pr(X \geq (1 + \delta)pN) \leq e^{-\delta^2pN/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(X \leq (1 - \delta)pN) \leq e^{-\delta^2pN/2}.
\]

We are now ready to prove our lower bounds on \( \rho^w_\infty(\Pi) \) and \( \rho_\infty(\Pi) \):
Moreover, if the arity of each predicate $\Pi$ is at least two, then there exists such a set $\Sigma_0$ of unweighted predicates.

**Proof.** We assume without loss of generality that $\varepsilon < 1$ is the inverse of a power of two. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_M$ be all the different functions contained in the set $\pi(\Pi)$ and let $\sum_{i=1}^M x_i f_i$ be their convex combination with $\psi(\sum_{i=1}^M x_i f_i) = \psi(\pi(\Pi))$. Let further $P^i$ be a predicate of $\Pi$ whose restriction with respect to a vector $\tau^i$ is $1$-extendable and $\pi_{P^i, \tau^i} = f_i$. Observe that there are no two indices $i \neq i'$ such that $P^i = P^{i'}$ and $\tau^i = \tau^{i'}$. Finally, let $K$ be the maximum arity of a predicate contained in $\Pi$.

We consider a random set $\Sigma$ of predicates whose arguments contain variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ where $n$ is a sufficiently large power of two which will be fixed later in the proof. Fix an integer $i = 1, \ldots, M$ and let $k$ be the arity of $P^i$ and $k'$ the number of stars contained in $\tau^i$. At this point, we abandon the condition that each variable can appear in at most one of the arguments of the predicate and we allow to include to $\Sigma$ predicates which do not satisfy this condition. Later, we prune the set $\Sigma$ to obey this constraint.

If $k > 1$, each of the $n^k 2^{k'}$ instances of the predicate $P^i$ whose $j$th argument, $1 \leq j \leq k$, is a positive literal containing one of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if $\tau_{ij} = 1$, a negative literal containing one of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if $\tau_{ij} = 0$ and a positive or negative literal containing one of the variables $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ if $\tau_{ij} = \star$, is included to $\Sigma$ randomly and independently of the other predicates with the probability $x_i 2^{-k'} n^{-(k-1+1/2l)}$. The weights of all these predicates are set to one.

If $k = 1$, each instance of the predicate $P^i$ whose only argument is a positive literal containing one of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if $\tau_{i1} = 1$, a negative literal containing one of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if $\tau_{i1} = 0$ and a positive or negative literal containing one of the variables $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ if $\tau_{i1} = \star$, is included to $\Sigma$ with the weight $x_i 2^{-k'} n^{1/2l}$. Note that if the arity of each predicate of $\Pi$ is at least two, the obtained set $\Sigma$ consists of unweighted predicates (more precisely, all the predicates have the weight equal to one).

Let $\Sigma^i$ be the predicates of $\Sigma$ corresponding to $P^i$ and $\tau^i$. We prove the following three statements (under the assumption that $n$ is sufficiently large):

(i) The total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma^i$ is at least $x_i (1 - \varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l}$ with the probability greater than $1 - 1/(4M)$.

(ii) With the probability greater than $1 - 1/(4M)$, each truth assignment which assigns true to exactly $n'$ of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ satisfies the predicates of $\Sigma^i$ whose total weight is at most $x_i (f_i(n'/n) + \varepsilon/4)n^{1+1/2l}$.

(iii) The total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma^i$ whose arguments do not contain different variables is at most $x_i (\varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l}$ with the probability greater than $1 - 1/(4M)$.

If the arity $k$ of $P^i$ is one or $x_i = 0$, then all the three statements hold with the probability one. In the rest, we consider the case that the arity of $P^i$ is at least two, i.e., $k \geq 2$, and $x_i > 0$.

The probability that the total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma^i$ is smaller than $x_i (1 - \varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l}$ is bounded by Proposition 11 from above by the following:

$$e^{-(\varepsilon/8)^2 x_i 2^{-k'} n^{-(k-1+1/2l)}(n^k 2^{k'})/2} = e^{-\varepsilon^2 x_i n^{1+1/2l}/128}.$$ 

Since $\varepsilon, x_i, l$ and $M$ do not depend on $n$, the probability that the total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma^i$ exceeds $x_i (1 - \varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l}$ is smaller than $1/(4M)$ if $n$ is sufficiently large.

Let $\mu$ be any of the $2^{2n}$ truth assignments for the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ and let $n'$ be the number of variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ which are set to be true by $\mu$. A predicate which can be included to $\Sigma^i$ is said to be good if it is satisfied by $\mu$. Note that there are exactly $f_i(n'/n)n^k 2^{k'}$ good predicates that could be included to $\Sigma^i$. If $f_i(n'/n) \leq \varepsilon/8$, then mark additional predicates to be good so that the total number of good predicates is $(\varepsilon/8)n^k 2^{k'}$ (note that since $\varepsilon$ is the inverse of a power of two, then this expression is an integer if $n$ is a sufficiently large power of two). Hence, the expected number of good predicates included to $\Sigma^i$ is exactly $\max\{f_i(n'/n), \varepsilon/8\} n^k 2^{k'} + x_i n^{-(k-1+1/2l)} 2^{-k'}$. Using the
fact that \( f_i(n'/n) \leq \frac{1}{4} \) and Proposition 11, we infer the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prob} \left( \mu \text{ satisfies more than } z_i \left( f_i(n'/n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) n^{1+1/2l} \text{ predicates of } \Sigma^i \right) \\
\leq \text{Prob} \left( \Sigma^i \text{ contains more than } z_i \left( f_i(n'/n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right) n^{1+1/2l} \text{ good predicates} \right) \\
\leq \text{Prob} \left( \Sigma^i \text{ contains } > (1 + \varepsilon/8)z_i \max\{f_i(n'/n), \varepsilon/8\} n^{1+1/2l} \text{ good predicates} \right) \\
\leq e^{-e^2z_i \max\{f_i(n'/n), \varepsilon/8\} n^{1+1/2l}/192} \leq e^{-e^3z_in^{1+1/2l}/1536}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since there are \( 2^{2n} \) possible truth assignment \( \mu \), the probability that there exists one which satisfies more than \( z_i(f_i(n'/n) + \varepsilon/4)n^{1+1/2l} \) clauses of \( \Sigma^i \) is at most \( 2^{2n} \cdot e^{-e^3z_in^{1+1/2l}/1536} \). Since \( e, z_i, \) and \( l \) are fixed, this probability is smaller than \( 1/(4M) \) if \( n \) is sufficiently large.

It remains to establish our third claim on \( \Sigma^i \). At most \( \binom{k}{l}n^{k-1}2^k \) out of all the \( n^k2^k \) predicates which can be included to \( \Sigma^i \) contain one variable in several of its arguments. Therefore, the expected number of such predicates which are contained in the set \( \Sigma^i \) is at most \( \binom{k}{l}n^{k-1}2^k z_i 2^{2-K} n^{-(k-1)+1/2l} = z_i(k)n^{1/2l} \). By Markov’s inequality (Proposition 10), the probability that the number of such predicates in \( \Sigma^i \) exceeds \( z_i(\varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l} \) is at most the following fraction:

\[
\frac{z_i(k)n^{1/2l}}{z_i(\varepsilon)n^{1+1/2l}} = \frac{8}{k^2} \frac{n}{\varepsilon^2}.
\]

Since \( \varepsilon, k, \) and \( M \) are independent of \( n \), the probability of this event is smaller than \( \frac{1}{4} \) if \( n \) is sufficiently large.

It can be concluded that with the probability greater than \( \frac{1}{4} \) the following three statements hold for the set \( \Sigma \) and a sufficiently large \( n \) (recall that \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} z_i = 1 \)):

1. The total weight of the predicates of \( \Sigma \) is at least \( (1 - \varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l} \).
2. Any truth assignment which assigns true to exactly \( n' \) of the variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) satisfies the predicates of \( \Sigma \) whose total weight does not exceed \( \left( \sum_{i=1}^{M} z_i f_i(n'/n) + \varepsilon/4 \right) n^{1+1/2l} \).
3. The total weight of the predicates whose arguments do not contain different variables is at most \( (\varepsilon/8)n^{1+1/2l} \).

We now estimate the number of semicycles of length at most \( l \) in \( \Sigma \) with respect to the partial truth assignment \( \mu_0 \) which sets all the variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) to be true. Note that all the restrictions of the predicates contained in \( \Sigma \) with respect to \( \mu_0 \) are 1-extendable. Let us consider a semicycle corresponding to the predicates \( P_1', \ldots, P_l' \), \( 2 \leq l' \leq l \), described by \( \tau_1', \ldots, \tau_{l'}' \). Let \( k_i \) be the arity of the predicate \( P_i' \) and \( k_i' \) the number of stars in \( \tau_i' \). The number of all semicycles corresponding to the restrictions of the predicates \( P_1', \ldots, P_l' \) determined by \( \tau_1', \ldots, \tau_{l'}' \) is at most \( \prod_{i=1}^{l'} n^{k_i-k_i'} n^{k_i'-1}2^{k_{i-1}'} \) (the indices are taken modulo \( l' \), i.e., \( k_0' = k_{l'}' \)). The probability of including any such particular sequence to \( \Sigma \) is \( \prod_{i=1}^{l'} k_i' n^{-(k_i-1)+1/2l}/2^{-k_i} \) where \( k_i' \) is the coefficient \( z_i \) corresponding to \( P_i' \) and \( \tau_i' \). Therefore, the expected number of semicycles contained in \( \Sigma \) that correspond to the restrictions of \( P_1', \ldots, P_l' \) determined by \( \tau_1', \ldots, \tau_{l'}' \) is at most \( \prod_{i=1}^{l'} k_i' n^{l'/2} \leq K^{l'} n^{l'/2} \) (recall that \( 0 \leq k_i' \leq 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq l' \) and \( K \) denotes the maximum arity of a predicate in \( \Pi \)).

Since there are at most \( M^{l'} \) ways how to choose the predicates \( P_1', \ldots, P_l' \) and \( 3^{K^{l'}} \) possible choices of the vectors \( \tau_1', \ldots, \tau_{l'}' \), the expected number of semicycles of \( \Sigma \) of length \( l' \) does not exceed \( (MK3^K)^{l'} n^{l'/2} \). By Proposition 10, the probability that \( \Sigma \) contains more than \( (\varepsilon/8l)n^{1+1/2l} \) semicycles of length at most \( l \) is at most the following:

\[
\frac{l(MK3^K)^{l'} n^{l'/2}}{(\varepsilon/8l)n^{1+1/2l}} \leq \frac{8l^2(MK3^K)^{l'}}{en^{1/2}}.
\]

Since the numbers \( l, K, M \) and \( \varepsilon \) do not depend on \( n \), this probability is smaller than \( \frac{1}{4} \) if \( n \) is sufficiently large. Therefore with positive probability, the set \( \Sigma \) has the properties (1)–(3) stated above and the number of its semicycles of length at most \( l \) with respect to the partial truth assignment \( \mu_0 \) is at most \( (\varepsilon/8l)n^{1+1/2l} \). For the rest of the proof, fix \( \Sigma^* \) to be any such set of predicates.

Remove from \( \Sigma^* \) all the predicates contained in semicycles of length at most \( l \) with respect to \( \mu_0 \) and all the predicates which contain the same variable in several of their arguments. Let \( \Sigma_0 \) be the resulting set of predicates. Note that there
are at most $l \cdot (e/8l)n^{1+1/2l} = (e/8)n^{1+1/2l}$ predicates contained in semicycles of length at most $l$. Since each of the predicates of $\Sigma'$ which is contained in a semicycle must contain one of the variables $y_1, \ldots, y_n$, its arity is at least two. Consequently, its weight is equal to one. Hence, the total weight of the predicates removed from $\Sigma'$ is at most $(e/8)n^{1+1/2l} + (e/8)n^{1+1/2l} = (e/4)n^{1+1/2l}$ and the total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma_0$ is at least $(1 - (3e/8))n^{1+1/2l}$. Clearly, the total weight of the predicates of $\Sigma_0$ which can be simultaneously satisfied by a truth assignment does not exceed the total weight of such predicates of $\Sigma'$. We can now conclude that the following holds for each truth assignment which sets $n' (0 \leq n' \leq n)$ of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ to be true:

$$
\rho^w(\Sigma_0) \leq \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^K 2^{-i} f_i(n'/n) + e/4 \right) n^{1+1/2l}}{(1 - 3e/8)n^{1+1/2l}} \leq \frac{\Psi(\pi(II)) + e/4}{1 - 3e/8} \\
\leq \Psi(\pi(II)) \frac{1 + e/4}{1 - 3e/8} \leq \Psi(\pi(II))(1 + e) \leq \Psi(\pi(II)) + e.
$$

Since $\Sigma_0$ contains no semicycles of length at most $l$ with respect to $\mu_0$ and all the restrictions of the predicates of $\Sigma_0$ with respect to $\mu_0$ are 1-extendable, the set $\Sigma_0$ is $l$-consistent by Lemma 9. Consequently, $\rho^w_l(II) \leq \Psi(\pi(II)) + e$. Moreover, if the arity of each predicate of $II$ is at least two, the weights of all the predicates of $\Sigma$ are one and $\rho_l(II) \leq \Psi(\pi(II)) + e$. □

We immediately infer from Corollary 8 and Theorem 12 the following expressions for $\rho^w_\infty(II)$ and $\rho^w_\infty(II)$:

**Corollary 13.** Let $II$ be a finite set of Boolean predicates. The following holds:

$$
\rho^w_\infty(II) = \Psi(\pi(II)).
$$

Moreover, if the arity of each predicate of $II$ is at least two, then the following holds:

$$
\rho_\infty(II) = \Psi(\pi(II)).
$$

As an application of Corollary 13, we compute the values $\rho^w_\infty(II)$ for several sets $II$:

**Example 14.** Let $II$ be the set of predicates from Example 4. Since $\pi_{P_1,\star}(p)$ equals to $\frac{3}{4}$ for all $0 \leq p \leq 1$, we infer $\Psi(\pi(II)) \leq \Psi(\pi_{P_1,\star}) = \frac{3}{4}$. On the other hand, the value of each of the functions $\pi_{P_1,1}$, $\pi_{P_2,11}$, $\pi_{P_{\star,1}}$, and $\pi_{P_{\star,\star}}$ for $p = \frac{3}{4}$ is at least $\frac{3}{4}$. Thus, the value of any convex combination of them for $p = \frac{3}{4}$ is also at least $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\Psi(\pi(II)) \geq \frac{3}{4}$. Hence, $\rho^w_\infty(II) = \frac{3}{4}$.

**Example 15.** Let $II$ be the set of predicates from Example 5. Since the function $\pi_{P,100,\star}(p)$ is $p(1 - p^2/4)$, we infer that $\Psi(\pi(II)) \leq \Psi(\pi_{P,100,\star}) = \frac{3}{4}$. On the other hand, each of the functions $\pi_{P,\tau}$ for all the vectors $\tau$ from Example 5 is at least $\frac{3}{4}$ for $p = 1$. Therefore, $\rho^w_\infty(II) = \Psi(\pi(II)) = \frac{3}{4}$.

**Example 16.** Let $II^k$ be the set containing a single predicate $P(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = x_1 \land (x_2 \lor \cdots \lor x_k)$ for an integer $k \geq 7$. Consider the vector $\tau = 10 \cdots 0 \star \cdots \star$. Clearly, the restriction of $P$ determined by $\tau$ is 1-extendable. It is easy to show that the maximum of the function $\pi_{P,\tau}$ is attained for $p_0 = k - \sqrt{4/(k - 2)}$ and it is strictly larger than $\frac{3}{4}$. Moreover, the value $\pi_{P,\tau}(p_0)$ is smaller or equal to the value $\pi_{P',\tau'}(p_0)$ for any $\tau'$ corresponding to a 1-extendable restriction of $P$. We infer that $\rho^w_\infty(II^k) = \Psi(\pi(II^k)) \geq \Psi(\pi_{P,\tau}) > \frac{3}{4}$.

Using Theorem 12, we are able to determine the values $\rho_l(P)$ for every 1-extendable Boolean predicate $P$ and for every $l \geq 1$:

**Theorem 17.** If $P$ is a $k$-ary Boolean predicate which is 1-extendable, then $\rho_l(P) = \rho^w_l(P) = \sigma(P)/2^k$ for each $l \geq 1$.

**Proof.** If $l = 1$, the statement follows from Lemma 2. Assume that $l \geq 2$. By Lemma 1, $\rho_l(P) \geq \sigma(P)/2^k$. We show that $\Psi(\pi(II)) = \sigma(P)/2^k$. Since the function $\pi_{P,\tau}(p)$ with $\tau = \star, \ldots, \star$ is constantly equal to $\sigma(P)/2^k$, the value of
respectively, where \( \Psi(\Pi) \) does not exceed \( \sigma(P)/2^k \). On the other hand, \( f(1/2) = \sigma(P)/2^k \) for every polynomial \( f \in \Pi \). Therefore, \( \Psi(\Pi) = \sigma(P)/2^k \) and the inequality \( \rho_1^w(P) \leq \rho_2^w(P) \leq \sigma(P)/2^k \) now follows from Corollary 13 (note that the arity of \( P \) is at least two unless it is constantly true). \( \square \)

5. 2-CNFS formulas

In this section, we study the structure of 2-CNFS formulas, i.e., CNFS formulas of clauses of sizes one and two. We first recall a well-known lemma about unsatisfiable formulas with clauses of sizes two which can be found, e.g., in [4]. If \( \Phi \) is a 2-CNFS formula with variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), then \( G(\Phi) \) denotes the directed graph of order \( 2n \) whose vertices correspond to literals \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) and \( \neg x_1, \ldots, \neg x_n \) and whose edge set is the following: for each clause \( (a \lor b) \), \( G(\Phi) \) contains an arc from the literal \( \neg a \) to the literal \( b \) and an arc from \( \neg b \) to \( a \) (note that both \( a \) and \( b \) represent literals, not variables). For each clause \( (a) \) (which can also be viewed as a clause \( (a \lor a) \)), we include an arc from the literal \( \neg a \) to \( a \).

**Lemma 18.** Let \( \Phi \) be a 2-CNFS formula with variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). The formula \( \Phi \) is satisfiable if and only if \( G(\Phi) \) contains no directed cycle through both the vertices \( x_i \) and \( \neg x_i \) for any \( i, 1 \leq i \leq n \).

An immediate corollary of Lemma 18 is the following:

**Lemma 19.** Each minimal inconsistent set of clauses of a 2-CNFS contains at most two clauses of size one.

We now show that there exist extremal 2-CNFS formulas in which each small inconsistent set of clauses contains two clauses of sizes one:

**Lemma 20.** Let \( 2 \leq l \leq L \) be any two integers. For each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a 2-CNFS \( l \)-consistent formula \( \Phi \) with \( \rho(\Phi) \leq \rho_1^w(\Pi_{2,SAT}) + \varepsilon \) such that each inconsistent set of \( L \) clauses contains at least two clauses of size one. Moreover, \( \Phi \) contains each single clause of size two at most once, but it may contain some one-literal clauses multiple times.

**Proof.** Fix integers \( l \geq 2 \) and \( L \geq l \) for the rest of the proof. Similarly, \( \delta < 1 \) is a positive real which will be chosen at the end of the proof. Fix a weighted \( l \)-consistent formula \( \Phi_0 \) with \( \rho(\Phi_0) < \rho_1^w(\Pi_{2,SAT})(1 + \delta) \). We now classify the variables contained in the formula \( \Phi_0 \): the set \( A_1 \) is formed by variables \( x \) contained in a clause of size one. We can assume without loss of generality that each variable \( x \in A_1 \) appears as a positive literal in the clause of size one. The set \( A_i \), \( 2 \leq i \leq l/2 \), consists of variables \( x \) which are contained in any \( A_j \), \( 1 \leq j \leq i - 1 \), and which are contained in a clause of the form \((\neg y \lor x)\) for \( y \in A_{i-1} \). Since \( \Phi \) is \( l \)-consistent, we can assume that all the occurrence of \( x \in A_i \) in the clauses \((\neg y \lor x)\), \( y \in A_{i-1} \), are positive: otherwise, there would be a set of at most \( i \) clauses that force \( x = \text{true} \) as well as a set of at most \( i \) clauses that force \( x = \text{false} \). The union of these two sets of clauses consists of at most \( 2i \) clauses and it is clearly inconsistent. Since \( i \leq l/2 \), this is impossible. Finally, let \( A_0 \) be the set of the remaining variables of \( \Phi \).

Let \( w_{ij} \), \( w_{ij}^T \) and \( w_{ij}^{-T} \) be the sum of the weights of the clauses of the type \((x \lor y)\), \((\neg x \lor y)\) and \((\neg x \lor \neg y)\), respectively, where \( x \in A_i \) and \( y \in A_j \). Similarly, let \( w_1 \) be the number (sum of the weights) of the clauses of the type \((x)\) where \( x \in A_1 \). We may assume that \( w_1 > 0 \). Otherwise, \( \rho(\Phi_0) \geq 3/4 \) and the existence of a formula \( \Phi \) follows from Theorem 17 applied with \( \Pi = \{P\} \) where \( P(x, y) = (x \lor y) \). Finally, \( W \) denotes the sum of all \( w_1, w_{ij}, w_{ij}^T \) and \( w_{ij}^{-T} \) for \( 0 \leq i, j \leq l/2 \). By the definition of the sets \( A_1, \ldots, A_{l/2} \), \( w_{ij} = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i, j \leq l/2 \) with \( i + 1 < j \). In addition, since \( \Phi \) is \( l \)-consistent, \( w_{ij}^{-T} = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i, j \leq l/2 \) with \( i + j + 1 \leq l \).

We now define \( W_p \) to be the maximum of the sum:

\[
\begin{align*}
    w_1 p_1 + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq l/2} w_{ij} (p_i + p_j - p_i p_j) + w_{ij}^{-T} (1 - p_i p_j) + \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq l/2} w_{ij}^T (1 - p_i + p_i p_j),
\end{align*}
\]  

(1)
We construct a 2-CNF formula minimal inconsistent sets of expression is at most \( Wp \) there is no “bad'' truth assignment with \( \{1/2\} + 1 \) disjoint sets consisting of \( n \) variables each. We construct a 2-CNF formula \( \Phi \) with variables \( X_0 \cup \cdots \cup X_{\lfloor 1/2 \rfloor} \). The formula \( \Phi \) contains \( n^{1/2L} \) copies of a clause \((x)\) for each \( x \in X_1 \). The other clauses are included into the formula \( \Phi \) randomly and independently as follows: the clauses \((x \lor y)\) where \( x \in X_i \) and \( y \in X_j \) with \( i \neq j \) are included to \( \Phi \) with the probability \( wijn^{1+1/2L}w_iw_jn^{-1+1/2L}w_1 \) and \( w_i\cap n^{1+1/2L}w_i \), respectively. The clauses \((x \lor y), (\neg x \lor y) \) and \((\neg x \lor \neg y) \), where \( x, y \in X_i \) are included to \( \Phi \) with the probability \( 2wijn^{-1+1/2L}w_i, w_i\cap n^{-1+1/2L}w_1 \) and \( 2w_i\cap n^{-1+1/2L}w_1 \), respectively.

We claim that the number of clauses of \( \Phi \) is at least \( Wn^{1+1/2L}(1 - \delta)/w_1 \) and the number of clauses which can be simultaneously satisfied does not exceed \( W\rho n^{1+1/2L}(1 + \delta)/w_1 + 3Wn^{1+1/2L}\delta/w_1 \) with the probability which tends to 1 as \( n \) goes to infinity. We show that each of the complementary events, i.e., the “bad’’ events, for each separate types of clauses occurs with the probability which tends to 0. Since the number of bad events is finite (and independent of \( n \)), this yields the claim. As an example, we present the analysis only for a single type of clauses, e.g., clauses \((x \lor y)\) for \( x \in X_i \) and \( y \in X_j \) with \( i \neq j \) for fixed integers \( i \) and \( j \). Namely, we aim to show that the number of clauses of this type is smaller than \( wijn^{1+1/2L}(1 - \delta)/w_1 \) with probability tending to 0. In addition, the probability that there is a truth assignment which assigns the true value to a fraction \( pi, pj \), of the variables of \( Xi, X_j \), respectively, and which satisfies more than \(wijn^{1+1/2L}(1 - (1-pj)(1-pj))(1 + \delta)/w_1 + 3wijn^{1+1/2L}\delta/w_1 = wijn^{1+1/2L}(pi + pj - pi pj)(1 + \delta)/w_1 + 3wijn^{1+1/2L}\delta/w_1 \) clauses of the considered type also tends to zero. Since \( W_p \) is defined as the maximum of 1 and there are finitely many choices of clause types, the latter would imply the claim.

By Proposition 11, the probability that the number of clauses \((x \lor y)\) with \( x \in X_i \) and \( y \in X_j \) is smaller than \( wijn^{1+1/2L}(1 - \delta)/w_1 \) is at most

\[
e^{-\delta^2wijn^{1+1/2L}/w_1/3} = e^{-\Theta(n^{1+2L})} \to 0.
\]

The second part of the claim is more difficult. We first prove the claim for \( pi \) and \( pj \) where \( pi \) or \( pj \) is at least \( \delta \). Fix now a truth assignment for \( Xi \cup X_j \) which assigns the true value to a fraction \( pi, pj \), of the variables \( Xi, X_j \), respectively. By Proposition 11, the probability that the number of clauses of the considered type satisfied by this fixed truth assignment exceeds \( wijn^{1+1/2L}(pi + pj - pi pj)(1 + \delta)/w_1 \) is at most:

\[
e^{-\delta^2wijn^{1+1/2L}/w_1 - n^2 (pi + pj - pi pj)/3} \leq e^{-\delta^2wijn^{1+1/2L}/w_1/3} = e^{-\Theta(n^{1+2L})}. 
\]

Since there are at most \( 2^{2n} \) possible truth assignments the probability that there exists a truth assignment with \( \delta \leq \max\{pi, pj\} \), which satisfy more clauses than claimed is at most \( 2^{2n} e^{-\Theta(n^{1+2L})} \to 0 \). We now show that if there is no “bad” truth assignment with \( \delta \leq \max\{pi, pj\} \), then there is no “bad” truth assignment with \( 0 \leq pi, pj \leq \delta \). Consider a truth assignment which assigns the true value to at most \( \delta n \) variables of each \( Xi \) and \( X_j \) and modify it to a truth assignment which assigns the true value to \( \lfloor \theta n \rfloor \) variables of each \( Xi \) and \( X_j \). This modification can only increase the number of satisfied clauses of the considered type. Since both the modified \( pi \) and \( pj \) are now larger than \( \delta \), the assignment satisfies at most \( wijn^{1+1/2L}(2\delta + 2/n - \delta^2)(1 + \delta)/w_1 \) clauses. If \( n \) is sufficiently large, then this expression is at most \( wijn^{1+1/2L}3\delta/w_1 \) as desired. This finishes the proof of the claim. \( \square \)

The number of variables of the formula \( \Phi \) is at most \( N = (\lfloor 1/2 \rfloor + 1)n \). By Lemma 18, there are at most \( (2N)^k \) minimal inconsistent sets of \( k \) clauses such that the size of each clause is two and there are at most \( (2N)^{k-1} \) minimal inconsistent sets of \( k - 1 \) clauses such that the size of each clause is two except for precisely one clause whose size is one. We omit the straightforward but little technical argument yielding these upper bounds. Since each clause of size two is included to \( \Phi \) with the probability at most \( Wn^{1+1/2L}/w_1 \), the expected number of minimal inconsistent
sets of at most \( L \) clauses containing zero or one clause of size one is at most the following:

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{L} \frac{(2N)^k W^{k-n-k}}{w_1^k} + \frac{(N)^{k-1} W^{k-n-(k-1)+(k-1)/2L}}{w_1^{k-1}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{L} \frac{(2(\lceil l/2 \rceil + 1))^k W^{k/2L}}{w_1^k} + \frac{(2(\lceil l/2 \rceil + 1))^{k-1} W^{k-n-(k-1)/2L}}{w_1^{k-1}}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{L} \frac{(l+2)^k W^{k/2L}}{w_1^k} + \frac{(l+2)^{k-1} W^{k-n-k/2L}}{w_1^{k-1}} \leq 2L(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L.
\]

By Markov’s inequality, the probability that there are more than \( 4L(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L \) such minimal inconsistent sets of clauses is at most \( \frac{1}{4} \). Therefore, if \( n \) is sufficiently large (with respect to a previously fixed \( \delta > 0 \)), with positive probability, the random formula \( \Phi \) has at least \( Wn^{1+1/2L}(1-\delta)/w_1 \) clauses, at most \( Wpn^{1+1/2L}(1+\delta)/w_1 + 3Wn^{1+1/2L}\delta/w_1 \) clauses of \( \Phi \) can be simultaneously satisfied and \( \Phi \) contains at most \( 4L(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L \) inconsistent sets of at most \( L \) clauses with no or a single clause of size one. Fix such a formula \( \Phi \). We obtain \( \Phi' \) from \( \Phi \) by removing all (at most) \( 4L(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L \) clauses of size two contained in an inconsistent set of at most \( L \) clauses with no or a single clause of size one. This may decrease the number of clauses of \( \Phi \) by at most \( 4L^2(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L \). On the other hand, the number of clauses which can be simultaneously satisfied cannot increase.

We now estimate \( \rho(\Phi') \) (observe that \( W_p \geq W/2 \)):

\[
\rho(\Phi') \leq \frac{Wpn^{1+1/2L}(1+\delta)/w_1 + 3Wn^{1+1/2L}\delta/w_1}{Wn^{1+1/2L}(1-\delta)/w_1 - 4L^2(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L} \leq \frac{W_p(1+\delta) + 3\delta W}{W(1-\delta) - 4L^2(l+2)^2 W^{L-n/2}/w_1^L} \leq \frac{W_p(1+\delta)}{W(1-\delta) - O(n^{-1/2-1/2L})}.
\]

Therefore, if \( n \) is sufficiently large, then

\[
\rho(\Phi') \leq \frac{W_p(1+\delta)}{W(1-\delta)} \leq \rho(\Phi_0) \frac{1+\delta}{1-2\delta} \leq \rho^m_7(III_{2-SAT}) \frac{(1+\delta)(1+\delta)}{1-2\delta}.
\]

Hence, for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we can choose \( \delta > 0 \) small enough that \( \rho(\Phi') \leq \rho^m_7(III_{2-SAT}) + \varepsilon \).

It remains to show that the formula \( \Phi' \) is \( l \)-consistent. By Lemma 19, each minimal inconsistent set of clauses of \( \Phi' \) contains at most two clauses of size one. On the other hand, each inconsistent set of at most \( L \) clauses contains at least two such clauses. Therefore, each minimal inconsistent set of at most \( L \) clauses of \( \Phi' \) contains precisely two clauses of size one. Fix such a set \( \Gamma \) of clauses of \( \Phi' \) and let \((x_1)\) and \((y_1)\) be the two clauses of size one contained in \( \Gamma \). Obviously, \( x_1, y_1 \in X_1 \). By Lemma 18, \( \Gamma \) contains clauses of size two in which \( x_1 \) and \( y_1 \) appear as negative literals. By the construction of \( \Phi' \), such clauses can be only \((\neg x_1 \lor y_2)\) and \((\neg y_1 \lor y_2)\) for some \( x_2, y_2 \in X_2 \). By Lemma 18, \( \Gamma \) has to contain clauses of size two in which \( x_2 \) and \( y_2 \) appear as negative literals. By the construction of \( \Phi' \), such clauses can be only \((\neg x_2 \lor x_3)\) and \((\neg y_2 \lor y_3)\) for some \( x_3, y_3 \in X_3 \). In this way, we continue until we reach the set \( X_{[l/2]} \). By the minimality of the set \( \Gamma \), \( x_i \neq y_i \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq l/2 \). Therefore, if \( |\Gamma| \leq [l/2] + 1 \), then \( \Gamma \) contains the clauses \((x_1), (\neg x_1 \lor x_2), \ldots, (\neg x_{[l/2]-1} \lor x_{[l/2]}), (y_1), (\neg y_1 \lor y_2), \ldots, (\neg y_{[l/2]-1} \lor y_{[l/2]}), (\neg x_{[l/2]} \lor \neg y_{[l/2]}), (\neg y_{[l/2]} \lor \neg y_{[l/2]}) \). Hence, \( |\Gamma| > l \) if \( l \) is even. If \( l \) is odd, then \( w_{[l/2][l/2]} = 0 \) and thus \( \Phi' \) cannot contain the clause \((\neg x_{[l/2]} \lor \neg y_{[l/2]}) \). This yields \( |\Gamma| > l \) in this case, too.

A close inspection of the proof of Lemma 20 yields that for any weights \( w_1, w_{ij}, w_{j} \) and \( w_{ij} \) with \( w_{ij} = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq j - 1 \) and \( w_{ij} = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i, j \) with \( i + j + 1 \leq l \), there is an \( l \)-consistent formula \( \Phi \) with \( \rho(\Phi) \leq W_p/W + \varepsilon \), where \( W = w_1 + \sum_{i,j} (w_{ij} + w_j) \) and \( W_p \) is the maximum of the sum (1) taken over all \( 0 \leq p_0, \ldots, p_{[l/2]} \leq 1 \). Therefore, we have the following formula for \( \rho^m_7(III_{2-SAT}) \) for all \( l \geq 2 \):

**Corollary 21.** For each \( l \geq 2 \), the following holds:

\[
\rho^m_7(III_{2-SAT}) = \min_{\sum_{i,j} (w_{ij} + w_j) = 1} W_p.
\]
where the minimum is taken over all combinations of weights with $w_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j - 1$, $w_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i, j$ with $i + j + 1 \leq l$ and $w_{ij} = w_{ji} = 0$ for $1 \leq i < [l/2]$ and $W_p$ is the maximum of the sum (1) taken over all $0 \leq p_0, \ldots, p_{[l/2]} \leq 1$.

6. Unary, binary and ternary Boolean predicates

As discussed in Section 2, it is enough to determine the values $\rho_l(P)$ for representatives of isomorphism classes of essentially unary, binary and ternary Boolean predicates. The case of $l$-extendable Boolean predicates was handled in Theorem 17. The only essentially unary, binary and ternary Boolean predicates which are not $l$-extendable (up to isomorphism) are the following: $P(x) = x$, $P(x, y) = x \land y$, $P(x, y, z) = x \land y \land z$, $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$ and $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z)$. The first three ones satisfy that $\sigma(P) = 1$ and the values $\rho_l(P)$ are determined by Lemma 3. Therefore, we know the values $\rho_l(P)$ for all essentially unary and binary Boolean predicates. We focus on $l$-consistent sets of predicates for $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$ and $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z)$ in the rest of this section. Tables 1 and 2 summarize our results.

6.1. The predicate $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$

We first handle the case of 2-consistent sets:

**Lemma 22.** It holds that $\rho_2(P) = \rho_2^w(P) = \frac{8}{27}$ for $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$.

**Proof.** We first show that $\rho_2(P) \geq \rho_2^w(P) \geq \frac{8}{27}$. Let us consider a 2-consistent set $\Sigma$ of weighted predicates. Since $\Sigma$ is 2-consistent, $\Sigma$ does not contain two predicates such that the first argument of one of them is $x$ and the first argument of the other is $\neg x$. Therefore, we may assume that the first argument of each predicate is a positive literal.

Choose now each variable of $\Sigma$ randomly and independently to be true with the probability $p = \frac{2}{3}$. The probability that any single predicate of $\Sigma$ is satisfied is either $p(p^2 + (1 - p)^2) = \frac{10}{27}$, if both the second and the third argument of it are positive or negative literals, or $2p^2(1 - p) = \frac{8}{27}$, otherwise. Hence, the expected fraction of satisfied constraints is at least $\frac{8}{27}$ and consequently $\rho(\Sigma) \geq \frac{8}{27}$. Since the choice of a 2-consistent set $\Sigma$ was arbitrary, we can conclude that $\rho_2(P) \geq \frac{8}{27}$.

It remains to show that $\rho_2^w(P) \leq \rho_2(P) \leq \frac{8}{27}$. For an integer $n \geq 3$, we consider a set $\Sigma_n$ of predicates of type $P$ with the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. $\Sigma_n$ is formed by all the $n(n - 1)(n - 2)$ predicates $P(x_i, x_j, \neg x_k)$ for $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$, where all $i, j$ and $k$ are mutually distinct. The set $\Sigma$ is clearly 2-consistent. We now compute $\rho(\Sigma_n)$. Consider a truth assignment which assigns the true value to exactly $n'$ variables of $\Sigma_n$. Then, the number of satisfied constraints is precisely $n'((n' - 1)(n - n') + (n - n')(n' - 1))$. Thus, we can conclude that (set $q = n'/n$):

$$\rho(\Sigma_n) \leq \max_{0 \leq q \leq 1} \frac{qn((qn - 1)(n - qn) + (n - qn)(qn - 1))}{n(n - 1)(n - 2)} \leq \max_{0 \leq q \leq 1} 2q^2(1 - q) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{8}{27} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Hence, $\rho_2(P) \leq \frac{8}{27}$ as claimed. $\square$

We are now ready to complete the analysis of $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$:

**Theorem 23.** If $P$ is the predicate $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$, then the following holds for all $l \geq 1$:

$$\rho_l(P) = \rho_l^w(P) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{4} & \text{if } l = 1, \\
\frac{8}{27} & \text{if } l = 2, \\
\frac{1}{2} & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

**Proof.** It follows that $\rho_1(P) = \rho_1^w(P) = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\rho_2(P) = \rho_2^w(P) = \frac{8}{27}$ from Lemmas 2 and 22. Hence, we can focus only on the case $l \geq 3$ in the rest of the proof. First, we show that $\rho_l^w(P) \leq \rho_l(P) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Consider an $l$-consistent set $\Sigma'$
Lemma 24. For each \( \rho(P') = \frac{1}{2} \) by Theorem 17. Let \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) be the variables contained in \( \Sigma' \). We construct an \( l \)-consistent set \( \Sigma \) of predicates \( \tilde{P} \) with \( \rho(\Sigma) = \rho(\Sigma') \). Introduce a new variable \( x \) and for each predicate \( P'(y_i, y_j), P'(\neg y_i, y_j), P'(y_i, \neg y_j) \) and \( P'(\neg y_i, \neg y_j) \) include to \( \Sigma \) a predicate \( P(x, y_i, y_j), P(x, \neg y_i, y_j), P(x, y_i, \neg y_j) \) and \( P(x, \neg y_i, \neg y_j) \), respectively. Since \( \Sigma' \) is \( l \)-consistent, the set \( \Sigma \) of predicates \( P \) is \( l \)-consistent, too. It is also not hard to see that \( \rho(\Sigma) = \rho(\Sigma') \). Therefore, \( \rho(\Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \) and \( \rho_l(P) \leq \frac{1}{2} \).

We now prove that \( \rho_l(P) \geq \rho_l^m(P) \geq \frac{1}{2} \) for \( l \geq 3 \). Let \( \Sigma \) be an \( l \)-consistent set of weighted predicates \( P \). Let \( X \) be the set of variables which appear as the first argument in some of the predicates of \( \Sigma \) and \( Y \) the set consisting of the remaining variables. Since \( \Sigma \) is \( 2 \)-consistent, we can assume that the first argument of each predicate is a positive literal. In addition, since \( \Sigma \) is \( 3 \)-consistent it contains neither a predicate \( P(x, x', \neg x'') \) nor a predicate \( P(x, \neg x', x'') \) for some \( x, x', x'' \in X \). Therefore, if we set each variable of \( X \) to be true, then each predicate of \( \Sigma \) is either satisfied (i.e., all its arguments are set and the predicate is true) or at least one of its arguments contains a variable from the set \( Y \). Choose now each variable of \( Y \) randomly and independently to be true with the probability \( \frac{1}{2} \). Each predicate, which was not satisfied by fixing the values of variables from the set \( X \), is now satisfied with the probability \( \frac{1}{2} \). Therefore, the expected weight of satisfied predicates is equal to half of the total weight. Hence, \( \rho(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \) and consequently \( \rho_l(P) \geq \rho_l^m(P) \geq \frac{1}{2} \). \( \square \)

6.2. The predicate \( P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z) \)

Before we analyze locally consistent sets of predicates for \( P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z) \), we consider \( 2 \)-consistent and \( 3 \)-consistent such sets:

**Lemma 24.** It holds that \( \rho_2(P) = \rho_2^w(P) = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \) for \( P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z) \).

**Proof.** We first show that \( \rho_2(P) \geq \rho_2^w(P) \geq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \). Let us consider a \( 2 \)-consistent set \( \Sigma \) of weighted predicates. Since \( \Sigma \) is \( 2 \)-consistent, \( \Sigma \) does not contain two predicates such that the first argument of one of them is \( x \) and the first argument of the other is \( \neg x \). Therefore, we may assume that the first argument of each predicate is a positive literal.

Choose now each variable of \( X \) randomly and independently to be true with the probability \( p = 3^{-1/2} > \frac{1}{2} \). The probability that any single predicate of \( \Sigma \) is satisfied is at least \( \rho(1 - p^2) = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \). Hence, the expected fraction of constraints which are satisfied is at least \( \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \) and consequently \( \rho(\Sigma) \geq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \). Since the choice of a \( 2 \)-consistent set \( \Sigma \) was arbitrary, we can conclude that \( \rho_2(P) \geq \rho_2^w(P) \geq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \).

It remains to show that \( \rho_2^w(P) \leq \rho_2(P) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \). For an integer \( n \geq 3 \), we consider a set \( \Sigma_n \) of the predicates \( P \) with the variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). \( \Sigma_n \) is formed by all the \( n(n-1)(n-2)/2 \) constraints \( P(x_i, \neg x_j, \neg x_k) \) for \( 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, i \neq j, i \neq k \) and \( j < k \). The set \( \Sigma \) is clearly \( 2 \)-consistent. We now compute \( \rho(\Sigma_n) \). Consider a truth assignment which assigns the true value to exactly \( n' \) variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). Then, the number of satisfied constraints is precisely the following \( n'(n-n')(n'-1) + (n-n')(n-n'-1)/2 \). We can now conclude that (set \( q = n'/n \)):

\[
\rho(\Sigma_n) \leq \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)/2}{n(n-1)(n-2)/2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).
\]

Hence, \( \rho_2(P) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9} \) as claimed. \( \square \)

**Lemma 25.** It holds that \( \rho_3^w(P) \leq \rho_3(P) \leq \frac{1}{2} \) for \( P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z) \).

**Proof.** For each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we construct a \( 3 \)-consistent set \( \Sigma \) with \( \rho(\Sigma) < \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \). Let \( n \) be an integer whose exact value will be chosen later. We construct a set \( \Sigma_n \) of predicates \( P \) with variables \( x_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq 2n + 1 \) and \( y_i^A \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq 2n + 1 \) where \( A \) ranges through all \( n \)-element subsets of \( \{1, \ldots, 2n + 1\} \setminus \{i\} \). The set \( \Sigma_n \) consists of predicates \( P(x_i, \neg x_j, y_i^A) \)
for all \(1 \leq i, j \leq 2n + 1, i \neq j\) and \(j \in A\) and predicates \(P(x_i, \neg x_j, \neg y_i^A)\) for all \(1 \leq i, j \leq 2n + 1, i \neq j\) and \(j \not\in A\).

In particular, the number of predicates contained in \(\Sigma_n\) is \((2n + 1)/2\). Clearly, \(\Sigma_n\) is 3-consistent.

Let us consider a truth assignment which satisfies the most number of predicates. Let \(n'\) be the number of the variables \(x_1, \ldots, x_{2n+1}\) with the true value. By symmetry, we can assume that the values of the variables \(x_1, \ldots, x_{n'}\) are true and the values of \(x_{n'+1}, \ldots, x_{2n+1}\) are false. Observe that all the predicates whose first argument is one of the literals \(x_{n'+1}, \ldots, x_{2n+1}\) are false. In particular, if \(n' \leq n\), then less than half of the predicates are satisfied. We focus on the case \(n' > n\) in the rest of the proof.

Consider now an integer \(i, 1 \leq i \leq n'\), and an \(n\)-element subset \(A\) of the set \(\{1, \ldots, 2n + 1\} \setminus \{i\}\). If \(|A \cap (\{1, \ldots, n'\} \setminus \{i\})| > (n' - 1)/2\), then the truth assignment (because it is optimal) assigns \(y_i^A\) the true value and, otherwise, it assigns \(\neg y_i^A\) the false value. Hence, the number of predicates, which contain \(y_i^A\) and which are satisfied, is \((2n - n' + 1) + \max\{|A \cap (\{1, \ldots, n'\} \setminus \{i\})|, n' - |A \cap (\{1, \ldots, n'\} \setminus \{i\})|\}\) for a fixed integer \(i\), the number of \(n\)-element subsets \(A\) of \(\{1, \ldots, 2n + 1\} \setminus \{i\}\) with max\{|\(A \cap (\{1, \ldots, n'\} \setminus \{i\})|, n' - |A \cap (\{1, \ldots, n'\} \setminus \{i\})|\}\} \geq (1 + \varepsilon)(n' - 1)/2\) is at most the following:

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{(1-\varepsilon)(n'-1)/2} \binom{n' - 1}{k} \binom{2n + 1 - n'}{n - k} + \sum_{k=(1+\varepsilon)(n'-1)/2}^{n'-1} \binom{n' - 1}{k} \binom{2n + 1 - n'}{n - k} \leq \sum_{0 \leq k \leq (1-\varepsilon)(n'-1)/2} \binom{n' - 1}{k} 2^{n+1-n'} \leq 2e^{(-2^2(n'-1)/2)} 2^{n'-1} 2^{n+1-n'} = 2^{n+1} e^{-2(n'-1)/6}.
\]

Hence, for a fixed \(i\), the number of satisfied predicates whose first argument is \(x_i\) is at most the following (recall that \(n + 1 \leq n'\)):

\[
\left(2n - n' + 1 + \frac{(1 + \varepsilon)(n'-1)}{2}\right) \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right) + 2n2^{2n+1} e^{-2(n'-1)/6} \leq \left(2n - n' + 1 + \frac{2n\varepsilon}{2}\right) \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right) + 2n2^{2n+1} e^{-2n/6} \leq \left(2n - n' - \frac{1}{2} + n\varepsilon\right) \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right) + 2n2^{2n+1} e^{-2n/6}.
\]

Consequently, the fraction of satisfied predicates of \(\Sigma_n\) does not exceed:

\[
\frac{n' \left(2n - (n' - 1)/2 + n\varepsilon\right) \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right) + 2n2^{2n+1} e^{-2n/6}}{(2n + 1)2 \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right)} \leq \left(\frac{(2n + 1)n + nn'\varepsilon}{(2n + 1)2}\right) \left(\frac{2n}{n}\right) + 2n2^{2n+1} e^{-2n/6} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + 2(2n + 1)e^{-2n/6}.
\]

We now choose \(n\) to be an integer such that \(2(2n + 1)e^{-2n/6} \leq \varepsilon/2\). Then, each truth assignment with \(n' > n\) satisfies at most the fraction of \(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon\) of the predicates of \(\Sigma_n\). Hence, \(\rho(\Sigma_n) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon\) as desired. \(\square\)

We are now ready to determine the values \(\rho_l(P)\) for the predicate \(P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z)\):

**Theorem 26.** Let \(P\) be the predicate \(P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z)\). Then, the following holds for all \(l \geq 1\):

\[
\rho_l(P) = \rho_l^w(P) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{3}{8} & \text{if } l = 1, \\
\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9} & \text{if } l = 2, \\
\rho_{l-2}^w(\Pi_{2\text{-SAT}}) & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** The equalities \(\rho_1(P) = \rho_1^w(P) = \frac{3}{8}\) and \(\rho_2(P) = \rho_2^w(P) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9}\) follow from Lemmas 2 and 24, respectively. We first prove that \(\rho_l(P) \geq \rho_l^w(P) \geq \rho_{l-2}^w(\Pi_{2\text{-SAT}})\) for \(l \geq 3\). Let \(\Sigma\) be an \(l\)-consistent set of weighted predicates \(P\) and let \(X\) be the set of variables of \(\Sigma\) which appear as the first argument in some predicates of \(\Sigma\). Since \(\Sigma\) is 2-consistent, we can assume that all the first arguments of the predicates of \(\Sigma\) are positive literals. Let \(Y\) be the set of the remaining variables of \(\Sigma\).
We construct an auxiliary \((l - 2)\)-consistent 2-CNF formula \(\Phi\) with the variables \(Y\) as follows. Since \(\Sigma\) is 3-consistent, it does not contain a predicate \(P(x, \neg x', \neg x'')\) where \(x', x'' \in X\). We now construct the formula \(\Phi\). For each predicate \(P(x, \neg x', y)\) and each predicate \(P(x, y, \neg x')\) of \(\Sigma\) with \(x' \in X\), we include the clause \((y)\) to \(\Phi\). Similarly, for each predicate \(P(x, \neg y, \neg x')\) and each predicate \(P(x, y, \neg x')\) with \(x' \in X\), we include the clause \((\neg y)\). For each predicate \(P(x, y, y')\) with \(y, y' \notin X\), we include the clause \((y \vee y')\) to \(\Phi\). We proceed analogously for predicates \(P(x, \neg y, y')\), \(P(x, y, \neg y')\) and \(P(x, \neg y, \neg y')\). The weights of the clauses are equal to the weights of the corresponding predicates. If several same clauses are included into \(\Phi\), we replace them by a single clause with weight equal to the sum of the weights.

We claim that the formula \(\Phi\) is \((l - 2)\)-consistent. If this is not the case, let \(I'\) be the minimum inconsistent set of clauses of \(\Phi\). By Lemma 19, \(I'\) contains at most two clauses of size one. We now find an inconsistent set \(I''\) of at most \(|I'| + 2\) predicates of \(\Sigma\). For each clause of \(I'\) of size two, include to \(I''\) the predicate of \(\Sigma\) corresponding to that clause. For each clause \((y), (\neg y)\), of \(I'\), include to \(I''\) the predicate \(P(x, y, \neg x'), P(x, \neg y, \neg x')\), respectively, which corresponds to that clause, together with one of the predicates of \(\Sigma\) whose first argument is \(x'\). Since \(I''\) contains at most two clauses of size two, \(|I''| \leq |I'| + 2 = l\). Moreover, since \(I''\) is inconsistent, \(I''\) is also inconsistent. This contradicts the fact that \(\Sigma\) is \(l\)-consistent.

Since the formula \(\Phi\) is \((l - 2)\)-consistent, there is a truth assignment which satisfies the fraction of \(\rho(\Phi) \geq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT})\) clauses of \(\Phi\). Extend this truth assignment to all the variables of \(\Sigma\) by assigning the true value to each variable \(x \in X\). All the predicates of \(\Sigma\) whose arguments contain solely the variables from the set \(X\) are satisfied and, in addition, the fraction of \(\rho(\Phi)\) of the remaining predicates are also satisfied. Therefore, \(\rho(\Sigma) \geq \rho(\Phi) \geq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT})\). Since the choice of a set \(\Sigma\) was arbitrary, we can conclude that \(\rho_1(P) \geq \rho(P) \geq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT})\).

It remains to prove that \(\rho(P) \leq \rho_1(P) \leq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT})\) for \(l \geq 3\). If \(l = 3\), the upper bound follows from Lemma 25 and the fact that \(\rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT}) = \frac{1}{2}\). For \(l \geq 4\) and \(\epsilon > 0\), fix an \((l - 2)\)-consistent 2-CNF formula \(\Phi\) with \(\rho(\Phi) \leq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT}) + \epsilon\) such that each minimal inconsistent set of at most \(l\) clauses contain two clauses of size one. Such a formula \(\Phi\) exists by Lemma 20. Moreover, we can assume that each clause of size two is contained in \(\Phi\) at most once. Let \(m\) be the number of clauses of \(\Phi\) of size one (counting multiplicities) and \(m\) the number of all clauses of \(\Phi\). Since \(\Phi\) is 2-consistent, \(m' / m \leq \rho(\Phi)\). We now construct an \(l\)-consistent set \(\Sigma\) of predicates \(P\) with \(\rho(\Sigma) = \rho(\Phi)\).

Let \(y_1, \ldots, y_n\) be the variables contained in the formula \(\Phi\). The set \(\Sigma\) will contain \((m + 1)\) variables \(y_i^j\) for \(1 \leq i \leq n\) and \(1 \leq j \leq m + 1\) and \(m + 1\) variables \(x^i_j\) for \(1 \leq j \leq m + 1\). Let \(C_1, \ldots, C_m\) be the clauses of \(\Phi\) (note that single variable clauses may appear in this sequence several times). For each clause \(C_k = (y_i \vee y_j)\), \(1 \leq k \leq m\), we include to \(\Sigma\) predicates \(P(x^i_j, y_i^j, y_j^j)\) for \(1 \leq j \leq m + 1\). Similarly, we proceed for clauses \(C_k = (y_i \vee \neg y_j)\) and \(C_k = (\neg y_i \vee \neg y_j)\). If the clause \(C_k\) is of size one, say \(C_k = (y_i)\), we include into \(\Sigma\) predicates \(P(x^i_j, y_i^j, \neg x^{(i+j) \mod (m+1)})\) for \(1 \leq j \leq m + 1\). In this way, even the one-variable clauses are transformed into distinct predicates. Therefore, \(\Sigma\) consists of \(m(m + 1)\) distinct predicates.

First, we show that \(\Sigma\) is \(l\)-consistent. Assume the opposite and let \(I\) be the minimum inconsistent set of predicates contained in \(\Sigma\), i.e., \(|I| \leq l\). Observe that if we set all the variables \(x^1, \ldots, x^n\) to be true, then \(\Sigma\) reduces to \(m + 1\) independent “copies” of the formula \(\Phi\). Therefore, if \(I\) is a set of \(l\) inconsistent predicates, it must contain predicates contained in one of these copies of \(\Phi\) which correspond to an inconsistent set \(I'\) of clauses of \(\Phi\). By symmetry, we can assume that predicates corresponding to \(I'\) are contained in the first copy of \(\Phi\). Since \(\Phi\) is \((l - 2)\)-consistent, \(|I'\) \geq l - 1\).

By the choice of \(\Phi\), each inconsistent set of at most \(l\) clauses of \(\Phi\) contains two clauses of size one. Let \(C_k = (y_i)\) and \(C_k' = (y_i')\) be these two clauses of size one, i.e., \(\Sigma\) contains the predicates \(P(x^1, y_i^j, \neg x^{(i+j) \mod (m+1)})\) and \(P(x^1, y_i^j, \neg x^{(k+1) \mod (m+1)})\). If \(I'\) is inconsistent, it must contain a predicate whose first argument is \(x^i\) as well as a predicate whose first argument is \(x^{(k+1) \mod (m+1)}\). Therefore, \(\Sigma\) contains at least \(|I'\) + 2 \geq l\) predicates. Hence, the set \(\Sigma\) is \(l\)-consistent.

It remains to show that \(\rho(\Sigma) = \rho(\Phi)\). Since \(\rho(\Phi)\) \leq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT}) + \epsilon\) and the choice of \(\epsilon\) was arbitrary, this would yield \(\rho_1(P) \leq \rho_{l-2}(2\text{-SAT})\). Fix a truth assignment such that the fraction of \(\rho(\Sigma)\) predicates of the set \(\Sigma\) is satisfied. We claim that there is a truth assignment which assigns all the variables \(x^1, \ldots, x^{n+1}\) the true value. Indeed, if \(x^i\) is false, then change its value to true. This causes at most \(m'\) previously satisfied predicates to be unsatisfied (precisely those which contain \(\neg x^j\) as the third argument) and, on the other hand, we can choose values of \(y_1^j, \ldots, y_n^j\) so that at least the \(\rho(\Phi)m\) predicates whose first argument is \(x^j\) are satisfied. Note that none of these \(\rho(\Phi)m\) predicates could be satisfied before the change. Since \(\rho(\Phi)m' \geq m' / m\) (recall that \(\rho(\Phi) \geq m' / m\)), the number of satisfied predicates is not
decreased after the change. Hence, we assume that all the variables $x^1, \ldots, x^{m+1}$ are set to be true by the considered truth assignment. Then, the set $\Sigma$ is reduced to $m + 1$ independent “copies” of the formula $\Phi$ (substitute the true value for all the variables $x^1, \ldots, x^{m+1}$). We conclude that $\rho(\Sigma) = \rho(\Phi)$. □

7. Conclusion

We studied instances of constraint satisfaction problems which are locally consistent. The values of $\rho_I(P)$ have been determined for all predicates that have arity at most three or are 1-extendable. We were not able to fully analyze non-1-extendable predicates. Already, the smallest two non-trivial such predicates, in particular $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \leftrightarrow z)$ and $P(x, y, z) = x \land (y \lor z)$, showed that the behavior of locally consistent problems for such predicates $P$ can be quite weird.

For the asymptotic behavior of $\rho_\infty(II)$, we settled almost completely the case of finite sets $II$ of predicates. The only case which remains open is to determine $\rho_\infty(II)$ for sets of predicates $II$ which contain a predicate of arity one. The case of infinite sets $II$ seems to be also interesting, but rather from the theoretical point of view than the algorithmic one: in most cases, it might be difficult to describe the input if the set $II$ is not a “nice” set of predicates. For an infinite set of predicates $II$, one can also define the set $\pi(II)$ and then $\Psi(\pi(II))$ to be the infimum of $\Psi$ taken over all convex combinations of finite number of functions from $\pi(II)$. It is not hard to verify that the proof of Theorem 12 can be translated to this setting. In particular, $\rho_\infty(II) \geq \Psi(\pi(II))$ for every infinite set $II$. However, the proof of Theorem 7 cannot be adopted to this case since the arity of the predicates of $II$ is not bounded. We suspect that the equality $\rho^w_\infty(II) = \Psi(\pi(II))$ does not hold for all (infinite) sets $II$.
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