

A SAT Solver + Computer Algebra Attack on the Minimum Kochen–Specker Problem

Zhengyu Li¹, Curtis Bright², Vijay Ganesh¹

¹School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology.

²School of Computer Science, University of Windsor.

Contributing authors: brian.li@gatech.edu; cbright@uwindsor.ca;
vganesh45@gatech.edu;

Abstract

One of the fundamental results in quantum foundations is the Kochen–Specker (KS) theorem, which states that any theory whose predictions agree with quantum mechanics must be *contextual*, i.e., a quantum observation cannot be understood as revealing a pre-existing value. The theorem hinges on the existence of a mathematical object called a KS vector system. While many KS vector systems are known, the problem of finding the minimum KS vector system in three dimensions has remained stubbornly open for over 55 years. In this paper, we present a new method based on a combination of a Boolean satisfiability (SAT) solver and a computer algebra system (CAS) to address this problem. Our approach shows that a KS system in three dimensions must contain at least 24 vectors. Our SAT+CAS method is over 35,000 times faster at deriving the previously known lower bound of 22 vectors than the prior CAS-based searches. More importantly, we provide the first computer-verifiable proof certificate of a lower bound to the KS problem with a proof size of 41.6 TiB in order 23. The increase in efficiency is due to the fact we are able to exploit the powerful combinatorial search-with-learning capabilities of SAT solvers, together with the CAS-based isomorph-free exhaustive method of orderly generation of graphs. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first application of a SAT+CAS method to a problem in the realm of quantum foundations and the first lower bound in the minimum Kochen–Specker problem with a computer-verifiable proof certificate.

1 Introduction

Quantum Mechanics (QM) is often described as one of the most successful physical theories of all time, and yet many questions regarding the very foundations of QM remain unresolved. To address these foundational issues, many interpretations of QM (i.e., mappings from mathematical formalisms of QM to physical phenomena) have been proposed. Hidden-variable theories are attempts at understanding counterintuitive QM phenomena through a deterministic lens by positing the existence of (possibly) unobservable physical entities or hidden variables [1] that standard QM theory does not account for (and hence is deemed incomplete). Over the years, many constraints have been imposed on hidden-variable theories, e.g., Bell’s inequalities that rule out the possibility of *local* hidden-variable theories that are also in agreement with the predictions of QM [2]. In a similar vein, Simon Kochen and Ernst Specker [3] proved their famous Kochen–Specker (KS) theorem in 1967 (and independently by John Bell in 1966 [4]) that essentially asserts that non-contextual hidden variable theories cannot reproduce the empirical predictions of QM.

The KS theorem rules out non-contextual hidden-variable theories via the existence of a finite set of three-dimensional vectors, referred to as a *KS vector system* [3]. A KS vector system (or simply a KS system) is a combinatorial object that witnesses a contradiction between non-contextuality (i.e., the assumption that observables can be assigned values prior to measurement and independent of measurement context) and the SPIN axiom of QM. The first KS vector system, discovered in 1967, contains 117 vectors [3]. Another theorem that relies on the existence of KS systems in an essential way is the “Free Will” theorem of John Conway and Simon Kochen [5].

Since the publication of Kochen and Specker’s theorem in 1967, physicists and mathematicians have wondered about the cardinality of the smallest-sized KS vector system (see Table 2 and Section 3). Finding the minimum KS system, referred to as the minimum KS problem, is not only of scientific and historical interest but also has direct applications in quantum information processing [6]. For example, finding a minimum KS system could enable applications in the security of quantum cryptographic protocols based on complementarity [7], zero-error classical communication [8], and dimension witnessing [9]. Further, the large size of all known KS systems has hindered physicists from using them for empirical tests of the KS theorem, similar to the empirical tests of Bell’s theorem [10].

1.1 Two definitions of the Kochen-Specker System

There are two definitions of the KS system widely used in literature. The “original” KS set definition used in this paper (Section 2) contains only the vectors necessary to prove the KS theorem mathematically. This “original” definition of a KS set is the one originally used by Kochen and Specker themselves. KS systems developed by this definition are commonly referred to as “original KS systems” [11]. However, from an experimental perspective, another definition that requires additional vectors in the KS system is used, since constructing the set in practice would involve vectors not explicitly needed in the mathematical proof. Specifically, this definition requires that every pair of vectors in a 3-dimensional KS set belongs to a set of 3 mutually

Discoverers	Original System	Extended System
Kochen, Specker [3]	117	192
Schütte [15]	33	49
Peres [26]	33	57
Conway, Kochen [14]	31	51

Table 1: Size of 3-dimensional Kochen–Specker systems and how they differ based on the definition used, as discussed in Subsection 1.1. In addition, Pavičić and Megill [27] discovered many other unique 3-dimensional extended KS systems with 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 69, etc. vectors through automated generation.

orthogonal vectors. KS systems developed by this alternative definition are commonly referred to as “extended KS systems” [11].

Both definitions are well-known and used extensively in the literature. For examples, the ‘original’ definition used in this paper is also used in [12], [13], [14], [15], [5], [16], [17], [18], [19], while the other definition is used in [11], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25]. As a result of the difference in the two definitions, the lower bound on the original KS system and the extended KS system are also different, as shown in Table 1.

John Conway has stressed the problem of finding the minimum number of three-dimensional vectors necessary to prove the “Free Will theorem” in public lectures on the topic (see [17]). Thus, knowing the smallest ‘original’ KS set is of interest since such a set would correspond to a proof of the Free Will theorem using the fewest number of three-dimensional directions. This in a certain sense would lead to the ‘simplest’ proof of the theorem. We believe the question of the minimal size of an ‘original’ KS set is theoretically interesting (independent of what the minimal size of an ‘experimental’ KS set is). In this paper, we investigate the lower bound of the original KS system. However, the paradigm proposed in this paper is easily adaptable and scalable, and the approach can be applied to both definitions given the appropriate SAT encoding of the problem.

1.2 The SAT+CAS Paradigm for Combinatorial Problems in Math and Physics

In recent years we have witnessed the dramatic impact of satisfiability (SAT) solvers—computer programs that take as input Boolean logic formulas and decide whether they have solutions—in areas as diverse as AI, software engineering, program verification, program synthesis, and computer security [28, 29]. Unfortunately, despite these fantastic achievements of SAT solvers, they struggle with certain problems such as those containing many symmetries [30] or those requiring the usage of more advanced mathematical theories than propositional logic [31]. Much work has been done to remedy these drawbacks, including the development of sophisticated symmetry breaking techniques [32] and the development of solvers that support richer logic such as “SAT modulo theories” or SMT solvers [33]. However, the mathematical support of SMT solvers is quite limited when compared with the vast mathematical functionality available in a modern computer algebra system (CAS).

In response to this need for a solver that combines the efficient search capabilities of SAT solvers with the mathematical knowledge available in CASs, a new kind of solving methodology was developed in 2015 by Zulkoski, Ganesh, and Czarnecki [34]

Discoverers	Year	Bound
Kochen, Specker [3]	1967	≤ 117
Jost [43]	1976	≤ 109
Conway, Kochen [14]	1990	≤ 31
Arends, Ouaknine, Wampler [17]	2009	≥ 18
Uijlen, Westerbaan [18]	2016	≥ 22
Li, Bright, Ganesh [44]	2022	≥ 23
Li, Bright, Ganesh / Kirchweger, Peitl, Szeider [19]	2023	≥ 24

Table 2: A chronology of the bounds on the size of the minimum KS vector system in three dimensions. This table should not be regarded as a comprehensive catalog of all three-dimensional KS systems (Section 3); rather, it is a chronological overview highlighting the advancements in reducing the size of the minimal 3-D KS system in line with its initial definition. The present work (presented at CanaDAM 2023) was performed independently of Kirchweger, Peitl, Szeider (presented at IJCAI 2023).

and independently by Ábrahám [35]. This SAT+CAS solving methodology has been successfully applied to many diverse problems, including circuit verification [36, 37], automatic debugging [38], finding circuits for matrix multiplication [39], computing directed Ramsey numbers [40], and verifying mathematical conjectures [41]. For other work in the intersection of symbolic computation and satisfiability checking, see Matthew England’s summary [42] of the SC-Square project. In short, the SAT+CAS methodology has found wide application in diverse fields that somehow require solving hard combinatorial problems.

In this paper, we use the SAT+CAS solving methodology (see Figure 1) to dramatically improve the performance of the search for KS systems compared to all previous approaches developed to prove lower bounds for the minimum KS problem (see Section 1.4). This is made possible via a combination of the powerful search and learning algorithms used in modern SAT solvers with an “isomorph-free exhaustive generation” approach that prevents the duplicate exploration of isomorphic parts of the search space by the solver. For example, such an approach was recently used to resolve the Lam’s problem from projective geometry [45]. Although isomorph-free exhaustive generation has been used extensively in combinatorial enumeration, it has only recently been combined with SAT solving [46, 47].

The traditional approach to preventing a SAT solver from repeatedly exploring isomorphic parts of a search space is via the use of *symmetry breaking* techniques [30]. One such symmetry breaking approach is to add “static” constraints to the input formula at the beginning of the search aimed at reducing the size of the search space [50, 51]. Unfortunately, such an approach can be quite expensive in the sense that the number of added constraints can be large (e.g., exponential in the number of variables of the formula that encodes the problem-at-hand). Another approach is to “dynamically” break symmetries during the solver’s search [30, 52] such as in the SAT modulo symmetries (SMS) paradigm [53, 54]. Our approach is similar in that it also dynamically adds constraints to the problem during the solving process. However, an important difference is that the SAT+CAS paradigm is more general since it goes beyond breaking symmetries. For example, in the resolution of the smallest




Fig. 1: A flowchart of our SAT+CAS based tool PhysicsCheck for solving the KS problem in the sequential setting. The instance generator generates the SAT instance encoding the KS problem (see Section 4), and the instance is simplified using CaDiCaL [48]. The simplified instance is passed to the MapleSAT+CAS tool (see Section 5) either sequentially or in parallel using cube-and-conquer [49]. Finally, an embeddability checker applies the SMT solver Z3 to determine whether the candidates are embeddable (see Section 6).

counterexample of the Williamson conjecture, we used the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) as part of the CAS computations [55].

1.3 Automated Verification of Results

Verification is of utmost importance in the context of computer-assisted proofs, given the mathematical nature of such computations—especially for nonexistence proofs. Fortunately, the SAT+CAS paradigm naturally lends itself to automated verification, given the fact that all modern SAT solvers produce verifiable proofs. By contrast, all previous computer-assisted proofs of lower bounds for the minimum KS problem are not verifiable.

Since our problem requires the solver to perform an exhaustive search, the validity of our nonexistence result is crucially dependent on the encodings and the computational tools that we use. For example, our nonexistence result crucially relies on the correctness of the SAT solver’s search and the computer algebra system’s isomorph-free exhaustive generation routine. Fortunately, our SAT+CAS method generates verifiable certificates

that allow an independent third party to certify that the SAT solver’s search is exhaustive and also that the facts provided by the isomorph-free generation are correct. Thus, one does not need to trust either the SAT solver or the CAS to trust that our results are correct—instead, one only needs to trust the correctness of the proof verifier. This is quite significant, as SAT solvers and CASs are complicated pieces of software that typically cannot be guaranteed to be bug-free. By contrast, a proof verifier is a much simpler piece of software that can be formally checked. In Section 9, we provide details on the verification techniques that we used to certify our results.

1.4 Our Contributions

In this paper, we present the first successful design and implementation of a SAT+CAS system with extensive verification aimed at problems in the realm of quantum foundations. Specifically, we do so by leveraging and improving the SAT+CAS paradigm to incorporate an isomorph-free generation method (as part of a new SAT+CAS tool, PhysicsCheck¹) to obtain tighter lower bounds on the minimum KS problem with four orders of magnitude speedup over previous computational methods developed for this problem. We managed to get this improvement in spite of the fact that we also generate verifiable proofs.

In more detail, we implement a robust push-and-run pipeline that incorporates a version of the MapleSAT Boolean SAT solver [56], the SMT solver Z3 [57], and a CAS-based isomorph-free exhaustive generation method known as orderly generation that we implemented and integrated into MapleSAT. We also describe new encoding techniques that enabled an efficient reduction of the minimum KS problem into a SAT problem. Finally, we propose an extension of the standard Boolean UNSAT proof certificate format DRAT (deletion, reverse asymmetric tautology) that enables us to construct certificates of nonexistence for KS systems without needing to trust either the SAT solver or the CAS. We provide a modified DRAT-trim proof checker that can check the nonexistence proof certificates we produced [58].

Our new approach establishes a lower bound of 24 for the minimum size of a KS system, as opposed to the previous best of 22.² Our approach is over 35,000 times more efficient than the previous best approach [18] and we solidify previous results by finding candidates missing in previous results (see Section 8). We also verified all certificates computed by the SAT and CAS solvers in all orders up to and including order 23 (see Section 9) in contrast to Kirchweger et al. [19] who verified 5% of their certificates in order 23.

In order to make the paper relatively self-contained, we provide a thorough background on the KS problem (Sec. 2) and previous work (Sec. 3). Following this, we motivate our SAT encoding of the KS problem (Sec. 4), provide an explanation of orderly generation in the context of the SAT+CAS method (Sec. 5), describe our usage of an SMT solver for embeddability checking (Sec. 6), and describe how we exploit

¹We provide an easy-to-use open source repository at <https://github.com/curtisbright/PhysicsCheck> for readers to reproduce our results.

²At the SC-Square workshop in 2022, we presented a preliminary version of this work where we improved the lower bound to 23 [44]. The lower bound has also been improved to 24 independently by Kirchweger et al. [19] (see the remarks in Sec. 3). Our current work will be first presented at AAAI 2024 as a student abstract [59].

parallelism (Sec. 7). Finally, we provide a comparison of our results and runtime with previous work (Sec. 8) and describe how we generate certificates of our nonexistence results that can be checked by an independent party (Sec. 9).

2 Background

In this section, we introduce several fundamental concepts from quantum foundations such as the SPIN axiom, 010-colorability, the KS theorem, and the KS vector system. For a deeper dive, we refer the reader to the QM section in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [1]. We assume that the reader is familiar with Boolean logic and SAT solvers. While we provide a very brief overview of cube-and-conquer SAT solvers, we refer the reader to the Handbook of Satisfiability [28] for a comprehensive overview.

2.1 The KS Theorem

Informally, the KS theorem states that there is a contradiction between the SPIN axiom of standard QM and the assumption of non-contextuality. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy provides a comprehensive background to the KS theorem and stresses its importance in the foundations of QM [1]. The proof of the KS theorem crucially relies on the existence of a KS vector system (see Figure 2). More precisely, exhibiting the existence of a KS vector system proves the KS theorem, which essentially states that the unit sphere is not 010-colorable (defined below).

Spin of an Elementary Particle: Spin is an intrinsic form of angular momentum carried by elementary particles. Its existence can be inferred from the Stern–Gerlach experiment [60]. In the context of this paper, a spin-1 particle is shot through a magnetic field in a given direction and continues undisturbed, deflects up, or deflects down—corresponding to 3 possible angular momentum states, namely 0, 1, and -1 . Thus, the square of this measurement is 0 or 1.

SPIN axiom: The SPIN axiom of QM states that the squared spin components of a spin-1 particle are 1, 0, 1 in three pairwise orthogonal directions of measurement. Thus, the observable corresponding to the question “is the squared spin 0?” measured in three mutually orthogonal direction always produces *yes* in exactly one direction and *no* in the other two orthogonal directions. We use the dual of the above form in the present work, i.e., the ‘010’ convention rather than ‘101’, following Uijlen and Westerbaan [18]. The SPIN axiom follows from the postulates of QM and is experimentally verifiable [61].

KS Vector System: A KS vector system can be represented in multiple ways and we describe it as a finite set of points on a sphere. As a consequence of the SPIN axiom, the squared-spin measurements along opposite directions must yield the same outcome. Therefore, two collinear vectors are considered to be equivalent. To define a KS vector system, we first formally define a vector system and the notion of 010-colorability. For the purposes of this paper, we limit ourselves to the 3-dimensional version of the KS problem as the size of the minimum Kochen–Specker system in higher dimensions is already known [62].

Definition 1 (Vector System). *A vector system is a finite set of non-collinear points on the unit sphere in \mathbf{R}^3 .*




Fig. 2: The 31 vectors of the smallest known KS system in three dimensions (discovered by John Conway and Simon Kochen circa 1990). For simplicity, the vectors have been scaled to lie on the cube with vertices $(\pm 2, \pm 2, \pm 2)$ instead of the unit sphere.

A $\{0, 1\}$ -coloring of a vector system is an assignment of 0 and 1 to each vector in the system. The colorings of interest to us are described in the following definition.

Definition 2 (010-Colorability of Vector Systems). A vector system is *010-colorable* if there exists an assignment of 0 and 1 to each vector such that:

1. No two orthogonal vectors are assigned 1.
2. Three mutually orthogonal vectors are not all assigned 0.

Definition 3 (KS Vector System). A *Kochen–Specker (KS) vector system* is one that is not 010-colorable.

Definition 4 (Orthogonality Graph). For a vector system \mathcal{K} , define its **orthogonality graph** $G_{\mathcal{K}} = (V, E)$, where $V = \mathcal{K}$, $E = \{(v_1, v_2) : v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{K} \text{ and } v_1 \cdot v_2 = 0\}$.

Essentially, the vertices of $G_{\mathcal{K}}$ are the vectors in \mathcal{K} , and there is an edge between two vertices exactly when their corresponding vectors are orthogonal. Similarly, the notion of 010-colorability can be translated from a vector system to an orthogonality graph.

Definition 5 (010-colorability of Graphs). A graph G is **010-colorable** if there is a $\{0, 1\}$ -coloring of the vertices such that the following two conditions are satisfied simultaneously:

1. No two adjacent vertices are colored 1.
2. For each triangle, the vertices are not all colored 0.

It is not always the case that an arbitrary graph has a corresponding vector system, but if one does exist then we say that such a graph is *embeddable*.

Definition 6 (Embeddable Graph). A graph $G = (V, E)$ is **embeddable** if it is a subgraph of an orthogonality graph for some vector system.

Being embeddable implies the existence of a vector system \mathcal{K} whose vectors have a one-to-one correspondence with the vertices of G in such a way that adjacent vertices are assigned to orthogonal vectors. An example of an unembeddable graph is the cyclic graph C_4 on 4 vertices, as the orthogonality constraints force a pair of opposite vertices to be mapped to collinear vectors (which are not allowed in a vector system).

Definition 7 (KS Graph). An embeddable and non-010-colorable graph is called a **KS graph**.

Observation 1. There exists a KS vector system if and only if there exists a KS graph.

2.2 The Minimum KS Problem

The minimum KS problem is to find a KS vector system of minimum cardinality, that is, a system with the fewest number of vectors in three-dimensional space (or equivalently a KS graph with the fewest number of vertices). Every KS system has an associated KS graph, so if a KS graph with cardinality n does not exist then a lower bound on the minimum KS problem is at least $n + 1$.

2.3 Cube-and-conquer

The cube-and-conquer SAT solving paradigm was developed in [63] to solve hard combinatorial problems. The method applies two (possibly) different types of SAT solvers in two stages: First, a “cubing solver” splits a SAT instance into a large number of distinct subproblems specified by cubes—formulas of the form $x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_n$ where x_i are literals. Second, a “conquering solver” solves each subproblem under the assumption that its associated cube is true (more precisely, the conjunction of the original instance and the cube).

The cube-and-conquer method has empirically been shown to be effective at quickly solving large satisfiability problems when the cubing solver generates many cubes encoding subproblems of similar difficulty. It has since been applied to solve huge combinatorial problems such as the Boolean Pythagorean triples problem [64],

the computation of Schur number five [65], and a SAT-based resolution of Lam’s problem [45].

3 Previous Work

Over the last 55+ years, many mathematicians and physicists such as Roger Penrose, Asher Peres, and John Conway have attempted to find a minimum 3-dimensional KS system (see Table 2). The first KS system was constructed in 1967 and it contained 117 vectors [3]. A KS system with 109 vectors was found by Res Jost [43] in 1976. Peres found a KS system of size 33 in 1991, and Schütte found a KS system of size 33 in 1996. The current smallest known KS system in three dimensions contains 31 vectors and was discovered by John Conway and Simon Kochen circa 1990 (see Figure 2). All these discoveries were made analytically, without the assistance of computational methods. Recently, Pavičić and Megill [27] applied an automated generation approach to robustly generate KS systems in odd dimensions. This approach led to the discovery of many more three-dimensional KS systems.

In 2011, Arends, Ouaknine, and Wampler proved several interesting properties of KS graphs and leveraged them to computationally establish that a KS system must contain at least 18 vectors [17]. Seven years later, Uijlen and Westerbaan showed that a KS system must have at least 22 vectors [18]. This computational effort used around 300 CPU cores for three months and relied on the *nauty* software package [66] to exhaustively search for KS graphs³. Pavičić, Merlet, McKay, and Megill [62] have improved a variation of the KS problem, one in which each vector is part of a mutually orthogonal triple (or a mutually orthogonal d -tuple in d dimensions). Under this restriction, they show a KS system must have at least 30 vectors in $d = 3$ dimensions, and in $d \geq 4$ dimensions the minimum KS system has 18 vectors. However, in three dimensions the gap between the lower and upper bounds of a KS system remains significant and the minimum size remains unknown.

Another way of measuring the size of a d -dimensional KS system is the number of mutually orthogonal “contexts” (cliques of size d in the orthogonality graph). Lisoněk, Badziąg, Portillo, and Cabello [67] found a six-dimensional KS system with seven contexts and showed this is the simplest possible KS system allowing a symmetry parity proof of the KS theorem. This KS system was later experimentally used by Cañas et al. [6] to perform measurements verified to arise from a quantum system rather than a classical system.

Preliminary versions of the present work were announced at the *2022 SC-Square workshop*, as well as at the *2023 Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing*, and at *CanaDAM 2023*. At the former two venues, we presented searches for KS systems with up to 22 vectors, and at CanaDAM 2023 we presented our work that extends this to a search for KS systems with up to 23 vectors. In each case the searches were exhaustive and no KS systems were found. Thus, a KS system in three dimensions must contain at least 24 vectors.

³Unfortunately, Uijlen and Westerbaan did not report the kind of CPUs they used, thus making it difficult to compare the two results. We make our best effort to estimate their total CPU time by the wall clock time reported.

The authors recently became aware of the contemporaneous work of Kirchweger, Peitl, and Szeider [19] who completed an independent search for KS systems with up to 23 vectors with a similar approach as our technical report [68] but with a SAT modulo symmetries (SMS) solver and an alternate definition of canonicity. They do not use orderly generation, as their definition of canonical does not satisfy property (2) from Sec. 5, but otherwise the SMS approach is similar in that it combines a SAT solver with a canonical checking routine [69]. Their approach can also be used to generate proof certificates, though the certificate verification was not performed with the exception of 5% of the certificates in the order 23 search. Going forward, we would like to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the SAT+CAS and SMS approaches and how they can be improved. Having said that, one big difference is that CAS systems are not limited to symmetry breaking. As mentioned in Sec. 1.2, we used a Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) from a CAS in our SAT+CAS result for the smallest counterexample of the Williamson conjecture [55].

4 SAT Encoding of the Minimum KS Problem

As stated earlier, every KS vector system \mathcal{K} can be converted into a KS graph $G_{\mathcal{K}}$. Each vector in \mathcal{K} is assigned to a vertex in $G_{\mathcal{K}}$, so that if two vectors are orthogonal, then their corresponding vertices are connected.

We say a KS graph is minimal if the only subgraph that is also a KS graph is itself. Arends, Ouaknine, and Wampler [17] proved that a three-dimensional minimal KS graph must satisfy the following properties:

1. The graph does not contain the 4-cycle graph C_4 as a subgraph.
2. Each vertex of the graph has a minimum degree 3.
3. Every vertex is part of a 3-cycle triangle graph C_3 .

We encode these three properties and the non-010-colorability of the KS graph in conjunctive normal form (CNF), as described below. If a SAT solver produces solutions for such an encoding, then these solutions are equivalent to graphs that satisfy all of the above-mentioned four constraints.

A simple undirected graph of order n has $\binom{n}{2}$ potential edges, and we represent each edge as a Boolean variable. The edge variable e_{ij} is true exactly when the vertices i and j are connected, where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. For convenience, we let both e_{ij} and e_{ji} denote the same variable since the graphs we consider are undirected. We also use the $\binom{n}{3}$ triangle variables t_{ijk} denoting that distinct vertices i , j , and k are mutually connected. In Boolean logic this is expressed as $t_{ijk} \leftrightarrow (e_{ij} \wedge e_{ik} \wedge e_{jk})$ which in conjunctive normal form is expressed via the four clauses $\neg t_{ijk} \vee e_{ij}$, $\neg t_{ijk} \vee e_{ik}$, $\neg t_{ijk} \vee e_{jk}$, and $\neg e_{ij} \vee \neg e_{ik} \vee \neg e_{jk} \vee t_{ijk}$. Again, the indices i , j , and k of the variable t_{ijk} may be reordered arbitrarily for notational convenience.

4.1 Encoding the Squarefree Constraint

To encode the property that a Kochen–Specker graph must be squarefree, we construct encodings that prevent the existence of any squares in the graph. Observe that three squares can be formed on four vertices. Therefore, for every choice of four vertices i, j, k, l , we use clauses $\neg e_{ij} \vee \neg e_{jk} \vee \neg e_{kl} \vee \neg e_{li}$, $\neg e_{ij} \vee \neg e_{jl} \vee \neg e_{lk} \vee \neg e_{ki}$, and

$\neg e_{il} \vee \neg e_{lj} \vee \neg e_{jk} \vee \neg e_{ki}$ to encode the fact that a solution produced by the solver must be squarefree. By enumerating all possible choices of four vertices and constructing the above CNF formula, we force the graph to be squarefree. The total number of clauses used is $3 \cdot \binom{n}{4}$.

4.2 Encoding the Minimum Degree Constraint

For each vertex i , to ensure that i is connected to at least three other vertices, we take each subset S of $\{1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, n\}$ with cardinality $n-3$ and construct the clause $\bigvee_{j \in S} e_{ij}$. By enumerating over all such subsets we enforce a minimum degree of 3 on vertex i . Thus, constructing similar formulae for all vertices $1 \leq i \leq n$, enforces that any vertex in the graph has a degree of at least 3. The total number of clauses used is therefore $n \cdot \binom{n-1}{n-3} = n \cdot \binom{n-1}{2}$.

4.3 Encoding the Triangle Constraint

We encode the property that every vertex is part of a triangle as follows: for each vertex i , we require 2 other distinct vertices to form a triangle, and there are $\binom{n-1}{2}$ possible triangles containing i . At least one of those triangles must be present in the KS graph—this is encoded by the clause $\bigvee_{j,k \in S} t_{ijk}$ where S is $\{1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, n\}$ and $j < k$. Using this clause for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ ensures that every vertex is part of a triangle and hence there are n triangle clauses.

4.4 Encoding the Noncolorability Constraint

Recall that the key property of a KS graph is that it is non-010-colorable. As stated earlier, a graph is non-010-colorable if and only if for all $\{0, 1\}$ -colorings of the graph, a pair of color-1 vertices is connected or a set of three color-0 vertices are mutually connected.

For each $\{0, 1\}$ -coloring, a KS graph has a set V_0 of color-0 vertices and a set V_1 of color-1 vertices. Given a specific such coloring, the clause

$$\bigvee_{\substack{i,j \in V_1 \\ i < j}} e_{ij} \vee \bigvee_{\substack{i,j,k \in V_0 \\ i < j < k}} t_{ijk}$$

encodes that this coloring is not a 010-coloring of a graph—since either a pair of color-1 vertices is connected or three color-0 vertices are mutually connected. Note that we have to generate such a clause for all possible colorings, and conjunct them together to obtain a non-colorability constraint for graphs of order n . An assignment that satisfies such a constraint corresponds to a graph that is not 010-colorable under any possible coloring. Observe that in order n the total number of such clauses is 2^n .

Fortunately, an empirical observation allows cutting the size of the formula dramatically: $\{0, 1\}$ -colorings with more than $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ color-1 vertices are unlikely to be 010-colourings and in practice are not useful in blocking 010-colourable graphs. Put differently, by dropping the constraints with $|V_1| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ we reduce the formula size drastically (making the formula easier to solve) and the corresponding increase in the

number of satisfying assignments is small enough that these candidates can be ruled out via post-processing (Section 9). In fact, for graphs up to order 23, no additional satisfying assignments (or candidate KS graphs) were generated.

4.5 Encoding Static Isomorphism Blocking Clauses

Following [70], we use symmetry breaking constraints that enforce a lexicographical order among rows of the graph’s adjacency matrix. These small number of additional constraints enable us to *statically block* many isomorphic graphs.

Given an adjacency matrix A of a graph, we define $A_{i,j}$ as the i th row of A without columns i and j . Codish et al. prove that up to isomorphism every graph can be represented by an adjacency matrix A for which $A_{i,j}$ is lexicographically equal or smaller than $A_{j,i}$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

We express that $A_{i,j} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ is lexicographically equal or less than $A_{j,i} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n]$ using $3n - 2$ clauses and auxiliary variables a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} [71]. The clauses are $\neg x_k \vee y_k \vee \neg a_{k-1}$, $\neg x_k \vee a_k \vee \neg a_{k-1}$, and $y_k \vee a_k \vee \neg a_{k-1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n - 1$. The literal $\neg a_0$ is omitted and the clause $\neg x_n \vee y_n \vee \neg a_{n-1}$ is also included.

5 Orderly Generation via SAT+CAS

The symmetry breaking constraints described in Section 4.5 do not block all isomorphic copies of adjacency matrices. Thus, a crucial part of the PhysicsCheck pipeline is the use of a SAT+CAS combination of a SAT solver and an isomorph-free generation routine (the CAS part). The orderly isomorph-free generation approach was developed independently by Read et al. [72] and Faradzev et al. [73]. It relies on the notion of a *canonical representation* of an adjacency matrix.

Definition 8 (Canonical Graph). *An adjacency matrix M of a graph is canonical if every permutation of the graph’s vertices produces a matrix lexicographically greater than or equal to M , where the lexicographical order is defined by concatenating the above-diagonal entries of the columns of the adjacency matrix starting from the left.*

An *intermediate* matrix of A is a square upper-left submatrix of A . If A is of order n then its intermediate matrix of order $n - 1$ is said to be its *parent*, and A is said to be a *descendant* of its intermediate matrices.

The orderly generation method is based on the following two consequences of Definition 8:

- (1) Every isomorphic class of graphs only has exactly one canonical representative.
- (2) If a matrix is canonical, then its parent is also canonical.

Note that the contrapositive of the second property implies that if a matrix is not canonical, then all of its descendants are not canonical. The orderly generation process only generates canonical matrices and they are built starting from the upper-left. Therefore, any noncanonical intermediate matrix that is encountered during an orderly generation exhaustive search can be discarded, as none of its descendants will be canonical.

As described in Figure 3, in our SAT+CAS implementation, when the SAT solver finds an intermediate matrix the canonicity of this matrix is determined by a canonicity-checking routine implemented in the PhysicsCheck system. If the matrix is noncanonical,




Fig. 3: A flowchart of the orderly generation algorithm implemented as part of PhysicsCheck’s SAT+CAS architecture.

Order n	SAT+CAS	Speedup over SAT	Speedup over CAS (nauty)
17	0.02 h	8.4×	24.2×
18	0.04 h	123.8×	211.5×
19	0.22 h	883.5×	717.6×

Table 3: The solving time for SAT + orderly generation and the speedup factor provided in each order $17 \leq n \leq 19$ when compared against SAT-only and CAS-only (nauty) approaches. We did not provide the speedup factor for $n > 19$ since the SAT-only and CAS-only instances could not be solved within 12,000 minutes. These runtimes are obtained on the same machine, thus providing an apple-to-apple comparison showing that our approach is orders of magnitude faster, with the speedup increasing asymptotically as the order grows. We report the solving time of SAT + O.G. in detail in Section 8.

then a “blocking” clause is learned which removes this matrix (and all of its descendants) from the search. Otherwise, the matrix may be canonical and the SAT solver proceeds as normal.

When a matrix is noncanonical, the canonicity-checking routine also provides a “witness” of this fact (a permutation of the vertices that produces a lex-smaller adjacency matrix). We combine this process with the symmetry breaking clauses of Codish et al. that canonical matrices can be shown to satisfy [70, Def. 8].

The orderly generation technique provides a speedup that seems to increase exponentially in the order n of the KS graph—see Table 3, which provides experimental running times comparing the SAT+CAS approach against SAT-only and CAS-only approaches. These timings were run on an Intel Xeon E5-2667 CPU and the CAS compared against was the *nauty* graph generator [66] with the same configuration from [18]. More details on our experimental setup can be found in Section 8.

As described in Figure 1, we simplify the SAT instance using the SAT solver CaDiCaL [48] before solving the instance using MapleSAT [74]. As a preprocessing step, we also run the orderly generation process on graphs with up to 12 vertices and add the generated blocking clauses directly into the instance provided to CaDiCaL—this allows the simplification to incorporate some of the knowledge derived from the orderly generation process.

6 Embeddability Checking

We refer to the solutions generated by the SAT solver as *KS candidates*. Note that we have to additionally check whether a KS candidate is embeddable in order to detect whether it is a KS graph (and hence corresponds to a KS vector system). Hence, we perform an embeddability check on every KS candidate generated by the SAT+CAS solver of PhysicsCheck.

Operationally, a graph G is said to be embeddable if every pair of adjacent G -vertices can be mapped to two orthogonal vectors on the unit sphere in \mathbf{R}^3 (refer to Definition 6). Otherwise, we say that G is unembeddable.

Our embeddability checking algorithm consists of two parts. The first part is an integration of the vector assignment algorithm of [18] that finds all possible vector assignments describing the orthogonal relations between the vectors v_i in a KS candidate defined by a set of edges E . A vector assignment is a set of edge pairs $C = \{(e_{ij}, e_{ik}), (e_{lm}, e_{ln}), \dots\} \subseteq E^2$ where each pair of edges share one common vertex and each pair is disjoint from each other, meaning the same edge cannot exist in more than one pair. Each pair (e_{ij}, e_{ik}) in C can be interpreted as a cross product relationship between the vectors v_i, v_j , and v_k , since the presence of e_{ij} and e_{ik} in the KS graph means that vector v_i must be orthogonal to both v_j and v_k in any embedding of the candidate.

The second part of the algorithm applies an SMT solver to determine the satisfiability of a system of nonlinear equations generated from a particular vector assignment as described below. More precisely, an assignment generated by Uijlen and Westerman's algorithm is converted into a set of cross and dot product equations, and these equations are passed to the theorem prover Z3 [57] that solves the equations over the real numbers. We denote the vector corresponding to vertex v_i as V_i in Z3, where V_i is a 3-tuple of real numbers.

Given a specific vector assignment generated by the previous algorithm, the system of constraints is as follows:

1. If $(e_{ij}, e_{ik}) \in C$, we add the cross product constraint $V_i = V_j \times V_k$.
2. If e_{ij} is one of the edges of E that is not contained in any of the pairs of C , we add the dot product constraint $V_i \cdot V_j = 0$.
3. If $i \neq j$ then V_i must not be collinear with V_j , so we add the noncollinearity constraint $V_i \times V_j \neq \vec{0}$.

A *free vector* is one that has not been fixed as the cross product of two other vectors. Of all possible assignments, we first choose the one with the least number of free vectors, since in practice such an assignment is likely to be solved more quickly.

It is important to note that for any vector assignment, each edge of the KS graph is encoded into either constraint 1 or 2, making the encoding shorter and more efficient than the naive encoding. Constraint 3 requires two vectors to be noncollinear rather than only being nonequal since we do not enforce vectors to have unit length for reasons of efficiency. This is a harmless optimization since vectors can be projected onto the unit sphere without disturbing these constraints.

We also fix two orthogonal vectors to be the standard vectors $(1, 0, 0)$ and $(0, 1, 0)$ to cut down on the number of free variables. To check whether a graph is embeddable, we use Z3 to determine whether these nonlinear arithmetic constraints are satisfiable




Fig. 4: The only two minimal nonembeddable graphs of order 10. These are the smallest squarefree graphs that are not embeddable.

over the real numbers. Z3 applies a CDCL-style algorithm to decide the satisfiability of such systems [75]. If a solution is found, it is an assignment of vertices to vectors that satisfies all orthogonality constraints and the graph is therefore embeddable.

Embeddability checking of large graphs can be further optimized by precomputing minimal unembeddable graphs, as defined below.

Definition 9 (Minimal Unembeddable Graph). *An unembeddable graph G is said to be a **minimal unembeddable graph** if any proper subgraph of G is embeddable.*

A graph is unembeddable if and only if it contains a minimal unembeddable subgraph. To optimize embeddability checking, we precomputed all minimal unembeddable graphs of orders up to and including 12. It suffices to only consider squarefree graphs in this enumeration, as the square graph C_4 is minimally unembeddable itself. Moreover, we only consider squarefree graphs with a minimum degree of 2 or greater, as a graph containing a vertex of degree 0 or 1 is not minimally unembeddable. If it was, removing that vertex from the graph yields another unembeddable subgraph—in contradiction to the supposition the graph was minimally unembeddable.

The embeddability of most graphs can be determined using the first assignment (with the fewest free vectors) in less than 1 second. If the satisfiability of an assignment is not determined within 10 seconds, we move on to a different orthogonality assignment and attempt the satisfiability check again until we determine the embeddability of a graph. Given a KS candidate, if the candidate contains a minimal unembeddable subgraph, then the candidate must be unembeddable. Using this property significantly speeds up the embeddability checking process, since nearly all candidates contain an unembeddable subgraph of order 10, 11, or 12 (see Section 8). In Figure 4 we provide the two minimal nonembeddable graphs of order 10 which appear frequently as subgraphs of KS candidates.

7 Parallelization

In this Section, we discuss the parallelization of the SAT+CAS solving process. In our implementation, parallelization is applied by dividing the SAT instance into smaller subproblems using the cube-and-conquer approach [63]. The approach applies the lookahead solver `march_cu` [63] to partition a hard problem into many cubes and offers very efficient solving time for some combinatorial problems.

During the splitting, the lookahead solver tries to find the next variable that will split the search space the most evenly. Each splitting variable will be added to the SAT instance as a new unit clause, generating two subproblems (one with a positive unit clause and one with a negative unit clause) that can be solved in parallel.

In prior applications of the cube-and-conquer technique [49, 76], the cubing solver generates a collection of cubes before the conquering solver is invoked. Subsequently, each of these subproblems is solved using the conquering solver in parallel. However, this approach presents two primary challenges. Firstly, the generated cubes might exhibit imbalanced solving times, especially since the cubing solver does not have the ability to call the CAS to incorporate isomorph-free generation. Secondly, the proof size for each subproblem will also vary, making it difficult to allocate an appropriate amount of memory to individual cores. In `PhysicsCheck`, we implement a slight modification of traditional cube-and-conquer practices to resolve the above challenges.

In our proposed method, the cubing solver operates on the CNF instance, generating a set of cubes until a fixed number of edge variables e_{ij} in each subproblem have determined values (either through added unit clauses or unit propagation). Subsequently, each subproblem is passed to the conquering solver (MapleSAT with orderly generation) and solved in parallel. To manage the termination of each subproblem, we set a condition such that if the proof size exceeds 7 GiB, the subproblem is further cubed and solved by increasing the number of edge variables e_{ij} to determine. In addition, we investigate a slight modification of the pipeline, where we augment instances that need to be cubed further with learned clauses derived from MapleSAT, encompassing noncanonical blocking clauses, unit and binary clauses, and candidate blocking clauses. Through ablation studies on orders 20 and 21, we found that incorporating these learned clauses can yield a 20-30% speedup. However, this improvement is not reflected in Table 4 for order 23 due to the significant storage demands of numerous large CNF instances with learned clauses. Addressing this storage overhead through redesigning segments of the `PhysicsCheck` pipeline is a part of the future work. This iterative process continues until all subproblems can be solved with corresponding proofs of size less than 7 GiB. We overcome the challenges posed by varying proof sizes by implementing this slight modification and it allows us to verify all generated proof certificates with at most 4 GiB of memory allocation.




Fig. 5: A flowchart of our SAT+CAS based tool PhysicsCheck for solving the KS problem in the parallel setting. During the cubing phase, the cubing solver march_cu is used to find the next variable to branch on, while CaDiCaL is used to simplify the instance at each iteration. During the solving phase, each subproblem is solved using SAT + CAS and verified using DRAT-trim in parallel. If the proof size exceeds 7GB for a subproblem, the SAT + CAS solver would timeout and trigger the next cubing phase. This iterative process continues until all subproblems can be solved and verified with proof sizes less than 7GiB. More details on this pipeline are described in Section 7.

8 Results

8.1 Experimental Setup

The non-parallel experiments were conducted on an Intel Xeon E5-2667 CPU, while the parallel experiments were conducted on the Compute Canada cluster⁴, where each node in the cluster is built using 2 x Intel E5-2683 v4 Broadwell @ 2.1GHz CPU with 4 GB of RAM running 64-bit CentOS Linux 7, (kernel release 3.10.0-1160.88.1.el7.x86_64). For the compilation of our software, we used the g++ compiler from GCC (GNU Compiler Collection) version 9.3.0 with option `-O3`.

The Compute Canada cluster has two sub-clusters called Graham and Cedar. The Graham cluster permits up to 1000 concurrent job submissions, while Cedar allows for up to 5000, enabling extensive parallel computing capabilities as described in Section 7. The use of Graham and Cedar significantly enhanced our ability to optimize the utilization of computational resources, ensuring thorough and efficient experimental evaluations.

To ensure that the efficiency of the PhysicsCheck pipeline can be properly compared with other approaches, we describe two metrics used to measure the runtime of the PhysicsCheck pipeline, especially in the parallel settings mentioned in Section 7:

- **Total CPU time:** The total CPU time is defined as the combined CPU time logged by each component of the PhysicsCheck pipeline (march_cu, CaDiCaL, MapleSAT + CAS, and DRAT-trim). If parallelization is enabled, then the total CPU time is the sum of CPU time of all parallelized processes.
- **Elapsed Real Time:** In the parallel setting, the “elapsed real time” refers to the actual time taken to process an input instance and obtain the final result. This can be visualized as the duration required to complete the longest path in Figure 5. It’s important to note that the elapsed real time does not include any scheduling time incurred by Compute Canada for each job. This exclusion is necessary because such scheduling is external to the PhysicsCheck pipeline and can vary, making runtime comparisons inconsistent if PhysicsCheck is executed by the readers.”

8.2 Findings and Runtimes

Given the CNF file with the encoded constraints, we use the aforementioned encoding techniques combined with the SAT+CAS approach to verify all previous results on KS systems up to order 21 with a speedup factor of over four order-of-magnitudes. Moreover, we improve on the best-known lower bound for a minimum KS system (see Table 4). The computations up to order 22 were done on an Intel Xeon E5-2667 CPU and the computations in order 23 were done on Intel E5-2683 CPUs that belong to Canada’s national advanced research computing platform. All computations are measured in both the total CPU time reported by the solver and the total wall clock time. Our search in order 21 is about 35,000 times faster than the previous computational search of Uijlen and Westerbaan which was distributed on approximately 300 CPU cores and took roughly three months [18]. Furthermore, we achieve comparable runtime to Kirchweger,

⁴This research was enabled in part by support provided by Compute Ontario (<https://www.computeontario.ca/>) and the Digital Research Alliance of Canada (alliancecan.ca).

n	Candidates	Simplifying	Solving
17	1	0.01 h	0.00 h
18	0	0.01 h	0.02 h
19	8	0.07 h	0.15 h
20	147	0.06 h	1.25 h
21	2,497	0.31 h	18.36 h
22	88,282	0.44 h	360.75 h

Table 4: A summary of our results on orders $17 \leq n \leq 22$ (in hours). The second column lists the number of KS candidates generated by PhysicsCheck. The computations up to order 22 were done sequentially as described in Section 8. Order 23 is too large to run sequentially, therefore we solve order 23 using parallelization as described in Section 7. We also re-solved order 21 and 22 using parallelization for a more comprehensive comparison (Table 5).

n	Candidates	Total CPU Time	Real Elapsed Time	Total Proof Size
21	2,497	298.50 h	13.39 h	0.2 TiB
22	88,282	3,271.68 h	50.19 h	1.9 TiB
23	3,747,950	52,619.16 h	847.48 h	41.6 TiB

Table 5: The total CPU time for each component of the PhysicsCheck pipeline when running in parallel on orders $21 \leq n \leq 23$ using the parallelization technique described in Section 7. The total CPU time is computed by adding up CPU time of each component, logged by march_cu (cubing), CaDiCaL (simplification), MapleSAT + CAS (solving), and Drat-trim (verification) respectively. The real elapsed time is motivated and defined in Section 8.1.

Peitl, and Szeider’s search [19] using a SAT modulo symmetries (SMS) solver. Uijlen and Westerbaan were unable to determine the embeddability of one particular graph of order 14. Using our embeddability checking approach, this graph is quickly shown to be unembeddable. By comparing our sets of minimal unembeddable subgraphs with Uijlen and Westerbaan’s online dataset of small graphs⁵, we find our minimal unembeddable subgraphs from order 10 to 12 to be identical to theirs up to isomorphism.

We compared our Kochen–Specker candidates with Uijlen and Westerbaan’s findings, and verified their conclusion that there is no KS system with strictly less than 22 vectors. In order 20, we found four additional KS candidates that were not present in the collection of Uijlen and Westerbaan, indicating that their search missed some KS candidates. We present one of the missing graphs in Figure 6. We verified that these four additional graphs satisfy the constraints of a KS candidate and therefore would be KS systems were they embeddable, but unfortunately, they are not.

In order 23, we adjust the colorability encoding in Section 4.4 by reducing the maximum number of color-1 vertices from $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ to $\lceil n/3 \rceil$ to counter the exponential blowup in the number of clauses. As a result, the SAT solver found 5,160,001 solutions in order 23, but 1,412,051 solutions could be 010-colored (using more than $\lceil n/3 \rceil$ color-1 vertices). After these 010-colorable graphs were removed, we were left with 3,747,950 candidates and this matches the count of Kirchweger et al. [19].

⁵<https://kochen-specker.info/smallGraphs/>




Fig. 6: One of the four graphs with 20 vertices that were not present in Uijlen and Westerbaan’s enumeration. The four graphs satisfy all constraints mentioned in Section 4, but are not embeddable, and therefore do not constitute a KS system.

All KS candidates of order less than 24 are not embeddable. The embeddability check is done quickly since over 99.99% of the candidates contain one of the minimal nonembeddable subgraphs up to order 12 and this can be checked cheaply. Even though all minimal nonembeddable subgraphs up to order 14 are found by Uijlen and Westerbaan [18], only minimal unembeddable graphs up to order 12 are used in the PhysicsCheck pipeline since we computed them ourselves (see Table 6). Specifically, there is a single order-22 candidate and there are 41 order-23 candidates that do not contain a minimal nonembeddable subgraph up to order 12.

For verification purposes, we also check if those graphs contain a minimal unembeddable subgraph up to order 14 using the list computed by Uijlen and Westerbaan [18]. We found that all candidates less than order 23 contain a minimal unembeddable subgraph up to order 14, and there are two order-23 candidates that do not contain any known minimal unembeddable subgraphs (see Figure 7), corroborating the findings obtained by Kirchweger et al. [19]. The candidates that do not contain any minimal nonembeddable subgraph up to order 12 are determined to be unembeddable using Z3. Therefore, we conclude that the minimum size of a KS system is at least 24.

Another notable question to address is the existence of a complex KS vector system. Specifically, is there a KS graph that can be embedded over the complex sphere? We employ a similar embeddability verification pipeline as mentioned earlier, with the distinction that vectors now may possess complex number coordinates. We discover that each KS graph up to order 23 either contains a complex unembeddable subgraph or is determined to be unembeddable over the complex via Z3. Therefore we conclude that the minimum size for both the real and complex KS system are at least 24.

Order	Squarefree + Min. Degree 2	Min. Unembed.	Runtime
4–9	164	0	30 s
10	563	2	4.1 m
11	3,257	5	1.3 h
12	23,699	10	27 h

Table 6: Counts for the number of minimal unembeddable graphs in orders up to 12 and the computation time for the embeddability check.




Fig. 7: The only two KS candidates up to order 23 that do not contain minimal nonembeddable graphs up to and including order 14. These two graphs are determined to be unembeddable by Z3.

9 Verification of Results

In order to verify the computations produced by the SAT solver, we enabled DRAT proof logging in the SAT solver so that nonexistence certificates are generated. This makes it possible for a proof verifier to provide an independent certification of the correctness of the solver’s conclusion (assuming the correctness of the constraints in the SAT instance).

A DRAT proof consists of a trace of the clauses learned by the solver during its execution. A proof verifier checks that each clause can be derived from the previous clauses using simple rules known to be logically consistent. The CAS-derived noncanonical blocking clauses cannot be verified using the normal rules, so they were specially tagged to be verified separately. Instead, they are justified via a CAS-derived permutation that, when applied to the blocked adjacency matrix, produces a lex-smaller adjacency matrix—and therefore provides a witness that the blocked matrix is noncanonical and is safe to block.

The CAS-derived clauses in the DRAT proof were prefixed by the character ‘ τ ’ to signify they should be trusted and we modified DRAT-trim [58] to trust such clauses (following the approach first used in [77]). The trusted CAS-derived clauses were separately verified by a permutation-applying Python script that applied the witnesses produced by the CAS to verify the blocked matrices were noncanonical. Similarly, when

a KS candidate is found the solver learns a trusted clause blocking the candidate (so that the search continues until all candidates have been found). The DRAT proof ends with the empty clause which by definition is not satisfiable. If the verifier is indeed able to verify the empty clause then we can have confidence that the SAT solver’s search missed no candidates without needing to trust the solver itself.

We have certified the results up to and including order 23. The uncompressed proofs in order 22 are about 1.9 TiB in total, and 41.6 TiB in order 23. The certification in orders 22 and 23 required using cube-and-conquer (as described in Sec. 7) to ensure that each DRAT proof could be verified with at most 4 GiB of memory.

We have conducted extensive cross-verification on all the results (KS candidates) produced by the SAT solver. For example, each KS candidate is passed into a verification script implemented using the NetworkX [78] graph package to verify that they satisfy all encoded constraints (see Section 4). In the order 23 search, some 010-colorable graphs that are colorable with more than $\lceil n/3 \rceil$ color-1s were discarded during this step.

We also test the embeddability pipeline by performing a verification on all embeddable subgraphs. Specifically, if a graph is embeddable and corresponds to a set of vectors, we check that no pair of vectors in the set are collinear, and a pair of vectors are orthogonal if their corresponding vertices are connected.

The candidate counts of the previous search [18] were larger than ours because the previous search did not require each vertex to be part of a triangle. However, we cross-verified that all our KS candidates from order 17 to 21 (except for the four new candidates that we discovered) are isomorphic to the previously known candidates. The previously known candidates were discovered using the graph theory package nauty—a very different approach than ours. Our candidates were verified to be isomorphic to the previously known candidates using both SageMath [79] and NetworkX [78].

10 Conclusion

We give a computer-assisted proof showing that a Kochen–Specker vector system in three dimensions must contain at least 24 vectors. Crucially, our proof is verifiable by an independent third-party proof checker. In addition, we provide a computational speedup of over four orders of magnitude over the previously used approach of Uijlen and Westerbaan [18]. For the first time, we successfully implemented and applied the SAT+CAS paradigm along with orderly isomorph-free generation to provide a robust pipeline for problems in quantum foundations. The validity of our work is further confirmed by Kirchweger, Peitl, Szeider [19], who performed an independent search for KS systems with up to 23 vectors with a similar approach as our technical report [68] using a SAT modulo symmetries (SMS) solver. Compared to previous work, our approach is less error-prone since we use heavily-tested proof-generating SAT solvers such as MapleSAT and CaDiCaL. We verified the produced proofs using independent proof checkers, meaning our result does not rely on the correctness of MapleSAT or CaDiCaL.

Finding the minimum KS system has remained stubbornly open for over 55 years. It is not only a problem of great importance to quantum foundations, but has direct applications to various fields of quantum information processing, such as quantum

cryptographic protocols [7], zero-error classical communication [8], and dimension witnessing [9]. As a consequence, a wide variety of techniques have been developed to address this question over the past several decades. We add a novel class of techniques to this body of work.

The SAT+CAS paradigm has been successfully used to resolve a number of mathematical problems in combinatorics, number theory, and geometry that had previously remained unsolved for many decades [39, 41, 45]. With this work, we extend the reach of the SAT+CAS paradigm, for the first time, to resolving combinatorial questions in the realm of quantum foundations.

Methods

The SAT instance generator consists of multiple Python functions and each function generates a specific type of constraint as described in Section 4. The CaDiCaL SAT solver is used to simplify input instances and output a simplified instance once it reaches a certain number of conflicts set by the user. The simplified instance thus generated is passed to the MapleSAT+CAS tool either sequentially or in parallel using cube-and-conquer. We use march_cu [63] as the cubing solver to alternate between cubing and solving based on the parallelization technique described in Section 7. Finally, an embeddability checker uses Uijlen and Westerbaan’s algorithm [18] to find vector assignments of KS candidates, then applies the SMT solver Z3 to determine whether the candidates are embeddable. The proof checking was done using a modified version of DRAT-trim [58].

Code Availability

The PhysicsCheck pipeline is free software and can be accessed at <https://github.com/curtisbright/PhysicsCheck>.

References

- [1] Held, C.: The Kochen-Specker Theorem. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University (2000). <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kochen-specker/>
- [2] Bell, J.S.: Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics: Collected Papers on Quantum Philosophy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815676>
- [3] Kochen, S., Specker, E.P.: The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **17**, 59–87 (1967) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1795-4_17
- [4] Bell, J.S.: On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447–452 (1966) <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.38.447>

- [5] Conway, J., Kochen, S.: The free will theorem. *Foundations of Physics* **36**, 1441–1473 (2006) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-006-9068-6>
- [6] Cañas, G., Arias, M., Etcheverry, S., Gómez, E.S., Cabello, A., Xavier, G.B., Lima, G.: Applying the simplest Kochen-Specker set for quantum information processing. *Physical Review Letters* **113**(9) (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.113.090404>
- [7] Cabello, A., D’Ambrosio, V., Nagali, E., Sciarrino, F.: Hybrid ququart-encoded quantum cryptography protected by Kochen-Specker contextuality. *Physical Review A* **84**(3), 030302 (2011) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.030302>
- [8] Cubitt, T.S., Leung, D., Matthews, W., Winter, A.: Improving zero-error classical communication with entanglement. *Physical Review Letters* **104**(23), 230503 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.230503>
- [9] Gühne, O., Budroni, C., Cabello, A., Kleinmann, M., Larsson, J.-Å.: Bounding the quantum dimension with contextuality. *Physical Review A* **89**(6), 062107 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.89.062107>
- [10] Santos, E.: Critical analysis of the empirical tests of local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 3646–3656 (1992) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.46.3646>
- [11] Larsson, J.-Å.: A Kochen-Specker inequality. *Europhysics Letters* **58**(6), 799 (2002)
- [12] Kochen, S., Specker, E.P.: The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. In: *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics*, pp. 293–328. Springer, Dordrecht (1975). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1795-4_17
- [13] Peres, A.: Two simple proofs of the Kochen–Specker theorem. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **24**(4), 175 (1991) <https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/24/4/003>
- [14] Peres, A.: *Quantum theory: concepts and methods* **72** (1997) <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47120-5>
- [15] Bub, J.: Schütte’s tautology and the Kochen–Specker theorem. *Foundations of Physics* **26**(6), 787–806 (1996) <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02058633>
- [16] Cabello, A.: How many questions do you need to prove that unasked questions have no answers? *International Journal of Quantum Information* **04**(01), 55–61 (2006) <https://doi.org/10.1142/s021974990600161x>
- [17] Arends, F., Ouaknine, J., Wampler, C.W.: On searching for small Kochen-Specker vector systems (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25870-1_4
- [18] Uijlen, S., Westerbaan, B.: A Kochen-Specker system has at least 22 vectors. *New Generation Computing* **34**(1), 3–23 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1007/>

- [19] Kirchweger, M., Peitl, T., Szeider, S.: Co-Certificate Learning with SAT Modulo Symmetries. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, California. Main Track, to appear (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.10427>
- [20] Pavičić, M.: Arbitrarily exhaustive hypergraph generation of 4-, 6-, 8-, 16-, and 32-dimensional quantum contextual sets. *Physical Review A* **95**(6), 062121 (2017)
- [21] Budroni, C., Cabello, A., Gühne, O., Kleinmann, M., Larsson, J.-Å.: Kochen–Specker contextuality. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **94**(4), 045007 (2022)
- [22] Held, C.: Kochen–Specker theorem. In: *Compendium of Quantum Physics*, pp. 331–335. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70626-7_104
- [23] Pavičić, M.: Hypergraph contextuality. *Entropy* **21**(11), 1107 (2019)
- [24] Pavičić, M., Merlet, J.-P., McKay, B., Megill, N.D.: Kochen–Specker vectors. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **38**(7), 1577 (2005)
- [25] Pavicic, M.: Quantum contextuality. *Quantum* **7**, 953 (2023)
- [26] Peres, A.: Two simple proofs of the Kochen–Specker theorem. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **24**(4), 175–178 (1991) <https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/24/4/003>
- [27] Pavicic, M., Megill, N.D.: Automated generation of arbitrarily many Kochen–Specker and other contextual sets in odd-dimensional Hilbert spaces. *Phys. Rev. A* **106**(6), 060203–1 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.106.L060203> [arXiv:2202.08197](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08197) [quant-ph]
- [28] Biere, A., Heule, M., Maaren, H., Walsh, T. (eds.): *Handbook of Satisfiability*. IOS Press, Amsterdam (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3233/faia336>
- [29] Ganesh, V., Vardi, M.Y.: *On the Unreasonable Effectiveness of SAT Solvers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108637435.032>
- [30] Metin, H., Baarir, S., Colange, M., Kordon, F.: *CDCLSym: Introducing Effective Symmetry Breaking in SAT Solving*. Springer, New York (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89960-2_6
- [31] Bright, C., Kotsireas, I., Ganesh, V.: When satisfiability solving meets symbolic computation. *Communications of the ACM* **65**(7), 64–72 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1145/3500921>

- [32] Aloul, F.A., Sakallah, K.A., Markov, I.L.: Efficient Symmetry Breaking for Boolean Satisfiability. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA (2003). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/1630659.1630699>
- [33] Barrett, C., Fontaine, P., Tinelli, C.: The Satisfiability Modulo Theories Library (SMT-LIB). www.SMT-LIB.org (2016)
- [34] Zulkoski, E., Ganesh, V., Czarnecki, K.: MathCheck: A Math Assistant via a Combination of Computer Algebra Systems and SAT Solvers. Springer, Cham (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21401-6_41
- [35] Ábrahám, E.: Building bridges between symbolic computation and satisfiability checking (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2755996.2756636>
- [36] Kaufmann, D., Biere, A.: Improving AMulet2 for verifying multiplier circuits using SAT solving and computer algebra. International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-022-00688-6>
- [37] Mahzoon, A., Große, D., Scholl, C., Konrad, A., Drechsler, R.: Formal verification of modular multipliers using symbolic computer algebra and boolean satisfiability. In: Proceedings of the 59th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference. ACM, New York (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3489517.3530605>
- [38] Mahzoon, A., Große, D., Drechsler, R.: Combining symbolic computer algebra and boolean satisfiability for automatic debugging and fixing of complex multipliers. In: 2018 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI), pp. 351–356 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISVLSI.2018.00071>
- [39] Heule, M.J.H., Kauers, M., Seidl, M.: New ways to multiply 3×3 -matrices. Journal of Symbolic Computation **104**, 899–916 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2020.10.003>
- [40] Neiman, D., Mackey, J., Heule, M.: Tighter bounds on directed Ramsey number $R(7)$. Graphs and Combinatorics **38**(5) (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-022-02560-5>
- [41] Bright, C., Ganesh, V., Heinle, A., Kotsireas, I., Nejati, S., Czarnecki, K.: MATHCHECK2: A SAT+CAS verifier for combinatorial conjectures (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45641-6_9
- [42] England, M.: SC-Square: Overview to 2021. In: Bright, C., Davenport, J. (eds.) Proceedings of the 6th SC-Square Workshop, pp. 1–6 (2022). <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3273/invited1.pdf>
- [43] Jost, R.: Measures on the finite dimensional subspaces of a Hilbert space: remarks to a theorem by A. M. Gleason. Studies in Mathematical Physics: Essays in Honour of Valentine Bergmann, 209–228 (1976) <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400868940-011>

- [44] Li, Z., Bright, C., Ganesh, V.: An sc-square approach to the minimum koche-specker problem. In: Uncu, A.K., Barbosa, H. (eds.) Proceedings of the 7th SC-Square Workshop Co-located with the Federated Logic Conference, SC-Square@FLoC 2022, as a Part of the 11th International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning, IJCAR 2022, Haifa, Israel, August 12, 2022. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 3458, pp. 55–66. CEUR-WS.org, ??? (2022). <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3458/paper6.pdf>
- [45] Bright, C., Cheung, K.K.H., Stevens, B., Kotsireas, I., Ganesh, V.: A SAT-based Resolution of Lam’s Problem. AAAI Press, California USA (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i5.16483>
- [46] Junttila, T., Karppa, M., Kaski, P., Kohonen, J.: An adaptive prefix-assignment technique for symmetry reduction. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **99**, 21–49 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2019.03.002>
- [47] Savela, J., Oikarinen, E., Järvisalo, M.: Finding Periodic Apartments via Boolean Satisfiability and Orderly Generation. EasyChair, UK (2020). <https://doi.org/10.29007/k8jd>
- [48] Biere, A., Fazekas, K., Fleury, M., Heisinger, M.: CaDiCaL, Kissat, Paracooba, Plingeling and Treengeling Entering the SAT Competition 2020. University of Helsinki, Helsinki (2020). <http://hdl.handle.net/10138/318754>
- [49] Heule, M.J.H., Kullmann, O., Marek, V.W.: Solving very hard problems: Cube-and-conquer, a hybrid SAT solving method. In: IJCAI, vol. 17, pp. 228–245 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/683>
- [50] Crawford, J.M., Ginsberg, M.L., Luks, E.M., Roy, A.: Symmetry-breaking predicates for search problems. In: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning. KR’96, pp. 148–159. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA (1996). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3087368.3087386>
- [51] Heule, M.J.H.: Optimal symmetry breaking for graph problems. *Mathematics in Computer Science* **13**(4), 533–548 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11786-019-00397-5>
- [52] Sellmann, M., Hentenryck, P.V.: Structural Symmetry Breaking. Professional Book Center, California (2005). <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/05/Papers/1121.pdf>
- [53] Kirchweger, M., Szeider, S.: SAT Modulo Symmetries for Graph Generation. Schloss Dagstuhl, Dagstuhl, Germany (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CP.2021.34>
- [54] Kirchweger, M., Scheucher, M., Szeider, S.: A SAT Attack on Rota’s Basis Conjecture. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CP.2022.34>

[//doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.SAT.2022.4](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.SAT.2022.4)

- [55] Bright, C., Kotsireas, I., Ganesh, V.: Applying computer algebra systems with SAT solvers to the Williamson conjecture. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **100**, 187–209 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2019.07.024>
- [56] Liang, J., Ganesh, V., Poupart, P., Czarnecki, K.: Exponential recency weighted average branching heuristic for SAT solvers. AAAI Press, California (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v30i1.10439>
- [57] de Moura, L., Bjørner, N.: Z3: An efficient SMT solver (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24
- [58] Wetzler, N., Heule, M.J.H., Hunt, W.A.: DRAT-trim: Efficient checking and trimming using expressive clausal proofs. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. 8561, pp. 422–429. Springer, Cham (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09284-3_31
- [59] Zhengyu Li, V.G. Curtis Bright: A sat solver and computer algebra attack on the minimum kochen-specker problem. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2024)
- [60] Gerlach, W., Stern, O.: Der experimentelle nachweis der richtungsquantelung im magnetfeld. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **9**, 349–352 (1922) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01326983>
- [61] Huang, Y.-F., Li, C.-F., Zhang, Y.-S., Pan, J.-W., Guo, G.-C.: Experimental test of the Kochen-Specker theorem with single photons. *Physical Review Letters* **90**(25) (2003) <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.90.250401>
- [62] Pavičić, M., Merlet, J.-P., McKay, B., Megill, N.D.: Kochen–Specker vectors. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **38**(7), 1577–1592 (2005) <https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/38/7/013>
- [63] Heule, M.J.H., Kullmann, O., Wieringa, S., Biere, A.: Cube and conquer: Guiding CDCL SAT solvers by lookaheads (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-34188-5_8
- [64] Heule, M.J.H., Kullmann, O., Marek, V.W.: Solving and verifying the boolean pythagorean triples problem via cube-and-conquer. In: Creignou, N., Le Berre, D. (eds.) *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing – SAT 2016*, pp. 228–245. Springer, Cham (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-40970-2_15
- [65] Heule, M.: Schur number five. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32. AAAI Press, California (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v32i1.12209>

- [66] McKay, B.D., Piperno, A.: Practical graph isomorphism, II. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **60**, 94–112 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.09.003>
- [67] Lisoněk, P., Badziąg, P., Portillo, J.R., Cabello, A.: Kochen-Specker set with seven contexts. *Physical Review A* **89**(4) (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.89.042101>
- [68] Li, Z., Bright, C., Ganesh, V.: A SAT Solver + Computer Algebra Attack on the Minimum Kochen–Specker Problem. Technical report, <https://cs.curtisbright.com/reports/nmi-ks-preprint.pdf> (2022)
- [69] Kirchweger, M., Scheucher, M., Szeider, S.: SAT-based generation of planar graphs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany (2023). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.SAT.2023.14>
- [70] Codish, M., Miller, A., Prosser, P., Stuckey, P.J.: Constraints for symmetry breaking in graph representation. *Constraints* **24**(1), 1–24 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10601-018-9294-5>
- [71] Knuth, D.E.: *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 4, Fascicle 6: Satisfiability*. Addison-Wesley Professional, Massachusetts (2015). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.5555/2898950>
- [72] Read, R.C.: *Every one a winner or how to avoid isomorphism search when cataloguing combinatorial configurations*. Elsevier, Amsterdam (1978). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060\(08\)70325-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060(08)70325-X)
- [73] Faradžev, I.A.: *Constructive enumeration of combinatorial objects* (1978)
- [74] Liang, J.H., Ganesh, V., Poupart, P., Czarnecki, K.: Learning Rate Based Branching Heuristic for SAT Solvers (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-40970-2_9
- [75] Jovanović, D., de Moura, L.: Solving non-linear arithmetic (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31365-3_27
- [76] Heule, M.J.H., Kullmann, O., Marek, V.W.: Solving and verifying the boolean Pythagorean triples problem via cube-and-conquer. In: *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, pp. 228–245. Springer, Cham (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-40970-2_15
- [77] Bright, C., Cheung, K.K.H., Stevens, B., Kotsireas, I., Ganesh, V.: Nonexistence certificates for ovals in a projective plane of order ten. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. 12126, pp. 97–111. Springer, Cham (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48966-3_8
- [78] Hagberg, A.A., Schult, D.A., Swart, P.J.: *Exploring Network Structure, Dynamics,*

and Function using NetworkX, Pasadena, CA USA (2008). <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/960616>

- [79] The Sage Developers: SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.6). (2022). <https://www.sagemath.org>