

ARTICLE

IntSat: Integer Linear Programming by Conflict-Driven Constraint-Learning

Robert Nieuwenhuis^a and Albert Oliveras^a and Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell^a

Barcelogic and Department of Computer Science, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled February 27, 2024

ABSTRACT

State-of-the-art SAT solvers are nowadays able to handle huge real-world instances. The key to this success is the so-called *Conflict-Driven Clause-Learning (CDCL)* scheme, which encompasses a number of techniques that exploit the conflicts that are encountered during the search for a solution. In this article we extend these techniques to Integer Linear Programming (ILP), where variables may take general integer values instead of purely binary ones, constraints are more expressive than just propositional clauses, and there may be an objective function to optimise. We explain how these methods can be implemented efficiently, and discuss possible improvements. Our work is backed with a basic implementation that shows that, even in this far less mature stage, our techniques are already a useful complement to the state of the art in ILP solving.

KEYWORDS

Integer Linear Programming; SAT Solving; Conflict-Driven Clause-Learning

AMS CLASSIFICATION

90C10

1. Introduction

Since the early days of computer science, propositional logic has been recognised as one of its cornerstones. A fundamental result in the theory of computing is the proof by Cook that SAT, that is, the problem of deciding whether a propositional formula is satisfiable or not, is NP-complete [20]. It was soon realised that, in consonance with this fact, a wide range of combinatorial problems could be expressed in SAT [42]. Hence, due to its potential practical implications, since then an extensive research has been underway of how SAT could be solved in an automated and efficient way [11]. As a result of this work, particularly intensive in the last two decades [9, 27, 32, 34, 37–39, 45, 56, 61], now SAT solvers routinely handle formulas coming from real-world applications with hundreds of thousands of variables and millions of clauses.

State-of-the-art SAT solvers are essentially based on the *Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland (DPLL)* procedure [22, 23]. In a nutshell, DPLL is a backtracking algorithm that searches for a (feasible) solution by intelligently traversing the search space. At each step a *decision* is made: a variable is selected for branching and is assigned a value either 0 or 1. Then the consequences of that decision are *propagated*, and variables that are forced to a value are detected. Each time a falsified clause (i.e., a *conflict*) is identified, backtracking is executed. Backtracking consists in undoing all assignments up to the last decision and forcing the branching variable to take the other value. When both values of the branching variable have already been tried without success, then the previous decision is backtracked. If the decision is the first one, and therefore there is no previous decision, then the formula can be declared unsatisfiable, i.e. infeasible.

This simple description is, however, far from the current implementations of SAT solvers. What accounts for their success is the so-called *Conflict-Driven Clause-Learning (CDCL)* scheme, which enhances DPLL with a number of techniques:

- *conflict analysis* and *backjumping* (i.e., non-chronological backtracking), which improves (chronological) backtracking [45];
- *learning* (that is, addition) of new clauses generated from conflicts [25];
- variable decision heuristics that select the most active variables in recent conflicts, like the *VSIDS* heuristic [47];
- value decision heuristics that select promising values for the chosen decision variable, such as the *last phase* strategy [54];
- data structures such as the *2-watched literal scheme* [47] for efficiently identifying propagations and conflicts;
- *restarts* [33];
- *clause cleanups* that periodically delete the least useful learnt clauses, e.g. based on their activity in conflicts [32].

Since the problems of Integer Linear Programming (ILP) and SAT are both NP-complete, they reduce one another. Thus a natural question is how solvers of the two areas compare. It turns out that, in spite of the maturity of the ILP solving technology and its astonishing achievements [12], for problem instances of a more combinatorial (as opposed to numerical) sort, SAT solvers with an encoding into propositional clauses can outperform even the best commercial ILP solvers run on a –far more compact– ILP formulation [4, 17].

The different nature of the algorithms underlying ILP solvers (based on branch-and-cut and the simplex method) and SAT solvers motivate this work, in which we aim at pushing the techniques of CDCL beyond SAT, while handling ILP constraints natively at all levels.

To do so, the following issues need to be addressed:

- variables are no longer binary, and may take general integer values. Moreover, the domains of values may be bounded (the variable can only take a value within an interval) or unbounded (the variable may take any value in \mathbb{Z}). Should we do case analysis by taking concrete values of variables or based on lower and upper

bounds? Also, the notion of decision has to be determined: does a decision fix a variable to a value, or does it split its domain? The value decision heuristics have to be defined as well. Finally, unbounded domains pose a problem with the termination of the search algorithm.

- constraints are not just clauses any more, and can be general linear inequalities. Hence the propagation mechanism (be it of variable values or of bounds) has to be redefined, as well as the algorithms and data structures for efficiently detecting when a propagation can be triggered or a conflict has arisen. Unlike in SAT, attention has to be paid to arithmetic and numerical problems, so as to ensure the soundness of the procedures. Most importantly, conflict analysis has to be generalised in such a way that backjumping and learning are possible.
- problems are no longer purely feasibility checks, and may require to optimise an objective function. In addition to enabling the search algorithm to optimise, for practical reasons the information provided by the objective function has to be integrated into the decision heuristics.

Building on top of the early ideas in [49], here we present the **IntSat** method, a family of new different conflict-driven *constraint*-learning algorithms for ILP. We illustrate the method with two algorithms, which differ in the way in which the aforementioned issues on extending conflict analysis and learning are resolved. We provide detailed explanations of how these algorithms can be implemented efficiently and also report an extensive up-to-date experimental analysis, comparing a basic implementation of **IntSat** against the best commercial (simplex-based) ILP solvers. The results show that, even in this far less mature stage, our techniques already are a useful complement to the state of the art in ILP solving, finding (good) solutions faster in a significant number of instances, especially in those of a more combinatorial (as opposed to numerical) nature.

This paper is structured as follows¹. Preliminary background on SAT and ILP is reviewed in Section 2. Section 3 introduces our two **IntSat** algorithms that generalise CDCL from SAT to ILP. After presenting the main hindrance in this generalisation (Section 3.1) and reviewing basic properties of propagation in ILP (Section 3.2), the common part of these algorithms is exposed (Section 3.3). Then their differences are described in detail (Sections 3.4 and 3.5, respectively). A discussion on extensions (Section 3.6) concludes Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to implementation issues, while in Section 5 the results of an experimental evaluation are reported. In Section 6, ideas for future research are outlined. Finally, Section 7 completes this article with an account of related work and conclusions.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Propositional Satisfiability

Let X be a finite set of *propositional variables*. If $x \in X$, then x and \bar{x} are *literals* of X . The *negation* of a literal l , written \bar{l} , denotes \bar{x} if l is x , and x if l is \bar{x} . A *clause* is a disjunction of literals $l_1 \vee \dots \vee l_n$. A (CNF) *formula* is a conjunction of one or more

¹**Note to the reviewers:** the proofs of the appendix could be left out of the final published version (unless you suggest otherwise).

clauses $C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$. When it leads to no ambiguities, we will sometimes consider a clause as the set of its literals, and a formula as the set of its clauses.

A (partial truth) *assignment* A is a set of literals such that $\{x, \bar{x}\} \subseteq A$ for no x . A literal l is *true* in A if $l \in A$, is *false* in A if $\bar{l} \in A$, and is *undefined* in A otherwise. A clause C is true in A if at least one of its literals is true in A , is false or a *conflict* if all of its literals are false in A , and is undefined otherwise. A formula F is true in A if all of its clauses are true in A . In that case, we say that A is a *solution* to F , and that F is *satisfied* by A . The problem of *SAT* consists in deciding, given a formula F , whether F is satisfiable, that is, there exists a solution to F . The systems that solve SAT are called *SAT solvers*.

The core of a *Conflict-Driven Clause-Learning (CDCL)* SAT solver is described in the following algorithm, where A is seen as an (initially empty) stack:

1. **Propagate:** while possible and no conflict appears, if, for some clause $l \vee C$, C is false in A and l is undefined, push l onto A , associating to l the *reason clause* C .
2. **if** there is no conflict
 - if** all variables are defined in A , output ‘solution A ’ and halt.
 - else** **Decide:** push an undefined literal l , marked as a *decision*, and go to step 1.
3. **if** there is a conflict and A contains no decisions, output ‘unsatisfiable’ and halt.
4. **if** there is a conflict and A contains some decision, use a clause data structure C , the *conflicting clause*. Initially, let C be any conflict.
 - 4.1. **Conflict analysis:**

Invariant: C is false in A , that is, if $l \in C$ then $\bar{l} \in A$.

Let l be the literal of C whose negation is topmost in A , and D be the reason clause of \bar{l} . Replace C by $(C \setminus \{l\}) \vee D$. Repeat this until there is only one literal l_{top} in C such that l_{top} is, or is above, A ’s topmost decision.
 - 4.2. **Backjump:** pop literals from A until either there are no decisions in A or, for some l in C with $l \neq l_{top}$, there are no decisions above \bar{l} in A .
 - 4.3. **Learn:** add the final C as a new clause, and go to 1 (where C propagates l_{top}).

The literal l_{top} at step 4 is called the *first implication point (1UIP)*, whence the conflict analysis above is said to follow a *1UIP scheme* [61].

Implicitly in this description of the algorithm, conflict analysis uses *resolution* [57] to inspect back the cause of a conflict. Given a variable x and two clauses of the form $x \vee A$ and $\bar{x} \vee B$ (the *premises*), the resolution rule infers a new clause $A \vee B$ (the *resolvent*). Graphically:

$$\frac{x \vee A \quad \bar{x} \vee B}{A \vee B}$$

Back to the algorithm, when the current conflicting clause C is replaced by $(C \setminus \{l\}) \vee D$, where l is the literal of C whose negation is topmost in A and D is the reason clause of \bar{l} , in fact resolution is being applied between C (viewed as $l \vee (C \setminus \{l\})$) and $\bar{l} \vee D$.

Example 2.1. Let us assume we have clauses $\bar{x}_1 \vee x_2$, $\bar{x}_3 \vee x_4$, $\bar{x}_5 \vee x_6$, $\bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6 \vee x_7$ and $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_7$. Since there is nothing to propagate at the beginning, we decide to make x_1 true and push it onto the stack of the assignment. Now due to $\bar{x}_1 \vee x_2$, literal x_2 is propagated and pushed onto the stack with reason clause \bar{x}_1 . Again there is nothing to propagate, so we decide to make x_3 true. Due to $\bar{x}_3 \vee x_4$, literal x_4 is propagated and pushed onto the stack with reason clause \bar{x}_3 . Yet again there is nothing else to propagate, so we decide to make x_5 true. Due to $\bar{x}_5 \vee x_6$, literal x_6 is propagated and pushed onto the stack with reason clause \bar{x}_5 . And in turn, due to $\bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6 \vee x_7$, literal x_7 is propagated and pushed onto the stack with reason clause $\bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6$. Now clause $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_7$ has become false under the current assignment $(x_1^d, x_2, x_3^d, x_4, x_5^d, x_6, x_7)$, where decisions are marked with a superscript d .

- **Conflict analysis:** The conflicting clause C is initially $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_7$. In the first iteration of conflict analysis, we replace \bar{x}_7 in C by the reason clause $\bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6$ of x_7 , which yields $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6$ as the new C . In the second iteration we similarly replace \bar{x}_6 in C , now $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6$, with the reason clause \bar{x}_5 of x_6 , which gives $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5$. Alternatively, since as explained above for each propagated literal l with reason clause D we are applying resolution between $l \vee D$ and C , the sequence of these two steps can be represented graphically as follows:

$$\frac{\mathbf{x_6} \vee \bar{x}_5 \quad \frac{\mathbf{x_7} \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6 \quad \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_7}{\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6}}{\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5}$$

where the variable that is eliminated at each step is highlighted in bold face, and the clauses on the right are the conflicting clauses, namely $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_7$, $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6$ and $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5$. Note that each of these clauses is false under the current assignment, as ensured by the invariant.

Now there is a single literal l_{top} in C (literal \bar{x}_5) such that $\overline{l_{top}}$ is, or is above, the stack's topmost decision (in this case, x_5). Therefore we backjump.

- **Backjump:** We pop literals from the stack until either (i) there are no decisions in the stack, or (ii) for some l in C with $l \neq l_{top}$, there are no decisions above \bar{l} in the stack. In this case (ii) applies with literal \bar{x}_2 as l , and so we pop the literals from x_7 down to x_3 , leaving the stack as (x_1^d, x_2) . Note in particular that the decision x_3 and its propagation x_4 , which are irrelevant to the conflict, are *jumped* over. The intuition is that, if we had had the clause $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5$ in the clause database at the time we decided x_3 , we would have propagated \bar{x}_5 before any decision. Precisely, the following *Learn* step will allow making this propagation.
- **Learn:** The final C , namely $\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5$, is learned and added to the clause database.

Back in step 1, we can finally propagate \bar{x}_5 with the learned clause, leading to the assignment (x_1^d, x_2, \bar{x}_5) . Now we decide x_4 , and all clauses are satisfied. The remaining variables can now be decided arbitrarily, and once all of them are defined, since there is no conflict the algorithm terminates with a solution.

2.2. Integer Linear Programming

Let X be a finite set of *integer variables* $\{x_1 \dots x_n\}$. An (*integer linear*) *constraint* over X is an expression of the form $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ where, for all i in $0 \dots n$, the *coefficients* a_i are integers (some of which may be zero). Each of the terms a_ix_i is called a *monomial* of the constraint. In what follows, variables are always denoted by (possibly sub-indexed or primed) lowercase x, y, z , and coefficients by a, b, c , respectively.

A constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ is said to be *normalised* if $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$. For any constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$, the constraint $a_1/d x_1 + \dots + a_n/d x_n \preceq \lfloor a_0/d \rfloor$, where $d = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, is an equivalent normalised constraint. Hence in what follows we assume all constraints to be eagerly normalised.

An *integer linear program (ILP)* over X is a set S of integer linear constraints over X , called the *constraints* of the ILP, together with a linear expression of the form $c(x_1, \dots, x_n) = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n$, called the *objective function*. A *solution* to a set of constraints S over X (and, by extension, to an ILP whose set of constraints is S) is a function $sol: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ that *satisfies* every constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ in S , that is, $a_1 \cdot sol(x_1) + \dots + a_n \cdot sol(x_n) \leq_{\mathbb{Z}} a_0$. If a solution to S exists, then S (and again by extension, any ILP whose set of constraints is S) is *feasible*, otherwise it is said to be *infeasible*. Without loss of generality, we will assume that the objective function in an ILP is to be minimised: an *optimal solution* to an ILP with constraints S and objective function c is a solution sol to S such that $c(sol) \leq c(sol')$ for any solution sol' to S . The problem of *Integer Linear Programming (ILP)* consists in finding an optimal solution to a given integer linear program. When there is no ambiguity, we will use ILP both for ‘integer linear program’ as well as ‘integer linear programming’.

A *bound* is a one-variable constraint $a_1x \preceq a_0$. Any bound can equivalently be written either as a *lower bound* $a \preceq x$ or as an *upper bound* $x \preceq a$. A variable x is *binary* in an ILP if its set of constraints S contains the lower bound $0 \preceq x$ and the upper bound $x \preceq 1$, so that effectively x can only take values either 0 or 1.

Given a set of constraints S and a constraint C , we write $S \models C$ when any solution to S is also a solution to C . The definition of \models is lifted to sets of constraints on the right-hand side in the natural way.

From constraints C_1 of the form $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ and C_2 of the form $b_1x_1 + \dots + b_nx_n \preceq b_0$ (called the *premises*), and natural numbers c and d , the *cut rule* derives a new constraint C_3 of the form $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n \preceq c_0$ (called the *cut*), where $c_i = ca_i + db_i$ for i in $0 \dots n$. The cut rule is correct in the sense that it only infers consequences of the premises: $\{C_1, C_2\} \models C_3$. If for some $i > 0$ we have $c_i = 0$, then we say that x_i is *eliminated* in this cut. Note that if $a_ib_i < 0$, then one can always choose c and d such that x_i is eliminated. See [18, 35, 58] for further discussions and references about Chvátal-Gomory cuts and their applications to solving ILP’s.

Example 2.2. Let us see an example of application of the cut rule to the constraints $4x + 4y + 2z \preceq 3$ and $-10x + y - z \preceq 0$. By multiplying the former by 5 and the latter by 2 and adding them up, we obtain the cut $22y + 8z \preceq 15$, in which variable x has been eliminated. Note that the resulting constraint $22y + 8z \preceq 15$ can be normalised by dividing by $\gcd(22, 8) = 2$, resulting into $11y + 4z \preceq 15/2$ and, by rounding down, $11y + 4z \preceq 7$.

3. IntSat

It is well known that the problem of SAT can be viewed as a particular case of ILP in which there is no objective function, all variables are binary and each constraint is of the form $x_1 + \dots + x_m - y_1 \dots - y_n > -n$, which is an equivalent formulation of a clause $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_m \vee \overline{y_1} \vee \dots \vee \overline{y_n}$ using that $\overline{y_j} = 1 - y_j$. This observation has been used in previous work as a starting point for the generalisation of CDCL to ILP [41]. However, a major obstacle that researchers have encountered in this extension is the so-called *rounding problem*, to which we devote Section 3.1.

3.1. The Rounding Problem

In order to describe the rounding problem, first of all let us review how it has been typically attempted to generalise CDCL from SAT to ILP.

In ILP, variables are no longer restricted to be just binary and may be general integer. As a consequence, the notion of literal of SAT needs to be adapted. In the ILP context, *bounds* may play the role of literals. Namely, lower bounds of the form $a \preceq x$ correspond to positive literals, whereas upper bounds $x \preceq a$ correspond to negative literals. Note that, if x is a binary variable, and therefore the bounds $0 \preceq x$ and $x \preceq 1$ must always hold, then $1 \preceq x$ forces x to take value 1 (true), while $x \preceq 0$ forces x to take value 0 (false).

Moreover, in ILP constraints can be arbitrary integer linear constraints instead of purely clauses. Therefore the propagation mechanism has to be extended. In this setting, (Boolean) propagation can be replaced with *bound propagation*. For the sake of simplicity let us define it by example, and leave a formal presentation for Section 3.2.

Example 3.1. Let us see an example of bound propagation. By transitivity, from the lower bound $1 \preceq x$, the upper bound $y \preceq 2$, and the constraint $x - 2y + 5z \preceq 5$, we infer that $1 - 4 + 5z \preceq 5$, as $y \preceq 2$ implies $-4 \preceq -2y$. Simplifying we obtain $5z \preceq 8$, and hence $z \preceq 8/5$, and by rounding down, $z \preceq 1$.

Now that it has been outlined how to propagate bounds, in order to generalise the CDCL algorithm it remains to be seen how to trace back the propagations when a conflict occurs. To that end, one can see the propositional resolution rule used in SAT as a means to eliminate a variable from a conjunction of two clauses. When considering integer linear constraints, a natural candidate for playing the same role is the *cut rule*. However, as the following example illustrates, mimicking the conflict analysis of CDCL SAT solvers does not yield the expected result.

Example 3.2. Assume we have two constraints $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$ and $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$. Let us first take the decision $0 \preceq x$, which propagates nothing. Then we take another decision $1 \preceq y$, which due to $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$ propagates $z \preceq 0$ (since $0 + 1 + 2z \preceq 2$, we get $2z \preceq 1$, that is $z \preceq 1/2$, and by rounding down finally $z \preceq 0$). Then $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$ becomes a *conflict*: it is false in the current assignment $A = (0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0)$, as $0 \preceq x$, $1 \preceq y$ and $z \preceq 0$ imply that $1 \preceq x + y - 2z$.

Now let us attempt a straightforward generalisation of conflict analysis: as $z \preceq 0$ is

the topmost (last propagated) bound, we apply a cut inference eliminating z between $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$, the *reason constraint* of the propagation, and $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$, which is now a *conflicting constraint* playing the analogous role of a conflicting clause. By adding these two constraints we obtain a new constraint $2x + 2y \preceq 2$, or equivalently, $x + y \preceq 1$. Then the conflict analysis is over because there is only one bound in A that is relevant for the conflicting constraint and which is at, or above, the last decision, namely $1 \preceq y$. But unfortunately at this point the conflicting constraint, that is $x + y \preceq 1$, is no longer false in A , breaking (what should be) the invariant. Hence, from $0 \preceq x$ it only propagates $y \preceq 1$, which is weaker than $y \preceq 0$, the negation of the previous decision $1 \preceq y$, which was expected to reverse now. As a consequence, the constraint that should be learnt is *too weak to justify a backjump*. This problem is due to the rounding that takes place when propagating z ²).

The rounding problem illustrated in Example 3.2 was addressed in an ingenious way by Jovanović and de Moura in their *CutSat* procedure [41]. In this work, a decision can only make a variable *equal* to its current lower or upper bound; i.e., if x is the decision variable and its current domain is determined by the lower bound $l \preceq x$ and the upper bound $x \preceq u$, then the next decision has to be either $x \preceq l$ (thus fixing the value of x to l) or $u \preceq x$ (fixing the value of x to u). Although, on the one hand, this restrains the decision heuristics significantly, on the other it is necessary so as to compute, at each conflict caused by bound propagations with rounding, *tightly propagating* constraints that also explain the same propagations but *without* rounding. Conflict analysis can then be performed using these tightly propagating constraints only, and thanks to that, the resulting constraint is guaranteed to justify a backjump, as in the SAT case. Nonetheless, there is yet another toll to be paid: the termination condition of the conflict analysis in [41] requires eliminating the variables of the propagated bounds until a decision bound allows one to stop. In SAT, the analogous condition would require that, unlike in the 1UIP learning scheme, the literal l_{top} in the CDCL algorithm should be a decision. The resulting learning scheme is known as the AllUIP scheme [61], and is well-known to perform very poorly, significantly worse than the 1UIP one.

In what follows, we will present *IntSat*, a new family of algorithms that extend the conflict-driven *clause-learning* scheme from SAT to a conflict-driven *constraint-learning* scheme³ in ILP with an alternative solution to the rounding problem. However, unlike [41], these algorithms admit arbitrary new bounds as decisions, and guide the search exactly as with the 1UIP approach in SAT solving.

3.2. Bound Propagation

Here we formally define bound propagation, which is a key subprocedure in the *IntSat* CDCL algorithms that will be introduced later on.

Let A be a set of bounds. We call two bounds $a \preceq x$ and $x \preceq a'$ *contradictory* if $a > a'$. A bound $a \preceq x$ is *redundant* with another bound $a' \preceq x$ if $a' \geq a$. Similarly, $x \preceq a$ is redundant with another bound $x \preceq a'$ if $a' \leq a$. If bound B is redundant with another bound B' , then we say B' is *stronger* than B . By $\min_A(a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n)$ and $\max_A(a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n)$ we represent respectively the minimum and the maximum

²See Lemma 3.7 in Section 3.2 for a formal justification.

³We will be using the same acronym CDCL for both when there is no ambiguity.

values of the expression $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n$ subject to the condition that x_1, \dots, x_n satisfy the bounds in A .

Definition 3.3 (False constraint, conflict). Let A be a set of bounds. If C is a constraint such that $\{C\} \cup A$ has no solution, then we say that C is *false* or a *conflict* in A .

The following lemma provides us with a characterisation of conflicts:

Lemma 3.4. Let C be a constraint of the form $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ and A be a set of pairwise non-contradictory bounds. The following hold:

- (1) Let lb_i be the strongest lower bound of x_i in A (or $-\infty$ if there are none), and let ub_i be the strongest upper bound of x_i in A (or $+\infty$ if there are none). Then

$$\min_A(a_ix_i) = \begin{cases} a_i \cdot lb_i & \text{if } a_i > 0, \\ a_i \cdot ub_i & \text{if } a_i < 0. \end{cases}$$

- (2) C is false in A if and only if

$$\sum_i \min_A(a_ix_i) > a_0.$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

If C is a constraint and R is a set of bounds, then C and R can be used to propagate new bounds as the following lemma indicates:

Lemma 3.5. Let C be a constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ and R a set of pairwise non-contradictory bounds. Let x_j be a variable and define $e_j = (a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_ix_i))/a_j$. The following hold:

- (1) If $a_j > 0$ then $\{C\} \cup R \models x_j \preceq \lfloor e_j \rfloor$.
(2) If $a_j < 0$ then $\{C\} \cup R \models \lceil e_j \rceil \preceq x_j$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

The previous lemma motivates the following definition, which presents the core concept in this subsection:

Definition 3.6 (Bound propagation). Let C , R , x_j and e_j be as in Lemma 3.5. We say that C and R propagate bound $x_j \preceq \lfloor e_j \rfloor$ if $a_j > 0$, or bound $\lceil e_j \rceil \preceq x_j$ if $a_j < 0$.

Finally, we conclude this subsection with a lemma that implies that the problem exposed in Section 3.1 – that is, that the constraint to be learnt may be too weak to explain a backjump, is indeed due to rounding (hence the name *rounding problem*).

Namely, we will prove that if a constraint C_2 propagates a bound and constraint C_1 is false with that bound, and the cut rule is applied between the two without rounding, then the new constraint C_3 that is obtained is still false. As a consequence, the falsity of the conflicting constraint in conflict analysis is kept invariant, and therefore in the absence of rounding in bound propagation the rounding problem cannot arise.

Lemma 3.7. *Let R be a set of non-contradictory bounds, C_1 be a constraint of the form $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$, and C_2 a constraint of the form $b_1x_1 + \dots + b_nx_n \preceq b_0$. Let us assume $a_j < 0$, $b_j > 0$ and that C_1 is false in $R \cup \{x_j \preceq e_j\}$, where $e_j = (b_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(b_ix_i))/b_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let us also assume that $x_j \preceq e_j$ is the strongest upper bound of x_j in $R \cup \{x_j \preceq e_j\}$. Let C_3 be the result of applying a cut inference between C_1 and C_2 eliminating x_j :*

$$C_3 : (a_1b_j - a_jb_1)x_1 + \dots + (a_nb_j - a_jb_n)x_n \preceq a_0b_j - a_jb_0 .$$

Then C_3 is false in R .

Proof. See Appendix A. □

The symmetric version of the lemma when $a_j > 0, b_j < 0$ and the propagated bound is a lower bound can be stated and proved analogously.

3.3. The Core IntSat Algorithm

As outlined in Section 1, in this work we introduce two new CDCL algorithms for ILP. Although they are different in the way conflict analysis, backjumping and learning are performed, they share the same structure. This common part, which will henceforth be referred to as *IntSat*, is presented in this section. In the description below, this *core* algorithm just decides the existence of integer solutions, i.e., it considers feasibility problems only. Optimisation, as well as other extensions, will be discussed later on in Section 3.6.

First of all, let us introduce the following definitions. Let A be a sequence of bounds over a set of variables X . A variable x is *defined to a* in A if $a \preceq x \in A$ and $x \preceq a \in A$ for some a . Note that if all variables of X are defined and there are no contradictory bounds in A then A can be seen as a total assignment $A: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. A bound B is *fresh* in A if there is no bound $B' \in A$ such that B is redundant or contradictory with B' .

The main idea of the core *IntSat* algorithm is as follows. The assignment A , implemented as a stack of bounds, is initially empty. Bound propagation is applied exhaustively while no conflict is detected. Every time a constraint RC and a set of bounds RS with $RS \subseteq A$ propagate a new bound B , this bound is pushed onto A , associating RC and RS to B as the *reason constraint* and the *reason set* of B , respectively. As in the SAT case, when no more propagations are possible and there is no conflict, if all variables are defined then the assignment determines a solution and the algorithm terminates, otherwise a decision is made. On the other hand, when a conflict arises, if there are no decisions to be undone we can conclude that there is no solution, otherwise a subprocedure performs conflict analysis, backjumping and learning. As a result, new constraints may be added to the set of constraints, and the assignment undoes

the last decision (and possibly more) and is extended with a new bound. Then the process is repeated with a new round of propagations.

More succinctly, the following pseudo-code describes the core IntSat algorithm for finding a solution to a set of constraints S :

- (1) **Propagate**: while possible and no conflict appears, if RC and RS propagate some fresh bound B , for some constraint RC and set of bounds RS with $RS \subseteq A$, then push B onto A , associating to B the *reason constraint* RC and the *reason set* RS .
- (2) **if** there is no conflict
 if all variables are defined in A , output ‘solution A ’ and halt.
 else **Decide**: push a fresh bound B , marked as a *decision*, and go to step 1.
- (3) **if** there is a conflict and A contains no decisions,
 output ‘infeasible’ and halt.
- (4) **if** there is a conflict and A contains some decision,
 Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn: compute a new assignment A' and a set T of new constraints to be added to the set of constraints S .
 Replace A by A' , add the constraints in T to S , and go to step 1.

Unlike in our exposition of CDCL for SAT in Section 2.1, in the above algorithm conflict analysis, backjumping and learning have been unified as a single subprocedure **Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn**. This subroutine is not developed explicitly until Sections 3.4 and 3.5, which will present two different ways in which it can be concreted, although many possibilities exist. The only requirements that should be satisfied are summarised in the following definition:

Definition 3.8. Procedure **Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn** with input a set of constraints S and an assignment A such that S contains a conflict with A and A contains a decision, and output a set of constraints T and an assignment A' , is *valid* if:

- (1) It terminates: the output is computed in finite time.
- (2) Any constraint $C \in T$ is a consequence of S , that is, $S \models C$.
- (3) The assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound, and A' is of the form $N B$, where B is a fresh bound in N .
- (4) Bound B has a *reason set* $RS \subseteq N$ such that $S \cup RS \models B$.
- (5) If bound B has a *reason constraint* RC then $S \models RC$.

Non-decision bounds obtained with bound propagation have both a reason set and a reason constraint. On the contrary, a non-decision bound B produced by the procedure **Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn** always has a reason set RS , but may have a reason constraint RC or not. Moreover, even if it is defined, this reason constraint is *only* required to be a consequence of S . Although for practical considerations it may be convenient that RC propagates B , the correctness of the algorithm does not depend on this. Finally also note that, on the other hand, decision bounds never have either a reason set or a reason constraint.

Example 3.9. Consider the following initial constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0: & -x - y - z \preceq -2 \\
C_1: & x + y \preceq 1 \\
C_2: & x + z \preceq 1 \\
C_3: & y + z \preceq 1 \\
C_4: & x \preceq 1 \\
C_5: & y \preceq 1 \\
C_6: & z \preceq 3
\end{aligned}$$

By adding the initial bounds to the empty stack and propagating exhaustively, the stack depicted below is obtained:

$0 \preceq z$	$\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 1\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq y$	$\{x \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq x$	$\{y \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$x \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_4
$y \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_5
$z \preceq 3$	\emptyset	C_6
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

Now no more new propagations can be made and there is no conflict. Since for example variable x is not defined yet, let us decide $1 \preceq x$. This propagates $y \preceq 0$ due to C_1 , and $z \preceq 0$ due to C_2 , leading to the following stack:

$z \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_2
$y \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_1
$1 \preceq x$	<i>decision</i>	
$0 \preceq z$	$\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 1\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq y$	$\{x \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq x$	$\{y \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$x \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_4
$y \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_5
$z \preceq 3$	\emptyset	C_6
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

Notice that C_0 is a conflict, as $C_0 \cup \{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, z \preceq 0\}$ is infeasible. Since the stack contains the decision $1 \preceq x$, at this point procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` would be called. In Sections 3.4 and 3.5 we will resume the execution of this example with different implementations of this procedure.

The following theorem states the termination, soundness and completeness of the core

IntSat algorithm, provided the subprocedure that performs conflict analysis, back-jumping and learning is valid:

Theorem 3.10. *Let us assume procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is valid. Then the core IntSat algorithm, when given as input a finite set of constraints S including for each variable x_i a lower bound $lb_i \preceq x_i$ and an upper bound $x_i \preceq ub_i$, always terminates, finding a solution if, and only if, there exists one, and returning ‘infeasible’ if, and only if, S is infeasible.*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

3.4. Resolution-based IntSat

In this section we develop a possible way of concreting the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` introduced in Section 3.3 as a subroutine of the core IntSat algorithm. The main idea is to mimic the resolution-based conflict analysis in SAT by only using *reason sets*, which are viewed now as negations of clauses of bounds. Thus, for now no reason constraints are considered in this purely resolution-based conflict analysis (until the hybrid versions explained in the next subsection). One of the shortcomings of this approach is that, at the end of conflict analysis, the explanation of the backjump is not a constraint but a clause of bounds, which does not belong to the language of ILP and hence cannot be learned directly. For this reason here we also review techniques that, in some common situations, allow one to convert clauses of bounds into equivalent constraints. If successful, a new constraint justifying the backjump is learned. Otherwise, in the cases in which this equivalent constraint cannot be found, nothing is learned (or at best only a *weaker* constraint could be learned). In any case, this does not affect the validity of the procedure and backjumping can be performed anyway.

A more precise pseudo-code description of `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` following this idea is shown below. The input consists of a set of constraints S and an assignment A such that S contains a conflict with A and A contains a decision, and the output is a set T of constraints that can be learned and a new assignment A' .

1. **Conflict analysis:** Let us define CS as the *Conflicting Set* of bounds. Initially, CS is a subset of bounds of A causing the falsehood of C for a certain conflict C in S , i.e., $C \in S$ is false in $CS \subseteq A$.

Invariants: $CS \subseteq A$ and $S \cup CS$ is infeasible.

Let B be the bound in CS that is topmost in A , and RS its reason set. Replace CS by $(CS \setminus \{B\}) \cup RS$. Repeat this until CS contains a single bound B_{top} that is, or is above, A 's topmost decision.

2. **Backjump:** Assign A' a copy of A . Pop bounds from A' until either there are no decisions in A' or, for some B in CS with $B \neq B_{top}$, there are no decisions above B in A' . Then push $\overline{B_{top}}$ onto A' with associated reason set $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}$.
3. **Learn:** if $\overline{CS} = \{\overline{B} \mid B \in CS\}$, viewed as a clause of bounds, can be converted into an equivalent constraint CC , let $T = \{CC\}$ else $T = \emptyset$.

Next let us argue that, as claimed in the introduction to this section, procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is reproducing the conflict analysis from SAT based on resolution. To that end, it is convenient to view the algorithm as working on the *logical negations* of the conflicting set and the reason sets. Namely, one of the invariants of conflict analysis is that $S \cup CS$ is infeasible. Equivalently, in a more logical notation we can say that $S \wedge (\bigwedge_{B \in CS} B)$ is unsatisfiable, or that $S \models \bigvee_{B \in CS} \overline{B}$. Similarly, the reason set of a non-decision bound B' satisfies that $S \cup RS \models B'$, which can be reformulated logically as $S \models B' \vee \bigvee_{B \in RS} \overline{B}$. Drawing a parallel with SAT, the clause $\bigvee_{B \in CS} \overline{B}$ would play the role of the *conflicting clause*, while the clause $\bigvee_{B \in RS} \overline{B}$ would correspond to the *reason clause* of B' . From this viewpoint, let us consider the step in the above algorithm in which the propagation of bound B' with reason set RS is unfold and CS is replaced by $(CS \setminus \{B'\}) \cup RS$. Now this can be interpreted as a resolution inference eliminating ‘literal’ B' between clause $\bigvee_{B \in CS} \overline{B}$, viewed as $\overline{B'} \vee (\bigvee_{B \in CS \setminus \{B'\}} \overline{B})$, and clause $B' \vee (\bigvee_{B \in RS} \overline{B})$. Note that the resolvent

$$\left(\bigvee_{B \in CS \setminus \{B'\}} \overline{B} \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{B \in RS} \overline{B} \right)$$

is precisely the negation of (the conjunction of bounds in) the set $(CS \setminus \{B'\}) \cup RS$.

Example 3.11. Let us revisit Example 3.2. There are two constraints $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$ and $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$. We take the decision $0 \preceq x$, which propagates nothing, and later on another decision $1 \preceq y$, which due to $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$ propagates $z \preceq 0$. This bound is then pushed with associated reason set $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\}$, resulting into the stack $A = (0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0)$. Now $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$ is a conflict, and $CS = \{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0\} \subseteq A$ is a set of bounds causing its falsehood.

Let us apply the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. In the first iteration of conflict analysis we unfold the propagation of $z \preceq 0$, and then CS becomes $CS \setminus \{z \preceq 0\} \cup \{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\} = \{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\}$. After this step there is a single bound of CS which is, or is above, the assignment’s topmost decision $1 \preceq y$ (namely $1 \preceq y$ itself, thus playing the role of B_{top}), and therefore `Conflict analysis` concludes. Then `Backjump` starts, and pops $z \preceq 0$ and $1 \preceq y$ from the assignment. Since $0 \preceq x$ is a bound in CS different from $1 \preceq y$ such that there are no decisions above it in the current assignment ($0 \preceq x$), no more bounds are popped. Finally $y \preceq 0$ (that is, $\overline{B_{top}}$) is pushed onto the stack with reason set $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\} \setminus \{1 \preceq y\} = \{0 \preceq x\}$, resulting into the assignment $(0 \preceq x, y \preceq 0)$.

In this case the clause of the negations of the bounds in the final conflicting set, namely

$$\overline{0 \preceq x} \vee \overline{1 \preceq y} \equiv x \preceq -1 \vee y \preceq 0,$$

cannot be converted into a constraint, as can be seen e.g. by geometric arguments, and therefore nothing is learnt (i.e., $T = \emptyset$). However, if additionally variable y were binary and x had an upper bound $x \preceq u$ for a certain $u \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the initial set of constraints, then one can see that the clause $x \preceq -1 \vee y \preceq 0$ could equivalently be transformed into the constraint $x \preceq u - uy - y$ (and finally $T = \{x \preceq u - uy - y\}$); see the end of this section for a systematic way of obtaining these transformations.

Example 3.12. Let us resume the execution of the core IntSat algorithm from Example 3.9. The constraints are:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0: & -x - y - z \preceq -2 \\
C_1: & x + y \preceq 1 \\
C_2: & x + z \preceq 1 \\
C_3: & y + z \preceq 1 \\
C_4: & x \preceq 1 \\
C_5: & y \preceq 1 \\
C_6: & z \preceq 3
\end{aligned}$$

Let A_0 be the stack corresponding to decision level 0:

$0 \preceq z$	$\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 1\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq y$	$\{x \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq x$	$\{y \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$x \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_4
$y \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_5
$z \preceq 3$	\emptyset	C_6
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

In Example 3.9 the execution was suspended at the first conflict that was encountered. Namely, the stack is


$z \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_2
$y \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_1
$1 \preceq x$	<i>decision</i>	
A_0		
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

and the conflict is C_0 , which is false due to $\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, z \preceq 0\}$.

Let us apply `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. We start conflict analysis with the conflicting set $CS = \{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, z \preceq 0\}$. The bound in CS which is topmost in the stack is $z \preceq 0$, which has reason set $\{1 \preceq x\}$. Therefore the new CS becomes $\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, z \preceq 0\} \setminus \{z \preceq 0\} \cup \{1 \preceq x\} = \{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, 1 \preceq x\}$. Notice that there are still two bounds in CS of the last decision level, namely $y \preceq 0$ and $1 \preceq x$. Of these, the topmost one is $y \preceq 0$, which has reason set $\{1 \preceq x\}$. Then the new conflicting set is $\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, 1 \preceq x\} \setminus \{y \preceq 0\} \cup \{1 \preceq x\} = \{x \preceq 1, 1 \preceq x\}$. Now there is a single bound B_{top} , which is $1 \preceq x$, which is or is above the stack's topmost decision, so conflict analysis is over.

The next step is `Backjump`, which pops bounds from the stack until either there are no decisions or, for some B in CS with $B \neq B_{top}$, there are no decisions above B in

the stack. In this case the latter holds with bound $x \preceq 1$ playing the role of B after having popped $z \preceq 0$, $y \preceq 0$ and $1 \preceq x$. Then $\overline{B_{top}}$, that is $x \preceq 0$, is pushed with reason set $\{x \preceq 1, 1 \preceq x\} \setminus \{1 \preceq x\} = \{x \preceq 1\}$, leading to the stack:



On the other hand, the clause of the negations of the final conflicting set $\{x \preceq 1, 1 \preceq x\}$, namely

$$\overline{x \preceq 1} \vee \overline{1 \preceq x} \equiv 2 \preceq x \vee x \preceq 0,$$

cannot be converted into a constraint, and so no constraint can be learnt.

This concludes the execution of `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. Back to the core `IntSat` algorithm, now due to C_0 we have that $x \preceq 0$ and $y \preceq 1$ propagate $1 \preceq z$, and $x \preceq 0$ and $z \preceq 3$ propagate $-1 \preceq y$. Then due to C_3 bound $1 \preceq z$ propagates $y \preceq 0$, and $-1 \preceq y$ propagates $z \preceq 2$. In turn, thanks to C_0 , we have that $x \preceq 0$ and $y \preceq 0$ propagate $2 \preceq z$, and $x \preceq 0$ and $z \preceq 2$ propagate $0 \preceq y$. Finally, bounds $2 \preceq z$ and $0 \preceq y$ make C_3 false. Since there are no decisions left in the stack, the algorithm terminates reporting that there is no solution.

The following theorem ensures that the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is valid, as required by Theorem 3.10:

Theorem 3.13. *The above procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is valid.*

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Finally, there is a step in the above description of the algorithm that requires further explanation. Namely, let us see when and how the clause consisting of the negations of the bounds in the final conflicting set can be converted into an equivalent constraint. For example, this transformation can be achieved if all bounds involve binary variables, except for at most one [5]. More specifically, if the clause is of the form

$$1 \preceq x_1 \vee \dots \vee 1 \preceq x_m \vee y_1 \preceq 0 \vee \dots \vee y_n \preceq 0 \vee k \preceq z,$$

where variables $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n$ are binary, z is an integer variable with lower bound lb (that is, $lb \preceq z$ for any solution) and $k > lb$ is an integer, then the clause can equivalently be written as

$$k - (k - lb) \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i + \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - y_j) \right) \preceq z.$$

Similarly, if the clause is of the form

$$1 \preceq x_1 \vee \dots \vee 1 \preceq x_m \vee y_1 \preceq 0 \vee \dots \vee y_n \preceq 0 \vee z \preceq k ,$$

where variables $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n$ are binary, z is an integer variable with upper bound ub (i.e., $z \preceq ub$ for any solution) and $k < ub$ is an integer, then the clause can equivalently be written as

$$z \preceq k + (ub - k) \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i + \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - y_j) \right) .$$

3.5. Hybrid Resolution and Cut-based IntSat

The algorithm for the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` presented in Section 3.4 suffers from some drawbacks. In the first place, if the clause with the negations of the bounds in the conflicting set cannot be converted into an equivalent constraint, at best only a weaker constraint can be learned. This is inconvenient, as learning is widely acknowledged as one of the key components to the success of SAT solvers. Moreover, from a proof complexity perspective, the resolution proof system that underlies the algorithm [55] is known to be less powerful than, e.g., the cutting planes proof system, based on the cut rule. For example, for pigeon-hole problems resolution proofs are exponentially long [36], while short polynomial-sized proofs exist in cutting planes. Unfortunately, pigeon-hole problems often arise as subproblems in real-life applications, such as scheduling and timetabling [2]: how to fit n tasks in less than n time slots, etc.

This section presents an alternative approach for `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. This new algorithm incorporates the cut rule, in an attempt to address the aforementioned issues. However, the cut rule does not replace resolution but is applied *in parallel*. Hence, in addition to the conflicting set, a *conflicting constraint* will also be maintained in conflict analysis, and when unfolding propagations cuts will be applied between this constraint and the reason constraints, which unlike in Section 3.4, will now be taken into account. In this way we can bypass the rounding problem and ensure that backjumping will be possible.

Next a description of the new algorithm for `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is shown. As in the previous section, the input consists of a set of constraints S and an assignment A such that S contains a conflict with A and A contains a decision, and the output is a set T of constraints that can be learned and a new assignment A' .

1. **Conflict analysis:** Let us define CC as the *Conflicting Constraint*, and CS as the *Conflicting Set* of bounds. Initially, CC is any conflict and CS is a subset of bounds of A causing the falsehood of CC , i.e., $CC \in S$ is false in $CS \subseteq A$.

Invariants: $S \models CC$, and $CS \subseteq A$, and $S \cup CS$ is infeasible.

Repeat the following three steps:

- 1.1. Let B be the bound in CS that is topmost in A , and RS its reason set. Replace CS by $(CS \setminus \{B\}) \cup RS$.
- 1.2. Let x and RC be the variable and the reason constraint of B , respectively.

If RC is defined and there exists a cut eliminating x between CC and RC then replace CC by that cut.

- 1.3. **Early Backjump:** If for some maximal $k \in \mathbb{N}$, after popping k bounds from A the last one being a decision, the conflicting constraint CC and a subset RS' of bounds of the resulting A propagate some fresh bound B' , then assign A' a copy of A , pop k bounds from A' , push B' onto A' with associated reason constraint CC and reason set RS' , and go to **Learn**.

until CS contains a single bound B_{top} that is, or is above, A 's topmost decision.

2. **Backjump:** Assign A' a copy of A . Pop bounds from A' until either there are no decisions in A' or, for some B in CS with $B \neq B_{top}$, there are no decisions above B in A' . Then push $\overline{B_{top}}$ onto A' with associated reason constraint CC and reason set $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}$.
3. **Learn:** Let $T = \{CC\}$.

Example 3.14. Again let us consider Example 3.2, and let us apply the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` to the conflict described there. We recall we have the set of constraints $S = \{x + y + 2z \preceq 2, x + y - 2z \preceq 0\}$ and the assignment $A = (0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0)$, where $0 \preceq x$ and $1 \preceq y$ are decisions while $z \preceq 0$ is a propagated bound with reason constraint $x + y + 2z \preceq 2$ and reason set $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\}$. The conflict is $x + y - 2z \preceq 0 \in S$, which is false due to $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0\} \subseteq A$.

Conflict analysis starts assigning $x + y - 2z \preceq 0$ to CC and the set of bounds $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y, z \preceq 0\}$ to CS . In the first iteration, in CS we replace $z \preceq 0$ by its reason set $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\}$. The resulting CS is $\{0 \preceq x, 1 \preceq y\}$. A cut eliminating z exists (see Example 3.2) and CC becomes $x + y \preceq 1$. Then conflict analysis is over because CS contains exactly one bound B_{top} , which is $1 \preceq y$, at or above A 's topmost decision. Then **Backjump** starts, and we pop bounds until for some B in CS with $B \neq B_{top}$, there are no decisions above B in A , in this case, until there are no decisions above $0 \preceq x$ in A . Hence bounds $z \preceq 0$ and $1 \preceq y$ are popped, and after that $\overline{B_{top}}$, which is $y \preceq 0$, is pushed with reason set $\{0 \preceq x\}$ and reason constraint $x + y \preceq 1$. Note that this reason constraint is not a 'good' reason, i.e., it does not propagate $y \preceq 0$, but is still a valid consequence of the set of constraints. Finally, in **Learn**, the final CC , which is $x + y \preceq 1$, is assigned to T so that it can be learned.

Example 3.15. Let us revisit Example 3.9 and complete the execution of the core `IntSat` algorithm. Let us recall the constraints:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
C_0 : & -x - y - z & \preceq -2 \\
C_1 : & x + y & \preceq 1 \\
C_2 : & x + z & \preceq 1 \\
C_3 : & y + z & \preceq 1 \\
C_4 : & x & \preceq 1 \\
C_5 : & y & \preceq 1 \\
C_6 : & z & \preceq 3
\end{array}$$

Let us define A_0 as the stack of decision level 0:

$0 \preceq z$	$\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 1\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq y$	$\{x \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$-2 \preceq x$	$\{y \preceq 1, z \preceq 3\}$	C_0
$x \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_4
$y \preceq 1$	\emptyset	C_5
$z \preceq 3$	\emptyset	C_6
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

The execution in Example 3.9 was interrupted at the first conflict, with the following stack:

$z \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_2
$y \preceq 0$	$\{1 \preceq x\}$	C_1
$1 \preceq x$	<i>decision</i>	
A_0		
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

Procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` starts with conflict analysis, where initially the conflicting constraint CC is C_0 , and the conflicting set CS is $\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, z \preceq 0\}$. The bound in CS which is topmost in the stack is $z \preceq 0$, which has reason set $\{1 \preceq x\}$ and reason constraint C_2 . Thus, as in Example 3.12, the new conflicting set becomes $\{x \preceq 1, y \preceq 0, 1 \preceq x\}$. Moreover, the cut rule can be applied to C_2 and C_0 to eliminate variable z , resulting into $C_7 : 1 \preceq y$, which becomes the new conflicting constraint. Now Early Backjump can be applied, since after popping $z \preceq 0, y \preceq 0$ and $1 \preceq x$ the constraint $1 \preceq y$ trivially propagates the fresh bound $1 \preceq y$ in A_0 . So $1 \preceq y$ is pushed with reason constraint $1 \preceq y$ and reason set \emptyset , leading to the stack:

$1 \preceq y$	\emptyset	C_7
A_0		
<i>bound</i>	<i>reason set</i>	<i>reason constraint</i>

Moreover, `Learn` adds $1 \preceq y$ to the set of constraints. This concludes procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`.

Now $1 \preceq y$ propagates $x \preceq 0$ due to C_1 , and $z \preceq 0$ due to C_3 . In turn, $x \preceq 0, z \preceq 0$ and $y \preceq 1$ make constraint C_0 false. As there are no decisions left in the stack, the execution of the core `IntSat` algorithm terminates reporting that the set of constraints is infeasible. Note that, compared to Example 3.12, the possibility to infer and learn $1 \preceq y$ allows proving infeasibility with many fewer propagations.

Finally, the next theorem ensures that procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is

valid, as required by Theorem 3.10:

Theorem 3.16. *The above procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is valid.*

Proof. See Appendix C. □

3.6. Extensions of IntSat

The IntSat algorithm described in Section 3.3 only decides the existence of integer solutions. In order to go beyond feasibility problems, *optimisation* can be handled in the following standard way. For finding a solution that minimises a linear objective function $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n$, each time a new solution *sol* is found, the constraint $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n \leq c_0$ where c_0 is $c_1sol(x_1) + \dots + c_nsol(x_n) - 1$ is added, so as to attempt to improve the best solution found so far. This triggers a conflict, from which the search continues. This objective strengthening is repeated until the problem becomes infeasible. Bound propagations from these successively stronger constraints turn out to be very effective for pruning. Unlike what happens in propositional logic, linear constraints are first-class citizens (i.e., belong to the core language), and therefore adding the constraints generated from the objective function is straightforward and does not require further encodings, as it happens in SAT [29].

Another simplification we have made for the sake of presentation is that constraints are assumed to be \leq inequalities with integer coefficients. However, with trivial transformations it is possible to tackle more general constraints. Namely, a constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \geq a_0$ can be expressed as $-a_1x_1 - \dots - a_nx_n \leq -a_0$, a constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n = a_0$ can be replaced by the two constraints $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \leq a_0$ and $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \geq a_0$, and rational non-integer coefficients a/b can be removed by multiplying both sides by b .

4. Implementation

In this section we describe some aspects of our current implementation of IntSat. It consists of roughly 10000 lines of simple C++ code that make heavy use of standard STL data structures. For instance, a constraint is an STL vector of monomials (pairs of two `ints`: the variable number and the coefficient), sorted by variable number, plus the independent term. Coefficients are never larger than 2^{30} , and cuts producing any coefficient larger than 2^{30} are simply not performed. In combination with the fact that we use 64-bit integers for intermediate results during bound propagation, cuts, normalisation, etc., this allows us to prevent overflow with a few cheap and simple tests.

STL vectors are also used, e.g., in the implementation of the assignment. There is a vector, the *bounds vector*, indexed by variable number, which can return in constant time the current lower and upper bounds for that variable. It always stores, for each variable x_i , the positions pl_i and pu_i in the stack of its current (strongest) lower bound and upper bound, respectively. The stack itself is another STL vector containing at each position three data fields: a bound, a natural number *pos*, and an *info* field that includes, among other information, (pointers to) the reason set and the reason constraint. The value *pos* is always the position in the stack of the previous bound of

Height in stack of current bound	
Lower	Upper
x_1	0
	\vdots
x_7	40
	\vdots

	\vdots		
40	$5 \preceq x_7$	23	<i>info</i>
	\vdots		
31	$x_7 \preceq 6$	14	<i>info</i>
	\vdots		
23	$2 \preceq x_7$	13	<i>info</i>
	\vdots		
14	$x_7 \preceq 9$	-1	<i>info</i>
13	$0 \preceq x_7$	-1	<i>info</i>
	\vdots		
1	$x_1 \preceq 8$	-1	<i>info</i>
0	$0 \preceq x_1$	-1	<i>info</i>

Figure 1. Example of bounds vector (left) and stack (right).

the same type (lower or upper) for that variable, with $pos = -1$ for initial bounds. When pushing or popping bounds, these properties are easy to maintain in constant time. See Figure 1 for an example of bounds vector and corresponding stack.

4.1. Bound propagation using filters

Affordably efficient bound propagation is crucial for performance. In our current implementation, for each variable x there are two *occurs lists*. The *positive* occurs list for x contains all pairs (I_C, a) such that C is a linear constraint where x occurs with a positive coefficient a , and the *negative* one contains the same for occurrences with a negative coefficient a . Here I_C is an index to the *constraint filter* F_C of C in an array of constraint filters. The filter is maintained cheaply, and one can guarantee that C does not propagate anything as long as $F_C \leq 0$, thus avoiding many useless (cache-) expensive visits to the actual constraint C . The filtering technique is based on the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let C be a constraint of the form $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$. Let R be the set consisting of the current lower bound $lb_i \preceq x_i$ and the current upper bound $x_i \preceq ub_i$ of x_i , for each variable x_i . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *Constraint C propagates a non-redundant bound on x_j if and only if*

$$-a_0 + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) > 0 .$$

- (2) *Constraint C propagates (a non-redundant bound) if and only if*

$$-a_0 + \max_j (|a_j|(ub_j - lb_j)) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) > 0 .$$

Proof. For the first claim, first let us assume $a_j > 0$. Then by Lemma 3.5, C and

R propagate $x_j \preceq \lfloor e_j \rfloor$, where $e_j = (a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i)) / a_j$. We have that this upper bound is non-redundant if and only if $\lfloor e_j \rfloor < ub_j$, that is, $\lfloor e_j \rfloor + 1 \leq ub_j$, or equivalently, $e_j < ub_j$, i.e., $a_j e_j < a_j ub_j$. By expanding the definition of e_j , this can be rewritten as

$$a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) < a_j ub_j ,$$

which holds if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &< a_j ub_j + \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ a_0 &< a_j ub_j - a_j lb_j + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ a_0 &< |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ 0 &< -a_0 + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) . \end{aligned}$$

The case $a_j < 0$ is analogous. By Lemma 3.5, we have C and R propagate $\lceil e_j \rceil \preceq x_j$, where $e_j = (a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i)) / a_j$. We have that this lower bound is non-redundant if and only if $\lceil e_j \rceil > lb_j$, that is, $\lceil e_j \rceil - 1 \geq lb_j$, or equivalently, $e_j > lb_j$, i.e., $a_j e_j < a_j lb_j$. By expanding the definition of e_j this can be rewritten as

$$a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) < a_j lb_j ,$$

which holds if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &< a_j lb_j + \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ a_0 &< a_j lb_j - a_j ub_j + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ a_0 &< |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) \\ 0 &< -a_0 + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) . \end{aligned}$$

As regards the second claim, following the previous result, we have that constraint C propagates a non-redundant bound if and only if there exists a variable x_j such that

$$|a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) > a_0 - \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) ,$$

and this happens if and only if

$$\max_j (|a_j|(ub_j - lb_j)) > a_0 - \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) .$$

□

Using the same notation as in the statement of Lemma 4.1, given a constraint C we define F'_C as $-a_0 + \max_j (|a_j|(ub_j - lb_j)) + \sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i)$. By Lemma 4.1, constraint

C propagates a non-redundant bound *if, and only if*, $F'_C > 0$. For the sake of efficiency, the filter F_C of C is actually an upper approximation of F'_C , i.e. $F_C \geq F'_C$, so C can only propagate if $F_C > 0$.

To preserve the property that $F_C \geq F'_C$, the filters need to be updated when new bounds are pushed onto the stack (and each update needs to be undone when popped, for which other data structures exist). Namely, assume a fresh lower bound $k \preceq x$ is pushed onto the stack. Let the previous lower bound for x be $k' \preceq x$. Note that $k' < k$. For each pair (I_C, a) in the positive occurs list of x , using I_C we access the filter F_C and increase it by $|a(k - k')|$. This accounts for the update of the term $\sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i)$ in the definition of F'_C , as $a > 0$ and

$$\min_{k \preceq x}(ax) = ak = a(k - k') + ak' = |a(k - k')| + \min_{k' \preceq x}(ax) .$$

On the other hand, for efficiency reasons, the term $\max_j (|a_j| (ub_j - lb_j))$ in the definition of F'_C is *not* updated. Since this term decreases as new bounds are added, we get the inequality $F_C \geq F'_C$.

Only when F_C becomes positive the constraint C is visited, as it may propagate some new bound. To avoid too much precision loss, after each time a constraint C is visited, F_C is reset to the exact value F'_C .

Finally, if a fresh upper bound $x \preceq k$ is pushed onto the stack, exactly the same is done, but using the negative occurs list and the previous upper bound $x \preceq k'$ for x . Note that $k < k'$, and if $a < 0$ then

$$\min_{x \preceq k}(ax) = ak = a(k - k') + ak' = (-a)(k' - k) + ak' = |a(k - k')| + \min_{x \preceq k'}(ax) .$$

4.2. *Early backjumps*

A significant amount of time in the hybrid resolution and cut-based conflict analysis of Section 3.5 is spent on determining whether an *Early Backjump* can be applied. In our current implementation, when we want to find the lowest decision level at which a certain constraint C propagates (a non-redundant bound), we take each of the variables that occur in C and go over the history of previous lower and upper bounds in the stack (using the aforementioned field *pos*). The heights in the stack of these bounds indicate the decision levels at which C could have propagated earlier.

The worst-case scenario in this process is when the constraint turns out not to propagate at any decision level, because all the potentially propagating decision levels have been examined but the outcome of the computation is useless. Fortunately, in some situations it is possible to see in advance that the constraint cannot propagate, and hence precious time can be saved. Namely, this is the case when the constraint has been obtained by applying an eliminating cut inference between two constraints whose only common variable is the one that is eliminated.

To prove this result formally, first we need the following lemma, which states that simplifying a constraint by dividing with a common divisor of the left-hand side and rounding down does not increase propagation power.

Lemma 4.2. *Let C_1 be a constraint of the form $ca_1x_1 + \dots + ca_nx_n \preceq ck + d$ with $0 \leq d < c$, and let C_2 be the constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq k$. If C_1 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on a variable x_j then neither does C_2 .*

Proof. For any variable x_i , let $lb_i \preceq x_i$ and $x_i \preceq ub_i$ be the current lower and upper bounds for x_i , respectively. Let A be the set of all these bounds.

Let us assume C_1 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on x_j . Then by Lemma 4.1 and since $0 \leq d < c$,

$$-ck - d + |ca_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_A(ca_ix_i) \leq 0$$

$$c(-k + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_A(a_ix_i)) \leq d$$

$$c(-k + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_A(a_ix_i)) < c$$

$$-k + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_A(a_ix_i) < 1$$

$$-k + |a_j|(ub_j - lb_j) + \sum_i \min_A(a_ix_i) \leq 0 ,$$

which implies that C_2 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on x_j . □

Finally, the following lemma ensures that, if the only common variable is the one that is eliminated, an eliminating cut does not improve the propagation power.

Lemma 4.3. *Let C_1 be a constraint of the form $ax + a_1y_1 + \dots + a_ny_n \preceq a_0$ and C_2 of the form $-bx + b_1z_1 + \dots + b_mz_m \preceq b_0$, where $a, b > 0$ and the variables y_i, z_j are different pairwise. Let C_3 be the result of applying a cut inference eliminating x :*

$$C_3 : ba_1y_1 + \dots + ba_ny_n + ab_1z_1 + \dots + ab_mz_m \preceq ba_0 + ab_0 .$$

Then C_3 propagates nothing more than C_1 and C_2 do.

Proof. For any variable $v \in \{x, y_i, z_j\}$, let $lb(v) \preceq v$ and $v \preceq ub(v)$ be the current lower and upper bounds for v , respectively. Let A be the set of all these bounds.

First of all, by virtue of Lemma 4.2 we notice that simplifying the cut by dividing with a common factor of the left-hand side and rounding down does not increase propagation power.

Now let us assume that C_1 and C_2 have been propagated exhaustively. As C_1 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on variable y_k ($1 \leq k \leq n$), by Lemma 4.1

$$|a_k| (ub(y_k) - lb(y_k)) + \min_A(ax) + \sum_{i=1}^n \min_A(a_i y_i) \leq a_0$$

$$|ba_k| (ub(y_k) - lb(y_k)) + \min_A(abx) + \sum_{i=1}^n \min_A(ba_i y_i) \leq ba_0 .$$

As C_2 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on variable x , by Lemma 4.1

$$|(-b)| (ub(x) - lb(x)) + \min_A((-b)x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \min_A(b_j z_j) \leq b_0$$

$$ab (ub(x) - lb(x)) + \min_A(a(-b)x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \min_A(ab_j z_j) \leq ab_0$$

$$ab (ub(x) - lb(x)) - \max_A(abx) + \sum_{j=1}^m \min_A(ab_j z_j) \leq ab_0 .$$

By adding both inequalities:

$$|ba_k| (ub(y_k) - lb(y_k)) + \min_A(abx) + \sum_{i=1}^n \min_A(ba_i y_i) +$$

$$ab (ub(x) - lb(x)) - \max_A(abx) + \sum_{j=1}^m \min_A(ab_j z_j) \leq ba_0 + ab_0 ,$$

which simplifies into

$$|ba_k| (ub(y_k) - lb(y_k)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \min_A(ba_i y_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m \min_A(ab_j z_j) \leq ba_0 + ab_0$$

as $\min_A(abx) - \max_A(abx) = ab(\min_A(x) - \max_A(x)) = ab(lb(x) - ub(x))$. This shows that C_3 does not propagate any non-redundant bound on variable y_k . The proof of the analogous result for z_l ($1 \leq l \leq m$) is symmetric. \square

To apply this result in conflict analysis, let C_1 be the current conflicting constraint, and C_2 be the reason constraint of the bound B of the conflicting set that is topmost in the stack. Since we have not been able to apply early backjump so far, C_1 does not propagate anything at any previous decision level. And since C_2 is a constraint of

the integer program and before each decision all bounds are exhaustively propagated, C_2 cannot propagate anything at any previous decision level either. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3, if C_1 and C_2 only have the variable x of bound B in common, and a cut eliminating x exists between C_1 and C_2 , then early backjump will not be applicable to the resulting constraint.

4.3. Clauses

Clauses are common in ILP problems. For example, *set covering* constraints, which are of the form $x_1 + \dots + x_n \succeq 1$, are a particular case of clauses where all literals are positive. As a reference, 50 out of the 240 instances of the Benchmark Set and 199 out of the 1065 instances of the Collection Set of the MIPLIB Mixed Integer Programming Library 2017 ⁴ (roughly 20 % in both cases) contain set covering constraints.

Hence there is a potential gain in giving clauses a particular treatment. For this reason, in our implementation they have a specialised implementation, with no difference with what could be found in current SAT solvers. This allows, for example, a more memory-efficient storage and a faster propagation, thanks to the use of watch lists instead of occurs lists. Moreover, some clause-specific constraint simplification techniques can be applied, such as the so-called lemma shortening introduced in MiniSAT [28], which has turned out to be essential in the state of the art of SAT solving.

In particular, *binary clauses* are implemented as edges of the so-called *binary graph* [6]. As it is common in SAT solvers, our implementation uses this graph not only for propagating even faster than with watch lists, but also for detecting equivalent literals, which are used to simplify the problem.

Apart from the edges coming from (explicit) binary clauses, we simulate that the binary graph also contains what we call *implicit binary clauses*. These are binary clauses that are consequences of constraints in the integer program, but which are not explicitly added to the graph. For example, a *set packing* constraint of the form $x_1 + \dots + x_n \leq 1$ implies binary clauses $\bar{x}_i \vee \bar{x}_j$, where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. In general, let us assume we are given an assignment A and we have a constraint $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ such that x_i, x_j are Boolean variables satisfying $1 \preceq x_i \notin A, 1 \preceq x_j \notin A$ and $a_i, a_j > 0$. Then the constraint implies (together with A) the binary clause $\bar{x}_i \vee \bar{x}_j$ if $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n \preceq a_0$ is false in $A \cup \{1 \preceq x_i, 1 \preceq x_j\}$. By Lemma 3.4, this happens if and only if

$$a_i + a_j > a_0 - \sum_{k=1}^n \min_A(a_k x_k) .$$

In practice, at the beginning of the search, once all bounds have been exhaustively propagated and before making any decision, all constraints are examined, and for each literal we store a list of the identifiers of those constraints that imply a binary clause with that literal. These lists of constraint identifiers are used in the algorithms that involve the binary graph to recompute on demand the binary clauses and thus simulate the corresponding edges.

These three different implementations of constraints (general constraints, clauses, binary clauses) coexist in the implementation. As a consequence, the stack of bounds

⁴See <https://miplib.zib.de>.

of the assignment has three integers that point to the constraint, clause and binary clause, respectively, that was propagated last, and specialised procedures for propagation are called when these pointers move forward towards the top of the stack. If a conflict is found, the conflicting constraint as well as the reason constraints (be they general constraints, clauses or binary clauses) are transformed into a common representation in order to carry out the analysis of the conflict.

4.4. *Decision heuristics*

As in SAT solvers, our current heuristics for selecting the variable of the next decision bound is based on recent activity: the variable with the highest activity score is picked. To that end, a priority queue of variables, ordered by activity score, is maintained. The score of a variable x is increased each time a bound containing x appears in the conflicting set during conflict analysis, and to reward *recent* activity, the amount of increment grows geometrically at each conflict.

Once a variable x is picked, one has to decide the actual decision bound: whether it is lower or upper, and how to divide the interval between the current lower bound l and the current upper bound u . Several strategies have been implemented, among others (in what follows, let m be the domain middle value $(l + u)/2$):

- (1) The domain of x is reduced to $[m + 1, u]$.
- (2) The domain of x is reduced to $[u, u]$.
- (3) The domain of x is reduced to $[l, m]$.
- (4) The domain of x is reduced to $[l, l]$.

The next two strategies attempt to steer the search towards minimising the cost in a ‘first-success’ manner. Let v be the best value for x in $\{l, u\}$ so as to minimise the objective function.

- (5) The domain of x is reduced to $[l, m]$ if $v = l$, otherwise to $[m + 1, u]$.
- (6) The domain of x is reduced to $[v, v]$.

The following three strategies are inspired by the last-phase polarity heuristic from SAT [56] and are aimed at finding a first solution quickly (which helps to prune the search tree dramatically). Let v be the last value that x was assigned to.

- (7) The domain of x is reduced to $[l, m]$ if $v \leq m$, otherwise to $[m + 1, u]$.
- (8) The domain of x is reduced to $[l, l]$ if $v \leq m$, otherwise to $[u, u]$.
- (9) Assume that $v \in [l, u]$. If $v = l$ or $v = u$, then the domain of x is reduced to $[l, l]$ or $[u, u]$, respectively. Otherwise, if v is closer to l than to u , then the domain of x is reduced to $[l, v]$, otherwise to $[v, u]$.

The next strategies are similar to the ones just described, but using other assignments as a reference.

- (10) Like (7), (8), (9), but using the value of x in the last solution.
- (11) Like (7), (8), (9), but using the value of x in an initial solution provided by the user.

The user can specify an order between these strategies, in such a way that if a strategy cannot be applied (for instance, in (7), (8), (9) if variable x has not been assigned yet, or in (9) if $v \notin [l, u]$), then the next strategy in the order is attempted.

5. Experiments

This section is devoted to the experimental evaluation of IntSat. After describing the competing solvers in Section 5.1 and explaining how the benchmarks have been obtained in Section 5.2, the results of this evaluation are shown in Section 5.3. Finally Section 5.4 presents some conclusions that can be drawn from the evaluation.

All experiments reported next were carried out on a standard 3.00 GHz 8-core Intel i7-9700 desktop with 16 Gb of RAM. A binary of our basic implementation as well as all benchmarks can be downloaded from [50], so that the interested reader can reproduce and verify the results reported here.

5.1. Solvers

In this experimental evaluation we compare our implementation with the newest versions of the following solvers:

- (1) Gurobi (v.9.5.1)
(www.gurobi.com/)
- (2) CPLEX (v.22.1.0.0)
(www.ibm.com/products/ilog-cplex-optimization-studio)
- (3) SCIP (v.8.0.0)
(www.scipopt.org/)
- (4) GLPK (v.5.0)
(www.gnu.org/software/glpk/)

CPLEX and Gurobi are well-known commercial ILP solvers, while GLPK and SCIP are non-commercial. It has to be pointed out that the technology behind these solvers is extremely mature, after decades of improvements: according to [13], between 1990 and 2020 they have seen a 3.7 million times speedup from *machine-independent* algorithmic improvements only (that is, a factor of 2.1 *per year*)! Rather than applying a single one-size-fits-all method, these solvers resort to a large variety of techniques, including, e.g., specialised cuts (Gomory, knapsack, flow and GUB covers, MIR, clique, zero-half, mod-k, network, submip, etc.), heuristics (rounding, RINS, solution improvement, feasibility pump, diving, etc.) and branching strategies (pseudo cost branching, strong branching, reliability branching, etc.). In what follows we will argue in favour of including the techniques presented in this article in this toolkit.

Due to their prevalence and great success in practice, in this evaluation we focus on comparing with Operations Research ILP solvers based on the simplex algorithm and branch-and-cut. However, there are other tools that can handle ILP with different approaches, which have not been included here mainly for performance reasons. For instance, SAT Modulo Theories (SMT) [52] solvers such as Mathsat5 [19], Yices [26], Z3 [24] or our own Barcelogic solver [14] are aimed at problems consisting of Boolean combinations of integer linear constraints, being ILP the particular case of *conjunctions* of

constraints. SMT solvers specialize in efficiently handling this arbitrary Boolean structure, while their *theory solver* component, the one that precisely handles conjunctions of constraints (our goal here), is not as sophisticated as in simplex-based systems. As a consequence, the performance of SMT solvers on ILP instances is in general orders of magnitude worse than CPLEX or Gurobi, and for this reason they are not included in these experiments.

Concerning SAT and Lazy Clause Generation (LCG) [53], from our own work (see among many others [1]), we also know too well that solvers that (lazily) encode integer linear constraints into SAT can be competitive as long as problems are mostly Boolean, without a heavy numerical/optimisation component. Also CSP solvers such as Sugar [60] or Gecode [59], which heavily focus on their rich constraint language, are in general very far from commercial Operations Research solvers on hard ILP optimisation problems. Because of that, these tools have not been considered in our experimental comparison either.

Finally, another solver very close to our methods is CutSat [41], which also attempts to generalise CDCL from SAT to ILP. As argued in Section 3.1, the approach that CutSat follows to work around the rounding problem poses important limitations, which translate in practice into a rather poor performance when compared to state-of-the-art ILP solvers, typically orders of magnitude slower [49]. Moreover, the current implementation can only handle feasibility problems and has no optimisation features.

5.2. Instances

The instances used in the experiments were taken from the MIPLIB Mixed Integer Programming Library. The latest edition of the library (MIPLIB 2017, available at <https://miplib.zib.de>) organises benchmarks into two sets: the *Benchmark Set*, which contains 240 instances that are solvable by (the union of) today’s codes and were chosen ‘subject to various constraints regarding solvability and numerical stability’; and the much larger *Collection Set*, which represents a diverse selection of instances [31]. See the MIPLIB website for statistics of each instance, including among others the number of continuous, integer and binary variables, the number of non-zeroes in the coefficient matrix, and the number of constraints in different classes: set covering, set packing, set partitioning, cardinality, knapsack, etc.

From these two sets of instances, we picked those that:

- (1) do not contain continuous variables, and
- (2) have lower and upper bounds for all variables, and
- (3) do not contain constraints or objective functions with fractional coefficients with many (four or more) decimal digits, and
- (4) contain at least one integer non-binary variable, and
- (5) are known to be infeasible or have a feasible solution, according to MIPLIB 2017.

Restrictions 1-3 in the above list are due to the limitations of our algorithms. In particular, to ensure that all coefficients are integer, the constraints and objective functions with fractional coefficients are multiplied by appropriate powers of 10. Moreover, instances with only binary variables were discarded, as our goal here are non-binary problems; to deal with binary linear programming, a specialised implementation would

Table 1. Infeasible instances.

	Problem statistics			Time					
	#cons	#vars	#ints	grb	cpx	scip	glpk	isr	isc
no-ip-64999	2547	2232	45	1.7	364.0	625.0	TO	TO	TO
no-ip-65059	2547	2232	45	2.6	30.6	145.3	TO	TO	TO
cryp..bj14	98021	48950	1120	3036.9	TO	TO	TO	3031.9	444.9
fhnw-sq3	167	2450	49	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos..shag	10187	4379	90	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos859080	164	160	80	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.1	TO	TO

perform much better (see Section 6.4). Finally, instances with an ‘open’ status at MIPLIB 2017 (that is, which are still not known to have a feasible solution or not) were not included after confirming that, within a reasonable amount of time, no solver could produce an answer for them.

After applying this filtering, we obtained 29 benchmarks from the Benchmark Set, and 40 from the Collection Set. We also added to our selection the three instances from MIPLIB 2010 that were used in our earlier work in [49] and that have been removed from the current 2017 edition of the library. Altogether we compiled a test suite consisting of 72 benchmarks.

In order to present the results in a coherent way, in what follows these instances will be classified depending on whether they admit a feasible solution or not, and whether they are feasibility or optimisation problems. Hence, out of the 72 instances of the benchmark suite, it turns out that 6 are infeasible: `cryptanalysiskb128n5obj14`, `no-ip-64999`, `no-ip-65059`, `fhnw-sq3`, `neos-3211096-shag` and `neos859080`. In fact, all of these but `neos859080` are actually feasibility problems, i.e., there is no objective function. The remaining 66 feasible instances of the test suite contain both feasibility and optimisation problems. As regards the former there are 6 feasibility instances, namely: `cryptanalysiskb128n5obj16`, `neos-3004026-krka`, `fhnw-sq2`, `lectsched-1`, `lectsched-2` and `lectsched-3`. The rest of the benchmark suite consists of 60 feasible optimisation instances.

5.3. Results

The time limit of all executions was set to 1 hour of wall-clock time. However, it is important to highlight that our implementation of `IntSat` (as well as `GLPK` and `SCIP`) is sequential and only uses one core, while on the other hand `CPLEX` and `Gurobi` are run in parallel mode. Therefore, they may use (and often do use) all of the eight cores that are available in the computer used for the experiments.

5.3.1. Infeasible instances

Table 1 summarizes the results on infeasible benchmarks. There is a row for each instance⁵. As regards columns, the first three describe size properties of the instance: number of constraints, (total) number of variables and number of (non-binary) integer variables. Recall that the number of continuous variables is always zero here. The rest of the columns show the time in seconds that each solver takes to prove infeasibility:

- (1) `grb` stands for `Gurobi`;

⁵Due to space limitations, the names of some of the instances are only partially displayed. However, the shrunk name is enough to identify them, e.g., using the search engine of the MIPLIB website.

Table 2. Feasible feasibility instances.

	Problem statistics			Time					
	#cons	#vars	#ints	grb	cpx	scip	glpk	isr	isc
crypt..obj16	98021	48950	1120	TO	TO	TO	TO	576.1	38.6
neos..krka	12545	17030	130	7.3	TO	266.4	TO	0.1	0.1
fhnw-sq2	91	650	25	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
lectsched-1	50108	28718	482	6.4	13.1	450.0	TO	0.3	0.3
lectsched-2	30738	17656	369	0.5	2.2	6.0	TO	0.1	0.1
lectsched-3	45262	25776	457	1.1	4.1	199.2	TO	0.2	0.2

- (2) cpx stands for CPLEX;
- (3) scip stands for SCIP;
- (4) glpk stands for GLPK;
- (5) isr (short for ‘IntSat Resolution’) stands for our core IntSat algorithm with the implementation of the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` as described in Section 3.4.
- (6) isc (short for ‘IntSat Cuts’) is similar to the previous solver, but with `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` implemented as in Section 3.5.

The timing TO stands for time out. The fastest solver for each problem (if any) is highlighted in bold face.

First of all, we remark the difficulty of most of these instances. Even for a tool like CPLEX, for half of the benchmarks infeasibility cannot be proved within the time limit of 1 hour; and over the 6 instances, Gurobi times out twice. Having said that, it appears that our techniques are not especially appropriate for this kind of problems: infeasibility can be proved only for a single instance. However, it is worth highlighting the complementarity of the techniques: for this particular instance `cryptanalysiskb128n5obj14`, which turns out to be a difficult problem even for Gurobi, the overall best solver, our solver `isc` performs comparatively well.

5.3.2. Feasible feasibility instances

Table 2 shows the results obtained on feasible feasibility benchmarks. The format of the table is as in Table 1, but here the last six columns indicate the time in seconds that each solver takes to prove feasibility (that is, to find a solution, given that in these instances there is no objective function).

As can be seen in the table, for these feasibility problems our IntSat solvers turn out to perform reasonably well. Any of the two uniformly performs better than any other solver, even CPLEX and Gurobi. Although admittedly the `lectsched-*` instances are rather easy, the other three are not so (e.g., CPLEX times out on all of them, *even with the eight available cores*). Moreover, in the particular case of the instance `cryptanalysiskb128n5obj16`, in fact our IntSat solvers are the only ones that could find a solution. It is worth noting that `isc` solved this instance in roughly 38 seconds.

5.3.3. Feasible optimisation instances

In this subsection we report the results on feasible optimisation instances. Here the focus will be on the ability of the solvers *to find good solutions quickly*, rather than

their strength in proving optimality. We do so motivated on practical grounds. Indeed, for many real-life instances it is simply impossible to certify optimality in the allotted time. As noted in [40], this can consume a huge fraction of the long overall running time. This is natural, as optimal solutions can be discovered using good heuristic guidance and may involve only exploring a small part of the space of solutions, while proving optimality, on the other hand, involves reasoning over the whole search space. For this precise reason, MILP solvers based on the simplex method and branch-and-cut actually only look for new solutions until they consider they are ‘close enough’ to the optimum, according to their MILP gap tolerance.

In consequence, in what follows feasible optimisation instances are divided into two groups, depending on whether or not an optimal solution could be *found* in the executions with the different solvers. In order to identify solutions as optimal without requiring solvers to effectively prove optimality, we use the optimal value of the objective function as reported in MIPLIB ⁶.

Namely, Table 3 displays the results on the 49 instances for which at least one solver could find an optimal solution within the time limit of 1 hour. The format of the table is as in Tables 1 and 2, but now the last six columns indicate the time in seconds that each solver takes to find an optimal solution. Here the timing TO means that the solver timed out before finding an optimal solution (although it may have obtained other worse solutions, which is not represented in the table for the sake of succinctness).

Table 4 shows the results on the remaining 11 instances. Given that none of the solvers could find an optimal solution, this table is different in that it does not display timings but how the objective function value of the best solution evolved along time. The format is similar to that in previous tables, with the difference that now each problem spans five rows, indicating the value of the best solution that could be found within the first 1 minute, 5 minutes, 15 minutes, 30 minutes and 60 minutes, respectively. Moreover, there is an additional final column with these time lapses to help reading the results. A dash means that the time lapse passed without discovering any solution. For each time lapse, the solver with the best objective value over all is highlighted in bold face.

First of all, let us compare our IntSat solvers between themselves. Out of 49 instances, in Table 3 there are 7 instances in which *isr* gives better results than *isc*, and among these, 1 instance in which *isc* actually times out. On the other hand, there are 15 instances in which *isc* is better than *isr*, and among these, 9 instances in which *isr* times out. As regards Table 4, *isr* is clearly superior to *isc* in instance *rococoC12-111000*, while the reverse occurs in instances *supportcase1*, *comp12-2idx*, *comp21-2idx*, *rococoC12-010001*, *ns1854840*, *proteindesign121hz512p19* and *nursesched-medium-hint03*.

Altogether, although the conflict analysis with cuts and early backjumps as described in Section 3.5 usually pays off, there is a significant number of instances on which a simpler conflict analysis yields better results. This complementarity suggests that, given that they are now run sequentially, a portfolio approach running both variants in parallel would be in order.

Now let us contrast our solvers with SCIP and GLPK. To simplify the comparison,

⁶Particular cases are instances *neos-4360552-sangro*, *neos-3426132-dieze* and *proteindesign121hz512p19*, which according to MIPLIB are still open and therefore their optimal values are not available. For these problems we have used the objective values of the best known solutions as a proxy.

Table 3. Feasible optimisation instances, time for finding the optimal solution.

	Problem statistics			Time					
	#cons	#vars	#ints	grb	cpx	scip	glpk	isr	isc
30n20b8	576	18380	62	1.5	1.7	88.7	TO	35.0	0.7
comp07-2idx	21235	17264	109	27.4	333.6	TO	TO	TO	38.5
comp08-2idx	12536	11554	67	5.3	918.3	657.0	TO	TO	TO
gt2	29	188	164	0.0	0.0	0.0	TO	15.6	0.0
hypo..id-k1	5195	2602	1	7.5	12.8	15.4	25.1	0.3	0.3
k1mushroom	16419	8211	1	38.1	330.3	942.8	TO	5.6	6.1
lect..4-obj	14163	7901	236	0.5	2.0	3.5	TO	0.4	0.5
lect..5-obj	38884	21805	416	TO	TO	TO	TO	129.7	240.8
manna81	6480	3321	3303	0.1	0.2	0.3	10.6	TO	TO
mzzv11	9499	10240	251	3.5	7.7	181.0	TO	41.2	51.3
mzzv42z	10460	11717	235	1.8	2.0	208.7	TO	205.4	80.1
neos-1223462	5925	5495	315	0.3	0.5	79.9	TO	TO	2.8
neos..4597	3486	3395	245	0.0	0.2	0.8	TO	7.1	0.3
neos-1354092	3135	13702	420	1461.5	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos-1582420	10180	10100	100	4.0	1.1	30.5	TO	TO	TO
neos..loue	3705	3255	3255	30.3	TO	1748.9	TO	TO	TO
neos..nubu	4725	8644	8644	0.5	0.4	5.6	234.0	TO	TO
neos..apure	169	100000	100000	15.6	6.3	157.3	76.4	TO	3538.9
neos..awhea	479	2375	1900	1.0	1.5	3.8	TO	TO	TO
neos..dieze	570	11550	8800	90.6	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos..gauja	220	2310	1890	8.2	3328.0	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos..gaula	200	2090	1900	2.0	2.5	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos..glina	44206	57196	22924	0.2	0.5	9.1	0.4	0.5	0.5
neos..wannon	85865	31728	31248	4.1	16.1	113.5	1933.7	1.2	3.2
neos-555001	3474	3855	73	0.1	1.1	0.9	TO	TO	41.0
neos-555343	3326	3815	15	3.5	61.6	TO	TO	TO	710.1
neos-555424	2676	3815	15	1.4	45.6	521.6	TO	TO	93.7
neos-555884	4331	3815	15	0.6	3257.6	102.1	TO	TO	TO
neos-662469	1085	18235	328	28.8	73.7	2475.2	TO	TO	TO
neos-686190	3664	3660	60	10.5	2.5	74.6	114.3	TO	TO
neos-950242	34224	5760	240	0.2	11.9	126.8	35.6	0.1	0.1
neos16	1018	377	41	0.6	14.0	83.6	TO	130.2	81.5
neos8	46324	23228	4	0.5	0.3	8.2	7.1	1.0	0.9
nurse..ium04	8668	29667	54	11.3	3434.6	TO	TO	TO	TO
nurse..den09	4872	11650	20	7.7	416.9	72.8	TO	TO	TO
nurse..ate03	5032	11690	20	9.9	270.8	160.2	TO	TO	TO
nurse..nt02	3522	10250	20	3.84	2.92	28.4	TO	TO	TO
prot..z512p9	301	159145	91	127.5	3386.5	TO	TO	TO	TO
prot..b11p9	254	132672	78	TO	3417.9	TO	TO	TO	294.3
prot..x11p8	254	127326	78	354.2	TO	TO	TO	TO	1581.1
roco..011000	1667	4456	136	382.8	228.7	1859.1	TO	TO	TO
roco..001000	1293	3117	124	231.3	75.2	337.0	TO	TO	TO
roco..010100	4010	12321	166	354.7	2220.8	TO	TO	716.2	TO
roco..011100	2367	6491	166	10.4	924.9	TO	TO	TO	TO
sp98ir	1531	1680	688	8.2	8.4	28.1	1190.7	TO	TO
splice1k1	6505	3253	1	255.6	320.3	1155.5	TO	14.4	18.8
supp..case33	20489	20203	101	25.3	12.0	191.4	TO	TO	213.5
neos..avoca	1570	2368	2325	298.5	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO
neos..ticino	308	4688	3809	28.0	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO

Table 4. Feasible optimisation instances, cost of best solution after different run times.

	Problem statistics			Value						Time lapse
	#cons	#vars	#ints	grb	cpx	scip	glpk	isr	isc	
supp..case1	59997	29999	200	—	—	—	—	—	296362	1 min
				—	—	—	—	—	296362	5 min
				—	—	—	—	—	293902	15 min
				—	—	—	—	—	293848	30 min
				—	—	—	—	—	293848	60 min
neos..sovi	7244	4318	179	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	5 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	15 min
				—	—	—	—	180185	180245	30 min
				—	—	—	—	180165	180185	60 min
roc..111000	10776	8619	187	36689	37623	38773	—	82087	—	1 min
				36247	36379	38773	—	82087	—	5 min
				35770	36284	38773	—	82087	87188	15 min
				35488	36221	38773	—	82087	87188	30 min
				35469	35588	38773	—	82087	87188	60 min
comp12-2idx	16803	11863	43	666	—	—	—	1035	825	1 min
				351	455	—	782	870	825	5 min
				350	401	934	782	784	769	15 min
				350	383	695	753	784	678	30 min
				350	364	682	658	784	678	60 min
supp..case19	10713	1429098	117806	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	5 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	15 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	30 min
				—	—	—	—	—	—	60 min
ns1854840	143616	135754	474	309200	—	427200	—	126000	65200	1 min
				309200	—	427200	—	126000	54400	5 min
				309200	—	427200	—	125800	26800	15 min
				27800	—	427200	—	97000	26800	30 min
				25000	—	427200	—	94000	26800	60 min
roco..010001	4636	16741	187	36314	40328	85756	—	65656	65742	1 min
				35532	36566	43177	—	65562	61523	5 min
				35485	35515	42166	—	60697	59654	15 min
				35479	34633	41795	—	60697	57719	30 min
				35122	34436	41795	—	60697	55983	60 min
neos..sangro	46012	10272	576	—	—	—	—	—	-6	1 min
				—	—	—	—	—	-6	5 min
				-6	—	—	—	-6	-7	15 min
				-6	—	—	—	-6	-7	30 min
				-6	—	—	—	-6	-7	60 min
nurse..int03	14062	34248	78	4662	—	8080	—	10534	5652	1 min
				137	334	8080	—	9534	3064	5 min
				119	232	8080	—	6925	2779	15 min
				117	171	7266	—	6925	2277	30 min
				116	123	1056	—	4797	1966	60 min
comp21-2idx	14038	10863	71	118	110	699	—	319	210	1 min
				83	106	250	250	319	190	5 min
				83	102	156	211	319	190	15 min
				83	93	150	211	319	183	30 min
				76	84	148	211	319	163	60 min
prot..12p19	301	2589931	91	3412	—	—	—	—	—	1 min
				3412	—	—	—	—	—	5 min
				3408	—	—	—	—	—	15 min
				3406	—	—	—	—	3602	30 min
				3406	—	—	—	—	3475	60 min

for each instance we will consider the best of `res` and `cut`, and the best of SCIP and GLPK. Regarding Table 3, we see that the best of our solvers was superior to the best solver of SCIP and GLPK in 20 instances, and the other way around in 19 instances. As for Table 4, our solvers were better in instances `supportcase1`, `neos-3214367-sovi`, `proteindesign121hz512p19`, `neos-4360552-sangro` and `ns1854840`, and the other way around for instances `rococoC12-010001` and `rococoC12-111000`. In short, we see our solvers tend to perform slightly better than SCIP and GLPK.

Finally, let us compare our solvers with CPLEX and Gurobi. Again, for the sake of simplicity, for each instance we will consider the best of `res` and `cut`, and the best of CPLEX and Gurobi. We see that in Table 3 the best of our solvers was superior to the best solver of CPLEX and Gurobi in 9 instances, and the other way around in 39 instances. As for Tables 4, our solvers were better in instances `supportcase1`, `neos-3214367-sovi` and `ns1854840`, and the other way around for instances `comp12-2idx`, `rococoC12-010001`, `neos-4360552-sangro`, `nursesched-medium-hint03`, `comp21-2idx` and `rococoC12-111000`. Although on the whole admittedly CPLEX and Gurobi are superior, there is about a 20% of the instances for which our solvers obtain better results, which is a non-negligible percentage. It has also to be reminded that, while `isr` and `isc` are sequential and only use one core, CPLEX and Gurobi are parallel and often use all eight available cores.

5.4. Conclusions of the Experiments

Altogether, the results of the experiments in Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 indicate that (both) our `IntSat` algorithms can be helpful on optimisation problems so as to find first solutions of relatively good quality. This is even more the case for feasibility problems, which are more amenable to our methods as optimisation is not natively supported. Our results thus confirm the well-known fact that depth-first search, which is the search strategy that CDCL solvers implement, is particularly appropriate for finding solutions fast. In fact, a typical search strategy in ILP solvers consists in first performing depth-first search in order to get a feasible solution to enable cost-based pruning in branch-and-bound, and then apply best-first search, so as to give more emphasis to the quality of the solutions. Taking this into account we consider that, in the diverse toolkit of techniques that ILP solvers implement, `IntSat` could provide an edge when feasibility is prioritised over optimality, or in the first stages of the search.

6. Future Work

A large number of further ideas around `IntSat` and its implementation are yet to be explored, among which we sketch the most relevant ones in this section.

6.1. Unboundedness

The current implementation assumes that for each variable there is an initial lower bound and an upper bound. This is used in the proof of Theorem 3.10 to ensure the termination of the core `IntSat` algorithm. Although it is common that this condition holds in real-life applications, some instances do have unbounded variables. In these cases non-termination may manifest itself in, e.g., bound propagation. For example, consider the set of constraints consisting of $C_1: x - y \leq 0$ and $C_2: -x + y + 1 \leq 0$,

which clearly does not have any solution. If we decide bound $0 \preceq x$, constraint C_1 propagates $0 \preceq y$, then C_2 propagates $1 \preceq x$, then constraint C_1 propagates $1 \preceq y$, and so on indefinitely, resulting into an endless chain of propagations. Hence, even bound propagation is not guaranteed to terminate for unbounded infeasible problems.

In theory, any ILP can be converted into an equivalent fully bounded one [58]. Unfortunately, these bounds turn out to be too large to be useful in practice.

A pragmatic solution to handle unbounded variables is to introduce a fresh auxiliary variable z with lower bound $0 \preceq z$, and for each variable x without lower bound add the constraint $-z \preceq x$, and similarly if it has no upper bound add $x \preceq z$. Then one can re-run the algorithm with successively larger upper bounds $z \preceq ub$ for z , thus guaranteeing completeness for finding (optimal) solutions.

An alternative strategy for handling unbounded variables is to apply the so-called *bounding transformation* presented in [15]. This allows reducing any problem to an equisatisfiable bounded one via a Mixed-Echelon-Hermite transformation composed with a double-bounded reduction.

6.2. Restarts and Constraint Database Management

From the practical point of view, our current implementation mimics several ideas from CDCL SAT solving without having tested them thoroughly.

For instance, like SAT solvers our basic implementation applies periodic *restarts*. We currently follow a policy that triggers a restart when the number of conflicts reaches a threshold. The user can specify if this threshold is determined according to the Luby sequence [44] or to an inner-outer geometric series [10]. Moreover, each of these strategies has a number of parameters with a significant effect on performance and whose values are still to be tuned.

Another aspect that requires further investigation is the *cleanup* policy for the constraint database; at each cleanup, we remove all non-initial constraints with more than two monomials and activity counter equal to 0. This activity counter is increased each time the constraint is a conflicting or reason constraint at conflict analysis, and is divided by 2 at each cleanup. Cleanups are done periodically in such a way that the constraint database grows rather slowly over time. The policy that is currently implemented triggers a cleanup after the number of new learnt constraints reaches a threshold, or the memory used by learnt constraints exceeds a space limit. We think there is still room for improvement in adjusting the parameters of this strategy based on experimental grounds. Furthermore, other cleanup strategies can be devised, e.g., by generalising the heuristics based on the *literal block distance* [7] that are used in state-of-the-art SAT solvers with great success.

Finally, modern SAT solvers heavily apply pre- and in-processing techniques [27, 30] to keep the constraint database small but strong. These techniques could be worth applying also in the context of CDCL solvers for ILP.

6.3. Conflict analysis

Several ideas can be explored for conflict analysis. Instead of taking the extreme position of always trying to apply early backjump (as in Section 3.5) or never (as in Section

3.4), one can, for instance, attempt to do an early backjump with the intermediate conflicting constraint C only if it is false in the current stack, or promising (e.g., short) according to some heuristic. Other conflict analysis algorithms mixing resolution with reason and conflicting sets and cuts with reason and conflicting constraints can also be designed.

In another line of investigation, the quality of the backjumps and the strength of the reason sets could be improved by doing some more work: e.g., instead of using the pre-stored reason sets, one can re-compute them on the fly during conflict analysis with the aim of maximising the length of the backjump. One can also do a bit of search during conflict analysis, e.g., by trying to remove non-topmost bounds and do cuts with these, with the aim of finding good early backjump cuts.

6.4. Binary ILP and Mixed ILP

Binary ILP is a particular case of ILP, and as such the algorithms presented here are directly applicable. However, given the prevalence of this kind of problems, it is worth to specialise the design and implementation of the data structures and subprocedures, e.g. in the propagation mechanism. Preliminary experiments with a binary ILP solver prototype [51] already show a significant speed-up in running time in comparison with the general basic implementation.

In the opposite direction, it also needs to be worked out how to apply the proposed algorithms in order to solve mixed ILP (MILP) instances, i.e., where not all variables are subject to integrality. For instance, one could decide on the integer variables as it is done now, and at any desired point, run an LP solver to optimise the values for the rational variables. The inclusion of lower bounding techniques, well-known from modern MILP solvers, needs to be considered as well.

7. Related Work and Conclusions

The success of SAT solving has spurred a number of research projects that attempt to extend CDCL-related techniques to ILP and MILP. Some of these come from the traditional MILP community. For example, in [3] conflict analysis is generalised to mixed integer programming thanks to special heuristics for branch-and-cut. These techniques are implemented in SCIP, one of the solvers used in the experiments in Section 5.

Other works come from the SAT area, as the aforementioned CutSat presented in [41], which has later been refined and extended in [16]. Unlike in these works, our cut-based reasoning does not replace but is performed *in parallel* to resolution-based reasoning with reason and conflicting sets.

In this same direction, the idea of applying reason and conflicting sets is not only reminiscent to the conflict analysis of SAT, but also of *SAT Modulo Theories* (SMT) [8, 52] for the theory of linear arithmetic, with the main difference, among others, that here new ILP constraints are obtained by cut inferences, normalised and learned, and not only new Boolean clauses that are disjunctions of literals representing bounds (usually only those that occur in the input formula). Other SAT/SMT related work, but for rational arithmetic is [21, 43, 46].

As outlined in Section 3.5, it is also worth mentioning that there may be some possible theoretical and practical consequences of the fact that our algorithm’s underlying cutting planes proof system is stronger than CDCL’s resolution proof system: could we outperform SAT solvers on certain SAT problems (e.g., pigeon-hole-like) for which no short resolution proofs exist? A similar question applies to the current SMT solvers, which are based on resolution as well [48].

It seems unlikely that for ILP or MILP solving one single technique can dominate the others; the best solvers will probably continue combining different methods from a large toolbox, which perhaps will also include this work at some point. Still, IntSat already appears to be the first alternative method for ILP that, without resorting to the simplex algorithm or LP relaxations, turns out to be competitive on hard optimisation problems. We expect that, give its large potential for enhancement, this work will trigger further research activity, in particular along the lines sketched in Section 6.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

All authors are supported by grant PID2021-122830OB-C43, funded by MCIN/ AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF: A way of making Europe”. The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in Optimization Methods and Software 27 Sep 2023 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10556788.2023.2246167>

References

- [1] I. Abío, R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Oliveras, E. Rodríguez-Carbonell, and P.J. Stuckey, *To Encode or to Propagate? The Best Choice for Each Constraint in SAT*, in *19th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, CP’13, 2013, pp. 97–106.
- [2] R.J.A. Achá and R. Nieuwenhuis, *Curriculum-based course timetabling with SAT and maxsat*, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 218 (2014), pp. 71–91.
- [3] T. Achterberg, *Conflict analysis in mixed integer programming*, *Discret. Optim.* 4 (2007), pp. 4–20.
- [4] F.A. Aloul, *Search techniques for sat-based boolean optimization*, *J. Frankl. Inst.* 343 (2006), pp. 436–447.
- [5] R. Asín, M. Bezem, and R. Nieuwenhuis, *Improving intsat by expressing disjunctions of bounds as linear constraints*, *AI Commun.* 29 (2016), pp. 205–209.
- [6] B. Aspvall, M.F. Plass, and R.E. Tarjan, *A linear-time algorithm for testing the truth of certain quantified boolean formulas*, *Information Processing Letters* 8 (1979), pp. 121 – 123.
- [7] G. Audemard and L. Simon, *Predicting learnt clauses quality in modern SAT solvers*, in *Proceedings of the 21st international joint conference on Artificial intelligence*, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., IJCAI ’09, 2009, pp. 399–404.
- [8] C.W. Barrett, R. Sebastiani, S.A. Seshia, and C. Tinelli, *Satisfiability modulo theories*, in *Handbook of Satisfiability*, IOS Press, 2009, pp. 825–885.

- [9] P. Beame, H.A. Kautz, and A. Sabharwal, *Towards understanding and harnessing the potential of clause learning*, J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR) 22 (2004), pp. 319–351.
- [10] A. Biere, *Picosat essentials*, J. Satisf. Boolean Model. Comput. 4 (2008), pp. 75–97. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3233/sat190039>.
- [11] A. Biere, M.J.H. Heule, H. van Maaren, and T. Walsh (eds.), *Handbook of Satisfiability*, Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications Vol. 185, IOS Press, 2009 February.
- [12] B. Bixby, *Presentation: Progress in Linear and Mixed-Integer Programming, 5 May 2017, Joint EURO/ORSC/ECCO Conference 2017 on Combinatorial Optimization* (2017).
- [13] R. Bixby, *Optimization: Past, Present and Future with Dr. Robert Bixby* (2021). Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_R8-nt5NyiE.
- [14] M. Bofill, R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Oliveras, E. Rodríguez-Carbonell, and A. Rubio, *The Barcelona SMT Solver*, in *Computer-aided Verification (CAV)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 5123. 2008, pp. 294–298.
- [15] M. Bromberger, *A Reduction from Unbounded Linear Mixed Arithmetic Problems into Bounded Problems*, in *Automated Reasoning - 9th International Joint Conference, IJ-CAR 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 14-17, 2018, Proceedings*, D. Galmiche, S. Schulz, and R. Sebastiani, eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 10900. Springer, 2018, pp. 329–345. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94205-6_22.
- [16] M. Bromberger, T. Sturm, and C. Weidenbach, *A complete and terminating approach to linear integer solving*, J. Symb. Comput. 100 (2020), pp. 102–136. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2019.07.021>.
- [17] H. Brown, L. Zuo, and D. Gusfield, *Comparing Integer Linear Programming to SAT-Solving for Hard Problems in Computational and Systems Biology*, in *AlCoB*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 12099. Springer, 2020, pp. 63–76.
- [18] V. Chvátal, *Edmonds polytopes and a hierarchy of combinatorial problems*, Discrete Mathematics 4 (1973), pp. 305–337.
- [19] A. Cimatti, A. Griggio, B. Schaafsma, and R. Sebastiani, *The MathSAT5 SMT Solver*, in *Proceedings of TACAS*, N. Piterman and S. Smolka, eds., LNCS Vol. 7795. Springer, 2013.
- [20] S.A. Cook, *The complexity of theorem-proving procedures*, in *Proceedings of the third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, New York, NY, USA. ACM, STOC '71, 1971, pp. 151–158.
- [21] S. Cotton, *Natural Domain SMT: A Preliminary Assessment*, in *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems - 8th International Conference, FORMATS 2010*. Springer LNCS 6246, 2010, pp. 77–91.
- [22] M. Davis, G. Logemann, and D. Loveland, *A Machine Program for Theorem-Proving*, Communications of the ACM, CACM 5 (1962), pp. 394–397.
- [23] M. Davis and H. Putnam, *A Computing Procedure for Quantification Theory*, Journal of the ACM, JACM 7 (1960), pp. 201–215.
- [24] L. de Moura and N. Björner, *Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver*, Tech. Rep., Microsoft Research, Redmond, 2007. Available at <http://research.microsoft.com/projects/z3>.
- [25] R. Dechter, *Enhancement schemes for constraint processing: Backjumping, learning, and cutset decomposition*, Artificial Intelligence 41 (1990), pp. 273–312. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0004370290900463>.
- [26] B. Dutertre and L. de Moura, *The YICES SMT Solver*, Tech. Rep., Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, 2006. Available at <http://yices.cs1.sri.com>.
- [27] N. Eén and A. Biere, *Effective Preprocessing in SAT Through Variable and Clause Elimination.*, in *8th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, SAT '05*, F. Bacchus and T. Walsh, eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 3569. Springer, 2005, pp. 61–75.
- [28] N. Eén and N. Sörensson, *An Extensible SAT-solver.*, in *6th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, SAT '03*, E. Giunchiglia and A. Tacchella, eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 2919. Springer, 2004, pp. 502–

- [29] N. Eén and N. Sörensson, *Translating Pseudo-Boolean Constraints into SAT*, Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation 2 (2006), pp. 1–26.
- [30] K. Fazekas, A. Biere, and C. Scholl, *Incremental Inprocessing in SAT Solving*, in *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing - SAT 2019 - 22nd International Conference, SAT 2019, Lisbon, Portugal, July 9-12, 2019, Proceedings*, M. Janota and I. Lynce, eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 11628. Springer, 2019, pp. 136–154. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24258-9_9.
- [31] A. Gleixner, G. Hendel, G. Gamrath, T. Achterberg, M. Bastubbe, T. Berthold, P.M. Christophel, K. Jarck, T. Koch, J. Linderoth, M. Lübbecke, H.D. Mittelmann, D. Ozyurt, T.K. Ralphs, D. Salvagnin, and Y. Shinano, *MIPLIB 2017: Data-Driven Compilation of the 6th Mixed-Integer Programming Library*, Mathematical Programming Computation (2020). Accepted for publication.
- [32] E. Goldberg and Y. Novikov, *BerkMin: A Fast and Robust SAT-Solver*, in *2002 Conference on Design, Automation, and Test in Europe, DATE '02*. IEEE Computer Society, 2002, pp. 142–149.
- [33] C.P. Gomes, B. Selman, and N. Crato, *Heavy-tailed distributions in combinatorial search*, in *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming-CP97*, G. Smolka, ed., Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997, pp. 121–135.
- [34] C.P. Gomes, B. Selman, and H. Kautz, *Boosting combinatorial search through randomization*, in *Proceedings of the fifteenth national/tenth conference on Artificial intelligence/Innovative applications of artificial intelligence*, Menlo Park, CA, USA. American Association for Artificial Intelligence, AAAI '98/IAAI '98, 1998, pp. 431–437.
- [35] R.E. Gomory, *Outline of an algorithm for integer solutions to linear programs*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 64 (1973), pp. 275–278.
- [36] A. Haken, *The intractability of resolution*, Theoretical Computer Science 39 (1985), pp. 297–308.
- [37] M. Heule, M. Jarvisalo, F. Lonsing, M. Seidl, and A. Biere, *Clause elimination for SAT and QSAT*, J. Artif. Intell. Res. 53 (2015), pp. 127–168. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.4694>.
- [38] J. Huang, *The effect of restarts on the efficiency of clause learning*, in *Proceedings of the 20th international joint conference on Artificial intelligence*, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., IJCAI '07, 2007, pp. 2318–2323.
- [39] M. Jarvisalo, M. Heule, and A. Biere, *Inprocessing Rules*, in *Automated Reasoning - 6th International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2012, Manchester, UK, June 26-29, 2012. Proceedings*, B. Gramlich, D. Miller, and U. Sattler, eds., Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 7364. Springer, 2012, pp. 355–370. Available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31365-3_28.
- [40] E.L. Johnson and U.H. Suhl, *Experiments in integer programming*, Discrete Applied Mathematics 2 (1980), pp. 39–55. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0166218X80900530>.
- [41] D. Jovanovic and L.M. de Moura, *Cutting to the chase - solving linear integer arithmetic*, J. Autom. Reasoning 51 (2013), pp. 79–108.
- [42] R. Karp, *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*, in *Complexity of Computer Computations*, R. Miller and J. Thatcher, eds., Plenum Press, 1972, pp. 85–103.
- [43] K. Korovin and A. Voronkov, *Solving Systems of Linear Inequalities by Bound Propagation*, in *CADE-23 - 23rd Int. Conf. on Automated Deduction*. 2011, pp. 369–383.
- [44] M. Luby, A. Sinclair, and D. Zuckerman, *Optimal speedup of Las Vegas algorithms*, Information Processing Letters 47 (1993), pp. 173–180.
- [45] J. Marques-Silva and K.A. Sakallah, *GRASP: A Search Algorithm for Propositional Satisfiability*, IEEE Transactions on Computers 48 (1999), pp. 506–521.
- [46] K.L. McMillan, A. Kuehlmann, and M. Sagiv, *Generalizing DPLL to Richer Logics*, in *Computer Aided Verification, 21st International Conference, CAV*. Springer LNCS 5643, 2009, pp. 462–476.

- [47] M.W. Moskewicz, C.F. Madigan, Y. Zhao, L. Zhang, and S. Malik, *Chaff: engineering an efficient SAT solver*, in *Proceedings of the 38th annual Design Automation Conference*, New York, NY, USA. ACM, DAC '01, 2001, pp. 530–535.
- [48] R. Nieuwenhuis, *SAT and SMT Are Still Resolution: Questions and Challenges (invited talk)*, in *Automated Reasoning - 6th International Joint Conference, IJCAR*. Springer LNCS 7364, 2012, pp. 10–13.
- [49] R. Nieuwenhuis, *The IntSat Method for Integer Linear Programming*, in *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, 20th International Conference, CP 2014, LNCS 8656*. 2014, pp. 574–589.
- [50] R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Oliveras, and E. Rodríguez-Carbonell, *Intsat source code, makefile and benchmarks* (2020). Available at www.cs.upc.edu/~erodri/intsat-journal.zip.
- [51] R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Oliveras, E. Rodríguez-Carbonell, and E. Rollon, *Employee scheduling with sat-based pseudo-boolean constraint solving*, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), pp. 142095–142104. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3120597>.
- [52] R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Oliveras, and C. Tinelli, *Solving SAT and SAT Modulo Theories: From an abstract Davis–Putnam–Logemann–Loveland procedure to DPLL(T)*, *Journal of the ACM, JACM* 53 (2006), pp. 937–977.
- [53] O. Ohrimenko, P.J. Stuckey, and M. Codish, *Propagation = Lazy Clause Generation*, in *CP*, C. Bessiere, ed., *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* Vol. 4741. Springer, 2007, pp. 544–558.
- [54] K. Pipatsrisawat and A. Darwiche, *Rsat 2.0: Sat solver description*, Tech. Rep. D–153, Automated Reasoning Group, Computer Science Department, UCLA, 2007.
- [55] K. Pipatsrisawat and A. Darwiche, *On the Power of Clause-Learning SAT Solvers with Restarts*, in *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, 15th International Conference, CP '09*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* Vol. 5732. Springer, 2009, pp. 654–668.
- [56] K. Pipatsrisawat and A. Darwiche, *On modern clause-learning satisfiability solvers*, *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 44 (2010), pp. 277–301.
- [57] J. Robinson, *A Machine-Oriented Logic Based on the Resolution Principle*, *Journal of the ACM, JACM* 12 (1965), pp. 23–41.
- [58] A. Schrijver, *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1986.
- [59] C. Schulte and G. Tack, *View-based propagator derivation*, *Constraints An Int. J.* 18 (2013), pp. 75–107.
- [60] N. Tamura, A. Taga, S. Kitagawa, and M. Banbara, *Compiling finite linear CSP into SAT*, *Constraints* 14 (2009), pp. 254–272.
- [61] L. Zhang, C.F. Madigan, M.W. Moskewicz, and S. Malik, *Efficient Conflict Driven Learning in a Boolean Satisfiability Solver*, in *International Conference on Computer-Aided Design, ICCAD '01*. 2001, pp. 279–285.

Appendix A. Proofs of Lemmas on Bound Propagation

In this appendix we detail all the proofs of the lemmas stated in Section 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. For the first claim, if $a_i > 0$ then $a_i x_i$ is increasing in x_i , so the minimum value takes place at the least value that x_i can take, that is lb_i , and at that point $a_i x_i$ evaluates to $a_i \cdot lb_i$. Note that, by convention, if $lb_i = -\infty$ then $a_i \cdot lb_i = -\infty$ as $a_i > 0$.

Similarly, if $a_i < 0$ then $a_i x_i$ is decreasing in x_i , so the minimum value takes place at the largest value that x_i can take, that is ub_i , and at that point $a_i x_i$ evaluates to $a_i \cdot ub_i$. Note that, by convention, if $ub_i = +\infty$ then $a_i \cdot ub_i = -\infty$ as $a_i < 0$.

As regards the second claim, we observe that the constraint is false if and only if $\min_A(a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n) > a_0$. And since A is a set of bounds, $\min_A(a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n) = \min_A(a_1x_1) + \dots + \min_A(a_nx_n)$.

□

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let us consider the case $a_j > 0$. Let us assume that there exists a solution sol to $\{C\} \cup R$ with $sol(x_j) = v > \lceil e_j \rceil$ and we will get a contradiction. If $v > \lceil e_j \rceil$ then $v \geq \lceil e_j \rceil + 1$, which implies $v > e_j$, that is, $a_j v > a_j e_j$. Expanding the definition of e_j we get

$$a_j v > a_0 - \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i)$$

or equivalently

$$a_j v + \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) > a_0 ,$$

which by Lemma 3.4 implies that $\{C\} \cup R \cup \{v \preceq x_j, x_j \preceq v\}$ has no solution, a contradiction.

The case $a_j < 0$ is similar. If there exists a solution sol to $\{C\} \cup R$ with $sol(x_j) = v < \lfloor e_j \rfloor$, then $v \leq \lfloor e_j \rfloor - 1$, which implies $v < e_j$, that is, $a_j v > a_j e_j$. The proof then follows in the same way as in the case $a_j > 0$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. By Lemma 3.4, C_1 is false in $R \cup \{x_j \preceq e_j\}$ if and only if $\sum_i \min_R(a_i x_i) > a_0$. But $\min_{R \cup \{x_j \preceq e_j\}}(a_j x_j) = a_j e_j$ as $a_j < 0$. So we have $a_j e_j + \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) > a_0$. By expanding the definition of e_j and multiplying at both sides by $b_j > 0$, we get

$$a_j b_0 - a_j \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(b_i x_i) + b_j \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) > a_0 b_j .$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} & -a_j \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(b_i x_i) + b_j \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(a_i x_i) = \\ & = \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(-a_j b_i x_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R(b_j a_i x_i) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} \min_R((-a_j b_i + b_j a_i) x_i) . \end{aligned}$$

Altogether

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \min_R((-a_j b_i + b_j a_i) x_i) > a_0 b_j - a_j b_0$$

and by Lemma 3.4 we have proved that C_3 is false in R . □

Appendix B. Proof of Termination, Soundness and Completeness of IntSat

In this appendix we prove in full detail Theorem 3.10, which states the termination, soundness and completeness of the core IntSat algorithm.

To that end some definitions are required. Given a stack of bounds A and a bound $B \in A$, we write the height of B in the stack as $\text{height}_A(B)$. Moreover, if a stack of bounds A is of the form $A_0 D_1 A_1 \cdots A_{n-1} D_n A_n$, where D_1, \dots, D_n are all the decision bounds in A , then we define the 0-th *decision level* as A_0 , the 1st decision level as $D_1 A_1$, and in general for $i > 0$, the i -th decision level as $D_i A_i$. If a bound B belongs to the i -th decision level, then we say that B has decision level i .

We will need the following lemma:

Lemma B.1. *Let us assume procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is valid. Let S_0 be the finite set of constraints given as input to the core IntSat algorithm. Let S be the set of constraints and A be the stack of bounds at any step of the execution of the algorithm. Then the following properties hold:*

- (1) S and S_0 have the same solutions: $S \models S_0$ and $S_0 \models S$.
- (2) A does not contain contradictory bounds.
- (3) For any bounds $B, B' \in A$, if $\text{height}_A(B) < \text{height}_A(B')$ then B' is not redundant with B .
- (4) For any non-decision bound $B \in A$, its reason set RS is such that: (i) $RS \subseteq A$, (ii) $\text{height}_A(B') < \text{height}_A(B)$ for any $B' \in RS$, and (iii) $S_0 \cup RS \models B$.
- (5) For any non-decision bound $B \in A$ with reason constraint RC , it holds that $S_0 \models RC$.
- (6) If A is of the form $A_0 D_1 A_1 \cdots A_{n-1} D_n A_n$, where D_1, \dots, D_n are all the decision bounds in A , then $S_0 \cup \{D_1, \dots, D_i\} \models A_i$ for all i in $0 \dots n$.

Proof. Given an execution of the algorithm, let us prove the properties by induction over the number of steps.

Let us prove the base case. At the beginning of the execution we have that $S = S_0$. Therefore property 1 holds trivially. Moreover, initially we also have that A is empty. So properties from 2 to 6 hold too.

Now let us prove the inductive case. Let us see that, if the properties hold at any step of the execution of the algorithm, then they are true at the next step.

To begin with, we notice that constraints are only added to S at step 4. These constraints are the result of calling procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. By hypothesis, any such constraint C satisfies that $S \models C$. As $S_0 \models S$, then $S_0 \models S \cup \{C\}$. And since $S \models S_0$, we also have that $S \cup \{C\} \models S_0$. Altogether, property 1 is preserved when S is updated.

As regards the properties involving the stack of bounds, we will use that bounds are pushed in the following circumstances:

- A. At step 1, when for a constraint $RC \in S$ and a set of bounds $RS \subseteq A$, we have that RC and RS propagate a fresh bound B .

- B. At step 2, when we decide a fresh bound B .
- C. At step 4, when we push a fresh bound B obtained from the call to procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`.

This case distinction will be used in the proofs of the remaining properties that follow.

Next let us see that the stack of bounds cannot contain redundant or contradictory bounds (properties 2 and 3). Note that in propagations (case A) and decisions (case B), only bounds that are fresh are added to A by construction, and hence cannot be redundant or contradictory. As regards case C, let A' be the stack returned by the call to `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. By hypothesis, the assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound, and A' is of the form $N B$, where B is a fresh bound in N . By induction hypothesis, since N is a prefix of A and B is fresh in N , when A is replaced by A' , we have that properties 2 and 3 hold.

Now let us prove that, after we push a non-decision bound B onto the stack, properties 4 and 5 hold. We distinguish the following cases (note that case B does not apply, as B is not a decision):

- A. By construction, the reason set RS of B satisfies $RS \subseteq A$. This implies that, after pushing B , bounds in RS will be below B in the stack. Moreover, if $RC \in S$ is the reason constraint of B , then $\{RC\} \cup RS \models B$ by Lemma 3.5. As $RC \in S$, we have that $S \cup RS \models B$. And since $S_0 \models S$, finally $S_0 \cup RS \models B$. This proves property 4. Moreover, since $RC \in S$ and $S_0 \models S$, we also have that $S_0 \models RC$, which proves property 5.
- C. Let A' be the stack returned by the call to `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. By the validity of the procedure, the assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound, and A' is of the form $N B$, where B is a fresh bound in N . By hypothesis, $RS \subseteq N$ and $S \cup RS \models B$. Therefore, bounds in RS are below B in the stack A' . And $S_0 \models S$ and $S \cup RS \models B$ imply $S_0 \cup RS \models B$, which proves property 4. Finally, if the reason constraint RC of B is defined, then by the validity of `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` $S \models RC$, which together with $S_0 \models S$ implies that $S_0 \models RC$, thus proving property 5.

Now let us prove property 6. It is enough to prove that, whenever a non-decision bound B is pushed onto a stack A of the form $A_0 D_1 A_1 \cdots A_{n-1} D_n A_n$, where D_1, \dots, D_n are all the decision bounds in A , then $S_0 \cup \{D_1, \dots, D_n\} \models B$. First, we notice that by property 4, the reason set RS of B is such that $RS \subseteq A$ and $S_0 \cup RS \models B$. Now, by recursively repeating the same reasoning for the previous non-decision bounds that there may be in RS , we have that the bounds in the left-hand side of the implication $S_0 \cup RS \models B$ can be reduced to only decisions and $S_0 \cup \{D_1, \dots, D_n\} \models B$.

To conclude the proof of Lemma B.1, we observe that all properties are trivially preserved when bounds are popped from the stack of bounds. The only exception is property 4 (i), i.e., that for any non-decision bound $B \in A$, its reason set RS is such that $RS \subseteq A$. But since bounds in RS are below B in the stack, before removing any element of RS we must have popped B already. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.10. First of all, let us prove that the core algorithm termi-

nates. To that end, extending [52], we define a well-founded ordering \succ on the states of the stack A , as follows. For a given A , the *size of the domain* of x_i , that is the number of possible values that the variable can still take, is $v_i(A) = v_i - \lambda_i + 1$, where $\lambda_i \preceq x_i$ and $x_i \preceq v_i$ are the topmost (and so strongest) lower and upper bounds of x_i in A . The aggregated domain size for all n variables is then $v(A) = v_1(A) + \dots + v_n(A)$. For $i \geq 0$ let A_i denote the bottom part of A , below (and without) the $(i + 1)$ -th decision.⁷ We define a stack A to be larger (i.e., less advanced, search-wise) than a stack A' , written $A \succ A'$, if $\langle v(A_0), \dots, v(A_m) \rangle >_{lex} \langle v(A'_0), \dots, v(A'_m) \rangle$, where m is the maximum number of decisions the stack can contain. This number is at most $\sum_{i=1}^n (ub_i - lb_i)$, where $lb_i \preceq x_i$ and $x_i \preceq ub_i$ are respectively the lower and the upper bounds of the variable x_i in S_0 , which are guaranteed to exist by the hypothesis of Theorem 3.10. Note that, when a fresh bound over variable x_i is pushed onto the stack, the size of the domain of x_i is decremented from $s > 1$ (otherwise, the bound could not be fresh) to $s' < s$; hence at most $ub_i - lb_i$ decisions can be made on x_i . The ordering \succ over stacks of bounds is well-founded as an infinitely decreasing chain of stacks would lead to an infinitely decreasing chain of tuples of natural numbers over the lexicographic ordering, which is well known to be well-founded.

To complete the proof of termination, let us see that at every step the algorithm either halts or transforms the stack of bounds A into an A' with $A \succ A'$.

First let us observe that, if a bound B over variable x_i is fresh in A and is pushed onto A , resulting into $A' = AB$, then $A \succ A'$. Indeed, if j is the last decision level of A' (that is, exactly j decisions have been made in A'), as B is fresh we have that $v_i(A_j) > v_i(A'_j)$ and $v_k(A_j) = v_k(A'_j)$ for all $k \neq i$. So $v(A_j) > v(A'_j)$. And since $A_p = A'_p$ for all $0 \leq p < j$, we have $v(A_p) = v(A'_p)$. Altogether, $A \succ A'$.

Now, in the propagation loop (step 1), the previous observation ensures that every propagation makes the stack decrease according to \succ . Hence the loop terminates either because no fresh bounds can be propagated, or due to a conflict. If there is no conflict, and if no fresh bounds can be decided, the algorithm halts. Otherwise a fresh bound is decided. Using again the previous observation, we see that the stack decreases according to \succ .

On the other hand, when there is a conflict, the algorithm halts if the stack contains no decisions. Otherwise, procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` is called. By the validity of the procedure, this call terminates. Moreover, the stack A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound, and A' is of the form $N B$, where B is a fresh bound in N . Let us assume that D is the $(i + 1)$ -th decision of A . Then $A_i = N$ and $A'_i = N B$, which implies that $v(A_i) > v(A'_i)$ as B is fresh in N . Furthermore, for all $0 \leq p < i$ we have $v(A_p) = v(A'_p)$ since $A_p = A'_p$. Altogether finally we see that $A \succ A'$, which concludes the proof of termination.

Now, as regards correctness, we observe that the algorithm halts

- A. when a conflict is found and the current stack of bounds contains no decision (returning ‘infeasible’), or
- B. when there is no conflict and no fresh bound can be decided (returning ‘solution A' ’).

In case A, by property 6 of Lemma B.1 we have that $S_0 \models A$, and by property 1 that

⁷Here A_i has a different meaning from that in the definition of decision level, or in property 6 of Lemma B.1.

$S \models S_0$, which together imply that $S \models A$. But, on the other hand, the conflict $C \in S$ is such that $\{C\} \cup A$ is infeasible, which implies that $S \cup A$ is infeasible. Altogether S is infeasible, and so is S_0 by property 1.

In case B, as no fresh bound can be decided, A determines a total assignment. And since there is no conflict, $A \models C$ for all $C \in S$. Hence, A is a solution to S , and by virtue of property 1 of Lemma B.1, it is a solution to S_0 as well. \square

Appendix C. Proofs of validity of `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`

In this appendix we prove Theorems 3.13 and 3.16, which ensure that different ways of implementing the procedure `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn` are valid.

Proof of Theorem 3.13. To start with, let us prove that the properties that $CS \subseteq A$ and that $S \cup CS$ is infeasible are indeed an invariant of conflict analysis, by induction on the number of steps.

At the beginning $CS \subseteq A$ holds by construction. Moreover, as C is false in CS we also have that $\{C\} \cup CS$ is infeasible, which together with $C \in S$ implies that $S \cup CS$ is infeasible.

Now let us assume that the property holds, and let us see that it is preserved in the next iteration of conflict analysis. If RS is the reason set of a non-decision bound $B \in A$, then $RS \subseteq A$ by property 4 of Lemma B.1, and therefore the condition $CS \subseteq A$ from the induction hypothesis implies that $(CS \setminus \{B\}) \cup RS \subseteq A$. Let us see now that $S \cup (CS \setminus \{B\}) \cup RS$ is infeasible by contradiction. If there is a solution sol , then in particular sol is a solution to $S \cup RS$. Since by properties 1 and 4 of Lemma B.1 we have $S \cup RS \models B$, this implies that sol satisfies B . But by definition sol also satisfies $CS \setminus \{B\}$. Altogether, sol is a solution to $S \cup CS$, which is a contradiction as $S \cup CS$ is infeasible by induction hypothesis.

Once we have proved the invariants of conflict analysis, we can proceed with the proof of validity of `Conflict_analysis_Backjump_Learn`. First, let us show its termination. Conflict analysis terminates because at each iteration the height in the stack A of the topmost bound of CS is decreased, by virtue of property 4 of Lemma B.1. Note that, if this topmost bound is a decision, then the exit condition of the loop is satisfied and conflict analysis halts. Finally, the termination of backjumping and learning is straightforward.

Let us prove now that for any constraint $C \in T$ we have $S \models C$ (property 2 in the definition of validity). If $T = \emptyset$ there is nothing to prove. Otherwise $T = \{CC\}$, where CC is a constraint equivalent to the final \overline{CS} , viewed as a clause (disjunction) of bounds. By the invariants of conflict analysis, $S \cup CS$ is infeasible. Therefore, for any sol solution to S , we have that sol cannot satisfy CS and hence there must be a bound $B \in CS$ such that $sol \models \overline{B}$. But this implies that sol satisfies the clause \overline{CS} , and so CC . Since sol is arbitrary, we have that indeed $S \models CC$.

Let us show now property 3 in the definition of validity. The stack A can be decomposed as NDM , where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is the last bound that is popped in backjumping. Note that this bound D must be a decision. Therefore A' has to be of the form $N\overline{B_{top}}$. It remains to be seen that $\overline{B_{top}}$ is a fresh bound in N . But if $\overline{B_{top}}$ were redundant with some bound $B \in N$, then B_{top} would be contradictory with

B in A , contradicting property 2 of Lemma B.1. Similarly, if $\overline{B_{top}}$ were contradictory with some bound $B \in N$, then B_{top} would be redundant with B in A , contradicting property 3 of Lemma B.1. Hence, $\overline{B_{top}}$ is indeed fresh in N .

Let us now prove property 4 in the definition of validity. To that end we need to characterise the last popped bound in backjumping. Since, by the invariants of conflict analysis, we have $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\} \subseteq A$, we can consider the maximum decision level in A of the bounds in $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}$, which we will denote by l (with the convention that $l = 0$ if $CS = \{B_{top}\}$). Note that A contains at least $l + 1$ decisions, since by definition of B_{top} its decision level is strictly greater than l . So let us define D' as the $(l + 1)$ -th decision in A , and let us prove that D' is the last bound that is popped from A' in backjumping. Let us distinguish two cases:

- If $CS = \{B_{top}\}$ then $l = 0$ and, according to the exit conditions, backjumping pops bounds from A' until there are no decisions left. Hence the last popped bound is the first decision, that is the $(l + 1)$ -th decision, which is D' .
- Otherwise, if $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\} \neq \emptyset$ we observe that, for any bound B in this set, we have that $\text{height}_A(B) < \text{height}_A(D')$. As a consequence, while D' is still in the stack A' , the exit condition of backjumping is not met. Moreover, once D' is popped, the bound in $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}$ with the highest height, which has decision level l , satisfies that there are no decisions above it in A' . Hence at this step backjumping halts.

Altogether, we conclude that D' is the last bound that is popped from A' in backjumping. And since for any bound $B \in CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}$ we have that $\text{height}_A(B) < \text{height}_A(D')$, it must be that $CS \setminus \{B_{top}\} \subseteq N$.

To complete the proof of property 4 in the definition of validity, we also have to see that $S \cup (CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}) \models \overline{B_{top}}$, or equivalently, that $S \cup (CS \setminus \{B_{top}\}) \cup \{B_{top}\} = S \cup CS$ is infeasible. But this is true, since it is an invariant of conflict analysis.

Lastly, as regards property 5 in the definition of validity, there is nothing to be proved. This concludes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 3.16. To start with, following the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.13, it is straightforward to see that the algorithm indeed terminates. Note that, as regards termination, the only difference between the procedure here and that in Section 3.4 is that now **Early Backjump** allows exiting the loop earlier.

Let us show property 2 in the definition of validity, that is, that for any constraint $C \in T$ we have $S \models C$. For that it is enough to see that $S \models CC$ is an invariant of conflict analysis. Let us prove it by induction on the number of steps. At the beginning $CC \in S$ by construction, and therefore $S \models CC$. Now let us assume that the property holds, and let us see that it is preserved in the next iteration of conflict analysis. Let B be the bound in CS that is topmost in A , and x its variable. Let us assume that RC the reason constraint of B is defined and that there exists a cut eliminating x between CC and RC , which we will denote by CC' (otherwise, CC does not change and there is nothing to prove). Then by the properties of the cut rule, $CC \wedge RC \models CC'$. Moreover $S \models RC$ by properties 1 and 5 of Lemma B.1. Thus, the induction hypothesis $S \models CC$

together with $S \models RC$ and $CC \wedge RC \models CC'$ imply that $S \models CC'$, which completes the proof of invariance. Also as a byproduct, this also proves property 5 in the definition of validity.

Let us show property 3 in the definition of validity. We have to see that the assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound, and A' is of the form $N B$, where B is a fresh bound in N . If **Backjump** is applied, this holds following the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.13. On the other hand, if **Early Backjump** is applied, let D be the last bound that is popped, which by construction is a decision. So the assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$, where N and M are sequences of bounds and D is a decision bound. Moreover, A' is of the form $N B'$, where by definition B' is a fresh bound in N . Hence property 3 is also true in this case.

Finally, regarding property 4 in the definition of validity, again following the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.13, it is straightforward to see that it holds for bounds that are pushed in **Backjump**. For bounds that are pushed in **Early Backjump**, let D be the last bound that is popped, which as observed above is a decision. Hence the assignment A can be decomposed as $N D M$. If B' is the bound that is pushed and CC and RS' are its reason constraint and its reason set, then by definition $RS' \subseteq N$ and $CC \cup RS' \models B'$, which together with $S \models CC$ implies $S \cup RS' \models B'$. \square