

Extended CTG Generalization and Dynamic Adjustment of Generalization Strategies in IC3

Yuheng Su

University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences
gipsyh.icu@gmail.com

Qiusong Yang*

Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences
qiusong@iscas.ac.cn

Yiwei Ci

Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences
yiwei@iscas.ac.cn

Ziyu Huang

Beijing Forestry University
fyy0007@bjfu.edu.cn

Abstract—The IC3 algorithm is widely used in hardware formal verification, with generalization as a crucial step. Standard generalization expands a cube by dropping literals to include more unreachable states. The CTG approach enhances this by blocking counterexamples to generalization (CTG) when dropping literals fails. In this paper, we extend the CTG method (EXCTG) to put more effort into generalization. If blocking the CTG fails, EXCTG attempts to block its predecessors, aiming for better generalization. While CTG and EXCTG offer better generalization results, they also come with increased computational overhead. Finding an appropriate balance between generalization quality and computational overhead is challenging with a static strategy. We propose DynAMic, a method that dynamically adjusts generalization strategies according to the difficulty of blocking states, thereby improving scalability without compromising efficiency. A comprehensive evaluation demonstrates that EXCTG and DynAMic achieve significant scalability improvements, solving 8 and 25 more cases, respectively, compared to CTG generalization.

I. INTRODUCTION

IC3 [1], also known as PDR [2], is a prominent SAT-based model checking algorithm widely used in hardware formal verification. It efficiently searches for inductive invariants without unrolling the model. IC3 is distinguished by its completeness in comparison to BMC [3] and its scalability compared to Interpolation-based Model Checking [4] and K-Induction [5]. IC3, widely recognized as a state-of-the-art algorithm, serves as the core engine for many efficient model checkers [6], [7].

To verify a property, IC3 aims to identify inductive invariants derived from a sequence of frames $F_0 \dots F_k$ that over-approximate the set of reachable states. A key procedure in IC3 is generalization (also known as minimum-inductive clause, or MIC). Given an unsafe state represented as a cube, the goal of generalization is to expand it to include as many additional unreachable states as possible, thereby reducing the number of iterations. The standard algorithm [1] adopts the down strategy [8], which attempts to drop as many literals as possible.

The results of standard generalization can sometimes be suboptimal. For example, when trying to block a literal-dropped cube $cand$ in frame F_i , the process only checks whether $\neg cand$ is inductive relative to F_{i-1} . If it is not, the

attempt to directly block $cand$ is abandoned. However, if the predecessors of $cand$ can be blocked in F_{i-1} , then $cand$ may then be blockable in F_i . To overcome this limitation, CTG generalization [9] has been proposed. This method aims to block counterexamples to generalization (CTG, which are also the predecessors of $cand$) when dropping literals fails. By attempting to block all predecessors of $cand$ in F_{i-1} , and if successful, $cand$ can then be blocked in F_i . This approach results in smaller cubes, blocks larger state spaces, and improves scalability compared to the standard method.

The results of CTG may sometimes still be suboptimal. Since it only considers blocking the predecessors of $cand$, if blocking the predecessors fails, it abandons directly blocking $cand$, even though the predecessors of $cand$'s predecessors could still be blocked. To address this issue, we propose EXCTG, an extension of CTG. Similar to CTG, when literal dropping fails, it attempts to block the CTG. However, if blocking the CTG also fails, EXCTG tries to block the predecessors of the CTG, leading to better generalization.

While CTG and EXCTG provide better generalization, they also introduce higher computational overhead, as they require significantly more SAT queries than the standard method. Current IC3 implementations typically adopt a single strategy and set of parameters applied across all generalization processes. Using the standard approach may lead to insufficient generalization, reducing scalability. Conversely, opting for CTG or EXCTG can increase generalization overhead, and in some simpler cases where such strong strategies are unnecessary, performance may actually suffer. Finding an appropriate balance between generalization quality and computational overhead is challenging with a static strategy. To mitigate this, we propose DynAMic (Dynamic Adjustment of MIC strategies), which measures the difficulty of blocking a state based on the number of blocking attempts and dynamically adjusts the generalization strategy and parameters according to this difficulty. For states that are easy to block, it uses the lightweight standard strategy to reduce overhead. For more challenging states, it applies more effective generalization strategies, such as CTG or EXCTG, depending on the difficulty.

We conducted a comprehensive evaluation, and the results show that our proposed EXCTG and DynAMic solved 8 and 25 more cases, respectively, compared to CTG generalization.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We use notations such as x, y for Boolean variables, and X, Y for sets of Boolean variables. The terms x and $\neg x$ are referred to as literals. Cube is conjunction of literals, while clause is disjunction of literals. A Boolean formula in Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF) is a conjunction of clauses. It is often convenient to treat a clause or a cube as a set of literals. For instance, given a clause c , and a literal l , we write $l \in c$ to indicate that l occurs in c .

A transition system, denoted as S , can be defined as a tuple $\langle X, Y, I, T \rangle$. Here, X and X' represent the sets of state variables in the current state and the next state respectively, while Y represents the set of input variables. The Boolean formula $I(X)$ represents the initial states, and $T(X, Y, X')$ describes the transition relation. State s_1 is a predecessor of state s_2 iff (s_1, s_2) is an assignment of T ($(s_1, s_2) \models T$). A safety property $P(X)$ is a Boolean formula over X . A system S satisfies P iff all reachable states of S satisfy P .

IC3 is a SAT-based model checking algorithm, which only needs to unroll the system at most once. It tries to prove that S satisfies P by finding an inductive invariant $INV(X)$ such that:

- $I(X) \Rightarrow INV(X)$
- $INV(X) \wedge T(X, Y, X') \Rightarrow INV(X')$
- $INV(X) \Rightarrow P(X)$

To achieve this objective, it maintains a monotone CNF sequence $F_0 \dots F_k$. Each *frame* F_i is a Boolean formula over X , which represents an over-approximation of the states reachable within i steps. Each clause c in F_i is called *lemma*. IC3 maintains the following invariant:

- $F_0 = I$
- $F_{i+1} \subseteq F_i$
- $F_i \Rightarrow F_{i+1}$
- $F_i \wedge T \Rightarrow F_{i+1}$
- for $i < k, F_i \Rightarrow P$

A lemma $\neg c$ (c is a cube) is said to be *inductive relative* to F_i if, starting from the intersection of F_i and $\neg c$, all states reached in a single transition are located inside $\neg c$. This can be expressed as a SAT query $\text{sat}(F_i \wedge \neg c \wedge T \wedge c')$. If this query is satisfied, it indicates that $\neg c$ is not inductive relative to F_i because we can find a counterexample that starts from $F_i \wedge \neg c$ and transitions outside of $\neg c$. If lemma $\neg c$ is inductive relative to F_i , it can be also said that cube c is blocked in F_{i+1} . If we want to block the cube c in F_{i+1} , we need to prove that $\neg c$ is inductive relative to F_i .

Algorithm 1, 2 and 3 provide an overview of the IC3 algorithm. The **ref** keyword in the function parameter indicates that it is passed by reference (& in C++). This algorithm incrementally constructs frames by iteratively performing the blocking phase and the propagation phase. During the blocking phase, it focuses on making $F_k \Rightarrow P$. It iteratively get a

Algorithm 1 Overview of IC3

```

1: function relind(cube  $c$ , frame  $i$ )
    $\triangleright$  Is clause  $\neg c$  inductive relative to  $F_i$ ?
2:   return  $\neg \text{sat}(F_i \wedge \neg c \wedge T \wedge c')$ 
3:
4: function get_predecessor()
5:    $\text{model} := \text{get\_model}()$   $\triangleright$  assignment of last SAT call
6:   return  $\{l \in \text{model} \mid \text{var}(l) \in X\}$ 
7:
8: function block(cube  $c$ , frame  $i$ )
9:   if  $i = 0$  then
10:    return false
11:   while  $\neg \text{relind}(c, i - 1)$  do
12:      $p := \text{get\_predecessor}()$ 
13:     if  $\neg \text{block}(p, i - 1)$  then
14:       return false
15:   // different strategy configurations
16:   if use_CTG then
17:      $\text{gen} := \text{ctg\_generalize}(c, i - 1, \text{CTG\_LV})$ 
18:   else
19:      $\text{gen} := \text{standard\_generalize}(c, i - 1)$ 
20:    $F_j := F_j \cup \{\neg \text{gen}\}, 1 \leq j \leq i$ 
21:   return true
22:
23: function propagate(frame  $k$ )
24:   for  $1 \leq i < k$  do
25:     for each  $c \in F_i \setminus F_{i+1}$  do
26:       if relind( $\neg c, i$ ) then
27:          $F_{i+1} := F_{i+1} \cup \{c\}$ 
28:       if  $F_i = F_{i+1}$  then
29:         return true
30:   return false
31:
32: procedure IC3( $I, T, P$ )
33:    $F_0 := I, k := 1, F_k := \top$ 
34:   while true do
35:     while  $\text{sat}(F_k \wedge \neg P)$  do
36:        $c := \text{get\_model}()$ 
37:       if  $\neg \text{block}(c, k)$  then
38:         return unsafe
39:      $k := k + 1, F_k := \top$ 
40:     if propagate( $k$ ) then
41:       return safe

```

cube c such that $c \models \neg P$, and block it recursively. This process involves attempting to block the cube's predecessors if it cannot be blocked directly. It continues until the initial states cannot be blocked, indicating that $\neg P$ can be reached from the initial states in k transitions thus violating the property. In cases where a cube can be confirmed as blocked, IC3 proceeds to enlarge the set of blocked states through a process called generalization. This involves dropping variables and ensuring that the resulting clause remains relative inductive,

Algorithm 2 Standard Generalization

```
1: function down(cube ref c, frame i)
2:   while true do
3:     if  $I \wedge c \neq \perp$  then
4:       return false
5:     if rebind(c, i) then
6:       return true
7:     p := get_predecessor()
8:     c :=  $c \cap p$       ▷ common literals in c and p
9:
10: function standard_generalize(cube c, frame i)
11:   for each l ∈ c do
12:     cand :=  $c \setminus \{l\}$ 
13:     if down(cand, i) then
14:       c := cand
15:   return c
```

Algorithm 3 CTG Generalization

```
1: function ctg_down(cube ref c, frame i, ctg_level cl)
2:   num_ctg := 0
3:   while true do
4:     if  $I \wedge c \neq \perp$  then
5:       return false
6:     if rebind(c, i) then
7:       return true
8:     p := get_predecessor()
9:     if cl > 0 and num_ctg < CTG_MAX and i > 0
10:    then
11:      if  $I \wedge c = \perp$  and rebind(p, i - 1) then
12:        gen := ctg_generalize(p, i - 1, cl - 1)
13:         $F_j := F_j \cup \{\neg gen\}, 1 \leq j \leq i$ 
14:        num_ctg := num_ctg + 1
15:        continue
16:      num_ctg := 0
17:      c :=  $c \cap p$ 
18: function ctg_generalize(cube c, frame i, ctg_level cl)
19:   for each l ∈ c do
20:     cand :=  $c \setminus \{l\}$ 
21:     if ctg_down(cand, i, cl) then
22:       c := cand
23:   return c
```

with the objective of obtaining a minimal inductive clause. The propagation phase tries to push lemmas to the top frame. If a lemma c in $F_i \setminus F_{i+1}$ is also inductive relative to F_i , then push it into F_{i+1} . During this process, if two consecutive frames become identical ($F_i = F_{i+1}$), then the inductive invariant is found and the safety of this model can be proved.

To the best of our knowledge, there are currently two generalization strategies:

- The standard generalization [1], [8] uses *down* to drop a literal, as shown in Algorithm 2. When trying to drop a




Fig. 1: p_0 , p_1 , and *cand* are cubes representing states, where p_0 is the predecessor of p_1 , and p_1 is the predecessor of *cand*. I represents the initial states. The cubes in shaded areas represent a set of states attempting to block. These diagrams illustrate the process of the different generalization strategies.

literal l , it first attempts to block the cube *cand* with l removed. If successful, l is dropped. If not, it then tries to block the cube that contains both *cand* and the counterexample (Line 8). For example in Fig. 1, the algorithm initially attempts to block *cand*, but this fails because *cand* has a predecessor p_1 , which has not yet been blocked. To block *cand*, p_1 must also be blocked. As a result, the algorithm tries to block c_0 (Line 8), but this also fails because c_0 contains some initial states (Line 3). Consequently, *cand* cannot be blocked, and literal dropping fails. We will refer to it as ‘Standard’ in the following sections.

- The CTG generalization [9] uses *ctg_down* to drop a literal, as shown in Algorithm 3 and Fig. 1. The key difference compared to *down* is that if blocking *cand* fails, it attempts to block the counterexample to generalization (CTG) of *cand* (*cand*’s predecessor p_1) (Line 10). If the predecessor can be blocked, it will generalize it by recursively calling *ctg_generalize* (Line 11), with a maximum recursion level *cl*. When $cl = 0$, *ctg_generalize* behaves the same as *standard_generalize*. Therefore, *ctg_generalize* can be recursively called up to a maximum level of CTG_LV. If all predecessors can be blocked, *cand* will also be blocked. However, if blocking the predecessor fails (p_1 has a predecessor p_0), or if the number of predecessors that need to be blocked exceeds CTG_MAX (Line 9), it will then attempt to block the cube c_0 , which contains both *cand* and its predecessors.

III. EXTENDED CTG GENERALIZATION

As shown in Fig. 1, when blocking *cand* fails, CTG attempts to block its predecessor, p_1 . However, if blocking p_1 also fails, CTG abandons directly blocking *cand* and instead tries to block a cube that contains both *cand* and its predecessor. We attempt to put more effort into generalization: if blocking p_1 fails, we also attempt to block its predecessor, p_0 . In Fig. 1, this succeeds because p_0 has no predecessor. As a result, p_1 can be blocked once p_0 is blocked, and *cand* can then be successfully blocked. But if blocking p_0 fails, we continue by attempting to block the predecessor of the predecessor of p_1 , and so on, to achieve better generalization.

Algorithm 4 EXCTG Generalization

```

1: function exctg_block(cube c, frame i, int ref limit,
   ctg_level cl)
2:   if  $I \wedge c \neq \perp$  then
3:     return false
4:   limit := limit - 1
5:   if limit = 0 then
6:     return false
7:   while true do
8:     if  $\neg \text{relind}(c, i - 1)$  then
9:       p := get_predecessor()
10:      if  $\neg \text{exctg\_block}(p, i - 1, \text{limit})$  then
11:        return false
12:      else
13:        gen := exctg_generalize(p, i - 1, cl)
14:         $F_j := F_j \cup \{\neg \text{gen}\}, 1 \leq j \leq i$ 
15:        return true
16:
17: function exctg_down(cube ref c, frame i, ctg_level cl)
18:   num_ctg := 0
19:   while true do
20:     if  $I \wedge c \neq \perp$  then
21:       return false
22:     if relind(c, i) then
23:       return true
24:     p := get_predecessor()
25:     if cl > 0 and num_ctg < CTG_MAX and i > 0
26:   then       if exctg_block(i, p, EXCTG_LIMIT, cl - 1)
27:   then       num_ctg := num_ctg + 1
28:               continue
29:   num_ctg := 0
30:   c :=  $c \cap p$ 
31:
32: function exctg_generalize(cube c, frame i, ctg_level cl)
33:   for each  $l \in c$  do
34:     cand :=  $c \setminus \{l\}$ 
35:     if exctg_down(cand, i, cl) then
36:       c := cand
37:   return c

```




Fig. 2: The relationships between Standard, CTG, and EXCTG.




Fig. 3: c_0 and c_1 represent bad states, and p_i denote their predecessors. The dashed circle illustrates the state space generalized from p_0 or p_4 using different strategies.

We extend the CTG generalization (EXCTG), as presented in Algorithm 4. The modifications are highlighted in blue. When blocking cube c fails, its predecessor p is identified. EXCTG puts more effort into blocking p by invoking the *exctg_block* function. The *exctg_block* function first attempts to block p . If this fails, the function recursively calls itself to block p 's predecessors. If blocking a predecessor of p fails, it continues to block the predecessor's predecessor, and so on. This process repeats until either all predecessors of p are successfully blocked—thus allowing p to be blocked—or the number of blocking attempts exceeds EXCTG_LIMIT, at which point the function returns false.

The relationships between Standard, CTG, and EXCTG generalizations are illustrated in Fig. 2. As shown, Standard is a special case of CTG (when CTG_LV = 0), and CTG is a special case of EXCTG (when EXCTG_LIMIT = 1).

IV. DYNAMICALLY ADJUSTING GENERALIZATION STRATEGIES

While EXCTG provides better generalization results, its computational cost is significantly higher. Each time a literal is dropped, many more SAT calls are required compared to the standard approach. The generalization strategies: Standard, CTG, and EXCTG, produce progressively better results but also come with increased computational overhead. In the cur-

rent implementations of the IC3 algorithm, the generalization strategy and its parameters are set at the beginning of the solving process and remain fixed throughout all subsequent generalization steps. However, the optimal strategies may vary depending on the specific bad states. For example, as shown in Fig. 3, p_0 is better suited for generalization using EXCTG, as blocking c_0 requires all of its predecessors to be blocked. If the current generalization does not block all the predecessors, further blocking and generalization will need to continue in the next iteration. Conversely, p_4 is more efficiently handled by the Standard method, as CTG and EXCTG introduce more computational overhead.

It may be more effective to find a trade-off between generalization quality and computational overhead. Perhaps, by dynamically and adaptively selecting the appropriate generalization strategy for different states, we could better harness the strengths of each strategy. However, the key challenge lies in determining when each generalization strategy should be applied. Intuitively, the harder a state is to block, the more effort we should invest in generalizing its predecessors. We quantify the difficulty of blocking a state by the number of failed attempts. When blocking a state c fails, we initially use the Standard strategy to generalize its predecessor. As the number of failed attempts to block c increases, we gradually switch to CTG or EXCTG. In this way, if a state is easy to block, we use Standard to reduce generalization overhead. If a state is difficult to block, we gradually apply strategies with better generalization to avoid under-generalization.

We introduce a heuristic method called DynAMic (Dynamic Adjustment of MIC strategies), as shown in Algorithm 5. When attempting to block a bad state c , an activity value act is recorded, which increases after each failed blocking attempt (Line 23), reflecting the difficulty of blocking c . If blocking c fails, its predecessor p is identified, and we attempt to block p . Once p is successfully blocked, we generalize it using the function $dyn_generalize$, which takes into account the act of p 's successor, c (Line 27).

The $dyn_generalize$ function dynamically adjusts the generalization strategy and parameters based on $sact$. We predefined two thresholds: CTG_TH and EXCTG_TH.

- When $sact < CTG_TH$, we use the Standard strategy.
- When $CTG_TH \leq sact < EXCTG_TH$, the CTG is used, and CTG_MAX is adjusted linearly based on $sact$. As the difficulty of blocking c increases, the maximum number of attempts to block CTG is raised accordingly.
- When $sact \geq EXCTG_TH$, the EXCTG strategy is applied, and EXCTG_LIMIT is adjusted based on $sact$. As the difficulty of blocking c increases, the maximum limits in EXCTG are adjusted upwards accordingly. However, since $sact$ can sometimes reach very large values, an excessively high EXCTG_LIMIT could negatively impact performance. To mitigate this, the growth rate of EXCTG_LIMIT is designed to gradually slow as $sact$ increases under the power function.

Algorithm 5 DynAMic Generalization

```

1: function  $dyn\_generalize$ (cube  $c$ , frame  $i$ , activity  $act$ )
2:   if  $act < CTG\_TH$  then
3:     // standard generalization
4:      $CTG\_LV := 0$ 
5:   else if  $act < EXCTG\_TH$  then
6:     // CTG generalization
7:      $CTG\_LV := 1$ 
8:      $EXCTG\_LIMIT := 1$ 
9:      $CTG\_MAX := (act - CTG\_TH) / 10 + 2$ 
10:  else
11:    // EXCTG generalization
12:     $CTG\_LV := 1$ 
13:     $EXCTG\_MAX := 5$ 
14:     $EXCTG\_LIMIT := (act - EXCTG\_TH)^{0.3} \cdot 2 + 5$ 
15:   $c := exctg\_generalize(c, i, CTG\_LV)$ 
16:  return  $c$ 
17:
18: function  $block$ (cube  $c$ , frame  $i$ , successor_activity  $sact$ )
19:   if  $i = 0$  then
20:     return  $false$ 
21:    $act := 0$ 
22:   while  $\neg relind(c, i - 1)$  do
23:      $act := act + 1$ 
24:      $p := get\_predecessor()$ 
25:     if  $\neg block(p, i - 1, act)$  then
26:       return  $false$ 
27:    $gen := dyn\_generalize(c, i - 1, sact)$ 
28:    $F_j := F_j \cup \{\neg gen\}, 1 \leq j \leq i$ 
29:   return  $true$ 

```

V. EVALUATION

A. Experiment Setup

We implemented Standard, CTG, EXCTG, and DynAMic within the rIC3 model checker [10], which is the 1st in the BV track of Hardware Model Checking Competition 2024 (HWMCC'24) [11]. For CTG generalization, we set the parameters to CTG_MAX = 3 and CTG_LV = 1, following the original experiment in [9]. For EXCTG, we used the same CTG parameters with the additional setting of EXCTG_LIMIT = 5. For DynAMic, the parameters were set to CTG_TH = 10 and EXCTG_TH = 40. We also consider the IC3 implementations in the state-of-the-art system ABC [6], using the standard and CTG strategies with identical parameters.

We conducted all configurations using the complete benchmark suite from the HWMCC'19 and HWMCC'20, comprising a total of 536 cases in AIGER format, all under identical resource constraints: 16GB of memory and a 3600s time limit. The evaluations were performed on an AMD EPYC 7532 processor running at 2.4 GHz. To increase our confidence in the correctness of the results, all results from rIC3 are certified by certifaiger [12]. To ensure reproducibility, we have provided our experimental artifact [13].

TABLE I: Summary of Results

Configuration	#Solved	Δ	PAR-2
rIC3-Standard	398	0	1922.54
rIC3-CTG	407	+9	1866.83
rIC3-EXCTG	415	+17	1802.63
rIC3-DynAMic	432	+34	1555.32
ABC-PDR-Standard	363	0	2405.96
ABC-PDR-CTG	369	+6	2352.13

B. Results

Table I presents a summary of the overall results, showing the number of solved cases for each configuration, as well as the additional cases solved using rIC3-Standard as the baseline. It also displays the PAR-2 score, commonly used in SAT competitions. Fig. 4 shows the number of cases solved over time, while Fig. 5 presents scatter plots comparing the solving times of different configurations. From these results, we make the following observations.

1) *Baseline*: The comparison demonstrates that the rIC3 systems perform well compared to the state-of-the-art system, ABC [6]. Therefore, it is appropriate to use rIC3-Standard as a baseline.

2) *EXCTG*:

- **Scalability.** CTG shows better scalability than Standard, consistent with the results in [9]. Our proposed EXCTG solved 8 more cases than CTG, further highlighting its effectiveness in improving scalability.
- **Efficiency.** EXCTG exhibits lower efficiency compared to both Standard and CTG, as shown in Figure 5 (b) and (c), with an increased solving time for most cases. This is because more SAT solver calls are made during each literal drop, leading to higher overhead.
- As shown in Figure 4, CTG initially solves fewer cases than Standard, but as time progresses, it surpasses Standard, consistent with the results reported in the original CTG paper [9]. Similarly, EXCTG follows the same pattern. Due to EXCTG’s lower efficiency, it starts off slower, but its better scalability enables it to solve more cases over time.

3) *DynAMic*:

- **Scalability.** DynAMic demonstrates significant scalability improvements, solving 25 more cases than CTG and 17 more cases than EXCTG. This result highlights the effectiveness of dynamically adjusting strategies.
- **Efficiency.** Although DynAMic demonstrates significant improvements in scalability, its efficiency remains comparable to Standard and CTG, while exceeding EXCTG, as shown in Fig. 5 (d), (e), and (f).

VI. RELATED WORK

Generalization is a critical component of the IC3 algorithm, and numerous efforts have focused on enhancing it.

The original IC3 algorithm employs down [8] to drop literals, significantly reducing the number of iterations. Building on this, CTG generalization [9] aims to block counterexamples




Fig. 4: The number of cases solved by different configurations over time.




Fig. 5: This plot compares the solving times (in seconds) between different configurations.

when literal dropping fails, achieving a more effective generalization. Details of both strategies are provided in Section II. We extend CTG by attempting to block the predecessors of

counterexamples, which further enhances generalization. Additionally, we achieve a balance between generalization quality and computational overhead through dynamic strategies.

Some works have enhanced generalization while still utilizing either the Standard or CTG. In [14], the authors aimed to predict the outcome before generalization, potentially reducing overhead if successful. The algorithm in [15] drops literals that do not appear in any subsumed lemmas from the previous frame, increasing the likelihood of propagating to the next frame. These two methods are not in conflict with our proposed methods and can be used simultaneously.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a novel generalization strategy called EXCTG, which extends CTG. Building on both existing approaches and EXCTG, we introduce DynAMic, a heuristic method that dynamically adjusts MIC strategies and parameters. Our evaluation demonstrates that these proposed approaches lead to significant improvements in scalability.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. R. Bradley, "Sat-based model checking without unrolling," in *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation - 12th International Conference, VMCAI 2011, Austin, TX, USA, January 23-25, 2011. Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, R. Jhala and D. A. Schmidt, Eds., vol. 6538. Springer, 2011, pp. 70–87.
- [2] N. Eén, A. Mishchenko, and R. K. Brayton, "Efficient implementation of property directed reachability," in *International Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD '11, Austin, TX, USA, October 30 - November 02, 2011*, P. Bjesse and A. Slobodová, Eds. FMCAD Inc., 2011, pp. 125–134. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2157675>
- [3] A. Biere, A. Cimatti, E. M. Clarke, M. Fujita, and Y. Zhu, "Symbolic model checking using SAT procedures instead of bdds," in *Proceedings of the 36th Conference on Design Automation, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 21-25, 1999*, M. J. Irwin, Ed. ACM Press, 1999, pp. 317–320.
- [4] K. L. McMillan, "Interpolation and sat-based model checking," in *Computer Aided Verification, 15th International Conference, CAV 2003, Boulder, CO, USA, July 8-12, 2003, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. A. H. Jr. and F. Somenzi, Eds., vol. 2725. Springer, 2003, pp. 1–13.
- [5] M. Sheeran, S. Singh, and G. Stålmarck, "Checking safety properties using induction and a sat-solver," in *Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, Third International Conference, FMCAD 2000, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-3, 2000, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. A. H. Jr. and S. D. Johnson, Eds., vol. 1954. Springer, 2000, pp. 108–125.
- [6] "Abc," <https://github.com/berkeley-abc/abc>.
- [7] "nuxmv," <https://nuxmv.fbk.eu>.
- [8] A. R. Bradley and Z. Manna, "Checking safety by inductive generalization of counterexamples to induction," in *Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, 7th International Conference, FMCAD 2007, Austin, Texas, USA, November 11-14, 2007, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 2007, pp. 173–180.
- [9] Z. Hassan, A. R. Bradley, and F. Somenzi, "Better generalization in IC3," in *Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD 2013, Portland, OR, USA, October 20-23, 2013*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 157–164. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6679405/>
- [10] "ric3," <https://github.com/gipsyh/rIC3>.
- [11] "Hwmcc," <https://hwmcc.github.io/>.
- [12] E. Yu, N. Froleyks, A. Biere, and K. Heljanko, "Towards compositional hardware model checking certification," in *Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD 2023, Ames, IA, USA, October 24-27, 2023*, A. Nadel and K. Y. Rozier, Eds. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–11. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.34727/2023/isbn.978-3-85448-060-0_12
- [13] "Artifact," <https://github.com/paperartifact/DynAMic>, 2024.
- [14] Y. Su, Q. Yang, and Y. Ci, "Predicting lemmas in generalization of ic3," in *Proceedings of the 61st ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*, ser. DAC '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3649329.3655970>
- [15] Y. Xia, A. Becchi, A. Cimatti, A. Griggio, J. Li, and G. Pu, "Searching for i-good lemmas to accelerate safety model checking," in *Computer Aided Verification - 35th International Conference, CAV 2023, Paris, France, July 17-22, 2023, Proceedings, Part II*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, C. Enea and A. Lal, Eds., vol. 13965. Springer, 2023, pp. 288–308.