

Smart Cubing for Graph Search: A Comparative Study*

Markus Kirchweger, Hai Xia, Tomáš Peitl, and Stefan Szeider

Algorithms and Complexity Group
 TU Wien, Vienna, Austria
 [mk,hxia,peitl,sz]@ac.tuwien.ac.at

Abstract

Parallel solving via cube-and-conquer is a key method for scaling SAT solvers to hard instances. While cube-and-conquer has proven successful for pure SAT problems, notably the Pythagorean triples conjecture, its application to SAT solvers extended with propagators presents unique challenges, as these propagators learn constraints dynamically during the search.

We study this problem using SAT Modulo Symmetries (SMS) as our primary test case, where a symmetry-breaking propagator reduces the search space by learning constraints that eliminate isomorphic graphs. Through extensive experimentation comprising over 10,000 CPU hours, we systematically evaluate different cube-and-conquer variants on three well-studied combinatorial problems. Our methodology combines prerun phases to collect learned constraints, various cubing strategies, and parameter tuning via algorithm configuration and LLM-generated design suggestions.

The comprehensive empirical evaluation provides new insights into effective cubing strategies for propagator-based SAT solving, with our best method achieving speedups of 2-3x from improved cubing and parameter tuning, providing an additional 1.5-2x improvement on harder instances.

1 Introduction

Propositional satisfiability (SAT) solvers based on conflict-driven clause learning can solve huge instances with millions of variables and clauses [Fichte *et al.*, 2023a]. However, for hard instances, particularly in combinatorial problems, parallelization becomes necessary. The cube-and-conquer technique has proven highly effective for such problems, most notably in resolving the Pythagorean triples conjecture [Heule *et al.*, 2016].

In cube-and-conquer, a look-ahead solver first partitions the search space into disjoint sub-problems via cubes (partial assignments), which are then solved independently by CDCL solvers. This independence enables efficient parallel solving.

When encoding combinatorial problems into SAT, particularly those involving graphs, we often encounter highly symmetric search spaces. Many mutually isomorphic graphs satisfy the same constraints, but a solver needs to check only one representative, the *canonical* element, from each isomorphism class. Standard CDCL solvers cannot leverage these symmetries, and static symmetry breaking methods cannot break all symmetries [Codish *et al.*, 2019].

SAT Modulo Symmetries (SMS) [Kirchweger and Szeider, 2021; Kirchweger and Szeider, 2024] addresses this limitation through dynamic symmetry breaking, using a custom propagator that learns symmetry-breaking predicates during the search. SMS has been successfully applied to several

*Research supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) within the projects 10.55776/36688 and 10.55776/COE12.

hard combinatorial problems, including problems from extremal combinatorics on graphs, hypergraphs, matroids, and clause sets¹.

While one could apply standard cube-and-conquer to any SAT-based system with propagators, this approach yields poor performance. The key challenge is that propagators learn constraints dynamically which are not present in the initial formula. In SMS, for instance, the cubing solver working only with the input formula effectively partitions the space of all graphs rather than the space of canonical graphs. Other propagator-based systems face similar issues when the propagators contribute essential constraints to reduce the search space.

Our contribution is a systematic study of cube-and-conquer methods adapted for SAT solving with propagators, using SMS as the primary test case. Following a carefully designed experimental methodology, we evaluate several cubing strategies and investigate effective partitioning approaches for problems with dynamic constraints. Our pipeline consists of a *prerun phase* to collect important learned clauses, *look-ahead-based cubing* with various heuristics, and a final *solving phase*. Since cubes from the same instance share structural properties, we use structured *algorithm configuration* [Lindauer *et al.*, 2022] to optimize the SAT solver specifically for the types of subproblems it will encounter. We also explore LLM-based design of look-ahead scoring functions that determine variable priorities during cubing. Our experimental evaluation comprises over 10,000 CPU hours across multiple benchmark problems.

Our *results* demonstrate consistent improvements across our three benchmark problems: triangle-free graph coloring, Kochen-Specker graph enumeration, and diameter-2-critical graphs. The prerun and cubing phase alone provides a speedup between 2x and 3x compared to standard SMS. Parameter tuning yields an additional 1.5x to 2x improvement, with the effect being most pronounced on harder instances. Our best-performing cubing strategy, based on established look-ahead techniques, consistently generates better-balanced subproblems than alternatives.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the notation used in the paper and some common knowledge on graphs and propositional logic. In Sections 3 and 4 thereafter, we introduce the two main characters in this paper: SMS and cube-and-conquer. In Section 5, we explain how we apply cube-and-conquer to SMS and give details of the various configurations. In Section 6, we provide a short background on our benchmark problems and encodings. We present the results of our comparison in Section 7 and wrap up in Section 8.

Supplementary Material Code and instances are available on Zenodo [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2025].

2 Preliminaries

For a positive integer n , we write $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Below we review basics from propositional logic and graph theory.

SAT. A *literal* is a propositional variable x or its negation \bar{x} . A *clause (cube)* is a disjunction (conjunction) of literals. A *CNF (DNF) formula* is a conjunction (disjunction) of clauses (cubes). We sometimes interpret clauses/cubes as sets of literals and CNF (DNF) formulas as sets of clauses (cubes). For a clause (cube) C , the cube (clause) $\{\bar{x} \mid x \in C\}$ is denoted by \bar{C} . We write $\text{var}(x) = \text{var}(\bar{x}) := x$ for the variable of a literal, $\text{var}(C) = \{\text{var}(x) \mid x \in C\}$ for a clause/cube C , and $\text{var}(F) = \bigcup_{C \in F} \text{var}(C)$ for a CNF/DNF formula F . An *assignment* to a set of variables V is a mapping $\tau : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and is extended to literals by $\tau(\bar{x}) = 1 - \tau(x)$. An assignment τ *satisfies* a clause C if it maps at least one of its literals to 1. An assignment to $\text{var}(F)$ that satisfies every clause of F is called a *satisfying assignment* or a *model*. The set of models of a formula F is denoted by $\text{mod}(F)$. If $\text{mod}(F) \neq \emptyset$ we say that F is *satisfiable*, otherwise it is *unsatisfiable*. If every

¹[Fazekas *et al.*, 2023; Janota *et al.*, 2025; Kirchweger *et al.*, 2022; Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a; Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023b; Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023c; Zhang *et al.*, 2024; Zhang and Szeider, 2023]

assignment $\tau : \text{var}(F) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a model, then F is a *tautology*. For two formulas F and G , if $\text{mod}(F) \subseteq \text{mod}(G)$, then F *entails* G , written $F \models G$. Two formulas F and G are *equisatisfiable* if they are both satisfiable or both unsatisfiable, and are *logically equivalent* if $\text{mod}(F) = \text{mod}(G)$. We will identify an assignment with the set of literals it maps to 1. For $V \subseteq \text{var}(F)$ and an assignment to V τ , we write $F[\tau]$ for the formula obtained from F by removing all literals mapped to 0 by τ , as well as all clauses satisfied by τ . A clause with only one literal is called a *unit clause*. If F contains a unit clause $C = (x)$, then the literal x must be set to 1 in every model, and without loss of generality, we can focus on the simplified formula $F[x]$. Repeated application of this rule until either there are no more unit clauses or an empty clause is created is called *unit propagation*.

Graphs. We consider simple, undirected and unweighted graphs without parallel edges or self-loops. A *graph* G consists of a set $V(G)$ of vertices and a set $E(G) \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ of edges; we denote the edge between vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ by uv or equivalently vu . We write \mathcal{G}_n to denote the class of all graphs with $V(G) = [n]$. The *adjacency matrix* of a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$, denoted by A_G , is the $n \times n$ matrix where the element at row v and column u , denoted by $A_G(v, u)$, is 1 if $vu \in E$ and 0 otherwise. For a permutation $\pi : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, $\pi(G)$ denotes the graph obtained from $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ by the permutation π , where $V(\pi(G)) = V(G) = [n]$ and $E(\pi(G)) = \{\pi(u)\pi(v) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$. Two graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ are *isomorphic* if there is a permutation $\pi : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $\pi(G_1) = G_2$; in this case G_2 is an *isomorphic copy* of G_1 .

3 SAT Modulo Symmetries (SMS)

Modern propositional satisfiability (SAT) solvers are primarily based on *conflict-driven clause learning* (CDCL) [Fichte *et al.*, 2023b; Marques-Silva *et al.*, 2021]. CDCL is a backtracking exhaustive search algorithm which decides the satisfiability of an input CNF as follows. In a loop, a CDCL solver runs unit propagation until fixpoint (all forced assignments), then picks a variable to branch on when there is nothing left to propagate, and learns new clauses from conflicts obtained through unit propagation when they occur (when both x and $\neg x$ is forced). When a model is found, the solver reports it; when it learns the empty clause, it reports unsatisfiability.

SMS is a framework that augments a CDCL SAT solver² with a custom propagator that can reason about graph isomorphisms (*symmetries*), allowing the SAT solver to search *modulo isomorphisms* for graphs with a given number n of vertices and which satisfy constraints specified by a propositional formula. The SMS propagator is a routine which checks whether the currently explored branch of the search tree contains a *canonical graph*. A canonical graph is a distinguished member of its isomorphism class—in SMS, it is the isomorphic copy with a lexicographically minimal adjacency matrix, where matrices are compared as row-wise concatenated vectors: the vector of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is $(0\ 1\ 0\ 0)$. This routine is thus referred to as the *minimality check*. The minimality check is called by the CDCL solver after unit propagation reaches fixpoint, and can trigger an additional conflict on top of ordinary CDCL and consequently learn a *symmetry-breaking clause*, which is a clause that excludes non-canonical graphs.

In order for SMS to check minimality, a graph from the current partial assignment of the CDCL solver has to be constructed. This is done by looking at the values of the specially designated *edge variables*, which, by convention, are the first $\binom{n}{2}$ variables of the formula (when searching for graphs with n vertices; the value n must be passed to SMS). These variables map to the upper triangle of the adjacency matrix in row-major order $\begin{pmatrix} \cdot & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 4 & 5 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 6 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}$, and from their assignment one can extract a *partially defined graph*, which is a graph in which the presence of some edges is unknown (whose

²At the moment, SMS uses the SAT solver CaDiCaL [Biere *et al.*, 2024] and communicates with it through the IPASIR-UP interface [Fazekas *et al.*, 2024].

variables are unassigned). SMS learns a symmetry-breaking clause when the current partially defined graph cannot be extended to any canonical graph.

The minimality check is only one of a set of external propagators implemented in SMS. These propagators can be used as a substitute for constraints that would be difficult to encode in propositional logic. A typical such example is non-3-colorability, which cannot be encoded in a polynomial-size propositional formula unless $\text{NP} = \text{coNP}$; more on the use of propagators in SMS in Section 6. Lexicographic minimality of the adjacency matrix among isomorphic copies is, like non-3-colorability, also a coNP -complete property [Crawford *et al.*, 1996].

Kirchweger and Szeider [2021; 2024] give a comprehensive description of SMS. For the purpose of this paper, the salient property of SMS is that parts of the encoding—namely, the symmetry-breaking clauses and any clauses added by other propagators—are learned dynamically during the solver run and are unknown at the beginning. As a consequence, we cannot simply reuse existing SAT parallelization methods, as those assume (of course) that the entire problem is represented in the encoding. In Section 5, we explain how to take the external propagators into account properly for parallelization; before that, we review the SAT parallelization technique cube-and-conquer.

4 Cube-and-Conquer

Assume that a hard CNF formula F is to be solved by a SAT solver, and let x be a variable of F . Consider the formulas $F[x]$ and $F[\bar{x}]$ where x is assigned true or false, respectively. Clearly, F is satisfiable if, and only if, at least one of $F[x]$ and $F[\bar{x}]$ is satisfiable. Therefore, instead of solving F , one can solve $F[x]$ and $F[\bar{x}]$, the point being that these *sub-problems* can be solved in parallel, and will hopefully be easier to solve than the original formula F . This reasoning applies equally for enumeration problems: in order to enumerate the models of F , one can separately enumerate the models of $F[x]$ and $F[\bar{x}]$, and take the union of the two.

This basic splitting idea can, of course, be applied recursively: by re-splitting the sub-problem $F[\bar{x}]$ we obtain the collection of sub-problems $F[x]$, $F[\bar{x}, y]$, and $F[\bar{x}, \bar{y}]$. In general, given an input formula F , and a DNF tautology $\Gamma = C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_r$ over (some of) the variables of F , the set of models of F is obtained as $\text{mod}(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \text{mod}(F[C_i])$. The C_i are called *cubes*, and the method that solves F by designing a suitable cube set Γ to divide into sub-problems and solving each sub-problem separately (typically in parallel) is called *cube-and-conquer* [Heule *et al.*, 2016; Heule *et al.*, 2018].

Note that Γ does not have to be a tautology. For satisfiability checking in ordinary SAT (no SMS or other special propagators), it is sufficient that $F \wedge \Gamma$ is equisatisfiable to F . In our context, we add symmetry-breaking clauses on the fly, and we enumerate models instead of just checking satisfiability. We thus must require preservation of all models, i.e., that $F \models \Gamma$, or, equivalently, that $F \wedge \neg\Gamma$ is unsatisfiable.

A fundamental optimization problem emerges: how to find a good splitter Γ in order to optimize solve (conquer) performance? The standard answer to this question is *look-ahead* solving. A look-ahead solver constructs a branching tree whose nodes are variables. At every node, the solver tries assigning each as yet unassigned variable in both possible ways and performs the associated formula reduction (repeated removal of falsified literals and satisfied clauses followed by unit propagation). It then collects information about the reduced formula in each branch into a numerical value and combines both values into a variable score using a *scoring function*. The goal of the scoring function is to produce a single number on which all variables can be compared, which reflects both the total amount of reduction resulting from the two assignments as well as how balanced the reduction is between the two branches. The variable that scores highest on this aggregate score is picked as the next branching variable, and two subproblems are created, on which the solver can be called recursively until a cutoff threshold is reached (typically specified as the number of variables to be assigned in total).

This basic method could be directly applied to SMS, but it is not entirely suitable for its own use. This is because, in SMS, not all information about the problem is encoded upfront in the formula F . Part of the encoding is “learned” dynamically, such as the symmetry-breaking clauses or other clauses added by propagators in SMS. In Section 5, we explain a cube-and-conquer adaptation that is tailored to SMS and scenarios with custom propagators in general.

5 Cubing with SMS

The main contribution of this paper is the design and experimental evaluation of various cube-and-conquer pipelines for SMS. We start with an encoder that produces a propositional CNF F . In traditional cube-and-conquer, one would start cubing F directly, but in our scenario, this would result in poor performance. Instead, we start with the *prerun* phase, in which F is enriched with additional clauses to obtain a formula F^* .

During the prerun, we run SMS, i.e., CaDiCaL and its attached propagators, for a bounded amount of time. The point of this prerun phase is to improve the performance of the cubing phase by collecting a set Σ of symmetry-breaking clauses, a set Π of propagator clauses as well as a set Λ of important learned clauses from CDCL. The most important learned clauses for Λ are unit clauses, but we also store and reuse learned clauses with up to 5 literals. We may find models during prerun; we simply store them and block in F^* . The enriched formula F^* is obtained as $F \wedge \Sigma \wedge \Pi \wedge \Lambda$.

After the prerun, we save the enriched CNF F^* and pass it on to the cuber. The cuber produces a set Γ of cubes to be solved by the final-phase solver.

The final solver is the same one as the one used for the prerun, up to the configuration of parameters.

Within this general framework, we evaluate a number of possible choices for each of the components and for the ways the components interact.


5.1 Prerun

For prerun, we always run CaDiCaL with SMS, and with a suitable domain-specific propagator as necessary for a benchmark problem (see Section 6 for details on the benchmark problems and propagators). When the prerun phase is followed by a cubing phase that uses CaDiCaL, the solver simply switches from prerun to cubing mode, and continues to run, preserving all learned clauses and any other acquired state. When cubing is done externally, the solver dumps Σ , Π , and Λ into a file and stops.

5.2 Cuber


For the cubing component, we evaluate several different methods:

CDCL with a cutoff. In this method, we continue running SMS as in prerun, but whenever the number of assigned edge variables reaches a predefined threshold, we collect all assigned edge literals, output them as a cube, and add the negation as an irredundant learned clause. Thus, the generation of cubes blindly follows whatever path the CDCL solver takes. This method has been fruitfully employed in previous applications of SMS [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a]. When using this method, we run SMS only once: after the amount of time given for prerun has elapsed, the solver simply switches to cubing mode and continues to run. Note that this also means that the resulting cubes highly depend on the solver state at the end of prerun, meaning that different runs can result in very different cubes. The process can be depicted in this diagram.



CaDiCaL with look-ahead. In this method, we simulate a look-ahead solver within CaDiCaL (inside SMS). We control the assignments made by CaDiCaL through the IPASIR-UP interface, using the `force_backtrack` function to navigate the search tree. At each decision point, we try to assign each candidate variable in both ways, counting the number of propagations a and b triggered in the two branches. If either assignment results in a conflict, we assign the variable to the opposite truth value and start the lookahead again. Otherwise, we backtrack one decision level and test another variable. If all variables are tested, we pick the variable for which the total number of propagations is as high and as balanced as possible. For this we use a *scoring function* σ , which balances these two aspects, and is a parameter of the method. The default scoring function is $\sigma(a, b) = \min(a, b) + \varepsilon(a + b)$, where $\varepsilon = 10^{-9}$ is a small positive number. The set of candidate variables can either be all unassigned variables, or all unassigned edge variables. The rationale for the latter choice is that it is cheaper to look ahead on a smaller set of variables. The structure of the process is the same as before, with the only difference that the ‘Cube’ phase in ‘Prerun-then-Cube’ is performed differently.

March.cu. `March.cu` is a genuine look-ahead solver with a long history of evolution [Heule *et al.*, 2004; Heule and van Maaren, 2006; Heule and van Maaren, 2009]. It works similarly to the previous method, except it takes into account more characteristics of the formula than just the number of propagations in each branch. Another difference is that the cubes it produces contain only branching literals. Therefore, the cubes do not contain information about all assigned variables including variables assigned by unit clauses. The scoring function used by `March.cu` is $\sigma(a, b) = a + b + ab$. The process looks as follows.



For CaDiCaL with look-ahead, we additionally configure the scoring function σ . As a reference point we start with the default function $\sigma_0(a, b) = \min(a, b) + \varepsilon(a + b)$, where a and b are the number of propagations triggered in the two branches. We run five rounds of the following procedure. We take the best-performing scoring function so far, and query OpenAI GPT-4o (via the ChatGPT web interface) to suggest four variants of the function that could potentially work better. For this, we informally describe the problem setting and the goal of the design to the LLM. We then evaluate each of the scoring functions on a training set of cubes (for details see Section 7), and repeat the process with the winner.

5.3 Conquering solver

For the final solver, we take CaDiCaL again, but this time we configure its parameters with the state-of-the-art automatic algorithm configuration tool SMAC [Lindauer *et al.*, 2022]. The final solver is thus the same one as used for prerun, up to possibly changed search strategies. However, there are more than 100 various adjustable strategies according to the exposed parameter list of CaDiCaL, and it is quite challenging to configure them together. Therefore, we first run a sensitivity analysis to identify promising parameters for configuring: we switch each parameter individually to an extreme value and compare the changed configuration to the default configuration on a set of cubes sampled

| cuber | LA scope | σ |
|------------|----------|----------|
| CDCL | NA | NA |
| CaDiCaL-LA | full | any |
| CaDiCaL-LA | edge | any |
| march-cu | full | default |

Table 1: A summary of cubing configurations. LA stands for look-ahead. We tested CaDiCaL looking ahead on either all or just the edge variables. The values “any” mean that any σ can be used by these cubers in principle; in practice we optimized σ using suggestions from OpenAI GPT-4o only with the full-scope CaDiCaL-LA cuber, and used the best result with the other variant as well.

from a fixed problem. Based on this, we identify a small set of decisive parameters that we then configure with SMAC. For details of the automatic configuration process, see Section 7.

All of the above described cubing configurations are summarized in Table 1.

6 Benchmark Problems and Encoding

In this section, we introduce the graph search problems and present encodings on which we evaluate our methods. For most problems, we only sketch the encoding *and refer to the original source*, as our main focus is on comparing the solving approaches. See Section 7 for a link to generator scripts and details of the formulas.

Our benchmark set consists of three different problems. In the first two cases (Subsections 6.1 and 6.2), the problems cannot be efficiently encoded into propositional logic, and external propagators (already implemented and available in the SMS library) are required. For these two problems, we describe what the propagator does. The last problem (Subsection 6.3) is encoded fully in propositional logic.

On top of the individual encoding (and propagators if necessary) for each problem, we also use incomplete static symmetry breaking constraints proposed by Codish *et al.* [[2019]]. These constraints are compatible with SMS in the sense that they are satisfied by the lexicographically minimal graph, but they are incomplete because they are satisfied by non-minimal graphs as well. We use these constraints to increase the amount of information about graph minimality in the formula (in addition to symmetry-breaking clauses found during the prerun phase).

6.1 Coloring Triangle-Free Graphs

A *proper k -coloring* of a graph G is a mapping $c : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ implies $c(u) \neq c(v)$. The *chromatic number* of a graph G is the smallest integer k , for which a proper k -coloring exists. If a graph contains a complete subgraph on k vertices, then its chromatic number must clearly be at least k . The opposite is not true: Mycielski [[1955]] explicitly constructed triangle-free graphs (without triangle subgraphs) with unbounded chromatic number. Erdős [1967] asked about the values $f(k)$, which denote the smallest number of vertices in a triangle-free non- $(k - 1)$ -colorable graph. Mycielski’s construction provides upper bounds on $f(k)$, and these are tight up to $k = 4$; for $k = 5$, minimal graphs are also known [Goedgebeur, 2020], but none of them is a *Mycielskian*. The cases $k \geq 6$ are open.

Task: Compute a triangle-free graph with n vertices and chromatic number at least k .

Encoding: We enumerate all triples of vertices to ensure triangle-freeness. Without loss of generality, we further restrict the search to *maximal triangle-free* graphs (triangle-free and adding any edge creates a triangle).

Propagator: When a canonical propositional model is found, the propagator checks whether it is k -colorable. If so, a *coloring clause* is learned, which ensures that this particular coloring will not work for future candidate graphs. For details we refer to [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a].

6.2 Kochen-Specker Graphs

Kochen-Specker (KS) vector systems are special sets of vectors in at least 3-dimensional space that form the basis of the Bell-Kochen-Specker Theorem, demonstrating quantum mechanics' conflict with classical models due to contextuality [Budroni *et al.*, 2022]. Kochen and Specker [[1967]] originally came up with a 3D KS vector system of size 117. The smallest known system (in 3D) has 31 vectors [Peres, 1991], while the best lower bound is 24 [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a; Li *et al.*, 2024]. These lower bounds were obtained with computer search for *KS candidate graphs: non-010-colorable* graphs with additional restrictions. A graph is 010-colorable if its vertices can be colored red and blue such that no two adjacent vertices are both red and no triangle is all blue.

Task: Enumerate all KS candidates with n vertices.

Encoding: For the full list of constraints and the encoding, see [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a].

Propagator: When a canonical model is found, the propagator checks whether it is 010-colorable, and if so learns a *coloring clause*, which ensures that at least one edge or triangle must be present to invalidate this particular coloring. For details we refer to [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a].

6.3 Diameter-2-Critical Graphs

The *diameter* of a graph G is the largest distance between a pair of vertices in G , where the *distance* of two vertices is the length of a shortest path between them. A disconnected graph has diameter ∞ . A graph is *diameter- d -critical* if its diameter is d and deletion of any edge increases the diameter. The study of extremal properties of graphs with prescribed diameter was initiated by Erdős and Rényi [1962] and has been the subject of intensive research. An important topic in the field is the characterization of diameter- d -critical graphs [Chen and Füredi, 2005; Haynes *et al.*, 2015; Loh and Ma, 2016]; in particular the case $d = 2$. The *Murty-Simon Conjecture* [Caccetta and Häggkvist, 1979] states that for a diameter-2-critical graph with n vertices and m edges, $m \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$, with equality attained only by the complete bipartite graph $K_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ (the related classic theorem of Mantel [[1907]] postulates the same for C_3 -free graphs).

Using Nauty [McKay and Piperno, 2014], Radosavljević and Živković [[2020]] computed all diameter-2-critical graphs with up to 10 vertices. Dailly *et al.* [[2019]] reported on a “computer search” for graphs with up to 11 vertices, focusing on graphs with a certain number of edges. Kirchweger and Szeider [[2024]] enumerated all diameter-2-critical graphs up to 13 vertices with SMS.

We use the SAT encoding from this last work—a CNF formula $D_2(n, m)$ which is satisfiable if and only if there is a diameter-2-critical graph G with n vertices and m edges. By a theorem of Fan [[1987]], the bound holds for all diameter-2-critical graphs with up to 24 vertices. We therefore set $m = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ to enumerate diameter-2-critical graphs that attain equality.

Task: Enumerate diameter-2-critical graphs with n vertices and m edges, in particular for $m = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$.

Encoding: We use variables $c_{i,j,k}$ to indicate whether k is a common neighbor of i and j , i.e., $c_{i,j,k} \leftrightarrow (e_{i,k} \wedge e_{j,k})$. With these variables it is easy to encode diameter-2-criticality; for details see the article by Kirchweger and Szeider [[2024]].

7 Results

In this section, we will present the technical details of our experiments and the results. The overarching goal is to minimize the time taken for the entire pipeline, from encoding to obtaining the solutions. However, since the entire setup is quite complicated, we decided to simplify some aspects.

We optimize the cubing and the conquering solver separately from each other. For each benchmark problem, we create a training and a test instance. The training instance is an easier instance of the problem with a smaller number of vertices, and the test instance is a harder instance with one more vertex. While this might not sound like a big step, the search space generally grows exponentially in the number of edges, so roughly like $\exp(\Omega(n^2))$. We want to note that for our selected combinatorial problems, the increment of the number of vertices from n to $n + 1$ typically makes the problem by orders of magnitude harder. Sometimes, in these problems, the solution is known for a particular n but not for $n + 1$ so far. For Kochen-Specker and triangle-free graphs, we train on 21 and test on 22 vertices; for the Murty-Simon conjecture, we train on 15 and test on 16 vertices. Details on how to produce the encodings and cubes can be found in the supplementary material.

Technical parameters. We use CaDiCaL v2.1.2. When in look-ahead mode, we turn off restarts and non-chronological backtracking. We use a forked version of March_cu obtained from https://github.com/BrianLi009/MathCheck/tree/main/gen_cubes/march_cu. We ran into memory problems when attempting to run the version of March_cu from <https://github.com/marijnheule/CnC>. We ran the cubing phase of the experiments on a cluster of machines equipped with 16× Intel Xeon E5-2640 v4, 2.40GHz 10-core processors and 160GB of RAM, running Ubuntu 18.04. We ran the conquering phase on a cluster equipped with 3× AMD EPYC 7402, 2.80GHz 24-core processors and 1024GB of RAM, running Ubuntu 18.04.

7.1 SMS Configuration

Let us for a moment fix the cubing component at the beginning of the default cuber CDCL. Our goal is to optimize the search strategies of the conquering solver. We first list all parameters of CaDiCaL, and pick those that are relevant to solver performance. We run a sensitivity analysis for each parameter. This means we take the default configuration, and for each parameter, we toggle it to a different value. In the case of numerical parameters, we change the value to the extreme end of the admissible range. We evaluate each thus obtained configuration on the set of cubes produced with the default cuber on each of the three training instances. With this, we identify a set of 10 parameters that seem promising for further automated tuning with SMAC. Along with the other two parameters for SMS itself (`frequency` and `cutoff`), the total 12 parameters are listed in the supplementary material.

In Figure 1, we list the best-ranked CaDiCaL parameters among sets of problems (cubes) with different default solving times. Each colored line indicates the rankings of a parameter on different sets of instances with specific default solving time ranges. We can clearly see that the three best-ranking parameters seldom drop out of the top league. For example, the parameter `BRD` is not only the most influential parameter when solving the cubes with default running time between 60 and 960




Figure 1: The parameters ranking of CaDiCaL parameters. 10 means a very poor rank, and that is the reason why different parameters can sometimes get the same rank.

seconds but also the second most decisive parameter among the cubes with longer default solving time.

We ran such sensitivity analysis for each cuber, but the significant parameters were similar in each case, and for efficiency reasons we decided to proceed with the SMAC phase only on the cubes from the default cuber. From this run of SMAC, we obtain, for each benchmark problem, a configuration of the parameters of SMS tuned specifically for this problem. Below, we refer to this obtained configuration simply as T_{un} , and to the default configuration as Def (the default is the same for each benchmark problem, but “tuned” is different for each problem).

7.2 Configuration of σ

We optimize the scoring function σ through an iterative process using GPT-o1. As explained in Section 5, starting with the default function, we run five rounds where GPT-o1 is asked to generate four variant scoring functions of the current performing one. The new functions are then evaluated by solving the cubes (generated by the full-variable look-ahead with the new functions) with the CaDiCaL with default configurations. This process yields specialized scoring functions for each benchmark problem whose intricate balance of terms defies intuitive human interpretation, yet demonstrates improved performance, as shown in the below. Finally, we pick the best-performing scoring functions among training instances for testing instances (harder instances), here are the top three.

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{KS}(a, b) &= 8 \min(a, b) + 2 \frac{\min(a, b)}{\max(a, b) + 1} + a + b \\ \sigma_{TF}(a, b) &= \min(a, b) + 10 \left(\frac{\min(a, b)}{\max(a, b) + 1} \right)^2 \\ \sigma_{SMC}(a, b) &= ab + a + b. \end{aligned}$$

7.3 Test performance

We compare different pipelines on the total solving time for all cubes, or in other words on the time that it would take to solve all cubes on a single processor. Since cubes are typically to be solved in parallel, we also report the time taken to solve the hardest cube for each pipeline, but this is not the main metric. This information is shown in Table 2, for all cubers and for Def and T_{un} , on the test instances.

In Figure 2 we show more detailed information about the distribution of running times over individual cubes. For each benchmark problem we show 4 plots: the rows differ in the cuber, the columns differ in the conquering solver. We compare default and best cuber, and also default and best configuration of CaDiCaL. The plots show the total running time for cubes, grouped by individual




Figure 2: The total time to solve all cubes grouped by cube hardness. For each benchmark we compare default and march-based cubing and Def and Tun conquering solver. The height of a bar between x_0 and x_1 is the total amount of time needed to solve the cubes which took between x_0 and x_1 minutes. The rightmost bar collects all remaining cubes. The total area of each chart is proportional to the total solving time reported in Table 2; all four charts for one problem use the same unit of area, and are thus pairwise comparable.

| cuber | Kochen-Specker | | | | Murty-Simon | | | | Δ -free | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | sum | | max | | sum | | max | | sum | | max | |
| | Def | Tun | Def | Tun | Def | Tun | Def | Tun | Def | Tun | Def | Tun |
| CDCL | 510.4 | 221.7 | 9.1 | 2.4 | 112.4 | 116.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 601.6 | 292.8 | 6.6 | 3.3 |
| CaDiCaL-LA-E | 836.0 | 290.3 | 17.7 | 7.9 | 60.8 | 56.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 657.1 | 260.3 | 16.9 | 7.3 |
| CaDiCaL-LA- \forall | 858.4 | 296.5 | 17.4 | 3.4 | 78.3 | 71.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 570.7 | 219.7 | 16.3 | 5.4 |
| march | 371.2 | 149.4 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 33.5 | 35.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 258.6 | 172.2 | 1.2 | 0.9 |

Table 2: Total solving time (sum) and time to solve the hardest cube (max) in CPU hours for cubes produced for test instances by different cubers (rows) and solved by default or hyper-parameter-tuned SMS. The best cuber for each column is in boldface.

running time. The total area of each plot corresponds to total solving time, and we can see that as we move right (within the group of four plots corresponding to one benchmark problem), the area shrinks and shifts to the left. This means that the total solving time is reduced, and is concentrated more into easier cubes, meaning that parallelization is going to be more effective.

Overall, from both Table 2 and Figure 2 we can see that both cubing and algorithm configuration are very effective for these problems, and that our prerun-based pipeline is effective for cubing with SMS, in particular with march.

8 Conclusion

Our experimental evaluation of cube-and-conquer pipelines with SMS revealed several key insights. March_{cu} emerged as the best-performing cuber in our setup for handling propagator-generated clauses, effectively balancing global search coverage with local constraint propagation. Our runtime analysis showed that harder instances benefit disproportionately from parameter tuning, suggesting

default solver heuristics may be suboptimal for specialized subproblems. This relationship between cube characteristics and solving strategies merits further investigation.

Several promising directions emerge from these findings. First, applying our LLM-guided scoring optimization to `march_cu` could yield additional improvements. Second, while `march_cu` generates well-balanced subproblems, our analysis suggests potential for specialized splitting strategies that account for propagator behavior. Finally, our success with automatic configuration raises interesting questions about parameter space structure, as the preliminary analysis indicates cube clusters that might benefit from targeted approaches. Our methodology demonstrates how carefully handling dynamically learned constraints can substantially improve parallel SAT-solving performance.

References

- [Biere *et al.*, 2024] Armin Biere, Tobias Faller, Katalin Fazekas, Mathias Fleury, Nils Froleyks, and Florian Pollitt. CaDiCaL 2.0. In Arie Gurfinkel and Vijay Ganesh, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 36th International Conference, CAV 2024, Montreal, QC, Canada, July 24-27, 2024, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 14681 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 133–152. Springer, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65627-9_7
- [Budroni *et al.*, 2022] Costantino Budroni, Adán Cabello, Otfried Gühne, Matthias Kleinmann, and Jan-Åke Larsson. Kochen-Specker contextuality. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 94:045007, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.94.045007>
- [Caccetta and Häggkvist, 1979] Louis Caccetta and Roland Häggkvist. On diameter critical graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 28(3):223–229, 1979. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(79\)90129-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(79)90129-8)
- [Chen and Füredi, 2005] Ya-Chen Chen and Zoltán Füredi. Minimum vertex-diameter-2-critical graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 50(4):293–315, 2005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20111>
- [Codish *et al.*, 2019] Michael Codish, Alice Miller, Patrick Prosser, and Peter J. Stuckey. Constraints for symmetry breaking in graph representation. *Constraints*, 24(1):1–24, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10601-018-9294-5>
- [Crawford *et al.*, 1996] James M. Crawford, Matthew L. Ginsberg, Eugene M. Luks, and Amitabha Roy. Symmetry-breaking predicates for search problems. In Stuart C. Shapiro Luigia Carlucci Aiello, Jon Doyle, editor, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR’96), Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, November 5-8, 1996*, pages 148–159. Morgan Kaufmann, 1996.
- [Dailly *et al.*, 2019] Antoine Dailly, Florent Foucaud, and Adriana Hansberg. Strengthening the Murty-Simon conjecture on diameter 2 critical graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 342(11):3142–3159, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2019.06.023>
- [Erdős and Rényi, 1962] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On a problem in the theory of graphs. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Matematikai Kutató Intézetének Közleményei*, 7(4):623–641 (1963), 1962.
- [Erdős, 1967] P. Erdős. Some remarks on chromatic graphs. *Colloq. Math.*, 16:253–256, 1967. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4064/cm-16-1-253-256>
- [Fan, 1987] Genghua Fan. On diameter 2-critical graphs. *Discret. Math.*, 67(3):235–240, 1987. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(87\)90174-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(87)90174-9)

- [Fazekas *et al.*, 2023] Katalin Fazekas, Aina Niemetz, Mathias Preiner, Markus Kirchweger, Stefan Szeider, and Armin Biere. IPASIR-UP: User propagators for CDCL. In Meena Mahajan and Friedrich Slivovsky, editors, *The 26th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing (SAT 2023), July 04-08, 2023, Alghero, Italy*, LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [Fazekas *et al.*, 2024] Katalin Fazekas, Aina Niemetz, Mathias Preiner, Markus Kirchweger, Stefan Szeider, and Armin Biere. Satisfiability modulo user propagators. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 81:989–1017, 2024.
- [Fichte *et al.*, 2023a] Johannes K. Fichte, Daniel Le Berre, Markus Hecher, and Stefan Szeider. The silent (r)evolution of SAT. *Communications of the ACM*, 66(6):64–72, June 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560469>
- [Fichte *et al.*, 2023b] Johannes K. Fichte, Markus Hecher, Daniel Le Berre, and Stefan Szeider. The silent (r)evolution of SAT. *Communications of the ACM*, 66(6):64–72, June 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560469>
- [Goedgebeur, 2020] Jan Goedgebeur. On minimal triangle-free 6-chromatic graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 93(1):34–48, 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.22467>
- [Haynes *et al.*, 2015] Teresa W. Haynes, Michael A. Henning, Lucas C. van der Merwe, and Anders Yeo. Progress on the Murty-Simon Conjecture on diameter-2 critical graphs: a survey. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 30(3):579–595, 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10878-013-9651-7>
- [Heule and van Maaren, 2006] Marijn Heule and Hans van Maaren. March_dl: Adding adaptive heuristics and a new branching strategy. *J. Satisf. Boolean Model. Comput.*, 2(1-4):47–59, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3233/SAT190016>
- [Heule and van Maaren, 2009] Marijn Heule and Hans van Maaren. Look-ahead based SAT solvers. In Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Hans van Maaren, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Satisfiability*, volume 185 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 155–184. IOS Press, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-58603-929-5-155>
- [Heule *et al.*, 2004] Marijn Heule, Mark Dufour, Joris E. van Zwieten, and Hans van Maaren. March_eq: Implementing additional reasoning into an efficient look-ahead SAT solver. In Holger H. Hoos and David G. Mitchell, editors, *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, 7th International Conference, SAT 2004, Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 10-13, 2004, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3542 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 345–359. Springer, 2004. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/11527695_26
- [Heule *et al.*, 2016] Marijn J. H. Heule, Oliver Kullmann, and Victor W. Marek. Solving and verifying the boolean pythagorean triples problem via cube-and-conquer. In Nadia Creignou and Daniel Le Berre, editors, *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing - SAT 2016 - 19th International Conference, Bordeaux, France, July 5-8, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9710 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 228–245. Springer Verlag, 2016.
- [Heule *et al.*, 2018] Marijn J. H. Heule, Oliver Kullmann, and Armin Biere. Cube-and-conquer for satisfiability. In Youssef Hamadi and Lakhdar Sais, editors, *Handbook of Parallel Constraint Reasoning*, pages 31–59. Springer, 2018. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63516-3_2
- [Janota *et al.*, 2025] Mikoláš Janota, Markus Kirchweger, Tomáš Peitl, and Stefan Szeider. Breaking symmetries in quantified graph search: A comparative study. In *AAAI 2025: The 39th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2025.

- [Kirchweger and Szeider, 2021] Markus Kirchweger and Stefan Szeider. SAT modulo symmetries for graph generation. In *27th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP 2021)*, LIPIcs, page 39:1–39:17. Dagstuhl, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CP.2021.34>
- [Kirchweger and Szeider, 2024] Markus Kirchweger and Stefan Szeider. SAT modulo symmetries for graph generation and enumeration. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 25(3):1–30, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3670405>
- [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2022] Markus Kirchweger, Manfred Scheucher, and Stefan Szeider. A SAT attack on Rota’s Basis Conjecture. In *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing - SAT 2022 - 25th International Conference, Haifa, Israel, August 2-5, 2022, Proceedings, 2022*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SAT.2022.4>
- [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023a] Markus Kirchweger, Tomás Peitl, and Stefan Szeider. Co-certificate learning with SAT modulo symmetries. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2023, 19th-25th August 2023, Macao, SAR, China*, pages 1944–1953. ijcai.org, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24963/IJCAI.2023/216>
- [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023b] Markus Kirchweger, Tomás Peitl, and Stefan Szeider. A SAT solver’s opinion on the Erdős-Faber-Lovász conjecture. In *26th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, SAT 2023, July 4-8, 2023, Alghero, Italy*, volume 271 of *LIPICs*, pages 13:1–13:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SAT.2023.13>
- [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2023c] Markus Kirchweger, Manfred Scheucher, and Stefan Szeider. SAT-based generation of planar graphs. In Meena Mahajan and Friedrich Slivovsky, editors, *The 26th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing (SAT 2023), July 04-08, 2023, Alghero, Italy*, LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SAT.2023.14>
- [Kirchweger *et al.*, 2025] Markus Kirchweger, Tomás Peitl, Stefan Szeider, and Hai Xia. Supplementary material for smart cubing for graph search: A comparative study. Online, Zenodo, 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14746543>
- [Kochen and Specker, 1967] Simon Kochen and Ernst Specker. The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *J. Math. Mech.*, 17(1):59–87, 1967.
- [Li *et al.*, 2024] Zhengyu Li, Curtis Bright, and Vijay Ganesh. A sat solver + computer algebra attack on the minimum kochen–specker problem. In Kate Larson, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-24*, pages 1898–1906. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2024. Main Track. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2024/210>
- [Lindauer *et al.*, 2022] Marius Lindauer, Katharina Eggenberger, Matthias Feurer, André Biedenkapp, Difan Deng, Carolin Benjamins, Tim Ruhkopf, René Sass, and Frank Hutter. Smac3: A versatile bayesian optimization package for hyperparameter optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(54):1–9, 2022. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-0888.html>
- [Loh and Ma, 2016] Po-Shen Loh and Jie Ma. Diameter critical graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 117:34–58, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2015.11.004>
- [Mantel, 1907] W. Mantel. Problem 28. *Wiskundige Opgaven*, 10:60–61, 1907.

- [Marques-Silva *et al.*, 2021] João Marques-Silva, Inês Lynce, and Sharad Malik. Conflict-driven clause learning SAT solvers. In Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Hans van Maaren, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Satisfiability - Second Edition*, volume 336 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 133–182. IOS Press, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA200987>
- [McKay and Piperno, 2014] Brendan D. McKay and Adolfo Piperno. Practical graph isomorphism, II. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 60:94–112, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.09.003>
- [Mycielski, 1955] Jan Mycielski. Sur le coloriage des graphs. *Colloquium Mathematicae*, 3(2):161–162, 1955.
- [Peres, 1991] A Peres. Two simple proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.*, 24(4):L175, feb 1991. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/24/4/003>
- [Radosavljević and Živković, 2020] Jovan Radosavljević and Miodrag Živković. The list of diameter-2-critical graphs with at most 10 nodes. *IPSI Transactions on Advanced Research*, 16(1):1–5, January 2020. <http://ipsitransactions.org/journals/papers/tar/2020jan/p9.pdf>.
- [Zhang and Szeider, 2023] Tianwei Zhang and Stefan Szeider. Searching for smallest universal graphs and tournaments with SAT. In *29th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, CP 2023, August 27-31, 2023, Toronto, Canada*, volume 280 of *LIPICs*, pages 39:1–39:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CP.2023.39>
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] Tianwei Zhang, Tomás Peitl, and Stefan Szeider. Small unsatisfiable k-cnfs with bounded literal occurrence. In Supratik Chakraborty and Jie-Hong Roland Jiang, editors, *27th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, SAT 2024, August 21-24, 2024, Pune, India*, volume 305 of *LIPICs*, pages 31:1–31:22. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.SAT.2024.31>