BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] D. Achlioptas, P. Beame, and M. Molloy. A sharp threshold in proof complexity. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 337–346, Crete, Greece, July 2001.

[2] M. Ajtai. The complexity of the pigeonhole principle. *Combinatorica*, 14(4): 417–433, 1994.

[3] M. Alekhnovich, J. Johannsen, T. Pitassi, and A. Urquhart. An exponential separation between regular and general resolution. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 448–456, Montréal, Canada, May 2002.

[4] F. A. Aloul, I. L. Markov, and K. A. Sakallah. Shatter: Efficient symmetry-breaking for boolean satisfiability. In *Proceedings of the 40th Design Automation Conference*, pages 836–839, Anahein, CA, June 2003.

[5] F. A. Aloul, A. Ramani, I. L. Markov, and K. A. Sakallah. PBS: A backtrack-search pseudo-boolean solver and optimizer. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, pages 346–353, Cincinnati, OH, May 2002.

[6] F. A. Aloul, A. Ramani, I. L. Markov, and K. A. Sakallah. Solving difficult SAT instances in the presence of symmetry. In *Proceedings of the 39th Design Automation Conference*, pages 731–736, New Orleans, LA, June 2002.

[7] E. Amir and S. A. McIlraith. Partition-based logical reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, pages 389–400, Breckenridge, CO, Apr. 2000.

[8] S. Arora, C. Lund, R. Motwani, M. Sudan, and M. Szegedy. Proof verification and hardness of approximation problems. In *Proceedings 33rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Pittsburgh, PA, Oct. 1992. IEEE.

[9] S. Arora and S. Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs. In *Proceedings 33rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Pittsburgh, PA, Oct. 1992. IEEE.

[10] A. Atserias and M. L. Bonet. On the automatizability of resolution and related propositional proof systems. In *CSL '02: 16th Workshop on Computer Science Logic*, volume 2471 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 569–583, Edinburgh, Scotland, Sept. 2002. Springer.

[11] A. Aziz, S. Tasiran, and R. K. Brayton. BDD variable orderings for interacting finite state machines. In *Proceedings of the 31th Design Automation Conference*, pages 283–288, San Diego, CA, June 1994.

[12] L. Baptista and J. P. Marques-Silva. Using randomization and learning to solve hard real-world instances of satisfiability. In *6th Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, pages 489–494, Singapore, Sept. 2000.

[13] R. J. Bayardo Jr. and R. C. Schrag. Using CST look-back techniques to solve real-world SAT instances. In *Proceedings, AAAI-97: 14th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 203–208, Providence, RI, July 1997.

[14] P. Beame, J. Culberson, D. Mitchell, and C. Moore. The resolution complexity of random graph k-colorability. Technical Report TR04-012, Electronic Colloquium in Computation Complexity, 2004. To appear in *Discrete Applied Mathematics*.

[15] P. Beame, R. Impagliazzo, T. Pitassi, and N. Segerlind. Memoization and DPLL: Formula caching proof systems. In *Proceedings 18th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 225–236, Aarhus, Denmark, July 2003.

[16] P. Beame, R. Impagliazzo, and A. Sabharwal. Resolution complexity of independent sets in random graphs. In *Proceedings Sixteenth Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 52–68, Chicago, IL, June 2001.

[17] P. Beame, R. Karp, T. Pitassi, and M. Saks. On the Complexity of Unsatisfiability Proofs for Random k-CNF Formulas. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 561–571, Dallas, TX, May 1998.

[18] P. Beame, H. Kautz, and A. Sabharwal. Understanding the power of clause learning. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1194–1201, Acapulco, Mexico, Aug. 2003.

[19] P. Beame, H. Kautz, and A. Sabharwal. Understanding and harnessing the potential of clause learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 22:319–351, Dec. 2004.

[20] P. Beame and T. Pitassi. Propositional Proof Complexity: Past, Present, Future. In *Current Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 42–70. World Scientific, 2001.

[21] R. Beigel. Finding maximum independent sets in sparse and general graphs. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 856–857, Baltimore, MD, Jan. 1999.

[22] E. Ben-Sasson, R. Impagliazzo, and A. Wigderson. Near-optimal separation of treelike and general resolution. Technical Report TR00-005, Electronic Colloquium in Computation Complexity, 2000. To appear in *Combinatorica*.

[23] E. Ben-Sasson and A. Wigderson. Short proofs are narrow - resolution made simple. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(2):149–169, 2001.

[24] 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 Design Automation Conference*, pages 317–320, New Orleans, LA, June 1999.

[25] A. Biere, A. Cimatti, E. M. Clarke, and Y. Zhu. Symbolic model checking without BDDs. In *5th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 193–207, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, Mar. 1999.

[26] B. Bollobás. *Random Graphs*. Academic Press, London, 1985.

[27] M. L. Bonet, J. L. Esteban, N. Galesi, and J. Johansen. On the relative complexity of resolution refinements and cutting planes proof systems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(5):1462–1484, 2000.

[28] M. L. Bonet and N. Galesi. Optimality of size-width tradeoffs for resolution. *Computational Complexity*, 10(4):261–276, 2001.

[29] M. L. Bonet, T. Pitassi, and R. Raz. Lower bounds for cutting planes proofs with small coefficients. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 62(3):708–728, Sept. 1997.

[30] R. I. Brafman. A simplifier for propositional formulas with many binary clauses. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 515–522, Seattle, WA, Aug. 2001.

[31] J. Buresh-Oppenheim and T. Pitassi. The complexity of resolution refinements. In *18th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 138–147, Ottawa, Canada, June 2003.

[32] D. Chai and A. Kuehlmann. A fast pseudo-boolean constraint solver. In *Proceedings of the 40th Design Automation Conference*, pages 830–835, Anahein, CA, June 2003.

[33] J. Chen, I. Kanj, and W. Jia. Vertex cover: Further observations and further improvements. *Journal of Algorithms*, 41(2):280–301, 2001.

[34] V. Chvátal. Determining the stability number of a graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(4):643–662, 1977.

[35] V. Chvátal and E. Szemerédi. Many hard examples for resolution. *Journal of the ACM*, 35(4):759–768, 1988.

[36] M. Clegg, J. Edmonds, and R. Impagliazzo. Using the Gröbner basis algorithm to find proofs of unsatisfiability. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 174–183, Philadelphia, PA, May 1996.

[37] A. Coja-Oghlan. The Lovász number of random graphs. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop on Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science*, volume 2764 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 228–239, Princeton, NY, Aug. 2003. Springer-Verlag.

[38] S. A. Cook. The complexity of theorem proving procedures. In *Conference Record of Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 151–158, Shaker Heights, OH, May 1971.

[39] S. A. Cook and R. A. Reckhow. The relative efficiency of propositional proof systems. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 44(1):36–50, 1977.

[40] W. Cook, C. R. Coullard, and G. Turan. On the complexity of cutting plane proofs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 18:25–38, 1987.

[41] J. M. Crawford, M. L. Ginsberg, E. M. Luks, and A. Roy. Symmetry-breaking predicates for search problems. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, pages 148–159, Cambridge, MA, Nov. 1996.

[42] P. T. Darga, M. H. Liffiton, K. A. Sakallah, and I. L. Markov. Exploiting structure in symmetry detection for CNF. In *Proceedings of the 41st Design Automation Conference*, pages 518–522, San Diego, CA, June 2004.

[43] M. Davis, G. Logemann, and D. Loveland. A machine program for theorem proving. *Communications of the ACM*, 5:394–397, 1962.

[44] M. Davis and H. Putnam. A computing procedure for quantification theory. *Communications of the ACM*, 7:201–215, 1960.

[45] R. Davis. Diagnostic reasoning based on structure and behavior. *Artificial Intelligence*, 24(1-3):347–410, 1984.

[46] J. de Kleer and B. C. Williams. Diagnosing multiple faults. *Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1):97–130, 1987.

[47] I. Dinur and S. Safra. On the hardness of approximating minimum vertex cover. *Annals of Mathematics*, 162(1):439–486, 2005.

[48] H. E. Dixon, M. L. Ginsberg, E. M. Luks, and A. J. Parkes. Generalizing boolean satisfiability II: Theory. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 22: 481–534, 2004.

[49] H. E. Dixon, M. L. Ginsberg, and A. J. Parkes. Generalizing boolean satisfiability I: Background and survey of existing work. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 21:193–243, 2004.

[50] J. L. Esteban, N. Galesi, and J. Messner. On the complexity of resolution with bounded conjunctions. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming: 29th International Colloquium*, volume 2380 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 220–231, Malaga, Spain, July 2002. Springer-Verlag.

[51] R. E. Fikes and N. J. Nilsson. STRIPS: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2(3/4):198–208, 1971.

[52] M. Fox and D. Long. The detection and exploitation of symmetry in planning problems. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 956–961, July 1999.

[53] M. Fox and D. Long. Extending the exploitation of symmetries in planning. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems*, pages 83–91, Apr. 2002.

[54] J. H. Gallier. *Logic for Computer Science*. Harper & Row, 1986.

[55] M. R. Genesereth. The use of design descriptions in automated diagnosis. *Artificial Intelligence*, 24(1-3):411–436, 1984.

[56] E. Giunchiglia, M. Maratea, and A. Tacchella. Dependent and independent variables in propositional satisfiability. In *Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA)*, volume 2424 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 296–307, Cosenza, Italy, Sept. 2002. Springer-Verlag.

[57] E. Goldberg and Y. Novikov. BerkMin: A fast and robust sat-solver. In *Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exposition (DATE)*, pages 142–149, Paris, France, Mar. 2002.

[58] C. P. Gomes, B. Selman, and H. Kautz. Boosting combinatorial search through randomization. In *Proceedings, AAAI-98: 15th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 431–437, Madison, WI, July 1998.

[59] C. P. Gomes, B. Selman, K. McAloon, and C. Tretkoff. Randomization in backtrack search: Exploiting heavy-tailed profiles for solving hard scheduling problems. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems*, pages 208–213, Pittsburgh, PA, June 1998.

[60] A. Haken. The intractability of resolution. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 39: 297–305, 1985.

[61] J. E. Harlow and F. Brglez. Design of experiments in BDD variable ordering: Lessons learned. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Aided Design*, pages 646–652, San Jose, CA, Nov. 1998.

[62] J. Håstad. Clique is hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$. *Acta Mathematica*, 182: 105–142, 1999.

[63] H. H. Hoos and T. Stützle. SATLIB: An online resource for research on SAT. In I. P. Gent, H. van Maaren, and T. Walsh, editors, *SAT2000*, pages 283–292. IOS Press, 2000. URL http://www.satlib.org.

[64] M. Huele, J. van Zwieten, M. Dufour, and H. van Maaren. March-eq: Implementing additional reasoning into an efficient lookahead SAT solver. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, volume 3542 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 345–359, Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 2004. Springer.

[65] R. Impagliazzo, T. Pitassi, and A. Urquhart. Upper and lower bounds for tree-like cutting planes proofs. In *9th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 220–228, Los Alamitos, CA, 1994.

[66] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random Graphs*. John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

[67] T. Jian. Algorithms for solving maximum independent set problem. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 35(9):847–851, 1986.

[68] D. S. Johnson and M. A. Trick, editors. *Cliques, Coloring and Satisfiability: Second DIMACS Implementation Challenge*, volume 26 of *DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*. AMS, 1996.

[69] R. M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–104. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.

[70] H. A. Kautz and B. Selman. Planning as satisfiability. In *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 359–363, Vienna, Austria, Aug. 1992.

[71] H. A. Kautz and B. Selman. Pushing the envelope: Planning, propositional logic, and stochastic search. In *Proceedings, AAAI-96: 13th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1194–1201, Portland, OR, Aug. 1996.

[72] H. A. Kautz and B. Selman. BLACKBOX: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. In *Working notes of the Workshop on Planning as Combinatorial Search, held in conjunction with AIPS-98*, Pittsburgh, PA, 1998.

[73] J. Köbler, U. Schöning, and J. Torán. *The Graph Isomorphism Problem: its Structural Complexity*. Birkhauser Verlag, 1993. ISBN 0-8176-3680-3.

[74] H. Konuk and T. Larrabee. Explorations of sequential ATPG using boolean satisfiability. In *11th VLSI Test Symposium*, pages 85–90, 1993.

[75] J. Krajíček. On the weak pigeonhole principle. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 170 (1-3):123–140, 2001.

[76] B. Krishnamurthy. Short proofs for tricky formulas. *Acta Informatica*, 22: 253–274, 1985.

[77] D. Le Berre and L. Simon (Organizers). SAT 2004 competition, May 2004. URL http://www.satcompetition.org/2004/.

[78] D. Le Berre and L. Simon (Organizers). SAT 2005 competition, June 2005. URL http://www.satcompetition.org/2005/.

[79] L. Levin. Universal sequential search problems. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 9(3):265–266, 1973. Originally in Russian.

[80] C. M. Li and Anbulagan. Heuristics based on unit propagation for satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 366–371, Nagoya, Japan, Aug. 1997.

[81] C. M. Li, B. Jurkowiak, and P. W. Purdom. Integrating symmetry breaking into a DLL procedure. In *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, pages 149–155, Cincinnati, OH, May 2002.

[82] I. Lynce and J. P. Marques-Silva. An overview of backtrack search satisfiability algorithms. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 37(3):307–326, 2003.

[83] P. D. MacKenzie, July 2005. Private communication.

[84] J. P. Marques-Silva and K. A. Sakallah. GRASP – a new search algorithm for satisfiability. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Aided Design*, pages 220–227, San Jose, CA, Nov. 1996.

[85] J. P. Marques-Silva and K. A. Sakallah. Robust search algorithms for test pattern generation. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing*, pages 152–161, Seattle, WA, June 1997.

[86] D. A. McAllester, B. Selman, and H. Kautz. Evidence for invariants in local search. In *AAAI/IAAI*, pages 321–326, Providence, RI, July 1997.

[87] M. Mézard and R. Zecchina. Random k-satisfiability problem: From an analytic solution to an efficient algorithm. *Physical Review E*, 66:056126, Nov. 2002.

[88] M. W. Moskewicz, C. F. Madigan, Y. Zhao, L. Zhang, and S. Malik. Chaff: Engineering an efficient SAT solver. In *Proceedings of the 38th Design Automation Conference*, pages 530–535, Las Vegas, NV, June 2001.

[89] D. B. Motter and I. Markov. A compressed breadth-first search for satisfiability. In *ALENEX*, volume 2409 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 29–42, San Francisco, CA, Jan. 2002. Springer.

[90] D. B. Motter, J. A. Roy, and I. Markov. Resolution cannot polynomially simulate compressed-BFS. *Ann. of Math. and A.I.*, 44(1-2):121–156, 2005.

[91] A. Nadel. The Jerusat SAT solver. Master's thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2002.

[92] R. Ostrowski, E. Grégoire, B. Mazure, and L. Sais. Recovering and exploiting structural knowledge from cnf formulas. In *8th Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, volume 2470 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 185–199, Ithaca, NY, Sept. 2002. Springer-Verlag.

[93] P. Pudlák. Lower bounds for resolution and cutting plane proofs and monotone computations. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 62(3):981–998, Sept. 1997.

[94] R. Raz. Resolution lower bounds for the weak pigeonhole principle. *Journal of the ACM*, 51(2):115–138, 2004.

[95] A. A. Razborov. Resolution lower bounds for perfect matching principles. In *Proceedings Seventeenth Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 17–26, Montreal, PQ, Canada, May 2002.

[96] S. Reda, R. Drechsler, and A. Orailoglu. On the relation between SAT and BDDs for equivalence checking. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Quality Electronic Design*, pages 394–399, San Jose, CA, Mar. 2002.

[97] J. M. Robson. Algorithms for maximum independent sets. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(3):425–440, 1986.

[98] A. Sabharwal. SymChaff: A structure-aware satisfiability solver. In *Proceedings, AAAI-05: 20th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 467–474, Pittsburgh, PA, July 2005.

[99] A. Sabharwal, P. Beame, and H. Kautz. Using problem structure for efficient clause learning. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing*, volume 2919 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 242–256, Portofino, Italy, May 2003. Springer-Verlag.

[100] M. Shindo and E. Tomita. A simple algorithm for finding a maximum clique and its worst-case time complexity. *Systems and Computers in Japan*, 21(3): 1–13, 1990.

[101] O. Shtrichman. Tuning SAT checkers for bounded model checking. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 480–494, Chicago, IL, July 2000.

[102] O. Shtrichman. Accelerating bounded model checking of safety properties. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 1:5–24, 2004.

[103] R. M. Stallman and G. J. Sussman. Forward reasoning and dependency-directed backtracking in a system for computer-aided circuit analysis. *Artificial Intelligence*, 9:135–196, 1977.

[104] P. R. Stephan, R. K. Brayton, and A. L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli. Combinatorial test generation using satisfiability. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits*, 15(9):1167–1176, 1996.

[105] R. E. Tarjan. Finding a maximum clique. Technical Report 72-123, Computer Science Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1972.

[106] R. E. Tarjan and A. E. Trojanowski. Finding a maximum independent set. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(3):537–546, 1977.

[107] E. Tomita and T. Seki. An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In *4th International Conference on Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 2731 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 278–289, Dijon, France, July 2003. Springer-Verlag.

[108] L. Trevisan. Non-approximability results for optimization problems on bounded degree instances. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 453–461, Crete, Greece, July 2001.

[109] G. S. Tseitin. On the complexity of derivation in the propositional calculus. In A. O. Slisenko, editor, *Studies in Constructive Mathematics and Mathematical Logic, Part II*. 1968.

[110] A. Urquhart. Hard examples for resolution. *Journal of the ACM*, 34(1):209–219, 1987.

[111] A. Urquhart. The symmetry rule in propositional logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 96-97:177–193, 1999.

[112] M. N. Velev and R. E. Bryant. Effective use of boolean satisfiability procedures in the formal verification of superscalar and vliw microprocessors. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 35(2):73–106, 2003.

[113] H. Zhang. SATO: An efficient propositional prover. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automated Deduction*, volume 1249 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 272–275, Townsville, Australia, July 1997.

[114] H. Zhang and J. Hsiang. Solving open quasigroup problems by propositional reasoning. In *Proceedings of the International Computer Symp.*, Hsinchu, Taiwan, 1994.

[115] L. Zhang, C. F. Madigan, M. H. Moskewicz, and S. Malik. Efficient conflict driven learning in a boolean satisfiability solver. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Aided Design*, pages 279–285, San Jose, CA, Nov. 2001.