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## Regular Resolution

## '37 Resolution.

'62 Tree-like resolution.
'68 Regular resolution: do not resolve a variable twice on same path. [Tseitin]

- Tree-like resolution is regular wlog.

Q Is regular resolution as powerful as general resolution?

- Formulas need exponentially long regular proofs.
- If regular $\equiv$ general, resolution needs exponentially long proofs.
'87 Separation regular vs general (by a constant).
[Huang, Yu]
'93 Separation regular vs general (superpolynomial).
'02 Separation regular vs general (exponential).
'11 Best separation to date: $\exp \left(L / \log ^{7} L \log \log L\right)$.
[AJPU] [Urquhart]
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Q Are restarts really needed?
'05 Pool resolution $\simeq$ CDCL w/o restarts.

- Pool res $\geq$ Regular res $\Rightarrow$ Formulas that separate general and regular are good candidates to separate general and pool.
'14 All such formulas easy for pool resolution.
- Also: formulas not good to run experiments with.
- Need new formulas!


## Proving Resolution Lower Bounds

## Largest clause in proof

## Size-Width Relation

Resolution $F$ requires width $W \Rightarrow F$ requires length $\exp \left(W^{2} / n\right)$
Tree-like resolution $F$ requires width $W \Rightarrow F$ requires length $\exp (W)$
Regular resolution ??

## Proving Resolution Lower Bounds

## Largest clause in proof

Size-Width RelationResolution $F$ requires width $W \Rightarrow F$ requires length $\exp \left(W^{2} / n\right)$
Tree-like resolution $F$ requires width $W \Rightarrow F$ requires length $\exp (W)$
Regular resolution ..... ??
LiftingResolution $F$ requires width $W \Rightarrow T(F)$ requires length $\exp (W)$
Tree-like resolution $F$ requires depth $D \Rightarrow T(F)$ requires length $\exp (D)$
Regular resolution ..... ??
Longest path in proof DAG
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## Main Result (Informal)

## Theorem

$F$ requires large depth $\Rightarrow T(F)$ requires long regular proofs.

- Simplifies separation between regular and general resolution.
- If $F$ has narrow proofs, then $T(F)$ still has short proofs.
- Obtain separation from $F$ with small width and large depth, e.g. pebbling formulas.
- New family of "sparse stone formulas".
- Improved separation: $\exp \left(L / \log ^{3} L \log \log ^{5} L\right)$.
- Can use in experiments.
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## Lifting with Indexing and Reusing

- Share all main variables among all gadgets.

Original variables

## Lifting with Sparse Indexing and Reusing

- Fix a bipartite graph $G([n] \cup[m], E)$; variable $s_{i}^{j}$ exists iff $(i, j) \in E$.
- $G$ is $n$ disjoint stars $\Rightarrow$ usual lifting.
- $F$ is pebbling formula and $G$ is complete graph $K_{n, m} \Rightarrow$ stone formula.
- $F$ is pebbling formula and $G$ is random graph $\Rightarrow$ sparse stone formula.



## Main Result

## Theorem (Dense)

If $F$ requires depth $D$, then $\mathcal{L}_{K}(F)$ requires regular length $\sim \exp \left(D^{2} / n\right)$.

## Main Result

## Theorem (Dense)

If $F$ requires depth $D$, then $\mathcal{L}_{K}(F)$ requires regular length $\sim \exp \left(D^{2} / n\right)$.

## Theorem (Sparse)

If $F$ requires depth $D$, then $\mathcal{L}_{G}(F)$ requires regular length $\sim \exp \left(D^{3} / n^{2} \log ^{2} n\right)$. $G$ is a random graph of degree $d=\log (n / D)$.
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## Updated plan

(1) Hit proof with lifting-respecting restriction $\rho$.
(2. If proof of $\mathcal{L}(F)$ is short, obtain proof of $\mathcal{L}(F) \upharpoonright_{\rho}=\mathcal{L}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ with no complex clauses.

3 But all proofs of $\mathcal{L}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ have a complex clause.

- Need restriction to respect lifting: $\mathcal{L}(F) \upharpoonright_{\rho}=F^{\prime}=\mathcal{L}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$.
[AJPU '02]
- Need to tweak what "wide" means.
- Clause is "complex" if
- talks about many main variables or
- matches many original variables or
- restricts the neighbourhood of many original variables
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## Proof Details (Dense)

Can query and forget but not requery

- Finding a good restriction is not too hard.
- To prove that all regular proofs have a complex clause:

Given truth assignment $\alpha$, find clause falsified by $\alpha$

- view proof as read-once branching program for Search $(\mathcal{L}(F))$
- use to build decision tree for Search( $F$ ).
- Key invariant: match original variables to main variables consistent with decision tree.
- If query selector variable: say "not matched" unless forced to.
- If query main variable: if matched, answer according to decision tree.
- If no complex clause, then a coloured main variable is never matched
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## Open Problems

- Are restarts needed?
- More formulas that separate regular and general resolution?

Thanks!

