

Reward-Oracle MCTS for Formal Theorem Proving: Sample-Efficient Search and the Need for Kernel-Level Proof Auditing

Bodla Krishna Vamshi, Haizhao Yang*

University of Maryland, College Park
kbodla@umd.edu, hzyang@umd.edu

Abstract

Formal theorem proving with large language models remains challenging due to the difficulty of navigating large proof search spaces efficiently. Existing tree search approaches either feed verbose compiler error messages directly into the generation context, increasing context usage during search, or employ non-standard evaluation protocols that prevent direct comparison with established baselines. We propose a three-role Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) framework that treats the Lean 4 compiler purely as a reward oracle using compiler output as a scalar signal for UCB-guided tree updates without feeding error content into the generation context. Our framework decomposes proof search into three roles: a generator for proof attempts, a decomposer for subgoal decomposition, and a critic for subgoal quality evaluation. We evaluate across 4 benchmarks spanning competition mathematics and physics (MiniF2F, PutnamBench, LeanPhysBench, PhysLeandata) with three prover models at standard proof attempt budgets (PAB@16 to PAB@256). Our method achieves 87.1% on MiniF2F with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B at PAB@256 and solves 26/659 PutnamBench problems at PAB@32 surpassing base sampling 18/659 at same proof attempt budget. Through an exhaustive axiom-level audit of every compiled proof, we further identify reward hacking in search-based theorem proving: DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B produces proofs on PutnamBench that pass compilation and the standard sorry-token scan while depending on sorryAx. The audit removes 4 and 8 such proofs from whole-proof sampling at PAB@32 and PAB@128, and 11 and 19 from MCTS. We do not attribute these counts to the search procedure; we report them to establish that kernel-level auditing is necessary for compiler-verified evaluation.

Introduction

Formal theorem proving with large language models has emerged as a challenging frontier in AI reasoning, requiring models to navigate exponentially large proof search spaces while satisfying the strict correctness requirements of interactive theorem provers such as Lean 4 (de Moura and Ullrich 2021) and Isabelle (Nipkow, Paulson, and Wenzel 2002). Recent advances in specialized prover models (Lin et al. 2025c; Ren et al. 2025; Wang et al. 2025) have demonstrated promising results on established benchmarks, yet the

fundamental challenge of efficiently exploring proof search spaces remains open.

We propose a three-role Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) framework built around a distinct architectural principle: the Lean 4 compiler is used exclusively as a *reward oracle*, rather than as a source of textual feedback for subsequent generations. Unlike compiler-guided approaches that append error messages or proof-state diagnostics to the model context, our method converts compilation outcomes into scalar rewards that are propagated through the search tree and used only for UCB-guided node selection. This separation between verification and generation prevents compiler feedback from accumulating with search depth, while still allowing formal verification signals to influence future exploration through value backpropagation. Consequently, the framework performs iterative, verifier-guided search over natural-language proof plans without requiring compiler-error-conditioned generation.

Our framework decomposes proof search into three distinct roles: a **generator** that produces complete proof attempts, a **decomposer** that breaks problems into subgoals with temperature-decayed sampling to balance exploration and exploitation, and a **critic** that evaluates subgoal quality to provide a richer reward signal than binary compiler output alone. At each MCTS iteration, the UCB policy traverses the current tree from the root to select a leaf node based on backpropagated compiler and critic rewards.

We restrict our primary comparison to whole-proof sampling on the same frozen checkpoint, rather than to methods such as BFS-Prover (Xin et al. 2025), HunyuanProver (Li et al. 2025a), which retrain or fine-tune the underlying prover model. Because these methods change the checkpoint itself via retrained value/policy networks, additional RL, or adversarially generated training data any performance delta conflates search-procedure gains with model gains, and cannot isolate the contribution of the search algorithm. Whole-proof sampling provides the cleanest primary baseline for isolating the effect of inference-time search while holding the prover checkpoint fixed. We additionally compare with inference-time structured-search baselines that use the same frozen checkpoints, prompts, and evaluation environment. Throughout the paper, we use the terms proof attempt budget and budget interchangeably, and denote it by $PAB@$.

We evaluate across four benchmarks spanning competi-

*Corresponding author.

Preprint. Under review.

tion mathematics and theoretical physics MiniF2F (Zheng, Han, and Polu 2022), PutnamBench (Tsoukalas et al. 2024), LeanPhysBench (Li et al. 2025b), and PhysLeandata (Zhang et al. 2026) using three specialized prover models (Goedel-Prover-V2-8B (Lin et al. 2025c), DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B (Ren et al. 2025), Kimina-Prover-Preview-Distill-7B (Wang et al. 2025)) at standard proof attempt budgets (PAB@16 to PAB@256). On PutnamBench, our method solves 26/659 problems with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B at PAB@32 surpassing base sampling’s 18/659 at same proof attempt budget. On MiniF2F, our method achieves 87.1% with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B at PAB@256 and continues to improve consistently as the proof attempt budget increases.

Beyond strong empirical results, we identify and characterize a reward-hacking phenomenon. DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, which was previously reported to exploit a Lean 4.9.0 interface vulnerability (Ren et al. 2025), produces exploit-dependent successful proofs under both whole-proof sampling and MCTS on PutnamBench. At PAB@32, the audit removes 4 successful proofs from whole-proof sampling and 11 from MCTS; at PAB@128, it removes 8 and 19, respectively. This finding highlights a fundamental evaluation risk, making kernel-level proof auditing essential for search-based theorem-proving evaluation. We further conduct a systematic multi-agent analysis showing that, for the evaluated models, selectively using a heterogeneous critic can improve proof search, whereas heterogeneous decomposition consistently degrades performance.

Related work

Formal Theorem Proving with Large Language Models

Early approaches to neural theorem proving focused on training specialized models to generate complete proof attempts in a single forward pass (First et al. 2023). GPT-f (Polu and Sutskever 2020) demonstrated that language models pre-trained on mathematical text could generate useful proof steps when fine-tuned on proof corpora, establishing the foundation for subsequent work. ReProver (Yang et al. 2023) introduced retrieval-augmented generation for tactic prediction, improving performance by conditioning proof generation on relevant premises retrieved from Mathlib.

Tree Search for Theorem Proving

Tree search methods have a long history in formal reasoning (Dong and Ma 2025; Xin et al. 2025; Li et al. 2025a). HyperTree Proof Search (Lample et al. 2022) applies Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) to Lean proof search using a learned value function jointly trained with the proof model to guide node expansion. COPRA (Thakur et al. 2024) performs context-sensitive proof search by maintaining proof state across attempts and incorporating compiler feedback into subsequent generations. Draft-Sketch-Prove (Jiang et al. 2023) decomposes proofs into high-level sketches that are subsequently completed by a tactic model, anticipating the use of intermediate proof decomposition. ReProver (Yang et al. 2023) improves tactic prediction through retrieval-augmented generation, while Prover Agent (Baba et al. 2026)

performs iterative compiler-guided search within a tree-based framework.

Monte Carlo Tree Search in Language Model Reasoning

MCTS has been applied broadly to improve LLM reasoning beyond theorem proving. Yao et al. (2023) introduced Tree of Thoughts, using LLM-guided search over reasoning steps with value estimation for intermediate states. Hao et al. (2023) proposed Reasoning via Planning, applying MCTS with LLM-based world models for multi-step reasoning tasks. Feng et al. (2024) extended AlphaZero-style self-play to mathematical reasoning, training value and policy networks jointly.

Whole-Proof Generation

A complementary research direction focuses on whole-proof generation (First et al. 2023), where the model generates a complete Lean proof script in a single pass, typically accompanied by an extended reasoning trajectory. Recent advances in this paradigm have been driven by two major approaches. The first employs expert-iteration frameworks, which iteratively incorporate successfully verified proofs into the training corpus to progressively improve the prover (Polu et al. 2022; Wu et al. 2021, 2025; Lin et al. 2025a; Dong and Ma 2025; Lin et al. 2025b,c). The second leverages reinforcement learning guided by proof-assistant verification signals, enabling models to refine proof generation through verifier-based feedback (Kaliszyk et al. 2018; Xin et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2025; Wang et al. 2025; Ren et al. 2025; Gloeckle et al. 2024; Ji et al. 2025; Lin et al. 2025c).

Reward Hacking in Reinforcement Learning

Reward hacking where agents exploit unintended patterns in reward signals rather than solving the intended task is a well-documented failure mode in reinforcement learning (Wang et al. 2026). In the LLM context, reward hacking has been observed in RLHF settings where models learn to exploit reward model weaknesses (Gao, Schulman, and Hilton 2022). In formal theorem proving specifically, Ren et al. (2025) reported that DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B exploited a Lean 4.9.0 compiler vulnerability where the `apply?` tactic failed to emit `sorry` declarations under certain conditions producing proofs that passed compilation without being mathematically valid.

Lean 4 Proof Evaluation Infrastructure

Automated evaluation of Lean 4 proofs requires interactive theorem prover infrastructure that can compile tactic-level proof attempts and return verification results programmatically. Several tools have been developed for this purpose, each with different design tradeoffs.

LeanDojo (Yang et al. 2023) is an open-source framework that provides a programmatic interface to Lean 4 through a REPL-based interaction model, enabling extraction of proof states, tactic execution, and premise retrieval from Mathlib. LeanDojo has become the standard evaluation infrastructure for many theorem proving benchmarks including MiniF2F

and PutnamBench, and its premise extraction capabilities underpin retrieval-augmented approaches such as ReProver (Yang et al. 2023).

LeanInteract (Poiroux, Kuncak, and Bosselut 2025) extends the REPL-based approach with improved session management and support for parallel proof evaluation, reducing the overhead of maintaining multiple concurrent Lean processes. PyPantograph (Aniva et al. 2024) takes a different approach, providing a Python-native interface to the Lean 4 kernel through direct FFI bindings rather than a REPL subprocess.

Kimina Lean Server (Santos et al. 2025) is purpose-built for large-scale parallel proof evaluation in the context of reinforcement learning and tree search methods. Unlike REPL-based tools that maintain sequential interaction with a single Lean process, Kimina Lean Server manages a pool of persistent Lean REPL instances that handle concurrent proof compilation requests enabling high-throughput evaluation at the sampling budgets required by tree search methods. The server exposes an HTTP interface that accepts complete Lean 4 proof strings and returns compilation results including success status, error messages, and `sorry` usage detection. Our method uses Kimina Lean Server as the compiler reward oracle throughout all experiments.

Comparison with Existing Inference-Time Search Methods

To clarify the algorithmic distinctions between our framework and prior inference-time search methods for formal theorem proving, Table 1 summarizes the major design choices. Unlike methods that condition future generation on compiler feedback or proof-state diagnostics, our approach treats the Lean verifier exclusively as a *reward oracle*: only the scalar reward is propagated through MCTS, while compiler messages are never inserted into the LLM context. Furthermore, our search operates over natural-language proof plans rather than formal proof states, allowing the search policy to allocate compute through UCB-guided exploration while remaining independent of compiler-specific feedback.

Method

Our framework decomposes proof search into three specialized roles: a **generator**, a **decomposer**, and a **critic** coordinated by a Monte Carlo Tree Search procedure. Each node $n_{d,k}^P$ in the search tree represents a subgoal state at depth d , child index k , with parent node P (where $P=r$ denotes the root). The tree is initialized with a single root node $n_{0,0}^r$ corresponding to the original theorem T . We describe the four phases of each MCTS iteration below, with the overall procedure illustrated in Figure 1. Throughout this paper, “states” in our method refer to natural-language proof-plan search states rather than formal Lean 4 proof states.

Selection

Beginning from the root node $n_{0,0}^r$, the selection phase traverses the tree by repeatedly choosing the child node that maximizes the UCB criterion:

$$\text{UCB}(n_{d,k}^P) = Q(n_{d,k}^P) + c \sqrt{\frac{\ln N(\text{parent}(n_{d,k}^P))}{N(n_{d,k}^P)}} \quad (1)$$

where $Q(n)$ is the empirical mean rollout reward of node n , $N(n)$ is its visit count, and $c = \sqrt{2}$ is the exploration constant. For an unvisited node, the exploration term is treated as $+\infty$, ensuring that every newly generated child is evaluated before previously visited children are reselected. Traversal continues until a leaf node is reached that is either terminal or has not yet been fully expanded. If the selected node is non-terminal and has not yet been expanded, it is expanded into K child nodes. Previously expanded internal nodes remain eligible for future traversal, and their children are repeatedly selected according to the UCB policy as the search proceeds. Thus, the tree is incrementally refined over successive iterations as visit counts and value estimates are updated through backpropagation.

Expansion

The selected node n at depth d is expanded by generating $K=4$ child subgoals (g_k) using the decomposer role. The decomposer is prompted with the original theorem and the trajectory from the root to the current node, namely, the sequence of subgoals accumulated along that path. It proposes the next intermediate proof step as a natural language subgoal, producing K diverse candidates that become child nodes $n_{d+1,1}^n, \dots, n_{d+1,K}^n$ in the tree.

A key design choice in expansion is **temperature decay**: the decomposer sampling temperature τ_d is annealed according to both the current depth d and the iteration index i as:

$$\tau_d = \tau_0 \cdot e^{-0.12d} \cdot e^{-0.03 \ln(1+i)} \quad (2)$$

starting from $\tau_0=0.7$. At shallow depths and early iterations, the higher temperature encourages diverse subgoal proposals, enabling broad exploration of distinct proof strategies. At greater depths and later iterations, the lower temperature concentrates sampling on more focused, committed proof directions. This schedule directly governs the exploration–exploitation balance of the search. Our ablation analysis, provided in the supplementary appendix submitted with the paper, shows that removing temperature decay consistently degrades performance across the evaluated models, indicating that it is a critical architectural component of our framework.

Evaluation

Each newly expanded child node $n_{d+1,k}^n$ is evaluated using two complementary reward signals that together form the rollout reward $r_t = r_c + r_s$.

Critic reward $r_c \in [0, 1]$. The critic role assesses the quality of the proposed subgoal g_k by sampling the critic LLM five times at a fixed low temperature of $\tau=0.3$ and averaging the scores. The low temperature ensures stable, consistent evaluation rather than diverse sampling. The critic provides a soft quality signal that compensates for the binary nature

Table 1: Architectural comparison between our framework and closely related inference-time search methods. “Compiler usage” refers to how Lean verification is incorporated into the search process.

Method	Search Representation	Search Strategy	Generator Receives Compiler Feedback	LLM Critic	Search Allocation	Reward Backprop.
COPRA	Formal proof state	Sequential refinement	✓ Compiler text	–	Fixed	–
Prover Agent	Proof attempts	Tree refinement	✓ Compiler text	–	Heuristic expansion	Method-specific
BFS+CG	Natural-language plans	Breadth-first	× (scalar evaluation only)	✓	Breadth-first	–
One-shot decomposition	Natural-language plans	Single expansion	× (scalar evaluation only)	✓	Flat expansion	–
Reward-Oracle MCTS (Ours)	Natural-language proof plans	UCB-guided MCTS	× Scalar reward only	✓	Adaptive	✓

of compiler feedback a subgoal that does not immediately yield a compiling proof may still receive high critic reward if it represents a promising intermediate step toward the final proof. The critic outputs a score $\hat{r}_c \in [0, 100]$, which we normalize as $r_c = \hat{r}_c/100 \in [0, 1]$.

Server reward $r_s \in [0, 1]$. The generator role produces S complete Lean 4 proof attempts for each child node, conditioned on the full trajectory from root to that node at a fixed temperature of $\tau=0.7$. Each attempt is submitted to the Kimina Lean server (Santos et al. 2025), which compiles the proof and checks for the absence of `sorry` declarations. Let s_k denote the number of attempts that compile successfully. We define the normalized server reward as $r_s = s_k/S$, $r_s \in \{0, 1/S, 2/S \dots, 1\}$. Crucially, we use compiler output solely as a scalar count signal no error message content is fed back into the generation context.

Backpropagation

After rollout evaluation, the obtained rollout reward r_t is propagated from the expanded node back to the root along the selected search path. For every node on this path, the visit count and cumulative reward are updated as

$$N(n) \leftarrow N(n) + 1, \quad W(n) \leftarrow W(n) + r_t,$$

and the node value used by UCB is computed as

$$Q(n) = \frac{W(n)}{N(n)}.$$

These updates follow the standard MCTS backpropagation procedure. These updated statistics are subsequently used by the UCB selection policy during future iterations to balance exploration and exploitation.

After backpropagation, the next iteration begins with a fresh selection phase from the root. The updated visit counts and value estimates allow the UCB policy to allocate more search effort to promising subtrees while continuing to explore less-visited alternatives.

Proof attempt Budget

At each of N MCTS iterations, one leaf node is selected according to the UCB policy and expanded into K child nodes. Each child is evaluated using S complete proof attempts, resulting in $K \times S$ generator rollouts per iteration. Therefore, the total proof-attempt sampling budget is exactly $N \times K \times S$ per problem. We scale the proof attempt budget by varying S while keeping N and K fixed:

$$\text{PAB@}B = N \times K \times S = 4 \times 4 \times S \quad (3)$$

giving $S=2$ for PAB@32, $S=4$ for PAB@64, $S=8$ for PAB@128, and $S=16$ for PAB@256. Throughout this paper, PAB@B denotes proof-attempt budget.

Results

We evaluate our framework across four benchmarks MiniF2F (Zheng, Han, and Polu 2022), PutnamBench (Tsoukalas et al. 2024), PhysLeandata (Zhang et al. 2026), and Lean-PhysBench (Li et al. 2025b) using three specialized prover models: Goedel-Prover-V2-8B (Lin et al. 2025c), DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B (Ren et al. 2025), and Kimina-Prover-Preview-Distill-7B (Wang et al. 2025). All results are averaged over 5 random seeds. Unlike much prior work in this area, we report mean $\pm$ standard deviation across 5 random seeds for all experiments to support statistical reliability of the reported gains.

Baseline description BFS+CG. Breadth-first expansion of the decomposition tree in which the critic score alone ranks and selects nodes for expansion at each level, with no UCB criterion and no backpropagation of compiler reward along the search path.

One-shot decomposition. All 16 subgoal candidates are generated in a single flat expansion from the root and each is evaluated independently, with no iterative reselection isolating whether gains derive from decomposition scaffolding alone rather than from iterative, reward-guided search.

Both baselines use the identical frozen checkpoints for the generator, decomposer, and critic roles as our framework, and identical prompt templates and decoding configurations; they differ from our method only in the search mechanism that allocates the fixed proof-attempt budget.

Main Results

Table 2 and 3 reports results on MiniF2F test set. Our method consistently outperforms whole proof sampling methods across all three models at matched proof attempt budgets. On Goedel-Prover-V2-8B our method achieves $84.2 \pm 0.5\%$ at PAB@32, surpassing whole-proof baseline (82.4%) (Table 3). To analyze the importance of individual reward functions, we perform ablations comparing the critic-only reward against the combined critic + verifier reward (Table 4).

To directly compare against a feedback-driven baseline on the same checkpoint, we reproduce Prover Agent (Baba




Figure 1: Overview of the proposed search framework. Each node $n^P_{d,N}$ represents the k -th child at depth d , with parent P : $P=r$ denotes the root.

et al. 2026) using their released implementation with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B as the prover model, under our evaluation environment (Lean 4.15.0, Mathlib commit 9837ca9d). At their native sample budget of 260, we obtain $86.2 \pm 0.1\%$ on MiniF2F, compared to $87.1 \pm 0.2\%$ for our method at PAB@256, despite Prover Agent’s use of direct compiler-error feedback in context versus our oracle-only signal.

On PutnamBench (Table 5), our method solves 26/659 problems with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B at PAB@32 and 36/659 at PAB@128, compared to 18/659 and 22/659 for whole-proof sampling. On PhysLeandata and LeanPhysBench (Tables 6, 7), our method consistently outperforms whole-proof sampling across all three models at the matched budget of PAB@16, with gains of +1.9% to +2.4% on PhysLeandata and +1.5% to +2.0% on LeanPhysBench with PhysLib context. Notably, our method without PhysLib context approaches the performance of whole-proof sampling with PhysLib suggesting that structured search partially compensates for the absence of domain-specific library context. Consistent gains across both physics benchmarks demonstrate that our method generalizes beyond mathematical domains where model familiarity is minimal.

Inference-token efficiency

In this section we additionally compare cumulative inference-token usage at PAB@32 (Table 8). All reported counts are

averaged across five complete runs per sample. We use vLLM package for inference with one model instance loaded per GPU; the same instance serves the generator, decomposer, and critic roles. We use 4 Nvidia H200-SXM GPUs for inference. Multiple completions are generated within batched requests: whole-proof sampling produces 32 outputs from one request, while each critic evaluation produces five outputs in one request whose scores are subsequently averaged. To ensure strict budget matching, neither method terminates early after finding a valid proof.

Despite the additional decomposition and critic computations, our framework consistently consumes fewer inference tokens across all three models. Relative to whole-proof sampling, total token usage decreases by 32.29% for Goedel-Prover-V2-8B, 33.17% for DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, and 33.07% for Kimina-Prover-7B. Output-token usage decreases by 35.35%, 36.07%, and 36.05%, respectively. Averaged across the three models, our framework reduces output-token generation by 35.83% and total token consumption by 32.84%. These results show that the short decomposer and critic interactions substantially reduce the number of generator output tokens consumed under the same proof-attempt budget, more than offsetting their additional token overhead. Both methods use an identical vLLM deployment with one model instance per GPU and the same maximum GPU-memory-utilisation setting of 0.95.

Table 2: Results on the miniF2F test set for different methods. All results are averaged over 5 random seeds.

Model	Method	Size	Generator completions	Decomposer completions	Critic completions	Success (%)
Kimina	BFS+CG	7B	$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	62.5 ± 0.6
	One-shot decomposition		$16 \times 2 \times 1$	16×1	16×1	61.3 ± 0.6
	Agent (ours)		$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	64.3 ± 0.8
DeepSeek	BFS+CG	7B	$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	75.4 ± 0.6
	One-shot decomposition		$16 \times 2 \times 1$	16×1	16×1	74.5 ± 0.3
	Agent (ours)		$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	77.1 ± 0.3
Goedel	BFS+CG	8B	$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	82.7 ± 0.4
	One-shot decomposition		$16 \times 2 \times 1$	16×1	16×1	81.7 ± 0.4
	Agent (ours)		$4 \times 2 \times 4$	4×4	4×4	84.2 ± 0.5

BFS indicates breadth first search, CG indicates critic guided search

Effect of Adaptive Decomposer Temperature

Table 9 reports the effect of removing temperature decay from the decomposer, replacing the annealed schedule

$$\tau_d = \tau_0 \cdot e^{-0.12d} \cdot e^{-0.03 \ln(1+i)} \quad (4)$$

(Equation 4) with a fixed temperature of $\tau=0.7$ throughout. Removing temperature decay consistently degrades performance across all three models: Kimina-Prover-7B drops from $64.3 \pm 0.8\%$ to $62.5 \pm 0.5\%$ (-1.8%), DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B from $77.1 \pm 0.3\%$ to $74.6 \pm 0.3\%$ (-2.5%), and Goedel-Prover-V2-8B from $84.2 \pm 0.5\%$ to $81.9 \pm 0.3\%$ (-2.3%).

These consistent drops across all models confirm that temperature decay is a critical architectural component rather than a model-specific artifact. Without decay, the decomposer maintains high temperature throughout the search continuing to propose diverse subgoals even at deeper depths and later iterations where the search should be committing to promising proof directions. This prevents the tree from effectively exploiting high-reward subtrees identified by backpropagated compiler rewards, reducing the search to essentially diverse but unguided sampling.

Multi-Agent Role Analysis

Table 10 reports results from our systematic multi-agent analysis on Minif2f test set for proof attempt budget of 32 (PAB@32), where Goedel-Prover-V2-8B is fixed as the generator and all combinations of Goedel-Prover-V2-8B, DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, and Kimina-Prover-7B are evaluated in the decomposer and critic roles. The objective is to examine whether introducing heterogeneous models into supporting roles can improve proof search performance over the homogeneous baseline.

Among the evaluated critic assignments, heterogeneous critics exhibit mixed behavior. Using DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B as the critic achieves the best overall performance ($86.1 \pm 0.3\%$), improving upon the homogeneous configuration ($84.2 \pm 0.5\%$) by 1.9 percentage points. In contrast, replacing the critic with Kimina-Prover-7B decreases performance to $82.7 \pm 0.4\%$. These results indicate that, for the

models evaluated here, an appropriately chosen heterogeneous critic can provide complementary evaluation signals that improve search quality, although this benefit is not observed for every model substitution.

The decomposer role exhibits a different trend. Replacing the homogeneous Goedel-Prover-V2-8B decomposer with either DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B or Kimina-Prover-7B consistently reduces performance, achieving $83.8 \pm 0.4\%$ (-0.4 points) and $82.2 \pm 0.5\%$ (-2.0 points), respectively. Furthermore, combining heterogeneous models in both supporting roles does not preserve the critic improvement. For example, using DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B as both decomposer and critic achieves only $80.9 \pm 0.3\%$, substantially below both the homogeneous baseline ($84.2 \pm 0.5\%$) and the configuration that changes only the critic ($86.1 \pm 0.3\%$). This suggests that, for the evaluated models, the performance gain from a heterogeneous critic depends on maintaining a homogeneous generator-decomposer pair.

Overall, within the scope of the evaluated models and benchmark, the strongest configuration pairs a Goedel-Prover-V2-8B generator and decomposer with a DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B critic. These findings suggest that selectively introducing heterogeneity into the critic role is a promising direction for improving theorem-proving search, while additional experiments across a broader range of generator models and benchmarks are needed to determine the extent to which these observations generalize.

Effect of the Iteration-Branching Allocation

We study how the fixed proof-attempt budget should be distributed between the number of MCTS iterations N and the branching factor K . We keep the number of complete proof attempts per child fixed at $S = 2$ and vary N and K such that

$$N \times K \times S = 32$$

for every configuration. Consequently, all settings use the same maximum number of complete proof generations, decomposition calls, and critic evaluations. Specifically, each configuration produces $NK = 16$ decomposition candidates, $5NK = 80$ critic evaluations, and $NKS = 32$ complete proof attempts. The configurations therefore differ pri-

Table 3: Results on miniF2F test set for different proof attempt budgets and methods. All results are averaged over 5 random seeds. Prover Agent is reproduced under our evaluation setting at a proof attempt budget of 260, since only at this budget does its full iterative-refinement pipeline execute.

Model	Method	Size	Budget	Success (%)
Kimina	Whole-proof	7B	32	62.8 $\pm$ 0.8
			64	65.1 $\pm$ 0.3
	Agent (ours)		32	64.3 $\pm$ 0.8
			64	66.9 $\pm$ 0.2
DeepSeek	Whole-proof	7B	32	75.2 $\pm$ 0.5
			64	76.3 $\pm$ 0.7
			128	77.5 $\pm$ 0.3
			256	78.2 $\pm$ 0.1
	Prover Agent	7B	260	81.7 $\pm$ 0.3
			32	77.1 $\pm$ 0.3
	64		79.3 $\pm$ 0.4	
	128		81.4 $\pm$ 0.2	
Agent (ours)	7B	256	82.6 $\pm$ 0.1	
		256	82.6 $\pm$ 0.1	
Goedel	Whole-proof	8B	32	82.4 $\pm$ 0.6
			64	83.3 $\pm$ 0.4
			128	83.9 $\pm$ 0.2
			256	84.7 $\pm$ 0.1
	Prover Agent	8B	260	86.2 $\pm$ 0.1
			32	84.2 $\pm$ 0.5
	64		85.6 $\pm$ 0.4	
	128		86.3 $\pm$ 0.2	
	Agent (ours)	8B	256	87.1 $\pm$ 0.2
			256	87.1 $\pm$ 0.2

marily in how these calls are distributed across sequential MCTS iterations.

As shown in Table 11, shallow configurations with large branching factors are computationally efficient but achieve lower proof success. The $N = 1, K = 16$ and $N = 2, K = 8$ configurations obtain success rates of 82.1% and 82.3%, respectively. In these settings, most of the budget is allocated to generating a broad set of decompositions, with limited opportunity to use intermediate rewards to guide subsequent node selection.

Increasing the number of MCTS iterations to $N = 4$ improves success to 84.2%. Notably, the $N = 1, K = 16$ and $N = 4, K = 4$ configurations use the same numbers of decomposition calls, critic evaluations, and complete proof attempts. Their performance difference therefore cannot be attributed to a larger component-call budget. Instead, the result indicates that distributing node expansions across multiple MCTS iterations, with intermediate reward backpropagation and subsequent UCB-guided selection, is more effective than generating all decomposition candidates in a single expansion.

Further increasing the number of iterations produces diminishing returns. The $N = 8, K = 2$ configuration achieves 83.7%, while the narrowest configuration, $N = 16, K = 1$, achieves 84.3%. The latter is only 0.1 percentage points above the $N = 4, K = 4$ configuration, while requir-

Table 4: Results on miniF2F test set for reward ablations. All results are averaged over 5 random seeds.

Model	Method	Size	PAB	Success (%)	
DeepSeek	Agent (critic only)	7B	32	73.7 $\pm$ 0.7	
			64	74.2 $\pm$ 0.3	
	Agent (critic+reward)		32	77.1 $\pm$ 0.3	
			64	79.3 $\pm$ 0.4	
			128	81.4 $\pm$ 0.2	
		256	82.6 $\pm$ 0.1		
Goedel	Agent (critic only)	8B	32	81.6 $\pm$ 0.6	
			64	82.5 $\pm$ 0.5	
	Agent (critic+reward)		32	84.2 $\pm$ 0.5	
			64	85.6 $\pm$ 0.4	
			128	86.3 $\pm$ 0.2	
		256	87.1 $\pm$ 0.2		

Table 5: Results on PutnamBench for different methods and proof attempt budgets. Following prior PutnamBench evaluations, results are reported as a single benchmark run over all 659 problems

Model	Method	Size	PAB	#Solved	
DeepSeek	Whole-proof	7B	32	9/659	
			32*	13/659	
			128	10/659	
			128*	18/659	
	Agent (ours)		32	16/659	
			32*	27/659	
			128	25/659	
			128*	44/659	
Goedel	Whole-proof	8B	32	18/659	
			128	22/659	
	Agent (ours)		32	26/659	
				128	36/659

*Potential exploit.

ing $2.8\times$ the wall-clock time of the $N = 1, K = 16$ setting, compared with $1.5\times$ for $N = 4, K = 4$. This difference in success is small relative to the variation across random seeds.

These results reveal an accuracy–latency trade-off. Broad, shallow search reduces inference latency but provides insufficient iterative refinement, whereas very narrow search increases sequential search overhead without yielding a meaningful improvement in proof success. We therefore use $N = 4, K = 4, S = 2$ in the main experiments, as it provides the best practical balance between proof success and wall-clock efficiency under the fixed proof-attempt budget.

Reward Hacking Analysis. DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B exhibits a substantially different pattern on PutnamBench. Before exploit auditing, whole-proof sampling solves 13/659 problems at PAB@32 and 18/659 at PAB@128, whereas our method solves 27/659 and 44/659, respectively. However, screening the successful proofs using previously reported exploit indicators identifies a substantial number

Table 6: Results on PhysLeandata test set. Results are averaged across 5 random seeds.

Model	Method	Size	PAB	Success (%)
Kimina	Whole-proof	7B	16	25.2 $\pm$ 0.6
	Agent (critic+reward)		16	27.5 $\pm$ 0.6
DeepSeek	Whole-proof	7B	16	33.8 $\pm$ 0.5
	Agent (critic+reward)		16	36.2 $\pm$ 0.6
Goedel	Whole-proof	8B	16	31.9 $\pm$ 0.7
	Agent (critic+reward)		16	33.8 $\pm$ 0.4

Table 7: Results on LeanPhysBench (proof attempt budget (PAB@B) = 16). Results are averaged across 5 random seeds. The PhysLib library is directly passed as context. Critic+server rewards used for all our method configurations.

Model	Method	Success (%)
Kimina	Whole-proof	9.3 $\pm$ 0.3
	Whole-proof (w/ PhysLib)	13.5 $\pm$ 0.7
	Agent (ours, no PhysLib)	11.5 $\pm$ 0.6
	Agent (ours, w/ PhysLib)	15.0 $\pm$ 0.7
DeepSeek	Whole-proof	11.5 $\pm$ 0.2
	Whole-proof (w/ PhysLib)	14.5 $\pm$ 0.2
	Agent (ours, no PhysLib)	13.0 $\pm$ 0.4
	Agent (ours, w/ PhysLib)	16.5 $\pm$ 0.6
Goedel	Whole-proof	10.0 $\pm$ 0.2
	Whole-proof (w/ PhysLib)	15.0 $\pm$ 0.2
	Agent (ours, no PhysLib)	12.0 $\pm$ 0.4
	Agent (ours, w/ PhysLib)	16.5 $\pm$ 0.3

containing the `apply?` tactic and `Cardinal`-family lemmas (`Cardinal.toNat`, `Cardinal.natCast_inj`). These patterns were identified in the DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B technical report (Ren et al. 2025) as being associated with a Lean 4.9.0 compiler/interface vulnerability in which `apply?` may fail to emit an explicit `sorry` declaration under certain conditions, producing proof declarations that compile despite depending on `sorryAx`.

After excluding proofs confirmed by our audit to depend on `sorryAx`, the whole-proof solve counts decrease from 13/659 to 9/659 at PAB@32 and from 18/659 to 10/659 at PAB@128. Thus, the audit removes 4 and 8 whole-proof solutions at the two budgets. For our method, the solve counts decrease from 27/659 to 16/659 at PAB@32 and from 44/659 to 25/659 at PAB@128, removing 11 and 19 solutions, respectively. Consequently, our method produces 7 more exploit-dependent successful proofs than whole-proof sampling at PAB@32 and 11 more at PAB@128.

Critically, successful exploitation is not observed on the physics benchmarks. On PhysLeandata, DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B generates exploit-related patterns for only 1 of the 200 evaluated problems, and none of these attempts compile successfully. Likewise, no exploit-dependent successful proof is identified on LeanPhysBench. These results suggest that the prover lacks sufficient familiarity with the graduate-level physics formalizations to construct the surrounding

Lean context required for the documented exploit pattern to succeed. We therefore observe successful exploit-dependent proofs primarily on PutnamBench, where the underlying prover already exhibits the documented behaviour. We report both unaudited and audited results transparently in Table 5 and recommend kernel-level proof auditing for models that exhibit anomalous increases in compiler-verified solve counts under search-based inference.

Potential Exploit Identification. To investigate the generation of exploitative proof strategies, we adopt a conservative multi-stage audit protocol. We first identify *potentially suspicious* proof attempts using the exploit patterns reported in the DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B technical report (Ren et al. 2025). That work reports that the 7B model occasionally exploits a Lean 4.9.0 compiler/interface bug on PutnamBench through characteristic proof structures involving the `apply?` tactic together with specific `Cardinal`-related lemmas, including `Cardinal.toNat` and `Cardinal.natCast_inj`. We use these patterns only as an initial screening mechanism; their lexical presence is never treated as sufficient evidence that a proof is exploitative. Because we are not Lean 4 domain experts, we rely on the indicators documented in prior work rather than independently deriving new exploit signatures. Accordingly, our initial screening can detect recurrences of the documented exploit family but cannot by itself rule out undocumented exploit patterns.

For every successfully compiled proof, including proofs that do not contain the previously reported lexical indicators, we append `#print axioms <theorem_name>` and recompile the resulting code using the same Lean evaluation environment. A proof is classified as a *potential exploit* only when the resulting theorem declaration depends on `sorryAx`. For proofs that also contain a documented suspicious construction, we additionally remove that construction and verify that the proof no longer compiles. Thus, neither the presence of `apply?` nor the use of `Cardinal`-family lemmas is independently sufficient for classification. Only successful proofs whose resulting declarations depend on `sorryAx` are removed from the audited solve counts. Since the underlying Lean behaviour has already been documented in prior work (Ren et al. 2025), we use the term *potential exploit* rather than claiming to have independently established a new compiler vulnerability.

Across all experiments, successful exploit-dependent proofs are observed only for DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B on PutnamBench. Under whole-proof sampling, the audit removes 4 successful proofs at PAB@32 and 8 at PAB@128. Under our MCTS framework, it removes 11 successful proofs at PAB@32 and 19 at PAB@128. No successful proof generated by Goedel-Prover-V2-8B or Kimina-Prover-Preview-Distill-7B is found to depend on `sorryAx` under the same audit protocol. Although DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B occasionally generates proof attempts containing exploit-related patterns on PhysLeandata, LeanPhysBench, and the MiniF2F test set, none of these attempts both compile successfully and produce a theorem declaration depending on `sorryAx`. They therefore do not contribute to the reported solve counts. These observations suggest that our MCTS framework does

Table 8: Role-level inference-token usage at PAB@32, averaged across five runs. Token counts are cumulative across all role completions in one complete benchmark run.

Model	Role/Method	Input	Output	Total
Goedel-Prover-V2-8B	Decomposer	1,438	1,449	2,887
	Critic	4,126	196	4,322
	Generator	4,231	203,580	207,811
	Whole-proof	117	317,420	317,537
DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B	Decomposer	1,347	1,392	2,739
	Critic	4,021	187	4,208
	Generator	4,058	204,113	208,171
	Whole-proof	117	321,762	321,879
Kimina-Prover-7B	Decomposer	1,427	1,466	2,893
	Critic	4,083	185	4,268
	Generator	4,135	203,611	207,746
	Whole-proof	117	320,986	321,103

Table 9: Results with and without temperature variation on miniF2F test set (proof attempt budget = 32; critic + server rewards used for all configurations). Results are averaged across 5 random seeds.

Model	Method	Success (%)
Kimina	Agent (ours, w/ temp. variation)	64.3 ± 0.8
	Agent (ours, w/o temp. variation)	62.5 ± 0.5
DeepSeek	Agent (ours, w/ temp. variation)	77.1 ± 0.3
	Agent (ours, w/o temp. variation)	74.6 ± 0.3
Goedel	Agent (ours, w/ temp. variation)	84.2 ± 0.5
	Agent (ours, w/o temp. variation)	81.9 ± 0.3

Table 10: Multi-agent analysis with different models in different roles on miniF2F test set with sampling budget PAB@32. Results are averaged across 5 random seeds.

Generator	Decomposer	Critic	Success (%)
Goedel	Kimina	Kimina	81.4 ± 0.4
Goedel	Kimina	Goedel	82.2 ± 0.5
Goedel	Goedel	Kimina	82.7 ± 0.4
Goedel	DeepSeek	DeepSeek	80.9 ± 0.3
Goedel	Goedel	DeepSeek	86.1 ± 0.3
Goedel	DeepSeek	Goedel	83.8 ± 0.4
Goedel	Goedel	Goedel	84.2 ± 0.5 [†]

[†] Baseline.

not introduce a new exploit strategy; instead, it could increase the number of successful exploit-dependent proofs produced by a model that already exhibits the documented behavior.

All our experiments, including the baselines, are conducted using Lean 4.15.0, Mathlib v4.15.0 (commit 9837ca9d, dated 2025-01-05), and the Kimina Lean Server 2.0.0 container image. Although the underlying interface behavior was originally documented under Lean 4.9.0 (Ren et al. 2025), we verify that proof attempts exhibiting the documented `apply?`-based pattern continue to produce theorem declarations depending on `sorryAx` under our pinned

Table 11: Effect of the iteration–branching-factor allocation under a fixed proof-attempt budget on MiniF2F with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B. We fix $S = 2$ proof attempts per child and vary the number of MCTS iterations N and children per expansion K , such that $NKS = 32$ for all configurations. Wall-clock time is reported relative to the $N = 1, K = 16$ configuration. Results are averaged over five random seeds.

N	K	S	Success (%)	Rel. Wall-Clock
1	16	2	82.1 ± 0.4	1.0×
2	8	2	82.3 ± 0.3	1.2×
4 [†]	4	2	84.2 ± 0.5	1.5×
8	2	2	83.7 ± 0.4	2.1×
16	1	2	84.3 ± 0.2	2.8×

[†] Configuration used in our main results.

Lean 4.15.0 and Mathlib environment.

To ensure that the audit is not limited to proofs matching the previously reported lexical indicators, we execute `#print axioms` on every successfully compiled proof generated by all three prover models, across all four benchmarks, methods, and proof-attempt budgets. Because `#print axioms` queries the dependencies of the resulting Lean declaration rather than relying on the evaluation wrapper’s surface-level compilation status or source-level `sorry` scan, it directly determines whether a successful declaration depends on kernel axioms such as `sorryAx`. This exhaustive audit finds no `sorryAx` dependency among successful proofs generated by Goedel-Prover-V2-8B or Kimina-Prover-Preview-Distill-7B under any evaluated configuration.

The same audit procedure is applied uniformly to whole-proof sampling and MCTS-generated proofs, enabling a controlled comparison between the two inference procedures. We emphasize that this procedure verifies axiom-level dependencies as reported by Lean; it does not constitute an independent mathematical or semantic validation beyond the guarantees provided by Lean’s kernel and axiom-dependency tracking.

Implementation details

Reproduction protocol and comparability to published results . All baselines in the paper are re-run in-house under a single pinned environment (Lean 4.15.0, Mathlib v4.15.0 commit 9837ca9d dated 2025-01-05, Kimina Lean Server 2.0.0), using the prompt templates in Section and the decoding configurations in Section . Our whole-proof sampling numbers are consequently not directly comparable to the pass@k figures reported in the original model releases, and we do not present them as reproductions of those figures. The factors accounting for the difference are, first, published numbers are obtained under substantially older toolchain pins, and solve rates are highly sensitive to this choice: (Gu et al. 2025) measure the same Goedel-Prover-V2-32B checkpoint at 90% pass@64 on MiniF2F and 86 solves on PutnamBench at pass@184 under Mathlib 4.9, but at 80% and 75 solves respectively under Mathlib 4.19 a ten-point swing on MiniF2F attributable to the toolchain alone, with no change to the model. Second, published figures use model-specific prompt templates and, for Goedel-Prover-V2, an optional compiler-guided self-correction mode; we instead use one uniform prompt template and decoding configuration across all three provers and disable self-correction, so that every method under comparison differs only in its search procedure and not in its inference stack.

Our decision to pin a recent toolchain rather than reproduce the original evaluation environment is deliberate. The axiom-level audit in the main paper (Subsections: Reward Hacking Analysis, Potential Exploit Identification) shows that the Lean 4.9.0-era interface behaviour documented by (Ren et al. 2025) admits proof declarations that compile successfully, pass the standard source-level sorry scan, and nonetheless depend on sorryAx. Compiler-verified solve counts obtained under that toolchain therefore cannot be taken at face value without a kernel-level audit, and re-deriving every baseline within a single pinned and exhaustively audited environment is what makes the internal comparisons in this paper meaningful. Every result reported in the main paper whole-proof sampling, BFS+CG, one-shot decomposition, our reproduction of Prover Agent, and our framework is internal to this environment, uses identical frozen checkpoints, and varies only the inference-time procedure.

Physlib library PhysLib is a Lean 4 support library introduced alongside LeanPhysBench in Lean4Physics (Li et al. 2025b). It formalizes standard physical units, dimensional constants, and the associated definitions against which the benchmark’s theorem statements are written. Following the evaluation protocol of (Li et al. 2025b), we supply PhysLib as direct input context: the library is prepended to the theorem statement within the prompt, rather than being exposed through premise retrieval or an import mechanism.

We report LeanPhysBench results both with and without this context Table 7. The with-PhysLib condition matches the setting used in the original benchmark evaluation and is the primary comparison; the no-PhysLib condition measures how far a prover can proceed on physics formalizations without access to the domain-specific definitions its statements

depend on. The protocol is applied identically to whole-proof sampling and to our framework at every budget, so the with-/without contrast varies only the presence of library context.

Inference configuration.

The three agent roles use different decoding configurations tailored to their respective objectives.

- **Generator.** Maximum generation length is 16,384 tokens with decoding temperature $\tau = 0.7$. This relatively higher temperature encourages diverse proof attempts while remaining sufficiently stable for formal proof generation.
- **Decomposer.** Maximum generation length is 1,024 tokens. The decomposer uses the adaptive temperature schedule described in Equation 4, allowing broader exploration during early search and progressively more focused subgoal generation at deeper levels.
- **Critic.** Maximum generation length is limited to 3 tokens with decoding temperature $\tau = 0.3$. Since the critic produces only scalar quality ratings rather than proofs, a low temperature is used to obtain stable and reproducible evaluations.

Prompt Configurations

We report the exact system prompts used for each of the three agent roles below. The same prompt template is used across all three prover models (Goedel-Prover-V2-8B, DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, Kimina-Prover-7B) and all four benchmarks (MiniF2F, PutnamBench, PhysLeandata, LeanPhysBench); only the theorem statement, decomposition trajectory, and (where applicable) domain-specific library context are substituted into the template placeholders at inference time.

Generator System Prompt

```
1 You are an expert Lean4 theorem prover.
2 Given a theorem and a decomposition that
   breaks it into tractable steps,
   produce a complete Lean4 proof.
3
4 THEOREM:
5 {theorem}
6
7 DECOMPOSITION:
8 {decomposition}
9
10 INSTRUCTIONS:
11 - You may use a <think>...</think> block
   for internal reasoning
12 - After the thinking block, output ONLY
   the raw Lean4 proof, no markdown
   fences, no prose
13 - Start your Lean4 output directly with
   the theorem declaration or 'by'
14 - Use 'have' statements to encode each
   decomposition step as an intermediate
   goal
15 - The proof must typecheck and close all
   goals
16 - Do not output anything after the
   closing 'done' or final tactic
```

Critic System Prompt	
1	You are an expert Lean4 theorem proving evaluator.
2	You will be given:
3	1. A main Lean4 theorem to prove
4	2. A decomposition trajectory of prior steps (if any)
5	3. A candidate next decomposition step to evaluate
6	
7	Rate the candidate step on how useful it is for making the main theorem provable.
8	
9	Scoring criteria:
10	- Does it meaningfully reduce the proof burden of the main theorem? (0-25 pts)
11	- Is it consistent with and builds on the prior trajectory? (0-25 pts)
12	- Is it specific and immediately actionable in Lean4? (0-25 pts)
13	- Does it avoid redundancy with prior steps? (0-25 pts)
14	
15	Score anchors:
16	- 0-20: Irrelevant, wrong direction, or harmful to the proof
17	- 21-40: Vaguely related but not actionable
18	- 41-60: Reasonable but generic or partially useful
19	- 61-80: Clearly useful and directly reduces proof burden
20	- 81-100: Optimal next step, precise and immediately actionable
21	
22	Theorem: {theorem}
23	Trajectory: {trajectory}
24	Candidate step: {candidate_step}
25	Score:

Decomposer Prompt	
1	You are an expert Lean4 proof strategist.
2	You will be given a theorem and optionally a list of decomposition steps already planned.
3	Your task is to output the single most useful NEXT proof step.
4	
5	THEOREM:
6	{theorem}
7	{prior_steps_block}
8	
9	INSTRUCTIONS:
10	- Output EXACTLY ONE next step, one sentence, plain English
11	- The step must be a concrete proof-structural move: an induction scheme, a case split,
12	a key lemma to establish, a rewrite rule to apply, or an algebraic transformation
13	- It must directly reduce what remains to be proven
14	- Do NOT write Lean4 code or pseudocode
15	- Do NOT explain your reasoning
16	- Do NOT repeat prior steps
17	- Do NOT state what the final answer is
18	
19	Valid examples:
20	"Apply induction on n, handling the base case n=0 and step case separately."
21	"Rewrite the goal using the identity $a^2 - b^2 = (a-b)(a+b)$."
22	"Case split on whether k is even or odd."
23	"Establish the auxiliary lemma that f(n) is monotone increasing, then apply it to bound the sum."
24	"Reduce to showing divisibility by expressing the left side as a telescoping product."
25	
26	Next step:

Example: A Potential Compiler Exploit

Listing 1 shows a representative Agent (critic+reward) proof attempt for putnam_1997_b5 generated by DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B that was flagged by our audit protocol ((Subsections: Reward Hacking Analysis, Potential Exploit Identification), stated in the main paper). The proof compiles successfully under the Kimina Lean server and superficially follows a standard structure: a base case (h_base), an inductive step (h_inductive), and a chain of trivial exact forwarding (h_main, h_final) that gives the appearance of a completed induction. Critically, however, the inductive step's proof obligation is discharged not through valid tactics but through a cascade of try blocks that falls back to the apply? tactic (highlighted, line 46) when omega and simp_all fail to close the goal.

Following our audit protocol, we append an axiom check to the compiled proof:

```

1 #print axioms putnam_1997_b5
  which returns:
1 'putnam_1997_b5' depends on axioms: [propext
  , sorryAx, Classical.choice, Quot.sound]
The presence of sorryAx confirms that, despite compiling
without an explicit sorry token in the source and despite
passing the Kimina server's sorry-token scan, the proof
does not in fact close all goals apply? silently discharges
an unproved obligation via the Lean 4.9.0 interface bug doc-
umented in Ren et al. (2025), rather than genuinely estab-
lishing the inductive step. Removing the flagged apply?
branch causes the proof to fail to compile, satisfying the sec-
ond criterion of our audit protocol ((Subsections: Reward
Hacking Analysis, Potential Exploit Identification), stated in
the main paper)) and confirming classification as a potential
exploit.

Listing 1: A DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B proof attempt for
putnam_1997_b5 flagged as a potential exploit. Line 46
shows the fallback apply? tactic responsible for the
sorryAx dependency.

1 import Mathlib
2 def tetration : Nat -> Nat -> Nat
3   | _, 0 => 1
4   | b, (m + 1) => b^(tetration b m)
5
6 theorem putnam_1997_b5
7   (n : Nat)
8   (hn : n >= 2)
9   : tetration 2 n == tetration 2 (n-1) [MOD n
  ] := by
10   have h_base : n = 2 -> tetration 2 n ==
    tetration 2 (n-1) [MOD n] := by
11     intro hn2
12     rw [hn2]
13     norm_num [tetration, Nat.ModEq]
14     <|> decide
15
16   have h_inductive : forall k >= 2,
    tetration 2 k == tetration 2 (k-1) [
  MOD k]
17   -> tetration 2 (k+1) == tetration 2 k
    [MOD (k+1)] := by
18     intro k hk h
19     have h1 : tetration 2 (k + 1) = 2 ^ (
    tetration 2 k) := by
20       rw [tetration]
21       <|> simp [Nat.add_comm, Nat.add_assoc,
    Nat.add_left_comm]
22       <|> induction k <|> simp_all [tetration
    , Nat.pow_succ]
23       <|> ring_nf at * <|> omega
24     have h2 : tetration 2 k = 2 ^ (tetration
    2 (k - 1)) := by
25       cases k with
26       | zero => contradiction
27       | succ k =>
28         cases k with
29         | zero => contradiction
30         | succ k =>
31           simp_all [tetration]
32           <|> simp_all [tetration, Nat.
    pow_succ]

```

```

33       <|> ring_nf at * <|> omega
34     rw [h1]; rw [h2]
35     have h3 : (2:Nat) ^ (2 ^ (tetration 2 (k
    - 1))) = 2 ^ (2 ^ (tetration 2 (k -
    1))) := rfl
36     have h4 : (2:Nat) ^ (2 ^ (tetration 2 (k
    - 1))) = 2 ^ (2 ^ (tetration 2 (k -
    1))) := rfl
37     simp_all [Nat.ModEq, Nat.ModEq]
38     <|> (try omega) <|>
39     (try { cases k with
40       | zero => contradiction
41       | succ k =>
42         cases k with
43         | zero => contradiction
44         | succ k => simp_all [tetration,
    Nat.pow_succ, Nat.ModEq] <|>
    omega }) <|>
45     (try { simp_all [tetration, Nat.pow_succ,
    Nat.ModEq] <|> omega }) <|>
46     (try { apply? })
47     <|> omega
48
49   have h_main : forall k >= 2, tetration 2 k
    == tetration 2 (k-1) [MOD k] := by
50     intro k hk
51     induction' hk with k hk ih
52     . norm_num [tetration, Nat.ModEq]
53     . cases k with
54     | zero => contradiction
55     | succ k =>
56       cases k with
57       | zero => norm_num [tetration, Nat.
    ModEq] at *
58       | succ k =>
59         have h1 := h_inductive (k + 2) (by
    omega) ih
60         simp_all [tetration, Nat.ModEq]
61         <|> omega
62
63   exact h_main n hn

```

Datasets

We evaluate our framework on four publicly available Lean 4 theorem-proving benchmarks spanning competition mathematics and college- to graduate-level physics.

MiniF2F (Zheng, Han, and Polu 2022) is a benchmark consisting of 244 test problems formalized in Lean 4. The problems are derived from international mathematics competitions, including the International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO), the American Invitational Mathematics Examination (AIME), and related contests. The benchmark covers a diverse range of mathematical domains, including algebra, number theory, geometry, inequalities, combinatorics, induction, and analysis, making it a standard benchmark for evaluating formal theorem provers.

PutnamBench (Tsoukalas et al. 2024) is a collection of formally verified problems compiled from the William Lowell Putnam Mathematical Competition. It contains challenging undergraduate-level mathematical theorems spanning algebra, analysis, geometry, combinatorics, number theory, and linear algebra, providing a rigorous benchmark for assessing

mathematical reasoning and proof-generation capabilities.

LeanPhysBench (Li et al. 2025b) is a benchmark of formally verified college-level physics problems written in Lean 4. The dataset covers multiple introductory and intermediate physics domains, including mechanics, oscillations and waves, electromagnetism, thermodynamics, optics, and related topics. We evaluate both with and without the accompanying PhysLib context following the benchmark protocol.

PhysLeanData (Zhang et al. 2026) is a large-scale Lean 4 benchmark containing graduate-level theoretical physics formalizations. The benchmark includes problems from advanced domains such as classical particle mechanics, classical string theory, relativity, quantum mechanics, quantum field theory, and related areas, providing an out-of-distribution evaluation setting for assessing the generalization capability of theorem-proving systems.

Conclusion and Limitations

We present a three-role MCTS framework that treats the Lean 4 compiler purely as a reward oracle, this prevents compiler-error content from accumulating in the generation context as search depth increases. This keeps compiler-feedback overhead constant with search depth. Under matched proof-attempt budgets, our method outperforms whole-proof sampling across four benchmarks spanning competition mathematics and graduate-level theoretical physics, reaching 87.1% on MiniF2F with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B at PAB@256, while consuming 32.8% fewer total inference tokens on average than the whole-proof baseline. Ablations show that both the temperature-decayed decomposer and the distribution of a fixed budget across multiple MCTS iterations, rather than a single wide expansion, are responsible for these gains. We also present an exhaustive axiom-level audit. We ran `#print axioms` on every successfully compiled proof produced by all three prover models across all four benchmarks, methods, and budgets not only on proofs matching previously reported lexical indicators. This audit shows that a substantial fraction of DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B’s successes on PutnamBench depend on `sorryAx` despite compiling cleanly and passing the standard source-level `sorry scan`: 4 of 13 and 8 of 18 whole-proof successes at PAB@32 and PAB@128, and 11 of 27 and 19 of 44 under our framework. The underlying apply? interface behaviour was documented for Lean 4.9.0 by Ren et al. (2025); we confirm it persists under our pinned Lean 4.15.0 and Mathlib environment.

References

Aniva, L.; Sun, C.; Miranda, B.; Barrett, C.; and Koyejo, S. 2024. Pantograph: A Machine-to-Machine Interaction Interface for Advanced Theorem Proving, High Level Reasoning, and Data Extraction in Lean 4. *arXiv:2410.16429*.

Baba, K.; Liu, C.; Kurita, S.; and Sannai, A. 2026. Prover Agent: An Agent-Based Framework for Formal Mathematical Proofs. *arXiv:2506.19923*.

de Moura, L.; and Ullrich, S. 2021. The Lean 4 Theorem Prover and Programming Language. In *Automated Deduction – CADE 28: 28th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Virtual Event, July 12–15, 2021, Proceed-*

ings, 625–635. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. ISBN 978-3-030-79875-8.

Dong, K.; and Ma, T. 2025. STP: Self-play LLM Theorem Provers with Iterative Conjecturing and Proving. *arXiv:2502.00212*.

Feng, X.; Wan, Z.; Wen, M.; McAleer, S. M.; Wen, Y.; Zhang, W.; and Wang, J. 2024. Alphazero-like Tree-Search can Guide Large Language Model Decoding and Training. *arXiv:2309.17179*.

First, E.; Rabe, M. N.; Ringer, T.; and Brun, Y. 2023. Baldur: Whole-Proof Generation and Repair with Large Language Models. *arXiv:2303.04910*.

Gao, L.; Schulman, J.; and Hilton, J. 2022. Scaling Laws for Reward Model Overoptimization. *arXiv:2210.10760*.

Gloeckle, F.; Limperg, J.; Synnaeve, G.; and Hayat, A. 2024. ABEL: Sample Efficient Online Reinforcement Learning for Neural Theorem Proving. In *The 4th Workshop on Mathematical Reasoning and AI at NeurIPS’24*.

Gu, A.; Piotrowski, B.; Gloeckle, F.; Yang, K.; and Markosyan, A. H. 2025. ProofOptimizer: Training Language Models to Simplify Proofs without Human Demonstrations. *arXiv:2510.15700*.

Hao, S.; Gu, Y.; Ma, H.; Hong, J. J.; Wang, Z.; Wang, D. Z.; and Hu, Z. 2023. Reasoning with Language Model is Planning with World Model. *arXiv:2305.14992*.

Ji, X.; Liu, Y.; Wang, Q.; Zhang, J.; Yue, Y.; Shi, R.; Sun, C.; Zhang, F.; Zhou, G.; and Gai, K. 2025. Leanabell-Prover-V2: Verifier-integrated Reasoning for Formal Theorem Proving via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv:2507.08649*.

Jiang, A. Q.; Welleck, S.; Zhou, J. P.; Li, W.; Liu, J.; Jamnik, M.; Lacroix, T.; Wu, Y.; and Lample, G. 2023. Draft, Sketch, and Prove: Guiding Formal Theorem Provers with Informal Proofs. *arXiv:2210.12283*.

Kaliszyk, C.; Urban, J.; Michalewski, H.; and Olšák, M. 2018. Reinforcement Learning of Theorem Proving. *arXiv:1805.07563*.

Lample, G.; Lachaux, M.-A.; Lavril, T.; Martinet, X.; Hayat, A.; Ebner, G.; Rodriguez, A.; and Lacroix, T. 2022. HyperTree Proof Search for Neural Theorem Proving. *arXiv:2205.11491*.

Li, Y.; Du, D.; Song, L.; Li, C.; Wang, W.; Yang, T.; and Mi, H. 2025a. HunyuanProver: A Scalable Data Synthesis Framework and Guided Tree Search for Automated Theorem Proving. *arXiv:2412.20735*.

Li, Y.; Liu, M.; Wang, R.; Ji, W.; He, Z.; Pan, R.; Huang, J.; Zhang, T.; and Fung, Y. R. 2025b. Lean4Physics: Comprehensive Reasoning Framework for College-level Physics in Lean4. *arXiv:2510.26094*.

Lin, H.; Sun, Z.; Welleck, S.; and Yang, Y. 2025a. Lean-STaR: Learning to Interleave Thinking and Proving. *arXiv:2407.10040*.

Lin, Y.; Tang, S.; Lyu, B.; Wu, J.; Lin, H.; Yang, K.; Li, J.; Xia, M.; Chen, D.; Arora, S.; and Jin, C. 2025b. Goedel-Prover: A Frontier Model for Open-Source Automated Theorem Proving. *arXiv:2502.07640*.

- Lin, Y.; Tang, S.; Lyu, B.; Yang, Z.; Chung, J.-H.; Zhao, H.; Jiang, L.; Geng, Y.; Ge, J.; Sun, J.; Wu, J.; Gesi, J.; Lu, X.; Acuna, D.; Yang, K.; Lin, H.; Choi, Y.; Chen, D.; Arora, S.; and Jin, C. 2025c. Goedel-Prover-V2: Scaling Formal Theorem Proving with Scaffolded Data Synthesis and Self-Correction. arXiv:2508.03613.
- Nipkow, T.; Paulson, L. C.; and Wenzel, M. 2002. *Isabelle/HOL: A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, volume 2283 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag.
- Poiroux, A.; Kuncak, V.; and Bosselut, A. 2025. LeanInteract: A Python Interface for Lean 4.
- Polu, S.; Han, J. M.; Zheng, K.; Baksys, M.; Babuschkin, I.; and Sutskever, I. 2022. Formal Mathematics Statement Curriculum Learning. arXiv:2202.01344.
- Polu, S.; and Sutskever, I. 2020. Generative Language Modeling for Automated Theorem Proving. arXiv:2009.03393.
- Ren, Z. Z.; Shao, Z.; Song, J.; Xin, H.; Wang, H.; Zhao, W.; Zhang, L.; Fu, Z.; Zhu, Q.; Yang, D.; Wu, Z. F.; Gou, Z.; Ma, S.; Tang, H.; Liu, Y.; Gao, W.; Guo, D.; and Ruan, C. 2025. DeepSeek-Prover-V2: Advancing Formal Mathematical Reasoning via Reinforcement Learning for Subgoal Decomposition. arXiv:2504.21801.
- Santos, M. D.; Wang, H.; de Saxcé, H.; Wang, R.; Baksys, M.; Unsal, M.; Liu, J.; Liu, Z.; and Li, J. 2025. Kimina Lean Server: Technical Report. arXiv:2504.21230.
- Thakur, A.; Tsoukalas, G.; Wen, Y.; Xin, J.; and Chaudhuri, S. 2024. An In-Context Learning Agent for Formal Theorem-Proving. arXiv:2310.04353.
- Tsoukalas, G.; Lee, J.; Jennings, J.; Xin, J.; Ding, M.; Jennings, M.; Thakur, A.; and Chaudhuri, S. 2024. Putnam-Bench: Evaluating Neural Theorem-Provers on the Putnam Mathematical Competition. arXiv:2407.11214.
- Wang, H.; Unsal, M.; Lin, X.; Baksys, M.; Liu, J.; Santos, M. D.; Sung, F.; Vinyes, M.; Ying, Z.; Zhu, Z.; Lu, J.; de Saxcé, H.; Bailey, B.; Song, C.; Xiao, C.; Zhang, D.; Zhang, E.; Pu, F.; Zhu, H.; Liu, J.; Bayer, J.; Michel, J.; Yu, L.; Dreyfus-Schmidt, L.; Tunstall, L.; Pagani, L.; Machado, M.; Bourigault, P.; Wang, R.; Polu, S.; Barroyer, T.; Li, W.-D.; Niu, Y.; Fleureau, Y.; Hu, Y.; Yu, Z.; Wang, Z.; Yang, Z.; Liu, Z.; and Li, J. 2025. Kimina-Prover Preview: Towards Large Formal Reasoning Models with Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2504.11354.
- Wang, X.; Tian, M.; Zeng, Y.; Huang, Z.; Yuan, J.; Chen, B.; Xu, J.; Zhou, M.; Liu, W.; Wu, M.; Guo, Z.; Qian, Q.; Wang, Y.; Zhang, F.; Yin, R.; Dou, S.; Lv, C.; Chen, T.; Song, K.; Tan, X.; Gui, T.; Zheng, X.; and Huang, X. 2026. Reward Hacking in the Era of Large Models: Mechanisms, Emergent Misalignment, Challenges. arXiv:2604.13602.
- Wu, M.; Norrish, M.; Walder, C.; and Dezfouli, A. 2021. TacticZero: Learning to Prove Theorems from Scratch with Deep Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2102.09756.
- Wu, Z.; Huang, S.; Zhou, Z.; Ying, H.; Yuan, Z.; Zhang, W.; Lin, D.; and Chen, K. 2025. InternLM2.5-StepProver: Advancing Automated Theorem Proving via Critic-Guided Search. arXiv:2410.15700.
- Xin, H.; Ren, Z. Z.; Song, J.; Shao, Z.; Zhao, W.; Wang, H.; Liu, B.; Zhang, L.; Lu, X.; Du, Q.; Gao, W.; Zhu, Q.; Yang, D.; Gou, Z.; Wu, Z. F.; Luo, F.; and Ruan, C. 2024. DeepSeek-Prover-V1.5: Harnessing Proof Assistant Feedback for Reinforcement Learning and Monte-Carlo Tree Search. arXiv:2408.08152.
- Xin, R.; Xi, C.; Yang, J.; Chen, F.; Wu, H.; Xiao, X.; Sun, Y.; Zheng, S.; and Shen, K. 2025. BFS-Prover: Scalable Best-First Tree Search for LLM-based Automatic Theorem Proving. arXiv:2502.03438.
- Yang, K.; Swope, A. M.; Gu, A.; Chalamala, R.; Song, P.; Yu, S.; Godil, S.; Prenger, R.; and Anandkumar, A. 2023. LeanDojo: Theorem Proving with Retrieval-Augmented Language Models. arXiv:2306.15626.
- Yao, S.; Yu, D.; Zhao, J.; Shafran, I.; Griffiths, T. L.; Cao, Y.; and Narasimhan, K. 2023. Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models. arXiv:2305.10601.
- Zhang, H.; Wang, R.; Pan, R.; Wang, W.; Meng, B.; and Zhang, T. 2026. PhysProver: Advancing Automatic Theorem Proving for Physics. arXiv:2601.15737.
- Zhang, J.; Wang, Q.; Ji, X.; Liu, Y.; Yue, Y.; Zhang, F.; Zhang, D.; Zhou, G.; and Gai, K. 2025. Leanabell-Prover: Posttraining Scaling in Formal Reasoning. arXiv:2504.06122.
- Zheng, K.; Han, J. M.; and Polu, S. 2022. MiniF2F: a cross-system benchmark for formal Olympiad-level mathematics. arXiv:2109.00110.