

STOCHBENCH: A Domain-Specific Benchmark for Stochastic Processes in Lean

Idan Davidovich Debargha Ganguly Vikash Singh Vipin Chaudhary
 Case Western Reserve University
 {idan, debargha, vikash, vipin}@case.edu
<https://huggingface.co/datasets/IdanDavidovich/StochBench>

Abstract

Leading benchmarks for formal theorem proving with large language models are small collections drawn from competition math, such as the IMO and Putnam, that poorly represent field-specific applications. We introduce STOCHBENCH, a Lean 4 benchmark of 450 graduate stochastic-processes problems at varying abstraction levels, each paired with its natural-language source. Addressing a field underrepresented in Mathlib, it covers finite and countable Markov chains, renewal processes, random walks, martingales, stopping times, queues, Brownian motion, stochastic calculus, weak convergence, and Poisson and continuous-time Markov processes. Our Opus 4.8-based agent achieves a 34.9% proof rate (157/450) under a 15-minute per-problem limit. STOCHBENCH better represents domain-specific applied mathematics while remaining challenging for advanced provers.

1 Introduction

Lean enables machine-checkable mathematics, with substantial formalizations including sphere packing in dimension eight, Brownian motion, and Fermat’s Last Theorem for regular primes [Hariharan et al., 2026, Degenne et al., 2025, Best et al., 2025]. Extending this progress to everyday mathematical assistance requires evaluating how consistently automated provers handle a discipline’s recurring arguments. Competition benchmarks and broad textbook collections offer valuable tests, but aggregate scores can obscure domain-specific strengths and failures [Zheng et al., 2021, Azerbayev et al., 2023, Tsoukalas et al., 2024].

We introduce STOCHBENCH, a Lean 4 benchmark for graduate stochastic processes, a field central to statistics and machine learning. Concentrating on related problems in Markov chains, martingales, and continuous-time processes, we prioritize within-domain depth over cross-domain breadth. Some problems, however, require infrastructure unavailable in the Mathlib environment [The mathlib Community, 2026]. *Direct* targets use Mathlib or shared definitions, while *abstracted* targets take the required properties as hypotheses. Lean verifies that each proved conclusion follows from its stated hypotheses. We have taken utmost care to make sure the (all human written) definitions and hypotheses faithfully represent the source problem, but can benefit from further peer review.

Our contributions are:

1. **A domain-focused benchmark.** We release 450 Lean 4 theorem targets paired with informal statements, alongside shared definitions and baseline proof attempts.
2. **A scope-aware baseline evaluation.** We annotate formalization scope and evaluate a compiler-guided proof agent under a 15-minute per-problem cap, reporting results by topic and representation.




Figure 1: Construction of STOCHBENCH: mathematician-led curation and LLM-assisted formalization with shared definitions produce 450 Lean 4 targets across eight topics, comprising 114 direct and 336 abstracted statements.

2 Related Work

Benchmarks for formal mathematical reasoning. Lean-based evaluation has developed along complementary axes of competition difficulty, curricular coverage, and research context. MINIF2F [Zheng et al., 2021] established a benchmark centered on Olympiad-style mathematics, PROOFNET [Azerbayev et al., 2023] paired informal statements and proofs with formal undergraduate theorem statements, and PUTNAMBENCH [Tsoukalas et al., 2024] extended competition-based evaluation to challenging undergraduate problems. FORMALMATH [Yu et al., 2025] expanded the scale and disciplinary coverage of Lean 4 benchmarks, while FORMALPROOFBENCH [Ravi et al., 2026] targeted advanced undergraduate and graduate problems from textbooks and qualifying examinations. Moving toward mathematical practice, RLMEVAL [Poiroux et al., 2025] evaluates theorems from research-level Lean formalization projects, and FORMALML [Yang et al., 2025] studies subgoal completion in machine-learning theory, including optimization and probability inequalities.

Proof automation, representation, and semantic faithfulness. Lean 4 [Moura and Ullrich, 2021] and Mathlib [The mathlib Community, 2020] provide an extensible proof environment and reusable mathematical abstractions for automated reasoning. LEANDOJO [Yang et al., 2023] combines programmatic proof interaction with retrieval-augmented premise selection, while LEAN COPILOT [Song et al., 2024] integrates tactic suggestion and proof search into interactive formalization. LEAN-STAR [Lin et al., 2024] interleaves informal reasoning with tactic generation; DEEPSEEK-PROVER-V1.5 [Xin et al., 2024] combines proof-assistant feedback with reinforcement learning and tree search; and DEEPSEEK-PROVER-V2 [Ren et al., 2025] develops reinforcement learning around subgoal decomposition. These advances address proof construction, but successful checking alone does not establish correspondence with an intended informal claim. FORMALALIGN [Lu et al., 2024] explicitly evaluates informal–formal semantic alignment, while MATHATLAS [Patel et al., 2026] examines graduate-level autoformalization with definitions and dependency structure. TAOBENCH [Taylor et al., 2026] isolates a related representation issue through paired, mathematically equivalent statements expressed using bespoke and Mathlib definitions.

Formal probability and stochastic-process infrastructure. Substantial Lean developments already support the mathematics underlying STOCHBENCH. Ying and Degenne [2022] formalize Doob’s martingale convergence theorems together with conditional expectation, stopping times, and martingale theory; Marion [2025] constructs trajectory-space probability measures through the Ionescu–Tulcea theorem, and Degenne [2025] develops Markov kernels and disintegration. Degenne et al. [2025] formalize Brownian motion and its extension and path-continuity machinery, while Coelho [2026a] develops the L^2 Itô integral and Itô’s formula for C^3 functions with bounded derivatives. Complementary work connects textbook probability to Mathlib interfaces [Deng and Shum, 2026], verifies

reinforcement-learning convergence [Zhang, 2025], and constructs a mathematical-finance library with explicit faithfulness auditing [Coelho, 2026b].

3 The STOCHBENCH Benchmark

Sources and selection. STOCHBENCH contains 450 Lean 4 theorem targets in graduate stochastic processes. We combine problems written for the benchmark with exercises, lemmas, theorems, and corollaries selected from *Probability, Mathematical Statistics, and Stochastic Processes* [Siegrist, 2022] and the MIT course notes and assignments for *Introduction to Stochastic Processes* [Wu, 2015], *Advanced Stochastic Processes* [Gamarnik, 2013], and *Discrete Stochastic Processes* [Gallager, 2011]. We selected problems for their relevance to stochastic processes and wrote them as claims with hypotheses. Statements that are closer to general probability theory, such as “show that the total variation distance satisfies triangle inequality : $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq \|\mu - \eta\|_{TV} + \|\eta - \nu\|_{TV}$ ”, were not included. The corpus covers eight topics, summarized in Table 1(a).

Statement construction. All benchmark-specific definitions, hypotheses and questions are human-written. An Opus 4.8-based formalizer assisted with expressing the problems as Lean theorem statements. We revised candidate statements using Lean feedback until they elaborated in Lean 4.30.0 with a fixed Mathlib version. Elaboration checks that a statement is well-typed. We consider the task to prove the theorem with established correspondence with the source problem. On the off chance that a formalization error has crept in, we also accept a kernel-checked proof of the theorem being incorrect.

Shared mathematical definitions. We build shared abstractions and definitions for recurring concepts. Finite-state chains use a common matrix representation for stochasticity, stationarity, irreducibility, aperiodicity, eventual positivity of transition powers, detailed balance, time reversal, and total-variation distance. `IsHittingSolution` and `returnTime` express first-step equations, while `nstep` defines transition powers through infinite sums for countable-state formulations. Other definitions connect the targets to Mathlib: `natStop` converts natural-valued stopping times to `WithTop`, `runningMax` expresses finite running maxima, and `IsConstDrift` states conditional increment identities. Reusing these definitions gives related targets a common mathematical representation.

Marginals and joint process laws. We distinguish the distribution of a process at one time from its joint behavior over time. `HasMatrixMarginals` relates the distribution of X_n to the corresponding row of P^n . `HasChainLaw` instead specifies finite-dimensional probabilities through

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(X_0 = x_0, \dots, X_n = x_n) = \nu(x_0) \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P(x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

The coupling-bound target combines matrix marginals with an explicit condition that the processes agree after the meeting time. The strong-stationary-time target uses the joint law and stopping-time conditions to relate the state at the stopping time to the state at a later deterministic time. These representations specify which information about the process is available to the prover.

Formalization scope. Some problems require infrastructure unavailable in the Mathlib environment. *Direct* targets use Mathlib objects or shared definitions, while *abstracted* targets take the required properties as hypotheses. The JSON records these labels as `literal` and `abstract`, respectively. The supplied properties may define an object or provide intermediate results from the source problem. These are different choices: specifying Brownian-motion properties does not assume a quadratic-variation conclusion, whereas assuming memorylessness removes the need to derive it from continuous-time chain dynamics. Likewise, a hitting-time target stated through first-step equations need not establish that their solution equals a pathwise expected hitting time.

Path properties and convergence. The targets state the required form of convergence explicitly. Brownian-motion properties are expressed through Gaussian increment laws, independence, and almost-sure path continuity; several targets package these properties in a local `IsBM` definition. The quadratic-variation target asks for convergence of the mean-square error as the partition mesh tends to zero. The Donsker target asks for convergence of expectations for every bounded continuous functional on $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, rather than only convergence at individual times. A separate target asks for existence and uniqueness of Wiener measure on continuous path space.

Topic	(a) Corpus composition			(b) Baseline			
	Direct	Abstracted	Items	Clean proofs			Rate (%)
				Direct	Abstracted	Total	
Poisson processes	5	35	40	0	7	7	17.5
Markov chains (finite & countable)	23	73	96	15	22	37	38.5
Renewal processes	0	41	41	0	2	2	4.9
Continuous-time Markov & queues	1	54	55	1	22	23	41.8
Random walks & large deviations	9	53	62	6	10	16	25.8
Martingales & stopping	67	27	94	51	7	58	61.7
Brownian motion & stochastic calculus	0	45	45	0	8	8	17.8
Weak convergence & functional limits	9	8	17	6	0	6	35.3
<i>All</i>	114	336	450	79	78	157	34.9
(c) Clean-proof rates by target class (%)				69.3	23.2		

Table 1: Corpus composition and baseline results for STOCHBENCH (recorded proving time at most 15 minutes). Only proofs with recorded proving times of at most 900 seconds are counted. Topic rates use all items in the topic; class rates use all items in the class. The class comparison is descriptive, not a controlled causal effect.

Human review and release. We reviewed the definitions and hypotheses against the source problems, but they would benefit from further peer review. Lean verifies that each completed proof establishes its conclusion under the stated hypotheses; source review assesses whether the definitions and hypotheses represent the intended problem. Each JSON record contains an identifier, a problem name, an informal statement, a Lean target, and a representation label. We also release the shared definitions and baseline proof attempts. The release is a collection of theorem targets, not a claim that all targets have complete proofs. Baseline proof checking and results are described in Section 4.

4 Evaluation

We evaluated a multi-turn tool-using Opus 4.8-based agent using `lean4skills` and the Lean LSP MCP server [Freer, 2025, Dressler, 2025]. Each target received one run capped at 15 minutes, allowing Lean-error inspection, library and shared-definition search, `loogle` and `leansearch` queries, and proof revisions. The same model family assisted with statement construction. This is a single-agent, single-budget baseline, not a model comparison or repeated-run evaluation.

The agent produced 157 clean proofs out of 450. A proof is *clean* if Lean accepts it without `sorry`, `sorryAx`, or additional admitted facts, checked by Lean comparator. Tables 1(b) and 1(c) report topic and class breakdowns. These are descriptive comparisons: they do not separate abstraction effects from differences in problems or library support.

Qualitative inspection found proof-search failures on plausible targets, missing lemmas or difficult library interfaces, and a smaller group of formalization defects, including missing measurability, integrability, or non-emptiness assumptions.

5 Limitations and Conclusion

We note that STOCHBENCH’s question curation, faithfulness review, and its topic and direct/abstracted classifications are currently decided by human curators, introducing some bias; as the corresponding terminologies were not rigorously defined within the scope of this work. Despite these limitations, STOCHBENCH provides a focused testbed for evaluating proof agents on graduate stochastic processes. Its newly constructed informal–formal pairs can support autoformalization training, while successfully checked baseline proofs provide supervision for proof generation. Together with the shared definitions, these resources support both the development of stronger domain-specific provers and the continued formalization of stochastic processes in Lean.

References

- Zhangir Azerbayev, Bartosz Piotrowski, Hailey Schoelkopf, Edward W. Ayers, Dragomir Radev, and Jeremy Avigad. ProofNet: Autoformalizing and formally proving undergraduate-level mathematics. *arXiv.org*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.12433.
- Alex Best, Christopher Birkbeck, Riccardo Brasca, Eric Rodriguez Boidi, Ruben van De Velde, and Andrew Yang. A complete formalization of fermat’s last theorem for regular primes in lean, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.01466>.
- Raphael Coelho. A Machine-Checked Itô Calculus for Brownian Motion, 2026a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.15089>.
- Raphael Coelho. A Formally Verified Library of Mathematical Finance in Lean 4, 2026b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.01356>.
- Rémy Degenne. Markov Kernels in Mathlib’s Probability Library, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.04070>.
- Rémy Degenne, David Ledvinka, Etienne Marion, and Peter Pfaffelhuber. Formalization of brownian motion in lean, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.20118>.
- Shuo Deng and Kenneth W. Shum. From Lecture Notes to Lean: Formalizing a Textbook on Probability Theory, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.27298>.
- Oliver Dressler. Lean LSP MCP: Tools for agentic interaction with the Lean theorem prover, 3 2025. URL <https://github.com/o0o0o0o/lean-lsp-mcp>.
- Cameron Freer. Lean 4 Skills: Theorem proving skill and workflow pack for AI coding agents, October 2025. URL <https://github.com/cameronfreer/lean4-skills>.
- Robert Gallager. 6.262 Discrete Stochastic Processes. Spring 2011. Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT OpenCourseWare, <https://ocw.mit.edu/>, 2011. License: Creative Commons BY-NC-SA.
- David Gamarnik. 15.070J Advanced Stochastic Processes. Fall 2013. Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT OpenCourseWare, <https://ocw.mit.edu/>, 2013. License: Creative Commons BY-NC-SA.
- Sidharth Hariharan, Christopher Birkbeck, Seewoo Lee, Ho Kiu Gareth Ma, Bhavik Mehta, Auguste Poiroux, and Maryna Viazovska. A milestone in formalization: The sphere packing problem in dimension 8, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.23468>.
- Haohan Lin, Zhiqing Sun, Yiming Yang, and Sean Welleck. Lean-STaR: Learning to Interleave Thinking and Proving, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10040>.
- Jianqiao Lu, Yingjia Wan, Yinya Huang, Jing Xiong, Zhengying Liu, and Zhijiang Guo. FormalAlign: Automated Alignment Evaluation for Autoformalization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10135>.
- Etienne Marion. A Formalization of the Ionescu-Tulcea Theorem in Mathlib, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.18616>.
- L. D. Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *CADE*, pages 625–635. Springer International Publishing, 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- Nilay Patel, Noah Arias, Davit Babayan, Victoria Cochran, Timothy Libman, Hafsah Mahmood, Liam McCarty, Soli Munoz, Laurel Willey, and Jeffrey Flanigan. MathAtlas: A Benchmark for Autoformalization in the Wild, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.14061>.
- Auguste Poiroux, Antoine Bosselut, and Viktor Kunčák. RLMEval: Evaluating Research-Level Neural Theorem Proving, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.25427>.
- Nikil Ravi, Kexing Ying, Vasilii Nesterov, Rayan Krishnan, Elif Uskuplu, Bingyu Xia, Janitha Aswedige, and Langston Nashold. FormalProofBench: Can models write graduate level math proofs that are formally verified? *arXiv.org*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2603.26996.

- Z. Z. Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanjia Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Zhe Fu, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Shirong Ma, Hongxuan Tang, Yuxuan Liu, Wenjun Gao, Daya Guo, and Chong Ruan. DeepSeek-Prover-V2: Advancing Formal Mathematical Reasoning via Reinforcement Learning for Subgoal Decomposition, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.21801>.
- Kyle Siegrist. Probability, Mathematical Statistics, and Stochastic Processes. LibreTexts, 2022. URL [https://stats.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Probability_Theory/Probability_Mathematical_Statistics_and_Stochastic_Processes_\(Siegrist\)](https://stats.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Probability_Theory/Probability_Mathematical_Statistics_and_Stochastic_Processes_(Siegrist)). Originally sourced from <http://www.randomservices.org/random>. License: CC BY 2.0.
- Peiyang Song, Kaiyu Yang, and Anima Anandkumar. Towards Large Language Models as Copilots for Theorem Proving in Lean, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.12534>.
- Alexander K Taylor, Junyi Zhang, Ethan Ji, Vigyan Sahai, Haikang Deng, Yuanzhou Chen, Yifan Yuan, Di Wu, Jia-Chen Gu, Kai-Wei Chang, Nanyun Peng, Amit Sahai, and Wei Wang. TaoBench: Do Automated Theorem Prover LLMs Generalize Beyond MathLib?, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.12744>.
- The mathlib Community. The Lean Mathematical Library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 367–381. ACM, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3372885.3373824. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3372885.3373824>.
- The mathlib Community. Missing undergraduate mathematics in mathlib. https://leanprover-community.github.io/undergrad_todo.html, 2026.
- George Tsoukalas, Jasper Lee, John Jennings, Jimmy Xin, Michelle Ding, Michael Jennings, Amityay Thakur, and Swarat Chaudhuri. PutnamBench: Evaluating neural theorem-provers on the putnam mathematical competition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37, pages 11545–11569, 2024. doi: 10.52202/079017-0368.
- Hao Wu. 18.445 Introduction to Stochastic Processes. Spring 2015. Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT OpenCourseWare, <https://ocw.mit.edu/>, 2015. License: Creative Commons BY-NC-SA.
- Huajian Xin, Z. Z. Ren, Junxiao Song, Zhihong Shao, Wanjia Zhao, Haocheng Wang, Bo Liu, Liyue Zhang, Xuan Lu, Qiushi Du, Wenjun Gao, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhibin Gou, Z. F. Wu, Fuli Luo, and Chong Ruan. DeepSeek-Prover-V1.5: Harnessing Proof Assistant Feedback for Reinforcement Learning and Monte-Carlo Tree Search, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.08152>.
- Kaiyu Yang, Aidan M. Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan Prenger, and Anima Anandkumar. LeanDojo: Theorem Proving with Retrieval-Augmented Language Models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.15626>.
- Xiao-Wen Yang, Zihao Zhang, Jianuo Cao, Zhi Zhou, Zenan Li, Lan-Zhe Guo, Yuan Yao, Taolue Chen, Yu-Feng Li, and Xiaoxing Ma. FormalML: A Benchmark for Evaluating Formal Subgoal Completion in Machine Learning Theory, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.02335>.
- Kexing Ying and Rémy Degenne. A Formalization of Doob’s Martingale Convergence Theorems in mathlib, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.05578>.
- Zhouliang Yu, Ruotian Peng, Keyi Ding, Yizhe Li, Zhongyuan Peng, Minghao Liu, Yifan Zhang, Zheng Yuan, Huajian Xin, Wenhao Huang, Yandong Wen, Ge Zhang, and Weiyang Liu. FormalMATH: Benchmarking Formal Mathematical Reasoning of Large Language Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.02735>.
- Shangdong Zhang. Towards Formalizing Reinforcement Learning Theory: A Robbins-Siegmund Approach, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.03618>.
- Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. miniF2F: A cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

A Supplementary material

A.1 An abstracted proof example - SOTA Prover

We illustrate Q361 through its natural-language statement, Lean abstraction, and an agent-generated proof obtained in a separate run lasting more than 30 minutes, outside the 15-minute baseline protocol.

Natural-language statement. Suppose that a Markov chain on a finite, nonempty state space Ω is irreducible and has stationary probability measure π . Define the hitting time of $x \in \Omega$ by

$$\tau_x = \min\{n \geq 0 : X_n = x\}.$$

For a fixed state $a \in \Omega$, let

$$t_{\odot} = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}_a[\tau_x] \pi(x), \quad t_{\text{hit}} = \max_{x, y \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}_x[\tau_y] \geq t_{\odot}.$$

Show that

$$t_{\text{hit}} \leq 2 \max_{w \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\tau_w], \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\tau_w] = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \pi(x) \mathbb{E}_x[\tau_w].$$

Formalization. The Lean statement represents expected hitting times by a real-valued function $g(x, y)$ satisfying the first-step equations

$$g(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & x = y, \\ 1 + \sum_{z \in \Omega} P(x, z)g(z, y), & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

These equations are supplied by `IsHittingSolution`; the proof works with this characterization rather than constructing hitting-time random variables. The assumptions `IsStochastic`, `IsIrreducible`, and `IsStationary` specify the transition matrix and stationary distribution. The auxiliary quantity $t_{\odot}$ and the given lower bound on t_{hit} are not needed for the formalized conclusion.

Proof structure and difficulty. Although Q361 asks for a single inequality, the generated proof develops nine auxiliary theorems across several levels of abstraction. It establishes nonnegativity of matrix powers and hitting-time solutions, extends closure under positive one-step transitions to positive matrix powers, and proves a maximum-principle propagation lemma. A return-time identity yields harmonicity of Kemeny’s function $K(x) = \sum_y \pi(y)g(x, y)$, whose constancy follows from irreducibility and the maximum principle. The same propagation lemmas are reused for $\theta(x) = g(x, b) - g(x, c)$ to establish the hitting-time triangle inequality. Stationary averaging then combines these results into a pointwise bound, which is lifted to the required supremum inequality.

Implications for proof search. The abstraction supplies the first-step equations, not Kemeny constancy or the triangle inequality. The proof therefore builds supporting mathematics rather than merely simplifying the supplied hypotheses. Its structure illustrates a challenge for hierarchical proof search: identifying useful intermediate statements, proving them at sufficient generality for reuse, and coordinating their dependencies. Here, elementary matrix and finite-sum reasoning supports harmonic-function arguments, which in turn support the global hitting-time bound. The agent-produced result is thus a coherent collection of auxiliary theorems together with their final composition. This example shows how an abstracted benchmark target can test mathematical proof construction beyond local tactic selection.

```
import Mathlib
import Leanproj.Basic
open MeasureTheory ProbabilityTheory Filter Auto
open scoped ENNReal NNReal Topology Matrix RealInnerProductSpace
attribute [local instance] Classical.propDecidable
set_option maxHeartbeats 2000000
set_option maxRecDepth 4096

namespace Q361Helpers

open Finset
```

```

/-- Entries of powers of a nonnegative matrix are nonnegative. -/
theorem pow_nonneg_entry {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) : ∀ n x y, 0 ≤ (P ^ n) x y := by
  intro n
  induction n with
  | zero => intro x y; simp [pow_zero, Matrix.one_apply]; split <;> norm_num
  | succ k ih =>
    intro x y
    rw [pow_succ, Matrix.mul_apply]
    apply Finset.sum_nonneg; intro z _
    exact mul_nonneg (ih x z) (hP1 z y)

/-- Hitting times are nonnegative. -/
theorem g_nonneg {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [Nonempty Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP2 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  (g : Ω → Ω → ℝ) (hg : ∀ x y, g x y = if x = y then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z y)
  (y : Ω) : ∀ x, 0 ≤ g x y := by
  obtain ⟨x0, -, hx0⟩ := Finset.exists_min_image Finset.univ (fun x => g x y)
  (Classical.arbitrary Ω, Finset.mem_univ _)
  have hmin : ∀ x, g x0 y ≤ g x y := fun x => hx0 x (Finset.mem_univ x)
  have hx0y : g x0 y = 0 := by
    by_cases h : x0 = y
    · rw [hg x0 y, if_pos h]
    · exfalse
  have hval := hg x0 y
  rw [if_neg h] at hval
  have hlb : (1 : ℝ) + ∑ z, P x0 z * g z y ≥ 1 + ∑ z, P x0 z * g x0 y := by
    have : (∑ z, P x0 z * g z y) ≥ ∑ z, P x0 z * g x0 y := by
      apply Finset.sum_le_sum; intro z _
      exact mul_le_mul_of_nonneg_left (hmin z) (hP1 x0 z)
    linarith
  have hsum : (∑ z, P x0 z * g x0 y) = g x0 y := by
    rw [← Finset.sum_mul, hP2 x0, one_mul]
  rw [hsum] at hlb
  linarith [hval, hlb]
  intro x
  calc 0 = g x0 y := hx0y.symm
  _ ≤ g x y := hmin x

/-- Forward-closure reachability: a set closed under positive one-step transitions is
closed under positive 'n'-step transitions. -/
theorem reach_closed {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y)
  (A : Ω → Prop) (hclosed : ∀ x, A x → ∀ z, 0 < P x z → A z)
  (x0 : Ω) (hx0 : A x0) : ∀ n z, 0 < (P ^ n) x0 z → A z := by
  have hpow := pow_nonneg_entry P hP1
  intro n
  induction n with
  | zero =>
    intro z hz
    rw [pow_zero, Matrix.one_apply] at hz
    by_cases h : x0 = z
    · rwa [← h]
    · simp [h] at hz
  | succ k ih =>
    intro z hz
    rw [pow_succ, Matrix.mul_apply] at hz
    have hex : ∃ w ∈ Finset.univ, (0 : ℝ) < (P ^ k) x0 w * P w z := by
      apply Finset.exists_lt_of_sum_lt; simp using hz
    obtain ⟨w, -, hw⟩ := hex
    have h1 : 0 < (P ^ k) x0 w :=
      lt_of_le_of_ne (hpow k x0 w) (fun h => by rw [← h, zero_mul] at hw; exact lt_irrefl _ hw)
    have h2 : 0 < P w z :=
      lt_of_le_of_ne (hP1 w z) (fun h => by rw [← h, mul_zero] at hw; exact lt_irrefl _ hw)
    exact hclosed w (ih w h1) z h2

/-- Maximum-principle propagation step: at a maximizing point where 'f' is harmonic, all

```

```

positively-reachable neighbours also attain the maximum. -/
theorem prop_step {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP2 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  (f : Ω → ℝ) (m : ℝ) (hmax : ∀ z, f z ≤ m) (x : Ω) (hfx : f x = m)
  (hharm : f x = ∑ z, P x z * f z) (z : Ω) (hz : 0 < P x z) : f z = m := by
have hsum0 : (∑ w, P x w * (m - f w)) = 0 := by
  have : (∑ w, P x w * (m - f w)) = (∑ w, P x w) * m - ∑ w, P x w * f w := by
    rw [Finset.sum_mul, ← Finset.sum_sub_distrib]
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro w _; ring
  rw [this, hP2 x, one_mul, ← hharm, hfx]; ring
have hnonneg : ∀ w ∈ Finset.univ, 0 ≤ P x w * (m - f w) := by
  intro w _; exact mul_nonneg (hP1 x w) (by linarith [hmax w])
have hzero := (Finset.sum_eq_zero_iff_of_nonneg hnonneg).mp hsum0 z (Finset.mem_univ z)
have : m - f z = 0 := by
  rcases mul_eq_zero.mp hzero with h | h
  · linarith [hz]
  · exact h
linarith

/-- Return-time identity: 'π w · (1 + ∑_z P(w,z) g(z,w)) = 1'. -/
theorem returnTime_identity {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [Nonempty Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (g : Ω → Ω → ℝ)
  (hg : ∀ x y, g x y = if x = y then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z y)
  (π : Ω → ℝ) (hpi2 : ∑ x, π x = 1)
  (hpi3 : ∀ y, ∑ x, π x * P x y = π y) (w : Ω) :
  π w * (1 + ∑ z, P w z * g z w) = 1 := by
have hswap : (∑ x, π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w) = ∑ x, π x * g x w := by
  have e1 : (∑ x, π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w) = ∑ x, ∑ z, π x * (P x z * g z w) := by
    apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
  rw [e1, Finset.sum_comm]
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _
  have : (∑ x, π x * (P x z * g z w)) = (∑ x, π x * P x z) * g z w := by
    rw [Finset.sum_mul]; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; ring
  rw [this, hpi3 z]
have s1 : (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x) = 1 - π w := by
  have : (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x) = ∑ x, (π x - if x = w then π x else 0) := by
    apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; by_cases hx : x = w <;> simp [hx]
  rw [this, Finset.sum_sub_distrib, hpi2, Finset.sum_ite_eq' Finset.univ w π]; simp
have s2 : (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w)
  = (∑ x, π x * g x w) - π w * ∑ z, P w z * g z w := by
  have step1 : (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w)
    = (∑ x, π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w) - π w * ∑ z, P w z * g z w := by
    have : (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w)
      = ∑ x, ((π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w) - (if x = w then π w * ∑ z, P w z * g z w else 0)) := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; by_cases hx : x = w <;> simp [hx]
    rw [this, Finset.sum_sub_distrib, Finset.sum_ite_eq' Finset.univ w]; simp
  rw [step1, hswap]
have key : (∑ x, π x * g x w)
  = (1 - π w) + ((∑ x, π x * g x w) - π w * (∑ z, P w z * g z w)) := by
  have e1 : (∑ x, π x * g x w)
    = ∑ x, π x * (if x = w then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z w) := by
    apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [hg x w]
  have e2 : (∑ x, π x * (if x = w then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z w))
    = (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x)
      + (∑ x, if x = w then 0 else π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z w) := by
    rw [← Finset.sum_add_distrib]
    apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _
    by_cases hx : x = w <;> simp [hx] <;> ring
  conv_lhs => rw [e1, e2, s1, s2]
nlinarith [key]

/-- Kemeny function 'K x = ∑_c π_c g(x,c)' is harmonic: 'K x = ∑_z P(x,z) K(z)'. -/
theorem K_harmonic {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [Nonempty Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP2 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  (g : Ω → Ω → ℝ) (hg : ∀ x y, g x y = if x = y then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z y)
  (π : Ω → ℝ) (hpi1 : ∀ x, 0 ≤ π x) (hpi2 : ∑ x, π x = 1)
  (hRT : ∀ w, π w * (1 + ∑ z, P w z * g z w) = 1) (x : Ω) :

```

```

    (∑ c, π c * g x c) = ∑ z, P x z * (∑ c, π c * g z c) := by
have hpx : π x * (1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z x) = 1 := hRT x
have hpxpos : 0 < π x := by
  rcases (hpi1 x).lt_or_eq with h | h
  · exact h
  · exfalse; rw [← h, zero_mul] at hpx; norm_num at hpx
have hret : π x * (∑ z, P x z * g z x) = 1 - π x := by nlinarith [hpx]
have e1 : (∑ c, π c * g x c) = ∑ c, (if c = x then 0 else π c * (1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z c
)) := by
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _
  rw [hg x c]; by_cases h : x = c
  · simp [h]
  · rw [if_neg h, if_neg (Ne.symm h)]
have e2 : (∑ c, (if c = x then 0 else π c * (1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z c)))
  = (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c)
  + (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c) := by
  rw [← Finset.sum_add_distrib]; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _
  by_cases h : c = x <;> simp [h] <;> ring
have sa : (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c) = 1 - π x := by
  have : (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c) = ∑ c, (π c - if c = x then π c else 0) := by
    apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; by_cases h : c = x <;> simp [h]
  rw [this, Finset.sum_sub_distrib, hpi2, Finset.sum_ite_eq' Finset.univ x π]; simp
have sb : (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c)
  = (∑ z, P x z * (∑ c, π c * g z c)) - π x * (∑ z, P x z * g z x) := by
  have drop : (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c)
    = (∑ c, π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c) - π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z x := by
    have : (∑ c, if c = x then 0 else π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c)
      = ∑ c, ((π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c)
        - (if c = x then π x * ∑ z, P x z * g z x else 0)) := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; by_cases h : c = x <;> simp [h]
    rw [this, Finset.sum_sub_distrib, Finset.sum_ite_eq' Finset.univ x]; simp
  rw [drop]
  congr 1
have l1 : (∑ c, π c * ∑ z, P x z * g z c) = ∑ c, ∑ z, π c * (P x z * g z c) := by
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
have l2 : (∑ z, P x z * (∑ c, π c * g z c)) = ∑ z, ∑ c, P x z * (π c * g z c) := by
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
  rw [l1, l2, Finset.sum_comm]
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; ring
  rw [e1, e2, sa, sb, hret]
ring

```

-- The Kemeny function is constant on an irreducible chain. --

```

theorem K_const {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [Nonempty Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP2 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  (hirr : ∀ x y, ∃ n : ℕ, 0 < (P ^ n) x y)
  (K : Ω → ℝ) (hharm : ∀ x, K x = ∑ z, P x z * K z) (a b : Ω) : K a = K b := by
obtain ⟨x0, -, hx0⟩ := Finset.exists_max_image Finset.univ K
  (Classical.arbitrary Ω, Finset.mem_univ _)
set m := K x0 with hm
have hmax : ∀ z, K z ≤ m := fun z => hx0 z (Finset.mem_univ z)
have hAclosed : ∀ x, K x = m → ∀ z, 0 < P x z → K z = m := by
  intro x hx z hz
  exact prop_step P hP1 hP2 K m hmax x hx (hharm x) z hz
have hall : ∀ y, K y = m := by
  intro y
  obtain ⟨n, hn⟩ := hirr x0 y
  exact reach_closed P hP1 (fun w => K w = m) hAclosed x0 rfl n y hn
  rw [hall a, hall b]

```

-- Hitting-time triangle inequality: 'g a b ≤ g a c + g c b'. --

```

theorem tri_ineq {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [Nonempty Ω] [DecidableEq Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP1 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP2 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  (hirr : ∀ x y, ∃ n : ℕ, 0 < (P ^ n) x y)
  (g : Ω → Ω → ℝ) (hg : ∀ x y, g x y = if x = y then 0 else 1 + ∑ z, P x z * g z y)
  (gnn : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ g x y) (a b c : Ω) : g a b ≤ g a c + g c b := by
  by_cases hbc : b = c
  · subst hbc

```

```

have h0 : g b b = 0 := by rw [hg b b, if_pos rfl]
have := gnn a b; nlinarith [h0]
set  $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} := \text{fun } x \Rightarrow g x b - g x c$  with h $\theta$ 
have hharm :  $\forall x, x \neq b \rightarrow x \neq c \rightarrow \theta x = \sum z, P x z * \theta z := \text{by}$ 
  intro x hxb hxc
have gb :  $g x b = 1 + \sum z, P x z * g z b := \text{by rw [hg x b, if_neg hxb]}$ 
have gc :  $g x c = 1 + \sum z, P x z * g z c := \text{by rw [hg x c, if_neg hxc]}$ 
simp only [h $\theta$ ]; rw [gb, gc]
have :  $(\sum z, P x z * (g z b - g z c)) = (\sum z, P x z * g z b) - \sum z, P x z * g z c :=$ 
  by
    rw [← Finset.sum_sub_distrib]; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _; ring
  rw [this]; ring
obtain ⟨x0, -, hx0⟩ := Finset.exists_max_image Finset.univ  $\theta$ 
(Classical.arbitrary  $\Omega$ , Finset.mem_univ _)
set m :=  $\theta x0$  with hm
have hmax :  $\forall z, \theta z \leq m := \text{fun } z \Rightarrow hx0 z$  (Finset.mem_univ z)
have h $\theta$ c :  $\theta c = g c b := \text{by simp only [h $\theta$ ]; rw [hg c c, if_pos rfl]; ring}$ 
have h $\theta$ b :  $\theta b = -g b c := \text{by simp only [h $\theta$ ]; rw [hg b b, if_pos rfl]; ring}$ 
have hmeq :  $m = \theta c := \text{by}$ 
  by_cases hcA :  $\theta c = m$ 
  · exact hcA.symm
  · by_cases hbA :  $\theta b = m$ 
    · exfalse
    · have h1 :  $m \leq 0 := \text{by rw [← hbA, h $\theta$ b]; linarith [gnn b c]}$ 
      have h2 :  $0 \leq \theta c := \text{by rw [h $\theta$ c]; exact gnn c b}$ 
      have h3 :  $\theta c \leq m := hmax c$ 
      apply hcA; linarith
    · exfalse
  have hAclosed :  $\forall x, \theta x = m \rightarrow \forall z, 0 < P x z \rightarrow \theta z = m := \text{by}$ 
    intro x hx z hz
    have hxb :  $x \neq b := \text{fun } h \Rightarrow hbA (h \triangleright hx)$ 
    have hxc :  $x \neq c := \text{fun } h \Rightarrow hcA (h \triangleright hx)$ 
    exact prop_step P hP1 hP2  $\theta$  m hmax x hx (hharm x hxb hxc) z hz
  obtain ⟨n, hn⟩ := hirr x0 c
  exact hcA (reach_closed P hP1 (fun w  $\Rightarrow \theta w = m$ ) hAclosed x0 rfl n c hn)
have h $\theta$ a :  $\theta a \leq \theta c := \text{by rw [← hmeq]; exact hmax a}$ 
rw [h $\theta$ c] at h $\theta$ a
simp only [h $\theta$ ] at h $\theta$ a
linarith

/-- The core inequality: every hitting time is at most '2 * M'. -/
theorem core_bound { $\Omega : \text{Type*}$ } [Fintype  $\Omega$ ] [Nonempty  $\Omega$ ] [DecidableEq  $\Omega$ ]
(P : Matrix  $\Omega \Omega \mathbb{R}$ ) (hP1 :  $\forall x y, 0 \leq P x y$ ) (hP2 :  $\forall x, \sum y, P x y = 1$ )
(hirr :  $\forall x y, \exists n : \mathbb{N}, 0 < (P^n) x y$ )
(g :  $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) (hg :  $\forall x y, g x y = \text{if } x = y \text{ then } 0 \text{ else } 1 + \sum z, P x z * g z y$ )
( $\pi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) (hpi1 :  $\forall x, 0 \leq \pi x$ ) (hpi2 :  $\sum x, \pi x = 1$ )
(hpi3 :  $\forall y, \sum x, \pi x * P x y = \pi y$ )
(M :  $\mathbb{R}$ ) (hM :  $\forall y : \Omega, (\sum x, \pi x * g x y) \leq M$ ) (a b :  $\Omega$ ) :
g a b  $\leq 2 * M := \text{by}$ 
have gnn :  $\forall x y, 0 \leq g x y := \text{fun } x y \Rightarrow g\_nonneg P hP1 hP2 g hg y x$ 
have hRT :  $\forall w, \pi w * (1 + \sum z, P w z * g z w) = 1 :=$ 
  fun w  $\Rightarrow$  returnTime_identity P g hg  $\pi$  hpi2 hpi3 w
have tri :  $\forall x y z, g x y \leq g x z + g z y :=$ 
  fun x y z  $\Rightarrow$  tri_ineq P hP1 hP2 hirr g hg gnn x y z
have Kconst :  $\forall x y, (\sum c, \pi c * g x c) = (\sum c, \pi c * g y c) := \text{by}$ 
  intro x y
  exact K_const P hP1 hP2 hirr (fun x  $\Rightarrow \sum c, \pi c * g x c$ )
  (fun x  $\Rightarrow$  K_harmonic P hP1 hP2 g hg  $\pi$  hpi1 hpi2 hRT x) x y
-- Step 1: g a b  $\leq K a + Z b$ 
have hgab : g a b  $\leq (\sum c, \pi c * g a c) + (\sum c, \pi c * g c b) := \text{by}$ 
  have h1 : g a b =  $\sum c, \pi c * g a b := \text{by rw [← Finset.sum_mul, hpi2, one_mul]}$ 
  rw [h1, ← Finset.sum_add_distrib]
  apply Finset.sum_le_sum; intro c _
  have htri := tri a b c
  have :  $\pi c * g a b \leq \pi c * (g a c + g c b) := \text{mul_le_mul_of_nonneg_left htri (hpi1 c)}$ 
  nlinarith [this]
-- Step 2: Z b  $\leq M$ 
have hZb :  $(\sum c, \pi c * g c b) \leq M := hM b$ 

```

```

-- Step 3:  $K a \leq M$ 
have hKa : ( $\sum c, \pi c * g a c$ )  $\leq M$  := by
  have hka_eq : ( $\sum c, \pi c * g a c$ ) =  $\sum x, \pi x * (\sum c, \pi c * g x c)$  := by
    have : ( $\sum x, \pi x * (\sum c, \pi c * g x c)$ ) =  $\sum x, \pi x * (\sum c, \pi c * g a c)$  := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [Kconst x a]
    rw [this, ← Finset.sum_mul, hpi2, one_mul]
  rw [hka_eq]
  have swap : ( $\sum x, \pi x * (\sum c, \pi c * g x c)$ ) =  $\sum c, \pi c * (\sum x, \pi x * g x c)$  := by
    have l1 : ( $\sum x, \pi x * (\sum c, \pi c * g x c)$ ) =  $\sum x, \sum c, \pi x * (\pi c * g x c)$  := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
    have l2 : ( $\sum c, \pi c * (\sum x, \pi x * g x c)$ ) =  $\sum c, \sum x, \pi c * (\pi x * g x c)$  := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
    rw [l1, l2, Finset.sum_comm]
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro c _; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; ring
  rw [swap]
  calc ( $\sum c, \pi c * (\sum x, \pi x * g x c)$ )  $\leq \sum c, \pi c * M$  := by
    apply Finset.sum_le_sum; intro c _
    exact mul_le_mul_of_nonneg_left (hM c) (hpi1 c)
  _ = M := by rw [← Finset.sum_mul, hpi2, one_mul]
linarith

end Q361Helpers

open Auto in
theorem q361_hitting_bound { $\Omega$  : Type*} [Fintype  $\Omega$ ] [Nonempty  $\Omega$ ] [DecidableEq  $\Omega$ ]
  (P : Matrix  $\Omega \Omega \mathbb{R}$ ) (hP : IsStochastic P) (hirr : IsIrreducible P)
  (g :  $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) (hg : IsHittingSolution P g)
  ( $\pi$  :  $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) (h $\pi$  : IsStationary P  $\pi$ ) :
  ( $\bigsqcup p : \Omega \times \Omega, g p.1 p.2$ )  $\leq 2 * \bigsqcup w, \sum x, \pi x * g x w$  := by
  obtain ⟨hP1, hP2⟩ := hP
  obtain ⟨hpi1, hpi2, hpi3⟩ := h $\pi$ 
  have hreach :  $\forall x y, \exists n : \mathbb{N}, 0 < (P \wedge n) x y$  := by
    intro x y
    obtain ⟨n, _, hn⟩ := hirr x y
    exact ⟨n, hn⟩
  set M :=  $\bigsqcup w, \sum x, \pi x * g x w$  with hMdef
  have hbddM : BddAbove (Set.range (fun w =>  $\sum x, \pi x * g x w$ )) := Finite.bddAbove_range _
  have hZle :  $\forall y : \Omega, (\sum x, \pi x * g x y) \leq M$  := fun y => le_ciSup hbddM y
  apply ciSup_le
  intro p
  exact Q361Helpers.core_bound P hP1 hP2 hreach g hg  $\pi$  hpi1 hpi2 hpi3 M hZle p.1 p.2

```

A.2 A direct proof example - Opus Prover

We illustrate Q222 through its natural-language statement, Lean abstraction, and an agent-generated proof obtained in a separate run lasting less than 15 minutes.

Natural-language statement. Suppose that P is irreducible. Show that there exists a probability measure π such that $\pi = \pi P$ and $\pi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

Formalization. The Lean statement represents the chain by a real transition matrix P on a finite, nonempty state space Ω . The assumptions `IsStochastic` and `IsIrreducible` specify nonnegative entries, unit row sums, and reachability through positive entries of matrix powers. A stationary probability measure is represented by a function $\pi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\pi(x) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega} \pi(x) = 1, \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega} \pi(x) P(x, y) = \pi(y).$$

```

import Mathlib
import Leanproj.Basic
open MeasureTheory ProbabilityTheory Filter
open scoped ENNReal NNReal Topology Matrix
open Auto
variable { $\Omega$  : Type*} {m0 : MeasurableSpace  $\Omega$ }

```




Figure 2: Main logical dependencies in the generated proof of Q361. Shared maximum-principle lemmas establish Kemeny constancy and the hitting-time triangle inequality, which are combined by stationary averaging to prove the bound. Nodes give Lean theorem names and their mathematical roles; dashed arrows indicate results supplied as hypotheses to later lemmas.

```

/-- The pushforward of a distribution 'v' by the transition matrix 'P': '(vP) y = ∑ x, v x * P x y' -/
private def stepMap {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (v : Ω → ℝ) : Ω → ℝ :=
  fun y => ∑ x, v x * P x y

/-- Cesàro averages of the iterates of 'stepMap P' started at 'v0'. -/
private noncomputable def cesaro {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (v0 : Ω → ℝ)
  (N : ℕ) : Ω → ℝ :=
  fun y => (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) y

/-- 'stepMap P' maps the standard simplex into itself. -/
private lemma stepMap_mem {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] {P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ}
  (hP0 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) (hP1 : ∀ x, ∑ y, P x y = 1)
  {v : Ω → ℝ} (hv : v ∈ stdSimplex ℝ Ω) : stepMap P v ∈ stdSimplex ℝ Ω := by
  refine ⟨fun y => ?_, ?_⟩
  · show 0 ≤ ∑ x, v x * P x y
    exact Finset.sum_nonneg (fun x _ => mul_nonneg (hv.1 x) (hP0 x y))
  · show ∑ y, ∑ x, v x * P x y = 1
    rw [Finset.sum_comm]
    calc ∑ x, ∑ y, v x * P x y = ∑ x, v x * ∑ y, P x y := by
      apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [Finset.mul_sum]
    _ = ∑ x, v x * 1 := by apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [hP1 x]
    _ = ∑ x, v x := by apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; rw [mul_one]
    _ = 1 := hv.2
  
```

```

/-- Entries of powers of a nonnegative matrix are nonnegative. -/
private lemma pow_nonneg_entries {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [DecidableEq Ω] {P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ}

  (hP0 : ∀ x y, 0 ≤ P x y) : ∀ n x y, 0 ≤ (P ^ n) x y := by
  intro n
  induction n with
  | zero => intro x y; rw [pow_zero]; by_cases h : x = y <|> simp [Matrix.one_apply, h]
  | succ n ih =>
    intro x y
    rw [pow_succ, Matrix.mul_apply]
    exact Finset.sum_nonneg (fun z _ => mul_nonneg (ih x z) (hP0 z y))

/-- A stationary distribution is stationary for every power of 'P'. -/
private lemma stationary_pow {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [DecidableEq Ω] {P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ}
  {π : Ω → ℝ} (hstat : ∀ y, ∑ x, π x * P x y = π y) :
  ∀ n y, ∑ x, π x * (P ^ n) x y = π y := by
  intro n
  induction n with
  | zero =>
    intro y
    rw [pow_zero]
    simp [Matrix.one_apply, Finset.sum_ite_eq']
  | succ n ih =>
    intro y
    calc ∑ x, π x * (P ^ (n + 1)) x y
      = ∑ x, ∑ z, π x * ((P ^ n) x z * P z y) := by
        apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _
        rw [pow_succ, Matrix.mul_apply, Finset.mul_sum]
      = ∑ z, ∑ x, π x * ((P ^ n) x z * P z y) := Finset.sum_comm
      = ∑ z, (∑ x, π x * (P ^ n) x z) * P z y := by
        apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _
        rw [Finset.sum_mul]; apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro x _; ring
      = ∑ z, π z * P z y := by
        apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro z _; rw [ih z]
      = π y := hstat y

theorem q222_stationary_existence_positive {Ω : Type*} [Fintype Ω] [DecidableEq Ω] [Nonempty Ω]
  (P : Matrix Ω Ω ℝ) (hP : IsStochastic P) (hirr : IsIrreducible P) :
  ∃ π : Ω → ℝ, IsStationary P π ∧ ∀ x, 0 < π x := by
  obtain ⟨hP0, hP1⟩ := hP
  -- Choose a starting point in the simplex.
  obtain ⟨v0, hv0⟩ : (stdSimplex ℝ Ω).Nonempty := Set.nonempty_coe_sort.mp inferInstance
  -- The iterates of 'stepMap P' stay in the simplex.
  have hiter : ∀ n, (stepMap P)^[n] v0 ∈ stdSimplex ℝ Ω := by
    intro n
    induction n with
    | zero => simp only [Function.iterate_zero_apply] using hv0
    | succ n ih => rw [Function.iterate_succ_apply']; exact stepMap_mem hP0 hP1 ih
  -- The Cesàro averages stay in the simplex.
  have hbm : ∀ N, cesaro P v0 N ∈ stdSimplex ℝ Ω := by
    intro N
    refine ⟨fun y => ?, ?⟩
    · show 0 ≤ (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) y
      exact mul_nonneg (by positivity) (Finset.sum_nonneg (fun n _ => (hiter n).1 y))
    · show ∑ y, (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) y = 1
      rw [← Finset.mul_sum, Finset.sum_comm]
      rw [Finset.sum_congr rfl (fun n (n : n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1)) => (hiter n).2)]
      rw [Finset.sum_const, Finset.card_range]
      simp only [nsmul_eq_mul, mul_one, Nat.cast_add, Nat.cast_one]
      exact one_div_mul_cancel (by positivity)
  -- Key algebraic identity: 'stepMap' moves the Cesàro average by a telescoping tail.
  have hdif : ∀ N y, stepMap P (cesaro P v0 N) y - cesaro P v0 N y
    = (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * (((stepMap P)^[N + 1] v0) y - v0 y) := by
    intro N y
    have hTb : stepMap P (cesaro P v0 N) y
      = (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n + 1] v0) y := by
      show ∑ x, cesaro P v0 N x * P x y = _

```

```

have e1 : ∀ x, cesaro P v0 N x * P x y
  = (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) x * P x y
:= by
  intro x
  show ((1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) x) * P x
y = -
  rw [mul_assoc, Finset.sum_mul]
  rw [Finset.sum_congr rfl (fun x _ : x ∈ Finset.univ => e1 x), ← Finset.mul_sum]
  congr 1
  rw [Finset.sum_comm]
  apply Finset.sum_congr rfl; intro n _
  show ∑ x, ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) x * P x y = ((stepMap P)^[n + 1] v0) y
  rw [Function.iterate_succ_apply']; rfl
have hbNy : cesaro P v0 N y
  = (1 / (N + 1 : ℝ)) * ∑ n ∈ Finset.range (N + 1), ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) y := rfl
rw [hTb, hbNy, ← mul_sub]
congr 1
rw [← Finset.sum_sub_distrib, Finset.sum_range_sub (fun n => ((stepMap P)^[n] v0) y)]
simp [Function.iterate_zero_apply]
-- Hence 'stepMap' of the average minus the average tends to '0'.
have htend0 : ∀ y, Filter.Tendsto (fun N => stepMap P (cesaro P v0 N) y - cesaro P v0 N y)
  Filter.atTop (nhds 0) := by
  intro y
  refine squeeze_zero_norm (fun N => ?_) tendsto_one_div_add_atTop_nhds_zero_nat
  rw [hdiff N y, norm_mul]
  have ha := mem_Icc_of_mem_stdSimplex (hiter (N + 1)) y
  have hb := mem_Icc_of_mem_stdSimplex hv0 y
  rw [Set.mem_Icc] at ha hb
  have hcnn : (0 : ℝ) ≤ 1 / ((N : ℝ) + 1) := by positivity
  rw [Real.norm_of_nonneg hcnn]
  have hbound : ||((stepMap P)^[N + 1] v0) y - v0 y|| ≤ 1 := by
    rw [Real.norm_eq_abs, abs_le]
    refine ⟨?, ?_⟩ <|> linarith [ha.1, ha.2, hb.1, hb.2]
  calc 1 / ((N : ℝ) + 1) * ||((stepMap P)^[N + 1] v0) y - v0 y||
    ≤ 1 / ((N : ℝ) + 1) * 1 := mul_le_mul_of_nonneg_left hbound hcnn
    _ = 1 / ((N : ℝ) + 1) := mul_one _
-- Extract a convergent subsequence of the averages; its limit is stationary.
obtain ⟨π, hπsimplex, φ, hφmono, hφtend⟩ := (isCompact_stdSimplex ℝ Ω).tendsto_subseq
  hbmem
have hπcoord : ∀ x, Filter.Tendsto (fun N => cesaro P v0 (φ N) x) Filter.atTop (nhds (π x))
  :=
  fun x => tendsto_pi_nhds.mp hφtend x
have key : ∀ y, ∑ x, π x * P x y = π y := by
  intro y
  have hL1 : Filter.Tendsto (fun N => ∑ x, cesaro P v0 (φ N) x * P x y) Filter.atTop
    (nhds (∑ x, π x * P x y)) :=
    tendsto_finset_sum _ (fun x _ => (hπcoord x).mul_const (P x y))
  have hL2 : Filter.Tendsto (fun N => cesaro P v0 (φ N) y) Filter.atTop (nhds (π y)) := hπ
    coord y
  have hLdiff : Filter.Tendsto
    (fun N => (∑ x, cesaro P v0 (φ N) x * P x y) - cesaro P v0 (φ N) y)
    Filter.atTop (nhds ((∑ x, π x * P x y) - π y)) := hL1.sub hL2
  have hL0 : Filter.Tendsto
    (fun N => (∑ x, cesaro P v0 (φ N) x * P x y) - cesaro P v0 (φ N) y)
    Filter.atTop (nhds 0) := (htend0 y).comp hφmono.tendsto_atTop
  have huniq := tendsto_nhds_unique hLdiff hL0
  linarith [huniq]
refine ⟨π, ⟨hπsimplex.1, hπsimplex.2, key⟩, ?_⟩
-- Strict positivity via irreducibility.
intro x0
obtain ⟨a, ha⟩ : ∃ a, 0 < π a := by
  by_contra h
  push_neg at h
  have h0 : ∑ x, π x = 0 :=
    Finset.sum_eq_zero (fun a _ => le_antisymm (h a) (hπsimplex.1 a))
  rw [hπsimplex.2] at h0
  exact one_ne_zero h0
obtain ⟨n, _, hn2⟩ := hirr a x0

```

```

have hpow := stationary_pow key n x0
rw [← hpow]
refine Finset.sum_pos'
  (fun x _ => mul_nonneg (hπsimplex.1 x) (pow_nonneg_entries hP0 n x x0)) ?_
exact ⟨a, Finset.mem_univ a, mul_pos ha hn2⟩

```




Figure 3: Main logical dependencies in the generated proof of Q222. A telescoping identity and compactness establish a stationary subsequential limit of the Cesàro averages. Irreducibility and stationarity under matrix powers then yield strict positivity. Nodes include helper lemmas and local proof facts; edge labels identify supplied hypotheses or supporting arguments.

A.3 An abstracted proof example - Opus Prover

We illustrate Q128 through its natural-language statement, Lean abstraction, and an agent-generated proof obtained in a separate run lasting less than 15 minutes.

Natural-language statement. Let $B_\mu(t) = \mu t + \sigma B(t)$ be a Brownian motion with drift. Show that $B_\mu(t) - \mu t$ is a martingale, and that $(B_\mu(t) - \mu t)^2 - \sigma^2 t$ is a martingale.

Formalization. The Lean statement uses a real-valued process B on a probability space with measure μ and filtration $\mathcal{F}$. Adaptedness and integrability of B_t and B_t^2 are explicit assumptions. For $0 \leq s \leq t$, HasLaw specifies $B_t - B_s \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t - s)$, and Indep specifies independence of this increment from $\mathcal{F}_s$. Lean uses c for the drift and μ for the probability measure. Writing

$X_t = ct + \sigma B_t$, the conclusion consists of the almost-sure conditional-expectation identities

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\mu[X_t - ct \mid \mathcal{F}_s] &= X_s - cs, \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu[(X_t - ct)^2 - \sigma^2 t \mid \mathcal{F}_s] &= (X_s - cs)^2 - \sigma^2 s.\end{aligned}$$

The increment properties are supplied as hypotheses; the proof derives the two identities from these properties.

```
import Mathlib
import Leanproj.Basic
open MeasureTheory ProbabilityTheory Filter
open scoped ENNReal NNReal Topology Matrix
open Auto
variable {Ω : Type*} {m0 : MeasurableSpace Ω}

theorem q128_drifted_brownian_martingale (μ : Measure Ω) [IsProbabilityMeasure μ]
  (F : Filtration ℝ m0) (B : ℝ → Ω → ℝ) (c σ : ℝ)
  (hadap : Adapted F B)
  (hint : ∀ t, Integrable (B t) μ)
  (hint2 : ∀ t, Integrable (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2) μ)
  (hB0 : ∀m ω ∂μ, B 0 ω = 0)
  (hincr : ∀ s t : ℝ, 0 ≤ s → s ≤ t →
    HasLaw (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) (gaussianReal 0 (t - s).toNNReal) μ)
  (hpast : ∀ s t : ℝ, 0 ≤ s → s ≤ t →
    Indep (MeasurableSpace.comap (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) inferInstance) (F s) μ) :
  (∀ s t : ℝ, 0 ≤ s → s ≤ t →
    μ[(fun ω => (c * t + σ * B t ω) - c * t) | (F s)]
    =m[μ] (fun ω => (c * s + σ * B s ω) - c * s)) ∧
  (∀ s t : ℝ, 0 ≤ s → s ≤ t →
    μ[(fun ω => ((c * t + σ * B t ω) - c * t) ^ 2 - σ ^ 2 * t) | (F s)]
    =m[μ] (fun ω => ((c * s + σ * B s ω) - c * s) ^ 2 - σ ^ 2 * s)) := by
  have hsq_int : ∀ v : NNReal, ∫ x, x ^ 2 ∂(gaussianReal (0:ℝ) v) = (v : ℝ) := by
    intro v
  have hv := variance_of_integral_eq_zero (μ := gaussianReal (0:ℝ) v) (X := fun x => x)
    measurable_id.aemeasurable (by simp using integral_id_gaussianReal (μ := (0:ℝ)) (v := v))
  rw [variance_fun_id_gaussianReal] at hv
  simp using hv.symm
  have main : ∀ s t : ℝ, 0 ≤ s → s ≤ t →
    (μ[B t | F s] =m[μ] B s) ∧
    (μ[fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2 | F s] =m[μ] fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2 + (t - s)) := by
    intro s t hst
  have hst0 : (0:ℝ) ≤ t - s := by linarith
  have hBt : Measurable (B t) := (hadap t).mono (F.le t) le_rfl
  have hBs : Measurable (B s) := (hadap s).mono (F.le s) le_rfl
  have hg_meas : Measurable (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) := hBt.sub hBs
  have hg_int : Integrable (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) μ := (hint t).sub (hint s)
  have hindep := hpast s t hst
  have hle1 : MeasurableSpace.comap (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) inferInstance ≤ m0 :=
    hg_meas.comap_le
  have hle2 : F s ≤ m0 := F.le s
  have hsm : StronglyMeasurable[MeasurableSpace.comap (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    inferInstance]
    (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) := (measurable_iff_comap_le.2 le_rfl).stronglyMeasurable
  have hEg : μ[fun ω => B t ω - B s ω] = 0 := by
    rw [(hincr s t hst).integral_eq, integral_id_gaussianReal]
  have hcz : μ[fun ω => B t ω - B s ω | F s] =m[μ] fun _ => (0 : ℝ) := by
    have h := condExp_indep_eq hle1 hle2 hsm hindep
    rw [hEg] at h; exact h
  have hmart : μ[B t | F s] =m[μ] B s := by
    have hcond_Bs : μ[B s | F s] = B s :=
      condExp_of_stronglyMeasurable hle2 (hadap s).stronglyMeasurable (hint s)
    have key : (B t) = (B s) + (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) := by
      funext ω; show B t ω = B s ω + (B t ω - B s ω); ring
    have hadd : μ[B t | F s] =m[μ]
      (μ[B s | F s] + μ[fun ω => B t ω - B s ω | F s]) := by
      calc μ[B t | F s] = μ[(B s) + (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) | F s] :=
        congrArg (fun h => μ[h | F s]) key
```

```

    _ =m[μ] _ := condExp_add (hint s) hg_int _
    filter_upwards [hadd, hcz] with ω h1 h3
    rw [h1]; simp [Pi.add_apply, hcond_Bs, h3]
  refine ⟨hmart, ?_⟩
  have hmemBt : MemLp (B t) 2 μ :=
    (memLp_two_iff_integrable_sq hBt.aestronglyMeasurable).2 (hint2 t)
  have hmemBs : MemLp (B s) 2 μ :=
    (memLp_two_iff_integrable_sq hBs.aestronglyMeasurable).2 (hint2 s)
  have hmemInc : MemLp (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) 2 μ := hmemBt.sub hmemBs
  have hd_int : Integrable (fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2) μ := hmemInc.integrable_sq
  have hmem2Bs : MemLp (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) 2 μ := hmemBs.const_mul 2
  have hb_int : Integrable ((fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)) μ :=
    hmem2Bs.integrable_mul hmemInc
  have ha_int : Integrable (fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) μ := hint2 s
  have ea : μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2 | ℱ s)] = fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2 :=
    condExp_of_stronglyMeasurable hle2 ((hadap s).pow_const 2).stronglyMeasurable ha_int
  have eb : μ[(fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) | ℱ s] =m[μ] fun _ => (0:ℝ)
  ) := by
    have hpull := condExp_mul_of_stronglyMeasurable_left
      (((hadap s).const_mul 2).stronglyMeasurable) hb_int hg_int
    filter_upwards [hpull, hcz] with ω h1 h3
    rw [h1]; simp [Pi.mul_apply, h3]
  have hsm_d : StronglyMeasurable[MeasurableSpace.comap (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    inferInstance]
    (fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2) :=
    ((measurable_iff_comap_le.2 le_rfl).pow_const 2).stronglyMeasurable
  have hEd : μ[(fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2)] = t - s := by
    have hc := (hincr s t hs hst).integral_comp (f := fun x : ℝ => x ^ 2) (by fun_prop)
    simp only [Function.comp_def] at hc
    rw [hc, hsq_int, Real.coe_toNNReal _ hst0]
  have ed : μ[(fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2 | ℱ s)] =m[μ] fun _ => (t - s) := by
    have h := condExp_indep_eq hle1 hle2 hsm_d hindep
    rw [hEd] at h; exact h
  have key2 : (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2) =
    (fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) + (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    + (fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2) := by
    funext ω; simp only [Pi.add_apply, Pi.mul_apply]; ring
  have hcongr : μ[(fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2 | ℱ s)] =
    μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) + (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    + (fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2) | ℱ s] :=
    congrArg (fun h => μ[h | ℱ s]) key2
  have e2 : μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) + (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) |
    ℱ s]
    =m[μ] (μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2 | ℱ s)]
    + μ[(fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω) | ℱ s]) :=
    condExp_add ha_int hb_int _
  have e1 : μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) + (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    + (fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2) | ℱ s]
    =m[μ] (μ[(fun ω => (B s ω) ^ 2) + (fun ω => 2 * B s ω) * (fun ω => B t ω - B s ω)
    | ℱ s]
    + μ[(fun ω => (B t ω - B s ω) ^ 2 | ℱ s)]) :=
    condExp_add (ha_int.add hb_int) hd_int _
  rw [hcongr]
  filter_upwards [e1, e2, eb, ed] with ω h1 h2 hb hd
  rw [h1]
  simp only [Pi.add_apply] at h2 ⊢
  rw [h2, ea]
  simp only [Pi.add_apply] at hb hd ⊢
  rw [hb, hd]
  ring
  constructor
  · intro s t hs hst
    have h368 := (main s t hs hst).1
    have harg : (fun ω => (c * t + σ * B t ω) - c * t) = σ • B t := by
      funext ω; simp only [Pi.smul_apply, smul_eq_mul]; ring
    rw [harg]
    have hsmul := condExp_smul (μ := μ) σ (B t) (ℱ s : MeasurableSpace Ω)
    filter_upwards [hsmul, h368] with ω h1 h2

```

```

simp only [Pi.smul_apply, smul_eq_mul] at h1
rw [h1, h2]; ring
intro s t hs hst
have hquad := (main s t hs hst).2
have harg : (fun ω => ((c * t + σ * B t ω) - c * t) ^ 2 - σ ^ 2 * t) =
  (σ ^ 2 • (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2)) - (fun _ => σ ^ 2 * t) := by
  funext ω; simp only [Pi.sub_apply, Pi.smul_apply, smul_eq_mul]; ring
rw [harg]
have hconst : μ[(fun _ => σ ^ 2 * t) | ℱ s] = fun _ => σ ^ 2 * t :=
  condExp_const (ℱ.le s) _
have hsmul := condExp_smul (μ := μ) (σ ^ 2) (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2) (ℱ s :
  MeasurableSpace Ω)
have hBt2 : MemLp (B t) 2 μ :=
  (memLp_two_iff_integrable_sq
    ((hadapt t).mono (ℱ.le t) le_rfl).astronglyMeasurable)).2 (hint2 t)
have hsub : μ[(σ ^ 2 • (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2)) - (fun _ => σ ^ 2 * t) | ℱ s]
  =ᵐ[μ] (μ[σ ^ 2 • (fun ω => (B t ω) ^ 2) | ℱ s] - μ[(fun _ => σ ^ 2 * t) | ℱ s]) :=
  condExp_sub (Integrable.smul (σ ^ 2) hBt2.integrable_sq) (integrable_const _) _
filter_upwards [hsub, hsmul, hquad] with ws hs1 hs2 hq
rw [hs1]
simp only [Pi.sub_apply, hconst]
rw [hs2]
simp only [Pi.smul_apply, smul_eq_mul]
rw [hq]
ring

```




Figure 4: Main logical dependencies in the generated proof of Q128. Both conclusions use the zero conditional increment mean. The squared-process argument additionally requires the conditional second moment and integrability of the cross term. Deterministic scaling and subtraction complete the proof. Nodes name local proof facts and the final theorem; edge labels identify additional hypotheses or algebraic steps.