

PROOF GAP: BENCHMARKING STEP-LEVEL FORMAL REASONING WITH LOCAL OBLIGATIONS DERIVED FROM NATURAL-LANGUAGE SOLUTIONS

Lihan Xie^{1,2} Zhicheng Hui¹ Yingjun Lan¹
 Zhehao Li¹ Xingzhi Qi¹ Siyue Huang¹ Jirui Liu¹
 Chuxiao Zeng¹ Bohan Zhao¹ Qinxiang Cao^{1,*}

¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University

²Shanghai Innovation Institute

ABSTRACT

Existing formal mathematics benchmarks, such as miniF2F, ProofNet, and PutnamBench, primarily evaluate models on constructing complete formal proofs for challenging problems. Because success is measured at the theorem level, these benchmarks offer limited insight into models’ step-level formal reasoning. Evaluating this capability separately enables finer-grained diagnosis of model limitations than theorem-level evaluation alone.

To fill this evaluation gap, we introduce ProofGap, a fine-grained benchmark for step-level formal reasoning. ProofGap is constructed through a natural-language proof-processing pipeline that decomposes each reasoning step into one or more aligned proof gaps. Applying this pipeline to natural-language solutions to 3,015 exercises in B. P. Demidovich’s Problems in Mathematical Analysis yields 26,116 gaps. The benchmark focuses on mathematical analysis, a domain that remains challenging for current models. By supplying the local context and target explicitly, gap completion isolates local formal proof construction from end-to-end proof composition, enabling more precise localization of model failures. Natural-language solutions serve as the provenance of these obligations, while the benchmark task itself starts from an already formalized local context and goal. Beyond benchmarking, the same pipeline may support future proof-verification systems, provided that semantic translation and sequential proof composition are handled reliably.

1 INTRODUCTION

Mathematical reasoning provides a demanding test of whether large language models can perform rigorous, multi-step inference. Although recent models have achieved impressive performance on natural-language mathematics, their proofs may still contain subtle logical errors, omitted assumptions, or unsupported intermediate claims that are difficult to detect reliably. Formal systems such as Lean, Rocq, and Isabelle offer a complementary approach by expressing mathematical arguments in precise languages and mechanically checking the resulting proofs de Moura & Ullrich (2021); Bertot & Castéran (2013); Nipkow et al. (2002). Building on this verifiable interface, powerful formal theorem-proving systems such as DeepSeek-Prover Ren et al. (2025) and AlphaProof Hubert et al. (2026) have emerged. In parallel, benchmarks such as miniF2F, ProofNet, and PutnamBench have provided standardized environments for evaluating statement formalization and formal proof construction across challenging mathematical problems. Despite differences in their specific tasks Zheng et al. (2022); Tsoukalas et al. (2024); Azerbayev et al. (2023), these benchmarks largely take the complete theorem as the basic unit of evaluation.

Yet in many practical settings, what is needed is not formal reasoning over a complete proof, but fine-grained feedback on individual reasoning steps. During natural-language proof generation, a

*Corresponding author.

critical step can be subjected to local formal verification as soon as it is proposed, allowing unsupported inferences to be detected and revised before their errors propagate through the subsequent argument. Such feedback can also be used to filter candidate reasoning steps or rank alternative reasoning trajectories, allowing models to prioritize directions supported by formal evidence. SAFE exemplifies this use case: it formalizes individual model-generated reasoning steps as Lean statements and combines the resulting proof states with a process reward model to improve Best-of-N trajectory selection Liu et al. (2025).

Step-level formal feedback is also valuable during training. Prior work has shown that process supervision over intermediate reasoning steps can provide more effective training signals than outcome supervision based solely on final answers Lightman et al. (2024). FoVer further uses formal verification tools to generate step-level error labels automatically, demonstrating that formal systems can provide machine-checkable training data for process reward models Kamoi et al. (2026). Such feedback can supervise the reasoning process itself, rather than assigning credit solely according to whether the final answer is correct.

Both settings require formal feedback that is trustworthy, localized, and sufficiently inexpensive to obtain repeatedly. Whole-proof formalization and proof search provide only a coarse signal and can be computationally costly when applied to every candidate proof or sampled training trajectory. A failure at the whole-proof level is also difficult to interpret: the natural-language argument may contain a logical error, the autoformalization component may translate the proof goal incorrectly, or the formal proof-generation model may fail even when given an accurately formalized and provable goal. MA-ProofBench makes this ambiguity concrete in mathematical analysis. Even with expert-reviewed Lean statements, several models that produce many natural-language proofs judged to be fully correct nevertheless achieve near-zero formal proof success on the same problems, with Mathlib hallucinations and incomplete proofs among the dominant failure modes Pu et al. (2026). Thus, whole-proof verification provides only a coarse signal for applications that require localized and actionable formal feedback.

For formal feedback to be reliable and actionable, each verification task should correspond to an identifiable reasoning step in the source natural-language proof, rather than to an arbitrary fragment of a formal derivation. To this end, we introduce ProofGap, a fine-grained benchmark for step-level formal reasoning. Using a semantics-aware pipeline for processing natural-language proofs, we construct ProofGap from 3,015 exercises originating from Demidovich’s *Problems in Mathematical Analysis* Demidovich (1969) and their Chinese reference solutions compiled by Fei and Zhou Fei & Zhou (2012).

ProofGap focuses on mathematical analysis not only because formal proof construction in this domain remains challenging for current models Yu et al. (2025); Pu et al. (2026), but also because many local inferences in analysis solutions depend on domain restrictions, nonzero conditions, sign conditions, and convergence assumptions that are easily left implicit in natural-language arguments. These characteristics make mathematical analysis a particularly informative testbed for evaluating step-level formal reasoning. Moreover, the breadth and diversity of Demidovich’s exercise collection provide a suitable foundation for the systematic, large-scale construction of such localized formal reasoning tasks.

To construct ProofGap, we build on a verifiable auto-formalization pipeline based on the Relaxed and Core Natural Formal Languages. The pipeline first translates a natural-language solution into an intermediate representation that preserves its stepwise reasoning structure, and then resolves its ambiguous notation, problem-solving constructs, and implicit variable scopes through a verifiable elaboration procedure. From the resulting semantically defined proof representation, a proof-gap generator derives localized verification conditions that expose the assumptions available at each point and the goal to be established. ProofGap takes the discharge of these conditions as its benchmark task.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We formulate step-level formal reasoning as a distinct evaluation problem in which models discharge local formal proof obligations derived from individual reasoning steps in textbook natural-language solutions.

- We construct ProofGap through a natural-language proof-processing procedure, obtaining 26,116 formal proof gaps from multi-step solutions to 3,015 exercises in mathematical analysis, and release both its original and Lean versions.¹
- For the original version, we provide a lightweight checker and a verifier-guided agent workflow to produce executable, checker-validated proofs; for the Lean version, we provide ground-truth proofs for exercises and gaps.
- We systematically evaluate a range of models on ProofGap and conduct fine-grained analyses to identify their major limitations in formal reasoning for mathematical analysis.

By evaluating models on localized, mechanically checkable proof obligations, ProofGap provides a fine-grained benchmark for studying formal reasoning beyond theorem-level success. These obligations may also serve as components of future natural-language proof-verification systems.

2 RELATED WORK

Research most closely related to ProofGap lies at the intersection of formal mathematics benchmarks, step-level mathematical verification, and formal reasoning in mathematical analysis. Table 1 compares representative formal mathematics benchmarks in terms of mathematical scope, target source, and evaluation granularity.

Table 1: Comparison of formal mathematics benchmarks by mathematical scope, target provenance, and evaluation granularity. Granularity is defined relative to the source problem or reasoning process; every evaluation target is nevertheless represented as a standalone formal theorem. NL denotes natural language.

Benchmark	Mathematical scope	Target source	Granularity	# Targets
miniF2F Zheng et al. (2022)	Multi-domain	Original problem	Theorem-level	488
ProofNet Azerbayev et al. (2023)	Multi-domain	Original problem	Theorem-level	371
PutnamBench Tsoukalas et al. (2024)	Multi-domain	Original problem	Theorem-level	640
FormalMATH Yu et al. (2025)	Multi-domain	Original problem	Theorem-level	5,560
MA-ProofBench Pu et al. (2026)	Mathematical analysis	Original problem	Theorem-level	200
FormalML Yang et al. (2025)	Machine learning theory	Formal proof subgoal	Step-level	4,937
FormalStep Liu et al. (2025)	Multi-domain	Model-generated NL reasoning step	Step-level	30,809
ProofGap	Mathematical analysis	Original textbook NL solution step	Step-level	26,116

Formal Mathematics Benchmarks. Existing benchmarks primarily construct formal evaluation targets from original mathematical problems. Representative benchmarks include miniF2F Zheng et al. (2022), ProofNet Azerbayev et al. (2023), PutnamBench Tsoukalas et al. (2024), and FormalMATH Yu et al. (2025). Despite differences in problem source, domain, and difficulty, these benchmarks generally derive their formal targets directly from the original problem statements and report whether models successfully prove them at the problem level. This setting is well suited to evaluating end-to-end formal proof construction, but provides limited insight into whether a model can formally justify a particular inference in the corresponding natural-language argument. Notably, although ProofNet provides natural-language proofs, it does not decompose their individual reasoning steps into aligned formal proof obligations.

¹Project repository: <https://github.com/xielihan/ProofGap-Benchmark>

Step-Level Mathematical Verification. Step-level reasoning has been studied through process-supervision datasets that label intermediate natural-language steps (Lightman et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024), and through formally grounded settings such as FoVer, FormalML, and SAFE/Formal-Step (Kamoi et al., 2026; Yang et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025). ProofGap differs from these works in the source of its formal targets and in its alignment criterion. FormalML extracts subgoals from existing Lean developments, while FormalStep autoformalizes model-generated reasoning trajectories, whose steps may be incorrect, redundant, or self-correcting. In contrast, ProofGap decomposes coherent textbook reference solutions into local proof obligations aligned with the logical structure of complete natural-language arguments.

Formal Reasoning in Mathematical Analysis. Mathematical analysis is particularly challenging for formal reasoning: local inferences often depend on domain restrictions, nonzeroness, differentiability, integrability, convergence assumptions, and library-specific representations of analytic concepts. Recent evaluations confirm this difficulty: FormalMATH reports substantially lower formal proof success on calculus than on algebra, and MA-ProofBench finds that models still struggle with mathematical analysis even when they perform much better on the corresponding natural-language problems. Precisely because end-to-end success remains low in this domain, fine-grained diagnosis is important: theorem-level failure alone cannot distinguish whether a model fails on analytic side conditions, local algebraic transformations, limit arguments, or the global proof plan. However, existing analysis benchmarks remain problem-level, constructing one formal target for each original problem. ProofGap complements them by processing reference solutions to 3,015 Demidovich exercises into 26,116 step-level formal targets, enabling localized evaluation of formal reasoning in mathematical analysis.

3 THE PROOFGAP BENCHMARK

3.1 TASK DEFINITION

A ProofGap instance is represented as a triple

$$(\Gamma, g, m), \quad (1)$$

where Γ is the well-scoped local context available at the current proof position, g is the target proposition, and m is an optional strategy annotation preserved from the source solution. These components correspond to the *ASSUM*, *GOAL*, and *METHOD* fields in the released data.

Given Γ and g , a model must generate a formal derivation accepted by the designated proof checker, thereby establishing

$$\Gamma \vdash g. \quad (2)$$

The annotation m is optional metadata rather than part of the proof obligation: it neither affects checker acceptance nor is provided to models in the reported evaluations. We release it to support future analyses of proof strategies and strategy-conditioned proving.

Each gap is evaluated independently. Intermediate propositions established earlier in the source solution are included in Γ and treated as available premises. The source natural-language step is used during benchmark construction and traceability analysis, but is not part of the model input. ProofGap therefore evaluates local formal proof completion over obligations derived from natural-language solutions. It does not directly evaluate natural-language autoformalization or the detection of invalid natural-language steps. Moreover, because intermediate propositions from earlier steps are supplied as premises, the task does not evaluate end-to-end proof composition.

3.2 BENCHMARK CONSTRUCTION

We construct ProofGap from exercises in B. P. Demidovich’s *Problems in Mathematical Analysis* and their Chinese reference solutions compiled by Fei and Zhou. The corpus covers major topics in mathematical analysis. Before formalization, we remove problems that depend on figures or unavailable external information, split independent subquestions, and normalize problem–solution boundaries.




Figure 1: Construction pipeline from a boxed natural-language reasoning step to a local ProofGap instance. Relaxed NFL preserves the original proof structure and method annotation, while Core NFL makes the implicit universal variables and assumption scopes explicit and normalizes f' as $\text{FunDeri}(f,1,1)$, where $\text{FunDeri}(f,1,1)$ denotes the first-order derivative of function f with respect to its first formal argument. The last column shows the emitted ProofGap instance and its corresponding Lean target.

Figure 1 illustrates the construction pipeline. In the first stage, a prompt-based translator converts each problem and solution into Relaxed Natural Formal Language (Relaxed NFL), a parser-readable intermediate representation that preserves the conditions, goal, proof structure, and method annotations of the source. The generated representation then undergoes parser validation and representation-consistency screening, which checks the preservation of the main assumptions, goal, and proof steps and rejects unsupported intermediate conclusions. Detailed screening criteria are provided in Appendix A.2.

In the second stage, the Relaxed NFL AST is elaborated into Core NFL, a normalized representation with explicit proof contexts and variable bindings. The elaboration decomposes compound propositions, disambiguates context-dependent notation, canonicalizes mathematical operations, and makes remaining free variables explicit. Most transformations are deterministic; unresolved notation or scope ambiguities are handled using constrained LLM heuristics followed by programmatic validation. The resulting Core NFL representation must pass syntax and binding-completeness checks.

In the third stage, the proof-gap generator traverses the Core NFL AST while maintaining the current proof state $\Gamma \vdash g$. When a step introduces an intermediate proposition P , the generator emits the obligation $\Gamma \vdash P$ and adds P to the context used to construct subsequent proof states, without requiring the preceding gap to be solved. Nested and backward proof steps are handled by generating the corresponding local obligations. Each gap retains a trace link to its source step and Core NFL node; a single source step may produce multiple gaps when compound or nested reasoning is decomposed. Formal generation rules are provided in Appendix A.4.

The generator first emits each local obligation in the benchmark-native ProofGap representation. To support evaluation with existing formal proof assistants, every generated gap is then translated into a Lean proof obligation using GPT-5.6-sol OpenAI (2026). Local declarations and assumptions are mapped to Lean binders and theorem premises, while the gap goal is mapped to the theorem conclusion. Each Lean theorem statement is paired with a proof verified by Lean prover. The translations are audited through a human-in-the-loop cross-review protocol. Multiple independently instantiated LLM reviewers compare each formalized obligation with the corresponding source problem and solution step. Any case flagged by at least one reviewer for a potential translation error or semantic ambiguity is escalated to human adjudication and retained only after its semantic fidelity has been confirmed.

3.3 STATISTICS AND COVERAGE

The final ProofGap benchmark contains 3,015 mathematical-analysis exercises and 26,116 proof gaps. Each exercise yields 8.66 gaps on average, with a median of 7. Each gap retains 8.33 assumptions on average, with a median of 6. These statistics show that a complete natural-language solution is typically decomposed into multiple local proof obligations, while each obligation preserves several facts available at the corresponding step of the solution.

We group the exercises into seven topics according to the organization of the source material. As shown in Table 2, ProofGap covers single-variable functions, limits, and continuity; single-variable differentiation; indefinite and definite integrals; series; multivariable differentiation; parameter integrals; and multiple, line, and surface integrals. Parameter integrals are treated as a separate category because their proof obligations frequently involve parameter-dependent limits, convergence conditions, and interchanges between limiting operations and integration.

Table 2: Topic coverage of ProofGap.

Topic	Exercises	Gaps
Functions & Limits	529	4,033
Single-Var. Differentiation	640	5,019
Indefinite and Definite Integrals	620	4,795
Infinite Series	455	4,986
Multivariable Differentiation	260	2,380
Parameter Integrals	100	1,082
Multiple, Line, and Surface Integrals	411	3,821

The topic distribution is not uniform, reflecting the composition of the source material. Nevertheless, every topic contains at least 100 exercises and more than 1,000 proof gaps. The benchmark therefore supports both aggregate evaluation and topic-level analysis across major components of undergraduate mathematical analysis.

4 A LIGHTWEIGHT PROOF-CHECKING FRAMEWORK FOR PROOFGAP

For the original version of ProofGap, we provide a lightweight proof-checking interface. Given a local context Γ and goal g , a model emits a short executable program in an 18-command domain-specific language (DSL), and a deterministic checker replays it against the evolving proof state. A program passes the checker only when every generated goal closes, yielding a replayable certificate.

The framework provides deterministic solving through *autosolve* and access to a 514-entry theorem library. Unsupported solver inputs return *unknown*, and theorem applications must discharge all premises and side conditions. A verifier-guided agent uses checker feedback to revise candidate programs; accepted certificates additionally undergo admit-free root replay and semantic audit. Appendix B gives the command, checker, and solver specifications, while Appendix B.5 and Figure 2 describe the agent workflow.

Baseline results. Treating *autosolve* as a lightweight automated theorem prover, we first apply this DSL command to all 26,116 ProofGap instances and directly close 2,838 gaps (10.87%). We then run our verifier-guided agent workflow on the remaining instances, using Codex as the agent and GPT-5.6-sol as its underlying model; the workflow synthesizes checker-validated DSL proofs for an additional 4,889 gaps. Together, the two stages solve 7,727 gaps (29.59%). Beyond model scoring, each accepted DSL program is an executable ground-truth solution for the corresponding gap in the original version of the benchmark.

5 EXPERIMENT

5.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Our experiments on the Lean version of ProofGap are organized around four research questions.

- **RQ1:** To what extent can the evaluated models solve the step-level formal proof obligations in ProofGap?
- **RQ2:** Under a fixed per-target sampling budget, how does performance on step-level gaps compare with performance on their corresponding complete exercise theorems?
- **RQ3:** How do specialized formal provers and general-purpose language models compare on the balanced ProofGap-280 subset?
- **RQ4:** What additional diagnostic information does step-level evaluation provide beyond the success or failure of complete theorem proving?

5.2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Evaluation sets. The complete Lean evaluation set contains 26,116 step-level gaps from 3,015 exercise instances, together with their corresponding 3,015 exercise theorems. Every target is accompanied by a Lean-verified reference proof that is withheld from the evaluated model. For cross-model comparison, we construct ProofGap-280 by sampling 10 gaps from each of the 28 strata defined by seven mathematical topics and four length categories. The selected gaps come from 280 distinct parent exercises, yielding 280 paired gap–exercise targets. Further details on the construction of ProofGap-280, together with model performance stratified by mathematical topic and proof length, are provided in Appendices D and E.2.

Models. We evaluate Goedel-Prover-V2-8B Lin et al. (2026), DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, and Kimina-Prover-Distill-8B Wang et al. (2025) on the full paired evaluation set and ProofGap-280. On ProofGap-280, we additionally evaluate Claude-Opus-4.8 Anthropic (2026), GPT-5.6-sol, Kimi-K3 Kimi Team (2026), GLM-5.2 GLM-5-Team (2026), and DeepSeek-V4-Pro DeepSeek-AI et al. (2026). Model configurations are provided in Appendix C.2.

Verification and metrics. We use a budget of eight candidate proofs per target, each capped at 8,192 tokens, and evaluate proof correctness with Lean. We report Pass@ k using the standard estimator of Chen et al. (2021). Gap-level scores assign equal weight to every gap (micro averaging). For exercise-level diagnosis at Pass@8, we first compute the fraction of solved gaps within each exercise, then average equally across exercises (macro coverage). Formal definitions are given in Appendix C.3; full-set Pass@1/3/8 results are provided in Appendix E.1.

5.3 RESULTS

Table 3: Pass@8 (%) on all 26,116 proof gaps, the 23,191 gaps not solved by the evaluated tactic portfolio, and the 3,015 corresponding exercise theorems.

Model	All gaps	Tactic-unsolved gaps	Exercise theorems
Goedel-V2-8B	35.39	27.48	4.28
DeepSeek-Prover-7B	33.27	25.16	3.32
Kimina-Distill-8B	31.99	23.57	2.92

5.3.1 FULL-SET SOLVABILITY (RQ1)

On the complete set of 26,116 proof gaps, Table 3 reports Pass@8 scores of 35.39% for Goedel, 33.27% for DeepSeek, and 31.99% for Kimina. Thus, even the strongest specialized prover leaves 64.61% of the local obligations unsolved. ProofGap therefore remains challenging despite evaluating individual steps rather than complete proofs.

Table 4: Topic-level Pass@8 (%). Each entry reports *gap/exercise-theorem* performance.

Topic	Goedel	DeepSeek	Kimina
Functions, Limits, and Continuity	44.41 / 8.88	40.32 / 7.56	39.10 / 7.37
Single-Variable Differentiation	35.11 / 4.69	32.72 / 2.50	32.12 / 2.97
Indefinite and Definite Integrals	32.43 / 1.77	30.57 / 1.45	28.59 / 0.16
Series	31.09 / 3.52	29.58 / 3.08	27.20 / 2.86
Multivariable Differentiation	40.21 / 3.08	38.24 / 2.69	37.73 / 1.92
Parameter Integrals	20.43 / 1.00	19.50 / 0.00	18.21 / 0.00
Multiple, Line, and Surface Integrals	36.82 / 3.89	35.57 / 3.41	35.15 / 2.68

Table 5: Mean exercise-level gap coverage, reported over all exercises and conditioned on whether the corresponding complete theorem is solved at Pass@8.

Model	Mean gap coverage (%)		
	All exercises	Theorem solved	Theorem failed
Goedel	31.15	75.07	29.19
DeepSeek	29.12	75.94	27.51
Kimina	27.63	79.12	26.08

Table 16 in Appendix E.1 examines whether the benchmark can be solved primarily through standard Lean automation. The strongest individual tactic, `aesop`, solves 9.67% of the gaps, while the union of all evaluated tactics solves 11.20%. Moreover, after removing the 2,925 gaps solved by the tactic union, the learned provers still achieve Pass@8 scores of 23.57–27.48% on the remaining 23,191 gaps. Their performance is therefore not limited to obligations already handled by the evaluated standard automation.

The topic-level results in Table 4 show that this difficulty is structured rather than uniform. All three provers perform best on single-variable functions, limits, and continuity (39.10–44.41%) and worst on parameter integrals (18.21–20.43%). The identical topic ordering across the three provers suggests that these differences reflect stable properties of the mathematical obligations rather than an isolated weakness of one model.

5.3.2 EFFECT OF PROOF GRANULARITY (RQ2)

Under the same eight-candidate budget per target, per-gap Pass@8 is 31.99–35.39%, whereas complete-theorem Pass@8 is only 2.92–4.28%. This separation is not caused solely by exercises with many gaps receiving greater weight. After assigning equal weight to each exercise, Table 5 shows that mean exercise-level gap coverage remains 27.63–31.15%, whereas complete-theorem Pass@8 is only 2.92–4.28%. Thus, step-level evaluation provides a substantial nonzero signal even when complete-theorem performance is close to the failure floor.

This comparison is conditional on the context supplied to each gap: the local target retains facts established earlier in the source solution, whereas the complete theorem must be proved from its original premises. The result therefore does not show that gap completion is an equivalent but easier theorem-proving task. Instead, it separates local proof construction from the additional demands of organizing and completing an end-to-end argument. The parameter-integral results make this distinction particularly visible: the models solve 18.21–20.43% of the local obligations but at most 1.00% of the corresponding complete theorems.

5.3.3 CROSS-MODEL COMPARISON (RQ3)

Table 7 shows a clear model-class separation on ProofGap-280. Every evaluated general-purpose model outperforms every specialized prover at the gap level. Even GLM-5.2, the weakest general-

Table 6: Local progress among exercises whose complete theorem is not solved at Pass@8. All values are percentages of theorem-failed exercises.

Model	Any gap solved	At least half	At least 75%
Goedel	78.03	22.59	4.99
DeepSeek	75.88	20.24	4.46
Kimina	72.39	18.79	4.68

Table 7: Pass@ k results (%) on ProofGap-280 and its 280 corresponding parent exercises. Each entry reports *proof-gap* / *parent-exercise* performance under an 8,192-token generation budget.

	Proof gap / parent exercise					
Model	Pass@1		Pass@3		Pass@8	
<i>Specialized Formal Provers</i>						
Goedel-V2-8B	29.74/	3.97	36.35/	5.64	39.29/	7.14
DeepSeek-Prover-7B	30.28/	4.06	36.77/	5.33	39.64/	5.71
Kimina-Distill-8B	30.15/	2.41	34.69/	3.42	35.71/	4.29
<i>Open-Weight General Models</i>						
Kimi-K3	70.71/	7.14	76.79/	8.21	81.07/	8.93
DeepSeek-V4-Pro	52.50/	2.86	62.14/	4.29	67.50/	5.00
GLM-5.2	47.86/	1.79	61.43/	2.50	65.00/	3.21
<i>Proprietary General Models</i>						
Claude-Opus-4.8	77.50/	8.21	83.93/	13.21	87.86/	13.93
GPT-5.6-sol	79.29/	12.99	84.97/	17.61	87.86/	21.43

purpose model at Pass@8, reaches 65.00%, exceeding the strongest specialized prover at 39.64% by 25.36 percentage points. This result highlights the substantial recent advances in the formal-reasoning capabilities of general-purpose language models.

The ranking changes substantially on the corresponding parent exercises. GPT-5.6-sol and Claude-Opus-4.8 retain clear advantages, and Kimi-K3 is numerically higher than the specialized provers, whereas DeepSeek-V4-Pro and GLM-5.2 are not. Notably, GPT-5.6-sol and Claude-Opus-4.8 tie at 87.86% on the gaps but obtain 21.43% and 13.93%, respectively, on the parent exercises. Similar gap-level performance can therefore coexist with markedly different end-to-end proof-construction ability.

5.3.4 DIAGNOSTIC RESOLUTION (RQ4)

Table 5 shows that gap coverage is strongly associated with complete-theorem success. Exercises whose theorem is solved have mean gap coverage of 75.07–79.12%, compared with 26.08–29.19% for theorem-failed exercises. Step-level performance is strongly associated with end-to-end theorem-proving success, while providing a substantially denser diagnostic signal.

At the same time, theorem failure does not imply an absence of local progress. As shown in Table 6, 72.39–78.03% of theorem-failed exercises contain at least one solved gap, 18.79–22.59% have at least half of their gaps solved, and 4.46–4.99% have at least three quarters solved. ProofGap therefore refines a binary theorem failure into a graded account of how many local formal obligations associated with the underlying argument a model can discharge under the evaluated budget.

6 CONCLUSION

We introduced ProofGap, a fine-grained benchmark for step-level formal reasoning based on local proof obligations derived from textbook natural-language solutions. It contains 26,116 gaps from 3,015 mathematical analysis exercises. Experiments show that gaps are substantially more tractable than complete theorems and reveal local progress hidden by theorem-level failure. These findings establish local formal proof completion as a useful interface for fine-grained evaluation and formally grounded diagnostic feedback. The benchmark currently covers one textbook in mathematical analysis; its proof-assistant evaluation is limited to Lean. It evaluates already formalized gaps independently and therefore does not directly measure natural-language autoformalization, invalid-step detection, or end-to-end proof composition. Future work should extend coverage across domains and proof assistants and evaluate complete pipelines that jointly address semantic translation, local proof discharge, and sequential proof composition.

REFERENCES

- Anthropic. Claude Opus 4.8 system card. System card, Anthropic, May 2026. URL <https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/0b4915911bb0d19eca5b5ee635c80fef830a37ea.pdf>. Model identifier: `claude-opus-4-8`; accessed 2026-07-28.
- Zhangir Azerbayev, Bartosz Piotrowski, Hailey Schoelkopf, Edward W. Ayers, Dragomir Radev, and Jeremy Avigad. Proofnet: Autoformalizing and formally proving undergraduate-level mathematics, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12433>.
- Yves Bertot and Pierre Castéran. *Interactive theorem proving and program development: Coq’Art: the calculus of inductive constructions*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *International Conference on Automated Deduction*, pp. 625–635. Springer, 2021.
- DeepSeek-AI, Anyi Xu, Bangcai Lin, Bing Xue, et al. Deepseek-v4: Towards highly efficient million-token context intelligence, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.19348>.
- Boris Pavlovich Demidovich. *Problems in Mathematical Analysis*. Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969.
- Dinghui Fei and Xuesheng Zhou. *Solutions to B. P. Demidovich’s Problems in Mathematical Analysis*. Shandong Science and Technology Press, Jinan, China, 4 edition, 2012. Six volumes, in Chinese.
- GLM-5-Team. Glm-5: from vibe coding to agentic engineering, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.15763>.
- Thomas Hubert, Rishi Mehta, Laurent Sartran, Miklós Z Horváth, Goran Žužić, Eric Wieser, Aja Huang, Julian Schrittwieser, Yannick Schroecker, Hussain Masoom, et al. Olympiad-level formal mathematical reasoning with reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 651(8106):607–613, 2026.
- Ryo Kamoi, Yusen Zhang, Nan Zhang, Sarkar Snigdha Sarathi Das, Ranran Haoran Zhang, Wenpeng Yin, and Rui Zhang. Efficient prm training data synthesis via formal verification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pp. 8246–8265, 2026.
- Kimi Team. Kimi k3: Open frontier intelligence, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.24653>.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=v8L0pN6EOi>.

- Yong Lin, Shange Tang, Bohan Lyu, Ziran Yang, Jui-Hui Chung, Haoyu Zhao, Lai Jiang, Yihan Geng, Jiawei Ge, Jingruo Sun, Jiayun Wu, Jiri Gesi, Ximing Lu, David Acuna, Kaiyu Yang, Hongzhou Lin, Yejin Choi, Danqi Chen, Sanjeev Arora, and Chi Jin. Goedel-prover-v2: Scaling formal theorem proving with scaffolded data synthesis and self-correction. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=j4C0nALrgK>.
- Chengwu Liu, Ye Yuan, Yichun Yin, Yan Xu, Xin Xu, Zaoyu Chen, Yasheng Wang, Lifeng Shang, Qun Liu, and Ming Zhang. Safe: Enhancing mathematical reasoning in large language models via retrospective step-aware formal verification. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 12171–12186, 2025.
- Tobias Nipkow, Markus Wenzel, and Lawrence C Paulson. *Isabelle/HOL: a proof assistant for higher-order logic*. Springer, 2002.
- OpenAI. GPT-5.6 system card. System card, OpenAI, July 2026. URL <https://deploymentsafety.openai.com/gpt-5-6>. Includes the gpt-5.6-sol model; accessed 2026-07-28.
- Lushi Pu, Weiming Zhang, Xinheng Xie, Zixuan Fu, Bingxiang He, Hongya Lyu, Xin Li, Jie Zhou, and Yudong Wang. Ma-proofbench: A two-tiered evaluation of llms for theorem proving in mathematical analysis, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.13782>.
- Z. Z. Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanbiao 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>.
- 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. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ChKCF75Ocd>.
- Haiming Wang, Mert Unsal, Xiaohan Lin, Mantas Baksys, Junqi Liu, Marco Dos Santos, Flood Sung, Marina Vinyes, Zhenzhe Ying, Zekai Zhu, Jianqiao Lu, Hugues de Saxcé, Bolton Bailey, Chendong Song, Chenjun Xiao, Dehao Zhang, Ebony Zhang, Frederick Pu, Han Zhu, Jiawei Liu, Jonas Bayer, Julien Michel, Longhui Yu, Léo Dreyfus-Schmidt, Lewis Tunstall, Luigi Pagani, Moreira Machado, Pauline Bourigault, Ran Wang, Stanislas Polu, Thibaut Barroyer, Wen-Ding Li, Yazhe Niu, Yann Fleureau, Yangyang Hu, Zhouliang Yu, Zihan Wang, Zhilin Yang, Zhengying Liu, and Jia Li. Kimina-prover preview: Towards large formal reasoning models with reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.11354>.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, Runxin Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Yu Wu, and Zhifang Sui. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce llms step-by-step without human annotations. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 9426–9439, 2024.
- 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>.
- 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>.
- Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. Minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.00110>.

A DATASET CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

A.1 DATA SOURCES AND PREPROCESSING

The raw corpus for ProofGap comes from the natural-language problems and solutions in B. P. Demidovich’s *Problems in Mathematical Analysis*. The book covers topics in mathematical analysis such as functions and limits, differentiation, integration, series, multivariable analysis, parameter integrals, and line and surface integrals. Its solutions usually have a clear step-by-step structure, making them suitable as input to the RNFL pipeline.

Before entering the autoformalization process, the raw text is lightly preprocessed. First, we remove problems whose understanding necessarily depends on figures, tables, or external geometric intuition. Second, we split problems containing multiple mutually independent subquestions into multiple samples, so that each sample corresponds to a clear problem statement and solution process. Finally, we normalize the boundaries between problems and solutions, preventing subsequent problems or residual formatting artifacts from being mixed into the same sample.

These procedures do not change the mathematical reasoning content of the original solutions. Instead, they provide structurally clear input for the subsequent Relaxed NFL translation, elaboration, and proof-gap generation.

A.2 RELAXED NFL REPRESENTATION AND AUTOMATIC TRANSLATION

This section explains how natural-language solutions are first represented as Relaxed NFL. Relaxed NFL is an intermediate representation between a natural-language solution and Core NFL. It remains close to natural mathematical writing but has a formal syntax, so it can be read by a parser and processed further. Its role is not to serve directly as the final verification target, but to provide a surface language that is easier for large language models to generate while still preserving proof structure.

Table 8: Representative natural-language structures preserved by Relaxed NFL.

Natural-language structure	Relaxed NFL form	Role
Known condition	GIVEN	Records problem premises.
Goal to prove	TO PROVE	Records the current proof goal.
Problem-solving entry	Solve	Records the object, solution set, or range to be found.
Intermediate conclusion	Have P	Aligns with a natural-language proof step.
Local assumption	Assume P { ... }	Represents conditional reasoning or a nested subproof.
Sufficiency transformation	It suffices to prove P	Represents backward reasoning.
Local proof of an intermediate proposition	We prove that P { ... }	Generates local proof gaps for P and then makes P available as an assumption.
Candidate answer and checking	Take t as a witness After checking, t satisfies the constraints	Records a candidate object and the verification of its constraints.
Method annotation	[@method M @]	Preserves proof-search hints from the source solution.

Relaxed NFL resembles natural-language proofs in two main respects. First, it preserves common reasoning structures in informal proofs, such as stating intermediate conclusions, reasoning under local assumptions, transforming the goal, and giving method hints. Second, it permits some terms and propositions to remain not fully elaborated. For example, surface notation such as f' , $|x|$, and a_n , as well as variable scopes introduced by expressions such as “take arbitrary x ” or “let x ,” may first be preserved in Relaxed NFL and then recovered precisely in later stages.

In the ProofGap construction, Relaxed NFL preserves at least the structures shown in Table 8.

A simplified grammar fragment is as follows:

```

<program> ::= <assumptions> Prove: <term> Proof: <proof>
           | <assumptions> Solve: <solving_step>
           | Solution: <derivation>

<proof> ::= <derivation> QED

<derivation> ::= <annotated_step> *

<annotated_step> ::= ([@method <method> @])? <step>

<step> ::= Have <term>
         | <action_step>
         | It suffices to prove <term>
         | We prove that <term> { <proof> }
         | Assume <term> { <derivation> }
         | <solving_step> { <derivation> }

<action_step> ::= Set <term> = <term>
               | Take <term> as a witness
               | After checking, <term> satisfies the constraints
               | After checking, <term> does not satisfy the
               constraints

<solving_step> ::= Find <term> such that <term>
                | Find all <term> such that <term>
                | Find the range of <term> such that <term>

```

This design makes Relaxed NFL more like a structured natural proof than a language for a particular proof assistant. It reduces the difficulty of the autoformalization stage while preserving enough proof-structural information for the subsequent Core NFL elaboration.

Based on the surface language above, natural-language problems and solutions are translated into Relaxed NFL. We use prompting-based translation: the prompt contains the syntax specification of Relaxed NFL, target-format requirements, and several examples from natural language to Relaxed NFL, so that the model learns to preserve proof structure rather than directly generating strict proof assistant code.

After generation, Relaxed NFL is passed through two types of filtering. The first is parser validation, which ensures that the generated text satisfies the syntactic constraints of Relaxed NFL and can be read by downstream programs. The second is representation-consistency screening, which filters results that are clearly inconsistent with the source solution. The screening focuses on the following points:

1. whether the main assumptions in the problem appear in GIVEN or in the corresponding local contexts;
2. whether the original goal is correctly translated as TO PROVE or Solve;
3. whether the main proof steps in the natural-language solution are represented by Have, Assume, We prove that, or It suffices to prove;
4. whether Relaxed NFL introduces key intermediate conclusions that have no basis in the source solution;
5. whether method annotations are broadly consistent with the corresponding natural-language steps.

This screening does not claim to prove that the natural-language solution and Relaxed NFL are equivalent in full mathematical semantics. Its purpose is closer to sanity checking: filtering structural errors, syntax errors, and clearly misaligned translations. Full verification does not occur at the

Relaxed NFL stage, but is realized through the subsequent Core NFL elaboration and proof-gap checking.

A.3 CORE NFL REPRESENTATION AND VERIFIABLE ELABORATION

We first give the surface structure of Core NFL and the corresponding organization of proof states. Core NFL is the normalized representation obtained after elaborating Relaxed NFL. Unlike Relaxed NFL, which is closer to natural proof writing, Core NFL requires proof steps to eventually be reduced to a small number of primitive proof constructors. This allows the proof-gap generator to maintain proof state uniformly along the proof AST and generate proof gaps. We then describe several finer-grained elaboration procedures used in the transition from Relaxed NFL to Core NFL.

Abstractly, Core NFL can be viewed as consisting of two syntactic categories:

Term and Method,

where Term denotes mathematical expressions or propositions in Core NFL, and Method denotes proof methods. The special method $?M$ denotes the empty method.

A proof state consists of the current sequence of assumptions and the current goal:

$$\text{PState} = \text{Term}^* \times \text{Term}.$$

If the current assumptions are Γ and the goal is G , the proof state is written as

$$\Gamma \vdash G.$$

A Core NFL proof consists of a small number of primitive proof constructors:

Proof ::= Forward(M, P, π)
 | Backward(M, P, π)
 | Subgoal(P, π_1, π_2)
 | QED.

The meanings of these constructors and their corresponding Relaxed NFL structures are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Primitive Core NFL proof constructors and their Relaxed NFL origins.

Core NFL constructor	Typical Relaxed NFL structure	Meaning
Forward(M, P, π)	[@method M] Have P	Derives an intermediate proposition P from the current proof state using method M , and adds P to the subsequent assumptions.
Backward(M, P, π)	[@method M] It suffices to prove P	Reduces the current goal to the subgoal P using method M , then continues by proving P .
Subgoal(P, π_1, π_2)	We prove that P { ... }	First proves the intermediate subgoal P with π_1 , then uses P as a known fact in π_2 .
QED	QED	Ends the current proof, indicating that the current goal follows from the current assumptions.

Thus, a Core NFL program can be regarded as

$$\text{Program} = \text{PState} \times \text{Proof}.$$

The Core NFL column in Figure 1 of the main paper displays a readable surface form of this structure in data construction: it has already made variable scopes, local conditions, and context-dependent

notation explicit, and can be consumed by the proof-gap generator. Internally, the system does not treat it as an ordinary text sequence, but parses it into a proof AST consisting of the proof-state structure and primitive proof constructors described above.

The definitions above explain how the main proof steps in Relaxed NFL are reduced to the core constructors required by Core NFL. In actual construction, finer-grained elaboration is also needed, such as recovering implicit variable scopes, eliminating ambiguities in context-dependent notation, splitting compound propositions, and normalizing derivative and integral notation in mathematical analysis. These processes are mainly performed by deterministic transformations. In the few places where the intent of the original natural-language proof must be judged, the system uses constrained LLM heuristics and requires the output to pass programmatic checks. We give several representative types of elaboration below.

A.3.1 NOTATION DISAMBIGUATION

A common source of ambiguity in natural mathematical writing is notation overloading: the same symbol may denote different mathematical objects. A simple example is $|x|$. Depending on the meaning of x , it may denote either the absolute value of a real number or the cardinality of a set. Therefore, the surface notation $|x|$ in Relaxed NFL cannot by itself be automatically fixed as a particular Core NFL term.

To perform notation disambiguation, the system preserves overloaded notation in the term language of Relaxed NFL while introducing unambiguous forms and auxiliary annotations:

```
<term> ::= ...
        | |<term>|
        | IsReal(<term>)
        | IsSet(<term>)
        | Abs(<term>)
        | Card(<term>)
```

Here, $| \cdot |$ is overloaded surface notation, while $\text{Abs}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Card}(\cdot)$ are unambiguous forms that can be deterministically translated to Core NFL. The annotations $\text{IsReal}(\cdot)$ and $\text{IsSet}(\cdot)$ record whether a term is regarded as a real number or as a set. They are not a static type system for Relaxed NFL, but annotations used to guide the interpretation of overloaded notation.

The elaborator performs static analysis over Relaxed NFL and maintains an environment recording these annotations. The annotations may come from two sources. The first is information explicitly preserved by the model during the initial autoformalization stage; for example, “for every real number t ” introduces $\text{IsReal}(t)$. The second is constraint propagation performed by the system according to operator signatures; for example, when an operator requires a set argument, an IsSet annotation is generated for the corresponding object. When the environment determines a unique interpretation, the system directly replaces the overloaded notation:

$$\begin{aligned} |t| &\mapsto \text{Abs}(t) && \text{if } \text{IsReal}(t), \\ |t| &\mapsto \text{Card}(t) && \text{if } \text{IsSet}(t). \end{aligned}$$

If multiple candidate interpretations remain after static constraints are applied, the system gives the model only the local proof context and a finite candidate set, asks it to select the intended interpretation, and then checks whether the choice is consistent with the current constraint environment.

The same disambiguation mechanism is also used for other context-dependent notation in mathematical analysis. For example, f' must be interpreted as a function derivative or some other derived object; a_n may denote the n -th term of a sequence, or a partial derivative of a function or multivariate object with respect to n ; and f^{-1} may denote an inverse function, a matrix inverse, or an ordinary power of -1 . The system selects the interpretation using the local object category, operator signatures, and contextual constraints, and uses constrained candidate selection when needed.

A.3.2 SPLITTING CHAINED EQUALITIES AND COMPOUND PROPOSITIONS

Natural-language proofs often compress several atomic relations into a single compound proposition, such as a chained inequality, a chained equality, or a conjunction. Relaxed NFL may pre-

serve this writing style. However, when generating proof gaps, a compound proposition that is too large mixes multiple local inferences into the same goal, making it difficult to obtain fine-grained step-level obligations. Therefore, elaboration normalizes such compound structures into smaller verification units:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Have } a < b < c &\rightsquigarrow \text{Have } a < b, \quad \text{Have } b < c, \quad \text{Have } a < c, \\ \text{Have } a = b = c &\rightsquigarrow \text{Have } a = b, \quad \text{Have } b = c, \quad \text{Have } a = c, \\ \text{Have } P \wedge Q &\rightsquigarrow \text{Have } P, \quad \text{Have } Q. \end{aligned}$$

This transformation does not perform proof search, nor does it try to prove the individual subpropositions. It only unfolds surface-level compound propositions into more explicit Core NFL steps. After expansion, each subproposition can generate an independent proof gap under the current proof state. This preserves the locality of the original proof step while making error localization more precise.

A.3.3 RECOVERING IMPLICIT VARIABLE SCOPE

Relaxed NFL permits temporarily unbound variables to appear in proof steps. For example, `Have P (x)` only states that the current step claims $P(x)$, but it does not yet specify whether x is an arbitrary real number, a fixed object, or a variable satisfying some local conditions. Core NFL needs such implicit scopes to be made explicit; otherwise, the generated proof gap lacks complete context.

For this purpose, the system first marks free variables in propositions with `[@free ... @]`, and then marks the implicit scope these variables should inhabit with `[@scope ... @]`. The scope annotation is then eliminated and converted into explicit quantifiers and conditions in Core NFL. For example:

```
Free-variable annotation:
[@free x @] Have P(x)

Scope annotation:
[@scope [forall x] [x in Real] @] {
  Have P(x)
}

After scope elimination:
Have forall (x), x in Real =>
  P(x)
```

Here, `[@free x @]` indicates that x has not yet been explicitly bound by the current proposition, while `[@scope [forall x] [x in Real] @]` indicates that the step should be interpreted as holding “for every real number x .” The model output for this step must pass a deterministic checker: all annotated free variables must fall within matching scopes, and apart from adding and eliminating scope annotations, no other part of the proof may be modified.

A.3.4 CANONICALIZING DERIVATIVES AND INDEFINITE INTEGRALS

Because ProofGap targets mathematical analysis, it also needs a unified internal canonical form for derivatives and indefinite integrals. The goal here is not to execute differentiation or integration, but to translate surface notation in natural writing into semantically explicit Core NFL terms without free variables.

Derivatives are uniformly represented as

$$\text{FunDeri}(f, g, n),$$

denoting the n -th derivative of function f with respect to function g . In this way, ordinary derivatives, partial derivatives, higher-order derivatives, and derivatives with respect to a composite function can all be placed in the same canonical form. For example, the derivative of $\sin(x)$ with respect to $\cos(x)$,

$$\frac{d(\sin x)}{d(\cos x)},$$

is written in Core NFL as

$$\text{FunDeri}(\lambda x. \sin x, \lambda x. \cos x, 1).$$

As another example, for the second-order partial derivative of a binary function $f(x, y)$ with respect to y , the natural notation

$$\frac{\partial^2 f(x, y)}{\partial y^2}$$

can first be represented as

$$\text{FunDeri}(f, \lambda x, y. y, 2).$$

Since $\lambda x, y. y$ selects only the second formal parameter, this representation can also be written in a more readable form:

$$\text{FunDeri}(\lambda x, y. f(x, y), 2, 2).$$

These two Core NFL terms have the same semantics; the latter only displays “differentiate with respect to the second formal parameter” more concisely.

The canonicalization of indefinite integrals is based on another consideration: an indefinite integral denotes a family of antiderivatives, not a single function value. For example, the natural notation

$$\int 2x \, dx = x^2 + C$$

is represented in Core NFL as an equality between two sets of functions:

$$\{ F \mid \forall x, \text{FunDeri}(F, 1, 1)(x) = 2x \} = \{ F \mid \exists C \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x, F(x) = x^2 + C \}.$$

This treatment is necessary: the result of $\int 2x \, dx$ is not a fixed function, but the set of all functions satisfying $F'(x) = 2x$; the right-hand side $x^2 + C$ also denotes a family of functions parameterized by an arbitrary real constant C . Thus, in Core NFL, an equality of indefinite integrals is naturally represented as an equality between two sets of functions.

A.4 PROOF-GAP GENERATION AND CHECKING

After verifiable elaboration, the semantics of Core NFL is given by proof-gap generation. That is, we do not interpret a Core NFL program directly as a complete proof object; instead, we interpret it as a process that generates verification conditions. If all generated proof gaps are successfully proved, then the Core NFL program is regarded as verified.

A proof gap consists of a proof state and a method:

$$\text{Gap} = \text{PState} \times \text{Method}.$$

If the proof state is $\Gamma \vdash G$ and the method annotation is M , the gap is written as

$$\Gamma \vdash_M G.$$

It means: under assumptions Γ , prove the goal G . The method M is a hint preserved from the natural-language solution and does not change the formal validity of the proof obligation.

The proof-gap generator PGG is defined recursively according to the structure of the Core NFL proof. Let $\Gamma; P$ denote appending proposition P to the end of the assumption sequence. The generation rules are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash G, \text{Forward}(M, P, \pi)) &= \{ \Gamma \vdash_M P \} \cup \text{PGG}(\Gamma; P \vdash G, \pi), \\ \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash G, \text{Backward}(M, P, \pi)) &= \{ \Gamma; P \vdash_M G \} \cup \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash P, \pi), \\ \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash G, \text{Subgoal}(P, \pi_1, \pi_2)) &= \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash P, \pi_1) \cup \text{PGG}(\Gamma; P \vdash G, \pi_2), \\ \text{PGG}(\Gamma \vdash G, \text{QED}) &= \{ \Gamma \vdash_{?M} G \}. \end{aligned}$$

This definition explains why ProofGap is a local benchmark: every gap comes from a proof constructor in Core NFL rather than from an arbitrary subgoal extracted from a complete theorem. An intermediate step in the natural-language solution corresponds to a proof-state transition in Core NFL and is then expanded into a local proof obligation.

Furthermore, we define

$$\text{CheckGap} : \text{Gap} \rightarrow \{\text{false}, \text{true}\},$$

and

$$\text{CheckProgram}(\sigma, \pi) = \bigwedge_{H \in \text{PGG}(\sigma, \pi)} \text{CheckGap}(H).$$

In this benchmark, `CheckGap` can be implemented through two compatible interfaces: the proof-checking framework over the lightweight `ProofGap` representation, and the corresponding Lean theorem skeleton. During evaluation, a model must generate, for each proof gap, a formal derivation accepted by the selected interface.

A.5 PROOF GAP DATA FIELDS AND LEAN SKELETON EXPORT

A released `ProofGap` instance expands the sequent form above into data fields:

```
ASSUM:
  Gamma

GOAL:
  G

METHOD:
  M
```

The `METHOD` field is optional. It records strategy hints from the source natural-language solution, such as “differentiate both sides,” “by monotonicity,” or “compare coefficients.” It is withheld in all reported evaluations and released for future analyses of strategy-conditioned proving.

Since each `ProofGap` sample already contains explicit local assumptions and a goal, it can be exported relatively directly as a Lean theorem skeleton. The Lean version and the lightweight `ProofGap` representation are two compatible interfaces for the same local proof obligation: the former supports manual inspection, reuse, and connection to the ecosystem of existing interactive theorem provers, while the latter provides a compact benchmark-native representation.

For example, the following `ProofGap`:

```
ASSUM:
DiffableFunc(f)
forall x, EvenFunc(f) => f(x) = f(-x)

GOAL:
forall x, EvenFunc(f)
=> FunDeri(f, 1, 1)(x) = -FunDeri(f, 1, 1)(-x)

METHOD:
differentiate both sides
```

can be exported as the following Lean theorem skeleton:

```

theorem gap2
  (f : Real -> Real)
  (h1 : Differentiable Real f)
  (h2 : forall x : Real, Function.Even f
    -> f x = f (-x)) :
  forall x : Real, Function.Even f ->
    deriv f x = -deriv f (-x) := by
  sorry

```

This export is mainly structural: ProofGap has already split the local proof obligation into ASSUM and GOAL, so exporting a Lean skeleton only requires translating each assumption into a theorem parameter and placing the goal in the conclusion position of the theorem. In the example above, `DiffableFunc(f)` is exported as the differentiability premise `h1`, the local fact `forall x, EvenFunc(f) => f(x)=f(-x)` is exported as premise `h2`, and GOAL becomes the theorem conclusion. Thus, the Lean form and the lightweight ProofGap form are not different tasks, but two representations and checking interfaces for the same proof-gap instance.

A.6 QUALITY CONTROL AND TRACEABILITY

Before a sample enters the final benchmark, it must pass several layers of programmatic checks:

1. the boundaries of the natural-language problem and solution are clear, and the sample does not depend on unrecoverable graphical information;
2. Relaxed NFL can be parsed by the parser;
3. Relaxed NFL has basic proof-structure consistency with the source solution;
4. elaboration from Relaxed NFL to Core NFL completes successfully;
5. free-variable annotations and scope annotations have been eliminated, and the binding-completeness check passes;
6. Core NFL can generate nonempty, parseable ASSUM and GOAL fields.

These checks cannot guarantee that the autoformalized result is absolutely correct in full mathematical semantics, but they keep the construction process controlled and verifiable. Relaxed NFL serves as an intermediate representation aligned with natural language, Core NFL provides a semantically explicit proof-state structure, and proof gaps turn the correctness of a complete proof into a set of locally checkable verification conditions. It is important to emphasize that the entire construction process operates on syntax trees generated by the parser: elaboration transforms the Relaxed NFL AST, while the proof-gap generator maintains proof state and generates proof obligations along the Core NFL proof AST. Therefore, each proof gap preserves its generation position in the proof AST and can be mapped back to the corresponding local proof step in the source solution.

B VERIFICATION FRAMEWORK AND AGENT BASELINE

This appendix expands the compact framework description in the main paper. It records the complete DSL command inventory, the checker’s operational trust boundary, explicit solver coverage, theorem-instantiation protocol, and the controller used by the verifier-guided baseline. The purpose is to make successful certificates replayable and the system’s failure modes explicit without enlarging the main-paper presentation.

B.1 DSL COMMAND INVENTORY

The DSL contains 18 commands, grouped in Table 10. Its granularity lies between an end-to-end formal proof and an unconstrained natural-language step: one instruction performs a recognizable reasoning operation, while the checker validates its exact effect. In particular, `autosolve` is itself a DSL command rather than an external preprocessing step. Automation can receive either every local hypothesis or an explicit model-selected subset; explicit selection records the dependencies of a step and limits accidental reliance on irrelevant context.

Table 10: The 18 DSL commands, organized by their role in proof-gap completion.

Command family	Commands	Effect on the proof state
Discharge	<code>autosolve</code> , <code>apply</code>	Close the goal with a solver or reduce it to the unmatched premises of an applicable hypothesis.
Fact management	<code>get_prop</code> , <code>use_condition</code> , <code>assert</code> , <code>destruct_and</code>	Instantiate a hypothesis or theorem, eliminate implication premises, establish a checked local claim, or decompose a conjunction.
Quantifiers and implications	<code>exists</code> , <code>get_exists</code> , <code>get_forall</code> , <code>get_condition</code>	Provide witnesses, open quantified hypotheses or goals, and move an antecedent from a goal into the local context.
Rewriting and normalization	<code>autoreplace</code> , <code>not_normalize</code> , <code>rewrite</code> , <code>rewrite_in limit</code> , <code>rewrite_in sum</code> , <code>rewrite_in setdesc</code>	Perform checked transformations, including binder-aware rewriting under limits, sums, and set comprehensions.
Branching	<code>case_analysis</code> , <code>or_intro</code>	Split on a disjunctive hypothesis or select a side of a disjunctive goal.

Surface syntax. Programs are line-oriented; formulas are enclosed in braces, hypotheses carry explicit indices, and a hash mark starts a comment. The following schematic forms summarize the complete command surface. Here `source` and `result` are a hypothesis or the goal, `dir` is a rewrite direction, and ellipses denote repeated binders or hypotheses rather than unchecked text.

```

autoreplace <scope>; from <term> to <term>; from <source> to <result>
not_normalize from (GOAL: {...}) to (GOAL: {...})
autosolve all_hypothesis
autosolve (hypothesis <i>: {...}) ...
get_prop (<hypothesis-or-theorem>) (<x> := {...}) ... as (hypothesis
  <j>: {...})
exists (<x> := {...}) ...
destruct_and (hypothesis <i>: {...}) as (hypothesis <j>: {...}) ...
rewrite (<dir>, <equation-or-iff>) (hypothesis <i>: {...}); from
  <source> to <result>
rewrite_in limit (<dir>, equation) (hypothesis <i>: {...}); from
  <source> to <result>
rewrite_in sum (<dir>, equation) (hypothesis <i>: {...}); from
  <source> to <result>
rewrite_in setdesc (<dir>, equation) (hypothesis <i>: {...}) (<x> :=
  {...}); from <source> to <result>
apply (hypothesis <i>: {...})
use_condition (<condition>) ... in (hypothesis <i>: {...}) as
  (hypothesis <j>: {...})
get_exists (hypothesis <i>: {...}) (<x> := {...}) ...
get_forall (GOAL: {...}) (<x> := {...}) ...
get_condition (hypothesis <j>: {...}) ... in (GOAL: {...})
assert (hypothesis <j>: {...}) [by proof { ... }]
case_analysis (hypothesis <i>: {...})
or_intro <left-or-right>

```

Command-level semantics. The checker assigns the following precise state transition to each command.

1. **autoreplace.** Recompute a supported local transformation in a hypothesis or the goal, using no hypotheses, all hypotheses, or an explicit subset. The command states the replaced

- term, its replacement, the complete source formula, and the claimed result; an arbitrary user-written substitution is not trusted.
2. **not_normalize.** Replace only the goal, and only when the old and new forms have α -equivalent fully unfolded negation normal forms. The command rejects a no-op and invokes neither general automation nor linear arithmetic.
 3. **autosolve.** Close the current goal only when the deterministic solver portfolio certifies it from all hypotheses or the explicitly selected subset. Thus `autosolve` is an ordinary DSL instruction whose success can be replayed.
 4. **get_prop.** Instantiate outer universal binders of a hypothesis or a named library theorem and add the checked instance as a new hypothesis. The checker requires enough outer binders, performs capture-avoiding simultaneous substitution and beta reduction, and compares the supplied result modulo α -equivalence.
 5. **exists.** Supply witnesses for one or more consecutive outer existential binders of the goal. The stated binder names must match those binders, and the residual goal is recomputed by the checker.
 6. **destruct_and.** Recursively flatten a conjunctive hypothesis. The number and order of explicitly named output hypotheses must exactly match all flattened conjuncts.
 7. **rewrite.** Apply a directed equation or biconditional from a hypothesis to a goal or hypothesis. It checks the complete before and after formulas and does not cross a protected binder. A rewrite rule still wrapped in an outer quantifier must first be instantiated.
 8. **rewrite_in_limit.** Rewrite one selected limit body using a hypothesis with exactly one outer universal binder and an equation conclusion. A conditional rule must hold eventually in the relevant punctured, one-sided, or infinite neighborhood.
 9. **rewrite_in_sum.** Rewrite one selected summand with the same single-binder equation form, after proving the rule condition for every index in the entire finite or supported infinite summation range.
 10. **rewrite_in_setdesc.** Rewrite within one selected set comprehension using an explicit map from the rule binder to the set binder. The side condition may use unaffected local set conditions but not the very condition being rewritten.
 11. **apply.** Close a matching goal or reduce it to the unmatched prefix of premises of an implication chain. Any resulting premises remain explicit proof obligations.
 12. **use_condition.** Discharge an ordered prefix of an implication hypothesis and add the residual implication or conclusion as a new hypothesis. Each premise is supplied by a matching hypothesis or by an `obvious` fact that is itself checked.
 13. **get_exists.** Open consecutive outer existentials in a hypothesis using fresh names and update that hypothesis in place.
 14. **get_forall.** Open consecutive outer universal binders of the goal using fresh names and replace the goal with the checked body.
 15. **get_condition.** Move an ordered prefix of goal antecedents into the local context under explicitly assigned fresh hypothesis indices.
 16. **assert.** Add an intermediate proposition only after it is discharged either by automation or by a nonempty nested DSL proof. The nested proof receives a copy of the outer assumptions; hypotheses made inside it cannot leak into the outer state.
 17. **case_analysis.** Split a disjunctive hypothesis into one active proof gap for each recursively exposed disjunct. Acceptance requires every resulting branch to close.
 18. **or_intro.** Select the left or right side of a binary disjunctive goal and replace the goal by that selected proposition.

B.2 CHECKER SEMANTICS AND TRUST BOUNDARY

The checker implements the operational semantics of these commands as deterministic proof-state transitions. Commands that transform a formula state both the source and intended result; the source must match the current state, and the checker recomputes or validates the claimed change.

Quantifier instantiation uses capture-avoiding substitution and compares expressions modulo α -equivalence. Fresh-variable and hypothesis-index constraints make the execution trace unambiguous. The `assert` command may contain a nested DSL program, but facts created inside that local proof do not escape; only its checked conclusion is added to the outer state. Acceptance requires every active goal to close, so a program cannot leave a case-analysis branch or local assertion unfinished.

Rewriting beneath implicit binders receives additional checks. Ordinary `rewrite` is binder protecting; the three `rewrite_in` commands are explicit, scoped exceptions. Their rule must be a hypothesis with exactly one outer universal binder and an equation conclusion. Before substitution, conflicting binders are α -renamed, and a candidate rule instance that depends on a binder introduced locally by the rule is rejected. Every unchanged sibling, binder, limit point, summation bound, and set condition must remain α -equivalent, so algebraic normalization cannot be hidden as an additional rewrite. Equality must hold eventually in the relevant neighborhood for a limit, at every index—including initial indices—for a sum, or under the unaffected local conditions of a set comprehension. Excluding the condition currently being rewritten prevents a circular, self-justifying set rewrite. These checks are particularly important in analysis, where an otherwise plausible rewrite may capture a variable or omit a domain condition.

The parser, checker, and solver have distinct failure contracts. A parse error produces no proof state; an illegal transition leaves the current state unaccepted; and a solver that cannot establish its obligation produces no certificate. In particular, unsupported solver input is reported as *unknown*. Execution reports the first failed command together with the remaining local context and goal. Thus syntax failures, unsupported automation, unfinished branches, and mathematically invalid transitions remain separable in downstream analysis.

B.3 SOLVER PORTFOLIO AND CAPABILITY BOUNDARIES

The DSL command `autosolve` invokes a portfolio of specialized, deterministic solvers over the selected hypotheses. Selected backends may also be requested explicitly; for example, the interface exposes `LimitCalcSolver`. An unsupported expression is reported as *unknown*; an unresolved side condition or exhausted bounded search likewise produces no certificate. This conservative contract permits composition without turning an unsupported expression into a proof.

Table 11: Major solver families and their supported fragments; the table does not claim completeness for the corresponding mathematical theories.

Capability family	Representative solvers	Supported reasoning
Logical and structural	<code>EqbSolver</code> , <code>Reflexivity</code> , <code>NotUnfoldSolver</code> , <code>FunctionApplySolver</code>	Hypothesis matching modulo α -equivalence, reflexive relations, negation normalization, beta reduction, definition unfolding, and deterministic piecewise-function evaluation.
Domains and constants	<code>ConstTypeSolver</code> , <code>DomainTypeSolver</code> , <code>shared</code> exact-numeric analysis	Membership in standard number sets, closure under contextual type facts, and exact evaluation of closed constants subject to definedness checks.
Algebra and inequalities	<code>PolyRatSolver</code> , <code>RootFracSolver</code> , <code>RootPowerSolver</code> , <code>SgnPureSolver/SgnSolver</code> , <code>IntervalSolver</code> , <code>SqueezeSolver</code> , <code>SmtLraSolver</code>	Polynomial and rational identities, root and fraction normalization, sign propagation, linear arithmetic, interval reasoning, and bound propagation.
Calculus and analysis	<code>DerivSolver</code> , <code>ContinuousFuncSolver</code> , <code>IntegrableFuncSolver</code> , <code>IntegralSolver</code> , <code>EvalBarSolver</code> , <code>LimitCalcSolver</code>	Symbolic derivatives, elementary continuity, integrability on finite closed intervals, antiderivative verification, endpoint evaluation, and conservative finite-point or positive-infinity limits.

Logical reduction and domain analysis. `EqbSolver` matches a goal against an assumption modulo α -equivalence, while the separate reflexivity backend handles relations such as equality and subset inclusion. `FunctionApplySolver` performs capture-avoiding simultaneous beta reduction, unfolds admissible nonrecursive closed definitions, and selects a piecewise point value only when the selected guard is proved and every preceding guard is disproved. `ConstTypeSolver` is restricted to number-set membership of closed constant terms; concrete primality is checked only up to 10^6 . `DomainTypeSolver` instead propagates contextual membership through compound expressions while retaining nonzero, root, and power conditions.

Algebra and inequalities. Polynomial and rational normalization, root-fraction normalization, and root-power conversion are separated into specialized backends. Sign solvers propagate positive, negative, zero, and nonzero information through supported expression structure. `IntervalSolver` performs interval-constraint propagation and distinguishes defined, undefined, and unknown closed expressions. `SqueezeSolver` uses explicit comparison and sign facts in a bounded local search; it neither invokes another solver to manufacture a side condition nor performs unrestricted algebraic expansion. Linear real arithmetic is available through a separate backend rather than being silently assumed by every transformation.

Calculus and analysis. The calculus backends certify restricted, explicit fragments rather than invoking a general computer-algebra oracle. `DerivSolver` evaluates `FunDeri` expressions from lambdas or admissible nonrecursive definitions and supports higher and mixed partials; it does not invent derivatives for unknown symbolic functions. Conditional derivative and pointwise-continuity definitions must hold on a real open neighborhood of the evaluation point, not merely at that point. `ContinuousFuncSolver` handles resolved unary lambdas, arithmetic closure, and supported elementary compositions subject to their natural domains. `IntegrableFuncSolver` automatically proves integrability only on finite closed intervals, using continuity as a sufficient condition. `IntegralSolver` verifies a normalized antiderivative family by differentiation and requires an explicit, unconstrained real integration constant; it does not synthesize an indefinite integral. `EvalBarSolver` checks finite endpoint evaluation of an explicit lambda after validating division, powers, logarithms, roots, and tangent at both endpoints. `LimitCalcSolver` supports continuity-based finite substitution and conservative positive-infinity rational or growth-order cases, but not negative-infinity and general one-sided limits, L'Hopital's rule, or general asymptotic equivalence.

Definedness and exactness. Solver obligations retain their domain information. Division requires a nonzero denominator, logarithms require admissible arguments and bases, even roots require non-negative radicands, and a piecewise branch is selected only under the guarded conditions above. Substitution is binder-aware, preventing a fact about a free variable from being reused for a shadowing bound variable. Rational expressions are evaluated exactly when possible, while constants such as e and π use certified rational intervals for comparisons rather than ordinary floating-point approximation. Unknown precision or an unsupported construct is never silently converted into a proof.

B.4 THEOREM LIBRARY

Many proof gaps require named mathematical knowledge beyond computation and decision procedures. We therefore provide a theorem library in the same formal language as the proof states. The packaged solutions use the included theorem-library snapshot, which contains 514 consecutively indexed DSL entries. They cover sets, binary relations, functions, cardinality, countability, and induction; limits, continuity, differentiation, integration, sequences, and series; algebraic, trigonometric, exponential, logarithmic, hyperbolic, inverse-trigonometric, and complex identities; and reusable definitions for intervals, extrema, function and sequence properties, and multivariable differential operators. The snapshot contains high-level results such as the mean-value and squeeze theorems, definition-expansion and bridge lemmas for short local steps, and alpha-compatible variants of frequently used declarations.

Table 12 gives a descriptive organization by index range. These ranges summarize the bundled sequence; they are not additional types trusted by the checker.

Table 12: Descriptive coverage of the bundled 514-entry theorem-library snapshot.

Indices	Count	Descriptive coverage
1–75	75	Sets and binary relations
76–109	34	Functions, cardinality, and natural numbers
110–147	38	Core analysis results and proof rules
148–241	94	Algebraic, trigonometric, exponential, and complex identities
242–277	36	Auxiliary mathematical operators and definitions
278–352	75	Function properties, continuity, differentiability, sequences, and series
353–494	142	Executable bridge lemmas for analysis reasoning
495–514	20	Alpha-variable compatibility entries

Each entry pairs a stable numeric identifier and a human-readable title with a formal DSL statement. Titles are not assumed to be globally unique, so the numbered identifier is the primary reference. Library entries and proof gaps pass through the same semantic parser, so intervals, indexed sums, and set comprehensions receive the same AST-level interpretation. To use an entry, a DSL program invokes `get_prop`, quotes the entry, optionally supplies explicit substitutions for a subset of its outer universal binders, and states the resulting hypothesis. The checker resolves the numbered entry, performs capture-avoiding instantiation and beta reduction, and accepts the hypothesis only when it is α -equivalent to the recomputed instance. Its premises must then be discharged explicitly. A model therefore cannot cite a nonexistent theorem or silently discard its side conditions, and missing library knowledge remains an observable failure mode.

This 514-entry theorem snapshot is included in the final artifact and used to replay its packaged solutions. Among the 7,727 accepted programs, 569 cite at least one numbered library entry; they contain 1,053 references spanning 180 distinct theorem identifiers. The library is thus used selectively alongside solver- and context-driven certificates.

B.5 UNIFIED VERIFIER-GUIDED AGENT WORKFLOW

The verifier-guided baseline integrates complementary mechanisms explored by four workflow implementations behind one task and checker interface; it does not assume that every implementation contains every mechanism. The language model proposes and revises DSL programs, whereas a deterministic controller atomically claims gaps, pins the checker and theorem-library versions, assigns budgets, and executes each candidate in an isolated work area. Attempts retain their DSL, first failure, residual state, and terminal decision, enabling replay and recovery. Figure 2 summarizes the workflow.




Figure 2: Verifier-guided agent baseline. Darker nodes denote model-directed work, while dashed arrows denote reuse. Stalled FAST attempts escalate to targeted DEEP search; acceptance requires an admit-free root replay and semantic audit before outcomes can guide later gaps.

Screening and FAST search. Screening performs source and terminal-evidence checks and first tests a cheap candidate such as `autosolve all.hypothesis`. Unresolved gaps enter bounded FAST search over short hypothesis, witness, binder, theorem, rewrite, assertion, and solver routes. For each attempt, the checker returns the first failed instruction, compact local evidence, and the residual proof state. A retry is justified only when it changes the route or proof state; a repeated failure signature or exhausted budget triggers escalation rather than another equivalent solver permutation.

DEEP search and subgaps. DEEP search retrieves a small set of relevant theorems, solver cards, recipes, or verified examples, then identifies the smallest bridge between the current state and target. It may organize that bridge as local assertions or recursive subgaps. Search-time placeholders can expose those subgaps, but they are never accepted as evidence: every subgap must be backfilled, and the complete root program must be replayed with zero admits.

Acceptance and typed diagnoses. A machine pass remains provisional. Acceptance additionally requires a closed, admit-free root proof and semantic checks of theorem instantiation, quantifier scope, rewriting, domain conditions, dependencies, and possible inconsistent assumptions. Other runs receive evidence-backed diagnoses such as invalid data, missing theorem or backend capability, known limitation, bug, or a localized unresolved blocker. Audited certificates populate the proof bank, while validated recurring failures populate the experience bank used for subsequent routing and retrieval.

Audited reuse. Atomic claims allow workers to process disjoint gaps concurrently, while publication into shared state is serialized. A successful proof enters the reference bank only after machine and semantic gates pass and duplicate content is removed. Repeated failure signatures first become experience candidates; they influence later routing only after mechanical regression evidence or review validates the proposed recovery rule. Retrieval is deliberately targeted, exposing a small ranked set rather than the complete history.

B.6 ORIGINAL-VERSION BASELINE AND REPORTING PROTOCOL

Treating `autosolve` as a lightweight automated theorem prover inside the DSL, we first apply it to all 26,116 instances; it closes 2,838 gaps. The remaining 23,278 instances are then processed by our verifier-guided agent workflow, using Codex as the agent and `gpt-5.6-sol` as its underlying model. Under the same checker and theorem-library snapshot, the workflow produces accepted DSL proofs for a further 4,889 gaps. The complete accounting is shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Checker-accepted certificates for the original ProofGap version. “Share of all” is measured over 26,116 gaps; the workflow stage rate is measured over its 23,278-instance residual input.

Stage	Inputs	Newly closed	Share of all	Stage rate
Direct <code>autosolve</code>	26,116	2,838	10.9%	10.9%
Verifier-guided workflow	23,278	4,889	18.7%	21.0%
Combined coverage	26,116	7,727	29.6%	—

Stage attribution prevents successes found by `autosolve` from being credited to the agent workflow. Operationally, a direct certificate consists of exactly one nonempty command, after removal of an optional numeric step prefix, and that command begins with `autosolve`; every other accepted program is assigned to the workflow stage. We report the workflow as a single baseline rather than attributing completions to its internal FAST or DEEP routes.

Every accepted DSL program is replayable under the checker and therefore provides an executable ground-truth solution for the corresponding gap in the original version of the benchmark. This is a solution-level notion of ground truth: multiple distinct DSL programs may validly certify the same local obligation. The remaining 18,389 gaps have no packaged certificate and are not treated as false or unprovable.

B.7 CERTIFICATE PACKAGE AND INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

The final original-version artifact contains one canonical directory for each of the 26,116 gaps. Exactly 7,727 directories contain both the gap and an accepted DSL program, while 18,389 contain the gap only. Seven secondary solutions for already represented canonical pairs are excluded, so the reported count is over unique exercise-gap pairs. A 26,116-row manifest records the canonical pair, whether a program is present, provenance, and a SHA-256 digest for every gap and every available program. A machine-readable build summary records the aggregate counts and component digests. The artifact also contains the 514-entry theorem snapshot used during replay.

The final artifact includes its packaged verifiers for 64-bit Linux and Windows together with a Python-standard-library verification driver. The driver executes only cases that contain a DSL program; gap-only cases are counted and skipped. It uses isolated temporary settings, result, and log locations for each case and normalizes UTF-8 byte-order marks, line endings, and blank lines in a temporary copy, leaving the submitted gap unchanged. Parallelism is configurable (default eight workers), as is the per-case timeout (default 120 seconds). A full replay is launched with `python3 check.py`; command-line options can select the platform, worker count, and timeout. Running the driver produces per-case execution and error logs, an aggregate tabular report, and a machine-readable summary.

A packaged case passes only when all of the following conditions hold:

1. the verifier process exits with status zero;
2. the structured result uses schema `test_dsl_structured_v2`;
3. `final_status` is `finish`;
4. both `proof_finished` and `proof_verified` are `true`;
5. both `admit_count` and `split_gap_count` are zero; and
6. standard output contains the terminal marker `dsl proof finished`.

The driver itself exits successfully only when every packaged DSL case passes all of these checks. Consequently, a merely parsable program, an unfinished case branch, an admitted subgap, or a process that exits cleanly without the structured proof evidence is not classified as passing by the replay driver.

C EVALUATION PROTOCOL

The Lean evaluation uses two paired target types. A *proof-gap target* asks the model to prove one local theorem with the context accumulated from earlier steps of the reference solution. Its *parent-exercise target* asks the model to prove the corresponding complete exercise theorem from the original premises. The complete evaluation contains 26,116 proof gaps from 3,015 exercises and their corresponding 3,015 parent-exercise theorems. The same set of exercises is used for paired gap-exercise and macro-coverage analyses. The reference proof is withheld in both settings.

C.1 PROMPT AND VERIFICATION INTERFACE

For a proof-gap target, the prompt contains the original imports, definitions, helper declarations, statements of preceding gap theorems, and the exact target statement. Every gap proof body is replaced by a marker or an omission comment, and later declarations are excluded. Earlier theorem statements remain available because they form part of the local context represented by the gap. For a parent-exercise target, the prompt contains the imports, definitions, and complete exercise statement, but no intermediate gap theorem or reference proof. In both cases, the model returns a JSON object whose `proof` field is a complete replacement for the target's `by` block.

The returned proof is inserted into the original module, with all other source text unchanged, and checked in a fresh process. The pinned environment uses Lean `v4.29.0-rc6` and Mathlib revision `5c8398df528176d9c87ccd9226ba8f7c8852d59c`. A candidate is accepted only if the reconstructed module compiles and a recursive `assert_no_sorry` check confirms that the target has no dependency on `sorryAx`. The checker also rejects proof escapes and declarations

that could change the trusted environment, including `sorry`, `admit`, `axiom`, `constant`, and `run_tac`. Candidate checks are isolated so that generated files and process state cannot be reused across targets.

C.2 MODELS AND CANDIDATE BUDGET

The full paired evaluation uses Goedel-Prover-V2-8B, DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, and Kimina-Prover-Distill-8B. ProofGap-280 additionally includes Kimi-K3, DeepSeek-V4-Pro, GLM-5.2, Claude-Opus-4.8, and GPT-5.6-sol. Each model receives the same target-specific prompt interface and generates eight candidate proofs per target. Each generation is capped at 8,192 output tokens. We use temperature 0.6 and nucleus-sampling parameter $\text{top}_p = 0.95$. The comparison is therefore controlled at the *target* level: one proof gap and one complete exercise theorem each receive eight candidates. It is not an exercise-level compute comparison, because an exercise containing multiple gaps induces multiple independently evaluated local targets.

C.3 PASS@ k AND EXERCISE-LEVEL COVERAGE

For fixed- n runs, let T be the number of targets, $n = 8$ the number of checked candidates per target, and c_i the number of accepted candidates for target i . For $k \leq n$, we use the standard unbiased estimator of Chen et al. (2021)

$$\widehat{\text{Pass@}k} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \left(1 - \frac{\binom{n-c_i}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right),$$

with the ratio interpreted as zero when $n - c_i < k$. At $k = 8$, this reduces exactly to the fraction of targets with at least one accepted candidate. All reported Lean evaluation runs have eight checked candidates per target and use this estimator. Malformed, timed-out, prohibited, or noncompiling returned candidates count as failures.

For the full proof-gap set, micro averaging assigns equal weight to each gap. The exercise-level diagnostic analyses use Pass@8. Let N be the number of paired exercises, n_i the number of gaps in exercise i , and $y_{ij}^{(8)} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicate whether at least one checked candidate solves its j -th gap under the eight-candidate budget. At this budget, micro-averaged gap performance and macro-averaged exercise coverage are

$$\text{GapPass}_{\text{micro}}@8 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} y_{ij}^{(8)}}{\sum_{i=1}^N n_i}, \quad \text{GapCov}_{\text{macro}}@8 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} y_{ij}^{(8)}.$$

Micro averaging weights all gaps equally; macro coverage first computes the fraction of solved gaps within each exercise and then weights all exercises equally. The reported exercise-level means and conditional analyses use all 3,015 paired exercises.

D PROOFGAP-280 CONSTRUCTION

ProofGap-280 is a reduced-cost, balanced subset for cross-model comparison. Its construction jointly controls mathematical topic and the length of the Lean reference proof. Reference-proof length is used only as reproducible sampling metadata: the reference proof itself, its length, and its hash are not included in the model prompt, and line count is not assumed to be a complete measure of mathematical difficulty.

D.1 LENGTH STRATA AND TOPIC MAPPING

The benchmark catalog parses the exact `by` proof body of each gap and counts its physical lines after removing trailing whitespace. The four strata are

TINY :	1–2	gold-proof lines,
SHORT :	3–5	gold-proof lines,
MEDIUM :	6–15	gold-proof lines,
LONG :	16 or more	gold-proof lines.

The seven topics follow the source-area mapping used in the main paper: functions, limits, and continuity; single-variable differentiation; indefinite and definite integrals; series; multivariable differentiation; parameter integrals; and multiple, line, and surface integrals.

D.2 BALANCED SAMPLING PROCEDURE

We form the Cartesian product of seven topics and four length strata, producing 28 sampling cells. Each cell contributes exactly ten gaps, giving 40 gaps per topic, 70 per length stratum, and 280 in total. Within each cell, eligible catalog entries are shuffled by Python’s deterministic `random.Random(20260727)` generator and selected subject to at most one gap from each base exercise number. The latter rule also prevents variants such as two separately indexed subquestions of the same numbered exercise from both entering the subset. Consequently, the 280 gaps have 280 distinct parent-exercise targets. After selection, rows are sorted by exercise number, exercise variant, and gap number to give a stable evaluation order.

Table 14: ProofGap-280 allocation across the 28 topic-by-length cells.

Topic	Tiny	Short	Medium	Long	Total
Functions, limits, and continuity	10	10	10	10	40
Single-variable differentiation	10	10	10	10	40
Indefinite and definite integrals	10	10	10	10	40
Series	10	10	10	10	40
Multivariable differentiation	10	10	10	10	40
Parameter integrals	10	10	10	10	40
Multiple, line, and surface integrals	10	10	10	10	40
Total	70	70	70	70	280

The released subset manifest records the seed, strategy, cell counts, stable subset position, exercise identifier, source topic, length stratum, reference proof line count, gap identifier, and paired original-exercise identifier for every selected row. It therefore permits exact regeneration of the subset and direct alignment of every gap result with its parent-exercise result.

E ADDITIONAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

E.1 FULL-SET PASS@ k

Table 15 gives the complete Pass@1, Pass@3, and Pass@8 results for the three specialized provers. The proof-gap columns use all 26,116 local targets, and the parent-exercise columns use their 3,015 corresponding complete theorems.

Table 15: Full-set Pass@ k (%) for proof gaps and complete parent-exercise theorems.

Model	All proof gaps			Parent exercises		
	Pass@1	Pass@3	Pass@8	Pass@1	Pass@3	Pass@8
Goedel-Prover-V2-8B	26.60	32.85	35.39	2.17	3.36	4.28
DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B	26.12	31.84	33.27	1.92	2.67	3.32
Kimina-Prover-Distill-8B	25.56	30.77	31.99	1.74	2.42	2.92

The standard-tactic union solves 2,925 gaps, or 11.20% of the full set. Removing these leaves 23,191 tactic-unsolved gaps (88.80%). As shown in Table 17, the learned provers retain substantial performance on this residual set; their results are not explained only by obligations already solved by the evaluated tactic portfolio.

Table 16: Solve rates of standard Lean tactics on 26,116 proof gaps. The union succeeds if any evaluated tactic succeeds.

Tactic	Solve rate (%)
assumption	1.78
simp	1.88
aesop	9.67
norm_num	2.45
linarith	2.75
nlinarith	2.85
ring	1.08
omega	0.17
Union	11.20

Table 17: Performance (%) on the 23,191 gaps not solved by the standard-tactic union.

Model	Pass@1	Pass@8	Solved at Pass@8
Goedel-Prover-V2-8B	18.61	27.48	6,374
DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B	17.81	25.16	5,834
Kimina-Prover-Distill-8B	17.07	23.57	5,467

E.2 PROOFGAP-280 BREAKDOWN

The main paper reports overall Pass@1, Pass@3, and Pass@8 for all models on ProofGap-280. The following tables give Pass@8 breakdowns for the five general-purpose models. Each entry in Tables 18 and 19 reports *proof gap* / *parent exercise*. Topic cells have denominator 40 and length cells have denominator 70.

Table 18: ProofGap-280 Pass@8 (%) by mathematical topic. Each entry is proof-gap / parent-exercise performance.

Model	Functions & limits		Single-var. diff.		Indef./def. integrals		Series	
GPT-5.6-sol	95.0/	55.0	90.0/	20.0	90.0/	2.5	90.0/	17.5
Claude-Opus-4.8	87.5/	37.5	87.5/	17.5	92.5/	2.5	92.5/	10.0
Kimi-K3	85.0/	27.5	80.0/	12.5	90.0/	0.0	80.0/	5.0
DeepSeek-V4-Pro	65.0/	10.0	57.5/	5.0	77.5/	0.0	65.0/	5.0
GLM-5.2	65.0/	5.0	57.5/	2.5	72.5/	0.0	67.5/	0.0

Model	Multivar. diff.		Parameter integrals		Multiple/line/surface integrals		Overall	
GPT-5.6-sol	90.0/	25.0	77.5/	7.5	82.5/	22.5	87.9/	21.4
Claude-Opus-4.8	90.0/	10.0	82.5/	2.5	82.5/	17.5	87.9/	13.9
Kimi-K3	82.5/	5.0	75.0/	2.5	75.0/	10.0	81.1/	8.9
DeepSeek-V4-Pro	65.0/	5.0	67.5/	2.5	75.0/	7.5	67.5/	5.0
GLM-5.2	60.0/	5.0	65.0/	2.5	67.5/	7.5	65.0/	3.2

Table 19: ProofGap-280 Pass@8 (%) by the reference proof length of the selected gap. Each entry is proof-gap / parent-exercise performance. The parent-exercise column is grouped by its paired gap’s stratum, not by the length of a parent-exercise reference proof.

Model	Tiny		Short		Medium		Long		Overall	
GPT-5.6-sol	100.0/	22.9	98.6/	24.3	92.9/	22.9	60.0/	15.7	87.9/	21.4
Claude-Opus-4.8	98.6/	12.9	98.6/	18.6	88.6/	14.3	65.7/	10.0	87.9/	13.9
Kimi-K3	98.6/	8.6	98.6/	11.4	92.9/	10.0	34.3/	5.7	81.1/	8.9
DeepSeek-V4-Pro	100.0/	7.1	91.4/	8.6	65.7/	2.9	12.9/	1.4	67.5/	5.0
GLM-5.2	97.1/	4.3	87.1/	5.7	64.3/	1.4	11.4/	1.4	65.0/	3.2

Length sensitivity. All five models solve at least 97.1% of Tiny gaps, whereas Long-gap Pass@8 ranges from 65.7% for Claude-Opus-4.8 to 11.4% for GLM-5.2. Much of the cross-model separation is therefore concentrated in longer local derivations. Reference-proof line count remains a coverage proxy rather than a complete measure of intrinsic difficulty.

Local versus end-to-end reasoning. GPT-5.6-sol and Claude-Opus-4.8 tie at 87.9% on gaps but reach 21.4% and 13.9%, respectively, on the paired exercises. Even in the Tiny stratum, parent-exercise Pass@8 is only 4.3–22.9%. The parent rows are grouped by the paired gap’s length, not by parent-theorem proof length.

Topic sensitivity. Parent exercises are easiest in functions and limits for every model. Indefinite and definite integral gaps reach 72.5–92.5%, but the paired exercise score is 2.5% for GPT-5.6-sol and Claude-Opus-4.8 and zero for the other models; parameter integrals are also difficult end to end. Local success therefore leaves substantial work in lemma selection, analytic side conditions, and proof composition.