

INEQAGENT: AGENTIC INEQUALITY PROVING IN LEAN WITH SYMBOLIC COMPUTATION

Gaolei He¹, Jinhui Li¹, Ruobing Zuo¹, Xia Zeng², Zhengfeng Yang¹

¹School of Software Engineering, East China Normal University
Shanghai, China

²School of Computer and Information Science, Southwest University
Chongqing, China

{glhe, jinhui1, rbzuo}@stu.ecnu.edu.cn
xzeng0712@swu.edu.cn, zfyang@sei.ecnu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Formal inequality proving requires mathematical reasoning and exact computation, often connected through intermediate lemmas and goal reformulations. We introduce IneqAgent, an agentic framework combining LLM reasoning with symbolic computation for inequality proving in Lean 4. Lemma-level Monte Carlo Tree Search coordinates lemma construction, goal reformulation, and symbolic backend selection. Complementary sum-of-squares, Bernstein, and successive difference-substitution backends produce exact certificates for local Lean proof generation. The agent integrates these proofs with LLM-generated steps and uses Lean feedback to construct complete proofs checked against the original theorem statements. On four benchmarks, IneqAgent with DeepSeek-V4-Flash solves 175 of 186 problems (94.09%), achieving the highest overall success rate among the evaluated methods. Across four backbones, it achieves higher success rates at low LLM inference cost thresholds than Direct Agent using the same backbone, with lower mean inference costs over each method’s successful runs. We also obtain Lean-verified strengthenings of Dittert’s conjecture in dimensions four and five, and certify the Holens–Djokovic (4, 4) inequality, implying Merris’s conjecture in dimension four. Code is available at <https://github.com/gaolei-he/IneqAgent>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Inequality proving is an important task in automated mathematical reasoning (Wei et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025a). Even concise inequalities can require carefully chosen substitutions, auxiliary bounds, and substantial algebraic computation. Proving them in Lean (de Moura & Ullrich, 2021) requires suitable mathematical strategies and explicit justification of each step, including sign and domain conditions.

Large language models (LLMs) support formal proof construction through learned proof generation and interaction with tools and verifiers (Lin et al., 2025; Ren et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025; Varambally et al., 2026; Requena et al., 2026). Symbolic methods complement these capabilities by constructing checkable algebraic certificates (Peyrl & Parrilo, 2008; Kaltofen et al., 2012; Magron & Safey El Din, 2018). Combining them presents two challenges. First, symbolic backends depend on the goal’s algebraic form and assumptions: a rational inequality, for example, may require denominator positivity before polynomial reformulation. Second, exact certificate construction can be computationally demanding. When numerical solvers are used, floating-point candidates typically satisfy certificate identities only approximately and require exact recovery and verification.

We introduce IneqAgent, an agentic framework combining LLM reasoning, symbolic computation, and Lean verification. The agent uses lemma-level MCTS to explore proof paths, choosing backend calls, goal reformulations, and intermediate lemmas according to the goal’s structure and backend requirements. It integrates certificate-derived local proofs with LLM-generated steps, rewrites, and proofs of side conditions. Lean checks the complete proof against the original theorem statement.

The symbolic module provides three complementary backends. Using Putinar-type certificates (Putinar, 1993), the sum-of-squares (SOS) backend extends the numerical-symbolic certification procedure of Kaltofen et al. (2012) from unconstrained problems to problems with equality and inequality constraints through sequential recovery. The Bernstein backend combines numerical and exact linear programming with subdivision for box-constrained goals. Successive difference substitution uses exact substitutions and coefficient nonnegativity checks for polynomial goals over nonnegative variables. The module supports applicable original goals and intermediate lemmas.

We apply IneqAgent to conjectures on matrix permanents, obtaining Lean-verified proofs of strengthened inequalities for Dittert’s conjecture in dimensions four and five that establish quantitative stability and unique maximizers. We also verify an exact SOS certificate for the Holens–Djokovic (4, 4) inequality in Lean and derive Merris’s conjecture in dimension four. On four inequality benchmarks, IneqAgent with DeepSeek-V4-Flash solves 175 of 186 problems (94.09%), achieving the highest overall success rate among the evaluated methods. It also records lower mean solving times than the evaluated LLM-based provers. Across four backbones, it achieves lower mean LLM inference costs and higher success rates at low cost thresholds than Direct Agent using the same backbone. Both means are computed over each method’s own successful runs. Ablations further support combining MCTS with symbolic computation.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We introduce IneqAgent, which uses lemma-level MCTS to coordinate LLM reasoning, goal reformulation, and symbolic computation, producing complete proofs checked by Lean against the original theorem statements.
- We develop a symbolic proving module with complementary SOS, Bernstein, and difference-substitution backends. We extend the recovery procedure of Kaltofen et al. (2012) to constrained SOS certificates through sequential recovery, and translate certificates from all three backends into local Lean proofs.
- We demonstrate applications to matrix-permanent conjectures and introduce LitIneq, a benchmark of 74 formalized inequality tasks from research papers and formal-verification projects. We evaluate IneqAgent through benchmark comparisons, inference-cost analysis, and ablation studies.

2 RELATED WORK

Symbolic Methods for Inequality Proving. General-purpose systems provide arithmetic and algebraic reasoning: Z3 supports SMT-based arithmetic solving (de Moura & Bjørner, 2008), while Maple provides symbolic manipulation and quantifier elimination (Heck, 1993). Symbolic-numeric computation methods convert approximate solutions into exact certificates (Peyrl & Parrilo, 2008; Kaltofen et al., 2012; Magron & Safey El Din, 2018). Other approaches exploit domain structure, including Bernstein representations with subdivision for box-constrained problems (Ray & Nataraj, 2009) and successive difference substitution for nonnegative variables (Xia & Yang, 2016). Isabelle/HOL’s `Sum_of_Squares` library integrates SOS certificates with formal proof checking (Chaieb & Meyer, 2025).

LLMs for Formal Theorem Proving. Neural provers generate tactics from formal proof states and search over their continuations (Polu & Sutskever, 2020; Lample et al., 2022), with retrieval supplying relevant library lemmas (Yang et al., 2023). More recent models incorporate proof data synthesis, self-correction, and subgoal decomposition (Lin et al., 2025; Ren et al., 2025). Agentic systems combine these capabilities with tool use and verifier feedback. Hilbert recursively combines informal reasoning with formal subgoal proving (Varambally et al., 2026), while AxProverBase uses a modular loop of proof proposals, review, memory, and tool use (Requena et al., 2026).

LLMs with Symbolic Reasoning for Inequality Proving. Existing systems assign different roles to learned reasoning and symbolic computation. LIPS combines symbolic generation and pruning of scaling steps with LLM-generated rewrites and goal ranking, checking the resulting proofs in Lean (Li et al., 2025a). IneqSearch combines symbolic decomposition with an LLM agent that proposes transformations, and expands its theorem database with newly proved inequalities (Li et al.,

2025b). For unconstrained polynomial inequalities, NSPI uses an LLM to conjecture approximate SOS decompositions, followed by numerical refinement, rational recovery, and Lean proof generation (Zuo et al., 2026). IneqAgent uses lemma-level MCTS to coordinate intermediate lemma construction, goal reformulation, and symbolic backend selection according to the current assumptions and algebraic structure. Its complementary backends produce exact certificates that are translated into local Lean proofs and combined with agent-generated steps to prove the original theorem.

3 METHODOLOGY

Problem formulation. We study the problem of proving inequalities in real variables. The expressions involved are constructed from real variables and constants using arithmetic operations and elementary functions, such as square roots, exponentials, logarithms, and trigonometric functions. For $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a typical inequality-proving problem is to establish

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in D, \quad (1)$$

where the domain D is specified by the theorem to be proved, as follows:

$$D := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \phi_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m; \psi_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0, j = 1, \dots, \ell\}.$$

Here, f , ϕ_i , and ψ_j are real-valued expressions of the form described above. When $m = \ell = 0$, we have $K = \mathbb{R}^n$, corresponding to an unconstrained problem. Strict inequalities are also allowed in both the constraints and the target. The input is a theorem statement formalized in Lean 4, and the task is to construct a complete proof accepted by the Lean kernel. For notational simplicity, we denote the Lean theorem-proving representation of problem (1) as $\Gamma \vdash G$.

To address problem (1), we propose IneqAgent, an agentic framework for automated inequality proving in Lean 4. The agent combines mathematical reasoning with symbolic computation to reformulate goals, construct intermediate lemmas, and assemble formal proofs. IneqAgent uses computational feedback from the symbolic computation module and diagnostics from the Lean proof module to guide and advance its subsequent proving steps. The overall design is illustrated in Fig. 1. We describe the framework in Section 3.1 and the symbolic computation module in Section 3.2.




Figure 1: Overview of IneqAgent. The agent normalizes the formal statement and assesses each goal for symbolic computation. It develops intermediate lemmas when further reasoning is needed, coordinates tool calls, and integrates local proofs into the current proof context. Symbolic feedback and Lean diagnostics guide subsequent attempts until the original theorem is proved.

3.1 AGENTIC FRAMEWORK FOR INEQUALITY PROVING

Assume that the inequality constraint problem to be proved is represented in Lean as $\Gamma \vdash G$. IneqAgent first normalizes the input problem into the standard form in (1). To facilitate

more effective proof search, IneqAgent incorporates a dedicated symbolic computation module, `sym.com.Module` (see Section 3.2), while its core proof reasoning module is an LLM prover based on the *lemma-level MCTS with symbolic awareness* framework. Based on the current proof state, IneqAgent determines whether to invoke `sym.com.Module`. When applicable, the module exploits algebraic computation to accelerate proof search and reduce the number of direct LLM reasoning calls, thereby improving computational efficiency. In addition, after each lemma introduction, reasoning step, or problem decomposition during the proof process, IneqAgent invokes Lean to formally verify the resulting proof state and ensure the correctness of the reasoning.

Lemma-Level MCTS with Symbol Awareness. The symbol-aware LLM prover adopts a lemma-level MCTS based proof search strategy, where each proof advancement can be viewed as an MCTS generation step consisting of *selection*, *action*, and *evaluation*. Specifically, a proof state consists of a set of premises Γ , a target proposition G , and a context recording the current node state and its score, as detailed below. Starting from the initial proof state $\Gamma \vdash G$ as the root node, IneqAgent constructs an MCTS tree. It first selects the root node v for expansion. The action begins with a symbolic-awareness check (described below). If the current form is not supported by the symbolic module, IneqAgent invokes the LLM to generate an appropriate lemma from the current proof state, and then invokes Lean to verify the lemma and derive a new proof state $\langle p^{(1)} \rangle \vdash g_1$ as a child node. Lean classifies the resulting state as *open*, *fail*, or *solved*; if the node is verified as solved, the proof terminates. A state is *solved* only when all proof obligations of the original theorem are discharged and Lean accepts the complete proof without `sorry` or `admit`; proving an intermediate lemma or resolving one subgoal leaves the state *open* when other obligations remain. IneqAgent then evaluates the new child node using Lean checking results and LLM-based assessment of proof progress, and assigns a score to the node as described below. The scores of all nodes along the selected path are subsequently updated.

IneqAgent then performs another selection from the root node v and continues with lemma introduction and node evaluation. To improve exploration of potentially promising proof paths, the root node is expanded whenever its number of accepted child nodes is below the current threshold k , according to a root-priority rule (see below). The current expansion threshold is given by $k := B(v)$, where the design of $B(\cdot)$ is described in Appendix A. If the proof has not yet been completed, a node u is selected for the next expansion by descending through the highest-scoring open child at each level, as described below. IneqAgent performs symbolic awareness or lemma introduction on u and evaluates the resulting node. This MCTS generation process is repeated until a node successfully passes Lean proof checking and is marked as solved. When a solved node is found, IneqAgent traverses the path from the root node to that node and extracts all intermediate proof steps to construct a complete Lean proof of the original problem.

Selection: Root-Priority Rule. During lemma-level MCTS based proof search, IneqAgent initializes a new root node and repeatedly expands it until it has $k := B(v)$ child nodes. Each subsequent exploration begins at the root and selects the child with the highest score. If the selected node has fewer than k children, it is expanded to generate an additional child node; otherwise, the selection operation identifies its highest-scoring child for the next exploration step.

Action: Symbol-Aware Actions. When an open node is selected for the first time, IneqAgent first performs symbolic awareness by checking whether the current theorem has an algebraic form supported by `sym.com.Module`. If the form is supported, IneqAgent directly invokes `sym.com.Module` to attempt an algebraic proof. If the form is unsupported or the symbolic computation fails, IneqAgent invokes the LLM to generate an appropriate lemma from the current proof state and adds it to the premise set. Lean is then invoked to verify the lemma and use it for subsequent reasoning. The resulting state can be *fail* or *solved*, or it can produce an open subgoal, which is recorded as an *open* state. This process completes the expansion of a new node.

Evaluation: Lean Feedback and Proof-Evolution Scoring. The score of a newly expanded node u follows the standard MCTS formulation (see Appendix A). A key component is the mean reward $Q(u) = \frac{W(u)}{N(u)}$, where $N(u)$ denotes the number of visits to node u , and $W(u)$ denotes its cumulative reward, updated as $W(u) \leftarrow W(u) + r(u)$. The reward $r(u)$ is determined by the Lean-verified proof state of u :

$$r(u) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } u \text{ is solved,} \\ 0, & \text{if } u \text{ fails,} \\ \lambda r_u^{\text{Lean}} + (1 - \lambda) r_u^{\text{LLM}}, & \text{if } u \text{ is open.} \end{cases}$$

Here, $r_u^{\text{Lean}} \in [0, 1]$ is a heuristic progress score based on Lean checking results and proof-text features, including changes in unfinished markers and newly added structured proof steps, as detailed in Appendix A. In contrast, $r_u^{\text{LLM}} \in [0, 1]$ is obtained by comparing the parent and candidate proofs, using the candidate’s Lean checking result to assess progress toward completing the original theorem. It rewards resolved proof obligations and useful intermediate results. IneqAgent then backpropagates the updated reward and updates the scores of all nodes along the selected path.

3.2 LEAN-VERIFIED SYMBOLIC PROVING

The symbolic module addresses polynomial nonnegativity goals within the general problem formulation above. These goals are prepared by the agent and may coincide with the input theorem or arise from reformulations and intermediate lemmas during proof search. Specifically, the module seeks to establish

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in K, \quad (2)$$

where

$$K := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m; h_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0, j = 1, \dots, \ell\},$$

and p, g_i, h_j are polynomials. The unconstrained case corresponds to $m = \ell = 0$. On success, the module returns an exact certificate for subsequent Lean proof generation and verification. If no certificate is obtained, it returns feedback to the agent for further proof search.

SOS-based proving under polynomial constraints. Motivated by Putinar’s Positivstellensatz (Putinar, 1993), the SOS backend searches for a certificate of the form

$$p = \sigma_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i \sigma_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j, \quad (3)$$

where $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$ are sums of squares and $q_1, \dots, q_{\ell}$ are polynomial multipliers unrestricted in sign. Such an identity is sufficient to establish the nonnegativity of p on K . Imposing degree bounds on the SOS polynomials and equality multipliers yields a finite-dimensional SOS relaxation. Each SOS polynomial is represented as $\sigma_i = z_i^T G_i z_i$, where z_i is a monomial vector and $G_i \succeq 0$ is a Gram matrix. Matching coefficients in the certificate identity gives linear equality constraints on the Gram-matrix entries and the coefficients of the equality multipliers. Together with the positive semidefiniteness constraints, these define an SDP feasibility problem, which we solve numerically using MOSEK.

For exact certification, we extend the hybrid symbolic-numeric recovery procedure of Kaltofen et al. (2012), developed for unconstrained problems, to the constrained SOS identity above. Recovery proceeds sequentially: we first recover rational positive semidefinite Gram matrices for the inequality SOS multipliers $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ and keep these multipliers fixed. The remaining task is to recover σ_0 and the equality multipliers from $p - \sum_{i=1}^m g_i \sigma_i = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j$. Gauss–Newton iterations refine the main SOS factorization and the equality multipliers to reduce the residual in this remaining identity. Rational recovery and exact coefficient correction then seek a rational main Gram matrix G_0 and rational equality multipliers satisfying the identity exactly. The complete polynomial identity and the positive semidefiniteness of all recovered Gram matrices are checked using exact arithmetic. Only certificates passing these checks are returned for subsequent Lean proof generation. Details are provided in Appendix B.1.

Bernstein-based proving under box constraints. For box-constrained goals, we use Bernstein representations and recursive subdivision, following Ray & Nataraj (2009). For a box

$$K = \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, b_i] \quad \text{with } a_i < b_i,$$

the affine substitution $x_i = a_i + (b_i - a_i)y_i$ maps the problem to the unit box $[0, 1]^n$. We denote the transformed target polynomial by $\tilde{p}$. Choose a multidegree bound $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ such that $d_i \geq \deg_{y_i} \tilde{p}$ for each i . The Bernstein basis polynomials are

$$B_{\mathbf{d}, \alpha}(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \binom{d_i}{\alpha_i} y_i^{\alpha_i} (1 - y_i)^{d_i - \alpha_i}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq d_i. \quad (4)$$

We seek a representation $\tilde{p} = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} B_{\mathbf{d}, \alpha}$ with $c_{\alpha} \geq 0$, where the sum ranges over the indices in Eq. 4. Let A have the monomial coefficient vectors of these Bernstein polynomials as its columns, and let $\mathbf{v}$ be the coefficient vector of $\tilde{p}$ in the same monomial basis. Matching coefficients yields the LP feasibility problem

$$\text{find } \mathbf{c} \quad \text{subject to} \quad A\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{c} \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

Any feasible solution certifies $\tilde{p} \geq 0$ on $[0, 1]^n$, since every Bernstein basis polynomial is nonnegative on this domain. We first solve this feasibility problem in floating-point arithmetic to obtain a numerical candidate.

If the numerical solve does not yield a suitable candidate certificate, we select a variable and split its interval into two subintervals, leaving the intervals of all other variables unchanged, and recursively apply the procedure to both resulting subboxes. When a candidate is obtained, we treat its near-zero entries as tentative zeros. Fixing the corresponding coefficients to zero yields a reduced LP, which we solve in exact arithmetic. If exact re-solving succeeds, we check the complete coefficient-matching identity and the nonnegativity of all recovered coefficients against the original problem on the current box. A local certificate is accepted only after these checks pass. The original box is certified once every leaf box has an accepted certificate. The local certificates and the subdivision tree are recorded for subsequent Lean proof generation, including verification that the subboxes cover the original domain.

Successive difference substitution. For polynomial nonnegativity on the nonnegative orthant $K = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, DiffSub applies the successive difference substitution method described by Xia & Yang (2016, Chapter 10). For each permutation π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, consider the ordering $x_{\pi(1)} \geq \dots \geq x_{\pi(n)} \geq 0$ and introduce nonnegative difference variables through

$$x_{\pi(i)} = \sum_{j=i}^n t_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad t_j \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

Here, $t_i = x_{\pi(i)} - x_{\pi(i+1)}$ for $i < n$, and $t_n = x_{\pi(n)}$. If the polynomial obtained by substituting into p has only nonnegative coefficients, its nonnegativity follows from $t_j \geq 0$, certifying the current ordering branch. Considering all variable orderings covers the entire domain K .

For every unresolved branch, the procedure repeats the ordering and substitution on the new nonnegative variables; certified branches require no further expansion. A complete certificate is obtained when every leaf branch is certified. All substitutions and coefficient checks use exact arithmetic, so no numerical recovery is required. The certificate records the ordering cases, substitution identities, and polynomial expansions at the leaves. If the search budget is exhausted while some branches remain unresolved, the backend returns an unsolved result.

The Translator converts each exact certificate into a local Lean proof. The agent integrates this proof into the surrounding context and justifies any reformulation connecting the polynomial statement to the original goal. A proof is accepted only after Lean verifies the original theorem statement.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We evaluate IneqAgent on four inequality benchmarks, compare its proving performance with existing systems, and examine LLM inference cost across four backbones. We further present three case studies on conjectures concerning matrix permanents. These case studies are evaluated separately from the benchmark suite.

4.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Benchmarks. The benchmark evaluation comprises 186 problems from three existing collections and our newly constructed LitIneq benchmark. MO-INT-20 is the 20-problem benchmark introduced with AIPS, comprising algebraic inequalities from the IMO, IMO shortlists, and national mathematical olympiads (Wei et al., 2024). Ineq-Real is the 50-problem subset of Ineq-Comp drawn from mathematics competitions, training materials, and Chinese Gaokao exams, with the problems manually formalized in Lean 4 (Zhao et al., 2025). The Evan Chen benchmark consists of 42 problems selected from *A Brief Introduction to Olympiad Inequalities*, Evan Chen’s 2014 notes (Chen, 2014).

To extend the evaluation beyond competition-oriented inequalities, we construct LitIneq, a benchmark comprising 74 inequality-proving tasks based on examples from research papers on inequality proving and polynomial optimization, as well as selected inequality proof obligations from the Flyspeck formalization of the Kepler conjecture. For polynomial optimization examples, we formulate tasks that establish bounds on the objective functions under the original constraints. We formalize each task as a self-contained Lean 4 theorem statement. Appendix C documents the source, original theorem or example identifier, and formalization details for each problem. Results are reported separately for each benchmark. The conjecture case studies in Section 4.5 are evaluated separately and are excluded from the 186-problem aggregate.

Baselines and backbones. We compare with symbolic systems, formal provers, and proving agents. The symbolic baselines are Z3 (de Moura & Bjørner, 2008), Maple (Heck, 1993), and Isabelle/HOL’s `sos` method (Chaieb & Meyer, 2025). The formal provers and agents are Goedel-Prover-V2-8B (Lin et al., 2025), DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B (Ren et al., 2025), AxProverBase (Requena et al., 2026), LIPS (Li et al., 2025a), and Hilbert (Varambally et al., 2026).

IneqAgent uses DeepSeek-V4-Flash for the main benchmark comparison in Table 1. For the inference-cost comparison in Table 2, we evaluate IneqAgent and Direct Agent with four backbones: DeepSeek-V4-Flash, Qwen3.8-Flash, Kimi-K3, and GPT-5.5. Each pairwise comparison uses the same backbone. Direct Agent denotes Codex running with its default agent configuration and access to Lean.

Evaluation protocol. All benchmark methods are evaluated with a two-hour time limit per problem. Success rates are computed over all problems in each benchmark, counting unsolved and timed-out problems as failures. Mean solving times are computed over the problems successfully solved by each method. For Z3 and Maple, success is assessed from solver outputs, and these runs do not produce proofs checked by a proof assistant. For IneqAgent, a problem is counted as solved only after Lean accepts the generated proof. Detailed evaluation settings and method-specific success criteria are provided in Appendix D.

4.2 MAIN RESULTS ON INEQUALITY BENCHMARKS

Table 1 reports success rates and mean solving times. IneqAgent achieves the highest success rate on each of the four benchmarks, solving 19/20 problems in MO-INT-20, 46/50 in Ineq-Real, 42/42 in Evan Chen, and 68/74 in LitIneq. Overall, it solves 175/186 problems (94.09%), compared with 141/186 (75.81%) for Hilbert, the strongest baseline in overall success rate, yielding an improvement of 18.28 percentage points.

On LitIneq, IneqAgent solves 68 problems, compared with 55 for AxProverBase, the strongest baseline on this benchmark. This corresponds to a success-rate improvement of 17.57 percentage points, extending the observed advantage beyond competition-oriented inequalities to tasks drawn from research papers and Flyspeck.

4.3 PROOF SUCCESS UNDER COST THRESHOLDS

We examine whether IneqAgent enables more problems to be proved at low LLM inference cost. Table 2 compares IneqAgent with Direct Agent on all 186 problems using four backbones. Each pairwise comparison uses the same backbone and pricing.

Table 1: Success rate (SR, %) and mean solving time over problems successfully solved by each method (Time, seconds). Overall aggregates all 186 problems; its mean time is weighted by the number of successful problems in each benchmark. Bold indicates the highest success rate in each benchmark and overall. A dash indicates that no problem was solved.

Method	MO-INT-20		Ineq-Real		Evan Chen		LitIneq		Overall	
	SR	Time	SR	Time	SR	Time	SR	Time	SR	Time
<i>Symbolic computation</i>										
Z3	25.00	234.20	30.00	20.04	42.86	0.15	55.41	1.80	42.47	19.59
Maple	0.00	–	10.00	1.69	26.19	1.28	41.89	152.60	25.27	101.132
Isabelle SOS	0.00	–	4.00	21.69	9.52	21.69	21.62	18.90	11.83	19.66
<i>LLM provers</i>										
Goedel-Prover-V2-8B	10.00	1323.86	28.00	779.01	30.95	842.92	59.46	856.65	39.25	852.11
DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B	10.00	503.94	18.00	492.84	28.57	422.14	44.59	525.31	30.11	497.22
<i>LLM-based proving frameworks</i>										
AxProverBase	75.00	1907.93	70.00	1381.69	73.81	1314.94	74.32	565.49	73.12	1094.43
Hilbert	75.00	1945.00	86.00	2461.94	76.19	1848.77	68.92	875.19	75.81	1693.86
LIPS	35.00	2479.74	36.00	2496.18	54.76	2165.82	41.89	109.207	42.47	1461.88
IneqAgent (ours)	95.00	333.87	92.00	180.66	100.00	147.92	91.89	96.56	94.09	156.76

Cost accounting and thresholds. All costs are reported in US cents and measure LLM inference expenditure only, excluding the computational costs of symbolic solving and Lean verification. The cost of a run accumulates across its LLM calls, including unsuccessful attempts within that run. For each threshold $b \in \{5, 10, 50, 100\}$, we count the problems successfully solved with cumulative LLM inference cost at most b . Success rate uses all 186 problems as its denominator, while mean cost is computed separately over each method’s qualifying successful runs. Unsolved and timed-out problems contribute to the success-rate denominator but are excluded from the mean cost. The No cap setting includes all successful runs. These thresholds are applied post hoc rather than used as stopping budgets and every run remains subject to the two-hour time limit.

Table 2: Proof success and LLM inference cost on 186 problems. Both methods use the backbone specified in the first column. All thresholds and mean costs are in US cents. SR (%) is the percentage of all 186 problems solved with cumulative LLM inference cost at or below the specified threshold; Cost is the mean cost over those successful runs. Thresholds are applied post hoc. No cap includes all successful runs and the two-hour per-problem limit still applies. Within each backbone and threshold, the highest SR is bold; the lower Cost is bold when both means are defined.

Backbone	Method	LLM inference cost threshold (US cents)									
		5		10		50		100		No cap	
		SR	Cost	SR	Cost	SR	Cost	SR	Cost	SR	Cost
DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Direct Agent	66.67	1.9499	79.03	2.7609	90.32	4.6700	90.32	4.6700	90.32	4.6700
	IneqAgent (ours)	88.17	0.6773	92.47	0.9485	94.09	1.3619	94.09	1.3619	94.09	1.3619
Qwen3.8-Flash	Direct Agent	68.28	1.7882	84.41	2.7370	92.47	4.0352	93.55	4.7061	93.55	4.7061
	IneqAgent (ours)	83.87	0.8219	89.25	1.1747	92.47	1.5543	92.47	1.5543	92.47	1.5543
Kimi-K3	Direct Agent	6.99	3.6009	25.27	6.3289	62.90	16.9118	76.34	25.8828	93.01	58.1366
	IneqAgent (ours)	50.54	0.1310	54.84	0.6915	76.34	8.0921	82.26	12.1085	86.56	19.3747
GPT-5.5	Direct Agent	0.00	–	2.15	8.7023	57.53	31.1488	77.42	41.3875	90.86	72.3548
	IneqAgent (ours)	48.92	0.1153	50.54	0.3824	67.74	7.0074	75.27	13.2915	90.86	63.7723

IneqAgent achieves higher success rates at the 5- and 10-cent thresholds across all four backbones. At 5 cents, the improvements range from 15.59 to 48.92 percentage points. For instance, DeepSeek-V4-Flash improves from 66.67% to 88.17%, while GPT-5.5 improves from 0.00% to 48.92%. At 50 cents, IneqAgent has higher success rates for three backbones and ties Direct Agent with Qwen3.8-Flash. These results show that more problems can be solved at low LLM inference cost with IneqAgent.

The relative success rates vary at higher thresholds. At 100 cents, Direct Agent achieves higher success rates with Qwen3.8-Flash and GPT-5.5. Without a cost cap, IneqAgent achieves a higher success rate with DeepSeek-V4-Flash, matches Direct Agent with GPT-5.5, and has lower success rates with Qwen3.8-Flash and Kimi-K3. Mean inference costs over each method’s successful runs are lower for IneqAgent across all four backbones. For Qwen3.8-Flash, the mean decreases from 4.7061 to 1.5543 cents, and for GPT-5.5, it decreases from 72.3548 to 63.7723 cents. These means describe each method’s own successful runs and do not constitute comparisons on an identical set of problems.

4.4 ABLATION STUDY

We ablate lemma-level MCTS and symbolic computation using DeepSeek-V4-Flash on the same 186 problems, with a two-hour time limit per problem. The *Base agent* generates and revises proofs with Lean feedback, using neither component. *Base + MCTS* adds lemma-level tree search, while *Base + Symbolic* enables symbolic proving of the original goal and intermediate lemmas. *IneqAgent (full)* combines both components.

Table 3: Ablation results with DeepSeek-V4-Flash on all 186 benchmark problems under a two-hour time limit per problem. Mean LLM inference cost and wall-clock time are computed over each variant’s successful problems. Bold indicates the highest success rate or the lowest reported mean.

Variant	SR (%) $\uparrow$	Avg. LLM cost (US cents) $\downarrow$	Avg. time (s) $\downarrow$
Base agent	90.32	4.6700	329.88
Base + MCTS	91.40	2.2251	191.64
Base + Symbolic	91.40	2.8514	200.56
IneqAgent (full)	94.09	1.3619	156.76

Table 3 shows that both components improve performance when added individually. MCTS increases the number of solved problems from 168 to 170, while symbolic computation also increases it to 170. Combining both components solves 175 problems, five more than either component alone. These results support the benefits of combining tree search with symbolic computation in IneqAgent.

The full configuration also achieves the lowest mean LLM inference cost and mean wall-clock time among the four variants. Relative to the base agent, these means are lower by 70.84% and 52.48%, respectively. Both measures are averaged over each variant’s own successful problems.

4.5 APPLICATIONS TO CONJECTURES ON MATRIX PERMANENTS

We evaluate IneqAgent on three polynomial proof tasks arising from conjectures on matrix permanents: strengthened forms of Dittert’s conjecture (Minc, 1983) in dimensions four and five, and the Holens–Djokovic (4, 4) inequality (Holens, 1964; Djoković, 1967), which implies the four-dimensional case of Merris’s conjecture (Merris, 1973). These case studies examine the framework’s ability to combine agentic reasoning with exact symbolic certification on research-level mathematical problems. They are evaluated separately from the 186-problem benchmark suite and are not subject to its two-hour time limit. Task sizes and costs are reported in Table 9 in Appendix E.

Dittert’s conjecture. For a nonnegative $n \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ with $\sum_{i,j} a_{ij} = n$, let $r_i = \sum_j a_{ij}$ and $c_j = \sum_i a_{ij}$ denote its row and column sums. Writing $\text{per}(A) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \prod_{i=1}^n a_{i,\sigma(i)}$, define $\Phi_n(A) = \prod_i r_i + \prod_j c_j - \text{per}(A)$. Dittert’s conjecture asserts that $\Phi_n(A) \leq 2 - n!/n^n$, with equality if and only if $A = J_n$, where every entry of J_n equals $1/n$. For $n \in \{4, 5\}$, IneqAgent produces Lean-verified proofs of the strengthened polynomial inequalities

$$p_n(A) := 2 - \frac{n!}{n^n} - \Phi_n(A) - \kappa_n \|A - J_n\|_F^2 \geq 0, \quad (7)$$

under the same constraints, where $\kappa_4 = 1/52$, $\kappa_5 = 1/2500$, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. These bounds establish quantitative stability and the unique maximizer J_n in both dimensions. For certificate search, we use the scaled target $P_4 = 32p_4$ in dimension four and a homogeneous reformulation $\tilde{F}_5$ in dimension five, defined in Appendix E.

Holens–Djokovic (4, 4) and Merris’s conjecture. Let Ω_4 denote the set of 4×4 nonnegative matrices whose row and column sums equal one. The Holens–Djokovic (4, 4) inequality is the polynomial nonnegativity statement

$$Q_4(A) := 24 \text{per}(A) - 2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^4 a_{ij}^3 \geq 0, \quad A \in \Omega_4. \quad (8)$$

Expressing the remaining entries in terms of the upper-left 3×3 block eliminates the row- and column-sum equalities, yielding a degree-four polynomial problem in nine variables while retaining the nonnegativity constraints on all entries. IneqAgent constructs an exact rational SOS certificate for the reduced problem. The argument for the contrary claim in Udayan & Somasundaram (2021, Theorem 6) contains an endpoint error(see Remark 1).

This result implies Merris’s conjecture in dimension four. Let $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^4 \text{per}(A(i \mid j))$, where $A(i \mid j)$ is obtained by deleting row i and column j . For $A \in \Omega_4$,

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq 4} S_j \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 S_j = 4 \text{per}(A) - \frac{1}{6} Q_4(A) \leq 4 \text{per}(A).$$

The SOS certificate and the case in which S_4 is minimal are verified in Lean; column relabeling gives the conclusion for any minimizing column.

5 CONCLUSION

We introduced IneqAgent, an agentic framework for formal inequality proving in Lean 4. Through lemma-level MCTS, it coordinates LLM reasoning, goal reformulation, and symbolic computation, integrating certificate-derived local proofs into complete proofs checked against the original theorem statements. Evaluation on four benchmarks and three polynomial proof tasks arising from matrix-permanent conjectures demonstrates its proving capability. Across four backbones, IneqAgent achieves higher success rates at low LLM inference cost thresholds than Direct Agent using the same backbone, with lower mean inference costs over each method’s successful runs.

AI USE STATEMENT

We used generative AI tools to polish the writing, assist in finding relevant literature and reference materials, and carry out experiments according to author-specified instructions, including which tests to run and how to run them. We reviewed the AI-assisted text, consulted the cited sources, and checked the experimental outputs. We take full responsibility for the content and results of this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2023YFA1009402, the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant XDA0480501.

REFERENCES

- Amine Chaieb and Philipp Meyer. Sum of Squares: A decision procedure for universal multivariate real arithmetic using semidefinite programming. Isabelle/HOL Library, theory Sum_of_Squares, 2025. URL https://isabelle.in.tum.de/website-Isabelle2025-2/dist/library/HOL/HOL-Library/Sum_of_Squares.html.
- Evan Chen. A brief introduction to olympiad inequalities. <https://web.evanchen.cc/handouts/Ineq/en.pdf>, 2014.
- Gi-Sang Cheon and Ian M. Wanless. An update on Minc’s survey of open problems involving permanents. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 403:314–342, 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2005.02.030.
- Gi-Sang Cheon and Ian M. Wanless. Some results towards the Dittert conjecture on permanents. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 436(4):791–801, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2010.08.041.
- Leonardo de Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. Z3: An efficient SMT solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pp. 337–340. Springer, 2008.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *Automated Deduction—CADE 28*, pp. 625–635. Springer, 2021.
- D. Ž. Djoković. On a conjecture by van der Waerden. *Matematički Vesnik*, 4(19)(4):272–276, 1967.
- Ioannis Z. Emiris. A general solver based on sparse resultants: Numerical issues and kinematic applications. Research Report 3110, INRIA, 1997.
- Ioannis Zacharias Emiris. *Sparse Elimination and Applications in kinematics*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1994.
- Jean-Charles Faugère. A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases (F4). *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 139(1–3):61–88, 1999. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4049(99)00005-5. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4049\(99\)00005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4049(99)00005-5).
- André Heck. *Introduction to MAPLE*. Springer, 1993. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4684-0519-4.
- F. Holens. Two aspects of doubly stochastic matrices: Permutation matrices and the minimum of the permanent function. Master’s thesis, University of Manitoba, 1964.
- Suk Geun Hwang. A note on a conjecture on permanents. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 76: 31–44, 1986. doi: 10.1016/0024-3795(86)90212-0.
- Suk Geun Hwang. On a conjecture of E. Dittert. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 95:161–169, 1987. doi: 10.1016/0024-3795(87)90032-2.
- Arieh Iserles. Personal communication at the occasion of the AMS–SIAM summer seminar in applied mathematics. Park City, Utah, 1995.
- Erich L. Kaltofen, Bin Li, Zhengfeng Yang, and Lihong Zhi. Exact certification in global polynomial optimization via sums-of-squares of rational functions with rational coefficients. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(1):1–15, 2012.
- Guillaume Lample, Timothée Lacroix, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Aurélien Rodriguez, Amaury Hayat, Thibaut Lavril, Gabriel Ebner, and Xavier Martinet. Hypertree proof search for neural theorem proving. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26337–26349, 2022.
- Zenan Li, Zhaoyu Li, Wen Tang, Xian Zhang, Yuan Yao, Xujie Si, Fan Yang, Kaiyu Yang, and Xiaoxing Ma. Proving olympiad inequalities by synergizing LLMs and symbolic reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, pp. 2304–2329, 2025a.
- Zhaoqun Li, Beishui Liao, and Qiwei Ye. IneqSearch: Hybrid reasoning for olympiad inequality proofs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, 2025b. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2025/hash/6c92839f0f9cddc96c694712a7143b09-Abstract-Conference.html.

-
- Yong Lin, Shange Tang, Bohan Lyu, Ziran Yang, Jui-Hui Chung, Haoyu Zhao, Lai Jiang, Yihan Geng, Jiawei Ge, Jingruo Sun, et al. Goedel-prover-v2: Scaling formal theorem proving with scaffolded data synthesis and self-correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03613*, 2025.
- Banglong Liu, Niuniu Qi, Xia Zeng, Lydia Dehbi, and Zhengfeng Yang. Automated proof of polynomial inequalities via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06592*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.06592>.
- Victor Magron and Mohab Safey El Din. RealCertify: A Maple package for certifying non-negativity. *ACM Communications in Computer Algebra*, 52(2):34–37, 2018.
- Marvin Marcus and Russell Merris. A relation between the permanent and determinantal adjoints. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 15(3):270–271, 1973. doi: 10.1017/S1446788700013173.
- Russell Merris. The permanent of a doubly stochastic matrix. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 80(7):791–793, 1973. doi: 10.1080/00029890.1973.11993372.
- Henryk Minc. Theory of permanents 1978–1981. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 12:227–263, 1983.
- César Muñoz and Anthony Narkawicz. Formalization of Bernstein polynomials and applications to global optimization. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 51(2):151–196, 2013. doi: 10.1007/s10817-012-9256-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-012-9256-3>.
- V. W. Noonburg. A neural network modeled by an adaptive Lotka–Volterra system. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 49(6):1779–1792, 1989. doi: 10.1137/0149109. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0149109>.
- Zhekai Pang. Proof of Dittert’s conjecture for dimensions $n \geq 17$. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.01531*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.01531>.
- Helfried Peyrl and Pablo A. Parrilo. Computing sum of squares decompositions with rational coefficients. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 409(2):269–281, 2008.
- Stanislas Polu and Ilya Sutskever. Generative language modeling for automated theorem proving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03393*, 2020.
- M. Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- Shashwati Ray and P. S. V. Nataraj. An efficient algorithm for range computation of polynomials using the Bernstein form. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 45(3):403–426, 2009. doi: 10.1007/s10898-008-9382-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10898-008-9382-y>.
- Z. Z. Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanjia Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Zhe Fu, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, et al. Deepseek-prover-v2: Advancing formal mathematical reasoning via reinforcement learning for subgoal decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21801*, 2025.
- Borja Requena, Austin Letson, Krystian Nowakowski, Izan Beltran-Ferreiro, and Leopoldo Sarra. A minimal agent for automated theorem proving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.24273*, 2026.
- Richard Sinkhorn. A problem related to the van der Waerden permanent theorem. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 16(1–4):167–173, 1984. doi: 10.1080/03081088408817620.
- Divya K. Udayan and Kanagasabapathi Somasundaram. The inequalities of Merris and Foregger for permanents. *Symmetry*, 13(10):1782, 2021. doi: 10.3390/sym13101782.
- Divya K. Udayan and Kanagasabapathi Somasundaram. Lih Wang’s and Dittert’s conjectures on permanents. *Special Matrices*, 12(1):20240006, 2024. doi: 10.1515/spma-2024-0006.
- Sumanth Varambally, Thomas Voice, Yanchao Sun, Zhifeng Chen, Rose Yu, and Ke Ye. Hilbert: Recursively building formal proofs with informal reasoning. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026.

-
- Jan Verschelde. *Polynomial homotopy continuation: A portable Ada software package*, 1996. URL <ftp://ftp.cs.kuleuven.ac.be/pub/NumAnal-ApplMath/PHC>. Computer program documentation.
- Jan Verschelde. The PHC pack, the database of polynomial systems. Technical report, University of Illinois, Mathematics Department, Chicago, USA, 2001.
- 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>.
- Chenrui Wei, Mengzhou Sun, and Wei Wang. Proving olympiad algebraic inequalities without human demonstrations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37, 2024.
- Alden H. Wright. Finding all solutions to a system of polynomial equations. *Mathematics of Computation*, 44(169):125–133, 1985. doi: 10.1090/S0025-5718-1985-0771035-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1985-0771035-4>.
- Bican Xia and Lu Yang. *Automated Inequality Proving and Discovering*. World Scientific, 2016.
- Kaiyu Yang, Aidan M. Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan Prenger, and Anima Anandkumar. LeanDojo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Haoyu Zhao, Yihan Geng, Shange Tang, Yong Lin, Bohan Lyu, Hongzhou Lin, Chi Jin, and Sanjeev Arora. Ineq-Comp: Benchmarking human-intuitive compositional reasoning in automated theorem proving on inequalities. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.12680>. Datasets and Benchmarks Track.
- Ruobing Zuo, Hanrui Zhao, Gaolei He, Zhengfeng Yang, and Jianlin Wang. From LLM-generated conjectures to Lean formalizations: Automated polynomial inequality proving via sum-of-squares certificates. OpenReview: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Lz8rHDmmKt>, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.15445>. Accepted to ICML 2026.

A LEMMA-LEVEL SEARCH DETAILS

This appendix gives the search rules used to allocate proving attempts in Section 3.1. The root node is denoted by v . For a selected node, we use u , and u' denotes a newly generated child or attempted child. Each node u represents a partial proof state $\Gamma_u \vdash G_u$, comprising the local context, established facts, and remaining goals. The initial root state is $\Gamma_v \vdash G_v$, corresponding to the initial state $\Gamma \vdash G$. An accepted edge $u \rightarrow u'$ records a proof extension with one or more fully proved local lemmas. Paths represent successive extensions, while sibling nodes retain alternative ways to advance the same state.

Selection and progressive widening. MCTS allocates proving attempts across alternative proof paths. For each node u , we maintain a visit count $N(u)$ and accumulated reward $W(u)$ from attempts backed up through that node. Their ratio $Q(u) = W(u)/N(u)$ is the mean reward, initialized to zero for unvisited nodes. A stagnation count $S(u)$ tracks consecutive attempts to expand u without useful progress. An open node is a valid proof state with remaining goals. At each iteration, selection starts at the root and either expands the current node or descends to an open child. Progressive widening sets the threshold for adding children:

$$B(u) = \max\{1, \lfloor \kappa \max(1, N(u))^\alpha \rfloor + \delta(S(u))\}, \quad (9)$$

where κ sets the branching scale, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ controls its growth, and $\delta(S) = \min\{2, \lfloor S/2 \rfloor\}$ allows up to two additional children when progress stalls. Only accepted proof states count toward this child limit; failed attempts are recorded separately. If u has fewer than $B(u)$ children, the agent generates a new extension from u . Otherwise, it descends to the open child u' maximizing the selection score

$$U(u' | u) = Q(u') + c \sqrt{\frac{\log(N(u) + 1)}{N(u') + 1}} - \min\{\rho S(u'), \rho_{\max}\}. \quad (10)$$

Here $Q(u')$ favors branches with higher observed rewards, the exploration term weighted by c encourages less-visited branches, and the bounded penalty discourages repeatedly unproductive ones, with strength ρ and maximum value $\rho_{\max}$. Selection continues until a node can be expanded. If no open child is available, the agent attempts a new extension at the current node u , even if the widening threshold has been reached.

Search parameters. Table 4 gives the default search configuration. We use ρ for the stagnation penalty and reserve λ for the Lean-LLM reward weight. New nodes initialize $N = W = Q = S = 0$. Selection scores are rounded to three decimal places.

Table 4: Default parameters for lemma-level search.

Parameter	Meaning	Value
κ	Progressive-widening scale	1.0
α	Progressive-widening exponent	0.5
c	Exploration coefficient	1.414
λ	Weight of the Lean-based reward	0.5
ρ	Stagnation penalty per attempt	0.06
$\rho_{\max}$	Maximum stagnation penalty	0.30

Reward and backpropagation. After expansion, Lean verification determines the candidate’s status: `solved` if it completes the theorem without `sorry` or `admit`, `open` if its intermediate lemmas are verified but goals remain, or `failed` if verification fails. Failed attempts provide diagnostics for repair; only valid open states can be selected for further search. For an open candidate u' , we combine a Lean-based heuristic score $r_{u'}^{\text{Lean}} \in [0, 1]$ with an LLM score $r_{u'}^{\text{LLM}} \in [0, 1]$. The former uses Lean checking results and proof-text features defined below. The latter compares the parent and candidate goals to estimate whether the new state is simpler and closer to completing the theorem. The LLM score guides search; correctness is determined by Lean. The reward is

$$r(u') = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } u' \text{ is solved,} \\ 0, & \text{if } u' \text{ fails Lean verification,} \\ \lambda r_{u'}^{\text{Lean}} + (1 - \lambda) r_{u'}^{\text{LLM}}, & \text{if } u' \text{ is open,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\lambda = 0.5$ gives equal weight to the two progress signals for an open candidate. The terminal rules take precedence: solved candidates receive one and failed candidates receive zero, regardless of the heuristic components. This final reward, rather than either component alone, updates the search statistics.

A valid extension creates a child, and its reward is backed up from that child to the root. A failed extension creates no accepted child; its diagnostics are retained, and its zero reward is backed up from the expanded parent u to the root. Thus, failed attempts increase visit counts without adding reward or occupying a child slot. For a failed extension, u' denotes the attempted child and $r(u') = 0$. Let u_i denote the i th node on the corresponding backpropagation path. Each node u_i is updated once:

$$N(u_i) \leftarrow N(u_i) + 1, \quad W(u_i) \leftarrow W(u_i) + r(u'), \quad Q(u_i) \leftarrow W(u_i)/N(u_i). \quad (12)$$

Thus, $Q(u_i)$ summarizes rewards from attempts through the branch rooted at u_i , rather than assigning a fixed score to its current goals. Search returns a complete Lean-verified proof when one is found and otherwise terminates when the budget is exhausted or no open state remains.

Lean-based heuristic score. Each candidate undergoes a compilation check allowing unfinished `sorry/admit` markers and a completion check requiring a Lean-accepted proof without these markers. For the heuristic, let e indicate whether the proof text differs from its parent’s, let $m_u, m_{u'}$ count occurrences of the unfinished markers in the two texts, and let $\Delta = m_u - m_{u'}$. Let b indicate successful compilation. These marker counts are textual features, rather than counts of Lean’s remaining goals.

Let a count newly added lines beginning with `have`, `suffices`, a typed `let`, `lemma`, or `theorem`. Added lines are candidate lines absent from the parent text. These features measure proof structure; local proof validity is determined separately by Lean. Starting from $h = 0$, we add the applicable terms in Table 5 and set

$$r_{u'}^{\text{Lean}} = \text{round}_3(\min\{0.95, \max\{0, h\}\}). \quad (13)$$

The structured-step bonus and the compilable-edit bonus are mutually exclusive. The agent timeout and execution-error penalties are also mutually exclusive; other applicable terms accumulate. The heuristic table includes failed-candidate features, but the failed branch of equation 11 overrides their sum with zero.

Table 5: Additive terms in the Lean-based heuristic. Agent execution refers to the proving-agent invocation for the current expansion.

Condition	Contribution to h
Candidate compiles ($b = 1$)	+0.35
Proof text changed ($e = 1$)	+0.10
Proof text unchanged ($e = 0$)	−0.12
Change in unfinished-marker count	$\max\{-0.30, \min\{0.30, 0.18\Delta\}\}$
$m_{u'} > 0$ unfinished markers remain	$-\min\{0.20, 0.04m_{u'}\}$
$a > 0$ new structured steps	$+\min\{0.20, 0.05a\}$
$a = 0, e = 1$, and $b = 1$	+0.03
Candidate status is <code>failed</code>	−0.25
Agent times out, with / without a text change	−0.20 / −0.35
Agent execution errors without a timeout	−0.10
Either Lean check times out (charged once)	−0.20
Proof text changed but does not compile	+0.05

LLM progress score. For an open candidate, the evaluator receives the target theorem, the parent and candidate proofs, and the candidate’s Lean checking result. It assesses the change in the proof rather than the absolute quality of the candidate. The prompt is given below; the placeholders are filled with the corresponding theorem, proof texts, and checking output. The `numeric score` is parsed and checked to lie in $[0, 1]$ before combining it with r^{Lean} . The heuristic’s numeric value is not included in the prompt.

Prompt Template for LLM Progress Evaluation

Task:

You are evaluating one step in a Lean proof search. Compare the child proof with the parent proof for the target theorem. Score the substantive progress made in this step, not the child’s absolute quality.

Instructions:

Give credit for resolving proof obligations or adding useful intermediate results. Do not reward longer text, cosmetic edits, unsupported claims, or removing `sorry` without a valid proof. Use the Lean result to check whether claimed progress is credible.

Scoring:

Score from 0 to 1:

- 0 no progress or regression;
- 0.25 small credible step;
- 0.5 substantial step;
- 0.75 most remaining work resolved;
- 1 theorem completely proved.

When evidence is unclear, score conservatively.

Input:

Target theorem: {theorem_statement}

Parent proof: {parent_content}

Child proof: {child_content}

Child Lean result: {lean_result}

Output format:

Return only JSON:

```
{"score": 0.0, "reason": "one concise sentence"}
```

Stagnation updates. Only a direct attempt to expand u updates $S(u)$; reward backpropagation does not change the stagnation counts of its ancestors. Let $M(u, u')$ be true if the candidate solves the theorem, or if its text changes and at least one of the following holds: $\Delta > 0$; it compiles and adds a structured step; or it compiles and has status `open`. Thus, the marker-reduction condition does not require compilation, while a changed, compilable open candidate satisfies this progress test even without reducing markers or adding structured steps. Using the final reward $r(u')$ and the parent’s mean $Q_{\text{old}}(u)$ before backpropagation, we update

$$S(u) \leftarrow \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } M(u, u') \text{ or } r(u') > Q_{\text{old}}(u) + 0.03, \\ S(u) + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

This local count determines both the widening slack and the bounded selection penalty. The next search iteration uses the updated counts and backed-up rewards.

B DETAILS OF SYMBOLIC PROVING

This appendix details the three symbolic proving backends introduced in Section 3.2. We consider polynomial nonnegativity goals of the form in Eq. 2, with $p, g_i, h_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ and variables ranging over $\mathbb{R}^n$. For box-constrained goals, the interval endpoints are also rational. Each backend searches for an exact certificate for a polynomial goal supplied by the agent, either directly from the input theorem or through an intermediate lemma or reformulation. Successful certificates are translated into local Lean proofs, and unsuccessful attempts return feedback for further agentic reasoning.

B.1 SOS-BASED PROVING UNDER POLYNOMIAL CONSTRAINTS

Degree-bounded SDP formulation. We use the polynomial goal and domain K from Section 3.2. The backend seeks a constrained SOS identity

$$p = \sigma_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i \sigma_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j, \quad (15)$$

where each σ_i is a sum of squares and each q_j is a polynomial multiplier unrestricted in sign. This certificate format is motivated by Putinar’s Positivstellensatz (Putinar, 1993). The theorem’s existence guarantee requires strict positivity and an Archimedean quadratic module, modulo the equality ideal when equalities are present. Our use of the certificate relies on its sufficiency: any exact identity of this form proves $p \geq 0$ on K .

Set $g_0 = 1$ and omit identically zero constraint polynomials. Choose a relaxation order d such that $\deg p, \deg g_i, \deg h_j \leq 2d$, and define

$$d_i = \left\lfloor \frac{2d - \deg g_i}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad e_j = 2d - \deg h_j. \quad (16)$$

Let z_i contain all monomials of total degree at most d_i in a fixed order. We represent $\sigma_i = z_i^T G_i z_i$ with $G_i \succeq 0$ and impose $\deg q_j \leq e_j$. The resulting identity is

$$p = \sum_{i=0}^m g_i z_i^T G_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j, \quad G_i \succeq 0. \quad (17)$$

Every summand has degree at most $2d$. Let coeff_{2d} extract coefficients in the monomial basis of total degree at most $2d$, and let $\mathcal{A}_d(G, q)$ be the coefficient vector of the right-hand side. Coefficient matching gives the SDP feasibility problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{find } G_0, \dots, G_m, q_1, \dots, q_{\ell} \quad \text{such that} \\ &\mathcal{A}_d(G, q) = \text{coeff}_{2d}(p), \quad G_i \succeq 0 \quad (i = 0, \dots, m). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here the decision variables are the independent Gram-matrix entries and the coefficients of the q_j . MOSEK supplies numerical candidates G_b^{num} , where $b = 0$ indexes the main SOS block and $b = 1, \dots, m$ indexes the SOS multipliers of the inequality constraints.

Rational recovery of SOS multipliers. We extend the numerical–symbolic certification procedure of Kaltofen et al. (2012), developed for unconstrained problems, to the constrained SOS identity in Eq. 15. We recover the certificate sequentially, first fixing the SOS multipliers $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ and then recovering the main SOS block together with the equality multipliers. For a candidate denominator D , numerical matrix entries are rounded to multiples of $1/D$ and symmetrized in exact arithmetic. Each rational candidate is checked by an exact LDL^T decomposition for positive semidefiniteness. The denominator is adjusted if a candidate fails this check.

For singular blocks with an available exact rational kernel subspace, recovery can be performed in reduced coordinates. Let the columns of P_b form a rational basis for the orthogonal complement of that subspace, and define

$$L_b = (P_b^T P_b)^{-1} P_b^T, \quad S_b^{\text{num}} = L_b G_b^{\text{num}} L_b^T. \quad (19)$$

Rational recovery and the exact positivity check are then applied to S_b^{num} . An accepted $S_b^{\mathbb{Q}} \succeq 0$ gives $G_b^{\mathbb{Q}} = P_b S_b^{\mathbb{Q}} P_b^T \succeq 0$, preserving the prescribed kernel subspace. This reduction is used only when the required exact kernel information is available.

After recovering the inequality-multiplier blocks, set

$$\sigma_i = z_i^T G_i^{\mathbb{Q}} z_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, m), \quad C_{\text{sm}} := \sum_{i=1}^m g_i \sigma_i, \quad R_0 := p - C_{\text{sm}}. \quad (20)$$

These rational SOS multipliers remain fixed throughout the subsequent recovery. The remaining task is

$$R_0 = \sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j. \quad (21)$$

Thus only one SOS block remains to be recovered; the equality multipliers are still to be determined. With no equality constraints, the task reduces to an SOS decomposition of R_0 .

Main-block recovery and exact verification. For the remaining main block, we use Gauss–Newton refinement followed by rational recovery. Write $\bar{z}_0 = z_0$ without reduction, or $\bar{z}_0 = P_0^\top z_0$ when using reduced coordinates. Factor G_0^{num} , or S_0^{num} in reduced coordinates, approximately as $U^\top U$. If θ collects the entries of U and the coefficients of the equality multipliers, define

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \text{coeff}_{2d} \left(R_0 - \|U\bar{z}_0\|_2^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j \right). \quad (22)$$

At iteration k , the Gauss–Newton update solves the linearized least-squares problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta_k &\in \underset{\Delta\theta}{\text{argmin}} \left\| \mathcal{R}(\theta_k) + J_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta_k) \Delta\theta \right\|_2^2, \\ \theta_{k+1} &= \theta_k + \Delta\theta_k, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the residual Jacobian. The previously recovered SOS multipliers enter only through the fixed polynomial R_0 .

From the refined matrix $U^\top U$, rational reconstruction and exact coefficient correction seek a main Gram matrix $G_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and rational equality multipliers satisfying

$$R_0 = z_0^\top G_0^{\mathbb{Q}} z_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j q_j, \quad G_0^{\mathbb{Q}} \succeq 0, \quad q_j \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]. \quad (24)$$

In reduced coordinates, the recovered matrix is $S_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $G_0^{\mathbb{Q}} = P_0 S_0^{\mathbb{Q}} P_0^\top$. Recovery targets the Gram matrix; the numerical factor U need not itself have rational entries. The coefficient correction enforces the identity in Eq. 24, and positive semidefiniteness is checked again after correction. For a single affine equality $h = 0$, the equality multiplier can instead be obtained by exact division of $R_0 - \sigma_0$ by h , with zero remainder required. If recovery or verification fails, recovery parameters are adjusted and the main block is refined or recomputed, while the accepted SOS multipliers remain fixed. Exhausting the available budget returns an unsolved result.

Finally, the complete identity in Eq. 15 is verified coefficientwise over $\mathbb{Q}$. Exact $LDL^\top$ decompositions supply weighted-square representations

$$\sigma_b = \sum_k w_{bk} s_{bk}(\mathbf{x})^2, \quad w_{bk} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}, \quad s_{bk} \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]. \quad (25)$$

Together with the rational equality multipliers, these representations form the certificate returned for Lean proof generation. On K , all SOS terms and their products with g_i are nonnegative, while every $h_j q_j$ vanishes, establishing $p \geq 0$.

B.2 BERNSTEIN-BASED PROVING UNDER BOX CONSTRAINTS

This backend uses Bernstein representations and recursive subdivision to certify polynomial non-negativity on a box, following Ray & Nataraj (2009). The numerical candidate search and exact recovery procedure are described below.

Coefficient matching on a box. Let $K = \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, b_i]$, with rational endpoints $a_i < b_i$. The affine map $T_K(\mathbf{y})_i = a_i + (b_i - a_i)y_i$ maps $[0, 1]^n$ onto K . Write $\tilde{p}_K = p \circ T_K$, and choose a multidegree $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ with $d_i \geq \deg_{y_i} \tilde{p}_K$. Define $I_{\mathbf{d}} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : \alpha_i \leq d_i\}$. The Bernstein basis polynomials in Eq. 4 are nonnegative on $[0, 1]^n$. Thus an expansion

$$\tilde{p}_K(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\alpha \in I_{\mathbf{d}}} c_{\alpha} B_{\mathbf{d}, \alpha}(\mathbf{y}), \quad c_{\alpha} \geq 0, \quad (26)$$

certifies $p \geq 0$ on K .

Write $\tilde{p}_K = \sum_{\beta \in I_d} v_\beta \mathbf{y}^\beta$, including zero coefficients where necessary. Let A contain the monomial coefficient vectors of the Bernstein polynomials as its columns. Its entries are

$$A_{\beta, \alpha} = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n \binom{d_i}{\alpha_i} \binom{d_i - \alpha_i}{\beta_i - \alpha_i} (-1)^{\beta_i - \alpha_i}, & \alpha \leq \beta, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

where multi-index inequalities are componentwise and both indices range over I_d . Matching coefficients gives the LP feasibility problem

$$\text{find } \mathbf{c} \quad \text{subject to} \quad A\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{c} \geq 0. \quad (28)$$

For a fixed multidegree, the Bernstein coefficients are unique, so this LP tests whether the unique coefficient vector is nonnegative.

Numerical candidates and exact recovery. We first solve Eq. 28 in floating-point arithmetic. Given a numerical candidate $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ and a zero threshold $\tau > 0$, we form the tentative support $S = \{\alpha \in I_d : |\hat{c}_\alpha| > \tau\}$. Fixing the remaining coefficients to zero gives the reduced problem

$$\text{find } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Q}^{|S|} \quad \text{subject to} \quad A_{:,S}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{u} \geq 0, \quad (29)$$

which we solve in exact arithmetic. Here $A_{:,S}$ contains the columns indexed by S . We reconstruct the full vector $\mathbf{c}^\mathbb{Q}$ by assigning the recovered coefficients to S and zero to its complement, then verify

$$A\mathbf{c}^\mathbb{Q} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{c}^\mathbb{Q} \geq 0 \quad (30)$$

exactly. Only a candidate passing both checks certifies the current box. The numerical threshold proposes a support; it does not establish that the discarded coefficients are exactly zero. If exact recovery or verification fails, the attempt returns an unresolved result to the search controller.

Binary subdivision and certificate construction. If no suitable numerical candidate is obtained and the subdivision budget permits, we choose a coordinate k and a rational split point $s \in (a_k, b_k)$, and form

$$K^- = K \cap \{\mathbf{x} : x_k \leq s\}, \quad K^+ = K \cap \{\mathbf{x} : x_k \geq s\}. \quad (31)$$

This replaces $[a_k, b_k]$ by $[a_k, s]$ and $[s, b_k]$, leaving all other coordinate intervals unchanged. Each child box is normalized separately, and the same certificate search is applied recursively to the original polynomial p on that box. Since $K = K^- \cup K^+$, certificates for both children certify the parent; the shared boundary is included in both closed boxes.

A successful certificate consists of the binary subdivision tree and an exact nonnegative Bernstein expansion for every leaf box. The Translator uses these data to verify the affine substitutions, local polynomial identities, coefficient nonnegativity, and coverage of the original box in Lean. If the search budget is exhausted while any leaf remains unresolved, the backend returns an unsolved result.

B.3 SUCCESSIVE DIFFERENCE SUBSTITUTION

DiffSub searches for a finite certificate of polynomial nonnegativity on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ using successive difference substitution (Xia & Yang, 2016, Chapter 10). The procedure combines variable ordering with linear substitutions and certifies branches whose transformed polynomials have nonnegative coefficients.

Ordering domains and substitutions. Let $\mathfrak{S}_n$ denote the permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For each $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, define

$$C_\pi = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid x_{\pi(1)} \geq \dots \geq x_{\pi(n)}\}. \quad (32)$$

Every nonnegative tuple admits such an ordering, so $\bigcup_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n} C_\pi = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. On each ordering domain, introduce nonnegative difference variables through the linear map

$$(T_\pi \mathbf{t})_{\pi(i)} = \sum_{j=i}^n t_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \mathbf{t} \geq 0. \quad (33)$$

This map is a bijection from $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ onto C_π , with inverse

$$t_i = x_{\pi(i)} - x_{\pi(i+1)} \quad (i < n), \quad t_n = x_{\pi(n)}. \quad (34)$$

Consequently, a polynomial q is nonnegative on C_π if and only if $q \circ T_\pi$ is nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. The ordering domains may overlap when coordinates are equal, and their union still covers the entire domain.

Recursive certificate construction. The root contains the input polynomial p . At a node with polynomial $q(\mathbf{u})$, we expand it exactly and test whether

$$q(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\alpha} a_{\alpha} \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}, \quad a_{\alpha} \geq 0 \text{ for every } \alpha. \quad (35)$$

Since every monomial is nonnegative for $\mathbf{u} \geq 0$, this condition certifies the node as a leaf. If the test fails and the search budget permits, we enumerate all orderings of the current variables and form the child polynomials $q_{\pi}(\mathbf{t}) = q(T_{\pi} \mathbf{t})$. Each child passing the coefficient test is closed; unresolved children are processed recursively by ordering and substituting their own nonnegative variables. An internal node is certified only when every ordering branch has been certified.

A successful certificate is a finite tree recording the ordering cases and substitution identities at internal nodes, together with the exact polynomial expansions and nonnegative coefficients at the leaves. The substitutions establish nonnegativity on each ordering domain, and coverage of these domains establishes nonnegativity at the parent. Applying this argument recursively proves $p \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. All substitutions, expansions, and coefficient checks use exact arithmetic. If the shared search budget is exhausted while any branch remains unresolved, the backend returns an unsolved result.

B.4 LEAN PROOF GENERATION AND VERIFICATION

The Translator converts exact certificates from the three backends into local Lean proofs of the supplied polynomial statements. For SOS, it instantiates the recovered rational weighted-square identity, proves nonnegativity of the weights and squared terms, and applies the inequality and equality assumptions to the multiplier terms. For Bernstein certificates, it formalizes the affine substitutions, derives the unit-box bounds, and verifies the nonnegative basis expansion on each leaf box. It then combines these local results using the subdivision tree and coverage of the parent boxes. For Diff-Sub, it constructs the ordering cases, proves nonnegativity of the difference variables, and verifies the substitution identities and coefficient nonnegativity at the leaves. Polynomial identities and rational arithmetic are verified within Lean. A local goal is discharged only after the generated proof is accepted by the Lean kernel.

The agent incorporates the verified local result into the surrounding proof context and establishes any conditions connecting it to the original goal. These include the assumptions required by the local certificate and the side conditions of any reformulation, such as denominator positivity or variable-substitution identities. The resulting complete proof is checked against the original theorem statement, with its original assumptions, by the Lean kernel.

C SOURCES AND CONSTRUCTION OF LITINEQ

We construct LitIneq by collecting 74 examples from research papers and formal-verification projects and formulating them as inequality-proving tasks in Lean 4. The benchmark combines polynomial bound-verification problems from global optimization with nonlinear inequalities from geometric and program verification.

Source collection. Table 6 summarizes the composition. We collect 41 polynomial instances from studies on Bernstein polynomials, global optimization, and inequality verification (Muñoz & Narkawicz, 2013; Liu et al., 2025; Ray & Nataraj, 2009), together with examples from the Flyspeck nonlinear-verification documentation.¹ For C1–C10, we retain the APPIRL benchmark formulations and identifiers. Table 6 lists their original sources as attributed in APPIRL.

¹A Tool for Formal Verification of Nonlinear Inequalities, Alexey Solovyev, Flyspeck project documentation.

Table 6: Collection sources and source attributions for the 74 LitIneq instances. C1–C10 attributions follow APPIRL.

Source group	Count	Instances and source attributions
Bernstein examples	2	Coefficient and subdivision examples
APPIRL benchmark	2	C1–C2: Verschelde (1996), <i>Polynomial homotopy continuation: A portable Ada software package</i> (Verschelde, 1996)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C3: Iserles (1995), personal communication at the AMS–SIAM summer seminar (Iserles, 1995)
APPIRL benchmark	2	C4, C6: Noonburg (1989), <i>A neural network modeled by an adaptive Lotka–Volterra system</i> (Noonburg, 1989)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C5: Verschelde (2001), <i>The PHC Pack, the database of polynomial systems</i> (Verschelde, 2001)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C7: Faugère (1999), <i>A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases (F4)</i> (Faugère, 1999)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C8: Wright (1985), <i>Finding all solutions to a system of polynomial equations</i> (Wright, 1985)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C9: Emiris (1994), <i>Sparse elimination and applications in kinematics</i> (Emiris, 1994)
APPIRL benchmark	1	C10: Emiris (1997), <i>A general solver based on sparse resultants: Numerical issues and kinematic applications</i> (Emiris, 1997)
Polynomial bounds from verification examples	8	Reaction Diffusion, Schwefel, Lotka–Volterra, Magnetism, Caprasse, Flyspeck Delta, Butcher, and Heart Dipole
Bernstein range-computation benchmark	21	A02, A04–A07, A09, A11–A18, and B01–B07
Flyspeck (HOL Light)	11	Original example identifiers
NASALib (PVS)	22	Original lemma names
Total	74	

The remaining 33 instances come from Flyspeck’s HOL Light development² and NASA’s PVS library, NASALib.³

Task construction and Lean formalization. For the 41 polynomial instances, we formulate bound-verification problems over explicit box domains. A selected lower bound $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq \ell$ is expressed as $p(\mathbf{x}) - \ell \geq 0$, with upper bounds handled analogously. Finite decimal coefficients and bounds are represented as exact rational numbers. For the HOL Light and PVS examples, we translate the selected statements and required definitions into Lean 4, making domain restrictions and positivity assumptions explicit. Each instance is packaged as a separate theorem with its own assumptions and target, retaining the strict or non-strict relation of the selected statement. Source identifiers and statement transformations are recorded for each instance.

Some instances involve explicit choices of domain or target. For A14 (Magnetism), we specify the box $[-5, 5]^7$ to resolve the ambiguous domain specification in the source. For B02 (Six-hump camel), we construct the target by subtracting a decimal approximation of the reported minimum from the objective polynomial. For B05 (Quadratic), we take $\sum_i x_i^2$ as the nonnegative target. For Flyspeck’s Delta bound, the 41-instance bound-verification collection contains a non-strict version, while the HOL Light collection retains the strict version.

Polynomial instances. Of the 74 instances, 49 have targets and assumptions consisting of polynomial comparisons with rational coefficients. These comprise the 41 polynomial instances described above, five Flyspeck instances, and three NASALib instances. Table 7 summarizes their distribution by the number of quantified real variables and the total degree of the target polynomial. Forty-six instances have box constraints, with two bound inequalities per variable and no explicit equality constraints. Among the remaining three, *simple* is unconstrained, *quadratic* has two polynomial inequality assumptions, and *ajn* has two alternative branches, each containing one equality and eleven inequalities.

Table 7: Distribution of the 49 polynomial instances by the number of variables n and target total degree d_p . Entries are instance counts. We count all quantified real variables, including parameters, without eliminating fixed variables. The degree is computed after expanding auxiliary definitions, simplifying rational constants, and moving the target to one side.

Variables n	Target total degree d_p			Total
	0–2	3–4	5–8	
1–2	6	2	2	10
3–4	4	9	0	13
5–6	7	7	3	17
7–8	4	2	2	8
11	0	1	0	1
Total	21	21	7	49

Instances involving non-polynomial expressions. The remaining 25 instances comprise six Flyspeck instances and nineteen NASALib instances. They involve rational expressions with variable-dependent denominators, absolute values, square roots, logarithms, exponentials, and trigonometric or inverse trigonometric functions, including sine, tangent, and arctangent. Among them, 21 statements contain between one and eight quantified real variables, counting parameters as variables, while four are closed numerical inequalities. Non-polynomial expressions may occur in the target, the assumptions, or the constants defining the domain. The classification follows the input expressions before proof-oriented reformulations.

²<https://github.com/flyspeck/flyspeck>

³<https://github.com/nasa/pvslib>

D EVALUATION PROTOCOL

All methods are evaluated with a two-hour time limit per problem. We use Lean and Mathlib v4.30.0 for all Lean-based methods. Each task retains its original assumptions and target statement; a successful Lean proof must establish that statement without `sorry` or `admit`.

Hardware and agent runtime. The local evaluation platform uses an Intel Core i9-10900K CPU at 3.70 GHz with 64 GB of DDR4 memory. IneqAgent and Direct Agent use `codex-cli` version 0.149.0 as the underlying LLM coding agent. API-based LLM inference is served externally; the locally deployed prover models use the GPUs specified below.

Symbolic computation. For Z3, we encode the assumptions together with the negated target as an SMT satisfiability query. An `unsat` result establishes the inequality, whereas `sat` indicates a counterexample; an unknown result or timeout is not counted as a success. For Maple, we use `PolynomialRing` from the `RegularChains` package to specify the polynomial ring and invoke `SamplePoints` to determine whether the corresponding counterexample constraints have real solutions. A problem is counted as solved when the computation establishes that no such solution exists. For Isabelle/HOL, we apply the `sos` method and count a success when Isabelle completes the formal proof.

LLM provers. We evaluate Goedel-Prover-V2-8B and DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B at pass@32. A problem is solved if at least one of up to 32 proof attempts produces a Lean-verified proof within the two-hour limit. Both models are deployed for inference on NVIDIA L40S GPUs.

Agentic frameworks. For the published agentic baselines, we use the configurations associated with the best reported results in their respective papers, subject to the common two-hour limit. Our framework uses DeepSeek-V4-Flash for the main comparison in Table 1. Agentic methods have no additional caps on proof attempts, LLM calls, or token usage, and API inference is provided by external services. In the cost comparison in Table 2, our framework and Direct Agent use the same backbone in each pair. Direct Agent runs with its default configuration and access to Lean.

We report the percentage of problems solved and the mean time in seconds over successful problems. We compute overall success rate over all 186 problems and overall mean time over all problems successfully solved by each method across the four datasets.

LLM inference pricing. Table 8 lists the token rates used for the four backbones. Uncached input, cached input, and output tokens are charged at their respective rates, and inference cost is accumulated over all LLM calls in a run. Each IneqAgent–Direct Agent pair uses the same backbone and rates. Rates are reported in USD per million tokens and the cost comparisons in Section 4.3 are reported in US cents.

Table 8: LLM inference rates in USD per million tokens. Input denotes uncached input tokens.

Backbone	Input	Cached input	Output
DeepSeek-V4-Flash	0.2206	0.0074	0.6618
Qwen3.8-Flash	0.1176	0.0147	0.3971
Kimi-K3	2.9412	0.2941	14.7059
GPT-5.5	5.0000	0.5000	30.0000

E DETAILS OF THE DITTERT, HOLENS–DJOKOVIC, AND MERRIS CONJECTURES

We give the historical context of the conjectures in Section 4.5, the Dittert certificate constructions, and the proof of our four-dimensional Merris result. Throughout, J_n denotes the matrix whose entries are $1/n$, Ω_n is the set of doubly stochastic $n \times n$ matrices, and $A(i \mid j)$ is obtained by

deleting row i and column j . We use $A \geq 0$ for entrywise nonnegativity and $Q \succeq 0$ for positive semidefiniteness of a symmetric matrix.

Table 9 shows that Dittert $n = 5$ has the largest expanded target, while HD $(4, 4)$ incurs the highest time and cost.

Table 9: Conjecture task sizes and costs. Dittert sizes refer to P_4 and $\tilde{F}_5$ before constraint elimination. For HD $(4, 4)$, sizes refer to the reduced Holens–Djokovic polynomial Q_4 , using the upper-left 3×3 entries as nine independent variables. Time is wall-clock time and Cost is total LLM inference cost.

Task	Variables	Total degree	Monomials	Time (s)	Cost (US cents)
Dittert, $n = 4$	16	4	521	5,292	84.6728
Dittert, $n = 5$	25	5	118,755	6,704	100.1654
HD $(4, 4)$	9	4	222	42,731	521.9610

E.1 DITTERT’S CONJECTURE

Let $K_n = \{A \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n} : \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} = n\}$, and let r_i and c_j be the row and column sums of A . Dittert’s conjecture, recorded in Minc’s 1983 survey and restated as Conjecture 28 in the survey of Cheon and Wanless (Minc, 1983; Cheon & Wanless, 2005), asserts

$$\Phi_n(A) := \prod_{i=1}^n r_i + \prod_{j=1}^n c_j - \text{per}(A) \leq 2 - \frac{n!}{n^n} \quad (A \in K_n), \quad (36)$$

with equality exactly at J_n . On Ω_n , both products of sums equal one, so the inequality reduces to the van der Waerden lower bound $\text{per}(A) \geq n!/n^n$. The additional difficulty is to control matrices in the larger simplex K_n , where neither the row sums nor the column sums are fixed individually.

Sinkhorn proved the $n = 2$ case and showed that a maximizing matrix has positive permanent (Sinkhorn, 1984). Hwang established that any entrywise positive maximizer must be J_n and that J_n is a strict local maximum (Hwang, 1986); he subsequently proved the $n = 3$ case (Hwang, 1987). These results leave the exclusion of nonuniform boundary maximizers as a central obstacle. Cheon and Wanless excluded partly decomposable matrices and matrices whose entire zero set forms a single block, and derived quantitative restrictions on the row and column sums of a possible counterexample (Cheon & Wanless, 2012). Udayan and Somasundaram also established full indecomposability of a maximizer in dimension four (Udayan & Somasundaram, 2024). These structural conditions alone do not identify the maximizer in that dimension. More recently, a 2026 preprint of Pang reports a proof for all $n \geq 17$ using refined scaling estimates (Pang, 2026). Our constructions below address dimensions four and five by explicit rational nonnegativity certificates. Both results include quantitative stability and uniqueness of the maximizer.

E.1.1 DIMENSION FOUR: A QUANTITATIVE STABILITY CERTIFICATE

Polynomial target and certificate template. Flatten the entries of A into $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{16})$, and set

$$h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{16} x_i - 4, \quad \Delta_4(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{16} (x_i - \tfrac{1}{4})^2, \quad P_{4,\lambda}(x) = 61 - 32\Phi_4(A(x)) - \lambda\Delta_4(x). \quad (37)$$

It suffices to prove $P_{4,\lambda} \geq 0$ under $x_i \geq 0$ and $h = 0$ for one rational $\lambda > 0$. We search for a degree-four constrained SOS identity of the form

$$P_{4,\lambda} = \sigma_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{16} x_i \sigma_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 16} x_i x_j \sigma_{ij} + hq, \quad (38)$$

where σ_0 is SOS of degree at most four, σ_i and σ_{ij} are SOS of degree at most two, and $\deg q \leq 3$. Every term except hq is nonnegative on the domain, and hq vanishes there. The initial template using only $x_i \sigma_i$ does not yield a positive stability parameter in the numerical search. Adding the

pairwise generators $x_i x_j$ yields a numerical value near 0.6153852, which motivates the rational candidate $\lambda = 8/13$. This value is accepted only after exact certification; we do not claim that it is the optimal stability parameter.

The resulting template has 136 small Gram blocks, corresponding to $16 + \binom{16}{2}$ generators, and one main block. The small blocks use $z_{\text{sm}} = (1, x_1, \dots, x_{16})^\top$ and have size 17×17 , and the main block uses all monomials of degree at most two and has size 153×153 . A numerical semidefinite solve supplies candidate matrices. Turning them into exact certificates requires handling both singularity and the coupling between blocks.

Removing the forced singular direction. Write $c = (1/4, \dots, 1/4)$. Since $P_{4,8/13}(c) = h(c) = 0$ and every generator $x_i, x_i x_j$ is positive at c , each SOS block must vanish at c . Thus, for a block $\sigma_b = z_b^\top G_b z_b$ with $G_b \succeq 0$, we have $G_b z_b(c) = 0$. Ordering z_b with its constant monomial first, write $z_b(c) = (1, \tilde{z}_b(c)^\top)^\top$ and define

$$R_b = \begin{pmatrix} -\tilde{z}_b(c)^\top \\ I \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_b = R_b S_b R_b^\top. \quad (39)$$

This parameterization enforces the known kernel exactly. The numerical reduced matrices S_b are positive definite, making rational recovery possible without perturbing the forced zero direction.

Sequential rational recovery. We recover and fix the 136 small reduced blocks first. Their entries are rounded to rational values with a common candidate denominator, and each block is accepted only when an exact $LDL^\top$ factorization has positive diagonal entries. The successful common denominator in the construction is 1331. Once these blocks are fixed, let

$$C_{\text{sm}} = \sum_i x_i \sigma_i + \sum_{i < j} x_i x_j \sigma_{ij}, \quad \mathcal{R} = P_{4,8/13} - C_{\text{sm}}.$$

The main block is rationalized and corrected to satisfy two conditions: its reduced matrix remains positive definite, and its residual vanishes identically after imposing the simplex equality. Explicitly, with $\sigma_0 = z_0^\top R_0 S_0 R_0^\top z_0$, where R_0 denotes the matrix R_b for the main block, we check

$$S_0 \succ 0, \quad (\mathcal{R} - \sigma_0) \left(x_1, \dots, x_{15}, 4 - \sum_{i=1}^{15} x_i \right) \equiv 0. \quad (40)$$

The successful denominator parameter for the main-block recovery is 32767. Exact polynomial division then yields $q = (\mathcal{R} - \sigma_0)/h$ with zero remainder, establishing Eq. 38 coefficientwise over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Scaling and the exact code target. The normalized target above and the integer-scaled certificate represent the same inequality. Define

$$Q_{4,\text{int}} = 61 - 32\Phi_4(A) = 32(61/32 - \Phi_4(A)), \quad D_4^s = \sum_{i=1}^{16} x_i^2 - 1. \quad (41)$$

With our convention $h = \sum_i x_i - 4$, the centered distance satisfies $\Delta_4 = D_4^s - h/2$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} F_s &:= 13Q_{4,\text{int}} - 8D_4^s, \\ F_c &:= 13Q_{4,\text{int}} - 8\Delta_4 = F_s + 4h = 13P_{4,8/13} \\ &= 416 \left(\frac{61}{32} - \Phi_4(A) - \frac{1}{52}\Delta_4 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The exported SOS identity for F_s has the same block structure as Eq. 38, with the weights scaled by 13. If its equality multiplier is q_{json} , the identity for F_c uses $q_{\text{json}} + 4$ and the same SOS blocks. The Lean definition `compactTarget` is F_c , dividing its nonnegativity statement by 416 gives the stability constant $1/52$. The coefficient $8/13$ belongs to the 32-fold scaled gap in P_4 ; it must be divided by 32 exactly once to obtain $1/52$.

Conclusion and formal verification. The final certificate contains 152 positively weighted rational squares in the main SOS and 16 in each of the 136 small SOS blocks. The Lean formalization checks the rational weights, the nonnegativity of the constraint factors, and the polynomial identity, and relates the flattened polynomial to the matrix statement. Therefore

$$\frac{61}{32} - \Phi_4(A) \geq \frac{1}{52} \|A - J_4\|_F^2 \quad (A \in K_4). \quad (43)$$

If $\Phi_4(A) = 61/32$, the squared norm must vanish, so $A = J_4$. Conversely, direct evaluation at J_4 gives equality. This establishes both the conjectured upper bound and the unique equality case. The updated proof record identifies `DH4_one_div_52_sos` as the coordinate-level stability theorem and lists matrix theorems for quantitative stability and the full four-dimensional conjecture in `DH4DittertOneDiv52Fast.lean`.

E.1.2 DIMENSION FIVE: SYMMETRY REDUCTION AND EXACT RECOVERY

Homogenization, distance term, and symmetry. For an arbitrary nonnegative 5×5 matrix, put $s = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} H_5(A) &= 1226s^5 - 5^9 \Phi_5(A), \\ G_5(A) &= s^3 \sum_{i,j=1}^5 (25a_{ij} - s)^2 = 625s^3 \sum_{i,j=1}^5 a_{ij}^2 - 25s^5, \\ \tilde{F}_5(A) &= 100H_5(A) - G_5(A). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

The strengthened certificate matches $\tilde{F}_5$, rather than H_5 alone. It is a homogeneous degree-five polynomial in 25 variables with 118,755 monomials after expansion and collection. The factor s^3 makes the squared-distance term homogeneous of degree five as well. Independent row and column permutations, together with transposition, form a symmetry group $\mathcal{T}$ of order $2(5!)^2 = 28,800$. Its action partitions the degree-five monomials into 54 orbits. Let $v(A)$ list the $\binom{26}{2} = 325$ degree-two monomials in the entries. We seek a rational symmetric matrix $Q \succeq 0$ such that

$$\tilde{F}_5(A) = \mathcal{S}_Q(A) := \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \tau(a_{11} v(A)^\top Q v(A)), \quad (45)$$

where τ acts by permuting matrix-entry variables. The factor a_{11} raises the degree from four to five and is nonnegative on the domain. Since both sides are invariant, coefficient matching requires only one equation per monomial orbit, giving 54 linear equations for Q .

Enforcing the equality-point kernel. A numerical semidefinite feasibility solve gives an approximate Gram matrix. At the all-ones matrix, $H_5 = G_5 = \tilde{F}_5 = 0$ and $v = \mathbf{1}_{325}$, and positive semidefiniteness therefore forces $Q\mathbf{1}_{325} = 0$. To preserve this condition throughout rational recovery, write $u = \mathbf{1}_{324}$ and parameterize

$$Q(S) = \begin{pmatrix} S & -Su \\ -u^\top S & u^\top Su \end{pmatrix} = R^\top S R, \quad R = (I_{324} \quad -u). \quad (46)$$

Here S is a symmetric 324×324 matrix. This parameterization enforces symmetry and the zero direction identically, and $Q(S) \succeq 0$ if and only if $S \succeq 0$.

Exact coefficient correction. Vectorize the upper triangle of S into $t \in \mathbb{Q}^{52,650}$. The orbit equations become a rational linear system $Bt = b$, where b contains the orbit coefficients of $100H_5 - G_5$. Strengthening the target changes this right-hand side; the symmetry operator and kernel parametrization are unchanged. After rounding the numerical reduced matrix to a rational candidate t_{rat} , the residual is $b - Bt_{\text{rat}}$. The completed matrix always has the zero direction, so evaluation at the all-ones matrix gives one dependency among the 54 equations. The construction identifies 53 independent rows and verifies their independence by exact elimination. Writing the selected system as $B_* t = b_*$, an exact correction is

$$\delta t = B_*^\top (B_* B_*^\top)^{-1} (b_* - B_* t_{\text{rat}}), \quad t_{\text{exact}} = t_{\text{rat}} + \delta t. \quad (47)$$

This is the minimum Euclidean-norm correction in the chosen upper-triangle coordinates. It limits the perturbation of the numerical candidate but does not itself prove positive semidefiniteness. All 54 original equations are checked again in exact arithmetic after the correction.

Exact positivity and quantitative stability. Positive semidefiniteness must be checked in exact arithmetic after coefficient correction. An exact $LDL^\top$ decomposition of the reduced matrix with nonnegative diagonal weights suffices: by Eq. 46, it gives a rationally weighted sum-of-squares representation of $v^\top Qv$. The strengthened certificate is accepted only after checking symmetry, the exact kernel equation, positive semidefiniteness, and all coefficient identities for $100H_5 - G_5$. Each summand in Eq. 45 is consequently nonnegative, proving $100H_5(A) - G_5(A) \geq 0$ for every $A \geq 0$, without a normalization assumption. At $s = 5$, let $\Delta_5 = \|A - J_5\|_F^2$. Then

$$G_5 = 5^7 \Delta_5, \quad \frac{\tilde{F}_5}{100 \cdot 5^9} = \frac{1226}{625} - \Phi_5(A) - \frac{1}{2500} \Delta_5. \quad (48)$$

Thus the normalized matrix conclusion is

$$\frac{1226}{625} - \Phi_5(A) \geq \frac{1}{2500} \|A - J_5\|_F^2 \quad (A \in K_5). \quad (49)$$

If $\Phi_5(A) = 1226/625$, the positive stability coefficient forces $\Delta_5 = 0$, hence $A = J_5$. Direct substitution gives equality at J_5 . This establishes the conjectured upper bound and uniqueness, including on the boundary of K_5 . Uniqueness follows from the distance estimate; it does not require the strengthened remainder itself to have only one zero.

Lean verification and the matrix theorem. The updated proof record identifies `h5Poly` with H_5 , `uniquenessGapPoly` with G_5 , and `compactTargetPoly` with $100H_5 - G_5$. The theorem `eval_compactTargetPoly_nonnegative` checks the strengthened target on the nonnegative orthant; `DH5_strengthened` then states $G_5/100 \leq H_5$. The matrix-level file `DH5Main.lean` applies $s = 5$ and Eq. 48 to obtain the $1/2500$ stability bound and the unique equality case. These are the quantitative-stability and dimension-five conjecture theorems listed in the updated record.

E.2 HOLENS–DJOKOVIC (4,4) AND MERRIS’S CONJECTURE

Merris proposed in 1973 that every $A \in \Omega_n$ satisfies

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} S_j(A) \leq n \operatorname{per}(A), \quad S_j(A) := \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{per}(A(i \mid j)) \quad (50)$$

(Merris, 1973). The permanent has the weighted column expansion $\operatorname{per}(A) = \sum_i a_{ij} \operatorname{per}(A(i \mid j))$. The conjecture asks for at least one column whose corresponding *unweighted* sum of minors is at most n times the permanent; this does not follow from the expansion alone.

A related result of Marcus and Merris gives $H^{1/2} \operatorname{Padj}(H) H^{1/2} \preceq n \operatorname{per}(H) I_n$ for positive semidefinite Hermitian H , where $\operatorname{Padj}(H)_{ji} = \operatorname{per}(H(i \mid j))$. For positive semidefinite doubly stochastic matrices, their averaged minor inequality implies Eq. 50 (Marcus & Merris, 1973). General doubly stochastic matrices need not be symmetric or positive semidefinite, so this argument does not cover the conjecture in full. Udayan and Somasundaram’s 2021 paper records the general problem as open for $n \geq 4$ and proves it for additional classes, including matrices constant within each column whose largest entry is at least $1/n$ (Udayan & Somasundaram, 2021).

E.2.1 DIMENSION FOUR: AN SOS PROOF VIA HOLENS–DJOKOVIC

Merris target and the certified polynomial. For $A \in \Omega_4$, write

$$S_j(A) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \operatorname{per}(A(i \mid j)), \quad M_{4,j}(A) = 4 \operatorname{per}(A) - S_j(A). \quad (51)$$

The desired conclusion is

$$\forall A \in \Omega_4, \quad \exists j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \quad M_{4,j}(A) \geq 0. \quad (52)$$

The SOS certificate directly proves the (4, 4) instance of the Holens–Djokovic conjecture (Holens, 1964; Djoković, 1967) in the polynomial form

$$Q_4(A) := 24 \operatorname{per}(A) - 2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^4 a_{ij}^3 \geq 0, \quad A \in \Omega_4. \quad (53)$$

As shown below, this implies a bound on the average of the four S_j , which in turn gives Eq. equation 52. Thus Q_4 is a sufficient polynomial target for the Merris result, and we do not identify it with any individual $M_{4,j}$.

Remark 1 (On a previous claim concerning the $(4, 4)$ case). Udayan & Somasundaram (2021, Theorem 6) claim that the Holens–Djokovic inequality fails for $n = k = 4$. Their proof defines

$$\Delta(t) = \text{per}(A) - \text{per}(tJ_4 + (1-t)A)$$

and subsequently uses $\Delta(1) = 0$. However, this definition gives

$$\Delta(1) = \text{per}(A) - \text{per}(J_4) = \text{per}(A) - \frac{3}{32},$$

which is generally nonzero. For example, $A = I_4$ gives $\Delta(1) = 29/32$. Consequently, the subsequent derivative argument, which relies on a zero at $t = 1$, does not establish the claimed disproof. The exact rational SOS certificate presented below independently establishes equation 8 for every $A \in \Omega_4$.

Nine-variable parametrization. Let $u = (u_{11}, u_{12}, \dots, u_{33})$ contain the upper-left 3×3 entries. Define $A(u)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &= u_{ij} & (i, j \leq 3), \\ a_{i4} &= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 u_{ij}, & a_{4j} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 u_{ij} & (i, j \leq 3), \\ a_{44} &= \sum_{i,j=1}^3 u_{ij} - 2. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

All row and column sums are then one. Every matrix in Ω_4 has this representation, and its feasible domain is exactly the sixteen linear inequalities $a_{ij}(u) \geq 0$. Consequently, the parametrization eliminates the equality constraints without relaxing nonnegativity. The polynomial $\hat{Q}_4(u) = Q_4(A(u))$ has nine variables, total degree four, and 222 nonzero monomials after expansion and collection. These are the sizes reported for the Merris experiment in Section 4.5; 222 counts the terms of this single SOS target.

Symmetrized rational SOS certificate. Let G consist of the row permutations, column permutations, and transposition, with $|G| = 2(4!)^2 = 1152$. These transformations preserve Ω_4 and Q_4 . The certificate uses four representative multipliers,

$$m_0(A) = a_{41}a_{42}a_{43}a_{44}, \quad m_1(A) = a_{44}, \quad m_2(A) = a_{44}a_{43}, \quad m_3(A) = a_{44}a_{33}, \tag{55}$$

and has the form

$$\hat{Q}_4(u) = \sum_{r=0}^3 \sum_{\tau \in G} \sum_{k=1}^{N_r} \lambda_{r,k} m_r(\tau A(u)) q_{r,k}(\tau A(u))^2, \quad \lambda_{r,k} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}. \tag{56}$$

Here each $q_{r,k}$ has rational coefficients; when expressed in nine coordinates, its argument is the upper-left block of $\tau A(u)$. The four blocks have $(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) = (9, 24, 42, 34)$ weighted squares before summing over transformations. The implementation partitions the blocks into $(8, 16, 24, 24)$ slices, respectively, for a total of 72 slices. This partition permits parallel checking of the same algebraic identity. For every feasible u , all transformed matrix entries, multipliers, weights, and squares are nonnegative. Hence the certificate establishes Eq. 53, including matrices with zero entries.

The certificate is discovered by semidefinite programming on the nine-variable model. Known equality cases, including the uniform matrix, impose vanishing conditions that reduce the Gram-block dimensions. Numerical Gram data are recovered over the rationals and factored into weighted squares. The exported weights, polynomials, symmetry mappings, and target coefficients are then checked by exact polynomial expansion. The numerical search supplies a candidate; acceptance depends on the rational identity and nonnegativity checks.

From Holens–Djokovic to Merris. For doubly stochastic 4×4 matrices, the proof uses the identity

$$3 \sum_{j=1}^4 S_j(A) = 4 + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^4 a_{ij}^3. \quad (57)$$

After substitution of Eq. 54, both sides are polynomials in u , and the identity is checked by exact expansion. Combining it with the SOS certificate gives

$$16 \operatorname{per}(A) - \sum_{j=1}^4 S_j(A) = \frac{2}{3} Q_4(A) \geq 0. \quad (58)$$

Choose a column j_* minimizing $S_j(A)$. Then

$$S_{j_*}(A) \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^4 S_j(A) \leq 4 \operatorname{per}(A), \quad (59)$$

which proves Eq. 52. This argument applies directly to every $A \in \Omega_4$ and does not require a limiting argument.

Formal verification and the public theorem’s scope. The supplied proof record describes the `HolensDjokovic44Fast` project using Lean and Mathlib version `v4.30.0-rc1`. Its sparse-polynomial modules establish evaluation semantics, while the symmetry and multiplier lemmas justify nonnegativity of each orbit certificate. Each slice checks rational weight nonnegativity and an exact polynomial identity. The certificate module combines all four blocks and identifies their sum with $24 \operatorname{per}(A(u)) - 2 - \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(u)^3$. The final matrix theorem connects the parametrization to Mathlib’s `Matrix.permanent` for arbitrary $A \in \Omega_4$.

The public theorem `holens_djokovic_4_4` states Eq. 53. The public theorem `merris_n4` assumes, in addition to $A \in \Omega_4$, that

$$S_4(A) \leq S_1(A), \quad S_4(A) \leq S_2(A), \quad S_4(A) \leq S_3(A),$$

and concludes $S_4(A) \leq 4 \operatorname{per}(A)$. For the mathematical existential statement, any minimizing column can be moved to position four by a column permutation. Such a permutation preserves double stochasticity and the permanent, and permutes the values S_j . Applying the stated theorem to the permuted matrix and relabeling the column yields Eq. 52. The supplied record documents the fixed-minimum-column Lean theorem; it does not list a separate public theorem with the existential conclusion.

The record reports no `sorry`, `admit`, or project-defined axioms. Large finite equalities are checked with `native_decide`, whose trusted base includes Lean’s native code generator and runtime.