arXiv:2610.41536v3 [cs.LO] 17 Nov 2026

DAPS: Dependency-Aware Premise Selection for LLM Theorem Proving

Zixuan Chen*
ETH Zurich
zxclara@outlook.com

Wenyuan Jiang
ETH Zurich
wenyjiang@student.ethz.ch

Junling Wang
ETH Zurich, ETH AI Center
junling.wang@ai.ethz.ch

Mrinmaya Sachan
ETH Zurich
mrinmaya.sachan@inf.ethz.ch

Yinya Huang*†
ETH Zurich, ETH AI Center
yinya.huang@hotmail.com

Abstract

LLM-based theorem proving in Lean 4 has advanced rapidly, but provers are difficult to leverage newly contributed lemmas, because retrieval skews toward popular foundational lemmas, leaving the right premises buried among hundreds of thousands of candidates. Existing neural selectors rank candidates by semantic similarity, with three intrinsic limitations: frequency-skewed retrieval, isolated pairwise ranking, and degradation on out-of-distribution queries such as competition problems and informal language. Given that mathematics is structured by dependencies rather than similarities, we restore this signal to both the training data and the model. We curate two underused dependency resources. We conduct the first systematic mining of 53 Lean Blueprint projects, a previously untapped corpus of 3,805 manually curated informal+formal nodes that capture rare, research-level premises absent from Mathlib4. We further pair it with the extraction of comprehensive, typed, multi-level Mathlib4 dependencies. We then introduce **DAPS**, a **d**ependency-**a**ware **p**remise **s**elector with a structural neighborhood encoder, a group-level contrastive objective, and a Mathlib-then-Blueprint adaptation procedure. **DAPS** reaches 78.74 Recall@16 on Mathlib4-Heldout (+11.41 over the strong selector LeanHammer) and widens the margin to 7× recall on competition-style queries. Downstream, its selected premises raise Goedel-Prover-V2-8B Pass@4 on miniF2F-test from 49.90 to 54.03 and improve all four general-purpose LLMs on the informal IMO-ProofBench (up to +11.4% relative). Project page: https://daps-eth.github.io/.

1 Introduction

LLM-based Lean 4 theorem proving has progressed rapidly, with frontier provers such as DeepSeek-Prover-V2 [31], Kimina-Prover [35], and Goedel-Prover-V2 [21] reaching IMO-level performance. Yet a fundamental limitation persists: these provers operate within a self-contained paradigm, generating subgoals and reusing constants they have already memorized. Provers are difficult to leverage newly contributed lemmas in Mathlib4 [34] or theorems established by domain experts in collaborative formalization projects, because they lack a reliable way to identify the appropriate premises

*Equal Contribution.
†Corresponding author.

40th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2026).




Figure 1: One dependency graph spanning Mathlib4 (left) and a representative Blueprint project (right). The two resources differ in density and composition. Mathlib4 averages 24 edges per node with strong directional asymmetry across node types, while Blueprint dependencies are much sparser, averaging 1.2, but carry research-level out-of-Mathlib4 declarations and informal LaTeX signals.

among the hundreds of thousands of available declarations. Closing this gap requires premise selection that can reliably reach the rare and recently introduced lemmas, not just the popular foundational ones the prover has already memorized.

Existing neural selectors [43, 49, 26] frame premise selection as semantic retrieval, a framing with three intrinsic limitations that better encoding cannot fix. (P1) **Frequency-skewed retrieval**: rare and recently added premises with weak text signal are displaced in top-K by popular foundational lemmas the prover already controls. (P2) **Group-level relevance**: pairwise similarity ranks each lemma in isolation, missing whether the top-K cohere as a usable proof toolkit. (P3) **Distribution shift**: Mathlib-trained semantic features degrade on out-of-distribution queries such as competition problems, research blueprints, and informal language. The three share a single root cause. Mathematics is structured by dependencies rather than similarities, so what makes a lemma useful is its position in the dependency graph, for example, the classes it presupposes, the lemmas it composes with, and its distance to known premises. Restoring this structure to both the training data and the model architecture is the unifying lever we pursue.

As shown in Figure 1 with the `flt-regular` project as a running example[1], Lean 4 makes at least two rich dependency resources available. **Mathlib4's compiled constant graph** (left) is a typed, heterogeneous DAG with 275k+ nodes and 6.5M edges, where each edge points from a declaration to a constant it uses in its statement or proof. The graph is directionally asymmetric: statement nodes (e.g., `theorem`, `lemma`) have high out-degree and low in-degree, while foundational constructs (e.g., `class`, `structure`, `instance`, `inductive`) show the opposite pattern. **Lean Blueprint projects**[2] (right) are collaborative formalization repositories that contribute 3,805 manually curated nodes (71.7% formal, 28.3% informal) across 53 research projects. Many of these nodes are recent or not-yet-formalized results absent from Mathlib4, so the graph is sparse with an average degree of just 1.2. *Against P1's frequency-skewed retrieval*, Blueprints supply the rare, advanced premises absent from Mathlib4, while the heavy-tailed shape of Mathlib4 itself (top 10% of nodes capture 56% of in-edges) lets us measure the frequency skew directly. *For P2's group-level relevance*, the Mathlib graph encodes which sets of premises are jointly used per proof, providing direct supervision over premise groups rather than individual lemmas. *For P3's distribution shift*, the two resources span in-domain Mathlib (left of Figure 1) and out-of-distribution informal+formal queries (right), and we additionally collect out-of-distribution competition and synthetic proofs as a third source.

We accordingly derive four evaluation benchmarks of increasing distribution shift: Mathlib4-Random (1,000 in-distribution queries with per-declaration random holdout), Mathlib4-Heldout (1,000 in-distribution queries with file-level isolation), **DAPS**-Collection (1,000 queries mined from 152k open-source competitions and synthetic proofs), and **DAPS**-Blueprint (236 informal+formal queries from advanced research projects).

We then introduce **DAPS**, a **d**ependency-**a**ware **p**remise **s**elector that addresses the three problems. *To counter the long-tail collapse of P1*, **DAPS** has a structural neighborhood encoding that augments

[1] https://leanprover-community.github.io/flt-regular/blueprint/dep_graph_document.html
[2] https://github.com/PatrickMassot/leanblueprint

each candidate's text representation with features summarizing its position in the dependency graph (i.e., the kinds of declarations it depends on, its connectivity, and its relation to the query). *For the group-level relevance of P2*, **DAPS** has a group-level training objective that pulls the multiple gold premises of a query towards the query embedding as a single group, away from negatives, so the model learns to rank jointly-useful premise sets near the top, not just individual nearest neighbors. *To absorb the distribution shift of P3*, **DAPS** has a Mathlib-then-Blueprint adaptation procedure that first trains on the abundant typed Mathlib graph, then continually adapts on Blueprint dependencies.

Experiments show that **DAPS** outperforms strong prior selectors on all four benchmarks, with the largest margins on out-of-distribution queries. The lead persists at small retrieval budgets on **DAPS**-Blueprint. Downstream, **DAPS** premises raise Goedel-Prover-V2-8B Pass@4 on miniF2F from 49.90 to 54.03. They also improve four general-purpose LLMs on the informal IMO-ProofBench by up to 11.4% over the best competing selector.

Our contributions are threefold:


- We diagnose three intrinsic limitations of existing premise selectors: long-tail collapse (P1), group-level relevance (P2), and distribution shift (P3).
- We bring underused Lean 4 dependency resources to bear on premise selection, specifically by systematically mining Lean Blueprint projects and comprehensive Mathlib4 dependencies. Derived from them, we release four evaluation benchmarks of increasing distribution shift: Mathlib4-Random, Mathlib4-Heldout, **DAPS**-Collection, and **DAPS**-Blueprint.
- We introduce **DAPS**, a dependency-aware premise selector that outperforms strong prior selectors on all four benchmarks, holds its lead at small retrieval budgets, and improves downstream formal theorem proving on miniF2F and informal theorem proving on IMO-ProofBench.

2 Related Works

Premise selection. Hammers [7, 29, 49], as a significant line of work, primarily rely on brute-force proof state suggestions, which are not well supported by LLM provers. Some advanced works [38, 16, 11, 26] develop frameworks for leveraging the advantages of both hammers and LLMs, where the LLMs are trained for tool use instead of using the premises. On the other hand, decomposition-based methods [17, 36, 3] solely break down proof goals into simpler objectives or tractable subgoals, using self-generated premises. Retrieval-augmented provers [43, 33] passively receive retrieved premises solely relying on semantic similarity. **DAPS** addresses this bottleneck by augmenting each candidate's text representation with its position in the Lean dependency graph and training on premise groups rather than individual lemmas, **DAPS** produces top-K premise sets whose collective utility is more legible to theorem proving.

Graph- and dependency-aware premise selection. A separate line of work treats premise selection as graph-structured retrieval over formula syntax or proof dependencies. Building on deep graph embeddings of formula trees [37], subsequent work strengthens the structural component via subgraph pooling [6], higher-order logic encodings [28], graph contrastive pretraining [19], and graph sequence learning [15]. Existing Lean dependency extractors are limited in different respects: lean-graph [4] resolves precise fully-qualified names through Lean meta-programming but covers only four node types and depth-bounded subgraphs from a root, import-graph [5] captures only module-level import edges and requires a successful `lake build`, and the ntp-toolkit underlying LeanHammer [49] recovers tactic-implicit (`rw`, `simp`) references but restricts nodes to theorems and definitions. **DAPS** contributes a richer extraction pipeline with the broadest node and edge schema, no Lean environment or successful build required, scales to the full Mathlib4 library with node-level file reconstruction, and extends to a previously untapped Blueprint corpus. It trains on this graph with a structural neighborhood encoder and group-level contrastive objective, rather than the per-formula syntax graphs and single-positive similarity ranking used by prior graph-based selectors.

LLM theorem proving. LLM-based theorem proving has evolved from transformer-based step generation [30] and LLM-driven goal decomposition [17, 36] to large-scale RL-trained whole-proof models such as DeepSeek-Provers [39, 40, 31], Kimina-Prover [35], and Goedel-Provers [20, 21], alongside natural-language provers such as Gemini Deep Think [23] and Aletheia [10]. All operate self-contained, relying on internally generated subgoals and memorized premises, overlooking the possibility of using newly established and rare theorems from external databases. **DAPS** provides the premise-side complement by surfacing rare and recently introduced lemmas from Lean libraries, enabling general-purpose LLMs to prove theorems beyond their training distribution.



(a) Typed edge spectrum.

(b) In-/out-degree asymmetry.

Figure 2: Mathlib4's dependency graph carries a rich, asymmetric, frequency-skewed structure. (a) 15 typed edge categories totaling 6.5M edges. (b) Average in- vs. out-degree per node category (bubble area $\propto \log_{10} \#\text{nodes}$). Statements (red) sit at the high-out/low-in extreme, foundational type-defining constructs (blue) at the opposite extreme.

3 Dependency Resources

We assemble two Lean 4 dependency resources, the typed dependency graph of Mathlib4 (Section 3.1) and a mined corpus of 53 open-source Lean Blueprint projects (Section 3.2), and derive four evaluation benchmarks from them (Section 3.3).

3.1 Mathlib Graph

We compile all Lean 4 source files in `mathlib-4.22.0`, which yields the corresponding compiled constants in the `*.olean` files for each formal declaration, including `theorems`, `lemmas`, `definitions`, `instances`, and so forth. Such compiled constants represent the dependencies. For each formal declaration, we also record its `type` and `docstring`. We disable notation pretty printing and extend the constants with their fully qualified name, following LeanHammer [49]. Because the goal of training **DAPS** is to bring together premises applicable for proving a specific theorem, for each declaration, we further parse its statement and the whole proof from the source Lean file. We record the line number and namespace for precise positioning and reconstruction. Additionally, we record the containment relationship between each declaration and its file, as well as the import relationship between files. As a result, these dependencies form a multi-level directed acyclic graph, where each node is either a formal declaration or a file, and each edge represents a typed relationship. Figure 2a shows the edge spectrum of the constructed dependency graph. Appendix E.1 shows the complete node and edge categories, and further analysis.

The graph also carries strong directional structure (Figure 2b). Statement categories `theorem` and `lemma`, which jointly comprise 56% of all declarations, have a low average in-degree (3–5) but a high average out-degree (27–31). These categories consume many premises but are rarely premises themselves. Foundational categories such as `class`, `structure`, and `instance` are opposite, with average in-degree up to two orders of magnitude higher and out-degree below 6. Premise selection is therefore inherently asymmetric retrieval, in which queries in the high-out, low-in end must be matched against premises in the high-in, low-out end. We encode in- and out-degree as separate features in **DAPS** to capture this asymmetry.

3.2 Blueprint Mining

In Lean 4, Blueprint is a tool to manage collaborative formalization projects. For each project, a dependency graph is automatically generated from the human-written chapters of cross-referenced definitions, lemmas, propositions, theorems, and corollaries, which are initially written in LaTeX and then progressively manually formalized in Lean 4. While some of these mathematical statements have been integrated into Mathlib, others have been written anew by mathematicians, and the dependencies are recorded solely in the blueprint. This is especially the case for advanced theorem formalization projects. As a result, the blueprint dependency graphs contain rich information that is not presented

Table 1: Mined Lean Blueprint corpus (full per-project listing in Appendix E.2).

# Projects	53
# Nodes / # Edges	3,805 / 4,651
Formal vs. informal nodes	2,728 (71.7%) / 1,077 (28.3%)
Project size: median / mean / range	35 / 71.8 / 6–525
Fully-formalized projects	14
Informal-majority projects	14

Table 2: Training and evaluation data.

Source	**#Train**	**#Val**	**Test slices (#queries)**
Mathlib4	275,842	2,000	Mathlib4-Heldout (1,000), Mathlib4-Random (1,000)
Blueprints	1,880	235	**DAPS**-Blueprint (236)
DAPS-Collection	–	–	**DAPS**-Collection (1,000)

in the Mathlib: (1) Each node has a high-quality informal statement and proof; (2) The graph contains infrequent nodes out of Mathlib. These provide high-quality and infrequent data for training **DAPS**.

We collect blueprints from open-sourced Blueprint projects. We exclude low-quality items, including those with an excessively high proportion of missing formalized statements and those with a limited number of dependencies. This results in 53 blueprint dependency graphs with a total of 3,805 nodes. Table 13 in Appendix E.2 includes detailed statistics.

Table 1 summarizes the resulting corpus, and Figure 3 breaks it down by project. The corpus contains 3,805 nodes and 4,651 dependency edges, split 71.7%/28.3% between formal and informal nodes. Project sizes are long-tailed: the median project contains 35 nodes, the mean 72, and a handful of research-level efforts account for over half of the total, while the remaining 38 smaller projects form the low-frequency tail. Such research-level projects include `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd` (525 nodes), `brownian-motion` (458), `pfr` (218), `equational_theories` (214), and the eleven FLT sub-chapters (239 combined). Together, these projects cover number theory, analysis, algebra, topology, and combinatorics, with no single area dominating.

Crucially, the formal/informal proportion varies widely across projects. Per-project formal ratio ranges from 29% (`FormalBook`) to 100% (`sphere-eversion`, `liquid-s1`), reflecting the full life-cycle from early-stage research blueprint to completed formalization. 14 are fully formalized, 14 remain informal-majority, and the rest sit in a mixed state. This is precisely what makes Blueprints a useful complement to Mathlib4, where every project contributes both fully-checked formal anchor nodes and informal frontier nodes that have yet to be formalized. The latter are the rare, high-value premises that no purely Mathlib-trained selector ever sees.




Figure 3: Composition of the mined Blueprint corpus. The top-15 projects are shown individually, while the remaining 38 are aggregated into the bottom bar. Bars are divided into formal nodes (green; statements with Lean proofs) and informal nodes (gray; LaTeX-only statements, sometimes with informal proofs).

3.3 Data Splits and Benchmarks

We use two training sources and one test-only out-of-distribution source (Table 2). **Mathlib4-Random** (1,000 queries) samples queries at random across all files, disjoint from the training and validation sets. **Mathlib4-Heldout** (1,000 queries) holds out entire source files from training, a more conservative split than the theorem-level holdout used by prior work [49]. **DAPS-Collection** (1,000 queries) probes query-side distribution shift. Queries are sampled from 152,038 (`problem, proof`) pairs aggregated from three open-source Lean 4 datasets in Olympiad and synthetic styles, with candidates still drawn from Mathlib4. **DAPS-Blueprint** (236 queries) is

the test slice of an 8:1:1 split of our Blueprint corpus, stressing rare premises and informal queries. Full split methodology and source datasets are in Appendix E.3.

4 The DAPS Selector

DAPS is introduced to address the sketched problems Section 1 with: a structural neighborhood encoder for P1 (Section 4.2), a group-level training objective for P2 (Section 4.3), and a two-stage adaptation procedure for P3 (Section 4.4). We first formalize the task.

4.1 Problem Formulation

Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ denote a Lean library represented as a typed multi-level dependency DAG, where $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of declarations and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{T}$ is a typed edge set with edge categories $\mathcal{T}$ (Section 3.1). For each query declaration $q \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{P}^\star(q) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ denote its *positive* premises — the declarations the verified proof of q depends on. Given a candidate pool $\mathcal{C}(q)$, premise selection produces a ranking $r : \mathcal{C}(q) \to \mathbb{R}$ that places $\mathcal{P}^\star(q)$ at the top, evaluated by Recall@K:

$$\mathrm{R@}K(q) \;=\; \frac{|\,\mathrm{Top}_K(r) \cap \mathcal{P}^\star(q)\,|}{|\mathcal{P}^\star(q)|}.$$

DAPS instantiates r by learning dependency-based embeddings $h(\cdot)$ of queries and candidates and ranking by cosine similarity $\mathrm{sim}(h(q), h(p))$.

4.2 Structural Neighborhood Encoding

For each candidate $p \in \mathcal{C}(q)$, we encode both p itself and a sampled neighborhood from its 2-hop dependency subgraph in $\mathcal{L}$. The neighborhood signal is what allows **DAPS** to rank rare premises whose own declaration text is short or unfamiliar (P1).

Semantic encoding. A small text encoder maps the concatenation of `name`, `category`, `signature`, `docstring`, `statement`, and `proof` of any declaration p to a base feature $h_{\mathrm{feat}}(p) = \mathrm{Encoder}(p)$. The encoder is fine-tuned with the masked contrastive loss of [49], with queries and premises encoded independently and their embeddings contrasted on (q, p_{pos}) and (q, p_{neg}) pairs, and then frozen for the rest of **DAPS** training (Appendix F).

Dynamic subgraph sampling. For each candidate p, we collect the 1- and 2-hop neighbors of p in $\mathcal{L}$, randomly sample m of them, score the m candidates with a learnable two-layer FFN over $h_{\mathrm{feat}}(\cdot)$, and retain the top-n scored neighbors as $\mathcal{N}(p)$. This sample-then-score selection bounds compute and memory while preferentially retaining structurally informative neighbors. It also matches the deployment-time constraint that downstream LLM provers consume only a bounded premise list.

Per-neighbor structural features. We adapt three token features from the relational graph transformer (RelGT) [9] and add one feature specific to typed dependency graphs. For each $p_i \in \{p\} \cup \mathcal{N}(p)$ we compute:

1. *Type* embedding $h_{\mathrm{type}}(p_i)$ via a one-hot over the `subcategory` field [9];
2. *Hop* embedding $h_{\mathrm{hop}}(p, p_i) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ giving the dependency hop distance from p to p_i [9];
3. *Positional* encoding $h_{\mathrm{pe}}(p_i)$ over the sampled local subgraph [9];
4. *Degree* embedding $h_{\mathrm{deg}}(p_i) = W_{\mathrm{deg}}\,[\deg^-(p_i); \deg^+(p_i)]$ of in- and out-degree, which is motivated by the directional asymmetry of the dependency graph (Section 3.1, Figure 2b), in which different declaration categories occupy distinct in- vs. out-degree regions.

Fusion. Per-neighbor representations are merged by a two-layer MLP O, with the candidate's own type re-injected through a residual path so it cannot be lost in subgraph aggregation:

$$h(p_i) \;=\; O\left[h_{\mathrm{feat}}(p_i);\, h_{\mathrm{type}}(p_i);\, h_{\mathrm{hop}}(p, p_i);\, h_{\mathrm{pe}}(p_i)\right] \;+\; h_{\mathrm{deg}}(p_i) \;+\; h_{\mathrm{res}}(p),$$

where $h_{\mathrm{res}}(p) = W_{\mathrm{type}}\,\mathrm{onehot}(\phi(p))$.

4.3 Group-Level Contrastive Objective

A useful proof typically requires several premises working together. Therefore, unlike the typical contrastive setup that a query is pulled toward a single positive sample, **DAPS** is designed to rank a

large set of candidate premises, in which multiple positives are pulled toward the query *as a group* relative to the negatives (P2).

For each query q in a training batch, we sample a positive set $\mathcal{P}_q^+ \subseteq \mathcal{P}^\star(q)$ (the top-ℓ positives under the category priority of Appendix F) and a negative set $\mathcal{P}_q^-$ via three complementary strategies, drawing on standard hard-negative mining techniques: (i) *temporal* sampling of k_t declarations preceding q in the same or imported files; (ii) *global* sampling of k_g declarations uniformly from $\mathcal{L}$; and (iii) *cross-batch* sampling of k_c candidates re-used from other queries in the batch, after masking those that collide with $\mathcal{P}^\star(q)$. The loss is

$$\mathcal{L}_q \;=\; -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}_q^+|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_q^+} \log \frac{\exp\big(\mathrm{sim}(h(q),\, h(p))/\tau\big)}{\sum_{p' \in \mathcal{P}_q^+ \cup \mathcal{P}_q^-} \exp\big(\mathrm{sim}(h(q),\, h(p'))/\tau\big)},$$

with temperature τ. Each positive contributes its own log-term but shares the denominator with the rest of $\mathcal{P}_q^+$ and all negatives, encouraging the entire positive group to dominate the ranking rather than only the closest one.

4.4 Mathlib-to-Blueprint Adaptation

Lean usage spans diverse distributions (P3). To transfer the structural signal learned on Mathlib4 to the long tail of advanced and not-yet-formalized premises in the Blueprint corpus (Section 3.2), **DAPS** uses a two-stage training procedure. *(1) Mathlib4 pretraining* yields strong representations of typed dependency graph structure on the abundant Mathlib data. *(2) Blueprint continual training* then fine-tunes the structural fusion modules on the Blueprint training split, with a smaller dynamic-sampling budget reflecting the smaller corpus size. The queries are informal statements, and the candidate premises are encoded with both their formal and informal statements. The implementation details are in Appendix F We report both the Mathlib-only and the continually-trained model in Section 5, demonstrating that the typed-graph signal learned on Mathlib transfers, and that Blueprint adaptation further improves recall on rare and advanced premises.

4.5 Informal-Query Adaptation

When the query itself is informal (i.e., a natural-language theorem statement), **DAPS** is paired with a formalizer $\mathcal{F}$ that produces a Lean statement $\tilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q_{\mathrm{nl}})$. **DAPS** then operates on $\tilde{q}$ as a formal query and returns Lean-side premises. This formalize-then-retrieve composition lets downstream systems that consume informal proofs, such as general-purpose LLMs, still benefit from dependency-aware retrieval, without **DAPS** itself ever processing natural language.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup


Datasets. We evaluate on the four benchmarks introduced in Section 3.3: Mathlib4-Random and Mathlib4-Heldout for in-distribution and within-Mathlib generalization, **DAPS**-Collection for query-side distribution shift to Olympiad and synthetic problems, and **DAPS**-Blueprint for retrieval against the rare, advanced, and informal+formal premises. Split sizes follow Table 2.

Baselines. We group baselines by the experiment in which each is evaluated. (1) *Retrieval baselines*: the symbolic selector MePo [24], the LeanDojo-trained ReProver [43] based on the small variant of Google ByT5 [41], the sentence-transformer-based LeanHammer [49], and the general-purpose Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]. For a fair comparison, we retrain ReProver, LeanHammer, and Qwen3-Embedding-8B on our Mathlib dependency data using their published recipes. MePo is symbolic and used as released, via the Lean implementation from LeanHammer[3]. Every method is run three times with different global random seeds. ReProver, LeanHammer, and Qwen3-Embedding-8B are deterministic at inference for a fixed checkpoint, MePo varies with its traversal ordering, and **DAPS** varies through dynamic subgraph sampling. (2) *Downstream-utility baselines*: in addition to Qwen3-Embedding-8B above, we compare against two production-grade Lean search engines that natively accept informal natural-language queries: LeanExplore [1] and LeanSearch [12]. Both are used as released APIs.

[3] https://github.com/hanwenzhu/premise-selection

Table 3: Retrieval results at $K=16$ on all four benchmarks. P, R, and F1 denote Precision@16, Recall@16, and macro-F1@16 (%). Values are means over three runs; standard deviations are reported in Tables 15–18 in Appendix H.1. Qwen3: Qwen3-Embedding-8B. For fair comparison, ReProver, LeanHammer, and Qwen3-Embedding-8B are retrained on the same Mathlib dependency data using their published recipes. MePo is symbolic and used as released. MePo is not applicable to **DAPS**-Blueprint. ‡: **DAPS** after Blueprint continual training; all other **DAPS** results are from the Mathlib-only model. Best results are in bold.

	Mathlib4-Random			**Mathlib4-Heldout**			**DAPS-Collection**			**DAPS-Blueprint**		
Method	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
MePo [25]	8.02	14.14	8.95	4.30	7.98	5.12	0.74	0.53	0.60	–	–	–
ReProver [43]	13.01	26.97	15.68	12.13	32.32	16.70	1.05	0.75	0.85	2.44	25.37	4.36
LeanHammer [49]	35.56	61.13	40.57	28.02	67.33	37.41	2.94	1.98	2.32	2.97	31.36	5.32
Qwen3 [47]	5.84	11.54	6.87	3.21	6.74	4.03	0.34	0.24	0.27	1.11	11.02	1.97
DAPS (Ours)	**37.60**	**66.01**	**43.49**	**32.47**	**78.74**	**43.67**	**26.28**	**13.84**	**18.00**	**3.83**‡	**42.21**‡	**6.87**‡



(a) Recall@K on **DAPS**-Blueprint. (b) Premise-frequency breakdown on Mathlib4-Random. (c) Premise-frequency breakdown on Mathlib4-Heldout.

Figure 4: Single-run comparison of **DAPS** with ReProver [43] and LeanHammer [49]. (a) Recall@K on **DAPS**-Blueprint for $K \in \{8, 16, 32\}$. (b) Per-pair hit@32 by premise frequency on Mathlib4-Random. (c) Per-pair hit@32 by premise frequency on Mathlib4-Heldout.

Metrics. For retrieval, we report precision, recall, and macro-F1 at a fixed budget of K retrieved premises. We use $K=16$ as the main setting (Table 3). Additional results at $K=32$ are reported in Appendix H.1. For the informal proving experiments, we follow the IMO-ProofBench protocol [22] and report grading scores from the IMO-ProofBench autograder, using the same grading prompts and grading model as the original benchmark.

Infrastructure. Training and inference compute, as well as hardware specifications, are reported in Appendix D.

5.2 Results on Premise Selection

Table 3 reports precision, recall, and macro-F1 at $K=16$ across the four benchmarks. Three observations stand out. (1) For in-distribution Mathlib retrieval (Mathlib4-Random/Mathlib4-Heldout), **DAPS** reaches 66.01/78.74 Recall@16, an absolute gain of +4.88/+11.41 over the strong prior selector LeanHammer (61.13/67.33), with corresponding F1 gains of +2.92/+6.26. (2) Under out-of-distribution shift to competition-style queries (**DAPS**-Collection), all prior selectors collapse to below 3% recall, with the best baseline at 1.98. **DAPS** reaches 13.84 recall and 26.28 precision, a 7× and 9× improvement respectively, demonstrating the value of dependency-graph signal under query distribution shift. (3) For rare, advanced, and informal+formal premises (**DAPS**-Blueprint), **DAPS** with Blueprint continual training reaches 42.21 Recall@16, +10.85 over LeanHammer (31.36).

Figure 4a reports Recall@K on **DAPS**-Blueprint for $K \in \{8, 16, 32\}$ from a single run, extending the $K=16$ comparison of Table 3. **DAPS** outperforms LeanHammer at every K, with absolute gains of +10.85, +11.01, and +9.48 at $K = 8$, 16, and 32, respectively. The gap remains large even at small K, demonstrating **DAPS**'s value for downstream LLMs with limited context windows for premises.

Table 4: Formal theorem proving results on miniF2F-test [48]. **Bold** and underline are the best and the second-best results, respectively.

	Goedel-Prover-V2-8B			DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B		
	pass@1	pass@2	pass@4	pass@1	pass@2	pass@4
w/o premises	36.48	43.62	49.90	34.07	42.23	48.23
LeanExplore [1]	**40.37**	47.18	52.36	36.73	44.29	48.72
LeanSearch [12]	39.19	46.05	51.43	34.32	42.21	47.32
Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]	39.86	46.41	51.84	35.09	42.86	47.68
MePo [25]	37.92	44.74	50.60	35.60	43.06	47.75
ReProver [43]	38.42	44.69	50.01	35.19	43.41	48.66
LeanHammer [49]	37.45	43.90	48.93	34.89	43.57	**49.19**
DAPS	39.96	**47.51**	**54.03**	**38.11**	**44.70**	49.06

Table 5: Downstream utility performance. Pass@8 of different LLMs on IMO-ProofBench [22] using premises from compared premise selectors. In this table, we strictly follow the original grading prompts from the IMO-ProofBench paper and use the identical grading model. Qwen3: Qwen3-Embedding-8B. $\Delta\%$: Relative improvement (in %) of DAPS over the best-performing baseline in each row, computed as (DAPS - best baseline) / best baseline.

Model	**LeanExplore**	**LeanSearch**	**Qwen3**	**DAPS**	$\Delta\%$
Qwen3-235b [42]	18.45	17.01	19.08	**21.25**	11.37
DeepSeek-V3.1 [8]	11.96	12.38	13.75	**13.90**	1.09
kimi-k2-instruct [2]	8.66	8.26	8.27	**9.08**	4.85
Gemini-3.6-Flash [14]	46.13	44.04	45.51	**48.69**	5.55

5.3 Results on Formal Theorem Proving

Table 4 reports results on miniF2F-test with two whole-proof provers. Implementation details are in Appendix G. We report Pass@k for $k \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ because these provers generate a whole proof from a premise list supplied once up front, so a single sample is high-variance.

Supplying **DAPS**-selected premises improves proof success over the no-premise baseline in all six settings, with Pass@1 gains of +3.48 on Goedel-Prover-V2-8B and +4.04 on DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B. **DAPS** is best in four of the six settings and within 0.5 points of the best in the other two. It also outperforms LeanExplore, a strong baseline, in five of the six settings. On DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B the gain narrows as k grows (+4.04, +2.47, +0.83), and all selectors land within two points of each other at Pass@4, suggesting that with a larger sampling budget the prover becomes the bottleneck rather than the premise list.

Other selectors do not consistently help. At Pass@4, LeanHammer falls below the no-premise baseline with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B (48.93 vs. 49.90), as do LeanSearch, Qwen3-Embedding-8B, and MePo with DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B. The same selector can also behave differently across provers. LeanHammer, a strong baseline in retrieval (Table 3), gives the best Pass@4 with DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B but the worst with Goedel-Prover-V2-8B. End-to-end proof success therefore depends jointly on the selected premises and the prover's ability to use them, and is not implied by retrieval metrics alone. Finally, the evaluated provers were not trained to condition on a supplied premise list, so these gains are likely a lower bound. Training provers for premise-conditioned generation is a promising direction we leave to future work.

5.4 Results on Informal Theorem Proving

We test whether **DAPS**'s retrieval improvements also transfer to informal proving, where a general-purpose LLM produces a natural-language proof, conditioned on a list of retrieved Lean premises.

Setup. We follow the adaptation in Section 4.5. Each informal IMO-ProofBench [22] query is first formalized into a Lean statement by Gemini 3 Pro [13]. The Lean statement is fed to each selector, which returns its top-16 Mathlib premises. The original informal query and the selected premises are then given to a general-purpose LLM, which writes an informal proof. The proof is graded by the IMO-ProofBench autograder with the original grading prompt and grading model. We evaluate four LLMs, Qwen3-235B [42], DeepSeek-V3.1 [8], Kimi-K2-Instruct [2], and Gemini-3.6-Flash [14]. We

compare **DAPS** with LeanExplore [1], LeanSearch [12], and Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]. Every selector receives the same formalized query and the same budget of $K{=}16$ premises. We report Pass@8 only, owing to the cost of the autograder.

Results. Table 5 reports the results. Premises returned by **DAPS** yield the highest grades for all four LLMs, with relative gains over the best baseline ranging from 1.09% (DeepSeek-V3.1) to 11.37% (Qwen3-235B). This holds even though the best baseline changes across LLMs (Qwen3-Embedding-8B for Qwen3-235B and DeepSeek-V3.1, LeanExplore for Kimi-K2-Instruct and Gemini-3.6-Flash). The gain on DeepSeek-V3.1 (+0.15 points) is small and may be within grader noise. Still, the consistent ordering across four model families shows that dependency-aware formal retrieval transfers to informal proof generation.

5.5 Analysis

Ablation study on training objective. To isolate the contribution of the group-level contrastive objective, we replace it with single-positive InfoNCE [27]. This drops Recall@32 to 56.48 on Mathlib4-Random, 56.00 on Mathlib4-Heldout, and 15.25 on **DAPS**-Collection, an absolute decrease of 23.14, 33.30, and 9.13 from the full **DAPS** configuration. The result confirms the value of group-level relevance as a training signal. Further ablation studies are deferred to Appendix H.3.

Premise frequency breakdown. On Mathlib4-Random and Mathlib4-Heldout, we collect all (`query` q`, gold premise` p) pairs from the test set and bucket each premise by its test-set frequency, i.e., the number of queries that list it as gold. For each pair, hit@32 is 1 if p appears in the selector's top-32 retrievals for q and 0 otherwise. We report the mean hit@32 within each bucket on Mathlib4-Random (Figure 4b) and Mathlib4-Heldout (Figure 4c). On Mathlib4-Random, **DAPS** and LeanHammer achieve broadly comparable per-bucket hit rates while ReProver trails consistently. LeanHammer narrowly leads on the head bucket and the singletons ($n = 1$), while **DAPS** leads in the four middle buckets. Semantic similarity is therefore sufficient when the training and test premise distributions are closely matched. The picture changes on Mathlib4-Heldout, whose file-level isolation introduces a moderate distribution shift on the query side. **DAPS** leads LeanHammer in every bucket, by 2.3 points on the head (91.6 vs 89.3) and 10.7 on the rarest bucket (50.1 vs 39.4), with the gap widening toward the tail. This matches the P1 prediction that rare premises carry less text signal, so baselines miss them more often once the test distribution shifts. In contrast, **DAPS** lifts performance uniformly across the frequency spectrum.

Case studies and limitations. We provide additional qualitative case studies and a failure-mode analysis for **DAPS** in Appendices H.4 and H.5. Detailed limitations are in Appendix A.

6 Conclusion

We identify three intrinsic limitations of current premise selectors, namely frequency-skewed retrieval (P1), the inability to model group-level relevance (P2), and brittleness under distribution shift (P3). All three trace back to underexploiting the dependency structure built into mathematics. We curate two underused Lean 4 dependency resources, a typed multi-level graph extracted from Mathlib4 and a systematically mined corpus of Lean Blueprint projects, and derive four retrieval benchmarks of increasing distribution shift. We introduce **DAPS**, a dependency-aware selector with a structural neighborhood encoder, a group-level contrastive objective, and a Mathlib-then-Blueprint adaptation procedure. Experiments show that **DAPS** outperforms strong selectors on all four benchmarks, with +11.41 Recall@16 over LeanHammer on Mathlib4-Heldout and a 7× recall margin on competition-style queries. The lead persists at small retrieval budgets on **DAPS**-Blueprint. Downstream, its premises raise Goedel-Prover-V2-8B Pass@4 on miniF2F from 49.90 to 54.03 and improve four general-purpose LLMs on the informal IMO-ProofBench. These results also suggest that premise-conditioned generation, rather than retrieval alone, is an important remaining bottleneck.

Acknowledgement and Disclosures

This work was supported in part by the ETH Career Seed Award to Yinya Huang, the Swiss AI Large Grant SCR1089274, and Swiss National Supercomputing Centre (CSCS) project ID a130. Junling Wang is partially supported by an ETH AI Center Doctoral Fellowship. Yinya Huang is partially supported by an ETH AI Center Postdoctoral Fellowship.

References

[1] Justin Asher. Leanexplore: A search engine for lean 4 declarations. *CoRR*, abs/2506.11085, 2025.

[2] Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, Guanduo Chen, Jiahao Chen, Ningxin Chen, Ruijue Chen, Yanru Chen, Yuankun Chen, Yutian Chen, Zhuofu Chen, Jialei Cui, Hao Ding, Mengnan Dong, Angang Du, Chenzhuang Du, Dikang Du, Yulun Du, Yu Fan, Yichen Feng, Kelin Fu, Bofei Gao, Hongcheng Gao, Peizhong Gao, Tong Gao, Xinran Gu, Longyu Guan, Haiqing Guo, Jianhang Guo, Hao Hu, Xiaoru Hao, Tianhong He, Weiran He, Wenyang He, Chao Hong, Yangyang Hu, Zhenxing Hu, Weixiao Huang, Zhiqi Huang, Zihao Huang, Tao Jiang, Zhejun Jiang, Xinyi Jin, Yongsheng Kang, Guokun Lai, Cheng Li, Fang Li, Haoyang Li, Ming Li, Wentao Li, Yanhao Li, Yiwei Li, Zhaowei Li, Zheming Li, Hongzhan Lin, Xiaohan Lin, Zongyu Lin, Chengyin Liu, Chenyu Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Jingyuan Liu, Junqi Liu, Liang Liu, Shaowei Liu, T. Y. Liu, Tianwei Liu, Weizhou Liu, Yangyang Liu, Yibo Liu, Yiping Liu, Yue Liu, Zhengying Liu, Enzhe Lu, Lijun Lu, Shengling Ma, Xinyu Ma, Yingwei Ma, Shaoguang Mao, Jie Mei, Xin Men, Yibo Miao, Siyuan Pan, Yebo Peng, Ruoyu Qin, Bowen Qu, Zeyu Shang, Lidong Shi, Shengyuan Shi, Feifan Song, Jianlin Su, Zhengyuan Su, Xinjie Sun, Flood Sung, Heyi Tang, Jiawen Tao, Qifeng Teng, Chensi Wang, Dinglu Wang, Feng Wang, and Haiming Wang. Kimi K2: open agentic intelligence. *CoRR*, abs/2507.20534, 2025.

[3] Chenrui Cao, Liangcheng Song, Zenan Li, Xinyi Le, Xian Zhang, HUI XUE, and Fan Yang. Reviving DSP for advanced theorem proving in the era of reasoning models. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.

[4] Patrik Cihal. lean-graph: Visualizing lean dependency graphs. https://github.com/patrik-cihal/lean-graph, 2024. Accessed: 2026.

[5] Lean Prover Community. import-graph: Tools for working with module dependencies in lean projects. https://github.com/leanprover-community/import-graph, 2024. Accessed: 2026.

[6] Maxwell Crouse, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Cristina Cornelio, Veronika Thost, Lingfei Wu, Kenneth D. Forbus, and Achille Fokoue. Improving graph neural network representations of logical formulae with subgraph pooling. *CoRR*, abs/1911.06904, 2019.

[7] Łukasz Czajka and Cezary Kaliszyk. Hammer for coq: Automation for dependent type theory. *Journal of automated reasoning*, 61(1):423–453, 2018.

[8] DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2412.19437, 2024.

[9] Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Sri Jaladi, Yangyi Shen, Federico López, Charilaos I. Kanatsoulis, Rishi Puri, Matthias Fey, and Jure Leskovec. Relational graph transformer. *CoRR*, abs/2505.10960, 2025.

[10] Tony Feng, Trieu H Trinh, Garrett Bingham, Dawsen Hwang, Yuri Chervonyi, Junehyuk Jung, Joonkyung Lee, Carlo Pagano, Sang-hyun Kim, Federico Pasqualotto, et al. Towards autonomous mathematics research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10177*, 2026.

[11] Emily First, Markus N. Rabe, Talia Ringer, and Yuriy Brun. Baldur: Whole-proof generation and repair with large language models. In Satish Chandra, Kelly Blincoe, and Paolo Tonella, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, pages 1229–1241. ACM, 2023.

[12] Guoxiong Gao, Haocheng Ju, Jiedong Jiang, Zihan Qin, and Bin Dong. A semantic search engine for mathlib4. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 8001–8013. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.

[13] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3 pro model card, November 2025.

[14] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.6 flash model card, July 2026.

[15] Edvard K. Holden and Konstantin Korovin. Graph sequence learning for premise selection. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 128:102376, 2025.

[16] Albert Qiaochu Jiang, Wenda Li, Szymon Tworkowski, Konrad Czechowski, Tomasz Odrzygózdz, Piotr Milos, Yuhuai Wu, and Mateja Jamnik. Thor: Wielding hammers to integrate language models and automated theorem provers. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022.

[17] Albert Qiaochu Jiang, Sean Welleck, Jin Peng Zhou, Timothée Lacroix, Jiacheng Liu, Wenda Li, Mateja Jamnik, Guillaume Lample, and Yuhuai Wu. Draft, sketch, and prove: Guiding formal theorem provers with informal proofs. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.

[18] Po-Nien Kung, Linfeng Song, Dawsen Hwang, Jinsung Yoon, Chun-Liang Li, Simone Severini, Mirek Olsák, Edward Lockhart, Quoc V. Le, Burak Gokturk, Thang Luong, Tomas Pfister, and Nanyun Peng. LEAP: supercharging llms for formal mathematics with agentic frameworks. *CoRR*, abs/2606.03303, 2026.

[19] Zhaoyu Li, Binghong Chen, and Xujie Si. Graph contrastive pre-training for effective theorem reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2108.10821, 2021.

[20] Yong Lin, Shange Tang, Bohan Lyu, Jiayun Wu, Hongzhou Lin, Kaiyu Yang, Jia LI, Mengzhou Xia, Danqi Chen, Sanjeev Arora, and Chi Jin. Goedel-prover: A frontier model for open-source automated theorem proving. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling*, 2025.

[21] Yong Lin, Shange Tang, Bohan Lyu, Ziran Yang, Jui-Hui Chung, Haoyu Zhao, Lai Jiang, Yihan Geng, Jiawei Ge, Jingruo Sun, Jiayun Wu, Jiri Gesi, Ximing Lu, David Acuna, Kaiyu Yang, Hongzhou Lin, Yejin Choi, Danqi Chen, Sanjeev Arora, and Chi Jin. Goedel-prover-v2: Scaling formal theorem proving with scaffolded data synthesis and self-correction. *CoRR*, abs/2508.03613, 2025.

[22] Thang Luong, Dawsen Hwang, Hoang H Nguyen, Golnaz Ghiasi, Yuri Chervonyi, Insuk Seo, Junsu Kim, Garrett Bingham, Jonathan Lee, Swaroop Mishra, Alex Zhai, Huiyi Hu, Henryk Michalewski, Jimin Kim, Jeonghyun Ahn, Junhwi Bae, Xingyou Song, Trieu Hoang Trinh, Quoc V Le, and Junehyuk Jung. Towards robust mathematical reasoning. In Christos Christodoulopoulos, Tanmoy Chakraborty, Carolyn Rose, and Violet Peng, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 35418–35442, Suzhou, China, November 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[23] Thang Luong, Edward Lockhart, et al. Advanced version of gemini with deep think officially achieves gold-medal standard at the international mathematical olympiad. *Google DeepMind Blog*, 1, 2025.

[24] Jia Meng and Lawrence C Paulson. Lightweight relevance filtering for machine-generated resolution problems. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 7(1):41–57, 2009.

[25] Jia Meng, Claire Quigley, and Lawrence C. Paulson. Automation for interactive proof: First prototype. *Inf. Comput.*, 204(10):1575–1596, 2006.

[26] Maciej Mikula, Szymon Tworkowski, Szymon Antoniak, Bartosz Piotrowski, Albert Q. Jiang, Jin Peng Zhou, Christian Szegedy, Lukasz Kucinski, Piotr Milos, and Yuhuai Wu. Magnushammer: A transformer-based approach to premise selection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024.

[27] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.

[28] Aditya Paliwal, Sarah M. Loos, Markus N. Rabe, Kshitij Bansal, and Christian Szegedy. Graph representations for higher-order logic and theorem proving. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020*, pages 2967–2974. AAAI Press, 2020.

[29] Lawrence C. Paulson. Three years of experience with sledgehammer, a practical link between automatic and interactive theorem provers. In Renate A. Schmidt, Stephan Schulz, and Boris Konev, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Practical Aspects of Automated Reasoning, PAAR-2010, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, July 14, 2010*, volume 9 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, pages 1–10. EasyChair, 2010.

[30] Stanislas Polu and Ilya Sutskever. Generative language modeling for automated theorem proving. *CoRR*, abs/2009.03393, 2020.

[31] Z. Z. Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanjia Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Zhe Fu, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Shirong Ma, Hongxuan Tang, Yuxuan Liu, Wenjun Gao, Daya Guo, and Chong Ruan. Deepseek-prover-v2: Advancing formal mathematical reasoning via reinforcement learning for subgoal decomposition. *CoRR*, abs/2504.21801, 2025.

[32] Marco Dos Santos, Haiming Wang, Hugues de Saxcé, Ran Wang, Mantas Baksys, Mert Unsal, Junqi Liu, Zhengying Liu, and Jia Li. Kimina lean server: Technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2504.21230, 2025.

[33] Ziju Shen, Naohao Huang, Fanyi Yang, Yutong Wang, Guoxiong Gao, Tianyi Xu, Jiedong Jiang, Wanyi He, Pu Yang, Mengzhou Sun, Haocheng Ju, Peihao Wu, Bryan Dai, and Bin Dong. Real-prover: Retrieval augmented lean prover for mathematical reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2505.20613, 2025.

[34] The mathlib Community. The Lean Mathematical Library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP 2020, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 2020. ACM.

[35] 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. *CoRR*, abs/2504.11354, 2025.

[36] Haiming Wang, Huajian Xin, Chuanyang Zheng, Zhengying Liu, Qingxing Cao, Yinya Huang, Jing Xiong, Han Shi, Enze Xie, Jian Yin, Zhenguo Li, and Xiaodan Liang. Lego-prover: Neural theorem proving with growing libraries. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024.

[37] Mingzhe Wang, Yihe Tang, Jian Wang, and Jia Deng. Premise selection for theorem proving by deep graph embedding. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 2786–2796, 2017.

[38] Yuhuai Wu. Formal premise selection with language models. In *Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Theorem Proving (AITP)*, volume 4, 2022.

[39] Huajian Xin, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Zhizhou Ren, Qihao Zhu, Bo Liu, Chong Ruan, Wenda Li, and Xiaodan Liang. Deepseek-prover: Advancing theorem proving in llms through large-scale synthetic data. *CoRR*, abs/2405.14333, 2024.

[40] Huajian Xin, Z. Z. Ren, Junxiao Song, Zhihong Shao, Wanjia Zhao, Haocheng Wang, Bo Liu, Liyue Zhang, Xuan Lu, Qiushi Du, Wenjun Gao, Haowei Zhang, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhibin Gou, Z. F. Wu, Fuli Luo, and Chong Ruan. Deepseek-prover-v1.5: Harnessing proof assistant feedback for reinforcement learning and monte-carlo tree search. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025.

[41] Linting Xue, Aditya Barua, Noah Constant, Rami Al-Rfou, Sharan Narang, Mihir Kale, Adam Roberts, and Colin Raffel. Byt5: Towards a token-free future with pre-trained byte-to-byte models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:291–306, 2022.

[42] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jian Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen3 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2505.09388, 2025.

[43] Kaiyu Yang, Aidan M. Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan J. Prenger, and Animashree Anandkumar. Leandojo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.

[44] Huaiyuan Ying, Zijian Wu, Yihan Geng, Jiayu Wang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Lean workbook: A large-scale lean problem set formalized from natural language math problems. In Amir Globersons, Lester Mackey, Danielle Belgrave, Angela Fan, Ulrich Paquet, Jakub M. Tomczak, and Cheng Zhang, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*, 2024.

[45] Jingyuan Zhang, Qi Wang, Xingguang Ji, Yahui Liu, Yang Yue, Fuzheng Zhang, Di Zhang, Guorui Zhou, and Kun Gai. Leanabell-prover: Posttraining scaling in formal reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2504.06122, 2025.

[46] Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Wen Xie, Ziqi Dai, Jialong Tang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, et al. mgte: Generalized long-context text representation and reranking models for multilingual text retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 1393–1412, 2024.

[47] Yanzhao Zhang, Mingxin Li, Dingkun Long, Xin Zhang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, An Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Junyang Lin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen3 embedding: Advancing text embedding and reranking through foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05176*, 2025.

[48] Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. Minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00110*, 2021.

[49] Thomas Zhu, Joshua Clune, Jeremy Avigad, Albert Qiaochu Jiang, and Sean Welleck. Premise selection for a lean hammer. *CoRR*, abs/2506.07477, 2025.

A Limitations

Our extraction and modeling pipeline is Lean 4 specific. Transferring it to Coq, Isabelle, or Agda would require system-specific reimplementation and evaluation. Following prior work on premise selection, we use the dependencies of one compiled reference proof as retrieval ground truth. Theorems that admit alternative proofs may therefore be undercounted by Recall@K, which is one reason we also report end-to-end proving results. Our formal evaluation covers two 7B to 8B whole-proof provers on miniF2F-test. It does not cover larger provers, tactic-level or online retrieval, or iterative prover feedback, and the evaluated provers were not trained for premise-conditioned generation. Extending **DAPS** to these settings and to other proof assistants are natural next steps.

B Broader Impacts

This work bridges formal and informal mathematical reasoning. We mine Lean Blueprints, research-level LaTeX repositories cross-referenced with in-progress Lean formalizations, and use the resulting dependency signal to improve both formal provers (Section **??**) and general-purpose LLMs on informal theorem proving (Section 4.5). Positive impacts include narrowing the gap between informal research mathematics and its formal counterpart, and supporting LLM-based mathematical assistants for working mathematicians. On the negative side, **DAPS** reflects the coverage and biases of Mathlib4 and the Blueprint projects we mined. Users working in mathematical areas underrepresented in these libraries may see reduced retrieval quality. The released artifacts contain only formal and informal mathematical content from public open-source projects, and we do not foresee misuse risks beyond those general to AI systems for mathematical reasoning.

C Reproducibility

We release the following at the URL[4] (also presented in the abstract) for review, under a permissive license upon publication:

- A demo of the Mathlib4 typed dependency graph and our extraction pipeline.
- A demo of the mined Blueprint corpus.
- Demos of the four evaluation benchmarks (Mathlib4-Random, Mathlib4-Heldout, **DAPS**-Collection, **DAPS**-Blueprint).
- the **DAPS** implementation, training and adaptation scripts, and evaluation pipeline.

Training hyperparameters are summarized in Table 14, with optimization details of learning-rate schedule, warmup, batching, and gradient accumulation in Appendix F. Compute requirements and runtime statistics for each training stage are reported in Appendix D.

D Compute Reporting

We summarize the compute resources used to produce the experimental results as follows.

Scope. This report covers the computation directly used for training the models reported in the main paper. The following are explicitly **not** included: (i) the foundation-model pretraining compute of third-party base models we build upon (e.g., MGTE [46]); (ii) compute used for inference with downstream LLM provers (general-purpose LLMs in Section 5.4), which we use as off-the-shelf systems; (iii) compute consumed by preliminary experimentation, failed runs, and hyperparameter sweeps not reflected in the final reported results.

Hardware. The experimental environment is heterogeneous, comprising a GPU cluster used for the main training stages and a local workstation used for the smaller Blueprint adaptation stage.

- **Cluster GPUs.** NVIDIA GH200 superchips (Arm Neoverse V2 Grace CPU, 72 CPU cores per superchip; H100 GPU with 96 GB HBM3 per chip in the configuration we use). Multi-GPU jobs span up to 16 GH200 chips, corresponding to 288 CPU cores per 4-GPU node.
- **Local workstation.** 1× Apple MacBook Pro (M4 Max, unified-memory architecture).

Per-workload compute. Table 6 summarizes the compute consumed by each training workload. GPU-hours are computed as (#GPUs) × (wall-clock runtime).

Notes on the estimates. The runtimes above are wall-clock estimates from our training logs and include data-loading, checkpointing, and validation, in addition to optimizer steps. They do not include cluster idle/queue time. The local Blueprint pipeline takes less than 3 hours end-to-end, of which roughly 2 hours is the training loop itself. The remainder is data preprocessing. All reported hour counts are conservative rounded-up estimates.

[4] https://daps-eth.github.io/

Table 6: Compute consumed by the reported training workloads. Cluster runtimes are aggregated GPU-hours on NVIDIA GH200. The Blueprint adaptation stage is reported as machine-hours since it runs on a single local workstation.

Workload	Hardware	#Devices	Runtime	Compute
Stage 1: text encoder warm-up	GH200 cluster	16	$\leq$12 h	$\leq$192 GPU-h
Stage 2: structural fusion training	GH200 cluster	16	$\leq$24 h	$\leq$384 GPU-h
Blueprint continual training	MacBook Pro (M4 Max)	1	$\leq$3 h	$\leq$3 machine-h
Total (cluster training)				$\leq$408 GPU-h
Total (local training)				$\leq$3 machine-h

E Data Schema

E.1 Mathlib Graph

This appendix documents the complete schema of the Mathlib4 dependency graph extracted in Section 3.1. Tables 7 and 8 report the per-category counts of all nodes and typed edges in the graph. Tables 9 and 10 describe the metadata fields recorded for each node and edge, respectively. Tables 11 and 12 report the in-degree and out-degree distributions broken down by node category.

Edge typing. The top 15 typed categories together span 6.5M edges and are dominated by typeclass and instance relations, with `USES_CLASS_DERIVED` and `USES_INSTANCE` alone accounting for 1.7M and 1.3M edges, respectively, while proof-level `DEPENDS_ON` edges contribute only 618K, less than 10% of the total. Recent neural premise selectors [43, 49] typically use these dependency relations as an untyped list of used constants, without distinguishing the dependency categories above. **DAPS** instead retains edge types as first-class features (Section 4).

Frequency-skewed concentration. The asymmetry yields a heavily head-concentrated in-edge distribution (Figure 5): the most-cited 1% of nodes attract 13% of all incoming dependencies, the top 5% attract 39%, and the top 10% attract 56%. The complement is a low-frequency of theorems and lemmas with very few citations and a correspondingly weak text signal. This indicates the significance of structural features for accurate retrieval.




Figure 5: The top 10% of nodes attract 56% of all incoming edges (category-aggregate approximation; per-node curve is steeper).

E.2 Blueprint Mining

This appendix lists per-project statistics of all 53 mined Lean Blueprint dependency graphs (Section 3.2), sorted by total node count. Each row corresponds to one blueprint dependency graph. Project names link to the original blueprint document. The corpus-level summary is reported in Table 1 of Section 3.2, and the corresponding visualization in Figure 3.

Table 7: Statistics of node categories.

Node Category	Total
theorem	116,096
lemma	39,832
definition	26,540
instance	22,462
definition_derived	15,841
theorem_derived	14,497
class_derived	11,472
structure_derived	9,085
file	6,726
lemma_derived	3,918
structure	3,260
abbrev	2,382
class	2,126
instance_derived	1,912
inductive_derived	1,183
others	762

Table 8: Statistics of edge categories.

Edge Category	Total
USES_CLASS_DERIVED	1,692,183
USES_INSTANCE	1,285,578
USES_DEFINITION	838,828
USES_CLASS	738,150
DEPENDS_ON	618,222
USES_STRUCTURE	567,065
CONTAINS	273,116
USES_INSTANCE_DERIVED	150,501
USES_ABBREV	106,383
USES_STRUCTURE_DERIVED	77,378
USES_DEFINITION_DERIVED	75,626
IMPORTS	20,794
USES_INDUCTIVE	17,332
USES_INDUCTIVE_COMPONENT_DERIVED	15,410
USES_INDUCTIVE_DERIVED	3,132
others	3,583

Table 9: Description of node fields.

Node Field	Definition
name	Fully qualified Lean name (e.g., AddConstMap.instFunLike) or the synthetic file_ identifiers we create from the filesystem.
category	Underlying ConstantInfo tag (theorem, def, instance, inductive, structure, class, constructor, recursor, etc.).
line/column	Start position from findDeclarationRanges?, measured in the source .lean file.
doc	Docstring preceding the declaration; null when absent.
signature	Canonical type with all binders and constants spelled out.
isProp	Flags declarations whose type lives in Prop.
isHumanTheorem	True only for human-authored theorems that have real source ranges and are not projection functions.
module	Module path, e.g., Mathlib.Algebra.AddConstMap.Basic
source_path	Path to the backing .lean file so tools can jump straight into the source tree.
lean4_start/lean4_end	The line where the node's Lean 4 code starts, according to the ConstantInfo. / The line where the node's Lean 4 code ends, decided based on our regex rules.
lean4_code	The raw Lean 4 text sliced from the .lean between lean4_start and lean4_end.
subcategory	Enriched category we assigned based on the category and declaration keyword in lean4_code.
statement	The statement portion of the lean4_code with comments removed.
proof	Complement to the statement, cpaturing the proof chunk using regex.
in_blacklist	Whether the node is on the curated black list.

Table 10: Description of edge fields.

Edge Field	Definition
source_name/target_name	The name entry of source/target node of the edge.
category	Semantic label chosen based on the source and the target's subcategory. Conventions: CONTAINS for file → declaration, IMPORTS for file → file, DEPENDS_ON for anything targeting a theorem/lemma/axiom (including _derived variants), and USES_<CATEGORY> (e.g., USES_CLASS, USES_INSTANCE_DERIVED, USES_STRUCTURE) for everything else.
explicit	Whether a dependency appears in the explicit argument positions of the source declaration. It is True when the referenced constant is used only through explicit parameters(i.e. binderInfo = .default). It is False when the dependency arises solely via implicit arguments, including implicit {} binders or typeclass instance parameters [].
direct	True if the dependency can be obtained from calling function getUsedConstantsAsSet in ConstantInfo). False if it is obtained through further unfolding the direct dependencies of auxiliary lemmas.
could_skip	True if the target node in_blacklist.

Table 11: In-degree distribution by node category (sorted by average out-degree).

Node Categories	#node	avg.	max #in-degree	total #in-degree
class	2,126	348.20	62,237	740,276
structure	3,260	174.95	24,449	570,325
class_derived	11,472	148.51	49,867	1,703,655
instance_derived	1,912	79.71	16,527	152,413
inductive	290	60.77	2,474	17,622
instance	22,462	58.24	32,159	1,308,114
abbrev	2,382	45.66	4,768	108,765
namespace_command	3	39.33	112	118
definition	26,540	32.61	58,468	865,368
section_command	3	30.67	66	92
inductive_component_derived	1,105	14.95	417	16,515
abbrev_derived	226	13.38	382	3,025
structure_derived	9,085	9.52	4,472	86,463
set_option_derived	10	9.00	45	90
definition_derived	15,841	5.77	5,024	91,467
theorem_derived	14,497	5.75	2,388	83,368
theorem	116,096	4.90	3,106	569,172
inductive_derived	1,183	3.65	113	4,315
namespace_command_derived	63	3.27	87	206
lemma	39,832	3.23	1,541	128,737

Table 12: Out-degree distribution by node category (sorted by average out-degree).

Node Categories	#node	avg.	max #out-degree	total #out-degree
file	6,726	43.70	684	293,910
example_derived	1	37.00	37	37
lemma	39,832	31.08	395	1,237,896
theorem	116,096	26.85	474	3,116,776
lemma_derived	3,918	25.36	259	99,369
attribute_derived	3	20.33	25	61
constant_derived	2	20.00	20	40
theorem_derived	14,497	18.66	337	270,442
instance	22,462	17.94	375	403,072
definition_derived	15,841	17.47	117	276,710
definition	26,540	16.62	151	441,037
abbrev_derived	226	14.38	62	3,251
variable_declaration	3	14.00	15	42
abbrev	2,382	13.85	91	32,996
variable_declaration_derived	94	13.67	42	1,285
section_command	3	13.00	27	39
structure_derived	9,085	12.45	135	113,129
instance_derived	1,912	11.94	115	22,828
class_derived	11,472	11.02	123	126,477
set_option_derived	10	10.60	18	106
recursor_derived	48	10.38	23	498
inductive_derived	1,183	8.54	74	10,098
section_command_derived	37	7.32	29	271
namespace_command_derived	63	7.29	20	459
structure	3,260	5.35	84	17,444
inductive	290	4.78	32	1,385
inductive_component_derived	1,105	4.71	40	5,206
namespace_command	3	4.67	9	14
class	2,126	3.87	50	8,231
open_command_derived	34	1.24	17	42
initialize	38	1.05	5	40
constructor	2	0.50	1	1
opaque	107	0.45	6	48
opaque_derived	19	0.42	3	8
syntax	181	0.19	4	35
macro_derived	80	0.11	1	9
syntax_derived	34	0.09	1	3

Table 13: Per-project statistics of the mined Lean Blueprint corpus, sorted by node count. Project names link to the original blueprint.

Project	#Nodes	#Edges	#Formal	#Informal
AlexKontorovich/PrimeNumberTheoremAnd	525	694	487	38
RemyDegenne/brownian-motion	458	732	298	160
teorth/pfr	218	403	214	4
teorth/equational_theories	214	185	145	69
firsching/FormalBook	189	93	55	134
florisvandoorn/carleson	179	213	175	4
Whysoserioushah/BrauerGroup_new	160	18	119	41
YaelDillies/toric	145	213	47	98
thefundamentaltheor3m/Sphere-Packing-Lean	139	201	93	46
kbuzzard/ClassFieldTheory	120	174	55	65
ilpreterosso/LEANearized-RadiiPolynomial	99	158	97	2
emilyriehl/infinity-cosmos	86	104	48	38
leanprover-community/liquid § s1	77	123	77	0
leanprover-community/sphere-eversion	73	101	73	0
Ivan-Sergeyev/seymour	72	137	38	34
b-mehta/ABC-Exceptions	58	89	35	23
mao3j1m0op/algebra-in-lean	54	69	54	0
sinhp/HoTTLean	54	17	17	37
b-mehta/unit-fractions	52	75	47	5
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch9	52	43	39	13
cameronfreer/exchangeability	50	69	50	0
florisvandoorn/BonnAnalysis	49	25	14	35
YaelDillies/LeanAPAP	49	61	37	12
ymonbru/M2	49	67	2	47
leanprover-community/flt-regular	45	51	28	17
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch10	39	38	39	0
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch5	35	40	34	1
james18lpc/GibbsMeasure	35	51	31	4
leanprover-community/liquid § s2	35	53	31	4
vbeffara/Cours_ED	35	0	1	34
AlexandreCharland/BlueprintRep	33	42	28	5
YaelDillies/ChandraFurstLipton	31	49	14	17
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch14	30	22	0	30
amatelus/amatelus	27	26	23	4
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch13	21	14	17	4
discreteGeometryInLean/polytopes-in-LEAN	18	20	11	7
e-vergo/ChebyshevCircles	18	22	18	0
lean-summer-research/finalized	17	18	17	0
maybemabeline/stone-duality	17	2	5	12
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch11	16	21	16	0
rwst/infinite-primes-via-log	16	13	15	1
utensil/lean-ga § s1	16	21	16	0
JonBannon/Junk-Test	13	8	0	13
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch8	12	13	12	0
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch2	10	11	10	0
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch7	10	7	4	6
unaoya/Mills	9	5	4	5
utensil/lean-ga § s2	9	10	8	1
hanwenzhu/LeanArchitect-example	8	8	7	1
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch3	8	10	8	0
matijasteblaj/blossoming-principle	8	0	2	6
AdamJasonKern/LBPTester	7	7	7	0
imperialcollegelondon/FLT § ch12	6	5	6	0
Total (53 projects)	**3,805**	**4,651**	**2,728**	**1,077**

E.3 Full Data Splits Method and Evaluation Benchmarks

Mathlib4 splits. The Mathlib dependency graph is divided into 275,842 nodes for training, 2,000 for validation, and 2,000 for testing. The 2,000 test nodes consist of two complementary 1,000-node slices used as separate benchmarks: **Mathlib4-Heldout** is built by grouping declarations by source file, shuffling the file list, and sequentially selecting files until the cumulative declaration count first exceeds 1,000. The corresponding files are excluded from training entirely, and the first 1,000 declarations from these files form the test set. This file-level holdout is more conservative than the theorem-level random holdout used by, e.g., LeanHammer [49], since within-file regularities (shared imports, sibling lemma context) cannot leak through training. **Mathlib4-Random** is built by randomly sampling 1,000 declarations from the remaining (non-heldout) files and excluding them from training.

DAPS-Blueprint. The Blueprint corpus is split 8:1:1 by node into train/validation/test, after dropping nodes without any recorded dependencies. The resulting test set, **DAPS-Blueprint**, contains 236 queries averaging 1.74 premises each. 26.0% are informal-only nodes (LaTeX statements without a Lean formalization). We split by node because the corpus contains only 53 projects with a highly long-tailed size distribution. A project-level split would allocate very few, highly unequal projects to validation and test, making the estimate unstable and strongly dependent on which projects are sampled. **DAPS**-Blueprint therefore measures retrieval of held-out nodes within the mined Blueprint collection, where premises are rare and queries are often informal.

DAPS-Collection. This dataset is held entirely out of training. We compile three open-source Lean 4 datasets under `mathlib-4.22.0` — `Goedel-LM/Lean-workbook-proofs`[5] [44, 20], `stoney0062/Leanabell-Prover-Traindata-SFT`[6] [45], and `AI-MO/NuminaMath-LEAN`[7], yielding 152,038 compilable `(problem, proof)` pairs in Olympiad and synthetic styles. We sample 1,000 of these and extract their dependency lists from the compiled proofs as ground-truth positives. Candidate premises still come from Mathlib, but the query distribution differs substantially from the Mathlib library, giving a clean test of generalization across query distributions while holding the candidate side fixed.

F Implementation Details of DAPS

Mathlib4 pretraining. Queries are drawn from the `theorem` and `lemma` categories, which are the two declaration types that carry proofs and therefore yield premise lists. For each query, positive premises are taken from its compiled dependencies and prioritized by category in the order `theorem` $\succ$ `theorem_derived` $\succ$ `lemma` $\succ$ `lemma_derived` $\succ$ `definition` $\succ$ `definition_derived` $\succ$ `instance`; the top ℓ are retained. The semantic encoder reads the `statement` field for queries, and the concatenation of `name`, `category`, `signature`, `docstring`, `statement`, and `proof` for premises.

Mathlib4 pretraining itself proceeds in two phases. We first warm up the semantic encoder (Section 4.2), initialized from MGTE [46], with the masked contrastive loss of [49], contrasting independently-encoded queries and premises. We use a cosine learning-rate schedule with warmup ratio 0.04, per-device train batch size 32, gradient accumulation steps 2, and a CachedMNRL mini-batch size of 32, giving an effective per-step batch of $32 \times 16 \times 2 = 1024$.

We then freeze the encoder to train the structural fusion with the multi-positive contrastive loss of Section 4.3 and all three negative-sampling strategies. We use a constant learning-rate schedule with warmup ratio 0.05, per-device train batch size 16, and gradient accumulation steps 8, giving an effective per-step batch of $16 \times 16 \times 8 = 2048$.

Hyperparameters for both phases are listed in Table 14. Detailed training instances are demonstrated in Figures 8 and 9.

Blueprint continual training. The query is encoded from the Blueprint node's informal LaTeX statement only. The candidate premise is encoded from its canonical identifier together with any

[5] https://huggingface.co/datasets/Goedel-LM/Lean-workbook-proofs
[6] https://huggingface.co/datasets/stoney0062/Leanabell-Prover-Traindata-SFT
[7] https://huggingface.co/datasets/AI-MO/NuminaMath-LEAN

Table 14: Training hyperparameters. ℓ = max positives per query (top-ℓ after category-priority sort); m, n = dynamic subgraph sampling budget (random sample/keep after FFN scoring); k_t, k_g, k_c = numbers of temporal/global/cross-batch negatives per query.

	ℓ	m	n	k_t	k_g	k_c
Mathlib4 encoder	32	300	64	0	3	`all`
Mathlib4 structural fusion	32	300	64	30	30	1,500
Blueprint continual training	`all`	33	33	15	45	960

of the following fields that are present: the informal statement, the Lean declaration name, and the formal Lean source. Reflecting the smaller corpus and lower average out-degree per node, both negative-sampling rates and the dynamic subgraph budget are reduced.

Continual training runs on a single GPU with a cosine learning-rate schedule (warmup ratio 0.05), per-device train batch size 16, and no gradient accumulation, giving an effective per-step batch of 16. Hyperparameters are listed in Table 14. Detailed training instance is demonstrated in Figure 10.

G Implementation Details of Formal Theorem Proving with DAPS

We conduct end-to-end formal theorem proving in Lean 4 on miniF2F-test [48]. Besides LeanExplore, LeanSearch, and Qwen3-Embedding-8B, we also include MePo, ReProver, and LeanHammer as premise selectors, together with a no-premise setting. For each target theorem, we use its formal statement as the query and let each selector retrieve the top-16 premises from Mathlib4. The retrieved premises are supplied in context to two whole-proof provers, Goedel-Prover-V2-8B [21] and DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B [31]. We use temperature 0.7 and top-p 0.95 for Goedel-Prover-V2-8B, temperature 0.93 and top-p 1.0 for DeepSeek-Prover-V2-7B, and a maximum of 16,384 output tokens for both. The generated proofs are verified with Kimina-Lean-Server [32], and we report Pass@k for $k \in \{1, 2, 4\}$.

Figure 6 shows the prompt used when a selector supplies 16 premises. The premises are listed by name and signature and presented as optional hints, so the prover is not required to use every retrieved item. Figure 7 shows the no-premise prompt, which keeps the same formal statement and output constraint but omits the hint block.

H Additional Results

H.1 Full Retrieval Results Across Metrics and Seeds

Tables 15 to 18 report precision, recall, and macro-F1 at $K \in \{16, 32\}$ as mean±standard deviation over three runs with different random seeds. A standard deviation of zero indicates deterministic inference for the evaluated checkpoint and query set. **DAPS** ranks first on every reported metric and budget across all four benchmarks.

H.2 Sensitivity to the Informal-Query Formalizer

Our informal proving pipeline (Section 4.4) first formalizes each natural-language query into a Lean statement before premise selection. To test how much the downstream result depends on this step, we vary the formalizer while fixing **DAPS** as the premise selector and Gemini-3.6-Flash [14] as the proof generator. We compare three sources of formal statements. Gemini 3 Pro [13] is the general-purpose LLM used in Section 4.5. Goedel-Formalizer-V2-32B [21] is a formalizer trained specifically for this task. The manual formalizations are the human-written Lean statements released by Kung et al.[18].

Table 19 reports Pass@4 on IMO-ProofBench. All three formalizers give comparable results. Gemini 3 Pro already serves as a strong formalizer at 46.55, and the specialized and manual formalizations improve this to 47.50 and 48.27. The downstream benefit of **DAPS** is therefore not tied to a single formalizer, while lower-noise formal statements bring modest additional gains.

Prompt for in-context premise use.

```
You are an expert in Lean 4 theorem proving. Complete the Lean 4 proof for the statement
below.

# Formal statement
```lean4
{formal_statement}
```

Hints - lemmas that may be related to this goal
These retrieved Lean 4 / Mathlib lemmas may hint at the concepts and dependencies your
proof involves. Use them as inspiration rather than a checklist. When one of them is
actually the lemma you need, reference it by its full name; otherwise use whatever works
(a different lemma or a tactic).
<premise>
[name_1]: [signature_1]
[name_2]: [signature_2]
[name_3]: [signature_3]
...
[name_16]: [signature_16]
</premise>

Instructions
- Do not use `sorry`. Output only the complete Lean 4 code, no explanation.

Proof
```lean4
```

Figure 6: Prompt for in-context premise use.

Baseline prompt without retrieved premises.

```
You are an expert in Lean 4 theorem proving.

# Formal statement
```lean4
{formal_statement}
```

Task
Write a complete Lean 4 proof for the formal statement. Output only the Lean 4 code.
```

Figure 7: Baseline prompt without retrieved premises.

### H.3 Ablation Studies

Table 20 reports component ablations of **DAPS**. We highlight three takeaways.

**Structural fusion drives most of the gain.** Removing the encoder warm-up costs 5 to 9 absolute Recall@32 points across the three benchmarks, while removing structural fusion entirely costs 23.34/45.46/18.85 points. The gap is largest in relative terms on **DAPS**-Collection, where structural fusion accounts for 18.85 of the 24.38 total, so the dependency-graph signal, not the encoder backbone, is what carries retrieval under distribution shift. The backbone still matters. Replacing MGTE with a ReProver/ByT5 encoder keeps much of the Mathlib performance but reduces **DAPS**-Collection to 1.08 when warmed and 4.70 when frozen, indicating that ByT5 is a weaker backbone and that our warm-up recipe, tuned for MGTE, does not transfer to it.
```

Table 15: Full retrieval results on Mathlib4-Random, reported as mean ± standard deviation over three runs. F1 denotes macro-F1. Best results are in bold.

Method	Precision@16	Recall@16	F1@16	Precision@32	Recall@32	F1@32
MePo [25]	8.02±0.01	14.14±0.03	8.95±0.02	5.72±0.01	18.84±0.04	7.93±0.02
ReProver [43]	13.01±0.00	26.97±0.00	15.68±0.00	9.58±0.00	36.97±0.00	13.99±0.00
LeanHammer [49]	35.56±0.00	61.13±0.00	40.57±0.00	23.45±0.00	73.99±0.00	32.81±0.00
Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]	5.84±0.00	11.54±0.00	6.87±0.00	3.91±0.00	15.25±0.00	5.68±0.00
DAPS (Ours)	**37.60±0.51**	**66.01±0.88**	**43.49±0.62**	**25.71±0.25**	**80.68±0.67**	**36.01±0.35**

Table 16: Full retrieval results on Mathlib4-Heldout, reported as mean ± standard deviation over three runs. F1 denotes macro-F1. Best results are in bold.

Method	Precision@16	Recall@16	F1@16	Precision@32	Recall@32	F1@32
MePo [25]	4.30±0.01	7.98±0.01	5.12±0.01	2.98±0.01	11.06±0.01	4.37±0.01
ReProver [43]	12.13±0.00	32.32±0.00	16.70±0.00	8.49±0.00	43.48±0.00	13.64±0.00
LeanHammer [49]	28.02±0.00	67.33±0.00	37.41±0.00	16.98±0.00	77.84±0.00	26.59±0.00
Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]	3.21±0.00	6.74±0.00	4.03±0.00	2.34±0.00	9.92±0.00	3.58±0.00
DAPS (Ours)	**32.47±0.06**	**78.74±0.19**	**43.67±0.10**	**19.67±0.05**	**89.25±0.17**	**30.79±0.07**

Multi-hop, bidirectional, all-category subgraphs are needed. Each restriction of the subgraph signal substantially degrades **DAPS**. Reducing the receptive field to 1-hop out-degree only costs 39.82/47.17 absolute Recall@32 points on the two Mathlib benchmarks. Replacing dynamic subgraph sampling (DySS) with uniform random sampling causes further losses, and restricting the sampled neighbors to the `theorem`, `lemma`, and `definition` categories degrades all three benchmarks, down to 0.72 on **DAPS**-Collection. Together, these results show that multi-hop directionality, learned sampling, and the full typed schema are all necessary for the structural signal to be useful.

The graph signal itself is essential. Replacing the real Mathlib dependency graph with a dummy graph (random nodes connected by random edges) collapses **DAPS** to 28.93/32.61/6.77 Recall@32 on the two Mathlib benchmarks and **DAPS**-Collection benchmark. This demonstrates the value of **DAPS**'s ability to exploit the typed dependency structure.

H.4 Successful Retrieval Cases

This appendix presents five qualitative retrieval case studies covering all four benchmarks of Section 3.3, with two examples from the most diverse benchmark **DAPS**-Blueprint. Each figure shows the query, the gold positive set, the top-10 retrievals from **DAPS** and the two strongest baselines (LeanHammer and ReProver), and a short commentary. The cases are chosen to illustrate the kinds of structural inferences **DAPS** makes that text-only baselines miss. Failure cases for **DAPS** are documented separately in Appendix H.5.

Table 17: Full retrieval results on **DAPS**-Collection, reported as mean ± standard deviation over three runs. F1 denotes macro-F1. Best results are in bold.

Method	Precision@16	Recall@16	F1@16	Precision@32	Recall@32	F1@32
MePo [25]	0.74±0.00	0.53±0.00	0.60±0.00	0.53±0.00	0.75±0.00	0.60±0.00
ReProver [43]	1.05±0.00	0.75±0.00	0.85±0.00	0.92±0.00	1.24±0.00	1.03±0.00
LeanHammer [49]	2.94±0.00	1.98±0.00	2.32±0.00	2.51±0.00	3.19±0.00	2.76±0.00
Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]	0.34±0.00	0.24±0.00	0.27±0.00	0.26±0.00	0.36±0.00	0.29±0.00
DAPS (Ours)	**26.28±0.48**	**13.84±0.24**	**18.00±0.32**	**22.52±0.73**	**23.53±0.76**	**22.88±0.74**

Table 18: Full retrieval results on **DAPS**-Blueprint, reported as mean ± standard deviation over three runs. F1 denotes macro-F1. Best results are in bold.

Method	Precision@16	Recall@16	F1@16	Precision@32	Recall@32	F1@32
ReProver [43]	2.44±0.00	25.37±0.00	4.36±0.00	1.55±0.00	32.04±0.00	2.93±0.00
LeanHammer [49]	2.97±0.00	31.36±0.00	5.32±0.00	1.96±0.00	40.42±0.00	3.70±0.00
Qwen3-Embedding-8B [47]	1.11±0.00	11.02±0.00	1.97±0.00	0.65±0.00	13.07±0.00	1.22±0.00
DAPS (Ours)	**3.83±0.03**	**42.21±0.75**	**6.87±0.06**	**2.42±0.05**	**50.08±0.89**	**4.55±0.10**

Table 19: Effect of the informal-query formalizer on IMO-ProofBench. Each row changes only the formalizer. The premise selector is **DAPS** and the proof generator is Gemini-3.6-Flash in every row. The metric is Pass@4. Best result in **bold**.

Query Formalizer	Pass@4
Gemini-3-Pro	46.55
Goedel-Formalizer-V2-32B	47.50
Manual formalization	**48.27**

Table 20: Component ablation of **DAPS**. Recall@32 results are reported. Rows progressively remove components from the full configuration (top row) to isolate each component's contribution. Encoder ablations vary the text encoder backbone. Subgraph ablations vary the dependency-graph signal that **DAPS** uses. **DySS**: Dynamic subgraph sampling. **TLD-only**: Restricted node categories of `theorem`, `lemma`, and `definition`. **Mathlib4-R**: Mathlib4-Random. **Mathlib4-H**: Mathlib4-Heldout. **DAPS-Coll.**: **DAPS**-Collection. All rows are single runs with a fixed seed.

Variant	Mathlib4-R	Mathlib4-H	DAPS-Coll.
(a) Full configuration			
DAPS (warmed-up MGTE encoder, DySS, 2-hop bidirectional, all node categories)	**79.63**	**89.31**	**24.38**
(b) Encoder ablations			
– encoder warm-up	74.30	81.08	15.63
– structural fusion (MGTE encoder only)	56.29	43.85	5.53
– MGTE encoder → warmed-up ReProver/ByT5	74.20	81.72	1.08
– MGTE encoder → frozen ReProver/ByT5	59.53	64.87	4.70
(c) Subgraph design ablations			
– 2-hop → 1-hop, out-degree only, with DySS	39.81	42.14	19.84
– DySS → Random sampling, 1-hop bidirectional	46.74	44.49	14.99
– all node categories → TLD-only, random sampling	23.44	25.03	0.72
– real graph → dummy random graph	28.93	32.61	6.77
(d) Contrastive loss ablation			
– group-level contrastive objective → InfoNCE [27]	56.48	56.00	15.25

H.5 Failure Mode Analysis

This appendix documents three distinct failure modes of **DAPS** identified through systematic inspection of low-recall queries across our benchmarks. Table 21 summarizes the taxonomy. The three modes stem from **DAPS**'s structural features, with overgeneralization across different dimensions of the dependency graph: type relations, name modifiers, and topical neighborhoods. We illustrate one representative case per mode below, in the same format as the success cases of Appendix H.4, with the commentary focused on diagnosing the failure mechanism.

Table 21: Failure modes observed in our case studies, with one representative case per mode (full case studies in Figures 16 to 18).

Failure mode	**Symptom**	**Rep. case**
Type over-generalization	**DAPS** retrieves typeclass instances on a type that shares the relevant typeclass with the target, but is not the target itself.	Figure 16
Lexical sibling drift	When the query is a modifier-prefixed or -suffixed sibling of an in-corpus lemma, **DAPS** retrieves thematically related premises rather than the near-identical sibling.	Figure 17
Topical subgraph drift	**DAPS** resolves the correct project, but selects the wrong topical subgraph when several thematically adjacent clusters compete.	Figure 18

A training instance for semantic encoder warm up

Query (statement field of Cardinal.mk_mul_le)

```
@[to_additive]
lemma _root_.Cardinal.mk_mul_le : #(s * t) ≤ #s * #t
```

Positive premise (serialized premise text of Set.mul)

```
name: Set.mul

signature: {α : Type u_2} → [Mul α] → Mul (Set α)

lean4_code:
/-- The pointwise multiplication of sets ‘s * t‘ and ‘t‘ is defined as ‘{x * y | x ∈ s,
    y ∈ t}‘ in
locale ‘Pointwise‘. -/
@[to_additive
     /-- The pointwise addition of sets ‘s + t‘ is defined as ‘{x + y | x ∈ s, y ∈ t}‘
    in locale
     ‘Pointwise‘. -/]
protected def mul : Mul (Set α) :=
  ⟨image2 (· * ·)⟩

scoped[Pointwise] attribute [instance] Set.mul Set.add
```

Sampled negative premises (3 per query, drawn uniformly from the premise pool, with self and known positives filtered out)

```
name: SimpleGraph.Walk.reverse_transfer

signature: ∀ {V : Type u} {G : SimpleGraph V} {u v : V} (p : G.Walk u v) {H : SimpleGraph
     V} (hp : ∀ (e : Sym2 V), List.instMembership.mem p.edges e → Set.instMembership.
    mem H.edgeSet e), Eq (p.transfer H hp).reverse (p.reverse.transfer H ⋯)

lean4_code:
@[simp]
... [truncated]

name: CategoryTheory.Limits.PushoutCocone.epi_inr_of_is_pushout_of_epi

signature: ∀ {C : Type u} [inst : CategoryTheory.Category C] {X Y Z : C} {f : inst.Hom X
    Y} {g : inst.Hom X Z} {t : CategoryTheory.Limits.PushoutCocone f g} (ht :
    CategoryTheory.Limits.IsColimit t) [CategoryTheory.Epi f], Catego
... [truncated]

name: rank_dual_eq_card_dual_of_aleph0_le_rank'

signature: ∀ {K : Type u} [inst : DivisionRing K] {V : Type u_1} [inst_1 : AddCommGroup V
    ] [inst_2 : Module K V], Cardinal.instLE.le Cardinal.aleph0 (Module.rank K V) → Eq
    (Module.rank (MulOpposite K) (LinearMap (RingHom.id K) V K)) (Cardinal.mk (Line
... [truncated]
```

Figure 8: A training instance for semantic encoder warm up.

A training instance for Mathlib4 pretraining

Query (statement field of Cardinal.mk_mul_le)

```
@[to_additive]
lemma _root_.Cardinal.mk_mul_le : #(s * t) ≤ #s * #t
```

Positive premise (serialized premise text of Set.image2_mul)

```
name: Set.image2_mul

category: theorem

signature: ∀ {α : Type u_2} [inst : Mul α] {s t : Set α}, Eq (Set.image2 (fun (x1 x2 :
     α) => instHMul.hMul x1 x2) s t) (instHMul.hMul s t)

statement: @[to_additive (attr := simp)]
theorem image2_mul : image2 (· * ·) s t = s * t

lean4_code:
@[to_additive (attr := simp)]
theorem image2_mul : image2 (· * ·) s t = s * t :=
  rfl
```

Sampled negative premises (3 shown from sample_negatives (random_hard=30, global=30; positives/self filtered))

```
name: Set.natCard_neg

category: lemma_derived

signature: ∀ {G : Type u_1} [inst : InvolutiveNeg G] (s : Set G), Eq (Nat.card (Set.neg.
     neg s).Elem) (Nat.card s.Elem)

statement: @[to_additive]
lemma natCard_inv (s : Set G) : Nat.card ↑(s⁻¹) = Nat.card s

lean4_code:
@[to_additive]
lemma natCard_inv (s : Set
... [truncated]

name: Set.ncard_smul_set

category: lemma

signature: ∀ {G : Type u_1} {α : Type u_3} [inst : Group G] [inst_1 : MulAction G α] (a
     : G) (s : Set α), Eq (instHSMul.hSMul a s).ncard s.ncard

statement: @[to_additive (attr := simp)]
lemma ncard_smul_set (a : G) (s : Set α) : (a • s).ncard = s.ncard

lean4_code:

... [truncated]

name: Set.natCard_smul_set

category: lemma

signature: ∀ {G : Type u_1} {α : Type u_3} [inst : Group G] [inst_1 : MulAction G α] (a
     : G) (s : Set α), Eq (Nat.card (instHSMul.hSMul a s).Elem) (Nat.card s.Elem)

statement: @[to_additive]
lemma natCard_smul_set (a : G) (s : Set α) : Nat.card ↑(a • s) = Na
... [truncated]
```

Figure 9: A training instance for Mathlib4 pretraining.

A training instance for Blueprint continual training

Query (statement field of equational_theories/partial-1323-sound)

```
Let \({\mathcal F}\) be a partial solution. Then if one defines a partial operation \(\
    diamond \) on \(M\) by requiring axioms (i), (ii), imposing the additional
    operations \[ (\phi _a(b)^n x,a) \diamond (\phi _b(c)^n y,b) = (\phi _c(a)^n z,c) \]
```

Positive premise (serialized premise text of equational_theories/partial-1323)

```
id: partial-1323

nlp: A partial solution is a finite family \({\mathcal F}\) of tuples \((x,y,z,a,b,c) \in
     (\mathbb {Q}^\times )^3 \times G^6\) with \(a,b,c,0\) distinct, such that the
    tuples \((\phi _a(b)^n x,a, \phi _b(c)^n y,b)\), \((\phi _b(c)^n y,b,\phi _c(a)^n z,
    c)\), \((\phi _c(a)^n z,c,\phi _a(b)^{n+1} x, a)\) for \((x,y,z,a,b,c) \in {\mathcal
     F}\) and \(n \geq 0\) are all distinct.

lean_decl_name: partial-1323
```

Sampled negative premises (3 shown from sample_negatives (repo=15, global=45; positives/self filtered))

```
id: eq40

nlp: Equation 40 is the law \(0 \diamond 0 \simeq 1 \diamond 1\) (or the equation \(x \
    diamond x = y \diamond y\)).

lean_decl_name: Equation40

lean4:
def Equation40 (G: Type*) [Magma G] := ∀ x y : G, x ◇ x =
... [truncated]

id: asterix-obelix-finite

nlp: Any finite magma satisfying the Asterix law (E65) also is left-cancellative and
    satisfies the Obelix law (E1491).

lean_decl_name: asterix-obelix-finite

id: greedy-iterate

nlp: Every partial solution can be extended to a complete solution that satisfies
    Equation 2 and Equation 3, and hence 1323.

lean_decl_name: Eq1323.exists_complete_function

lean4:
theorem exists_com
... [truncated]
```

Figure 10: A training instance for Blueprint continual training.

Case study: `pfr/multidist-ruzsa-III` **(DAPS-Blueprint)**

Query (informal statement):
Let $m \geq 2$ and let $X_{[m]}$ be a tuple of G-valued random variables. If the X_i all have the same distribution, then $D[X_{[m]}] \leq m \cdot d[X_i; X_i]$ for any $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Gold positives (6): `pfr/ruz-copy`, `pfr/ruz-indep`, `pfr/sumset-lower`, `pfr/klm-1`, `pfr/multidist-copy`, `pfr/multidist-indep`.

DAPS top-10:
1. `pfr/ruzsa-diff`
2. ✓ `pfr/ruz-copy`
3. ✓ `pfr/ruz-indep`
4. `pfr/ruzsa-triangle`
5. `pfr/multidist-nonneg`
6. `pfr/sym-zero`
7. ✓ `pfr/sumset-lower`
8. `pfr/multidist-def`
9. `pfr/ruzsa-nonneg`
10. `pfr/multidist-ruzsa-I`

Recall@32: ***5/6*** *(0.83)*

LeanHammer top-10:
1. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks2-theorem-3`
2. `FormalBook/ch20theorem2`
3. `FormalBook/ch16theorem2`
4. `pfr/foursum-bound`
5. `LeanAPAP/drc`
6. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-cor-3-1`
7. `pfr/phi-first-estimate`
8. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/buthe-theorem-2f`
9. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/buthe-theorem-2d`
10. `pfr/ruzsa-diff`

Recall@32: ***0/6*** *(0.00)*

ReProver top-10:
1. `FormalBook/ch38lemma2`
2. `carleson/antichain-decomposition`
3. `pfr/gen-ineq`
4. `ABC-Exceptions/prop:ThueEquations`
5. `toric/1-1-phiA`
6. `polytopes-in-LEAN/prop:v_is_h`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Dedekind-nonvanishing`
8. `FormalBook/ch22lemma1`
9. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Dedekind-PNT`
10. `equational_theories/axiom-b`

Recall@32: ***0/6*** *(0.00)*

Commentary. DAPS retrieves `ruz-copy` and `ruz-indep`, the two defining lemmas linking Ruzsa distance $d[\cdot;\cdot]$ to entropies, in positions 2 and 3, and surfaces 5 of the 6 gold premises within its top-16. LeanHammer and ReProver miss *all* 6 gold premises within their top-32, instead of retrieving lemmas from unrelated Blueprint projects (`FormalBook`, `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd`, `carleson`, `ABC-Exceptions`, `toric`). The gold premises form a tight subgraph in PFR's Ruzsa-distance section. **DAPS**'s typed dependency edges keep retrieval inside this neighborhood, while the text-only baselines are pulled across the corpus by surface similarity to other entropy and inequality lemmas.

Figure 11: Case study from the `teorth/pfr` Blueprint project. ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. Premise names follow the PFR Blueprint label scheme.

Case study: `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks-corollary-3-12` **(DAPS-Blueprint)**

Query (informal statement):

Let $5/8 < \sigma_2 \leq 1$, $t_0 = t_0(\sigma_2, x) = \max\left(H_{\sigma_2}, \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log x}{R}}\right)\right)$, $T > t_0$. *Let* $K \geq 2$, $\lambda = (T/t_0)^{1/K}$, *and consider* $(t_k)_{k=0}^K$ *the sequence given by* $t_k = t_0\lambda^k$. *Then*

$$\Sigma^1_{\sigma_2} = 2 \sum_{\substack{0<\gamma<T \\ \sigma_2 \leq \beta < 1}} \frac{x^{\beta-1}}{\gamma} \leq \varepsilon_4(x, \sigma_2, K, T),$$

Gold positives (4): `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/zero-density-bound`, `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Riemann-von-Mangoldt-estimate`, `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/RH-up-to`, `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/classical-zero-free-region`.

DAPS top-10:

1. ✓ `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/zero-density-bound`
2. ✓ `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Riemann-von-Mangoldt-estimate`
3. ✓ `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/RH-up-to`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Etheta-def`
5. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-eq_A_16`
6. `ABC-Exceptions/lem:SubSumGeometry`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/Epsi-def`
8. `ABC-Exceptions/lem:Triviaibici`
9. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/classical-bound-psi`
10. `Sphere-Packing-Lean/thm:ramanujan-formula`

Recall@32: ***4/4*** *(1.00)*

LeanHammer top-10:

1. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks-proposition-3-11`
2. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks-proposition-3-14`
3. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks2-lemma-10b`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-eq_A_13`
5. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-eq_A_10`
6. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/fks2-corollary-26`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-cor-3-1`
8. `carleson/Holder-van-der-Corput`
9. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-eq_A_12`
10. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/buthe-theorem-2d`

Recall@32: ***0/4*** *(0.00)*

ReProver top-10:

1. `toric/1-2-14-dual-rat-cone`
2. `ABC-Exceptions/def:nu`
3. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/lem:abadimpseri`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-thm_16`
5. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/lem:aachcanc`
6. `FormalBook/ch26lemma_d`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-prop-3-sub-1`
8. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/bklnw-cor-5-1`
9. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/lem:abadeulmac'`
10. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/symm_inv_log`

Recall@32: ***0/4*** *(0.00)*

Commentary. DAPS retrieves *all four* gold premises in its top-32 (positions 1, 2, 3, and 16), giving perfect recall. The two failure modes of the baselines are revealing. LeanHammer stays inside `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd` but is captured by surface similarity to the query name: it returns `fks-proposition-3-11/14` and several `bklnw-eq_*` entries from neighboring sections of the same paper, missing the gold premises that live in the earlier zero-density and zero-free-region sections. ReProver drifts further, retrieving lemmas from `toric` and `ABC-Exceptions` entirely outside the relevant subgraph. **DAPS**'s typed dependency edges resolve the precise mathematical neighborhood of zero-density estimates and zero-free regions of ζ, that this corollary actually consumes.

Figure 12: Case study from the `AlexKontorovich/PrimeNumberTheoremAnd` Blueprint project. ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. Premise names follow the PFR Blueprint label scheme.

Case study: `lean_workbook_plus_39047` **(cosine difference formula, DAPS-Collection)**

Query (Lean 4 statement):

```
theorem lean_workbook_plus_39047 (x y : R) :
    cos (x - y) = cos x * cos y + sin x * sin y := by
```

Gold positives (16, ranked by priority): `Real.cos`, `Real.instSub`, `Real.instAdd`, `Real.cos_sub`, `Real.sin`, `AddGroup`, `neg_add_cancel`, `add_neg_cancel`, `lt_trans`, `IsStrictOrderedRing`, … (16 total).

DAPS top-10:

1. `Real.instRatCast`
2. ✓ `Real.instSub`
3. `Real.pseudoMetricSpace`
4. `Real.instMul`
5. ✓ `Real.instAdd`
6. `Real.instRing`
7. `Real.instNeg`
8. `Real.instDivisionRing`
9. `Real.instSemigroup`
10. `Real.normedCommRing`

Recall@32: ***4/16*** *(0.25)*

LeanHammer top-10:

1. `Complex.cos`
2. ✓ `Real.cos`
3. `Complex.sin`
4. `Complex.cos_neg`
5. ✓ `Real.sin`
6. `Complex.cos_add`
7. `Complex.ofReal_cos`
8. `Complex.ofReal_sin`
9. `Complex.sin_add`
10. `Real.cos_add`

Recall@32: ***3/16*** *(0.19)*

ReProver top-10:

1. ✓ `Real.cos`
2. `Complex.ofReal_cos`
3. `Complex.sin`
4. `Complex.cos`
5. `Complex.ofReal_sin`
6. `Complex.sin_eq_zero_iff_cos_eq`
7. `Complex.cos_eq_zero_iff_sin_eq`
8. `Complex.sin_ofReal_re`
9. `Real.cos_zero`
10. ✓ `Real.sin`

Recall@32: ***2/16*** *(0.12)*

Commentary. All three selectors hit at least one gold premise here, but the top-10 reveals different retrieval behaviors. **DAPS**'s top-10 is dominated by `Real.inst*` typeclass instances (8 of 10 entries), which is the algebraic infrastructure on which the cosine-difference proof actually rewrites. LeanHammer surfaces both `Real.cos` and `Real.sin` in its top-5 but wastes the remaining slots on `Complex.*` duplicates (6 of 10 entries) of the same trigonometric lemmas. ReProver shows the same `Complex.*` drift more severely. The two signals are complementary: textual encoders catch the namesake trig lemmas faster, but **DAPS**'s typed dependency edges surface the typeclass and structural premises that proofs of competition-style theorems also depend on, yielding the highest overall Recall@32.

Figure 13: Case study from the **DAPS**-Collection benchmark (a Lean Workbook problem). ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. Premise names follow Mathlib4 declaration paths.

Case study: `add_lt_add_of_lt_of_lt` **(Mathlib4-Heldout)**

Query (Lean 4 source, additive version generated by `@[to_additive]`):

```
@[to_additive (attr := gcongr high)]
theorem mul_lt_mul_of_lt_of_lt [MulLeftStrictMono α]
    [MulRightStrictMono α]
    {a b c d : α} (h₁ : a < b) (h₂ : c < d) :
    a * c < b * d
```

Gold positives (6): `add_lt_add_left`, `add_lt_add_right`, `instTransLt_mathlib`, `AddLeftStrictMono`, `AddRightStrictMono`, `Preorder`.

DAPS top-10:

1. ✓ `Preorder`
2. `MulLeftStrictMono`
3. `MulRightStrictMono`
4. ✓ `AddRightStrictMono`
5. ✓ `AddLeftStrictMono`
6. `mul_lt_mul_of_lt_of_lt`
7. ✓ `add_lt_add_left`
8. ✓ `add_lt_add_right`
9. `mul_lt_mul_left'`
10. `mul_lt_mul_right'`

Recall@32: ***6/6*** *(1.00)*

LeanHammer top-10:

1. `gauge`
2. `gauge_def`
3. `gauge_def'`
4. `Set.instMembership`
5. `Module`
6. `gauge_nonneg`
7. `Real.instInfSet`
8. `gauge_zero`
9. `Set`
10. `InfSet.sInf`

Recall@32: ***0/6*** *(0.00)*

ReProver top-10:

1. `min_lt_max_of_mul_lt_mul`
2. `Left.min_le_max_of_mul_le_mul`
3. `Right.min_le_max_of_mul_le_mul`
4. `LinearOrder.lift`
5. `max_mul_min`
6. `max_min_distrib_right`
7. `max_min_distrib_left`
8. `min_le_max_of_mul_le_mul`
9. `fn_max_mul_fn_min`
10. `min_mul_max`

Recall@32: ***0/6*** *(0.00)*

Commentary. DAPS retrieves all six gold premises within its top-11 and five of them within its top-10. The remaining four entries in **DAPS**'s top-10 are the multiplicative siblings (`MulLeftStrictMono`, `MulRightStrictMono`, `mul_lt_mul_of_lt_of_lt`, `mul_lt_mul_left'`, `mul_lt_mul_right'`), which are the `@[to_additive]` source declarations from which the additive query is generated. LeanHammer drifts to the unrelated `gauge` namespace (a functional analysis context) and loses the strict monotonicity meaning entirely. ReProver stays closer in spirit by retrieving `min`/`max` lemmas about multiplication, but still misses all six gold premises. The dependency graph captures the `@[to_additive]` inheritance link and lifts both the multiplicative parent and the additive children into top positions, while text-only retrieval reaches for surface similarity and ends up in adjacent but unrelated parts of Mathlib.

Figure 14: Case study from the Mathlib4-Held-out benchmark. ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. Premise names are Mathlib4 declaration paths.

Case study: `Algebra.map_leftMulMatrix_localization` **(Mathlib4-Random)**

Query (Lean 4 statement):

```
theorem Algebra.map_leftMulMatrix_localization
    {ι : Type*} [Fintype ι] [DecidableEq ι]
    (b : Basis ι R S) (a : S) :
    (algebraMap R R_m).mapMatrix (leftMulMatrix b a) =
    leftMulMatrix (b.localizationLocalization R_m M S_m)
                  (algebraMap S S_m a)
```

Gold positives (32, ranked by priority): `Algebra.leftMulMatrix_eq_repr_mul`, `Matrix.ext`, `Module.Basis.localizationLocalization_apply`, `Module.Basis.localizationLocalization_repr_algebraMap`, `Algebra.algebraMapSubmonoid`, `Algebra.leftMulMatrix`, `Matrix`, `Module.Basis.localizationLocalization`, `RingHom.mapMatrix`, `algebraMap`, … (32 total).

DAPS top-10:

1. ✓ `Algebra.algebraMapSubmonoid`
2. ✓ `Module.Basis.localizationLocalization`
3. `IsScalarTower.algebraMap_apply`
4. ✓ `Module.Basis`
5. `Module.Basis.coe_mapCoeffs`
6. `RingEquiv.ofBijective`
7. ✓ `Module.Basis.instFunLike`
8. ✓ `Algebra.leftMulMatrix`
9. `Algebra.smul_def`
10. `Algebra.toModule`

Recall@32: ***11/32*** *(0.34)*

LeanHammer top-10:

1. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.map`
2. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point`
3. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.map_injective`
4. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.baseChange`
5. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.instAddZeroClass`
6. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.instZero`
7. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine`
8. `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point.instAddCommGroup`
9. `Algebra`
10. `WeierstrassCurve.toAffine`

Recall@32: ***3/32*** *(0.09)*

ReProver top-10:

1. `ModuleCat.isFG`
2. `ModuleCat.forget_obj`
3. `LinearMap.id_fgModuleCat_comp`
4. `FGModuleCat.hom_id`
5. `CategoryTheory.Linear.fullSubcategory`
6. `LinearMap.comp_id_fgModuleCat`
7. `FGModuleCat.instFullModuleCatForgetâĆĆ`
8. `ModuleCat.hom_id`
9. `ModuleCat.Algebra.instLinear`
10. `FGModuleCat.carrier`

Recall@32: ***0/32*** *(0.00)*

Commentary. DAPS retrieves five gold premises in its top-10 (`Algebra.algebraMapSubmonoid`, `Module.Basis.localizationLocalization`, `Module.Basis`, `Module.Basis.instFunLike`, `Algebra.leftMulMatrix`) and 11 of the 32 gold premises within its top-32. The remaining entries cluster tightly in the `Algebra` and `Module.Basis` namespaces that the query actually depends on. LeanHammer drifts to `WeierstrassCurve.Affine.Point` (elliptic curve points), losing the algebra and localization context entirely. ReProver drifts to `ModuleCat` and `FGModuleCat` (the category-theoretic recasting of module theory), retrieving zero gold premises in its top-32. **DAPS**'s typed dependency edges resolve the precise mathematical neighbourhood that this theorem consumes, while text-only baselines latch onto unrelated parts of Mathlib that share only superficial vocabulary.

Figure 15: Case study from the Mathlib4-Random benchmark. ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. Premise names are Mathlib4 declaration paths.

Failure case study: `paul_2_mod_5` **(DAPS-Collection)**

Query (Lean 4 statement):

```
theorem paul_2_mod_5 (p : ℕ) (hp : p.Prime) (hp1 : p ≠ 5) :
    p % 5 ≠ 0 := by
```

Gold positives (17, ranked by priority): `Nat.instMulZeroClass`, `Nat.Prime`, `Nat.instOne`, `Nat.instCharZero`, `Nat.Prime.eq_one_or_self_of_dvd`, `Nat.instAddMonoidWithOne`, `AddGroup`, `neg_add_cancel`, `add_neg_cancel`, `lt_trans`, … (17 total).

DAPS top-10:

1. `Rat.instNormedField`
2. `Rat.nontrivial`
3. `mul_ne_zero`
4. `Rat.instCharZero`
5. `Rat.instField`
6. `Fact.elim`
7. `NormMulClass.toNoZeroDivisors`
8. `Rat.mul_den`
9. `Real.instNontrivial`
10. `Nat.Prime.ne_zero`

Recall@32: ***0/17*** *(0.00)*

LeanHammer top-10:

1. ✓ `Nat.Prime`
2. `Nat.decidablePrime`
3. `Nat.Prime.ne_one`
4. `Nat.Prime.two_le`
5. `Nat.Prime.pos`
6. `Nat.Prime.one_le`
7. `Nat.Prime.one_lt`
8. `Nat.Prime.ne_zero`
9. `Nat.Prime.not_dvd_one`
10. `Nat.Prime.prime`

Recall@32: ***2/17*** *(0.12)*

ReProver top-10:

1. `Nat.Prime.ne_one`
2. ✓ `Nat.Prime`
3. `Nat.Prime.pos`
4. `Nat.Prime.one_lt`
5. `Nat.prime_def`
6. `Nat.prime_def_lt`
7. `Nat.Prime.ne_zero`
8. ✓ `Nat.Prime.eq_one_or_self_of_dvd`
9. `Nat.prime_def_lt'`
10. `Nat.Prime.pred_pos`

Recall@32: ***2/17*** *(0.12)*

Commentary. This is a failure mode for **DAPS**. The query is a short fact about natural-number primality, but **DAPS**'s top-10 is dominated by typeclass instances on `Rat` and `Real` (`Rat.instNormedField`, `Rat.instField`, `Rat.instCharZero`, `Real.instNontrivial`) rather than the corresponding `Nat` instances that the proof actually rewrites against. **DAPS** likely over-generalizes along the typeclass dimension. Several gold premises are typeclass instances that both `Nat` and `Rat` satisfy (`instCharZero`, `Field`, `IsStrictOrderedRing`), and **DAPS**'s structural features apparently collapse the two types into the same neighborhood, then pick the more densely-connected `Rat` variants. Text-only baselines avoid this confusion here because the query name `Nat.Prime` is lexically explicit. LeanHammer and ReProver both retrieve `Nat.Prime` and several `Nat.Prime.*` lemmas, and ReProver also surfaces the gold theorem `Nat.Prime.eq_one_or_self_of_dvd` at position 8. All three selectors still miss most of the typeclass infrastructure that the proof depends on, so absolute Recall@32 remains low for everyone. The case illustrates a real limitation of dependency-aware retrieval. When several types share the relevant typeclass structure, and the query carries a strong text signal toward only one of them, structural features alone can pick the wrong type.

Figure 16: Failure case study from **DAPS**-Collection (a Lean Workbook problem). ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. **DAPS** retrieves zero gold premises in its top-32 on this query, while LeanHammer and ReProver each retrieve two. Premise names are Mathlib4 declaration paths.

Failure case study: `brownian-motion/lem:M_uniform_integrable` **(DAPS-Blueprint)**

Query (informal statement):
The sequence $(M_T^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is uniformly integrable (bounded in* L^1 *norm).*

Gold positives (2): `brownian-motion/lem:A_uniform_integrable`, `brownian-motion/def:classD`.

DAPS top-10:
1. `BonnAnalysis/lem:fourier-multiplication`
2. `exchangeability/lem:covariance_structure`
3. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableIffNorm`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/RectangleIntegral_tendsTo_VerticalIntegral`
5. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/ResidueTheoremOnRectangleWithSimplePole`
6. `BonnAnalysis/thm:kernel-approximation`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/HolomorphicOn.vanishesOnRectangle`
8. `brownian-motion/def:elemStochIntegralBilin`
9. `exchangeability/lem:contractable_dist_eq`
10. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableDominatedSingleton`

Recall@32: ***0/2*** *(0.00)*

LeanHammer top-10:
1. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableNorm`
2. ✓ `brownian-motion/lem:A_uniform_integrable`
3. `brownian-motion/lem:Submartingale.uniformIntegrable_of_antitone_of_ge`
4. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableIffNorm`
5. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableDominatedSingleton`
6. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableAdd`
7. `brownian-motion/def:HasIntegrableSup`
8. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableDominated`
9. `radii-polynomial/thm:norm_mul_le`
10. `brownian-motion/lem:covariation_eq_inner`

Recall@32: ***1/2*** *(0.50)*

ReProver top-10:
1. ✓ `brownian-motion/lem:A_uniform_integrable`
2. `brownian-motion/lem:uniformIntegrableNorm`
3. `brownian-motion/lem:IsSquareIntegrable.sup_eLpNorm_eq_eLpNorm_limitProcess`
4. `ClassFieldTheory/lem:norm_comm`
5. `FLT_ch5/Hurwitz.norm`
6. `brownian-motion/lem:Submartingale.uniformIntegrable_of_antitone_of_ge`
7. `FLT_ch5/Hurwitz.norm_one`
8. `FLT_ch5/Hurwitz.exists_near`
9. `FLT_ch5/Hurwitz.norm_zero`
10. `brownian-motion/cor:doob_lp_norm`

Recall@32: ***1/2*** *(0.50)*

Commentary. This is a second failure mode for **DAPS**, distinct from the failure in Appendix 16. The query has only two gold premises. The first one, `A\_uniform\_integrable`, differs from the query name `M\_uniform\_integrable` by a single letter in the prefix, making it a strong lexical match that text-only baselines exploit directly. LeanHammer surfaces it at position 2 and ReProver at position 1. **DAPS** instead drifts across the Blueprint corpus, retrieving thematically related premises about analysis and integrability from unrelated projects (`BonnAnalysis/lem:fourier-multiplication`, `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/RectangleIntegral_tendsTo_VerticalIntegral`, `exchangeability/lem:covariance_structure`). **DAPS**'s structural features over-generalize across the global corpus when the query carries a strong lexical anchor that points to a tightly-named in-project sibling. Together with the type-level over-generalization illustrated in Appendix 16, this case suggests that **DAPS** would benefit from a stronger text-side anchoring signal to suppress structural neighbors that share thematic context but live in distant parts of the corpus.

Figure 17: Failure case study from **DAPS**-Blueprint (the brownian-motion project). ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. **DAPS** retrieves zero gold premises in its top-32 here, while LeanHammer and ReProver each retrieve one (the lexically near-identical `A_uniform_integrable`). The case illustrates a second failure mode for **DAPS**. When the gold premise shares strong lexical similarity with the query name, text-only baselines exploit the direct match, whereas **DAPS** drifts across the global Blueprint corpus along thematic lines.

Failure case study: `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/ResidueOfTendsTo` **(DAPS-Blueprint)**

Query (informal statement):
If a function f is holomorphic in a neighborhood of p and $\lim_{s\to p}(s-p)\,f(s) = A$, then $f(s) = \dfrac{A}{s-p} + O(1)$ near p.

Gold positives (1): `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/existsDifferentiableOn_of_bddAbove`.

DAPS top-10:
1. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/tendsto_rpow_atTop_nhds_zero_of_norm_gt_one`
2. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/MellinConvolutionTransform`
3. `radii-polynomial/prop:fixed_point_iff_zero`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/DeltaSpikeMass`
5. `radii-polynomial/thm:neumann_series`
6. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/MellinOfPsi`
7. `radii-polynomial/prop:operator_norm_properties`
8. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/MellinOfDeltaSpike`
9. `radii-polynomial/lem:newton_fderiv`
10. `carleson/nontangential-operator-boundary`

Recall@32: ***0/1*** *(0.00)*

LeanHammer top-10:
1. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/isHolomorphicOn`
2. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/HolomorphicOn_riemannZeta0`
3. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/logDerivResidue`
4. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/LogDerivZetaHolcSmallT`
5. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/ResidueMult`
6. ✓ `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/existsDifferentiableOn_of_bddAbove`
7. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/LogDerivZetaHolcLargeT`
8. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/schwarz-id`
9. `sphere-eversion/lem:param_trick`
10. `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd/BddAbove_to_IsBigO`

Recall@32: ***1/1*** *(1.00)*

ReProver top-10:
1. `FormalBook/ch26lemma_d`
2. `M2/def:homotopy_diagram`
3. `M2/def:homotopy_colimit`
4. `FormalBook/ch41proof1`
5. `FormalBook/ch41proof5`
6. `FormalBook/ch41proof4`
7. `FormalBook/ch41proof3`
8. `FormalBook/ch41proof2`
9. `Sphere-Packing-Lean/lemma:phi0-transform`
10. `ABC-Exceptions/def:nu`

Recall@32: ***0/1*** *(0.00)*

Commentary. This case illustrates a within-project topical drift for **DAPS**. The query is a residue-style statement about holomorphic functions, and the unique gold premise is `existsDifferentiableOn_of_bddAbove`, a technical lemma in PNT's holomorphy/residue cluster. **DAPS** stays inside the `PrimeNumberTheoremAnd` and `radii-polynomial` projects but drifts to a different topical subgraph, retrieving the Mellin-transform and operator-norm lemmas (`MellinConvolutionTransform`, `MellinOfPsi`, `MellinOfDeltaSpike`, `neumann_series`, `operator_norm_properties`). LeanHammer's text encoder identifies the correct PNT subcluster (`isHolomorphicOn`, `HolomorphicOn_riemannZeta0`, `logDerivResidue`, `ResidueMult`, `BddAbove_to_IsBigO`) and surfaces the gold at position 6. ReProver scatters across unrelated projects (`FormalBook`, `M2`, `Sphere-Packing-Lean`, `ABC-Exceptions`) and also fails. The case shows that even when **DAPS** correctly localizes to the right project, its structural features can pick the wrong topical subgraph within that project when several thematically adjacent clusters compete.

Figure 18: Failure case study from **DAPS**-Blueprint (the PrimeNumberTheoremAnd project). ✓ marks premises in the gold positive set. **DAPS** retrieves zero gold premises in its top-32, while LeanHammer retrieves the single gold premise at position 6, and ReProver also fails. The case reveals a within-project topical drift for **DAPS**. Structural features can resolve the right project but pick the wrong topical subgraph when several thematically adjacent clusters exist.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

The checklist is designed to encourage best practices for responsible machine learning research, addressing issues of reproducibility, transparency, research ethics, and societal impact. Do not remove the checklist: **The papers not including the checklist will be desk rejected.** The checklist should follow the references and follow the (optional) supplemental material. The checklist does NOT count towards the page limit.

Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question in the checklist:

- You should answer [Yes], [No], or [N/A].
- [N/A] means either that the question is Not Applicable for that particular paper or the relevant information is Not Available.
- Please provide a short (1–2 sentence) justification right after your answer (even for [N/A]).

The checklist answers are an integral part of your paper submission. They are visible to the reviewers, area chairs, senior area chairs, and ethics reviewers. You will also be asked to include it (after eventual revisions) with the final version of your paper, and its final version will be published with the paper.

The reviewers of your paper will be asked to use the checklist as one of the factors in their evaluation. While [Yes] is generally preferable to [No], it is perfectly acceptable to answer [No] provided a proper justification is given (e.g., error bars are not reported because it would be too computationally expensive" or "we were unable to find the license for the dataset we used"). In general, answering [No] or [N/A] is not grounds for rejection. While the questions are phrased in a binary way, we acknowledge that the true answer is often more nuanced, so please just use your best judgment and write a justification to elaborate. All supporting evidence can appear either in the main paper or the supplemental material, provided in appendix. If you answer [Yes] to a question, in the justification please point to the section(s) where related material for the question can be found.

IMPORTANT, please:

- **Delete this instruction block, but keep the section heading "NeurIPS Paper Checklist"**,
- **Keep the checklist subsection headings, questions/answers and guidelines below.**
- **Do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers**.

1. **Claims**

   Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

   Answer: [Yes]

   Justification: The abstract and Section 1 state the data, method, benchmark, and downstream claims, and Sections 3, 4, and 5 report the corresponding evidence.

   Guidelines:

   - The answer [N/A] means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
   - The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A [No] or [N/A] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
   - The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
   - It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. **Limitations**

   Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

   Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Appendix A the limitations. Appendix H.5 discusses three observed failure modes of **DAPS** with detailed case studies.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper has no limitation while the answer [No] means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. **Theory assumptions and proofs**

   Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

   Answer: [N/A]

   Justification: The paper does not present formal theoretical theorems or proof claims. The mathematical content in Section 4 defines the retrieval objective and training loss.

   Guidelines:

   - The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
   - All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
   - All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
   - The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
   - Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
   - Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. **Experimental result reproducibility**

   Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

   Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Section C summarizes reproducibility. Section 3.3 introduces dataset construction. Section 5.1 and Appendix E.3 describe the datasets, splits, baselines, and metrics. Appendix F discloses training details and main hyperparameters. All dependency graphs, benchmarks, the extraction pipeline, and the model code are released at the URL in the abstract.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a [No] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general. releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
  (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
  (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
  (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
  (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. **Open access to data and code**

   Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

   Answer: [Yes]

   Justification: The data and code can be accessed via https://daps-eth.github.io/.

   Guidelines:

   - The answer [N/A] means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
   - Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy) for more details.
   - While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so [No] is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
   - The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy) for more details.

- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. **Experimental setting/details**

   Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer) necessary to understand the results?

   Answer: [Yes]

   Justification: Training configuration and details are summarised in Table 14. Data splits and benchmark methodology are in Section 3.3 and Appendix E.3.

   Guidelines:

   - The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
   - The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
   - The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. **Experiment statistical significance**

   Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

   Answer: [No]

   Justification: Main retrieval numbers in Table 3 are single-run point estimates due to compute budget. Per-bucket and per-category breakdowns in the analysis sections expose result stability through stratification rather than seeds. Variance across seeds remains a limitation.

   Guidelines:

   - The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
   - The authors should answer [Yes] if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
   - The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
   - The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
   - The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
   - It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
   - It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
   - For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g., negative error rates).
   - If error bars are reported in tables or plots, the authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. **Experiments compute resources**

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Appendix D reports the hardware, device counts, runtime estimates, and aggregate compute for the training workloads used in the reported results.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. **Code of ethics**

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The work uses public Lean libraries, public Blueprint projects, and public theorem proving benchmarks, and does not involve private personal data, human subjects, surveillance data, or safety-critical deployment.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer [No], they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. **Broader impacts**

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: A brief broader impacts statement is included in Appendix B. The work bridges formal and informal mathematical reasoning by mining Lean Blueprints and improving LLM-based informal theorem proving, with no specific misuse concerns beyond general AI-for-mathematics considerations.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer [N/A] or [No], they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate Deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.

- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. **Safeguards**

    Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pre-trained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

    Answer: [N/A]

    Justification: The paper releases theorem-proving graphs, benchmarks, and selector code rather than a high-risk generative model or scraped dataset with personal or sensitive content.

    Guidelines:

    - The answer [N/A] means that the paper poses no such risks.
    - Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
    - Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
    - We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. **Licenses for existing assets**

    Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

    Answer: [Yes]

    Justification: Mathlib4 (Apache 2.0) , the Lean Blueprint tool, and the source datasets for **DAPS**-Collection (`Goedel-LM/Lean-workbook-proofs`, `stoney0062/Leanabell-Prover-Traindata-SFT`, `AI-MO/NuminaMath-LEAN`) are cited with their respective licenses in Section 3.3 and Appendix E.3.

    Guidelines:

    - The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not use existing assets.
    - The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
    - The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
    - The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
    - For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
    - If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, `paperswithcode.com/datasets` has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
    - For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
    - If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. **New assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Four new evaluation benchmarks and the **DAPS** model are introduced. Their construction, intended use, and license are documented in Section 3.3, Appendix E.3, and the README of the released repository (anonymous URL in abstract).

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing experiments or research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing experiments or research with human subjects, so IRB approval is not applicable.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. **Declaration of LLM usage**

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does *not* impact the core methodology, scientific rigor, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Section 4.5 and Section 5.4 describe the LLM use in the informal theorem proving experiment, including formalization with Gemini 3 Pro and proof generation by evaluated general-purpose LLMs.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy in the NeurIPS handbook for what should or should not be described.