

Long-horizon autoformalization of a core theorem underlying $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$

Sirui Lu^{1,2,*}, Ruixuan Deng^{3,*}, Yanqiao Zhu⁴, Zhengfeng Ji³

¹Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Straße 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany

²Munich Center for Quantum Science and Technology (MCQST), Schellingstraße 4, D-80799 Munich, Germany

³Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

⁴Department of Computer Science, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, USA

*Equal contribution

Landmark mathematical formalizations have taken specialist teams years to complete. We present FormalFlow, a system that coordinates AI proving agents under human supervision to address statement drift and proof composition in long-horizon formalization. Drawing on software engineering principles and practices, it uses a shared blueprint to guide nested planning, proving and review loops. Agents strengthen verification and review throughout formalization. We completed a machine-checked Lean 4 proof of the quantum soundness of the classical low individual-degree test, a core theorem underlying $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$. Developing the proof took 63 days; greater parallelism could further reduce this time. The final library contains 126,367 lines of Lean code, all generated by agents. The formalization corrects side conditions and intermediate errors while preserving the published final error bound under corrected assumptions. This work provides a verified foundation for quantum complexity and demonstrates a route to affordable verification of major research proofs by small teams.

Correspondence: Zhengfeng Ji (jizhengfeng@tsinghua.edu.cn)

Repository: <https://github.com/LionSR/MIPStarRE>

1 Introduction

Gaps in mathematical proofs can go unnoticed for years, even after peer review. Formalization has the potential to address this issue by translating each informal proof step into a proof term that can be verified by a proof assistant such as Lean, Isabelle, or Rocq. Large human-led formalization projects have achieved landmark results, including the Four-Color Theorem [1], the Feit–Thompson Odd Order Theorem (over 150,000 lines of proof scripts, including supporting libraries) [2], the Kepler Conjecture (over 500,000 lines of proof scripts) [3], and the Liquid Tensor Experiment [4, 5]. These achievements required years of manual work and coordination. Artificial-intelligence systems have now advanced automated theorem proving and autoformalization to the point where machine-checked proofs can be produced on a far greater scale [6–12]. Recent results show that cutting-edge models can formalize research-level mathematics [13–15]. Concurrent work on LeanMarathon also studies agent coordination for Lean autoformalization [16].

The central challenge for long-horizon autoformalization is to bring a large, evolving codebase to a complete proof while retaining control of its mathematical structure. Successive agent calls can introduce duplicate constructions, competing representations, and layers of intermediate results that still depend on unproved steps. As these additions accumulate, later agents and the supervising mathematician can lose sight of how the partial results form a complete argument. The project can then stall despite its growing size. If its mathematical structure cannot be recovered, the accumulated code may have to be abandoned and the

formalization restarted. Long developments therefore require repeated consolidation of useful results and an explicit account of what remains to be proved.

We address this problem with FormalFlow, an autoformalization framework inspired by software-engineering principles. It coordinates agents through shared repositories, continuous integration, and code review [17, 18]. We distilled its reusable multi-agent infrastructure into the open oh-my-formalization template, so that other formalization projects can adopt the same coordination machinery without rebuilding it from scratch. The shared repository holds the paper, the Lean codebase, proof-gap notes, and an interactive blueprint [19]: a dependency graph and mathematical specification that maps each informal claim in the paper to its formal Lean declaration. FormalFlow connects task planning, proving, and review through nested loops (Figure 1), using the failures found during the work to improve subsequent checks. Human supervisors set milestones, resolve discrepancies between the paper and the formalization, and inspect the final definitions.

FormalFlow coordinates formalization as an iterative process towards a fixed point: a complete formalization in which all dependencies compile, all statements represent the target mathematics accurately, and no open obligations remain. In each iteration, a multi-agent system inspects the evolving repository against the paper and the blueprint, retains verified and reusable proofs, removes abandoned proof attempts, and records newly exposed obligations as issues. Clearly defined protocols for proof gaps and open obligations guide the iteration towards this fixed point. Current models still take shortcuts that compile without proving the intended claim. The iterative process accommodates such deviations because each pass audits the revised repository and repairs errors left by the previous pass.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework by using it to formalize a central component of the $MIP^* = RE$ theorem [20]. This theorem establishes that interactive proofs with two entangled provers can decide every recursively enumerable language and refutes Connes’ embedding conjecture [21]. The component we formalize is the quantum soundness of the classical low individual-degree test (LIDT) [22], in which a referee checks whether two non-communicating provers answer consistently with evaluations of a low-individual-degree polynomial. Quantum soundness states that when the provers win with high probability, global measurements with polynomial outcomes describe their strategies. This test has a history that makes it a natural target for formalization. A proof gap in the low-degree-test analysis [23] affected the subsequent two-player NP-hardness result [24], quantum games PCP [25], $NEEXP \subseteq MIP^*$ [26], and the original proof of $MIP^* = RE$ [20, 27]. The LIDT is a weaker variant introduced in Ji et al. [22] to replace the LDT and recover the latter two results. The proof of $MIP^* = RE$ therefore depends on the quantum soundness of LIDT.

Our formalization is complete, contains no unproven placeholders (sorry), and uses only the standard axioms of classical mathematics. The resulting library contains 126,367 lines of Lean across 337 files (Supplementary Appendix A). During this process, FormalFlow uncovered and repaired two errors in the published theorem statement and three in the intermediate error budget. We also provide a public development history recording the failures, repairs, and changes to verification alongside the verified theorem and supporting library. By reducing a hundred-page formalization from years of specialist labour to weeks of supervised agent work, this work opens the way to a fully verified proof of $MIP^* = RE$. More broadly, it shows that machine-checked verification of major results in mathematics and theoretical computer science can move from a rare achievement to a realistic standard.




Figure 1 | Three nested scales of work and one cross-scale process. Rows (a)–(c) read from the largest scale to the smallest: (a) task planning, (b) the review loop, and (c) the work session, inside which the proof loop repeats until the proof compiles. The **highlighted task** expands into the review row, and the **highlighted session** expands into the work-session row. In (a), the orchestrator takes one task at a time from the todo list; the follow-up issues of a merged change become new tasks. In (b), review agents compare each pull request with the paper: findings send it back to the work session, and a passing request merges through a blocking gate. In (c), task agents read the task record and edit the proof; a failing compiler check sends the edit back, as the dashed retry arrow shows, and a passing one reaches the green, kernel-checked commit, which still has to pass review. Human decisions bracket the sequence: humans set the objectives that seed the todo list and audit the final statement; when the proof and the paper disagree, a gap note goes to the proof-gap protocol, where humans decide whether to correct the paper, repair the proof, or close, and an approved correction returns to the task. The bottom row, (d) check growth, is a separate process: failure patterns observed at review (red diamond) inform new checks, which are introduced through reviewed pull requests and run by continuous integration (CI) on relevant changes, where they may report findings before becoming blocking gates (magenta marks). Grey boxes are human decisions, orange boxes are AI agents, and dotted boxes are automated checks.

2 Results

We present two linked results. First, we introduce FormalFlow, a system that uses coding language models to translate long informal mathematical proofs into verified Lean code. Second, we use it to formalize the quantum soundness theorem for the low individual-degree test (LIDT) [22], a central result in the proof of $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$ [20]. The argument uses quantum information, non-commutative polynomial identities, Naimark dilations, semidefinite programming (SDP) duality, spectral graph expansion, and inductive pasting of local low-degree approximations. Formalizing it demanded both mathematical work and coordination across the codebase. We formalized foundations absent from Mathlib, including state-dependent distances between quantum measurements, finite-dimensional SDP duality with complementary slackness, and bipartite Naimark dilations. We also tracked error propagation across dozens of inductive stages and combined thousands of intermediate lemmas. In turn, the composition failures and statement drift this

work exposed guided the design of FormalFlow. We first describe the system and then present the completed LIDT formalization.

2.1 FormalFlow Framework

FormalFlow is an autoformalization framework that coordinates proving agents on long mathematical formalizations through nested feedback loops and a shared GitHub repository (Figure 1). Alongside the scripts that define FormalFlow, the repository stores the complete project record: its history, source paper, gap notes, Lean 4 codebase, and an interactive blueprint [19]. We distilled reusable parts of FormalFlow into the `oh-my-formalization` template and supporting tools (Supplementary Appendix H) for use in other mathematical formalization projects.

FormalFlow addresses two related obstacles to long formalizations: composition and statement drift. Each agent has a finite context window and works on only part of the codebase, while work may pass between different models, harnesses, and human users. The resulting components must nevertheless use compatible definitions, assumptions, and bounds. When a proof is difficult, its statement can drift towards an easier claim through added assumptions or a weakened conclusion, causing further issues for composition.

FormalFlow coordinates distributed proving agents across four nested operational scales and an orthogonal governance loop (Figure 1). At the macro-scale, task planning organizes the global proof into an interactive blueprint and GitHub issues, ensuring that agents only attempt lemmas whose mathematical prerequisites have been established. At the meso-scale, an agent work session checks out a dedicated git branch for one task, develops code, and opens a pull request. Before any code merges, the review loop audits the formal declarations against the paper and blueprint, returning unfulfilled obligations to further work sessions. At the micro-scale, within an individual work session, the agent executes an autonomous proof loop, repeatedly querying compiler diagnostics and tactic states to repair syntax and local proof obligations. Finally, an orthogonal check-growth process converts newly diagnosed defect patterns into automated continuous-integration linters and updated review prompts that run on every subsequent pull request (Supplementary Appendix D).

This hierarchical coordination is necessary because compiler satisfaction does not imply mathematical progress. Within the fast inner proof loop, an agent can easily drive local error counts to zero by proving degenerate tautologies, strengthening hypotheses, or modifying declarations. During the LIDT formalization, this failure mode caused the repository’s sorry count to drop to one while 114 of the 283 blueprint declarations remained unformalized or mathematically disconnected (Supplementary Appendix B). Figure 2 traces these measures across the project: the placeholder count, the blueprint’s completion, the library’s size, and the proof-gap notes, against the phases of the work.

FormalFlow also includes a proof-gap protocol for suspected disagreements between the formalization and the paper. When an agent encounters such a discrepancy while discharging an obligation, the protocol records it for human adjudication. Human supervisors decide whether to correct the paper, repair the formalization, or close the gap note without a change. Agents then implement the approved resolution and update the gap note and blueprint. Methods provides further details on how FormalFlow operates.

2.2 A Complete Formalization for LIDT

LIDT and its formalization. LIDT is a low-degree test used in the proof of $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$ [20, 22]. In its quantum soundness analysis, a referee tests whether two non-communicating provers who share quantum entanglement answer questions by evaluating a multivariate polynomial $g : \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ of individual degree at most d . The referee samples questions according to one of three subtests chosen with equal probability (Figure 3): the axis-parallel lines test, the self-consistency test, and the diagonal lines test. Quantum soundness states that if a projective strategy on two finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces succeeds with probability $1 - \epsilon$, then there are global polynomial measurements G^A and G^B with two forms of approximate agreement. On average over points u , evaluating Bob’s global polynomial at u agrees with Alice’s point answer, and evaluating Alice’s global polynomial agrees with Bob’s point answer. The two global polynomial measurements also agree with each other.




Figure 2 | Two measures of progress, 7 March to 24 June 2026. The ribbon marks the four phases of the work and the events that separated them; dashed lines carry the phase boundaries through the panels. By the compiler’s measure (c), the proof was nearly done seven weeks in: the sorry count rose to 149 on 1 April as the Lean skeleton was stubbed out, then fell to one by 29 April. By the blueprint’s measure (b) it was not: that day 114 of 283 target declarations were still not ready (orange) and 240 carried no leanok marker (dashed magenta). The next three weeks went into statements and interfaces rather than placeholders. The blueprint grew to 681 targets (a, dotted, right axis), the not-ready count peaked at 293 on 8 May, and the proof-gap notes (d) appeared in exactly this window: none before 29 April, 13 open at once on 15 May, 25 by 12 June. The two measures met on 23 May, when the last placeholder closed and all 566 remaining targets were fully formalized (blue); consolidation then trimmed the library (a, grey area, left axis) from a peak near 142k lines to 126k, and the blueprint from 668 to 566 targets, without changing the theorem. All 25 were closed by 23 June, the last two as repairs. Series are last values per day; Figure S2 traces the notes one by one.


The proof of the soundness theorem [22] constructs this global measurement by induction on the number of variables m . It reduces the m -variate test to $(m - 1)$ -variate instances by slicing along hyperplanes, applying self-improvement, enforcing approximate commutativity, and pasting local polynomial measurements into a global operator (Figure 3c). Each inductive stage fixes the state space, measurement operators, and error bounds required by the next stage.

The (m, q, d) -low individual degree test. A referee interacts with Alice and Bob and samples $u \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$ uniformly. With probability $1/3$ each, it performs:


- 1. Axis-parallel line.** Choose a random coordinate direction i and let $\ell = \{u + te_i : t \in \mathbb{F}_q\}$. One prover returns a degree- d polynomial f on ℓ ; the other returns $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ at u . Accept iff $f(u) = a$.
- 2. Self-consistency.** Both provers receive u and return $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Accept iff $a = b$.
- 3. Diagonal line.** Sample $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ uniformly, then $v \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$ uniformly with $v_{i+1} = \dots = v_m = 0$. Let $\ell = \{u + tv : t \in \mathbb{F}_q\}$. One prover returns a degree- md polynomial f on ℓ ; the other returns $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ at u . Accept iff $f(u) = a$.

In both line tests, the two prover roles are assigned uniformly at random.

(a) The three tests the referee performs.



(b) An honest polynomial strategy.



(c) The proof architecture.

Figure 3 | The low individual-degree test and its formal proof. **(a)** The referee plays one of three tests with the two provers, Alice and Bob. **(b)** An honest strategy uses a shared polynomial g : Alice returns $f = g|_\ell$ and Bob returns $a = g(x)$. The referee accepts when $f(x) = a$; the roles may be interchanged. The surface illustrates g schematically; its domain is $\mathbb{F}_q^m$. **(c)** The Lean formalization combines a base layer of quantum-information inequalities with self-improvement and pasting in the main induction. For a strategy accepted with high probability, quantum soundness gives question-independent polynomial-valued measurements whose evaluations approximately agree with the provers' answers. The two measurements also give approximately consistent polynomial outcomes, even when the provers share entanglement.

At the pinned snapshot (24 June 2026), the library contained 126,367 lines of Lean across 337 files. The library contained no unproven placeholders, and an in-kernel axiom audit confirmed that the development depends only on Lean's standard foundational axioms (Supplementary Appendix A). One of the coauthors of the LIDT paper audited the top-level theorem statements and gap resolutions against the published mathematics [22]. Supplementary Appendix B reports gap resolution separately from proof completion.

The discovered proof gaps. Formalizing the proof generated 25 gap notes, which record places where the formalization and the published proof did not initially agree (Supplementary Appendix B; Figure 2d). The paper-gap log in Figure 4 collects these notes; the human adjudication branch in Figure 1 shows how they return to the proof work. Some notes led to corrections of the theorem statement or error budget when a proof obligation could not be closed as published; others led to repairs of the formalization. Each note is a repository file, cited below by issue number and, when an issue has several notes, by a short slug. Table S4 lists all notes. We classified the corrections to the published argument into three principal categories:

- (i) *Error-bound corrections*: Much of the LIDT proof bounds approximation errors. Several bounds used incorrect arithmetic or misapplied an intermediate result.

Table 1 | Classification of the 21,651 review comments and reports, one subcategory each. Shares are fractions of all 21,651 entries; follow-up is counted in [Supplementary Appendix F](#).

Review category	Objects	Share
Mathematics and agreement with the paper	11,949	55.19%
▷ Mathematical content	5,520	25.50%
▷ Source and blueprint correspondence	3,742	17.28%
▷ Semantic and API invariants	2,687	12.41%
Exposition and library design	6,998	32.32%
▷ Mathematical exposition	3,307	15.27%
▷ Library architecture and API	2,059	9.51%
▷ Reuse and maintainability	1,632	7.54%
Audit and execution infrastructure	2,704	12.49%
▷ Build, CI and review automation	1,064	4.91%
▷ Reproducibility, security and environment	119	0.55%
▷ Repository process and evidence	1,521	7.03%
Total	21,651	100.00%

For example, a substitution step is printed as preserving its consistency error, although the proposition it cites charges a loss. The repair required a sharper comparison at the sub-measurement scale. The printed proof replaces the polynomial measurement G^A by Q^A , the completion of its orthonormalized sub-measurement P^A , and carries the consistency error ζ_1 across unchanged, whereas the substitution proposition it cites adds the square root of the state-dependent distance and gives $\zeta_1 + \sqrt{\zeta_2}$. The formal proof compares G^A against P^A instead, where the square root is taken at the smaller scale $100 \zeta_1^{1/4}$, and shows that completion cannot decrease the match mass, giving $\zeta_1 + 10 \zeta_1^{1/8}$ (gap notes 1099, line-169 loss and sharper fix; [Supplementary Section C.5.1](#)).

In another example, completing an orthonormalized sub-measurement adds an unstated $2 \zeta_1$ term. After this term is absorbed into the cascade parameter, the completion error is $\zeta_2 = 200 \zeta_1^{1/4} + 42 \zeta_1^{1/8}$ rather than the printed coefficient 40 (gap note 904).

These local repairs prevented the errors from propagating through the proof.

- (ii) *Boundary-case analysis*: Formalization also required explicit treatment of boundary cases omitted from the informal argument. Gap note 422 shows that the printed conditions permit $k = 0$ when $d = 0$; the formal theorem requires $0 < k$. Similarly, gap note 930 (main-induction-successor-coefficient) treats the $m = 1$ boundary of the induction.
- (iii) *Side-condition handling*: A typographical error changed a condition needed later in the proof. For example, the printed condition $k \geq md$ on the line-sampling parameter is insufficient for the successor pasting stage, whose additive Chernoff bound requires $k \geq 400 md$ (gap note 906).

The formalized theorem incorporates all such corrections; its final conclusion is unchanged, and the test remains sound with the printed error expression under the tightened side conditions.

Role of code reviews. Automated review played an important role in the LIDT formalization. The review corpus contains 21,651 comments and reports retrieved on 27 July 2026 across 1,904 closed pull requests ([Table 1](#)). [Supplementary Appendix F](#) gives the corpus construction, classification method, and sensitivity analysis. Under the default classification, mathematics and agreement with the paper formed the largest

category (55.2%). This category remained the largest under the alternative tie-breaking rules in [Supplementary Appendix F](#).

Shortcut patterns and self-evolution. During the LIDT formalization, we observed shortcuts that passed the Lean checker without establishing the intended intermediate claim. Such shortcuts impede long formalizations by causing statement drift and composition failures. Review and integration exposed three patterns:

- (i) *Tautological aliases*: In rewriting the Laplacian, an early draft defined $L_{\text{diff}} := M^{-1}I - K$ directly, reducing an algebraic identity that required spectral graph analysis to syntactic reflexivity ($x = x$).
- (ii) *Vacuous witnesses*: In rounding to projectors, an early witness chose the projection [1] on a one-dimensional carrier, establishing no state-dependent closeness to the supplied measurement on its original carrier.
- (iii) *Conclusion inlining*: In the self-improvement stage, an early draft accepted properties derived from semidefinite programming as auxiliary hypotheses in the theorem signature through a `SelfImprovementBridgePackage`.

Each shortcut initially passed the compiler. Review identified each departure, and a complete proof of the corresponding mathematical claim in the paper replaced the shortcut ([Supplementary Appendix B](#) catalogs these across the ten blueprint chapters).

Replaying the proof-debt scanner over the repository history traces how these patterns accumulated and were removed. The number of flagged statements with unproved helper obligations, circular dependencies, or conclusion-shaped hypotheses increased from 1 to 63 between 22 March and 6 May 2026. The count fell to zero on 11 May, when the scanner became a blocking continuous-integration check, and remained at zero thereafter. These detections surfaced through different channels. Automated review identified the one-dimensional rounding witness on the introducing pull request, but it was still merged; an issue then tracked the repair. The conclusion-shaped induction hypothesis was likewise flagged before merge, when no blocking scanner for that pattern yet existed. Once checks blocked changes, the inspected failures showed concrete repairs: one proof-debt failure led to a corrected Lean/blueprint boundary, and five marker failures led to corrected declaration documentation. [Supplementary Appendix D](#) gives the inspected cases and their coverage. To prevent autonomous agents from evading verification by weakening CI linters, such as when an agent attempted to whitelist `sorry` in continuous integration ([Supplementary Appendix D](#)), all modifications to test harnesses and agent instructions required the same agent review.

3 Discussion

This work shows that long-horizon autoformalization of a complete research proof is feasible in an agent-intensive, human-supervised setting. We formalized the quantum soundness of the classical low individual-degree test, including corrections to the published statement and intermediate error bounds [22]. Under human supervision, the models produced all the Lean code through repeated interaction with compiler feedback. Completing such a proof, however, requires more than resolving compiler errors. Lean checks that a proof establishes its stated theorem, but not whether that theorem captures the intended mathematical meaning of the corresponding result in the paper. As a formalization grows, we must therefore manage drift in Lean statements, definitions, and interfaces by repeatedly comparing intermediate declarations with the blueprint and the paper.

This distinction between a checked component and its intended mathematical role also explains why tracking the count of unresolved `sorry` placeholders is an unreliable measure of progress toward the full theorem. In automated proving, agents can rapidly eliminate placeholders by strengthening premises, weakening conclusions to tautologies, or decoupling definitions from the global theorem. During our project, the repository’s `sorry` count first dropped to one while 114 of the 283 declarations tracked by the blueprint were not yet fully formalized ([Supplementary Appendix B](#)). A component can compile without error while

leaving its essential mathematical obligation buried in an auxiliary hypothesis or exposing an interface that downstream arguments cannot use. Resolving these discrepancies requires following the complete dependency chain and revising compiler-accepted components until their assumptions, representations, and conclusions support the complete proof (Supplementary Appendix C).

These recurring defects prompted continuous adaptation of FormalFlow itself. Humans established the initial roles, skills, review procedures, and validity gates. As agents and human auditors identified recurring failure modes, they proposed countermeasures and implemented targeted audits or stronger gates in response (Supplementary Appendix D). FormalFlow therefore evolved alongside the formalization. This experience suggests that oversight in long-running agent systems may need to adapt as new failures emerge [28, 29].

The majority of our formalization work was completed in April and May 2026. Since then, stronger models, larger formalizations such as Erdos90 [30], and research advances accompanied by Lean certificates [15] have expanded the scope of machine-checked mathematics. As these developments expand autoformalization, our documented failures and repairs provide practical precedents for organizing, reviewing, and repairing large formalization codebases. The verified quantum soundness of the low individual-degree test and its supporting library establish the foundation for completing the full formalization of $MIP^* = RE$ [20] and provide the analytic machinery required for the subsequent verification of Pauli-basis testing.

4 Methods

We describe how FormalFlow stores the state of the LIDT formalization and coordinates work across its four nested scales.

Blueprint, repository, and memory. Each fresh session reads the relevant paper text, blueprint nodes, Lean code, gap notes, project instructions, and a memory store. Individual language-model sessions carry no memory across invocations, so the shared GitHub repository maintains the complete project state (Section 2.1). The project documentation and memory directory provide persistent instructions and conventions that every session reads afresh, regardless of which model or agent runs it. The directory also contains 147 dated audit and session reports, which agents retrieve by file name.

Starting from the primary $\LaTeX$ paper, human supervisors consult with agents to establish the initial structural decomposition in an interactive blueprint [19]. They also construct a corresponding Lean skeleton of namespaces, definitions, and unproven theorem signatures. As the formalization progresses, we instruct an orchestrator agent to split broad blueprint statements into intermediate lemmas and add obligations for missing steps and unstated prerequisites. Every paper-facing Lean declaration links to a blueprint statement, and every blueprint statement links to a specific claim in the paper. These links support claim-by-claim comparison. The blueprint thus provides a shared data structure that language-model agents can read and maintain. Unlike the rigid data structures of traditional programs, it represents the proof structure in natural-language $\LaTeX$. In the ideal case this scaffolding would simplify the work to formalizing all the statements of the paper and leaving the proofs to be filled in. Finding definitions that are correct and mutually compatible is, however, itself a non-trivial task and part of the formalization process.

Task generation and organization. We organize proof obligations as GitHub issues. Tracking issues cover chapters of the original paper and theorem families; GitHub’s native sub-issue links record individual proof tasks (Figure 1). We build the workflow around GitHub’s native pull-request, issue, and Actions infrastructure. Pretrained language models exhibit strong proficiency with standard software-engineering tools, making native repository infrastructure an effective substrate for asynchronous multi-agent coordination without centralized scheduling bottlenecks. It also makes the formalization transparent and easy to audit: external readers can inspect every task, review discussion, and code change through standard public interfaces. Agents open proof-task issues as work progresses. Issue workflows classify eligible new issues and supply Mathlib scouting reports for eligible formalization tasks. With post-merge tracking enabled, the issue

tracker examines merged changes and discussions for newly exposed proof obligations. It creates follow-up issues, attaches them to the relevant open tracker, and recommends a next task whose prerequisites are resolved. A separate weekday workflow summarizes proof activity and open problems. [Section E.4](#) describes these workflows during the formalization. The repair of the mathematical pasting step in Results is an example of the feedback from review to new proof tasks shown in [Figure 1](#).

The formalization session. We use TeXRA, Claude Code, OpenCode, and Codex to work on proof tasks in the shared repository. TeXRA’s multi-agent system, described in our earlier work [31], allows independent tasks to proceed concurrently, including in separate worktrees. [Sections E.9](#) and [E.10](#) report the recorded agent contributions and the breakdown of model usage.

The agent selects an open issue whose prerequisites are resolved and follows the repository’s standing instructions ([Section E.1](#)). A session begins with the paper. The standing instructions set the reading order: first the paper, then the blueprint node, and finally the Lean files. They require agents to document the mathematical proof strategy from the paper before attempting formal tactics, preventing the introduction of ad-hoc shortcuts. Before attempting a proof, agents search Mathlib and the codebase for existing lemmas. Dedicated scouting sessions post reports that subsequent proof sessions read before attempting the proof. The instructions favour small lemmas that can be reused and composed. A session that modifies a paper-labelled theorem concludes with a statement integrity audit that compares its assumptions and conclusions directly with the paper. The session also synchronizes the blueprint markers in the same change and produces a pull request in the required format. A proving session thus transitions from an assigned issue to a local worktree, generates the required lemmas and blueprint annotations, and submits an auditable pull request.

Tool loops, autonomous goals, and stopping criteria. Proving sessions operate autonomously toward an approved mathematical obligation with a strict stopping condition. The agent iteratively explores proof tactics, searches Mathlib, and inspects compiler diagnostics. When the agent becomes idle, a continuation prompt returns it to that target objective. Execution terminates when either the target declaration compiles cleanly under `lake env lean` without `sorry` placeholders or unapproved axioms, or an iteration budget is exhausted, escalating the task for human review. [Section E.7](#) details these procedures and the continuation prompt.

The repository instructions require the agent to type-check the edited file with `lake env lean` and scan it for `sorry` and `axiom`. Changes affecting imports or shared declarations also require `lake build`. Declarations that retain `sorry` tokens cannot mark a blueprint node complete and remain tracked as open proof debt. The agent reports its verification through the planning tool; statement review then checks that the proof discharged the intended obligation rather than an auxiliary shortcut.

Review and integration. Each worktree uses the Lean toolchain [32] and Mathlib [33]. Every pull request undergoes a multi-layer verification gate before merge. First, continuous integration runs full compilation (`lake build`) and the kernel axiom audit (`Lean.collectAxioms`), verifying that the code compiles and depends strictly on approved axioms. Separate workflows check blueprint and source integrity ([Supplementary Appendices A](#) and [D](#)). Second, automated review agents evaluate proposed Lean changes for mathematical fidelity against the paper, the blueprint, and the library architecture. We couple these checks to automated repair workflows in GitHub Actions. When a build or blueprint check fails, GitHub Actions dispatches a repair agent with compiler diagnostics to resolve the failure directly on the pull-request branch. When review comments identify actionable discrepancies, the repair agent addresses unresolved threads under maintainer authorization. Repair prompts ([Supplementary Appendix G](#)) enforce local verification before pushing and require agents to isolate mathematical obstructions rather than weaken statements. To prevent infinite repair loops and runaway token expenditure, automated repairs are restricted to a safety cap of five consecutive commits before halting for human review. [Section E.6](#) details the triggers, termination rules, and an audited repair sequence.

When concurrent branches conflict, an automated integration agent rebases the pull request in a dedicated worktree, resolves syntactic and semantic conflicts, and verifies full compilation before merging.




Figure 4 | The FormalFlow workflow. Task agents work on open proof tasks and submit their changes as pull requests. Issue-tracking agents organize follow-up proof obligations. Review agents compare statements with the blueprint and paper; Lean checks proofs and the axiom audit checks their dependencies. These checks run independently, according to the files changed: Lean and build changes trigger compilation and the axiom audit, while changes to Lean, blueprint, gap notes, or project instructions trigger review. Agents merge reviewed changes under the project instructions; authors steer the work and assess mathematical gaps. Agents document deviations from the paper in separate paper-gap notes. They may also propose changes to prompts, scripts, and automated checks through pull requests. The review prompt is read from the base branch, so a proposed prompt edit does not govern its own review.

Section E.9 reports the agent markers recorded in commit metadata. Edits to standing instructions, review prompts, and continuous-integration scripts follow the same pull-request review process. To ensure evaluation integrity, automated review workflows load their prompts from the repository’s protected base branch, ensuring that a proposed prompt edit cannot govern its own review. Build and review workflows run independently on the changes each covers.

The proof-gap protocol. Sometimes the printed claim itself is wrong. When an agent cannot reconcile a proof obligation with the paper, it files a standardized L^AT_EX gap document specifying the paper passage, the failing obligation, the mathematical cause, a proposed correction to the formalization or the paper, the downstream consequences, and the final repair. Each document registers one of three decisions: (a) correcting the paper’s mathematics, where the formal statement adopts the repaired bound or tightened hypothesis (such as the 400 *md* side condition or the degree-0 pasting construction), an erratum note is recorded, and downstream dependencies adjust to the repaired interface; (b) repairing the formalization, where the Lean encoding was defective (such as unnormalized state scaling or an ungrounded carrier witness) and is rewritten to match the paper’s intended mathematical object; or (c) closing without modification, where the perceived discrepancy is resolved as an artifact of notation or an alternative formalization path, leaving both the paper and formal statements unchanged. Affected declarations and all dependent theorems carry metadata markers linking to the gap document until the gap is resolved. [Supplementary Appendix B](#) details the dated gap notes and statement trajectory from first compiler-accepted versions to the verified theorem.

Auditing and discrepancy resolution. During major repair phases, maintainers run a comprehensive audit instruction across the repository. Each pass scans the formal declarations against the blueprint and the paper, detects unproved bridge scaffolding or unfaithful hypotheses, and records the remaining obligations as issues for further work. The next pass examines the revised statements and their dependencies under the same audit instruction. This iterative process continues until an audit pass identifies no new discrepancies: the statements agree with the paper and any approved corrections, their proof obligations are discharged, and the Lean checks pass. [Supplementary Appendix G](#) reproduces the instruction and the defect taxonomy used for this process.

Automated checks. We catalogue recurring failure patterns and use them to revise review instructions and add automated checks for subsequent changes. Automated review agents continue to look for failures outside existing static checks. For example, review agents found an intermediate theorem whose auxiliary hypotheses supplied variance bounds that the paper does not assume; an automated repair pull request (PR #1466) restored the paper’s statement and left the missing step as a tracked obligation, which a subsequent session proved (PR #1496). In the induction section, PR #1664 aligned the interface of the self-improvement lemma with the published paper and prevented the theorem from being marked complete while an underlying dependency remained open. We then added a transitive proof-status check to continuous integration. The check fails any pull request that marks a result complete while any transitive dependency contains open proof debt. Static audits provide further evidence of agreement: paper-facing docstrings cite the exact lines formalized, linters check that gap notes follow their templates, and custom scripts flag conclusion-shaped hypotheses, unlinked declarations, and redundant helpers ([Supplementary Appendix D](#)).

Checking the completed proof. The compiler and an in-kernel axiom audit decide validity. The build workflow audits the kernel’s axiom environment with 68 standard-axiom assertions and 228 no-unproven-step assertions. The completed build contains no unfinished proofs, and the main theorem depends strictly on the three standard axioms of classical mathematics (`propext`, `Classical.choice`, and `Quot.sound`) ([Supplementary Appendix A](#)). A standalone comparator repository certifies that the formalized theorem statement matches the certified target. Because the Lean kernel cannot check whether this target faithfully captures the theorem in the paper, a coauthor of the LIDT paper [22] and our team audited the top-level theorem and its dependent definitions against the paper, unfolding definitions down to Lean primitive types to check for weakened statements and unintended auxiliary assumptions. The repository metrics in [Table S11](#) describe the library at proof completion (24 June 2026) under Lean toolchain v4.31.0.

Data availability

The data supporting the findings of this study are available in the public [MIPStarRE GitHub repository](#). The main-theorem proof was completed in May 2026. Library integration and statement alignment continued in June, including removal of the legacy same-space route and proof of a heterogeneous sub-measurement consistency lemma ([Supplementary Appendix B](#)). The MIPStarRE repository also contains the [interactive blueprint](#) and the gap notes.

Code availability

The Lean proof and supporting library are available in the [MIPStarRE repository](#). The reported library measurements use snapshot b39705 and Lean 4 v4.31.0; [Supplementary Appendix A](#) gives the build and verification instructions. The formalization is registered in the [Palomar Registry](#) as PALOMAR-2026-08-18-000001: the registry re-checks the proofs with Lean from its registered source and publishes the exact statement (`MIPStarRE.LDT.Test.mainFormal`), the libraries it uses, and the review’s comments. The registered source is the companion [comparator repository](#), which certifies that the library’s main theorem matches the registered target statement.

AI disclosure. The Lean 4 code and the blueprint have been fully generated by the multi-agent AI system we developed under our supervision. We used LLM-based tools for editing parts of the manuscript text and figures; all scientific content was checked by the authors, who take responsibility for it.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

We thank Thomas Vidick for suggesting to organize a comparator and Challenge.lean for the Lean formalization. We thank the Palomar team for building the registry.

This work is partially supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2023YFA1009403), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12347104), and Beijing Science and Technology Planning Project (Grant No. Z25110100810000). The work is partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – EXC-2111 – 390814868. This research is part of the Munich Quantum Valley, which is supported by the Bavarian state government with funds from the Hightech Agenda Bayern Plus.

Supplementary Information

A	The formal theorem and its verification	16
A.1	The formal statement	16
A.2	The error parameters	17
A.3	Scope	18
A.4	Checking the completed proof	18
A.5	Software configuration	18
A.6	Reproducing the checks	18
B	Trajectory of the formal statements	19
	Structure, notation, and color conventions	19
B.1	Three worked trajectories	19
B.2	Timeline of formal transitions	21
B.3	Ten-chapter formalization milestones	23
B.4	The blueprint as a measure of progress	25
B.5	The 25 gap notes	26
C	Cross-module composition in the inductive proof	31
C.1	Overview	31
C.2	Case study I: register placement, role symmetrization, and self-consistency	33
C.3	Case study II: assembling self-improvement and reindexing its bounds	35
C.4	Case study III: semidefinite duality and the false assumption $I \leq Z$	36
C.5	Case study IV: consistency under rounding and completion	37
C.6	Case study V: rerandomization graph Laplacian and centered variance trace	38
C.7	Case study VI: interpolation support and degree-zero pasting	39
C.8	Case study VII: pasting telescoping sum and inductive successor arithmetic	40
C.9	Index of theorem inputs and outputs	40
D	Verification tools and proof integrity checks	43
D.1	Overview	43
D.2	Checks 1 and 2: hypothesis and proof-debt scanners	44
D.3	Check 3: helper structure reviews and scaffolding removal	44
D.4	Check 4: kernel axiom audits	45
D.5	Check 5: blueprint synchronization and declaration checks	46
D.6	Mathematical review	46
D.7	Measuring the checks	46

E	GitHub task tracking, agent contributions, and model usage	49
E.1	From proof decomposition to session instructions	49
E.2	Tracking proof tasks	49
E.3	From body checklists to native sub-issues	49
E.4	Issue creation and organization through GitHub Actions	51
E.5	Pull-request links and task decomposition	53
E.6	Automated pull-request repair	53
E.7	Tool loops, goal mode, and proof-task completion	54
E.8	Codebase metrics and project timeline	55
E.9	Account attribution and agent commit contributions	56
E.10	Model token usage and accounting	57
F	The review dataset	63
F.1	Population	63
F.2	Reading and classification	63
F.3	Examples of review findings	64
G	Prompt for auditing and repairing the formalization	68
H	Tools distilled for new formalizations	70

We organize the supplementary material around the completed theorem, the mathematical changes needed to prove it, and the procedures used to check and coordinate the work. [Supplementary Appendix A](#) states the formal theorem and explains how to verify it. [Supplementary Appendix B](#) traces the changes from early formal statements to their corrected forms. [Supplementary Appendix C](#) then examines how the corrected lemmas fit together in the inductive proof, with particular attention to their hypotheses, operator representations, and error bounds. [Supplementary Appendix D](#) describes the automated checks and mathematical review used to detect unproved obligations and departures from the intended statements. [Supplementary Appendix E](#) records how proof tasks were organized and documents agent contributions and model usage. [Supplementary Appendix G](#) reproduces the prompt used to audit and repair the codebase when formal statements had departed from the paper. Finally, [Supplementary Appendix H](#) describes the template and tools distilled from this work for use in new formalizations.

A The formal theorem and its verification

A.1 The formal statement

Using our multi-agent formalization pipeline under human supervision, we verified the quantum soundness of the classical low individual-degree test (LIDT) [22] used in answer reduction toward $\text{MIP}^* = \text{RE}$ [20]. The theorem and proof statistics refer to the MIPStarRE revision specified below. The comparator checks use a later revision. Provers that pass the test with high probability must use strategies close to global polynomial measurements whose evaluations agree approximately with their point answers and with each other. The formal statement applies to any projective strategy on any pair of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. It has the conclusion and error bound printed in the paper, with two corrected side conditions. Here m denotes the number of variables, d the individual-degree bound, q the field size, and ε the soundness error. The printed condition $k \geq md$ becomes $k \geq 400md$ in the formal proof, and at $d = 0$, where the printed condition permitted $k = 0$, the formal theorem requires $0 < k$. The final error term is

$$\nu = 100000 k^2 m^4 \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{40000}} + (d/q)^{\frac{1}{40000}} + \exp(-k/(2560000 m^2)) \right), \quad (\text{S1})$$

where k is a free integer parameter in the analysis. Figure S1 places the printed and formal statements side by side.

Informal soundness statement. Consider a projective strategy $(\psi, A^A, B^A, L^A, A^B, B^B, L^B)$ that passes the (m, q, d) -low individual degree test with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$. Let $k \geq md$ be an integer and ν be defined as in Equation (S1). Then there are projective measurements $G^A, G^B \in \text{PolyMeas}(m, q, d)$ such that:

1. *Consistency with A.* On average over $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbb{F}_q^m$,

$$A_a^{A,u} \otimes I \simeq_\nu I \otimes G_{[g(u)=a]}^B,$$

$$I \otimes A_a^{B,u} \simeq_\nu G_{[g(u)=a]}^A \otimes I.$$

2. *Self-consistency.*

$$G_g^A \otimes I \simeq_\nu I \otimes G_g^B.$$

(a) Informal statement.

```
theorem mainFormal
  (params : Parameters) [FieldModel params.q] {A {B : Type*}
    [Fintype {A}] [DecidableEq {A}] [Fintype {B}] [DecidableEq {B}]
    (strategy : ProjStrat params {A} {B}) (eps : Error)
    (hpass : strategy.PassesLowIndividualDegreeTest eps) (k : ℕ)
    -- paper prints k ≥ md
    (hk : 400 * params.m * params.d ≤ k)
    -- absent from the paper
    (hk0 : 0 < k) : ∃
  G_A : ProjMeas (Polynomial params) {A}, ∃
  G_B : ProjMeas (Polynomial params) {B},
  ConsRel strategy.state
    (uniformDistribution (Point params))
    (IdxProjMeas.toIdxSubMeas strategy.pointMeasurementA)
    (polynomialEvaluationFamily params G_B.toSubMeas)
    (mainFormalError params k eps) ∧
  ConsRel strategy.state
    (uniformDistribution (Point params))
    (polynomialEvaluationFamily params G_A.toSubMeas)
    (IdxProjMeas.toIdxSubMeas strategy.pointMeasurementB)
    (mainFormalError params k eps) ∧
  ConsRel strategy.state
    (uniformDistribution Unit)
    (constSubMeasFamily G_A.toSubMeas)
    (constSubMeasFamily G_B.toSubMeas)
    (mainFormalError params k eps)
```

(b) Formal statement.

Figure S1 | The soundness theorem in two forms. **(a)** The statement printed in the paper [22]. **(b)** The statement that the Lean kernel has checked. Each hypothesis and each conclusion on the left has a formal counterpart on the right, including the error bound. The comments on the right mark two corrected side conditions: the formal theorem requires $k \geq 400md$ where the paper prints $k \geq md$, and it requires $0 < k$, which the paper omits.

A.2 The error parameters

Table S1 lists the error bounds used in pasting and the final proof. Intermediate parameters ν_1 – ν_3 (representing base-case line and plane consistency errors) are absorbed into the inductive step bound ν_5 . We write $E := \varepsilon^{1/32} + \delta^{1/32} + \gamma^{1/32} + \zeta^{1/32} + (d/q)^{1/32}$. We highlight the corrected expressions and display the printed values alongside them. The corrected ν_8 still satisfies $\nu_7 + \nu_8 \leq \nu$ at the pasting stage. In the final proof, the corrected completion error ζ_2 and the error from the operator substitution in Section 5 of the LIDT paper [22] contribute to $\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$, which is bounded by the final error in Equation (S1).

Table S1 | The error parameters of the proof. The final error in Equation (S1) bounds the accumulated errors. Here $E = \varepsilon^{1/32} + \delta^{1/32} + \gamma^{1/32} + \zeta^{1/32} + (d/q)^{1/32}$. In the final-assembly rows, σ is the induction error for the symmetrized $(3\varepsilon, 3\varepsilon, 3\varepsilon)$ -good strategy; in the last row it denotes the output of one pasting step. The paper reuses the letter ν at three scales: the pasting-stage ν of the last row, the induction error $\nu = 1000k^2m^2(\varepsilon^{1/1024} + \delta^{1/1024} + \gamma^{1/1024} + (d/q)^{1/1024})$ that absorbs it, and the final error of Equation (S1). Sections C.5.1 and C.8.1 derive the corrected ζ_2 and ν_8 . Section C.5.1 gives the repaired point-consistency bound and shows how the final error bound includes it.

Parameter	Defined in	Expression or bound	Absorbed into
ε	Test definition (good strategy)	Axis-parallel lines test fails w.p. $\leq \varepsilon$	ζ ; ν_5 – ν_7 ; ν
δ	Test definition (good strategy)	Self-consistency test fails w.p. $\leq \delta$	ζ ; ν_5 – ν_7 ; ν
γ	Test definition (good strategy)	Diagonal lines test fails w.p. $\leq \gamma$	ν_4 – ν_8 ; ν
ζ	Self-improvement (helper lemma)	$100m(\varepsilon^{1/2} + \delta^{1/2} + (d/q)^{1/2})$	The pasting hypotheses; ν_4 – ν_8
ζ_1	Final assembly (symmetrized pair)	$2\sigma + 2\sqrt{3\varepsilon + 2\sigma} + md/q$	ζ_2 ; ζ_3 ; $\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$
ζ_2	Final assembly (completion)	$200\zeta_1^{1/4} + 42\zeta_1^{1/8}$ (printed $200\zeta_1^{1/4} + 40\zeta_1^{1/8}$)	ζ_3 ; $\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$
ζ_3	Final assembly (self-consistency)	$6\zeta_1 + 6\zeta_2$	$\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$; final self-consistency
$\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$	Final assembly (point consistency)	$2\sigma + 2\sqrt{\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8} + \zeta_3/2}$ (printed $2\sigma + 2\sqrt{\zeta_1 + \zeta_3/2}$)	Final error in Equation (S1)
ν_4	Pasting (commuting past $\hat{G}$'s)	$426k^2m(\gamma^{1/16} + \zeta^{1/16} + (d/q)^{1/16})$	ν_5 via $\nu_1 + 2\sqrt{\nu_4}$; ν_8
ν_5	Pasting ($\hat{H}$ – B consistency)	$43kmE$	ν_6 via $k^2/q + k\nu_5$; ν_7
ν_6	Pasting (H – B consistency)	$44k^2mE$	H – A consistency: $\nu_6 + \sqrt{8m\varepsilon + 4\delta} \leq \nu$
ν_7	Pasting (over all outcomes)	$46k^2mE$	Completeness of H : $\nu_7 + \nu_8 \leq \nu$
ν_8	Pasting (from $\hat{H}$ to G)	$46k^2m(\gamma^{1/32} + \zeta^{1/32} + (d/q)^{1/32})$ (printed $46km(\dots)$)	Completeness of H : $\nu_7 + \nu_8 \leq \nu$
ν	Pasting theorem	$100k^2mE$	$\sigma = \kappa(1 + \frac{1}{100m}) + 2\nu + e^{-k/(80000m^2)}$; the induction; Equation (S1)

A.3 Scope

The quantum soundness theorem is proved from the standard axioms of classical mathematics in Lean (`propext`, `Classical.choice`, `Quot.sound`). The quantum soundness proof does not invoke the two classical precursor theorems, Raz–Safra [34] and Polishchuk–Spielman [35].

A.4 Checking the completed proof

At snapshot b39705 (24 June 2026), the library contains no unfinished proofs. The in-kernel axiom audit checks the dependencies of `Test.mainFormal` and other selected declarations. Its `assert_standard_axioms` command requires exactly `propext`, `Classical.choice`, and `Quot.sound`; `Test.mainFormal` receives this check. Its separate `assert_no_sorry_axiom` command rejects a dependency on `sorryAx`, Lean’s axiom for an unfinished proof. Both commands use `Lean.collectAxioms` to list the axioms on which a declaration depends and report an error if the condition fails. The declaration audit additionally rejects `explicit axiom` and `constant` commands in the library tree. As a cosmetic convenience for repository status display, a text scanner checks tracked files for `sorry` tokens, finding zero at this snapshot; formal soundness relies strictly on the in-kernel axiom collection above.

We later exported the main formal statement to give readers a separate file to inspect against the theorem in the paper. The companion `LDT-comparator` repository uses the official Lean comparator to check that the library proves this certified target. The exported file imports only `Mathlib` and includes the declarations needed to state `Test.mainFormal`. The target theorem has one intentional `sorry`; the comparator checks the submitted proof against that target and its dependent definitions. We must also compare this target with the theorem in the paper. The export tooling entered MIPStarRE in [commit 9e882d](#) on 16 July 2026. A check for changes to the exported statement followed in [commit 5e8e64](#) on 17 July. Both additions postdate the completion of the proof (24 June 2026).

A.5 Software configuration

At proof completion, Lean and `Mathlib` are pinned to v4.31.0. The July comparator checkout pins both to v4.32.0. In the June repository state, the build workflow compiles the library and runs the kernel axiom audit on pull requests that change Lean files, Lake configuration, the toolchain, or that workflow. Separate workflows run the blueprint and source-integrity checks described in [Supplementary Appendix D](#).

A.6 Reproducing the checks

To reproduce the proof checks, select the repository head at 24 June 2026 with its toolchain, build the library, and run the declaration and in-kernel axiom audits described above. The latter verifies the axiom dependencies of the main theorem. The exported-statement check uses the July revision, regenerates the target statement, and compares it byte by byte with the certified target. The full comparator checks the proof against this target using the library dependency and toolchain from the same revision.

B Trajectory of the formal statements

Structure, notation, and color conventions

We trace how the statements changed during the formalization of the quantum low individual-degree test (LIDT) [22], using the 2,778-commit pinned history of the MIPStarRE repository. Each milestone cites a pull request, commit, or issue. We follow the statements across the ten blueprint chapters and list the formal gap notes.

- **Theorem and lemma numbering:** When an environment heading names a statement in the paper, its base number matches the paper’s numbering [22]. Other labels are local to this appendix.
- **Defect highlighting:** Light rose highlighting marks placeholder witnesses unrelated to the input, unproved hypotheses, missing side conditions, or invalid algebraic steps.
- **Repair highlighting:** Light teal highlighting marks proved constructions, corrected domain bounds, and completed proofs.
- **Commit and pull request identifiers:** Pull requests (PR #123), issues (issue #456), and commits (8ae0cc) cite historical commits and issues in the public repository.

Throughout this appendix, *measurement*, *sub-measurement*, and *projective sub-measurement* refer to the finite-matrix structures used for the LIDT paper. A sub-measurement has positive outcomes whose total is at most the identity; a measurement has total equal to the identity; and a projective sub-measurement also has idempotent outcomes. We therefore distinguish a family of projective matrices from a projective sub-measurement, and both from a complete projective measurement. In all formal declarations, operator measurements act on finite-dimensional spaces and are represented by finite complex matrices $\text{Matrix}(\iota, \iota; \mathbb{C})$ on finite decidable carrier types ι .

B.1 Three worked trajectories

A *formally valid shortcut* is a compiler-accepted construction that avoids part of the intended proof or changes the statement without proving the paper’s claim: Lean verifies that a proof term establishes its stated proposition, but whether that proposition expresses the original mathematical claim requires a separate check [31]. We follow three statements from their initial compiler-accepted shortcuts to the corrected theorems, showing where later proof steps required a repair.

B.1.1 Trajectory 1: rounding to projectors

Lemma 5.6 in the paper takes an almost-projective measurement $\{A_a\}$ on a state ψ with rounding defect at most 2ζ and produces a family of projective matrices $\{R_a\}$ close to A_a on ψ , satisfying $A_a \otimes I \approx_{2\sqrt{\zeta}} R_a \otimes I$ and $\sum_a R_a \leq (1 + 2\sqrt{\zeta})I$. The initial formalization at commit 8ae0cc used a witness unrelated to both A and ψ , defining a trivial 1×1 projection matrix [1] on an unrelated one-dimensional carrier (`carrier := PUnit`). This satisfied the existential goal at distance zero from itself while establishing no closeness to the input measurement A . Chapter 7 could not use this result because it required state-dependent closeness on the input carrier $\mathcal{H}_A$ (PR #287). The final verified theorem (PR #1126, PR #1632) constructs the projective matrices on $\mathcal{H}_A$ by continuous functional calculus in three cases, using an exact eigenspace projection at $\zeta = 0$, a spectral cutoff for $0 < \zeta \leq 1/4$, and zero projectors for $\zeta > 1/4$, achieving the sharp $2\sqrt{\zeta}$ closeness bound (`projectiveNonMeasurement_of_sourceAlmostProjective_two_mul_full`). Contrasting the

defective stand-in with the verified theorem gives:

$$\sum_a \langle \psi | (A_a - A_a^2) \otimes I | \psi \rangle \leq 2\zeta \implies$$

$$\exists \{R_a\} \subseteq \text{End}(\mathbb{C}^1), \quad R_a^2 = R_a = R_a^\dagger, \quad \sum_a R_a \leq (1 + 2\sqrt{\zeta})I \quad (\text{defective witness on PUnit})$$

$$\exists \{R_a\} \subseteq \text{End}(\mathcal{H}_A), \quad R_a^2 = R_a = R_a^\dagger, \\ A_a \otimes I \approx_{2\sqrt{\zeta}} R_a \otimes I, \quad \sum_a R_a \leq (1 + 2\sqrt{\zeta})I \quad (\text{repaired theorem on } \mathcal{H}_A).$$

(S2)

Here A is a measurement and ψ is normalized. The earlier witness on PUnit was on an unrelated carrier and did not satisfy the required closeness relation to the input strategy.

B.1.2 Trajectory 2: Naimark sub-measurement dilation

Theorem 5.1 in the paper takes sub-measurements $\{A_a^x\}$ and $\{B_b^y\}$ on a bipartite state ψ and calls the dilated outputs measurements on the original outcome alphabets, preserving correlations. The first formal draft (82d70f) asserted completeness on the unextended alphabet. For a deficient input, completeness on that alphabet cannot preserve all outcome probabilities. For example, on a one-dimensional space with a single outcome,

$$A_* = 0, \quad B_* = I \implies \langle \psi | A_* \otimes B_* | \psi \rangle = 0, \quad \hat{A}_* = \hat{B}_* = I \implies 1. \quad (\text{S3})$$

The corrected construction first completes each sub-measurement on an extended alphabet:

$$A_a^{x,+} = A_a^x, \quad A_{\perp}^{x,+} = I - \sum_a A_a^x. \quad (\text{S4})$$

After projective dilation, we retain the original outcomes as a projective sub-measurement. The bipartite construction (PR #1782, 440cb0) proves

$$\langle \psi | A_a^x \otimes B_b^y | \psi \rangle = \langle \hat{\psi} | \hat{A}_a^x \otimes \hat{B}_b^y | \hat{\psi} \rangle, \quad \sum_a \hat{A}_a^x \leq I, \quad \sum_b \hat{B}_b^y \leq I. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Here $\hat{\psi}$ is the original state tensored with a product auxiliary state, with registers reordered by prover. The construction for each question at 6311ba preserved marginals but still required the joint correlation theorem. The repaired construction in PR #1782 (440cb0) supplies that identity on the four-register space $(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux},A}) \otimes (\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{aux},B})$.

B.1.3 Trajectory 3: the soundness statement

Theorem 3.10 in the paper states soundness under $k \geq md$. The history includes a theorem restricted to a shared carrier and a theorem with independent carriers whose statement was revised during integration. The early declaration at f659da used one shared carrier and took a bridge package containing the conclusion as an input. By PR #912 (805e89), the same-space mainFormal already required $400md \leq k$ and $0 < k$. At 440cb0, the two declarations had different assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mainFormal} : & \quad \text{one shared carrier, } 400md \leq k, \quad 0 < k, \\ \text{mainFormal_sourceStatement} : & \quad \text{independent carriers, } md \leq k \quad \text{with no } 0 < k. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S6})$$

The statement with independent carriers needed two corrections: pasting needs $k \geq 400md$ (issue #1507), while $d = k = 0$ makes the printed error vanish (issue #422). Commits 78d56a and 27df27 added the stronger sampling bound and positivity condition to this theorem. Commit 28d541 removed the same-space theorem and named the independently quantified theorem Test.mainFormal. Its final statement appears in Section A.1; the zero-sampling counterexample and pasting estimate appear in Sections C.7.2 and C.8.1.

B.2 Timeline of formal transitions

Table S2 summarizes the mathematical statement transitions and repairs from March to June 2026; Figure 2 places the project’s phases and review changes on the same calendar.

Table S2 | Chronology of formal transitions and repairs (March–June 2026). In March and April most entries replace an intermediate stand-in with a proved construction. The May and June entries document proofs of the bridge hypotheses, corrected side conditions, and checks required before merging.

Date	Milestone	Module	Phenomenon	Change
24 Mar	PR #19 , PR #36	Ch. 5 (Expansion)	Tautological <code>rfl</code>	Defined Fourier inner product directly as Kronecker delta; proved by reflexivity.
27 Mar	commit 78a14c	Ch. 5 (Expansion)	Definitional alias	Defined Laplacian difference form as $L_{\text{diff}} := L$; proved by <code>rfl</code> .
03 Apr	commit 826b53	Ch. 2 (Registers)	Tensor registers	Added explicit left/right tensor placement, while some of Bob’s operators were still placed with <code>liftLeft</code> .
04 Apr	PR #148	Ch. 2 (Registers)	Register placement	Corrected <code>liftLeft</code> $\rightarrow$ <code>liftRight</code> mislabeling for Bob ($A \otimes B$).
05 Apr	PR #210	Ch. 9 (Pasting)	Empty support	Case-split collision bound ($k \leq q$) and empty support ($k > q$) in <code>ldDnoteq</code> .
09 Apr	PR #251	Ch. 7 (SDP)	Formulation fix	Refactored SDP primal from complete measurement to sub-measurement ($\sum T_g \leq I$).
09 Apr	commit bfd9ed	Ch. 7 (SDP)	Trivial delta	Solved the reduced SDP using single-outcome delta $T_g = \delta_{g,g_0} I$ and dual $Z = I$.
09 Apr	commit 8ae0cc	Ch. 4 (Rounding)	Unrelated 1D witness	Proved rounding using trivial witness $R = [1]$ on an unrelated 1D space $\mathbb{C}^1$ (<code>carrier := PUnit</code>).
09 Apr	commit 48d147	Ch. 7 (Self-Imp.)	Supplied hypotheses	Supplied four bridge fields: state permutation invariance, helper self-consistency, evaluation data processing, and final fields.
09 Apr	PR #287	Ch. 4 (Rounding)	Input-dependent statement	Required the rounding statement to depend on input measurement A and state ψ .
11 Apr	PR #303	Ch. 4 (SVD)	Assumption bundling	Stored the $Q \approx P$ approximation bound as an unproved field in <code>QXPLayerData</code> .
12 Apr	commit f659da	Ch. 10 (Assembly)	Assumed conclusion	Required the target conclusion as input field witness in <code>MainFormalBridgePackage</code> .
15 Apr	PR #375 , PR #385	Ch. 2 (Test)	Branch correction	Removed false point-agreement and per-prover goodness claims (issue #360); restored cross-prover agreement branch and proved symmetrized strategy’s self-consistency equal to it.
15 Apr	PR #407	Ch. 1 (Precursors)	Conditional statement	Merged a classical soundness statement containing <code>sorry</code> ; issue #408 flagged the defect and <code>c530eb</code> reverted it the same day.
16 Apr	PR #416	Ch. 1 (Precursors)	Conditional statement	Replaced <code>sorryAx</code> classical statements with conditional versions and added the axiom audit.
18 Apr	PR #473 , PR #526	Ch. 4 (Rounding)	Caller-supplied data	Converted <code>RankReductionBridgePackage</code> into caller-supplied parameters.

Continued on next page

Date	Milestone	Module	Phenomenon	Change
19 Apr	commit de9a97	Ch. 6 (Variance)	Fourier coefficient	Replaced default with a witness storing the constant Fourier coefficient; orthogonal slots remained zero.
20 Apr	PR #542	Ch. 6 (Variance)	Trace assembly	Used the decomposition to prove the global-variance trace identity.
21 Apr	PR #495, PR #561	Ch. 9 (Pasting)	Sentinel removal	Deleted <code>extractSlice0r0</code> ; introduced <code>InterpolationSupportWitness</code> .
22 Apr	PR #576	Ch. 5 (Expansion)	Character sums	Proved Fourier orthonormality from additive character sums via Mathlib.
22 Apr	PR #552	Ch. 10 (Induction)	Coefficient repair	Proved pasting error factorization $\nu_{\text{paste}} \leq \frac{1}{5} \nu_{\text{ind}}$, resolving $m = 1$ arithmetic gap.
25 Apr	commit f553d9, commit 1d3532	Ch. 4 (SVD)	SVD field removal	Removed explicit SVD fields from <code>QXPLayerData</code> and proved $P \approx Q$ from primitive fields.
25 Apr	PR #726	Ch. 4 (Rounding)	Projector range ONB	Constructed the auxiliary space from projector ranges <code>IsProj.rangeONB</code> .
27 Apr	commit 323776	Ch. 2 (Registers)	Direct-sum helpers	Added <code>BiProjStrat</code> direct-sum symmetrization helpers on the role-tagged carrier.
27 Apr	commit 15df91	Ch. 9 (Pasting)	Quadratic error	Corrected <code>lem: from-H-to-G</code> telescoping sum error from linear $46km$ to quadratic $46k^2m$.
29 Apr	issue #904, PR #909	Ch. 10 (Induction)	Cascade absorption	Absorbed $+2\zeta_1$ completion term into cascade parameter ζ_2 (coeff 42).
01 May	PR #958, commit c31419	Ch. 2 (Registers)	Independent carriers	Generalized <code>ProjStrat</code> to separate Alice and Bob carrier types.
01 May	commit a3fcfc	Ch. 5 (Expansion)	Combinatorial sum	Proved Laplacian edge identity from entrywise indicator symmetries and bijections.
01 May	commit 9343ff, issue #933	Ch. 3 (Prelim)	State normalization	Added explicit <code>QuantumState.IsNormalized</code> hypothesis required by the paper's expectation bounds.
03 May	PR #1126	Ch. 4 (Rounding)	Zero-error case	Formulated 3-branch spectral cutoff with exact 1-eigenspace projection at $\zeta = 0$.
04 May	PR #1190, issue #1099	Ch. 4 (Line-169)	Pre-completion	Proved pre-completion transport $\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$ via match-mass monotonicity.
04 May	PR #1210, commit da3e3f	Ch. 4 (SVD)	Rectangular identities	Proved rectangular-SVD identities under supplied factors and their algebraic hypotheses.
05 May	commit 773228	Ch. 4 (SVD)	Positive-Gram extension	Constructed coisometric factor from positive Gram matrix under required cardinality bound.
05 May	issue #1093, PR #1239, commit dc2fae	Ch. 7 (SDP)	Total overlap	Proved total-overlap displacement $\eta \leq \sqrt{ F_Q \varepsilon_{\text{DP}}}$ after setup in PR #1222 .
06 May	commit 3685be	Ch. 7 (SDP)	False dominance hypothesis	Introduced block SDP, but assumed saturation via the unproved hypothesis $I \leq Z$.
11 May	PR #1462	Ch. 7 (Self-Imp.)	Conditional theorem	Isolated <code>selfImprovement_assumingFinalFields</code> ; restored the theorem statement.

Continued on next page

Date	Milestone	Module	Phenomenon	Change
11 May	issue #1456 , PR #1466 , PR #1496	Ch. 6 (Variance)	Statement restoration	Removed three supplied variance-bound hypotheses from <code>globalVarianceOfPoints</code> ; restored paper statement and proved it via local transport.
13 May	PR #1539	Ch. 10 (Induction)	Conditional API removal	Removed <code>mainInductionPublicWrapper</code> and conditional induction APIs.
15 May	PR #1632	Ch. 4 (Ortho)	Sharp constant	Proved sharp paper constant $100\zeta^{1/4}$ (via 2ζ scale), avoiding the doubled 4ζ error.
16 May	PR #1638	Ch. 7 (Self-Imp.)	Theorem assembly	Assembled self-improvement from strategy and consistency inputs using the tracked SDP theorem.
17 May	PR #1643	Ch. 9 (Pasting)	Degree-zero branch	Implemented dedicated $d = 0$ constant-polynomial pasting construction.
18 May	PR #1664 , issue #1645	Ch. 10 (Induction)	Corrected input	Restated <code>selfImprovementInInductionSection</code> to take a polynomial measurement G and proved it from Chapter 7 theorem.
19 May	PR #1708	Ch. 7 (SDP)	Duality proof	Proved cone separation and slack mass saturation lemma without $I \leq Z$.
22 May	commit 440cb0 , PR #1782	Ch. 3 (Naimark)	Tensor assembly	Proved 4-register two-sided correlation preservation <code>naimarkTensorProductCorrelation</code> .
23 May	commit 78d56a	Ch. 10 (Induction)	Factor-400 range	Confirmed $400md \leq k$ for the revised induction statement; the restricted same-space theorem already required it (PR #912).
23 May	commit 27df27	Ch. 10 (Soundness)	Positive sample count	Added $0 < k$ to the reopened two-space statement to exclude the zero error at $d = k = 0$.
10 Jun	commit 28d541	Ch. 2 (Registers)	Same-space removal	Removed legacy same-space strategy definitions, renamed two-space theorem to <code>Test.mainFormal</code> .
19 Jun	PR #2348	Ch. 3 (Prelim)	Heterogeneous lemma	Proved heterogeneous consistency lemma <code>consSubMeas_heterogeneous</code> on distinct carriers.
20 Jun	commit 3e09f4	Ch. 7 (SDP)	Dominance removal	Removed all <code>*WithDominance</code> declarations; used canonical slack saturation throughout.

B.3 Ten-chapter formalization milestones

The formalization spans ten blueprint chapters. Combining their results exposed mismatched registers, unproved dominance hypotheses, invalid default values, and missing side conditions in the induction.

[Table S3](#) documents the ten chapter milestones. For each chapter, the table gives the initial statement, the defect identified during integration (surfaced by downstream compilation failures, automated CI scanners, or maintainer code review), the corrected statement, the repository commit or PR, and the mathematical discussion in [Supplementary Appendices A to C](#).

Table S3 | Ten-chapter formalization milestones. Initial statements, problems found during integration, corrected forms, and mathematical case studies in [Supplementary Appendices A to C](#).

Chapter & topic	Initial statement	Problem found	Final statement	PR / issue	Math ref
Ch. 1: Classical soundness (15 Apr–23 May)	Quoted classical soundness directly as a Lean theorem using placeholder sorry (187c2c).	issue #408 identified sorryAx among the theorem’s transitive axioms; PR reverted same day (c530eb).	Stated as conditional premise PolishchukSpielman ClassicalSoundness Statement; quantum soundness verified axiom-clean.	PR #416 , issue #408	App. A §A.3
Ch. 2: Quantum registers (3 Apr–1 May)	Single local carrier ι with both operators multiplied on the left register $(A \cdot B) \otimes I$ (a0bec1).	Audit revealed both provers acting on the left register; Bob operator lifts set to liftLeft (PR #148).	Independent carriers ι_A, ι_B with explicit $A \otimes I$ vs $I \otimes B$; direct-sum role carrier Role $\times(\iota_A \oplus \iota_B)$.	PR #148 , PR #958 , issue #560	App. C Case I (§C.2)
Ch. 3: Naimark dilation (30 Mar–22 May)	Complete output asserted for sub-measurement input on original alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ (82d70f); 1-measurement local dilation.	issue #933 (unnormalized state scaling); 6311ba (questionwise interface lacked joint correlation preservation).	Projective sub-measurements on $\mathcal{A}$ via Option($\mathcal{A}$) completion; 4-register bipartite dilation space.	PR #332 , PR #1782 , issue #933	App. B §B.1.2
Ch. 4: Spectral rounding (9 Apr–3 May)	Rounding proved on an unrelated 1D space carrier := PUnit (8ae0cc); $P \approx Q$ bound bundled in QXPlayerData.	PR #287 required rounding to depend on input A ; missing rectangular SVD in Mathlib; Line-169 transport incurred $\sqrt{\cdot}$ loss (issue #1099).	Rounding by continuous functional calculus in 3 cases (PR #1126); positive-Gram polar extension (773228); match-mass Line-169 transport.	PR #287 , PR #1126 , PR #1190	App. B §B.1.1; C Case IV.a (§C.5.1)
Ch. 5: Hypercube graph (24 Mar–22 Apr)	Fourier inner product defined as Kronecker delta via rfl; Laplacian difference form defined as $L_{\text{diff}} := L$ (78a14c).	PR #721 review found that the definition did not express the random-edge Dirichlet form.	Fourier orthonormality proved from character sums (PR #576); combinatorial Laplacian proved entrywise from edge symmetries.	PR #576 , PR #721 , a3fcfc	App. C Case V (§C.6)
Ch. 6: Global variance (24 Mar–22 Apr)	Variance decomposition used default zero-operator witness; globalVarianceOfPoints took 3 supplied hypotheses (issue #1456).	Fields for orthogonal Fourier data set to zero; issue #1456 found that hypotheses assumed the required conclusions.	Centered residual family $A_1^u = A^u - A_{\text{avg}}$ satisfying $\sum_u A_1^u = 0$; lifted trace identity with prefactor $1/M$.	PR #542 , PR #1466 , PR #1496	App. C Case V (§C.6)
Ch. 7: Self-imp. & SDP (9 Apr–19 May)	SelfImprovement BridgePackage assumed the conclusions as fields; SDP solved with 1-outcome delta witness; saturation assumed $I \leq Z$.	issue #1453 found that the proof returned a supplied conclusion; $I \leq Z$ proved false in general; substitution of a sub-measurement required control of total overlap η .	Finite-dimensional canonical strong duality; slack saturation from weak-duality inequalities; total-overlap bound $\eta \leq \xi + 2\sqrt{\xi_{\text{ortho}}}$ from completeness transfer.	PR #1239 , PR #1462 , PR #1708	App. C Cases II, III, IV.b (§C.3–C.5.2)

Continued on next page

Chapter & topic	Initial statement	Problem found	Final statement	PR / issue	Math ref
Ch. 8: Commutativity (3 Apr–1 May)	Theorem header typed at m while point consistency evaluated on $\mathbb{F}_q^{m+1}$ slices; scalar-to-tensor transport assumed no loss.	issue #930 identified dimension mismatch on transverse slices; issue #713 exposed $2\sqrt{\zeta}$ tensor transport loss.	Strategy stated at successor dimension $m + 1$ via <code>params.next</code> ; full-slice scalar-to-tensor bridges proved with $\sqrt{\zeta}$ loss.	PR #730 , issue #930 , 6824be	Gap notes (§B.5)
Ch. 9: Pasting (5 Apr–29 Apr)	The function <code>extractSliceOr0</code> returned 0 on empty slices; linear error $46km$ in telescoping sum; missing $d = 0$ constant branch.	The default zero value invalidated point consistency on unmeasured slices; summing the recurrence with $\sqrt{v_4} \propto k$ gave quadratic k^2 loss.	Support-certified interpolation via <code>Interpolation</code> ; <code>SupportWitness</code> ; quadratic error $46k^2m$; dedicated $d = 0$ pasting construction.	PR #210 , PR #495 , PR #1643	App. C Cases VI, VII (§C.7, §C.8.1)
Ch. 10: Soundness induction (12 Apr–23 May)	Printed condition $k \geq md$ admitted $md \leq k < 400md$ and $k = 0$; successor error estimate $(1.01)(4) = 4.04 > 4$ failed at $m = 1$.	issue #1507 exposed factor-400 pasting gap; issue #422 found that the error vanishes at $k = 0$; issue #1645 identified a mismatched input.	Tightened side conditions $400md \leq k$ and $0 < k$; successor error bound $v_{\text{paste}} \leq \frac{1}{5}v_{\text{ind}}$ repairing $m = 1$ to $2.42 \leq 4$.	PR #552 , PR #909 , PR #1664	App. C §C.8.2, §C.8.1, §C.7.2

B.4 The blueprint as a measure of progress

The blueprint, built with Massot’s `leanblueprint` tool [19], tracks the dependencies between statements. Each target statement is marked *not ready* while its formulation or dependencies remain unsettled, *stated* once a Lean counterpart exists, and *fully formalized* once both statement and proof are verified (the `leanok` marker). Panels b and c of Figure 2 plot these counts by day, alongside the sorry placeholder count in the Lean sources. The counts are taken per first-parent commit, over the first 1,669 of the 1,793 first-parent commits reachable at the pinned snapshot, which form the integration sequence within that snapshot’s 2,778 total commits.

The two panels measure distinct properties: a chapter whose Lean files contain no sorry markers can still assert statements that fail to match the paper. Counts in this subsection track unique Lean declarations linked via the blueprint’s `\lean` tags (several per statement environment; remarks excluded); the main text’s 181 blueprint nodes are the statement environments themselves at the pinned snapshot, which link to 598 declarations. On 29 April 2026, the placeholder count dropped to one (the main theorem itself) and remained there for 335 commits; that day the blueprint listed 283 target declarations, of which 114 were not ready. While this one placeholder remained, the blueprint continued to expand: by 8 May it listed 610 targets, with 246 not ready. Blueprint counts were also non-monotone: on 20 May the not-ready count rose from 5 to 26, and on 22–23 May the target count dropped from 668 to 612 as green (fully formalized) construction nodes were reclassified against the paper. When the last placeholder was replaced by a proof on 23 May (27df27), 23 nodes were still marked not ready; the not-ready count reached zero later that day, settling at 566 fully formalized target declarations through 4 June 2026.

Individual chapters also required revisions after being marked complete; their completion dates, integration challenges, and final verified statements are documented in the consolidated milestone ledger (Table S3).

B.5 The 25 gap notes

At snapshot b39705 (24 June 2026), the repository contains 25 gap notes. These notes document audits that found no discrepancy, repairs to formal proofs, and corrections to statements from the paper. None of these notes is an unfinished dependency of `mainFormal` at the pinned snapshot.

The 25 gap notes fall into eight categories by the nature of the suspected discrepancy; two issues span several notes ([issue #930](#) five, [issue #1099](#) two), so notes are cited by identifier and, where needed, a short slug:

- (i) **Corrected side conditions (2 notes):** Tightened or added hypotheses of the paper’s main theorem (issues 906 and 422).
- (ii) **Repaired formal-interface mismatches (3 notes):** Mismatches between the paper’s hypotheses and early formal statements or proofs, repaired on the formal side; the paper’s statements are unchanged (issues 196, 1230, and 930/self-improvement ν).
- (iii) **Clarified wording and statement scope (5 notes):** Impossibility of complete original-alphabet dilation for sub-measurements, a harmless ambient-dimension typo, normalization conventions, removal of a nonnegativity assumption, and mismatched blueprint links (issues `naimark`, 930/dimension typo, 933, 938, 2338).
- (iv) **Corrected quantitative error bounds (5 notes):** Substitution losses, telescoping factors, and the total-overlap displacement (issues 1099/line-169 loss, 1099/sharper fix, 1093, 930/successor coefficient, 930/pasting error).
- (v) **Endpoint branches (3 notes):** Case splits for empty distinct tuples ($k > q$), exact zero-error spectral cutoffs ($\zeta = 0$), and degree-zero pasting ($d = 0$) (issues 930/distinct tuples, 1100, 1622).
- (vi) **Adjusted constants (1 note):** An increased scalar coefficient (issue 904).
- (vii) **Design adjustments (1 note):** The blueprint polynomial definition recast to the paper’s representative predicate (polynomial-divergence).
- (viii) **Verified design decisions (5 notes):** Audits of choices made in the formalization that found no discrepancy with the paper, and a proof recovering the paper’s sharp constant (issues 458, 713, 760, 1228, 1032).

[Table S4](#) lists all 25 gap notes, one row per file, by identifier, chapter, theorem stage, category, severity, scope, resolution, and case-study cross-reference (— where no case study discusses the note). Severity is an author judgement of the discrepancy’s consequence for the paper statement, independent of the difficulty rating inside each note. Scope records whether the discrepancy concerned the paper’s printed statement, the formal statement only, or a proof step.

[Figure S2](#) shows when each of the 25 gap notes was opened and closed. These files document 20 distinct suspected issues. Notes were opened when a discrepancy was suspected and closed when the decision they called for was executed in the repository: the paper corrected, the formalization repaired, or the discrepancy dismissed with a recorded reason. The commit that executed the decision dates the closure. The table uses each note’s concluding description and the figure the action documented in its commit history. These classifications differ for five notes because the text and commit history describe different aspects of the outcome. For mathematical derivations of the quantitative gaps, including the Line-169 transport loss ($\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$), the total-overlap displacement ($\eta \leq \hat{\zeta} + 2\sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}}$), and the Bernoulli telescoping error ($46k^2m$), we refer to the dedicated case studies in [Supplementary Appendix C](#).




Figure S2 | Life cycle of proof-gap notes. (a) The number of gap notes open on each date, drawn as a band whose width counts the open items (one strand each); decreases in width mark notes closing, with their outcomes labelled directly. Twenty-five gap notes opened between 29 April and 12 June 2026, and all were closed by 23 June: nine after an audit found no discrepancy, thirteen by repairs to the formalization, and three by corrections to formal theorem statements ([issue #906](#), [issue #422](#), and the Naimark note). A note counts as closed when the decision it called for was executed in the repository. Ten of the notes closed the day they opened. The retrospective audit [issue #930](#) entered as one suspected issue and split into five notes. (b) On the same time axis: the number of unfinished proofs in the library (daily closing values), which had fallen to one by 29 April, when the first notes opened, and reached zero on 23 May, the day five notes closed. Dates and outcomes are taken from the gap-note files and their commit history; the comments in this figure’s file list the dates and outcomes for each entry.

The total-overlap note and the completed proof The total-overlap gap note was filed on 5 May 2026 (e42bf2), and the proof completed the required transport on 16 May (134d08). We show the repair and how it satisfies the final error bound in [Section C.5.2](#).

Table S4 | The 25 gap notes. Gap notes indexed by identifier, chapter, stage, category, severity, scope, mathematical resolution, and case-study reference (— where no case study discusses the note). Rows are the gap notes at the pinned snapshot, one per note, ordered by the date each note opened; determinations follow the decision executed in the repository.

Note ID	Ch.	Stage	Category	Severity	Scope	Determination & resolution	Case ref
issue-904	Ch. 10	Cascade	Constant	Low	Proof	Repaired: widened Step 6 cascade coefficient from 40 to 42, absorbing the completion proposition’s omitted $+2\zeta_1$ residual.	Case IV.a
issue-906	Ch. 10	Main soundness	Side condition	High	Statement	Corrected: printed $k \geq md$ strengthened to $k \geq 400md$, the sampling hypothesis required by the successor pasting theorem; the excluded interval shown to be nonempty.	Case VII

Continued on next page

Note ID	Ch.	Stage	Category	Severity	Scope	Determination & resolution	Case ref
issue-196	Ch. 7	SDP primal	Interface	Medium	Formal statement	Repaired: primal feasible set restored to submeasurements $\sum_g T_g \leq I$; the equality encoding excluded the paper's strict Slater witness.	Case III
issue-458	Ch. 3	Foundation layer	Audit	Low	Statement	Audited: prime-power encoding of q , finite-support distributions, and the zero measurement family; no hypothesis or conclusion altered; no discrepancy.	—
issue-713	Ch. 8	Scalar transport	Audit	Low	Proof	Absorbed: converting the hybrid scalar estimate adds $2\sqrt{\zeta}$ in the tensor closeness of IP form; the existing error bound includes it; no discrepancy.	—
issue-760	Ch. 8	Scalar chain	Audit	Low	Proof	Audited: ten-step scalar approximation chain and the exact BAB-ABA swap identity; the formal total matches the paper's $\nu = 48m(\sqrt{\gamma} + \sqrt{\zeta})$; no discrepancy.	—
polynomial-divergence	Ch. 3	Polynomial defn.	Design	Low	Statement	Repaired: blueprint polynomial set recast from a function-type subtype to the paper's representative-of-degree- $\leq d$ predicate, enabling Schwartz-Zippel.	—
issue-930 (dimension typo)	Ch. 8	Commutativity	Wording	Low	Statement	Clarified: printed (m, q, d) is a harmless typo; the formal statement types the ambient strategy at $(m + 1, q, d)$ via <code>params.next</code> ; no Lean change needed.	—
issue-930 (distinct tuples)	Ch. 9	Distinct tuples	Endpoint	Low	Statement	Repaired: distinct-tuple weights defined for all k , normalized only when $k \leq q$; the $k > q$ case proved with the trivial k^2/q bound.	—
issue-930 (successor coeff.)	Ch. 10	Successor step	Error bound	Medium	Proof	Repaired: printed absorption $(1 + \frac{1}{100m})(m^2 + 3) \leq (m + 1)^2$ fails at $m = 1$; the sharper $\nu_{\text{paste}} \leq \nu_{\text{ind}}/5$ absorbs both coefficients for all $m \geq 1$.	Case VII
issue-930 (pasting error)	Ch. 9	Bernoulli pasting	Error bound	Medium	Statement	Corrected: telescoping the printed stage losses gives $\nu_8 = 46k^2m$, not the printed $46km$; the corrected quadratic error is absorbed by $\nu = 100k^2m$.	Case VII

Continued on next page

Note ID	Ch.	Stage	Category	Severity	Scope	Determination & resolution	Case ref
issue-930 (self-improvement ν)	Ch. 7	Self-improvement	Interface	High	Formal statement	Repaired: restored the paper's input consistency hypothesis $A_a^u \otimes I \simeq_\nu I \otimes G_{[g(u)=a]}$ to selfImprovement; removed SelfImprovementObligations.	Case II
issue-933	Ch. 3	Preliminaries	Wording	Low	Proof	Audited: paper's unit-vector convention versus the positive-cone QuantumState; IsNormalized assumed in each lemma rather than in the state definition; no theorem-level defect.	—
issue-938 (truncation)	Ch. 4	Truncation	Wording	Low	Proof	Audited: abstract averaging lemma proved for arbitrary real f , dropping the paper's implicit $f \geq 0$; a conservative strengthening; no discrepancy.	—
issue-1100	Ch. 4	Spectral rounding	Endpoint	Low	Proof	Repaired: unconditional rounding — witness from the paper's $0 < \zeta \leq 1/4$ branch, an exact $\zeta = 0$ spectral-projector branch, and a trivial $\zeta > 1/4$ branch.	—
issue-1099 (line-169 loss)	Ch. 4	Line-169 transport	Error bound	Medium	Proof	Repaired: the printed <code>prop: triangle-sub</code> use drops $\sqrt{\zeta_2}$; the theorem claiming exactly ζ_1 was removed and the formalization proves the bound $\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$.	Case IV.a
issue-1099 (sharper fix)	Ch. 4	Line-169 repair	Error bound	Medium	Proof	Repaired: pre-completion match-mass comparison at $\epsilon = 100\zeta_1^{1/4}$ takes the square root before completion, giving $\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$ and preserving the final error bound.	Case IV.a
issue-1093	Ch. 7	Point consistency	Error bound	Medium	Proof	Repaired: $\eta \leq \hat{\zeta} + 2\sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}}$ by completeness transfer in both directions (134d08).	Case IV.b
issue-1228	Ch. 4	Orthonormalization	Audit	Low	Proof	Audited: no discrepancy; pinned Mathlib lacks the rectangular polar theorem, so a project-local positive-Gram construction supplies the coisometric factor.	—
issue-1230	Ch. 7	SDP slackness	Interface	High	Proof	Repaired: canonical block-SDP strong duality and saturated slackness proved without dominance $I \leq Z$; conditional dominance wrappers removed.	Case III

Continued on next page

Note ID	Ch.	Stage	Category	Severity	Scope	Determination & resolution	Case ref
naimark	Ch. 3	Naimark dilation	Wording	High	Statement	Corrected: read as projective sub-measurement on the original alphabet; the complete-measurement form is impossible; bipartite correlation preservation proved.	App. B §B.1.2
issue-1032	Ch. 4	Orthonormalization	Audit	Low	Proof	Audited: sharp $100\zeta^{1/4}$ paper constant proved at the 2ζ completion scale, avoiding the other completion proof's larger bound $120\zeta^{1/4}$; no discrepancy with the paper.	—
issue-1622	Ch. 9	Degree-zero pasting	Endpoint	Medium	Proof	Repaired: dedicated $d = 0$ pasting branch proved; the unrestricted theorem <code>ldPasting</code> assembles it without adding a $0 < d$ hypothesis.	Case VI
issue-422	Ch. 10	Main soundness	Side condition	High	Statement	Corrected: the printed hypothesis permits $k = 0$ at $d = 0$, where the printed error vanishes and demands impossible exact degree-zero consistency; the soundness statement now requires $0 < k$.	Case VI
issue-2338	Ch. 3	Blueprint links	Wording	Low	Statement	Clarified: Chapter 3 blueprint links retargeted to the two-space heterogeneous lemma forms; no mathematical discrepancy.	—

C Cross-module composition in the inductive proof

C.1 Overview

To combine the stages of the inductive proof [22], each theorem must supply the carrier Hilbert space, operator representation, and error bound required by the next theorem. The cases below concern five kinds of mismatch:

1. Carrier and register mismatches: an operator intended for separate spatial tensor factors $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ acts on a single matrix algebra or an uncoupled space.
2. Inlined conclusions: a theorem assumes its target conclusion as an input hypothesis, leaving callers to prove it.
3. Missing invariants: a downstream stage assumes structural properties that fail for general quantum strategies, such as operator dominance $I \preceq Z$ or unit trace normalization.
4. Default values on invalid inputs: a partial function returns 0 on invalid inputs, making the consistency claim false.
5. Insufficient error bounds: intermediate estimates introduce additive error terms that exceed the error allowed by the next theorem.

C.1.1 Interface mismatches between inductive stages

While Lean checks that a proof establishes its stated type, combining stages fails whenever an upstream lemma produces an object on a different carrier space, with a different operator representation, or under a weaker error bound than downstream steps require.

The simplest example is a theorem that takes its own conclusion as an extra hypothesis. In the early declaration of `mainFormal`, the caller supplied the desired measurements and their consistency bounds in `MainFormalBridgePackage`. The proof then returned that package’s witness (Section C.2). Writing H for the original hypotheses and Q for the desired conclusion, the early declaration proved $H \implies (Q \implies Q)$; the repair proves $H' \implies Q$ from the corrected hypotheses H' (Section B.1.3).

The other cases leave different obligations to the caller: relating carrier spaces, proving that interpolation nodes lie in the support, or obtaining a sufficiently small error bound. In each case, we compare what one stage proves with what the next stage requires, then identify the construction or estimate that closes the gap.

C.1.2 The completed inductive proof

The completed proof uses thirteen principal declarations in five stages:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Semidefinite programming and duality foundation:} \\ & \quad \text{matrixSdpCanonicalStrongDuality, sdp_statement_with_slackness} \\ \implies & \text{ Self-improvement core and projective rounding:} \\ & \quad \text{selfImprovementHelper, selfImprovement} \\ \implies & \text{ Inductive slice adapters and answer carriers:} \\ & \quad \text{selfImprovementInInductionSection} \\ & \quad \text{AnswerSelfImprovementData.ofSelfImprovementInInductionSection} \\ & \quad \text{AnswerSelfImprovementData.ofAnswerCarrier, SelfImprovementData.ofAnswer} \\ \implies & \text{ Low-degree pasting and Bernoulli recurrence:} \\ & \quad \text{ldPastingInInductionSection, Pasting.ldPasting} \\ \implies & \text{ Induction and role unsymmetrization:} \\ & \quad \text{mainInductionSuccessorNext_ofSmallErrorConstruction} \\ & \quad \text{mainInduction, mainFormal.} \end{aligned} \tag{S7}$$

The steps in Equation (S7) supply the following data:

1. The semidefinite programming stage proves canonical strong duality and slack mass saturation for block matrix variables, constructing a positive sub-measurement T and dual operator $Z \geq 0$ with $Z \geq A_g$ and $P(T) = D(Z)$.
2. The self-improvement proof uses T and local and global variance bounds on the hypercube, applying continuous functional calculus and positive-Gram polar extension to produce an orthonormalized projective sub-measurement H with improved self-consistency.
3. The induction lemmas convert answer-valued slice strategies on $\mathbb{F}_q^{m+1}$ into polynomial-valued strategies, preserving the slice consistency bounds through product equivalences and Fubini reindexing.
4. The pasting stage combines slice measurements into an ambient polynomial measurement through Bernoulli recurrence and Lagrange interpolation on nodes proved to lie in the support.
5. The final induction step combines the induction hypothesis with self-improvement and pasting, unsymmetrizes the role register, and bounds the accumulated error by `mainFormalError`.

C.2 Case study I: register placement, role symmetrization, and self-consistency

C.2.1 The top-level conclusion supplied as a hypothesis

We examine the declaration behind the statement history in [Section B.4](#). The early theorem received its conclusion through `MainFormalBridgePackage`.

Definition 10.1a (The top-level conclusion assumed as a hypothesis (f659da, 12 April 2026)). *An early draft declared the top-level theorem with its target conclusion bundled as an input hypothesis:*

```
-- Schematic excerpt from commit f659da
structure MainFormalBridgePackage (params) (strategy : ProjStrat params iota) (eps k) : Prop where
  witness : exists G_A G_B,
    ConsRel strategy.state ... (mainFormalError params k eps) /\ ...

theorem mainFormal (params) (strategy : ProjStrat params iota) (eps : Error)
  (_hpass : strategy.PassesLowIndividualDegreeTest eps)
  (k : Nat) (_hk : params.m * params.d <= k)
  (hbridge : MainFormalBridgePackage params strategy eps k) :
  exists G_A G_B, ... (mainFormalError params k eps) := by
exact hbridge.witness
```

The proof `exact hbridge.witness` returns the supplied conclusion directly. Because `mainFormal` is the top-level soundness theorem of the entire formalization, packaging the conclusion as a structure hypothesis reduced the verification to the trivial tautology $Q \implies Q$. This scaffolding was introduced in an early agent draft (f659da) to allow dependent module interfaces to type-check before the inductive proof compiled. In a subsequent audit, maintainers identified the tautology ([issue #493](#)), and an agent session under author guidance replaced `MainFormalBridgePackage` with the genuine inductive assembly proof (`mainFormal_of_mainInduction`, [PR #1789](#)), ensuring that the top-level theorem discharged all obligations using only verified mathematical prerequisites. The test-passing and sampling hypotheses, `_hpass` and `_hk`, were properly bound in the final theorem.

C.2.2 Spatial register placement and tensor lifts

Alice’s and Bob’s operators act on separate factors of $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, as $A \otimes I_B$ and $I_A \otimes B$, respectively. Early matrix definitions placed both provers’ operators in a single matrix algebra or on the left factor:

$$\text{ev}(\psi, (A \cdot B) \otimes I). \quad (\text{S8})$$

Commit 050358 introduced explicit left and right Kronecker embeddings, and 7e79c1 ([PR #148](#)) corrected Bob’s operators to `liftRight`, giving the required bipartite tensor representation:

$$\text{ev}(\psi, A_a^u \otimes B_b^v) = \text{Re } \tau(\rho_\psi(A_a^u \otimes B_b^v)). \quad (\text{S9})$$

C.2.3 The correlation-preserving dilation input

We use the joint correlation identity from the Naimark construction in [Section B.1.2](#). Its outputs are projective sub-measurements on the original alphabets, with the dilated state arranged on Alice’s and Bob’s local registers. This supplies the bipartite input for the role construction below.

C.2.4 Role symmetrization on direct-sum carrier spaces

The induction theorem `mainInduction(m)` requires a synchronous, permutation-invariant strategy. For an arbitrary quantum strategy $\mathcal{S} = (\psi, A, B)$ on separate local spaces $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, the measurement operators lack permutation symmetry. Naimark dilations constructed independently for Alice and Bob need not produce the same local carrier Hilbert space.

PR #958 (c31419) generalized `ProjStrat` to independently quantified carriers ι_A and ι_B . Commit e3e437 added direct-sum block helpers, and commit 440cb0 completed the role-register construction for different local carriers. Both local spaces of the symmetrized strategy embed into the enlarged carrier:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{role}} := \mathbb{C}^{\text{Role} \times (\iota_A \oplus \iota_B)}, \quad \rho_{\text{role}} \in \text{End}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{role}} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{\text{role}}). \quad (\text{S10})$$

The bipartite strategy symmetrizes the state across the two provers by forming an equal mixture of the two tensor orientations:

$$\rho_{\text{role}} = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_\psi \oplus \text{SWAP}(\rho_\psi)), \quad (\text{S11})$$

embedded into the endomorphism space $\text{End}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{role}} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{\text{role}})$. In the formalization, `roleRegisterSymmState` constructs this density matrix by embedding ρ_ψ and its swapped permutation into the direct-sum blocks (`localPairABBlock`) scaled by the trace normalization factor `roleRegisterDensityScale`. Operators act block-diagonally through `localDirectSumBlock`, giving a permutation-invariant strategy even when the original local dimensions differ.

C.2.5 Relating test agreement to self-consistency

The induction requires a within-prover self-consistency relation:

$$A_a^u \otimes I \simeq_\delta I \otimes A_a^u, \quad (\text{S12})$$

where the same point measurement acts on both registers [22]. The physical test, by contrast, queries provers on the same point u and accepts when answers agree ($a = b$), measuring cross-prover consistency (A^A, A^B) .

Commit 028107 (11 April 2026) defined self-consistency as the average of two within-prover defects:

$$\mathbb{E}_u \left(1 - \sum_a \langle \psi | A_a^{A,u} \otimes A_a^{A,u} | \psi \rangle \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_u \left(1 - \sum_a \langle \psi | A_a^{B,u} \otimes A_a^{B,u} | \psi \rangle \right), \quad (\text{S13})$$

whereas the printed test measures the overlap mass of $A_a^{A,u} \otimes A_a^{B,u}$. PR #385 (9645d3) restored the cross-prover agreement subtest and connected the two formulations through symmetrization. Passing the test bounds cross-prover agreement error by `3ε` in `point_agreement_le_three_mul`, and the role-symmetrized strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\text{role}}$ satisfies:

$$\text{selfConsistencyError}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{role}}) = \text{pointAgreementError}(\mathcal{S}), \quad (\text{S14})$$

proved in `roleRegisterSymmStrategy_selfConsistency_eq_pointAgreement`. Because both provers in the symmetrized strategy share the same measurement operators, within-prover self-consistency coincides with cross-prover agreement.

C.2.6 Slice strategies and their error bounds

At commit 1a7f43 (6 May 2026), the restricted-slice module established that failure probabilities of restricted strategies and answer-valued strategies coincide. The induction hypothesis `mainInduction(m)`, however, requires an explicit strategy for each slice $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$.

Commit 440cb0 introduced this required structure:

```
-- Schematic excerpt from commit 440cb0
structure AnswerSuccessorRestrictedFailureProfile
  (strategy : AnswerSymStrat params.next iota) : Type where
  axisParallel : Fq params -> Error
  selfConsistency : Fq params -> Error
  diagonal : Fq params -> Error
  restrictedGood : forall x,
    (xRestrictedAnswerSymStratOfAnswer params strategy x).IsGood
    (axisParallel x) (selfConsistency x) (diagonal x)
```

The downstream theorem `answerSuccessorRestrictedSliceConclusions` applies the induction hypothesis to `xRestrictedAnswerSymStratOfAnswer`. Lemma `answerSuccessorDiagonalSliceIndexErrorAverage_eq_diagonalIndexError` proves the equality of average errors using a product equivalence and uniform-average identities on $\mathbb{F}_q^m \times \mathbb{F}_q$.

The final theorem allows independently quantified carriers and uses the corrected sampling hypotheses stated in [Section A.1](#). The zero-sampling counterexample appears in [Section C.7.2](#); the sampling history appears in [Section B.1.3](#).

C.3 Case study II: assembling self-improvement and reindexing its bounds

C.3.1 The self-improvement theorem and assumed intermediate steps

Theorem 9.4 of Ji et al. [22] takes a polynomial measurement $G = \{G_g\}$ consistent with the point measurement A at error ν . It constructs a projective sub-measurement $H = \{H_g\}$ with improved self-consistency and a dual operator $Z \geq \mathbb{E}_u A_{g(u)}^u$. Early formalizations assumed the intermediate steps in a bridge structure.

Definition 5.1a (Intermediate steps assumed in a bridge structure (48d147, 9 April 2026)). *An early draft of Chapter 7 declared:*

```
-- Schematic excerpt from commit 48d147
structure SelfImprovementBridgePackage (params) (strategy) (G) : Prop where
  permInvariant : PermInvState strategy.state
  helperStrongSelfConsistency : SelfImprovementHelperConclusion ... ->
    BipartiteSSCRel strategy.state (uniformDistribution Unit) ...
  evaluationDataProcessing : SDDRel strategy.state (uniformDistribution Unit) ... ->
    SDDRel strategy.state (uniformDistribution (Point params)) ...
  finalFields : SelfImprovementHelperConclusion ... ->
    SelfImprovementFinalFields ...

theorem selfImprovement (hbridge : SelfImprovementBridgePackage params strategy G) :
  SelfImprovementConclusion ... := by
  let _ := hcons -- Consistency hypothesis discarded!
  exact hbridge.finalFields ...
```

Two inputs required by the bridge package differed from those available in Chapter 10:

1. **Permutation invariance for orthonormalization:** Converting helper sub-measurements $\hat{H}$ into projective sub-measurements H via orthonormalization required `PermInvState strategy.state`, whereas inductive slice strategies provide only goodness (`strategy.IsGood eps delta gamma`).
2. **Different index spaces (`Unit` $\neq$ `Point`):** Semidefinite programming proved relation estimates over the singleton space `uniformDistribution Unit`, whereas induction required estimates over the uniform distribution on affine points `uniformDistribution (Point params)`.

C.3.2 Assembling the internal proof without bridge packages

The theorem statement was restored in d8f6a6 (PR #1462), conditional wrappers were removed in 4b04a2 (PR #1539), and the internal proof was assembled in 134d08 (PR #1638, merged in 9aebc8).

Theorem 5.1 (Self-improvement assembly and the remaining SDP proof (9aebc8, 652887)). *The theorem `selfImprovement` takes test goodness $(\varepsilon, \delta, \gamma)$, the measurement G , and input consistency h_{cons} , assembling the verified self-improvement guarantee through four mathematical stages:*

- (i) **Primal-dual SDP solution with slackness:** Solving the semidefinite program (Section C.4) yields optimal sub-measurements $\{T_g\}$ and dual matrix Z satisfying complementary slackness.
- (ii) **Completeness transfer via input consistency:** Combining input consistency h_{cons} with slackness bounds the total defect $I - \sum_g T_g$ on the strategy state.
- (iii) **Strong self-consistency and orthonormalization:** Establishing strong self-consistency on the helper outputs permits Gram orthonormalization into exact projectors.
- (iv) **Final error aggregation:** Bounding the cumulative difference against G yields $\sum_g \|T_g - G_g\|_1 \leq \zeta$, discharging the fields of `SelfImprovementConclusion`.

PR #1708 (652887) closed the remaining SDP complementary slackness obligation. With this step proved, `selfImprovement` depended only on the standard axioms.

C.4 Case study III: semidefinite duality and the false assumption $I \leq Z$

C.4.1 Primal feasibility and Slater constraint qualification

Lemma 9.1 of Ji et al. [22] considers the block semidefinite program:

$$\sup_{\{T_g\}} \sum_g \text{Tr}(T_g A_g) \quad \text{subject to} \quad T_g \geq 0, \sum_g T_g \leq I, \quad (\text{S15})$$

with dual constraint $Z \geq A_g$ for all g , minimizing $\text{Tr}(Z)$. Restricting primal variables to complete measurements ($\sum_g T_g = I$) excludes the strict Slater interior point $T_g^{\text{strict}} = \frac{1}{2M}I$, since $\sum_g T_g = \frac{1}{2}I < I$. PR #251 (9747be) expanded the feasible set to sub-measurements $\sum_g T_g \leq I$. Strict dual feasibility is supplied by $Z^{\text{strict}} = 2I$, satisfying $Z - A_g \geq I > 0$.

C.4.2 A counterexample to $I \leq Z$

Early matrix definitions (3685be) attempted to deduce primal saturation $\sum_g T_g = I$ from the canonical slack equation $(I - \sum_g T_g)Z = 0$ by assuming operator dominance:

$$I \leq Z. \quad (\text{S16})$$

This condition fails for general quantum strategies. Consider a single polynomial outcome ($M = 1$) on $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}$ with $A_{g_0} = \frac{1}{2}I$. The optimal dual variable is $Z = \frac{1}{2}I$. Then $Z - A_{g_0} = 0 \geq 0$, so Z is dual feasible and optimal with $\text{Tr}(Z) = 1/2 = \text{Tr}(T_{g_0} A_{g_0})$. However:

$$Z - I = \frac{1}{2}I - I = -\frac{1}{2}I \not\geq 0 \implies I \not\leq Z. \quad (\text{S17})$$

The dominance hypothesis is false in general and cannot be supplied by Chapter 7 callers.

C.4.3 Saturating the slack while preserving the objective

The verified proof (PR #1708, 652887) proves canonical strong duality $P(X) = D(Z)$ directly via finite-dimensional convex cone separation. The **Slack Mass Saturation Lemma** (67715a) transfers the positive slack block $S = I - \sum_g T_g \geq 0$ into a distinguished polynomial block g_* :

$$\tilde{T}_{g_*} := T_{g_*} + S, \quad \tilde{T}_g := T_g \text{ for } g \neq g_*. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Then $\sum_g \tilde{T}_g = I$, and weak duality shows that the objective remains optimal:

$$P(X) \leq P(X_{\text{sat}}) \leq D(Z) = P(X) \implies P(X_{\text{sat}}) = P(X) = D(Z). \quad (\text{S19})$$

Commits 3e09f4, c303e5, and 6339ab removed all intermediate declarations that assumed $I \leq Z$.

C.5 Case study IV: consistency under rounding and completion

C.5.1 IV.a Line 169: bounding consistency before completion

In Section 3 of the paper, Line 169 applies triangle substitution to replace G^A with its completed projective measurement Q^A , claiming the same consistency error:

$$\begin{aligned} G_g^A \otimes I &\simeq_{\zeta_1} I \otimes G_g^B, & G_g^A \otimes I &\approx_{\zeta_2} Q_g^A \otimes I \\ \implies Q_g^A \otimes I &\simeq_{\zeta_1} I \otimes G_g^B. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S20})$$

Substitution using state-dependent closeness $\approx_{\zeta_2}$ adds a square-root error term, giving $\zeta_1 + \sqrt{\zeta_2}$.

PR #1190 (1dd593, issue #1099) resolved this by comparing G^A against the pre-completion sub-measurement P^A instead. Because $G^A \approx_{100\zeta_1^{1/4}} P^A$, the match-mass loss is bounded by $\sqrt{100\zeta_1^{1/4}} = 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$. Completion at a distinguished outcome g_0 cannot decrease the match mass:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_g \langle \psi | (Q_g^A \otimes G_g^B) | \psi \rangle &\geq \sum_g \langle \psi | (P_g^A \otimes G_g^B) | \psi \rangle, \\ &(\text{completeAtOutcomeProj_left_matchMass_ge}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S21})$$

This yields the corrected bound:

$$Q_g^A \otimes I \simeq_{\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}} I \otimes G_g^B. \quad (\text{S22})$$

The extra term in ζ_2 . Completing an orthonormalized sub-measurement with self-consistency error ζ_1 adds an unstated term $+2\zeta_1$. PR #909 (1ad5f9) increased the Step 6 coefficient in cascadeZeta2 from the printed 40 to 42:

$$\zeta_2 = 200\zeta_1^{1/4} + 42\zeta_1^{1/8}. \quad (\text{S23})$$

To see how these repairs fit the final error bound, let σ be the value of `mainInductionError` at $(\text{params}, k, 3\epsilon, 3\epsilon, 3\epsilon)$, and let $\nu_{\text{final}} = \text{mainFormalError}(\text{params}, k, \epsilon)$. For $0 \leq \epsilon$, $400md \leq k$, $0 < k$, and $\nu_{\text{final}} < 1$, the scalar comparison uses

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &= 2\sigma + 2\sqrt{3\epsilon + 2\sigma + md/q}, \\ \zeta_2 &= 200\zeta_1^{1/4} + 42\zeta_1^{1/8}, & \zeta_3 &= 6\zeta_1 + 6\zeta_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

The corrected point-consistency bound is

$$\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}} = 2\sigma + 2\sqrt{\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}} + \zeta_3/2 \leq \nu_{\text{final}}. \quad (\text{S25})$$

This is `MainFormalScalarBounds.zeta4Repaired_le_mainFormalError`.

The final proof in `mainFormalConclusion_ofRoleRegisterScalarBoundary` bounds its point-consistency error by $\zeta_4^{\text{repaired}}$ and applies this inequality.

C.5.2 IV.b Sub-measurement total-overlap displacement η

When applying triangle substitution to sub-measurements, the total operators $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \sum_g \hat{H}_g \leq I$ and $H_{\text{tot}} = \sum_g H_g \leq I$ do not sum to identity. Substituting sub-measurements introduces an unstated total-overlap displacement parameter:

$$\eta := \mathbb{E}_u |\langle \psi | A_{\text{tot}}^u \otimes (H_{\text{tot}} - \hat{H}_{\text{tot}}) | \psi \rangle|, \quad (\text{S26})$$

yielding $\text{ConsRel}(\psi, A, H, \delta + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{DP}}} + \eta)$.

PR #1239 (dc2fae) proved the Cauchy–Schwarz bound:

$$\eta \leq \sqrt{|\mathbb{F}_q| \varepsilon_{\text{DP}}} \quad (\text{final_fields_total_difference_le_sqrt_card_data}). \quad (\text{S27})$$

This cardinality-dependent estimate is an intermediate bound. The final assembly in 134d08 uses completeness transfer to control both signs of the difference of total expectations. Write $\hat{\zeta}$, $\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}$, and $\hat{\zeta}_{\text{DP}}$ for the helper, orthogonalization, and data-processing errors at $(\text{params}, \varepsilon, \delta)$. Because A^u is complete, $A_{\text{tot}}^u = I$, and the bound is

$$\eta = |\langle \psi | I \otimes (H_{\text{tot}} - \hat{H}_{\text{tot}}) | \psi \rangle| \leq \hat{\zeta} + 2\sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}}. \quad (\text{S28})$$

Thus the corrected point-consistency error satisfies

$$2\hat{\zeta} + \sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{DP}}} + 2\sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}} \leq \text{selfImprovementError}(\text{params}, \varepsilon, \delta). \quad (\text{S29})$$

The scalar inequality assumes $0 \leq \varepsilon, \delta \leq 1$ and $d \leq q$; the proof treats the other parameter ranges separately. The proof passes this total-difference bound to `final_fields_of_helper_outputs_of_total_difference`. Its scalar estimate is `final_fields_point_consistency_total_difference_error_le_selfImprovementError`. The earlier wrapper in PR #1348 (ec5277) requires a right-total monotonicity hypothesis; it does not absorb $\sqrt{|\mathbb{F}_q| \varepsilon_{\text{DP}}}$ into the final threshold.

C.6 Case study V: rerandomization graph Laplacian and centered variance trace

While the graph Laplacian and variance trace identities are derived within Chapters 5 and 6, their early shortcut definitions directly blocked downstream composition in Chapter 7. The self-improvement step in Chapter 7 required an operator inequality $L \geq \lambda_2(I - J/M)$ that can only be deduced from the Dirichlet edge-sum decomposition; a tautological definition alias prevented downstream proofs from accessing edge-level expansion properties.

C.6.1 Proving the Laplacian identity from edge sums

The expansion argument expresses the Laplacian $L = M^{-1}I - K$ of the coordinate rerandomization graph as an average of edge differences:

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u,v \in \mathbb{F}_q^m} W(u,v)(|u\rangle - |v\rangle)(\langle u| - \langle v|). \quad (\text{S30})$$

An early draft (78a14c, 27 March 2026) defined the operator tautologically:

$$L_{\text{diff}} := M^{-1}I - K \quad (\text{laplacianRewrite} := \text{rfl}). \quad (\text{S31})$$

The verified proof (PR #1033, 020fc9, a3fcfc) defines $(L_{\text{diff}})_{a,b}$ entrywise as a weighted sum over ordered pairs and proves entrywise equality with $(M^{-1}I - K)_{a,b}$ using transition symmetry $W(u,v) = W(v,u)$ and marginal row sums $\sum_v W(u,v) = M^{-1}$.

C.6.2 Replacing zero residuals by centered operators

Self-improvement expresses global variance as a trace over centered residuals:

$$A_{\perp}^u = A^u - A_{\text{avg}}, \quad A_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_u A^u, \quad \sum_u A_{\perp}^u = 0. \quad (\text{S32})$$

Commit de9a97 stored the constant Fourier coefficient $A_0 = M^{-1/2} \sum_u A^u = \sqrt{M} A_{\text{avg}}$, but set both fields for the orthogonal component to zero:

$$A_{\perp} := 0. \quad (\text{S33})$$

PR #542 (ef0768) constructed the centered residual family $u \mapsto A^u - A_{\text{avg}}$, proved $\sum_u A_{\perp}^u = 0$, and obtained the trace identity:

$$\text{globalVariance}(A, \psi) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q^m} \text{ev}_{\psi}((A_{\perp}^u)^{\dagger} A_{\perp}^u) \quad (\text{globalVarianceTraceForm_eq_closedForm}). \quad (\text{S34})$$

C.7 Case study VI: interpolation support and degree-zero pasting

C.7.1 Replacing default zero by interpolation on the support

Definition 12.8 of Ji et al. [22] reconstructs an $(m + 1)$ -variate polynomial from slice outcomes $(g_1, \dots, g_k) \in (\text{Poly} \cup \{\perp\})^k$. Commit 3cc379 returned the zero polynomial for an empty slice:

$$\text{extractSliceOr0}(\perp) := 0. \quad (\text{S35})$$

The zero polynomial satisfies the degree bound, so that part of the proof compiled. Its evaluation is always 0, however, so it does not give the point consistency needed for empty slices in the Chapter 10 induction.

PR #495 and PR #561 (64ae1b, c77bc0) eliminated `extractSliceOr0` and packaged the interpolation support into `InterpolationSupportWitness`:

```
-- Schematic excerpt from commit 64ae1b
structure InterpolationSupportWitness (params) (gs : Fin k -> GHatOutcome params) where
  support : Finset (Fin k)
  subset_support : support <= gHatTupleSupport gs
  card_eq : support.card = params.d + 1
```

The input to `interpolateCompletedSlicesFromSupport` includes a proof that all interpolation nodes lie in the support: $\sigma \subseteq \text{supp}(g)$.

C.7.2 Degree-zero pasting and the missing $0 < k$ hypothesis

When $d = 0$, polynomials are constant along the appended coordinate ($\text{Poly}(m + 1, q, 0) \cong \text{Poly}(m, q, 0)$).

PR #1643 (88c323) formalized this separate construction by defining the height-averaged sub-measurement `averagedSliceAppendedSubMeas` without Lagrange interpolation.

The case $d = 0$ also exposed a missing hypothesis in the paper. When $d = 0$, the printed condition $k \geq md$ permits $k = 0$. The prefactor k^2 makes the error bound zero:

$$\nu = 100000 \cdot 0^2 \cdot m^4 \left(\varepsilon^{1/40000} + (0/q)^{1/40000} + e^{-0/(2560000 m^2)} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{S36})$$

Consider a strategy on $\mathbb{C}$ where the point measurement answers 0 at point u_0 and 1 at point u_1 . Setting $\varepsilon = 1$, the strategy satisfies all printed hypotheses. However, a degree-zero polynomial is constant, so consistency at u_0 forces the answer to be 0, while consistency at u_1 forces it to be 1. No measurement can satisfy the printed conclusion at $\nu = 0$. The formal theorem excludes this case by requiring $0 < k$ (27df27).

C.8 Case study VII: pasting telescoping sum and inductive successor arithmetic

C.8.1 From $\hat{H}$ to G : the telescoping sum ($46k^2m$ correction)

Lemma 12.8 of Ji et al. [22] relates the $\hat{H}$ -mass of outcomes with type weight $|\tau| \geq d+1$ to a binomial tail in G via $k+1$ hybrid quantities $M_0, \dots, M_k$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_1, \dots, x_k} \sum_{\tau: |\tau| \geq d+1} \sum_{(g_1, \dots, g_k) \in \text{Outcomes}_\tau} \langle \psi | \hat{H}_{g_1, \dots, g_k}^{x_1, \dots, x_k} \otimes I | \psi \rangle \approx_{\nu_8} \sum_{i=d+1}^k \binom{k}{i} \langle \psi | G^i (I - G)^{k-i} \otimes I | \psi \rangle. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Adjacent terms satisfy:

$$|M_{j-1} - M_j| \leq \Delta_k := 2\sqrt{2\zeta} + 2\sqrt{\nu_4(k)}. \quad (\text{S38})$$

Because the commutation loss $\nu_4(k) \propto k^2m$ already scales quadratically with k , the term $\sqrt{\nu_4(k)}$ grows linearly with k . Summing the k differences gives:

$$|M_0 - M_k| \leq \sum_{j=1}^k |M_{j-1} - M_j| \leq k\Delta_k \leq 46k^2m(\gamma^{1/32} + \zeta^{1/32} + (d/q)^{1/32}). \quad (\text{S39})$$

Commit 15df91 corrected the paper's misprinted factor $46km$ to $46k^2m$ in `fromHToError`.

The additive Chernoff bound at threshold $\theta = 1/(200m)$ requires $k \geq 2d/\theta = 400md$. The same-space theorem adopted this restriction in PR #912 (805e89); 78d56a later confirmed it for the reopened induction step. Section B.1.3 distinguishes these stages.

C.8.2 Inductive error growth at $m = 1$

In the inductive step from dimension m to $m+1$, the printed paper absorbed coefficients via:

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{100m}\right)(m^2 + 3) \leq (m+1)^2, \quad (\text{S40})$$

claiming the inequality holds “because $m \geq 2$ ”. At the induction base step $m = 1$, this fails:

$$(1.01)(1^2 + 3) = 4.04 > 4 = (1+1)^2. \quad (\text{S41})$$

PR #552 (70aa84) proved the sharper pasting bound $\nu_{\text{paste}} \leq \frac{1}{5}\nu_{\text{ind}}$. The theorem is `ldPastingInInductionNu_le_fifth_mainInductionNu`. Regrouping the successor error gives:

$$\left((m^2 + 1)\left(1 + \frac{1}{100m}\right) + \frac{2}{5}\right)\nu \leq (m+1)^2\nu. \quad (\text{S42})$$

The inequality holds for all $m \geq 1$; at $m = 1$, it gives $2.42 \leq 4$.

C.9 Index of theorem inputs and outputs

Table S5 catalogs fifteen proved connections across the ten blueprint chapters, separating cross-chapter producer-consumer interfaces (such as spatial register lifts and Naimark dilation products) from intra-chapter proof repairs (such as semidefinite duality slack saturation and degree-zero pasting) that unblocked downstream composition.

Table S5 | Theorem inputs and outputs. The table catalogs fifteen proved connections between modules across the ten blueprint chapters.

Chapter / interface / case	Declarations and repair
Ch. 2 (Registers) Spatial register placement Case I	Producer: QuantumState.eval (826b53) Consumer: ProjStrat (7e79c1) Corrected Bob’s operator lift from liftLeft to liftRight, so the two provers act on separate tensor factors in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.
Ch. 2 (Strategies) Role symmetrization Case I	Producer: roleRegisterSymmStrategy (440cb0) Consumer: mainInduction (c31419) Embedded $\mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_B$ into role space $\mathcal{K}_{\text{role}}$ via localDirectSumBlock, constructing a permutation-invariant strategy without requiring equal local dimensions.
Ch. 2 (Subtests) Agreement to self-consistency Case I	Producer: point_agreement_le_three_mul (9645d3) Consumer: roleRegisterSymmStrategy_selfConsistency (9645d3) Proved that test failure probability $\leq \varepsilon$ bounds cross-prover agreement error by 3ε , giving a self-consistency error of at most 3ε for the symmetrized strategy.
Ch. 10 (Induction) Strategies on each slice Case I	Producer: AnswerSuccessorRestrictedFailureProfile (440cb0) Consumer: answerSuccessorRestrictedSliceConclusions (440cb0) Constructed a strategy for each slice $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and reindexed the error averages using Fubini; the earlier declarations gave only equalities between errors.
Ch. 7 (Self-Imp.) Self-improvement assembly Case II	Producer: selfImprovementHelper (5f0fc8) Consumer: selfImprovementInInductionSection (134d08) Derived point-indexed relations over $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ from Unit-indexed ones, assembling helper completeness, strong self-consistency, and orthonormalization.
Ch. 7 (SDP) SDP primal sub-measurements Case III	Producer: sdpStrictPrimalSubMeas (ca96c4) Consumer: matrixSdpCanonicalStrongDuality (e4ca6d) Enlarged the primal feasible set from complete measurements to sub-measurements, supplying the strict Slater interior point $T_g = \frac{1}{2M}I$ with total mass $\frac{1}{2}I < I$.
Ch. 7 (SDP) SDP slack mass saturation Case III	Producer: matrixSdpCanonicalSaturateSlackBlockMatrix (67715a) Consumer: sdp_statement_with_slackness (31c8e3) Added the slack block S to g_* and applied weak duality $P(X) \leq P(X_{\text{sat}}) \leq D(Z) = P(X)$, removing the false dominance hypothesis $I \preceq Z$.
Ch. 4 (Rounding) Line-169 consistency bound Case IV.a	Producer: completeAtOutcomeProj_left_matchMass_ge (1dd593) Consumer: mainFormalConclusion (cd148c) Bounded the loss of match mass against the sub-measurement P^A before completion, then proved that completion cannot decrease it, giving error $\zeta_1 + 10\zeta_1^{1/8}$.
Ch. 3 (Prelim.) Total-overlap displacement Case IV.b	Producer: completenessTransferProjectiveP (134d08) Consumer: selfImprovement (134d08) Bounded total-overlap displacement by $\eta \leq \hat{\zeta} + 2\sqrt{\hat{\zeta}_{\text{ortho}}}$ using completeness transfer, then absorbed the resulting point-consistency error into selfImprovementError.
Ch. 5 (Expansion) Rerandomization graph Laplacian Case V	Producer: rerandomizeCoordWeight_symm (a3fcfc) Consumer: laplacian_eq_edgeDifferenceForm (a3fcfc) Proved entrywise equality $L = M^{-1}I - K$ from coordinate-swap symmetry $W(u, v) = W(v, u)$ and marginal sums, replacing an identity made true by definition.

Continued on next page

Chapter / interface / case	Declarations and repair
Ch. 6 (Variance) Centered global variance trace Case V	Producer: canonicalGlobalVarianceDecomposition (ef0768) Consumer: globalVarianceTraceForm_eq_closedForm (ef0768) Constructed the centered residual family $A_{\perp}^u = A^u - A_{\text{avg}}$ with $\sum_u A_{\perp}^u = 0$, proving the global variance trace identity.
Ch. 9 (Pasting) Supported Lagrange interpolation Case VI	Producer: InterpolationSupportWitness (64ae1b) Consumer: interpolateCompletedSlicesFromSupport (c77bc0) Replaced the default value <code>extractSliceOr0($\perp$) := 0</code> with interpolation on a support set of size $ \sigma = d + 1$, preserving point consistency.
Ch. 9 (Pasting) Degree-zero pasting completion Case VI	Producer: averagedSliceAppendedSubMeas (88c323) Consumer: degreeZeroPastedPointConsistency (88c323) Completed height-averaged sub-measurements at degree $d = 0$ without interpolation, treating arbitrary k by cases. The top-level $0 < k$ correction is a separate soundness obligation (§C.7.2).
Ch. 9 (Pasting) Pasting telescoping sum Case VII	Producer: fromHToGStageMass (15df91) Consumer: fromHToG_bound (15df91) Summed k differences between adjacent hybrid terms to obtain the binomial-tail bound, correcting the misprinted error factor to $\nu_8 = 46k^2m$.
Ch. 10 (Induction) Successor error regrouping Case VII	Producer: ldPastingInInductionNu_le_fifth_mainInductionNu (70aa84) Consumer: mainInductionSuccessorNext (70aa84) Proved $\nu_{\text{paste}} \leq \frac{1}{5}\nu_{\text{ind}}$ to close the base step $m = 1$ via $(m^2 + 1)(1.01) + 2/5 = 2.42 \leq 4$, fixing the printed failure $(1.01)(4) = 4.04 > 4$.

D Verification tools and proof integrity checks

D.1 Overview

An interactive theorem prover checks that a proof has its declared type [33, 36]. Reviewers must still check whether that type states the intended theorem from the papers [20, 22]. A declaration can pass type checking by assuming the conclusion as a hypothesis, taking unproved intermediate results as structure fields, or constructing a witness on a trivial space.

We implemented five checks for these shortcuts, alongside mathematical review (Table S6). Table S7 summarizes when each of the five checks began reporting findings and when findings began to block merges.

Between mid-April and mid-May 2026, we merged 74 commits updating agent instructions, automated review prompts, and continuous integration workflows; 29 directly updated prompt and policy configurations. Agent instructions, reviewer prompts, automated repair loops, maintainer checklists, and CI scanners all checked for hypotheses that assume the conclusion and helper structures whose fields had not been proved.

Table S6 | The five automated checks for proof shortcuts and statement changes.

Check	Target	Mechanism	Action on failure
1. Conclusion-shaped hypotheses (§D.2)	Proof evasion	Parses binders in theorem signatures; matches conclusion predicates in hypotheses	Fails continuous integration (PR #1511)
2. Proof debt in paper-facing headers (§D.2)	Auxiliary obligations	Scans blueprint-linked declarations for warning terms	Fails continuous integration (PR #1511)
3. Helper structure reviews (§D.3)	Unused helpers	Requires constructor, consumer, or issue	Maintainers block merge; reviewed PRs remove unused structures (PR #1440)
4. Kernel axiom audits (§D.4)	Axiom leaks	Inspects environment with <code>Lean.collectAxioms</code>	Elaboration fails when unexpected axioms appear (PR #416)
5. Blueprint synchronization (§D.5)	Unverified green nodes	Cross-references blueprint tags with Lean definitions and docstrings	Rejects unexpected warning terms in CI on paper-facing nodes (PR #1767)

Table S7 | Evolution of the five checks from reporting to blocking.

Date	Shortcut observed	Check introduced	Status over time
15 April 2026	Classical soundness proof omitted; sorryAx in transitive axioms (issue #408).	Kernel axiom audits (PR #416).	Blocking from introduction; relaxed once for 14 min (commit 3aeb70 , 20 May); restored (commit fc7376).
26 April 2026	Hypotheses that assume the conclusion (SelfImprovementBridgePackage, issue #493).	Conclusion-shaped hypothesis scanner (PR #784).	Report-only from 26 April (PR #784); blocking from 11 May (PR #1511).
09 May 2026	Unused helper structures and unproved intermediate fields (issue #1381).	Helper structure reviews (PR #1440).	Enforced via maintainer review checklist and PR review audits.
11 May 2026	Names for unproved obligations (Bridge, Package, ...) in headers of blueprint-linked theorems (issue #1458).	Proof-debt scanner (PR #1475).	Report-only in PR #1475 ; --ci added in PR #1506 ; blocking from 11 May (PR #1511).
20 May 2026	Green blueprint nodes with warning terms in docstrings or linked declaration names (issue #1693).	Blueprint synchronization audit (PR #1767).	Blocking from introduction, with explicit allowances for justified uses.

D.2 Checks 1 and 2: hypothesis and proof-debt scanners

These checks detect theorems whose statements differ from the paper by assuming unproved results. Check 1 inspects the binder structure of each theorem. Check 2 inspects public declaration names and type signatures for stems used for unproved obligations.

D.2.1 Implementation

The hypothesis scanner parses theorem signatures into hypotheses and conclusions. It flags hypotheses that share predicates with the conclusion. The proof-debt scanner checks blueprint-linked theorems against a list of stems used for unproved obligations:

```
ForbiddenStems := {Bridge, Residual, Repair, Package, Input, Producer, Hypotheses, Assumptions, ... }.
```

The declaration audit blocks direct axiom and constant commands in source code.

D.2.2 Historical example: SelfImprovementBridgePackage

The named package introduced on 9 April 2026 (48d147) and the later inline-existential variant documented in [issue #493](#) are the two forms these scanners check. The proof-debt scanner flags named obligations; the conclusion scanner compares inline existential binders with their conclusions. [Supplementary Appendix B](#) details the statement repairs, and [Section C.3](#) gives the assembled proof. The statement was restored in [PR #1462](#), the proof assembled in [PR #1638](#), and the SDP proof proved in [PR #1708](#).

D.3 Check 3: helper structure reviews and scaffolding removal

This check prevents unproved obligations from persisting in auxiliary data structures. Proving agents introduced intermediate structures to bundle hypotheses, intermediate operators, or witness candidates. Without review, these structures can hide proof obligations from the scanners.

D.3.1 Requirements for merging

Before approving a merge, maintainers require one of the following for each intermediate data structure (issue #1379):

1. an explicit **constructor theorem** deriving the structure from established premises,
2. an explicit **consumer theorem** using the structure to prove a required step, or
3. an issue specifying what remains to be proved.

The review-and-fix loop stops automated repairs after five consecutive tagged repair commits.

D.3.2 Historical example: removing unused structures

After reviewing helper declarations, we removed unused scaffolding structures and temporary input abbreviations (such as intermediate Naimark, rounding, and spectral-truncation witness structures) in PR #1440 (bb1839, issue #1381).

The QXPLayerData repair replaced assumed structure fields with a mathematical construction. [Supplementary Appendix B](#) traces its successive repairs; reviewers check which theorems construct these fields and which proof steps use them.

D.4 Check 4: kernel axiom audits

This check verifies that core theorems do not depend, directly or through other declarations, on unfinished proofs (sorryAx) or custom mathematical axioms.

D.4.1 Implementation

Continuous integration runs the in-kernel axiom audit. Its assertions inspect transitive axiom dependencies with `Lean.collectAxioms` and fail elaboration when the expected axiom condition is violated. [Section A.4](#) specifies the two assertions and their application to the completed proof.

D.4.2 Historical examples: unfinished proofs and a relaxed axiom check

The classical soundness placeholder in PR #407 motivated the audit. An automated tracker flagged its transitive sorryAx dependency (issue #408), and c530eb reverted the pull request. In PR #416, we made the unproved classical premise explicit and added an axiom audit for the quantum theorem. [Supplementary Appendix B](#) details this transition. The axiom audit detects axiom dependencies; reviewers must inspect assumptions written as explicit hypotheses.

On 20 May 2026, selfImprovement temporarily depended on a helper with a sorry tracked in issue #1642. In an automated repair session on PR #1734, an agent modified the test harness in commit 3aeb70, adding sorry to expectedSelfImprovementAxioms and expectedInductionSelfImprovementAxioms in an attempt to satisfy a failing CI run. This test-harness tampering was caught during an audit fourteen minutes later; commit fc7376 restored both lists to the standard axioms and rewrote the proof to remove the unfinished helper. The pull request merged later that day with the strict axiom check restored; the relaxed configuration never reached the main branch. This was the only instance during the formalization where an agent relaxed the axiom verification harness.

D.5 Check 5: blueprint synchronization and declaration checks

This check flags blueprint nodes that appear complete (green) in the dependency graph but link to substitute statements or helper declarations that assume unproved results.

D.5.1 Implementation

We manage the mathematical blueprint with Massot’s `leanblueprint` tool [19] and check its Lean links with two scripts. The blueprint synchronization check reads the $\text{\LaTeX}$ blueprint files, extracts all `\lean` and `\leanok` tags, and checks that the linked declarations exist in the Lean codebase. The green-node audit searches linked declaration names and public headers for terms used for unproved obligations and checks their immediate docstrings for `**Unfaithful:**` markers. It reports these matches and, in `--ci` mode, rejects unexpected matches on nodes that state results from the paper, except for listed allowances. Mathematical review determines whether a flagged hypothesis belongs to the displayed statement.

D.5.2 Historical example: reviewing green nodes with warning terms

In PR #1767 (issue #1693), we added the green-node integrity audit and committed its findings at e3d697. The audit identified links whose names suggested unproved obligations and compared them with the displayed blueprint statements. For example, `SliceBoundednessInput.storedBoundedResidualBound` states a boundedness assumption already present in the displayed commutativity claim. Among the green nodes checked against the paper, the audit found none that assumed an obligation absent from the displayed statement. The script reports unexpected links; it does not remove `\leanok` tags.

D.6 Mathematical review

We compared formal statements and the lemmas used to prove them with the argument in the LIDT paper. For example, the interpolation sentinel compiled but failed to provide point consistency on empty slices; Section C.7.1 gives its replacement by support-certified interpolation. The Line-169 transport required an additional error estimate; Section C.5.1 gives the repaired bound. Reviewers must therefore check that each lemma supplies the quantities required by the next proof step, even when both declarations type-check.

D.7 Measuring the checks

Tables S6 and S7 summarize the scope and deployment history of each check. We measured how often the scanners flagged patterns on the main branch, how long known shortcuts took to detect, and which pull requests failed the blocking CI checks.

D.7.1 Running the final scanners on earlier snapshots

We ran the final versions of the automated scanners on 23 dated snapshots of the main branch between 7 March and 5 June 2026. We used the same matching rules for every snapshot. The counts include only variants that these rules detect.

Figure S3 shows the proof-debt scanner’s findings. Flagged paper-facing declarations rose from 1 on 22 March to 63 on 6 May 2026, before the proof-debt scanner entered continuous integration. On 11 May, the scan merged in report-only mode (PR #1475, 12:46 UTC). The `--ci` flag was added that evening (PR #1506, 20:31 UTC), and PR #1511 made scanner failures fail the CI job at 23:27 UTC. The count dropped to zero that day and remained zero across all eight subsequent snapshots through 5 June, when the scanner covered 487 paper-facing declarations. The remaining SDP proof obligation closed later in PR #1708. The scanner flags four issues in the 9 April snapshot, including the `selfImprovement` shortcut introduced that day in 48d147.

The conclusion-shaped hypothesis scanner found no matches in the same 23 snapshots except on 21 April 2026. The number of declarations scanned grew from 44 to 2,602. Daily April snapshots show when this hypothesis appeared and was removed. An inline existential hypothesis on `mainInduction` entered the main branch through PR #491 on 18 April. It was removed on 23 April while the surrounding bridge structure was refactored. By the time the report-only scan merged three days later (PR #784), review in issue #493 had




Figure S3 | Findings before and after we added the proof-debt scanner. We ran the current proof-debt detector, unmodified, over 23 verified snapshots of the repository’s main branch using the same matching rules for every snapshot. The blue curve counts its findings on paper-facing theorems at each snapshot; the grey curve, drawn to its own scale, is the number of paper-facing statements the detector scanned. The dashed vertical line marks 11 May 2026, the day the scan entered continuous integration in report-only mode. The `--ci` flag was added eight hours later; [PR #1511](#) made scanner failures fail the CI job that night. Data: `data/m1_proof_debt_replay.csv`.

identified the issue, and the refactoring had removed it. After the scanner became blocking on 11 May ([PR #1511](#)), the finding count remained at zero across all eight subsequent snapshots without expanding the scanner’s allowlist.

D.7.2 How long the shortcuts survived

[Table S8](#) details when the three shortcuts in [Supplementary Appendix B](#) were introduced, detected, and repaired. From 11 May, findings covered by the blocking rules fail the CI checks. Both scanners run on pull requests that change Lean files; the proof-debt scanner also runs on blueprint changes.

Table S8 | Time from introduction to first observed detection for the three documented shortcuts. We measure to the first issue, review comment, or failing check logged in the repository. The repairs followed on 1–2 May 2026 for the Laplacian alias (the [PR #1033](#) chain), the same night for the rounding statement ([PR #287](#), with the construction proved in [PR #652](#), [PR #726](#), and [PR #1126](#)), and 11 May 2026 for the selfImprovement statement ([PR #1462](#)).

Pattern	Introduced	First observed detection	Detected by	Latency
Definitional alias of the Laplacian, closed by <code>rfl</code>	27 Mar 2026 (78a14c)	25 Apr 2026, 00:46 UTC: a review fix on PR #721 drops <code>\leanok</code> from the blueprint node as a “vacuous tautology”.	Automated reviewers checking blueprint tags	29 days
Rounding witness on a one-point space ($R = [1]$, <code>PUnit</code> carrier)	9 Apr 2026, 20:45 UTC (PR #274)	Same day: a review bot’s risk note in the body of the introducing pull request, then issue #279 filed 19 minutes after merge.	Automated pull-request review that did not block the merge; an issue was then filed under the owner account	Under 1 day (flagged before merge, then merged)
Conclusion-shaped hypotheses on selfImprovement	9 Apr 2026, named stem (48d147); 18 Apr 2026, inline existentials (PR #491)	18 Apr 2026, 04:13 UTC: issue #493 names PR #491 before its 11:34 UTC merge; 10 May 2026, 05:42 UTC: issue #1453 flagged the unproved named package.	Review filed as a tracker issue	0 days for inline form; 31 days to the issue about the named package

D.7.3 Failures reported by blocking checks

Three CI audit jobs ran these checks on pull requests that changed the files covered by each job, from 11–12 May 2026 until 16 July 2026. A single workflow (343bf0) then combined the jobs without changing their commands. Across 4,113 logged pull-request runs during this period, 49 failed. Of these, 42 were transient infrastructure failures (such as runner timeouts, checkout errors, or empty job steps). Only seven failures arose from substantive verification checks: five caused by unfaithful blueprint markers and one caused by proof debt, while the conclusion-shaped scanner gave consistent reports of unproved obligations. On the inspected branches, the flagged Lean or blueprint content was repaired, and the pull requests merged with passing checks. This distribution reflects that the vast majority of shortcut attempts and mathematical drift were caught and repaired earlier in the workflow—during interactive agent sessions and pull-request review discussions—before changes reached the merge gate. Continuous integration functioned primarily as an automated safety net against regressions rather than the primary discovery mechanism.

We counted each run’s latest attempt, so a failed attempt followed by a successful retry does not appear in the failure list. The proof-debt scanner ran in report-only mode for eight hours, too briefly for a comparison with the blocking period. The raw CI logs have expired; we used archived step statuses and branch history to classify the failures.

E GitHub task tracking, agent contributions, and model usage

E.1 From proof decomposition to session instructions

A saved continuation prompt begins:

Continue to address the opened issues.

The rest of the prompt asks for parallel subagents, separate worktrees, cleanup and refactoring, blueprint synchronization, and merging after reviews agree and review threads are resolved, followed by work on the next issues. The issues supplied the obligations and dependencies; the paper, blueprint, and repository instructions supplied the mathematical context and checks. The agent could therefore resume work from this record, submit a proof for review, address the comments, and continue with the next task.

GitHub workflows also invoked Claude Code and Codex from issue and pull-request discussions, and Open-Code from comments. These workflows supplied the request together with standing instructions for preserving the paper’s mathematical statements.

E.2 Tracking proof tasks

We used tracking issues to organize proof tasks as they arose during formalization. Initially, we listed pending tasks as Markdown checkboxes in each tracking issue. Editing a checklist did not update the underlying issue hierarchy, so the checklist could disagree with the child issues. We resolved this by making GitHub native sub-issues the task tree, while the issue description retained the narrative explanation of the task. Only native parent-child relations defined the task tree.

The tracker for the quantum-soundness theorem ([issue #422](#)) is an example. Its description lists five issues for assembling the theorem ([issue #423](#)–[issue #427](#)). The native hierarchy contains 17 sub-issues: we added tasks as the proof required auxiliary lemmas and connections between intermediate results.

For any tracking issue, GitHub computes completion as the fraction of closed sub-issues. GitHub counts a child when its state is CLOSED and separately tracks why it was closed. To complete the proof task, we also check the proof in Lean and review whether its statement proves the required result. The tracking workflow counts closed children and posts a comment when a triggering event finds every child closed. Closing the parent remains a separate action. At the audited August revision, the job runs after reopening a child, closing a child as completed, and opening or merging a non-fork pull request; a child closed as not planned does not itself trigger this job.

E.3 From body checklists to native sub-issues

As the formalization grew, we changed how the tracker logged child tasks. [Figure S4](#) reconstructs the two representations for tracker [issue #422](#). [Table S9](#) documents the changes from the early checklists through commit b39705 to the August revision.




Figure S4 | From body checklist to native sub-issues. (Left): the 23 April body tasklist stored six direct tasks (#423–#428) and three checked milestones (#470, #471, and #509), so editing that text changed the displayed task list. (Right): after PR #674, issue #422’s task state came from native parent–child relations; its description still listed the tasks. At the 31 August 2026 query, all 17 native children were closed on GitHub. Grey state markers denote GitHub closure, not mathematical completion. We reconstructed the task lists here and omitted the surrounding GitHub interface.

Table S9 | Changes to GitHub task tracking. The last column states the change in repository behavior.

Date	Reference	Task state	Repository behavior
26 Mar 2026	Commit f93895	Body checklist	The tracking-issue template stored child references as Markdown checkboxes.
29 Mar 2026	Commit d6e341	Body checklist	The post-merge scan could append a new - [] #N entry to that list.
24 Apr 2026	PR #674 ; commit 4233ee	Native sub-issues	GitHub native sub-issues replaced Markdown checkboxes for tracking child tasks.
24 Jun 2026	Commit b39705	Native sub-issues	At commit b39705, the merged-PR scan created follow-up issues, attached them to an open tracker, and logged the action.
16–17 Jul 2026	Commit bb4889 ; commit f692c9 ; commit 1c6eed ; commit 442c15	Native sub-issues	The combined workflow kept native sub-issues, separated completion notices, and gave progress comments a stable marker.
31 Aug 2026	Commit 507e81	Native sub-issues	Separate scripts count closed children and find follow-up work in merged pull requests.

With the review switch enabled, a non-fork pull-request merge triggers an automated review of its description, review discussions, and diff. It creates issues for follow-up work introduced by the merge, excluding completed tasks, pre-existing sorry placeholders, and cosmetic comments.

Across the project, automated post-merge follow-up scans created 110 issues (117 bot-created issues in total). Together with maintainer filings, follow-up tasks accounted for 292 of the 725 issues opened in the repository (40.3%), concentrating in April and May 2026 during core proof formalization. For each new task, the automation creates a native sub-issue under the relevant tracker, links the pull request, and posts an update to the tracker.

In the later August revision, a separate script counts closed children, updates progress ratios, and posts state changes in comments with stable markers to avoid duplicates. It reads native issue relations and states, so edits to issue descriptions do not change the task hierarchy or trigger completion notices.

E.4 Issue creation and organization through GitHub Actions

We used separate GitHub Actions workflows for classifying tasks, preparing proof strategies, and auditing dependencies for newly opened issues.

Auto-labeling and anchor audit. When a contributor or agent opened an issue, the *Issue Classification* workflow evaluated its title and description against the repository taxonomy. It assigned area labels (formalization, infrastructure, cleanup), paper identifiers (2009.12982), and mathematical topic labels (ldt-basic, pasting, proof-infra). Beyond applying labels, the triage agent audited the issue description for necessary mathematical anchors: paper theorem references, blueprint nodes, and target Lean declaration names. It posted an initial classification comment specifying the applied labels, summarizing the technical scope, and listing missing mathematical references needed before formalization could begin. This audit helps human researchers inspect formalization progress while preventing agents from re-deriving mathematical results already available in Mathlib.

Automated Mathlib audit and scouting. For issues labeled formalization, the *Mathlib Scout* workflow performed an automated audit across Mathlib and the local codebase. The scouting agent searched for existing lemmas, matching type signatures, and relevant algebraic structures, distinguishing results already present upstream from project-specific gaps that required new proofs. It posted a structured scouting report directly on the issue, identifying relevant definitions, citations with file paths, and a suggested lemma decomposition.

Scouting reports as proving prompts. These automated issue comments served as direct prompt context for subsequent proving agents. When a proving session (dispatched through Claude Code or Codex) began work on an issue, the agent read the issue description together with the triage and scouting comments. Because the scout had already identified the relevant Mathlib declarations and structured the proof into modular steps, the proving agent avoided redundant library searches and adhered to existing project conventions.

Worked example: issue #2454. To illustrate the interaction between auto-labeling, Mathlib scouting, and proving prompts, [Section E.4](#) reproduce the automated comments posted to [issue #2454](#) (a task to extract shared finite-support lemmas from the pasting layer into a reusable API). Upon issue creation, the classification agent assigned topic labels and noted the missing declaration names ([Section E.4](#)). The Mathlib scout then audited Mathlib and the local repository, identifying exact lemmas in `Mathlib.Data.Fintype.CardEmbedding` and proposing a three-lemma architecture ([Section E.4](#)). The proving agent on [PR #2455](#) ingested this report as prompt context and implemented the exact three-declaration plan proposed by the scout, closing the issue.

Auto-labeling and initial classification comment on [issue #2454](#)

Initial classification

Labels

Added formalization, 2009.12982, pasting, proof-infra. The issue describes extracting shared finite-support lemmas from the pasting layer into a reusable API, which fits the formalization and proof-infrastructure categories.

Reading

The issue identifies a repeated pattern in the pasting layer: constructing the finite support of injective point tuples, proving its cardinality via `Equiv.subtypeInjectiveEquivEmbedding`, and proving nonemptiness when $k \leq q$. The goal is to move these facts next to `distinctTupleDistribution` so that downstream total-variation and averaging proofs can cite a single support API.

The issue does not currently give specific file paths, line numbers, the current inline declaration names, or the target Lean declaration name for the factored support API.

Next step

Add the specific file paths and line numbers where the repeated support constructions currently live, and name the target Lean declaration (or declarations) that should hold the factored facts. If a blueprint anchor or LaTeX label corresponds to `distinctTupleDistribution`, include that reference as well.

Mathlib scouting and audit report on [issue #2454](#)

Mathlib Scouting Report

Mathematical source

- Refactoring task: source facts are already in the repository (`MIPStarRE/LDT/Pasting/Defs/Tuples.lean`, defining `distinctTuples` and `distinctTupleDistribution`) and downstream consumers in `Core/DDistinct.lean` and `ComparisonLemmas/LineInterpolation/`.
- Goal: Factor out the finite support of injective `PointTuple params k`, its cardinality `params.q.descFactorial k`, and nonemptiness ($k \leq q$) into a shared API.

Relevant Mathlib definitions and lemmas

- `Equiv.subtypeInjectiveEquivEmbedding` (`Mathlib/Logic/Embedding/Basic.lean`): equivalence between injective functions and embeddings.
- `Fintype.card_embedding_eq` (`Mathlib/Data/Fintype/CardEmbedding.lean`): cardinality formula for embeddings between finite types.
- `Nat.descFactorial_pos` (`Mathlib/Data/Nat/Factorial/Basic.lean`): gives $0 < n^k \leftrightarrow k \leq n$, establishing nonemptiness directly.

Relevant project definitions

- `MIPStarRE.LDT.Pasting.distinctTuples`: set of k -tuples with injective coordinates.
- `MIPStarRE.LDT.Pasting.ldDnoteq`: main total-variation bound $\text{TV}(\text{uniform}, \text{distinct}) \leq k^2/q$.

Suggested approach

Create a shared support API in `Tuples.lean` with three declarations:

- (i) `distinctTupleSupport params k: Finset.univ.filter (Function.Injective)` as a named definition.
- (ii) `card_distinctTupleSupport`: cardinality equals `params.q.descFactorial k`, proved via `subtypeInjectiveEquivEmbedding` and `card_embedding_eq`.
- (iii) `distinctTupleSupport_nonempty_iff`: nonemptiness equivalent to $k \leq q$, proved via `Nat.descFactorial_pos`.

Gaps to fill

- No Mathlib gap: all required embedding and factorial lemmas already exist in Mathlib.
- Project gap only: factoring the repeated local proofs into `Tuples.lean`.

The *Issue Tracker* workflow responded to issue completion or reopening and to pull-request opening or merging. At this snapshot, an agent performed both tracking updates and post-merge follow-up review when the review switch was enabled. Its prompt required each new proof task to identify the mathematical source, the relevant Lean declarations, and what remained to be proved. It also instructed the agent to inspect dependencies and recommend an unblocked task, taking account of what that task would enable downstream. These recommendations were posted in issue comments. The post-merge creation procedure appears in [Section E.3](#); [Section E.5](#) gives an example.

Periodic reporting served a separate purpose. The *Daily Standup Summary* workflow ran on weekdays or on request and asked an agent to summarize proved results, proof strategies, open problems, and dependencies in a dated issue. Its prompt required updating an existing report for that date rather than creating a duplicate. The scheduled *Stale issue audit* instead produced a report of stale source citations without editing issues.

E.5 Pull-request links and task decomposition

Pull-request descriptions explicitly linked code changes to the underlying proof tasks using keyword references. We used `Addresses #N` when a pull request advanced an intermediate step, and `Closes #N` when it discharged the target obligation. Merging a pull request with a closing keyword automatically updated the sub-issue state on GitHub and advanced the parent tracker’s progress.

The decomposition of [issue #422](#) (tracking the induction step) illustrates this hierarchical progression ([Table S10](#)). When PR [#1031](#) merged, the post-merge triage opened child issues [issue #1037](#) and [issue #1038](#), attaching both as native sub-issues under [issue #422](#). Subsequent pull requests advanced or closed these children individually until the final statement correction closed the parent tracker.

Table S10 | Task decomposition and pull-request relations in the history of tracker [issue #422](#).

Reference	Relation	State change
Issue #1037 , issue #1038	Native children of issue #422	Both issues added as children of the tracker.
PR #1045	<code>Closes #1038</code>	Merged PR closed the answer-side bridge task.
PR #1218	<code>Addresses #1037</code>	Merged PR advanced the successor-slice task.
PR #1221	<code>Closes #1037</code>	Merged PR closed that child issue.
PR #1789	<code>Closes #422</code>	Final statement correction closed the parent tracker.

Native sub-issues maintained the hierarchical decomposition of mathematical goals into tractable tasks, while pull-request links recorded the exact code changes that resolved each obligation.

E.6 Automated pull-request repair

Automated repair loops in GitHub Actions returned compiler diagnostics and review findings directly to proving agents. Because each pull request maintained its target branch, review discussions, and incremental commits across separate agent invocations, verification and repair proceeded asynchronously after the initiating session concluded.

Dispatch from repository events. At the pinned proof snapshot, the *Auto Fix (Lean)* workflow routed failures from continuous integration and code review to specialized repair jobs. A failing *Lean Action CI* run dispatched build repair; a failing *Lint blueprint* run dispatched blueprint repair. For mathematical review, a completed run of *Claude Code Review (Lean)* dispatched review repair if the pull request carried the `auto-fix-claude` label. This review trigger required the review workflow itself to finish execution, regardless of whether the reviewer approved the change. Label-triggered dispatch evaluated current repository state: it queried the latest completed checks for the head commit and collected active, unresolved review threads, skipping outdated discussions from earlier commits and avoiding redundant repairs when a subsequent build had already succeeded. Dispatch was restricted to internal branches and could be disabled repository-wide.

Repair on the pull-request branch. The dispatcher passed the failed run identifier and log output to the build or blueprint repair agent, or provided the review summary and unresolved comment threads to the review repair agent. Each repair job checked out the pull-request branch directly. When multiple feedback types triggered concurrently, the workflow serialized execution in a fixed order—build, blueprint, and review—to prevent concurrent push conflicts, while a branch-level concurrency group cancelled superseded jobs whenever a newer commit arrived.

Repair prompts specified mandatory local verification before pushing: Lean repairs required `lake build`, while blueprint repairs required recompiling the blueprint and validating declaration links. The agent pushed directly to the branch with an automated repair marker and summarized its edits in a pull-request comment. For theorems formalizing results from the paper, standing instructions strictly forbade altering the mathematical statement to bypass proof obligations; if an agent could not establish the declared statement, it was instructed to document the mathematical blocker rather than weaken assumptions or conclusions. Routine build and review repairs thus fed directly into the proof-gap protocol whenever a failure exposed a genuine mathematical discrepancy.

Continuation and stopping. To prevent runaway iteration, a guard action terminated automation after five consecutive commits bearing automated repair markers (such as `[claude-review-fix]`), counting build, blueprint, and review repairs cumulatively. The counter inspected commit trailers backward from HEAD and reset whenever an unmarked commit appeared, bounding individual automated sequences rather than lifetime repairs on a branch. To prevent cyclic ping-pong between reviewer and repair agents, the review workflow skipped evaluation when the latest commit carried a repair marker. A repair job exited immediately without invoking the model if all review threads had already been addressed or if no actionable code changes remained. While agents verified changes locally before pushing, CI workflows independently validated the resulting commits on GitHub before merge.

Case study: automated review and repair. PR #2340 retargeted blueprint dependencies to theorem formulations allowing independent Hilbert spaces for Alice and Bob. Automated review on the initial pull request triggered two successive repair cycles. The first repair, [commit 8ced55](#), reorganized the corresponding gap note and corrected its mathematical citations. The second, [commit 0fdcb4](#), replaced an informal table of declaration names with explicit mathematical statements contrasting the single-space and heterogeneous formulations, and updated downstream references. Both commits carried the `[claude-review-fix]` trailer. A subsequent agent pass verified that all requested revisions were satisfied, concluding the repair sequence without additional commits. The blueprint compilation, blueprint–Lean synchronization, and proof-debt scanners all passed cleanly on the final commit. This trace illustrates how repository-triggered loops ingest review comments, apply targeted mathematical corrections to the working branch, and re-verify against automated checks without human intervention.

E.7 Tool loops, goal mode, and proof-task completion

FormalFlow kept a proving session active across model turns by retaining its objective and supplying a continuation prompt before the session would otherwise wait for user input. At TeXRA commit 9114c3eb2d (10 June 2026), the objective was a text document stating what to achieve, how to approach it, and what to check before stopping. The plan tool presented the objective for approval. Approving it with goal mode enabled started the session’s automatic continuations. For proof work, the objective identified the mathematical obligation, while the repository instructions below specified how to check the result.

When the goal was active and no follow-up message was waiting, TeXRA prompted the agent to continue, supplying the objective and elapsed time. The continuation prompt began:

```
Autonomous objective active. Keep working until it is verifiably done. Do not end your
turn to summarize progress or hand back control; only stop when the objective's end state
is true and you have inspected real evidence for it.
```

It also instructed the agent not to replace the objective with a smaller or easier task, and to check evidence for every requirement before declaring the task complete.

The agent ended the goal through the plan tool’s complete command, which required a reason describing how it had checked the result. The tool removed the active goal entry, which stopped further automatic continuations. The completion command logged this report; the proof was checked through Lean commands and comparison with the paper. If execution failed or was cancelled, TeXRA paused the active goal.

Repository events and progress checks. We used GitHub subscriptions to notify the proving session of changes in the repository. The TeXRA implementation at 9114c3eb2d provided a `github_subscription` tool for watching a repository, an individual pull request, or an issue. TeXRA polled GitHub through its REST API and sent changes to the subscribing session as follow-up messages. Pull-request subscriptions reported comments and reviews from accounts that passed the bot filter, including agents using author accounts. The filter checked GitHub account type and the `[bot]` login suffix. Subscriptions also reported failed checks and their annotations, changes in merge conflicts, and completed continuous-integration checks for the latest pull-request commit.

The subscription distinguished completed checks from passing checks for each commit, so a successful rerun could produce a new notification after an earlier failure. A pull-request subscription ended when the pull request closed or merged. An issue subscription remained active after closure and notified the session if the issue reopened. TeXRA queued these events with user messages and delivered them before the goal reminder. The agent could then respond to repository changes while continuing to work toward the same objective and stopping condition.

The orchestrator also called `progressCheck` at the end of a session. This read-only agent inspected the objective, subagent results, Git and pull-request state, and follow-up tasks that could now proceed. The agent recommended whether to stop, continue with a task, choose among remaining tasks, or ask the user when the objective was unclear. Its report returned to the parent session as a follow-up message, and the orchestrator then acted on the recommendation. The orchestrator thus checked for remaining work before ending the session.

Proof-task checks. At the pinned snapshot, the repository instructions directed agents to read the LIDT paper, then the blueprint, then the Lean code. For a theorem labelled as coming from the paper, agents had to preserve the paper’s hypotheses and conclusion. After each edit, they had to compare the Lean statement with the paper and identify any extra assumptions or changes to the conclusion.

Agents first type-checked the changed Lean file and checked for unfinished proofs. Changes to imports or shared declarations also required a library build. They also reviewed whether the compiled proof established the requested statement. The final-theorem axiom audit is described in [Supplementary Appendix A](#).

The pull-request conventions in [Section E.5](#) specified how to report partial progress or close a completed task.

E.8 Codebase metrics and project timeline

At completion of the proof, the library contains 126,367 lines of Lean across 337 files. [Table S11](#) summarizes the library metrics and the formalization timeline.

Table S11 | Library and formalization metrics at proof completion (24 June 2026). Commit counts include every ancestor reachable from that revision.

Measurement	Value
Lines of Lean in the library	126,367
Lean source files in the library	337
Library sorry tokens	0
Explicit custom axioms	0
Lean / Mathlib version	v4.31.0
Formalization timeline	7 March–24 June 2026
Calendar days / active commit days	110 / 83
Commits reachable from the snapshot	2,778
Pull requests merged by 24 June 2026	1,790

We counted commits reachable from the pinned snapshot and active commit days from their author dates. The pull-request count includes requests merged by 24 June 2026.

E.9 Account attribution and agent commit contributions

We counted commits by author name and by agent names in the Co-Authored-By field, using the history up to commit b39705. [Table S12](#) separates agent-named accounts from author accounts and lists author-account commits that name an agent as a co-author. Although git author metadata attributes 2,314 commits (83.3%) to author accounts, all formal Lean code was generated by autonomous language-model sessions. Interactive agent sessions running locally in developer terminals inherited the host environment’s default git credentials, so commits created during local agent runs were recorded under author accounts in the early days. Later, we explicitly configured bot identifiers for different agent harnesses to the best effort.

Table S12 | Account names and agent co-author markers at commit b39705 (24 June 2026). The last row counts author-account commits that name an agent as co-author; these commits are also included in the author-account row. Local agent sessions committed under host author accounts in the early days.

Account or marker	Commits
All commits reachable from the snapshot	2,778
Author accounts	2,314
Agent-named accounts	464
Author-account commits with agent co-author trailers	327

We collected author identities and commit messages, grouped aliases of the same author, and identified agent names in the author field and Co-Authored-By trailers. Agent-named accounts and agent co-author trailers identify 791 commits (28.5%). But in fact, all of the commits are being carried out by the agents.

E.10 Model token usage and accounting

We measured model token usage across the MIPStarRE repository and the older workspace that enclosed its checkout, which together encompass the low-degree test formalization and related preparatory developments. We combine TeXRA exports, machine checkpoints, native Codex logs, and OpenCode message accounting after removing duplicate histories from forked sessions. The resulting dataset contains 56,089 interactive records. These records account for 30.121 billion tokens: 30.035 billion input tokens and 85.676 million output tokens. Relative to the completed library of 126,367 lines of verified Lean, this corresponds to an overall intensity of approximately 238,000 tokens per line of accepted Lean. The marked asymmetry between input and output tokens reflects the structure of interactive formalization: each turn feeds the entire file context, Lake compiler diagnostics, and blueprint dependencies back to the model, while the model generates concise tactic scripts or proof repairs. Additional Codex index counters remain separate from this total, as missing session logs prevent deduplicating inherited fork history or resolving overlap with TeXRA exports. Continuous-integration workflow runs in GitHub Actions from the same period (1 April–4 June 2026) yielded no surviving recoverable token counts.

Figure S5 plots TeXRA usage alongside reported dollar values, and Figure S6 presents native Codex and OpenCode separately. The recorded API usage value for TeXRA totaled \$10,181.77 USD, whereas OpenCode operated through enterprise API endpoints without per-call dollar tagging and native Codex ran under fixed subscription seats. Table S13 breaks down input and output by model whenever recorded, placing entries without a recorded model in dedicated categories.




Figure S5 | Recorded model usage in TeXRA across the MIPStarRE workspaces and the older workspace that enclosed them. Token bars show input plus output; cached input is counted once. TeXRA includes API and subscription routes. Dollar bars show reported usage values, not subscription charges. Model colours match Figure S6.




Figure S6 | Recorded native model usage in the retained project sessions. Token bars show input plus output; cached input is counted once. OpenCode output includes recorded reasoning tokens. Native Codex was used through a subscription. Identified Codex sessions from TeXRA are excluded. Model colours match Figure S5; token counts here are in millions. Dollar bars show reported usage values.

Table S13 | Recorded token usage in the MIPStarRE workspaces and the older workspace that enclosed them, combining retained TeXRA machine exports and recovered native Codex and OpenCode records. Token counts are in millions. Cached input is part of input; share is the fraction of all input and output tokens.

Model	Input	Cached input	Output	Share (%)
GPT-5.4	14,721.154	12,713.549	44.090	49.020
GPT-5.5	9,262.304	8,761.890	20.089	30.817
DeepSeek-pro	2,162.273	2,143.377	6.847	7.201
Claude Opus 4.6	1,407.632	1,326.941	2.424	4.681
GPT-5.6 Sol	793.349	705.352	2.481	2.642
TeXRA (model unrecorded)	436.082	416.408	1.324	1.452
Claude Sonnet 4.6	432.370	420.189	2.351	1.443
Claude Opus 4.7	214.177	182.612	0.798	0.714
Kimi K3	208.834	204.026	1.706	0.699
GPT-5.4-mini	171.567	155.870	1.667	0.575
Codex (model unrecorded)	159.255	151.258	0.803	0.531
Claude Opus 4.8	44.753	43.214	0.393	0.150
Gemini 3.1 Pro	15.710	13.613	0.366	0.053
Claude SDK (model unrecorded)	2.723	2.519	0.044	0.009
GLM-4.7	1.579	1.512	0.013	0.005
DeepSeek-flash	0.837	0.751	0.005	0.003
GPT-5.2	0.237	0.076	0.145	0.001
Claude Opus 5	0.274	0.000	0.065	0.001
gpt54pro	0.189	0.000	0.003	0.001
GPT-5.6 Terra	0.094	0.014	0.064	0.001
big-pickle	0.031	0.015	0.000	0.000
Total	30,035.425	27,243.188	85.676	100.000




Figure S7 | Recorded usage during formalization. Calls are selected through 4 June 2026, as in the proof-status figure. Retained call dates cover 1 April to 22 May 2026. The bands accumulate 22.56 billion input and output tokens from 54,916 records, assigned to an explicit call or message creation timestamp of each call (UTC). A further 6.49 billion recorded tokens have no retained call date and are omitted; calls dated outside the formalization period are also excluded.




Figure S8 | Recorded token usage and dollar amounts by agent and model. Aligned rows merge verified agent aliases and retain harness origins. The left panel stacks input plus output tokens by model; the right panel stacks reported usage values using the same colours. Native Codex and Claude Code use subscriptions. Reported values are not subscription charges; a dagger marks records without a reported value.




Figure S9 | Prompt caching in the combined workspace records. Each rate is the sum of recorded cache-read tokens divided by the sum of input tokens for that model and route. We separate recorded routes when a model appears in multiple harnesses, including OpenCode. These labels identify the route, not an additional model. Colours match [Figure S5](#).

[Figure S7](#) charts the chronology of calls with recoverable dates between 7 March and 4 June 2026, grouped by model provider. These retained dates do not span the entire interval, and the workspace totals also include undated records as well as activity outside this window. [Figure S8](#) groups token volumes and reported usage values by agent identifier and native client. Across all providers, prompt caching served 90.7% of total input tokens. [Figure S9](#) compares these cache-read proportions across models and execution routes, weighting each entry by input volume.

F The review dataset

F.1 Population

The review dataset classified in the main text consists of the GitHub comments and review reports left on pull requests and issues in the MIPStarRE repository. We retrieved them via the GitHub REST API on 27 July 2026: review reports across all 1,904 closed pull requests, alongside repository-wide listings of inline comments, issue discussions, and pull-request threads. The 1,904 closed pull requests span numbers 1 to 2,615 (opened between 20 March and 17 July 2026, with 1,816 merged); every pull request carrying discussion comments belongs to this set. Each entry entered the inventory under an identifier combining its type in [Table S14](#) with its GitHub ID, preserving its body text, author, account category, timestamp, and target thread. Inline comments are split into root comments and replies. In addition, 1,089 review reports recorded a submission state, all “commented”, without comment body text. These entries count in the population inventory and in the classified totals; because they carry no comment text, we report below the effect of routing all of them to repository process.

Table S14 | The 21,651 review comments and reports retrieved on 27 July 2026, by type and by the account type that GitHub assigns to the author.

Record type	Count	Bot accounts	User accounts
Review reports	7,656	6,859	797
Inline review comments, roots	6,426	6,426	0
Inline review comments, replies	790	8	782
Pull-request discussion comments	2,675	1,208	1,467
Issue comments outside pull requests	4,104	2,531	1,573
Total	21,651	17,032	4,619

Each review action is counted individually: an underlying mathematical issue typically spans an initial root comment, replies, change requests, and a subsequent approval. Automated review agents, posting under dedicated bot identities, opened all 6,426 inline root comments: Claude Code, GitHub Copilot, Cursor Bugbot, and the Codex connector. The 782 inline replies under user accounts reflect automated proving and repair agents operating through personal developer credentials ([Section E.9](#)); human authors wrote no Lean code throughout the project, providing only high-level steering and occasional review comments.

F.2 Reading and classification

Classification proceeded in two stages: an open-ended reading pass with GPT-5.4, followed by a deterministic term-matching classifier. Because the Lean compiler verifies type correctness but cannot judge whether definitions and theorems match the intended mathematics of the paper, review focused heavily on checking formal declarations and intermediate arguments against the published proof. The 21,651 comments and reports were grouped chronologically by pull request or issue into 2,733 reading units of at most 20 comments, allowing the model to evaluate replies, root comments, and review reports in their conversational context.

For each comment or report, the model returned a summary of the claim, a descriptive mechanism label and definition, and categorical ratings for signal class, defect support, severity, follow-up status, and thematic relevance. To ensure every summary was grounded directly in the comments, the prompt required exact reading receipts consisting of verbatim substrings extracted from the comment text and from any supporting resolution. An automated harness validated every response against the inputs, retrying generations that omitted comments, produced invalid labels, or failed exact-substring checks, yielding 15,773 distinct validated mechanism labels in the archived dataset.

We then grouped these labels into the three primary categories and nine subcategories of the main-text table using a deterministic classifier. The script scores normalized text across the model’s structured outputs against curated term lists for each subcategory, isolating technical claims from conversational phrasing. Each entry is assigned to the subcategory with the highest match count, breaking ties in favor of the first-listed subcategory in the taxonomy; 117 entries without domain matches defaulted to repository process. The versioned classification script reproduces all twelve counts of the main-text table exactly.

Mathematics and agreement with the paper remains the largest category across all classification variations. Top-score ties occurred across categories in 2,574 instances. Under the default taxonomy ordering, mathematical alignment receives 55.2%. Reversing the tie-breaking priority yields 45.2%, and excluding cross-category ties yields 51.3%. Routing all 1,089 textless reviews to process gives 52.2%.

An independent pilot study on the inline root comments tested the taxonomy against other model families: GPT-5.6 Terra and Sol classified the comments with context, and Claude Opus 4.8 adjudicated disagreements. When projected onto our three categories, the pilot agreed with the term classifier on 62.7% of the mapped roots (4,023 of 6,412). The pilot assigned 37.2% of roots to mathematical alignment versus 57.0% from the keyword classifier, reflecting the broader keyword coverage used in the script.

Follow-up labels mark the immediate response visible within the discussion thread. Across the entire population, 3,953 findings identified a concrete defect or plausible risk claim. Of these, 713 (18.0% of defect claims, but only 3.3% of the total 21,651 review events) prompted an observed code change in the same discussion thread. A further 3,038 findings (76.9% of defect claims) were accepted without an observed change, deferred, or left without a reply; most other comments were routine bookkeeping or positive confirmations.

F.3 Examples of review findings

Table S15, Table S16, and Table S17 give one to three findings for each subcategory of the main-text table, each from a comment or report in the review dataset that the reading pass labelled a confirmed defect with an observed change and the classifier placed in the subcategory shown. For each finding, the first line states the form the paper, the blueprint, or the interface requires, the second the form the reviewed draft had, and the third the form after the repair; where a formula or code fragment is shown, the defect is marked with defect highlighting and the repair with repair highlighting.

Table S15 | Review findings under “Mathematics and agreement with the paper”. Paper: the required form; Draft: the reviewed form; Repair: the merged form.

Subcategory	Finding
Mathematical content	Paper (Prop. 4.9, A and B projective): $\text{sdd}(\psi; A, B) = 2 \text{cons}(\psi; A, B)$, so $\approx_{2\delta} \Leftrightarrow \approx_{\delta}$. Draft: $\text{cons} \leq \text{sdd}$, although the same calculation had established the equality, giving only $\approx_{\delta} \Rightarrow \approx_{\delta}$ and doubling the error at every use. Repair: $2 \text{cons} = \text{sdd}$ and the implication restated as $\approx_{2\delta} \Rightarrow \approx_{\delta}$ (PR #515).
Mathematical content	Paper (commutativity of points): $A_a^u \otimes I \simeq_{\gamma m} I \otimes L_{[f(u)=a]}^{\ell}$ on average over a uniformly random point u and a uniformly random line ℓ through it. Draft: the question distribution was $\mathcal{D} = \delta_{(\ell_0, t_0)}$, a point mass on one default question, so the averaged relation constrained a single (ℓ, t) and a strategy failing almost everywhere still satisfied the bound. Repair: $\mathcal{D} = \text{Unif}(\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{F}_q)$, and $\text{Unif}(\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{F}_q^2)$ for the two-point relation, with the line set $\mathcal{L}$ finite through $\ell \mapsto (\text{base}, \text{direction})$ (PR #121).
Mathematical content	Paper (local variance of points): six steps with errors $2\delta, 2\epsilon, \frac{md}{q}, \frac{md}{q}, 2\epsilon, 2\delta$ and the k-step triangle inequality give $\approx_{6(4\epsilon + 4\delta + 2md/q)}$, relaxed to $24(\epsilon + \delta + \frac{md}{q})$. Draft obligation: $\leq 4\epsilon + 4\delta + 2\frac{md}{q}$, the factor $k = 6$ dropped, six times stronger than the chain proves. Repair: $\leq 6(4\epsilon + 4\delta + 2\frac{md}{q})$, with $6(\dots) \leq 24(\epsilon + \delta + \frac{md}{q})$ as a separate lemma (PR #780).
Source and blueprint correspondence	Blueprint (pasted sum to a polynomial in G): for a bipartite state ψ_{bi}, $\mathbb{E}_x \sum_{ \tau \geq d+1} \sum_g \langle \psi_{\text{bi}} \hat{H}_g^x \otimes I \psi_{\text{bi}} \rangle \approx_{\nu_8} \sum_{r=d+1}^k \binom{k}{r} \langle \psi_{\text{bi}} G^r (I - G)^{k-r} \otimes I \psi_{\text{bi}} \rangle$. Draft: a free state parameter with the added premise $\psi_{\text{bi}} = \psi$, absent from the blueprint and never used in the proof. Repair: parameter and premise removed; the lemma is stated at the strategy’s state ψ, the identification the paper makes (PR #446).
Source and blueprint correspondence	Paper (cascade bound): $\nu \leq 10000 k^2 m^2 (\epsilon^{1/1024} + (d/q)^{1/1024}) \Rightarrow \sigma \leq 10000 k^2 m^4 E$. Draft blueprint, tagged complete: $0 \leq \nu \wedge \nu \leq 1000 k^2 m^2(\dots)$, a conjunct Lean never assumes and a coefficient ten times too small. Repair: $\nu \leq 10000 k^2 m^2(\dots)$, matching Lean symbol for symbol (PR #507).
Semantic and API invariants	Paper: a sub-measurement is $\{A^a\}$ with $A^a \geq 0$ and $\sum_a A^a = T \leq I$. Draft: the three invariants became structure fields with default proofs left unproved, so any caller obtained them for free. Repair: no defaults; every construction site proves $A^a \geq 0$, $\sum_a A^a = T$, and $T \leq I$ (PR #124).

Table S16 | Review findings under “Exposition and library design”.

Subcategory	Finding
Mathematical exposition	Interface (base case $m = 1$): the distinguished outcomes are the zero polynomial, $a_A = a_B = 0$. Draft: the docstring said so; the code took <code>Classical.choice (inferInstance: Nonempty _)</code>, an arbitrary element not provably equal to 0. Repair: <code>a_A = a_B = 0</code> built explicitly, with the proof $\deg_{x_i} 0 \leq d$ (PR #1044).
Mathematical exposition	Definition: normalization is $\tau(\rho) = 1$ for the density operator ρ under the normalized trace, with no purity assumption. Draft docstring: $\langle \psi \psi \rangle = 1$, “as is standard for pure strategies”. Repair: $\tau(\rho) = 1$, coinciding with $\langle \psi \psi \rangle = 1$ for pure states; the corrected reading gave $\tau(\rho) = 1 \Rightarrow \dim \mathcal{H} \geq 1$ and removed a redundant instance argument (PR #443).
Library architecture and API	Blueprint: the public successor-step wrapper returns $G \in \text{PolyMeas}(m + 1, q, d)$ “without exposing the intermediate bookkeeping packages”. Draft: its hypotheses mentioned a <code>private</code> helper for the restriction package $\mathcal{R}$ five times, a name no caller outside the module can write. Repair: <code>\mathcal{R} := ofRestrictedProbabilities(...)</code> bound locally inside each hypothesis (PR #649).
Library architecture and API	Paper (restricted probabilities): $\mathbb{E}_x[\frac{m}{m+1}\varepsilon_x] \leq \varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}_x[\frac{m}{m+1}\gamma_x] \leq \gamma$, one transverse weight for both branches. Draft: $\mathbb{E}_x[w_{\text{diag}}\gamma_x] \leq \gamma$ with w_{diag} deleted earlier and undefined, so the module did not elaborate. Repair: $\mathbb{E}_x[\frac{m}{m+1}\gamma_x] \leq \gamma$ (PR #660).
Reuse and maintainability	The review certified the six-step chain and $6(4\varepsilon + 4\delta + 2\frac{md}{q}) \leq 24(\varepsilon + \delta + \frac{md}{q})$ against the paper. Draft: the line-chart identity $\ell_{u,i,t_0}(t) = u[i \mapsto (u_i - t_0) + t]$ was proved twice, once as a helper nothing called and once inline. Repair: helper deleted, the identity stated once (PR #898).
Reuse and maintainability	The final stage needs $\sqrt{100m} \leq 10m$, $\sqrt{10m} \leq 4m$, $\sqrt{400m} \leq 20m$, and $\sqrt{960m} \leq 31m$ for $m \geq 1$. Draft: the four bounds were <code>private</code> and unused in the helper module and re-proved verbatim in the module that needed them. Repair: <code>public</code>, stated once, the duplicates deleted (PR #1295).

Table S17 | Review findings under “Audit and execution infrastructure”.

Subcategory	Finding
Build, CI and review automation	Invariant: review runs skip commits produced by automation prefixes (Claude and Codex, automatic and review-driven). Draft guard: <code>^\[claude-(auto review)-fix\]</code>, allowing Codex prefixes to escape and re-trigger review loops. Repair: <code>^\[(claude codex)-(auto review)-fix\]</code> (PR #1392).
Build, CI and review automation	Coverage test: required scripts in workflow w must be included in path filters for each trigger e. Draft: evaluated path filters across the union of all YAML blocks, masking missing triggers. Repair: enforced path filter coverage independently for each trigger block (PR #960).
Reproducibility, security and environment	The documented per-file check must terminate. Draft: one simplification step with 22 arguments made the file’s check exceed 120 s and caused the CI build to time out. Repair: reverted the step to an explicit tracked obligation naming the missing reindexing, allowing the build to pass (PR #662).
Reproducibility, security and environment	Toolchain pin audit: ensure toolchain version strings match between README and lakefile. Draft: string mismatch between ‘4.28.0’ and ‘v4.28.0’. Repair: normalized version strings on both sides before comparison (PR #762).
Repository process and evidence	Idempotent notices: automated merge notices include a deduplication marker to prevent re-posting upon webhook redelivery. Draft: notice body inserted text inside the marker, causing re-posting on redelivered merge events. Repair: moved deduplication marker to a strict body prefix, plus a regression test (PR #2595).

G Prompt for auditing and repairing the formalization

During major repair phases, when accumulated conditional wrappers and stand-in structures obscured the remaining mathematical debt, we the human deployed a comprehensive audit-and-repair prompt across the repository. The prompt instructs agents to audit theorem declarations against the published paper and interactive blueprint, classify every discrepancy, and either restore source-faithful statements with tracked obligations or extract useful intermediate lemmas.

We apply this prompt once in the goal mode to the repository, where after each natural end turn of the agent, another progress check agent is launched to check the progress of the repair, and then prompt the main agent to continue the repair. The complete audit and repair instruction follows.

Audit and repair prompt

Audit and repair the LDT formalization so that paper-facing Lean and blueprint statements match the source paper, and so that remaining red or unfinished dependency-graph nodes are classified by their real mathematical status.

Work in `~/Local/agentFormalization/MIPStarRE`. The source of truth is `references/ldt-paper/`, then `blueprint/src/`, then `MIPStarRE/`. Also check the GitHub Pages branch in a separate worktree and inspect the generated blueprint dependency graph, including `dep_graph_document.html`, so that the audit reflects the public non-green nodes.

This is not a renaming task. Mechanical renames of Bridge, Package, Residual, Repair, Producer, Input, or Hypotheses do not solve the problem. The task is to determine what mathematical assertion is missing or incorrectly represented, and then either prove it, state it faithfully with a tracked sorry, or remove the misleading paper-facing link.

Main invariants:

1. A theorem, lemma, or proposition advertised as a paper result must match the cited statement in `references/ldt-paper/` up to faithful formal encoding. Do not add a bridge, residual, repair, package, producer, input, generic hypotheses bundle, or arbitrary implication hypothesis to make the theorem compile.
2. If a proof step is missing, keep the paper-facing theorem visible and source-faithful. It may contain a tracked sorry during paper-realignment mode. The missing step should become a named proof obligation or construction theorem, not an extra assumption on the paper theorem.
3. Conditional helpers may remain only when they preserve useful mathematics. They must have names and docstrings that say they are internal obligations, not source hypotheses. They must not be linked by `\leanok` to the source-labelled blueprint theorem.
4. Some boundary hypotheses may be faithful formal encodings: positivity needed for division, nonemptiness, decidability, field-model instances, or finite-type structure. These must be distinguished from load-bearing invented proof assumptions.
5. Prefer larger useful repair batches. Each PR should discharge several related audit items when possible, but avoid unrelated refactoring.

Audit procedure:

A. Inspect the public dependency graph from the GitHub Pages branch and list the non-green or missing nodes. For each node, compare:

- the paper statement in `references/ldt-paper/`;
- the blueprint statement and its `\lean{}` / `\leanok` status;
- the Lean declaration, if any;
- whether the Lean proof contains sorry, axiom, or proof-evasion scaffolding;

- whether the Lean statement has extra hypotheses or a weakened conclusion.

B. Scan the Lean and blueprint sources for proof-debt vocabulary and conditional scaffolding: Bridge, bridge, Residual, residual, Repair, repair, Package, package, Producer, producer, Input, input, Hypotheses, hypotheses, Assumptions, assumptions, sorryAx, obstruction, conditional, ofBridge, ofObligations.

Classification for every item:

- Missing statement: no Lean declaration yet corresponds to the paper statement.
- Stated with proof hole: Lean declaration is source-faithful but contains sorry.
- Unlinked statement: Lean declaration exists and is faithful, but the blueprint does not point to it.
- Unfaithful statement: Lean declaration has extra non-paper hypotheses, changed quantifiers, weakened conclusions, or packaged conclusions.
- Conditional helper: useful internal theorem, but not the paper theorem.
- Boundary condition: extra Lean hypothesis appears mathematically necessary for a faithful formal encoding.
- Obsolete scaffolding: conditional object has no mathematical value and should be removed or replaced by a sorry in the source-faithful theorem.

Repair policy:

1. First recover actual mathematics from existing scaffolding. If a bridge or package contains a real construction or inequality, extract a self-contained theorem stated from paper hypotheses.
2. If the scaffold merely assumes the missing step, do not preserve it as a paper theorem. Restore the paper-aligned statement and leave the missing proof as a tracked sorry or named obligation.
3. Update the blueprint only when the Lean statement is faithful. Remove or avoid \leanok for conditional helpers.
4. Add concise docstrings for proof obligations explaining the paper label, the missing mathematical step, and the intended discharge.
5. Update tracking issues. Use native GitHub subissues to connect the main bridge-debt tracking issue to specific repair tasks. One PR may address multiple subissues.
6. Treat statement drift and definition drift as high priority, because incorrect definitions propagate through downstream theorems.
7. Assign yourself when you do it

Deliverables:

- A table or issue comment classifying the non-green dependency graph nodes and remaining sorry sites by mathematical status.
- One or more PRs that make real mathematical progress: source-faithful statements restored, useful obligations proved or isolated, misleading conditional paper links removed, and local checks improved where cheap.
- For each PR, include a statement integrity audit: paper assumptions, Lean assumptions, paper conclusion, Lean conclusion, verdict.
- Validation commands in the PR body. Prefer local single-file checks first; run lake build only when the batch touches shared declarations.

H Tools distilled for new formalizations

FormalFlow evolved as we carried out the formalization. Proof attempts and mathematical review exposed missing obligations and recurring discrepancies, which led us to revise the project instructions, review procedures, and automated checks. We distilled reusable parts of this work into a project template and supporting tools for new formalizations. These tools bring together the preparation of a Lean project, the correspondence between mathematical statements and formal declarations, and the instructions followed in proving sessions. The preceding appendices record how the system developed in the LIDT formalization; here we describe what a new project can reuse.

Preparing the project. `oh-my-formalization` collects the initial project structure in a template: a Lean package with a pinned Mathlib dependency, a blueprint, paper-gap notes, and automated builds. The blueprint links mathematical statements to Lean declarations and records their dependencies. The template also includes procedures for publishing the blueprint and gap notes, so that the mathematics and its corrections can be read alongside the formal development. `lean-env-action` provides the common Lean environment for the automated checks, including retrieval of compiled Mathlib dependencies. The project then runs `lake build` and its own verification commands. A new formalization supplies the paper, definitions, and target statements in place of the template’s sample mathematics.

Maintaining the mathematical account. `texra-blueprint` collects shared tools for rendering the blueprint and recording departures from the paper. It supports declaration links, dependency references, and bibliographies, with checks for specified rendering errors. Its paper-gap notes preserve the cited assertion, the mathematical point at issue, and the proposed correction, together with the status of the decision. Checks require registered source identifiers and reject references to missing notes; the notes are published as individual PDFs with a common index. This makes the proof-gap protocol available from the beginning of a project: when a proof requires an additional hypothesis or a changed bound, the mathematical change has an explicit record for subsequent review.

Carrying the procedures across sessions. `texra-lean-skills` collects reusable instructions for agents working on Lean proofs. They cover searching the existing library, developing proofs, maintaining the blueprint, recording gaps, and simplifying proofs without changing their statements. Shared conventions also specify documentation and review requirements. The project supplies the mathematical context and open obligations, while these instructions give successive sessions a common procedure for addressing them. As in the LIDT formalization, further proof attempts and review can lead to revisions of that procedure.

Together, these tools provide a starting point for applying FormalFlow to a new mathematical problem. The target theorem and its dependencies determine the proof tasks; the blueprint and gap notes retain the mathematical account as those tasks are resolved. The review and repeated audit described in Methods and [Supplementary Appendix G](#) check the resulting development against the intended statements.

References

- [1] Georges Gonthier. Formal proof—the four-color theorem. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 55(11):1382–1393, 2008.
- [2] Georges Gonthier, Andrea Asperti, Jeremy Avigad, Yves Bertot, Cyril Cohen, François Garillot, Stéphane Le Roux, Assia Mahboubi, Russell O’Connor, Sidi Ould Biha, Ioana Pasca, Laurence Rideau, Alexey Solovyev, Enrico Tassi, and Laurent Théry. A machine-checked proof of the odd order theorem. In *ITP*, pages 163–179, 2013.
- [3] Thomas Hales, Mark Adams, Gertrud Bauer, Tat Dat Dang, John Harrison, Le Truong Hoang, Cezary Kaliszyk, Victor Magron, Sean McLaughlin, Tat Thang Nguyen, Quang Truong Nguyen, Tobias Nipkow, Steven Obua, Joseph Pleso, Jason Rute, Alexey Solovyev, Thi Hoai An Ta, Nam Trung Tran, Thi Diep Trieu, Josef Urban, Ky Vu, and Roland Zumkeller. A formal proof of the Kepler conjecture. *Forum Math. Pi*, 5:e2, 2017.
- [4] Johan Commelin and Adam Topaz. Abstraction boundaries and spec driven development in pure mathematics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 61(2):241–255, 2024.
- [5] Kevin Buzzard and Richard Taylor. Towards a Lean proof of Fermat’s last theorem. <https://imperialcollegelondon.github.io/FLT/>, 2024. Project website.
- [6] Stanislas Polu and Ilya Sutskever. Generative language modeling for automated theorem proving. arXiv:2009.03393 [cs.LG], 2020.
- [7] Guillaume Lample, Timothée Lacroix, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Aurélien Rodriguez, Amaury Hayat, Thibaut Lavril, Gabriel Ebner, and Xavier Martinet. HyperTree proof search for neural theorem proving. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [8] Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. miniF2F: A cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [9] Yuhuai Wu, Albert Q. Jiang, Wenda Li, Markus N. Rabe, Charles Staats, Mateja Jamnik, and Christian Szegedy. Autoformalization with large language models. In *NeurIPS*, pages 32353–32368, 2022.
- [10] Trieu H. Trinh, Yuhuai Wu, Quoc V. Le, He He, and Thang Luong. Solving olympiad geometry without human demonstrations. *Nature*, 625(7995):476–482, 2024.
- [11] 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 sub-goal decomposition. arXiv:2504.21801 [cs.CL], 2025.
- [12] Thomas Hubert, Rishi Mehta, Laurent Sartran, Miklós Z. Horváth, Goran Žužić, Eric Wieser, Aja Huang, Julian Schrittwieser, Yannick Schroecker, Hussain Masoom, Ottavia Bertolli, Tom Zahavy, Amol Mandhane, Jessica Yung, Iuliya Beloshapka, Borja Ibarz, Vivek Veeriah, Lei Yu, Oliver Nash, Paul Lezeau, Salvatore Mercuri, Calle Sönne, Bhavik Mehta, Alex Davies, Daniel Zheng, Fabian Pedregosa, Yin Li, Ingrid von Glehn, Mark Rowland, Samuel Albanie, Ameya Velingker, Simon Schmitt, Edward Lockhart, Edward Hughes, Henryk Michalewski, Nicolas Sonnerat, Demis Hassabis, Pushmeet Kohli, and David Silver. Olympiad-level formal mathematical reasoning with reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 651(8106):607–613, 2026.
- [13] Ahmad Rammal, Niket Patel, Fabian Gloeckle, Amaury Hayat, Julia Kempe, Remi Munos, Charles Arnal, and Vivien Cabannes. Formalizing mathematics at scale. arXiv:2605.29955 [cs.AI], 2026.
- [14] George Tsoukalas, Anton Kovsharov, Sergey Shirobokov, Anja Surina, Moritz Firsching, Gergely Bérczi, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, Arun Suggala, Adam Zsolt Wagner, Eric Wieser, Lei Yu, Aja Huang, Miklós Z. Horváth, Andrew Ferraiuolo, Henryk Michalewski, Edward Lockhart, Codrut Grosu, Thomas Hubert, Matej Balog, Pushmeet Kohli, and Swarat Chaudhuri. Advancing mathematics research with AI-driven formal proof search. arXiv:2605.22763 [cs.AI], 2026.
- [15] OpenAI. Ten advances in mathematics and theoretical computer science. <https://openai.com/index/ten-advances-in-mathematics/>, 2026. Online report.
- [16] Yuanhe Zhang, Yuekai Sun, Taiji Suzuki, Jason D. Lee, and Fanghui Liu. LeanMarathon: Toward reliable AI co-mathematicians through long-horizon Lean autoformalization. arXiv:2606.05400 [cs.AI], 2026.
- [17] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R. Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world GitHub issues? In *ICLR*, 2024.

- [18] John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. SWE-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. In *NeurIPS*, pages 50528–50652, 2024.
- [19] Patrick Massot. leanblueprint: A plasTeX plugin to build formalization blueprints. <https://github.com/PatrickMassot/leanblueprint>, 2020. GitHub repository.
- [20] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. $MIP^* = RE$. arXiv:2001.04383 [quant-ph], 2020.
- [21] Alain Connes. Classification of injective factors. Cases II_1 , II_∞ , III_λ , $\lambda \neq 1$. *Ann. Math.*, 104(1):73–115, 1976.
- [22] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. Quantum soundness of the classical low individual degree test. arXiv:2009.12982 [quant-ph], 2020.
- [23] Thomas Vidick. Three-player entangled XOR games are NP-hard to approximate. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(3):1007–1063, 2016.
- [24] Anand Natarajan and Thomas Vidick. Two-player entangled games are NP-hard. In *CCC*, pages 20:1–20:18, 2018. Withdrawn due to an error inherited from arXiv:1302.1242.
- [25] Anand Natarajan and Thomas Vidick. Low-degree testing for quantum states, and a quantum entangled games PCP for QMA. In *FOCS*, pages 731–742, 2018.
- [26] Anand Natarajan and John Wright. NEXP is contained in MIP^* . In *FOCS*, pages 510–518, 2019.
- [27] Thomas Vidick. It happens to everyone...but it’s not fun. <https://mycqstate.wordpress.com/2020/09/29/it-happens-to-everyonebut-its-not-fun/>, 2020. Blog post.
- [28] Binghai Wang, Chenlong Zhang, Dayiheng Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Jiawei Chen, Mingze Li, Mouxiang Chen, Rongyao Fang, Siyuan Zhang, Xuwu Wang, Yuheng Jing, Zeyao Ma, and Zeyu Cui. The verification horizon: no silver bullet for coding agent rewards. arXiv:2606.26300, 2026.
- [29] Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in AI safety. arXiv:1606.06565 [cs.AI], 2016.
- [30] Boris Alexeev. Erdos90: Formal Lean proof of OpenAI’s 2026 counterexample to the Erdős unit distance conjecture. <https://github.com/plby/Erdos90>, 2026. GitHub repository.
- [31] Sirui Lu, Erickson Tjoa, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Multi-agent autoformalization of tensor network theory. arXiv:2607.07857 [quant-ph], 2026.
- [32] Leonardo de Moura, Soonho Kong, Jeremy Avigad, Floris van Doorn, and Jakob von Raumer. The Lean theorem prover (system description). In *CADE*, pages 378–388, 2015.
- [33] The mathlib Community. The Lean mathematical library. In *CPP*, pages 367–381, 2020.
- [34] Ran Raz and Shmuel Safra. A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability PCP characterization of NP. In *STOC*, pages 475–484, 1997.
- [35] Alexander Polishchuk and Daniel A. Spielman. Nearly-linear size holographic proofs. In *STOC*, pages 194–203, 1994.
- [36] Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *CADE*, pages 625–635, 2021.