

A Closer Look at Logical Reasoning with LLMs: The Choice of Tool Matters

Long Hei Matthew Lam
Monash University

llam0013@student.monash.edu.au

Ehsan Shareghi

Monash University

Ehsan.Shareghi@monash.edu

Abstract

Logical reasoning serves as a cornerstone for human cognition. Recently, the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) has demonstrated promising progress in solving logical reasoning tasks effectively. To improve this capability, recent studies have delved into integrating LLMs with various symbolic solvers using diverse techniques and methodologies. While some combinations excel on specific datasets, others fall short. However, it remains unclear whether the variance in performance stems from the methodologies employed or the specific symbolic solvers utilized. Therefore, there is a lack of consistent comparison between symbolic solvers and how they influence LLM’s logical reasoning ability. We perform experiments on LLMs integrated with 3 symbolic solvers: Z3, Pyke, and Prover9, and compare their performance on 3 logical reasoning datasets: ProofWriter, PrOntoQA, and FOLIO. Our findings indicate that when combined with LLMs Pyke’s performance is significantly inferior to that of Prover9 and Z3. Z3’s overall accuracy performance slightly surpasses Prover9, but Prover9 could execute more questions.¹

1 Introduction

Logical reasoning constitutes a fundamental aspect of human intelligence and is a key factor in solving tasks that require problem-solving, critical thinking, and decision-making skills (Huang and Chang, 2023). In recent years, Natural Language Reasoning (NLR) has shown significant advancements, propelled by the introduction of Large Language Models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023), achieving remarkable performance on a variety of natural language reasoning tasks including program synthesis, arithmetic reasoning, symbolic reasoning, and common-sense reasoning (Wei et al., 2022a; Zhu et al., 2023; Bubeck et al., 2023;

Singh et al., 2023). While LLMs demonstrate notable logical reasoning capabilities (Saparov and He, 2023; Saparov et al., 2023), they encounter three prevailing challenges. Firstly, LLMs often exhibit a propensity for heuristic shortcuts (Dasgupta et al., 2022). Secondly, they are prone to hallucinate and generate outputs that appear plausible but contradict real-world knowledge (Ji et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; McKenna et al., 2023). Thirdly, the inherent ambiguity and nuanced characteristics intrinsic to natural language present obstacles for LLMs (Kazemi et al., 2023; Han et al., 2022; Aroca-Ouellette et al., 2021).

Existing approaches to tackle these challenges could be categorised into 2 streams: (1) Relying on LLMs’ internal capabilities via mechanisms like Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022b; Kojima et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023). (2) Combining LLMs with external symbolic mechanisms (Nye et al., 2021; Pan et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023; Lyu et al., 2023). While the former approach enhances the performance of LLMs in solving logical reasoning tasks, the state-of-the-art approach integrates LLMs with symbolic solvers. This latter approach leverages LLMs’ remarkable proficiency in translating natural language into logically consistent languages such as First Order Logic (FOL) or other symbolic solvers specified language (e.g., Pyke, Z3) (Yang et al., 2023), and symbolic solver’s ability to reason transparently and faithfully (Metaxiotis et al., 2002).

There are 3 contributing factors that influence the performance of a symbolic solver augmented LLMs: (1) LLMs translation capability, and whether the LLMs can translate natural language into executable symbolic form by the symbolic solver without losing any syntactic and semantic meaning, (2) symbolic solver’s ability to process the translation and raise specific errors (i.e., the required symbolic solver specified language is dynamic, simple and interpret-able), and (3) The

¹Code and data are publicly available at https://github.com/Mattylam/Logic_Symbolic_Solvers_Experiment

choice of symbolic solver and its internal performance (i.e., Given LLM’s translation is correct and interpretable, the symbolic solver returns the correct result.). The third contributing factor is beyond the score of this project and extends into research for SAT solvers.

Existing published results try a variety of formalism and tools to compare the benefits of this paradigm (Pan et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024). Table 1 demonstrates various tools used in recent studies to tackle a variety of datasets. There is a degree of inconsistency in how these existing papers conduct experiments on different datasets, making it impossible to have a fair understanding of each approach. A contributing factor to this is the variability of tools and methods that are being used in different papers. Pan et al. (2023) justifies the use of different solvers based on the type of reasoning dataset it is trying to solve (e.g., Pyke (Frederiksen, 2008) is used to solve a Deductive Reasoning Dataset: ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021) and Z3 (de Moura and Bjørner, 2008) is used to solve an Analytical Reasoning Dataset: AR-LSAT (Zhong et al., 2022)). Whereas Ye et al. (2023) tackles ProofWriter using Z3. During our preliminary experiment, we found that Ye et al. (2023)’s approach performed significantly better than Pan et al. (2023)’s approach on ProofWriter. There is currently a lack of consistent comparison that will allow others to understand better where this performance gain stems from.

In this paper, we take 3 widely used tools Z3 (de Moura and Bjørner, 2008), Pyke (Frederiksen, 2008) and Prover9² and compare (1) the difficulty LLMs face for translating natural language into their desired input format, and (2) the internal capability of these tools at solving certain satisfiability tasks. To conduct this, we choose GPT-3.5-Turbo (OpenAI, 2023), and 3 widely used benchmarks ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021), FOLIO (Han et al., 2022), and ProntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023), and conduct a fair side-by-side comparison of tools by trying various number of identical one-shots prompts, and minimal adjustment for each solver. Our findings indicate that Pyke’s performance is significantly inferior to that of Prover9 and Z3. While Z3’s overall accuracy performance slightly surpasses Prover9, Prover9 could execute a greater number of questions.

²<https://www.cs.unm.edu/mccune/prover9/>

2 Logical Reasoning

2.1 Formalism

The study of logic and reasoning has been explored by philosophers for thousands of years. Given this field’s immense breadth and intricacy, this paper focuses on two aspects of logical reasoning (1) translation of natural language to formal logic (i.e., how natural language is represented in logical reasoning tasks.) and (2) classical logical reasoning.

2.2 Natural Language to Formal Logic

Natural language is inherently ambiguous and context-dependent (Yu et al., 2023). The same logic can be represented in different ways (i.e., *not eating or writing* equals *not eating and not writing*). The meaning of a sentence can vary given different contexts (i.e., “I saw her duck.” could mean that a pet duck was found, or she ducked down to avoid something). Whereas formal logic is unambiguous and context-independent. It prioritizes logical consistency and prevents contradictions. The translation of NL to FOL is a brittle and error-prone process. The translations not only need to be structurally correct but also functional (i.e., symbolic solvers can properly process the translation without errors). Traditionally, NL-FOL translation has been addressed via rule-based methods (Bos and Markert, 2005), but they suffer from coverage issues and fail to scale to real-life applications. Therefore, attention has been placed on LLMs to solve the NL to FOL translation problem through instruction tuning and prompting LLMs (Yang et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2023).

Propositional logic also known as First-order Logic (FOL) is built around objects and relations. It has a simple paradigm consisting of combinations of seven fundamental logics (FOLs, including conjunction \wedge , disjunction \vee , negation \neg , implication \rightarrow , equation \equiv , universal quantifier \forall , and existential quantifier \exists) with simple propositions (Enderton, 2001). Symbolic solver’s input language is constructed upon these fundamental logics, the distinction lies in their respective representations (e.g., Z3 uses `Forall()` instead of \forall . Pyke and Prover9 use the same FOL symbol \forall).

2.3 Classical Logical Reasoning

Classical logical reasoning refers to reasoning tasks that involve a clear logical reasoning path (i.e., all the information to solve the task is given explicitly

Solver	Dataset	Papers	Problem Type
Z3	AR-LSAT (Zhong et al., 2022), ProntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023), ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021), BoardgameQA (Kazemi et al., 2023)	LogicLM (Pan et al., 2023), SatLM (Ye et al., 2023)	Analytical, Deductive, FOL
Pyke	ProntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023), ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021)	LogicLM (Pan et al., 2023), Logical Solver (Feng et al., 2023)	Deductive, FOL
Prover9	FOLIO (Han et al., 2022)	LogicLM (Pan et al., 2023)	Deductive, FOL
Python-constraints	BIG-Bench (Suzgun et al., 2022), CLUTRR (Sinha et al., 2019)	LMLP (Zhang et al., 2024), ProgLM (Gao et al., 2023)	Analytical, Deductive

Table 1: A summary of the symbolic solvers and the datasets it has solved in different studies.

or implicitly). Yu et al. (2023) categories Classical Logical Reasoning into two main aspects, deductive reasoning tasks and defeasible reasoning tasks.

Deductive Reasoning is a form of logical thinking where conclusions are drawn from a set of premises or statements that are assumed to be true. Typically, the process initiates with facts and rules derived from the logical context and then progresses through a sequence of inference steps until the query can be proved or disproved (Poole and Mackworth, 2010).

Most commonly used logical reasoning datasets involve deductive reasoning rules like Modus Ponens (e.g., given “All cats are carnivores” and “Fae is a cat”, we conclude “Fae is a carnivore”) or Conjunction introduction (e.g., given "Alex is a cat" and "Alex is an orange", we conclude "Alex is a cat and orange"). ProntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023) and ProntoQA OOD (Saparov et al., 2023) are recent synthetic datasets created to analyse the capacity of LLMs for deductive reasoning in a fictional setting. The distinction between them is that ProntoQA OOD adds more complex deductive reasoning rules. ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021) is another commonly used dataset for deductive logical reasoning. The problems are expressed in a more naturalistic language form. The dataset is comprehensive and provides a close world (i.e., True/False conclusions only) and open world assumption (i.e., True/False/Unknown conclusions) with adjustable difficulty level represented by depth (i.e., the number of hops to reach a conclusion). Recent tool-augmented approaches like Ye et al. (2023) use Z3 to solve ProofWriter (Depth 5, Close World assumption ³), whereas Pan et al. (2023)

³Close World Assumption: The answers of the questions can only be True/False.

uses Pyke to solve ProofWriter (Depth 5 ⁴, Open World assumption ⁵) and ProntoQA (Depth 5).

2.4 Defeasible Reasoning

Defeasible reasoning is a form of logical reasoning that deals with conclusions that are subject to revision or change based on new information or evidence. Unlike deductive reasoning, where conclusions are certain if the premises are true, defeasible reasoning involves making non-conclusive conclusions that can be overridden by additional information (Russel and Norvig, 2003). Defeasible reasoning tasks include inductive and abductive reasoning tasks. Induction produces a new general rule from the given premises, abduction involves generating plausible hypotheses for the observation (Yu et al., 2023). A commonly used dataset for assessing defeasible reasoning tasks is defeasibleNLI (Rudinger et al., 2020), which assesses whether a premise can weaken or strengthen a likely conclusion.

Abduction is a form of logical inference that involves forming the best possible explanation or hypothesis to account for a given set of observations or facts (Bhagavatula et al., 2019). Given the statement “Jenny finds her house in a mess when she returns from work and her door was cut in half”, the hypothesis “a thief broke into her house” could be a more plausible explanation than “a kangaroo broke into her house”. This reasoning capability relies more on commonsense and LLM’s understanding of the physical world (Aroca-Ouellette et al., 2021; Srivastava et al., 2022). The tool-based approach cannot be used on these datasets because they lack

⁴Depth 5: The questions require at least 5 hops of reasoning to reach to a conclusion

⁵Open World Assumption: The answers of the questions can only be True/False/Unknown.

Dataset	Synthetic	Reasoning Type
FOLIO	✗	FOL
ProofWriter	✓	Deductive
PrOntoQA	✓	Deductive
LogiQA	✓	Mixed
CLUTTR	✓	Inductive
BoardgameQA	✓	Deductive
LogicNLI	✓	Deductive
AR-LSAT	✗	Analytical

Table 2: Statistic of typical datasets used for Natural Language Reasoning with LLMs.

a complete reasoning path for solvers to interpret.

Induction involves the generation of broader principles or generalisations derived from existing knowledge (Yu et al., 2023). In induction, the essence lies in summarising of facts and creating a general rule for it (e.g., if given an observation “Every morning for the past week, the sun has risen in the east.”, the rule induced here would be “the sun always rises in the east.”) There has been a lack of study in testing LLM’s ability to perform induction because it is difficult to measure whether if the general rule is correct universally or just in context (e.g., The sun will not rise at all if the location is in Iceland and the season is winter.). As LLM’s commonsense reasoning improves, its ability to perform induction reasoning will also improve.

Table 2 provides a summary of typical logical reasoning datasets used to evaluate the different types of logical reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

2.5 Logical Reasoning Tools

Many tools come equipped with built-in functions designed to assist in solving logical reasoning tasks (e.g., Lean (De Moura et al., 2015), Prolog (Colmerauer, 1990) and Clips (Hickey, 2000)). This research concentrates on Z3, Pyke, and Prover9⁶, because they have been widely applied in recent academic literature (Pan et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023; Feng et al., 2023) and belong to distinct families of symbolic solvers that offer diverse approaches to logical reasoning.

Z3 is a satisfiability modulo theories (SMT) solver developed by Microsoft (de Moura and Bjørner, 2008). The SMT solver provides algorithms to determine whether a set of mathematical formulas is satisfiable. Z3 encompasses a diverse

array of functionalities, including equality reasoning, arithmetic operations, manipulation of fixed-size bit-vectors, handling of arrays, and incorporation of quantifiers. More importantly, Z3 is also a theorem prover for first-order logic augmented with various built-in theories (Mera and Bjørner, 2010). These capabilities make Z3 a versatile tool for a wide range of applications in research.

As shown in Table 1, recent studies have tackled a wide range of logical reasoning datasets using Z3 incorporated with LLMs. As demonstrated in Appendix A.2, Z3’s required translation from LLM is sentence by sentence, eliminating the need for pre-defining predicates, facts, and queries as required in Pyke. This capability simplifies the process for LLMs to interpret and implement Z3. In addition, Z3 is more dynamic than Prover9 and Pyke. For example, Z3 is the only symbolic solver that supports setting preferences over different rules (i.e., rule 2 is preferred over rule 5) as shown in Ye et al. (2023). This is because Z3 directly uses Python as its main programming language, the execution of Z3 does not require extra files or a specific programming language. An example of how Z3 tackles BoardgameQA is included in Appendix A.4. Because Z3 was developed as an SMT solver which focuses on analytical reasoning, it has been underutilised for solving deductive and FOL problems. Ye et al. (2023) is the only study incorporating Z3 in solving deductive reasoning problems.

Pyke is a theorem solver with a Python-based framework used for building and executing rule-based expert systems. (Frederiksen, 2008). Pyke uses a backward-chaining rule-based system, similar to Prolog (Colmerauer, 1990), to generate a function call graph before the functions are called. Given a logical question, Pyke initially establishes a knowledge base and incorporates all known Facts and Rules from the solver’s inputs. Then, it iteratively applies given Rules on already known Facts, aiming at obtaining more implied Facts until the conclusion is proved or disproved. The reasoning process of Pyke is a black box but Feng et al. (2023) modified Pyke’s source code and trained LLM’s on it to solve logical reasoning tasks. This approach yielded promising outcomes, demonstrating the adaptability and effectiveness of Pyke in facilitating logical inference tasks. Compared to Z3, Pyke was specifically built for solving FOL reasoning tasks, and the conclusions do not require extra programming (i.e., Conclusions are automat-

⁶<https://www.cs.unm.edu/~mccune/prover9/>

ically True/False/Unknown, whereas Z3 requires extra rule setting for Unknown conclusions because it can only produce Satisfiable or Unsatisfiable results). However, Pyke’s language is less dynamic, and the execution requires extra files (i.e., need to pre-define rule.krb, fact.krb and query.krb files) which makes the logical reasoning task translation more error-prone. Furthermore, Pyke presents challenges in installation and is susceptible to capacity limitations in different operating systems.

Prover9 is an automated theorem prover for first-order and equational logic based on resolution (Robinson, 1965) and paramodulation rules. Prover9 converts FOL statements to conjunctive normal form (CNF) and then performs resolution on the CNF to deduce whether a conclusion is true, false, or unknown. Prover9 is less flexible compared to Z3 because it is not a Python package and does not support a variety of dynamic operations like setting rule preferences. Prover9 uses FOL as its programming language, simplifying the task since LLMs like GPT (OpenAI, 2023) are proficient with NL-FOL translations. In addition, Prover9’s package can be installed online, but like Pyke, it is susceptible to capacity limitations in different operating systems.

3 Logical Reasoning with LLMs

3.1 Free-form Approaches

The free-form approaches rely on LLMs’ internal capabilities via various mechanisms to help improve LLM’s performance in logical reasoning. For example, prompts that encourage LLMs to solve tasks in a chain-of-thought approach is a general technique that enhances LLM’s performance (Wei et al., 2022b; Kojima et al., 2022). Despite the promising outcomes, this approach falls short when dealing with complex logical reasoning tasks. This limitation stems from the lack of explicit logical grounding and the inherent ambiguous and nuanced nature of natural language. Recent studies have introduced Formal Logic to address this challenge. Han et al. (2022) shows that incorporating first-order logic (FOL) translations into the context can notably enhance LLM’s performance. Feng et al. (2023) emulates the reasoning processes of an automated theorem solver (Pyke) through solving Logical tasks using the tool-based approach and training LLMs on Pyke’s reasoning steps. The Free-form approach capitalises on the inherent capabilities of LLM to learn complex logical rules. However,

this approach solely relies upon LLM’s logical reasoning prowess and is susceptible to issues such as hallucinations and taking shortcuts (Dasgupta et al., 2022; Ji et al., 2023). To address this issue, recent works has begun to augment language models with access to symbolic solvers (Ye et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023).

3.2 Tool-based Approaches

The tool-based approach combines LLMs with external symbolic mechanisms. This synergy harnesses the exceptional capability of LLMs to convert ambiguous natural language into logically consistent and structured language. By doing so, it ensures logical coherence while also tapping into the transparent and faithful reasoning abilities of symbolic solvers.

Ye et al. (2023) and Gao et al. (2023) integrated Z3 and Python interpreters with LLMs to tackle various reasoning datasets. Pan et al. (2023) expanded upon this by incorporating a broader range of symbolic solvers and employing error-solving self-refinement techniques. However, the rationale behind the adoption of symbolic solvers primarily relied on theoretical definitions rather than empirical performance evaluations. Consequently, there exists a gap in the literature regarding the exploration of the interplay between LLMs, symbolic solvers, and their respective performance characteristics.

The primary advantages of the tool-based approach are: (1) The tasks are now processed with clear logical grounding and unambiguous language. This approach guarantees that the answer is not a product of hallucination or shortcuts, because the symbolic tools will exhaustively process all logical rules in the premise and only execute clear and correct commands. (2) As LLM’s translation capability continues to improve, the tool-based approach will be able to solve more complex logical problems, provided they fall within the logical reasoning capacity of symbolic solvers. (3) The errors are clearly labeled and displayed. This allows the introduction of various error-solving mechanisms like self-refinement (Pan et al., 2023). In contrast, it is difficult for the free-form approach to improve upon its current results. In this study, errors are isolated into solver-specific errors (e.g., LLM’s translation misses a bracket, which causes the solver to throw an error) and parse errors (i.e., Predicate extraction mistakes or LLMs interpreting the task incorrectly, examples of these are shown

in Appendix A.3).

The main disadvantages of the tool-based approach are: (1) This approach does not apply to tasks that do not have a complete reasoning chain. All symbolic solvers require a full chain of logic to reach the correct conclusion (e.g., Premise: People like Mark love bbq. Question: Mark is not Human?). Both humans and LLMs can answer this question correctly, but a tool-based approach will fail. This is due to the break in the chain of logic. The term “Mark is human” is missing from the premise. Although this term is obvious for humans and LLMs, symbolic solvers require the exact match in predicates to process the task. A detailed discussion of this issue is included in section 4.6. (2) Changes in LLMs can cause solver-specific errors.⁷ (3) This approach is unforgiving to simple translation errors. While processing logical tasks, Human and LLMs can often bypass errors to some extent and still reach the correct conclusion. However, a tool-based approach requires the LLM to translate tasks flawlessly, even minor mistakes like misusing suffixes (e.g., “Jompuses(x)” instead of “Jompus(x)”) will cause the symbolic solver to throw an error. One of the main focuses of this study is the analysis of how different symbolic tools handle errors caused by LLMs.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experiment Setting

We evaluate GPT-3.5-Turbo integrated with Z3, Pyke, Prover9 on three common logical reasoning datasets. We limit the data size to 200 due to limited computational resources. The 3 datasets are introduced as follows. An example from each dataset is included in Appendix A.1.

ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021) is a commonly used dataset for deductive logical reasoning. Compared with PrOntoQA, the problems are expressed in a more naturalistic language form. We evaluate 6 different variations of ProofWriter. We use both open-world and close-world assumptions, including depth-2, depth-3, and depth-5 (i.e., each part requiring 2, 3, and 5 hops of reasoning). To ensure a fair evaluation, we control the datasets to have a fair share of True, False, and Unknown answers.

⁷For instance, during the experiment stage, we tried to rerun the SatLM experiment on ProofWriter, but the execution rate dropped from 99% to 20%. This is caused by GPT3.5 not being able to add a complete bracket to the method Forall(). It is a surprising mistake that continues to happen.

PrOntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023) is a synthetic dataset created to analyze the capacity of LLMs for deductive reasoning. We use the hardest fictional characters version and the hardest 5-hop subset for evaluation. PrOntoQA only has questions in the close world setting (i.e., True/False only). We include this dataset in the experiment to compare natural and fictional settings, as it has a similar level of logical difficulty to ProofWriter.

FOLIO (Han et al., 2022) is a difficult expert-written dataset for first-order logical reasoning. The problems are mostly aligned with real-world knowledge and expressed in naturally flowing language. Tackling its questions demands adeptness in complex first-order logic reasoning. Pyke is unable to solve FOLIO, this is due to the lack of a built-in function for the exclusive disjunction (i.e., either/or). In contrast, Prover9 and Z3 offer a built-in function to handle this logic seamlessly.

Techniques This experiment aims to assess the performance of LLM when paired with various symbolic solvers. Unlike Pan et al. (2023) and other studies, we exclude self-refinement methods and random guessing procedures. In cases where LLM’s translation is infeasible, it will not yield an answer, and any specific errors encountered are documented. The only exception is the bracket issue as mentioned in section 3.2 for the translation of Z3, as this was not an issue in experiments done in Ye et al. (2023) and Pan et al. (2023).

Prompts We use a one-shot demonstration for all experiments. If different solvers are employed to tackle the same dataset, the given prompt problem remains consistent, with the sole variance lying in the solver-specific translations of the prompts. Examples of the prompt are shown in Appendix A.2.

Evaluation The primary metrics for evaluation consist of two key factors: the percentage of executable logical formulations (Exe_Rate), and the accuracy of their execution (Exe_Acc).

4.2 Main Results

We report the results of the tool-based reasoning approach experiments with gpt-3.5-turbo (OpenAI, 2023) in Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5. We have three major observations.

1. Z3 outperforms Prover9 and Pyke across all datasets. With gpt-3.5-turbo, Z3’s executable accuracy surpasses Prover9 by an average of 2.01% and

Dataset	Z3		Prover9		Pyke	
	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc
ProofWriter D5 OWA	91%	96.15%	95%	94.74%	66.5%	91.73%
PrOntoQA	95.5%	97.9%	85.5%	74.27%	99.5%	72.86%
FOLIO	29%	84.45%	61%	65.56%	✗	✗

Table 3: Analysis of accuracy and execution status of Experiment done with gpt-3.5-turbo on 3 Datasets. We present the percentage of executable logical formulations (Exe_Rate) together with the accuracy of the execution (Exe_Acc). ✗: the tool was unable to solve this dataset

ProofWriter	Z3		Prover9		Pyke	
	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc
CWA						
Depth 5	90%	98.89%	96.5%	99.48%	65%	88.46%
Depth 3	87.5%	100%	90.5%	100%	53%	90.57%
Depth 2	87.5%	100%	95%	100%	56.5%	87.61%

Table 4: Analysis of accuracy and execution status of LLM + ProofWriter Experiment close world assumption (True/False) in different depth levels. We present the percentage of executable logical formulations (Exe_Rate) together with the accuracy of the execution (Exe_Acc).

Pyke by an average of 14.73% in both ProofWriter and PrOntoQA. This observation holds even when adjusting the difficulty level in ProofWriter, as illustrated in Table 4 and Table 5. For FOLIO, we observe that Z3 has a relatively high accuracy rate of 84.45% but a meager execution rate of 29%. In contrast, Prover9 has a lower accuracy rate but achieves a significantly better execution rate of 61%. Given the significant disparity in execution rates, it would be unfair to directly compare their accuracy performance. Z3’s performance gain can be attributed to LLMs’ strong understanding of Z3’s language and the simplicity of translation. Z3 is a popular tool, it is used in numerous studies and heavily discussed online, this enhances LLM’s understanding of the Z3 solver-specific language. In addition, as discussed in section 2.5, compared to Prover9 and Pyke, the Z3 translation follows a straightforward sentence-by-sentence approach, it does not require the extraction of Predicates, Facts, and Rules.

2. Prover9 emerges as a versatile tool for LLMs. While Prover9 may not surpass Z3 regarding Executable Accuracy, it consistently maintains a high Executable Rate and achieves Executable Accuracy levels close to Z3, as illustrated in Figure 2. Prover9 is also able to execute more questions in FOLIO. Overall, Prover9 would be a competitive second choice for solving deductive reasoning datasets and shows potential for tackling more complex logical datasets.

3. Pyke’s performance is significantly worse than Prover9 and Z3. Pyke’s primary issue is the




Figure 1: The bar plot on the left displays the execution rate, while the bar plot on the right shows the execution accuracy for ProofWriter CWA D5 and PrOntoQA.

low and inconsistent executable rate. Although Pyke maintained a high executable rate for PrOntoQA, its average executable rate across other experiments is around 60%. Additionally, Pyke lacks built-in functions for the logical constructs "either" and "if and only if," preventing its use for solving FOLIO. Overall, Pyke should only be considered as the third option in solving logical reasoning datasets.

4.3 Natural vs. Fictional

We compare the performance of PrOntoQA Depth 5 and ProofWriter CWA Depth 5 to investigate how different symbolic solvers affect the performance of tool-augmented LLMs in natural versus fictional world settings. The results are displayed in Figure 1. The main difference between the datasets is that PrOntoQA uses fictional characters (i.e., imag-

ProofWriter OWA	Z3		Prover9		Pyke	
	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc	Exe_Rate	Exe_Acc
Depth 5	91%	96.15%	95%	94.74%	66.5%	91.73%
Depth 3	83%	98.79%	88%	95.45%	60.5%	78.51%
Depth 2	80.5%	98.14%	89%	97.75%	61.5%	83.74%

Table 5: Analysis of accuracy and execution status of LLM + ProofWriter Experiment open world assumption (True/False/Unknown) in different depth levels. We present the percentage of executable logical formulations (Exe_Rate) together with the accuracy of the execution (Exe_Acc). D5 refers to Depth 5, which means the number of hops to reach conclusion.

	Z3	Prover9	Pyke
True_Acc	100%	100%	86.36%
False_Acc	98.41%	93.85%	92.86%
Unknown_Acc	90.16%	90.16%	95.74%

Table 6: A detailed breakdown of ProofWriter Depth 5 OWA’s performance in different categories. Given questions are executable, True_Rate: the rate of Symbolic solver correctly labeling True questions; False_Rate: the rate of Symbolic solver correctly labeling False questions; Unknown_Rate: the rate of Symbolic solver correctly labeling Unknown questions

inary characters like Jompus and Wompus), while ProofWriter is expressed in more naturalistic language. Saparov et al. (2023) have shown that real-world knowledge helps LLMs in reasoning more effectively, a fictional world setting decreases LLM’s logical performance. Prover9’s performance is most aligned with this belief. The executable rate decreases by 11%, and executable accuracy drops by 25.21% in a fictional setting. Z3’s performance remains consistent, the executable rate slightly increases by 5.5% in a fictional setting. Surprisingly, Pyke’s execution rate improves by 34.5% in the fictional dataset. This rise in execution rate was due to the decrease in parse error. Overall, in a fictional setting, Z3 remains consistent and outperforms both Prover9 and Pyke. While Prover9 experiences a significant performance decline in fictional settings, it slightly exceeds Z3 in natural settings. Pyke consistently performs the worst among the three symbolic solvers across both settings. These findings suggest that for natural logical reasoning datasets, both Z3 and Prover9 are viable options. However, for fictional datasets, Z3 is the preferable choice.

4.4 Close World vs. Open World

In a closed-world assumption, the answer to a logical reasoning task is limited to being either True or False. An open-world assumption allows for

the answers to be True, False, or Unknown. Generally, LLMs perform best on questions where the answer is “True”, followed by “False”, and then “Unknown” (Tafjord et al., 2021; Saparov and He, 2023). This is due to the overall increase in reasoning steps required for “False” and “Unknown” conclusions. To determine that an answer is “Unknown”, LLMs must exhaustively evaluate all premises and facts before concluding. In contrast, a “True” conclusion typically requires fewer reasoning steps. The tool-based approach does not have this concern because it offloads reasoning to symbolic solvers. Symbolic solvers do not take shortcuts, it exhaustively evaluates all rules regardless of the answer. When comparing the performance of ProofWriter OWA D5 and ProofWriter CWA D5, both Z3 and Prover9 maintain consistent and high performance, each achieving over 95% executable accuracy. As shown in Table 6, both Z3 and Prover9 successfully solve 100% of the “True” questions. Z3 outperforms Prover9 in solving “False” questions, while both solvers handle 90.16% of the “Unknown” questions. In contrast, Pyke excels at solving “Unknown” questions with a success rate of 95.74%, but it performs the worst on “True” questions. It is important to note that Pyke’s overall comparison with the other two solvers is limited due to its lower executable rate of 66.5%, which is on average 22% lower than Z3 and Prover9. Overall, Z3 and Prover9 stand out as the better tools for LLMs. Z3 boasts higher accuracy ratings, while Prover9 has a higher executable rate.

4.5 Depth Analysis

The reasoning ability of LLMs generally diminishes as the number of reasoning hops increases (Han et al., 2022). This belief aligns with our experiment in ProofWriter OWA and CWA. The results of our experiment is shown in Table 4 and Table 5. As shown in Figure 2, Z3 and Prover9’s performance improves as the depth de-




Figure 2: Execution Accuracy for GPT3.5 combined with different solvers on the ProofWriter Dataset OpenWorld Assumption Depth 5

creases. On the other hand, Pyke’s performance diminishes as the depth decreases, indicating a decline in effectiveness with simpler datasets. We did not alter the one-shot prompt when generating translations for datasets with varying depths. This suggests that an LLM prompted with more challenging datasets can aid in solving easier datasets for Z3 and Prover9, but not Pyke. These findings suggest that both Z3 and Prover9 perform well in solving ProofWriter in varying depth. Prover9 demonstrates a higher executable rate, whereas Z3 achieves a higher accuracy rate.

4.6 Complex Logic

One of the key functions of symbolic solvers is their ability to effectively handle complex logic. We test this ability using the FOLIO dataset. Pyke cannot solve FOLIO due to the lack of built-in functions. Prover9 and Z3 did not achieve satisfactory results; Z3 struggled with execution rate, while Prover9 struggled with accuracy rate. However, Z3 shows a promising future for tackling this natural and complex dataset because it reaches an accuracy rate of 85.45%. The primary factors that limit the execution rate performance of Z3 on FOLIO are: (1) some natural wordings in FOLIO make it difficult for predicate extraction, (2) FOLIO is humanly annotated and thus assumes a degree of commonsense, this presents incomplete reasoning chains for certain questions. For example, the term “Some turtles exist.” is hard to translate, the LLM translated it as “Exist([x], Turtle(x))”, but this interpretation is wrong and not executable, it is hard for LLMs to quantify “some”. The specific example is shown in A.3, and (3) one shot prompt is not enough for LLMs to learn how to translate naturally diverse dataset like FOLIO. As shown in A.3, LLM incorrectly translated

the statement “Marvin cannot be from Earth and from Mars.” into “Not(And(FromEarth(marvin), FromMars(marvin)))”, which entails Marvin is not from Earth and not from Mars. The simple fix is just to change Not() into Xor(). This problem was caused by the inherently ambiguous nature of the natural language and the lack of prompting. Overall, Z3 has great potential in tackling FOLIO, whereas Prover9 lacks the accuracy and error-displaying function for continued improvement.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, we investigated and compared the performance of LLMs combined with three widely used symbolic solvers to closely examine how each solver influences the performance of tool-augmented LLMs. Through our experiment, we objectively compare the performance of LLMs combined with different solvers, demonstrating that the choice of tool significantly impacts the ability to solve logical reasoning datasets.

An important future direction for the tool-augmented method is tackling increasingly difficult logical reasoning datasets. There remain several challenging logical reasoning datasets that have the potential to be solved by tool-augmented LLMs. We can leverage Z3’s dynamic capabilities to help define more complex logic and solve the datasets presented by Saparov et al. (2023), which feature increasingly structured and complex logic in a fictional setting. Another direction is exploring different methodologies that can enhance the translation quality of LLMs for symbolic solvers. This includes enhancing consistent predicate extraction and completing reasoning chains. Z3 is particularly useful in this scenario because LLMs have a better understanding of Z3, and we can leverage Z3’s error-checking capabilities.

Only large language models are capable of complex reasoning, as small models struggle with grasping intricate logic (Saparov and He, 2023). However, there is potential to fine-tune small language models to perform translation tasks. For instance, Yang et al. (2023) trained a small LLaMA 7B model (Touvron et al., 2023) to translate natural language into first-order logic (FOL). Given that Prover9 operates using FOL, it can be effectively utilized in such translation tasks. This opens up the potential for small language models to perform logical reasoning tasks effectively.

References

- Stephane Aroca-Ouellette, Cory Paik, Alessandro Roncone, and Katharina Kann. 2021. [PROST: physical reasoning about objects through space and time](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021, Online Event, August 1-6, 2021*, volume ACL/IJCNLP 2021 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 4597–4608. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Chaitanya Malaviya, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ari Holtzman, Hannah Rashkin, Doug Downey, Scott Wen-tau Yih, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Abductive commonsense reasoning.
- Johan Bos and Katja Markert. 2005. Recognising textual entailment with logical inference. In *Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 628–635.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott M. Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. 2023. [Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4](#). volume abs/2303.12712.
- Alain Colmerauer. 1990. An introduction to prolog iii. volume 33, pages 69–90. ACM New York, NY, USA.
- Ishita Dasgupta, Andrew K. Lampinen, Stephanie C. Y. Chan, Antonia Creswell, Dharshan Kumaran, James L. McClelland, and Felix Hill. 2022. [Language models show human-like content effects on reasoning](#). volume abs/2207.07051.
- Leonardo De Moura, Soonho Kong, Jeremy Avigad, Floris Van Doorn, and Jakob von Raumer. 2015. The lean theorem prover (system description). In *Automated Deduction-CADE-25: 25th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Berlin, Germany, August 1-7, 2015, Proceedings 25*, pages 378–388. Springer.
- Leonardo Mendonça de Moura and Nikolaj S. Bjørner. 2008. [Z3: an efficient SMT solver](#). In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 4963 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 337–340. Springer.
- Herbert B Enderton. 2001. A mathematical introduction to logic. Elsevier.
- Jiazhan Feng, Ruochen Xu, Junheng Hao, Hiteshi Sharma, Yelong Shen, Dongyan Zhao, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. Language models can be logical solvers.
- Bruce Frederiksen. 2008. Applying expert system technology to code reuse with pyke.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [PAL: program-aided language models](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10764–10799. PMLR.
- Simeng Han, Hailey Schoelkopf, Yilun Zhao, Zhenting Qi, Martin Riddell, Luke Benson, Lucy Sun, Ekaterina Zubova, Yujie Qiao, Matthew Burtell, David Peng, Jonathan Fan, Yixin Liu, Brian Wong, Malcolm Sailor, Ansong Ni, Linyong Nan, Jungo Kasai, Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Shafiq R. Joty, Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryscinski, Xi Victoria Lin, Caiming Xiong, and Dragomir Radev. 2022. [FOLIO: natural language reasoning with first-order logic](#). volume abs/2209.00840.
- Timothy J Hickey. 2000. Clip: a clip (intervals) dialect for metalevel constraint solving. In *International Symposium on Practical Aspects of Declarative Languages*, pages 200–214. Springer.
- Jiaxin Huang, Shixiang Gu, Le Hou, Yuexin Wu, Xuezhi Wang, Hongkun Yu, and Jiawei Han. 2023. [Large language models can self-improve](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 1051–1068. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2023. [Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 1049–1065. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. [Survey of hallucination in natural language generation](#). volume 55, pages 248:1–248:38.
- Mehran Kazemi, Quan Yuan, Deepti Bhatia, Najoung Kim, Xin Xu, Vaiva Imbrasaite, and Deepak Ramachandran. 2023. [Boardgameqa: A dataset for natural language reasoning with contradictory information](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. [Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning](#). volume abs/2301.13379.

- Nick McKenna, Tianyi Li, Liang Cheng, Mohammad Javad Hosseini, Mark Johnson, and Mark Steedman. 2023. [Sources of hallucination by large language models on inference tasks](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 2758–2774. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sergio Mera and Nikolaj Bjørner. 2010. Dkai and z3: A logic embedding experiment. pages 504–528. Springer.
- Kostas S. Metaxiotis, Dimitris Askounis, and John E. Psarras. 2002. [Expert systems in production planning and scheduling: A state-of-the-art survey](#). volume 13, pages 253–260.
- Maxwell I. Nye, Michael Henry Tessler, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Brenden M. Lake. 2021. [Improving coherence and consistency in neural sequence models with dual-system, neuro-symbolic reasoning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 25192–25204.
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 technical report](#). volume abs/2303.08774.
- Liangming Pan, Alon Albalak, Xinyi Wang, and William Wang. 2023. [Logic-lm: Empowering large language models with symbolic solvers for faithful logical reasoning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 3806–3824. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Poole and Alan K. Mackworth. 2010. [Artificial intelligence - foundations of computational agents](#). Cambridge University Press.
- John Alan Robinson. 1965. A machine-oriented logic based on the resolution principle. volume 12, pages 23–41. ACM New York, NY, USA.
- Rachel Rudinger, Vered Shwartz, Jena D Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Thinking like a skeptic: Defeasible inference in natural language. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4661–4675.
- S Russel and P Norvig. 2003. [Artificial intelligence-a modern approach](#). pearson education inc.
- Abulhair Saparov and He He. 2023. [Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Abulhair Saparov, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Vishakh Padmakumar, Nitish Joshi, Mehran Kazemi, Najoung Kim, and He He. 2023. [Testing the general deductive reasoning capacity of large language models using OOD examples](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Shashi Kant Singh, Shubham Kumar, and Pawan Singh Mehra. 2023. Chat gpt & google bard ai: A review. In *2023 International Conference on IoT, Communication and Automation Technology (ICICAT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE.
- Koustuv Sinha, Shagun Sodhani, Jin Dong, Joelle Pineau, and William L Hamilton. 2019. Clutrr: A diagnostic benchmark for inductive reasoning from text.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. 2022. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them.
- Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi, and Peter Clark. 2021. [Proofwriter: Generating implications, proofs, and abductive statements over natural language](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021, Online Event, August 1-6, 2021*, volume ACL/IJCNLP 2021 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 3621–3634. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). volume abs/2302.13971.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022a. [Emergent abilities of large language models](#). volume 2022.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Yuan Yang, Siheng Xiong, Ali Payani, Ehsan Shareghi, and Faramarz Fekri. 2023. [Harnessing the power of large language models for natural language to first-order logic translation](#). volume abs/2305.15541.

- Xi Ye, Qiaochu Chen, Isil Dillig, and Greg Durrett. 2023. [Satlm: Satisfiability-aided language models using declarative prompting](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Fei Yu, Hongbo Zhang, and Benyou Wang. 2023. [Nature language reasoning, A survey](#). volume abs/2303.14725.
- Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A. Smith. 2023. [How language model hallucinations can snowball](#). volume abs/2305.13534.
- Yi-Fan Zhang, Hanlin Zhang, Li Erran Li, and Eric Xing. 2024. [Evaluating step-by-step reasoning through symbolic verification](#).
- Wanjun Zhong, Siyuan Wang, Duyu Tang, Zenan Xu, Daya Guo, Yining Chen, Jiahai Wang, Jian Yin, Ming Zhou, and Nan Duan. 2022. Analytical reasoning of text. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 2306–2319.
- Zhaocheng Zhu, Yuan Xue, Xinyun Chen, Denny Zhou, Jian Tang, Dale Schuurmans, and Hanjun Dai. 2023. [Large language models can learn rules](#). volume abs/2310.07064.

A Appendix

A.1 Dataset Examples

ProofWriter

Example: ProofWriter Depth 5 Open World Assumption Q774

Problem:

The bald eagle is blue. The bald eagle is kind. The bald eagle likes the cat. The bald eagle does not visit the tiger. The cat chases the mouse. The cat is green. The cat likes the bald eagle. The cat likes the mouse. The cat does not like the tiger. The mouse likes the cat. The tiger chases the cat. The tiger chases the mouse. The tiger is red. The tiger likes the cat. The tiger visits the cat. The tiger visits the mouse. If something likes the bald eagle then it is blue. If something visits the bald eagle and it visits the cat then the bald eagle is red. If something chases the mouse then it visits the cat. If something is blue then it chases the tiger. If something visits the cat and the cat chases the tiger then the tiger likes the bald eagle. If something likes the tiger then the tiger likes the bald eagle. If something chases the mouse then it visits the mouse.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or unknown?
The cat does not like the mouse.

Answer: False

PrOntoQA

Example: ProntoQA Q3

Problem:

Vumpuses are floral. Vumpuses are tumpuses. Tumpuses are brown. Each tumpus is a wumpus. Wumpuses are small. Each wumpus is a rompus. Each zumpus is metallic. Every rompus is happy. Rompuses are impuses. Each impus is amenable. Each impus is a dumpus. Every dumpus is not metallic. Dumpuses are numpuses. Each numpus is bitter. Each numpus is a jompus. Every jompus is cold. Each jompus is a yumpus. Wren is a tumpus. Question:

Is the following statement true or false?

Wren is not metallic.

Answer: True

FOLIO

Example: FOLIO dev Q1

Problem:

If people perform in school talent shows often, then they attend and are very engaged with school events. People either perform in school talent shows often or are inactive and disinterested members of their community. If people chaperone high school dances, then they are not students who attend the school. All people who are inactive and disinterested members of their community chaperone high school dances. All young children and teenagers who wish to further their academic careers and educational opportunities are students who attend the school. Bonnie either

both attends and is very engaged with school events and is a student who attends the school, or she neither attends and is very engaged with school events nor is a student who attends the school.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or uncertain?

If Bonnie is either both a young child or teenager who wishes to further her academic career and educational opportunities and chaperones high school dances or neither is a young child nor teenager who wishes to further her academic career and educational opportunities, then Bonnie is either a student who attends the school or is an inactive and disinterested member of the community.

Answer: True

A.2 Prompts

Full prompts for all experiments can be seen https://github.com/Mattylam/Logic_Symbolic_Solvers_Experiment

ProofWriter Prompts for Z3 Solver One-shot demonstration

Given a problem description and a question. The task is to parse the problem and the question into Python Z3 solver.

Problem:

Anne is quiet. Erin is furry. Erin is green. Fiona is furry. Fiona is quiet. Fiona is red. Fiona is rough. Fiona is white. Harry is furry. Harry is quiet. Harry is white. Young people are furry. If Anne is quiet then Anne is red. Young, green people are rough. If someone is green then they are white. If someone is furry and quiet then they are white. If someone is young and white then they are rough. All red people are young.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or unknown? Anne is white.
###

solution in Python:

```
def solution():  
# Anne is quiet.  
quiet(Anne)  
# Erin is furry.  
furry(Erin)  
# Erin is green.  
green(Erin)  
# Fiona is furry.  
furry(Fiona)  
# Fiona is quiet.  
quiet(Fiona)  
# Fiona is red.  
red(Fiona)  
# Fiona is rough.  
rough(Fiona)  
# Fiona is white.  
white(Fiona)
```

```

# Harry is furry.
furry(Harry)
# Harry is quiet.
quiet(Harry)
# Harry is white.
white(Harry)
# Young people are furry.
ForAll([x], Implies(young(x), furry(x)))
# If Anne is quiet then Anne is red.
Implies(quiet(Anne), red(Anne))
# Young, green people are rough.
ForAll([x], Implies(And(young(x), green(x)), rough(x)))
# If someone is green then they are white.
ForAll([x], Implies(green(x), white(x)))
# If someone is furry and quiet then they are white.
ForAll([x], Implies(And(furry(x), quiet(x)), white(x)))
# If someone is young and white then they are rough.
ForAll([x], Implies(And(young(x), white(x)), rough(x)))
# All red people are young.
ForAll([x], Implies(red(x), young(x)))
# Question: the following statement true, false, or unknown? Anne is white.
return white(Anne)

```

ProofWriter Prompts for Prover9 One shot demonstration for LLM

Given a problem description and a question, the task is to parse the problem and the question into first-order logic formulas. The grammar of the first-order logic formula is defined as follows:

1. Logical conjunction of expr1 and expr2: $\text{expr1} \wedge \text{expr2}$
2. Logical disjunction of expr1 and expr2: $\text{expr1} \vee \text{expr2}$
3. Logical exclusive disjunction of expr1 and expr2: $\text{expr1} \oplus \text{expr2}$
4. Logical negation of expr1: $\neg \text{expr1}$
5. expr1 implies expr2: $\text{expr1} \rightarrow \text{expr2}$
6. expr1 if and only if expr2: $\text{expr1} \leftrightarrow \text{expr2}$
7. Logical universal quantification: $\forall x$
8. Logical existential quantification: $\exists x$

Problem

Anne is quiet. Erin is furry. Erin is green. Fiona is furry. Fiona is quiet. Fiona is red. Fiona is rough. Fiona is white. Harry is furry. Harry is quiet. Harry is white. Young people are furry. If Anne is quiet then Anne is red. Young, green people are rough. If someone is green then they are white. If someone is furry and quiet then they are white. If someone is young and white then they are rough. All red people are young.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or unknown? Anne is white.

###

Predicates

quiet(x) ::: x is quiet.
 furry(x) ::: x is furry.
 green(x) ::: x is green.
 red(x) ::: x is red.
 rough(x) ::: x is rough.
 white(x) ::: x is white.
 young(x) ::: x is young
 Premises
 quiet(Anne) ::: Anne is quiet.
 furry(Erin) ::: Erin is furry.
 green(Erin) ::: Erin is green.
 furry(Fiona) ::: Fiona is furry.
 quiet(Fiona) ::: Fiona is quiet.
 red(Fiona) ::: Fiona is red.
 rough(Fiona) ::: Fiona is rough.
 white(Fiona) ::: Fiona is white.
 furry(Harry) ::: Harry is furry.
 quiet(Harry) ::: Harry is quiet.
 white(Harry) ::: Harry is white.
 $\forall x(\text{young}(x) \rightarrow \text{furry}(x))$::: Young people are furry.
 $(\text{quiet}(\text{Anne}) \rightarrow \text{red}(\text{Anne}))$::: If Anne is quiet then Anne is red.
 $\forall x(\text{young}(x) \wedge \text{green}(x) \rightarrow \text{rough}(x))$::: Young, green people are rough.
 $\forall x(\text{green}(x) \rightarrow \text{white}(x))$::: If someone is green then they are white.
 $\forall x((\text{furry}(x) \wedge \text{quiet}(x)) \rightarrow \text{white}(x))$::: If someone is furry and quiet then they are white.
 $\forall x((\text{young}(x) \wedge \text{white}(x)) \rightarrow \text{rough}(x))$::: If someone is young and white then they are rough.
 $\forall x(\text{red}(x) \rightarrow \text{young}(x))$::: All red people are young.
 Conclusion:
 white(Anne)

ProofWriter Prompts for Pyke Solver One-shot demonstration

Task Description: You are given a problem description and a question. The task is to:

- 1) define all the predicates in the problem
- 2) parse the problem into logic rules based on the defined predicates
- 3) write all the facts mentioned in the problem
- 4) parse the question into the logic form

Problem:

Anne is quiet. Erin is furry. Erin is green. Fiona is furry. Fiona is quiet. Fiona is red. Fiona is rough. Fiona is white. Harry is furry. Harry is quiet. Harry is white. Young people are furry. If Anne is quiet then Anne is red. Young, green people are rough. If someone is green then they are white. If someone is furry and quiet then they are white. If someone is young and white then they are rough. All red people are young.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or unknown? Anne is white.

###

Predicates:

quiet(\$x, bool) ::: x is quiet.
 furry(\$x, bool) ::: x is furry.
 green(\$x, bool) ::: x is green.
 red(\$x, bool) ::: x is red.


```

rough($x, bool) ::: x is rough.
white($x, bool) ::: x is white.
young($x, bool) ::: x is young
Facts:
quiet(Arne, True) ::: Arne is quiet.
furry(Erin, True) ::: Erin is furry.
green(Erin, True) ::: Erin is green.
furry(Fiona, True) ::: Fiona is furry.
quiet(Fiona, True) ::: Fiona is quiet.
red(Fiona, True) ::: Fiona is red.
rough(Fiona, True) ::: Fiona is rough.
white(Fiona, True) ::: Fiona is white.
furry(Harry, True) ::: Harry is furry.
quiet(Harry, True) ::: Harry is quiet.
white(Harry, True) ::: Harry is white.
young($x, True) >>> furry($x, True) ::: Young people are furry.
quiet(Arne, True) >>> red(Arne, True) ::: If Arne is quiet then Arne is red.
young($x, True) && green($x, True) >>> rough($x, True) ::: Young, green people are rough.
green($x, True) >>> white($x, True) ::: If someone is green then they are white.
furry($x, True) && quiet($x, True) >>> white($x, True)
::: If someone is furry and quiet then they are white.
young($x, True) && white($x, True) >>> rough($x, True)
::: If someone is young and white then they are rough.
red($x, True) >>> young($x, True) ::: All red people are young.
Query:
white(Arne)

```

A.3 Incorrect Example Generation

The following section includes classic Incorrect translations, more incorrect translations can be found in Processed_Datasets in https://github.com/Mattylam/Logic_Symbolic_Solvers_Experiment

Example 1: Prover9 PrOntoQA_2 Parse error

.....

$\forall x(\text{Dumpus}(x) \rightarrow \text{Happy}(x))$::: Every dumpus is happy.

$\forall x(\text{Dumpus}(x) \rightarrow \text{Vumpus}(x))$::: Each dumpus is a vumpus.

$\forall x(\text{Vumpus}(x) \rightarrow \text{Bright}(x))$::: Vumpuses are bright.

$\forall x(\text{Vumpus}(x) \rightarrow \text{Jompus}(x))$::: Every vumpus is a jompus.

$\forall x(\text{Jompus}(x) \rightarrow \text{Large}(x))$::: Jompuses are large.

Stella is a yumpus.

Conclusion:

Bright(Stella) ::: Stella is bright.

Analysis: LLM failed to perform all translations, "Stella is yumpus" was not translated, thus system throws a parse error

Example 2: Z3 FOLIO_dev_27 Incorrect Interpretation

Problem: All aliens are extraterrestrial. If someone is from Mars, then they are aliens. No extraterrestrial is human. Everyone from Earth is a human. **Marvin cannot be from Earth and from**

Mars. If Marvin is not from Earth, then Marvin is an extraterrestrial.

Question: Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or uncertain?
Marvin is an alien.

Answer: False

Predicted Answer: Unknown

Translation from LLM:

.....

All aliens are extraterrestrial.

ForAll([x], Implies(Alien(x), Extraterrestrial(x)))

If someone is from Mars, then they are aliens.

ForAll([x], Implies(FromMars(x), Alien(x)))

No extraterrestrial is human.

ForAll([x], Implies(Extraterrestrial(x), Not(Human(x))))

Everyone from Earth is a human.

ForAll([x], Implies(FromEarth(x), Human(x)))

Marvin cannot be from Earth and from Mars.

Not(And(FromEarth(marvin), FromMars(marvin)))

If Marvin is not from Earth, then Marvin is an extraterrestrial.

Implies(Not(FromEarth(marvin)), Extraterrestrial(marvin))

Question: Marvin is an alien.

return Alien(marvin)

Analysis: LLM incorrectly interpreted the logic of the statement. The correct translation should be $Xor(And(FromEarth(marvin), FromMars(marvin)))$, the wording of the statement makes it ambiguous for LLMs to interpret. If the statement was, Marvin is either from Earth or from Mars, LLMs would have been able to translate it.

Example 3: Z3 FOLIO_dev_16 Difficult predicate extraction

Problem: All rabbits are cute. **Some turtles exist.** An animal is either a rabbit or a squirrel. If something is skittish, then it is not still. All squirrels are skittish. Rock is still.

Question: Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or uncertain?

Rock is a turtle. Answer: Unknown

Error: ExecutionError NameError: name 'Exist' is not defined. Did you mean: 'exit'?"

Translation from LLM:

.....

All rabbits are cute.

ForAll([x], Implies(Rabbit(x), Cute(x)))

Some turtles exist.

Exist([x], Turtle(x))

An animal is either a rabbit or a squirrel.

ForAll([x], Or(Rabbit(x), Squirrel(x)))

If something is skittish, then it is not still.

ForAll([x], Implies(Skittish(x), Not(Still(x))))

All squirrels are skittish.

ForAll([x], Implies(Squirrel(x), Skittish(x)))

Rock is still.

Still(Rock)

Question: Rock is a turtle.

return Turtle(Rock)

A.4 How Z3 tackles BoardgameQA

A few players are playing a boardgame. The current state of the game is as follows. The cat is named Meadow. The cat published a high-quality paper. The gecko winks at the eagle. The puffin is named Peddi. And the rules of the game are as follows. Rule1: Regarding the cat, if it has a high-quality paper, then we can conclude that it prepares armor for the canary. Rule2: If you are positive that you saw one of the animals rolls the dice for the eagle, you can be certain that it will also proceed to the spot right after the sun bear. Rule3: If the cat prepares armor for the canary and the cricket gives a magnifier to the canary, then the canary will not remove one of the pieces of the aardvark. Rule4: If the cat has a name whose first letter is the same as the first letter of the puffin's name, then the cat does not prepare armor for the canary. Rule5: The canary removes one of the pieces of the aardvark whenever at least one animal proceeds to the spot right after the sun bear. Rule6: Regarding the cat, if it has something to sit on, then we can conclude that it does not prepare armor for the canary. Rule3 is preferred over Rule5. Rule4 is preferred over Rule1. Rule6 is preferred over Rule1.

Based on the game state and the rules and preferences, does the canary remove from the board one of the pieces of the aardvark?

```
# solution in Python:
def solution():
# rules
# Rule1: Regarding the cat, if it has a high-quality paper, then we can conclude that it prepares
armor for the canary.
Rule1 = Implies(has_high_quality_paper(cat), prepare_armor(cat, canary))
# Rule2: If you are positive that you saw one of the animals rolls the dice for the eagle, you can be
certain that it will also proceed to the spot right after the sun bear.
Rule2 = ForAll([x], Implies(roll_dice(x, eagle), proceed_to_spot_right_after(x, sun_bear)))
# Rule3: If the cat prepares armor for the canary and the cricket gives a magnifier to the canary,
then the canary will not remove one of the pieces of the aardvark.
Rule3 = Implies(And(prepare_armor(cat, canary), give_magnifier(cricket, canary)),
Not(remove_piece(canary, aardvark)))
# Rule4: If the cat has a name whose first letter is the same as the first letter of the puffin's name,
then the cat does not prepare armor for the canary.
Rule4 = Implies(has_same_first_letter_name(cat, puffin), Not(prepare_armor(cat, canary)))
# Rule5: The canary removes one of the pieces of the aardvark whenever at least one animal
proceeds to the spot right after the sun bear.
Rule5 = Implies(Exists([x], proceed_to_spot_right_after(x, sun_bear)), remove_piece(canary,
aardvark))
# Rule6: Regarding the cat, if it has something to sit on, then we can conclude that it does not
prepare armor for the canary.
Rule6 = Implies(has_something_to_sit_on(cat), Not(prepare_armor(cat, canary)))
# The current state of the game is as follows. The cat is named Meadow. The cat published a
high-quality paper. The gecko winks at the eagle. The puffin is named Peddi.
# The cat is named Meadow. The puffin is named Peddi. The first letter of Meadow is M. The first
letter of the Peddi is P. So the cat does not have the same first letter name as the puffin.
has_same_first_letter_name(cat, puffin) == False
# The cat published a high-quality paper.
has_high_quality_paper(cat) == True
# The gecko winks at the eagle.
winks_at(gecko, eagle) == True
# preferences. Rule3 is preferred over Rule5. Rule4 is preferred over Rule1. Rule6 is preferred
```

over Rule1.

```
soft_rules = [Rule5, Rule1, Rule1]
```

```
# Rule3 is preferred over Rule5. So Rule5 is suppressed by the precondition of Rule3.
```

```
Rule5 = Or(And(prepare_armor(cat, canary), give_magnifier(cricket, canary)), Rule5)
```

```
# Rule4 is preferred over Rule1. So Rule1 is suppressed by the precondition of Rule4.
```

```
Rule1 = Or(has_same_first_letter_name(cat, puffin), Rule1)
```

```
# Rule6 is preferred over Rule1. So Rule1 is suppressed by the precondition of Rule6.
```

```
Rule1 = Or(has_something_to_sit_on(cat), Rule1)
```

```
# question: does the canary remove from the board one of the pieces of the aardvark?
```

```
return remove_piece(canary, aardvark)
```