

Large Language Models for Mathematical Analysis

Ziye Chen

Boston University
ziyechen@bu.edu

Hao Qi

Boston University
haoqi@bu.edu

Abstract

Mathematical problem-solving is a key field in artificial intelligence (AI) and a critical benchmark for evaluating the capabilities of large language models (LLMs). While extensive research has focused on mathematical problem-solving, most existing work and datasets concentrate on computational tasks, leaving gaps in areas like mathematical analysis, which demands rigorous proofs and formal reasoning. We developed the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, comprising proof-based problems from mathematical analysis topics such as Sequences and Limits, Infinite Series, and Convex Functions. We also designed a guiding framework to rigorously enhance LLMs' ability to solve these problems. Through fine-tuning LLMs on this dataset and employing our framework, we observed significant improvements in their capability to generate logical, complete, and elegant proofs. This work addresses critical gaps in mathematical reasoning and contributes to advancing trustworthy AI capable of handling formalized mathematical language. The code is publicly accessible at [LLMs for Mathematical Analysis](#).

1 Introduction

Mathematical analysis, with its emphasis on rigorous proofs and formal methods like the ϵ - δ definition of limits, poses a significant challenge for artificial intelligence (AI). Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable advancements in solving computational problems across various domains, yet they often struggle with the formal rigor and reasoning required for mathematical analysis. Generating correct and structured solutions in this field remains a challenging task, as LLMs frequently rely on uncritical, computational shortcuts or fail to produce logically sound proofs. (See Appendix A for a test example.)

Existing mathematical datasets for fine-tuning and benchmarking LLMs primarily focus on com-

putational tasks in areas like algebra, calculus, and geometry, while deliberately avoiding proof-based problems. This limitation hinders the development of LLMs capable of solving problems that require precise reasoning and formal processes.

To address this gap, we developed the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, a specialized corpus of proof-based problems in real analysis sourced from *Problems in Mathematical Analysis* (Demidovich, 1964) and *Problems and Solutions in Real Analysis* (Hata, 2007). This dataset includes diverse topics such as Sequences and Limits, Infinite Series, and Convex Functions. Additionally, we designed a guiding framework to improve LLMs' ability to generate rigorous, clear, and logically sound solutions.

By fine-tuning models like Llama 3.2 (Meta, 2024) and Qwen2 (Alibaba, 2024) on this dataset and applying the framework, our work advanced the field of AI-facilitated reasoning and contributed to building trustworthy AI capable of handling complex, formalized mathematical languages.

2 Related Work

2.1 Mathematics Benchmarks for AI

The rapid development of AI has prompted the continuous introduction of mathematics benchmarks. GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) is a dataset of grade school math word questions, while MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) contains challenging competition problems. MathVerse (Zhang et al., 2024b) collected multi-subject problems with diagrams, and GeoEval (Zhang et al., 2024a) facilitated a deeper investigation into the performance of LLMs in solving geometry problems. TAL-SCQ5K¹ consists of multiple-choice questions in both English and Chinese. We collect and present the distribution of mainstream dataset topics in Figure 1.

¹<https://github.com/math-eval/TAL-SCQ5K>

2.2 LLMs for Mathematics

As extensive research progresses, LLMs have demonstrated proficiency in solving mathematical problems. Trinh et al., 2024 introduced Alpha-Geometry, a theorem prover for Euclidean plane geometry that approached the performance of an average International Mathematical Olympiad gold medallist using a neuro-symbolic system. Studies by Wang et al., 2023 show that LLMs with over 100B parameters are capable of addressing intricate tasks by employing a chain-of-thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2023) when given a limited set of reasoning examples. And CoT frameworks have been used to enhance mathematical performance, incorporating other tools (He-Yueya et al., 2023). Researchers in OpenAI claimed that their newest model (OpenAI, 2024b) placed among the top 500 students in the U.S. in a qualifier for the USA Math Olympiad. However, some of the excellent performance on these benchmarks may result from memorizing the data from these benchmarks (Xu et al., 2024).

In the studies above, the impressive performance of LLMs is often shown by solving problems from fields like geometry or algebra since they can quickly be evaluated by checking the result. However, the importance of the solution process is ignored. We focus on the analyzing process to unlock the more comprehensive language potential of state-of-art models.

3 Motivation

LLMs rely on extensive datasets to develop their reasoning and problem-solving capabilities. However, most existing mathematical datasets for fine-tuning and benchmarking LLMs focus on computational tasks in domains such as algebra, number theory, calculus, geometry, statistics, and linear algebra. These datasets almost exclusively contain questions that require numerical or symbolic computation while deliberately avoiding proof-based problems. This leaves a significant gap in the ability of LLMs to handle rigorous reasoning and formal proofs, especially in mathematical analysis.

Mathematical analysis requires a deep understanding of formal processes, such as ϵ - δ proofs and precise logical reasoning. Current LLMs often fail to produce solutions that adhere to these rigorous standards, as they are trained primarily on datasets that emphasize computation over formal derivation. To address this limitation, we developed the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, which focuses on




Figure 1: Mathematical fields distribution of current datasets. Note that most of the questions are computation-related with a finite answer.

proof-based problems. By incorporating problems that emphasize rigor and logical progression, this dataset aims to equip LLMs with the tools needed to handle formalized mathematical reasoning. This work is motivated by the goal of enhancing LLMs' performance in domains that demand rigorous use of languages, ultimately contributing to the development of more trustworthy and capable AI systems. Specifically, this study aims to reach the following research objectives:

- RQ_1 : How can we develop a dataset for pre-training and benchmarking LLMs on mathematical analysis?
- RQ_2 : How can we create a framework to improve LLMs' ability to solve mathematical analysis problems?
- RQ_3 : How can we effectively evaluate the solutions generated by LLMs to ensure correctness and rigor?

4 Dataset

Given that there has been no benchmark for evaluating mathematical proofs, the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset is designed to enhance the ability of LLMs to solve mathematical analysis problems using rigorous and formally restricted methods, particularly the ϵ - δ technique. The dataset is divided into two parts: one for pretraining and one for benchmarking. Files can be founded at [DEMI-MathAnalysis](#).

4.1 Dataset Creation

DEMI-MathAnalysis is built from problems in renowned texts. It covers topics like Sequences and Limits, Infinite Series, Continuous Functions, Differentiation, Integration, Improper Integrals, Series of Functions, Approximation by Polynomials,

and Convex Functions. We ensure that topics of questions are distributed as evenly as possible and present the statistics in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Number of questions per topic in DEMI-MathAnalysis.

As an example in Figure 3 shows, each problem is transcribed in LaTeX format and paired with a detailed step-by-step solution. We have examined the quality of the answers to ensure that they do not include non-existent lemmas or incorrect grammar.

Problem

Prove that $n \sin(2n!e\pi)$ converges to 2π as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Solution

Let r_n and ϵ_n be the integral and fractional parts of the number $n!e$ respectively. Using the expansion

$$e = 1 + \frac{1}{1!} + \frac{1}{2!} + \frac{1}{3!} + \dots,$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} r_n = n! \left(1 + \frac{1}{1!} + \frac{1}{2!} + \dots + \frac{1}{n!} \right) \\ \epsilon_n = \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} + \dots, \end{cases}$$

since

$$\frac{1}{n+1} < \epsilon_n < \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} + \dots = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus $\sin(2n!e\pi) = \sin(2\pi\epsilon_n)$. Note that this implies the irrationality of e . Since $n\epsilon_n$ converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \sin(2\pi\epsilon_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin(2\pi\epsilon_n)}{\epsilon_n} = 2\pi.$$

Hence $n \sin(2n!e\pi)$ converges to 2π as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Figure 3: An example in DEMI-MathAnalysis. The LaTeX code has been rendered for better reading.

4.2 Dataset Structure

Each entry in the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset consists of four components:

1. **Number:** A serial identifier linked to the original problem in the source material, enabling easy cross-referencing.
2. **ProblemType:** A classification of the problem by its mathematical domain, aiding targeted training and evaluation.

3. **Problem:** The problem statement, formatted in LaTeX to ensure clarity and precision for both humans and LLMs.

4. **Solution:** A comprehensive, step-by-step solution written with formal mathematical rigor, highlighting key reasoning steps and adhering to standardized notation.

This dataset serves as a foundation for fine-tuning LMMs in the following section. It bridges gaps in existing mathematical datasets that focus primarily on computational tasks, ensuring that models are exposed to diverse problem types and guided toward generating logically sound, clear, and complete solutions.

5 Guiding Framework

Based on the dataset, we proposed a framework for mathematical analysis that integrates functional components to guide LLMs in solving problems in a human-like way. By combining problem classification, knowledge retrieval, and solution generation, the framework introduces an adaptable pipeline for addressing reasoning and formatting complexities.

5.1 Components

As shown in Figure 4, the framework consists of the following key components:

1. **Problem Identification:** The input problem is first analyzed and classified into a specific category. This classification is performed by a lightweight LLM classifier trained on meta-data from the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset. Accurate classification ensures that the subsequent steps are tailored to the problem’s mathematical domain, aligning the solution process with its requirements.

2. **Prompt Construction:** Once the problem is classified, a detailed prompt is constructed to guide the LLM in generating a solution. The prompt includes:
 - The full problem statement to provide complete context.
 - The problem type, as determined by the classifier, to help the model focus on the appropriate reasoning approach.
 - Supplementary knowledge retrieved dynamically from the Knowledge Base to

provide relevant mathematical context, such as theorems, definitions, or key properties.

This process ensures that the LLM receives all necessary information in a structured format, optimizing its ability to process and solve the problem.

3. **Knowledge Base Integration:** The Knowledge Base is a curated repository of mathematical concepts, rules, and formal methods specific to mathematical analysis. It includes:

- Key definitions, such as the ϵ - δ definition of limits.
- Theorems and properties, such as those related to series convergence or convexity.
- Problem-specific heuristics, such as step-by-step methods for proving continuity or differentiability.

During prompt construction, relevant entries from the Knowledge Base are retrieved and incorporated into the prompt. This step ensures that the LLM is equipped with the required mathematical context, reducing reliance on general knowledge and increasing the rigor of the solution.

4. **Solution Generation:** The Problem Solver module, powered by a fine-tuned LLM, uses the constructed prompt to generate a detailed solution. The solution generation process emphasizes:

- Logical rigor: Ensuring each step logically follows from the previous one.
- Completeness: Addressing all aspects of the problem and avoiding gaps in reasoning.
- Clarity: Presenting the solution in a well-organized and comprehensible manner.

The Problem Solver incorporates formal reasoning techniques, such as ϵ - δ proofs, series approximations, and convexity arguments, to produce solutions that adhere to the rigorous standards of mathematical analysis.

5.2 Features and Benefits

This framework bridges the gap between computational problem-solving and rigorous proof-based




Figure 4: Framework of instructing analysis problems.

reasoning by equipping LLMs with the tools and methodologies needed to tackle formalized mathematical problems. It introduces several innovations to enhance LLMs' problem-solving ability, which requires powerful reasoning abilities:

- **Dynamic Prompt Adaptation:** Prompts are dynamically tailored based on the problem type and retrieved knowledge, ensuring relevance and context-specific guidance.
- **Fine-Tuned Models:** The framework fine-tunes mainstream models on the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, optimizing them for proof-based thinking.
- **Formal Reasoning Integration:** The framework explicitly incorporates formal methods such as ϵ - δ proofs and theorems on series convergence into the solution process.

6 Experiment and Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of our framework and provide a baseline of the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, we conducted extensive experiments using multiple language models. Our goal was to measure the improvements in solving proof-based problems in mathematical analysis, focusing on logical rigor, completeness, and clarity.

6.1 Experiment Setup

We applied our framework to two relatively small models (Llama-3.2-3B and Qwen-2.5) and tested

the state-of-the-art OpenAI o1-preview model. The prompts for fine-tuning and inference are listed in Appendix C. With the help of Unsloth (Han and Han, 2023), we fine-tuned the models faster with less memory cost. The hyper-parameter settings can be found in Appendix B.

6.2 Evaluation Setup




Figure 5: Proof evaluation process using GPT-4o.

For evaluation, we utilized GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024a) as an expert. The evaluation was based on five key indicators, with a total score of 10 points:

- **Correctness:** Logical rigor and adherence to problem requirements.
- **Completeness:** Full justification of all steps and handling of assumptions.
- **Clarity:** Structured presentation and consistency in mathematical notation.
- **Relevance:** Use of appropriate methods and avoidance of irrelevant details.
- **Insight:** Understanding of concepts and elegance of the solution.

Figure 5 shows the procedure, and the detailed prompt can be found in Appendix D.

6.3 Results and Discussion

The results demonstrate significant improvements in the models’ ability to handle formal mathematical reasoning when fine-tuned with the dataset and

Model	Averaged Score
Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct	0
Fine-Tuned Llama-3.2	33.5%
Fine-Tuned Llama-3.2 with framework	40.8%
Qwen-2.5-Math-7B-bnb-4bit	0
Fine-Tuned Qwen-2.5	37.6%
Fine-Tuned Qwen-2.5 with framework	38.6%
OpenAI o1-preview	41.5%

Table 1: LLMs’ performance on DEMI-MathAnalysis.

the framework. Table 1 summarizes the averaged evaluation scores for each model:

The evaluation revealed significant differences between baseline models, fine-tuned models, and models utilizing the framework. Both baseline models, Llama-3.2-3B-Instruct and Qwen-2.5-Math-7B-bnb-4bit, failed to handle the rigorous proof-based problems in the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset, achieving an average score of 0. This result emphasizes the complexity of the dataset and the need for specialized fine-tuning. Fine-tuning alone brought substantial improvements, with Llama-3.2 achieving an average score of 33.5% and Qwen-2.5 reaching 37.6%.

Incorporating the proposed framework further enhanced performance. For Llama-3.2, the framework increased the score to 40.8%, demonstrating its capability to guide models in generating more rigorous and logically sound solutions. Similarly, Qwen-2.5’s performance improved to 38.6%, showcasing the framework’s adaptability across different models.

Comparatively, the OpenAI o1-preview model achieved the highest score of 41.5%, underscoring its state-of-the-art capabilities. However, the results show that fine-tuning smaller models with the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset and applying the framework allows these models to approach the performance of much larger systems.

These findings validate the effectiveness of our idea in enhancing LLMs’ ability to tackle formal mathematical reasoning. The significant improvements observed after fine-tuning and framework integration demonstrate that even smaller models have the potential to achieve robust performance on proof-based problems when guided by structured methodologies.

7 Conclusion

This work addresses the challenges of solving mathematical analysis problems using LLMs by introducing the DEMI-MathAnalysis dataset and a

novel framework designed to enhance their reasoning capabilities. The dataset fills a critical gap by focusing on rigorous, proof-based problems that are often absent in existing mathematical datasets. Complementing the dataset, the framework integrates problem classification, knowledge retrieval, and solution generation to guide LLMs toward producing logical, complete, and rigorous solutions.

Evaluation results demonstrate significant performance improvements, particularly for fine-tuned models leveraging the framework. These results validate the effectiveness of the dataset and the framework in advancing LLMs' ability to tackle proof-based reasoning tasks, bridging the gap between computational problem-solving and formal mathematical reasoning. However, one shortcoming comes that these results dominated by LLMs may fluctuate within a certain range. Without considering labor-intensive activities, a future task is to develop a more robust proof evaluation system. One can convert the outputs into Lean (Moura and Ullrich, 2021), a language that automates proofs, or design more detailed prompts.

Future work also involves expanding the dataset to include a broader range of mathematical topics and refining the framework for improved generalization and adaptability. By addressing these areas, we aim further to contribute to developing trustworthy and versatile AI systems.

References

- Alibaba. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10671.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- B.P. Demidovich. 1964. *Problems in Mathematical Analysis. Edited by B. Demidovich. Translated From the Russian by G. Yankovsky*. Russian Monographs and Texts on Advanced Mathematics and Physics. Mir Publishers.
- Daniel Han and Michael Han. 2023. [Unsloth ai: Fine-tune llms 2x faster 2-5x faster with 80% less memory](#). GitHub repository.
- M. Hata. 2007. *Problems and Solutions in Real Analysis*. Series on number theory and its applications. World Scientific.
- Joy He-Yueya, Gabriel Poesia, Rose E. Wang, and Noah D. Goodman. 2023. [Solving math word problems by combining language models with symbolic solvers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.09102.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset](#). *NeurIPS*.
- Meta. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. 2021. [The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language](#). In *Automated Deduction – CADE 28*, pages 625–635, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- OpenAI. 2024a. [Gpt-4o system card](#). Technical report.
- OpenAI. 2024b. [Openai o1 system card](#). Technical report.
- Trieu Trinh, Yuhuai Tony Wu, Quoc Le, He He, and Thang Luong. 2024. [Solving olympiad geometry without human demonstrations](#). *Nature*, 625:476–482.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.11171.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.11903.
- Ruijie Xu, Zengzhi Wang, Run-Ze Fan, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. [Benchmarking benchmark leakage in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.18824.
- Jiaxin Zhang, Zhongzhi Li, Mingliang Zhang, Fei Yin, Chenglin Liu, and Yashar Moshfeghi. 2024a. [GeoEval: Benchmark for evaluating llms and multi-modal models on geometry problem-solving](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.10104.
- Renrui Zhang, Dongzhi Jiang, Yichi Zhang, Haokun Lin, Ziyu Guo, Pengshuo Qiu, Aojun Zhou, Pan Lu, Kai-Wei Chang, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. 2024b. [Mathverse: Does your multi-modal llm truly see the diagrams in visual math problems?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.14624.

A Current answer to a specific Problem from GPT-4o

If we input the following problem:

Prove that if $f(x)$ is a continuous function, then the function $F(x) = |f(x)|$ is also continuous.

The answer for reference should be:

Let x_0 be any continuous point, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there always exists $\delta > 0$, such that when $|x - x_0| < \delta$, there is always $|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$. From

$$||f(x)| - |f(x_0)|| \leq |f(x) - f(x_0)|$$

we know that

$$||f(x)| - |f(x_0)|| < \epsilon$$

so $F(x)$ is continuous on x_0 . And we can deduce that $F(x)$ is continuous since x_0 can be any continuous point.

Without fine-tuning and a guiding framework, the answer of LLMs, like GPT-4o, is shown in Figure 6, which is more cluttered and doesn't fit the rigorous mathematical language students typically learn about in a university course.

Let's prove that if $f(x)$ is continuous, then $F(x) = |f(x)|$ is also continuous.

Step 1: Definition of continuity

A function $f(x)$ is continuous at a point x_0 if:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = f(x_0).$$

We want to show that the function $F(x) = |f(x)|$ is also continuous at any point x_0 , which means we need to show that:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} F(x) = F(x_0),$$

which in our case becomes:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |f(x)| = |f(x_0)|.$$

Step 2: Use the continuity of $f(x)$

Since $f(x)$ is continuous at x_0 , we know that:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = f(x_0).$$

Step 3: Apply the continuity of the absolute value function

The absolute value function $|x|$ is continuous everywhere, and it preserves limits. That is, for any real-valued function $g(x)$, if $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x) = g(x_0)$, then:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |g(x)| = |g(x_0)|.$$

Applying this to $f(x)$, we have:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |f(x)| = |\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)| = |f(x_0)|.$$

Step 4: Conclusion

Therefore, since:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |f(x)| = |f(x_0)|,$$

we conclude that $F(x) = |f(x)|$ is continuous at x_0 . Since x_0 is arbitrary, this shows that $F(x)$ is continuous everywhere that $f(x)$ is continuous.

Thus, if $f(x)$ is continuous, then $F(x) = |f(x)|$ is also continuous.

👁️ 🗨️ 🔄 📄 📌

Figure 6: **Answer from GPT-4o without fine-tuning or guidance.** We can tell that it understands the connection between function limits and continuity, but it fails to provide a proof using the precise definition.

B Training settings

per_device_train_batch_size = 2,

gradient_accumulation_steps = 4,
warmup_steps = 5,
max_steps = 300,
learning_rate = 2e-4,
optim = "adamw_8bit",
weight_decay = 0.01,
lr_scheduler_type = "linear",
seed = 3407.

C Prompt used for fine-tuning and inference

C.1 Classifier

As a mathematical assistant, You need to analyze the problem to find out what type of problem it belongs to in Real Analysis. Provide the Problem_Type and the Knowledges which may be used to solve this problem.

```
### Problem:
{}

### Problem_Type:
{}

### Knowledge:
{}
```

C.2 Solver

As a mathematical assistant, solve the following problem. Provide a detailed, step-by-step solution using rigorous mathematical reasoning. If the problem requires the use of the ϵ - δ method (e.g., when proving limits or continuity), ensure that you apply it appropriately. Use precise mathematical language and notation throughout your solution.

```
### Problem_Type:
{}

### Problem:
{}

### Knowledge:
{}

### Solution:
{}
```

D Prompt used for evaluation

You are a mathematical expert in Real Analysis. You need to evaluate the process of a proof of a real analysis problem.

Please follow the steps to give a score to the solution: Here are 5 key indicators to measure when evaluating a proof solution in Real Analysis:

1. Correctness

Logical Rigor: Does the solution logically follow from the given premises and known mathematical principles?

Adherence to Problem Requirements: Does the solution directly address the question and utilize the given conditions appropriately?

Accuracy: Are all mathematical statements, derivations, and conclusions valid?

2. Completeness

Full Proof: Is every step justified, leaving no significant gaps in reasoning?

Handling of Assumptions: Does the solution explicitly consider all assumptions and conditions stated in the problem?

3. Clarity

Structured Presentation: Is the solution organized logically, with clear progression from problem statement to conclusion?

Explanations: Are key steps, methods, and transitions explained clearly and concisely?

Notation Consistency: Is the mathematical notation consistent and aligned with standard practices?

4. Relevance

Appropriateness of Methods: Does the solution use the most relevant and efficient mathematical tools for the problem?

Avoidance of Irrelevant Details: Does the solution focus on solving the problem without introducing unnecessary complications or tangents?

5. Insight

Understanding of Concepts: Does the solution reflect a deep understanding of the underlying mathematical principles and the problem's nuances?

Elegance: If possible, is the solution concise and elegant, avoiding overcomplicated arguments?

Two points for each indicator for a total of ten points. And then I will give you the solution and the correct solution for your reference.