

# Enhancing Formal Theorem Proving: A Comprehensive Dataset for Training AI Models on Coq Code

Andreas Florath<sup>1\*</sup>

**Abstract**  
 In the realm of formal theorem proving, the Coq proof assistant stands out for its rigorous approach to verifying mathematical assertions and software correctness. Despite the advances in artificial intelligence and machine learning, the specialized nature of Coq syntax and semantics poses unique challenges for Large Language Models (LLMs). Addressing this gap, we present a comprehensive dataset specifically designed to enhance LLMs' proficiency in interpreting and generating Coq code. This dataset, derived from a collection of over 10,000 Coq source files, encompasses a wide array of propositions, proofs, and definitions, enriched with metadata including source references and licensing information. Our primary aim is to facilitate the development of LLMs capable of generating syntactically correct and semantically meaningful Coq constructs, thereby advancing the frontier of automated theorem proving. Initial experiments with this dataset have showcased its significant potential; models trained on this data exhibited enhanced accuracy in Coq code generation. Notably, a particular experiment revealed that a fine-tuned LLM was capable of generating 141 valid proofs for a basic lemma, highlighting the dataset's utility in facilitating the discovery of diverse and valid proof strategies. This paper discusses the dataset's composition, the methodology behind its creation, and the implications of our findings for the future of machine learning in formal verification. The dataset is accessible for further research and exploration:  
<https://huggingface.co/datasets/florath/coq-facts-props-proofs-gen0-v1>

**Keywords**  
 Mathematics Formal Proof — Coq — dataset — ML — LLM

<sup>1</sup>*flonatel GmbH & Co. KG, Aachen, Germany*  
 \*Corresponding author: [andreas@florath.net](mailto:andreas@florath.net)

<b>Contents</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Prior Art</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Licenses</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Dataset “coq-facts-props-proofs”</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>4</b>
7.1	info.parquet	4
7.2	facts.parquet	4
7.3	props-proof.parquet	4
<b>8</b>	<b>Experiments</b>	<b>5</b>
8.1	Experiment 1: $n = n + 0$	5
	Prompt and Reference Proof • Model Responses • Comparative Model Responses • Discussion	
8.2	Experiment 2: $7 + 3 = 10$	6
	Prompt and Theoretical Proof • Model's Response • Comparison with Other Models • Discussion	
	8.3 Experiment 3: $S(m * n) = m * n + n$	6
	Prompt and Challenge • Discussion	
<b>9</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Outlook</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Acknowledgment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>8</b>
	12.1141 Ways to Proof the Lemma	8

## 1. Introduction

In the exploration of Large Language Models (LLMs) for code optimization [1], two significant limitations were identified:

- The dependency on human interaction impedes the model's ability to function autonomously, limiting its applicability to extensive source code collections and automation processes.
- The indefinite nature of optimization completion, where a considerable portion of time is allocated to verification rather than the optimization process itself. The

measurement of optimization efficacy remains a challenge.

The adoption of formal mathematical proofs presents a logical advancement for overcoming the second limitation. Through formal proof assistants like Coq [2], Lean [3], or Isabelle [4], the verification of propositions (such as lemmas or theorems) becomes definitive. Once verified, the proposition is conclusively validated, eliminating the need for further evaluation.

This approach advocates for focusing on domains akin to programming, yet characterized by determinate termination states. The development of a system, potentially using agent-based models, is proposed. Such a system could subsequently be applied to the autonomous optimization of source code, thereby resolving the identified challenges.

## 2. Objectives

This research endeavors to advance the integration of machine learning and artificial intelligence within the realm of formal theorem proving, emphasizing the Coq Proof Assistant. By developing a dedicated dataset, this work aims to refine ML models, notably enhancing LLMs' capabilities in processing and generating Coq code. The objectives are meticulously outlined to encompass:

**Enhance Syntax and Semantic Comprehension:** Enhancing LLMs' proficiency in interpreting and generating Coq code by providing a comprehensive dataset, thereby facilitating a deeper comprehension of Coq's syntax, mathematical logic, and proof strategies.

**Enable Autonomous Content Generation:** Empowering LLMs to autonomously formulate mathematical definitions, lemmas, examples, and exercises, adjusting the complexity to bolster formal mathematics contributions.

**Optimize Coq Files for Machine Interaction:** Refining Coq codebases for improved machine interaction through simplification and standardization, aiming for broader application and usage.

**Facilitate Proof Generation:** Equipping LLMs with the necessary tools for autonomous proof generation, laying a foundation for innovative advancements in formal proofs.

The pursuit of these objectives is anticipated to elevate LLMs' efficiency with Coq code, marking significant progress in automated theorem proving and broadening the horizons for formal mathematics and computer science research.

## 3. Prior Art

A singular comprehensive dataset, *The Stack v2*, has been identified amidst extensive research efforts as encompassing a diverse and extensive collection of Coq source code [5]. Hosting over 150,000 files, with nearly 80,000 under a permissive license, the dataset stands out by providing identifiers

for source code retrieval from S3 storage rather than including the code directly. Unprocessed raw data constitutes the dataset's format, presenting each file in a single row. Notably, precise and detailed license documentation is provided for each file, an approach mirrored in the dataset discussed herein.

On Huggingface [6], four additional datasets containing Coq source code were found. Two of these datasets comprised entire Coq files within single rows, leading to impractical usability due to excessively large row sizes, with the largest containing over 6 million characters [7, 8]. Although these collections were sizable, the licensing terms were inadequately addressed, mixing data from various repositories under different licenses without proper license adherence. Queries regarding licensing prompted the removal of both datasets.

CoqGym [9] presents another notable attempt, offering a substantial collection under the Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 Generic License [10], which is incompatible with the licenses of the included Coq source code [11]. The issue of license compatibility remains unresolved [12]. Furthermore, CoqGym duplicated content from other projects into its repository, resulting in a dataset that is now outdated by five years.

The dataset "coq\_code" [13] on Huggingface, though adhering to a step-by-step format (including hypothesis, goal, and tactic), is limited, containing fewer than 25,000 entries. Its formatting is suboptimal, with data merged into a single text column and separated by special tags.

In parallel efforts to utilize machine learning for enhancing formal proving in Coq, research has been conducted on the automation of lemma name generation, leveraging a dataset constructed from approximately 450 Coq source files from the math-comp project. This dataset, aimed at producing AST and token files through preprocessing, encountered challenges in data bloat and clarity, raising questions on its efficacy for LLM training or fine-tuning. To date, there's no documented success in employing this specific dataset for LLM enhancement [14, 15]. Another effort was formatting Coq code using language models. [16]

No datasets containing Coq source code were found on Kaggle at the time of this writing. [17]

Against the backdrop of these endeavors, the dataset presented in this paper distinguishes itself through a unique combination of scale, organization, and focus on formal theorem proving. Unlike previously mentioned datasets, which either offer raw, unprocessed files or are constrained by licensing and formatting issues, this dataset provides a curated and processed collection of Coq code.

Two recent publications, although not directly related to the dataset focus of this paper, share similar approaches or motivations:

An approach is described where a large-scale, graph-based dataset and a graph neural network are employed to dynamically integrate and leverage the hierarchical structure of definitions, theorems, and proofs within Coq. This method sig-

nificantly enhances AI agents’ capability to adapt to new mathematical concepts and lemmas not encountered during training, presenting a critical advancement in the automation of theorem proving [18].

A novel methodology employing Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) to guide LLMs for the generation of verified programs in Dafny, Lean, and Coq, named VMCTS, enhances synthesis capabilities by incorporating verifier feedback directly into the search algorithm, showcasing its efficiency by solving complex verification problems in notably shorter times compared to base models and even rivaling ChatGPT4’s augmented capabilities [19].

## 4. Data Sources

The Coq source files for the datasets were meticulously collected from a diverse array of sources across the internet, focusing on repositories that are pivotal within the Coq community and cover a broad spectrum of mathematical and computational theories. These sources encompass a range of categories, including foundational libraries, formalized mathematical theorems, computer science concepts, and algorithm implementations.

Foundational Libraries and Frameworks form the bedrock, with repositories like the official Coq repository [20], math-comp (Mathematical Components) [21], and Coq’s standard library extensions [22]. These are essential for anyone working with Coq, offering basic definitions, theorems, and tactics widely used in further Coq developments.

Formalized Mathematics and Theorem Proofs are represented through collections such as GeoCoq (geometry) [23], the formal proofs of the Four Color Theorem [24], and various projects under the Coq-community umbrella focusing on specific mathematical domains like algebra [25], number theory [26], and logic [27]. These projects not only provide proofs of known theorems but also extend the library of formalized mathematics accessible for Coq users.

Computer Science Theories and Algorithms feature prominently, with projects like Verdi (for distributed systems verification) [28], the Iris project for concurrent systems [29], and various algorithm collections including sorting, graph theory, and data structures. These repositories are crucial for researchers and practitioners interested in the formal verification of software and algorithms.

The repositories were chosen for their quality, relevance to the Coq community, and contribution to the ecosystem. The collected datasets aim to provide comprehensive coverage of the syntax and semantics employed in Coq development, supporting the project’s goal of enhancing LLMs’ understanding and generation capabilities with respect to Coq code. The datasets ensure a wide representation of the Coq language’s potential applications, from pure mathematics to computer science.

## 5. Licenses

Addressing the complexities of licensing within the context of aggregating datasets from various sources is a non-trivial challenge. [5] The datasets compiled for enhancing Large Language Models’ (LLMs) comprehension and generation of Coq code embody this challenge, as they amalgamate content from a multitude of repositories, each governed by its unique license. Given the diverse origins of the Coq source files, the datasets do not subscribe to a singular license. Instead, each row in the facts and proposition / proofs table link to the license table where for each row the needed information can be found.

To comply with the stipulations of these licenses, especially those like MIT which mandate the inclusion of original licensing and authorship information, the dataset incorporates copies of the original license files and, where available, the author files. This practice ensures adherence to the legal requirements of software redistribution, particularly for open-source licenses that permit such activities.

The compilation strictly omits libraries or files that lack an explicit open-source license or are under a commercial license, thereby ensuring that the dataset comprises only data that is legally redistributable. This careful selection process is pivotal for maintaining the integrity and legality of the datasets, facilitating their use in research and development without infringing upon copyright laws or license conditions.

The dataset encompasses a wide range of licenses, reflecting the diversity of the Coq community and the broader open-source ecosystem. Among these are:

- Apache License 2.0 (Apache-2.0)
- BSD 2-Clause "Simplified" License (BSD-2-Clause)
- BSD 3-Clause "New" or "Revised" License (BSD-3-Clause)
- CEA CNRS Inria Logiciel Libre License, versions 1.0, 2.1 (CECILL-1.0, CECILL-2.1), including its variants CECILL-B and CECILL-C for library and plugin distributions, respectively
- GNU General Public License versions 2.0 only (GPL-2.0-only), 3.0 only (GPL-3.0-only), and 3.0 or later (GPL-3.0-or-later)
- GNU Lesser General Public License versions 2.1 only (LGPL-2.1-only), 2.1 or later (LGPL-2.1-or-later), 3.0 only (LGPL-3.0-only), and 3.0 or later (LGPL-3.0-or-later)
- MIT License (MIT)
- Mozilla Public License 2.0 (MPL-2.0)
- UniMath License (specific to the UniMath library)

This approach ensures that the datasets not only respect the legal and ethical considerations of software redistribution but also provide a rich, legally compliant resource for advancing the capabilities of LLMs in processing and generating Coq code.

## 6. Dataset “coq-facts-props-proofs”

This dataset is comprised of three distinct tables:

1. Definitions or notations categorized as facts.
2. Theorems and lemmas, alongside their proofs, classified as propositions.
3. Licensing and repository information for each entry within the facts and propositions tables.

License identification was conducted manually: a license hint within the `Readme` file was prioritized, followed by the contents of any `LICENSE` file. Only repositories under open-source licenses permitting redistribution were included.

The dataset exclusively features Coq source code files (`.v` files), which were pre-processed using a customized OCaml parser to separate Coq sentences, remove comments, and eliminate directives like `#global`. This process also involved condensing multiple consecutive whitespaces into a single space and deduplicating based on facts and proposition/proof content rather than file origin. The preprocessing was purely done on parsing level, no evaluation of the Coq source code was done. Consequently, some parts of the Coq code may not evaluate or may not be compatible with the latest version of Coq.

The `facts` table is one cornerstone of the dataset, encompassing definitions or notations. Each row within this table represents a unique fact, identified by a Coq definition or notation. These facts are detailed through several key columns:

**fact** the fact itself, presented in Coq syntax

**imports** a list of imports, specifying the Coq modules and libraries required for the fact’s context

**filename** the filename, indicating the source file from which the fact was extracted

**symbolic\_name** the symbolic name, providing a reference handle for the fact to the repository and license information.

The table `props-proofs` is the other key component of the dataset. The structure is very similar to the `facts` table, but instead of using the `facts` column there are two columns **proposition** and **proof**.

The “info” table within our dataset acts as a vital link between the **symbolic\_name** and its corresponding repository, enriched with precise licensing information. It is comprised of four columns:

**symbolic\_name** serving as a unique identifier correlating to entries within the “facts” and “props-proofs” tables

**url** providing the repository’s location which hosts the source Coq files

**hexsha** representing the Git SHA of the last commit at the time the repository was checked out, offering a snapshot for reproducibility and version tracking

**spdx-id** detailing the license under which the repository’s content is distributed, in alignment with the Software Package Data Exchange (SPDX) identifiers.

The dataset is accessible on huggingface: [30].

## 7. Statistics

### 7.1 info.parquet

The `info.parquet` table comprises 142 rows, each representing a repository. The distribution of licenses across these repositories is outlined below:

License	Count	License	Count
MIT	43	Apache-2.0	3
LGPL-2.1-only	29	MPL-2.0	3
LGPL-2.1-or-later	12	GPL-3.0-only	3
CECILL-B	9	GPL-3.0-or-later	3
CECILL-1.0	7	BSD-3-Clause	2
LGPL-3.0-only	7	CECILL-2.1	2
LGPL-3.0-or-later	6	GPL-2.0-only	1
CECILL-C	6	CECILL-2.0	1
BSD-2-Clause	4	UniMath	1

### 7.2 facts.parquet

Data pertaining to the `facts.parquet` table is provided below, with measurements based on character count:

Columns	4
Rows	103,446
Shortest fact	12
Longest fact	37,630
Mean length	132.26
Standard deviation	359.47


### 7.3 props-proof.parquet

Details regarding the `props-proof.parquet` table are summarized below, with lengths measured in characters:

Columns	5
Rows	166,035
Shortest proposition	13
Longest proposition	7400
Mean length proposition	104.05
Standard deviation proposition	97.65
Shortest proof	11
Longest proof	177585
Mean length proof	347.88
Standard deviation proof	1290.80

Observations indicate high standard deviations, attributed to the presence of a few exceptionally long facts, propositions, and proofs. The deviation pattern when excluding the top 5% of length can be seen in figure 1.





**Figure 1.** Deviation of length of proofs for the 0.95 percentile

## 8. Experiments

In this section, we explore one of many possible applications of the dataset through the fine-tuning of an existing base model, Mistral-7b [31]. This exercise is meant to serve as an illustration of the dataset’s potential rather than a comprehensive or central focus of the paper. Our intention is to demonstrate, via selected examples, how the dataset can be utilized to potentially enhance LLM’s understanding and generation of Coq code.

The fine-tuning process, performed on an NVidia A30 GPU across approximately seven days, involved adapting the model to better handle Coq syntax and logic as represented in the dataset. Every three hours a snapshot of the model was generated. It’s important to note that while the model’s performance post fine-tuning provides insights into the dataset’s utility, it represents only one of many possible evaluation metrics.

The model’s output underwent evaluation at a temperature setting of 0.4 across different snapshots using `coqc` or `coqide`. We curated the output for readability, truncating responses at logical endpoints such as `Qed.`, to focus on the model’s capability to produce syntactically and logically coherent Coq constructs. These choices were guided by the goal of assessing the model’s ability to generate syntactically and logically correct Coq code, underlining the qualitative rather than quantitative nature of this experiment. A version of the model which was trained only using Coq code with permissive licenses is publicly available [32].

Additionally, we made prompt adjustments to encourage Coq-specific responses from the different models, indicating the necessity of tailored inputs for optimal output in domain-specific tasks. The comparison of the fine-tuned model against several prominent LLMs provides a broader context for evaluating the dataset’s impact on enhancing Coq code generation capabilities, albeit this comparison is illustrative of the dataset’s potential rather than an exhaustive evaluation of its efficacy.

The models under observation and for comparison:

**CoqLLM-FineTuned** This model was fine-tuned with the

complete dataset described in this paper, specifically designed to enhance its proficiency in interpreting and generating Coq code and serves as the experiment to show the usefulness of the dataset.

**Mistral-7b-Instruct-0.2** Based on the Mistral-7b architecture, this model leverages instructional data to guide its responses and programming language understanding. [31]

**Starcode2-15b** Starcode2-15b has been trained on over 600 different programming languages, including Coq, providing it with a broad syntax and semantic understanding across a wide array of languages. [5]

**Google Gemini** This publicly available chat model from Google demonstrates capabilities in natural language processing and understanding, applied across various contexts, including programming. [33]

**OpenAI ChatGPT 4** As OpenAI’s publicly available chat model, ChatGPT 4 showcases advancements in language models’ ability to engage in detailed conversations and generate code snippets. [34]

### 8.1 Experiment 1: $n = n + 0$

#### 8.1.1 Prompt and Reference Proof

For this experiment, the lemma tested was as follows:

```
1 Lemma plus_n_0 : forall n:nat, n = n + 0.
```

The reference proof contained within the training data is straightforward [23]:

```
1 Proof.
2   induction n; trivial.
3 Defined.
```

#### 8.1.2 Model Responses

Among the 563 responses generated that began with `Proof.`, 141 were identified as valid (see section 12.1), demonstrating the model’s adeptness not only in understanding Coq syntax but also in navigating its semantic landscape to reach valid conclusions through various methods.

Notably, the variety of proofs highlights the LLM’s capacity to utilize a broad spectrum of Coq’s proof strategies, ranging from direct application of arithmetic simplification (`auto with arith.`) to structural induction and recursive definitions (`induction n as [| n IHn].`). This diversity not only showcases the potential of LLMs in theorem proving but also suggests a nuanced understanding of the Coq proof assistant’s capabilities, opening new avenues for exploring automated theorem proving.

These findings are particularly significant as they suggest that LLMs, when equipped with a well-curated dataset, can extend beyond mere syntactic correctness to exhibit a deep comprehension of mathematical logic and proof strategies. This depth enables the generation of multiple, distinctively valid approaches to proving a single proposition, thereby enriching the repertoire of automated theorem proving.

These implications reinforce the utility of specialized datasets in enhancing the performance of LLMs within domain-specific tasks such as theorem proving.

### 8.1.3 Comparative Model Responses

**Mistral-7b-Instruct** Responded in a non-Coq language and failed to generate a valid proof even after prompt adaptation.

**ChatGPT 4** Although replying in Coq, the proof offered was incorrect.

**Google Gemini** Required prompt modification before producing a correct proof.

**StarCoder2-15b** Did not provide any proof, despite being prompted.

### 8.1.4 Discussion

This experiment highlights the CoqLLM-FineTuned model's superior capability in producing correct Coq proofs that were not part of its training set, distinguishing it from other models, including those of similar size and significantly larger ones like ChatGPT 4 or Google Gemini. The model not only demonstrated its understanding of Coq syntax and logic but also its ability to creatively solve problems without directly reproducing training data.

## 8.2 Experiment 2: $7 + 3 = 10$

### 8.2.1 Prompt and Theoretical Proof

The prompt for this experiment was:

```
1 Lemma ex1: 7 + 3 = 10.
```

Notably, this specific lemma did not exist within the training dataset. However, a theoretically valid proof employing basic reflexivity is suggested:

```
1 Proof.
2   reflexivity.
3 Qed.
```

### 8.2.2 Model's Response

Remarkably, the CoqLLM-FineTuned model independently arrived with most responses at the same proof as the one proposed, successfully utilizing the `reflexivity` tactic.

### 8.2.3 Comparison with Other Models

**Mistral-7b-Instruct** Failed to provide a valid Coq proof, responding inappropriately and deviating significantly from the prompt.

**ChatGPT 4, Google Gemini, and StarCoder2-15b** Each of these models managed to produce valid proofs, indicating a general competence in handling straightforward arithmetic propositions in Coq.

### 8.2.4 Discussion

This experiment underscores the performance of the CoqLLM-FineTuned model in generating a valid proof for a proposition not present in its training set, further exemplifying its advanced reasoning capabilities. Unlike the Mistral-7b-Instruct model, which failed to generate a correct response,

the CoqLLM-FineTuned, alongside other prominent models like ChatGPT 4, Google Gemini, and StarCoder2-15b, demonstrated proficiency in Coq syntax and logical reasoning.

## 8.3 Experiment 3: $S(m * n) = m * n + n$ .

### 8.3.1 Prompt and Challenge

The lemma explored in this experiment was as follows:

```
1 Lemma mult_S : forall m n : nat, S (m * n) = m * n
   + n.
```

Intentionally erroneous, this lemma serves to test the LLMs' ability to recognize or question the validity of a proposition, essentially assigning them an impossible task.

### 8.3.2 Discussion

Despite the intrinsic fallacy in the lemma, all tested models, including Mistral-7b-Instruct, ChatGPT 4, Google Gemini, StarCoder2, and CoqLLM-FineTuned, endeavored to construct a proof without indicating any recognition of the proposition's incorrectness. This uniform approach across diverse models reveals a critical area for future enhancement in LLMs' capabilities: the detection of inherently flawed or unsolvable problems.

## 9. Results

The fine-tuning of a Large Language Model (LLM) with the Coq dataset demonstrated promising outcomes, with the model generating outputs with a high probability exclusively in Coq syntax. This specificity in output underscores the dataset's effectiveness in aligning the trained model with the requirements of both agent systems and Coq runtime environments, making it a preferred choice for these applications.

The endeavor also revealed the feasibility of achieving significant advancements in model performance with limited resources and within a constrained timeframe. The refined model showcased an ability to produce insightful, Coq-compatible remarks, underscoring the potential for further enhancing the efficiency of theorem proving in Coq.

Moreover, the careful curation, cleanup, and licensing of the dataset not only facilitated this study but also ensure its utility for the broader research community. This resource is poised to contribute to the ongoing development of agents, marking a crucial step in the journey towards more sophisticated and autonomous theorem proving systems.

Building upon these achievements, the notable success in Experiment 1 (see section 8.1), where the fine-tuned LLMs generated 141 valid proofs for the proposition  $n = n + 0$  opens a new vista for the application of LLMs in generating valuable Coq source code. This accomplishment illustrates the models' capacity not only to adhere to syntactic correctness but also to engage in creative problem-solving within the Coq framework. The presence of valid, varied proofs further underscores the potential utility of LLMs as tools for enriching and expanding Coq datasets with new, verified source code.

## 10. Outlook

The successful fine-tuning of the Large Language Model (LLM) using the Coq dataset opens up several promising avenues for future research and application enhancements:

**Agent-based Application:** The dataset can serve as a training data for models for developing agents capable of interacting with, and reasoning about, Coq code. This could significantly streamline processes in formal methods and theorem proving by providing automated assistance.

**Refining Prompts with the Dataset:** Utilizing the dataset to fine-tune prompts can enhance the generation of higher quality and more relevant content. This improvement can bolster the model’s capacity to tackle intricate problem-solving and reasoning within formal verification’s scope.

**Hypothesis, Goal, Tactic Approach:** Implementing a structured approach that defines hypotheses, sets goals, and employs tactics could further sophisticate the model’s interaction with formal proofs. This strategy could facilitate the development of more advanced models capable of autonomously devising and verifying proofs, thus pushing the boundaries of what’s possible in automated theorem proving.

**Curating, Enhancing, and Enlarging the Coq Source Code Base Using LLMs:** The demonstrated capacity of LLMs to generate valid and diverse Coq proofs opens the door to utilizing these models for the curation, enhancement, and expansion of the Coq source code base. By integrating LLM-generated code into the dataset, we can continuously improve the quality and breadth of Coq resources available to the research community, fostering a more dynamic and robust ecosystem for theorem proving and formal verification.

These directions not only underscore the potential for the dataset to catalyze significant advancements in the field but also highlight the broader implications for enhancing AI’s role in formal methods and beyond.

## 11. Acknowledgment

The author extend his sincere gratitude to Andrei Agapi for his invaluable ideas and for conducting the initial review, which significantly contributed to the enhancement of this paper.

“Stylish Article” template [35] was used.

## 12. Appendix

### 12.1 141 Ways to Proof the Lemma

The validation was performed using `coqc` version 8.19.1. In addition to the proposition, the validated coq source file contained some `Require Imports` as well as some notations like `plus_0_1` or `plus_comm`.

```

1 Proof. auto with arith. Qed.
2 Proof. destruct n; simpl; auto. Qed.
3 Proof. induction n; simpl; auto. Qed.
4 Proof. intro n; apply eq_add_S; auto with arith. Qed.
5 Proof. intro n; destruct n as [|p]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto. Qed.
6 Proof. intro n; elim n ; auto with arith. Qed.
7 Proof. intro n; elim n ; simpl; auto. Qed.
8 Proof. intro n; elim n using nat_rect. - reflexivity. - intros m Hrec; simpl; auto. Qed.
9 Proof. intro n; elim n using nat_rect. - reflexivity. - intros m Hrec; simpl; rewrite <- Hrec; auto with
  arith. Qed.
10 Proof. intro n; elim n using nat_rect. - reflexivity. - simpl. auto with arith. Qed.
11 Proof. intro n; elim n using nat_rect; auto. Qed.
12 Proof. intro n; elim n. - reflexivity. - intros m IHm. simpl. rewrite <- IHm. reflexivity. Qed.
13 Proof. intro n; elim n. - reflexivity. - intros p IHp; simpl; rewrite <- IHp; reflexivity. Qed.
14 Proof. intro n; elim n; auto with arith. Qed.
15 Proof. intro n; elim n; auto. Qed.
16 Proof. intro n; elim n; simpl. - reflexivity. - intros m IHm; rewrite <- IHm; reflexivity. Qed.
17 Proof. intro n; elim n; simpl. reflexivity. intros m IH. rewrite <- IH. auto with arith. Qed.
18 Proof. intro n; elim n; simpl. reflexivity. intros m IHm. rewrite <- IHm. reflexivity. Qed.
19 Proof. intro n; elim n; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
20 Proof. intro n; elim n; simpl; auto. Qed.
21 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn; auto. Qed.
22 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHp; reflexivity. Qed.
23 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| m IHm]; auto with arith. Qed.
24 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n Hrecn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- Hrecn; reflexivity. Qed.
25 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]. - reflexivity. - simpl. apply f_equal. assumption. Qed.
26 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]. - reflexivity. - simpl. rewrite <- IH. reflexivity. Qed.
27 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto. Qed.
28 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IH; reflexivity. Qed.
29 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]; auto. Qed.
30 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]; simpl. - reflexivity. - rewrite <- IH; ring. Qed.
31 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IH]; simpl; auto. Qed.
32 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl. rewrite <- IHn. reflexivity. Qed.
33 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto. Qed.
34 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; now rewrite <- IHn. Qed.
35 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- (IHn); auto. Qed.
36 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- (plus_n_0 n); reflexivity.
  Qed.
37 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn at 1; reflexivity. Qed.
38 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn; auto. Qed.
39 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn; reflexivity. Qed.
40 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite IHn at 1; reflexivity. Qed.
41 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p Hp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- Hp; reflexivity. Qed.
42 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p Hp]. - simpl; auto with arith. - simpl; rewrite <- Hp; reflexivity.
  Qed.
43 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl. rewrite <- (IHp). reflexivity. Qed.
44 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl. rewrite <- IHp. reflexivity. Qed.
45 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
46 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto. Qed.
47 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite -> IHp at 1; reflexivity. Qed.
48 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHp at 1; reflexivity. Qed.
49 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHp; auto with arith. Qed.
50 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHp; auto. Qed.
51 Proof. intro n; induction n as [| p IHp]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHp; reflexivity. Qed.
52 Proof. intro n; induction n as [|n IH]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IH. reflexivity. Qed.
53 Proof. intro n; induction n as [|n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; auto. Qed.
54 Proof. intro n; induction n as [|n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn; reflexivity. Qed.
55 Proof. intro n; induction n as [|n IHn]; simpl; auto. Qed.
56 Proof. intro n; induction n as [|n' IHn']. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn'; reflexivity. Qed.
57 Proof. intro n; replace 0 with (S 0 - 1); auto. Qed.
58 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); auto with *. Qed.
59 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); auto with arith. Qed.
60 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); auto. Qed.

```



```

61 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); reflexivity. Qed.
62 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); simpl; auto. Qed.
63 Proof. intro n; rewrite (plus_comm n 0); trivial. Qed.
64 Proof. intro n; rewrite <- (plus_n_0 n); reflexivity. Qed.
65 Proof. intro n; rewrite <- Nat.add_0_r at 1. reflexivity. Qed.
66 Proof. intro n; rewrite Nat.add_0_r; reflexivity. Qed.
67 Proof. intro n; rewrite Nat.add_comm; auto. Qed.
68 Proof. intro n; rewrite Nat.add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
69 Proof. intro n; rewrite add_comm. reflexivity. Qed.
70 Proof. intro n; rewrite add_comm; auto with arith. Qed.
71 Proof. intro n; rewrite add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
72 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_0_r; reflexivity. Qed.
73 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_comm with (m := 0); auto. Qed.
74 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_comm; apply plus_0_n. Qed.
75 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_comm; auto. Qed.
76 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_comm; exact (plus_0_n n). Qed.
77 Proof. intro n; rewrite plus_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
78 Proof. intro n; simpl. auto with arith. Qed.
79 Proof. intro n; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
80 Proof. intro n; simpl; auto. Qed.
81 Proof. intro; apply eq_add_S ; auto with arith. Qed.
82 Proof. intro; apply eq_add_S; auto. Qed.
83 Proof. intro; apply nat_ind with (P := fun n => n = n + 0). - reflexivity. - intros; simpl; auto. Qed.
84 Proof. intro; apply sym_eq; apply Nat.add_0_r. Qed.
85 Proof. intro; elim n using nat_rect. - reflexivity. - intros m Hrec; simpl in |- *; rewrite Hrec; auto
  with arith. Qed.
86 Proof. intro; elim n. - reflexivity. - intros; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
87 Proof. intro; elim n; simpl; auto. Qed.
88 Proof. intro; induction n as [| n IH]; simpl; auto. Qed.
89 Proof. intro; induction n as [| n IHn]. - reflexivity. - simpl; rewrite <- IHn; reflexivity. Qed.
90 Proof. intro; induction n as [| p IHp]; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
91 Proof. intro; induction n as [| p IHp]; simpl; auto. Qed.
92 Proof. intro; induction n as [|n IH]; simpl; auto. Qed.
93 Proof. intro; induction n; simpl; auto. Qed.
94 Proof. intro; rewrite <- (Nat.add_comm 0); reflexivity. Qed.
95 Proof. intro; rewrite <- (add_comm 0); apply plus_0_n. Qed.
96 Proof. intro; rewrite <- (plus_n_0 n); reflexivity. Qed.
97 Proof. intro; rewrite <- add_comm; auto with arith. Qed.
98 Proof. intro; rewrite <- add_comm; auto. Qed.
99 Proof. intro; rewrite <-plus_n_0. reflexivity. Qed.
100 Proof. intro; rewrite Nat.add_0_r; reflexivity. Qed.
101 Proof. intro; rewrite Nat.add_comm; auto with arith. Qed.
102 Proof. intro; rewrite Nat.add_comm; auto. Qed.
103 Proof. intro; rewrite Nat.add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
104 Proof. intro; rewrite Nat.add_comm; trivial. Qed.
105 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; auto with *. Qed.
106 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; auto with arith. Qed.
107 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; auto. Qed.
108 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
109 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; simpl; auto. Qed.
110 Proof. intro; rewrite add_comm; simpl; reflexivity. Qed.
111 Proof. intro; rewrite plus_comm; apply plus_0_n. Qed.
112 Proof. intro; rewrite plus_comm; auto with arith. Qed.
113 Proof. intro; rewrite plus_comm; auto. Qed.
114 Proof. intro; rewrite plus_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
115 Proof. intro; rewrite plus_comm; simpl; reflexivity. Qed.
116 Proof. intro; ring. Qed.
117 Proof. intro; ring_simplify; reflexivity. Qed.
118 Proof. intro; ring_simplify; trivial. Qed.
119 Proof. intro; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
120 Proof. intros n; now rewrite <- Nat.add_comm. Qed.
121 Proof. intros. rewrite <- Nat.add_comm. apply eq_refl. Qed.
122 Proof. intros. rewrite <- plus_comm. reflexivity. Qed.
123 Proof. intros. rewrite Nat.add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
124 Proof. intros; now rewrite Nat.add_0_r. Qed.
125 Proof. intros; now rewrite Nat.add_comm. Qed.
126 Proof. intros; rewrite <- (plus_n_0 n); reflexivity. Qed.
127 Proof. intros; rewrite <- Nat.add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
128 Proof. intros; rewrite <- add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
129 Proof. intros; rewrite <- plus_n_0; reflexivity. Qed.

```

```

130 Proof. intros; rewrite Nat.add_comm; apply Nat.add_0_l. Qed.
131 Proof. intros; rewrite Nat.add_comm; apply add_0_l. Qed.
132 Proof. intros; rewrite Nat.add_comm; apply plus_0_n. Qed.
133 Proof. intros; rewrite Nat.add_comm; reflexivity. Qed.
134 Proof. intros; rewrite plus_comm; exact (plus_0_n n). Qed.
135 Proof. intros; ring. Qed.
136 Proof. intros; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
137 Proof. simpl. auto with arith. Qed.
138 Proof. simple induction n; auto. Qed.
139 Proof. simple induction n; simpl in |- *; auto with arith. Qed.
140 Proof. simple induction n; simpl; auto with arith. Qed.
141 Proof. simple induction n; simpl; auto. Qed.

```

## References

- [1] Andreas Florath. *LLM Interactive Optimization of Open Source Python Libraries – Case Studies and Generalization*. 2024. arXiv: 2312.14949 [cs.SE].
- [2] The Coq Development Team. *The Coq Proof Assistant*. accessed 2024-02-29. URL: <https://coq.inria.fr/>.
- [3] *Lean*. accessed 2024-03-18. URL: <https://lean-lang.org>.
- [4] *Isabelle*. accessed 2024-03-18. URL: <https://isabelle.in.tum.de>.
- [5] Anton Lozhkov et al. *StarCoder 2 and The Stack v2: The Next Generation*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.19173 [cs.SE].
- [6] *Huggingface Datasets*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets>.
- [7] *Huggingface Dataset: coq-github-scrape*. accessed 2024-02-27. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/cassanof/coq-github-scrape>.
- [8] *Huggingface Dataset: coq-train*. accessed 2024-02-27. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/metareflection/coq-train>.
- [9] Kaiyu Yang and Jia Deng. “Learning to Prove Theorems via Interacting with Proof Assistants”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2019.
- [10] *CC BY 2.0 LEGAL CODE Attribution 2.0 Generic*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/legalcode.en>.
- [11] *ShareAlike compatibility: GPLv3*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: [https://wiki.creativecommons.org/wiki/ShareAlike\\_compatibility:\\_GPLv3](https://wiki.creativecommons.org/wiki/ShareAlike_compatibility:_GPLv3).
- [12] *License Compatibility Review Suggested for Dataset*. accessed 2024-03-18. URL: <https://github.com/princeton-vl/CoqGym/issues/87>.
- [13] *Dataset jbb/coq-code*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/jbb/coq-code>.
- [14] Pengyu Nie et al. “Deep Generation of Coq Lemma Names Using Elaborated Terms”. In: *International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning*. 2020, pp. 97–118. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-51054-1\_6.
- [15] *MathComp Corpus*. accessed 2024-03-08. URL: <https://github.com/EngineeringSoftware/math-comp-corpus>.
- [16] Pengyu Nie et al. *Learning to Format Coq Code Using Language Models*. 2020. arXiv: 2006.16743 [cs.HC].
- [17] *Kaggle datasets*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets>.
- [18] Jason Rute et al. *Graph2Tac: Learning Hierarchical Representations of Math Concepts in Theorem proving*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.02949 [cs.LG].
- [19] David Brandfonbrener et al. *Verified Multi-Step Synthesis using Large Language Models and Monte Carlo Tree Search*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.08147 [cs.SE].
- [20] *Coq*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/coq/coq>.
- [21] *Mathematical Components*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/math-comp>.
- [22] *coq-ext-lib*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/coq-community/coq-ext-lib.git>.
- [23] *GeoCoq*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/GeoCoq/GeoCoq>.

- [24] *The Four Color Theorem*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/coq-community/fourcolor.git>.
- [25] *algebra-tactics*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/math-comp/algebra-tactics.git>.
- [26] *coqprime*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/they/coqprime>.
- [27] *100 famous theorems proved using Coq*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/coq-community/coq-100-theorems.git>.
- [28] *verdi*. accessed 2024-03-01. URL: <https://github.com/uwplse/verdi>.
- [29] *stdpp*. accessed 2024-03-07. URL: <https://gitlab.mpi-sws.org/iris/stdpp.git>.
- [30] *Coq Facts, Propositions and Proofs*. accessed 2024-03-18. URL: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/florath/coq-facts-props-proofs-gen0-v1>.
- [31] Albert Q. Jiang et al. *Mistral 7B*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.06825 [cs.CL].
- [32] *CoqLLM-FineTuned-Experiment-Gen0*. accessed 2024-03-18. URL: <https://huggingface.co/florath/CoqLLM-FineTuned-Experiment-Gen0>.
- [33] Gemini Team et al. *Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2312.11805 [cs.CL].
- [34] OpenAI et al. *GPT-4 Technical Report*. 2024. arXiv: 2303.08774 [cs.CL].
- [35] *Stylish Article*. <https://www.latextemplates.com/template/stylish-article>. Accessed: 2023-11-01.