



Presenting Proofs with Adapted Granularity

Marvin Schiller[†] and Christoph Benzmüller^{*}

[†]Saarland University, Germany

[†]DFKI GmbH, Germany

^{*}Articulate Software, Angwin, CA, USA

KI 2009 – 32nd Annual Conference on AI,
September 15th – 18th, 2009



Studienstiftung
des deutschen Volkes



**UNIVERSITÄT
DES
SAARLANDES**



Proof Step Size in Mathematics Instruction

[1] “Let x be an element of $A \cap (B \cup C)$, [2] then $x \in A$ and $x \in B \cup C$. [3] This means that $x \in A$, and either $x \in B$ or $x \in C$. [4] Hence we either have (i) $x \in A$ and $x \in B$, or we have (ii) $x \in A$ and $x \in C$. [5] Therefore, either $x \in A \cap B$ or $x \in A \cap C$, so [6] $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. [7] This shows that $A \cap (B \cup C)$ is a subset of $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. [8] Conversely, let y be an element of $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. [9] Then, either (iii) $y \in A \cap B$, or (iv) $y \in A \cap C$. [10] It follows that $y \in A$, and either $y \in B$ or $y \in C$. [11] Therefore, $y \in A$ and $y \in B \cup C$ [12] so that $y \in A \cap (B \cup C)$. [13] Hence $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ is a subset of $A \cap (B \cup C)$. [14] In view of Definition 1.1.1, we conclude that the sets $A \cap (B \cup C)$ and $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ are equal.”

Proof of $A \cap (B \cup C) = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$, reproduced from Bartle/Sherbert: Introduction to Real Analysis, 1982.



Proof Step Size in Mathematics Instruction

9 Then, either (iii) $y \in A \cap B$, or (iv) $y \in A \cap C$.

10a $y \in A \wedge y \in B$, or $y \in A \cap C$ (Def. \cap)

10b $y \in A \wedge y \in B$, or $y \in A \wedge y \in C$ (Def. \cap)

10c It follows that $y \in A$, and either $y \in B$ or $y \in C$. (Distr.)

6 $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. **7** This shows that $A \cap (B \cup C)$ is a subset of $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. **8** Conversely, let y be an element of $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. **9** Then, either (iii) $y \in A \cap B$, or (iv) $y \in A \cap C$. **10** It follows that $y \in A$, and either $y \in B$ or $y \in C$. **11** Therefore, $y \in A$ and $y \in B \cup C$. **12** so that $y \in A \cap (B \cup C)$. **13** Hence $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ is a subset of $A \cap (B \cup C)$. **14** In view of Definition 1.1.1, we conclude that the sets $A \cap (B \cup C)$ and $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ are equal."

Proof of $A \cap (B \cup C) = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$, reproduced from
Bartle/Sherbert: Introduction to Real Analysis, 1982.



Overview

- ① Framework for Granularity-Adaptive Proof Presentation
 - Approach
 - Case Study
- ② An Empirical Study on Granularity
- ③ Conclusion



Granularity-Adaptive Proof Presentation Framework

Goal: bridge granularity gap between theorem proving systems/mathematical practice

- ▶ parameterized over 'granularity policy'
- ▶ adaptive (e.g. to user's/learner's knowledge)
- ▶ implementation (here, using MAS Ω_{MEGA}) & experiments

Previous Work

- ▶ HiProofs [Denney et al. 2006], proof presentation in Isabelle [Simons, 1997], Theorema [Buchberger et al., 1997], Coq [Coscoy, Kahn, Thery, 1995], etc.
- ▶ hierarchical proof planning, proof explainer P.rex [Fiedler 2001]
- ▶ particular granularity levels, e.g. *what-you-need-is-what-you-stated* [Autexier/Fiedler 2006]



Granularity as a Classification Problem

Approach

- ▶ Granularity as a classification problem; simple/composite steps can be *appropriate*, *too big* or *too small*
- ▶ Identify properties of proof steps that can make them appropriate/inappropriate (granularity criteria)

E.g.

9 Then, either (iii) $y \in A \cap B$, or (iv) $y \in A \cap C$.

10 It follows that $y \in A$, and either $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.

- (i) two concepts involved: def. of \cap , distributivity,
- (ii) total number of concept applications: three,
- (iii) involved concepts have been previously applied,
- (iv) all manipulations apply to a common part in **9**,
- (v) the names of the applied concepts are not explicitly mentioned
- (vi) inferences belong to naive set theory and propositional logic.

- ▶ Model decision which steps are skipped/combined via classic expert system



Algorithm

Main loop (input: proof tree)

- (i) consider (iteratively larger) proof segments
- (ii) analyze granularity-relevant properties of each composite step
- (iii) judge each composite step via granularity classifier (assign labels “too big” / “too small” / “appropriate”), with and without mentioning concept name(s)
- (iv) select composite steps of “appropriate” size
- (v) pretty print & simple NL (pattern-based)

‘Granularity policies’ expressed as classifiers (e.g. rule sets/decision trees), e.g.

- * $\text{concepts} \in \{0, 1\} \wedge \text{eq-Defn} = 0 \wedge \text{verb} = \text{true} \Rightarrow \text{too-small}$
- * $\text{concepts} \in \{2, 3, 4\} \wedge \text{U-Defn} \in \{1, 2, 3\} \Rightarrow \text{too-big}$
- ...
- * $_ \Rightarrow \text{appropriate}$



Classifiers

... model different levels of proof granularity.

Classifiers can be

- ▶ hand-authored
- ▶ fitted to sample proofs (using machine learning)
- ▶ learned (via ML) from annotated proof samples

Granularity Criteria

- ▶ mastered/unmastered concepts (w.r.t. simple overlay student model)
- ▶ are hypotheses/subgoals introduced?
- ▶ direction (forward/backward)
- ▶ explicitness (explanation)
- ▶ etc...



Example

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
 \text{DEFU (8)} & \frac{x \in S \vdash x \in S}{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (7)} & \frac{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in S}{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (6)} & \frac{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S}{(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DISTR (5)} & \frac{(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S}{(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DEFU (4)} & \frac{(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in S}{(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (3)} & \frac{(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S}{(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in S} & \\
 \text{DEF}\subseteq \text{ (2)} & \frac{(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in S}{\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq S} & \\
 \text{DEF EQ (1)} & \frac{\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq S}{\vdash \underbrace{(A \cap (B \cup C))}_T = \underbrace{((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))}_S} & \\
 & & \frac{y \in T \vdash y \in T}{(y \in A \wedge y \in (B \cup C)) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (15)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in (B \cup C)) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEFU (14)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T} \text{DISTR (13)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (12)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEFU (11)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEFU (10)} \\
 & & \frac{(y \in ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))) \vdash y \in T}{\vdash ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)) \subseteq T} \text{DEF}\subseteq \text{ (9)}
 \end{array}$$

- : appropriate
- : appropriate with explanation
- : too small (skipped)



Example

	$x \in S \vdash x \in S$	$y \in T \vdash y \in T$	
DEFU (8)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in (B \cup C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEF \cap (15)
DEF \cap (7)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (14)
DEF \cap (6)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T$	DISTR (13)
DISTR (5)	$(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEF \cap (12)
DEFU (4)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEF \cap (11)
DEF \cap (3)	$(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (10)
DEF \subseteq (2)	$\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq S$	$\vdash ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)) \subseteq T$	DEF \subseteq (9)
DEF EQ (1)	$\vdash \underbrace{(A \cap (B \cup C))}_T = \underbrace{((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))}_S$		

$$\frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T}{(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T} \text{DEF}\cap$$

Properties:
 concepts: 1,
 total: 1,
 mastered: 1,
 etc...

Classification re-
 sult: "too small"
 (w. and w./o.
 explanation)



Example

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{DEFU (8)} \quad \frac{x \in \mathbf{S} \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (7)} \quad \frac{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (6)} \quad \frac{(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DISTR (5)} \quad \frac{(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEFU (4)} \quad \frac{(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEF}\cap \text{ (3)} \quad \frac{(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEF}\subseteq \text{ (2)} \quad \frac{(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in \mathbf{S}}{\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq \mathbf{S}} \\
 \text{DEF EQ (1)} \quad \frac{\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq \mathbf{S}}{\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) = ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))}
 \end{array}$$

Properties:
 concepts: 1,
 total: 2,
 mastered: 1,
 etc...

Classification re-
 sult: "too small"
 (w. and w./o.
 explanation)

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in \mathbf{T}}{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in \mathbf{T}} \text{DEF}\cap \\
 \frac{(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in \mathbf{T}}{(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in \mathbf{T}} \text{DEF}\cap
 \end{array}$$



Example

	$x \in S \vdash x \in S$	$y \in T \vdash y \in T$	
DEFU (8)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in (B \cup C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (15)
DEFN (7)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (14)
DEFN (6)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T$	DISTR (13)
DISTR (5)	$(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (12)
DEFU (4)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (11)
DEFN (3)	$(x \in (A \cap (B \cup C))) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (10)
DEF \subseteq (2)	$F(A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq S$	$F((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)) \subseteq T$	DEF \subseteq (9)
DEF EQ (1)	$\vdash \underbrace{(A \cap (B \cup C))}_T = \underbrace{((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))}_S$		

$(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T$	DISTR
$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN
$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN
$(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	

Properties:
 concepts: 2,
 total: 3,
 mastered: 2,
 etc...

Classification re-
 sult: "appropriate" (w./o. ex-
 planation)



Example

	$x \in S \vdash x \in S$	$y \in T \vdash y \in T$	
DEFU (8)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in (A \cap C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in (B \cup C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (15)
DEFN (7)	$(x \in (A \cap B) \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (14)
DEFN (6)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in A \wedge y \in C) \vdash y \in T$	DISTR (13)
DISTR (5)	$(x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in A \wedge y \in B \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (12)
DEFU (4)	$(x \in A \wedge x \in (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S$	$(y \in (A \cap B) \vee y \in (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFN (11)
DEFN (3)	$x \in (A \cap (B \cup C)) \vdash x \in S$	$y \in ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)) \vdash y \in T$	DEFU (10)
DEF \subseteq (2)	$\vdash (A \cap (B \cup C)) \subseteq S$	$\vdash ((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)) \subseteq T$	DEF \subseteq (9)
DEF EQ (1)	$\vdash \underbrace{(A \cap (B \cup C))}_T = \underbrace{((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))}_S$		



Output for the Running Example

- 1) We show that $((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C)$ and $(A \cap B \cup C \subseteq (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))$...because of definition of equality
- 2) We assume $x \in A \cap B \cup C$ and show $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$
- 3) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \cup C$
- 4) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)$
- 5) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C$
- 6) Therefore, $x \in A \cap B \vee x \in A \cap C$
- 7) Therefore, $x \in A \cap B \vee x \in A \cap C$
- 8) We are done with the current part of the proof (i.e., to show that $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$). [It remains to be shown that $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C$]
- 9) We assume $y \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ and show $y \in A \cap B \cup C$
- 10) Therefore, $y \in A \cap B \vee y \in A \cap C$
- 11) Therefore, $(y \in A \wedge y \in B) \vee y \in A \cap C$
- 12) Therefore, $(y \in A \wedge y \in B) \vee (y \in A \wedge y \in C)$
- 13) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)$
- 14) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge y \in B \cup C$
- 15) This finishes the proof. Q.E.D.

Ruleset:
 $_ \Rightarrow$ "appropriate"



Output for the Running Example

- 1) We show that $((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C)$ and $(A \cap B \cup C \subseteq (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))$...because of definition of equality
- 2) We assume $x \in A \cap B \cup C$ and show $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$
- 3) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \cup C$
- 4) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)$
- 5) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C$
- 6) ~~Therefore, $x \in A \cap B \vee x \in A \cap C$~~
- 7) Therefore, $x \in A \cap B \vee x \in A \cap C$
- 8) We are done with the current part of $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$. [It remains $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C$]
- 9) We assume $y \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ a
- 10) Therefore, $y \in A \cap B \vee y \in A \cap C$
- 11) ~~Therefore, $(y \in A \wedge y \in B) \vee y \in A$~~
- 12) ~~Therefore, $(y \in A \wedge y \in B) \vee (y \in A \wedge y \in C)$~~
- 13) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)$
- 14) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge y \in B \cup C$
- 15) This finishes the proof. Q.E.D.

Ruleset:

- * $\text{concepts} \in \{0, 1\} \wedge \text{eq-Defn}=0 \wedge \text{verb}=\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{too-small}$
- * $\text{hypintro}=0 \wedge \text{eq-Defn}=0 \wedge \text{U-Defn}=0 \wedge \text{verb}=\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{too-small}$
- * $\text{concepts} \in \{2, 3, 4\} \wedge \text{U-Defn} \in \{1, 2, 3\} \Rightarrow \text{too-big}$
- * $\text{hypintro} \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \wedge \text{concepts} \in \{2, 3, 4\} \Rightarrow \text{too-big}$
- * $\text{unm.c.u.}=0 \wedge \text{total} \in \{0, 1, 2\} \wedge \text{N-Defn} \in \{1, 2\} \wedge \text{close}=\text{false} \Rightarrow \text{too-small}$
- * $\text{eq-Defn} \in \{1, 2\} \wedge \text{verb}=\text{false} \Rightarrow \text{too-big}$
- * $\text{eq-Defn} \in \{1, 2\} \wedge \text{verb}=\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{app.}$
- * $\text{eq-Defn}=0 \wedge \text{verb}=\text{false} \Rightarrow \text{app.}$
- * $_ \Rightarrow \text{app.}$



Output for the Running Example

- 1) We show that $((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C)$ and $(A \cap B \cup C \subseteq (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C))$...because of definition of equality **7,13,14**
- 2) We assume $x \in A \cap B \cup C$ and show $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ **1**
- 3) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \cup C$ **2**
- 4) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge (x \in B \vee x \in C)$ **3**
- 5) Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in B \vee x \in A \wedge x \in C$ **4**
- 6) Therefore, $x \in A \cap B \vee x \in A \cap C$ **5**
- 7) We are done with the current part of the proof (i.e., to show that $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$). [It remains to be shown that $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subseteq A \cap B \cup C$] **6**
- 8) We assume $y \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ and show $y \in A \cap B \cup C$ **8**
- 9) Therefore, $y \in A \cap B \vee y \in A \cap C$ **9**
- 10) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge (y \in B \vee y \in C)$ **10**
- 11) Therefore, $y \in A \wedge y \in B \cup C$ **11**
- 12) This finishes the proof. Q.E.D. **12**



Empirical study

- ▶ Assess performance of learning classifiers from annotated samples (from different math. domains)
- ▶ I.e, proof presentation at different step sizes (1-4 Ω_{MEGA} assertion level steps), (four) human mathematicians judge (label) them as appropriate, too small, too big.
- ▶ Apply machine learning (here, J48, PART, SMO, Linear Regression) to learn classifiers, statistical evaluation.



Study Environment

```
proofmanager Standalone
File Edit Options Buffers Tools Complete In/Out Signals Help

***** Proof Exercise: *****
The exercise is to show that for all A: for all B: for all C:
  An(BuC) = (AnB)u(AnC)

***** Previous Steps: *****
1. We assume  $x \in An(BuC)$  and show  $x \in (AnB)u(AnC)$ 

2. Therefore,  $x \in A \wedge x \in B \cup C$  ...because of definition of intersection


***** Current Step: *****
3. We are done with the current part of the proof (i.e., to show that
   $x \in (AnB)u(AnC)$ )... because of definition of union and definition of
  intersection. It remains to be shown that  $(AnB)u(AnC) \subseteq An(BuC)$ .


Please rate the step size!
>

-u:** *inferior-lisp* 99% L3848 (Inferior Lisp:run)-----
```



Study Environment

step size (w.r.t.
assertion level
inferences) 
randomized

explanation
randomized 

proofmanager Standalone

File Edit Options Buffers Tools Complete In/Out Signals Help

***** Proof Exercise: *****

The exercise is to show that for all A: for all B: for all C:

$An(BuC) = (AnB)u(AnC)$

***** Previous Steps: *****

1. We assume $x \in An(BuC)$ and show $x \in (AnB)u(AnC)$
2. Therefore, $x \in A \wedge x \in BuC$...because of definition of intersection

***** Current Step: *****

3. We are done with the current part of the proof (i.e., to show that $x \in (AnB)u(AnC)$)... because of definition of union and definition of intersection. It remains to be shown that $(AnB)u(AnC) \subseteq An(BuC)$.

Please rate the step size!

>

-u:** *inferior-lisp* 99% L3848 (Inferior Lisp:run)-----



Study Results

- ▶ $N_1 = 135$, $N_2 = 198$, $N_3 = 142$, $N_4 = 127$
- ▶ most steps rated as appropriate, in particular those generated from one Ω_{MEGA} assertion level step (92%, 69%, 83%, 96%)
- ▶ interrater reliability on common sample (61 steps): 71% overall agreement, (Fleiss') multi-rater $\kappa=0.38$
- ▶ Performance of individually learned classifiers (for each judge), on common sample:

Class. Perf.	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4
% correct	83.6–91.8	68.9–78.7	77.0–90.2	80.3–88.5
Cohen's κ	0.59–0.80	0.44–0.64	0.50–0.78	-0.11–0.23

- ▶ Classification more successful for Judge 1 on 135 steps, regression better for Judge 4 ()
- ▶ features *total* (# Ω_{MEGA} assertion level steps) and *concepts* alone often predict reasonably well



Conclusion

- ▶ explored proof granularity as a classification problem, model/assess different levels of granularity
- ▶ assertion level proofs easily yield relevant information for classification and proof presentation task
- ▶ proof presentation adapts to samples/different judges, this process is automated.
- ▶ future work: application and evaluation in e-learning context