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Abstract

Extraction of supportive premises for a mathematical problem can contribute to profound success in improving automatic reasoning systems. One bottleneck in automated theorem proving is the lack of a proper semantic information retrieval system for mathematical texts. In this paper, we show the effect of keyword extraction in the natural language premise selection (NLPS) shared task proposed in TextGraph-16 that seeks to select the most relevant sentences supporting a given mathematical statement.

1 Introduction

A mathematical statement requires a collection of appropriate definitions, previously proved statements, and inference rules to be proved. The automatic reasoning field deals with computing systems automating proof procedures and proof checking. One of the considerations in implementing automatic deduction and artificial intelligence approaches is restricting the proof search space and preventing the automatic prover from pursuing unfruitful reasoning paths. A dual aspect of search is looking for previous results that could be useful in proof completion (Portoraro, 2021).

Premise selection was initially introduced in (Blanchette et al., 2016) as a task to select a part of a formal library that improves the chance that an automatic prover can prove a mathematical conjecture. In (Irving et al., 2016), neural network-based premise selectors were applied for the first time, and (Ferreira and Freitas, 2021) reformulated the problem as a pairwise relevance classification problem.

Similar challenges in mathematical context have been proposed, such as ARQMATH (Zanibbi et al., 2020) seeking an answers retriever and ranker for a given mathematical question. An answer retriever system mainly needs to consider mathematical text similarities. However, the premise selector task also requires a mathematical concept understanding component.

In this study, we work on the shared-task introduced by the 16th Workshop on Graph-Based Natural Language Processing (Valentino et al., 2022) on natural language premise selection. In this task, the teams are given a collection of mathematical statements in natural language and the goal is to retrieve supportive premises from a knowledge-base that can prove certain statements.

In this study we look into the effectiveness of keyword extraction in selecting premises for proving each statement outperforms the TF-IDF-based baseline.

2 Approach

2.1 Data Description

The dataset used in this task is a collection of mathematical statements and their premises extracted from ProofWiki, available in (Ferreira and Freitas, 2020). Each statement in the dataset is expressed in natural language, and the formulas are in \( \text{LaTeX} \) format. An overview of the dataset can be found in Table 1. The collection contains 21614, statements spanning 1227949, tokens in total.

2.2 Preprocessing

For data cleaning, we perform specific preprocessing steps, e.g., removing \( \text{LaTeX} \) commands such as \texttt{begin} that describe a part of a formula in the sentence from the texts of statements. We perform this step to avoid their extractions as keywords in the next part of the pipeline. Then using an automatic keyword extractor (Campos et al., 2020), we generate up to 20 keywords for each sentence. Table 1 provides sample keywords for an example statement.

Embedding. To compare the semantic and context similarity of keywords, we also produce all keywords embeddings using fastText embedding pretrained on Wikipedia (Joulin et al., 2016).
Let \( Q_n = (a_j)_{0 \leq j \leq n} \) be a geometric sequence of length \( n \) consisting of positive integers only. Let \( a_1 \) and \( a_n \) be coprime. Then the \( j \)th term of \( Q_n \) is given by: \( a_j = q^j p^{n-j} \).

Let \( (x_n) \) be a geometric sequence in \( \mathbb{R} \) defined as \( x_n = ar^n \) for \( n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots \). The parameter: \( r \in \mathbb{R} : r \neq 0 \) is called the common ratio of \( (x_n) \).

We select the premises with maximum scores as the ultimate premise for each statement.

### 2.3 Retrieval Approach

The retrieval system should assign a score between the statements and their candidate premises. For sentences \( S_1, S_2 \) in dataset (coming from statement or premises) we extract the keyword sets \( KS_1 \) and \( KS_2 \) respectively. We define our suggested schemes for scoring as follows:

1. **Keyword Jaccardian Similarity.** The intersection cardinality over union cardinality of extracted keywords from the statement and the candidate premise:
   \[
   \text{Score}(KS_1, KS_2) = \frac{|KS_1 \cap KS_2|}{|KS_1 \cup KS_2|}
   \]

2. **Keyword Affecting Relevance Score.** We measure the affecting relevance scores of keywords in the intersection keywords set:
   \[
   \text{Score}(KS_1, KS_2) = \sum_{k_i \in KS_1 \cap KS_2} (1 - r_{i1}) \times (1 - r_{i2})
   \]
   where \( r_{i1} \) and \( r_{i2} \) are keyword scores for keyword \( k_i \) in the sentences \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) respectively.

3. **Keyword Embedding Similarity.** Sum of cosine similarity of embeddings in two keyword sets:
   \[
   \text{Score}(KS_1, KS_2) = \sum_{k_1 \in KS_1, k_2 \in KS_2} \cos\text{-sim}(k_1, k_2)
   \]

We select the premises with maximum scores as the ultimate premise for each statement.

### 2.4 Evaluation

The systems are supposed to rank the sentences in the knowledge base premises for a given mathematical statement. We evaluate our NLPS system using Mean Average Precision (MAP) for 500 top premises retrieved from the knowledge base and introduced the term frequency (TF-IDF) model as a baseline.

### 3 Results

The results achieved using methods described in the previous section compared to the baseline score are presented in Table 2. Keyword-based approaches performed reasonably well in retrieving premises for given mathematical statements and outperformed the TF-IDF-based baseline. However, the embedding-based approach did not achieve competitive performance. One reason can be the ambiguity in the fixed embeddings as fastText.

### 4 Conclusions

In this paper, we checked the effectiveness of keyword extraction of mathematical statements for premise selection shared task NLPS and considered three keyword scoring schemas. Given statements,
Table 2: Mean Average Precision (MAP) score for our proposed methods in comparison with the tf-idf baseline.

| Method         | Dev   | Test  |
|----------------|-------|-------|
| Base line      | 0.1239| 0.1228|
| Jaccardian Sim.| 0.1364| 0.1414|
| Affected Rel.  | 0.1256| 0.129 |
| Embedding Sim. | 0.0539| 0.05  |

we scored the keywords extracted for each statement and selected supportive sentences. Results show that keywords of statements can be effectively used in selecting relevant premises.
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