
Training Language Models to Use Prolog as a Tool

Niklas Mellgren
University of Southern Denmark
mellgrenniklas@gmail.com

Peter Schneider-Kamp
University of Southern Denmark
petersk@imada.sdu.dk

Lukas Galke Poech
University of Southern Denmark
galke@imada.sdu.dk

Abstract

Ensuring reliable tool use is critical for safe agentic AI systems. Language models frequently produce unreliable reasoning with plausible but incorrect solutions that are difficult to verify. To address this, we investigate fine-tuning models to use Prolog as an external tool for verifiable computation. Using Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO), we fine-tune Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct on a cleaned GSM8K-Prolog-Prover dataset while varying (i) prompt structure, (ii) reward composition (execution, syntax, semantics, structure), and (iii) inference protocol: single-shot, best-of-N, and two agentic modes where Prolog is invoked internally or independently. Our reinforcement learning approach outperforms supervised fine-tuning, with our 3B model achieving zero-shot MMLU performance comparable to 7B few-shot results. Our findings reveal that: 1) joint tuning of prompt, reward, and inference shapes program syntax and logic; 2) best-of-N with external Prolog verification maximizes accuracy on GSM8K; 3) agentic inference with internal repair yields superior zero-shot generalization on MMLU-Stem and MMLU-Pro. These results demonstrate that grounding model reasoning in formal verification systems substantially improves reliability and auditability for safety-critical applications. The source code for reproducing our experiments is available under <https://github.com/niklasmellgren/grpo-prolog-inference>

1 Introduction

Reasoning is the key driver of recent advances in large language models [1–3]. With its origins in chain-of-thought prompting [4] to better handle logic puzzles and mathematical tasks, reasoning also powers LLM agents, where reasoning steps are interleaved with taking action (i.e., tool use) [5]. Reasoning traces, i.e., the text generated when reasoning is elicited, was initially considered to yield an explanation for the final result as a side effect. However, more and more evidence suggest that reasoning traces are not always faithful [6, 7], i.e., the reasoning traces do not necessarily correspond to how the model actually arrives at its final output. This lack of faithfulness renders reasoning traces invalid as a robust explanation for the final response or action.

In safety-critical application domains (e.g., law, healthcare), being able to trace and audit the reasoning of an LLM is crucial in order to validate and justify the final decision (cf., EU AI Act). Textual reasoning traces that are potentially unfaithful do not serve this purpose. Thus, we here investigate an alternative way of reasoning, where large language models interact with a symbolic reasoning engine.

Symbolic reasoning engines, such as implemented in the declarative Prolog programming language, offer precise and auditable reasoning traces, i.e., composed of explicit facts and rules. Recent studies have shown that prompting LLMs to emit Prolog code, and then executing it in a symbolic

runtime, can dramatically improve accuracy over text-only reasoning [8, 9]. These methods currently rely on in-context learning prompting or supervised fine-tuning. However, only the most powerful commercial models are capable of the level of in-context learning needed for reliably using a niche programming language that likely has not much prevalence in the pre-training data. Similarly, supervised fine-tuning is prone to overfitting to the specific post-training dataset being employed.

Motivated by recent findings that reinforcement learning may lead to better generalization than supervised fine-tuning [10], we investigate if we can teach an LLM to use Prolog as a tool through reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards (RLVR). Specifically, we employ group relative policy optimization (GRPO) [11] which has led to promising results in DeepSeek-R1 and its R0 variant, which exclusively uses GRPO as post-training [1]. To teach a language model how to use Prolog via GRPO, we systematically study different system prompts, reward suites, and inferences strategies.

Our results will establish that RLVR, and specifically GRPO, is well-suited to teach even a relatively small language model with only 3B parameters to use Prolog as a tool – as evidenced by strong results on mathematical and logical reasoning tasks (GSM8k, subsets of MMLU) that hit a weight-class of LLMs above (i.e., the 3B + Prolog models are comparable to 7B models). Moreover, the symbolic reasoning traces are spelled out as crisp logical rules and derivations processed by the Prolog’s (faithful) symbolic reasoning engine. While our experiments are currently limited to maths (where most work on LLM-based reasoning originates), we envision that reasoning traces in Prolog (i.e., logical derivations) will be useful more broadly in safety-critical applications (e.g., healthcare, law).

Statement of Contributions In contrast to prior work that has relied on in-context learning or supervised fine-tuning to have language models emit Prolog, we use reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards to teach language models to use Prolog as a tool. Our contributions are three-fold:

- We demonstrate that reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards enables small language models to use Prolog as an external tool, outperforming supervised fine-tuning baselines. Critically, our 3B model with agentic inference achieves zero-shot performance on MMLU benchmarks comparable to few-shot results from 7B models, showing that careful training can compensate for scale.
- We conduct a systematic investigation across prompt structures, reward compositions, and inference protocols, revealing that: (a) prompt-reward interactions shape program syntax and logic; (b) best-of-N with external verification maximizes in-distribution accuracy; and (c) agentic inference with internal repair yields superior zero-shot generalization under distribution shift (GSM8k \rightarrow MMLU).
- We show that grounding model reasoning in formal verification systems produces auditable symbolic traces and improves reliability—critical requirements for deploying language models in safety-critical applications

2 Related Work

Our work brings together reasoning and tool use in large language models. Whereas prior work has regarded reasoning and tool use as separate steps [5], we hybridize this account and investigate using symbolic reasoning engine as a tool. We will now lay out the related work on reasoning and tool use.

Reasoning The idea of reasoning in large language models has its origins in the chain-of-thought prompting strategy [12], later used also for crafting AI agents that iterative tool use and reasoning about the tools’ outputs [5]. More recently, studies have investigated how reasoning can be ingrained into language models through reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards on mathematical reasoning tasks [1, 11]. Specifically, DeepSeekMath [11] has introduced group-relative policy optimization (GRPO), whereby the language model generates multiple reasoning traces and final outputs. The final output is compared to the ground truth and the reward is backpropagated through the reasoning trace that led to a positive outcome. In DeepSeek-R1 [1], the authors have further advanced this procedure and also investigated GRPO as the sole post-training method for a base model, discovering reflection-like reasoning behavior purely through reward-driven exploration. Models capable of reasoning also facilitate test-time scaling, i.e., using more compute on more challenging problems [2].

Tool Use Tool use in language models originates in ToolFormer [13], where a language model was trained to use basic tools, such as calculator to help with simple arithmetics that are still challenging for language models. Neurosymbolic reasoning methods have shown that LLMs paired with symbolic engines can dramatically improve arithmetic and logical problem solving. [8] introduce a pure zero-shot neurosymbolic Prolog pipeline that prompts a pretrained LLM to emit Prolog predicates and rules without any fine-tuning – and then executes them in SWI-Prolog (a specific Prolog interpreter). By employing a multiple-try inference loop-sampling up to N candidate programs and halting on the first one that executes successfully – they achieve substantial gains in accuracy: When using GPT-3.5 Turbo + Prolog with multiple-try inference, they report 80.4% accuracy (versus 57.1% for text-only CoT), and GPT-4 + Prolog reaches 95.2% (versus 92.0% text-only CoT).

3 Methods

The aim of our approach is to teach a language model to use Prolog as a tool. Beyond basic tool-calling syntax, this entails that the language model must be capable of emitting proper Prolog code that corresponds to the task at hand.

Prolog is a declarative programming language in which facts and rules can be described and subsequently processed by a symbolic reasoning engine. As an example the program with statements. A minimal example of a Prolog program is `A. A -> B. B -> C. C?`, which would lead the reasoning engine to conclude that C is true. Prolog fully implements first-order predicate logic. The rationale is that through providing an interface to Prolog’s reasoning engine, we should be able to improve language models capabilities to carry out sound reasoning traces and due to execution of a symbolic reasoning engine, those reasoning traces come with faithfulness guarantees.

Given a dataset of reasoning tasks and numerical ground truth values $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i < N}$, we have a language model generate G responses for each $x_i, i < N$. Those responses that lead to the correct outcome, with the possibility of combining this main reward function with extra reward function, e.g., to nudge the model to produce syntactically correct Prolog code and preventing the model from circumventing the task through a simple print statement.

The standard way to teach a language model to use new tools is through supervised fine-tuning [13], which we consider our baseline. The key hypothesis we test in this paper is that reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards may be better suited to teach a language model to use Prolog as a tool than supervised fine-tuning.

We experiment with four carefully crafted system prompts (as will be detailed in Section 3.1), three different reward suites (Section 3.2), and two types of inference protocols: prolog-as-output and prolog-as-a-tool (Section 3.3, each of which instantiated with two different concrete protocols).

3.1 System Prompts

We provide an overview of the tested system prompts. The full system prompts can be found in Appendix B. The system prompts are used both during training and during inference.

SP Base: Minimal Prompt for Symbolic Grounding Following a “start simple” strategy [14], the SP Base system prompt establishes a minimal yet effective template for aligning LLMs with symbolic execution engines like Prolog. It defines a fixed two-part XML schema: a `<reasoning>` section for short, structured step-by-step logic, and an `<answer>` section that emits Prolog code with a single constraint-solving clause (`solve(X)`). The Prolog code always includes `:- use_module(library(clpq)).`, ensuring compatibility with constraint logic programming (CLP(Q)) (see subsection B.1). SP Base is also consistent with Tan et al. [9], who demonstrate that lightweight Prolog-based prompts form an effective baseline for CoT-based arithmetic reasoning, when paired with strict symbolic evaluation.

SP Struct: Structured Output with Explicit Code Layout The SP Struct prompt incentivizes alignment with symbolic programming language by enforcing a fixed internal structure within each output section. The `<reasoning>` block guides the model to decompose the task into ordered, numbered logical steps. The `<answer>` block is explicitly formatted: code must start with the `CLP(Q)` import, define constants or intermediate predicates (if needed), and conclude with a `solve/1` clause

written entirely using curly-brace constraints. This prompt incentivizes breaking complex tasks into simpler subtasks and to build modular prompts that produce more predictable structured outputs.

SP Declare: Declarative Abstraction and Predicate-Level Alignment Inspired by prior work, where reasoning traces are translated into predicates [9], the third system prompt, **SP Declare**, requires the model to encode every numeric constant mentioned in the problem statement as a named predicate (e.g., `bags_per_trip(james, 10)`). These constants must be queried and referenced symbolically inside the final `solve/1` clause, and never embedded directly as literals.

SP Reflect: Reflexive Reasoning and Self-Correction The SP Reflect prompt extends SP Struct by adding a built-in meta-cognitive loop. After the model completes its initial `<reasoning>`, it must review its own logic to check for potential flaws. If issues are found, it should retry the reasoning step and only then emit the final Prolog code in `<answer>`. This embedded “reflection” mechanism enables internal error-checking and symbolic self-correction.

3.2 Reward Composition

As GRPO is based on reinforcement learning, it allows us to flexibly define a reward function (that does not need to be differentiable). We experiment with three different reward suites (see Table 1 for an overview), that we briefly describe in the following.

Table 1: Composition of different reward suites.

Reward components	Suite 1	Suite 2	Suite 3
Correctness	✓	✓	✓
Prolog Syntax	✓	✓	✓
Response Format	✓	✓	✓
XML Tag Count	✓	✓	✓
Semantic Similarity		✓	✓
Predicate Name Overlap		✓	✓
Prolog Structure			✓
prolog_helpers.pl			✓
Hard-coding penalty			✓
Curriculum reward weighting			✓
Multi-objective balancing			✓
Reward normalization and clipping			✓

Reward Suite 1: Structural Execution Shaping In developing our first reward-shaping scheme, we build directly on the GRPO reward functions from Will Brown [15], using them as a baseline to create a suite that nudges the model toward generating correct, executable Prolog code.

Correctness Reward: We extract the model’s `<answer>...</answer>` block, execute it using SWI-Prolog, and compare the numeric output to the ground truth. Exact matches receive a score of 2.0; incorrect but numeric outputs earn 1.0; and any executable attempt, even with unbound variables or failures, earns 0.5.

Prolog Syntax Reward: Inspired by neurosymbolic scaffolding [8], we award 0.2 points (up to 1.0) for detecting hallmark Prolog constructs: directives like `:- use_module`, the `solve/1` clause, and clause terminators `(.)`. This rewards syntactic validity without enforcing a strict all-or-nothing gate.

Soft- and Strict-Format Rewards We provide both soft and strict format incentives. The *soft format reward* assigns 0.5 points if the output contains both a `<reasoning>...</reasoning>` block and a subsequent `<answer>...</answer>` block. The *strict format reward* grants an additional 0.5 only when the entire completion exactly matches a line-by-line XML regular expression.

XML-Count Heuristic: To support fine-grained compliance, we add a continuous schema-adherence score: each correctly placed XML tag (`<reasoning>`, `</reasoning>`, `<answer>`, `</answer>`) contributes 0.125, with a small per-character penalty applied to trailing text after `</answer>`.

Figure 1 shows the progression of the correctness reward over training steps.




Figure 1: Correctness reward progression during training across different system prompts under Reward Suite 1. By isolating the execution-based signal, we see that SP-Base, SP-Struct, and SP-Reflect reach the highest correctness reward levels. This indicates that minimal scaffolding plus executable output dominate performance on downstream tasks.

Reward Suite 2: Semantic-Similarity Augmentation Having ensured that outputs are executable and conform to the XML schema, we now introduce a reward that promotes code which corresponds to the reference code even when surface forms differ. In addition to the components of reward suite 1, we additionally employ semantic similarity. The semantic similarity score $S_{\text{sem}} \in [0, 1]$ combines two complementary signals. First, we extract the contents of the `<answer>`-block from both the model output and the ground-truth data. Each code snippet is then embedded using the Sentence-BERT model `all-MiniLM-L6-v2`, and cosine similarity is computed between the resulting vectors, yielding $\cos \in [0, 1]$. In parallel, we calculate predicate-name overlap by identifying all functors of the form `name(` using a regular expression. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{model}}$ and \mathcal{P}_{ref} denote the sets of predicate names extracted from the model and reference programs, respectively. The normalized intersection is: $\text{pred} = \frac{|\mathcal{P}_{\text{model}} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\text{ref}}|}{\max(1, |\mathcal{P}_{\text{ref}}|)}$. The final semantic similarity score is the average of these two signals: $S_{\text{sem}} = \frac{1}{2}(\cos + \text{pred}) \in [0, 1]$. If either code block is missing or empty, we assign $S_{\text{sem}} = 0$. To align with the other reward scales, we rescale the semantic score to $[0.5, 2.0]$: $\text{reward} = \max(0.5, 2 \times S_{\text{sem}})$.

A more detailed description and analysis of Reward Suite 2 can be found in Appendix A.

Reward Suite 3: Curriculum-Guided Structural Optimization Our third reward suite builds on top of the semantic similarity and format shaping of Reward Suite 2 by adding Prolog-structure-sensitive rewards and a curriculum-driven schedule that gradually shifts the model from broad exploration toward focused exploitation as training progresses. Details can be found in Appendix A.

3.3 Inference Protocols

We evaluate our Prolog-grounded reasoning pipeline under four complementary protocols—**Single-Try**, **Multiple-Try**, **Agentic Internal**, and **Agentic Independent**—each run at a fixed decoding temperature of 0.2, aligned with a typical low-temperature regime for reasoning tasks [16].

Prolog-as-output In both single-try inference and multiple-try inference protocols, SWI-Prolog is used *post hoc*—as an external tool invoked only after the LLM produces an answer. The model has no visibility into the execution result and cannot revise its output in response. This setup reflects a *generate-then-verify* paradigm, where symbolic correctness is assessed retrospectively.

In the first protocol, **Single-Try** inference, we flatten the system and user messages into one prompt per problem, extract the `<answer> . . </answer>` block, and execute it in SWI-Prolog. This direct decoding strategy estimates $P(\text{correct} \mid \text{prompt})$ without retries or feedback.

The second prolog-as-output protocol, **Multiple-Try** inference, strategy leverages sampling diversity by drawing up to $N = 20$ independent completions per prompt. We halt at the first response that produces an integer or float. Because each sample is drawn from the same $P(\text{output} \mid \text{prompt})$, the probability of success across N trials is $1 - (1 - p)^N$, where p is the Single-Try success rate. The expected number of trials until first success follows a geometric distribution with mean $1/p$. Rather than targeting fixed coverage, we record the actual first-success indices. This best-of- N decoding converts latent capability into throughput and mirrors the setup of earlier works [8, 9].

Prolog-as-a-tool In both Agentic Internal and Agentic Independent, SWI-Prolog acts as an interactive, callable engine, transforming the LLM’s behavior from passive code generation to tool-augmented reasoning with self-verification capabilities.

These protocols treat SWI-Prolog as an interactive tool accessible *during* generation. We define a callable function `run_prolog()` using structured `<tool_call>` blocks from the Qwen tokenizer’s chat template. The model invokes this tool mid-dialogue, receives execution results, and integrates the feedback into subsequent reasoning turns—enabling iterative refinement. For both protocols, the system prompt is extended by the a tool declaration describing how the Prolog tool can be invoked (exact prompt can be found in Appendix C).

In the **Agentic-Internal** protocol, we embed a self-reflective correction loop within a single session of up to 20 turns. After each decode-execute step, failures (syntax errors, unbound variables, recursion timeouts, or non-numeric outputs) trigger targeted feedback and allow the language model to iterate. Exact prompt can be found in Appendix C. We also “shake” the temperature (multiplying by 1.15 up to 0.3) if repeated or empty generations occur, and compress older messages into summaries once the prompt length exceeds 95% of the 2048-token context budget. This design enables in-place correction and self-verification, and is inspired by the reflexive loops used in Tan et al. (2024) [9].

In the **Agentic-Independent** protocol, we treat each generation–execution–reflection cycle as a bounded, self-contained “agentic try”. We allow up to 20 total turns per problem, but unlike the Agentic Internal strategy, we discard context and reset the session entirely whenever we detect signs of persistent failure, e.g., repeated empty generations, invalid numeric outputs, or excessive duplicate attempts. Each fresh retry reinitializes the conversation with only the original system and user messages, exploring a new trajectory in the model’s sampling space. This hard-reset policy helps escape local minima and recursion traps that in-place correction may reinforce Liu et al. [17], Shyamalan et al. [18]. Within each problem, the total retry budget is preserved: the number of turns used in each session is subtracted from the global cap of 20. We continue until either (i) a valid numeric result is produced, or (ii) the full budget is exhausted.

4 Experimental Setup

Datasets and pre-processing We build upon the *gsm8k-prolog* dataset [19], which provides an SWI-Prolog implementation for each *GSM8K* problem from the original `openai/gsm8k` dataset. For every example, we run the reference Prolog code under `CLP(Q)` to extract its numeric result, then compare this to the original `openai/gsm8k` answer.

Out of 7473 problems, we found 15 discrepancies: 14 arose from errors in the OpenAI *GSM8K* answers (error rate of 0.1874%), and one from the Prolog references. We manually recomputed and reformatted each correct answer to match the official style, then updated both splits and created the cleaned *gsm8k-prolog-prover* dataset, now 100% consistent under SWI-Prolog execution.

Throughout our experiments we will use a training of 2,500 examples and validation set of 375 examples from this new *gsm8k-prolog-prover* dataset. For testing, we report scores on the official *GSM8k* test set as well as a zero-shot generalization test on *MMLU-Stem* and *MMLU-Pro*.

Implementation details All experiments use a 4-bit quantized *Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct* and attach a LoRA [20] adapter for parameter-efficient GRPO training on a 40 GB GPU. After training, we merge the LoRA weights into the base checkpoint to obtain a full 16-bit model for downstream evaluation.

Hyperparameters We train for one epoch with the AdamW optimizer, a batch size of 8, a learning rate of $5 \cdot 10^{-6}$, a cosine learning rate schedule, weight decay of 0.1, and gradient clipping to 0.1. Random seeds are kept fixed.

Baselines As our main baseline, we contrast our approach with supervised fine-tuning (SFT) baseline, which employs a standard causal language modeling objective. For perfect comparability, we use the same data and the same base model as in our main proposed GRPO training strategy. We further use the same hyperparameters as for our proposed GRPO training method. For reference, we also include the performance of larger and more powerful models, such as DeepSeekMath-7B-RL, Mistral-7B and Gemma-7B on the official GSM8k test split and on MMLU-Stem/Pro.

Evaluation Measures For every generated response, we evaluate three complementary metrics. First, the main evaluation is **accuracy** measuring whether the output parses as a valid integer or float and exactly matches the numeric answer in the ground truth. Second, **structural validity** checks whether the generated Prolog code includes at least one user-defined predicate other than `solve/1` and at least one arithmetic constraint enclosed in `{ . . . }`. This is assessed using the static analyzer `prolog_helpers.pl`. Third, **semantic similarity** quantifies how close the generated logic is to the reference Prolog program using cosine similarity over embeddings.

5 Results

Comparison of System Prompts and Reward Suites We first evaluate our GRPO training method on the `gsm8k-prolog-prover` validation dataset under all three reward suites and both Single-Try and Multiple-Try inference protocols. Table 2 shows the results. The most accurate model is `sp-struct-multipletry-rwd1`, which achieves 89.87% accuracy. Reward Suite 1 consistently yields the highest accuracy across prompt variants.

Table 2: Validation results across prompt variants, reward suites, and inference strategies. Accuracy (**Acc**), semantic similarity (**Sem**), and structure validity (**Struc**) are averaged over `gsm8k-prolog-prover` validation set (375 samples). Best results per metric are marked **bold**, second best underlined.

Prompt	Setup	Acc ↑	Sem ↑	Struc ↑
SP-Base	Single-Try Rwd1	77.87	3.20	0.00
	Single-Try Rwd2	80.27	17.60	0.27
	Single-Try Rwd3	82.67	10.13	0.27
	Multiple-Try Rwd1	85.33	2.13	0.27
	Multiple-Try Rwd2	84.53	20.00	0.27
	Multiple-Try Rwd3	82.93	9.33	0.00
SP-Struct	Single-Try Rwd1	85.33	5.60	1.07
	Single-Try Rwd2	73.60	29.07	3.20
	Single-Try Rwd3	64.27	29.33	66.93
	Multiple-Try Rwd1	89.87	8.27	1.60
	Multiple-Try Rwd2	84.53	32.00	3.20
	Multiple-Try Rwd3	83.73	40.00	89.60
SP-Declare	Single-Try Rwd1	34.40	31.20	49.60
	Single-Try Rwd2	33.07	33.33	46.40
	Single-Try Rwd3	26.27	26.27	42.40
	Multiple-Try Rwd1	66.93	59.73	94.67
	Multiple-Try Rwd2	73.60	<u>62.13</u>	<u>92.53</u>
	Multiple-Try Rwd3	62.40	62.67	90.40
SP-Reflect	Single-Try Rwd1	74.40	1.60	0.80
	Single-Try Rwd2	79.73	4.53	0.00
	Single-Try Rwd3	72.00	22.40	76.27
	Multiple-Try Rwd1	<u>88.53</u>	2.93	1.33
	Multiple-Try Rwd2	88.27	2.93	0.27
	Multiple-Try Rwd3	87.73	26.13	91.47

While accuracy is highest under `sp-struct-multipletry-rwd1`, the best-performing models in semantic similarity and structural correctness differ across configurations. Reward Suite 3’s curriculum-

guided weighting enhances the structure score. Most prompt variants, especially SP-Struct and SP-Declare, see large structural gains under Rwd3. For example, SP-Declare improves from 49.60% (Rwd1) to 94.67% (Rwd3) in structural correctness. The only exception is SP-Base, which consistently underperforms in terms of structure score. Moreover, multiple-try inference strategy consistently yields substantial accuracy gains over single-try decoding.

Qualitative Analysis Analyzing the logfiles for sp-struct-rwd1 (examples in Appendix D, we observe that the model delegates final computations to SWI-Prolog via solve/1, but performs its intermediate reasoning in natural language. This explains the high accuracy yet poor semantic and structural alignment (sem: 8.27%, struc: 1.60% in multiple-try). It reaches correct answers but deviates from the Prolog reference solutions of the gsm8k-prolog-prover dataset. In contrast, sp-declare-rwd2 emits Prolog code that matches reference structures and achieves strong semantic similarity (62.13%) and structural correctness (92.53%), but at the cost of lower accuracy (73.60%). The declarative prompt improves code form (and thus, faithfulness) at the cost of accuracy.

Comparison of Prolog-as-a-Tool Inference Protocols Next, we evaluate the agentic internal and agentic independent inference protocols with the best performing reward suite 1 and all system prompts. As shown in Table 3, the most accurate results (86.13%) are obtained with the Agentic Independent protocols combined with either the SP-Base or the SP-Struct system prompt. However, the second best results with an accuracy 84.27% are obtained by the agentic internal setting. Notably, the SP-Declare system prompt excels in semantic similarity and structure.

Table 3: Agentic evaluation on gsm8k-prolog-prover validation set. For each prompt variant, we report accuracy (**Acc**), semantic similarity (**Sem**), and structural correctness (**Struc**) using the best-performing reward suite.

System Prompt	Agentic Mode	Acc	Sem	Struc
SP-Base	Internal	82.93	58.52	0.80
	Independent	86.13	58.95	0.27
SP-Struct	Internal	<u>84.27</u>	55.18	5.07
	Independent	86.13	56.08	5.87
SP-Declare	Internal	69.87	81.36	73.07
	Independent	72.00	80.68	72.53
SP-Reflect	Internal	<u>84.27</u>	54.57	9.07
	Independent	83.47	54.57	10.40

GRPO versus SFT baseline Now, we evaluate whether our proposed GRPO-based training method outperforms the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) baseline in a fully controlled environment (same starting model, same hyperparameters, same training data). As shown in Table 4, the best GRPO method exceeds the best SFT method by more than 10 accuracy points (90% vs. 79%). On average across the four inference methods, GRPO training yields 56% higher accuracy scores than the SFT baseline.

Table 4: Comparison of GRPO versus SFT on the gsm8k-prolog-prover validation set

Training method	System Prompt	Reward	Inference	Acc	Sem	Struc
SFT (baseline)	SP-Struct	—	Single-try	21.60	20.80	64.27
SFT (baseline)	SP-Struct	—	Multiple-try	65.07	36.00	66.13
SFT (baseline)	SP-Struct	—	Agentic Internal	79.20	68.03	49.60
SFT (baseline)	SP-Struct	—	Agentic Independent	55.46	73.98	52.53
GRPO (ours)	SP-Struct	Rwd1	Single-try	85.33	5.60	1.07
GRPO (ours)	SP-Struct	Rwd1	Multiple-try	89.87	8.27	1.60
GRPO (ours)	SP-Struct	Rwd1	Agentic Internal	84.27	55.18	5.07
GRPO (ours)	SP-Struct	Rwd1	Agentic Independent	<u>86.13</u>	56.08	5.87

Results for the official GSM8k Test Split We evaluate both the fully-trained and subset-trained variants of the best-performing configuration—sp-struct-rwd1—on the official openai/gsm8k test split (1320 examples). Each model is tested across all four inference strategies.

Table 5: Performance of full-data vs. subset-trained models on the official openai/gsm8k test split (1320 examples). Overall **best** and second-best 3B models are highlighted.

Model	Inference Protocol	Accuracy
DeepSeekMath-7B (reference)	Single-Try	86.70
Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	Single-Try	75.28
SP-Struct RWD1-Full (GRPO on 7473 examples)	Multiple-Try	80.21
	Agentic-Internal	78.17
	Agentic-Independent	77.86
Qwen2.5-3B-Instruct	Single-Try	73.99
SP-Struct RWD1-Subset (GRPO on 1750 samples)	Multiple-Try	78.24
	Agentic-Internal	77.20
	Agentic-Independent	76.80

Table 5 shows the results. Although sp-struct-rwd1 surpasses DeepSeekMath-7B-RL on our 375-sample validation set using multiple-try inference (89.87% vs. 86.7%), on the official 1320-example GSM8K test it scores 80.21%, below DeepSeekMath’s 86.7%. This highlights that, although careful alignment of prompts, rewards, and inference can let a 3B model match or even exceed a 7B baseline on in-distribution Prolog tasks, there remains a performance gap on the full GSM8K benchmark.

On the cleaner, in-distribution 375 examples, restarts (Agentic-Independent and Multiple-Try) were often enough to find a valid Prolog encoding quickly, so that strategy slightly outperformed the agentic-internal repair approach. On the full GSM8K test, which contains more varied formulations, retaining and building on each failed attempt (Agentic-Internal) becomes more powerful—allowing the model to accumulate debugging context that a fresh restart would lose. Despite being trained on only 23.5% of the data, the subset model performs competitively with only 1–2 points behind the fully-trained variant across most inference modes.

Zero-Shot Generalization Test: MMLU-Stem and MMLU-Pro We measure cross-dataset generalisation by evaluating the fully-trained model on the multiple-choice datasets MMLU-Stem and MMLU-Pro. The **STEM** dataset covers a variety of STEM disciplines (physics, chemistry, biology, anatomy, electrical engineering, computer security, machine learning) and the **Pro** dataset covers a variety of challenging questions withing subjects such as law, finance, clinical medicine, psychology, philosophy, etc.). Each dataset contributes $n = 375$ validation questions. We keep the original SP-Struct prompt and ask for the *zero-based index* of the correct multiple-choice option (see Appendix E); no in-context examples are given, so the setting is strictly zero-shot.

Table 6: Our models are evaluated strictly zero-shot on the validation set (375 samples). All other baseline models use 5-shot prompts (few-shot); they are shown to illustrate how far a 3B model can close the gap without extra examples or larger parameter budgets. **Best** and second best models are highlighted per parameter budget.

Model	MMLU-Stem	MMLU-Pro
Our GRPO-trained Qwen2.5 models with 3B parameters and zero-shot evaluation		
SP-Struct-RWD1-full Single-Try	50.93	21.33
SP-Struct-RWD1-full Multiple-Try	53.60	26.67
SP-Struct-RWD1-full Agentic-Internal	56.80	30.67
SP-Struct-RWD1-full Agentic-Independent	58.13	<u>29.33</u>
Baselines from a weight class above (7B) and 5-shot evaluation		
DeepSeekMath Base-7B (few-shot)	56.50	–
Mistral 7B (5-shot)	<u>51.10</u>	<u>30.90</u>
Gemma 7B (5-shot)	–	33.70

As shown in Table 6, the agentic inference protocols, *Internal* and *Independent*, consistently outperform Single-Try and Multiple-Try inference. Specifically, on MMLU-Stem, our full-data model improves from 53.6% (Multiple-Try) to 58.13% (Agentic Independent). MMLU-Pro shows an improvement from 26.67% (Multiple-Try) to 30.7% (Agentic Internal). Interestingly, the results from our models under *zero-shot* are comparable to models with a 7B parameter budget from the DeepSeekMath, Mistral, and Gemma families with *5-shot prompting* (i.e., they have 5 examples in the prompt to facilitate in-context learning).

6 Discussion

Our experiments reveal several key insights about how reinforcement fine-tuning and inference shape symbolic reasoning in a 3B-parameter LLM. First, simple execution-based rewards combined with sampling produce the best accuracy. Reward Suite 1, based solely on execution correctness and light format rewards, yields the highest GSM8K accuracy across all prompt variants. This suggests that once a prompt guides the model to emit valid Prolog structure, adding complex semantic or structural signals may distract from the core goal.

Second, the choice of inference strategy matters more under distribution shift. On the held-out validation split, Agentic-Independent slightly outperformed Agentic-Internal, indicating that hard resets help the model escape local traps. However, on the full openai/GSM8K test set, Agentic-Internal pulled ahead by preserving in-session debugging context to enable incremental refinement. While multiple-try sampling suffices for narrow arithmetic problems, interactive self-repair becomes crucial under distribution shift.

Third, prompt design and reward composition reveal systematic trade-offs. The sp-struct-rwd1-multiple-try configuration achieved the highest accuracy (89.87%) but weak structural (1.6%) and semantic alignment (8.27%). In contrast, sp-declare-rwd2-multiple-try achieved higher semantic similarity (62.13%) and structural correctness (92.53%), at the cost of lower accuracy (73.6%). These trends indicate that minimal scaffolding plus strong rewards optimize for correctness, while richer structural shaping is needed for code-faithfulness.

Finally, small models can rival larger ones if learning, prompting, and inference are well-designed. On zero-shot MMLU tasks, the best agentic configurations (58.1% MMLU-Stem, 30.7% MMLU-Pro) match few-shot 7B baselines, showing that reinforcement over symbolic execution traces combined with agentic inference can counterbalance smaller parameter budgets.

Limitations and Future Directions This work is limited to fine-tuning on simple reasoning problems (GSM8K), using a single tool (SWI-Prolog), and one reinforcement method (GRPO). Generalization to richer domains, such as probabilistic programming [21], remains unexplored, as does integrating multiple tools. Lastly, reward shaping currently follows a fixed curriculum; future work may benefit from dynamic reward schedules based on live validation metrics.

7 Conclusion

We have proposed a training pipeline, including concrete system prompts and reward suites, to teach language models to use Prolog as a tool via reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards – demonstrating that this approach outperforms supervised fine-tuning. Our findings show that: (1) the interaction between system prompt and reward function shapes the syntactic and logical form of generated Prolog programs; (2) best-of-N decoding with Prolog verification achieves highest accuracy on in-distribution tasks; and (3) agentic inference with an internal repair strategy yields superior zero-shot generalization across distribution shifts. Critically, we demonstrate that a compact 3B model with agentic inference can match 7B baselines on MMLU benchmarks, showing that architectural efficiency can be achieved through careful prompt and reward design. These findings demonstrate that grounding model reasoning in formal verification systems offers a practical path toward more reliable and auditable AI systems for safety-critical applications.

References

- [1] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Yongan Li, Yantao Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [2] Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025.
- [3] Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024.
- [4] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *NeurIPS*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [5] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [6] Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, et al. Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv:2307.13702*, 2023.
- [7] Debjit Paul, Robert West, Antoine Bosselut, and Boi Faltings. Making reasoning matter: Measuring and improving faithfulness of chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv:2402.13950*, 2024.
- [8] Nasim Borazjanizadeh and Steven Piantadosi. Reliable reasoning beyond natural language: A neurosymbolic approach. *arXiv:2407.11373*, 2024.
- [9] Xiaoyu Tan, Yongxin Deng, Xihe Qiu, Weidi Xu, Chao Qu, Wei Chu, Yinghui Xu, and Yuan Qi. THOUGHT-LIKE-PRO: Enhancing reasoning of large language models through self-driven prolog-based chain-of-thought. *arXiv:2407.14562*, 2024.
- [10] Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. Sft memorizes, rl generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. *arXiv:2501.17161*, 2025.
- [11] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Yongan Li, Yantao Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [12] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Chandra Le, John Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Zhou, Colin Raffel, John Bosma, and Graham Neubig. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (NeurIPS 2022)*, 2022.
- [13] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *NeurIPS*, 36:68539–68551, 2023.
- [14] Chip Huyen. *AI Engineering: Building Applications with Foundation Models*. O’Reilly Media, 2025.
- [15] Will Brown. grpo-demo. GitHub Gist, 2025. URL <https://gist.github.com/willccbb/4676755236bb08cab5f4e54a0475d6fb>.
- [16] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Manya Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeff Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.

- [17] Haoran Liu, Zhen Xu, and Jiang Peng. Balancing exploration and exploitation in rl: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(2), 2022.
- [18] Ramachandran Shyamalan, Vivek Balaji, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, John Langford, and Ian Osband. Exploration-exploitation transitions in policy gradient methods. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [19] Thomas X. Yang. gsm8k-prolog: A prolog implementation of the gsm8k dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/Thomas-X-Yang/gsm8k-prolog>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-05-01.
- [20] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2022)*, 2022.
- [21] Eli Bingham, Jonathan P. Chen, Martin Jankowiak, Fritz Obermeyer, Neeraj Pradhan, Theofanis Karaletsos, Rohit Singh, Paul Szerlip, Paul Horsfall, and Noah D. Goodman. Pyro: Deep universal probabilistic programming. *arXiv:1810.09538*, 2018.
- [22] Samy Bengio, Oriol Vinyals, Navdeep Jaitly, and Noam Shazeer. Scheduled sampling. In *NeurIPS*, 2015.
- [23] Shagun Narvekar, Jivko Sinapov, Matteo Leonetti, Josh Ramos, Matthew E. Taylor, and Peter Stone. Curriculum learning for reinforcement learning domains: A framework and survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(181):1–50, 2020.
- [24] Alexander Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv:2305.18512*, 2023.
- [25] Jacob Casper, Will Brown, Pamela Mishkin, Carl Olsson, and Christopher Socher. Avoiding winner-takes-all in multi-objective rl via clipped reward normalization. In *AAAI-23*, 2023.
- [26] Xuebin Li, Yutong Ban, Jiaqi Li, and Jianyu Wang. The sensitivity of rl fine-tuning to learning rates and batch sizes. In *NeurIPS Workshop on Advances in Language Model Optimization*, 2023.
- [27] Wei Huang, Li Zhao, and Ming Chen. Analyzing learning rate sensitivity in lora-fine-tuned language models. *arXiv:2403.12345*, 2024.
- [28] Jacob Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, Aviral Kumar, and Colin Raffel. Test-time scaling laws for language model reasoning. *NeurIPS*, 37, 2024.
- [29] Razvan Pascanu, Tomas Mikolov, and Yoshua Bengio. On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In *ICML*, 2013.
- [30] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2019)*, 2019.
- [31] Nando Srinivas, Andreas Krause, Matthias Seeger, and Sham M. Kakade. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. In *ICML*, 2010.
- [32] Eric Brochu, Vlad M. Cora, and Nando de Freitas. A tutorial on bayesian optimization of expensive cost functions, with application to active user modeling and hierarchical reinforcement learning. *arXiv:1012.2599*, 2010.
- [33] Bobak Shahriari, Kevin Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P. Adams, and Nando de Freitas. Taking the human out of the loop: A review of bayesian optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, 2016.
- [34] James Bergstra and Yoshua Bengio. Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Feb):281–305, 2012.

Appendix

A Reward Suites in Detail

A.1 Detailed Analysis of Reward Suite 2




Figure 2: Semantic similarity reward across different prompt variants under Reward Suite 2.

Figure 2 reveals clear trends in semantic alignment across prompt variants. The `sp-declare` prompt consistently achieves the highest average semantic similarity, indicating that its predicate-level abstraction leads to closer alignment with reference Prolog programs. Other prompts such as `sp-struct` and `sp-base` converge to moderately high similarity, while `sp-reflect` underperforms. This confirms that Reward Suite 2’s embedding-based feedback meaningfully shapes model behavior toward semantically aligned and structurally consistent code.

A.2 Details of Reward Suite 3

Prolog Structure Reward Each reference Prolog code:

1. Loads arithmetic constraints with `:- use_module(library(clpqc)).;`
2. States problem facts as one-line clauses; and
3. Defines exactly one public predicate, `solve/1`, whose single argument is the final result.

A typical example:

```
:- use_module(library(clpqc)).  
  
sell_clips(natalia, april, 48).  
  
solve(Total) :-  
    sell_clips(natalia, april, April),  
    { May = April / 2 },  
    { Total = April + May }.
```

prolog_helpers.pl. The helper script `prolog_helpers.pl` analyzes any candidate program and prints:

PREDICATE_COUNT — user predicates other than `solve`

```

                                CONSTRAINT_COUNT — goals inside { ... }
$ swipl -q -f prolog_helpers.pl \
  -g "analyze_code('prog.pl',P,C),halt."
PREDICATE_COUNT: 1
CONSTRAINT_COUNT: 2

```

A program is marked *structurally valid* whenever $\text{PREDICATE_COUNT} \geq 1$ and $\text{CONSTRAINT_COUNT} \geq 1$.

We convert the same counts into a scalar reward $S \in [0, 2]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_p &= \min(0.25 \times \text{PREDICATE_COUNT}, 0.75) \\
s_c &= \min(0.30 \times \text{CONSTRAINT_COUNT}, 0.90) \\
S_{\text{raw}} &= s_p + s_c
\end{aligned}$$

Hard-coding penalty. If `solve/1` contains a literal numeric assignment—detected via the pattern:

```
solve(...) :- ... = <number>. or solve(...) :- { ... = <number> }.
```

then the score is scaled by 0.2:

$$S = 0.2 \times S_{\text{raw}}.$$

Otherwise, $S = S_{\text{raw}}$. The final value is clipped to $[0, 2]$ and returned as the `prolog_structure_reward`.

Rationale and percentage mapping. Each auxiliary predicate adds 0.25 up to a cap of 0.75 (three helpful helpers), and each arithmetic constraint adds 0.30 up to 0.90 (three useful constraints). Beyond these caps, further clauses no longer raise the reward, preventing inflation through repetition. The maximum attainable $S_{\text{raw}} = 0.75 + 0.90 = 1.65$ is linearly mapped to a 0–100 % structural score:

$$\text{Struct\%} = \min\left(1, \frac{S}{1.65}\right) \times 100.$$

A program that reaches the caps and avoids hard-coding therefore receives 100% structural credit, whereas a hard-coded answer is immediately reduced to 20 % of the score it would otherwise earn.

Curriculum-Based Weight Scheduling Instead of using a static mix of sub-rewards, we dynamically adjust weight allocations based on training progress $t \in [0, 1]$ —defined as the fraction of prompts seen—via a logistic function:

$$\sigma(t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-k(t-\tau)}}, \quad k = 12, \tau = 0.5.$$

This sigmoid-shaped curriculum has proven effective in sequence-to-sequence scheduling and reinforcement-learning contexts [22, 23].

Multi-Objective Balancing We let $\text{early}[k]$ and $\text{late}[k]$ be the weight for sub-reward k at the beginning and end of training, respectively. We interpolate between them using the same sigmoid $\sigma(t)$:

$$\text{weights}[k] = \text{early}[k] + (\text{late}[k] - \text{early}[k]) \times \sigma(t).$$

This scheme echoes the curriculum-guided shaping used in Direct Preference Optimization [24], ensuring that no sub-reward dominates prematurely and that supervision intensifies in structure and correctness as training progresses.

Reward	Early Weight	Late Weight
Semantic	0.35	0.10
XML Format	0.25	0.10
Syntax	0.10	0.10
Correctness	0.15	0.45
Structure	0.15	0.25

Table 7: Early and late-stage reward weights used for curriculum interpolation in Reward Suite 3. These define the endpoints of the training schedule, with semantic and formatting objectives emphasized early, and correctness and structural reasoning prioritized late.

While Table 7 defines the curriculum endpoints, Figure 3 shows how weights evolve over time under our sigmoid interpolation, confirming the gradual shift in learning priorities.




Figure 3: Interpolated reward weights over training steps, driven by the sigmoid progression schedule. Each curve shows how a specific sub-reward (e.g., structure, correctness) increases or decreases in emphasis as training progresses.

Reward Normalization and Clipping To avoid dominance effects due to scale mismatches across reward components, we normalize and clip all sub-rewards into a shared range. This prevents the “winner-takes-all” dynamic and follows best practices in multi-signal RL [25].

Final Aggregation For each example, we normalize and weight the five signals—**Semantic**, **Correctness**, **Structure**, **Syntax**, and **Format**—then sum the weighted values and scale the result into $[0, 2]$:

$$\text{final_reward} = 2.0 \times \sum_{k=1}^5 w_k \cdot r_k$$

This final scaling preserves the $[0, 2]$ reward range established in Suite 1 (where a perfect program earned 2.0), maintains compatibility with GRPO’s learning rate and gradient magnitudes, and ensures comparability across all three reward suites.

Over time, this curriculum drives the model from early-format scaffolding toward concise, logically rich, and syntactically robust Prolog encodings [17, 18].

A.3 Reward Progression throughout Training

Figure 4 shows the progression of the correctness reward under reward suite 2.




Figure 4: Correctness reward progression during training across different system prompts under Reward Suite 2.




Figure 5: Prolog structure reward progression for each prompt variant in Reward Suite 3. As scheduled weights shift toward structural fidelity, models like sp-declare and sp-struct learn to emit programs with diverse predicates and logically well-formed constraint blocks. sp-base exhibits a delayed but eventual increase, following the sigmoid schedule’s shift from format to structure.

Figure 5 shows how structural competence emerges as a function of the curriculum weights.

B System Prompts

B.1 SP-Base System Prompt

You are a Prolog assistant specialized in solving math problems.

Provide your solution strictly in this XML format:

```
<reasoning>
- Give concise step-by-step reasoning here.
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clp)).

solve(X) :-
{X = final numeric answer}.
</answer>
```

B.2 SP-Struct System Prompt

You are a specialized Prolog code-generating assistant.

Your task is to solve math problems by providing a structured answer in two clearly defined sections:

1. <reasoning>
 - Provide a clear, concise step-by-step explanation of how you arrive at the solution.
2. <answer>
 - Provide executable Prolog code using constraint logic programming to compute the numeric answer.
 - Always start with: ':- use_module(library(clp)).'
 - Define any necessary numeric constants or intermediate values using predicates.
 - Final answer should be unified explicitly in solve(X) using curly-brace constraints, without printing commands.

Use this XML format strictly:

```
<reasoning>
(Your step-by-step reasoning here)
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clp)).

(Any predicates/constants defined here)

solve(X) :-
(Intermediate computations using curly braces)
{X = final constraint logic}.
</answer>
```

B.3 SP-Declare System Prompt

You are a specialized Prolog code-generating assistant that must follow a strict structured format to solve math problems.

Your task is to solve math problems by providing an answer in two clearly defined sections:

1. <reasoning>
 - Provide a clear, concise, step-by-step explanation of your solution.
 - Explain how each numeric constant from the problem is represented by a predicate.
 - Do not include unnecessary calculations using literal numbers; instead, reference the predicates you define.
2. <answer>
 - Provide executable Prolog code using constraint logic programming (CLP) to compute the numeric answer.

- Always start with: `':- use_module(library(clpq)).'`
- For every numeric constant mentioned in the problem, define a predicate with a descriptive name.
For example, if the problem states that James carries 10 bags per trip, include: `bags_per_trip(james, 10).`
Similarly, define predicates for other constants (e.g., `trips_per_day(james, 20).` `days(5).`)
- In the solve predicate, retrieve each value by querying its predicate and use these values in your arithmetic constraints.
- Use curly-brace constraints (e.g., `{Total = Bags * Trips * Days}`) to compute the final answer.
- The final answer must be explicitly unified in the solve predicate (e.g., `solve(Total_bags) :- ...`).

Ensure your answer strictly follows this XML format:

`<reasoning>`

Your detailed, step-by-step reasoning here, with references to the predicates defined for numeric constants.

`</reasoning>`

`<answer>`

`:- use_module(library(clpq)).`

Define numeric constants as predicates:

`bags_per_trip(james, 10).`

`trips_per_day(james, 20).`

`days(5).`

`solve(Total_bags) :-`

`bags_per_trip(james, Bags),`

`trips_per_day(james, Trips),`

`days(Days),`

`{Total_bags = Bags * Trips * Days}.`

`</answer>`

Do not shortcut the process by embedding direct numeric literals in the solve predicate.

Every numeric constant must be defined via a predicate and then referenced in the arithmetic computations.

B.4 SP-Reflect System Prompt

You are a specialized Prolog code-generating assistant.

Your task is to solve math problems by providing a structured answer in two clearly defined sections:

1. `<reasoning>`

- Provide a clear, concise step-by-step explanation of how you arrive at the solution.

- Review the reasoning at the end of the `<reasoning>` section to ensure that all computations and logical deductions are correct.

- If something is not correct, then try again: Provide a clear, concise step-by-step explanation of how you arrive at the solution.

2. `<answer>`

- Provide executable Prolog code using constraint logic programming to compute the numeric answer.

- Always start with: `':- use_module(library(clpq)).'`

- Define any necessary numeric constants or intermediate values using predicates.

- Final answer should be unified explicitly in `solve(X)` using curly-brace constraints, without printing commands.

Use this XML format strictly:

```

<reasoning>
- Your step-by-step reasoning here
- Your review of the reasoning here
- Your potential further step-by-step reasoning here
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clp)).

(Any predicates/constants defined here)

solve(X) :-
  (Intermediate computations using curly braces)
  {X = final constraint logic}.
</answer>

```

C Agentic Prompts

C.1 System Prompt for Agentic Internal and Agentic Independent

```

You have one tool:
<tools>
{"name": "run_prolog", "arguments": [{"code": "string"}]}
</tools>
- Use the "run_prolog" tool to execute your answer in the <answer> section.

```

C.2 Agentic Internal Context Feedback

```

The code failed to produce a numeric result.
Let's fix it:
1. Reflect on what went wrong.
2. Recalculate
3. Adjust your answer to:
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clp)).
solve(X) :-
  {X = final_number}.
</answer>
...

```

D Inference Examples

D.1 SP-Struct-RWD1 Example

```

<reasoning>
To determine how many more cakes Louise needs to bake, we can break down
the problem step by step.

1. Louise needs a total of 60 cakes.
2. She has already baked half of 60 cakes, which is 30 cakes.
3. She has  $60 - 30 = 30$  cakes left to bake.
4. Today, she bakes half of the remaining 30 cakes, which is  $30 / 2 = 15$ 
   cakes.
5. After baking 15 cakes, she has  $30 - 15 = 15$  cakes left to bake.
6. The next day, she bakes a third of the remaining 15 cakes, which is  $15 / 3 = 5$ 
   cakes.
7. After baking 5 cakes, she has  $15 - 5 = 10$  cakes left to bake.

Therefore, Louise needs to bake 10 more cakes.
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clp)).

```

```
solve(C) :-
C = 10.
</answer>
```

D.2 SP-Declare-RWD1 Example

```
<reasoning>
- Walter works 5 days a week in a fast-food chain and earns $5 per hour.
- He works 4 hours a day, so his daily earning is  $4 * \$5 = \$20$ .
- He works 5 days a week, so his weekly earning is  $5 * \$20 = \$100$ .
- Walter allocates  $3/4$  of his weekly earning for his schooling.
- We need to find  $3/4$  of $100.
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

working_days(Walter, 5).
hours_per_day(Walter, 4).
hourly_wage(Walter, 5).
schooling_fraction(Walter, 3/4).

solve(School_allocation) :-
working_days(Walter, Days),
hours_per_day(Walter, Hours),
hourly_wage(Walter, Wage),
schooling_fraction(Walter, Fraction),
{School_allocation = Fraction * (Days * Hours * Wage)}.
</answer>
```

D.3 SP-Struct-RWD1-Agent-Internal Example

```
- TURN 1 -
(USER) <reasoning>
To find out how many bunnies Michael has, we can first calculate the
number of dogs and cats he has, and then subtract that total from the
total number of pets.

1. Calculate the number of dogs: 25% of 36 pets.
2. Calculate the number of cats: 50% of 36 pets.
3. Subtract the sum of dogs and cats from the total number of pets to
find the number of bunnies.

Let's denote the total number of pets as 36. The number of dogs
is  $0.25 * 36$ , and the number of cats is  $0.50 * 36$ . The number of bunnies
is then  $36 - (0.25 * 36 + 0.50 * 36)$ .

<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

number_of_dogs(Pets, Dogs) :-
Dogs is 0.25 * Pets.

number_of_cats(Pets, Cats) :-
Cats is 0.50 * Pets.

number_of_bunnies(Pets, Dogs, Cats, Bunnies) :-
Bunnies is Pets - (Dogs + Cats).

number_of_bunnies(36, Dogs, Cats, Bunnies) :-
number_of_dogs(36, Dogs),
number_of_cats(36, Cats),
number_of_bunnies(36, Dogs, Cats, Bunnies).

solve(X) :-
```



```
number_of_bunnies(36, Dogs, Cats, Bunnies),
{X = Bunnies}.
</answer>
```

```
[TOKENS:post-gen] used=622 (32.9%) | rem=1268 | budget=1890
»> WARNING: Potential infinite recursion detected in Prolog code
»> run_prolog→ None
[TOKENS:pre-feedback] used=622 (32.9%) | rem=1268 | budget=1890
```

```
»> FEEDBACK INJECTED:
The code failed to produce a numeric result.
```

Let's fix it:

```
1. Reflect on what went wrong.
2. Recalculate
3. Adjust your answer to:
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).
```

```
solve(X) :-
{X = final_number}.
</answer>
```

```
<tool_call>{
  "name": "run_prolog",
  "arguments": {
    "code": ":- use_module(library(clpq)).\n\nsolve(X) :- {X = final_number}."
  }
}
```

```
[TOKENS:post-feedback] used=731 (38.7%) | rem=1159 | budget=1890
[TOKENS:pre-gen] used=731 (38.7%) | rem=1159 | budget=1890
```

– TURN 2 –

(ASSISTANT) <reasoning>

The previous code had a logical error in the definition of the helper predicates. The helper predicates should directly compute the number of dogs, cats, and bunnies without needing to be called separately. We can simplify the process by directly calculating the number of dogs and cats and then subtracting from the total number of pets to find the number of bunnies.

```
1. Calculate the number of dogs: 25% of 36 pets.
2. Calculate the number of cats: 50% of 36 pets.
3. Subtract the sum of dogs and cats from the total number of pets to
find the number of bunnies.
```

Let's directly compute the number of bunnies as a single step.

```
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-
{X = 36 - (0.25 * 36 + 0.50 * 36)}.
</answer>
```

```
[TOKENS:post-gen] used=926 (49.0%) | rem=964 | budget=1890
»> run_prolog→ 9
```

D.4 SP-Struct-RWD1 Agentic-Independent Example

QUESTION 54: Please generate a piece of Prolog code to solve the given math problem.

Jenny wants to know whether bone meal or cow manure makes better fertilizer. The control plant with no fertilizer grows 36 inches high, the plant with bone meal grows to 125% of the height of the control plant, and the cow manure plant grows to 200% of the height of the bone meal plant. How tall is the cow manure plant in inches?

»> INDEPENDENT AGENTIC_TRY #1

[TOKENS:pre-gen] used=332 (17.6%) | rem=1558 | budget=1890

– TURN: 1/20 –

(Assume the height of the plant with bone meal is 125% of 36 inches, and the height of the cow manure plant is 200% of the height of the bone meal plant.)

(USER) <reasoning>

To determine the height of the cow manure plant, we need to follow these steps:

1. Calculate the height of the plant with bone meal, which is 125% of the height of the control plant.
2. Calculate the height of the cow manure plant, which is 200% of the height of the bone meal plant.

The height of the control plant is 36 inches.

1. Height of the bone meal plant = 125% of 36 inches = $1.25 * 36$ inches.

2. Height of the cow manure plant = 200% of the height of the bone meal plant = $2.00 * (1.25 * 36 \text{ inches})$.

</reasoning>

<answer>

:- use_module(library(clpq)).

height_control_plant(36).

height_bone_meal(B) :-

B is $1.25 * \text{height_control_plant}(36)$.

height_cow_manure(C) :-

C is $2.00 * \text{height_bone_meal}(B)$.

solve(C) :-

height_cow_manure(C).

</answer>

[TOKENS:post-gen] used=653 (34.6%) | rem=1237 | budget=1890

»> WARNING: Potential infinite recursion detected in Prolog code

»> run_prolog→ None

[TOKENS:pre-feedback] used=653 (34.6%) | rem=1237 | budget=1890

»> FEEDBACK INJECTED:

The code failed to produce a numeric result.

Let's fix it:

1. Reflect briefly on what went wrong.

2. Recalculate

3. Adjust your answer to:

<answer>

:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-

```
{X = final_number}.
</answer>

<tool_call>{
  "name": "run_prolog",
  "arguments": {
    "code": ":- use_module(library(clpq)).\n\nsolve(X) :- {X = final_number}."
  }
}

[TOKENS:post-feedback] used=763 (40.4%) | rem=1127 | budget=1890
[TOKENS:pre-gen] used=763 (40.4%) | rem=1127 | budget=1890

- TURN: 2/20 -

(ASSISTANT) <reasoning>
Upon reviewing the previous code, it appears that the issue might be
related to the way the height of the bone meal plant and the cow manure
plant are calculated and unified.

1. Calculate the height of the bone meal plant:
- Height of the bone meal plant = 1.25 * 36 inches.

2. Calculate the height of the cow manure plant:
- Height of the cow manure plant = 2.00 * (1.25 * 36 inches).

To ensure the final height is correctly computed and unified, we
need to make sure the intermediate steps are correctly defined and the
final height is directly computed and unified in one step.

Let's redefine the solve predicate to directly compute the height
of the cow manure plant and unify it with the variable X.
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-
X = 2.00 * 1.25 * 36.
</answer>

[TOKENS:post-gen] used=973 (51.5%) | rem=917 | budget=1890
»> run_prolog→ 2.0*1.25*36
[TOKENS:pre-feedback] used=973 (51.5%) | rem=917 | budget=1890

»> FEEDBACK INJECTED:
The code failed to produce a numeric result.

Let's fix it:

1. Reflect briefly on what went wrong.
2. Recalculate
3. Adjust your answer to:
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-
{X = final_number}.
</answer>

<tool_call>{
  "name": "run_prolog",
  "arguments": {
    "code": ":- use_module(library(clpq)).\n\nsolve(X) :- {X = final_number}."
  }
}
```

[TOKENS:post-feedback] used=1083 (57.3%) | rem=807 | budget=1890
[TOKENS:pre-gen] used=1083 (57.3%) | rem=807 | budget=1890

– TURN: 3/20 –

(ASSISTANT)

(ASSISTANT) <reasoning>

Upon reviewing the previous code, it appears that the issue might be related to the way the height of the cow manure plant is directly computed and unified.

The height of the cow manure plant is $2.00 * (1.25 * 36 \text{ inches})$. We can simplify this to:

- Height of the bone meal plant = $1.25 * 36 \text{ inches}$.
- Height of the cow manure plant = $2.00 * (1.25 * 36 \text{ inches}) = 2.00 * B$, where B is the height of the bone meal plant.

To directly compute and unify the final height, we can simplify the expression and directly compute the final height in one step.

Let's redefine the solve predicate to directly compute the height of the cow manure plant and unify it with the variable X.

</reasoning>

<answer>

:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-

X = $2.00 * 1.25 * 36$.

</answer>

[TOKENS:post-gen] used=1306 (69.1%) | rem=584 | budget=1890

»> run_prolog→ $2.0 * 1.25 * 36$

»> Aborting this attempt—resetting context for a new independent try

»> Total steps used: 3/20

»> TRY RESULT → pred=None, steps=3, took 23.05s

»> Bailed – no valid numeric answer; retrying with fresh context

»> INDEPENDENT AGENTIC_TRY #2

[TOKENS:pre-gen] used=332 (17.6%) | rem=1558 | budget=1890

– TURN: 4/20 –

(Assume all growth is in whole inches.)

(USER) <reasoning>

To determine the height of the cow manure plant, we need to follow these steps:

1. The control plant grows to 36 inches.
2. The bone meal plant grows to 125% of the control plant's height.
3. The cow manure plant grows to 200% of the bone meal plant's height.

First, we calculate the height of the bone meal plant:

[Height of bone meal plant] = $36 * 1.25$

Next, we calculate the height of the cow manure plant:

[Height of cow manure plant] = [Height of bone meal plant] $\times 2$

Finally, we need to find the height of the cow manure plant.

</reasoning>

<answer>

:- use_module(library(clpq)).

height_of_bone_meal_plant(Height) :-

Height is $36 * 1.25$.

```

height_of_cow_manure_plant(CowManureHeight) :-
height_of_bone_meal_plant(BoneMealHeight),
CowManureHeight is BoneMealHeight * 2.

solve(CowManureHeight) :-
height_of_cow_manure_plant(CowManureHeight).

CowManureHeight = CowManureHeight.
</answer>

[TOKENS:post-gen] used=619 (32.8%) | rem=1271 | budget=1890
»> WARNING: Potential infinite recursion detected in Prolog code
»> run_prolog→ 90.0
»> Total steps used: 4/20
»> TRY RESULT → pred='90.0', steps=1, took 8.58s

Q#54 | Pred: 90.0 | Gold: 90.0

```

E System Prompt for SP-Struct Zero-Shot MMLU Evaluation

```

You are a specialized Prolog code-generating assistant.
You have one tool:

<tools>
{"name":"run_prolog", "arguments":[{"code":"string"}]}
</tools>

Your task is to choose the correct option index for a multiple-choice question, and
present your work in two clearly defined sections:

1. <reasoning>
- Provide a clear, concise step-by-step explanation of how you determine which option
is correct.
- Refer to the correct option by its zero-based index.

2. <answer>
- Provide executable Prolog code using constraint logic programming to compute the
index of the correct choice.
- Always start with: ':- use_module(library(clpq)).'
- Final answer should be unified in solve(X) using a single curly-brace constraint
that sets X to the chosen index.

Use this XML format strictly:
<reasoning>
(Your step-by-step reasoning here)
</reasoning>
<answer>
:- use_module(library(clpq)).

solve(X) :-
{X = correct_index}.
</answer>

- Use the "run_prolog" tool to execute your answer in the <answer> section.

```

F Hyperparameter Tuning

Because sp-struct-rwd1 achieved the highest validation accuracy among our tested variants, we ran Bayesian hyper-parameter optimisation to see whether it could be pushed further on the GSM8K-Prolog-Prover task.

Using a Weights & Biases sweep with "method": "bayes", the system fits a Gaussian Process surrogate model $P(y \mid \mathbf{x})$ that estimates validation reward y (specifically, `eval/rewards/correctness_reward_func`) as a function of the hyperparameter configuration \mathbf{x} :

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{learning_rate}, r, \text{lora_alpha}, \\ \text{batch_size}, \text{num_generations}, \\ \text{max_grad_norm}, \text{weight_decay} \end{pmatrix}$$

We selected our search ranges based on established best practices and recent findings. First, the learning rate is sampled log-uniformly between 5×10^{-6} and 1×10^{-4} , since prior work has shown it to be the most sensitive hyperparameter in LoRA-augmented RL fine-tuning [26, 27]. For LoRA capacity, we restrict the rank r to $\{32, 64\}$ and α to $\{64\}$, as gains beyond $r \approx 64$ diminish at the 3B-parameter scale [20]. We use per-device batch sizes of 8 or 16 to balance throughput against gradient stability. The number of rollouts (`num_generations`) is set to either 4 or 8, since additional generations reduce policy-gradient variance [28]. Gradient clipping (`max_grad_norm`) is drawn uniformly from $[0.1, 1.0]$ to prevent exploding gradients [29], and weight decay is chosen from $\{0.01, 0.1, 0.2\}$ to control overfitting [30].

After each fine-tuning run, the new observation (\mathbf{x}_t, y_t) updates the GP posterior, and the next trial maximizes the UCB acquisition function $\mu_t(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa \sigma_t(\mathbf{x})$ [31].

Because $\alpha = \{64\}$ is static, we effectively tune $d = 6$ hyper-parameters and cap the sweep at $T = d + 6 = 12$ trials—the lower edge of the $[d + 5, 2d + 5]$ guideline [32]. An $O(d)$ budget can reveal any main-effect (single-parameter) gains, whereas interaction-driven gains would need a super-linear ($\approx O(d^2)$) search [33]. Twelve runs therefore offer a cheap “easy-win” check; if they fail to beat the baseline it implies that further progress would demand a much larger, GPU-prohibitive sweep, while still letting us pinpoint the key hyper-parameters at a fraction of grid or random search cost [34].




Figure 6: Parallel coordinates plot of 12 hyperparameter trials from Bayesian optimization. Each line represents one sweep, colored by validation correctness reward (`eval/rewards/correctness_reward_func`).

The best configuration found, denoted `sp-struct-rwd1-hyper` (section F), was then evaluated on the `gsm8k-prolog-prover` test split. Table 8 compares its accuracy to our original `sp-struct-rwd1` model:

Model	Mode	Acc
SP-Struct-RWD1	Multiple-Try	89.87
SP-Struct-RWD1-Hyper	Multiple-Try	89.07

Table 8: Test accuracy on GSM8K-Prolog-Prover. Hyperparameter tuning did not surpass the original baseline.




Figure 7: Bar chart of hyperparameter importances computed by W&B’s fANOVA analysis on our sweep.

Although the tuned variant fell 0.8 percentage points short of the baseline (Table 8), fANOVA analysis (Figure 7) shows that only `learning_rate`, `max_grad_norm`, and—more weakly—`num_generations` materially influence the reward. The remaining variables either contribute minimally or degrade performance. This experiment thus clarifies where the performance plateau lies, and where future compute investment would be most effective.

Best configuration The configuration that scored the highest in correctness for the evaluation dataset was:

`learning_rate`: 0.00001821

`lora_alpha`: 64

`max_grad_norm`: 0.4359

`num_generations`: 8

`per_device_train_batch_size`: 16

`r`: 64

`weight_decay`: 0.2

`eval/rewards/correctness_reward_func`: 1.859