
MathAtlas: A Benchmark for Autoformalization *in the Wild*

Nilay Patel^{†*}
nilay@ucsc.edu

Noah Arias
ngarias@ucsc.edu

Davit Babayan
dbabaya1@ucsc.edu

Victoria Cochran
vacochra@ucsc.edu

Timothy Libman
tlibman@ucsc.edu

Hafsah Mahmood
hzmahmoo@ucsc.edu

Liam McCarty
lmccarty@ucsc.edu

Soli Munoz
mmunoz35@ucsc.edu

Laurel Willey
lwwilley@ucsc.edu

Jeffrey Flanigan^{*}
jmflanig@ucsc.edu

University of California, Santa Cruz

^{*}Primary authors

[†]Correspondence

Abstract

Current autoformalization benchmarks are largely focused on olympiad or undergraduate mathematics, while graduate and research-level mathematics remains underexplored. In this paper, we introduce *MathAtlas*, the first large-scale autoformalization benchmark of *in the wild* graduate-level mathematics, containing $\sim 52k$ theorems, definitions, exercises, examples, and proofs extracted from 103 graduate mathematics textbooks. *MathAtlas* is enriched with a mathematical dependency graph containing $\sim 178k$ relations, and is the first autoformalization benchmark to include such relations, facilitating evaluation and development of dependency-aware autoformalization systems. Our extensive experiments show that *MathAtlas* is high quality but extremely challenging: strong baselines achieve at most 9.8% correctness on theorem statements and 16.7% on definitions. Furthermore, we find performance of state-of-the-art models degrades substantially with dependency depth: on *MA-Hard*, a subset of 700 entities with the deepest dependency trees, the best model achieves only 2.6% correctness for autoformalization on this challenging dataset. We release *MathAtlas* to the community as a benchmark set for large-scale autoformalization of graduate-level mathematics *in the wild*.

1 Introduction

The popularity of formal mathematics (computer verifiable mathematics) within the mathematics community has grown dramatically over recent years [30, 32, 15]. Together with advances in AI, this has caused a surge of interest in **autoformalization** [10, 36, 13, 3, 18], the task of automatically converting natural language math to a formal verifiable language such as Lean [24].

Until recently, autoformalization work has been largely focused on simpler settings such as olympiad or undergraduate mathematics [3, 36, 41, 1, 2, 12, 19], where mathematical statements require limited




Figure 1: An entity from *MathAtlas* together with a subgraph of its dependency tree. In yellow (bottom), we have a target theorem statement to be formalized (Proposition 15). Proposition 15 contains three “object references” to previously defined mathematical concepts: Dedekind ring, prime ideals, and principal ideal ring, which are dependencies needed to correctly formalize the theorem. These objects each have their own dependency tree (shown with a red border), and so on. Formalizations of objects possibly already exist (e.g., in Mathlib), or they need to be synthesized before the target statement can be formalized.

prerequisite material to properly formalize, much of which already has been formalized by humans in libraries such as Mathlib [22].

However, in more advanced mathematics, autoformalization becomes increasingly complex. Advanced mathematics has a large amount of prerequisite theory, much of which has yet to be formalized. This means an autoformalization system must first retrieve or produce the necessary dependent theory, correctly formalize it, and then formalize the original target statement.

Additionally, existing benchmarks typically focus on theorem statements, and ignore formalizations of mathematical *definitions*. Systems which can only autoformalize theorem statements are limited in their scope by the level of existing theory because they cannot formalize theorems using math concepts they do not already have definitions for. Thus, creating scalable autoformalization systems necessitates the study of definition autoformalization, for which large-scale real-world benchmarks are lacking [39, 34].

To comprehensively evaluate the performance of autoformalization methods in higher-level mathematics, we present **MathAtlas**¹, a large-scale, graduate-level benchmark designed to measure autoformalization performance on mathematics in the wild. *MathAtlas* contains $\sim 51k$ informal entities, divided into statements (theorems, examples, and exercises), definitions, and proofs, which are extracted from 103 graduate math textbooks. Entities in *MathAtlas* span 87 areas of mathematics, including real analysis, differential geometry, category theory, topology, quantum groups, among others. Some entities in *MathAtlas* are formalizable on top of Mathlib, but many require additional formal theory which may not currently exist. To facilitate access to these required dependencies, we enrich each entity with long-range dependency relations, local variable references, and local context (see Figure 1).

MathAtlas is the first large-scale, *in the wild* autoformalization benchmark of graduate-level mathematics, the first to include rich contextual and dependency data, and the first to annotate their inter-entity dependencies. Our extensive experiments show that *MathAtlas* is very challenging: strong baseline methods have low overall autoformalization correctness (10.5% on statements and 20.3% on definitions) on *MathAtlas*. Furthermore, we find this performance is correlated with an entity’s *dependency depth*: our strongest baseline has only 2.6% overall correctness on **MA-Hard**, a subset of 700 entities with the deepest dependency trees.

Finally, we investigate how well existing semantic faithfulness metrics for autoformalization generalize to *MathAtlas*. We present **MA-Align**², a binary classification benchmark of 200 entities from *MathAtlas*. Unlike prior benchmarks such as ConsistencyCheck [7] and CriticLeanBench[28], *MA-Align* contains both labeled examples of theorem statements and definitions, and covers a

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/MathAtlas/MathAtlas>

Definition 2.7.10 (Invariant bilinear form).: Let $V = V_0 \oplus V_1$ be a superspace and carrying a representation of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. A bilinear form $(\cdot|\cdot)$ is said *invariant* if, for any homogeneous element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $v, w \in V$, $(Xv|w) + p(v, X)(v|Xw) = 0$. Moreover, if V is the representation space of the adjoint representation, then the bilinear form is said *adjoint invariant*.

Corollary 3.A.24: Let X be a compact Kahler manifold. Then the inclusion $i : (\mathcal{A}^*(X)^c, d) \subset (\mathcal{A}^*(X), d)$ is a dga-quasi-isomorphism.

Example 5.1.14.: Find two fundamental matrices for the linear homogeneous system in Example 5.1.11.

Figure 2: Several entities from *MathAtlas* of various types: (1) a definition entity which defines two terms: “invariant” and “adjoint invariant”. (2) a theorem statement of a corollary from complex geometry. (3) an example from an ODE textbook.

wide variety of mathematics at the graduate level. Our experiments show that prior baselines have significant room for improvement on *MA-Align*.

We organize the rest of the paper as follows: In § 2, we present *MathAtlas*, its construction, contents and quality. We then discuss the benchmark’s autoformalization metrics (§ 3), before moving on to our autoformalization experiments and an analysis of the results (§ 4). Finally, we discuss related works (§ 5), and conclude (§ 6).

2 MathAtlas Benchmark

MathAtlas is constructed automatically from textbook documents. We discuss the entity and relation types in *MathAtlas*, and then discuss our entity and relation extraction pipeline. We also measure the quality of *MathAtlas* with a human evaluation.

2.1 Structure of *MathAtlas*

The structure of *MathAtlas* is as follows, with some relevant statistics.

Entities We use the term **entity** to mean a span of informal text which can be formalized, such as a theorem in a textbook. In *MathAtlas*, entities are either definitions, theorems, proofs, examples, or exercises (see Figure 2). Entities can, but don’t always, have **identifiers**, such as “Theorem 4.3.” These identifiers are sometimes referenced by other entities (see Figure 1). Importantly, entities sometimes contain multiple formalizable items. For example, in Figure 2, Definition 2.7.10 actually defines two objects, and so its formalization may require two definitions.

References Entities can contain **references** to other entities, dependent mathematical objects, or local variables which are not explicitly defined in the entity itself. We call these *entity references*, *object references*, and *local variable references*, respectively.

Relations We also include relations between entity references and the target entity, and object references and entities which define those objects. For example, an entity e_{met} may define a *metric space*, and contain an object reference r_{top} to a *topological space*, which is defined in an entity e_{top} . In this case, we add a relation $\langle e_{met}, e_{top} \rangle$ (see Figure 1). We define *dependency depth* to be the maximum height of an items dependency tree, where nodes are *entities* (e.g., definitions or theorems) and edges are *object references*. Similarly, we define *dependency mass* to be the total number of unique nodes in a particular entity’s dependency tree.

Statistics We now discuss some statistics of *MathAtlas*. Overall, *MathAtlas* contains of 52,052 entities, which are comprised of $\sim 18k$ theorems, $\sim 10k$ exercises, $\sim 10k$ definitions, $\sim 10k$ proofs, and 5k examples.

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/MathAtlas/MA-Align>

About 90% of entities contain at least one object reference. In sum, there are $\sim 193k$ object references, for an average of 3.69 per entity. Of these, our relation extraction system found a matching target entity for 83.7%, for a total of $\sim 161k$ total object relations in the full graph. In addition, 20.5% of entities contain an entity reference, summing to $\sim 17k$ total entity references. Of these, over 99.8% were matched with a target entity.

We now briefly present some features of *MathAtlas*’s dependency graph. Nodes have an average dependency depth of 30 (median of 17), but range anywhere from 0 to 80. We also find a stark difference in dependency depth based on the field of mathematics. For example, entities from textbooks on Lie algebra or Quantum groups had an average depth of ~ 50 , whereas those from books on set theory and logic had an average depth of ~ 6 . This is in-line with the intuition that certain fields of mathematics have more prerequisites, and thus deeper dependency trees.

2.2 Construction of *MathAtlas*

Here we give an overview of our dataset construction pipeline. For additional details, see Appendix A.

To construct *MathAtlas*, we collect 103 PDFs of math texts from a variety of sources and several fields of mathematics including subfields of algebra, analysis, geometry, number theory, probability, quantum theory, category theory, topology, and others. The math texts cover a total of 87 fields and subfields of mathematics. Following our pipeline (Figure 5), we convert the PDFs to MMD (mathematical markdown) files and filter out pages containing metadata, such as indices or glossaries. Then, we run an entity extraction model on the MMDs, which identifies spans of text corresponding to entity types, along with any identifier found in the entity (e.g., “Example 3.4”). Next, on any extracted entity, we run a reference extractor to identify any references to other entities, objects, or local variables. Lastly, on *definition* entities, we run a name extraction system, which identifies the name(s) of the defined object(s).

After extracting entities and associated metadata, we construct our dependency graph with a relation extraction system (see Appendix A for system details). We add “refers-to” relations between entity references and their target entities, and between an object references and the entity which defines that object, if present. Finally, we add a “proves” relation between a proof entity and the theorem entity it proves.

2.3 Quality Analysis of *MathAtlas*

We measure the intrinsic entity and relation extraction quality of the entities in *MathAtlas*.

To evaluate entity extraction quality, we annotate a random sample of 250 extracted entities from *MathAtlas*, 50 entities of each type, based on whether the entity is valid.³ For an entity to be valid, it must be complete (e.g., not cut off at the start or end, no missing segments due to improper PDF-markdown conversion), and have a correctly labeled type. We find that overall, 90.4% of the annotated entities are correctly extracted (see Table 1).

We also annotate 100 randomly sampled references, comprised of 50 object references and 50 entity references. Like before, references are considered correct if they are complete and are labeled with the correct type. We find that 96% of references were properly extracted. Of the four examples with errors, three were identifiers which were mistaken as entity references, and one was a name mistaken for an object reference.

Finally, we measure the performance of our relation extraction system. For each of the 100 randomly sampled references above, we retrieve 10 candidate targets with LeanSearch and annotate which, if any, are correct. We compute precision, recall, and F1 score of our automated system against the human annotations. Overall, we find an F1 score of 94.8% (see Table 1a).

³Our annotators hold, at minimum, undergraduate math degrees.

Table 1: Intrinsic data quality analysis of *MathAtlas*.

Ref. type	F1	Recall	Precision
Entity ref.	94.7%	100%	90%
Object ref.	94.9%	98%	92%
Overall	94.8%	99%	91%

(a) Performance of our relation extraction system on a human-annotated subset of 100 extracted relations (50 of each type). To measure recall, we annotate gold target entities from among the retrieved candidates; if no selected candidate is an appropriate match, we assume none exists.

Entity Type	Valid %
Definition	98.0%
Theorem	94.0%
Proof	80.0%
Example	86.0%
Exercise	94.0%
Overall	90.4%

(b) Precision of our entity extraction system on a human-annotated subset of 250 examples (50 of each type).

3 Autoformalization Metrics for *MathAtlas*

Following previous work, we use the standard autoformalization metric of **compile rate**.⁴ However, compile rate does not measure faithfulness of the formalization, so we also report *semantic faithfulness* (see subsection 3.1 for a full discussion).

We report a combined metric of compile rate and semantic faithfulness which we call **correctness**. A formal statement must both compile and be faithful to the informal statement for it to be considered correct.

3.1 Semantic Faithfulness Metric

Here, we discuss semantic faithfulness as a metric, and present experiments showing limitations of prior methods and our improvements.

Together with syntactic correctness (compilation rate), semantic correctness, or *semantic faithfulness* is a critical metric for autoformalization. Faithfulness measures whether a formal statement has the same mathematical meaning as its informal source. Prior work on semantic faithfulness [21, 7, 28, 20] focuses on easier domains (olympiad or undergraduate math), and does not measure alignment of definitions. *MathAtlas* highlights this gap in prior work, as it contains both high-level mathematics and definition entities.

To assess the quality of semantic faithfulness metrics on graduate-level, *in the wild* mathematics, we introduce *MA-Align*, a semantic faithfulness benchmark of syntactically correct 200 statements and definitions from *MathAtlas*. Each informal entity is formalized by `gpt-oss-120b`, and annotated with a binary label, “aligned” or “misaligned”.⁵ We evaluate prior LLM-as-judge systems, CriticLean [28], as well as our few-shot LLM-as-judge on ConsistencyCheck [7] and CriticLeanBench [28], and *MA-Align* (see Table 2).⁶

3.2 Semantic Faithfulness Results

We now analyze the results of our semantic faithfulness experiments (Table 2). Overall, we find that CriticLean has strong performance on ConsistencyCheck and CriticLeanBench, but a notable drop in accuracy on *MA-Align*. In contrast, the strongest LLM-as-judge system (`gpt-5.2` with an engineered prompt) drops performance on ConsistencyCheck and CriticLeanBench, but improves by 6% on *MA-Align* for definitions and 5% for statements. We suspect this tradeoff is in part due to the selected examples, which were selected from *MathAtlas* and therefore in-domain for *MA-Align*.

⁴We use the software package `blv` [26] to measure compile rate, compiled against Lean version v4.24.0.

⁵We selectively sample 200 such entities to better balance the label distribution.

⁶We note that we leave out FormalAlign [21] as a baseline as there is no official implementation, and our reimplementations were unable to match the reported results.

Table 2: Results of various methods on several semantic faithfulness benchmarks. “ReForm prompt” refers to the faithfulness prompt used by Chen et al. [7], and “Our Prompt” is an engineered, few-shot prompt optimized for gpt 5.2 with examples taken from *MathAtlas*.

Model	ConsistencyCheck	CriticLeanBench	MA-Align Defs.	MA-Align Stmt.
CriticLean				
CriticLean (14B)	81.7	84.4	68.0	56.0
CriticLean (32B)	82.6	86.4	80.0	75.0
ReForm Prompt				
gpt-oss-120b	84.9	85.4	76.0	61.0
Qwen3 (14B)	80.9	82.4	70.0	57.0
Qwen3 (32B)	74.6	71.5	74.0	67.0
Our Prompt (Few-shot)				
gpt-oss-120b	81.1	83.8	78.0	65.0
Qwen3 (14B)	71.3	59.4	68.0	71.0
Qwen3 (32B)	80.5	72.4	71.0	68.0
gpt-5.2	82.1	79.0	86.0	80.0

However, as gpt-5.2 is both proprietary and expensive to use, we elect to use CriticLean (32B) as our primary semantic faithfulness metric for *MathAtlas*, as it is still well-correlated with human evaluations, is open source,

4 Autoformalization Experiments

In this section, we present autoformalization experiments on *MathAtlas* with several strong baseline methods. We first detail the various models and settings, followed by an analysis of the results.

4.1 Dataset Splits

MathAtlas is naturally divided into five splits corresponding to each entity type: *definitions*, *theorems*, *exercises*, *examples*, and *proofs*. However, exercises, examples, and theorems are formalized similarly: that is, as a theorem statement in Lean 4. Thus, we report results on a joint “statement” split comprised of all exercises, examples, and theorems. Note that only a correct *statement* is required, not the full proof. We leave the study of proof and full-theorem formalization for future work.

Additionally, we analyze several variables pertinent to high-level, *in the wild* autoformalization. First, we investigate whether an item already existing in Mathlib affects a system’s autoformalization performance. It is likely that LLMs have seen Mathlib in its training data. Additionally, Mathlib is constructed bottom-up, meaning entities lower-level fields are more likely to already be formalized. These reasons suggest that existing items will have a higher average correctness. Secondly, we determine to what extent *max dependency depth* affects correctness, as well as *dependency mass* (i.e., the total number of dependencies in the dependency tree).

MA-Hard We select a subset of ~ 700 examples with the deepest dependency trees, which we call *MA-Hard*. This set primarily consists of examples from more advanced graduate-level mathematics, such as Algebraic Geometry and Lie Theory, and spans 14 subjects. We also note that *MA-Hard* consists of both statements (~ 600) and definitions (~ 100).

Open Split Approximately 30% of entities in *MathAtlas* are extracted from Springer textbooks. To comply with copyright law, we release code to generate *MathAtlas* in full, which can be run by those who have access to Springer textbooks. However, to facilitate access to *MathAtlas*, we release an open split of the remaining 70% of the data publicly.⁷ All examples from *MA-Hard* are in the open split. Our results on this open subset are reported in the Appendix in Table 5.

⁷<https://huggingface.co/datasets/MathAtlas/MathAtlas>

Table 3: Results for autoformalization experiments on *MathAtlas*. “Compiles” measures the percentage of examples which successfully compile. “Faithful” measures what percent of the compiling theorems are faithful. “Correct” indicates the overall percentage of statements which compile and are faithful.

Model	Compiles	Faithful	Correct
Prompted			
gpt-oss-20b (zs)	10.5%	20.9%	2.2%
+few-shot	18.1%	41.4%	7.5%
+tuned prompt	17.1%	47.4%	8.1%
+tuned exs.	20.8%	56.3%	11.7%
+context	16.1%	55.9%	9.0%
gpt-oss-120b (zs)	13.4%	49.3%	6.6%
+few-shot	24.2%	57.0%	13.8%
+tuned prompt	26.0%	58.8%	15.3%
+tuned exs.	28.5%	58.5%	16.7%
+local context	25.8%	58.9%	15.2%
Fine-tuned			
Herald 7B	11.8%	12.7%	1.5%
Kimina 7B	27.3%	8.4%	2.3%
ATLAS-L 8B	21.4%	16.4%	3.5%
Goedel 8B	20.3%	34.9%	7.1%
Goedel 32B	23.2%	30.6%	7.1%
ReForm 8B	19.0%	48.4%	9.8%
Prompted			
gpt-oss-20b (zs)	9.9%	42.4%	4.2%
+few-shot	16.5%	35.8%	5.9%
+tuned prompt	16.8%	32.7%	5.5%
+tuned exs.	19.1%	35.1%	6.7%
+local context	18.6%	36.0%	6.7%
gpt-oss-120b (zs)	14.3%	47.6%	6.8%
+few-shot	16.8%	43.5%	7.3%
+tuned prompt	17.1%	43.9%	7.5%
+tuned exs.	21.7%	35.9%	7.8%
+local context	20.0%	34.5%	6.9%

(a) Autoformalization results for definitions. We do not evaluate fine-tuned methods for definitions because there are no prior-work models available for definitions. The best performance in each category and column are bolded.

(b) Autoformalization results for statements (theorems, examples, and exercises). The best performance in each category and column are bolded.

4.2 Evaluated Methods

We measure the performance variety of autoformalization baselines, including fine-tuned methods and prompting methods. We evaluate several strong models with zero and few-shot prompting. We test zero-shot and few-shot prompting with gpt-oss-120B and gpt-oss-20b [27] (see Appendix B for full prompts). We supply the target entity text as input, and the expected output is a syntactically and semantically correct formal representation in Lean 4 (see § 3). This approach has been extensively studied in prior work, especially on benchmarks such as miniF2F [41] and ProofNet [3]. We perform an ablation, evaluating zero-shot prompting, few-shot with randomly selected examples from LeanWorkbook [38], adding an engineered prompt, and using annotated, graduate-level examples. We use the zero-shot prompt from Zhang et al. [39]. Our engineered prompt is more detailed in its instructions. Importantly, it instructs the model to synthesize background theory when necessary, and allows for multiple formal output statements as is sometimes required in *MathAtlas*.


On statements, we also test fine-tuned methods: Herald Translator [12], Goedel Formalizer v2 [17], Kimina Autoformalizer [33], Atlas Translator [19], and ReForm [7]. However, for definitions, we do not include any fine-tuned methods, as our experiments revealed autoformalization methods for theorems were unable to generalize to definitions in this domain.⁸

Added Local Context As discussed in subsection 2.1, some entities in *MathAtlas* require context to define variables, entities, or otherwise elaborate a mathematical setting. We evaluate a simple baseline of including the prior 500 tokens in the context window of the LLM. For this setting, we test only the few-shot prompted systems, as this is out-of-domain for the fine-tuned models.

4.3 Results

In this section we analyze the results of our autoformalization experiments on *MathAtlas*.

⁸We are unable to evaluate some prior definition autoformalization methods such as ARIA [34] or LoC-Decomp [31] due to unreleased code.



(a) Correctness versus dependency depth of our best performing system for definitions (gpt-oss-120b).

(b) Correctness versus dependency depth of our best performing system for statements (ReForm 8B)

Figure 4: Correctness of our strongest models compared with dependency depth on examples in *MathAtlas*.

Overall, we find *MathAtlas* to be very challenging. On the *statement* split, our strongest baseline is ReForm 8B, which achieved an overall correctness of 9.8% (see Table 3). We note the disparity between compilation rate and correctness, especially in fine-tuned models: Kimina 7B, for example, achieves 27.3% compilation rate, but just 2.3% of formalizations compile and are faithful. On the *definition* split, our strongest system is gpt-oss-120b, with 16.7% correctness, likewise with a significant 11.8% gap between compilation rate and overall correctness. As shown in Table 4, *MA-Hard* poses a significant challenge, with our strongest model achieving only 2.6% correctness.

Local Context Many items in *MathAtlas* require local context to correctly solve. However, including 300 tokens of local context seems to confuse prompted systems, and the input decreases system performance from 20.3% to 17.4% on definitions, and 10.5% to 8.6% on statements for the best model (see Table 3). This drop in performance indicates further research is necessary on incorporating local context into autoformalization methods.

Object Dependencies Next, we compare correctness versus max dependency depth. In Figure 4, we notice a clear trend, showing that our best systems is less likely to correctly formalize deeper targets. We compute a two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov, and find significant difference between the max depth distributions for correct and incorrect examples ($p < 0.001$).

Existence in Mathlib We compare correctness of definitions which are and aren’t grounded in Mathlib (see Figure 3). We find that 27.9% of definitions which our linker grounded in Mathlib are correctly formalized, whereas only 16.8% of missing definitions are correct, statistically significant difference (chi-square $p < 0.001$). This supports intuition, as Mathlib is likely to be in the training data for modern LLMs like gpt-oss-120b, which may result in inflated autoformalization performance on those entities.




Figure 3: Correctness of formalized entities from our best models compared with presence in Mathlib. Entities which our retrieval system (LeanSearch [11]) found in Mathlib are significantly more likely to be correctly formalized than otherwise.

5 Related Works

LLMs for Autoformalization Large language models (LLMs) have made significant advancements in autoformalization. Early work with LLMs such as in Wu et al. [36] used naive approaches, but

Table 4: Performance of few-shot prompted models on *MA-Hard*, which contains both definitions and statements.

Model	Compiling	Faithful	Correct
gpt-oss-20b	14.3%	14.7%	2.1%
gpt-oss-120b	14.6%	17.8%	2.6%

showed promise in the methodology. Further refinements with fine-tuning on various data made significant progress [12, 17, 37, 19, 4] but, as we show in this paper, face similar issues in more difficult settings. More recently, there has been work on breaking down targets either by decomposing into subproblems [31] or retrieving dependencies first [34, 23]. These methods have encouraging results in harder settings [14], but use proprietary and expensive models and are token-inefficient. ProofFlow [6] introduces a method for formalizing natural language proofs, as well as ProofScore, a metric for measuring faithfulness to the natural language.

Autoformalization Benchmarks Prior autoformalization benchmarks have largely focused on formalizing theorem statements [41, 3], primarily on olympiad or undergraduate mathematics. LeanEuclid [25] is a benchmark for autoformalizing geometry from Euclid’s *Elements* and the UniGeo dataset [8]. Zhang et al. [39] present two definition-specific benchmark of 100 definitions taken from arXiv and Wikipedia, and show proprietary LLMs have low performance. The FATE-H and FATE-X benchmarks [14] consist of 100 problems from commutative and abstract algebra, and pose a significant challenge compared to previous work. In contrast to the FATE benchmarks, *MathAtlas* is much larger, contains multiple entity types, is more varied in topic, and includes local and long-range dependencies which facilitate the study of isolated system components, such as retrieval or synthesis.

Autoformalization Metrics Correctness in autoformalization is measured with two metrics: compilation and semantic faithfulness. The former is simple to measure with the language’s compiler, or specialized tools such as Kimina Lean Server [29] or blv [26].

More difficult to measure is faithfulness, which measures whether the generated formal language code is semantically equivalent to the input informal statement. FormalAlign [21] introduces a methodology for fine-tuning an alignment model for statements. However, the methodology does not scale well to more difficult domains, and fails to capture the types of mistakes made by more advanced autoformalization models.⁹ For benchmarks with gold formal labels, BEq [18] judges semantic equivalence between two formal statements based on definitional equivalence, and TransTED [20] presents a tree-based similarity metric. ProofScore [6] as previously mentioned is a faithfulness metric specifically for proofs. Using an LLM-as-judge approach has been common for measuring semantic faithfulness [40], and has shown promise as a scalable metric. ConsistencyCheck [7] is a benchmark for semantic faithfulness metrics, but as we show in subsection 3.2, high performance on ConsistencyCheck does not necessarily imply high performance in harder domains such as *MA-Align*.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, we introduce *MathAtlas*, a large-scale benchmark for graduate-level autoformalization of mathematics in the wild. Through extensive experiments, we show that that *MathAtlas* is very challenging for existing autoformalization systems.

In contrast to prior benchmarks, *MathAtlas* with a dependency-graph structure which identifies prerequisite theory for each entity. Our analysis shows that entities with deeper dependency trees are substantially less likely to be formalized correctly. To study this difficulty, we construct *MA-Hard*, a subset of 700 entities with the deepest dependency trees in *MathAtlas*, on which our strongest system achieves only 2.6% correctness. We additionally observe that entities successfully grounded to existing formalizations in Mathlib are significantly more likely to be formalized correctly.

Finally, we introduce *MA-Align*, a benchmark for evaluating semantic faithfulness on both mathematical statements and definitions for *MathAtlas*. Experiments on *MA-Align* show that trained metrics

⁹No implementation or model weights have been released as of this paper. Our analysis of these results is based on our re-implementation, which failed to match reported numbers.

such as CriticLean, as well as strong LLM-as-judge systems, have clear room for improvement in faithfulness evaluation.

We release *MathAtlas*, *MA-Align*, and our experimental code to support future research for *in the wild* autoformalization.

Limitations

MathAtlas primarily deals with graduate-level mathematics, and leaves more difficult domains such as research mathematics for future work. Certain textbooks are also omitted from *MathAtlas* due to copyright concerns, which can potentially bias data.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under the Artificial Intelligence, Formal Methods, and Mathematical Reasoning (AIMing) NSF grant, award #2523479. This work used resources available through the National Research Platform (NRP) at the University of California, San Diego. NRP has been developed, and is supported in part, by funding from National Science Foundation, from awards 1730158, 1540112, 1541349, 1826967, 2112167, 2100237, and 2120019, as well as additional funding from community partner.

References

- [1] Exploration of neural machine translation in autoformalization of mathematics in Mizar I. Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3372885.3373827>.
- [2] A. Agrawal, S. Gadgil, N. Goyal, A. Narayanan, and A. Tadipatri. Towards a Mathematics Formalisation Assistant using Large Language Models. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.07524>.
- [3] Z. Azerbayev, B. Piotrowski, and J. Avigad. ProofNet: A Benchmark for Autoformalizing and Formally Proving Undergraduate-Level Mathematics Problems.
- [4] Z. Azerbayev, H. Schoelkopf, K. Paster, M. D. Santos, S. McAleer, A. Q. Jiang, J. Deng, S. Biderman, and S. Welleck. Llemma: An Open Language Model For Mathematics, Oct. 2023.
- [5] L. Blecher, G. Cucurull, T. Scialom, and R. Stojnic. Nougat: Neural optical understanding for academic documents, 2023.
- [6] R. Cabral, T. M. Do, X. Yu, W. M. Tai, Z. Feng, and X. Shen. ProofFlow: A Dependency Graph Approach to Faithful Proof Autoformalization, Oct. 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2510.15981>. arXiv:2510.15981 [cs].
- [7] G. Chen, J. Wu, X. Chen, W. X. Zhao, R. Song, C. Li, K. Fan, D. Liu, and M. Liao. Reform: Reflective autoformalization with prospective bounded sequence optimization, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.24592>.
- [8] J. Chen, T. Li, J. Qin, P. Lu, L. Lin, C. Chen, and X. Liang. Unigeo: Unifying geometry logical reasoning via reformulating mathematical expression, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.02746>.
- [9] R. Escrivá, H. Bashir, M. Isom, J. Huber, Macronova, S. Kedia, itaismith, L. VanderHart, J. Radhakrishnan, tanujnay112, T. Azarov, B. Eggers, K. Diaz, L. Pei, jasonvigil, D. Kim, A. Troynikov, P. I. Thomas, R. P. nicolasgere, G. Shahbazian, E. Culver, C. Gamble, D. Dash, T. Krusinski, W. Gu, swyx.io, M. Keller, R. Him, and naynaly10. chroma-core/chroma. <https://github.com/chroma-core/chroma>, may 7 2026. URL <https://github.com/chroma-core/chroma>.
- [10] S. Gadgil, A. R. Tadipatri, A. Agrawal, A. Narayanan, and N. Goyal. Towards automating formalisation of theorem statements using large language models.

- [11] G. Gao, H. Ju, J. Jiang, Z. Qin, and B. Dong. A semantic search engine for mathlib4, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13310>.
- [12] G. Gao, Y. Wang, J. Jiang, Q. Gao, Z. Qin, T. Xu, and B. Dong. Herald: A natural language annotated lean 4 dataset, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10878>.
- [13] A. Q. Jiang, W. Li, and M. Jamnik. Multilingual mathematical autoformalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2311.03755*, 2023.
- [14] J. Jiang, W. He, Y. Wang, G. Gao, Y. Hu, J. Wang, N. Guan, P. Wu, C. Dai, L. Xiao, and B. Dong. Fate: A formal benchmark series for frontier algebra of multiple difficulty levels, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.02872>.
- [15] A. Kontorovich and T. Tao. Prime Number Theorem and More, Jan. 2024. URL <https://github.com/AlexKontorovich/PrimeNumberTheoremAnd>.
- [16] W. Kwon, Z. Li, S. Zhuang, Y. Sheng, L. Zheng, C. H. Yu, J. E. Gonzalez, H. Zhang, and I. Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2023.
- [17] Y. Lin, S. Tang, B. Lyu, Z. Yang, J.-H. Chung, H. Zhao, L. Jiang, Y. Geng, J. Ge, J. Sun, J. Wu, J. Gesi, X. Lu, D. Acuna, K. Yang, H. Lin, Y. Choi, D. Chen, S. Arora, and C. Jin. Goedel-prover-v2: Scaling formal theorem proving with scaffolded data synthesis and self-correction, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.03613>.
- [18] Q. Liu, X. Zheng, X. Lu, Q. Cao, and J. Yan. Rethinking and improving autoformalization: towards a faithful metric and a dependency retrieval-based approach. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hUb2At2DsQ>.
- [19] X. Liu, K. Bao, J. Zhang, Y. Liu, Y. Chen, Y. Liu, Y. Jiao, and T. Luo. Atlas: Autoformalizing theorems through lifting, augmentation, and synthesis of data, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.05567>.
- [20] X. Liu, T. Zhu, Z. Dong, Y. Liu, Q. Guo, Z. Liu, Y. Chen, and T. Luo. Assess: A semantic and structural evaluation framework for statement similarity, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.22246>.
- [21] J. Lu, Y. Wan, Y. Huang, J. Xiong, Z. Liu, and Z. Guo. FormalAlign: Automated Alignment Evaluation for Autoformalization, Oct. 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10135>. arXiv:2410.10135 [cs].
- [22] T. mathlib Community. The lean mathematical library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs, POPL '20*. ACM, Jan. 2020. doi: 10.1145/3372885.3373824. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3372885.3373824>.
- [23] M. J. Min, Y. Gao, W. Sy, Z. Li, X. Si, and O. Bastani. Divide and abstract: Autoformalization via decomposition and abstraction learning. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=NjgaeXNt3>.
- [24] L. d. Moura and S. Ullrich. The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language, 2021. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- [25] L. Murphy, K. Yang, J. Sun, Z. Li, A. Anandkumar, and X. Si. Autoformalizing Euclidean geometry. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- [26] Nilay Patel. offendo/blv. <https://github.com/offendo/blv>, mar 11 2026. URL <https://github.com/offendo/blv>.
- [27] OpenAI, :, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, J. Ai, S. Altman, A. Applebaum, E. Arbus, R. K. Arora, Y. Bai, B. Baker, H. Bao, B. Barak, A. Bennett, T. Bertao, N. Brett, E. Brevdo, G. Brockman, S. Bubeck, C. Chang, K. Chen, M. Chen, E. Cheung, A. Clark, D. Cook, M. Dukhan, C. Dvorak, K. Fives, V. Fomenko, T. Garipov, K. Georgiev, M. Glaese, T. Gogineni, A. Goucher, L. Gross, K. G. Guzman, J. Hallman, J. Hehir, J. Heidecke, A. Helyar, H. Hu, R. Huet, J. Huh, S. Jain, Z. Johnson,

- C. Koch, I. Kofman, D. Kundel, J. Kwon, V. Kyrilov, E. Y. Le, G. Leclerc, J. P. Lennon, S. Lessans, M. Lezcano-Casado, Y. Li, Z. Li, J. Lin, J. Liss, Lily, Liu, J. Liu, K. Lu, C. Lu, Z. Martinovic, L. McCallum, J. McGrath, S. McKinney, A. McLaughlin, S. Mei, S. Mostovoy, T. Mu, G. Myles, A. Neitz, A. Nichol, J. Pachocki, A. Paino, D. Palmie, A. Pantuliano, G. Parascandolo, J. Park, L. Pathak, C. Paz, L. Peran, D. Pimenov, M. Pokrass, E. Proehl, H. Qiu, G. Raila, F. Raso, H. Ren, K. Richardson, D. Robinson, B. Rotsted, H. Salman, S. Sanjeev, M. Schwarzer, D. Sculley, H. Sikchi, K. Simon, K. Singhal, Y. Song, D. Stuckey, Z. Sun, P. Tillet, S. Toizer, F. Tsimpouras, N. Vyas, E. Wallace, X. Wang, M. Wang, O. Watkins, K. Weil, A. Wendling, K. Whinnery, C. Whitney, H. Wong, L. Yang, Y. Yang, M. Yasunaga, K. Ying, W. Zaremba, W. Zhan, C. Zhang, B. Zhang, E. Zhang, and S. Zhao. gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b model card, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10925>.
- [28] Z. Peng, Y. Yao, K. Ma, S. Guo, Y. Li, Y. Zhang, C. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Z. Yu, L. Li, M. Liu, Y. Xia, J. Shen, Y. Wu, Y. Cao, Z. Zhang, W. Huang, J. Liu, and G. Zhang. Criticlean: Critic-guided reinforcement learning for mathematical formalization, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06181>.
- [29] M. D. Santos, H. Wang, H. de Saxcé, R. Wang, M. Baksys, M. Unsal, J. Liu, Z. Liu, and J. Li. Kimina lean server: Technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.21230>.
- [30] P. Scholze and K. Buzzard. Liquid tensor experiment, Dec. 2020. URL <https://xenaproject.wordpress.com/2020/12/05/liquid-tensor-experiment/>.
- [31] J. Shi, Z. Zhang, B. Ma, S. Zhao, Y. Yuan, and G. Wang. Loc-decomp: LLM autoformalization via logical concept decomposition and iterative feedback correction. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0KFQ4F9YEH>.
- [32] T. Tao. Formalizing the proof of pfr in lean4 using blueprint: a short tour, Nov. 2023. URL <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2023/11/18/formalizing-the-proof-of-pfr-in-lean4-using-blueprint-a-short-tour>.
- [33] H. Wang, M. Unsal, X. Lin, M. Baksys, J. Liu, M. D. Santos, F. Sung, M. Vinyes, Z. Ying, Z. Zhu, J. Lu, H. de Saxcé, B. Bailey, C. Song, C. Xiao, D. Zhang, E. Zhang, F. Pu, H. Zhu, J. Liu, J. Bayer, J. Michel, L. Yu, L. Dreyfus-Schmidt, L. Tunstall, L. Paganì, M. Machado, P. Bourigault, R. Wang, S. Polu, T. Barroyer, W.-D. Li, Y. Niu, Y. Fleureau, Y. Hu, Z. Yu, Z. Wang, Z. Yang, Z. Liu, and J. Li. Kimina-prover preview: Towards large formal reasoning models with reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.11354>.
- [34] H. Wang, R. Xie, Y. Wang, G. Gao, X. Yu, and B. Dong. Aria: An agent for retrieval and iterative auto-formalization via dependency graph, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.04520>.
- [35] L. Wang, N. Yang, X. Huang, L. Yang, R. Majumder, and F. Wei. Improving text embeddings with large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.00368>.
- [36] Y. Wu, A. Q. Jiang, W. Li, M. N. Rabe, C. Staats, M. Jamnik, and C. Szegedy. Autoformalization with Large Language Models. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12615>.
- [37] Y. Wu, D. Huang, R. Wan, Y. Peng, S. Shang, C. Cao, L. Qi, R. Zhang, Z. Du, J. Yan, and X. Hu. Stepfun-formalizer: Unlocking the autoformalization potential of llms through knowledge-reasoning fusion, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.04440>.
- [38] H. Ying, Z. Wu, Y. Geng, J. Wang, D. Lin, and K. Chen. Lean workbook: A large-scale lean problem set formalized from natural language math problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03847*, 2024.
- [39] L. Zhang, M. Valentino, and A. Freitas. Autoformalization in the wild: Assessing LLMs on real-world mathematical definitions. In C. Christodoulopoulos, T. Chakraborty, C. Rose, and V. Peng, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1720–1738, Suzhou, China, Nov. 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-332-6. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.90. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-main.90/>.

- [40] L. Zhang, M. Valentino, and A. Freitas. Beyond Gold Standards: Epistemic Ensemble of LLM Judges for Formal Mathematical Reasoning, June 2025.
- [41] K. Zheng, J. M. Han, and S. Polu. MiniF2F: A cross-system benchmark for formal Olympiad-level mathematics. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.00110v2>.




Figure 5: *MathAtlas* creation pipeline. For visual convenience, we combine the “name” and “reference” extractors into one step called “identifier extractor.”

```

Text:
"M is compact iff G is abelian."

Reasoning:
- M not introduced → include local_variable_reference
- G not introduced → include local_variable_reference
- compact is a named property → include object_reference
- abelian is a named property → include object_reference

Output:
[
  {"term": "M", "reference_type": "local_variable_reference"},
  {"term": "G", "reference_type": "local_variable_reference"},
  {"term": "compact", "reference_type": "object_reference"},
  {"term": "abelian", "reference_type": "object_reference"}
]

```

Figure 6: Example of reference extraction system input and output.

A Extraction Pipeline

Our extraction pipeline starts with 103 selected textbooks covering a wide range of mathematics. We use Nougat [5] to convert PDFs into Mathematical Markdown (MMD). We then run our entity extraction system, followed by our reference extraction and name extraction systems, and finally our relation extraction system. We detail each below.

Entity Extraction Our entity extraction system is a few-shot, prompt-engineered *gpt-oss-120b*. We prompt the model to generate an array of JSON objects with keys “type” indicating the entity’s type, optionally an “identifier”, which are spans such as Definition 3.9 or Theorem 15, and “text”, which is the actual text of the entity. We enforce this structure with a JSON schema using structured decoding, a temperature of 0.3, and otherwise default sampling parameters.

We then run our reference extractor system, likewise a prompted *gpt-oss-120b* model. The reference extractor takes as input an extracted entity, and outputs a list of JSON objects with keys “term,” indicating the text of the reference, and “reference_type,” which is one of *object_reference*, *entity_reference*, or *local_variable_reference*. This is likewise enforced with JSON schema, and uses a temperature of 0.3.

Then, we run the name extractor, also a prompted *gpt-oss-120b*, prompted to output the names of objects defined in the entity. The output a JSON array of strings, again enforced with a schema and structured decoding. We likewise use a temperature of 0.3.

Relation Extraction Each entity is embedded into a ChromaDB instance [9] together with all its metadata, using the Mistral E5 model from Wang et al. [35]. Then, our relation extraction system works in two stages. First, we use the same model to retrieve candidate matches from the entity database. Secondly, we prompt gpt-oss-120b to determine which, if any, is the correct match, accounting for usage and context. If there are multiple matches, we prioritize those from the same textbook, or otherwise those with the highest matching score.

Grounding in Mathlib We use LeanSearch [11] to link definitions in *MathAtlas* to formal definitions in Mathlib. We query the definition text to get 10 candidate matches, and select from the matches using a prompted “gpt-oss-120b.” Unlike the authors however, we find that augmenting the query degrades performance, so we skip that step in our final run. We suspect this is because our queries are already fully-formed definitions rather than keywords or phrases. We include the selected matches as well as all 10 candidates for each definition in the released dataset.

B Prompts

```
## Task
You are given a block of markdown mathematical text.
Your task is to identify and extract all contiguous snippets that correspond to any of the following
mathematical entity types:

- Definition
- Theorem (this includes propositions, lemmas, corollaries)
- Example
- Exercise
- Proof

Only extract genuine mathematical content of these types.
Ignore and do NOT extract:

- General exposition or narrative explanation
- Chapter titles, section headings, or indexes
- Transitional text or motivation
- References to earlier or later results without stating them

## What qualifies as an entity

### 1. Definitions (very important)

A definition does NOT require a heading or numbering.

You must extract a block as a definition if its primary purpose is to introduce, name, or precisely
describe a mathematical object or concept, even if it appears inline in the text.

Treat a block as a definition if it contains definitional language, including but not limited to:

- "is called"
- "is defined as"
- "we call"
- "is said to be"
- "the ... of ... is"
- "an element ... is"
- an emphasized or italicized term followed by an explanation
- a mathematical object followed by a copular verb ("is", "are") and a precise condition

If a paragraph answers the question "What is X?", it is a definition.

A single paragraph may introduce multiple concepts (e.g., minimum polynomial and conjugate).
If so, extract the entire paragraph as one definition entity.

Unlabeled definitions are mandatory.
Failure to extract them is considered an incorrect output.

### 2. Theorems

Extract any explicitly stated mathematical claim intended to be true, including:

- Theorem
- Proposition
- Lemma
- Corollary

Treat all of these as type "theorem".

The entity must assert a result, not merely mention one.

### 3. Proofs

Extract a proof only when:
```

- It is explicitly labeled (e.g., "Proof.", "Proof of Proposition 3.2."), and
- It contains actual mathematical reasoning or argument

Special rule:
If a proof appears only as part of an exercise prompt (e.g., "Prove that ...") and contains no mathematical argument beyond the statement itself, do NOT extract a separate proof entity.

Caution:
Be careful to extract a full proof, and do not cut off any information halfway through.

4. Examples

Extract examples that demonstrate or instantiate a mathematical concept, whether labeled ("Example 2.3") or clearly signposted in the text.

5. Exercises

Extract exercises or problems intended for the reader to solve, whether labeled or clearly formatted as such.

Output format

For each extracted entity, produce a JSON object with the following keys:

- "type": one of "definition", "theorem", "example", "exercise", "proof" (always lowercase)
- "identifier": a concise label taken verbatim from the text introducing the entity (e.g., "Definition 6.9.", "Proposition 6.11.", "Proof.", "Exercise 7(b)")
If no explicit label, number, or name is present, set this to null.
- "text": the exact text of the entity, copied verbatim.
Do NOT summarize, paraphrase, normalize spacing, or rewrite mathematics.

Ordering rules

- Preserve the original order of appearance.
- Each entity must be its own JSON object.
- Do not merge separate entities.
- Do not invent or infer missing text.

Reasoning step (required)

Before producing the final output:

1. Scan the text systematically from start to end.
2. Actively search for:
 - Explicit labels (Definition, Theorem, Proof, etc.)
 - Implicit definitions using definitional language
3. For each candidate block:
 - Decide whether it is genuine mathematical content
 - Confirm it matches one of the allowed entity types
4. Exclude all non-mathematical exposition.

Only after completing this identification and segmentation should you produce the output.

Output constraints

- Respond with a JSON list only
- Do NOT wrap the JSON in code fences
- Do NOT include explanations, commentary, or reasoning in the output
- If no valid entities are found, return an empty list: []

Priority reminder

If a block introduces or defines a mathematical object - even without a heading - it MUST be extracted as a "definition".

Figure 7: Prompt for entity extraction

You are given a mathematical definition written in textbook style.

Your task is to extract the names of the mathematical objects, concepts, or properties being defined.

Rules:

- Return only the names of the items being defined.
- Do not include symbols, formulas, or explanations.
- If multiple items are defined, return all of them.
- If a definition gives multiple synonymous names (e.g. "X (or Y)"), include the most standard or commonly used name.
- Ignore purely notational conventions unless they define a commonly named concept.
- Normalize names to lowercase unless capitalization is standard.
- Output the result as a JSON-style list of strings.

Definition:
{{DEFINITION_TEXT}}

```

Output format:
["name 1", "name 2", ...]

### Examples:

Example 1:
Definition:
**Definition 0.3.4**.:
1. A _union_ of two sets  $\set{A}$  and  $\set{B}$  is defined as  $\set{A \cup B} \coloneqq \{x : x \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$ .
2. An _intersection_ of two sets  $\set{A}$  and  $\set{B}$  is defined as  $\set{A \cap B} \coloneqq \{x : x \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$ .
3. A _complement_ of  $\set{B}$  relative to  $\set{A}$  (or _set-theoretic difference_ of  $\set{A}$  and  $\set{B}$ ) is defined as  $\set{A \setminus B} \coloneqq \{x : x \in A \text{ and } x \notin B\}$ .
4. We say _complement_ of  $\set{B}$  and write  $\set{B^c}$  instead of  $\set{A \setminus B}$  if the set  $\set{A}$  is either the entire universe or if it is the obvious set containing  $\set{B}$ , and is understood from context.
5. We say sets  $\set{A}$  and  $\set{B}$  are _disjoint_ if  $\set{A \cap B} = \emptyset$ .

Output:
["union", "intersection", "set-theoretic difference", "complement", "disjoint"]

Example 2:
Definition:
**Definition 6.1** ( $\mathbb{RCA}_0$ ): An _integral domain_ is a ring  $\set{R}$  with no nonzero zero-divisors

Output:
["integral domain"]

```

Figure 8: Prompt for name extraction

```

You are an expert mathematician and a specialist in formal mathematics, especially Lean 4 and mathlib4.

Your task is to identify all mathematical references that appear in a given mathematical definition, theorem, lemma, or statement.

A reference is any term, symbol, or phrase whose meaning depends on a previously defined mathematical object, entity, or external context.

You must classify each reference into exactly one of the following categories.

-----
REFERENCE TYPES
-----

1. "object_reference"

A standard, named mathematical object, structure, property, or concept whose definition exists independently of the current text.

Examples:
- group
- topological space
- metric space
- compact space
- real number
- real vector space
- group homomorphism
- general linear group
- continuous function
- prime number
- finite set

Include:
- Named mathematical structures
- Named mathematical properties if they have formal definitions
- Standard named constructions

Do NOT include:
- Generic words like "element", "set", "function", "number"
- Logical words like "if", "then", "and", "exists"
- Less specific forms of an object. I.e., in the sentence "Let G be an abelian group", you should include "abelian group", NOT "group".

-----

2. "entity_reference"

A reference to a specific previously defined, labeled, or numbered mathematical item.

Examples:
- Definition 3.4
- Theorem 2.1
- Lemma 5
- Proposition 4.2
- Corollary 1.3
- previous lemma
- above theorem
- following definition

```

```

These refer to specific formal entities in the document structure.

-----

3. "local_variable_reference"

A symbol that refers to a mathematical object but is NOT explicitly introduced in the current text.

A symbol is explicitly introduced if the current text declares it using phrases such as:

- let M be ...
- suppose M is ...
- fix M ...
- given M ...
- where M is ...
- for M a ...
- denote by M ...
- let M := ...
- assume M is ...
- take M ...
- any equivalent explicit declaration

If a symbol is explicitly introduced in the current text, DO NOT include it.

Only include symbols that are used WITHOUT being introduced.

EXAMPLES

Example:

Text:
"Let G be a group. Then G is abelian iff the center of G equals G."

Reasoning:
- G is explicitly introduced -> exclude
- group is a named object -> include
- abelian is a named property -> include
- center is a named construction -> include

Output:
[
  {"term": "group", "reference_type": "object_reference"},
  {"term": "abelian", "reference_type": "object_reference"},
  {"term": "center", "reference_type": "object_reference"}
]

-----

Example:

Text:
"M is compact iff G is abelian."

Reasoning:
- M not introduced -> include local_variable_reference
- G not introduced -> include local_variable_reference
- compact is a named property -> include object_reference
- abelian is a named property -> include object_reference

Output:
[
  {"term": "M", "reference_type": "local_variable_reference"},
  {"term": "G", "reference_type": "local_variable_reference"},
  {"term": "compact", "reference_type": "object_reference"},
  {"term": "abelian", "reference_type": "object_reference"}
]

-----

If no references exist, output:

[]

```

Figure 9: Prompt for reference extraction

```

You are a meticulous expert in Lean 4 and 'mathlib4'.

Your task is to act as a "grounding" reasoner for a formalization agent. Your goal is to determine
whether a given mathematical concept has a canonical formal definition in 'mathlib', based on a
list of search candidates.

-----

Your Task (Follow These Steps PRECISELY)

-----

Step 1: Direct Match Analysis

-----

- First, look for a direct, canonical definition among the candidates.

```

```

- A direct match is typically a 'class', 'structure', or 'def' whose name is very similar to the
  concept name.

Example:
- Concept: "local ring"
- Match: 'class IsLocalRing'

- If you find a clear, direct match, use that as your primary answer.

-----
Step 2: Deduction from Usage Patterns
(Only if no direct match is found in Step 1)
-----

- If no direct match was found in Step 1, your task is to deduce the canonical name by finding a consistent usage pattern across multiple 'theorem' and 'instance' candidates.

- Analyze the signatures:
  Look for a common identifier that is consistently used as a type or typeclass across multiple
  candidates.

- Example:
  If you are looking for "CharZero" and the search results include:
  - 'instance : CharZero N'
  - 'instance : CharZero Z'
  - 'theorem my_thm [CharZero R]'

  Then the identifier 'CharZero' appears repeatedly as a typeclass. This is overwhelming evidence that
  the canonical definition is named 'CharZero'.

- Strict Rule:
  The name you select must be an identifier that is explicitly present in the candidate list.

  - Do not invent, combine, or guess a new name.
  - If no single, consistent pattern emerges from the candidates, you must conclude that no confident
    match can be found.

-----
Step 3: Final Decision
-----

- Based on your analysis from Step 1 and Step 2, determine the single best candidate for the concept.

- Your answer MUST be a single, valid JSON object with the following keys:

  - "best_match":
    The list index of the candidate which precisely matches the search query. If no confident match
    can be found through either direct matching or inference, the value must be 'null'.

  - "reasoning":
    An explanation of why you chose a match, or didn't choose any match.

```

Figure 10: Prompt for grounding entities to mathlib. 10 candidate results are fed into this prompt, and the output is an index of the best match and a reasoning.

C Additional Experimental Details

We use vLLM [16] as an efficient inference server for all of our dataset construction, autoformalization, and evaluation. If specified, we use the author’s recommended sampling parameters. Otherwise, we use a temperature of 0.5, a top-p of 0.95, and otherwise default parameters for all autoformalization experiments. We use deterministic sampling for our semantic faithfulness systems.

All experiments were run on a single H200 GPU. Depending on the model, full-benchmark runs run from 1-10 hours. Checking compilation runs on 10 cpu workers for approximately 5 minutes. Measuring faithfulness runs for ~1-2 hours, depending on the number of successfully compiling examples.

D Broader impacts

We release *MathAtlas* with the hope to advance the field of autoformalization, and with it, AI and mathematics in general. This outcome can potentially have larger societal impact as AI becomes more powerful and more widely used. However, it is unlikely that this contribution in particular will have large-scale negative ramifications.

Table 5: Autoformalization results on the “open” split of MathAtlas. The results listed here are similar to those in Table 3, but restricted to a subset of the data.

Model	Compiles	Faithful	Correct
Prompted			
gpt-oss-20b (zs)	9.5%	48.4%	4.6%
+few-shot	16.3%	47.2%	7.7%
+tuned prompt	16.8%	47.6%	8.0%
+tuned exs.	19.9%	60.3%	12.0%
gpt-oss-120b (zs)	13.0%	49.2%	6.4%
+few-shot	24.2%	57.0%	13.8%
+tuned prompt	26.0%	58.8%	15.3%
+tuned exs.	27.4%	62.0%	17.0%

(a) Autoformalization results for definitions. The best performance in each category and column are bolded.

Model	Compiles	Faithful	Correct
Fine-tuned			
Herald 7B	11.8%	14.4%	1.7%
Kimina 7B	27.1%	8.1%	2.2%
ATLAS-L 8B	20.1%	16.9%	3.4%
Goedel 8B	18.9%	37.6%	7.1%
Goedel 32B	22.3%	32.7%	7.3%
ReForm 8B	18.1%	50.8%	9.2%
Prompted			
gpt-oss-20b (zs)	9.3%	49.5%	4.6%
+few-shot	16.5%	35.8%	5.9%
+tuned prompt	16.8%	32.7%	5.5%
+tuned exs.	19.1%	35.1%	6.7%
gpt-oss-120b (zs)	15.5%	43.2%	6.7%
+few-shot	16.3%	44.2%	7.2%
+tuned prompt	17.1%	43.9%	7.5%
+tuned exs.	20.7%	38.6%	8.0%

(b) Autoformalization results for statements (theorems, examples, and exercises). The best performance in each category and column are bolded.