
Beyond Compilation: Evaluating Faithful Natural-Language-to-Lean Statement Formalization

Ke Zhang

University of California, Riverside
kzhan153@ucr.edu

Patricio Gallardo Candela*

University of California, Riverside
patricio.gallardocandela@ucr.edu

Sudhir Murthy

University of California, Riverside
smurt002@ucr.edu

Yi Xie

University of Arizona
yix@arizona.edu

Zhi Wang

University of California, San Diego
zhw119@ucsd.edu

Maziar Raissi*

University of California, Riverside
maziar.raissi1@ucr.edu

Abstract

Theorem-proving benchmarks evaluate proof search against fixed formal statements, but natural-language-to-Lean formalization must generate the formal statement itself. In this setting, compilation is only a validity check: a Lean declaration may type-check while omitting hypotheses, changing domains, or expressing a vacuous claim. We study faithful statement formalization as both an evaluation problem and a bottleneck-attribution problem. On a 400-entry graduate-level benchmark spanning real analysis, complex analysis, topology, and algebra, our protocol combines Lean compilation, cross-model semantic judging, and human expert calibration. The resulting picture is different from compile-rate evaluation: a full tool-augmented agent reaches 89.5% compilation but only 60.5% consensus faithfulness, exposing a 29.0-point compile-pass but consensus-unfaithful gap. Targeted human audits support the metric as a conservative decision boundary: across available case-level audits, 96.0% of consensus-positive outputs are human-confirmed faithful, while 82.4% of compile-pass consensus-negative outputs are human-confirmed semantic failures. Under this metric, existing one-shot formalizer models and prover-oriented Lean models remain low, suggesting that formal validity, proof-oriented Lean competence, and faithful statement generation should be reported separately. We then use a full 2^3 factorial design to decompose three recurring interventions in formalization pipelines: parametric expert drafting, Mathlib/context search, and Lean elaboration feedback. Elaboration feedback is the largest validity intervention, but it also exposes a larger compile-pass semantic-failure bucket; search mainly improves grounding and selectivity; and fine-tuned drafting is largely substitutable in this tool stack once feedback and grounding are available.

*Corresponding authors: Maziar Raissi and Patricio Gallardo Candela.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong mathematical problem-solving ability Castellevecchi [2025], while proof assistants such as Lean 4 de Moura and Ullrich [2021] provide a trusted kernel for checking formal syntax, types, and proofs. Much of the recent Lean AI benchmark and systems literature therefore focuses on theorem proving: given a fixed formal statement, generate a proof that the checker accepts Zheng et al. [2022], Yang et al. [2023], Wang et al. [2025], Ren et al. [2025], Lin et al. [2025]. This setting has a clean success criterion. If the statement is fixed and trusted, checker acceptance of the proof is a strong evaluation signal.

Natural-language-to-Lean *statement formalization* has a different failure mode. Here the model generates the formal statement itself. Lean can verify that a declaration is well-typed, but it cannot verify that the declaration expresses the same mathematical meaning as the original natural-language theorem. A compiling statement may omit a hypothesis, change the domain, strengthen or weaken the claim, or encode a vacuous version of the result. Thus compilation is an essential validity filter, but not a sufficient measure of success. Prior work has recognized this problem through reference-pair benchmarks such as ProofNet Azerbayev et al. [2023], filtering pipelines using compilation, back-translation, NLI, or human checks Ying et al. [2024], compiler/back-translation checks for Lean 4 translators Gao et al. [2025], alignment evaluators Lu et al. [2025], and faithful equivalence metrics such as BEq Liu et al. [2025]. We take this distinction as the central evaluation problem.

This paper studies faithful statement formalization: translating natural-language mathematics into Lean 4 theorem declarations that both compile and preserve the intended meaning. We evaluate this task on a curated benchmark of 400 graduate-level statement entries drawn evenly from real analysis, complex analysis, topology, and algebra. Our evaluation combines compiler verification with semantic faithfulness scoring by independent LLM judges, strict consensus reporting, and human expert calibration. The resulting metric is not a formal equivalence proof; it is a calibrated semantic filter intended to support system comparison and to expose compile-valid but meaning-shifted statements at scale.

We compare general-purpose LLMs, dedicated statement formalizers (Herald Translator Gao et al. [2025], Kimina-Autoformalizer Project Numina [2025], Wang et al. [2025], and StepFun-Formalizer Wu et al. [2026]), prover-oriented Lean models (Kimina-Prover and Goedel-Prover Wang et al. [2025], Lin et al. [2025]), and tool-augmented agents under the same validity-and-faithfulness metric. For the systems we test, Lean-specialized and proof-oriented training do not by themselves yield high faithful statement generation under a statement-only protocol.

The central empirical finding is that the semantic bottleneck remains visible even after strong validity repair. The full agent compiles most outputs, but nearly one third of benchmark entries land in the compile-pass but consensus-unfaithful bucket, and human review confirms that this bucket is usually a real semantic failure. This is a measurement study with three interlocking artifacts: a graduate-level benchmark, a human-calibrated faithfulness metric, and a factorial decomposition of common pipeline interventions.

We then use factorial ablation to attribute gains across three common intervention axes: parametric drafting, Mathlib/context grounding, and Lean elaboration feedback. The decomposition shows that elaboration feedback dominates validity repair, search mainly helps grounding and efficiency, and fine-tuned drafting is largely redundant in this tool stack once feedback and grounding are available. This shifts the contribution away from the familiar observation that verifier feedback is useful: the point is to measure which interventions improve formal validity, which improve semantic faithfulness, and which merely make the repair trajectory cheaper.

Contributions. First, we assemble a graduate-level benchmark from open mathematical sources and pair it with a human-calibrated consensus LLM-as-Judge metric for statement formalization, combining Lean validity with GPT-5.2/Gemini semantic consensus. Human audits show high precision for consensus-positive labels and confirm that most audited consensus-negative compile-pass outputs are genuine semantic failures, making the metric a conservative operating point rather than an equivalence proof. Second, we use this protocol to quantify the compile-pass gap and to compare general-purpose LLMs, specialized formalizers, prover-oriented Lean models, and tool-augmented agents under one metric. Third, we use factorial design as bottleneck attribution, separating the effects of parametric drafting, Mathlib/context grounding, and Lean elaboration feedback on

validity, faithfulness, and efficiency. We release the benchmark, agent implementation, evaluation scripts, and tool-call logs to support reproducible analysis of successful and failed formalization trajectories.

2 Problem Setting

We address the task of **statement formalization**: automatically translating natural-language mathematical statements into valid Lean 4 theorem declarations. This task is the first step before proof search: it bridges informal human intent and machine-checkable syntax, but it does not attempt to prove the resulting declaration.

Statement formalization vs. theorem proving. The distinction matters for evaluation. In theorem proving benchmarks, the formal statement is fixed; the system succeeds when it produces a proof accepted by the checker. In statement formalization, the statement is generated. The checker can reject ill-typed code, but it cannot decide whether a type-correct declaration is the intended translation of the natural-language input. Our benchmark and metrics therefore evaluate generated declarations, not proof search against trusted declarations.

2.1 Task Definition

Formally, let $\mathcal{X}$ be the space of informal mathematical statements and $\mathcal{Y}$ be the space of valid Lean 4 declarations. Given an input $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the system must generate a statement $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ satisfying three criteria: **syntactic validity** (it compiles in Lean 4 with Mathlib), **statement-centricity** (it omits proofs via `:= by sorry`), and **semantic faithfulness** (it expresses the same mathematical claim as x).

2.2 Evaluation Context

Most recent Lean benchmarks study proof search rather than statement generation. MiniF2F provides fixed formal Olympiad statements for cross-system theorem proving Zheng et al. [2022]; LeanDojo extracts formal theorems and proofs from Mathlib and evaluates models by whether they can complete proofs from proof states Yang et al. [2023]; recent formal reasoning models such as DeepSeek-Prover, Kimina-Prover, and Goedel-Prover report progress largely through proof-generation success on supplied formal Lean statements Ren et al. [2025], Wang et al. [2025], Lin et al. [2025]. In these settings, checker acceptance is a strong evaluation signal because the formal target statement is already specified.

Statement autoformalization has a different evaluation burden. ProofNet pairs natural-language undergraduate theorems with Lean 3 statements and evaluates statement translation against references Azerbayev et al. [2023]. Lean Workbook constructs a large Lean problem set from natural-language problems and filters generated statements using compilation, back-translation, NLI, and human examination Ying et al. [2024]. Herald trains a dedicated statement translator and validates generated statements with Lean compiler and LLM back-translation checks Gao et al. [2025]. StepFun-Formalizer trains dedicated autoformalization models and evaluates them with syntax checks and BEq-style equivalence to gold formal statements Wu et al. [2026], Liu et al. [2025]. PDA studies process-driven Lean 4 autoformalization over statements and proofs and uses compiler-derived process feedback to train a verifier Lu et al. [2024]. FormalAlign evaluates informal–formal semantic alignment directly Lu et al. [2025]. Most directly for statement-level equivalence, Liu et al. [2025] propose BEq, a neuro-symbolic equivalence metric evaluated against expert-annotated formal-statement equivalence labels.

Our setting is complementary to reference-based equivalence metrics such as BEq Liu et al. [2025]: our benchmark consists of natural-language textbook statements without gold Lean declarations. Rather than replacing formal equivalence checking, we use compiler validity, cross-model semantic judging, and human expert calibration as an operational metric for system comparison, then study what this metric reveals about model families and tool categories.

Table 1: Benchmark Dataset Composition.

Domain	Source Material	N
Real Analysis	<i>Basic Analysis</i> (Lebl) Lebl [2025a]	100
Complex Analysis	<i>Cultivating Complex Analysis</i> (Lebl) Lebl [2025b]	100
Topology	<i>Notes on Topology</i> (McKay) McKay [2025]	100
Algebra	<i>Abstract Algebra</i> (Doty) Doty [2025]	100
Total		400

2.3 Dataset Construction

To benchmark this task, we curated a dataset of 400 graduate-level statement entries derived from open-source LaTeX lecture notes and textbooks. We selected sources that provide natural-language statements without accompanying formal code, ensuring the task represents genuine translation rather than retrieval. As detailed in Table 1, the dataset is balanced across four domains—Real Analysis, Complex Analysis, Topology, and Algebra—with 100 examples from each; all benchmark rates are reported per entry rather than as counts of unique theorem schemas.

2.4 Evaluation Protocol

To evaluate generated statements, we adopt a two-stage **Consensus LLM-as-Judge** protocol. First, we apply a **Compiler Verification** filter: any code that fails to compile is not faithful. Second, for compiling code, two independent LLM judges—GPT-5.2 in Medium Thinking mode and Gemini-2.5-Pro—compare the generated Lean declaration against the original natural-language input and assign statement-level faithfulness scores on a 0–10 scale. The judge prompt and rubric (Appendix C) were reviewed and adjusted by a Lean 4-experienced researcher to align the evaluation with statement-level meaning. Human calibration of this automated metric is reported in Section 4.1.

The metric is not intended to certify mathematical truth or proof completeness; it is intended to detect whether a compiling declaration preserves the intended statement.

We therefore treat the strict consensus threshold as a high-precision operating point for comparison, and separately audit negative buckets to measure how conservative it is.

Success Metric: We define a generated translation y for an input statement x as **Faithful** if and only if it compiles and both semantic judges score it at least 9:

$$\text{Compiles}(y) = \text{True} \quad \text{AND} \quad \min\{\text{Score}_{\text{GPT}}(x, y), \text{Score}_{\text{Gemini}}(x, y)\} \geq 9,$$

where the two score functions are implemented by GPT-5.2 and Gemini-2.5-Pro, respectively.

Cross-judge consensus. Across systems, Gemini-2.5-Pro consistently accepts more outputs than GPT-5.2, and most GPT-5.2 positives are also accepted by Gemini. Because our reported consensus label requires both judges, it is best viewed as an intersection rule accompanied by an empirical high-overlap pattern:

$$\text{Pass}_{\text{Consensus}} = \text{Pass}_{\text{GPT}} \cap \text{Pass}_{\text{Gemini}}, \quad \frac{|\text{Pass}_{\text{GPT}} \cap \text{Pass}_{\text{Gemini}}|}{|\text{Pass}_{\text{GPT}}|} \text{ is high empirically.}$$

Table 2 summarizes this GPT-to-Gemini empirical coverage at the system-family level; Appendix Table 8 gives the full per-system counts and the small number of GPT-only exceptions, and Appendix Figure 4 shows domain-level judge disagreement. Because the rows aggregate different numbers of systems, the consensus/GPT ratio rather than the raw count is the relevant quantity. This pattern supports using strict $\text{GPT} \cap \text{Gemini}$ consensus as a conservative reported faithfulness metric.

3 Formalization Pipeline and Tool Factors

The agent architecture, illustrated in Figure 1, is structured as a controlled implementation of three common remedies in autoformalization pipelines: drafting from a Lean-specialized prior, grounding

Table 2: **Cross-judge GPT-positive coverage summary.** Counts are aggregated over different numbers of evaluated outputs; this table measures how often GPT-positive labels are also Gemini-positive and therefore counted by consensus, not system accuracy. Consensus counts outputs labeled faithful by both GPT-5.2 and Gemini-2.5-Pro.

System group	Outputs	GPT-5.2 faithful	Consensus	Consensus/GPT
One-shot baselines	3200	474	469	98.9%
GPT-5.2 agent configs	2800	1168	1144	97.9%
Alt. orchestrators (111)	800	534	524	98.1%
Full system (111)	400	248	242	97.6%




Figure 1: **Agent orchestration logic.** The orchestrator calls optional drafting, search, and compiler-feedback tools in Lean 4.




Figure 2: **Multi-model agent comparison (config 111).** All three orchestrators converge to 60–65% consensus-faithful outputs despite different one-shot baselines (19–28%).

through search, and repairing through verifier feedback. The core component is a central LLM orchestrator (GPT-5.2) that interacts with the Lean 4 environment via a defined API. Unlike static prompting, this architecture allows the model to maintain a persistent state, observing compiler errors, retrieved symbols, or draft translations before deciding on the next step. This design decouples natural-language reasoning from formal checking: Lean supplies high-precision validity feedback, while the orchestrator remains responsible for preserving the mathematical meaning of the input statement.

The purpose of this architecture is diagnostic rather than architectural novelty: it exposes separable information channels so that the same benchmark can ask which channel moves validity, faithfulness, or efficiency.

3.1 Tools and the Bottlenecks They Target

We equip the agent with tools that target different bottlenecks in statement formalization. **Expert Drafting (T)** is a parametric translation prior: the `lean4_translator` tool requests a specialized Lean statement draft from the fine-tuned Herald model before the general orchestrator edits or verifies it. **Knowledge Search (S)** provides Mathlib/context grounding through symbol lookup tools such as `lean_inspect_name` and `lean_resolve_name`, together with general web search; these tools return identifier candidates, types, and definitions, but they are not a dedicated semantic retrieval system such as LeanSearch Gao et al. [2024]. **Compiler Feedback (F)** exposes Lean

elaboration feedback through the `lean_repl_runner`, giving whole-statement validity checks and error messages for syntax, type, namespace, and elaboration repair.

We treat drafting (T), search (S), and elaboration feedback (F) as the three binary factors of a 2^3 factorial study; the full design and notation are deferred to Section 5. Detailed specifications of the tool definitions and signatures are provided in Appendix B.

3.2 Controlled Prompt Assembly

To avoid confounding tool effects with prompt wording, all configurations use the same role definition and Lean-generation instructions: the agent must translate rather than prove, produce one theorem declaration ending in `:= by sorry`, import `Mathlib`, and avoid invented definitions or axioms. The only part that changes is the tool-availability block, which declares which tools the agent may call. Thus, the factorial analysis varies access to drafting, search, and feedback tools while holding the task definition, output requirements, and anti-hallucination instructions fixed. Full prompt templates are provided in Appendix B.

4 Performance Evaluation

4.1 Human Expert Validation

Before comparing systems, we summarize the human audit only to establish that the consensus metric is usable. Lean 4 reviewers re-scored targeted audit samples with the same 0–10 rubric. Applying each audit’s case-level decision rule first, then pooling the positive-bucket audits, gives $194/202 = 96.0\%$ human-confirmed precision: 130/133 from the custom-agent strict-consensus subset and 64/69 from the independent three-reviewer Batch-B audit. For compile-pass consensus-negative outputs, the corresponding pooled confirmation rate is $112/136 = 82.4\%$: 95/114 from the custom-agent negative bucket and 17/22 from Batch B. Thus strict consensus is a high-precision, conservative operating point rather than an equivalence proof; Appendix E gives the full table, protocol, reviewer coverage, strictness analysis, and case studies.

4.2 Main Results

Figure 3 presents performance on the 400-entry benchmark across general LLMs, specialized formalizers, prover-oriented Lean models, and the full tool-augmented agent. One-shot systems without tools remain far below the full agent: the general-purpose LLM baselines shown here reach **19.8–28.0%** consensus faithfulness, specialized formalizers reach **9.0–12.3%**, and prover-oriented models reach only **4.0–5.0%**. Compilation alone would substantially overstate progress: for example, Goedel-Prover compiles **19.2%** of statements but is consensus-faithful on only **5.0%**. In contrast, the full tool-augmented agent framework ($T_{\max} = 24$) boosts compilation to **89.5%** and consensus faithfulness to **60.5%**.

In prover-oriented runs, despite an explicit statement-only prompt requiring declarations ending in `:= by sorry`, models frequently emit proof-oriented reasoning, tactic bodies, malformed declarations, or no extractable Lean statement. We therefore treat these baselines as a transfer diagnostic from proof training to statement generation, not as proof benchmarks. The conservative conclusion is not that prover models lack formalization ability in general, but that proof-oriented Lean competence does not automatically transfer to prompt-following, statement-centric, semantically faithful formalization when the formal target statement is not supplied.

The metric also changes the interpretation of tool-agent performance. The full agent’s 89.5% compile rate might suggest that the task is close to solved under compiler-only evaluation. Under semantic consensus, however, 116/400 entries compile but are not accepted as faithful, a 29.0-point compile-pass/faithfulness gap visualized in Figure 3; the Batch-A human audit confirms most reviewed cases in this bucket as genuine semantic mismatches. This compile-pass gap is the main empirical gap studied in the remainder of the paper.

Aggregate scores also hide substantial per-instance complementarity across tool settings (Table 3). The all-tools configuration is strong but not uniformly dominant: some cases it misses are solved by leaner configurations, and most of these recoverable misses already compile under 111 but fail strict semantic consensus. This makes the remaining bottleneck sharper than “REPL helps”: tool




Figure 3: **Main results.** Compile rate and semantic faithfulness diverge across model families. Our custom agent with all three tools (T,F,S) reaches 60.5% faithful formalization. Faithfulness is strict GPT/Gemini consensus on $N = 400$ statements.

Table 3: **Across-configuration outcome structure for the custom GPT-5.2 agent.** Counts are over the same 400 inputs and all eight tool configurations. The union row is an oracle diagnostic over completed experiments, not a deployed selector.

Outcome	Count	Rate
All-tools config 111 faithful	242/400	60.5%
Best single config 011 faithful	248/400	62.0%
Faithful under at least one config	313/400	78.2%
Faithful under every config	41/400	10.2%
Never faithful under any config	87/400	21.8%
Missed by 111 but faithful elsewhere	71/400	17.8%
of missed: compile-pass under 111	55/400	13.8%
of missed: compile-fail under 111	16/400	4.0%

access changes the formalization trajectory, and the open problem includes per-instance routing or early stopping. Trajectory length is a useful warning signal specifically when feedback is enabled: pooling the four $F=1$ configurations, faithfulness falls from 81.3% for 1–2 step runs to 12.0% for 19–24 step runs; across the nonempty no-feedback configurations, the corresponding drop is only 32.0% to 17.0% (Appendix Table 20).

Additional orchestrator checks with Sonnet 4.5 and Gemini-2.5-Pro show the same pattern: all three 111 agents reach 60–65% consensus faithfulness despite different one-shot baselines (Figure 2; full table in Appendix G.5).

5 Bottleneck Decomposition

Aggregate accuracy collapses three different questions: whether an output compiles, whether it preserves the intended statement, and how much tool interaction it costs. A tool can raise compile rate while enlarging the compile-pass but semantically rejected bucket, so the diagnostic target is not just which tool helps on average, but which boundary each tool moves: validity, faithfulness, or efficiency.

Table 4: **Bottleneck decomposition results.** Performance across all 2^3 configurations ($N = 400$). Each row fixes the translation prior (**T**) and search (**S**) factors and compares runs without vs. with elaboration feedback (**F**).

Fixed factors		$F = 0$		$F = 1$	
T	S	Comp.	Faith.	Comp.	Faith.
0	0	26.25	19.75	91.50	61.25
1	0	30.25	24.50	93.50	58.75
0	1	45.50	33.00	87.25	62.00
1	1	50.00	36.00	89.50	60.50

Table 5: **Bottleneck main effects on Faithful accuracy.** Effects are average high-minus-low differences over the other two factors; 95% confidence intervals use bootstrap resampling ($B = 10,000$).

Factor	$X=1$	$X=0$	Effect	95% CI
Elaboration feedback (F)	60.6	28.3	+32.3	[28.7, 35.9]
Grounding search (S)	47.9	41.1	+6.8	[3.6, 10.0]
Translation prior (T)	44.9	44.0	+0.9	[-2.1, 4.0]

5.1 Factorial Design over (T,F,S)

Formally, each tool setting is a bit vector

$$c = (t, f, s) \in \{0, 1\}^3, \quad \mathcal{C} = \{000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111\},$$

where the bits denote access to (T,F,S). We run every benchmark item under every $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and evaluate metrics $m(c)$ such as compile rate, consensus-faithful rate, and tool cost. Main effects are high-minus-low averages over the other factors; for example,

$$\Delta_F(m) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{t,s \in \{0,1\}} [m(t, 1, s) - m(t, 0, s)].$$

Thus 111 is the full tool-augmented agent, while 000 is the One-Shot Baseline established in Section 4. The remaining seven configurations selectively toggle tool definitions in the system prompt while holding the task prompt fixed.

5.2 Main Effects: Validity vs. Faithfulness

Table 4 reports performance across all configurations, with each row comparing the same (T, S) setting before and after elaboration feedback (**F**). To quantify the contribution of each factor, we compute standard factorial main and interaction effects, defined as differences in mean response between the high and low levels of a factor (averaged over the other factors).

Beyond final accuracy, the key pattern is that tools move different boundaries. Feedback greatly expands validity: $(000) \rightarrow (010)$ increases compiled outputs from 105 to 366 and faithful outputs from 79 to 245, but also increases the compile-pass semantic gap from 26 to 121. Search has a different role: when feedback is enabled, it slightly changes final faithfulness but improves semantic selectivity, reducing the compile-pass gap from 121 to 101 for $T = 0$ and from 139 to 116 for $T = 1$. The full conditional table and tool-usage counts are in Appendix F.

Feedback is therefore the largest validity intervention, but it is not a semantic oracle: it moves many noncompiling cases into both the faithful and compile-pass-but-unfaithful buckets. The domain split in Table 6 shows why this matters. Complex Analysis converts most feedback-driven validity gains into faithful statements, while Algebra and Topology gain far less in final faithfulness; for Topology, this pattern is consistent with advanced Mathlib encoding and coverage constraints in examples involving covering spaces and fundamental groups. Search improves final faithfulness mainly without feedback ($\Delta_S(F=0) = +12.4$ pts vs. $\Delta_S(F=1) = +1.2$ pts), and with feedback it mainly improves selectivity and efficiency: REPL calls fall by 29.8% for $(010) \rightarrow (011)$ and 26.6% for $(110) \rightarrow (111)$. The translation prior is not the limiting bottleneck in this tool stack: it helps without feedback ($\Delta_T(F=0) = +3.9$ pts) but slightly hurts with feedback ($\Delta_T(F=1) = -2.0$ pts), suggesting substitutability once a strong orchestrator has compiler feedback and grounding.

Table 6: **Domain-wise effect of elaboration feedback.** Effects are high-minus-low percentage-point differences for the feedback factor F , computed within each domain under the same per-entry consensus metric. The gap column is compile-pass but consensus-unfaithful.

Domain	Δ Compile	Δ Faithful	Δ Gap	FaithfulCompile ($F=1$)
Complex Analysis	+66.2	+54.2	+12.0	81.5%
Real Analysis	+56.8	+31.2	+25.5	57.4%
Topology	+42.0	+22.8	+19.2	64.5%
Algebra	+44.8	+21.0	+23.8	63.5%

Table 7: **Per-item transition ledger for tool additions.** Each row compares the same 400 inputs before and after adding one tool under a fixed context. New faithful counts cases that become faithful; lost faithful counts cases that were faithful before but not after.

Change	Configs	New faithful	Lost faithful	Net
Add F alone	000 $\rightarrow$ 010	175	9	+166
Add F with S	001 $\rightarrow$ 011	129	13	+116
Add F with T,S	101 $\rightarrow$ 111	117	19	+98
Add S with F	010 $\rightarrow$ 011	42	39	+3
Add S with T,F	110 $\rightarrow$ 111	38	31	+7
Add T with F,S	011 $\rightarrow$ 111	33	39	-6

5.3 Interactions and Per-Item Trajectory Churn

The negative interactions make the result more specific than “REPL helps.” Search and feedback partially substitute because both expose Mathlib-grounded information: search gives targeted symbol-/type information, while feedback gives whole-statement elaboration diagnostics. Under this setup, Search is most valuable as a capability tool when feedback is absent and as an efficiency/selectivity tool when feedback is present. The same regime dependence appears for the translation prior: a specialist draft is useful in low-tool settings, but can anchor the repair loop once feedback is available. We treat this as an empirical observation about this tool stack, not as a claim that fine-tuned Lean translators are generally unnecessary.

The per-item transitions behind these aggregate effects are strongly nonmonotone (Table 7). Thus small net interaction effects can hide large trajectory churn. The useful design question is therefore not only which tool improves the average rate, but when an orchestrator should trust, ignore, or stop after a tool-induced repair path. This motivates per-instance routing or early-stopping policies, and the released trajectory logs are intended to support that follow-on analysis: final scores alone do not distinguish a clean first translation from a long repair loop that eventually compiles the wrong statement.

6 Limitations

Our task is translating natural language into valid Lean 4 statement declarations, not generating proofs. Provability is a useful downstream sanity check, but it is neither necessary nor sufficient for statement faithfulness: a faithful declaration may be hard to prove automatically, while a provable declaration may formalize the wrong claim. Similarly, our LLM-as-judge metric is a scalable semantic audit, not a formal equivalence proof. Human audits support high positive precision and confirm that most rejected compile-pass outputs are real semantic failures, but 24/136 (17.6%) audited compile-pass negative-bucket cases are human-rescued faithful cases, so strict consensus should be interpreted as conservative. The main orchestrator and one judge are from the same model family; the Sonnet/Gemini orchestrator checks and the human audits mitigate, but do not eliminate, this possible dependence.

The benchmark covers 400 statements from four open mathematical sources across four graduate areas; broader textbook coverage and research-level statements remain out of scope. The Search factor measures the retrieval tools implemented in this agent—Mathlib symbol lookup, namespace resolution, and general web search—not a dedicated semantic retriever such as LeanSearch Gao et al. [2024]. Stronger retrieval may change the Search main effect and the $F \times S$ interaction. Finally,

tool-augmented formalization is more expensive than one-shot generation; although Search reduces compiled iterations, the full REPL loop remains a barrier to real-time interactive use.

7 Conclusion

Statement formalization should be evaluated as meaning preservation, not only as Lean acceptance. The central lesson is that execution feedback can make many more declarations type-check, but it does not decide whether the checked object is the intended theorem. Human-calibrated semantic evaluation makes this gap visible and gives a conservative way to compare systems at scale.

The bottleneck analysis also shows that tools are not monotone add-ons. Feedback, search, and drafting can help, interfere, or change failure modes depending on domain and trajectory, so average gains alone are not enough to understand a formalization pipeline. This suggests a more diagnostic view of autoformalization: the system should know when it is repairing syntax, when it is searching for the right mathematical interface, and when continued repair is likely to drift away from the original statement. Future systems should therefore pair strong Lean feedback with semantic evaluation and policies that decide when to search, repair, restart, or stop.

References

- Zhangir Azerbayev, Bartosz Piotrowski, Hailey Schoelkopf, Edward W Ayers, Dragomir Radev, and Jeremy Avigad. Proofnet: Autoformalizing and formally proving undergraduate-level mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12433*, 2023.
- Davide Castelvechi. AI models solve maths problems at level of top students. *Nature*, 644:7, 2025.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language (system description). In *Automated Deduction – CADE 28*, volume 12699 of *LNCS*, pages 625–635. Springer, 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- Stephen R. Doty. Lecture notes on abstract algebra. <https://github.com/srdoty/AbstractAlgebraBook>, 2025. GitHub repository; accessed 2025-09-04.
- Guoxiong Gao, Haocheng Ju, Jiedong Jiang, Zihan Qin, and Bin Dong. A semantic search engine for mathlib4. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 8001–8013. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.470. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.470/>.
- Guoxiong Gao, Yutong Wang, Jiedong Jiang, Qi Gao, Zihan Qin, Tianyi Xu, and Bin Dong. Herald: A natural language annotated lean 4 dataset. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- Jiří Lebl. Basic analysis: Introduction to real analysis. <https://github.com/jirilebl/ra>, 2025a. GitHub repository; accessed 2025-09-04.
- Jiří Lebl. Guide to cultivating complex analysis: Working the complex field. <https://github.com/jirilebl/ca>, 2025b. GitHub repository; accessed 2025-09-04.
- Yong Lin, Shange Tang, Bohan Lyu, Ziran Yang, Jui-Hui Chung, Haoyu Zhao, Lai Jiang, Yihan Geng, Jiawei Ge, Jingruo Sun, et al. Goedel-prover-v2: Scaling formal theorem proving with scaffolded data synthesis and self-correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03613*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.03613>.
- Qi Liu, Xinhao Zheng, Xudong Lu, Qinxiang Cao, and Junchi Yan. Rethinking and improving autoformalization: Towards a faithful metric and a dependency retrieval-based approach. In *Proceedings of ICLR 2025 (Spotlight)*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hUb2At2DsQ>.
- Jianqiao Lu, Yingjia Wan, Zhengying Liu, Yinya Huang, Jing Xiong, Chengwu Liu, Jianhao Shen, Hui Jin, Jipeng Zhang, Haiming Wang, Zhicheng Yang, Jing Tang, and Zhijiang Guo. Process-driven autoformalization in lean 4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01940*, 2024.
- Jianqiao Lu, Yingjia Wan, Yinya Huang, Jing Xiong, Zhengying Liu, and Zhijiang Guo. Formalalign: Automated alignment evaluation for autoformalization. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B5RrIFMqbe>.
- Benjamin McKay. Topology lecture notes. <https://github.com/Ben-McKay/topology-lecture-notes>, 2025. GitHub repository; accessed 2025-09-04.

- Project Numina. Kimina-Autoformalizer-7B. <https://huggingface.co/AI-MO/Kimina-Autoformalizer-7B>, 2025. Model card; cites Kimina-Prover Preview, arXiv:2504.11354.
- ZZ Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanxia Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Zhe Fu, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, et al. Deepseek-prover-v2: Advancing formal mathematical reasoning via reinforcement learning for subgoal decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21801*, 2025.
- Haiming Wang, Mert Unsal, Xiaohan Lin, Mantas Baksys, Junqi Liu, Marco Dos Santos, Flood Sung, Marina Vinyes, Zhenzhe Ying, Zekai Zhu, et al. Kimina-prover preview: Towards large formal reasoning models with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11354*, 2025.
- Yutong Wu, Di Huang, Ruosi Wan, Yue Peng, Shijie Shang, Chenrui Cao, Lei Qi, Rui Zhang, Xishan Zhang, Zidong Du, Jie Yan, and Xing Hu. Stepfun-formalizer: Unlocking the autoformalization potential of llms through knowledge-reasoning fusion. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 33980–33988, 2026. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v40i40.40691. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/40691>.
- Kaiyu Yang, Aidan M. Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan Prenger, and Anima Anandkumar. Leandojo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2023.
- Huaiyuan Ying, Zijian Wu, Yihan Geng, Jiayu Wang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Lean workbook: A large-scale lean problem set formalized from natural language math problems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:105848–105863, 2024.
- Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. In *ICLR*, 2022.

A Artifact Availability

An anonymized repository containing the agent code, benchmark files, generated results, evaluation scripts, tool-call logs, and human-check materials is available at https://anonymous.4open.science/r/neurips_happy_submission_anon-4AFF/README.md.

B Agent Implementation Details

B.1 Prompt Assembly

The system prompt is constructed from three modular components: (i) a **task definition** establishing the core translation objective, (ii) a **general usage guide** containing fixed best practices for Lean 4 code generation, and (iii) a **capability block** that is dynamically populated based on the factorial configuration (T, F, S) . This structure holds the agent’s semantic goal and coding standards (i and ii) fixed, while selectively enabling or disabling external tools (iii) to isolate the causal effect of each capability. We assemble (i) and (ii) into a **Shared Base Prompt**, shown below, while the capability block definitions are provided in Appendix B.3.

B.2 Shared Base Prompt

Base System Prompt

You are an expert Lean4 translation agent.
 Your task is to translate a natural-language mathematical statement into faithful Lean4 syntax (NOT a proof). The final result must: - import Mathlib at the very top - compile in Mathlib - be semantically faithful to the original statement - end with ‘:= by sorry’
 You are NOT proving anything. You are only producing a correctly typed, correct-meaning Lean statement.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR CODE GENERATION

- The Lean file MUST start with: import Mathlib
- The Lean file MUST contain exactly ONE final translated statement representing the original natural-language meaning.

- The final statement MUST end with: `:= by sorry`
 - Do NOT write any proof code before `:= by sorry` (no `'by'`, `'simp'`, `'have'`, `'calc'`, etc. anywhere before the final `:= by sorry`).
 - Do NOT invent new definitions, axioms, constants, or placeholder structures.
 - Prefer robust formulations: use quantifiers, membership, and $\leftrightarrow$ characterizations rather than fragile definitional equalities.
 - Only finish when the last written version: (1) compiles in Mathlib (if `lean4_repl_runner` is available) (2) is semantically faithful to the original statement
- When both are satisfied, return: `"status": "success"`

B.3 Tool-Availability Blocks

Each factorial configuration (T, F, S) determines which tools are exposed to the agent. We implement this by a modular prompt template in which the AVAILABLE TOOLS block is constructed by including the corresponding tool-specification entries and omitting inactive ones. We show the complete tool block for the fully enabled configuration $(1, 1, 1)$ below; other configurations are obtained by deleting the entries for tools that are disabled.

Tool Block (T=1, F=1, S=1)

AVAILABLE TOOLS

`lean4_translator(statement)`

Draft a Lean 4 statement using the fine-tuned Herald translator (you may edit or ignore).

`lean_write_file(code)`

Write the full Lean file to the workspace (imports + exactly one final statement).

`lean4_repl_runner()`

Compile the current Lean file and return compiler feedback.

`lean_inspect_name(name, imports?, include_print?)`

Query Mathlib about an identifier via `#check/#print`.

`lean_resolve_name(token, namespace_hints?, imports?, top_k?)`

Suggest likely Mathlib identifiers for an unknown or ambiguous token.

`search_online(query)`

Run a web search and return results for the query.

B.4 Tool Interfaces

Agent Tool API

Tool	Arguments	Functionality
<code>lean_inspect_name</code>	<code>name, imports?, include_print?</code>	Checks whether a Mathlib symbol exists and returns its type (<code>#check</code>) and optionally its definition (<code>#print</code>).
<code>lean_resolve_name</code>	<code>token, namespace_hints?, imports?, top_k?</code>	Performs fuzzy symbol resolution to map informal or incorrect names to valid Mathlib identifiers.
<code>lean4_repl_runner</code>	Lean 4 code to be executed	Compiles the current Lean file and returns compiler diagnostics (errors, warnings, and success flags).
<code>lean4_translator</code>	<code>statement</code>	Invokes the fine-tuned Herald translator to generate a draft Lean formalization of the natural-language input.
<code>search_online</code>	<code>query</code>	Performs external web search to retrieve mathematical or documentation context not present in Mathlib.

B.5 Example Execution Trace

Example Execution Trace (agent tool calls)		
Step	Tool	Arguments (agent side)
1	lean_write_file	path="jirilebl_ca_ca_17658.lean"; content = import Mathlib ... theorem jirilebl_ca_ca_17658 ... := by sorry
2	lean4_repl_runner	path="jirilebl_ca_ca_17658.lean"
3	lean_inspect_name	name="Polynomial.IsConstant"
4	lean_inspect_name	name="Polynomial.eval"
5	lean_inspect_name	name="Polynomial.isConstant"
6	lean_inspect_name	name="Polynomial.natDegree"
7	lean_write_file	path="jirilebl_ca_ca_17658.lean"; content = patched theorem uses p.natDegree $\neq$ 0 and Polynomial.eval
8	lean4_repl_runner	path="jirilebl_ca_ca_17658.lean"

C LLM-as-a-Judge Prompt and Rubric

We evaluate semantic faithfulness using an LLM-as-a-judge that receives: (i) the natural-language statement, (ii) the generated Lean 4 code, and (iii) a boolean `compile_pass`. The judge outputs a JSON object with fields `faithful` and `grade` (0–10). If `compile_pass=false`, we require `faithful=false` and restrict the grade to 0–3. The translation is considered as faithful if and only if the code compiles and the score is ≥ 9 .

Judge system prompt (verbatim)
You are an expert in Lean 4, Mathlib, and mathematics. You are $\hookrightarrow$ judging TRANSLATION-ONLY. Input: (1) a natural-language statement, (2) a Lean 4 code snippet, $\hookrightarrow$ (3) <code>compile_pass</code> boolean. Your job: decide whether the Lean code, AS A STATEMENT, matches the $\hookrightarrow$ meaning of the natural-language statement. Key policy (NOT PICKY): - If <code>compile_pass = False</code>: the translation is NOT faithful. grade $\hookrightarrow$ must be 0..3. <code>faithful=false</code>. - If <code>compile_pass = True</code>: ignore the proof/body entirely (including $\hookrightarrow$ <code>`by sorry`</code>). Proof completeness is NOT part of the evaluation. - A translation is faithful if the Lean statement expresses the same $\hookrightarrow$ mathematical claim as the NL statement. Auxiliary definitions policy (lenient but not allowing cheating): - Auxiliary defs/lemmas are allowed if they are reasonable $\hookrightarrow$ encodings/abbreviations and do not change the meaning. - However, if the code introduces a clearly vacuous placeholder for a $\hookrightarrow$ nontrivial concept (e.g. <code>`def X := True`</code>, <code>`:= none`</code>, <code>`:= 0`</code> for $\hookrightarrow$ something meant to be meaningful), and that placeholder is $\hookrightarrow$ essential to making the final theorem appear to match, then the $\hookrightarrow$ translation is NOT faithful. How to judge meaning (focus): - Compare the MAIN theorem/definition statement(s) to the NL $\hookrightarrow$ statement.

- Check quantifiers (forall/exists), logical structure
 $\hookrightarrow$ ($\rightarrow$ / $\leftarrow$ / $\wedge$ / $\vee$), and key hypotheses.
- Check main objects/domains: Nat/Int/Real, rings/groups, ZMod n ,
 $\hookrightarrow$ matrices, etc.
- Small implementation details are OK if the meaning is preserved.

Scoring guide (integer 0..10):

- 0: unrelated.
- 1-3: compile_pass is False OR statement is clearly wrong.
- 4-6: compiles, but meaning is materially different / missing key
 $\hookrightarrow$ hypotheses / wrong domain;
 might be "in the ballpark".
- 7-8: compiles, mostly matches, but has a noticeable mismatch (e.g.
 $\hookrightarrow$ strengthened/weakened in an important way).
- 9: compiles, very close; only tiny mismatch.
- 10: compiles and meaning matches.

Output contract (STRICT):
 Return a single JSON object with exactly these fields:

```
{
  "faithful": true or false,
  "grade": 0..10,
  "thought": "### BEGIN THOUGHT\n<short explanation focusing on\n  \hookrightarrow statement-level comparison>\n### END THOUGHT"
}
```

Return ONLY valid JSON. No extra keys. No markdown outside JSON.

D Additional Metric Validation Results

Table 8: **Full comparison of LLM judges and their consensus.** Entries count translations that compile and are judged *Faithful* by each judge; **Consensus** counts those labeled Faithful by both. **GPT-only** counts GPT-positive outputs not accepted by Gemini, showing that the GPT/Gemini relation is high-overlap rather than a deterministic hierarchy.

System	Gemini	GPT-5.2	Consensus	GPT-only
<i>One-shot baselines</i>				
Kimina-Prover	18	16	16	0
Goedel-Prover	21	21	20	1
Kimina-Autoformalizer	43	36	36	0
Herald Translator	52	43	43	0
StepFun-Formalizer	55	49	49	0
GPT-5.2	90	81	79	2
Sonnet 4.5	145	116	114	2
Gemini-2.5-Pro	122	112	112	0
<i>Tool-augmented agents (GPT-5.2 orchestrator)</i>				
Config 100	112	98	98	0
Config 001	160	134	132	2
Config 101	174	146	144	2
Config 110	282	241	235	6
Config 111	291	248	242	6
Config 010	304	250	245	5
Config 011	291	251	248	3
<i>Tool-augmented agents (alt. orchestrators, config 111)</i>				
Sonnet 4.5	315	271	262	9
Gemini-2.5-Pro	307	263	262	1

Across all rows in Table 8, the GPT-only column sums to 39 out of 2176 GPT-positive labels (1.8%). Thus GPT positives are almost always, but not literally always, accepted by Gemini.




Figure 4: **GPT-Gemini disagreement by mathematical domain.** Total number of GPT-Gemini disagreements aggregated across all ten experimental systems.

Figure 4 shows that the remaining disagreements are not uniformly distributed across domains. Real Analysis accounts for the largest number of conflicts (125), followed by Algebra (82), Complex Analysis (61), and Topology (58). This aligns with the domain difficulty results: under the full agent setting (config=111), Real Analysis has the lowest Faithful rate among the four domains (Table 21), leaving more borderline cases for judges to interpret.

E Human-Check Validation Details

This appendix reports the human-review protocol behind Table 9. We keep the audit identities separate: Reviewer 1 audits consensus-positive outputs from the custom agent, Batch A audits the custom agent’s compile-pass but consensus-unfaithful bucket, and Batch B evaluates a separate 100-case Aristotle system run. Rates are computed within each blinded audit batch on the same case_id; cross-audit theorem-name overlap is diagnostic only and is not pooled as if it were the same Lean output.

What kind of “soundness” is supported? The audits support an *operational* soundness claim for the reported metric: if an output is counted as faithful by strict $\text{GPT} \cap \text{Gemini}$ consensus, human reviewers usually agree that it preserves the statement meaning; if a compile-passing output is rejected by strict consensus, it is usually a real semantic mismatch rather than mere evaluator noise. This is not a formal proof of semantic equivalence, and it is not a recall guarantee. In particular, the compile-pass negative-bucket audits show that strict consensus is conservative: 24/136 (17.6%) audited cases are rescued by human majority. The appropriate interpretation is therefore: strict consensus is a high-precision, conservative decision boundary for large-scale system comparison, with human-audited evidence on both sides of the boundary.

Table 9: **Human calibration summary.** Pooled rows give the case-level summary used in the abstract. Component rows report the separate audit identities; rates are not computed by treating the four reviewers as a repeated-measures panel.

Audit	Human-confirmed count	Rate
Pooled consensus-positive precision	194/202	96.0%
Pooled compile-pass negative-bucket confirmation	112/136	82.4%
Custom-agent strict-consensus positive precision	130/133	97.7%
Independent Batch-B positive precision	64/69	92.8%
Custom-agent negative-bucket confirmation	95/114	83.3%
Independent Batch-B compile-pass negative confirmation	17/22	77.3%
Independent Batch-B all-negative confirmation	23/28	82.1%

Table 10: **Human-audit design and units of analysis.** All rates are computed inside one audit identity. The Reviewer 1 audit and Batch A/B should not be pooled as if they reviewed identical Lean code.

Audit	System/output source	Selection rule	N	Reviewers
Reviewer 1 positive audit	Custom agent, config 111	Domain-proportional sample from compile-passing positive-label outputs	138 scored	1
Batch A	Custom agent, config 111	Compile-pass but strict-consensus-unfaithful outputs	116	3
Batch B	Aristotle	Domain-proportional full-evaluation sample; 98 effective outputs after two missing returns	100	3

Reviewer score threshold and majority rule. Human reviewers used the same 0–10 semantic faithfulness scale as the LLM judges. A score ≥ 9 is treated as faithful. Majority labels require at least two numeric human scores on the same blinded `case_id`; compile failures are counted as unfaithful even if a reviewer notes that the intended mathematical content looks close. This compile-aware rule matches the paper metric, where faithfulness requires both compilation and semantic agreement. In the three-reviewer Batch A/B audits, reviewers also self-reported their use of LLM assistance: Reviewer 2 reported no LLM assistance, while Reviewers 3 and 4 each reported low assistance (2/10 on a 1–10 usage scale). Reviewer 1 did not provide a self-report for this field.

Table 11: **Individual reviewer behavior in the two three-reviewer audits.** Batch A is an LLM-negative bucket, so reviewer “agreement” means confirming the LLM-negative label. Batch B is a full evaluation sample, so agreement is binary agreement with strict GPT $\cap$ Gemini consensus on effective Aristotle outputs. Faithful counts use the compile-aware rule.

Audit	Reviewer	Numeric scores	Human faithful	Human unfaithful	LLM agreement
Batch A	Reviewer 2	114	44	70	70/114 = 61.4%
Batch A	Reviewer 3	116	28	88	88/116 = 75.9%
Batch A	Reviewer 4	90	9	81	81/90 = 90.0%
Batch B	Reviewer 2	96	57	39	71/96 = 74.0%
Batch B	Reviewer 3	98	79	19	85/98 = 86.7%
Batch B	Reviewer 4	76	64	12	71/76 = 93.4%

The individual-reviewer table is useful because it shows that the calibration result is not produced by one unusually permissive reviewer. Reviewers differ substantially: Reviewer 2 is more likely to rescue Batch-A LLM-negative cases, while Reviewer 4 is stricter and more aligned with the LLM boundary. The majority rule averages over these differences and is the reported estimator for the three-reviewer audits.

Table 12: **Batch A: custom-agent compile-pass but consensus-unfaithful audit.** Human majority is computed over cases with at least two numeric reviewer scores. Two Topology cases were marked inconclusive or lacked sufficient numeric coverage.

Domain	Selected	Majority denom.	Human faithful	Human unfaithful
Algebra	31	31	7	24
Complex Analysis	16	16	3	13
Real Analysis	42	42	6	36
Topology	27	25	3	22
Total	116	114	19	95

Batch A shows that the custom-agent negative bucket is not merely judge over-conservatism: among 114 cases with sufficient same-case human coverage, human majority confirms 95 as unfaithful (83.3%) and rescues 19 as faithful (16.7%). Because all Batch-A items compile, this directly supports the compile-pass but semantically unfaithful gap highlighted in Figure 3.

Table 13: **Same-case majority agreement with the automatic metric.** Batch A contains only strict-consensus-negative outputs by construction. Batch B contains both positive and negative automatic labels.

Audit	Majority denom.	LLM+ / Human+	LLM+ / Human-	LLM- / Human+	LLM- / Human-
Batch A	114	–	–	19	95
Batch B	97	64	5	5	23

Table 13 gives the most direct same-case calibration view. In Batch B, the automatic and human-majority labels agree on 87/97 effective cases (89.7%). The off-diagonal cells are balanced: five consensus positives are rejected by human majority, and five consensus negatives are rescued by human majority. Thus the Batch-B full-evaluation sample does not indicate a systematic inflation of the automatic faithful rate; its headline strict-consensus faithful rate is 70/98, while the human-majority faithful rate is 69/97.

Table 14: **Batch B: independent full-evaluation audit.** Batch B contains 100 cases from a separate system run; two missing outputs are excluded from effective-rate denominators. Human majority requires at least two numeric reviewer scores and treats compile failures as unfaithful.

Quantity	Count	Rate
Strict-consensus faithful	70/98	71.4%
Human-majority faithful	69/97	71.1%
LLM/human majority agreement	87/97	89.7%
Consensus-positive precision	64/69	92.8%
Compile-pass consensus-negative human confirmation	17/22	77.3%
Compile-pass consensus-negative human rescued	5/22	22.7%
Consensus-negative human confirmation	23/28	82.1%
Consensus-negative human rescued	5/28	17.9%

Table 15: **Batch B positive-bucket strictness sensitivity.** The majority metric is the main reported precision estimate. The stricter rows show how much the estimate changes when requiring all available reviewers, or all three reviewers, to score the statement as faithful.

Positive-bucket rule	Count	Rate
Human majority faithful	64/69	92.8%
All available numeric reviewers score ≥ 9	51/69	73.9%
All three reviewers present and all score ≥ 9	45/60	75.0%
All-three rule, missing third reviewer treated as failure	45/69	65.2%

The harsh variants are not used as the headline metric because they conflate semantic correctness with reviewer coverage and strict unanimity. They are useful as stress tests: even under unanimous-

reviewer requirements, many consensus-positive outputs remain faithful, while the majority metric is the appropriate operating point for comparing systems at scale.

Table 16: **Wilson 95% intervals for the main audit rates.** Intervals quantify sampling uncertainty; they do not include possible systematic rubric bias.

Quantity	Count	Rate	Wilson 95% interval
Pooled consensus-positive precision	194/202	96.0%	[92.4, 98.0]%
Pooled compile-pass negative-bucket confirmation	112/136	82.4%	[75.1, 87.8]%
Reviewer 1 positive precision, all scored cases	135/138	97.8%	[93.8, 99.3]%
Reviewer 1 positive precision, strict-consensus subset	130/133	97.7%	[93.6, 99.2]%
Batch B positive precision, majority rule	64/69	92.8%	[84.1, 96.9]%
Batch A negative-bucket confirmation	95/114	83.3%	[75.4, 89.1]%
Batch B compile-pass negative-bucket confirmation	17/22	77.3%	[56.6, 89.9]%
Batch B all-negative confirmation	23/28	82.1%	[64.4, 92.1]%
Batch B LLM/human-majority agreement	87/97	89.7%	[82.1, 94.3]%

The intervals reinforce the qualitative conclusion without overclaiming. Positive precision is high in both the original custom-agent audit and the independent Batch-B audit. Compile-pass negative-bucket confirmation is also high, but its interval is wider in Batch B because there are only 22 compile-pass consensus-negative cases with majority coverage. The false-negative rates are not negligible: Batch A rescues 19/114 consensus-negative cases, and Batch B rescues 5/22 compile-pass consensus-negative cases. This is why the main paper describes strict consensus as conservative rather than complete.

E.1 Compact Human-Check Case Studies

The following audited examples give the original natural-language statement, the translated Lean 4 code, GPT/Gemini judge scores, and all available anonymized human-reviewer scores. The first five show boundary or off-diagonal cases; the next five are strict-consensus positives from Batch B where all three same-case reviewers scored the output faithful. Human scores use the 0–10 rubric, with scores ≥ 9 treated as faithful; R1–R4 denote Reviewers 1–4, and “–” means that reviewer did not score that generated Lean output. When an R1 score is shown for a Batch B case, it is a theorem-name-overlap diagnostic rather than a same-output score; the same-output Batch B scores are R2–R4.

Case A-005: loop obstruction becomes vacuous

Original NL statement. Suppose that $Z \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a domain in the complex plane and that $g : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a complex analytic function defined in Z . A logarithm for $g(z)$ is a complex analytic function $G : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ so that $g(z) = e^{G(z)}$. Prove that $g(z)$ has a logarithm $G(z)$ just when both of the following conditions are satisfied: (1) $g(z) \neq 0$ for any $z \in Z$ and (2) g takes every loop in Z to a null homotopic loop in $\mathbb{C} - \{0\}$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib

open Set
open scoped Topology

theorem benmckay_top_covering_spaces_502
  (Z : Set ℂ) (hZ₁ : IsOpen Z) (hZ₂ : IsConnected Z)
  (g : ℂ → ℂ) (hg : AnalyticOn ℂ g Z) :
  (∃ G : ℂ → ℂ, AnalyticOn ℂ G Z ∧ ∀ z ∈ Z, g z = Complex.exp (G z)) ↔
  ((∀ z ∈ Z, g z ≠ 0) ∧
   ∀ x : ↑Z,
   ∀ γ : Path x x,
   ∃ γ₀ : Path (g (x : ℂ)) (g (x : ℂ)),
   Path.Homotopic γ₀ (Path.refl _))
:= by
sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	–	5	4	3

Audit note. Human reviewers confirmed a real semantic failure: the generated condition used `Path.Homotopic` in the ambient $\mathbb{C}$, making the loop obstruction essentially vacuous.

Case A-019: reviewer-strictness stress case

Original NL statement. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be C^2 and H_f continuous in a convex set U . Show that the second-order Taylor expansion is uniform on compact subsets of U .

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib

theorem taylor_second_order_uniform_on_compact
  {n : ℕ} {f : (Fin n → ℝ) → ℝ} {U : Set (Fin n → ℝ)}
  (hconv : Convex ℝ U)
  (hC2 : ContDiffOn ℝ 2 f U)
  (hcont : ContinuousOn (fun x => fderiv ℝ (fun y => fderiv ℝ f y) x) U) :
  ∀ {K : Set (Fin n → ℝ)}, IsCompact K → K ⊆ U →
  TendstoUniformlyOn
    (fun x : (Fin n → ℝ) =>
      fun y : (Fin n → ℝ) =>
        (f y - f x - (fderiv ℝ f x) (y - x) -
          (1 / (2 : ℝ)) *
            (fderiv ℝ (fun z => fderiv ℝ f z) x) (y - x) (y - x)) /
          ||y - x|| ^ (2 : ℕ))
    (fun _ => (0 : ℝ))
    (⊥ : Filter (Fin n → ℝ))
    K := by
  sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	3	5	–	10	3	0

Audit note. One reviewer judged the output better than the ambiguous NL wording, while the other two flagged vacuity or an incorrectly directed filter formulation.

Case A-050: strict-consensus false negative

Original NL statement. Prove that every contractible space is connected and has trivial homotopy groups.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib

theorem contractible_connected_and_trivial_homotopyGroups
  (X : Type*) [TopologicalSpace X] [ContractibleSpace X] :
  ConnectedSpace X ∧ ∀ (n : ℕ) (x : X), Subsingleton (HomotopyGroup (Fin n) X x) := by
  sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	9	5	10	10	9	10

Audit note. All available reviewers accepted the high-level Lean encoding via `ContractibleSpace`, `ConnectedSpace`, and `subsingleton HomotopyGroups`.

Case B-041: semantic-looking output blocked by compilation

Original NL statement. Let X and Y be topological spaces with basepoints $x_0 \in X$ and $y_0 \in Y$. Prove that $\pi_1(X \times Y, (x_0, y_0)) \cong \pi_1(X, x_0) \times \pi_1(Y, y_0)$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib

open CategoryTheory FundamentalGroupoid FundamentalGroupoidFunctor
```

```

noncomputable def <benmckay_top_fundamental-groups_336>
  (X : Type*) (Y : Type*) [TopologicalSpace X] [TopologicalSpace Y]
  (x₀ : X) (y₀ : Y) :
    FundamentalGroup (X × Y) (x₀, y₀) ≃* FundamentalGroup X x₀ × FundamentalGroup Y y₀ where
toFun p := (Path.Homotopic.projLeft p, Path.Homotopic.projRight p)
invFun q := Path.Homotopic.prod q.1 q.2
left_inv p := Path.Homotopic.prod_projLeft_projRight p
right_inv q := by
  ext
  · exact Path.Homotopic.projLeft_prod q.1 q.2
  · exact Path.Homotopic.projRight_prod q.1 q.2
map_mul' a b := by
  set A := TopCat.of X
  set B := TopCat.of Y
  set pL := projLeft A B
  set pR := projRight A B
  show (pL.map (b >> a), pR.map (b >> a)) =
    (pL.map b >> pL.map a, pR.map b >> pR.map a)
  rw [pL.map_comp, pR.map_comp]

```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
0	2	3	10	0	0	10

Audit note. The declaration attempts the intended isomorphism but fails the compiler filter. Two reviewers followed the compile-aware rubric and assigned 0; two judged the mathematical encoding as matching.

Case B-091: consensus-positive boundary case

Original NL statement. Show that the map $\varphi : G \rightarrow G \times H$ given by $\varphi(x) = (x, 1)$ is an injective homomorphism.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```

import Mathlib

theorem srdoty_alg_products_372
  (G H : Type*) [Group G] [Group H] :
  Function.Injective (MonoidHom.inl G H) := by sorry

```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	10	10	10	7	10	6

Audit note. Human majority rejected the consensus-positive label: the statement proves `Function.Injective (MonoidHom.inl G H)`, with the homomorphism property folded into the chosen object rather than stated as part of the conclusion.

Precision B-002: complex sine lower bound

Original NL statement. Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Show that $|\sin z| \geq |\sin(\Re z)|$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```

import Mathlib

theorem jirilebl_ca_ca_19223 (z : ℂ) :
  ||Complex.sin z|| ≥ |Real.sin z.re| := by sorry

```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	10	10	10	10	10	10

Audit note. This is a clean precision-positive example: both automatic judges and all three same-output Batch B reviewers accepted the direct Mathlib formulation of the stated inequality.

Precision B-013: convexity inequality

Original NL statement. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable. Show that if f is convex on U , then for all $x, y \in U$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, $f(tx + (1 - t)y) \leq tf(x) + (1 - t)f(y)$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib
```

```
theorem «jirilebl_ra_ch-several-vars-ders_3076»
  {n : ℕ} {U : Set (EuclideanSpace ℝ (Fin n))} {f : EuclideanSpace ℝ (Fin n) → ℝ}
  (_hU : IsOpen U) (_hf : DifferentiableOn ℝ f U) (hconv : ConvexOn ℝ U f)
  {x y : EuclideanSpace ℝ (Fin n)} (hx : x ∈ U) (hy : y ∈ U)
  {t : ℝ} (ht0 : 0 ≤ t) (ht1 : t ≤ 1) :
  f (t • x + (1 - t) • y) ≤ t * f x + (1 - t) * f y := by sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	10	10	–	10	10	10

Audit note. The Lean statement uses `ConvexOn` to encode the hypothesis and states exactly the Jensen-style inequality under the membership and interval assumptions.

Precision B-022: ring sign identity

Original NL statement. Let R be a ring and let $a \in R$. Show that $(-1)a = -a$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib
```

```
theorem srdoty_alg_Z_n_513 {R : Type*} [Ring R] (a : R) : (-1) * a = -a := by sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	10	10	10	10	10	10

Audit note. The positive label is unsurprising but useful as a control case: the generated declaration is a literal Lean rendering of the textbook ring identity.

Precision B-039: closure of a union

Original NL statement. Let X be a topological space. Prove that $\overline{A \cup B} = \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ for all subsets $A, B \subset X$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib
```

```
theorem benmckay_top_topology_551
  {X : Type*} [TopologicalSpace X] (A B : Set X) :
  closure (A ∪ B) = closure A ∪ closure B := by sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	10	10	–	10	10	10

Audit note. Reviewers agreed that the translation preserves the quantification over arbitrary subsets of an arbitrary topological space and the closure-of-union identity.

Precision B-073: nonnegative truncation limit

Original NL statement. Let $\{x_n\}$ be convergent and $y_n = \max\{x_n, 0\}$. Show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n \geq 0$.

Translated Lean 4 code.

```
import Mathlib
```

```
open Filter Topology
```

```
theorem «jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-ser_1015» (x : ℕ → ℝ) (L : ℝ)
  (hx : Tendsto x atTop (nhds L)) :
  ∃ M : ℝ, M ≥ 0 ∧ Tendsto (fun n => max (x n) 0) atTop (nhds M) := by sorry
```

Compile	GPT	Gemini	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	9	10	9	10	10	10

Audit note. The theorem states convergence of the truncated sequence to some nonnegative limit, matching the intended conclusion while avoiding an unnecessary explicit formula for the limit.

E.2 Four-Reviewer Theorem-Name Overlap Diagnostic

The Reviewer 1 audit and the three-reviewer audits were not designed as a four-reviewer repeated-measures study. Nevertheless, some theorem names occur in both the Reviewer 1 audit and the Reviewer 2/3/4 reviewed batches. Table 17 lists the cases where Reviewer 1 and all three later reviewers provided numeric scores. There are 32 such theorem-name overlaps: 3 in Batch A and 29 in Batch B. Exact Lean-code overlap with the Reviewer 1 audit is 0/32, so the table should be read as a diagnostic of reviewer strictness and theorem-level consistency, not as four humans scoring the same generated Lean declaration.

Table 17: **Theorem-name overlaps with numeric scores from Reviewers 1–4.** Scores ≥ 9 are faithful. **Maj4**=1 means at least three of the four reviewers scored the theorem-name occurrence as faithful; **All4**=1 means all four did. Exact Lean-code overlap with the Reviewer 1 audit is 0/32 for this table.

Audit	Case	Theorem name	R1	R2	R3	R4	Maj4	All4
A	case_007	jirilebl_ca_ca_1436	10	10	10	9	1	1
A	case_049	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-funcs_497	9	2	4	5	0	0
A	case_050	benmckay_top_covering-spaces_1191	10	10	9	10	1	1
B	case_001	jirilebl_ca_ca_9083	10	7	10	10	1	0
B	case_002	jirilebl_ca_ca_19223	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_003	jirilebl_ca_ca_14036	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_004	jirilebl_ca_ca_6258	10	10	9	9	1	1
B	case_011	jirilebl_ra_ch-multivar-int_2082	10	10	10	9	1	1
B	case_012	jirilebl_ca_ca_9443	10	7	10	10	1	0
B	case_014	jirilebl_ca_ca_19383	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_019	jirilebl_ra_ch-several-vars-ders_2586	9	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_022	srdoty_alg_Z_n_513	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_025	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-ser_4420	9	10	10	9	1	1
B	case_032	srdoty_alg_Z_n_1021	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_041	benmckay_top_fundamental-groups_336	10	0	0	10	0	0
B	case_042	srdoty_alg_Z_n_505	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_045	srdoty_alg_actions_705	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_046	jirilebl_ca_ca_19814	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_049	srdoty_alg_abstract-gps_942	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_050	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-ser_2828	10	10	10	9	1	1
B	case_052	jirilebl_ca_ca_2342	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_062	jirilebl_ca_ca_19502	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_069	jirilebl_ca_ca_2441	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_073	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-ser_1015	9	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_074	benmckay_top_fundamental-groups_24	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_081	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-ser_4256	10	5	10	10	1	0
B	case_085	jirilebl_ra_ch-seq-funcs_497	9	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_090	srdoty_alg_Z_n_725	10	9	10	10	1	1
B	case_091	srdoty_alg_products_372	10	7	10	6	0	0
B	case_095	jirilebl_ra_ch-several-vars-ders_2843	10	5	10	10	1	0
B	case_099	jirilebl_ca_ca_19562	10	10	10	10	1	1
B	case_100	srdoty_alg_Z_n_828	10	10	10	10	1	1

This overlap diagnostic is consistent with the main calibration story but is deliberately not used as the primary estimator. Among the 32 theorem-name overlaps, 29/32 have a four-reviewer majority faithful label and 25/32 are unanimous faithful. However, because exact Lean-code overlap with the Reviewer 1 audit is 0/32, these rows cannot be used to replace the within-batch same-case estimates in Tables 12–13. Their value is narrower: they show that when the same theorem names reappear in a later three-reviewer audit, the Reviewer 1 positive impression is usually not contradicted by the other reviewers, while the few disagreements identify cases where the theorem admits different generated formalizations or stricter reviewer interpretations.

F Additional Factorial and Tool-Usage Details

Table 18: **Validity vs. semantic selectivity by tool configuration.** Conditional faithfulness is Faithful/Compile. The gap column counts outputs that compile but fail strict semantic consensus.

T	Config		Compile Count	Faithful Count	Faithful/Compile Rate	Compile-pass gap Count
	F	S				
0	0	0	105	79	75.2%	26
1	0	0	121	98	81.0%	23
0	0	1	182	132	72.5%	50
1	0	1	200	144	72.0%	56
0	1	0	366	245	66.9%	121
0	1	1	349	248	71.1%	101
1	1	0	374	235	62.8%	139
1	1	1	358	242	67.6%	116

Table 19: **Tool usage counts.** Cumulative tool invocations across the subset with complete tool-call logs ($N = 384$; all accuracy results use $N = 400$).

(T, F, S)	Trans.	REPL	S_{total}	Notes
(0,1,0)	0	1496	0	Feedback-only
(0,1,1)	0	1050	1726	+Search (REPL↓)
(1,1,0)	257	1374	0	Feedback + Expert
(1,1,1)	112	1008	1913	+Search (REPL↓)

Table 20: **Trajectory length and faithfulness.** Rows pool runs by final trajectory length. $F=1$ pools configs 010, 011, 110, and 111; $F=0$ pools the nonempty no-feedback configs 001, 100, and 101. Accuracy follows the paper’s per-entry consensus metric.

Step bin	$F=1$		$F=0$, nonempty	
	Faithful	Rate	Faithful	Rate
1–2	300/369	81.3%	119/372	32.0%
3–5	325/437	74.4%	129/353	36.5%
6–9	188/292	64.4%	53/181	29.3%
10–12	72/137	52.6%	24/79	30.4%
13–18	58/140	41.4%	32/115	27.8%
19–24	27/225	12.0%	17/100	17.0%

G Additional Domain Results

G.1 Domain Metrics under Full Configuration

Domain metrics under config 111

Table 21: **Domain metrics under config=111.** Conditional faithfulness is computed as Faithful/Compile.

Domain	Compile	Faithful	Faithful/Compile	Steps (mean)	Steps (median)
Complex Analysis	0.95	0.82	0.86	6.88	5
Real Analysis	0.89	0.49	0.55	9.84	7.5
Algebra	0.87	0.56	0.64	9.83	6.5
Topology	0.87	0.61	0.70	9.20	6

G.2 Judge Scores by Domain

Average judge scores by domain across configurations

Table 22: **Average faithfulness scores by domain and configuration.** Columns correspond to tool configurations in (T, F, S) bit order.

Domain	001	010	011	100	101	110	111
Algebra	5.60	7.14	7.23	4.46	5.85	7.20	7.22
Complex Analysis	4.72	9.27	8.91	4.20	4.94	8.94	8.98
Real Analysis	4.62	7.38	7.34	3.59	4.75	7.33	7.31
Topology	5.39	7.10	7.03	4.47	6.14	7.05	7.25

Interpretation. Score trends are consistent with the domain difficulty ranking in Appendix G.1: Complex Analysis attains the highest scores under tool-enabled settings, while Real Analysis remains lowest.

G.3 Domain-Level Feedback Effects




Figure 5: Faithful rate by domain and configuration.

Domain-wise effect of Compiler Feedback (F)

Table 23: **Domain-wise effect of compiler feedback.** Rates average faithful outcomes over configurations with and without the feedback tool.

Domain	F=0 (avg)	F=1 (avg)	ΔF
Complex Analysis	0.28	0.81	+0.53
Real Analysis	0.23	0.53	+0.30
Algebra	0.37	0.57	+0.20
Topology	0.38	0.57	+0.19

Interpretation. Complex Analysis benefits most from compiler feedback (+53 pts), likely due to mature Mathlib coverage. Algebra and Topology show smaller gains (+20 pts), suggesting either limited library support or intrinsic formalization difficulty.

G.4 Domain-Level Effects of Search (S)

Simple effect of Search conditioned on Feedback

The Search tool (S) provides symbol-level queries via `#check/#print` and general web search. It accesses useful Mathlib information without full compilation diagnostics, but it is not a dedicated semantic retrieval system. As noted in Section 5.3, the Lean-level search tools and REPL feedback are backed by the same Lean/Mathlib snapshot, contributing to the negative interaction $F \times S = -11.1$ pts.

Table 24: **Domain-wise simple effect of search conditioned on feedback.** Search has a larger marginal effect when full Lean elaboration feedback is unavailable.

Domain	F=0		F=1	
	S=0	S=1	S=0	S=1
Algebra	0.28	0.42	0.565	0.57
Complex Analysis	0.25	0.30	0.815	0.81
Real Analysis	0.16	0.27	0.525	0.525
Topology	0.29	0.42	0.55	0.59
Avg ΔS	+10.8 pts		+1.0 pts	

Interpretation. When full REPL is unavailable (F=0), the implemented search tools provide substantial gains (+10.8 pts average). Once full REPL is enabled (F=1), the marginal benefit of Search drops to near zero (+1.0 pts), suggesting that whole-program diagnostics overlap with symbol-level information in this implementation. This domain-level breakdown corroborates the negative $F \times S$ interaction reported in Section 5.3.

G.5 Multi-Model Orchestrator Comparison

To assess whether the framework’s gains are specific to the GPT-5.2 orchestrator or reflect structural properties of tool-augmented formalization, we evaluate two additional orchestrator models—Claude Sonnet 4.5 and Gemini-2.5-Pro—on the full 400-entry benchmark under the 111 (all tools) configuration.

Table 25: **Multi-model robustness under config 111.** Faithfulness is strict $\text{GPT} \cap \text{Gemini}$ consensus on $N = 400$.

Orchestrator	One-shot	Agent 111	Uplift
GPT-5.2	19.8%	60.5%	+40.7 pts
Sonnet 4.5	28.5%	65.5%	+37.0 pts
Gemini-2.5-Pro	28.0%	65.5%	+37.5 pts

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 25, all three models show large uplift from the tool-augmented framework (+148 to +163 faithful translations) and converge to 60–65% consensus-faithful outputs despite markedly different one-shot baselines (19–28%). This convergence suggests that the benefits of iterative tool use under the faithfulness metric are not specific to the GPT-5.2 orchestrator.