

---

# Improving Autoformalization using Type Checking

---

**Auguste Poiroux**  
EPFL  
auguste.poiroux@epfl.ch

**Gail Weiss**  
EPFL  
gail.weiss@epfl.ch

**Viktor Kunčák\***  
EPFL  
viktor.kuncak@epfl.ch

**Antoine Bosselut\***  
EPFL  
antoine.bosselut@epfl.ch

## Abstract

Large language models show promise for autoformalization, the task of automatically translating natural language into formal languages. However, current autoformalization methods remain limited. The last reported state-of-the-art performance on the ProofNet formalization benchmark for the Lean proof assistant, achieved using Codex for Lean 3, only showed successful formalization of 16.1% of informal statements. Similarly, our evaluation of GPT-4o for Lean 4 only produces successful translations 34.9% of the time. Our analysis shows that the performance of these models is largely limited by their inability to generate formal statements that successfully *type-check* (i.e., are syntactically correct and consistent with types) – with a whopping 86.6% of GPT-4o errors starting from a type-check failure. In this work, we propose a method to fix this issue through *decoding with type-check filtering*, where we initially sample a diverse set of candidate formalizations for an informal statement, then use the Lean proof assistant to filter out candidates that do not type-check. Using GPT-4o as a base model, and combining our method with self-consistency, we obtain a +18.3% absolute increase in formalization accuracy, and achieve a new state-of-the-art of 53.2% on ProofNet with Lean 4.

## 1 Introduction

Automatic verification of logical reasoning holds promise for formal verification of mathematical proofs, software and hardware verification, and artificial intelligence. Proof assistants enable rigorously expressing mathematical statements and mechanically checking their proofs, but they require formalization: translating informally-stated mathematical statements into formal language. However, converting informal statements to semantically-equivalent formal statements is nontrivial, prompting new research into methods that automate this conversion, a task referred to as *autoformalization*.

Current state-of-the-art methods in autoformalization rely on the few-shot formalization capabilities of large language models [Wu et al., 2022, Azerbayev et al., 2023a] or distilled back-translation [Jiang et al., 2023] [Azerbayev et al., 2023a]. The success rate of these techniques have been limited up to his point, with the reported state-of-the-art result for autoformalization into Lean 3 [de Moura et al., 2015] on the ProofNet benchmark [Azerbayev et al., 2023a] being 16.1% (achieved using the Codex model [Chen et al., 2021]). We show that more recent LLMs achieve higher performance but still do not reliably provide helpful formalizations. GPT-4o, the best-performing model we test, successfully translates only 34.9% of statements into Lean 4 [Moura and Ullrich, 2021].

Our analysis reveals that a common failure mode of these methods is their inability to *type-check*, which evaluates whether a formalization correctly uses the grammar and the existing definitions

---

\*Equal Supervision

of a theorem prover (and its associated proof library). While type-checking does not ensure that a statement is a correct translation of the informal input, it is a precursor for a correct translation and is both deterministic and fast, enabling easy automation. We observe that type-checking rates for these methods range from 4% [Jiang et al., 2023] to 45.2% [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023a] depending on the model, the formal language, and the benchmark. Moreover, we show that improvements in type-checking rates translate into improved accuracy at translating informal statements.

In this work, we leverage these findings and propose a method that uses the type-checking signal from automatic theorem provers to enhance autoformalization methods. In particular, for a given informal statement and a target formal language, we generate several potential formalizations and use the underlying proof assistant to identify and filter out those statements that do not type check. From the filtered candidates, we propose several heuristics to select a single translation as the final formalization. We apply our method to four different models on the ProofNet benchmark using the Lean 4 proof assistant. Our manual evaluation of the correctness of produced formalizations demonstrates that our method substantially increases autoformalization accuracy, with a particularly notable increase on even the best-performing model: the performance of GPT-4o improves from 34.9% accuracy of greedy decoding to 53.2% accuracy.

We summarize our contributions as the following:

- We present a **new three-step method to improve current autoformalization methods** that can be applied on top of any existing autoformalization method that supports sampling multiple candidate formalizations for an informal statement.
- We demonstrate that our method is effective across four different models: Llama3-8B, Llemma-7B, Llemma-34B, and GPT-4o. Combined with our approach, GPT-4o sets a new state-of-the-art accuracy on the ProofNet benchmark: 53.2%.
- We present an **ablation study** that demonstrates the importance of both the filtering and the selection heuristics for the overall success of our method. We evaluate their contributions when used independently. We find that filtering increases performance even when used with a random selection, while selection heuristics alone do not always yield better results than greedy decoding, confirming the importance of type-check filtering.
- We discuss the strengths and weaknesses of current LLMs for this task and identify potential future directions to enhance them.

## 2 Background

**Interactive Theorem Proving:** Autoformalization in mathematics depends on formal systems, such as Coq [Castéran and Bertot, 2004], Lean [Moura and Ullrich, 2021], Isabelle [Nipkow et al., 2002], and their mathematical libraries. In this work, we focus on Lean: a powerful interactive theorem prover with a growing base of definitions and proven statements known as Mathlib [mathlib Community, 2020]. Specifically, we focus on the current version of Lean, Lean 4.

**Autoformalization:** Autoformalization designates methods capable of automated formalization, the task of translating natural language into formal systems. Classical programmatic tools can be used to translate constrained natural language statements into formal systems [Pathak, 2024]. However, in this work, we are interested in translating non-constrained natural language statements. In Wu et al. [2022], the authors found that large language models are a promising approach and are capable of autoformalization through the use of in-context learning. They report a success rate of 25.3% on problems sampled from the MATH dataset through manual inspection. They mention the idea of using distilled back-translation to further improve model performance. In Azerbaiyev et al. [2023a] and Jiang et al. [2023], they demonstrate that distilled back-translation indeed improves performance on some base models but still falls short in comparison to proprietary LLMs with few-shot learning.

**Benchmarks:** MiniF2F [Zheng et al., 2022] is a widely used benchmark in the field of neural theorem proving. It consists of 488 math competition problems that, while resembling those found in the International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO), also include simpler problems. FIMO [Liu et al., 2023], a more recent addition, is specifically composed of 149 IMO problems, providing a focused set of high-difficulty challenges. Both benchmarks feature aligned informal and formal statements, making them suitable for use as autoformalization benchmarks. ProofNet [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023a], on the other hand, is specifically designed for autoformalization. It consists of




Figure 1: **Overview of our method.** An LLM generates several candidate Lean-4 formalizations for a provided informal statement. The Lean-4 proof assistant type-checks them and filters out the statement that does not pass (the statement has hallucinated `IrratNum`, a type which does not exist in `Mathlib4`). Finally, a selection heuristic, such as majority vote or Self-BLEU, is applied to the remaining candidate formalizations, and a single final formalization is returned.

371 undergraduate mathematical exercises, making it an essential benchmark for evaluating the performance of autoformalization models.

**LLM sampling-based methods:** Our method uses a selection step in which we employ self-consistency methods such as majority voting [Wang et al., 2023] and Self-BLEU [Zhu et al., 2018]. Such methods have empirically proven to be effective across a wide range of NLP tasks [Li et al., 2024]. In particular, Lewkowycz et al. [2022] demonstrated the substantial effectiveness of the combination of sampling and majority voting on the MATH benchmark [Hendrycks et al., 2021]. Further works in this direction improve over majority voting components by using trained verifiers [Hosseini et al., 2024].

### 3 Method

In our work, we focus on Lean 4, the latest version of the Lean language, and the current official version used to develop the `Mathlib` library [mathlib Community, 2020]. We describe in this section the 3 main components of our proposed method: sampling, filtering, and selection. A simple schematic representation of these steps is presented in Figure 1.

#### 3.1 Sampling

In our experiments, unless stated otherwise, we employ temperature sampling with  $T = 0.7$  and generate  $n = 50$  autoformalization attempts per informal statement. Depending on the models, we either use the `vLLM` library [Kwon et al., 2023] or the OpenAI API to generate predictions.

**Cleaning:** Certain models often try to provide proofs after generating formal statements. Furthermore, we find that generated names for theorems sometimes clash with names in the `Mathlib` library. To avoid being considered as invalid by the Lean type-checker, we trim proofs, substitute theorem names for dummy identifiers, and normalize whitespace when parsing the generated theorems. Additionally, the Lean proof assistant requires theorems to be accompanied by proofs. To address this, we append a dummy `sorry` proof to each theorem (which indicates to Lean that the proof will be provided later).

#### 3.2 Filtering

We use the `REPL`<sup>2</sup> tool developed by the Lean community to implement our filtering step. For any formal statement, if the statement is valid, `REPL` will return `declaration uses 'sorry'`, meaning that the statement is well-typed and that we should provide an actual proof instead of `sorry`. Other-

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/leanprover-community/repl>

wise, the tool will return error messages explaining why the formal statement is ill-formed, which we use as an indicator to filter out such statements.

### 3.3 Selection

In our selection process, we employ and compare three distinct heuristics to refine and choose the best outputs generated by the models: random selection, majority voting, and Self-BLEU.

**Random:** As a baseline selection strategy, we randomly choose an output from the set of generated candidates.

**Majority voting** [Wang et al., 2023]: We aggregate multiple outputs and select the most frequently occurring candidate as the final choice, relying on consensus to mitigate the impact of any single erroneous output.

**Self-BLEU** [Zhu et al., 2018]: We evaluate the similarity of the generated outputs by calculating the BLEU score between all pairs of candidates. We then select the generated candidate with the highest aggregated BLEU score.

## 4 Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the experimental setup under which we tested our method.

### 4.1 Dataset

We use the ProofNet benchmark [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023a] to evaluate our autoformalization method. ProofNet is an autoformalization benchmark of undergraduate mathematical exercises containing 371 pairs of informal statements and corresponding formalizations in Lean 3. The dataset is split into a validation set with 185 samples and a test set with 186 samples. Since our work is focused on Lean 4, we used a recent port of ProofNet in Lean 4 made by an independent team of researchers.<sup>3</sup>

### 4.2 Models

We consider the following models for our experiments:

**Llemma-7B & 34B** [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023b]: These models are based on CodeLlama 7B and 34B [Rozière et al., 2024] and have been further pre-trained on the ProofPile-2 collection of mathematical data, which was introduced along with these models.

**Llama3-8B-Instruct**<sup>4</sup>: an open-source model from the Llama3 family with state-of-the-art general capabilities for its size at the time when our study took place.

**GPT-4-turbo**<sup>5</sup> and **GPT-4o**<sup>6</sup>: state of the art general LLMs. Specifically, we use versions gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 and gpt-4o-2024-05-13 for reproducibility purposes.

For each of these models, we consider two adaptation approaches:

**Fine-tuning through distilled back-translation:** LLMs are better at informalization, i.e., translating formal statements to informal mathematical statements, than autoformalizing [Wu et al., 2022, Azerbaiyev et al., 2023a]. Using this fact, Jiang et al. [2023] informalized the Lean 4 Mathlib library with GPT-4 OpenAI et al. [2024] to create a dataset, MMA, of formal-informal pairs. We fine-tuned the Llemma-7B and Llama3-8B models on the MMA dataset.

**Few-shot learning:** Similar to Azerbaiyev et al. [2023a], we use 12-shot prompting to generate formal statements from informalization.

---

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/rahul3613/ProofNet-lean4>

<sup>4</sup><https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>

<sup>5</sup><https://openai.com/index/new-models-and-developer-products-announced-at-devday/>

<sup>6</sup><https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

Method	Model	Validation			Test		
		Type-check	Accuracy	TEP	Type-check	Accuracy	TEP
12-shot	Codex	-	-	-	23.7*	13.4*	88.1
Prompt retrieval	Codex	-	-	-	45.2*	16.1*	65.3
MMA fine-tune	Llama3-8B	12.4	6.5	93.7	-	-	-
MMA fine-tune	Llemma-7B	15.1	8.1	92.4	-	-	-
12-shot	Llama3-8B	14.6	7.6	92.4	14.0	5.9	91.4
12-shot	Llemma-7B	27.6	10.3	80.7	30.7	12.4	79.1
12-shot	Llemma-34B	34.0	17.8	80.3	30.7	14.0	80.6
12-shot	GPT-4-turbo	25.4	21.6	95.2	28.0	24.2	95.0
12-shot	GPT-4o	34.0	29.2	93.2	43.6	34.9	86.6

Table 1: **Baseline performance on ProofNet using greedy decoding.** Except for Codex, which has been evaluated on Lean 3 in Azerbayev et al. [2023a] (indicated with an asterisk), all models are evaluated on Lean 4. Codex results on the validation split have not been reported. Given the poor results of models fine-tuned on MMA, we did not evaluate these models on the test split due to the cost of human annotation. Additionally, we report the *Type Error Proportion* (TEP), which represents the proportion of autoformalization errors caused by type-checking failures. The TEP is calculated using the formula  $\frac{1 - \text{type-check}}{1 - \text{accuracy}}$ .

### 4.3 Evaluation

For the moment, no reliable automated evaluation metrics exist for the task of autoformalization, as there exist many semantically equivalent ways to state a given theorem. While programmatic tools can be used to automatically type-check generated statements, which is moderately correlated with accuracy, type-checking is not a sufficient condition for a formal statement to be considered as correct. While previous studies have used BLEU as a metric to evaluate autoformalization [Azerbayev et al., 2023a], the correlation between BLEU and formal statement correctness was also found to be low. Consequently, we rely on human evaluation to compute accuracy for all of our experiments and evaluate all generated formal statements by our models using the following binary rubric:

**Correct:** A formal statement is considered correct if it is semantically equivalent to the informal statement. Throughout this paper, accuracy refers to the proportion of statements evaluated as correct.

**Incorrect:** We annotate as incorrect all generated formal statements that deviate even slightly from the semantics of the informal statement. In cases of doubt about the correctness, we annotate the generated formal statement as incorrect.

This manual evaluation effort, though comprehensive and methodical, is an important bottleneck that limits the number of experiments that can be run. Consequently, for all human evaluation, we evaluate only samples that pass type-checking as samples that do not type-check are incorrect by design (though we still include these latter samples when computing the accuracy metric). Furthermore, to reduce variance among evaluations, we also batch together formalization predictions sharing the same associated informal statement, allowing the annotator to directly compare several formalization attempts, and eliminating inconsistencies between evaluations.

Finally, while pure LLM autoformalization is one axis of this study, we are also interested in how useful these models might be in AI-assisted formalization settings. In this scenario, producing *close-to-correct* formalizations is already a useful feat, as they can be corrected with minimal effort on the part of a user. Consequently, similar to Jiang et al. [2023], we also distinguish incorrect formal statements that can be corrected with low effort in certain studies. We define *close-to-correct* formalizations as those with one slightly diverging hypothesis or conclusion, typically fixable in a matter of seconds. To provide a more concrete estimation of what is considered fixable with low effort, we present several examples of such predictions on the ProofNet validation set in subsection A.3.

## 5 Results

**Performance Analysis** To establish a baseline performance, we evaluate the same models described above using few-shot learning and greedy decoding. We also report evaluation results for the Llemma-




Figure 2: **Autoformalization accuracy on the ProofNet test set.** All models are prompted with 12-shot examples. Detailed results are reported in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3. **Left:** Proportion of formalized statements evaluated as correct. **Right:** Proportion of formalized statements evaluated as correct or as fixable with a low amount of effort (i.e., *close-to-correct*).

7B and Llama3-8B-Instruct models fine-tuned on the MMA dataset [Jiang et al., 2023] using LoRA [Hu et al., 2021] (see details in subsection A.1). We report results in Table 1 and add previous state-of-the-art results achieved on the Lean 3 version of the ProofNet benchmark for comparison. Overall, we find that for comparably-sized models, the domain-specific model Llemma-7B outperforms Llama3-8B-Instruct in both fine-tuning (8.1% vs 6.5%) and few-shot settings (10.3% vs 7.6%) in terms of accuracy, suggesting that training on mathematical data, e.g., ProofPile-2 [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023b], helps models develop autoformalization capabilities. Interestingly, fine-tuning on the MMA dataset [Jiang et al., 2023] performs slightly worse than using base models with 12-shot learning. We observe that fine-tuned models have a tendency to generate incomplete local contexts, possibly because the MMA dataset uses Mathlib formal statements, which often rely on global, declared variables.

Most importantly, however, we note the large proportion of errors for all methods due to type-check failures (as measured by TEP). In Figure 2, we report results on the ProofNet test dataset of supplementing these models using our decoding with type-check filtering method. We find that the best strategy is to use type-check filtering and Self-BLEU for the selection step. We observe a consistent and significant improvement over the greedy baseline across all models evaluated. Interestingly, even using random selection over filtered generated statements is enough to substantially outperform the greedy decoding baseline.

**Accuracy with low correction effort** One goal of autoformalization is the development of AI-assisted tools for formalization. In this setting, producing close-to-correct formal statements can already help users by providing hints and potential directions. Using the same setup as in the previous section, we report our results on the ProofNet test split in Figure 2 (**Right**). We find that, by using our method, open-source models Llemma-7B and Llemma-34B can autoformalize 50% of the mathematical statements from the ProofNet test benchmark in a *close-to-correct* way. Moreover, while the accuracy between the best open-source model and GPT-4o was 17.6% fully correct statements, we only observe a difference of 10.2% between these baselines in the *close-to-correct* setting.

## 6 Analysis

All the results in this section are conducted on the **validation** split of the ProofNet benchmark. Results on this split slightly differ from the ones presented on the test split, which can, in part, be explained by the high variance induced by the small size of the benchmark. Full results on both of these splits can be found in Table 2.

**Ablation study** Here, we empirically study the contribution of the filtering and selection components of our method by evaluating our method with and without filtering, as well as with different




Figure 3: **Ablation study:** Type-check and accuracy score on ProofNet validation split for various ablations of our method. All base models in this plot were prompted with 12-shot examples. For results using the filter step, the type-check rate is the same across all selection methods since the selection is restricted to only type-checking statements. Exact numbers are reported in Table 4

selection heuristics. As before, for evaluations using multiple samples, we generate 50 samples with temperature  $T = 0.7$ . We present the results in Figure 3. First, we observe that the greedy baseline always outperforms the *No filter + Random selection* method, suggesting that greedy decoding performs better than randomly sampling a formal statement.<sup>7</sup>

Additionally, while majority voting (*No filter + Majority voting*) and Self-BLEU selection (*No filter + Self-BLEU*) generally improve the accuracy of random sampling, both struggle to increase the performance of random sampling beyond that of the greedy decoding baseline. Meanwhile, adding type-check filtering to the random samples substantially outperforms the greedy decoding baseline even without any final selection heuristic (*No filter + Random selection*), likely due to the low type-check rate of most generated samples using either decoding algorithm across all models.

We conclude that the type-check filter is the critical component in our method, and that applying a candidate selection method such as Self-BLEU after filtering further improves the accuracy.

**Effect of Sample Size** We also evaluate the effect of the number of candidates generated in the sampling step. Until now, we used a default number of  $n = 50$ . In this section, we test the effect of generating different numbers of samples. In Figure 4, we report type-check rate and accuracy evolution for values of  $n$  ranging from 1 to 50. For all models, we observe a monotonic increase in the type-check rate and accuracy, and our results even suggest that generating  $n > 50$  samples could further improve accuracy.

**Effect of Statement Length** Our analysis reveals that models struggle to generate correct statements when presented with informal statements that map to longer formalizations. We investigate this phenomenon by binning examples in our validation set according to the length of their *reference* formalizations (as measured by the number of characters in the statement). In Figure 5 we observe that accuracy decreases as the length of the formalization increases for both greedy decoding and our method and across all models. Importantly, we find that our method improves accuracy for all length bins of reference formalizations, with a relatively larger improvement on longer formal statements.

**Effect of Type-checking on Accuracy** Being well-typed is a necessary condition for an accurate formal statement, but does not guarantee a perfect correlation between these metrics. For example, a model that consistently outputs the same correctly-typed statement will have a higher type-check rate but lower accuracy compared to one that attempts to formalize its input correctly. In Figure 6, we plot the accuracy of our method relative to the type-check rate. We find that the Pearson correlation

<sup>7</sup>Generating only a single random sample with temperature sampling is equivalent to the *No filter + Random selection* baseline.




Figure 4: **Scaling trends** on ProofNet validation split using 12-shot prompting and our method (type-check filter + Self-BLEU). We vary the number of candidate samples from  $n = 1$  to 50. Exact numbers are reported in Table 5 of the appendix.




Figure 5: **Accuracy stratified by formal statement length** on ProofNet validation split. We split the samples in 3 bucket sizes with the same number of samples.

between accuracy and type-check rate is 0.58 overall, 0.75 for methods that do not use a type-check filter (red), and 0.51 for those that do (blue).<sup>8</sup> While this correlation is moderately or strongly positive correlation in all settings, using the type-check rate as a reliable proxy for accuracy remains arguably insufficient. In the right figure, we plot the accuracy conditioned on well-typed formalizations, i.e., the percentage of well-typed formalizations that were also correct. While our method increases overall accuracy, we see it reduces accuracy within the well-typed candidates, potentially indicating that Greedy decoding with type-checking would be the most precise method if the greedily decoded statement successfully type-checked. A second interesting observation is that GPT-4o has high accuracy above 80% among the cases where it produces at least one output that type checks, which is important for practical use because type checking will detect the remaining failure cases.

## 7 Discussion

**Limitations** Currently, comparing autoformalization models necessitates manual evaluation. Unfortunately, this approach is not scalable and significantly restricts the number of experiments that can be conducted. Additionally, human evaluation is not a deterministic metric, which can lead to inconsistencies between studies. While type-check rate has been proposed as a proxy for autoformalization accuracy in Azerbayev et al. [2023a], these metrics do not correlate strongly enough with correctness (as shown in Figure 6). Our method also requires more computational resources than the greedy decoding baseline. Generating 50 autoformalizations per problem might seem impractical. However, by using the same prompt for these generations, our technique benefits from parallel sampling where different optimizations, such as paged attention [Kwon et al., 2023], exist. Furthermore, we observe a clear benefit to sampling multiple candidates in Figure 4, indicating this cost is perhaps worth the increase in final correctness. In our experiments, generating 50 autoformalizations per problem on the ProofNet benchmark takes a few minutes on a single A100 GPU for all models tested. Post-processing

<sup>8</sup>Even with the type-check filter, the type-check rate may be below 100% if no generated candidate statements type-check successfully






Figure 6: **Left:** Correlation between Accuracy and Type-check score for all models on the ProofNet validation set. We distinguish results using type-check filtering (blue) and those that do not (red). **Right:** We plot (per model) the accuracy for examples in the benchmark for which the model managed to produce at least one type-checking statement.

the generated statements (type-checking and selection) can take up to one hour on a consumer-grade CPU. Lastly, this work focuses on statement autoformalization in a simplified setting. Whether this method can be effectively applied to real-world use cases remains to be demonstrated.

**Data contamination:** ProofNet 3 was released in February 2023, and an unofficial port to Lean 4 has been publicly available since March 2024. Since the cutoff training dates for all models used in these experiments are before March 2024, Lean 4 data contamination due to training is not possible. However, it remains theoretically possible that some models were trained on the Lean 3 version and weakly generalized to Lean 4. Our in-depth study in subsection A.7 suggests that data contamination due to training is unlikely among the models we evaluated. Nonetheless, during our data contamination study, we found that 4 examples from the 12-shot prompt in Azerbayev et al. [2023a], which we intended to compare to, were also present in the benchmark (2 in the validation set and 2 in the test set). Fortunately, this affects the results only negligibly (at most  $\sim 1.1\%$ ). We report all our results with a correction where we automatically label as *incorrect* all formalization predictions associated with the leaked statements.

**Deduplication:** In our method, we do not deduplicate the predictions after the sampling and filtering steps. Theoretically, deduplication would cause majority voting to degenerate into a random baseline, and the random baseline would be biased toward selecting more statements considered as less likely by the generative model. However, we have not empirically validated this approach.

**Temperature tuning:** While we haven’t specifically examined the impact of temperature on accuracy, we believe it is crucial during the sampling step. Increasing the temperature can enhance accuracy by promoting greater exploration when sampling a large number of statements. Specifically, with a temperature of 0.7, we observed that GPT-4o’s diversity and type-check rate evolution were low. We anticipate that raising the temperature could further improve performance.

**Societal impact:** Our work aims to assist mathematicians in formalizing their research. Although we are still far from achieving a fully automated formalization tool, such a development would greatly aid mathematicians in verifying their work, thereby enhancing their productivity. Mathematicians with malicious intents could use this to accelerate their research as well.

## 8 Conclusion

We introduced a new method for autoformalization that can be integrated with existing approaches. This method involves sampling, filtering out answers that do not type-check, and selecting from the remaining candidates using either majority voting or Self-BLEU. We empirically demonstrated its effectiveness and conducted an ablation study to show the contribution of each component. A current bottleneck in developing new statement autoformalization methods is evaluation. Discovering an

automated metric strongly correlated with accuracy could accelerate the creation of more powerful autoformalization techniques. Based on our findings, we believe our results can be further improved by increasing the number of generated samples, tuning the temperature, and enhancing the selection step. Additionally, while we applied our method to LLMs using a simple 12-shot prompt, employing stronger base strategies, such as prompt retrieval as suggested by Azerbayev et al. [2023a], could yield better results.

## References

- Z. Azerbayev, B. Piotrowski, H. Schoelkopf, E. W. Ayers, D. Radev, and J. Avigad. ProofNet: Autoformalizing and Formally Proving Undergraduate-Level Mathematics, Feb. 2023a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12433>. arXiv:2302.12433 [cs].
- 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, Nov. 2023b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10631>. arXiv:2310.10631 [cs].
- P. Castéran and Y. Bertot. *Interactive theorem proving and program development. Coq’Art: The Calculus of inductive constructions*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. Springer Verlag, 2004. URL <https://hal.science/hal-00344237>. Traduction en chinois parue en 2010. Tsinghua University Press. ISBN 9787302208136.
- M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, A. Ray, R. Puri, G. Krueger, M. Petrov, H. Khlaaf, G. Sastry, P. Mishkin, B. Chan, S. Gray, N. Ryder, M. Pavlov, A. Power, L. Kaiser, M. Bavarian, C. Winter, P. Tillet, F. P. Such, D. Cummings, M. Plappert, F. Chantzis, E. Barnes, A. Herbert-Voss, W. H. Guss, A. Nichol, A. Paine, N. Tezak, J. Tang, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, S. Jain, W. Saunders, C. Hesse, A. N. Carr, J. Leike, J. Achiam, V. Misra, E. Morikawa, A. Radford, M. Knight, M. Brundage, M. Murati, K. Mayer, P. Welinder, B. McGrew, D. Amodei, S. McCandlish, I. Sutskever, and W. Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- L. de Moura, S. Kong, J. Avigad, F. van Doorn, and J. von Raumer. The lean theorem prover (system description). In A. P. Felty and A. Middeldorp, editors, *Automated Deduction - CADE-25*, pages 378–388, Cham, 2015. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-319-21401-6.
- D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Kadavath, A. Arora, S. Basart, E. Tang, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt. Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset, Nov. 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>. arXiv:2103.03874 [cs].
- A. Hosseini, X. Yuan, N. Malkin, A. Courville, A. Sordoni, and R. Agarwal. V-STaR: Training Verifiers for Self-Taught Reasoners, Feb. 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06457>. arXiv:2402.06457 [cs].
- E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021.
- A. Q. Jiang, W. Li, and M. Jamnik. Multilingual Mathematical Autoformalization, Nov. 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03755>. arXiv:2311.03755 [cs].
- 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, 2023.
- A. Lewkowycz, A. J. Andreassen, D. Dohan, E. Dyer, H. Michalewski, V. V. Ramasesh, A. Slone, C. Anil, I. Schlag, T. Gutman-Solo, Y. Wu, B. Neyshabur, G. Gur-Ari, and V. Misra. Solving Quantitative Reasoning Problems with Language Models. In *NeurIPS*, Oct. 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=IFXTZERXdm7>.
- J. Li, Q. Zhang, Y. Yu, Q. Fu, and D. Ye. More agents is all you need, 2024.
- C. Liu, J. Shen, H. Xin, Z. Liu, Y. Yuan, H. Wang, W. Ju, C. Zheng, Y. Yin, L. Li, M. Zhang, and Q. Liu. FIMO: A Challenge Formal Dataset for Automated Theorem Proving, Dec. 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.04295>. arXiv:2309.04295 [cs].

- 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>.
- L. d. Moura and S. Ullrich. The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In A. Platzer and G. Sutcliffe, editors, *Automated Deduction – CADE 28*, pages 625–635, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-79876-5.
- T. Nipkow, L. C. Paulson, and M. Wenzel. *Isabelle/Hol a Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*. Springer, Berlin and New York, 2002.
- OpenAI, J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Al-tenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, R. Avila, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, V. Balcom, P. Baltescu, H. Bao, M. Bavarian, J. Belgum, I. Bello, J. Berdine, G. Bernadett-Shapiro, C. Berner, L. Bogdonoff, O. Boiko, M. Boyd, A.-L. Brakman, G. Brockman, T. Brooks, M. Brundage, K. Button, T. Cai, R. Campbell, A. Cann, B. Carey, C. Carlson, R. Carmichael, B. Chan, C. Chang, F. Chantzis, D. Chen, S. Chen, R. Chen, J. Chen, M. Chen, B. Chess, C. Cho, C. Chu, H. W. Chung, D. Cummings, J. Currier, Y. Dai, C. Decareaux, T. Degry, N. Deutsch, D. Deville, A. Dhar, D. Dohan, S. Dowling, S. Dunning, A. Ecoffet, A. Eleti, T. Eloundou, D. Farhi, L. Fedus, N. Felix, S. P. Fishman, J. Forte, I. Fulford, L. Gao, E. Georges, C. Gibson, V. Goel, T. Gogineni, G. Goh, R. Gontijo-Lopes, J. Gordon, M. Grafstein, S. Gray, R. Greene, J. Gross, S. S. Gu, Y. Guo, C. Hal-lacy, J. Han, J. Harris, Y. He, M. Heaton, J. Heidecke, C. Hesse, A. Hickey, W. Hickey, P. Hoeschele, B. Houghton, K. Hsu, S. Hu, X. Hu, J. Huizinga, S. Jain, S. Jain, J. Jang, A. Jiang, R. Jiang, H. Jin, D. Jin, S. Jomoto, B. Jonn, H. Jun, T. Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, A. Kamali, I. Kanitscheider, N. S. Keskar, T. Khan, L. Kilpatrick, J. W. Kim, C. Kim, Y. Kim, J. H. Kirchner, J. Kiros, M. Knight, D. Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, A. Kondrich, A. Konstantinidis, K. Kosic, G. Krueger, V. Kuo, M. Lampe, I. Lan, T. Lee, J. Leike, J. Leung, D. Levy, C. M. Li, R. Lim, M. Lin, S. Lin, M. Litwin, T. Lopez, R. Lowe, P. Lue, A. Makanju, K. Malfacini, S. Manning, T. Markov, Y. Markovski, B. Martin, K. Mayer, A. Mayne, B. McGrew, S. M. McKinney, C. McLeavey, P. McMillan, J. McNeil, D. Medina, A. Mehta, J. Menick, L. Metz, A. Mishchenko, P. Mishkin, V. Monaco, E. Morikawa, D. Mossing, T. Mu, M. Murati, O. Murk, D. Mély, A. Nair, R. Nakano, R. Nayak, A. Neelakantan, R. Ngo, H. Noh, L. Ouyang, C. O’Keefe, J. Pachocki, A. Paino, J. Palermo, A. Pantuliano, G. Parascandolo, J. Parish, E. Parparita, A. Passos, M. Pavlov, A. Peng, A. Perelman, F. de Avila Belbute Peres, M. Petrov, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, M. Pokrass, V. H. Pong, T. Powell, A. Power, B. Power, E. Proehl, R. Puri, A. Radford, J. Rae, A. Ramesh, C. Raymond, F. Real, K. Rimbach, C. Ross, B. Rotsted, H. Roussez, N. Ryder, M. Saltarelli, T. Sanders, S. Santurkar, G. Sastry, H. Schmidt, D. Schnurr, J. Schulman, D. Selsam, K. Sheppard, T. Sherbakov, J. Shieh, S. Shoker, P. Shyam, S. Sidor, E. Sigler, M. Simens, J. Sitkin, K. Slama, I. Sohl, B. Sokolowsky, Y. Song, N. Staudacher, F. P. Such, N. Summers, I. Sutskever, J. Tang, N. Tezak, M. B. Thompson, P. Tillet, A. Tootoonchian, E. Tseng, P. Tuggle, N. Turley, J. Tworek, J. F. C. Uribe, A. Vallone, A. Vijayvergiya, C. Voss, C. Wainwright, J. J. Wang, A. Wang, B. Wang, J. Ward, J. Wei, C. Weinmann, A. Welihinda, P. Welinder, J. Weng, L. Weng, M. Wiethoff, D. Will-ner, C. Winter, S. Wolrich, H. Wong, L. Workman, S. Wu, J. Wu, M. Wu, K. Xiao, T. Xu, S. Yoo, K. Yu, Q. Yuan, W. Zaremba, R. Zellers, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, S. Zhao, T. Zheng, J. Zhuang, W. Zhuk, and B. Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- S. Pathak. Gflean: An autoformalisation framework for lean via gf, 2024.
- B. Rozière, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, R. Sauvestre, T. Remez, J. Rapin, A. Kozhevnikov, I. Evtimov, J. Bitton, M. Bhatt, C. C. Ferrer, A. Grattafiori, W. Xiong, A. Défossez, J. Copet, F. Azhar, H. Touvron, L. Martin, N. Usunier, T. Scialom, and G. Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2024.
- X. Wang, J. Wei, D. Schuurmans, Q. Le, E. Chi, S. Narang, A. Chowdhery, and D. Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models, 2023.
- Y. Wu, A. Q. Jiang, W. Li, M. N. Rabe, C. Staats, M. Jamnik, and C. Szegedy. Autoformaliza-tion with Large Language Models, May 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12615>. arXiv:2205.12615 [cs].

- K. Zheng, J. M. Han, and S. Polu. MiniF2F: a cross-system benchmark for formal Olympiad-level mathematics, Feb. 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.00110>. arXiv:2109.00110 [cs] version: 2.
- Y. Zhu, S. Lu, L. Zheng, J. Guo, W. Zhang, J. Wang, and Y. Yu. Texus: A benchmarking platform for text generation models, 2018.

## A Appendix

### A.1 MMA fine-tuning

We used the Axolotl library version 0.4.0 (<https://github.com/OpenAccess-AI-Collective/axolotl>). The MMA dataset has been downloaded from <https://github.com/albertqjiang/MMA>. We found that training for more than 2 epochs generally hurt performance on the ProofNet benchmark. We report the best results we got across all checkpoints. The results reported in the paper have been produced using the checkpoints after the second epoch for the Llemma-7B model and after the first epoch for the Llama3-8B Instruct model. We used 1x RTX 4090 for a few hours to train these models.

### A.2 Detailed results

Selection method	Model	Validation		Test	
		Type-check	Accuracy	Type-check	Accuracy
<b>MMA fine-tune</b>					
Random			-	-	-
Majority	Llama3-8B	33.5	10.8	-	-
Self-BLEU			11.9	-	-
Random			-	-	-
Majority	Llemma-7B	61.1	13.0	-	-
Self-BLEU			14.0	-	-
<b>12-shot</b>					
Random			13.5		16.7
Majority	Llama3-8B	42.7	15.1	46.2	18.3
Self-BLEU			17.3		16.1
Random			18.9		25.8
Majority	Llemma-7B	84.9	27.6	88.7	28.5
Self-BLEU			27.6		36.6
Random			25.4		24.7
Majority	Llemma-34B	89.7	33.5	84.4	31.2
Self-BLEU			37.3		36.6
Random			45.4		51.1
Majority	GPT-4o	65.9	50.3	70.4	52.7
Self-BLEU			49.2		53.2

Table 2: Evaluation results (in percentage) of our method on ProofNet. For all these results, for each informal statement in the benchmark, we sampled 50 formalization attempts per model and filtered type-checking ones before applying a selection method. Given the poor results of our models fine-tuned on MMA, we decided to not pursue evaluations of these models on the test split. We observe some performance differences between the two splits which are caused by the small size of the ProofNet benchmark (2x 185 statements) and by human evaluation variance.

### A.3 Low-correction effort formalizations

In this section, we present several examples of autoformalizations on ProofNet validation split that are evaluated as incorrect yet fixable with low effort. Evaluation results on ProofNet test split are presented in Table 3.

Method	Model	Type-check	Accuracy
Greedy	Llama3-8B	14.0	9.1
Filter + Random	Llama3-8B	46.2	23.7
Filter + Majority	Llama3-8B	46.2	25.8
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llama3-8B	46.2	25.3
Greedy	Llemma-7B	30.6	16.7
Filter + Random	Llemma-7B	88.7	37.1
Filter + Majority	Llemma-7B	88.7	40.9
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-7B	88.7	48.9
Greedy	Llemma-34B	30.6	19.9
Filter + Random	Llemma-34B	84.4	35.5
Filter + Majority	Llemma-34B	84.4	40.3
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-34B	84.4	51.1
Greedy	GPT-4o	43.5	40.3
Filter + Random	GPT-4o	70.4	60.7
Filter + Majority	GPT-4o	70.4	60.2
Filter + Self-BLEU	GPT-4o	70.4	61.3

Table 3: Models performance (in percentage) on ProofNet test split when accounting for formalizations that can be corrected with a low amount of efforts.

### A.3.1 Rudin exercise\_1\_1a

**Informal statement:** If  $r$  is rational ( $r \neq 0$ ) and  $x$  is irrational, prove that  $r + x$  is irrational.

**Generated formalization:**

```
theorem exercise_1_1a (hr : r ≠ 0) (hi : Irrational x) : Irrational (r + x) :=
```

**Issue:**  $r$  has not been declared as a rational number.

### A.3.2 Herstein exercise\_4\_3\_25

**Informal statement:** Let  $R$  be the ring of  $2 \times 2$  matrices over the real numbers; suppose that  $I$  is an ideal of  $R$ . Show that  $I = (0)$  or  $I = R$ .

**Generated formalization:**

```
theorem exercise_4_3_25 {R : Type*} [CommRing R] (I : Ideal (Matrix (Fin 2) (Fin 2)
  ℝ)) : I = ⊥ ∨ I = ⊤ :=
```

**Issue:** Superfluous declaration of CommRing R.

### A.3.3 Munkres exercise\_29\_10

**Informal statement:** Show that if  $X$  is a Hausdorff space that is locally compact at the point  $x$ , then for each neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$ , there is a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $x$  such that  $\bar{V}$  is compact and  $\bar{V} \subset U$ .

**Generated formalization:**

```
theorem exercise_29_10 {X : Type*} [TopologicalSpace X] [T1Space X]
  [LocallyCompactSpace X] {x : X} {U : Set X} (hU : IsOpen U) (hxU : x ∈ U) : ∃
  (V : Set X), x ∈ V ∧ IsOpen V ∧ IsCompact (closure V) ∧ closure V ⊆ U :=
```

**Issue:** A Hausdorff space is a  $T_2$  space and not a  $T_1$  space. Additionally,  $X$  is assumed to be locally compact everywhere instead of at the point  $x$ .

#### A.4 Ablation study detailed results

Method	Model	Type-check	Accuracy
Greedy	Llama3-8B	14.6	7.6
No filter + Random	Llama3-8B	10.8	4.9
No filter + Majority	Llama3-8B	14.0	6.5
No filter + Self-BLEU	Llama3-8B	15.1	7.0
Filter + Random	Llama3-8B	42.7	13.5
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llama3-8B	42.7	17.3
Greedy	Llemma-7B	27.6	10.3
No filter + Random	Llemma-7B	26.5	6.5
No filter + Majority	Llemma-7B	25.9	10.8
No filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-7B	33.0	15.1
Filter + Random	Llemma-7B	88.7	18.9
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-7B	88.7	27.6
Greedy	Llemma-34B	34.0	17.8
No filter + Random	Llemma-34B	25.4	9.2
No filter + Majority	Llemma-34B	25.4	12.4
No filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-34B	33.5	16.8
Filter + Random	Llemma-34B	89.7	25.4
Filter + Self-BLEU	Llemma-34B	89.7	37.3
Greedy	GPT-4o	34.0	29.2
No filter + Random	GPT-4o	34.0	25.9
No filter + Majority	GPT-4o	36.2	30.8
No filter + Self-BLEU	GPT-4o	36.8	30.3
Filter + Random	GPT-4o	65.9	45.4
Filter + Self-BLEU	GPT-4o	65.9	49.2

Table 4: Models performance (in percentage) on ProofNet validation split removing different aspects of our method. We also report the Filter + Self+BLEU results as a reference.

#### A.5 Sampling scaling

Model	Type-check				Accuracy			
	n=1	n=5	n=20	n=50	n=1	n=5	n=20	n=50
Llama3-8B	10.8	23.2	33.5	42.7	4.9	8.1	11.3	17.3
Llemma-7B	26.5	50.8	71.3	84.9	6.5	13.0	25.9	27.6
Llemma-34B	25.4	55.7	78.9	89.7	9.2	16.8	33.5	37.3
GPT-4o	34.0	47.6	56.2	65.9	25.9	35.7	41.1	49.2

Table 5: Evaluation results (in percentage) of our method on ProofNet validation split for different numbers of formalizations sampled during the sampling phase of our method (represented by the number  $n$  in this table). We used a 12-shot prompt with the filter+Self-BLEU variant of our method and a temperature of 0.7.

#### A.6 12-shot examples

**Note:** We translated the 12-shot prompt from ProofNet to Lean 4, with as minimal changes as possible, for the accuracy comparison with previous results to be as fair as possible. In particular, we did not remove/change the statements leaked from the benchmark and did not correct potential formalization mistakes in this prompt.

Natural language version:

Let  $P$  be a  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ . Then  $P$  is contained in a Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem exists_le_sylow {Group G} {P : Subgroup G} (hP : IsPGroup p P) : ∃ Q :
  Sylow p G, P ≤ Q :=
```

Natural language version:

Let  $E$  and  $F$  be complex normed spaces and let  $f : E \rightarrow F$ . If  $f$  is differentiable and bounded, then  $f$  is constant. Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem exists_eq_const_of_bounded {E : Type u} [NormedAddCommGroup E] [NormedSpace
  ℂ E] {F : Type v} [NormedAddCommGroup F] [NormedSpace ℂ F] {f : E → F} (hf :
  Differentiable ℂ f)(hb : IsBounded (range f)) : ∃ c, f = const E c :=
```

Natural language version:

Let  $X$  be a topological space; let  $A$  be a subset of  $X$ . Suppose that for each  $x \in A$  there is an open set  $U$  containing  $x$  such that  $U \subset A$ . Then  $A$  is open in  $X$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem subset_of_open_subset_is_open (X : Type*) [TopologicalSpace X]
(A : Set X) (hA : ∀ x ∈ A, ∃ U : Set X, IsOpen U ∧ x ∈ U ∧ U ⊆ A) :
  IsOpen A :=
```

Natural language version:

Two multiplicative functions  $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow R$  are equal if and only if  $f(p^i) = f(g^i)$  for all primes  $p$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem eq_iff_eq_on_prime_powers [CommMonoidWithZero R] (f : ArithmeticFunction R)
(hf : f.IsMultiplicative) (g : ArithmeticFunction R) (hg : g.IsMultiplicative) :
f = g ↔ ∀ p i : ℕ, Nat.Prime p → f (p ^ i) = g (p ^ i) :=
```

Natural language version:

If  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are complex, then  $|z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_n| \leq |z_1| + |z_2| + \dots + |z_n|$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem abs_sum_leq_sum_abs (n : ℕ) (f : ℕ → ℂ) :
abs (∑ i in Finset.range n, f i) ≤ ∑ i in Finset.range n, abs (f i) :=
```

Natural language version:

If  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $|x + y|^2 + |x - y|^2 = 2|x|^2 + 2|y|^2$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```
theorem sum_add_square_sub_square_eq_sum_square (n : ℕ) (x y : EuclideanSpace ℝ
  (Fin n)) :
||x + y||^2 + ||x - y||^2 = 2*||x||^2 + 2*||y||^2 :=
```

Natural language version:

If  $x$  is an element of infinite order in  $G$ , prove that the elements  $x^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  are all distinct.

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:



```

theorem distinct_powers_of_infinite_order_element (G : Type*) [Group G] (x : G)
  (hx_inf : ∀ n : ℕ, x ^ n ≠ 1) :
  ∀ m n : ℤ, m ≠ n → x ^ m ≠ x ^ n :=

```

---

Natural language version:

A set of vectors  $\{v_i\}_{i \in I}$  orthogonal with respect to some bilinear form  $B : V \times V \rightarrow K$  is linearly independent if for all  $i \in I, B(v_i, v_i) \neq 0$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```

theorem linear_independent_of_is_Ortho {V K : Type*} [Field K]
  [AddCommGroup V] [Module K V] {n : Type*} {B : BilinForm K V}
  {v : n → V} (hv₁ : B.iIsOrtho v)
  (hv₂ : ∀ (i : n), ¬B.IsOrtho (v i) (v i)) :
  LinearIndependent K v :=

```

---

Natural language version:

Suppose that  $V$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector space. Then for some set of vectors  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^k$ , if  $k > n$  then there exist scalars  $f_1, \dots, f_k$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k f_i v_i = 0$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```

theorem exists_nontrivial_relation_sum_zero_of_dim_succ_lt_card {K V : Type*}
  [DivisionRing K] [AddCommGroup V] [Module K V] [FiniteDimensional K V]
  {t : Finset V} (h : FiniteDimensional.finrank K V + 1 < t.card) :
  ∃ (f : V → K), t.sum (λ (e : V) => f e · e) = 0 ∧ t.sum (λ (e : V) => f e) = 0
  ∧ ∃ (x : V) (H : x ∈ t), f x ≠ 0 :=

```

---

Natural language version:

A group is commutative if the quotient by the center is cyclic.

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```

theorem comm_group_of_cycle_center_quotient {G H : Type*} [Group G] [Group H]
  [IsCyclic H] (f : G →* H) (hf : f.ker ≤ (center G : Subgroup G)) :
  CommGroup G :=

```

---

Natural language version:

If  $H$  is a  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ , then the index of  $H$  inside its normalizer is congruent modulo  $p$  to the index of  $H$ .

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```

theorem card_quotient_normalizer_modEq_card_quotient {G : Type*} [Group G] [Fintype
  G] {p : ℕ} {n : ℕ} [hp : Fact p.Prime]
  {H : Subgroup G} (hH : Fintype.card H = p ^ n) :
  Fintype.card (normalizer H / Subgroup.comap ((normalizer H).subtype : normalizer H
  →* G) H) ≡
  Fintype.card (G / H) [MOD p] :=

```

---

Natural language version:

Suppose  $X, Y, Z$  are metric spaces, and  $Y$  is compact. Let  $f$  map  $X$  into  $Y$ , let  $g$  be a continuous one-to-one mapping of  $Y$  into  $Z$ , and put  $h(x) = g(f(x))$  for  $x \in X$ . Prove that  $f$  is uniformly continuous if  $h$  is uniformly continuous.

Translate the natural language version to a Lean 4 version:

```

theorem uniform_continuous_of_continuous_injective_uniform_continuous_comp
  {X Y Z : Type*} [MetricSpace X] [MetricSpace Y] [MetricSpace Z]
  (hY : CompactSpace Y) (f : X → Y) (g : Y → Z) (hgc : Continuous g)
  (hgi : Function.Injective g)
  (h : UniformContinuous (g ∘ f)) : UniformContinuous f :=

```

---

## A.7 Data contamination

Data contamination is a serious issue in today’s LLM benchmarks. In fact, large language models are trained on large-scale training data so, despite the filtering efforts, data leakage might happen. While data leakage from a Lean 4 port of the ProofNet benchmark is not possible, as discussed in section 7, there is still a possibility for a leak of the Lean 3 version. Such data leakage for the Llemma models family [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023b] seems unlikely, given that some researchers involved in the development of these models are also authors of ProofNet [Azerbaiyev et al., 2023a].

For our data contamination study, we use an unofficial Lean 4 port (<https://github.com/rahul3613/ProofNet-lean4>) of ProofNet benchmark made by an independent research team. This port shows minimal differences from the original Lean 3 ProofNet benchmark, preserving the order of hypotheses and terms. Upon analyzing the raw predictions of all models, we did not find any exact matches with the Lean 4 ground truths. This is primarily because the theorems in the benchmark follow an `exercise_number` naming scheme, which the models do not produce. Consequently, we employed fuzzy matching for our data contamination checks. This involved normalizing whitespaces and removing comments and theorem names. We found a maximum of 2.2% matches (4 statements out of 185/186) for each model independently on the validation split, including the 2 statements leaked by the prompt. Given that the space of correct formal statements is heavily constrained, this hit rate is quite reasonable. Below, we provide a list of all unique hits found across all models and experiments. Most of these hits are very short and almost unavoidable. Considering these results, it seems unlikely that significant data leakage occurred during the training of these models.

### A.7.1 List of all the hits found (using fuzzy matching) across all our experiments on the validation split:

**Munkresexercise\_29\_1:** Show that the rationals  $\mathbb{Q}$  are not locally compact.

```

theorem exercise_29_1 : ¬ LocallyCompactSpace ℚ :=

```

**Dummit-Footeexercise\_1\_1\_22a:** If  $x$  and  $g$  are elements of the group  $G$ , prove that  $|x| = |g^{-1}xg|$ .

```

theorem exercise_1_1_22a {G : Type*} [Group G] (x g : G) :
  orderOf x = orderOf (g⁻¹ * x * g) :=

```

**Hersteinexercise\_2\_1\_27:** If  $G$  is a finite group, prove that there is an integer  $m > 0$  such that  $a^m = e$  for all  $a \in G$ .

```

theorem exercise_2_1_27 {G : Type*} [Group G]
  [Fintype G] : ∃ (m : ℕ), ∀ (a : G), a ^ m = 1 :=

```

**Munkresexercise\_17\_4:** Show that if  $U$  is open in  $X$  and  $A$  is closed in  $X$ , then  $U - A$  is open in  $X$ , and  $A - U$  is closed in  $X$ .

```

theorem exercise_17_4 {X : Type*} [TopologicalSpace X]
  (U A : Set X) (hU : IsOpen U) (hA : IsClosed A) :
  IsOpen (U \ A) ∧ IsClosed (A \ U) :=

```

**Hersteinexercise\_5\_5\_2:** Prove that  $x^3 - 3x - 1$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

```

theorem exercise_5_5_2 : Irreducible (X^3 - 3*X - 1 : Polynomial ℚ) :=

```

**Munkresexercise\_32\_3:** Show that every locally compact Hausdorff space is regular.

```

theorem exercise_32_3 {X : Type*} [TopologicalSpace X]
  (hX : LocallyCompactSpace X) (hX' : T2Space X) :
  RegularSpace X :=

```

**Hersteinexercise\_4\_3\_25:** Let  $R$  be the ring of  $2 \times 2$  matrices over the real numbers; suppose that  $I$  is an ideal of  $R$ . Show that  $I = (0)$  or  $I = R$ .

```

theorem exercise_4_3_25 (I : Ideal (Matrix (Fin 2) (Fin 2) ℝ)) :
  I = ⊥ ∨ I = ⊤ :=

```

## A.7.2 Statements leaked by the ProofNet prompt:

### Munkresexercise\_13\_1

```

theorem subset_of_open_subset_is_open (X : Type*) [TopologicalSpace X]
  (A : Set X) (hA : ∀ x ∈ A, ∃ U : Set X, IsOpen U ∧ x ∈ U ∧ U ⊆ A):
  IsOpen A :=

```

### Dummit-Footeexercise\_1\_1\_34

```

theorem distinct_powers_of_infinite_order_element (G : Type*) [Group G] (x : G)
  (hx_inf : ∀ n : ℕ, x ^ n ≠ 1) :
  ∀ m n : ℤ, m ≠ n → x ^ m ≠ x ^ n :=

```