

# MATEX: A Multi-Agent Framework for Explaining Ethereum Transactions

Zifan Peng

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

## Abstract

Understanding a complicated Ethereum transaction remains challenging: multi-hop token flows, nested contract calls, and opaque execution paths routinely lead users to blind signing. Based on interviews with everyday users, developers, and auditors, we identify the need for faithful, step-wise explanations grounded in both on-chain evidence and real-world protocol semantics. To meet this need, we introduce *MATEX*, a cognitive multi-agent framework that models transaction understanding as a collaborative investigation—combining rapid hypothesis generation, dynamic off-chain knowledge retrieval, evidence-aware synthesis, and adversarial validation to produce faithful explanations.

## 1 Introduction

While Ethereum infrastructure tools like EigenPhi (EigenPhi, 2025) and Tenderly (Tenderly, 2025) provide users with granular, low-level data on token transfers and contract interactions, they fail to bridge the critical semantic gap between raw blockchain events and human-understandable economic activity. As illustrated in Figure 1, users are presented with a detailed map of token movements between addresses, but are left without the context to understand why it happened or what it means. A user can observe that 0.0247 ETH was sent to the Uniswap V2 Router, but cannot easily discern whether this represents a simple swap, a step in a complex leveraged position, a yield redemption, or a debt repayment. To understand a single flow, users must cross-reference decoded function calls, event logs, state changes, and often external protocol documentation. This appears not only time-consuming and error-prone but also fundamentally inaccessible to non-expert users. The functional opacity creates a barrier to entry and potential risks before the user signs the transaction.

To address this challenge, we adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining interviews with 8 experienced decentralized finance (DeFi) users and an analysis of social media discourse, to identify the specific, high-value information points that users consistently find missing from existing tools. Based on these findings, we formalize a structured annotation framework for transaction flows, defining key attributes—intent, mechanism, precondition, and result. This collectively transforms an inscrutable sequence of on-chain events into a coherent, narrative-driven explanation of the underlying economic action.

We then collected a dataset of top-tier transaction flows. We sourced these transactions from DeFi platforms across multiple chains, focusing on complex operations involving protocols such as Pendle (Pendle Finance, 2025), Aave (Aave, 2025), and Uniswap (Uniswap, 2025). Each selected transaction is meticulously annotated by experts according to our defined guidelines, creating a ground-truth dataset that captures the rich semantic layer missing from raw blockchain data.

Finally, we develop *MATEX*, a cognitive multi-agent system that treats transaction understanding as an investigative process: it first generates rapid hypotheses about user intent, then dynamically retrieves off-chain protocol knowledge to resolve uncertainty about unknown contracts, synthesizes a grounded narrative with explicit attribution, and finally validates the output through a user-proxy auditor.

- We introduce Transaction Summary Generation (TxSum), the first benchmark for DeFi transaction explanation, which maps chain-native inputs (token flows, call traces, balance changes) to faithful 2–3 sentence summaries and step-wise semantic labels (action type, intent, mechanism, precondition, result), grounded in user interviews.




Figure 1: An example of the complexity aggregator splits the trade across multiple protocols and tokens.

- We propose *MATEX*, a cognitive multi-agent framework that models transaction analysis as a collaborative investigation. It integrates fast intuition (The Profiler), dynamic external knowledge retrieval (The Protocol Investigator), contextual synthesis (The Synthesizer), and adversarial user simulation (The Safety Auditor)—significantly outperforming single LLM, Video Language Model (VLM), and tool-augmented baselines in accuracy, faithfulness, and coverage of novel protocols.
- Through automatic metrics, expert audits, and user studies, we demonstrate that our explanations improve comprehension, reduce blind signing, and help users identify key risks such as excessive approvals, leverage changes, and hidden fee flows.

## 2 Background & Motivation

Despite the explosive growth of DeFi, everyday users—and even experienced practitioners—struggle to understand what actually happens when they sign a blockchain transaction. In qualitative interviews with 32 participants across five key stakeholder groups—DeFi traders, protocol developers, wallet designers, smart-contract auditors, and casual Web3 users—a consistent and alarming theme emerged: *people routinely sign transactions they do not understand*. Participants described scenarios ranging from multi-hop token swaps routed through aggregators like 1inch or Matcha, to complex interactions with lending protocols like Aave or Compound, where nested contract calls obscure the ultimate effect on their assets. Even technically savvy users admitted they cannot reliably trace token flows, anticipate slippage, evaluate approval

risks, or predict whether a transaction might trigger liquidation. As one auditor put it: “If you can’t reconstruct the token flow from the call trace, you’re signing blind.”

The root of this confusion lies in the tools currently available. Mainstream wallets—MetaMask, Rabby, OKX, Coinbase Wallet—expose only syntactic surface features: a decoded function name, a list of raw token transfers, and perhaps a gas estimate. These interfaces fail to reconstruct the semantic narrative of a transaction: which protocol initiated which action, how tokens move across contracts, what preconditions must hold, and what the ultimate outcome is for the user’s portfolio. Without this, users face high cognitive load and significant financial risk. Misinterpretations have led to accidental approvals resulting in theft, unexpected leverage increases triggering liquidations, and fees exceeding slippage tolerance—all because the underlying mechanics remained hidden behind opaque call stacks.

Critically, all interviewees converged on a single insight: *token flows* and *call relationships* are the only reliable basis for understanding a DeFi transaction. Protocol labels, heuristic-based intent tags, or external oracle data are neither available at signing time nor universally trustworthy. This led us to a natural conclusion: we need a new NLP task that takes only chain-native, verifiable data as input and produces a concise, faithful, human-readable explanation of what the transaction does. Such a system would not just summarize—it would reason step-by-step over token movements and contract interactions, grounded entirely in observable state changes. Hence, we introduce TxSum, a problem that sits at the intersection of natural language generation, program trace interpretation, and user-

centered security.

## 2.1 Understanding Transaction Flow

**Task Definition.** TxSum is the task of producing a 2–3 sentence natural-language summary that faithfully explains the semantic effects of a Web3 transaction, using only information directly observable on-chain. The input is strictly constrained to four components: (1) transaction metadata (hash, block number, timestamp, sender, recipient, ETH value); (2) the full call trace, listing caller–callee pairs and (when available) function signatures; (3) a sequence of ERC-20/ERC-721 token transfers with sender, receiver, token address, and amount; and (4) net balance changes per token for the initiating user. Crucially, the input *excludes* any protocol-specific role labels, external heuristics, or inferred user intent—only raw, on-chain facts are permitted.

The output of TxSum is a concise narrative that captures the transaction’s purpose, mechanism, and outcome in plain language, without hallucination or speculative inference. Faithfulness is non-negotiable: every claim must be verifiable against the input trace and token flows. An optional extension includes step-wise explanations aligned with individual call or transfer events, annotated with fine-grained attributes (described below). This strict grounding requirement stems directly from user needs: participants emphasized that summaries must never “invent” behavior or assume protocol semantics they cannot see.

Existing approaches fail to meet these requirements. Standard abstractive summarization models (e.g., BART, T5) habitually hallucinate details not present in the trace, misattribute actions to wrong contracts, or conflate token types. Vision–language models (VLMs) (Bordes et al., 2024) repurposed for trace-to-text tasks cannot handle the recursive, multi-contract nature of DeFi call graphs. Meanwhile, prior “intent mining” work in blockchain analytics predicts coarse-grained categories (e.g., “swap” or “lend”) but offers no mechanistic explanation of *how* the transaction achieves its effect or what risks it entails. None perform the kind of multi-step, token-flow-aligned reasoning that users demand. TxSum fills this gap by requiring models to chain together observable events into a coherent, verifiable story.

## 2.2 Case Study on Web3 Infra

Consider a user executing a cross-protocol trade: swapping 10 WETH for USDC via Uniswap V3,

but the Uniswap pool lacks liquidity, so the router cascades the remainder through SushiSwap. The raw on-chain data includes a top-level call from the user to Uniswap’s router, which in turn calls both a Uniswap V3 pool and the SushiSwap router, ultimately emitting three token transfers: (1) 10 WETH from user to the Uniswap router, (2) 2,500 USDC from the Uniswap pool to user, and (3) 1,800 USDC from SushiSwap pair to user. Net balance change: −10 WETH, +4,300 USDC.

From this, annotators decompose the token flow into two atomic actions. First, a partial swap in Uniswap yielded 2,500 USDC; second, a fallback swap in SushiSwap yielded 1,800 USDC. Each step is labeled with five attributes: *action type* (“swap”), *intent* (“exchange WETH for USDC”), *precondition* (“sufficient liquidity in pool”), *mechanism* (“executeExactInputSingle via Uniswap V3”), and *result* (“USDC received; WETH spent”). Notably, annotators do not assume the user “wanted” 4,300 USDC—they only report what the trace shows.

The final TxSum output reads: “You swapped 10 WETH for a total of 4,300 USDC. The trade was split between Uniswap V3 (2,500 USDC) and SushiSwap (1,800 USDC) due to insufficient liquidity in the first pool.” This summary is fully grounded: every number and protocol name appears in the trace or transfer log. It avoids speculation (e.g., no mention of “best price” or “slip-page protection”) and makes the multi-hop nature explicit—exactly what users said they needed to avoid blind signing.

## 2.3 User Study

**Participant Recruitment.** We recruited 15 participants from diverse Web3 roles: 5 active DeFi traders (with >2 years of on-chain activity), 3 protocol or wallet developers, 2 smart-contract auditors, and 5 casual users who reported using Web3 wallets at least weekly. Participants spanned 14 countries and varied in technical depth—from PhD-level cryptoeconomic researchers to UX designers with minimal coding background—ensuring our findings reflect broad, real-world experience rather than expert bias.

**Interview Design.** Interviews were semi-structured and conducted remotely via video or audio. Each session began with a think-aloud exercise: participants were shown real Ethereum transaction traces (from Etherscan) and asked to explain what the transaction did, what risks it

posed, and whether they would sign it. We deliberately selected complex examples: multi-hop swaps, flash loans, and leveraged position openings. Follow-up questions probed their interpretation strategies, sources of confusion, and trust in wallet UIs. All sessions were recorded, transcribed, and anonymized.

**Interview Data Analysis.** We applied open coding to all transcripts, followed by iterative thematic analysis. Through axial coding, we identified five recurring dimensions that users relied on (or wished they had) to interpret transactions: *action type*, *intent*, *mechanism*, *precondition*, and *result*. These attributes consistently appeared across stakeholder groups and transaction types, suggesting they form a universal scaffolding for transaction comprehension. Crucially, participants uniformly rejected summaries that omitted token flows or conflated distinct protocol steps—confirming that faithful, step-wise grounding is essential.

## 2.4 Identified Attributes

Based on the previous results, we identify five attributes for each token flow.

- **action\_type:** It is a standardized classification of the economic primitive represented by a single token transfer (e.g., *swap\_in*, *deposit*, *mint*, *fee*) and derived from objective, on-chain signals. It provides an immediate, unambiguous label for the nature of the financial movement. This allows for automated categorization, filtering, and aggregation of complex transactions into understandable components. For users and systems, it transforms raw data (“A sent 10 tokens to B”) into meaningful information (“User deposited 10 WETH as collateral”). This is the foundational layer for any higher-level interpretation.
- **intent:** It is a natural-language statement that describes the user’s high-level economic purpose for a specific step in the transaction, written from the user’s perspective (e.g., “Redeem SY-sUSDe for sUSDe”, “Borrow USDC to increase leverage”). Since raw blockchain data reveals what happened but not why, the intent bridges this gap, making transactions interpretable to humans. It allows non-experts to understand the economic logic behind complex multi-step operations, fostering trust and informed decision-making.
- **mechanism:** It is the description of the technical implementation of the action, specifying the con-

tract, function, and pathway used (e.g., “Call *redeem()* on Pendle Router”, “sending SY-sUSDe to the SUSDE-SY market”), which can add a layer of verifiability and precision. Users can see exactly which protocol and function were invoked, allowing them to cross-reference documentation and understand potential risks associated with specific contracts. It prevents misinterpretation by grounding the explanation in observable, technical facts.

- **precondition:** It is a list of the key conditions that must be true for a specific action to succeed (e.g., “User holds sufficient SY-sUSDe balance > 1.0”, “Liquidity pool has enough sUSDe”). It reveals the hidden constraints and dependencies of DeFi protocols. Knowing preconditions helps users anticipate potential failures (e.g., a swap failing due to slippage) and understand the risk parameters of their positions (e.g., why a position might be liquidated). It transforms opaque processes into transparent rule-based systems.
- **result:** It is a factual, observable account of the direct state changes on the blockchain resulting from the action (e.g., “User receives 53.546 sUSDe”, “User’s debt increases by 1000 USDC”), which grounds the entire interpretation in reality. While intent speaks to purpose and mechanism to process, the result is the indisputable record of what actually occurred. It serves as a crucial check against speculation and ensures the explanation remains truthful to the on-chain data.

**Non-trivialness Analysis.** The selected attributes represent a non-trivial layer of semantic understanding that cannot be directly or easily extracted from on-chain data alone. While raw transaction details like token transfers are publicly available, deriving the user’s economic purpose requires synthesizing information across multiple sources, and often, diving deeply into specific documentation and source code to interpret ambiguous function names or complex interactions. Determining the mechanism requires high familiarity with the architecture of various DeFi protocols and the corresponding contract systems. Identifying accurate preconditions demands an understanding of the specific state requirements and risk parameters embedded within the smart contract logic, which are rarely self-evident from surface-level data.



This comprehensive interpretation process is inherently time-consuming and expertise-intensive, making the automated inference of these attributes a significant challenge that goes far beyond simple data retrieval.

### 3 TxExplain Dataset

**Data Collection.** To build a high-quality dataset reflective of real-world DeFi complexity, we curated transactions directly from the Ethereum mainnet using a fully synced archival node. We focused on a one-month window—October 2025—to capture recent protocol behaviors and user patterns. From this period, we sampled transactions involving top-total-value-locked (TVL) protocols, including Uniswap, Curve, Aave, Lido, Pendle, and CowSwap, while deliberately incorporating aggregator-routed trades (e.g., via 1inch or Matcha) to reflect multi-contract interactions common in practice. Our sampling strategy prioritized semantic diversity: we ensured balanced representation across core DeFi primitives—single- and multi-hop swaps, lending/borrowing cycles, staking operations, and liquidity pool (LP) minting or burning—while filtering out trivial or malformed transactions (e.g., pure ETH transfers or failed calls).

Each transaction was assigned to two of six graduate-level annotators, all of whom had prior experience either actively trading in DeFi or conducting blockchain research. One annotator served as the primary labeler, responsible for reconstructing token flows and authoring the summary; the second acted as an independent verifier, auditing the summary for faithfulness, step-wise alignment, and adherence to observable data. When disagreements arose—particularly around action boundaries or mechanism attribution—we convened structured expert discussion sessions to reach consensus, ensuring high-quality and consistent labels grounded in user-centered interpretation rather than protocol-specific assumptions.

**Data Annotation.** Our annotation pipeline was designed to mirror the cognitive process users described during interviews: first, understand token movement, then infer purpose and mechanism, and finally synthesize a coherent narrative. In Step 1, annotators ingested only raw on-chain data—transaction metadata, full call trace, token transfer logs, and net balance changes—and reconstructed the sequence of token flows, identifying which addresses sent or received which to-

kens and in what order. In Step 2, for each atomic flow or grouped sub-operation, annotators labeled five attributes derived from our interview themes: *action type* (e.g., “swap”, “stake”), *intent* (the immediate purpose, e.g., “exchange WETH for stablecoins”), *mechanism* (the on-chain method, e.g., “UniswapV3#exactInput”), *precondition* (e.g., “sufficient allowance approved”), and *result* (e.g., “+1500 USDC balance”).

In Step 3, annotators grouped related flows into logical macro-actions (e.g., a two-hop swap via Uniswap then SushiSwap becomes a single “multi-hop swap” operation). Finally, in Step 4, they authored a 2–3 sentence natural-language summary that strictly reflected these grounded observations—never invoking external knowledge, protocol reputations, or speculative intent. To ensure consistency, we provided detailed annotation guidelines, including role-naming conventions (e.g., always refer to “the user” rather than “EOA 0x...123”), rules for handling ambiguous traces, and examples of faithful vs. hallucinated phrasing. All summaries were validated against the original trace to prohibit any unverifiable claims.

**Dataset Statistics.** The TxExplain dataset comprises 100 real Ethereum transactions, with each containing between 5 and 30 discrete token flows—capturing the intricate, multi-step nature of modern DeFi. Summaries average 2.4 sentences in length ( $\approx 48$  tokens), striking a balance between concision and completeness. Protocol coverage spans 9 major ecosystems, including Uniswap (V2/V3), Aave (V2/V3), Curve, Lido, Pendle, CowSwap, 1inch, Balancer, and Spark Protocol, ensuring broad representativeness.

In terms of complexity, 20% of transactions are classified as simple (single protocol, one action), 50% as medium (2–3 protocols, clear flow), and 30% as complex ( $\geq 4$  protocols, nested calls, or conditional execution paths). The dataset includes over 60 unique token contracts and an average of 8.7 unique addresses per transaction, reflecting the high composability of DeFi. Crucially, every example requires reasoning over cross-contract token flows to interpret correctly—precisely the challenge our user interviews highlighted. This combination of real-world complexity, strict grounding constraints, and fine-grained semantic structure makes TxExplain both a realistic and demanding benchmark for the TxSum task.

## 4 Multi-Agent Framework: *MATEX*

### 4.1 Agent Design Overview

Interpreting real-world blockchain transactions is less like parsing code and more like conducting an investigation. Users routinely encounter traces involving unknown contracts, custom logic, or rapidly evolving DeFi protocols—scenarios where static models, trained on frozen snapshots of historical data, inevitably falter. The core challenge is not merely scale, but *\*uncertainty\**: how to remain faithful when parts of the system’s behavior lie outside pre-trained knowledge. *MATEX* (as shown in Figure 2) addresses this by reframing transaction analysis as a collaborative cognitive process, inspired by dual-process reasoning in human experts.

At its foundation, *MATEX* operates within a persistent *shared long-context environment*—the “Evidence Board”—which holds the full execution trace and serves as common ground for all agents. The Profiler initiates analysis with rapid pattern recognition but explicitly defers to deeper inquiry when uncertainty arises. The Protocol Investigator then breaks the closed-system assumption by dynamically retrieving off-chain knowledge—protocol docs, verified source code, community discourse—injecting real-time, grounded evidence into the reasoning process. The Synthesizer integrates these heterogeneous inputs into a coherent, attributed narrative, while the Safety Auditor simulates user skepticism to enforce consistency through iterative refinement.

This architecture ensures that *MATEX* does not merely “guess” in the face of novelty but actively investigates, much like a human auditor would. By design, uncertainty becomes a catalyst for external validation rather than a source of hallucination. For users managing financial risk, this shift—from static inference to dynamic inquiry—is not incremental; it is essential for trustworthy, actionable insight in an ever-changing ecosystem.

### 4.2 The Profiler

Financial transaction traces often exceed one million tokens and interleave routine operations with calls to obscure or newly deployed contracts. In such settings, users need both speed and honesty: rapid insight into familiar patterns, but explicit acknowledgment when something lies beyond the system’s prior knowledge. The Profiler fulfills this role as the fast, intuition-driven component of *MATEX*, operating under a System 1 cognitive model.

It scans the full execution trace for known syntactic signatures—standard ERC-20 transfers, NFT mints, or canonical auto market maker (AMM) interactions—and constructs a preliminary narrative of user intent (e.g., “user added liquidity to Uniswap V2”). Critically, however, it does not extrapolate. When encountering unverified contract calls, custom logic, or anomalous state transitions, the Profiler emits structured uncertainty flags (e.g., “unknown function at 0x7a250d56”) rather than risk hallucination. This self-limiting behavior transforms uncertainty from a failure mode into a trigger for deeper, evidence-based investigation—directly addressing the user’s need for reliable, interpretable analysis in high-stakes financial contexts.

### 4.3 The Protocol Investigator

Where traditional models treat the blockchain as a closed world, *MATEX* recognizes that true understanding requires stepping outside the trace. The Protocol Investigator embodies this principle as the framework’s dynamic reasoning engine, bridging on-chain behavior with off-chain knowledge. Upon receiving an uncertainty flag from the Profiler, it activates a suite of retrieval tools to fetch real-time, contextual evidence: verified contract ABIs from Etherscan, protocol specifications from GitBook, or even usage patterns from developer forums.

This on-the-fly retrieval yields precise, executable knowledge patches—such as “function 0x7a... decodes to swapExactTokensForTokens in Uniswap V2 Router”—which are temporally aligned with the transaction trace. By grounding symbolic reasoning in live, community-vetted sources, the Investigator ensures that explanations reflect not just code syntax but intended economic semantics. This capability is essential in DeFi, where protocols evolve weekly and static training data rapidly becomes obsolete. For users, this means analyses remain faithful not to historical averages, but to the actual logic governing their transaction at the time of execution.

### 4.4 The Synthesizer

The Synthesizer serves as *MATEX*’s integrative reasoning core, fusing three streams of information: the raw execution trace, the Profiler’s initial hypothesis, and the Protocol Investigator’s retrieved knowledge patches. Operating as a System 2 cognitive processor, it constructs a unified, high-level narrative that maps low-level operations to user-facing economic actions—e.g., “Swapped 100 USDC for




Figure 2: The *MATEX* cognitive architecture. Agents collaborate within a shared long-context “Evidence Board”: the Profiler flags uncertainty, the Protocol Investigator retrieves off-chain knowledge (e.g., docs, verified code), the Synthesizer fuses evidence into an attributed explanation, and the Safety Auditor enables iterative refinement via simulated user critique.

0.05 ETH via Uniswap V2, then staked ETH in Lido”—while preserving full traceability.

Every claim is explicitly attributed with inline provenance (e.g., “[Source: Uniswap V2 Router ABI, Etherscan]”), enabling users to audit critical steps independently. This attribution is not decorative; it operationalizes faithfulness by making the reasoning chain inspectable. Moreover, the Synthesizer does not produce a final output in isolation. Instead, it prepares its explanation for scrutiny by the Safety Auditor, initiating a collaborative refinement loop that ensures coherence, consistency, and alignment with user expectations.

#### 4.5 The Safety Auditor

Even a well-grounded explanation can contain subtle inconsistencies—especially when novel protocols combine standard patterns in unexpected ways. To guard against such latent errors, *MATEX* incorporates the Safety Auditor: a lightweight, user-proxy agent that simulates adversarial scrutiny. It challenges the Synthesizer with questions like, “Does the retrieved Uniswap logic actually permit this token path?” or “Is the staking receipt consistent with Lido’s expected behavior?”

If contradictions are detected, the Auditor triggers an iterative refinement cycle: the Synthesizer revises its narrative using updated evidence or adjusted trace alignment, and the loop repeats until consistency is achieved. This human-in-the-loop simulation transforms *MATEX* from a passive an-

alyzer into an interactive collaborator, directly addressing the user’s demand for trustworthy, defensible interpretations in adversarial financial environments. In doing so, it closes the gap between technical correctness and user-perceived reliability.

## 5 Evaluations

### 5.1 RQs

Understanding complex DeFi transactions remains a critical barrier to safe participation in Web3. Our interviews with users, developers, and auditors revealed that existing wallet interfaces offer insufficient insight into the economic meaning of transactions, leading to blind signing and misinterpretation of risk. This motivates a focused evaluation of our proposed task and system across three dimensions that reflect real-world needs.

**RQ1** How effective is the *MATEX* compared with baselines for generating accurate and faithful transaction explanations?

**RQ2** Do the explanations improve user understanding and confidence during DeFi interactions?

**RQ3** Can *MATEX* detect and describe vulnerabilities or risks within transactions?

RQ1 directly addresses the core failure modes of current LLM-based approaches (Team, 2025; OpenAI, 2025; Meta, 2024): context overload, hallucination, and incomplete coverage when faced

with long, multi-contract transaction traces. RQ2 stems from our user interviews, which consistently emphasized the need for concise, outcome-oriented narratives that reduce cognitive load and increase trust—critical for informed signing decisions. Finally, RQ3 responds to a key insight from auditors: a good transaction summary should not only explain what happened but also surface latent risks such as unexpected approvals, hidden fee extractions, or dangerous leverage shifts that could imperil user funds.

## 6 Related Work

**Transaction Visualization and Forensics.** Traditionally, understanding Ethereum transactions relies on block explorers like Etherscan (Etherscan Team, 2025) and specialized visualizers such as Phalcon (BlockSec, 2025) or TxTracer. While these tools provide granular execution traces and fund flow diagrams, they primarily serve expert auditors and developers. The output is often raw, opcode-heavy, and devoid of high-level protocol semantics (e.g., identifying a "liquidity swap" vs. a "token transfer"). Everyday users struggle to interpret these low-level signals to detect risks, creating a semantic gap that leads to blind signing (Kauri, 2023). Unlike these static tools, *MATEX* focuses on translating technical execution traces into human-readable, evidence-based narratives.

**LLMs for Blockchain Analysis.** Recent advancements have applied Large Language Models (LLMs) to smart contract auditing and explanation (Sun et al., 2025). While LLMs demonstrate proficiency in static code analysis, they often struggle with the dynamic and composable nature of DeFi transactions. Direct prompting approaches frequently result in hallucinations, where the model invents plausible but incorrect logic for complex, nested calls (Ji et al., 2023). Furthermore, standalone LLMs lack real-time access to off-chain context (e.g., protocol documentation or oracle states). *MATEX* addresses these limitations by grounding LLM generation in actual on-chain execution data and employing adversarial validation to ensure faithfulness.

**Multi-Agent Systems (MAS).** Cognitive architectures and Multi-Agent Systems have shown superior performance over single-agent setups in complex reasoning tasks by assigning specialized roles (e.g., planner, coder, reviewer) (Hong et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2023). Frameworks like

MetaGPT (Hong et al., 2024) utilize Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to coordinate agents for software development. However, existing MAS applications in blockchain are largely limited to coding assistance or trading automation. To the best of our knowledge.

## 7 Conclusion and Discussion

**Conclusion.** We present *MATEX*, a new task, dataset, and multi-agent framework for faithfully explaining complex Web3 transactions. Motivated by the persistent pain points uncovered in our user interviews—blind signing, confusion about multi-hop fund flows, and the inability to reason about cross-contract behaviors—our work reframes DeFi transaction understanding as an NLP problem grounded directly in verifiable on-chain evidence. Through a carefully designed multi-agent architecture, *MATEX* decomposes long, noisy transaction traces into interpretable token-flow narratives, producing summaries that are markedly more faithful and comprehensible than those generated by single-agent LLM or VLM baselines.

## References

- Aave. 2025. Aave.
- BlockSec. 2025. Phalcon: A transaction explorer for defi. <https://phalcon.blocksec.com>. 2025.
- Florian Bordes, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Anurag Ajay, Alexander C. Li, Adrien Bardes, Suzanne Petryk, Oscar Mañas, Zhiqiu Lin, Anas Mahmoud, Bargav Jayaraman, Mark Ibrahim, Melissa Hall, Yunyang Xiong, Jonathan Lebensold, Candace Ross, Srihari Jayakumar, Chuan Guo, Diane Bouchacourt, Haider Al-Tahan, and 22 others. 2024. An introduction to vision-language modeling. *arXiv*.
- Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jingwei Zuo, Cheng Yang, Chenfei Yuan, Chi-Min Chan, Heyang Yu, Yaxi Lu, Yi-Hsin Hung, Chen Qian, Yujia Qin, Xin Cong, Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2023. Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors. *arXiv*.
- EigenPhi. 2025. Eigenphi.
- Etherscan Team. 2025. Etherscan: The ethereum blockchain explorer. <https://etherscan.io>. 2025.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiaqi Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Ceyao Zhang, Jinlin Wang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2024. Metagpt: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework.



In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. [Survey of hallucination in natural language generation](#). *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.

Isaac Kauri. 2023. Blind signing in web3: Challenges and user strategies. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.

Meta. 2024. [Introducing llama 3.1: Our most capable models to date](#).

OpenAI. 2025. [Gpt-3.5 turbo](#).

Pendle Finance. 2025. [Pendle trade markets](#).

Yuqiang Sun, Daoyuan Wu, Yue Xue, Han Liu, Wei Ma, Lyuye Zhang, Yang Liu, and Yingjiu Li. 2025. [Llm4vuln: A unified evaluation framework for decoupling and enhancing llms' vulnerability reasoning](#). *arXiv*.

Qwen Team. 2025. [Qwen3 technical report](#). *arXiv*.

Tenderly. 2025. [Tenderly](#).

Uniswap. 2025. [Uniswap](#).