

MIRROR: A Multi-Agent Framework with Iterative Adaptive Revision and Hierarchical Retrieval for Optimization Modeling in Operations Research

Yifan Shi^{*1} Jialong Shi^{*1} Jiayi Wang¹ Ye Fan² Jianyong Sun^{†1}

Abstract

Operations Research (OR) relies on expert-driven modeling—a slow and fragile process ill-suited to novel scenarios. While large language models (LLMs) can automatically translate natural language into optimization models, existing approaches either rely on costly post-training or employ multi-agent frameworks, yet most still lack reliable collaborative error correction and task-specific retrieval, often leading to incorrect outputs. We propose MIRROR, a fine-tuning-free, end-to-end multi-agent framework that directly translates natural language optimization problems into mathematical models and solver code. MIRROR integrates two core mechanisms: (1) execution-driven iterative adaptive revision for automatic error correction, and (2) hierarchical retrieval to fetch relevant modeling and coding exemplars from a carefully curated exemplar library. Experiments show that MIRROR outperforms existing methods on standard OR benchmarks, with notable results on complex industrial datasets such as IndustryOR and Mamo-ComplexLP. By combining precise external knowledge infusion with systematic error correction, MIRROR provides non-expert users with an efficient and reliable OR modeling solution, overcoming the fundamental limitations of general-purpose LLMs in expert optimization tasks.

1. Introduction

Operations Research (OR) serves as a foundational methodology for solving complex decision-making problems and plays an indispensable role in domains such as manufactur-

ing, logistics, supply chain management, energy scheduling, and public services (Cannas et al., 2024). By formulating mathematical optimization models and leveraging high-performance solvers such as Gurobi (Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2024), COPT (Ge et al., 2024). OR significantly improves resource utilization efficiency, reduces operational costs, and enables enterprises to maximize economic returns. Despite its well-established value, the practical adoption of OR faces a fundamental bottleneck: real-world problems are typically expressed in unstructured natural language, while translating them into rigorous mathematical models and executable code requires deep domain expertise and programming proficiency, making the process time-consuming, labor-intensive, and poorly scalable. This high knowledge barrier limits OR’s accessibility for small- and medium-sized enterprises and non-technical users, and further complicates adaptation to dynamic changes in operational environments—such as demand shifts or updated constraints—that necessitate frequent, expert-driven model revisions.

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in natural language understanding, mathematical reasoning, symbolic manipulation, and code generation—often approaching or even surpassing human expert performance. Current mainstream LLMs can be broadly categorized into two paradigms: general models and reasoning models. General models, including GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2024a), DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), and Qwen-3 (Yang et al., 2025a), excel in semantic comprehension and broad knowledge coverage through extensive pre-training on textual corpora, enabling accurate interpretation of complex problem descriptions and the generation of preliminary modeling insights. Meanwhile, reasoning model architectures such as GPT-o1 (OpenAI et al., 2024b) and DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025) explicitly enhance systematic thinking, multi-step reasoning chains, and self-correction mechanisms, thereby achieving superior performance in structured tasks such as mathematical derivation, constraint formalization, and code synthesis.

Motivated by recent advances in large language models (LLMs), researchers have explored various approaches to

¹Xi’an Jiaotong University, Xi’an, Shaanxi, China

²Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi’an, Shaanxi, China.
Correspondence to: Jianyong Sun <jy.sun@xjtu.edu.cn

*Equal contribution. †Corresponding author.>.

automatically translate unstructured natural language problem statements into solvable mathematical optimization models, aiming to democratize operations research for non-experts. Recent efforts such as LLMOPT (Jiang et al., 2025), ORLM (Huang et al., 2025a), and MiniOpt (Anonymous, 2026a) train specialized models via supervised fine-tuning or reinforcement learning on synthetic datasets; however, they face two fundamental challenges: high-quality annotated data is scarce and expensive to construct, and the outputs inherently lack natural verifiability, making evaluation and debugging difficult—particularly for smaller-scale models. To circumvent these limitations, a growing line of work has shifted toward multi-agent frameworks that coordinate multiple LLM agents to collaboratively construct optimization models without any additional training. Systems like Chain-of-Experts (Xiao et al., 2023), OptiMUS (Ahmaditeshnizi et al., 2024), and ORMind (Wang et al., 2025) decompose complex modeling tasks into specialized roles and enable iterative interaction among agents, offering a flexible and practical alternative. Nevertheless, existing multi-agent frameworks are still constrained by closed architectures that lack extensibility; their external knowledge is often generated by the large models themselves, introducing hallucinations, biases, or misalignments with task requirements, which yields low-quality and poorly relevant contextual support. More critically, most of these frameworks lack reliable correction mechanisms, making it difficult to detect and rectify errors after code execution, thereby creating hidden risks of solution failure and diminished system credibility.

To address these limitations, we propose MIRROR, a Multi-Agent framework with **Iterative Revision** and **Hierarchical Retrieval** for optimization modeling in **Operation Research**, with the following key contributions. (Appendix A presents a visual comparison of existing methods and MIRROR.)

- **We propose MIRROR, an end-to-end multi-agent framework.** This framework requires no fine-tuning and automatically transforms natural language descriptions of optimization problems into executable solver code. Its dual-memory architecture consists of local memory and shared global memory: the former records the outputs required by the revision-stage agents to ensure intra-task consistency, while the latter enables cross-task knowledge transfer.
- **We design an Iterative Adaptive Revision (IAR) mechanism.** Whenever solver code execution fails, the mathematical modeling and code generation agents switch to their respective revision experts, diagnose errors in either the model or the solver code, and generate structured revision tips. The system then iteratively refines both the model and solver code without human intervention until a correct solution is obtained or a preset limit reached. Unlike existing methods, our

approach stores the historical model, code, and associated revision tips in a local memory pool to provide contextual history for subsequent corrective iterations.

- **We propose a Hierarchical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (HRAG) mechanism.** It based on an exemplar library constructed via an automated synthesis and labeling pipeline. The mechanism employs a two-stage retrieval strategy—first coarse-grained filtering by overall problem semantics and metadata, then fine-grained reranking based on subproblem types and deep semantic similarity—to provide highly relevant exemplar contexts for modeling and code generation, significantly improving model rationality and solver code correctness.

MIRROR achieves state-of-the-art performance among current multi-agent approaches on multiple operations research benchmarks. It notably outperforms existing methods on challenging datasets such as IndustryOR and Mamo-ComplexLP. The framework also demonstrates effectiveness with small open-source language models, enhancing their optimization modeling capabilities without any task-specific training.

2. Related Work

LLMs for Math and Code Generation In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable advances in mathematical reasoning and code generation. On the mathematical side, specialized models such as Qwen2.5-Math (Yang et al., 2024) and DeepSeek-Prover (Ren et al., 2025) have enhanced formalized inference, while systems like AlphaEvolve (Novikov et al., 2025) and MM-Agent (Liu et al., 2025) further integrate LLMs into end-to-end mathematical problem-solving pipelines. In code generation, frameworks including CodeAct (Wang et al., 2024), KareCoder (Huang et al., 2024), SWE-bench (Jimenez et al., 2024), and Web-bench (Xu et al., 2025) demonstrate the potential of LLMs for autonomous programming and debugging. Building on these developments, the present study focuses on the intersection of mathematical modeling and programming—automated optimization modeling—and categorizes existing solutions into two paradigms: Learning-based LLM Optimization Modeling and Agent-based LLM Optimization Modeling.

Learning-based LLM Optimization Modeling Recent learning-driven studies enhance LLM-based optimization modeling via data synthesis, targeted fine-tuning, and reinforcement learning to address domain adaptation and data scarcity in operations research. On the data synthesis front, ORLM (Huang et al., 2025a) introduces the semi-automated OR-Instruct framework. Moreover, OptMATH (Lu et al.,

2025), Step-Opt (Wu et al., 2025), and ReSocratic (Yang et al., 2025b) generate high-quality modeling data through automated validation processes. On the learning mechanism side, LLMOPT (Jiang et al., 2025), MiniOpt (Anonymous, 2026a), and SIRL (Chen et al., 2025) reduce modeling hallucinations and improve generalization by integrating structured representations and verifiable learning mechanisms such as external solver feedback. OR-R1 (Ding et al., 2025) achieves similar effects via verifiable learning mechanisms, particularly test-time reinforcement learning. Additionally, CALM (Tang et al., 2025) and StepORLM (Zhou et al., 2025) refine reasoning trajectories through corrective adaptation and process supervision, further augmenting the reasoning capabilities of LLMs for complex optimization tasks.

Agent-based LLM Optimization Modeling To overcome the inherent limitations of fixed decomposition strategies, multi-agent frameworks enhance modeling performance through specialized role allocation and collaborative mechanisms. Chain-of-Experts (Xiao et al., 2023) introduces a Conductor to orchestrate domain experts, whereas OptiMUS (Ahmaditeshnizi et al., 2024) utilizes a modular structure to decouple formulation, coding and evaluation modules, effectively handling long-text descriptions and complex data. At the execution level, OptimAI (Anonymous, 2026b) incorporates a Planner and a Code Critic to enable strategic reflection, while OR-LLM-Agent (Zhang & Luo, 2025) leverages the capabilities of reasoning LLMs to decompose the task into three sub-tasks: modeling, code generation and debugging. Furthermore, to enhance reliability, ORMind (Wang et al., 2025) draws on cognitive dual-process theory to implement counterfactual reasoning for error detection, while LEAN-LLM-OPT (Liang et al., 2026) employs a lightweight few-shot approach to reduce computational overhead without compromising modeling effectiveness.

Summary and Gaps Despite recent progress, existing methods face two main limitations. First, learning-based models rely on annotated datasets that are scarce and expensive to create. Their “black-box” nature also makes it difficult to diagnose errors or adapt to new constraints without costly re-training. Second, most current multi-agent frameworks often hallucinate due to a lack of external domain knowledge. Moreover, they typically struggle to effectively use solver feedback for error correction, leading to repeated execution failures. To bridge these gaps, we propose MIRROR, which integrates external knowledge retrieval with execution-based iterative revision.

3. Methodology

The overall architecture of MIRROR is depicted in Figure 1. MIRROR is a LLMs—based multi-agent collaborative

framework designed for end-to-end automated modeling—from natural language problem descriptions to formal mathematical models and executable solver code. The system operates within a four-phase closed-loop paradigm: analysis, modeling, implementation, and revision, ensuring correctness and robustness through IAR and HRAG mechanisms (see Section 3.2 for details).

The entire workflow is divided into generation and revision stages. In the generation phase, based on the input optimization problem, the Parameter Extraction, Modeling Advisor, Mathematical Modeling, and Code Generation agents sequentially perform their respective functions to finally produce the solver code. Problem analysis is performed via a sequential dual-agent architecture: the Parameter Extraction Agent first structures key problem parameters, and its output is passed as contextual input to the Modeling Advisor Agent to produce a structured interpretation of the problem. Together, they produce a unified semantic representation. This representation is then consumed by the Mathematical Modeling Agent to generate a formal mathematical model, which is subsequently compiled into executable solver code by the Code Generation Agent. Both agents leverage the same HRAG mechanism, performing coarse-grained filtering based on metadata followed by fine-grained reranking according to subproblem types, to dynamically integrate the most relevant modeling patterns and solver code exemplars from the exemplar library.

The generated solver code is immediately executed for validation. If execution succeeds, the process terminates; otherwise, the system triggers the IAR phase: the Mathematical Modeling Agent and Code Generation Agent assume revised roles as the Modeling Revision Agent and Code Revision Agent, respectively. They jointly diagnose the root cause of the failure and, leveraging their initial outputs stored in the local memory pool, generate structured revision tips that serve as a reference strategy for further corrections in the event of subsequent compile errors. The system employs a dual-memory-pool architecture: The local memory pool stores historical outputs of the agents involved in the revision phase, providing the necessary contextual history for error diagnosis and refinement, while the shared global memory pool accumulates outputs from all functional agents across tasks, enabling cross-task knowledge reuse and continuous system evolution.

3.1. Component Overview

To enable end-to-end automated modeling from natural language problem descriptions to executable optimization programs, we design a multi-agent framework composed of specialized agents operating in coordination. We denote the space of natural language optimization tasks by \mathcal{T} , where each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ represents a complete problem statement. The




Figure 1. MIRROR: An LLM-based multi-agent framework that automates end-to-end optimization modeling—from natural language to executable solver code—through four phases: Understanding, Modeling, Implementation, and Revision. Hierarchical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (HRAG) retrieves relevant exemplars for model and solver code synthesis; upon execution failure, the Iterative Analysis and Revision (IAR) mechanism leverages local memory to diagnose and refine outputs. Local memory stores per-task agent history for revision, while global memory accumulates cross-task knowledge for system-wide evolution.

unified exemplar library used in the hierarchical retrieval-augmented generation mechanism is defined as \mathcal{L} . For each task t , the retrieval process yields a task-specific candidate set $\mathcal{R}_t \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, from which relevant modeling and solver code exemplars are selected. The framework comprises two phases: the Generation Phase, responsible for initial solution construction, and the IAR Phase, which handles iterative error correction.

3.1.1. AGENTS IN THE GENERATION PHASE

- **Parameter Extraction Agent f_{param}** This agent is Responsible for identifying and structuring key parameters from t . It then outputs p , a JSON object containing parameter symbols, data types, and semantic definitions, with its generation adhering to three principles: real-world discreteness or continuity, practical feasibility

of values, and compatibility with mathematical operations.

- **Modeling Advisor Agent f_{adv}** This agent provides domain-aware semantic guidance through a structured interpretation of t . It then outputs g , a standardized JSON list comprising operational clarifications of domain-specific terms, salient problem details, and a characterization of the problem’s essence—all strictly derived from inferable information in the original text.
- **Mathematical Modeling Agent f_{model}** This agent acts as the core formulator. It integrates the problem t , parameters p , advisory guidance g , and a set of retrieved modeling exemplars $\mathcal{R}_{\text{model}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_t$. It synthesizes a formal optimization model $m = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O})$, explicitly defining the decision variables (\mathcal{V}), constraints (\mathcal{X}),

and the objective function (\mathcal{O}).

- **Code Generation Agent** f_{code} This agent translates the mathematical model into an executable program. Using the formal model m and retrieved code exemplars $\mathcal{R}_{\text{code}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_t$, it produces the solver code c . The agent is designed to handle implementation details and resolve potential inconsistencies between the abstract model and the specific syntax requirements of the solver such as Gurobi

Executor The external executor receives the generated code c and attempts to run it. It returns either a numerical solution n or a failure flag \perp accompanied by a specific error message e (e.g., syntax errors, execution timed out). This feedback signal is crucial for triggering the subsequent revision phase.

3.1.2. AGENTS IN THE IAR PHASE

When execution fails, the Mathematical Modeling and Code Generation agents switch roles to function as revision specialists, leveraging the Dual Memory mechanism.

- **Modeling Revision Agent** δ_{model} This agent focuses on rectifying logical or formulation errors. It analyzes the error message e and the previous modeling trace stored in the local memory. It then reconstructs the model to produce a corrected version \tilde{m} and generates a structured revision model tip τ_m . This tip serves as a strategic reference to prevent similar errors in future iterations.
- **Code Revision Agent** δ_{code} This agent addresses implementation-level failures. It takes the corrected model \tilde{m} , the error message e , and the history of the previous code generation as context. It repairs the solver code to yield a new version \tilde{c} and produces a code tip τ_c , ensuring the code is syntactically correct and consistent with the revised mathematical model.

3.2. Mechanism Overview

MIRROR integrates three core mechanisms to enable robust, reusable, and self-correcting automated modeling: IAR, HRAG, and Dual Memory.

Iterative Adaptive Revision (IAR) The system first performs forward generation by sequentially invoking f_{param} , f_{adv} , f_{model} , and f_{code} to map the input task t to executable solver code c . If Executor returns a failure, the IAR mechanism is triggered: The modeling revision agent δ_{model} and the code revision agent δ_{code} collaboratively diagnose the root cause of the error and generate structured revision tips. These historical models, solver code, and their corresponding revision tips are stored in a local memory pool to provide

contextual history for subsequent corrective iterations. They then iteratively refine both the mathematical model and its solver code implementation. Subsequently, the revised solver code is executed again. This process continues until a valid solution is produced or the maximum number of revision rounds is reached, thereby establishing a closed-loop, execution-driven self-correction mechanism. Here is the main Structure of a Revision Instance (see Appendix D for the concrete process).

Revision Instance

Generation Phase

problem: Consider a transportation problem with multiple products...?

...

Result: COMPILE ERROR

IAR Phase

– First Revision –

...

Result: COMPILE ERROR

– Second Revision –

```
{{"original_incorrect_model_objective": "...",
"revised_correct_model_objective": "..."},
{"original_incorrect_code_snippet": "...",
"revised_correct_code_snippet": "..."}}
```

Result: ACCEPT

Hierarchical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (HRAG)

The mechanism follows a sampling–allocation strategy. In the sampling step, a unified exemplar library \mathcal{L} —consisting of 602 high-quality and balanced optimization instances—is constructed to enable contextual augmentation. Each example is first structured as a (t, m, c) triple and then annotated with a high-level category and a fine-grained subproblem type (see Appendix C.1 for details of the sampling procedure). The allocation step then retrieves relevant examples and delivers them to the agent.

Retrieval follows a two-stage strategy:

1. **Coarse-grained filtering:** An embedding model Θ_{emb} combined with the Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) (Adams et al., 2022) algorithm retrieves diverse yet semantically relevant candidate examples (see Appendix C.2 for MMR algorithmic details), followed by metadata-based filtering to ensure alignment with problem type.
2. **Fine-grained reranking:** A large language model reranks candidate examples based on problem category alignment and deep semantic similarity, selecting examples relevant to the target task.

At most two high-value examples are delivered as $\mathcal{R}_{\text{model}}$ or $\mathcal{R}_{\text{code}}$ for use by the modeling and code agents follows this structure (see Appendix C.3 for details). respectively, If no suitable example exists, an empty signal is returned

to trigger robust fallback handling. Here is the format of a data instance entry from the exemplar library.

Data Instance

```
{“en_answer”: 10000.0, “prompt”: “A construction company is
planning to allocate resources across four different tasks: ...?”,
“response”: “## Mathematical Model: ... “VARIABLES”: ...
“CONSTRAINTS”: ... “OBJECTIVE”: ... ## Python Code: ...”,
“problem_type”: “Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP)”,
“problem_subtype”: “Discrete Scheduling & Assignment”}
```

Dual Memory To support knowledge accumulation and reuse, the system maintains two memory pools:

- **Local Memory Pool:** Stores the primary agent’s own historical outputs (e.g., past models, debugging tips), providing contextual history for its revision phase. This memory is used exclusively for the agent’s subsequent tasks, reflecting its role-specific adaptability.
- **Global Memory Pool:** Accumulates outputs from all functional agents across tasks, enabling knowledge reuse and system-level evolution through shared experience.

In summary, MIRROR integrates specialized agent roles with the aforementioned dynamic mechanisms, not only generating verifiable solver code from natural language by dynamically incorporating relevant exemplar knowledge, but also triggering iterative collaborative revisions upon execution failure to progressively improve the correctness of both the model and the solver code.

4. Experiments

In this section, we evaluate MIRROR on five diverse datasets to assess its optimization solving capabilities.

4.1. Experimental Setup

Benchmarks We evaluate our method on five standard benchmarks in the domain of optimization modeling: NL4Opt (Ramamonjison et al., 2023), Mamo (Huang et al., 2025b), IndustryOR (Chen et al., 2025), and ComplexOR (Xiao et al., 2023). From the Mamo benchmark, we specifically utilize two subsets: Mamo-EasyLP and Mamo-ComplexLP. According to the complexity analysis in (Xiao et al., 2025), which quantifies problem difficulty based on the number of variables and constraints, NL4Opt, Mamo-EasyLP, and ComplexOR are classified as simple tasks, whereas IndustryOR and Mamo-ComplexLP are categorized as complex tasks. Additionally, the last 163 instances of Mamo-EasyLP are reserved as part of the source data for the exemplar library \mathcal{L} , while the remaining 489 instances constitute the test set.

Baselines We compare MIRROR against three categories of methods:

(1) **Traditional prompting:** Standard Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) prompting is applied on two models: the backbone model (qwen-plus-2025-09-11) and DeepSeek-v3, to evaluate conventional inference under different LLMs.

(2) **Learning-based models:** MiniOpt, LLMOPT, OptMATH, ORLM, and SIRL—methods that fine-tune specialized models on large-scale optimization datasets for end-to-end modeling.

(3) **Agent-based methods:** OptiMUS, ORMind, and Chain-of-Experts(COE), which use multi-agent LLM frameworks with division-of-labor collaboration. All are implemented using the same backbone model as our method for fair comparison.

Additionally, we validate MIRROR’s effectiveness on a smaller model: qwen3-30b-a3b-instruct-2507 (abbreviated as qwen3-30B), comparing CoT prompting against the full MIRROR framework.

Implementation Details Except for the small-model ablation, all experiments use qwen-plus-2025-09-11 as the backbone model, with temperature set to 0 for deterministic and reproducible outputs. Generated code is formatted for the Gurobi solver.

Evaluation Metric We adopt **pass@1** (Chen et al., 2021) as the primary metric, defined as the proportion of problem instances for which the model generates a correct solution in a single attempt. A prediction \hat{y} is considered correct if it satisfies the relative error tolerance with respect to the ground-truth optimal value y^* :

$$\frac{|y^* - \hat{y}|}{|y^*|} < 10^{-3}, \quad (1)$$

and to handle the case where $y^* = 0$, we introduce an absolute error criterion: $|y^* - \hat{y}| < 10^{-1}$.

4.2. Results Analysis

Overall Performance MIRROR achieves the highest rank among all fully evaluated methods in Table 1, setting a new state of the art among multi-agent approaches for end-to-end optimization modeling. Notably, this performance is attained without any task-specific fine-tuning, relying solely on collaborative reasoning, hierarchical retrieval, and iterative adaptive revision.

Advancement over Agent-based Baselines Among existing agent-based methods, COE achieves the highest macro-average accuracy (68.20%), outperforming OptiMUS(53.57%) and ORMind (61.28%). MIRROR surpasses

Table 1. Accuracy (pass@1, %) of different methods across benchmark datasets.

Category	Models / Methods	NL4Opt	Mamo EasyLP	Mamo ComplexLP	IndustryOR	ComplexOR	Macro Avg	Rank
<i>Traditional prompting</i>								
	Backbone model	72.24	85.07	44.83	46.00	44.44	58.52	7
	Deepseek-v3	73.88	84.66	57.14	51.00	55.56	64.45	3
	qwen3-30B	68.57	85.28	30.54	41.00	33.33	51.74	10
<i>Learning-based methods</i>								
	MiniOpt (14B)*	92.17	90.80	33.65	27.00	61.11	60.95	6
	LLMOPT (14B)*	80.28	89.53	44.08	29.00	35.29	55.64	8
	OptMATH (7B)*	78.70	84.20	34.12	19.00	33.33	49.87	11
	ORLM (8B)*	85.70	82.30	37.40	38.00	—	—	—
	SIRL (32B)*	98.00	94.60	61.10	48.00	—	—	—
<i>Agent-based methods</i>								
	OptiMUS	57.96	85.28	45.81	51.00	27.78	53.57	9
	COE	84.90	87.93	57.63	55.00	55.56	68.20	2
	ORMind	77.55	81.19	52.22	51.00	44.44	61.28	5
<i>Ours</i>	MIRROR	86.50	87.30	67.50	57.00	61.11	71.88	1
	MIRROR (30B)	82.40	86.90	52.70	53.00	44.44	63.89	4

All agent-based methods use the default model. Bold denotes current SOTA; “—” indicates unreported results; values marked with * are from other papers: SIRL and ORLM from their original works, and all other learning-based methods from MiniOpt.

Table 2. Ablation study of MIRROR components (Accuracy (pass@1, %))

Variant	NL4Opt	Mamo EasyLP	Mamo ComplexLP	IndustryOR	ComplexOR	Macro Avg
MIRROR	86.50	87.30	67.50	57.00	61.11	71.88
W/o IAR	85.70	86.90	67.00	55.00	61.11	71.14
W/o HRAG	85.30	86.70	63.50	54.00	50.00	67.90
W/o Both	84.10	86.50	62.05	52.00	44.44	65.82

all of them, exceeding COE on four out of five benchmarks and achieving improvements of +9.9% on Mamo-ComplexLP and +5.6% on ComplexOR. This consistent improvement demonstrates that the iterative adaptive revision mechanism and hierarchical retrieval-augmented generation mechanism in our framework capture complex constraints and non-standard problem structures more effectively than previous agent designs.

Superiority to Learning-based Models MIRROR requires no task-specific training yet outperforms all learning-based baselines in terms of average performance: MiniOpt (14B), LLMOPT (14B), OptMATH (7B), ORLM (8B), and SIRL (32B). On the challenging Mamo-ComplexLP and IndustryOR benchmarks, it achieves 67.50% and 57.00% accuracy, respectively—surpassing the strongest prior model, SIRL (32B), by 6.40 and 9.00 percentage points. This shows that structured agent collaboration can excel at complex optimization modeling without large-scale supervised fine-tuning.


Advantage Over Traditional Prompting Approach MIRROR, using the backbone model, achieves a macro-

average score of 71.88%, outperforming Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting on the same model (58.52%) by 13.4 points. It also exceeds CoT applied to the stronger DeepSeek-v3 model (64.45%).


Effective Transfer to Small Model When applied to qwen3-30B, MIRROR boosts macro-average accuracy from 51.74% (achieved by COT) to 63.89%—a 12.15-point improvement without fine-tuning—confirming its plug-and-play utility for accessible models.

4.3. Ablation Study

we conduct an ablation study on the five datasets: NL4Opt, Mamo-EasyLP, Mamo-ComplexLP, IndustryOR, and ComplexOR. We evaluate four variants: the full MIRROR (with both IAR and HRAG), and three ablated versions—removing only IAR, only HRAG, or both. As shown in Table 2, the full model achieves the highest macro-average accuracy of 71.88%, outperforming the w/o HRAG variant (67.90%), w/o IAR (71.14%), and w/o Both (65.82%). This confirms that both mechanisms contribute to performance, with HRAG yielding a larger gain.



(a) Wrong Answer Rate Across Datasets and Methods



(b) Compile Error Rate Across Datasets and Methods

Figure 2. Ablation Study of MIRROR

We further decompose errors into wrong answer rate (executable solver code that generates incorrect numerical result) and compile error rate (syntactically invalid solver code that fails to execute), as these reflect distinct failure modes in optimization modeling: the former indicates flawed reasoning, while the latter reveals structural or grammatical mistakes in the generated solver code. Figure 2 visualizes these two error types across configurations. The light-colored regions in Figure 2a represent the compile error rate. Since the wrong answer rates are significantly higher than the compile error rates in most cases across the datasets and mechanisms, the light-colored regions for the former are omitted in Figure 2b to ensure a clearer visualization of the latter.

For Wrong Answer Rate all datasets except ComplexOR show a consistent decrease or remain stable from the w/o Both configuration to single-mechanism variants and finally

to the full model, indicating that both mechanisms help produce correct solutions. Notably, removing HRAG leads to a larger increase in wrong answers than removing IAR; for example, on IndustryOR, the wrong answer rate is 3.00% higher when only HRAG is removed compared to when only IAR is removed. This suggests that HRAG enhances both problem modeling and solver code generation through its two-stage retrieval strategy, thereby improving the accuracy of the final results.

For Compile Error Rate the opposite trend is observed: on NL4Opt, Mamo-EasyLP, and IndustryOR, the w/o IAR variant incurs higher compile errors than w/o HRAG, demonstrating that the IAR mechanism’s closed-loop iterative adaptive revision process effectively identifies and resolves compilation failures. Averaged across all datasets, the compile error rate decreases from 8.06% in the w/o Both setting to 2.60% with IAR only and 2.65% with HRAG only, and further declines to 1.91% when both mechanisms are used. This highlights their complementary contributions to generating valid and executable optimization models and solver code.

5. Conclusion

We present MIRROR, a training-free multi-agent framework for automated operations research (OR) modeling that bridges the gap between natural language problem descriptions and formal mathematical models with executable solver code. By integrating Hierarchical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (HRAG) for dynamic exemplar retrieval and an Iterative Analysis and Revision (IAR) mechanism for execution-driven self-correction, MIRROR effectively mitigates the hallucination and fragility of general-purpose large language models in specialized OR tasks. Experiments show that MIRROR achieves strong performance across diverse OR modeling benchmarks, attaining state-of-the-art results on complex industrial datasets and significantly boosting the capabilities of small open-source language models—without any task-specific training. This work paves the way toward accessible, reliable, and scalable AI-assisted decision-making for real-world operations research applications.

Impact Statement

This work aims to make optimization modeling more accessible by enabling non-experts to formulate and solve real-world problems from natural language, without requiring task-specific training. It has potential benefits in domains such as logistics, energy, and supply chain management. As with any AI-assisted tool, incorrect or ambiguous inputs could lead to flawed outputs; thus, human oversight remains essential. The system does not use personal data and is intended solely as a decision-support aid.

References

- Adams, D., Suri, G., and Chali, Y. Combining state-of-the-art models with maximal marginal relevance for few-shot and zero-shot multi-document summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10808*, 2022.
- Ahmaditeshnizi, A., Gao, W., and Udell, M. OptiMUS: Scalable optimization modeling with (MI)LP solvers and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 577–596. PMLR, 2024.
- Anonymous. MiniOpt: Reasoning to model and solve general optimization problems with limited resources, 2026a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nIWCUVJ6OU>.
- Anonymous. OptimAI: Optimization from natural language using LLM-powered AI agents, 2026b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JtgZkVdAIP>.
- Cannas, V. G., Ciano, M. P., Saltalamacchia, M., and Secchi, R. Artificial intelligence in supply chain and operations management: A multiple case study research. *International Journal of Production Research*, 62(9):3333–3360, 2024.
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., de O. Pinto, H. P., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- Chen, Y., Xia, J., Shao, S., Ge, D., and Ye, Y. Solver-informed RL: Grounding large language models for authentic optimization modeling. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=80L235oVBe>.
- DeepSeek-AI, Liu, A., Feng, B., Xue, B., Wang, B., Wu, B., Lu, C., Zhao, C., Deng, C., Zhang, C., Ruan, C., Dai, D., Guo, D., Yang, D., Chen, D., Ji, D., Li, E., Lin, F., Dai, F., ..., and Pan, Z. DeepSeek-V3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2025.
- Ding, Z., Tan, Z., Zhang, J., and Chen, T. OR-R1: Automating modeling and solving of operations research optimization problem via test-time reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.09092*, 2025.
- Ge, D., Huangfu, Q., Wang, Z., Wu, J., and Ye, Y. Cardinal optimizer (COPT) user guide. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.14314*, 2024.
- Guo, D., Yang, D., Zhang, H., Song, J., Wang, P., Zhu, Q., Xu, R., Zhang, R., Ma, S., Bi, X., et al. DeepSeek-R1 incentivizes reasoning in LLMs through reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 645(8081):633–638, 2025.
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi optimizer reference manual, 2024. URL <https://www.gurobi.com/ReferenceManual>.
- Huang, C., Tang, Z., Hu, S., Jiang, R., Zheng, X., Ge, D., Wang, B., and Wang, Z. ORLM: A customizable framework in training large models for automated optimization modeling. *Operations Research*, 2025a.
- Huang, T., Sun, Z., Jin, Z., Li, G., and Lyu, C. Knowledge-aware code generation with large language models. In *2024 IEEE/ACM 32nd International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*, pp. 52–63. IEEE Computer Society, April 2024.
- Huang, X., Shen, Q., Hu, Y., Gao, A., and Wang, B. Large language models for mathematical modeling: Towards bridging the gap between natural and mathematical languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13144*, 2025b.
- Jiang, C., Shu, X., Qian, H., Lu, X., Zhou, J., Zhou, A., and Yu, Y. LLMOPT: Learning to define and solve general optimization problems from scratch. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, pp. 101580–101606, 2025.
- Jimenez, C. E., Yang, J., Wettig, A., Yao, S., Pei, K., Press, O., and Narasimhan, K. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world GitHub issues? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- LangChain Team. Langchain, 2023. URL <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>. GitHub repository.
- Liang, K., Lu, Y., Mao, J., Sun, S., Yang, C., Zeng, C., Jin, X., Qin, H., Zhu, R., and Teo, C.-P. LLM for large-scale optimization model auto-formulation: Bridging flexibility and standardization via agentic workflow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.09635*, 2026.
- Liu, F., Yang, Z.-R., Liu, C., Song, T., Gao, X., and Liu, H. MM-agent: LLM as agents for real-world mathematical modeling problem. In *2nd AI for Math Workshop*

- @ ICML 2025, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=QyKBf7X98d>.
- Lu, H., Xie, Z., Wu, Y., Ren, C., Chen, Y., and Wen, Z. Opt-MATH: A scalable bidirectional data synthesis framework for optimization modeling. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=9P5e6iE4WK>.
- Novikov, A., Vü, N., Eisenberger, M., Dupont, E., Huang, P.-S., Wagner, A. Z., Shirobokov, S., Kozlovskii, B., Ruiz, F. J. R., Mehrabian, A., et al. AlphaEvolve: A coding agent for scientific and algorithmic discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13131*, 2025.
- OpenAI, Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., and Akkaya, I. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2024a.
- OpenAI, Jaech, A., Kalai, A., Lerer, A., Richardson, A., El-Kishky, A., et al. OpenAI o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024b.
- Ramamonjison, R., Yu, T., Li, R., Li, H., Carenini, G., Ghaddar, B., He, S., Mostajabdaveh, M., Banitalebi-Dehkordi, A., Zhou, Z., et al. NL4Opt competition: Formulating optimization problems based on their natural language descriptions. In *NeurIPS 2022 Competition Track*, pp. 189–203. PMLR, 2023.
- Ren, Z. Z., Shao, Z., Song, J., Xin, H., Wang, H., Zhao, W., Zhang, L., Fu, Z., Zhu, Q., Yang, D., et al. DeepSeek-Prover-V2: Advancing formal mathematical reasoning via reinforcement learning for subgoal decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21801*, 2025.
- Tang, Z., Ye, Z., Huang, C., Huang, X., Li, C., Li, S., Chen, G., Yan, M., Wang, Z., Zha, H., et al. CALM before the STORM: Unlocking native reasoning for optimization modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.04204*, 2025.
- Wang, X., Chen, Y., Yuan, L., Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Peng, H., and Ji, H. Executable code actions elicit better LLM agents. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 50208–50232. PMLR, 2024.
- Wang, Z., Chen, B., Huang, Y., Cao, Q., He, M., Fan, J., and Liang, X. ORMind: A cognitive-inspired end-to-end reasoning framework for operations research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01326*, 2025.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 24824–24837, 2022.
- Wu, Y., Zhang, Y., Wu, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, J., and Cheng, J. Step-Opt: Boosting optimization modeling in LLMs through iterative data synthesis and structured validation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17637*, 2025.
- Xiao, Z., Zhang, D., Wu, Y., Xu, L., Wang, Y. J., Han, X., Fu, X., Zhong, T., Zeng, J., Song, M., et al. Chain-of-experts: When LLMs meet complex operations research problems. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Xiao, Z., Xie, J., Xu, L., Guan, S., Zhu, J., Han, X., Fu, X., Yu, W., Wu, H., Shi, W., Kang, Q., Duan, J., Zhong, T., Yuan, M., Zeng, J., Wang, Y., Chen, G., and Zhang, D. A survey of optimization modeling meets LLMs: Progress and future directions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-25)*, pp. 10742–10750, 2025. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2025/1192.
- Xu, K., Mao, Y., Guan, X., and Feng, Z. Web-Bench: A LLM code benchmark based on web standards and frameworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07473*, 2025.
- Yang, A., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Gao, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Tu, J., Zhou, J., Lin, J., et al. Qwen2.5-Math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122*, 2024.
- Yang, A., Li, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Gao, C., Huang, C., Lv, C., et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025a.
- Yang, Z., Wang, Y., Huang, Y., Guo, Z., Shi, S., Han, X., Feng, L., Song, L., Liang, X., and Tang, J. Optibench meets resocratic: Measure and improve llms for optimization modeling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, pp. 24726–24759, 2025b.
- Zhang, B. and Luo, P. OR-LLM-Agent: Automating modeling and solving of operations research optimization problem with reasoning large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10009*, 2025.
- Zhou, C., Xu, T., Lin, J., and Ge, D. StepORLM: A self-evolving framework with generative process supervision for operations research language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22558*, 2025.

A. Method

In this section, we provide a concise visualization along with a comparative analysis of learning-based methods, existing multi-agent methods, and the MIRROR method.




Figure 3. Comparison of optimization modeling methods. (a) Learning-based methods train task-specific models on dedicated datasets but lack execution feedback. (b) Existing agent-based methods employ a closed-loop to iteratively refine the multi-agent system using execution errors. (c) MIRROR combines hierarchical retrieval, which dynamically incorporates exemplar knowledge, with iterative adaptive revision to enable structured error diagnosis and collaborative correction, achieving accurate, robust, and fine-tuning-free optimization modeling.

Learning-based methods focus on task-specific training. As illustrated in Figure 3a, specific optimization problems are inputted into a Large Language Models (LLMs). Rather than being a general-purpose model, the LLM is pre-trained on specialized, labeled datasets to acquire domain-specific expertise. While this approach enables rapid generation of Python code, the output is produced in a single-pass manner. It lacks real-time interaction with the actual execution environment, making it difficult to evaluate or debug the generated content. Consequently, such methods exhibit lower robustness when encountering unseen or complex edge cases.

As illustrated in Figure 3b, existing agent-based methods utilize a dynamic closed-loop mechanism based on the multi-agent system. Instead of single-model training, collaborative LLM experts generate code and iteratively refine it through an execution feedback loop. While this self-correction enhances performance in complex tasks, the system’s closed architecture limits its extensibility with external knowledge. Moreover, relying on internally generated context often triggers hallucinations or task misalignment. More critically, most existing frameworks lack reliable error-correction mechanisms, making it difficult to detect and rectify mistakes after code execution. Thus, despite its reactive correction capabilities, the framework remains hindered by potential solution failures and limited reliability.

Our proposed MIRROR method introduces a knowledge-augmented multi-agent framework. As illustrated in Figure 3c, the framework utilizes a hierarchical retrieval mechanism to access a curated exemplar library, providing reliable reference knowledge that significantly reduces model hallucinations during the model and code generation process. Unlike existing agent-based methods, our approach incorporates an iterative adaptive revision process and a dual-memory architecture, where the system stores historical models, code, and associated revision tips in a local memory pool to provide contextual history for subsequent corrective iterations. By integrating dynamic knowledge retrieval with the adaptive revision, MIRROR, as a fine-tuning-free optimization modeling method, improves the accuracy of modeling and solving while overcoming the limitations of existing frameworks in terms of the extensibility and reliability.

B. Dataset

B.1. The Introduction of Different Benchmarks

In this section, we provide an overview of the five benchmarks used for performance evaluation: NL4Opt, Mamo-EasyLP, Mamo-ComplexLP, IndustryOR, and ComplexOR. These datasets represent a wide array of optimization tasks and constraints,

thereby providing a rigorous foundation to validate the robustness and cross-domain adaptability of our proposed method.

NL4Opt is a standardized and widely used benchmark originating from the NeurIPS 2022 competition. It features high-quality linear programming tasks across six diverse domains. Through a rigorous filtering process, the benchmark provides a collection of refined instances for evaluating automated modeling performance. The dataset contains **245** problems.

Mamo is a mathematical modeling dataset consisting of two segments: **Mamo-EasyLP** and **Mamo-ComplexLP**. The EasyLP segment comprises high school-level problems (**652** instances), while the ComplexLP segment involves more advanced, undergraduate-level formulations (**203** instances).

IndustryOR is the first industrial benchmark specifically designed for operations research (OR), comprising **100** real-world problems sourced from eight different industries. This dataset encompasses five major mathematical programming types: linear programming (LP), integer programming (IP), mixed-integer programming (MIP), non-linear programming (NLP), and others, distributed across three distinct levels of difficulty.

ComplexOR is the first benchmark dataset specifically designed for complex operations research (OR) problems. Its instances are sourced from a wide range of materials, including academic papers, textbooks, real-world industrial scenarios, covering multiple domains such as supply chain optimization and warehouse logistics, with a total of **18** instances.

B.2. Complexity Analysis of Evaluation Benchmarks

In this section, we provide a detailed analysis of the complexity of the five benchmark datasets to characterize the challenges involved in the modeling task.

(Xiao et al., 2025) adopts standard prompting to generate models for each problem, using the number of variables and constraints within the model as the metric for its complexity. The complexity results obtained from this research on different datasets are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Dataset Complexity

Dataset	Complexity
NL4Opt	5.59
Mamo-EasyLP	7.12
Mamo-ComplexLP	13.35
IndustryOR	14.06
ComplexOR	5.98

The results reveal a clear distinction in complexity levels among the evaluated datasets. Specifically, Mamo-ComplexLP and IndustryOR are identified as the most challenging benchmarks, exhibiting significantly higher complexity compared to the others. This indicates that problems within these two datasets involve a more extensive scale of decision variables and constraints. In contrast, NL4Opt, Mamo-EasyLP and ComplexOR show relatively lower complexity levels. This hierarchical distribution of complexity across the datasets ensures that the modeling tasks cover a wide range of difficulty, providing a robust basis for evaluating model performance under different scales of problem constraints.

C. Hierarchical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (HRAG)

C.1. Exemplar Library Sampling Procedure

The exemplar library \mathcal{L} is constructed through a multi-stage curation pipeline during the preparation phase, where ground-truth verification signals are available to assess correctness—not only solver code executability but also solution optimality. We start with raw instances from three sources: OptiBench (Yang et al., 2025b) (605 instances), OptMATH (359 instances), and the last 163 instances from Mamo-EasyLP, totaling 1,127 optimization problems. Each instance is processed by the MIRROR framework to complete missing mathematical formulations and executable solver code. Crucially, the generated model–solver code pairs are validated against oracle solver; only those yielding correct optimal solutions are retained, resulting in 652 fully specified and verified problem–solution pairs. Subsequently, we employ the large language model `qwen-plus` to annotate each verified instance with a high-level problem category and a fine-grained subproblem type. Instances whose categories cannot be confidently determined are filtered out. The final repository contains 602 high-quality, balanced optimization instances, denoted as \mathcal{L} .

Instance

```
{
  "en_answer": 10000.0,
  "prompt": "A construction company is planning to allocate resources across four different tasks: $x_1$, $x_2$, $x_3$, and $x_4$. These tasks could represent various stages of the construction process such as site preparation, foundation work, framing, and finishing. The objective is to minimize the total cost associated with these tasks while meeting all task requirements and constraints. Each unit of resource allocated to tasks $x_1$, $x_2$, $x_3$, and $x_4$ incurs a cost of 100 dollars, 200 dollars, 300 dollars, and 400 dollars respectively. The allocation must adhere to the following conditions: - The combined resources allocated for tasks $x_1$ and $x_2$ cannot exceed 30 units due to manpower or equipment limitations. - Twice the resources allocated for task $x_1$ combined with those for task $x_3$ should be at least 40 units in order to meet project milestones. - The difference in resources between task $x_4$ and task $x_2$ should exactly equal 20 units possibly due to scheduling or sequential dependencies among these tasks. - Task $x_1$ along with half of the resources allocated for task $x_3$ should not be less than 10 units considering certain quality standards or safety regulations. Given that all resource allocations are integers because they may correspond to indivisible items like workers or machines. Also each task has specific bounds on resource allocation: What is the minimum total cost in dollars for the company given these constraints?",
  "response": "## Mathematical Model:\n\n{\n\n\"VARIABLES\":\n\n\"$x_1$, $x_2$, $x_3$, $x_4$ are non-negative integer variables representing resource units allocated to tasks 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.\",\n\n\"CONSTRAINTS\": [\n\n\"$x_1 + x_2 \\le 30$,\", \n\n\"$2 \\cdot x_1 + x_3 \\ge 40$,\", \n\n\"$x_4 - x_2 == 20$,\", \n\n\"$x_1 + 0.5 \\cdot x_3 \\ge 10$,\", \n\n],\n\n\"OBJECTIVE\": \"minimize $100 \\cdot x_1 + 200 \\cdot x_2 + 300 \\cdot x_3 + 400 \\cdot x_4$\", \n\n}\n\n\n## Python Code:\n\npython\nimport gurobipy as gp\nfrom gurobipy import GRB\n\n# Create model\nmodel = gp.Model(\"ConstructionResourceAllocation\")\n\n# Define integer variables with non-negativity constraints\nx1 = model.addVar(vtype=GRB.INTEGER, name=\"$x_1$,\", lb=0)\nx2 = model.addVar(vtype=GRB.INTEGER, name=\"$x_2$,\", lb=0)\nx3 = model.addVar(vtype=GRB.INTEGER, name=\"$x_3$,\", lb=0)\nx4 = model.addVar(vtype=GRB.INTEGER, name=\"$x_4$,\", lb=0)\n\n# Set objective: minimize total cost\nmodel.setObjective(100*x1 + 200*x2 + 300*x3 + 400*x4, GRB.MINIMIZE)\n\n# Add constraints\nmodel.addConstr(x1 + x2 <= 30, \"Constraint1\")\nmodel.addConstr(2*x1 + x3 >= 40, \"Constraint2\")\nmodel.addConstr(x4 - x2 == 20, \"Constraint3\")\nmodel.addConstr(x1 + 0.5*x3 >= 10, \"Constraint4\")\n\n# Optimize\nmodel.optimize()\n\n# Output the minimum total cost and optimized variables\nprint(int(model.objVal))\nprint(int(x1.x))\nprint(int(x2.x))\nprint(int(x3.x))\nprint(int(x4.x))\n\n\n\n\", \"problem_type\": \"Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP)\", \"problem_subtype\": \"Discrete Scheduling & Assignment\"}
```

C.2. MMR Algorithm: Principle and Implementation

The Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) algorithm is a widely used retrieval strategy that balances relevance to the query and diversity among selected results. In our HRAG framework, MMR is employed in the fine-grained matching stage to select diverse yet highly relevant exemplars from the curated library \mathcal{L} , ensuring both semantic alignment and contextual variety.

The standard MMR formula is defined as:

$$\text{MMR} = \arg \max_{D_i \in D \setminus S} \left[\lambda \cdot \text{Sim}_1(D_i, Q) - (1 - \lambda) \cdot \max_{D_j \in S} \text{Sim}_2(D_i, D_j) \right] \quad (2)$$

where:

- Q is the input query (e.g., problem description),
- D is the full set of candidate exemplars,

- S is the current set of selected exemplars (initially empty),
- $\text{Sim}_1(D_i, Q)$ measures the relevance between candidate D_i and query Q ,
- $\text{Sim}_2(D_i, D_j)$ measures the similarity between candidate D_i and already-selected exemplar D_j ,
- $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ controls the trade-off between relevance (λ close to 1) and diversity (λ close to 0).

In our implementation, we use LangChain (LangChain Team, 2023)’s default MMR retriever, which selects diverse yet relevant exemplars via cosine similarity in a shared embedding space. The retrieved sets $\mathcal{R}_{\text{model}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{code}}$ thus provide semantically aligned but non-redundant context for modeling and code generation.

C.3. Exemplar Structure

Modeling Exemplar Structure

```
{{
  "Problem description": "...",
  "Mathematical Model": {{
    "VARIABLES": "...",
    "CONSTRAINTS": "...",
    "OBJECTIVE": "..."
  }}
}}
```

Solver Code Exemplar Structure

```
{{
  "Problem description": "...",
  "Mathematical Model": {{
    "VARIABLES": "...",
    "CONSTRAINTS": "...",
    "OBJECTIVE": "..."
  }},
  "Code": "..."
}}
```

C.4. Hierarchical Retrieval Algorithm

Hierarchical Retrieval Algorithm

```
Algorithm: Hierarchical Retrieval of MIRROR Framework
GLOBAL VARIABLES:
  vector_store = NULL
  rag_chain = NULL
  data_path = "<knowledge_base_file_path>"
  persist_dir = "<vector_db_persistence_directory>"
  embedding_model_name = "text-embedding-v4"

FUNCTION load_json_lines_from_md(file_path: STRING) -> LIST[Document]:
  documents = EMPTY LIST
  OPEN file_path WITH ENCODING "utf-8" AS f:
    FOR line_num FROM 1 TO total_lines IN f:
      line = TRIM(f.readline())
      IF line IS EMPTY OR line STARTS WITH ("#", "<!--", "```"):
        CONTINUE
      TRY:
        data = PARSE JSON FROM line
        problem_type = data.GET("problem_type", "general")
```

```

        problem_subtype = data.GET("problem_subtype", "general")
        doc = Document(
            page_content = line,
            metadata = {
                "source": file_path,
                "line": line_num,
                "problem_type": problem_type,
                "problem_subtype": problem_subtype
            }
        )
        ADD doc TO documents
    CATCH JSONDecodeError:
        CONTINUE
RETURN documents

FUNCTION _initialize_rag():
    GLOBAL vector_store, rag_chain
    IF vector_store IS NOT NULL AND rag_chain IS NOT NULL:
        RETURN

    load_dotenv()
    api_key = GET ENVIRONMENT VARIABLE "DASHSCOPE_API_KEY"
    IF api_key IS EMPTY:
        RAISE ValueError("DASHSCOPE_API_KEY not found in environment variables.")

    embeddings = DashScopeEmbeddings(
        model = embedding_model_name,
        dashscope_api_key = api_key
    )

    IF persist_dir DOES NOT EXIST:
        PRINT "Building vector database from md ..."
        docs = load_json_lines_from_md(data_path)
        IF docs IS EMPTY:
            RAISE RuntimeError("No valid JSON lines found in the data file.")
        Chroma.from_documents(
            documents = docs,
            embedding = embeddings,
            persist_directory = persist_dir,
            collection_name = "knowledge_base"
        )
        PRINT "Vector DB built with " + LEN(docs) + " examples."

    vector_store = Chroma(
        persist_directory = persist_dir,
        embedding_function = embeddings,
        collection_name = "knowledge_base"
    )

    retriever = vector_store.as_retriever(
        search_type = "mmr",
        search_kwargs = {"k": 3, "fetch_k": 10}
    )

    prompt_template = "model/code retrieval prompt template"
    prompt = PromptTemplate.from_template(prompt_template)

    llm = ChatTongyi(
        model_name = "qwen-plus-2025-09-11",
        temperature = 0,
        dashscope_api_key = api_key
    )

```

```

rag_chain = (
    {"context": retriever, "question": RunnablePassthrough()}
    | prompt
    | llm
)

FUNCTION retrieve_knowledge(query: STRING) -> STRING:
    CALL _initialize_rag()
    TRY:
        response = rag_chain.invoke(query)
        IF response HAS ATTRIBUTE "content":
            RETURN response.content
        ELSE:
            RETURN STRING(response)
    CATCH Exception AS e:
        RETURN "Retrieval failed: " + STRING(e)

```

D. Case Study

In this section, we provide a detailed case study to demonstrate the inner workings of our proposed MIRROR framework. By tracing the iterative modeling process of a representative problem from the ComplexOR dataset, we specifically highlight the effectiveness of the IAR mechanism in the problem-solving process. This case study illustrates how the MIRROR identifies potential modeling flaws and iteratively refines the solution through its IAR mechanism, ultimately leading to a more robust and accurate final output.

D.1. Problem Description

Consider a transportation problem with multiple products. Given a set of cities *Cities* and a set of links *Links* between the cities. Each city i has a certain supply of each product p ($Supply_{i,p}$) and a certain demand for each product p ($Demand_{i,p}$). The cost of shipping one package of product p from city i to city j is $ShipmentCost_{i,j,p}$. Each link (i,j) has a certain capacity for each product p ($Capacity_{i,j,p}$) and a joint capacity $JointCapacity_{i,j}$ for all products. The problem aims to minimize the total cost of shipping products from the cities to the cities. The total number of packages to be shipped on each link (i,j) should not exceed its joint capacity. How to decide the number of packages of each product p to be shipped from each city i to each city j ? The following parameters are included in this problem: *Cities*: list, a list of cities; *Links*: list, a list of links between the cities; *Products*: list, a list of products; *Supply*: list of lists, the supply of each product at each city; *Demand*: list of lists, the demand of each product at each city; *ShipmentCost*: list of lists of lists, the cost of shipping each product from each city to each city; *Capacity*: list of lists of lists, the capacity of shipping each product from each city to each city; *JointCapacity*: list of lists, the joint capacity of each link. The following data is included in this problem: 'Cities': ['A', 'B'], 'Links': [['A', 'B']], 'Products': ['Product1'], 'Supply': [[10], [0]], 'Demand': [[0], [10]], 'ShipmentCost': [[[1]]], 'Capacity': [[[10]]], 'JointCapacity': [[10]].

D.2. Iterative Adaptive Revision Details

Revision Details

```

{
  "second_reversion": {
    "second_reversion": {
      "original_incorrect_model_objective": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in range(len(Products))} ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p] - rationale: the objective must only iterate over existing links (i,j) in Links to avoid index out-of-range errors; the original code incorrectly assumed a full Cartesian product of all city pairs, but only specified links are valid.",
      "revised_correct_model_objective": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in range(len(Products))} ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p] - rationale: ShipmentCost is a 3D array indexed by [link_index][product_index], where

```



```

link_index corresponds to the position of (i,j) in the Links list. Thus, for
each link (i,j), we use its positional index in Links (not city-to-city
mapping) to access the correct cost. The original code incorrectly attempted
to map city names to link indices using a dictionary (link_to_idx), but the
cost array is already indexed by link position in Links, so we directly use
i,j as indices into ShipmentCost assuming the order of Links matches the
first dimension of ShipmentCost.",
"original_incorrect_code_snippet": "ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i],
Cities[j])]][p] * flow[i, j, p]", "model.addConstr(flow[i, j, p] <=
Capacity[link_idx][p], name=f"capacity_{i}_{j}_{p}")",
"revised_correct_code_snippet": "ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i],
Cities[j])]][0][p] * flow[i, j, p]", "model.addConstr(flow[i, j, p] <=
Capacity[link_idx][0][p], name=f"capacity_{i}_{j}_{p}")".
}
}

```

D.3. Workflow Execution

Initial Implementation

```

Parameter Extractor:
{"Cities"; "Links"; "Products"; "Supply";
"Demand"; "ShipmentCost"; "Capacity"; "JointCapacity"}
Modeling Advisor:
{"Domain Terminology"; "Problem Key Point"; "Problem Essence"}
Modeling Expert:
{"VARIABLES"; "CONSTRAINTS"; "OBJECTIVE"}
Code Generation Expert:
{Gurobi-based Python code}

[Initial Result]: COMPILER_ERROR

```

First Revision

```

Modeling Revision Expert:
{Inputs:
- Original Model:
{
  "VARIABLES": "flow[i][j][p] is a non-negative continuous variable representing
the number of packages of product p shipped from city i to city j, where i
and j are indices of cities in Cities, and p is an index of products in
Products",
  "CONSTRAINTS": ["sum_{j: (i,j) in Links} flow[i][j][p] - sum_{j: (j,i) in Links}
flow[j][i][p] = Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p] for all i in Cities and all p in
Products", "0 <= flow[i][j][p] <= Capacity[i][j][p] for all (i,j) in Links
and all p in Products", "sum_{p in Products} flow[i][j][p] <=
JointCapacity[i][j] for all (i,j) in Links"],
  "OBJECTIVE": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in Products}
ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p]"
}
- Error Message:
{'iter_1': "...ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p]\n
~~~~~\nIndexError: list index out of range", 'status': 'Runtime
Error'}
- Memory Tip:
{No tip for reference}
}
Modeling Expert:
{output:
{

```

```

"VARIABLES": "flow[i][j][p] is a non-negative continuous variable representing
the number of packages of product p shipped from city i to city j, where
(i,j) is a link in Links and p is a product in Products. The indices i and j
refer to the positions of cities in the Cities list, and p refers to the
position of the product in the Products list.",
"CONSTRAINTS": ["sum_{j: (i,j) in Links} flow[i][j][p] - sum_{j: (j,i) in Links}
flow[j][i][p] = Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p] for all i in range(len(Cities))
and all p in range(len(Products))", "0 <= flow[i][j][p] <= Capacity[i][j][p]
for all (i,j) in Links and all p in range(len(Products))", "sum_{p in
range(len(Products))} flow[i][j][p] <= JointCapacity[i][j] for all (i,j) in
Links"
],
"OBJECTIVE": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in range(len(Products))}
ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p] -rationale: the objective must only
iterate over existing links (i,j) in Links to avoid index out-of-range
errors; the original code incorrectly assumed a full Cartesian product of
all city pairs, but only specified links are valid."
}
}

```

Code Revision Expert:

{Inputs:

- Initial Code:

```

import gurobipy as gp
from gurobipy import GRB
# Extract parameters
Cities = ['A', 'B']
Links = [['A', 'B']]
Products = ['Product1']
Supply = [[10], [0]]
Demand = [[0], [10]]
ShipmentCost = [[[1]]]
Capacity = [[[10]]]
JointCapacity = [[10]]
# Map cities to indices
city_to_idx = {city: i for i, city in enumerate(Cities)}
n_cities = len(Cities)
n_products = len(Products)
n_links = len(Links)
# Create index mappings for links
link_to_idx = {}
for idx, link in enumerate(Links):
    link_to_idx[(link[0], link[1])] = idx
# Initialize model
model = gp.Model("Multi_Product_Transportation")
# Decision variables: flow[i][j][p] = amount of product p shipped from city i to
city j
flow = model.addVars(
    n_cities, n_cities, n_products,
    lb=0, ub=GRB.INFINITY, name="flow"
)
# Objective: minimize total shipping cost
model.setObjective(
    gp.quicksum(
        ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p]
        for i in range(n_cities)
        for j in range(n_cities)
        for p in range(n_products)
        if (Cities[i], Cities[j]) in [(link[0], link[1]) for link in Links]
    ),
    GRB.MINIMIZE
)
# Flow conservation constraints: supply - demand = net outflow

```

```

for i in range(n_cities):
    for p in range(n_products):
        outflow = gp.quicksum(flow[i, j, p] for j in range(n_cities) if (Cities[i],
            Cities[j]) in [(link[0], link[1]) for link in Links])
        inflow = gp.quicksum(flow[j, i, p] for j in range(n_cities) if (Cities[j],
            Cities[i]) in [(link[0], link[1]) for link in Links])
        model.addConstr(outflow - inflow == Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p],
            name=f"flow_balance_{i}_{p}")
# Per-product capacity constraints
for link_idx, (i_city, j_city) in enumerate(Links):
    i = city_to_idx[i_city]
    j = city_to_idx[j_city]
    for p in range(n_products):
        model.addConstr(flow[i, j, p] <= Capacity[i][j][p],
            name=f"capacity_{i}_{j}_{p}")
# Joint capacity constraint: total flow on link (sum over products) must not exceed
joint capacity
for link_idx, (i_city, j_city) in enumerate(Links):
    i = city_to_idx[i_city]
    j = city_to_idx[j_city]
    total_flow = gp.quicksum(flow[i, j, p] for p in range(n_products))
    model.addConstr(total_flow <= JointCapacity[i][j],
        name=f"joint_capacity_{i}_{j}")
# Optimize model
model.optimize()
- Error Message:
{'iter_1': ...ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p]\n
~~~~~\nIndexError: list index out of range', 'status': 'Runtime
Error'}
- Memory Tip:
{No tip for reference}
}
Code Revision Expert:
{output:"The new code(first revision)"}

[After Revision] Result: COMPILE_ERROR

```

Second Revision

Modeling Expert:

```

{inputs:
- Original Model:
{
    "VARIABLES": "flow[i][j][p] is a non-negative continuous variable representing
        the number of packages of product p shipped from city i to city j, where
        (i,j) is a link in Links and p is a product in Products. The indices i and j
        refer to the positions of cities in the Cities list, and p refers to the
        position of the product in the Products list.",
    "CONSTRAINTS": [
        "sum_{j: (i,j) in Links} flow[i][j][p] - sum_{j: (j,i) in Links} flow[j][i][p] =
            Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p] for all i in range(len(Cities)) and all p in
            range(len(Products))",
        "0 <= flow[i][j][p] <= Capacity[i][j][p] for all (i,j) in Links and all p in
            range(len(Products))",
        "sum_{p in range(len(Products))} flow[i][j][p] <= JointCapacity[i][j] for all
            (i,j) in Links"
    ],
    "OBJECTIVE": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in range(len(Products))}
        ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p] - rationale: the objective must only
        iterate over existing links (i,j) in Links to avoid index out-of-range
        errors; the original code incorrectly assumed a full Cartesian product of
        all city pairs, but only specified links are valid."
}

```

```

}
- Error Message:
{'iter_2': ...ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i], Cities[j])]][p] * flow[i, j,
    p]...TypeError: can't multiply sequence by non-int of type \'Var\'', 'status':
    'Runtime Error'}
- Memory Tip:
{
    "tip_type": "modeling",
    "scenario": "transportation",
    "error_statement": "The cost of shipping one package of product p from city i to
        city j is ShipmentCost_{i, j, p}",
    "correct_component": "ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p] where i, j are indices
        corresponding to the position of cities in the Cities list, and p is the index
        of the product in the Products list, but only for (i,j) pairs that exist in
        Links",
    "incorrect_model": "ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p] for all i, j in Cities
        and p in Products, without validating that (i,j) is in Links"
}
}
Modeling Expert:
{output:
{
    "VARIABLES": "flow[i][j][p] is a non-negative continuous variable representing the
        number of packages of product p shipped from city i to city j, where i and j
        are indices corresponding to the position of cities in the Cities list, and p
        is the index of the product in the Products list, defined only for (i,j) pairs
        that exist in Links.",
    "CONSTRAINTS": [
        "sum_{j: (i,j) in Links} flow[i][j][p] - sum_{j: (j,i) in Links} flow[j][i][p] =
            Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p] for all i in range(len(Cities)) and all p in
            range(len(Products))",
        "0 <= flow[i][j][p] <= Capacity[i][j][p] for all (i,j) in Links and all p in
            range(len(Products))",
        "sum_{p in range(len(Products))} flow[i][j][p] <= JointCapacity[i][j] for all
            (i,j) in Links"
    ],
    "OBJECTIVE": "minimize sum_{(i,j) in Links} sum_{p in range(len(Products))}
        ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i][j][p] - rationale: ShipmentCost is a 3D array
        indexed by [link_index][product_index], where link_index corresponds to the
        position of (i,j) in the Links list. Thus, for each link (i,j), we use its
        positional index in Links (not city-to-city mapping) to access the correct
        cost. The original code incorrectly attempted to map city names to link
        indices using a dictionary (link_to_idx), but the cost array is already
        indexed by link position in Links, so we directly use i,j as indices into
        ShipmentCost assuming the order of Links matches the first dimension of
        ShipmentCost."
}}
}

```

```

Programming Expert:
{inputs:
- Initial Code:
import gurobipy as gp
from gurobipy import GRB
# Extract parameters
Cities = ['A', 'B']
Links = [['A', 'B']]
Products = ['Product1']
Supply = [[10], [0]]
Demand = [[0], [10]]
ShipmentCost = [[[1]]]
Capacity = [[[10]]]
JointCapacity = [[10]]
# Map cities to indices

```



```

city_to_idx = {city: i for i, city in enumerate(Cities)}
n_cities = len(Cities)
n_products = len(Products)
n_links = len(Links)
# Create index mappings for links
link_to_idx = {}
for idx, link in enumerate(Links):
    link_to_idx[(link[0], link[1])] = idx
# Initialize model
model = gp.Model("Multi_Product_Transportation")
# Decision variables: flow[i][j][p] = amount of product p shipped from city i to
    city j
flow = model.addVars(
    n_cities, n_cities, n_products,
    lb=0, ub=GRB.INFINITY, name="flow"
)
# Objective: minimize total shipping cost
model.setObjective(
    gp.quicksum(
        ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i], Cities[j])]][p] * flow[i, j, p]
        for i in range(n_cities)
        for j in range(n_cities)
        for p in range(n_products)
        if (Cities[i], Cities[j]) in link_to_idx
    ),
    GRB.MINIMIZE
)
# Flow conservation constraints: supply - demand = net outflow
for i in range(n_cities):
    for p in range(n_products):
        outflow = gp.quicksum(flow[i, j, p] for j in range(n_cities) if (Cities[i],
            Cities[j]) in link_to_idx)
        inflow = gp.quicksum(flow[j, i, p] for j in range(n_cities) if (Cities[j],
            Cities[i]) in link_to_idx)
        model.addConstr(outflow - inflow == Supply[i][p] - Demand[i][p],
            name=f"flow_balance_{i}_{p}")
# Per-product capacity constraints
for link_idx, (i_city, j_city) in enumerate(Links):
    i = city_to_idx[i_city]
    j = city_to_idx[j_city]
    for p in range(n_products):
        model.addConstr(flow[i, j, p] <= Capacity[link_idx][p],
            name=f"capacity_{i}_{j}_{p}")
# Joint capacity constraint: total flow on link (sum over products) must not exceed
    joint capacity
for link_idx, (i_city, j_city) in enumerate(Links):
    i = city_to_idx[i_city]
    j = city_to_idx[j_city]
    total_flow = gp.quicksum(flow[i, j, p] for p in range(n_products))
    model.addConstr(total_flow <= JointCapacity[link_idx][0],
        name=f"joint_capacity_{i}_{j}")
# Optimize model
model.optimize()
- Error Message:
{'iter_2': ...ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i], Cities[j])]][p] * flow[i, j,
    p]...TypeError: can't multiply sequence by non-int of type '\Var\'', 'status':
    'Runtime Error'}
- Memory Tip:
{
    "tip_type": "code",
    "scenario": "transportation",
    "error_statement": "The cost of shipping one package of product p from city i to
        city j is ShipmentCost_{i, j, p}",

```

```

"code_error_location": {
  "objective_setting": "IndexError: list index out of range",
  "data_processing": "Mismatch between 3D ShipmentCost structure and assumed
    indexing"
},
"correct_code_snippet": "ShipmentCost[link_to_idx[(Cities[i], Cities[j])]][p] *
  flow[i, j, p]",
"incorrect_code_snippet": "ShipmentCost[i][j][p] * flow[i, j, p]"
}
}
Programming Expert:
{output:"The new code(second revision)"}

[After Revision] Result: ACCEPT

```

D.4. Analysis of Results

In the initial implementation phase, the Programming Expert erroneously assumed the transportation network to be a fully connected graph and adopted a Cartesian product traversal of all city pairs to construct the objective function. However, the data provided in the problem only contains specific sparse links. This exhaustive traversal caused the solver code to trigger an ‘IndexError’ (list index out of range) when attempting to access the ‘ShipmentCost’ for non-existent links.

In response to this error, the system triggered the first revision (Attempt 1). The Modeling Expert rapidly identified the mismatch between the model and the data structure, pointing out that the objective function must iterate only over the existing links. Accordingly, the Programming Expert introduced a ‘link_to_idx’ mapping table and corrected the solver code logic to traverse only valid links. However, although this correction resolved the index out of range issue, the newly generated solver code encountered a ‘TypeError’ during runtime. The error message indicated that the system was attempting to multiply a sequence by a Gurobi variable, suggesting that the solver code’s handling of the indexing levels for the 3D array ‘ShipmentCost’ remained biased, failing to extract scalar values.

Faced with this more subtle data type error, the system conducted a second revision (Attempt 2). During this stage, the MIRROR performed an in-depth analysis of the 3D list structure of ‘ShipmentCost’. The Modeling Expert provided a crucial Memory Tip, explicitly specifying that the correct indexing method must precisely match the data dimensions. Based on this, the Programming Expert fine-tuned the solver code again, correcting the indexing for the cost and capacity arrays (e.g., adjusting from ‘ShipmentCost[...][p]’ to ‘ShipmentCost[...][0][p]’ to adapt to the data structure).

After these two rounds of feedback-based iterative optimization, the solver code finally passed compilation and was solved successfully (Final result: ACCEPT). This process demonstrates that the IAR mechanism can not only repair surface-level syntax errors but also progressively resolve deep-seated logical flaws and data structure alignment issues through multiple rounds of “trial-analysis-correction” loops, thereby ensuring the correctness and robustness of the final solution.

E. Prompt Templates for Agents

Prior to acceptance, and to prevent unintended disclosure of the full implementation, only partial prompt templates are shown. In this section, we present representative excerpts of the prompt templates used by each expert agent in the MIRROR framework. These excerpts illustrate the core instruction structure that guides the Large Language Models in performing their specialized roles. Note that content enclosed in curly braces denotes dynamic placeholders. At runtime, these are filled with context-specific information—such as the user’s problem statement, feedback from the Iterative Adaptive Revision (IAR) mechanism, or relevant modeling exemplars retrieved via hierarchical retrieval. This modular and context-aware prompting design enables MIRROR to generalize across diverse optimization tasks while maintaining high fidelity and controllability.

Parameter Extractor

```

ROLE_DESCRIPTION = 'You are an assistant that extracts parameters and their types or
  shape from the given problem.'
GENERATION_TASK = '''

```

```

Please Extract parameters along with their concise definitions from the problem
description:
{problem_description}
The comment from your colleague is:
{comment_text}
**Key Principles for Parameter Type:
...
Your output should be in JSON format as follows:
{{
  "Parameter1": {"Type": ...,
    "Definition": ...},
  "Parameter2": {"Type": ...,
    "Definition": ...},
  ...
}}
Provide only the requested JSON output without any additional information.
'''

```

Modeling Advisor

```

ROLE_DESCRIPTION = """You are a senior operations research expert. Your role is to
provide constructive, positive insights about the problem's domain terminology,
key points, and essential nature-based strictly on the given text. Never
critique, imply missing information, or speculate."""
FORWARD_TASK = """Review the following problem description and your colleague's
comment:
{problem_description}
{comment_text}
Provide 2-3 concise, helpful insights that may support accurate modeling.
Each insight must belong to exactly one of these categories:
- "Domain Terminology":...
- "Problem Key Point": ...
- "Problem Essence": ...
All insights must be directly inferable from the provided text-do not invent
assumptions.
Output ONLY a JSON list in this exact format:
[
  {{
    "category": "Domain Terminology" | "Problem Key Point" | "Problem Essence",
    "insight": "A clear, practical sentence."
  }}
]
No other text, formatting, or explanation."""

```

Modeling Expert

```

ROLE_DESCRIPTION = 'You are a modeling assistant specialized in the field of
Operations Research for mathematical formulation.'
FORWARD_TASK = '''Now the origin problem is as follows:
{problem_description}
You can refer to the parameters and other information provided by your colleagues:
{comments_text}
please generate a optimization model for the problem.
Your output format should be a JSON like this:
{{
  "VARIABLES": ...
  "CONSTRAINTS": ...
  "OBJECTIVE": ...
}}
Don't give any other information.
'''

```

'''

Modeling Revision Expert

```

REVISION_TASK = '''You are a senior operations research expert performing debugging
and knowledge distillation.
Your task is to Diagnose the root cause and produce a fully corrected model.
and Extract a structured tip encoding: what went wrong, where, and how to fix
it - for future reuse. based on:
- The original problem description
- The incorrect model
- The solver error
- The last tip
### Input
Problem Description:
{problem_description}
###Original (Incorrect) Model:
{original_model}
###Execution Error (from the code):
{error_message}
### The Last tip for reference
The last tip is provided for reference only and may be incorrect - please carefully
verify and use your judgment
{last_tip}.
### Output Requirement
Return a tuple of two JSON objects:
First: A tip JSON with EXACTLY the following keys::
{{
  "tip_type":...
  "scenario": ...
  "error_statement": ...
  "correct_component":...
  "incorrect_model": ...
}}
Second: The fully corrected model in standard JSON format:
{{
  "VARIABLES": ...
  "CONSTRAINTS": ...
  "OBJECTIVE": ...
}}
You MUST output in exactly this format:
TIP_JSON
<split>
CORRECTED_MODEL_JSON
No additional text, explanations, or formatting marks are allowed.'''

```

Code Expert

```

ROLE_DESCRIPTION = 'You are a Python programmer specializing in operations research
and optimization.'
FORWARD_TASK = '''You are presented with a specific problem and tasked with
developing an efficient Python program to solve it.
The original problem is as follows:
{problem_description}
Your colleague has constructed a mathematical model for reference:
{comments_text}
Please note that this model may contain errors and is used as a reference.
...
Requirements:
1. ...

```

```
2. ...
3. ...
4. ...
```

Code Revision Expert

```
REVISION_TASK = '''You are debugging an optimization implementation that encountered
    errors during execution.
The original problem and attempted solution are as follows:
### Problem Context
{problem_description}
### Original Code
{initial_code}
### Execution Error
{error_message}
### The Last tip for reference
- The last tip is provided for reference only and may be incorrect - please
  carefully verify and use your judgment
{last_tip}.
Your goal is twofold:
1. Diagnose the root cause and produce a fully corrected implementation.
2. Extract a structured tip encoding: what went wrong, where, and how to fix it -
  for future reuse.
Output a tuple of two JSON objects:
(
  {{
    "tip_type": ...,
    "scenario": ...
    "error_statement": ...
    "correct_code_snippet": ...
    "incorrect_code_snippet": ...
  }},
  "Full corrected Python code using Gurobipy"
)
Rules:
-...
- ...
- ...
- ...
Return exactly:
TIP_JSON
<split>
CORRECTED_CODE_JSON
'''
```