

# Gold-Medal-Level Olympiad Geometry Solving with Efficient Heuristic Auxiliary Constructions

Boyan Duan <sup>△</sup>, Xiao Liang <sup>○†</sup>, Shuai Lu <sup>□</sup>, Yaoxiang Wang <sup>□</sup>, Yelong Shen <sup>□</sup>, Kai-Wei Chang <sup>○</sup>,  
Ying Nian Wu <sup>○</sup>, Mao Yang <sup>□</sup>, Weizhu Chen <sup>□</sup>, Yeyun Gong <sup>□†</sup>

<sup>△</sup>ETH Zurich, <sup>□</sup>Microsoft, <sup>○</sup>University of California, Los Angeles

Work done during Boyan, Xiao, and Yaoxiang’s internship at Microsoft, <sup>†</sup>Corresponding authors.

Automated theorem proving in Euclidean geometry, particularly for International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO) level problems, remains a major challenge and an important research focus in Artificial Intelligence. In this paper, we present a highly efficient method for geometry theorem proving that runs entirely on CPUs without relying on neural network-based inference. Our initial study shows that a simple random strategy for adding auxiliary points can achieve “silver-medal” level human performance on IMO. Building on this, we propose **HAGeo**, a Heuristic-based method for adding Auxiliary constructions in Geometric deduction that solves **28 of 30** problems on the IMO-30 benchmark, achieving “gold-medal” level performance and surpassing AlphaGeometry, a competitive neural network-based approach, by a notable margin. To evaluate our method and existing approaches more comprehensively, we further construct **HAGeo-409**, a benchmark consisting of 409 geometry problems with human-assessed difficulty levels. Compared with the widely used IMO-30, our benchmark poses greater challenges and provides a more precise evaluation, setting a higher bar for geometry theorem proving.



**Date:** December 2, 2025



**Code:** <https://github.com/boduan1/HAGeo>



**Benchmark:** <https://huggingface.co/datasets/HAGeo-409>



**Email:** Xiao Liang ([vitoliang0601@gmail.com](mailto:vitoliang0601@gmail.com)); Yeyun Gong ([yegong@microsoft.com](mailto:yegong@microsoft.com))

## 1 Introduction

Automatic mathematical theorem proving is one of the fundamental goals of Artificial Intelligence (AI). As a branch of mathematics studied for over two millennia, Euclidean geometry serves as one of the four primary problem categories in the International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO), the world’s leading high school mathematics competition. Given its enduring importance, automated theorem proving in Euclidean geometry has remained a focus of research and has been extensively studied for decades (Gelernter, 1959; Gelernter et al., 1960; Reiter, 1972).

As a recent advance, AlphaGeometry (Trinh et al., 2024) demonstrates remarkable progress by utilizing a deduction database and an algebraic reasoning (DDAR) engine. It employs a neural-symbolic system to exhaustively deduce new statements using a symbolic engine and a neural language model trained on hundreds of millions of synthetic data to add auxiliary points for Euclidean geometry problem solving. It achieves a “silver-medal” performance on the IMO-30 benchmark, a collection of 30 competition-level geometry problems from the International Mathematical Olympiad between 2000 and 2022, solving 24 of the 30 problems <sup>1</sup>. More recently, by incorporating multiple Large Language Models (LLMs) instead of a small neural network and introducing a shared knowledge mechanism, AlphaGeometry2 (Chervonyi et al., 2025) successfully solves all problems in IMO-30. Meanwhile, TongGeometry (Zhang et al., 2024) achieves the same performance by employing neural models with guided tree search; however, its technical details remain unreported.

Despite their effectiveness, a common limitation of these methods is the reliance on neural models, particularly LLMs, which requires additional GPU resources for inference. In our initial study, we find that even a simple

<sup>1</sup>We report that one of the 25 announced proofs by AlphaGeometry on IMO-30 is wrong in Appendix A.

random strategy for adding auxiliary points using only CPUs allows the system to reach AlphaGeometry’s performance on IMO-30, solving 25 of 30 problems. These surprising results raise a promising research question: *Could the system achieve “gold-medal” performance by simply employing an efficient strategy for adding auxiliary points without relying on neural inference?*

To answer this, we propose **HAGeo**, a heuristic method that relies solely on adding auxiliary constructions in deduction without using a neural network, outperforming AlphaGeometry and achieving “gold-medal” performance on the IMO-30 benchmark. Specifically, HAGeo adds heuristic auxiliary points with favorable geometric properties, such as the intersections of circles and lines, which can be discovered through numerical calculations. Given that the deduction engine already assumes all numerical information is available, our method introduces no additional assumptions about numerical values. Moreover, we develop optimized deduction rules to lower time complexity without sacrificing deductive capability and optimize the implementation, yielding an approximately 20× speedup over AlphaGeometry’s DDAR engine. These improvements enable faster and more scalable inference.

For evaluation, while the IMO-30 benchmark is widely used, we find that it overlooks problem difficulty and most of its problems are relatively easy, as judged by professionals. Besides, it consists of only 30 problems, which could lead to high variance in evaluation. Therefore, this benchmark does not reliably reflect a method’s true capability. To address the limitations of IMO-30 and more comprehensively evaluate geometry problem solving, we construct **HAGeo-409**, a benchmark consisting of 409 Olympiad-level geometry problems with human-assessed difficulty labels and generally more challenging than IMO-30. The problems have been systematically converted into geometry-specific language assisted by LLMs, numerically verified, and corrected through manual inspection, making them more rigorous for evaluation.

*In summary, our main contributions are as follows:*


- We propose HAGeo, a heuristic method for adding auxiliary points in automated theorem proving for Euclidean geometry, achieving “gold-medal” performance on CPUs and surpassing AlphaGeometry’s neural network-based approach.
- We implemented an improved DDAR engine that achieves roughly a 20× inference speedup compared to AlphaGeometry’s DDAR engine.
- We construct HAGeo-409, a comprehensive benchmark comprising 409 IMO-level geometry problems with human-assessed difficulty scores that are generally more challenging than those in IMO-30. Experiments on both benchmarks demonstrate the effectiveness of our method.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Automated Theorem Proving for Euclidean Geometry

Existing methods for automated theorem proving in Euclidean geometry can be broadly divided into algebraic and synthetic approaches. Algebraic methods typically transform a geometry problem into a system of polynomial equations, which can then be solved using Wu’s method (Wu, 1978; Chou, 1988) or the Gröbner basis method (Lazard, 1983). For synthetic methods, Chou et al. (1993) applied the area method and generated human-readable proofs for more than 400 geometry problems, while Chou et al. (2000) introduced a deductive database (DD) based on a set of geometric rules.

Building on synthetic methods, remarkable progress has recently been made in the field. AlphaGeometry (Trinh et al., 2024) improves the *DD method with an additional algebraic engine* (DDAR) and employs a neural network to add extra auxiliary points for geometry problems. It achieves a “silver-medal” performance on the IMO-30 benchmark. When combined with Wu’s method (Sinha et al., 2024), which independently solves 15 of the 30 problems on IMO-30, AlphaGeometry can solve 27/30 problems. More recently, TongGeometry (Zhang et al., 2024) improved AlphaGeometry’s DD engine and proposed a tree-search-based method that solves 30/30 problems on IMO-30, but the technical details remain unavailable. AlphaGeometry2 (Chervonyi et al., 2025) introduces several improvements over AlphaGeometry, including enhancements to its geometric language, increased efficiency of the DDAR engine, and support for the “double point” feature in DDAR. It further extends the neural network with an ensemble of multiple language models and introduces shareable



**Figure 1** Problem difficulty distribution of the IMO-30 benchmark and our new HAGeo-409 benchmark.

knowledge across different searches, while also refining the synthetic dataset with more complex problems and a better-balanced distribution.

## 2.2 Geometry Problem Dataset

Prior work has collected multiple Olympiad-level mathematics datasets for theorem proving (Ying et al., 2024; Xin et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2024; De Moura et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2021). However, these datasets primarily focus on algebra and number theory in Olympiad competitions, with only a few of them dedicated to Olympiad-level geometry theorem proving. Furthermore, most of them are based on *Lean* (Moura and Ullrich, 2021), which is less effective for geometry problems. Recent work (Liang et al., 2025a; Li et al., 2025) shows even frontier LLMs exhibit weaker performance on geometry than on algebra, and data augmentation targeted at this challenging subdomain has shown promise in mitigating this issue (Liang et al., 2025b).

Recently, AlphaGeometry generated a large-scale synthetic dataset with 100 million problems to train a neural network for adding auxiliary points. It randomly generates geometric configurations and uses the DDAR engine to deduce geometric facts, which are then considered as geometry problems. GeoGen (Bak et al., 2020) proposes adding a few objects to triangle and quadrilateral configurations to extract geometry theorems, generating more than 100 turnaround problems. Using a method similar to GeoGen, TongGeometry generates over 100 million geometric configurations and extracts 6 billion geometry problems. However, their further technical details are not provided.


## 3 HAGeo-409 Benchmark Construction

Previous studies, such as AlphaGeometry, primarily employed two benchmarks to evaluate their Euclidean geometry theorem-proving systems: JGEX-231 (Sturm and Zengler, 2011) and IMO-30. The JGEX-231 benchmark consists of 231 relatively simple geometry problems, while IMO-30 includes only 30 problems drawn from International Mathematical Olympiads spanning 2000 to 2022. Furthermore, as in the IMO competition, problems 1 and 4, 2 and 5, and 3 and 6 typically differ substantially in difficulty; however, we observe that the IMO-30 benchmark predominantly contains problems that are not especially challenging.

Since it is important to know the upper limit of problem difficulty that a method could solve, in this work, we constructed a more comprehensive benchmark from Mathematical Olympiad competitions, with each problem annotated with human-evaluated difficulty levels. We first collected more than 2000 geometry problems from the contest data collection of Art of Problem Solving website (Programs, 2025). Then, we converted these problems into our geometry-specific language, with an illustration provided in Appendix C. The successfully converted raw dataset contained more than 1,000 geometry problems, all of which were verified numerically, ensuring that each problem’s conclusion is numerically correct.

However, not all problems in the raw dataset are paired with a human-annotated difficulty score. We retain a subset of problems, along with around 50 additional problems from the mathematical platform ShuZhiMi<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>A Wechat mini program dedicated to Olympiad-level mathematical problems.



**Figure 2** Overview of the HAGEO method. First, the DDAR engine deduces new statements in the problem. If the DDAR does not solve the problem, our heuristic-based strategy gives additional attempts for adds auxiliary constructions to help solve the problem and re-runs the DDAR.

The difficulty level ranges from 1 to 7 (corresponding to easy to hard) and is defined as the average rating provided by ShuZhiMi users. The final benchmark contains over 400 problems with difficulty level annotations. We categorize the benchmark into difficulty ranges  $[1, 3)$ ,  $[3, 4)$ ,  $[4, 5)$ ,  $[5, 6)$ ,  $[6, 7]$  and present the statistics in Figure 1. Notably, compared with HAGEO-409, whose average difficulty is 3.47, the IMO-30 benchmark is relatively easy, with an average difficulty of only 2.85.

We also report that the conversion process is non-trivial. We employ GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024) with a few-shot prompt, as illustrated in Prompt 3, to convert geometry problems from natural language into our geometry-specific language. However, only around 50% of the problems could be converted into a construction-based definition, and less than 20% could be automatically converted and numerically verified. We then manually revised the remaining problems that could be expressed in our geometric language and obtained the raw dataset. To evaluate AlphaGeometry on our HAGEO-409, we used GPT-4o with Prompt 2 to convert the problems into the AlphaGeometry format, and manually corrected errors in the converted problems. To ensure a fair comparison with AlphaGeometry, we further refined HAGEO-409 to align with the its format as closely as possible. For example, if AlphaGeometry defines the circumcircle as  $o = \text{circumcenter } a \ b \ c$ ;  $d = \text{oncircle } o \ a$ ; (which introduces the circumcenter), we also add this point in our setting.

## 4 Method


### 4.1 General Pipeline

In HAGEO, a geometry problem is first converted into our geometry-specific language and then processed to encode all its properties into a deduction graph. The Deduction Database (DD) (Section 4.3) and Algebraic Reasoning (AR) (Section 4.4) engines expand the deduction graph through a brute-force search over all deduction rules and by performing algebraic deductions involving equations of length, ratio, or angle. If the DDAR fails to solve the problem, we further attempt  $K$  different auxiliary constructions based on our heuristic strategies, and the DDAR engine is rerun for each attempt, as detailed in Section 4.5. Additional details on DDAR are provided in Appendix B. The overview of HAGEO is shown in Figure 2.

### 4.2 Geometry-Specific Languages

Unlike theorem proving in other mathematical domains, such as algebra, which can be formally expressed in *Lean*, geometry lacks a standardized formal language for theorem proving. In HAGEO, we adopt the geometry-specific language in GeoGebra (Team, 2025), which includes definitions of points, lines, and circles, along with a fixed set of construction actions.

For example, consider a problem that defines new points  $X, Y$  as the intersection of line  $AB$  and a circle that is centered at  $O$  and passes through point  $P$ . Our geometric language first defines the line  $AB$ :  $l = \text{line } A \ B$ , then circle  $(O, OP)$ :  $\omega = \text{circle\_center\_point } O \ P$ , and then define the points  $X, Y$ :  $X, Y = \text{intersection } l \ \omega$ . When the problem involves more advanced constraints, we address them through curve intersections. For example, if the problem defines a point  $X$  that satisfies  $\angle AXB = \angle CDE$  and  $X$  lies on line  $PQ$ , we first define a curve  $\omega$  with the first condition, then set  $X$  as the intersection of  $\omega$  and line  $PQ$ .



**Figure 3** Pipeline for adding heuristic auxiliary points. Each complete auxiliary construction consists of up to  $N$  rounds of auxiliary point generation. In each round, the system selects one valid auxiliary point from all possible candidates determined through algebraical computation.

In contrast to AlphaGeometry, which employs a point-based geometric language that considers only points, our definition better reflects the natural language of problem statements, encompassing diverse geometric objects. This design is also more consistent with the deduction engine that includes rules with multiple objects, such as lines and circles, rather than only points as in AlphaGeometry.

### 4.3 Deduction

The symbolic deduction engine deduces new statements by brute-force searching over a fixed set of deduction rules. Each deduction rule has the form  $P_1(x_1), \dots, P_k(x_k) \Rightarrow Q(x)$ , where  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  and  $Q$  are predicates, and  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  and each  $x$  represent a set of geometric objects. Since defining the same point in different ways is an important technique, we extend the DD engine to support deductions involving identical points, whereas AlphaGeometry’s engine restricts all points to be distinct.

The deduction is represented as a graph, where geometric objects and relations are represented as vertices and edges. Whenever a new property is deduced, the deduction graph is updated accordingly—by adding vertices or edges, or by merging existing ones. To enhance scalability and inference speed, we develop a deduction engine that operates with significantly higher efficiency, *running approximately 20 times faster than AlphaGeometry*. Specifically, we evaluate both methods on the same machine. The average solving time of AlphaGeometry’s DDAR on IMO-30 is 42.77 seconds, whereas ours achieves an average of 1.75 seconds, representing a  $24\times$  speed improvement.

The improved inference efficiency stems from the modifications to the deduction rules and the optimizations in their implementation. We provide two examples in the following grey box. These updated rules reduce time complexity while preserving the same deductive capacity, thereby improving the efficiency of most time-consuming rules and significantly accelerating the speed of the deduction engine.

### 4.4 Algebraic Reasoning

Building on the geometric properties deduced by the DD engine, we further adapt an AR engine to infer additional statements algebraically. The AR engine first converts all length, ratio, and angle relations into linear equations. For example, it converts  $\angle(l_1, l_2) = \angle(l_3, l_4)$  into  $\text{dir}(l_1) + \text{dir}(l_4) - \text{dir}(l_2) - \text{dir}(l_3) = 0$ , where  $\text{dir}(l)$  represents the direction of the line as the directed angle of  $l$  with the  $x$  axis *mod*  $\pi$ . It then aggregates all linear equations into a coefficient matrix and derives new relations accordingly. Specifically, it

1. We replace (angle-chasing rule on lines  $l_i, m_i$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \angle(l_1, l_2) = \angle(m_1, m_2), \angle(l_1, l_3) = \angle(m_1, m_3) \\ \Rightarrow \angle(l_2, l_3) = \angle(m_2, m_3) \\ \Downarrow \\ \angle(l_1, l_2) = \angle(m_1, m_2) \Rightarrow \angle(l_1, m_1) = \angle(l_2, m_2) \end{aligned}$$

(2) We replace (positive similar triangle rule on  $\triangle ABC, \triangle DEF$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \angle(AB, BC) = \angle(DE, EF), \angle(AC, BC) = \angle(DF, EF) \Rightarrow \triangle ABC \stackrel{+}{\sim} \triangle DEF \\ \Downarrow \\ \angle(AB, DE) = \angle(AC, DF) = \angle(BC, EF) \\ \Rightarrow \triangle ABC \stackrel{+}{\sim} \triangle DEF \end{aligned}$$

uses Gaussian Elimination<sup>3</sup> to identify the independent set of variables and express all variables as linear combinations of this set. It then expresses all  $x_i - x_j$  as linear combinations of the independent variables and finds all equivalent  $x_{i1} - x_{j1} = x_{i2} - x_{j2}$ .

It is worth noting that our implementation is fully based on matrix manipulation. To reduce matrix size and improve computational efficiency, we merge all equivalent variables before constructing the matrix. For the final step, we use an equivalent alternative implementation that takes all  $x_i + x_j$  instead of  $x_i - x_j$  and finds all  $x_{i1} + x_{j1} = x_{i2} + x_{j2}$ , which halves the computation due to the symmetry.


#### 4.5 Heuristic for Auxiliary Points

Adding auxiliary constructions is an important strategy for solving geometry problems and can be regarded as selecting from the set of all valid auxiliary objects. However, while the number of valid constructions can be very large, only a small set of them is useful. AlphaGeometry employs a neural network to construct auxiliary points while reporting that its implemented heuristic approach solves only 18 out of 30 problems on the IMO-30 benchmark. However, in their implementation, the rule-based heuristic only uses fixed rules to add auxiliary points. For example, "If  $M$  is the midpoint of  $AB$ , and  $N$  is the midpoint of  $CD$ , then add the midpoint  $P$  of  $AD$  as an auxiliary point".

In geometry, we usually add auxiliary constructions with good geometric properties; for example, the intersection of multiple curves may yield a promising auxiliary point. Guided by this principle, our heuristic designates a constructed point as a potential auxiliary point if it non-trivially lies on a line or circle.

Specifically, we employ a numerically driven auxiliary-point heuristic that only includes basic auxiliary constructions, such as the midpoint, reflection, foot of the perpendicular, and intersection, since it is easy to verify whether the resulting relation is trivial. Importantly, the numerical calculations introduce no extra assumptions for assigning numerical values to all geometric objects. This is because the deduction step (as detailed in Section 4.3) already requires numerical checks, such as verifying that points  $A, B, C$  are not collinear, which inherently assumes that numerical values for all geometric objects are available.

We categorize auxiliary points into several categories, as detailed in Figure 4 and illustrated in the paired visualization in Figure 5, including previously mentioned points with favorable geometric properties such as *intersections*, *midpoints*, and *reflections*. The random auxiliary points are also incorporated to enhance the generalization of the procedure. Additionally,



**Figure 5 Illustration of heuristic auxiliary points.** Geometry configuration:  $I, G, O, H$  are the incenter, centroid, circumcenter, and orthocenter of  $\triangle ABC$ ;  $L, M, N$  are the midpoints of  $BC, CA, AB$ ; and  $D, E, F$  are the tangent points of the incircle ( $I$ ) with sides  $BC, CA, AB$ .

<sup>3</sup>[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaussian\\_elimination](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaussian_elimination)



### Heuristics for Auxiliary Points

#### 1. The intersection of multiple lines.

If multiple lines  $l_1, \dots, l_n$  intersect ( $n \geq 3$ ), then take the intersection of two of them as an auxiliary point.

Eg.1: The lines  $AD, BE, CF$  intersects, and we can take  $U = AD \cap BE$  as an auxiliary point.

#### 2. The intersection of multiple lines and circles.

If multiple lines  $l_1, \dots, l_n$  and circles  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m$  intersect ( $m + n \geq 3, n \geq 1$ ), then take the intersection of a line and a circle ( $m \geq 1$ ) or two circles ( $n \geq 3$ ) as an auxiliary point.

Eg.2: The lines  $AI, OL$  and circle  $(ABC)$  intersects, and we can take  $V$ , the intersection of  $AI$  and  $(ABC)$  as an auxiliary point.

#### 3. A midpoint non-trivially lies on lines or circles.

If the midpoint of  $AB$  lies on a line  $l \neq AB$  or a circle  $\omega$ , then take it as an auxiliary point.

Eg.3: The midpoint of  $AH$ , defined as  $W$ , lies on circle  $(LMN)$ , and we take  $W$  as an auxiliary point.

#### 4. Reflection of a point with respect to another point non-trivially lies on lines or circles.

If the reflection of a point  $A$  wrt another point  $B$  lies on line  $l \neq AB$  or circle  $\omega$ , then take it as an auxiliary point.

Eg.4: The reflection of  $H$  wrt  $L$ , defined as  $X$ , lies on circle  $(ABC)$ , and we take  $X$  as an auxiliary point.

#### 5. Foot of a point lies on another line.

If the foot of a point  $A$  on line  $l$  ( $A \notin l$ ) lies on another line  $m$  ( $m \neq l, A \notin m$ ), then take it as an auxiliary point.

Eg.5: The foot of point  $B$  on line  $AI$  lies on line  $LN$ , defined as  $Y$ , and we take  $Y$  as an auxiliary point.

#### 6. Random constructions.

Randomly perform an action over a random set of geometry objects corresponding to the action.

Eg.6: Construct a point  $Z$  such that  $\triangle ZHD$  is a clockwise equilateral triangle.

**Figure 4** The heuristics proposed in HAGeo. The paired visualization is present in Figure 5. Each heuristic is exemplified using a distinct color, which are aligned with the lines and points shown in Figure 5.

we also provide a special heuristic for “identical points”: if an existing point lies on multiple circles and lines, this point of intersection (which is identical to the existing one) is also selected as an auxiliary point.

If the system fails to solve a geometric problem in the initial DDAR, we add auxiliary points based on our heuristics to assist the DDAR engine for up to  $K$  additional attempts. Specifically, during each auxiliary construction attempt, the system first calculates all potential auxiliary points from the aforementioned heuristic categories and then randomly selects one point(s) along with its corresponding construction. It repeats this process for  $N$  rounds and obtains the final set of auxiliary constructions, which are integrated into the new DDAR runs. It is worth noting that both the DDAR and heuristic auxiliary construction procedures are fully executed on CPUs without neural inference. The experiments in Section 5.2 show that equipping DDAR with our proposed heuristic auxiliary adding approach yields high efficiency and effectiveness, surpassing both the random selection baseline and the neural-network-based strategy in AlphaGeometry.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Settings

**Parameters** . In our proposed HAGeo, we set the number of auxiliary construction rounds to  $N = 6$  in each auxiliary attempt. In experiments on the IMO-30 dataset in Table 2, we use  $K = 4096$  auxiliary construction attempts, which is significantly fewer than the equivalent auxiliary and DDAR attempts used in AlphaGeometry. For comparison on HAGeo-409, we set the number of attempts  $K = 2048$  for both our heuristic methods and a random baseline for adding auxiliary points, as this yields a roughly comparable number of DDAR samples to those in the AlphaGeometry experiment. We also report the performance of our method and the random baseline at  $K = 8192$  to evaluate the upper bound of our approach.

Level	Count	AlphaGeometry 16-64-8	Random @2048	HAGeo @2048	Random @8192	HAGeo @8192
1–3	161	118 (73.3%)	127 (78.9%)	141 (87.6%)	128 (79.5%)	149 (92.5%)
3–4	112	44 (39.3%)	62 (55.4%)	87 (77.7%)	69 (61.6%)	93 (83.0%)
4–5	71	13 (18.3%)	13 (18.3%)	29 (40.8%)	18 (25.4%)	36 (50.7%)
5–6	43	2 (4.7%)	2 (4.7%)	5 (11.6%)	3 (7.0%)	7 (16.3%)
6–7	22	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.1%)
Total	409	177 (43.3%)	204 (49.9%)	263 (64.3%)	218 (53.3%)	287 (70.2%)

**Table 1** Experimental results on the HAGeo-409 benchmark across different difficulty levels. We compare our HAGeo method with AlphaGeometry and the random baseline. In AlphaGeometry, we set the beam search parameter to be (beam, batch, depth) = (16, 64, 8). For both the random auxiliary point construction and the strategies in HAGeo, we set  $K$  to 2,048 and 8,192 to ensure a comprehensive evaluation.

Method	IMO-30
DDAR	15
AlphaGeometry	24*
Random Auxiliary points + DDAR	25
HAGeo	28

**Table 2** Comparison on the IMO-30 benchmark. \* indicates that we report AlphaGeometry as solving 24 problems instead of 25, as we found the proof for IMO-2020-P1 to be incorrect, details provided in Appendix A.


**Device and Time Constraints** All experiments were conducted on a 64-core CPU machine, with an additional 80 GB A100 GPU used for AlphaGeometry’s language model (LM). Each DDAR run was given a 60-second time limit per problem, with a total of 1.5 hours allocated for experiments on the IMO-30 benchmark. We implemented a parallel version of AlphaGeometry’s DDAR code and separated its LM and DDAR inference. The LM was first executed for full beam search under a 1.5-hour time limit, generating a complete list of auxiliary proposals. For a fair comparison, we then run their DDAR to solve the problems under another 1.5-hour time constraint. To perform all methods on a 64-core machine under a 1.5 hour time limit, we set AlphaGeometry’s beam search parameter to (beam, batch, depth) = (16, 64, 8), which approximately reaches the maximum time limit setting on the 64-core CPU device.

## 5.2 Results

**Evaluation on the IMO-30 Benchmark** We compare the performance of HAGeo with AlphaGeometry and the random baseline on the IMO-30 benchmark, as shown in Table 2. Given the erroneous proofs potentially resulting from implementation mistakes in AlphaGeometry, we emphasize that manual verification is essential for the final evaluation. Therefore, we manually verified the proofs produced by our method on the IMO-30 benchmark, conducted by an IMO gold medalist. We find that even the random strategy for adding auxiliary points could solve 25 problems in the IMO-30 dataset, which is comparable to AlphaGeometry and reaches the “silver-medal” performance. Notably, our proposed HAGeo solves 28 out of 30 problems, outperforming AlphaGeometry by a notable margin and achieving “gold-medal” performance on IMO-30. We further evaluated our method on recent IMO problems from 2024 and 2025 (with difficulty scores of 2.5 and 3.2, respectively), where it successfully solved them within 20 seconds each.

**Evaluation on our HAGeo-409 benchmark** . We also compare our method with AlphaGeometry and the random baseline on the HAGeo-409 benchmark, with the results reported in Table 1. Notably, all methods solve fewer problems as the difficulty increases, demonstrating the reliability of the difficulty annotations in HAGeo-409. Notably, our method performs effectively in the difficulty ranges [1,3) and [3,4) when  $K$  is





**Figure 6** Pass@ $K$  results of HAGEo and the random DDAR baseline on HAGEo-409 across different difficulty levels. Top row: [1, 3], [3, 4], and [4, 5]; Bottom row: [5, 6], [6, 7], and the full benchmark. The red double arrow  $\leftrightarrow$  indicates the performance gap between the best results of the random baseline and our method.

set to 8192, achieving solve rates of 92.5% and 83.0%, respectively, surpassing AlphaGeometry by 19.2% and 43.7%. Moreover, our method is capable of successfully solving two of the most challenging problems at the difficulty level [6, 7]. These results highlight both the robust generalization and the strong upper-bound performance of HAGEo in automated geometric theorem proving.

### 5.3 Ablation Study

We conduct an ablation study to analyze the effect of the number of attempts  $K$  (Pass@ $K$ ) on the HAGEo-409 benchmark across different difficulty levels. Specifically, we report the number of solved problems under  $K$  generated auxiliary constructions and DDAR attempts using both the random strategy and the strategy employed in HAGEo, as illustrated in Figure 6. As  $K$  increases, both the random and our heuristic auxiliary point construction strategies show improved performance, with our approach consistently outperforming the random baseline. Moreover, our strategy is able to solve the most difficult problems in the level of [6, 7] when  $K$  is sufficiently large. These results highlight the robust scalability and effectiveness of our strategy in addressing the most challenging geometry theorem-proving tasks as  $K$  grows.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose HAGEo, a heuristic method based on numerical computation using only CPUs to add auxiliary points in DDAR for automated Euclidean geometry theorem proving. Our method solves 28 out of 30 problems on the IMO-30 benchmark, achieving “gold-medal” performance while being 20 times faster than AlphaGeometry. Furthermore, we develop a more comprehensive benchmark, HAGEo-409, with human-evaluated difficulty annotations, featuring geometric problems that are generally more difficult than those in the IMO-30 benchmark. Experiments on this new benchmark also demonstrate both the scalability and effectiveness of our method.

## References

- P Bak, RNDr Stanislav Krajčí, and Mgr Michal Rolínek. *Automated generation of planar geometry Olympiad problems*. PhD thesis, Master Thesis, 2020.
- Yuri Chervonyi, Trieu H Trinh, Miroslav Olšák, Xiaomeng Yang, Hoang Nguyen, Marcelo Menegali, Junehyuk Jung, Vikas Verma, Quoc V Le, and Thang Luong. Gold-medalist performance in solving olympiad geometry with alphageometry2. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03544*, 2025.
- Shang-Ching Chou. An introduction to wu’s method for mechanical theorem proving in geometry. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 4(3):237–267, 1988.
- Shang-Ching Chou, Xiao-Shan Gao, and Jing-Zhong Zhang. Automated production of traditional proofs for theorems in euclidean geometry. In *Proceedings of Eighth IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 48–56, 1993.
- Shang-Ching Chou, Xiao-Shan Gao, and Jing-Zhong Zhang. A deductive database approach to automated geometry theorem proving and discovering. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 25(3):219–246, 2000.
- Leonardo De Moura, Soonho Kong, Jeremy Avigad, Floris Van Doorn, and Jakob von Raumer. The lean theorem prover (system description). In *Automated Deduction-CADE-25: 25th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Berlin, Germany, August 1-7, 2015, Proceedings 25*, pages 378–388. Springer, 2015.
- Herbert Gelernter. Realization of a geometry-theorem proving machine. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Processing*, page 273–282, 1959.
- Herbert Gelernter, James R Hansen, and Donald W Loveland. Empirical explorations of the geometry theorem machine. In *Papers presented at the May 3-5, 1960, western joint IRE-AIEE-ACM computer conference*, pages 143–149, 1960.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- Daniel Lazard. Gröbner bases, gaussian elimination and resolution of systems of algebraic equations. In *European Conference on Computer Algebra*, pages 146–156. Springer, 1983.
- Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiaxin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, et al. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419*, 2025.
- Xiao Liang, Zhong-Zhi Li, Yeyun Gong, Yang Wang, Hengyuan Zhang, Yelong Shen, Ying Nian Wu, and Weizhu Chen. Sws: Self-aware weakness-driven problem synthesis in reinforcement learning for llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08989*, 2025a.
- Xiao Liang, Zhongzhi Li, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Ying Nian Wu, Zhijiang Guo, and Weizhu Chen. Beyond pass@1: Self-play with variational problem synthesis sustains rlvr. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.14029*, 2025b.
- Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *International Conference on Automated Deduction*, pages 625–635. Springer, 2021.
- Aops Programs. Art of problem solving. [https://artofproblemsolving.com/community/c13\\_contests](https://artofproblemsolving.com/community/c13_contests), 2025. Accessed: 2025-06-24.
- Raymond Reiter. *The use of models in automatic theorem-proving*. University of British Columbia. Department of Computer Science, 1972.
- Shiven Sinha, Ameya Prabhu, Ponnuram Kumaraguru, Siddharth Bhat, and Matthias Bethge. Wu’s method can boost symbolic ai to rival silver medalists and alphageometry to outperform gold medalists at imo geometry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06405*, 2024.
- Thomas Sturm and Christoph Zengler. Automated deduction in geometry: 7th international workshop, adg 2008, shanghai, china, september 22-24, 2008, revised papers, 04 2011.
- Geogebra Team. Geogebra. <https://www.geogebra.org/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-06-24.
- Trieu H Trinh, Yuhuai Wu, Quoc V Le, He He, and Thang Luong. Solving olympiad geometry without human demonstrations. *Nature*, 625(7995):476–482, 2024.

- Chenrui Wei, Mengzhou Sun, and Wei Wang. Proving olympiad algebraic inequalities without human demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14219*, 2024.
- W-T Wu. On the decision problem and the mechanization of theorem proving in elementary geometry. *Scientia Sinica*, 21:157–179, 1978.
- Huajian Xin, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Zhizhou Ren, Qihao Zhu, Bo Liu, Chong Ruan, Wenda Li, and Xiaodan Liang. Deepseek-prover: Advancing theorem proving in llms through large-scale synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14333*, 2024.
- Huaiyuan Ying, Zijian Wu, Yihan Geng, Jiayu Wang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Lean workbook: A large-scale lean problem set formalized from natural language math problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03847*, 2024.
- Chi Zhang, Jiajun Song, Siyu Li, Yitao Liang, Yuxi Ma, Wei Wang, Yixin Zhu, and Song-Chun Zhu. Proposing and solving olympiad geometry with guided tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10673*, 2024.
- Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. Minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00110*, 2021.

## **Appendix Contents for HAGeo**

<b>A</b>	<b>Fallacious Proof in AlphaGeometry</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Preliminary for DDAR</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Example of our Geometry-Specific Language</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Example in our HAGeo-409</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Example Proof of a Problem in IMO-30</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Prompt to Convert Natural Language into AlphaGeometry’s Geometric Language</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>Prompt to Convert Natural Language into our Geometric language</b>	<b>23</b>

## A Fallacious Proof in AlphaGeometry

Here we present a detailed illustration of the fallacious proof for IMO-2020-P1 produced by AlphaGeometry. AlphaGeometry releases their proof to the IMO-30 problems in their supplementary material. As shown in section 2.28, the step 9 of the proof for IMO-2020-P1 is wrong.

In Step 9 of the proof, it states:

$P, A, M$  are collinear,  $A, Z, D$  are collinear,  $A, D, E$  are collinear,  $\angle OPM = \angle ONM$  and  $\angle ODE = \angle ONE \Rightarrow \angle(PO, AM) = \angle(DO, AZ)$ .

This statement is incorrect because it implicitly assumes that  $M$ ,  $N$ , and  $E$  are collinear, which is not proven.

## B Preliminary for DDAR

The Deductive Database and Algebraic Reasoning (**DDAR**) engine serves as the symbolic core of the existing generative automated geometry theorem-proving frameworks (Trinh et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Chervonyi et al., 2025). It combines rule-based deductive database (DD) inference with algebraic reasoning (AR), forming a unified system that jointly explores geometric and numerical dependencies.

**Deductive Database Engine.** The deductive component focuses on inferring new geometric properties from known premises using a set of geometric rules that follow the paradigm “If X, then Y”. Each rule encodes a logically valid transformation, such as deducing collinearity, parallelism, or equality of segments and angles. Inspired by AlphaGeometry (Trinh et al., 2024), we adopt a structured deductive engine (Chou et al., 2000; Sturm and Zengler, 2011) that incrementally expands the deductive closure of all provable statements. This procedure is highly efficient, typically finishing in seconds on standard CPUs and requiring at most a few minutes, while ensuring comprehensive coverage of symbolic inferences. A specific example of our deduction process in the geometry-specific language is provided in Case 1.

**Algebraic Reasoning.** The algebraic reasoning module complements the DD inference by handling arithmetic and ratio-based relations that cannot be captured symbolically. In AR, all geometric equalities are represented in a canonical linear form, such as  $a - b - c + d = 0$ , enabling the use of Gaussian elimination to uncover hidden dependencies among variables. Variables may correspond to geometric quantities, including angles, distances, or ratios. As an example from AlphaGeometry, the angle equality  $\angle ABC = \angle XYZ$  can be represented as  $s(AB) - s(BC) = s(XY) - s(YZ)$ , where  $s(AB)$  denotes the angle between segment  $AB$  and the x-axis, modulo  $\pi$ . Notably, the algebraic computations can be represented in a coefficient matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ , where  $N$  denotes the number of variables and  $M$  the number of input equations. To ensure numerical completeness, constant terms such as  $\pi$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and rational ratios are also included in the coefficient matrix. This algebraic procedure efficiently generates new equivalences, such as quantitative relationships among existing angles or edges, thereby enhancing the symbolic reasoning process.

**Joint Deductive–Algebraic Inference.** The DDAR engine could alternate between deductive and algebraic reasoning to build a consistent and exhaustive set of provable statements. After each round of symbolic deduction, the resulting statements could be passed to the algebraic module for further inference, and the new algebraic results are reintroduced into the deductive reasoning stage. This iterative interaction allows DDAR to reason across both geometric and numerical domains while maintaining logical soundness. In practice, the DDAR process converges rapidly, typically within a few seconds and may take up to minutes, yielding a compact yet complete closure of geometric knowledge for theorem proving.

## C Example of our Geometry-Specific Language

Here we provide an example (IMO 2010 p2) illustrating how we convert a geometric problem from its natural language description into our geometry-specific language.

*Problem in natural language:*

Given a triangle  $ABC$ , with  $I$  as its incenter and  $\Gamma$  as its circumcircle,  $AI$  intersects  $\Gamma$  again at  $D$ . Let  $E$  be a point on the arc  $BDC$ , and  $F$  a point on the segment  $BC$ , such that  $\angle BAF = \angle CAE < \frac{1}{2}\angle BAC$ . If  $G$  is the midpoint of  $IF$ , prove that the meeting point of the lines  $EI$  and  $DG$  lies on  $\Gamma$ .

*Problem in our geometry-specific language:*

A B C = triangle; O = circumcenter A B C; (O) = circumcircle A B C; I = incenter A B C; AI = line A I; D = intersection AI (O); BC = line B C; F = on\_line BC; l = angle\_equal1 A C B A F; E = intersection l (O); G = midpoint I F; DG = line D G; EI = line E I; K = intersection DG EI; Prove: cong O A O K

## D Example in our HAGeo-409

We also provide an example (ShuZhiMi 2023 MOST Mock p2) in our HAGeo-409 benchmark.

*Problem in natural language:*

Given two positively similar triangles  $\triangle A_1A_3A_5 \sim \triangle A_4A_6A_2$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ , define  $X_i$  as the intersection of  $A_iA_{i+2}$  and  $A_{i+1}A_{i-1}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ , let  $O_i$  be the circumcenter of  $\triangle A_iX_iA_{i+1}$  ( $A_7 = A_1$ ). Prove that the three lines  $O_1O_4, O_2O_5, O_3O_6$  are concurrent.

*Problem in our geometry-specific language:*

A1 A3 A5 = triangle; A4 = point; A6 = point; l1 = angle\_equal1 A4 A6 A5 A1 A3; l2 = angle\_equal1 A6 A4 A5 A3 A1; A2 = intersection l1 l2; A1A3 = line A1 A3; A2A6 = line A2 A6; X1 = intersection A1A3 A2A6; A2A4 = line A2 A4; X2 = intersection A1A3 A2A4; A3A5 = line A3 A5; X3 = intersection A2A4 A3A5; A4A6 = line A4 A6; X4 = intersection A3A5 A4A6; A1A5 = line A1 A5; X5 = intersection A1A5 A4A6; X6 = intersection A1A5 A2A6; O1 = circumcenter A1 X1 A2; O2 = circumcenter A2 X2 A3; O3 = circumcenter A3 X3 A4; O4 = circumcenter A4 X4 A5; O5 = circumcenter A5 X5 A6; O6 = circumcenter A6 X6 A1; O1O4 = line O1 O4; O2O5 = line O2 O5; K = intersection O1O4 O2O5; Prove: collinear K O3 O6



## E Example Proof of a Problem in IMO-30

Problem IMO-2008-p6 in Natural Language (Converted following AlphaGeometry):

Let  $T_1T_2T_3$  be a triangle. Define point  $I$  as the circumcenter of triangle  $T_1T_2T_3$ . Define circle  $(I)$  as the circle centered  $I$  passing through  $T_1$ . Let  $T_4$  be any point on circle  $(I)$ . Define lines  $l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4$  as the tangent lines at  $T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4$  on circle  $(I)$ . Define point  $A$  as the intersection of  $l_1, l_2$ . Define point  $B$  as the intersection of  $l_2, l_3$ . Define point  $C$  as the intersection of  $l_3, l_4$ . Define point  $D$  as the intersection of  $l_4, l_1$ . Define point  $I_1$  as incenter of triangle  $ABD$ . Define point  $I_2$  as the incenter of triangle  $BCD$ . Define point  $P_1$  as the foot of  $I_1$  on line  $BD$ . Define point  $P_2$  as the foot of  $I_2$  on line  $BD$ . Define  $(I_1)$  as the circle centered  $I_1$  passing through  $P_1$ . Define  $(I_2)$  as the circle centered  $I_2$  passing through  $P_2$ . Define lines  $m_1, m_2$  be the excommon tangent of circle  $(I_1), (I_2)$ . Define  $U_1, U_2$  as the tangent points of  $m_1, m_2$  with  $(I_1)$ . Define  $V_1, V_2$  as the tangent points of  $m_1, m_2$  with  $(I_2)$ . Define point  $X$  as the intersection of lines  $m_1, m_2$ . Prove that  $IX = IT_1$ .

The original Problem:

$T_1 T_2 T_3 = \text{obtuse\_triangle}$ ;  $I = \text{circumcenter } T_1 T_2 T_3$ ;  $(I) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I T_1$ ;  $T_4 = \text{on\_circle } (I)$ ;  $IT_1 = \text{line } I T_1$ ;  $IT_2 = \text{line } I T_2$ ;  $IT_3 = \text{line } I T_3$ ;  $IT_4 = \text{line } I T_4$ ;  $l_1 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_1 IT_1$ ;  $l_2 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_2 IT_2$ ;  $A = \text{intersection } l_1 l_2$ ;  $l_3 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_3 IT_3$ ;  $B = \text{intersection } l_2 l_3$ ;  $l_4 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_4 IT_4$ ;  $C = \text{intersection } l_3 l_4$ ;  $D = \text{intersection } l_4 l_1$ ;  $I_1 = \text{incenter } A B D$ ;  $I_2 = \text{incenter } B C D$ ;  $BD = \text{line } B D$ ;  $P_1 = \text{foot } I_1 BD$ ;  $P_2 = \text{foot } I_2 BD$ ;  $(I_1) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I_1 P_1$ ;  $(I_2) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I_2 P_2$ ;  $m_1 m_2 = \text{ex\_common\_tangent } (I_1) (I_2)$ ;  $U_1 = \text{intersection } m_1 (I_1)$ ;  $U_2 = \text{intersection } m_2 (I_1)$ ;  $V_1 = \text{intersection } m_1 (I_2)$ ;  $V_2 = \text{intersection } m_2 (I_2)$ ;  $X = \text{intersection } m_1 m_2$ ; Prove:  $\text{cong } I X I T_1$

The problem with our Auxiliary constructions:

$T_1 T_2 T_3 = \text{obtuse\_triangle}$ ;  $I = \text{circumcenter } T_1 T_2 T_3$ ;  $(I) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I T_1$ ;  $T_4 = \text{on\_circle } (I)$ ;  $IT_1 = \text{line } I T_1$ ;  $IT_2 = \text{line } I T_2$ ;  $IT_3 = \text{line } I T_3$ ;  $IT_4 = \text{line } I T_4$ ;  $l_1 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_1 IT_1$ ;  $l_2 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_2 IT_2$ ;  $A = \text{intersection } l_1 l_2$ ;  $l_3 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_3 IT_3$ ;  $B = \text{intersection } l_2 l_3$ ;  $l_4 = \text{perpendicular\_line } T_4 IT_4$ ;  $C = \text{intersection } l_3 l_4$ ;  $D = \text{intersection } l_4 l_1$ ;  $I_1 = \text{incenter } A B D$ ;  $I_2 = \text{incenter } B C D$ ;  $BD = \text{line } B D$ ;  $P_1 = \text{foot } I_1 BD$ ;  $P_2 = \text{foot } I_2 BD$ ;  $(I_1) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I_1 P_1$ ;  $(I_2) = \text{circle\_center\_point } I_2 P_2$ ;  $m_1 m_2 = \text{ex\_common\_tangent } (I_1) (I_2)$ ;  $U_1 = \text{intersection } m_1 (I_1)$ ;  $U_2 = \text{intersection } m_2 (I_1)$ ;  $V_1 = \text{intersection } m_1 (I_2)$ ;  $V_2 = \text{intersection } m_2 (I_2)$ ;  $X = \text{intersection } m_1 m_2$ ;  $l_5 = \text{line } B I_2$ ;  $E = \text{foot } I l_5$ ;  $l_6 = \text{line } I C$ ;  $F = \text{foot } B l_6$ ; Prove:  $\text{cong } I X I T_1$

Proof:

$IT_1=IT_2, IT_1=IT_3, IT_1=IT_4 \Rightarrow T_4$  on circle  $(T_1T_2T_3)$   
 $\langle EI, l_5 \rangle = \langle l_6, BF \rangle$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5 \Rightarrow I$  on circle  $(BEF)$   
 $\langle l_3, IT_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, IT_4 \rangle$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $T_4$  on line  $l_4$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_4 \Rightarrow T_4$  on circle  $(CIT_3)$   
 $I$  is circumcenter of  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_4$  on circle  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_4$  on line  $l_4$ ,  $IT_4 \perp l_4 \Rightarrow l_4$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$   
 $I$  is circumcenter of  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $IT_3 \perp l_3 \Rightarrow l_3$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$   
 $\langle IT_3, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_6, BF \rangle$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $I$  on circle  $(BEF) \Rightarrow T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$   
 $\langle IT_2, l_2 \rangle = \langle l_6, BF \rangle$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $I$  on circle  $(BEF) \Rightarrow T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$   
 $I$  is circumcenter of  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $IT_2 \perp l_2 \Rightarrow l_2$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$   
 $T_4$  on circle  $(CIT_3)$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_4$ ,  $T_4$  on line  $l_4 \Rightarrow \langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle$   
 $l_4$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_4$  on circle  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_4$  on line  $l_4 \Rightarrow \langle T_1T_3, T_1T_4 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle$   
 $l_3$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $T_4$  on circle  $(T_1T_2T_3) \Rightarrow \langle T_1T_3, T_1T_4 \rangle = \langle l_3, T_3T_4 \rangle$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_3, BF \rangle$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow \langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, FT_2 \rangle$   
 $l_2$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2 \Rightarrow \langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$   
 $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$   
 $l_3$  is tangent to  $(T_1T_2T_3)$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_3, BF \rangle$ ,  $\langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_3, T_1T_4 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_3, T_1T_4 \rangle = \langle l_3, T_3T_4 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle l_3, BF \rangle = \langle l_3, T_3T_4 \rangle$   
 $\langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, FT_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle IT_3, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle T_2T_3, FT_2 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle$   
 $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle l_3, BF \rangle = \langle l_3, T_3T_4 \rangle \Rightarrow BF // T_3T_4$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow \langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, IT_3 \rangle$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow \langle IT_2, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle$   
 $IT_2=IT_3 \Rightarrow \langle IT_2, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, IT_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle T_2T_3, FT_2 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, l_4 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle T_3T_4, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_2 \rangle$   
 $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BF, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle FT_3, l_3 \rangle$   
 $BF // T_3T_4 \Rightarrow \langle BF, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, T_2T_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, IT_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle IT_2, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, IT_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle IT_2, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle BF, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle FT_3, l_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle T_3T_4, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_3T_4, T_2T_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FT_3, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_2 \rangle$   
 $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_5, ET_3 \rangle$   
 $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF) \Rightarrow \langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, ET_2 \rangle$   
 $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle l_3, l_5 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle CI_2, l_4 \rangle = \langle l_3, CI_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle CI_2, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, CI_2 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT_3, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FT_2, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_5, ET_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_5, ET_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, ET_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle l_3, l_5 \rangle$ ,  $\langle l_3, l_5 \rangle = \langle l_5, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle T_2T_3, ET_2 \rangle = \langle l_5, BD \rangle$   
 $\langle CI_2, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, CI_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle FT_2, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_4, FT_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle FT_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, FT_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle CI_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, CI_2 \rangle$   
 $\langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle = \langle l_5, ET_3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle T_2T_3, l_5 \rangle = \langle l_3, ET_3 \rangle$   
 $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5 \Rightarrow \langle BF, EF \rangle = \langle l_2, ET_2 \rangle$   
 $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle BF, EF \rangle = \langle l_3, ET_3 \rangle$   
 $\langle T_2T_3, ET_2 \rangle = \langle l_5, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle ET_2, BD \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_5 \rangle$   
 $\langle CI_2, l_6 \rangle = \langle l_6, CI_2 \rangle \Rightarrow CI_2 // l_6$   
 $\langle ET_2, BD \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_5 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_2T_3, l_5 \rangle = \langle l_3, ET_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, EF \rangle = \langle l_3, ET_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, EF \rangle = \langle l_2, ET_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle ET_2, BD \rangle = \langle l_2, ET_2 \rangle$   
 $CI_2 // l_6$ ,  $C$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow \text{line } CI_2 \equiv l_6$   
 $\langle BI_1, BD \rangle = \langle l_2, BI_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BD, BI_1 \rangle = \langle BI_1, l_2 \rangle$   
 $\langle ET_2, BD \rangle = \langle l_2, ET_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BD, ET_2 \rangle = \langle ET_2, l_2 \rangle$   
 $\text{line } CI_2 \equiv l_6 \Rightarrow I_2$  on line  $l_6$   
 $\langle BD, BI_1 \rangle = \langle BI_1, l_2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BD, ET_2 \rangle = \langle ET_2, l_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI_1, ET_2 \rangle = \langle ET_2, BI_1 \rangle$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow \langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle IT_3, EI \rangle$   
 $I$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle BI_1, IT_3 \rangle$   
 $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_3$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $T_3$  on line  $l_3$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_3 \Rightarrow \langle FT_2, BF \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$   
 $T_2$  on circle  $(BEF)$ ,  $T_2$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_2$ ,  $E$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5 \Rightarrow \langle ET_2, l_5 \rangle = \langle FT_2, BF \rangle$   
 $\langle BD, l_2P_2 \rangle = \langle BF, l_6 \rangle$ ,  $P_2$  on line  $BD$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I_2$  on line  $l_6 \Rightarrow P_2$  on circle  $(BFI_2)$   
 $\langle BI_1, ET_2 \rangle = \langle ET_2, BI_1 \rangle \Rightarrow BI_1 // ET_2$   
 $\langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle IT_3, EI \rangle$ ,  $\langle FT_3, EF \rangle = \langle l_3, l_5 \rangle$ ,  $\langle l_3, l_5 \rangle = \langle l_5, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle IT_3, EI \rangle = \langle l_5, BD \rangle$   
 $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle BI_1, IT_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle BF, FT_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle l_2, T_2T_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle T_1T_2, T_1T_3 \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle FT_2, BF \rangle = \langle T_2T_3, l_3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle ET_2, l_5 \rangle = \langle FT_2, BF \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI_1, IT_3 \rangle = \langle ET_2, l_5 \rangle$   
 $P_2$  on circle  $(BFI_2)$ ,  $F$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $I_2$  on line  $l_6$ ,  $P_2$  on line  $BD$ ,  $I_2$  on line  $l_5$ ,  $B$  on line  $l_5 \Rightarrow \langle FP_2, BF \rangle = \langle l_2P_2, l_5 \rangle$

```

<BD,I2P2>=<EI,I5> => <BD,EI>=<I2P2,I5>
BI1//ET2 => <BI1,BI>=<ET2,BI>
<IT3,EI>=<I5,BD> => <BD,EI>=<I5,IT3>
<BI,IT3>=<ET2,I5> => <ET2,BI>=<I5,IT3>
I2 is tangent to (T1T2T3), T2 on line I2, T4 on circle (T1T2T3) => <T2T4,T3T4>=<I2,T2T3>
I on circle (BEF), T2 on circle (BEF), F on line I6, I on line I6, T2 on line I2, B on line I2 => <FT2,BF>=<IT2,BI>
<BI1,BI>=<ET2,BI>, <ET2,BI>=<I5,IT3>, <BD,EI>=<I5,IT3>, <BD,EI>=<I2P2,I5>, <FP2,BF>=<I2P2,I5> => <BI1,BI>=<FP2,BF>
>
<FT2,BF>=<IT2,BI>, <FT2,BF>=<T2T3,I3>, <T1T2,T1T3>=<T2T3,I3>, <T1T2,T1T3>=<I2,T2T3>, <T2T4,T3T4>=<I2,T2T3> =>
<IT2,BI>=<T2T4,T3T4>
<BI1,BI>=<FP2,BF> => <BF,BI>=<FP2,BI1>
<IT2,BI>=<T2T4,T3T4> => <T2T4,IT2>=<T3T4,BI>
BF//T3T4 => <BF,BI>=<T3T4,BI>
IT2=IT4 => <IT4,T2T4>=<T2T4,IT2>
<BF,BI>=<FP2,BI1>, <BF,BI>=<T3T4,BI>, <T2T4,IT2>=<T3T4,BI>, <IT4,T2T4>=<T2T4,IT2> => <FP2,BI1>=<IT4,T2T4>
<ET2,I5>=<FT2,BF>, <FT2,BF>=<T2T3,I3>, <T1T2,T1T3>=<T2T3,I3>, <T1T2,T1T3>=<I2,T2T3>, <T2T4,T3T4>=<I2,T2T3> =>
<ET2,I5>=<T2T4,T3T4>
<FP2,BI1>=<IT4,T2T4> => <IT4,FP2>=<T2T4,BI1>
BF//T3T4 => <BF,I5>=<T3T4,I5>
<ET2,I5>=<T2T4,T3T4> => <T2T4,ET2>=<T3T4,I5>
P2 on circle (BFI2), F on line I6, I2 on line I6, P2 on line BD, I2 on line I5, B on line I5 => <BF,I5>=<FP2,I2P2>
BI1//ET2 => <T2T4,BI1>=<T2T4,ET2>
<BF,I5>=<FP2,I2P2>, <BF,I5>=<T3T4,I5>, <T2T4,ET2>=<T3T4,I5>, <T2T4,BI1>=<T2T4,ET2>, <IT4,FP2>=<T2T4,BI1> => <
FP2,I2P2>=<IT4,FP2>
<BD,I2P2>=<IT4,I4> => <BD,I2P2>=<IT4,I4>
<BD,DI2>=<DI2,I4> => <BD,DI2>=<DI2,I4>
<FP2,I2P2>=<IT4,FP2> => <FP2,I2P2>=<IT4,FP2>
m2 is tangent to (I1), I1 is circumcenter of (I1), U2 on line m2 => I1U2⊥m2
m1 is tangent to (I1), I1 is circumcenter of (I1), U1 on circle (I1), U1 on line m1 => I1U1⊥m1
m1 is tangent to (I2), I2 is circumcenter of (I2), V1 on circle (I2), V1 on line m1 => I2V1⊥m1
m2 is tangent to (I2), I2 is circumcenter of (I2), V2 on circle (I2), V2 on line m2 => I2V2⊥m2
<BD,DI2>=<DI2,I4>, <BD,I2P2>=<IT4,I4>, <FP2,I2P2>=<IT4,FP2> => <DI2,FP2>=<FP2,DI2>
<I1,IT1>=<I2,IT2>, T2 on line I2, T1 on line I2, A on line I1 => T2 on circle (AIT1)
<DI2,FP2>=<FP2,DI2> => DI2⊥FP2
<IT3,I6>=<T3T4,I4>, <T1T3,T1T4>=<T3T4,I4>, <T1T3,T1T4>=<I3,T3T4> => <IT3,I6>=<I3,T3T4>
T2 on circle (AIT1), T2 on line I2, A on line I2, A on line I1, T1 on line I1 => <T1T2,IT2>=<I1,AI>
T2 on circle (AIT1), T2 on line I2, A on line I2, A on line I1, T1 on line I1 => <AI,I2>=<IT1,T1T2>
IT1=IT2 => <IT1,T1T2>=<T1T2,IT2>
<I1,IT1>=<I4,IT4>, T1 on line I1, T4 on line I4, D on line I1, D on line I4 => T4 on circle (DIT1)
m1⊥I1U1, m2⊥I1U2 => <m1,I1U1>=<m2,I1U2>
I2V1⊥m1, I2V2⊥m2 => <I2V1,m1>=<I2V2,m2>
<IT3,I6>=<I3,T3T4> => <T3T4,I6>=<I3,IT3>
<AI,I2>=<IT1,T1T2>, <IT1,T1T2>=<T1T2,IT2>, <T1T2,IT2>=<I1,AI> => <AI,I2>=<I1,AI>
T4 on circle (DIT1), D on line I1, T1 on line I1, D on line I4, T4 on line I4 => <DI,IT1>=<I4,T1T4>
I4 is tangent to (T1T2T3), T4 on circle (T1T2T3), T4 on line I4 => <T2T4,T1T2>=<I4,T1T4>
<m1,I1U1>=<m2,I1U2> => <I1U1,I1U2>=<m1,m2>
<I2V1,m1>=<I2V2,m2> => <I2V1,I2V2>=<m1,m2>
m2⊥I1U2, m2⊥I2V2 => <m2,I1U2>=<m2,I2V2>
DI2⊥FP2, I3⊥IT3, <T3T4,I6>=<I3,IT3> => <DI2,FP2>=<T3T4,I6>
<AI1,I1>=<I2,AI1> => <AI1,I1>=<I2,AI1>
<AI,I2>=<I1,AI> => <AI,I1>=<I2,AI>
<DI,IT1>=<I4,T1T4>, <T2T4,T1T2>=<I4,T1T4> => <DI,IT1>=<T2T4,T1T2>
I1U2=I1U1, I2V1=I2V2 => I1U2/I1U1=I2V1/I2V2
<I1U1,I1U2>=<m1,m2>, <I2V1,I2V2>=<m1,m2> => <I1U1,I1U2>=<I2V1,I2V2>
<m2,I1U2>=<m2,I2V2> => I1U2//I2V2
FP2⊥DI2, I3⊥IT3, <T3T4,I6>=<I3,IT3> => <FP2,DI2>=<T3T4,I6>
<BF,I5>=<FP2,I2P2>, <BF,I5>=<T3T4,I5> => <FP2,I2P2>=<T3T4,I5>
P2 on circle (BFI2), F on line I6, I2 on line I6, P2 on line BD, I2 on line I5, B on line I5 => <BD,I5>=<FP2,I6>
<DI2,FP2>=<T3T4,I6> => <DI2,T3T4>=<FP2,I6>
T2 on circle (BEF), T3 on circle (BEF) => <EF,FT3>=<ET2,T2T3>
BI1//ET2 => <BI1,T2T3>=<ET2,T2T3>
T3 on circle (BEF), E on line I5, B on line I5, T3 on line I3, B on line I3 => <EF,FT3>=<I5,I3>
<AI,I1>=<I2,AI>, <AI1,I1>=<I2,AI1> => <AI,AI1>=<AI1,AI>
<DI,IT1>=<T2T4,T1T2> => <DI,T2T4>=<IT1,T1T2>
I1U2/I1U1=I2V1/I2V2, <I1U1,I1U2>=<I2V1,I2V2> => <I2V1,V1V2>=<U1U2,I1U2>
I1U2//I2V2 => <V1V2,I1U2>=<V1V2,I2V2>
I2V1=I2V2 => <I2V1,V1V2>=<V1V2,I2V2>
I1U1=I1U2 => <I1U1,U1U2>=<U1U2,I1U2>
I1U1⊥m1, m2⊥I1U2 => <I1U1,m1>=<m2,I1U2>
<FP2,DI2>=<T3T4,I6> => <DI2,I6>=<FP2,T3T4>
<FP2,I2P2>=<T3T4,I5> => <FP2,T3T4>=<I2P2,I5>
<I1P1,BD>=<I5,EI> => <BD,EI>=<I1P1,I5>
<BI1,T2T3>=<ET2,T2T3>, <EF,FT3>=<ET2,T2T3>, <EF,FT3>=<I5,I3>, <BD,I5>=<I5,I3>, <BD,I5>=<FP2,I6>, <DI2,T3T4>=<
FP2,I6> => <BI1,T2T3>=<DI2,T3T4>
<AI,AI1>=<AI1,AI> => AI//AI1
<AI,I2>=<IT1,T1T2>, <DI,T2T4>=<IT1,T1T2> => <AI,I2>=<DI,T2T4>
<I2V1,m1>=<I2V2,m2>, V2 on line m2, V1 on line m1, X on line m2, X on line m1 => X on circle (I2V1V2)
<m1,I1U1>=<m2,I1U2>, U2 on line m2, U1 on line m1, X on line m2, X on line m1 => X on circle (I1U1U2)
m1 is tangent to (I2), V1 on circle (I2), V1 on line m1, V2 on circle (I2), P2 on circle (I2) => <P2V1,P2V2>=<m1,V1V2>
m2 is tangent to (I2), V2 on circle (I2), V2 on line m2, V1 on circle (I2), P2 on circle (I2) => <P2V1,P2V2>=<V1V2,m2>
<I1U1,U1U2>=<U1U2,I1U2>, <I2V1,V1V2>=<U1U2,I1U2>, <I2V1,V1V2>=<V1V2,I2V2>, <V1V2,I1U2>=<V1V2,I2V2> => <I1U1,
U1U2>=<V1V2,I1U2>
<I1U1,m1>=<m2,I1U2> => <I1U1,m2>=<m1,I1U2>
<DI2,I6>=<FP2,T3T4>, <FP2,T3T4>=<I2P2,I5> => <DI2,I6>=<I2P2,I5>
<BI1,BI>=<ET2,BI>, <ET2,BI>=<I5,IT3>, <BD,EI>=<I5,IT3>, <BD,EI>=<I1P1,I5> => <BI1,BI>=<I1P1,I5>
<BI1,T2T3>=<DI2,T3T4> => <BI1,DI2>=<T2T3,T3T4>
BF//T3T4 => <T2T3,BF>=<T2T3,T3T4>
<BF,FT3>=<T2T3,I3> => <T2T3,BF>=<I3,FT3>
I on circle (BEF), T3 on circle (BEF), F on line I6, I on line I6, T3 on line I3, B on line I3 => <BI,I6>=<I3,FT3>

```

$AI//AI1 \Rightarrow \text{line } AI \equiv AI1$   
 $I2 \text{ is tangent to } (T1T2T3), T2 \text{ on line } I2, T4 \text{ on circle } (T1T2T3) \Rightarrow \langle T2T3, T3T4 \rangle = \langle I2, T2T4 \rangle$   
 $\langle AI, I2 \rangle = \langle DI, T2T4 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle I2, T2T4 \rangle$   
 $X \text{ on circle } (I2V1V2), V1 \text{ on line } m1, X \text{ on line } m1, V2 \text{ on line } m2, X \text{ on line } m2 \Rightarrow \langle V1V2, I2V2 \rangle = \langle m1, I2X \rangle$   
 $X \text{ on circle } (I1U1U2), U2 \text{ on line } m2, X \text{ on line } m2, X \text{ on line } m1, U1 \text{ on line } m1 \Rightarrow \langle U1U2, I1U2 \rangle = \langle m1, I1X \rangle$   
 $\langle P2V1, P2V2 \rangle = \langle V1V2, m2 \rangle, \langle P2V1, P2V2 \rangle = \langle m1, V1V2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle V1V2, m2 \rangle = \langle m1, V1V2 \rangle$   
 $\langle I1U1, U1U2 \rangle = \langle V1V2, I1U2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle I1U1, U1U2 \rangle = \langle V1V2, I1U2 \rangle$   
 $\langle I1U1, m2 \rangle = \langle m1, I1U2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle I1U1, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, I1U2 \rangle$   
 $\langle DI2, I6 \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, \langle BD, EI \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, P2 \text{ on line } BD, I2 \text{ on line } I5, E \text{ on line } I5, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow DP2/DI2 = EI/II2$   
 $\langle BI1, BI \rangle = \langle I1P1, I5 \rangle, \langle BD, EI \rangle = \langle I1P1, I5 \rangle, P1 \text{ on line } BD, B \text{ on line } I5, E \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow BE/BI = I1P1/BI1$   
 $\langle DI2, I6 \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, \langle BD, EI \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, P2 \text{ on line } BD, I2 \text{ on line } I5, E \text{ on line } I5, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow DP2/I2P2 = EI/EI2$   
 $\langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle I3, FT3 \rangle, \langle T2T3, BF \rangle = \langle I3, FT3 \rangle, \langle T2T3, BF \rangle = \langle T2T3, T3T4 \rangle, \langle BI1, DI2 \rangle = \langle T2T3, T3T4 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle BI1, DI2 \rangle$   
 $\text{line } AI \equiv AI1 \Rightarrow I1 \text{ on line } AI$   
 $\langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle I2, T2T4 \rangle, \langle T2T3, T3T4 \rangle = \langle I2, T2T4 \rangle, \langle T2T3, BF \rangle = \langle T2T3, T3T4 \rangle, \langle T2T3, BF \rangle = \langle I3, FT3 \rangle, \langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle I3, FT3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle BI, I6 \rangle$   
 $I1U1 \perp m1, I2V1 \perp m1 \Rightarrow \langle I1U1, m1 \rangle = \langle I2V1, m1 \rangle$   
 $\langle U1U2, I1U2 \rangle = \langle m1, I1X \rangle, \langle I2V1, V1V2 \rangle = \langle U1U2, I1U2 \rangle, \langle I2V1, V1V2 \rangle = \langle V1V2, I2V2 \rangle, \langle V1V2, I2V2 \rangle = \langle m1, I2X \rangle \Rightarrow \langle m1, I1X \rangle = \langle m1, I2X \rangle$   
 $\langle V1V2, m2 \rangle = \langle m1, V1V2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle V1V2, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, V1V2 \rangle$   
 $\langle I1U1, U1U2 \rangle = \langle V1V2, I1U2 \rangle, \langle I1U1, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, I1U2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle U1U2, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, V1V2 \rangle$   
 $I2V1 = I2V2, I2V2 = I2V1 \Rightarrow I2V1/I2V2 = I2V2/I2V1$   
 $DP2/DI2 = EI/II2 \Rightarrow EI/DP2 = II2/DI2$   
 $BE/BI = I1P1/BI1 \Rightarrow BE/I1P1 = BI/BI1$   
 $I1P1 = I1U2 \Rightarrow BE/I1P1 = BE/I1U2$   
 $DP2/I2P2 = EI/EI2 \Rightarrow EI/DP2 = EI2/I2P2$   
 $\langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle BI1, DI2 \rangle, \langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle BI, I6 \rangle, I1 \text{ on line } AI, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow BI/BI1 = II2/DI2$   
 $\langle I1U1, m1 \rangle = \langle I2V1, m1 \rangle \Rightarrow I1U1/I2V1$   
 $\langle m1, I1X \rangle = \langle m1, I2X \rangle \Rightarrow I1X/I2X$   
 $\langle V1V2, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, V1V2 \rangle, X \text{ on line } m2, V2 \text{ on line } m2, X \text{ on line } m1, V1 \text{ on line } m1 \Rightarrow V1X/V1V2 = V2X/V1V2$   
 $\langle U1U2, m1 \rangle = \langle m2, V1V2 \rangle, X \text{ on line } m2, U2 \text{ on line } m2, X \text{ on line } m1, U1 \text{ on line } m1, V1 \text{ on line } m1, V2 \text{ on line } m2 \Rightarrow U1X/U1U2 = V2X/V1V2$   
 $I2V1/I2V2 = I2V2/I2V1 \Rightarrow V1V2/I2V1 = V1V2/I2V2$   
 $I1U2/I1U1 = I2V1/I2V2, \langle I1U1, I1U2 \rangle = \langle I2V1, I2V2 \rangle \Rightarrow U1U2/I1U1 = V1V2/I2V2$   
 $BE/I1P1 = BE/I1U2, BE/I1P1 = BI/BI1, BI/BI1 = II2/DI2, EI/DP2 = II2/DI2, EI/DP2 = EI2/I2P2 \Rightarrow BE/I1U2 = EI2/I2P2$   
 $I1U1/I2V1, I1X/I2X, U1 \text{ on line } m1, X \text{ on line } m1, V1 \text{ on line } m1 \Rightarrow I1X/U1X = I2X/V1X$   
 $I1P1 = I1U2, I2V1 = I2P2 \Rightarrow I1P1/I1U2 = I2V1/I2P2$   
 $U1X/U1U2 = V2X/V1V2, V1X/V1V2 = V2X/V1V2 \Rightarrow U1X/U1U2 = V1X/V1V2$   
 $I1U1 = I1P1, I2P2 = I2V1 \Rightarrow I1U1/I1P1 = I2P2/I2V1$   
 $U1U2/I1U1 = V1V2/I2V2, V1V2/I2V1 = V1V2/I2V2 \Rightarrow U1U2/I1U1 = V1V2/I2V1$   
 $I1U1 = I1P1, I2P2 = I2V2 \Rightarrow I1U1/I1P1 = I2P2/I2V2$   
 $I1U1 = I1P1, I2V1 = I2V2 \Rightarrow I1U1/I1P1 = I2V1/I2V2$   
 $I1X/I2X \Rightarrow \text{line } I1X \equiv I2X$   
 $BE/I1U2 = EI2/I2P2 \Rightarrow BE/EI2 = I1U2/I2P2$   
 $I1X/U1X = I2X/V1X \Rightarrow I1X/I2X = U1X/V1X$   
 $I1P1/I1U2 = I2V1/I2P2 \Rightarrow I1P1/I2V1 = I1U2/I2P2$   
 $U1X/U1U2 = V1X/V1V2 \Rightarrow U1U2/V1V2 = U1X/V1X$   
 $I1U1/I1P1 = I2P2/I2V1 \Rightarrow I1P1/I2V1 = I1U1/I2P2$   
 $U1U2/I1U1 = V1V2/I2V1 \Rightarrow I1U1/I2V1 = U1U2/V1V2$   
 $I1U1/I1P1 = I2P2/I2V2 \Rightarrow I1P1/I2V2 = I1U1/I2P2$   
 $I1U1/I1P1 = I2V1/I2V2 \Rightarrow I1P1/I2V2 = I1U1/I2V1$   
 $\text{line } I1X \equiv I2X \Rightarrow I2 \text{ on line } I1X$   
 $BE/EI2 = I1U2/I2P2, I1P1/I2V1 = I1U2/I2P2, I1P1/I2V1 = I1U1/I2P2, I1P1/I2V2 = I1U1/I2P2, I1P1/I2V2 = I1U1/I2V1, I1U1/I2V1 = U1U2/V1V2, U1U2/V1V2 = U1X/V1X, I1X/I2X = U1X/V1X \Rightarrow BE/EI2 = I1X/I2X$   
 $BE/EI2 = I1X/I2X, I2 \text{ on line } I1X, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5, I2 \text{ on line } I5, X \text{ I1 I2 and E B I2 have same order} \Rightarrow BE/BI2 = I1X/I1I2$   
 $BE/BI2 = I1X/I1I2 \Rightarrow I1I2/BI2 = I1X/BE$   
 $BE/EI2 = I1X/I2X \Rightarrow I1X/BE = I2X/EI2$   
 $I1I2/BI2 = I1X/BE, I1X/BE = I2X/EI2 \Rightarrow I1I2/BI2 = I2X/EI2$   
 $FP2 \perp DI2, I1P1 \perp BD \Rightarrow \langle FP2, DI2 \rangle = \langle I1P1, BD \rangle$   
 $\langle FP2, BF \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, \langle BD, EI \rangle = \langle I2P2, I5 \rangle, \langle BD, EI \rangle = \langle I1P1, I5 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FP2, BF \rangle = \langle I1P1, I5 \rangle$   
 $I1I2/BI2 = I2X/EI2, I2 \text{ on line } I1X, I2 \text{ on line } I5, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow \langle I5, BI1 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), T2 \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6, T2 \text{ on line } I2, B \text{ on line } I2 \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT2 \rangle = \langle BI, IT2 \rangle$   
 $T2 \text{ on circle } (BEF), T2 \text{ on line } I2, B \text{ on line } I2, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow \langle BF, FT2 \rangle = \langle I5, ET2 \rangle$   
 $BI1/ET2 \Rightarrow \langle I5, BI1 \rangle = \langle I5, ET2 \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), T2 \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow \langle FT2, EF \rangle = \langle IT2, EI \rangle$   
 $T2 \text{ on circle } (BEF), T2 \text{ on line } I2, B \text{ on line } I2, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow \langle FT2, EF \rangle = \langle I2, I5 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT3, EF \rangle = \langle I3, I5 \rangle, \langle I3, I5 \rangle = \langle I5, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle FT3, EF \rangle = \langle I5, BD \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow \langle BF, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, EI \rangle$   
 $\langle FP2, DI2 \rangle = \langle I1P1, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle DI2, BD \rangle = \langle FP2, I1P1 \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), T3 \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow \langle FT3, ET3 \rangle = \langle I6, EI \rangle$   
 $\langle FP2, BF \rangle = \langle I1P1, I5 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BF, I5 \rangle = \langle FP2, I1P1 \rangle$   
 $\langle BF, FT2 \rangle = \langle BI, IT2 \rangle, \langle BF, FT2 \rangle = \langle I5, ET2 \rangle, \langle I5, BI1 \rangle = \langle I5, ET2 \rangle, \langle I5, BI1 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle$   
 $\langle FT2, EF \rangle = \langle IT2, EI \rangle, \langle FT2, EF \rangle = \langle I2, I5 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle IT2, EI \rangle = \langle I2, I5 \rangle$   
 $\langle FT3, EF \rangle = \langle I5, BD \rangle \Rightarrow \langle EF, BD \rangle = \langle FT3, I5 \rangle$   
 $\langle DI2, BD \rangle = \langle FP2, I1P1 \rangle, \langle BF, I5 \rangle = \langle FP2, I1P1 \rangle, \langle BF, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, EI \rangle, \langle FT3, ET3 \rangle = \langle I6, EI \rangle \Rightarrow \langle DI2, BD \rangle = \langle FT3, ET3 \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6, E \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5 \Rightarrow \langle EF, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, BI \rangle$   
 $\langle BI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle$   
 $\langle IT2, EI \rangle = \langle I2, I5 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle EI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, I2 \rangle$   
 $\langle EF, BD \rangle = \langle FT3, I5 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BD, EF \rangle = \langle I5, FT3 \rangle$   
 $\langle DI2, BD \rangle = \langle FT3, ET3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BD, DI2 \rangle = \langle ET3, FT3 \rangle$   
 $\langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle BI1, DI2 \rangle, \langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle BI, I6 \rangle, I1 \text{ on line } AI, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow DI/DI2 = I1I/BI1$   
 $\langle EF, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, BI \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, EF \rangle$   
 $\langle BI, I6 \rangle = \langle BI1, DI2 \rangle, \langle AI, DI \rangle = \langle BI, I6 \rangle, I1 \text{ on line } AI, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow BI/I1I = II2/DI$   
 $\langle BI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, EX \rangle, \langle EI, IT2 \rangle = \langle I5, I2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle BI, EI \rangle = \langle I2, EX \rangle$   
 $\langle BD, DI2 \rangle = \langle ET3, FT3 \rangle, \langle BD, EF \rangle = \langle I5, FT3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle DI2, EF \rangle = \langle I5, ET3 \rangle$   
 $DI/DI2 = I1I/BI1 \Rightarrow DI/I1I = DI2/BI1$   
 $\langle BI, I5 \rangle = \langle I6, EF \rangle, I2 \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6, I2 \text{ on line } I5, B \text{ on line } I5, E \text{ on line } I5, F \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow EI2/EF = II2/BI$   
 $BI/I1I = II2/DI \Rightarrow DI/I1I = II2/BI$   
 $IT2 = IT3 \Rightarrow \langle IT3, T2T3 \rangle = \langle T2T3, IT2 \rangle$   
 $I \text{ on circle } (BEF), T2 \text{ on circle } (BEF), T3 \text{ on circle } (BEF), F \text{ on line } I6, I \text{ on line } I6 \Rightarrow \langle IT3, T2T3 \rangle = \langle I6, FT2 \rangle$

**Listing 1** Example geometric theorem proving from our HGeo.

**Proof:**

$$\Rightarrow IX = IT_3$$



## F Prompt to Convert Natural Language into AlphaGeometry's Geometric Language

Translate a geometry problem from natural language into the following format:

The geometric objects in the converted problem format only contain points.

The naming conventions follows the following rule:

Points are named using lower letters like a,b,c,...,x,y,z, or lower letters with subscripts numbers like a<sub>1</sub>, b<sub>1</sub>, a<sub>2</sub>, ...

Convert the name if not in this convention, for example, convert I\_A to i\_1

The format is divided into two parts: 1. Problem Definition and 2. Conclusion to be Proved.

Note that the definitions of points are separated by '; ' and definition and conclusion are separated by ' ? '

Problem Definition:

The general structure starts by setting some initial structure and then adding one or more geometry objects each time.

Initial or free structures can be point, segment, triangle, quadrilateral, pentagon, ...

For example:

"Free point A" convert to "a = free"

"Segment AB" convert to "a b = segment"

"Triangle ABC" or "Acute triangle ABC" or "Obtuse triangle ABC" convert to "a b c = triangle".

"Isosceles triangle ABC with AB=AC" convert to "a b c = iso\_triangle"

"Right triangle ABC with angle  $\angle A=90^\circ$ " convert to "a b c = r\_triangle".

"Right Isosceles triangle ABC" convert to "a b c = risos"

"Equilateral triangle ABC" "a b c = ieq\_triangle"

"Quadrilateral ABCD" is converted to "a b c d = quadrangle".

"Trapezoid ABCD with AB//CD" convert to "a b c d = trapezoid"

"Isosceles Trapezoid ABCD with AB//CD and AD=BC" convert to "a b c d = eq\_trapezoid"

"Right trapezoid ABCD with  $\angle A=90^\circ$ " convert to "a b c d = r\_trapezoid"

"Rectangle ABCD" convert to "a b c d = rectangle"

"Pentagon ABCDE" is converted to "a b c d e = pentagon".

Each time a new point is constructed, using one or two constraints,

The constraints could be:

"M is the midpoint of AB" convert to "m = midpoint a b".

"X is foot of A on BC" is converted to "x = foot a b c".

"X as the reflection of A wrt point B" convert to "x = mirror a b".

"X as the reflection of A wrt line BC" convert to "x = reflect a b c".

"X Y are tangent points of the tangent lines from point A to circle centered O passing through B" convert to "x y = tangent x y a o b"

"X satisfies AX is the diameter in (O)" convert to "x = mirror a o"

"The common tangent line l1, l2 of (O1,A) and (O2,B) tangent the two circles at X1,Y1, X2,Y2" convert to "x1 y1 x2 y2 = cc\_tangent x y o1 a o2 b"

"O is circumcenter of ABC" convert to "o = circumcenter a b c".

"I is incenter of ABC" convert to "i = incenter a b c".

"H is orthocenter of ABC" convert to "h = orthocenter A B C".

"I is the excenter of  $\angle A$  in ABC" convert to "i = excenter a b c",

"I as the excenter of  $\angle B$  in ABC" convert to "i = excenter b c a",

"I is the excenter of  $\angle C$  in ABC" convert to "i = excenter c a b".

"G is centroid of ABC" convert to "g = centroid a b c"

"N is the nine-point center of ABC" convert to "n = ninepoints a b c".

"X satisfies ABCX is a parallelogram" convert to "x = parallelogram a b c x".

"X Y are points such that XYAB is square" convert to "x y = square a b".

"X satisfies XBC is a equilateral triangle" convert to "x = eq\_triangle x b c"

"X such that XA=BC" convert to "x = eqdistance x a b c"

"X on line BC" convert to "x = on\_line b c".

"X on parallel line from A to BC" convert to "x = on\_pline a b c"

"X on the perpendicular line from A to BC" convert to "x = on\_tline a b c"

"X on perpendicular bisector of AB" convert to "x = on\_bline a b"

"X on angle bisector of  $\angle BAC$ " convert to "x = angle\_bisector b a c"

"X on circle with center O pass through A" convert to "x = on\_circle o a"

"X on circle passing through A B C" convert to "x = on\_circum a b c"

"X on circle with diameter AB" convert to "x = on\_dia a b".

"X on tangent from point A to circle centered O passing through A" convert to "x = on\_tline a o a".

"X satisfies  $\angle XAB = \angle DEF$ " convert to "on\_aline x a b d e f"

"X satisfies  $\angle AXB = \angle DEF$ " convert to "eqangle3 x a b e d f"

If X satisfies two constraints, separate the two constraints with ", "

For example, X is the intersection of two conditions, it can be written as "X = condition1, condition2":

"X is the intersection of AB and CD" convert to "X = on\_line a b, on\_line c d".

"X is the intersection of circles (O, A) and (P, B)" convert to "x = on\_circle o a, on\_circle p b".

"X is the other intersection of line AB with circle (O, P)" convert to "X = on\_line a b, on\_circle o p".

Conclusion to be Proved:

"A B C D are cyclic" converted to "? cyclic a b c d".

"A, B, and C are collinear" convert to "? coll a b c".

"AB perpendicular to CD" convert to "? perp a b c d".

"AB parallel to CD" convert to "? para a b c d".

"AB = CD" convert to "? cong a b c d",

"Angle  $\angle ABC = \angle DEF$ " convert to "? eqangle a b b c d e e f".

"Ratio  $AB/CD = EF/GH$ " convert to "? eqratio a b c d e f g h"

"M is the midpoint of AB" convert to "? midp m a b".

" $ABC \sim DEF$ " or "ABC is similar to DEF", convert to "? simtri a b c d e f".

" $ABC \cong DEF$ " or "ABC is congruent to DEF", convert to "? contri a b c d e f".

Some conclusion need definition of new points:

"AB bisect CD" or "AB pass through the midpoint of CD" convert to "m = midpoint a b ? midp m c d"

"AB, CD, EF are concurrent" convert to "x = on\_line a b, on\_line c d ? coll x e f".

Note that each new point is separated by a semicolon ";", and the conclusion is separated by " ? ".

Note that newly added points must have different names from previously defined points.

Some conversions require slight modifications:

In triangle ABC,  $\angle A$  is that same as  $\angle BAC$ .



The incircle or excircle (I) touching BC at point D can be viewed as the foot I on BC, hence convert to "d = foot i b c".

The euler line is the line through orthocenter and circumcenter, X on euler line of ABC convert to "a b c = triangle; o = circumcenter a b c; h = orthocenter a b c; x = on\_line o h"

The initial structure (O1),(O2) intersect in A, B we can first define A B then define O1,O2 on perpendicular bisector "a b = segment; o1 = on\_bline a b; o2 = on\_bline a b"

The initial structure parallelogram ABCD, we need first define ABC then D "a b c = triangle; d = parallelogram a b c d;"

The initial structure cyclic ABCD, we need first define ABC then D "a b c = triangle; d = on\_circum a b c;"

Here are a few examples:

Problem 1:

Let  $ABCD$  be a trapezoid with  $AB \parallel CD$  and  $\Omega$  is a circle passing through  $A, B, C, D$ . Let  $\omega$  be the circle passing through  $C, D$  and intersecting with  $CA, CB$  at  $A_1, B_1$  respectively.  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  are the points symmetric to  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  respectively, with respect to the midpoints of  $CA$  and  $CB$ . Prove that the points  $A, B, A_2, B_2$  are concyclic.

Convert to:

a b c d = eq\_trapezoid; o = on\_bline c d; a1 = on\_line a c, on\_circle o c; b1 = on\_line b c, on\_circle o c; m1 = midpoint c a; m2 = midpoint c b; a2 = mirror a1 m1; b2 = mirror b1 m2 ? cyclic a b a2 b2

Problem 2:

Given is an acute triangle  $ABC$ . Its heights  $BB_1$  and  $CC_1$  are extended past points  $B_1$  and  $C_1$ . On these extensions, points  $P$  and  $Q$  are chosen, such that angle  $PAQ$  is right. Let  $AF$  be a height of triangle  $APQ$ . Prove that angle  $BFC$  is a right angle.

Convert to:

a b c = triangle; b1 = foot b a c; c1 = foot c a b; p = on\_line b b1; q = on\_line c c1, on\_tline a a p; f = foot a p q ? perp b f f c

Problem 3:

Let  $ABC$  be a triangle. Circle  $\Gamma$  passes through  $A$ , meets segments  $AB$  and  $AC$  again at points  $D$  and  $E$  respectively, and intersects segment  $BC$  at  $F$  and  $G$  such that  $F$  lies between  $B$  and  $G$ . The tangent to circle  $BDF$  at  $F$  and the tangent to circle  $CEG$  at  $G$  meet at point  $T$ . Suppose that points  $A$  and  $T$  are distinct. Prove that line  $AT$  is parallel to  $BC$ .

Convert to:

a b c = triangle; o = free; d = on\_line a b, on\_circle o a; e = on\_line a c, on\_circle o a; f = on\_line b c, on\_circle o a; g = on\_line b c, on\_circle o a; o1 = circumcenter b d f; o2 = circumcenter c e g; t = on\_tline f o1 f, on\_tline g o2 g ? para a t b c

Problem 4:

Let  $ABC$  be a triangle with circumcentre  $O$ . The points  $D, E, F$  lie in the interiors of the sides  $BC, CA, AB$  respectively, such that  $DE$  is perpendicular to  $CO$  and  $DF$  is perpendicular to  $BO$ . (By interior we mean, for example, that the point  $D$  lies on the line  $BC$  and  $D$  is between  $B$  and  $C$  on that line.) Let  $K$  be the circumcentre of triangle  $AFE$ . Prove that the lines  $DK$  and  $BC$  are perpendicular.

Convert to:

a b c = triangle; o = circumcenter a b c; d = on\_line b c; e = on\_line a c, on\_tline d c o; f = on\_line a b, on\_tline d b o; k = circumcenter a e f ? perp d k b c

Problem 5:

In a triangle  $ABC$  with a right angle at  $C$ , the angle bisector  $AL$  (where  $L$  is on segment  $BC$ ) intersects the altitude  $CH$  at point  $K$ . The bisector of angle  $BCH$  intersects segment  $AB$  at point  $M$ . Prove that  $CK = ML$ .

Convert to:

c a b = r\_triangle; l = on\_line b c, angle\_bisector b a c; h = foot c a b; k = on\_line c h, angle\_bisector b a c; m = on\_line a b, angle\_bisector b c h ? cong c k m l

Problem 6:

Let  $ABC$  be a triangle with  $\angle BAC \neq 90^\circ$ . Let  $O$  be the circumcenter of the triangle  $ABC$  and  $\Gamma$  be the circumcircle of the triangle  $BOC$ . Suppose that  $\Gamma$  intersects the line segment  $AB$  at  $P$  different from  $B$ , and the line segment  $AC$  at  $Q$  different from  $C$ . Let  $ON$  be the diameter of the circle  $\Gamma$ . Prove that the quadrilateral  $APNQ$  is a parallelogram.

Convert to:

a b c = triangle; o = circumcenter a b c; o1 = circumcenter o b c; p = on\_line a b, on\_circle o1 o; q = on\_line a c, on\_circle o1 o; n = mirror o o1 ? para a p n q

Problem 7:

In an acute-angled triangle  $ABC$  on the sides  $AB, BC, AC$  the points  $H, L, K$  so that  $CH \perp AB, HL \parallel AC, HK \parallel BC$ . Let  $P$  and  $Q$  feet of altitudes of a triangle  $HBL$ , drawn from the vertices  $H$  and  $B$  respectively. Prove that the feet of

the altitudes of the triangle  $\triangle AKH$ , drawn from the vertices  $A$  and  $H$  lie on the line  $PQ$ .

Convert to:

$a\ b\ c = \text{triangle}; h = \text{foot } c\ a\ b; l = \text{on\_line } b\ c, \text{ on\_pline } h\ a\ c; k = \text{on\_line } a\ c, \text{ on\_pline } h\ b\ c; p = \text{foot } h\ b\ l; q = \text{foot } b\ h\ l; x = \text{foot } a\ h\ k$   
 $; y = \text{foot } h\ a\ k\ ? \text{ coll } p\ q\ x$

Problem 8:

Let  $ABCD$  be a parallelogram such that  $|AB| > |BC|$ . Let  $O$  be a point on the line  $CD$  such that  $|OB| = |OD|$ . Let  $\omega$  be a circle with center  $O$  and radius  $|OC|$ . If  $T$  is the second intersection of  $\omega$  and  $CD$ , prove that  $AT$ ,  $BO$  and  $\omega$  are concurrent.

Convert to:

$a\ b\ c = \text{triangle}; d = \text{parallelogram } a\ b\ c\ d; o = \text{on\_line } c\ d, \text{ on\_bline } b\ d; t = \text{on\_line } c\ d, \text{ on\_circle } o\ c; x = \text{on\_line } a\ t, \text{ on\_line } o\ b\ ? \text{ cong}$   
 $o\ x\ o\ c$

Problem 9:

As shown in the figure below, the in-circle of  $\triangle ABC$  is tangent to sides  $AB$  and  $AC$  at  $D$  and  $E$  respectively, and  $O$  is the circumcenter of  $\triangle BCI$ . Prove that  $\angle ODB = \angle OEC$ .

Convert to:

$a\ b\ c = \text{triangle}; i = \text{incenter } a\ b\ c; d = \text{foot } i\ a\ b; e = \text{foot } i\ a\ c; o = \text{circumcenter } b\ c\ i\ ? \text{ eqangle } o\ d\ b\ c\ e\ e\ o$

Problem 10:

In acute triangle  $ABC$ ,  $\angle A < \angle C$ ,  $O$  is the circumcenter of the triangle.  $M$  is the midpoint of segment  $BC$ ,  $(AOM)$  intersects the line  $AB$  again at  $D$  and intersects the segment  $AC$  at  $E$ . Prove that  $DM = EC$ .

Convert to:

$a\ b\ c = \text{triangle}; o = \text{circumcenter } a\ b\ c; m = \text{midpoint } b\ c; o1 = \text{circumcenter } a\ o\ m; d = \text{on\_line } a\ b, \text{ on\_circle } o1\ a; e = \text{on\_line } a\ c, \text{ on\_circle } o1\ a\ ? \text{ cong } d\ m\ e\ c$

Please follow these examples to convert the following problems:  
 {INPUT\_PROBLEM}

**Listing 2** An illustration of prompt converting a natural language problem into AlphaGeometry's geometry specific language.

## G Prompt to Convert Natural Language into our Geometric language

Translate a geometry problem from natural language into the following format:

The geometric objects in the problem include points, lines, and circles.

The naming conventions follows the following rule:

Points are named using uppercase letters like A, B, C...X, Y, Z, or uppercase letters with subscripts (numbers or lowercase letters) like A1, B1, Ai, Bj, I\_1, I\_a...

Convert the name if not in this convention, for example, convert I\_A to I\_a

Lines are named using lowercase letters like l, m... or lowercase letters with numbers like l1, m2,... or by the names of two points on the line like AB, CD.

Circles are named using the center of the circle of the circle (O), (P),... or diameter of the circle (AB),(CD),... or three points on the circle with parentheses or or (ABC), (DEF),... or the center and a point on the circle separated by a comma (O, A), (O, P)... or similar with lines with lower case letter c, cl,... or greek letter such as  $\Gamma, \gamma, \Omega, \omega$ ...

The format is divided into two parts: 1. Problem Definition and 2. Conclusion to be Proved.

Problem Definition:

The general structure starts by setting some initial structure and then adding one or more geometry objects each time.

Initial structures can be triangle, acute\_triangle, or right\_triangle, quadrilateral, pentagon, ... or point line circle:

"Triangle ABC" convert to "A B C = triangle".

"Acute triangle ABC" convert to "A B C = acute\_triangle".

"Right triangle ABC" convert to "A B C = right\_triangle".

"Obtuse triangle ABC" convert to "A B C = obtuse\_triangle".

"Isosceles triangle ABC with AB=BC" convert to "B A C = isos\_triangle"

"Equilateral triangle ABC" "A B C = equilateral\_triangle"

"Quadrilateral ABCD" is converted to "A B C D = quadrilateral".

"Cyclic quadrilateral ABCD" is converted to "A B C D = cyclic\_quadrilateral".

"Tangential quadrilateral ABCD" convert to "A B C D = tangential\_quadrilateral".

"Pentagon ABCDE" is converted to "A B C D E = pentagon".

"Hexagon ABCDEF" is converted to "A B C D E F = hexagon".

Each time a new point or line or circle is constructed, the definition for each point is given using one or two constraints,

The constraints could be:

"A on line BC" convert to "A = on\_line BC".

"A on circle (O)" convert to "A = on\_circle (O)".

"D is the foot of A on BC" is converted to "D = foot A BC".

"M is the midpoint of AB" convert to "M = midpoint A B".

"M is the midpoint of arc ABC" convert to "M = midarc A B C"

"M is the midpoint of arc AB without C" convert to "M = midarc\_no A B C"

"O is the circumcenter of ABC" convert to "O = circumcenter ABC".

"H is the orthocenter of ABC" convert to "H = orthocenter A B C".

"I is the incenter of ABC" convert to "I = incenter A B C".

"N is the nine-point center of ABC" convert to "N = ninepointcenter A B C".

"I1 is the excenter relative to  $\angle A$  in ABC" convert to "I1 = excenter A B C",

"I2 as the excenter relative to  $\angle B$  in ABC" convert to "I2 = excenter B C A",

"I3 is the excenter relative to  $\angle C$  in ABC" convert to "I3 = excenter C A B".

"P is the isogonal conjugate of Q wrt ABC" convert to "P = isogonal\_conjugate A B C".

"X satisfies ABCX is a parallelogram" convert to "X = parallelogram A B C X".

"X Y are points such that XYAB is square" convert to "X Y = square A B".

"X as the reflection of A wrt line BC" convert to "X = reflect A BC".

"X as the reflection of A wrt point B" convert to "X = reflect A B".

"The radical axis of circles (A) and (B)" convert to "radical\_axis (A) (B)".

"Tangent from point A to circle (O)" convert to "tangent\_line A (O)".

"the tangent line from A to (O) intersect (O) at X, Y" convert to "X Y = tangent\_point A (O)"

"Euler line of triangle ABC" convert to "euler\_line A B C".

"perpendicular bisector of AB" convert to "perpendicular\_bisector AB".

"The angle bisector of angle ABC" or "The angle bisector of angle B in triangle ABC" convert to "angle\_bisector A B C".

"The external angle bisector of angle ABC" or "The external angle bisector of angle B in triangle ABC" convert to "angle\_exbisector A B C".

"line through A parallel to BC" convert to "parallel\_line A BC".

"perpendicular line through A to BC" convert to "perpendicular\_line A BC".

"circle with diameter AB" convert to "(AB)".

"X satisfies AX=BC" convert to "length\_equal A X B C"

"X satisfies  $\angle AXY = \angle PQR$ " convert to "angle\_equal A X Y P Q R"

"O is the circumcenter of triangle formed by lines l1,l2,l3" convert to "X Y Z = triangle l1 l2 l3; O = circumcenter X Y Z" here X Y Z should be new points with different names

"AB is the diameter in (O)" (where A is already defined) convert to "B = antipodal A (O)"

"l is a line through A" convert to "l = line\_through A"

" $\omega$  is a circle through A B" convert to " $\omega$  = circle\_through A B"

If X satisfies two constraints, separate the two constraints with ", "  
For example, X is the intersection point under two conditions, it can be written as "X = condition1, condition2" or "X = intersection condition1, condition2" . :

"X is the intersection of AB and CD" convert to "X = AB, CD".

"X is the intersection of circles (O, OA) and (P, PB)" convert to "X = (O, OA), (P, PB)".

"X is the other intersection of line AB with circle (O, OP)" convert to "X = AB, (O, OP)".

"X as the other intersection of line PQ with circle (ABC)" convert to "X = PQ, (ABC)".

Note that there should always be a ", " between two conditions.

Conclusion to be Proved:

"A B C D are cyclic" converted to "concylic A B C D".

"A, B, and C are collinear" convert to "collinear A B C".

"AB, CD, EF are concurrent" convert to "concurrent AB CD EF".

"AB perpendicular to CD" convert to "perpendicular AB CD".

"AB parallel to CD" convert to "parallel AB CD".

"AB = CD" convert to "cong AB CD",

" $\angle ABC = \angle DEF$ " convert to "equal\_angle ABC DEF".

"M is the midpoint of AB" convert to "midpoint M A B".

"ABC ~ DEF" or "ABC is similar to DEF", convert to "similar ABC DEF".

"ABC  $\cong$  DEF" or "ABC is congruent to DEF", convert to "contri ABC DEF".

"ABCD is a square" convert to "square A B C D".

"Circles (O1), (O2), and (O3) having a common radical axis" or "(O1), (O2), (O3) are coaxal" convert to "coaxal (O1) (O2) (O3)".

"AB bisect CD" or "AB pass through the midpoint of CD" convert to "bisect AB CD"

Note that each new point is separated by a semicolon ";", and the conclusion is separated by "Prove: ".

Note that newly added points must have different names from previously defined points.

Some conversions require slight modifications:

In triangle ABC,  $\angle A$  is that same as  $\angle BAC$ .

The incircle or excircle (I) touching BC at point D can be viewed as the foot I on BC, hence convert to "D = foot I BC" or directly "D = (I), BC".

Note that AB represents a line or segment without any space in between, such as in "concurrent AB CD EF" or "foot X AB".

Here are a few examples:

Problem 1:

In a cyclic hexagon ABCDEF, extend AB and CD to intersect at point G. Extend AF and DE to intersect at point H. Let M and N be the circumcenters of triangles BCG and EFH, respectively. Prove that lines BE, CF, and MN are concurrent.

Convert to:

A B C D E F = cyclic\_hexagon; G = AB, CD; H = AF, DE; M = circumcenter B C G; N = circumcenter E F H; Prove: concurrent BE CF MN

Problem 2:

Let H be the orthocenter of triangle ABC, and P be any point. The lines AP, BP, and CP intersect the circumcircle of triangle ABC at points A1, B1, and C1, respectively. Let A2, B2, and C2 be the reflections of A1, B1, and C1 over the sides BC, CA, and AB, respectively. Then, A1, B1, C1, and H are concyclic.

Convert to:

A B C = triangle; H = orthocenter A B C; P = point; A1 = AP, (ABC); B1 = BP, (ABC); C1 = CP, (ABC); A2 = reflect A1 BC; B2 = reflect B1 CA; C2 = reflect C1 AB; Prove: concyclic A1 B1 C1 H

Problem 3:

In triangle ABC, the incircle (I) touches sides BC, CA, and AB at points D, E, and F, respectively. Prove that lines AD, BE, and CF are concurrent.

Convert to:

A B C = triangle; I = incenter A B C; D = foot I BC; E = foot I CA; F = foot I AB; Prove: concurrent AD BE CF

Problem 4:

Let  $\triangle ABC$  be a triangle with  $AC > BC$ , let  $\omega$  be the circumcircle of  $\triangle ABC$ , and let  $r$  be its radius. Point  $P$  is chosen on  $\overline{AC}$  such that  $BC = CP$ , and point  $S$  is the foot of the perpendicular from  $P$  to  $\overline{AB}$ . Ray  $BP$  meets  $\omega$  again at  $D$ . Point  $Q$  is chosen on line  $SP$  such that  $PQ = r$  and  $S, P, Q$  lie on a line in that order. Finally, let  $E$  be a point satisfying  $\overline{AE} \perp \overline{CQ}$  and  $\overline{BE} \perp \overline{DQ}$ . Prove that  $E$  lies on  $\omega$ .

Convert to:

A B C = triangle; O = circumcenter A B C; P = AC, (C,B); S = foot P AB; D = intersection BP, (ABC); Q = SP, (P,OA); l1 = perpendicular\_line A CQ; l2 = perpendicular\_line B DQ; E = intersection l1, l2; Prove: on\_circle E (ABC)

Problem 5:

Let  $\triangle ABC$  be an acute, scalene triangle with orthocenter  $H$ . Let  $\ell_a$  be the line through the reflection of  $B$  with respect to  $CH$  and the reflection of  $C$  with respect to  $BH$ . Lines  $\ell_b$  and  $\ell_c$  are defined similarly. Suppose lines  $\ell_a$ ,  $\ell_b$ , and  $\ell_c$  determine a triangle  $T$ . Prove that the orthocenter of  $T$ , the circumcenter of  $T$ , and  $H$  are collinear.

Convert to:

A B C = acute\_triangle; H = orthocenter A B C; B1 = reflect B CH; C1 = reflect C BH; la = line B1 C1; A1 = reflect A BH; B2 = reflect B AH; lb = line A1 B2; A2 = reflect A CH; C2 = reflect C AH; lc = line A2 C2; X = lb, lc; Y = la, lc; Z = la, lb; H1 = orthocenter X Y Z; O1 = circumcenter X Y Z; Prove: collinear H H1 O1

Problem 6:

Let  $ABCD$  be a parallelogram with  $AC = BC$ . A point  $P$  is chosen on the extension of ray  $AB$  past  $B$ . The circumcircle of  $\triangle ACD$  meets the segment  $PD$  again at  $Q$ . The circumcircle of triangle  $\triangle APQ$  meets the segment  $PC$  at  $R$ . Prove that lines  $CD, AQ, BR$  are concurrent.

Convert to:

C A B = isos\_triangle; D = parallelogram A B C D; P = on\_line AB; Q = intersection PD, (ACD); R = intersection PC, (APQ); Prove: concurrent CD AQ BR

Problem 7:

Let  $I$  be the incentre of acute triangle  $ABC$  with  $AB \neq AC$ . The incircle  $\omega$  of  $ABC$  is tangent to sides  $BC, CA$ , and  $AB$  at  $D, E$ , and  $F$ , respectively. The line through  $D$  perpendicular to  $EF$  meets  $\omega$  at  $R$ . Line  $AR$  meets  $\omega$  again at  $P$ . The circumcircles of triangle  $PCE$  and  $PBF$  meet again at  $Q$ . Prove that lines  $DI$  and  $PQ$  meet on the line through  $A$  perpendicular to  $AI$ .

Convert to:

A B C = acute\_triangle; I = incenter A B C; D = foot I BC; E = foot I CA; F = foot I AB; R = intersection perpendicular\_line D EF, (I); P = intersection AR, (I); Q = intersection (PCE), (PBF); X = DI, PQ; Prove: perpendicular AI AX

Problem 8:

Let  $\triangle ABC$  be an acute triangle with circumcircle  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\ell$  be a tangent line to  $\Gamma$ , and let  $\ell_a$ ,  $\ell_b$  and  $\ell_c$  be the lines obtained by reflecting  $\ell$  in the lines  $BC$ ,  $CA$  and  $AB$ , respectively. Show that the circumcircle of the triangle determined by the lines  $\ell_a$ ,  $\ell_b$  and  $\ell_c$  is tangent to the circle  $\Gamma$ .

Convert to:

A B C = acute\_triangle;  $\omega$  = circumcircle A B C; X = on\_circle  $\omega$ ; l = tangent X  $\omega$ ; la = reflect l BC; lb = reflect l CA; lc = reflect l AB;  $\Omega$  = circumcircle la lb lc; Prove: tangent  $\omega \Omega$

Problem 9:

Let  $\Omega$  and  $O$  be the circumcircle and the circumcentre of an acute-angled triangle  $ABC$  with  $AB > BC$ . The angle bisector of  $\angle ABC$  intersects  $\Omega$  at  $M \neq B$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the circle with diameter  $BM$ . The angle bisectors of  $\angle AOB$  and  $\angle BOC$  intersect  $\Gamma$  at points  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. The point  $R$  is chosen on the line  $PQ$  so that  $BR = MR$ . Prove that  $BR \parallel AC$ .

Convert to:

A B C = acute\_triangle; O = circumcenter A B C; M = midarc\_no A C B;  $\Gamma$  = circle (BM); P = intersection perpendicular\_line O AB,  $\Gamma$ ; Q = intersection perpendicular\_line O BC,  $\Gamma$ ; R = PQ, length\_equal B R M R; Prove: parallel BR AC

Problem 10:

Let  $\triangle ABC$  be a triangle with  $\angle B > \angle C$ . Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be two different points on line  $AC$  such that  $\angle PBA = \angle QBA = \angle ACB$  and  $A$  is located between  $P$  and  $C$ . Suppose that there exists an interior point  $D$  of segment  $BQ$  for which  $PD = PB$ . Let the ray  $AD$  intersect the circle  $ABC$  at  $R \neq A$ . Prove that  $QB = QR$ .

Convert to:

A B C = triangle; P = AC, angle\_equal P B A B C A; Q = AC, angle\_equal Q B A A C B; D = BQ, length\_equal P D P B; R = intersection AD, (ABC); Prove: cong Q B Q R

Please follow these examples to convert the following problem:  
{INPUT\_PROBLEM}

**Listing 3** An illustration of prompt converting a natural language problem into our geometry specific language.