
CombiGraph-Vis: A Curated Multimodal Olympiad Benchmark for Discrete Mathematical Reasoning

Hamed Mahdavi¹ Pouria Mahdavinia¹ Alireza Farhadi⁴ Pegah Mohammadipour¹
Samira Malek¹ Majid Daliri³ Pedram Mohammadipour⁴ Alireza Hashemi²
Amir Khasahmadi⁵ Vasant Honavar¹

¹Pennsylvania State University ²City University of New York ³New York University
⁴Amirkabir University of Technology ⁵Autodesk

Abstract

CombiGraph-Vis is a 1,135-problem benchmark for discrete mathematical reasoning spanning 13 domains and three formats (short-answer, multiple-choice, and yes/no). Notably, 35% of problems include images whose structure is essential for finding solutions. Each problem comes with a verified solution and technique labels, with the entire dataset curated and validated through agentic workflows under human oversight to ensure consistency and fidelity. Evaluations across diverse model families reveal a wide performance range (16%–78% accuracy), with particularly sharp drops on image-based problems. For standalone multiple-choice problems, clear gaps emerge between correct-answer accuracy and among-choices accuracy, indicating vulnerability to trap choices. The benchmark emphasizes reasoning over graphs, grids, and other combinatorial objects. We release the dataset, solutions, technique labels, and evaluation code to support research on robust multimodal discrete-math reasoning. <https://github.com/combigraphviz2025/combigraph-viz>




Figure 1: **Per-model performance on CombiGraph-Vis.** Across all 1135 problems, the performance of each model is summarized by four evaluation tracks: avg@8 (average score), pass@8 (any-of-8), maj@8 (majority-of-8), and all-pass@8 (all-of-8) under our eight-sample chain-of-thought protocol.

1 Introduction

General-purpose math benchmarks increasingly show ceiling effects, limiting their ability to differentiate model capabilities, while multimodal datasets often under-represent discrete mathematics

[3, 6]. Recent multimodal efforts broaden coverage but lack the depth needed to assess discrete mathematical reasoning skills [10, 16]. Competition-oriented benchmarks are valuable, but they mostly feature problems crafted to demand elaborate proofs rather than to elicit short answers, even when the problems admit a concrete final answer [4, 12]. Multimodal competition collections exist, but they are not focused on discrete mathematics with fine-grained technique analyzes [5].

We introduce CombiGraph-Vis, a benchmark of 1135 problems for discrete mathematical reasoning across 13 domains and three formats (short-answer, multiple-choice, yes/no), with substantial visual content (35% image-tagged problems). Each problem includes a verified solution and technique labels, and the dataset is curated and validated via agentic workflows with human oversight to ensure consistency and fidelity. Problems stress reasoning over graphs, grids, combinatorial constructions, and logic-driven puzzles, yielding short, checkable answers.

Evaluations across diverse model families show strong separation on single-sample accuracy (16%–78%), larger drops on image-tagged items, and clear differences between correct-answer accuracy and among-choices accuracy of standalone multiple-choice problems, indicating susceptibility to distractors. CombiGraph-Vis complements prior resources by centering discrete mathematics, providing verified solutions and technique labels, and enabling targeted analysis of multimodal reasoning. We release the dataset, corrected solutions, labels, and evaluation code to support research on robust multimodal discrete-math reasoning.

2 CombiGraph-Vis Dataset

CombiGraph-Vis is a 1135-problem benchmark for discrete mathematical reasoning across 13 domains and three formats (short-answer, multiple-choice, yes/no). About one-third of problems include images. Each problem includes a verified solution and technique labels.


2.1 Data Collection

We gathered all of the problems from the Iranian National Olympiad in Informatics first and second round competitions through the years. Formats in the source competitions changed over time, shifted from mainly multiple-choice to also short-answer and yes/no. We collected first-round problems (5–34) and selected second-round sets (24th, 25th, 26th, 30th, 32nd). PDFs were the primary source. We used the official website of the competition to validate and fill gaps. When questions shared definitions or a setup, we stored the shared text in context for evaluation of context-dependent problems (Figure 3). We redrew figures when originals were low resolution or contained Persian text. We used an agentic workflow to label multiple-choice problems as standalone or choice-dependent. We show toy examples in the main text (Figure 2a), and full examples are in Appendix E.

2.2 Data Curation Process Using Agentic Workflows

We applied agentic workflows with human-in-the-loop to fix existing errors in the dataset during the data curation phase. Our initial analysis identified three distinct error categories with different patterns requiring specialized detection approaches. PDF to markdown conversion errors, translator/annotator errors, and original source errors.

First Phase: Problem Validation. We developed a two-phase validation and correction process using agentic workflows to detect mistakes in problems and solutions. Our first phase uses an agentic workflow that generates validation reports through three specialized critics (Figure 2b). Each critic examines the complete problem data—including context (if any), text, and answer choices—alongside both Persian and English solutions, the correct option, and final answer. The critics are: **Typo/Clarity Critic**, **Logical Soundness Critic**, and **Final Answer Match**. We run these critic stages three times independently for each problem to generate three validation reports. We then use an aggregator stage that applies majority voting to synthesize the three reports into one structured output report with multiple diagnostic fields. Complete implementation details for the first phase are provided in Algorithm 1 (Appendix H). To filter problematic cases, we use the Overall Error Severity taxonomy with five categories: No issues (1), Minor issues (2), Moderate issues (3), Major issues (4), and Critical failure (5). We checked the generated reports for a handful of cases and detected systematic patterns where problems flagged with "major issues" typically contained only minor typos, while those marked "critical failure" often had single correctable errors. We selected all cases with severity



Context-Dependent Problem (toy example)				
Context: A <i>step sequence</i> of length n is an integer sequence $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ with $a_{i+1} - a_i = 1$ for all i. Assume $a_1 = 0$. Question: How many step sequences of length 5 end at $a_5 = 2$?				
1. 2	2. 3	3. 4	4. 5	5. 6

Figure 3: Illustrative toy example of a context-dependent problem.

scores above 1 for the second validation and error correction phase, accepting this conservative threshold to minimize false negatives while managing the high false positive rate we observed.

Second Phase: Automated Error Resolution. Many first-phase flags were not true source errors (e.g., parsing/formatting artifacts, translation slips, or misreads of brief official solutions), so we add a second phase to separate these from genuine issues and apply targeted fixes. The workflow first classifies each case (from aggregated first-phase reports) as: (i) a pipeline parsing/conversion issue, (ii) a potential original-source error, or (iii) an image-understanding issue. Pipeline issues receive surgical edits to every existing field except the original Persian problem and solution, followed by validation. Potential original-source cases undergo a solution-engagement pass that expands the brief solution, tries to understand the detected issue and attempts to reclassifies the case; minor, fixable cases proceed with automated edits, while major cases or image-understanding issue are flagged for later human review. The detailed algorithms for this workflow can be found in 2 and 3 (Appendix H).

3 Results

Across all evaluation settings, we observe clear separations between model families, with top-tier models achieving strong but far from saturated accuracy, mid-tier models trailing substantially, and lightweight/open-weight models far behind. Accuracy drops on image-tagged items compared to text-only items, revealing persistent gaps in visual mathematical understanding. Analysis of a standalone data subset shows that models are often lured by wrong choices deliberately crafted to make competition settings more challenging.

Overall Performance Our results are summarized in Table 1 (cf. Figure 1). Top-tier models achieve avg@8 accuracy of approximately 75–78%, whereas mid-tier and lightweight/open-weight models lag by 20–40 percentage points across evaluation settings. This broad dispersion persists across formats

and modalities, confirming that CombiGraph-Vis is not saturated: even the strongest models leave substantial headroom while weaker models remain far from ceiling. The per-model tracks (avg@8, pass@8, maj@8, all-pass@8) further reinforce clear separations among model families.

Table 1: Per-model accuracy on CombiGraph-Vis (avg@8). Columns report overall, image slices, multiple-choice (Choice-Dep.), yes/no, and the second-round subset. The three rightmost columns quantify multiple-choice behavior in standalone setting: MC Standalone, Among-Choices, and Δ = (Among-Choices – Standalone), a proxy for distractor susceptibility. Bold marks the best score in each column.

Model	All	Img Yes	Img None	Choice-Dep.	Yes/No	Second Round	MC Standalone	Among-Choices	Δ
gemini-2.5-flash	63.4	50.9	70.3	56.9	74.1	50.4	63.45	83.73	20.28
gemini-2.5-flash-lite	50.8	33.8	60.2	50.6	66.4	30.2	49.19	73.08	23.89
gemini-2.5-pro	75.8	66.9	80.8	72.9	81.9	71.6	75.75	90.04	14.29
gemma-3-12b-it	23.2	17.5	26.3	31.1	28.3	13.7	21.25	65.41	44.17
gemma-3-27b-it	27.5	20.1	31.6	38.5	32.4	12.6	24.99	70.44	45.45
gemma-3-4b-it	16.1	12.1	18.4	15.9	40.6	9.7	13.59	57.46	43.87
gpt-4o	27.6	20.4	31.6	31.4	49.9	15.9	24.55	64.09	39.55
gpt-4o-mini	22.5	16.9	25.5	25.2	50.8	14.6	18.97	60.42	41.45
gpt-5	78.0	68.2	83.5	81.2	75.7	75.6	77.74	92.03	14.29
gpt-5-mini	65.4	53.9	71.8	69.0	37.4	59.9	67.82	85.40	17.58
gpt-5-nano	58.9	43.5	67.5	55.4	44.4	46.3	61.11	82.91	21.80

Modality Gap. Table 1 shows consistent drops on image-tagged items relative to text-only problems. For top-tier models, the gap from no-image to image conditions is typically 14–16 percentage points (e.g., 83.5% $\rightarrow$ 68.2% and 80.8% $\rightarrow$ 66.9%), and for mid-tier models it can approach 20 points. This indicates that parsing and reasoning over structured visuals—graphs, grids, geometric diagrams—remain central bottlenecks, materially impacting overall accuracy.

Standalone vs Among-Choices on MC. As discussed, we filter MC problems into choice-dependent and standalone subsets. Typically, standalone MC problems in competition settings are equipped with choices that appear correct at first sight to push students into making mistakes. Inspired by this, we propose an experimental setup to study this effect. For each model we compute: (i) **Standalone avg@8** = mean correctness over 8 samples; and (ii) **Among-Choices avg@8** = mean fraction of standalone problems whose final answer lies among the original options (not necessarily correct). This result can be seen in Table 1. The large Δ values indicate that models consistently produce answers that coincide with some provided choice but not necessarily the correct one. This systematic gap between Among-Choices and Standalone accuracy reveals a susceptibility to these crafted competition traps. In other words, the trap choices often steers models toward distractor recognition rather than robust derivation, whereas the standalone format demands genuine solution construction. Moreover, the large Δ values provide strong support for adopting our evaluation suite as an RL environment, since models can potentially learn to avoid deliberately crafted distractors—an ability that is a prerequisite for performing well in competition-level reasoning.

Topic-Level Performance. Per-topic accuracies highlight both broad strengths and persistent weaknesses. Top-tier models are strong in combinatorics, number reasoning, and invariants/monovariants, and they show competitive results in computational geometry (see Figure 4 in Appendix D). In contrast, graph-theoretic subdomains (e.g., connectivity, matchings) and formal languages expose larger spreads across models, with mid-tier and lightweight/open-weight models struggling markedly. The dispersion suggests that discrete math reasoning is not uniformly mastered across mathematical domains.

4 Conclusion

Together, our findings indicate that CombiGraph-Vis yields strong separations across model families, exposes enduring multimodal reasoning deficits, and stresses the difference between distractor sensitive recognition and derivation-based solution. We leverage these observations in the discussion to analyze error modes and to outline methodological directions for building models that can reliably solve complex, multimodal discrete mathematics problems.

References

- [1] J. Chen, J. Tang, J. Qin, X. Liang, L. Liu, E. P. Xing, and L. Lin. Geoqa: A geometric question answering benchmark towards multimodal numerical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14517*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14517>.
- [2] K. Chernyshev, V. Polshkov, V. Stepanov, A. Myasnikov, E. Artemova, A. Miasnikov, and S. Tilga. U-math: A university-level benchmark for evaluating mathematical skills in large language models. In O. Arviv, M. Clinciu, K. Dhole, R. Dror, S. Gehrmann, E. Habba, I. Itzhak, S. Mille, Y. Perlitz, E. Santus, J. Sedoc, M. Shmueli Scheuer, G. Stanovsky, and O. Taffjord, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Generation, Evaluation and Metrics (GEM²)*, pages 974–1001, Vienna, Austria and virtual meeting, July 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-261-9. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.gem-1.77/>.
- [3] K. Cobbe, V. Lyzhov, M. Bavarian, M. Kossakowski, H. Chen, A. Power, L. Kaiser, and J. Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- [4] B. Gao, F. Song, Z. Yang, Z. Cai, et al. Omni-math: A universal olympiad level mathematic benchmark for large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) — OpenReview*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yaqPf0KA1N>.
- [5] C. He, R. Luo, Y. Bai, S. Hu, Z. Thai, J. Shen, J. Hu, X. Han, Y. Huang, Y. Zhang, J. Liu, L. Qi, Z. Liu, and M. Sun. Olympiadbench: A challenging benchmark for promoting AGI with olympiad-level bilingual multimodal scientific problems. In L.-W. Ku, A. Martins, and V. Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3828–3850, Bangkok, Thailand, Aug. 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.211. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.211/>.
- [6] D. Hendrycks et al. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) — OpenReview*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7Bywt2mQsCe>.
- [7] H. Kydlíček and G. Ganderberger. Math-verify: A python library for mathematical expression verification, 2024. URL <https://github.com/huggingface/Math-Verify>. Version 0.8.0.
- [8] J. Li et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024*, 2024.
- [9] . Liu et al. Clevr-math: A dataset for compositional language, visual and mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05358*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.05358>.
- [10] P. Lu, H. Bansal, T. Xia, J. Liu, C. Li, H. Hajishirzi, H. Cheng, K.-W. Chang, M. Galley, and J. Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KUNzEQMWU7>. ICLR 2024 (oral).
- [11] H. Mahdavi, A. Hashemi, M. Daliri, P. Mohammadipour, A. Farhadi, S. Malek, Y. Yazdanifard, A. Khasahmadi, and V. G. Honavar. Brains vs. bytes: Evaluating llm proficiency in olympiad mathematics. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.xxxxx*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=V4RIJxt02s>.
- [12] Y. Mao, Y. Kim, and Y. Zhou. Champ: A competition-level dataset for fine-grained analyses of LLMs’ mathematical reasoning capabilities. In L.-W. Ku, A. Martins, and V. Srikumar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 13256–13274, Bangkok, Thailand, Aug. 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.785. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.785/>.
- [13] x. Z. Pan, P. Zhou, J. Ai, W. Zhao, K. Wang, X. Peng, W. Shao, H. Yao, and K. Zhang. Mpbench: A comprehensive multimodal reasoning benchmark for process errors identification. In W. Che, J. Nabende, E. Shutova, and M. T. Pilehvar, editors, *Findings of the Association*

- for *Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 21586–21606, Vienna, Austria, July 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-256-5. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.1112. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-acl.1112/>.
- [14] R. Qiao, Q. Tan, G. Dong, M. Wu, C. Sun, X. Song, J. Wang, Z. GongQue, S. Lei, Y. Zhang, Z. Wei, M. Zhang, R. Qiao, X. Zong, Y. Xu, P. Yang, Z. Bao, M. Diao, C. Li, and H. Zhang. We-math: Does your large multimodal model achieve human-like mathematical reasoning? In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2025.
 - [15] D. Schwenk, A. Khandelwal, C. Clark, K. Marino, and R. Mottaghi. A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2022*, pages 146–162. Springer, 2022.
 - [16] K. Wang et al. Measuring multimodal mathematical reasoning with math-vision dataset. In *NeurIPS 2024 Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/1b8a53a4d483589a0b07fdd2a9e4d4b2-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html.
 - [17] X. Wang, J. Wei, D. Schuurmans, Q. Le, E. H. Chi, S. Narang, A. Chowdhery, and D. Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1PL1NIMMrw>.
 - [18] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, B. Ichter, F. Xia, E. H. Chi, Q. V. Le, and D. Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
 - [19] H. Wu, W. Hui, Y. Chen, W. Wu, K. Tu, and Y. Zhou. Conic10k: A challenging math problem understanding and reasoning dataset. In H. Bouamor, J. Pino, and K. Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6444–6458, Singapore, Dec. 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.427. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.427/>.
 - [20] A. S. Yue, L. Madaan, T. Moskowitz, D. Strouse, and A. K. Singh. Harp: A challenging human-annotated math reasoning benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08819*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.08819>.
 - [21] X. Yue, Y. Ni, K. Zhang, T. Zheng, R. Liu, G. Zhang, S. Stevens, D. Jiang, W. Ren, Y. Sun, C. Wei, B. Yu, R. Yuan, R. Sun, M. Yin, B. Zheng, Z. Yang, Y. Liu, W. Huang, H. Sun, Y. Su, and W. Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9556–9567, June 2024.
 - [22] C. Zou, Y. Song, Z. Hu, Y. Liao, C. Li, X. Yang, and Y. Wang. Dynamath: A dynamic visual benchmark for evaluating mathematical reasoning robustness of vision language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VOAMTA8jKu>.

A Related Work

Mathematical Reasoning Benchmarks. GSM8K introduced 8,500 grade school math word problems with verification-based training, demonstrating that step-by-step solutions improve both accuracy and reliability[3]. MATH scaled this approach to high school competition mathematics with 12,500 problems across algebra, geometry, number theory, and other domains[6]. Methodological advances complemented these datasets: chain-of-thought prompting enabled explicit reasoning steps[18], while self-consistency enhanced reliability through majority voting over multiple solution paths[17]. Competition-focused datasets followed with CHAMP providing 270 problems with rich concept-level annotations[12] and OMNI-MATH aggregating 4,428 Olympiad-style problems from international competitions across over 33 mathematical sub-domains[4].

Visual Mathematical Reasoning. Visual mathematical reasoning benchmarks address problems where images contain essential information for solving mathematical questions. Domain-specific approaches include GeoQA with 5,010 geometric problems requiring diagram interpretation[1] and Conic10K with 10,861 conic section problems providing formal symbolic representations[19]. Comprehensive collections followed: MathVista combines 6,141 visual math problems from 28 existing datasets spanning geometry, statistics, and algebraic reasoning[10], MATH-V curates 3,040 competition problems requiring visual context understanding across 16 mathematical disciplines[16], and OlympiadBench extends beyond mathematics with 8,476 bilingual multimodal problems covering both mathematics and physics from international competitions[5]. Compared to these, our benchmark centers discrete math style reasoning over graphs, grids, and combinatorial objects with short, checkable answers and technique labels.

General Multimodal Reasoning. General multimodal reasoning benchmarks evaluate capabilities beyond mathematical domains. MMMU targets expert-level understanding with 11,500 college questions spanning art, business, science, health, humanities, and social science[21], while MMBench provides systematic evaluation across 20 ability dimensions with 3,000+ multiple-choice questions[8]. Knowledge-intensive approaches include A-OKVQA with 25,000 questions requiring both visual understanding and world knowledge[15] and CLEVR-Math with 10,000 synthetic questions testing systematic combination of arithmetic operations in visual contexts[9].

Evaluation Methods and Robustness. Advanced evaluation methods examine solution quality and reasoning stability beyond final answer accuracy. We-Math introduces a diagnostic framework that decomposes 15,000 mathematical problems by knowledge concepts and evaluates models across four categories: insufficient knowledge, inadequate generalization, complete mastery, and rote memorization[14]. DynaMath focuses on robustness evaluation by generating multiple variants of each seed problem, creating 501 base problems with over 5,000 variations to test consistency across input perturbations[22], while MPBench provides a meta-evaluation framework for visual mathematical reasoning, testing models’ abilities in step checking, solution aggregation, and guided step selection across 1,000 competition problems[13]. Our evaluation complements these perspectives by quantifying modality gaps and distractor susceptibility (standalone vs. choice-dependent MC) in discrete, image-tagged settings.

Solution Assessment. Evaluating open-ended mathematical solutions presents unique challenges requiring specialized assessment frameworks. HARP compiles 3,000 short-answer competition problems from prestigious contests, providing multiple human solution strategies and reference answers to enable comprehensive evaluation[20], while U-MATH targets university-level mathematical reasoning with 1,100 problems spanning calculus, linear algebra, and advanced topics, introducing a meta-evaluation framework that assesses the quality of LLM-based grading systems[2]. Tooling for automated answer verification supports reliable scoring of algebraic/numeric responses (e.g., Math-Verify)[7]. Further, reducing proof-based tasks to final-answer grading can misalign with intended assessment goals[11]. CombiGraph-Vis focuses on short, checkable formats paired with verified solutions and reports results by format and modality to align evaluation with task intent.

B Task Formats and Verification Protocol

We evaluate models by generating eight solutions per problem using a chain-of-thought prompt that instructs models to produce step-by-step reasoning and wrap the final answer in `\boxed{}` format (Appendix J.2). For choice-dependent multiple-choice problems, we include the answer choices in the prompt to ensure the model selects from the provided options. To parse the final answer from the model’s output, we use a simple regex pattern that matches the `\boxed{}` format. If all of the choices for that specific problem were numerical/algebraic expressions, we used the Math-Verify[7] library to check if the extracted answer is equivalent to the final answer. In case the generated solution didn’t follow the instruction and didn’t wrap the final answer in `\boxed{}`, or the choices were not numerical/algebraic expressions, we offloaded the task to an LLM (Gemini 2.5 Flash) to extract the final answer. In the prompt, we asked the model to extract the final answer’s raw value, and the matching choice (if any) and the standardized form of the final answer (in case the choices were not numerical/algebraic expressions and the final answer matched one of the choices). We then checked if the extracted answer is equal to the final answer or the extracted choice is equal to the correct option.

C Technique Labels and Taxonomy

To enable fine-grained analysis of mathematical reasoning capabilities, we applied technique labeling based on the official Iranian Informatics Olympiad curriculum. Each problem receives hierarchical labels following a three-level taxonomy: Topic $\rightarrow$ Sub-topic $\rightarrow$ Sub-sub-topic (e.g., Combinatorics $\rightarrow$ Counting Foundations $\rightarrow$ Stars & bars). We use a single prompt that assigns labels based on techniques that explicitly appear in solution steps. The taxonomy covers 13 major topics spanning discrete mathematics with 89 distinct sub-sub-topic labels that capture precise mathematical approaches used in solutions. This fine-grained labeling enables researchers to analyze model performance across specific techniques, identify capability gaps, and design targeted evaluation protocols. The complete hierarchical taxonomy and labeling prompt are provided in Appendix J.3.

D Topic Level Performance




Figure 4: Per-model accuracy by topic (%). Best score per topic is highlighted in bold within each cell.

E Full Examples for Problem Categories

Choice-Dependent Problem (dataset exemplar)

A calculating machine has an internal memory called M . This machine can calculate an expression by performing the following instructions:

- Add X : Adds the value of X to the value of M and stores the result in M .
- Mul X : Multiplies the value of X by the value of M and stores the result in M .

In the above instructions, X can be an integer or a variable. Assume the initial value of M is zero. For example, the following instructions, from left to right, calculate the expression $ax + 5$: Add a , Mul x , Add 5 . **Which of the following expressions cannot be calculated by this machine?**

1. $ax^2 + bx + c$
2. $(a + b)xy + ya$
3. $(ax + by)(a + b)$

4. $3x^5 + 1$
5. All these expressions can be calculated

Standalone Problem (dataset exemplar)

We have written numbers 1 to 78 clockwise on a circle. We select the number 1 as the current number and repeat the following operations until only one number remains on the circle:

- If the current number is x , remove it from the circle, add one unit to the x next numbers clockwise on the circle, and select the number after that (two places clockwise from the removed number) as the current number.

Note that if the number of remaining numbers on the circle is less than 3, one or more numbers might have more than one unit added to them.

What is the remainder when the number that finally remains on the circle is divided by 5?

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4

Context-Dependent Problem (dataset exemplar)

Context: Consider the following definition for the next three questions: An $m \times n$ table where each cell contains an integer is called a 'counting table' if the absolute difference of the numbers written in any two adjacent (row-wise or column-wise) cells is exactly one. As an example, the table below is a 2×3 counting table.

2	3	2
3	2	1

Question: A counting $m \times n$ table, with all its cells filled, is given. We want to reveal the numbers in a minimum number of its cells (their numbers become known to us) so that we can deduce the numbers in the remaining cells. In what range does this minimum lie?

1. 1 or 2
2. $[3, m + n - 1]$
3. $[\frac{mn}{2}, m + n]$
4. $[\frac{mn}{2}, mn - 1]$
5. Exactly mn

F Dataset Statistics

Category	Count	% of Total	With Images
All Problems	1135	100.0	406 (35.8%)
Short-answer	884	77.9	321 (36.3%)
Multiple-choice	157	13.8	49 (31.2%)
Yes/No	94	8.3	36 (38.3%)

Table 2: CombiGraph-Vis dataset statistics.

G Deferred Definitions and Explanations

Overall Error Severity.

1. **No issues.** Clear, correct; e.g., punctuation/spacing only.
2. **Minor issues.** Small typos/notation/wording that do not change interpretation; e.g., $\binom{n}{k}$ written as $C(n, k)$.
3. **Moderate issues.** Multiple minor issues or one ambiguity; intended reading still recoverable; e.g., missing variable domain but inferable.
4. **Major issues.** Contradiction, missing crucial data, or a flawed step that invalidates the solution path; e.g., incorrect identity used.
5. **Critical failure.** Pervasive/fatal problems (nonsense/corrupted content or irreconcilable mismatch); e.g., unreadable required figure or answer contradicts solution.

Error Category Definitions.

1. **Conversion errors.** Parser/OCR defects (notation, formatting, encoding); e.g., $\binom{n}{k} \rightarrow \frac{n}{k}$, dropped subscripts.
2. **Translator/annotator errors.** Translation or metadata mistakes (typos, choice permutation, mislabel); e.g., swapped options B/C.
3. **Original source errors.** Issues in archived materials/errata; e.g., mis-scanned digit or incorrect constant in the source PDF.

Critic Definitions.

1. **Typo/Clarity Critic.** Flags typos, translation slips, and clarity/formatting issues by comparing English with source text; e.g., inconsistent notation or mistranslated term.
2. **Logical Soundness Critic.** Checks step-by-step reasoning and computations; e.g., unjustified inequality step or omitted counting case.
3. **Final Answer Match.** Makes sure that the final answer stated in the solution matches the final answer stored in the database.

H Implementation Details

Algorithm 1 Problem Validation Workflow (First Phase)

Require: Problem datum $d = (\text{problem}, \text{choices}, \text{english_solution}, \text{context}, \text{correct_option}, \text{answer_value}, \text{crawled_persian_markdown}, \text{svg_sources})$
Ensure: problem_validation_data

- 1: reports $\leftarrow []$
- 2: **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ to 3 **do**
- 3: typo_report $\leftarrow \text{TypoClarityCritic}(d)$
- 4: logic_report $\leftarrow \text{LogicalSoundnessCritic}(d)$
- 5: answer_report $\leftarrow \text{AnswerVerificationCritic}(d)$
- 6: combined_report $\leftarrow \text{ReportCollector}(\text{typo_report}, \text{logic_report}, \text{answer_report})$
- 7: Append(reports, combined_report)
- 8: **end for**
- 9: joined_reports $\leftarrow \text{JoinReportChunks}(\text{reports})$
- 10: validation_result $\leftarrow \text{FinalAggregator}(\text{joined_reports})$
- 11: **return** validation_result

Algorithm 2 Error Detection and Classification

Require: Problem datum $d = (\text{problem}, \text{choices}, \text{english_solution}, \text{context}, \text{correct_option}, \text{answer_value}, \text{crawled_persian_markdown}, \text{svg_sources})$
Ensure: Classification result agg with fix requirements

- 1: findings_md $\leftarrow \text{BuildFindingsText}(\text{LoadValidationData}(d.id))$
- 2: reports $\leftarrow []$
- 3: **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ to 3 **do**
- 4: $r \leftarrow \text{IssueDetector}(d, \text{findings_md})$
- 5: Append(reports, r)
- 6: **end for**
- 7: reports_md $\leftarrow \text{JoinIssueReportChunks}(\text{reports})$
- 8: agg $\leftarrow \text{IssueAggregator}(\text{reports_md}, d)$
- 9: **if** agg.is_original_source_error **then**
- 10: engagement_md $\leftarrow \text{SolutionEngager}(d, \text{agg.agggregated_report_md})$
- 11: src_cls $\leftarrow \text{IssueDetectorWithEngagement}(d, \text{engagement_md})$
- 12: src_cls_md $\leftarrow \text{FormatToMarkdown}(\text{src_cls})$
- 13: agg $\leftarrow \text{EngagementReportSynthesizer}(\text{agg.agggregated_report_md}, \text{engagement_md}, \text{src_cls_md})$
- 14: **if** agg.requires_human_intervention **then**
- 15: **return** ComposeHumanInterventionReport(agg)
- 16: **end if**
- 17: **else if** agg.is_image_understanding_issue **then**
- 18: **return** ComposeHumanInterventionReport(agg)
- 19: **end if**
- 20: **return** agg

▷ Classification result for automated fixing

Algorithm 3 Automated Error Resolution and Fixing

Require: Problem datum d , classification result agg from Algorithm 2

Ensure: Fixed problem data or human intervention report

```
1: fix_plan_md ← FixPlanner(agg.aggregated_report_md, d)
2: fixed ← Fixer(fix_plan_md, d)
3: ctx ← UpdateContextWithFixes(fixed)
4: fixed_md ← FormatFixedData(ctx.fixed_problem_data)
5: successes ← 0
6: for  $t \leftarrow 1$  to 20 do
7:   result ← Validator(agg.aggregated_report_md, fix_plan_md,  $d$ , fixed_md)
8:   if result.is_fixed then
9:     successes ← successes + 1
10:    if successes  $\geq 5$  then
11:      break
12:    end if
13:  else
14:    successes ← 0
15:    fix_plan_md ← RePlanner(agg.aggregated_report_md, result.reasoning, fix_plan_md,  $d$ )
16:    fixed ← Fixer(fix_plan_md,  $d$ )
17:    ctx ← UpdateContextWithFixes(fixed)
18:    fixed_md ← FormatFixedData(ctx.fixed_problem_data)
19:  end if
20: end for
21: return ComposeAutoFixOutput( $d$ , agg, fix_plan_md, fixed_md)
```

I Prompt Specifications

I.1 Problem Validation Prompts

I.1.1 TypoClarityCritic

TypoClarityCritic Prompt

You are a meticulous editor and proofreader, specializing in technical and
→ mathematical content. Your sole task is to review a given math problem
→ and its solution for **critical** surface-level errors that fatally impact
→ its meaning or solvability. If available, you will ALSO be provided
→ with inline SVG XMLs as text under the placeholder {svg_sources}; you may
→ use their textual content (e.g., embedded <text> labels) as additional
→ context.

Focus ONLY on the following types of fatal errors:

- **Semantically Significant Typos:** Look for spelling mistakes, incorrect
→ variable names (e.g., 'x' used in one place, 'X' in another), sign/symbol
→ errors (e.g., '=' vs '≠', '<' vs '<='), misplaced decimals, or
→ unit/notation inconsistencies **that change the mathematical meaning**. A
→ typo in a variable/symbol is critical; a typo in a descriptive word is
→ not, unless it creates ambiguity that affects meaning.
- **Explicit Grammar Errors (Meaning-Changing):** Unambiguous grammatical
→ mistakes that alter conditions or conclusions (e.g., missing "not", wrong
→ quantifier, singular/plural mismatch that changes scope, misplaced
→ "only"). Do not flag awkward-but-understandable text.
- **Meaning-Altering Translation Errors:** Mistranslations that invert or
→ distort meaning (e.g., "at least" vs "at most", omission of "distinct",
→ "positive" vs "non-negative").

Crucially, you must IGNORE the following:

- Minor grammatical errors that do not change the meaning.
- Awkward but understandable phrasing or style.

- Missing or introduced labels/notation for clarity (e.g., A/B labels, $\hookrightarrow$ introducing variables) unless they create a direct contradiction.
- References that belong to problem-solution matching (e.g., claims of $\hookrightarrow$ different problem, domain or method differences) - these are out of scope $\hookrightarrow$ for this stage.
- Mathematical rigor, depth of explanation, or solution correctness.

We are not looking for a perfectly written text. We are looking for a $\hookrightarrow$ **functionally correct** text. Only flag an issue if it prevents a $\hookrightarrow$ reasonably skilled person from understanding and solving the problem $\hookrightarrow$ correctly.

****DO NOT:****

- Solve the problem.
- Verify the mathematical logic.
- Check if the final answer is correct.

You will be provided with the problem, its potential choices, the provided $\hookrightarrow$ solution, and possibly a Persian version of the solution for reference.

****Problem Data:****

- ****Problem:****

```

{problem}

```

- ****Choices:****

```

{choices}

```

- ****Provided English Solution:****

```

{english_solution}

```

- ****Provided Persian Solution (for reference, may be empty):****

```

{persian_solution}

```

- ****Context (if any):****

```

{context}

```

****Optional SVG XMLs (if provided):****

```

{svg_sources}

```

****Important Note on "Context":**** The `Context` field, when present, contains $\hookrightarrow$ a shared introduction or definitions for a set of related problems. It is $\hookrightarrow$ a critical part of the problem statement. You must also review the $\hookrightarrow$ context for any typos, grammatical errors, or translation issues.

****CRITICAL: Text-Only Analysis:**** Base your analysis **EXCLUSIVELY** on the text

- $\hookrightarrow$ content. **DO NOT** use image analysis to detect typos/translation errors.
- $\hookrightarrow$ Focus only on the written problem statement, solution text, and the
- $\hookrightarrow$ content inside the provided SVG XMLs (if any).

****Decision rules (apply all):****

- Evidence requirement: For every flagged issue, quote the exact text $\hookrightarrow$ snippet(s) that demonstrate the error.
- Meaning-change threshold: Only flag if the typo/grammar/translation issue $\hookrightarrow$ plausibly changes the mathematical meaning or solvability.

- Notation consistency: Inconsistent variable names/symbols (e.g., 'a' vs 'α', 'x' vs 'X') are errors only if they create ambiguity or contradiction in meaning.
- Scope fence: Do not report missing labels, domain mismatches, method selection, or any problem-solution matching concerns; these belong to a different stage.
- Ambiguity rule: When uncertain, do not flag as fatal. Note the ambiguity and rate severity ≤ 2.

Review the texts and produce a report in markdown format.

****Output format**** (respond ONLY with Markdown; no JSON, no code fences, no extra commentary). Use exactly these sections:

Summary

- 1-2 sentences describing whether there are meaning-changing surface errors (typo/grammar/translation).

Findings

- Comprehensive bullet list of ALL meaning-changing typo/grammar/translation errors you identified (do not omit any). For each finding, include:
 - The minimal quoted snippet(s) that show the error
 - A one-line justification of how the error changes meaning/solvability (alignment with this stage's goal)

Categories

- Bullet list of applicable categories: typo, grammar_error, translation_error, other

Severity

- Rate the overall severity of issues on a scale from 1 (no issues) to 5 (worst case). Use this scale:
 - 1: No issues - text is clear and correct at the surface level
 - 2: Minor issues - small/ambiguous issues; no impact on meaning or correctness
 - 3: Moderate issues - multiple issues causing intermittent ambiguity; meaning mostly intact
 - 4: Major issues - severe ambiguity/errors that likely change meaning or solvability
 - 5: Critical failure - pervasive meaning-changing errors make the problem/solution unusable

1.1.2 LogicalSoundnessCritic

LogicalSoundnessCritic Prompt

You are a data integrity specialist. Your task is to check two simple things

- about the problem-solution pair. Your stage goal is ONLY to determine
- whether the solution is seemingly trying to solve the same stated
- problem, and whether the solution explicitly mentions that the original
- problem was changed. You must NOT assess solution correctness, judge the
- method, or evaluate completeness.

****Your Goal:****

1. ****Same Problem Check****: Does the solution appear to be attempting to solve the same problem stated, or does it seem to solve a completely different problem?
2. ****Problem Substitution Check****: Does the solution explicitly mention that the original problem was wrong/changed during the exam?

****For Goal 1 - Heuristics to detect different problems:****

- Solution discusses completely different mathematical domain (e.g., problem
→ about geometry, solution about number theory)
- Solution addresses fundamentally different question type (e.g., problem
→ asks for proof, solution provides numerical calculation for unrelated
→ quantity)
- Solution starts with completely different input parameters with no
→ connection to stated problem
- Solution's final answer targets a different object/type than what the
→ problem asks for
- Solution relies on constraints or assumptions not present in, or
→ contradicting, the problem/context text

****What to IGNORE for Goal 1:****

- Solution is incomplete, brief, or poorly explained
- Solution uses different approach or method than expected
- Solution shows intermediate calculations or introduces helpful notation
- Solution quality, mathematical rigor, or level of detail

****For Goal 2 - Look for explicit statements like:****

- "The original problem was incorrect/changed"
- "This problem was modified from the exam version"
- "The exam had an error, so this version solves the corrected problem"

****What to IGNORE for Goal 2:****

- Hints or implications without explicit mention of change/error
- General comments about difficulty, ambiguity, or author preference
- Any inference based on images

****Text sources you may use:****

- The written problem statement and solution text
- The `Context` field (if present)
- The inline SVG XMLs (if provided) available under the placeholder
→ `{svg\_sources}` - treat them strictly as text (e.g., read <text> labels),
→ not as images

****CRITICAL: Text-Only Analysis:**** Base your analysis EXCLUSIVELY on textual
→ sources above. DO NOT use image analysis.

You will find the complete problem data in the preceding messages of this
→ conversation, including any typo/clarity analysis.

****Decision rules (apply all):****

- Burden of proof: Declare "different problem" only if at least two
→ independent, text-based indicators are present. If evidence is single,
→ weak, or ambiguous, classify as "same problem" and note uncertainties.
- Evidence requirement: Support each indicator with direct text
→ quotes/snippets from the problem/solution (and, if helpful, from
→ `{svg\_sources}`).
- Derived numbers are allowed: Numbers not in the problem but plausibly
→ derived from stated inputs are normal and must not be used as evidence of
→ mismatch.
- Notation neutrality: Symbols/labels introduced by the solution (A, B, x1,
→ x2) are not evidence of mismatch unless they contradict named entities or
→ constraints explicitly defined in text.
- Answer-target check: If the problem asks for X but the solution's final
→ target is Y (different type/object), count as one indicator.
- Constraint alignment: If the solution assumes constraints that contradict
→ explicitly stated problem/context constraints, count as one indicator.
- Ambiguity rule: When uncertain, default to "same problem" (severity ≤ 2)
→ and list the uncertainties explicitly.

Produce a report in markdown format.

```

**Output format** (respond ONLY with Markdown; no JSON, no code fences, no
↳ extra commentary). Use exactly these sections and structure:

# Summary
- 1-2 sentences stating whether the solution matches the problem and whether
↳ substitution is explicitly mentioned.

# Findings
- If none, write: None
- Otherwise, for each finding, use this exact template (leave one blank line
↳ between findings):
  - Finding ID: F1
  - Goal: same_problem_check | substitution_check
  - Indicators: [indicator_1, indicator_2, ...]
    - Choose from: domain_mismatch, question_type_mismatch,
      ↳ input_param_mismatch, answer_target_mismatch,
      ↳ constraint_contradiction, explicit_substitution_statement
  - Evidence:
    - Problem: "exact quoted snippet from problem"
    - Solution: "exact quoted snippet from solution"
  - Alignment: One sentence explaining how this finding supports the stage
    ↳ goal (same_problem_check or substitution_check)
  - Category: mismatch | other

# Categories
- List only those that apply: mismatch, other

# Severity
- One integer 1-5 using this scale:
  - 1: Matches; no credible indicators
  - 2: Mostly matches; minor/ambiguous inconsistencies
  - 3: Partial match; one credible indicator
  - 4: Likely different problem; two credible indicators
  - 5: Clearly different problem; multiple strong indicators or explicit
    ↳ substitution statement

```

I.1.3 AnswerVerificationCritic

AnswerVerificationCritic Prompt

```

You are a data verification agent. Your job is to perform a simple but
↳ crucial cross-check of the provided data for a math problem.

**Your Goal:**
- Compare the final answer derived in the **Provided English Solution** with
↳ the official answer recorded in the database fields (`correct_option` and
↳ `answer_value`).
- Identify any discrepancies.

**Example Scenarios to Catch:**
- The solution text concludes that "the answer is 12," but the `answer_value`
↳ is 15.
- The solution text says "Option 3 is correct," but the `correct_option` is
↳ 2.
- The problem is a yes/no question, and the solution proves "yes," but the
↳ `answer_value` is "no."

You will find the complete problem data (problem statement, choices,
↳ solution, context, images etc.) in the preceding messages of this
↳ conversation. Your task is to analyze that information. Use the images
↳ (if any) associated with the problem and solution. Use them to understand
↳ the context of any text that refers to them.

```

****Note on "Context":**** The `Context` field may contain definitions that
→ clarify the nature of the expected answer (e.g., whether it should be an
→ integer, a set, etc.). Keep this in mind during your verification.

Analyze the `Provided English Solution` to determine the answer it produces,
→ and compare it against the `Correct Option Field` and `Answer Value
→ Field`. Produce a report in markdown format, stating clearly whether
→ there is a mismatch or if the data is consistent.

Output format (respond ONLY with Markdown; no JSON, no code fences, no extra
→ commentary). Use exactly these sections:

Summary

- 1-2 sentences stating "Consistent" or describing the mismatch and where it
→ occurred.

Findings

- Comprehensive bullet list that explicitly identifies the answer extracted
→ from the solution text, the database's `correct\_option`/`answer\_value`,
→ and any mismatch. Include minimal quotes where helpful.

Categories

- Bullet list of applicable categories: mismatch, other

Severity

- Rate the overall severity of verification issues on a scale from 1 (no
→ issues) to 5 (worst case). Use this scale:
- 1: No issues - solution and database are consistent
- 2: Minor issues - small ambiguity; likely consistent
- 3: Moderate issues - some ambiguity or partial mismatch
- 4: Major issues - clear mismatch affecting correctness
- 5: Critical failure - fundamental inconsistency; recorded answer and
→ solution contradict

I.1.4 FinalAggregator

FinalAggregator Prompt

You are a senior analyst and judge. Your task is to synthesize multiple
→ critique reports into a final, structured JSON conclusion that details
→ every unique, validated finding.

****Input:****

You will receive a single markdown string containing the concatenated,
→ synthesized reports from each review iteration.

...

{aggregated_report_md}

...

****Your Goal:****

1. ****Synthesize Unique Findings:**** Read all reports and identify every
→ distinct issue mentioned. Cluster semantically equivalent issues across
→ reports into a single candidate finding.
2. ****Majority Vote Inclusion:**** For each candidate finding, count how many
→ distinct critic reports support it. Include a finding in the final output
→ only if it is supported by a majority of critic reports ($\geq \text{ceil}(N/2)$)
→ where N is the number of critic reports considered). Discard singletons.

```

3. **Extract Details for Each Finding:** For each included finding,
  ↳ determine its specific `location` (e.g., "Solution, paragraph 3"), its
  ↳ `category`, and a specific `severity` score (1-5) for that issue alone.
4. **Determine Overall Severity:** Judge the final `overall_severity` based
  ↳ on the number, nature, and severity of all included findings. A single
  ↳ critical issue might warrant a 5, but a pattern of many moderate issues
  ↳ could also indicate a deeply flawed problem. Use the following scale for
  ↳ your final judgment:
    - 1: No issues - The problem/solution pair appears clear and correct
      ↳ overall.
    - 2: Minor issues - One or two small problems with no impact on meaning
      ↳ or correctness.
    - 3: Moderate issues - Multiple problems hindering clarity, or one
      ↳ significant issue.
    - 4: Major issues - Several significant contradictions or a pattern of
      ↳ errors that likely invalidates the solution.
    - 5: Critical failure - Pervasive issues, or a single fatal flaw, make
      ↳ the pair unusable.
5. **Write Summary Comment:** Provide a high-level, 2-3 sentence
  ↳ `summary_comment` of the findings.
6. **Set Final Flag:** Set `is_issue_detected` to `true` if your list of
  ↳ findings is not empty.

**Adjudication Rubric:**
- Validate each critic claim against text: For every claim, cite exact text
  ↳ snippets (problem/solution). Ignore image-based claims.
- Label each claim: Validated, Refuted, or Inconclusive. Include a brief
  ↳ reason.
- Conflict resolution: When critics disagree, prefer claims with stronger,
  ↳ directly quoted textual evidence. Discard claims lacking such evidence or
  ↳ relying on images.
- Majority vote rule: Cluster similar claims across critic reports. For each
  ↳ clustered issue, compute support_count = number of distinct critic
  ↳ reports that raise it. Include only if support_count >= ceil(N/2).
  ↳ Exclude singletons.
- Output policy: Only include majority-supported, Validated findings in
  ↳ `aggregated_findings`. Briefly summarize Refuted/Inconclusive or
  ↳ non-majority claims in `summary_comment` as adjudication notes.
- Overall severity: Judge holistically from the included findings (count,
  ↳ breadth, severity); do not use max-only.
- Ambiguity bias: If no claim can be validated with direct text evidence, set
  ↳ `is_issue_detected` to false and `overall_severity` to 1, and explain
  ↳ uncertainty in `summary_comment`.

**Output Instructions:**
Produce a single, valid JSON object that conforms strictly to the schema
  ↳ below. Do NOT add any extra text, markdown formatting, or explanations
  ↳ outside of the JSON object.

**JSON Schema for Output:**
```json
{
 "$schema": "http://json-schema.org/draft-07/schema#",
 "title": "ProblemValidationOutput",
 "type": "object",
 "properties": {
 "overall_severity": {
 "type": "integer",
 "minimum": 1,
 "maximum": 5,
 "description": "A final judgment on the overall severity, considering
 ↳ all findings. Scale: 1=None, 2=Minor, 3=Moderate, 4=Major,
 ↳ 5=Critical."
 }
 }
}

```

```

 },
 "summary_comment": {
 "type": "string",
 "description": "A high-level, 2-3 sentence summary of the overall
 ↪ findings."
 },
 },
 "aggregated_findings": {
 "type": "array",
 "description": "A list of unique, validated issues found in the
 ↪ problem/solution pair.",
 "items": {
 "type": "object",
 "properties": {
 "description": {
 "type": "string",
 "description": "A detailed description of the unique issue,
 ↪ synthesized from all critic reports."
 },
 "location": {
 "type": "string",
 "description": "The specific location of the issue (e.g.,
 ↪ 'Problem Statement, paragraph 2', 'Solution, equation 3')."
 },
 "category": {
 "type": "string",
 "description": "The category of the issue (one of 'mismatch',
 ↪ 'typo', 'clarity')."
 },
 "severity": {
 "type": "integer",
 "minimum": 1,
 "maximum": 5,
 "description": "The severity of this specific issue, from 1
 ↪ (minor) to 5 (critical)."
 }
 },
 "required": ["description", "location", "category", "severity"]
 },
 },
 "is_issue_detected": {
 "type": "boolean",
 "description": "True if any substantive issue is validated, otherwise
 ↪ false."
 },
 },
 "required": [
 "overall_severity",
 "summary_comment",
 "aggregated_findings",
 "is_issue_detected"
]
 }
 ...

```

## I.2 Error Resolution Prompts

### I.2.1 IssueDetector

#### IssueDetector Prompt

**\*\*Role:\*\*** You are an expert forensic analyst for a multi-stage data processing pipeline. Your task is to analyze the provided data, identify the root cause of discrepancies based on the known pipeline, and classify the error.

#### ### How to Determine the True Final Answer

Before classifying an error, you must determine the ground truth for the final answer by following this strict hierarchy. This is the most critical part of your analysis.

1. **\*\*Find the Stated Answer Key:\*\*** First, check the ``crawled_persian_markdown`` for an explicit statement of the correct option, like "Option X is correct".
2. **\*\*The Stated Answer is the Target:\*\***
  - \* If an explicit option is stated, find its corresponding **\*\*value\*\*** from the Persian ``choices`` list. This value is the **\*\*intended correct answer (the ground truth)\*\***.
  - \* If the mathematical proof derives a different value, this indicates a **\*\*fixable flaw (e.g., a typo, calculation error, or encoding issue) within the proof\*\***. Your task is to assume the stated answer is correct and identify the flaw in the proof.
3. **\*\*Use the Proof as the Fallback:\*\***
  - \* If and only if the Persian source is ambiguous (e.g., "Option ? is correct"), you must then rely on the mathematical derivation in the proof to determine the true answer value.
4. **\*\*Map the True Value to Our Choices:\*\*** Once you have the absolute true answer **\*value\*** (determined from either the stated key or the proof), find the corresponding option number in **\*\*our English `choices`\*\***. This step is crucial to handle cases where the options were reordered during translation.

To make the best judgment, you must understand how the data was created and where errors can be introduced.

#### **\*\*CRITICAL: Understand the Data Pipeline to Find the Error Source:\*\***

To identify the source of an error, you must first understand how the data was created. Here is the exact procedure we followed:

1. **\*\*PDF to Markdown Parsing:\*\*** We started with the original Persian exam PDFs and used an automated tool to parse them into markdown. This process sometimes introduces errors, like misinterpreting LaTeX (``\binom`` as ``\frac``) or failing to extract an image. The ``persian_solution`` field is the direct output of this step.
2. **\*\*LLM Translation:\*\*** The parsed Persian markdown was then translated into English using a Large Language Model. This step can introduce its own errors, especially with Right-to-Left (RTL) language nuances. For example, the order of items in a list (``7, 10, 11``) might be incorrectly reversed (``11, 10, 7``). The ``english_solution``, ``problem``, and ``choices`` fields are the output of this step.
3. **\*\*Image Separation:\*\*** We manually separated images from the parsed text. It's possible an image was missed or mismatched during this step.

**\*\*Ground Truth:\*\***

You have access to ``crawled_persian_markdown``. This is the ultimate source of  
 → truth for what the official source published. However, the official  
 → source may omit the full solution: sometimes it provides only hints, and  
 → sometimes it includes only the problem with no solution. In such cases,  
 → downstream English content may come from a trusted alternative (e.g.,  
 → official PDF extraction). Therefore:  
 - Use ``crawled_persian_markdown`` as the authoritative reference for the  
 → official problem statement and any content it does include.  
 - Absence of a solution in ``crawled_persian_markdown`` does NOT imply an error  
 → in the English solution by itself; In these cases, we have extracted the  
 → solution from the official PDF, which adds the possibility of mistakes in  
 → the english solution. Evaluate consistency using all provided references.

#### **\*\*Your Root Cause Analysis Procedure\*\***

To accurately identify the error, you must follow this exact two-step  
 → procedure. Do not skip steps or classify an error until you have traced  
 → its origin according to this hierarchy of suspicion.

#### **\*\*Step 1: Verify Translation Fidelity (Check for Pipeline Errors)\*\***

Your first and most important task is to meticulously compare the English  
 → text fields (``problem``, ``context``, ``choices``, ``english_solution``) against  
 → the ``crawled_persian_markdown`` (the ground truth).

\* **\*\*Outcome:\*\*** If you find any discrepancy—a mistranslated equation, a  
 → reversed list, a sentence that doesn't match—the root cause is a  
 → **\*\*Pipeline Error\*\***. You must select the appropriate ``Mistranslation...``  
 → or related category and set the ``Pipeline Step`` to ``LLM Translation`` or  
 → ``PDF to Markdown Parsing``. **\*\*In this case, you must not proceed to Step**  
 → **2.\*\***

#### **\*\*Step 2: Analyze the Source (Check for Source Errors)\*\***

If, and only if, you have confirmed that the English data is a faithful and  
 → accurate translation of the ``crawled_persian_markdown``, should you then  
 → analyze the Persian source for internal flaws.

\* **\*\*Outcome:\*\*** If you find a demonstrable mathematical error, a typo, or a  
 → notational abuse *\*within the Persian source itself\**, the root cause is an  
 → **\*\*Original Source Error\*\***. You must select the ``OriginalSourceError``  
 → category and set the ``Pipeline Step`` to ``External Source``.

#### **\*\*Common Error Patterns Stemming from this Pipeline:\*\***

\* **\*\*`MistranslationEquation`:\*\*** **\*\* (Cause: Step 1 or 2)\*\***. A mathematical  
 → variable, expression, or equation was parsed incorrectly or went missing  
 → during PDF extraction (e.g., ``\binom`` became ``\frac``) or was  
 → mistranslated by the LLM. Compare the English version to both Persian  
 → versions to pinpoint the source.  
 \* **\*\*`MistranslationOrderingRTL`:\*\*** **\*\* (Cause: Step 2)\*\***. The order of items  
 → in a list, question, or choices was reversed or scrambled during the  
 → Persian-to-English translation. This is a classic RTL vs. LTR issue.  
 \* **\*\*`MistranslationAnswerKey`:\*\*** **\*\* (Cause: Step 2 & manual intervention)\*\***.  
 → The original problem had an issue (e.g., the correct answer value was not  
 → in the choices). We may have manually added the correct value to the  
 → English ``choices``, but the LLM-translated ``english_solution`` text might  
 → still incorrectly state that the answer isn't available.  
 \* **\*\*`ManualErrorIncorrectGuess`:\*\*** **\*\* (Cause: Manual intervention)\*\***. The  
 → original Persian source marked the correct option with a ``?`` or it was  
 → ambiguous. A human manually filled in the ``correct_option`` and  
 → ``answer_value``. **\*\*Analyze the solution's mathematical reasoning in the**  
 → **``crawled_persian_markdown``. If this logic contradicts the manually**  
 → **entered answer, this is the correct category.\*\*** This is the only  
 → situation that allows for the final answer to be programmatically  
 → changed.

\* **`MissingImage`**:\*\* **\*(Cause: Step 1 or 3)\***. An image referenced in the  
 ↳ text is missing. Compare the ``english_solution`` to the  
 ↳ ``crawled_persian_markdown`` to see if an image reference is present in the  
 ↳ source but absent in the final version.

\* **`ImageUnderstandingIssue`**:\*\* **\*(External Cause)\***. The error is not in  
 ↳ the text, but in the model's inability to correctly interpret an image's  
 ↳ content. The text across all versions is likely consistent.

\* **`OriginalSourceError`**:\*\* **\*(External Cause)\***. The logical flaw exists  
 ↳ in the official source material itself. **\*\*To claim this category, you**  
 ↳ **must provide a mathematical counter-example or proof demonstrating the**  
 ↳ **error.\*\*** You cannot claim an error simply because the source is vague,  
 ↳ concise, or contains an unproven claim (the benefit of the doubt always  
 ↳ goes to the source). This category includes typos, abuse of notation  
 ↳ (e.g., wrong indexing, undefined variables), or demonstrable mathematical  
 ↳ mistakes in the proof.

\* **`NoDiscernibleError`**:\*\* **\*(Cause: Upstream Validator False Positive)\***.  
 ↳ A meticulous comparison of the ``english_solution``, ``persian_solution``,  
 ↳ and ``crawled_persian_markdown`` shows they are all consistent and  
 ↳ logically sound. The error is likely a false positive from the initial  
 ↳ upstream validation workflow. Use this category if you can find no fault  
 ↳ in the data.

**\*\*Your Task:\*\***

1. Meticulously compare the three data versions (``crawled_persian_markdown``,  
 ↳ ``persian_solution``, ``english_solution``) to trace where the error was  
 ↳ introduced.
  2. Enumerate all distinct issues you find (do not stop at the "most likely"  
 ↳ one). For each issue:
    - Assign the exact category from the list below.
    - Write a detailed, plausible scenario that references the specific  
 ↳ pipeline step that caused it.
    - Add a confidence tag: ``High``, ``Medium``, or ``Low``.
    - Group repeated occurrences of the same category under a single issue  
 ↳ entry, and list all occurrences with precise locations/snippets.
    - Rate the impact severity as ``Critical``, ``Major``, or ``Minor``.
- Order the issues by severity (Critical -> Major -> Minor). There is no cap  
 ↳ on the number of issues; include minor typos/notation issues as well.

**\*\*Input Data:\*\***

- Crawled Persian Markdown (Source of Truth): {`crawled_persian_markdown``}
- Our Parsed Persian Markdown: {`persian_solution``}
- English Problem: {`problem``}
- Context: {`context``}
- English Choices: {`choices``}
- English Solution: {`english_solution``}
- SVG XMLs (if any):  
 ...  
 {`svg_sources``}  
 ...

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are provided as auxiliary aids to clarify  
 ↳ equations or diagram content. The equivalent rendered PNG images are  
 ↳ already embedded in the problem/solution/context. Use SVGs only to  
 ↳ improve understanding; do not output or modify them.

Note on Context: The ``context`` field contains introductory text or diagrams  
 ↳ that are essential for understanding the problem but are not part of the  
 ↳ formal question. Treat it as part of the overall problem definition.

**\*\*Output Instructions:\*\***

For each distinct issue you identify, format your analysis using the

- following markdown structure. If you find multiple issues, repeat this
- block for each one, separated by a horizontal rule (`---`). List issues
- in descending order of severity.

```

Category: [Exact category name]
Severity: [Critical | Major | Minor]
Confidence: [High | Medium | Low]
Pipeline Step: [PDF to Markdown Parsing | LLM Translation | Image
→ Separation | Manual Intervention | External Source]
Explanation: [Detailed plausible scenario of how/why this issue occurred]
Occurrences:
- [Document: crawled_persian_markdown | persian_solution | english_solution |
→ choices | problem] - [location/snippet] - [what is wrong vs expected]
- [add more bullets for each occurrence]

```

## I.2.2 IssueAggregator

### IssueAggregator Prompt

```

Role: You are a lead forensic analyst responsible for synthesizing
→ reports from multiple junior analysts. You have received several
→ `IssueDetectionReport`s for the same problem. Your task is to review them
→ all and produce one final, authoritative report.

```

### How to Determine the True Final Answer

Before classifying an error, you must determine the ground truth for the

- final answer by following this strict hierarchy. This is the most
- critical part of your analysis.

1. **\*\*Find the Stated Answer Key:\*\*** First, check the
  - `crawled\_persian\_markdown` for an explicit statement of the correct
  - option, like "Option X is correct".
2. **\*\*The Stated Answer is the Target:\*\***
  - \* If an explicit option is stated, find its corresponding **\*\*value\*\***
    - from the Persian `choices` list. This value is the **\*\*intended correct**
    - answer (the ground truth)\*\*.
  - \* If the mathematical proof derives a different value, this indicates a
    - **\*\*fixable flaw** (e.g., a typo, calculation error, or encoding issue)
    - within the proof\*\*. Your task is to assume the stated answer is
    - correct and identify the flaw in the proof.
3. **\*\*Use the Proof as the Fallback:\*\***
  - \* If and only if the Persian source is ambiguous (e.g., "Option ? is
    - correct"), you must then rely on the mathematical derivation in the
    - proof to determine the true answer value.
4. **\*\*Map the True Value to Our Choices:\*\*** Once you have the absolute true
  - answer **\*\*value\*\*** (determined from either the stated key or the proof), find
  - the corresponding option number in **\*\*our English `choices`\*\***. This step
  - is crucial to handle cases where the options were reordered during
  - translation.

**\*\*CRITICAL: Understand the Data Pipeline to Evaluate the Reports:\*\***  
 To make the best judgment, you must understand how the data was created and

- where errors can be introduced.

1. **\*\*PDF to Markdown Parsing:\*\*** We started with original Persian exam PDFs
  - and used a tool to parse them into markdown (`persian\_solution`). This
  - step can cause LaTeX errors or miss images.

2. **\*\*LLM Translation:\*\*** The parsed markdown was then translated into English (↪ ``english_solution``, ``problem``, etc.). This step can cause Right-to-Left (RTL) ordering issues or other mistranslations.
3. **\*\*Image Separation & JSON Formatting:\*\*** Manual steps that could also introduce errors.
4. **\*\*Ground Truth:\*\*** The ``crawled_persian_markdown`` reflects what the official source published. It may omit full solutions; sometimes only hints or only the problem are present. Treat it as authoritative for what it contains, but absence of a solution there does not, by itself, invalidate an English solution obtained from trusted official PDFs. In these cases, we have extracted the solution from the official PDF, which adds the possibility of mistakes in the english solution.

**\*\*Common Error Patterns Stemming from this Pipeline:\*\***

- \* ``MistranslationEquation``: Caused by Step 1 or 2.
- \* ``MistranslationOrderingRTL``: Caused by Step 2.
- \* ``MistranslationAnswerKey``: Caused by Step 2 & manual fixes.
- \* ``ManualErrorIncorrectGuess``: **\*\*Cause: Manual intervention\*\***. The original Persian source marked the correct option with a '?' or it was ambiguous. A human manually filled in the ``correct_option`` and ``answer_value``. **\*\*Analyze the solution's mathematical reasoning in the ``crawled_persian_markdown``. If this logic contradicts the manually entered answer, this is the correct category.\*\*** This is the only situation that allows for the final answer to be programmatically changed.
- \* ``MissingImage``: Caused by Step 1 or 3.
- \* ``ImageUnderstandingIssue``: External issue with the image understanding capability of the model.
- \* ``OriginalSourceError``: **\*\*Cause: External Cause\*\***. The logical flaw exists in the official source material itself. **\*\*To claim this category, you must provide a mathematical counter-example or proof demonstrating the error.\*\*** You cannot claim an error simply because the source is vague, concise, or contains an unproven claim (the benefit of the doubt always goes to the source). This category includes typos, abuse of notation (e.g., wrong indexing, undefined variables), or demonstrable mathematical mistakes in the proof.
- \* ``NoDiscernibleError``: The upstream validation was likely a false positive.

**\*\*The Hierarchy of Suspicion: Your Guiding Principle\*\***

Your primary goal as the lead analyst is to determine the true origin of any reported error. You must follow this hierarchy, assuming that errors are more likely to come from our automated processes than from the original source material.

1. **\*\*Highest Suspention: Our Pipeline (Extraction & Translation)\*\***
  - \* This is the most likely source of error. Before considering any other cause, you must first rule out errors from PDF parsing or LLM translation.
  - \* **\*\*Evidence:\*\*** A discrepancy between the English fields (``problem``, ``solution``, etc.) and the ``crawled_persian_markdown``.
  - \* **\*\*Your Action:\*\*** If a pipeline error is confirmed, it is the primary cause. The goal is to make our data consistent with the source.
2. **\*\*Medium Suspicion: Minor Flaws in the Source Solution\*\***
  - \* If, and only if, you have confirmed the English data is a faithful translation, then consider minor errors in the source solution itself.
  - \* **\*\*Evidence:\*\*** The source proof contains typos, bad phrasing, or non-standard notation but is otherwise logically sound.

```

* **Your Action:** Acknowledge the minor source flaw. This can be fixed
 ↳ automatically.

3. **Lowest Suspicion: Flaws in the Source Problem Statement or Final
 ↳ Answer**
 * This is extremely rare. Assume the original problem statement and
 ↳ stated final answer are correct unless there is overwhelming and
 ↳ unambiguous evidence of an error (e.g., a completely unintelligible
 ↳ typo).

Handling Combined Errors:
If you find evidence of both a minor source error AND a subsequent
↳ translation error, your final report must prioritize fixing the source
↳ concept first, then addressing the translation based on that corrected
↳ concept.

Your Task:
1. Review all provided detection reports below. Note the categories,
 ↳ explanations, and confidence scores from each analyst.
2. Aggregate ALL distinct issues across reports; do not stop at the most
 ↳ likely one.
3. For each aggregated issue, provide: Category; Severity \[Critical | Major
 ↳ | Minor\]; Confidence \[High | Medium | Low\]; Pipeline Step; and grouped
 ↳ Occurrences (per-location bullets).
4. Order issues by Severity (Critical -> Major -> Minor), then by
 ↳ Confidence.
5. Choose ONE overall `final_category` (the dominant issue for executive
 ↳ labeling) and list all remaining categories in `secondary_categories`.
6. Set control flags from the entire merged set of issues (not only from
 ↳ `final_category`).
7. Produce your final aggregated report as a markdown document. Do not
 ↳ propose removing any image references; image content is essential and
 ↳ must be preserved.

Aggregation Rules
- Deduplicate same-category issues across reports and union their
 ↳ occurrences.
- Severity: take the highest severity reported for that issue across reports.
- Confidence: High if most reports are High and there are no strong
 ↳ conflicts; otherwise Medium; Low if evidence is conflicting or weak.
- Pipeline Step: choose the step best supported by evidence; if mixed, state
 ↳ the primary step and note alternates.
- **Prioritize Pipeline Errors in Conflict:** When reports conflict, apply
 ↳ the Hierarchy of Suspicion. If one analyst reports a `Mistranslation` and
 ↳ another reports an `OriginalSourceError` for the same discrepancy, the
 ↳ `Mistranslation` diagnosis takes precedence. Only classify the issue as
 ↳ an `OriginalSourceError` if there is shared evidence that the English
 ↳ text is a *faithful translation* of a flawed Persian source. When in
 ↳ doubt, default to the pipeline error.

Detection Reports from Junior Analysts:
{issue_reports_md}

Problem Data for Reference:
- Crawled Persian Markdown (Source of Truth): {crawled_persian_markdown}
- Our Parsed Persian Markdown: {persian_solution}
- English Problem: {problem}
- English Choices: {choices}
- English Solution: {english_solution}
- Correct Option: {correct_option}
- Answer Value: {answer_value}
- SVG XMLs (if any):
 ...

```

```

{svg_sources}
...
- Context: {context}

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are provided as auxiliary aids to clarify
→ equations or diagram content. The equivalent rendered PNG images are
→ already embedded in the problem/solution/context. Use SVGs only to
→ improve understanding; do not output or modify them.

Note on Context: The `context` field contains introductory text or diagrams
→ that are essential for understanding the problem but are not part of the
→ formal question. Treat it as part of the overall problem definition.

Return only a single valid JSON object conforming to the schema below. Do not
→ include any extra text or code fences. Keys must be double-quoted.

Rules for Setting Control Flags
Your primary task is to review ALL detected issues from the junior analysts'
→ reports and set the following boolean flags based on the *entire set* of
→ findings. The `final_category` is for descriptive purposes only; these
→ flags control the workflow.

1. **`is_original_source_error`**:
 - MUST be `true` if `OriginalSourceError` is present in ANY of the
 → detected issues (either as a primary or secondary finding).
 - MUST be `false` otherwise.

2. **`is_image_understanding_issue`**:
 - MUST be `true` if `ImageUnderstandingIssue` OR `MissingImage` is
 → present in ANY of the detected issues.
 - MUST be `false` otherwise.

3. **`requires_human_intervention`**:
 - MUST be `true` if `is_original_source_error` is `true` OR
 → `is_image_understanding_issue` is `true`.
 - MUST be `false` otherwise.

JSON Schema for Output:

{
 "title": "AggregatedIssueReport",
 "type": "object",
 "properties": {
 "final_category": {
 "type": "string",
 "enum": [
 "MistranslationEquation",
 "MistranslationOrderingRTL",
 "MistranslationAnswerKey",
 "ManualErrorIncorrectGuess",
 "MissingImage",
 "ImageUnderstandingIssue",
 "OriginalSourceError",
 "NoDiscernibleError",
 "Other"
]
 },
 "requires_human_intervention": { "type": "boolean" },
 "is_original_source_error": {
 "type": "boolean",
 "description": "True if 'OriginalSourceError' appears in ANY detected
 → issues (primary or secondary)."
 },
 "is_image_understanding_issue": {

```

```

 "type": "boolean",
 "description": "True if 'ImageUnderstandingIssue' or 'MissingImage' was
 ↪ detected. Controls the workflow branch."
 },
 "secondary_categories": {
 "type": "array",
 "items": {
 "type": "string",
 "enum": [
 "MistranslationEquation",
 "MistranslationOrderingRTL",
 "MistranslationAnswerKey",
 "ManualErrorIncorrectGuess",
 "MissingImage",
 "ImageUnderstandingIssue",
 "OriginalSourceError",
 "NoDiscernibleError",
 "Other"
]
 }
 },
 "plausible_scenario_md": { "type": "string" },
 "aggregated_report_md": { "type": "string" }
},
"required": ["final_category", "requires_human_intervention",
↪ "is_original_source_error", "is_image_understanding_issue",
↪ "plausible_scenario_md", "aggregated_report_md"]
}

```

### Output Structure for `aggregated\_report\_md`

- Header: Final Category + Flags (concise, visible summary).
- Issues Breakdown: one block per issue with Category, Severity, Confidence,
 ↪ Pipeline Step, and grouped Occurrences (per-location bullets).
- Evidence Synthesis: explain how reports were merged, how conflicts were
 ↪ resolved, and why the chosen pipeline step/labels were selected.
- Final Decision & Rationale: why this `final\_category` dominates; how flags
 ↪ were computed from the whole set.

**\*\*Example Output:\*\***

**\*\*Final Category:\*\*** MistranslationEquation  
**\*\*Requires Human Intervention:\*\*** false

**## Issues Breakdown**

**### Issue 1**

- **\*\*Category:\*\*** MistranslationEquation
- **\*\*Severity:\*\*** Major
- **\*\*Confidence:\*\*** High
- **\*\*Pipeline Step:\*\*** LLM Translation
- **\*\*Occurrences:\*\***
  - Document: english\_solution - snippet shows  $\frac{n}{k}$ ; expected
 ↪  $\binom{n}{k}$
  - Document: problem - heading formula mirrored incorrectly

**### Issue 2**

- **\*\*Category:\*\*** MistranslationOrderingRTL
- **\*\*Severity:\*\*** Minor
- **\*\*Confidence:\*\*** Medium
- **\*\*Pipeline Step:\*\*** LLM Translation
- **\*\*Occurrences:\*\***
  - Document: choices - order reversed ("11, 10, 7" vs "7, 10, 11")

**## Evidence Synthesis**

Reports 1 and 3 independently confirm equation mistranslation with high  
 ↳ confidence; Report 2 identifies the ordering issue. We merge  
 ↳ same-category findings and union occurrences. Severity is taken as the  
 ↳ highest reported; confidence is High for Issue 1 due to consistent  
 ↳ evidence, Medium for Issue 2 due to partial agreement.

**## Final Decision & Rationale**  
 The dominant issue is MistranslationEquation (Major, High), thus it is  
 ↳ selected as `final\_category`. MistranslationOrderingRTL is retained via  
 ↳ `secondary\_categories`. Control flags are computed from the entire set of  
 ↳ issues.

### I.2.3 SolutionEngager

#### SolutionEngager Prompt

**\*\*Role:\*\*** You are an expert mathematician tasked with expanding a very  
 ↳ concise mathematical solution into a complete, rigorous proof. Your goal  
 ↳ is to fill in all omitted steps and justify every claim. During this  
 ↳ process, if you encounter any statement that you can definitively prove  
 ↳ is incorrect, document it as an error.

**\*\*Understanding Our Data Pipeline and Why This Task Matters\*\***  
 To perform this role correctly, you must understand how our data was created  
 ↳ and why errors might exist:

- \*\*Original Source:\*\*** We started with official Persian exam PDFs from math  
 ↳ olympiads and used automated tools to parse them into markdown. This  
 ↳ parsing can introduce errors like misinterpreting LaTeX (`\binom` as  
 ↳ `\frac`) or missing images.
- \*\*Translation Pipeline:\*\*** The parsed Persian markdown was then translated  
 ↳ into English using an LLM. This can introduce translation errors,  
 ↳ especially with Right-to-Left language issues (e.g., reversing the order  
 ↳ of items in lists).
- \*\*Manual Processing:\*\*** Images were separated manually, and everything was  
 ↳ formatted into JSON for our database.
- \*\*Current Situation:\*\*** Our validation workflow has flagged this problem as  
 ↳ potentially containing an error. However, we suspect the error might be  
 ↳ in the original source material itself-either a typo, unclear phrasing,  
 ↳ or an actual mathematical mistake made under deadline pressure.

**\*\*Your Critical Role in This Pipeline:\*\***  
 The upstream validation detected an issue, but it's unclear whether this is  
 ↳ due to:

- A real mathematical error in the original source
- Poor/unclear phrasing that makes a correct solution seem wrong
- Translation/processing errors from our pipeline

Since the original solutions are extremely concise (typical of olympiad  
 ↳ publications), directly analyzing them often leads to false positives-a  
 ↳ statement might seem wrong simply because its justification was omitted.  
 ↳ Your job is to expand the solution completely, and during this process,  
 ↳ determine if any claims are genuinely mathematically incorrect.

**### Your Primary Directive: The Hierarchy of Truth**

Before you begin your analysis, you must understand the ground truth of the  
 ↳ problem. Your entire analysis must be based on the following strict  
 ↳ hierarchy.

1. **\*\*Find the Stated Answer Key:\*\*** First, check the  
 ↪ ``crawled_persian_markdown`` for an explicit statement of the correct  
 ↪ option, like "Option X is correct".
2. **\*\*The Stated Answer is the Target:\*\***  
 \* If an explicit option is stated, find its corresponding **\*\*value\*\***  
 ↪ from the Persian ``choices`` list. This value is the **\*\*intended correct**  
 ↪ answer (the ground truth)\*\*. Your job is to treat this answer as  
 ↪ correct.  
 \* If the mathematical proof in the solution appears to derive a  
 ↪ different value, this signals a **\*\*flaw within the proof\*\***. Your task  
 ↪ is not to challenge the answer, but to expand the proof and pinpoint  
 ↪ the exact typo, calculation error, or logical leap that causes it to  
 ↪ deviate from the correct target answer.
3. **\*\*Use the Proof as the Ground Truth (Fallback Case):\*\***  
 \* If, and only if, the Persian source is ambiguous (e.g., states  
 ↪ "Option ? is correct"), does the burden of proof shift. In this  
 ↪ specific case, you must then rely on the mathematical derivation in  
 ↪ the proof to determine the true answer.

**\*\*CRITICAL PRINCIPLE: Benefit of the Doubt\*\***

You must give the original solution the benefit of the doubt. Only flag  
 ↪ something as an error if you can provide concrete evidence  
 ↪ (counterexample, derivation, proof, or clear reasoning) that demonstrates  
 ↪ the statement is mathematically incorrect. You cannot flag something as  
 ↪ wrong simply because it lacks justification or seems unclear.

**\*\*Source Material Selection\*\***

Follow this decision recipe, in order:

1. **\*\*Persian has hints + solution:\*\*** Use both together. Expand the solution  
 ↪ while leveraging the hints for structure and intent.
2. **\*\*Persian has solution only (concise):\*\*** Expand that Persian solution into  
 ↪ a complete, rigorous proof.
3. **\*\*Persian has hints; English has solution:\*\*** Combine them. Use Persian  
 ↪ hints to guide structure and intent, and fill in the detailed steps from  
 ↪ the English solution. If there is a conflict, prefer the Persian source's  
 ↪ intent and notation. Explicitly annotate any conflicts and explain how  
 ↪ English steps were adapted to align with the Persian intent/notation.
4. **\*\*Persian has neither solution nor hints:\*\*** Use the English solution as  
 ↪ the fallback source.

Notation Policy: Preserve the original (Persian) notation when it is

- ↪ nonstandard but internally consistent. Define symbols upon first use and,
- ↪ if helpful, include a parenthetical mapping to standard notation. Do not
- ↪ silently normalize unless absolutely necessary; prefer preserving
- ↪ fidelity and explaining.

**\*\*Your Task:\*\***

Engage honestly with each claim. When uncertain about a claim's correctness,  
 ↪ assume it is correct and attempt to justify it. If, during justification,  
 ↪ you become confident it is incorrect, explain mathematically why (proof  
 ↪ or counterexample). Aim for full rigor; include all necessary steps.  
 ↪ Prefer clear and complete reasoning over brevity.

1. **\*\*Expand the Solution:\*\*** Rewrite the solution fully and clearly, providing  
 ↪ justification for each claim. For every claim, either confirm its  
 ↪ correctness with reasoning, or-if you are confident it is wrong-provide a  
 ↪ mathematical refutation (proof or counterexample).
2. **\*\*Document Proven Errors:\*\*** If during expansion you encounter a statement  
 ↪ that you can prove is incorrect, document it with concrete evidence.

3. **\*\*Assess Overall Integrity:\*\*** Determine if the original solution's core  
 ↳ logic is sound or fundamentally flawed.
4. **\*\*Reconcile Original-Source vs Pipeline Errors:\*\*** If your expansion shows  
 ↳ the source is correct and prior issues came from  
 ↳ parsing/translation/formatting, explicitly state this downgrade. If  
 ↳ issues are typos/notation/wording, treat them as Minor, Fixable (not an  
 ↳ original-source error). Only assert a true `OriginalSourceError` when you  
 ↳ can exhibit a concrete mathematical contradiction or an unfixable flaw in  
 ↳ the core reasoning.

### ### Final Assessment Criteria

Your final assessment is critical for the next stage of the workflow. Use the  
 ↳ following definitions to make your judgment:

#### **\*\*Choose "Major Logical Flaw" IF:\*\***

- The core method or theorem used in the proof is fundamentally incorrect and  
 ↳ could not lead to the correct answer, even with minor fixes.
- The proof contains a chain of incorrect logical steps that makes the entire  
 ↳ argument unsalvageable.
- Fixing the proof would require a complete rewrite using a different  
 ↳ mathematical approach, not just a series of simple corrections.

#### **\*\*Choose "Minor, Fixable Issue" IF:\*\***

- The overall method of the proof is sound, but it contains localized errors  
 ↳ such as typos, calculation mistakes, incorrect variable names, or  
 ↳ notational errors.
- The proof correctly reaches the stated answer key, but you identified a  
 ↳ specific flaw in a few steps that needs correction.
- The logic is correct but is presented in a very vague or confusing way that  
 ↳ can be clarified with minor rewriting.

#### **\*\*Inputs:\*\***

- **\*\*Initial Issue Report:\*\*** {aggregated\_report\_md}
- **\*\*Persian Source:\*\*** {crawled\_persian\_markdown}
- **\*\*English Source:\*\*** {english\_solution}
- **\*\*Problem Context:\*\*** {problem}
- **\*\*Choices:\*\*** {choices}
- **\*\*Correct Option:\*\*** {correct\_option}
- **\*\*Answer Value:\*\*** {answer\_value}
- **\*\*SVG XMLs:\*\*** {svg\_sources}
- **\*\*Context:\*\*** {context}

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are provided as auxiliary aids to clarify  
 ↳ equations or diagram content. The equivalent rendered PNG images are  
 ↳ already embedded in the problem/solution/context. Use SVGs only to  
 ↳ improve understanding; do not output or modify them.

Note on Context: The ``context`` field contains introductory text or diagrams  
 ↳ that are essential for understanding the problem but are not part of the  
 ↳ formal question. Treat it as part of the overall problem definition.

#### **\*\*Output Format:\*\***

##### **## Source Analysis**

(State which source you used and whether it contained a complete solution)

##### **## Expanded Rigorous Solution**

(Your complete, step-by-step expansion of the original solution)

##### **## Claim-by-Claim Justification**

For each claim referenced in the original solution (and any newly clarified  
 ↳ intermediate claim), provide:

- **\*\*Claim:\*\*** [quote or precise paraphrase]

```

- **Status:** [Confirmed | Uncertain-but-plausible | Incorrect-with-proof]
- **Justification/Evidence:**
 - If Confirmed or Uncertain-but-plausible: brief reasoning or derivation
 ↳ showing why it holds or why it is plausibly correct.
 - If Incorrect-with-proof: a concise derivation or counterexample
 ↳ demonstrating the error; citing well-known theorems with brief
 ↳ justification is acceptable.
- **Initial Correction Proposal (if applicable):** If this claim can be
 ↳ corrected with a minor, surgical edit (e.g., typo, index, notation,
 ↳ single-sentence clarification), propose the precise minimal change while
 ↳ preserving images and structure. If it appears to require structural
 ↳ changes, note that no minor proposal is appropriate here.

Holistic Fixability Assessment
Provide a holistic judgment of fixability across all claims taken together.
↳ Label and justify:
- **Overall Fixability:** [Minor-surgical | Major-rewrite | Unknown]
- **Narrative:** Explain how the errors were introduced (e.g., translation
 ↳ pipeline, parsing, formatting) and whether a straightforward, coherent
 ↳ set of minimal edits can resolve all issues. Consider the solution as a
 ↳ whole: if a clear narrative and concise set of targeted edits suffice, it
 ↳ is Minor-surgical; if the approach/method is invalid or requires a
 ↳ substantial rewrite, it is Major-rewrite.

Documented Errors (if any)
(Any statements you can prove are incorrect, with concrete evidence. Provide
↳ a concise derivation or counterexample; citing well-known theorems with
↳ brief justification is acceptable. **Remember: if the proof derives an
↳ answer that contradicts the stated answer key, the error is in the proof,
↳ not the answer key.** IMPORTANT: Reference the specific location in the
↳ ORIGINAL source material where each error occurs, not your expanded
↳ version.)

Final Assessment
(Either "Minor, Fixable Issue" or "Major Logical Flaw")

Proposed Corrections Summary (if Minor/Fixable)
Consolidate all minor, surgical proposals into a coherent, minimal set of
↳ edits that resolves the issues. Do not delete images; preserve original
↳ notation unless you define a clear mapping.

```

## I.2.4 IssueDetectorWithEngagement

### IssueDetectorWithEngagement Prompt

```

Role: You are a senior decision-maker in an AI data pipeline. Your task
↳ is to synthesize a deep-dive analysis of a math problem and determine if
↳ the identified source error requires human intervention or can be fixed
↳ automatically.

How to Determine the True Final Answer

Before making your final decision, you must re-verify the ground truth for
↳ the final answer by following this strict hierarchy.

1. **Find the Stated Answer Key:** First, check the
 ↳ `crawled_persian_markdown` for an explicit statement of the correct
 ↳ option, like "Option X is correct".
2. **The Stated Answer is the Target:**
 * If an explicit option is stated, find its corresponding **value**
 ↳ from the Persian `choices` list. This value is the **intended correct
 ↳ answer (the ground truth).

```

```

 * If the mathematical proof derives a different value, this indicates a
 ↪ fixable flaw (e.g., a typo, calculation error, or encoding issue)
 ↪ within the proof. Your task is to assume the stated answer is
 ↪ correct and identify the flaw in the proof.
3. Use the Proof as the Fallback:
 * If and only if the Persian source is ambiguous (e.g., "Option ? is
 ↪ correct"), you must then rely on the mathematical derivation in the
 ↪ proof to determine the true answer value.
4. Map the True Value to Our Choices: Once you have the absolute true
 ↪ answer value (determined from either the stated key or the proof), find
 ↪ the corresponding option number in our English `choices`. This step
 ↪ is crucial to handle cases where the options were reordered during
 ↪ translation.

Understanding the Context
A previous stage (`SolutionEngager`) has performed a detailed, evidence-based
↪ analysis of the problem's solution. Your job is to use that analysis,
↪ combined with your knowledge of our data pipeline, to make the final
↪ call.

Common Error Patterns:
* `ManualErrorIncorrectGuess`: A human's guess for the answer was
↪ contradicted by the source proof.
* `OriginalSourceError`: The source material itself contains a demonstrable
↪ mathematical mistake, typo, or notational error.
* `Mistranslation...`: An error was introduced during translation.

How to Interpret the Engagement Analysis

The `SolutionEngager` uses the following strict criteria to make its
↪ assessment. You must use these same definitions to interpret its
↪ findings.

"Major Logical Flaw" means:
- The core method or theorem used in the proof is fundamentally incorrect and
↪ could not lead to the correct answer, even with minor fixes.
- The proof contains a chain of incorrect logical steps that makes the entire
↪ argument unsalvageable.
- Fixing the proof would require a complete rewrite using a different
↪ mathematical approach.

"Minor, Fixable Issue" means:
- The overall method of the proof is sound, but it contains localized errors
↪ such as typos, calculation mistakes, incorrect variable names, or
↪ notational errors.
- The logic is correct but is presented in a vague or confusing way that can
↪ be clarified with minor rewriting.

Your Decision Criteria:
Based on the `Detailed Engagement Analysis` and the full context, you must
↪ decide:

Requires Human Intervention (`true`) IF:
- The engagement analysis proves a Major Logical Flaw in the source
↪ material's core reasoning that cannot be salvaged by a small number of
↪ targeted edits.
- The errors are so complex or numerous that they require domain expertise
↪ beyond the scope of an automated fix plan.

Can Be Handled Automatically (`false`) IF:

```

- The engagement analysis shows a coherent, straightforward narrative of
  - introduced errors (e.g., translation/parsing/formatting) and a concise,
  - minimal set of targeted edits can resolve all issues (Minor, Fixable).
  - The core logic is sound.
- The analysis confirms a `ManualErrorIncorrectGuess` where the correct
  - answer can be reliably derived from the source proof.

**\*\*CRITICAL PRINCIPLE:\*\*** Trust the evidence-based assessment. Major vs Minor
 

- is about repair scope (structural rewrite vs surgical edits), not just
- about whether an error is proven. If the `SolutionEngager` could not
- mathematically prove an error, give the benefit of the doubt to the
- source and classify the issue as fixable.

**### Post-Engagement Reconciliation: Re-applying the Hierarchy of Suspicion**

The deep-dive analysis provides you with powerful new evidence. Your primary
 

- task is to use this evidence to re-apply the Hierarchy of Suspicion and
- confirm or overturn the initial `OriginalSourceError` diagnosis.

1. **\*\*Re-check for Pipeline Errors:\*\*** The `SolutionEngager` may have
  - uncovered subtle translation or parsing artifacts that were not obvious
  - before. For example, a confusing sentence in the source might have been
  - mistranslated, making it seem like a logical error when it was not.
  - \* **\*\*Action:\*\*** If the engagement report provides strong evidence that
    - the issue is actually a **\*\*Pipeline Error\*\*** (mistranslation, parsing),
    - you must treat the issue as fixable.
2. **\*\*Re-assess the Source Error:\*\*** If the engagement confirms the English
  - text is a faithful translation, now re-evaluate the source flaw based on
  - its severity.
  - \* **\*\*Is it a Minor Flaw?\*\*** The engagement may have proven the error is
    - just a typo, a notational inconsistency, or a poorly phrased
    - sentence, while the core logic remains sound. This is a "Minor,
    - Fixable Issue".
  - \* **\*\*Is it a Major Flaw?\*\*** The engagement may have provided a
    - mathematical proof that the source's core reasoning is unsalvageable.
    - This is a "Major Logical Flaw".

Your final decision on `requires\_human\_intervention` must be based on this
 

- re-evaluation. Downgrading a supposed `OriginalSourceError` to a fixable
- pipeline or minor source error is a primary goal of this stage.

**\*\*Inputs:\*\***

- **\*\*Initial Issue Report:\*\*** {aggregated\_report\_md}
- **\*\*Detailed Engagement Analysis:\*\*** {solution\_engagement\_report\_md}
- **\*\*Persian Source:\*\*** {crawled\_persian\_markdown}
- **\*\*English Source:\*\*** {english\_solution}
- **\*\*Problem Context:\*\*** {problem}
- **\*\*Choices:\*\*** {choices}
- **\*\*Correct Option:\*\*** {correct\_option}
- **\*\*Answer Value:\*\*** {answer\_value}
- **\*\*SVG XMLs:\*\*** {svg\_sources}
- **\*\*Context:\*\*** {context}

Note on Context: The `context` field contains introductory text or diagrams
 

- that are essential for understanding the problem but are not part of the
- formal question. Treat it as part of the overall problem definition.

**\*\*JSON Schema:\*\***

```
{
 "title": "SourceIssueClassification",
 "type": "object",
 "properties": {
```

```

 "requires_human_intervention": {
 "type": "boolean",
 "description": "True if the issue requires human review, false if it
 ↳ can be handled automatically"
 },
 "reasoning": {
 "type": "string",
 "description": "Brief justification for the decision, explaining why
 ↳ the issue is deemed major or minor based on the new, comprehensive
 ↳ context."
 }
 },
 "required": ["requires_human_intervention", "reasoning"]
}

```

## I.2.5 EngagementReportSynthesizer

### EngagementReportSynthesizer Prompt

**\*\*Role:\*\*** You are the **\*\*Lead Analyst\*\*** in a multi-stage AI workflow designed  
↳ to automatically detect and repair errors in math problems. You are the  
↳ crucial synthesis point in the most complex branch of the workflow.

**\*\*The Big Picture: What We Are Doing\*\***  
Our overall goal is to create a reliable, automated system that can fix  
↳ complex issues in our dataset. Think of it as an assembly line of AI  
↳ specialists. An early specialist (``IssueAggregator``) has flagged a  
↳ problem with a potentially critical ``OriginalSourceError``.

Because this is a serious accusation, the workflow paused the normal "fix-it"  
↳ process and instead launched a deep-dive forensic investigation. Two  
↳ expert agents were dispatched:

1. ``SolutionEngager``: This agent performed a detailed, step-by-step logical  
↳ breakdown of the original Persian solution to understand its core  
↳ reasoning.
2. ``IssueDetectorWithEngagement``: This agent used the ``SolutionEngager``'s  
↳ report to make a final, expert judgment on the nature and fixability of  
↳ the source error.

**\*\*Your Specific Role in this Workflow\*\***  
You are the specialist who receives the initial, high-level alert  
↳ (``aggregated_report_md``) and the detailed reports from the forensic  
↳ investigation (``solution_engagement_report_md`` and  
↳ ``source_issue_classification_md``).

Your mission is to **\*\*create the single, final, and authoritative**  
↳ ``AggregatedIssueReport`` JSON object\*\*. The next agent in the pipeline,  
↳ the ``FixPlanner``, will base its entire repair strategy on the report you  
↳ generate. The quality and coherence of your output will determine whether  
↳ the problem is fixed correctly or the entire process fails.

**\*\*Your Task:\*\***

Your mission is to produce the final, authoritative ``AggregatedIssueReport``  
↳ JSON object. To do this, you must synthesize all inputs by narrating the  
↳ outcome of the post-engagement re-evaluation, guided by the Hierarchy of  
↳ Suspicion.

1. **\*\*Establish the Baseline:\*\*** Start with the ``Initial Report``. Note its  
↳ original ``final_category`` and findings.

2. **\*\*Apply the Hierarchy of Suspicion Lens:\*\*** Use the detailed evidence from
  - the `Engagement Report` and `Final Classification` to re-evaluate the baseline findings.
  - \* Did the engagement reveal a **\*\*Pipeline Error\*\***
    - (mistranslation/parsing) that was previously misdiagnosed as a source error?
  - \* If not, did the engagement confirm a source error but classify it as
    - **\*\*Minor and Fixable\*\*** (e.g., typo, notational issue) rather than a
      - Major Logical Flaw?
3. **\*\*Synthesize the Narrative:\*\*** In the `plausible\_scenario\_md` and
  - `aggregated\_report\_md`, you must tell the story of this re-evaluation.
  - For example: "Initially, the issue was flagged as an OriginalSourceError.
  - However, a deep-dive analysis revealed that the confusing sentence in the
  - English solution was actually a mistranslation of a complex but correct
  - statement in the Persian source. Therefore, the issue has been downgraded
  - to a MistranslationEquation."
4. **\*\*Update Categories and Flags:\*\*** Based on your new understanding,
  - determine the final, correct `final\_category` and `secondary\_categories`.
  - Critically, you must re-compute all boolean flags
    - (`requires\_human\_intervention`, `is\_original\_source\_error`, etc.) based
    - on this *\*final\** set of issues, following the Decision Standard below.
5. **\*\*Generate the Final Report:\*\*** Ensure the `aggregated\_report\_md` contains
  - all required sections (Issues Breakdown, Evidence Synthesis, Final
  - Decision, Change Log, etc.) reflecting your synthesized findings.

**\*\*Inputs:\*\***

1. **\*\*Initial Report (`aggregated\_report\_md`):\*\***  
{aggregated\_report\_md}
2. **\*\*Engagement Report (`solution\_engagement\_report\_md`):\*\***  
{solution\_engagement\_report\_md}
3. **\*\*Final Classification (`source\_issue\_classification\_md`):\*\***  
{source\_issue\_classification\_md}  
(Formatted markdown produced by `FormatSourceIssueClassification`.)
4. **\*\*Problem Data for Reference:\*\***
  - Crawled Persian Markdown (Source of Truth): {crawled\_persian\_markdown}
  - English Problem: {problem}
  - English Choices: {choices}
  - English Solution: {english\_solution}
  - Correct Option: {correct\_option}
  - Answer Value: {answer\_value}
  - SVG XMLs (if any):  
  
{svg\_sources}
  - Context: {context}

Note on Context: The `context` field contains introductory text or diagrams  
 → that are essential for understanding the problem but are not part of the  
 → formal question. Treat it as part of the overall problem definition.

**### Decision Standard for Human Intervention (Post-Engagement)**

You must set the final `requires\_human\_intervention` flag based on the  
 → outcome of your re-evaluation using the Hierarchy of Suspicion:

- Set to `true` ONLY if the engagement confirms a **\*\*Major Logical Flaw\*\*** in
  - the source's core reasoning that is not salvageable by minor edits, OR if
  - an image issue blocks repair.
- Set to `false` if the re-evaluation downgrades the issue to a **\*\*Pipeline**
  - Error\*\* OR a **\*\*Minor, Fixable Source Error\*\***.

```

Output Instructions:
Produce a single, valid JSON object with double-quoted keys that conforms
→ strictly to the `AggregatedIssueReport` schema provided below. Do NOT add
→ any extra text, markdown, explanations, or code fences. Return only the
→ JSON object.

JSON Schema for Output:
```json
{
  "title": "AggregatedIssueReport",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "final_category": {
      "type": "string",
      "enum": [
        "MistranslationEquation",
        "MistranslationOrderingRTL",
        "MistranslationAnswerKey",
        "ManualErrorIncorrectGuess",
        "MissingImage",
        "ImageUnderstandingIssue",
        "OriginalSourceError",
        "NoDiscernibleError",
        "Other"
      ]
    },
    "requires_human_intervention": { "type": "boolean" },
    "is_original_source_error": {
      "type": "boolean",
      "description": "True if 'OriginalSourceError' was detected among any of
→ the issues. Controls the workflow branch."
    },
    "is_image_understanding_issue": {
      "type": "boolean",
      "description": "True if 'ImageUnderstandingIssue' or 'MissingImage' was
→ detected. Controls the workflow branch."
    },
    "secondary_categories": {
      "type": "array",
      "items": { "type": "string" }
    },
    "plausible_scenario_md": { "type": "string" },
    "aggregated_report_md": { "type": "string" }
  },
  "required": ["final_category", "requires_human_intervention",
→ "is_original_source_error", "is_image_understanding_issue",
→ "plausible_scenario_md", "aggregated_report_md"]
}
```

```

## I.2.6 FixPlanner

### FixPlanner Prompt

```

Role: You are an expert AI data repair specialist. Your task is to
→ analyze an issue report and the corresponding problem data, then create a
→ clear, step-by-step markdown plan to fix the data.

How to Interpret the Issue Report: The Hierarchy of Suspicion

```

Before you create a single instruction, you must understand the origin of the  
→ error as determined by the `Aggregated Issue Report`. Your plan must be  
→ tailored to the error's source, following this hierarchy:

1. **\*\*If the error is from our Pipeline (Extraction/Translation):\*\***  
\* **\*\*Your Goal:\*\*** Make our data a perfect reflection of the  
→ `crawled\_persian\_markdown` source.  
\* **\*\*Your Plan:\*\*** Create instructions to correct mistranslations, fix  
→ parsing errors, and align our data with the ground truth.
2. **\*\*If the error is a Minor Flaw in the Source Solution:\*\***  
\* **\*\*Your Goal:\*\*** Correct the minor flaw (e.g., typo, notational error)  
→ in the source's logic and reflect that fix in our English data.  
\* **\*\*Your Plan:\*\*** Your instructions should surgically correct the  
→ `english\_solution\_local\_images` to fix the issue.
3. **\*\*If there are Combined Errors (Source + Pipeline):\*\***  
\* **\*\*Your Goal:\*\*** Create a plan that addresses the root cause first.  
\* **\*\*Your Plan:\*\*** Your instructions must be ordered correctly. First, an  
→ instruction to address the conceptual fix needed for the source  
→ error. Second, an instruction to fix the translation based on that  
→ now-corrected concept.
4. **\*\*If the `Aggregated Issue Report`'s `final\_category` is**  
→ `NoDiscernibleError` and there are no `secondary\_categories`:  
\* **\*\*Your Goal:\*\*** Confirm that no changes are needed and produce a plan  
→ stating this explicitly.  
\* **\*\*Your Plan:\*\*** You must generate a plan containing a single  
→ instruction: "No discernible error was found. The data is correct  
→ as-is and requires no changes."

#### ### CRITICAL RULES FOR PLANNING FIXES

Your authority to make changes is strictly limited. While your primary goal  
→ is to create a complete plan to fix all issues in the report, you must  
→ operate within the following non-negotiable constraints:

##### #### RULE 0: CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Your primary goal is to follow all rules. If you find that fixing an issue  
→ according to one rule (e.g., `RULE 3`) would force you to violate another  
→ rule (e.g., `RULE 1`), you must prioritize safety. Your plan should:

1. Perform any minor, safe fixes that do not cause a conflict.
2. Clearly state the nature of the rule conflict you encountered (e.g.,  
→ "Correcting the solution to match the updated problem would require a  
→ full rewrite, which violates RULE 1.").
3. Explicitly recommend that the problem requires human intervention.

##### #### RULE 1: MODIFICATIONS MUST BE MINOR AND SURGICAL

You are **\*\*forbidden\*\*** from rewriting entire solutions. The goal is to repair,  
→ not replace.

- \* **\*\*You CAN:\*\*** Make minor edits like correcting typos, changing variables,  
→ fixing indices, or modifying equations within a sentence. You may rewrite  
→ one or two sentences if absolutely necessary to correct a specific,  
→ localized error.
- \* **\*\*You CANNOT:\*\*** Propose a total rewrite, restructure the entire logical  
→ flow, or add large new paragraphs of explanation.

##### #### RULE 2: THE FINAL ANSWER IS SACROSANCT

Your plan must be generated by following this exact procedure for handling  
→ the final answer.

**\*\*Step 1: Determine if the Database Answer is Correct\*\***

Your first job is to determine the absolute true answer by applying the

- official hierarchy to the ``crawled_persian_markdown``.
- If the source states an explicit answer (e.g., "Option 3 is correct"),
- that is the ground truth.
- If the source is ambiguous (e.g., "Option ?"), then the answer is the one
- derived from the proof.

#### **\*\*Step 2: Plan the Fix Based on the Issue Category\*\***

You are **\*\*strictly forbidden\*\*** from planning any changes to ``correct_option``

- or ``answer_value`` unless the issue category is
- ``ManualErrorIncorrectGuess``.
- **\*\*IF the category is ``ManualErrorIncorrectGuess``:** Your plan must update
- the database ``correct_option`` and ``answer_value`` to match the ground
- truth you derived in Step 1.
- **\*\*IF the issue is a flaw in the proof\*\*** (i.e., the proof's result does
- not match the stated answer key): Your plan must focus on making a
- **\*\*minor, surgical correction\*\*** to the proof text in
- ``english_solution_local_images`` so that it correctly leads to the stated
- ground truth answer. **\*\*Do not change the answer itself.\*\***
- **\*\*IF the issue is anything else\*\*** (e.g., ``OriginalSourceError``,
- ``MistranslationAnswerKey``): Your plan must only address textual issues
- and **\*\*must not\*\*** alter ``correct_option`` or ``answer_value``.

#### **#### RULE 3: UPHOLD THE HIERARCHY OF TRUTH**

Your primary directive is to ensure the data is a high-fidelity

- representation of the original Persian source
- (``crawled_persian_markdown``). All fixes must follow this strict
- hierarchy, where lower-priority data is always corrected to match
- higher-priority data.

1. **\*\*Ultimate Authority (``crawled_persian_markdown``):\*\*** This is the absolute
- ground truth.
2. **\*\*Problem Definition (``problem``, ``context``, ``choices``):\*\*** These fields
- must be a faithful translation of the Ultimate Authority.
3. **\*\*Derived Explanation (``english_solution_local_images``):\*\*** This field
- must correctly solve the problem as defined in the ``problem`` field.

- **\*\*You MUST:\*\*** If the ``context`` contains a typo or mistranslation (when
- compared to the Ultimate Authority), your plan must correct the ``context``
- field.
- **\*\*You MUST:\*\*** If the ``problem`` has a typo or mistranslation (when compared
- to the Ultimate Authority), your plan must correct the ``problem`` field
- AND then also correct the ``english_solution_local_images`` so it solves
- the now-correct problem.
- **\*\*You MUST NOT:\*\*** Ever "fix" the ``problem`` field to justify an error in the
- ``english_solution_local_images``. The solution always yields to the
- problem.

#### **\*\*Inputs:\*\***

1. **\*\*Aggregated Issue Report (``aggregated_report_md``):\*\*** This is the ground
- truth. It describes what is wrong with the problem.

#### **\*\*Your Goal:\*\***

Generate a list of clear, actionable instructions describing the complete,

- cascading changes required. Your plan must be exhaustive; every distinct
- issue mentioned in the Aggregated Issue Report, regardless of whether it
- is the ``final_category`` or a ``secondary_category``, must have a
- corresponding step in your plan. Focus only on minimal edits.

#### **\*\*Constraints (Critical):\*\***

- Do not propose removing, renaming, or altering any image references. Image  
↳ content is essential and must be preserved.
- If an instruction would implicitly remove an image (e.g., replacing a  
↳ section that contains images), rewrite the instruction to keep the images  
↳ intact and only change the necessary text.
- Never instruct to delete image markdown (e.g., lines that start with `. Images must remain present in the final content.

**\*\*Examples of Good Fix Plans:\*\***

**\*\*Simple Example (Single Issue):\*\***

- \* **\*\*Scenario:\*\*** The report indicates that the `correct\_option` is 3, but  
↳ the logic clearly points to the answer value found in option 5.
- \* **\*\*Good Plan:\*\***
  1. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** The `correct\_option` field is incorrect. It should  
↳ be changed from 3 to 5.
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `correct\_option`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** The issue report identifies this as an error, and  
↳ the solution's logic derives the answer found in option 5.
  2. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** Update the `answer\_value` field to match the content  
↳ of option 5.
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `answer\_value`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** This is a cascading change to keep the answer  
↳ value consistent with the corrected option.

**\*\*Complex Example (Multiple Issues):\*\***

- \* **\*\*Scenario:\*\*** The report's main issue is `ManualErrorIncorrectGuess` (the  
↳ `correct\_option` is wrong) but it also notes a minor typo in the last  
↳ sentence of the solution.
- \* **\*\*Good Plan:\*\***
  1. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** The `correct\_option` field is incorrect. It should  
↳ be changed from 2 to 4.
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `correct\_option`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** The issue report identifies this as a Manual  
↳ Error, and the solution's logic derives the answer found in  
↳ option 4.
  2. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** Update the `answer\_value` field to match the content  
↳ of option 4.
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `answer\_value`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** This is a cascading change to keep the answer  
↳ value consistent with the corrected option.
  3. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** In the `english\_solution\_local\_images`, correct a  
↳ typo in the last sentence. Change "teh final anser" to "the final  
↳ answer".
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `english\_solution\_local\_images`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** The report noted a secondary typo issue that needs  
↳ to be addressed for clarity.

**\*\*"No-Op" Example (No Error Found):\*\***

- \* **\*\*Scenario:\*\*** The report's `final\_category` is `NoDiscernibleError` and  
↳ `secondary\_categories` is empty.
- \* **\*\*Good Plan:\*\***
  1. **\*\*Instruction:\*\*** No discernible error was found. The data is correct  
↳ as-is and requires no changes.
    - \* **\*\*Target Fields:\*\*** `None`
    - \* **\*\*Rationale:\*\*** The Aggregated Issue Report concluded that the  
↳ initial validation was a false positive and the data is correct.

**\*\*Aggregated Issue Report:\*\***  
{aggregated\_report\_md}

**\*\*Text Fields to Analyze:\*\***  
- problem: {problem}  
- choices: {choices}

```

- english_solution_local_images: {english_solution}
- context: {context}
- correct_option: {correct_option}
- answer_value: {answer_value}
- SVG XMLs (if any):
  ```
  {svg_sources}
  ```

```

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are auxiliary. The equivalent PNG renderings are already present in the context. Use SVGs only to disambiguate equations or figure details when forming the plan; do not propose editing or outputting SVGs.

Generate your `FixPlan` as a markdown document.

**\*\*Required Output Structure:\*\***

You must generate a markdown document with a level 3 header `### Fix Plan` and a numbered list of instructions. Each instruction must contain a nested list with the `Target Fields` and `Rationale`.

```

```markdown
### Fix Plan

1. **Instruction:** [A clear, natural language instruction describing the complete change.]
  ↳
  * **Target Fields:** [A comma-separated list of field names, e.g., `correct_option`, `answer_value`]
  * **Rationale:** [A brief explanation for why this fix is necessary.]
2. **Instruction:** [The next instruction, if any.]
  ↳
  * **Target Fields:** [...]
  * **Rationale:** [...]
...

```

****Example Output:****

```

```markdown
Fix Plan

1. **Instruction:** The `correct_option` field is incorrect. It should be changed from 3 to 5.
 ↳
 * **Target Fields:** `correct_option`
 * **Rationale:** The aggregated report indicates that while the solution logic is sound, it points to the answer value contained in option 5, not option 3.
2. **Instruction:** Update the `answer_value` field to match the numerical value or content of the new correct option (option 5).
 ↳
 * **Target Fields:** `answer_value`
 * **Rationale:** This is a cascading change required to keep the `answer_value` consistent with the `correct_option`.
...

```

## I.2.7 Fixer

### Fixer Prompt

You are an expert editor that executes a given fix plan with surgical precision. You will be given the original problem data and a set of instructions. Your task is to rewrite the specified fields to apply the fixes.

**\*\*Your Rules:\*\***

- Only modify the fields explicitly mentioned in the instructions.
- If a field is not mentioned, do not change it.
- Apply ALL instructions in the plan.
- Do not add any new information, explanations, or stylistic changes. Your  
→ work should be a minimal-edit based on the plan.
- Do not remove, rename, or alter any image references. Preserve all image  
→ markdown and their order. Images are essential and must remain present in  
→ the corrected content.
- **\*\*CRITICAL JSON RULE:\*\*** The output must be a single, valid JSON object. The  
→ text fields (`problem`, `choices`, etc.) often contain markdown and  
→ LaTeX. In JSON strings, all backslash characters (`\\`) MUST be escaped  
→ with another backslash. For example, if the corrected text contains  
→ `\\binom{n}{k}`, you must write it as `\\\\binom{n}{k}` in the JSON  
→ output. This is the most important rule.

**\*\*Fix Plan:\*\***  
{fix\_plan\_md}

**\*\*Original Data:\*\***

- problem: {problem}
- choices: {choices}
- english\_solution\_local\_images: {english\_solution}
- context: {context}
- correct\_option: {correct\_option}
- answer\_value: {answer\_value}
- SVG XMLs (if any):  
{svg\_sources}

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are auxiliary. The equivalent PNG  
→ renderings are already present in the context. Use SVGs only to  
→ disambiguate equations or figure details while applying changes; do not  
→ output or modify SVGs.

Generate the `FixedProblemData` as a single, valid JSON object that strictly  
→ conforms to the schema. Use double-quoted keys. For any fields you did  
→ not change, set them to null. Return only the JSON object - no schema, no  
→ prose, and no code fences.

**\*\*JSON Schema for Output:\*\***

```
```json
{
  "title": "FixedProblemData",
  "description": "The output from the Fixer stage, containing the complete,
  → updated text for modified fields.",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "problem": {
      "type": ["string", "null"],
      "description": "The full, corrected problem text. If unchanged, this is
      → null."
    },
    "choices": {
      "type": ["string", "null"],
      "description": "The full, corrected choices text. If unchanged, this is
      → null."
    },
    "english_solution_local_images": {
      "type": ["string", "null"],
      "description": "The full, corrected solution text. If unchanged, this
      → is null."
    },
    "context": {
```

```

    "type": ["string", "null"],
    "description": "The full, corrected context text. If unchanged, this is
    ↪ null."
  },
  "correct_option": {
    "type": ["integer", "null"],
    "description": "The corrected option number. If unchanged, this is
    ↪ null."
  },
  "answer_value": {
    "description": "The corrected answer value. If unchanged, this is
    ↪ null."
  }
}
}
...

```

I.2.8 Validator

Validator Prompt

You are a meticulous verifier and senior analyst. Your task is to validate
 ↪ that a set of fixes, applied to a math problem's data, has resolved the
 ↪ issues outlined in an original fix plan. If issues remain, you must
 ↪ create a new, refined fix plan.

Governing Principles for Validation

Your analysis must be guided by the following strict principles. A fix is
 ↪ **invalid** (`is_fixed: false`) if it violates any of them.

****1. Locational and Logical Integrity:****

- * A fix is **invalid** if the location of the change does not match the
 ↪ location of the reported error. You must first verify that the fields
 ↪ modified by the Fixer are the same fields where the error was identified
 ↪ in the ``Original Issue Report``.
- * A fix is **invalid** if the `*type*` of fix is illogical for the `*type*` of
 ↪ error. For example, if the report identifies a ``MistranslationEquation``
 ↪ in the solution, a fix that changes the ``problem`` text is logically
 ↪ inconsistent and must be rejected. The fix must directly address the
 ↪ reported issue in its specific context.

****2. Final Answer Integrity:****

Your verification of the final answer must follow two steps: checking
 ↪ permission and checking correctness.

- * **Permission Check:** First, check if ``correct_option`` or ``answer_value``
 ↪ were modified. If they were, you must confirm that the original issue
 ↪ category was **ManualErrorIncorrectGuess**. Changing the final answer
 ↪ for any other reason is a critical failure and the fix is invalid.
- * **Correctness Check:**
 - * If the answer was changed (for a ``ManualErrorIncorrectGuess``), you
 ↪ must verify that the new answer matches the ground truth derived from
 ↪ the ``crawled_persian_markdown``'s proof (as a fallback for an
 ↪ ambiguous source).
 - * If the `*proof text*` was changed, you must verify that the new text
 ↪ now correctly derives the ground truth answer stated in the original
 ↪ Persian source's answer key. A fix is invalid if it "corrects" the
 ↪ proof to lead to the wrong answer.

****3. Scope of Edits (Minor Changes Only):****

* You must ensure the Fixer did not perform a major rewrite of the
→ solution. Compare the original and fixed `english\_solution\_local\_images`.
→ The changes should be minor and surgical (e.g., typos, variable
→ corrections, a rewritten sentence or two). If the solution has been
→ substantially rewritten, the fix is invalid.

****4. Content Preservation:****

* You must verify that no important information, equations, or image
→ references were accidentally deleted from the solution text. The fix
→ should only add or modify, not remove correct information.

****Context:****

Another AI, the "Fixer," was given an original fix plan and the original
→ problem data. It has produced a new version of the data. Your job is to
→ act as a quality assurance step.

****CRITICAL: Understanding What the Fixer Can and Cannot Modify****

The Fixer can ONLY modify these specific fields:

- `problem` (the English problem statement)
- `choices` (the English choices)
- `english\_solution\_local\_images` (the English solution)
- `context` (additional context text)
- `correct\_option` (the correct option number)
- `answer\_value` (the answer value)

The Fixer CANNOT and WILL NOT modify:

- `crawled\_persian\_markdown` (this is our source of truth and remains
→ unchanged)
- Any other fields not listed above

When evaluating fixes, do NOT expect `crawled\_persian\_markdown` to be
→ changed. It is provided only as a reference for comparison and validation
→ purposes.

****Note on 'No Discernible Error' Category:**** If the `Original Issue Report`
→ states that the category is "No Discernible Error," it means the initial
→ automated validation was likely a false positive. In this case, your
→ primary task is to confirm that the problem data is indeed correct and
→ that the "Fixer" has not introduced any unnecessary or incorrect changes.
→ If the data remains correct, you should set `is\_fixed` to `true`.

Note on Sources: The `crawled\_persian\_markdown` reflects what the official
→ source published, but it may omit full solutions (sometimes only hints or
→ only the problem). Treat it as authoritative for what it contains. When
→ absent, a valid English solution may come from other trusted official
→ materials (e.g., official PDF extraction). Evaluate consistency across
→ all provided materials and validation findings.

****Inputs:****

1. ****Original Issue Report (`aggregated\_report\_md`):**** This is the ground
→ truth. It describes what was originally found to be wrong with the
→ problem.
 {aggregated_report_md}
2. ****Original Fix Plan (`fix\_plan\_md`):**** The plan the Fixer was supposed to
→ follow.
 {fix_plan_md}
3. ****Original Problem Data:**** The data before any changes were made.
 - ****Problem:**** {problem}
 - ****Choices:**** {choices}
 - ****Solution:**** {english_solution}

```

- **Crawled Persian** Markdown (Source of Truth):
  ↳ {crawled_persian_markdown}
- **Context:** {context}
- **Correct Option:** {correct_option}
- **Answer Value:** {answer_value}
- **SVG XMLs (if any):**

```

```

{svg_sources}

```

Note on SVGs: The SVG XML snippets are provided only to clarify equations or figure contents. The equivalent PNG images are already present in the data. Use SVGs as auxiliary references only; do not output or modify SVGs.

4. ****Summary of Applied Fixes (`fixed\_data\_md`):**** A summary of the changes the Fixer made.

```

{fixed_data_md}

```

****Your Task:****

1. ****Evaluate the Plan:**** First, review the "Original Fix Plan." Does it seem like a reasonable and complete solution for the issues described in the "Original Issue Report"?
2. ****Compare Data:**** Meticulously compare the "Original Problem Data" with the "Summary of Applied Fixes." Remember: only evaluate changes to the fields the Fixer can modify (listed above). Do NOT expect `crawled\_persian\_markdown` to be changed.
3. ****Verify:**** Determine if the applied fixes successfully and completely address *all* the issues from the "Original Issue Report." Note any discrepancies between the plan and the final fix. Critically, ensure that all image references that existed in the original data are still present in the fixed content; if any image reference is missing, the fix must be rejected.
4. ****Identify New Issues:**** Check if the fixes introduced any new problems or cascading errors (e.g., changing the choices but not updating the `correct\_option`).
5. ****Make a Decision (`is\_fixed`):****
 - If all issues from the "Original Issue Report" are resolved and no new issues exist, set `is\_fixed` to `true`.
 - Otherwise, set `is\_fixed` to `false`.
6. ****Provide Reasoning:**** Briefly explain your decision. If not fixed, clearly state what is still wrong, including any missing image references.
7. ****Re-Plan Decision (`needs\_replan`):****
 - If `is\_fixed` is `false` and the existing fix plan is inadequate or incorrect, set `needs\_replan` to `true`.
 - Otherwise, set `needs\_replan` to `false`.

****Output Instructions:****

Produce a single, valid JSON object with double-quoted keys that conforms strictly to the schema below. Do NOT add any extra text, markdown, explanations, or code fences. Return only the JSON object.

Consistency Constraint (Critical):

- `is\_fixed` can be `true` only and only if `needs\_replan` is `false`. If `needs\_replan` is `true`, then `is\_fixed` must be `false`.

****CRITICAL JSON RULE:**** The output must be a single, valid JSON object. Some

- ↪ fields may contain markdown and LaTeX. In any JSON string, all backslash characters (`\\`) MUST be escaped with another backslash. For example, if
- ↪ a fix plan instruction is ``change \\frac to \\binom``, you must write it
- ↪ as `"change \\\frac to \\\binom"` in the JSON output. This is the most
- ↪ important rule.

****JSON Schema for Output:****

```
{
  "title": "ValidationResult",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "is_fixed": {
      "type": "boolean",
      "description": "True if all issues in the original plan are resolved
        ↪ and no new issues were created."
    },
    "reasoning": {
      "type": "string",
      "description": "A brief explanation of the validation outcome. If not
        ↪ fixed, this should explain what is still wrong."
    },
    "needs_replan": {
      "type": "boolean",
      "description": "True if the current fix plan should be revised before
        ↪ the next iteration."
    }
  },
  "required": ["is_fixed", "reasoning", "needs_replan"]
}
```

I.2.9 RePlanner

RePlanner Prompt

You are a meticulous technical editor and AI repair specialist. The Validator

- ↪ determined that the current fix plan needs revision. Write a new, clear,
- ↪ high-level, and machine-executable plan for the Fixer to carry out. The
- ↪ output must be a markdown document.

****How to Re-Assess the Issue: The Hierarchy of Suspicion****

The previous plan failed. Before creating a new one, you must re-evaluate the

- ↪ error's origin using the ``Aggregated Issue Report`` and the ``Validator`
- ↪ `Reasoning``. Your new plan must be tailored to the error's source,
- ↪ following this hierarchy:

1. ****If the error is from our Pipeline (Extraction/Translation):****
 - * ****Your Goal:**** Make our data a perfect reflection of the
 - ↪ ``crawled_persian_markdown`` source.
 - * ****Your Plan:**** Create instructions to correct mistranslations, fix
 - ↪ parsing errors, and align our data with the ground truth.
2. ****If the error is a Minor Flaw in the Source Solution:****
 - * ****Your Goal:**** Correct the minor flaw (e.g., typo, notational error)
 - ↪ in the source's logic and reflect that fix in our English data.
 - * ****Your Plan:**** Your instructions should surgically correct the
 - ↪ ``english_solution_local_images`` to fix the issue.
3. ****If there are Combined Errors (Source + Pipeline):****
 - * ****Your Goal:**** Create a plan that addresses the root cause first.

* ****Your Plan:**** Your instructions must be ordered correctly. First, an
→ instruction to address the conceptual fix needed for the source
→ error. Second, an instruction to fix the translation based on that
→ now-corrected concept.

CRITICAL RULES FOR PLANNING FIXES

Your authority to make changes is strictly limited. While your primary goal
→ is to create a complete plan to fix all issues in the report, you must
→ operate within the following non-negotiable constraints:

RULE 0: CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Your primary goal is to follow all rules. If you find that fixing an issue
→ according to one rule (e.g., `RULE 3`) would force you to violate another
→ rule (e.g., `RULE 1`), you must prioritize safety. Your plan should:

1. Perform any minor, safe fixes that do not cause a conflict.
2. Clearly state the nature of the rule conflict you encountered (e.g.,
→ "Correcting the solution to match the updated problem would require a
→ full rewrite, which violates RULE 1.").
3. Explicitly recommend that the problem requires human intervention.

RULE 1: MODIFICATIONS MUST BE MINOR AND SURGICAL

You are ****forbidden**** from rewriting entire solutions. The goal is to repair,
→ not replace.

* ****You CAN:**** Make minor edits like correcting typos, changing variables,
→ fixing indices, or modifying equations within a sentence. You may rewrite
→ one or two sentences if absolutely necessary to correct a specific,
→ localized error.

* ****You CANNOT:**** Propose a total rewrite, restructure the entire logical
→ flow, or add large new paragraphs of explanation.

RULE 2: THE FINAL ANSWER IS SACROSANCT

You are ****strictly forbidden**** from planning any changes to `correct\_option`
→ or `answer\_value` unless the aggregated issue report's final category is
→ exactly ****`ManualErrorIncorrectGuess`****.

* ****IF the category is `ManualErrorIncorrectGuess`:**** Your plan's objective
→ is to derive the correct answer from the mathematical proof in the
→ `crawled\_persian\_markdown` and update `correct\_option` and `answer\_value`
→ to match that derived truth.

* ****IF the category is `OriginalSourceError`:**** You ****must not**** change
→ `correct\_option` or `answer\_value`. Your plan must focus on making minor
→ textual edits to the solution to clarify the flawed reasoning or fix the
→ notation/typos.

* ****IF the category is `MistranslationAnswerKey`:**** Your plan must ****only****
→ remove the sentence stating the answer is not in the choices. Do not
→ change `correct\_option` or `answer\_value`.

RULE 3: UPHOLD THE HIERARCHY OF TRUTH

Your primary directive is to ensure the data is a high-fidelity
→ representation of the original Persian source
→ (`crawled\_persian\_markdown`). All fixes must follow this strict
→ hierarchy, where lower-priority data is always corrected to match
→ higher-priority data.

1. ****Ultimate Authority (`crawled\_persian\_markdown`):**** This is the absolute
→ ground truth.
2. ****Problem Definition (`problem`, `context`, `choices`):**** These fields
→ must be a faithful translation of the Ultimate Authority.

3. **Derived Explanation** (``english_solution_local_images``): **This field**
 ↳ must correctly solve the problem as defined in the ``problem`` field.

- **You MUST:** If the ``context`` contains a typo or mistranslation (when
 ↳ compared to the Ultimate Authority), your plan must correct the ``context``
 ↳ field.
- **You MUST:** If the ``problem`` has a typo or mistranslation (when compared
 ↳ to the Ultimate Authority), your plan must correct the ``problem`` field
 ↳ AND then also correct the ``english_solution_local_images`` so it solves
 ↳ the now-correct problem.
- **You MUST NOT:** Ever "fix" the ``problem`` field to justify an error in the
 ↳ ``english_solution_local_images``. The solution always yields to the
 ↳ problem.

Any plan that violates these rules is invalid and will be rejected.

Inputs:

- Aggregated Issue Report (markdown):
`{aggregated_report_md}`
- Validator Reasoning (why previous plan failed):
`{validator_reasoning}`
- Existing Fix Plan (to revise):
`{fix_plan_md}`

Text Fields to Analyze:

- problem: `{problem}`
- choices: `{choices}`
- english_solution_local_images: `{english_solution}`
- context: `{context}`
- correct_option: `{correct_option}`
- answer_value: `{answer_value}`
- SVG XMLs (if any):
`...`
`{svg_sources}`
`...`

Constraints (Critical):

- Do not propose removing, renaming, or altering any image references. Image
 ↳ content is essential and must be preserved.
- If an instruction would implicitly remove an image, rewrite it to keep
 ↳ images intact and only change necessary text.
- Never instruct to delete image markdown (e.g., lines that start with ``.

Required Output Structure:

```
```markdown
Fix Plan

1. Instruction: [...]
 * Target Fields: [...]
 * Rationale: [...]
2. Instruction: [...]
 * Target Fields: [...]
 * Rationale: [...]
...
```
```

J Complete Technique Taxonomy

The following hierarchy contains all 89 sub-sub-topic labels used for technique classification in CombiGraph-Vis. Each problem receives labels from this taxonomy based on techniques that explicitly appear in its solution.

J.1 Technique Labeling Prompt

Technique Labeler Prompt

Task

Given a `{problem}`, its `{solution}`, and optional `{context}`, determine
→ which techniques were **actually used** in the solution and output them
→ as a **list** of labels. Each label must strictly follow the three-level
→ path:

`Topic -> Sub-topic -> Sub-sub-topic`

Only use items from the **Reference Topic Hierarchy** below. Pick the **most**
→ **specific** sub-sub-topic(s) that apply.

Inputs

* **Problem:** `{problem}`
* **Solution:** `{solution}`
* **Context (optional):** `{context}`

What "Context" Means (read carefully)

* **Definition:** `{context}` is any preliminary text that defines the
→ setting, objects, constraints, notations, or assumptions that the problem
→ and solution rely on (e.g., "colors are considered identical up to
→ rotation," "multisets allowed," "graph is simple and undirected," special
→ definitions, or domain restrictions).
* **Usage Rule:** Treat `{context}` as part of the problem setup. If
→ `{context}` narrows, extends, or clarifies the setting, **apply** it when
→ deciding techniques (e.g., "combinations with repetition" becomes
→ applicable if `{context}` allows multisets).
* **Conflict Rule:** If `{context}` conflicts with generic assumptions,
→ **prefer** `{context}` unless the solution explicitly overrides it.

Decision Rules (strict)

1. **Most-specific only:** Every label must be a full three-level chain from
→ the hierarchy (no truncations).
2. **Evidence-based:** Base labels on steps that **appear** in the solution,
→ not merely plausible alternatives.
3. **Context-aware:** Incorporate `{context}` constraints/definitions when
→ identifying techniques.
4. **Multi-technique:** Include all materially used techniques. Mark exactly
→ one label as primary.
5. **Ties:** If two sub-sub-topics plausibly apply, prefer the one explicitly
→ named or most central to the argument.
6. **Out-of-scope moves:** If the solution uses ideas not present in the
→ hierarchy, add one extra array item with `"topic": "OTHER"` and a short
→ `"justification"` describing the idea. Do **not** invent new hierarchy
→ items.

Output Format (JSON)

Return **only** a JSON **array**. Each element is an object of this shape:

```
```json
[
 {
 "topic": "...",
 "sub_topic": "...",
 "sub_sub_topic": "...",
 "primary": true,

```

```

 "justification": "1-3 sentences citing the exact step(s) in the solution
 ↪ (and any relevant context) that evidence this technique."
 }
]
...

* Include exactly one element with `"primary": true`. All others must
 ↪ have `"primary": false`.
* If there are no valid hierarchy techniques, return an array with a single
 ↪ `"OTHER"` item as described in Rule 6.

Worked Micro-Examples

Example A (single technique)
Solution step: "We count integer solutions to $x_1 + \dots + x_k = n$ using stars
 ↪ and bars."
-> Output:

```json
[
  {
    "topic": "Combinatorics",
    "sub_topic": "Counting Foundations",
    "sub_sub_topic": "Stars & bars",
    "primary": true,
    "justification": "Applies the balls-into-bins formula to count
    ↪ nonnegative integer solutions to a sum."
  }
]
...

Example B (multiple techniques)
Solution steps: "Apply Inclusion-Exclusion to avoid overcounting... then use
  ↪ linearity of expectation to bound the count."
-> Output:

```json
[
 {
 "topic": "Combinatorics",
 "sub_topic": "Advanced Counting",
 "sub_sub_topic": "Inclusion-Exclusion (e.g., derangements)",
 "primary": true,
 "justification": "Main count constructed via inclusion-exclusion to
 ↪ correct overcounting."
 },
 {
 "topic": "Combinatorics",
 "sub_topic": "Probabilistic Method (intro)",
 "sub_sub_topic": "Linearity-of-expectation tricks",
 "primary": false,
 "justification": "Uses expectation linearity to bound the count after
 ↪ inclusion-exclusion."
 }
]
...

Reference Topic Hierarchy (choose only from these leaves)

Combinatorics

* Counting Foundations

 * Sum/Product/Complement rules

```

```

* Bijections (one-to-one counting)
* Permutations & arrangements (with/without repetition; circular)
* Combinations (with/without repetition; multisets)
* Stars & bars (integer-solution counting)
* Binomial theorem; lattice paths; basic identities
* **Advanced Counting**

* Inclusion-Exclusion (e.g., derangements)
* Double counting
* **Recurrences & Generating Ideas**

* Linear recurrences (characteristic equations)
* Classic sequences (Fibonacci, Catalan)
* Light generating functions (ordinary/exponential)
* **Symmetry Counting**

* Burnside's lemma
* Pólya enumeration (intro)
* **Invariants & Monovariants**

* Parity/modular invariants
* Coloring/weighting arguments
* Termination via monovariants
* **Probabilistic Method (intro)**

* Linearity-of-expectation tricks
* Existence proofs via expectation

Graph Theory

* **Basics**

* Definitions & representations (adjacency list/matrix)
* Degree/handshaking; degree & *graphic* sequences
* Isomorphism; traversals (BFS/DFS); paths, cycles, distance
* **Trees**

* Properties; rooted/binary trees
* DFS/BFS trees
* Spanning trees & counting
* **Connectivity**

* Connectedness; cut vertices/bridges
* k-connectivity; blocks (biconnected components)
* **Directed Graphs**

* Strongly connected components
* Tournaments
* **Cycles & Trails**

* Eulerian trails/tours
* Hamiltonian paths/cycles
* **Matchings & Covers**

* Bipartite matchings; Hall's marriage theorem
* Matchings in general graphs; independence number
* Vertex/edge covers (and relations in bipartite graphs)
* **Planarity & Coloring**

* Planar graphs; Euler's formula (applications)
* Vertex/edge coloring; counting colorings

Combinatorial Game Theory

```

```

* **Modeling & State Analysis**

 * Game graphs; win/lose/draw states
 * DP for state evaluation; kernels; strategy existence proofs
* **Canonical Examples**

 * Nim; partisan games; Hex; Shannon switching game

Probability (Elementary)

* **Core Concepts**

 * Sample spaces & events; basic probability
 * Conditional probability; independence; Bernoulli trials
* **Expectation**

 * Random variables; linearity of expectation
 * Indicator variables

Number Theory (Contest Essentials)

* **Divisibility & GCD/LCM**

 * Euclidean algorithm; Bézout's identity
* **Primes & Congruences**

 * Modular arithmetic; Fermat's little theorem; CRT
* **Counting Toolbox**

 * Multiplicative functions $\tau(n)$, $\sigma(n)$, $\varphi(n)$; multiplicativity
 * Fast exponentiation; modular inverses
 * Counting by gcd/lcm; CRT-based counts

Formal Languages & Automata (CS touch-in)

* **Languages**

 * Alphabets, strings, languages
* **Machines**

 * DFA & NFA; pushdown automata; Turing machines

Algorithmic Techniques (non-coding)

* **Greedy**

 * Exchange arguments; counterexample design
* **Dynamic Programming**

 * State modeling for counting/optimization (sequences, grids, graphs)
* **Divide-and-Conquer & Recursion**

 * Recurrences; correctness ideas
* **Search**

 * Backtracking & pruning; BFS/DFS as search patterns
* **Classic Tricks**

 * Binary search on answer; two-pointers/sliding window
* **Proof of Correctness**

 * Invariants; loop/phase arguments

Conceptual Data Structures (no code)

```

```

* **Linear Containers**

 * Stack, queue, deque
* **Priority & Set Structures**

 * Heaps/priority queues; sets/maps; hashing ideas
* **Disjoint Set Union (Union-Find)**

 * Connectivity; cycle detection
* **Graph Representations**

 * Adjacency list vs matrix; trade-offs

Strings & Combinatorics on Words

* **Structural Properties**

 * Prefix/suffix/border; periodicity
 * Palindromes
* **Counting & Constraints**

 * Counting constrained strings
 * Links to automata (acceptance as constraints)

Discrete and Computational Geometry

* **Primitives**

 * Orientation test (cross-product sign)
 * Line/segment intersection
* **Polygons & Lattice**

 * Polygon area (shoelace)
 * Lattice points; Pick's theorem
* **Convexity**

 * Convex-hull intuition and uses

Logical & Puzzle Reasoning

* **Logic & Proof Moves**

 * Propositional logic; contradiction/contrapositive
* **Puzzle Tactics**

 * Invariants for grid/tiling; parity tricks
 * Constructive examples & counterexamples

Inequalities & Algebraic Tools

* **Core Inequalities**

 * AM-GM; Cauchy-Schwarz (incl. Titu's lemma)
 * Rearrangement inequality
* **Summation Tricks**

 * Telescoping; bounding techniques

General Proof Strategies

* **Mathematical Induction**

 * Weak vs. Strong induction

```

```

* Structural induction (on trees, graphs, etc.)
* Formulating & strengthening the inductive hypothesis
* Infinite descent / Minimal counterexample
* **Pigeonhole Principle (PHP)**

* Simple form ($n+1$ pigeons in n holes)
* Generalized/Strong form ($\lceil N/k \rceil$ items)
* Applications in geometry, number theory, and graphs
* **Extremal Principle**

* Core idea (Max/Min argument)
* Proving existence or properties of extremal objects
* **Coloring & Invariant Arguments**

* Coloring proofs (e.g., checkerboard/parity coloring)
* Invariants (properties that remain constant)
* Monovariants (properties that change monotonically)

```

## J.2 Solution Generation Prompt

### Solution Generation Prompt

#### # Olympiad Problem Solution Instructions

You are tasked with solving a mathematical olympiad-level problem. Provide a  
 ↪ complete, rigorous, and mathematically accurate solution that meets the  
 ↪ standards expected in competitive mathematics.

#### ## Input Components

##### \*\*Context:\*\* {context}

- This provides background information, definitions, and preliminary setup  
 ↪ for the problem  
 - Pay careful attention to any special notation, constraints, or conditions  
 ↪ defined here

##### \*\*Problem:\*\* {problem}

- This is the main question to be solved  
 - Identify exactly what is being asked and what the final answer should be

##### \*\*Choices:\*\* {choices}

- If present, these are the multiple choice options  
 - Your final answer must match one of these choices exactly

#### ## Solution Standards

Your solution must demonstrate:

1. **\*\*Complete Mathematical Rigor\*\***: Every step must be mathematically  
 ↪ justified with proper reasoning
2. **\*\*Clear Logical Flow\*\***: Present arguments in a logical sequence that  
 ↪ builds toward the solution
3. **\*\*Precise Definitions\*\***: Use mathematical terminology accurately and  
 ↪ define any non-standard notation
4. **\*\*Thorough Analysis\*\***: Consider all relevant cases and address potential  
 ↪ edge cases
5. **\*\*Computational Accuracy\*\***: All calculations must be correct and  
 ↪ verifiable

```

6. **Proof Completeness**: If proving a statement, ensure the proof covers
 ↳ all necessary cases and is gap-free

Solution Structure

1. **Problem Analysis**: Begin by clearly restating what needs to be found
 ↳ and identifying key constraints
2. **Approach Strategy**: Explain your solution method and why it's
 ↳ appropriate
3. **Detailed Working**: Show all mathematical steps with clear
 ↳ justifications
4. **Verification**: When possible, verify your answer through alternative
 ↳ methods or checking edge cases
5. **Final Answer**: Present the final answer clearly

Mathematical Notation Requirements

- Use correct LaTeX notation for all equations and mathematical symbols
- Use \\(and \\) for inline mathematics
- Use \\[and \\] for display mathematics (block equations)
- Do not use any unicode characters - stick to proper LaTeX formatting
- Show intermediate steps clearly with proper mathematical formatting

Answer Format Requirements

- Wrap your final numerical answer, expression, or choice in:
 ↳ \\boxed{your_answer}
- For multiple choice questions, include both the choice number and
 ↳ description if applicable
- Ensure the boxed answer directly addresses what the problem asks for
- If the answer is a mathematical expression, present it in its simplest form

Mathematical Communication


- Use proper mathematical terminology and maintain precision in language
- Distinguish clearly between "implies," "if and only if," "for all," etc.
- Explain the reasoning behind each major step
- Present arguments in a logical sequence that builds toward the solution
- Consider all relevant cases and address potential edge cases

Solve the given problem following these guidelines.


```

### J.3 Hierarchical Taxonomy of Topics in CombiGraph-Vis


## Combinatorics




## Graph Theory




## Combinatorial Game Theory




## Probability




## Number Theory (Contest Essentials)




## Formal Languages & Automata




## Algorithmic Techniques




## Conceptual Data Structures




## Strings & Combinatorics on Words




## Computational Geometry



## Logical & Puzzle Reasoning



## Inequalities & Algebraic Tools



## Proof Strategies

