A note about Euler’s inequality and automated reasoning with dynamic geometry
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Abstract. Using implicit loci in GeoGebra Euler’s inequality $R \geq 2r$ can be investigated in a novel way. Some unavoidable side effects of the implicit locus computation introduce unexpected algebraic curves. By using a mixture of symbolic and numerical methods a possible approach is sketched up to investigate the situation.
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1 GeoGebra: a symbolic tool for obtaining generalizations of geometric statements

GeoGebra [1] is a well known dynamic geometry software package with millions of users worldwide. Its main purpose is to visualize geometric invariants. Recently GeoGebra has been supporting investigation of geometric constructions also symbolically by harnessing the strength of the embedded computer algebra system (CAS) Giac [2]. One direct use of the embedded CAS is automated reasoning [3]. In this paper we use in particular the implicit locus derivation feature [4] in GeoGebra, by using the command LocusEquation with two inputs: a Boolean expression and the sought mover point. For example, given an arbitrary triangle $ABC$ with sides $a$, $b$ and $c$, entering LocusEquation[$a==b$,C] results in the perpendicular bisector $d$ of $AB$, that is, if $C$ is chosen to be an element of $d$, then the condition $a = b$ is satisfied.

Obtaining implicit loci is a recent method in GeoGebra to get interesting facts on classic theorems. These facts are closely related to algebraic curves which usually describe generalization of the classic results. Sometimes it is computationally difficult to obtain the curves quickly enough, but some new improvements in Giac’s elimination algorithm opened the road to effectively investigate a large number of geometric constructions [5,6] including Holfeld’s 35th problem [5,7], a generalization of the Steiner-Lehmus theorem [5,8] or the right triangle altitude theorem [4].
We need to admit that the possibility to generalize well known theorems is a consequence of using unordered geometry \cite[p. 97]{9} in the applied tools and theories. In unordered geometry one cannot designate only one intersection point of a line and a conic (or two conics), so both will be considered at the same time. This results in obtaining a larger set of points for the resulting algebraic curve as expected. The obtained set may be inconvenient in some cases, but can be fruitful to obtain some interesting generalizations.

2 Euler’s inequality

We recall that in Euclidean planar geometry Euler’s inequality states that \( R \geq 2r \) where \( R \) and \( r \) denote the radius of the circumscribed circle and the inscribed circle of a triangle, respectively.

Since GeoGebra’s Automated Reasoning Tools \cite{3} use Gröbner bases in the background, inequalities cannot really be investigated by them automatically.\footnote{Here we refer to \cite[p. 227]{10} which suggests using a different approach, based purely on equations by investigating the distance of the centers of the circumscribed and inscribed circles.} Certain experiments can however be started by fixing the ratio of the studied quantities, here \( R \) and \( r \). For example, one can start with some concrete experience by comparing \( R \) and say \( 3r \) (see Fig. 1), and then simply change the constant \( 3 \) to some different value. As output, the red curve in the figure gives a necessary geometric condition where to put \( C \) in order to have \( R = 3r \).

The result seems complicated for the first look. By doing some more experiments, it turns out that the two inner oval parts of the curve show relevant information on the concrete question, but the other parts show something different. That is, by setting \( C \) to an arbitrary point of the inner oval parts, the equality \( R = 3r \) will occur. For the other parts we will see later in Sec. 2.2 that the radii \( r_a, r_b \) and \( r_c \) of the excircles will take the role of \( r \) over.

After doing further experiments by changing the constant \( 3 \) to lower values, when getting close to \( 2 \) the inner oval parts seem to disappear even more and more (Fig. 2), and finally for the experiment \( R = 2r \) the inner oval parts are not visible any longer (Fig. 3).

The first confusing result is why the points \( \left( \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \) are not plotted in this graph—we recall that the equality holds if and only if the triangle is equilateral. Unfortunately, the plotting routine in GeoGebra does not show this isolated point. In fact, other systems (including Wolfram|Alpha and Desmos) are also unable to automatically plot even the easiest examples of a very similar situation, namely that a curve has an acnode. Such a basic example is the curve \( x^3 - x^2 - y^2 = 0 \) for which the point \((0,0)\) is not shown in the graph, but is clearly an isolated point of the curve \cite{11}.
Fig. 1. An implicit curve (in red) as the output of GeoGebra command $\text{LocusEquation}[R==3r, C]$. Here points $A$ and $B$ are fixed in the plane and $C$ is a free point. (In other words: Triangle $ABC$ has fixed vertices $A$ and $B$.) The computation of the sought set of mover point $C$ is a moderately difficult problem: an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7 CPU 860 @ 2.80GHz computer requires 3.7 seconds for the whole computation.

Fig. 2. Result of $\text{LocusEquation}[R==2.1r, C]$ and $\text{LocusEquation}[R==2.01r, C]$. To properly plot the latter a suitable zoom factor may be required due to possible inaccuracies in the plotting routine in GeoGebra.
Fig. 3. The inner oval parts disappear when plotting the case $R = 2r$.

The result of the command \texttt{LocusEquation[\textit{R=2r},C]} is
\[
x^{18} - 225 \, y^{18} - 1481 \, x^2 \, y^{16} - 4004 \, x^4 \, y^{14} - 5460 \, x^6 \, y^{12} - 3262 \, x^8 \, y^{10} + 770 \, x^6 \, y^{10} + 2604 \, x^{12} \, y^6 + 1756 \, x^{14} \, y^4 + 535 \, x^{16} \, y^2 - 504 \, x^{17} + 1256 \, x \, y^{16} + 6752 \, x^3 \, y^{14} + 13632 \, x^5 \, y^{12} + 10336 \, x^7 \, y^{10} - 4400 \, x^9 \, y^8 - 14304 \, x^{11} \, y^6 - 11008 \, x^{13} \, y^4 - 3808 \, x^{15} \, y^2 + 1764 \, x^{16} + 1276 \, x^{16} + 1416 \, x^{14} - 6936 \, x^4 \, y^{12} - 11544 \, x^6 \, y^{10} + 8008 \, x^8 \, y^8 + 33048 \, x^{10} \, y^6 + 30104 \, x^{12} \, y^4 + 11896 \, x^{14} \, y^2 - 3528 \, x^{15} - 2888 \, x \, y^{14} - 2296 \, x^3 \, y^{12} + 6296 \, x^5 \, y^{10} - 7000 \, x^7 \, y^8 - 41944 \, x^9 \, y^6 - 47080 \, x^{11} \, y^4 - 21368 \, x^{13} \, y^2 + 4410 \, x^{14} - 1094 \, y^{14} + 2854 \, x^2 \, y^{12} - 1262 \, x^4 \, y^{10} - 370 \, x^6 \, y^8 + 31246 \, x^8 \, y^6 + 46226 \, x^{10} \, y^4 + 24230 \, x^{12} \, y^2 - 3528 \, x^{13} - 2888 \, x \, y^{12} + 592 \, x^3 \, y^{10} + 5704 \, x^5 \, y^8 - 12704 \, x^7 \, y^6 - 29240 \, x^9 \, y^4 - 17840 \, x^{11} \, y^2 + 1764 \, x^{12} + 1276 \, y^{12} - 1136 \, x^2 \, y^{10} - 5940 \, x^4 \, y^8 + 1472 \, x^6 \, y^6 + 11604 \, x^8 \, y^4 + 8368 \, x^{10} \, y^2 - 504 \, x^{11} + 1256 \, x \, y^{10} + 2984 \, x^3 \, y^8 + 912 \, x^5 \, y^6 - 2608 \, x^7 \, y^4 - 2296 \, x^9 \, y^2 + 63 \, x^{10} - 225 \, y^{10} - 581 \, x^2 \, y^8 - 330 \, x^4 \, y^6 + 246 \, x^6 \, y^4 + 283 \, x^8 \, y^2 = 0.
\]

By using GeoGebra’s \texttt{Substitute[I,\{x=1/2,y=sqrt(3)/2\}]} command (here \textit{I} denotes the obtained implicit curve object) we get $0 = 0$ which shows that the
expected point is indeed an element of the curve. The same result can be seen for the point \( \left( \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \).

The obtained polynomial can be factored by using GeoGebra’s Factor[LeftSide[I]−RightSide[I]] command. The factorization is

\[
(x^2 + y^2) \cdot (7 x^8 - 28 x^7 + 12 x^6 y^2 + 42 x^6 - 36 x^5 y^2 - 28 x^5 \\
- 6 x^4 y^4 + 34 x^4 y^2 + 7 x^4 + 12 x^3 y^4 - 8 x^3 y^2 - 20 x^2 y^6 \\
- 26 x^2 y^4 - 2 x^2 y^2 + 20 x y^6 + 20 x y^4 - 9 y^8 + 46 y^6 - 9 y^4) \\
\cdot (9 x^8 - 36 x^7 + 52 x^6 y^2 + 54 x^6 - 156 x^5 y^2 - 36 x^5 + 102 x^4 y^4 \\
+ 190 x^4 y^2 + 9 x^4 - 204 x^3 y^4 - 120 x^3 y^2 + 84 x^2 y^6 + 186 x^2 y^4 \\
+ 34 x^2 y^2 - 84 x y^6 - 84 x y^4 + 25 y^8 - 14 y^6 + 25 y^4). \\
\]

Here the first factor \( p_1 = x^2 + y^2 \) clearly corresponds to the point \( A \). The second factor \( p_2 = 7x^8 - \ldots \) shows all real points of the curve \( I \) (without the points \( \left( \frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \)), and the third factor \( p_3 = 9x^8 - \ldots \) has seemingly no real points, but after computing its acnodes by solving the inequality system \( p_3 = 0, (p_3)'_x = 0, (p_3)'_y = 0, H(p_3) > 0 \), where \( H \) denotes the Hessian matrix, we may explore symbolically that the polynomial indeed describes the two expected isolated real points as well.

This approach with the Hessian cannot be achieved in GeoGebra. Instead, a numerical way can be tried to visualize the function \( f(x, y) = p_3 \) in 3 dimensions (Fig. 4) to find the real roots, namely \( \left( \frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right), (0, 0) \) and \((1, 0)\). Also in some other computer algebra systems a contour plot may help (see Fig. [5]), or to use extra packages which have more sophisticated methods to plot real curves (as seen in Fig. [6]).

Finally we remark that by using Maple’s evala(AFactor(\ldots)) command we can verify that \( p_2 \) and \( p_3 \) are irreducible over \( C \). This can also be achieved by using Singular’s absolute factorization library (absfact.lib).

### 2.1 Summary of the difficulties

The above shows some difficulties in our case. First of all, by using Gröbner bases there seems no completely automatic way to obtain Euler’s inequality—however, the paper [10] sketches up a possible method (without full explanation in general). In our approach one needs to start some experiments by choosing the ratio between \( R \) and \( r \) randomly. In our opinion, this problem can be automatically resolved by using real geometry and quantifier elimination not only in our case, but in general.

The second problem is that the plotted graph can be inaccurate: the equilateral case for \( R = 2r \) cannot be read off by the user in GeoGebra. It would be expected that the output curve should contain the set of points where the equality holds—this does not seem to be the case here because of the failure of the plotting algorithm. The case of failure even for some easy cubic examples show...
Fig. 4. A 3D plot of $p_3$ in GeoGebra. Here we used the command $f(x,y) := \text{Element}[\text{Factors}[\text{LeftSide}[l]-\text{RightSide}[l]],3,1]$ and opened the Graphics 3D View.
Fig. 5. A contour plot of $p_3$ in Mathematica.

Fig. 6. Plotting $p_3$ with Maple’s algcurves package and its plot_real_curve command.
that this problem cannot be easily worked around without using extra software packages.

For similar reasons the factorization does not directly help finding the equilateral case, either. Only a 3D plot—actually a numerical approach—gives some hints where to look for the equality.

2.2 Why the octic \( p_2 \)?

Similarly to the Steiner-Lehmur generalization in [8] here we silently introduced three other circles as extensions of the incircle. They are the excircles—in unordered geometry one cannot distinguish between internal and external angle bisectors.

After some experimenting it can be concluded that different sections of the octic \( p_2 \) describe different circles among the three excircles (Fig. 7).

Fig. 7. Various parts of the octic \( p_2 \) show the sought moving points \( C \) for statements \( R = 2r_a \) (red), \( R = 2r_b \) (green) and \( R = 2r_c \) (blue). The figure was produced with GeoGebra by attaching a new point (denoted again by \( C \)) to the octic \( p_2 \), and then constructing \( r_a, r_b, r_c \) and \( R \) by using the attached point as “\( C \)”, and computing which excircle would be connected with the appropriately chosen attached point—then the color of \( C \) was dynamically set by using the RGB scheme (see [12] for a similar concept). Finally tracing and animation were switched on for \( C \) to cover all possible screen points of the octic.
2.3 The inequality does not hold for excircles

Continuing the process that changing the constant 3 to lower values, including less numbers than 2, we learn that the inner oval parts of the curve will not be visible any longer. This is the case e. g. for 1.9: there are no visible inner oval parts (and they do not exist, either, because of Euler’s inequality), but the other parts still do (Fig. 8). This supports the idea that the inequality with respect to \( r \) cannot be transferred to \( r_a, r_b \) or \( r_c \). That is, we concluded that Euler’s inequality always fails on excircles.

Fig. 8. Result of \( \text{LocusEquation}[1.9 r == R, C] \).

3 Conclusion

We used a novel method to obtain implicit loci in GeoGebra to investigate Euler’s inequality. This well known statement can also be approached by a mixture of symbolic and numerical observations. Our experiments are clearly not acceptable as a new way of proof, but steps to claim promising conjectures. For other investigations of classic or new statements—that is, to generalize geometric equations or inequalities—this kind of approach may be hopefully fruitful.

Also we highlight that a better approach might be to use real geometry and quantifier elimination. To find the most efficient way to formalize and prove Euler’s inequality and present it in an adequate form in a dynamic geometry software tool is an on-going work of the authors.
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