

Can machines reason non-verbally?

Shaheer U. Saeed^{1,2,3,*}, Zion Tse^{1,2}, Gregory Slabaugh¹,
Daniel C. Alexander³, Yipeng Hu³

¹Digital Environment Research Institute, Queen Mary University of London

²Centre for Bioengineering, Queen Mary University of London

³UCL Hawkes Institute, University College London

*Correspondence e-mail: shaheer.saeed@qmul.ac.uk

Abstract

Modern machines can solve equations, follow logic and reason through language, yet they still struggle with problems that require visual non-verbal reasoning. This is evident even in advanced systems such as DeepSeek, ChatGPT and Gemini, which remain limited on visual tasks such as completing abstract patterns or delineating ambiguous regions-of-interest. Unlike explicit intermediate steps in verbal reasoning which can be verified through logic or automated tests, visual reasoning involves implicit intermediate steps with no clear methods for verification. Non-verbal reasoning is therefore challenging to model and, as a result, remains a fundamental limitation of current machine intelligence. Here we introduce GenVerOpt, a general framework that unifies generation, verification and optimisation into a reasoning pipeline for machines. By generating candidate solutions, verifying their correctness, and iteratively refining them, GenVerOpt enables per-sample optimisation rather than relying solely on dataset-level trends captured during model training. This process mirrors human problem-solving where multiple possibilities are imagined, evaluated, and refined until a correct solution emerges. Across diverse domains, GenVerOpt demonstrates capabilities beyond existing systems: it surpasses humans on abstract IQ puzzles, matches clinicians in prostate cancer segmentation, exceeds experts in liver vessel reconstruction and outperforms state-of-the-art approaches in tumour boundary alignment. These results show that machine reasoning can extend beyond language, establishing visual non-verbal reasoning as a foundation for more flexible and generalisable intelligence.

Keywords: Computer vision, Reasoning, Medical Imaging

The non-verbal roots of human reasoning

Non-verbal reasoning: the capacity to generate, evaluate and iteratively refine solutions without the use of language, is a fundamental component of intelligence [1–4]. In early human evolution, this ability was crucial for survival, such as for detecting camouflaged predators, tracking prey, and interpreting complex visual cues [5]. The same cognitive abilities later enabled more abstract reasoning, such as linking friction to fire-making or crafting tools based on the observation of material interactions [2]. Crucially, these abilities predated language and cannot be reduced to verbal thought [2]. Although language has now become a powerful tool for articulating and extending reasoning, it also introduces biases tied to specific linguistic structures [6]. This raises the question of whether language is best viewed as a complement to, or simply an extension of, more general non-verbal reasoning [7, 8]. Evidence from human cognitive development further supports this distinction: children reason about space, numeracy and causality long before acquiring language [9, 10]. These insights suggest that non-verbal reasoning operates independently, underscoring its primacy and indispensability in intelligent thought.

The gap between verbal and non-verbal reasoning in machines

Despite the non-verbal origins of human reasoning, recent advances in machine reasoning have focused predominantly on language-based tasks [11, 12]. Advances in natural language processing (NLP) have enabled models to solve algebraic problems, perform logical inference, and generate code, capabilities that rely on structured verbal reasoning [4, 11, 12]. Reasoning has also been successfully modelled in structured domains such as board games, where search and optimisation can identify effective sequences of actions [13, 14]. This progress has been driven in part by the availability of well-defined verification methods, such as formal logic rules, unit tests and game outcomes, that make it possible to check whether a proposed solution is correct. This verifiability allows models to attempt multiple intermediate steps, discard those that fail, and iteratively refine these steps until a valid solution is reached. In this way, reasoning in machines differs from simple pattern recognition, where it is not limited to mapping inputs to outputs, but instead involves generating, verifying, and optimising candidate solutions under a clear criterion of correctness.

However, reasoning approaches developed for language-based or structured domains do not readily extend to visual tasks, even in state-of-the-art multimodal systems [15–18]. Unlike language or board games, visual reasoning often involves implicit, non-discrete intermediate steps and lacks clear mechanisms for verification. Moreover, some tasks, such as tracing the continuation of a visual pattern, are solved more naturally through direct visual inference than by translating them into words, where verbalisation is typically a post hoc description rather than the reasoning process itself [7, 19, 20]. As illustrated in Fig. 1, advanced systems such as ChatGPT and Gemini, which combine text and image processing, struggle with tasks that require spatial inference, abstract pattern recognition, or multi-step visual problem-solving. Notably, this limitation persists even when visual reasoning problems are reduced to multiple-choice tasks with a small set of candidate solutions and an explicitly verifiable

correct answer. These limitations may stem from reasoning pipelines in multimodal systems being optimised for structured, verifiable tasks in language, rather than for the implicit forms of inference demanded by vision [16, 21]. While specialised domain-specific approaches exist for particular visual tasks [22–24], general-purpose visual reasoning remains an unsolved challenge. This persistent gap between verbal and visual reasoning highlights a critical limitation in current machine intelligence.

A key barrier to extending reasoning to more complex visual problems is the lack of reliable rules or automated mechanisms for verifying solutions. Unlike multiple-choice puzzles, many real-world visual tasks have high-dimensional solution spaces for which correctness cannot be specified through a predefined answer or simple rule. Verification instead often depends on human interpretation of complex image data. While human-labelled datasets can provide supervision, many reasoning tasks are too complex to capture with sufficiently large labelled-datasets, with the additional constraint of high annotation costs in many specialised domains [25]. Furthermore, intermediate visual reasoning steps are often abstract and not directly representable by humans, making them difficult to formulate into supervision signals for machines. Intelligence quotient (IQ) puzzles (see Fig. 1) therefore provide a controlled example of the visual reasoning problem where constraining the task to multiple-choice answers substantially reduces the solution space and makes verification explicit, yet state-of-the-art multi-modal and task-specific models still perform near chance (approximately 25% average accuracy), far below human performance (56% accuracy) [16].

Bridging the machine reasoning gap

Developing models capable of reasoning beyond language could unlock new frontiers in machine intelligence, particularly in tasks that require, or are more effectively solved by, visual reasoning. Beyond the abstract IQ puzzles described earlier, medical image analysis offers concrete examples where success depends not just on recognition but on multi-step reasoning about structure and context. In prostate cancer segmentation on MR images, for example, tumour boundaries are often ambiguous, requiring integration of conflicting visual cues across slices and anatomical landmarks to arrive at a plausible delineation [26]. In liver vessel segmentation on CT images, spatial reasoning is essential: a human observer can recognise when a broken vessel segment should be linked to its parent branch, or when two similar-looking structures actually belong to different trees, both decisions that involve chaining relationships rather than simple pixel-level classification [27]. Similarly, in image registration, aligning pre-operative MR with intra-operative ultrasound requires reasoning about how tissue has deformed, inferring correspondences that go beyond local appearance [28]. Current data-dependent deep learning models fail to capture such intricacies because curating a sufficiently representative dataset for such problems is challenging due to high variability not only in the problems themselves but also in the expert annotations due to disagreements. These examples highlight a fundamental distinction: while current deep learning models excel at direct mapping from input to output, they lack the capacity to perform multi-step, non-verbal reasoning needed to resolve ambiguity, enforce structural consistency, and generalise beyond training data.





 A B C D	 A B C D	 A B C D	 A B C D
ChatGPT: Each row seems to show a progression or movement of the black corner segments. In each row: The black segment moves one corner clockwise as you go from left to right. Option A is the correct one — it has the black corner in the lower left. Gemini: The position one step clockwise from "Top-Left" is "Top-Right". Comparing with Options: Option A: Top-Left shaded. Option B: Top-Right shaded. Option C: Right shaded. Option D: Bottom-Right shaded. The final answer is B Answer and Explanation: Black region moves clockwise, skipping one step each time Correct: D	ChatGPT: Option A: Black dot at top-left only → only 1 dot → Not valid. Option B: Black dots at top-middle and middle-left → 2 dots → Not enough. Option C: Black dots at bottom-middle and bottom-left → 2 dots → Not enough. Option D: Black dots at top-right, middle-middle, and bottom-middle → 3 dots. Correct Answer: D It completes the pattern both in terms of quantity (3 dots) and placement logic. Gemini: Option A: Dot at (3,2). Option B: Dot at (1,1). Option C: Dot at (4,1). Option D: Dots at (1,1) and (3,1). The calculated pattern for the missing cell is a single dot at position (4,1). This corresponds to Option C. Answer and Explanation: Black dot moves left-to-right, skipping one each time, adapting to the new arrangement Correct: C	ChatGPT: In the first cell, + is bottom-right. In the second cell, +1 is bottom. So in the third cell, + should move bottom-left. In the first cell, - is top-left. There's no minus in the second cell (maybe it "skips" or "completes" the loop). So in the third, the minus likely goes top-right, continuing the rotation. Answer: Option C Gemini: Consider a simple Superposition without Elimination that assumes the symbols in Cell (3,2) replace the symbols in Cell (3,1), but since they are the same, this is not helpful. The answer is Option C. This choice is made by assuming a flaw in the question's premise and picking a visually plausible option, but logically the answer is the plain cross. Answer and Explanation: From left-to-right, first two squares dictate direction of each symbol, either clockwise or counter clockwise; in last row + moves clockwise and - counter clockwise Correct: A	ChatGPT: Following the alternating pattern, next should be a triangle (since the pattern alternates trapezium-triangle-trapezium, etc.). Now for the arrow direction: Arrows follow a rotation pattern repeating across the grid. We can see it's rotating clockwise → the missing arrow should be down-left Answer: Option A (triangle with an pointing down-left) Gemini: Let's assume the rule is a Combinat of C(R,1) and C(R,2) to form C(R,3) C(R,3) Shape: The shape not present in C(R,1) or C(R,2). (Square) C(R,3) Arrow: The arrow position from C(R,2). (Arrow is present, pointing down-left). C(R,3) Shading: The diagonal bisect from C(R,2). The final answer is C. Answer and Explanation: Each row has trapezium, square, triangle; arrow head is always flipped; black region always on opposite side to two with consistent black regions Correct: C

Fig. 1: IQ test puzzles solved by recent state-of-the-art reasoning AI models.

A recipe for reasoning - Generate, Verify, Optimise

Psychology literature has identified use of extended thinking time to be one of the main mechanisms for human reasoning [4, 29, 30]. Thinking time can be consumed to consider multiple decision strategies and their outcomes in greater detail, leading to improved solutions. This process involves ‘imagining’ potential solutions, deciding how likely each imagined solution is to be successful, and then selecting the solution with the highest success likelihood.

In machines, reasoning processes can be modelled in a similar framework, involving: 1) generation: which produces a variety of candidate solutions; 2) verification: which determines the correctness likelihood of each solution; 3) optimisation: which allows selection of the most optimal solution. We call this the Generation - Verification - Optimisation, or GenVerOpt, framework.

The generation of candidate solutions may be sourced from previous experience across diverse tasks, sampled from a solution space, or acquired from an intelligent agent. In this sense, generation resembles inference in conventional machine learning, mapping inputs to outputs. The key distinction is that inference typically yields a single deterministic prediction, whereas reasoning requires generating multiple plausible candidates, often sampled stochastically. However, any such generation is likely to be non-exhaustive and potentially erroneous, at least to a certain degree, due to large solution spaces in modern vision tasks. Therefore, the generated solutions need

verification, to determine their correctness and optimisation to select the most correct solution. In humans, these three processes are thought to be intertwined. When we consider a problem and refine the specifics of certain decisions, solution generation or ‘imagination’ is guided towards higher likelihoods of correctness. In other words, the generation of candidate solutions is rarely random and is almost always guided towards optimality, even during the generation process.

Fig. 2 presents an overview of the general GenVerOpt framework alongside a specific implementation (further details in the ‘Machine visual reasoning in action’ section).

A full mathematical description of the GenVerOpt framework is presented in the ‘methodological description’ section of the supplementary materials .

How GenVerOpt compares to conventional deep learning

The reasons for modelling GenVerOpt for machine reasoning are twofold. Firstly, verification is easier than generation due to a comparatively lower-dimensional solution space. This is supported by psychology literature, which illustrates the difficulty of generation with an example i.e., generating a good piece of writing is much more difficult than recognising which piece of writing is good or bad [31]. In machine learning literature, similar conclusions have been reached where lower-dimensional tasks such as classification are easy to generalise to, compared to higher dimensional tasks such as segmentation or localisation [32]. The second reason relates to the optimisation in GenVerOpt compared to conventional deep learning. In conventional deep learning, model weights are optimised with respect to a dataset and the model then infers on unseen samples. This makes models likely to be stuck in local optima, shaped by dataset biases, label subjectivity, or limited sample diversity. In contrast, GenVerOpt performs optimisation at the level of individual samples, where solutions are iteratively proposed and verified for each new input. While not exhaustive, this process allows exploration of multiple plausible solutions per case, for example, alternative boundary placements in ambiguous segmentations, before the final solution, making it less likely to be stuck in local optima caused by dataset-level trends [33–35]. This means that dataset-specific local optima in deep learning, often caused by data biases, subjectivity in human labels and limited data diversity, are unlikely to propagate into the sample-specific optimisation in GenVerOpt.

Machine visual reasoning in action

To illustrate the potential of machine visual reasoning, we apply different versions of the GenVerOpt framework to four representative tasks. Each case study implements distinct approaches to generation, verification, and optimisation, reflecting the flexibility of the framework.




Fig. 2: Overview of GenVerOpt (top: conceptual summary; bottom: details of one implementation of GenVerOpt for the dummy task of human segmentation on natural images).

Abstract visual reasoning: IQ test pattern puzzles

Visual IQ tests present pattern puzzles in which objects move or transform according to a hidden rule across a grid or sequence. The task is to select the candidate that completes the pattern, requiring abstract reasoning beyond recognition or memorisation. Such puzzles, widely used to assess human intelligence, provide a natural benchmark for evaluating machine reasoning.

GenVerOpt implementation

In this setting, solution generation is trivial: all candidate answers are predefined, and the correct one is guaranteed to be among them. This deliberately constrains the solution space, providing a controlled setting in which visual verification can be isolated from the complexity of solution generation. The challenge lies in verification, judging which option correctly completes the pattern.

To model verification, we train a neural network to evaluate the correctness of each candidate solution. For training, candidates are inserted into the missing square of the puzzle, creating complete grids, labelled as correct or incorrect. The verifier is trained across diverse puzzle types, spanning geometric transformations, spatial relationships, and logical patterns [16]. To encourage generalisation to new puzzle types, we adopt the Reptile meta-learning algorithm [32].

The trained network is then fine-tuned using a small, task-specific set of 32 temporal movement puzzles, examples requiring pattern continuation in space and time (see Fig. 1). During inference, the network outputs a prediction score for each candidate, which we interpret as the likelihood of correctness.

Since the solution space is small and fully enumerated, optimisation reduces to an exhaustive search: the system evaluates all candidates using the verification network and selects the one with the highest predicted correctness. This provides a minimal implementation of GenVerOpt in which generation and optimisation are constrained, allowing the learned verifier to be evaluated directly.

Surpassing human performance on abstract visual reasoning

As shown in Fig. 3, GenVerOpt outperforms all tested machine reasoning models, and even human participants, on 379 temporal movement puzzles. While existing models perform near the level of chance (25% accuracy) and fail to capture abstract visual concepts such as skipping, ordering, or continuity (Figs. 1, 3), GenVerOpt consistently identifies the correct answer.

Crucially, its outputs are not binary but graded: ranked probabilities reveal the semantic plausibility of alternatives. For example, in the left panel of Fig. 3, clearly incorrect candidates receive the lowest confidence, while options spatially adjacent to the correct solution receive higher scores, that are still lower than the true answer. This behaviour, consistently observed across the dataset, suggests that GenVerOpt learns structural relationships underlying the puzzles, rather than over-fitting to superficial cues.

These results show that even a minimal implementation of GenVerOpt supports robust abstract reasoning, setting a new benchmark for machine performance on visual IQ tests and suggesting a path toward more general non-verbal intelligence.




Fig. 3: IQ test puzzles solved by GenVerOpt and a comparison with humans and commonly used AI models. Open-source models LLaVA and Deepseek were fine-tuned using low-rank adaptation on the dataset before inference and closed-source models were primed using four-shot prompting with examples randomly selected from the datasets and performance averaged across 8 runs. Task-specific models were trained from scratch on the same data as GenVerOpt.

Resolving ambiguity: prostate cancer segmentation

Prostate cancer segmentation on MR images involves delineating diseased regions that often appear subtly and inconsistently across patients and sequences [26]. Ambiguous boundaries, anatomical variability, and low tissue contrast make the task inherently uncertain, even for experts. Accurate segmentation therefore requires reasoning over spatial context and structural cues, providing a strong test of machine reasoning under visual ambiguity.

GenVerOpt implementation

Unlike IQ puzzles, where correctness is binary, medical segmentation involves ambiguous solution spaces with multiple near-correct answers. To capture this, we model




Fig. 4: Examples of medical imaging problems solved by GenVerOpt and compared with human experts and recent state-of-the-art AI models.

generation and verification jointly, allowing both components to co-evolve in response to ambiguity.

This interaction is framed following a framework similar to Goodfellow et al. [36]: a generator proposes segmentations, while a verifier predicts their likelihood of correctness. During training, expert or consensus-labelled segmentations are treated as fully correct (probability 1), while the generator’s outputs are treated as incorrect (probability 0). The generator is trained to maximise correctness measured by verifier scores, while the verifier learns to distinguish fine-grained correctness. Meta-learning with Reptile [32, 37] across multiple segmentation tasks enables generalisation across domains.

For a new task, both components are fine-tuned with only 64 labelled task-specific examples. Optimisation is then carried out using reinforcement learning (RL) self-play, where two copies of the generator propose candidate solutions, the verifier evaluates them, and the higher-scoring output is rewarded while the other is penalised. Note

that the solutions are sampled probabilistically using the logits (raw probability without thresholding) and thus the two solutions are likely to be unique (further details described in the ‘methodological description’ section of the supplementary materials). The generator is trained, using this reward/ penalty signal, to produce better solutions on the next iterations. Iterating this process refines solutions toward higher verifier correctness. Pairwise comparison improves stability and reduces verifier bias, akin to preference-based reinforcement learning in language models [38]. Once the verifier scores stabilise, the solution is regarded as complete and the optimisation can be terminated.

While components still incorporate human supervision, such as using labelled examples to guide generation or verification, training on related tasks improves generalisability. Crucially, the use of randomness during solution generation ensures a broad search over plausible candidates, enabling the system to optimise for each individual input. This diversity reduces the risk of dataset-level biases and allows GenVerOpt to produce well-reasoned solutions that go beyond the scope of its training data.

This iterative optimisation captures several key attributes of human-like reasoning [4]. First, performance improves with extended ‘thinking time’, as optimisation steps yield predictions with higher verifier correctness, mimicking how humans deliberate before decision-making. Second, the process produces intermediate steps where each iteration provides a candidate solution and its correctness estimate, analogous to human reasoning trails. Finally, the framework demonstrates strong generalisation from minimal supervision, requiring only a small number of labelled samples per task. These properties are further explored in the ‘supplementary results’ section of the supplementary materials.

Together, these components allow GenVerOpt to navigate ambiguity, generalise across medical segmentation tasks, and optimise solutions in a way that mimics the flexibility and deliberation of expert human reasoning.

Resolving ambiguous pathology like a trained clinical expert

As shown in Fig. 5, GenVerOpt substantially outperforms state-of-the-art automated methods for prostate cancer segmentation, achieving statistically significant gains. Unlike conventional deep learning systems that fail in the face of subtle or conflicting cues, GenVerOpt’s iterative generation–verification cycle allows it to refine solutions until uncertainty is resolved. This is demonstrated in the top example, where although the deep learning and GenVerOpt solutions are initially similar, GenVerOpt refines the tumour boundaries despite a similar appearance of the healthy tissue and tumour.

Strikingly, with only 64 task-specific training examples, GenVerOpt exceeds the accuracy of a human imaging expert while performing at the level of a trained clinician. This demonstrates that reasoning-driven optimisation can overcome the very ambiguities that limit both current algorithms and human–machine parity. By reducing reliance on scarce expert annotations while delivering expert-level accuracy, GenVerOpt offers direct value for clinical workflows, where precise tumour delineation is critical for diagnosis, therapy planning, and patient outcomes.

Inferring structure: outlining liver vessel trees

Liver vessel segmentation on CT images requires tracing highly variable and branching vascular structures [27]. Overlapping intensities with surrounding tissue, occlusions, and irregular vessel morphology make the task error-prone, even for experts [39]. Accurate segmentation requires reasoning over spatial context to link vessels into coherent trees, providing a strong test for structural visual reasoning.

GenVerOpt implementation

For this task, we employ the same generator–verifier framework used in prostate cancer segmentation, fine-tuned with only 64 task-specific vessel annotations. To encourage structural fidelity, we further augment training with examples containing artificially broken vessels, allowing the verifier to penalise discontinuities and guide the generator toward anatomically plausible solutions. Optimisation proceeds as before, iteratively refining predictions until the verifier’s correctness stabilises.

Achieving human-like structural awareness

As shown in Fig. 5, GenVerOpt achieves a Dice score on par with a trained human observer while substantially outperforming state-of-the-art automated methods. Crucially, its advantage lies not only in voxel-level accuracy but in reasoning about structure, where GenVerOpt reconstructs vessel hierarchies with a higher proportion of correct parent–child assignments than all baselines, and even slightly surpasses human performance with statistical significance (where human performance is measured as a single expert’s segmentation compared with a consensus between three experts used as ground truth). Qualitative results further show that GenVerOpt produces markedly fewer broken or disconnected vessels, demonstrating its ability to enforce global anatomical coherence. Together, these results highlight that GenVerOpt goes beyond segmentation to capture the relational logic of vascular anatomy, a capability with direct implications for surgical planning, interventional navigation, and disease monitoring.

Identifying correspondence: aligning prostate tumour boundaries

Prostate tumour alignment between pre-operative MR and intra-operative ultrasound (US) is complicated by tissue deformation, variability in tumour appearance, and partial occlusions during surgery [28, 40]. Accurate alignment requires reasoning beyond local appearance, integrating spatial and structural cues to infer the most plausible correspondence between boundaries, critical for ensuring accurate biopsies and effective focal treatments.

GenVerOpt implementation

In this task, GenVerOpt predicts corresponding regions-of-interest across MR and US images. Solution generation is built on the Segment Anything Model (SAM) [41], with




Fig. 5: Performance comparison of GenVerOpt against expert humans and recent state-of-the-art AI systems for medical imaging tasks.

prompts controlled by a prompt-predicting neural network that outputs paired locations across both modalities. Segmentations are obtained using positive-only prompts, applied one at a time on US and MR respectively. Each image pair is sampled with 16 corresponding prompts in total, yielding corresponding segmentations on both images. These corresponding segmentations are then used to compute a dense displacement field that warps the US image into alignment with the MR image.

Verification is based on two complementary measures: the Dice overlap between the SAM-segmented regions post-registration and the structural similarity index (SSIM) between the warped and fixed images. These scores quantify both anatomical correspondence and image-level consistency.

Optimisation uses RL to train the prompt-predicting neural network to predict prompt locations, given an input pair of images. Each candidate set of points is rewarded according to the verification score, guiding the system toward prompts that maximise alignment accuracy. By learning to predict point locations that jointly optimise Dice and SSIM, GenVerOpt discovers correspondences that enable efficient and robust registration.

Performance is evaluated using target registration error (TRE) on unseen landmarks (normalised by assuming unaligned 12.5mm as the maximum error), as well as Dice overlap on anatomical structures such as the prostate gland, which are separate from the SAM-segmented regions in the generation and verification steps. These external metrics ensure that alignment quality reflects genuine generalisation rather than over-fitting to supervision.

Outperforming state-of-the-art

GenVerOpt achieves statistically significantly higher Dice overlap and lower TRE compared to leading registration methods, reflecting its ability to adapt flexibly to patient-specific deformations and appearance shifts. By delivering more reliable tumour alignment, GenVerOpt has the potential to improve intra-operative guidance and directly enhance the precision of prostate cancer interventions.

Non-verbal reasoning: a pathway to more intelligent machines

Human intelligence was built on non-verbal reasoning long before language, enabling survival, discovery, and problem-solving in complex environments. Bringing this capacity into machine intelligence, through the GenVerOpt framework, enables progress on a diverse set of challenging visual reasoning tasks, from abstract pattern puzzles to complex problems in medical imaging.

GenVerOpt demonstrates that reasoning in machines need not rely on language or vast labelled datasets. Instead, iterative cycles of generation, verification, and optimisation can allow systems to deliberate, adapt, and refine their solutions; resolving ambiguity, generalising from minimal supervision, and exposing interpretable reasoning trails.

Our case studies suggest a general pathway for machine intelligence: one where systems can move beyond recognition to true problem-solving, capable of handling uncertainty and structural complexity across domains. Such an approach could transform healthcare, where reasoning about anatomy and pathology is critical, and extend more broadly to scientific discovery and real-world decision-making.

Equipping machines with non-verbal reasoning may be key to achieving flexible intelligence beyond the limits of language and current datasets.

Acknowledgments

Funding:

This work was supported by the International Alliance for Cancer Early Detection, an alliance between Cancer Research UK [EDDAPA-2024/100014] & [C73666/A31378], the University of Cambridge, the OHSU Knight Cancer Institute, the German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), the University College London, the University of Manchester, and the Dana Farber Cancer Institute; and the National Institute for Health Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre.

Supplementary materials

Contents

Methodological description
Supplementary results (ablations)
Computational cost
Fig. S6 to S7
Algo. S1 to S2
Tables S1 to S5
References 69 to 84

Methodological description

GenVerOpt formalisation

Generation:

Generation produces candidate solutions, given an input. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ denote the image and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ denote the solution, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the domain of images and $\mathcal{Y}$ is the domain of solutions (e.g., the solution could be labels, segmentations or deformation fields). The generation module is a stochastic function $g(\cdot; \theta) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$, parametrised by θ , where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the space of probability distributions over $\mathcal{Y}$.

For an input $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the generator $g(x; \theta)$ specifies a distribution over possible solutions. Candidate solutions are sampled using $y \sim g(x; \theta)$, where multiple independent draws yield alternative candidates.

Verification:

Verification determines the correctness probability of a given input-solution pair. The verification module is modelled as a function $v(\cdot; \phi) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, parametrised by ϕ . For an input-solution pair (x, y) , the correctness score is given by $v(x, y; \phi) \in [0, 1]$, which can be interpreted as the likelihood that y is a correct solution for x .

Optimisation:

Optimisation aims to identify, for each input, the most plausible solution according to the verifier. Formally, the solution is given by $y^* = \arg \max_{y \sim g(x; \theta)} \mathbb{E} [v(x, y; \phi)]$.

In practice, the expectation is approximated by iterative sampling and refinement: the generator proposes candidate solutions, the verifier scores them, and the process is repeated until the solution stabilises. Crucially, this optimisation is performed per sample, allowing the framework to deliberate and adapt to each new input independently of dataset-level supervision.

Learning generation and verification before reasoning

Before inference-time reasoning can take place, the generation and verification modules must be jointly optimised so that they provide meaningful candidates and correctness estimates. This optimisation is performed at the dataset level or across datasets.

While in principle both modules may be non-parametric, as demonstrated in some of our case studies, for generality we describe them here in their parametric form. The generator $g(x; \theta)$ is trained to produce candidate solutions that approach the distribution of correct solutions, while the verifier $v(x, y; \phi)$ is trained to assign high scores to correct input-solution pairs (x, y) and low scores otherwise.

One of the strategies described in our case studies is joint training, where the verifier learns to discriminate between correct and generated solutions, while the generator is updated to maximise verifier scores. This interplay encourages the generator to produce more realistic candidates and the verifier to sharpen its discrimination.

Formally, the joint objective can be expressed as:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}} [\mathcal{L}(v(x, g(x; \theta); \phi), c(x, y))] \quad (1)$$

where $c(x, y) \in [0, 1]$ is the correctness label (1 for expert-labelled solutions, 0 for generated solutions).

In our formulation, $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ can be expressed as two complementary losses, one for the verifier and one for the generator.

Verifier objective:

The verifier should approximate $c(x, y)$. Using binary cross-entropy, the verifier objective is framed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_v(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{x, y} [v(x, y; \phi) \times \log c(x, y) - (1 - v(x, y; \phi)) \times \log(1 - c(x, y))] \quad (2)$$

Generator objective:

The generator should maximise the verifier-predicted correctness of the generated solutions. Therefore, the generator objective maximises the verifier score:

$$\mathcal{L}_g(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim g(x; \theta)} [v(x, y; \phi)] \quad (3)$$

Alternating optimisation:

The joint objective summarised in Equation 1 is a proxy for alternating updates of the verifier (Equation 2) using $\min_{\phi} \mathcal{L}_v$ and the generator (equation 3) using $\max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_g$.

Cross-task meta-optimisation:

To enable generalisation across tasks, we extend this training with the Reptile meta-learning algorithm. Let $\{\mathcal{D}_\gamma\}_{i=1}^M$ denote datasets from related tasks (e.g., if the target task is cancer segmentation then related tasks can be organ segmentation). For each dataset $\mathcal{D}_\gamma$, the parameters (θ, ϕ) are optimised using a single step of the alternating optimisation above, producing task-specific solutions (θ_i, ϕ_i) . The shared cross-task parameters can then be updated as:

$$(\theta, \phi) \leftarrow (\theta, \phi) + \alpha \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M [(\theta_i, \phi_i) - (\theta, \phi)] \quad (4)$$

where α is the step-size.

The cross-task optimisation encourages the generator and verifier to acquire task-agnostic priors that can be rapidly adapted to new tasks with limited supervision.

Reinforcement learning self-play for optimisation

Reinforcement learning

One of the mechanisms for optimisation described in our case studies is RL self-play.

When using simple single-agent RL, the generator $g(x; \theta)$ defines a distribution over candidate solutions and the verifier provides a likelihood of correctness $v(x, y; \phi)$.

The optimisation objective is therefore to maximise the expected verifier score:

$$J(\theta|x) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim g(x; \theta)} [v(x, y; \theta)] \quad (5)$$

The optimisation goal is then:

$$y^* = \arg \max_{y \sim g(x; \theta)} \mathbb{E} [J(\theta|x)] \quad (6)$$

This corresponds to the optimisation goal stated earlier (in the ‘GenVerOpt formalisation - Optimisation’ section).

Self-play

To estimate the gradients of $J(\theta)$, we use a self-play strategy. Two candidate solutions $y_1, y_2 \sim g(x; \theta)$ are sampled independently and the verifier assigns scores to each $v(x, y_1; \theta)$ and $v(x, y_2; \theta)$. A relative reward can then be computed as $R = v(x, y_1; \theta) - v(x, y_2; \theta)$.

The generator parameters are updated with a policy-gradient step:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta | x) \approx \Delta R, (\nabla_{\theta} \log g(y_1 | x; \theta) - \nabla_{\theta} \log g(y_2 | x; \theta)). \quad (7)$$

Using this for updates in gradient ascent increases the probability of sampling higher-scoring candidates and decreases the probability of lower-scoring ones, thereby shifting the generator distribution toward regions of higher verifier correctness. Repeated iterations progressively refine the generator’s outputs, and the best-scoring candidate at convergence is selected as the final solution. The relative formulation incentivises the direction of improvement rather than simply relying on an absolute score, this ensures that any small fluctuations in absolute discriminator scores are less likely to impact the learning process.

Materials and datasets

IQ test pattern puzzles

For the IQ test puzzles, we utilised the MM-IQ dataset [16]. The data used for training and evaluation are summarised in Tab. 1 below.

Dataset	Samples	Role
Logical Operation	395	Training
Spatial Relationship	102	Training
Geometric Relationship	355	Training
Temporal Movement	32 + 379	Fine-tuning + Evaluation

Table 1: IQ test pattern puzzles dataset

Medical image segmentation

Both the prostate cancer and liver vessel segmentation tasks utilise the same datasets for the initial training of the verifier and generator. These datasets are summarised in Tab. 2 below.

Dataset	Modality	Structure	Cohort Country	Samples	Role
[42]	CT	Spleen	United States	41	Training
[43]	CT	Gallbladder	United States	30	Training
[43]	CT	Adrenal Gland	United States	30	Training
[43]	CT	Major Vessels	United States	30	Training
[43]	CT	Stomach	United States	30	Training
[44]	CT	Kidneys	>3 countries	119	Training
[44]	CT	Bladder	>3 countries	119	Training
[45]	MR	Liver	Turkey	15	Training
[45]	MR	Kidneys	Turkey	15	Training
[45]	MR	Spleen	Turkey	15	Training
[46]	MR	Bladder	China	40	Training
[46]	MR	Gallbladder	China	40	Training
[46]	MR	Prostate	China	40	Training
[46]	MR	Major Vessels	China	40	Training
[42]	MR	Prostate	Netherlands	48	Training
[42]	CT	Liver Tumour	France	131	Training
[42]	CT	Pancreas Tumour	United States	282	Training
[42]	CT	Colon Tumour	United States	126	Training
[47]	CT	Kidney Tumour	United States	489	Training
[26]	mp-MR	Prostate Tumour	United Kingdom	64 + 500	Fine-tuning + Evaluation
[42]	CT	Liver Vessels	United States	64 + 200	Fine-tuning + Evaluation

Table 2: A summary of the data sets used for training and evaluation for the prostate cancer and liver vessel segmentation tasks.

Region correspondence

The region correspondence task utilised the muRegPro [\[40\]](#) dataset which consists of 135 paired MR and US images of the prostate. Segmentations are available for evaluation and include structures such as prostate gland boundaries, zonal structures, water-filled cysts, and calcifications. Landmarks are also identified on tumour boundaries for evaluation.

Supplementary results

All the supplementary results are described for the task of prostate cancer segmentation with performance evaluated on data that was held-out from training.

Ablating methodological components

We remove components from our methodological framework described in the ‘Learning generation and verification before reasoning’ and ‘Reinforcement learning self-play for optimisation’ sections. The omission of joint training means that the generator and verifier are trained separately, where the generator is first trained to perform the task using human labels and then a verifier is trained subsequently. The omission of self-play refers to replacing the two copies of the generator in the optimisation process with a single copy and replacing the reward based on difference in verifier scores with an absolute reward based on directly on the single verifier score. The omission of RL refers to replacing RL with joint training as the optimisation process for final reasoning. The results in Tab. 3 show that all components contributed positively towards performance.

Generator + Verifier			Optimiser		Performance
Joint Training	Reptile	Cross-task training	Self-play	RL	
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	62.4±4.9
✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	51.4±5.5
✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	54.8±4.6
✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	60.6±5.4
✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	49.5±4.7
✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	53.8±5.9
✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	41.7±5.4
✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	32.3 ±6.2

Table 3: Ablation study - removing components from the framework to test efficacy of different approaches. The standard deviation is across different runs rather than patient cases.

Varying amounts of task-specific data before reasoning

Before initiating the optimisation process in the GenVerOpt framework, the generator and verifier are fine-tuned with task-specific data. The variation in performance with increasing amounts of task-specific data is summarised in Tab. 4. The trend show an improvement with increasing data up to a plateau at 64 samples. The reasoning or optimisation time per sample decreases as more samples are added with a plateau observed after 64 samples.

The relationship between reasoning time and performance

For 64 task-specific samples used for initiating the optimisation in GenVerOpt, we evaluate how the performance varies with reasoning time i.e., time spent in the RL self-play optimisation. The performance is averaged across 24 samples.

Samples	Performance	Reasoning Time / h
16	56.1 $\pm$ 4.7	40
32	59.6 $\pm$ 5.4	35
48	60.1 $\pm$ 4.9	31
64	62.4 $\pm$ 4.9	26
80	61.5 $\pm$ 5.1	24
96	61.7 $\pm$ 5.5	25

Table 4: Measuring performance of GenVerOpt, given different amounts of labelled task-specific examples.

Reasoning Time / h	Performance
0	38.2 $\pm$ 4.9
4	42.4 $\pm$ 4.9
8	47.6 $\pm$ 5.2
12	52.9 $\pm$ 4.3
16	55.7 $\pm$ 5.3
20	58.3 $\pm$ 5.7
24	61.3 $\pm$ 4.6
28	62.2 $\pm$ 4.8
32	61.7 $\pm$ 5.1

Table 5: Performance variation with reasoning time.

Computational cost

The computational cost of the GenVerOpt framework is summarised in Tab. 6. Note that the time quoted for the ‘Reason’ phase is for a single sample. In practice a batch of 24 samples can be processed in parallel on the described hardware.

Hardware	GPU Hours			Power (W)	Carbon (kg CO2/h)
	Pre-train	Adapt	Reason		
Nvidia A100	672	16	26	300W	0.13

Table 6: Carbon footprint.

References

- [1] Heyes, C. New thinking: the evolution of human cognition (2012).
- [2] Gowlett, J. A. The discovery of fire by humans: a long and convoluted process. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **371**, 20150164 (2016).

- [3] Evans, J. S. B. Heuristic and analytic processes in reasoning. *British Journal of Psychology* **75**, 451–468 (1984).
- [4] Kahneman, D. Of 2 minds: How fast and slow thinking shape perception and choice [excerpt]. *Scientific American* **15** (2012).
- [5] Sherwood, C. C., Subiaul, F. & Zawidzki, T. W. A natural history of the human mind: tracing evolutionary changes in brain and cognition. *Journal of anatomy* **212**, 426–454 (2008).
- [6] Wolff, P. & Holmes, K. J. Linguistic relativity. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* **2**, 253–265 (2011).
- [7] Kahneman, D. & Klein, G. Conditions for intuitive expertise: a failure to disagree. *American psychologist* **64**, 515 (2009).
- [8] Bilalić, M., McLeod, P. & Gobet, F. Why good thoughts block better ones: The mechanism of the pernicious einstellung (set) effect. *Cognition* **108**, 652–661 (2008).
- [9] Baillargeon, R. Infants’ reasoning about hidden objects: evidence for event-general and event-specific expectations. *Developmental science* **7**, 391–414 (2004).
- [10] Baillargeon, R. Innate ideas revisited: For a principle of persistence in infants’ physical reasoning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* **3**, 2–13 (2008).
- [11] Guo, D. *et al.* Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948* (2025).
- [12] Wei, J. *et al.* Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **35**, 24824–24837 (2022).
- [13] Feng, X. *et al.* Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17179* (2023).
- [14] Anthony, T., Tian, Z. & Barber, D. Thinking fast and slow with deep learning and tree search. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017).
- [15] Murlidaran, S., Wang, W. Y. & Eckstein, M. P. Comparing visual reasoning in humans and ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14102* (2021).
- [16] Cai, H., Yang, Y. & Hu, W. Mm-iq: Benchmarking human-like abstraction and reasoning in multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00698* (2025).
- [17] Shojaei, P. *et al.* The illusion of thinking: Understanding the strengths and limitations of reasoning models via the lens of problem complexity. *arXiv preprint*

- arXiv:2506.06941* (2025).
- [18] Wolf, D. *et al.* Your other left! vision-language models fail to identify relative positions in medical images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.00549* (2025).
 - [19] Gobet, F. Concepts without intuition lose the game: commentary on montero and evans (2011). *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* **11**, 237–250 (2012).
 - [20] Bilalić, M., McLeod, P. & Gobet, F. Inflexibility of experts—reality or myth? quantifying the einstellung effect in chess masters. *Cognitive psychology* **56**, 73–102 (2008).
 - [21] Mitchell, M. Artificial intelligence learns to reason (2025).
 - [22] Pan, C., He, W., Tu, Z. & Ren, L. Dino-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in vision foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24025* (2025).
 - [23] Chen, H. *et al.* Fast-in-slow: A dual-system foundation model unifying fast manipulation within slow reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01953* (2025).
 - [24] Saeed, S. U. *et al.* Reasoning in machine vision: learning to think fast and slow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.22075* (2025).
 - [25] Wang, H. *et al.* A comprehensive survey on deep active learning in medical image analysis. *Medical Image Analysis* **95**, 103201 (2024).
 - [26] Ahmed, H. U. *et al.* Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric mri and trus biopsy in prostate cancer (promis): a paired validating confirmatory study. *The Lancet* **389**, 815–822 (2017).
 - [27] Chierici, A. *et al.* Vascular liver segmentation: a narrative review on methods and new insights brought by artificial intelligence. *Journal of International Medical Research* **52**, 03000605241263170 (2024).
 - [28] Huang, S. *et al.* One registration is worth two segmentations 665–675 (2024).
 - [29] Kahneman, D. Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *American economic review* **93**, 1449–1475 (2003).
 - [30] Evans, J. S. B. In two minds: dual-process accounts of reasoning. *Trends in cognitive sciences* **7**, 454–459 (2003).
 - [31] Yun, K., Peng, Y., Samaras, D., Zelinsky, G. J. & Berg, T. L. Exploring the role of gaze behavior and object detection in scene understanding. *Frontiers in psychology* **4**, 917 (2013).
 - [32] Nichol, A. & Schulman, J. Reptile: a scalable metalearning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999* **2**, 4 (2018).

- [33] Ahn, S., Kim, S. & Yun, S.-Y. Mitigating dataset bias by using per-sample gradient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15704* (2022).
- [34] Guo, Y. *et al.* Spottune: transfer learning through adaptive fine-tuning. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* 4805–4814 (2019).
- [35] Kohl, S. *et al.* A probabilistic u-net for segmentation of ambiguous images. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018).
- [36] Goodfellow, I. *et al.* Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM* **63**, 139–144 (2020).
- [37] Nichol, A., Achiam, J. & Schulman, J. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999* (2018).
- [38] Rafailov, R. *et al.* Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **36**, 53728–53741 (2023).
- [39] Wu, M., Qian, Y., Liao, X., Wang, Q. & Heng, P.-A. Hepatic vessel segmentation based on 3d swin-transformer with inductive biased multi-head self-attention. *BMC Medical Imaging* **23**, 91 (2023).
- [40] Baum, Z., Saeed, S. U., Min, Z., Hu, Y. & Barratt, D. Mr to ultrasound registration for prostate challenge-dataset. *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)* (2023).
- [41] Kirillov, A. *et al.* Segment anything. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision* 4015–4026 (2023).
- [42] Antonelli, M. *et al.* The medical segmentation decathlon (2021).
- [43] Synapse. Multi-atlas labeling beyond the cranial vault - workshop and challenge (2013). URL <https://www.synapse.org/#!/Synapse:syn3193805/wiki/217789>. Online; accessed Jun 2022.
- [44] Rister, B., Yi, D., Shivakumar, K., Nobashi, T. & Rubin, D. L. Ct-org, a new dataset for multiple organ segmentation in computed tomography. *Scientific Data* **7**, 1–9 (2020).
- [45] Kavur, A. E. *et al.* Chaos challenge-combined (ct-mr) healthy abdominal organ segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis* **69**, 101950 (2021).
- [46] Ji, Y. *et al.* Amos: A large-scale abdominal multi-organ benchmark for versatile medical image segmentation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **35**, 36722–36732 (2022).

- [47] Heller, N. *et al.* The state of the art in kidney and kidney tumor segmentation in contrast-enhanced ct imaging: Results of the kits19 challenge. *Medical image analysis* **67**, 101821 (2021).