

AlphaZeroES: Direct score maximization outperforms planning loss minimization

Carlos Martin¹ and Tuomas Sandholm^{1,2,3,4}

{cgmartin, sandholm}@cs.cmu.edu

¹Carnegie Mellon University

²Strategy Robot, Inc.

³Optimized Markets, Inc.

⁴Strategic Machine, Inc.

arXiv:2406.08687v1 [cs.AI] 12 Jun 2024

Abstract

Planning at execution time has been shown to dramatically improve performance for agents in both single-agent and multi-agent settings. A well-known family of approaches to planning at execution time are AlphaZero and its variants, which use Monte Carlo Tree Search together with a neural network that guides the search by predicting state values and action probabilities. AlphaZero trains these networks by minimizing a planning loss that makes the value prediction match the episode return, and the policy prediction at the root of the search tree match the output of the full tree expansion. AlphaZero has been applied to both single-agent environments (such as Sokoban) and multi-agent environments (such as chess and Go) with great success. In this paper, we explore an intriguing question: In single-agent environments, can we outperform AlphaZero by directly maximizing the episode score instead of minimizing this planning loss, while leaving the MCTS algorithm and neural architecture unchanged? To directly maximize the episode score, we use evolution strategies, a family of algorithms for zeroth-order blackbox optimization. Our experiments indicate that, across multiple environments, directly maximizing the episode score outperforms minimizing the planning loss.

1 Introduction

Lookahead search and reasoning is a central paradigm in artificial intelligence, and has a long history [Newell and Ernst, 1965, Hart et al., 1968, Nilsson, 1971, Hart et al., 1972, Lanctot et al., 2017, Brown et al., 2018]. In many domains, planning at execution time significantly improves performance. In games like chess and Go, and single-agent domains like Sokoban, Pacman, and 2048, all state-of-the-art approaches use some form of planning by the agent. Many planning approaches use *Monte Carlo Tree Search* (MCTS), which iteratively grows a search tree from the

current state, and does so asymmetrically according to the information seen so far. A prominent subfamily of approaches in this category are AlphaZero and its variants, which leverage function approximation via neural networks to learn good heuristic predictions of the values and action distributions at each state, which can be used to guide the tree search. AlphaZero (and its variants) train this prediction function by minimizing a *planning loss* consisting of a *value loss* and a *policy loss*.

In this paper, we set out to explore whether we can outperform AlphaZero and its variants in single-agent environments, where they are state of the art [Antonoglou et al., 2022, Danihelka et al., 2022], by *directly maximizing the episode score* instead, while leaving all other aspects of the agent, MCTS algorithm, and neural architecture unchanged. Since MCTS is not differentiable, to maximize the episode score, we employ evolution strategies, a family of algorithms for zeroth-order blackbox optimization.

In §2, we introduce our notation and present a detailed formulation of the problem. In §3, we describe prior related work and research. In §4, we present our method. In §5, we describe our experimental benchmarks and present our results. In §6, we present our conclusion and suggest directions for future research.

2 Problem formulation

In this section, we formulate the problem in detail and introduce some required notation. If \mathcal{X} is a set, $\Delta\mathcal{X}$ denotes the set of probability distributions on \mathcal{X} . An *environment* is a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \rho, \delta)$ where \mathcal{S} is a set of states, \mathcal{A} is a set of actions, $\rho : \Delta\mathcal{S}$ is an initial state distribution, and $\delta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}$ is a transition function. A *policy* is a function $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta\mathcal{A}$ that maps a state to an action distribution. Given an environment and policy, an *episode* is a tuple (s, a, r, γ) that is generated as follows. First, an initial state $s_0 \sim \rho$ is sampled. Thereafter, on each timestep $t \in \mathbb{N}$, an action $a_t \sim \pi(s_t)$ is sampled, and a reward,

discount factor, and new state $(r_t, \gamma_t, s_{t+1}) = \delta(s_t, a_t)$ are obtained. The discount factor represents the probability of the episode ending at that timestep. For a given episode, the *return* at timestep $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined recursively as $R_t = r_t + \gamma_t R_{t+1}$. The *score* is the return at the initial timestep, R_0 . An environment is said to *terminate* at time t when $\gamma_t = 0$. The existence of such a t ensures that R_0 is well-defined and finite. Our goal is to find a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta \mathcal{A}$ that maximizes the expected score $\mathbb{E} R_0$.

3 Related research

In this section, we describe related research. Additional related research can be found in the appendix.

Monte Carlo methods are a wide class of computational algorithms that use repeated random sampling to estimate numerical quantities. In the setting of planning, Monte-Carlo evaluation estimates the value of a position by averaging the return of several random rollouts. *Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)* [Coulom, 2007] combines Monte-Carlo evaluation with tree search. Instead of backing-up the min-max value close to the root, and the average value at some depth, a more general backup operator is defined that progressively changes from averaging to min-max as the number of simulations grows. This provides a fine-grained control of the tree growth and allows efficient selectivity. A survey of recent modifications and applications of MCTS can be found in Świechowski et al. [2023].

AlphaGo [Silver et al., 2016] used a variant of MCTS to tackle the game of Go. It used a neural network to evaluate board positions *and* select moves. These networks are trained using a combination of supervised learning from human expert games and reinforcement learning from self-play. It was the first computer program to defeat a human professional player. AlphaGo Zero [Silver et al., 2017a] used reinforcement learning alone, *without* any human data, guidance or domain knowledge beyond game rules. AlphaZero [Silver et al., 2018] generalized AlphaGo Zero into a single algorithm that achieved superhuman performance in many challenging games, including chess and shogi.

MuZero [Schrittwieser et al., 2020] combined AlphaZero’s tree-based search with a *learned dynamics model*. The latter allows it to plan in environments where the agent does *not* have access to a simulator of the environment at execution time. In the authors’ words, “All parameters of the model are trained jointly to accurately match the policy, value, and reward, for every hypothetical step k , to corresponding target values observed after k actual time-steps have elapsed.” Gumbel MuZero [Danihelka et al., 2022] is a policy improvement algorithm based on sampling actions without replacement. It replaces the more heuristic mechanisms by which AlphaZero selects and uses actions, both at root nodes and at non-root nodes. It matches the state of the art on Go, chess, and Atari, and significantly improves prior performance when planning with few simulations.

4 Proposed method

In this section, we present a detailed description of our proposed method, which we call AlphaZeroES.

4.1 Planning algorithm

MCTS grows a search tree asymmetrically, focusing on more promising subtrees. Recent variants of MCTS, as described in Section 3, use value function approximation to guide the search. For our experiments, we use the implementation of Gumbel MuZero [Danihelka et al., 2022], which is the prior state of the art for this setting, found in the open-source Google JAX library mctx [Babuschkin et al., 2020]. MCTS iteratively constructs a search tree starting from some given state s_0 . Each node in this tree contains a state, predicted value, predicted action probabilities, and, for each action, a visit count N , action value Q , reward, and discount factor. Each iteration of the algorithm consists of three phases: *selection*, *expansion*, and *backpropagation*.

During *selection*, we start at the root and traverse the tree until a leaf edge is reached. At internal nodes, we select actions according to the policy described in Danihelka et al. [2022]. When we reach a leaf edge (s, a) , we perform *expansion* as follows. We compute $(r, \gamma, s') = \delta(s, a)$, storing r and γ in the edge’s parent node. We then query the agent’s *prediction function* $(v, p) = f_\theta(s')$ to obtain the predicted value and action probabilities of s' . A new node is added to the tree containing this information, with action visit counts and action values initialized to zero. Finally, we perform *backpropagation* as follows. The new node’s value estimate is backpropagated up the tree to the root in the form of an n -step return. Specifically, from $t = T$ to 0, where T is the length of the trajectory, we compute an estimate of the cumulative discounted reward that bootstraps from the value estimate v_T : $G_t = \sum_{i=0}^{T-1-t} \gamma^i r_{t+1+i} + \gamma^{T-t} v_T$. For each such t , we update the statistics for the edge (s_t, a_t) as follows: $Q(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow \frac{N(s_t, a_t)Q(s_t, a_t) + G_t}{N(s_t, a_t) + 1}$, $N(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow N(s_t, a_t) + 1$. The *simulation budget* is the total number of iterations, which is the number of times the search tree is expanded, and therefore the size of the tree.

4.2 Prediction function

The prediction function of the agent takes an environment state as input and outputs a probability distribution over actions and value estimate. Our experimental settings have states that are naturally modeled as *sets* of objects (such as sets of cities, facilities, targets, boxes, *etc.*), where each object can be described by a vector (*e.g.*, the coordinates of a city and whether it has been visited or not). Therefore, we seek a neural network architecture that can process a *set* of vectors, rather than just a single vector. Some early work on neural networks that can process sets was carried out by McGregor [2007] and McGregor [2008].

In our experiments, we use *DeepSets* [Zaheer et al., 2017], a neural network architecture that can process sets of inputs in a way that is equivariant or invariant (depending on the desired type of output) with respect to the inputs. It is known to be a universal approximator for continuous set functions, provided that the model’s latent space is sufficiently high-dimensional Wagstaff et al. [2022]. DeepSets may be viewed as the most efficient incarnation of the Janossy pooling paradigm [Murphy et al., 2018], and can be generalized by Transformers [Vaswani et al., 2017, Kim et al., 2021]. A permutation-*equivariant* layer of the DeepSets architecture has the form [Zaheer et al., 2017, Supplement p. 19] $\mathbf{Y} = \sigma(\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{1} \otimes ((\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{C}))$ where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-ones vector of appropriate dimensionality, and σ is a nonlinear activation function, such as ReLU. A permutation-*invariant* layer is simply a permutation-equivariant layer followed by global average pooling (yielding an output that is a vector rather than a matrix) followed by a nonlinearity. In problems where the action space matches the set of inputs (such as cities in the TSP problem, or points in the vertex k -center and maximum diversity problems), the predicted action logits are read out via an affine dense layer following the permutation-equivariant layer, before global pooling. In problems where the action space is a fixed set of actions (such as Sokoban and the navigation problems), the predicted action logits are read out via an affine dense layer following the permutation-invariant layer. In both cases, the predicted value is read out via an affine dense layer from the output of the permutation-invariant layer.

4.3 Training procedure

AlphaZero minimizes a *planning loss*, which is the sum of a *value loss* and a *policy loss*: $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{value}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{policy}} = \sum_t (R_t - v_t)^2 + \sum_t H(w_t, p_t)$. Here, $(v_t, p_t) = f_\theta(s_t)$ is the predicted state value and action probabilities for s_t , respectively. $(R_t - v_t)^2$ is the squared difference between v_t and the actual episode return R_t . $H(w_t, p_t)$ is the cross entropy between the action weights w_t returned by the MCTS algorithm for s_t and p_t . In contrast, in our approach, we fix *the exact same architecture, hyperparameters, and MCTS algorithm*, but change the optimization objective. Instead of minimizing the planning loss, we seek to *maximize the episode score directly*. One potential way we could seek to do this is by using policy gradient methods, which yield an estimator of the gradient of the expected return with respect to the agent’s parameters. There is a vast literature on policy gradient methods, which include REINFORCE [Williams, 1992] and actor-critic methods [Konda and Tsitsiklis, 1999, Grondman et al., 2012].

However, there is a problem. Most of these methods assume that the policy is *differentiable*—more precisely, that its output action distribution is differentiable with respect to the parameters of the policy. However, our planning

policy uses MCTS as a subroutine, and standard MCTS is not differentiable. Because our policy contains a non-differentiable submodule, we need to find an alternative way to optimize the policy’s parameters. Furthermore, Metz et al. [2021] show that differentiation can fail to be useful when trying to optimize certain functions—specifically, when working with an iterative differentiable system with chaotic dynamics. Fortunately, we can turn to black-box (*i.e.*, zeroth-order) optimization. Black-box optimization uses only function evaluations to optimize a black-box function with respect to a set of inputs. In particular, it does not require gradients. In our case, the black-box function maps our policy’s parameters to a sampled episode score.

There is a class of black-box optimization algorithms called evolution strategies (ES) [Rechenberg and Eigen, 1973, Schwefel, 1977, Rechenberg, 1978] that maintain and evolve a population of parameter vectors. Natural evolution strategies (NES) [Wierstra et al., 2014, Yi et al., 2009] represent the population as a distribution over parameters and maximize its average objective value using the score function estimator. For many parameter distributions, such as Gaussian smoothing, this is equivalent to evaluating the function at randomly-sampled points and estimating the gradient as a sum of estimates of directional derivatives along random directions [Duchi et al., 2015, Nesterov and Spokoiny, 2017, Shamir, 2017, Berahas et al., 2022].

ES is a scalable alternative to standard reinforcement learning [Salimans et al., 2017], and also a viable method for learning non-differentiable parameters of large supervised models [Lenc et al., 2019]. We use OpenAI-ES [Salimans et al., 2017], an NES algorithm that is based on the identity $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{z}$, where \mathcal{N} is the standard multivariate normal distribution with the same dimension as \mathbf{x} .

This algorithm works as follows. Let \mathcal{I} be a set of indices. For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ in parallel, sample $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathcal{N}$ and compute $\delta_i = f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}_i)$. Finally, compute the pseudo-gradient $\mathbf{g} = \frac{1}{\sigma |\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_i \mathbf{z}_i$. To reduce variance, like Salimans et al. [2017], we use antithetic sampling [Geweke, 1988], also called mirrored sampling [Brockhoff et al., 2010], which uses pairs of perturbations $\pm \sigma \mathbf{z}_i$. The resulting gradient is fed into an optimizer. OpenAI-ES is massively parallelizable, since each δ_i can be evaluated on a separate worker. Furthermore, the entire optimization procedure can be performed with minimal communication bandwidth between workers. All workers are initialized with the same random seed. Worker i evaluates δ_i , sends it to the remaining workers, and receives the other workers’ values (this is called an allgather operation in distributed computing). Thus the workers compute the same \mathbf{g} and stay synchronized. This process is described in Algorithm 2 of Salimans et al. [2017]. The full training process is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributed training.

The following algorithm runs on each worker. All workers are initialized with the same random seed.

The function f samples an episode given parameters for the agent, and outputs the episode score.

```
 $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$  is the perturbation scale  
 $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \leftarrow \text{agent.initialize\_parameters}()$   
 $S \leftarrow \text{optimizer.initialize\_state}(\mathbf{x})$   
loop  
   $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \text{optimizer.get\_parameters}(S)$   
   $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \text{set of available workers}$   
  for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  do  
     $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{I}_d)$   
   $j \leftarrow \text{own worker rank}$   
   $\delta_j \leftarrow f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}_j) - f(\mathbf{x} - \sigma \mathbf{z}_j)$   
  send  $\delta_j$  to other workers  
  receive  $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I} - \{j\}}$  from other workers  
   $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2\sigma|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_i \mathbf{z}_i$   
   $S \leftarrow \text{optimizer.update\_state}(S, \mathbf{g})$ 
```

5 Experiments

In this section, we describe our experiments and present our results. Unless stated otherwise, we use the following hyperparameters. We use 10 trials per experiment, training and evaluation batch sizes of 10,000, 1,000 batches per epoch, 4 hours of training time per trial, the Adabelief [Zhuang et al., 2020] optimizer, a perturbation scale of 0.1 for OpenAI-ES, an MCTS simulation budget of 8 (Gumbel Muzero, the AlphaZero variant we use, can learn reliably with as few as 2 simulations [Danihelka et al., 2022, p. 8]), hidden layer sizes of 16 for the DeepSets network, 1 equivariant plus 1 invariant hidden layer for the DeepSets network, and the ReLU activation function.

In our plots, we show the episode scores attained by AlphaZero (labeled `es=0` in the plot legend) vs. AlphaZeroES (labeled `es=1` in the plot legend). To perform a fair comparison, since AlphaZero and AlphaZeroES optimize different objectives, we test both across a wide range of learning rates (labeled `lr` in the plot legend). In addition, we show the value losses and policy losses over the course of training. Though AlphaZeroES does not optimize these losses directly, we are interested in observing what happens to them as a side-effect of AlphaZeroES maximizing the episode score. Solid lines show the mean across trials, and bands show the standard error of the mean. We emphasize that it is not our goal to develop the best special-purpose solver for any one of these domains. That is beyond the scope of this paper. Rather, we are interested in a *general-purpose* approach that can tackle *all* of these domains, and learn good heuristics on its own by discovering generalizable patterns in data. More narrowly, we wish to study how well an agent like AlphaZero can learn to leverage MCTS via direct score maximization rather than planning loss minimization.

Navigation problem In this environment, an agent navigates a gridworld to reach as many targets as possible within a given time limit. At the beginning of each episode, targets are placed uniformly at random in a 10×10 grid, as is the agent. On each timestep, the agent can move up, down, left, or right by one tile. The agent reaches a target when it moves into the same tile. The agent receives a reward of +1 when it reaches a target. Thus the agent is incentivized to reach as many targets as possible within the time limit. For our experiments, we use 20 targets and a time limit of 50 steps. The prediction network observes a set of vectors, one for each target, where each vector contains the coordinates of the target, a boolean 0-1 flag indicating whether it has already been reached, and the number of episode timesteps remaining.

This environment has been used before as a benchmark by Oh et al. [2017, §4.2]. It resembles a traveling salesman-like problem in which several “micro” actions are required to perform the “macro” actions of moving from one city to another. (Also, the agent can visit cities multiple times and does not need to return to its starting city.) This models situations where several fine-grained actions are required to perform relevant tasks, such as moving a unit in a real-time strategy game a large distance across the map.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. The blue square is the agent. Green squares are unreached targets. Yellow squares are reached targets. Experimental results are shown in Figure 1. AlphaZeroES outperforms AlphaZero in terms of episode score. Unlike AlphaZero, it does not seem to minimize the value and policy losses by a noticeable amount.

Sokoban Sokoban is a puzzle in which an agent pushes boxes around a warehouse to get them to storage locations. It is played on a grid of tiles. Each tile may be a floor or a wall, and may contain a box or the agent. Some floor tiles are marked as storage locations. The agent can move horizontally or vertically onto empty tiles. The agent can also move a box by walking up to it and push it to the tile beyond, if the latter is empty. Boxes cannot be pulled, and they cannot be pushed to squares with walls or other boxes. The number of boxes equals the number of storage locations. The puzzle is solved when all boxes are placed at storage locations. Planning ahead is crucial, since an agent can easily get stuck if it makes the wrong move.

Sokoban has been studied in the field of computational complexity and shown to be PSPACE-complete [Culbertson, 1997]. It has received significant interest in artificial intelligence research because of its relevance to automated planning (e.g., for autonomous robots), and is used as a benchmark. Sokoban’s large branching factor and search tree depth contribute to its difficulty. Skilled human players rely mostly on heuristics and can quickly discard several futile or redundant lines of play by recognizing patterns and subgoals, narrowing down the search significantly. Various automatic solvers have been developed in the litera-




Figure 1: Navigation state and metrics.

ture [Junghanns and Schaeffer, 1997, 2001, Froyleys and Balyo, 2016, Shoham and Schaeffer, 2020], many of which rely on heuristics, but more complex Sokoban levels remain a challenge.

Our environment is as follows. We use the unfiltered Boxoban training set [Guez et al., 2018a], which contains 900,000 levels of size 10×10 each. At the beginning of each episode, we sample a level from this dataset uniformly at random. As a form of data augmentation, we sample one of the eight symmetries of the square uniformly at random (a horizontal flip, vertical flip, and/or 90-degree rotation) and apply it to the level. In each timestep, the agent has four actions available to it, for motion in each of the four cardinal directions. The level ends after a specified number of timesteps. (We use 50 timesteps.) The return at the end of an episode is the number of goals that are covered with boxes. Thus the agent is incentivized to cover all of the goals. The prediction network observes a set of vectors, one for each tile in the level, where each vector contains the 2 coordinates of the tile, 4 boolean flags indicating whether the tile contains a wall, goal, box, and/or agent, and the number of episode timesteps remaining.

An example state is shown in Figure 2. This image was rendered by the JSoko software [Meger, 2023], an open-source Sokoban implementation. The yellow vehicle is the agent, who must push the brown boxes into the goal squares marked with Xs. (Boxes tagged “OK” are on top of goal squares.) Experimental results are shown in Figure 2. AlphaZeroES outperforms AlphaZero in terms of episode score. Unlike AlphaZero, it does not seem to minimize the value and policy losses by a noticeable amount.

Traveling salesman problem The *traveling salesman problem (TSP)* is a classic CO problem. Given a set of cities and their pairwise distances, the goal is to find a shortest route that visits each city once and returns to the starting city. This problem has important applications in operations research, including logistics, computer wiring, vehicle routing, and various other planning problems [Matai et al., 2010]. TSP is known to be NP-hard [Karp, 1972], even in the Euclidean setting [Papadimitriou, 1977]. Various approximation algorithms and heuristics [Nilsson, 2003] have been developed for it.

Our environment is as follows. We seek to learn to solve TSP in general, not just one particular instance of it. Thus, on every episode, a new problem instance is generated by sampling a matrix $\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1]^{n \times 2})$, representing a sequence of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ cities. In our experiments, we use $n = 20$. At timestep $t \in [n]$, the agent chooses a city $a_t \in [n]$ that has not been visited yet. At the end of the episode, the length of the tour through this sequence of cities (including the segment from the final city to the initial one) is computed, and treated as the *negative* score. Thus the agent is incentivized to find the shortest tour through all the cities. Formally, the final score is $-\sum_{t \leq n} d(\mathbf{X}_{a_t}, \mathbf{X}_{a_{t+1 \bmod n}})$, where d is the Euclidean




Figure 2: Sokoban state and metrics.

metric. The prediction network observes a set of vectors, one for each city, where each vector contains the coordinates of the city and 3 boolean 0-1 flags indicating whether it has already been visited, whether it is the initial city, and whether it is the current city.

An example state is shown in Figure 3. Dots are cities. The red dot is the initial city. The lines connecting the dots constitute the constructed path. The dotted line is the last leg from the final city back to the initial city. Experimental results are shown in Figure 3. AlphaZeroES outperforms AlphaZero in terms of episode score. Interestingly, as a side effect, it minimizes the policy loss about as much as AlphaZero does. It also minimizes the value loss (except at the highest learning rate), though to a lesser extent than AlphaZero.

Vertex k -center problem The *vertex k -center problem (VKCP)* is a classic CO problem that has applications in facility location and clustering. The problem is as follows. Given n points in \mathbb{R}^d , select a subset \mathcal{S} of k points that maximizes the distance from any point in the original set to its nearest point in \mathcal{S} . The n points can be interpreted as possible locations in which to build facilities (*e.g.*, fire stations, police stations, supply depots, *etc.*), where \mathcal{S} is the set of locations in which such facilities are built, and the goal is to minimize the maximum distance from any location to its nearest facility. (There is also a variant of the problem that seeks to minimize the *mean* distance.) This problem was first proposed by Hakimi [1964]. It is an NP-hard problem, and various approximation algorithms have been proposed for it [Kariv and Hakimi, 1979, Gonzalez, 1985, Dyer and Frieze, 1985, Hochbaum and Shmoys, 1985, Shmoys, 1994]. A survey and evaluation of approximation algorithms can be found in Garcia-Diaz et al. [2019].

For our experiments, we sample $n = 40$ locations uniformly at random from the unit square and let $k = 20$. At any timestep t , the agent can select a location $a_t \in [n]$ that has not been selected yet to add a facility at that location. The final score is $-\max_{i \in [n]} \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in [0, 1]^2$ is the position of point $i \in [n]$ and d is the Euclidean metric. The prediction network observes a set of vectors, one for each point, where each vector contains the coordinates of the point and a boolean 0-1 flag indicating whether it has been included in the set.

An example state is shown in Figure 4. Black dots are locations, red dots are facilities placed so far, and red lines connect locations to their nearest facility. Experimental results are shown in Figure 4. AlphaZeroES outperforms AlphaZero in terms of episode score. In this environment, AlphaZeroES hardly minimizes the value and policy losses as a side effect.

Maximum diversity problem The *maximum diversity problem (MDP)* is as follows. Given n points in \mathbb{R}^d , select a subset \mathcal{S} of k points that maximizes the minimum




Figure 3: TSP state and metrics.




Figure 4: VKCP state and metrics.

distance between distinct points. (There is also a variant of the problem that seeks to maximize the *mean* distance between distinct points.) This problem is strongly NP-hard, as can be shown via reduction from the clique problem [Kuo et al., 1993, Ghosh, 1996]. Various heuristics have been proposed for it [Glover et al., 1998, Katayama and Narihisa, 2005, Silva et al., 2007, Duarte and Martí, 2007, Martí et al., 2010, Lozano et al., 2011, Wu and Hao, 2013, Martí et al., 2013]. This problem has applications in ecology, medical treatment, genetic engineering, capital investment, pollution control, system reliability, telecommunication services, molecular structure design, transportation system control, emergency service centers, and energy options, as catalogued in Glover et al. [1998, Table 1].

For our experiments, we sample $n = 40$ locations uniformly at random from the unit square and let $k = 20$. At any timestep t , the agent can select a point $a_t \in [n]$ that has not been selected yet to add to the set \mathcal{S} . The final score is $\min_{i,j \in \mathcal{S}, i \neq j} d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in [0, 1]^2$ is the position of point i and d is the Euclidean metric. The prediction network observes a set of vectors, one for each point, where each vector contains the coordinates of the point and a boolean 0-1 flag indicating whether it has been included in the set.

An example state is shown in Figure 5. Black dots are the points, red dots are the points selected so far, and the red line connects the closest pair of distinct points in the set selected so far. Experimental results are shown in Figure 5. AlphaZeroES outperforms AlphaZero in terms of episode score. As a side effect, it minimizes the policy loss about as much as AlphaZero does. However, unlike AlphaZero, it does not seem to minimize the value loss.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we set out to study whether AlphaZero and its newest variants can be improved by maximizing the episode score directly instead of minimizing the standard planning loss. Since MCTS is not differentiable, we maximize the episode score by using evolution strategies. We tested our approach on multiple CO problems and motion planning problems. Our experimental results indicate that our approach outperforms planning loss minimization. Our work opens up new possibilities for tackling environments where planning is important. It does this by allowing agents to learn to leverage internal nondifferentiable planning algorithms, such as MCTS, *in a purely blackbox way*. That is, instead of training the agent’s parameters to minimize some indirect proxy objective, such as a planning loss, we can now maximize the desired objective *directly*.

7 Acknowledgments

This material is based on work supported by the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship ONR N00014-23-1-2876,




Figure 5: MDP state and metrics.

National Science Foundation grants RI-2312342 and RI-1901403, ARO award W911NF2210266, and NIH award A240108S001.

References

- Carlo Aironi, Samuele Cornell, Stefano Squartini, et al. A graph-based neural approach to linear sum assignment problems. *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 34(3), 2024.
- Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Sherjil Ozair, Thomas K. Hubert, and David Silver. Planning in stochastic environments with a learned model. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- Igor Babuschkin, Kate Baumli, Alison Bell, Surya Bhatipatiraju, Jake Bruce, Peter Buchlovsky, David Budden, Trevor Cai, Aidan Clark, Ivo Danihelka, Antoine Dedieu, Claudio Fantacci, Jonathan Godwin, Chris Jones, Ross Hemsley, Tom Hennigan, Matteo Hessel, Shaobo Hou, Steven Kapturowski, Thomas Keck, Iurii Kemaev, Michael King, Markus Kunesch, Lena Martens, Hamza Merzic, Vladimir Mikulik, Tamara Norman, George Papamakarios, John Quan, Roman Ring, Francisco Ruiz, Alvaro Sanchez, Rosalia Schneider, Eren Sezener, Stephen Spencer, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Wojciech Stokowiec, Luyu Wang, Guangyao Zhou, and Fabio Viola. The DeepMind JAX Ecosystem, 2020.
- Maria-Florina Balcan, Travis Dick, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. Learning to branch. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 344–353. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR), 2018.
- Maria-Florina Balcan, Siddharth Prasad, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. Structural analysis of branch-and-cut and the learnability of gomory mixed integer cuts. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 35:33890–33903, 2022.
- Maria-Florina Balcan, Travis Dick, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. Learning to branch: Generalization guarantees and limits of data-independent discretization. *Journal of the ACM*, 71(2):1–73, 2024.
- Maria-Florina F Balcan, Siddharth Prasad, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. Sample complexity of tree search configuration: Cutting planes and beyond. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 34:4015–4027, 2021.
- Yoshua Bengio, Andrea Lodi, and Antoine Prouvost. Machine learning for combinatorial optimization: a methodological tour d’horizon. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 290(2):405–421, 2021.
- Albert S. Berahas, Liyuan Cao, Krzysztof Choromanski, and Katya Scheinberg. A theoretical and empirical comparison of gradient approximations in derivative-free optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 22, 2022.
- Dimo Brockhoff, Anne Auger, Nikolaus Hansen, Dirk V. Arnold, and Tim Hohm. Mirrored sampling and sequential selection for evolution strategies. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature, PPSN XI*, 2010.
- Noam Brown, Tuomas Sandholm, and Brandon Amos. Depth-limited solving for imperfect-information games. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- Rémi Coulom. Efficient selectivity and backup operators in Monte-Carlo tree search. In *Computers and Games*, 2007.
- Joseph Culberson. Sokoban is PSPACE-complete, 1997.
- Ivo Danihelka, Arthur Guez, Julian Schrittwieser, and David Silver. Policy improvement by planning with Gumbel. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- Abraham Duarte and Rafael Martí. Tabu search and grasp for the maximum diversity problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 178(1):71–84, 2007.
- John C. Duchi, Michael I. Jordan, Martin J. Wainwright, and Andre Wibisono. Optimal rates for zero-order convex optimization: the power of two function evaluations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61, 2015.
- Martin E. Dyer and Alan M. Frieze. A simple heuristic for the p-centre problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 3(6): 285–288, 1985.
- Gregory Farquhar, Tim Rocktaeschel, Maximilian Igl, and Shimon Whiteson. TreeQN and ATreeC: Differentiable tree planning for deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- Nils Froylyks and Tomás Balyo. *Using an algorithm portfolio to solve sokoban*. PhD thesis, Karlsruhe Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2016.
- Jesus Garcia-Diaz, Rolando Menchaca-Mendez, Ricardo Menchaca-Mendez, Saúl Pomares Hernández, Julio César Pérez-Sansalvador, and Noureddine Lakouari. Approximation algorithms for the vertex k-center problem: Survey and experimental evaluation. *IEEE Access*, 7:109228–109245, 2019.
- Dobrik Georgiev Georgiev, Danilo Numeroso, Davide Bacciu, and Pietro Liò. Neural algorithmic reasoning for combinatorial optimisation. In *Learning on Graphs Conference*, pages 28–1. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR), 2024.

- John Geweke. Antithetic acceleration of Monte Carlo integration in Bayesian inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 1988.
- Jay B. Ghosh. Computational aspects of the maximum diversity problem. *Operations research letters*, 19(4):175–181, 1996.
- Fred Glover, Ching-Chung Kuo, and Krishna S Dhir. Heuristic algorithms for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of information and Optimization Sciences*, 19(1):109–132, 1998.
- Teofilo F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theoretical computer science*, 38: 293–306, 1985.
- Ivo Grondman, Lucian Busoniu, Gabriel AD Lopes, and Robert Babuska. A survey of actor-critic reinforcement learning: standard and natural policy gradients. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 2012.
- Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Karol Gregor, Rishabh Kabra, Sebastien Racaniere, Theophane Weber, David Raposo, Adam Santoro, Laurent Orseau, Tom Eccles, Greg Wayne, David Silver, Timothy Lillicrap, and Victor Valdes. An investigation of model-free planning: boxoban levels, 2018a.
- Arthur Guez, Theophane Weber, Ioannis Antonoglou, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Daan Wierstra, Remi Munos, and David Silver. Learning to search with MCT-Snets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018b.
- S. Louis Hakimi. Optimum locations of switching centers and the absolute centers and medians of a graph. *Operations research*, 12(3):450–459, 1964.
- Peter E. Hart, Nils J. Nilsson, and Bertram Raphael. A formal basis for the heuristic determination of minimum cost paths. *IEEE transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, 4(2):100–107, 1968.
- Peter E. Hart, Nils J. Nilsson, and Bertram Raphael. Correction to "a formal basis for the heuristic determination of minimum cost paths". *ACM SIGART Bulletin*, 37:28–29, 1972.
- Dorit S. Hochbaum and David B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k-center problem. *Mathematics of operations research*, 10(2):180–184, 1985.
- Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Mohammadamin Barekatin, Simon Schmitt, and David Silver. Learning and planning in complex action spaces. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 4476–4486. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR), 2021.
- Andreas Junghanns and Jonathan Schaeffer. Sokoban: A challenging single-agent search problem. In *IJCAI Workshop on Using Games as an Experimental Testbed for AI Research*, 1997.
- Andreas Junghanns and Jonathan Schaeffer. Sokoban: Enhancing general single-agent search methods using domain knowledge. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2001.
- Oded Kariv and S. Louis Hakimi. An algorithmic approach to network location problems. i: The p-centers. *SIAM journal on applied mathematics*, 37(3):513–538, 1979.
- Richard M. Karp. *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*. Springer, 1972.
- Kengo Katayama and Hiroyuki Narihisa. An evolutionary approach for the maximum diversity problem. In *Recent advances in memetic algorithms*, pages 31–47. Springer, 2005.
- Elias Khalil, Hanjun Dai, Yuyu Zhang, Bistra Dilikina, and Le Song. Learning combinatorial optimization algorithms over graphs. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017.
- Jinwoo Kim, Saeyoon Oh, and Seunghoon Hong. Transformers generalize deepsets and can be extended to graphs & hypergraphs. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 34:28016–28028, 2021.
- Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 1999.
- Ching-Chung Kuo, Fred Glover, and Krishna S. Dhir. Analyzing and modeling the maximum diversity problem by zero-one programming. *Decision Sciences*, 24(6):1171–1185, 1993.
- Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Audrunas Gruslys, Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, David Silver, and Thore Graepel. A unified game-theoretic approach to multiagent reinforcement learning. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017.
- Eric Larsen, Sébastien Lachapelle, Yoshua Bengio, Emma Frejinger, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Andrea Lodi. Predicting solution summaries to integer linear programs under imperfect information with machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.11876*, 2(4):14, 2018.
- Karel Lenc, Erich Elsen, Tom Schaul, and Karen Simonyan. Non-differentiable supervised learning with evolution strategies and hybrid methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03139*, 2019.
- Manuel Lozano, Daniel Molina, C. Garcı, et al. Iterated greedy for the maximum diversity problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 214(1):31–38, 2011.

- Rafael Martí, Micael Gallego, and Abraham Duarte. A branch and bound algorithm for the maximum diversity problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 200(1):36–44, 2010.
- Rafael Martí, Micael Gallego, Abraham Duarte, and Eduardo G. Pardo. Heuristics and metaheuristics for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 19: 591–615, 2013.
- Rajesh Matai, Surya Prakash Singh, and Murari Lal Mittal. Traveling salesman problem: an overview of applications, formulations, and solution approaches. *Traveling salesman problem, theory and applications*, 2010.
- Nina Mazyavkina, Sergey Sviridov, Sergei Ivanov, and Evgeny Burnaev. Reinforcement learning for combinatorial optimization: A survey. *Computers & Operations Research*, 134:105400, 2021.
- Simon McGregor. Neural network processing for multiset data. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 460–470. Springer, 2007.
- Simon McGregor. Further results in multiset processing with neural networks. *Neural networks*, 21(6):830–837, 2008.
- Matthias Meger. JSoko - website of the open source Sokoban game JSoko, 2023. Accessed: 2023-10-19.
- Luke Metz, C. Daniel Freeman, Samuel S. Schoenholz, and Tal Kachman. Gradients are not all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05803*, 2021.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharshan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 2015.
- Ryan L. Murphy, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Vinayak Rao, and Bruno Ribeiro. Janossy pooling: Learning deep permutation-invariant functions for variable-size inputs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01900*, 2018.
- Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17, 2017.
- Allen Newell and George Ernst. The search for generality. In *Proc. IFIP Congress*, volume 65, pages 17–24, 1965.
- Christian Nilsson. Heuristics for the traveling salesman problem. *Linköping University*, 2003.
- Nils J. Nilsson. Problem-solving methods in. *Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 1971.
- Junhyuk Oh, Satinder Singh, and Honglak Lee. Value prediction network. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- Christos H. Papadimitriou. The euclidean travelling salesman problem is np-complete. *Theoretical computer science*, 4(3):237–244, 1977.
- Ruizhong Qiu, Zhiqing Sun, and Yiming Yang. DIMES: A differentiable meta solver for combinatorial optimization problems. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 35:25531–25546, 2022.
- Sébastien Racanière, Théophane Weber, David Reichert, Lars Buesing, Arthur Guez, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Oriol Vinyals, Nicolas Heess, Yujia Li, et al. Imagination-augmented agents for deep reinforcement learning. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- Ingo Rechenberg. Evolutionsstrategien. In *Simulationsmethoden in der medizin und biologie*, pages 83–114. Springer, 1978.
- Ingo Rechenberg and Manfred Eigen. *Evolutionsstrategie: optimierung technischer systeme nach prinzipien der biologischen evolution*. Frommann-Holzboog Stuttgart, 1973.
- John R. Rice. The algorithm selection problem. In *Advances in computers*, volume 15, pages 65–118. Elsevier, 1976.
- Tim Salimans, Jonathan Ho, Xi Chen, Szymon Sidor, and Ilya Sutskever. Evolution strategies as a scalable alternative to reinforcement learning, 2017.
- Tuomas Sandholm. Very-large-scale generalized combinatorial multi-attribute auctions. In Nir Vulkan, Alvin E. Roth, and Zvika Neeman, editors, *The Handbook of Market Design*, chapter 16, pages 379–412. Oxford University Press, September 2013.
- Alexander Schrijver et al. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.
- Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Thomas Hubert, Karen Simonyan, Laurent Sifre, Simon Schmitt, Arthur Guez, Edward Lockhart, Demis Hassabis, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, and David Silver. Mastering atari, Go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature*, 2020.
- Hans-Paul Schwefel. *Numerische optimierung von computer-modellen mittels der evolutionsstrategie*. Birkhäuser Basel, 1977.
- Ohad Shamir. An optimal algorithm for bandit and zero-order convex optimization with two-point feedback. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18, 2017.

- D. Shmoys. Computing near-optimal solutions to combinatorial optimization problems. Technical report, Cornell University Operations Research and Industrial Engineering, 1994.
- Yaron Shoham and Jonathan Schaeffer. The fess algorithm: A feature based approach to single-agent search. In *IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2020.
- Geiza C. Silva, Marcos R.Q. De Andrade, Luiz S. Ochi, Simone L. Martins, and Alexandre Plastino. New heuristics for the maximum diversity problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 13:315–336, 2007.
- David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, Sander Dieleman, Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 2016.
- David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, Yutian Chen, Timothy Lillicrap, Fan Hui, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 2017a.
- David Silver, Hado van Hasselt, Matteo Hessel, Tom Schaul, Arthur Guez, Tim Harley, Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, David Reichert, Neil Rabinowitz, Andre Barreto, and Thomas Degris. The predictron: end-to-end learning and planning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017b.
- David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, Karen Simonyan, and Demis Hassabis. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science*, 2018.
- Maciej Świechowski, Konrad Godlewski, Bartosz Sawicki, and Jacek Mańdziuk. Monte Carlo tree search: a review of recent modifications and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 2023.
- Aviv Tamar, YI WU, Garrett Thomas, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. Value iteration networks. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2016.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017.
- Edward Wagstaff, Fabian B. Fuchs, Martin Engelcke, Michael A Osborne, and Ingmar Posner. Universal approximation of functions on sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(151):1–56, 2022.
- Daan Wierstra, Tom Schaul, Tobias Glasmachers, Yi Sun, Jan Peters, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Natural evolution strategies. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2014.
- Ronald J. Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 1992.
- Qinghua Wu and Jin-Kao Hao. A hybrid metaheuristic method for the maximum diversity problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 231(2):452–464, 2013.
- Xuxi Yang, Werner Duvaud, and Peng Wei. Continuous control for searching and planning with a learned model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07430*, 2020.
- Sun Yi, Daan Wierstra, Tom Schaul, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Stochastic search using the natural gradient. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2009.
- Manzil Zaheer, Satwik Kottur, Siamak Ravanbakhsh, Barnabas Poczos, Russ R. Salakhutdinov, and Alexander J. Smola. Deep sets. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017.
- Juntang Zhuang, Tommy Tang, Yifan Ding, Sekhar C. Tatikonda, Nicha Dvornek, Xenophon Papademetris, and James Duncan. Adabelief optimizer: Adapting step-sizes by the belief in observed gradients. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33: 18795–18806, 2020.

A Additional related research

Value Iteration Network (VIN) [Tamar et al., 2016] is a fully differentiable network with a planning module embedded within. It can learn to plan and predict outcomes that involve planning-based reasoning, such as policies for reinforcement learning. It uses a differentiable approximation of the value-iteration algorithm, which can be represented as a convolutional network, and is trained end-to-end using standard backpropagation.

Predictron [Silver et al., 2017b] consists of a fully abstract model, represented by a Markov reward process, that can be rolled forward multiple “imagined” planning steps. Each forward pass accumulates internal rewards and values over multiple planning depths. The model is trained end-to-end so as to make these accumulated values accurately approximate the true value function.

Value Prediction Network (VPN) [Oh et al., 2017] integrates model-free and model-based RL methods into a single network. In contrast to previous model-based methods, it learns a dynamics model with abstract states that is trained to make action-conditional predictions of future returns rather than future observations. VIN performs value iteration over the entire state space, which requires that 1) the state space is small and representable as a vector with each dimension corresponding to a separate state and 2) the states have a topology with local transition dynamics (such as a 2D grid). VPN does not have these limitations. VPN is trained to make its predicted values, rewards, and discounts match up with those of the real environment [Oh et al., 2017, §3.3].

Imagination-Augmented Agent (IAA) [Racanière et al., 2017] augments a model-free agent with imagination by using environment models to simulate imagined trajectories, which are provided as additional context to a policy network. An environment model is any recurrent architecture which can be trained in an unsupervised fashion from agent trajectories. Given a past state and current action, the environment model predicts the next state and observation. The imagined trajectory is initialized with the current observation and rolled out multiple time steps into the future by feeding simulated observations.

MCTSnet [Guez et al., 2018b] incorporates simulation-based search inside a neural network, by expanding, evaluating and backing-up a vector embedding. The parameters of the network are trained end-to-end using gradient-based optimisation. When applied to small searches in the well-known planning problem Sokoban, it outperforms dprior MCTS baselines.

TreeQN [Farquhar et al., 2018] is an end-to-end differentiable architecture that substitutes value function networks in discrete-action domains. Instead of directly estimating the state-action value from the current encoded state, as in *Deep Q-Networks (DQN)* [Mnih et al., 2015], it uses a learned dynamics model to perform planning up to some fixed-depth. The result is a recursive, tree-structured network between the encoded state and the predicted state-action values at the leaves. The authors also propose ATreeC, an actor-critic variant that augments TreeQN with a softmax layer to form a stochastic policy network. Unlike MCTS-based methods, the shape of the planning tree is fixed, and the agent cannot “focus” on more promising subtrees to expand during planning.

Yang et al. [2020] proposed Continuous MuZero, an extension of MuZero to continuous actions, and showed that it outperforms the *soft actor-critic (SAC)* algorithm. Hubert et al. [2021] proposed Sampled MuZero, an extension of the MuZero algorithm that is able to learn in domains with arbitrarily complex action spaces (including ones that are continuous and high-dimensional) by planning over sampled actions.

Stochastic MuZero [Antonoglou et al., 2022] extended MuZero to environments that are inherently stochastic, par-

tially observed, or so large and complex that they appear stochastic to a finite agent. It learns a stochastic model incorporating after-states following an action, and uses this model to perform a stochastic tree search. It matches the performance of MuZero in Go while matching or exceeding the state of the art in a set of canonical single and multi-agent environments, including 2048 and backgammon.

Machine learning for tuning integer programming and combinatorial optimization techniques

Another, different, form of learning in search techniques is tuning *integer programming (IP)* and *combinatorial optimization (CO)* [Schrijver et al., 2003] techniques. The idea of automated algorithm tuning goes back at least to Rice [1976]. It has been applied in industrial practice at least since 2001, when Sandholm [2013] started using machine learning to learn IP algorithm configurations (related to branching, cutting plane generation, *etc.*) and IP formulations based on problem instance features, in the context of combinatorial auction winner determination in large-scale sourcing auctions. In 2007, the leading commercial general-purpose IP solvers started shipping with such automated configuration tools.

IP solvers typically use a tree search algorithm called branch-and-cut. However, such solvers typically come with a variety of tunable parameters that are challenging to tune by hand. Research has demonstrated the power of using a data-driven approach to automatically optimize these parameters.

Similarly, real-world applications that can be formulated as CO problems often have recurring patterns or structure that can be exploited by heuristics. The design of good heuristics or approximation algorithms for NP-hard CO problems often requires significant specialized knowledge and trial-and-error, which can be a challenging and tedious process.

The rest of this section reviews some of the newer work on automated algorithm configuration in IP and CO.

Khalil et al. [2017] sought to automate the CO tuning process using a combination of reinforcement learning and graph embedding. They applied their framework to a diverse range of optimization problems over graphs, learning effective algorithms for the Minimum Vertex Cover, Maximum Cut and Traveling Salesman problems.

Bengio et al. [2021] surveyed recent attempts from the machine learning and operations research communities to leverage machine learning to solve IP and CO problems. According to the authors, “Given the hard nature of these problems, state-of-the-art algorithms rely on handcrafted heuristics for making decisions that are otherwise too expensive to compute or mathematically not well defined. Thus, machine learning looks like a natural candidate to make such decisions in a more principled and optimized way.” They cite Larsen et al. [2018], who train a neural network to predict the solution of a stochastic load planning problem for which a deterministic mixed integer lin-

ear programming formulation exists. The authors state that “The nature of the application requires to output solutions in real time, which is not possible either for the stochastic version of the load planning problem or its deterministic variant when using state-of-the-art MILP solvers. Then, ML turns out to be suitable for obtaining accurate solutions with short computing times because some of the complexity is addressed offline, *i.e.*, in the learning phase, and the run-time (inference) phase is extremely quick.”

Another survey of reinforcement learning for CO can be found in Mazyavkina et al. [2021]. According to the authors, “Many traditional algorithms for solving combinatorial optimization problems involve using hand-crafted heuristics that sequentially construct a solution. Such heuristics are designed by domain experts and may often be suboptimal due to the hard nature of the problems. *Reinforcement learning (RL)* proposes a good alternative to automate the search of these heuristics by training an agent in a supervised or self-supervised manner.”

To address the scalability challenge in large-scale CO, Qiu et al. [2022] propose an approach called *Differentiable Meta Solver (DIMES)*. Unlike previous deep reinforcement learning methods, which suffer from costly autoregressive decoding or iterative refinements of discrete solutions, DIMES introduces a compact continuous space for parameterizing the underlying distribution of candidate solutions. Such a continuous space allows stable REINFORCE-based training and fine-tuning via massively parallel sampling.

Aironi et al. [2024] proposed a graph-based neural approach to linear sum assignment problems, which are well-known CO problems with applications in domains such as logistics, robotics, and telecommunications. In general, obtaining an optimal solution to such problems is computationally infeasible even in small settings, so heuristic algorithms are often used to find near-optimal solutions. Their paper investigated a general-purpose learning strategy that uses a bipartite graph to describe the problem structure and a message-passing graph neural network model to learn the correct mapping. The proposed graph-based solver, although sub-optimal, exhibited the highest scalability, compared with other state-of-the-art heuristic approaches.

Georgiev et al. [2024] note that “Solving NP-hard/complete combinatorial problems with neural networks is a challenging research area that aims to surpass classical approximate algorithms. The long-term objective is to outperform hand-designed heuristics for NP-hard/complete problems by learning to generate superior solutions solely from training data.” The authors proposed leveraging recent advancements in neural algorithmic reasoning to improve learning of CO problems.

Balcan et al. [2018, 2024] provide the first sample complexity guarantees for tree search parameter tuning, bounding the number of samples sufficient to ensure that the average performance of tree search over the samples nearly matches its future expected performance on the unknown instance distribution. Balcan et al. [2021] prove the first

guarantees for learning high-performing cut-selection policies tailored to the instance distribution at hand using samples. Balcan et al. [2022] derive sample complexity guarantees for using machine learning to determine which cutting planes to apply during branch-and-cut.