

Parallel Distributed Approaches to Combinatorial Optimization: Benchmark Studies on Traveling Salesman Problem

Carsten Peterson

*Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Lund,
Sölvegatan 14A, S-22362 Lund, Sweden*

We present and summarize the results from 50-, 100-, and 200-city TSP benchmarks presented at the 1989 Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) postconference workshop using neural network, elastic net, genetic algorithm, and simulated annealing approaches. These results are also compared with a state-of-the-art hybrid approach consisting of greedy solutions, exhaustive search, and simulated annealing.

1 Background

Using neural networks to find approximate solutions to difficult optimization problems is a very attractive prospect. In the original paper (Hopfield and Tank 1985) 10- and 30-city traveling salesman problems (TSP) were studied with very good results for the $N = 10$ case. For $N = 30$ the authors report on difficulties in finding optimal parameters. In Wilson and Pawley (1988) further studies of the Tank-Hopfield approach were made with respect to refinements and extension to larger problem sizes. Wilson and Pawley (1988) find the results discouraging. These and other similar findings have created a negative opinion about the entire concept of using neural network algorithms for optimization problems in the community.

Recently a novel scheme for mapping optimization problems onto neural networks was developed (Peterson and Söderberg 1989a). The key new ingredient in this method is the reduction of solution space by one dimension by using multistate neurons [Potts spin (Wu 1983)], thereby avoiding the destructive redundancy that plagues the approach of the original work by Tank and Hopfield (1985). The idea of using Potts glass for optimization problems was first introduced by Kanter and Sompolinsky (1987). This encoding was also employed by Van den Bout and Miller (1988). Very encouraging results were found when exploring this technique numerically (Peterson and Söderberg 1989a).

An alternative approach to solve TSP in brain-style computing was developed by Durbin and Willshaw (1987) and Durbin et al. (1989), where

a feature map algorithm is used. Basically, an elastic "rubber band" is allowed to expand to touch all cities. The dynamic variables are the coordinates on the band, which vary with a gradient descent prescription on a cleverly chosen energy function. It has recently been demonstrated that there is a strong correspondence between this elastic net algorithm and the Potts approach (Simic 1990; Yuille 1990; Peterson and Söderberg 1989b).

Parallel to these developments *genetic algorithms* have been developed for solving these kind of problems (Holland 1975; Mühlenbein et al. 1988) with extremely high quality results.

Given the above mentioned scepticism toward the neural network approach and the relatively unknown success of the genetic approach we found it worthwhile to test these three different parallel distributed approaches on a common set of problems and compare the results with "standard" simulated annealing. The simulations of the different algorithms were done completely independently at different geographic locations and presented at the 1989 NIPS postconference workshop (Keystone, Colorado). To further increase the value of this minireport we have also included comparisons with a hybrid approach consisting of greedy solutions, exhaustive search, and simulated annealing (Kirkpatrick and Toulouse 1985).

The testbeds consisted of 50-, 100-, and 200-city TSP with randomly chosen city coordinates within a unit square. All approaches used an identical set of such city coordinates. The reason for choosing TSP is its wide acceptance as a NP-complete benchmark problem. The problem sizes were selected to be large enough to challenge the algorithms and at the same time feasible with limited CPU availability. Since the neural network approaches are known to have a harder time with random (due to the mean field theory averaging involved) than structured problems (Peterson and Anderson 1988) we chose the former.

2 The Algorithms

Before comparing and discussing the results we briefly list the key ingredients and parameter choices for each of the algorithms.

2.1 The Potts Neural Network (Peterson and Söderberg 1989a). This algorithm is based on an energy function similar to the one used in the original work by Tank and Hopfield (1985).

$$E = \sum_{ij} D_{ij} \sum_a S_{ia} S_{j(a+1)} - \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_i \sum_a S_{ia}^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_a (\sum_i S_{ia})^2 \quad (2.1)$$

In equation 2.1 the first term minimizes the tour length (D_{ij} is the inter-city distance matrix), and the second and third terms ensure that each

city is visited exactly once. A major novel property is that the condition

$$\sum_a S_{ia} = 1 \quad (2.2)$$

is always satisfied; the dynamics is confined to a hyperplane rather than a hypercube. Consequently the corresponding mean field equations read

$$V_{ia} = \frac{e^{U_{ia}}}{\sum_b e^{U_{ib}}} \quad (2.3)$$

where $V_{ia} = \langle S_{ia} \rangle_T$ and the local fields U_{ia} are given by

$$U_{ia} = -\frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial E}{\partial V_{ia}} \quad (2.4)$$

The mean field equations (equation 2.3) are minimizing the free energy ($F = E - TS$) corresponding to E in equation 2.1. A crucial parameter when solving equations 2.3 and 2.4 is the temperature T . It should be chosen in the vicinity of the critical temperature T_c . In Peterson and Söderberg (1989a) is a method for estimating T_c in advance by estimating the eigenvalue distribution of the linearized version of equation 2.3. This turns out to be very important for obtaining good solutions.

For the details of annealing schedule, choice of α, β etc. used in this benchmark study we refer to the "black box" prescription in Peterson and Söderberg (1989a, Sect. 7).

2.2 The Elastic Net (Durbin and Willshaw 1987). This approach is more geometric. It is a mapping from a plane to a circle such that each city on the plane is mapped onto a point on the circle (path). The N city coordinates are denoted \mathbf{x}_i . Points on the path are denoted \mathbf{y}_a , where $a = 1, \dots, M$. Note that M can in principle be larger than N . The algorithm works as follows:

Start with a small radius circle containing the M \mathbf{y}_a coordinates with an origin slightly displaced from the center of gravity for the N cities. Let the \mathbf{y} coordinates be the dynamic variables and change them such that the energy

$$E = -\alpha K \sum_i^N \log \sum_a^M e^{|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_a|^2 / 2K^2} + \beta \sum_a^M |\mathbf{y}_{a+1} - \mathbf{y}_a|^2 \quad (2.5)$$

is minimized. Gradient descent on equation 2.5 causes the initial circle to expand in order to minimize the distances between \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{x} coordinates in the first term of equation 2.5 at the same time as the total length is minimized by the second term. Good numerical results were obtained with this method with $M > N$ (Durbin and Willshaw 1987). The parameter K in equation 2.5 has the role of a temperature and as in the case of the neural network approach above a critical value K_0 can be computed

N	M	α	β	K_0	N_{iter}
50	125	0.2	2.0	0.29	300
100	250	0.2	2.0	0.26	300
200	500	0.2	4.0	0.27	182

Table 1: Parameters Used for the Elastic Net Algorithm. The parameters α and β are chosen to satisfy conditions for valid tours (Durbin et al. 1989).

from a linear expansion (Durbin et al. 1989). The values of the parameters used in this benchmark (Durbin and Yuille, private communication) can be found in Table 1.

This algorithm is closely related to the Potts neural network (Simic 1990; Yuille 1990; Peterson and Söderberg 1989b). Loosely speaking this connection goes as follows. Since the mean field variables V_{ia} are probabilities (cf. equation 2.2) the average distances between tour positions $d_{ab} = |y_a - y_b|$ and average distances between cities and tour positions $\tilde{d}_{ia} = |x_i - y_a|$ can be expressed in terms of the distance matrix D_{ij} . The second term in equation 2.5 can then be identified with the tour length term in equation 2.1 if the metric is chosen to be D_{ij}^2 rather than D_{ij} . The first term in equation 2.5 corresponds to the entropy of the Potts system (equation 2.1); gradient descent on equation 2.5 corresponds to minimizing the free energy of the Potts system, which is exactly what the MFT equations are doing.

There is a difference between the two approaches, which has consequences on the simulation level. Each decision element S_{ia} in the Potts neural network approach consists of two binary variables, which in the mean field theory treatment becomes two analog variables; N cities require N^2 analog variables. In the elastic net case N cities only require $2M(M > N)$ analog variables; it is a more economical way of representing the problem.

2.3 The Genetic Algorithm (Mühlenbein et al. 1988; Gorges-Schleuter 1989). For details we refer the reader to Mühlenbein et al. (1988) and Gorges-Schleuter (1989). Here we briefly list the main steps and the parameters used.

1. Give the problem to M individuals.
2. Let each individual compute a local minimum (2-quick¹).
3. Let each individual choose a partner for mating. In contrast to earlier genetic algorithms (Holland 1975) global ranking of all indi-

¹This is the 2-opt of Lin (1965) with no checkout.

N	M	D	$r_1 : r_2 : \dots : r_D$	$[c_1, c_2]$	m	N_{gen}
50	64	8	0.25:0.20:0.15:0.10:0.10:0.10:0.05	$[N/4, N/2]$	0.01	30
100						23
200						562

Table 2: Parameters Used for the Genetic Algorithm. The choice of $M = 64$ was motivated by the available 64 T800 transputer configuration of Mühlenbein (private communication).

1. $T_0 = 10$; $L_0 = N$.
2. Until variance of cost function < 0.05 , update according to
 $T = T/0.8$; $L = N$ (heating up).
3. While percentage of accepted moves $> 50\%$, update according to
 $T = 0.95 \times T$; $L = N$ (cooling).
4. Until number of uphill moves $= 0$, update according to
 $T = 0.95 \times T$; $L = 16N$ (slow cooling).

Figure 1: Annealing schedule.

viduals is not used. Rather, local neighborhoods of size $D - 1$ were used in which the selection is done with weights (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_D) . The global best gets weight r_1 and the remaining local neighbors get r_2, \dots, r_D , respectively.

4. Crossover and mutation. A random string of "genes" is copied from the parent to the offspring. The string size is randomly chosen in the interval $[c_1, c_2]$. Mutation rate $= m$.
5. If not converged return to point 2.

The parameters used for the benchmarks (Mühlenbein, private communication) are shown in Table 2.

2.4 Simulated Annealing (Kirkpatrick et al. 1983). The parameters of this algorithm are the initial temperature T_0 , and the annealing schedule, which determines the next value of T and the length of time L spent at each T . The annealing schedule used is very generous (see Fig. 1) and is

based on a requirement that the temperature be high enough such that the variance of the energy is less than T :

$$(\langle E^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle^2) / T \ll 1 \quad (2.6)$$

2.5 A Hybrid Approach² (Kirkpatrick and Toulouse 1985). The above parallel distributed and simulated annealing approaches are clean in the sense that each of them relies on a single algorithm with no optimization of initial states etc. It would not be surprising that if one wants to push the quality to the limits a hybrid approach would be most rewarding. Indeed this turns out to be the case for a combination of greedy, simulated annealing and exhaustive search approaches (Kirkpatrick and Toulouse 1985). The procedure is as follows:

1. A greedy tour is obtained by starting at city #1, then proceeding to the nearest remaining city, then the nearest remaining city, and so on until all cities have been visited once.
2. Simulated annealing, using two-bond and restricted three-bond rearrangements as "moves," is used to equilibrate the tours at a temperature chosen to yield approximately the same length as found by the greedy step 1. Subsequent annealing lowers the temperature to shrink the tours until accepted moves are scarce.
3. Exhaustive search is performed on the result of step 2, using two-bond rearrangements until no more improvements are found, then restricted three-bond rearrangements. If a three-bond improvement is found, the exhaustive search resumes with two-bond moves, halting when no improvements are found using either type of move.

3 Results

In Table 3 we compare the averaged performance of the neural network (5 trials), elastic net (1 trial), genetic algorithm (1 trial), simulated annealing (5 trials), and hybrid (5 trials) algorithms. For comparison we have also included the results from random distributions based on 1000 trials. Results of the greedy solutions (step 1 in the hybrid approach) are approximately equal to the figures reported for NN and SA in Table 3.

4 Summary and Comments

The overall performance of the three different parallel distributed approaches is impressive.

²The author is responsible for denoting this method "hybrid."

	N	NN	EN	GA	SA	HA	RD
	50	6.61	5.62	5.58	6.80		26.95
	100	8.58	7.69	7.43	8.68	7.48	52.57
	200	12.66	11.14	10.49	12.79	10.53	106.42

Table 3: Performance Averages (Tour Lengths) of the Neural Network (NN), Elastic Net (EN), Genetic Algorithm (GA), Simulated Annealing (SA), Hybrid Approach (HA), and Random Distribution (RD).

	No. of operations	No. of iterations	Total
NN	$\sim N^3$	Const.	$\sim N^3$
EN	$\sim N$	Const.	$\sim N^2$
GA	$\sim MN$	$\sim N (?)$	$\sim MN^2 (?)$
HA			$\sim N^2$

Table 4: Time Consumption for the Different Algorithms When Executed Serially.

- They are all better or equal to “standard” simulated annealing. These methods are here to stay! The genetic algorithm is the winner closely followed by the hybrid approach of Kirkpatrick and Toulouse (1985) and Kirkpatrick (private communication) and the elastic net method.
- Even though the neural network approach does not fully match the performance of the other two the results invalidate the common saying: “Neural networks optimization algorithms do not work for $N > 30$ problems.” This algorithm has also been tested on larger problem sizes (C. Peterson, unpublished) than presented in this report with no sign of quality deterioration.³
- It is somewhat surprising that the performance of the neural network algorithm is of less quality than that of the elastic net given the close connection discussed above. We believe this is due to the fact that the former is more sensitive to the position of T_c . Indeed, subsequent modifications of the annealing procedure and choice of T_c (C. Peterson, unpublished) have lead to better results.³ Also, the performance of the NN algorithm can be substantially improved

³In order to strictly adhere to the NIPS presentations we did not include these extensions and improvements in this report.

when starting out from a greedy solution, heating the system up and letting it relax with the MFT equations.³

- Another important issue is computing time. It splits up into two parts: number of operations (in serial execution) per iteration for a given problem size N and the number of iterations needed for convergence. In Table 4 we compare these numbers for the different algorithms. The convergence times in this table are all empirical. The numbers in Table 4 have limited value since the real strength in the distributed parallel approaches is their inherent parallelism.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Richard Durbin, Alan Yuille, Heinz Mühlenbein, and Scott Kirkpatrick for providing simulation results from the elastic net (Durbin and Yuille), genetic algorithm (Mühlenbein), and a hybrid approach (Kirkpatrick) for these comparisons. Also the stimulating atmosphere provided by the organizers of the 1989 NIPS postconference workshop is very much appreciated.

References

- Durbin, R., and Willshaw, G. 1987. An analogue approach to the travelling salesman problem using an elastic net method. *Nature (London)* **326**, 689.
- Durbin, R., Szeliski, R., and Yuille, A. 1989. An analysis of the elastic net approach to the traveling salesman problem. *Neural Comp.* **1**, 348.
- Gorges-Schleuter, M. 1989. ASPARAGOS — An asynchronous parallel genetic optimization strategy. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, D. Schaffer, ed., p. 422. Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo.
- Holland, J. H. 1975. *Adaption in Natural and Adaptive Systems*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Hopfield, J. J., and Tank, D. W. 1985. Neural computation of decisions in optimization problems. *Biol. Cybernet.* **52**, 141.
- Kanter, I., and Sompolinsky, H. 1987. Graph optimization problems and the Potts glass. *J. Phys. A* **20**, L673.
- Kirkpatrick, S., and Toulouse, G. 1985. Configuration space analysis of the travelling salesman problem. *J. Phys.* **46**, 1277.
- Kirkpatrick, S., Gelatt, C. D., and Vecchi, M. P. 1983. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science* **220**, 671.
- Lin, S. 1965. Computer solutions of the traveling salesman problem. *Bell Syst. Techn. J.* **44**, 2245.
- Mühlenbein, H., Gorges-Schleuter, M., and Krämer, O. 1988. Evolution algorithms in combinatorial optimization. *Parallel Comp.* **7**, 65.
- Peterson, C., and Anderson, J. R. 1988. Applicability of mean field theory neural network methods to graph partitioning. Tech. Rep. MCC-ACA-ST-064-88.

- Peterson, C., and Söderberg, B. 1989a. A new method for mapping optimization problems onto neural networks. *Int. J. Neural Syst.* 1, 3.
- Peterson, C., and Söderberg, B. 1989b. The elastic net as a mean field theory neural network. Tech. Rep. LU TP 80-18.
- Simic, P. D. 1990. Statistical mechanics as the underlying theory of "elastic" and "neural" optimizations, Tech. Reps. CALT-68-1556 and C3P-787. *Network: Comp. in Neural Syst.* (in press).
- Van den Bout, D. E., and Miller, T. K., III. 1988. A traveling salesman objective function that works. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks*, p. 299.
- Wilson, G. V., and Pawley, G. S. 1988. On the stability of the travelling salesman problem algorithm of Hopfield and Tank. *Biol. Cybernet.* 58, 63.
- Wu, F. Y. 1983. The Potts model. *Rev. Modern Phys.* 54, 235.
- Yuille, A. 1990. Generalized deformable models, statistical physics, and matching problems. *Neural Comp.* 2, 1-24.

Received 1 February 90; accepted 22 May 90.

This article has been cited by:

1. Joshua D. Summers, Claudia Eckert, Ashok K. Goel. 2017. Function in engineering: Benchmarking representations and models. *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing* 31:4, 401-412. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Alberto Pliego Marugán, Fausto Pedro García Márquez, Benjamin Lev. 2017. Optimal decision-making via binary decision diagrams for investments under a risky environment. *International Journal of Production Research* 55:18, 5271-5286. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Thomas Hanne, Rolf Dornberger. Transportation Problems 43-71. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Friederike Wall. 2016. Organizational dynamics in adaptive distributed search processes: effects on performance and the role of complexity. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering* 17:4, 283-295. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Fausto Pedro García Márquez, Isidro Peña García Pardo, Marta Ramos M. Nieto. 2015. Competitiveness based on logistic management: a real case study. *Annals of Operations Research* 233:1, 157-169. [[Crossref](#)]
6. B. F. Kostenko, J. Pribiš, M. Z. Yuriev. 2009. Quantum elastic net and the traveling salesman problem. *Physics of Particles and Nuclei Letters* 6:7, 599-604. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Mircea Ancău. 2009. The processing time optimization of printed circuit board. *Circuit World* 35:3, 21-28. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Mircea Ancău. 2008. The optimization of printed circuit board manufacturing by improving the drilling process productivity. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 55:2, 279-294. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Wen Dong Zhang, Yan Ping Bai, Hong Ping Hu. 2006. The incorporation of an efficient initialization method and parameter adaptation using self-organizing maps to solve the TSP. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 172:1, 603-623. [[Crossref](#)]
10. E.M Cochrane, J.E Beasley. 2003. The co-adaptive neural network approach to the Euclidean Travelling Salesman Problem. *Neural Networks* 16:10, 1499-1525. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Zong-Ben Xu, Hui-Dong Jin, Kwong-Sak Leung, Yee Leung, Chak-Kuen Wong. 2002. An automata network for performing combinatorial optimization. *Neurocomputing* 47:1-4, 59-83. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Shin Ishii, Masa-aki Sato. 2002. Doubly constrained network for combinatorial optimization. *Neurocomputing* 43:1-4, 239-257. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Sandra Duni Ekşioğlu, Panos M. Pardalos, Mauricio G. C. Resende. Parallel Metaheuristics for Combinatorial Optimization 179-206. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Martin Lagerholm, Carsten Peterson, Bo Söderberg. 2000. Airline crew scheduling using Potts mean field techniques. *European Journal of Operational Research* 120:1, 81-96. [[Crossref](#)]
15. D. T. Pham, D. Karaboga. Introduction 1-50. [[Crossref](#)]

16. Kazuhiro Tsuchiya, Yoshiyasu Takefuji, Ken-ichi Kurotani. 1999. A neural network parallel algorithm for one-dimensional gate assignment problems. *Electrical Engineering in Japan* **129**:2, 71-77. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Kazuhiro Tsuchiya, Yoshiyasu Takefuji, Ken-ichi Kurotani. 1999. A neural network parallel algorithm for one-dimensional gate assignment problems. *Electrical Engineering in Japan* **129**:2, 71-77. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Shengjiang Chang, Kwok-Wo Wong, Wenwei Zhang, Yanxin Zhang. 1999. Algorithm for optimizing bipolar interconnection weights with applications in associative memories and multitarget classification. *Applied Optics* **38**:23, 5032. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Theodore B. Trafalis, Suat Kasap. Neural Networks Approaches for Combinatorial Optimization Problems 259-293. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Eric Bonabeau, Florian Hénau. 1998. Monte Carlo Partitioning of Graphs with a Self-Organizing Map. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* **09**:07, 1107-1119. [[Crossref](#)]
21. P. Avella, S. Benati, L. Cánovas Martínez, K. Dalby, D. Di Girolamo, B. Dimitrijevic, G. Ghiani, I. Giannikos, N. Guttmann, T.H. Hultberg, J. Fliege, A. Marin, M. Munõz Márquez, M.M. Ndiaye, S. Nickel, P. Peeters, D. Pérez Brito, S. Policastro, F.A. Saldanha de Gama, P. Zidda. 1998. Some personal views on the current state and the future of locational analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* **104**:2, 269-287. [[Crossref](#)]
22. François Chapeau-Blondeau, Fabrice Janez, Jean-Louis Ferrier. 1997. A Dynamic Adaptive Relaxation Scheme Applied to the Euclidean Steiner Minimal Tree Problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **7**:4, 1037-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Shin Ishii, Masa-aki Sato. 1997. Chaotic Potts Spin Model for Combinatorial Optimization Problems. *Neural Networks* **10**:5, 941-963. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Ibrahim H. Osman, Gilbert Laporte. 1996. Metaheuristics: A bibliography. *Annals of Operations Research* **63**:5, 511-623. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Helmut E. Mausser, Michael J. Magazine. 1996. Comparison of neural and heuristic methods for a timetabling problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **93**:2, 271-287. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Shivakumar Vaithyanathan, Laura I. Burke, Michael A. Magent. 1996. Massively parallel analog tabu search using neural networks applied to simple plant location problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* **93**:2, 317-330. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Masa-aki Sato, Shin Ishii. 1996. Bifurcations in mean-field-theory annealing. *Physical Review E* **53**:5, 5153-5168. [[Crossref](#)]
28. M. Aourid, B. Kaminska. 1996. Minimization of the 0-1 linear programming problem under linear constraints by using neural networks: synthesis and analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications* **43**:5, 421. [[Crossref](#)]

29. Carsten Peterson, Ola Sommelius, Bo Söderberg. 1996. Variational approach for minimizing Lennard-Jones energies. *Physical Review E* **53**:2, 1725-1731. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Shawn Day, Andrea Basso, Paul Werbos, John Fulcher, James Austin, Soheil Shams, Kari Torkkola, Thierry Deneux, Gary Lawrence Murphy. Neural Network Applications . [[Crossref](#)]
31. Vittorio Maniezzo, Marco Dorigo, Alberto Colorni. 1995. Algodesk: An experimental comparison of eight evolutionary heuristics applied to the Quadratic Assignment Problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **81**:1, 188-204. [[Crossref](#)]
32. A.H. Gee, R.W. Prager. 1995. Limitations of neural networks for solving traveling salesman problems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **6**:1, 280-282. [[Crossref](#)]
33. P. M. Pardalos, L. Pitsoulis, T. Mavridou, M. G. C. Resende. Parallel search for combinatorial optimization: Genetic algorithms, simulated annealing, tabu search and GRASP 317-331. [[Crossref](#)]
34. P. T. W. Hudson, E. O. Postma. Choosing and using a neural net 273-287. [[Crossref](#)]
35. E. O. Postma. Optimisation networks 145-156. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Richard Blankenbecler. 1994. Deformable templates — revisited and extended — with an OOP implementation. *Computer Physics Communications* **81**:3, 318-334. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Ping Lu, M. Asif Khan. 1994. Nonsmooth trajectory optimization - An approach using continuous simulated annealing. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* **17**:4, 685-691. [[Crossref](#)]
38. A. L. Yuille, J. J. Kosowsky. 1994. Statistical Physics Algorithms That Converge. *Neural Computation* **6**:3, 341-356. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
39. Alan L. Yuille, Paul Stolorz, Joachim Utans. 1994. Statistical Physics, Mixtures of Distributions, and the EM Algorithm. *Neural Computation* **6**:2, 334-340. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
40. . Bibliography 877-970. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Harukazu Igarashi. 1994. A solution for combinatorial optimization problems using a two-layer random field model-mean-field approximation. *Systems and Computers in Japan* **25**:8, 61-71. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Reiner Kree. Neural Networks: Architectures, Learning and Performance 150-164. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Mattias Ohlsson. 1993. Extensions and explorations of the elastic arms algorithm. *Computer Physics Communications* **77**:1, 19-32. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Ibrahim M. Elfadel, Alan L. Yuille. 1993. Mean-field phase transitions and correlation functions for Gibbs random fields. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision* **3**:2, 167-186. [[Crossref](#)]

45. B. FU, P. HAJELA. 1993. THE QUADRATIC ASSIGNMENT PROBLEM USING A GENERALIZED DEFORMABLE MODEL. *Engineering Optimization* 21:1, 21-33. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Mattias Ohlsson, Carsten Peterson, Bo Söderberg. 1993. Neural Networks for Optimization Problems with Inequality Constraints: The Knapsack Problem. *Neural Computation* 5:2, 331-339. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
47. K.T. Sun, H.C. Fu. 1993. A hybrid neural network model for solving optimization problems. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 42:2, 218-227. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Arnfried Ossen. Learning Topology-Preserving Maps Using Self-Supervised Backpropagation 586-591. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Lars Gislén, Carsten Peterson, Bo Söderberg. 1992. Complex Scheduling with Potts Neural Networks. *Neural Computation* 4:6, 805-831. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
50. Lars Gislén, Carsten Peterson, Bo Söderberg. 1992. Rotor Neurons: Basic Formalism and Dynamics. *Neural Computation* 4:5, 737-745. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
51. R. DIGIROLAMO. Flight control law synthesis using neural network theory . [[Crossref](#)]
52. K. KRISHNAKUMAR. Genetic algorithms - An introduction and an overview of their capabilities . [[Crossref](#)]
53. Mattias Ohlsson, Carsten Peterson, Alan L. Yuille. 1992. Track finding with deformable templates — the elastic arms approach. *Computer Physics Communications* 71:1-2, 77-98. [[Crossref](#)]
54. K. Krishnakumar, David E. Goldberg. 1992. Control system optimization using genetic algorithms. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* 15:3, 735-740. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Xin Yao. 1992. Finding approximate solutions to NP-hard problems by neural networks is hard. *Information Processing Letters* 41:2, 93-98. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Carsten Peterson. 1992. Neural networks as classifiers in subatomic physics. *Nuclear Physics News* 2:1, 14-18. [[Crossref](#)]
57. B. Roysam, A.K. Bhattacharjya. 1992. Hierarchically structured unit-simplex transformations for parallel distributed optimization problems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* 3:1, 108-114. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Heinz Mühlenbein. PARALLEL GENETIC ALGORITHMS IN COMBINATORIAL OPTIMIZATION 441-453. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Carsten Peterson. Pattern Recognition in High Energy Physics with Neural Networks 149-163. [[Crossref](#)]
60. H. Mühlenbein. Parallel Genetic Algorithms in Optimization 2-15. [[Crossref](#)]

61. J. Ghosh, A. Hukkoo, A. Varma. 1991. Neural networks for fast arbitration and switching noise reduction in large crossbars. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* 38:8, 895-904. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Xin YAO. On Finding Approximate Solutions to Hard Problems by Neural Networks 1219-1222. [[Crossref](#)]
63. CARSTEN PETERSON. 1991. Mean Field Theory Neural Networks for Feature Recognition, Content Addressable Memory and Optimization. *Connection Science* 3:1, 3-33. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Mohamed A. El-Sharkawi, Robert J. Marks, Siri Weerasooriya. Neural Networks and Their Application to Power Engineering 359-461. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Jiann-Ming Wu, Cheng-Yuan Liou. Incorporating elastic ring into Potts neural network 1553-1556. [[Crossref](#)]
66. M.W. Dixon, G.R. Cole, M.I. Bellgard. Using the Hopfield model with mean field annealing to solve the routing problem in packet-switched communication networks 2966-2970. [[Crossref](#)]
67. M.W. Dixon, G.R. Cole, M.I. Bellgard. Using the Hopfield neural network with mean field annealing to solve the shortest path problem in a communication network 2652-2657. [[Crossref](#)]
68. M.C.S. Boeres, L.A.V. de Carvalho, V.C. Barbosa. A faster elastic-net algorithm for the traveling salesman problem 215-220. [[Crossref](#)]
69. M.W. Dixon, G.R. Cole, M.I. Bellgard. A neural network shortest path algorithm for routing in packet-switched communication networks 1602-1606. [[Crossref](#)]
70. K. Urahama, H. Nishiyuki. Neural algorithms for placement problems 2421-2424. [[Crossref](#)]
71. R. Lister. Annealing networks and fractal landscapes 257-262. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Chi-Hwa Song, Kyunghye Lee, Won Don Lee. Extended simulated annealing for augmented TSP and multi-salesmen TSP 2340-2343. [[Crossref](#)]
73. L. Hérault. Neural Networks without Training for Optimization 443-490. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Bo Söderberg. Optimization with neural networks 243-256. [[Crossref](#)]