

# Letters, Colors, and Words: Constructing the Ideal Building Blocks Set.

Ricardo Esteban Salazar Ordoñez<sup>†</sup>

*Project advisor: Shahrzad Jamshidi<sup>‡</sup>*

---

**Abstract.** Define a **building blocks set** to be a collection of  $n$  cubes (each with six sides) where each side is assigned one letter and one color from a palette of  $m$  colors. We propose a novel problem of assigning letters and colors to each face so as to maximize the number of words one can spell from a chosen dataset that are either **mono words**, all letters have the same color, or **rainbow words**, all letters have unique colors. We explore this problem considering a chosen set of English words, up to six letters long, from a typical vocabulary of a US American 14 year old and explore the problem when  $n = 6$  and  $m = 6$ , with the added restriction that each color appears exactly once on the cube. The problem is intractable, as the size of the solution space makes a brute force approach computationally infeasible. Therefore we aim to solve this problem using random search, simulated annealing, two distinct tree search approaches (greedy and best-first), and a genetic algorithm. To address this, we explore a range of optimization techniques: random search, simulated annealing, two distinct tree search methods (greedy and best-first), and a genetic algorithm. Additionally, we attempted to implement a reinforcement learning approach; however, the model failed to converge to viable solutions within the problem’s constraints. Among these methods, the genetic algorithm delivered the best performance, achieving a total of 2846 mono and rainbow words.

**Keywords:** Permutations, Simulated Annealing, Tree-search, genetic-algorithm.

**1. Introduction.** Building blocks are an iconic toy designed to be employed in block play, whose learning outcomes (if employed since early ages) range from development of motor, and classification, to mathematical and problem-solving skills [7]. Our notion of a building blocks set extends this concept focusing on the integration language learning with color recognition to create a constrained problem for children: what words can you spell that are uniform in color (**mono words**) or consisting of all distinct colors (**rainbow words**). Formally, we define a **building block set** to correspond to  $n$  cubes. For each face of the cube, we assign one letter and one of color from a specified palette. In this paper, we focus on the case where  $n = 6$  and suppose our palette consists of 6 colors. In addition, we restrict the coloring so that each face of the cube has a unique color. [Figure 1](#) shows the template for one of the described cubes.

We intend to find a set of cubes that can be used as a spelling game where children aim to find as many mono and rainbow English words as they can. See [Figure 2](#) for an example of each type of word.

In [section 2](#) we reduced the original dataset to only words of up to six letters, represented our cube set as a 36-item array, and decided what letters would be repeated after we make sure that the 26 letters of the alphabet are included. In [subsection 3.1](#) we look at random search, method that after 1.3 million permutations its best solution could spell 1881 words. Consequently in [subsection 3.2](#) we implemented simulated annealing as a way to make our search more structured, which allowed us to land to a solution of 2352 words after 250 thousand iterations. In [subsection 3.3](#) we constrained the search a bit more by structuring a tree and

---

<sup>†</sup>Lake Forest College., Lake Forest, IL ([salazarordon@lakeforest.edu](mailto:salazarordon@lakeforest.edu)).

<sup>‡</sup>Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, IL ([sjamshidi@lakeforest.edu](mailto:sjamshidi@lakeforest.edu)).




Figure 1: Cube colouring template.



Figure 2: Example of Mono and Rainbow words.

first implementing a constrained greedy algorithm, which yielded a solution with a total of 2268 words. We then implemented best-first search algorithm which found a permutation that allows for 2323 words. Then tried a regular greedy algorithm, using this method, we were able to find a permutation with a rating of 2386 words. In [subsection 3.4](#) we attempted to create an RL agent that would navigate the tree structure (same set up as the previous section), however the the training never converged so we decided to move on and in [subsection 3.5](#) where we try to find a solution through a genetic algorithm which allowed us to find a permutation with a total of 2846 words.

## 2. Set up.

**2.1. Data set.** Given that we are focusing on making a puzzle toy to spell English words with children as target users. Our data set consists of words ranked by Age-of-Acquisition from zero to 14 years old. The original list of words had approximately 44 thousand words [3], between duplicates and acronyms. For example, ‘stock’ appeared 14 times to account for the different meanings. These were removed. However, since we have only six cubes, we restricted the dataset to words that are 6 characters long or less, leaving us with a total of 9624 words.

**2.2. One-dimensional representation of a cube set.** Since the orientation of the faces on the cube is unimportant, we represent a single cube as a six-element array of letters where the indices act as labels for the six colors (see Figure 3). The six block set is then represented as a 36-item array where the color label is computed using modular arithmetic. For example, the color at index 11 :=  $11 \bmod 6$  (see Figure 4). Additionally, the cube label can be computed by using the floor function. For example, the letter at index 32 belongs to the cube  $\lfloor \frac{32}{6} \rfloor$  (see Figure 4)




Figure 3: Representation of a cube in one dimension.




Figure 4: Representation of a six-block set in one dimension.

**2.3. Letter repetition.** As we want to make sure to include each letter of the English alphabet at least once, we have ten vacant spots in our cube-set. This remainder could be distributed by assigning more repetitions to the most frequent letter. That is why we calculated the each letter frequency relative to our data set. Table 1 shows the letters sorted by frequency, we decided to round the frequency to the thousandth place so that every frequency is non-zero. We use this value to calculate the percentage of the remainder (rounded) that should be allocated to a given letter, starting from the most frequent until the corresponding portion of a letter is equal to zero, then this process is repeated using an updated number of reminder spots, until all the spots had been taken, or the corresponding portion for the most frequent letter is zero, in which case we simply assign whatever number of spots are left, to it. In other words, every letter that has a relative frequency  $\geq 0.05$  gets assigned an extra repetition. Then the new number of vacant spots is 1, and we simply allocate it to letter ‘e’, thus completing the 36 letters in our six-cube set. Table 2 shows the number of repetitions for our set (the highlighted column), we also include the letter repetitions that other cube sets may have if we use the same strategy for distributing the vacant spots. Using this information we created an array of 36-letters (see Table 3) that yields a word count of 960, and we label as ‘The base permutation’, since we will use it as a starting point whenever we create a random

permutation. Figure 5 illustrates the full one-dimensional representation of a cube set that uses ‘The base permutation’.

Table 1: Letters sorted by frequency

Letter	Relative frequency
e	0.115
a	0.086
r	0.073
o	0.066
t	0.063
i	0.061
s	0.059
l	0.059
n	0.054
u	0.040
d	0.037
c	0.037
p	0.033
m	0.031
h	0.029
y	0.027
g	0.027
b	0.026
f	0.019
w	0.016
k	0.016
v	0.012
z	0.004
x	0.004
j	0.003
q	0.002

Table 2: Letter Repetitions

Letter	Number of cubes					
	6	10	15	20	25	30
e	3	6	9	12	16	20
a	2	4	6	9	13	14
r	2	3	6	8	10	12
o	2	3	5	7	9	11
t	2	3	5	7	9	11
i	2	3	5	7	9	10
s	2	3	5	7	8	10
l	2	3	5	7	8	10
n	2	3	4	6	8	9
u	1	2	4	5	6	7
d	1	2	3	5	6	7
c	1	2	3	4	6	7
p	1	2	3	4	5	6
m	1	2	3	4	5	6
h	1	2	3	4	5	5
y	1	2	3	4	4	5
g	1	2	3	4	4	5
b	1	2	3	3	4	5
f	1	2	2	3	3	4
w	1	2	2	3	3	3
k	1	2	2	1	3	3
v	1	1	2	1	2	3
z	1	1	1	1	1	2
x	1	1	1	1	1	2
j	1	1	1	1	1	2
q	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 3: Base permutation

E	E	E	A	A	R	R	O	O	T	T	I	I	S	S	L	L	N	N	U	D	C	P	M	H	Y	G	B	F	W	K	V	Z	X	J	Q
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

## CONSTRUCTING THE IDEAL BUILDING BLOCKS SET

---

Index	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	...	30	31	32	33	34	35
letter	E	E	E	A	A	A	R	R	O	O	T	T	...	K	V	Z	X	J	Q
color	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5	...	0	1	2	3	4	5

**Cube 0**                      **Cube 1**                      **Cube 5**

Figure 5: Base cube set.

**2.4. Search space.** Given that our cube-set includes one letter repeated three times, and eight other repeated twice, the number of possible permutations is a follows:

$$\frac{P_{36}^{36}}{3!(2!)^8} = 2.42183155 * 10^{38}$$

It takes approximately 1.07 seconds to count how many words a specific configuration can spell, so an exhaustive search will take about  $6 * 10^{30}$  years. The problem is, therefore, intractable.

### 3. Search algorithms.

**3.1. Random Search.** To establish a baseline for comparison, we implemented a random search by shuffling the base permutation. We produced a total of 1.3 million random permutations and kept track of three maximization targets: mono words, rainbow words, and the sum of both. [Table 4](#) shows the results of the search showing the sum of mono and rainbow as ‘word count’. In [Appendix B](#) you can see the 10 best permutations found for each maximization target.

Table 4: Results from Random search

Maximization target	Word count
Mono	1569
Rainbow	1813
Sum	1881

**3.2. Simulated Annealing.** When thinking about algorithms that leverage the power of randomness, simulated annealing usually comes to mind. This search requires us to treat our problem as a graph, where we decide whether or not to move from one state to another (randomly chosen) neighbouring state if it’s better than the current or based on a probability. Since the algorithm attempts to emulate a process of metallurgy, that probability is in function of a sense of high energy or ‘temperature’ that will decrease slowly as time passes. So, the algorithm will initially be more likely to visit a state that performs worse than the current, during early stages in comparison to later stages. This is the way in which simulated annealing deals with the balance between exploration and exploitation [2]. In our case, a neighbour will be the result of swapping two items chosen at random. We ran this algorithm for 250 thousand iterations, with an initial ‘temperature’ of 1000 and a cooling rate or 0.999. And the results are seen in [Table 5](#).

Table 5: Results from simulated annealing

Maximization target	Word count
Mono	1497
Rainbow	2243
Sum	2352

**3.3. N-ary tree search algorithms.** In the interest of conducting a controlled exploration of the search space, we can create a uniform N-ary tree, where, every child node is the result of making a small modification in the parent. We found it suitable to make a 180-ary tree, so that the current node (parent) is connected to all unique face-swaps within a cube, for every cube ( $6\binom{6}{2}$ ) along with all unique face-swaps for the letters of the same color, for every color ( $6\binom{6}{2}$ ). For illustrative purposes, [Figure 6](#) shows an example of the fifteen unique element swaps within a cube, and [Figure 7](#) shows an example of the fifteen unique swaps within a color.

Although this method of creating child permutations allows for cyclic references and redundant states—due to some trivial swaps and the fact that some changes can be quickly reverted in just two generations—by keeping track of all visited permutations and excluding them as possible parents, we end up with a tree structure that constrains the search space enough to make greedy-like approaches computationally manageable, while simultaneously ensuring that any permutation in the search space is still theoretically reachable (see [Appendix A](#)).

It is important to note that because we explore this 180-ary tree using three greedy algorithms, we will only be able to find local maxima near the starting point. So, our success in finding a satisfactory result hinges on the selection of a diverse set of roots. We decided that we will test each case with three different roots: ‘Base’ permutation, a random permutation (as seen in [Table 6](#)) generated using a seed = 2000 which we label ‘Seed2K’ and yields a word count of 1550, and, a third permutation, sourced from the results of [subsection 3.1](#) (E.g when maximizing mono, the root used will be the best permutation found through random search when we maximized mono words).




Figure 6: Example of swaps within a cube.



Figure 7: Example of swaps within a given color.

Table 6: Seed2K permutation

E	S	D	A	U	O	Y	G	T	J	C	R	R	L	H	B	F	E	S	I	K	V	E	I	T	Q	N	X	W	M	L	A	Z	P	N	O
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



**3.3.1. Constrained greedy search.** This algorithm will choose the parent of the next level by selecting a permutation that ranks equal or better than its precursor, if such a permutation exists, otherwise it will stop the search. Because of this constrain the last permutation to become a parent before the search stops, will be the best solution. We executed this algorithm with a budget of 130 thousand unique permutations per tree, and the results are shown in [Table 7](#).

Table 7: Results from Greedy Algorithm

Target	Root	Word count	Found at
Mono	Base	1509	G484-P82115
	Seed2K	1546	G88-P15398
	Mono from random search	1531	G39-P6916
Rainbow	Base	2268	G25-P4444
	Seed2K	2167	G18-P3303
	Rainbow from random search	2074	G15-P2717
Sum	Base	2116	G16-P2888
	Seed2K	2199	G31-P5596
	Sum from random search	2074	G15-P2717

The column ‘Found at’ indicates us in which generation (E.g G15 is the 15th generation) and after how many unique permutations was the solution found (E.g P2717 means 2717th permutation). If we look carefully we can appreciate that several of the trees in [Table 7](#) end up rather quickly, way before reaching the 130 thousand permutations.

**3.3.2. Best-first search.** An approach that will help us make sure that we visit exactly the number of unique permutations that we want is best first search, that at every given level all of the child permutations are put into a priority queue. The parent of the next generation will simply be the permutation at the front of the queue. Because of the priority queue sorts its entries from highest to lowest word count, the next parent can come from any generation, not just from the immediate one. Different to [subsection 3.3.1](#), we need to keep track of and update the best permutation we come across. After running nine trees with a target of at least 150 thousand permutations generated, the results are as show in [Table 8](#).

Table 8: Results from Best First Search

Target	Root	Word count	Found at
Mono	Base	1949	G236-P41396
	Seed2K	1858	G335-P57992
	Mono from random search	1867	G28-P4948
Rainbow	Base	2280	G850-P148581
	Seed2K	2234	G744-P130448
	Rainbow from random search	2258	G603-P106256
Sum	Base	2296	G671-P117117
	Seed2K	2328	G839-P146807
	Sum from random search	2323	G483-P8494

**3.3.3. Greedy search.** Thinking about how quickly [subsection 3.3.1](#) would come to halt after a couple of generations, we decided to relaxed its constrains allowing the algorithm to run for as many iterations as specified. So, this algorithm will select the parent of the next generation by selecting the best child permutation in a generation even if such a candidate is not equal or better than its precursor. We will need to keep track of and update the best permutation we come across. We ran this set up for 130 thousand permutations. The results are listed in [Table 9](#).

Table 9: Results Greedy algorithm

Target	Root	Word count	Found at
Mono	Base	1509	G484-P82115
	Seed2K	1546	G88-P15398
	Mono from random search	1531	G39-P6916
Rainbow	Base	2386	G652-P114941
	Seed2K	2325	G593-P104536
	Rainbow from random search	2310	G513-P90969
Sum	Base	2286	G439-P77233
	Seed2K	2360	G277-P48954
	Sum from random search	2331	G666-P117592

[Table 10](#) will help us compare the results from the three algorithms we tried in this sub section. As we can appreciate, the best result was obtained using the regular Greedy algorithm with the ‘Base’ permutation as root of the tree.

Table 10: Comparison for the tree algorithms

Algorithm	Root	Word count
Constrained greedy	Base	2268
Best First Search	Seed2K	2328
Greedy	Base	2386

**3.4. Reinforcement Learning.** Given that several breakthroughs and advances thought to be near impossible to be conquered by machines has been achieved by Reinforcement learning (like AlphaGo or the multiple applications on video games and robotics)[5] we thought that creating an RL agent and training it to make permutations out of our base permutation, would most likely give us good results. With the objective of making an RL model whose results can be comparable to our previous methods, we thought of an agent navigating the tree search structure described in subsection 3.3. The goal was for the agent to learn a strategy for selecting the parent of the next generation, aiming for the final state to be a high-ranking permutation. Since we won't be evaluating every child at each level, we can also describe the agent as one that builds a high-ranking permutation by making a series of valid swaps (see Figure 6 and Figure 7).

**Environment.** We used the Gymnasium API[6] by Farama Foundation to set up our Building Blocks environment. Gymnasium offers several pre-made RL environments to learn and experiment with, but also provides an interface to create custom environments.

**Observation space:** Describing the observation space whether partial or fully observable. In our case, the observation space represents a procedure made of 36 sub procedures that are mutually independent, where each sub procedure can be done in 26 different ways. So, the cardinality of a set containing all the possible observations would be equal to  $26^{36}$ . Following Gymnasium guidelines, we express this space as multi-discrete space of 36 items where every item can take up an integer between 0 to 25 ( `Gymnasium.spaces.MultiDiscrete([26,26,26,... 26])` ).

**Action space:** The 180 options from which the agent can take one at a given time step (The list of 2-item tuples that describe the Pitted swaps see image 6 and image 7). In Gymnasium it is described as a discrete space that can have a value between 0 and 179 ( `Gymnasium.spaces.Discrete(180)` ).

**Reset Function:** That is called whenever the agent is initialized, or it reaches a terminal state. In the case of our custom environment, this function sets the current observation to a random permutation. It also initializes a visited list to keep track of the unique permutations that the agent has generated.

**Step Function:** That is called at every time-step, it takes as input a valid action taken by the agent. We translate this action into a change in the current state by using the action chosen by the agent as an index of the 'swaps list' and making the swap. We also calculate

the reward and keep track of the current state in the visited list. The step function requires us to return a 4-item tuple containing an integer or decimal representing the reward, a Boolean describing whether the agent has reached a terminal state, a Boolean describing whether the agent has reached a truncated state, and a dictionary with extra information about the action taken.

As you may have noticed, we talked about rewarding the agent in the ‘step’ function call, but did not get into the details of how this was calculated. That is because there were two general ways in which we could reward: Immediate reward and delayed reward. With an immediate reward system, the agent would have more feedback on every specific action at a given state but would lack a sense of long-term benefits. And with a delayed reward, it has a sense of long term benefits but being ignorant of how good specific actions are. We examined the two different reward systems, both of which require us to set up the training/testing process in terms of episodes of  $n$  time-steps each episode. For an immediate reward system, at every time-step, the reward will be a thousandth of the difference of the current state and the initial state’s word count (which can be positive or negative), but only for those non-repeating permutations within an episode. Otherwise, the reward will be -1. With this penalty, we attempted to incentivize the agent to take actions that result in unique permutations. We also hoped to prevent loops where a change is made at time-step  $t$  and then reversed at  $t+1$ . For a delayed reward system, the agent will only be rewarded at the end of an episode. The reward will be a thousandth of the difference between the current word count and the initial word count.

*Algorithms.* When it comes to RL, StableBaselines3 [4] has one of the most documented and reliable implementations of learning algorithms for python. Out of a list of 12 RL algorithms available through StableBaselines3, we tried two algorithms that work best for discrete spaces: Proximal Policy Optimization(PPO) and Deep Q-Network (DQN), both using a ‘multi-layer perceptron policy’ (MlpPolicy).

*Training.* We trained 4 agents, one using PPO and the immediate reward, one using DQN and immediate reward, one using PPO and delayed reward, and one using DQN and delayed reward. We ran each of them for a total of 1000 episodes with an episode length of 500 time-steps.

*Evaluation.* When we want to evaluate a model trained using StableBaselines3 model, we have two options of prediction: deterministic and non-deterministic. However, for every one of the models evaluated with deterministic prediction, the agent would make a choice and then undo the change, resulting in an agent that simply oscillates between two choices and never progresses. That is why we relied on non-deterministic predictions. In Table 11 you can find the best word count found after running each model for 50 episodes, where every episode lasts 500 time-steps.

Since RL agents learn by making random choices and then creating a policy based on the experiences it is exposed to, we created a ‘random agent’ as a control case, that would make random choices at every time-step. We also ran this agent for 50 episodes, so that it could

Table 11: Comparison of Immediate and Delayed Reward Training

	PPO	DQN
Immediate reward training	1853 words	1737 words
Delayed reward training	1804 words	1725 words

give us a better sense of how our agent improved after training. The best word count found by our control agent was a total of **1832 words**. By contrast, our trained agents, showed no appreciable improvement, which tells us that it will require more training time for our agents to perform better than a random version of itself, and even more time for such agents to perform better than our previously executed methods. As a result, we abandoned this method and chose to explore genetic algorithms which are well suited to noisy problems.

**3.5. Genetic algorithm.** genetic algorithms attempt to mimic the way genetic information is passed down from parents to offspring, through natural selection[1]. And since we are attempting to maximize the permutation of a 36-item array, a genetic algorithm seems promising as a sequence of letters is analogous to a sequence of genes, therefore in our context the individuals or chromosomes are our 36-item permutations.

**3.5.1. Set up.** We will start from a specified number of random individuals, every generation after that is made up partly of elites from the previous generation, crossed, mutant and random individuals. We describe how these sub populations are generated hereafter.

*Elites.* The top number of specified individuals, that are transferred to the next generation intact.

*Crossovers.* Crossed offspring are created by combining different segments of genetic information —also known as loci— from two individuals. Although in biology the length of a locus varies, since we are working with a set of 6 cubes, it is beneficial for us to think of each cube as a locus. So, the process of crossover is a six-step process in which the corresponding locus is copied from either parent at random. See [Figure 8](#) for a visual representation. It is worth mentioning that this process of crossover will probably break the constraint that we stipulated in [subsection 2.3](#): "... to include each letter of the English alphabet at least once, ...". That is because the random choice of loci will result in the inclusion or exclusion of some letters, generating cube sets that are not a permutation of the ‘Base’ permutation. We chose to have two types of crossovers: type 1 are the result of crossing two elites, and type 2 are the result of crossing an elite and a non-elite. The parents of both types are chosen randomly.




Figure 8: Example of a crossover

*Mutations.* Mutations happen by making a carbon copy of a given individual and simply swapping 2 of its items chosen at random. We will always mutate the best  $n$  elites.

**3.5.2. Tests.** In the interest to see if a ‘good’ starting point will give a population an advantage, we created parallel scenarios for the starting point: The first scenario’s original population is completely random, but for scenario 2 and 3, three individuals are arbitrarily chosen and the rest are randomly generated.

For scenario 2, we included the ‘Base’ permutation, the ‘Seed2K’, and, the best permutation from [subsection 3.1](#). The idea was for this scenario to have poor-performing permutations. For scenario 3 we included the best permutations found by each algorithm of [subsection 3.3](#) when maximizing for the sum of rainbow and mono words.

We ran 7 iterations with different parameters as shown in [Table 12](#). The ‘Found at :’ row of each scenario tells us the generation in which a permutation with this word count was found for the first time (E.g G588 represents the 588th generation). At the beginning we tested 1000 generations per iteration, but as we see in iterations 1-3 the best results are found by the 323rd iteration (on average), so we decided to reduce the number of generations to 500.

---

**CONSTRUCTING THE IDEAL BUILDING BLOCKS SET**

---

Table 12: Arguments and results for Iterations of genetic algorithm.

	Iteration						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generations	1000	1000	1000	500	500	500	500
Elites	40	20	40	20	20	10	20
Crossed type 1	40	20	13	6	10	25	10
Crossed type 2	0	0	27	14	10	25	10
Mutated	10	30	10	40	40	20	50
Random	10	30	10	20	20	20	10
Scenario 1 best:	2717	2510	2775	2590	2726	2638	2810
Found at :	G588	G187	G987	G424	G158	G392	G367
Scenario 2 best:	2706	2349	2698	2703	2705	2703	2794
Found at :	G485	G64	G398	G320	G129	G254	G350
Scenario 3 best:	2666	2360	2846	2763	2749	2769	2778
Found at :	G77	G0	G845	G260	G82	G316	G362

The best permutation was found during iteration 3, scenario 3, with a total of 2846 words. Its corresponding permutation is ‘aoweuigycntelsdrnheieoaaamtfdprlstr’, which is missing some letters (f, j, q, v, x and z), as we were expecting. Visit [this page](#) to visualize these results

We modified the crossover function to re include letters that a crossed child loses. After making these changes we re ran the experiment, with the same parameters as before and the results are listed in [Table 13](#).

Table 13: Arguments and results for Iterations of genetic algorithm corrected.

	Iteration						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generations	1000	1000	1000	500	500	500	500
Elites	40	20	40	20	20	10	20
Crossed type 1	40	20	13	6	10	25	10
Crossed type 2	0	0	27	14	10	25	10
Mutated	10	30	10	40	40	20	50
Random	10	30	10	20	20	20	10
Scenario 1 best:	2218	2308	2302	2302	2232	2220	2245
Found at :	G991	G158	G658	G256	G151	G171	G397
Scenario 2 best:	2216	2224	2245	2203	2203	2219	2221
Found at :	G164	G123	G423	G92	G99	G61	G171
Scenario 3 best:	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Found at :	G0	G0	G0	G0	G0	G0	G0

The highest word count achieved by this ‘corrected’ experiment was 2360, but since this

occurred in every iteration of scenario 3 at generation 0, it indicates the algorithm never improved beyond an initial arbitrary individual. This would mean that the actual best word count found by the corrected version of the genetic algorithm is 2846, found in scenario 1 of iteration 2.

**4. Conclusions.** Our experimentation demonstrated several search and optimization algorithms for our six-cube set of ‘Building blocks’. Table 14 shows the results found by each algorithm when we adhere to the constrain stated in section 2 of including every letter of the English alphabet in our set, we see that the best word count was found by performing a greedy algorithm in subsection 3.3.3. See Table 14 to compare the best word counts found by each algorithm.

Table 14: Comparison of all algorithms

Algorithm	Permutation	Word count
Random search	tpndaqaeiiuocrxleyltvhoebzrfkmjwgssn	1881
Simulated annealing	oqieeyvbtpfdaeuiuojcnslnrlhskmzwt	2352
Constrained greedy	eioxauioehjanqsrprtgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	2268
Best First Search	yqoiaektdpvflnsjhrxaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	2328
Greedy	oieauieoyqaetrnjlhvktzpmnlrfgxcswb	2386
Genetic Corrected	ioiajeeauqeopgytcwhkrslxmrlzdnbytnfs	2308

However, during subsection 3.5 we also found that if we relax such constrains, we can achieve a significant improvement in contrast to the other algorithms, as we saw in Table 12. We should also bare in mind that said constraints make sense only for a set of six cubes, since the need to make sure to include every single letter of the alphabet in our set is less of an issue as we make our set larger.

With a sufficiently large set of cubes, we could potentially spell every word in our dataset. Our goal would then be to determine the smallest set of cubes that achieves this. The findings from this paper could be used to reduce our word list by eliminating the words found with our 6-cube set, enabling us to focus on maximizing coverage of the remaining words

**Appendix A. permutation proof.** We express the 6-cube building block set as a 36-entry tuple.

$$(l_0, l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots, l_{33}, l_{34}, l_{35}) \text{ where } l_i \text{ is a letter from the English alphabet}$$

$S_{36}$ , the symmetric group on 36 elements describes all possible permutations. We will describe these elements as acting on the indices rather than the elements themselves. Additionally, we refer to a ‘legal’ move as going from parent to child within the tree discussed in subsection 3.3.

We define a ‘legal move’ as a two-cycle in  $S_{36}$ ,  $(x,y)$  such that either one of the following holds: That  $i$  and  $j$  belong to the same cube as expressed in (A.1), or that  $i$  and  $j$  have the



same color, as expressed by (A.2).

$$(A.1) \quad 6n \leq x, y < 6(n+1) \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

$$(A.2) \quad |x - y| \equiv 0 \pmod{6}$$

**Lemma A.1.** *Suppose two entries in a 6-cube building block set need to be swapped. This can be done in three of fewer ‘legal moves’.*

*Proof.* Let  $i$  and  $j$  be the indices corresponding to the entry swap. If  $(i, j)$  is a legal move, we are done.

Suppose that this is not the case.

Let  $0 \leq a, b \leq 5$  where  $a \neq b$ , and let  $0 \leq m, n \leq 5$  where  $m \neq n$ .

Then,  $\exists nm$  such that

$$i = 6n + a \quad \text{and} \quad j = 6m + b$$

Consider a third index  $k = 6n + b$ , where  $k \neq i$  and  $k \neq j$ .

Since  $0 \leq n \leq 5$  and  $0 \leq b < 6$ , it follows that

$$0 \leq k \leq 6 \cdot 5 + 5 = 35$$

**Observation 1:**  $(i, k)$  is a legal move since

$$6n \leq i, k < 6(n+1)$$

**Observation 2:**  $(k, j)$  is a legal move since

$$k - j = 6n + b - 6m - b = 6(n - m) \equiv 0 \pmod{6}$$

Hence we can permute in the following way:

$$(i, k)(k, j)(i, k)$$

This product of three moves is equivalent to  $(i, j)$ .

**Theorem A.2.** *Any element in  $S_{36}$  can be represented as legal moves.*

*Sketch of proof:* Let  $\sigma \in S_{36}$ .  $\sigma$  can be decomposed into a product of only two cycles. By [Lemma A.1](#), those two cycles can be broken down into at most a product of three ‘legal moves’. Hence  $\sigma$  can be written as a product of only legal moves. Note that 36-cycle permutations can be expressed as a product of 35 two-cycles. Based on our work, a 36-cycle can be decomposed into somewhere between 35 and 105 legal moves. So, the exploration of 130 thousand legal moves, is sufficiently expressive in terms of permutations.

**Appendix B. Results of random search per maximization case.**

Table 15: Random search per maximization case

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>
Mono maximization	ovrsmgbijtefnruektsezlxiwoyahadcqpln	164	1405	1569
	qmesrezkbepdlxwlsnijgtrrhnyaoocivfua	164	1338	1502
	hsljbtifsncaeygxewoerzrlpndkmtivaq	159	1334	1493
	aynntismhzrdefskexralvwtlqiocpeugjo	158	1326	1484
	arlqymriwclnpjitghtvxsaafskeobuezdnoe	157	1379	1536
	auirdtsnxgeltkzepohqcnayrfvolbemjsiw	157	1324	1481
	edssrohnpnwlxgrlcvmaymaeikjfeiuazttob	157	1464	1621
	itowhalnzdetmkxeuejjiyasplbrgvsoqcnfr	156	1405	1561
	ayocrqsiwsolpziglxehkmtredevabtnnuef	156	1293	1449
	tojvdsnmnqixswhallecypbtakgeuorfzrni	155	1355	1510
Rainbow maximization	esvrlgoraxbwycutsiinomehjtklqepdafnz	28	1813	1841
	tpndaqaeeiuocrxleyltvhoebzrfkmjwgssn	69	1812	1881
	lwhorbnslixajtrunfecmqgpykeisdzvtaoe	57	1798	1855
	iiyaoupnxnwteargecnklmfdtoslveqjrshzb	52	1790	1842
	nrfdvphzbneolgcmytriswajulqtkeoaesxi	59	1785	1844
	nsvnlxdqtrsufekioabmgtecaourjepzwlih	68	1778	1846
	evinyrztakwiecqtumjoasehgsolfxpdrbnl	40	1778	1818
	sfnvyhbsleloekrptdcejmtwiauqorxzna	91	1775	1866
	wtkedlxlirbmncjtjpnzayohervsegaouqis	84	1773	1857
	trxfnlewlorkzoeasgbspqcdmnpjaiuyevih	57	1773	1830
Sum maximization	tpndaqaeeiuocrxleyltvhoebzrfkmjwgssn	69	1812	1881
	sfnvyhbsleloekrptdcejmtwiauqorxzna	91	1775	1866
	smgxtcvlthjndewioqkazoeaiyubfrprlns	102	1755	1857
	wtkedlxlirbmncjtjpnzayohervsegaouqis	84	1773	1857
	lwhorbnslixajtrunfecmqgpykeisdzvtaoe	57	1798	1855
	jcsfwabizdaxisutoenrgklmhyeoeqplvrnt	97	1753	1850
	wztselbgyxthoeiacunofqvrapeisjlkmdrn	80	1770	1850
	yondtsheoriabpflxveinkautgqwcemlszjr	84	1762	1846
	nsvnlxdqtrsufekioabmgtecaourjepzwlih	68	1778	1846
	nrfdvphzbneolgcmytriswajulqtkeoaesxi	59	1785	1844

Appendix C. Results of simulated annealing per maximization case.

Table 16: Simulated annealing per maximization case

	Permutation	Mono	Rainbow	Sum	Found at
Mono maximization	otmgjhwralnkredxzunaiyviiesefctbploqs	227	1268	1495	P60981
	oeakqbspduvowsiyznnaexhrermfjgtllci	226	1299	1525	P52603
	eedfkbstaxznwpecjinrmyqroailhutslovg	225	1326	1551	P52405
	eeazkbstdxfnwsecqinriyroamlhutplov	222	1368	1590	P52321
	wsilvbetdxquheegzoipmfrnaaycnsrlokt	221	1199	1420	P52131
	wsilvbeeaxquttegzhipmfrnrlycnsadoko	220	1239	1459	P52066
	rtrljcaenfqimauebkiwgxhtpoovsesdzyz	217	1207	1424	P50276
	ltrljcaenfqimauebkiwgxhtpoovsesdzyz	213	1217	1430	P50275
	etryjcaenfximaueqkirwglhtpoovnsldbzs	211	1241	1452	P50221
	klorrcbasotfymtwaqnduepjlinxsviehgez	210	1287	1497	P47092
Rainbow maximization	tkrosidtsqlawvjanuypnexocglzrefbmihe	4	2239	2243	P37893
	ykrosidtsqlawvjanutpnexocglzrefbmihe	4	2214	2218	P37840
	ykrosidtsqlatvjanuwpnexocglzrefbmihe	4	2213	2217	P37749
	wkrosidtsqlatvjanuypnexocglzrefbmihe	4	2206	2210	P37653
	gkrosadtsqlitvjanumynexocwzlzrefbpihe	5	2174	2179	P37284
	gkrosadtsqletvjanumynexocwzlzrifbpihe	5	2171	2176	P37280
	gcrosidtwqletvjanumynexokslarzfbpihe	6	2159	2165	P37074
	gcrosidtwzletvjanumynexokslarqfbpihe	6	2156	2162	P37005
	gcrosidthzletvjanumynexokslarqfbpiwe	6	2154	2160	P36980
	gcrosidtmzletvjanuhynexokslarqfbpiwe	6	2131	2137	P36971
Sum maximization	oqieeyvbtpfdaeuiuojcrnslrnlhxskmzwt	79	2273	2352	P52704
	oqieeyvbtpfdaeuiaoxcnslrnlhjskmzwt	76	2271	2347	P52444
	oqieeyvbtpfdaeuiaoxcnslrnlhjskmzwt	72	2273	2345	P52403
	oqyeeivbtpfdaeuiuojcrnslrnlhxskmzwt	96	2240	2336	P50859
	oqieeywbtpfvaeuaiuojmnrslrnlxhksczgd	73	2262	2335	P47960
	oqieeywbtpfvaeoaiuxmrlhnrlnskscjzdt	94	2234	2328	P46335
	oqieeywbtpfvaeoaiuxmrlhnrlnskscjdt	91	2231	2322	P46325
	oqieeywbtpfvaeoaiuxmrlhnrlnskjczsd	101	2214	2315	P46180
	oqieeywbtpfvaeoaiuxmrlhnrlnskdczsjt	93	2220	2313	P45908
	oqieeywbtpfvaeoaiuxmrlhnrlnskdczsjt	92	2210	2302	P45675

Appendix D. Results from N-ary tree algorithms.

Table 17: Constrained greedy algorithm with the ‘base’ permutation as root

	Permutation	Mono	Rainbow	Sum	Found at
Mono Maximization	qreaahveoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstxywncu	201	1308	1509	G484-P82115
	qreaahgeoitjlnleszidbrpxfmkstvywncu	201	1299	1500	G484-P82114
	qreaahzeoitjlnlesxidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1371	1572	G484-P82113
	qreaahjeoitoxlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1350	1551	G484-P82112
	vreaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstqywncu	201	1274	1475	G484-P82111
	greaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpqfmkstvywncu	201	1283	1484	G484-P82110
	zreaahxeoitjlnlesqidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1349	1550	G484-P82109
	jreaahxeoitqlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1345	1546	G484-P82108
	xreaahqeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1358	1559	G484-P82107
	qreaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1353	1554	G483-P81912
Rainbow Maximization	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	48	2220	2268	G25-P4444
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	49	2216	2265	G24-P4239
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	49	2211	2260	G26-P4633
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	51	2207	2258	G25-P4457
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbycsftmezlnw	51	2206	2257	G26-P4634
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrpkgtvbyctfsmezlnw	46	2206	2252	G26-P4614
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	55	2206	2261	G26-P4582
	eioxauioehjaqnsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	57	2205	2262	G23-P4207
	eioxauioehjanqsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmewlnz	50	2204	2254	G25-P4471
	eioxauioehjaqnsrldrptgdkvbyctfsmezlnw	56	2204	2260	G24-P4267
Sum Maximization	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	55	2061	2116	G16-P2888
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnncvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	71	2044	2115	G17-P3018
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	75	2039	2114	G17-P2991
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnncvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	57	2054	2111	G17-P3028
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcmbpmhygdjtxesfkr	56	2054	2110	G17-P3035
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	64	2041	2105	G17-P3065
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	63	2042	2105	G15-P2786
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnncvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	66	2038	2104	G16-P2859
	quooaaeloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdjtxesfkr	71	2033	2104	G16-P2806
	euoaaqloeitwrizslnnvcbpmhygdftxesjkr	59	2045	2104	G15-P2710

Table 18: Constrained greedy algorithm with the ‘Seed2K’ permutation as root

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	asouadttgjyrsefclbrivkieemxqwnplhzno	203	1343	1546	G88-P15398
	asouadrtgjyrsefclbeivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1265	1468	G88-P15397
	asouadstgjyreefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1287	1490	G88-P15396
	psouadetgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnalhzno	203	1256	1459	G88-P15395
	tsouadetgjyrsefclbrivkieamxqwnplhzno	203	1305	1508	G88-P15394
	rsouadetgjyrsefclbaivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1322	1525	G88-P15393
	ssouadetgjyraefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1256	1459	G88-P15392
	esouadatgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1306	1509	G88-P15391
	asouadetgjyrsefclbrikvietmxqwnplhzno	203	1336	1539	G88-P15356
	asouadetgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1324	1527	G87-P15209
Rainbow Maximization	qeikoirmtvwgrfhhblesjapeoxsntcylnzdua	50	2117	2167	G18-P3303
	xeikoirmtvwgrfhhblesjapeoqsntcylnzdua	50	2109	2159	G19-P3452
	qeikoirmtvwgrfhhblesjapeonsxtcylnzdua	42	2108	2150	G19-P3420
	qeakoirmtvwgrfhhblesjipeonsxtcylnzdua	42	2106	2148	G18-P3243
	qeakoirmtvwgrfhhblesjipeoxsntcylnzdua	50	2105	2155	G17-P3143
	qeikoirmtvwgrfhhblesjapeoxsntcylhzdua	58	2102	2160	G19-P3444
	ieikoqrmtvwgrfhhblesjapeoxsntcylnzdua	52	2100	2152	G19-P3364
	qaekoirmtvwgrfhhblesjipeoxsntcylnzdua	54	2099	2153	G18-P3188
	qeadoirmtvwgrfhhblesjipeoxsntcylnzdua	50	2099	2149	G16-P2866
	qeikoirmtvwgrfhhblesjapeocsntxylnzdua	49	2098	2147	G19-P3422
Sum Maximization	qodauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslnex	65	2134	2199	G31-P5596
	qadouesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslnex	76	2120	2196	G32-P5693
	qadouesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslxen	81	2115	2196	G31-P5516
	qokauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslnex	65	2130	2195	G32-P5807
	jodauesytcfglnpvrqiziaoatekbwmrslnex	65	2130	2195	G32-P5776
	qodauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslxen	70	2124	2194	G30-P5354
	qodauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslnex	65	2127	2192	G32-P5732
	jodauesytcfglnpvrqiziaoatekbwmrslxen	70	2121	2191	G31-P5600
	qodauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmxlksen	75	2114	2189	G31-P5589
	qodauesytcfglnpvrjiziaoatekbwmrslxen	70	2119	2189	G31-P5555

Table 19: Constrained greedy algorithm with the best permutations from random search as roots

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	omvsgrsiftjbtrkeuenezlxwiyaholdqpcn	213	1318	1531	G39-P6916
	omvsgrniftjbtrkeueiezlxsayaholdqpcn	213	1271	1484	G39-P6915
	omvsgrtiftjbirkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1238	1451	G39-P6914
	lmvsgrriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayahoodqpcn	213	1260	1473	G39-P6913
	smvsgrriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwoayaholdqpcn	213	1222	1435	G39-P6912
	nmvsgrriiftjbtrkeueoezlxsayaholdqpcn	213	1287	1500	G39-P6911
	tmvsgrriiftjborkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1299	1512	G39-P6910
	imvsgrroiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1280	1493	G39-P6909
	omvsgrriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1249	1462	G39-P6875
	omvsgrriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1251	1464	G38-P6674
Rainbow Maximization	elxrcgotavskysutbwinazemjrilqehfodnp	27	2047	2074	G15-P2717
	elxrcgotavqkysutbwinomezjrilsehfadnp	23	2047	2070	G14-P2636
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinamezjrilqehfodnp	23	2047	2070	G14-P2612
	elxrcgotavskysutbminazewjrilqehfodnp	27	2046	2073	G16-P3006
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinomezjrilqehfadnp	23	2046	2069	G13-P2417
	elxrcgotavqkysutbwinamezjrilsehfodnp	23	2043	2066	G15-P2812
	elorcgotavskysutbwinamezjrilqehfxdnp	23	2042	2065	G15-P2782
	elxzcgotavskysutbwinaremjrilqehfodnp	27	2041	2068	G16-P2969
	elxrcgotaksvysutbwinazemjrilqehfodnp	26	2041	2067	G16-P2863
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinamezqriljehfodnp	20	2040	2060	G15-P2722
Sum Maximization	elxrcgotavskysutbwinazemjrilqehfodnp	27	2047	2074	G15-P2717
	elxrcgotavqkysutbwinomezjrilsehfadnp	23	2047	2070	G14-P2636
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinamezjrilqehfodnp	23	2047	2070	G14-P2612
	elxrcgotavskysutbminazewjrilqehfodnp	27	2046	2073	G16-P3006
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinomezjrilqehfadnp	23	2046	2069	G13-P2417
	elxrcgotavqkysutbwinamezjrilsehfodnp	23	2043	2066	G15-P2812
	elorcgotavskysutbwinamezjrilqehfxdnp	23	2042	2065	G15-P2782
	elxzcgotavskysutbwinaremjrilqehfodnp	27	2041	2068	G16-P2969
	elxrcgotaksvysutbwinazemjrilqehfodnp	26	2041	2067	G16-P2863
	elxrcgotavskysutbwinamezqriljehfodnp	20	2040	2060	G15-P2722

Table 20: Best-first search with the ‘base’ permutation as root

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	tnvfdpeiqliahkxlesnsjrlrwbcgmtouzyae	225	1724	1949	G236-P41396
	tbvfdpeiqliansjleshnzrlrwkcgmtouxyae	225	1716	1941	G263-P46186
	hbvfdpeiqliankjlestnxrlrwscgmtouzyae	225	1716	1941	G260-P45625
	tbvfdpeiqlioianqleshkjrlrwscgmtouzyae	225	1716	1941	G258-P45305
	tkvfdpeiqlioiahnxlesnszrlrwbcgmtouqyae	225	1716	1941	G250-P43936
	tkvgdpeiqlioiahnjmsnsxrlrwbcfetouzyae	225	1716	1941	G248-P43611
	tkvgdpeuqlioiahnjfesnsxrlrwbcclmtouzyae	225	1716	1941	G242-P42524
	tkvgdpeiqlioiahnqfesnsjrlrwbcclmtouzyae	225	1716	1941	G241-P42361
	tkvgdpeiqlioiahnxlesnsjrlrwbcfntouqyae	225	1716	1941	G240-P42188
	tnvfdpeiqlioiahkjgesnsxrlrwbcclmtouzyae	225	1716	1941	G238-P41838
Rainbow Maximization	aioeqaluecrwnyszltpfbtnvdojsrmxeighk	54	2226	2280	G850-P148581
	aioeqaluecrwdoszltpfbtnvnyjsrmxeighk	54	2207	2261	G858-P150024
	aioeqaluezrwnyscltpfbtnvdojsrmxeighk	54	2205	2259	G851-P148833
	aioeqaluecrwtyszlnpfbtnvdojsrmxeighk	54	2204	2258	G851-P148728
	aioeqawuecrmnyszltpfbtnvlojsrdxeighk	59	2202	2261	G855-P149418
	aioexaluecrwnyszltpfbtnvdojsrmheigqk	54	2202	2256	G852-P149023
	aioeqaluezrwnyscltpfbtnvdojsrmheigxk	54	2202	2256	G852-P149009
	aioeqaluecrwnyszltpfbtnvmojsrdheigxk	55	2201	2256	G850-P148595
	aioeqawuecrwnyszltvfbtvplojsrdmeighk	53	2201	2254	G854-P149270
	aioeqaduecrwnyszltpfbtnvlojsrmheigxk	54	2200	2254	G852-P148966
Sum Maximization	eioaqaiuewtxhzmnrfejsjdcpokgvtbysrnl	71	2225	2296	G671-P117117
	qioaeaiuewtzlyxmnrbesfcdpokgvtbjnsrnl	66	2204	2270	G825-P143881
	eioaaqiuewtzhylmnrbesfcdpokgvtbjnsrnl	78	2192	2270	G820-P143053
	aioaeqiuewtxbylsnrfejsdpokgvtbznmrl	60	2210	2270	G790-P137990
	qioaeaiuewtxbylmnrfejsdpokgvtbznsrnl	69	2201	2270	G790-P137851
	eioaaxiuewtjhzmnrqesfcdpokgvtbysrnl	70	2200	2270	G780-P136263
	aioaqeiuewtjhzlsnrfesxdepovgktbysnmrl	62	2208	2270	G767-P133896
	aioajeiuewtqhyilmnrfesxdepokgvtbznsrnl	57	2213	2270	G756-P132025
	eioaaqiuewtjhylmnrxesfcdpokgvtbznsrnl	74	2196	2270	G749-P130799
	eioaaqiuewtjhzlsnrfesxdepovgktbysnmrl	81	2189	2270	G746-P130223

Table 21: Best-first search with the ‘seed2K’ permutation as root

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	aezoaupfvnmbsrzwlnei qeyortjcdstlkhigh	222	1636	1858	G335-P57992
	aezoaupfvnmbsrzhlnei jeiortxcdgtlk wys	222	1636	1858	G327-P56698
	aezoaupfvnmbsrjclnei qeyortxwdstlkhigh	222	1636	1858	G321-P55631
	aezoaupfvcmbsrznnei jeyortxwdstlkhigh	222	1636	1858	G320-P55475
	aeqoiupfvhmbbsrjclnei zeaortxndstlkwyg	222	1636	1858	G317-P54941
	aeqoiupfvwmbsrzclgei jeaortxndstlkhy n	222	1636	1858	G315-P54644
	aezoaupfvhybsrznnei qeiortjcdstlkwm g	222	1636	1858	G297-P51584
	aezoaupfvnmbsrxhlnei qeiortjcdstlkwy g	222	1636	1858	G296-P51398
	eezoaupfvhmbbsrxnlnei qeiortjcdstlkwy g	222	1636	1858	G296-P51355
	aejoaupfvhmbbsrzclnei qeiortxndstlkwy g	222	1636	1858	G289-P50219
Rainbow Maximization	zeokuirmbvtnrxdllhsfagwoncetqyljipea	34	2200	2234	G744-P130448
	ziukoelbhvtmrsxdlnsfagwoncetyqrjipea	65	2170	2235	G795-P139326
	zeupoilbhvtmrsndlxsjageoncetqyrfikwa	43	2170	2213	G772-P135431
	zeokuirmbvtxrsndllhsfagwoncetqyljipea	42	2170	2212	G760-P133221
	zeokuilmbvtnrxdllhsfagwonyetcqrjipea	38	2170	2208	G753-P132053
	zeokuirsmvtbrnqdlhljageoncetxysfipwa	36	2170	2206	G850-P148975
	zeokuilmbvntnrsqdlhsfagwoncetxyrjipea	36	2170	2206	G827-P145004
	zeopuilmbvtnrshdlxsfakeoncetqyrjigwa	35	2170	2205	G765-P134191
	zeokuilmbvtnrsgdlhsgafwoncetxyrjipea	34	2170	2204	G829-P145313
	zeokuilmbvtnrxdllhsjagwoncetqyrfipea	34	2170	2204	G746-P130875
Sum Maximization	yqoiaekt dpvfnsjhrxaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	104	2224	2328	G839-P146807
	xqoiaekt dpvfhsrnjiaeouytegbwcrmlnzs	110	2207	2317	G845-P147867
	xqoiaedtkpvfnsjhryaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	90	2227	2317	G842-P147388
	xqoiaedtkpvfnsjhryaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	96	2220	2316	G852-P149164
	yqoiaext dpvfnsjhrxaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	104	2212	2316	G838-P146628
	yqoiaedtkpvfnrshjxaeouitegbwcrmnzls	89	2226	2315	G857-P150038
	xqoiaekt dpvfnsnhryaeouitegbwcrmljzs	104	2211	2315	G849-P148683
	eqoiaykt dpvfhsjnrxaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	103	2212	2315	G841-P147157
	yxqoiaedtkpvfnrshjxaeouitegbwcrmlnzs	98	2216	2314	G854-P149466
	geoiaykt dpvfnsrhjiaeouetxgbwcrmlnzs	110	2204	2314	G846-P148174



Table 22: Best-first search with the best permutations from random search as roots

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	wkvpdgeyjseonmxrltsfceblioqaaunlztrn	217	1650	1867	G28-P4948
	hfvpdgeyjteoskxrltwmceblioqaaunlzsrn	217	1650	1867	G297-P50568
	nmvdpdteyxseoskzrlnwfcebgoiqaaunljtri	217	1650	1867	G235-P40262
	hfjpdgemzseoskvrltwyceblioqaaunlxtrn	217	1650	1867	G233-P39913
	hkxtdgeyjpeosmvrllwfceblioqaaunlzsrn	217	1650	1867	G226-P38689
	hfvpdgeyxteoskzrltwmceblioqaaunljsrn	217	1650	1867	G224-P38337
	hkvpdieyxseowmzrltsfcebgoiqaaunljtrn	217	1650	1867	G221-P37848
	hkvpdgeyjseonmzrlnsfceblioqaaunlxtrt	217	1650	1867	G204-P35027
	hkjpdieyzseonmvrlltsfcebgoiqaaunlxtrn	217	1650	1867	G202-P34639
	hfvpdtektzlosmxregwyceblioqaaunljsrn	217	1650	1867	G185-P31815
Rainbow Maximization	lnhrvmodatpkiyoeecisbgasuzfwxrqlnt	42	2216	2258	G603-P106256
	lnzrptotadvkixoyeeecisbgasujfwqrhlnt	31	2197	2228	G845-P148320
	lnzrvtotadfkkiyoeecisbgasuxpwqrhlnt	33	2196	2229	G836-P146854
	lnhrvtodatpkixoyeeecisbgasujfwqrzlnm	32	2196	2228	G775-P136275
	lnhrvmodztpkixoyeeecisbgasujfwqralnt	32	2196	2228	G761-P133682
	lnhrvtodztpkijoseeciybgasuxfwqralnt	32	2196	2228	G757-P133087
	lnhrvmodztpkijoyeeecisbgasuxfwqralnt	32	2196	2228	G754-P132454
	lnhrnmodatfkqyoeecisbgasuxvwirzlpnt	31	2196	2227	G780-P137079
	lnhrfmodatpkqyoeecisbgasuxvwirzlnnt	31	2196	2227	G762-P133919
	lnhrvmosatfkkiyoeecisbgaduxpwqrzlnnt	31	2196	2227	G750-P131821
Sum Maximization	dpbvwtioeuacgytexrnzhiljsnlorsfmkae	89	2234	2323	G483-P84941
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhjnlxsnlqrsfmkae	95	2205	2300	G854-P149887
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhfnxlqsnlorsjmkae	94	2197	2291	G851-P149505
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhfnqlxsnlorsjmkae	91	2199	2290	G847-P148802
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhfnolxsnlqrsjmkae	75	2215	2290	G845-P148405
	dpbvwtioeqacgmtezhxnuljsnlorsyfkae	78	2212	2290	G822-P144360
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhfnolqsnljrsxmkae	79	2211	2290	G818-P143646
	dpbvwtioeuacgytezhfnqljsnlorsxkmae	80	2210	2290	G816-P143318
	dpbvwtioeuacgzteyrfhnljsnlorsxmkae	100	2190	2290	G811-P142401
	vpbdwtioeuacgytezhfnqljsnlorsxmkae	97	2193	2290	G811-P142363

Table 23: Greedy algorithm with the ‘base’ permutation as root

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	qreaahveoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstxywncu	201	1308	1509	G484-P82115
	qreaahgeoitjlnleszidbrpxfmkstvywncu	201	1299	1500	G484-P82114
	qreaahzeoitjlnlesxidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1371	1572	G484-P82113
	qreaahjeitoxlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1350	1551	G484-P82112
	vreaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstqywncu	201	1274	1475	G484-P82111
	greaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpqfmkstvywncu	201	1283	1484	G484-P82110
	zreaahxeoitjlnlesqidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1349	1550	G484-P82109
	jreaahxeoitqlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1345	1546	G484-P82108
	xreaahqeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1358	1559	G484-P82107
	qreaahxeoitjlnleszidbrpgfmkstvywncu	201	1353	1554	G483-P81912
Rainbow Maximization	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhvktzdpmslnrfgxcswb	69	2317	2386	G652-P114941
	qaeoiueiyeoabhslxrdgvktfncmswnljtrz	82	2315	2397	G380-P67131
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhkztdvpmslnrfgxcswb	63	2314	2377	G650-P114550
	qaeoiueiyeoabhslxrdgvktfncmswnljtrz	76	2314	2390	G381-P67261
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhvktzdpmslnrbgxcswf	69	2313	2382	G653-P115247
	qaeoiueijeoabhslxrdgvktfncmswnlytrz	82	2312	2394	G379-P66870
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhvktzdpmslnrfgxcswb	64	2310	2374	G651-P114769
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhkztdvpmslnrfgxcswb	65	2310	2375	G651-P114762
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhvktzplsmnrfgxcswb	74	2309	2383	G653-P115129
	oieaueioyqaetrnjlhkztdvplsmnrfgxcswb	67	2309	2376	G652-P114954
Sum Maximization	euiaoaheojkxswcfgmneqdtlbiypvtrzsrln	56	2230	2286	G439-P77233
	auiaaoexoevkhmwcfgslejdtntiypzbnqsrln	54	2225	2279	G711-P125136
	auiaoevoexkhfwcmgsdejltntpiytzbrqsnlr	54	2225	2279	G608-P106934
	euiaoaheofkxswcjmneqdtlbiypvtrzsrln	56	2222	2278	G440-P77528
	auieoahoenklswcrgxbefqpndiytmjzsltr	60	2216	2276	G190-P33634
	auiaoevoexkhmwcfgslejdtntiypzbnqsrln	55	2220	2275	G712-P125192
	auiaoevoefkhmwcvgslejdtntiypzbnqsrln	54	2221	2275	G710-P124855
	auiaoefoezkhvwcmsdejltntpiytxbrqsnlr	54	2221	2275	G656-P115438
	auiaoefoexkhvwcmsdejltntpiytzbrqsnlr	54	2221	2275	G609-P107185
	auiaoevoexkhfwcmgsdejltntpiytzbrqsnlr	55	2220	2275	G607-P106774

Table 24: Greedy algorithm with the ‘Seed2K’ permutation as root

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	asouadttgjyrsefclbrivkieamxqwnplhzno	203	1343	1546	G88-P15398
	asouadrtgjyrsefclbeivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1265	1468	G88-P15397
	asouadstgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1287	1490	G88-P15396
	psouadetgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnalhzno	203	1256	1459	G88-P15395
	tsouadetgjyrsefclbrivkieamxqwnplhzno	203	1305	1508	G88-P15394
	rsouadetgjyrsefclbaivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1322	1525	G88-P15393
	ssouadetgjyraefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1256	1459	G88-P15392
	esouadatgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1306	1509	G88-P15391
	asouadetgjyrsefclbrikvietmxqwnplhzno	203	1336	1539	G88-P15356
	asouadetgjyrsefclbrivkietmxqwnplhzno	203	1324	1527	G87-P15209
Rainbow Maximization	svogcelzutwardahsjxtiyenpebfqrlkno	6	2319	2325	G593-P104536
	svogcelzutwardahsqxtiyenpebfjrlkno	6	2317	2323	G592-P104197
	sxogcezvtwardahsjltiyenpebfqrlkno	6	2314	2320	G602-P106107
	svogcexzutwardahsjltiyenpebfqrlkno	6	2314	2320	G594-P104636
	sxogcezvtwardahsqliiyenpebfjrlkno	6	2313	2319	G601-P105865
	svogcexzutwardahsqliiyenpebfqrlkno	6	2313	2319	G593-P104460
	svogcelzutwardahsjxtikmenpebfqrlkno	6	2312	2318	G594-P104686
	szogcexvtwardahsjltiyenpebfqrlkno	6	2311	2317	G595-P104819
	svogcelzutwardahsqxtikmenpebfjrlkno	6	2311	2317	G593-P104510
	szogcezvtwardahsqliiyenpebfjrlkno	6	2310	2316	G596-P105061
Sum Maximization	wozeuakycgtelsdjhiihoaamqmbfpvtrnslxr	94	2266	2360	G277-P48954
	wozeuakycgtelsdjhqieoaimbfpvtrnslxr	106	2253	2359	G278-P49112
	wozeuakycgtelsdjhqieoaimbtpvfrnslxr	94	2262	2356	G280-P49482
	wozeuagkycgtelsdqnhjioaimtfpvbrlnslxr	94	2261	2355	G315-P55633
	koyeuawczgtelsdjhnoieoaimbtpvfrnslxr	90	2265	2355	G285-P50347
	wozeuakycgtelsdjhiihoaamqmbtpvfrnslxr	85	2270	2355	G281-P49638
	zoweuakycgtelsdjhiihoaamqmtfpvbrnslxr	91	2264	2355	G277-P48889
	wozeuakycgtelsdjhiihoaamqmtfpvbrnslxr	88	2266	2354	G276-P48798
	kozeuawycgtelsdjhiihoaamqmtfpvbrnslxr	88	2265	2353	G275-P48585
	wozeuakycgtelsdqnhjioaimbtpvfrnslxr	93	2259	2352	G289-P51082

Table 25: Greedy algorithm with the best permutations from random search

	<b>Permutation</b>	<b>Mono</b>	<b>Rainbow</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Found at</b>
Mono Maximization	omvsgrsiftjbtrkeuenezlxwiyaholdqpcn	213	1318	1531	G39-P6916
	omvsgrniftjbtrkeueiezlxsayaholdqpcn	213	1271	1484	G39-P6915
	omvsgrtiftjbirkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1238	1451	G39-P6914
	lmvsgriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayahoodqpcn	213	1260	1473	G39-P6913
	smvsgriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwoayaholdqpcn	213	1222	1435	G39-P6912
	nmvsgriiftjbtrkeueoezlxsayaholdqpcn	213	1287	1500	G39-P6911
	tmvsgriiftjborkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1299	1512	G39-P6910
	imvsgroiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1280	1493	G39-P6909
	omvsgriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1249	1462	G39-P6875
	omvsgriiftjbtrkeuenezlxwsayaholdqpcn	213	1251	1464	G38-P6674
Rainbow Maximization	afuwvkjlernhqnostdesicytemagpxorizbl	5	2305	2310	G513-P90969
	anuwvkjlernhqfastdesicytemogpxorizbl	5	2303	2308	G509-P90286
	anuwvkjlernhqfastdemicytesogpxorizbl	5	2302	2307	G508-P90138
	afuwvkqlernhjnostdesicytemagpxorizbl	5	2301	2306	G512-P90802
	anuwvkqlernhjfastdesicytemogpxorizbl	5	2298	2303	G510-P90441
	anuwvkqlernhjfastdemicytesogpxorizbl	5	2298	2303	G509-P90265
	anuwvklernhqjostdesicytemagpforizbl	9	2296	2305	G524-P92906
	anuwvkjlernhqnostdesicytefagpxorizbl	5	2295	2300	G514-P91155
	anuwvkjlernhqfastdesicytemagpxorizbl	5	2295	2300	G510-P90474
	anuwvkjlernhqfastdemigytesocpxorizbl	5	2295	2300	G507-P89949
Sum Maximization	rlsmxniaoieuibptvfhnlkoryzdteceqjgas	73	2258	2331	G666-P117592
	rlsmxniaoieufptvwbhnlkoryzdteceqjgas	77	2252	2329	G667-P117800
	rlsmzniaoieuibptvfhnlkorydteceqjgas	72	2252	2324	G606-P107054
	rlsmzniaoieuibptvfhnlkoryxdteceqjgas	70	2253	2323	G605-P106851
	rlsmzniaoieufptvwbhnlkoryxdteceqjgas	74	2249	2323	G604-P106707
	nrsmzlaioeuiptvwbhnlkordcjteyqsxgae	64	2259	2323	G506-P89471
	rlsmxniaoieuibptvfhnlkoryqdteceqjgas	73	2249	2322	G667-P117884
	rlsmxniaoieuibptvfhnlkoryjdteceqzgas	70	2252	2322	G649-P114620
	nrsmzlaioeuiptvwbhnlkordcxtteyqsjgae	64	2258	2322	G507-P89720
	nrsmzlaioeuiptvwbhnlkordjcdteyqsxgae	64	2258	2322	505-P89312

**Acknowledgments.** I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Shahrzad Jamshidi for all the support she has given me during my time at Lake Forest College, especially in this project.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. BEASLEY, D. R. BULL, AND R. R. MARTIN, *An overview of genetic algorithms: Part 1, fundamentals*, University computing, 15 (1993), pp. 56–69.
- [2] D. BERTSIMAS AND J. TSITSIKLIS, *Simulated annealing*, Statistical Science, 8 (1993), pp. 10–15.
- [3] M. BRYSSBAERT AND A. BIEMILLER, *Test-based age-of-acquisition norms for 44 thousand english word meanings*, Behavior Research, 49 (2017), pp. 1520–1523, <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0811-4>.
- [4] A. RAFFIN, A. HILL, A. GLEAVE, A. KANERVISTO, M. ERNESTUS, AND N. DORMANN, *Stable-baselines3: Reliable reinforcement learning implementations*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 22 (2021), pp. 1–8, <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-1364.html>.
- [5] R. SUTTON AND A. BARTO, *Reinforcement Learning, second edition: An Introduction*, Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning series, MIT Press, 2018, <https://books.google.com/books?id=5s-MEAAAQBAJ>.
- [6] M. TOWERS, A. KWIATKOWSKI, J. TERRY, J. U. BALIS, G. DE COLA, T. DELEU, M. GOULÃO, A. KALLINTERIS, M. KRIMMEL, A. KG, ET AL., *Gymnasium: A standard interface for reinforcement learning environments*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17032, (2024).
- [7] N. C. YUSNITA, *The effectiveness of puzzle games in stimulating problem solving ability in early childhood*, Jurnal Scientia, 12 (2023), pp. 788–793.