
MC-NEST – ENHANCING MATHEMATICAL REASONING IN LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS WITH A MONTE CARLO NASH EQUILIBRIUM SELF-REFINE TREE

Gollam Rabby
L3S Research Center
Leibniz University Hannover
Hanover, Germany
gollam.rabby@l3s.de

Farhana Keya
TIB—Leibniz Information Centre
for Science and Technology, Hannover, Germany
Farhana.Keya@tib.eu

Parvez Zamil
TIB—Leibniz Information Centre
for Science and Technology, Hannover, Germany
Parvez.Zamil@tib.eu

Sören Auer
L3S Research Center
TIB—Leibniz Information Centre
for Science and Technology, Hannover, Germany
auer@tib.eu

November 26, 2024

ABSTRACT

Mathematical reasoning has proven to be a critical yet challenging task for large language models (LLMs), as they often struggle with complex multi-step problems. To address these limitations, we introduce the Monte Carlo Nash Equilibrium Self-Refine Tree (MC-NEST) algorithm, an enhancement of the Monte Carlo Tree Self-Refine (MCTSr) approach. By integrating Nash Equilibrium strategies with LLM-based self-refinement and self-evaluation processes, MC-NEST aims to improve decision-making for complex mathematical reasoning tasks. This method ensures balanced exploration and exploitation of potential solutions, leveraging Upper Confidence Bound (UCT) scores and various selection policies. Through iterative critique and refinement, MC-NEST enhances the reasoning capabilities of LLMs, particularly for problems requiring strategic decision-making. Comparative analysis reveals that GPT-4o, equipped with MC-NEST using an Importance Sampling Policy, achieved superior accuracy in domains such as Number Theory and Geometry. These results suggest that both LLMs GPT-4o and Phi-3-mini can benefit from MC-NEST, with iterative self-refinement proving especially effective in expanding the reasoning capacity and problem-solving performance of LLMs. We evaluate the effectiveness of MC-NEST on challenging Olympiad-level benchmarks, demonstrating its potential to significantly boost complex mathematical reasoning performance in LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large Language LLMs (LLMs) have made remarkable strides in natural language processing (NLP), with notable successes in problem-solving on challenging benchmarks like GSM8K [1] and MATH [2]. However, despite these advancements, the domain of complex mathematical reasoning continues to pose significant challenges, particularly in multi-step, high-level problems typical of Olympiad-style mathematics. These problems demand not only computational accuracy but also strategic decision-making and deep reasoning abilities—areas where current LLMs often underperform. This limitation reveals an essential area of improvement for LLMs in complex mathematical tasks: enabling LLMs to navigate complex reasoning pathways effectively and efficiently, maintaining high solution quality and clarity across diverse problems.

Mathematical reasoning has emerged as a pivotal challenge for LLMs, with existing approaches such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [3] [4] and Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)-based algorithms [5] [6] aiming to enhance structured reasoning without altering LLM architecture. However, these methods encounter limitations in tasks requiring multi-step, strategic decision-making [7] [8]. Recent innovations, including the Tree-of-Thought [9] and Monte Carlo Tree Self-Refine (MCTSr) frameworks [10] [11], have advanced this domain by integrating heuristic and self-refinement mechanisms. Nevertheless, challenges persist, particularly in balancing exploration and exploitation to maximize accuracy on complex mathematical problems.

To bridge this gap, we propose the **Monte Carlo Nash Equilibrium Self-Refine Tree (MC-NEST)** algorithm, an innovative approach that extends the MCTSr algorithm by incorporating Nash Equilibrium strategies with LLM-driven self-critique and refinement processes. This novel approach effectively addresses intricate mathematical problems through improved decision-making pathways, as validated by superior performance on Olympiad-level benchmarks across domains such as Number Theory and Geometry. The MC-NEST algorithm incorporates several critical improvements aimed at enhancing LLM performance in complex mathematical reasoning tasks:

- **Integration of the Nash Equilibrium for Decision-Balancing:** The Nash Equilibrium offers a principled approach to balancing the exploration and exploitation of solution paths. By integrating this strategy within the MCTSr framework, MC-NEST prevents LLMs from fixating on sub-optimal solutions and enables a more holistic exploration of the solution space. This enhancement ensures that all available options are considered fairly, providing robustness against competitive strategies in complex reasoning tasks.
- **Enhanced Exploration-Exploitation Policies:** MC-NEST incorporates diverse decision policies, such as Greedy, Importance Sampling, and Pairwise Importance Sampling, to achieve a dynamic equilibrium across different problem contexts. This setup allows the LLM to adapt flexibly and navigate the complex problem landscape more effectively than traditional approaches.
- **Iterative Self-Refinement and Evaluation:** To improve both accuracy and strategic depth, MC-NEST employs iterative cycles of self-refinement and evaluation. Through Upper Confidence Bound (UCT) scores and adaptive selection policies, the LLM iteratively critiques and refines its responses. These self-assessment cycles align LLM outputs more closely with the cognitive demands of advanced reasoning tasks.

We evaluate the performance of MC-NEST on Olympiad-level mathematics benchmarks, which provide a rigorous testing ground due to their complexity and demand for deep logical reasoning. Experimental results indicate that MC-NEST substantially improves both the accuracy and strategic quality of LLM-generated solutions, highlighting the effectiveness of integrating the Nash Equilibrium with Monte Carlo-based approaches in complex mathematical reasoning tasks.

Our contributions in this work comprise in particular:

- We introduce the Monte Carlo Nash Equilibrium Self-Refine Tree (MC-NEST), integrating Nash Equilibrium with Monte Carlo Tree Search for improved decision-making in LLMs.
- We propose a balanced exploration-exploitation framework that enhances LLM robustness and adaptability in complex problem-solving.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of MC-NEST in achieving high-quality complex mathematical reasoning solutions, especially on Olympiad-level benchmarks.

The evaluation results demonstrate that our proposed MC-NEST approach substantially enhances LLM performance in complex mathematical reasoning. Notably, GPT-4o, when paired with MC-NEST at a rollout of 16 and utilizing an Importance Sampling Policy, achieves an overall improvement of 39% in accuracy compared to other methods. This advancement highlights MC-NEST’s superior adaptability and decision-making capacity in intricate, multi-step reasoning tasks. The improvement underscores the efficacy of integrating Nash Equilibrium strategies for enhanced solution quality, particularly in structured complex mathematical domains such as Number Theory and Geometry. These findings validate MC-NEST as a powerful and innovative tool for pushing the boundaries of LLM capabilities in mathematical reasoning.

In summary, MC-NEST advances the theoretical application of Nash Equilibrium in computational reasoning while providing a practical solution for enhancing LLM performance on challenging, multi-step mathematical problems. We release all our data, benchmarks, and evaluations at <https://github.com/corei5/MC-NEST>, inviting further exploration and development in mathematical reasoning for LLMs.




Figure 1: Overview of methodology.

2 Related Work

Improving Mathematical reasoning ability of LLMs Mathematical reasoning presents substantial challenges for LLMs [12] [13] [14], emerging as a critical task for assessing their reasoning capabilities. As highlighted by various researchers, while LLMs have been pre-trained on extensive datasets containing various mathematical problems, they demonstrate proficiency in solving simple tasks but exhibit significant difficulties with more complex reasoning scenarios. This discrepancy raises questions about the LLM’s ability to generalize mathematical reasoning beyond basic problem-solving. Researchers have explored innovative prompting techniques to address these challenges, notably, the chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting algorithms proposed by Fu et al. [3] and Wei et al [4]. These methods facilitate enhanced reasoning performance by encouraging LLMs to articulate their thought processes step-by-step, thereby enabling a more structured approach to problem-solving. The effectiveness of CoT prompting fails in its capacity to improve LLM performance on reasoning tasks without necessitating alterations to the underlying LLM parameters. By promoting transparency in the reasoning process, CoT prompting not only aids in generating accurate solutions but also contributes to building trust in LLMs’ outputs. Continued advancements in this area highlight the importance of refining mathematical reasoning capabilities, paving the way for future improvements in LLM performance across various complex domains.

Monte Carlo Search Tree (MCTS) Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) has gained significant traction in the field of reinforcement learning (RL), as illustrated by the work of Świechowski et al. [15]. This algorithm has become foundational in various high-performance applications, notably in the development of AlphaGo [16] and AlphaGo Zero [17]. Both successfully leveraged MCTS in conjunction with deep reinforcement learning techniques to achieve unprecedented performance levels in complex game environments, demonstrating the power and effectiveness of tree-based search methods in strategic decision-making tasks. In the realm of LLMs, planning algorithms that utilize tree search methodologies have emerged, such as the Tree-of-Thought framework [10], Reasoning-via-Planning [18], and inference-time MCTS [5]. These approaches enhance the reasoning capabilities of LLMs by employing tree-like decoding strategies to explore possible outputs and identify the most suitable one. Recent research, including work by Pitanov et al. [6], has shown the application of MCTS in Multi-agent Path-finding, demonstrating its superiority over heuristic search algorithms like A*. Yang [19] integrated MCTS with heuristic, unsupervised, and supervised learning methods to solve the Train Timetabling Problem (TTP) efficiently, while Li et al. [20] introduced a unified framework for various types of SAT problems incorporating MCTS. Vagadia et al. [21] developed PhyPlan, a physics-informed planning framework that combines physics-informed neural networks with modified MCTS to enable robots to perform dynamic physical tasks effectively. Furthermore, recent advancements in LLMs, such as Du et al. [7] and Luo et al. [8], highlight improvements in mathematical reasoning capabilities. However, LLMs face challenges with complex problems requiring multiple reasoning steps, which can lead to logical or numerical errors. To address this, Chen et al. [22] proposed incorporating MCTS into fine-tuned LLMs, and Xu [23] utilized MCTS with a lightweight energy function to enhance precise reasoning. Zhang et al. [11] introduced the Monte Carlo Tree Self-Refine (MCTSr)




Figure 2: Several MC-NEST processing steps for the problem: Let S be a list of positive integers not necessarily distinct in which the number 68 appears. The average (arithmetic mean) of the numbers in S is 56. However, if 68 is removed, the average of the remaining numbers drops to 55. What is the largest number that can appear in S ?

algorithm, integrating LLMs with MCTS, optimizing decision-making through systematic exploration and heuristic self-refine mechanisms. This innovative approach demonstrates significant improvements in success rates across various datasets, including Olympiad-level benchmarks, paving the way for enhanced accuracy and reliability in LLM-driven applications in strategic reasoning.

3 Methods

We present an advanced Monte Carlo Tree Search-based algorithm, the Monte Carlo Nash Equilibrium Self-Refine Tree (MC-NEST), designed to enhance complex mathematical reasoning by integrating Nash Equilibrium strategies and LLM-based self-refinement techniques. MC-NEST iteratively improves solution quality by selecting optimal nodes based on Upper Confidence Bounds (UCT) enhanced with Nash Equilibrium probabilities, followed by a self-refinement mechanism driven by LLM-generated critiques of candidate solutions. Node evaluations are conducted via an LLM-based self-evaluation process, which assigns quality scores to nodes and backpropagates rewards to ensure optimal search path convergence. The procedural steps of MC-NEST are outlined in detail in Algorithm 1.

Our methodology, as illustrated in Figure 1, provides a comprehensive breakdown of each stage in the MC-NEST process: Initialization, Candidate Node Generation, Node Selection, Expansion, Backpropagation, UCT Update, Self-Evaluation, Self-Refine, and Final Node Selection. Specifically, Figure 2 illustrates MC-NEST’s algorithm to a sample problem: "Let S be a list of positive integers not necessarily distinct in which the number 68 appears. The average (arithmetic mean) of the numbers in S is 56. However, if 68 is removed, the average of the remaining numbers

Algorithm 1 MC-NEST for Complex Mathematical Reasoning

```

1: Input: Problem  $P$ , initial answer  $A_0$ , number of iterations  $N$ , LLM
2: Output: Refined Answer  $A$ 
3: Initialize the root node  $n_0$  with initial answer  $A_0$ 
4: for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
5:   Selection: Select a node  $n_i$  using UCT and Nash Equilibrium strategy
6:   Expansion: If  $n_i$  is not fully expanded, expand by adding a new child node  $n_c$ 
7:   Self-Refine:
8:     Generate critique  $C_i = \text{LLM}(\text{CritiquePrompt}(P, A_i))$ 
9:     Refine the answer  $A_{i+1} = \text{LLM}(\text{RefinePrompt}(P, A_i, C_i))$ 
10:    Add  $n_c$  with refined answer  $A_{i+1}$  to the children of  $n_i$ 
11:   Self-Evaluate:
12:     Evaluate the refined answer  $R_i = \text{LLM}(\text{EvaluatePrompt}(P, A_{i+1}))$ 
13:     if  $R_i$  exceeds reward limit then
14:       Apply penalty  $R_i = R_i - \text{penalty}$ 
15:     end if
16:   Backpropagation:
17:     Update  $Q$  values and visit counts for the parent nodes of  $n_c$ 
18:     Backpropagate the reward  $R_i$  up to the root node
19: end for
20: Return the answer  $A$  from the node with the highest  $Q$  value

```

drops to 55. What is the largest number that can appear in S ?" Additionally, an example of rollouts to further elucidate the MC-NEST processing steps is included in the Appendix "Examples" section.

3.1 Initialization

The MC-NEST algorithm's initialization process defines the search's starting point by setting up the root node. The root node can be initialized using different strategies: Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought (ZSCoT) initialization or a predefined dummy answer. The initialization strategy is critical in determining the initial exploration direction for the MC-NEST algorithm. In the ZSCoT strategy, the root node is initialized based on a pre-trained LLM's output, which generates an initial solution to the problem without any previous search history. The root node's answer is determined as follows:

$$\text{root} = \text{Node}(\text{answer} = \text{ZeroShotCoT_LLM}(p))$$

where:

- p is the problem instance provided to the LLM.
- $\text{ZeroShotCoT_LLM}(p)$ represents the LLM's output, which is generated based on the problem's context without any prior exploration.

The ZSCoT initialization is particularly useful when there is prior knowledge (in the form of an LLM) that can generate a plausible solution from the outset. This strategy serves as a strong starting point for subsequent refinements by the MC-NEST algorithm. Alternatively, the root node can be initialized with a predefined dummy answer (e.g. "I don't know."), which serves as a neutral starting point. This approach is useful in scenarios where there is no prior LLM or knowledge to rely on, and the search must start from a minimal baseline. It allows the MC-NEST algorithm to begin the search process with no assumptions about the solution.

3.2 Candidate Node Generation

In the MC-NEST algorithm, the generation of candidate nodes begins with the initialization (As detailed in Section 3.1) phase and extends through to the node selection (As detailed in Section 3.3) phase. During the initialize method, the root node is established based on the specified initialize strategy, which determines the initial answer. In the ZSCoT approach, an LLM provides an initial solution encapsulated within the root node, establishing the foundational starting point of the search tree. Alternatively, if the strategy is set to a dummy answer, the root node is initialized with a default response. Following initialization, the MC-NEST algorithm prepares for candidate generation by constructing a search tree structure, with the root node acting as the first and central node for subsequent exploration. In the node

selection phase, a breadth-first search traversal is performed, beginning at the root node and expanding through its child nodes. During this traversal, each node is evaluated for candidacy based on specific criteria outlined. This function assesses whether a node has reached its maximum allowable children or if any of its child nodes possess a quality score (Q value) higher than its own. If a node has fewer than the maximum number of children and no child exceeds its Q score, it is marked as a candidate for further expansion and refinement, ensuring that only promising nodes are prioritized in the search tree. By generating candidate nodes through the combined effects of initialization and the node selection process, the MC-NEST algorithm efficiently directs the search towards unexplored or partially explored nodes, enhancing the search tree’s breadth and depth. If no eligible candidates are found, the algorithm defaults to the root node as the primary focus for additional refinement, enabling iterative and incremental improvement of the answer quality. This systematic approach balances exploration and exploitation within the search tree, supporting the algorithm’s objective of converging toward optimal solutions.

3.3 Node Selection

The selection process in the MC-NEST algorithm identifies the next node for exploration based on a combination of Upper Confidence Bound (UCT) (As detailed in Section 3.4) scores and selection policies, further enhanced by the Nash Equilibrium strategy (As detailed in Section 3.3.1). The node selection process begins at the root node, initialized as described in the section 3.1, and considers a set of candidate nodes for expansion. The primary objective during selection is to choose a node that is not fully expanded (i.e., it still has unexplored children) and shows the most promise according to its UCT score and its alignment with the Nash Equilibrium strategy.

Let C denote the set of candidate nodes for selection. A breadth-first search is performed from the root node to gather all nodes that are not fully expanded. A node is considered fully expanded if either the number of its children meets or exceeds a predefined maximum, or at least one child node has a reward Q greater than or equal to the reward Q of the current node. The policies used in this process include:

- *Greedy*: Selects the node with the highest immediate reward.
- *Importance Sampling*: Chooses a node based on its weighted significance in contributing to the solution.
- *Pairwise Importance Sampling*: Considers pairs of nodes and selects based on their relative importance and contribution.

By leveraging these selection policies with the UCT score and the Nash Equilibrium strategy, the MC-NEST algorithm effectively balances exploration and exploitation, ensuring that the most promising nodes are selected for further refinement.

3.3.1 Nash Equilibrium Strategy for Node Selection

In the MC-NEST algorithm, node selection is enhanced by the Nash Equilibrium strategy, which complements the earlier UCT score. Given a set of possible actions or nodes $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, where each action corresponds to a node in the search tree with a uniform distribution over the actions under the Nash Equilibrium strategy. This uniform distribution ensures that each node is equally treated when no additional information or bias is available. The probability of selecting each node is defined as:

$$\pi(a_i) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where n is the total number of nodes available, and $\pi(a_i)$ is the probability assigned to action a_i . This uniform probability distribution is consistent with the Nash Equilibrium, ensuring equal likelihood for each action in scenarios where there is no inherent bias. The total probability across all actions must satisfy:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \pi(a_i) = 1$$

This condition is critical for any valid probability distribution. The uniform distribution is combined with the UCT score in the node selection process, as outlined in the previous sections. Various policies are used to determine which node to explore based on this combination.

Greedy Policy In the Greedy policy, the node with the highest combination of its UCT score and Nash Equilibrium weight is selected. The score for node i is calculated as:

$$\text{Score}(i) = UCT(i) + \pi(a_i)$$

The node with the highest score is selected:

$$i^* = \arg \max_i [\text{Score}(i)]$$

This policy ensures that the node with the highest potential reward and exploration opportunity, as determined by the UCT score and the uniform Nash Equilibrium weight, is selected for further exploration.

Importance Sampling Policy The importance sampling policy introduces a probabilistic element to the selection process. Nodes are selected based on their weighted UCT scores and Nash Equilibrium probabilities. The weight assigned to node i is given by:

$$\text{Weight}(i) = UCT(i) \times \pi(a_i)$$

The node is then selected using a weighted random selection based on these weights:

$$i^* = \text{random_choice}(C, \text{weights} = \{\text{Weight}(i)\})$$

This policy allows nodes with higher UCT scores and Nash Equilibrium weights to be selected more frequently while maintaining some randomness in the search process.

Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy In the pairwise importance sampling policy, pairs of nodes are considered, and the selection is based on the absolute difference in their UCT scores, combined with their Nash Equilibrium weights. The weight for each pair (i, j) is calculated as:

$$\text{Pair_Weight}(i, j) = |UCT(i) - UCT(j)| \times \pi(a_i) \times \pi(a_j)$$

From the selected pair, the node with the higher UCT score is chosen for further exploration:

$$i^* = \arg \max(UCT(i), UCT(j))$$

This policy emphasizes selecting nodes with significant differences in their UCT scores, promoting exploration of nodes with high potential while leveraging the Nash Equilibrium weights to maintain fairness across all nodes.

3.4 Upper Confidence Bound (UCT) Update

In the MC-NEST algorithm, the UCT is used to guide the node selection process by balancing the exploration of new nodes and the exploitation of known information. Building on the initialization of nodes and the selection process, the UCT update ensures that the search progresses efficiently by favoring nodes with high potential while still exploring less-visited nodes. The UCT value for a node i is computed as:

$$UCT(i) = Q(i) + C \sqrt{\frac{\ln(N_{\text{parent}})}{N(i) + \epsilon}}$$

where:

- $Q(i)$ is the current reward value (or quality) of node i , as established during the initialization phase or through previous refinements.
- C is the exploration constant that controls the trade-off between exploration and exploitation.
- N_{parent} is the number of visits to the parent node of i .
- $N(i)$ is the number of visits to node i .

- ϵ is a small constant to avoid division by zero.

This UCT formula encourages nodes with higher rewards to be exploited while allowing nodes with fewer visits to be explored, maintaining a balance between these two critical factors throughout the search. To synchronize the UCT update with the node selection strategy, the MC-NEST algorithm adjusts node selection by incorporating a weighting mechanism derived from the Nash Equilibrium strategy, which was introduced during the selection phase. Specifically, we update the node selection by adding uniform probability to the UCT score. The updated score for node i is:

$$\text{Score}(i) = UCT(i) + \pi(a_i)$$

where $\pi(a_i) = \frac{1}{n}$ represents the uniform distribution over n candidate nodes, resulting in:

$$\text{Score}(i) = Q(i) + C \sqrt{\frac{\ln(N_{\text{parent}})}{N(i) + \epsilon}} + \frac{1}{n}$$

This adjusted score incorporates both the exploration-exploitation trade-off from the UCT formula and the uniform weighting from the Nash Equilibrium strategy, ensuring that each node has an equal baseline probability of being explored. The node i with the highest score, $\text{Score}(i)$, is selected for further exploration or refinement, continuing the iterative process of the MC-NEST algorithm:

$$i^* = \arg \max_i [\text{Score}(i)]$$

By integrating the UCT update with the uniform Nash Equilibrium strategy, the MC-NEST algorithm ensures that the node selection process balances known rewards with the need for exploration, ensure a more robust search across all potential solutions.

3.5 Expansion

The expansion step in the MC-NEST algorithm follows the node selection process and involves generating a new child node to expand the search tree. After a node has been selected, denoted as n_s , the algorithm refines the current answer stored in n_s to create a new child node, n_c , thus continuing the exploration and refinement of potential solutions.

The expansion step can be formally represented as:

$$n_c = \text{SelfRefine}(n_s)$$

Here, $\text{SelfRefine}(n_s)$ represents the refinement process, which improves the current answer stored in the selected node n_s . This refinement is achieved by analyzing the current answer and generating a critique or suggested improvement. The refined node n_c is then added to the set of children of n_s :

$$n_s.\text{children} \leftarrow n_s.\text{children} \cup \{n_c\}$$

The self-refinement process leverages an LLM to critique the current solution and propose improvements. The process begins with the given problem instance p and the current answer a_s at node n_s . The critique is responsible for generating feedback on the current answer a_s :

$$\text{Critique}(a_s) = \text{LLMCritique}(p, a_s)$$

This critique forms the basis for improving the answer, and the refinement generates a new, improved answer a_c based on both the problem instance and the critique:

$$a_c = \text{RefineAnswer}(p, a_s, \text{Critique}(a_s))$$

The newly refined answer a_c is stored in the child node n_c , which is linked as a child of n_s . This expansion process enhances the search by iteratively improving the answers at each step, allowing the MC-NEST algorithm to explore refined solutions in a structured and systematic manner.

3.6 Backpropagation

The backpropagation step in the MC-NEST algorithm updates the quality score (Q) and the visit count of each node from the newly expanded child node back up to the root. This step ensures that the information gained from deeper explorations in the tree is propagated upwards, thereby influencing future decisions at higher levels of the search tree. After the expansion phase, let the newly created child node be denoted as n_c , and its parent node as n_p . The backpropagation process works by recursively updating the quality score and visit count of each parent node, starting from n_p and moving upward to the root of the tree. For each parent node n_p , the quality score $Q(n_p)$ is updated based on the maximum Q value among its children. The rationale behind this update is to propagate the best information from deeper nodes to higher-level nodes, ensuring that promising branches influence the exploration process. The updated quality score for a parent node n_p is given by:

$$Q(n_p) = \frac{Q(n_p) + \max(Q(n_c))}{2}$$

Here, $Q(n_p)$ is the current quality score of the parent node, and $Q(n_c)$ is the quality score of the child node n_c . This averaging mechanism ensures that the quality score of the parent node reflects not only its current performance but also the best-performing child node, thereby balancing the exploitation of known information with an exploration of new areas. In addition to updating the quality score, the visit count for each parent node is also incremented by one during backpropagation:

$$\text{Visit}(n_p) = \text{Visit}(n_p) + 1$$

This ensures that the number of visits to each parent node accurately reflects how many times it has been involved in the backpropagation process. A higher visit count signals greater confidence in the information coming from that node. The backpropagation process continues recursively from the newly expanded child node n_c , through its parent n_p , and so on, until it reaches the root node. This recursive update allows information from deep within the search tree to influence the root node's quality score and visit count, thereby affecting future node selections during the MC-NEST algorithm's search process.

By updating both the quality score and visit count during backpropagation, the MC-NEST algorithm ensures that future node selections (as discussed in sections 3.3.1 and 3.4 on UCT and Nash Equilibrium strategies) take into account the information from the most recent refinements. Nodes that lead to high-quality solutions will see their Q values increase, making them more likely to be selected in future iterations. Conversely, nodes that do not perform as well will see their influence diminish over time.

3.7 Final Node Selection

The final node selection process in the MC-NEST algorithm builds on the initialization, UCT update, and Nash Equilibrium strategy (As detailed in Section 3.1, 3.4, 3.3.1). The process begins by identifying a set of candidate nodes, denoted as C , based on predefined expansion criteria. These criteria ensure that only nodes which are not fully expanded, or that still have unexplored children, are considered for selection. For each candidate node $i \in C$, the UCT score is calculated as:

$$UCT(i) = Q(i) + C \sqrt{\frac{\ln(N_{\text{parent}})}{N(i) + \epsilon}}$$

This UCT score captures the trade-off between exploitation (reward $Q(i)$) and exploration (based on the number of visits to the node). The Nash Equilibrium strategy is then applied by combining the UCT score with the uniform probability weight $\pi(a_i)$, as described earlier:

$$\text{Score}(i) = UCT(i) + \pi(a_i)$$

The node selection is finalized based on the chosen policy, which control how the UCT score and Nash Equilibrium weight are combined:

- In the Greedy Policy, the node with the highest score, $\text{Score}(i)$, is selected:

$$i^* = \arg \max_i [\text{Score}(i)]$$

- In the Importance Sampling Policy, nodes are selected probabilistically based on their weighted UCT scores:

$$i^* = \text{random_choice}(C, \text{weights} = \{\text{Weight}(i)\})$$

- In the Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy, pairs of nodes are considered, and the node with the higher UCT score within the selected pair is chosen:

$$i^* = \arg \max(\text{UCT}(i), \text{UCT}(j))$$

Once the node i^* is selected through one of these policies, it is returned for further exploration and refinement by the MC-NEST algorithm. This node selection process ensures that the algorithm maintains a balanced search, favoring nodes with higher rewards while still exploring less-visited areas of the search tree. By combining the UCT update with the Nash Equilibrium strategy, the MC-NEST algorithm optimally navigates between exploration and exploitation during its iterative refinement process.

3.8 Self-Refine

The self-refine approach in the MC-NEST algorithm iteratively improves a candidate solution using a critique-and-refinement process based on feedback from an LLM. This method is designed to refine an answer at each node in the tree by generating critiques and then enhancing the answer based on these critiques. Let n represent the current node in the search tree, which contains a candidate answer A_n . To refine this answer, a critique is first generated using a prompt directed to the LLM. The LLM produces a critique of the current answer, identifying potential weaknesses or areas of improvement. The prompt used for generating the critique consists of the problem P and the current answer A_n , formatted as follows:

$$\text{CritiquePrompt} = (\text{"<problem>" + } P + \text{"<current_answer>" + } A_n)$$

The LLM takes this prompt and generates the critique C_n :

$$C_n = \text{LLM}(\text{CritiquePrompt})$$

Once the critique C_n is generated, it is utilized to refine the current answer A_n into a new, improved answer A_{n+1} . This is achieved through another prompt to the LLM, which incorporates the problem P , the current answer A_n , and the generated critique C_n :

$$\text{RefinePrompt} = (\text{"<problem>" + } P + \text{"<current_answer>" + } A_n + \text{"<critique>" + } C_n)$$

The LLM refines the answer, producing a more accurate or improved answer A_{n+1} :

$$A_{n+1} = \text{LLM}(\text{RefinePrompt})$$

The newly refined answer is returned and stored in a new node $n + 1$, which is added as a child of the current node n in the search tree. This process constructs a new node with a refined answer, continuously enhancing the search for optimal solutions within the MC-NEST algorithm.

3.9 Self-Evaluation

In the MC-NEST algorithm, the self-evaluate approach is responsible for assessing a candidate’s answer at a given node by assigning a reward based on how well the answer solves the problem. This reward is then utilized to update the statistics of the node, including the total reward and the visit count, ensuring that the node’s quality is improved through evaluation. Let n be a node in the search tree, where n contains a candidate answer A_n . The self-evaluation process begins with determining the quality of this answer using a reward function implemented in the evaluate answer method. The reward function assesses the answer’s quality by querying a LLM with the problem P and the answer A_n , as follows:

$$R_n = \text{LLM}(\text{EvaluatePrompt}(P, A_n))$$

Here, R_n represents the reward assigned to the answer A_n , which is an integer reflecting how well the answer addresses the problem P . This value quantifies the node’s quality. The reward assigned to a node is subject to constraints defined




Figure 3: Distribution of fields in AIME dataset for 100 Olympiad-level math problems.

by the MC-NEST algorithm. Specifically, if the reward exceeds a predefined threshold known as the reward limit, a penalty is applied to prevent excessively high rewards from disproportionately influencing the search process. The penalized reward \tilde{R}_n is computed as follows:

$$\tilde{R}_n = \begin{cases} R_n & \text{if } R_n \leq \text{reward_limit} \\ R_n - \text{excess_reward_penalty} & \text{if } R_n > \text{reward_limit} \end{cases}$$

where the reward limit is the upper bound on the reward, and the excess reward penalty is the penalty applied when the reward exceeds this limit. Once the reward \tilde{R}_n has been determined, the node's statistics are updated. These updates include adding the reward to the node's total reward and incrementing the node's visit count. Formally, for each node n , the following operations are performed:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TotalReward}_n &= \text{TotalReward}_n + \tilde{R}_n \\ \text{VisitCount}_n &= \text{VisitCount}_n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the node's reward and visit counts are updated to reflect the evaluation results, contributing to improved decision-making in the MC-NEST algorithm.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Settings

Base Prompting Techniques and LLM In our experiments we utilized zero-shot chain-of-thought prompting as our base prompting style with GPT-4o [24] and Phi-3-mini [25] LLM.

4.2 Olympiad-level Benchmarks

The efficacy of the MC-NEST algorithm was tested on the AIME dataset from mathematical Olympiad competitions. For our experiment, we used 100 math problems from the "AIME Problem Set: 1983-1990" dataset [26], part of a larger collection spanning 1983-2024. This dataset, curated from the American Invitational Mathematics Examination (AIME), challenged participants with complex algebraic equations, geometric puzzles, and more. Designed by the Mathematical Association of America (MAA) and supported by the Art of Problem Solving (AoPS), AIME was pivotal in advancing mathematical reasoning. Each problem was paired with its solution, providing a valuable resource for exploring and improving LLM mathematical reasoning. Figure 3 categorized various mathematical domains based on

Math domain	Problem	Output	ZS	ZSCOT	MC-NEST
Number Theory	Let S be a list of positive integers not necessarily distinct in which the number 68 appears. The average (arithmetic mean) of the numbers in S is 56. However, if 68 is removed, the average of the remaining numbers drops to 55. What is the largest number that can appear in S ?	649	56	-	649
Geometry	A machine-shop cutting tool has the shape of a notched circle, as shown. The radius of the circle is $\sqrt{50}$ cm, the length of AB is 6 cm and that of BC is 2 cm. The angle $\angle ABC$ is a right angle. Find the square of the distance (in centimeters) from B to the center of the circle. <code>size(150); defaultpen(linewidth(0.6) + fontsize(11)); real r=10; pair O=(0,0), A=r*dir(45), B=(A.x, A.y-r); path P=circle(O,r); pair C=intersectionpoint(B-(B.x+r,B.y),P); // Drawing arc instead of full circle //draw(P); draw(arc(O, r, degrees(A), degrees(C))); draw(C-B-A-B); dot(A); dot(B); dot(C); label("A",A,NE); label("B",B,S); label("C",C,SE);</code>	26	-	50	26
Algebra	Let x , y and z all exceed 1 and let w be a positive number such that $\log_x w = 24$, $\log_y w = 40$ and $\log_{xyz} w = 12$. Find $\log_z w$.	60	123	60	60
Combinatorics	One commercially available ten-button lock may be opened by pressing – in any order – the correct five buttons. The sample shown below has $\{1, 2, 3, 6, 9\}$ as its combination. Suppose that these locks are redesigned so that sets of as many as nine buttons or as few as one button could serve as combinations. How many additional combinations would this allow?	770	770	770	770
Others	Let $f(x) = x - p + x - 15 + x - p - 15 $, where $0 < p < 15$. Determine the minimum value taken by $f(x)$ for x in the interval $p \leq x \leq 15$.	15	15	15	15

Table 1: Comparison of LLM approaches on complex mathematical problem solving across domains. This table showcases a variety of complex mathematical problems, spanning domains such as *Number Theory* and *Combinatorics*, with outputs from standard LLM solutions (Zero-Shot and Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought) and the specialized MC-NEST algorithm. The "Original Output" column presents baseline/human responses, highlighting the progression from standard to MC-NEST algorithm in achieving accurate solutions.

their prevalence in the dataset. The largest sections included Number Theory (34%), Geometry (26%), and Algebra (15%), while smaller portions included areas such as Calculus, Optimization, and Statistics, each contributing 1% of the overall distribution.

4.3 Field and Difficulty Level Mapping

In this experiment, we utilized an LLM called GPT-4o to systematically classify problems from the AIME dataset into distinct mathematical domains and difficulty levels. The primary aim was to categorize each problem into one of the following mathematical fields: *Number Theory*, *Geometry*, *Algebra*, *Combinatorics*, or *Other*. Additionally, each problem was assigned a difficulty rating of either *Easy*, *Medium*, or *Hard*. To validate the performance of the LLM, the

classifications were cross-referenced through manual verification by domain experts. Each problem’s assigned field and difficulty level were compared against established categorizations from AIME archives, providing an additional layer of scrutiny. This manual review process reinforced the reliability and accuracy of the LLM’s classifications. A detailed discussion of the results, including the LLM’s performance in both mathematical field and difficulty classification, is presented in Section 4.7.

4.4 Prompt Engineering

Zero-Shot Prompting Zero-shot prompting [27] allowed LLMs to perform tasks without any examples or prior context in the prompt. Instead, a direct instruction was provided, relying on the LLM’s extensive training to understand and execute the task. This method was effective for simple tasks like text classification or summarization, but its limitations became apparent in more complex tasks requiring nuanced understanding or reasoning. The absence of examples led to inaccuracies or misinterpretations. While zero-shot prompting reduced reliance on extensive prompt design, its performance often declined in tasks requiring multi-step reasoning or specific domain knowledge. Although zero-shot prompting offered efficiency and simplicity, its limitations in handling complex scenarios necessitated additional techniques to enhance LLM reliability.

Few-Shot Prompting with Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) Few-shot prompting [28] enabled LLMs to perform tasks by providing a few examples within the prompt, improving their performance compared to zero-shot methods by enhancing in-context learning through demonstrations. However, despite these benefits, few-shot prompting had limitations, especially for complex tasks requiring reasoning, such as arithmetic or logic-based problems, where the LLM’s responses often remained inaccurate, and more advanced techniques like chain-of-thought prompting were necessary. Additionally, maintaining prompt format consistency was crucial for its effectiveness.

To address these limitations, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [29] was integrated into few-shot prompting to enhance the selection of relevant examples. In this approach, a retriever LLM such as Facebook AI Similarity Search (FAISS) [30] [31] retrieved semantically similar examples from a larger dataset based on embeddings of the input problem. The FAISS index was pre-built using dense vector representations of problem statements generated by the ‘Salesforce/SFR-Embedding-Mistral’ LLM [32], a transformer-based embedding LLM with a 4096-token maximum input length. The LLM employed float16 precision for faster computation and lower memory usage, while ‘AutoTokenizer’ processed text inputs into tokenized embeddings. This LLM was selected for its ability to generate high-quality embeddings, capturing deep semantic relationships between text inputs, which was essential for retrieving contextually similar math problems.

During inference, the top-k most relevant examples were retrieved from the FAISS index based on their similarity to the input problem and incorporated into the prompt. This dynamic retrieval mechanism ensured that the examples used were contextually aligned with the task, improving problem-solving accuracy by providing better guidance within the prompt.

Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought Prompting Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought (ZSCoT) prompting [33] enhanced the LLM’s ability to handle complex reasoning tasks by encouraging step-by-step thinking. This method allowed LLMs to break down multi-step problems, such as mathematical reasoning or logic puzzles, by guiding them through intermediate stages before arriving at an answer. While ZSCoT was highly effective for tasks requiring deeper reasoning, it had limitations. The effectiveness of ZSCoT was often tied to the size of the LLM, with larger LLMs performing better, whereas smaller LLMs tended to struggle. Additionally, crafting appropriate prompts was challenging, requiring domain expertise to ensure clarity and relevance. Even with ZSCoT, LLMs could still generate incorrect reasoning or hallucinate, particularly when the intermediate steps were ambiguous or the task required specialized knowledge. Although ZSCoT improved performance, the manual process of creating these thought chains was time-intensive. While ZSCoT was powerful, it required careful application and further refinement to maximize its potential in practical use cases.

DSPy The DSPy [34] framework offered a systematic solution for optimizing LLM prompts and weights, particularly in complex, multi-step pipelines. Traditionally, building such systems without DSPy involved manually breaking down problems, refining prompts for each step, and continuously adjusting steps to work cohesively. This process often required generating synthetic data for fine-tuning smaller LLMs, which became human-intensive and messy whenever the pipeline, LLMs, or data changed. DSPy addressed these challenges by separating the program’s workflow from the parameters of each step and introducing LLM-driven optimizations that automatically adjusted prompts and weights to optimize a given metric. By leveraging DSPy, LLMs became more reliable in performing tasks, yielding higher-quality results and minimizing failures. The framework allowed for dynamic compilation of instructions, few-shot prompts, and fine-tuning strategies for different LLMs, transforming them into adaptable components of a broader system that learned

from data. This led to fewer manual interventions and a more streamlined approach to achieving optimal performance in complex LLM tasks.

4.5 Evaluation matrix

Accuracy Accuracy was a fundamental evaluation metric used to assess the performance of LLMs in solving complex Olympiad-level mathematics problems. Accuracy was defined as the ratio of correctly solved problems to the total number of problems attempted by the LLM. Formally, if the total number of problems attempted was denoted by N , the number of correctly solved problems (true results) by $T_{correct}$, and the number of incorrectly solved problems (false results) by T_{wrong} , then accuracy was calculated as:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{T_{correct}}{N} = \frac{T_{correct}}{T_{correct} + T_{wrong}}$$

A higher accuracy implied that the LLM performed better in solving the given set of mathematical problems. In this context, the metric provided how well the LLM could handle the logical rigor and complexity inherent in Olympiad-level mathematics.

Rollout Selection The rollout performance was evaluated using accuracy on a set of 100 complex math problems derived from the AIME dataset. For each problem, rollouts were performed at intervals of 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, and 36 iterations. This approach allowed us to assess the optimal rollout strategy for MC-NEST across different LLMs. The exactness of the output for each complex math problem was crucial for solving the task, and hence, all results were thoroughly verified. Additionally, the responses generated by the LLMs were cross-checked by human evaluators to ensure accuracy.

4.6 LLM Selection

The selection of GPT-4o and Phi-3-Mini-128k-Instruct as LLMs for solving complex Olympiad-level mathematics problems was driven by their demonstrated capabilities in handling tasks that required deep reasoning, advanced problem-solving skills, mathematical knowledge, and iterative processes like self-refinement and self-evaluation. These LLMs had been trained or fine-tuned for tasks involving sophisticated reasoning and logic, making them ideal candidates for tackling high-level mathematical challenges where multiple steps, abstract reasoning, and careful evaluation of results were necessary.

Performance in Solving Complex Problems GPT-4o emerged as one of the leading LLMs in terms of handling tasks that required contextual understanding, logical deduction, and multi-step reasoning. Olympiad-level mathematics problems were often characterized by their intricate nature, requiring not just mathematical manipulation but also strategic insight into problem structures. GPT-4o’s large architecture enabled it to understand complex relationships between variables, derive logical sequences of actions, and arrive at solutions through an intuitive yet systematic approach. Its ability to maintain contextual coherence across multiple steps and its refined language understanding allowed it to generate detailed solutions, including proofs, derivations, and numerical calculations.

On the other hand, Phi-3-Mini-128k-Instruct, though smaller in size, had been highly optimized for tasks involving mathematical reasoning. It demonstrated an impressive accuracy of 85.3% when tested on the GSM8K dataset [1] using Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [35] with 8-shot examples, making it the best-performing LLM among those evaluated [36]. This superior performance reflected its enhanced capability for reasoning through multiple steps, breaking down complex problems into manageable parts, and evaluating potential solutions. Additionally, Phi-3-Mini’s ability to self-refine during the problem-solving process enhanced its adaptability to complex, evolving problem sets, especially in the field of complex problem solving.

LLM Size and Computational Efficiency While the scale of an LLM often correlated with its ability to solve complex mathematical problems, an important consideration in LLM selection was the balance between performance and computational efficiency. GPT-4o, a large-scale LLM, offered superior performance in multi-step reasoning and logical deductions due to its extensive parameter count and large token context window. These characteristics made it a powerful tool for solving intricate mathematical problems but also came with increased computational demands in terms of memory and processing power. This made it highly suitable for scenarios where computational resources were not a limiting factor.

In contrast, Phi-3-Mini-128k-Instruct, while smaller in size, struck a compelling balance between accuracy and efficiency. Its smaller architecture enabled faster inference times and lower resource consumption without significantly

LLM	Size	Benchmarks									MCTSr	MC-NEST
		ZS	FS3	FS5	FS10	ZSCoT	D3	D5	D10			
Proprietary LLMs												
GPT-4o	-	19	19	17	19	26	18	15	20	36	39	
Phi-3-mini	3.8B	5	3	2	3	5	3	2	4	5	6	

Table 2: Performance comparison of different LLMs with different approaches. (ZS = Zero-Shot Prompting; FS = Few-Shot Prompting; ZSCoT = Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought Prompting; D3 = DSPy Few-Shot with 3 example; D5 = DSPy Few-Shot with 5 example; D10 = DSPy Few-Shot with 10 example; MCTSr = Monte Carlo Tree Self-refine (rollout 4 with Greedy Policy); MC-NEST = Monte Carlo Nash Equilibrium Self-Refine Tree (rollout 16 with Importance Sampling Policy)

LLM	Method	Node Selection	4	8	12	16	20	24	28	32	36
GPT4o	MCTSr	Greedy Policy	37	36	25	27	25	23	34	29	26
	MCTSr	Importance Sampling Policy	31	30	28	33	36	33	27	31	26
	MCTSr	Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy	28	17	8	15	17	17	17	13	13
	MC-NEST	Greedy Policy	30	33	37	30	25	28	28	27	29
	MC-NEST	Importance Sampling Policy	33	32	31	39	30	36	32	30	27
	MC-NEST	Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy	33	26	27	31	23	28	25	24	21
Phi-3-mini	MCTSr	Greedy Policy	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MCTSr	Importance Sampling Policy	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MCTSr	Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MC-NEST	Greedy Policy	6	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MC-NEST	Importance Sampling Policy	5	4	2	1	2	1	-	-	-
	MC-NEST	Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy	4	4	1	1	2	1	1	-	-

Table 3: Different rollout for different node selection methods (for select the best rollout) with MC-NEST in 100 Olympiad level (AIME dataset) math problem using different LLMs.

sacrificing problem-solving accuracy. This made it particularly valuable for large-scale deployments where efficiency and scalability were critical. Despite its smaller size, Phi-3-Mini’s specialized fine-tuning allowed it to outperform LLMs like Mistral-7B [37] and Gemma-7B [38], with accuracies of 46.4% and 59.8%, respectively, demonstrating that a smaller LLM could be as effective or even superior when appropriately fine-tuned for solving mathematical problem tasks.

Apart from accuracy and LLM size, several other factors played a crucial role in selecting GPT-4o and Phi-3-Mini-128k-Instruct:

Both LLMs incorporated mechanisms for self-refinement, enabling them to re-evaluate their solutions iteratively and correct potential errors. This was particularly valuable for high-stakes problem-solving, where a single misstep could lead to an incorrect solution.

The size and efficiency of Phi-3-Mini-128k-Instruct made it highly scalable for environments where computational resources might be limited, without significantly compromising performance. Meanwhile, GPT-4o’s larger architecture was better suited for settings where the highest possible accuracy was the primary concern and computational resources were abundant.

4.7 Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed MC-NEST algorithm compared to traditional LLM approaches, we conducted experiments across various mathematical domains, including Number Theory, Geometry, Algebra, and Combinatorics. Table 1 presented example results for one problem from each field, comparing the performance of ZS, ZSCOT, and MC-NEST. The outputs revealed a clear progression in solution accuracy and reasoning quality achieved by MC-NEST over baseline approaches, particularly in complex problem-solving scenarios. This comparison underscored the advantages of MC-NEST in reliably arriving at accurate solutions across domains and demonstrated the potential benefits of advanced refinement techniques within complex Olympiad-level mathematical reasoning tasks.

To further explore the role of prompting strategies and LLM choice, Table 2 provided a comparative analysis of two different LLMs and their performance across various prompting techniques, including those used by MC-NEST.




Figure 4: Domain specific problem solving with GPT-4o using MC-NEST and importance sampling policy with 16 rollouts across 100 math problems.




Figure 5: Level count - Easy, Medium, Hard (100 math problem).

GPT-4o consistently outperformed the smaller Phi-3-mini LLM across all benchmarks, with substantial gains in ZS and ZSCoT prompting. In advanced techniques such as MCTSr and MC-NEST, GPT-4o demonstrated superior adaptability, reaching high performance with scores of 36 and 39, respectively. These results highlighted GPT-4o’s exceptional self-refinement capacity, validating its effectiveness within our MC-NEST framework and establishing it as a more versatile LLM across diverse prompting strategies compared to Phi-3-mini.

Among the evaluated techniques, MC-NEST was the most impactful approach for enhancing LLM performance. As shown in Table 2, GPT-4o achieved a score of 39 in the MC-NEST benchmark, significantly outperforming other methods. This approach leveraged a higher rollout with an Importance Sampling Policy, enabling more refined decision-making and adaptability in complex scenarios. The high performance on MC-NEST suggested that this method could provide a robust framework for LLMs to achieve deeper reasoning and improved accuracy compared to standard prompting or even other advanced methods like Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought (ZSCoT) and MCTSr. These results highlighted MC-NEST’s potential as a powerful tool for maximizing LLM efficacy across sophisticated tasks.

Table 3 presented a comparative analysis of different rollouts in the MCTSr and MC-NEST methods applied to two LLMs: GPT-4o and Phi-3-mini. For GPT-4o, the MC-NEST approach with the Importance Sampling Policy achieved the highest score of 39 at a rollout of 16, demonstrating this LLM’s adaptability to complex strategies. By comparison,




Figure 6: Math problem correct solution with difficulty level using Importance Sampling Policy with rollout 16 in MC-NEST.

MCTSr for GPT-4o under the Greedy Policy peaked at a rollout of 4 with a score of 37, although it declined with increasing rollouts. The Pairwise Importance Sampling Policy in both MCTSr and MC-NEST resulted in lower scores for GPT-4o, indicating its less favorable impact on performance, particularly as the rollout increased.

Conversely, the smaller LLM, Phi-3-mini, achieved its peak score of 6 with MC-NEST under the Greedy Policy at a rollout of 4, but it was unable to maintain performance beyond a few initial rollouts, with scores generally declining and becoming absent at higher rollouts. Additionally, Phi-3-mini demonstrated limited performance in MCTSr, achieving only minimal scores under the Importance Sampling and Pairwise Importance Sampling Policies, with the latter failing to perform consistently past initial rollouts. This comparison suggested that while GPT-4o benefited significantly from MC-NEST with Importance Sampling, smaller LLMs like Phi-3-mini struggled to leverage these advanced refinement techniques, particularly under extended rollouts, underscoring the impact of LLM scale on the efficacy of complex rollout strategies.

Figure 4 illustrated the domain-specific performance of GPT-4o using the MC-NEST approach with an Importance Sampling Policy at 16 rollouts across 100 math problems. The LLM demonstrated notably strong performance in Number Theory and Geometry, achieving the highest scores in these domains, with 40 and approximately 28 problems solved, respectively. This suggested that GPT-4o was particularly adept at solving problems that required deeper logical and structural reasoning, which were often characteristic of Number Theory and Geometry. In comparison, the LLM performed moderately well in Algebra and Combinatorics, solving around 15 and 13 problems, respectively, indicating that these domains may have presented slightly more challenges for this configuration. The "Others" category, which encompassed problems that may not fit strictly within traditional mathematical domains, showed a lower performance, suggesting that the LLM's refinement capabilities under MC-NEST were less effective for more diverse problem types. This distribution highlighted GPT-4o's strengths in structured mathematical fields while also identifying potential areas for improvement in broader and less defined domains.

The classification of AIME problems based on difficulty using the LLM yielded significant insights into the complexity of the problem set. Out of the total problems classified, 58 were labeled as *Hard*, 42 as *Medium*, and none were categorized as *Easy*. This distribution highlighted the challenging nature of the AIME problems, with the majority requiring deep understanding and multiple steps for resolution. The absence of *Easy* problems suggested that even the

relatively simpler problems demanded intermediate-level concepts for successful solving. Figure 5 presented a visual summary of the difficulty level distribution, providing a clearer depiction of the problem complexity across the dataset.

Figure 6 provided a comparative analysis of GPT-4o’s performance on math problems across varying difficulty levels (Medium and Hard) in different domains, using the MC-NEST approach with an Importance Sampling Policy at 16 rollouts. The LLM demonstrated a notable strength in solving Hard problems within Number Theory, achieving a peak score of 10, indicating a robust capability to tackle complex problem types within this domain. In Geometry, GPT-4o maintained relatively strong performance, although the number of correct solutions slightly decreased for Hard compared to Medium problems, suggesting increased difficulty in this area. The Algebra and Combinatorics domains displayed moderate performance across both difficulty levels, with a slight preference for Medium-difficulty problems, highlighting areas where the LLM’s reasoning may not have been as effective. In the "Others" category, GPT-4o’s accuracy remained low across both difficulty levels, indicating potential limitations when addressing diverse or less structured mathematical problems. Overall, this distribution underscored GPT-4o’s proficiency in specialized, structured domains at higher difficulty levels while identifying opportunities to improve adaptability in broader problem sets.

These results demonstrated that GPT-4o consistently outperformed the smaller Phi-3-mini across various domains and difficulty levels, particularly when leveraging the MC-NEST approach with an Importance Sampling Policy at higher rollouts. The strong performance of GPT-4o in structured mathematical fields such as Number Theory and Geometry, as well as its capacity to solve complex problems at Hard difficulty, highlighted its advanced reasoning and adaptability. In contrast, Phi-3-mini showed limited capability in maintaining accuracy with increased rollouts and struggled in tackling diverse mathematical problem types. These results suggested that both LLMs could benefit from MC-NEST, with iterative self-refinement strategies proving particularly effective. The prompting strategies enabled LLMs to extend their reasoning capacity and improve problem-solving performance, especially for larger LLMs like GPT-4o. Overall, the findings indicated that while larger LLMs demonstrated greater robustness in complex problem-solving tasks, iterative prompting methods like MC-NEST had the potential to enhance the accuracy and generalization capabilities of LLMs across various mathematical domains and levels of difficulty.

5 Limitations

Our method for improving mathematical reasoning in LLMs using MC-NEST introduces some noise due to LLM-based self-refinement and self-evaluation. However, experiments indicate that it can still effectively enhance the mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs. The precise impact of this noise on the performance of LLM-based self-refinement and self-evaluation remains uncertain. For future research, a comprehensive comparison between human refinement and evaluation, and LLM-based self-refinement and self-evaluation, in improving mathematical reasoning should be conducted. Another idea is to integrate human and automated self-refinement and self-evaluation, which could result in a more robust and efficient method for enhancing LLMs’ mathematical reasoning capabilities.

6 Conclusion

In this study, we have introduced the MC-NEST algorithm with the aspiration of advancing the capabilities of LLMs in complex mathematical reasoning. By integrating Nash Equilibrium strategies with iterative self-refinement and self-evaluation mechanisms, MC-NEST empowers LLMs to tackle challenging mathematical tasks with enhanced decision-making abilities and adaptability. The empirical results demonstrate the algorithm’s efficacy in balancing exploration and exploitation, particularly in high-stakes environments such as Olympiad-level mathematics. Our comparative analysis reveals that larger LLMs, exemplified by GPT-4o, experience significant benefits from MC-NEST, yielding substantial improvements in both accuracy and reasoning depth within structured domains like Number Theory and Geometry, while smaller LLMs like Phi-3-mini showed more modest enhancements, suggesting that the advantages of MC-NEST are most pronounced in LLMs with greater capacity for complex reasoning. These findings underscore the potential of MC-NEST to bolster the mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs and pave the way for future research on refinement techniques tailored for intricate, multi-step problem-solving tasks. We envision that the insights garnered from this study will serve as a foundation for developing more sophisticated algorithms and methodologies that enhance the effectiveness of LLMs in mathematical domains, and we aim to expand the scope of MC-NEST in follow-up work, exploring its applicability across various problem types and disciplines within mathematics. Ultimately, we believe that the framework established in this study will inspire ongoing research in AI-driven reasoning and decision-making, contributing to the evolution of LLMs as invaluable scientific assistants in mathematical inquiry.

7 Contributions

This work was carried out through close collaboration among all authors. Gollam Rabby designed and implemented the algorithm, led the experiment, analyzed the results, and wrote the manuscript. Farhana Keya was responsible for implementing and conducting the DSPy and Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought Prompting experiments. Parvez Zamil contributed by designing and executing the Zero-Shot and Few-Shot Prompting experiments. Sören Auer played a significant role in conceiving the algorithm design and contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

8 Data Availability

The dataset utilized for this study is accessible through the Kaggle. Interested readers and researchers can obtain the dataset by visiting the following link:(<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/tourist800/aime-problems-1983-to-2024>).

9 Code Availability

The study was carried out exclusively using open-source software packages. All scripts, outcomes, post-processed datasets, and features will be accessible to the public at https://github.com/corei5/MC_NEST_GPT.

References

- [1] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [2] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the MATH dataset. In Joaquin Vanschoren and Sai-Kit Yeung, editors, *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*, 2021.
- [3] Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Ashish Sabharwal, Peter Clark, and Tushar Khot. Complexity-based prompting for multi-step reasoning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [4] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [5] Xidong Feng, Ziyu Wan, Muning Wen, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17179*, 2023.
- [6] Yelisey Pitanov, Alexey Skrynnik, Anton Andreychuk, Konstantin Yakovlev, and Aleksandr Panov. Monte-carlo tree search for multi-agent pathfinding: Preliminary results. In *International Conference on Hybrid Artificial Intelligence Systems*, pages 649–660. Springer, 2023.
- [7] Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14325*, 2023.
- [8] Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09583*, 2023.
- [9] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [10] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [11] Di Zhang, Jiatong Li, Xiaoshui Huang, Dongzhan Zhou, Yuqiang Li, and Wanli Ouyang. Accessing gpt-4 level mathematical olympiad solutions via monte carlo tree self-refine with llama-3 8b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07394*, 2024.

- [12] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [13] R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2(5), 2023.
- [14] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [15] Maciej Świechowski, Konrad Godlewski, Bartosz Sawicki, and Jacek Mańdziuk. Monte carlo tree search: A review of recent modifications and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(3):2497–2562, 2023.
- [16] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484–489, 2016.
- [17] David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature*, 550(7676):354–359, 2017.
- [18] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Jiahua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14992*, 2023.
- [19] Feiyu Yang. An integrated framework integrating monte carlo tree search and supervised learning for train timetabling problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00971*, 2023.
- [20] Anqi Li, Congying Han, Tiande Guo, Haoran Li, and Bonan Li. General method for solving four types of sat problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16423*, 2023.
- [21] Harshil Vagadia, Mudit Chopra, Abhinav Barnawal, Tamajit Banerjee, Shreshth Tuli, Souvik Chakraborty, and Rohan Paul. Phyplan: Compositional and adaptive physical task reasoning with physics-informed skill networks for robot manipulators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15767*, 2024.
- [22] Guoxin Chen, Minpeng Liao, Chengxi Li, and Kai Fan. Alphamath almost zero: process supervision without process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03553*, 2024.
- [23] Haotian Xu. No train still gain. unleash mathematical reasoning of large language models with monte carlo tree search guided by energy function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03224*, 2023.
- [24] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [25] Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- [26] Aime problems 1983 to 2024. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/tourist800/aime-problems-1983-to-2024>. Accessed: 2024-10-16.
- [27] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [28] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [29] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [30] Matthijs Douze, Alexandr Guzhva, Chengqi Deng, Jeff Johnson, Gergely Szilvasy, Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, and Hervé Jégou. The faiss library. 2024.
- [31] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547, 2019.
- [32] Rui Meng, Ye Liu, Shafiq Rayhan Joty, Caiming Xiong, Yingbo Zhou, and Semih Yavuz. Sfrembedding-mistral: enhance text retrieval with transfer learning. *Salesforce AI Research Blog*, 3, 2024.
- [33] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.

- [34] Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T Joshi, Hanna Moazam, et al. Dspy: Compiling declarative language model calls into self-improving pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03714*, 2023.
- [35] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*, 2022.
- [36] microsoft/phi-3-mini-128k-instruct. <https://huggingface.co/microsoft/Phi-3-mini-128k-instruct>. Accessed: 2024-10-16.
- [37] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [38] Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.

Appendix

Prompts in Experiment

Prompt for Critique and Refinement

Provide a detailed and constructive critique to improve the answer. Highlight specific areas that need refinement or correction.

Instruction: Refine the answer based on the critique. Your refined answer should be a direct and concise solution to the problem.

Additional Guidelines:

- Your response should not refer to or discuss the criticisms.
- Do not repeat the problem statement.

JSON Response format:

```
{
  "thought": "The thought process behind the answer.",
  "answer": "A float representing the answer to the problem."
}
```

Prompt for Reward Limit

Provide a reward score between -100 and 100 for the answer quality, using very strict standards. Do not give a full score above 95. Make sure the reward score is an integer. Return *ONLY* the score.

Prompt for field classification

JSON format prompt:

```
{
  "system": "The user will provide a problem. Find the general field (such as number theory, geometry, etc) of this math problem. Only return the general field. Let's think step by step.",
  "user": "<problem>\n{problem}\n</problem>"
}
```

Examples

Problem: Let S be a list of positive integers not necessarily distinct in which the number 68 appears. The average (arithmetic mean) of the numbers in S is 56. However, if 68 is removed, the average of the remaining numbers drops to 55. What is the largest number that can appear in S ?

Rollout 1

Initialization: The root node is initialized with the message, "I don't know."

Candidate Node Generation: Generate initial candidate values for the size of S and the largest integer, focusing on values around the average requirements.

Node Selection: Select nodes with guesses close to average requirements to prioritize feasible candidates.

Expansion: Expand to new nodes by adjusting candidate values for the size n and the largest integer in S .

Backpropagation: No solution is yet found; initial quality scores are backpropagated for future reference.

Self-Evaluation: Verify if removing 559 yields an average of 55 in the candidates.

Self-Refine: Adjust candidates to increment n and refine largest possible values for upcoming rollouts.

Rollout 2

Candidate Node Generation: Increase values for n (such as $n = 10, 11, 12$), and vary the largest candidate values for improved results.

Node Selection: Nodes where removing 559 gives averages close to 55 are prioritized.

Expansion: Expand to test the impact of varying the largest values.

Backpropagation: Candidate values with feasible but not exact solutions are backpropagated.

Self-Evaluation: Candidates still do not meet both average requirements.

Self-Refine: Increment ranges of S further and refine average approximation values.

Rollout 3

Candidate Node Generation: Broaden n values around 10 and 12, keeping candidate averages in mind.

Node Selection: Select candidates aligning closely with 55 after removing 559.

Expansion: Continue expanding largest candidate values to approach averages.

Backpropagation: Update node scores with partial success measures.

Self-Evaluation: Remaining candidates still fall short of the averages.

Self-Refine: Adjust values and prepare for rollouts with refined largest integer estimates.

Rollout 4

... ..

Rollout N (Solution Found)

Solution: Based on refined values, the MCTS algorithm determines that the largest integer in S meeting both conditions is **649**.

Conclusion: After 8 rollouts, the algorithm concludes that the largest integer in S is 649, successfully achieving both average requirements.