

The En Route Truck-Drone Delivery Problem

Danny Krizanc¹, Lata Narayanan², Jaroslav Opatrny², and Denis Pankratov²

¹Department of Mathematics & Comp. Sci., Wesleyan University, Middletown, USA

²Department of CSSE, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

February 2, 2024

Abstract

We study the truck-drone cooperative delivery problem in a setting where a single truck carrying a drone travels at constant speed on a straight-line trajectory/street. Delivery to clients located in the plane and not on the truck's trajectory is performed by the drone, which has limited carrying capacity and flying range, and whose battery can be recharged when on the truck. We show that the problem of maximizing the number of deliveries is strongly NP-hard even in this simple setting. We present a 2-approximation algorithm for the problem, and an optimal algorithm for a non-trivial family of instances.

1 Introduction

The use of unmanned aerial vehicles or drones for last-mile delivery in the logistics industry has received considerable attention in business and academic communities, see for example [1, 3, 15, 9]. Drones have been shown in a recent analysis [13] to have significantly less lifecycle costs, and faster delivery time compared to diesel or electric trucks in urban, suburban, and rural settings, and have less harmful emissions compared to diesel trucks. The potential applications where drone delivery could make a big impact include contactless delivery, return of unsatisfactory goods, rural or hard-to-access delivery and delivery in disaster relief scenarios.

In this paper we consider a system in which the delivery of physical items to clients located in the plane is done by *two cooperating mobile agents* having different but complementary properties. The first mobile agent, called the *drone* can move in any direction but it can travel only a limited distance, called its *flying range*, before it needs to recharge its battery. Furthermore, it has limited carrying capacity. The second mobile agent, called the *truck* can travel only along a fixed trajectory, called a *street* but its battery/fuel is not only sufficient to follow the street as long as necessary, but it is also equipped with a charging facility where the drone can recharge whenever it reaches the truck. Furthermore, it can carry all items that are to be delivered to the clients.

The delivery of items to clients is done as follows. All items to be delivered are preloaded on the truck at the warehouse. The truck then moves along the street at a fixed speed and it delivers items to any client who is located on its trajectory. The delivery of an item to a client who is not located on the trajectory of the truck must be carried out by the drone. At an appropriate time, the drone flies from the truck with the item to be delivered to the given client, drops the item there, and then flies back to the still-moving truck. There it can recharge, pick up another item, and make the next delivery, and so on. Clearly the same set-up can also be used to pick up items rather than deliver them. For ease of exposition, we always talk about item delivery in this paper.

Given a set of delivery locations and the parameters of the agents, i.e., the trajectory and the speed of the truck, the flying range of the drone and its speed, we want to compute a feasible

schedule of deliveries that *maximizes the number of deliveries* made. Such a schedule specifies the order in which the deliveries to clients are done by the drone, and for each delivery it gives the time the drone leaves the truck. Clearly, to be feasible, the schedule should ensure that for each delivery, the drone can fly to the delivery location and back to the still-moving truck while having travelled distance at most its flying range, and arrive at the truck in time to start its next delivery.

1.1 Related work

The algorithmic study of truck-drone cooperative delivery problems was initiated by Murray and Chu [12] and Mathew et al. [11] where the problem of a single truck being helped by a single drone to deliver packages to customers is studied. Since then there has been a great deal of work (Murray and Chu’s paper has received more than 1000 citations) on different versions of what is variously referred to as Truck-Drone Cooperative Delivery, Drone-Aided Delivery or Last-Mile Delivery problems. Variations considered include multiple trucks, multiple drones, drone-only delivery, mixed truck-drone delivery, etc. We refer the reader to recent surveys for more details [4, 3, 9, 15, 16].

In the above work, the problem is most often modelled using a weighted directed graph with customers as nodes, streets and drone flight paths as edges, etc. Under these circumstances the problems become versions of the Travelling Salesperson Problem or the Vehicle Routing Problem. As such they are all easily seen to be NP-hard in general and are solved by adapting known exact (e.g., Mixed Integer Linear Programming) or heuristic (e.g., greedy) techniques. For specialized domains some variants can be shown to be polynomial time, e.g. on trees [2].

In most of the previous research it is assumed that the points at which a truck and drone can rendezvous are part of the input (e.g., customer locations, depots) and that the truck or drone stops at the rendezvous point to wait for the other to arrive. More recent work [7, 8, 10, 14] has focused on the case where the rendezvous can occur “en route” as the truck is moving and the rendezvous points are to be determined by the algorithm, as is the case with our study. In these papers, the problems studied are again generalized versions of TSP or VRP and are attacked via adaptations of known exact or heuristic techniques. Here we restrict ourselves to the simplest version of the problem with one truck and one drone, where the truck travels at a constant speed along a single street. Surprisingly, even in this case, as shown in Section 3, the problem is strongly NP-hard.

All of the above work is concentrated on minimizing either the total delivery time or total energy requirements (or some combination of both) to deliver all of the packages to all of the customers. To the best of our knowledge we are the first to consider the problem of maximizing the number of clients that are satisfied in the en route model.

1.2 Our Truck-Drone Model

We define the truck-drone delivery problem more formally as follows. We assume that the delivery points as well as the trajectories of the truck and the drone, are set in the 2-dimensional Cartesian plane. Without loss of generality, we assume the warehouse is located at $[0, 0]$, and the truck starts fully loaded with all items to be delivered at the warehouse at time 0, and subsequently moves right on the x -axis with constant speed 1. Note that this allows us to measure the elapsed time by the distance of the truck from the origin.

The speed of the drone is denoted by v and it is assumed that v is a constant that is greater than 1. The *flying range* of the drone is given by the value R , and is defined as the maximum distance that the drone can fly on a full battery without needing to be recharged. We assume that the time to recharge the drone’s battery, and to pick up an item from the truck, or to drop off an item at its delivery location are negligible compared to the delivery times, and thus are equal to

0. Therefore, any time the drone leaves the truck it can fly its full range R before returning to the truck.

We are given a multi-set $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$ of delivery points in the plane where the deliveries are to be made. The truck delivers any item whose delivery point is located on its trajectory, we assume that this can be done with negligible delay. Thus we assume below that none of the points in D is located on the trajectory of the truck, *i.e.*, on the positive x -axis.

We now define a feasible delivery schedule for the truck-drone delivery problem.

Definition 1. Given an instance $I = (v, R, D)$ of the truck-drone problem, where $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$, we define a schedule \mathcal{S}_I to be an ordered list of delivery points to which deliveries are made, and the start time of each delivery, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{S}_I = ((d_{i_1}, s_1), (d_{i_2}, s_2), \dots, (d_{i_m}, s_m)), m \leq n$$

where m is called the length of the schedule and for $1 \leq j \leq m$ the drone makes a delivery to d_{i_j} by leaving the truck at point $[s_j, 0]$. The schedule is feasible, if $s_1 \geq 0$, and for each j , $1 \leq j \leq m - 1$, the drone can reach d_{i_j} when leaving the truck at position $[s_j, 0]$ and return to the truck at or before $[s_{j+1}, 0]$.

Schedule \mathcal{S}_I is called *optimal* if there is no schedule that is longer than \mathcal{S}_I , that is, makes more deliveries than \mathcal{S}_I .

Given an instance $I = (v, R, D)$ of the truck-drone problem, where v and R are the speed and the range of the drone respectively, and D is the set of delivery points, the goal of the truck-drone delivery problem is to find an optimal delivery schedule.




Figure 1: Instance $I = (2, 10, \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\})$, and its schedule $\mathcal{S}_I = ((1, d_1), (5, d_2), (7, d_3))$. The trajectory of the drone is in blue, that of the truck in red. The blue numbers give the distances, the black numbers show the time sequence

Figure 1 shows an example of a truck-drone problem and of a feasible schedule.

1.3 Our results

In Section 3, we show that even for the ostensibly simple case of a single truck travelling on a straight line, and a single drone, the truck-drone delivery problem is strongly NP-hard. In particular, we show that given an instance I of the truck-drone problem and an integer k , it is strongly NP-hard [5] to decide whether there is a schedule \mathcal{S}_I of length k .

In Section 4, we describe a greedy algorithm \mathcal{A}_g and show that it computes a 2-approximation of an optimal schedule in $O(n^2)$ time. The factor of 2 is shown to be tight for this algorithm. Finally, in Section 5, we define a *proper* family of instances. Roughly speaking, in such instances, the delivery points do not have the same or “nearly” the same x -coordinates, where “nearly” depends on the difference in their y -coordinates. In particular, the greater the difference in the y -coordinates of the points, the greater is the difference in their x -coordinates in *proper* instances. We then give an $O(n^3)$ algorithm that calculates an optimal schedule for any *proper* instance.

2 Preliminary Observations

We say that a point $d = [x, y]$ is *reachable* by the drone from position $[s, 0]$ if the drone can leave the truck at $[s, 0]$, fly to point d and fly back to the truck with the total distance travelled at most its flying range R . First we examine some geometric properties of points in the plane that are reachable from $[s, 0]$ by the drone flying with speed v and having flying range R .

Suppose the drone leaves the truck at position $[s, 0]$, makes a delivery at $d = [x, y]$ and returns to the truck using its *full range* R . To fly range R the drone needs time $t = R/v$ and at that time the truck is at position $[s + R/v, 0]$. Therefore, the drone can make a delivery at point $d = [x, y]$ if




Figure 2: In Ellipse E shown above, the speed of the drone is not much higher than that of the truck. When the speed of the drone increases, the distance between the foci decreases, and the ellipse becomes closer to a circle.

the total distance it flew satisfies the equation

$$|[s, 0], [x, y]| + |[x, y], [s + R/v, 0]| = R$$

Clearly all such points d reachable by the drone from $[s, 0]$ using its full flying range lie on *ellipse* E (see Figure 2) with left focus $[s, 0]$ and right focus $[s + R/v, 0]$. Furthermore, the *major radius*, i.e. the length of the *semi-major axis* of the ellipse is $M = \frac{R}{2}$, and *minor radius*, i.e. the length of its *semi-minor axis* is $m = \frac{R}{2v} \sqrt{v^2 - 1}$. Next, considering also the delivery points that can be reached by the drone by flying distance $< R$, we conclude that all points reachable from $[s, 0]$ by the drone *within* its flying range are located *on or inside* the ellipse E .

Assuming that the ellipse E is centered at $[0, 0]$, its left focus $[s, 0] = [-\frac{R}{2v}, 0]$, and its right focus is $[\frac{R}{2v}, 0]$, and M, m are the major, minor radii as specified above. The equation of the ellipse is:

$$\frac{x^2}{M^2} + \frac{y^2}{m^2} = 1 \tag{1}$$

Clearly, delivery to point $d = [x, y]$ is *feasible* only if $-m \leq y \leq m$, i.e., all delivery points should be located in a band of width $2m$ centered along the x -axis.

Assume a delivery point d is on the right half of ellipse E , and the drone makes a delivery to d starting from the truck at point $[s', 0]$ between the foci of the ellipse E . Since the distance from

$[s', 0]$ to d is shorter than the distance from the left focus $[s, 0]$ of E to d , the drone can reach the delivery point d , flying for distance $< R$. However, the drone when leaving the truck at point $[s, 0]$ arrives at d *earlier* than when staying on the truck and leaving for d only later at point $[s', 0]$, and therefore it also returns to the truck *earlier*. Thus when using flying distance less than R the drone returns to the truck *later* as shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The red lines show the delivery with the full range R , the green lines show the delivery with range less than R .

This leads to the next observation:

Observation 1. *Consider a delivery point d in the right half of the ellipse E . To make a delivery to d flying less than the full range R , the drone must start the delivery at a point to the right of the left focus of E and the drone returns to the truck to the right of the right focus of E . Starting points for the drone to the left of the left focus are not feasible.*

A symmetric observation holds about delivery points on the left half of E .

We now determine for each delivery point an interval on the trajectory of the truck describing feasible departure points for the drone to make a delivery to point d . Given a delivery point d , let E_1 and E_2 be the ellipses with major radius M and minor radius m , such that their foci are located on the x -axis, with E_1 containing d on its right half, while E_2 contains d on its left half. Let f_{i1}, f_{i2} be the foci of E_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (see Figure 4). The following observation now follows from Observation 1 above.

Observation 2. *Focus f_{11} is the point of the earliest start for a delivery to d , and focus f_{12} is the point of the earliest return to the truck from a delivery to d . Focus f_{21} is the point of the latest start for a delivery to d that can meet the truck, and Focus f_{22} is the latest return to the truck from any delivery to d . Feasible start points for delivery to d lie between f_{11} and f_{21} , with the corresponding return to the truck occurring between f_{12} and f_{22} .*

In the rest of this paper, given a delivery point d we denote its earliest start time as $es(d)$ and the corresponding earliest return as $er(d)$, the latest start time of d as $ls(d)$, and the corresponding latest return back to the truck as $lr(d)$,

Notice that for any delivery point d we have

$$er(d) - es(d) = lr(d) - ls(d) = R/v$$

the distance between the foci of E .

Given a point $d = [x, y]$, we can calculate the values $es(d)$, $ls(d)$ as follows. Imagine a horizontal line passing through d . It intersects the ellipse E centered at 0 at two points $[-x', y]$ and $[x', y]$. According to Equation (1), we have $(x')^2/M^2 + y^2/m = 1$. Therefore, $x' = M\sqrt{1 - \frac{y^2}{m^2}}$. Now,




Figure 4: The red lines show the earliest delivery to d , the blue lines show the latest delivery to d . A delivery to d could be scheduled to start at a point between f_{11} and f_{21} .

imagine sliding the ellipse E along the x -axis. When E touches d for the first time, we obtain E_1 having travelled distance $x - x'$. Similarly, when E touches d for the last time, we obtain E_2 having travelled distance $x + x'$. Thus, we have:

Observation 3. For $d = [x, y]$
 $es(d) = x - \frac{R}{2v} - x'$, and $er(d) = es(d) + R/v$,
 $ls(d) = x - \frac{R}{2v} + x'$, and $lr(d) = ls(d) + R/v$.

The next lemma gives the return point of the drone to the truck after a delivery to a delivery point $d = [x, y]$, starting from the truck at a position $[s, 0]$.

Lemma 1. Suppose we wish to make a delivery to a delivery point $d = [x, y]$ using the drone, starting from the truck at position $[s, 0]$, and returning to the truck at position $[\text{ret}, 0]$.

1. If $es(d) \leq s \leq ls(d)$.

$$\text{ret} = \text{ret}(s, d, v) := s + \frac{s + av - x + \sqrt{b^2 - s(v^2 - 1)(b + s + av - x)}}{v^2 - 1} \quad (2)$$

where $a = \sqrt{y^2 + (s - x)^2}$, $b = sv^2 + av - x$.

2. If $s < es(d)$, then $\text{ret}(s, d, v) = er(d)$.

3. If $s > ls(d)$, then delivery is impossible, thus we set $\text{ret}(s, d, v) = \infty$.

Proof. To see (1), observe that the total distance travelled by the drone is $d_1 = |[s, 0], [x, y]| + |[x, y], [\text{ret}, 0]| = a + \sqrt{(\text{ret} - x)^2 + y^2}$, which the drone travels in time d_1/v . At the same time the truck travels the distance $d_2 = \text{ret} - s$. Thus we have the equation

$$\begin{aligned} a + \sqrt{(x - \text{ret})^2 + y^2} &= v(\text{ret} - s) \\ (x - \text{ret})^2 + y^2 &= (v(\text{ret} - s) - a)^2 \\ x^2 - 2x\text{ret} + \text{ret}^2 + y^2 &= v^2(\text{ret}^2 - 2s\text{ret} + s^2) - 2av(\text{ret} - s) + y^2 + (s^2 - 2sx + x^2) \\ \text{ret}^2 - 2x\text{ret} &= v^2\text{ret}^2 - 2v^2s\text{ret} - 2av\text{ret} + v^2s^2 + 2avs + s^2 - 2sx \\ 0 &= (v^2 - 1)\text{ret}^2 - 2(sv^2 + av - x)\text{ret} + s(v^2s + s + 2av - 2x) \\ 0 &= (v^2 - 1)\text{ret}^2 - 2b\text{ret} + s(b + s + av - x), \end{aligned}$$

and by solving the quadratic equation for $\text{ret} > s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{ret} &= \frac{b + \sqrt{b^2 - s(v^2 - 1)(b + s + av - x)}}{v^2 - 1} \\ &= s + \frac{s + av - x + \sqrt{b^2 - s(v^2 - 1)(b + s + av - x)}}{v^2 - 1},\end{aligned}$$

as needed.

For (2), note that if $s < es(d)$ then the drone remains on the truck until position $[es(d), 0]$ is reached and then it starts a delivery from position $[es(d), 0]$, since by Observation 1, this gives the earliest time the drone can start from the truck for a delivery to point d . Thus for any such s the drone returns to the truck at position $[er(d), 0]$.

Finally, (3) follows from Observation 2. \square

For s where $es(d) \leq s \leq ls(d)$ and a delivery point $d = [x, y]$, we call $\text{ret}(s, d, v) - s$ the *round-trip flight time* to d from $[s, 0]$. It can be seen from Formula 2 that the round-trip flight time is not a linear function in s , which makes a calculation of a schedule for a given instance of the truck-drone problem more complicated.

Observation 4. *For a delivery point $d = [x, y]$ and a point $[s, 0]$ between $es(d)$ and $ls(d)$, the round-trip flight time $\text{ret}(s, d, v) - s$ reaches the maximal value R/v at $s = es(d)$, it decreases until $s = x(1 - 1/\sqrt{v^2 - 1})$ and then increases until $s = ls(d)$ where it again reaches the maximal value R/v .*

Lemma 2. *Let $d = [x, y]$ and $d' = [x', y']$ be two delivery points, and suppose there are valid drone trajectories from $[s, 0]$ to d returning at $[r, 0]$ and from $[s', 0]$ to d' returning at $[r', 0]$. If $s' < s < r \leq r'$, then there is also a valid drone trajectory from $[s', 0]$ to d returning at a point before $[r, 0]$.*

Proof. Let R_1 be the length of the drone trajectory from $[s', 0]$ to d' and then to $[r', 0]$, and similarly, let R_2 be the length of the drone trajectory from $[s, 0]$ to d and then to $[r, 0]$. Then R_1/v and R_2/v respectively are the distances from $[s', 0]$ to $[r', 0]$ and from $[s, 0]$ to $[r, 0]$. Since $s' < s < r \leq r'$, it follows that $R_2 < R_1$. Now consider the ellipse E_1 with parameters (R_1, v) with $[s', 0]$ as its left focus. Then d' is on the right half of E_1 , and $[r', 0]$ must be its right focus. Similarly, let E_2 be the ellipse with parameters (R_2, v) with $[s, 0]$ and $[r, 0]$ as its left and right foci respectively, and with d on the right half of the ellipse. Since $s' < s < r \leq r'$, the ellipse E_2 is completely contained in E_1 , and the point d is in the interior of the ellipse E_1 . It follows that there is a valid drone trajectory to d starting at $[s', 0]$. Furthermore, since the drone reaches d earlier if it starts at $[s', 0]$ than if it stayed on the truck until $[s, 0]$ and then flew to d , it must also return to the truck earlier than $[r, 0]$. \square

In the truck-drone instance that we use in the proof of strong NP-hardness in Section 3, many of the delivery points are located on the y axis. For these points we can simplify the expression used to define function $\text{ret}(s, d, v) - s$, and this simplified expression is used to obtain upper and lower bounds on $\text{ret}(s, d, v) - s$.

Lemma 3. *For $s \geq 0$ and a delivery point $d = [0, y]$ with $v/4 \leq y \leq v/2$ we have*

$$\frac{2y}{v} < \text{ret}(s, d, v) - s < \frac{2y}{v} + \frac{1 + 4s^2 + s}{v^2 - 1}.$$

Proof. Let $\Delta s := \text{ret}(s, d, v) - s$. Then the distance travelled by the drone is $\sqrt{s^2 + y^2} + \sqrt{(s + \Delta s)^2 + y^2}$. Since the drone travels at speed v , the time taken by the drone is then

$$\frac{\sqrt{s^2 + y^2} + \sqrt{(s + \Delta s)^2 + y^2}}{v}.$$

During the delivery, the truck travels distance Δs at speed 1 taking the time Δs . Equating the two times we get:

$$\frac{\sqrt{s^2 + y^2} + \sqrt{(s + \Delta s)^2 + y^2}}{v} = \Delta s.$$

Solving for Δs , we obtain:

$$\Delta s = \frac{2(v\sqrt{s^2 + y^2} + s)}{v^2 - 1}.$$

From this expression we immediately obtain the lower bound on Δs using $s \geq 0$:

$$\Delta s \geq \frac{2vy}{v^2 - 1} \geq \frac{2y}{v}.$$

Next observe that $\sqrt{s^2 + y^2} \leq y + \frac{s^2}{2y}$. Plugging this inequality into the expression for Δs we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta s &\leq \frac{2(v(y + s^2/2y) + s)}{v^2 - 1} = \frac{2vy + \frac{v}{y}s^2 + 2s}{v^2 - 1} = \frac{2\left(1 - \frac{1}{v^2}\right)vy + 2\frac{1}{v^2}vy + \frac{v}{y}s^2 + 2s}{v^2 - 1} \\ &= \frac{2y}{v} + \frac{2\frac{y}{v} + \frac{v}{y}s^2 + s}{v^2 - 1} \leq \frac{2y}{v} + \frac{1 + 4s^2 + s}{v^2 - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $v/4 \leq y \leq v/2$. □

3 Strong NP-hardness

In this section we prove that the following decision problem is strongly NP-hard:

Problem 1 (Schedule Length problem). *Given an instance I of the truck-drone problem, and an integer p , is there a schedule \mathcal{S}_I of length p (that is, \mathcal{S}_I makes p deliveries)?*

We show below that there is a polynomial reduction from the well known 3-Partition problem [5] to the Schedule Length problem. Recall that in the 3-Partition problem we are given a multi-set of integers $Y = \{y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_n\}$, where $n = 3k$. Let $T = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i/k$. The 3-Partition problem asks if there is a partition of Y into k triples, such that the sum of elements in each triple is equal to T . The 3-Partition problem is strongly NP-hard [5].

Theorem 1. *The Schedule Length problem is strongly NP-hard.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by exhibiting a reduction from a 3-Partition instance $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ to an instance I of the Schedule Length problem. We use the notation for the 3-Partition instance Y introduced immediately prior to the statement of the theorem. We assume that n is sufficiently large; the values in Y are bounded from above by a polynomial in n , so that $n^c < T \leq n^{c+1}$ for a sufficiently large constant c .

We now define the corresponding instance I of the Schedule Length problem as follows. The speed of the drone is set to $v = T$ and the flying range of the drone is set to $R = 4T$. Then the minor radius of the ellipse corresponding to the speed and range of the drone is $m = 2\sqrt{T^2 - 1}$.

For this proof, we depart from our convention of the truck starting at $[0, 0]$ and instead specify the starting position of the truck as $[2, 0]$ (this does not affect the complexity of the problem, but

makes some of the formulas nicer). The set of delivery points D is partitioned into three subsets called A, B and C , that are defined below:

$A = \{[0, y_1], [0, y_2], \dots, [0, y_n]\}$ is a set of delivery points located on the y -axis and correspond to the inputs to the 3-Partition problem.

$B = \{[6 + \epsilon(n), m], [2(6 + \epsilon(n)), m], \dots, [(k - 1)(6 + \epsilon(n)), m]\}$ and

$C = \{[k(6 + \epsilon(n)), m], [k(6 + \epsilon(n)) + 4, m], \dots, [k(6 + \epsilon(n)) + 4T, m]\}$

are sets of delivery points that are located at distance m from the x -axis and $\epsilon(n) \in (0, 1)$ is a function of n to be specified later.

Observe that each delivery point in $B \cup C$ can be reached by the drone from exactly one location on the x -axis, and the drone must fly its full range $R = 4T$ to make the delivery and return to the truck, and therefore, each such delivery takes time $R/v = 4$. See Figure 5 for an illustration of the instance I produced by the reduction, as well as the unique feasible drone trajectories for delivery points in B and C .

In total there are $n + (k - 1) + T + 1$ delivery points, and we set $p = n + (k - 1) + T + 1$ in the Schedule Length problem instance. In other words, this instance asks whether there is a schedule that delivers to *all* the delivery points. Observe that the number of points and their coordinates are all bounded by a polynomial in n , so the reduction runs in polynomial time.




Figure 5: Illustration of the Schedule Length instance I output by the reduction from the 3-partition problem. The unique feasible drone trajectories for delivery points in B and C are also shown.

We claim that the instance Y to the 3-Partition problem is a yes-instance if and only if I is a yes-instance to the Schedule Length problem. It is clear that since the flying range of the drone equals $4T$, no deliveries to points in A can be scheduled after the deliveries to points in C are made. Thus a valid schedule delivering to all the points must schedule deliveries to A in the intervals between deliveries to points in B . There are k such intervals, and each interval is of length $2 + \epsilon(n)$. We claim that at most three points $[0, y_{i_1}], [0, y_{i_2}], [0, y_{i_3}]$ can be scheduled within such an interval and if only if $y_{i_1} + y_{i_2} + y_{i_3} \leq T$. Establishing this claim would finish the proof of the theorem.

Assume we have three integers $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, y_{i_3}$ such that $y_{i_1} + y_{i_2} + y_{i_3} \leq T$ and the truck with the drone on it is at position $[i(6 + \epsilon(n)) + 2, m]$ for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. By the upper bound on the delivery time in Lemma 3 and observing that $i < k = n/3$, the total time for the three consecutive deliveries

started at $[i(6 + \epsilon(n) + 2), m]$ is at most

$$\frac{2(y_{i_1} + y_{i_2} + y_{i_3})}{T} + 3 \frac{1 + 4(k(6 + \epsilon(n)))^2 + (k(6 + \epsilon(n)))}{T^2 - 1} \leq 2 + \frac{2n^2(6 + \epsilon(n))^2}{T^2 - 1} = 2 + O(n^2/T^2). \quad (3)$$

Thus, the deliveries to $[0, y_{i_1}], [0, y_{i_2}], [0, y_{i_3}]$ can be completed before the delivery to $[(i + 1)(6 + \epsilon(n) + 2), m]$ is scheduled, provided that $O(n^2/T^2) = O(n^{-2c+2}) \leq \epsilon(n)$.

Assume we have three integers $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, y_{i_3}$ such that $y_{i_1} + y_{i_2} + y_{i_3} > T$ and the truck with the drone on it is at position $[i(6 + \epsilon(n) + 2), m]$ for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. By the lower bound on the delivery time in Lemma 3, the total time for the three consecutive deliveries started at $[i(6 + \epsilon(n) + 2), m]$ is at least $2(y_{i_1} + y_{i_2} + y_{i_3})/T > 2 + 1/T$ and they cannot be completed before the delivery to $[(i + 1)(6 + \epsilon(n) + 2), m]$ is scheduled, provided that the term $1/T \geq n^{-c-1}$ exceeds $\epsilon(n)$.

It is left to notice that because we can take n and c sufficiently large, we can find $\epsilon(n)$ satisfying:

$$O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2c-2}}\right) < \epsilon(n) < \frac{1}{n^{c+1}}.$$

For example, one could take $c = 4$ and $\epsilon(n) = 1/n^6$. This completes the proof of strong NP-hardness. \square

4 A Greedy Approximation Algorithm

In this section we describe a greedy scheduling algorithm for the truck-drone problem. Our algorithm, which we call \mathcal{A}_g , assigns deliveries to the drone as the truck moves from left to right starting from the initial position of the truck at $[0, 0]$. When the truck with the drone is at position $[s, 0]$, our greedy algorithm schedules a delivery to point d which, from among all feasible delivery points, minimizes the round-trip flight time from $[s, 0]$, i.e., which gives the *earliest possible return* for the drone to the truck. Notice that the delivery point which minimizes the round-trip flight time from $[s, 0]$ is not necessarily the delivery point that is at the shortest distance from $[s, 0]$. For example, in Figure 8, the point d_1 is closer than d_2 to $[s, 0]$. Thus one needs to use the function defined by Formula 2 to calculate which delivery point requires the shortest time to return to the truck. We then update s to be this shortest return time. If there are no feasible delivery points, then s is set to the earliest time any of the remaining points can be reached after the current time.




Figure 6: The black arrows, red arrows show the travel of the drone according to an optimal, greedy schedule, respectively, for an instance $I = (0, 4, 8, D)$ with D containing five delivery points $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_5\}$. The black crosses and red crosses on the x -axis indicate the return points of OPT and \mathcal{A}_g , respectively.

Algorithm 1 gives the pseudocode for \mathcal{A}_g . It is straightforward to see that Algorithm \mathcal{A}_g can be implemented in $O(n^2)$ time, since a single evaluation of ret takes constant time. Figure 6 gives an example of the trajectories of the drone according to an optimal schedule and that of the schedule calculated by \mathcal{A}_g .

Algorithm 1 Greedy Approximation Algorithm \mathcal{A}_g to Compute Feasible Delivery Schedule

Require: Instance $I = (v, R, D)$ where $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$, is a list of delivery points.

Ensure: \mathcal{S}_I is a feasible schedule of deliveries.

```
1:  $\mathcal{S}_I \leftarrow L \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2:  $s \leftarrow 0$ 
3:                                      $\triangleright$  For each delivery point  $d_i$ , calculate  $es(d_i)$  and  $ls(d_i)$  and insert triple into  $L$ .
4: for  $i = 1 \dots n$  do
5:   if  $s \leq ls(d_i)$  then
6:      $x.es = es(d_i)$ 
7:      $x.ls = ls(d_i)$ 
8:      $x.d = d_i$ 
9:     Insert( $L, x$ )
10:  end if
11: end for
12: Sort( $L, key = es$ )
13: while  $L \neq \emptyset$  do
14:    $x \leftarrow first(L)$ 
15:
16:   if  $s < x.es$  then
17:      $s \leftarrow x.es$                                       $\triangleright$  If no feasible delivery point, move  $s$  forward.
18:   end if
19:                                      $\triangleright$  Find feasible delivery point which minimizes the return time to truck.
20:    $r_{min} \leftarrow \infty$ 
21:   while  $x \neq NIL$  and  $s \geq x.es$  do
22:      $r \leftarrow ret(s, v, x.d_i)$ 
23:     if  $r < r_{min}$  then
24:        $r_{min} \leftarrow r$ 
25:        $save \leftarrow x$ 
26:     end if
27:      $x \leftarrow next(L)$ 
28:   end while
29:                                      $\triangleright$  Insert next delivery point into schedule, update  $s$  and list  $L$ 
30:   Insert ( $\mathcal{S}_I, (save.d, s)$ )
31:    $s \leftarrow r_{min}$ 
32:   for  $x \in L$  do
33:     if  $x.lr < s$  then
34:       Delete ( $L, x$ )
35:     end if
36:   end for
37: end while
```

In the next theorem we compare the size of the schedule calculated by Algorithm \mathcal{A}_g with respect to an optimal algorithm.

Theorem 2. *Given an instance $I = (v, R, D)$ of the truck-drone delivery problem, let \mathcal{S}_g be the schedule produced by the algorithm \mathcal{A}_g and let \mathcal{S}_{OPT} be an optimal schedule. Then*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{OPT}| \leq 2|\mathcal{S}_g|$$

Proof. Let $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$ and let

$$\mathcal{S}_{OPT} = ((d_{i_1}, s_1), (d_{i_2}, s_2), \dots, (d_{i_p}, s_p)), \text{ and}$$

$\mathcal{S}_g = ((d_{j_1}, s'_1), (d_{j_2}, s'_2), \dots, (d_{j_q}, s'_q))$, where $q \leq p \leq n$.

We give a function \mathcal{F} that maps delivery points in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} to points in \mathcal{S}_g . For every k , with $1 \leq k \leq p$, define r_k to be the return time of the drone for the k^{th} delivery in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} and similarly for every k , with $1 \leq k \leq q$, define r'_k to be the return time of the drone for the k^{th} delivery in \mathcal{S}_g . Define Q_k to be the set of delivery points in \mathcal{S}_g whose return to the truck in the greedy schedule occurs *during* the flight time of the drone to deliver the k^{th} item in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} . That is,

$$Q_k = \{d_{j_\ell} : r'_\ell \in (s_k, r_k]\}$$

If $Q_k \neq \emptyset$, define $last(Q_k)$ to be the element of Q_k with the latest return according to the greedy schedule.

Now define P_k to be the set of delivery points in \mathcal{S}_g whose start time in the greedy schedule is before the start time of the k^{th} delivery in the optimal schedule, but whose return to the truck in the greedy schedule occurs between the return from the k^{th} delivery in the optimal schedule and the start of the $(k+1)^{st}$ delivery. That is:

$$P_k = \{d_{j_\ell} : s'_\ell \leq s_k \text{ and } r_k < r'_\ell \leq s_{k+1}\}$$

If $P_k \neq \emptyset$, note that it can have only one element, denote it as p_k .

We are now ready to define the function \mathcal{F} . For all $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

$$\mathcal{F}(d_{i_k}) = \begin{cases} last(Q_k) & \text{if } Q_k \neq \emptyset & (4a) \\ p_k & \text{if } Q_k = \emptyset \text{ and } P_k \neq \emptyset & (4b) \\ d_{i_k} & \text{otherwise} & (4c) \end{cases}$$

We give an example to illustrate function \mathcal{F} using an instance shown in Figure 6. In that case the optimal schedule makes 5 deliveries in order to $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5)$ and greedy schedule contains 3 deliveries (d_3, d_4, d_5) listed in order, omitting the starting times. For this case the function \mathcal{F} is as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(d_1) = d_3, \mathcal{F}(d_2) = d_4, \mathcal{F}(d_3) = d_3, \mathcal{F}(d_4) = d_5, \text{ and } \mathcal{F}(d_5) = d_5.$$

First we prove that Clauses 4a, 4b, and 4c define a valid function on L' , that is, every delivery point in the optimal schedule is mapped to a delivery point in the greedy schedule. Since Q_k and P_k only contain delivery points in the greedy schedule, the only case to consider is that $Q_k = P_k = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F}(d_{i_k}) = d_{i_k}$ and d_{i_k} is not part of the schedule \mathcal{S}_g of the greedy algorithm \mathcal{A}_g .

Let ℓ be the largest integer such that $s'_\ell \leq s_k$. By assumption $d_{j_\ell} \neq d_{i_k}$. Since $Q_k = P_k = \emptyset$, either $r'_\ell > s_{k+1}$ or $r'_\ell \leq s_k$. If $r'_\ell \leq s_k$ (see Figure 7(a)), consider the $(\ell+1)^{st}$ delivery by the greedy algorithm. We know that $s'_{\ell+1} > s_k$ and since $Q_k = \emptyset$, it must be that $r'_{\ell+1} > r_k$. Thus for its $(\ell+1)^{st}$ delivery, the greedy heuristic should have chosen to deliver to d_{i_k} rather than to $d_{j_{\ell+1}}$, a contradiction.

Therefore it must be that $r'_\ell > s_{k+1}$. But then, using Lemma 2, there is a valid trajectory for the drone flying to d_{i_k} starting at s'_ℓ with an *earlier* return time that is at most $r_k \leq s_{k+1} < r'_\ell$ (see Figure 7(b)). Thus for its ℓ^{th} delivery, the greedy heuristic should have chosen to deliver to d_{i_k} rather than to d_{j_ℓ} , a contradiction. Thus d_{i_k} must be part of the greedy schedule, and \mathcal{F} is a valid function mapping the delivery points in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} to the delivery points in \mathcal{S}_g .

Finally, we claim that \mathcal{F} maps at most two delivery points in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} to one delivery point in \mathcal{S}_g . First, since the half-closed intervals $(s'_1, r'_1], (s'_2, r'_2], \dots, (s'_{k'}, r'_{k'}]$ are all disjoint, and the half-closed intervals $(s_1, r_1], (s_2, r_2], \dots, (s_{k'}, r_{k'}]$ are also all disjoint, and any return point $[r', 0]$ can satisfy at most one of Clauses 4a and 4b, it follows that distinct elements in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} are mapped to distinct elements of \mathcal{S}_g by those two clauses. Second, clearly distinct elements in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} are mapped to




Figure 7: This figure illustrates the two cases in the proof that the function \mathcal{F} in Theorem 2 is well defined. Red lines show deliveries in a presumed greedy schedule, and black lines indicate deliveries in a presumed optimal schedule. The dashed line represents the x axis, with distances from the origin marked.

distinct elements of \mathcal{S}_g by Clause 4c. Therefore, the only kind of "collision" that can occur is that $\mathcal{F}(d_{i_k})$ is mapped to d_{j_ℓ} by Clause 4a or Clause 4b and $\mathcal{F}(d_{i_q})$ is mapped to d_{j_ℓ} by Clause 4c. This proves our claim that \mathcal{F} maps at most two delivery points in \mathcal{S}_{OPT} to one delivery point in \mathcal{S}_g .

We conclude that the schedule \mathcal{S}_g created by \mathcal{A}_g contains at least $\lceil p/2 \rceil$ elements, as desired. That is, \mathcal{A}_g is a 2-approximation algorithm. \square

The approximation ratio of 2 is tight. To see this, consider the instance given in Figure 8. For this instance the schedule computed by the greedy algorithm contains exactly one half of the delivery points, while an optimal schedule makes deliveries to all points. Thus, the approximation factor of 2 in Theorem 2 cannot be improved.




Figure 8: Approximation factor of 2 is sharp: in this instance, d_1, d_3, d_5, \dots are located at the maximal reach of the drone, and reachable only from the left focus of the corresponding ellipse (dashed green). An optimal schedule, shown in black, contains all points in order $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, \dots$. The greedy algorithm, can immediately schedule a delivery to d_2 , but not to d_1 . After scheduling a delivery to d_2 a delivery to d_1 is not feasible any more, and this scheduling, shown in red, is repeated, resulting in the schedule d_2, d_4, d_6, \dots

5 Optimal algorithm for a restricted set of inputs

As seen in the proof of strong NP-hardness in Section 3, having many delivery points with the same x -coordinate creates a decision problem: should a delivery to a point $[0, y]$ be scheduled prior to or after the truck reaches $[0, 0]$. These decisions make the truck-drone problem NP-hard. In this section, we specify a family of instances called proper instances in which the delivery points do not have the same or "nearly" the same x -coordinates, where "nearly" depends on the difference in their y -coordinates. In particular, the greater the difference in the y -coordinates of the points, the

greater is the difference in their x -coordinates in proper instances. We show that there is $O(n^3)$ algorithm to compute an optimal schedule for proper instances.

Definition 2. Let $I = (v, R, D)$ be an instance of the truck-drone delivery problem where $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$. We say I is a proper instance if:

- for every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, with $i \neq j$, the delivery point d_j is not contained in the triangle $[es(d_i), 0], d_i, [lr(d_i), 0]$, and
- the set of closed intervals $\{[es(d_1), ls(d_1)], [es(d_2), ls(d_2)], \dots, [es(d_n), ls(d_n)]\}$ form a proper interval graph [6], i.e., no interval in the set is a subset of another interval in the set.

Figure 9 shows an example of a proper instance. The definition of a proper instance implies that the delivery points have pairwise different x -coordinates and clearly, not many of them can reside in a narrow vertical band.

The lemma below implies that for a proper instance with $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$, the intervals $[es(d_1), ls(d_1)], [es(d_2), ls(d_2)], \dots, [es(d_n), ls(d_n)]$ are ordered by the x -coordinates of the corresponding points in D .

Lemma 4. Let $I = (v, R, D)$ be a proper instance of the truck-drone delivery problem with $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$. Let $d_i = [x_i, y_i]$ and $d_j = [x_j, y_j]$ be two points of D with $x_i < x_j$. Then either $ls(d_i) < es(d_j)$, or $es(d_i) < es(d_j) \leq ls(d_i) < ls(d_j)$

Proof. If $y_j < y_i$ then $ls(d_j) > ls(d_i)$. Since interval $[es(d_j), ls(d_j)]$ cannot contain $[es(d_i), ls(d_i)]$, either $ls(d_i) < es(d_j)$, or $es(d_i) < es(d_j) \leq ls(d_i) < ls(d_j)$.

If $y_j > y_i$ then $es(d_j) > es(d_i)$. Since interval $[es(d_i), ls(d_i)]$ cannot contain $[es(d_j), ls(d_j)]$, either $ls(d_i) < es(d_j)$, or $es(d_i) < es(d_j) \leq ls(d_i) < ls(d_j)$. \square

Given an instance $I = (v, R, D)$, we can verify if I is a proper instance in $O(n^2)$ time by checking each pair of intervals for non-containment, and each triangle for the non-inclusion of other points of D .




Figure 9: An example of a proper instance $I = (v, R, D)$ position for $v = 3$, and $r = 12$. For each delivery point the red segment points to the corresponding ed and ld points on the line, and the green segment points to the corresponding la . The three topmost points are at the limit of the reach of the drone.

The following lemma is used to show that for proper instances we can restrict our attention to schedules in which the subsequent deliveries are ordered by the x -coordinates of delivery points, and in which the trajectories of the drone are non-crossing. See Figure 10 for an illustration.

Lemma 5. Let $I = (v, R, D)$ be a proper instance of the truck-drone problem. Assume that there is a feasible schedule for this instance in which a delivery to, say $d_2 = [x_2, y_2]$ immediately precedes that to $d_1 = [x_1, y_1]$, with $x_1 < x_2$. Then




Figure 10: (i) The crossing trajectories to d_1 and d_2 are shown in black. (ii) The non-crossing trajectories, shorter in total, are in red.

1. The trajectories of the drone to d_1 and d_2 must cross.
2. By swapping the order of deliveries to d_1 and d_2 the total time of the two deliveries cannot increase, and thus swapping the two deliveries maintains the feasibility of the schedule, i.e., crossings of two consecutive trajectories can be avoided.




Figure 11: Illustration for the proof of (1) in Lemma 5. $d_1 = [x_1, y_1]$ and $d_2 = [x_2, y_2]$ with $x_1 < x_2$ and delivery to d_2 occurring before the delivery to d_1 . Figure (a) illustrates the case of $y_1 \leq y_2$ and the shaded region demonstrates locations of d_1 which result in a crossing trajectory. Figure (b) illustrates the case of $y_1 \geq y_2$ and the shaded region demonstrates locations of d_2 which result in a crossing trajectory.

Proof. To see (1), let s_i, r_i denote the start and return times to delivery point d_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume for contradiction that delivery trajectories do not cross. If $y_1 \leq y_2$, then d_1 lies inside the triangle $[r_2, 0], d_2, [x_2, 0]$. This triangle is clearly contained in $[es(d_2), 0], d_2, [lr(d_2), 0]$ contradicting D being proper. If $y_1 \geq y_2$ then d_2 lies inside the triangle $[x_1, 0], d_1, [s_1, 0]$, which is contained inside $[es(d_1), 0], d_1, [lr(d_1), 0]$. This also contradicts D being proper. See Figure 11.

Next, we show (2). By Observation 1 we can assume that the delivery to d_1 starts immediately at time r_2 , i.e., $s_1 = r_2$ and terminates at time r_1 . Clearly, in this case $es(d_2) < ls(d_1)$ and thus, by Lemma 4, $es(d_1) < es(d_2) \leq s_2 < r_2 \leq ls(d_1) < ls(d_2)$. Thus, a delivery to d_1 can be started at time s_2 , and a delivery to d_2 can be started at time r_2 or later. It remains to show that the reversal in the delivery order can terminate latest at time r_1 .

Suppose first that delivery to d_1 , when started at time s_2 takes at most as much time as a delivery to d_2 at time s_2 , see Figure 10 (ii). In the paragraph below, we use s_i to denote the point $[s_i, 0]$ and similarly r_i to denote the point $[r_i, 0]$. Consider the quadrilateral s_2, d_1, d_2, r_1 shown in blue. Since our instance is a proper instance, the triangle s_2, d_1, r_1 doesn't contain d_2 and thus this quadrilateral is convex. By the triangular inequality the sum $|s_2, d_1| + |d_2, r_1|$ of the lengths

of two opposite sides of the quadrilateral is strictly less than the sum of the length of its diagonals $|d_1, r_1| + |s_2, d_2|$. Therefore,

$$|s_2, d_1| + |d_1, r_2| + |r_2, d_2| + |d_2, r_1| < |s_2, d_2| + |d_2, r_2| + |r_2, d_1| + |d_1, r_1|$$

and the path s_2, d_1, r_2, d_2, r_1 is shorter than the trajectory s_2, d_2, r_2, d_1, r_1 . However, the path s_2, d_1, r_2, d_2, r_1 is *not necessarily a valid drone trajectory* if the delivery to d_1 from s_2 takes less time than the delivery to d_2 from s_2 . Then, when delivering to d_1 first, the drone returns to the truck at point r'_2 located strictly between s_2 and r_2 . But then the path s_2, d_1, r'_2, d_2, r_1 is even shorter than path s_2, d_1, r_2, d_2, r_1 . Thus, when starting the delivery to d_2 at r'_2 , the drone returns to the truck at a point r'_1 to the left of r_1 , which improves the total delivery time to d_1 and d_2 .




Figure 12: Reversing the directions of deliveries and the movement of the truck in (ii) converts a configuration of the second case to the first case

Now suppose instead that delivery to d_1 , when started from s_2 , takes more time than the delivery to d_2 from s_2 , as for example on Figure 12 (i). By the shape of the function $\text{ret}(s, d, v)$, see Observation 4, and since $es(d_1) < es(d_2)$ and $ls(d_1) < ls(d_2)$, a delivery to d_1 , when started from s_1 also takes more time than the delivery to d_2 from s_1 . Consider the configuration on Figure 12(ii) in which we reverse the movement of the drone and of the truck. Then we reduced this to the previous case and a delivery from s_1 first to d_2 and then to d_1 is shorter, and by reversing this once more we obtain that the delivery from s_2 first to d_1 and then to d_2 is shorter. \square

A proper instance is guaranteed to have an optimal schedule with non-crossing trajectories. However not all optimal schedules give non-crossing trajectories. Indeed there are non-proper instances where crossing of trajectories is required in any optimal schedule as demonstrated in Figure 13.




Figure 13: An instance of the problem where any optimal schedule must contain crossing trajectories. Points d_1 and d_3 are at the maximum reach of the drone. When scheduling a delivery first to d_1 then a delivery is possible either to d_2 or to d_3 , but not to both.

Definition 3. Let $I = (v, R, D)$ be an instance of the truck-drone delivery problem where $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$. We call schedule

$$\mathcal{S}_I = ((d_{i_1}, s_1), (d_{i_2}, s_2), \dots, (d_{i_m}, s_m)), m \leq n$$

monotone if the x -coordinate of d_{i_j} is strictly less than the x -coordinate of $d_{i_{j+1}}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq m - 1$,

In the next theorem we show that there always exists a monotone schedule with the optimal substructure property for proper instances.

Theorem 3. Let $I = (v, R, D)$ be a proper instance of the truck-drone delivery problem with $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$. Assume that the points in D are listed according to increasing x -coordinate. Then there is an optimal schedule $\mathcal{S}_I = ((d_{i_1}, s_1), (d_{i_2}, s_2), \dots, (d_{i_m}, s_m))$, $m \leq n$ for this instance with the following properties:

1. \mathcal{S}_I is monotone.
2. For every $j \leq m$, the initial part $((d_{i_1}, s_1), (d_{i_2}, s_2), \dots, (d_{i_j}, s_j))$ of \mathcal{S}_I minimizes the delivery completion time for any subset of $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{i_j}\}$ of size j .

Proof. Assume $I = (v, R, D)$ is a given proper instance of the truck-drone delivery problem and let \mathcal{S}_I be an optimal schedule for it. By a repeated application of Lemma 5 we can swap any two consecutive deliveries that don't respect the order of x -coordinates of points, as in the bubble sort, while maintaining the schedule optimal. This eventually produces a monotone schedule of the same (optimal) length, proving (1).

To show (2), assume that for some $j \leq m$, there is a subset of j points $\{d'_{i_1}, d'_{i_2}, \dots, d'_{i_j}\}$ of the set $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{i_j}\}$ for which there is a schedule $((d'_{i_1}, s'_1), (d'_{i_2}, s'_2), \dots, (d'_{i_j}, s'_j))$ with $s'_j < s_j$ and which minimizes the delivery completion time for any subset of $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{i_j}\}$ of size j . Then by concatenating $((d'_{i_1}, s'_1), (d'_{i_2}, s'_2), \dots, (d'_{i_j}, s'_j))$ with $((d_{i_{j+1}}, s_{j+1}), \dots, (d_{i_m}, s_m))$, we get a valid schedule. In this manner, repeating the process starting with $j = i_m$ and decreasing appropriately the value of j we can get a schedule for I that is optimal, monotone, and satisfies the property 2 of the theorem. \square

We use Theorem 3 to describe a dynamic programming algorithm that finds an optimal schedule for proper instances.

Theorem 4. There is an $O(n^3)$ algorithm that calculates an optimal schedule for any proper instance $I = (v, R, D)$ of the truck-drone delivery problem.

Proof. Assume the delivery points in D are listed in the order of their x coordinates. Define $T(i, j)$ to be the earliest delivery completion time for the truck and the drone to perform exactly i deliveries from among d_1, d_2, \dots, d_j where d_j must be included in the schedule. If such a schedule is not possible, we define $T(i, j) = \infty$. We can compute $T(i, j)$ using dynamic programming as follows. We clearly have $T(1, j) = \text{ret}(s, d_j, v)$ for the base case of $i = 1$ (see Lemma 1 for the definition of ret) where $[s, 0]$ is the starting position of the truck. For $i \geq 2$, we have $T(i, j) = \min_{j' < j} \text{ret}(T(i - 1, j'), d_j, v)$. This recursive formula immediately follows from the optimal substructure property stated in Theorem 3: a schedule resulting in the earliest completion time of making i out of the first j deliveries where d_j is included consists of delivering to $i - 1$ out of the first $j' < j$ delivery points (with earliest completion time $T(i - 1, j')$) followed by earliest delivery completion to d_j . Note that defining $\text{ret}(s', v, d) = \infty$ when $s' > \text{ls}(d)$ and $T(i, j) = \infty$ when delivery is impossible correctly works with the recursive computation of T .

Having computed T , we can find the maximum number of deliveries that can be completed in a valid schedule by taking the maximum m such that $T(m, j) \neq \infty$ for some j . By recording for each (i, j) pair which choice of j' resulted in the table entry $T(i, j)$, we can reconstruct the schedule itself using standard backtracking techniques.

The running time is dominated by computing the table $T(i, j)$. It has $O(n^2)$ entries and each entry can be computed in time $O(n)$, since a single evaluation of ret takes constant time. The overall runtime is then $O(n^3)$. \square

6 Discussion

We have shown that even in the simple case of a single drone with a single truck travelling in a straight line, the problem of coordinating their efforts to maximize the number of deliveries made is hard. Our work raises a number of different questions. We show that a greedy strategy achieves a 2-approximation. Is a better approximation possible? In particular, is the problem APX-hard or might there be a PTAS for it? Our implementation of the greedy strategy runs in $O(n^2)$ time. Is a better running time for the algorithm possible by taking advantage of the structure of the intervals created by the drone paths? The set of proper instances includes those where the y -coordinate is fixed. Could this be expanded to include points with a limited number of different y -coordinates? More generally, is there a "natural" setting in which the problem becomes fixed-parameter tractable? Finally, many variations on the problem are worth pursuing. Rather than maximizing the number of deliveries made with a given speed or drone range, one could consider the dual problems of minimizing the speed or range required to complete all deliveries. Versions with multiple drones and/or trucks, larger capacity drones, etc. are also of interest.

References

- [1] A. Cornell, B. Kloss, and R. Riedel. Drones take to the sky, potentially disrupting last-mile delivery. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/aerospace-and-defense/our-insights/future-air-mobility-blog/drones-take-to-the-sky-potentially-disrupting-last-mile-delivery>, 2023.
- [2] Thomas Erlebach, Kelin Luo, and Frits C. R. Spieksma. Package delivery using drones with restricted movement areas. In Sang Won Bae and Heejin Park, editors, *33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea*, volume 248 of *LIPICs*, pages 49:1–49:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [3] H. Eskandaripour and E. Boldsaikhan. Last-mile drone delivery: Past, present, and future. *Special Issue The Applications of Drones in Logistics*, 2023.
- [4] Júlia C Freitas, Puca Huachi V Penna, and Túlio AM Toffolo. Exact and heuristic approaches to truck–drone delivery problems. *EURO Journal on Transportation and Logistics*, 12:100094, 2023.
- [5] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability; A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman & Co., New York, NY, USA, 1990.
- [6] M. C. Golumbic. Interval graphs and related topics. *Discrete Mathematics*, 55:113–121, 1985.
- [7] Arindam Khanda, Federico Corò, and Sajal K Das. Drone-truck cooperated delivery under time varying dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Workshop on Advanced tools, programming*

- languages, and PPlatforms for Implementing and Evaluating algorithms for Distributed systems*, pages 24–29, 2022.
- [8] Hongqi Li, Jun Chen, Feilong Wang, and Yibin Zhao. Truck and drone routing problem with synchronization on arcs. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, 69(6):884–901, 2022.
 - [9] Giusy Macrina, Luigi Di Puglia Pugliese, Francesca Guerriero, and Gilbert Laporte. Drone-aided routing: A literature review. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 120:102762, 2020.
 - [10] Adriano Masone, Stefan Poikonen, and Bruce L Golden. The multivisit drone routing problem with edge launches: An iterative approach with discrete and continuous improvements. *Networks*, 80(2):193–215, 2022.
 - [11] Neil Mathew, Stephen L Smith, and Steven L Waslander. Optimal path planning in cooperative heterogeneous multi-robot delivery systems. In *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics XI: Selected Contributions of the Eleventh International Workshop on the Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics*, pages 407–423. Springer, 2015.
 - [12] Chase C Murray and Amanda G Chu. The flying sidekick traveling salesman problem: Optimization of drone-assisted parcel delivery. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 54:86–109, 2015.
 - [13] Aishwarya Raghunatha, Emma Lindkvist, Patrik Thollander, Erika Hansson, and Greta Jonsson. Critical assessment of emissions, costs, and time for last-mile goods delivery by drones versus trucks. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):11814, 2023.
 - [14] Teena Thomas, Sharan Srinivas, and Chandrasekharan Rajendran. Collaborative truck multi-drone delivery system considering drone scheduling and en route operations. *Annals of Operations Research*, pages 1–47, 2023.
 - [15] Li. X., J. Tupayachi, A. Sharmin, and M. Ferguson. Drone-aided delivery methods, challenge, and the future: A methodological review. *Drones*, 7:191, 2023.
 - [16] Ruowei Zhang, Lihua Dou, Bin Xin, Chen Chen, Fang Deng, and Jie Chen. A review on the truck and drone cooperative delivery problem. *Unmanned Systems*, pages 1–25, 2023.