




Collision-Free Robot Scheduling

Duncan Adamson 

Leverhulme Research Centre for Functional Materials Design, University of Liverpool, UK

Nathan Flaherty 

Leverhulme Research Centre for Functional Materials Design, University of Liverpool, UK

Igor Potapov  

Department of Computer Science, University Of Liverpool, UK

Paul G Spirakis  

Department of Computer Science, University Of Liverpool, UK

Abstract

Robots are becoming an increasingly common part of scientific work within laboratory environments. In this paper, we investigate the problem of designing *schedules* for completing a set of tasks at fixed locations with multiple robots in a laboratory. We represent the laboratory as a graph with tasks placed on fixed vertices and robots represented as agents, with the constraint that no two robots may occupy the same vertex at any given timestep. Each schedule is partitioned into a set of timesteps, corresponding to a walk through the graph (allowing for a robot to wait at a vertex to complete a task), with each timestep taking time equal to the time for a robot to move from one vertex to another and each task taking some given number of timesteps during the completion of which a robot must stay at the vertex containing the task. The goal is to determine a set of schedules, with one schedule for each robot, minimising the number of timesteps taken by the schedule taking the greatest number of timesteps within the set of schedules.

We show that this problem is NP-complete for many simple classes of graphs, the problem of determining the fastest schedule, defined by the number of time steps required for a robot to visit every vertex in the schedule and complete every task assigned in its assigned schedule. Explicitly, we provide this result for complete graphs, bipartite graphs, star graphs, and planar graphs. Finally, we provide positive results for line graphs, showing that we can find an optimal set of schedules for k robots completing m tasks of equal length of a path of length n in $O(kmn)$ time, and a k -approximation when the length of the tasks is unbounded.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases Graph Exploration, Scheduling, NP-Completeness, Approximation Algorithms

1 Introduction

Across a wide range of industries, there is an increase in the use of automation. This has led to a wide range of problems relating to the scheduling of autonomous agents within workplaces. This includes spacecraft manufacturing [19], Unmanned Aerial Vehicle [22], and vehicle routing [24].

In this paper, we are particularly interested in the scheduling of robots within chemistry labs. This is motivated by a significant and expanding body of work concerning robotic chemists. Initial work on these systems focused on building robots performing reactions within fixed environments [18, 16, 20, 17, 15], however recently Burger et al. [6] have presented a robot capable of moving within a laboratory and completing tasks throughout the space. The works of Burger et al. [6] and Liu et al. [19] provide the main motivation for this work, namely the problem of moving robots within a laboratory environment (as presented by Burger et al. [6]) while avoiding collisions (as investigated in the manufacturing context by Liu et al. [19]).

In addition to physical science motivation, our model and algorithmic results are strongly based on graph theory, in particular, graph exploration. Informally, we model our problem as

a graph problem, where robots are represented as agents in the graph, with the goal of finding a set of walks for each robot, allowing every task to be completed without any collisions. Our model of movement for robots within the graph matches the exploration model given by Czyzowicz et al. [7], where agents (robots) start at fixed points within the graph, then can move provided that no pair of agents occupy the same vertex in the same time steps. The primary difference between our model and that of [7] is that in our setting, the agents are given a schedule from some central system rather than each having to determine the best route separately.

More general exploration problems have been considered in a variety of settings. Of particular interest to us are the works regarding the efficient exploration of temporal graphs. As in our setting, exploration is, in most cases, centrally controlled, with the primary goal of minimising the number of time steps required to complete the exploration, corresponding to the length of the longest walk taken by any agent in the graph. Further, having the edge set of the graph change over time is similar to, and indeed can be closely mimicked by, the collision-avoiding condition in our problem, in the sense that the available moves for a given agent change throughout the lifetime of the graph.

There is a large number of results across many settings and variations of the temporal graph exploration problem, including when the number of vertices an agent can visit in one timestep is unbounded [3, 13], bounded [10, 9, 21], and for specific graph classes [1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 12, 11, 23]. Particularly relevant to us is the work of Michail and Spirakis [21], who showed that the problem of determining the fastest exploration of a temporal graph is NP-hard, and, furthermore, no constant factor approximation algorithm exists of the shortest exploration (in terms of the length of the path found by the algorithm, compared to the shortest path exploring the graph) unless $P = NP$. As noted, the change in the structure of temporal graphs is close to the challenges implemented in our graph by agents blocking potential moves from each other. In terms of positive results, the work of Erlebach et al. [9] provided a substantial set of results that have formed the basis for much of the subsequent work on algorithmic results for temporal graph exploration. Of particular interest to us are the results that show that, for temporal graphs that are connected in every timestep, an agent can visit any subset of m vertices in at most $O(nm)$ time, and provide constructions for faster explorations of graphs with b agents and an (r, b) -division ($O(n^2b/r + nr b^2)$ time), and $2 \times n$ grids with $4 \log n$ agents ($O(n \log n)$ time).

1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we present a set of results for the k -ROBOT SCHEDULING problem. A short summary is provided in Table 1. Informally, we define the k -ROBOT SCHEDULING scheduling problem as the problem of assigning schedules (walks on the graph with robots completing every task from a given set), minimising the time needed to complete the schedule.

We lay out the remainder of this paper as follows. In Section 2 we provide the definitions and notation used in the rest of the paper, with the k -ROBOT SCHEDULING problem fully presented in Problem 1. In Section 3 we show that k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is NP-complete for a large number of graph classes, explicitly Complete graphs (Theorem 5), Bipartite graphs (Theorem 6), Star graphs (Theorem 7), and Planar graphs (Theorem 10). Finally, Section 4 provides the algorithmic results for this paper, namely an optimal algorithm for constructing a schedule for k -robots on a path graph for tasks with equal length (Theorem 18), and a k -approximation algorithm for creating a schedule with k -robots on a path graph (Theorem 19).

Setting	Result
General graphs, $k \in \mathbb{N}$	NP-complete (Theorem 4)
Complete graphs, $k \geq 2$	NP-complete (Theorem 5)
Bipartite graphs, $k \geq 2$	NP-complete (Theorem 6)
Star graphs (and trees), $k \geq 2$	NP-complete (Theorem 7)
Planar graphs, $k \in \mathbb{N}$	NP-complete (Theorem 10)
Path graphs, with m tasks of equal duration, $k \in \mathbb{N}$	Optimal $O(kmn)$ time Algorithm (Theorem 18)
Path graphs, $k \in \mathbb{N}$	k -approximation Algorithm (Theorem 19)

■ **Table 1** Our results for different graph classes and numbers, k , of robots.

2 Preliminaries

For the remainder of this paper, we define graphs as a tuple containing a set of vertices V and a set of edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. A *walk* in a graph G of length ℓ is a sequence of ℓ edges such that the second vertex in the i^{th} edge is the first vertex in the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ edge, i.e. a sequence of the form $(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_{\ell-1}, v_\ell)$. Any walk w can visit the same vertex multiple times and may use the same edge multiple times. Given a walk $w = (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_{\ell-1}, v_\ell)$, we denote by $|w|$ the total number of edges in w , and by $w[i]$ the i^{th} edge in w . In this paper, we also allow walks to contain self-adjacent moves, i.e. moves of the form (v_i, v_i) for every vertex in the graph. We do so to represent remaining at a fixed position for some length of time. Given a pair of naturals $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ where $i \leq j$, we denote by $[i, j]$ the set $i, i+1, \dots, j$. For a given walk w , we denote by $w[i, j]$ the walk $w[i], w[i+1], \dots, w[j]$.

In this problem, we consider a set of autonomous agents, which we call *robots*, moving on a given graph $G = (V, E)$ and completing a set of tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$. As mentioned in our introduction, this problem originates in the setting of lab spaces, particularly in the chemistry setting. As such, our definitions of robots and tasks are designed to mimic those found in real-world problems. We associate each task with a vertex on which it is located and the duration required to complete the task. We do not allow tasks to be moved by a robot, a task can only be completed by a single robot remaining at the station for the entire task duration, and any robot may complete any number of tasks, with no restrictions on which task a robot can complete. This requirement reflects the motivation from chemistry, where tasks reflect reactions that must be done within an exact time frame and at a fixed workstation.

Formally, we define a task t_i as a tuple (d_i, v_i) where d_i is the *duration* of the task, and v_i is the vertex at which the task is located. We use $|t_i|$ to denote the duration of the task t_i . In general, the reader may assume that for a graph $G = (V, E)$ containing the vertex set $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, the notation i_t is used to denote the index of the vertex at which task $t = (d, v_{i_t})$ is located. This will be specified throughout the paper where relevant.

To complete tasks, we assign each robot a *schedule*, composed of an alternating sequence of walks and tasks. We note that each schedule can begin and end with either a walk and a walk, a walk and a task, a task and a walk, or a task and a task. We treat each schedule

as a set of commands to the robot, directing it within a given time frame. In this way, we partition the schedule into a set of time steps, with each time step allowing a robot to move along one edge or complete some fraction of a task, with a task t requiring exactly $|t|$ time steps to complete. We call the time span of a schedule the total number of timesteps required to complete it. We denote the time span of the schedule C containing the walks w_1, w_2, \dots, w_ℓ and tasks t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m by $|C| = \left(\sum_{i \in [1, \ell]} |w_i|\right) + \left(\sum_{j \in [1, m]} |t_j|\right)$. Given a walk w directly following the task t in the schedule C , we require that the first edge traversed in w begins at the vertex v_i on which t is located. Similarly, we require that the task t' following the walk w' in the schedule C is located on the last vertex in the last edge in w' .

The *walk representation* $\mathcal{W}(C)$ of a schedule C is an ordered sequence of edges formed by replacing the task $t_i = (d, v_i)$ in C with a walk of length $|t_i| = d$ consisting only of the edge (v_i, v_i) , then concatenate the walks together in order. Note that $|\mathcal{W}(C)| = |C|$. For a given robot R assigned schedule C , in timestep j R is located on the vertex $v \in V$ that is the end vertex of the i^{th} edge in $\mathcal{W}(C)$, i.e. the vertex v such that $\mathcal{W}(C)[i] = (u, v)$. We require the first vertex in the walk representation of any schedule C assigned to robot R to be the *starting vertex* of R , i.e. some predetermined vertex representing where R starts on the graph. If the schedule C containing the task t is assigned to robot R , we say that t is *assigned* to R .

Given a set of schedules $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ for a set of k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k , and set of tasks $\mathcal{T} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$. we say that \mathcal{C} is *task completing* if for every task $t \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists exactly one schedule C_i such that $t \in C_i$. We call \mathcal{C} *collision-free* if there is no timestep where any pair of robots occupy the same vertex. Formally, \mathcal{C} is collision-free if, for every C_i, C_j where $i \neq j$ and time-step $s \in [1, |C_i|]$, $\mathcal{W}(C_i)[s] = (v, u)$ and $\mathcal{W}(C_j)[s] = (v', u')$ satisfies $u \neq u'$ and $(v, u) \neq (v', u')$.

For the remainder of this paper, we assume every robot in the graph is assigned exactly 1 schedule. Given 2 sets of schedules \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' , we say \mathcal{C} is *faster* than \mathcal{C}' if $\max_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} |C_i| < \max_{C'_j \in \mathcal{C}'} |C'_j|$, where $\max_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}}$ returns the schedule in \mathcal{C} with the longest time-span. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, set of k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k starting on vertices sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k , and set of tasks \mathcal{T} , a *fastest* task-completing, collision-free set of k -schedules is the set of schedules \mathcal{C} such that any other set of task-completing, collision-free schedules is no faster than \mathcal{C} . Note that there may be multiple such schedules.

► **Problem 1** (*k*-ROBOT SCHEDULING). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, set of k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k starting on vertices sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k , and set of tasks \mathcal{T} , what is the fastest task-completing, collision-free set of k -schedules $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ such that C_i can be assigned to $R_i, \forall i \in [1, k]$?*


We can rephrase *k*-ROBOT SCHEDULING as a decision problem by asking, for a given time-limit L , if there exists some task-completing, collision-free set of k -schedules $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ such that C_i can be assigned to R_i and $|C_i| \leq L$, for all $i \in [1, k]$.

► **Example 2.** An example of a task-fulfilling set of schedules for the graph shown in Figure 1 is

$$\{[(v_7, v_8), (v_8, v_5)], v_5\}, \quad \{[(v_9, v_6), (v_6, v_3), (v_3, v_2)], v_2, [(v_2, v_1), (v_1, v_4)], v_4\}$$

which has a makespan $Sp(S)$ of 9. Which in this case is clearly not optimal, since if the robot starting on v_9 was the one to complete v_5 then we have the following faster schedule, $\{(v_7, v_4, v_4, v_1, v_2, v_2, v_2), (v_9, v_6, v_5, v_5, v_5, v_5, v_5)\}$ which has a span of 7.

■ **Figure 1** A graph with tasks and robots. Blue vertices indicate the positions of robots and red vertex indicate the locations of tasks, with the red numbers being the durations of the tasks.



2.1 Problems used for NP-hardness reductions

Before providing our results, we provide a quick overview of the problems that are used in Section 3 as a basis for the hardness. As these are well-known problems, this may primarily be thought of as an overview of the notation used for the remainder of the paper. For more details on this problem, we turn the reader to the textbook of Garey and Johnson [14].

k-Set Partition.

Given a set of integers $\mathcal{S} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m)$, we define a *partition* of \mathcal{S} into k sets as a set of k -sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k such that $\bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} S_i = \mathcal{S}$ and for any $i, j \in [1, k], i \neq j, S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$. In the case of multiple integers with the same value, we assume that each entry in the set has a unique identifier, allowing this definition to hold. An *exact partition* of \mathcal{S} into k sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k is a partition such that $\sum_{s \in S_i} s = \sum_{s' \in S_j} s' = \sum_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} s'' / k$, for every $i, j \in [1, k]$. The *k*-set partition problem asks if an exact partition exists for a given set \mathcal{S} and integer k .

Hamiltonian Path.

A *Hamiltonian path* for a given graph G is a walk w in G such that each vertex is visited *exactly* once. The Hamiltonian path problem asks if such a path exists for a given graph.

3 Hardness Results

In this section, we show that the *k*-ROBOT SCHEDULING problem is NP-complete, even for highly restricted graph classes. Explicitly, we prove NP-Hardness results for complete graphs, bipartite graphs, trees and planar graphs. We note that our hardness result for complete graphs, bipartite graphs, and trees hold for at least 2 robots, while that for planar graphs holds even for 1 robot. As such, the result for trees does not imply the result for planar graphs. The proof of Theorem 4 follows from these proofs. In order to claim NP-completeness however, we must first prove that the problem is in NP.

► **Lemma 3.** *k*-ROBOT SCHEDULING is in NP, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Observe that given any solution to *k*-ROBOT SCHEDULING, we can verify the correctness in polynomial time (relative to the length of the certificate) by simulating the solution. Hence, the problem is in NP. ◀

► **Theorem 4.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is NP-complete for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

► **Theorem 5.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING on complete graphs is NP-complete for any $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. We prove this by a reduction from the set partition problem.

Given an instance of the set partition problem containing the set of integers $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}$ and integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct a k -ROBOT SCHEDULING instance containing the complete graph $G = (V, E)$. The vertex set V is composed of two sets V^R and V^T where $V^R = (v_1^r, v_2^r, \dots, v_k^r)$ and $V^T = (v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_m^t)$, with $V = V^R \cup V^T$ we refer to V^R as the set of *robot vertices*, and V^T as the set of *task vertices*. As G is a complete graph, $E = V \times V$, i.e. the set of all potential edges corresponding to pairs of vertices $\{(v, u) \mid v, u \in V\}$. We construct the set of tasks t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m where t_i has a time-span of $S_i - 1$ and is located on vertex v_i^t . Finally, we construct k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k with R_i initially located on vertex v_i^r .

We claim that there exists a task-completing conflict-free schedule requiring $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$ time if and only if there exists an exact partition of \mathcal{S} into k sets. In one direction, observe that given some exact partition $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k$ we can construct a schedule $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ where, if $\mathcal{S}_i = (S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, \dots, S_{i_{m_i}})$ then $C_i = ((v_i^r, v_{i_1}^t), t_{i_1}, (v_{i_1}^t, v_{i_2}^t), t_{i_2}, \dots, t_{i_{m_i-1}}, (v_{i_{m_i-1}}^t, v_{i_{m_i}}^t), t_{i_{m_i}})$. First, observe that, as $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k$ is an exact partition of \mathcal{S} , each vertex in G is visited exactly once, and therefore the set of schedules \mathcal{C} is conflict-free. Further, the time required to complete the schedule C_i corresponds to the time to move between each vertex in the schedule and the time to complete each task. As the task t_i has a duration of $s_i - 1$, then the time for the robot R assigned task t_i in its schedule requires 1 timestep to reach v_i^t from the previous vertex (either the previous task or the starting vertex), and $s_i - 1$ timesteps to complete t_i , the total cost of completing the schedule C_i is equal to $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_i} s$, and thus the total time to complete the set of schedules \mathcal{C} is $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$.

In the other direction, given some set of schedules $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ such that \mathcal{C} takes $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$ time steps to complete, we can construct a partition of \mathcal{S} by making the sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k$ where \mathcal{S}_i contains the integers in \mathcal{S} corresponding to the tasks completed in C_i . Note that as each vertex can be reached in a single timestep from any starting vertex, the total cost of the schedule C_i completing m_i tasks is equal to m_i plus the length of the tasks, equal to $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_i} s - 1$, hence the time-span of C_i is $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_i} s = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$. Additionally, as $\sum_{i \in [1, k]} |C_i| \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$, any schedule taking $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$ must satisfy $|C_i| = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s/k$ for every $i \in [1, k]$, completing the reduction. ◀

► **Theorem 6.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING on bipartite graphs is NP-complete for any $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. This result follows the same outline as Theorem 5, using set partition as the basis for the reduction.

Given an instance of the set partition problem containing a set $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and natural $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct a bipartite graph G containing two sets of vertices, the *robot vertices* $V^R = \{v_1^r, v_1^{r'}, v_2^r, v_2^{r'}, \dots, v_k^r, v_k^{r'}\}$ and the *task vertices* $V^T = \{v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_m^t\}$. For every pair $i \in [1, m], j \in [1, k]$, we add the edge (v_i^t, v_j^r) to the edge set. Additionally, we add the edge $(v_j^r, v_j^{r'})$ to the edge set for every $j \in [1, k]$. Note that this graph is now bipartite by construction.

For the element $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$, we construct the task T_i with completion time $t_i = 2S_i - 2$, and place T_i on v_i^t . Similarly, for every $j \in [1, k]$, we create a robot R_j and place it on vertex $v_j^{r'}$.

We now claim that there exists a collision-free task-completing schedule for this instance of ROBOT SCHEDULING terminating in $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} 2s/k$ time if and only if there exists an exact partition of \mathcal{S} into k sets of equal size.

In one direction, given a partition S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k of \mathcal{S} , we can construct the schedules C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k as follows. From $S_i = \{s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \dots, s_{i_{m_i}}\}$, we construct C_i by starting with

the walk from $v_i^{r'}$ to $v_{i_1}^t$ via v_i^r , then complete the task t_{i_1} . Next, we add the walk from $v_{i_1}^t$ to $v_{i_2}^t$ via v_i^r , and complete task t_{i_2} . In general, after completing task t_{i_j} , we add to walk from $v_{i_j}^t$ to $v_{i_{j+1}}^t$ via v_i^r , then complete $t_{i_{j+1}}$. Note that the time span between completing task t_{i_j} and task $t_{i_{j+1}}$ is exactly $2 + |t_{i_{j+1}}| = 2S_i$. Further, as the robot R_i only occupies the task vertices corresponding to the tasks in C_i , and the robot vertices $v_i^r, v_i^{r'}$, this set of schedules is conflict-free. Therefore, the total time to complete this schedule is equal to $\sum_{s \in S_i} 2s$, and hence if $\sum_{s \in S_i} s = \sum_{s' \in S} s'/k$, then $|C_i| = \sum_{s' \in S} s'/k$.

In the other direction, given any conflict-free task-completing schedule $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$, note that as the total time to complete all tasks is $\sum_{s \in S} 2s - 2$, and the minimum time to travel between any pair of vertices is 2, the schedule C_i with the longest time-span satisfies $|C_i| \geq \sum_{s \in S} 2s/2$, and $|C_i| = \sum_{s \in S} 2s/k$ if and only if $|C_j| = \sum_{s \in S} 2s/k, \forall C_j \in \mathcal{C}$. Now, assume that $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$ satisfies $|C_i| = \sum_{s \in S} 2s/k, \forall C_i \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, we construct the partitions S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k by adding to S_i the integers corresponding to the tasks assigned to C_i . Following the same arguments as above, note that the time-span from completing task t_{i_j} and task $t_{i_{j+1}}$ in C_i is exactly equal to $2s_{i_j}$, and thus as $|C_i| = \sum_{s \in S} 2s/k$, $\sum_{s \in S_i} s = \sum_{s \in S} s/k$, completing the reduction. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 7.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is NP-complete on star graphs for $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. Recall that a star graph is a tree where all but one vertex has degree 1.

As in Theorems 5 and 6, we prove this statement by reduction from the set partition problem. Assume we are given a set partition instance where $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}$. We assume, without loss of generality, that $s \geq 2, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. From this instance, we construct the 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance as follows. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph containing the set $V = \{v_s\} \cup V^T \cup V^R = \{v_s\} \cup \{v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_m^t\} \cup \{v_1^r, v_2^r\}$ of $m + 3$ vertices. We call the subset $V^T = \{v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_m^t\}$ the *task vertices*, the subset $V^R = \{v_1^r, v_2^r\}$ the *robot vertices*, and that vertex v_s the *star vertex*. As the names imply, the task vertices will contain the tasks, the robot vertices will be the start position of the robots, and the star vertex will be the central vertex of the graph. The edge set E is defined as $\{(v_s, v_i) \mid v_i \in V \setminus \{v_s\}\}$. We add 2 robots, R_1 and R_2 , placing R_1 on v_1^r and R_2 on v_2^r .

We construct the set of tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$, defining the task t_i as having a duration of $2 \cdot s_i - 2$, and is located on v_i^t . We highlight now that the even length of each task is key to the remainder of our reduction. In brief, we ensure that there exists some schedule where R_1 will complete tasks only on even timesteps and R_2 only on odd time steps. In this way, we avoid collision as R_1 will only occupy the star vertex on odd timesteps and R_2 on even timesteps.

Now, we claim there exists a schedule \mathcal{C} taking $1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$ time if and only if there exists a perfect partition of \mathcal{S} into 2 sets.

In one direction, let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2\}$ be such a schedule. Then, we can construct 2 subsets of \mathcal{S}, S_1, S_2 by adding to S_i the entry in \mathcal{S} corresponding to each task completed in C_i . Note that only 1 robot can occupy the star vertex v_s on any given round, and further, no task can be completed before round 4 (corresponding to the 2 timesteps taken to reach the task from one of the start vertices, and the minimum of 2 task duration as given by our construction). Therefore, we can assume, without loss of generality, that robot R_1 occupies v_s at timestep 1 (respectively, R_2 occupies v_s at timestep 2). By extension, note that the first task completed by robot R_i must happen at timestep $k \cdot s - 2 + i - 1$, for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Now, observe that R_1 will complete the first task in C_1 on some even time step, and R_2 will complete the first task in C_2 on some odd time step. Therefore, as there is no reason for a robot to wait on a completed task if it can move to the next task in the schedule without collision, we can assume R_1 moves onto v_s on odd time steps and leaves on even times steps, while R_2 moves onto v_s on even time steps and leaves on

odd time steps. By extension, C_1 must take time equal to $\sum_{s \in S_1} 2s$, corresponding to the $2s-2$ time to complete task $s \in S_1$, and the 2 time steps to move from the previous task (or v_1^r) to the task. Similarly, C_2 must take time equal to $1 + \sum_{s \in S_2} 2s$, with the additional cost of 1 due to having to wait for an extra time step before moving to v_s . It follows from this construction that given a perfect partition of \mathcal{S} , one can construct a schedule \mathcal{C} taking $1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$ time.

Now, assume that no schedule taking $1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$ time exists. Then, by the same arguments as above, it must not be possible to form any perfect partition of \mathcal{S} as such a partition would give a schedule taking $1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$ time. Hence, this statement holds. ◀

Despite being NP-Hard for $k \geq 2$, when we have only one robot the problem becomes trivial.

► **Observation 8.** *1-ROBOT SCHEDULING can be solved in polynomial time for star graphs.*

► **Corollary 9.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is NP-complete for trees.*

► **Theorem 10.** *1-ROBOT SCHEDULING on planar graphs is NP-complete, even when all tasks are of equal duration.*

Proof. To prove NP-Hardness we reduce from the Hamiltonian Path problem in planar graphs.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a planar graph where $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. From G , we construct a 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance with the graph G and set of tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n\}$ where every task has duration 1 and task T_i is placed on vertex v_i .

Now, a robot A is placed on some vertex v_s . Observe that the fastest task-completing collision-free schedule for G with A requires visiting every vertex in G' at least once, then spending one time step on that vertex. Therefore, if a task-completing collision-free schedule \mathcal{C} has $Sp(\mathcal{C}) = 2n - 1$, then there must exist some path visiting every vertex in V exactly once, as visiting any vertex more than once would require an extra time step. Hence, given such a schedule, there exists a Hamiltonian path starting at v_s in G . By checking if any such schedule taking $2n - 1$ timesteps when A starts at vertex v_s for every $v_s \in V$, we can determine if any Hamiltonian path exists in G .


In the other direction, given a Hamiltonian path starting at v_s , we can construct a schedule taking $2n - 1$ timesteps by stopping at each vertex for a single timestep to complete the associated task. Hence, the reduction holds. ◀

► **Corollary 11.** *k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is NP-complete on planar graphs for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$*


4 Algorithmic Results for path graphs

In this section, we present a set of algorithmic results for path graphs. Recall that a graph G is a path if and only if every vertex has a degree at most 2, and there exist exactly 2 vertices with degree 1. Formally, a path P of length n contains the set of vertices $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, and the set of edges $E = \{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_{n-1}, v_n)\}$. For the remainder of this section for a given pair of vertices v_i, v_j on a path graph, we say that v_i is *left* of v_j if $i < j$, and that v_i is *right* of v_j if $i > j$.

In Section 4.1, we provide an algorithm for finding an optimal schedule for 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING on a line. In Section 4.2, we provide two results regarding 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING for paths. Explicitly, we provide an algorithm that is optimal when every task has equal length and a 2-approximation for general length tasks. In Section 4.3, we generalise this to give an optimal algorithm for k -robots with equal-length tasks and a k -approximation in the general setting.



■ **Figure 2** The path graph P_6 with red nodes representing tasks and blue circles representing the locations of robots.



■ **Figure 3** An example of the partition algorithm deciding where to split the graph shown in Figure 2, with the value of C_1 being shown above each subgraph.

4.1 1-Robot Scheduling on Path Graphs

In this section, we provide an algorithm for finding the optimal schedule for a single robot on a path. We first provide a sketch of the algorithm, then prove in Lemma 12 that this algorithm is optimal. Corollary 13 shows that the time needed to complete the fastest schedule can be computed via a closed-form expression.

1-Robot Scheduling Algorithm

Let P be a path graph of length n , let $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ be a set of tasks, and let R be the single robot starting on vertex $sv = v_{i_s}$. We assume, without loss of generality, that t_j is located on v_{i_j} such that v_{i_j} is left of $v_{i_{j+1}}$, i.e. $\forall j \in [1, m-1], i_j < i_{j+1}$. Note that there may exist some task t_i located on sv without contradiction. Using this notation, the optimal schedule $\mathcal{C} = \{C\}$ is:

- $C = \{ (v_s, v_{s+1}), (v_{s+1}, v_{s+2}), \dots, (v_{i_m-1}, v_{i_m}), t_m, (v_{i_m}, v_{i_m-1}), (v_{i_m-1}, v_{i_m-2}), \dots, (v_{i_{m+1}+1}, v_{i_{m+1}}), t_{m-1}, \dots, (v_{i_1+1}, v_{i_1}), t_1 \}$ if $|i_s - i_m| \leq |i_s - i_1|$.
- $C = \{ (v_s, v_{s-1}), (v_{s-1}, v_{s-2}), \dots, (v_{i_1+1}, v_{i_1}), t_1, (v_{i_1}, v_{i_1+1}), (v_{i_1+1}, v_{i_2+2}), \dots, (v_{i_2-1}, v_{i_2}), t_2, \dots, (v_{i_m-1}, v_{i_m}), t_m \}$ if $|i_s - i_m| > |i_s - i_1|$.

► **Lemma 12.** *The fastest task-completing schedule for 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path graph P of length n with m tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ located on vertices $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m}$, and a robot R starting on vertex v_s can be constructed in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. We prove this statement by showing that the construction above is correct. Note that if T is not ordered, then we can sort the list by position of the tasks in $O(n)$ using a radix sort.

Observe that any task-completing schedule must have the robot completing every task. Therefore, the fastest schedule will correspond to the shortest walk visiting every vertex containing a task. We further assume, without loss of generality, that $i_1 \leq s \leq i_m$, as the fastest schedule for any 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance where $s < i_1$ (respectively, $s > i_m$) must start with the robot moving from v_s to v_{i_1} , and thus this path can be appended to the final solution.

Observe that if v_s is not v_{i_1} or v_{i_m} , R must visit some subset of vertices more than once. Further, any task-completing schedule must visit both v_{i_1} and v_{i_m} at least once. Therefore, there must exist some subsequence F of the edges in the optimal schedule C corresponding to a walk between v_{i_1} and v_{i_m} . Additionally, there must be some subsequence F' corresponding to a walk in the optimal schedule C ending before the first edge in F and corresponding to a walk from v_s to either v_{i_1} , or v_{i_m} . Therefore, as the above construction only contains these walks, one must be minimal. Now, note that if $|i_s - i_m| \leq |i_s - i_1|$, then the shortest walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_m} is shorter than the shortest walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_1} , and thus the schedule starting with the walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_m} is shorter than the schedule starting with the walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_1} . Otherwise, the schedule starting with the walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_1} is shorter than the schedule starting with the walk from v_{i_s} to v_{i_m} . ◀

► **Corollary 13.** *The fastest task-completing schedule for 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path graph P of length n with m tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ located on vertices $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m}$ and a robot R starting on vertex v_s requires*

$$\min(|s - i_1|, |s - i_m|) + i_m + i_1 + \sum_{t \in T} t$$

time.

4.2 2-Robot Scheduling on Path Graphs

We now move to 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path. First, we provide a new algorithm generalising the above algorithm for 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING. In Section 4.3, we will further generalise this to k -ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path; however, it is valuable to consider 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING first, both to illuminate the main algorithmic ideas and to provide a base case for later inductive arguments. As in Section 4.1, we start by providing an overview of our algorithm, which we call the *partition algorithm*. In Lemma 16, we show that when all tasks have equal length, this algorithm is optimal. Finally, in Theorem 17, we show that when there are no bounds on the length of the tasks, this algorithm returns a schedule that has a time-span a factor of at most 2 greater than the time-span of the fastest task-completing collision-free schedule.

The Partition Algorithm

Let P be a path graph of length n , let $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ be the set of tasks, and let R_L and R_R be the pair of robots starting on vertices $sv_L = v_{i_L}$ and $sv_R = v_{i_R}$ respectively. We call R_L the *left robot* and R_R the *right robot*, with the assumption that sv_L is left of sv_R . We denote by i_j the index of the vertex containing the task t_j , and assume that $i_j < i_{j+1}$, for every $j \in [1, m-1]$. For notation, let $C_1(P, T, sv)$ return the optimal schedule for a single robot starting at sv on the path P for completing the task set T .

We construct the schedule by partitioning the tasks into 2 sets, $T_L = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_q)$ and $T_R = (t_{q+1}, t_{q+2}, \dots, t_m)$. We determine the value of q by finding the value which minimises $\max(|C_1(P_{1, \max(\ell, i_q)}, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_\ell), sv_L)|, |C_1(P_{\min(i_{q+1}, v_r), m}, (t_{q+1}, t_{q+2}, \dots, t_m), sv_R)|)$. We will use $C_2(P, T, (sv_L, sv_R))$ to denote the schedule returned by this process.

► **Example 14.** An example of execution of the partition algorithm is shown in Figure 3. For this example the left robot (starting on vertex 5) will be assigned the schedule $((5, 4), (4, 3)), 3, [(3, 2), (2, 1)], 1$ and the right robot has the schedule $(6, [(6, 5), (5, 4)], 4)$.

► **Lemma 15.** *Given an instance of 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING on an n -length path P with a set of equal-length tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$, and starting vertices $sv_L = v_{i_L}, sv_R = v_{i_R}$, for any schedule $\mathcal{C} = (C_\ell, C_r)$ where the rightmost task t_R assigned to the left robot is right of the leftmost T_L assigned to the right robot, there exists some schedule $\mathcal{C}' = (C'_\ell, C'_r)$ that takes no more time than \mathcal{C} and does not contain any such tasks.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = (C_\ell, C_r)$ be a schedule where the rightmost task $t_{L,R}$ (**L**eft robot's **R**ightmost task) assigned to the left robot R_L is right of the leftmost task $t_{R,L}$ (**R**ight robot's **L**eftmost task) assigned to the right robot R_R . Let $t_{L,R}$ be located on $v_{L,R}$ and $t_{R,L}$ be located on $v_{L,R}$. Note that the left robot R_L must visit the vertex $v_{R,L}$ containing task $t_{R,L}$, and the right robot R_R must visit the vertex $v_{L,R}$ containing $t_{L,R}$. Observe now that R_R must be right of R_L during the execution of task $t_{L,R}$ by R_L . Therefore, if R_L completes task $t_{R,L}$ on the last visit to $v_{R,L}$ in the schedule C_ℓ before reaching $v_{L,R}$, there can be no conflict with R_R . By the same argument, R_R can complete task $t_{L,R}$ on the last visit to $v_{L,R}$ in the schedule C_r before reaching $v_{R,L}$. Hence by assigning $t_{R,L}$ to R_L and $t_{L,R}$ to R_r in this manner, there will be no conflict, and further, R_L will reach $v_{L,R}$ in the same time step as t is completed in C_ℓ , and then immediately leave.

Repeating these arguments, we can generate a new schedule \mathcal{C}' taking the same number of timesteps as \mathcal{C} and satisfying the condition that the rightmost task completed by R_L is left of the leftmost task completed by R_R . Note that R_L may start right of some task completed by R_R (equivalently, R_R may start left of some task completed by R_L , though not both) in \mathcal{C}' . Thus, it can not be assumed that a faster schedule is formed by removing the walk between the rightmost task assigned to R_L by \mathcal{C} , and the rightmost task assigned to it by \mathcal{C}' . Hence, we can only claim that the time span \mathcal{C}' is no greater than the time span of \mathcal{C} . ◀

► **Lemma 16.** *Given an instance of 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING on an n -length path P with a set of tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ where the length of t_i is equal to the length of t_j for every $i, j \in [1, m]$. Further, let sv_L and sv_R be the starting vertices of the robots. Then $C_2(P, T, (sv_L, sv_R))$ returns the fastest schedule in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. Following Lemma 15, we have that there exists some schedule \mathcal{C} where every task assigned to R_L is left of every task assigned to R_R and such that no schedule completes all tasks faster than \mathcal{C} . Further, if R_L starts right of every task completed in C_L , then there exists some such \mathcal{C} in which R_L starts by moving to the first task completed in C_L (equivalently, if R_R starts left of every task completed in C_R , then there exists some such \mathcal{C} in which R_R starts by moving to the first task completed in C_R). Now, note that the fastest schedule solving the given 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance contains a solution to the 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING instances corresponding to $P_{1, \max(\ell, i_q)}, T_L = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_q)$ with the robot starting on sv_L , and $P_{\min(r, i_{q+1}, n)}, T_L = (t_{q+1}, t_{q+2}, \dots, t_m)$ with the robot starting on sv_R , where q is the number of tasks completed by R_L . Now, assume that C_L is not the fastest schedule satisfying the first 1-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance.

Recalling that the solution given by $C_1(P_{1, \max(\ell, i_q)}, T_L, sv_L)$ will move R_L left if v_L is right of the first task in T_L , C_L can be replaced with $C_1(P_{1, \max(\ell, i_q)}, T_L, v_L)$ without adding any collisions while taking no more time than C_L . Following the same arguments for C_R , we get that the optimal solution to the 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING instance must be of the form $(C_1(P_{1, \max(\ell, i_q)}, T_L, sv_L), C_1(P_{1, \min(r, i_{q+1}), T_R, sv_R}))$, for some $q \in [1, m]$. Hence, by checking each value of q and selecting the fastest such schedule, we determine the fastest schedule.

To achieve the time complexity result, if we assume that the first partition assigns all tasks to the R_R , requiring T_R time steps to complete, then proceeds by removing the leftmost task from the schedule, the time required to complete the second schedule assigned to R_R can be found in constant time with the equation $T_R - \min(|r - i_1|, |r - i_m|) - i_1 - |t_1| + \min(|r - i_2|, |r - i_m|) + i_2$, where r is the index of the vertex v_r where R_R starts. Therefore, after an initial cost of $O(m)$ to compute T_T , the time required to complete the schedule assigned to the right robot requires $O(1)$ time at each step. The same arguments may be applied to the time required to compute the schedule assigned to the left robot. As $O(m)$ steps are needed, the time complexity of this method is $O(m)$, and hence the statement holds. ◀

► **Theorem 17.** *Given an instance of 2-ROBOT SCHEDULING on an n -length path $P = (V, E)$ with a set of tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ and starting vertices sv_L and sv_R . Then $C_2(P, T, (sv_L, sv_R))$ returns a schedule with a time-span at most a factor of 2 greater than the time-span of the fastest schedule solving this instance.*

Proof. Let a be the number of timesteps required by the fastest task-completing collision-free schedule to solve this instance, $\mathcal{C} = (C_L, C_R)$. Now, let $t_{R,L}$ be the rightmost task assigned to the left robot. We construct the new schedule $\mathcal{D} = (D_L, D_R)$ by setting $D_L = C_1(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L}), sv_L)$, and $D_R = C_1(P, T \setminus (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L}), sv_R)$. Note that R_L must visit every vertex containing any task in $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L})$ as in C_L , R_L must either complete t_1 or be left of t_1 when it is completed, and completes $t_{R,L}$. Therefore, in time a , it is possible to complete all tasks in $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L})$, and for R_L to visit every vertex in $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L})$ at least once. As such, in $2a$ time, it must be possible for R_L to complete all the tasks in $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L})$ and visit each such vertex. As $C_1(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L}), sv_L)$ returns the fastest schedule in which R_L completes every task in $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L})$, $|C_1(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L}), sv_L)| \leq 2a$. Applying the same arguments to the right robot gives $|C_1(P, T \setminus (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{R,L}), sv_R)| \leq 2a$, and thus $C_2(P, T, (sv_L, sv_R))$ has a time-span of at most $2a$, completing the proof. ◀

4.3 k -robots on the path

Now, we generalise the 2 robots on a path instance to an arbitrary number. To do so, we build a dynamic programming algorithm based on the same principles as the previous partition algorithm. As in the previous sections, we first provide an overview of the algorithm, then the main results. In Theorem 18, we show that this algorithm is optimal when all tasks are of equal length. Finally, in Theorem 19, we show that this algorithm produces a schedule that is at most a factor of k slower than the fastest schedule for a given k -ROBOT SCHEDULING instance.

The k -Partition Algorithm.

Let P be a path of length n , $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$ be a set of tasks, and let sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k be the starting vertices of the robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k respectively, with the assumption that R_i starts left of R_{i+1} , for every $i \in [1, k-1]$. Further, we denote by i_t the index such that v_{i_t} contains task t , and assume that $i_{t_j} < i_{t_{j+1}}$ (i.e. task t_j is left of t_{j+1}) for every $j \in [1, m-1]$. We construct a $k \times m$ table S , with $S[c, \ell]$ containing the time required to complete the fastest collision-free schedule completing tasks t_1, t_2, \dots, t_ℓ with robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_c .

First, observe that $S[1, \ell]$ can be computed, for every $\ell \in [1, m]$, in $O(m)$ time. Now, assuming the value of $S[c-1, \ell]$ has been computed for every $\ell \in [1, m]$, the value of $S[c, r]$ is computed by finding the value r' such that $\max(|C_1(P, (t_{r'+1}, t_{r'+2}, \dots, t_r))|, S[c-1, r'])$ is minimised, formally $S[c, r] = \min_{r' \in [1, r]} \max(|C_1(P, (t_{r'+1}, t_{r'+2}, \dots, t_r))|, S[c-1, r'])$. Letting \mathcal{S} be an auxiliary table such that $\mathcal{S}[c, \ell]$ contains the schedule corresponding to the time

given in $\mathcal{S}[c, \ell]$, a task-completing collision-free schedule for the k -ROBOT SCHEDULING instance is given in $\mathcal{S}[k, m]$.

For the remainder of this section, let $S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$ return the schedule determined by this table. Note that for $S_2(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2))$, this becomes equivalent to the partition algorithm given in Section 4.2.

► **Theorem 18.** *Given an instance of k -ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path $P = (V, E)$ with equal length tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ on vertices $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m}$ and k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k starting at $sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k = v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \dots, v_{j_k}$, there are no schedules taking less time than the schedule returned by $S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$. Further, this schedule can be found in $O(kmn)$ time.*

Proof. We prove this in an inductive manner, using $S_2(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2))$ as a base case, proven in Lemma 16.

Assume that, for every $c \in [1, k-1]$, $S_c(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_c))$ returns such a schedule. Now, consider the schedule given by $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k) = S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$. Let t_q be the leftmost task completed by R_k . Note that by construction, the schedule $S_{k-1}(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{q-1}), (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_{k-1}))$ must be the fastest collision-free schedule completing the tasks t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{q-1} with the robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k-1} on P .

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists some schedule \mathcal{C}' such that $\mathcal{C}' = (C'_1, C'_2, \dots, C'_k)$ completes all tasks faster than \mathcal{C} . If $C_k = C'_k$ then we have a contradiction, as $(C'_1, C'_2, \dots, C'_{k-1})$ must then complete t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{q-1} faster than $(C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{k-1})$, contradicting the assumption that $S_{k-1}(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{q-1}), (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_{k-1}))$ is optimal.

Now, assume that R_k does not solve t_m . Then, either every task is solved by some other robot, or there exists some task t' left of t_m that is solved by R_k . Observe that by having the robot solving t_m solve the leftmost task t' completed by R_k , the total time of the schedule remains the same. Following this argument for each task assigned to R_k from right to left gives a schedule in which R_k solves tasks t_m, t_{m-1}, \dots, t_r for some $r \in [1, m]$. As the fastest path for R_k completing these tasks is given by $C_1(P, (t_{r'}, t_{r'+1}, \dots, t_m), sv_k)$, and the fastest task-completing schedule for the remaining tasks is given by $S_{k-1}(P, (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{r'-1}), (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_{k-1}))$, matching the solution given by $S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$.

For the time complexity, note that computing the table \mathcal{S} requires $k \cdot m$ entries to be added, each needing $O(m)$ computations corresponding to each partition of the robots and an additional $O(n)$ time to write the updated schedule. As there are $k \cdot m$ entries, the total time complexity of this process is $O(km^2 + kmn) = O(kmn)$. ◀

► **Theorem 19.** *Given an instance of k -ROBOT SCHEDULING on a path $P = (V, E)$ with tasks $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)$ on vertices $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m}$ and k robots R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k starting at $sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k = v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \dots, v_{j_k}$, the schedule returned by $S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$ is no more than a factor of k slower than the optimal. Further, this schedule can be found in $O(km^2)$ time.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ be the fastest schedule solving the k -ROBOT SCHEDULING instance, and let $\mathcal{C}' = (C'_1, C'_2, \dots, C'_k)$ be the schedule returned by $S_k(P, T, (sv_1, sv_2, \dots, sv_k))$. Further, let a be the number of timesteps required to complete \mathcal{C} . Observe that in a time steps, there is sufficient time for each robot to complete all tasks assigned to it, as well as relevant movement, including having every robot move between the leftmost and rightmost tasks assigned to it. Therefore, R_1 can complete all tasks between the leftmost and rightmost tasks completed in at most C_1 in $k \cdot a$ time. Repeating this argument gives the k approximation. ◀

5 Conclusion

We have shown that our definition of k -ROBOT SCHEDULING is hard to even on highly constrained classes of graphs while being solvable for path graphs with equal-length tasks and approximable for tasks of any length. While these results paint a strong picture of the complexity of this problem, we are left with several open questions. The most direct is as to whether our approximation algorithm for path graphs can be improved or if an optimal algorithm can be found. We conjecture that a polynomial time algorithm exists for this setting; however, at present, no such algorithm has been found. The second natural direction is to look at the remaining classes of graphs that have not been covered by our existing results. The most obvious of these are cycles, which, while closely related to paths, can not be solved by naive application of our current tools. While it seems likely that similar optimality and approximation results can be found, this paper leaves these as open problems.

References

- 1 D. Adamson, V. V. Gusev, D. Malyshev, and V. Zamaraev. Faster exploration of some temporal graphs. In *1st Symposium on Algorithmic Foundations of Dynamic Networks (SAND 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- 2 E. C. Akrida, G. B. Mertzios, P. G. Spirakis, and C. Raptopoulos. The temporal explorer who returns to the base. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 120:179–193, 2021.
- 3 E. Arrighi, F. V. Fomin, P. Golovach, and P. Wolf. Kernelizing temporal exploration problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10110*, 2023.
- 4 H. L. Bodlaender and T. C. van der Zanden. On exploring always-connected temporal graphs of small pathwidth. *Information Processing Letters*, 142:68–71, 2019.
- 5 B. M. Bumpus and K. Meeks. Edge exploration of temporal graphs. *Algorithmica*, 85(3):688–716, 2023.
- 6 B. Burger, P. M. Maffettone, V. V. Gusev, C. M. Aitchison, Y. Bai, X. Wang, X. Li, B. M. Alston, B. Li, R. Clowes, et al. A mobile robotic chemist. *Nature*, 583(7815):237–241, 2020.
- 7 J. Czyzowicz, D. Dereniowski, L. Gąsieniec, R. Klasing, A. Kosowski, and D. Pająk. Collision-free network exploration. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 86:70–81, 2017.
- 8 A. Deligkas and I. Potapov. Optimizing reachability sets in temporal graphs by delaying. *Information and Computation*, 285:104890, 2022.
- 9 T. Erlebach, M. Hoffmann, and F. Kammer. On temporal graph exploration. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 119:1–18, 2021.
- 10 T. Erlebach, F. Kammer, K. Luo, A. Sajenko, and J. T. Spooner. Two Moves per Time Step Make a Difference. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 141:1–141:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- 11 T. Erlebach and J. T. Spooner. Faster exploration of degree-bounded temporal graphs. In *43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- 12 T. Erlebach and J. T. Spooner. Exploration of k -edge-deficient temporal graphs. *Acta Informatica*, 59(4):387–407, 2022.
- 13 T. Erlebach and J. T. Spooner. Parameterized temporal exploration problems. In *1st Symposium on Algorithmic Foundations of Dynamic Networks (SAND 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- 14 M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and intractability*. W. H. Freeman and Company, 1979.

- 15 J. M. Granda, L. Donina, V. Dragone, D. Long, and L. Cronin. Controlling an organic synthesis robot with machine learning to search for new reactivity. *Nature*, 559(7714):377–381, 2018.
- 16 R. D. King. Rise of the robo scientists. *Scientific American*, 304(1):72–77, 2011.
- 17 S. Langner, F. Häse, J. D. Perea, T. Stubhan, J. Hauch, L. M. Roch, T. Heumueller, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and C. J. Brabec. Beyond ternary opv: High-throughput experimentation and self-driving laboratories optimize multi-component systems, 2019. [arXiv:1909.03511](#).
- 18 J. Li, S. G. Ballmer, E. P. Gllis, S. Fujii, M. J. Schmidt, A. M. E. Palazzolo, J. W. Lehmann, G. F. Morehouse, and M. D. Burke. Synthesis of many different types of organic small molecules using one automated process. *Science*, 347(6227):1221–1226, 2015.
- 19 S. Liu, J. Shen, W. Tian, J. Lin, P. Li, and B. Li. Balanced task allocation and collision-free scheduling of multi-robot systems in large spacecraft structure manufacturing. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 159:104289, 2023.
- 20 B. P. MacLeod, F. G. L. Parlane, T. D. Morrissey, F. Häse, L. M. Roch, K. E. Dettelbach, R. Moreira, L. P. E. Yunker, M. B. Rooney, J. R. Deeth, V. Lai, G. J. Ng, H. Situ, R. H. Zhang, M. S. Elliott, T. H. Haley, D. J. Dvorak, A. Aspuru-Guzik, J. E. Hein, and C. P. Berlinguette. Self-driving laboratory for accelerated discovery of thin-film materials, 2020. [arXiv:1906.05398](#).
- 21 O. Michail and P. G. Spirakis. Traveling salesman problems in temporal graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 634:1–23, 2016.
- 22 R. A. Qamar, M. Sarfraz, S. A. Ghauri, and A. Mahmood. Trmaxalloc: Maximum task allocation using reassignment algorithm in multi-uav system. *Computer Communications*, 206:110–123, 2023.
- 23 S. Taghian Alamouti. *Exploring temporal cycles and grids*. PhD thesis, Concordia University, 2020.
- 24 L. Zhang, C. Yang, Y. Yan, Z. Cai, and Y. Hu. Automated guided vehicle dispatching and routing integration via digital twin with deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 72:492–503, 2024.