

A Conflict-Aware Optimal Goal Assignment Algorithm for Multi-Robot Systems

Aakash and Indranil Saha

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
 Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur
 {aakashp, isaha}@cse.iitk.ac.in

Abstract

The fundamental goal assignment problem for a multi-robot application aims to assign a unique goal to each robot while ensuring collision-free paths, minimizing the total movement cost. A plausible algorithmic solution to this NP-hard problem involves an iterative process that integrates a task planner to compute the goal assignment while ignoring the collision possibilities among the robots and a multi-agent path-finding algorithm to find the collision-free trajectories for a given assignment. This procedure involves a method for computing the next best assignment given the current best assignment. A naive way of computing the next best assignment, as done in the state-of-the-art solutions, becomes a roadblock to achieving scalability in solving the overall problem. To obviate this bottleneck, we propose an efficient conflict-guided method to compute the next best assignment. Additionally, we introduce two more optimizations to the algorithm — first for avoiding the unconstrained path computations between robot-goal pairs wherever possible, and the second to prevent duplicate constrained path computations for multiple robot-goal pairs. We extensively evaluate our algorithm for up to a hundred robots on several benchmark workspaces. The results demonstrate that the proposed algorithm achieves nearly an order of magnitude speedup over the state-of-the-art algorithm, showcasing its efficacy in real-world scenarios.

1 Introduction

A fundamental problem related to operating a multi-robot system is the *anonymous multi-agent pathfinding (AMAPF)* problem (Stern et al. 2019). In this problem, the initial locations of a set of robots and a set of goal locations are given, and the aim is to assign each robot to a goal such that the assigned paths are collision-free and the total cost or makespan of the trajectories of the robots to their designated goal locations is minimized. Though this problem is at the core of many multi-robot applications such as warehouse management (Li et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2021; Das, Nath, and Saha 2021), disaster response (Tian et al. 2009), precision agriculture (Gonzalez-de-Santos et al. 2017), mail and goods delivery (Grippa et al. 2019), etc., its computational intractability (Yu and LaValle 2013) poses a major hindrance in developing a scalable solution.

To deal with the computational hardness of the AMAPF problem, two main approaches have been studied in the

literature. The first approach is a decoupled one, where the task assignment problem and the path planning problem are solved sequentially. These methods (Turpin et al. 2013; Turpin, Michael, and Kumar 2013; Turpin et al. 2014) are scalable but generally considers only makespan as the objective function and do not provide any guarantee of optimality. The second approach integrates the task planner and the motion planner, and, through their iterative interaction, find the optimal collision-free paths for the robots upon convergence. These methods (Ma and Koenig 2016; Hönig et al. 2018), though guarantee optimality, suffer from the lack of scalability. A major outstanding question on multi-agent planning is whether there could be a scalable algorithm that can also guarantee the optimality of the collision-free paths for the agents in terms of the total cost.

In this paper, we present an optimal algorithm for the AMAPF problem with minimization of the total cost as the objective, which is scalable to a large number of robots. Our algorithmic solution is inspired by the design of CBS-TA (Hönig et al. 2018), which involves an iterative process that integrates a task planner based on Hungarian algorithm (Kuhn 1955) to compute the goal assignment while ignoring the collision possibilities among the robots and the state-of-the-art multi-agent path-finding algorithm CBS (Sharon et al. 2015) to find the collision-free trajectories for a given assignment. This procedure is based on a method for computing the next best assignment given the current best assignment. However, CBS-TA's naive way of computing the next best assignment using the standard algorithm (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987) becomes the major bottleneck to achieving scalability in solving the overall problem.

In this paper, we target this prime roadblock to achieve scalability in solving an AMAPF problem optimally. Towards this goal, we propose a conflict-guided method to compute the next best assignment. Our method keeps track of the partial robot-goal assignments that led to an increase in the cost while resolving robot-robot collisions during the collision-free multi-agent path-finding stage. We use these cost-increasing partial robot-goal assignments to formulate constraints and use them to postpone computing new assignments containing the same partial robot-goal assignments. This postponement is enforced until there is a possibility of computing robot-goal assignments with

a lower cost. Afterwards, the postponed assignments are reconsidered to find collision-free paths.

While postponement of the computation of the inefficient assignments has been our major algorithmic contribution, we also introduce two other powerful optimizations to the basic integrated task assignment and path planning algorithm. First, in our algorithm, we incorporate the mechanism for computing an assignment without computing the independent paths between all robot goal pairs, as introduced in (Aakash and Saha 2022). The standard assignment computation algorithm Hungarian method requires the costs for all robot-goal pairs a priori. (Aakash and Saha 2022) provides an algorithm that can compute an optimal assignment while computing only a few independent paths between robot-goal pairs in a demand-driven way. We adapt their mechanism in computing the assignments in such a way that we compute the paths between the robot-goal pairs minimally while computing an assignment, and the paths computed for one assignment computation can be reused in the subsequent assignment computations. Second, we introduce a path memoization mechanism to prevent duplication in constrained path computations for multiple robot-goal pairs.

We implement our algorithm in Python and evaluate it through extensive experimentation on several standard benchmark workspaces. As a baseline, we use CBS-TA (Hönig et al. 2018), which is considered to be the state-of-the-art for solving the AMAPF problem optimally. We evaluate our algorithm for up to 100 robots. Experimental results demonstrate that our algorithm scales well with the number of robots and outperforms CBS-TA by an order of magnitude. We also evaluate the efficacy of the individual optimizations through an ablation study, which confirms that all three optimizations introduced in this paper contribute significantly to the overall performance of the algorithm.


2 Problem

2.1 Preliminaries

Notations. Let \mathbb{N} represent the set of natural numbers and \mathbb{R} represent the set of real numbers. For a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$.

Workspace. A workspace WS is a 2D rectangular space which is divided by grid lines into square-shaped cells. Each cell can be addressed using its coordinates. In general, a workspace consists of a set O of cells that are occupied by obstacles. Mathematically, $WS = \langle dimension, O \rangle$, where $dimension$ is a tuple of the number of cells along the coordinate axes.

Motion Primitives. In a 2D workspace, we assume that a robot can move in 4 directions (Up, Down, Left and Right) from its current location while respecting the workspace boundaries. It also has the option to stay in its current cell. Each motion primitive incurs a cost of 1 unit, indicative of the time required for its execution.



(a) Workspace

	G1	G2	G3	G4
R1	2	2	2	4
R2	4	6	2	4
R3	2	2	4	6
R4	5	7	3	5

(b) Final Assignment

Figure 1: An example problem

2.2 Problem Definition

In a typical multi-robot application, robots must complete a set of tasks within a designated workspace. These tasks are associated with specific locations within the workspace, referred to as *goal locations*. The robots must navigate to their respective goal locations to complete their assigned tasks. A *collision-free robot-goal assignment* is defined as the allocation of a unique goal to each robot, such that the resulting paths are devoid of collisions (robot-robot collisions or robot-obstacle collisions). The *cost* of such an assignment represents the sum of the costs incurred by each robot to reach their respective goal locations. An *optimal collision-free robot-goal assignment* is the one that minimizes the cost. We now define the problem formally.

Problem 1. Consider a multi-robot application with a grid-based workspace WS , the set S of start locations of the robots, and the set F of goal locations as inputs. Each robot can be assigned to at most one goal, and each goal can be served by at most one robot. Find a collision-free robot-goal assignment for the multi-robot application such that the cost of the assignment is minimized.

2.3 Example

Consider a multi-robot application in the 5×5 workspace as illustrated in Figure 1(a). It consists of four robots (R1, R2, R3, and R4) and four goals (G1, G2, G3, and G4). The black-colored cells denote the obstacles. We aim to determine an assignment of robots to goals that optimizes the total cost of movement of all the robots while guaranteeing collision-free paths. Figure 1(b) displays a cost matrix associated with the multi-robot application, which is an outcome of our approach. Here, the colored cells reflect the actual costs, while the white cells display the heuristic costs (computed using the Manhattan distance) corresponding to the robot-goal pairs. The matrix cells in green color depict the assignment that has an optimal total cost while ensuring collision-free paths. In the next section, we present an efficient approach to achieve this aim.

3 Algorithm

In this section, we present the details of our algorithm that efficiently computes optimal collision-free robot-goal assignment for multi-robot systems. It learns the sets of conflicting robot-goal paths that inevitably lead to an increase in the assignment cost. This enables the

Algorithm 1: Optimal Collision-Free Goal Assignment for Multi-Robot Systems

Global: *OPEN*, *MemPath*, *root_gen*

```
1 procedure solve_goal_assignment ( WS, S, F )
2   root_gen  $\leftarrow$  0
3   for i = 1 to |S| do
4     for j = 1 to |F| do
5        $\lfloor C(i)(j) = \text{get\_Manhattan\_distance}(S(i), F(j))$ 
6      $\langle C, \theta \rangle \leftarrow \text{get\_first\_assignment}(C)$ 
7     if  $\theta$  is not None then
8        $\lfloor \text{latest\_root\_cost} \leftarrow \text{create\_root}(\theta)$ 
9     while OPEN is not empty do
10       $\Upsilon^* \leftarrow \text{extract best node from } OPEN$ 
11       $\text{conflict} \leftarrow \text{get\_first\_conflict}(\Upsilon^*.path)$ 
12      if conflict is None then
13         $\lfloor \text{return } \Upsilon^*.path$ 
14       $\text{edge1} = (\text{conflict.robot}_1, \Upsilon^*.M(\text{conflict.robot}_1))$ 
15       $\text{edge2} = (\text{conflict.robot}_2, \Upsilon^*.M(\text{conflict.robot}_2))$ 
16       $\text{Acc\_conf}(\Upsilon^*.root\_id).add(\text{edge1}, \text{edge2})$ 
17      Constraints  $\leftarrow \text{create\_constraints}(\text{conflict})$ 
18       $\text{create\_child\_nodes}(\Upsilon^*, \text{Constraints}, WS, S, F)$ 
19       $\Upsilon_{next} \leftarrow \text{peep at next best node within } OPEN$ 
20      if  $\Upsilon_{next}.root = \text{False}$  then
21        if  $\Upsilon_{next}.cost > \Upsilon_{next}.parent.cost$  and
22           $\Upsilon_{next}.conf\_reg = \text{False}$  then
23           $\text{cost}_{inc} = \Upsilon_{next}.cost - \Upsilon_{next}.root\_cost$ 
24           $\text{conf\_rec} = \langle \text{Acc\_conf}(\Upsilon_{next}.root\_id), \text{cost}_{inc} \rangle$ 
25          if conf_rec not in Conflict_rec then
26             $\lfloor \text{Conflict\_rec.add}(\text{conf\_rec})$ 
27             $\Upsilon_{next}.conf\_reg \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
28          if  $\Upsilon_{next}.cost > \text{latest\_root\_cost}$  then
29             $\langle C, \theta \rangle \leftarrow \text{get\_next\_assignment}(C,$ 
30              Conflict_rec)
31            if  $\theta$  is not None then
32               $\lfloor \text{latest\_root\_cost} \leftarrow \text{create\_root}(\theta)$ 
31 procedure create_root (  $\theta$  )
32   root_gen  $\leftarrow$  root_gen + 1
33    $\Upsilon \leftarrow \text{new search node}$ 
34    $\Upsilon.root \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
35    $\Upsilon.root\_id \leftarrow \text{root\_gen}$ 
36    $\Upsilon.parent \leftarrow \text{None}$ 
37    $\Upsilon.constraints \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
38    $\Upsilon.M \leftarrow \theta.M, \Upsilon.path \leftarrow \theta.path$ 
39    $\Upsilon.cost \leftarrow \theta.cost, \Upsilon.root\_cost \leftarrow \theta.cost$ 
40   insert  $\Upsilon$  to OPEN
41   return  $\Upsilon.cost$ 
42 procedure create_child_nodes( $\Upsilon^*$ , Constraints, WS, S, F)
43   for each robot r  $\in$  Constraints do
44      $\Upsilon \leftarrow \text{new search node}$ 
45      $\Upsilon.root \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
46      $\Upsilon.root\_id \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.root\_id$ 
47      $\Upsilon.root\_cost \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.root\_cost$ 
48      $\Upsilon.parent = \Upsilon^*$ 
49      $\Upsilon.constraints \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.constraints +$ 
50       Constraints(r)
51      $\Upsilon.M \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.M, \Upsilon.path \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.path$ 
52      $g = \Upsilon.M(r), c = \Upsilon.constraints(r)$ 
53      $\Upsilon.path(r) \leftarrow \text{get\_constrained\_path}(r, g, c)$ 
54      $\Upsilon.cost \leftarrow \Upsilon^*.cost - \text{compute\_cost}(\Upsilon^*.path(r)) +$ 
55        $\text{compute\_cost}(\Upsilon.path(r))$ 
56     insert  $\Upsilon$  to OPEN
55 procedure get_constrained_path(r, g, c)
56   if MemPath(r)(g)(c) does not exist then
57      $\lfloor \text{MemPath}(r)(g)(c) \leftarrow \text{ASTAR}(WS, S(r), F(g), c)$ 
58   return MemPath(r)(g)(c)
```

algorithm to postpone the expensive computation of several assignments that contain those learned conflicts.

3.1 Algorithm Description

We present our goal assignment algorithm formally in two parts, namely, Algorithms 1 and 2. While Algorithm 1 captures our complete approach, Algorithm 2 exclusively exhibits the procedures related to conflict-aware computation of assignments. Our algorithm and notation draw inspiration from the state-of-the-art CBS-TA (Hönig et al. 2018). Like CBS-TA, our approach builds a search forest to look for a goal assignment that is collision-free and has optimal cost. Typically, a search forest consists of more than one tree, each rooted at its respective root denoting a

specific assignment. An assignment can potentially contain two or more robots whose paths conflict with each other. Let us denote the location of a robot r_i at timestep τ by $loc_{r_i}^\tau$. A conflict between two robots r_i and r_j can be either a 'vertex conflict' (i.e., \exists time $\tau : loc_{r_i}^\tau = loc_{r_j}^\tau$) or an 'edge conflict' (i.e., \exists time $\tau : loc_{r_i}^\tau = loc_{r_j}^{\tau+1}$ and $loc_{r_i}^{\tau+1} = loc_{r_j}^\tau$). Each tree may contain a set of nodes representing the assignment (specific to its root) with additional vertex or edge constraints that result from mitigation of conflicts. We use a priority queue *OPEN* to store the nodes belonging to the trees of the forest, prioritizing them based on the cost due to the assignment and any associated constraints.

The first procedure `solve_goal_assignment` acts as the *main* module that invokes other procedures to solve the

Algorithm 2: Conflict-Aware Assignment

Global: $ASGN_OPEN, ASGN_POST$

```
1 procedure get_first_assignment( $C$ )
2    $\theta \leftarrow$  new asgn node
3    $\theta.O \leftarrow \emptyset, \theta.I \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4    $\langle C, M, path \rangle \leftarrow$  compute_assignment( $C, \theta.O, \theta.I$ )
5    $\theta.M \leftarrow M, \theta.path \leftarrow path$ 
6    $\theta.cost \leftarrow$  compute_cost( $path$ )
7   insert  $\theta$  to  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 
8   return  $\langle C, \theta \rangle$ 

9 procedure get_next_assignment( $C, Conflict\_rec$ )
10   $\theta^* \leftarrow$  extract least cost node from  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 
11  if  $\theta^*$  does not exist then
12    return None
13   $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow$  derive set of robots from  $\theta^*.M$ 
14  sort  $Conflict\_rec$  in decreasing order of  $cost_{inc}$ 
15  // create custom order for looping
16  for each tuple  $t \in Conflict\_rec$  do
17    for each edge  $(r, g) \in t.Acc\_conf$  do
18      if  $r \notin ordered\_robots$  then
19         $ordered\_robots.add(r)$ 
20         $\mathcal{R}.remove(r)$ 
21  select any robot  $rt \in \mathcal{R}$ 
22  for each remaining robot  $r \in (\mathcal{R} - rt)$  do
23     $ordered\_robots.add(r)$ 
24  for each robot  $r \in ordered\_robots$  do
25    if  $r \notin \theta^*.I$  then
26       $\theta \leftarrow$  new asgn node
27       $\theta.O \leftarrow \theta^*.O \cup \{r, \theta^*.M(r)\}$ 
28       $\theta.I \leftarrow \theta^*.I \cup \{u, \theta^*.M(u) : ind_u < ind_r\}$ 
29       $lb_{cf.asgn} \leftarrow \theta^*.cost$ 
30      for each tuple  $t \in Conflict\_rec$  do
31        if  $t.Acc\_conf \subseteq \theta.I$  then
32           $lb_{cf.asgn} \leftarrow lb_{cf.asgn} + t.cost_{inc}$ 
33          exit loop
34      if  $lb_{cf.asgn} > \theta^*.cost$  then
35         $ASGN\_POST.add(\langle lb_{cf.asgn}, \theta.O, \theta.I \rangle)$ 
36      else
37         $\langle C, M, path \rangle \leftarrow$ 
38          compute_assignment( $C, \theta.O, \theta.I$ )
39        if  $M \neq \emptyset$  then
40           $\theta.M \leftarrow M, \theta.path \leftarrow path$ 
41           $\theta.cost \leftarrow$  compute_cost( $path$ )
42          insert  $\theta$  to  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 

41   $best\_cost_{avail} \leftarrow$  min cost from  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 
42   $best\_cost_{post} \leftarrow$  min cost from  $ASGN\_POST$ 
43  while  $best\_cost_{avail} > best\_cost_{post}$  do
44     $\Delta \leftarrow$  min( $ASGN\_POST$ )
45     $\theta \leftarrow$  new asgn node
46     $\theta.O \leftarrow \Delta.O, \theta.I \leftarrow \Delta.I$ 
47    repeat lines 36-40
48     $best\_cost_{avail} \leftarrow$  min cost from  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 
49     $best\_cost_{post} \leftarrow$  min cost from  $ASGN\_POST$ 

50   $\theta^* \leftarrow$  select least cost node from  $ASGN\_OPEN$ 
51  return  $\langle C, \theta^* \rangle$ 
```

optimal collision-free goal assignment problem. It accepts the workspace WS , the set S of start locations of the robots, and the set F of goals locations as inputs. As a first step, it computes the heuristic cost (Manhattan distance) for each robot-goal pair and finds an initial robot-goal assignment (Algo 1: Line 3-6). This assignment has an optimal cost (based on the actual costs for the assigned robot-goal pairs), but may consist of collisions among the robots. On the existence of an initial assignment, the algorithm creates a corresponding root node (of the search forest) through the `create_root` procedure (Algo 1: Line 8). The `create_root` procedure (Algo 1: Lines 31-41) also initializes the root node's attributes, including the robot-goal assignment (denoted by M in Algo 1: Line 38).

Algorithm 1 performs a set of steps iteratively in the process to find an optimal collision-free goal assignment (Algo 1: Lines 9-30). It extracts the best node from $OPEN$ and checks the associated assigned paths for conflict (Algo 1: Lines 10-11). In the absence of conflict, the algorithm reports the current set of assigned paths as output (Algo 1: Lines 12-13). However, in the event of a conflict, the algorithm follows the well-known 'Conflict-Based Search' (CBS) framework (Sharon et al. 2012, 2015) to derive the constraints from the conflict and generate the child nodes (Algo 1: Lines 17-18).

Let us now review our key algorithmic contributions.

Conflict-Aware Assignment Computation. With a focus on finding an optimal collision-free goal assignment, our approach, like CBS-TA, may require to compute a sequence of next best assignments apart from the optimal assignment. It is possible to enumerate the K best solutions in various domains, including goal assignment (Eppstein 2016). However, instead of inefficiently generating a set of K best assignments, we draw inspiration from the existing approach of (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987) and devise a novel method of computing the next best assignment on demand.

Unlike CBS-TA, which computes the next best assignment immediately on the expansion of a root node (representing the current best assignment), our approach computes the next best assignment only when continuing the search within the forest would lead to a cost that exceeds the largest cost among all the roots (denoting the largest assignment cost in the forest). We propose a novel *conflict-aware assignment computation* mechanism for multi-robot systems that efficiently computes the next best assignment given the current best. It encompasses the following three steps.

1. *Conflict accumulation:* Alternatively, we define the path of a robot r to its assigned goal g as an edge denoted by (r, g) . When there is a conflict between two robots (i.e., between two paths or edges), Algorithm 1 cumulatively accumulates the pair of conflicting edges in the related tree's basket Acc_conf (Algo 1: Lines 14-16).
2. *Conflict registration:* After the creation of child nodes in adherence to CBS, Algorithm 1 *peeps at (and not extract)* the tentative next best node Υ_{next} within $OPEN$ (Algo 1: Line 19). If Υ_{next} is a non-root

node with a cost greater than its parent’s cost, and if its ‘conflict registered’ flag ($conf_reg$) is not set, the algorithm registers ($learns$) the set of accumulated conflicting edges (Acc_conf) with corresponding cost increment ($cost_{inc}$) in the conflict record ($Conflict_rec$) (Algo 1: Lines 20-26). The $conf_reg$ flag also assists in determining the next best node by distinguishing and prioritizing the nodes having identical costs (see Remark 1).

3. *Assignment computation*: If the cost of the tentative next best node appears to exceed the largest cost among the roots, we proceed to compute the next best assignment (i.e., a new root) (Algo 1: Lines 27-30). Drawing inspiration from the established approach of (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987), we propose a novel routine through Algorithm 2 that uses conflict-guided approach for the computation of next best assignment of robots to goals, given the current best assignment in multi-robot application. In this algorithm, we employ the following two priority queues: (a) $ASGN_OPEN$, which stores the nodes representing the computed assignments, prioritizing them based on the cost of assignment, and (b) $ASGN_POST$, which stores meta data about the assignments whose computations are postponed, prioritizing them based on the lower bound cost of the postponed assignments (discussed later). We formulate a conflict-guided approach in which we postpone the computation of an assignment when it is guaranteed to include a set of conflicting edges that will unavoidably escalate the assignment’s cost. And the postponement should happen with the largest inevitable cost increase. To achieve this, Algorithm 2 sorts the tuples (of \langle set of conflicting edges, cost increment \rangle) in $Conflict_rec$ in descending order of cost increments (Algo 2: Line 14).

The existing literature considers iteration over the set of robots in a sequential order to partition the solution space of the assignments (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987; Hönig et al. 2018). In a major divergence from the previous works, we create a custom ordering of robots, which aids in maximizing the number of postponed assignments. We place the robots that indulge in any conflict ahead of the non-conflicting robots in the custom order (Algo 2: Lines 15-22).

Using the new custom order, we perform the conventional steps of building the ‘omit’ and the ‘include’ sets of edges, which are used while determining an assignment (Algo 2: Lines 23-27). However, before going ahead with the assignment computation, we scan its ‘include’ set to check for the presence of one of the learned sets of conflicting edges. If a learned set is indeed a subset of the ‘include’ set, we postpone the computation of the assignment, and save a corresponding entry in the priority queue $ASGN_POST$ (Algo 2: Lines 28-34). The first element lb_{cf_asgn} of the tuple saved in $ASGN_POST$ denotes the lower bound cost of the collision-free assignment. Let θ^* be the current best assignment and t be the tuple in $Conflict_rec$ such

that $t.Acc_conf \subseteq$ ‘include’ set of an assignment not yet computed. Then, the lower bound cost of this assignment can be computed as:

$$lb_{cf_asgn} \leftarrow \theta^*.cost + t.cost_{inc}.$$

After the assignments are computed or postponed using the custom order, we revoke the postponement and compute those assignments whose lb_{cf_asgn} are less than the minimum cost among the computed assignments stored in $ASGN_OPEN$ (Algo 2: Lines 41-49).

Remark 1. *In Algorithm 1, two instances require determining the best node from the set of available nodes in the priority queue $OPEN$ (Algo 1: Lines 10 and 19). This selection hinges on two criteria, prioritized as follows: (a) cost, where lower values are favored, and (b) the ‘conflict registered’ flag ($conf_reg$), with a preference for “False” over “True”. The second criterion accelerates the process of conflict registration, meaning that conflicts are learned more rapidly.*

Remark 2. *In Algorithm 1, Line 19, we only peep at the next best node within the priority queue $OPEN$ without extracting it. The reason behind this look-ahead approach is as follows. There can be numerous nodes with the same cost. If conflict registration were to occur only when a node with a higher cost is selected for processing, the nodes with lower costs would need to be processed first. This would delay the utilization of valuable conflict information. Therefore, looking ahead to the next best node allows proactive conflict registration, optimizing the conflict-aware assignment computation.*

Heuristic Distance-Based Assignment Computation.

The goal assignment algorithm introduced in (Aakash and Saha 2022) can compute a robot-goal assignment efficiently (without avoiding robot-robot collisions) by avoiding the computation of a majority of robot-goal paths. We adapt their solution for our problem by making the following customizations to create a new procedure $compute_assignment$ (Algo 2: Lines 4 and 36). We provide two additional inputs, namely, an ‘include’ set and an ‘omit’ set, to the aforesaid algorithm to further increase its efficiency. Since the robots and goals that are a part of the ‘include’ set are compulsorily included in the assignment, we eliminate the rows and columns corresponding to them from the cost matrix. Additionally, we assign an infinite cost to the robot-goal pairs present in the ‘omit’ set. An invocation of the $compute_assignment$ procedure can leave the cost matrix in a state where it has a mix of heuristic and actual costs. We preserve and forward the modified state of the cost matrix in the subsequent invocations to prevent duplicate path computations for the robot-goal pairs.

Path Memoization. Several robots may retain their assigned paths between two or more robot-goal assignments. This implies that the conflicts and the corresponding constraints can remain consistent across many assignments. To leverage this consistency, we introduce ‘Path Memoization’, which involves caching the paths computed under specific constraints for future reuse.




Figure 2: Applying Algorithm 1 on Problem in Figure 1(a)

Thus, in cases where CBS requires the computation of a robot-goal path under previously encountered constraints, we utilize the memoized path instead of recomputing it (Algo 1: Lines 55-58).

3.2 Example

In Figure 2, we illustrate the execution of Algorithm 1 on the multi-robot goal assignment problem introduced in Figure 1. Specifically, Figure 2(a) showcases the initial robot-goal assignment that has an optimal total cost of 11. The arrows visually map out the respective paths. At timestep 3, a conflict arises between the paths of robots R2 and R4 within cell (1, 2). Algorithm 1 employs CBS to resolve this conflict, generating a search tree as depicted in Figure 2(b). The search tree originates from the root node ‘N1’ which represents the initial assignment devoid of constraints. Each node within this tree encapsulates three pieces of information: (a) the assignment’s cost, potentially with collisions, under specific constraints, (b) value of ‘conflict registered’ flag (*conf_reg*) which aids in distinguishing and prioritizing nodes having identical costs, and (c) the

first conflict in the node’s associated paths. The grey color of nodes ‘N1’ and ‘N2’ signify that their processing is complete. The tentative next best node for processing seems to be ‘N3’ (or ‘N4’) with a cost of 12. Thus, Figure 2(b) displays that state of the search tree from which the next node cannot be chosen for processing without incurring an increase in the cost of assignment. Having met the hurdle of cost increment, Algorithm 1 registers the set of accumulated conflicting paths (*Acc_conf*) with corresponding cost increment (*cost_{inc}*) (Figure 2(c)). The value of *cost_{inc}* represents the disparity between the cost of the tentative next best node and that of the corresponding root. Subsequently, the *conf_reg* flag of ‘N3’ is set to “True” (Figure 2(d)).

Since the probable next best node’s cost (12) exceeds the current largest cost among root nodes (11), Algorithm 1 invokes the *get_next_assignment* procedure (expanded in Algorithm 2) to compute the next best assignment. It generates a custom ordering of robots (Figure 2(e): first table) by keeping the robots engaged in conflicts ahead of those with non-conflicting paths. Consequently, R2 and R4 appear before R1 and R3 in the order. Following the established approach outlined in prior works (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987; Hönig et al. 2018), the *get_next_assignment* procedure computes the ‘include’ set corresponding to each robot in the custom order except the last one. We see that the set of conflicting paths {R2G3, R4G4} forms a subset of robot R1’s ‘include’ set {R2G3, R4G4}. Thus, the computation of assignment corresponding to the ‘include’ and ‘omit’ sets of R1 is postponed (Figure 2(e): second table). The meta-data of the postponed assignment are saved for possible future reinstatement (Figure 2(e): third table). The assignment computed against robot R2 in (Figure 2(e): second table) has a cost of 11 and it happens to be the second best assignment (Figure 2(f)). Notably, it is free from collisions, and thus, the desired solution.

Note that in Figure 2(b), the paths R2G3 and R4G4 need an update twice for the same respective set of constraints. With path memoization, Algorithm 1 computes both the paths only once, and reuses them during their second update. Additionally, utilizing the customized heuristic distance-based assignment computation (Aakash and Saha 2022), our approach effectively circumvents the need to compute four actual costs. The white cells in Figure 1(b) reflect this optimization.

3.3 Theoretical Properties

Correctness. Let us review the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. *In a multi-robot application, if an assignment of robots to goals contains a set of conflicting robot-goal pairs (or edges) that escalates the assignment cost, then any other assignment containing the same set of conflicting robot-goal pairs will experience at least an equal escalation in its cost.*

Proof. For a particular robot-goal assignment in a multi-robot application, consider that there exists a set of conflicting robot-goal pairs that effectively increases the cost of the assignment during the resolution of conflicts.

It implies that there must be some robot ‘ r ’ whose path has conflict with few of its fellow robot(s) ‘ J ’, and its path cost increases while attempting to resolve the conflict. An increase in the path cost of robot ‘ r ’ means that there did not exist any alternative path for ‘ r ’ that could have prevented the cost increment. Now, in a different assignment, assume that ‘ r ’ and its fellow conflicting robots ‘ J ’ have same assigned goals. In other words, their paths poses the same conflict, and again, there would not be any alternative path for ‘ r ’ that could prevent the cost increase. Note that ‘ r ’ can have additional conflicts due to other robots whose assignments got altered. Thus, attempting to resolve these conflicts would result in a cost increase by at least the same value as in the prior assignment. \square

Lemma 2. *Given the current best assignment (in terms of cost) of robots to goals in a multi-robot application, and a conflict record comprising of sets of conflicting robot-goal pairs (or edges) with corresponding cost increments, Algorithm 2’s `get_next_assignment` procedure computes the next best assignment.*

Proof. From the given current best assignment of robots to goals, it is straightforward to derive the set of robots. Using the given conflict record and the derived set of robots, Algorithm 2’s `get_next_assignment` (or, GNA for short) procedure creates a custom order of robots, such that the robots indulging in any conflict are kept ahead of the non-conflicting ones. For a set of robots and a set of goals, an assignment solution space consists of all the possible assignments. Together with the current best assignment, the custom order of robots is used for the disjoint partitioning of the assignment solution space, rather than using a naive order (like, $r_1, r_2, r_3, \dots, r_n$) as done in the existing literature (Murty 1968; Chegireddy and Hamacher 1987; Hönig et al. 2018). It has been shown that, irrespective of the chosen order, such a partitioning covers the complete solution space minus the current best assignment (Murty 1968).

Two sets of robot-goal edges, namely the ‘include’ set and the ‘omit’ set are used to determine the partitions. While determining the partition, an assignment adhering to the ‘include’ and ‘omit’ sets is computed that is locally optimal to the corresponding partition. The edges listed in the ‘include’ set are supposed to be part of the assignment, whereas those in the ‘omit’ set must be excluded. The population of the ‘include’ set takes place incrementally, and is thus, *influenced* by the ordering of robots. The custom order ensures that the ‘include’ set rapidly accumulates the edges consisting of conflicting robots.

The GNA procedure postpones the computation of an assignment if its ‘include’ set contains a known set of conflicting edges that would inevitably escalate the assignment’s cost during the resolution of conflicts. According to Lemma 1, such postponement of assignment computation is valid. A lower bound cost of the deferred assignment is derived by adding the certain cost increase (due to conflicts) to the cost of the current best assignment.

After the partitioning of the assignment solution space is complete, during which some assignments, locally

optimal to the respective partitions, get computed and the rest assignment computations get postponed, the GNA procedure does an additional step. In this step, if a postponed assignment’s lower bound cost becomes lesser than the minimum cost of the computed but unprocessed assignments, the GNA procedure revokes the postponement and computes the assignment (Algo 2: Lines 41-49). This ensures that any eligible assignment is not missed, and thus, the GNA procedure provides the next best assignment in terms of cost. \square

Following are the theorems on the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 is complete.*

Proof. To impose constraints and mitigate collisions, Algorithm 1 employs CBS which has been shown to be complete (Sharon et al. 2015). Each root node undergoes a CBS search. Incrementally imposing additional constraints gradually diminishes the number of alternative paths with optimal costs, eventually leading to an inevitable increase in the path’s (or node’s) cost. During the CBS search, if the cost of the tentative next best node appears to exceed the maximum cost among the root nodes, Algorithm 1 proceeds to compute the next best assignment. This process can continue until all possible assignments have been enumerated. Thus, the search is exhaustive in both goal assignment and path planning. \square

Theorem 2. *Algorithm 1 provides an optimal collision-free solution to the multi-robot goal assignment problem (Problem 1), i.e., the path of each robot is free from collision and the sum of individual costs of all robots is minimized.*

Proof. In order to resolve collisions among the robots of a multi-robot application, Algorithm 1 applies CBS search, which is shown to be complete and optimal (Sharon et al. 2015), on each root node (i.e., assignment). The cost of a collision-free solution is always either equal to or greater than the respective root node’s cost (proof: Lemma 1, (Sharon et al. 2015)). During the CBS search in a particular tree, if the cost of the tentative next best node appears to exceed the maximum cost among the root nodes, Algorithm 1 proceeds to compute the next best assignment by invoking the Algorithm 2’s `get_next_assignment` procedure. From the proof of Lemma 2, it is evident that the assignments are computed by `get_next_assignment` procedure in increasing cost order. And Algorithm 1 uses the best cost-first expansion order of processing the nodes from the priority queue *OPEN*. \square

Time complexity. Problem 1 has been known to be NP-hard (Yu and LaValle 2013). The worst-case scenario is the one in which for a problem instance, all possible assignments get enumerated. Algorithm 1 does not claim an improvement over the baseline in terms of the worst-case time complexity. Nonetheless, the average case performance of Algorithm 1 is significantly better than the baseline, which is evident from the experimental results shared in Section 4.2.




Figure 3: Computation Time Comparison with Baseline for Various Workspaces
 (X -axis: Runtime(s), Y -axis: Runtime(s)) (Leftmost four plots: $R = 50$, Rightmost four plots: $R = 100$)

4 Evaluation

In this section, we present the results obtained from our experimental evaluation of Algorithm 1.

4.1 Experimental Setup

To assess Algorithm 1, we consider the state-of-the-art CBS-TA (Höning et al. 2018) as the baseline. Our approach consists of three pivotal components: (a) **H**euristic distance-based assignment computation, denoted by ‘h’, computes the assignments efficiently by trying to avoid the exhaustive computation of all robot-goal paths (unconstrained). (b) **P**ath **m**emoization, denoted by ‘m’, caches the paths computed under certain constraints for future reuse, and (c) **A**ssignment computation **p**ostponement, denoted by ‘p’, uses the encountered conflicts to postpone assignment computations. We use the notations h, m, and p in the forthcoming plots. Here are a few examples of what they represent: h0m0p0: denotes the baseline in which none of the three enhancements are present, h0m0p1: denotes the partially enhanced version consisting of only the postponement of assignment computation, and h1m1p1: denotes our approach consisting of all the three enhancements. We implement the baseline and our proposed algorithm in Python. The source code of

the implementation is submitted as supplementary material.

Benchmarks and Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate Algorithm 1 on benchmark workspaces (Sturtevant 2012; Stern et al. 2019) as well as a randomly generated workspace. We use runtime to be the evaluation metric.

We run all the experiments in a desktop machine with Intel® Core™ i7-8700 CPU @ 3.20 GHz processor, 32 GB RAM, and Ubuntu 20.04 OS. We run each experiment for 50 times to report the results.

4.2 Experimental Results

Throughout our experiments, we take 900s and 1800s as the timeouts for the multi-robot systems having 50 and 100 robots, respectively.

Algorithm 1 vs. Baseline. In Figure 3, we present the runtime scatter plots for the comparison between different approaches. The X -axis represents the runtime (s) of the baseline (h0m0p0), while the Y -axis displays the runtime (s) of the labeled approach. The number of robots is denoted by R . The first four scatter plots in each row are for $R = 50$ whereas the last four are for $R = 100$. The red horizontal and vertical lines indicate the timeout. The crossover point of the runtimes is depicted by the red




Figure 4: Ablation Study for Various Workspaces
(X-axis: Approaches, Y-axis: Runtime(s))
(Left: $R = 50$, Right: $R = 100$)




Figure 5: Scalability Comparison between Baseline
(h0m0p0) and Our Approach (h1m1p1)
(a) $OD = 20\%$, $WS : 200 \times 200$
(b) $R = 50$, $WS : 100 \times 100$
(c) $R = 50$, $OD : 20\%$

diagonal line. We observe that across all cases, our approach (h1m1p1) outperforms the baseline (h0m0p0) and the other

variations that implement only a single enhancement.

Ablation Study. In Figure 4, we use comparative violin plots to perform an ablation study of the three key enhancements that we incorporate into our approach. We present the comparative violin plots for two scenarios within each workspace: one with 50 robots (left side plot) and another with 100 robots (right side plot). The X-axis represents the following approaches: h0m1p1, h1m0p1, h1m1p0, and h1m1p1 (see Section 4.1 for their interpretation). The Y-axis represents the runtime (s) of the four approaches. The red horizontal line marks the timeout. The white dot within the embedded box plot in a violin indicates the median. The density of the data points is reflected by the width of the violin. Across all cases, the median and the width of the violins collectively show that our approach (h1m1p1), without removal of any enhancement, has the most optimized performance.

Scalability Analysis. In Figure 5, we vary three parameters, namely, the number of robots R , the obstacle density OD , which represents the percentage of workspace cells that are occupied by obstacles, and the workspace size to compare the runtime of our approach (h1m1p1) with that of baseline (h0m0p0).

5 Conclusion

We have presented a centralized algorithm to solve the multi-robot goal assignment problem while optimizing the total cost of movement of all the robots. The paths assigned to the robots by our algorithm are free from collisions. We have considered the established CBS-TA as the baseline for the evaluation of our algorithm. Our experimental results, in particular, the scatter plots, reflect that our approach outperforms the baseline by an order of magnitude for almost all the cases.

Our algorithm can also be applied to optimize makespan while solving the collision-free multi-robot goal assignment problem. To achieve this, the assignment computation module, currently focusing on optimizing total cost, needs to be replaced by the assignment computation module that optimizes makespan (Fulkerson, Glicksberg, and Gross 1953; Gross 1959).

References

- Aakash; and Saha, I. 2022. It Costs to Get Costs! A Heuristic-Based Scalable Goal Assignment Algorithm for Multi-Robot Systems. In *ICAPS*, 2–10. AAAI Press.
- Chegireddy, C. R.; and Hamacher, H. W. 1987. Algorithms for Finding k-Best Perfect Matchings. *Discrete applied mathematics*, 18(2): 155–165.
- Chen, Z.; Alonso-Mora, J.; Bai, X.; Harabor, D. D.; and Stuckey, P. J. 2021. Integrated Task Assignment and Path Planning for Capacitated Multi-Agent Pickup and Delivery. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(3): 5816–5823.
- Das, S. N.; Nath, S.; and Saha, I. 2021. OMCORP: An Online Mechanism for Competitive Robot Prioritization. In *ICAPS*, 112–121.

- Eppstein, D. 2016. Encyclopedia of Algorithms, Chapter k-Best Enumeration. *Springer*, 680: 1003–1006.
- Fulkerson, D. R.; Glicksberg, I. L.; and Gross, O. A. 1953. *A Production-Line Assignment Problem*. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.
- Gonzalez-de-Santos, P.; Ribeiro, A.; Fernandez-Quintanilla, C.; Lopez-Granados, F.; Brandstoeetter, M.; Tomic, S.; Pedrazzi, S.; Peruzzi, A.; Pajares, G.; Kaplanis, G.; Perez-Ruiz, M.; Valero, C.; del Cerro, J.; Vieri, M.; Rabatel, G.; and DeBilde, B. 2017. Fleets of robots for environmentally-safe pest control in agriculture. *Precision Agriculture*, 18: 574–614.
- Grippa, P.; Behrens, D. A.; Wall, F.; and Bettstetter, C. 2019. Drone delivery systems: job assignment and dimensioning. *Auton. Robots*, 43(2): 261–274.
- Gross, O. 1959. The Bottleneck Assignment Problem. Technical Report P-1620, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.
- Hönig, W.; Kiesel, S.; Tinka, A.; Durham, J.; and Ayanian, N. 2018. Conflict-Based Search with Optimal Task Assignment. In *AAMAS*, 757–765.
- Kuhn, H. W. 1955. The Hungarian Method for the Assignment Problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2): 83–97.
- Li, J.; Tinka, A.; Kiesel, S.; Durham, J. W.; Kumar, T. K. S.; and Koenig, S. 2021. Lifelong Multi-Agent Path Finding in Large-Scale Warehouses. In *AAAI*, 11272–11281.
- Ma, H.; and Koenig, S. 2016. Optimal Target Assignment and Path Finding for Teams of Agents. In *AAMAS*, 1144–1152.
- Murty, K. G. 1968. An Algorithm for Ranking all the Assignments in Order of Increasing Cost. *Operations Research*, 16(3): 682–687.
- Sharon, G.; Stern, R.; Felner, A.; and Sturtevant, N. R. 2012. Conflict-Based Search For Optimal Multi-Agent Path Finding. In *AAAI*, 563–569. AAAI Press.
- Sharon, G.; Stern, R.; Felner, A.; and Sturtevant, N. R. 2015. Conflict-Based Search for Optimal Multi-Agent Pathfinding. *Artificial Intelligence*, 219: 40–66.
- Stern, R.; Sturtevant, N. R.; Felner, A.; Koenig, S.; Ma, H.; Walker, T. T.; Li, J.; Atzmon, D.; Cohen, L.; Kumar, T. K. S.; Boyarski, E.; and Bartak, R. 2019. Multi-Agent Pathfinding: Definitions, Variants, and Benchmarks. *SoCS*, 151–158.
- Sturtevant, N. 2012. Benchmarks for Grid-Based Pathfinding. *Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games*, 4(2): 144 – 148.
- Tian, Y.-T.; Yang, M.; Qi, X.-Y.; and Yang, Y.-M. 2009. Multi-robot task allocation for fire-disaster response based on reinforcement learning. In *2009 International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, volume 4, 2312–2317.
- Turpin, M.; Michael, N.; and Kumar, V. 2013. Concurrent assignment and planning of trajectories for large teams of interchangeable robots. In *ICRA*, 842–848.
- Turpin, M.; Mohta, K.; Michael, N.; and Kumar, V. 2013. Goal Assignment and Trajectory Planning for Large Teams of Aerial Robots. In *RSS*. Berlin, Germany.
- Turpin, M.; Mohta, K.; Michael, N.; and Kumar, V. 2014. Goal assignment and trajectory planning for large teams of interchangeable robots. *Auton. Robots*, 37(4): 401–415.
- Yu, J.; and LaValle, S. 2013. Structure and Intractability of Optimal Multi-Robot Path Planning on Graphs. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 27(1): 1443–1449.