# Weighted Group Search on the Disk & Improved Lower Bounds for Priority Evacuation \*

Konstantinos Georgiou<sup>1</sup> and Xin Wang<sup>1</sup>

Department of Mathematics, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON, Canada {konstantinos, x85wang}@torontomu.ca

**Abstract.** We consider *weighted group search on a disk*, which is a search-type problem involving 2 mobile agents with unit-speed. The two agents start collocated and their goal is to reach a (hidden) target at an unknown location and a known distance of exactly 1 (i.e., the search domain is the unit disk). The agents operate in the so-called *wireless* model that allows them instantaneous knowledge of each others findings. The termination cost of agents' trajectories is the worst-case *arithmetic weighted average*, which we quantify by parameter *w*, of the times it takes each agent to reach the target, hence the name of the problem.

Our work follows a long line of research in search and evacuation, but quite importantly it is a variation and extension of two well-studied problems, respectively. The known variant is the one in which the search domain is the line, and for which an optimal solution is known. Our problem is also the extension of the so-called *priority evacuation*, which we obtain by setting the weight parameter *w* to 0. For the latter problem the best upper/lower bound gap known is significant.

Our contributions for weighted group search on a disk are threefold. *First*, we derive upper bounds for the entire spectrum of weighted averages *w*. Our algorithms are obtained as a adaptations of known techniques, however the analysis is much more technical. *Second*, our main contribution is the derivation of lower bounds for all weighted averages. This follows from a *novel framework* for proving lower bounds for combinatorial search problems based on linear programming and inspired by metric embedding relaxations. *Third*, we apply our framework to the priority evacuation problem, improving the previously best lower bound known from 4.38962 to 4.56798, thus reducing the upper/lower bound gap from 0.42892 to 0.25056.

Keywords: Mobile Agents, Combinatorial Search, Lower Bounds, Linear Programming

### 1 Introduction

Autonomous mobile agent searching over geometric domains such as lines, disks, circles, triangles and polygons has been the subject of extensive research over the last decades. In these problems, a fleet of agents is tasked with finding a hidden item in the geometric domain while complying with searchers' specifications. One of the most significant parameters that distinguish these variations is how the cost of the solution is quantified, effectively identifying the set of feasible solutions and changing the computational boundaries of the underlying problem. Indeed, in traditional search problems, e.g. *search* and rescue scenarios, one is concerned just with the finding of the hidden item, hence quantifying the cost as the time it takes the first agent to reach the target. In the other extreme, e.g. in *evacuating* scenarios, one is concerned with minimizing the time the last agent reaches the hidden item. These objective variations are combined with other fundamental specifications, such as the communication model and possibility of faultiness.

Despite the growing number of problems in the field, the number of problems for which matching upper and lower bounds are known is also increasing. Empirically, problems that admit full symmetry, involving the agents' specifications, domain, communication model, etc., are those that admit strong or matching upper and lower bounds. However, even a small deviation from symmetry makes any lower bounds to the problems particularly difficult to tackle. Examples include

<sup>\*</sup> Research supported in part by NSERC.

the face-to-face communication model, where knowledge is shared in an asymmetric way during the execution of the search, different agent speeds, or abstract domains such as triangles. Recently, asymmetry was also introduced as part of the way the search cost is quantified by considering the objective of only a *distinguished agent* reaching the hidden item, a problem known as *priority evacuation*. Negative results for this and similar problems are rare, and usually weak and challenging.

The main contribution of our work is a framework that provides lower bounds for combinatorial search problems. More generally, our starting point is the study of a generalization of the priority evacuation problem on the disk, which we obtain by considering *asymmetric* cost functions. Aside from the upper bounds we derive for these problems, our primary contribution is a framework for proving lower bounds (for these as well as for more general problems) that is based on linear programming and metric embedding relaxations. We demonstrate the usefulness of the framework by establishing lower bounds for our weighted evacuation problems, and in particular by improving the previously best lower bound known for the priority evacuation problem.

### 1.1 Related Work

The study of search-type problems dates back to the 1960's and has resulted to a rich theory that has been summarized in books [1,2] and surveys [21,30,37], among others. Originally, the problem pertained to the identification of a hidden object within a search domain, and hence the objective was to minimize the time the object was found [7]. Already with one searcher, the problem has seen interesting, and surprisingly challenging variations touching on the searcher's specs and the search domain, some of which we briefly discuss next. More recently, and with the emergence of fleet-robotics, search-type problems were considered with multiple searchers, see e.g. [15].

A basic example of a search space is the so-called linear search problem that has been considered with one [5] or multiple searchers [11]. The same problem has also been considered with the objective of minimizing the weighted average of the searchers' termination times [36] (that we also use in this work). Other 1-dimensional settings include variations such as searching rays [10] or graphs [4], or also search for multiple objects [9,14].

Searching two-dimensional domains has become a more dominant topic in the last decade or so. Considered domains include polygons [29], the quite popular disk [15], the plane [28], regular polygons [19] the equilateral triangle and square [13,26], arbitrary triangles [32], and  $\ell_p$  unit disks [35]. Many of these problems have also seen variations pertaining to the communication model or more generally to the the searchers' specifications, e.g. searching the disk in the face-to-face model [27], with different searchers' speeds [6], and with different searchers' communication capabilities [23,31]. Last but not least, search problems have also been considered under faultiness settings, see for example [8,16,22,24,25,34,39]

A number of search problems have also been considered with less standard objectives. For example [12] considered a multi-objective search-type problem, [3] studied search problems under a broad competitive algorithmic lens, [38] considered information/cost trade-offs, [17,18] considered time/energy trade-offs, and [33] introduced search-and-fetch problems in two dimensions. More closely related to our work, is the so-called priority evacuation objective introduced in [19,20] where search termination is called when a distinguished searcher reaches the target.

#### 1.2 Discussion on New Results

In this study, we explore a natural extension of the priority evacuation problem on the disk introduced in [19,20]. Our specific problem, termed the *weighted group search* on the disk, is parameterized by  $w \in [0, 1]$ . Parameter *w* represents a designated arithmetic weighted average (i.e.  $\frac{x+wy}{1+w}$ , when considering the weighted average of *x*, *y*) that defines the objective function, hence the name of the problem. The same objective was previously considered with the line as the search domain and solved optimally in [36]. Moreover, our weighted group search problem with w = 0 corresponds exactly to the previously studied priority evacuation problem on the disk for which the best lower and upper bound known are 4.38962 and 4.81854, respectively, creating a notable gap that remains an open problem.

Our results are derivations of upper and lower bounds for the weighted group search problem on the disk for all  $w \in [0, 1]$ . Our upper bounds are obtained by a family of mobile agent trajectories (algorithms) that are adapting with w. The derived algorithm for w = 0 is exactly the best algorithm known for the previously studied priority evacuation problem (with performance 4.81854). and therefore our positive results can be understood as generalizations, still technical to analyze, of known algorithmic techniques. The main contribution of this work is the introduction of a novel framework for deriving lower bounds for general search problems. We discuss the key technical and conceptual ideas in the following section. Here we emphasize the significance of the obtained results in an area where finding strong lower bounds is notoriously challenging and rare. Indeed, we design a framework for proving lower bounds that is applicable to general objective functions, and to general discrete search domains. Our framework utilizes Linear Programming relaxations that are inspired by metric embedding relaxations of Euclidean 2-dimensional metric spaces induced by optimal search strategies. Indeed, we apply our framework to the weighted group search problem on the disk and we find lower bounds for all  $w \in [0,1]$ , resulting in upper/lower bound gaps that are diminishing with w. When w = 1 the bound is optimal. However, the punchline of our new methodology pertains to the lower bound obtained for w = 0, corresponding to previously studied priority evacuation. For this problem our techniques allow us to improve the previously best lower bound known to 4.56798, reducing this way the upper/lower bound gap from 0.42892 to 0.25056.

### 1.3 Key Technical and Conceptual Ideas

Our approach to establishing *upper bounds* for weighted group search involves a generalization of the algorithm presented in [19]. We achieve this by specifically parameterizing the algorithm's behavior and performance according to the parameter w of the cost function. Unsurprisingly, when w = 0, our algorithm aligns with the one detailed in [19]. The inherent challenge in analyzing our family of algorithms, which vary with w, lies in the fact that they generate diverse trajectories for the agents, where critical domain points are visited with varying order. These points are possible locations of the hidden item, which have been explored already, but whose close neighborhood has not been explored yet, and hence a adversarial placement of the hidden item arbitrarily close to those points is a possibility. Such points are necessarily introduced by strong search algorithms, as in these algorithms an agent may abandon the search of the disk in order to move in its interior, potentially in order to expedite evacuation should the hidden item be located by the other agent. Hence, identifying the optimal choices within that family (as a function of w) becomes more technical than the case w = 0. Consequently, quantifying the solution cost for all inputs necessitates a meticulous analysis, which at a high level considers various searched space configurations. For this reason, the contribution of this section is primarily only technical in nature.

The main contribution of this work lies in introducing a novel framework for proving *lower bounds* applicable to various combinatorial search-type problems. As an illustration of our methodology, we derive lower bounds for the weighted group search problem across all values of w. Specifically, we establish a matching lower bound for w = 1 and, notably, an improved lower bound for w = 0 addressing the priority evacuation problem. The challenge inherent in proving lower bounds for the weighted group search (as well as the priority evacuation or similar problems) stems from the contiguous search domain and the asymmetry of the objective function. Any lower bound argument necessitates the consideration of snapshots of an algorithm at certain time-stamps, identifying a finite collection of potential input placements for which the algorithm must perform well. Additionally, due to the online nature of the problem, the algorithm must operate identically until the input is discovered. The critical question revolves around how these finite points are processed by the two agents. A key observation is that the time-stamps, combined with potential input placements and agent trajectories, induce a finite 2-dimensional  $\ell_2$  metric space. By conditioning on the order in which input placements are visited, one can model the optimal algorithm's performance using a Non-Linear Program (NLP). While solving all NLPs (corresponding to all permutations of placement visitations) identifies the optimal algorithm for the specific finite search domain, the challenge lies in the difficulty of solving these NLPs and providing proper certificates of optimality. In that direction, a second key observation is that one can relax the induced 2-dimensional  $\ell_2$ metric spaces to abstract metric spaces, leading to Linear Programs (LPs). These LPs can be solved efficiently, with accompanying certificates of optimality. Importantly, the optimal values of these LPs serve as lower bounds for the NLPs, consequently establishing lower bounds for the original problems. Our framework relies among others on symbolic (not numerical), computer-assisted calculations, which we did not exhaust when deriving the lower bounds, suggesting that further improvements are possible by bypassing current computational limitations.

# 1.4 Roadmap

We start with Section 2.1 where we give some formal definitions and introduce proper terminology. This is followed by Section 2.2 where we present past and new results using the underlying new terminology, along with some key observations. Section 3 introduces our first main contribution, which is a framework based on (metric-inspired) linear program relaxations that give rise to lower bounds for geometric search-type problems. In Section 4 we apply our framework to the previously studied priority evacuation problem with 2 agents, effectively improving the previously best lower bound known. Finally, in Section 5 we study the weighted group search problem on the disk, which is a generalization of the priority evacuation problem, deriving upper and lower bounds, the latter using our general framework of Section 3. Finally, in Section 6 we conclude with some future directions.

# 2 Preliminaries

# 2.1 Problem Definition, Notation & and some Observations

We consider a class of search-type problems  $WS_{\mathscr{D}}^{f}$  (for Wireless Search) with 2 agents in the wireless model, which we define next. In these problems, 2 unit speed agents are initially collocated at the origin of the Euclidean plane, i.e.  $\mathbb{R}^{2}$  equipped with the  $\ell_{2}$  metric. The 2 agents have distinct (known) identities that we call  $A_{0}, A_{1}$ . Given a known geometric object  $\mathscr{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2}$  and a known cost function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{2} \to \mathbb{R}$  (non-decreasing in both coordinates), a solution to the problem is given by trajectories  $\tau_{i} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{2}, i = 0, 1$ , that induce movements for the 2 agents of speed at most 1. The two agents operate in the *wireless model* and they need to find a hidden target, in the following mathematical sense. For each fixed *target I*  $\in \mathscr{D}$ , we allow *both* trajectories  $\tau_{i}$  to depend on *I only after I* is

visited by *any* agent, i.e. when for some  $t \ge 0$  and  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  we have that  $\tau_i(t) = I$ . Equivalently, two executions of the trajectories are identical for different inputs up to the moment the first of these inputs is hit by a trajectory.

For each  $I \in \mathcal{D}$ , we also denote the *termination time*  $T_i(I)$  of agent  $A_i$  as the first time that agent  $A_i$  visits target I. The agent who is the first that visits the target is referred to as the *finder*. We emphasize that each  $T_i(I)$  depends on all  $\tau_0, \tau_1$  and I (while trajectories  $\tau_j$  may only depend on I after the target is visited). The objective of  $WS_{\mathcal{D}}^f$  is to determine trajectories  $\tau_0, \tau_1$  so as to minimize the *search cost* 

$$\sup_{I \in \mathscr{D}} \frac{f(T_0(I), T_1(I))}{f(\|I\|_2, \|I\|_2)}.$$

When *f* is the max function, the problem is known as *evacuation*, and when *f* is the projection function, then it is known as *priority evacuation*. For this reason, also refer to the objective also as the *evacuation cost*. In this work we consider the following search domains: (a)  $\mathcal{D} = DISK$ , the unit radius disk, and (b)  $\mathcal{D} = n$ -GON, the vertices of a regular *n*-gon inscribed in the unit radius disk.

Some important observations are in place. *First*, the underlying search space (i.e. the space where agents' movements take place) is the 2-dim Euclidean space. Searching in other  $\ell_p$  metrics has been considered in [35]. For convenience, we think of the search domains embedded on the Cartesian plane so that the unit disks are centered at the origin. The fact that the underlying search space is a metric space, and in particular the Euclidean metric space will be essential in our lower bound arguments. *Second*, for a given  $I \in \mathcal{D}$ , let agent  $A_i$  be the finder of the target, and suppose that this happens at time t, i.e.  $I = \tau_i(t)$ . Since the other agent can have her trajectory depend on this finding (wireless model), we may assume that  $A_{1-i}$  moves directly to the target, i.e. that

$$T_{1-i}(I) = t + \|\tau_i(t) - \tau_{1-i}(t)\|_2 = t + \|I - \tau_{1-i}(t)\|_2.$$
(1)

*Third*, for the search domains we consider, i.e. the disk or the vertices of *n*-gons, all possible targets are at distance 1 from the origin. Agents that knew in advance the position of any target *I* (i.e. if trajectories  $\tau_i(t)$  could depend on *I* for all  $t \ge 0$ ) would need time 1 to reach the target, inducing cost  $f(||I||_2), ||I||_2) = f(1, 1)$ , independent of the target *I*. Hence, when quantifying the performance of a search trajectory as per its search cost, we perform both worst case and competitive analysis. In particular, both performance quantifications admit the same optimal trajectories, and the corresponding optimal search costs are off by constant multiplicative factor f(1, 1) that depends only on *f*, hence they are also equal when f(1, 1) = 1.

#### 2.2 Past Results, Search Domains & Cost Functions

A number of past results can be described in the framework of  $WS^f_{\mathscr{D}}$  problems as we demonstrate next. The discussion focuses on the wireless model. For other communication models, one has to adjust the definition of feasible trajectories.

Typical search problems, where search is complete when the first agent reaches the target, are associated by definition with cost function  $f(x, y) = \min\{x, y\}$ . When multiple agents are involved in search, and one quantifies the performance by the time the last agent reaches the target, then one uses  $f(x, y) = \|(x, y)\|_{\infty} = \max\{x, y\}$ . The case where the performance is determined by the termination time of a designated agent, then one needs the projection function  $f(x, y) = \operatorname{proj}_2(x, y) = y$  (or  $\operatorname{proj}_1$ ). Finally, one may also consider a weighted average of the termination times of the two agents, by using cost function  $f(x, y) = g_w(x, y) := wx + y$ , where without loss of generality  $w \in [0, 1]$ 

(note that one may use a scaling factor w + 1 without affecting optimizers). With these definitions in mind, we have that  $g_0 = \text{proj}_2$  and  $g_1 = \|\cdot\|_1$ .

There are four notable examples of  $WS^f_{\mathscr{D}}$  problems that were considered before. Our new findings build upon ideas found in these results, which we naturally generalize as well as in some cases we also improve:

- $WS^{g_w}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus[-1,1]}$ , also known as weighted group search on a line, was considered in [36] where the search space  $\mathscr{D}$  was the one dimensional real line excluding all points at most 1 away from the origin. The problem has been solved optimally. Our work is the first to consider the same cost function but on the disk.
- $WS_{DISK}^{\|\cdot\|_{\infty}}$  is the classic evacuation problem on the disk, solved optimally in [15], where the cost function is simply described as the time that the last agent reaches the target.
- $WS_{DISK}^{proj_2}$  is the priority evacuation problem (with 1 servant and 1 distinguished searcher, the queen) considered in [19]. In our current work, first we improve the lower bound for the problem, as well as we generalize it by considering cost functions  $g_w$ , where  $w \in [0, 1]$ , and the same search domain. Recall that  $g_0 = \text{proj}_2$ .
- WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>6-GON</sub> was considered in [19] and solved optimally. Our methodology implies the same lower bound. Moreover, we are the first to study search domain *n*-GON, with *n* > 6, where in particular we derive lower bounds for WS<sup>gw</sup><sub>n-GON</sub>,  $w \in [0, 1]$ , for n = 7, 8, 9.

The motivation for studying search domain *n*-GON relates to the fact that a lower bound to the problem is also a lower bound to searching domain DISK (for the same cost function), an idea introduced in [15], and later used in [19]. The following lemma is explicit in these works. Even though it was previously used only for the  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  and  $\operatorname{proj}_2$  cost functions, it holds more generally for any non-decreasing cost function f. Here we generalize the statement, since we will need it when studying the weighted group search problem. We emphasize that the lemma establishes lower bounds to algorithms addressing the search of the disk, conditioning on their performance of searching *n*-gons.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $t_0$ ,  $t_1$  be the termination time lower bounds of agents  $A_0$ ,  $A_1$ , respectively, for some input to  $WS_{n-GON}^f$ . Then, no algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^f$  with these termination times of the agents has evacuation cost better than  $\frac{f(t_0+\pi/n,t_1+\pi/n)}{f(1,1)}$ .

*Proof.* We let an arbitrary algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$  run for time  $1 + \pi/n - \epsilon$ . In this time, the 2 agents have searched at most  $2\pi/n - 2\epsilon$  of the disk. It is easy to see then that there is an inscribed regular *n*-gon, none of whose vertices have been explored yet. Note that *n*-GON is a subset of the search domain DISK, and hence any target *I* of *n*-GON is an eligible target of DISK. For target *I*, the agents' termination times are increased by  $\pi/n$ , and the claim follows.

Specifically all cost-functions  $f \in \{\text{proj}_2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}, g_w\}$  have the property that f(x+a, y+a)/f(1, 1) = f(x, y)/f(1, 1) + a. Now in Lemma 1, let  $c_n$  be the derived lower bound for  $WS_{n-\text{GON}}^f$  induced by target *I*. The same target *I* is an eligible adversarial choice for  $WS_{\text{DISK}}^f$ , hence for the latter problem, the target is reached at least  $\pi/n$  time later. This means, the following quantity is a valid lower bound to  $WS_{\text{DISK}}^f$ .

$$\frac{f\left(T_0(I) + \frac{\pi}{n}, T_1(I) + \frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{f\left(1, 1\right)} = \frac{f\left(T_0(I), T_1(I)\right)}{f\left(1, 1\right)} + \frac{\pi}{n} = c_n + \frac{\pi}{n}$$
(2)

In fact the best lower bound of  $\pi/6 + 3 + \sqrt{3}/2$  for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>DISK</sub> is due to the provable lower bound of  $3 + \sqrt{3}/2$  for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>6-GON</sub>, see [19]. In this work we strengthen this result by deriving *new lower bounds* for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>*n*-GON</sub>, n > 6.

# 3 Improved Framework for Proving Lower Bounds

In this section we leverage the existing framework for showing lower bounds for  $WS_{n-GON}^{f}$ , and in light of Lemma 1, that would imply adjusted lower bounds for  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$ , too. In what follows [n] denotes the set  $\{0, 1, ..., n\}$ , so for example  $[1] = \{0, 1\}$ . Moreover, we denote the set of all permutations of [n] by  $\mathcal{R}_n$ .

Our first task is to provide a systematic way in order to find the optimal solution to  $WS_{n-GON}^{f}$ . At a high level that would be accomplished by solving  $\frac{(n-1)!2^{n-1}}{n}$  many Non-Linear Programs. Recall that we think of the *n*-GON embedded on the Cartesian Euclidean space, inscribed in a unit-radius circle and centered at the origin. For this reason its vertices are identified by points ( $\cos(2i\pi/n)$ ,  $\sin(2i\pi/n)$ ), i = 0, ..., n-1. Now, for a permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n$  (corresponding to the *n* vertices of *n*-GON), we slightly abuse notation and we write  $\rho_i$  to denote both the *i*-th element of the permutation, as well as the corresponding point ( $\cos(2\rho_i\pi/n)$ ,  $\sin(2\rho_i\pi/n)$ ) on the plane.

The main idea of our formulation is that search strategies for  $WS_{n-GON}^{f}$  can be classified with respect to the order that vertices are visited, given by some permutation  $\rho$  over [n], and the identities of the agents that visit these vertices, given by a binary string  $b \in [1]^n$ . In particular, this means vertex  $\rho_i$ , i.e. the *i*-th visited vertex, is visited no later than vertex (target)  $\rho_j$ , when i < j, and that target  $\rho_i$  is visited by agent  $A_{b_i}$ . We call such a search strategy a  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm. Note that without loss of generality (due to symmetry), we may assume that the first vertex to be visited is vertex 0, and that the second visited vertex is one among  $1, \ldots, \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor + 1$ . This gives rise to at most  $\frac{(n-1)!2^{n-1}}{n}$  classes of search algorithms. Next we show how to find the optimal  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm, for each fixed  $\rho, b$ , by solving a Non-Linear Program.

**Lemma 2.** For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , permutation  $\rho$  of [n], binary string  $b \in [1]^n$  and  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , consider the Non-Linear Program<sup>1</sup>

$$\min \max_{i \in [n]} \{ f(c_i^0, c_i^1) \}$$
(NLP<sup>f</sup><sub>n</sub>( $\rho, b, t_0$ ))
  
s.t.:  $t_n \ge t_{n-1} \ge \dots \ge t_1 \ge t_0$ 
  
 $t_{i+1} - t_i \ge \left\| L_{i+1}^j - L_i^j \right\|_2, \quad i \in [n-1], j \in [1]$ 
  
 $c_i^j \ge t_i + \left\| L_i^j - L_i^{b_i} \right\|_2, \quad i \in [n], j \in [1]$ 

in variables  $\{c_i^j, t_i, x_i, y_i\}_{j \in [1], i \in [n]}$ , where in particular we used abbreviations  $L_i^{b_i} = \rho_i$  and  $L_i^{1-b_i} = (x_i, y_i)$ . Then, for every convex cost function f,  $(\text{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  admits a unique (hence global) minimum, and the optimizer for  $t_0 = 1$  corresponds to the optimal  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm for WS $_{n-\text{GON}}^f$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that the domain of the Non-Linear Program is convex. Indeed, any constraint of the form  $|| ||_2 \le c$  is convex, hence the intersection of convex constraints define a convex feasible region. As for the objective f is given to be convex, while max $\{\cdot\}$  is convex too, hence also their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For the intended meaning of the variables, the reader may consult the proof of the lemma.

composition. This makes the Non-Linear Program convex. Note also that the non-linear program is bounded from below by  $f(t_0 t_0)$ , hence it admits an optimal solution, which is the only (global) minimum.

Next we argue that for the fixed  $\rho$ , b, and by setting  $t_0 = 1$ , the Non-Linear Program correctly finds the termination cost of the optimal  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm for WS<sup>f</sup><sub>n-GON</sub> (scaled by f(1, 1)). For this, we present the semantics of the chosen variables that identify the behavior of the  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm. -  $c_i^j$  is the time by which agent j reaches vertex  $\rho_i$ ,  $j \in [1]$ ,  $i \in [n]$ .

-  $t_i$  is the time by which vertex  $\rho_i$  is visited for the first time, by any agent,  $i \in [n]$ .

-  $x_i$ ,  $y_i$  are coordinates of agent  $j = 1 - b_i$ , i.e. the agent that does not visit  $\rho(i)$  first,  $i \in [n]$ .

Therefore, indeed, if  $L_i^j$  denotes the position of agent  $A_j$  when potential target  $\rho_j$  is visited (which are subject to an algorithmic choice), we have that

$$\begin{split} L_i^{b_i} &= \rho_i, \\ L_i^{1-b_i} &= (x_i, y_i), \end{split}$$

for each i. By (1), we obtain

$$c_i^j \ge t_i + \left\| L_i^j - L_i^{b_i} \right\|_2,$$

i.e. a bound for agent *j* to visit vertex  $\rho_i$ . Since *f* is non-decreasing in each coordinate, this constraint will be satisfied with equality for the optimal solution (hence we could also eliminate variables  $c_i^j$ ), but we leave the constraint as is for the sake of better exposition.

Clearly, because the agents are moving at speed at most 1, the time elapsed between the visitation of  $\rho_{i+1}$  and  $\rho_i$  cannot be less than the time needed by each agent  $A_j$  to move from  $L_i^j$  to  $L_{i+1}^j$ , i.e. no more than  $\left\|L_{i+1}^j - L_i^j\right\|_2$ . Finally, the time that the first vertex is visited is at least  $t_0 = 1$ , overall showing that the constraints capture the  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm visitation times of all potential targets.

Finally, as per the definition the search cost, and due to that in  $WS_{n-GON}^{f}$  there are only *n* many potential targets, one needs to compute the search cost for each potential target  $\rho_i$ , which equals  $f(c_i^0, c_i^1)/f(1, 1)$ , only that in the description of the non-linear program we omit the multiplicative factor f(1, 1).

We slightly abuse notation, and we denote by  $NLP_n^f(\rho, b, t_0)$  also the optimal value of the same Non-Linear Program. The following corollary follows immediately by our definitions, and Lemma 2.

**Corollary 1.** The optimal search cost for  $WS_{n-GON}^{f}$  equals  $\frac{1}{f(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_{n}, b \in [1]^{n}} NLP_{n}^{f}(\rho, b, 1)$ .

Note that any solution to  $(\text{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  is associated with an embedding of points  $L_i^j$  in the  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell_2)$  metric space, where in particular  $d(L_i^j, L_{i'}^{j'}) = \left\|L_i^j - L_{i'}^{j'}\right\|_2$ . This metric space satisfies the triangle inequality. Therefore, requiring that distances  $d_{j,i,j',i'} := d(L_i^j, L_{i'}^{j'})$  satisfy the triangle inequality, but not necessarily that the space is embeddable to  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (or even that it is  $\ell_2$ ), gives rise to a natural relaxation to the problem. This idea is materialized in the next lemma.

**Lemma 3.** For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , permutation  $\rho$  of [n],  $b \in [1]^n$  and  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , consider the Non-Linear Program (Relaxation)

$$\min \max_{i \in [n]} \left\{ f\left(c_{i}^{0}, c_{i}^{1}\right) \right\}$$

$$(\text{REL}_{n}^{f}(\rho, b, t_{0}))$$

$$s.t.: t_{n} \ge t_{n-1} \ge ... \ge t_{1} \ge t_{0}$$

$$t_{i+1} - t_{i} \ge d_{j,i+1,j,i}, i \in [n-1], j \in [1]$$

$$c_{i}^{j} \ge t_{i} + d_{j,i,b_{i},i}, i \in [n], j \in [1]$$

$$d_{b_{i},i,b_{i'},i'} = \left\| \rho_{i} - \rho_{i'} \right\|_{2}, i, i' \in [n]$$

$$\left\{ \left\{ L_{i}^{j} \right\}_{j \in [1],i \in [n]}, d(L_{i}^{j}, L_{i'}^{j'}) = d_{j,i,j',i'} \right\} \text{ is a metric}$$

in variables  $\{c_i^j, t_i, d_{j,i,j',i'}\}_{j,j' \in [1],i,i' \in [n]}$ . Then,  $(\operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  admits a unique (global) minimum, that we denote by  $\operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0)$ , and in particular  $\operatorname{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0) \ge \operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0)$ .

*Proof.* First we observe that the feasible region of  $(\operatorname{REL}_{n}^{f}(\rho, b, t_{0}))$  is a polyhedron. Indeed, for all  $i, i' \in [n]$ , we have that  $\|\rho_{i} - \rho_{i'}\|_{2}$  is a constant, while the axioms that distance function  $d_{j,i,j',i'}$  defines a metric for points  $\{L_{i}^{j}\}_{j \in [1], i \in [n]}$  is a collection of linear constraints (including the triangle inequalities). It is also easy to see that the objective is bounded from below by  $f(t_{0}, t_{0})$ , hence, the Non-Linear Pogram admits a unique local (global) minimizer.

Finally, we show that  $(\operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  is a relaxation to  $(\operatorname{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$ , implying the claimed inequality. To see why, note that the constraints of  $(\operatorname{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  require that

$$\left(\left\{L_{i}^{j}\right\}_{j\in[1],i\in[n]},d(L_{i}^{j},L_{i'}^{j'})\right)=d_{j,i,j',i'}\right)$$

is embeddable in  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell_2)$ , and therefore the distance function  $d_{j,i,j',i'} = \left\| L_i^j - L_{i'}^{j'} \right\|_2$  is a metric.  $\Box$ 

The significance of  $(\operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  over  $(\operatorname{NLP}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  is that the former can be solved much faster, especially when f is a linear function (e.g. when  $f \in \{\operatorname{proj}_2, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}, g_w\}$ ), in which case the resulting relaxation is a Linear Program (a basic trick introduces a new linear variable, and a collection of inequality constraints that simulate that the optimal solution simulates the max function). Because  $(\operatorname{REL}_n^f(\rho, b, t_0))$  is easy to solve, it will be used to provide search cost lower bounds to  $\operatorname{WS}_{DISK}^f$ , as the next lemma suggests.

**Lemma 4.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , no algorithm to  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$  has search cost better than

$$\mathscr{L}_n^f := \frac{1}{f(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} \operatorname{REL}_n^f \left(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n}\right).$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 1 and Lemma 1, and for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have that any solution to  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$  has cost at least  $\frac{1}{f(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} NLP_n^f(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n}) \ge \frac{1}{f(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} REL_n^f(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n})$ , where the last inequality is due to Lemma 3.

Lemma 4 effectively implies that for each *n*, one can solve  $(n-1)!2^{n-1}/n$  Convex Programs (or more specifically Linear Programs, if *f* is linear), in order to obtain lower bound  $\mathcal{L}_n^f$  for WS<sup>*f*</sup><sub>DISK</sub>. This idea is explored in Section 4 specifically for  $f = \text{proj}_2$ , and more generally in Section 5 for cost functions  $f = g_w$ ,  $w \in [0, 1]$ .

#### 4 Implied (and Improved) Lower Bounds for Priority Evacuation

In this section we present and prove one of our main contributions, which is an improved lower bound to the Priority Evacuation Problem  $WS_{DISK}^{proj_2}$ .

**Theorem 1.** No algorithm for WS<sup>proj</sup><sub>DISK</sub> has evacuation cost less than  $1 + \pi/9 + \sqrt{3}/2 + \cos(\pi/18) + 4\sin(\pi/9) \approx 4.56798$ .

As a reminder, the previously best lower bound known for the problem was 4.38962. Note that not only the improvement is significant, but most importantly, the provided framework allows for even further improvements if one utilizes computational resources more efficiently, e.g. use specialized software for solving LP's instead of MATHEMATICA that was used in this project.

The proof of Theorem 1 follows immediately from Lemma 4 once we present new lower bounds for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>*n*-GON</sub>, n > 6. Indeed, for  $f = \text{proj}_2$ , we have that f(1, 1) = 1 and the cost function is linear. For this reason, due to Lemma 4, and as per the calculations (2), no algorithm for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>DISK</sub> has evacuation cost less than  $\frac{1}{f(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} \text{REL}_n^{\text{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n}) = \frac{\pi}{n} + \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} \text{REL}_n^{\text{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1)$ , where in particular  $\text{REL}_n^{\text{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1)$  is a lower bound to the optimal  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm for WS<sup>proj<sub>2</sub></sup><sub>*n*-GON</sub>. For each  $n = 3, \ldots, 9$ , we solve  $\text{REL}_n^{\text{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1)$  for all permutations  $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n$  and all binary strings  $b \in [1]^n$ , and we report the smallest values in Table 1. The calculations were computer-assisted but also symbolic (non-numerical).<sup>2</sup>

n	$min_{\rho\in\mathscr{R}_n,b\in[1]^n}\operatorname{REL}_n^{\operatorname{proj}_2}(\rho,b,1)$	Num	b	ρ
3	$1 + \sqrt{3}$	2.73205	{0,1,0}	(1,2,3)
4	$1 + 3/\sqrt{2}$	3.12132	$\{1, 0, 0, 1\}$	(1, 2, 3, 4)
5	$1 + \sqrt{25 + 2\sqrt{5}}/2$	3.71441	$\{0, 1, 0, 1, 1\}$	(1, 3, 2, 4, 5)
6	$3 + \sqrt{3}/2$	3.86603	$\{1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1\}$	(1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 6)
7	$1 + \cos((3\pi/14)) + 5\sin((\pi/7))$	3.95125	$\{1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0\}$	(1, 2, 3, 7, 4, 6, 5)
8	$1 + \sqrt{2}/2 + 6\sin(\pi/8)$	4.00321	$\{1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1\}$	(1, 2, 3, 8, 4, 6, 5, 7)
9	$1 + \sqrt{3}/2 + \cos(\pi/18) + 4\sin(\pi/9)$	4.21891	$\{1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0\}$	(1, 2, 3, 9, 4, 8, 5, 7, 6)

Table 1: Lower bounds to  $WS_{n-GON}^{\text{proj}_2}$ , for n = 3, ..., 9 are given in the first column as the solutions to the Linear Programs  $REL_n^{\text{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1)$ . The second column is the numerical value of the lower bound, while the last two columns contain the corresponding minimizer permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_n$  and binary string  $b \in [1]^n$ .

From Table 1, and for n = 9, we derive a new lower bound to  $WS_{DISK}^{proj_2}$ , which is

$$\frac{\pi}{9} + \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}_9, b \in [1]^9} \operatorname{REL}_9^{\operatorname{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1) = \frac{\pi}{9} + 1 + \sqrt{3}/2 + \cos(\pi/18) + 4\sin(\pi/9) \approx 4.56798,$$

as promised. The lower bounds for n = 3, 4, 5 are only derived for comparison (and to illustrate how easily our methodology can derive new lower bounds to  $WS_{n-GON}^{proj_2}$ ). We also emphasize that the reported lower bound for n = 6 agrees with the one reported and proven in [19]. In particular, this

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Calculations were performed symbolically with MATHEMATICA. The solution to any LP comes with a proof of optimality.

implies that for n = 6, and due to the matching upper bound for  $WS_{6-GON}^{proj_2}$  in [19], we have that relaxation  $REL_6^{proj_2}(\rho, b, 1)$  to  $NLP_6^{proj_2}(\rho, b, 1)$  is exact, at least for the optimizers  $\rho$ , b on Table 1. This is no longer the case for n = 7, 8, 9, since the solution found for  $REL_7^{proj_2}(\rho, b, 1)$  is not embeddable in  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell_2)$ . For this reason, it is no surprise that quantities

$$\frac{\pi}{n} + \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_n, b \in [1]^n} \operatorname{REL}_n^{\operatorname{proj}_2}(\rho, b, 1)$$

are not increasing in *n*, and only the lower bounds for n = 7,9 improve upon the one derived for n = 6. Finally, the computations for n = 10 are more intense, but unfortunately they do not give rise to further improvement (without exhausting all permutations and binary strings, a solution was found that gives a weaker lower bound that the case n = 9). Finally, the case n = 11 cannot be treated exhaustively since the number of configurations (approximately  $7 \cdot 10^8$ ) becomes forbidden, especially for the size of the linear programs that is growing too, with  $\Theta(n^3)$  constraints and  $\Theta(n^2)$  variables.

### 5 Weighted Group Search on the Disk

In this section we derive upper and lower bounds for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$ , stemming from the cost function  $g_w(x, y) = wx + y, w \in [0, 1]$ . Our upper and lower bounds are quantified by concrete formulas. Our lower bounds are derived by utilizing Lemma 4. In Figure 1 we summarize our results graphically before we give the technical details in Sections 5.1, 5.2.



Fig. 1: Derived upper and lower bounds for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$ , where  $g_w(x, y) = wx + y$ ,  $w \in [0, 1]$ .

We emphasize that for w = 0 we have that  $g_w = g_0 = \text{proj}_2$ . In particular, the upper bound depicted in Figure 1 is also the one reported in [19] for WS<sup>proj</sup><sub>2</sub>, while the depicted lower bound is an improvement of the one derived in [19], but lower than the one we proved for the special problem WS<sup>g\_0</sup><sub>DISK</sub> in Section 4. This is because for the lower bounds to WS<sup>g\_w</sup><sub>DISK</sub> we relied on the lower bounds we managed to prove for WS<sup>g\_w</sup><sub>7-GON</sub>. Indeed, dealing with lower bounds to WS<sup>g\_w</sup><sub>9-GON</sub> was computationally too demanding, taking into consideration that parameter *w* also ranges in [0, 1].

### 5.1 Upper Bounds to Weighted Group Search on the Disk

The upper bound results are quantified in the following lemma (and are depicted in Figure 1).

**Lemma 5.** For each  $w \in [0, 0.2]$ , let  $\alpha = \alpha_w$  and  $\beta = \beta_w$  be the solutions to non-linear system<sup>3</sup>  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3$ , where

$$\gamma_1 = \alpha + \frac{2\sin(\alpha)}{w+1}$$
$$\gamma_2 = 2\pi - \alpha - \beta + \frac{2\sin\left(\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2} + \sin\left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right)\right)}{w+1}$$
$$\gamma_3 = 2\sin\left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right) + \frac{\alpha + \beta + w(-\alpha - \beta + 2\pi)}{w+1}$$

see also Figure 2b. Then for each  $w \in [0,1]$ ,  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  admits a solution with search cost at most  $1 + d_w + \frac{2\sin(d_w)}{w+1}$ , where  $d_w = \alpha_w$  if  $w \le w_0$  and  $d_w = \arccos\left(-\frac{w+1}{2}\right)$  otherwise. Moreover,  $w_0$  is defined by equation  $\alpha_w = \arccos\left(-\frac{w+1}{2}\right)$ , with  $w_0 \approx 0.0456911$ .

As we will see next, the threshold of  $w \le 0.0456911$  corresponds to the critical ratio of the two weights  $1/0.0456911 \approx 21.8861$  that indicates when the agent with the higher weight has incentive to deviate from the search in order to expedite her evacuation. When the agents' weight ratio is less than 21.8861, then a plain vanilla algorithm is the best we can report, which however is optimal when the weight ratio is 1, i.e. when w = 1, see Lemma 7.



(a) The (a, b)-Detour Algorithm for WS<sup>*f*</sup><sub>DISK</sub>. Agent  $A_0$  trajectory is depicted in blue, and agent  $A_1$  trajectory is depicted in red.



(b) The bevavior of parameters  $\alpha_w$ ,  $\beta_w$ , solutions to the non-linear system of Lemma 5. Only the values for  $w \le 0.0456911$  are relevant to the (a, b)-Detour Algorithm when applied to WS<sup> $g_w$ </sup><sub>DISK</sub>.

Fig. 2: The Detour Algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$ , and some of its parameters.

First we present the so-called (a, b)-detour Algorithm, introduced in [19], specifically for WS<sup>proj</sup><sub>DISK</sub>. For this, we present the two agent trajectories  $\tau_0, \tau_1 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ , where the functions depend on parameters a, b. Both trajectories will be piece-wise movements along arcs and chords of the unit radius disk. The description of the trajectories is given under the assumption that no target is reported or found. Should the target be located by the agent, then the agent halts and transmits the finding message to her peer. Should the finding message reach an agent, then the agent moves along the shortest path towards the target. We emphasize that the algorithm is applicable to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>  $\alpha_w$ ,  $\beta_w$  are to be invoked only for smaller values of w. Also  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3$ , admits a solution also for higher values, but not for all  $w \in [0, 1]$ . The value of 0.2 was chosen only for aesthetic reasons.

search domain DISK, and therefore provides some solution to  $WS_{DISK}^{f}$ , for any cost function f. For the exposition, we also use abbreviation  $c(t) := (\cos(t), \sin(t))$ , which is the parametric equation of the unit-radius disk. Next we give formal description of the search algorithm; the reader may also consult Figure 2a. All movements are always at unit speed.

# **Definition 1** (The (a, b)-Detour Algorithm for WS<sup>1</sup><sub>DISK</sub>).

*Trajectory*  $\tau_0 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$  *of agent*  $A_0$ *, starting from origin* O*: Move to point* L = c(-a)*; Search clockwise up to point* E = c(b)*; Move to* D = c(0) *along chord* ED.

*Trajectory*  $\tau_1 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$  *of agent*  $A_1$ *, starting from origin* O*: Move to point* L = c(-a)*; Search counterclockwise up to point* D = c(0)*; Move to* E = c(b) *along chord* ED*; Search clockwise up to* D = c(0)*.* 

The following lemma effectively proves our upper bound claim of Lemma 5.

**Lemma 6.** For each  $w \in [0, 1]$ , let

$$a_w = \begin{cases} \alpha_w \ w \le w_0 \\ \pi \ w > w_0 \end{cases}, \quad b_w = \begin{cases} \beta_w \ w \le w_0 \\ 0 \ w > w_0 \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha_w, \beta_w$  and  $w_0 \approx 0.0456911$  are as in Lemma 5. Then, the  $(a_w, b_w)$ -Detour Algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  has evacuation  $cost 1 + d_w + \frac{2 sin(d_w)}{w+1}$ , where

$$d_w = \begin{cases} \alpha_w & w \le w_0\\ \arccos\left(-\frac{w+1}{2}\right) & w > w_0 \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We begin the proof by analyzing the  $(\pi, 0)$ -Detour Algorithm that is applicable to  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  for  $w \ge w_0 \approx 0.0456911$  (we shall see soon that there is continuity of the evacuation cost at  $w = w_0$ ). In that case, each agent searches half the perimeter of the unit disk. If the target is reported after searching for time  $t \le \pi$ , then the termination time  $T_i(t)$  of the finder  $i \in [1]$  is  $T_i(t) = 1 + t$ , and as per (1) that of the non-finder is  $T_{1-i}(t) = 1 + t + 2\sin(t)$ . Any of the two agents could be the finder, but for cost function  $g_w(x, y) = wx + y$  with  $w \in [0, 1]$ , it is not less costly when the finder is agent  $A_0$ , and for this reason, the search cost of the algorithm, should the exit be reported after searching time t, is

$$\frac{g_w(1+t,1+t+2\sin{(t)})}{g_w(1,1)} = 1+t+\frac{2\sin{(t)}}{w+1}.$$

The last expression is increasing up to  $t_w = \arccos(-(w+1)/2)$ , and then decreasing, i.e. it is concave. It follows that its maximum becomes  $1 + t_w + \frac{2\sin(t_w)}{w+1}$ , as claimed.

We now turn our attention to the performance of the  $(\alpha_w, \beta_w)$ -Detour Algorithm, for  $w \le w_0$ . Parameter values for  $\alpha_w, \beta_w$  are depicted in Figure 2b. We distinguish 4 cases as to where the target may be placed, and in each of them we evaluate the termination times of the agents, along with the associated worst case search costs  $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4$  (and our parameters  $\alpha_w, \beta_w$  are identified by making all costs equal). For the analysis, the reader may also consult Figure 2a. In what follows arcs are read counter-clockwise.

**Case 1:** Target is placed in arc *DD'*, i.e. it is found while the two agents search in opposite direction for up to  $\alpha_w$  time. The search in this phase lasts for time  $\alpha_w$ , hence the target is reported after searching for  $t \le \alpha_w$ . From the analysis we performed when  $w \le w_0$ , we know that in the current case, the search cost is  $1 + t + \frac{2\sin(t)}{w+1}$ . For all  $w \le w_0$  we have that  $\alpha_w \le \arccos((-(w+1)/2))$ , see also Figure 3a (in fact  $w_0$  was identified by equation  $\alpha_{w_0} \le \arccos((-(w_0 + 1)/2))$ , see statement of

Lemma 5). Therefore, as per our previous analysis, the cost in this case remains strictly increasing in *t*, and hence in Case 1, the worst case search cost is

 $c_1 = 1 + \alpha_w + \frac{2\sin\left(\alpha_w\right)}{w+1}.$ 



(a) Comparison between  $\alpha_w$  and  $\arccos -(w+1)/2$ , and the defining value of  $w_0$ .



(b) The plot of  $2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w - 2\sin(\beta_w)/2$  in blue proves that for all  $w \le w_0$ , point *K* in Figure 2a lies within arc D'E (case 2 in the proof of Lemma 6). The plot of  $-2\pi + 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w)/2$  in orange proves that for all  $w \le w_0$ , agent  $A_0$  arrives at *E* before agent  $A_1$  reaches *D* for the second time, (case 4 in the proof of Lemma 6). The line y = 0 in green is depicted for reference.





(c) The derivative of search cost (3). The plot depicts the plane z = 0, showing that the derivative of the function is negative and bounded away from 0, in the subject domain.

(d) The derivative of search cost (4). The values are are close to 1 showing that the cost function is strictly increasing in the subject domain.



**Case 2:** Target is placed in arc D'K, i.e. while agent  $A_1$  moves from D to E along chord DE. First we show that point K lies in between arc D'E, that is agent  $A_1$  arrives at E before agent  $A_0$ . To see why, notice that agent  $A_0$  arrives at E in time  $1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w$ . Similarly, agent  $A_1$  arrives at E in time  $1 + \alpha_w + 2\sin(\beta_w)/2$ . The time gap of these events is

$$1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w (1 + \alpha_w + 2\sin(\beta_w)/2) = 2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w - 2\sin(\beta_w)/2.$$

The latter expression remains non-negative for all  $w \le w_0$  as claimed, see Figure 3b.

To resume, we verified that for the duration agent  $A_0$  searches arc D'K (of length  $2\sin(\beta_w/2)$ ), agent  $A_1$  moves along chord DE (of the same length). If the exit is reported by  $A_0$  at time  $t \in [0, 2\sin(\beta_w/2)]$ , then the termination cost of that agent is  $T_0(t) = 1 + \alpha_w + t$ . Note that in that case, the target is placed at  $c(-2\alpha_w - t)$ . Agent  $A_1$  needs to additionally spend the time to reach the target, and this is what we compute next. For this we utilize the parametric equation for a unit speed movement between points A, B, which reads as

$$l(t, A, B) := A + \frac{t}{\|B - A\|}(B - A).$$

More specifically, for the aforementioned placement of the target, agent  $A_1$  lies at

$$l(t, D, E) = l(t, c(0), c(\beta_w)),$$

and hence its termination cost is, as also per (1),

$$T_1(t) = 1 + \alpha_w + t + \left\| c(-2\alpha_w - t) - l(t, c(0), c(\beta_w)) \right\|.$$

We conclude that in this case, the search cost for cost function  $g_w$  is

$$\frac{g_w(T_0(t), T_1(t))}{g_w(1, 1)} = \frac{g_w(T_0(t), T_1(t))}{w+1} = 1 + \alpha_w + t + \frac{\left\|c(-2\alpha_w - t) - l\left(t, c(0), c(\beta_w)\right)\right\|}{w+1}.$$
 (3)

The latter function admits an analytic formula, whose derivative for  $t \le 2\sin(\beta_w/2)$  is depicted in Figure 3c, together with plane z = 0. The plot shows that the derivative of the function is negative and bounded away from 0, in the domain  $t \in [0, 2\sin(\beta_w/2)]$ , for all  $w \in [0, w_0]$ . By Figure 2b, we know that  $\beta_w \le \beta_0 = 0.925793$  (value  $\beta_0$  was used in [19] specifically for WS<sup>g\_0</sup><sub>DISK</sub>). For this reason, our plot ranging over  $w \in [0, 2\sin(1/2)]$  is sufficient for the purpose of showing that the search cost in decreasing in *t*. Since at t = 0, the case was already considered in Case 1, we conclude that for the worst case search cost in this case we have  $c_2 = c_1$ .

**Case 3:** Target is placed in arc *KE*.

Note that by the previous case, while agent  $A_0$  is moving counter-clockwise along chord KE, agent  $A_1$  is moving counter-clockwise along arc ED, starting from points K, E, respectively. First we argue that agent  $A_0$  reaches E before  $A_1$  reaches D for the second time. Indeed, agent  $A_0$  reaches E in time  $1 + 2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w$ , while  $A_1$  reaches D for the second time at  $1 + \alpha_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) + \beta_w$ . So we have

$$1 + \alpha_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) + \beta_w - (1 + 2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w) = -2\pi + 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2).$$

The latter expression is depicted in Figure 3b and is positive.

This means that Case 3 has a time span equal to the length of arc *KE* which equals  $2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w - 2\sin(\beta_w/2)$  and during that time, the distance between the two agents is invariant (and equal to the length of arc *KE*). Therefore the search cost in this case is the highest when the target is found by  $A_0$  as late as possible, i.e. close to *E* in arc *KE* (the maximum is not attained, rather we calculate the supremum of the search cost). In the limit, the termination cost of agent  $A_0$  is  $T_0 = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w$ , while agent pays in addition its distance to the exit, as in (1), that is

$$T_1 = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w + 2\sin(\alpha_w + \beta_w/2 + \sin(\beta_w/2)).$$

Overall, the worst case termination cost in this case is

$$c_{3} = \frac{g_{w}(T_{0}, T_{1})}{g_{w}(1, 1)} = \frac{g_{w}(T_{0}, T_{1})}{w + 1} = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_{w} - \beta_{w} + \frac{2\sin\left(\alpha_{w} + \beta_{w}/2 + \sin\left(\beta_{w}/2\right)\right)}{w + 1}$$

**Case 4:** Target is placed in arc *DE*.

In this case, the target is found by agent  $A_1$ . The phase has time span equal to the length of arc *ED*, i.e.  $2\sin(\beta_w/)$ , and recall that from our previous analysis, agent  $A_1$  reaches *D* for the second time while agent  $A_0$  is still moving along chord *ED* from *E* towards *D*.

Agent  $A_1$  starts searching arc ED when  $A_0$  is at point K still moving counter-clockwise along the perimeter. Agent  $A_0$  reaches point E in time equal to the length of arc KE, i.e.  $2\pi - 2\alpha_w - \beta_w - \beta_w$ 

 $2\sin(\beta_w/2)$ . In this time window, the distance of the two agents is invariant. In fact, the termination cost in this case is dominated by the cost of Case 3, since now the extra distance towards the target needs to be covered by the "light" agent whose termination cost is scaled by  $w \in [0,1]$ . For this reason, we may assume that the target is reported by  $A_1$  in arc *ED* after  $A_0$  reaches *E*, and while  $A_1$  moves along chord *ED*, from *E* towards *D*.

We reset the clock at time  $1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w$  when  $A_0$  reaches point E, after which time the agent moves along trajectory  $l(t, c(\beta_w), c(0)), t \in [0, 2\sin(\beta_w/2)]$ . When we reset the clock, agent  $A_1$  lies in  $c(2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi)$ , and therefore at additional time t it is located at

$$c(2\alpha_w+2\beta_w+2\sin(\beta_w/2)-2\pi-t),$$

where  $t \leq 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi$ .

To conclude, each  $t \in [0, 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi]$  corresponds to a placement of the target that is located by agent  $A_1$  for her termination cost  $T_1(t) = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w + t$ . Agent  $A_0$  will have to pay the additional cost of moving to the target, and hence her termination cost in this case, as in (1), is

$$T_0(t) = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w + t + \left\| l(t, c(\beta_w), c(0)) - c \left( 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi - t \right) \right\|.$$

Hence, in this case the termination cost for cost function  $g_w$  becomes

$$\frac{g_w(T_0(t), T_1(t))}{g_w(1, 1)} = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w + t + w \frac{\|l(t, c(\beta_w), c(0)) - c(2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi - t)\|}{w + 1}.$$
(4)

Now we claim that this cost is increasing in  $t \le 2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi$ . Note that the function admits a closed formula, and therefore we can compute its derivative, that is depicted in Figure 3d. The plot confirms that derivative is remains close to 1, as expected, since the 2 agents are moving towards the same point c(0), one along the arc *ED* and one along the chord *ED*. The domain in the figure was chosen to be  $t \in [0,5]$  which is a superset of time window of the case we are considering, because  $2\alpha_w + 2\beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) - 2\pi \le 2\alpha_0 + 2\beta_0 + 2\sin(\beta_0/2) - 2\pi \approx 0.460808$ .

To conclude, in this case, the termination cost is the highest when the target is placed within arc *ED* arbitrarily close to point D = c(0) (again the maximum is not attained because point *D* was visited before, so we report the supremum). But then, the target is found by agent  $A_1$  in time  $T_1 = 1 + \alpha_w + 2 \sin(\beta_w/2) + \beta_w$ , while agent  $A_0$  arrives at point *D* at time

$$T_0 = 1 + 2\pi - \alpha_w - \beta_w + 2\sin(\beta_w/2).$$

That is, in the current case the termination cost equals

$$c_4 = \frac{g_w(T_0, T_1)}{g_w(1, 1)} = 1 + 2\sin(\beta_w/2) + \frac{\alpha_w + \beta_w + w(-\alpha_w - \beta_w + 2\pi)}{w + 1},$$

which also concludes the termination cost analysis for all cases 1,2,3,4.

In order to conclude the claim of Lemma 6 by calculating the termination cost of the  $(\alpha_w, \beta_w)$ -Detour Algorithm when  $w \le w_0$ , which equals

$$\max\{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4\}.$$

Note that  $c_1 = c_2$ , and as per the statement of Lemma 5 the values of parameters  $\alpha_w$ ,  $\beta_w$ , as a function of w, where chosen specifically by requiring that  $c_1 = c_3 = c_4$ . Therefore, the termination cost is also described by the formula derived in Case 1, that is  $1 + \alpha_w + \frac{2\sin(\alpha_w)}{w+1}$ .

#### 5.2 Lower Bounds to Weighted Group Search on the Disk

In this section we give the details of how we obtained the lower bound values to  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  reported in Figure 1.

**Theorem 2.** For all  $w \in [0,1]$ , no algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  has evacuation cost less than  $\max\left\{1 + \pi, 1 + \pi/7 + \frac{1}{w+1}\cos((3\pi/14)) + 5\sin(\pi/7)\right\} \approx \max\left\{4.14159, 3.61822 + \frac{0.781831}{w+1}\right\}$ .

We start with a weak lower bound.

**Lemma 7.** No algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  has evacuation cost less than  $1 + \pi$ .

*Proof.* An arbitrary algorithm for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  needs time at least  $1 + \pi$  to search the entire domain. This means that there is always a target placement for which the termination time of each agent is at least  $1 + \pi - \epsilon$ , resulting in overall search cost  $\frac{g_w(1+\pi-\epsilon,1+\pi-\epsilon)}{w+1} = 1 + \pi - \epsilon$ .

Notably, the result is tight for w = 1. Indeed, by Lemma 6 the upper bound for  $WS_{DISK}^{g_1}$  uses the  $(\pi, 0)$ -Detour Algorithm with performance  $1 + d_1 + 2\sin(d_1)2 = 1 + \pi$  (note that  $d_1 = \arccos\left(-\frac{1+1}{2}\right) = \pi$ ). For small values of w, we obtain better bounds by deriving lower bounds to  $WS_{n-GON}^{g_w}$  for n = 7.

For small values of w, we obtain better bounds by deriving lower bounds to  $WS_{n^-GON}^{proj_2}$  for n = 7. Unlike how we approached  $WS_{DISK}^{proj_2}$  (which is the same as  $WS_{DISK}^{g_0}$ ), this time we need to solve  $\operatorname{REL}_n^{g_w}(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n})$  not only for all permutations  $\rho$  and binary strings b, but also for enough many values of  $w \in [0, 1]$ . In this direction, we use n = 7 and compute the lower bounds to  $WS_{DISK}^{g_w}$  from w = 0 up to 1 with step size  $0.001^4$ . The following is a strict generalization of the results in Table 1 pertaining to  $WS_{7-GON}^{g_w}$  with n = 7, and was obtained by computer assisted calculations for determining the minimum value of  $\operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}(\rho, b, 1)$  over all permutations  $\rho$  and binary strings b.

**Lemma 8.** No algorithm for WS<sup> $g_w$ </sup><sub>7-GON</sub> has evacuation cost less than  $1 + \frac{1}{w+1} \cos\left(\frac{3\pi}{14}\right) + 5\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{7}\right)$ .

Strictly speaking the bound of Lemma 8 equals  $\min_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}_7, b \in [1]^7} \operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}(\rho, b, 1)$  only for  $w \le 0.8$  (for higher values, this technique gives a slightly better lower bound), however, this is already subsumed by the bound of Lemma 7. We conclude that for each w, and using Lemma 4 and the calculations (2), no algorithm for WS<sup>g\_w</sup><sub>DISK</sub> has evacuation cost less than

$$\frac{1}{g_w(1,1)} \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_7, b \in [1]^7} \operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}\left(\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{7}\right) = \frac{\pi}{7} + \min_{\rho \in \mathscr{R}_7, b \in [1]^7} \operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}\left(\rho, b, 1\right),$$

where in particular  $\operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}(\rho, b, 1)$  is a lower bound to the optimal  $(\rho, b)$ -algorithm for  $\operatorname{WS}_{7-\text{GON}}^{g_w}$ . To resume, we solve  $\operatorname{REL}_7^{g_w}(\rho, b, 1)$  for all permutations  $\rho \in \mathscr{R}_7$  and all binary strings  $b \in [1]^n$ , and we report the smallest values in Lemma 8. Overall, this implies that no algorithm for  $\operatorname{WS}_{\text{DISK}}^{g_w}$  has search cost less than  $1 + \pi/7 + \frac{1}{w+1} \cos(3\pi/14) + 5\sin(\pi/7)$ . This observation, together with Lemma 7 give the proof of Theorem 2. Lastly we note that the transition value of w for which the lower bound of Lemma 7 is weaker equals

$$\frac{7\cos(\frac{3\pi}{14})}{6\pi - 35\sin(\frac{\pi}{7})} - 1 \approx 0.493827.$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Considering 7-GONS for our proof is the highest value we could handle computationally, due to the large number of w values we needed to consider. For comparison, the results we obtained for WS<sup>proj2</sup><sub>DISK</sub> using 9-GONS took several days to be computed. The order by which the number of configurations increase between *n*-GONS and (n + 1)-GONS, each time computing REL<sup>*gw*</sup><sub>*n*</sub>( $\rho, b, 1 + \frac{\pi}{n}$ ), is 2*n*, but this does not take into account the additional computation cost for solving much larger linear programs with  $\Theta(n^2)$  variables and  $\Theta(n^3)$  constraints.

### 6 Conclusion

It this work we studied the weighted group search problem on the disk with 2 agents operating in the wireless model, a problem that was previously studied on the line. The weighted problem on the disk is a generalization of the so-called priority evacuation problem, for which the best upper and lower bounds known exhibit a significant gap. For the problem on the disk, we designed and analyzed algorithms that adapt with the underlying cost function. We complemented our results by providing lower bounds for the entire spectrum of arithmetic weighted average cost functions. Our most significant contribution is the framework we developed in order to prove the lower bounds. More specifically, we introduced linear programs, which arise as relaxations to non-linear programs modeling the behavior of optimal solutions to combinatorial search type problems. The framework is applicable to more general cost functions, as well as it can be adjusted to provide lower bounds to highly asymmetric searchers' specifications. Among others, we demonstrate the power of this technique by improving the previously best lower bound known for priority evacuation, from 4.38962 to 4.56798. The bound can be further improved if one uses the provided framework and utilizes more efficient computational tools, e.g. software tailored to solving LPs (the current symbolic results were obtained using MATHEMATICA). One of the the most challenging future directions in the area would be to consider other searchers' communication models, including the face-to-face model, that has been proved to be challenging even with standard cost functions.

### References

- 1. S. Alpern, R. Fokkink, L. Gasieniec, R. Lindelauf, and V. Subrahmanian. *Search Theory: A Game Theoretic Perspective*. Springer, 2013.
- 2. S. Alpern and S. Gal. The Theory of Search Games and Rendezvous. Kluwer, 2003.
- 3. S. Angelopoulos, C. Dürr, and S. Jin. Best-of-two-worlds analysis of online search. In R. Niedermeier and C. Paul, editors, *36th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2019, March 13-16, 2019, Berlin, Germany*, volume 126 of *LIPIcs*, pages 7:1–7:17. Schloss Dagstuhl Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- 4. S. Angelopoulos, C. Dürr, and T. Lidbetter. The expanding search ratio of a graph. *Discret. Appl. Math*, 260:51–65, 2019.
- 5. R. Baeza Yates, J. Culberson, and G. Rawlins. Searching in the plane. *Information and Computation*, 106(2):234–252, 1993.
- 6. E. Bampas, J. Czyzowicz, L. Gasieniec, D. Ilcinkas, R. Klasing, T. Kociumaka, and D. Pajak. Linear search by a pair of distinct-speed robots. *Algorithmica*, 81(1):317–342, 2019.
- 7. A. Beck. On the linear search problem. Israel Journal of Mathematics, 2(4):221–228, 1964.
- 8. A. Bonato, K. Georgiou, C. MacRury, and P. Prałat. Algorithms for p-faulty search on a half-line. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–30, 2022.
- P. Borowiecki, S. D. 0001, D. Dereniowski, and L. Kuszner. Distributed evacuation in graphs with multiple exits. In J. Suomela, editor, *Structural Information and Communication Complexity - 23rd International Colloquium, SIROCCO 2016, Helsinki, Finland, July 19-21, 2016, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 9988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 228–241, 2016.
- 10. S. Brandt, K.-T. Foerster, B. Richner, and R. Wattenhofer. Wireless evacuation on m rays with k searchers. *Theor. Comput. Sci*, 811:56–69, 2020.
- 11. M. Chrobak, L. Gasieniec, T. Gorry, and R. Martin. Group search on the line. In G. F. Italiano, T. Margaria-Steffen, J. Pokorný, J.-J. Quisquater, and R. Wattenhofer, editors, *SOFSEM*, volume 8939 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 164–176. Springer, 2015.
- 12. H. Chuangpishit, K. Georgiou, and P. Sharma. A multi-objective optimization problem on evacuating 2 robots from the disk in the face-to-face model; trade-offs between worst-case and average-case analysis. *Information*, 11(11):506, 2020.
- 13. H. Chuangpishit, S. Mehrabi, L. Narayanan, and J. Opatrny. Evacuating equilateral triangles and squares in the faceto-face model. *Comput. Geom*, 89:101624, 2020.
- 14. J. Czyzowicz, S. Dobrev, K. Georgiou, E. Kranakis, and F. MacQuarrie. Evacuating two robots from multiple unknown exits in a circle. In *ICDCN*, pages 28:1–28:8. ACM, 2016.

- 15. J. Czyzowicz, L. Gasieniec, T. Gorry, E. Kranakis, R. Martin, and D. Pajak. Evacuating robots via unknown exit in a disk. In F. Kuhn, editor, *DISC 2014*, volume 8784 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 122–136. Springer, 2014.
- J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, M. Godon, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, W. Rytter, and M. Wlodarczyk. Evacuation from a disc in the presence of a faulty robot. In S. Das and S. Tixeuil, editors, *SIROCCO 2017*, volume 10641 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 158–173. Springer, 2017.
- 17. J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, M. Lafond, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. Shende. Energy Consumption of Group Search on a Line. In C. Baier, I. Chatzigiannakis, P. Flocchini, and S. Leonardi, editors, 46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019), volume 132 of Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), pages 137:1–137:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, M. Lafond, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. Shende. Time-energy tradeoffs for evacuation by two robots in the wireless model. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 852:61–72, 2021.
- 19. J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. Shende. Priority evacuation from a disk: The case of n= 1, 2, 3. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 806:595–616, 2020.
- 20. J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. Shende. Priority evacuation from a disk: The case of  $n \ge 4$ . *Theoretical Computer Science*, 846:91–102, 2020.
- 21. J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, and E. Kranakis. Group search and evacuation. In *Distributed Computing by Mobile Entities*, pages 335–370. Springer, 2019.
- 22. J. Czyzowicz, K. Georgiou, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. Shende. Search on a line by byzantine robots. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 32(04):369–387, 2021.
- 23. J. Czyzowicz, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, D. Pankratov, and S. Shende. Group evacuation on a line by agents with different communication abilities. *ISAAC 2021*, pages 57:1–57:24, 2021.
- 24. J. Czyzowicz, R. Killick, E. Kranakis, and G. Stachowiak. Search and evacuation with a near majority of faulty agents. In *SIAM Conference on Applied and Computational Discrete Algorithms (ACDA21)*, pages 217–227. SIAM, 2021.
- 25. J. Czyzowicz, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, and J. Opatrny. Search on a line with faulty robots. *Distributed Comput*, 32(6):493–504, 2019.
- J. Czyzowicz, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, L. Narayanan, J. Opatrny, and S. M. Shende. Wireless autonomous robot evacuation from equilateral triangles and squares. In S. Papavassiliou and S. Ruehrup, editors, *14th International Conference, ADHOC-NOW*, volume 9143 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 181–194. Springer, 2015.
- 27. Y. Disser and S. Schmitt. Evacuating two robots from a disk: a second cut. In *International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity*, pages 200–214. Springer, 2019.
- 28. O. Feinerman and A. Korman. The ants problem. Distributed Computing, 30(3):149–168, 2017.
- S. P. Fekete, C. Gray, and A. Kröller. Evacuation of rectilinear polygons. In W. Wu and O. Daescu, editors, *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications 4th International Conference, COCOA 2010, Kailua-Kona, HI, USA, December 18-20, 2010, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 6508 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 21–30. Springer, 2010.
- 30. P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, and N. Santoro, editors. *Distributed Computing by Mobile Entities, Current Research in Moving and Computing*, volume 11340 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2019.
- 31. K. Georgiou, N. Giachoudis, and E. Kranakis. Evacuation from a disk for robots with asymmetric communication. In 33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2022). Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- 32. K. Georgiou and W. Jang. Triangle evacuation of 2 agents in the wireless model. In Algorithmics of Wireless Networks: 18th International Symposium on Algorithmics of Wireless Networks, ALGOSENSORS 2022, Potsdam, Germany, September 8–9, 2022, Proceedings, pages 77–90. Springer, 2022.
- 33. K. Georgiou, G. Karakostas, and E. Kranakis. Search-and-fetch with 2 robots on a disk: Wireless and face-to-face communication models. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 21, 2019.
- 34. K. Georgiou, E. Kranakis, N. Leonardos, A. Pagourtzis, and I. Papaioannou. Optimal circle search despite the presence of faulty robots. In F. Dressler and C. Scheideler, editors, *ALGOSENSORS 2019*, volume 11931 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 192–205. Springer, 2019.
- 35. K. Georgiou, S. Leizerovich, J. Lucier, and S. Kundu. Evacuating from  $\ell_p$  unit disks in the wireless model. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 944:113675, 2023.
- 36. K. Georgiou and J. Lucier. Weighted group search on a line & implications to the priority evacuation problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 939:1–17, 2023.
- 37. R. Hohzaki. Search games: Literature and survey. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 59(1):1–34, 2016.
- 38. A. Miller and A. Pelc. Tradeoffs between cost and information for rendezvous and treasure hunt. J. Parallel Distributed Comput, 83:159–167, 2015.

39. X. Sun, Y. Sun, and J. Zhang. Better upper bounds for searching on a line with byzantine robots. In *Complexity and Approximation*, pages 151–171. Springer, 2020.