

# Graph Coloring to Reduce Computation Time in Prioritized Planning

Patrick Scheffe  \*Julius Kahle  \*Bassam Alrifaae  †

## Abstract

Distributing computations among agents in large networks reduces computational effort in multi-agent path finding (MAPF). One distribution strategy is prioritized planning (PP). In PP, we couple and prioritize interacting agents to achieve a desired behavior across all agents in the network. We characterize the interaction with a directed acyclic graph (DAG). The computation time for solving MAPF problem using PP is mainly determined through the longest path in this DAG. The longest path depends on the fixed undirected coupling graph and the variable prioritization. The approaches from literature to prioritize agents are numerous and pursue various goals. This article presents an approach for prioritization in PP to reduce the longest path length in the coupling DAG and thus the computation time for MAPF using PP. We prove that this problem can be mapped to a graph-coloring problem, in which the number of colors required corresponds to the longest path length in the coupling DAG. We propose a decentralized graph-coloring algorithm to determine priorities for the agents. We evaluate the approach by applying it to multi-agent motion planning (MAMP) for connected and automated vehicles (CAVs) on roads using, a variant of MAPF.

**Code** [github.com/embedded-software-laboratory/p-dmpc](https://github.com/embedded-software-laboratory/p-dmpc)

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Motivation

In multi-agent planning problems, several agents may share a common objective or must respect common constraints. Traditional multi-agent path finding (MAPF) is a problem where multiple agents navigate through an environment modeled as a graph  $\mathcal{G}_M = (\mathcal{V}_M, \mathcal{E}_M)$ . This graph consists of a set of vertices  $\mathcal{V}_M$ , representing locations, and a set of edges  $\mathcal{E}_M$ , representing the paths connecting these locations. Each agent  $i$  aims to move from its starting vertex  $s_i \in \mathcal{V}_M$  to its target vertex  $t_i \in \mathcal{V}_M$ . The primary constraint for each agent is to avoid collisions with other agents. A collision occurs if two agents,  $i$  and  $j$ , occupy the same vertex  $v$  at the same time step  $k$ , which can be represented by the tuple

---

\*Chair of Embedded Software, RWTH Aachen University, Im Süsterfeld 9, 52072 Aachen, Germany

†Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of the Bundeswehr Munich, Werner-Heisenberg-Weg 39, 85579 Neubiberg, Germany

$\langle i, j, v, k \rangle$ . Additionally, a collision can also happen when both agents traverse the same edge  $(v - u) \in \mathcal{E}_M$ , denoted by the tuple  $\langle i, j, v, u, k \rangle$ .

Solving a MAPF problem optimally is NP-hard (Yu, 2016; Yu & LaValle, 2013). Centralized approaches exploit the problem structure or lazily explore the solution space in order to increase their computational efficiency (e.g., Barer, Sharon, Stern, & Felner, 2021; Guo & Yu, 2024; Li, Ruml, & Koenig, 2021; Pan, Wang, Bi, Zhang, & Yu, 2024; Sharon, Stern, Felner, & Sturtevant, 2015; Yu, 2020). Prioritized planning (PP), introduced by Erdmann and Lozano-Pérez (1987), is a computationally more efficient method for MAPF. Instead of solving a MAPF problem optimally, PP divides the problem into multiple subproblems, and each agent solves only its subproblem. Since the subproblems are smaller in size compared to the centralized problem, the computational complexity is reduced. Additionally, agents can compute the solution in a distributed fashion.

Since only a subset of agents is considered in each subproblem, a method is necessary to find consensus among agents. Consensus, in general, can be established, e.g., by iteration (Blasi, Kögel, & Findeisen, 2018; Čáp, Novák, Kleiner, & Selecký, 2015; C. Kloock & Werner, 2020; M. Kloock & Alrifaae, 2023; Trodden & Richards, 2013). In PP, this is solved by each agent bearing a priority. Agents with lower priority are obligated to avoid collision with agents bearing higher priority. This requires each agent to consider the higher priority agents as dynamic obstacles while planning. After solving the subproblem, the resulting plans are exchanged among agents and considered in the planning problems of lower priority agents. This requires sequential planning in order of decreasing priority (van den Berg & Overmars, 2005). Thus, the maximum computation time of PP for MAPF scales approximately linearly with the number of agents.

The feasibility, optimality, and computation time of a solution in PP depends on the prioritization, among other factors. This poses a challenge in large-scale MAPF problems when computation time is limited.

## 1.2 Related Work

In PP, an agent  $i$  solves its MAPF subproblem by optimizing its own solution considering the communicated predictions of higher-priority agents as dynamic obstacles.

**Definition 1** (Prediction). A prediction  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j)}$  of agent  $j$  is agent  $j$ 's optimized solution at time  $k$ . A prediction  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j|i)}$  of agent  $j$  in agent  $i$  is agent  $j$ 's prediction from agent  $i$ 's perspective at time  $k$ .

One of the difficulties in distributed optimization approaches such as PP is guaranteeing prediction consistency among the agents in the network (Alrifaae, Heßeler, & Abel, 2016; C. Kloock & Werner, 2020; Trodden & Richards, 2013), or compensating for the lack thereof. Let the set of agent  $i$ 's neighbors be denoted by  $\mathcal{V}^{(i)}$  and equal the set of agents that agent  $i$  considers in its subproblem (see Section 1.4 for a precise definition).

**Definition 2** (Prediction Consistency). A network is prediction consistent at time step  $k$  if the prediction  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j|i)}$  of all neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{V}^{(i)}$  in every agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  equals their own prediction  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j)}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j|i)} = \mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j)}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \forall j \in \mathcal{V}^{(i)}. \quad (1)$$

We differentiate between parallel and sequential PP. Parallel PP has nearly constant computation time, but can lead to a loss of prediction consistency. In contrast, sequential PP guarantees prediction consistency, but the computation time of the MAPF instance increases linearly with the number of agents.

### 1.2.1 Parallel PP

In parallel PP, agents compute solutions parallelly and exchange predictions afterwards. Assuming no delay introduced by the communication, the communicated predictions can be used no earlier than in the following time step. Each agent consequently shifts the received predictions by one time step such that the prediction time matches the time in its planning problem. Assuming continuous computation, the entries at the end of the prediction are missing after such a shift and must be estimated (Alrifaae, 2017). When an agent deviates from the prediction it communicated in the previous time step, the predictions become inconsistent. Since the subproblems are then solved using different data, the MAPF solution might inadvertently violate constraints or become unstable. Consequently, parallelizing the computation requires dealing with the problem of prediction inconsistency, as presented in the following literature review.

A solution to the problem of prediction inconsistency is to constrain an agent’s change from a previous prediction. Dunbar and Caveney (2012) and Zheng, Li, Li, Borrelli, and Hedrick (2017) show stability of PP with parallel computation applied to vehicle platoons. Nearly consistent predictions are achieved with a penalty on changes of previously predicted plans and a terminal constraint. Dunbar and Murray (2006) stabilize a distributed formation controller by limiting the control action to restrain deviations from previously predicted plans. Another approach to enable parallel computation in linear time-invariant systems is tube-based distributed model predictive control, in which each controller rejects bounded disturbances (Richards & How, 2007). While there are improvements to tighten the tubes (Farina & Scattolini, 2012; Riverso & Ferrari-Trecate, 2012), a downside to tube-based MPC remains the conservativeness of its solutions. In our previous work (Scheffe, Xu, & Alrifaae, 2024), the predictions of neighbors, and thus the constraints, are overapproximated by their reachable set. Consequently, agents can compute in parallel while guaranteeing satisfaction of the original constraint. However, the overapproximation tightens the constraints compared to sequential PP and therefore leads to more conservative solutions.

Although successful in their respective applications, the above approaches have higher input constraints and therefore less flexibility when solving the planning problem. This might lead to more conservative solutions or even constraint violations.

### 1.2.2 Sequential PP

In sequential PP, agents compute their solutions sequentially. An agent waits for the prediction of higher prioritized agents before it solves its own planning problem. In one time step, every agent in the network agrees on the predictions of others. Thus, sequential PP guarantees prediction consistency among the agents in the network (Alrifaae et al., 2016), but suffers from increasing computation time.

The following literature review considers approaches in which agents compute sequentially. In sequential computation of PP, the prioritization determines the computation order

of agents besides the aforementioned responsibility to consider higher prioritized agents in their subproblem. There are  $N_A!$  prioritizations, with  $N_A \in \mathbb{N}$  being the number of agents in the network. In large-scale networks, the number of prioritizations is too large to evaluate online. To reduce the computational effort required to find the best prioritization, several heuristics have been proposed.

The following heuristics pursue the goal of achieving feasible solutions for every agent in the network. Wu, Bhattacharya, and Prorok (2020) prioritizes agents that have fewer options to achieve their goal. In our previous work (M. Kloock, Scheffe, et al., 2019), multiple car-like robots simultaneously move from an arbitrary start pose to a defined target pose in a confined space. We prioritize robots to increase the feasibility of this go-to-formation problem: The more obstructed the target pose in the formation is to reach for a robot, the higher its priority. The highest priority is given to robots that need to stop in front of a space boundary, the second highest to robots that need to stop in front of another robot. The lowest priority is given to robots with a target pose in free space, next to another robot or next to a space boundary<sup>1</sup>. Luo, Chakraborty, and Sycara (2016) and Scheffe, Dorndorf, and Alrifae (2022) let agents plan iteratively and communicate an optimal solution without considering other agents. The agents receive a priority based on the number of predicted collisions with the plans of other agents. This also resembles the idea of prioritizing agents that are more restricted.

The following are objective-based heuristics and prioritize agents to improve the quality of the MAPF solution. In our previous work (M. Kloock, Kragl, Maczjewski, Alrifae, & Kowalewski, 2019), we prioritize agents with the goal of increasing the traffic flow rate at a road intersection. The objective function penalizes a deviation from a reference speed and a change of acceleration. In order to reduce changes in the acceleration and therefore increase the networked solution quality, we prioritize agents if they are faster and closer to the intersection. The less time a vehicle has left before it needs to start decelerating to come to a full stop in front of the intersection, the higher its priority. In the work of van den Berg and Overmars (2005), robots with longer estimated travel distances receive higher priority to more evenly distribute the travel time among robots. The algorithm presented by Chalaki and Malikopoulos (2022) prioritizes vehicles at intersections using job-shop scheduling. Bennewitz, Burgard, and Thrun (2002) prioritizes agents randomly. Priorities are swapped iteratively to increase the quality of the MAPF solution. The planning problem has to be solved in each iteration, which increases computation effort. Zhang, Li, Huang, and Koenig (2022) present a prioritization algorithm based on machine learning that performs competitively compared to heuristic algorithms.

Many of these approaches affect the feasibility or the optimality of the agents' solutions to the MAPF problem. However, they do not consider the influence of the prioritization on the computation time to solve MAPF using PP.

### 1.2.3 Parallelization in Sequential PP

When agents need to consider common objectives or constraints, we term these agents coupled. For agents that are not coupled, prioritizations exist such that their computations can be parallelized without risking an inadvertent violation of constraints (Alrifae,

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XGq18FrjW6I>

2017; Alrifaae et al., 2016). The goal of minimizing the number of sequential computations corresponds to a timetabling problem. In the work of Welsh and Powell (1967), an incompatibility matrix represents the coupling of jobs. The problem is to find the minimum time needed to perform the jobs, which is solved by graph coloring. Jobs with the same color can be scheduled in the same time slot.

This concept is transferred to PP for distributed trajectory planning of vehicles by Kuwata, Richards, Schouwenaars, and How (2007). A coupling graph connects vertices with an edge if the corresponding vehicles are within a certain distance. Their work proves that vehicles without edges can plan their trajectories simultaneously. To maximize the number of simultaneous computations, a central entity determines the planning order through a heuristic coloring algorithm. All vehicles associated with vertices of the same color can compute simultaneously. (Kuwata et al., 2007) do not prove that prioritization through graph coloring is equivalent to maximizing the number of simultaneous computations in PP. Additionally, the centralized entity which performs graph coloring introduces high effort of communication and represents a single point of failure for the system.

### 1.3 Contribution of this Article

In PP, the number of agents whose computations can be parallelized depends on the coupling and the prioritization. The coupling is often determined by the application. Therefore, the computation time to solve MAPF using PP can only be influenced through the prioritization. We present a prioritization algorithm to reduce computation time by maximizing the number of parallel agent computations. We formalize the problem of maximizing the number of parallel agent computations and prove the problem’s equivalence to a graph coloring problem. We formulate our algorithm for graph coloring such that it can be solved in a decentralized fashion by each agent.

### 1.4 Notation

In this paper, we speak of agents whenever concepts are generally applicable to PP. A variable  $x$  is marked with a superscript  $x^{(i)}$  if it belongs to agent  $i$ . The actual value of a variable  $x$  at time  $k$  is written as  $x_k$ , while values predicted for time  $k+l$  at time  $k$  are written as  $x_{k+l|k}$ . A trajectory is denoted by replacing the time argument with  $(\cdot)$  as in  $x_{\cdot|k}$ . For any set  $\mathcal{S}$ , the cardinality of the set is denoted by  $|\mathcal{S}|$ .

We use graphs as a modeling tool of networks. Every agent is associated with a vertex, so the terms are used synonymously.

**Definition 3** (Directed graph). A directed graph  $\vec{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{V}, \vec{\mathcal{E}})$  is a pair of two sets, the set of vertices  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N_A\}$  and the set of directed edges  $\vec{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ . The edge from  $i$  to  $j$  is denoted by  $(i \rightarrow j)$ . An oriented graph is a directed graph obtained from an undirected graph by replacing each edge  $(i - j)$  with either  $(i \rightarrow j)$  or  $(j \rightarrow i)$ .

We characterize the relation between agents by their adjacency.

**Definition 4** (Adjacency). A vertex  $j$  is a predecessor of vertex  $i$  iff  $(j \rightarrow i) \in \mathcal{E}$ . The set of predecessors of vertex  $i$  is denoted by

$$\mathcal{V}^{(i\leftarrow)} = \{j \mid (j \rightarrow i) \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (2)$$

A vertex  $j$  is a successor of vertex  $i$  iff  $(i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}$ . The set of successors of vertex  $i$  is denoted by

$$\mathcal{V}^{(i\rightarrow)} = \{j \mid (i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (3)$$

A vertex  $j$  is a neighbor to or adjacent to vertex  $i$  if it is either a predecessor or a successor. The set of neighbors of vertex  $i$  is denoted by

$$\mathcal{V}^{(i)} = \mathcal{V}^{(i\rightarrow)} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(i\leftarrow)}. \quad (4)$$

We assume that states of agents are observable, and therefore we refer to states instead of outputs. The definitions and methods can be transferred to outputs as well, which we omit for brevity.

## 1.5 Structure of this Article

The rest of this article is organized as follows. First, our PP framework for multi-agent motion planning (MAMP) is introduced in Section 2. MAMP is a variant of MAPF, in which the kinodynamic constraints of agents are taken into account during planning. The problem that the present paper addresses is formally defined in Section 3, before our solution to it using graph coloring is presented in Section 4. We show numerical results of our approach in Section 5 by applying it to MAMP for connected and automated vehicles (CAVs) at intersections.

## 2 Prioritized Planning for Multi-Agent Motion Planning

This section provides a background to PP applied to MAMP and prioritization. MAMP is a variant of MAPF which can be applied to CAVs. While MAPF abstracts the environment and system dynamics in a graph representation, MAMP explicitly considers the system dynamics as ordinary differential equations and models the environment by static obstacles represented as polygons. Further, MAPF aims at planning a complete path from a start to a goal vertex. Contrary, the objective in our MAMP application is to plan for a fixed time horizon and to shift the horizon every time step, commonly known as receding horizon planning or online replanning (Cashmore et al., 2019; Li, Tinka, et al., 2021; Scheffe, Pedrosa, Flaßkamp, & Alrifaae, 2023; Shahar et al., 2021; Silver, 2005). The planning problem in MAMP is modeled as an optimal control problem (OCP). Certainly, there exists work that extend beyond traditional categorization of MAPF by, e.g., incorporating system dynamics (Alonso-Mora, Beardsley, & Siegwart, 2018; Le & Plaku, 2018; Luo et al., 2016).

Our framework PP framework for MAMP is illustrated in Figure 1. Agents solve their OCP (Section 2.2) when they have received all predictions from their predecessors, and send their predictions to their successors. To determine the predecessors and successors of agents, we couple (Section 2.1) and prioritize (Section 4) them. This paper focuses on the prioritization step, which we evaluate in the application of MAMP for CAVs. We sketch coupling and solving the OCP for trajectory planning in the following for context. Whenever we refer to a MAMP problem incorporating the entire network of agents, we term this as an MAMP instance.




Figure 1: Our framework of PP which runs every time step.  $\mathbf{x}_k^{(i)}$  is the state,  $\mathcal{G}$  is the undirected coupling graph,  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  is the directed coupling graph,  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(i)}$  is the prediction of agent  $i$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^{(j|i)}$  is the prediction of agent  $j$  in agent  $i$ .

## 2.1 Couple

If agents interact via their objective or constraint functions, we speak of coupled agents. A coupling graph represents the interaction between agents.

**Definition 5** (Directed coupling graph). A directed coupling graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(k) = (\mathcal{V}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(k))$  is an oriented graph obtained from orienting the edges of an undirected coupling graph at time step  $k$ . If an edge  $(i \rightarrow j)$  is directed from agent  $i$  to agent  $j$ , then agent  $j$  is responsible for considering the respective coupling objective and constraint in its planning problem.

The application in which MAMP is used determines which coupling objectives and constraints must be considered in the OCPs. For example, collision freeness between robots can be achieved via coupling constraints.

The undirected coupling graph can often be determined in networked applications before solving the OCP. In robot applications, if robots move on predetermined paths, we can couple robots if these paths intersect. Paths can be predetermined for road vehicles following lanes, or for warehouse robots (Ma, Li, Kumar, & Koenig, 2017). In MAMP, agents move freely. We analyze their reachable set for the prediction horizon, and couple them if their reachable sets intersect, similar to Scheffe et al. (2024).

## 2.2 Solve OCP

The objective of an agent  $i$  is to follow a reference trajectory:

$$J^{(i)}(k) = \sum_{l=1}^{N_p} \ell_x^{(i)} \left( \mathbf{x}_{k+l|k}^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}_{k+l|k}^{(i)} \right). \quad (5)$$

$N_p \in \mathbb{N}$  is the prediction horizon,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is the number of states, and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is the number of inputs. The function  $\ell_x^{(i)}: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  penalizes a deviation to the reference trajectory  $\mathbf{r}_{\cdot|k}^{(i)}$  of agent  $i$  and constitutes the objective function (6a) in the following OCP. The OCP

is solved inside the MAMP of each agent  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  at each time step  $k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{u}_{\cdot|k}^{(i)}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & J^{(i)}(k) \end{aligned} \tag{6a}$$

subject to

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+l+1|k}^{(i)} = f_d(\mathbf{x}_{k+l|k}^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}_{k+l|k}^{(i)}), \quad l = 0, \dots, N_p - 1, \tag{6b}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+l|k}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad l = 1, \dots, N_p - 1, \tag{6c}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+N_p|k}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{X}_f, \tag{6d}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k}^{(i)} = \mathbf{x}^{(i)}(k), \tag{6e}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+l|k}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad l = 0, \dots, N_p - 1, \tag{6f}$$

$$c_c^{(i \leftarrow j)}(\mathbf{x}_{k+l|k}^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_{k+l|k}^{(j)}) \leq 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, N_p, \quad j \in \mathcal{V}^{(i \leftarrow)}(k). \tag{6g}$$

The vector field  $f_d: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  in (6b) resembles the discrete-time system model with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  as the number of states and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  as the number of inputs. The input to the model  $f_d$  consists of a vector  $\mathbf{u}_{\cdot|k} \in \mathcal{U}$  which is the control input and a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  which is the agent's system state. The set of feasible control inputs is denoted as  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  and the set of feasible system states is denoted as  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ .  $\mathcal{X}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  denotes the set of feasible terminal states. This allows to further constrain this system state to achieve stable solutions. The function  $c_c^{(i \leftarrow j)}: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in (6g) resembles the coupling constraint with predecessors. The set of predecessors  $\mathcal{V}^{(i \leftarrow)}(k)$  contains the neighbors of  $i$  with higher priority, see Section 4.

### 3 Problem Statement

The goal of our prioritization function is to reduce the computation time of the MAMP instance. Agents can compute decentralized components of the PP framework in parallel, i.e., coupling and prioritizing in Figure 1. However, coupled agents must plan in sequence to guarantee prediction consistency. When all agents plan sequentially, the computation time grows approximately linearly with the number of agents. However, if some agents are uncoupled, they can potentially plan in parallel without affecting the prediction consistency. An agent starts to plan as soon as it has received the predictions from each of its predecessors. This offers a chance to reduce the computation time. We term the highest number of sequentially planning agents the number of computation levels  $N_c$  in the MAMP instance. The number of computation levels corresponds to the longest path in the directed coupling graph  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ . With the following definitions, we can formalize the number of computation levels.

**Definition 6** (Degree). The degree

$$d^{(i)} = |\mathcal{V}^{(i)}| \tag{7}$$

of a vertex  $i$  denotes the number of its adjacent vertices. The number of incoming edges called in-degree is denoted by

$$d^{(i \leftarrow)} = |\mathcal{V}^{(i \leftarrow)}|. \tag{8}$$



The number of outgoing edges called out-degree is denoted by

$$d^{(i\rightarrow)} = |\mathcal{V}^{(i\rightarrow)}|. \quad (9)$$

Let the sources of  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$  be the set of vertices without incoming edges

$$\mathcal{V}_s = \{i \in \mathcal{V} \mid d^{(i\leftarrow)} = 0\} \quad (10)$$

and the sinks be the set of vertices without outgoing edges

$$\mathcal{V}_t = \{i \in \mathcal{V} \mid d^{(i\rightarrow)} = 0\}. \quad (11)$$

Note that since the coupling graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG), there is at least one source and one sink. The number of computation levels  $N_c$  is the length of the longest path between  $\mathcal{V}_s$  and  $\mathcal{V}_t$  in  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ . Note that the number of computation levels depend on the coupling and the prioritization of the agents.

All components of our PP framework considered, the computation time of an MAMP instance consists of the coupling time, the prioritization time, the planning time, and the communication time. The computation time which is influenced most by prioritization is the prioritization time and the planning time. We introduce the following assumptions to state the addressed problem.

**Assumption 1.** The planning times  $T^{(i)}$  of all agents  $i$  are similar,

$$T^{(i)} \approx T \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (12)$$

Assumption 1 is mild if we use an anytime algorithm for planning. An anytime algorithm aims to find an initial solution quickly and then incrementally improve the solution as time allows (Likhachev, Gordon, & Thrun, 2003). Limiting the planning time results in nearly constant planning times of all agents.

**Assumption 2.** The planning time of an agent is far greater than the prioritization time,

$$T^{(i)} \gg T_{\text{prio}}^{(i)} \quad (13)$$

Assumption 2 is reasonable if an involving planning problem is solved in the MAMP. This is the case if, e.g., the OCP solved in MAMP is nonconvex, as in trajectory planning for CAVs.

According to Assumption 2, we can overapproximate the prioritization time as the maximum of all prioritization times  $T_{\text{prio}}^{(i)}$  for simplicity. To obtain the computation time  $T$  of the MAMP instance, we weigh the vertices  $\mathcal{V}$  with their respective planning time by a weighting function  $f_w: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f_w(i) = T^{(i)}, \quad (14)$$

with the planning time  $T^{(i)}$  of agent  $i$  required to solve its subproblem. Let  $P_{\text{max}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  denote the longest path between  $\mathcal{V}_s$  and  $\mathcal{V}_t$  in  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$  weighted with  $f_w$ . The sum of the maximum prioritization time and the planning times along this path corresponds to the computation time of the MAMP instance

$$T = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \left( T_{\text{prio}}^{(i)} \right) + \sum_{i \in P_{\text{max}}} T^{(i)}. \quad (15)$$

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the computation time of the MAMP instance is mainly influenced by the number of levels  $N_c$  of a coupling DAG. This coupling DAG is constructed from the undirected coupling graph with the prioritization function  $p$ . Since our goal is to decrease computation time, we formally state our problem as follows.

**Problem 1.** Given an undirected coupling graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , determine a prioritization function  $p^*$  that minimizes the number of levels  $N_c$ :

$$p^* = \arg \min_p N_c(\mathcal{G}, p). \quad (16)$$

## 4 Problem Solution

This section first introduces the concept of prioritization in PP in Section 4.1. We prove the equivalence of Problem 1 to a vertex coloring problem in Section 4.2. We solve Problem 1 with the decentralized algorithm presented in Section 4.3.

### 4.1 Priority Idea

In PP, we prioritize the agents in the network (Alrifaae et al., 2016; Kuwata et al., 2007). Prioritizing agents results in clear responsibilities and determines the order of computations in sequential PP. A prioritization function  $p: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  prioritizes every agent's vertex in the network. If  $p(i) < p(j)$ , then agent  $i$  has a higher priority than agent  $j$ , or agent  $i$  is prioritized over agent  $j$ .

By prioritizing, we can transform an undirected coupling graph into a directed coupling graph which is a DAG. An edge points towards the vertex with lower priority,

$$(i \rightarrow j) \in \vec{\mathcal{E}} \iff p(i) < p(j) \wedge (i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (17)$$

For the orientation of every edge to be well-defined, a valid prioritization function needs to assign pairwise different priorities to vertices that are connected by an edge, i.e.,

$$p(i) \neq p(j), \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{V}, i \neq j, (i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (18)$$

**Lemma 1.** *Given the construction rule in (17), the directed coupling graph  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$  resulting from the undirected coupling graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and a valid prioritization function  $p$  regarding (18) is a DAG.*

*Proof.* We prove this by contradiction analogous to Yuan, Qin, Lin, Chang, and Zhang (2017). Assume the directed graph  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$  to contain a cycle consisting of the edges  $(i_1 \rightarrow i_2), \dots, (i_{n-1} \rightarrow i_n), (i_n \rightarrow i_1)$ . From the construction rule (17) of  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$  and from the transitive property of the “<” relation follows  $p(i_1) < p(i_n)$  which contradicts that there exists an edge  $(i_n \rightarrow i_1)$  in the cycle, i.e.,  $p(i_1) > p(i_n)$ .  $\square$

### 4.2 Graph Coloring

The goal of vertex coloring is to partition a set of vertices  $\mathcal{V}$  of a graph into a set of colors  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that no two adjacent vertices are of the same color. The mapping of vertices

to colors is defined by the function  $\varphi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . In order to produce a valid coloring,  $\varphi$  has to satisfy

$$\varphi(i) \neq \varphi(j), \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{V}, i \neq j, (i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (19)$$

We translate a graph coloring function  $\varphi$  to a prioritization function  $p_{\text{color}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_c$  be all vertices of color  $c \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\mathcal{V}_c = \{i \mid i \in \mathcal{V}, \varphi(i) = c\}. \quad (20)$$

We can generate a directed graph from a graph colored with  $\varphi$  with a prioritization function  $p_{\text{color}}$  that fulfills the requirement

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\text{color}}(i) < p_{\text{color}}(j), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_{c_1}, \forall j \in \mathcal{V}_{c_2} \\ \iff c_1 < c_2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

By definition of graph coloring,  $p_{\text{color}}$  is a valid prioritization function regarding (18). According to Lemma 1, the resulting directed graph is a DAG.

**Theorem 1.** *Let a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  be colored by the coloring function  $\varphi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $p_{\text{color}}$  be a prioritization function that fulfills (21), so we can convert a colored coupling graph  $\mathcal{G}$  to a coupling DAG  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ . The number of colors  $N_c$  corresponds to the number of levels  $N_c$ .*

*Proof.* We proof this by induction.

**Basis:** Assume a coupling graph colored with one color. This implies that there exist no edges between the vertices of the graph. With any  $p_{\text{color}}$ , it follows that the number of levels is one. It can be concluded that the number of colors corresponds to the number of levels for  $N_c = N_c = 1$  color.

**Inductive step:** We assume that the coupling graph colored with  $N_c = k$  colors results in  $k$  levels. If a new color is necessary for a vertex, this vertex must be connected with an edge to a vertex of each already assigned color. Since there cannot be an edge between vertices in the same level, a new level must be added. Therefore, the number of colors is  $N_c = k + 1$  and the number of levels is  $N_c = k + 1$ . It can be concluded that the number of colors corresponds to the number of levels for  $k + 1$  colors.  $\square$

The chromatic number  $\chi(\mathcal{G})$  is the smallest number of colors needed to properly color a graph  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\chi: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

**Problem 2.** Given an undirected coupling graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , find a coloring function  $\varphi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  that yields a coloring with the chromatic number  $\chi(\mathcal{G})$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Problem 1 is equivalent to Problem 2 with a prioritization function that respects (21).*

*Proof.* Follows directly from Theorem 1. Since the number of colors in the coupling graph corresponds to the number of levels in the coupling DAG, minimizing the number of colors is the same as minimizing the number of levels.  $\square$

The graph coloring problem belongs to the class of NP-complete problems. Hence, no efficient algorithm that results in a coloring function for which it holds that  $N_c = \chi(\mathcal{G})$  is known (Garey & Johnson, 1976). Further, the problem of determining the chromatic

number of a graph  $\chi(\mathcal{G})$  is NP-hard (McDiarmid, 1979). Only special cases exist where the chromatic number is known beforehand, e.g., a 2-coloring for trees or an  $N_A$ -coloring for fully connected graphs. Hence, we propose a polynomial-time decentralized greedy graph coloring algorithm.

### 4.3 Polynomial-time Decentralized Graph Coloring

In this section we describe our approach of graph coloring. In contrast to approaches from literature (Kuwata et al., 2007; Welsh & Powell, 1967), we propose a decentralized algorithm. The input to the algorithm is the undirected coupling graph, in which every vertex is associated with a unique number. Every agent in the networked control system solving this algorithm must obtain the same prioritization to realize decentral execution.

To overcome the efficiency problem of optimal graph coloring algorithms, we approximate the solution to the minimal graph coloring with a greedy algorithm such that  $N_c/\chi(\mathcal{G})$  is close to 1 (Garey & Johnson, 1976). Greedy coloring algorithms select and color vertices one after another with the corresponding smallest possible color  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

To select the next vertex to be colored, we propose a heuristic based on a combination of a saturation degree ordering (SDO), a largest degree ordering (LDO), and a first-fit ordering (FFO) (Al-Omari & Sabri, 2006; Hasenplaugh, Kaler, Schardl, & Leiserson, 2014) to achieve a consistent and near-optimal coloring among agents. It arranges vertices corresponding to an SDO, an LDO, and an FFO, in descending importance for the ordering. An SDO arranges the vertices in descending order according to the saturation degree, i.e., the number of their differently colored neighbors. An LDO arranges the vertices in descending order according to the number of neighbors  $d^{(i)}$ . An FFO arranges the vertices by their unique number. For decentralized execution, the result of our algorithm must be consistent across all agents. The first two orderings can be ambiguous, if multiple vertices have the same saturation degree and the same number of neighbors. However, such ambiguities are always resolved through unique vertex numbers, guaranteeing a consistent coloring among the agents. Consequently, the algorithm results in the same coloring for all agents, given the same input.

Algorithm 1 details our coloring algorithm. The algorithm iteratively colors vertices until every vertex is colored (Line 3). All vertices yet to be colored are investigated in the for-loop in Line 5. If the current saturation degree  $s$  is greater than the current maximum saturation degree  $s_{\max}$ ,  $s_{\max}$  and the next vertex to be colored  $i_{\max}$  are updated (Lines 8 and 9). This procedure corresponds to an SDO. If the saturation degrees are equal, the algorithm returns to an LDO (Line 10) and updates  $i_{\max}$  with  $i$  if  $i$  has a higher degree than the current  $i_{\max}$ . Otherwise,  $i_{\max}$  remains the first vertex in the list of vertices according to an FFO. The set of valid colors for vertex  $i_{\max}$  is the set difference of all colors and its adjacent colors (Lines 12 and 13). The minimal possible color is assigned to  $i_{\max}$  with  $\varphi$  (Line 14), and the vertex is removed from the set of uncolored vertices (Line 15). Since in each iteration of the outer loop one vertex is colored, the algorithm will terminate in  $N_A$  iterations. Since the number of available colors is infinite, the algorithm will always return a valid coloring.

An FFO needs to iterate only once over the set of vertices, resulting in a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N_A)$ . An LDO needs to compare the degree of every vertex, leading to a

---

**Algorithm 1** Decentralized greedy graph coloring

---

**Input:** Graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ **Output:** Graph coloring  $\varphi$ 

```
1:  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{1, \dots, N_A\}$   $\triangleright$  set of colors
2:  $\varphi(\mathcal{V}) \leftarrow 0$ 
3: while  $\mathcal{V} \neq \emptyset$  do
4:    $s_{\max} \leftarrow -1$   $\triangleright$  implicit selection via FFO follows
5:   for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  do
6:      $s \leftarrow |\{c \mid \varphi(j) = c \neq 0, j \in \mathcal{V}^{(i)}\}|$   $\triangleright$  saturation degree
7:     if  $s > s_{\max}$  then
8:        $s_{\max} \leftarrow s$ 
9:        $i_{\max} \leftarrow i$   $\triangleright$  selection via SDO
10:    if  $s = s_{\max}$  and  $d^{(i)} > d^{(i_{\max})}$  then  $\triangleright$  selection via LDO
11:       $i_{\max} \leftarrow i$ 
12:     $\mathcal{C}_{\text{adj}} \leftarrow \{c \mid \varphi(j) = c \neq 0, j \in \mathcal{V}^{(i_{\max})}\}$   $\triangleright$  adjacent colors
13:     $\mathcal{C}_{\text{poss}} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_{\text{adj}}$ 
14:     $\varphi(i_{\max}) \leftarrow \min \mathcal{C}_{\text{poss}}$ 
15:     $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus i_{\max}$ 
16: return  $\varphi$ 
```

---

time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N_A^2)$ . For every vertex, an SDO needs to check every adjacent vertex to determine the saturation degree, which results in a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N_A^3)$ . Thus, Algorithm 1 also has a polynomial time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N_A^3)$ .

*Remark 1.* Assuming edges in the coupling graph contain constraints, their number equals the number of incoming edges  $d^{(i \leftarrow)}$  in PP, which depends on the prioritization function  $p$ . We can reorder the sequence of colors and thus the computation levels to influence the number of incoming edges of vertices. Equally distributing the number of constraints among agents can be beneficial for the feasibility of the planning problems and the solution cost of the MAMP instance. A vertex with a high degree should therefore be on a level with a low number, so that the edges are outgoing rather than incoming.

Figure 2 illustrates the proposed problem solution with an example. From an example undirected graph (Figure 2a), a baseline prioritization which assigns priorities equal to the vertex number results in four computation levels. Coloring the vertices solves Problem 1 and reduces the number of computation levels to three. Further reordering of the levels reduces the maximum number of incoming edges per agent from two to one and from three to two.

## 5 Evaluation in a Trajectory Planning Application of CAVs

We evaluate the presented approach on reducing computation time by prioritization in the context of CAVs. In Section 5.2, we present the experiment setup, an intersection scenario




Figure 2: Example of problem solution process

with eight vehicles. In Section 5.3, we compare the computation time of the MAMP instance of our approach with prioritization approaches from literature. In Section 5.4, we evaluate the quality of the trajectories of the vehicles in the MAMP instance.

The algorithms are implemented in MATLAB and are publicly available<sup>2</sup>. They ran on an off-the-shelf laptop with an Apple Silicon M3 Pro 12-Core CPU with 2.7 GHz to 4.1 GHz and 36 GB of RAM.

We compare our prioritization algorithm with three algorithms from literature. Each algorithm is represented by a prioritization function  $p: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . The first function prioritizes vehicles according to their vertex number (Alrifaae et al., 2016) and is denoted by  $p_{\text{constant}}$ . The second function prioritizes vehicles randomly at each time step (Bennewitz et al., 2002) and is denoted by  $p_{\text{random}}$ . The third function prioritizes vehicles with a constraint-based heuristic (Scheffe et al., 2022). A higher number of potential collisions with other vehicles result in a higher priority. The function is denoted by  $p_{\text{constraint}}$ .

## 5.1 Trajectory Planning

In our application of trajectory planning for CAVs, the objective (6a) of a CAV  $i$  is to stay close to a reference trajectory. In our work, the vector field  $f_d^{(i)}$  is a nonlinear kinematic single-track model (Rajamani, 2006, section 2.2). The coupling constraint (6g) achieves collision avoidance with predecessors.

It is computationally hard to find the global optimum to OCP (6) due to its nonlinearity and nonconvexity. We approximate (6) with a receding horizon graph search based on our

<sup>2</sup>[github.com/embedded-software-laboratory/p-dmpc](https://github.com/embedded-software-laboratory/p-dmpc)




Figure 3: Coupling graph for eight-lane intersection with eight vehicles. For each direction of the intersection, one vehicle turns right and one vehicle moves straight, which is indicated by dots. The undirected coupling graph is based on the potential collisions between vehicles.

previous work (Scheffe et al., 2023) which can be solved online. The system model is quantized in a motion primitive automaton which consists of a set of states and a set of transitions, called motion primitives. Finding a feasible solution to (6) results in a tree search which can be solved by means of an A\* algorithm. In this work, we use a sampling-based approach on the basis of Monte Carlo tree search (MCTS). In each time step, our MCTS evaluates  $N_{\text{exp}}$  random transitions in the search tree. The algorithm thus builds part of the complete search tree. After  $N_{\text{exp}} \in \mathbb{N}$  transitions, the path with the lowest cost according to (6a) is selected as the solution to (6). The algorithm has no guarantee on optimality, but achieves feasible solutions with nearly constant computation time, satisfying Assumption 1.

## 5.2 Intersection Scenario

We evaluate the presented approach to reduce computation time by prioritization to distributed trajectory planning for road vehicles at an intersection with two incoming and two outgoing lanes for each direction. The intersection is part of a simulation of the Cyber-Physical Mobility Lab, an open-source, remotely-accessible testbed for CAVs (M. Kloock et al., 2021). Figure 3 depicts the initial states with eight vehicles as well as the associated undirected coupling graph. From each direction, one vehicle is turning right, and one vehicle is moving straight. The experiments run for  $k_{\text{experiment}} = 25$  time steps with a time step duration of 0.2s. The MPC uses a prediction horizon of  $N_p = 8$ , the MCTS which solves the OCP uses  $N_{\text{exp}} = 2500$  expansions.




Figure 4: Computation time using  $p_{\text{color}}$  (our approach) compared to other prioritizations in the experiment starting from the initial states shown in Figure 3.




Figure 5: Number of prioritizations for the coupling graph in Figure 3 that result in a coupling DAG with the given number of computation levels  $N_c$ .

### 5.3 Computation Time

Figure 4 shows the computation time of the MAMP instance according to (15) for different prioritizations. For each prioritization, the median and maximum computation time over all time steps are displayed. In our experiment, we decrease the maximum computation time by more than 57.9% compared to the prioritization  $p_{\text{constant}}$ .

The decrease in computation time comes mostly from a reduction in the number of computation levels. Each prioritization produces a directed coupling graph, which results in a certain number of computation levels. As the number of different prioritizations for  $N_A$  vehicles is  $N_A!$ , there are  $8! = 40\,320$  different prioritizations for the vehicles.

Figure 5 shows the number of computation levels for these prioritizations, which ranges from three to eight given the undirected coupling graph in Figure 3.

Figure 6 shows the median and maximum computation levels  $N_c$  over all time steps. As vehicles move during the experiment, the undirected coupling graph changes, and with it the number of computation levels. The median is at two, since as vehicles exit the intersection, only two vehicles are coupled in each outgoing lane. With our algorithm to solve the OCP (Section 5.1), we obtain a strong correlation between the number of computation levels and the computation time of the MAMP instance. The maximum number of computation levels for  $p_{\text{random}}$  is five, which can be expected given most prioritizations result in four or five computation levels (Figure 5).

Figure 7 depicts the directed coupling graphs resulting from  $p_{\text{constant}}$  and our proposed coloring prioritization function  $p_{\text{color}}$  for the first time step of the experiment with the






Figure 6: Number of computation levels using  $p_{\text{color}}$  (our approach) compared to other prioritizations in the experiment starting from the initial states shown in Figure 3.




Figure 7: Computation levels and coupling DAG with prioritizations  $p_{\text{constant}}$  and  $p_{\text{color}}$  (our approach) for the coupling graph in Figure 3

undirected coupling graph depicted in Figure 3. Prioritization with  $p_{\text{constant}}$  results in eight computation levels, whereas we can color the graph using Algorithm 1 with only three different colors, resulting in three computation levels.

The vehicles compute the prioritization with our approach in a decentralized fashion and thus parallelly. The maximum of the graph coloring computation time is 0.81 ms, which is negligible when compared to the trajectory planning task.

#### 5.4 Quality of Trajectories

The quality of trajectories  $J_p$  of a prioritization algorithm  $p$  according to the cost of the OCP of each vehicle is given as

$$J_p = \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\text{experiment}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} J_p^{(i)}(k), \quad (22)$$

with  $k_{\text{experiment}}$  being the number of time steps in the experiment, and  $J_p^{(i)}(k)$  given in (5). The cost normalized to that of the prioritization  $p_{\text{constant}}$  is shown in Figure 8. In our experiment, the cost increased by 26.2% compared to the prioritization  $p_{\text{constant}}$ . All vehicles were able to pass the intersection with all prioritizations.




Figure 8: Cost  $J_{p_{\text{color}}}$  using our approach  $p_{\text{color}}$  compared to the cost  $J_p$  using other prioritizations in the experiment starting from the scene shown in Figure 3. Cost is normalized to the cost  $J_{p_{\text{constant}}}$  of prioritization  $p_{\text{constant}}$ .

## 6 Discussion


In the following, we discuss our approach which prioritized agents using graph coloring. The discussion regards the computation effort, the quality of agents’ solutions in the MAMP instance, and the communication effort.

### 6.1 Computation Effort


The computation time of our coloring algorithm scales in an order of  $\mathcal{O}(N_A^3)$  with the number of agents as discussed in Section 4.2. This effort should at least be compensated by the reduced computation time for the MAMP instance. The amount of reduced computation time for the MAMP instance depends on mainly two factors.

The first factor is the computation demand for the control problem in each agent. If the control problem in each agent is computationally simple, the reduction of computation levels might not be very beneficial. However, nonconvex optimization problems, such as trajectory planning with collision avoidance, typically are computationally demanding and therefore benefit from a reduction of computation levels. If the computation demand is sensitive to the prioritization and thus the constraints, which can be the case in A\*-based algorithms, the reduction in computation levels might be counteracted by an increase in computation demand. In sampling-based algorithms like MCTS, the nearly constant computation demand mainly depends on the number of explored samples. Thus, the reduction of computation time is proportional to the reduction of computation levels.

The second factor is the undirected coupling graph of the MAMP instance. For a fully connected coupling graph, any prioritization algorithm results in  $N_A$  computation levels. For a coupling graph which is a path graph, the worst prioritization with regards to the computation time would result in  $N_A$  levels, whereas our prioritization through graph coloring always results in only two levels. A path graph is a graph that consists of a single path (Lunze, 2019) in which each vertex has a degree of two except the vertices at the end and beginning of the path have a degree of one. Coupling graphs that have a chromatic number of two, such as the one shown in Figure 9, are bipartite graphs. For the graph in Figure 9, a prioritization with priorities according to vertex numbers would result in eight computation levels, while our proposed coloring algorithm achieves two computation levels.



(a) Undirected bipartite coupling graph



(b) Computation levels (CL) and coupling DAG

Figure 9: Transformation of undirected bipartite graph to DAG using graph coloring

**Theorem 3.** *Given an undirected coupling graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , the minimum number of computation levels  $N_c$  is upper bounded by the maximum degree of vertices in the graph, i.e.,*

$$\min_p N_c(\mathcal{G}, p) \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} d^{(i)} + 1. \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* The number of computation levels  $N_c$  corresponds to the longest path in the directed coupling graph  $\vec{\mathcal{G}}$ . By the Gallai (1968)-Hasse (1965)-Roy (1967)-Vitaver (1962) theorem,

$$\min_p N_c(\mathcal{G}, p) = \chi(\mathcal{G}). \quad (24)$$

According to Welsh and Powell (1967),

$$\chi(\mathcal{G}) \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} d^{(i)} + 1. \quad (25)$$

□

From Theorem 3 follows that the number of computation levels, and thus the networked computation time, is not depending on the number of agents in the coupling graph, but only on its maximum degree. From Theorem 3 we also conclude that sparse coupling graphs with few edges are more likely to benefit from our approach. The maximum number of computation levels that can result from any prioritization is equal to the length of the longest path in the undirected coupling graph. The greater the difference of the chromatic number and the length of the longest path in the undirected coupling graph, the higher the potential computation time reduction for the MAMP instance with a prioritization through graph coloring.

## 6.2 Quality of Solutions

The quality of a solution consists of its cost, and its feasibility, i.e., does a solution exist which satisfies all constraints. Our approach does not need any application-specific knowledge about agents' constraints or interactions. On the one hand, this makes the approach

more general. On the other hand, the approach cannot consider constraints or interactions during prioritization, which might result in solutions of lower quality. Our approach prioritizes agents at each time step, which can result in an inversion of the priorities between agents. Such inversions can drastically change the OCP of an agent. This stands in disharmony to the concept of MPC, on which our PP approach for MAMP relies on. In MPC the OCP is expected to be known for the prediction horizon. Consequently, frequent changes of priorities might deteriorate the solution quality. Additionally, our cost metric takes the whole optimized solution of agents into account, even though only the first control input is applied. In our experiment, we observed an increase of solution cost by 26.2% compared to the prioritization  $p_{\text{constant}}$ . However, the random prioritization  $p_{\text{random}}$ , which also frequently changes priorities, increases the solution quality compared to  $p_{\text{constant}}$ . Thus, in general, it seems difficult to assess the solution quality on the basis of the coupling DAG structure. With our proposed approach, all vehicles were able to cross the intersection. The solution quality should be seen in relation to the highly decreased computation time.

### 6.3 Communication Effort

The communication in our PP framework (Figure 1) is limited to communicating predictions to successors, i.e., communication takes place where agents are connected in the directed coupling graph. The number of sequential communications corresponds to the number of computation levels. Therefore, through reducing the number of computation levels, our approach also reduces the number of sequential communications. However, communication instead takes place in parallel, which puts a higher communication load on the communication infrastructure. Depending on the infrastructure, the implications on the communication can be beneficial or detrimental.

## 7 Conclusion

We proposed a prioritization strategy which reduces the computation time in PP for MAMP, a variant of MAPF. We proved the equivalence of this problem to graph coloring of a given undirected coupling graph of the MAMP instance and prioritizing agents on the basis of the vertex colors. Our coloring algorithm works in a decentralized fashion, which avoids a single point of failure and reduces the amount of communication required. We successfully applied our process for prioritization to vehicles crossing an eight-lane intersection using an PP approach for MAMP based on MPC, for which the reduction of computation time is around 57.9% compared to a baseline approach from literature. Our approach can be applied to any domain with prioritized computations, provided that the coupling graph is known. Especially in large-scale systems with sparse coupling graphs, our approach can significantly reduce the computation time and thus improve the scalability.

The feasibility of each agent’s planning problem and the quality of the solutions also depend on the prioritization. In our experiment, the solution cost was increased by 26.2% compared to a baseline approach from literature. In the future, we will further investigate prioritization considering feasibility and quality of solutions.

## 8 Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) within the Priority Program SPP 1835 “Cooperative Interacting Automobiles” (grant number: KO 1430/17-1).

## References

- Al-Omari, D. H., & Sabri, K. E. (2006, April). New Graph Coloring Algorithms. *Journal of Mathematics and Statistics*, 2(4), 439–441. doi: 10.3844/jmssp.2006.439.441
- Alonso-Mora, J., Beardsley, P., & Siegwart, R. (2018, April). Cooperative Collision Avoidance for Nonholonomic Robots. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 34(2), 404–420. doi: 10.1109/TRO.2018.2793890
- Alrifaae, B. (2017). *Networked Model Predictive Control for Vehicle Collision Avoidance* (Doctoral dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.18154/RWTH-2017-04199>
- Alrifaae, B., Heßeler, F.-J., & Abel, D. (2016). Coordinated Non-Cooperative Distributed Model Predictive Control for Decoupled Systems Using Graphs. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(22), 216–221. doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2016.10.399
- Barer, M., Sharon, G., Stern, R., & Felner, A. (2021, September). Suboptimal Variants of the Conflict-Based Search Algorithm for the Multi-Agent Pathfinding Problem. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Combinatorial Search*, 5(1), 19–27. doi: 10.1609/socs.v5i1.18315
- Bennewitz, M., Burgard, W., & Thrun, S. (2002, November). Finding and optimizing solvable priority schemes for decoupled path planning techniques for teams of mobile robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 41(2), 89–99. doi: 10.1016/S0921-8890(02)00256-7
- Blasi, S., Kögel, M., & Findeisen, R. (2018, January). Distributed Model Predictive Control Using Cooperative Contract Options. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(20), 448–454. doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.11.048
- Čáp, M., Novák, P., Kleiner, A., & Selecký, M. (2015, July). Prioritized Planning Algorithms for Trajectory Coordination of Multiple Mobile Robots. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 12(3), 835–849. doi: 10.1109/TASE.2015.2445780
- Cashmore, M., Coles, A., Cserna, B., Karpas, E., Magazzeni, D., & Ruml, W. (2019, July). Replanning for Situated Robots. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 29, 665–673. doi: 10.1609/icaps.v29i1.3534
- Chalaki, B., & Malikopoulos, A. A. (2022). A Priority-Aware Replanning and Resequencing Framework for Coordination of Connected and Automated Vehicles. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6, 1772–1777. doi: 10.1109/LCSYS.2021.3133416
- Dunbar, W. B., & Caveney, D. S. (2012, March). Distributed Receding Horizon Control of Vehicle Platoons: Stability and String Stability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(3), 620–633. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2011.2159651
- Dunbar, W. B., & Murray, R. M. (2006, April). Distributed receding horizon control for multi-vehicle formation stabilization. *Automatica*, 42(4), 549–558. doi: 10.1016/

j.automatica.2005.12.008

- Erdmann, M., & Lozano-Pérez, T. (1987, November). On multiple moving objects. *Algorithmica*, 2(1), 477. doi: 10.1007/BF01840371
- Farina, M., & Scattolini, R. (2012, June). Distributed predictive control: A non-cooperative algorithm with neighbor-to-neighbor communication for linear systems. *Automatica*, 48(6), 1088–1096. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2012.03.020
- Gallai, T. (1968). On directed paths and circuits. *Theory of graphs*, 38, 2054.
- Garey, M. R., & Johnson, D. S. (1976, January). The Complexity of Near-Optimal Graph Coloring. *Journal of the ACM*, 23(1), 43–49. doi: 10.1145/321921.321926
- Guo, T., & Yu, J. (2024, October). Expected 1.x Makespan-Optimal Multi-Agent Path Finding on Grid Graphs in Low Polynomial Time. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 81, 443–479. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.16299
- Hasenplaugh, W., Kaler, T., Schardl, T. B., & Leiserson, C. E. (2014, June). Ordering heuristics for parallel graph coloring. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures* (pp. 166–177). Prague Czech Republic: ACM. doi: 10.1145/2612669.2612697
- Hasse, M. (1965, January). Zur algebraischen Begründung der Graphentheorie. I. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 28(5-6), 275–290. doi: 10.1002/mana.19650280503
- Kloock, C., & Werner, H. (2020, May). Prediction Mismatch in Distributed Model Predictive Control. In *2020 European Control Conference (ECC)* (pp. 1224–1229). Saint Petersburg, Russia: IEEE. doi: 10.23919/ECC51009.2020.9143753
- Kloock, M., & Alrifaae, B. (2023). Coordinated Cooperative Distributed Decision-Making Using Synchronization of Local Plans. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 8(2), 1292–1306. doi: 10.1109/TIV.2023.3234189
- Kloock, M., Kragl, L., Maczijekowski, J., Alrifaae, B., & Kowalewski, S. (2019). Distributed Model Predictive Pose Control of Multiple Nonholonomic Vehicles. In *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)* (pp. 1620–1625). doi: 10.1109/IVS.2019.8813980
- Kloock, M., Scheffe, P., Maczijekowski, J., Kampmann, A., Mokhtarian, A., Kowalewski, S., & Alrifaae, B. (2021). Cyber-Physical Mobility Lab: An Open-Source Platform for Networked and Autonomous Vehicles. In *European Control Conference (ECC)* (pp. 1937–1944). doi: 10.23919/ECC54610.2021.9654986
- Kloock, M., Scheffe, P., Marquardt, S., Maczijekowski, J., Alrifaae, B., & Kowalewski, S. (2019). Distributed Model Predictive Intersection Control of Multiple Vehicles. In *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)* (pp. 1735–1740). doi: 10.1109/ITSC.2019.8917117
- Kuwata, Y., Richards, A., Schouwenaars, T., & How, J. P. (2007, July). Distributed Robust Receding Horizon Control for Multivehicle Guidance. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 15(4), 627–641. doi: 10.1109/TCST.2007.899152
- Le, D., & Plaku, E. (2018, October). Cooperative, Dynamics-based, and Abstraction-Guided Multi-robot Motion Planning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 63, 361–390. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.11244
- Li, J., Ruml, W., & Koenig, S. (2021, May). EECBS: A Bounded-Suboptimal Search for Multi-Agent Path Finding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(14), 12353–12362. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v35i14.17466
- Li, J., Tinka, A., Kiesel, S., Durham, J. W., Kumar, T. K. S., & Koenig, S. (2021).

- Lifelong Multi-Agent Path Finding in Large-Scale Warehouses. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(13), 11272–11281.
- Likhachev, M., Gordon, G., & Thrun, S. (2003). ARA\*: Anytime A\* with Provable Bounds on Sub-Optimality. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (pp. 767–774). Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press.
- Lunze, J. (2019). *Networked control of multi-agent systems*. Rotterdam: Bookmundo.
- Luo, W., Chakraborty, N., & Sycara, K. (2016, July). Distributed dynamic priority assignment and motion planning for multiple mobile robots with kinodynamic constraints. In *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)* (pp. 148–154). Boston, MA, USA: IEEE. doi: 10.1109/ACC.2016.7524907
- Ma, H., Li, J., Kumar, T. S., & Koenig, S. (2017, May). Lifelong Multi-Agent Path Finding for Online Pickup and Delivery Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* (pp. 837–845). Richland, SC: International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- McDiarmid, C. (1979, February). Determining the Chromatic Number of a Graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 8(1), 1–14. doi: 10.1137/0208001
- Pan, Z., Wang, R., Bi, Q., Zhang, X., & Yu, J. (2024, August). RH-ECBS: Enhanced conflict-based search for MRPP with region heuristics. *Robotica*, 1–11. doi: 10.1017/S0263574724000894
- Rajamani, R. (2006). *Vehicle Dynamics and Control*. New York: Springer Science.
- Richards, A., & How, J. P. (2007, September). Robust distributed model predictive control. *International Journal of Control*, 80(9), 1517–1531. doi: 10.1080/00207170701491070
- Riverso, S., & Ferrari-Trecate, G. (2012, November). Tube-based distributed control of linear constrained systems. *Automatica*, 48(11), 2860–2865. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2012.08.024
- Roy, B. (1967). Nombre chromatique et plus longs chemins d’un graphe. *Revue française d’informatique et de recherche opérationnelle*, 1(5), 129–132.
- Scheffe, P., Dorndorf, G., & Alrifaae, B. (2022). Increasing Feasibility with Dynamic Priority Assignment in Distributed Trajectory Planning for Road Vehicles. In *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)* (pp. 3873–3879). doi: 10.1109/ITSC55140.2022.9922028
- Scheffe, P., Pedrosa, M. V. A., Flaßkamp, K., & Alrifaae, B. (2023). Receding Horizon Control Using Graph Search for Multi-Agent Trajectory Planning. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 31(3), 1092–1105. doi: 10.1109/TCST.2022.3214718
- Scheffe, P., Xu, J., & Alrifaae, B. (2024, June). Limiting Computation Levels in Prioritized Trajectory Planning with Safety Guarantees. In *2024 European Control Conference (ECC)* (pp. 297–304). Stockholm, Sweden: IEEE. doi: 10.23919/ECC64448.2024.10591179
- Shahar, T., Shekhar, S., Atzmon, D., Saffidine, A., Juba, B., & Stern, R. (2021, March). Safe Multi-Agent Pathfinding with Time Uncertainty. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70, 923–954. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.12397
- Sharon, G., Stern, R., Felner, A., & Sturtevant, N. R. (2015, February). Conflict-based search for optimal multi-agent pathfinding. *Artificial Intelligence*, 219, 40–66. doi:

- 10.1016/j.artint.2014.11.006
- Silver, D. (2005). Cooperative Pathfinding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 1(1), 117–122. doi: 10.1609/aiide.v1i1.18726
- Trodden, P., & Richards, A. (2013, February). Cooperative distributed MPC of linear systems with coupled constraints. *Automatica*, 49(2), 479–487. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2012.11.007
- van den Berg, J., & Overmars, M. (2005, August). Prioritized motion planning for multiple robots. In *2005 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems* (pp. 430–435). doi: 10.1109/IROS.2005.1545306
- Vitaver, LM. (1962). Determination of minimal coloring of vertices of a graph by means of Boolean powers of the incidence matrix. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk* (Vol. 147, pp. 758–759). Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Welsh, D. J. A., & Powell, M. B. (1967, January). An upper bound for the chromatic number of a graph and its application to timetabling problems. *The Computer Journal*, 10(1), 85–86. doi: 10.1093/comjnl/10.1.85
- Wu, W., Bhattacharya, S., & Prorok, A. (2020, May). Multi-Robot Path Deconfliction through Prioritization by Path Prospects. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)* (pp. 9809–9815). Paris, France: IEEE. doi: 10.1109/ICRA40945.2020.9196813
- Yu, J. (2016, January). Intractability of Optimal Multirobot Path Planning on Planar Graphs. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 1(1), 33–40. doi: 10.1109/LRA.2015.2503143
- Yu, J. (2020, March). Average case constant factor time and distance optimal multi-robot path planning in well-connected environments. *Autonomous Robots*, 44(3-4), 469–483. doi: 10.1007/s10514-019-09858-z
- Yu, J., & LaValle, S. (2013, June). Structure and Intractability of Optimal Multi-Robot Path Planning on Graphs. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 27(1), 1443–1449. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v27i1.8541
- Yuan, L., Qin, L., Lin, X., Chang, L., & Zhang, W. (2017, November). Effective and efficient dynamic graph coloring. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(3), 338–351. doi: 10.14778/3157794.3157802
- Zhang, S., Li, J., Huang, T., & Koenig, S. (2022). Learning a Priority Ordering for Prioritized Planning in Multi-Agent Path Finding. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Combinatorial Search*, 15(1), 208–216.
- Zheng, Y., Li, S. E., Li, K., Borrelli, F., & Hedrick, J. K. (2017, May). Distributed Model Predictive Control for Heterogeneous Vehicle Platoons Under Unidirectional Topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 25(3), 899–910. doi: 10.1109/TCST.2016.2594588