

Decentralised multi-agent coordination for real-time railway traffic management

Leo D’Amato^{1,3}, Paola Pellegrini², Vito Trianni³

¹Politecnico di Torino, DAUIN, Corso Castelfidardo, 34/d, Turin 10128, Italy.

²Univ Gustave Eiffel, COSYS-ESTAS, F-59650 Villeneuve d’Ascq, France

³Institute for Cognitive Sciences and Technologies, CNR, Via G. D. Romagnosi 18/A, 00196 Rome, Italy.
leo.damato@polito.it

Abstract

The real-time Railway Traffic Management Problem (rtRTMP) is a challenging optimisation problem in railway transportation. It involves the efficient management of train movements while minimising delay propagation caused by unforeseen perturbations due to, e.g, temporary speed limitations or signal failures. This paper re-frames the rtRTMP as a multi-agent coordination problem and formalises it as a Distributed Constraint Optimisation Problem (DCOP) to explore its potential for decentralised solutions. We propose a novel coordination algorithm that extends the widely known Distributed Stochastic Algorithm (DSA), allowing trains to self-organise and resolve scheduling conflicts. The performance of our algorithm is compared to a classical DSA through extensive simulations on a synthetic dataset reproducing diverse problem configurations. Results show that our approach achieves significant improvements in solution quality and convergence speed, demonstrating its effectiveness and scalability in managing large-scale railway networks. Beyond the railway domain, this framework can have broader applicability in autonomous systems, such as self-driving vehicles or inter-satellite coordination.

1 Introduction

In the realm of railway transportation, the *real-time Railway Traffic Management Problem* (rtRTMP) [Qu *et al.*, 2015; Pellegrini *et al.*, 2015] is the problem of efficiently coordinating train movements across a railway network to counteract possible knock-on delays caused by traffic perturbations such as train malfunctions, signal failures, or temporary speed limitations. Knock-on delays are due to conflicts, that require external intervention on train paths through rerouting or rescheduling. Traditionally, such interventions have relied on centralised decision-making by human dispatchers, often with limited computational support, and primarily guided by personal experience.

In the academic literature, centralised approaches dominate, employing methods such as Integer Linear Programming (ILP) [Caimi *et al.*, 2012; Meng and Zhou, 2014;

Toletti *et al.*, 2020], Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) [Luan *et al.*, 2020; Fischetti and Monaci, 2017; Pellegrini *et al.*, 2015; Törnquist and Persson, 2007; Lu *et al.*, 2022; Reynolds and Maher, 2022; Leutwiler *et al.*, 2023], and graph-based formulations [Corman *et al.*, 2010; Lamorgese and Mannino, 2015; Mascis and Pacciarelli, 2002; Samà *et al.*, 2017; Bettinelli *et al.*, 2017; Rodriguez, 2007]. However, centralised approaches struggle to scale with increasing network sizes due to computational constraints. These constraints may be overcome by developing decentralised approaches, where decision-making is distributed across individual trains acting as autonomous agents [Marcelli and Pellegrini, 2020].

Decentralisation potentially scales better to large-scale area networks, possibly at the cost of accepting non-optimal but still effective solutions. One possible approach to the decentralised rtRTMP (dec-rtRTMP), presented by [Van Thienen *et al.*, 2019], focuses on resolving conflicts individually by adjusting train schedules or routes. In contrast, [Shang *et al.*, 2018] suggest empowering trains to make individual decisions, optimizing their movements based on observations of preceding trains. Another proposal by [Yong *et al.*, 2017] introduces swarm intelligence, organizing trains into groups to address common conflicts collectively. In addition, several methods from Artificial Intelligence (AI) have gained attention in this domain, especially following the recent developments in deep neural architectures [Jusup *et al.*, 2021]. For instance, [Khadilkar, 2019] advocates for reinforcement learning (RL), where agents learn from past experiences to make decisions. The Flatland challenges, initiated by European railway managers, have spurred research in this direction [Mohanty *et al.*, 2020], offering a simplified railway simulator for testing different machine learning (ML) approaches. However, deploying learning algorithms in such complex environment can be challenging and the lack of guarantees on the feasibility of the obtained solution together with the black-box nature of these approaches, makes them difficult to accept by stakeholders.

An alternative approach consists in merging optimisation-based planning with self-organisation [D’Amato *et al.*, 2024]. In this approach, individual trains need to agree on possible schedules resulting from local optimisation by interacting with neighbours. [D’Amato *et al.*, 2024] proved the viability of the deployment to real world scenarios of such an hybrid

approach to the dec-rtRTMP. More specifically, they studied a small portion of the line connecting Paris and Le Havre, in France, showing that, in case of traffic perturbations, not only the proposed approach is better than following the original timetable, but also it achieves performance comparable to the centralised state of the art. One of the key components is the self-organised process that enables reaching coordination among the agents on a feasible solution. To this end, decentralised consensus protocols [Pease *et al.*, 1980; Amirkhani and Barshooi, 2022] offer a framework for achieving such an agreement among agents without central control. Simple stochastic models, like the Voter Model, are often sufficient for a population to converge on shared opinions [Holley and Liggett, 1975]. These have been adapted to the dec-rtRTMP as a proof of concept [D’Amato *et al.*, 2024], but without providing a clear problem formulation or a characterisation of the expected performance. In this study, we move a crucial step in this direction.

We reframe the dec-rtRTMP as a Distributed Constraint Optimisation Problem (DCOP) [Fioretto *et al.*, 2018], a mathematical framework used to model problems where multiple agents coordinate to find an optimal solution while respecting constraints imposed by their interactions. This perspective provides a principled foundation for designing and analysing decentralised coordination algorithms. Inspired by the literature on DCOP, we propose a novel decentralised multi-agent coordination algorithm that extends the classical Decentralised Stochastic Algorithm (DSA) [Fitzpatrick and Meertens, 2003], tailored for solving the dec-rtRTMP. Our method leverages asynchronous local interactions among agents and employs adaptive strategies to efficiently resolve conflicts and optimise train routes and schedules.

Our contributions are summarised as follows:

- We provide a formal DCOP formulation of the dec-rtRTMP.
- We build a dataset for benchmarking decentralised solvers of the dec-rtRTMP.
- We introduce a novel stochastic algorithm for the solution of the dec-rtRTMP inspired by the DCOP solvers existing in the literature.

Despite being framed in the railway traffic management domain, the proposed approach is versatile and can be extended to other multi-agent systems requiring decentralised coordination, such as autonomous vehicle routing [Jing *et al.*, 2020] or inter-satellite coordination and scheduling [Picard *et al.*, 2021; Yang *et al.*, 2021].

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: in Section 2, we describe our DCOP formulation of the dec-rtRTMP. In Section 3, we present our decentralised multi-agent coordination algorithm adopted to solve a given instance of the dec-rtRTMP. In Section 4, we present the experimental settings we designed to study the main properties and the results obtained with our approach and compare them to those of a classical DSA algorithm. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper with discussions about future research directions.

2 Problem Formulation

In this section, we first present the structure of a general DCOP and then we cast our dec-rtRTMP in terms of such framework.

General DCOP. The main ingredients of a DCOP problem are agents and variables. Importantly, each variable is owned by an agent; this is what makes the problem distributed. Formally, a DCOP is a tuple $\langle A, V, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{U}, \eta \rangle$, where:

- A is the set of agents, $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$.
- V is the set of variables, $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m\}$. In the most general formulation, one agent may control more than one variable, while some agents may control no variables at all (i.e. $n \neq m$). Here, we assume that each variable v_i is controlled by exactly one agent a_i ($n = m$).
- \mathcal{D} is the set of variable-domains, $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m\}$, where each $D_i \in \mathcal{D}$ is a finite set containing the possible values of variable v_i .
- A *value assignment* is a pair (v_i, d_i) where $d_i \in D_i$ denotes the value currently assigned to variable v_i by the agent a_i . A *partial assignment* S is a set of value assignments $\{(v, d) : v \in W \subset V\}$ involving only a proper subset W of the variable set V . A *complete assignment* is a set of value assignments involving all the variables in V . We denote by $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}_p \cup \mathfrak{S}_c$ the set of all possible assignments (both partial \mathfrak{S}_p and complete \mathfrak{S}_c).
- A set of constraints on partial assignments determine properties of value assignments and relations among them. Constraints can be *unary* when involving only one variable, *binary* when involving two variables or *k-ary* when involving k variables. In a DCOP formulation, constraints can be translated into cost functions (hence, the DCOP is a minimization problem) or into utility functions (hence, a maximisation problem). Here, we consider the latter option and introduce a set of functions $\mathcal{U} = \{u : \mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$, each providing the utility of satisfying a constraint on the assignment $S \in \mathfrak{S}$.
- The objective function $\eta : \mathfrak{S}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ maps each possible complete assignment to a score. For a complete assignment $S \in \mathfrak{S}_c$, we denote by $\mathfrak{S}(S, u)$ the set of all (partial) assignments that are subsets of S and that have the cardinality required by the utility function u . Then the objective function is defined as:

$$\eta(S) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{S' \in \mathfrak{S}(S, u)} u(S').$$

The goal of the agents in a DCOP is to achieve an optimal solution, namely a complete assignment S^* that maximises the objective function η . The search of an optimal solution is distributed because each agent can only access local information when assigning a value to the variable it controls. Indeed, each agent a_i can interact with just a subset N_i of the agents A . We refer to N_i as the *neighbourhood* of the agent a_i . This means that each agent a_i can only observe the assignments of the variables controlled by its neighbours, i.e. the set $S(N_i) = \{(v_j, d_j) : a_j \in N_i \text{ and } v_j = d_j\}$, and thus it cannot fully evaluate the objective function η .

dec-rtRTMP as DCOP. In a dec-rtRTMP, we can think of trains as agents. Each train a_i can control its own path v_i , i.e. the sequence of track sections it is going to pass through in the next future with the time at which it will do so. At any time, each train can choose among a finite number of different paths between origin and destination, constituting the domain D_i for the variable v_i . Thus, a value assignment (v_i, d_i) corresponds to the decision of the agent a_i to follow the path d_i . Each path d_i is assigned a *path utility* $u_r(v_i, d_i)$ by the agent a_i , i.e. a real number representing how convenient is for the train to follow such path. We assume this value to be normalised to be in the range $[0, 1]$. The path utility represent a soft constraint on the validity and quality of a path, as its value can depend on the prediction of the delay accumulated at the end of the day by following the path d_i , the number of passengers carried and other factors. When selecting a path, trains should choose the one with the highest path utility but, at the same time, they must also account for the other trains in the system. More specifically, each agent a_i has to select a path that not only possesses a high path utility, but that is also compatible with the paths of all its neighbours N_i . Two paths d_i and d_j belonging respectively to distinct agents a_i and a_j are said to be compatible if no track section is concurrently used by the trains when the two paths are simultaneously implemented. Compatibilities between two paths represent the binary constraints of the problem, and are associated to the compatibility utility u_c :

$$u_c((v_i, d_i), (v_j, d_j)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_i \text{ and } d_j \text{ are compatible,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

An optimal solution to the dec-rtRTMP is thus a complete assignment that maximises the sum of both utilities defined above, namely the objective function η .

Furthermore, since we only have unary and binary constraints, we can also provide a compact visual representation of a given instance of the dec-rtRTMP in the form of a pair of graphs $(\mathcal{G}_I, \mathcal{G}_C)$. The graph \mathcal{G}_I is the *interaction graph*, i.e., a graph whose nodes are agents and links represent neighbouring agents, while \mathcal{G}_C is the constraint graph, i.e. a n -partite graph whose nodes are all the possible paths $d \in \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D$ generated by the agents and the links indicate the compatibility between paths.

At this abstraction level, we do not discuss specific implementations of the path generation process, compatibility evaluation or neighbourhood identification since our focus is primarily on presenting a novel algorithm inspired by the DCOP literature to solve an instance of dec-rtRTMP. The interested reader can refer to [D’Amato *et al.*, 2024] for an example of specific implementation of similar components, presented in full details and in a real setting.

3 A decentralised multi-agent coordination algorithm

This section describes the self-organization process at the heart of our decentralised coordination approach. Inspired by the classical Decentralised Stochastic Algorithm (DSA) [Fitzpatrick and Meertens, 2003] from the DCOP literature, coordination is achieved through an iterative procedure,

through which agents try to reach a (possibly optimal) solution to a given problem instance $(\mathcal{G}_I, \mathcal{G}_C)$ by only exploiting local information about their respective neighbours.

At each iteration, the agent a_i decides which value $d \in D_i$ to assign to the variable v_i it controls. The algorithm starts with the agents performing a greedy assignment, i.e. $v_i = d^*$, where $d^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{d \in D_i} u_r(v_i, d)$. At each subsequent iteration, a_i can decide either to keep its current assignment for v_i or switch to another value $d' \in D_i$. This choice depends solely on the local information available to the agent, that is, the path utility of the paths in D_i and the degree of compatibility of (v_i, d) with the current assignments $S(N_i)$ of its neighbours, $\forall d \in D_i$. Note that the path utility of neighbours’ paths is not known, as this information is private to each agent.

More specifically, at each iteration t , the agent a_i , whose current assignment is (v_i, d) , operates the following steps:

1. It randomly selects at most $k \geq 1$ neighbours from N_i . We denote by $K_i(t)$ the subset of neighbours selected by the agent a_i at time t . If $k \geq |N_i|$, then $K_i(t) = N_i$.
2. It observes the current assignments of the selected neighbours, i.e. the set $S(K_i(t))$.
3. It creates a ranking over the set D_i . For each $d \in D_i$, the agent computes its rank $r(d, t)$ as the number of binary constraints satisfied by a potential assignment of d to v_i with respect to the current assignments $S(K_i(t))$ of the selected neighbours, i.e.

$$r(d, t) = \sum_{(v_j, d_j) \in S(K_i(t))} u_c((v_i, d), (v_j, d_j))$$

Hence, $r(d, t)$ represents the degree of compatibility of the value d with the current assignments of the selected neighbours.

4. It decides to keep its current assignment (v_i, d) or to switch to a more compatible value $d' \in D_i$ according to the following policy:
 - (a) if $r(d, t) = k$ (i.e. d is compatible with the assignments of all the selected neighbours in $K_i(t)$), then the agent keeps $v_i = d$ as its current assignment.
 - (b) if $r(d, t) < k$, then the agent selects a more compatible value by sampling a value d' from the set of values D_i satisfying the property $d' = \operatorname{argmax}_{d \in D_i} r(d, t)$. In case of multiple values d' satisfying this property, a probabilistic choice is made with probability proportional to their respective path utility $u_r(v_i, d')$.

The policy described in step 4 allows the agents to gradually adjust their assignments towards a configuration (solution to the problem) in which all neighbouring agents hold compatible values, while prioritising values with the highest possible utility score. The parameter k acts as a sort of learning rate for the algorithm. With high values of the parameter k , the agent considers multiple neighbours during the decision making. This can lead the agent to seek compatibility with more neighbours at the same time, hence possibly increasing the speed of convergence towards a shared solution. Conversely,

when k is small (possibly, $k = 1$) the agent only considers a few neighbours or just one at the time, and therefore the speed of convergence may be slower.

Convergence Criteria. We implemented an asynchronous multi-agent simulation to emulate real-world operation. Specifically, at each iteration, one single agent is selected randomly and updates its assignment following the default policy discussed above. This ensures that agents take turn with an approximate period of n iterations. This iterative process continues until one of the following conditions is met: (i) *Convergence*: all agents achieve a state where their hypotheses are compatible with all their neighbours; (ii) *Maximum Iterations*: a predefined maximum number of iterations is reached.

DSA. Our algorithm differs from the classical DSA on three aspects:

- A DSA agent *always* interacts with all its neighbours (it cannot select a subset of them according to k).
- A DSA agent, with probability $1 - \alpha$, can decide to keep its assignment a priori, regardless of the assignments of the neighbours. The parameter α is known as *activation probability*.
- A DSA agent implements a different policy. In our implementation of DSA, the agent a_i assigns a score $r(d)$ to each value $d \in D_i$ as follows:

$$r(d) = u_r(v_i, d) + \sum_{(v_j, d_j) \in S(N_i)} u_c((v_i, d), (v_j, d_j))$$

Then, the agent greedily assigns to v_i the value d^* with the highest score r . In some variants of DSA [Zhang *et al.*, 2005], the assignment can be ϵ -greedy, i.e. with a (usually small) probability ϵ , the agent assigns a random value d to the variable v_i instead of being always greedy. This helps escaping local maxima.

Hence, our algorithm improves over DSA by adding a more flexible interaction scheme and proposing a slightly different policy for the decision-making phase.

4 Experiments

We conducted the evaluation of our algorithm on a dataset comprising synthetically generated problem instances defined by the following parameters: number of agents (n), interaction rate (p_{int}), maximum number of paths per agent (n_d), minimum number of solutions (n_{sol}), and a random seed (σ). The interaction graph \mathcal{G}_I is created as a connected graph with n nodes and edges added with probability p_{int} . Each agent in \mathcal{G}_I generates between 1 and n_d paths, forming the nodes of the constraint graph \mathcal{G}_C . Paths have path utilities of 1 (preferred) or 0.1 (less preferred), following a standard practice for experimentation in multi-alternative decisions in which the less-preferred options are considered distractors with an equally low utility [Reina *et al.*, 2017]. Edges in \mathcal{G}_C are initialized to construct n_{sol} solutions and refined to ensure that each node has at least degree 1. While n_{sol} sets a minimum, the total number of solutions is computed post-generation, as described in Section S3 of the Supplementary Material. The distribution of the total number of solutions of the problem

instances in our dataset is reported in Figure 1. Problem instances were generated with fixed $p_{\text{int}} = 0.3$ and $n_d = 8$, varying $n \in \{10, 20, 50, 100\}$ and $n_{\text{sol}} \in \{3, 5, 10\}$, yielding 1200 instances. Further details about the data generation process can be found in section S2 of the Supplementary Material. The dataset will be publicly available with the aim of stimulating research on dec-rtRTMP.

We benchmark our algorithm against a classical DSA (with $\alpha = 0.9$ and $\epsilon = 0$, but see the Supplementary Matrial for additional values of α) in terms of quality of the solution and speed of convergence. Below, we present the results of the execution of our algorithm.

4.1 Results

We exploited the synthetic dataset to test the quality of the proposed decentralised multi-agent coordination algorithm varying the value of the parameter k . In more detail, we deployed agents that consider only one neighbour during the decision-making process (hence, $k = 1$, hereafter referred to as `k_1`), as well as agents that consider all their neighbours during the decision-making process (hence, $k = \infty$, hereafter referred to as `k_all`). On each problem instance, we executed our decentralised algorithm 100 times per type of agent, every time using a different random seed to ensure robustness and reproducibility. On each execution, we set an upper bound on the number of iterations. The upper bound has been fixed to 10^5 and every time our algorithm exceeds this bound the execution is interrupted resulting in a failure. The same experimental setting holds for the classical DSA (hereafter referred to as `dsa`).

We evaluated our approach based on the quality of the solution obtained at the end of the self-organization process and the speed of convergence to that solution. Regarding solution quality, we ranked all solutions for each problem instance in decreasing order of their objective value η , with the optimal solutions (those maximizing η) at the top. We then assessed the position of the solution found by our algorithm within this ranking, averaging the results over 100 runs. For speed of convergence, we measured the number of steps required for the n agents to converge to a solution. It is important to note that under the policy described in Section 3, any solution acts as an absorbing state for the system, meaning no agent changes state once a solution is found.

Figure 2 shows the average position in the ranking of the solution given by the proposed approach compared to DSA. Additionally, it shows the fraction of runs that end up in a failure (see the last bar in each plot labelled ‘Fail’). We first notice that `k_1` only fails on large problem instances (large n and n_{sol}), while `k_all` presents a small number of failures in many conditions, even for small problem instances ($n = 10$, $n_{\text{sol}} = 3$). By analysing the behaviour of the system in such instances, we discovered that the large value of k leads to deadlocks, whereby the system oscillates between configurations that are not solutions to the problem. We observed deadlocks with any value of $k > 1$. Instead, with $k = 1$, deadlocks are not possible, because any agent interacts with only a single neighbour and finding one incompatibility is enough to escape eventual deadlock configurations, provided that a sufficient number of iterations is performed.




Figure 1: Distribution of the number of solutions per problem instance. Problem instances are grouped by the number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. For each combination of n and n_{sol} , there are 100 problem instances in our dataset. As evident from panels in the bottom left of the figure, when we add solutions to a graph \mathcal{G}_C with few nodes, there is a high probability that the links of two solutions can be combined to form new solutions that we have not been explicitly inserted in the graph. This happens less frequently as the number of nodes in \mathcal{G}_C increases.

The discovery of deadlocks lead us to introduce an adaptive strategy (referred to as `k_ada`), in which each agent in the system initially considers all its neighbours during the decision-making process and, after 1000 iterations, it starts reducing the number of neighbours considered, linearly over a window of 10^4 iterations, until it considers only a single neighbour ($k = 1$). This will remove deadlocks as soon as agents reach the value $k = 1$. At the same time, it can preserve the features of high values of k such as an expected higher convergence rate, as conjectured in Section 3. In Figure 2, we show that `k_ada` always reaches a feasible solution but for very large problem instances ($n = 100, n_{sol} = 10$), where failures are just a few and they are not due to deadlocks. Hence, the adaptive approach successfully removes the deadlock occurrence issue.

Looking at the ranking of the produced solutions in Figure 2, we found that, when the agents consider all their neighbours during the decision making phase, the rate of convergence to an optimal solution is not significantly impacted by the number of agents in the system. As an example, consider the first row in Figure 2: the `k_all` and `k_ada` strategies have a convergence rate to an optimal solution around 80%, regardless of the number of agents in the system. The same does not hold true for `k_1`, as the convergence rate to the optimal solution drops as soon as the number of agents increases.

The second factor impacting on the rate of convergence to an optimal solution is the minimum number of solutions of the problem instance. As shown in Figure 2, the larger n_{sol} , the harder it is for our algorithm to converge to an optimal solution, regardless of the type of strategy adopted and of the number of agents in the system. Additionally, we note that instances that have many possible solutions are more difficult to solve (e.g., the rank of the solutions found is generally

lower when $n = 20$ and $n_{sol} = 10$, where there are instances with a large amount of solutions, see Figure 1). In such conditions, most solutions have the same score η due to the way in which solutions are constructed. Hence, agents do not particularly favour one solution over the other, often ending up in lower-ranked solutions.

It is important to note that, when our algorithm does not converge to an optimal solution, it usually converges to a solution in the top-3 of the ranking, as reported by the bottom panel of Figure 3. For example, the adaptive strategy, even on the most difficult problems, converges to a top-3 solution at least 50% of the times. However, this is not enough to properly measure the quality of our algorithm, since it is not obvious if the value of a solution in second or third position in the ranking is close to the optimal value. For this reason, for each solution obtained with our algorithm, we measure the percentage deviation of its score η from the score of the optimal solutions (first position in ranking), namely the regret. The upper panel of Figure 3 shows the regret of solutions in second and third positions of the ranking. We can observe that `k_all` and `k_ada` have similar performance, with a median regret up to 10% on most executions and around 20% in the worst case, and they clearly outperform the `k_1` strategy. This means that, even when it is not optimal, the quality of the solution of our algorithm is largely acceptable.

With respect to the speed of convergence, Figure 4 demonstrates that the `k_ada` strategy is the best performing one. The `k_all` strategy shows similar performance but it fails on many problem instances, even those with a small number of agents and few solutions due to deadlocks. The `k_ada` strategy does not suffer from deadlocks, since, after a certain number of iterations, k falls back to 1 and the agents are able to escape the deadlock. This is evident from the bumps in




Figure 2: Ranking of the solutions given by our algorithm. Data are grouped by the type of agent, by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. Bars with label “1” represent the fraction of executions that converged to an optimal solution. Bars with label “ ≥ 10 ” represent the fraction of executions that converged to a solution in position greater than 10 in the ranking. Bars with label “Fail” represent the fraction of executions that exceeded the upper bound of 10^5 iterations.




Figure 3: Top: Regret (percentage loss from the optimal solution value) of the solutions given by our algorithm in position 2 or 3 of the ranking. Data are grouped by type of agent, by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. Bottom: Average convergence rate to a top-3 solution.

the tails in the histograms of k_{ada} in Figure 4, which correspond to those problem instances on which k_{all} failed to converge and that are instead solved by k_{ada} by lowering the value of k . On the other hand, when $k = 1$, our algorithm never experiences deadlocks but is much slower to converge to a solution, to the point that in problem instances with a lot of agents and a lot of solutions, it never converges before the threshold of 10^5 iterations.

For what concerns dsa , it shows slightly worse performance with respect to k_{all} in terms of solution quality (see Figure 2). In fact the two strategies are similar since each

agent considers all its neighbours during the decision making phase. However, the policy implemented by the dsa agents results in larger convergence times and also in several convergence failures (see Figure 4 and the Supplementary Material for other values of α).

In conclusion, k_{ada} seems to be the best algorithm since it features a speed of convergence similar to k_{all} but, as k_1 , it is not subject to deadlocks. Also, it achieves a good rate of convergence to a top-3 solution of any given problem instance.




Figure 4: Distribution of convergence times (in terms of number of iterations) per type of agent on problem instances grouped by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. For each of the 100 problem instances characterised by n and n_{sol} , we performed 100 executions of our algorithm for each agent type. Each execution has an upper bound of 10^5 iterations, beyond which it fails.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we presented a decentralised multi-agent coordination algorithm to solve the dec-rtRTMP, a challenging optimisation problem in railway transportation. It involves the efficient management of train movements on a railway network while minimising delay propagation caused by unexpected events such as temporary speed limitations or signal failures. Our contributions include a formal DCOP formulation of the dec-rtRTMP, a benchmark dataset for evaluating decentralised solvers, and a novel stochastic algorithm for decentralised multi-agent coordination. Through extensive experimentation, we tested three variants of our approach against a classical DSA from DCOP literature and we evaluated the results in terms of solution quality and convergence speed. We found that our algorithm, when using adaptive agents, achieves high-quality solutions, typically ranking within the top-3 solutions, significantly outperforming the classical DSA. Additionally, the algorithm demonstrates robustness in convergence, particularly in scenarios with varying numbers of agents and solution complexity.

Our work builds upon recent research trends that advocate for decentralisation in railway traffic management. Our DCOP-based reformulation of the dec-rtRTMP represents a proposal for an abstract mathematical framework to deal with such problem. However, translating this abstract framework into concrete case studies can be challenging. Depending on the application, one should carefully define some key aspects like the concept of interaction between trains, the concept of compatibility between paths of distinct trains and other operational aspects. Nonetheless, recent work on railway traffic management has demonstrated that similar approaches to decentralised railway traffic management are feasible [Mohanty

et al., 2020; D’Amato *et al.*, 2024], paving the way for new developments in this field.

Besides addressing the dec-rtRTMP, the proposed algorithm for DCOP could be applied to other application domains, related to traffic management or to other decentralised coordination problems [Jing *et al.*, 2020; Picard, 2022; Zilberstein *et al.*, 2025; Picard *et al.*, 2021; Yang *et al.*, 2021]. The key feature of target problems are the decentralised choice among a set of alternatives, respecting the compatibility of choices among neighbouring agents. A key aspect of the proposed approach is a policy that prioritises binary constraints (e.g., compatibility of value assignments) over unary constraints (e.g., quality of value assignment), as the former determines the ranking of value assignments while the latter is exploited only for choosing among equally-ranked assignments. On the contrary, DSA merges all constraints in a single utility. In future work, we will deepen our analyses to understand to what extent the prioritisation of binary constraints over unary ones is beneficial to convergence or detrimental to quality. Additionally, we will formally address the existence of deadlock conditions, to find ways of avoiding them while maximising the coordination ability within a neighbourhood of agents. Finally, we aim at deploying adaptive algorithms that learn the parameters from the outcome of previous coordination rounds.

References

- [Amirkhani and Barshooi, 2022] Abdollah Amirkhani and Amir Hossein Barshooi. Consensus in multi-agent systems: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(5):3897–3935, 2022.

- [Bettinelli *et al.*, 2017] A. Bettinelli, A. Santini, and D. Vigo. A real-time conflict solution algorithm for the train rescheduling problem. *Transportation Research Part B-methodological*, 106:237–265, 2017.
- [Caimi *et al.*, 2012] Gabrio Caimi, Martin Fuchsberger, Marco Laumanns, and Marco Lüthi. A model predictive control approach for discrete-time rescheduling in complex central railway station areas. *Computers & Operations Research*, 39(11):2578 – 2593, 2012.
- [Corman *et al.*, 2010] Francesco Corman, Andrea D’Ariano, Dario Pacciarelli, and Marco Pranzo. A tabu search algorithm for rerouting trains during rail operations. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 44(1):175–192, 2010.
- [D’Amato *et al.*, 2024] Leo D’Amato, Federico Naldini, Valentina Tibaldo, Vito Trianni, and Paola Pellegrini. Towards self-organizing railway traffic management: concept and framework. *Journal of Rail Transport Planning & Management*, 29:100427, 2024.
- [Fioretto *et al.*, 2018] Ferdinando Fioretto, Enrico Pontelli, and William Yeoh. Distributed constraint optimization problems and applications: A survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61:623–698, 2018.
- [Fischetti and Monaci, 2017] Matteo Fischetti and Michele Monaci. Using a general-purpose mixed-integer linear programming solver for the practical solution of real-time train rescheduling. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 263(1):258 – 264, 2017.
- [Fitzpatrick and Meertens, 2003] Stephen Fitzpatrick and Lambert Meertens. Distributed coordination through anarchic optimization. In *Distributed sensor networks: A multiagent perspective*, pages 257–295. Springer, 2003.
- [Holley and Liggett, 1975] R A Holley and T M Liggett. Ergodic theorems for weakly interacting infinite systems and the voter model. *The annals of probability*, 3(4):643–663, 1975.
- [Jing *et al.*, 2020] Peng Jing, Hanbin Hu, Fengping Zhan, Yuexia Chen, and Yuji Shi. Agent-based simulation of autonomous vehicles: A systematic literature review. *IEEE Access*, 8:79089–79103, 2020.
- [Jusup *et al.*, 2021] Matej Jusup, Alessio Trivella, and Francesco Corman. A review of real-time railway and metro rescheduling models using learning algorithms. In *21st Swiss Transport Research Conference (STRC 2021)*, page 27 p., 2021.
- [Khadilkar, 2019] H. Khadilkar. A scalable reinforcement learning algorithm for scheduling railway lines. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 20(2):727–736, 2019.
- [Lamorgese and Mannino, 2015] Leonardo Lamorgese and Carlo Mannino. An exact decomposition approach for the real-time train dispatching problem. *Operations Research*, 63(1):48–64, 2015.
- [Leutwiler *et al.*, 2023] Florin Leutwiler, Guillem Bonet Filella, and Francesco Corman. Accelerating logic-basedenders decomposition for railway rescheduling by exploiting similarities in delays. *Computers & Operations Research*, 150:106075, 2023.
- [Lu *et al.*, 2022] Gongyuan Lu, Jia Ning, Xiaobo Liu, and Yu (Marco) Nie. Train platforming and rescheduling with flexible interlocking mechanisms: An aggregate approach. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 159:102622, 2022.
- [Luan *et al.*, 2020] Xiaojie Luan, Bart De Schutter, Lingyun Meng, and Francesco Corman. Decomposition and distributed optimization of real-time traffic management for large-scale railway networks. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 141:72 – 97, 2020.
- [Marcelli and Pellegrini, 2020] E. Marcelli and P. Pellegrini. Literature review toward decentralized railway traffic management. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 13(3):234–252, 2020.
- [Mascis and Pacciarelli, 2002] Alessandro Mascis and Dario Pacciarelli. Job-shop with blocking and no-wait constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, (143):498–517, 2002.
- [Meng and Zhou, 2014] Lingyun Meng and Xuesong Zhou. Simultaneous train rerouting and rescheduling on an n-track network: A model reformulation with network-based cumulative flow variables. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 67:208 – 234, 2014.
- [Mohanty *et al.*, 2020] Sharada Mohanty, Erik Nygren, Florian Laurent, Manuel Schneider, Christian Scheller, Nilabha Bhattacharya, Jeremy Watson, Adrian Egli, Christian Eichenberger, Christian Baumberger, Gereon Vienken, Irene Sturm, Guillaume Sartoretti, and Giacomo Spigler. Flatland-RL: Multi-agent reinforcement learning on trains, 2020.
- [Pease *et al.*, 1980] M. Pease, R. Shostak, and L. Lamport. Reaching agreement in the presence of faults. *Journal of the ACM*, 27(2):228—234, 1980.
- [Pellegrini *et al.*, 2015] P. Pellegrini, G. Marlière, R. Pesenti, and J. Rodriguez. RECIFE-MILP: an effective MILP-based heuristic for the real-time railway traffic management problem. *Intelligent Transportation Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, 16(5):2609–2619, 2015.
- [Picard *et al.*, 2021] Gauthier Picard, Clément Caron, Jean-Loup Farges, Jonathan Guerra, Cédric Pralet, and Stéphanie Roussel. Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems Challenges in Earth Observation Satellite Constellations. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-2021)*, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-2021), pages 39–44, Londres, United Kingdom, May 2021.
- [Picard, 2022] Gauthier Picard. Trajectory coordination based on distributed constraint optimization techniques in unmanned air traffic management. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents*

- and *Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2022)*, page 1065–1073, Richland, SC, 2022. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [Qu *et al.*, 2015] Wenhua Qu, Francesco Corman, and Gabriel Lodewijks. A review of real time railway traffic management during disturbances. In Francesco Corman, Stefan Voß, and Rudy R. Negenborn, editors, *Computational Logistics*, pages 658–672, Cham, 2015. Springer International Publishing.
- [Reina *et al.*, 2017] Andreagiovanni Reina, James A R Marshall, Vito Trianni, and Thomas Bose. Model of the best-of-N nest-site selection process in honeybees. *Physical Review E*, 95(5):052411–15, 2017.
- [Reynolds and Maher, 2022] Edwin Reynolds and Stephen J. Maher. A data-driven, variable-speed model for the train timetable rescheduling problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 142:105719, 2022.
- [Rodriguez, 2007] Joaquin Rodriguez. A constraint programming model for real-time train scheduling at junctions. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 41:231–245, 2007.
- [Samà *et al.*, 2017] Marcella Samà, Andrea D’Ariano, Francesco Corman, and Dario Pacciarelli. A variable neighbourhood search for fast train scheduling and routing during disturbed railway traffic situations. *Computers & Operations Research*, (78):480–499, 2017.
- [Shang *et al.*, 2018] Fei Shang, Jingyuan Zhan, and Yangzhou Chen. Distributed model predictive control for train regulation in urban metro transportation. In *2018 21st International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1592–1597. IEEE, 2018.
- [Toletti *et al.*, 2020] Ambra Toletti, Marco Laumanns, and Ulrich Weidmann. Coordinated railway traffic rescheduling with the resource conflict graph model. *Journal of Rail Transport Planning & Management*, 15:100173, 2020.
- [Törnquist and Persson, 2007] Johanna Törnquist and Jan A. Persson. N-tracked railway traffic re-scheduling during disturbances. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 41(3):342–362, 2007.
- [Van Thielen *et al.*, 2019] Sofie Van Thielen, Francesco Corman, and Pieter Vansteenwegen. Towards a conflict prevention strategy applicable for real-time railway traffic management. *Journal of Rail Transport Planning & Management*, 11:100139, 2019.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2021] Weiyi Yang, Lei He, Xiaolu Liu, and Yingwu Chen. Onboard coordination and scheduling of multiple autonomous satellites in an uncertain environment. *Advances in Space Research*, 68(11):4505–4524, 2021.
- [Yong *et al.*, 2017] Cui Yong, Martin Ullrich, and Liang Jijian. Decentralized, autonomous train dispatching using swarm intelligence in railway operations and control. In *7th International Conference on Railway Operations Modelling and Analysis - RailLille2017*, pages 521–540. IAROR, 2017.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2005] Weixiong Zhang, Guandong Wang, Zhao Xing, and Lars Wittenburg. Distributed stochastic search and distributed breakout: properties, comparison and applications to constraint optimization problems in sensor networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 161(1–2):55–87, January 2005.
- [Zilberstein *et al.*, 2025] Itai Zilberstein, Ananya Rao, Matthew Salis, and Steve Chien. Decentralized, Decomposition-Based Observation Scheduling for a Large-Scale Satellite Constellation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 82:169–208, 2025.

Supplementary Materials

S1 Introduction

The structure of supplementary material is as follows: Section S2 illustrates the generation process of a problem instance. Section S3 describes an integer linear-programming formulation of the problem, useful to compute optimal solutions in a centralised way, as a benchmark for decentralised approaches. Section S4 shows the effect of the activation probability α by running experiments with $\alpha = 1, 0.9$ and 0.7 .

Recall from the main text that an instance of dec-rtRTMP can be compactly represented as a pair of graphs $(\mathcal{G}_I, \mathcal{G}_C)$ where $\mathcal{G}_I = (\mathcal{V}_I, \mathcal{E}_I)$ is the *interaction graph*, i.e. a graph whose nodes \mathcal{V}_I are agents and links \mathcal{E}_I represents neighbouring agents, and $\mathcal{G}_C = (\mathcal{V}_C, \mathcal{E}_C)$ is the *constraint graph*, i.e. a n -partite graph whose nodes \mathcal{V}_C are all the possible paths $d \in \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D$ generated by the agents and the links \mathcal{E}_C denote compatible paths. An example of problem instance is reported in Figure S1.




Figure S1: An example of problem instance in our DCOP-based formulation of the dec-rtRTMP. (A) Interaction graph \mathcal{G}_I . (B) Constraint graph \mathcal{G}_C . (C) Two possible solutions of the problem instance.

S2 Data Generation

To generate a problem instance, we specify (i) the number of agents n , (ii) the interaction rate between agents p_{int} , (iii) the maximum number of paths each agent can generate n_d , (iv) the minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we want the problem instance to have, and (v) a random seed σ since the generation process is not deterministic.

The parameters n and p_{int} determine the stochastic generation of the interaction graph \mathcal{G}_I : n corresponds to the number of nodes of \mathcal{V}_I while p_{int} corresponds to the probability of an edge between two nodes, and therefore it varies between 0 and 1. \mathcal{G}_I is generated as a connected graph because, when it is not connected, our algorithm can be applied to each connected component independently. To generate \mathcal{G}_I as random connected graph, we operate the following steps: we first create a tree with nodes \mathcal{V}_I and then we add random links between nodes with probability p_{int} .

The parameters n_d and n_{sol} are instead used to generate the constraint graph \mathcal{G}_C . Each agent in \mathcal{G}_I generates a random number of paths between 1 and n_d . Each path d is associated with a utility value $u(d)$. We assume that each agent has one preferred path and other less desirable ones. The former has

a utility value equal to 1, while the latter have a small utility value equal to 0.1. This choice follows a standard practice for experimentation in multi-alternative decisions in which the less-preferred options are considered distractors with an equally low value [Reina *et al.*, 2017]. The set of paths of all the agents correspond to the nodes \mathcal{V}_C of \mathcal{G}_C . The links in \mathcal{G}_C are inserted according to the following procedure: we first construct n_{sol} different solutions (see below), and the links constituting such solutions are then added to \mathcal{G}_C . At this point not all the nodes in \mathcal{G}_C have a link and thus we randomly add one link for each node with degree 0 to avoid having paths that are not compatible with any other path. When adding random links, we must take into account the interactions in \mathcal{G}_I . Indeed, if two agents do not interact, there is no reason to check the compatibility of their paths and thus we only randomly add links between paths of neighbouring agents.

The construction of a solution to the problem is straightforward: it is enough to randomly select one path per agent and then add all the possible links between paths of neighbouring agents in \mathcal{G}_C . Note that even if we add n_{sol} solutions to a problem instance, the total number of solutions can be greater than n_{sol} because the union of the links constituting two solutions can generate several additional solutions, especially if the number of nodes in \mathcal{V}_C is small. This means that the total number of solutions in a problem instance cannot be controlled at generation time but must be computed after the generation, in a centralised fashion, by means of the CPLEX solver, as described in Section S3. Figure 1 in the main text shows the distribution of the number of solutions in the problem instances of our dataset. Note that the highest number of solutions is found in instances in which n is not much larger than n_{sol} , with instances in the group determined by $n = 20$ and $n_{\text{sol}} = 10$ having up to 10^4 possible solutions. Instead, when n is much larger than n_{sol} (e.g., $n = 100$ and $n_{\text{sol}} = 10$), only the minimum number of solutions n_{sol} is present.

We generated problem instances by fixing the interaction rate $p_{\text{int}} = 0.3$ and the maximum number of paths per train $n_d = 8$. These values have been selected empirically to obtain a sufficiently rich topology for \mathcal{G}_I and \mathcal{G}_C . Then, we generate problem instances by varying $n \in \{10, 20, 50, 100\}$ and $n_{\text{sol}} \in \{3, 5, 10\}$. For each combination, we generate 100 instances by varying the random seed $\sigma \in \{0, \dots, 99\}$. The seed σ is used to make the generation process reproducible. Overall, the total number of problem instances in our dataset is 1200.¹

S3 Centralised solution to the coordination problem

In this section, we aim at determining if a given problem instance $(\mathcal{G}_I, \mathcal{G}_C)$ admits a solution and, in case it does, we want to compute all possible solutions while identifying the optimal ones. To accomplish this, we can reformulate the problem as an integer linear programming (ILP) task and uti-

¹The dataset will be publicly available with the aim of stimulating research on dec-rtRTMP.

lize widely available software such as CPLEX² as solvers. Such a centralised approach provides a reference for the evaluation of the decentralised solutions in our experiments, as discussed in the main text.

To define the ILP formulation, we first introduce the mapping $\alpha : \mathcal{V}_C \mapsto \{1, \dots, n\}$ associating to each path d the index of the agent it belongs to. Then, we define the binary decision variables y_d as follows:

$$y_d = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_{\alpha(d)} = d \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{V}_C \quad (1)$$

where the notation $v_{\alpha(d)} = d$ means that the path d has been assigned to the variable $v_{\alpha(d)}$ controlled by the agent $a_{\alpha(d)}$. Recall also that each node $d \in \mathcal{V}_C$ has a value $u(d)$. Then, the centralized optimization problem consists in finding the appropriate complete assignment of paths to maximise the following objective function:

$$\max \sum_{d \in \mathcal{V}_C} u(d) y_d \quad (2)$$

provided that the following constraints are satisfied:

$$\sum_{d \in D_i} y_d = 1, \quad \forall i = 1 \dots n \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{d' \in D_j; (d, d') \in \mathcal{E}_C} y_{d'} \geq y_d \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{V}_C, \quad \forall j = 1 \dots n : A_j \in \mathcal{N}_{\alpha(d)}, j \neq \alpha(d) \quad (4)$$

Constraints (3) ensure that exactly one path per train is selected (each agent can only assign one value to the variable it controls). Constraints (4) state that, if path d is selected and it is associated to agent $\alpha(d)$, then each neighbouring agent in $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha(d)}$ must select a path that is compatible with d .

By exploiting CPLEX as solver for this ILP formulation of the agent coordination in the dec-rtRTMP, we are able to find all possible solutions to a given problem instance, and among them, to identify the optimal ones as well.

S4 DSA

We run the DSA algorithm with $\alpha = 1, 0.9, 0.7$ and evaluate its performance as in the main text. See Figures S2, S3 and S4.

²<https://www.ibm.com/it-it/products/ilog-cplex-optimization-studio>




Figure S2: Ranking of the solutions given by DSA algorithms. Data are grouped by the type of agent, by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. Bars with label “1” represent the fraction of executions that converged to an optimal solution. Bars with label “ ≥ 10 ” represent the fraction of executions that converged to a solution in position greater than 10 in the ranking. Bars with label “Fail” represent the fraction of executions that exceeded the upper bound of 10^5 iterations.




Figure S3: Top: Regret (percentage loss from the optimal solution value) of the solutions given by DSA algorithm in position 2 or 3 of the ranking. Data are grouped by type of agent, by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. Bottom: Average convergence rate to a top-3 solution.




Figure S4: Distribution of convergence times (in terms of number of iterations) per type of agent on problem instances grouped by number of agents n and by minimum number of solutions n_{sol} we require the problem instance to have. For each of the 100 problem instances characterised by n and n_{sol} , we performed 100 executions of DSA algorithm for each agent type. Each execution has an upper bound of 10^5 iterations, beyond which it fails.