

Multi-Agent Goal Assignment with Finite-Time Path Planning

Tony A. Wood and Maryam Kamgarpour

Abstract—Minimising the longest travel distance for a group of mobile robots with interchangeable goals requires knowledge of the shortest length paths between all robots and goal destinations. Determining the exact length of the shortest paths in an environment with obstacles is challenging and cannot be guaranteed in a finite time. We propose an algorithm in which the accuracy of the path planning is iteratively increased. The approach provides a certificate when the uncertainties on estimates of the shortest paths become small enough to guarantee the optimality of the goal assignment. To this end, we apply results from assignment sensitivity assuming upper and lower bounds on the length of the shortest paths. We then provide polynomial-time methods to find such bounds by applying sampling-based path planning. The upper bounds are given by feasible paths, the lower bounds are obtained by expanding the sample set and leveraging knowledge of the sample dispersion. We demonstrate the application of the proposed method with a multi-robot path-planning case study.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative multi-robot systems provide great value in applications such as coordinated search and rescue, large-scale agriculture, and efficient transportation of people and goods. Given a group of robots with interchangeable goals, deciding which one is assigned to which goal is crucial for achieving a joint objective. For instance, in a search and rescue mission robots should be assigned to goal destinations such that all possible locations of distressed humans can be visited in a minimal amount of time. Apart from the obvious incentive to complete a cooperative mission at minimum cost or time, see e.g. [1], [2], an optimal goal assignment can also provide other benefits in regard to multi-robot coordination such as inter-agent collision-avoidance guarantees, [3]–[5].

If the costs of sending robots to goals are known, optimally deciding which robot should go to which goal corresponds to a well-studied problem called task assignment, see [6], [7] for an overview. Typically, the costs are dependent on the lengths of the shortest paths between each robot and each goal. For instance, when the robots have the same constant velocity, minimising the shortest path is equivalent to minimising the travel time. When the robot environment contains obstacles, finding the shortest obstacle-avoiding path between two locations is an infinite dimension and challenging problem. Finite-dimensional optimisation-based formulations involve collision-avoidance constraints that are either smooth non-convex, see e.g. [8], [9] or mixed-integer, see e.g. [10], [11], and are NP-hard to solve to global optimality. There exist

sampling-based approaches for shortest path search, see e.g. [12], [13], but they are only guaranteed to converge to the optimal solution asymptotically as the number of samples and the computational complexity approach infinity.

In this paper, we investigate when finite-time approximations of the shortest path search are sufficient to determine the optimal assignment of robots to goals. We focus on the Bottleneck Assignment Problem (BAP), see e.g., [14], [15], where the objective is to minimise the largest cost associated with the assigned agent-task pairs, referred to as the bottleneck. The BAP is particularly relevant for minimum-time requirements when a team of agents operates in parallel because the largest assigned agent-task cost then relates to the time of completing all tasks, [7], [16]. In this work, we follow an iterative approach to find an assignment where the complexity of the path planning is increased step by step to achieve better and better accuracy. As a stopping criterion, we check if we can certify that an obtained assignment is guaranteed to be a minimiser of the BAP defined with respect to the true shortest paths. If such a certificate is returned, we know that no further computational effort needs to be invested in planning the paths between unassigned robot-goal pairs.

For multi-agent path planning with variable complexity we consider sampled roadmap graphs as they are a popular approach for obtaining obstacle-avoiding paths, see e.g. [13], [17], [18]. The key idea is to probe the configuration space with a desired number of samples and check if they can be connected without intersecting any obstacles. Intuitively, the complexity of the approach increases when more samples are considered. The most common roadmap algorithm, called Probabilistic Road-Map (PRM), utilises probabilistic sampling where samples are drawn from the configuration space at random. It has been shown to provide probabilistic completeness [19], meaning that the probability of finding a feasible path, if one exists, goes to one when the number of samples goes to infinity. Variants of PRM [13] have been shown to also be asymptotically optimal, meaning that the obtained path converges to the shortest obstacle-avoiding path with probability one. In [20] the convergence rate of such algorithms is investigated as a function of the sample dispersion. However, these results do not directly provide a converging bound on the shortest path that keeps at least a fixed safety distance from the obstacles.

To obtain a criterion for stopping the iterative increase of the planning complexity we apply assignment sensitivity analysis. In particular, given estimates of the path lengths between all robots and goals and a corresponding bottleneck optimising assignment, we are interested in knowing how

The authors are with the SYCAMORE Lab, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland {tony.wood,maryam.kamgarpour}@epfl.ch

much error in the estimates can be tolerated in order for the assignment to remain optimal. Methods to quantify such sensitivity for different types of assignment objectives and perturbation models have been derived in [2], [21]–[24]. While these methods have been used for post-assignment analysis, they have not been applied to determine whether the accuracy of the cost estimates is sufficient for knowing the true optimal assignment in a scenario where the estimates are being refined at the time the assignment is made.

The contributions of this paper can be grouped into two parts:

i) The first contribution is providing a generic approach for optimal goal assignment with finite-time multi-robot path planning. To this end, we apply recent results on bottleneck assignment sensitivity presented in [24] and propose an iterative algorithm that increases the complexity of the path planning step-wise and returns a certificate when an assignment can be obtained that is known to be optimal. We prove that if the certificate is returned, it is guaranteed that the assignment made with estimates of the path lengths is optimal for the true shortest paths. We also show that given a limit on the computational complexity, the algorithm will terminate in a finite time. The generic approach relies on the existence of polynomial-time methods to determine upper and lower bounds on the shortest paths between all robots and goals that converge as the invested computational complexity increases.

ii) The second set of contributions consists in deriving specific methods used to bound the shortest paths between robots and goals. Given a map of obstacles and the required safety distance that robots must keep from them, we propose a sampling-based method to obtain both upper and lower bounds. The upper bounds are determined by finding feasible paths via a roadmap that is generated within the safe set. The lower bounds are obtained by generating a second roadmap that contains nodes representing positions that can be closer to the obstacles than the required safety distance. The distance from the obstacles is a function of the sample dispersion. Results from [20] are then applied to these non-feasible paths in a novel manner to bound the optimal path lengths from below. We prove that the resulting bounds converge to the true shortest safe paths as the sample size increases.

The paper is organised as follows. We formulate the path-planning, task-assignment, and certification problem and provide an outline of the proposed solution in Section II. The approach is summarised by Algorithm 1, which we show to have desired properties given requirements on the subroutines it contains. In Section III we discuss how to satisfy the requirements on the subroutines that bound the path lengths with sampling-based implementations. We then demonstrate the application of the approach in Section IV before concluding with Section V.

II. SHORTEST BOTTLENECK PATH

We begin by providing some definitions required to formulate the problem mathematically. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact configuration space with dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$. For a given margin, $\delta > 0$, and a subset of the configuration space, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$, the δ -interior of \mathcal{C} , denoted $\mathcal{C}^\delta := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \inf_{y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{C}} \|x - y\|_2 \geq \delta\}$,

is the set of all configurations that are at least a distance of δ away from $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. Given a closed set of obstacles, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{obs}} \subset \mathcal{X}$, we define the obstacle free-space as $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}} := \text{cl}(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_{\text{obs}})$, where $\text{cl}(S)$ denotes the closure of set S . Let there be a set of agents, \mathcal{A} , where each agent, $i \in \mathcal{A}$, is a robot with initial configuration $p_i \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$. Cooperatively the agents are required to fulfil a set of tasks, \mathcal{T} , where each task, $j \in \mathcal{T}$, represents a goal configuration $g_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$. A function, $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, is a path if it is continuous and has bounded variation. Let Σ denote the set of all paths and $c : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ map a path to its arc length. For obstacle-avoiding path planning, we define the following two particular subsets of paths.

Definition 1 (Robot-goal path). *A path, $\sigma \in \Sigma$, connects robot $i \in \mathcal{A}$ and goal $j \in \mathcal{T}$ if $\sigma(0) = p_i$ and $\sigma(1) = g_j$. The set of all paths connecting i and j is denoted by $\Sigma_{i,j}$.*

Definition 2 (δ -clearance path). *For $\delta > 0$, a path, $\sigma \in \Sigma$, has δ -clearance in $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ if $\sigma(\tau) \in \mathcal{C}^\delta$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$. The set of all paths with δ -clearance in \mathcal{C} is denoted by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^\delta$.*

We assume that there are no more goals than robots, i.e. $|\mathcal{A}| \geq |\mathcal{T}|$, and that each robot is contained inside a ball centred at its reference position with radius $s > 0$. We then formulate the cooperative obstacle-avoiding path-planning problem for a scenario where the largest required travel distance of all assigned agents is to be minimised,

$$\text{minimise} \quad \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} c(\sigma_{i,j}) \pi_{i,j} \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \pi_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}, \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_i = 1 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (1c)$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}} \pi_j \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}, \quad (1d)$$

$$\sigma_{i,j} \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}}^s \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}. \quad (1e)$$

Note that if there were more goals than robots, i.e., $|\mathcal{A}| < |\mathcal{T}|$, the roles of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{T} would switch and (1c) would change to an inequality and (1d) would become an equality.

In Section II-A we explain why the problem given in (1) is hard to solve and make definitions used for tackling it. We then propose a solution approach with an algorithm in Section II-B and formally show its properties in Section II-C.

A. Challenge of Finding Optimal Assignment

If for every agent-task pair, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$, the length of the shortest robot-goal path with s -clearance in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$, denoted $c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$, where

$$\sigma_{i,j}^s \in \underset{\sigma \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}}^s}{\text{argmin}} c(\sigma), \quad (2)$$

was given, then (1) would reduce to a BAP with the family of weights $W = (c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$. Let $B(W)$ be an operator that returns the set of optimal assignments that solve the BAP. We note that for known weights the BAP can be solved efficiently, see [7]. However, the shortest paths, defined in (2), are not known a-priori and are hard to find.

There exist path-planning methods that estimate the shortest paths with finite complexity, e.g. optimisation with a convex

approximation of the constraints. Some methods converge to the optimum as the complexity of the approach approaches infinity, e.g. PRM* [13]. While the true optimal paths are not found in finite time, the paths returned by the algorithms with finite complexity may provide sufficiently good estimates. We, therefore, address the following problem.

Problem Statement. *While increasing the complexity of the path planning, certify when the accuracy is sufficient, i.e., when $(c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ can be bounded tight enough, for finding the optimal assignment of robots to goals, i.e., for guaranteeing that an obtained Π^* is an optimiser of (1)?*

To this end, we identify ranges of path lengths for each possible robot-goal pair for which a considered assignment is optimal. Expressed in terms of assignment weights, this corresponds to quantifying allowable perturbations to nominal weights. The following definitions formalise the meaning of allowable perturbation intervals such that we can introduce a certification method in the next subsection.

Definition 3 (Allowable perturbation). *Given a family of weights, $W = (w_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, with $w_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\Pi \in B(W)$ be a bottleneck assignment. A family of perturbations $V = (v_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, with $v_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, is allowable with respect to Π for W if $\Pi \in B(W + V)$, where $W + V = (w_{i,j} + v_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$.*

Let $\Lambda = ([-\underline{\lambda}_{i,j}, \bar{\lambda}_{i,j}])_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ be a family of intervals. A family of perturbations, $V = (v_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, is contained in Λ , denoted $V \in \Lambda$, if for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$ we have $v_{i,j} \in [-\underline{\lambda}_{i,j}, \bar{\lambda}_{i,j}]$. Similarly, a second family of intervals $\Lambda' = ([-\underline{\lambda}'_{i,j}, \bar{\lambda}'_{i,j}])_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ is contained in Λ , denoted $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$, if $[-\underline{\lambda}'_{i,j}, \bar{\lambda}'_{i,j}] \subseteq [-\underline{\lambda}_{i,j}, \bar{\lambda}_{i,j}]$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$.

Definition 4 (Allowable family of intervals). *The family of intervals Λ is allowable relative to assignment Π for weights W if for all perturbations $V \in \Lambda$ it is guaranteed that V is an allowable perturbation with respect to Π for W .*

B. Certification Algorithm

Algorithm 1 outlines the approach we follow to find an assignment with a given limit on the computational complexity. Given a considered complexity, parameterised by n , the algorithm involves computing families of upper and lower bounds on shortest path lengths for every robot-goal pair with subroutines `Lower` and `Upper`, respectively. The averages of the upper and lower bounds are used as assignment weights to determine a candidate assignment with subroutine `BottleneckAssignment`. To determine whether the returned assignment is guaranteed to be optimal for the true shortest paths a subroutine `AllowableIntervals` is executed. If for all agent-task pairs the upper and lower bounds lie within the range of perturbed weights defined by the allowable intervals, the algorithm terminates with a certificate, $Q = \text{true}$. Otherwise, the complexity is increased by a factor α and the procedure is repeated until either a certificate is found or the maximal complexity defined by n_{\max} is reached.

Several methods of obtaining upper and lower bounds for the optimal costs, $(c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, are conceivable. Such

Algorithm 1: Iterative planning and assignment

Input: Agent positions $P = (p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$,
goal positions $G = (g_j)_{j \in \mathcal{T}}$, free space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$,
safety distance s ;
Output: Assignment Π , certificate Q ;
Parameters: Initial complexity $n_{\min} \in \mathbb{N}$,
maximal complexity $n_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$,
increase factor $\alpha > 0$;

```

1  $Q \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
2  $n \leftarrow n_{\min}$ 
3 while  $Q = \text{false}$  and  $n \leq n_{\max}$  do
4    $(u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \leftarrow \text{Upper}(P, G, \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}, s, n)$ 
5    $(l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \leftarrow \text{Lower}(P, G, \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}, s, n)$ 
6    $W \leftarrow \left( \frac{l_{i,j} + u_{i,j}}{2} \right)_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ 
7    $\Pi \leftarrow \text{BottleneckAssignment}(W)$ 
8    $\Lambda \leftarrow \text{AllowableIntervals}(W, \Pi)$ 
9   if  $\left( \left[ \frac{l_{i,j} - u_{i,j}}{2}, \frac{u_{i,j} - l_{i,j}}{2} \right] \right)_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \subseteq \Lambda$  then
10     $Q \leftarrow \text{true}$ 
11  else
12     $n \leftarrow \alpha \cdot n$ 

```

bounds should converge to the optimal costs as the invested complexity increases. In Section III we focus on a sampling-based method where the complexity parameter is given by the sampling size n . The requirements for a generalisation to other methods are summarised in the following.

Requirement 1. *The complexities of `Upper` and `Lower` are polynomial in the number of robots and parameter n . Furthermore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_{i,j} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_{i,j} = c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ while $u_{i,j} \geq c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ and $l_{i,j} \leq c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ for all $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$.*

We use an edge removal algorithm introduced in [15] to implement `BottleneckAssignment` but any other method to solve a BAP, see [6], can be used. To implement `AllowableIntervals` we use the method derived in [24]. It computes the lexicographic maximal family of intervals that are allowable for a given family of weights and a corresponding bottleneck assignment. The formal requirements for `AllowableIntervals` are summarised in the following.

Requirement 2. *The complexity of `AllowableIntervals` is polynomial in the number of agents. Furthermore, Λ is allowable with respect to Π for W according to Definition 4.*

C. Theoretical Guarantees

To state the properties of Algorithm 1, we first make the following assumption on the existence of paths connecting all robots and goals.

Assumption 1. *For safety distance, $s > 0$, obstacle map, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{obs}} \subset \mathcal{X}$, all robots $i \in \mathcal{A}$, and all goals $j \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists a connecting path with s -clearance, as defined in Definitions 1 and 2, i.e. the set $\Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}}^s$ is non-empty.*

Theorem 1. *Given Assumption 1, assume Requirements 1 and 2 are satisfied. If Algorithm 1 terminates with $Q = \text{true}$, then the returned assignment, Π , is bottleneck minimising for the shortest paths between robots and goals, i.e., $\Pi^* = \Pi$ is an optimiser of (1).*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary iteration of the while given in Lines 3-12 of Algorithm 1. Because Requirement 1 is satisfied, we have $(c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \in ([l_{i,j}, u_{i,j}])_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, where $(u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ and $(l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ are determined in Lines 4 and 5. In Line 7, Π is determined such that it is a bottleneck assignment for weights $W = (w_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, with $w_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2}(l_{i,j} + u_{i,j})$ according to Line 6. Given that Requirement 2 is satisfied, we know from Definitions 3 and 4 that $\Pi \in B(W + V)$ for all $V \subseteq \Lambda$, where Λ is an allowable family of intervals determined in Line 8. If the algorithm returns $Q = \text{true}$, it means that the condition on Line 9 is satisfied and the difference between the weights and the true shortest paths corresponds to an allowable perturbation. Then, we have that $\Pi \in B((c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}})$. \square

From Theorem 1 we know that Algorithm 1 returning a certificate is a sufficient condition for assignment optimality. We note that given a finite complexity limit, parameterised by n_{\max} , the algorithm may terminate with $Q = \text{false}$ in which case no statement about the assignment optimality can be made. Next, we show that it terminates in finite time.

Proposition 1. *Given Assumption 1, assume Requirements 1 and 2 are satisfied. If the increase factor is such that*

$$\alpha > \left(\frac{n_{\max}}{n_{\min}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n_{\max}}}, \quad (3)$$

then Algorithm 1 has a computational complexity that is polynomial in parameter n_{\max} and the number of robots $|\mathcal{A}|$.

Proof. For a given complexity parameter n and at most $|\mathcal{A}|$ tasks, let $C_U(|\mathcal{A}|, n)$ denote the complexity of `Upper`, $C_L(|\mathcal{A}|, n)$ denote the complexity of `Lower`, $C_B(|\mathcal{A}|)$ denote the complexity of the bottleneck assignment, and $C_A(|\mathcal{A}|)$ denote the complexity of computing the allowable intervals. If (3) is satisfied, then there will be at most n_{\max} iterations of the while loop on Lines 3-12 of Algorithm 1. Therefore, the worst-case complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n_{\max}(C_U(|\mathcal{A}|, n_{\max}) + C_L(|\mathcal{A}|, n_{\max}) + C_B(|\mathcal{A}|) + C_A(|\mathcal{A}|)))$. We know that $C_B(|\mathcal{A}|)$ and $C_A(|\mathcal{A}|)$ are polynomial in $|\mathcal{A}|$ from [6] and [24], respectively. Given the satisfaction of Requirements 1 and 2, it thus follows that the algorithm is polynomial in $|\mathcal{A}|$ and n_{\max} . \square

III. SAMPLING-BASED PATH PLANNING

In this section we apply sampling-based path planning to derive particular implementations of the subroutines `Upper` in Section III-B and `Lower` in Section III-C. To this end, we first provide some background on roadmap algorithms in Section III-A.

A. Background on Sampled Roadmaps

Sampling-based planning consists of finding paths between desired starting and goal points by connecting samples of the

configuration space. A popular approach that is suited for multi-query path planning, e.g. the planning for multiple robots and goals simultaneously, consists of building a so-called roadmap. A roadmap is a graph with vertices representing points in a desired set, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, and edges representing lines contained in \mathcal{C} that connect such points. The roadmap building approach outlined in Algorithm 2 (closely related to sPRM in [13] and gPRM in [20]) relies on the following subroutines: `Sample` first generates a set of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ samples of the configuration space, $\mathcal{N} := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and then returns the subset of these samples that are in \mathcal{C} , i.e., $S = \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{C}$; `Near` returns the set of nodes within a radius r of node v , i.e., $\mathcal{X}_{\text{Near}} = \{x \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{v\} \mid \|x - v\|_2 < r\}$; `UninterruptedEdge` returns `true` if and only if the linear interpolation between nodes u and v lies entirely in the sample space \mathcal{C} .

Algorithm 2: RoadMap

Input: Agent positions $P = (p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$,
goal positions $G = (g_j)_{j \in \mathcal{T}}$, sample space \mathcal{C} ,
connection radius r , sample size n ;
Output: Rode-map nodes \mathcal{V} , roadmap edges \mathcal{E} ;

- 1 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{Sample}(\mathcal{C}, n)$
- 2 $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup P \cup G$
- 3 $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 4 **for** $v \in \mathcal{V}$ **do**
- 5 $\mathcal{X}_{\text{Near}} \leftarrow \text{Near}(\mathcal{V}, v, r)$
- 6 **for** $x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{Near}}$ **do**
- 7 **if** `UninterruptedEdge`(\mathcal{C}, v, x) **then**
- 8 $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \cup \{(v, x)\} \cup \{(x, v)\}$

If the graph returned by Algorithm 2 connects nodes p_i and g_j , then a routine for finding the shortest path in a graph, such as Dijkstra's or A* algorithms, can be applied. The resulting path remains in \mathcal{C} and connects robot $i \in \mathcal{A}$ and goal $j \in \mathcal{T}$, i.e. $\hat{\sigma}_{i,j} \leftarrow \text{ShortestPath}(p_i, g_j, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\hat{\sigma}_{i,j} \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^0$. Crucially, obtaining a path in this way can be achieved in polynomial time.

Remark 1 (Shown in [13]). *The computational complexities of RoadMap and one query of Dijkstra's algorithm in the resulting graph are each $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.*

In [20] conditions for feasibility, see Remark 2, and accuracy, see Theorem 2, of the roadmap based path planning were derived as functions of the sample dispersion.

Definition 5 (l_2 -dispersion). *For a finite non-empty set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{X}$, the dispersion of \mathcal{S} in the compact set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$, with positive Lebesgue measure, is*

$$D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}) := \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|s - c\|_2.$$

The dispersion of the node set generated in Line 2 of Algorithm 2, i.e. $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$, can be described as the radius of the largest ball in \mathcal{C} that does not contain a node $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Remark 2 (Shown in [20]). *If the connection radius in Algorithm 2 is selected such that $r > 2D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$, then the graph returned by Algorithm 2 not connecting p_i and g_j means that*

there does not exist a path for robot $i \in \mathcal{A}$ and goal $j \in \mathcal{T}$ with δ -clearance, for any $\delta \geq 2D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$.

The satisfaction of this condition and an upper bound on the connection radius are assumed in [20] to provide bounds on the obtained path lengths.

Assumption 2. *The connection radius, r , in Algorithm 2, is selected such that $r \in (2D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}), \delta - D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}))$.*

We note that for Assumption 2 to be satisfied, we must have $\delta > 3D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$.

Theorem 2 (proven in [20]). *For a given margin, $\delta > 0$, assume there exists a path, $\sigma \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^\delta$, connecting robot $i \in \mathcal{A}$ and goal $j \in \mathcal{T}$ with δ -clearance as defined in Definitions 1 and 2. Let $c(\hat{\sigma}_{i,j})$ be the length of the path between p_i and g_j returned by `shortestPath`($p_i, g_j, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}$), where $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is the graph obtained by Algorithm 2 on samples with l_2 -dispersion of $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ and a connection radius, r , that satisfies Assumption 2. Then, we have*

$$c(\hat{\sigma}_{i,j}) \leq \left(1 + \frac{2D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})}{r - 2D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})}\right) \min_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}^\delta} c(\sigma).$$

The sample dispersion depends on the sampling scheme applied in the subroutine `Sample`. Intuitively, the more samples considered the smaller the dispersion is, i.e., $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ decreases for increasing n . Given just the set of samples, it is difficult to determine the dispersion. However, if the samples are generated with a deterministic procedure, a bound on the dispersion, $\hat{D} \geq D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$, can be computed. For instance, in the case where $\mathcal{C} = [0, 1]^d$ and the samples are obtained by gridding with a cubic lattice with $n = k^d$ uniformly spaced grid points and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the dispersion is bound by $\hat{D} = 0.5d^{\frac{1}{2}}n^{-\frac{1}{d}}$, see [25]. For the two-dimensional case, i.e., $\mathcal{C} = [0, 1]^2$ the lowest possible dispersion bound of $\hat{D} = 0.62n^{-\frac{1}{d}}$ is achieved with triangular tiling, see [18]. In probabilistic sampling-based motion planning algorithms, such as PRM [17] and PRM* [13], the samples are randomly drawn from a probability distribution. For random samples drawn from a known distribution, probabilistic properties of the dispersion can be expressed as a function of the number of samples n . For instance the dispersion of n independently uniformly sampled points on $[0, 1]^d$ is $\mathcal{O}(\log(n)^{\frac{1}{d}}n^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ with probability 1, see [26]. We note that using a value that bounds the dispersion with a certain probability, leads to the certification results holding with the same probability.

B. Implementation of Upper

To obtain upper bounds for the shortest paths with s -clearance, we apply the subroutine described in Algorithm 2 and generate a feasible path, $\bar{\sigma}_{i,j} \in \Sigma_{i,j} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}}^s$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$ via a roadmap graph $(\bar{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}})$ created by sampling from $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$. Based on the properties discussed in Section III-A, the connection radius, r , is selected such that it decreases with the dispersion bound, \hat{D} , for increasing sample sizes, n , such that Assumption 2 is satisfied. If the dispersion is sufficiently small, feasible paths are found for every robot-goal pair. The solid blue lines in Figure 1 illustrate examples

of such feasible paths for varying sample sizes. The sample set, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$, is represented by the white area that consists of all points that have a greater distance from all obstacles than s .

The arc lengths of the feasible paths are then used as upper bounds on the optimal path costs, i.e., $(u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} = (c(\bar{\sigma}_{i,j}))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \geq (c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$. In [20] it is shown, based on Theorem 2, that these paths converge to the optimal path asymptotically as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We know from Remark 1 that the complexity of finding these upper bounds is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|^2 n^2)$. To fulfil the second half of Requirement 1 we derive lower bounds next.

C. Implementation of Lower

To determine lower bounds on the shortest paths with s -clearance, we consider an alternative roadmap graph, $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$. It is generated by expanding the space from which samples are taken to include some points that are outside of the s -interior of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$, i.e., in the $(s - \delta)$ -interior of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$ with $\delta \in [0, s]$. In other words, we allow for samples that are closer to obstacles than s . We note that the path constructed from such samples may not be feasible. However, by regulating the amount of the extension of the sample space with parameter δ , lower bounds on the shortest feasible paths are obtained. If the dispersion of the nodes in the roadmap has a known upper bound, $\hat{D} \geq D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$, we can bound the optimal path lengths with the following corollary derived from Theorem 2.

Corollary 1. *If Assumptions 1 holds, the connection radius, r , is selected such that Assumption 2 is satisfied for a margin, $\delta \in [0, s]$, then we have*

$$\left(1 - \frac{2\hat{D}}{r}\right) c(\underline{\sigma}_{i,j}) \leq c(\sigma_{i,j}^s), \quad (4)$$

where $\underline{\sigma}_{i,j}$ is the shortest path in roadmap $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ connecting p_i and g_j , the optimal path $\sigma_{i,j}^s$ is defined in (2), and $\hat{D} \geq D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$ is any upper bound on the sample dispersion.

Algorithm 3 shows a specific procedure to implement Lower. Given knowledge of the sampling scheme, see Section III-A, a bound is computed in subroutine `DispersionBound` as a function of the sample size. If the dispersion bound is too large, i.e., $3\hat{D}(n) \geq s$, then Algorithm 3 returns infinitely low lower bounds on the optimal path lengths. If the dispersion bound is sufficiently small, i.e., $3\hat{D} < s$, then the shortest paths in the roadmap graph $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ are used to compute lower bounds on the optimal path lengths based on (4). Analogue to the procedure for Upper the connection radius is selected such that it decreases with the dispersion bounds as sample size n increases. However, in the case of Lower the set from which the samples are drawn, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}$, varies as it shrinks towards $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$ with increasing n . The dotted blue lines in Figure 1 illustrate the path obtained from $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ for varying sample sizes. The sample set, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}$, is the union of the white and red areas consisting of all points that have a greater distance from all obstacles than $s - \delta$.

Changing the parameters $\zeta, \eta \in (0, 1)$ allows for tuning the decrease rates of r and δ while guaranteeing the satisfaction of Assumption 2. For small values of ζ the margin, δ , decreases




Fig. 1: Shortest paths generated from roadmaps $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ [solid blue line] and $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ [dotted blue line] with robot position [blue dot], goal [green star], obstacles [black area], expansion of obstacles by s [red area], and expansion of obstacles by $s - \delta$ [grey area], for parameter values $\zeta = 0.5$, $\eta = 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$, and samples obtained from triangular tiling.

Algorithm 3: Lower

Input: Initial positions $P = (p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$,
goal positions $G = (g_j)_{j \in \mathcal{T}}$, free space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}$,
safety distance s , sample size n ;
Output: Lower bounds $L = (l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$;
Parameters: Margin tuning parameter $\zeta \in (0, 1)$,
radius tuning parameter $\eta \in (0, 1)$;

- 1 $\hat{D} \leftarrow \text{DispersionBound}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}, n)$
- 2 **if** $\hat{D} \geq \frac{s}{3}$ **then**
- 3 $(l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} \leftarrow (-\infty)_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$
- 4 **else**
- 5 $\delta \leftarrow (3\hat{D})^\zeta s^{1-\zeta}$
- 6 $r \leftarrow \eta 2\hat{D} + (1 - \eta)(\delta - \hat{D})$
- 7 $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}}) \leftarrow \text{RoadMap}(P, G, \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, r, n)$
- 8 $\beta \leftarrow 1 - \frac{2\hat{D}}{r}$
- 9 **for** $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$ **do**
- 10 $\underline{\sigma}_{i,j} \leftarrow \text{ShortestPath}(p_i, g_j, \underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$
- 11 $l_{i,j} \leftarrow \beta c(\underline{\sigma}_{i,j})$

only slowly with the sample size n , for larger ζ the margin decreases faster and follows the dispersion bound \hat{D} more closely. In turn, for small values of η the connection radius follows the upper bound given by Assumption 2, for larger η the radius takes values closer to its lower bound.

From Remark 1 we know that the complexity of Algorithm 3 is also $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{A}|^2 n^2)$. We conclude this section by showing that Requirement 1 can therefore be satisfied with this sampling-based implementation.

Lemma 1. *The values $(l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ returned by Algorithm 3 are lower bounds on the optimal paths $(c(\sigma_{i,j}^s))_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$, defined in (2), and converge to the optimal values if $\hat{D} \geq D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$ and $\hat{D} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. If $s \leq 3\hat{D}$, Algorithm 3 returns $(l_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}} = (-\infty)_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}}$ and we have $l_{i,j} < c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$. If $s > 3\hat{D}$, then from Lines 5 and 6, we have $\delta > 3\hat{D} \geq 3D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$ and $r > 2\hat{D}(n) \geq 2D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$.

We also have $r < \delta - \hat{D} \leq \delta - D(\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}, \underline{\mathcal{V}})$ and Assumption 2 is therefore satisfied. From Assumption 1 and the fact that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s \subset \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}$ we know that there exists a path in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}}$ that connects p_i and g_j for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$. From Remark 2 it follows that there exists a path in $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ that connects p_i and g_j for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$. The path $\underline{\sigma}_{i,j}$ determined in Line 10 is the shortest path in $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ connecting p_i and g_j . From Corollary 1 it follows that $l_{i,j} = (1 - \frac{2\hat{D}}{r})c(\underline{\sigma}_{i,j}) \leq c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we have $\frac{\hat{D}}{r} \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$ and for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$ $c(\underline{\sigma}_{i,j}) \rightarrow c(\sigma_{i,j}^s)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

IV. CASE STUDY

In this section, we present a multi-agent path-planning example to demonstrate the proposed approach. We first discuss the numeric configuration and results in Section IV-A and then summarise the key observations in Section IV-B.

A. Robot-Goal Assignment Scenario

We consider a set of agents, \mathcal{A} , representing 5 ground robots. The initial positions of the robots $p_1, \dots, p_5 \in \mathcal{X}$ are illustrated in Figure 2a in different shades of blue. The configuration space contains obstacles, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{obs}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ shown in black, from which the robot centroid positions must keep a safety distance of at least $s = 0.3\text{m}$. The cooperative mission of the agents is to visit all 3 goals, $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \mathcal{X}$ shown in green, that represent the task set, \mathcal{T} .

Figures 2b, 2c, and 2d show the results from three iterations of the Algorithm 1 with a deterministic sampling strategy based on triangular tiling. The initial sample size for the path length bounding schemes is selected to be $n_{\text{min}} = 1024$ and the sample increase factor is $\alpha = 4$. The maximum complexity is set to $n_{\text{max}} = 75000$. We note for this choice of parameters we have $3\hat{D} < s$ in the first iteration and (3) is satisfied. The margin tuning parameter is set to $\zeta = 0.1$ and the radius tuning parameter is set to $\eta = 0.1$. In each iteration of the while-loop of Algorithm 1, two paths are generated for each robot-goal pair: one, shown with a solid line, lies in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$ based on roadmap graph $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ and one, shown with a dotted line,




Fig. 2: Iterative multi-query path planning with robot positions [blue dots], goals [green stars], obstacles [black area], expansion of obstacles by s [red area], and expansion of obstacles by $s - \delta$ [grey area]. Shortest paths generated from roadmaps $(\bar{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}})$ [solid blue lines] and $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$ [dotted blue lines] are shown, where assigned robot-goal pairs [thick] and paths corresponding to assignment weights that are not contained in the allowable intervals [yellow background] are highlighted.

lies in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}$ based on roadmap graph $(\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}})$. The lengths of these paths are used to determine the upper and lower bounds of assignment weights, respectively, where the lower bound computation includes the scaling factor $\beta = 1 - \frac{2\hat{D}}{r}$. The candidate assignment of goals to robots is made based on the averages of the upper and lower bounds. The resulting robot-goal pairings are illustrated by thick lines. The allowable ranges of path lengths for the optimality of the candidate assignments are given in Table I. The numerical values of the other evolving variables are listed in Table II.

We note that in the first iteration the roadmaps are coarse, see Figure 2b. Given the resulting small value of the scaling factor, $\beta = 0.332$, and the significant difference between $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^s$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\text{free}}^{s-\delta}$, with margin $\delta = 0.290\text{m}$, we observe that the upper and lower bounds are not tight enough to satisfy the stopping criteria on Line 9 of Algorithm 1, i.e. $[l_{i,j}, u_{i,j}] \not\subseteq [w_{i,j} - \underline{\Delta}_{i,j}, w_{i,j} + \bar{\Delta}_{i,j}]$, for several agent-goals pairs $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{T}$ highlighted with yellow in Figure 2b and Table I.

In the second iteration, the roadmaps are generated from $n = 4168$ samples. As shown in Figure 2c, the paths are therefore smoother, the obstacles have been expanded slightly more by shrinking the margin parameter to $\delta = 0.270\text{m}$, and the scaling factor has increased to $\beta = 0.677$. We observe that the candidate assignment has changed in comparison to the first iteration, see the framed cells of Table I. But still, some of the path bounds lie outside of the allowable range, shown again in yellow. The sample size and the related complexity are therefore increased further.

Finally, in the third iteration, illustrated in Figure 2d, with sample size $n = 16672$, the margin has reduced to $\delta = 0.252\text{m}$ and the scaling factor is $\beta = 0.835$. By this step, the upper and lower bounds on the optimal paths have converged enough to certify the candidate assignment as bottleneck optimal and the algorithm terminates.

B. Key Observations

Sampling-based path planning allows us to quickly find feasible paths with low complexity. More samples are required however to find possible paths through narrow corridors of the safe space. Finding such improved paths can lead to large differences in the travel distance cost as can be seen for Agent 2 and Goal 2 in Iterations 1 and 2. We observe that the lower bounds derived in Section III-C are loose for the smallest sample sizes considered and that it requires a large number of samples and long computation time to reach useful scaling factor values as seen in Table II. We note that the computation time, t , is provided for a non-optimised code implementation in Matlab where the bounds for all 15 agent-tasks pairs are computed in series.

The paths obtained with a small number of samples lead to the non-optimal assignment in this example. That is, when the path planning is refined with more samples, different robot-goal pairings are preferred. It is however unclear a-priori how many samples are required to guarantee finding the optimal assignment. In this example, the optimal assignment is found in the second iteration. At that stage, however, the uncertainty in the length of shortest paths is still too high to guarantee the optimality of the assignment. Once the algorithm returns the certificate, in this case during the third iteration, we know that it has converged to the true optimal assignment. At this point, there is no benefit in further refining the paths for the unassigned robot-goal pairings.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We introduced a method that certifies if the knowledge about the shortest obstacle-avoiding paths between robots and goal destinations collected in finite time is sufficient to find an optimal bottleneck assignment. More specifically, we first

TABLE I: Allowable range of path length in [m] for each agent-goal pair. Assigned pairs are indicated with box framing, and pairs violating the stopping condition of Algorithm 1 are highlighted in yellow.

	Iteration 1 (n = 1024)			Iteration 2 (n = 4168)			Iteration 3 (n = 16672)		
	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
Agent 1	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.47]$	$[1.66, \infty)$	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.61]$	$[1.80, \infty)$	$(-\infty, \infty)$
Agent 2	$(-\infty, 1.22]$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.66]$	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.80]$	$(-\infty, \infty)$
Agent 3	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$[1.22, 1.94]$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$[1.47, \infty)$	$[1.66, \infty)$	$[1.47, \infty)$	$[1.61, \infty)$	$[1.80, \infty)$	$[1.59, \infty)$
Agent 4	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.94]$	$[1.47, \infty)$	$[1.66, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.46]$	$[1.61, \infty)$	$[1.80, \infty)$	$(-\infty, 1.59]$
Agent 5	$(-\infty, \infty)$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$[1.94, \infty)$	$[1.47, \infty)$	$[1.66, \infty)$	$[1.47, \infty)$	$[1.61, \infty)$	$[1.80, \infty)$	$[1.59, \infty)$

TABLE II: Evolving variable values

Sample size n	1042	4168	16672
Dispersion bound \hat{D}	0.071m	0.035m	0.018m
Margin δ	0.290m	0.270m	0.252m
Connection radius r	0.211m	0.219m	0.215m
Scaling factor β	0.332	0.677	0.835
Computation time t	1.3s	11.4s	144.5s
Certificate Q	false	false	true

introduced a generic approach that given an initial computational complexity determines if the bounds on the shortest path lengths obtained with this complexity are sufficient to guarantee that an optimal bottleneck assignment is found. If no certificate is returned, the complexity is increased and the procedure is repeated until either sufficiently tight bounds are computed or a predefined maximum complexity is reached. We then provided a specific method to obtain such bounds via sampling-based path planning, where the lower bounds are computed from enlarged sampling spaces. The proposed upper and lower limits on the shortest path lengths converge to the true shortest path lengths asymptotically as the sample size increases. We prove that the proposed algorithm terminates in finite time and that the obtained assignment is optimal if a certificate is returned.

We presented a case study to demonstrate the application of the approach. The considered case provides an example where the algorithm returns a certificate that guarantees the optimality of the assignment using only estimates for the optimal path lengths obtained with manageable complexity. We observed however that to achieve tight bounds, a large number of samples may be required which quickly leads to computational and storage challenges. Code efficiency was not part of the scope of this paper but should be addressed in future work to be able to provide certification results for cases where the assignment is more sensitive to cost changes. Alternative methods to lower bound the shortest paths via polyhedral approximation of the obstacles is the subject of ongoing work. Extending research should also investigate methods to choose the complexity increase from one iteration to the next.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Arslan, J. R. Marden, and J. S. Shamma, "Autonomous vehicle-target assignment: A game-theoretical formulation," *J. Dyn. Syst. Meas. Control. Trans. ASME*, vol. 129, no. 5, pp. 584–596, 2007.
- [2] C. Nam and D. A. Shell, "When to do your own thing: Analysis of cost uncertainties in multi-robot task allocation at run-time," in *IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom.*, no. June, 2015, pp. 1249–1254.
- [3] M. Turpin, K. Mohta, N. Michael, and V. Kumar, "Goal Assignment and Trajectory Planning for Large Teams of Interchangeable Robots," *Auton. Robots*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 401–415, 2014.
- [4] P. MacAlpine, E. Price, and P. Stone, "SCRAM: Scalable Collision-Avoiding Role Assignment with Minimal-makespan for formational positioning," in *Proc. Natl. Conf. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 3, 2015, pp. 2096–2102.
- [5] T. A. Wood, M. Khoo, E. Michael, C. Manzie, and I. Shames, "Collision Avoidance Based on Robust Lexicographic Task Assignment," *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 5693–5700, 2020.
- [6] D. W. Pentico, "Assignment problems: A golden anniversary survey," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 176, no. 2, pp. 774–793, 2007.
- [7] R. E. Burkard, M. Dell'Amico, and S. Martello, *Assignment Problems, revised reprint*. Siam, 2012.
- [8] U. Rosolia, S. De Bruyne, and A. G. Alleyne, "Autonomous Vehicle Control: A Nonconvex Approach for Obstacle Avoidance," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 469–484, 2017.
- [9] X. Zhang, A. Liniger, and F. Borrelli, "Optimization-Based Collision Avoidance," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 972–983, 2021.
- [10] T. Schouwenaars, B. De Moor, E. Feron, and J. How, "Mixed integer programming for multi-vehicle path planning," *2001 Eur. Control Conf. ECC 2001*, pp. 2603–2608, 2001.
- [11] A. Richards and J. P. How, "Aircraft trajectory planning with collision avoidance using mixed integer linear programming," *Proc. Am. Control Conf.*, vol. 3, pp. 1936–1941, 2002.
- [12] Y. Kuwata, J. Teo, G. Fiore, S. Karaman, E. Frazzoli, and J. P. How, "Real-time motion planning with applications to autonomous urban driving," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1105–1118, 2009.
- [13] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, "Sampling-based algorithms for optimal motion planning," *Int. J. Rob. Res.*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 846–894, 2011.
- [14] U. Pferschy, "Solution methods and computational investigations for the linear bottleneck assignment problem," *Comput. (Vienna/New York)*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 237–258, 1997.
- [15] M. Khoo, T. A. Wood, C. Manzie, and I. Shames, "A Distributed Augmenting Path Approach for the Bottleneck Assignment Problem," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control [accepted]*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2011.09606.pdf>
- [16] I. Shames, A. Dostovalova, J. Kim, and H. Hmam, "Task allocation and motion control for threat-seduction decoys," *IEEE 56th Annu. Conf. Decis. Control*, pp. 4509–4514, 2017.
- [17] L. E. Kavraki, P. Švestka, J. C. Latombe, and M. H. Overmars, "Probabilistic roadmaps for path planning in high-dimensional configuration spaces," *IEEE Trans. Robot. Autom.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 566–580, 1996.
- [18] S. M. LaValle, *Planning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [19] L. E. Kavraki, M. N. Kolountzakis, and J. C. Latombe, "Analysis of probabilistic roadmaps for path planning," *IEEE Trans. Robot. Autom.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 166–171, 1998.
- [20] L. Janson, B. Ichter, and M. Pavone, "Deterministic sampling-based motion planning: Optimality, complexity, and performance," *Int. J. Rob. Res.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 46–61, 2018.
- [21] C. J. Lin and U. P. Wen, "Sensitivity analysis of the optimal assignment," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 149, no. 1, pp. 35–46, 2003.
- [22] A. Volgenant, "An addendum on sensitivity analysis of the optimal assignment," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 169, no. 1, pp. 338–339, 2006.
- [23] C. J. Lin and U. P. Wen, "Sensitivity analysis of objective function coefficients of the assignment problem," *Asia-Pacific J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 203–221, 2007.
- [24] E. Michael, T. A. Wood, C. Manzie, and I. Shames, "Sensitivity Analysis for Bottleneck Assignment Problems," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 303, no. 1, pp. 159–167, 2022.
- [25] A. G. Sukharev, "Optimal strategies of the search for an extremum," *USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 119–137, 1971.
- [26] P. Deheuvels, "Strong bounds for multidimensional spacings," *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 411–424, 1983.