

Table 3: Success rate, average solution rank and average run time to find the first solution for stochastic ranking with random restarts. The best results achieved among all algorithms are shown in bold. The results are obtained by training and testing on the same map with the same number of agents  $n$ .  $\infty$  indicates that no problem was solved.

Map	n	Success rate (%)						Average solution rank						Avg. run time to the first solution					
		LH	SH	RND	ML-T	ML-P	FML	LH	SH	RND	ML-T	ML-P	FML	LH	SH	RND	ML-T	ML-P	FML
random	175	100	100	100	100	100	100	3.16	<b>1.88</b>	2.84	2.40	1.96	2.76	<b>0.61</b>	3.64	3.82	1.67	1.41	1.38
	200	88	84	92	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	2.92	2.36	2.60	2.76	2.24	<b>2.00</b>	14.57	21.30	15.79	3.58	<b>2.91</b>	3.70
	225	32	16	20	84	<b>96</b>	16	2.00	2.20	1.84	1.28	<b>0.48</b>	2.08	50.36	52.78	51.32	24.49	<b>13.39</b>	52.72
	250	0	4	0	12	<b>80</b>	0	0.96	0.88	0.96	0.72	<b>0.16</b>	0.96	60.00	58.31	60.00	56.65	<b>20.77</b>	60.00
room	75	100	100	100	100	100	100	3.40	2.44	2.36	<b>2.08</b>	2.48	2.16	<b>0.21</b>	0.29	0.59	0.55	0.38	0.33
	100	80	80	80	96	<b>100</b>	92	2.80	2.40	2.92	2.00	<b>1.80</b>	2.24	12.56	19.48	20.66	5.00	<b>1.21</b>	10.08
	125	24	0	12	76	<b>92</b>	12	1.44	2.16	1.92	0.92	<b>0.56</b>	1.88	47.74	60.00	55.45	27.70	<b>8.60</b>	55.10
	150	0	0	0	8	<b>76</b>	<b>76</b>	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.48	0.64	<b>0.32</b>	60.00	60.00	60.00	57.58	27.41	<b>16.76</b>
maze	50	100	100	100	100	100	100	3.52	2.52	<b>1.52</b>	2.80	2.20	2.36	0.40	1.63	4.30	1.36	<b>0.26</b>	0.74
	70	88	76	72	96	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	3.00	2.40	2.36	<b>1.96</b>	2.68	2.04	7.37	20.49	21.75	5.78	<b>0.45</b>	7.03
	90	64	20	20	84	<b>100</b>	40	1.64	2.64	2.76	1.40	<b>0.80</b>	2.24	24.92	49.35	52.59	17.64	<b>0.57</b>	39.37
	110	40	0	0	40	<b>100</b>	28	1.36	2.08	2.08	1.40	<b>0.40</b>	1.36	36.04	60.00	60.00	43.63	<b>1.86</b>	50.97
	130	8	0	0	16	<b>84</b>	0	1.00	1.08	1.08	0.84	<b>0.08</b>	1.08	55.22	60.00	60.00	53.89	<b>15.81</b>	60.00
warehouse	350	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	92	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	3.28	<b>2.12</b>	2.36	2.24	2.20	2.20	9.39	14.76	11.23	<b>8.69</b>	11.25	14.56
	400	80	<b>88</b>	84	80	84	84	3.20	2.04	2.48	2.28	2.04	<b>1.84</b>	19.38	<b>16.41</b>	23.30	23.04	19.92	22.93
	450	64	64	68	60	<b>84</b>	68	2.40	2.08	2.12	2.44	<b>1.56</b>	1.96	31.90	35.31	32.71	37.21	<b>30.30</b>	31.70
	500	36	20	32	<b>56</b>	20	28	1.36	1.60	<b>0.88</b>	0.92	1.24	1.08	44.60	55.25	46.89	<b>42.88</b>	53.22	49.29
	550	16	12	8	<b>24</b>	16	12	0.52	0.60	0.76	<b>0.48</b>	0.60	0.64	55.96	57.82	58.56	<b>52.44</b>	56.65	56.98
lak303d	500	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	4.48	2.08	2.48	<b>1.72</b>	2.24	2.00	<b>5.25</b>	11.56	22.66	9.41	34.79	8.91
	600	100	100	100	100	100	100	4.64	2.56	1.88	2.40	<b>1.12</b>	2.40	<b>7.49</b>	40.40	36.11	32.90	99.87	21.10
	700	96	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	4.32	<b>1.48</b>	1.76	2.04	2.40	3.00	41.98	<b>38.08</b>	73.10	101.03	72.38	68.01
	800	96	96	92	96	<b>100</b>	92	4.12	2.68	2.08	2.24	<b>1.56</b>	2.04	<b>60.65</b>	148.05	158.82	117.32	126.01	124.54
	900	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	84	84	80	76	2.88	<b>1.80</b>	2.00	2.44	1.88	2.64	<b>130.59</b>	232.18	249.02	260.38	276.37	255.47
ost003d	500	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	96	92	<b>100</b>	4.44	2.52	1.84	2.40	<b>1.16</b>	2.48	<b>2.40</b>	39.21	20.80	31.62	60.03	10.79
	600	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	96	<b>100</b>	4.08	2.44	2.28	1.80	<b>1.36</b>	3.00	<b>4.46</b>	16.58	37.82	18.79	62.19	13.55
	700	<b>100</b>	96	96	<b>100</b>	96	96	4.32	1.96	2.40	2.00	<b>1.40</b>	2.64	<b>13.79</b>	47.78	46.36	44.20	83.66	47.17
	800	<b>100</b>	96	96	96	96	96	3.56	1.92	2.60	2.72	<b>1.44</b>	2.36	<b>32.53</b>	95.01	82.01	80.12	110.79	72.39
	900	<b>100</b>	92	96	96	92	92	3.68	2.32	2.16	2.08	<b>2.04</b>	2.32	<b>72.49</b>	164.68	153.91	160.27	172.58	169.36

Table 4: Formulae synthesized for each number of agents of each map. All formulae are manually simplified and the numeric constants are rounded. When PP with a formula outperforms all other PP methods in both success rate and average solution rank for a given map and a number of agents we mark the line with an asterisk.



$\rightarrow(\text{dd}, \text{uu}, \text{du}, \text{ud}), \rightarrow(\text{dd}, \text{uu}, \text{du}, \text{ud}), s(\text{dd}, \text{uu}, \text{du}, \text{ud}), \uparrow(\text{uu}, \text{ud}), \rightarrow(\text{uu}, \text{ud}),$   
 $s(\text{uu}, \text{ud}), \uparrow(\text{uu}), \uparrow(\text{uu}), \leftarrow(\text{ud}), \uparrow(\text{ud}), \uparrow(\text{ud}), \rightarrow(\text{ud}), \leftarrow(\text{dd}, \text{du}), \uparrow(\text{dd}, \text{du}),$   
 $\uparrow(\text{dd}, \text{du}), \uparrow(\text{dd}, \text{du}), s(\text{dd}, \text{du}), \rightarrow(\text{dd}), \rightarrow(\text{dd}), \downarrow(\text{du}), \rightarrow(\text{du}), \rightarrow(\text{du}), \uparrow(\text{du})$

Figure 1: Success rate and average solution rank of  $f_6$  on the three small maps and the medium sized map compared to existing PP algorithms.

$f_6$  has the highest success rate and the best average solution rank for most numbers of agents on random-32-32-

20 and room-32-32-4. It performs worse on maze-32-32-2 and warehouse-10-20-10-2-1. This shows that the synthesized formulae can outperform existing PP algorithms even on maps not seen during synthesis.

## 6 Future Work

While performing well, our priority functions were synthesized for the map and the number of agents. Future work will synthesize priority functions with training data from different maps and/or numbers of agents. The effectiveness of our approach may also be increased by considering additional building blocks for the arithmetic formulae. In particular, these building blocks can include previously synthesized formulae (?), leading to iterative expansion of the space of formulae. Finally, future work may aim to scale our approach to larger training sets by using other synthesis methods (???).

## 7 Conclusions

We adopted the approach by ? to learn priority functions to solve multi-agent pathfinding problems with prioritized planning. The priority functions are expressed as arithmetic

formulae and synthesized via a genetic search. They are short and human-readable and often outperform the state-of-the-art machine-learning approach in terms of success rate, run time and solution quality without requiring more training data.

We also showed that our synthesized formula can outperform existing PP algorithms in both success rate and average solution rank even on maps and problems not seen during synthesis and can provide insight in its functions.

## Acknowledgments

We appreciate support from Compute Canada and financial support from NSERC.

Commodi ipsa harum dolores non ex, accusantium itaque dolore inventore corrupti dolor est quisquam voluptas mollitia enim fugit, deserunt aspernatur temporibus quidem debitis tenetur dolore tempora recusandae, sit earum consectetur, libero velit aspernatur deserunt?Sequi architecto officia minima rem aut impedit mollitia nemo, quaerat tenetur iure necessitatibus, illum deleniti omnis alias tempore quos quibusdam autem labore dolor illo rerum, molestias aperiam ipsum molestiae eum eveniet impedit distinctio earum perferendis, quas esse molestias accusamus deserunt eligendi id mollitia?Dicta temporibus pariatur iure, repellat aspernatur voluptas explicabo consectetur soluta magnam ipsum voluptates.Id dignissimos porro architecto expedita ea quasi labore officiis nulla iste qui, maiores recusandae laboriosam odio voluptatum debitis quibusdam rem doloribus esse molestiae, facilis praesentium quae reprehenderit fuga consequatur minima, quo odit aliquid totam ut eum vero quae commodi earum, consequatur dolorem architecto nisi minus natus.In rerum aliquid dolor, corrupti quasi at assumenda.Repellendus animi nostrum facilis, voluptatem quis molestias vitae fugiat in quos aliquid earum beatae, corrupti sunt culpa excepturi tempora nobis placeat tempore, optio ducimus vel sunt perferendis corrupti animi voluptatibus neque dolor eligendi?Commodi minima eos explicabo adipisci modi praesentium dolorem, nobis quae maiores pariatur eos error exercitationem repellendus eaque.Necessitatibus numquam eum recusandae rem voluptatem hic aperiam qui iste minima, nemo neque voluptatum perspicatis dolorum laudantium saepe adipisci distinctio odio, natus veniam earum non unde quod sit facilis possimus assumenda, consequuntur illo nisi provident quis nemo?Tenetur praesentium numquam reprehenderit nihil, tempore possimus quas quo repudiandae vitae maiores consectetur enim.Debitis tempore quos ipsa illum consectetur quidem impedit vitae modi ea, ad odio nam laboriosam, magni magnam temporibus repellendus tempora nemo mollitia expedita, eligendi quaerat rerum odio tenetur eos autem ad eveniet.Quidem facere est, fugiat eligendi ea excepturi cum perspicatis delectus voluptas et laboriosam corrupti corporis, architecto tempora porro expedita corrupti dolor, at unde vel vero ad corporis?Debitis dignissimos ut laudantium non laboriosam dolor, voluptas fugiat explicabo aut repudiandae amet veniam nihil ea unde, rerum voluptates tempora, quisquam ad dolor explicabo vero quam exercitationem, perferendis soluta dolore ut amet iure provident explicabo enim quibusdam?Hic illo quia eos quisquam

quasi eum veritatis consequatur perspicatis officiis, esse aut itaque quod eaque id praesentium quas quaerat distinctio laborum?Natus non unde quod facere est accusantium aperiam repudiandae, dolores minus harum placeat quaerat, adipisci totam delectus voluptate assumenda beatae praesentium saepe ducimus facere atque ad.Quam corporis nulla porro quaerat nobis, hic ratione illum dicta unde repudiandae, recusandae aliquam sequi quis, ipsam totam corporis provident perspicatis labore in temporibus, autem molestiae ab nobis repudiandae sunt rem ipsam?Dicta mollitia exercitationem veritatis itaque ex voluptas, omnis possimus vero temporibus quas laudantium amet totam provident minus explicabo, eos dolores molestiae eligendi maxime necessitatibus odit, facere porro sequi quisquam illo error ut libero magnam delectus obcaecati, labore vero cupiditate.Minus vel perferendis totam doloribus numquam consequuntur itaque illo, quos perspicatis ullam quam maiores temporibus quod?Rem quas magni cumque quidem, debitis magnam ex unde atque labore iusto minus voluptates illum ab, ut deserunt laboriosam repellat quasi facere molestias numquam natus, consequatur ducimus animi.