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I think I should speak in present most of the time?

# Abstract

Say also that is intends to explore task allocation in swarm 3 independent task blahblah

This paper proposes a software implementation of an ant-inspired mathematical task allocation model created by Alejandro Cornejo et Al. [link]. Moreover, it declines the implementation in two architecture of the swarm robotic paradigm; A centralized and a distributed version. Through a set of experiments and thorough comparisons against strong task allocation methods, is has been proven that .. Also speak about PSI RND and GTA More……

# Introduction

[link file:///Users/freak/Downloads/bxy107.pdf]

**This paragraph can also easily go somewhere else more introduction**

This project intends to explore two architectures of the swarm robotic paradigm. Firstly, the centralized one (see figure n), where the information about the environment is not shared among all the individuals but is rather kept in a single entity that any robot can reach out to given deterministic conditions (space and time). This single entity is usually referred to as the leader and can be anything from a robot to a static information center and is also responsible for delivering a task allocation for any robot requesting one. The centralized architecture is well suited for a small number of robots [link] but has obvious downsides when the group of robots become larger as the communication failure (information loss) and overhead quickly creates a disturbance in the system [link]. Moreover, this system has what is commonly referred to as a single point of failure, where if the information center breaks or stops functioning, the entire swarm is impacted and cannot perform further action [link]. The second architecture is the distributed architecture. This time, the information is shared among all individuals through local communication where each robot shares its state and is responsible for understanding their environment and assigning a task to themselves. Given the mode of communication, this architecture does not suffer the same downsides as the centralized one. It is scalable and robust to failure as if one of few robots are removed, the rest of the swarm keeps sharing their state and the system keeps working. Moreover, this architecture does not suffer from communication failure and overhead as if such happens it is only locally to one robot, which does not impact the rest of the swarm.

- Also, my system AITA was not implemented ANYWHERE (on the web that is, no paper has done it) so it’s nice that I provide a proof

My thesis is also an experiment proposal so that hopefully people can use it afterward with their own system. Also, it is meant to be use for overly simplistic robot as ants.

Explain what I will do and from who I will “copy”

**Say something about task allocation .. swarm .. the future .. refer to other paper, they might’ve the answer**

Talk about response treshold

**I think mine is treshhold as well.**

**[1]**

**“un mot qui veut dire avertissement sur »**

*#! I know I want to use robot simulated because I want to assess the efficenicy of the allocation system for robots. Doing it with few robot wouldn’t prove so much.*

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frobt.2020.00036/full> -> this website explain why is swarm robotic. Maybe I can have a reflexion part on the thesis, and transpose it to the ants. Like it says

“ **Group size regulation** allows the robots in the swarm to form groups of desired size. If the size of the swarm exceeds the desired group size, it splits into multiple groups.” But ants don’t have such complex system.

**[0]**

## Related work

[1]

Small chapter here that will define the set of dependent task, why it work and why it is relevant

-> will have to explain how some model are based on ant characteristic and why I don’t use them

Also cite a bunch of paper and what they did there.

<https://www.google.com/search?q=task+allocation+in+autonomous+swarm+robot&oq=task&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i59j69i61l3j69i65l2.832j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

<file:///Users/freak/Downloads/Distributed_Task_Allocation_in_Swarms_of_Robots.pdf>

-> this one for instance talk about “scalability” and how it is important that the task changes in function of the needs. This is different from my task allocation system as as of now, the robot cannot quantify needs.

My robot are made to solve a set of task from A to Z without any arrogance on the speed of the execution

<https://people.idsia.ch/~frederick/taskallocation.pdf> -> this one has flying robot .. not yet relevant to me.

<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188778566.pdf> -> AUCTION!

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2472396_ALLIANCE_An_Architecture_for_Fault_Tolerant_Multi-Robot_Cooperation>

Ant-Inspired Task Allocation Model Within a Swarm of Homogeneous Simulated Robotic-Agents

<file:///Users/freak/Downloads/paper_preV.pdf>

Payam paper, could be used in the “related work”

<file:///Users/freak/Downloads/Task_Allocation_in_Robotic_Swarms_Explicit_Communi.pdf>

Heavily interesting, it says that

“This leads to a huge amount of differently designed global missions and as a result to many different solutions which are hard to compare[3]. Thus in most of the proposed methods in this area, researchers have only introduced their own methods and refrained from comparing with other methods. Our scenario also possesses different features, goals and finally distinct global foraging mission compared to previous scenarios in task allocation field”

<file:///Users/freak/Downloads/AnInterruptibleTaskAllocationModel%20(2).pdf>

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4803959>

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8023527>

- Maybe I can slo defend why interaction rate is not optimal because it’s to localisation and time based. ()

# Task allocation

Here, explain what the worker will be doing

4eme tache sert pas a grand chose, le but c’est de montrer que les robots peuvent s’adapter

# A Centralized and a Distributed Ant-Inspired Task Allocation

This section describes the main algorithm used in the development of the simulation for the swarm of robots to achieve task allocation. Moreover, it explains the choice of a distributed version of the algorithm over a centralized one by experimenting and discussing the results. Throughout the section, the terms AITA and DAITA will be used. AITA stands for **A**nt-**I**nspired **T**ask **A**llocation and DAITA for **D**istributed **A**nt-**I**nspired **T**ask **A**llocation.

Maybe somewhere talk about the strensght of the system envisaged by Alejandro

## Introduction

The ant-inspired task allocation model used has been designed in 2014 by Alejandro Cornejo et Al. [link]. It only exists a mathematical model of it (no robotic or software implementation), which makes it a good candidate for experiments. The algorithm is a crossover between a multitude of studies of ant’s task allocation models such as the threshold algorithm [link] or the interaction-rate model [link].

Say what is interesting in the algorithm over others..

## The system model

Alejandro Cornejo et Al. introduce four quantifier helpers that help a worker telling whether a task is in energy deficit or surplus. To begin with, they define a function **d**(T, t) as being the **demand** for a task t at a given time T. The **demand** function can depend on any aspect of the current environment, such as the weather, the current number of ants in the colony, etc. Secondly, the function **e**(T, a, t) yields how much **energy** an ant can provide to a task t at a given time T (note that the energy can be any type of energy, it will not impact the model). The **energy**an ant can provide to a task also depends on environmental variables, but also an ant’s characteristics and previous experience of the specific task. Thirdly, they define the **energy supplied** to a task t at a given time T **w**(T,t) as being the sum of the **energy** **e**(T, a,t) currently provided by all ant performing the task. Finally, they define **q**(T,t) as being **d**(T,t) – **w**(T,t), or; the current demand for a task minus the current energy supplied by all ant to that task at the specific given time T (this paper will refer **w**(T,t) as being the **energy difference**).

Given these 4 helpers, they define a satisfying task assignment as being one where no task is in energy deficit, that is, the task is in equilibrium. Being in equilibrium for a task means that the **energy supplied** to a task t exactly matches the **demand** of the task. (maybe that’s repetition)

## Model restrictions

In the previous section, four helpers have been defined, however, it is still unclear how they are exactly used as it only has been mentioned of potential “environmental variable” for the demand or “ant’s characteristics and experience” for the energy. It is because the environmental variables, ant’s characteristics, and experience settings are so phenomenally broad that it is impossible to include every one of them in the mode. Indeed, even Alejandro Cornejo et Al. have decided to leave this choice to someone else who would implement the task allocation they have created, as they highlight how the complexity of individual variation quickly results in an “intractable task allocation formulation”. Being an intractable formulation means that there is no efficient way to solve the task allocation problem [Link]. Intractable problems are commonly referred to as NP-complete problems [Link],.

# The paper says it could also be impacted by previous experience .. maybe the robot can have a short memory

# That would say "ho .. I was close to food 10 timestep ago.. it is likely that I still have food nearby"

# The robot cannot sense their long-range environment, but maybe, for task such as food, we could sense the short

# environment and say "if I sense food then the energy I can provide is higher"

# Energy is based on ant characteristic to achieve a task.

# Our simulation is a homogeneous system, meaning that no robots have better characteristics than others

# As of now.. the energy is 1. Meaning that each robot can perform anytask as good as any other

# ? maybe .. if the robots know about any last foraging point .. then maybe the energy it can supply is greater?

#! or .. if you already are on the area for the task .. maybe increase?

In realf life it would be different, maybe reflect here with some paper from Gordon

This project’s implementation of the demand and the energy is the following; As will be elaborated later, the simulated individuals are a set of homogeneous robots. Working with homogeneous robots means that every one of them provide the same characteristics and skills to a task, which is highly helpful as it serves as a workaround as to what exactly would be the energy a worker can supply. Indeed, since all the robots share the same characteristics, one can set the energy a robot can supply to a task at a specific time t to being 1 (for simplicity , previous experience has been omitted).

As for the demand and what exactly being in need for a task means, the later section “” explains it.

## Task allocation algorithm

This section is an overview of the AITA algorithm. The complete algorithm can be found in Alejandro Cornejo et Al’s research paper.

### The binary feedback function

The algorithm is based on the worker’s ability to sense its direct and local environment through a binary-feedback function f(T, i). Recall the helper function q(T,t) which is the energy difference for a task t at a given time T. The binary feedback function yields 1 if the energy difference for a task is in equilibrium or in energy surplus, -1 otherwise (not that the binary feedback function does not provide enough information for the workers to tell whether a task has reach exact equilibrium). The paper also introduces other binary feedback functions in their further work section, which will not be covered in this paper. Sensing the energy difference for a task through a binary function means that a worker is unable to quantify by how much a task is in energy deficit or surplus. This is very important as it fundamentally shapes the way the task allocation system works. Being able to sense only little and local information is also biologically accurate as ants don’t have the exact knowledge of the energy supplied to a task [link] in their sometimes up to 1’000’000 million individual nests [link].

### Worker’s states

The algorithm (which considers the size of the colony |A| as being fixed) works as follows:

Firstly, all

The algorithm also introduces five states for the worker to be in, namely: Resting, FirstReserve, SecondReserve, TempWorker, and CoreWorker. Along with the five states, it also introduces a table of potentials Q for each task, which is used by the worker to determine which task it will be executing next. The table Q of potentials is updated via the binary feedback function, the task in energy surplus or equilibrium get a potential of 0, and the task in energy deficit see their potential increasing (up to 3).

1. My model will also introduce simple robot as the task allocation is mainly biological evolution of ants throughout millions of years. So it is to prove that this task allocation suits simplistic robotic
2. the fact that a forager when switching to another task drop its resource (unless core or temps worker) is purely arbitrary .. I need to write something about it in the paper
3. A big part of how good the model will be is how efficient my ant are at solving the task

Maybe do something of that : that is not from me, it’s from the paper right

We are mostly interested in satisfiable task allocation problems where the energy available at the colony far exceeds the energy demands of the tasks. This is likely consistent with what has been observed in real ant colonies [4], where even during periods where tasks have a very high demand (such as nest migration) an important fraction of the ants remain idle where the rest perform the tasks necessary for the survival of the colony. Ideally, we would like to find task assignments that achieve equilibrium for every task (i.e., where the energy demand equals the energy supply). However due to rounding issues this is not always possible, even when restricted to satisfiable task allocation problems. For instance, consider the case where the energy demand for each task is an odd number and the energy that can be exerted by each ant on any task is an even number. In this case, regardless of the number of ants assigned to each task, no task can be at equilibrium. For this reason, we instead seek task assignments that minimize the squared difference between the energy demands and the energy supplied. Formally, an optimal task assignment is one that minimizes P τ∈T q(τ, t) 2 . Clearly a task assignment where all tasks are at equilibrium is optimal, but the opposite need not be true.

AITA and DAITA

**Talk about the model**

* **Talk about task in general, “task allocation generalist” is a paper defining the use of specifc task from specific ants. It could be interesting to talk about it**

Robot’s gone mechanisms

**Here, redo the algorithm as I know how it should be, no copy past the algo from pseudo code**

- Expliquer quelque technique pour detecter quand les robots sont out et dire comment et pourquoi ça pourrait marcher (comme le 100 timestep, si la distance de comm ou l’erreur est trop grande c’est faussé)

**DAITA**

**Comm -> one at a time**

**AITA**

Solution that has been put into place -> the nest now handles the task assignment, robot send they information needed to be assigned a new task along with their status report. The nest then receives, calculate a new, report and send back the task and robot information to the robot

Also introduce here communication?

* **Talk about task allocation, demand and how energy supply could’ve and could impact the result**

**Comm -> simultaneous receive and send (assumption) -> but maybe also in the assumption communication in the experiment part .. maybe get inspiration from other paper ..**

Here, introduce AITA and DAITA. Say why there’s two, why one is centralized, what it implies. Compare them and show some experiment to say which one will be use for the other comparisons.

as assessed in the paper, an ant is capable to know that a task is in energy deficit or surplus, but not able to quantify it. so following the model, it is not because there's more deficit to a task that more ant should be allocated to it.

## Paper’s assumptions

if one task can be set to an equilibrium, then all other task will be served .. because when eq. reached, the robot are reassigned -> to be verified

Explain here that I will run a first set of experiment to show which of centralized or distriubuted is best, say that we are going to use DAITA but that is also depending on communication range

- La communication failure va mettre en lumière pourquoi avoir du centralised memory est nul. Since the nest has to report to everyone, if only one fails to communicate its value there’s gonna be a big shift in the nest actual values -> not really since I have implemented a robust system. BTW talk about that in the thesis, the DAITA system that checks if information is redundant (the whole memory information updation)

# RND, GTA and PSI

**other chapter)**

## RND, GTA and PSI

To give a more in-depth analysis of AITA and DAITA, it has been chosen to implement three other algorithms that would evolve and be experimented on in the same environment with the same set of tasks to perform. This section provides an overview of each of them, highlighting why they have been chosen over others and what can be expected from every one of them.

### Random Task Allocation Algorithm

The random task allocation algorithm, or RND, is a system where each individual, given that it is not currently performing a task (currently performing a task means currently carrying a payload), is attributed a new task every 600 simulation step (after thorough experiments, 600 simulation step has been seen to be the most optimal task time) following a uniform distribution (that is, no task as more chance to be selected over another). Since the robots do not require sharing any kind of information and don't need to be aware of the current world state, this task allocation system does not suffer any kind of communication failure or overhead, which makes him highly scalable and robust.

This algorithm has been chosen because it is the simplest algorithm one can design, and thus serves as a lower boundary as to what the ant-inspired algorithm (and any other elaborated algorithm) should not go below. It is expected that this algorithm performs the poorest as it does not worry about the current world's state and is very inconsistent (for instance, even though the probability is extremely low, one could end up in a system where only the foraging task is performed throughout the entire lifetime of a simulation).

### Greedy Task Allocation Algorithm

The greedy task allocation algorithm, or GTA, is a system where the robots share their states to others within the swarm and coordinate to cover the task that requires the most attention. As for the AITA, DAITA, and RND, a robot cannot be attributed to a new task if it is currently performing one. Because the information is distributed among the entire system (the memory and communication systems are the ones used by DAITA), this algorithm suffers the same challenges as DAITA, that is, communication failure and system disturbance.

A greedy algorithm has been selected because itusually perform very well in a wide range of situations, but consume a lot of computational power. Thus, this algorithm is expected to perform well but at computational costs that are high compared to other systems.

### Partitioning social inhibition Task Allocation Algorithm

The Partitioning Social Inhibition task allocation algorithm, or PSI, is a system issued from a research paper "Division of Labor in a Swarm of Autonomous Underwater Robots by Improved Partitioning Social Inhibition" (Payam Zahadat et al. [link]). Payam Zahadat et al. claim that "The PSI algorithm maintains a division of labor and allocation of tasks to different members of a swarm. It is adaptive to changes in the swarm size and relative demands for different tasks." Being adaptive to changes in the swarm size and demand for the tasks is important because it is part of what the other TAs are being experimented on. PSI is also interesting because it does not fall under the category of algorithms that are easily applicable to any kind of situation, rather they are robotic related or not (such as GTA and RND) since it is also an attempt at solving the task allocation problem. This sub-section is an overview of the algorithm and the way it has been implemented within the system developed for this project.

For this research paper, Payam Zahadat has been kind enough to provide the student with the C++ code with which the simulation was run. The algorithm has then been transferred to the Python code the student is working with and adapted to the current environment and communication mechanisms. This adaptation means that PSI is executing the same set of tasks as all of the other TAs, which provides fair and accurate data. Overall, the algorithm is expected to perform as well as in Payam Zahadat et al.'s experiment, but the system is also expected to suffer from the consequences of applying the algorithm to the student's environment (which is discussed under the discussion section TODO).

#### **PSI Algorithm**

Each robot of the swarm holds an x value that represents their physiological age. This x value is distributed over a range of xmin and xmax (the value of the variables are defined in table n) where the range is split equally by the number of tasks so that each task gets the same amount of distribution (see figure n). PSI aims to distribute each individual's x value relative to the current demands for the tasks to achieve equilibrium (recall that the equilibrium is when the number of robots assigned for a task matches or covers the current demand of the task). PSI uses the same communication system as DAITA and PSI and is thus distributed. Using the same system means that PSI is expected to suffer from the same challenges as DAITA and GTA (communication failure and system disturbance). The value x changes through time and local interaction with the member of the swarm, but this paper does not intend to cover that. For further information it, please refer to the paper.

As mentioned above, PSI has not been written to run under the same kind of environment as for the one DAITA and the other algorithms have been designed for, meaning that PSI has been adapted to fit this project's simulation and its constraints. The two impacted areas are the demand and the specific condition under which a worker can be allocated a new task.

##### Demand

The current implementation of the environment yields that a demand for a task can variate from -inf to inf, whereas in Payam et al.'s system the tasks have a value that represents a fraction of the current demand and usually variates between 1 and some positive number. This means that in the PSI's original system, no task can have a negative demand or a demand of 0. To counter that, it has been chosen to map the actual demand of the environment to a 1 - 20 scale (only for PSI) as follows:

Imagine the following sequence of demand [23, 132, 12], where 23 is the current demand for the foraging task, 132 is the current demand for the nest processing task, and 12 is the demand for the current cleaning task.

**TODO** put that into equations:

# First, the highest demand is determined

max\_demand = max(23, 132, 12)

# Then each demand is mapped to the 1-20 system following this equation where x is the input demand:

f(x) = math.ceil(x / max\_demand \* 20)

return f(x) if demand > 1

1 otherwise

A wide range of tests and experiments have proven that this system accurately complies with how the PSI's task allocation algorithm is designed to work. The tests and experiments are not shown in this project as the goal is only to get as close as possible to the performance of PSI under its original setup.

##### Condition under which a worker can be attributed a new task

As for all the other algorithms, PSI cannot attribute a task if the robot is currently performing one. What it means for PSI is that the value x of each individual is delayed as long as the worker is currently carrying a payload. Tests have shows that it does not impact the efficiency of PSI.

# Experiments

[intro of section]

In this section, I should also publish the base array table for PSI and all the other TA.

## Environment & Simulation

Maybe define the environment first

The own fact that I created the whole simulation with the real robot and not just pure logic is because I want to restrict the model to real life conditions to see how it does

* I am gonna let the robot finish their task before removal, because i want to be as accurate as possible.

### Communication

Range is infinite

Show communication distribution -> and explain how it works

Communication time is instant (1 timestep)

No communication overhead

Explain how AITA works

### Noise

I have conducted some test and even when loosing 30% of every communication packet the system is strong

Thought task switch – [2]

Because the TAs are not deterministic, I have sample 5 times and averaged

**Talk about the restrictions and assumptions**

**What is important:**

* Being able to denote all the variable I can act on
* Say why I would act on one more than an other
* Choosing which I want to keep the same and why (and vice-versa)

**WORLD**

* Arena size: The further away the robot are from their task point, the longer it will take for them to be active in it
* Robot speed: Kind of the same as Arena size .. if the robot is too slow the distance to the task point “becomes longer”
* Where the resources drop .. as of now, I randomise it, but It would be faire to have always the same area to have consistent testing
* Where the areas are
* NEST starting values -> this will influence the result a lot I do believe

**TASK**

* Number of task -> the more task the more ants you need (that has been proven by the math paper where number of ant had to be greater than something .. )
* Number of ants -> Related to above
* Speed at which a task will decrease -> If a task decrease at high speed, more ant will move to it
* Speed at which a task will increase -> related to above, reverse
* The energy a robot can supply to a task -> I will have to be pretty clear about that, and reflect possible real life robot implementation
* Explain the task and how they could relate to real life problem ..

**ROBOT**

* I can do a lot of thing where I improve the robot’s ability to perform a task. so I will code until I think the robot is in a done state and say why I choose to do so and such
* Battery level -> not super necessary but I think that in a real robotic setup this would be a problem, so interesting to see how and why this could be of a problem
* Making sure I know why and what to assess
* Making parallel with the paper is highly important

Imagine there are four ants performing a task with a demand of 0, energy surplus is at equilibrium, but when the demand is higher then more ants will be unblocked to assisted the task as the task is in energy surplus

1. Thesis concern: If I were to work with real ants, I wouldn't need to dodge other robot as ant can go over each others.. but in real life not the same. just talk about it at some point .. it is part of the constraint -> congestion
2. Robot’s avoidance

### Navigation

1. My navigation is map based, as to be an abstraction of something I don’t wish to spend to much time on.
2. Pheromones might not be that useful. Because we have to obey robotics law, our robot cannot crawl on top of each other and thus following a pheromone path is super hard. I can also show at the end by deactivating the robot’s avoidance and show the result. Maybe explain that early result have proven what I found was wrong
3. Maybe show at the end the result along with the pheromone and with the localisation.

**Simulation vs Reality**

Keeping my simulated environment is nice because it means I can change the way robot go to a given location by not caring too much about how I would implement it in real life. That’0s another problem. As long as I keep a high level of accuracy and noise I can exempt myself from explanation.

What do I want to experiment?

The implemented algorithms, AITA, DAITA, PSI, RND, and GTA, are tested in an agent-based simulation. The experiments intend to assess the efficiency of the system over five categories that are commonly referred to as being what a swarm robotic system should be good at, namely: Its scalability, which is the system's ability to adapt to a change of workforce (whether it is adding or removing individuals). Its robustness, or how well the system does against communication or robot failures. Its versatility, which states that the system should apply to a wide range of tasks. Its adaptability, or how good can the system adapts to dynamic environments. And finally, the reliability of the system stating that the robot should be consistent in its probability of solving a given task.

TODO: argue somewhere that if they are capable of doing these three tasks they can effectively do ANYTHING else even if independent

TODO: Change the name with something that make sense so it reflects what is used in PSI to introduce the experiments.

## Speed and reliability

The first experiment (EXP1) consists of a speed test. The goal is to collect, process, and clean 50 resources as quickly as possible. At each new start, the demand for the foraging task is 50 resources, and the demand for the nest processing and cleaning tasks are both set to 0. Moreover, the foraging demand increases by 5 for every 500 simulation steps to keep the system busy.

## Robustness of the system

The second experiment (EXP2) is a robustness experiment designed for the TAs to show their performances over a period of 30’000 simulation steps. The system starts with a foraging demand of 25 and both the nest processing demand and the cleaning demand set to 0 (Note de bas de page 1:). Then, the demand for the foraging task increases by 7 (instead of 5 previously) for every 500 simulation timestep. Tests have proven that using 7 over 5 keeps the system busy at its max capacity for the whole period, whereas 5 usually keeps the system in a lazy state, with more or less half of the workers busy on average, over the whole period.

## Adaptive change in workforce

The last experiment (EXP3) tests the scalability, robustness, and adaptability of the system. The experiment consists of removing a class of workers at a given timestep, and re-introduce it later on. The system starts with a foraging demand of 25 (Note de bas de page 1:), and this time both an increase in the foraging demand of 5 and 7 is used for the test.

The class of workers being removed is the nest processors, [explain why]. The class is removed at the 20’000 simulation step for the system to have enough time to start and stabilized itself. Then, the class of workers is re-introduced at the 40’000 simulation step and the simulation stops at the 60’000 simulation step. During the time the class of workers is gone and soon after the class is re-introduced, adaptability in the current environment is expected to be observed.

Note de bas de page 1: Since the AITA and DAITA systems make use of idle states, one could think it is unfair to start the system with a foraging demand of 25 as for a simulation of 40 robots, 15 of them would be inactive at the start compared to 0 for PSI, GTA and RND (since none of them uses idle robots). However, and as will be visible in the result section, even though the system partially starts inactive, it quickly becomes busy resulting in all robots being requested for work, keeping the experiment fair and accurate.

## Scalability of the system MORE?

To observe the scalability of the system, both AITA and DAITA are running each of the experiments with 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 robots.

## Robustness of the system MORE?

To demonstrate the robustness of the system, noise in the communication has been introduced in the system, see section “noise”.

## Communication

The experiments on communication, or EXPS, are meant to observe the robustness and the possible flaw of a system based on distributed communication. The set of the experiment first consists of using the IR sensor of the Thymio-II to share the information among the individuals. This communication is directional and limited in its range, which is 14 cm on average. Then, the experiment assumes a communication device is placed on top of each Thymio-II and enables multidirectional communication (whether the robot receiving the communication is in front or behind does not matter as long as it is within the range). With this new communication device, range variating from NUMBER; NUMBER; NUMBER; are tested.

## Deroulement of the experiments ..

First, the bundle of experiments EXP1, EXP2, and EXP3, is performed to highlight the difference between the centralized version of the implemented algorithm, AITA, and the distributed one, DAITA, with the number of robots variating from 10, 20, 30, 40, to 50 robots. The goal is to demonstrate the possible flows in both systems and which performs the best given the environment and the experiments created for this project. Secondly, the set of experiments EXPS intends to demonstrate the reliability and robustness of the DAITA distributed communication system. Finally, each of the other algorithms, RND, GTA, and PSI run EXP1, EXP2, and EXP3 with 40 robots each time (experiments with the number of robots have shown that 40 is the number that best demonstrates the weaknesses and advantages of each system).

Each of these experiments is run 5 times and then averaged to give a more fair outcome compared to a single run. Running the experiments 5 times also enables the demonstration of the reliability of the implemented system as one can compare each run and see if the “deroulement” and outcome are approximately the same each time.

## Metrics

For me, robot that are not temp or core are considered as unassigned. But they are effectively assigned to a task, just waiting for the demand to raise to a level for which they would actually have to work

Explain EVERY metric that is being measured

[x]

## Results

* **Talk about task allocation, demand and how energy supply could’ve and could impact the result**
* As of now I have a lot of congestion in my system, maybe talk about how I could prevent it and cite “Task allocation pitonakova”
* I imagine it is going to be interesting to assess how many robot it needs for a set of task to be at an equilibrium
* Say that psi was not designed for such task, which will explain a lot of thinngngngnggs

**Discuss and experiment on lemmas and theorem of the task allocation model**

* I can also say (this paper does not intend to cover the proof established in the paper, but more to assess its efficiency though a set of experiments and comparisons to established and well tested models such as .. “

They made assumption that I need to verify and discuss

“How much robot does it take to have n task at equilibrium” “following lemma tatata .. let’s try and see” “it did not reach .. but if we do that .. the result are better .. blah blah blah”

“How much task can n robot whit stand”

*#! as of now, the task handler makes sure the robot is not assigned a new task if he carries a resource*

*#! obs: the robot are usually deposing resource in the middle but the maintenance only scan the edges (when no avoidance)*

*#! ob: when more demand than robot, no oscilliation*

*#! ob: when too much osc the robot struggles to complete a task because it is always pulled somewhere else.*

*# ? my tweak with the >=3 fixes it*

*#! obs: sometimes an ant nest processing can lose its task assignemnt by going outside the border and be replaced by another once.*

*#! that is the same issues as descibred line 276*

*#!obs: a robot with AITA will not change task unless its task's demand is satisfied first. even if the other task has hiiigh demand.*

*#!obs seems to bring a lot of congestion since they are all trying to go at the same place*

*#! sometimes the robot will be oscilliating between task and no task, the sensor will go outside the zone*

*#! > even though the robot did not intend to leave the area, but because outside HOME, the robot keeps its task.*

*#! > it varies between has\_to\_work and not has\_to\_work so when the sensors leave the area HOME the robot does not have to report*

*#! > and will keep its state ...*

*# ? but is what I did the best option now? (go\_and\_stay\_home)*

## Discussions

**Discuss possible variable and how they have impacted the task allocation model**

1. the paper proposes initial condition (such as no mouvement in task needs for a define amount of time) -> maybe I could propose stress test to relate to real life condition

For the conclusion

Maybe the greedy woul’dve perform worse with more task? Take the experiment from which I stole all the graphs idea because they were comparing GTA over 100 task and with other TAs and it was the worse

# Future work

**Possible improvements to the math model**

Given the exact implementation of the math model, the experiments have reach a certain result, but it could be changed so that ..

1. Every n step, re assign every robot with the current world state -> my take is that the distribution is going to be better
2. maybe the robots could "see" or "reassess" the needs when entering an area or something .. idk (even though it says that they would not try to assess how much energy can an ant give to a task as it makes the problem NP-complete)
3. maybe the gordon idea with the map could be tested as improvement (even though it says that they would not try to assess how much energy can an ant give to a task as it makes the problem NP-complete)
4. sometimes some ants are not even allocated .. maybe if all task have enough ants some idle should be attributed a random task=

Also the real-life implementation

Read payam’s email, I think she mention somewhere something that could potentially be future work

# Conclusion