
Article

Implementation of Path Planning for Robotic Aquaculture Monitoring

Anthony Davis ^{1,*}, Paul S. Wills ¹, James E. Garvey ², William Fairman ¹, Md Arshadul Karim ^{1,*}, and Bing Ouyang ^{1,*}

¹ Harbor Branch Oceanic Institute, Florida Atlantic University, 5600 US 1 North, Fort Pierce, FL 34946, USA

² Center For Fisheries, Aquaculture, And Aquatic Sciences, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901, USA

* Correspondence: anthonydavis2020@fau.edu (A.D.); BOuyang@fau.edu (B.O.)

Abstract: Marine food chains are highly stressed by aggressive fishing practices and environmental damage. Aquaculture has increasingly become a source of seafood which spares the deleterious impact to wild fisheries. However, continually monitoring water quality to successfully grow and harvest fish is labor intensive. The Hybrid Aerial Underwater Robotic System (HAUCS) is a swarm of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and underwater measurement devices designed to collect water quality data of aquaculture ponds. Three methods of path planning for the UAVs are simulated and experimentally verified at Southern Illinois University’s aquaculture research center to demonstrate the feasibility of HAUCS.

Keywords: aquaculture; robotics; monitoring; machine learning; path planning; vehicle routing problem; drones

1. Introduction

Global fish stocks in every ocean have been declining for decades primarily due to overfishing [1,2]. Changes in the marine environment from human pollution have also brought about further reductions of fish populations and the bioaccumulation of pollutants such as heavy metals in wild fish [3,4]. Since 1990, fish consumption has doubled while capture fishery production has remained constant. The rising demand has been met by the explosive growth of aquaculture, which has grown exponentially over the last few decades, producing more fish than capture fisheries for the first time in 2012 [5].

Aquaculture is a labor intensive activity, with the most burdensome task being maintaining appropriate water quality levels. Of particular importance is the level of dissolved oxygen (DO), which, if mismanaged, will result in the sudden collapse of a fish pond. Fish farmers typically measure DO by attaching a sensor to a vehicle which is manually driven to each pond. This process is repeated multiple times a day, and is particularly important to measure at night when DO levels typically drop due to the lack of photosynthesis and subsequent plant respiration. Because DO measurement is a repetitive and relatively simple task, it is a prime target for automation.

Much advancement has been made toward the use of AI and drones to help manage production and maintenance on aquaculture farms. Besides monitoring water quality levels, methods have been proposed to automate activities such as fish counting, fish length estimation, and facility surveillance [6,7]. Two distinct approaches have been used to approach the problem of automating the task of monitoring DO levels. The first approach consists of using stationary DO sensors, wireless communications and a power source installed into each pond [8–10] to constantly monitor water quality levels. While this type of solution does reduce labor costs, equipment and installation costs do not scale well for industrial sized farms which have thousands of ponds. Additionally, sensors which remain

Citation: Davis, A.; Wills, P. S.; Garvey, J.; Fairman, W.; M. A. Karim; Ouyang, B. Title. *Appl. Sci.* **2022**, *1*, 0. <https://doi.org/>

Received:

Accepted:

Published:

Publisher’s Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Submitted to *Appl. Sci.* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).




Figure 1. Top Left: SwellPro Splashdrone 4 with orange payload visible underneath. **Top Right:** Side view with the winch release mechanism and radio housing in black. **Bottom Left:** Underside with the orange winch drum visible. **Bottom Right:** Payload which contains BLE transmitter and DO, temperature and pressure sensors.

in water will biofoul if they are not regularly maintained. These hardware and maintenance requirements will detract from the goal of reducing overall costs.

The other type of approach to automatically monitor DO levels involves the design of sensor packages [11,12] and vehicles [13,14] to travel between ponds on a regular basis to collect their water quality data. This reduces the maintenance burden and eliminates the need to install sensors for each pond. Remote sensing techniques have also been proposed to predict DO levels using multispectral images of the pond surface [15]. While remote sensing would greatly simplify the task for the drones, it introduces the risk of poorly predicting the DO due to the unknown level of oxygenation beneath the surface.

The research into this second approach of using autonomous vehicle mounted sensors works has demonstrated that DO measurement using drones is feasible, but it has not yet demonstrated the ability to automate their data collection. Our proposed solution is the Hybrid Aerial Underwater Robotic System (HAUCS) [16,17]. In this system, DO sensors and radio modules are installed on a set of drones which are programmed to fly and land in each pond using GPS to take measurements before returning to be recharged. The drones conduct a direct, multi-depth measurement of DO to gain a full understanding of the state of each pond.

The routing of the drones in a safe and efficient manner is not trivial. Multi-robot navigation is a well studied topic of research, with many differing constraints and requirements [18,19]. Devising the path for each drone is an example of the Vehicle Routing Problem




Figure 2. **Left:** America's Catch Catfish Farm with approximately 700 ponds. **Right:** Example of 300 pond simulated aquaculture distribution. Adapted from [29].

(VRP), a generalization of the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP). In the VRP, a group of vehicles must visit each node of a graph with the minimal longest route. This ensures the most equal distribution of distance required to be traveled by each drone, which will allow the fewest possible of drones needed to adequately monitor the farm. Considerable research has been invested in TSP, VRP and its numerous variants [20–22], and as a result many solutions to this routing problem are available. More specifically, this environment is an example of Distance Constrained VRP (DVRP) due to the limiting factor being the range of the drones.

Most VRP research consists of node graphs which are highly idealized. While most studies focus on randomly generated node locations with 100 nodes or less, the reality of aquaculture farms is they may have up to thousands of ponds. Aquaculture farms also dig their ponds in a regular, grid-like manner which would facilitate repetitive paths. There are relatively few VRP methods which are intended for calculating routes for more than 100 nodes [23,24], and fewer methods for calculating paths in a grid space [25,26]. Another factor to consider is the drones will be required to fly in inclement weather. The impact of wind on their path planning may be highly significant, yet there is very little research regarding its impact on drone path planning [27,28]. These unique conditions require special consideration that are not sufficiently studied in the literature.

To create a realistic distribution of fish ponds, an algorithm was devised using some basic assumptions of how a typical fish farm is organized. First, a randomly generated convex polygon is created to replicate the farms available land and a grid of points is filled inside it. Then, 20% of the points are removed in order to replicate empty ponds and add additional variation. This creates a pattern of points which are not completely regular yet not completely random and is a reasonably accurate generalization of the spacial distribution of typical fish farms. Future work will consider the impact of wind by increasing the accumulated cost of traveling in upwind directions.

Our previous work investigated three different VRP approaches for this problem using these simulated fish farms [29]. These approaches were the Google Linear Optimization Package (GLOP) [30], Graph Attention Model (GAM) [31], and our heuristic solution, the HAUCS Path Planning algorithm (HPP). These methods were selected because they represent high performing methods with different approaches. GLOP is a linear optimization method, which computes the most optimal or nearly optimal solution for a set of node locations given certain linear relationships. GAM is a machine learning method which uses a transformer network with self attention to predict the next node to visit. Finally, HPP is a simple geometric heuristic that operates on the assumption that the nodes are evenly distributed, and so can be efficiently covered with a sensible back-and-forth pattern. Further details of the HPP implementation can be found in our previous works [29,32] The results for these three methods differed depending on the scale of the simulated farm. For small farms, which consist of 50 to 200 ponds, GLOP was the most efficient router with the lowest average maximum route length. For larger farms, which was simulated as 200



Figure 3. Southern Illinois University aquaculture research center. The takeoff location is marked with a green dot, all available ponds are marked with a blue dot.

ponds to 700 ponds, HPP provided the best routing. GLOP is not able to compute routes for farms that large due to the high computational complexity of the method, so the most optimal solutions cannot be found in a reasonable amount of time. While GAM was not able to outperform GLOP in small farms or HPP in large farms, it achieved comparable quality of results for large and small farms in a fraction of the time.

This work is intended to validate the conclusions derived from our simulations. We apply the three methods to ponds in the Southern Illinois University aquaculture research center and return a set of routes for each method. These routes are then loaded onto a set of three drones, and power measurements from the drones are recorded after they fly their missions to conduct their measurements.

2. Materials and Methods

The drones used to facilitate this study were the SwellPro Splashdrone 4. They are IP67 waterproof drones meant for hobbyist photography and aquatic activities which include waterproof connectors for payload, camera and gimbal controls. Three drones were used to conducted our experiment. The SwellPro Software Development Kit (SDK) was used as the interface between the path planning methods and the flight controllers. The custom flight control software used to transmit missions to the Splashdrones and the GLOP and HPP methods are available at <https://github.com/tonydavis629/HAUCS>.

Attached to the underside of the drone is a housing for communication equipment and the winch release mechanism, see figure 1. The winch holds the sensor payload which is released into the pond upon landing on the surface of the water down to a depth of 2 meters. The payload consists of a Seeed Studio XIAO nRF52840 Sense board which is used to send the sensor data wirelessly to an ESP32 Wifi LoRa V2 board contained in the winch mechanism, where it is then forwarded to an identical ESP32 board functioning as the base station. The base station receives the sensor data and uploads it to a Firebase instance to automatically update an android app with the water quality status of each pond, see figure 5.

A satellite image of the Southern Illinois University aquaculture research center is seen in figure 3. This facility has the capacity for 90 ponds, however at the time of testing only 26 ponds were safe to land in. Issues such as lack of water, excessive overgrowth, and power line obstacles prevented the use of 64 ponds. These 26 available ponds were loaded into the three path planning methods: GLOP, GAM and HPP.




Figure 4. Routes for each path planning method, from left to right: GLOP, GAM, HPP. The black square signifies the launch point. Plotted with tools from [31].

3. Results

The GPS coordinates of each of the ponds were recorded and normalized between 0 and 1 in order to facilitate the computation of the routes. These normalized list of coordinates were input into each of the three path planning methods, the output of each being three lists of coordinates representing the ponds to be visited by each drone. These three routes were then loaded into the drones for autonomous flight testing. During the flight, GPS, battery and temperature data were recorded. The routes for each method are simulated and visualized in figure 4.

3.1. Simulation Data

For each path planning method, the simulated distance is calculated as a means to estimate the relative energy draw and time required from each drone, see table 1. As expected by the results of our previous study, GLOP and GAM are comparatively efficient and HPP produces significantly longer routes. HPP works on the assumption that the ponds are evenly distributed, which was not valid for our tests because only a small number of ponds were used. As a result, HPP is not effective for this situation. If all 90 ponds were available, it would be expected to be comparatively optimal to the others, while also allowing for better air space deconfliction and requiring minimal computation.

Table 1. Simulated Distance

Method	Drone 1	Drone 2	Drone 3	Total	Average
GLOP	1.91	1.87	1.91	5.70	1.90
GAM	2.35	1.64	1.73	5.72	1.91
HPP	2.9	1.73	3.01	7.64	2.55

3.2. Flight Data

Power data from the flights were recorded using the Splashdrone's flight recorder in order to validate the simulated power draw of each method. DO, temperature, and pressure data were not recorded as they were not the focus of this experiment. Tables 2, 3 and 4 shows similar results to the simulated data. GLOP is slightly more optimal than GAM, which are both significantly more efficient than HPP. In terms of power draw, GLOP and GAM were not significantly different. These results give validation to the assumption that using calculated horizontal distance is a good proxy for power consumption, and our simulations can give a good approximation of the range requirements for drones in HAUCS. This assumption may not hold for situations such as high winds or farms with significant changes in elevation.




Figure 5. Android app displaying water quality readings sent by the drone

Table 2. Flight Time (seconds)

Method	Drone 1	Drone 2	Drone 3	Total	Average
GLOP	586	621	448	1655	552
GAM	689	517	586	1792	597
HPP	863	426	862	2151	717

Table 3. Battery Drain (mAh)

Method	Drone 1	Drone 2	Drone 3	Total	Average
GLOP	1518	1716	1848	5082	1694
GAM	1914	1584	1650	5148	1716
HPP	2442	1254	2442	6138	2046

Table 4. Battery Drain (%)

Method	Drone 1	Drone 2	Drone 3	Total	Average
GLOP	23	26	28	77	26
GAM	29	24	25	78	26
HPP	37	19	37	93	31

3.3. Issues

A number of hardware and software failures were experienced during the automated flight tests. The Splashdrone is designed to reach desired altitude relative to the take off location, not an absolute above sea level altitude. This causes issues when the elevation of the ponds are significantly different because the drone will reach inconsistent altitudes when traveling between the ponds. This is not only a problem for air space deconfliction, but it requires that the drone's altitude be set according to the maximum difference in elevation of its ponds. This is not ideal from a battery or safety perspective, and supports the use of a flight controller which can be programmed to take off to a specified sea level altitude. This way, the drones can be assigned to certain altitudes to avoid the possibility of in-air collisions. Using an above ground level altitude assigned may also work and

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

reduce the amount of altitude required to keep air space deconflicted, but introduces greater complexity as the drones would be changing altitude between ponds.

Towards the end of our testing, one of the drones leaked during a pond landing and was subsequently water damaged. This is a critical concern for HAUCS, as the drones will be expected to work robustly without leaks on a regular basis. This particular drone had crashed earlier during testing, so it is likely the damage from that crash caused a fault in a seal or a crack in the body. Future iterations of HAUCS will require great care in the design of the drone body to ensure the testability of a water tight seal in the event of a crash and as a matter of regular maintenance.

Another failure occurred which resulted in the drone directing itself off course and into the tree line, which was likely caused by a failure of the onboard GPS. High accuracy GPS is not required, but high reliability is, especially due to the risk of crashing during automated flights. A potential solution to this would be redundant onboard GPS modules, which would likely be worth the added expense due to the importance of the GPS modules in this system. Object avoidance measures such as radar or vision would also be a possible solution, however they may also significantly increase expense, weight, and complexity.

4. Discussion

These initial results validate the use of drones as a means to monitor water quality levels in an aquaculture environment. With simple software and off the shelf hardware, precalculated missions can be sent to drones which dutifully execute and send data to a cloud service for real time monitoring. This system has the potential to reduce prices of farmed fish and address the labor shortage in the North American aquaculture industry.

Significant work is still required before HAUCS is ready for commercialization. Reliability and robustness of the automated flights is of the utmost importance, and as demonstrated by our system failures, it is still a work in progress. Lightweight object avoidance systems for UAVs do exist [33,34], and may need to be implemented for safety and reliability. However, additional testing is required to verify if GPS guided flight can function reliably for aquaculture monitoring.

Extrapolating from the data collected for these 26 ponds, estimations for drone range capacity requirements can now be made for other farms. Considering that measuring 9 ponds took approximately 26% battery capacity, all 90 ponds of the SIU aquaculture center could reliably be measured by 3-5 Splashdrones. Additional data will need to be collected from other facilities to give a better picture of the range requirements in general, as different farms will have different sized ponds with different distances between them.

Additional testing will also be necessary to further validate the three path planning methods. As was expected, GLOP and GAM perform nearly identically for small farms. Testing HPP on a large farm could validate its use as a large scale path planning algorithm for aquaculture monitoring. Most commercial farms are indeed much larger than the SIU facilities, so its validation would be highly valuable.

Inclement conditions such as wind and rain provide an additional complication for HAUCS, as fish ponds need to be monitored particularly closely in these conditions due to the unpredictable effect of harsh weather on DO and the fact that flights may be inhibited or grounded. High winds may make certain routes more inefficient if they involved traveling upwind unnecessarily. Factoring in the wind by increasing the simulated cost or distance in the upwind direction may be needed to fly efficiently in windy regions. Path plans may also need to be reconstructed on the fly due to changes in conditions or hardware failures. Real time monitoring and flight adjustment will be required of HAUCS to operate in all conditions, as will proper user notification in the event that flights cannot be conducted. Programming a type of automatic emergency response system will be necessary in the event of sudden and unexpected weather. Such a response may consist of the use of protective waypoints for drones to take shelter temporarily without the need to return to the home station.



Figure 6. Splashdrone landing in a pond

5. Conclusions

The Hybrid Aerial and Underwater Robotic System is a promising direction for reducing labor costs in aquaculture farms. The concept has been experimentally validated for its potential, but requires significant improvement before commercialization. Additional testing must be completed on larger farms to confirm the expected performance of the HPP method as well as to collect data on varied aquaculture environments. Drones which are equipped with accurate above sea level altitude instruments and some means of object avoidance should be used in future tests in order to address problems which were identified in this study. Flights in windy and rainy conditions pose an especially difficult problem due to the elevated need for water measurements and the danger of flying in inclement weather.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, B.O. and P.S.W.; data curation, A.D.; software, A.D., W.F., A.K., B.O.; investigation, A.D., W.F., A.K., B.O. and P.S.W.; writing, A.D.; review and editing, B.O.; supervision, B.O. and P.S.W.; funding acquisition, B.O. and P.S.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture through the National Robotics Initiative 2.0: Ubiquitous Collaborative Robots program (NRI-2.0), under Grant 2019-67022-29204 and Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute Foundation Summer Internship.

Data Availability Statement: Collected data can be found at <https://github.com/tonydavis629/HAUCS>

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to acknowledge the students and staff of SIU for their assistance during our testing.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Palomares, M.; Froese, R.; Derrick, B.; Meeuwig, J.; Nöel, S.L.; Tsui, G.; Woroniak, J.; Zeller, D.; Pauly, D. Fishery biomass trends of exploited fish populations in marine ecoregions, climatic zones and ocean basins. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **2020**, *243*, 106896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2020.106896>.
2. Srinivasan, U.T.; Watson, R.; Rashid Sumaila, U. Global fisheries losses at the exclusive economic zone level, 1950 to present. *Marine Policy* **2012**, *36*, 544–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2011.10.001>.
3. Affandi, F.A.; Ishak, M.Y. Impacts of suspended sediment and metal pollution from mining activities on riverine fish population—a review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **2019**, *26*, 16939–16951. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05137-7>.
4. Zeitoun, M.M.; Mehana, E.S.E. Impact of Water Pollution with Heavy Metals on Fish Health: Overview and Updates **2014**. p. 14.

5. Ritchie, H.; Roser, M. Biodiversity. *Our World in Data* **2021**. 251
6. Ubina, N.A.; Cheng, S.C.; Chen, H.Y.; Chang, C.C.; Lan, H.Y. A Visual Aquaculture System Using a Cloud-Based Autonomous Drones. *Drones* **2021**, *5*, 109. <https://doi.org/10.3390/drones5040109>. 252
7. Ubina, N.A.; Cheng, S.C. A Review of Unmanned System Technologies with Its Application to Aquaculture Farm Monitoring and Management. *Drones* **2022**, *6*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/drones6010012>. 253
8. Shaghaghi, N.; Nguyen, T.; Patel, J.; Soriano, A.; Mayer, J. DOxy: Dissolved Oxygen Monitoring. In Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE Global Humanitarian Technology Conference (GHTC); IEEE: Seattle, WA, USA, 2020; pp. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/GHTC46280.2020.9342916>. 255
9. Harun, Z.; Reda, E.; Hashim, H. Real time fish pond monitoring and automation using Arduino. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* **2018**, *340*, 012014. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/340/1/012014>. 259
10. Sung, W.T.; Chen, J.H.; Wang, H.C. Remote fish aquaculture monitoring system based on wireless transmission technology. In Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Information Science, Electronics and Electrical Engineering; IEEE: Sapporo, Japan, 2014; pp. 540–544. <https://doi.org/10.1109/InfoSEEE.2014.6948171>. 261
11. Yao, D.; Cheng, L.; Wu, Q.; Zhang, G.; Wu, B.; He, Y. Assessment and prediction of fishery water quality using electrochemical sensor array carried by UAV. In Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Symposium on Olfaction and Electronic Nose (ISOEN); IEEE: Fukuoka, Japan, 2019; pp. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISOEN.2019.8823406>. 264
12. Koparan, C.; Koc, A.B.; Privette, C.V.; Sawyer, C.B. Adaptive Water Sampling Device for Aerial Robots. *Drones* **2020**, *4*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3390/drones4010005>. 266
13. Kumagai, M.; Ura, T.; Kuroda, Y.; Walker, R. New AUV designed for lake environment monitoring. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 2000 International Symposium on Underwater Technology (Cat. No.00EX418); IEEE: Tokyo, Japan, 2000; pp. 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UT.2000.852519>. 271
14. Esakkir, B.; Ganesan, S.; Mathiyazhagan, S.; Ramasubramanian, K.; Gnanasekaran, B.; Son, B.; Park, S.W.; Choi, J.S. Design of Amphibious Vehicle for Unmanned Mission in Water Quality Monitoring Using Internet of Things. *Sensors* **2018**, *18*, 3318. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s18103318>. 274
15. Wang, L.; Yue, X.; Wang, H.; Ling, K.; Liu, Y.; Wang, J.; Hong, J.; Pen, W.; Song, H. Dynamic Inversion of Inland Aquaculture Water Quality Based on UAVs-WSN Spectral Analysis. *Remote Sensing* **2020**, *12*, 402. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12030402>. 275
16. Den Ouden, C.J.; Wills, P.S.; Lopes, L.; Sanderson, J.; Ouyang, B. Evolution of the Hybrid Aerial Underwater Robotic System (HAUCS) for Aquaculture: Sensor Payload and Extension Development. *Vehicles* **2022**, *4*, 390–408. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vehicles4020023>. 278
17. Ouyang, B.; Wills, P.S.; Tang, Y.; Hallstrom, J.O.; Su, T.C.; Namuduri, K.; Mukherjee, S.; Rodriguez-Labra, J.I.; Li, Y.; Den Ouden, C.J. Initial Development of the Hybrid Aerial Underwater Robotic System (HAUCS): Internet of Things (IoT) for Aquaculture Farms. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* **2021**, *8*, 14013–14027. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2021.3068571>. 281
18. Sun, G.; Zhou, R.; Di, B.; Dong, Z.; Wang, Y. A Novel Cooperative Path Planning for Multi-robot Persistent Coverage with Obstacles and Coverage Period Constraints. *Sensors* **2019**, *19*, 1994. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19091994>. 283
19. Alam, T.; Bobadilla, L. Multi-Robot Coverage and Persistent Monitoring in Sensing-Constrained Environments. *Robotics* **2020**, *9*, 47. <https://doi.org/10.3390/robotics9020047>. 285
20. Kumar, S.N.; Panneerselvam, R. A Survey on the Vehicle Routing Problem and Its Variants. *Intelligent Information Management* **2012**, *04*, 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.4236/iim.2012.43010>. 287
21. Erdelić, T.; Carić, T. A Survey on the Electric Vehicle Routing Problem: Variants and Solution Approaches. *Journal of Advanced Transportation* **2019**, *2019*, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5075671>. 289
22. Cheikhrouhou, O.; Khoufi, I. A comprehensive survey on the Multiple Traveling Salesman Problem: Applications, approaches and taxonomy. *Computer Science Review* **2021**, *40*, 100369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2021.100369>. 291
23. Rojas Viloria, D.; Solano-Charris, E.L.; Muñoz-Villamizar, A.; Montoya-Torres, J.R. Unmanned aerial vehicles/drones in vehicle routing problems: a literature review. *International Transactions in Operational Research* **2021**, *28*, 1626–1657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.12783>. 294
24. Braekers, K.; Ramaekers, K.; Van Nieuwenhuyse, I. The vehicle routing problem: State of the art classification and review. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* **2016**, *99*, 300–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2015.12.007>. 296
25. Hongyun, L.; Xiao, J.; Hehua, J. Multi-goal path planning algorithm for mobile robots in grid space. In Proceedings of the 2013 25th Chinese Control and Decision Conference (CCDC); IEEE: Guiyang, China, 2013; pp. 2872–2876. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CCDC.2013.6561435>. 298
26. Daniel, K.; Nash, A.; Koenig, S.; Felner, A. Theta*: Any-Angle Path Planning on Grids. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **2010**, *39*, 533–579. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.2994>. 301
27. Luo, H.; Liang, Z.; Zhu, M.; Hu, X.; Wang, G. Integrated optimization of unmanned aerial vehicle task allocation and path planning under steady wind. *PLOS ONE* **2018**, *13*, e0194690. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194690>. 303
28. Ito, S.; Akaiwa, K.; Funabashi, Y.; Nishikawa, H.; Kong, X.; Taniguchi, I.; Tomiyama, H. Load and Wind Aware Routing of Delivery Drones. *Drones* **2022**, *6*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.3390/drones6020050>. 305
29. Davis, A.; Mukherjee, S.; Wills, P.S.; Ouyang, B. Path planning algorithms for robotic aquaculture monitoring. In Proceedings of the Big Data IV: Learning, Analytics, and Applications; SPIE: Orlando, United States, 2022; p. 26. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2618783>. 307
30. Vehicle Routing Problem | OR-Tools | Google Developers. 309

31. Kool, W.; van Hoof, H.; Welling, M. Attention, Learn to Solve Routing Problems!. 2019. arXiv:1803.08475 [cs, stat]. 310
32. Mukherjee, S.; Ouyang, B.; Namuduri, K.; Wills, P.S. Multi-Agent Systems (MAS) related data analytics in the Hybrid Aerial Underwater Robotic System (HAUCS). In Proceedings of the Big Data III: Learning, Analytics, and Applications; Ahmad, F.; Markopoulos, P.P.; Ouyang, B., Eds.; SPIE: Online Only, United States, 2021; p. 13. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2588710>. 311
33. Uddin, M.S. Low Cost Lightweight Obstacle Detection System for Micro Aerial Vehicles. In Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE 6th International Conference on Engineering Technologies and Applied Sciences (ICETAS); IEEE: Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 2019; pp. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICETAS48360.2019.9117303>. 312
34. Saha, S.; Natraj, A.; Waharte, S. A real-time monocular vision-based frontal obstacle detection and avoidance for low cost UAVs in GPS denied environment. In Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE International Conference on Aerospace Electronics and Remote Sensing Technology; IEEE: Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 2014; pp. 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICARES.2014.7024382>. 313