

# Unifying and Certifying Top-Quality Planning Supplementary Material

**Primary Keywords:** (4) *Theory*;

**Definition 1** Let  $\Pi$  be some planning task,  $\mathcal{P}_\Pi$  be the set of its plans, and  $R$  be some relation over  $\mathcal{P}_\Pi$ . The dominance top-quality planning problem is defined as follows. Given a natural number  $q$ , find a set of plans  $P \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\Pi$  such that

1.  $\forall \pi \in P, \text{cost}(\pi) \leq q$ ,
2.  $\forall \pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \setminus P$  with  $\text{cost}(\pi') \leq q$ ,  $\exists \pi \in P$  such that  $(\pi, \pi') \in R$ , and
3.  $P$  is minimal under  $\subseteq$  among all  $P' \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\Pi$  for which conditions 1 and 2 hold.

**Theorem 1** The dominance top-quality planning problem for  $R_{\ell\ell}$  is the loopless top-quality planning problem.

**Proof:** Recall that  $(\pi, \pi') \in R_{\ell\ell}$  if and only if (a)  $\pi$  is a loopless plan and (b) if  $S'$  are the states traversed by  $\pi$ , then  $\pi'$  traverses some  $s \in S'$  more than once. Let  $P$  be a solution to the dominance top-quality planning problem for  $R_{\ell\ell}$ . Let  $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \setminus P$  be a plan with a loop such that  $\text{cost}(\pi') \leq q$  and let  $\pi$  be some plan such that  $\text{cost}(\pi) \leq q$  and  $(\pi, \pi') \in R_{\ell\ell}$ . Such a plan  $\pi$  always exists and can be obtained from  $\pi'$  by removing loops. Condition 2 of Definition 1 allows  $\pi'$  not to be in  $P$  and therefore condition 3 will ensure that  $\pi' \notin P$ . Together with condition 1 this gives us that  $P$  does not include plans with loops.

For a plan  $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi^{\ell\ell}$  with  $\text{cost}(\pi') \leq q$ , assume to the contrary that  $\pi' \notin P$ . Then, from condition 2 we have that there exists  $\pi \in P$  such that  $(\pi, \pi') \in R_{\ell\ell}$ . That implies that there exists a state  $s$  that the plan  $\pi'$  traverses more than once, contradicting  $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi^{\ell\ell}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3** If  $P$  is a solution to the dominance top-quality planning problem, then  $\bar{P}$  is a solution to the top-quality planning problem.

**Proof:** To show that  $\bar{P}$  is a solution to the top-quality planning problem, we need to show that (i)  $\forall \pi \in \bar{P}$ , we have  $\text{cost}(\pi) \leq q$ , and (ii)  $\forall \pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \setminus \bar{P}$ , we have  $\text{cost}(\pi) > q$ .

For (i), since  $\bar{P} := P \cup \bigcup_{\pi \in P} \{\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \mid \text{cost}(\pi') \leq q, (\pi, \pi') \in R\}$ , we have the condition holds due to the first condition of Definition 1 for  $P$ .

For (ii), if  $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \setminus \bar{P}$ , then  $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}_\Pi \setminus P$ . Assume to the contrary that  $\text{cost}(\pi') \leq q$ . Then, from the second condition of Definition 1 for  $P$ , there exists a plan  $\pi \in P$  such that  $(\pi, \pi') \in R$ . But then, by the definition of  $\bar{P}$  we have  $\pi' \in \bar{P}$ , giving us a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 5** Let  $\Pi$  be a planning task,  $\pi$  be its plan and  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$  be the loopless transformation under  $\pi$ . Then  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$  forbids exactly  $\pi$  and all plans dominated by  $\pi$ .

**Proof:** The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2 of Katz et al. (2018). Let  $r : \mathcal{O}' \mapsto \mathcal{O}$  be the mapping of action copies back to the original action:  $r(o_i^f) = r(\bar{o}_i) = r(o_i^e) = r(\bar{o}') = r(\bar{o}) = r(\bar{o}_i^e) = r(\bar{o}) = r(\bar{o}') = r(\bar{o}_i) = o$ . Note that  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$  restricted to the variables  $\mathcal{V}$  equals to the task  $\Pi$ , modulo the copies of the actions split into the cases of reaching one of the states  $s_i$  or none of them. Thus, for each plan  $\pi'$  for  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$ ,  $r(\pi')$  is a plan for  $\Pi$ .

For the other direction, for each  $o \in \pi$  at most one of the action copies is applicable in each state. So, every applicable in  $s_0$  sequence of actions  $\rho$  in  $\Pi$  can be uniquely mapped into a sequence  $r^{-1}(\rho)$  of  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$ . Observe that  $\pi = \langle o_1 \dots o_n \rangle$  is mapped to  $\langle o_1^f \dots o_n^f \rangle$ , which leads to a state where  $\langle \bar{v}^d, F \rangle$  and therefore not a goal state. Looking now at a plan  $\pi'$  such that  $(\pi, \pi') \in R_{\ell\ell}$ , reaching some state  $s_i$  on  $\pi$  at least twice. When the action that reaches  $s_i$  for the second time (either  $o_i^e$  or  $\bar{o}_i^e$ ) is applied in  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$ , the value  $\langle \bar{v}^e, T \rangle$  is reached and cannot be changed by any action. Therefore the corresponding sequence of actions is not a plan for  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$ .

Let  $\pi' \neq \pi$  some plan for  $\Pi$  such that  $(\pi, \pi') \notin R_{\ell\ell}$  and let  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  be the corresponding applicable sequences of actions in  $\Pi_\pi^{\ell\ell}$ . Let  $o$  be the first action where  $\pi'$  diverges from  $\pi$ . Then, the corresponding to  $o$  action in  $\rho'$  is one of  $\{\bar{o}_i, \bar{o}, \bar{o}', \bar{o}_i^e, \bar{o}, \bar{o}'\}$  and achieves  $\langle \bar{v}^d, T \rangle$ . The value of  $\bar{v}^d$  is never changed anymore, since there are no actions that achieve  $\langle \bar{v}^d, F \rangle$ . Since  $\pi'$  does not reach any of the states  $s_0, \dots, s_n$  more than once, none of the copies of the actions in  $\rho'$  are  $o_i^e$  or  $\bar{o}_i^e$ , which are the only copies that achieve  $\langle \bar{v}^e, T \rangle$ . Therefore, at the end of the execution of  $\rho'$  we have  $\langle \bar{v}^e, F \rangle$ . Since all the effects on the original variables are preserved precisely, we get that  $\rho'$  achieves a goal state and therefore a plan.  $\square$

## References

Katz, M.; Sohrabi, S.; Udrea, O.; and Winterer, D. 2018. A Novel Iterative Approach to Top-k Planning. In de Weerd, M.; Koenig, S.; Röger, G.; and Spaan, M., eds., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS 2018)*, 132–140. AAAI Press.