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Abstract
The International Planning Competition (IPC) in 2020 was the first one for a long time to host tracks on Hierarchical Task Network (HTN) planning. HYPERTENSION, the winner of the track on totally-ordered problems, comes with an interesting technique: it stores parts of the decomposition path in the state to mark expanded tasks and forces its depth first search to leave recursive structures in the hierarchy. This can be seen as a form of loop detection (LD) – a technique that is not very common in HTN planning. This might be due to the spirit of encoding enough advice in the model to find plans (so that loop detection is simply not necessary), or because it becomes a computationally hard task in the general (i.e. partially-ordered) setting. We integrated several approximate and exact techniques for LD into the progress search of the HTN planner PANDA. We test our techniques on the benchmark set of the IPC 2020. Both in the partial ordered and total ordered track, PANDA with LD performs better than the respective winner of the competition.

Introduction
The International Planning Competition (IPC) in 2020 was the first for a long time to host tracks on Hierarchical Task Network (HTN) planning (Erol, Hendler, and Nau 1996; Bercher, Alford, and Höller 2019): one for the full formalism, and one where decomposition methods need to be totally-ordered (TO) HTN planning. HYPERTENSION (Magnaguagno, Meneguzzi, and de Silva 2021), the winner of the TO track, comes with an interesting technique: it memorizes some of the applied decompositions in newly added state features. Based on this book-keeping, HYPERTENSION forces its depth first search to leave recursive decomposition structures that otherwise may lead to infinite loops by forbidding decompositions of tasks that occur a second time during the decomposition process. This can be seen as a limited form of loop detection (LD). It is limited since it can only detect loops in a single decomposition path.

A detection is impossible if two different paths lead to isomorphic task networks. Further, the specific technique used by HYPERTENSION renders its search incomplete (though this seems not to be a problem on the IPC benchmark set) as it does not consider changes in the original state variables.

LD is not commonly used in HTN planning. This might be due to the spirit of encoding enough advice into the model to find plans (making LD unnecessary), or because it becomes a hard to solve task in the general, i.e. partially-ordered (PO), setting. For loop detection, it is not sufficient to only consider states, but one also has to take the tasks in the current task network and their ordering relations into account. This makes LD in general as hard as Graph Isomorphism (Behnke, Höller, and Biundo 2015).

We investigate the effect of loop detection on the heuristic progression search of the HTN planner PANDA (Höller et al. 2018, 2019, 2020; Höller, Bercher, and Behnke 2020). We propose several (exact and approximate) LD techniques and evaluate them on the benchmark sets of the IPC 2020. Our techniques increase the performance of PANDA in both tracks. In the PO setting, the base PANDA already solves more instances than the IPC’s winner, but loop detection further increases coverage and IPC score. In the TO setting, the base PANDA performs worse than the runner-up of the IPC and better than the winner when using loop detection.

Formal Framework
We use the HTN formalism introduced by Geier and Bercher (2011). In HTN planning, we have two types of tasks. Let A be the set of actions (primitive tasks) and C the set of abstract (also called compound tasks). The environment is described using a set of propositional state symbols F. A state s is defined by a subset of F that holds in it (i.e. s ∈ 2F). Propositions not in s are supposed to be false. The functions prec, add, and del map actions to their preconditions, add-, and delete-effects. All are defined as f : A → 2F. An action a is applicable in a state s if and only if prec(a) ⊆ s. The state s′ resulting from the application of a is defined as s′ = γ(a, s) = (s \ del(a)) ∪ add(a). A sequence of actions a1a2...an is applicable in a state s0 if for 1 ≤ i ≤ n, ai is applicable in si−1 with si = γ(ai, si−1).

Tasks are maintained in Task Networks (TNs), which are partially-ordered multi-sets of tasks. A TN is defined by a triple (T, α, ∗), where T is a set of task identifiers, α a function mapping the task ids to tasks α : T → A ∪ C, and ∗ a partial order on T. Abstract tasks are decomposed using a set of decomposition methods M. A method is a pair (c, tn) where c is an abstract task that defines which task can be decomposed by the method, and tn a TN defining
its subtasks. When a method is applied to an abstract task \( c \) in a TN, \( c \) is deleted from the network, the subtasks of the method are added, and inherit the ordering relations of \( c \) with respect to other task in the network. A method \( m = (c, tn) \) decomposes a TN \( tn_1 = (T_1, \prec_1, \alpha_1) \) including a task \( t \in T_1 \) with \( \alpha_1(t) = c \) into a TN \( tn_2 \) defined as follows. Let \( tn' = (T', \prec', \alpha') \) be a TN that is equal to \( tn \) but using ids not contained in the decomposed network (i.e. \( T_1 \cap T' = \emptyset \)).

\[
\begin{align*}
tn_2 &= \{(T_1 \setminus \{t\}) \cup T', \prec' \cup \prec_1, (\alpha_1 \setminus \{t \rightarrow c\}) \cup \alpha' \} \\
\prec_D &= \{(t_1, t_2) \mid (t_1, t) \in \prec_1, t \in T', (t, t_2) \in \prec' \} \\
& \cup \\
& \{(t_1, t_2) \mid (t_1, t_2) \in \prec_1, t_1 \not\in T', t_2 \not\in T' \}
\end{align*}
\]

When \( tn_1 \) can be decomposed into \( tn_2 \) by using 0 or more (sequential) method applications, we write \( tn_1 \rightarrow^* tn_2 \).

An HTN planning problem is defined as \( P = (F, C, A, M, s_0, tn_1, prec, add, del) \). The two elements \( s_0 \) and \( tn_1 \) define the initial state (i.e. \( s_0 \in 2^F \)) and the initial TN. A solution to the problem is a TN \( tn = (T, \alpha, \prec) \) with:

- \( tn_1 \rightarrow^* tn \), i.e. it can be obtained by decomposing the initial task network.
- \( \forall t \in T : \alpha(t) \in A \), i.e. all tasks are primitive.
- There is a sequence \( t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n \) of all task identifiers in \( T \) that satisfies the ordering relation \( \prec \) such that \( \alpha(t_1) \alpha(t_2) \ldots \alpha(t_n) \) is applicable in \( s_0 \).

An HTN planning problem is called totally-ordered if and only if the ordering relations of the subtasks of all methods and in \( tn_1 \) are total, i.e. the orderings are linear paths.

There are mainly two search techniques in HTN planning. In progression search, only tasks of a TN without predecessors in the ordering relation are processed, i.e., decomposed in case of abstract tasks, or applied, in case of primitive tasks. Other systems are closer to the definition given above: search nodes contain a TN and a set of causal links and (additional) ordering relations. These systems search flaw-based like POCL planners in classical planning.

### Loop Detection in HTN Planning

As given before, our aim is to combine LD and heuristic progression search. Here, search nodes are stored in a fringe during search. We additionally used a visited list \( V \) to keep track of already seen nodes. Before adding a node to the fringe, we check whether it has been seen before, i.e. is in \( V \), and if so discard it. In progression search, a search node is a pair \((s, tn)\) of a state \( s \) and a task network \( tn \). For testing whether \((s, tn) \in V \), we have to compare states and TNs. We divide \( V \) into buckets \( V[s] \) s.t. all visited nodes with state \( s \) are in \( V[s] \). Access to the buckets is done via bit-wise XOR hashing on 64-bit unsigned integers followed by an exact comparison. We then have to decide for a given TN \( tn \) whether \( tn \in V[s] \). Since TNs differ in their ids, we have to check whether there is a TN in \( V[s] \) that is isomorphic to \( tn \).

**Definition 1.** Two TNs \( tn_1 = (T_1, \prec_1, \alpha_1) \) and \( tn_2 = (T_2, \prec_2, \alpha_2) \) are isomorphic if and only if there is a bijective function \( f : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \) such that \( \forall t, t' \in T_1 : (t, t') \in \prec_1 \iff (f(t), f(t')) \in \prec_2 \) and \( \alpha_1(t) = \alpha_2(f(t)) \).

The **Task Network Isomorphism Problem** is to decide whether two given TNs are isomorphic.

This is only the simplest and weakest definition. It could be extend to **dominance**, where the solutions that can be reached from one TNs are a strict superset of the other TNs. Consider two TNs that (1) are equal despite the ordering relations and (2) the ordering relations of one TN is a subset of that of the others. We can safely prune the more constrained one as any solution is still reachable through the other one. Determining even this simple type of ordering dominance is NP-complete (Behnke, Höller, and Biundo 2015). We have thus not looked into dominance pruning. Even the strict isomorphism problem is already as hard as Graph Isomorphism (GI) (Behnke, Höller, and Biundo 2015). Furthermore, we do not only have to do the comparison between two TNs, but check for a given TN \( tn_1 \) whether there exists a TN \( tn_2 \in V[s] \) such that \( tn_1 \) and \( tn_2 \) are isomorphic.

Given these difficulties, it is worthwhile to investigate (a) common special cases and (b) approximations for TN isomorphism. We consider only overapproximations, i.e., techniques that always identify isomorphism, but may also state that two TNs are isomorphic when they in fact are not. Using such a LD leads to an incomplete search, but can pay off in practice — provided the problem remains solvable.

We first discuss techniques for TOHTN planning and come to PO afterwards. Each section starts with the exact isomorphism test and gives approximations afterwards. All presented approximations render the search incomplete, i.e., only the exact tests result in a complete overall planner. However, in our evaluation we also include combinations of the presented techniques. They first use the approximate test and perform the exact one when nodes are identified as identical by the approximation. This works well in practice (especially in the PO setting, where the exact test is costly) and does not render the search incomplete.

### Total Order HTN Planning

**Exact Isomorphism** For TOHTN planning, the TN of every search node is a sequence of tasks \( S = \{t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \). Given such a sequence \( S \), we have to check whether \( V[s] \) contains \( S \). Currently, we use the `set` from the C++ Standard Template Library. This way, exactly testing whether \( S \in V[s] \) takes \( \mathcal{O}(|S| \cdot \log |V[s]|) \) time. By using a trie we could obtain \( \mathcal{O}(|A \cup C| \cdot |S|) \), which can be reduced by hashing and/or a balanced tree per node of the trie to \( \mathcal{O}(|A \cup C| \cdot \log |S|) \).

**Task Hash** With a growing number of search nodes, even this logarithmic test can become too expensive. To mitigate the issue, we have added a hashing step before testing whether \( S \in V[s] \), i.e. we again divide \( V[s] \) into hash buckets and test only the bucket into which \( S \) falls. Such a hashing function can also be used as an (over-)approximate isomorphism test, if we consider two TNs isomorphic if their hash is equal. Our first hashing method is called `taskhash`. It discards all ordering information from the TNs and computes a hash value that only incorporates information on which task is how often in a given TN. Let \( N = C \cup A \). Further, let \( \ell 2n : N \rightarrow \{0, \ldots, |N| - 1\} \) be a function
that maps each task to a number between 0 and the total number of tasks in the particular HTN problem minus one. Let \( \text{count} : \text{TN} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \) with \( \text{count}(\{ t \in T \mid \alpha(t) = n \}) = |\{ t \in T \mid \alpha(t) = n \}| \) be a function counting the occurrences of the task \( n \) in a given TN and \( \text{prn} : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \) a function that maps a number \( n \) to the \( n \)th prime number. Lastly, let \( pl \) be a large prime number small enough to prevent overflows. We compute \( \text{taskhash} \) as follows:

```plaintext
function taskhash(tn)
    hash = 0
    for n \in \mathbb{N} and 0 \leq j < count(tn, n) do
        hash = (hash + prn(j \cdot |N| + 2 \cdot n(n))) \mod pl
    return hash
```

**Relaxation and soundness.** The only information left is how many instances of which task are in the network. Any ordering information is discarded. This method returns the same hash for two nodes that are not isomorphic, but differ in their ordering relations.

**Runtime.** Checking isomorphism of general TNs can have an exponential runtime in the size of the TNs. Also, we have to test every TN under consideration separately as there is no criterion on which e.g. a binary search could be performed. For parallel-sequences problems we achieve the same runtime as for totally-ordered problems.

**Task Hash** As for TO problems, we use \( \text{taskhash} \) to speed-up or to approximate the exact isomorphism test.

**Task Layers** Since \( \text{taskhash} \) performs a very strong approximation (it ignores all ordering constraints), we present an approximation that takes ordering at least partially into account. We divide the tasks in a given TN into layers according to their ordering relations. The first layer contains tasks without predecessors in the ordering relations, the second layer those tasks that are ordered behind the tasks in the first layer, and so on. Let \( tn = (T, \prec, \alpha) \) be a TN. Starting with \( i = 0 \) the layers are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
T_i &= \{ t \in T \mid \exists t' \in (T \setminus \bigcup \limits_{j<i} T_j) \text{ with } (t', t) \in \prec \} \\
L_i &= \{ (\alpha(t) \mid t \in T_i) \}
\end{align*}
\]

We calculate the \( L_i \) sets for each TN and return a match when all layers are identical. \( L_i \)s are stored as balanced tree.

**Relaxation and soundness.** We lose information on the exact ordering between the tasks in a given layer and the ones in the preceding and succeeding layers. We might also lose information on the exact number of instances of a task (when they are in the same layer). Since isomorphic TNs only differ in their ids, but not in \( \alpha \) and the ordering relations used here, it will correctly return equality for isomorphic TNs, but might also return it for TNs that are not isomorphic. Consider e.g. \( tn_1 \) where \( a \) is ordered before \( b \) and \( c \) before \( d \), and \( tn_2 \) where \( a \) is ordered before \( d \) and \( c \) before \( b \).

**Runtime.** PANDA stores TNs as directed graph, so layers can be calculated in linear time. For comparing two TNs, all layers are compared, which can also be done in linear time (with respect to the size of the TNs). Overall access takes \( O(|tn| \cdot |L| \cdot \log |V| |s|) \).

**Ordering Relations** The last approximation considers ordering relations locally. Let \( tn = (T, \prec, \alpha) \) be a TN. We compute the following:

\[
\text{OR} = \{ (\alpha(t), \alpha(t')) \mid (t, t') \in \prec \}
\]

We return a match when it is equal for two TNs.

**Relaxation and soundness.** This technique cannot distinguish multiple instances of the same task. For isomorphic TNs, it returns the same result since they only differ in their id set. It may, however, also return the same result when the TNs differ: consider a TN with a chain \( a \) before \( b \) and \( b \) before \( c \), and a single extra task \( b \). The result will be the same as for \( a \) before \( b \), and the second instance of \( b \) before \( c \).

**Runtime.** Given the TN representation of PANDA, the set can be computed in linear time in \(|tn|\). Using balanced trees we get \( O(|tn| + |OR| \cdot \log |V| |s|) \) overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Coverages</th>
<th>% duplicates</th>
<th>IPC Score</th>
<th>% duplicates</th>
<th>IPC Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barman (20)</td>
<td>3 4 2 3 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe FO (25)</td>
<td>24 24 24 24 24 24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP (17)</td>
<td>14 4 14 14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rover (20)</td>
<td>13 11 12 11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite (25)</td>
<td>24 24 24 24 24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (40)</td>
<td>13 13 13 13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworking (30)</td>
<td>27 27 27 27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Coverage Table – Partial Order Track.
Empirical Evaluation

We implemented our techniques in the PANDA system (Höller et al. 2021) and combined it with PANDA’s progression search and Relaxed Composition (RC) heuristics (Höller et al. 2018) that internally use classical heuristics to guide the HTN search. We use the Add (Bonet and Geffner 2001), FF (Hoffmann and Nebel 2001) and LM-Cut (Helmert and Domshlak 2009) heuristics. The search is based on a ground model, which is different to several systems from the IPC that do not ground the model. We use the grounding procedure presented by Behnke et al. (2020).

We tested against PANDA without our techniques and against the participants of the IPC 2020, i.e., HYPTENSION (Magnaguagno, Meneguzzi, and de Silva 2021), LILOTANE (Schreiber 2021a,b), SIADEX (Fernandez-Olivares, Vellido, and Castillo 2021), PDPL4I (Pellier and Fiorino 2021), PYHiPOP (Lesire and Albore 2021). We further included the TOAD system (Höller 2021), and PANDASAT in its current TO (Behnke, Höller, and Biundo 2018; Behnke 2021) and PO versions (Behnke, Höller, and Biundo 2019). We have updated the IPC planners to their newest versions, some of which fixed bugs in the original planners. We used the IPC 2020 benchmark set.

Experiments ran on Xeon Gold 6242 CPUs using 1 core, 8 GB of memory, and 30 minutes time limit.

In the following, we compare coverage and give certain metrics for our techniques like time needed for loop detection or percentage of duplicate search nodes. A more extensive evaluation can be found in a technical report (Höller and Behnke 2021). For the TO track, greedy best first (GBFS) worked best for PANDA, while in the PO track, weighted A* had the highest coverage. We only report these for PANDA.

Table 1 shows the results for the totally-ordered track. It first gives the absolute coverage of the systems. Configurations marked with a th use the taskhash test, those marked with s use only the exact test for totally-ordered problems, those marked with t+s first hash with taskhash and then use the exact test on all TNs in the hash bucket.

All GBFS configurations except for those using LM-Cut have a higher coverage than the other systems, while the GBFS LM-Cut configurations are placed between the IPC 2020 winner HYPTENSION and the runner-up LILOTANE. The best configurations use the RC-Add heuristic, followed by RC-FF and RC-LM-Cut. The configurations not using LD have lower coverage than the IPC systems. The best of our configurations beats the respective PANDA baseline by 84% for RC-Add, 95% for RC-FF, and 108% for RC-LM-Cut. For the best configuration, the table gives on the right the number of false hits of the taskhash function, i.e., the number of nodes identified as visited by taskhash that in fact where no duplicates. There are mainly two domains where this happens. Averaged over all algorithms and heuristics we have 3.33% false hits. This is also relatively stable over search algorithms and heuristics. The second additional column shows the following: based on search without duplicate pruning we calculated the percentage of visited nodes that would have been pruned when using it. Here the results differ widely: between 0% (in the Satellite and Towers domains) and 100% (after rounding; in the Logistics domain) of the search nodes are duplicates. In the median instance 87.56% of search nodes are duplicates. The last column gives the percentage of time spend for LD using GBFS RC-Add with only taskhash.

Table 2 summarizes the results for the PO track. Configurations marked with th only use the taskhash function, those marked oh use the taskhash followed by Task Layers and Ordering Relations (denoted ordering hashes). Computing both of the latter two functions together does not significantly increase the computational effort compared to computing one of them, so we decided to always use their combination. When +gi follows, the exact test is performed in case of a hash collision. We applied the special handling for parallel-sequences instances whenever possible. These are all instances except for the 50 instances of the two Monroe domains and one instance of UM-Translog.

In the PO track, PANDA has a higher coverage than the IPC systems also without our techniques. However, they increase the coverage (though less significant than in the TO setting, between 5% and 8%). The configurations using the FF heuristic perform best. The number of false positive hits of the taskhash function is much higher than in the TO setting. When we look at the specific domains, we see that the approximate taskhash function has a higher coverage in a single domain (both compared to the exact calculation and to the basic PANDA configuration): PCP. It encodes Post Correspondence Problem, where the relaxation of the ordering relations seems to be especially harmful. In the other domains, it performs at least as good as the other methods.

Conclusion

We have introduced several techniques for loop detection in HTN planning. The problem boils down to deciding whether two TNs are isomorphic. We introduced exact and approximate techniques that overapproximate isomorphism, which might lead to an incomplete search but works very well in practice. We integrated our techniques into the heuristic progression search of the PANDA framework and evaluated them on the benchmark sets of the IPC 2020. They pay off in both the partially-ordered and the totally-ordered setting (though the gain in performance is much higher in the latter).

Our techniques are directly applicable in systems using a ground progression search. For POCL-like algorithms, the basic task in LD is still the comparison of task networks, so our techniques might be helpful. However, search nodes additionally include causal links. When these links shall be taken into account, this imposes further complexity and the adaptation of our techniques is not a straightforward task.
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