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**Abstract**—Planning for object search requires the generation and sequencing of views in a continuous space. These plans need to consider the effect of overlapping views and a limit imposed on the time taken to compute and execute the plans. We formulate the problem of view planning in the presence of overlapping views and time constraints as an Orienteering Problem with history-dependent rewards. We consider two variants of this problem—in variant (I) only the plan execution time is constrained, whereas in variant (II) both planning and execution time are constrained. We abstract away the unreliability of perception, and present a sampling-based view planner that simultaneously selects a set of views and a route through them, and incorporates a prior over object locations. We show that our approach outperforms the state of the art methods for the orienteering problem by evaluating all algorithms in four environments that vary in size and complexity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Planning of visual search for objects in large continuous spaces is an open problem with many aspects that make existing solutions inadequate. A set of views must be selected from an infinite number of possible views. To provide any preference ordering over this infinite set, it is necessary to have prior information about where objects might be found, and for that prior to be non-uniform. This formulation of the task of finding the best set of views is a sub-modular problem, and greedy solutions can be shown to have bounded sub-optimality. However, it does not take into account the costs of sequencing those views—the best set of views may, for instance, be time consuming to visit, and there may be another set of views that is slightly worse in terms of the information provided but vastly quicker for a robot to traverse.

The view planning problem is further complicated by four issues. First, some views will overlap and the value of a view, at any point in a sequence of views, will depend on the sequence of views taken so far. Since the values of views are history dependent, the problem ceases to be sub-modular. Second, the sensing process should ideally be modeled as being unreliable, transforming the problem from one of planning in a physical space, to one of planning in belief space. Third, in many practical applications, the time available to execute the planned trajectory of views is constrained. Fourth, existing view planning approaches have not considered the length of time used to plan, which will determine how much of the plan can be executed.

![Fig. 1: View planning with overlapping views and time limit.](image)

We propose a solution to the first, third, and fourth of these issues related to the challenging problem of view planning with overlapping views and time constraints. We do not consider unreliable perception, which transforms view planning into a yet worse class of problems—we leave this for future consideration. In this paper, we refer to the problem of bounded execution time as variant (I), and to the problem of bounded planning and execution time as variant (II).

We assume the ability to use sensor inputs to generate 2D and 3D maps of the environment, for navigation and object recognition; and assume prior knowledge about the locations of objects. We make the following key contributions:

- We show that the view selection and view sequencing problem can be posed as an orienteering problem (OP) with redundant views and history-dependent rewards.
- We present a Gibbs sampling-based view planning algorithm (GVP) that produces approximate solutions, but will provably converge in the limit to an optimal sequence given a finite set of views.
- We extend our algorithm (GVP) to learn, from a batch of example problems, how to divide the available time between thinking and acting.
- We evaluate our approaches on a range of environments under different time constraints and compare them to the state of the art.

To locate any given object, our algorithm (GVP) first generates a much larger number of candidate views than can possibly be searched in the available time, orders them by the probability of providing a view of the object, and selects the $m$ best views for subsequent analysis. A sampler incrementally selects a sequence of views that simultaneously maximizes the likelihood of finding the object, considering the field of view overlap and the viewing history, and minimizes the time taken to do so—see Fig. 1. Many such sampling processes are run, each of which is terminated when the time limit is reached, and the robot chooses the best sequence of views.
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II. RELATED WORK

Early work on object search discussed its intractability in a continuous space, even under some simplifying assumptions [1]. Subsequent approaches have employed different strategies to address the complexity, e.g., visual saliency [2]; planning at the level of rooms and views with associative knowledge [3], [4]; and search with qualitative spatial relations [5]. Some approaches assume reliable observations, whereas others reason under partial observability using a mix of qualitative and probabilistic reasoning for efficient search, e.g., for estimating target location at the level of rooms [6] or locations in rooms [7], [8].

The fundamental problem of view planning for object search can be viewed as a generalization of the art gallery problem and the watchman problem. The art gallery problem is NP-hard, and is a generalization of the guarding problem where sensors have infinite range, bounded only by obstacles [9]. A randomized algorithm developed for this problem provides a high probability of bounded error between its coverage and the optimal solution [10]. Approximate algorithms have been proposed for art gallery problem sequenced by a traveling salesman problem (TSP) [11]. With unreliable sensing, the joint art-gallery and watchman problem is a continuous space, continuous action POMDP, but even discrete state, discrete action POMDPs can become computationally intractable. Researchers have partially addressed this intractability through hierarchical decompositions [4].

Our view planning problem is related to planning in belief space, e.g., for task and motion planning [12], although we do not plan in belief space. Also, unlike probabilistic roadmaps [13], we do not restrict the solution space too much, since we consider time constraints. There is also some relation to work in temporal logic planning [14], although existing approaches do not address the issues of interest and do not scale like our approach.

Our view planning problem is most related to the orienteering problem (OP) [15]. In an OP, a rewarding sequence of locations must be visited, where each location can have (in general) a different associated reward. We use a sampling-based algorithm for the OP as one of the baselines for comparison [16]. OPs, are however, typically stationary reward problems, whereas we must solve a varying-reward OP, also called general OP [17].

We assume reliable perception and work with a continuous state, continuous action MDP with a history-dependent reward function. Our novel contribution is an algorithm for the joint problem of selecting views (art-gallery) and planning a route in continuous space. We present a randomized algorithm that interleaves the selection of views with the selection of the route. Unlike previous work, including those that used stochastic branch and bound [18] or Monte-Carlo tree search [19], our method has very low space complexity.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We decompose the problem of view planning for object search with time constraints in a continuous environment into two parts: (i) transforming the continuous problem into a discrete problem; and (ii) solving the discrete problem using a sampling-based approach. We consider the discrete problem as an OP with history-dependent rewards, i.e., given a fully connected graph of locations $s \in S$, a cost function $C(s, s')$, and a time limit $T$, maximize the expected reward $R(s_0, s_1, \ldots)$ obtained from a sequence of visited locations—the reward of a location depends on the locations that have been visited before. We investigate two variants of this problem formulation. Variant (I) considers only the execution time ($T_E$) when solving the view planning problem within a time limit, i.e., $T_E \leq T$. Variant (II) considers both planning time ($T_P$) and execution time ($T_E$), i.e., $(T_P + T_E) \leq T$.

IV. SAMPLING-BASED VIEW PLANNING

This section provides an overview of our algorithm, followed by a detailed description (Sec. IV-A), an adaptive extension (Sec. IV-B), and the implementation (Sec. IV-C).

We assume that we are given a: (1) 2D map ($M_{2D}$); (2) 3D map ($M_{3D}$); (3) probability distribution $P$ of a robot at location $s$ observing an object of a certain type; and (4) cost function $C(s, s')$ that provides the temporal cost of moving between locations $s$ and $s'$.

To search for objects within time limit $T$, the robot generates a trajectory $s = s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_{t'}$ composed of a sequence of locations $s_t$ ($t = 0, \ldots, t'$). Here, $t$ indexes waypoints in the trajectory—the time from the $t$-th to the $t+1$-th location is not fixed, and $t'$ denotes the index of the last feasible waypoint given time limit $T$. We use $\phi : s \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to denote whether or not we can observe the object at location $s$. Then $P(\phi_t = 1 | \phi_{1:t-1}, s_{1:t})$, with $\phi_t = \phi(s_t)$, is the probability of a positive observation at the next time step given the trajectory history—Sec. IV-C describes how we compute these probabilities. Given $T$, $P$ and $C$, the objective is to find a trajectory $s$ that maximizes expected reward $R$:

$$R_T(s) = \sum_{t=1}^{t'} P(\phi_t = 1 \land \phi_k = 0 \forall k < t);$$

with total cost not exceeding time limit $T$.
### Algorithm 1: View planning (phase one): OP construction

```plaintext
Input: 2D map M_{2D}; prob. dist. of perceiving an object P (based on M_{2D}), target coverage \( tc \) (0 < tc \leq 1)
Output: Set of locations \( S \); cost function \( C \)

1. Function GVP-OP-CONST (M_{2D}, P, tc)
2. Begin
3. \( S \leftarrow \emptyset \)
4. \( Cov(S) \leftarrow 0 \)
5. While \( Cov(S) < tc \) do
   6. \( s \leftarrow \text{sampleLocation}(M_{2D}) \)
   7. \( S \leftarrow S \cup s \)
   8. \( Cov(S) \leftarrow Cov(S) + P(s) \)
9. End while
10. \( I^* \) Filter redundant locations \( s \in S \) with zero/low probability (P) such that the coverage constraint holds*/
11. \( S \leftarrow \text{filterRedundantLocations}(S) \)
12. End while
13. For \( s \in S, s' \in S \) do
   14. \( C(s,s') \leftarrow \text{computeCost}(M_{2D}, s, s') \)
15. Return \( S, C \)
```

The cost function is given by:

\[
C(s) = C(s_{1:t}) = \sum_{l=1}^{t'} C(s_{l-1}, s_l) \leq T.
\] (2)

Instead of exhaustively exploring all possible trajectories \( s \), we generate them from a distribution, which prefers trajectories that look the best myopically, and puts a non-zero probability on every path.

### A. The Sampling-based Algorithm

The core idea of our algorithm is a two-phase anytime sampling-based optimization of the reward function. The first phase (Alg. 1) transforms the continuous problem into an OP, and samples a set of possible locations \( S \) until the search area is covered to a certain degree (Lines 3-8):

\[
Cov(S) = \sum_{s \in S} P(s) \geq tc
\] (3)

where \( tc \) denotes a given target coverage\(^1\). Locations with zero or low probability are filtered out to satisfy the coverage constraint (Line 9), and the cost \( C(s, s') \) for all location pairs is calculated (Lines 12-13).

The second phase (Alg. 2), which solves the OP, first selects the \( m \) best locations from \( S \) (Line 4), and updates and normalizes \( P \) by taking view dependencies into account (Line 6). Next, it generates a series of trajectories defined as an ordered sequence of locations, i.e., \( s^k = (s^k_1, s^k_2, \ldots, s^k_{t^k}) \), within time limit \( T \) (Lines 8-20). All trajectories start from the current robot pose, i.e., \( \forall k, s^k_0 = s_0 \). The 0th location of the \( k \)th trajectory \( (s^k_0) \) is sampled from the following distribution without replacement (Line 14):

\[
s^k_t \sim P(\phi^k_t, s^k_{t-1}, s_t) = \frac{e^{-\rho C(s^k_{t-1}, s^k_t)}}{Z} \tag{4}
\]

where \( t = 1, \ldots, t^k \) and \( \phi^k_t = 0 \) if we have not found the object yet. The exponential is the transition distribution of choosing the next location based on costs, and \( Z \) is a normalizing constant. The sampling procedure only stops when time limit \( T \) is exceeded, and discards the last location, i.e., all sampled trajectories account for the time constraint in Equation 2. However, the trajectories can be of different length. Finally, \( \rho \geq 0 \) is a parameter used to adjust the influence of the cost function. If \( \rho = 0 \), \( e^{-\rho C(s^k_{t-1}, s^k_t)} \) is a uniform distribution, and reward is only based on location and not costs—higher the value of \( \rho \), greater the preference for locations with lower costs, leading to more cost-effective trajectories. When a decision must be made, the trajectory with the highest reward (so far) is chosen for execution (Equation 1) (Lines 21-22). If there is a tie, the trajectory with the smallest expected cost is chosen. We experimentally analyzed the effect of the parameters in both algorithms. However, finding an optimal setting for the parameters is beyond the scope of this paper.

### B. Adaptive View Planning

The algorithm for variant (I) do not include planning time within the time constraint\(^2\). To account for the planning time \( T_P \) in variant (II), we revised the constraint as \( T_P + T_E \leq T \), resulting in a trade-off between planning time and execution time. To maximize the expected reward \( R_T \) acquired during execution, the robot is required to minimize its planning time. As an algorithm’s planning time is influenced by parameters \( T, n_s, m \), their optimal values need to be determined\(^3\). Since they depend on \( T \) and on the problem size \( |S| \), we determine them experimentally.

\(^1\)Cov(S) takes the dependency of views into account.

\(^2\)We assume a complete plan should be produced before execution. This assumption can be relaxed by allowing concurrent planning and execution.

\(^3\)In adaptive view planning, we use \( T \) to refer to the algorithm’s parameter, and \( T \) to refer to the given time constraint; whereby we assume that \( T \leq T \).
Let us assume a robot is given a new search problem with time limit \( T' \) and size \( |S'| \). For an optimal solution, the robot need to determine values of the parameters that maximize the reward function \( R_T \). Since the planning time \( T_P \) is included in the time limit, the robot cannot search the parameter space exhaustively. We propose to approximate the surface of the reward function from known problems. We assume that the robot has computed the reward functions over the parameter space \( (\bar{T}, n_s, m) \) for some (but not all) search problems, and uses this information to interpolate (or extrapolate) the reward function for new search problems. We index pre-computed reward functions by \( T \) and \( |S| \), i.e. \( r(T, |S|) \). To determine the parameters \((\bar{T}, n_s, m)\) that maximize the reward for a new problem \( (T', |S'|) \), adaptive extension sampling performs the following steps:

1. Select two known problems \((T_1, |S_1|)\) and \((T_2, |S_2|)\)
2. Interpolate (or extrapolate) \( r(T', |S'|) \) from the pre-computed functions \( r(T_1, |S_1|) \) and \( r(T_2, |S_2|) \).
3. Find the maximum in \( r(T', |S'|) \) and return the corresponding \( \bar{T}, n_s, m \).

In this work we have used a linear interpolation method.

C. Implementation

This section describes the integration of our algorithm with other components, and our algorithm’s implementation.

a) Integration on a robot: We integrated our view planner with the perception and action components of a simulated SCITOS A5 robot [http://metralabs.com] equipped with a 2D laser range finder, a depth camera, and a semantic camera. The range finder is used to create \( M_{2D} \) for robot navigation. The cameras are mounted on a pan-tilt unit (PTU) and have the same field of view. The depth camera is used to generate \( M_{3D} \). The semantic camera is used for object recognition—it returns true (false) when an object of a given type is (is not) in the field of view. Recall that we assume perfect perception as we are primarily evaluating the planning algorithm—a more realistic sensor model can be included if needed. We also use the motion planning and navigation routines from the Robot Operating System (ROS). The robot and the camera can thus be controlled by specifying a target pose the PTU’s angles respectively.

b) Sampling of locations \( S \): Step 1 of Alg. 1 samples locations \( s \in S \) until a predefined area of \( M_{3D} \) is covered (based on \( P \)). Each location \( s \) is composed of robot pose \((x, v)\) and view pose \( s \in V \) variables, i.e., \( s = (x, v) \). We first sample a robot pose \( x \) from \( M_{2D} \) and verify that the robot can reach it. We then generate a number \( n_v \) of random pan and tilt angles for the PTU (can use fixed angles too), and use the SCITOS robot model’s forward kinematics to compute the poses of the cameras on the PTU. At each pose \( x \in X \), the robot takes several views \( v \in V \). We repeat this process until the predefined space is covered.

c) Probability distribution \( P(\phi_0 = 1|s_{1:T}) \): The probability distribution \( P \) is based on the assumption that objects rest on surfaces. From a given \( M_{3D} \), we first extract the supporting surfaces based on the estimated normal of each voxel. Then, we identify the supporting surfaces’ voxels that would be observed at each generated pose, by counting the number of voxels that lie within a frustum projected to the pose \( s \). This provides the initial distribution over views, i.e., \( P(\phi_0 = 1) \). Since we sample views without replacement, we remove any selected views, update the probabilities of dependent views, and normalize the distribution. We treat overlapping views as mutually dependent; once a view is chosen, we update the probabilities of all dependent views. We do this until we reach a plan length \( t^\phi \).

d) Cost function \( C(s, s') \): The cost, represented as time in seconds, of moving between locations \( s \) and \( s' \) is the maximum of two sub-costs (1) navigation cost \( C_{nav} \); and (2) pan-tilt unit cost \( C_{ptu} \)—we assume the robot can navigate and operate its PTU concurrently:

\[
C(s, s') = C((x, v), (x', v')) = \max(C_{nav}(x, x'), C_{ptu}(v, v')).
\]

To compute the navigation cost for a pair of robot poses \((x, x')\), we call the motion planner in ROS, retrieve a trajectory of waypoints, calculate the linear and angular distances between all consecutive waypoints, multiply them by their respective velocities, take the maximum of the linear and angular durations, and sum them up. The PTU cost is calculated by multiplying the differences between the current and the target pan-tilt angles by their respective velocities, and computing the maximum of these values.

V. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

We evaluated our view planning algorithm in simulation\(^4\). For variant (I), we compared our algorithm with baseline algorithms in four simulated office environments that vary in size and complexity (Tab. I). The hypothesis was that our algorithm would scale better than the baseline algorithms, especially in larger environments. We used the expected reward as the performance measure. For variant (II), we demonstrate the selection of our algorithm’s parameters as a function of problem size \(|S|\) and time limit \( T \), thus supporting scaling by adapting to spatio-temporal constraints. The hypothesis was that our adaptive approach would outperform fixed strategies in novel environments. We measured the (a) expected rewards from the generated plans; and (b) performance when the plans were executed in a simulated environment—for the latter, performance was measured by the number of objects found.

A. Experimental Results: Simulation

Simulation trials were conducted in the robot simulator MORSE [21]. For each environment in Tab. I, we generated 2D and 3D maps, and sampled locations such that 95% of the space was covered. In all environments, the robot had a predefined starting location.

1) Variant (I): For different time limits \( T \), we compared our algorithm (GVP) with a stochastic algorithm for the OP [16] (OP-S), and two sequential approaches that greedily select \( m \) best views and sequence them using a TSP solver—one sequences greedily (TSP-G) and the other uses dynamic

\(^4\) An evaluation of the algorithm in the real world is given in [20].
programming (TSP-DP). We expect our approach to scale better in larger environments as it chooses locations freely from the initial distribution—TSP-based methods compute a solution for a fixed set. Tab. II summarizes the results.

Since the sampled locations cover 95% of the space, 0.95 is the maximum reward possible. All approaches degrade in performance as the environments grow larger. Among the two sampling-based approaches, GVP is superior to OP-S in all environments, except in E2 with $T = 120$. Although OP-S achieves a comparable performance in smaller environments, performance is much worse in larger environments. Similarly, TSP-G performs well for the small environments, but the results for the larger environments are poor, as hypothesized. TSP-DP provided good results in multiple trials, but it could not compute a solution in environments E1-E3 for longer intervals, e.g., although planning time is not considered, a solution could not be computed on a standard laptop in ≤ 10 minutes—TSP-DP was able to sequence no more than 21 locations. The performance of the TSP-based approaches depends on the spatial distribution of the best $m$ views. Hence, their performance cannot be predicted easily. Overall, our algorithm provides effective, if sub-optimal, solutions for a range of environments and time limits.

2) **Variant (II):** The planning time of the algorithms would have had a considerable effect on the results reported above if they were included in the time limits, e.g., $T_P$ (in seconds) of algorithms in Tab. II were: OP-S (5-7); TSP-G (4-6); TSP-DP (4-584); and GVP (102-321). We performed an additional set of over 55k trials that evaluated the expected reward by considering both $T_P$ and $T_E$ (for E1 and E3). In Fig. 2, we illustrate the expected reward in environment E3 corresponding to two conditions: (a) $T_E \leq T$, and (b) $T_P + T_E \leq T$. The expected reward in (b) was calculated based on partial trajectories—only locations visited within $T$ contributed to the reward. The reward function in (a) shows a rapid increase with respect to $m$; most of the configurations in (a) lead to a high reward (mainly dependent on $m$). However, in (b), configurations with large $n_s$ and $m$ lead to low or even zero rewards as planning with an increasing number of views and trajectories becomes more expensive. The selection of appropriate values for parameters is thus critical.

### TABLE I: Experimental Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (m^2)</strong></td>
<td>Small (32m^2)</td>
<td>Medium (96m^2)</td>
<td>Large (168m^2)</td>
<td>Huge (240m^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage (%)</strong></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locations (unfiltered)</strong></td>
<td>91 (322)</td>
<td>139 (402)</td>
<td>319 (1462)</td>
<td>399 (1533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D occ. grid size (voxels)</strong></td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>4519</td>
<td>8775</td>
<td>12950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D occupancy grid maps</strong></td>
<td><img src="Image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="Image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="Image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="Image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II: Comparison with baseline algorithms. Configuration for OP-S and GVP: $n_s = 250; m = 80; \varphi = 1.0.$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>OP-S</th>
<th>TSP-G</th>
<th>TSP-DP</th>
<th>GVP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>$R_T$</td>
<td>$R_E$</td>
<td>$R_P$</td>
<td>$R_T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2:** Reward function for E3 ($T = 600$) considering (a) only execution time, and (b) both planning time and execution time. The range of parameter values explored $n_s \in \{5, ..., 1000\}$, $m \in \{5, ..., |S|\}$, $T \in \{30, ..., 600\}$ (only maximal reward with respect to $T$ is shown).

![Image](Image5)

Our adaptive view planning algorithm determines values of parameters $n_s$ and $m$ for a given time limit $T$ and problem size $|S|$ based on planning results of known environments (cf. Sec. IV-B). For instance, consider environments E1 and E3 to have been explored—Fig. 2 shows some of the reward functions for these environments. Based on these reward functions we derive parameters for a novel, medium-sized environment (E2) through interpolation, and a large-sized environment (E4) through extrapolation. We hypothesize that our adaptive approach, can outperform fixed strategies in novel environments because it can better adjust to the problem size.

Fig. 3 shows the average performance of our adaptive approach and two fixed strategies ($f1$ and $f2$) in 3900 simulations of object search tasks in all environments (E1-E4). Each trial is successful if a single object (whose location is unknown) is perceived. Performance is measured as the percentage of successful trials. The **adaptive policy** performs at least as well as the fixed strategies in all cases but one. The performance improvement is statistically significant in E2.
will eventually fail as problem size and/or time limit are
where the fixed strategies perform poorly.

(a) E1
(b) E2
(c) E3
(d) E4

Fig. 3: **Average performance per time T**. Average fraction
of successful trials for single-object search tasks in E1-E4,
considering $T_P$ and $T_E$. For each time limit $T$, each strategy
was executed multiple times, proportional to the surface area
of an environment (E1: 20x, E2: 40x, E3: 80x, E4: 120x;
with a total of 3900 searches).

E3, E4 when our approach is compared with fixed
strategy $f_1$. Similarly, the results are statistically significant
in E3 and E4 when our approach is compared with $f_2$. The fixed
strategies use the full set of views ($|S|$), whereas the adaptive
strategy only uses a subset of views according to the problem
size and time limit, thus reducing planning time and leaving
more time for execution. The performance improvement is
particularly pronounced in the larger environments (E3, E4)
where the fixed strategies perform poorly.

Results in Fig. 3 indicate that adaptive parameter selection
generalizes to unknown environments (E2 and E4), and that it
outperforms the best fixed strategy ($n_s = 100, m = |S|, T = T$).
This is not entirely surprising, as any fixed strategy
will eventually fail as problem size and/or time limit are
changed. The adaptive strategy performs worse than one of the
fixed strategies in E2 ($T = 240$). Although our adaptive
strategy chose the optimal set of plan parameters based on the
reward function, the actual performance was sub-optimal. If
robot encounters a significant mismatch between the expected
reward and its actual performance, this could be an indication
that its prior knowledge (here $P$) is incorrect. In such
situations, a robot can optimize its parameters from its actual
performance, e.g., through reinforcement learning. These
results encourage us to further explore adaptive planning.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has presented a sampling-based algorithm for the
challenging open problem of view planning for object
search under time constraints. We posed this problem as an
OP with history-dependent rewards, and imposed a time limit.
Experimental results indicate that our approach outperforms
state of the art methods. Furthermore, our adaptive strategy
generalizes well in comparison with fixed sampling strategies
for object search in different (novel) environments.

Although the proposed approach has been integrated with
the components of a mobile robot, the algorithm itself does not
depend on any kinematic structure, e.g., it can be used to
plan views of a camera on a manipulator arm or a quadcopter.

Future work will further explore view planning with time
constraints, under partial observability.
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