

Subgoaling Relaxation-based Heuristics for Numeric Planning with Infinite Actions

Ángel Aso-Mollar¹, Diego Aineto¹, Enrico Scala², Eva Onaindia¹

¹Universitat Politècnica de València

²Università degli Studi di Brescia

{aaso,dieaigar,onaindia}@vrain.upv.es, {enrico.scala}@unibs.it

Abstract

Numeric planning with control parameters extends the standard numeric planning model by introducing action parameters as free numeric variables that must be instantiated during planning. This results in a potentially infinite number of applicable actions in a state. In this setting, off-the-shelf numeric heuristics that leverage the action structure are not feasible. In this paper, we identify a tractable subset of these problems—namely, controllable, simple numeric problems—and propose an optimistic compilation approach that transforms them into simple numeric tasks. To do so, we abstract control-dependent expressions into bounded constant effects and relaxed preconditions. The proposed compilation makes it possible to effectively use subgoaling heuristics to estimate goal distance in numeric planning problems involving control parameters. Our results demonstrate that this approach is an effective and computationally feasible way of applying traditional numeric heuristics to settings with an infinite number of possible actions, pushing the boundaries of the current state of the art.

Introduction

In numeric planning, states include numeric variables, which are updated by actions through arithmetic effects (Fox and Long 2003). This extension of classical planning enables quantitative information to directly influence the evolution of the system, representing phenomena such as resource consumption, cumulative change, or behavior governed by numeric computations.

Support for numeric state variables is insufficient for many problems in which the control is subject to numerically parameterized actions. Consider, for example, a turn-right action with a certain degree of rotation or a pour-water action involving an arbitrary number of liters. Research conducted in this line focuses on extending numeric planning to include *control parameters*; i.e., action parameters that extend over infinite numeric domains. Different approaches have explored this idea from complementary perspectives. The TM-LPSAT planner (Shin and Davis 2005) integrates the control parameters into a hybrid SAT and linear programming framework. POPCORN (Savaş et al. 2016) and NextFLAP (Sapena, Onaindia, and Marzal 2024), in contrast, embed control parameters within a forward partial-order planning search. More recently, the ap-

proach of (Heesch et al. 2024) delegates the selection of control parameter values to a neural model.

The aforementioned works treat control parameters as constraints that narrow the search space, ruling out the modeling of these parameters as decision variables, as this would lead to an infinite action space. For example, a robot may be allowed to turn right through an angle between 20° and 45° , yet the consequences of each specific value can differ significantly. The S-BFS approach (Aso-Mollar et al. 2025b), however, introduces sampling into a forward state-space search algorithm to explicitly handle control parameters during planning.

S-BFS studies the problem of numeric planning with *control variables*, a reformulation of actions with infinite domain numeric parameters. It is a principled framework for reasoning in such settings under full state information, which allows for the use of heuristic functions as estimators. S-BFS provides a systematic way of searching when there are infinitely many action instantiations, using a sampling function to iteratively generate subsets of successors. Although it shows to be competitive with respect to SOTA methods, even when simple heuristics are used (Aso-Mollar et al. 2025a), the core difficulty with this approach lies in that standard, informative numeric heuristics (Scala et al. 2016, 2020a) cannot be used in infinite action spaces.

In this paper, we identify a tractable fragment of numeric planning with control variables and introduce an optimistic compilation that transforms such problems into simple numeric tasks, a common approach in the literature of numeric planning (Li et al. 2018) or HTN planning (Höller et al. 2019) for defining novel estimators. To do so, we abstract control-dependent expressions and convert them into bounded constant effects and relaxed preconditions. We prove that the resulting compiled problems are safe pruning under the subgoaling relaxation. This enables existing numeric subgoaling heuristics to be used directly to estimate the distance to the goal in the original infinite tasks. Our results show that this compilation yields an effective and computationally feasible mechanism for applying traditional numeric heuristics in problems with infinite actions.

Background

In this section, we summarize the control variables formalism of S-BFS, its search scheme and the subgoaling relax-

ation for numeric planning, on which the heuristic estimators defined by our approach are based.

Numeric planning with control variables

We adopt the numeric planning with control variables formalization by Aso-Mollar et al. (2025a) and adapt it to our needs. In this setting, F is a set of propositional state variables, X , a set of numeric state variables, and U a set of numeric control variables. We assume for every variable $v \in X \cup U$ that a valuation function maps v to its domain $\text{Dom}(v)$, and that a numeric domain is a subset of the rational numbers; that is, $\text{Dom}(v) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ for every $v \in X \cup U$. We denote the set of arithmetic expressions over X and U as $\text{Expr}(X \cup U)$. First, we define controllable numeric conditions as usual numeric planning conditions that also involve control variables.

Definition 1 (Controllable numeric condition). A **controllable numeric condition** is an inequality $(\xi \bowtie 0)$, where $\xi \in \text{Expr}(X \cup U)$ and $\bowtie \in \{<, \leq, \dot{=}, \geq, >\}$, combined with logical operators. We denote the set of all controllable numeric conditions over X and U as $\text{Constr}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X \cup U)$.

Controllable numeric assignments are defined as numeric assignments that involve control variables in the right part of the assignment.

Definition 2 (Controllable numeric assignments). A **controllable numeric assignment** is an atomic update of the form $(x := \xi)$, where $x \in X$ and $\xi \in \text{Expr}(X \cup U)$. We denote assignments of the form $(x := x + \xi)$ as $(x += \xi)$. We also denote the set of all controllable numeric assignments from $X \cup U$ to X as $\text{Assign}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, U)$. A set of numeric assignments $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \text{Assign}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, U)$ is **consistent** if, for every $x \in X$, there is at most one assignment $(x := \xi)$ in \mathcal{A} , as defined for propositional assignments.

Additionally, we denote as $\text{Constr}_{\mathbb{B}}(F)$ and $\text{Assign}_{\mathbb{B}}(F)$ the sets of propositional conditions and assignments, respectively.

Definition 3 (Numeric planning problem with control variables). A **numeric planning problem with control variables** is a tuple $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$, where:

- A is a finite set of actions $a = (\text{Pre}(a), \text{Eff}(a))$, where $\text{Pre}(a) = \langle \text{Pre}_{\mathbb{B}}(a), \text{Pre}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) \rangle$ and $\text{Eff}(a) = \langle \text{Eff}_{\mathbb{B}}(a), \text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) \rangle$, such that
 1. $\text{Pre}_{\mathbb{B}}(a) \in \text{Constr}_{\mathbb{B}}(F)$ and $\text{Pre}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) \in \text{Constr}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X \cup U)$ are sets of conditions;
 2. $\text{Eff}_{\mathbb{B}}(a) \subseteq \text{Assign}_{\mathbb{B}}(F)$ and $\text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) \subseteq \text{Assign}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, U)$ are consistent sets of assignments;
- s_0 is the initial state with valuations over F and X ;
- $G = \langle G_{\mathbb{B}}, G_{\mathbb{Q}} \rangle$, where $G_{\mathbb{B}} \in \text{Constr}_{\mathbb{B}}(F)$ and $G_{\mathbb{Q}} \in \text{Constr}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$, are the goal conditions.

A **plan** in this setting, $\pi = ((a_i, \mu_i))_{i=1}^k$, is a sequence of pairs consisting of an action and a control valuation. A plan is **valid** if there exists a sequence of states $(s_i)_{i=1}^k$ such that $s_i \models \text{subs}_{\mu_i}(\text{Pre}(a_i))$, where subs_{μ_i} denotes the substitution of control variables in numeric expressions according to valuation μ_i . A plan is a **solution** if it leads to a goal state, i.e., if $s_k \models G$.

Searching with Delayed Partial EXPansions

Hereinafter, we approach the problem of searching for a valid plan using the search scheme of S-BFS, which is based on Delayed Partial Expansions (DPEX) of search nodes. To cope with the infinite branching factor, DPEX follows a BFS-like scheme that relies on a sampling function ϕ to iteratively generate finite subsets of successors, referred to as partial expansions, and on a rectification function r_h to update the parent's f -value after each partial expansion. The rectification function r_h can be seen as an abstraction of a heuristic function h that adjusts the evaluation of h accordingly to the number of partial expansions performed in a given state. Algorithm 1 describes how DPEX works.

Algorithm 1: DPEX $_{\phi, r_h}$

```

1: Input: Sampling function  $\phi$ , rectification function  $r_h$ , num. samples  $K$ , initial state  $s_0$ , goal conditions  $G$ 
2: Output: Goal reached
3:  $\text{Open} \leftarrow \{(f(s_0), s_0)\}$ 
4: while  $\text{Open} \neq \emptyset$  do
5:   Extract node  $s$  with lowest  $f$ -value from  $\text{Open}$ 
6:   if  $s \models G$  then
7:     return true
8:   else
9:     for  $i = 1$  to  $K$  do
10:      Sample a successor  $s'$  using  $\phi$ 
11:      Insert  $(f(s'), s')$  into  $\text{Open}$ 
12:      if  $s$  is not fully expanded then
13:        Rectify  $f(s)$  using  $r_h$ 
14:        Insert  $(f(s), s)$  into  $\text{Open}$ 
15: return false

```

The algorithm maintains a frontier of states ordered by an evaluation function f (line 3). At each iteration, the state with lowest f is selected (line 5) and K successors are sampled using a sampling function ϕ (lines 9–10) and inserted in the frontier (line 11). If the selected node is not fully expanded, its f -value is updated via a rectification function r_h (lines 12–13) and reinserted (line 14). Through this interplay of sampling and rectification, DPEX can handle infinite branching factors efficiently while remaining probabilistically complete under mild assumptions on ϕ and r_h . It becomes critical to have a heuristic function h that accurately estimates the cost to the goal. Hereinafter, we will attempt to address this issue by leveraging the subgoaling relaxation.

Subgoaling relaxation for numeric planning

A **numeric planning problem** is a numeric planning problem with control variables such that $U = \emptyset$. For numeric planning problems, the subgoaling relaxation extends its classical counterpart (Bonet and Geffner 2001) by taking advantage of the numeric structure of the problem. It relies on the notion of the m-times regressor (Scala et al. 2020a), an operator that rewrites a condition to identify the actions that can contribute positively to achieving it. Given a state s , an action is considered a **possible achiever** of a condition if s




Figure 1: The inclusion of control variables introduces a shift in the decision space of numeric planning problems.

satisfies the m -regressed version of that condition for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

The subgoaling relaxation is particularly effective for simple numeric planning problems, that is, problems in which all conditions are linear and all assignments follow the form $x += k$ for some constant k . In these cases, the m -times regressor can be computed in closed form. This relaxation allows the derivation of both admissible and inadmissible heuristic estimates, following the principles of the classical h_{\max} and h_{add} heuristics, respectively. Such heuristics can be computed by using just possible achievers.

Let ψ be a condition and $\psi^{r(a,m)}$ the m -times regressor of ψ through a ; the *add* heuristic is defined as follows

$$\hat{h}_{\text{hbd+}}^{\text{add}}(s, \psi) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \models \psi \\ \min_{a \in \text{ach}(\psi)} \left(\hat{h}_{\text{hbd+}}^{\text{add}}(s, \text{Pre}_{\mathbb{B}}(a)) + \lambda(a) \right) & \psi \in \text{PCs} \\ \min_{\substack{a \in A, \\ s \models \psi^{r(a, \hat{m})}, \\ \forall \hat{m} \in \mathbb{Q}^+}} \left(\hat{m} \lambda(a) + \hat{h}_{\text{hbd+}}^{\text{add}}(s, \text{Pre}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a)) \right) & \psi \in \text{SCs} \\ \sum_{\substack{c \subset \psi \\ |c|=1}} \hat{h}_{\text{hbd+}}^{\text{add}}(s, c) & |\psi| > 1 \end{cases}$$

Where $\lambda(a)$ denotes the cost of action a , PC is the set of propositional conditions and SC is the set of simple numeric conditions. \hat{m} represents the continuous relaxation of the number of repetitions, used for computational complexity reasons (Scala et al. 2020a).

Let \mathcal{P} be a numeric planning problem; we denote its subgoaling relaxation by \mathcal{P}^1 . We are particularly interested in proper **relaxations** that guarantee an over-approximation of the problem; i.e., if the original problem has at least one solution, so does its relaxation. This property proves very beneficial in the heuristic search, as it can be used for safely pruning and tends to provide more reliable estimates.

Controllable simple numeric problems

Extending numeric planning problems with control variables makes the decision space of each state potentially infinite, since now a single action with a control variable gives rise to infinitely many grounded instantiations, i.e., pairs of

action-control valuation. Figure 1 illustrates this problem in a node with three applicable actions.

The infinitude of the action space directly impacts the heuristic computation. Recall that, in the subgoaling relaxation, an action is considered a possible achiever of a condition when the regressed condition holds in the current state. With control variables, a single condition may therefore have infinitely many possible achievers, making the explicit computation of the heuristic derived from the relaxation infeasible.

A common strategy in related work facing similarly prohibitive costs is to compile the original problem into a simpler numeric model that relaxes certain aspects of the dynamics. Heuristic estimates are then computed over this compiled problem, which is more amenable to explicit reasoning and efficiently captures an informative approximation of the original task. This compilation-based approach is recurrent in the literature and can be seen, for instance, in work such as the effect-abstraction based relaxation in (Li et al. 2018) for numeric planning problems with linear effects or the HTN planning abstraction for guiding search (Höller et al. 2019).

Following this strategy, we seek to identify a subset of numeric planning problems with control variables whose compilation yields simple numeric planning problems. Since, in standard numeric planning *without* control variables, the subgoaling relaxation admits a closed-form computation only for the class of simple numeric planning problems (Scala et al. 2020a), our goal is to characterize an analogous class in the control-variable setting, which we call **controllable simple numeric problems**, with the aim of enabling the effective use of the subgoaling relaxation in the control-variable setting through a compilation.

Definition 4 (Controllable simple numeric conditions). *Given a set of controllable numeric assignments $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Assign}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, U)$, a numeric condition $(\xi \triangleright 0)$ is **controllable simple** iff*

- ξ is linear w.r.t. X , i.e., $\xi = (\xi_X \triangleright \xi_U)$, where $\xi_X \in \text{Expr}(X)$ is linear and $\xi_U \in \text{Expr}(U)$;
- $\triangleright \in \{>, \geq\}$;
- $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\varphi = (x := \xi')$, if x appears in ξ , φ can be rewritten as $(x += \xi'')$, where $\xi'' \in \text{Expr}(U)$.

A numeric planning problem with control variables $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$ is a **controllable simple numeric prob-**

lem iff every condition in \mathcal{P} is controllable simple. Recall that the set of all controllable simple numeric problems is a subset of the set of all numeric planning problems with control variables.

Example 1. Consider a controllable simple numeric problem defined as follows:

- **Fluents:** $F = \emptyset$,
- **Numeric state variables:** $X = \{x, y\}$,
- **Control variables:** $U = \{u_1, u_2\}$,
- **Initial state:** $x = 0, y = 0$,
- **Numeric goal:** $x > 20$,
- **Single action a with:**
 - **Preconditions:** $x > u_1, y > u_2$,
 - **Effects:** $x += 2u_1 + u_2, y += u_1 - 3u_2$.

This problem is a controllable simple numeric problem because the goal and conditions are controllable simple, and the effects of the action are of the desired form, i.e., additive and linear only with respect to the control variables.

Controllable simple numeric problems are problems such that conditions are linear in the state variables and such that the effects depend only on control variables. Since control variables are *free and bounded* variables that are not part of the state, we can consider them as “lifted numbers”. From this perspective, concretizing the values of control variables in a controllable simple numeric planning problem yields a simple numeric planning problem. What we need is a concretization that makes the relaxation safe-pruning.

Optimistic compilation

In this section, we present a relaxation that compiles a controllable simple numeric planning problem into a simple numeric one. We demonstrate that this compilation is safe-pruning under the subgoal relaxation, which automatically allows the use of numeric subgoal heuristics for estimate calculations through the compilation. To lay the groundwork, we first briefly review the closed arithmetic of intervals:

Definition 5 (Closed arithmetic of intervals). Given $x = [\underline{x}, \bar{x}]$ and $y = [\underline{y}, \bar{y}]$, then:

- $x + y = [\underline{x} + \underline{y}, \bar{x} + \bar{y}]$
- $x - y = [\underline{x} - \bar{y}, \bar{x} - \underline{y}]$
- $x \cdot y = [\min(\underline{x} \cdot \underline{y}, \underline{x} \cdot \bar{y}, \bar{x} \cdot \underline{y}, \bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}), \max(\underline{x} \cdot \underline{y}, \underline{x} \cdot \bar{y}, \bar{x} \cdot \underline{y}, \bar{x} \cdot \bar{y})]$

Given an arithmetic expression over U , $\xi \in \text{Expr}(U)$, we will denote $\text{Dom}(\xi)$ as the interval resultant from the arithmetic operation of the domain interval for every variable. For example, if $\text{Dom}(u_1) = [1, 2]$ and $\text{Dom}(u_2) = [0, 3]$, then $\text{Dom}(3u_1 + u_2) = 3 \cdot [1, 2] + [0, 3] = [3, 6] + [0, 3] = [3, 9]$. We will refer to the lower and upper bound of $\text{Dom}(\xi)$ as its **extreme valuations**, i.e., $\underline{\text{Dom}}(\xi)$ and $\bar{\text{Dom}}(\xi)$.

We define the optimistic compilation for the controllable simple numeric problem as a new problem with every controllable simple condition relaxed to its lower bound, and considering every extreme valuation for every effect of the original actions, that is:

Definition 6 (Optimistic compilation). Given a controllable simple numeric planning problem $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$, we define the **optimistic compilation** of \mathcal{P} , $\mathcal{P}_O = (F, X, A_O, s_0, G)$, as the numeric planning problem resulting from substituting every expression $\xi \in \text{Const}(X \cup U)$ with its extreme valuations. That is, for each $a \in A$ such that $\text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) = \{(x_1 += \xi_u^{x_1}), \dots, (x_n += \xi_u^{x_n})\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ and $\xi_u^{x_1}, \dots, \xi_u^{x_n} \in \text{Expr}(U)$ we define a new set $\Lambda(a)$ such that:

- $\Lambda(a) = \{a_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n} \mid \lambda_i \in \{\underline{\text{Dom}}(\xi_u^{x_i}), \bar{\text{Dom}}(\xi_u^{x_i})\} \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$,
- $\text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}) = \{(x_1 += \lambda_1), \dots, (x_n += \lambda_n)\}$
- For every atomic condition $\psi \equiv (\xi_X \triangleright \xi_U)$ appearing in $\text{Pre}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a)$, it transforms to $\psi_O \equiv (\xi_X \triangleright \underline{\text{Dom}}(\xi_U))$ in $\text{Pre}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}) \forall \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.
- $A_O = \bigcup_{a \in A} \Lambda(a)$

This compilation produces a finite problem by exhaustively enumerating all optimistic valuations of the control-dependent effects of each action. In parallel, all controllable simple conditions in the preconditions are relaxed to their lower bound, intuitively ensuring that any action that is executable in the original problem under some valuation of the control variables remains executable in the compiled task. The resulting problem then over-approximates the behavior of the original one.

Example 2. Consider Example 1 from the previous section, with control variable domains $\text{Dom}(u_1) = [0, 4]$ and $\text{Dom}(u_2) = [3, 5]$. First, we compute the ranges of the linear expressions:

$$\text{Dom}(2u_1 + u_2) = [3, 13], \quad \text{Dom}(u_1 - 3u_2) = [-15, -5].$$

The optimistic compilation generates four actions corresponding to the extreme bounds of these expressions. All actions share the same preconditions, coming from the original preconditions $x > u_1, y > u_2$:

$$x > 3, \quad y > -15.$$

The actions and their effects are:

Action	Effect on x	Effect on y
$a_{3, -15}$	$x += 3$	$y += -15$
$a_{13, -15}$	$x += 13$	$y += -15$
$a_{3, -5}$	$x += 3$	$y += -5$
$a_{13, -5}$	$x += 13$	$y += -5$

Each action represents one combination of extreme values for the expressions involving the control variables.

The first thing we need to prove is that, in fact, this compilation induces a simple numeric planning problem.

Theorem 1. Given $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$ a controllable simple numeric planning problem, \mathcal{P}_O is a simple numeric planning problem.

Proof. This holds trivially since control variables only appear in actions, and since \mathcal{P} is controllable-simple, conditions are linear with respect to X , so in \mathcal{P}_O conditions are linear given that control variables’ expressions become constants. Effects also become additive with respect to a constant for the same reason. \square

After proving that the compiled problem is in fact simple numeric, we need to prove that the optimistic compilation is safe pruning under the subgoal relaxation. This will enable an effective use of the subgoal relaxation as dead-end detector and as heuristic estimator.

Theorem 2. *Given $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$ a controllable-simple numeric planning problem, let Π be the set of solutions for \mathcal{P} . Then $\Pi_{\mathcal{P}} \neq \emptyset \implies \Pi_{\mathcal{P}_O} \neq \emptyset$, i.e., the compilation is safe pruning under the subgoal relaxation.*

Proof. If $\Pi_{\mathcal{P}} \neq \emptyset$, let $\pi \in \Pi_{\mathcal{P}}$ be a solution for \mathcal{P} . We proceed by induction over π .

Base case. A condition reached by an empty plan is trivially satisfied in the initial state s_0 , which is the same in both compilations.

Inductive step. A condition reached by π that is not true in the initial state implies the existence of some pair $\langle a_i, \mu_i \rangle$ in π making ψ true from the state s_{i-1} reached by the prefix of π up to $\langle a_i, \mu_i \rangle$. We want to discover a possible achiever in the relaxation that works towards ψ . Let us define ψ as an abstract condition $\psi \equiv \sum_{x_i} w_{x_i} \cdot x_i \triangleright \xi_u$, where $\xi_u \in \text{Expr}(U)$. But $\sum_{x_i \in X} w_{x_i} \cdot x_i \triangleright \xi_u \geq \underline{\text{Dom}}(\xi_u)$, and thus the set of states that fulfill the compiled condition in \mathcal{P}_O is always greater than those in \mathcal{P} . In particular, since $s_{i-1} \models_{\mu_i} \text{Pre}(a_i)$, by hypothesis of induction, then it follows that $s_{i-1} \models \text{Pre}(a_{i\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}) \forall \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$.

Now, it is just a matter of choosing the right lambdas in order for the effects to work towards fulfilling ψ . This can be computed by calculating the net effect $N_{\psi,a}$ of each action $a_{i\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}$ and choosing the right extreme values for it to be positive. For every $e \in \text{Eff}(a)$, the net effect before the compilation, or the contribution of the action towards fulfilling the condition, can be computed as a trivial generalization of the net effect for standard numeric planning (Scala et al. 2020a):

$$N_{\psi,a} = \sum_{\substack{x_i \in \text{lhs}(e) \\ e \in \text{Eff}(a)}} w_{x_i} \cdot \xi_u^{x_i}$$

But $N_{\psi,a}$ in this setting is an expression that depends on control variables; concretely, its domain can be calculated as an interval regarding the close arithmetic:

$$\text{Dom}(N_{\psi,a}) = \sum_{\substack{x_i \in \text{lhs}(e) \\ e \in \text{Eff}(a)}} w_{x_i} \cdot \text{Dom}(\xi_u^{x_i})$$

If the domain of the net effect is greater than zero, then the action is a possible achiever for the condition because it has a positive contribution on the condition. $\text{Dom}(N_{\psi,a})$ is an interval that **we actually know has a positive side**, because of the inductive hypothesis, since there exists some control valuation μ_i that actually makes ψ fulfillable, which also means that the substitution of the expression using the control valuation, $\text{subs}_{\mu}(N_{\psi,a})$, follows $\text{subs}_{\mu}(N_{\psi,a}) \in \text{Dom}(N_{\psi,a})$ and $\text{subs}_{\mu}(N_{\psi,a}) > 0$.

We choose lambdas taking into account the sign of each w_{x_i} . If $w_{x_i} > 0$, we define $\lambda_i := \overline{\text{Dom}(\xi_u^{x_i})}$, and if $w_{x_i} < 0$, we define $\lambda_i := \underline{\text{Dom}(\xi_u^{x_i})}$. With this choice of lambdas,

we know for certain that $a_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}$ is a possible achiever of ψ_O . This is because the choice of lambdas also implies a valuation μ_O such that $\text{subs}_{\mu_O}(N_{\psi,a}) \geq \text{subs}_{\mu}(N_{\psi,a})$, because we are taking the extreme values for the expressions, and we know that the right side of that inequality is greater than zero by induction.

Finally, observe that the subgoal relaxation considers reachability of conditions separately, and thus, since all conditions are reachable, so is any conjunction of them, q.e.d. \square

Although the optimistic compilation constitutes a safe-pruning relaxation, its main drawback is that the number of compiled actions grows exponentially with the number of effects in each action. The remainder of this work focuses on mitigating this overhead.

Reducing the complexity of the optimistic compilation

The exponential nature of the optimistic compilation makes it impractical to use. Nevertheless, if we follow the proof of Theorem 2, it is actually possible to reduce the set of optimistic actions involved. The objective of this section is thus to reduce the size of the compilation by looking and theoretical properties that can be inferred from the proof of the last theorem. Let us first define what we call the sign choice function:

Definition 7 (Sign choice function). *Let $\mathcal{P} = (F, X, U, A, s_0, G)$ be a controllable simple numeric planning problem and let $a \in A$. Let $\text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a) = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ and for each effect e_j let $\text{lhs}(e_j) \in X$ be the state variable it updates and $\xi_u^{lhs(e_j)} \in \text{Expr}(U)$ the control-only expression contributing to that update. For a given atomic condition $\psi \equiv \sum_{x_i \in X} w_{x_i} x_i \triangleright \xi_u$, we define the **sign choice** function of a given effect as*

$$\chi_{\psi,a}(e_j) = \begin{cases} \overline{\text{Dom}(\xi_u^{lhs(e_j)})}, & \text{if } w_{lhs(e_j)} > 0 \\ \underline{\text{Dom}(\xi_u^{lhs(e_j)})}, & \text{if } w_{lhs(e_j)} < 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } w_{lhs(e_j)} = 0 \end{cases}$$

The **signature** of action a relative to a condition ψ is a vector of sign choices $\sigma_{\psi,a}$ such that:

$$\sigma_{\psi,a} = (\chi_{\psi,a}(e_1), \dots, \chi_{\psi,a}(e_m))$$

The signature of an action only uses the variants of the compilation that have a positive net effect over the condition, i.e., that are possible achievers.

Definition 8 (Signature compilation). *Let \mathcal{P} be a controllable simple numeric planning problem. Let $\Sigma_a := \{\sigma_{\psi,a} \mid \psi \in \Psi_a\}$, where Ψ_a is the set of all relevant conditions for a , i.e., every condition that contain $\text{lhs}(e_j)$ for some $e_j \in \text{Eff}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a)$. We define the **signature compilation** of \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{P}_{Σ} , as the optimistic compilation with a reduced set of actions:*

$$A_{\Sigma}(a) := \{a_{\sigma} \mid \sigma \in \Sigma_a\}, \quad \forall a \in A$$

Defining $A_{\Sigma} = \bigcup_{a \in A} A_{\Sigma}(a)$, then $\mathcal{P}_{\Sigma} = (F, X, A_{\Sigma}, s_0, G)$.

We can further reduce each set Σ_a by collapsing signatures to their non-zero components, that is, by removing effect entries that do not participate in any relevant condition. This allows multiple signatures to be merged when they differ only in components that are irrelevant for all conditions under consideration. For example, the set $\{(0, 4), (3, 7)\}$ is equivalent to $\{(3, 4), (3, 7)\}$, and the set $\{(0, 1), (5, 0)\}$ is equivalent to $\{(5, 1)\}$ after collapsing the zero entry. This reduced compilation can also be used to detect non-solvability of the problem, since it exposes actions whose effects do not contribute positively to any goal-relevant condition. The resulting action set A_Σ is still a subset of A_O and preserves the relaxation property established in the previous theorem.

Proposition 1. *Given a controllable-simple numeric planning problem \mathcal{P} , then \mathcal{P}_Σ is a relaxation under the subgoaling relaxation. In other words, replacing A_O by the reduced set A_Σ preserves the relaxation property.*

Proof. In the compilation to \mathcal{P}_Σ , we construct the reduced set $A_\Sigma \subseteq A_O$ by selecting only those instantiations that can act as achievers of at least one goal or subgoal. That is, for every subgoal g , if an action $a \in A_O$ can achieve g under some instantiation of its control variables, the corresponding instantiation is included in A_Σ . Conversely, any action that cannot contribute to achieving any subgoal is discarded.

Since A_Σ is a subset of A_O that preserves all possible achievers for every subgoal, the subgoaling relaxation remains valid: any relaxed plan that exists in \mathcal{P} can also be constructed in \mathcal{P}_Σ . No new constraints are introduced, and no potential achievers are removed from consideration for the purpose of the relaxation. Therefore, \mathcal{P}_Σ maintains the relaxation property under the subgoaling relaxation, as required. \square

Example 3. *Continuing the previous example, recall that a is the only action schema with effects $e_1 : x += 2u_1 + u_2$ and $e_2 : y += u_1 - 3u_2$, and compiled preconditions $x > 3$ and $y > -15$. The conditions relevant to a (that is, those involving a variable appearing in $\text{lhs}(e_j)$) are the goal $x > 20$ and the numeric preconditions of the action $y > -15$ and $x > 3$. We compute the signatures with respect to each of these conditions:*

- For $\psi_1 \equiv x > 20$ and $x > 3$ we have coefficients $w_x = 1$ and $w_y = 0$, and then we only need the upper bound for x .
- For $\psi_2 \equiv y > -15$ we have $w_x = 0$ and $w_y = 1$, and then we only need the upper bound for y .

The signature set relevant to action a is $\Sigma_a = \{(13, 0), (0, -5)\}$, which collapses into $\Sigma_a = \{(13, -5)\}$. Hence, the only relevant action is the one with the upper bounds, since w_x and w_y is greater or equal than zero for every precondition. According to the definition of the signature compilation, we only need to generate the action $a_{13, -5}$. In this case, the compiled problem has the same amount of actions as the original.

The size of the signature compilation can be proven to be linear with respect to the number of conditions of the problem, i.e., linear with respect to the size of the problem.

Proposition 2 (Size bound of the signature compilation). *Let \mathcal{P} be a controllable-simple numeric planning problem, and let $\mathcal{P}_\Sigma = (F, X, A_\Sigma, s_0, G)$ be its signature compilation. For each action a from \mathcal{P} , let Ψ_a be the set of all relevant atomic conditions for a , i.e., every condition that contain $\text{lhs}(e_j)$ for some $e_j \in \text{Eff}_\mathbb{Q}(a)$. Let the set of signatures of a be $\Sigma_a := \{\sigma_{\psi, a} \mid \psi \in \Psi_a\}$ and let Ψ denote the total number of distinct numeric atomic conditions that appear in \mathcal{P} , that is, the number of atomic numeric conditions occurring in both action preconditions and in the goal. Then,*

$$|A_\Sigma| \leq |A| \cdot |\Psi|$$

which means that the size of the compilation is polynomial with respect to the size of the original problem, in terms of the number of original preconditions.

Proof. By definition $\Sigma_a = \{\sigma_{\psi, a} \mid \psi \in \Psi_a\}$ and hence $|\Sigma_a| = |\Psi_a|$. Since Ψ_a is a subset of the set of all numeric atomic conditions of the problem, we have $|\Psi_a| \leq |\Psi|$ for every $a \in A$. Therefore $|A_\Sigma| = \sum_{a \in A} |\Sigma_a| \leq \sum_{a \in A} |\Psi| = |A| \cdot |\Psi|$ \square

The cardinality bound on the action set of the signature compilation remains tractable in practice, thanks to the dependence on the average of signatures between each action and the fact that the set of effects is usually much lower than the set of all variables X . The compilation remains almost linear in practice with only higher bounds if tighter sets of preconditions Ψ_a are present, and can be computed polynomially with respect to the number of conditions of the problem.

We define the heuristic h_Σ^{add} as the numeric heuristic \hat{h}_{hbd+}^{add} applied to the compiled problem obtained through the signature compilation of the problem.

Extracting more information from subgoaling heuristics

The additive heuristic h_Σ^{add} computes costs by summing relaxed action contributions for each subgoal. While this provides strong and valuable search guidance, this relaxation ignores positive interactions among actions, causing a systematic overestimation of the real plan cost, especially in domains with overlapping effects. This overestimation is a direct consequence of counting the cost of actions multiple times when they contribute to several subgoals, even though, in a real plan, the same action instance may suffice for several achievements.

To address this limitation, the h^{mfp} heuristic (Scala et al. 2020b), based on multi-repetition relaxed plans in simple numeric planning problems, merges redundant action contributions by tracking the maximum required count for each action rather than simply accumulating all individual contributions. This approach is also safe-prunning and allows h^{mfp} to more accurately capture the dependencies and synergies between numeric actions and subgoals, reducing inadmissible overestimation and providing more informed search guidance for simple numeric planning problems. We then define h_Σ^{mfp} as the h^{mfp} heuristic under the signature compilation.

Experiments

In this section, we analyze the practical impact of the signature compilation used in the h_{Σ}^{add} and h_{Σ}^{mfp} heuristics. We implemented both heuristics in the ENHSP planner and compared their performance with existing heuristics within the Delayed Partial Expansions (DPEX) algorithm. We also evaluated their performance against the NextFLAP planner.

DPEX instantiation In our experiments we use DPEX with $f(n) = r_h(n, s)$ as node evaluation criterion, where $r_h(n, s) = h(s) + \log(1 + n)$, i.e., logarithmic rectification, where n is the number of partial expansions of s . For each partial expansion, five successors are uniformly sampled via rejection sampling over the hypercube of control variables, rather than directly within the precondition polytope. Direct sampling over the polytope is not a trivial problem, and an interesting direction for future work. Experiments were conducted with a fixed seed on a 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-12900KF CPU running Ubuntu 22.04 LTS, with a 30-minute timeout and 8 GB memory limit, and five runs per problem.

Baselines. Our experiments are evaluated against baseline search configurations that rely on domain-independent heuristics. Specifically, we compare against two heuristics: a blind heuristic h^0 and the Manhattan goal-counting heuristic h^{mgc} , which computes the Manhattan distance to the numeric subgoals and counts the number of satisfied propositional subgoals. The Manhattan goal-counting heuristic is particularly effective in domains with numeric goal constraints, although its performance is highly domain specific and does not capture the causal structure of actions. We also compare against a standard run of the deterministic planner NextFLAP, capable of handling control parameters. The purpose of the baseline evaluation is to assess whether exploiting action and goal structure within heuristic computations yields a performance benefit; which is particularly relevant because previous evaluations with DPEX had to rely on structure-independent heuristics.

Domains. We use three domains introduced in POP-CORN: CASHPOINT, PROCUREMENT and TERRARIA. These domains only have propositional goal conditions and are relatively hard, especially the TERRARIA domain which uses six control variables at the same time and the PROCUREMENT domain that has a lot of causality between actions. We also use four enhanced domains from the numeric IPC as in (Aso-Mollar et al. 2025b): BLOCKGROUPING, COUNTERS, DRONE and SAILING. The first three have numeric goal conditions, while the fourth one has only propositional. The DRONE domain is the hardest one since it has a lot of dead-ends, while the SAILING domain stands out for being unbounded in the position of the boats. For each of these seven domains, we considered both continuous (C) and discrete (D) versions, i.e., we used control variables with and without decimals, respectively. For every domain, we generated 20 problems of increasing size, which can be found in the supplementary material.

Heuristic setup. The overhead cost of setting up the heuristic is negligible, with an average time of approxi-

mately 15 milliseconds. Moreover, in Table 1 we compare the number of actions with respect to the original problem A and the compiled ones A_O and A_{Σ} , and we observe that the overhead of the signature compilation A_{Σ} is far lower than that of the first compilation A_O . In certain domains such as CASHPOINT, PROCUREMENT or TERRARIA there is only one action needed in the signature compilation, since the control variables act as unbounded amounts of production with no upper limit. Especially in these domains, the difference with respect to the optimistic compilation A_O is clear. As an example, in the PROCUREMENT domain every action has an average of 3 control-dependent effects.

Domain	$ A $	$ A_{\Sigma} $	$ A_O $
BLOCKGROUPING	114.60	229.20	229.20
CASHPOINT	7379.00	7379.00	8758.00
COUNTERS	15.00	26.00	30.00
DRONE	14.50	20.50	25.375
PROCUREMENT	470.00	470.00	1700.50
SAILING	22.70	53.45	53.45
TERRARIA	40.00	40.00	120.00

Table 1: Average size of action sets A , A_{Σ} and A_O .

Results. Table 2 reports coverage results for each domain and problem. For this analysis, we consider whether at least one run of DPEX successfully solves the problem. We also show runs solved by either h_{Σ}^{add} or h_{Σ}^{mfp} in the h_{Σ} column, and by NextFLAP in the NF column.

Domain	h^0	h^{mgc}	h_{Σ}^{add}	h_{Σ}^{mfp}	h_{Σ}	NF
BLOCKG.-C (20)	0	20	20	20	20	18
BLOCKG.-D (20)	0	20	20	20	20	16
CASHP.-C (20)	10	8	20	20	20	10
CASHP.-D (20)	10	17	20	20	20	9
COUNT.-C (20)	12	20	20	19	20	19
COUNT.-D (20)	16	20	20	20	20	17
DRONE-C (20)	12	0	2	13	13	0
DRONE-D (20)	18	18	18	18	18	0
PROCUR.-C (20)	8	10	16	10	16	10
PROCUR.-D (20)	5	9	14	11	14	10
SAIL.-C (20)	0	14	12	20	20	2
SAIL.-D (20)	1	12	20	20	20	0
TERR.-C (20)	6	6	20	4	20	0
TERR.-D (20)	6	7	20	3	20	0
TOTAL (280)	105	181	242	218	261	111

Table 2: Coverage for domain and heuristic employed. The column h_{Σ} corresponds to instances solved by either one of h_{Σ}^{add} or h_{Σ}^{mfp} , and NF corresponds to instances solved by NextFLAP.

Overall, the compilation-based approach is consistently dominant across all domains. We observe that either the h_{Σ}^{add} heuristic or the h_{Σ}^{mfp} heuristic systematically outperform the h^{mgc} executions. This is particularly noteworthy because h^{mgc} is specifically tailored for purely numeric domains such as BLOCKGROUPING, COUNTERS or SAILING, where the results show that incorporating action structure into heuristic computation is generally beneficial, especially for the SAILING domain.




Figure 2: Comparison of the runs of h_{Σ}^{add} or h_{Σ}^{mfp} heuristic versus baselines in terms of plan length, time and number of (partial) expansions, for the best case between the 5 runs.

The assumptions introduced by the compilation’s relaxation directly affect the performance of both heuristics, as reflected in the two columns corresponding to h_{Σ}^{add} and h_{Σ}^{mfp} . The compilation purposefully ignores control variables values when computing heuristic estimates. This can result in overly aggressive commitments to actions that do not properly account for control-dependent feasibility conditions. The effect is more pronounced in domains with a larger number of control variables or where these variables play a significant role and participate in many constraints, such as PROCUREMENT or DRONE, and might explain the performance degradation.

This tendency of the compilation committing too aggressively to certain actions also interacts with the fact that the additive heuristics overestimate the true cost. Interestingly, there appears to be a nontrivial interaction between the compilation’s underestimation and the heuristic’s overestimation. The analysis suggests a correlation between these two effects when looking at coverage in domains such as PROCUREMENT or COUNTERS, which perform better in h_{Σ}^{add} runs than in h_{Σ}^{mfp} ones, and it supports the hypothesis that both phenomena may “balance” each other out, partially compensating for their respective flaws and ultimately improving performance. The h_{Σ}^{mfp} correction, although better for the general case, might worsen results in some specific scenarios.

Regarding the comparison with NextFLAP, we observe that its performance is comparable to blind search with h^0 . This is a relevant result, because our approach exploits full state information to perform heuristic search, and this leads to significantly better scalability in practice, as confirmed by our analysis.

Following a more detailed analysis, Figure 2 presents a comparison in terms of plan length, time and number of (partial) expansions for each domain individually regarding h_{Σ} with respect to the best of the baselines h^{mgc} . We evaluate only the instances solved by both of the proposed approaches, comparing the best-performing run of either strategy. Extended figures with additional comparisons can be found in the supplementary material.

We observe a clear dominance of our approach over the goal-sensitive strategy, as well as a consistent trend toward improved performance compared to the numeric heuristic h^{mgc} . As expected, h^{mgc} remains slightly superior regarding analyzed metrics for the pure numerical domains, such as BLOCKGROUPING or COUNTERS, when considering the instances solved by both approaches. This behavior is likely tied to the nature of the compilation, further motivating the search for more informed ways of exploiting the infinite yet structured action space present in these problems.

Conclusions and future work

As a conclusion, we have proposed a heuristic based on the numeric subgoal relaxation that is applicable to the setting of control variables and achieves competitive results compared to standard domain-independent heuristics. This heuristic is based on an optimistic relaxation, which transforms the original problem into a tractable simple numeric planning problem. This compilation, however, is exponential in the number of effects of the problem at hand, so to mitigate this potential combinatorial explosion we introduce the signature compilation, which retains only actions that contribute positively to conditions.

Our approach provides a practical and theoretically sound method for applying standard numeric heuristics based on subgoaling in the context of control variables, supported with experimental evaluation. We observed that the over-approximation inherent in the optimistic compilation, which ignores the control component in the decision-making, can lead to decreased performance in some domains.

This work therefore opens a promising line of research for future exploration of heuristic computation in problems with control variables. In particular, by identifying concrete valuations for which possible achievers are more informative in order to bridge the gap with most geometric domains. Although addressing this challenge is nontrivial, our approach provides a solid foundation for developing increasingly informed and effective heuristics in this setting.

References

Aso-Mollar, Á.; Aineto, D.; Scala, E.; and Onaindia, E. 2025a. Handling Infinite Domain Parameters in Planning Through Best-First Search with Delayed Partial Expansions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-25*, 8456–8464. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

Aso-Mollar, Á.; Aineto, D.; Scala, E.; and Onaindia, E. 2025b. A Sampling Approach to Planning with Infinite Domain Control Variables. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling, ICAPS-25*, 149–153.

Bonet, B.; and Geffner, H. 2001. Planning as heuristic search. *Artificial Intelligence*, 129(1): 5–33.

Fox, M.; and Long, D. 2003. PDDL2.1: An Extension to PDDL for Expressing Temporal Planning Domains. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 20: 61–124.

Heesch, R.; Cimatti, A.; Ehrhardt, J.; Diedrich, A.; and Niggemann, O. 2024. A Lazy Approach to Neural Numerical Planning with Control Parameters. In *European Conference on Artificial Intelligence 2024, Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 4262–4270. IOS Press.

Höller, D.; Bercher, P.; Behnke, G.; and Biundo, S. 2019. On Guiding Search in HTN Planning with Classical Planning Heuristics. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, 6171–6175. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

Li, D.; Scala, E.; Haslum, P.; and Bogomolov, S. 2018. Effect-Abstraction Based Relaxation for Linear Numeric Planning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-18*, 4787–4793. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

Sapena, O.; Onaindia, E.; and Marzal, E. 2024. A Hybrid Approach for Expressive Numeric and Temporal Planning with Control Parameters. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 242: 122820.

Savas, E.; Fox, M.; Long, D.; and Magazzeni, D. 2016. Planning Using Actions with Control Parameters. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI-16*, volume 285 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 1185–1193. IOS Press.

Scala, E.; Haslum, P.; Thiébaut, S.; and Ramírez, M. 2016. Interval-Based Relaxation for General Numeric Planning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 655–663. IOS Press.

Scala, E.; Haslum, P.; Thiébaut, S.; and Ramírez, M. 2020a. Subgoaling Techniques for Satisficing and Optimal Numeric Planning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 68: 691–752.

Scala, E.; Saetti, A.; Serina, I.; and Gerevini, A. E. 2020b. Search-Guidance Mechanisms for Numeric Planning Through Subgoal Relaxation. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 30(1): 226–234.

Shin, J.; and Davis, E. 2005. Processes and Continuous Change in a SAT-based Planner. *Artificial Intelligence*, 166(1-2): 194–253.