

Hybrid Reinforcement Learning and Search for Flight Trajectory Planning

Alberto Luise ✉

University of Bologna, Italy

Michele Lombardi ✉

University of Bologna, Italy

Florent Teichteil Koenigsbuch ✉

Airbus-Toulouse, France

Abstract

This paper explores the combination of Reinforcement Learning (RL) and search-based path planners to speed up the optimization of flight paths for airliners, where in case of emergency a fast route re-calculation can be crucial. The fundamental idea is to train an RL Agent to pre-compute near-optimal paths based on location and atmospheric data and use those at runtime to constrain the underlying path planning solver and find a solution within a certain distance from the initial guess. The approach effectively reduces the size of the solver's search space, significantly speeding up route optimization. Although global optimality is not guaranteed, empirical results conducted with Airbus aircraft's performance models show that fuel consumption remains nearly identical to that of an unconstrained solver, with deviations typically within 1%. At the same time, computation speed can be improved by up to 50% as compared to using a conventional solver alone. This paper discusses the theoretical framework, the different implementation strategies, the adopted testing procedures, the obtained results and finally further possible developments and future perspectives.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Computing methodologies → Artificial intelligence

Keywords and phrases Reinforcement Learning AI Hybrid methods

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

The optimal trajectory for an airliner to go from point A to point B is often not a straight line, not only due to the Earth's curvature but also due to weather conditions, wind, temperature and other atmospheric factors. Furthermore, fully simulating an aircraft is not an easy task, as they are very complex machines: computing the transition states and costs from one waypoint to another in a search graph requires to call an external performance model simulator which is very CPU time consuming. Therefore, standard flight planning algorithms rely on a number of approximations ranging from simplified performance model to decoupled lateral/longitudinal search. In order to allow for practical use of more accurate and non-decoupled flight planning models as the ones developed by Airbus in the *scikit-decide* library [3], more advanced techniques like hybridization of machine learning and model-based planning are necessary. While computation speed might not be a problem when computing an airport-to-airport route in advance, it could become crucial depending on the application. In fact, in case of **Flight Diversion**, an automated planner could be used on-line to re-compute multiple trajectory options to the nearest airports in case a passenger has a critical health condition and has to be taken to a hospital as soon as possible. In these circumstances a slow planner, accurate as it may be, is not adequate.

The solution proposed in this paper is to build over an existing route construction approach, based on combinatorial search and light constraint propagation via Forward Checking. Specifically, inspired by the UNIFY framework [9], a coarse route construction



© Alberto Luise, Michele Lombardi, Alistair Nottle, and Florent Teichteil Koenigsbuch;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

stage based on Reinforcement Learning (RL) is introduced, and used to constrain the existing combinatorial approach to search in the vicinity of the RL routes. The resulting hybrid method can reduce the computation time by up to 50%, thanks to the low inference cost of RL, with a negligible or moderate loss in terms of solution quality. Additionally, while the focus of this paper is on a deterministic version of the problem, the method could be naturally extended to account for uncertainty.

2 Problem Definition

This paper considers the problem of planning a route for an aircraft from an origin to a destination, accounting for earth geometry, weather, and fuel consumption through a deterministic model. Such a trajectory is generally specified via a sequence of waypoints, starting with the origin and ending with the destination. Navigation between subsequent waypoints is assumed to follow a great circle trajectory, with no adjustment made for adverse weather or obstacles. In this paper, reducing fuel consumption is the main objective, since it accounts for flight time, but also for potentially difficult encountered weather conditions.

Formally, the state of an aircraft can be modeled as a pair (x, s) , where $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ represents the aircraft location in a three-dimensional space and the vector s captures all remaining state components, such as mass, acceleration, fuel level, etc. Weather conditions include the wind speed, wind direction, and temperature and are modeled through a tensor field $\xi(x)$, associating relevant information to each location. The cost of flying between two locations x' and x'' along a great circle trajectory is specified via a function $f_\xi(x', x'')$, which is evaluated by means of a simulator. An aircraft route consists of a sequence $\tau = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^n$, where x_1 represents the origin and x_n the destination. The cost of traversing the route is given by:

$$f_\xi(\tau) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_\xi(x_k, x_{k+1}). \quad (1)$$

This work assumes the availability of an approximation algorithm capable of computing near-optimal routes; in this specific case such an algorithm consists in a planner that works by: 1) defining a discretization of the three-dimensional space between the origin and the destination; 2) building a directed-graph representation over the discretization, using forward-checking to account for feasibility of flight maneuvers; 3) computing the cost of moving from connected nodes in the graph via a linear approximation of the cost $f_\xi(x', x'')$, for reduced computational cost; 4) searching for an optimal path via A*, guided by a custom heuristic. The algorithm is implemented in the *scikit-decide* library, an AI framework for Reinforcement Learning, Automated Planning and Scheduling [3]. It has been co-developed at Airbus AI Research together with the ANITI research center and TUPLES project and provides multiple solvers capable of interacting with pre-existing or custom built environments.

The space discretization consists of a three-dimensional box, whose number of nodes along each axis can be configured. A finer discretization results in a better approximation of the cost, a better representation of the continuous nature of aircraft travel, and therefore in remarkably better route costs. Unfortunately, a linear increase of the number of nodes on every axis leads to a cubic increase in the total number of nodes. Together with the complex nature of the problem cost, this results in run-times that are not suitable for online scenarios, where flight diversions need to be quickly computed. The main goal of this contribution is that of *reducing the time needed to compute a route*. Additionally, this work aims at paving the way for a solution approach capable of accounting for uncertainty in the weather condition fields, which is currently treated as deterministic.

3 Hybrid model

The structure of a solution for the considered problem (i.e. a sequence of locations) suggests that significant run-time reductions could be reached via a hierarchical approach [5, 6]: for example, one could think of planning a route with a coarse discretization, then connecting the resulting waypoints with routes built using a finer discretization. Unfortunately, using a coarse discretization makes the linear cost approximation used by the planner very inaccurate. Additionally, forcing the route to traverse the waypoints built with a coarse discretization can be overly restrictive, especially if such waypoints are poorly chosen. Finally, such a hierarchical approach could not be easily extended to deal with weather uncertainty.

The proposed idea is to build a “soft” hierarchical approach, where the problem is first tackled by a faster, less accurate approach (traversing a continuous space instead of being constrained by a waypoint graph) and afterwards this information is used by a more thorough planner to solve the task from the beginning but with a clear guideline for the optimal solution. The high-level route needs to be calculated using an algorithm with a very fast run time, capable of dealing with non-linear environments and possibly ready to deal with uncertainty; a perfect fit for this description is **Reinforcement Learning**. The low-level route can then be calculated by the scikit-decide planner using A^* , but with an additional constraint forcing it to explore only the graph within a fixed distance from the previously computed trajectory, composed of a few intermediate points in space. This results in a significant reduction of the search space and of the computation time.

3.1 The Reinforcement Learning Agent

As previously stated, the task of the RL agent is to build a coarse trajectory, including only a small pre-decided number n of waypoints. In particular, the agent is formally a function taking as input a destination x_n and the current aircraft location x , and providing as output an action. The function is actually the composition of a feature extraction module and a Neural Network (NN), i.e. $a_\theta(g(x, x_n))$. Starting from the current location and the destination, the feature extractor provides to the NN: 1) the difference vector between the destination and the current location, rotated by an angle ϕ in order to make every instance of the problem appear as a straight trip upwards and deprived of the altitude component; 2) all information from the weather field. Formally, we have that:

$$g : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} R_\phi I_2 (x_n - x) \\ \xi(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where:

$$R_\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\phi) & -\sin(\phi) \\ \sin(\phi) & \cos(\phi) \end{pmatrix} \quad I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

The I_2 matrix is used to filter out the altitude component from the locations. The RL agent does not handle altitude directly, for multiple reasons:

- The impact of altitude on the horizontal projection of the flight plan in term of lateral deviations is typically lower than the width of the corridor used by the low-level flight planner. Therefore, taking into account altitude in the RL agent would not change much the resulting coarse trajectory, thereby the corridor used by the flight planner.
- Considering altitude would increase the number of dimensions of both the state and the action space for the Agent, further increasing the difficulty of the learning problem.

XX:4 Integrating RL with Search & Optimization strategies

- The search graph used by the planner is often quite narrow along the vertical component (due to altitude control), and therefore plays a minor role in the research cost (and even if it had a major impact, vertical components marginally impact the horizontal profile).
- Designing an agent that is insensitive to altitude allows one to avoid retraining in case an altitude profile is imposed by flight regulators, since these only require adjustments to the A^* planner.

Based on this information, the NN a_θ computes an output action, consisting of a two dimensional vector in $[-1, 1]^2$, which is then scaled up and rotated to obtain a movement vector on the two dimensional plane. This is used to compute the next aircraft location as:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \begin{pmatrix} R_\phi^{-1} a_\theta(x, x_n) \frac{\|x_n - x_1\|_2}{n} \\ \Delta h_k \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

where x_1 is the route origin and Δh_k is the difference in altitude for the current step, according to the altitude profile. The maximum distance the plane will be allowed to travel in a direction each step is the total length of the trip divided by the number of sub-steps calculated in the path. At training time, all movement vectors are generated according to the agent output, meaning that the destination might not be reached exactly. At inference time, the actual destination is always used as the last waypoint.

Give that the planning problem cost consists of the fuel consumption, one may think of using its (negated) value as the reward for the RL agent. Doing this would however result in naïve (and physically meaningless) policies, since fuel consumption can be minimized by just keeping the aircraft stationary. The Agent needs information guiding it towards the destination, and for this reason the reward consists of two components. The first one is **the component of the movement vector which contributes to reaching the destination**, obtained by projecting it onto the distance vector from start to finish, normalized by the sub-step length. It can be defined as

$$V_k = \frac{\|(\Delta x_k \cdot D_k) / (D_k \cdot D_k) \times D_k\|_2}{\|\Delta x_k\|_2} - \lambda \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta x_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$, D_k is the distance vector between x_k and the destination. For this computation, the altitude component is removed from both vectors. Finally λ is a small regularization parameter preventing V_k from reaching 1. The second component is actually the fuel consumption. In detail, the reward function is $-(1 - V_k)^\gamma \cdot F_k$ where F_k is the consumed fuel $f_\xi(x_k, x_{k+1})$ and γ is an hyperparameter regulating the importance given to both components of the equation. The λ term inside V_k prevents multiplication by zero.

The training method used for the agent is part of the Proximal Policy Optimization family, containing algorithms that learn a policy without having an explicit model of their environment. Specifically it's an adaptation of *PPO-clip*, which in addition to the standard Actor-Critic approach¹ employs a clipping mechanism, which improves stability preventing overly large changes in a single step. Its inner workings and formulas are detailed in [8]. The agent was trained over 16,000 random instances of the Flight Planning problem, obtained by sampling two points per trip (origin and destination) from the European sky, coarsely represented by a rectangular area between $71^\circ N, 35^\circ E$ (above Finland) and $34^\circ N, 10^\circ W$ (Canary Islands). If the distance between the sampled points is lower than a threshold

¹ Actor-Critic approaches combine a policy (the Actor), which samples the actions, and a differentiable value function (the Critic) that evaluates the rewards and provides low-variance gradients [7].

t , the pair is re-sampled. In all our experiments, we train the agent to generate routes including five waypoints, hence $n = 5$. These include the origin and the destination. Despite a single training routine taking up to 10 hours (making grid search especially difficult), at runtime the Agent, independently from the trip length, takes $\sim 1.5s$ to calculate the approximate trajectory.

3.2 The Complete Model

Once the Agent’s calculations are completed, the Flight Planning Domain is invoked and the graph for the trajectory search is built. Such search graph is a three-dimensional matrix of nodes with a latitude, longitude and altitude component and with size $\{I, J, H\}$. Its first and last rows are composed of identical nodes, representing the starting point and the arrival point. The A^* solver explores this network as a directed graph, where each node $n_{i,j,h}$ is only able to reach the ones in the successive row moving within adjacent values of j and h , i.e. $n_{i+1,j',h'}$, where $j' \in \{j - 1, j, j + 1\}$ and $h' \in \{h - 1, h, h + 1\}$.


Information from the route computed by the RL agent is incorporated, by marking some of the nodes as unreachable based on their distance from the approximate trajectory. Specifically, while i represents the distance from the objective and h is the altitude component only handled by the planner, the j values will be used to define the optimality region acting as a threshold for reachable points (modifying accordingly the starting point of the algorithm in the first row of identical points). The final search space is thus calculated as follows:

- for each row, an intermediate point lying on the approximate trajectory of length m is calculated as $\bar{x}_i = x_p + (x_{p+1} - x_p)(i \bmod s)/s$, where $s = I/m$ and $p = i/s$;
 - after that, the index of the point $x_{i,\bar{j}}$ closest in space to the previously calculated one is saved, and the smallest and largest values of \bar{j} will define the optimal region;
 - the region is expanded or shrunk until its width $\bar{j}_{max} - \bar{j}_{min}$ is equal to the w parameter.
- Once this procedure is complete, the *sk-decide* planner is called to solve the instance on the newly formed graph, with the starting point of the search being $x_{0,(\bar{j}_{max}-\bar{j}_{min})/2,H/2}$. By changing the value of w , one can control the extent of graph being searched. A sufficiently large w recovers the original planner behavior.

4 Experiments

All experiments were performed on a 8-Core, 3593 Mhz CPU, with 16 GB of RAM and a SSD with a sequential read speed of 3068 MB/s, operating inside an Anaconda environment on Windows 11. The RL training took place as described in Section 3.1, implemented using the Gymnasium library [2] for the environment and Stable-Baseline3 [4] for the Agent. Grid search was employed to optimize the following hyperparameters:

- **Hidden Size:** the number of nodes in each hidden layer;



■ **Figure 1** Hybrid Model workflow: the blue points are the original graph, the RL route is in green, and the azure area is the constrained region.

XX:6 Integrating RL with Search & Optimization strategies

Hidden Size	Clip Range	Learning Rate	Exponent	End Reward
64	0.2	5×10^{-6}	2.0	True

■ **Table 1** Optimized hyperparameter values

- **Clip Range:** bounds that limit how much the policy can change during training, represented by the letter ϵ . It's typically set to a small value in $[0.1, 0.25]$;
- **Learning Rate:** used in gradient descent training;
- **Reward Exponent:** represented by the letter γ in the loss function, it determines how much importance is given to the direction taken by the plane or to the fuel consumed;
- **Extra End Reward:** flag boosting the last reward given to the Agent if the destination is reached (or hindering it in case of a missed flight). Given a threshold T used to set a minimum distance required from the precise destination to consider the approximate path as "valid", the added value to the final reward is calculated as follows:

$$r(P_k, T)_k = \begin{cases} -\rho_1 * D(P_k, T) & D(P_k, T) > T \\ \rho_2 * (1 - D(P_k, T)) & D(P_k, T) < T \end{cases} \quad (6)$$


Where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are weights used to give more importance to the rewards to be delivered, in this case set respectively to 5 and 2. The optimal values found for each of these parameters are reported in Table 1. An additional, important parameter for both the original and the hybrid method is the number of Forward Points, i.e. the granularity of the discretization along the axis that connects the origin and the destination. In our experiments, such parameter is used as a target for sensitivity analysis.

4.1 Test results

The main goal of this contribution is increasing computation speed without losing optimality. We start by investigating whether the hybrid approach can compute routes with a fuel consumption similar to that of the original approach. Table 2 shows results for twelve routes between randomly chosen European airports, which show that fuel consumption remains the same despite the search space reduction, except for a single trip from Zurich to Budapest (which has an error of $\sim 0.23\%$). All results shown, unless otherwise specified, will be conducted on a search graph of size $(41 \times 11 \times 3)$, with a width value w of 5. Additionally, all weather data used is sourced from the Global Ensemble Forecast System (GEFS) [1], with each simulation corresponding to the forecast from the day prior to execution.

Route	FRA-CDG	LHR-AMS	MAD-LIS	FCO-VIE	MUC-BER	BCN-BRU
Planner	1615.12	1330.48	1885.67	2572.38	1652.93	3337.58
Hybrid	1615.12	1330.48	1885.67	2572.38	1652.93	3337.58
Route	ARN-CPH	PRG-WAW	ZRH-BUD	BRU-VIE	OTP-VIE	ZAG-FRA
Planner	2042.24	1922.11	2626.45	2853.91	2624.23	2426.20
Hybrid	2042.24	1922.11	2632.47	2853.91	2624.23	2426.20


■ **Table 2** Fuel consumption per trip between random European airports. All measurements are in kilograms of fuel, for graph with 41 Forward points and a value for w of 5.



■ **Figure 2** Graphs comparing Computation Speed for both Trajectory size and Region width. In Figure 2.a, on the left, are shown Planner and hybrid model search time against number of rows in the search graph (i.e. points composing the final trajectory, or the first component in a graph of size $(x \times 11 \times 3)$). On the right, in Figure 2.b, the Hybrid model's solving time (represented as a percentage over the average plan of the original approach) is plotted against w with the planner's average time as reference. All data shown is an average of 5 trips between airports in Europe. Raw data is included in Table 3 for 2.a and Table 4 for 2.b.

In Figure 2.a a simple speed comparison between the original approach and the hybrid model is shown, against the number of Forward (FWD) points. While to an increase in FWD Points generally corresponds an increase in computation time, this is not a fixed rule and can present exceptions. For example, an advantageous alignment of the specific network with the ground truth optimal trajectory or by the graph becoming large enough that correcting early mistakes has a broader impact on the results. In any case, for graphs longer than 26 FWD points (the default value for the planner is 41) the hybrid model sees a noticeable time consumption reduction, reaching up to a 50% gain for 51 points. Note also that these values are averages of trips of different length for which calculation time varies heavily, as can be noted by the Standard Deviation in both comparisons. Figure 2.b shows another speed comparison, this time against the Region width parameter w . An increase in width tends to result in a higher computation time, up to reaching the same values of the standalone planner², but also with a lower fuel consumption. There is however a broad range of w values for which improvements on both metrics are reported. It should be noted, however, that this is a trade-off: a smaller Region size would yield better performance at the cost of optimality, since reducing the search space exceedingly could filter out the optimal trajectory. This concept is best understood in Figure 3, which contains two different graphs showing how fuel consumption changes between different values of w and different trip lengths. As can be seen in the comparison, the optimal value (in terms of fuel consumption) for w is not consistent across various lengths and should therefore be chosen accordingly. However, it is also evident that a threshold after which the cost function remains optimal exists, in this case being an Optimal Region of width 5. For this reason, and given the preceding analysis, a value for w immediately below half the graph size is recommended to maintain optimality, but it can be lowered for shorter trips that require less profound exploration.

² This happens because with a region of width 11, the resulting search graph coincides precisely with the original one, as 11 is also the default value for its columns, as noted at the beginning of Subsection 4.1.



■ **Figure 3** Analysis of computation speed relatively to changes in the width of the optimal region. While Fuel Consumption is displayed with its absolute values, on the left axis, on the right axis the Solving Time is shown as a percentage w.r.t. the value computed by the planner alone (which as can be seen in Figure 2.b coincides with the Hybrid Model solution with maximum width), in order to best understand the contribution of the model.

5 Conclusions

This paper has explored the integration of Reinforcement Learning into the planning strategies used for flight planning support, using realistic Airbus aircraft performance models and weather data. The primary objective was to enhance the efficiency of aircraft trajectories computations, leveraging the strengths of RL to complement traditional path planning techniques. A novel hybrid solution was proposed, combining RL and search techniques to expedite the process of route optimization: the agent pre-computes an approximate trajectory to be used as a starting point, reducing the search space for the solver and thus accelerating computation. The integration of RL proved effective in maintaining optimal fuel consumption while significantly reducing computation time, especially in complex scenarios involving larger graph sizes. It should be noted, however, that reducing exceedingly the search will yield sub-optimal solutions. Empirical results demonstrated that the hybrid model can reduce computation time by around 40% compared to the standalone solver on a standard setup, with a width value immediately below half the graph's size and without sacrificing the quality of the solution. This improvement and increase up to 50% for particularly large graph searches. As efficiency is crucial in emergency scenarios where rapid decision-making is essential, such as Flight Diversion, the hybrid model shows promising results.

5.1 Future developments

This work has been designed in a way that accommodates the inclusion of future works on **uncertainty**, which could be handled well by a Reinforcement Learning agent. Every piece of data regarding weather has been treated as deterministic, which is fine for a simulation but unrealistic for a real world application: sensors can be imprecise, predictions can be inaccurate. Furthermore, RL could also be used to predict and avoid extreme weather conditions, such as incoming storms, by analyzing surrounding indicators (to be defined with the help of an expert). Overall, creating an hybrid model with the inclusion of a RL agent has shown to provide huge benefits with little trade-off, provided that parameters are chosen accordingly, showing potential for both real world application and future research.

References

- 1 Global Ensemble Forecast System (GEFS). URL: <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/products/weather-climate-models/global-ensemble-forecast>.
- 2 Gymnasium Documentation. URL: <https://gymnasium.farama.org/api/env/>.
- 3 Scikit-Decide. URL: <https://github.com/airbus/scikit-decide>.
- 4 Stable Baselines 3 Documentation. URL: <https://stable-baselines3.readthedocs.io/en/master/>.
- 5 Ron Alford, Vikas Shivashankar, Mark Roberts, Jeremy Frank, and David W. Aha. Hierarchical planning: Relating task and goal decomposition with task sharing. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-16*, pages 3022–3029, 7 2016. URL: <https://www.ijcai.org/Proceedings/16/Papers/429.pdf>.
- 6 Pascal Bercher, Ron Alford, and Daniel Höller. A survey on hierarchical planning – one abstract idea, many concrete realizations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 6267–6275. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/875>.
- 7 Ivo Grondman, Lucian Busoniu, Gabriel A. D. Lopes, and Robert Babuska. A survey of actor-critic reinforcement learning: Standard and natural policy gradients. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 42(6):1291–1307, 2012. doi:10.1109/TSMCC.2012.2218595.
- 8 John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.
- 9 Mattia Silvestri, Allegra De Filippo, Michele Lombardi, and Michela Milano. Unify: a unified policy designing framework for solving constrained optimization problems with machine learning, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14030>, arXiv:2210.14030.

A Raw data

FWD points	Solver (average)	Std. Dev.	Hybrid (average)	Std. Dev	% diff.
11	4.16s	0.27	5.10s (1.58)	0.64 (0.12)	+22.59%
16	4.77s	0.31	5.64s (1.62)	0.71 (0.07)	+18.23%
21	7.09s	2.43	7.04s (1.63)	2.03 (0.09)	-0.70%
26	7.40s	2.08	7.31s (1.34)	1.45 (0.07)	-1.21%
31	8.05s	1.74	6.37s (1.36)	1.02 (0.06)	-20.86%
36	10.78s	2.82	7.37s (1.32)	1.27 (0.07)	-31.63%
41 (default)	16.43s	7.02	9.54s (1.18)	2.30 (0.05)	-41.93%
46	20.80s	8.15	11.09s (1.16)	3.51 (0.06)	-46.68%
51	23.15s	10.62	11.58s (1.33)	5.77 (0.09)	-49.98%

■ **Table 3** Computation time for each graph size, averaged on 5 random trips between Europe airports, measured with both the original implementation and the hybrid algorithm. For the Hybrid model’s time, the value in parenthesis represents the amount of time consumed by the Agent (which is included in the total value).

XX:10 Integrating RL with Search & Optimization strategies

Width	Solving Time	Std. Dev.	% diff.
1	4.9794	0.5539	-76.1%
2	7.3123	1.6795	-64.9%
3	9.7566	2.58305	-53.1%
4	11.3227	3.86545	-45.9%
5	14.8819	4.37435	-28.5%
6	13.4395	4.9456	-35.5%
7	15.2860	5.87655	-26.8%
8	13.8638	5.80685	-33.4%
9	17.2255	7.2818	-17.5%
10	18.0411	7.3641	-13.5%
11	20.8290	9.1876	0%

■ **Table 4** Computation time for each region width, averaged on 5 random trips between Europe airports, measured with the hybrid algorithm.

Width	Fuel (450km)	Fuel (1200km)	Time (450km)	Time (1200km)
1	1334.474	2918.500	5.937s	6.062s
2	1318.156	2918.500	8.338s	10.932s
3	1312.256	2888.188	10.023s	13.095s
4	1312.256	2886.763	11.415s	15.920s
5	1312.391	2878.729	11.771s	16.950s
6	1312.256	2878.729	12.287s	23.339s
7	1312.391	2878.729	13.953s	23.690s
8	1312.391	2878.729	18.605s	25.793s
9	1312.256	2878.729	17.341s	27.774s
10	1312.256	2878.729	17.967s	30.654s
11	1312.256	2878.729	19.059s	30.725s

■ **Table 5** Variations of Fuel Consumption and Elapsed Time for two trips of different length, namely 450km and 1200km.