



HAL
open science

Agent-based simulation of unmanned aerial vehicles in civilian applications: A systematic literature review and research directions

Yazan Mualla, Amro Najjar, Alaa Daoud, Stéphane Galland, Christophe Nicolle, Ansar-Ul-Haque Yasar, Elhadi Shakshuki

► To cite this version:

Yazan Mualla, Amro Najjar, Alaa Daoud, Stéphane Galland, Christophe Nicolle, et al.. Agent-based simulation of unmanned aerial vehicles in civilian applications: A systematic literature review and research directions. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, In press, 100, pp.344-364. 10.1016/j.future.2019.04.051 . hal-02120738

HAL Id: hal-02120738

<https://hal.science/hal-02120738v1>

Submitted on 21 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

A Systematic Literature Review and Research Directions of Agent-based Simulation for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles in Civilian Applications

Yazan MUALLA^a, Amro NAJJAR^b, Alaa DAOUD^c, Stéphane GALLAND^a,
Christophe NICOLLE^d, Ansar-Ul-Haque YASAR^e, Elhadi SHAKSHUKI^f

^aCIAD, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, UTBM, F-90010 Belfort, France

^bUmeå University, 907 36 Umeå, Sweden

^cMines Saint Étienne, 158, cours Fauriel CS 62362 42023 Saint-Étienne, France

^dCIAD, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, UB, F-21000 Dijon, France.

^eTransportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, 3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium.

^fAcadia University, Wolfville, NS, B4P 2R6, Canada.

Abstract

Recently, the civilian applications of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are gaining more interest in several domains. Due to operational costs, safety concerns and legal regulations, Agent-Based Simulation (ABS) are commonly used to implement models and conduct tests. This has resulted in abundant research works addressing ABS in UAVs. This paper aims at providing a comprehensive overview of this domain by conducting a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) on relevant research works in the previous ten years. Eight research questions are considered at the beginning of the review, including the understanding of the evolution of UAV simulations in multi-agent systems in the last decade, identifying the key components of the agent-based UAV models and frameworks. From the SLR results, seven research directions are highlighted, including problems related to autonomy, explainability, security, flight duration, integration within smart cities regulations, and validation & verification of the models.

Keywords: Multi-Agent Systems, Agent-Based Simulation, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Systematic Literature Review, Civilian Applications

1. Introduction

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), most commonly known as drones, are becoming increasingly popular for civilian applications in several domains such as agriculture, transportation, products delivery, energy, emergency response, telecommunication, environment preservation and infrastructure. According to

*Corresponding author

Email address: yazan.mualla@utbm.fr (Yazan MUALLA)

6 Teal Group’s 2018 World civilian UAV Market Profile and Forecast report [1],
7 civilian UAV production will total US\$88.3 billion in the next decade, with a
8 12.9% compound annual growth rate. The same report states that the civil-
9 ian UAV sector promises to be the most dynamic growing sector of the world
10 aerospace industry in the following years. Furthermore, fueled by a growing de-
11 mand from governments and private consumers, civilian UAV market is expected
12 to quadruplicate over the next decade. The key features making the UAVs inter-
13 esting to use are their small dimensions, ability to take-off and land vertically,
14 good maneuverability, simple mechanics, and payload capability. These features
15 make UAVs accessible for civilian applications deployed in urban environment
16 where they started to be used as a practical solution for cost-efficient and rapid
17 delivery. One of the mostly known examples is Amazon Prime Air where UAVs
18 are used to deliver packages to customers [2, 3]. Another important example
19 that comes from the health-care sector is the transportation of medical sam-
20 ples and products using a UAV health-care delivery network [4]. Even though
21 there were some concerns about the safety of this procedure in such transporta-
22 tion environments, it has been shown that the UAV transportation systems
23 are a viable option for the transportation of medical samples and products [5].
24 Another notable example comes from the Oil&Gas industry. The tragic Deep-
25 water Horizon accident in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, as well as the increase
26 in deepwater offshore activity, have increased public interest in Health, Safety
27 and Environment (HSE) counter-measures for sub-surface releases of hydrocar-
28 bons. To attain a proper contingency planning, response managers urge for a
29 system allowing instant detection and characterization of accidental releases. To
30 meet these requirements, a heterogeneous robotic system involving UAVs was
31 developed for early detection of hydrocarbons [6].

32 Despite these initial successes, UAV technology is still in its early stages
33 of development. For this reason, considerable limitations should be addressed
34 before a large scale deployment of UAVs in civilian applications is possible. The
35 main drawbacks to mention are related to the safety of humans facing UAV
36 failures [7], and the high amount of energy consumed by these devices cou-
37 pled with their limited battery life [8]. Moreover, since civilian applications are
38 mostly deployed in urban environments involving multiple actors, considerable
39 research efforts should be dedicated to enhancing the UAV perceptual intelli-
40 gence required to coordinate complex environments [9], and more importantly to
41 address the possible consequences, especially on people safety, of a mechanical
42 failure that may cause a crash and the costs of such incident.

43 To guarantee it is safe for UAVs to fly over people’s heads and to reduce costs,
44 different scenarios must be modeled and tested. However, currently, most of the
45 regulations in force restrict the use of UAVs in cities. For this reason, to perform
46 tests with real UAVs, one needs access to expensive hardware and field tests that
47 are costly, time-consuming, and require trained and skilled people to pilot and
48 maintain the UAVs. Moreover, in the field, it may also be hard to reproduce
49 the same scenario several times [10]. To overcome these limitations, simulation
50 frameworks have been developed to allow transferring real-world scenarios into
51 executable models (*i.e.* simulating UAV activities in a digital environment).

52 An agent is defined as an autonomous software entity that is *situated* in
53 some environment and where it is capable of actions and coordination with
54 other agents to achieve specific goals [11]. For these reasons, the resulting Multi-
55 Agent System (MAS) technology have been established as a suitable platform
56 for implementing autonomous behavior and decision-making in computer sys-
57 tems [12, 13]. An Agent-Based Simulation (ABS) model is a set of interacting
58 intelligent entities that reflect, within an artificial environment, the relation-
59 ships in the real world [14]. The results make ABS a natural step forward
60 into understanding and managing the complexity of today’s business and social
61 systems.

62 Despite this promising research efforts, very few works were dedicated to
63 understand and analyze existing works using ABS in civilian UAV applications.
64 Very few surveys outlined a comprehensive set of research questions pertaining
65 to multi-agent simulations for civilian UAV applications.

66 Against this background, the objective of this paper is two-fold:

- 67 1. Conduct a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) of the research address-
68 ing MAS in civilian UAV applications. This SLR aims to identify the
69 most important research questions, analyze the literature, and outline key
70 challenges and research directions.
- 71 2. Outline and discuss the research directions of UAVs in civilian applications

72 To the best of our knowledge, no systematic literature study has been conducted
73 to review the research addressing ABS in civilian UAV applications.

74 The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 states and defines
75 the SLR methodology adapted from [15, 16]. Section 3 details the analysis and
76 results of the SLR. Based on the results of the SLR, Section 4 identifies the
77 major research directions. Section 5 discusses the related works. Section 6
78 concludes this paper and identifies future research perspectives.

79 2. SLR Methodology

80 Recently, research on computer science in general and on artificial intelli-
81 gence, in particular, has witnessed a significant increase both qualitatively and
82 quantitatively. For this reason, SLRs are becoming popular to help analyze
83 the evolutions of these domains. Kitchenham and Charters [17] define SLR
84 as follows: “*A form of secondary study that uses a well-defined methodology*
85 *to identify, analyze and interpret all available evidence related to a specific re-*
86 *search question in a way that is unbiased and (to a degree) repeatable.”* Where
87 *secondary study* refers to “*a study that reviews all the primary studies relating*
88 *to a specific research question.”* In this paper, we define a *primary study* as a
89 research paper addressing a specific research question in the domain of UAVs.
90 The aim of SLRs can be threefold [17]: *(i)* to summarize the existing evidence
91 concerning a specific technology that is being used broadly, *(ii)* to identify gaps
92 in the existing research in order to suggest areas for future investigation, and
93 *(iii)* to provide a background allowing to position new research activities.




Figure 1: The systematic literature review process (the figure adapted from [18, 19]).

94 With these goals in mind, we base our systematic literature review on [15,
95 16], which are among the most common methodologies for computer science
96 SLRs. Such an approach ensures rigorousness, fairness, and reproducibility.
97 Figure 1 illustrates the review process.

98 This section is organized as follows. First, Section 2.1 highlights the research
99 questions. Second, Section 2.2 explains the review protocol, how conflicts are
100 resolved and biases overcome. Third, in Section 2.3, the defined protocol is
101 executed and the review process is undertaken (document collection, conflict
102 resolution, *etc.*).

103 2.1. Key Research Questions

104 Following the Goal Question Metric (GQM) [16], we define our generic free-
105 form question as “Discover and evaluate the possible scientific MAS contribu-
106 tions to the civilian UAV applications.” On the field, it may be hard to deploy
107 UAVs because of safety and security issues. Moreover, it may be difficult to re-
108 produce the same scenario several times in order to test hypotheses and validate
109 the UAV behaviors. ABS is a suitable tool for overcoming these limitations. In
110 order to reflect this aspect, the generic free-form question becomes “Discover and
111 evaluate the possible scientific ABS contributions to the civilian UAV applica-
112 tions.” This question is broken down into Research Questions (RQs) exploring
113 key issues in ABS for civilian UAV applications. The research questions are
114 mainly concerned with this type of applications. More specifically, these ques-
115 tions cover the purposes, issues, used simulation frameworks, publications date,
116 authors, countries, *etc.* These questions were formulated based on the authors’
117 knowledge in the UAV and ABS domains as well as the common practices from
118 other SLRs. In what follows, eight RQs are considered within this review, and
119 listed below:

120 **RQ1:** Understand the evolution of UAV simulations in MAS in the last decade
121 in terms of key contributors (research labs), geographic distributions,
122 growth over the years. Having answers to this RQ will help researchers

123 determine the liveness of the MAS modeling domain for civilian UAV
124 applications. Moreover, this RQ will enable highlighting the active con-
125 tributors. In this way, it may help researchers to find quickly new con-
126 tributions in the domain.

127 **RQ2:** Identify the main UAV *research topics* and civilian *application domains*
128 addressed in the studied papers. On one hand, we consider it is impor-
129 tant to determine active research topics in order to highlight less active
130 research topics where more contributions are needed. On the other hand,
131 and as the market of civilian UAVs is expanding rapidly in several ap-
132 plication domains [1], a synthetic view of these application domains will
133 enable researchers to determine the typical applications for their research,
134 and possibly identify new application domains.

135 **RQ3:** Identify the artificial intelligence models scaffolding the solutions in the
136 reviewed papers. This RQ is set up in order to have a view on the types
137 of agent architectures used for implementing civilian UAV applications.
138 It also helps researchers understand the potential of these agent & system
139 architectures, and their limitations. The following sub-questions focus
140 on specific types of models and architectures.

141 **RQ3.1:** Investigate the agent architecture used in the solution (*e.g.*
142 cognitive agent, Belief-Desire-Intension (BDI) agent, reactive
143 agent, *etc.*).

144 **RQ3.2:** Investigate the architecture of the system in the studied papers
145 (decentralized vs centralized).

146 **RQ3.3:** Investigate whether the proposed model (agent or simulation
147 architectures) includes the environment, and how the UAVs in-
148 teract with their environment.

149 **RQ4:** Investigate whether models and technologies enabling to implement con-
150 cepts related to Internet-of-Things (IoT), pervasive systems or ubiqui-
151 tous systems are considered in the studied papers. IoT is a technological
152 domain that is more and more used within smart cities. This RQ will
153 highlight if technologies like wireless sensor networks, connected vehicles,
154 connected buildings, *etc.* are considered as a component of the agent-
155 based system in the studied papers. In such systems, IoT contributes to
156 the model at the agent level (objects may be modeled as agents) and at
157 the agent environment level (objects are not agents). This RQ will also
158 highlight how IoT devices and UAVs are interacting together.

159 **RQ5:** Identify the communication technology used by the UAVs to connect
160 to other entities: In order for UAVs to be deployed and used in their
161 environment, especially in smart cities, they could either be connected
162 to infrastructure entities, *i.e.* Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I), or to other
163 UAVs, *i.e.* Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V). Understanding the communication
164 technology of the UAV in the proposed simulated works is key to assess
165 whether frameworks are capable of producing realistic simulations.

166 **RQ6:** Identify the main model category used by the proposed work (*e.g.* mathe-
167 matical, algorithm-based, *etc.*) This RQ is set up in order to determine if
168 the contributions to civilian UAV applications are formal or semi-formal.
169 It will lead us to a statement and arguments regarding the validation of
170 UAV models.

171 **RQ7:** Assess the evaluation of the proposed model: Simulation for civilian UAV
172 applications needs scenarios to be set up, and the use of datasets may
173 help to create such simulation in a realistic way. This RQ assesses if the
174 evaluation relies on a dataset, on a generated synthetic dataset, or no
175 dataset. This will highlight the different datasets, and the scenarios (if
176 no dataset is used) from literature.

177 **RQ8:** Identify the simulation frameworks used to implement the proposed so-
178 lutions, and the main advantages & disadvantages of each framework
179 especially if it excels in a specific civilian UAV application domain. This
180 RQ is related to the technological means used by the researchers for
181 implementing the MAS for civilian UAV applications. It should help
182 researchers to determine and choose the best framework for their own
183 model implementation.

184 2.2. Defining The Review Protocol

185 As shown in Fig. 1, defining the *review protocol* is done right after having set
186 the RQs. The protocol we used for this article involves the following steps. First
187 Section 2.2.1 chooses the databases used as sources of information and defines
188 the *stop criterion*. Section 2.2.2 defines the exclusion/inclusion criteria used by
189 the reviewers to exclude/include articles chosen from the databases before the
190 stop criterion was triggered. Section 2.2.3 presents the quality criteria used by
191 the reviewers to assess the quality of the primary studies. Finally, Section 2.2.4
192 explains the policies used to mitigate subjective biases and resolve conflicts.

193 2.2.1. Database Selection

194 This process is composed of the following couple of steps:

- 195 a) IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, and Google Scholar are selected as
196 the three databases constituting the source of information. The selection
197 of the first two databases is obvious in computer science. Google Scholar
198 is selected because it provides a large list of documents that are not indexed
199 into the two previous databases, *e.g.* papers from conference proceedings,
200 Ph.D. and Master theses. Despite not being peer-reviewed, these articles
201 obtained from Google scholar might be important given that the interest
202 in the studied topic is rapidly increasing in the recent years.
- 203 b) The databases are queried with a set of keywords. These keywords are
204 devised based on the authors knowledge of the UAV and MAS domains.

205 When queried with these keywords, each database responded with a set of
206 articles that are considered by the reviewing process. The numbers of articles
207 to be produced by the queries is relatively large for IEEE Xplore, ACM DL, and
208 Google Scholar databases. However, only a few of these articles were relevant
209 to the research questions raised in the previous section. For this reason, as in
210 [20], the following stop criterion was applied: “*Stop the collecting of articles*
211 *after a sequence of 10 titles, completely incoherent with the query, appeared in*
212 *the list.*” Determining whether an article is coherent is left to the reviewers’
213 subjective view when they deemed that there was no adherence between the
214 query performed on the database and the title/abstract of the article appearing
215 in the result.

216 2.2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria definition

217 The articles appearing in the resulting pool of articles are not necessarily
218 useful to answer the research questions defined above. For this reason, most of
219 literature review methodologies [19, 20] apply a set of exclusion criteria to retain
220 only pertinent articles. The set of exclusion criteria, defined by the authors, is
221 listed below:

222 **ExC1:** *Not a recent research work* — Papers that were published before 2008,
223 *i.e.* with a publication year < 2008, are excluded. It is assumed that
224 the non-recent research is not up-to-date due to the high evolution rate
225 of the UAV technologies and usages.

226 **ExC2:** *Invalid type of paper, the document is a poster or a demo* — It is
227 assumed that a poster or a demo cannot give enough details on the con-
228 tributions, as there is no enough contributed content for evaluation.
229 Ph.D. theses, Master theses, technical reports are included.

230 **ExC3:** *Invalid type of paper, the paper is a survey* — It is assumed that the
231 survey papers (*i.e.* secondary studies) do not provide contributions
232 directly on the UAV models nor UAV technologies.

233 **ExC4:** *Impossible to access the paper text* — It is impossible to evaluate a paper
234 when its text cannot be accessed (PDF download, online text, *etc.*)

235 **ExC5:** *Extended paper* — The paper is extended by another paper by the same
236 authors. The contributions in the extended paper are enclosing the ones
237 from the original paper, so that the latter is excluded.

238 **ExC6:** *Unrelated to UAV* — The paper has no contribution neither in the fields
239 of UAV models nor UAV technologies.

240 **ExC7:** *Unrelated to agent-based systems* – The paper has no contribution in the
241 fields of agent-based technologies nor distributed artificial intelligence.
242 Generally, only multi-agent applications are included, but if the system
243 includes agents that communicate with other entities like Infrastructure
244 (refer to ExC14), then they will also be included.

- 245 **ExC8:** *UAV manufacturing only* — The paper’s contribution is related to the
 246 manufacturing of UAVs, *i.e.* it is related to the design and implemen-
 247 tation of hardware, mechanic or electronic components.
- 248 **ExC9:** *Positioning system only* — The paper’s contribution is related to the
 249 definition of novel positioning systems within UAVs. The contribution
 250 focuses on a perception model that enables each UAV to compute its
 251 position in the air.
- 252 **ExC10:** *UAV detection system only* — The paper’s main concern is UAV detec-
 253 tion within the system. In other words, the contribution is not related
 254 to UAV behavior, but to a system that is detecting the UAV in the air.
- 255 **ExC11:** *No civilian application* — The paper contains only military applications
 256 that cannot be applied to civilian fields.
- 257 **ExC12:** *No simulation contribution* — The paper’s contribution cannot be ap-
 258 plied to UAV simulation. In several papers, the model is deployed on
 259 real UAVs without simulation. Even if the paper has not a direct con-
 260 tribution to UAV simulation, if the proposed model could be deployed
 261 within a simulation environment, the corresponding paper is not ex-
 262 cluded.
- 263 **ExC13:** *Simulation in 2D* — The paper’s contributions include a simulation
 264 model in 2D that cannot be extended to the third dimension. It is as-
 265 sumed that 2D simulation of UAVs cannot achieve the highly detailed
 266 reproduction of the UAV behavior when they are in the air. Addi-
 267 tionally, they do not provide detailed environment model. However, to
 268 estimate the portion of 2D and 3D simulations, we keep track of this
 269 exclusion criterion, and plot how many papers were excluded due to
 270 being based on 2D simulation (c.f. Section 2.3).
- 271 **ExC14:** *No UAV cooperation nor interaction* — The paper contains a contribu-
 272 tion related to neither the cooperation of UAVs nor interaction between
 273 UAVs. V2I and V2V communications are assumed to be the base frame-
 274 work for supporting UAV interaction. If a paper contains a model for
 275 a single UAV that has V2I communication, it is not excluded since this
 276 type of models could be duplicated in order to set up a more complex
 277 simulation environment based on stigmergy¹ communication.
- 278 **ExC15:** *Human interaction with no autonomous UAV* — The paper contains
 279 only a contribution related to the interaction between humans and the

¹This term has been introduced by the French biologist Pierre-Paul Grassé in 1959 for describing the termite behavior. It is defined as: “*Stimulation of the workers by the work that they performed.*” This term expresses the notion that the actions of an agent leave signs in the environment. These signs are perceived by itself and other agents, which determine their next actions [21]

Table 1: The Quality Questions

#	Quality Question
Q1	Do the authors provide a sound rationale (<i>i.e.</i> motivation) for their work?
Q2	Is there an adequate description of the context in which the study has been conducted?
Q3	Is there a clear statement of the findings and the results including data that support the findings?
Q4	Are the limitation of the study discussed and highlighted?

280 UAVs, for piloting or controlling the UAVs. In other words, the con-
 281 tribution focuses on the human-UAV interaction without autonomous
 282 control of the UAVs.

283 These exclusion criteria are applied to the documents in two steps. In the
 284 first *coarse-grained* step, the articles were only eliminated if their titles and
 285 abstracts satisfied at least one of the exclusion criteria. In the second *fine-*
 286 *grained* step, the remaining papers are screened but this time reading the whole
 287 body of the paper.

288 2.2.3. Quality Criteria

289 As has been recommended by Kitchenham and Charters [17] and Kitchen-
 290 ham et al. [22], most of the SLRs rely on quality criteria allowing to assess the
 291 quality of primary studies, (*c.f.* [19, 20] for another example). Defining quality
 292 criteria as a list of questions is a common practice. Typical quality criteria
 293 include: (*i*) whether the authors of primary studies provided a sound rationale
 294 for their work, (*ii*) details provided about the context and the design of the
 295 technical evaluation, (*iii*) the statement of the results.

296 Note that, as it is the case in [19], the quality criteria are not used to
 297 exclude/include primary studies. Rather, they are used to report the overall
 298 quality of primary studies included by the SLR. To assess the quality of the
 299 reviewed works, Table 1 defines four quality questions, adapted from [19]. Note
 300 that Q3 is of particular interest since having an overview of the quality of
 301 evaluations of the set of articles dealing with a specific research question can
 302 give a good idea on the maturity of this research question.

303 2.2.4. Biases and disagreements

304 In order to mitigate the subjectivity of the reviewing process, certain mea-
 305 sures were taken to overcome biases and resolve conflicts. In particular, each
 306 task of Phase 2 in Fig. 1 was conducted by at least 2 reviewers. Thus, as shall
 307 be discussed later, the steps of article exclusion/inclusion (*c.f.* Section 2.2.2),
 308 answering the RQs, and quality assessment (*c.f.* Section 2.2.3), were under-
 309 taken by at least two reviewers for each article. A third reviewer intervened as
 310 a referee to resolve a conflict in the exclusion/inclusion and in the RQ answer-
 311 ing steps. As for the quality assessment task, quality assessments provided by
 312 reviewers for each article were averaged.

Table 2: The results of the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step

Database	Number of Papers	Percentage
Selected from Keyword Set 1	131	$\approx 41\%$
Selected from Keyword Set 2	185	$\approx 59\%$
Sum from Set 1 & 2	316	$=100\%$
Total Included	123	$\approx 39\%$
Total Excluded	193	$\approx 61\%$

Table 3: The results of the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step

	Number of Papers	Percentage
Included	30	$\approx 24\%$
Excluded	70	$\approx 57\%$
Conflict	23	$\approx 19\%$
Referee Included	12	$\approx 10\%$
Total Included	42	$\approx 34\%$
Total Excluded	81	$\approx 66\%$

313 2.3. Performing The Review

314 This section gives an account of how the SLR has been conducted and dis-
315 cusses the results of the exclusion/inclusion step. Two keyword sets were ap-
316 plied to the three databases (IEEE Xplore, ACM DL, and Google Scholar). The
317 first keyword set is {UAV, agent, simulation}, whereas the second keyword set
318 is {UAV, agent-based simulation, drones, civil, multi-agent systems}. A
319 stop criterion of 10 articles was applied to the results of each keyword set and
320 database. After the stop criterion was applied, the total number of articles re-
321 tained was 316. The next step is to apply the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion
322 step. Note that since this step screens papers based on their titles and abstracts,
323 some exclusion criteria might be more helpful than others (*e.g.* ExC1 and ExC2).

324 Table 2 shows the results of the *coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step*. As
325 can be seen from the third row in the table, the total number of papers acquired
326 from the two sets combined is 316 papers. The results listed in Table 2 show
327 that about 39% (123 papers) of the total number of papers were included by
328 the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step.

329 Fig. 2 plots the geographical distributions of papers before the fine-grained
330 inclusion/exclusion step. The number of papers published by US researchers
331 is highest worldwide. The geographical distribution of the papers could be
332 partly explained by the investment rate in R&D in each country [23], illustrated
333 by Fig. 3. The notable exception is China, which invests 2% of its GDP
334 (US\$370, 589.7M) but has a number of papers equal to France (2.3% of GPP,
335 US\$60, 781.6M). Another notable point is the Czech Rep., which has 11 papers
336 with an average R&D investment (2% of GPP, US\$6, 719M). All the authors
337 from Czech Rep. are collaborating with partners within US-funded projects.
338 This fact may explain the high number of publications for this country. From
339 Fig. 2, it is interesting to note that, even if civilian UAV-related regulations
340 in USA are less restrictive than in Europe (*c.f.* Section RD6), the number
341 of papers over Europe is two times higher than the number of papers in North




Figure 2: The geographical distribution of papers after the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 3: The investments in R&D for the 18 most publishing countries [23] after the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 4: The number of papers per year after the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 5: The percentage of excluded papers per exclusion criteria in the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 6: The percentage of papers with 2D simulation scenario vs. papers with 3D simulation scenario.




Figure 7: The number of papers with 2D and 3D simulation scenarios per year.

342 America. This can be attributed to the EU research policy that enforces funding
343 on breaking technologies, such as UAVs. Fig. 4 plots the number of papers per
344 year since 2008 after the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step. The number
345 of papers grows with a slop of 0.6364.

346 The next step within the review process is the *fine-grained exclusion/inclusion*
347 *step*. It is applied to the 123 papers selected during the previous step. More
348 specifically, the content of the paper is screened and the paper is excluded if
349 it satisfies at least one of the 15 exclusion criteria defined in Section 2.1. Ta-
350 ble 3 shows the results of the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step. Each paper
351 was reviewed by at least two reviewers. If all the reviewers of a paper decided
352 that it should be included in the review, the paper is included (*c.f.* the first
353 row of the table). The paper is excluded if all of its reviewers agreed upon its
354 exclusion (the second row of the table). Otherwise, in case of a conflict among
355 reviewers, we relied on a referee to resolve this conflict. If the referee accepts
356 the paper, then it is included in the review. As shown in the table, 23 papers
357 (about 19% of the total number of the papers) generated conflicts among the
358 reviewers. Out of these papers, 12 papers were added by the referee raising the
359 total number of included papers to 42 (about 34% of the papers remaining after
360 the coarse-grained exclusion/inclusion step). For a list of the 42 papers, please
361 refer to Table 6.

362 Most of the papers screened in the fine-grained step were highly related
363 to the RQs. As indicated by Table 3, 66% of them were excluded, and Fig.
364 5 plots the percentage of excluded papers per exclusion criterion. Note that
365 some papers were excluded because of satisfying multiple exclusion criteria.
366 Examining the reviews shows that approximately 24% of excluded papers were
367 excluded because of ExC13, which filters out a paper if it is not addressing 3D
368 simulation scenario. Fig. 6 compares the percentage of papers presenting 2D and
369 3D simulations in the pool of papers before the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion
370 (whose total number is 123), excluding 26 papers that were not determined
371 either they use simulation or not, or either they are 2D or 3D. As can be seen
372 from the figure, despite ExC13 being the most common cause for exclusion, the
373 majority of the papers whose simulation dimension was determined ended up
374 addressing 3D simulations. In order to understand the general tendencies of
375 2D and 3D simulations, Fig. 7 plots the number of papers proposing 2D/3D
376 simulations per year. As shown in the figure, the number of papers proposing 3D
377 simulations is witnessing a confirmed and significant increase (2018 should not
378 be considered since this review was conducted in August 2018). This is mainly
379 due to the fact that UAV systems are intrinsically in three dimensions, and this
380 third dimension must be included within the models in order to evaluate the
381 behaviors of the UAVs regarding the safety concerns. Additionally, simulating
382 UAVs in a 2D model forbids the deployment of the algorithms in real UAVs
383 except in very specific cases in which the altitude of the UAVs is constant.
384 Nevertheless, in this later case, the deployed algorithms must ensure that the
385 UAVs remain at the same altitude regardless of the environment conditions.

386 This section offered a detailed account of how the review was performed and
387 provided useful statistics about the included/excluded papers. Furthermore,

388 it discussed the most common exclusion criteria. Next section presents and
389 discusses the results of the SLR regarding the research questions presented in
390 Section 2.1.

391 **3. Results of the Review and Analysis**

392 This section provides a detailed analysis of the SLR results. It analyzes
393 the papers retained after the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step and discusses
394 each one of the RQs defined in Section 2.1 respectively. Note that the results are
395 related to MAS in civilian UAV applications and are derived from the research
396 questions and the exclusion criteria defined in the SLR methodology.

397 *3.1. Demographic Data (RQ1)*

398 To understand the evolution of UAV simulations in MAS in the last decade
399 (stated as a question by RQ1), Fig. 8 plots the number of papers per year after
400 the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step. Despite a decrease in the number
401 of papers in 2009 and 2012 (2018 should not be considered since this review
402 was conducted in August 2018), it appears from the figure that there is a stable
403 growth in the numbers of papers, with a slop of 0.2727. Furthermore, comparing
404 the results of this figure with those of Fig. 4 confirms this observation since in
405 Fig. 4, the number of papers witnesses a roughly stable growth between 2008
406 and 2016.

407 To understand the geographic distributions of the main contributors in the
408 studied domain, Fig. 9 plots the number of papers per country after the fine-
409 grained exclusion/inclusion step. Compared with Fig. 2, The number of papers
410 published by US researchers is still highest worldwide. As previously noticed,
411 researchers from the Czech Rep. are collaborating with partners within US-
412 funding projects. This fact may explain the high number of publications for
413 this country compared to its R&D investment, illustrated in Fig. 10. In the
414 mentioned figure, it is interesting to note that, even if civilian UAV-related
415 regulations in USA are less restrictive than in Europe, the number of papers
416 over Europe (32 papers) is three times higher than the number of papers in North
417 America (9 papers). We explain this by the fact that the EU research policy
418 enforces funding on breaking technologies, such as UAVs. Additionally, with
419 a relatively lower R&D investment rate of EU countries (Fig. 10), researchers
420 from these countries have fewer opportunities for funding UAV deployment on
421 real fields. This pushes them to resort to simulation environments for validating
422 the UAV behaviors before any deployment.

423 *3.2. Research Topics & Application Domains (RQ2)*

424 This section discusses the results and answers the research questions raised
425 in RQ2 (*c.f.* Section 2.1). In particular, it deals with the research topics (Section
426 3.2.1) and the application domains (Section 3.2.2).




Figure 8: The number of papers per year after the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 9: The geographical distribution of papers after the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 10: The investments in R&D [23] of the publishing countries after the fine-grained exclusion/inclusion step.




Figure 11: The main research topics related to civilian UAVs applications.




Figure 12: The average ACL for each research topic.




Figure 13: The main civilian UAV application domains.

427 *3.2.1. Research Topics*

428 Subjects or issues that a researcher is interested in when conducting research
429 on UAVs. These “research topics” provide the general directions to researchers
430 for exploring, defining, and refining their ideas. Fig. 11 plots the main research
431 topics addressed in the reviewed articles, and Table 4 lists the papers per each
432 research topic. It is worth mentioning that some papers were flagged as having
433 more than one research topic. Therefore, and to normalize the weights given
434 by each paper to the research topics distribution, we have decided to assign the
435 most dominant research topic per paper. The addressed research topics are:

436 **T1:** *Coordination* (17%), UAVs interact in order to coordinate their actions for
437 reaching their common objectives;

438 **T2:** *Mission Management* (14%) addresses the optimal dynamic assignment of
439 high-level missions, *i.e.* objectives, to UAVs. High-level missions are those
440 where the UAVs rely on a high-level description of their objectives without
441 many details and without human guidance;

442 **T3:** *Collision Avoidance* (14%) allows to increase UAV safety by avoiding col-
443 lisions among UAVs, persons, animals, and other objects;

444 **T4:** *UAV Formation (Platooning)* (9%) addresses the definition of flight forma-
445 tions for UAVs;

446 **T5:** *Surveillance* (9%) enables UAVs to help the detection of dangerous and
447 illegal situations;

448 **T6:** *Path Planning* (7%) focuses on the statical and dynamical computing of
449 the best paths to fly along according to the environmental constraints;

450 **T7:** *Task Allocation* (7%) is the optimal dynamic (potentially distributed) as-
451 signment of tasks to the UAVs;

452 **T8:** *Certification & Regulation* (7%) is related to the definition of regulations
453 dedicated to UAVs, and of the associated certifications for UAVs or pilots;

454 **T9:** *Simulation* (7%) focuses on the design and implementation of developed
455 simulation frameworks to understand and validate UAV behaviors;

456 **T10:** *Communication* (3%) is related to the definitions of the means of commu-
457 nication between the UAVs, and between a UAVs and the ground infras-
458 tructure;

459 **T11:** *Coverage* (3%) addresses the problems of map coverage;

460 **T12:** *Tracking* (3%) focuses on the detection and tracking of objects in the en-
461 vironment of the UAVs.

Table 4: The reviewed papers per research topic

Research topic	Papers per topic
<i>Coordination</i>	Bürkle et al. [24], Zhu et al. [25], Rollo et al. [26], De Benedetti et al. [27], Cimino et al. [28], Ciarletta et al. [29], Obdržálek [30]
<i>Mission Management</i>	Wei et al. [31], Gunetti et al. [32, 33], Stenger et al. [34], Sampedro et al. [35], Fulford et al. [36]
<i>Collision Avoidance</i>	Ashraf et al. [37], Kandil et al. [38], Šišlák et al. [39], Arokiasami et al. [40], Zou et al. [41], Kucherov and Kucherov [42]
<i>UAV Formation (Platooning)</i>	Van der Walle et al. [43], Sutton et al. [44], Benedetti et al. [45], Bürkle and Leuchter [46]
<i>Surveillance</i>	Semsch et al. [47], Khaleghi et al. [48], Bentz and Panagou [49], da Silva et al. [50]
<i>Task Allocation</i>	Wei et al. [51], Evertsz et al. [52], Vasilijevic et al. [6]
<i>Path Planning</i>	Volf et al. [53], Peng et al. [54], Ma et al. [55]
<i>Certification & Regulation</i>	Webster et al. [56, 57], Schatten [58]
<i>Simulation</i>	Pechoucek et al. [59], Veloso et al. [60], De Benedetti et al. [61]
<i>Communication</i>	Agogino et al. [62]
<i>Coverage</i>	Albani et al. [63]
<i>Tracking</i>	Ferrag et al. [64]

462 Therefore, as Fig. 11 shows, the research topics have diverse aims and tackle
463 several aspects related to UAVs, ranging from low-level (*i.e.* close to hardware)
464 issues, such as UAV communication, to high-level concerns that require consid-
465 erable UAV autonomy (*e.g.* mission management).

466 In order to assess the UAV autonomy involved in each research topic, we
467 rely on an autonomy metric proposed by Clough [65] to measure Autonomous
468 Control Levels (ACL) of UAVs. This metric is a scale ranging from 0 (for a
469 remotely piloted non-autonomous UAVs) to 10 (for a fully autonomous UAVs).
470 Fig. 12 plots the average ACL for each research topics. Note that ACL values
471 were either mentioned explicitly by the authors of the primary studies or were
472 determined by the reviewers by evaluating the UAV autonomy according to the
473 ACL scale.

474 As can be seen in Fig. 12, some research topics tended to endow UAVs with
475 more autonomy than others. For instance, coverage, coordination, surveillance,
476 and mission management need more autonomy than path planning, collision
477 avoidance and communications.

478 Note that research topics such as certification & regulation and simulation
479 attained relatively high ACL. However, the main concerns of these works were
480 building a simulation environment for the UAVs (in case of the simulation re-
481 search topic) and certifying that UAVs adhere to the enforced regulations &
482 norms (in case of the certification & regulation research topic). For this reason,
483 the UAVs implementation provided by these works were mainly case-studies
484 lacking details about the evaluations and the implementations.

485 Furthermore, no reviewer reported a paper with an ACL scale higher than
486 6. This is explained by the fact that higher levels of autonomy in the ACL scale

487 were associated with specific military application requirements (*e.g.* battle-
488 space knowledge, battle-space cognizance, *etc.*), and this SLR focuses on work
489 related to civilian applications only. Note that this issue could be solved by
490 relying on other metrics allowing to evaluate the maturity of the contributions.
491 Technology Readiness Level (TRL) [66] is one metric that would help in this
492 direction. Yet, unlike the ACL, it is not focused on UAV autonomy. For this
493 reason, we opted for ACL in this paper.

494 3.2.2. Application Domains

495 In addition to the research topics, RQ2 addresses the application domains of
496 UAVs. They refer to the applied research, in which scientific studies and research
497 works aim to solve practical problems in specific application domains. Fig.
498 13 shows the distribution of the civilian UAV application domains of studied
499 papers, and Table 5 lists the papers per each application domain. It is worth
500 mentioning that some papers tackle several application domains. Therefore,
501 and to normalize the weights given by each paper to the application domains
502 distribution, we have decided to assign the most dominant application domain
503 per paper. For the paper that has no dominant application domain, or if its
504 contribution is application independent, it is considered to be in the General
505 domain. The resulting application domains are:

- 506 **D1:** *General* (53%);
- 507 **D2:** *Urban Planning* (26%);
- 508 **D3:** *Emergency Response* (12%);
- 509 **D4:** *Telecommunication* (5%);
- 510 **D5:** *Agriculture* (2%);
- 511 **D6:** *Border surveillance* (2%).

512 As seen in Figure Fig. 13, *Urban planning* and *General* are the most com-
513 mon application domains. This figure shows the growing attention given to
514 UAV applications in civilian and urban environments since the share of urban
515 planning is about 26%, while other application domains such as agriculture,
516 emergency response, border surveillance, which often take place outside the
517 urban environment, received less attention.

518 In order to assess the maturity of the reviewed primary studies, we resorted
519 to the quality criterion Q3 defined in Table 1. Q3 evaluates the quality of the
520 experiments conducted by the authors of primary studies and the statements of
521 the obtained results. The intuition here is that the more mature the application
522 domain is the higher would be its score for Q3.

523 Fig. 14 shows the average Q3 score obtained per application domain. As can
524 be seen from the figure, based on their maturity, the application domains can
525 be classified into two clusters. The first cluster represents relatively mature ap-
526 plication domains (agriculture, telecommunications, and emergency response).




Figure 14: The average of quality metric Q3 given by reviewers per application domain.




Figure 15: The average ACL per agent architecture.




Figure 16: The agent architectures used in the reviewed papers.




Figure 17: The multi-layer architecture of the agents, adapted from [67].




Figure 18: The number of papers with system model (direct collaboration/reactive) and with system architecture (centralized/decentralized).




Figure 19: The proportion of dynamic and static agent environments.

Table 5: The reviewed papers per application domain

Application domain	Papers per application domain
<i>General</i>	Ashraf et al. [37], Wei et al. [51], Bürkle et al. [24], Wei et al. [31], Rollo et al. [26], Gunetti et al. [32, 33], Evertsz et al. [52], Webster et al. [57], Sampedro et al. [35], Sutton et al. [44], Peng et al. [54], Zou et al. [41], Ma et al. [55], Bentz and Panagou [49], da Silva et al. [50], De Benedetti et al. [27, 61], Obdržálek [30], Fulford et al. [36], Kucherov and Kucherov [42], Ferrag et al. [64]
<i>Urban Planning</i>	Semsch et al. [47], Volf et al. [53], Webster et al. [56], Kandil et al. [38], Arokiasami et al. [40], Pechoucek et al. [59], Veloso et al. [60], Šišlák et al. [39], Khaleghi et al. [48], Bürkle and Leuchter [46], Schatten [58]
<i>Emergency Response</i>	Zhu et al. [25], Van der Walle et al. [43], Benedetti et al. [45], Cimino et al. [28], Vasilijevic et al. [6]
<i>Telecommunication</i>	Agogino et al. [62], Ciarletta et al. [29]
<i>Border Surveillance</i>	Stenger et al. [34]
<i>Agriculture</i>	Albani et al. [63]




Figure 20: The number of papers with agent architecture as per research topic.

527 The second cluster represents less mature application domains (general, urban
 528 planning, and border surveillance). Note that these assessments only concern
 529 works using ABS for civilian UAV applications.

530 3.3. Artificial Intelligence or Agent Architecture Type (RQ3)

531 This section deals with the RQ3. First, in Section 3.3.1 the used agent archi-
 532 tectures are identified and discussed. Second, in Section 3.3.2, the used system
 533 architectures are analyzed. Finally, Section 3.3.3 discusses how the primary
 534 studies dealt with the dynamicity of the environment.

535 3.3.1. Agent Architecture (RQ3.1)

536 The results of the SLR concerning the agents' architectures showed that
 537 agents used in the studied research works, mainly fall into five categories:

538 (i) Reactive agents, (ii) Flocking agents, (iii) Belief–Desire–Intention (BDI)
539 agents, (iv) Agents using cognitive architectures, and (v) Evolutionary agents.
540 The following list presents these architectures respectively.

541 • **Reactive agents:** The behavior of reactive agents is driven by their
542 reactions to external stimuli (*e.g.* a message from another agent) or a
543 change in their environment (a perceived obstacle).

544 Within the reactive agent behaviors, **Flocking agents** behavior is the
545 behavior exhibited when a group of agents, *e.g.* birds, fishes are moving
546 together. Basic architectures of flocking behavior are controlled by three
547 simple rules: (i) separation for avoiding crowding neighbors, (ii) align-
548 ment for steering towards average heading of neighbors, (iii) cohesion for
549 steering towards average position of neighbors. With these three simple
550 rules, the flock moves in an extremely realistic way, creating complex
551 motion and interaction that would be extremely hard to create otherwise.

552 • **Cognitive agents:** Agents of this type rely on cognitive architecture.
553 The latter aims at describing human cognitive processes as precisely as
554 possible. In contrast to BDI, whose main inspiration is *philosophical* and
555 relies on Michael Bratman’s theory of human practical reasoning and on
556 modal logic [68], cognitive architectures are inspired by an in-depth under-
557 standing of the human brain from biological and neurological perspectives.
558 There are many implementations of cognitive architectures. Soar [69] is
559 one of the widely used ones.

560 A special type of cognitive agents are **BDI agents**. They are rational
561 agents that having a “mental attitudes” of Beliefs, Desire, and Intention
562 representing respectively the information, the motivational, and the de-
563 liberative states of the agent [70]. BDI agents are capable of integrating
564 planning, scheduling, execution, information gathering, and coordination
565 with other agents [13].

566 • **Evolutionary agents:** They are agents that are based on evolution-
567 ary algorithms. An evolutionary algorithm is a subset of evolutionary
568 computation [71], a generic population-based meta-heuristic optimization
569 algorithm. It uses mechanisms inspired by biological evolution, such as re-
570 production, mutation, recombination, and selection. Candidate solutions
571 to the optimization problem play the role of individuals in a population,
572 and the fitness function determines the quality of the solutions. Evolution
573 of the population then takes place after the repeated application of the
574 above operators.

575 Fig. 16 shows the agent architectures used in the papers. As can be seen
576 from the figure, cognitive architectures were the most common among the pri-
577 mary studies ($\approx 41\%$) followed by Reactive agents ($\approx 22\%$) and BDI ($\approx 14\%$).
578 This result shows that proactive agents, those agents capable of goal-directed
579 behavior (BDI agents, and cognitive agents) constitute about 55% of all the an-
580 alyzed studies whereas reactive agents (including those with flocking behavior)

581 are less common ($\approx 24\%$ of the analyzed works). This shows that most of the
582 research works seek to equip the UAVs with greater autonomy and goal-directed
583 behavior.

584 In order to understand the correlation between the agent architectures and
585 the autonomy, Fig. 15 shows the average ACL per agent architecture (*c.f.* [65]
586 and Section 3.2). The BDI agents offered the highest level of autonomy, followed
587 by cognitive agents, evolutionary agent, and lastly reactive agents. This result
588 confirms our expectations and suggests that cognitive architecture and BDI
589 agents are promising paradigms allowing to build more autonomous UAVs.

590 Fig. 20 shows the number of papers with agent architecture as per research
591 topic. The most used agent architectures are cognitive (without BDI) (17) and
592 reactive (without flocking) (9), considering all the research topics.

593 This fact is explained by the characteristics of the research topics: the ideal
594 agent-based modeling of UAVs is usually based on a multi-layer architecture
595 [67], illustrated by Fig. 17. The operational layer corresponds to the (very-
596)short term, *i.e.* the control of the UAVs. The tactic layer is associated with
597 the planning of the UAV actions, *e.g.* path planning. The strategic layer is
598 associated with the missions of the UAVs. In this layer, mission and task man-
599 agement need more complex models typically found in the cognitive scope. It
600 is interesting to note that a low number of papers contains a multi-layer model.
601 The other papers focus on a single layer, mostly tactic or strategic.

602 3.3.2. Decentralization/Centralization (RQ3.2)

603 Fig. 18 shows the number of papers with reactive / direct collaboration sys-
604 tem model, and with the system architecture used by the model (decentralized
605 / centralized). As expected, the majority of the papers are related to decentral-
606 ized architectures, which correspond to one of the major characteristics of MAS
607 and UAV systems. However, 12 papers contain proposals that correspond to a
608 centralized architecture, *i.e.* the model contains a central agent, or the model
609 is formalized in such a way that it could be implemented only with centralized
610 frameworks, *e.g.* Simulink [72] (*c.f.* Section RQ8).

611 3.3.3. Environment Dynamicality (RQ3.3)

612 Immersing agents in dynamic physical, virtual or mixed environments is still
613 a challenge for MAS researchers. As has been established in [73], an essential
614 part of such systems is the MAS environment, in order to provide the services
615 allowing agents to interact with it. However, defining what is the interface
616 between the agents and their environment is not obvious. A key aspect is to
617 both respect their autonomy and ensure that the environment rules are enforced.
618 Weyns et al. [73] define *agent environment* as the software layer between the
619 external world and the agents.

620 *Dynamic agent environments* include endogenous processes that enable the
621 environment's state to evolve dynamically outside the control of the agent. In a
622 *static agent environment*, such process is not included. Additionally, the agent
623 environment state could evolve only as a consequence of the agents' actions. If
624 an action is never applied to the agent environment by the agents, it is *passive*.




Figure 21: The proportion of the models that are including or not the IoT concept.

Figure 22: The types of communications.




Figure 23: The main families of models.




Figure 24: The main formal models correlated with the agent architecture (decentralized/centralized).




Figure 25: The use of datasets by the reviewed papers.




Figure 26: The qualitative evaluation of the reviewed papers.

625 Fig. 19 shows the proportion of the dynamic and static agent environments.
626 Half of the papers propose models based on a static environment, 48% on a
627 dynamic environment. Due to the complexity of the UAV systems, static agent
628 environments are used in order to control the complexity of the modeling and
629 enabling an easier validation.

630 Agent environments in most of the reviewed papers are passive. In these
631 cases, UAV missions are mainly surveillance, collision detection, coordination,
632 *etc.* However, as UAVs become involved in more application domains where
633 acting on the environment is necessary, there are likely to become more *active*
634 to the agent environment.

635 3.4. UAV Environment with IoT (RQ4)

636 The smart city concept integrates Information and Communication Tech-
637 nology (ICT) (*c.f.* Section RQ5), and various physical devices connected to the
638 network, *e.g.* IoT or Wireless Sensor Network (WSN) [74].

639 Fig. 21 shows the proportion of papers that include the IoT concept against
640 the papers that do not. 9 papers include IoT, and 33 do not. According to
641 [74], several opportunities for UAVs use to support a smart city exist. These
642 opportunities will be very beneficial to any smart city that would utilize UAVs
643 for their economic growth and development. Therefore, it is important to inves-
644 tigate whether IoT is considered in the reviewed models. The low proportion of
645 reviewed papers that are considered IoT indicates that it is still an open issue.
646 According to our knowledge, this proportion may be explained by the fact that
647 researchers focus on the UAV behavior itself, not on the UAV environment.

648 3.5. UAV Interaction and Communication (RQ5)

649 Vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication is the passing of information
650 from a vehicle to any entity that may affect the vehicle and vice versa [75]. It is
651 a vehicular communication system that incorporates other more specific types
652 of communication as Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I), Vehicle-to-Network (V2N),
653 Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V), Vehicle-to-Pedestrian (V2P), Vehicle-to-Device (V2D)
654 and Vehicle-to-Grid (V2G). The purpose of this research question is to identify
655 the V2X used by the UAVs to connect to other entities. Among all these types
656 of communication, reviewers have found references to V2I and V2V only.

657 The main motivations for V2X are road safety, traffic efficiency, and energy
658 savings within smart cities. UAVs are one of the means for setting up the smart
659 city concept [74]. Therefore, it is important to highlight the V2X technologies
660 that are considered within UAV models.

661 Fig. 22 plots the type of communications used: 33% of the papers includes
662 a communication between the UAVs and the infrastructure (V2I), 17% between
663 UAVs (V2V) by using: (i) implicit communication, *i.e.* the communication
664 means are not explicitly described; (ii) direct communication means, *e.g.* Wire-
665 less; or (iii) by using stigmergy communication. 17% of the papers propose a
666 model with both V2I and V2V components.

667 Finally, 33% of the papers do not consider any specific communication ap-
668 proach. Therefore, when communication is considered within these primary

669 studies, it is not detailed; and the authors seem to assume that the information
670 is exchanged whatever the communication mean is. These papers are not ex-
671 cluded because they contain models that support interaction among the UAV
672 agents, even if it is in an abstract level.

673 It is interesting to note that 66% of the papers consider that UAVs are
674 connected entities that need to interact with their environment or with other
675 UAVs. This is in-line with the fact that UAVs may contribute to set up the
676 smart city concept (*c.f.* Section RQ4).

677 3.6. Family of models (RQ6)

678 The purpose of this RQ is to identify the family of the models that are used
679 within the proposed works. Three major families are considered:

- 680 • **Mathematical model:** including formal models enable to verify and
681 validate the behavior of the UAVs. Formal verification is the act of prov-
682 ing or disproving the correctness of UAV algorithms with respect to a
683 certain formal specification, using formal methods of mathematics. The
684 verification of these systems is done by providing a formal proof on an
685 abstract mathematical model of the system, the correspondence between
686 the mathematical model and the nature of the system being otherwise
687 known by construction.
- 688 • **Algorithm-based model:** are the models based on the general com-
689 puter programming theory. These models are basically instances of a logic
690 written in a software to produce the UAV behaviors. These algorithms
691 are not based on mathematical models, such that it is hard to give a proof
692 of completeness and stability.
- 693 • **Not-categorized model:** If a paper’s contribution can be classified
694 neither mathematically nor as algorithm-based, it is put into the “None”
695 category. In most of the reviewed papers, the contributions within this
696 category are presented with abstract or general explanations without equa-
697 tions, algorithms, state machine, *etc.* For example, the UAV behavior is
698 described by a schematic drawing.

699 Fig. 23 shows a repartition of the models according to their family. It is
700 interesting to note that 38% of the proposed models are mathematical, and
701 43% are algorithm-based. Indeed, even if mathematical models are harder to
702 define than algorithm-based models, safety concerns related to UAVs lead re-
703 searchers to give a proof of safety and stability of the UAV behaviors over the
704 time by providing mathematical models. Safety validation is not outside the
705 algorithm-based models. In all the related papers, simulation testbeds are used
706 for validating the behaviors of the proposed models.

707 As mentioned within the RQ3 analysis, the architecture in the reviewed
708 models could be classified as centralized or decentralized architectures. Fig.
709 24 shows the correlation between the system architecture classification and the
710 mathematical/algorithm-based model classification. As expected for MAS, the
711 architectures are mostly decentralized, whatever the type of model.




Figure 27: The used simulation frameworks.

712 3.7. Evaluation and simulation scenarios (RQ7)

713 The purpose of this research question is related to the evaluation of the
 714 proposed models: whether it relies on a dataset, or on a generated synthetic
 715 dataset, or no dataset. Only a few of the reviewed papers (5%) have a reference
 716 to a dataset for setting up the UAV simulations; 17% of the papers have gen-
 717 erated a specific dataset for evaluation; While, the majority have no dataset.
 718 In papers with no datasets, simulation scenarios are defined as ad hoc by the
 719 authors.

720 This relatively low number of papers with datasets may be explained by the
 721 difficulties for building such sets, *e.g.* it is hard to gather realistic data and
 722 initialize a UAV model from it. This issue is related to the research direction
 723 RD7 detailed below. Having well-established testbeds with datasets helps to
 724 unify the testing process, and allows for systematic comparisons between the
 725 solutions proposed by researchers.

726 3.8. Simulation Frameworks (RQ8)

727 Enabling early validation of a UAV system design requires the simulation of
 728 its components. This requires the development of adapted simulation environ-
 729 ment. Identifying the frameworks used to implement the proposed solutions,
 730 and the main advantages & disadvantages of each of them is a challenge by
 731 itself.

732 Fig. 27 shows the used simulation frameworks in the reviewed papers. Sev-
 733 eral frameworks are used: AgentFly [76], Simulink [72], Gazebo [77], NetLogo
 734 [78], MASON [79], A-globe [80], Repast Simphony [81], JADE [82], PROMELA
 735 [83], Gwendolen [84], Neptus [85], jME3 [60], and SPADE [86]. Table 6 pro-
 736 vides the list of these frameworks. All used frameworks are open source except
 737 for AgentFly, A-globe and Simulink. In our previous work [87], a comparison
 738 between open-source ABS frameworks was provided. However, the comparison
 739 lacked some frameworks that were revealed by the SLR provided in this work.

Table 6: The reviewed papers per used framework

Framework	Papers using the framework
Ad hoc	Agogino et al. [62], Ashraf et al. [37], Wei et al. [51, 31], Bürkle et al. [24], Rollo et al. [26], Gunetti et al. [33], Evertsz et al. [52], Kandil et al. [38], Sampredo et al. [35], Peng et al. [54], Benedetti et al. [45], De Benedetti et al. [27, 61], Bürkle and Leuchter [46], da Silva et al. [50], Schatten [58]
MASON [79]	Albani et al. [63], Zou et al. [41]
AgentFly [76]	Semsch et al. [47], Pechoucek et al. [59], Šišlák et al. [39]
PROMELA [83]	Webster et al. [56]
A-globe [80]	Volf et al. [53], Stenger et al. [34]
NetLogo [78]	Cimino et al. [28], Zhu et al. [25]
Simulink [72]	Gunetti et al. [32], Ciarletta et al. [29], Kucherov and Kucherov [42]
Gwendolen [84]	Webster et al. [57]
Gazebo [77]	Arokiasami et al. [40], Ma et al. [55]
Repast Simphony [81]	Khaleghi et al. [48]
Neptus [85]	Vasiljevic et al. [6]
jME3 [60]	Veloso et al. [60]
SPADE [86]	Obdržálek [30]
JADE [82]	Fulford et al. [36]
n/a	Van der Walle et al. [43], Sutton et al. [44], Bentz and Panagou [49], Ferrag et al. [64]

740 The two most used frameworks by the papers in the SLR are AgentFly (7%),
741 Simulink (7%). However, the result indicate that no framework was favored by
742 researchers for civilian UAV applications. The larger part of the of implemen-
743 tations in the reviewed papers is using an ad hoc framework (43%). These
744 simulation frameworks are typically developed by the authors of the reviewed
745 papers from scratch. This fact leads us to consider that the existing frame-
746 works do not cover all the needs mandatory for implementing a UAV simulation
747 software. Moreover, and due to the abundance of frameworks with no clear
748 distinguished features related to UAVs, the authors generally prefer to setup
749 their own configuration and build the simulation framework from scratch even
750 though it is time-consuming. Regarding the public availability of the imple-
751 mented solution, only one paper has provided full access to the code [41], and
752 some papers provided partial access to pieces of code or to open source tools
753 that they used [35, 48, 6, 55, 60, 29, 58, 30], while the rest of papers did not
754 provide any access.

755 3.9. Discussion

756 The results and the discussion above help to understand the recent tenden-
757 cies in the studied domain. Nevertheless, the conclusions drawn in this paper
758 are only valid within the predefined domain of ABS and MAS for civilian UAV
759 applications. Thus the tendencies discussed in Section 3 cannot be generated
760 to all UAV applications. Their scope and validity are limited by the keywords
761 and the exclusion criteria defined in Section 2.

762 Based on the quality criteria defined in Section 2.2.3, the quality of the
763 papers were evaluated according to the four quality criteria defined in Table 1

764 related to the explanations on the motivations (Q1), the study context (Q2),
765 the theoretical and experimental results (Q3), and the limitations and research
766 directions (Q4). Fig. 26 shows the average evaluation for each of these criteria.
767 Reviewers have provided a score, according to their background and knowledge,
768 based on three levels of quality: “bad”, “average”, “good”. Each paper was
769 evaluated by at least two reviewers and the results were averaged into a scale
770 from 1 to 5. Over the entire set of the papers, motivations and contexts are
771 clearly explained. Presentation of the results is described with the minimum
772 set of details to allow a researcher to reproduce the presented results. Finally,
773 as can be seen from the figure, reviewers have considered that the limitations of
774 the proposed models and approaches are not enough detailed within the papers.
775 However, as UAV technology evolves and new UAV manufacturers claim new
776 customers and social flight clubs enlist fresh enthusiast amateur pilots, these
777 open issues and limitations are becoming significant challenges.

778 For instance, regulation and collision avoidance are among the prominent
779 challenges to be settled. Yet, the air is still largely unregulated and unmarked,
780 especially to the naked eye, unequipped with height measuring methods, without
781 prior knowledge of any restrictions regarding the filming of surrounding people,
782 and the seriousness of the threat a UAV poses as it zooms past or above people.
783 Moreover, enhanced availability of better GPS-trackers, quieter copters, and
784 smaller “footprint” also raises new legal issues and requires current and up-
785 to-date regulation. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the world still remains
786 behind on effective UAV control. Yet, these issues have not received enough
787 attention in the reviewed papers. Namely, regulation is addressed directly in
788 no more than 7% of the papers. while collision avoidance and UAV safety are
789 addressed only by 11% of the papers.

790 To help address these understudied open issues and limitations, the next
791 section identifies the main research directions.

792 4. Challenges and Research Directions

793 In this section, the major challenges and research directions related to UAVs
794 are listed. These directions are either mentioned in the reviewed papers or
795 identified based on our own experience. The following list provides a synthesis
796 of these challenges and research directions.

797 **RD1: Making the UAV autonomous;** This research direction is neither specif-
798 ically control-related, nor concerned with inner-loop feedback stability
799 and control. Since the early UAV research works [88], several related
800 issues have been considered: (i) secure communications, unjammable
801 data link (this point is specifically addressed in RD3); (ii) coordination;
802 (iii) target identification; (iv) target assignment; and (v) deconfliction.
803 References cite automated decision aiding/decision making as one of the
804 most difficult problems leading to autonomy. Man-machine interface,
805 communications, task and path planning, and target identification are
806 real and difficult issues.

807 The aim of a typical UAV planning algorithm is to determine a path
808 through the environment while satisfying all the constraints and the
809 mission objectives. Such a planning algorithm involves several levels of
810 planning: (i) pre-mission planning where all the information is static.
811 This is the best plan that can be made based on the available informa-
812 tion. (ii) near term plan, which is executed in the air and involves the
813 physical flying of the UAVs. This can be looked at as a trajectory track-
814 ing task, which can be completely automated through inner-loop control,
815 autopilot design, tracking, and short-term on-line trajectory generation.
816 It is the intermediate level of planning where the desired capability of
817 autonomous control is achieved. (iii) Near real-time in-flight replanning
818 is needed as new sensor information or commands are received by the
819 UAVs. The challenge is to optimally update the off-line plan as per the
820 new received information and/or the unforeseen occurred events. The
821 optimization problem is dominated by size, complexity, uncertainty, and
822 the fact that the mission could be shared by different UAVs. This leads to
823 problems related to the cooperation and coordination of the autonomous
824 UAVs, and opens the door for challenges like flexible autonomy [24] and
825 initiative decision-making [89].

826 **RD2:** *Explaining the UAV Behavior;* As shown in the previous section, there
827 is a confirmed tendency towards the development of increasingly au-
828 tonomous UAV systems. This evolution would minimize the human in-
829 tervention by relieving the human operator from the burden of contin-
830 uously monitoring the UAVs. Nevertheless, in unpredictable situations,
831 the UAV behavior might not conform to expectations of the human oper-
832 ator. For instance, in a product delivery scenario, an autonomous UAV
833 may choose to deviate from its expected path because of an unforeseen
834 event. Enhancing the UAVs with explaining capabilities would allow
835 the human operator to understand the reasons behind UAV behavior
836 and raises its trust in the autonomous UAV system. Moreover, the re-
837 cent developments of the domain of eXplainable AI (XAI) help UAVs
838 to move in this direction. As a matter of fact, UAV has been cited
839 as one of the applications where XAI would be needed [90]. Further-
840 more, developing explainable UAV would have a very positive impact
841 on human-machine teaming. Recently, this research direction is being
842 explored by military UAV applications. Similar efforts should be con-
843 sidered for civilian applications [91]. As shown by recent studies, using
844 BDI agents is a promising approach to develop explainable agents [92].
845 A key explanation for this success lies in the fact that BDI paradigm
846 is inspired from *folk psychology* which means that “*the core concepts of*
847 *the agent framework map easily to the language people use to describe*
848 *their reasoning and actions in everyday conversations*” [93]. Therefore,
849 BDI architecture offers a more straightforward description making mod-
850 els easier to explain for end-users. For this reason, UAV agents relying
851 on BDI architectures, which represent only 14% of papers reviewed in

852 this SLR (*c.f.* Figure 16), are likely to increase in numbers if the issue
853 of explainable UAV behavior is to become a hot research topic.

854 **RD3:** *Ensuring Security and Authentication;* The quest of developing auto-
855 nomous and decentralized UAV systems raises several challenges related
856 to security and authentication. For instance, within a swarm, a UAV
857 must be able to detect and entrust its peers, and ensure data confiden-
858 tiality and integrity. Otherwise, faulty or malicious UAVs may deviate
859 the swarm behavior [94]. These challenges are accentuated by the fact
860 that most UAV swarms are designed to operate autonomously without
861 a central regulating authority. Recent research has outlined *Block-Chain*
862 *Technology* (BCT) as a potential solution to overcome this problem. In
863 addition to providing a platform allowing for secured interactions among
864 UAVs, BCT can also be used to enhance the decentralized decision mak-
865 ing of the UAV swarm since it allows all the participants to share an
866 identical view of the world, and facilitate agreements among UAV teams
867 [94]. Yet, before BCT is ready to be used with UAVs, several limitations
868 must be solved [94]: *(i) latency:* the time required to update the block-
869 chain is too long to allow real-time compliance (a common requirement
870 in UAV applications); *(ii)* Most of the UAVs are resource-constrained
871 devices which might be unable to undertake the heavy computations de-
872 manded by BCT. For this reason, recent research works in BCT propose
873 lightweight techniques (*e.g.* “proof of stake”) that can be handled by
874 resource-constrained devices such as the UAVs; *(iii)* On the long run,
875 BCT can be very demanding in terms of bandwidth and communication
876 overhead since all agents should share a copy of a long “ledger” of inter-
877 actions [95]. This issue, known as “bloat”, poses a considerable challenge
878 to UAV teams which have limited hardware and communication capa-
879 bilities.

880 **RD4:** *Increasing the flight duration;* Another problem is the UAV battery life.
881 This well-known problem is related to the UAV design and concerns the
882 improvement of the UAV battery life. Currently, the battery of a typical
883 UAV allows for up to 13 to 20 minutes of continues flight. In a large
884 number of application cases, this duration is not long enough to enable
885 UAVs to achieve their objective before they run out of power and fall
886 down. There are some technical solutions allowing to increase the battery
887 life. Yet, as the battery capacity increases, its size and weight generally
888 increase, which cause the UAVs to consume more power. Battery man-
889 agement can help handle this issue by managing battery consumption
890 prediction and planning [96], scheduling [97], and replacement of battery
891 [98, 99]. Battery wireless charging is also an option through power lines
892 [100], or an automatic charging system that uses charging stations posi-
893 tioned along the path of the UAV mission [101]. For long-endurance and
894 high-altitude flights, solar-powered UAVs could be used [102, 103, 104].

895 **RD5:** *Integrating UAVs into smart cities;* A smart city integrates heteroge-
896 neous connected objects to automate or simplify autonomous and trans-
897 parent accomplishment of various daily tasks, both personal and pro-
898 fessional [74]. A smart city is an urban area that uses different types
899 of electronic data collection sensors to supply information which is used
900 to manage assets and resources efficiently. This includes data collected
901 from citizens, devices, and assets that are processed and analyzed to mon-
902 itor and manage traffic and transportation systems, power plants, water
903 supply networks, waste management, law enforcement, information sys-
904 tems, schools, libraries, hospitals, and other community services [105].
905 The smart city concept integrates ICT, and various physical devices con-
906 nected to the network to optimize the efficiency of city operations and
907 services and connect to citizens [106]. According to Farhan et al. [107],
908 several opportunities for UAVs uses to support a smart city exist. These
909 opportunities will be very beneficial to any smart city that would utilize
910 UAVs for their economic growth and development.

911 One of the new trends in civilian UAV applications in smart cities is using
912 UAVs in geospatial surveying. The main design of a smart city requires
913 the optimization of data flows provided by wireless sensor networks as
914 sensors are the main component of any autonomous system such as those
915 involving UAVs. This combination of technologies creates a wide range
916 of applications and opportunities such as fire management in open areas
917 where the use of UAVs and micro-UAVs is very beneficial. The potentials
918 vary from a wide range of available solutions and innovations that are
919 evolving quickly. Due to the reliability of most UAV designs, integration
920 of such technologies make it possible to install wireless sensors on-board
921 to make the UAVs usable in geospatial, land surveying and Geographic
922 Information System (GIS) applications in smart cities in addition to
923 being helpful for environmental analysis. These opportunities may lead
924 to cost reduction and cutting down on the number of manpower hours
925 involved in such activities.

926 The integration of UAV solutions with machine-to-machine, Radio-
927 frequency identification (RFID) and live video streaming increased the
928 role of UAVs in public safety areas. This new trend will move the cities
929 management personnel from being reactive to proactive and will lever-
930 age data. Furthermore, the involvement of UAVs in surveillance activi-
931 ties will reduce costs and increase the efficiency of the operations. The
932 efficiency of security and safety systems in a city has become a serious
933 concern not only for smart cities but also for any type of cities or com-
934 munities. Involvement of UAVs in smart policing activities has lately
935 been supported by the US Congress and top level federal agencies such
936 as the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and the US Department of Justice.

937 UAVs can act as a third party technology to coordinate information
938 from various systems within a smart city. Since they are controlled at
939 the ground station once they receive information the ground system can

940 send commands to UAVs to direct the information to another system or
941 UAVs.

942 In addition to integrating UAVs into smart cities, integrating them into
943 large, open and isolated space is another research direction. Applica-
944 tions in agriculture, environment preservation and sustainable energy
945 (*e.g.* solar farms monitoring, electric transport, *etc.*) are countless.

946 **RD6:** *Proposing and Evaluating UAV regulations*; Regulations about introduc-
947 ing UAVs, including air traffic regulations, landing/taking off regulations,
948 *etc.* are not yet fully developed, and there exist serious safety and privacy
949 problems mostly due to the lack of regulations.

950 Globally, regulations regarding the use of UAVs are still immature. So
951 far, at the multilateral level, the International Civil Aviation Organiza-
952 tion (ICAO) is the lead platform for framing regulations for UAV op-
953 erations. Several regulations were passed to regulate the use of UAVs;
954 however, no proposals were made from a technological point of view.
955 Moreover, legislation varies from region to region and between countries
956 [108].

957 Recognizing the enormous potential growth of UAVs, the European Avi-
958 ation Safety Agency (EASA) has been tasked by the European Commis-
959 sion to frame regulations for UAV operations. In 2014, the Commission
960 published “A new era for aviation—Opening the aviation market to the
961 civilian use of remotely piloted aircraft systems in a safe and sustainable
962 manner” [109] but this does not include the UAVs. The EASA published
963 a comprehensive proposal in May 2017 covering the technical and oper-
964 ational aspects of operating UAV. According to the proposal, all UAVs
965 above 250 g need to be registered. The proposal put the alignment of
966 different national UAV legislations as one of Horizon 2020 goals. How-
967 ever, these goals have been postponed until 2050. Moreover, different
968 European countries have different regulations – for instance, one can fly
969 UAVs commercially in Switzerland if line-of-sight can be ensured, within
970 certain altitude limitations and not flying near protected areas such as
971 airports. On the other hand, France has more restrictive regulations in
972 place where it is mandatory that any UAV operation over a city needs to
973 be authorized by aviation authorities. In Belgium, Brussels is planning
974 to create “U-space” in 2019, a European controlled space for UAVs flying
975 above 150 m in height and weighing less than 150 kg.

976 In India, some work examines civilian UAV operations and analyses the
977 major policy gaps in the country’s evolving policy framework. It argues
978 that ad hoc measures taken by agencies have been ineffective, whether in
979 addressing issues of quality control, or response mechanisms, questions
980 of privacy and trespass, air traffic, and legal liability [110].

981 USA has by far the most mature civilian UAV regulations in place.
982 The New Small UAS Rule (107) of the Federal Aviation Administra-
983 tion (FAA) that was issued in August 2016 regulates most of the UAV

984 operations, especially those related to commercial or civilian purposes.
985 The FAA has relaxed the regulations for UAV operations in the com-
986 mercial sector considering that the UAV applications are estimated to
987 generate an additional US\$82 billion for the economy of USA.

988 Making progress on the issue of reaching a common legislation will be
989 a complicated task. This is because international conventions on inter-
990 national civilian aviation, such as the Chicago Convention, apply only
991 to civilian manned aircraft but not to unmanned ones [108]. It is neces-
992 sary to have a legislation that will be open and generic in the technical
993 aspects. This is because legislations that are limited to specific aircraft
994 types or only permit the use of remote controls with certain character-
995 istics would become obsolete in the near future, as new advances in the
996 field of UAVs appear. Furthermore, regulations should not only consider
997 the civilian liability of these devices but also aspects that will assure the
998 security of the citizens, for example, the protection of data in deployed
999 vehicles [108].

1000 **RD7:** *Verifying and validating the UAV behavior*; According to [111], the more
1001 complex a UAV software function gets, the more difficult it becomes
1002 to test. Furthermore, functional requirements are only one aspect of a
1003 system. Beyond the pure verification of a requirement lies the benchmark
1004 of the implemented solution. The resulting outcome may be determined
1005 by a test of the requirement, but the specific path to the solution can
1006 have different levels of quality. Therefore, additional tests have to verify
1007 that the specified safety boundaries, as well as additional constraints, are
1008 met by this algorithm. To be able to assess highly automated functions
1009 and to be able to assure a high-quality software system, it is, therefore,
1010 necessary to implement a scoring system or a benchmark to evaluate
1011 the autonomy using non-functional requirements. For example, for path
1012 planning the standardized benchmark by [112] is utilized to measure the
1013 correctness and result quality by expressing a set of pass/fail criteria
1014 from the standardized baseline solution.

1015 It is important to notice that benchmarks are problem specific, and not
1016 implementation specific. This enables developers not only to test a path-
1017 planning algorithm automatically, without a manual review from an en-
1018 gineer, but also to evaluate algorithms and compare them with different
1019 implementations and solution approaches. The development of such au-
1020 tomatic tests and benchmarks for additional problems, such as sensor
1021 fusion and computer vision, to generally assess the capability to fulfill
1022 navigation safety and performance requirements, will be critical to the
1023 progress of UAVs and the evaluation of new approaches [111].

1024 The growing pressure to innovate and the demand for shorter develop-
1025 ment cycles require changes in the UAV development methodology. As a
1026 result, there is a shift in the demands on testbed systems. This desire for
1027 shorter development times stands opposed to the growing complexity re-

1028 required for developing of increasingly automated and autonomous systems
1029 [113]. Enabling early validation of such system designs requires the simu-
1030 lation of components. This requires the development of adapted simula-
1031 tion environment, possibly real-time, composed of a collection of reusable
1032 modules combining real and virtual components (also called XiL: X-in-
1033 the-Loop, where X meaning alternatively Model/Software/Hardware and
1034 Human).

1035 **5. Related Works**

1036 Recently, several works surveyed the emerging topics of UAVs. However,
1037 these works mainly focused on vertical applications without considering the
1038 aspects and challenges across multiple application domains and research topics.
1039 For instance, Hayat et al. [114] focused on the characteristics and requirements
1040 of UAV networks for envisioned civilian applications between 2000 and 2015
1041 from a communications and networking point of view. Motlagh et al. [115]
1042 reviewed Low-altitude UAVs highlighting their potential use in the delivery of
1043 IoT services from the sky. Other surveys focused on traffic management [116],
1044 environmental monitoring [117], ad hoc networks in UAV applications [118],
1045 routing and energy efficiency in UAV communication networks [119], and UAV
1046 coverage [120].

1047 One interesting survey is provided by Chmaj and Selvaraj [121] in which
1048 the authors surveyed the applications implemented using cooperative swarms of
1049 UAVs that operate as a distributed processing system. However, this survey did
1050 not consider the challenges facing UAVs in these applications and the potential
1051 role of new technologies in UAV uses.

1052 Shakhatreh et al. [122] reviewed civilian UAV applications and challenges.
1053 They identify current research trends and future challenges for civilian UAV
1054 applications, including: charging, collision avoidance, swarming, networking and
1055 security-related challenges. Yet, this survey was mainly inspired by low-level
1056 aspects of the UAV like networking and wireless communication. Moreover, the
1057 listing of the comparison was in sequence without a cross-application domain
1058 discussion.

1059 Other surveys focused on system identification and UAV-human interactions.
1060 In particular, current methods and applications of system identification for small
1061 low-cost UAVs were provided by Hoffer et al. [123], while the interaction between
1062 UAVs and humans applications were considered in another survey [124]. In this
1063 later work, a taxonomy of control methods that enable operators to control
1064 swarms effectively was developed. With highlighting challenges, unanswered
1065 questions, and open problems for Human-Swarm interaction.

1066 **6. Conclusions**

1067 UAVs are becoming increasingly popular for civilian applications. The aim
1068 of this paper is twofold. First, conduct a SLR on research addressing MAS,

1069 and specifically ABS, in civilian UAV applications. Second, outline and analyze
1070 the challenging research direction of civilian UAV applications. The following
1071 section states the principal findings. Note that while the SLR concentrated on
1072 research using ABS for civilian UAV applications, some of the findings below
1073 pertain to key research issues in agent and MAS (*e.g.* agent architectures,
1074 decentralization, *etc.*).

1075 Following a well established SLR methodology, we identified 8 Research
1076 Questions (RQ) helping to assess the contributions of MAS and ABS in civilian
1077 UAV applications. The main findings were:

- 1078 1. Research on MAS and ABS for civilian UAV applications has witnessed a
1079 considerable increase in the past decade, and most of the reviewed papers
1080 were written in Europe followed by North America and Asia.
- 1081 2. Coordination, mission management, UAV formation (platooning), colli-
1082 sion avoidance, task allocation, and path planning were the most studied
1083 research topics while “Urban planning” and “General” accounted for the
1084 majority of application domains.
- 1085 3. The majority of papers covered by the SLR opted for a goal-directed agent
1086 architecture to model their agents. Furthermore, most of these studies
1087 adopted a decentralized system architecture.
- 1088 4. Despite the key role that the UAV is expected to assume in smart cities
1089 and connected smart environments, only a fifth of the reviewed paper
1090 integrate IoT technologies in their research works.
- 1091 5. The majority of the reviewed papers address UAV connectivity. This
1092 shows that most of the reviewed papers view UAVs as connected entities
1093 both among themselves and with their environment.
- 1094 6. Algorithm-based models were used slightly more than the mathematical
1095 models by the reviewed papers.
- 1096 7. To evaluate their contributions, only 5% of papers rely on public datasets
1097 and less than 20% use generated datasets. The remaining majority do
1098 not use any dataset for evaluation purposes. This underlines the absence
1099 of common testbeds and datasets allowing to evaluate and compare these
1100 works.
- 1101 8. In a related finding, the results showed that to conduct their experiments,
1102 about 40% of the studied papers implement their own ad hoc simulations.
1103 This might be an indication that existing frameworks are not meeting all
1104 the needs required for implementing UAV simulations.

1105 As a result of this analysis, we outlined the following key challenges and research
1106 directions: (*i*) Model design of fully autonomous UAV; (*ii*) Explanation of the
1107 UAV behaviors when they are part of a complex system; (*iii*) Security and
1108 authentication of UAV; (*iv*) Increasing of the flight duration; (*v*) Technical

1109 integration of UAV into smart cities; *(vi)* Proposal and evaluation of UAV-
1110 related regulations; and *(vii)* Verification and validation the UAV behaviors.

1111 Regarding the SLR, a future work will be to compare the contributions based
1112 on MAS to those using real UAVs. In this way, it will be possible to highlight
1113 the position and the growth of MAS within the UAV community.

1114 Additionally, RD7 and the need for simulation testbeds suggest that the
1115 use of ABS frameworks for UAVs will gain more interest in complex civilian
1116 applications scenarios. Therefore, one future work is to rely on the results of this
1117 SLR to select specific criteria allowing to define a methodology to compare ABS
1118 frameworks and evaluate them based on civilian UAV application considerations.

1119 Acknowledgements

1120 This work is supported by the Regional Council of Bourgogne Franche-Comté
1121 (RBFC, France) within the project UrbanFly 20174-06234/06242.

1122 This work is partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and
1123 Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

1124 References

- 1125 [1] Teal Group, World Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Systems – 2018 Market Profile and
1126 Forecast, Tech. Rep., Teal Group Corporation, 2018.
- 1127 [2] D. Bamburly, Drones: Designed for product delivery, Design Management Re-
1128 view 26 (1) (2015) 40–48.
- 1129 [3] R. D’Andrea, Guest editorial can drones deliver?, IEEE Transactions on Au-
1130 tomation Science and Engineering 11 (3) (2014) 647–648.
- 1131 [4] J. E. Scott, C. H. Scott, Models for Drone Delivery of Medications and Other
1132 Healthcare Items, IJHISI 13 (3) (2018) 20–34, doi:10.4018/IJHISI.2018070102.
- 1133 [5] T. Amukele, P. M. Ness, A. A. Tobian, J. Boyd, J. Street, Drone transportation
1134 of blood products, Transfusion 57 (3) (2017) 582–588.
- 1135 [6] A. Vasilijevic, P. Calado, F. Lopez-Castejon, D. Hayes, N. Stilinovic, D. Nad,
1136 F. Mandic, P. Dias, J. Gomes, J. Molina, et al., Heterogeneous robotic system
1137 for underwater oil spill survey, in: OCEANS 2015-Genova, IEEE, 1–7, 2015.
- 1138 [7] G. Wild, J. Murray, G. Baxter, Exploring Civil Drone Accidents and Incidents
1139 to Help Prevent Potential Air Disasters, Aerospace 3 (3) (2016) 22.
- 1140 [8] A. Rodić, G. Mester, Modeling and simulation of quad-rotor dynamics and spa-
1141 tial navigation, in: Intelligent Systems and Informatics (SISY), 2011 IEEE 9th
1142 International Symposium on, IEEE, 23–28, 2011.
- 1143 [9] D. Floreano, R. J. Wood, Science, technology and the future of small autonomous
1144 drones, Nature 521 (7553) (2015) 460–466.

- 1145 [10] F. Lorig, N. Dammenhayn, D.-J. Müller, I. J. Timm, Measuring and Comparing
1146 Scalability of Agent-Based Simulation Frameworks, in: German Conference on
1147 Multiagent System Technologies, Springer, 42–60, 2015.
- 1148 [11] M. Wooldridge, An introduction to multiagent systems, John Wiley & Sons,
1149 2009.
- 1150 [12] G. Weiss, et al., Multiagent Systems (Intelligent Robotics and Autonomous
1151 Agents series), 2013.
- 1152 [13] K. P. Sycara, Multiagent systems, *AI magazine* 19 (2) (1998) 79.
- 1153 [14] M. Wooldridge, N. R. Jennings, Intelligent agents: Theory and practice, *The
1154 knowledge engineering review* 10 (2) (1995) 115–152.
- 1155 [15] D. Budgen, P. Brereton, Performing systematic literature reviews in software
1156 engineering, in: Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Software
1157 engineering, ACM, 1051–1052, 2006.
- 1158 [16] B. A. Kitchenham, P. Brereton, M. Turner, M. K. Niazi, S. Linkman, R. Pre-
1159 torius, D. Budgen, Refining the systematic literature review process—two
1160 participant-observer case studies, *Empirical Software Engineering* 15 (6) (2010)
1161 618–653.
- 1162 [17] B. Kitchenham, S. Charters, Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature
1163 Reviews in Software Engineering, 2007.
- 1164 [18] P. Brereton, B. A. Kitchenham, D. Budgen, M. Turner, M. Khalil, Lessons from
1165 applying the systematic literature review process within the software engineering
1166 domain, *Journal of systems and software* 80 (4) (2007) 571–583.
- 1167 [19] M. Galster, D. Weyns, D. Tofan, B. Michalik, P. Avgeriou, Variability in soft-
1168 ware systems—a systematic literature review, *IEEE Transactions on Software
1169 Engineering* 40 (3) (2014) 282–306.
- 1170 [20] D. Calvaresi, D. Cesarini, P. Sernani, M. Marinoni, A. F. Dragoni, A. Sturm,
1171 Exploring the ambient assisted living domain: a systematic review, *Journal of
1172 Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 8 (2) (2017) 239–257.
- 1173 [21] H. Parunak, Making swarming happen, in: Conf. on Swarming and Network
1174 Enabled Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveil-
1175 lance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR), McLean, Virginia, USA, 2003.
- 1176 [22] B. A. Kitchenham, O. P. Brereton, D. Budgen, Z. Li, An Evaluation of Quality
1177 Checklist Proposals-A participant-observer case study., in: EASE, vol. 9, 167,
1178 2009.
- 1179 [23] UNESCO, How much does your country invest in
1180 R&D?, URL [http://uis.unesco.org/apps/visualisations/
1181 research-and-development-spending/](http://uis.unesco.org/apps/visualisations/research-and-development-spending/), 2018.
- 1182 [24] A. Bürkle, F. Segor, M. Kollmann, Towards Autonomous Micro UAV Swarms,
1183 *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems* 61 (1-4) (2011) 339–353, doi:
1184 10.1007/s10846-010-9492-x.

- 1185 [25] X. Zhu, Z. Liu, J. Yang, Model of Collaborative UAV Swarm Toward Coordination and Control Mechanisms Study, in: Proceedings of the International
1186 Conference on Computational Science, ICCS 2015, Computational Science at
1187 the Gates of Nature, Reykjavík, Iceland, 1-3 June, 2015, 2014, 493–502, doi:
1188 10.1016/j.procs.2015.05.274, 2015.
- 1190 [26] M. Rollo, M. Selecký, P. Losiewicz, J. Reade, N. Maida, Framework for incremental development of complex unmanned aircraft systems, in: Integrated
1191 Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance Conference (ICNS), 2015, IEEE,
1192 1–14, 2015.
- 1194 [27] M. De Benedetti, F. D’Urso, F. Messina, G. Pappalardo, C. Santoro, Self-Organising UAVs for Wide Area Fault-tolerant Aerial Monitoring, in: Proceedings of the 16th Workshop ”From Objects to Agents”, Naples, Italy, June 17-19,
1195 2015., 135–141, 2015.
- 1198 [28] M. G. C. A. Cimino, A. Lazzeri, G. Vaglini, Combining stigmergic and flocking behaviors to coordinate swarms of drones performing target search, in: 6th International Conference on Information, Intelligence, Systems and Applications, IISA 2015, Corfu, Greece, July 6-8, 2015, 1–6, doi:10.1109/IISA.2015.7387990,
1199 2015.
- 1200 [29] L. Ciarletta, A. Guenard, Y. Presse, V. Galtier, Y.-Q. Song, J.-C. Ponsart, S. Aberkane, D. Theilliol, Simulation and Platform Tools to develop safe flock of UAVs: a CPS Application-Driven Research, in: Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), 2014 International Conference on, IEEE, 95–102, 2014.
- 1203 [30] Z. Obdržálek, Mobile agents in multi-agent UAV/UGV system, in: Military Technologies (ICMT), 2017 International Conference on, IEEE, 753–759, 2017.
- 1204 [31] Y. Wei, M. B. Blake, G. R. Madey, An Operation-Time Simulation Framework for UAV Swarm Configuration and Mission Planning, in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Science, ICCS 2013, Barcelona, Spain, 5-7 June, 2013, 1949–1958, doi:10.1016/j.procs.2013.05.364, 2013.
- 1205 [32] P. Gunetti, T. J. Dodd, H. Thompson, Simulation of a Soar-Based Autonomous Mission Management System for Unmanned Aircraft, *J. Aerospace Inf. Sys.* 10 (2) (2013) 53–70, doi:10.2514/1.53282.
- 1206 [33] P. Gunetti, H. Thompson, T. J. Dodd, Autonomous mission management for UAVs using soar intelligent agents, *Int. J. Systems Science* 44 (5) (2013) 831–852, doi:10.1080/00207721.2011.626902.
- 1207 [34] A. Stenger, B. Fernando, M. Heni, *Autonomous Mission Planning for UAVs: A Cognitive Approach*, Citeseer, 2013.
- 1208 [35] C. Sampedro, H. Bayle, J. L. Sanchez Lopez, R. Suarez Fernandez, A. Rodriguez Ramos, M. Molina, P. Campoy Cervera, A flexible and dynamic mission planning architecture for uav swarm coordination, in: Proceedings of 2016 International Conference on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), ETSI.Informatica, 2016.

- 1226 [36] C. Fulford, N. Lie, E. Earon, R. Huq, C. Rabbath, The Vehicle Abstraction
1227 Layer: A simplified approach to multi-agent, autonomous UAV systems develop-
1228 ment, in: System Simulation and Scientific Computing, 2008. ICSC 2008. Asia
1229 Simulation Conference-7th International Conference on, IEEE, 483–487, 2008.
- 1230 [37] A. Ashraf, A. Majd, E. Troubitsyna, Towards a realtime, collision-free motion
1231 coordination and navigation system for a UAV fleet, in: Proceedings of the
1232 Fifth European Conference on the Engineering of Computer-Based Systems,
1233 ECBS 2017, Larnaca, Cyprus, August 31 - September 01, 2017, 11:1–11:9, doi:
1234 10.1145/3123779.3123805, 2017.
- 1235 [38] A. A. Kandil, A. Wagner, A. Gotta, E. Badreddin, Collision avoidance
1236 in a recursive nested behaviour control structure for Unmanned Aerial Ve-
1237 hicles, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Systems,
1238 Man and Cybernetics, Istanbul, Turkey, 10-13 October 2010, 4276–4281, doi:
1239 10.1109/ICSMC.2010.5642396, 2010.
- 1240 [39] D. Šišlák, P. Volf, Š. Kopřiva, M. Pěchouček, Agentfly: NAS-wide simulation
1241 framework integrating algorithms for automated collision avoidance, in: Inte-
1242 grated Communications, Navigation and Surveillance Conference (ICNS), 2011,
1243 IEEE, F7–1, 2011.
- 1244 [40] W. A. Arokiasami, P. Vadakkepat, K. C. Tan, D. Srinivasan, Interoperable multi-
1245 agent framework for unmanned aerial/ground vehicles: towards robot autonomy,
1246 Complex & Intelligent Systems 2 (1) (2016) 45–59.
- 1247 [41] X. Zou, R. Alexander, J. McDermid, Testing Method for Multi-UAV Con-
1248 flict Resolution Using Agent-Based Simulation and Multi-Objective Search, J.
1249 Aerospace Inf. Sys. 13 (5) (2016) 191–203, doi:10.2514/1.I010412.
- 1250 [42] D. P. Kucherov, D. Kucherov, Group behavior of UAVs in obstacles presence,
1251 in: 2016 4th International Conference on Methods and Systems of Naviga-
1252 tion and Motion Control (MSNMC), National aviation university, 51–54, doi:
1253 10.1109/MSNMC.2016.7783104, 2016.
- 1254 [43] D. Van der Walle, B. Fidan, A. Sutton, C. Yu, B. D. Anderson, Non-hierarchical
1255 UAV formation control for surveillance tasks, in: American Control Conference,
1256 2008, IEEE, 777–782, 2008.
- 1257 [44] A. Sutton, B. Fidan, D. Van der Walle, Hierarchical uav formation control for
1258 cooperative surveillance, IFAC Proceedings Volumes 41 (2) (2008) 12087–12092.
- 1259 [45] M. D. Benedetti, F. D’Urso, F. Messina, G. Pappalardo, C. Santoro, UAV-based
1260 Aerial Monitoring: A Performance Evaluation of a Self-Organising Flocking Al-
1261 gorithm, in: 10th International Conference on P2P, Parallel, Grid, Cloud and
1262 Internet Computing, 3PGCIC 2015, Krakow, Poland, November 4-6, 2015, 248–
1263 255, doi:10.1109/3PGCIC.2015.78, 2015.
- 1264 [46] A. Bürkle, S. Leuchter, Development of Micro UAV Swarms, in: Autonome Mo-
1265 bile Systeme 2009 - 21. Fachgespräch, Karlsruhe, 3./4. December 2009, Springer,
1266 217–224, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-10284-4_28, 2009.

- 1267 [47] E. Semsch, M. Jakob, D. Pavlíček, M. Pechoucek, Autonomous UAV Surveillance
1268 in Complex Urban Environments, in: Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE/WIC/ACM
1269 International Conference on Intelligent Agent Technology, IAT 2009, Milan,
1270 Italy, 15-18 September 2009, 82–85, doi:10.1109/WI-IAT.2009.132, 2009.
- 1271 [48] A. M. Khaleghi, D. Xu, Z. Wang, M. Li, A. Lobos, J. Liu, Y. Son, A
1272 DDDAMS-based planning and control framework for surveillance and crowd
1273 control via UAVs and UGVs, *Expert Syst. Appl.* 40 (18) (2013) 7168–7183,
1274 doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2013.07.039.
- 1275 [49] W. Bentz, D. Panagou, 3D dynamic coverage and avoidance control in
1276 power-constrained UAV surveillance networks, in: Unmanned Aircraft Systems
1277 (ICUAS), 2017 International Conference on, IEEE, 1–10, 2017.
- 1278 [50] L. C. B. da Silva, R. M. Bernardo, H. A. de Oliveira, P. F. Rosa, Multi-UAV
1279 agent-based coordination for persistent surveillance with dynamic priorities, in:
1280 Military Technologies (ICMT), 2017 International Conference on, IEEE, 765–
1281 771, 2017.
- 1282 [51] Y. Wei, G. R. Madey, M. B. Blake, Agent-based simulation for UAV swarm mis-
1283 sion planning and execution, in: Proceedings of the Agent-Directed Simulation
1284 Symposium, part of the 2013 Spring Simulation Multiconference, SpringSim '13,
1285 San Diego, CA, USA, April 07 - 10, 2013, 2, 2013.
- 1286 [52] R. Evertsz, J. Thangarajah, N. Yadav, T. Ly, A framework for modelling tactical
1287 decision-making in autonomous systems, *Journal of Systems and Software* 110
1288 (2015) 222–238, doi:10.1016/j.jss.2015.08.046.
- 1289 [53] P. Volf, D. Sislák, M. Pechoucek, Large-Scale High-Fidelity Agent-Based Simu-
1290 lation in Air Traffic Domain, *Cybernetics and Systems* 42 (7) (2011) 502–525,
1291 doi:10.1080/01969722.2011.610270.
- 1292 [54] Z.-h. Peng, J.-p. Wu, J. Chen, Three-dimensional multi-constraint route plan-
1293 ning of unmanned aerial vehicle low-altitude penetration based on coevolution-
1294 ary multi-agent genetic algorithm, *Journal of Central South University of Techno-*
1295 *logy* 18 (5) (2011) 1502.
- 1296 [55] X. Ma, Z. Jiao, Z. Wang, D. Panagou, Decentralized prioritized motion plan-
1297 ning for multiple autonomous UAVs in 3D polygonal obstacle environments, in:
1298 International Conference on Unmanned Aircraft Systems, 2016.
- 1299 [56] M. P. Webster, M. Fisher, N. Cameron, M. Jump, Formal Methods for the
1300 Certification of Autonomous Unmanned Aircraft Systems, in: *Computer Safety,*
1301 *Reliability, and Security - 30th International Conference, SAFECOMP 2011,*
1302 *Naples, Italy, September 19-22, 2011. Proceedings,* 228–242, doi:10.1007/978-3-
1303 642-24270-0_17, 2011.
- 1304 [57] M. P. Webster, N. Cameron, M. Fisher, M. Jump, Generating Certification
1305 Evidence for Autonomous Unmanned Aircraft Using Model Checking and Simu-
1306 lation, *J. Aerospace Inf. Sys.* 11 (5) (2014) 258–279, doi:10.2514/1.I010096.
- 1307 [58] M. Schatten, Multi-agent based Traffic Control of Autonomous Unmanned
1308 Aerial Vehicles, Tech. Rep., Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, University of Za-
1309 greb, 2015.

- 1310 [59] M. Pechoucek, M. Jakob, P. Novák, Towards Simulation-Aided Design of Multi-
1311 Agent Systems, in: Programming Multi-Agent Systems - 8th International
1312 Workshop, ProMAS 2010, Toronto, ON, Canada, May 11, 2010. Revised Se-
1313 lected Papers, 3–21, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28939-2_1, 2010.
- 1314 [60] R. Veloso, Z. Kokkinogenis, L. S. Passos, G. Oliveira, R. J. Rossetti, J. Gabriel,
1315 A platform for the design, simulation and development of quadcopter multi-agent
1316 systems, in: Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI), 2014 9th Iberian
1317 Conference on, IEEE, 1–6, 2014.
- 1318 [61] M. De Benedetti, F. D’Urso, F. Messina, G. Pappalardo, C. Santoro, 3D Simula-
1319 tion of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, in: Proceedings of the 18th Workshop ”From
1320 Objects to Agents”, Scilla (RC), Italy, June 15-16, 2017., 7–12, 2017.
- 1321 [62] A. K. Agogino, C. HolmesParker, K. Tumer, Evolving large scale UAV
1322 communication system, in: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Confer-
1323 ence, GECCO ’12, Philadelphia, PA, USA, July 7-11, 2012, 1023–1030, doi:
1324 10.1145/2330163.2330306, 2012.
- 1325 [63] D. Albani, T. Manoni, D. Nardi, V. Trianni, Dynamic UAV Swarm Deployment
1326 for Non-Uniform Coverage, in: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference
1327 on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS 2018, Stockholm,
1328 Sweden, July 10-15, 2018, 523–531, 2018.
- 1329 [64] A. Ferrag, A. Oussar, M. Guiatni, Robust coordinated motion planning for
1330 UGV/UAV agents in disturbed environment, in: Modelling, Identification and
1331 Control (ICMIC), 2016 8th International Conference on, IEEE, 472–477, 2016.
- 1332 [65] B. T. Clough, Metrics, schmetrics! How the heck do you determine a UAV’s
1333 autonomy anyway, Tech. Rep., AIR FORCE RESEARCH LAB WRIGHT-
1334 PATTERSON AFB OH, 2002.
- 1335 [66] H. Mihaly, From NASA to EU: the evolution of the TRL scale in Public Sector
1336 Innovation, *The Innovation Journal* 22 (2017) 1–23.
- 1337 [67] J. Michon, A critical view of driver behaviour models: What do we know, what
1338 should we do?, *Human Behavior and Traffic Safety* (1985) 487–525.
- 1339 [68] M. Bratman, *Intention, Plans, and Practical Reason*, Center for the Study of
1340 Language and Information, 1987.
- 1341 [69] J. E. Laird, *The Soar cognitive architecture*, MIT press, 2012.
- 1342 [70] A. S. Rao, M. P. Georgeff, et al., BDI agents: from theory to practice., in:
1343 *ICMAS*, vol. 95, 312–319, 1995.
- 1344 [71] P. A. Vikhar, Evolutionary algorithms: A critical review and its future prospects,
1345 in: the 2016 International Conference on Global Trends in Signal Processing,
1346 Information Computing and Communication (ICGTSPICC), 261–265, 2016.
- 1347 [72] B. Ozpineci, L. M. Tolbert, Simulink implementation of induction machine
1348 model-a modular approach, in: *Electric Machines and Drives Conference, 2003.*
1349 *IEMDC’03. IEEE International*, vol. 2, Ieee, 728–734, 2003.

- 1350 [73] D. Weyns, A. Omicini, J. Odell, Environment as a First-class Abstraction in
1351 Multi-Agent Systems, *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 14 (1)
1352 (2007) 5–30, ISSN 1387-2532, special Issue on Environments for Multi-agent
1353 Systems.
- 1354 [74] A. Glaser, G. Allmendinger, Smart Cities Growth Opportunities Overview 2016–
1355 2021, Tech. Rep., Boulder, USA, 2017.
- 1356 [75] C. Weií, V2X communication in Europe - from research projects towards stan-
1357 dardization and field testing of vehicle communication technology, *Comput.*
1358 *Netw.* 55 (14) (2011) 3103–3119.
- 1359 [76] D. Sislak, P. Volf, M. Pechoucek, C. T. Cannon, D. N. Nguyen, W. C.
1360 Regli, Multi-Agent Simulation of En-Route Human Air-Traffic Controller, in:
1361 the Twenty-Fourth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference,
1362 AAAI Press, Toronto, Canada, ISBN 978-1-57735-568-7, 2323–2328, 2012.
- 1363 [77] N. Koenig, A. Howard, Design and use paradigms for gazebo, an open-source
1364 multi-robot simulator, in: *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2004.(IROS 2004).*
1365 *Proceedings. 2004 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, vol. 3, IEEE, 2149–
1366 2154, 2004.
- 1367 [78] U. Wilensky, I. Evanston, NetLogo: Center for connected learning and computer-
1368 based modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 4952.
- 1369 [79] S. Luke, C. Cioffi-Revilla, L. Panait, K. Sullivan, G. C. Balan, MASON: A
1370 Multiagent Simulation Environment, *Simulation* 81 (7) (2005) 517–527.
- 1371 [80] D. Šišlák, M. Rollo, M. Pěchouček, A-globe: Agent platform with inaccessibility
1372 and mobility support, in: *International Workshop on Cooperative Information*
1373 *Agents*, Springer, 199–214, 2004.
- 1374 [81] M. J. North, T. R. Howe, N. T. Collier, J. R. Vos, The repast symphony run-
1375 time system, in: *Proceedings of the agent 2005 conference on generative social*
1376 *processes, models, and mechanisms*, vol. 10, ANL/DIS-06-1, co-sponsored by
1377 Argonne National Laboratory and The University of Chicago, 13–15, 2005.
- 1378 [82] F. L. Bellifemine, G. Caire, D. Greenwood, *Developing multi-agent systems with*
1379 *JADE*, vol. 7, John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- 1380 [83] G. J. Holzmann, *The SPIN model checker: Primer and reference manual*, vol.
1381 1003, Addison-Wesley Reading, 2004.
- 1382 [84] L. A. Dennis, B. Farwer, Gwendolen: a BDI language for verifiable agents,
1383 in: *Proceedings of the AISB 2008 Symposium on Logic and the Simulation of*
1384 *Interaction and Reasoning*, Society for the Study of Artificial Intelligence and
1385 *Simulation of Behaviour*, 16–23, 2008.
- 1386 [85] P. S. Dias, S. L. Fraga, R. M. Gomes, G. M. Goncalves, F. L. Pereira, J. Pinto,
1387 J. B. Sousa, Neptus-a framework to support multiple vehicle operation, in:
1388 *Oceans 2005-Europe*, vol. 2, IEEE, 963–968, 2005.

- 1389 [86] M. E. Gregori, J. P. Cámara, G. A. Bada, A jabber-based multi-agent sys-
1390 tem platform, in: Proceedings of the fifth international joint conference on Au-
1391 tonomous agents and multiagent systems, ACM, 1282–1284, 2006.
- 1392 [87] Y. Mualla, W. Bai, S. Galland, C. Nicolle, Comparison of Agent-based Simu-
1393 lation Frameworks for Unmanned Aerial Transportation Applications, *Procedia*
1394 *Computer Science* 130 (C) (2018) 791–796.
- 1395 [88] P. Chandler, M. Pachter, Research Issues in Autonomous Control of Tactical
1396 UAVs, in: American Control Conference, Philadelphia, USA, 1998.
- 1397 [89] A. de Castro, J. Torres-Sánchez, J. Peña, F. Jiménez-Brenes, O. Csillik,
1398 F. López-Granados, An automatic random forest-OBIA algorithm for early weed
1399 mapping between and within crop rows using UAV imagery, *Remote Sensing*
1400 10 (2) (2018) 285.
- 1401 [90] D. Gunning, Explainable artificial intelligence (xai), Defense Advanced Research
1402 Projects Agency (DARPA), nd Web .
- 1403 [91] B. van der Vecht, J. van Diggelen, M. Peeters, J. Barnhoorn, J. van der Waa,
1404 SAIL: a social artificial intelligence layer for human-machine teaming, in: In-
1405 ternational Conference on Practical Applications of Agents and Multi-Agent
1406 Systems, Springer, 262–274, 2018.
- 1407 [92] J. Broekens, M. Harbers, K. Hindriks, K. Van Den Bosch, C. Jonker, J.-J. Meyer,
1408 Do you get it? User-evaluated explainable BDI agents, in: German Conference
1409 on Multiagent System Technologies, Springer, 28–39, 2010.
- 1410 [93] E. Norling, Folk psychology for human modelling: Extending the BDI paradigm,
1411 in: Proceedings of the Third International Joint Conference on Autonomous
1412 Agents and Multiagent Systems-Volume 1, IEEE Computer Society, 202–209,
1413 2004.
- 1414 [94] E. C. Ferrer, The blockchain: a new framework for robotic swarm systems, arXiv
1415 preprint arXiv:1608.00695 .
- 1416 [95] A. Wagner, Ensuring network scalability: How to fight blockchain bloat, *Bitcoin*
1417 *Magazine* 6.
- 1418 [96] N. K. Ure, G. Chowdhary, T. Toksoz, J. P. How, M. A. Vavrina, J. Vian, An
1419 automated battery management system to enable persistent missions with mul-
1420 tiple aerial vehicles, *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics* 20 (1) (2015)
1421 275–286.
- 1422 [97] S. Park, L. Zhang, S. Chakraborty, Battery assignment and scheduling for
1423 drone delivery businesses, in: 2017 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on
1424 Low Power Electronics and Design, ISLPED 2017, Taipei, Taiwan, July 24-26,
1425 2017, 1–6, doi:10.1109/ISLPED.2017.8009165, 2017.
- 1426 [98] K. A. Suzuki, P. Kemper Filho, J. R. Morrison, Automatic battery replacement
1427 system for UAVs: Analysis and design, *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*
1428 65 (1-4) (2012) 563–586.

- 1429 [99] D. Lee, J. Zhou, W. T. Lin, Autonomous battery swapping system for quad-
1430 copter, in: Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), 2015 International Conference
1431 on, IEEE, 118–124, 2015.
- 1432 [100] M. Simic, C. Bil, V. Vojisavljevic, Investigation in Wireless Power Transmis-
1433 sion for UAV Charging, in: 19th International Conference in Knowledge Based
1434 and Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems, KES 2015, Singapore, 7-9
1435 September 2015, 1846–1855, doi:10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.295, 2015.
- 1436 [101] C. Wang, Z. Ma, Design of wireless power transfer device for UAV, in: Mecha-
1437 tronics and Automation (ICMA), 2016 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE,
1438 2449–2454, 2016.
- 1439 [102] S. Hosseini, M. Mesbahi, Energy-aware aerial surveillance for a long-endurance
1440 solar-powered Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, *Journal of Guidance, Control, and*
1441 *Dynamics* (2016) 1980–1993.
- 1442 [103] J.-S. Lee, K.-H. Yu, Optimal path planning of solar-powered UAV using gravita-
1443 tional potential energy, *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*
1444 53 (3) (2017) 1442–1451.
- 1445 [104] R. D’Sa, D. Jenson, T. Henderson, J. Kilian, B. Schulz, M. Calvert, T. Heller,
1446 N. Papanikolopoulos, SUAV: Q-An improved design for a transformable solar-
1447 powered UAV, in: *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2016 IEEE/RSJ
1448 International Conference on, IEEE, 1609–1615, 2016.
- 1449 [105] D. McLaren, J. Agyeman, *Sharing Cities: A Case for Truly Smart and Sustain-*
1450 *able Cities*, MIT press, ISBN 9780262029728, 2015.
- 1451 [106] M. Peris-Ortiz, D. R. Bennett, D. Pérez-Bustamante Yábar, *Sustainable Smart*
1452 *Cities: Creating Spaces for Technological, Social and Business Development*,
1453 Springer, ISBN 9783319408958, 2016.
- 1454 [107] M. Farhan, A. Idries, M. Nader, J. Al-Jaroodi, I. Jawhar, UAVs for Smart Cities:
1455 Opportunities and Challenges, in: *International Conference on Unmanned Air-*
1456 *craft Systems (ICUAS)*, Orlando, FL, USA, 2014.
- 1457 [108] P. Chamoso, A. González-Briones, A. Rivas, F. Bueno De Mata, J. M. Corchado,
1458 *The Use of Drones in Spain: Towards a Platform for Controlling UAVs in Urban*
1459 *Environments*, *Sensors* 18 (5) (2018) 1416.
- 1460 [109] I. Union, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament,
1461 the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee
1462 of the Regions, Brussels, 2014.
- 1463 [110] R. P. Rajagopalan, R. Krishna, *Drones: Guidelines, regulations, and policy gaps*
1464 *in India*, Occasional Papers .
- 1465 [111] C. Torens, F.-M. Adolf, L. Goormann, Certification and Software Verification
1466 Considerations for Autonomous Unmanned Aircraft, *Journal of Aerospace Com-*
1467 *puting, Information and Communication* .

- 1468 [112] B. Mettler, Z. Kong, C. Goerzen, M. Whalley, Benchmarking of Obstacle Field
1469 Navigation Algorithms for Autonomous Helicopters, *Journal of Intelligent and*
1470 *Robotic Systems* 27 (1–4) (2010) 65–100.
- 1471 [113] M. Paulweber, K. Lebert, *Powertrain Instrumentation and Test Systems: Devel-*
1472 *opment - Hybridization - Electrification*, Springer, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-32135-
1473 6, 2016.
- 1474 [114] S. Hayat, E. Yanmaz, R. Muzaffar, Survey on Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Net-
1475 works for Civil Applications: A Communications Viewpoint, *IEEE Communi-*
1476 *cations Surveys and Tutorials* 18 (4) (2016) 2624–2661.
- 1477 [115] N. H. Motlagh, T. Taleb, O. Arouk, Low-altitude unmanned aerial vehicles-based
1478 internet of things services: Comprehensive survey and future perspectives, *IEEE*
1479 *Internet of Things Journal* 3 (6) (2016) 899–922.
- 1480 [116] A. Puri, A survey of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) for traffic surveillance,
1481 Department of computer science and engineering, University of South Florida
1482 (2005) 1–29.
- 1483 [117] B. Bayat, N. Crasta, A. Crespi, A. M. Pascoal, A. Ijspeert, Environmental mon-
1484 itoring using autonomous vehicles: a survey of recent searching techniques, *Cur-*
1485 *rent opinion in biotechnology* 45 (2017) 76–84.
- 1486 [118] Z. Zhao, T. Braun, Topology Control and Mobility Strategy for UAV Ad-hoc
1487 Networks: A Survey, in: *Joint ERCIM eMobility and MobiSense Workshop,*
1488 *Citeseer*, 27–32, 2012.
- 1489 [119] L. Gupta, R. Jain, G. Vaszkun, Survey of important issues in UAV commu-
1490 nication networks, *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 18 (2) (2016)
1491 1123–1152.
- 1492 [120] Y. Chen, H. Zhang, M. Xu, The coverage problem in UAV network: A survey,
1493 in: *Computing, Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT), 2014*
1494 *International Conference on*, IEEE, 1–5, 2014.
- 1495 [121] G. Chmaj, H. Selvaraj, Distributed processing applications for UAV/drones: a
1496 survey, in: *Progress in Systems Engineering*, Springer, 449–454, 2015.
- 1497 [122] H. Shakhathreh, A. Sawalmeh, A. Al-Fuqaha, Z. Dou, E. Almaita, I. Khalil,
1498 N. S. Othman, A. Khreishah, M. Guizani, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: A
1499 Survey on Civil Applications and Key Research Challenges, arXiv preprint
1500 arXiv:1805.00881 .
- 1501 [123] N. V. Hoffer, C. Coopmans, A. M. Jensen, Y. Chen, Small low-cost unmanned
1502 aerial vehicle system identification: a survey and categorization, in: *Unmanned*
1503 *Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), 2013 International Conference on*, IEEE, 897–904,
1504 2013.
- 1505 [124] A. Kolling, P. Walker, N. Chakraborty, K. Sycara, M. Lewis, Human interaction
1506 with robot swarms: A survey, *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*
1507 46 (1) (2016) 9–26.



1508

Yazan MUALLA is a Ph.D. candidate at the Belfort-Montbéliard University of Technology (ComUE Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté), France. His research interests include Multi-Agent Systems, Agent-Based Modeling & Simulation, Smart Environments and Intelligent Transport Systems. He obtained his MSc in Cyber-Physical Social Systems from Mines Saint Étienne, France. He obtained his BSc and MSc in Information Technology Engineering from Damascus University, Syria. From 2010 to 2014, he was a field engineer at Schlumberger international company in the Measurements & Logging while Drilling segment.

1509



1510

Dr. Amro NAJJAR is a post-doc at the Umea University, Sweden. His research interests include Multi-Agent Systems, Multi-agent Simulation, Explainable AI and Human-Computer Interaction. He received his Ph.D. in Computer Science from Mines Saint Étienne, France, with the title “Multi-Agent Negotiation for QoE-Aware Cloud Elasticity Management”.

1511



1512

Alaa DAOUD is a Ph.D. candidate at Mines Saint Étienne, France. His research interests are Multi-Agent Systems, Web of Things, Connected Objects, and Semantic Web. He obtained his MSc in Cyber-Physical Social Systems from the Université Jean Monnet of Saint Étienne, France, with the title “Semantic Web Environments for Multi-Agent Systems”. He obtained his BSc in Information Technology Engineering from Damascus University, Syria.

1513



1514

Prof. Dr. Stéphane GALLAND is a full professor at the Belfort-Montbéliard University of Technology (UTBM), France. His research interests include Agent-Oriented Software Engineering and Simulation, Smart Environments, and Intelligent Transport Systems. He received his Ph.D. in Computer Science from Mines Saint Étienne, France. He is the founder and deputy director of the Distributed Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Laboratory of Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, France. He is the head of the “smart environment” research group at UTBM. He has authored more than 80 research articles in international journals, conferences and workshops.

1515



1516

Prof. Dr. Christophe NICOLLE is a full professor at Université de Bourgogne (UB), France. His research interests include Knowledge Representation and Reasoning. He is founder and director of the Distributed Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Laboratory of Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, France. He is the founder and head of the “Checksem” business unit at UB. He has authored more than 120 research articles in international journals, conferences and workshops.


1517



1518

1519

Prof. Dr. Eng. Ansar-Ul-Haque YASAR is a professor at the Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Belgium. His broader research interests include Ubiquitous Computing, Intelligent Transport Systems and Mobility Management. He received his Ph.D. in Engineering from Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. He has authored more than 60 research articles in international journals, conferences and workshops.



1520

1521

Prof. Dr. Elhadi SHAKSHUKI is a professor in the Jodrey School of Computer Science at Acadia University, Canada. His research interests include Intelligent Agents, Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, Distributed Systems, and Wireless Sensor Networks. He received his Ph.D. in Engineering from University of Waterloo, Canada. He has authored more than 200 research articles in international journals, conferences and workshops.