Optimization of construction safety inspection path from the perspective of risk
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Abstract: Safety inspection work often determines the probability of accidents in construction, but also affects the production cost of work, to improve the quality and efficiency of construction safety inspection work, it is very important to propose a patrol inspection strategy. By comprehensively considering risk factors, a safety inspection path is formed. The objective function is constructed the RP-ACO (Risk Probability-ACO) algorithm is proposed, and based on the original ACO algorithm, the segmentation function is introduced to adjust the pheromone strength by changing the state transition rule. Simulation results show that when only the risk probability value is considered, the average objective function of the RP-ACO algorithm is 20.0573, and the average number of convergences is 110.6 times, which has great advantages over the 20.0639 and 232.2 In the oliver30 test case, the minimum value of the RP-ACO algorithm is 423.9117, and the average value is 425.8249, which has obvious advantages over the original ACO algorithm, which has obvious advantages over the original ACO of 425.8201 and 429.0233. It can be seen that with the increase of emission reduction measures and the increase of spacing, the superiority of the RP-ACO algorithm is more obvious. Taking the safety inspection work of a construction site as an example, the inspection workload and inspection time under different paths were analyzed, and the correctness and effectiveness of the proposed safety inspection algorithm were analyzed. The results show that the inspection path formulated according to the construction safety risk can effectively reduce the inspection workload. At the same time, the inspection path optimization algorithm designed by the RP-ACO algorithm is used to realize the optimization of inspection.
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1. Introduction

On construction sites, safety inspections are especially important as they are loaded with the safety of workers and production costs. In the previous inspection process, safety officers often decided the inspection order according to their preferences. Nowadays, with the development of intelligent construction sites, inspection efficiency will be improved by introducing intelligence into the preparation of inspection paths. The construction site in the regional conditions are different, and its risk probability value is also different if combined with the risk
probability value for inspection.

In the problem of path optimization, algorithms such as Guo\cite{1} 2021 adopted swarm, Bai\cite{7} 2021 adopted simulated annealing, Zhu\cite{16} 2020 adopted neural network, Wang\cite{13} 2020 adopted genetic and 2021 Chen\cite{2} adopted A* are widely used. However, these algorithms also have some drawbacks, such as poor robustness, local miniaturization, and insufficient adaptability. Colorni\cite{3} 1991, Dorigo\cite{4} Dorigo\cite{5} 2002, Khaled\cite{10} 2018, Ye\cite{16} 2020 put forward The robustness of the ant colony algorithm has some advantages over other algorithms, with the features of positive feedback, high robustness and parallelism, and strong intelligent search capability, so the ant colony algorithm is the preferred to solve the path optimization problem. However, the ant colony algorithm also has defects, and it is easy to fall into the dilemma of local optimum and slow convergence speed. In this paper, we make improvements to the traditional ant colony algorithm according to He\cite{8} 2021, Zhang\cite{17} 2017, Ma\cite{12} 2021, Liu\cite{11} 2004, which improves the convergence speed and the optimal searchability of the ant colony.

For the construction site safety inspection path optimization problem, firstly, the scoring method is used to construct a risk probability model for each area of construction, Secondly, the risk probability model is combined with the path shortest model, again the traditional ant colony algorithm is improved, and finally, 20 areas of a construction site are used as a model for simulation to confirm the feasibility of the study.

2. Problem description and model

The safety inspection problem is similar to the TSP problem, where the safety officer does not repeat the point inspection of the equipment during the inspection. Specific description: A safety officer, with a set of areas \( N \), starts from the first area and inspects the remaining areas of \( N-1 \) until the inspection is completed. Correspondingly and at the same time to meet the constraints: the safety officer can only be inspected within the scope of the site, that is, within the specified scope, and only once for each area.

The safety officer can check the area based on the path length and the magnitude of the risk probability value. The first two optimization objectives are to determine the path length optimization and the risk probability value.

\( \text{① Optimal path:} \)

\[
\min f_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} L_{i,j} 
\]

\( \text{② The probabilistic model of risk probability is specified as follows.} \)

\[
\min f_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} PR_{i,j} / PR_{i,j}
\]

In Eq. 2: \( i, j \) are regions.

(iii) The above two objectives are dimensionless by normalization, and the function \( F_{ij} \) is
formed by adding the weight coefficients \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \).

\[ F_{ij} = \omega_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} L_{i,j} + \omega_2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} PR_{i,j} / PR_{j} \]  

In equation (3): \( F_{ij} \) is the objective function; \( N \) is the number of inspection regions, \( L_{i,j} \) is the distance between 2 regions \( i,j \) in the inspection process, \( PR_i, PR_j \) refers to the risk probability value of region \( i \), region \( j \) respectively; \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) are the weighting coefficients, if the priority path is the shortest, then increase the value of \( \omega_1 \); if the priority risk probability value is large, then increase the value of \( \omega_2 \).

Constraints in the mathematical model.

1) \( X_{ij} \) is 1 means the inspector walks from area \( i \) to area \( j \), otherwise, it is 0.

2) Only one inspection per region.

\[ \sum_{j \in N \cup S \setminus i} \sum_{j \neq i} x_{ij} = 1, \quad i \in N \]  
\[ \sum_{i \in N \cup S \setminus j} \sum_{i \neq j} x_{ij} = 1, \quad j \in N \]  

3) The safety officer will look for the next area after completing the inspection of one area.

\[ \sum_{i \in N \setminus j} x_{ih} = \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} x_{bj}, \quad h \in N \]  

3. Site risk probability value model

3.1 Construction site safety risk classification.

1) Weather factor: The weather conditions on the day of inspection by the safety officer are different. 2) Equipment factor: The equipment used is different. 3) Personnel factor: The ability of construction personnel to pay attention to safety is different. 4) Environmental factor: The environment in which the construction is carried out is different. 5) Management factor: The system of the company regarding safety.


3.2 Site construction safety risk probability model

In classifying the site construction safety risks, the above influencing factors are represented by D1-D5. The values in the initial decision table are the scores (scores are integers of (0, 10]) scored by the project team according to the actual situation in each area.

For the weight assignment of D1-D5, industry experts discussed and finally determined the weights of D1-D5 as 10%, 20%, 30%, 30%, and 10%, respectively. The mathematical expression of the probability of construction safety risk is
\[ D = 0.1*D1 + 0.2*D2 + 0.3*D3 + 0.3*D4 + 0.1*D5 \]  
\[ P_f = D / 10 \]

In equation (8): \( D \) is the total score and \( P_f \) is the risk probability.

### Table 1: Initial Decision Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 1: D1 is the weather factor; D2 is the equipment factor; D3 is the personnel factor; D4 is the environmental factor; and D5 is the management factor.

## 4. RP-ACO Algorithm

For the inspection path optimization problem considering the probability value of security risk, the optimization method of the improved ant colony is selected. The improvement points are mainly divided into two aspects: one is to improve the state transfer rule to increase the randomness of the search path; the second is to introduce the segmentation function to adjust the pheromone intensity to achieve the optimization of the point inspection path.

### 4.1 Improvements to the transfer probability

The traditional transfer idea of ant the long algorithm is to first determine all feasible points in the next step and then select a point from the feasible points as the next path point by the roulette principle according to the calculated transfer probability Zhu\([9]\) 2021. The mathematical expression for the transfer probability of feasible points is

\[
P_{jk}^k = \left\{ \begin{array}{cl} \frac{\tau_{ij}^k(t)^\alpha \cdot \eta_{ij}^k(t)^\beta}{\sum_{i \in allow} \tau_{ij}(t)^\alpha \cdot \eta_{ij}(t)^\beta} & j \in allow \setminus i \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{array} \right. \]  

In equation (9): \( P_{jk}^k \) denotes the probability of ant \( k \) moving from \( I \) to \( j \); \( \tau_{ij}(t) \) denotes the pheromone concentration from \( I \) to \( j \); \( \eta_{ij}(t) \) denotes the inverse of the distance between two path points \( I,j \), also denotes the visibility of ants from \( I \) to \( j \); \( allow \) is the set of nodes that have not been visited yet, \( \alpha \) is the pheromone factor, which takes values usually between [1, 4]; \( \beta \) is the heuristic function factor, which takes values range is usually between [0, 5].

The roulette wheel path selection method has a small probability of selecting the optimal path when the weighted product of pheromones and heuristic information is not large. The pseudorandom distribution transfer rule makes the ant colony more inclined to choose the path with
more pheromones and thus the optimal path. The specific expressions are as follows.

\[
P_f = \begin{cases} 
\arg \max \{\tau_{ij}(t)^\alpha [\eta_{kl}(t)]^{\beta}\} & q < q_0 \\
p_f^0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(10)

In equation (10): \(q\) is a random number uniformly distributed in the interval \([0, 1]\), which is used to regulate the random search ability of the algorithm for new paths, such that \(q_0 = 0.1\).

When the point inspector selects the device, a random number \(q\) is first generated, and later the transfer method is determined by comparing the magnitude of \(q\) and \(q_0\).

4.2 Adjustment of pheromone intensity \(Q\)

Pheromones are divided into global updates and local updates.

① Pheromone global update expressions.

\[
\tau_{ij}(t+1) = \tau_{ij}(t) \times (1 - \rho) + \Delta \tau_{ij}, 0 < \rho < 1; \Delta \tau_{ij} = \sum_k \Delta \tau_{ij}^k
\]

(11)

\[
\Delta \tau_{ij}^k = \begin{cases} 
\frac{Q}{F_k}, & \text{If ant } K \text{ passes the pathpoint } i \text{ to } j \\
0, & \text{or}
\end{cases}
\]

(12)

② Pheromone local update expressions:

\[
\tau_{ij}(t+1) = \tau_{ij}(t) \times (1 - \rho)
\]

(13)

In Eqs. (11-13): \(\tau_{ij}(t+1)\) denotes the pheromone concentration on the device \(i\) to \(j\) at \(t+1\) cycles; \(\rho\) denotes the pheromone volatility factor; \(\Delta \tau_{ij}\) denotes the pheromone increment of ant \(k\) through device \(i\) to \(j\); \(Q\) is a constant; and \(F_k\) denotes the path of ant \(k\). The ability of the ant colony algorithm to search for paths can be changed by varying \(\Delta \tau_{ij}\) in the global update formula of pheromone.

To enable the ant colony to choose the optimal path effectively when the pheromone on the path changes, the pheromone constant \(Q\) is transformed into a segmentation function \(Q_t\), and different values are taken at different iterations. The pheromone can be set to a smaller value at the early stage of ant colony action, which is used to enhance the searchability of the algorithm; in the middle stage, it is necessary to speed up the search speed of the algorithm for new paths and avoid the pheromone being too small to fall into a chaotic state, so the \(Q\) value should be set larger in the middle stage. At the later stage, the optimal path has been found, so the \(Q\) value is set to the maximum, to converge to the optimal path quickly. The mathematical expression of the pheromone segmentation function is
4.3 Parameter setting

The setting of parameters affects the performance of the ant colony algorithm to some extent, so reasonable parameters need to be set. The values of two parameters are set as quantitative, and the test is performed by changing another variable. The initial default parameters were set as $\alpha=1$, $\beta=1$, $\rho=0.1$, $m=70$, the number of iterations was 200, and the determination was performed on the probability of risk value model ($\omega_1=0$, $\omega_2=1$) with ten determinations.

The values of $\rho$ are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of $\rho$</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From the data in Table 2, it can be seen that when $\rho = 0.7$, its three worthy data are better than other values.

② The values of the number of iterations ($\alpha=1$, $\beta=1$, $\rho=0.7$) are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of $t$</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20.1434</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>20.1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>20.1252</td>
<td>20.1078</td>
<td>20.1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>20.1009</td>
<td>20.0756</td>
<td>20.0758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 3, it can be seen that when the number of iterations is 300, its objective function value is at a clear advantage.

③ The values of $\alpha$ ($\beta=1$, $\rho=0.7$, $t=300$) were taken as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of $\alpha$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20.1266</td>
<td>20.2399</td>
<td>20.2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>20.1013</td>
<td>20.1821</td>
<td>20.2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>20.0758</td>
<td>20.1504</td>
<td>20.1751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 4, it is clear that when $\alpha = 1$, its objective function value is a clear advantage.

④ The values of $\beta$ ($\alpha=1$, $\rho=0.7$, $t=300$) are shown in Table 5.
From the data in Table 5, it is clear that when $\beta = 4$, its objective function value is a clear advantage.

In summary, the final parameters are set as $\alpha=1$, $\beta=4$, $\rho=0.7$, $m=70$, and the number of iterations is 300.

### 4.4 Improved algorithm flow

#### 4.5 Algorithm Time Complexity Analysis

Zhu\(^9\) 2021 Algorithm complexity analysis of RP-ACO: It is known that $N$ is the number of devices, $m$ is the number of ants, and $T$ is the number of iterations. In each iteration, the complex consists of the complexity of population initialization $O(m*N)$, the complexity of generating ant paths using transfer probability rules $O(m*N^2)$, the complexity of recording the optimal paths of m ant iterations $O(m*(N-1))$, and the complexity of updating the pheromone values $O(m*(N-1))$ as $O(m*N)^2$.

Thus the complexity of the RP-ACO algorithm is $\text{TRP-ACO} = O(T*(m*N^2))$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20.1266</td>
<td>20.0928</td>
<td>20.0852</td>
<td>20.0654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>20.1013</td>
<td>20.0845</td>
<td>20.0711</td>
<td>20.0589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>20.0758</td>
<td>20.0703</td>
<td>20.0564</td>
<td>20.0522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20.1266</td>
<td>20.0928</td>
<td>20.0852</td>
<td>20.0654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>20.1013</td>
<td>20.0845</td>
<td>20.0711</td>
<td>20.0589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>20.0758</td>
<td>20.0703</td>
<td>20.0564</td>
<td>20.0522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Experimental case study

5.1 Experimental cases

In this case, a construction site is selected as a sample for a safety inspection, and Figure 1 shows the manual inspection roadmap. Table 6 shows the coordinate values and risk probability values of the area facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Motor coordinate value and its risk probability value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3 3 3 3 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10 8 5 3 9 7 4 2 10 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk probability value</td>
<td>0.88 0.68 0.85 0.56 0.84 0.63 0.92 0.63 0.65 0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X       | 5 5 5 5 6 6 3 7 8 8                               |
| Y       | 8 5 4 3 7 6 6 7 6 7                               |
| Risk probability value | 0.89 0.68 0.76 0.96 0.76 0.94 0.82 0.85 0.71 0.66 |

5.2 Selection of weights

The respective optimal paths are selected for weights $\omega_1=1, \omega_2=0$; $\omega_1=0, \omega_2=1$.

① When $\omega_1=1, \omega_2=0$, i.e., when only the shortest path is considered.

The shortest distance of the route is 31.8372; the route through the line is $13 \rightarrow 14 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 15 \rightarrow 17 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 20 \rightarrow 18 \rightarrow 16 \rightarrow 12$.

② When $\omega_1=0, \omega_2=1$, i.e., when only the probability of risk value is considered.

The shortest distance of the path is 20.0463; the path line is $9 \rightarrow 19 \rightarrow 15 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 14 \rightarrow 16 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 18 \rightarrow 17 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 20 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 4$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Comparison of ACO and RP-ACO algorithms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weights Coefficient</td>
<td>ACO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_1$</td>
<td>$\omega_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>20.057 20.063 20.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>31.837 31.837 31.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data in Table 7, it can be concluded that by comparing the results of the two algorithms run ten times longitudinally and horizontally as well as analyzing them in many aspects, RP-ACO has better values and convergence speed than the traditional algorithm when only the risk probability value is considered; the optimal value of both algorithms is 31.8372 when only the distance is considered, due to the limitation of the process flow and production layout in practice, so the equipment between The distance is close and the number is limited, which leads to a small difference between the two algorithms in this respect.

To further verify the superiority of the RP-ACO algorithm, oliver30 was selected as a test case from TSPLIB and compared with PSO, GA, and ACO algorithms for 20 TSP problem experiments, and the results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Comparison table of each algorithm on the TSP problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Average value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>471.671</td>
<td>525.6646</td>
<td>569.6497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>424.9003</td>
<td>460.51573</td>
<td>541.1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO</td>
<td>425.8201</td>
<td>429.0233</td>
<td>432.9609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP-ACO</td>
<td>423.9117</td>
<td>425.8249</td>
<td>427.1752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the experimental results in Table 8, it is clear that the RP-ACO algorithm holds a clear advantage.

5.3 Setting of $\omega_1$, $\omega_2$ weighting coefficients

The problem to be solved is an inspection path optimization problem considering the risk probability value, so both weights must be considered. From the above two sets of data, it can be concluded that the optimization result obtained by considering only the distance is 1.59 times of the optimization result by considering only the risk probability value, which also means that the influence of the distance factor on the objective function is 1.59 times of the risk factor, so the weight $\omega_2$ is 1.59 times of the weight $\omega_1$, that is, $\omega_1=0.38, \omega_2=0.62$.

When $\omega_1=0.38, \omega_2=0.62$, the shortest route and shortest distance are shown in Figure 1:7→14→13→12→16→18→20→19→17→15→11→10→9→5→1→2→6→3→4→8
In the figure: the horizontal axis is the x-axis coordinate of the device, and the vertical axis is the y-axis coordinate of the device. From Figure 2, the shortest distance is 25.1927 (in hundred meters), the blue line is the walking path, and the red line is the connection line between the starting point and the endpoint.

However, it can be found from Figure 1 that it is a complete Hamiltonian circle diagram, and it is obvious that the consideration of the probability of risk values is not thorough enough, so the weight coefficients of both need to be adjusted.

5.4 Adjustment of $\omega_1, \omega_2$ weighting coefficients

It is clear from Figures 2 and 3 that when $\omega_1 = 0.06$, the path diagram is no longer a clear Hamiltonian circle diagram, but is influenced by the probability-at-risk value, resulting in a change in the path.

And when $\omega_1=0.07$, its path diagram begins to gradually approach the Hamiltonian circle, which can also be seen that its consideration of the weight of the path distance dominates the position. Therefore, with $\omega_1=0.06$ and $\omega_1=0$ as two bounds, the compromise position is taken. That is, the weighting coefficient $\omega_1$ is set to 0.03, and $\omega_2$ is set to 0.97. Its path diagram is shown in Figure 4. The specific path lines are: 12$\rightarrow$13$\rightarrow$14$\rightarrow$7$\rightarrow$3$\rightarrow$1$\rightarrow$5$\rightarrow$11$\rightarrow$16$\rightarrow$18$\rightarrow$17$\rightarrow$19$\rightarrow$20$\rightarrow$15$\rightarrow$10$\rightarrow$9$\rightarrow$6$\rightarrow$2$\rightarrow$4$\rightarrow$8. Compared to $\omega_1=1$, the path line changes considerably when $\omega_2=0$. This also indicates that the risk probability value of the equipment has been taken into account in the path planning of the inspection through this adjustment of the weighting factor.
Fig. 2 $\omega_1 = 0.07, \omega_2 = 0.93$

Fig. 3 $\omega_1 = 0.06, \omega_2 = 0.94$

Fig. 4 $\omega_1 = 0.03, \omega_2 = 0.97$
5.5 Inspection path optimization verification

The path diagram prepared using the algorithm is compared with a manual drawing to illustrate the feasibility of its optimization.

1) Manual experience to determine the inspection path

The inspection route previously used at the site was based on the habits of the safety officer, with a path of [1-2-3-4-5-6-7--20], a distance of 4550 m, and a time of about 2 h.

2) Inspection path with the shortest path as the goal

When only the shortest path is considered, the planned path is [13→14→8→7→4→3→6→2→1→5→9→10→11→15→17→9→20→18→16→12.], the distance is 3183 m, and the time taken is about 1.4 h.

3) Consider both path shortest and risk probability

After adjusting the weights for it, this shortest path is [12→13→14→7→3→1→5→11→16→18→17→19→20→15→10→9→6→2→4→8], a distance of 2084 m, and a time of about 1.1 h.

The comparison of different inspection paths is shown in Table 9, and the results show that the inspection efficiency is significantly improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Total inspection distance/m</th>
<th>Total time consumption/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4550</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

The improved ant colony algorithm RP-ACO is used to plan the inspection path based on the risk probability value, and the global search capability of the algorithm is enhanced by changing the state transfer rules and introducing segmentation functions to change the pheromone constants.

(1) The inspection path optimization algorithm generated by the RP-ACO algorithm was adopted to achieve the optimization of the inspection path by combining it with the risk probability.

(2) The safety inspection path optimization algorithm based on risk probability values can provide a useful reference for practical work.

(3) The optimization method proposed in this paper improves the efficiency of site safety inspection by human influence, uneven inspection quality, and low efficiency in site safety inspection, and provides a reference for site intelligence.
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