Abstract—This paper proposes a method for efficient training of the Q-function for continuous-state Markov Decision Processes (MDP), such that the traces of the resulting policies satisfy a Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) property. The logical property is converted into a limit deterministic Büchi automaton with which a product MDP is constructed. The control policy is then synthesized by a reinforcement learning algorithm assuming that no prior knowledge is available from the MDP. The proposed method is evaluated in a numerical study to test the quality of the generated control policy and is compared against conventional methods for policy synthesis such as MDP abstraction (Voronoi quantizer) and approximate dynamic programming (fitted value iteration).

I. INTRODUCTION

Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) are extensively used as a family of stochastic processes in automatic control, computer science, economics, etc. for modeling of sequential decision-making problems consisting of a set of states and a set of actions. By choosing relevant actions, a decision maker, which is often called “agent”, can move between the states [1] and receives a scalar reward. However, the outcomes of taking actions are probabilistic and not fully under the control of the agent [2]. An MDP is said to be solved when the agent is able to choose optimal actions at any given state so that the reward is maximized in the long run, i.e., to find an optimal action selection policy that returns the maximum expected reward [1].

When the state space and action space are finite, this stochastic behavior can be captured and stored in a matrix that is often called transition probability matrix. With transition probability matrix available, the most immediate method to solve a given MDP is to use Dynamic Programming (DP) that iteratively applies Bellman operation over the state space of the MDP [2]. In case when the state space or action space is not finite approximate DP is often employed. The approximation can be done over the state or action space, e.g. [3]–[6], or over the Bellman operation, e.g. [7]–[9].

Reinforcement Learning (RL), on the other hand, is a machine learning algorithm that is widely used to train an agent to interact with an MDP when the stochastic behavior of the MDP is initially unknown. RL is inherently different than DP in the sense that it does not need to have access to the whole state space but rather depends on a set of samples, either collected online or offline [10]. If these set of samples have sequentiality then they are called traces. Hence, RL sometimes is called trace-based approximate DP. Interestingly, RL is proved to converge to the same action selection policy as DP under certain assumptions [2].

However, conventional RL is mostly focused on problems in which MDP states and actions are finite. Nonetheless, many interesting real-world control tasks, require actions to be taken in response to high-dimensional or real-valued sensory inputs [11]. For example, consider the problem of drone control in which the drone state is represented as its Euclidean position $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

The simplest way to solve an infinite-state MDP with RL is to discretize the state space and then to use the conventional methods in RL to find the optimal policy [9]. Although this method can work well for many problems, the resulting discrete MDP is often inaccurate and may not capture the full dynamics of the original MDP. One might argue that by increasing the number of discrete states the latter problem can be resolved. However, the more states we have the more expensive and time-consuming our computations will be. Thus, MDP discretization has to always deal with the trade off between accuracy and the curse of dimensionality.

An alternative solution is to use an approximation function which is achieved via regression over the set of samples. At a given state, this function is able to estimate the value of the expected reward. Therefore, in continuous-state RL, this approximation replaces conventional RL state-action-reward look-up table which is used in finite-state MDPs. A number of methods are available to approximate the expected reward, e.g. CMACs [12], kernel-based modelling [13], tree-based regression [14], basis functions [15], etc.

Among these methods, neural networks offer great promise in reward modelling due to their ability to approximate any non-linear function [16]. There exist numerous successful applications of neural networks in RL for infinite or large-state space MDPs, e.g. Deep Q-networks [17], TD-Gammon [18], Asynchronous Deep RL [19], Neural Fitted Q-iteration [20], CACLA [21], etc.

In this paper, we propose to employ neural networks to synthesize a control policy for infinite-state MDPs such that the generated traces satisfy a Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) property with a positive probability. LTL allows us to specify complex mission tasks in a rich time-dependent formal language. By employing LTL we are able to express complex high-level control objectives that are hard to express and achieve for other methods from vanilla RL [10], [22] to more recent developments such as Policy Sketching [23]. Examples include liveness and cyclic properties, where the agent is required to make progress while concurrently executing components, to take turns in critical sections or to execute a
sequence of tasks periodically.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section II reviews basic concepts and necessary definitions. In Section III we discuss the LTL logic and a method to express it as an automaton. In Section IV we propose our neural-fitted-based algorithm which is able to exploit the expressiveness of temporal logic. Sections V and VI present modified versions of Voronoi quantizer and fitted value iteration to enable us to compare them with our algorithm: case studies are provided in Section VII to quantify the performance of the proposed algorithms.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Problem Framework

We adopt standard MDP with continuous-state space as the model for agent-environment interaction [24]:

**Definition 2.1 (continuous-state space MDP):** The tuple $\mathbf{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, s_0, P, \mathcal{A}_P, L)$ is an MDP over a set of states $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite set of actions, $s_0$ is the initial state and $P : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, 1]$ is a Borel-measurable transition kernel which assigns to any state and any action a probability measure on the Borel space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ [24]. $\mathcal{A}_P$ is a finite set of atomic propositions and a labeling function $L : \mathcal{S} \to 2^{\mathcal{A}_P}$ assigns to each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ a set of atomic propositions $L(s) \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{A}_P}$.

Note that in general, an MDP $\mathbf{M}$ in Definition 2.1 can have a set of initial states $\mathcal{S}_0$ instead of a single state $s_0$. Also, a finite-state MDP is a special case of continuous-state space MDP in which $|\mathcal{S}| < \infty$ and $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \to [0, 1]$ is the transition probability function. The transition function $P$ induces a matrix which is usually known as transition probability matrix in the literature.

**Definition 2.2 (Path):** In a continuous-state MDP $\mathbf{M}$, an infinite path $\rho$ starting at $s_0$ is a sequence of states $\rho = s_0 \xrightarrow{a_0} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} ...$ such that every transition $s_i \xrightarrow{a_i} s_{i+1}$ is possible in $\mathbf{M}$, i.e. $s_{i+1}$ belongs to the smallest Borel set $B$ such that $P(B|s_i, a_i) = 1$ (or in a discrete MDP, $P(s_{i+1}|s_i, a_i) > 0$). We might also denote $\rho$ as $s_0$, to emphasize that $\rho$ starts from $s_0$.

**Definition 2.3 (Stationary Policy):** A stationary (randomized) policy $\text{Pol} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, 1]$ is a mapping from each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to the probability of taking action $a$ in state $s$. A deterministic policy is a degenerate case of a randomized policy which outputs a single action at a given state, that is $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \exists a \in \mathcal{A}, \text{Pol}(s, a) = 1$.

In an MDP $\mathbf{M}$, we define a function $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ that denotes the immediate scalar bounded reward received by the agent from the environment after performing action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in state $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

**Definition 2.4: (Expected (Infinite-Horizon) Discounted Reward):** For a policy $\text{Pol}$ on an MDP $\mathbf{M}$, the expected discounted reward is defined as [10]:

$$U_{\text{Pol}}(s) = \mathbb{E}^{\text{Pol}}[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n R(s_n, \text{Pol}(s_n))|s_0 = s],$$  

(1)

where $\mathbb{E}^{\text{Pol}[\cdot]}$ denotes the expected value given that the agent follows policy $\text{Pol}$, $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is a discount factor and $s_0, ..., s_n$ is the sequence of states generated by policy $\text{Pol}$ up to time step $n$.

**Definition 2.5 (Optimal Policy):** Optimal policy $\text{Pol}^*$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{Pol}^*(s) = \arg \sup_{\text{Pol} \in \mathcal{D}} U_{\text{Pol}}(s),$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is the set of all stationary deterministic policies over the state space $\mathcal{S}$.

**Theorem 2.1:** In any MDP $\mathbf{M}$ with bounded reward function and finite action space, if there exists an optimal policy, then that policy is stationary and deterministic. [25] [26].

An MDP $\mathbf{M}$ is said to be solved if the agent discovers an optimal policy $\text{Pol}^* : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}$ to maximize the expected reward. From Definitions 2.3 and 2.5 it means that the agent has to take actions that return the highest expected reward. Note that the reward function for us as the designer is known in the sense that we know over which state (or under what circumstances) the agent will receive a given reward. The reward function specifies what the agent needs to achieve but not how to achieve it. Thus, the objective is that the agent itself comes up with an optimal policy. In the following, we give background on Q-learning [27], which is widely used to solve finite-state MDPs. Later we present fundamentals of other approaches for solving infinite-state MDPs.

B. Classical Q-learning

Let the MDP $\mathbf{M}$ be a finite-state MDP. Q-learning (QL), a sub-class of RL algorithms, is extensively used to find the optimal policy for a given finite-state MDP [10]. For each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and for any available action $a \in \mathcal{A}$, QL assigns a quantitative value $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is initialized with an arbitrary and finite value for all state-action pairs. As the agent starts learning and receiving rewards, the Q-function is updated by the following rule when the agent takes action $a$ at state $s$:

$$Q(s, a) \leftarrow Q(s, a) + \mu[R(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s', a') - Q(s, a)],$$  

(2)

where $Q(s, a)$ is the Q-value corresponding to state-action $(s, a)$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$ is called learning rate or step size, $R(s, a)$ is the reward obtained for performing action $a$ in state $s$, $\gamma$ is the discount factor, and $s'$ is the state obtained after performing action $a$. Q-function for the rest of the state-action pairs remains unchanged.

Under mild assumptions, for finite-state and finite-action spaces QL converges to a unique limit, as long as every state action pair is visited infinitely often [27]. Once QL converges, the optimal policy $\text{Pol}^* : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}$ can be generated by selecting the action that yields the highest $Q$, i.e.,

$$\text{Pol}^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s, a),$$

where $\text{Pol}^*$ is the same optimal policy that can be generated via DP with Bellman operation. This means that when QL converges, we have

$$Q(s, a) = R(s, a) + \mathbb{E}^{\text{Pol}^*}[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma^n R(s_n, \text{Pol}^*(s_n))|s_1 = s'],$$

(3)
where \( s' \in B \) is the agent new state after choosing action \( a \) at \( s \) such that \( P(B|s, a) = 1 \).

C. Neural Fitted Q-iteration

Recall the QL update rule (4), in which the agent stores the Q-values for all possible state-action pairs. In the case when the MDP has a continuous state space it is not possible to directly use standard QL since it is practically infeasible to store \( Q(s, a) \) for every \( s \in S \) and \( a \in A \). Thus, we have to turn to function approximators in order to approximate the Q-values of different state-action pairs of the Q-function. Neural Fitted Q-iteration (NFQ) [20] is an algorithm that employs neural networks [28] to approximate the Q-function, due to the ability of neural networks to generalize and exploit the set of samples. NFQ, is the core behind Google famous algorithm Deep Reinforcement Learning [17].

The update rule in (2) can be directly implemented in NFQ. In order to do so, a loss function has to be introduced that measures the error between the current Q-value and the new value that has to be assigned to the current Q-value, namely

\[
L = (Q(s, a) - (R(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a')))^2. \tag{4}
\]

Over this error, common gradient descent techniques can be applied to adjust the weights of the neural network, so that the error is minimized.

In classical QL, the Q-function is updated whenever a state-action pair is visited. In the continuous state-space case, we may update the approximation in the same way, i.e., update the neural net weights once a new state-action pair is visited. However, in practice, a large number of trainings might need to be carried out until an optimal or near optimal policy is found. This is due to the uncontrollable changes occurring in the Q-function approximation caused by unpredictable changes in the network weights when the weights are adjusted for one certain state-action pair [29]. More specifically, if at each iteration we only introduce a single sample point the training algorithm tries to adjust the weights of the neural network such that the loss function becomes minimum for that specific sample point. This might result in some changes in the network weights such that the error between the network output and the previous output of sample points becomes large and failure to approximate the Q-function correctly. Therefore, we have to make sure that when we update the weights of the neural network, we explicitly introduce previous samples as well: this technique is called “experience replay” [30] and detailed later.

The core idea underlying NFQ is to store all previous experiences and then reuse this data every time the neural Q-function is updated. NFQ can be seen as a batch learning method in which there exists a training set that is repeatedly used to train the agent. In this sense NFQ is an offline algorithm as experience gathering and learning happens separately.

D. Voronoi Quantizer

As stated earlies, many existing RL algorithms, e.g. QL, assume a finite state space, which means that they are not directly applicable to continuous state-space MDPs. Therefore, if classical RL is employed to solve an infinite-state MDP, the state space has to be discretized first and then the new discrete version of the problem has to be tackled. The discretization can be done manually over the state space. However, one of the most appealing features of RL is its autonomy. In other words, RL is able to achieve its goal, defined by the reward function, with minimum supervision from a human. Therefore, the state space discretization should be performed as part of the learning task, instead of being fixed at the start of the learning process.

Nearest neighbor vector quantization is a method for discretizing the state space into a set of disjoint regions [31]. The Voronoi Quantizer (VQ) [32], a nearest neighbor quantizer, maps the state space \( S \) onto a finite set of disjoint regions called Voronoi cells. The set of centroids of these cells is denoted by \( \mathcal{C} = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^{m} \), \( c_i \in S \), where \( m \) is the number of the cells. Therefore, designing a nearest neighbor vector quantizer boils down to coming up with the set \( \mathcal{C} \). With \( \mathcal{C} \), we are able to use QL and find an approximation of the optimal policy for a continuous-state space MDP. The details of how the set of centroids \( \mathcal{C} \) is generated as part of the learning task in discussed later.

E. Fitted Value Iteration

Finally, this section introduces Fitted Value Iteration (FVI) for continuous-state numerical dynamic programming using a function approximator [33]. In standard value iteration the goal is to find a mapping (called value function) from the state space to \( \mathbb{R} \) such that it can lead the agent to find the optimal policy. The value function in our setup is \( \mathbb{R} \) when \( \text{Pol} \) is the optimal policy, i.e. \( U^{\text{Pol}} \). In continuous state spaces, no analytical representation of the value function is in general available. Thus, an approximation can be obtained numerically through approximate value iteration, which involves approximately iterating the Bellman operator \( T \) on some initial value function [9]. FVI is explored more later in the paper.

III. LINEAR TEMPORAL LOGIC PROPERTIES

In order to specify a set of desirable constraints (i.e. properties) over the agent we employ Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) [34]. An LTL formula can express a wide range of properties, such as safety and persistence. LTL formulas over a given set of atomic propositions \( AP \) are syntactically defined as

\[
\varphi ::= \text{true} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{AP} \mid \varphi \land \varphi \mid \neg \varphi \mid \bigcirc \varphi \mid \varphi \lor \varphi. \tag{5}
\]

We define the semantics of LTL formula next, as interpreted over MDPs. Given a path \( \rho \), the \( i \)-th state of \( \rho \) is denoted by \( \rho[i] = s_i \). Furthermore, the \( i \)-th suffix of \( \rho \) is \( \rho[i..] \) where \( \rho[i..] = s_i \xrightarrow{a_1} s_{i+1} \xrightarrow{a_{i+1}} s_{i+2} \xrightarrow{a_{i+2}} s_{i+3} \xrightarrow{a_{i+3}} \cdots \).

Definition 3.1 (LTL Semantics): For an LTL formula \( \varphi \)
and for a path \( \rho \), the satisfaction relation \( \rho \models \varphi \) is defined as
\[
\begin{align*}
\rho \models \alpha & \iff \alpha \in L(\rho(0)) \\
\rho \models \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2 & \iff \rho \models \varphi_1 \land \rho \models \varphi_2 \\
\rho \models \neg \varphi & \iff \rho \not\models \varphi \\
\rho \models \Diamond \varphi & \iff \rho[1..] \models \varphi \\
\rho \models \varphi_1 \lor \varphi_2 & \iff \exists j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ s.t. } \rho[j..] \models \varphi_2 \quad \text{and} \\
\forall i, 0 \leq i < j, \rho[i..] \models \varphi_1
\end{align*}
\]

Using the until operator we are able to define two temporal
modalities: (1) eventually, \( \Diamond \varphi = \text{true} \lor \varphi \); and (2) always, \( \Box \varphi = \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi \). However, the operator always \( \Box \) can be dropped from an LTL formula for the sake of simplicity:

An LTL formula \( \varphi \) over \( A^P \) specifies the following set of words:
\[
\text{Words}(\varphi) = \{ \sigma \in (2^{A^P})^\omega \text{ s.t. } \sigma \models \varphi \}.
\]

**Definition 3.2 (Policy Satisfaction):** We say that a stationary deterministic policy \( Pol \) satisfies an LTL formula \( \varphi \) if:
\[
P^F[L(s_0)L(s_1)L(s_2)\ldots] \in \text{Words}(\varphi) > 0,
\]
where every transition \( s_i \to s_{i+1}, i = 0, 1, \ldots \) is constructed by taking action \( Pol(s_i) \) at state \( s_i \).

For an LTL formula \( \varphi \), an alternative method to express the set of associated words, i.e., \( \text{Words}(\varphi) \), is to employ an automaton. Limit Deterministic Büchi Automata (LDBA) [35] are one of the most succinct and simplest automata for that purpose [36]. We need to first define a Generalized Büchi Automaton (GBA) and then formally introduce an LDBA.

**Definition 3.3 (Generalized Büchi Automaton):** A GBA \( N = (Q, q_0, \Sigma, F, \Delta) \) is a structure where \( Q \) is a finite set of states, \( q_0 \subseteq Q \) is the set of initial states, \( \Sigma = 2^{A^P} \) is a finite alphabet, \( F = \{ F_1, \ldots, F_J \} \) is the set of accepting conditions where \( F_j \subseteq Q, 1 \leq j \leq f \), and \( \Delta : Q \times X \to 2^Q \) is a transition relation.

Let \( \Sigma^\omega \) be the set of all infinite words over \( \Sigma \). An infinite word \( w \in \Sigma^\omega \) is accepted by a GBA \( N \) if there exists an infinite run \( \theta \in \Sigma^\omega \) starting from \( q_0 \) where \( \theta[i+1] \in \Delta(\theta[i], \omega[i]) \), \( i \geq 0 \) and for each \( F_j \in F \)
\[
\inf(\theta) \cap F_j \neq \emptyset,
\]
where \( \inf(\theta) \) is the set of states that are visited infinitely often in the sequence \( \theta \). The accepted language of the GBA \( N \) is the set of all infinite words accepted by the GBA \( N \) and it is denoted by \( L_N(N) \).

**Definition 3.4 (LDBA):** A GBA \( N = (Q, q_0, \Sigma, F, \Delta) \) is limit deterministic if \( Q \) can be partitioned into two disjoint sets \( Q = Q_N \cup Q_D \), such that [35]:

- \( \Delta(q, a) \subseteq Q_N \) and \( |\Delta(q, a)| = 1 \) for every state \( q \in Q_D \) and for every corresponding \( a \in \Sigma \),
- for every \( F_j \in F, F_j \subseteq Q_D \).

Intuitively, an LDBA is a GBA that has two partitions: initial \( (Q_N) \) and accepting \( (Q_D) \). The accepting part includes all the accepting states and has deterministic transitions.

**Remark 3.1:** The LTL-to-LDBA algorithm proposed in [35] results in an automaton with both the initial and the accepting parts having deterministic transitions and there are non-deterministic \( \varepsilon \)-transitions between the initial part and the accepting part. An \( \varepsilon \)-transition allows an automaton to change its state spontaneously and without reading an input symbol. Although according to Definition 3.4, this structure is still a limit-deterministic automaton, the determinism in the initial part is stronger than that required in Definition 3.4.

**IV. Logically-Constrained NFQ**

In this section, we propose an NFQ-based algorithm that is able to synthesize a policy that satisfies a temporal logic property. We call this algorithm Logically-Constrained NFQ (LCNFQ). Next, we relate the notion of MDP and automaton by synchronizing them to create a new structure that is first of all compatible with RL and second that embraces the logical property.

**Definition 4.1 (Product MDP):** Given an MDP \( M(S, A, s_0, P, A^P, L) \) and an LDBA \( N(Q, q_0, \Sigma, F, \Delta) \) (or a DFA \( D = (Q, q_0, \Sigma, \Delta) \)) with \( \Sigma = 2^{A^P} \), the product MDP is defined as \( (M \otimes N) = M_N(S, A, s_0, P, A^P, L, F, \Delta) \), where \( S = S \times Q, s_0 = (s_0, q_0), A^P \otimes N = \{ s \in S, s_0 \subseteq S^\omega \} \) is the set of accepting states such that for each \( s_\omega = (s, q) \in F, q \in F \). The intuition behind the transition kernel \( P^F \) is that given the current state \( (s_i, q_i) \) and action \( a \) the new state is \( (s_j, q_j) \) where \( s_j \sim P^F(s_i, a) \) and \( q_j \in \Delta(q_i, L(s_j)) \).

**Definition 4.2 (Absorbing Set):** We define the set \( A = B(S^\omega) \) to be an absorbing set if \( P^F(A) = 1 \) for all \( s^\omega \in A \) and for all \( a \in A \). An absorbing set is called accepting if it includes \( F \). We denote the set of all accepting absorbing sets by \( \mathcal{A} \).

**Remark 4.1:** The defined notion of absorbing set in continuous-state MDPs is equivalent to the notion of maximum end components in finite-state MDPs. Intuitively, once a trace ends up in an absorbing set (or a maximum end component) it can never escape from it [37].

The product MDP encompasses transition relations of the original MDP and the structure of the Büchi automaton, thus it inherits characteristics of both. Therefore, a proper reward function can lead the RL agent to find a policy that is optimal and that respects both the original MDP and the LTL property \( \varphi \). In this paper, we propose an on-the-fly reward function that observes the current state \( s^\omega \), the action \( a \) and observes the subsequent state \( s^{'\omega} \) and gives the agent a scalar value according to the following rule:
\[
R(s^\omega, a) = \begin{cases} 
    r_p & \text{if } s^\omega \notin \mathcal{A}, s^{'\omega} \in \mathcal{A}, \\
    r_n & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( r_p = M + y \times m \times \text{rand}(s^\omega) \) is a positive reward and \( r_n = y \times m \times \text{rand}(s^\omega) \) is a neutral reward where \( y \in [0, 1] \) is a constant, \( 0 < m < M, \) and \( \text{rand} : S^\omega \to (0, 1) \) is a function that generates a random number in \( (0, 1) \) for each state \( s^\omega \).

The role of the function \( \text{rand} \) is to break the symmetry in LCNFQ, i.e., if all weights in a feedforward net [16] start
with equal values and if the solution requires that unequal weights be developed, the network can never learn. The reason is that the correlations between the weights within the same hidden layer can be described by symmetries in that layer, i.e. identical weights. Therefore, the neural net can generalize if such symmetries are broken and the redundancies of the weights are reduced. Starting with a completely identical weights prevents the neural net to minimize these redundancies and optimize the loss function.

In LCNFQ, the temporal logic property is initially specified as a high-level LTL formula $\varphi$. The LTL formula is then converted to an LDBA $N$ to form a product MDP $M_N$ (see Definition 4.1). In order to use the experience replay technique we let the agent run in the MDP and we store all episode traces, i.e. experiences, in the form of $(s^\circ, a, s^{\circ\prime}, R(s^\circ, a), q)$. Here $s^\circ = (s, q)$ is the current state in the product MDP, $a$ is the chosen action, $s^{\circ\prime} = (s', q')$ is the resulting state, and $R(s^\circ, a)$ is the reward. The set of past experiences is called the sample set $E$.

We employ $n$ separate feedforward neural nets where $n = |\mathcal{Q}|$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is the finite cardinality of the automaton $N$. Each neural net is associated with a state in the LDBA and together the neural nets approximate the Q-function in the product MDP. For each automaton state $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ the associated neural net is called $B_{q_i} : S^\circ \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Once the agent is at state $s^\circ = (s, q_i)$ the neural net $B_{q_i}$ is used for the local Q-function approximation. The set of neural nets acts as a global hybrid Q-function approximator $Q : S^\circ \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note that the neural nets are not fully decoupled. For example, assume that by taking action $a$ in state $s^\circ = (s, q_i)$ the agent is moved to state $s^{\circ\prime} = (s', q_j)$ where $q_i \neq q_j$. According to (4) the weights of $B_{q_i}$ are updated such that $B_{q_i}(s^\circ, a)$ has minimum possible error to $B_{q_j}(s^{\circ\prime}, a')$. Therefore, the value of $B_{q_j}(s^{\circ\prime}, a')$ affects $B_{q_i}(s^\circ, a)$.

Let $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ be a state in the LDBA. Then define $E_{q_i} := \{(x_1, \cdots, x_k) \in \mathcal{E} | x = q_i\}$ as the set of experiences within $\mathcal{E}$ that is associated with state $q_i$, i.e., $E_{q_i}$ is the projection of $\mathcal{E}$ onto $q_i$. Once the experience set $E_{q_i}$ is gathered, each neural net $B_{q_i}$ is trained by its associated experience set $E_{q_i}$. At each iteration a pattern set $P_{q_i}$ is generated based on $E_{q_i}$:

$$P_{q_i} = \{(input_i, target_i), l = 1, ..., |E_{q_i}|\}$$

where $input_i = (s_i^\circ, a_i)$ and $target_i = R(s_i^\circ, a_i) + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s_i^{\circ\prime}, a')$ such that $(s_i^\circ, a_i, s_i^{\circ\prime}, R(s_i^\circ, a_i), q_i) \in E_{q_i}$. The pattern set is used to train the neural net $B_{q_i}$. We use $\text{Rprop}$ [38] to update the weights in each neural net, as it is known to be a fast and efficient method for batch learning [20]. In each cycle of LCNFQ (Algorithm 1), the training schedule starts from networks that are associated with accepting states of the automaton and goes backward until it reaches the networks that are associated to the initial states. In this way we allow the Q-value to back-propagate through the networks. LCNFQ stops when a satisfying policy is generated.

**Remark 4.2:** One might argue that a single neural net can be used to approximate the global Q-function. In order to do so we first applied integer encoding to inputs in which an integer number is assigned to each automaton state in the input $s_i^\circ = (s_i, q_i)$. As it was expected, with this encoding we observed poor performance since this encoding allows the network to assume an ordinal relationship between automaton states. We then used one hot encoding [39] in which each automaton state $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ is replaced by a binary number of length $|\mathcal{Q}|$ with all bits zero except the $i$th bit which is one. However, the performance of the trained network was poor and therefore, we turned to the final solution of employing $n$ separate neural nets that work together in a hybrid manner to approximate the global Q-function.

Recall that the reward function (7) only returns a positive value when the agent has a transition to an accepting state in the product MDP. Therefore, if accepting states are reachable, by following this reward function the agent is able to come up with a policy $Pol^{\circ\prime}$ that leads to the accepting states. This means that the trace of read labels over $S$ (see Definition 4.1) results in an automaton state to be accepting. Therefore, the trace over the original MDP is a trace that satisfies the given logical property. Recall that the optimal policy has the highest expected reward comparing to other policies. Consequently, the optimal policy has the highest expected probability of reaching to the accepting set, i.e. satisfying the LTL property.

The next section studies state space discretization as the most popular alternative approach to solving infinite-state MDPs.

### V. Voronoi Quantizer

Inspired by [32], we propose a version of Voronoi quantizer that is able to discretize the state space of the product MDP $S^\circ$. In the beginning, $\mathcal{C}$ is initialized to consist of just one $c_1$, which corresponds to the initial state. This means that the agent views the entire state space as a homogeneous region when no apriori knowledge is available. Subsequently, when the agent explores, the Euclidean distance between each newly visited state and its nearest neighbor is calculated. If this distance is greater than a threshold value $\Delta$ called “minimum resolution”, or if the new state $s^\circ$ has a never-visited automaton state then the newly visited state is appended to $\mathcal{C}$. Therefore, as the agent continues to explore, the size of $\mathcal{C}$ would increase until the relevant parts of the
state space are partitioned. In our algorithm, the set $\mathcal{C}$ has $n$ disjoint subsets where $n = |Q|$ and $\Omega$ is the finite set of states of the automaton. Each subset $\mathcal{C}^q_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ contains the centroids of those Voronoi cells that have the form of $c^q_j = (., q_j)$, i.e. $\bigcup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{C}^q_j = \mathcal{C}^q$ and $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{C}^q_j$. Therefore, a Voronoi cell
\[
\{ (s, q_j) \in S^\otimes \mid \| (s, q_j) - c^q_i \|_2 \leq \| (s, q_j) - c^q_j \|_2 \}
\]
is defined by the nearest neighbor rule for any $i' \neq i$. The VQ algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2. The proposed algorithm consists of several resets at which the agent is forced to re-localize to its initial state $s_0$. Each reset is usually called an episode, as such in the rest of the paper we call this algorithm episodic VQ.

VI. FITTED VALUE ITERATION

In this section we propose a modified version of FVI that can handle the product MDP. The global value function $v : S^\otimes \to \mathbb{R}$, or more specifically $v : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$, consists of $n$ number of sub-value functions where $n = |Q|$. For each $q_j \in \Omega$, the sub-value function $v^q_j : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ returns the value of the states of the form $(s, q_j)$. As we will see shortly, in a same manner as LCNFQ, the sub-value functions are not decoupled.

Let $P^q_{\mathcal{S}}(dy|s^\otimes, a)$ be the distribution over $S^\otimes$ for the successive state given that the current state is $s^\otimes$ and the current action is $a$. For each state $(s, q_j)$, the Bellman update over each sub-value function $v^q_j$ is defined as:
\[
Tv^q_j(s) = \sup_{a \in A} \int v(y)P^q_{\mathcal{S}}(dy|(s, q_j), a), \quad (8)
\]
where $T$ is the Bellman operator [40]. The update in (8) is a special case of general Bellman update as it does not have a running reward and the (terminal) reward is embedded via value function initialization. The value function is initialized according to the following rule:
\[
v(s^\otimes) = \begin{cases} 
 r_p & \text{if } s^\otimes \in A_t \\
 r_n & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \quad (9)
\]

Remark 6.1: The key difference between DP and RL is that the first introduce the model is known which means knowing the transition kernel (or probabilities). On the contrary, (2) only requires to have access to a set of samples. Further, (8) tries to find the optimal value function while (2) is learning a mapping from state-action pairs to $\mathbb{R}$.

The main hurdle in executing the Bellman operator in continuous state MDPs, as in (8), is that no analytical representation of the value function $v$ and also sub-value functions $v^q_j$, $q_j \in \Omega$ is available. Therefore, we employ an approximation method by introducing the operator $L$. The operator $L$ constructs an approximation of the value function denoted by $Lv$ and of each sub-value function $v^q_j$ which we denote by $Lv^q_j$. For each $q_j \in \Omega$ the approximation is based on a set of points $\{(s_i, q_j)\}_{i=1}^k \subset S^\otimes$ which are called centers. For each $q_j$, the centers $i = 1, \ldots, k$ are distributed uniformly over $\mathcal{S}$ such that they uniformly cover $\mathcal{S}$.

We employ a kernel-based approximator for our FVI algorithm. Kernel-based approximators have attracted a lot of attention mostly because they perform very well in high-dimensional state spaces [9]. One of these methods is the kernel averager, which can be represented by the following expression for each state $(s, q_j)$:
\[
Lv^q_j(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} K(s_i - s)\frac{v^q_i(s_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} K(s_i - s)}, \quad (10)
\]
where the kernel $K : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a radial basis function, such as $e^{-|s-s_i|/h}$, and $h$ is smoothing parameter. Each kernel has a center $s_i$ and the value of it decays to zero as $s$ diverges from $s_i$. This means that for each $q_j \in \Omega$ the approximation operator $L$ in (10) is a convex combination of the values of the centers $\{(s_i, q_j)\}_{i=1}^k$ having larger weight given to those values $v^q_i(s_i)$ for which $s_i$ is close to $s$. Note that the smoothing parameter $h$ controls the weight assigned to more distant values.

Remark 6.2: It has been proven that FVI is stable and converging when the approximation operator is non-expansive [33]. The operator $L$ is said to be non-expansive if:
\[
\sup_{s \in S} \left| Lv^q_j(s) - Lv^q_j(s) \right| \leq \sup_{s \in S} \left| v^q_j(s) - v^q_j(s) \right|,
\]
where $Lv^q_j(s)$ is the approximated value function at $(s, q_j)$ at iteration $t$ of the algorithm. The kernel averager in (10) is a non-expansive approximator [9].

In order to approximate the integral in Bellman update (8) we use a Monte Carlo approximation [41]. For each center $(s_i, q_j)$ and for each action $a$, we sample the next state $y_{S}^q(s_i, q_j)$ for $z = 1, \ldots, Z$ times and append it to set of

Algorithm 2: Episodic VQ

```
input : MDP M, minimum resolution $\Delta$
output : Approximated Q-function $Q$
repeat
  initialize $Q(c_1, a) = 0, \forall a \in A$
  repeat
    initialize $c_1 = \text{initial state}$
    set $c = c_1$
    $\alpha = \arg \max_{a \in A} Q(c, a)$
    repeat
      execute action $\alpha$ and observe the next state $(s', q)$
      if $c_{\text{new}}$ is empty then
        append $c_{\text{new}} = (s', q)$ to $c_q$
        initialize $Q(c_{\text{new}}, a) = 0, \forall a \in A$
      else
        determine the nearest neighbor $c_{\text{new}}$ within $c_q$
        if $c_{\text{new}} = c$ then
          if $\|c - (s', q)\|_2 > \Delta$ then
            append $c_{\text{new}} = (s', q)$ to $c_q$
            initialize $Q(c_{\text{new}}, a) = 0, \forall a \in A$
          else
            $Q(c, a) = (1 - \mu)Q(c, a) + \mu[R(c, a) + \gamma \max_{a'}(Q(c_{\text{new}}, a'))]$
          end
        end
        $c = c_{\text{new}}$
      end
    end
  until end of trial
until end of trial
```
We then replace the integral with
\[ I_a(s_i, q_j) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{z=1}^{Z} L_v(y^z_a(s_i, q_j)). \] (11)

The approximate value function \( L_v \) is initialized according to (9). In each cycle of FVI, the approximate Bellman update is first performed over the sub-value functions that are associated with accepting states of the automaton, i.e. those that have initial value of \( r_p \), and then goes backward until it reaches the sub-value functions that are associated to the initial states. In this manner, we allow the state values to back-propagate through the transitions that connects the sub-value function via (11). Once we have the approximated value function, we can generate the optimal policy by following the maximum value (Algorithm 3).

VII. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We describe a mission planning architecture [42] for an autonomous Mars-rover that uses LCNFQ to follow a mission on Mars, i.e. to solve a continuous-state space MDP such that the resulting policy satisfies an LTL property. The scenario of interest is that we start with an image from the surface of Mars and then we add the desired labels from \( 2^{AP} \), e.g.

![Fig. 1: Coprates quadrangle (Image courtesy of NASA, JPL and USGS.)](image)

![Fig. 2: Melas Chasma and Coprates Chasma, in the central and eastern portions of Valles Marineris. Map color spectrum represents elevation, where red is high and blue is low. (Image courtesy of NASA, JPL, Caltech and University of Arizona.)](image)

We compare LCNFQ with Voronoi quantizer and FVI and we show that LCNFQ outperforms these methods.

A. MDP Structure

In this numerical experiment the area of interest on Mars is Coprates quadrangle (Fig. 1), which is named after the Coprates River in ancient Persia. The Coprates quadrangle...
stretches from 45° to 90° west longitude and 0° to 30° south latitude on Mars. There exist a significant number of signs of water, with ancient river channels and networks of stream channels showing up as sinuous and meandering ridges and lakes.

We consider two parts of Valles Marineris, a canyon system in Coprates quadrangle (Fig. 2). The blue dots, provided by NASA, indicate locations of recurring slope lineae (RSL) in the canyon network. RSL are seasonal dark streaks regarded as the strongest evidence for the possibility of liquid water on the surface of Mars. RSL extend downslope during a warm season and then disappear in the colder part of the Martian year [43]. The two areas mapped in Fig. 2 Melas Chasma and Coprates Chasma, have the highest density of known RSL.

For each case, let the entire area be our MDP state space $S$, where the rover location is a single state $s \in S$. At each state $s \in S$, the rover has a set of actions $A = \{ \text{left, right, up, down, stay} \}$ by which it is able to move to other states: at each state $s \in S$, when the rover takes an action $a \in \{ \text{left, right, up, down} \}$ it is moved to another state (e.g., $s'$) towards the direction of the action with a range of movement that is randomly drawn from $[0, D]$ unless the rover hits the boundary of the area which forces the rover to remain on the boundary. In the case when the rover chooses action $a = \text{stay}$ it is again moved to a random place within a circle centered at its current state and with radius $d \ll D$. Again, $d$ captures disturbances on the surface of Mars and can be tuned accordingly.

With $S$ and $A$ defined we are only left with the labeling function $L : S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ which assigns to each state $s \in S$ a set of atomic propositions $L(s) \subseteq 2^{AP}$. With the labeling function, we are able to divide the area into different regions and define a logical property over the traces that the agent generates. In this particular experiment, we divide areas into three main regions: neutral, unsafe, and target. The target label goes on RSL (blue dots), the unsafe label lays on the parts with very high elevation (red colored) and the rest is neutral. In this example we assume that the labels do not overlap each other.

Note that when the rover is deployed to its real mission, the precise landing location is not known. Therefore, we should take into account the randomness of the initial state $s_0$. The dimensions of the area of interest in Fig. 2a are 456.98 x 322.58 km and in Fig. 2b are 323.47 x 215.05 km. The diameter of each RSL is 19.12 km. Other parameters in this numerical example have been set as $D = 2$ km, $d = 0.02$ km, the reward function parameter $y = 0$ for LCNFQ and $y = 0$ for VQ and FVI, $M = 1$, $m = 0.05$ and $AP = \{ \text{neutral, unsafe, target}_1, \text{target}_2 \}$.

### B. Specifications

The first control objective in this numerical example is expressed by the following LTL formula over Melas Chasma (Fig. 2a):

$$\Diamond (t_1 \land t_2) \land \Box (t_2 \rightarrow \Box t_2) \land \Box (u \rightarrow \Box u),$$  

(12)

where $n$ stands for “neutral”, $t_1$ stands for “target 1”, $t_2$ stands for “target 2” and $u$ stands for “unsafe”. Target 1 are the RSL (blue bots) on the right with a lower risk of the rover going to unsafe region and the target 2 label goes on the left RSL that are a bit riskier to explore. Conforming to [12] the rover has to visit the target 1 (any of the right dots) at least once and then proceed to the target 2 (left dots) while avoiding unsafe areas. Note that according to $\Box (u \rightarrow \Box u)$ in (12) the agent is able to go to unsafe area $u$ (by climbing up the slope) but it is not able to come back due to the risk of falling. With [12] we can build the associated Büchi automaton as in Fig. 3

The second formula focuses more on safety and we are going to employ it in exploring Coprates Chasma (Fig. 2b) where a critical unsafe slope exists in the middle of this region.

$$\Diamond t \land \Box (t \rightarrow \Box t) \land \Box (u \rightarrow \Box u)$$  

(13)

In (13), $t$ refers to “target”, i.e. RSL in the map, and $u$ stands for “unsafe”. According to this LTL formula, the agent has to eventually reach the target ($\Diamond t$) and stays there ($\Box (t \rightarrow \Box t)$). However, if the agent hits the unsafe area it can never comes back and remains there forever ($\Box (u \rightarrow \Box u)$). With [13] we can build the associated Büchi automaton as in Fig. 4.

Having the Büchi automaton for each formula, we are able to use Definition [4,1] to build product MDPs and run LCNFQ on both.

### C. Simulation Results

This section presents the simulation results. All simulations are carried on a machine with a 3.2GHz Core i5 processor and 8GB of RAM, running Windows 7.

LCNFQ has four feedforward neural networks for (12) and three feedforward neural networks for (13), each associated
Table I: Simulation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Sample Complexity</th>
<th>Discounted Expected Reward at $s_0$</th>
<th>Success Rate†</th>
<th>Training Time∗(s)</th>
<th>Iteration Num.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melas Chasma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCNFQ</td>
<td>7168 samples</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95.64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 0.4$)</td>
<td>27886 samples</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1732.35</td>
<td>2195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 1.2$)</td>
<td>7996 samples</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>273.049</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVI</td>
<td>40000 samples</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coprates Chasma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCNFQ</td>
<td>2680 samples</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>166.13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 0.4$)</td>
<td>8040 samples</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3666.18</td>
<td>3870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 1.2$)</td>
<td>3140 samples</td>
<td>0.0562</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>931.33</td>
<td>2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ ($\Delta = 2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVI</td>
<td>25000 samples</td>
<td>0.0717</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average for 10 trainings † Testing the value function or Q-function once training is finished (for 100 trials)

The discount factor $\gamma$ is also set to be equal to 0.9.

The discount factor is a measure of how far ahead in time the agent looks. A discount factor closer to one prioritize the rewards in the future whereas, on the other hand, a discount factor closer to zero looks for immediate rewards. The value of discount factor is often empirically chosen by researchers to be near 0.9 [10].
The generated path in Melas Chasma when the landing location, i.e. the black rectangle, is $(118, 85)$.

The generated path in Coprates Chasma when the landing location, i.e. the black rectangle, is $(194, 74)$.

Fig. 6: Results of learning with episodic VQ

The generated path in Melas Chasma when the landing location, i.e. the black rectangle, is $(118, 85)$.

The generated path in Coprates Chasma when the landing location, i.e. the black rectangle, is $(194, 74)$.

Fig. 7: VQ generated cells in Melas Chasma for different resolutions

Parameter is $h = 0.18$ and the sampling time is $Z = 25$ for both regions where both are empirically adjusted to have the minimum possible value for FVI to generate satisfying policies. The number of basis points also is set to be 100, so the sample complexity of FVI is

$$100 \times Z \times |A| \times (|Q| - 1).$$

(14)

We do not sample the states in the product automaton that are associated to the accepting state of the automaton since when we reach the accepting state the property is satisfied and there is no need for further exploration. Hence, in (14) the last term is $(|Q| - 1)$. However, if the property of interest produces an automaton that has multiple accepting states, then we need to sample those states as well.

Note that in Table I, in terms of timing, FVI outperforms the other methods. However, we have to remember that FVI is an approximate DP algorithm, which inherently needs an approximation of the transition probabilities (Remark 6.1). Therefore, as we have seen in Section VII in (11), for the set of basis points we need to sample the subsequent states.

This reduces FVI applicability as it might not be possible in practice.

Additionally, both FVI and episodic VQ need careful hyper-parameter tuning to generate a satisfying policy, i.e., $h$ and $Z$ for FVI and $\Delta$ for VQ. On the other hand, the big merit of LCNFQ is that it does not need any external intervention. Further, as in Table II LCNFQ succeeds to efficiently generate a better policy compared to FVI and VQ. LCNFQ has less sample complexity while at the same time produces policies that are more reliable and also has better expected reward, i.e. higher probability of satisfying the given property.

We also would like to underline that, unlike LCNFQ, VQ is an online learning algorithm in which experience gathering and learning happens simultaneously. Lastly, we tried formal abstraction methods, e.g. FAUST$^2$ [6], to generate a finite-state MDP from the continuous-state MDP with a certain error. However, due to the low variance of the kernel function in our experiment, these methods simply timed out. Thus, for the sake of saving space we do not include them in this work.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper proposed LCNFQ, a method to train Q-function in a continuous-state MDP such that the resulting traces satisfy a logical property. Continuous-state MDPs are of interest since they are more accurate in capturing the dynamics of the problem. However, it does not mean that one cannot apply LCNFQ to large-scale finite-state MDPs.

The logical property in LCNFQ was expressed as an automaton with which we built a product MDP. The product MDP was the main framework for LCNFQ to be employed. The proposed algorithm used hybrid modes to automatically switch between neural nets when it was necessary.

We would like to emphasize that neural-net-based algorithms exploit the positive effects of generalization in
approach (FVI), which are common solutions to deal with performance. We compared the performance of LCNFQ to experience and the learning process is highly data efficient. Generalization is that the learning algorithm requires less the network properly learns [20]. The positive effect of disturbing previously learned experiences when approximation while at the same time avoid the negative effects of disturbing previously learned experiences when the network properly learns [20]. The positive effect of generalization is that the learning algorithm requires less experience and the learning process is highly data efficient.

LCNFQ is tested in a numerical example to verify its performance. We compared the performance of LCNFQ to a discretization solution (VQ) and also a continuous DP approach (FVI), which are common solutions to deal with continuous-state MDPs.
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