Abstract—This paper proposes a new highly scalable optimal control synthesis algorithm from linear temporal logic specifications, called STyLuS* for large-scale optimal Temporal Logic Synthesis, that is designed to solve complex temporal planning problems in large-scale multi-robot systems. Existing planning approaches with temporal logic specifications rely on graph search techniques applied to a product automaton constructed among the robots. In our previous work, we have proposed a more tractable sampling-based algorithm that builds incrementally trees that approximate the state-space and transitions of the synchronous product automaton and does not require sophisticated graph search techniques. Here, we extend our previous work by introducing bias in the sampling process which is guided by transitions in the Buchi automaton that belong to the shortest path to the accepting states. This allows us to synthesize optimal motion plans from product automata with hundreds of orders more states than those that existing optimal control synthesis methods or off-the-shelf model checkers can manipulate. We show that STyLuS* is probabilistically complete and asymptotically optimal and has exponential convergence rate. This is the first time that convergence rate results are provided for sampling-based optimal control synthesis methods. We provide simulation results that show that STyLuS* can synthesize optimal motion plans for very large multi-robot systems which is impossible using state-of-the-art methods.
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I. INTRODUCTION

CONTROL synthesis for mobile robots under complex tasks, captured by Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) formulas, builds upon either bottom-up approaches when independent LTL expressions are assigned to robots [1]–[4] or top-down approaches when a global LTL formula describing a collaborative task is assigned to a team of robots [5], [6], as in this work. Common in the above works is that they rely on model checking theory [7], [8] to find paths that satisfy LTL-specified tasks, without optimizing task performance. Optimal control synthesis under local and global LTL specifications has been addressed in [9], [10] and [11]–[13], respectively. In top-down approaches [11]–[13], optimal discrete plans are derived for every robot using the individual transition systems that capture robot mobility and a Non-deterministic Büchi Automaton (NBA) that represents the global LTL specification. Specifically, by taking the synchronous product among the transition systems and the NBA, a synchronous product automaton can be constructed. Then, representing the latter automaton as a graph and using graph-search techniques, optimal motion plans can be derived that satisfy the global LTL specification and optimize a cost function. As the number of robots or the size of the NBA increases, the state-space of the product automaton grows exponentially and, as a result, graph-search techniques become intractable. Consequently, these motion planning algorithms scale poorly with the number of robots and the complexity of the assigned task. A more tractable approach is presented in [14], [15] that identifies independent parts of the LTL formula and builds a local product automaton for each agent. Nevertheless, this approach can be applied only to finite LTL missions and does not have optimality guarantees.

To mitigate these issues, in our previous work we proposed a sampling-based optimal control synthesis algorithm that avoids the explicit construction of the product among the transition systems and the NBA [10]. Specifically, this algorithm builds incrementally directed trees that approximately represent the state-space and transitions among states of the product automaton. The advantage is that approximating the product automaton by a tree rather than representing it explicitly by an arbitrary graph, as existing works do, results in significant savings in resources both in terms of memory to save the associated data structures and in terms of computational cost in applying graph search techniques.

In this work, we propose a new highly scalable optimal control synthesis algorithm from LTL specifications, called STyLuS* for large-scale optimal Temporal Logic Synthesis, that is designed to solve complex temporal planning problems in large-scale multi-robot systems. In fact, STyLuS* extends the sampling-based synthesis algorithm proposed in [16] by introducing bias in the sampling process. For this, we first exploit the structure of the atomic propositions to prune the NBA by removing transitions that can never be enabled. Then, we define a metric over the state-space of the NBA that captures the shortest path, i.e., the minimum number of feasible transitions, between any two NBA states. Given this metric, we define a probability distribution over the nodes that are reachable from the current tree so that nodes that are closer to the final/accepting states of the NBA are sampled with higher probability; no particular sampling probability is proposed in [16]. We show that introducing bias in the sampling process does not violate the sampling assumptions in [16] so that STyLuS* inherits the same probabilistic com-
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pleteness and asymptotic optimality guarantees. Moreover, we provide exponential convergence bounds; the first in the field of optimal control synthesis methods. We show that by biasing the sampling process we can synthesize optimal motion plans from product automata with order $10^{900}$ states and beyond, which is hundreds of orders more states than those that any existing optimal control synthesis algorithms [12], [13], [16]–[18] can handle. For example, our algorithm in [16] when implemented with uniform sampling, can optimally solve problems with order $10^{10}$ states, which are still more than existing methods [12], [13], [17], [18]. Compared to off-the-shelf model-checkers, such as NuSMV [19] and nuXmv [20], that can design feasible but not optimal motion plans, our proposed biased sampling-based algorithm can find feasible plans much faster. NuSMV can solve problems with order $10^{30}$ states, while nuXmv can handle infinite-state synchronous transition systems but it is slower than STyLuS$^\ast$. Note that STyLuS$^\ast$ can be implemented in a distributed way, as in our recent work [21], which can further decrease the computational time.

Relevant sampling-based control synthesis methods are also presented in [22], [23]. These methods consider continuous state spaces and employ sampling-based methods to build discrete abstractions of the environment that are represented by graphs of arbitrary structure, e.g., as in [24], [25] for point-to-point navigation. Once these abstractions become expressive enough to generate motion plans that satisfy the LTL specification, graph search methods are applied to the respective PBA to design a feasible path. However, representing the environment using graphs of arbitrary structure compromises scalability of temporal logic planning methods since, as the size of these graphs increases, more resources are needed to save the associated structure and search for optimal plans using graph search methods. While our proposed sampling-based approach assumes that a discrete abstraction of the environment is available, as in [24]–[30], it builds trees, instead of arbitrary graphs, to approximate the product automaton. Therefore, it is more economical in terms of memory requirements and does not require the application of expensive graph search techniques to find the optimal motion plan. Instead, it tracks sequences of parent nodes starting from desired accepting states. Combined with the proposed biased sampling approach, our method can handle much more complex planning problems with more robots and LTL tasks that correspond to larger NBAs. A more detailed comparison with [22], [23] can be found in [16].

A preliminary version of this work can be found in [31]. In [31] it is shown that the proposed biased sampling process satisfies the assumptions in [16] so that the proposed algorithm inherits the same probabilistic completeness and asymptotic optimality guarantees. Compared to [31], here we additionally provide exponential convergence rate bounds. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first sampling-based motion planning algorithm with temporal logic specifications that also has convergence-rate guarantees. Moreover, we provide additional extensive simulation studies that show the effect of bias in sampling in the convergence rate of the algorithm, as well as scalability of our method with respect to the number of robots, the size of the transition systems, and the size of the NBA. We also compare our method to relevant state-of-the-art methods. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first optimal control synthesis method for global temporal logic specifications with optimality and convergence guarantees that can be applied to large-scale multi-robot systems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section [I] we present the problem formulation. In Section [II] we describe our proposed sampling-based planning algorithm and in Section [III] we examine its correctness, optimality, and convergence rate. Numerical experiments are presented in Section [IV].

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider $N$ mobile robots that live in a complex workspace $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We assume that there are $W$ disjoint regions of interest in $\mathcal{W}$. The $j$-th region is denoted by $r_j$ and it can be of any arbitrary shape. Given the robot dynamics, robot mobility in the workspace $\mathcal{W}$ can be represented by a weighted Transition System (wTS). The wTS for robot $i$ is defined as follows:

Definition 2.1 (wTS): A weighted Transition System (wTS) for robot $i$, denoted by wTS$_i = (Q_i, q^0_i, \rightarrow_i, w_i, A\pi_i, L_i)$ where: (a) $Q_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{W} \{q^j_i\}$ is the set of states, where a state $q^j_i$ indicates that robot $i$ is at location $r_j$; (b) $q^0_i \in Q_i$ is the initial state of robot $i$; (c) $\rightarrow_i \subseteq Q_i \times Q_i$ is the transition relation for robot $i$. Given the robot dynamics, if there is a control input $u_i$ that can drive robot $i$ from location $r_j$ to $r_{j'}$, then there is a transition from state $q^j_i$ to $q^{j'}_i$ denoted by $(q^j_i, q^{j'}_i) \in \rightarrow_i$; (d) $w_i : Q_i \times Q_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a cost function that assigns weights/costs to each possible transition in wTS. For example, such costs can be associated with the distance that needs to be traveled by robot $i$ in order to move from state $q^j_i$ to state $q^{j'}_i$; (e) $A\pi_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{W} \{\pi^{j}_{i}\}$ is the set of atomic propositions, where $\pi^{j}_{i}$ is true if robot $i$ is inside region $r_j$ and false otherwise; and (f) $L_i : Q_i \rightarrow \mathcal{A}\pi_i$ is an observation/output function defined as $L_i(q^j_i) = \pi^j_{i}$ for all $q^j_i \in Q_i$.

Given the definition of the wTS, we can define the synchronous Product Transition System (PTS) as follows:

Definition 2.2 (PTS): Given $N$ transition systems wTS$_i = (Q_i, q^0_i, \rightarrow_i, w_i, A\pi_i, L_i)$, the product transition system PTS$_N = \text{wTS}_1 \otimes \text{wTS}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{wTS}_N$ is a tuple PTS$_N = (Q_{\text{PTS}}, q^0_{\text{PTS}}, \rightarrow_{\text{PTS}}, w_{\text{PTS}}, A\pi_{\text{PTS}}, L_{\text{PTS}})$ where (a) $Q_{\text{PTS}} = Q_1 \times Q_2 \times \cdots \times Q_N$ is the set of states; (b) $q^0_{\text{PTS}} = (q^0_1, q^0_2, \ldots, q^0_N) \in Q_{\text{PTS}}$ is the initial state, (c) $\rightarrow_{\text{PTS}} \subseteq Q_{\text{PTS}} \times Q_{\text{PTS}} \times Q_{\text{PTS}}$ is the transition relation defined by the rule $\Delta_{\text{PTS}}(q, q' \rightarrow q'')$, where with slight abuse of notation $q_{\text{PTS}} = (q_1, \ldots, q_N) \in Q_{\text{PTS}}, q_i 
\\$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$; (d) $w_{\text{PTS}} : Q_{\text{PTS}} \times Q_{\text{PTS}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a cost function that assigns weights/costs to each possible transition in PTS, defined as

\[ w_{\text{PTS}}(q_{\text{PTS}}, q'_{\text{PTS}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i(q_i, q'_{\text{PTS},i}) \]

\[^{1}\text{For simplicity of notations we consider disjoint regions } r_j.\text{ However, overlapping regions can also be considered by introducing additional states to wTS, defined in Definition 2.1 that capture the presence of robot } i \text{ in more than one region.}\]
\[ w_{PTS}(q_{PTS}, q'_{PTS}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i(\Pi_{wTS}, q_{PTS}, \Pi_{wTS}, q'_{PTS}), \]

where \( q_{PTS} \in Q_{PTS} \), and \( \Pi_{wTS}, q_{PTS} \) stands for the projection of state \( q_{PTS} \) onto the state space of \( wTS \). The state \( \Pi_{wTS}, q_{PTS} \) is obtained by removing all states in \( q_{PTS} \) that do not belong to \( Q \); (e) \( AP = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} AP_i \) is the set of atomic propositions; and, (f) \( L_{PTS} = \bigcup_{i} L_i : Q_{PTS} \to AP \) is an output/information function giving the set of atomic propositions that are satisfied at a state \( q_{PTS} \in Q_{PTS} \).

In what follows, we give definitions related to the PTS that we will use throughout the rest of the paper. An infinite path \( \tau \) of a PTS is an infinite sequence of states, \( \tau = \tau(1)\tau(2)\tau(3) \ldots \) such that \( \tau(1) = q_{PTS} \), \( \tau(k) \in Q_{PTS} \), and \( (\tau(k), \tau(k+1)) \in \to_{PTS} \), \( \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), where \( k \) is an index that points to the \( k \)-th entry of \( \tau \) denoted by \( \tau(k) \). The trace of an infinite path \( \tau = \tau(1)\tau(2)\tau(3) \ldots \) of a PTS, denoted by \( \text{trace}(\tau) = (2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega} \), where \( \omega \) denotes infinite repetition, is an infinite word that is determined by the sequence of atomic propositions that are true in the states along \( \tau \), i.e., \( \text{trace}(\tau) = L(\tau(1))L(\tau(2)) \ldots \ldots \). A finite path of a PTS can be defined accordingly. The only difference with the infinite path is that a finite path is defined as a finite sequence of states of a PTS. Given the definition of the weights \( w_{PTS} \) in Definition 2.2 the cost of a finite path \( \tau \), denoted by \( J(\tau) \geq 0 \), can be defined as

\[ J(\tau) = \sum_{k=1}^{\lvert \tau \rvert - 1} w_{PTS}(\tau(k), \tau(k+1)), \tag{1} \]

where \( \lvert \tau \rvert \) stands for the number of states in \( \tau \). In words, the cost captures the total cost incurred by all robots during the execution of the finite path \( \tau \).

We assume that the robots have to accomplish a complex collaborative task captured by a global LTL statement \( \phi \) defined over the set of atomic propositions \( AP = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} AP_i \). Due to space limitations, we abstain from formally defining the semantics and syntax of LTL. A detailed overview can be found in [7]. Given an LTL formula \( \phi \), we define the language \( \text{Words}(\phi) = \{ \sigma \in (2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega} | \sigma \models \phi \} \), where \( \models \subseteq (2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega} \times \phi \) is the satisfaction relation, as the set of infinite words \( \sigma \in (2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega} \) that satisfy the LTL formula \( \phi \). Any LTL formula \( \phi \) can be translated into a Nondeterministic Büchi Automaton (NBA) over \((2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega}\) denoted by \( B \) defined as follows [32].

**Definition 2.3 (NBA):** A Nondeterministic Büchi Automaton (NBA) \( B \) over \((2\mathbb{A}P)^{\omega}\) is defined as a tuple \( B = (Q_B, Q_B^0, \Sigma, \to_B, Q_B^F) \), where \( Q_B \) is the set of states, \( Q_B^0 \subseteq Q_B \) is a set of initial states, \( \Sigma = 2\mathbb{A}P \) is an alphabet, \( \to_B \subseteq Q_B \times \Sigma \times Q_B \) is the transition relation, and \( Q_B^F \subseteq Q_B \) is a set of accepting/final states.

Given the PTS and the NBA \( B \) that corresponds to the LTL \( \phi \), we can now define the Product Büchi Automaton (PBA) \( P = PTS \otimes B \), as follows [7]:

**Definition 2.4 (PBA):** Given the product transition system \( PTS = (Q_{PTS}, q_{PTS}^0, \to_{PTS}, w_{PTS}, AP, L_{PTS}) \) and the NBA \( B = (Q_B, Q_B^0, \Sigma, \to_B, Q_B^F) \), we can define the Product Büchi Automaton \( P = PTS \otimes B \) as a tuple \( P = (Q_P, Q_P^0, \to_P, w_P, Q_P^F) \) where (a) \( Q_P = Q_{PTS} \times Q_B \) is the set of states; (b) \( Q_P^0 = q_{PTS}^0 \times Q_B^0 \) is a set of initial states; (c) \( \to_P \subseteq Q_P \times 2\mathbb{A}P \times Q_P \) is the transition relation defined by the rule: \( (q_{PTS} \to_{PTS} q'_{PTS}) \land (q_P \to_P q'_P) \). Transition from state \( q_P \in Q_P \) to \( q'_P \in Q_P \), is denoted by \((q_{PTS}, q'_B) \in \to_B \), or \( q_P \rightarrow_P q'_P \); (d) \( w_P(q_P, q'_P) = w_{PTS}(q_{PTS}, q'_{PTS}) \), where \( q_P = (q_{PTS}, q'_B) \) and \( q'_P = (q'_{PTS}, q'_B) \); and (e) \( Q_P^F = Q_{PTS} \times Q_B^F \) is a set of accepting/final states.

Given \( \phi \) and the PBA an infinite path \( \tau \) of a PTS satisfies \( \phi \) if and only if \( \text{trace}(\tau) \in \text{Words}(\phi) \), which is equivalently denoted by \( \tau \models \phi \). Specifically, if there is a path satisfying \( \phi \), then there exists a path \( \tau \models \phi \) that can be written in a finite representation, called prefix-suffix structure, i.e., \( \tau = \tau_{pref}[\tau_{suffix}]^\omega \), where the prefix \( \tau_{pref} \) is executed only once followed by the indefinite execution of the suffix part \( \tau_{suffix} \). The prefix part \( \tau_{pref} \) is the projection of a finite path \( \rho_{pref} \) that lives in \( Q_P \) onto \( Q_{PTS} \). The path \( \rho_{pref} \) starts from an initial state \( q_{pref}^0 \in Q_P \) and ends at a final state \( q_{pref}^F \in Q_P^F \), i.e., it has the following structure \( \rho_{pref} = (q_{PTS}, q'_B) (q_{PTS}, q_B) \ldots (q_{PTS}, q'_B) \) with \((q_{PTS}, q'_B) \in Q_{PTS} \). The suffix part \( \tau_{suffix} \) is the projection of a finite path \( \rho_{suffix} \) that lives in \( Q_P \) onto \( Q_{PTS} \). The path \( \rho_{suffix} \) is a cycle around the final state \( (q_{PTS}, q'_B) \), i.e., it has the following structure \( \rho_{suffix} = (q_{PTS}, q'_B) (q_{PTS}, q_B) \ldots (q_{PTS}, q'_B) (q_{PTS}, q_B) \ldots (q_{PTS}, q'_B) (q_{PTS}, q_B) \), where \((q_{PTS}, q'_B) \in Q_{PTS} \). Then our goal is to compute a plan \( \tau = \tau_{pref}[\tau_{suffix}]^\omega = \Pi_{\text{PTS}^{\rho_{pref}}}[\Pi_{\text{PTS}^{\rho_{suffix}}}^\omega] \), where \( \Pi_{\text{PTS}} \) stands for the projection on the state-space \( Q_{PTS} \), so that the following objective function is minimized

\[ J(\tau) = J(\tau_{pref}) + (1 - \beta)J(\tau_{suffix}), \tag{2} \]

where \( J(\tau_{pref}) \) and \( J(\tau_{suffix}) \) stand for the cost of the prefix and suffix part, respectively and \( \beta \in [0, 1] \) is a user-specified parameter. Specifically, in this paper we address the following problem.

**Problem 1:** Given a global LTL specification \( \phi \), and transition systems \( wTS_i \), for all robots \( i \), determine a discrete team plan \( \tau \) that satisfies \( \phi \), i.e., \( \tau \models \phi \), and minimizes the cost function (2).

**A. A Solution to Problem 7**

Problem 1 is typically solved by applying graph-search methods to the PBA. Specifically, to generate a motion plan \( \tau \) that satisfies \( \phi \), the PBA is viewed as a weighted directed graph \( G_P = (V_P, \mathcal{E}_P, w_P) \), where the set of nodes \( V_P \) is indexed by the set of states \( Q_P \), the set of edges \( \mathcal{E}_P \) is determined by the transition relation \( \rightarrow_P \), and the weights assigned to each edge are determined by the function \( w_P \). Then, to find the optimal plan \( \tau \models \phi \), shortest paths towards final states and shortest cycles around them are computed. More details about this approach can be found in [9], [12], [13], [17] and the references therein.

**III. SAMPLING-BASED OPTIMAL CONTROL SYNTHESIS**

In this section, we build upon our previous work [16] and propose a biased sampling-based optimal control synthesis algorithm that can synthesize optimal motion plans \( \tau \) in prefix-suffix structure, i.e., \( \tau = \tau_{pref}[\tau_{suffix}]^\omega \), that satisfy a given global LTL specification \( \phi \) from PBA with arbitrarily large state-space. The procedure is based on the incremental
construction of a directed tree that approximately represents the state-space \( Q_P \) and the transition relation \( \rightarrow_P \) of the PBA defined in Definition 2.4. In what follows, we denote by \( G_T = \{V_T, E_T, \text{Cost}\} \) the tree that approximately represents the PBA \( P \). Also, we denote by \( q^*_P \), the root of \( G_T \). The set of nodes \( V_T \) contains the states of \( Q_P \) that have already been sampled and added to the tree structure. The set of edges \( E_T \) captures transitions between nodes in \( V_T \), i.e., \((q_P, q'_P) \in E_T\) if there is a transition from state \( q_P \in V_T \) to state \( q'_P \in V_T \). The function \( \text{Cost} : V_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) assigns the cost of reaching node \( q_P \in V_T \) from the root \( q^*_P \) of the tree. In other words, \( \text{Cost}(q_P) = J(q_P) \), where \( q_P \in V_T \) and \( \tau_T \) is the path in the tree \( G_T \) that connects the root to \( q_P \).

The construction of the prefix and the suffix part is described in Algorithm 1. In lines 1-3, first the LTL formula is translated to a NBA \( B = (Q_B, Q_B^0, \rightarrow_B, Q_B^F) \); in lines 4-5, the LTL formula is translated to an LTL formula \( \phi \) is synthesized in lines 21-22.

### A. Feasible Words

In this section, given the NBA \( B \) that corresponds to the assigned LTL formula \( \phi \), we define a function \( d : Q_B 	imes Q_B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) that returns the minimum number of feasible NBA transitions that are required to reach a state \( q^*_B \in Q_B \) starting from a state \( q_B \in Q_B \) [lines 13 Algo. 1]. This function will be used in the construction of the prefix and suffix parts to bias the sampling process. A feasible NBA transition is defined as follows; see also Figure 1.

**Definition 3.1 (Feasible NBA transitions):** A transition \((q_B, \sigma^*, q_B') \in \rightarrow_B \) is feasible if the finite word \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma = 2^{A_P} \) is a feasible word, i.e., if \( \sigma^* \) can be generated by the PTS defined in Definition 2.2.

To characterize the words \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma \) that are feasible, we first need to define the words \( \sigma^*_i \in \Sigma_i = 2^{A_P} \) that are feasible, i.e, the words that can be generated by wTS, defined in Definition 2.1.

**Definition 3.2 (Feasible words \( \sigma^*_i \in \Sigma_i \)):** A word \( \sigma^*_i \in \Sigma_i \) is feasible if and only if \( \sigma^*_i \not\preceq b^*_i \), where \( b^*_i \) is a Boolean formula defined as

\[
b^*_i = \forall_{r_j} (\forall_{r_i} (\tau^r_i \land \tau^e_i)).
\]

Note that the Boolean formula \( b^*_i \) is satisfied by any finite word \( \sigma^*_i \in \Sigma_i \) that requires robot \( i \) to be present in two or more disjoint regions, simultaneously. For instance, the word \( \sigma^*_i = \pi^r_i \land \pi^e_i \) satisfies \( b^*_i \). Next, we define the feasible words \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma \).

**Definition 3.3 (Feasible words \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma \)):** A word \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma \) is feasible if and only if \( \sigma^*_i \not\preceq b^*_i \) for all robots \( i \), where \( \sigma^*_i = \Pi_i | \Sigma, \sigma^*, b^*_i \) is defined in [3], and \( \Pi_i | \Sigma \) stands for the projection of the word \( \sigma^* \) onto \( \Sigma_i = 2^{A_P} \).

To define the proposed function \( d : Q_B \times Q_B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), we first construct sets \( \{q^*_B, q_B \} \subseteq \Sigma \) that collect feasible finite words \( \sigma^* \) that enable a transition from a state \( q_B \in Q_B \) to \( q^*_B \in Q_B \) according to \( \rightarrow_B \) [line 2 Algo. 1]. To construct these sets, sets \( \{q^*_B, q_B \} \subseteq \Sigma \) that collect all feasible (or infeasible) words \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma \) that enable a transition from \( q_B \in Q_B \) to \( q^*_B \in Q_B \).

Note that if we consider regions \( r_j \) that are not necessarily disjoint, then the Boolean formula \( b^*_i \) is defined as \( b^*_i = \forall_{r_j} (\forall_{r_i} (\tau^r_i \land \tau^e_i)) \). Note also that definition of infeasible words depends on the problem at hand, i.e., the definition of atomic propositions included in the sets \( A_P \).

\[\text{Algorithm 1: STyLuS}^*: \text{large-scale optimal Temporal Logic Synthesis}\]

**Input:** LTL formula \( \phi \), \((wTS_1)^N_{i=1}\), \(q^*_P \subseteq Q_P \), maximum number of iterations \( n^\text{pre}, n^\text{max} \)

**Output:** Optimal plans \( \tau \models \phi \)
1. Convert \( \phi \) to a NBA \( B = (Q_B, Q_B^0, \rightarrow_B, Q_B^F) \);
2. \([\Sigma^\text{feas}, q_B^0, q_B^0] = \text{FeasibleWords}(\{q_B^0, q_B^0\} \subseteq Q_B)\);
3. Construct graph \( G_B \) and \( d(q_B, q_B^0) \);
4. Define goal set: \( \Lambda^\text{pre} \)
5. for \( b_0 = 1 : (Q_B^0) \) do
6. Initial NBA state: \( q_B^0 = Q_B^0(b_0) \);
7. Root of the tree: \( q^*_P = (q_B^0, q_B^0) \);
8. \([q^*_P, \mathcal{P}] = \text{ConstructTree}(\Lambda^\text{pre}, wTS_1, \ldots, wTS_N, B, q_B^0, n^\text{max})\);
9. for \( a = 1 : |\mathcal{P}| \) do
10. \( q^*_P = \mathcal{P}(a) \);
11. Define goal set: \( \Lambda^\text{opt} \)
12. if \( (q^*_P, \sigma^*_i) \) then
13. \( \mathcal{G}_T = \{q^*_P, \varnothing\}; \)
14. \( \mathcal{S}_a = \{q^*_P\}; \)
15. Compute \( \tau^\text{opt} \) (see 16);
16. \( \sigma^*_i = \text{argmin}_{\sigma^*_i} J(q^*_P) + J(\tau^\text{opt}) \);
17. \( \mathcal{G}_T = \{q^*_P, \varnothing\}; \)
18. \( \mathcal{S}_a = \{q^*_P\}; \)
19. Compute \( \tau^\text{opt} \) (see 17);
20. \( \sigma^*_i = \text{argmin}_{\sigma^*_i} J(q^*_P) + J(\tau^\text{opt}) \);
21. Optimal Plan: \( \tau = \tau^\text{opt} \)


$q_B' \in Q_B$, for all $q_B, q_B' \in Q_B$, are required. Then, the sets $\Sigma_{q_B, q_B'} \subseteq \Sigma_{q_B, q_B'}$ can be constructed by removing from $\Sigma_{q_B, q_B'}$ all words $\sigma^*$ that are not feasible, for all $q_B, q_B' \in Q_B$.

Next, we view the NBA as a directed graph $G_B = (V_B, E_B)$, where the set of nodes $V_B$ is indexed by the states $q_B \in Q_B$ and the set of edges $E_B \subseteq V_B \times V_B$ collects the edges from nodes/states $q_B$ to $q_B'$ denoted by $(q_B, q_B')$, where $(q_B, q_B')$ exists if $\Sigma_{q_B, q_B'} \neq \emptyset$ [line 3 Alg. 1]. Assigning weights equal to one to all edges in the set $E_B$, we define the function $d : Q_B \times Q_B \rightarrow N$ as

$$
d(q_B, q_B') = \begin{cases} |SP_{q_B, q_B'}|, & \text{if } SP_{q_B, q_B'} \text{ exists}, \\
\infty, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
$$

where $SP_{q_B, q_B'}$ denotes the shortest path in $G_B$ from $q_B \in V_B$ to $q_B' \in V_B$ and $|SP_{q_B, q_B'}|$ stands for its cost, i.e., the number of transitions/edges in $SP_{q_B, q_B'}$.

B. Construction of Optimal Prefix Parts

In this section we describe the construction of the tree $G_T = \{V_T, E_T, Cost\}$ that will be used for the synthesis of the prefix part [lines 4 Alg. 1]. Since the prefix part connects an initial state $q_T = (q_{PTS}, b_0) \in Q_B$, to an accepting state $q_T = (q_{PTS}, q_B) \in Q_B'$, with $q_B \in Q_B$, we can define the goal region for the tree $G_T$, as [line 4 Alg. 1]:

$$
X_B^\text{goal} = \{q_T = (q_{PTS}, q_B) \in Q_T \mid \exists \gamma \in Q_B' \}.
$$

(5)

The root $q_T'$ of the tree is an initial state $q_T' = (q_{PTS}, b_0)$ of the PBA and the following process is repeated for each initial state $q_T' \in Q_T'$, in parallel [line 5 Alg. 1]. The construction of the tree is described in Algorithm 2 [line 8 Alg. 1]. In line 6 of Algorithm 1 $Q_B'(b_0)$ stands for the $b_0$-th initial state assuming an arbitrary enumeration of the elements of the set $Q_B$. The set $V_T$ initially contains only the root $q_T'$, i.e., an initial state of the PBA [line 1 Alg. 1] and, therefore, the set of edges is initialized as $E_T = \{\emptyset$ [line 2 Alg. 2]. By convention, we assume that the cost of zero is [line 3 Alg. 2]. Given the root $q_T'$, we select a feasible final state $q_B \in Q_B'$, such that (i) $d(q_T', q_B) \neq \infty$ and (ii) $d(q_T', q_B) \neq \infty$. Among all final states that satisfy both (i) and (ii), we select one randomly denoted by $q_B^f,$ [line 5 Alg. 2]. If there does not exist such a state $q_B^f$, then this means that there is no prefix-suffix plan associated with the initial state $q_T'$. In this case, the construction of the tree stops without having detected any final states around which a loop exists [lines 7 Alg. 2]. The final state $q_B^f,$ will be used in the following subsection in order to bias the exploration of the NBA towards this state. We also define the set $D_{min}$ that collects the nodes $q_P = (q_{PTS}, q_B) \in V_T$ that have the minimum distance $d(q_T, q_B)$ among all nodes in $V_T$, i.e.,

$$
D_{min} = \{q_P = (q_{PTS}, q_B) \in V_T \mid d(q_T, q_B) \leq d_{min} \},
$$

(6)

where $d_{min} = \min \cup \{d(q_T, q_B) \in V_T \} \cup |q_B| \in \Delta \in V_T$, and $\Pi \subseteq Q_B$ stands for the projection of all states $q_B \in V_T \subseteq Q_B$ onto $Q_B$. The set $D_{min}$ initially collects only the root [line 8 Alg. 2].

1) Sampling a state $q_B^f$ \in Q_B: The first step in the construction of the graph $G_T$ is to sample a state $q_B^f$ from the state-space of the PBA. This is achieved by a sampling function $\text{Sample}$. See Algorithm 3. Specifically, we first create a state $q_{PTS}^f = \Pi_{PTS}q_{rand}$, where $q_{rand}$ is sampled from a given discrete distribution $f_{rand}(q_P|q_T) : V_T \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\Pi_{PTS}q_{rand}$ stands for the projection of $q_{rand}$ onto the state-space of the PTS [line 1 Alg. 3]. The probability density function $f_{rand}(q_P|q_T)$ defines the probability of selecting the state $q_P \in V_T$ as the state $q_P^f$ at iteration $n$ of Algorithm 2 given the set $V_T$. The distribution $f_{rand}$ is defined as follows:

$$
f_{rand}(q_P|V_T, D_{min}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|D_{min}|}, & \text{if } q_P \in D_{min} \\
\frac{1}{1-p_{rand}(q_P)}, & \text{if } q_P \notin D_{min}
\end{cases}
$$

(7)

where $p_{rand} \in (0, 5, 1)$ stands for the probability of selecting any node $q_P \in D_{min}$ to be $q_P^f$. Note that $p_{rand}$ can change with iterations $n$ but it should always satisfy $p_{rand} \in (0, 5, 1)$ so that states $q_P = (q_{PTS}, q_B) \in D_{min}$ are selected more often to be $q_P^f$ [line 1 Alg. 3].

Remark 3.4 (Density function $f_{rand}$): Observe that the discrete density function $f_{rand}$ in (7) is defined in a uniform-like way, since all states in the set $D_{min}$ are selected with probability $\frac{1}{|D_{min}|}$, while the states in $V_T \setminus D_{min}$ are selected with probability $\frac{1-p_{rand}(q_P)}{|V_T\setminus D_{min}|}$, where $p_{rand} \in (0, 5, 1)$. However, alternative definitions for $f_{rand}$ are possible as long as $f_{rand}$ (a) satisfies Assumptions 4.1(i)-(iii) made in [16]; and (b) is biased to generate states that belong to $D_{min}$ more often than states that belong to $V_T \setminus D_{min}$. Assumptions 4.1(i) and 4.1(ii) in [16] are required to guarantee that the proposed algorithm
is probabilistically complete while Assumptions 4.1(i)-(iii) are required for the asymptotic optimality of the proposed method; see Section [IV]. The fact that the density function \(q\) satisfies Assumption 4.1 in [16] is shown in Section [IV]. Finally, bias in the sampling process is illustrated in Figure 2.

**Fig. 2.** Graphical depiction of the proposed sampling function when \(N = 1\). The thick black arrow ends in the state that will be selected with probability \(q\) from \(q\) is reachable from \(q\) next to each state \(q_B \in Q_B\), we also note inside parentheses the value of \(d(q_B, q_{B,F,\text{feas}})\).

We collect all states \(q_{B,\text{cand,min}}^{\text{rand}} \in R_B(q_{B,\text{rand}})\) that satisfy \(R_{\text{dec}}(q_{B,\text{cand,min}}) \neq \emptyset\) in the set \(\mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}})\), defined as

\[
\mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}}) = \{q_{B,\text{cand,min}} \mid R_{\text{dec}}(q_{B,\text{cand,min}}) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq R_B(q_{B,\text{rand}}).
\]

Next, given the set \(\mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}})\), we sample a state \(q_B^{\text{min}} \in \mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}})\) from a discrete distribution \(f_{B,\text{min}}(q_B, \mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}}))\) as

\[
f_{B,\text{min}}(q_B, \mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}})) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}})|}.
\]

Note that if \(\mathcal{M}(q_{B,\text{rand}}) = \emptyset\), then no sample will be taken at this iteration [line 12, Alg. 3].

**b) Selection of \(q_B^{\text{dec}} \in R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})\):** Given the state \(q_B^{\text{min}}\) and its respective set \(R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})\), we sample a state \(q_B^{\text{dec}} \in R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})\) from a given discrete distribution \(f_{\text{dec}}(q_B, R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}}))\) [line 7, Alg. 3], defined as

\[
f_{\text{dec}}(q_B, R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})) = \frac{1}{|R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})|}.
\]

for all \(q_B \in R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}})\); see also Figure 2. Note that if \(R_{\text{dec}}(q_B^{\text{min}}) = \emptyset\), then no sample \(q_B^{\text{new}}\) is generated [line 10, Alg. 3].

Given \(q_B^{\text{min}}\) and \(q_B^{\text{dec}}\), we select a word \(\sigma^*\) from \(\Sigma_{q_B^{\text{pre}}, q_B^{\min}} \neq \emptyset\) [line 8, Alg. 3][5]. Given the word \(\sigma^*\), we construct the set \(\mathcal{L}\) so that the i-th element of \(\mathcal{L}\) captures the region where robot \(i\) has to be so that the word \(\sigma^*\) can be generated. For instance, the set \(\mathcal{L}\) corresponding to the word \(\sigma^* = \pi_{r_i}^J \pi_{p_z}^I\) is constructed so that \(\mathcal{L}(i) = r_j\); \(\mathcal{L}(z) = r_e\) and \(\mathcal{L}(h) = \emptyset\), for all robots \(h \neq i, z\). Then, we sample a state \(q_{B,\text{new}}\), for all robots \(i\), from a discrete distribution \(f_{\text{pre},i}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}) : R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}) \rightarrow [0, 1]\) [line 14, Alg. 3], defined as

\[
f_{\text{pre},i}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}})|}, & \text{if } \mathcal{L}(i) = \emptyset, \\ \frac{1}{|R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}})|} \cdot \min(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}), & \text{if } \mathcal{L}(i) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}
\]

where \(R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}})\) collects all states in \(Q_i\) that can be reached in one hop from \(q_i = q_{B,\text{rand}} = \Pi_{wTS, q_{B,\text{rand}}}\), i.e.,

\[
R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}) = \{q_i \in Q_i \mid q_i \neq q_{B,\text{rand}} \Rightarrow r_i\}.
\]

where \(\Pi_{wTS, q_{B,\text{rand}}}\) stands for the projection of \(q_{B,\text{rand}}\) onto the state-space of wTS. Also, in (11), viewing wTS as a graph, \(SP_{q_{B,\text{rand}}, q_{i,\text{c}(i)}}\) stands for the shortest path from the node/state \(q_{B,\text{rand}}\) to the state \(q_{i,\text{c}(i)}\), i.e., \(SP_{q_{B,\text{rand}}, q_{i,\text{c}(i)}}\) is a finite sequence of states in wTS, that start from \(q_{B,\text{rand}}\) and end at the state \(q_{i,\text{c}(i)}\), see also Figure 2. Also, \(SP_{q_{B,\text{rand}}, q_{i,\text{c}(i)}}(2)\) stands for the second state in this sequence. Moreover, in (11), \(p_{\text{new}}\) stands for the probability for the selection of the state \(SP_{q_{B,\text{rand}}, q_{i,\text{c}(i)}}(2)\) to be \(q_{\text{new}}\) if \(\mathcal{L}(i) \neq \emptyset\). Note that \(p_{\text{new}}\) can change with iterations.

\[p_{\text{new}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}})|}, & \text{if } \mathcal{L}(i) = \emptyset, \\ \frac{1}{|R_{\text{wTS}}(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}})|} \cdot \min(q_i, q_{B,\text{rand}}), & \text{if } \mathcal{L}(i) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}
\]

To speed up the detection of final states, we always select the same word \(\sigma^* \in \Sigma_{q_B^{\text{pre}}, q_B^{\min}}\) for a given pair of states \(q_B^{\text{rand}}\) and \(q_B^{\text{dec}}\). Also, by construction of \(q_B^{\text{dec}}\), it holds that \(\Sigma_{q_B^{\text{pre}}, q_B^{\min}} \neq \emptyset\).
Algorithm 3: Function \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} = \) Sample(\( V_T, D_{\text{min}}(w_{\text{TS}}, N) \))

1. Pick a state \( q_B^{\text{rand}} = (q_{\text{PTS}}, q_B^{\text{rand}}) \in V_T \) from \( f_{\text{rand}} \).
2. Compute \( R_B(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \).
3. if \( R_B(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \neq \emptyset \) then
   4. Compute \( M(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \subseteq R_B(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \).
5. if \( M(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \neq \emptyset \) then
   6. Sample \( q_B^{\text{new}} \in M(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \) from \( f_{\text{min}} \).
   7. Select \( q_B^{\text{new}} \in R_B(q_B^{\text{min}}) \).
   8. Pick \( \sigma^* \in \Sigma_{q_B^{\text{new}}, q_B^{\text{pred}}} \).
   9. else
      10. \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} = \emptyset \).
   11. else
      12. \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} = \emptyset \).
   13. if \( (R_B(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \neq \emptyset) \land (M(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \neq \emptyset) \) then
   14. Pick a state \( q_{\text{new}}^{\text{new}} \) from a given probability distribution \( f_{\text{new}, i} \), for all robots \( i \).
   15. Construct \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} = (q_1^{\text{new}}, \ldots, q_N^{\text{new}}) \).

The algorithm selects a state \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) that satisfies the conditions specified in the algorithm. The selection is based on the probability distribution \( f_{\text{new}, i} \) for each robot \( i \).

In order to build incrementally a graph whose set of nodes approximates the space-state \( Q_P \), we need to append to \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) a state from the space-state \( Q_B \) of the NBA \( B \). Let \( q_B^{\text{new}} = Q_B(b) \) be the candidate Büchi state that will be attached to \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \), where \( Q_B(b) \) stands for the \( b \)-th state in the set \( Q_B \) assuming an arbitrary enumeration of the elements of the set \( Q_B \). The following procedure is repeated for all \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} = Q_B(b) \) with \( b \in \{1, \ldots, |Q_B|\} \). First, we construct the state \( q_B^{\text{new}} = (q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}}, q_B^{\text{new}}) \in Q_T \) [line 16 Alg. 2] and then we check if this state can be added to the tree \( G_T \) [lines 17-18 Alg. 2]. If the state \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) does not already belong to the tree from a previous iteration of Algorithm 2, i.e., if \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \notin V_T \) [line 15 Alg. 2], we check which node in \( V_T \) (if there is any) can be the parent of \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) in the tree \( G_T \). If there exist candidate parents for \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) then the tree is extended towards \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \) and the set \( D_{\text{min}} \) is updated [line 19 Alg. 2]. If \( q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{new}} \in V_T \), then the rewiring step follows [lines 20-21 Alg. 2] that aims to reduce the cost of nodes \( q_P \in V_T \). A detailed description of the ‘extend’ and ‘rewire’ steps can be found in [16].

Remark 3.5 (Density function \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \)) Observe that the discrete density function \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \) in (11) is defined in a uniform-like way, similar to \( f_{\text{rand}} \) in (7). However, alternative definitions for \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \) are possible as long as \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}}(q_i, \sigma^{(i)}) \) satisfies Assumptions 4.2(i)-(iii) in (16); and (b) is biased to generate the state \( S_P^{q_1, q_1^{(i)}}(\sigma^{(i)}) \) if defined more often than the other states that belong to \( R_{\text{PTS}}(q_B^{\text{rand}}) \). Assumptions 4.2(i) and 4.2(ii) in (16) are required to guarantee that the proposed algorithm is probabilistically complete while Assumptions 4.2(i)-(iii) are required to prove the asymptotic optimality of the proposed method; see Section IV. Finally, bias in the sampling increases scalability of the proposed control synthesis method; see Section V. The fact that the density function (11) satisfies Assumption 4.2 of (16) is shown in Section IV. Note that, as it will be discussed later, \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \) can also change with iterations \( n \) of Algorithm 2. The same remark also holds for the density functions \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{aff}, k} \), that will be introduced in Section III-C for the construction of the suffix parts.

2) Construction of Paths: The construction of the tree \( G_T \) ends after \( n_{\text{max}} \) iterations, where \( n_{\text{max}} \) is user specified [line 9 Alg. 2]. Then, we construct the set \( P = V_T \cap X_{\text{goal}}^{\text{pre}} \) [line 22 Alg. 2] that collects all the states \( q_P \in V_T \) that belong to the goal region \( X_{\text{goal}}^{\text{pre}} \). Given the tree \( G_T \) and the set \( P \) [line 8 Alg. 1] that collects all states \( q_P \in X_{\text{goal}}^{\text{pre}} \cap V_T \), we can compute the prefix plans [lines 9-10 Alg. 1]. In particular, the path that connects the \( a \)-th state in the set \( P \), denoted by \( P(a) \), to the root \( q_P \) constitutes the \( a \)-th prefix plan and is denoted by \( P_{\text{pre}, a} \) [line 10 Algorithm 1]. Specifically, the prefix part \( P_{\text{pre}, a} \) is constructed by tracing the sequence of parent nodes starting from the node that represents the accepting state \( P(a) \) and ending at the root of the tree.

Remark 3.6 (Bias in Prefix Parts): During the construction of the prefix parts, the sampling density functions \( f_{\text{rand}} \) and \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \), are biased towards detecting states \( q_P = (q_{\text{PTS}}, q_B^{\text{feas}}) \in Q_T \), where \( q_{\text{PTS}} \) can be any state in \( Q_{\text{PTS}} \) and \( q_B^{\text{feas}} \) is given feasible final state of the NBA. Once such a state \( q_P = (q_{\text{PTS}}, q_B^{\text{feas}}) \) is detected, we can switch the bias towards a different feasible final state. Also, once all such feasible final states \( q_B^{\text{feas}} \) are detected or after a pre-determined number of iterations \( n \), we can switch from biased density functions to unbiased (uniform) density functions \( f_{\text{rand}} \) and \( f_{\text{new}, i}^{\text{pre}} \), that favor exploration of \( Q_P \) towards all directions, by selecting \( P_{\text{rand}} = D_{\text{min}}/|V_T| \) and \( P_{\text{new}} = 1/|R_{\text{PTS}}(q_B^{\text{rand}})| \), where recall that \( q_B^{\text{rand}} = \Pi_{i=1}^w(|V_T|, q_B^{\text{rand}}) \).

C. Construction of Optimal Suffix Parts

Once the prefix plans \( P_{\text{pre}, a} \) for all \( a \in \{1, \ldots, |P|\} \) are constructed, the corresponding suffix plans \( P_{\text{aff}, a} \) are constructed [lines 11-12 Alg. 1]. Specifically, every suffix part \( P_{\text{aff}, a} \) is a sequence of states in \( Q_P \) that starts from the state \( P(a) \) and ends at the same state \( P(a) \). To construct the suffix part \( P_{\text{aff}, a} \) we build a tree \( G_T = \{V_T, E_T, \text{Cost}\} \) that approximates the PBA \( P \), in a similar way as in Section III-B and implement a cycle-detection mechanism to identify cycles around the state \( P(a) \). The only differences are that: (i) the root of the tree is now \( q_P = P(a) \) [line 12 Alg. 1] detected during the construction of the prefix plans, (ii) the goal region corresponding to the root \( q_P = P(a) \), is defined as

\[
\lambda_{\text{goal}}(q_P) = \{q_P = (q_{\text{PTS}}, q_B) \in Q_T \mid \{q_P, L(q_{\text{PTS}}, q_B) \in \epsilon \rightarrow P\},
\]

(iii) we first check if \( q_P \in \lambda_{\text{goal}} \) [line 14 Alg. 1], and (iv) a probability density function \( f_{\text{aff}, a}^{\text{pre}} \) is different from (11) is employed. As for (iii), if \( q_P \notin \lambda_{\text{goal}} \) the construction of the tree is trivial, as it consists of only the root, and a loop around it with zero cost [line 15 Alg. 1]. If \( q_P \notin \lambda_{\text{goal}} \), then the tree \( G_T \) is constructed by Algorithm 2 [line 18 Alg. 1].
As for (iv), \( f_{\text{new},i}(q_i \mid q_{\text{rand}}^*) : \mathcal{R}_wTS(q_{\text{rand}}^*) \rightarrow [0, 1] \) [line 14] Alg. 3 that generates \( q_{\text{new}}^* \) is defined as
\[
f_{\text{new},i}(q_i \mid q_{\text{rand}}^*) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-p_{\text{new}}}{|\mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^*)|}, & \text{if } (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land \mathcal{L}_{\text{feas}}(q_i \mid L(i) = \emptyset), \\
\frac{p_{\text{new}}}{|\mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^*)|}, & \text{if } (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land \mathcal{L}_{\text{feas}}(q_i \mid L(i) = \emptyset), \\
p_{\text{new}} \cdot |\mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^*)|^{-1}, & \text{if } (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land (L(i) = \emptyset) \land (q_i \not\in S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^*) \land \mathcal{L}_{\text{feas}}(q_i \mid L(i) = \emptyset), \\
0, & \text{otherwise}. 
\end{cases}
\]
if \( q_{\text{new}}^* \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}^\text{dec} \), where \( \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}^\text{dec} \) denotes the set of all states \( q_i \in \mathcal{Q}_R \) for which \( q_{\text{new}}^* \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}^\text{dec} \). \( \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}^\text{dec} \) is defined in Alg. 2 that approximates the PBA is \( O(|V_T|) \), since \( |L(i)| = |V_T| - 1 \). Due to the incremental construction of the tree we get that \(|V_T| = |V_P| < |V_P| + |E_P|\) which shows that our proposed algorithm requires fewer memory resources compared to existing optimal control synthesis algorithms that rely on the construction of the PBA.\(^{[12, 13]}\)

Moreover, the time complexity of sampling the state \( q_{\text{new}}^* \) in Algorithm 3 is \( O(\max(|\mathcal{Q}_L|, |\mathcal{Q}_R|) \cdot (|\mathcal{Q}_L| + |\mathcal{Q}_R|)) \), where \( |\mathcal{Q}_L| \) denotes the total number of edges in the wTS, viewing it as a graph. The term \( \max(|\mathcal{Q}_L|, |\mathcal{Q}_R|) \) captures the computational time to construct the reachable set \( \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^*) \) for the largest state-space \( \mathcal{Q}_L \) among all robots; note that the sets \( \mathcal{R}_{\text{wTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^*) \) can be constructed simultaneously, i.e., in parallel, across the robots. Similarly, the term \( \max(|\mathcal{Q}_L|, |\mathcal{Q}_R|) \) is due to the computation of the shortest paths \( S\upsilon_{\text{rand}}^* \cup S\upsilon_{\text{pre}}^* \) using the Djikstra algorithm. Moreover, the time complexity of ‘extend’ and the ‘rewire’ step is \( O(|V_T| \cdot (N + 1)) \), as shown in Section IV-D in [18].

Remark 3.8 (Implementation): Note that in practice the prefix and suffix parts can be constructed in parallel. Specifically, as soon as a new final state is detected during the construction of the prefix parts, the construction of a new tree rooted at this final state can be triggered immediately so that the respective suffix part is detected. Moreover, observe that the for-loop over all the initial states of the PBA in line 5 of Algorithm 1 can also be executed in parallel. A distributed implementation of the ‘sample’, ‘extend’, and ‘rewire’ step is also presented in [21].

### IV. Convergence Analysis

In this section, we examine the correctness, optimality, and convergence rate of STyLuS* described in Algorithm 1. Specifically, in Section IV-A we show that STyLuS* is probabilistically complete and asymptotically optimal. Then, in Section IV-B we show that Algorithm 2 converges exponentially fast to the optimal solution of Problem 1. In what follows, we denote by \( \mathcal{G}_P^* = \{V_P, E_P, \text{Cost}\} \) the tree that has been built by Algorithm 2 at the \( n \)-th iteration for the construction of either a prefix or suffix part. We also denote the nodes \( q_{\text{rand}}^* \) and \( q_{\text{pre}}^* \) at iteration \( n \) by \( q_{\text{rand}}^r \) and \( q_{\text{pre}}^r \), respectively. The same notation also extends to \( f_{\text{new},i}, f_{\text{rand}}, f_{\text{pre}}, p_{\text{rand}}, \) and \( p_{\text{new}} \). Also, in what follows we define the reachable set of state \( q_P \in \mathcal{Q}_P \) as
\[
\mathcal{R}_P^P(q_P) = \{q_P \in \mathcal{Q}_P \mid q_P \rightarrow q_P \} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_P,
\]
i.e., \( \mathcal{R}_P^P(q_P) \) collects all states \( q_P \in \mathcal{Q}_P \) that can be reached in one hop from \( q_P \in \mathcal{Q}_P \).

#### A. Completeness and Optimality

In this section, we show that STyLuS* is probabilistically complete and asymptotically optimal. To show this, we first show the following results. The proofs of the following propositions can be found in Appendix A.

**Proposition 4.1 (Biased Probability Density \( f_{\text{rand}}^r(q_P) \)).** Assume that \( p_{\text{rand}} > \epsilon \), for all \( n \geq 1 \) and for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). Then, the probability density function \( f_{\text{rand}}(q_P \mid V_P^r) : V_P^r \rightarrow [0, 1] \) defined in (7) is (i) bounded away from zero on \( V_P^r \).
(ii) bounded below by a sequence \( g(n)(q_p, V^n_T) \), such that \( \sum_{n=1}^\infty g(n)(q_p, V^n_T) = \infty \), for any given node \( q_p \in V^n_T \), and (iii) can generate independent samples \( q_p^{\text{rand}, n} \).

Proposition 4.1 implies that \( f_{\text{rand}} \) defined in (7) satisfies Assumption 4.1 (i) and (iii) in (16) and the relaxed version of Assumption 4.1 (ii) discussed in Remark A.1 in (16). Note that to ensure that the sampling process is biased towards a final state, \( \epsilon \) should satisfy \( \epsilon \geq 0.5 \). Note that, since \( p_{n}^{\text{rand}} \) can change with \( n \), as long as \( p_{n}^{\text{rand}} > \epsilon \) for all \( n \geq 1 \), we can switch from biased to unbiased (uniform) sampling process by selecting \( p_{n}^{\text{rand}} = |D_{\text{rand}}|^n/|V|^n_T \), where in this case \( \epsilon = 1/|Q_T| \). Finally, due to Proposition 4.1, we can show that there exists an infinite sequence \( K \), so that for all \( k \in K \) it holds \( q_p^{\text{rand}, n+k} = q_p^{\text{rand}, n} \); see Lemma 5.4 in (16).

Proposition 4.2 (Biased Probability Density \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}} \)):
Assume that \( p^{\text{new}}_n > \epsilon \), for all \( n \geq 1 \) and for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). Then, the probability density functions \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}}(q_p, V_T) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{\text{new}}^{\text{i}}(q_i | q_{i-1}^{\text{rand}, n}) \) defined in (11), (13), and (14) (i) are bounded away from zero on \( R_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{rand}, n} \); (ii) for any fixed and given node \( q_p^{\text{PTS}} = q_p^{\text{rand}, n} \in V_T \), there exists an infinite sequence \( h^{n+k}(q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{rand}, n+k}) \) so that the distributions \( f_{\text{new}}^{n+k}(q_p, V_T) = q_p^{\text{rand}, n+k} \), for all \( k \in K \), satisfy \( f_{\text{new}}^{n+k}(q_p, V_T) = h^{n+k}(q_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{rand}, n+k}) \); and (iii) given a state \( q_p^{\text{PTS}, n} \), independent samples \( q_p^{\text{PTS}, n} \) can be drawn from the probability density function \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}} \).

Proposition 4.2 implies that the functions \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}} \) defined in (11), (13), and (14) satisfy Assumption 4.2 (i) and (iii) in (16) and the relaxed version of Assumption 4.2 (ii) discussed in Remark A.2 in (16). Note that to ensure that the sampling process is biased towards a final state, \( \epsilon \) should satisfy \( \epsilon \geq 0.5 \). Moreover, note that Proposition 4.2 holds even if the state which \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}} \) is biased at iteration \( n \) changes. This means that during the construction of the prefix part we can switch the bias towards a different state \( q_p^{\text{rand}, n} \) at any iteration \( n \). As before, the fact that \( p^{\text{new}}_n > \epsilon \) with \( n \geq 1 \) allows us to switch from biased to unbiased (uniform) sampling process by selecting \( p^{\text{new}}_n = 1/|R_{\text{PTS}}^{\text{rand}, n} | \), where in this case \( \epsilon = 1/|Q_T| \).

Since the probability density functions \( f_{\text{rand}}^{\text{n}} \) and \( f_{\text{new}}^{\text{n}} \) satisfy Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 in (16), we can show, following the same steps as in (16), that STyLuS* is probabilistically complete and asymptotically optimal.

Theorem 4.3 (Completeness & Optimality): Assume that there exists a solution to Problem 1. Then, STyLuS* described in Algorithm 1 is probabilistically complete, i.e., it will find with probability 1 a motion plan \( \tau = \phi \), as \( n_{\text{max}} \to \infty \) and \( n_{\text{max}} \to \infty \) and asymptotically optimal, i.e., it will find with probability 1 the optimal motion plan \( \tau = \phi \), as \( n_{\text{max}} \to \infty \) and \( n_{\text{max}} \to \infty \), that minimizes the cost function \( J(\tau) \) defined in (2).

B. Rate of Convergence
In this section, we show that STyLuS* converges exponentially to the optimal solution of Problem 1. To show this, we first show that it converges exponentially fast to a feasible solution of Problem 1.

Theorem 4.4 (Convergence Rate to a Feasible Solution): Assume that there exists a solution to Problem 1 in prefix-suffix form. Let \( p \) denote either the prefix or suffix part of this solution in the PBA defined as

\[
p = q^n_1, q^n_2, \ldots, q^n_{K-1}, q^n_K,
\]

that is of length (number of states) \( K \) and connects the root \( q^n_1 \) of the tree to a state \( q^n_K \) defined exactly as \( q^n_1 \), for all \( k \in \{1,2,\ldots,K-1\} \). Then, there exist parameters \( a(n)(p) \) such that the probability \( \Pi_{\text{Suc}}(q^n_K) \) that Algorithm 2 detects the state \( q^n_K \) is defined exactly as \( q^n_1 \), for all \( n \geq K \).

Proof: To prove this result, we model the sampling process discussed in Section III-B1 as a Poisson binomial process. Specifically, we define binomial random variables \( Y_n \) at every iteration \( n \) of Algorithm 2 so that \( Y_n \) is only the state \( q^n_k \) is sampled and added to the tree at iteration \( n \), where \( k \) is the smallest element of the set \( \{1,\ldots,K\} \) that satisfies \( q^n_k \notin V_T^{-1} \). Then, using the random variables \( Y_n \), we define the random variable \( Y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Y_n \) which captures the total number of successes of the random variables \( Y_n \) and we show that it follows a Poisson binomial distribution. Finally, we show that \( \Pi_{\text{Suc}}(q^n_K) \geq p(Y \geq K) \) which yields (17) by using the Chernoff bounds (39) to (Y).

Let \( Y_n \) for all \( k \in \{1,\ldots,K\} \) denote a Bernoulli random variable associated with iteration \( n \) of Algorithm 2 that is equal to 1 if the state \( q^n_k \) is sampled and added to the tree at iteration \( n \) or has already been added to the tree at a previous iteration \( m < n \), and is 0 otherwise. Observe that \( X_k^n \) is equal to 1 for all iterations \( n \geq 1 \) of Algorithm 2 since the tree is rooted at \( q^n_k \) and, therefore, \( q^n_k \in V_T^n \), for all \( n \geq 1 \). By construction of the sampling step in Section III-B1 the probability that \( X_k^n = 1 \) is defined as follows

\[
\Pi_{\text{add}}(\frac{K}{p}) = \begin{cases}
\frac{\sum_{q_p \in V^n_T \cap R^n_T(q^n_K)} [f_{\text{rand}}(q_p, V_T^n) f_{\text{new}}(q^n_k(p, V_T^n))]}{1 - \Pi_{\text{Suc}}(q^n_K)} & \text{if } q^n_k \notin V^n_T, \\
1 & \text{if } q^n_k \in V^n_T,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \Pi_{\text{Suc}}(q^n_k) \) is defined in (15), and \( q^n_k = \Pi_{\text{rand}}(q^n_K) \). Observe that if \( q^n_k \cap V^n_T(\frac{K}{p}) = \emptyset \) then \( \Pi_{\text{add}}(\frac{K}{p}) = 0 \). Moreover, note that \( q^n_k \) already belongs to \( V^n_T \) from a previous iteration \( m < n \) of Algorithm 2, then it trivially holds that \( \Pi_{\text{add}}(\frac{K}{p}) = 1 \).

Given the random variables \( X_k^n \), we define the discrete random variable \( Y_n \), initialized as \( Y_1 = X_k^1 \) and for every subsequent iteration \( n > 1 \) defined as

\[
Y_n = \begin{cases}
X_k^n, & \text{if } Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} \land (X_k^{n-1} = 0) \\
X_k^{n+1}, & \text{if } Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} \land (X_k^{n-1} = 1) \\
X_k^K, & \text{if } Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} \land (X_k^{n-1} = 1) \land (k + 1 > K).
\end{cases}
\]

In words, \( Y_n \) is defined exactly as \( Y_{n-1} \), i.e., \( Y_n = Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} = X_k^n \), if \( Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} = 0 \), i.e., if the state \( q^n_k \).
associated with the random variable $Y_{n-1} = X_{k-1}^n$ does not exist in the tree at iteration $n - 1$. Thus, in this case, $Y_n = X_k^n = 1$ if the state $q_k^n$ in (16) is added to the tree at iteration $n$; see the first case in (19). Also, $Y_n = X_k^{n+1}$ if $Y_{n-1} = X_k^{n-1} = 1$, i.e., if the state $q_k^n$ was added to the tree at the previous iteration $n - 1$. In this case, $Y_n = X_k^{n+1} = 1$, if the next state $q_k^{n+1}$ in (16) is added to the tree at iteration $n$ (or has already been added at a previous iteration $m < n$); see the second case in (19). If $k + 1 > K$ and $X_k^{n-1} = 1$, then we define $Y_n = X_k^n$; see the last case in (19). Note that in this case, $Y_n$ can be defined arbitrarily, i.e., $Y_n = X_k^n$, for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, since if $k + 1 > K$ and $X_k^{n-1} = 1$, then this means that all states that appear in (16) have been added to $\mathcal{Y}_T$. By convention, in this case we define $Y_n = X_k^n$. Since $Y_n$ is equal to $X_k^n$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, as per (19), for all $n \geq 1$, we get that $Y_n$ also follows a Bernoulli distribution with parameter of probability of success $p_n^{\text{succ}}$ equal to the probability of success of $X_k^n$ defined in (18), i.e.,

$$p_n^{\text{succ}} = \mathbb{P}\{q_k^n\},$$

where the index $k$ is determined as per (19).

Given the random variables $Y_n$, $n \in \{1, \ldots, n_{\max}\}$, we define the discrete random variable $Y$ as

$$Y = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} Y_n. \quad (20)$$

Observe that $Y$ captures the total number of successes of the random variables $Y_n$ after $n_{\max}>0$ iterations, i.e., if $Y = y$, $y \in \{1, \ldots, n_{\max}\}$, then $Y_n = 1$ for exactly $y$ random variables $Y_n$. Therefore, if $Y \geq K$, then all states that appear in the path $p$ of length $K$ given in (16) have been added to the tree, by definition of the random variables $Y_n$ and $Y$ in (19) and (20), respectively. Since there may be more than one path in the PBA that connect the goal state $q_P^k$ to the root $q_P$, we conclude that the probability $\Pi_{\text{succ}}(q_P^k)$ of finding the goal state $q_P^k$ within $n_{\max}$ iterations is at least $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq K)$, i.e.,

$$\Pi_{\text{succ}}(q_P^k) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y \geq K). \quad (21)$$

In what follows, our goal is to compute the probability $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq K)$. Observe that $Y$ is defined as a sum of Bernoulli random variables $Y_n$ that are not identically distributed as their probabilities of success $p_n^{\text{succ}}$ are not fixed across the iterations $n$, since the definition of $Y_n$ changes at every iteration $n$ as per (19). Therefore, $Y$ follows a Poisson Binomial distribution which has a rather complicated pmf which is valid for small $n$ and numerically unstable for large $n$; see e.g., [37, 38]. Therefore, instead of computing $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq K)$, we compute a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq K)$ by applying the Chernoff bound to $Y$; see e.g., [36]. Specifically, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y < K) < \mathbb{P}(Y \leq K) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq K \frac{\mu}{\mu})$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{Y} \leq (1 - (1 - \frac{1}{\mu}))\mu\right) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq (1 - \delta)\mu) \leq e^{-\frac{\mu^2}{2}},$$

where $\mu$ is the mean value of $Y$ defined as $\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} p_n^{\text{succ}}$. Also, the last inequality in (22) is due to the Chernoff bound in the lower tail of $Y$ and holds for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Observe that the Chernoff bound can be applied to $Y$, as it is defined as the sum of independent Bernoulli random variables $Y_n$. Specifically, the random variables $Y_n$ are independent since independent samples $q_n^{\text{new}}$ can be generated by the proposed sampling process, described in Section III-B1 by construction of the density functions $f_{\text{rand}}$ and $f_{\text{new},i}$. Substituting $\delta = 1 - \frac{K}{\mu}$ in (22), we get

$$\mathbb{P}(Y < K) \leq e^{-\frac{\mu}{2} + K - \frac{K^2}{2}}(\mathbb{E}) \leq e^{-\frac{\mu}{2} + K} = e^{-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} p_n^{\text{succ}}}{2} + K}, \quad (23)$$

where the last inequality is due to $e^{-\frac{K^2}{2}} \leq 1$. Recall that (23) holds for any $\delta = 1 - \frac{K}{\mu} \in (0, 1)$, i.e., for any $n_{\max}$ that satisfies

$$0 < \delta < 1 \implies K < \mu = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} p_n^{\text{succ}} \implies K < n_{\max}, \quad (24)$$

where the last inequality in (24) is due to $p_n^{\text{succ}} \leq 1$. Therefore, (23) holds as long as $n_{\max} > K$.

Note also that the inequality $0 < K < \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} p_n^{\text{succ}}$ in (24) is well defined, since $p_n^{\text{succ}} = \mathbb{P}_n(q_k^n)$ is strictly positive for all $n \geq 1$ by definition of $Y_n$. To show that, observe that if $Y_n = X_k^n$, for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, then it holds that $q_k^n \in \mathcal{V}_T$, by construction of $Y_n$ in (19). Then, by definition of the feasible path (1), we have that $q_k^n \in \mathcal{R}_T$. Thus, we get that $q_k^n \in \mathcal{V}_T \cap \mathcal{R}_T$. Then, $p_n^{\text{succ}} = \mathbb{P}_n(q_k^n) > 0$ (see also (18)) holds, since (i) $\mathcal{V}_T \cap \mathcal{R}_T(q_k^n) \neq \emptyset$, as $q_k^n \in \mathcal{V}_T \cap \mathcal{R}_T(q_k^n)$; (ii) $f_{\text{rand}}$ is bounded away from zero by construction in (7) (as long as $p_{\text{rand}} > 0$), for all $n \geq 1$, i.e., $f_{\text{rand}}(q_k^n - 1) > 0$, $q_k^n - 1 \in \mathcal{V}_T^{(1)}$; and (iii) $f_{\text{new},i}^{\text{succ}}$ is bounded away from zero on $\mathcal{R}_\text{wts}(q_i^{k-1})$, for all $n \geq 1$ and for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ by construction in (11), (13), and (14) (as long as $p_{\text{new},i} > 0$), i.e., $f_{\text{new},i}^{\text{succ}}(q_i^{k-1}) > 0$, where $q_i^k = \Pi_{\text{wts},i}(q_i^{k-1})$.

Thus, we proved that there exist parameters $\alpha_n(\cdot) = p_n^{\text{succ}} \in (0, 1]$ associated with every iteration $n$ of Algorithm 2 such that the probability $\Pi_{\text{succ}}(q_P^k)$ of finding the goal state $q_P^k$ within $n_{\max} > K$ iterations satisfies

$$1 \geq \Pi_{\text{succ}}(q_P^k) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(Y < K) \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} \alpha_n(0)}{2} + K},$$

completing the proof. 

Observe that Theorem 4.4 holds for any (biased or unbiased) density functions $f_{\text{rand}}^n$ and $f_{\text{new},i}^n$, that can possibly change with iterations $n$, as long as they (i) are bounded away from zero on $\mathcal{V}_T$ and $\mathcal{R}_\text{wts}(q_i)$, respectively; and (ii) can generate independent samples, which are essentially the Assumptions 4.1(i), 4.1(ii), 4.2(i), and 4.2(ii), respectively. Therefore, the
probability of finding a feasible plan converges exponentially to 1 even if we switch to an unbiased density function by selecting $p_{\text{rand}}^n = |P_m^n|/|\mathcal{V}^n_T|$ and $p_{\text{new}}^n = 1/|R_{\text{TS}}(\gamma_i, p_{\text{rand}}^n)|$.

**Remark 4.5 (Effect of bias):** The parameters $\alpha_n(p)$ in Theorem 4.4 capture the probability of sampling a state that belongs to a path in $G^T_2$ at iteration $n$; see also (18). The higher the parameters $\alpha_n(p)$ are, the larger the probability $\Pi_{\text{opt}}(q^T_2)$ is of detecting the goal state $q^K_2$ in $X_{\text{goal}}$ given any feasible path $p$ of length $K$ that connects $q^K_2$ to the root $q_1$ within $\max_n > K$ iterations; see also (17). This also implies that for a given $q^K_2,\text{feas}$ if the density functions $f_{\text{rand}}^n$ and $f_{\text{new}}^n$ are biased towards feasible states, i.e., towards states $q^K_2,\text{feas}$ with $R_{\gamma}(q^K_2,\text{feas}) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists at least one feasible (either prefix or suffix) path $p$ associated with $q^K_2,\text{feas}$ so that its parameters $\alpha_n(p)$ are larger than the parameters of any other feasible path, which can be associated with any NBA final state in case of prefix part. As a result, this path will be detected faster than any other feasible path in the PBA. If this path $p$ is a prefix path, then it ends at a PBA final state that is associated with $q^K_2$ while if it is a suffix part, its end state is the root. Note that using biased density functions does not mean that all, e.g., prefix paths associated with $q^K_2,\text{feas}$ will be detected faster than if unbiased density functions were used. Instead, what this means is that if the sampling process is biased towards feasible states $q^K_2,\text{feas}$, then there exists at least one prefix path associated with $q^K_2,\text{feas}$ that will be detected much faster. Also, paths which the sampling process is not biased to are expected to be detected slower than if unbiased (uniform) density functions are employed. Finally, recall that the sampling process is towards shortest paths, in terms of numbers of hops, in the state-space of both the WTS and the NBA. Therefore, the paths that the sampling functions are biased to are expected to have a small $K$, i.e., a small number of transitions/states. The latter is also verified through numerical experiments in Section V.

Remark 4.6 (Biasing towards infeasible states): Note that if the density functions $f_{\text{rand}}^n$ and $f_{\text{new}}^n$ are biased towards states that violate the LTL formula, i.e., states $q^K_2,\text{new}$ with $R_{\gamma}(q^K_2,\text{new}) = \emptyset$, then the parameters $\alpha_n(p)$, associated with a feasible path $p$, will have low values, by construction of $f_{\text{rand}}^n$ and $f_{\text{new}}^n$. As a result, a large number of iterations is expected until $p$ is detected due to Theorem 4.4. Also, note that in general, it is not possible to know a priori whether the states in the PBA which the sampling process is biased to are feasible or not; therefore, in practice, values for $p_{\text{rand}}^n$ and $p_{\text{new}}^n$ that are arbitrarily close to 1 should be avoided, as they might significantly slow down the synthesis part.

Using Theorem 4.4 and Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we establish the exponential convergence rate to the optimal, either prefix or suffix, path that connects a desired goal state to the root of the tree.

**Theorem 4.7 (Convergence Rate to the Optimal Path):** Assume that there exists a solution to Problem 1 in prefix-suffix form. Let $p^*$ denote either the prefix or suffix part of the optimal solution in the PBA defined as

$$p^* = q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_{K-1}, q^K_2,$$

that is of length $K$ (number of states) and connects the root $q^K_2$ of the tree to a state $q^K_2 \in X_{\text{goal}}$, where $q_2^k \rightarrow p q^{k+1}_2$, for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K - 1\}$. Then, there exist parameters $\gamma_n(q^K_2) \in (0, 1)$ for every state $q^K_2$ in (25) and every iteration of Algorithm 2, as well as an iteration $n_k$ of Algorithm 2 for every state $q^n_2$ in (25), so that the probability $\Pi_{\text{opt}}(p^*)$ that Algorithm 2 detects the optimal path (25) within $\max_n$ iterations satisfies

$$\Pi_{\text{opt}}(p^*) \geq \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} (1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma_n(q^K_2)}{\alpha_n(q^n_2)} + 1}) \cdot (1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma_n(q^n_2)}{\alpha_n(q^n_2)} + K}),$$

(26)

if $\max_n > 2K$. In (26), the parameters $\alpha_n(p^*)$ are defined as in Theorem 4.4 and $n$ is any fixed iteration of Algorithm 2 that satisfies $n \leq n_{\max} - K$.

Proof: To show this result, first we show that if all states in (25) exist in the tree $G^T_2$ within $n < n_{\max}$ iterations of Algorithm 2 and if these states are eventually selected (after iteration $n$) to be the nodes $q_{\text{new}}^n$ in the order that they appear in (25), then the optimal path (25) is detected by Algorithm 2. Second, we compute the probability that the above statement is satisfied within $n_{\max}$ iterations. Finally, we show that this probability is a lower bound to the probability of finding the optimal path (25), which yields (26).

First, assume that (i) all states $q_2^n$ exist in the tree at iteration $n < n_{\max}$, and (ii) there exists a finite sequence $N := \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{K-1}\}$ of iterations of Algorithm 2 where $n_{k+1} > n_k > n \iff q^n_2 = q_{\text{new}}^n$. In what follows, we use induction to show that the optimal path is detected at iteration $n_{K-1}$. Specifically, by assumptions (i) and (ii), we have that $q^n_2$ will be selected to be the state $q_{\text{new}}^n$ at iteration $n_{k-1}$, and if $q^n_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_1}$, observe that by definition of the optimal path (25), the optimal cost of $q^n_2$ is obtained when $q^n_2$ is directly connected to the root $q_1$. Therefore, by construction of the rewiring step, $q^n_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_1}$ will get rewired to $q^{n_1}_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_1}$ at iteration $n_1$. Next, the inductive step follows. By assumptions (i) and (ii), it holds that $q^{n_1}_2$ is selected to be the node $q_{\text{new}}^{n_1}$ at iteration $n_1 \implies q_{\text{new}}^{n_1}$ is connected to the root as in (25) (inductive assumption). We will show that at the subsequent iteration $n_k > n_{k-1}$, $q^n_2$ will get rewired to $q^{n_2}_2$, which is connected to the root as in (25). In particular, by assumptions (i) and (ii), we have that there exists an iteration $n_k > n_{k-1}$, such that $q^n_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_1}$ is selected to be the node $q_{\text{new}}^{n_2}$ while $q^{n_2}_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_2}$. Therefore, by definition of the optimal path (25), the optimal cost of $q^{n_2}_2$ is obtained when $q^{n_2}_2$ is connected to the root as in (25). Therefore, by construction of the rewiring step, we conclude that $q^{n_2}_2$ will get rewired to $q^{n_1}_2 \in V^n_{\gamma_1}$ at iteration $n_k$. Then, by induction, we conclude that at iteration $n_{K-1}$, the state $q_{\text{new}}^{n_{K-1}}$ will get rewired to $q^{n_{K-1}}_2$ which is connected to the root as in (25), i.e., the optimal path (25) exists in the tree at iteration $n_{K-1}$.

The probability that both assumptions (i) and (ii) will become true within $n$ and $n_{\max}$ iterations, respectively, is $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{max}) \cap A(n)) = \mathbb{P}(R(n_{max})) \mathbb{P}(A(n))$, where $A(n)$ is the event that all states in (25) have been added to the tree at iteration $n < n_{\max}$ and $R(n_{max})$ denotes the event that all the
states that appear in the optimal path (25) have been selected to be the nodes $q_{P_{\text{new}}}$ in the order they appear in (25) after the iteration $n_1$ and before the iteration $n_{\text{max}}$. Then, the probability that the optimal path is detected within $n_{\text{max}}$ iterations satisfies

$$
\Pi_{\text{opt}}(p^{*}) \geq \mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n)) \mathbb{P}(A(n)),
$$
(27)

where the inequality in (27) is due to the fact that satisfying assumptions (i) and (ii) is a sufficient, and not necessary, condition to find the optimal path.

In what follows, we compute a lower bound for the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n))$ and $\mathbb{P}(A(n))$ which we will then substitute in (27) to get (26). Recall that $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n))$ captures the probability that Algorithm 2 will reach all iterations $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_{K-1}$, after the iteration $n_\bar{i}$ (i.e., $\bar{n} < n_1$) and before the iteration $n_{\text{max}}$, given the event $A(n)$. Therefore, we first need to show that the sequence $N = \{n_1, \ldots, n_{K-1}\}$ exists since, otherwise, it trivially holds that $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n)) = 0$ for any $n_{\text{max}}$. Assume that such a sequence $N$ does not exist. Then, this means that there exists an iteration $n_\bar{k} \in N$, where $1 \leq \bar{k} < K$, such that after the iteration $n_\bar{k}$ the state $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}+1}$ will never be selected to be the node $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}+1}$. The latter implies that after the iteration $n_\bar{k}$ the state $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}+1}$ that is reachable from $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}} \in \mathcal{V}_{T_{\bar{k}}}$ as per (25), i.e., $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}} \rightarrow_{\bar{k}+1} q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}+1}$, will not be selected infinitely often to be the node $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{\bar{k}+1}$, which contradicts Corollary 5.6 of [16]. Therefore, we conclude that the sequence $N$ exists. Note that given $K$ and $n_{\text{max}}$, the sequence $N$ can only exist if $\bar{n} < n_{\text{max}} - K$,

$$\bar{n} < n_{\text{max}} - K,$$
(28)

since otherwise, there will not be enough iterations left after $\bar{n}$ so that the states $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, K-1\}$ are selected to be the nodes $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$.

Next, we compute a lower bound for the probability $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n))$. To do this, we first define Bernoulli random variables $Z_{\bar{k}}^{k}$ so that $Z_{\bar{k}}^{k} = 1$ if $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k} \in \mathcal{V}_{T_{\bar{k}}}$ at iteration $n$ of Algorithm 2 and 0 otherwise. By construction of the sampling step, $Z_{\bar{k}} = 1$ occurs with probability

$$
P_{\text{new}}^{\bar{k}}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}) = \sum_{q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k} \in \mathcal{V}_{T_{\bar{k}}} \cap \mathcal{R}_{T_{\bar{k}}}^{k}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k})} P_{\text{rand}}^{k}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}) f_{\text{rand}}^{k}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k} | q_{\text{PTS}}^{k}),
$$
(29)

where $\mathcal{R}_{T_{\bar{k}}}^{k}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k})$ is defined in (15) and $f_{\text{new}}^{k}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k} | q_{\text{PTS}}^{k}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} f_{\text{new},i}(q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k} | q_{\text{PTS}}^{k})$.

Given $Z_{\bar{k}}^{k}$, we define the following discrete random variables for all states $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, K-1\}$

$$
Z_{\bar{k}} = \sum_{n = n_{\bar{k}} - 1}^{n_{\text{max}}} Z_{\bar{k}}^{n},
$$
(30)

where $n_0 = \bar{n}$. Notice that the sum in (30) is well-defined as long as Algorithm 2 has reached iteration $n_{\bar{k}-1}$ within $n_{\text{max}}$ iterations. Also, note that $Z_{\bar{k}}$ follows a Poisson Binomial distribution, since it is defined as the sum of Bernoulli random variables that are not identically distributed. Moreover, observe that $Z_{\bar{k}}$ captures the total number of times $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ was selected to be the node $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ when $n \in [n_{\bar{k}+1}, n_{\text{max}}]$ i.e., after $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k-1} \in \mathcal{V}_{T_{\bar{k}}}$ was selected to be the node $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k-1}$. Therefore, $Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1$ means that $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ was selected to be $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ at least once in the interval $[n_{\bar{k}+1}, n_{\text{max}}]$. Thus, we can rewrite the event $R(n_{\text{max}})$ as

$$
R(n_{\text{max}}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{K-1} (Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1).
$$
(31)

Given (31) and using the Bayes rule, $\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n))$ can be written as follows

$$
\mathbb{P}(R(n_{\text{max}}) | A(n)) = \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{P}( (Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1) | B_k, A(n)),
$$
(32)

where $B_k = \bigcap_{i=1}^{K-1} (Z_i \geq 1)$, for all $k > 1$ and $B_0 = \emptyset$. In words, $\mathbb{P}( (Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1) | B_k, A(n))$ captures the probability of reaching iteration $n_k$ within $n_{\text{max}}$ iterations, given that iteration $n_{\bar{k}-1}$ has already been reached and all states $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ have been added to the tree by the iteration $\bar{n} < n_1$. Also, observe that $Z_{\bar{k}}$ is well-defined in (32). Specifically, recall that $Z_{\bar{k}}$, defined in (30), is well defined as long as Algorithm 2 reaches iteration $n_{\bar{k}-1}$ within $n_{\text{max}}$ iterations. This requirement is satisfied in (32) since the probability of $Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1$ is computed given the events $B_k$ and $A(n)$.

Following the same logic as in the proof of Theorem 4.4, we can show that

$$
\mathbb{P}( (Z_{\bar{k}} \geq 1) | B_k, A(n)) \geq 1 - e^{-\sum_{n_{\bar{k}} = k}^{n_{\text{max}}} \gamma_n(q_{\text{new}}^{k}) + K},
$$
(33)

as long as $n_{\text{max}} > n_{\bar{k}-1}$. In [33], $\gamma_n(q_{\text{new}}^{k})$ is $P_{\text{new}}^{k}(q_{\text{new}}^{k})$ defined in (29). Moreover, recall from the proof of Theorem 4.4 that

$$
P(A(n)) = \Pi_{\text{new}}(q_{\text{new}}^{k}) \geq 1 - e^{-\sum_{n_{\bar{k}} = k}^{n_{\text{max}}} \gamma_n(q_{\text{new}}^{k}) + K},
$$
(34)

which holds for $\bar{n} > K$, where $K$ is the length of any path, including the optimal path $p^{*}$, that connects $q_{P_{\text{new}}}^{k}$ to the root of the tree.

Substituting equations (32), (33), and (34) into (27) yields (26) which holds for $\bar{n} < n_{\text{max}} - K$ due to (28) and $n_{\bar{k}} > K$ due to (34) or, equivalently, for $\bar{n} < n_{\text{max}} - K$ and $n_{\text{max}} > 2K$ completing the proof.

Note that Theorem 4.7 holds for any (biased or unbiased) density functions $f_{\text{rand}}^{k}$ and $f_{\text{new},i}$, that can possibly change with iterations $n$, as long as they satisfy Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 of [15], respectively. Therefore, the probability of finding the optimal plan converges exponentially to 1 even if at any iteration $\bar{n}$ we switch bias to a different state or switch to an unbiased density function by selecting $P_{\text{rand}}^{k} = |P_{\text{min}}^{k}|/|\mathcal{V}_{T_{\bar{k}}}|$ and $P_{\text{new}} = 1/|\mathcal{R}_{\text{PTS}}(q_{\text{rand}}^{k})|$.

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present case studies, implemented using MATLAB R2015b on a computer with Intel Core i7 2.2GHz.
and 4Gb RAM, that illustrate the scalability of our proposed algorithm compared to state-of-the-art methods. Simulation studies that show the advantage of the employed reachability-based sampling process, discussed in Section III-B1 compared to sampling approaches that generate random states \(q_{t \text{prw}}\) that belong to \(Q_F\), as e.g., in [18], can be found in Section VI in [16]; see also Proposition 5.1 in [16].

Given a NBA that corresponds to the assigned LTL specification, the first step in the proposed algorithm is to construct the sets of feasible words \(\Sigma_{q_B,q_B'}\), \(q_B,q_B' \in Q_B\). Note that the construction of the sets \(\Sigma_{\text{feas}}\) can become computationally expensive as \(N\) and \(W\) increase since the size of \(A_P = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \bigcup_{e=1}^W \{ \pi_{r} \}\) also increases and so does the size of the alphabet \(\Sigma = 2^{A_P}\) and the size of \(\Sigma_{q_B,q_B'}\). To mitigate this issue, instead of defining the set of atomic propositions as \(A_P = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \bigcup_{e=1}^W \{ \pi_{r} \}\), we define the set \(A_P\) using the atomic propositions \(\{ \xi_e \} \cup \varnothing\), where \(\varnothing\) stands for the empty word and \(E\) denotes the total number of Boolean formulas \(\xi_e\) in conjunctive or disjunctive normal form that appear in the LTL formula and are defined over the atomic propositions \(\pi_{r_i}\). This allows us to construct smaller LTL formulas defined over \(2^{\{ \xi_e \} \cup \varnothing\}\). As a result, the computational cost of creating the NBA and the sets \(\Sigma_{\text{feas}}\) decreases. In the following case studies, the sets \(\Sigma_{q_B,q_B'}\) are computed using the software package [33] that relies on [34] for the construction of the NBA.

### A. Completeness, Optimality, and Scalability

a) Probabilistic Completeness & Scalability: In what follows, we examine the performance of STYLu** with respect to the number of robots and the size of the wTSs. The results for all considered planning problems are reported in Table I. In Table I, the first, second, and third column show the number \(N\) of robots, the size of the state-space \(Q_i\), which is the same for all wTSs, and the size of the state-space of the PBA, defined as \(|Q_B| = |Q_B| \prod_{i=1}^N |Q_i|\), respectively. Viewing the wTSs as graphs, the average degree of the nodes of the examined wTSs with \(|Q_i| = 9\), \(|Q_i| = 10^2\), \(|Q_i| = 10^3\), \(|Q_i| = 2.5 \cdot 10^5\), and \(|Q_i| = 10^4\) is 4, 12, 30, 20, and 42, respectively, for all robots \(i\) and for each case study in Table I. The fourth and fifth column of Table I show the total number of iterations \(n\) of Algorithm 2 required to find the first prefix and suffix part and the corresponding size of the constructed trees, respectively. The sixth column shows the time required until the first prefix and suffix part are detected, without executing the rewiring step. The runtime of NuSMV [19] or nuXmv [20] are reported in the last column. The ‘M’, in the last column, means that NuSMV and nuXmv failed to build the model of the multi-robot system and, therefore, we could not proceed to the model-checking process. On the other hand, ‘F’ means that the model was built but the LTL formula is too long, with thousands of logical operators and atomic propositions \(\pi_{r_i}\), to input it to NuSMV or nuXmv in a user-friendly way. Particularly, neither of NuSMV and nuXmv allow to define the LTL specifications in the more compact and symbolic form, discussed before, using the Boolean formulas \(\xi_e\). Instead, the LTL formulas have to be expressed explicitly using the atomic propositions \(\pi_{r_i}\).

For all case studies shown in Table I, we consider the following LTL task

\[
\phi = G(\xi_1 \rightarrow (\neg \xi_1 \cup L E_2)) \land (\square \neg \xi_1) \land (\square \neg \xi_3) \land (\square \neg \xi_4) \land (\neg \xi_5 \cup L E_3) \land (\square \neg \xi_5) \land (\square \neg \xi_6) \land (\square \neg \xi_7 \land \neg \xi_8),
\]

(35)

The LTL formula (37) is satisfied if (i) always when \(\xi_1\) is true, then at the next step \(\xi_1\) should be false until \(\xi_2\) becomes true; (ii) \(\xi_1\) is true infinitely often; (iii) \(\xi_3\) is true infinitely often; (iv) \(\xi_4\) is true infinitely often; (v) \(\xi_5\) is false until \(\xi_5\) becomes true; (vi) \(\xi_6\) is always false; (vii) \(\xi_7\) is true infinitely often; and (viii) eventually either \(\xi_7\) or \(\xi_8\) are true. Recall that, in (37), \(\xi_e\) is a Boolean formula in conjunctive or disjunctive normal form that is true depending on what atomic propositions \(\pi_{r_i}\) that are true. For instance, for the planning problem with order \(10^{21}\) in Table I, \(\xi_1\) is defined as

\[
\xi_1 = (\pi_{r_1}^{1000}) \land (\pi_{r_2}^{20} \lor \pi_{r_3}^{90} \lor \pi_{r_4}^{11}) \land (\pi_{r_5}^{1} \lor \pi_{r_6}^{20} \lor \pi_{r_7}^{25} \lor \pi_{r_8}^{35}),
\]

which is true if (i) robot 1 is in region \(r_{100}\); (ii) robot 8 is in one of the regions \(r_{20}, r_{90}\), and \(r_{11}\); and (iii) robot 9 is in one of the regions \(r_1, r_{10}, r_{25}\), and \(r_{35}\). All other Boolean formulas \(\xi_e\) are defined similarly. The considered LTL formula corresponds to a NBA with \(|Q_B| = 21, |Q_B'| = 1, |Q_B''| = 2\), and 125 transitions. Note that both final states of the NBA are feasible. Given the NBA, we construct the sets \(\Sigma_{\text{feas}}\) and \(\Sigma_{q_B,q_B'}\).
in 0.1 seconds approximately for all case studies in Table I.
To speed up the detection of the first feasible plan, we do not execute the rewiring step until the first final state and a loop around it are detected. Due to this modification, STyLuS* can only generate feasible plans; see also Section VI in [16] for relevant propositions.

Observe in Table I that STyLuS*, NuSMV, and nuXmv have comparable performances when both a small number of robots and small enough wTSs are considered; see e.g., the planning problems with order $10^3$, $10^{10}$, and $10^{21}$. However, as either the number of robots or the size of the wTSs increases, STyLuS* outperforms both NuSMV and nuXmv in terms of both runtime and the size of problems that it can handle. For instance, both NuSMV and nuXmv fail to build the model when $N = 1$ and $|\mathcal{Q}| = 10^4$, with average degree of the wTS equal to 42. As a result, it was impossible to synthesize a feasible motion plan using either NuSMV or nuXmv. In fact, for this single-robot planning problem, NuSMV could build the model only for much sparser wTSs with average degree equal to 4. In this case, the model was built in 15 minutes and the verification process finished in almost 1 second. On the other hand, for such sparse wTSs, STyLuS* synthesized a feasible prefix and suffix part in 16 and 14 seconds, respectively.

Moreover, observe in Table I that STyLuS* can synthesize feasible motion plans for large-scale multi-robot systems quite fast. For instance, it can synthesize in almost 35 minutes a feasible team plan $\tau$ for a team of $N = 200$ robots where each robot is modeled as a transition system with $|\mathcal{Q}| = 10^4$ states and the PBA has $|\mathcal{Q}_P| = 21 \times (10^4)^{200} \approx 10^{801}$ states. Finally, note that the runtimes reported in Table I can be significantly improved if STyLuS* is executed in parallel, as in [21], and if the shortest paths required by each robot in the sampling step are constructed simultaneously (and not sequentially) across the robots, as also discussed in Section III-E. Note also that the LTL formulas for the problems that involve more than 100 robots include thousands of logical operators and atomic propositions $\pi_j^i$ and, therefore, they are too long to input them to NuSMV and nuXmv in a user-friendly way. Also, recall that NuSMV and nuXmv can only generate feasible, and not optimal, plans; see also Section VI in [16] for relevant comparative simulation studies.

In Figures 3 and 4 we examine the performance of STyLuS* with respect to the sparsity of the transition systems wTS,

viewing them as graphs, for the planning problems of Table I with order $10^{10}$ and $10^{300}$, respectively. Specifically, in Figure 3(a) we observe that as the wTSs become denser, the required number of iterations to find the first feasible prefix-suffix plan decreases, since the length of the shortest paths in the wTSs, that are used in the sampling process, decreases. We also observe in Figure 3(b) that as the wTSs become denser, the total runtime to find the first feasible prefix-suffix plan initially increases and eventually starts to decrease. The reason is that as the wTSs become denser, the required shortest paths are more difficult to find and, therefore, the computational cost per iteration $n$ of generating the states $q^*_{F,\text{feas}}$ increases; see also Section III-E. However, as the wTSs becomes fully connected the total runtime starts to decrease, since only few iterations are required to find a feasible plan, as discussed before. The same observations apply to Figure 4 as well, that pertains to the planning problem with order $10^{301}$.

b) Switching between sampling densities: Since optimality depends on the discovery of prefix plans to all feasible final states, bias can be used sequentially to every feasible final state $q^*_{F,\text{feas}}$ to discover such plans, as also discussed in Remark 3.6. Once all feasible final states $q^*_{F,\text{feas}}$ have been detected, or after a pre-determined number of iterations $n$, the rewiring step is activated and uniform sampling is used to better explore the PBA towards all directions in $\mathcal{Q}_P$. Instead, biased sampling favors exploration towards the shortest paths that lead to the final states. Note also that the proposed method finds initial feasible plans with small enough cost $J(\tau)$, even though the rewiring step is not activated, due to the biased sampling that favors wTS transitions that correspond to the shortest NBA paths towards $q^*_{F,\text{feas}}$. For instance, observe in Figure 6 which concerns the planning problem with order $10^{10}$, that the cost of the best prefix part decreased from 415.48 to 314.58 meters within 5.5 hours. In total, 156 final states were detected and the first one was found after 0.42 seconds. On the other hand, using uniform sampling distributions from the beginning, the cost of the best prefix part decreased from 823.96 to 706.18 meters within 5.5 hours. In this case, 4 final states were detected and the first one was found after 1.34 hours.

c) Asymptotic Optimality: Next, we validate the asymptotic optimality of STyLuS* discussed in Theorem 4.3. Specifically, we consider a team of $N = 2$ robots modeled...
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the same structure as Table I. For all case studies shown in 

wTSs, as in the previous case study, but also for a larger and 

with respect to the number of the robots and the size of the 

runtime to find the optimal prefix part is illustrated in Figure 

5. Case Study III: Figures 5(a) and 5(b) show the evolution the cost 

of the best prefix part constructed by STyLuS∗ with respect to iterations \( n \) 

and runtime, respectively. Red diamonds denote a new final state detected 

by wTSs with \( |Q_1| = 16 \) states and 70 transitions, including 

self-loops around each state. The assigned task is expressed 

in the following temporal logic formula.

\[
\phi = \Box \Diamond (\pi_1^{f_6} \land \Diamond (\pi_2^{f_1 + i}) \land \Box (\neg \pi_1^{f_6}) \\
\land \Box (\pi_2^{f_1 + i} \rightarrow \Diamond (\neg \pi_2^{f_1 + i}) \land (\Diamond \pi_2^{f_1 + i}) \land (\Box \Diamond \pi_2^{f_1 + i}))
\] (36)

In words, this LTL-based task requires (a) robot 1 to visit 

location \( r_6 \), (b) once (a) is true robot 2 to visit location \( r_{14} \), 

(c) conditions (a) and (b) to occur infinitely often, (d) robot 

1 to always avoid location \( r_9 \), (e) once robot 2 visits location \( r_{14} \), 

it should avoid this area until robot 1 visits location \( r_4 \), 

(f) robot 2 to visit location \( r_{12} \) eventually, and (g) robot 2 to visit 

location \( r_{10} \) infinitely often. The NBA that corresponds 

to the LTL specification (36) has \( |Q_B| = 24 \) states with 

\( |Q^p_B| = 1 \), \( |Q^f_B| = 4 \), and 163 transitions. Specifically, 

the set of final states is defined as \( B_F = \{6, 9, 11, 13\} \) and all of 

them are feasible. Also, the state space of the corresponding 

PBA consists of \( |Q_{1-1}| = 164, 144 \) states, which is small 

enough so that the existing optimal control synthesis methods 

discussed in Section II-A can be used to find the optimal plan. 

Figure 5 shows the evolution of the cost of the best prefix part 

constructed by STyLuS∗ with respect to iterations \( n \) and time. 

Observe in Figure 5(a) that as \( n \) increases, STyLuS∗ finds 

the optimal prefix part which has cost 5 meters. The required 

runtime to find the optimal prefix part is illustrated in Figure 

5(b). On the other hand, the cost of the prefix part constructed 

by NuSMV and nuXmv is 8.8824 meters.

B. Scalability for larger and denser NBA

In this case study, we examine the performance of STyLuS∗ 

with respect to the number of the robots and the size of the 

wTSs, as in the previous case study, but also for a larger and 

denser NBA. The results are reported in Table III which has 

the same structure as Table II. For all case studies shown in 

Table III, we consider the following LTL task 

\[
\phi = G (\xi_1 \rightarrow (\Box \neg \xi_2 U \xi_2)) \land (\Box \Diamond \xi_1) \land (\Box \Diamond \xi_3) \land (\Box \Diamond \xi_4) \land \\
(\neg \xi_1 U \xi_5) \land (\Box \neg \xi_6) \land (\Box \Diamond \xi_7) \land (\Diamond \xi_8) \land (\Diamond \xi_9)),
\] (37)

The LTL formula (37) is satisfied if (i) always when \( \xi_1 \) is 

true, then at the next step \( \xi_1 \) should be false until \( \xi_2 \) becomes 

true; (ii) \( \xi_1 \) is true infinitely often; (iii) \( \xi_3 \) is true infinitely 

often; (iv) \( \xi_4 \) is true infinitely often; (v) \( \xi_1 \) is false until \( \xi_5 \) 

becomes true; (vi) \( \xi_6 \) is always false; and (vii) \( \xi_7, \xi_8 \) and \( \xi_9 \) 

are true in this order infinitely often. Also, the LTL formula (37) 
corresponds to a NBA with \( |Q_B| = 59, |Q^p_B| = 1 \), \( |Q^f_B| = 8 \), 
among which 6 final states are feasible, and 884 transitions. 

Given the NBA, we construct the sets \( \Sigma^{\text{feas}} \subset 2^{A_P} \) in 0.14 

seconds approximately for all case studies in Table III.

Observe in Table III that the total number of iterations and 

the total runtime to detect the first feasible plan have increased 

compared to the corresponding planning problems in Table II 

due to the larger size of the NBA. Moreover, observe that both 

NuSMV and nuXmv can find the first feasible plan faster than 

STyLuS∗ when planning problems with few robots and small 

wTSs are considered; see, e.g., the problems with order 103, 

1010, 1021 in Table III. However, similar to the previous case 

case study, when the number \( N \) of robots or the size of the wTSs 

increases, STyLuS∗ outperforms both model checkers both in 
terms of runtime and size of the state-space that they can 

handle.

Remark 5.1 (Self-loops in wTSs): Note that all wTSs 

considered in Tables III are constructed so that there are 

self-loops around each state, modeling in this way waiting actions 
of robots at all regions \( r_j \). If self-loops are removed, the number 
of required iterations and respective runtime increase, as 
then the length of the shortest loop around every state increases 
(from its previous value of 1). For instance, for the planning 
problem with order 1021 in Table III after removing all self-loops, 

the total number of iterations required to detect the first 
feasible prefix and suffix part have increased from \( n_{\text{Pre1}} = 33 \) 

and \( n_{\text{Suf1}} = 33 \) to \( n_{\text{Pre1}} = 533 \) and \( n_{\text{Suf1}} = 991 \), respectively. 

Similarly, the corresponding runtimes have increased from 0.7 

and 0.4 seconds to 7.1 and 10.6 seconds. On the other hand, 

NuSMV and nuXmv can synthesize feasible motion plans in 

almost 3 seconds. Adding or removing self-loops does not 

seem to affect much the runtime/scalability of NuSMV and 
uXmv.

C. Comparison with off-the-shelf model checkers: Summary

The numerical experiments presented in Sections V-A and 

V-B show that STyLuS∗ outperforms both NuSMV and nuXmv.
for large and dense wTSs, whether they have self-loops or not, and regardless of the size of the NBA. On the other hand, for small and sparse transition systems with or without self-loops, NuSMV and nuXmv become faster than STyLuS*, as the size of the NBA increases. Also, for small and sparse transition systems without self-loops, the off-the-shelf model checkers find feasible paths faster than STyLuS*. Nevertheless, NuSMV and nuXmv can only find feasible paths while STyLuS* can detect the optimal plan with probability that converges to 1 exponentially fast.

Finally, note that NuSMV and nuXmv cannot handle collision avoidance constraints that require all robots to maintain a distance between them that is always at least equal to $R$ units; see e.g., [39]. The reason is that a cost function cannot be embedded in the transition systems that are provided as an input to them. Instead, STyLuS* can check if such safety properties are satisfied every time a sample is taken. Figure 8 shows the total time required by STyLuS* to detect the final first state for the planning problem with order $10^{11}$ when collision avoidance constraints are imposed. Specifically, observe that as $R$ increases the runtime of STyLuS* increases, since the number of samples that are rejected increases due to the imposed proximity restrictions.

**D. The effect of biased sampling**

Next, we illustrate the effect of introducing bias in the sampling process on the control synthesis performance. Specifically in Figure 7 we show the probabilities $P(Y \geq K)$ and $\Pi_{suc}(q^K_F)$ defined in Theorem 4.4 for biased and unbiased sampling for various choices of $n_{\text{max}}$ and final states $q^K_F$. Recall that (i) $P(Y \geq K)$ captures the probability that all states that belong to a given feasible path $p$ of length $K$ that connects $q^K_F$ to the root have been added to the tree within $n_{\text{max}}$ iterations and (ii) $\Pi_{suc}(q^K_F) \geq P(Y \geq K)$, using either biased or unbiased sampling. Also, notice that as $n_{\text{pre}}$ increases, both probabilities $P(Y \geq K)$ and $\Pi_{suc}(q^K_F)$ converge to 1, using either biased or unbiased (uniform) sampling density functions, as expected due to Theorem 4.4.

In Figures 7(a)-7(c) and 7(d)-7(f) the density functions are biased to the feasible final states $q^K_F$ that is connected to the root through a feasible prefix part $p_1$ with length $K = 13$. In Figures 7(b) and 7(e) the state $q^K_F$ is selected as $q^K_F = ((13,10),6) \in Q_F$ that is connected to the root through a feasible prefix part $p_2$ with length $K = 6$. In fact, $p_2$ corresponds to the optimal prefix part. In Figures 7(c) and 7(f) the state $q^K_F$ is selected as $q^K_F = ((13,15),13) \in Q_F$ that is connected to the root through a feasible prefix part $p_3$ with length $K = 7$. Note that the feasible prefix paths $p_4$, $p_5$, and the respective final states $q^K_F$ are randomly selected.

Observe first that in Figure 7 as $n_{\text{pre}}$ increases, both probabilities $P(Y \geq K)$ and $\Pi_{suc}(q^K_F)$ converge to 1 for both biased and uniform (unbiased) sampling, as expected by Theorem 4.4. This shows probabilistic completeness of STyLuS*. Moreover, observe in Figure 7(a) that for small $n_{\text{max}}$, when sampling is biased towards $q^K_F$ is selected as $q^K_F = ((6,10),9) \in Q_F$ that is connected to the root through a feasible prefix part $p_4$ with length $K = 7$. Note that the feasible prefix paths $p_4$, $p_5$, and the respective final states $q^K_F$ are randomly selected.

| $n$ | $|Q_F|$ | $|Q|$ | $n_{\text{pre}} + n_{\text{suf}}$ | $|V_{\text{pre}}| + |V_{\text{suf}}|$ | $\text{Pre1} + \text{Suf1}$ | NuSMV/nuXmv |
|-----|-------|-------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1   | 100   | $10^4$ | 54 + 92          | 533 + 274        | 2.18+1.55 (secs) | M/M            |
| 1   | 1000  | $10^4$ | 78 + 51          | 326 + 252        | 1.84+1.37 (secs) | $< 1$ sec      |
| 1   | 10000 | $10^4$ | 150 + 107        | 769 + 364        | 19.2+11.2 (secs) | M/M            |
| 9   | 9     | $10^{10}$ | 93 + 27       | 400 + 168        | 20.7+18.9 (secs) | $< 1$ sec      |
| 10  | 100   | $10^{10}$ | 51+ 39         | 650 + 239        | 2.1+0.74 (secs)  | $\approx 32$ sec |
| 10  | 1000  | $10^{10}$ | 36 + 154        | 450 + 404        | 3.9+6.1 (secs)   | $\approx 800$ sec |
| 10  | 2500  | $10^{10}$ | 61 + 98         | 710 + 516        | 10.4+11.9 (secs) | M/M $\approx$ 32 mins |
| 10  | 10000 | $10^{10}$ | 47 + 164        | 722+604           | 56.6 + 98.1 (secs) | M/M            |
| 100 | 100   | $10^{10}$ | 21 + 117        | 154 + 1431       | 1.6+18.5 (secs)  | F/F            |
| 100 | 1000  | $10^{10}$ | 52 + 74         | 401 + 856        | 19.8+53.22 (secs) | M/M            |
| 100 | 10000 | $10^{10}$ | 39 + 89        | 398 + 1621       | 5.1+28.3 (mins)  | M/M            |
| 150 | 10000 | $10^{10}$ | 39 + 112        | 526+1864          | 8.3 + 60.11 (mins) | M/M           |
| 200 | 10000 | $10^{10}$ | 48 + 103        | 588 + 1926       | 11.7+65.9 (mins) | M/M            |
Fig. 7. Figures 7(a)—7(c) and Figures 7(d)—7(f) refer to the case where sampling is biased towards $j \in \{P\}$ when collision avoidance constraints are imposed for various choices of $K$. The average runtime for $N$ experiments for every value of $n$ was estimated from a total of 100 experiments for various choices of $n$. To generate the results of Figure 7 the rewiring step is deactivated.

Fig. 8. Case Study I ($N = 10$ robots, $|Q| = 1000$ states): Comparison of the average runtime for 5 experiments required to detect the first final state when collision avoidance constraints are imposed for various choices of $R$. PBA while biased sampling favors exploration in the vicinity of the shortest paths, in terms of hops, to the final states.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper proposed a new optimal control synthesis algorithm for multi-robot systems with temporal logic specifications. We showed that the proposed algorithm is probabilistically complete, asymptotically optimal, and converges exponentially fast to the optimal solution. Finally, we provided extensive comparative simulation studies showing that the proposed algorithm can synthesize optimal motion plans from product automata with state-spaces hundreds of orders of magnitude larger than those that state-of-the-art methods can manipulate.
APPENDIX A

PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS

A. Proof of Proposition 2.1

Part (i) holds, since $p_{\text{new},i}^{n} > \epsilon$, by assumption, for all $n \geq 1$. Part (iii) trivially holds by definition of $f_n^{\text{rand}}$ in (7). As for part (ii) observe that $\max(1/D_{\min}, 1/|V^f_n|V^f_n) \geq 1/|Q|$. Therefore, for any fixed and given node $f$, $\min(n, n^{\epsilon}, 1 - n^{\epsilon}, 1 - n^{\epsilon})/|Q| > 0$. Since there exists an infinite sequence $\{f_n^{\epsilon}, (q_{\text{rand}}_n)^{\epsilon}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} = (\min(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)/|Q|)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $f_n^{\epsilon}(q_{\text{rand}}_n) \geq g_n^{\epsilon}(q_{\text{rand}}_n)$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g_n^{\epsilon}(q_{\text{rand}}_n) = \infty$, therefore, $\min(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)/|Q|$ is a strictly positive constant term completing the proof.

B. Proof of Proposition 2.2

Part (i) holds since $f_n^{\text{rand},i}(q_{\text{rand}},n)$ is bounded away from zero on $R_{\mathcal{W}TS}, (q_{\text{rand},n}^{i})$, for all robots $i$ as $p_{\text{new}}^{n} > \epsilon$, for all $n \geq 1$, by assumption. Part (iii) trivially holds by definition of $f_n^{\text{new}}$. As for part (ii), following the same logic as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we can show that for the functions $f_{n+k}^{\epsilon}$ in (11), (13), and (14), it holds that $f_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\text{rand}},n+k) \geq \min(p_{\text{new}}^{n+k}, 1 - p_{\text{new}}^{n+k})/(|Q|_k) > \min(1 - \epsilon, n^{\epsilon})/(|Q|_k)$. Thus, we get $f_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\epsilon})_{\text{rand},n+k} = N_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\text{rand}},n+k) \geq (\min(1 - \epsilon))_{\text{rand},n+k} > 0$ so that $f_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\epsilon})_{\text{rand},n+k} > h_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\epsilon})_{\text{rand},n+k}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{n+k}^{\epsilon}(q_{\epsilon})_{\text{rand},n+k} = \infty$, since $\min(1 - \epsilon)/|Q|$ is a strictly positive constant term completing the proof.
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