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Abstract—Reinforcement learning (RL) is a promising approach and has limited success towards real-world applications, because ensuring safe exploration or facilitating adequate exploitation is a challenges for controlling robotic systems with unknown models and measurement uncertainties. Such a learning problem becomes even more intractable for complex tasks over continuous space (state-space and action-space). In this paper, we propose a learning-based control framework consisting of several aspects: (1) linear temporal logic (LTL) is leveraged to facilitate complex tasks over an infinite horizon which can be translated to a novel automaton structure; (2) we propose an innovative reward scheme for RL-agent with the formal guarantee such that global optimal policies maximize the probability of satisfying the LTL specifications; (3) based on a reward shaping technique, we develop a modular policy-gradient architecture utilizing the benefits of automaton structures to decompose overall tasks and accelerate the performance of learned controllers; (4) by incorporating Gaussian Processes (GPs) to estimate the uncertain dynamics of the system, we synthesize a model-based safeguard using Exponential Control Barrier Functions (ECBFs) to ensure the safety-critical requirements with high-order relative degrees. In addition, we utilize the properties of LTL automatons and ECBFs to construct a guiding process to further improve the efficiency of exploration. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the framework via several robotic environments. And we show such an ECBF-based modular deep RL algorithm achieves near-optimal success rates and guard safety with a high probability confidence during training.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a sequential decision-making process and focuses on learning the optimal policies that maximize the long-term reward via sampling from unknown environments \cite{1}. Markov decision processes (MDP) are often employed to model the dynamics of the interaction. Growing research has been devoted to studying RL-based motion planning over an MDP without any prior knowledge on complex robot dynamics and uncertainty models. This approach has been successfully employed in robotics where it was extended to continuous state and action spaces via actor-critic methods \cite{2,3,4}. However, the key feature of RL is its sole dependence on exploration of the environment. The challenge of interpreting the inner workings of many RL algorithms makes it intractable to encode the behaviors of the systems during training, especially while the learning parameters have not yet converged to a stable control policy. The safe-critical notation refers the systems in which certain failure conditions are not tolerable and may be harmful for physical systems. Due to safe-critical requirements of real-world applications during training, any modern RL algorithm has limited success of physical systems beyond simulated applications. In this work, we propose a safe-critical control framework to address the issue of the uncertain model over continuous space integrating with the data-driven machine learning.

Safe RL is an emerging research filed focusing on finding the optimal policy that maximizes the expected return while ensuring safe-critical constraints during learning process \cite{5}. As for unknown models with noisy measurements, Gaussian processes (GPs) \cite{6} have shown to be efficient state-space-driven method online validating non-parametric model with a probabilistic confidence. Recent learning-based results \cite{7,8,9} utilize GPs for reachability analysis and iterative predictions. Furthermore, the works \cite{10} and \cite{11} study Lyapunov verification for safety in terms of stability guarantees and model predictive control for safe exploration, respectively. In the field of nonlinear controls, Control Barrier Function (CBF) was introduced as an effective tool for safe-critical constraints \cite{12}. The approach has been successfully integrated with GPs to certify learning-based control schemes while ensuring safe exploration \cite{13,14}. Both of them propose a GP-based safe online RL via CBF: Richard et al. \cite{14} developed a guiding process and guaranteed the performance when applying trust region policy optimization (TRPO). However, all these works mainly focus on conventional control objectives, and not complex logic specifications. In this framework, we study the problems of safe RL from the perspective of formal methods defining high-level tasks. In addition, it is challenging to design a suitable and dense reward, especially for complex tasks \cite{1}. Reward sparseness negatively impacts the optimal convergence of the overall learning process. Reward shaping is a common strategy to accelerate policy learning and relevant techniques are well-studied in literature \cite{15,16,17}. Recent work in \cite{18} proposes the use of self-supervised online reward shaping to speed up learning without altering the optimal policy. To facilitate learning of complex high-level tasks, this work also designs a automatic reward shaping process to guide the agent toward the satisfaction.
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A. Related Works

Formal logics embrace rich expressivity to describe robotic objectives [19]. Considering automaton-free strategies, [20], [21] take robustness of signal temporal logic (STL) as rewards to guide RL-agents, and [22] proposed a neuro-feedback control to satisfy tasks defined as Signal interval temporal logic (SITL). Linear temporal logic (LTL) is leveraged as a mature tool to express complex tasks. Model checking of the MDP models commonly involves converting LTL formulas into different automaton structures e.g., deterministic finite automaton (DFA), deterministic Rabin automaton (DRA) [23], limit deterministic (generalized) Büchi automaton (LDBA or LDGBA) [24]. By taking DFA as reward machines to guide the LTL satisfaction, works [25]–[27] applied Deep Q Network (DQN) [28] and addressed high-dimensional state space. However, DFA can only define LTL tasks over finite horizons. As for infinite horizons, DFA was adopted to guide LTL satisfaction in [29]–[31], but [32] analyzes that DRA may fail to lead the RL-agent completing the missions. Instead, results [32], [33] applying LDBA as instructions of RL-agents, which only has one accepting set resulting sparser reward. Among the automatic architectures, employing LDGBA with several accepting sets for RL becomes a better choice and existing works [32], [34] leveraged it over discrete spaces. When considering continuous state and action space, [35]–[37] incorporate deep deterministic policy gradient (DDPG) [2]. However, utilizing the standard DDPG algorithm in [35] cannot handle complex infinite-horizons tasks resulting in an unsatisfactory success rate, and [38] shows that directly applying LDGBA with deterministic policies to create product MDPs [36], [37] may fail to satisfy the LTL specifications. The application of deterministic policies is crucial for high dimensional analysis especially for the continuous space, since many widely-applied deep RL methods adopt the actor-critic architecture relying on deterministic policies e.g., deep deterministic policy gradients (DDPG). Our recent letter [38] bridges the gap by designing a novel embedded automaton structure, and proposes a provably-correct modular architecture that jointly optimizes LTL sub-policies and achieves the satisfaction with high success rates. Most importantly, none of works above consider the safety-critical aspects during training.

Considering control synthesis of safe RL subject to LTL, recent works [39]–[41] either required strong assumptions about the dynamics of RL-agent (known model), or can only handle low-dimensional state or action space. As for continuous space, Li et al. [40] first combined the CBF and safe RL guided by robustness of Truncated LTL (TLTL) for satisfaction in dynamic environment, which can be also extended to combine with GPs and relax the assumption of known dynamic systems. However, TLTL can only express the formulas over finite horizons. In contrast, this work mainly considers the LTL formulas with repetitive patterns, where finite horizons can be regarded as a special case.

B. Contributions

In this paper, we introduce a general learning-based control architecture for satisfying high-level complex tasks captured by LTL, while safe-critical requirement is achieved during training. Our approach is realized in a policy gradient RL setting. The LTL formulas are converted to Embedded LDGBAs (E-LDGBA) to synchronously record unvisited accepting sets. A novel reward scheme is developed to guide the RL-agent search towards the desired behaviors, based on which we create a modular DDPG to achieve goals with ideal performance. Then a safe module is presented and associated with the learning process, which can be regarded as a model-based "shield" through GPs and CBF that can handle higher relative degrees. In particular, the CBF compensators are synthesized online by quadratic programming based on the learned nominal model of GPs. Notably, the designed modular DDPG composed from automaton components is a distributed architecture of neural networks that can be trained synchronously during each episode. This work extends [38] in two main directions. Firstly, we consider online safe-critical control during learning process. Secondly, a RL guiding module is proposed to generate efficient exploration. To best of our knowledge, this is the first work that fully integrates automaton structures and the property of CBF to improve exploration and enhance the optimal satisfaction.

Compared with existing literature, our detailed contributions are:

- From the task-perspective, this work generalizes the deep RL-based approach for LTL specification over both infinite horizons and finite horizons.
- As for the automaton-based learning, we develop an innovative automaton (E-LDGBA) structure to enable the deterministic policy for acceptance satisfaction, which allows adopting DDPG and more advanced algorithms for control over continuous space.
- On the aspect of reward scheme, we propose an automatic reward function. To improve the density of rewards, we design a reward shaping procedure without adding extra hyper-parameters, while still keeping the original optimality. The overall RL reward scheme also provides formal guarantees for maximum probability of satisfaction.
- In order to improve the success rate of learned policies, we propose a modular DDPG by utilizing the automaton states to decompose the complex task into several subtasks. This innovative architecture is shown to outperform the method of directly applying the standard DDPG algorithms. It’s worth to point out the modular neural network structure using automaton can be easily adopted with any other advanced deep RL algorithms e.g. Soft Actor-Critic (SAC).
- To ensure safety, we incorporate GPs and ECBFs in the form of higher relative degrees, which can be efficiently solved using the quadratic programming online and provides a bounded confidence evaluation. We design a guiding procedure by integrating the violation of automaton structure and the perturbations of ECBF to facilitate the efficiency of exploration and promote the outputs of the deep RL deriving from the set of safe policies.
C. Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follow. In Section II we introduce the modeling framework and formally define the problem. Section III presents a novel design of automaton structure with its benefits to reformulate the problem. In Section IV the automatic dense reward scheme is proposed and verified to guide the RL-agent for satisfaction with maximum probability. Then a modular deep RL architecture is developed to effectively find the approximated optimal policy over continuous space. Based on Section IV, Section V synthesizes a safe-critical methodology for the learning process with efficient guiding and safe feasibility enabled. In Section VI the experimental results are presented. Last, Section VII concludes the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Markov Decision Processes and Reinforcement Learning

The evolution of a dynamic system $S$ starting from any initial state $s_0 \in S_0$ is given by

$$
\dot{s} = f(s) + g(s)a + d(s)
$$

where $s \in S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state vector in the compact set $S$ and $a \in A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input. The functions $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $g: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $d: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are locally Lipschitz continuous. In [1], the function $f$ and $g$ are known, and $d$ is unknown with uncertainties. Given an $k$-step output trajectory $y = y_0 y_1 y_2 \ldots y_k$ of $S$, the dynamic system is considered a piecewise function with respect to $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Assumption 1. We have access to measurements $s \in S$ and $y = f(s) + g(s)a + d(s) + \omega$, where $\omega$ is additive Gaussian noise.

Assumption 2. The unknown function $d$ has low complexity, as measured under the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) norm $\|d\|_{\text{RKHS}}$. $d$ has a bounded RKHS norm with respect to known kernel $k$, that is $\|d_j\|_{\text{RKHS}} \leq \infty$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where $d_j$ represents the $j$-th component of the vector function $d$, where $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

As for most kernels in practice, an RKHS is dense in the space of continuous functions restricted to a compact domain $S$. Thus, assumption 2 indicates we can uniformly approximate the continuous function $d$ on a compact set $S$.

To capture the robot motion and environmental properties, we use a continuous labeled Markov decision processes (cl-MDP) [43] to abstract the interaction between dynamic system $S$ of the robot and a environment.

Definition 1. A cl-MDP is a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (S, S_0, A, p_S, \Pi, L, S)$, where $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous state space, $S_0$ is a set of initial states, $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a continuous action space, $\Pi$ is a set of atomic propositions, $L: S \to 2^\Pi$ is a labeling function, and $p_S$ represents the system dynamics as $p_S: \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times A \times S \to [0, 1]$ is a Borel-measurable conditional transition kernel such that $p_S(\cdot | s, a)$ is a probability measure of $s \in S$ and $a \in A$ over the Borel space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of all Borel sets on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The transition probability $p_S$ captures the motion uncertainties of the agent.

Here the state-space and action-space in $\mathcal{M}$ and [1] are the same. The cl-MDP $\mathcal{M}$ evolves by taking an action $a_i$ at each stage $i$. A control policy is a sequence of decision rules $\xi = \xi_0 \xi_1 \ldots$ at each time step, which yields a path $s = s_0 a_0 s_1 a_1 s_2 a_2 \ldots \overline{M}$ s.t. for each transition $s_i \overset{a_i}{\rightarrow} s_{i+1}$, $a_i$ is generated based on $\xi_i$.

Definition 2. A control policy $\xi = \xi_0 \xi_1 \ldots$ is station if $\xi_i = \xi, \forall t \geq 0$, where $\xi$ can be deterministic so that $\xi: S \to A$ or randomized so that $\xi: S \times A \to \{0, 1\}$. On the other hand, a policy is memoryless if if each $\xi_i$ depends on its current state, and a policy is finite-memory or history dependent if $\xi_i$ depends on its past path history until $i$.

A key aspect of cl-MDPs to observe is that optimal policies may be the form of finite-memory that makes problems intractable. And stochastic policies are not ideal when considering continuous action-space. In this work, we show how to apply memoryless and deterministic policies to efficiently address the formulated problem.

Since $d$ is an unknown function, $p_S$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is unknown a priori. We must learn desired policies through data.

Assumption 3. We have access to observations $L(s_t)$ at every time step $t$.

Note assumption 1 and 3 state that a RL-agent can only measure its current state and observe the associated label.

Given a cl-MDP $\mathcal{M}$, let $A: S \times A \times S \to \mathbb{R}$ denote a reward function. Given a discounting function $\gamma: S \times A \times S \to \mathbb{R}$, the expected discounted return under policy $\xi$ starting from $s \in S$ is defined as

$$
U^\xi(s) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \cdot A(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \mid s_0 = s \right].
$$

An optimal policy $\xi^*$ maximizes the expected return for each state $s \in S$, i.e.,

$$
\xi^* = \arg \max_{\xi} U^\xi(s).
$$

The function $U^\xi(s)$ is often referred to as the value function under policy $\xi$. Without information of $p_S$, reinforcement learning (RL) [44] is a powerful strategy to find the optimal policy. In this work, we focus on the policy gradient methods employing deep neural networks to parameterize the policy model, due to their excellent performance on control problems over continuous state-space and action-space. The details of our RL algorithm are provided Section IV.

B. Barrier Functions

Definition 3. An arbitrary safe set $C$ is defined by the super-level set of a continuous differential function (barrier function) $h: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$
C = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(s) \geq 0 \},
$$

$$
\partial C = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(s) = 0 \},
$$

$$
\text{Int}(C) = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(s) > 0 \}
$$

(2)
where $\partial \mathcal{C}$ is the boundary and $Int(\mathcal{C})$ is the interior of the $\mathcal{C}$. The set $\mathcal{C}$ is forward invariant for the system (1) if $\forall s_0 \in \mathcal{C} \cap S_0$, the condition $s_t \in \mathcal{C}, \forall t \geq 0$ holds. The system (1) is safe with respect to the set $\mathcal{C}$ if such a set is forward invariant.

This framework applies barrier functions in the form $h \geq 0$ to define safe properties of a given cl-MDP. Consequently, it is assumed that any safe-critical constraint can be represented as \( h \geq 0 \). We also assume RL-agents start from initial state $s_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ s.t. $h \geq 0$, which indicates safe-critical constraints will not be violated at beginning.

C. Linear Temporal Logic

Linear temporal logic (LTL) is a formal language that is extensively employed to describe complex mission tasks. An LTL formula is built on a set of atomic propositions $\Pi$, which are properties of system states that can be either true or false, and standard Boolean operators such as $\wedge$ (conjunction), $\vee$ (disjunction), $\neg$ (negation), and temporal operators such as $\Diamond$ (eventually), $\Box$ (next), $\square$ (always), and $\mathcal{U}$ (until). The semantics of an LTL formula are interpreted over a word, which is an infinite sequence $o = o_0o_1\ldots$ where $o_i \in 2^\mathcal{I}$ for all $i \geq 0$, and $2^\mathcal{I}$ represents the power set of $\mathcal{I}$. Denote by $o \models \varphi$ if the word $o$ satisfies the LTL formula $\varphi$. Detailed descriptions of the syntax and semantics of LTL can be found in [19].

Definition 4. Given a cl-MDP and $k_b$ barrier functions, the safe set can be defined as $\mathcal{C} = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_b \geq 0, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, k_b\} \}$. A safe task is denoted as $\phi_{safe}$, and $\phi_{safe} \models \mathcal{C}$ defines a safe task satisfied by rendering forward invariant with respect to $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 4 builds a connection between safe sets and LTL safe tasks such that optimal policies satisfying the LTL task $\Pi_{safe}$ will render safe invariant.

D. Problem Formulation

Consider an RL-agent with partial known dynamic system as the form of $S$ with the corresponding safe set $\mathcal{C}$ that performs a mission described by an LTL formula $\phi = \square\phi_{safe} \wedge \phi_g$ where $\phi_{safe} \models \mathcal{C}$. The interaction of the RL-agent with the environment is modeled by a cl-MDP $\mathcal{M} = (S, S_0, A, p_s, \Pi, L, S)$. Under a policy $\xi = \xi_0\xi_1\ldots$ with unknown transition probabilities $p_s$, the induced path over $\mathcal{M}$ is $s_\infty^\xi = s_0, s_1, s_2, \ldots$. Let $L(s_\infty^\xi) = l_0l_1\ldots$ be the sequence of labels associated with $s_\infty^\xi$ such that $l_i \in L(s_i), \forall i \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. Denote the satisfaction relation by $L(s_\infty^\xi) \models \phi$ if the induced trace satisfies $\phi$. The probabilistic satisfaction under the policy $\xi$ from an initial state $s_0 \in S_0$ can then be defined as

$$Pr^\xi_M(\phi) = Pr^\xi_M(L(s_\infty^\xi) \models \phi | s_\infty^\xi \in S_\infty^\xi),$$

where $S_\infty^\xi$ is a set of admissible paths from the initial state $s_0$ under the policy $\xi$.

Assumption 4. It is assumed that there exists at least one policy whose induced traces satisfy the task $\phi$ with non-zero probability. And there is no conflicts between $\phi_g$ and $\phi_{safe}$.

III. AUTOMATON SYNTHESIS

A. E-LDGBA

Given an LTL that specifies a complex task, the satisfaction of the LTL can be evaluated by an LDGBA [24]. Before defining LDGBA, we first introduce the generalized Büchi automaton (GBA).

Definition 5. A GBA is a tuple $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where $Q$ is a finite set of states; $\Sigma = 2^\mathcal{I}$ is a finite alphabet; $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow 2^Q$ is the transition function, $q_0 \in Q$ is an initial state, and $F = \{F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_f\}$ is a set of accepting sets with $F_i \subseteq Q, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$.

Denote by $q = q_0q_1\ldots$ a run of a GBA, where $q_i \in Q, i = 0, 1, \ldots$. The run $q$ is accepted by the GBA, if it satisfies the generalized Büchi acceptance condition, i.e., $\inf(q) \cap F_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$, where $\inf(q)$ denotes the infinitely part of $q$.

Definition 6. A GBA is an LDGBA if the transition function $\delta$ is extended to $Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}) \rightarrow 2^Q$, and the state set $Q$ is partitioned into a deterministic set $Q_D$ and a non-deterministic set $Q_N$, i.e., $Q_D \cup Q_N = Q$ and $Q_D \cap Q_N = \emptyset$, where

- the state transitions in $Q_D$ are total and restricted within it, i.e., $|\delta(q, \alpha)| = 1$ and $\delta(q, \alpha) \subseteq Q_D$ for every state $q \in Q_D$ and $\alpha \in \Sigma$,
- the $\epsilon$-transition is not allowed in the deterministic set, i.e., for any $q \in Q_D$, $\delta(q, \epsilon) = \emptyset$, and
- the accepting sets are only in the deterministic set, i.e., $F_i \subseteq Q_D$ for every $F_i \in F$.

To convert an LTL formula to an LDGBA, readers are referred to Owl [25]. However, previous works [24], [19] have shown that directly utilizing LDGBA with the deterministic...
Algorithm 1 Procedure of E-LDGBA

1: procedure INPUT: (LDGBA \( \mathcal{A} \), \( f_V \), \( T \) and length \( L \))
2: \( \) Output: A valid run \( \mathcal{q} \) with length \( L \) in \( \mathcal{A}_0 \)
3: set \( T = F \) and \( count = 1 \)
4: set \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} = q \)
5: while \( count \leq L \) do
6: \( \) \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} = \delta(\mathcal{q}_{cur}, \alpha) \)
7: \( T = f_V(\mathcal{q}_{next}, T) \)
8: \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} = \mathcal{q}_{next} \)
9: \( \) check if \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} \) is an accepting state
10: \( \) add state \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} \) to \( \mathcal{q} \)
11: \( count++ \) and \( \mathcal{q}_{cur} = \mathcal{q}_{next} \)
12: end while
13: end procedure

policy may fail to satisfy LTL specifications due to its several accepting sets, and many advanced deep RL algorithms are based on the assumption that there exists at least one deterministic policy to achieve desired objective. As a result, LDGBA can not be adopted with DDPG algorithm. To overcome the difficulty, we propose a designed E-LDGBA as follow.

For an LDGBA \( \mathcal{A} \), a tracking-frontier set \( T \) is designed to keep track of unvisited accepting states. Particularly, \( T \) is initialized as \( T_0 = F \) and \( B \) is a Boolean variable, which indicates the satisfaction of accepting condition for each round. The set \( (T, B) = f_V(q, T) \) is synchronously updated as:

\[
T(q, T) = \begin{cases} 
(T \setminus F_j, \text{False}) & \text{if } q \in F_j \text{ and } F_j \in T, \\
(F \setminus F_j, \text{True}) & \text{if } q \in F_j \text{ and } T = 0, \\
(T, \text{False}) & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

Definition 7 (Embedded LDGBA). Given an LDGBA \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F) \), its corresponding E-LDGBA is denoted by \( \mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \eta, F, f_V, T, B) \) where \( T \) is initially set as \( T_0 = F \) s.t. \( \eta = Q \times 2^F \) is the set of augmented states and \( 2^F \) denotes all subsets of \( F \) e.g. \( \eta = (q, T) \); The finite alphabet \( \Sigma \) is the same as the LDGBA; The transition \( \delta \in \Sigma \cup \{\} \times \{\} + 2^\eta \) is defined as \( \delta(\eta, \sigma) \) with \( \sigma \in (\Sigma \cup \{\}) \), e.g., \( \eta = (q, T) \) and \( \delta = (q', T) \), and it satisfies two conditions: 1) \( \delta(\eta, \sigma) = q' \), and 2) \( T \) is synchronously updated as \( T = f_V(q', T) \) after transition \( \delta = (q', \alpha) \).

In Definition 7 the state-space is embedded with the tracking-frontier set \( T \) that can be practically represented via one-hot encoding based on the indices of accepting states, which is synchronously updated after each transition. We here abuse the tuple for the definition of E-LDGBA. Once an accepting set \( F_j \) is visited, it will be removed from \( T \). If \( T \) becomes empty, it will be reset as \( F \setminus F_j \). The accepting state of E-LDGBA is determined based on the current automaton state such that the accepting set should be unvisited for each round of the repetitive task. Alg. 1 shows the procedure of generating a valid run for E-LDGBA. Such a novel design ensures all accepting sets of original LDGBA to be visited in each round under the deterministic policy.

Denote \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) and \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) as the E-LDGBA and LDGBA, respectively, for an LTL formula \( \phi \). Let \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \subseteq \Sigma^\omega \) and \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \subseteq \Sigma^\omega \) be the accepted language of the \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) and \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) automaton, respectively, with the same alphabet \( \Sigma \). Based on [19], \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \subseteq \Sigma^\omega \) is the set of all infinite words accepted by \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) that satisfy LTL formula \( \phi \).

Lemma 1. For any LTL formula \( \phi \), we can construct LDGBA \( \mathcal{A}_\phi = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F) \) and E-LDGBA \( \mathcal{A}_\phi = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \eta, F, f_V, T) \). Then it holds that

\[
\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi).
\]

Proof. See Appendix A-A

As illustrated in problem [1], this work studies the LTL formulas as the form \( \phi = \Box\phi_{safe} \land \phi_q \). We can define a sink component based on the property \( \phi_{safe} \) as:

Definition 8. A non-accepting sink component \( \mathcal{Q}_{sink} \subseteq \mathcal{Q} \) of an E-LDGBA is the union of all strongly connected graph with no outgoing transitions induced by a set of states \( Q_{sc} \) such that the accepting condition can not be satisfied if starting from any state in \( \mathcal{Q}_{sink} \).

The automaton will enter into \( \mathcal{Q}_{unsafe} \) whenever \( \phi_{safe} \) is violated, which means \( \phi \) can not be satisfied anymore. The \( \mathcal{Q}_{unsafe} \) can be applied as a safe indicator during training.

B. Embedded Product MDP

To satisfy a complex LTL-defined task over infinite horizons, we can create a product structure \( \pi \), and any policy \( \pi \) of \( P \) is a memoryless policy which can be projected into a finite-memory policy \( \pi \) in \( M \) [19].

Definition 10. Given a cl-MDP \( M \) and an LDGBA \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \), the EP-MDP is defined as \( \mathcal{P} = M \times \mathcal{A}_\phi = (X, U, P, x, x_0, F^*, S, T, f_V, B) \), where \( X = S \times 2^Q \) is the set of product states, i.e., \( (x, q, T) \in X \); \( \mathcal{U} = A \cup \{\} \) is the set of actions, where the \( \epsilon \)-actions are only allowed for transitions from \( Q_N \). \( x_0 = (s_0, q_0) \) is the initial state; \( P = \{P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_f\} \) where \( P_j = \{s, \eta\in X|s, q, \eta \in \mathcal{F}_j, j \in \{1, \ldots, f\}\} \); \( p^\pi \) is the transition kernel for any transition \( x, u, x' \) with \( x = (s, \eta) \) and \( x' = (s', \eta') \) such that: (1) \( p^\pi(x, u, x') = p^\pi(s', a, \phi) \) if \( s' \sim p^\pi(\cdot | s, a, \phi) \); (2) \( p^\pi(x, u, x') = 1 \) if \( u \in \{\epsilon\}, \eta' \in \delta(\eta), \epsilon \) and \( s' = s \); and (3) \( p^\pi(x, u, x') = 0 \) otherwise.

The EP-MDP \( \mathcal{P} \) captures the identification of admissible agent motions over \( M \) that satisfy the task \( \phi \). Let \( \pi \) denote a policy over \( P \) and denote by \( x_0 \in X_0 = x_0 x_1 x_2 \ldots \) the infinite path generated by \( \pi \). Suppose \( x_0 \in Q_{sink} \) over \( \mathcal{P} \) corresponds to a path \( s = s_0 s_1 \ldots \) over \( M \) with associated labels \( L(s) = l_0 l_1 \ldots \). Since the state \( x_t \) is unique given the
agent’s past path $s [: t]$ and past labels $L(s [: t])$ up to $t$, any policy over $\mathcal{P}$ are the memory-less policy.

A path $x_\infty$ satisfied the acceptance condition denoted as $x_\infty = \text{Acc}_\pi$ if $\inf (x_\infty) \cap F_\pi \neq \emptyset$, $\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$, and an accepting path satisfies the LTL task $\phi$. We denote $Pr_\pi \left[ x_0 = \text{Acc}_\pi \right]$ as the probability of satisfying the acceptance of $\mathcal{P}$ under policy $\pi$ starting from initial state $x_0$, and denote $Pr_{\text{max}} \left[ x_0 = \text{Acc}_\pi \right] = \max Pr_\pi \left[ x_0 = \text{Acc}_\pi \right]$. As a result, finding a policy $\xi$ of $\mathcal{M}$ to satisfy $\phi$ is equivalent to searching a policy $\pi$ of $\mathcal{P}$ to satisfy the accepting condition. As a result, we aim at synthesizing policies over $\mathcal{P}$ to solve Problem 1.

Remark 2. Explicitly constructing the EP-MDP is impossible over continuous space. In this work, we generate EP-MDP on-the-fly, which means the algorithm tracks the states of an underlying structure based on definition 10.

C. Properties of EP-MDP

A sub-MDP $\mathcal{M}(S', \mathcal{A}')$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is a pair $(S', \mathcal{A}')$ where $S' \subseteq S$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ is a finite action space of $S'$ such that (i) $S' \neq \emptyset$, and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A}'(s), \forall s \in S'$; (ii) $\{s' \in S' | p_s(s, a, s') > 0, \forall s \in S, a \in \mathcal{A}'(s)\}$. An induced graph of $\mathcal{M}(S', \mathcal{A}')$ is denoted as $G(S', \mathcal{A}')$ that is an directed graph, where $S'$ is regarded as a set of nodes, and if $p_s(s, a, s') > 0$, for any $s, s' \in S$, there exists a edge between $s, s'$ in $G(S', \mathcal{A}')$. A sub-MDP is called a strongly connected component (SCC) if its induced graph is strongly connected such that for all pairs of nodes $s, s' \in S'$, there is a path from $s$ to $s'$. Given a MDP and one of its SCCs, there may exist paths staring within the SCC and ending outside of the SCC.

Definition 11. A Markov chain $MC_\pi$ is a sub-MDP of $\mathcal{P}$ induced by a policy $\pi$.

Definition 12. Given an EP-MDP $\mathcal{P}$ under policy $\pi$, a bottom strongly connected component (BSCC) of the Markov chain $MC_\pi$ is a strongly connected component with no outgoing transitions.

Definition 13. A sub-MDP $\mathcal{M}(S', \mathcal{A}')$ is called an end component (EC) of $\mathcal{M}$ if it’s a BSCC. An EC $\mathcal{M}(S', \mathcal{A}')$ is called a maximal end component (MEC) if there is no other EC $\mathcal{M}(S', \mathcal{A}')$ such that $S' \subseteq S''$ and $\mathcal{A}'(s) \subseteq \mathcal{A}''(s), \forall s \in S$.

Consider a sub-EP-MDP $\mathcal{P}^\prime(X',U')$, where $X' \subseteq X$ and $U' \subseteq U$. If $\mathcal{P}^\prime(X',U')$ is a maximum end component (MEC) of $\mathcal{P}$ and $X' \cap F_0^\prime \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$, then $\mathcal{P}^\prime(X',U')$ is called an accepting maximum end component (AMEC) of $\mathcal{P}$. Once a path enters an AMEC, the subsequent path will stay within it by taking restricted actions from $U'$. Satisfying task $\phi$ is equivalent to reaching an AMEC 19. Moreover, a MEC that does not intersect with any accepting sets is called a rejecting MEC (RMEC) and a MEC intersecting with only partial accepting sets is called a neutral maximum end component (NMEC).

Definition 14. States of any Markov chain $MC_\pi$ under policy $\pi$ can be represented by a disjoint union of a transient class $T_\pi$ and $n_R$ closed irreducible recurrent classes $R_\pi$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_R\}$ 46.

Under policy $\pi$, the notation $T_\pi$ represents the behaviors before entering into MECs and $R_\pi$ involves the behaviors after entering into a MEC.

Lemma 2. Given an EP-MDP $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{A}_0$, the recurrent class $R_\pi$ of $MC_\pi$, $\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n_R\}$, induced by $\pi$ satisfies one of the following conditions: (i) $R_\pi \cap F_i^\prime \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$, or (ii) $R_\pi \cap F_i^\prime \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$.

Proof. See Appendix A-B.

Lemma 2 indicates that, for any policy, all accepting sets will be placed either in the transient class or in the recurrent classes. As a result, we can exclude the case of the RMEC, which simplifies the analysis of the accepting condition of EP-MDP related to the MEC.

To fully utilizes benefits of the LTL and E-LDGBA to specify the safe-critical control requirement in definition 5 we define the sink components for the EP-MDP as:

Definition 15. Given an EP-MDP $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{A}_0$, the non-accepting unsafe sink component can be defined as: $X_{\text{unsafe}} \subseteq X$ s.t. $X_{\text{unsafe}} = \{s, q \in X | q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\text{unsafe}}\}$.

Based on 19 deriving the system entering into $X_{\text{unsafe}}$ violates the representation of safety constraint over $\mathcal{P}$. The problem 7 can be reformulated as: Problem 2.

To solve problem 2 we also divide the solution into two parts. Section 4 of this paper constructs a modular RL architecture to generate RL controllers of solving the part (i) of problem 2. Section 3 of this paper fulfill the requirement in part (ii) of problem 2 by proposing a GP-based ECBF compensators for the RL controllers to ensure the safety during training.

IV. LEARNING-BASED CONTROL

First, Subsection IV-A develops a base reward design over the EP-MDP to guide the RL-agent to find an optimal policy satisfying the LTL task with maximum probability. In order to improve the reward density, Subsection IV-B synthesizes a potential function for the reward shaping process where the original optimal policies are verified to remain invariant. Finally, Subsection IV-C shows how to apply the shaped reward function to construct a modular deep RL architecture and effectively solve part (i) of Problem 2.

A. Base Reward Scheme

Let $F_0^\prime$ denote the union of accepting states, i.e., $F_0^\prime = \{x \in X | x \in F_i^\prime, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}\}$. For each transition $(x, u', x')$ in the EP-MDP, the reward and discount function only depend on current state $x$, i.e., $R(x, u', x') = R(x)$ and $\gamma(x, u', x') = \gamma(x)$. 


Inspired by $[33]$, we propose a reward function as:

$$R(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - r_F, & \text{if } x \in F_U^P, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and a discounting function as

$$\gamma(x) = \begin{cases} r_F, & \text{if } x \in F_U^P, \\ \gamma, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $r_F(\gamma_F)$ is a function of $\gamma_F$ satisfying $\lim_{\gamma_F \to 1^-} r_F(\gamma_F) = 1$ and $\lim_{\gamma_F \to 1^-} 1 - r_F(\gamma_F) = 0$.

Given a path $x_t = x_tx_{t+1} \ldots$ starting from $x_t$, the return is denoted by

$$D(x_t) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \gamma(x_t[j]) \right) R(x_t[i]) \quad (8)$$

where $\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} := 1$ and $x_t[i]$ denotes the $(i+1)$th state in $x_t$.

Based on (8), the expected return of any state $x \in X$ under policy $\pi$ can be defined as

$$U(\pi)(x) = \mathbb{E}[D(x_t) | x_t[t] = x]. \quad (9)$$

Due to several accepting sets of the E-LDGBA resulting in more complicated situations, e.g., AMEC, NMEC and RMEC, even though one adopts the previous reward design, the same conclusion about (9) in $[33]$ cannot hold in this work. Importantly, we establish the following theorems which bridges the gap between probabilistic guarantees and acceptance satisfaction and is one of the main contributions.

**Theorem 1.** Given the EP-MDP $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{A}_0$, for any state $x \in X$, the expected return under any policy $\pi$ satisfies

$$\exists i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}, \lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} U(\pi)(x) = \Pr_{\pi} \{\Box F_i^P\} \quad (10)$$

where $\Pr_{\pi} \{\Box F_i^P\}$ is the probability that the paths starting from state $x$ will eventually intersect a $F_i^P \in F^P$.

**Proof.** See Appendix A-C

**Theorem 2.** Consider an EP-MDP $\mathcal{P}$ to an LTL formula $\phi$. Based on Assumption 1, there exists a discount factor $\gamma$, with which any optimization method for (9) with $\gamma_F > \gamma$ and $r_F > \gamma$ can obtain a policy $\pi$, such that the induced run $r_F^\pi$ satisfies the accepting condition of $\mathcal{P}$ with non-zero probability.

**Proof.** See Appendix A-D

Theorem 2 proves that by selecting $\gamma_F > \gamma$ and $r_F > \gamma$, optimizing the expected return in (9) can find a policy satisfying the given task $\phi$ with non-zero probability. Finally, the following conclusion of probabilistic satisfaction holds.

**Theorem 3.** Given an EP-MDP $\mathcal{P}$, by selecting $\gamma_F \to 1^-$, the optimal policy $\pi^*$ that maximizes the expected return (9) also maximizes the probability of satisfying the accepting condition, i.e., $\Pr_{\pi^*} \{x_0 = Acc_P\} = \Pr_{\max} \{x_0 = Acc_P\}$.

**Proof.** Since $\gamma_F \to 1^-$, we have $\gamma_F > \gamma$ and $r_F > \gamma$ from Lemma 2. There exists an induced run $r_F^\pi$ satisfying the accepting condition of $\mathcal{P}$. According to Theorem 1, $\lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} U(\pi^*)(x)$ is exactly equal to the probability of visiting the accepting sets of an AMEC. Optimizing $\lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} U(\pi^*)(x)$ is equal to optimizing the probability of entering AMECs.

**B. Dense Reward Shaping**

Since the base reward function in Section IV-A is always zero for $x \notin F_U^P$, the reward signal might become sparse. To further increase the density of the reward, we propose a potential function $\Phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$, and transform the reward as follows:

$$R'(x, u^P, x') = R(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot \Phi(x') - \Phi(x) \quad (11)$$

Given $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{A}_0 = \{X, U^P, p^P, x_0, F^P, T, f_V, B\}$, let $F_U = \{q \in Q | q \in F_i, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}\}$ denote the union of automaton accepting states. For the states of $\mathcal{P}$ whose automaton states belong to $Q \setminus (F_U \cup q_0 \cup Q_{sink})$, it is desirable to assign positive rewards when the agent first visits them and assign large value of reward to the accepting states to enhance the convergence of neural network. Starting from the automaton initial state, exploring any automaton state in $Q \setminus (F_U \cup q_0 \cup Q_{sink})$. The set $T_{\Phi}$ is then updated after each transition of $(s, q, T, u^P, (s', q', T))$ of $\mathcal{P}$ as:

$$f_\Phi(q', T) = \begin{cases} T_{\Phi} \setminus q', & \text{if } q \in T_{\Phi}, \\ T_{\Phi} \setminus q' \setminus \Phi, & \text{if } B = \text{True}, \\ T_{\Phi}, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The set $T_{\Phi}$ will only be reset when $B$ in $f_V$ becomes True, indicating that all accepting sets in the current round have been visited. Then the potential function $\Phi(x)$ for $x = (s, q, T)$ is constructed as:
Proposition 1. Given a PL-MDP $\mathcal{M}$ and an E-LDGBA $\mathcal{A}_\phi$, by selecting $\gamma_F \rightarrow 1^-$, the optimal policy $\pi^*$ that maximizes the expected return in (15) by applying the shaped reward in (11) in the corresponding EP-MDP also maximizes the probability of satisfying $\phi$, i.e., $\Pr_{\pi^*}[x_0 \models \text{Acc}\mathcal{P}] = \Pr_{\pi_{\text{max}}}[x_0 \models \text{Acc}\mathcal{P}]$.

Proof. The work of [15] has shown that optimizing the expected return in (15) using the shaped reward in (11) is equivalent to optimizing $\pi$ with the base reward scheme, and the generated optimal policies from these two forms are the same. According to Theorem 3 one has the result.

Next, we take the above design into a policy gradient RL algorithm to effectively find the approximated optimal policy over continuous space.

C. Modular Deep RL

The objective of policy-based RL attempts to find the optimal policy that maximizes the long-term expected return (15). There are several common methods: (i) policy iteration, (ii) derivative-free optimization, (iii) deep policy gradient (DPG). This work can be adopted to any of them. To address the MDPs with continuous state and action space, we implement the deep deterministic policy gradient (DDPG) algorithm [2].

Different from directly adopting the DDPG, this framework proposes a modular architecture to improve the performance of the task satisfaction, and its general idea is to divide the LTL task into several sub-tasks based on the automaton structure and apply several DDPG for each sub-task.

The basics of DDPG is to approximate the current deterministic policy via a parameterized function $\pi(x; \theta^u)$ called actor. The actor is a deep neural network whose set of weights are $\theta^u$. The critic function also applies a deep neural network with parameters $\theta^Q$ to approximate action-value function $Q(x, a; \theta^Q)$, which is updated by minimizing the following loss function:

$$L(\theta^Q) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta^u}} \left[ (y - Q(x, \pi(x; \theta^u) | \theta^Q))^2 \right],$$

(16)

The actor can be updated by applying the chain rule to the expected return with respect to actor parameters $\theta^u$ as the following policy gradient theorem:

$$\nabla_{\theta^u} U^\pi(x) \approx \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta^u}} \left[ \nabla_{\theta^u} Q(x, \pi(x; \theta^u) | \theta^Q) \right]_{\pi_{\theta^u} = \pi(x; \theta^u)} \nabla_{\theta^u} \pi(x; \theta^u).$$

(17)

The complex LTL task $\phi$ can be divided into simple composable modules. Each state of the automaton in the LDGBA is a module and each transition between these automaton states is a "task divider". In particular, given $\phi$ and its LDGBA $\mathcal{A}_\phi$, we propose a modular architecture of $|Q|$ DDPG respectively, i.e., $\pi_{q_i}(x; \theta^u)$ and $Q_{q_i}(x, a; \theta^Q)$ with $q_i \in Q$, along with their own replay buffer. Experience samples are stored in each replay buffer $\mathcal{B}_{q_i}$ in the form of $(x, u^\pi, R(x), \gamma(x), x')$. By dividing the LTL task into sub-tasks, the set of neural nets acts in a global modular DDPG architecture, which allows the agent to jump from one module to another by switching between the set of neural nets based on transition relations of $\mathcal{A}_\phi$. 

Figure 2. Example of modular architecture based on reward shaping for the LTL formula $\varphi_P$. The distributed actor-critic neural networks are constructed based on the LDGBA components and are learning synchronously online.
Example 2. Continuing with example [1] Fig. [2] shows the modular DDPG architecture corresponding to the LTL formula $\phi_P$ based on the reward shaping scheme, where each pair of actor critic neural networks represents the standard DDPG structure along with an automaton state, and the transitions of them are consistent with the LDGBA structure.

Remark 3. In the modular architecture, instead of dividing complex tasks by the states of E-LDGBA that has more automaton states $Q$ due to the embedded frontier set, we decompose the overall task based on the more compact set of states $Q$ of LDGBA, which simplifies the number of distributed pairs of actor-critic, and reduces the complexity of training and achieves the same objective.

The proposed method to solve a continuous MDP with LTL specifications is summarized in Alg. [3] Line (8-12) and line (13-15) represent the learning process with and without safe leaning enabled. Details of safe learning and exploration guiding are introduced in [4] Instead of constructing the EP-MDP priori, product states of EP-MDP are synchronized on-the-fly (line 14-15). We assign each individual replay buffer $B_{q_i}$ and a random process noise $N_{q_i}$. The corresponding weights of modular networks, i.e., $Q_{q_i}(x,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_i}})$ and $\pi_{q_i}(x|\theta^{\pi_{q_i}})$, are also updated at each iteration (line 18-23). All neural networks are trained using their own replay buffer, which is a finite-sized cache that stores transitions sampled from exploring the environment. Since the direct implementation of updating target networks can be unstable and divergent [28], the soft update [18] is employed, where target networks are slowly updated via relaxation (line 23).

Note that for each iteration we first observe the output of the shaped reward function $R'$, then execute the update process via $f_V$ and $f_b$ (line 14).

Theorem 4. Given a PL-MDP $M$ and an E-LDGBA $A_{q_i}$, the optimal policy $\pi^*$ generated from modular DDPG/PPo by applying the shaped reward (17) maximizes the probability of satisfying $\phi$ in the limit i.e., $Pr^{\pi^*}[x_0 \models AccP] \approx Pr_{max}[x_0 \models AccP]$. 

Proof. Theorem [5] can be directly proved according to Proposition [1] and the nature of nonlinear regression for deep neural networks (DNNs).

Theorem [5] and Proposition [1] assume that all state-action values can be exactly optimized, which is not in practical when considering continuous space. As for DNNs, we have to stop the training after finite number of steps in practice and the synthesised policy derived from this nonlinear regression process might be sub-optimal with respect to the true $\pi^*$ as in Theorem [4]. It’s also worth to note our algorithm can be easily extended with other advanced deep RL algorithms e.g. soft actor-critic (SAC) [47].

V. SAFE LEARNING AND EXPLORATION GUIDING

Continuing with the deep RL-based control above, this Section focuses on adding the safety guard as a "shield" during learning process. First, subsection \ref{sec:proof} introduce GPs to approximate the unknown model in (1). Then subsection \ref{sec:algorithm} presents the Safe modular DDPG.

Algorithm 2 Safe modular DDPG

1: procedure INPUT: (MDP $M$, LDGBA $A_{q_i}$)
2: Output: modular DDPG for optimal policy $\pi^*$
3: Initialization: $[Q]$ actor $\pi_{q_i}(x|\theta^{\pi_{q_i}})$ and critic networks $Q_{q_i}(x,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_i}})$ with arbitrary weights $\theta^{\pi_{q_i}}$ and $\theta^{Q_{q_i}}$ for all $q_i \in Q$;
4: $[Q]$ corresponding target networks $\pi_{q_i}(x|\theta^{\pi_{q_i}})$ and $Q_{q_i}(x,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_i}})$
5: with weights $\theta^{\pi_{q_i}}$ and $\theta^{Q_{q_i}}$ for each $q_i \in Q$, respectively; $[Q]$ replay buffers $B_{q_i}$; $[Q]$ random processes noise $N_{q_i}$
6: set maximum episodes $E$ and iteration number $\tau$
7: for each episode in $E$ do
8: sample an initial state $s_0$ of $M$ and $q_0$ of $A_{q_i}$ as $s_0,q_0$
9: set $t = 0$ and construct an initial product state $x_t = (s_0,q_0,T)$
10: while $t < \tau$ do
11: execute action from modular RL with exploration noise e.g., $u^P = \pi_q(x|\theta^{\pi_q}) + R_{q_i}$
12: if CBF-based Safe learning enabled then
13: set $\alpha_{RL}(s_t) = u^P$ and obtain $\alpha_{safe}(s_t)$ via QP [32]
14: execute $\alpha_{safe}(s_t)$ and observe $x_{t+1} = (s_{t+1},q_{t+1},T)$, $R'(x_t,u^P_{t+1},x_{t+1})$
15: store the transition information in replay buffers $B_{q_{t+1}}$:
16: $(x_t,\alpha_{safe}(s_t),R_{RL}(x_t,u^P_{t+1},x_{t+1}),x_{t+1})$
17: end if
18: execute $u^P_t$ and observe $x_{t+1} = (s_{t+1},q_{t+1},T)$, $R'(x_t,u^P_{t+1},x_{t+1})$
19: store the transition information in replay buffers $B_{q_{t+1}}$:
20: $(x_t,u^P_t,R'(x_t,u^P_{t+1},x_{t+1}),x_{t+1})$
21: end while
22: execute the updates via $f_V(q_{t+1},T)$ and $f_b(q_{t+1},T_b)$
23: calculate target values for each $i \in N$ (mini-batch sampling of $B_{q_i}$) as:
24: $y_i = R'(x_t,u^P_t,x_{t+1}) + \gamma(x_t) \cdot Q_{q_{t+1}}(x_{t+1},u^P_{t+1}|\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}})$
25: update weights $\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}}$ of critic neural network $Q_{q_{t+1}}(x,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}})$
26: by minimizing the loss function:
27: $L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i - Q_{q_{t+1}}(x,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}}))^2$
28: update weights $\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}}$ of actor neural network $\pi_{q_{t+1}}(x|\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}})$ by maximizing the policy gradient:
29: $\nabla_{\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}}} U_{\pi_{q_{t+1}}} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \nabla_{\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}}} Q_{q_{t+1}}(x_t,u^P|\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}}) \right] | \theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}} = \pi_{q_{t+1}}(x_t|\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}})$
30: soft update of target networks:
31: $\theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}} \leftarrow \tau \theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}} + (1 - \tau) \theta^{Q_{q_{t+1}}}$
32: $\theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}} \leftarrow \tau \theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}} + (1 - \tau) \theta^{\pi_{q_{t+1}}}$
33: end for
34: end procedure
The mean function and covariance kernel function is selected to make use of GP regression. Informally, a GP is a distribution that is parameterized by a mean function $\mu$ and a covariance function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$. For a multivariate GP, $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is additive Gaussian noise $\sigma_u$ corresponding measurements $s$ as $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \Sigma)$, where $\mu_i$ and covariance $\Sigma$ of posterior distribution for $s_i$ at an arbitrary query state $s_i \in S$ can be calculated as:

$$\hat{u}_i(s_i) = \hat{k}_i^T \left( K_i + \sigma^2_{\text{noise}} I_{N_m} \right)^{-1} y_i$$

$$\sigma^2_i(s_i) = k_i((s_i, s_i) - \hat{k}_i^T (K_j + \sigma^2_{\text{noise}} I_{N_m})^{-1} \hat{k}_i$$

where $\hat{k}_i = [k_i(s_i, s_1), \ldots, k_i(s_i, s_{N_m})]^T$, $y_i = [y_i(s_1), \ldots, y_i(s_{N_m})]^T$ with $y_i(s) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_y(s), \Sigma_y(s))$, and $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m \times N_m}$ is a kernel matrix s.t. $K_i^{(j)} = k_i(s_j, s_l)$ with $j, l \in \{1, \ldots, N_m\}$.

Then we can describe the evaluation of uncertain dynamics $d(s)$ by a bounded estimation with probability $(1 - \delta)^n$ as:

$$\Pr \{ u(s_i) - k_3 \sigma(s_i) \leq d(s) \leq u(s_i) + k_3 \sigma(s_i) \} \geq (1 - \delta)^n$$

(19)

where $Pr \{ \cdot \}$ represents the probability measurement, $u(s) = [u_1(s), \ldots, u_n(s)]^T$, $\sigma(s) = [\sigma_1(s), \ldots, \sigma_n(s)]^T$, and $k_3$ is a design parameter determining $\delta$. The $d(s)$ is estimated over a multivariate GP.

### Remark 4
Applying GPs for large amounts of training data intractable and problematic due to the expensive matrix computation in (19). However, this work alleviates such an issue via the episodic sampling method, and any other methods for the model estimation can also be applied into this framework.

### B. Probabilistic Exponential Control Barrier Function

Utilizing GPs for a bounded approximation of $d(s)$ allows us to consider model-based approaches to safeguard during learning process. As for the continuous nonlinear systems, control barrier function (CBF) is an efficient tool for maintaining safety [12]. We directly apply the previous result to define the first order CBF.

**Definition 16.** Consider a system $S$ in (1) and assume $d(x)$ is known, and the safe set $C \subseteq S$ with a continuous differentiable (barrier) function $h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (2). If $\frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \neq 0$ for all $s \in \partial C$ and there exists an extended $K$ function $\alpha$ s.t.

$$L_f h + L_y h(a) + L_d h(s) \geq -\alpha(h(s)) \quad (20)$$

Then for a trajectory $s = s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_{N_t}$ of system (1) starting from any $s_0 \in C$ under controllers satisfying (20), one gets $s_i \in C \forall i \in \{0, \ldots, N_t\}$. And $h$ is a continuous CBF for $S$ with the safe invariant set $C$.

For the continuous differentiable function $h$ of the system $S$ with high relative degree $r_h \geq 1$, denote $f'(s) = f(s) + d(s)$ and one has $r_h^0$ time-derivative of $h(s)$:

$$h^{(r_h)}(s) = L_y^r h(s) + L_d L_y^{r-1} h(s) a.$$
for $r_b > 1$. ECBF is a special case of more general forms of Higher Order Control Barrier Function (HOCBF) \cite{50} and the HOCBF can be easily adopted into this framework.

Now, we can relax the assumption that one has the full knowledge of the system, and extend results to the unknown system described in Section II-A by incorporating GPs. Specifically, the unknown part $d(x)$ is approximated by the learned GP model with mean $u(s)$, covariance $\sigma(s)$ and $k_d$ as in (19). Let’s denote $\hat{f}(s)$ as estimation notation of function $f'(s)$ e.g., $\hat{f}(s) = f(s) + \hat{d}(s)$. The GP-based traverse variable can be represented as: $\hat{x}_b = [h(s), L_f h(s), \ldots, L_f^{n-1} h(s)]^T$. We can provide the probabilistic ECBF for the nominal system.

**Theorem 5.** Consider a system $S$ in (7) with unknown $d(x)$ and sets $C \subseteq S$ with a differentiable (barrier) function $h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\forall s \in C, h(s) \geq 0$, if there exists a close-loop stable $K_b$ s.t.:

$$L_f^N h(s) + L_g L_f^{n-1} h(s) a + K_b \hat{x}_b \geq 0,$$

(22)

Then starting from any $s_0 \in C$, controllers of the system $S$ satisfying (22), render the set $C$ forward invariant with probability at least $(1 - \delta)^n$.

**Proof.** Since $\hat{d}(s) \in [u(s) - k_d, u(s) - k_d]$, one has

$$\Pr \left\{ F(s, a) + GP_l \leq \hat{F}(s, a) \leq F(s, a) + GP_h \right\} \geq (1 - \delta)^n$$

where $F(s, a) = f(s) + g(s) a$, $\hat{F}(s, a) = F(s, a) + \hat{d}(s)$, $GP_l = u(s) - k_d \sigma(s)$, and $GP_h = u(s) + k_d \sigma(s)$. Then we can obtain the conclusion:

$$\Pr \left\{ L_f^N h(s) + L_g L_f^{n-1} h(s) a + K_b \hat{x}_b \geq 0 \right\} \geq (1 - \delta)^n.$$

\[ \square \]

Next, we can formulate the relaxed ECBF condition of (22) into the following quadratic program (QP) to find the controllers that safeguard the system (1) with at least probability $(1 - \delta)^n$:

$$(a_{CBF}, \epsilon) = \arg \min_{a, \epsilon, \eta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} a^T H(s) a + K_i \epsilon \right\}$$

s.t

$$L_f^N h(s) + L_g L_f^{n-1} h(s) a + K_b \hat{x}_b + \epsilon \geq 0$$

(23)

where $H(s)$ is any positive definite matrix (pointwise in $s$) $a_{low}^{(i)}$ and $a_{high}^{(i)}$ represent the lower band and higher bound of each element of the control input. To ensure the existence of solutions for the QP, $\epsilon$ is a relaxation variable, and $K_i$ is a large value parameter that penalizes the safety violations. The solution of the ECBF-QP enforces the safe condition with the min-norm form (minimum control energy). As for a poor nominal model, incorporating the GP model provides the confidence of certifying desired controllers.

**Lemma 3.** For dynamic system (7) with unknown $d(s)$ and $s_0 \in C = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(s) \geq 0 \}$,

(i) feasible solutions of (22) for all $s \in S$ with $\epsilon = 0$ renders safe set $C$ forward invariant with probability $(1 - \delta)^n$.

(ii) feasible solutions of (23) for all $s \in S$ with $\epsilon_{high} \geq \epsilon > 0$ approximately renders safe set $C_\epsilon = \{ s \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(s) + \frac{\epsilon_{high}}{\eta} \geq 0 \}$ with probability $(1 - \delta)^n$.

**Proof.** For part (i), since $\epsilon = 0$, the feasible solutions of (19) strictly follows the ECBF condition in theorem 5 and it provides the probabilistic bound $(1 - \delta)^n$ of the GP model (19).

For part (ii), we can utilize the discrete-time system $S_d$ as an approximately form of (1) given the sampling time $\Delta t$, and the safe set in (2) can be estimated as $C_d$ over $S_d$. Inspired by [51], there exists a discrete-time ECBF $h_d$ with $\eta \in (0, 1]$ that renders the set invariant as:

$$h_d(\hat{F}(s_t, a)) \geq (1 - \eta) h_d(s_t),$$

(24)

Then the constraint $h_d(\hat{F}(s_t, a)) \geq (1 - \eta) h_d(s_t) + \epsilon$ in (23) can be reformulated as:

$$h_d(\hat{F}(s_t, a)) + \frac{\epsilon_{high}}{\eta} \geq 0 \geq (1 - \eta) h_d(s_t) + \frac{\epsilon_{high}}{\eta}.$$ (25)

This equation and theorem 5 conclude the proof. \[ \square \]

Note constructing the accurate discrete-time ECBF over $S_d$ for general safe requirements is challenging even if there exists one, and lemma 5 theoretically applies it to evaluate the performance of the relaxed ECBF-QP. The deterministic control laws $a_{CBF}$ solving from (23) perform a high confidence about safeguarding the system using GPs for uncertain systems.

**Remark 6.** One can easily extend the framework for the data-driven based barrier functions [52, 53]. This work focuses on efficient safe learning for the optimal policy that satisfies high-level LTL over infinite horizons and bypass the consideration of unknown ECBFs. Also we can combine multiple ECBFs as constraints into (23) to define complex safe regions.

C. ECBF-Based Safe Learning

Before developing safe-critical methodology, it’s reasonable to show that there’s no conflicts between safe exploration and optimal policies generated from Section IV.

**Lemma 4.** Given the LTL formula as the form of $\phi = \bigcap_{t < \infty} \phi_{safe}$, let $\pi_{opt}$ denotes the optimal policy obtained from Section IV and $\pi_{safe}$ denotes a set of all safe policies satisfying $\bigcap_{t < \infty} \phi_{safe}$. One has the property $\pi_{opt} \in \pi_{safe}$.

**Lemma 4** can be straightly proved according to the fact that $\phi_{safe}$ is encoded into a part of LTL objective $\phi$, and $\pi_{opt}$ is verified to satisfy $\phi$. This relationship is shown in Fig. 3.

During the learning process, let $x_t = (s_t, \pi_t)$ and $\pi_t$ denote product state and learning policy at time-step $t$ respectively. And $u^*_{t}$ is the action obtained based on the policy $\pi_t$, e.g. $u^*_{t} \sim \pi_t$. According to definition 10 one has the action of $M$ as

$$a_{RL}(s_t) = \begin{cases} u^*_{t}, & \text{if } u^*_{t} \notin \{\epsilon\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$ (26)

The controller for any state $s$ during training can be generated based on (26) as $a_{RL}(s_t)$. However, such a controller may not be safe. To overcome the issue, one builds the QP according to GP-based ECBF in (23) as a safeguard module.
to provide the minimal perturbation $a_{pt}(s_t)$ for the original control $a_{RL}(s_t)$.

$$(a_{pt}, \epsilon) = \arg\min_{a, \epsilon} \frac{1}{2}(a_{RL}(s_t) + a)^T H(s_t)(a_{RL}(s_t) + a) + K_c \epsilon$$

subject to $L^0_{0} h(s_t) + L^0_{d} L^0_{0}^{-1} h(s_t)(a_{RL}(s_t) + a) + K_c \xi_0 + \epsilon \geq 0$

$$a_{low}^{(i)} \leq (a_{RL}(s_t) + a)^{(i)} \leq a_{high}^{(i)}, i \in \{0, \ldots, n\}, \quad (27)$$

Consequently, the actual implemented safe-critical controllers can be formulated from (27) as:

$$a_{Safe}(s_t) = a_{RL}(s_t) + a_{pt}(s_t) \quad (28)$$

During the evolution of the dynamic system (1), the "shield" of (27) compensates the model-free RL controller $a_{RL}(s_t)$ based the GP-based CBF condition, and keeps the state safe via deploying the final safe controller $a_{Safe}(s_t)$.

However, purely combining GPs and ECBF during learning process may negatively influence the exploration for original optimal convergence as verified in Section IV. Since the optimal parameterized RL-policy $\pi^*$ of the controller $a_{RL}(s_t)$ attempts to optimize the expected return and $\pi^*_0$ is generated based on the distribution of the policy-gradient optimization in (17), the feedback reward at each time actually corresponds to the controller $a_{RL}(s_t)$. While the actual reward collection in reply buffer is associated to the controller $a_{CBF}(s_t)$, which is not consistent with the RL-policy $\pi^*$ inducing undesired behaviors. As a result, the modular DDPG receives no informative feedback about the unsafe behaviors compensated from (27). Moreover, another crucial issue is that the functionality of $a_{Safe}(s_t)$ is too monotonous to guide the policy exploration and the corresponding RL policy $\pi^*$ may always being around the margins of unsafe sets, as illustrate in Fig. 3(a).

**D. Exploration Guiding**

In order to achieve safe and efficient guiding, the work [14] estimates the previous history of CBF perturbations to improve the efficiency of the learning process. However, such a design for LTL specifications may negatively impact the exploration of original optimal policy proposed in Section IV and it can not provide formal guarantees on the aspect of LTL satisfaction.

To overcome the intruded challenges above, this section proposes a automaton-based guiding process combining the properties of E-LDGBA and ECBF. Given a LTL formula as the form $\phi = \square \phi_{safe} \land \phi_{s} \land \phi_{a}$ where $\phi_{safe}$ is the specification related to the safe set $C$, $M$, the intuition for (28) is that $a_{pt}(s_t) \neq 0$ implies the unsafe RL controller $a_{RL}(s_t)$, which violates the $\square \phi_{safe}$ of $\phi$. Consequently, the objective of efficient exploration is to encourage the RL-agent operating in the safe region $C$, and to enforce $a_{pt}(s_t)$ decaying to zero.

Recall during the learning process, one has $x_t = (s_t, q_{t} \mid \pi_t$ at time-step $t$, and obtains $a_{RL}(s_t)$ as (26) from corresponding $u^P_t \sim \pi_t$. Then applying GP-based QP (27) generates $a_{pt}(s_t)$ and $a_{Safe}(s_t)$. The next state $x_{t+1} = (s_{t+1}, q_{t+1})$ can be generated by taking the safe action $a_{Safe}(s_t)$ s.t. $p_S(s_{t+1} | s_{t}, a_{Safe}(s_t)) \neq 0$ and $q_{t+1} = \delta(q_{t}, L(s))$. The automaton-based safe guiding consists of three steps: ECBF-based reward shaping, violation-based automaton updating, and relay buffer switching. The procedure of safe guiding is shown in Fig. 4(b), compared with the method of directly combining the safe execution in Fig. 4(a).

**Definition 18.** Given the transition $\delta^P_t = (x_t, a_{Safe}(s_t), x_{t+1})$, where $x_t = (s_t, q_{t} \mid \pi_{t}$, $a_{RL}(s_t)$ is obtained from $u^P_t \sim \pi_{t}$ as (26), $a_{Safe}(s_t) = a_{RL}(s_t) + a_{pt}(s_t)$, and $x_{t+1} = (s_{t+1}, q_{t+1})$ generated based on definition [10] during learning process, the three-step exploration guiding can be
defined as:

First, the reward is shaped based on the safe properties:

\[ R_{CBF}(δ^p) = \begin{cases} \alpha_{pt}(s_t) \mid q \in Q_{unsafe}, & \text{if } a_{rl}(s_t) \neq 0, \\ R'(δ^p), & \text{if } a_{rl}(s_t) = 0, \end{cases} \]

where \( r_n \in \mathbb{R} \) is a constant parameter s.t. \( r_n < 0 \).

Then, the automaton component \( \overline{q}_{t+1} \) of product state \( x_{t+1} \) is updated:

\[ \overline{q}_{t+1} = \left\{ \overline{q} \text{ s.t. } \overline{q} \in \overline{Q}_{\text{unsafe}} \mid \delta(\overline{q}_t, L(s_t)), \text{ if } a_{rl}(s_t) \neq 0 \right\}, \]

\[ \text{if } a_{rl}(s_t) = 0. \tag{30} \]

Third, instead of storing information \( a_{safe}(s_t) \) and \( R'(δ^p) \), add \( (x_t, a_{rl}(s_t), R_{CBF}(δ^p), x_{t+1}) \) to replay buffer for training.

In the \( \text{29} \), \( r_n \leq 0 \text{ s.t. } r_n \mid a_{rl}(s_t) \mid \) represents how much the \( a_{rl}(s_t) \) violates the safe constraint \( \square \phi_{safe} \), which is propositional to the absolute value of CBF compensators. Similarly, the \( \text{30} \) switches the obtained automaton state \( \overline{q}_{t+1} \) to be the state of \( \overline{Q}_{\text{unsafe}} \) definition \( 9 \). Different from the work \( \text{14} \) that takes \( a_{safe}(s_t) \) into the replay buffer for training, third step keeps the original modular RL controller \( a_{rl}(s_t) \) integrating with the shaped reward \( R_{CBF} \) into training. As for actor-critic methods of the modular RL, such a design can improve the efficiency of exploration and stabilize the learning results, since the controllers \( a_{rl} \) in relay buffer are generated from the policy distributions of the actor, whereas controllers \( a_{safe} \) are only for safe execution that are not consistent with the outputs of the modular actor-critic architecture. The overall procedure of safe learning and guiding is illustrate in Line (8-12) of Alg. \( 2 \). This idea of enforcing optimal policies is illustrated in Fig. \( 3 \) (b). Finally, we show that the original optimal policies generating from Section \( \text{1V} \) remain invariant applying safe learning and guiding processes.

**Theorem 6.** Given a PL-MDP \( M \) and an E-LDGBA \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \), the optimal policy \( \pi^* \) generated from modular DDPG by applying the three-step exploration guiding procedure in definition \( 18 \) maximizes the probability of satisfying \( \phi \) in the limit.

**Proof.** The safe guiding is to efficiently enhance the \( a_{pt}(s_t) \) rapidly decaying to 0. Based on definition \( 18 \) the intuitive of safe guarding is bridge the connect between the unsafe component \( \overline{Q}_{\text{unsafe}} \) of E-LDGBA and CBF controllers \( a_{pt}(s_t) \) s.t. \( a_{pt}(s_t) \neq 0 \) indicates the original \( a_{rl}(s_t) \) violates the safe requirement of \( \phi = \square \phi_{safe} \land \phi_g \). Consequently, the objective is to verify that assigning negative reward to the states of \( \overline{Q}_{\text{unsafe}} \) preserves optimal solutions in Proposition \( 1 \) and Theorem \( 2 \). We show the proof by contradiction. See appendix \( \text{A-E} \) for more details.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

We demonstrate the framework in several environments with corresponding LTL tasks. To show the effectiveness of safe modular DDPG with guiding enabled, we compare our framework referred as safe modular with guiding (Modular-DDPG-ECBF-Guiding) with three baselines: (i) safe standard DDPG with guiding (Standard-DDPG-ECBF-Guiding), (ii) modular or standard DDPG without safe module enabled (Standard-DDPG, Modular-DDPG), (iii) safe modular DDPG without guiding (Modular-DDPG-ECBF-off-Guiding). We therefore consider four variants of the baseline as summarized in Table \( \text{I} \). A tool Owl \( \text{45} \) is used to convert LTL specifications to LDGBA that are then manually transformed into E-LDGBA. Various implementations based on OpenAI gym are carried out on a machine with 2.80 GHz quad-core CPU, 16 GB RAM, an external Nvidia RTX 1080 GPU and Cuda enabled. The details of experimental setting can be found in Appendix \( \text{A-F} \).

It’s worth to point out that it’s more challenging for RL agent satisfying tasks over infinite horizons. Consequently, We focus on the evaluation of the infinite-horizon formulas and analyze its success rates of the formulas at the end (Fig. \( 16 \)). The safe sets and control barrier functions are defined separately for each dynamic system, and Fig. \( 15 \) shows the safety rates of all tasks through different baselines. The video demonstration of all case studies can be found in our YouTube channel \( \text{13} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Modular DDPG</th>
<th>Standard DDPG</th>
<th>Safe Module</th>
<th>Exploration Guiding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modular-DDPG-ECBF-(On)-Guiding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular-DDPG-ECBF-Off-Guiding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular-DDPG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-DDPG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPBs and ECBFs provide a model-based high-probability safeguard during learning process s.t. deployed controllers \( a_{safe} \) render the safe set \( C \) forward invariant. Safe guiding utilizes the property of violation for the LTL form \( \phi = \square \phi_{safe} \land \phi_g \) integrating with the safe invariant set to enforce the efficient exploration. Then \( a_{pt}(s_t) \) gradually decays to 0 and becomes inactive. The overall structure pushes the RL policies generated from the set of safe polices without altering the original optimality, while maintaining safety during interaction.

A. Cart-Pole and Inverted-Pendulum

We first apply algorithms to the control of simulated environments powered by the OpenAI gym. The LTL formulas over infinite horizons are all formulated as the form \( \phi_g = \diamond \phi_{green} \land \square \diamond \phi_{yellow} \), which require to visit the blue and green regions infinitely often, while staying within the safe set \( \phi_{safe} \). And the tasks over finite horizons are in the form of \( \phi_g = \diamond (\phi_{green} \land \diamond \phi_{yellow}) \).

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gGX-EQ9Sc
Cart-Pole: The physical simulation of CartPole is introduced in Fig. 5. In this case, a pendulum is attached to a cart that moves horizontally along a friction-less track, and the control input is a horizontal force to the cart. Denote $s = [\theta_p, s_c, \dot{\theta}_p, \dot{s}_c]^T$ as the state (cart position, pendulum angle and corresponding velocities) of the dynamic system and its true dynamics are defined as follows:

$$\dot{s}_p = \frac{(u - d) + h_1 \cos \theta_p \sin \theta_p + h_2 \dot{\theta}_p \sin \theta_p}{h_1 + h_2 \cos^2 \theta},$$

$$\dot{s}_c = \frac{g_1(u - d) \cos \theta_p + g_2 \dot{\theta}_p^2 \cos \theta_p \sin \theta_p + g_3 \sin \theta}{g_4 + g_5 \cos^2 \theta_p},$$

where external control force limit $a \in [-20N, 20N]$, and $h_1, \ldots, h_4$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_4$ are the physics parameters. To introduced model uncertainty, one assumes 30% error in the physics constants. The safe set of two control barrier functions is introduced as

$$C_1 = \{(\theta_p, s_c) : (12 - \theta_p^2 \geq 0) \land (2.4^2 - s_c^2 \geq 0)\}.$$

The corresponding LTL formula that hold the system stay at safe set $C_1$ is defined as $\phi_{C_1}$. The overall LTL formula over infinite horizons can be $\phi_{\text{Cart1}} = \Box \phi_{C_1} \land \phi_{g_{\text{in}}}$, where $\phi_{g_{\text{in}}}$ requires the agent to periodically visit blue and green regions that are located range from $-1.44$ to $-0.96$ and from $0.96$ to $1.44$ m, respectively, and the LTL formula over finite horizons can be $\phi_{\text{Cart2}} = \Box \phi_{C_1} \land \phi_{g_{\text{in}}}$, where $\phi_{g_{\text{in}}}$ requires the agent to sequentially visit blue and green regions. The results of $\phi_{\text{Cart1}}$ are shown in Fig. 6, 7 and 8.

Fig. 6 compares the mean reward achieved via different baselines. Fig. 6(c) extracts the results of Fig. 6(a) for more detailed comparison. Fig. 6(a) and (c) show that safe modular DDPG and modular DDPG achieve the same performance such that the safe module with guiding will maintain safe during training and will not alter the RL optimality, and the safe modular without guiding will influence the exploration and RL optimality. Fig. 6(b) states the modular DDPG has better performance than the standard DDPG (higher rewards). Even though there’s a slightly higher rewards using modular architecture in Fig. 6(b), it will influence the success rates of optimal polices completing the task over infinite horizons as shown in Fig. 16.

Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 show the absolute value of maximum angle and position of each episode during learning and evaluation process, respectively. First, Fig. 7 demonstrates the benefits of applying the safe module such that the ECBF compensators as minimal perturbations safeguard the RL-agent during learning. Then Fig. 8 compares the safe performance using different baselines. Especially, it shows the advantage of the guiding procedure. Since the dynamics of CartPole is more complex and sensitive that makes the QP easier to be infeasible when the exploration guiding is not enabled and the RL controllers always render the systems to be in the margin of the safe set. The safety rates of infinite-horizons task $\phi_{\text{Cart1}}$ and finite-horizons task $\phi_{\text{Cart2}}$ using different baselines are shown in Fig. 15 which also illustrates the improvement of the exploration guiding.

Inverted-Pendulum: The physical simulation of inverted-
pendulum is introduced in Fig. 9. The true dynamic of state \( \theta \) that has mass \( m \), length \( l \) and torque \( u \) is introduced as follows:

\[
\dot{\theta} = \frac{3g}{2l} \sin \theta + \frac{3}{2ml^2} u,
\]

where torque limit is \([-15, 15]\) and nominal model assumes to have 40% errors of parameters. The safe set of a control barrier function is defined as \( C_2 = \{ \theta : (\frac{\pi}{4})^2 > 0 \} \). The corresponding LTL formula that hold the system stay at safe set \( C_2 \) is defined as \( \phi_{C_2} \). The whole LTL formula over infinite horizons can be \( \phi_{Pen1} = \Box C_2 \land \phi_{gp1} \), where \( \phi_{gp1} \) requires the agent to periodically visit blue and green regions that are located at \(-\frac{\pi}{4}\) rads and \(\frac{\pi}{4}\) rads, respectively, and \( \phi_{Pen2} = \Box C_2 \land \phi_{gp2} \), where \( \phi_{gp2} \) requires the agent to sequentially visit blue and green regions. The analysis of \( \phi_{Pen1} \) is shown in Fig. 10 and 11.

Fig. 10 (a) (b) compares the mean reward and absolute value of maximum angles during learning process generated via different baselines, respectively. Especially, Fig. 10 (a) concludes that the safe modular learning with exploration guiding can be more efficient to find the optimal policies, since the guiding module will enforce the exploration within a set of safe policies. In addition, Fig. 10 (b) shows the importance of the safe module during learning process. At the same time, Fig. 11 focuses on illustrating the effectiveness of the exploration guiding and compares the baselines during learning and evaluation process. By assigning negative rewards when the ECBF controllers involved, it’s shown that the our algorithm enhances the RL-agent updating within the safe set and leads the output of ECBF controllers to dramatically decay.

B. Particle Gym and Mars Rover

We test the algorithms to the control of the car-like models. Let \( s = [p_x, p_y, \theta, v]^T \), \( a = [u, \phi]^T \), and \( L \) denote the state (position, heading, velocity), control variables (acceleration, steering angle), and length of the vehicle, respectively. The dynamics of the model are as follows:

\[
\dot{s} = [v \cos \theta, v \sin \theta, \frac{\tan \phi}{L}, K_u u]^T
\]

where \( K_u \) is the physical constant. To model the unknown model, we set 25% error in the parameters \( L \) and \( K_u \) and add Gaussian noise to the accelerations.

**Particle Gym:** For the car-like dynamic model, we first test our algorithm in the particle gym environment as shown in Fig. 12. The two missions of RL-agent (red circle) require to sequentially visit the blue regions from number 1 to 5 over infinite and finite horizons, respectively. The safety is to avoid the black obstacles and stay within the rectangular workspace, which can be encoded as multiple decentralized ECBFs. The LTL task over infinite horizons can be formulated as:

\[
\phi_{Gym1} = \Box ((\Diamond R_1 \land \Diamond (R_2 \land \Diamond \ldots \land R_6)) \rightarrow R_1) \land \Box \phi_{C_2},
\]

where \( R_i \) is \( i \)-th blue region indexed with a number \( i \), and \( \phi_{C_2} \) represents safety requirements associated with ECBFs. The simulated trajectory of \( \phi_{Gym1} \) for one round of the repetitive satisfaction is shown in Fig. 12 (b). Also the task over finite horizons version can be \( \phi_{Gym2} = (\Diamond R_1 \land \Diamond (R_2 \land \Diamond \ldots \land R_6)) \rightarrow R_1 \land \Box \phi_{C_2} \). The results of mean reward collection for the task \( \phi_{Gym1} \) during training compared with two baselines are shown in Fig. 14 (a) left, which
illustrates the better performance of modular architecture and effectiveness of the exploration guiding.

Mars Rover: We then implement our algorithm in a large scale and pixel-based environment, and conduct motion planning to complete complex exploration missions using satellite images as shown in Fig. 13. The missions are to explore areas around the Victoria Crater [54] shown in Fig. 13 (a), which is an impact crater located near the equator of Mars. Layered sedimentary rocks are exposed along the wall of crater, providing information about the ancient surface condition of Mars. The mission is related to visiting all spots along with the path of the well-known Mars Rover Opportunity, which is shown in Fig. 13 (b), and avoiding the unsafe areas (red circle). The LTL specification specifying such missions over infinite horizons is expressed as:

\[ \varphi_{V_1} = \square((\Box V_1 \land \Box (V_2 \land \Box \ldots \land V_{10})) \rightarrow V_{\text{Start}}) \land \square \varphi_{C_4}, \]

where \( V_i \) denotes \( i \)-th target (blue spot) counts from bottom-left to top-right. \( \varphi_{C_4} \) represents safety requirements (barrier functions) s.t. the agent should always avoid the unsafe crater area marked as red circle in Fig. 13 (b). The description of overall task in English is "visit the target from 1 to 10 and then return to the start position, repetitively, while avoiding the unsafe regions". Similarly, the corresponding task over finite horizons version can be \( \varphi_{V_2} = (\Box V_1 \land \Box (V_2 \land \Box \ldots \land V_{10})) \rightarrow V_{\text{Start}} \land \Box \varphi_{C_4} \). The results of mean reward collection for the task \( \varphi_{Gym_1} \) during training compared with two baselines are shown in Fig. 14 right, which also shows the better performance and effectiveness of safe modular DDPG with guiding enabled.

C. Complexity and Performance Analysis

First, safety rates is the number of safe episodes versus all episodes, and Fig. 15 shows the safety rates for all tasks over all environments through different baselines. It shows that the benefits of the ECBF-based safe module and the improvement of the exploration guiding. Then, we analyze the training complexity for various baselines shown in Table IV. From the aspect of safe learning, the developed safe module requires to solve quadratic programming at each step, and the training time increased for both safe modular and safe standard DDPG methods. This is reasonable since the algorithm needs to check whether controllers are safe at each step. As for the aspect of modular architecture, even though it adopts several distributed actor-critic neural network pairs, they are synchronously trained online, and each of them is only responsible for a sub-task. Consequently, the training time will mainly be influenced by the number of steps and episodes for both safe modular and standard DDPG. For the complex tasks e.g., \( \varphi_{V_2} \), the modular architecture can complete the task faster (terminate the episode earlier) during learning, and reduce the training time.

To state the performance of the modular structure, we mainly compare the methods safe modular DDPG and safe standard DDPG that are both enabled with exploration guiding. Then, we take 200 runs applying the learned model, and analyze the success rate for all aforementioned tasks. Due to growing dimensions of automaton structure for more complex tasks and limited training process in practice, it becomes more difficult for standard DDPG to explore the whole tasks over infinite horizons, and distinguish the procedure of the satisfaction. As shown in Fig. 16, we can conclude that modular architecture has better and more stable performance, whereas the standard DDPG yields poor performance for complex tasks with repetitive pattern (infinite horizons).

VII. Conclusions

Achievement of safe critical requirements during learning is a challenging problem with a significant real-world applicability. Part of the challenge stems from the uncertain and unknown dynamic systems, and the impact of the exploration involving optimal solutions. Such a problem becomes even more difficult but more meaningful when RL-agents are tasked to accomplish complex human instructions over infinite horizons and continuous space. The main difficulties are due to the nature of nonlinear regression to recognize each stage of task-satisfaction and the need for large training episodes. Therefore, we proposed the ECBF-based safe RL framework combining with GPs for estimation of the nominal systems, and trained an RL agent guided by the LTL specifications to describe high-level complex tasks. These features will
be crucial in employing reinforcement learning on physical applications, where human are able to formulate advanced objectives specified in the formal language. They are also important in the case where problems require online efficient computation and effective learning performance.

This frameworks combines model-free deep RL, GP-based ECBF control and automata theory of compositional LTL syntax. On the training side, the designed E-LDGBA allows us to apply the deterministic policy and overcome the issue of sparse rewards, and the reward shaping technique further enhance dense rewards. On the evaluation side, by fully utilizing the automaton structure, we synthesis a innovative modular DDPG architecture that replies on the distributed neural networks to improve the performance of the learning results for complex tasks. We also propose a novel approach by integrating the sink components of LTL automaton and ECBF perturbations to enforce the guiding of exploration. A significant formal verification is that the above modules (safe and modular) will not have impact to desired behaviors with respect to original optimal solutions.

We implement the overall algorithm in various control systems and demonstrate its benefits by comparing with several baselines. Our results are encouraging for several future directions. This work assumes we are given a valid safe set that can be rendered forward invariant, which opens the questions of whether we can learn the safe set in addition to the controllers. Future lines will also consider multi-agent cooperative tasks and safe learning that are scalable on the number of agents.
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APPENDIX A
RELEVANT PROOF

A. Proof of Lemma 7

We prove (1) by showing that \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \) and \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \).

Case 1: \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \): For any accepting language \( \omega = \omega_0\alpha_1 \ldots \in \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \), there exists a corresponding run \( r = q_0\omega_0\alpha_1 \ldots \) of \( A_\phi \) s.t.
\[
\inf (r) \cap F_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}. \tag{31}
\]

For the run \( r \), we can construct a sequence \( \tau = q_0\alpha_0q_1\alpha_1 \ldots \) by adding each state \( q \) with the set \( T \), which is synchronously updated via \( \tau \) after each transition. It can be verified that such a run \( \tau \) is a valid run of \( \mathcal{A}_\phi \) based on definition 7. According to (31), since the tracking-frontier set \( T \) will be reset once all accepting sets have been visited, it holds inf(\( \tau \)) \( \cap F_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \) s.t. \( \omega \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \).

Case 2: \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\phi) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \): Similarly, for any accepting language \( \omega = \pi_0\pi_1 \ldots \in \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \), there exists a corresponding run \( r = q_0\pi_0q_1\pi_1 \ldots \) of \( A_\phi \) s.t.
\[
\inf (r) \cap F_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\}. \tag{32}
\]

For the run \( \tau \), we can construct a sequence \( r = q_0\pi_0q_1\pi_1 \ldots \) by projecting each state \( \pi = (q, T) \) into \( q \). It can be simply verified that such a run \( \tau \) is a valid run of \( A_\phi \) based on definition 7. According to (32), it holds inf(\( \tau \)) \( \cap F_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \) s.t. \( \omega \in \mathcal{L}(A_\phi) \).

B. Proof of Lemma 2

The strategy of the following proof is based on contradiction. Assume there exists a policy such that \( R_i^k \cap F^F_k \neq \emptyset \), \( \forall k \in K \), where \( K \) is a subset of \( 2^{\{1, \ldots, f\}} \setminus \{\{1, \ldots, f\}\} \). As discussed in (55), for each state in recurrent class, it holds that \( \sum_{n=0}^\infty p^n(x, x) = \infty \), where \( x \in R_i^k \cap F^F_k \) and \( p^n(x, x) \) denotes the probability of returning from a transient state \( x \) to itself in \( n \) steps. This means that each state in the recurrent class occurs infinitely often. However, based on the embedded tracking-frontier function of EP-MDP, once \( x_k \) is visited, the corresponding \( F^F_k \) is removed from \( T \), and the tracking set \( T \) will not be reset until all accepting sets have been visited. As a result, neither \( q_k \in F^F_k \) nor \( x_k = (s, q_k, T) \in R_i^k \cap F^F_k \) with \( s \in S \) will occur infinitely, which contradicts the property \( \sum_{n=0}^\infty p^n(x, x_k) = \infty \).

C. Proof of Theorem 1

Lemma 5. For any path \( x_t \) and \( D(x_t) \) in (8), it holds that \( 0 \leq \gamma_F : D(x_t[t + 1]) \leq D(x_t) \leq 1 - r_F + r_F \cdot D(x_t[t + 1]) \leq 1 \), where \( x_t[t + 1] \) denotes the suffix of \( x_t \) starting from \( x_t[t + 1] \). Let \( \mbox{BSCC} (MC_{\mathcal{P}}^F) \) denote the set of all BSCCs of an induced Markov chain \( MC_{\mathcal{P}}^F \) and let \( X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \) denote the set of accepting states that belongs to a BSCC of \( MC_{\mathcal{P}}^F \) s.t. \( X_{\mathcal{P}}^F := \{ x \in X | x \in F^F_k \} \). Then, for any state \( x \in X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \), it holds that \( \lim_{\gamma_F \to 1-} U^\pi (x) = 1 \).

The proof of Lemma 5 is omitted since it is a straightforward extension of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 in (33), by replacing LDBA with E-LDBA.

Based on whether or not the path \( x_t \) intersects with accepting states of \( F^F_k \), the expected return in (6) can be rewritten as
\[
U^\pi (x) = E^\pi [D(x_t) | x_t = \diamond F^F_k] \cdot Pr^\pi [x = \diamond F^F_k] + E^\pi [D(x_t) | x_t \neq \diamond F^F_k] \cdot Pr^\pi [x \neq \diamond F^F_k], \tag{33}
\]
where \( Pr^\pi [x = \diamond F^F_k] \) and \( Pr^\pi [x \neq \diamond F^F_k] \) represent the probability of eventually reaching and not reaching \( F^F_k \) eventually under policy \( \pi \) starting from state \( x \), respectively.

To find the lower bound of \( U^\pi (x) \), for any state \( x_t \) with \( x_t[t] = x \), let \( t + N_t \) be the index that \( x_t \) first intersects a state in \( X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \), i.e., \( N_t = \min \{i | x_t[t + i] \in X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \} \). The following holds
\[
E^\pi [D(x_t) | x_t = \diamond F^F_k] \geq E^\pi [D(x_t) | x_t \cap X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \neq \emptyset] \tag{1}
\]
\[
\geq E^\pi [\gamma_{N_t} \cdot D(x_t[t + N_t]) | x_t[t + N_t] = x | x_t \cap X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \neq \emptyset] \tag{2}
\]
\[
\geq E^\pi [\gamma_{N_t} \cdot x_t \cap X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \neq \emptyset] \cdot U_{\min} (x_t[t + N_t]) \tag{3}
\]
\[
\geq E^\pi [\gamma_{N_t} \cdot x_t \cap X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \neq \emptyset] \cdot U_{\min} (x_{\text{Acc}}), \tag{4}
\]
where \( x_{\text{Acc}} \in X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \), \( U_{\min} (x_{\text{Acc}}) = \min_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}}^F} U^\pi (x) \), and \( n_t \) is a constant. By Lemma 5, one has \( U_{\min} (x_{\text{Acc}}) = 1 \). In (34), the first inequality (1) holds because visiting \( X_{\mathcal{P}}^F \) is one of the cases for \( F^F_k \) that satisfy \( x_t = \diamond F^F_k \), e.g., \( F^F_k \) can be placed outside of all BSCCs; the second inequality (2) holds due to Lemma 3; the third inequality (3) holds due to the Markov properties of (8) and (9); the fourth inequality (4) holds due to Jensen's inequality. Based on (34), the lower bound of (33) is
\[
U^\pi (x) \geq \gamma_{N_t} \cdot U_{\min} (x_{\text{Acc}}) \cdot Pr^\pi [x = \diamond F^F_k] - \text{from which one has}
\]
\[
\lim_{\gamma_F \to 1-} U^\pi (x) \geq \gamma_{N_t} \cdot Pr^\pi [x = \diamond F^F_k]. \tag{35}
\]

Similarily, let \( t + M_t \) denote the index that \( x_t \) first enters the BSCC that contains no accepting states. We have
\[
E^\pi [D(x_t) | x_t \neq \diamond F^F_k] \leq E^\pi [1 - r_{F,k} | x_t \neq \diamond F^F_k] \leq 1 - r_{F,k} \tag{6}
\]
\[
\leq 1 - r_{F,k} | M_t = x_t \neq \diamond F^F_k] = 1 - r_{M_t}^k, \tag{36}
\]
where \( n \) is a constant and (36) holds due to Lemma 5 and Markov properties.

Hence, the upper bound of (33) is obtained as
\[
\lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} U^\pi (x) = \Pr_\pi \left[ x = \diamond F^P + (1 - r_{m}) \Pr_\pi \left[ x \neq \diamond F^P \right] \right]
\]
By (36) and (37), we can conclude
\[
\Pr_\pi \left[ x = \diamond F^P + (1 - r_{m}) \Pr_\pi \left[ x \neq \diamond F^P \right] \right] \leq \lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} U^\pi (x)
\]
According to \( \lim_{\gamma \to 1^-} r_F (\gamma_F) = 1 \) in the reward function, (10) can be concluded.

D. Proof of Theorem 2

For any policy \( \pi \), \( M \gamma^n_p \) is the expected reward under policy \( \pi \), which can be reorganized as
\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c} U^{tr}_{\pi} \\ U^{r}_{\pi} \end{array} \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{i} \gamma^n_p \\ \gamma^n_p \end{array} \right] \left( \begin{array}{c} P^n_{\pi} (T, T) \\ 0 \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{i} \gamma^n_p \end{array} \right)^{n} \left( \begin{array}{c} R^{tr}_{\pi} \\ R^{r}_{\pi} \end{array} \right)
\]
where \( U^{r}_{\pi} \) and \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} \) are the expected return of states in transient and recurrent classes under policy \( \pi \), respectively. In (38), \( P^n_{\pi} (T, T) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r} \) is the probability transition matrix between states in \( T_{\pi} \), and \( P^n_{\pi} = \left[ P^n_{1\pi}, \ldots, P^n_{m\pi} \right] \) is the transition probability matrix where \( P^n_{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r} \) represents the transition probability from a transient state in \( T_{\pi} \) to a state of \( R_{\pi} \). The \( P_{\pi} (R, R) \) is a diagonal block matrix, where the \( i \)-th block is a \( N_i \times N_i \) matrix containing transition probabilities between states within \( R_{\pi} \). Note that \( P_{\pi} (R, R) \) is a stochastic matrix since each block matrix is a stochastic matrix [55]. Similarly, the rewards \( R_{\pi} \) can also be partitioned into \( R^{tr}_{\pi} \) and \( R^{rcc}_{\pi} \).

The following proof is based on contradiction. Suppose there exists a policy \( \pi^* \) that optimizes the expected return, but does not satisfy the accepting condition of \( \mathcal{P} \) with non-zero probability. Based on Lemma 2 the following is true: \( F_k \subseteq T_{\pi^*}, \forall k \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \), where \( T_{\pi^*} \) denotes the transient class of Markov chain induced by \( \pi^* \) on \( \mathcal{P} \). First, consider a state \( x_R \in R_{\pi^*} \) and let \( P^{x_{R}R}_{\pi^*} \) denote a row vector of \( P^{x_{R}}_{\pi^*} (R, R) \) that contains the transition probabilities from \( x_R \) to the states in the recurrent class \( R_{\pi^*} \), after \( n \) steps. The expected return of \( x_R \) under \( \pi^* \) is then obtained from (38) as
\[
U^{rcc}_{\pi^*} (x_R) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n_p \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{k} \gamma^n_p \\ \gamma^n_p \end{array} \right] \left( \begin{array}{c} P^{x_{R}R}_{\pi^*} \\ 0 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{k} \gamma^n_p \end{array} \right)^{n} R^{rcc}_{\pi^*},
\]
where \( k_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} N_i, k_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i \). Since \( R_{\pi^*} \cap F_{\pi^*} = \emptyset, \forall k \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \), by the designed reward function, all entries of \( R^{rcc}_{\pi^*} \) are zero. We can conclude \( U^{rcc}_{\pi^*} (x_R) = 0 \). To show contradiction, the following analysis will show that \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) > U^{rcc}_{\pi^*} (x_R) \) for any policy \( \pi \) that satisfies the accepting condition of \( \mathcal{R} \). Thus, it’s true that there exists \( R^* \) such that \( R^*_R \cap F^* = \emptyset, \forall k \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \). We use \( \gamma \) and \( \tilde{\gamma} \) to denote the lower and upper bound of \( \gamma \).

Case 1: If \( x_R \in R \), there exist states such that \( x_A \in R \). From Lemma 2 the entries in \( R^{cc}_{\pi} \) corresponding to the recurrent states in \( R \) have non-negative rewards and at least there exist \( f \) states in \( R^* \) from different accepting sets \( F^* \) with positive reward \( 1 - r_F \). From (38), \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) \) can be lower bounded as
\[
U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n_p (P^{x_{R}R_{\pi}}_{\pi} F^*) > 0,
\]
where \( P^{x_{R}R_{\pi}}_{\pi} F^* \) is the transition probability from \( x_R \) to \( x_A \) in \( n \) steps. We can conclude in this case \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) > U^{rcc}_{\pi^*} (x_R) \).

Case 2: If \( x_R \in T \), there are no states of any accepting set \( F^* \) in \( T \). As demonstrated in [55], for a transient state \( x_{tr} \in T \), there always exists an upper bound \( \Delta < \infty \) such that \( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n_p (x_{tr}, x_{tr}) < \Delta \), where \( \gamma^n_p (x_{tr}, x_{tr}) \) denotes the probability of returning from a transient state \( x_T \) to itself in \( n \) time steps. In addition, for a recurrent state \( x_{rec} \) of \( R \), it is always true that
\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n_p (x_{rec}, x_{rec}) > \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_p},
\]
where there exists \( \gamma \) such that \( \gamma_p (x_{rec}, x_{rec}) \) is nonzero and can be lower bounded by \( \tilde{\gamma} \) [55]. From (38), one has
\[
U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n_p (x_{rec}, x_{rec}) > \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_p} 
\]
Let \( \max (\cdot) \) and \( \min (\cdot) \) represent the maximum and minimum entry of an input vector, respectively. The upper bound \( \tilde{m} \) is \( \max (\tilde{M}) \) and \( \tilde{m} \geq 0 \), where \( \tilde{M} \) is a block matrix whose nonzero entries are derived similarly to \( \tilde{p} \) in (40). The utility \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) \) can be lower bounded from (40) and (41) as \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) \geq 1 - \tilde{m} \). Since \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) = 0 \), the contradiction \( U^{rcc}_{\pi} (x_R) > 0 \) is achieved if \( 1 - \tilde{m} > 0 \). The procedure shows the contradiction of the assumption that \( \pi^* \) that does not satisfy the acceptance condition of \( \mathcal{P} \) with non-zero probability is optimal, and Theorem 2 is proved.

E. Proof of Theorem 6

Suppose there exists a policy \( \pi^* \) that optimizes the expected return, but derives the system intersecting with \( Q_{unsa} \) with non-zero probability. Based on Lemma 2 the following is true: \( F_k \subseteq T \), \( \forall k \in \{1, \ldots, f\} \), where \( T \) denotes the transient class of Markov chain induced by \( \pi^* \) on \( \mathcal{P} \).

Consider two type of states \( x_R \in R \) and \( x_T \in T \). Let \( P^{x_{R}R}_{\pi} \) denote a row vector of \( P^{x_{R}}_{\pi} (R, R) \) that contains the transition probabilities from \( x_R \) to the states in the same recurrent class \( R^* \), after \( n \) steps. The expected return of \( x_R \)
and \( x_T \) under \( \pi \) are then obtained from (38) respectively as

\[
U^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^n \left[ 0_{k_1}^T P_{\pi}^{x_R R_j} 0_{k_2}^T \right] R^{rec}_{\pi},
\]

\[
U^{tr}_{\pi} > \gamma^n P^{n}_{\pi} (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}) R^{rec}_{\pi},
\]

where \( k_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} N_i \), \( k_2 = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n} N_i \), \( P^{tr}_{\pi} = [P^{tr}_{\pi 1} \ldots P^{tr}_{\pi m}] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \sum_{i=1}^{m} N_i} \) is the probability transition matrix, and the \( P_{\pi} (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}) \) is a diagonal block matrix.

Since \( R^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R) \subseteq X_{\text{unsafe}} \neq \emptyset \) where \( X_{\text{unsafe}} \) is introduced in definition [15], all entries of \( R^{rec}_{\pi} \) are negative. We can conclude \( U^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R) \leq 0 \). To show contradiction, by selecting \( \gamma_F \to 1^- \) the following analysis will show the contradiction e.g.,

\[
U^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R) > U^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R),
\]

where \( \bar{\pi} \) is a policy that satisfies the accepting condition of \( \mathcal{P} \).

One has two cases of the analysis. (i) \( x_R \in R^I_{\pi} \), we can obtain \( U^{rec}_{\pi}(x_R) \geq 0 \) from (39). (ii) \( x_R \in T_{\pi} \), the inequality \( U^{tr}_{\pi}(x_R) > 0 \) holds according to (40) and (41).

Accordingly, we prove the original optimal policies using based reward in Theorem [3] remain invariant during the procedure of safe guiding. Then we can conclude that the safe guiding will not alter the original optimal policies of (15) applying shaped reward (11) from the work [15].

F. Experimental Details

In each experiment, the LTL tasks are converted into LDGBA that is applied to construct the modular DDPG algorithm. The EP-MDP between E-LDGBA and cl-MDP is synthesized on-fly. As for each actor/critic structure, we used the same feed-forward neural network setting with 3 fully connected layers that has \([64, 64, 64]\) units and ReLu activations. We initiate a Gaussian action distribution for the continuous action space that is parameterized via actors.

The parameters of the base reward function, reward shaping, and exploration guiding are set-up as \( r_F = 0.9, \gamma_F = 0.99, \eta_{\Phi} = 1000, \) and \( r_n = -50. \) The training settings and complexity analysis are shown in Table [11] that provides a comprehensive comparison of time complexity for different tasks using various baselines.