

Scaling Learning based Policy Optimization for Temporal Tasks via Dropout

Navid Hashemi

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, United States

NAVIDHAS@USC.EDU

Bardh Hoxha

Toyota NA R&D, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States

BARDH.HOXHA@TOYOTA.COM

Danil Prokhorov

Toyota NA R&D, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States

DANIL.PROKHOROV@TOYOTA.COM

Georgios Fainekos

Toyota NA R&D, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States

GEORGIOS.FAINEKOS@TOYOTA.COM

Jyotirmoy Deshmukh

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, United States

JDESHMUK@USC.EDU

Abstract

This paper introduces a model-based approach for training feedback controllers for an autonomous agent operating in a highly nonlinear (albeit deterministic) environment. We desire the trained policy to ensure that the agent satisfies specific task objectives and safety constraints, both expressed in discrete-time Signal Temporal Logic (DT-STL). One advantage for reformulation of a task via formal frameworks, like DT-STL, is that it permits quantitative satisfaction semantics. In other words, given a trajectory and a DT-STL formula, we can compute the *robustness*, which can be interpreted as an approximate signed distance between the trajectory and the set of trajectories satisfying the formula. We utilize feedback controllers, and we assume a feed forward neural network for learning these feedback controllers. We show how this learning problem is similar to training recurrent neural networks (RNNs), where the number of recurrent units is proportional to the temporal horizon of the agent’s task objectives. This poses a challenge: RNNs are susceptible to vanishing and exploding gradients, and naïve gradient descent-based strategies to solve long-horizon task objectives thus suffer from the same problems. To tackle this challenge, we introduce a novel gradient approximation algorithm based on the idea of dropout or gradient sampling. We show that, the existing smooth semantics for *robustness* are inefficient regarding gradient computation when the specification becomes complex. To address this challenge, we propose a new smooth semantics for DT-STL that under-approximates the robustness value and scales well for backpropagation over a complex specification. We show that our control synthesis methodology, can be quite helpful for stochastic gradient descent to converge with less numerical issues, enabling scalable backpropagation over long time horizons and trajectories over high dimensional state spaces. We demonstrate the efficacy of our approach on various motion planning applications requiring complex spatio-temporal and sequential tasks ranging over thousands of time-steps.

Keywords: Signal Temporal Logic, Neural Network Control, Feedback Control, Dropout, Gradient Descent

1 Introduction

The use of neural networks for feedback control enables data-driven control design for highly nonlinear environments. Several techniques have been proposed to train NN-based controllers, including deep reinforcement learning (RL) (Berducci et al., 2021; Li et al., 2017; Chua et al., 2018; Srinivasan et al., 2020; Velasquez et al., 2021), deep imitation learning (Fang et al., 2019), and neural predictive control Yaghoubi and Fainekos (2019b). Techniques to synthesize neural controllers (including deep RL methods) largely focus on optimizing cost functions that are constructed from user-defined state-based rewards or costs. These rewards are often proxies for desirable long-range behavior of the system and can be error-prone Pan et al. (2022); Skalse et al. (2022); Amodei et al. (2016) and often require careful design Hadfield-Menell et al. (2017); Sorg et al. (2010,?).

On the other hand, in most engineered safety-critical systems, the desired behavior can be described by a set of spatio-temporal task-objectives. For example, consider modeling a mobile robot where the system must reach region R_1 before reaching region R_2 , while avoiding an obstacle region. Such spatio-temporal task objectives can be expressed in the mathematically precise and symbolic formalism of Discrete Time Signal Temporal Logic (DT-STL) (Maler and Nickovic, 2004). A key advantage of DT-STL is that for any DT-STL specification and a system trajectory, we can efficiently compute the *robustness degree*, i.e. the approximate signed distance of the trajectory from the set of trajectories satisfying/violating the specification (Donzé and Maler, 2010; Fainekos et al., 2009).

There is a growing body of literature on control design with DT-STL specifications that uses the robustness degree as an objective function to be optimized. This literature brings together two separate threads: (1) smooth approximations to the robustness degree of STL specifications (Gilpin et al., 2020; Pant et al., 2017) enabling the use of STL robustness in gradient-based learning of open-loop control policies, and (2) representation of the robustness as a computation graph allowing its use in training neural controllers using back-propagation (Yaghoubi and Fainekos, 2019a; Leung et al., 2019, 2021; Hashemi et al., 2023; Hashemi et al.). While existing methods have demonstrated some success training open-loop NN policies Leung et al. (2019, 2021), and also closed-loop NN policies Hashemi et al. (2023); Hashemi et al.; Yaghoubi and Fainekos (2019a), several key limitations still remain. Consider the problem of planning the trajectory of a UAV in a complex, GPS-denied urban environment; here, it is essential that the planned trajectory span several minutes while avoiding obstacles and reaching several sequential goals (Windhorst et al., 2021). We show that none of the existing methods to synthesize closed-loop (or even open-loop) policies scale to handle long-horizon tasks.

A key reason for this is the inherent computational challenge in dealing with long-horizon specifications. Training open-loop policies treats the sequence of optimal control actions over the trajectory horizon as decision variables to maximize the robustness of the given STL property. Typical approaches use gradient-descent where in each iteration, the new control actions (i.e. the open-loop policy) are computed using the gradient of the DT-STL property w.r.t. the control actions. If the temporal horizon of the DT-STL property is K , then, this in turn is computed using back-propagation of the DT-STL robustness value through a computation graph representing the composition of the DT-STL robustness computation graph and K copies of the system dynamics. Similarly, if we seek to train closed-loop

(neural) feedback control policies using gradient descent, then we can treat the one-step environment dynamics and the neural controller as a recurrent unit that is repeated as many times as the temporal horizon of the DT-STL property. Gradient updates to the neural controller parameters are then done by computing the gradient of the STL computation graph composed with this RNN-like structure. In both cases, if the temporal horizon of φ is several hundred steps, then gradient computation requires back-propagation through those many steps. These procedures are quite similar to the ones used for training an RNN with many recurrent units. It is well-known that back-propagation through RNNs with many recurrent units faces problems of vanishing and exploding gradients (Goodfellow et al., 2016; Ba et al., 2016). To address these limitations, we propose a sampling-based approximation of the gradient of the objective function (i.e. the STL property), that is particularly effective when dealing with behaviors over large time-horizons. Our key idea is to approximate the gradient during back-propagation by an approximation scheme similar to the idea of drop-out layers used in deep neural networks. The main idea of drop-out layers is to probabilistically pick set the output of some neurons in the layer to zero in order to prevent over-fitting. We do a similar trick: in each training iteration we pick some recurrent units to be "frozen", i.e., we use older fixed values of the NN parameters for the frozen layers, effectively approximating the gradient propagation through those layers. We show that this can improve training of NN controllers by at least an *order of magnitude*. Specifically, we reduce training times from hours to minutes, and can also train reactive planners for task objectives that have large time horizons.

The core ideas in this paper build on our prior work that proposed a ReLU-based neural network encoding (called STL2NN) of DT-STL formulas to exactly compute the robustness value Hashemi et al. (2023). We show how we can significantly extend this computation graph to obtain *smooth, guaranteed underapproximations* of the DT-STL robustness value, and scale gradient-based back-propagation with the new smooth semantics to long-horizon temporal tasks.

Contributions. To summarize, we make the following contributions:

1. We develop a sampling-based approach, inspired by dropout Srivastava et al. (2014), to approximate the gradient of DT-STL robustness w.r.t. the NN controller parameters. Emphasizing the time-steps that contribute the most to the gradient, our method randomly samples time points over the trajectory. We utilize the structure of the STL formula and the current system trajectory to decide which time-points represent critical information for the gradient.
2. We propose smooth versions of computation graphs representing the robustness degree computation of a DT-STL specification over the trajectory of a dynamical system. Our computation graph guarantees that it lower bounds the robustness value with a tunable degree of approximation.
3. We develop a back-propagation framework which leverages the new differentiable structure, and we show how we can handle DT-STL specifications.
4. We demonstrate the efficacy of our approach on high dimensional nonlinear dynamical systems involving long-horizon and dynamic temporal specifications.

Related Work. The use of temporal logic specifications for controller synthesis is a well-studied problem. Early work focuses on the model-based setting, where the environment dynamics are described either as Markov decision processes (Sadigh and Kapoor, 2016; Haesaert et al., 2018) or as differential equations (Gilpin et al., 2020; Pant et al., 2018; Raman et al., 2014; Farahani et al., 2015; Lindemann and Dimarogonas, 2018; Raman et al., 2015; Kalagarla et al., 2020; Lacerda et al., 2015; Guo and Zavlanos, 2018)). Recent years have also seen growing interest in data-driven techniques (Balakrishnan et al., 2022; Li et al., 2018) for control synthesis. In addition, automata-based approaches (Sadigh et al., 2014; Hasanbeig et al., 2018; Hahn et al., 2020; Lavaei et al., 2020) are also proposed in the field to address temporal logic based objectives. In (Liu et al., 2021), the authors propose an imitation learning framework where a Model-Predictive Controller (MPC) guaranteed to satisfy an STL specification is used as a teacher to train a recurrent neural network (RNN). In (Wang et al., 2023; Balakrishnan and Deshmukh, 2019), the authors replace handcrafted reward functions with the STL robustness within single-agent or multi-agent deep RL frameworks. The overall approach of this paper is the closest to the work in (Yaghoubi and Fainekos, 2019a; Leung et al., 2019, 2021; Hashemi et al., 2023; Hashemi et al.), where STL robustness is used in conjunction with back-propagation to train controllers. The work in this paper makes significant strides in extending previous approaches to handle very long horizon temporal tasks, crucially enabled by the novel sampling-based gradient approximations. Due to the structure of our NN-controlled system, we can seamlessly handle time-varying dynamics and complex temporal dependencies. We also note that while some previous approaches focus on obtaining open-loop control policies, we focus on synthesizing closed-loop, feedback NN-controllers which can be robust to minor perturbations in the system dynamics.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notation and the problem definition. We propose our learning-based control synthesis algorithms in Section 3, present experimental evaluation in Section 6, and conclude in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

We use bold letters to indicate vectors and vector-valued functions, and calligraphic letters to denote sets. We denote the set, $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $[n]$. A feed forward neural network (NN) with ℓ hidden layers is denoted by the array $[n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{\ell+1}]$, where n_0 denotes the number of inputs, $n_{\ell+1}$ is the number of outputs and for all $i \in [\ell]$, n_i denotes the width of i^{th} hidden layer. The notation $x \overset{u}{\sim} \mathcal{X}$ implies the random variable x is sampled from the compact set $\mathcal{X}$ via uniform distribution.

NN Feedback Control Systems (NNFCS). Let $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{a}$ denote the state and action variables that take values from compact sets $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, respectively. We use $\mathbf{s}_k$ (resp. $\mathbf{a}_k$) to denote the value of the state (resp. action) at time k . We define a neural network controlled system (NNFCS) as a recurrent difference equation

$$\mathbf{s}_{k+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{s}_k, \mathbf{a}_k), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_k = \pi_\theta(\mathbf{s}_k, k)$ is the control policy. We assume that the control policy is a parameterized function π_θ , where θ is a vector of parameters that takes values in Θ . Later in the paper, we instantiate the specific parametric form using a neural network for the controller.




Figure 1: Shows an illustration of the recurrent structure for the control feedback system.

That is, given a fixed vector of parameters θ , the parametric control policy π_θ returns an action $\mathbf{a}_k$ as a function of the current state $\mathbf{s}_k \in \mathcal{S}$ and time $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{a}_k = \pi_\theta(\mathbf{s}_k, k)$.

Closed-loop Model Trajectory. For a discrete-time NNCS as shown in Eq. (1), and a set of designated initial states $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, under a pre-defined feedback policy π_θ , Eq. (1) represents an autonomous discrete-time dynamical system. For a given initial state $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, a system trajectory $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta]$ is a function mapping time instants in $[0, K]$ to $\mathcal{S}$, where $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](0) = \mathbf{s}_0$, and for all $k \in [0, K-1]$, $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](k+1) = \mathbf{f}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](k), \pi_\theta(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](k), k))$ ¹. Here, K is some integer called the trajectory horizon, and the exact value of K depends on the DT-STL task objective that the closed-loop model trajectories must satisfy. The computation graph for this trajectory is a recurrent structure. Figure 1 shows an illustration of this structure and its similarity to an RNN.

Task Objectives and Safety Constraints. We assume that task objectives and safety constraints are specified using the syntax of Discrete-Time Signal Temporal Logic (DT-STL)(Maler and Nickovic, 2004). We assume that DT-STL formulas are specified in positive normal form, i.e., all negations are pushed to the signal predicates²

$$\varphi = h(\mathbf{s}) \bowtie 0 \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \mathbf{U}_I \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \mathbf{R}_I \varphi_2 \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{U}_I$ and $\mathbf{R}_I$ are the timed until and release operators, $\bowtie \in \{\leq, <, >, \geq\}$, and h is a function from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. In this work, since we use discrete-time semantics for STL (referred to as DT-STL), the time interval I is a bounded interval of integers, i.e., $I = [a, b], a \leq b$. The timed eventually ($\mathbf{F}_I$) and always ($\mathbf{G}_I$) operators can be syntactically defined through until and release. That is, $\mathbf{F}_I \varphi \equiv \top \mathbf{U}_I \varphi$ and $\mathbf{G}_I \varphi \equiv \perp \mathbf{R}_I \varphi$ where $\top$ and $\perp$ represent true and false. The formal semantics of DT-STL over discrete-time trajectories have been previously presented in (Fainekos and Pappas, 2006). We briefly recall them here. Note that without timestamps, DT-STL is just a regular language; nevertheless, in this work, we need to use robust semantics which are not defined over automata or regular expressions.

Boolean Semantics and Formula Horizon. We denote the formula φ being true at time k in trajectory $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta]$ by $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], k \models \varphi$. We say that $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], k \models h(\mathbf{s}) \bowtie 0$ iff $h(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](k)) \bowtie 0$. The semantics of the Boolean operations ($\wedge, \vee$) follow standard logical semantics of conjunctions and disjunctions, respectively. For temporal operators, we say

1. If the policy π_θ is obvious from the context, we drop the θ in the notation $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta]$.
2. Any formula in DT-STL can be converted to a formula in positive normal form using DeMorgan's laws and the duality between the Until and Release operators)

$\sigma[s_0 ; \theta], k \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{U}_I \varphi_2$ is true if there is a time k' , s.t. $k' - k \in I$ where φ_2 is true and for all times $k'' \in [k, k']$, φ_1 is true. Similarly, $\sigma[s_0 ; \theta], k \models \varphi_1 \mathbf{R}_I \varphi_2$ is true if for all times k' with $k' - k \in I$, φ_2 is true, or there exists some time $k'' \in [k, k']$ such that φ_1 was true. The temporal scope or horizon of a DT-STL formula defines the last time-step required to evaluate the formula, $\sigma[s_0 ; \theta], 0 \models \varphi$ (see (Maler and Nickovic, 2004)). For example, the temporal scope of the formula $\mathbf{F}_{[0,3]}(x > 0)$ is 3, and that of the formula $\mathbf{F}_{[0,3]} \mathbf{G}_{[0,9]}(x > 0)$ is $3 + 9 = 12$. We also set the horizon of trajectory equivalent to the horizon of formula, as we plan to monitor the satisfaction of the formula by the trajectory.

Quantitative Semantics (Robustness value) of DT-STL. Quantitative semantics of DT-STL roughly define a signed distance of a given trajectory from the set of trajectories satisfying or violating the given DT-STL formula. There are many alternative semantics proposed in the literature (Donzé and Maler, 2010; Fainekos and Pappas, 2006; Rodionova et al., 2022; Akazaki and Hasuo, 2015); in this paper, we focus on the semantics from (Donzé and Maler, 2010) that are shown below. The robustness value $\rho(\varphi, \sigma[s_0 ; \theta], k)$ of a DT-STL formula φ over a trajectory $\sigma[s_0 ; \theta]$ at time k is defined recursively as follows³.

φ	$\rho(\varphi, k)$	φ	$\rho(\varphi, k)$
$h(\mathbf{s}_k) \geq 0$	$h(\mathbf{s}_k)$	$\mathbf{F}_{[a,b]} \psi$	$\max_{k' \in [k+a, k+b]} \rho(\psi, k')$
$\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$	$\min(\rho(\varphi_1, k), \rho(\varphi_2, k))$	$\varphi_1 \mathbf{U}_{[a,b]} \varphi_2$	$\max_{k' \in [k+a, k+b]} \left(\min \left(\rho(\varphi_2, k'), \min_{k'' \in [k, k']} \rho(\varphi_1, k'') \right) \right)$
$\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$	$\max(\rho(\varphi_1, k), \rho(\varphi_2, k))$	$\varphi_1 \mathbf{R}_{[a,b]} \varphi_2$	$\min_{k' \in [k+a, k+b]} \left(\max \left(\rho(\varphi_2, k'), \max_{k'' \in [k, k']} \rho(\varphi_1, k'') \right) \right)$
$\mathbf{G}_{[a,b]} \psi$	$\min_{k' \in [k+a, k+b]} \rho(\psi, k')$		

(3)

We note that if $\rho(\varphi, k) > 0$ the DT-STL formula φ is satisfied at time k , and we say that the formula φ is satisfied by a trajectory if $\rho(\varphi, 0) > 0$.

Discrete Time STL Robustness as a ReLU NN. The quantitative semantics of DT-STL is based on min/max operators. Therefore, the robust interpretation of a DT-STL specification is difficult to be used in gradient-based method for learning. However, min / max operators can be expressed using ReLU functions as follows (see Hashemi et al. (2023)):

$$\min(a_1, a_2) = a_1 - \text{ReLU}(a_1 - a_2), \quad \max(a_1, a_2) = a_2 + \text{ReLU}(a_1 - a_2). \quad (4)$$

This allows the computation graph representing the robustness of a DT-STL formula w.r.t. a given trajectory to be expressed using repeated application of the ReLU function (with due diligence in balancing min, max computations over several arguments into a tree of at most logarithmic height in the number of operands). We call this ReLU-based computation graph as STL2NN. STL2NN, despite being reformulated with ReLU, is equivalent to non-smooth robust DT-STL semantics, making it unsuitable for back-propagation. To address this, we introduce smooth activation functions to create a differentiable computation graph. One of the main advantages of STL2NN is that it provides a neural network with depth that increases logarithmically with the complexity of STL formula. As we see later, this helps reduce some of the computational cost during back-propagation.

3. For brevity, we omit the trajectory from the notation, as it is obvious from the context.

Prior Smooth Quantitative Semantics for DT-STL. To address non-differentiability of the robust semantics of STL, there have been a few alternate definitions of smooth approximations of the robustness in the literature. The initial proposal for this improvement is provided by Pant et al. (2017). Later the authors in Gilpin et al. (2020) proposed another smooth semantics which is also a guaranteed lower bound for the robustness value that can be even more advantageous computationally. We denote the smooth robustness of trajectory $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta]$ for temporal specification φ , with $\tilde{\rho}(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta], 0)$.

Problem Definition. In this paper, we provide algorithms to learn a policy π_{θ^*} that maximizes the degree to which certain task objectives and safety constraints are satisfied. In particular, we wish to learn a neural network (NN) control policy π_{θ} (or equivalently the parameter values θ), s.t. for any initial state $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, using the control policy π_{θ} , the trajectory obtained, i.e., $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta]$ satisfies a given DT-STL formula φ . In other words, our ultimate goal is to solve the optimization problem shown in Eq. (5). For brevity, we use $F(\mathbf{s}_k, k ; \theta)$ to denote $\mathbf{f}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta](k), \pi_{\theta}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta](k), k))$.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* &= \arg \max_{\theta} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathcal{I}} [\rho(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta], 0)]), \\ \text{s.t. } \forall k : 1 \leq k < K : \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta](k+1) &= F(\mathbf{s}_k, k ; \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

However, as this problem is computationally challenging, we instead relax the problem to maximizing the expected value of the robustness only over a set of states sampled from the initial states. We solve this problem using algorithms based on stochastic gradient descent followed by statistical verification to obtain high-confidence control policies. We discuss the details of these steps in what is to follow.

3 Training Neural Network Control Policies

Our solution strategy is to treat each time-step of the given dynamical equation in Eq. (1) as a recurrent unit. We then sequentially compose or unroll as many units as required by the horizon of the DT-STL specification.

Example 1 Assume a one-step dynamics with scalar state, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ and scalar feedback control policy $a_k = \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ as, $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_k))$. If the specification is $\mathbf{F}_{[0,3]}(\mathbf{x} > 0)$, then, we use 3 instances of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_k))$ by setting the output of the k^{th} unit to be the input of the $(k+1)^{\text{th}}$ unit. This unrolled structure implicitly contains the system trajectory, $\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta]$ starting from some initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$ of the system. The unrolled structure essentially represents the symbolic trajectory, where each recurrent unit shares the NN parameters of the controller




Figure 2: This figure shows the symbolic trajectory generated by NN feedback controller, and the computation graph for DT-STL robustness. The DT-STL robustness is presented as a Nero-symbolic computation graph Hashemi et al. (2023) via ReLU and Linear activation functions.

(see Figure. 2 for more detail). By composing this structure with the robustness semantics representing the given DT-STL specification φ ; we have a computation graph that maps the initial state of the system in Eq. (1) to the robustness degree of φ . Thus, training the parameters of this resulting structure to guarantee that its output is positive (for all initial states) guarantees that each system trajectory satisfies φ .

However, we face a challenge in training the neural network controller that is embodied in this structure.

Challenge: As our model can be thought of as a recurrent structure with number of repeated units proportional to the horizon of the formula, naïve gradient-based training algorithms suffer as we attempt to compute the gradient using back-propagation through the unrolled system dynamics. As our structure is recurrent, the gradient computation faces the same issues of vanishing and exploding gradients when dealing with long trajectories that RNNs may face in training (Pascanu et al., 2013). We introduce an efficient technique to approximate gradients for long trajectories that is inspired by the idea of dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014). We call this approximation for the gradient as **sampld gradient**.

Example 2 We again consider the Example 1 to compute for its robustness's gradient and clarify the notion of vanishing/exploding gradient. The gradient of robustness with respect to the control parameters can be formulated as,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \rho(\varphi, 0)}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\partial \rho(\varphi, 0)}{\partial \sigma[\mathbf{x}_0; \theta]} \left[0, \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_2}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_3}{\partial \theta} \right], \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_0} \frac{\partial a_0}{\partial \theta}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_2}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_1} \frac{\partial a_1}{\partial \theta} + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_1} \frac{\partial a_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_1}{\partial \theta}, \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_3}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_2} \frac{\partial a_2}{\partial \theta} + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_2} \frac{\partial a_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_2}{\partial \theta}.\end{aligned}$$

This formulation clearly shows the rise of multiplications as the time index of the state gets higher. As an example, one of the additive terms contributing in gradient computation for $\mathbf{x}_3$ is,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_3}{\partial \theta} = \dots + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_2} \frac{\partial a_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_1} \frac{\partial a_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_0} \frac{\partial a_0}{\partial \theta} + \dots$$

and in case we consider another scenario where, the trajectory have 1000 time-steps, then this additive term appears as,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_{1000}}{\partial \theta} = \dots + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{999}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_{999}} \frac{\partial a_{999}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{999}} \right) \dots \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_1} \frac{\partial a_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial a_0} \frac{\partial a_0}{\partial \theta} + \dots,$$

that may explode during gradient computation in back-propagation due to a high number of multiplications.

In order to train the controller, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}_0 \sim \mathcal{I}} [\rho(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], 0)] \right), \quad \text{s.t. } \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta](k+1) = F(\mathbf{s}_k, k; \theta).$$

This optimization aims to increase the expectation of the robustness for initial states uniformly sampled from the set of initial states. An approximate solution for this optimization problem

can be proposed as training the NN controller using a vanilla gradient-based back-propagation algorithm that receives a random initial state $\mathbf{s}_0$ from a set of sampled initial states $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \subset \mathcal{I}$, and updates the parameters of the neural network controller. Since it does not guarantee for all initial states $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, thus the next step is to verify that the computed π_θ guarantees the satisfaction of the specification φ for any initial condition $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathcal{I}$. To prove this for all the initial states, we could use a methodology like Hashemi et al. (2023) that uses reachability analysis to verify the synthesized controller. However, given the long time-horizon, this method may face computational challenges. An alternate approach is to eschew deterministic guarantees, and instead obtain probabilistic guarantees using the notion of **Beta** distribution (see Sec. 6.7).

4 Extension to Long Horizon Temporal Tasks & Higher Dimensional Systems

To alleviate exploding/vanishing gradients, inspired by the idea of dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014) for back-propagation, we instead propose a sampling-based technique, where we only select certain time-points in the trajectory for gradient computation, while using a fixed older control policy at the non-selected points. Our approach to gradient sampling can be also viewed through the lens of stochastic depth, as suggested by Huang et al. (2016), which involves sampling layers followed by identity transformations provided in ResNet. However, our methodology differs as we employ a distinct approach that is better suited for control synthesis within the Signal Temporal Logic (STL) framework.

4.1 Sampling-Based Gradient Approximation Technique

This technique is based on sampling across recurrent units and is originally inspired by dropout proposed in (Srivastava et al., 2014). Considering the NN controllers rolled out over the trajectory, the idea of dropout suggests removing the randomly selected nodes from a randomly selected NN controller over the trajectory. This requires the node to be absent in both forward-pass and backward-pass in the back-propagation algorithm. However, our primary goal is to alleviate the problem of vanishing and exploding gradients. Thus, we propose to sample random time-steps and select all of its controller nodes to apply dropout. However, for long trajectories we need to drop out a large portion of time-steps that result in inaccurate approximation, thus we compensate for this by repeating this process and computing for accumulative gradients (See parameters N_1, N_2 in Algorithm. 1). Restriction of dropout to sample time-steps results in less number of self multiplication of weights and therefore alleviates the problem of vanishing/exploding gradient. However, this may result in disconnection between the trajectory states, and thus we need to apply modifications to this strategy. To that end, we drop out the selected nodes, but we also replace that group of selected nodes (i.e., the controller unit) with a constant function that returns the evaluation of the controller unit (at that specific time-step) in forward pass. This strategy motivates us to define the sampled trajectory as proposed in Definition. 1.

Definition 1 (Sampled Trajectory) *Consider the set of time-steps $\mathcal{T} = \{0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$ sampled from the horizon $\mathcal{K} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, K\}$, and the control parameters $\theta^{(j)}$ in the gradient step j . The sampled trajectory $\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})$ is a subset of trajectory states $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}]$,*

where $\text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(0) = \mathbf{s}_0$ and, for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$:

$$\text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(i+1) = \mathbf{f}_i^{(j)}(\text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(i)).$$

Given the pre-computed actions (assumed as constants) $\{\mathbf{a}_{1+t_i}, \mathbf{a}_{2+t_i}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{t_{i+1}-1}\}$ using $\theta^{(j)}$ in the gradient step j , the dynamics model $\mathbf{f}_i^{(j)}$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{f}_i^{(j)}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(\dots(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{s}, t_i ; \theta^{(j)}), \mathbf{a}_{1+t_i}), \mathbf{a}_{2+t_i}), \dots, \mathbf{a}_{t_{i+1}-1}).$$

Figure. 5 clarifies this definition through visualization. This definition replaces the set of selected nodes - on a randomly selected time-step - with its pre-computed evaluation. This set of nodes are indeed a controller unit on the time-steps sampled to be dropped out⁴. We then name, the set of remaining states on the trajectory - that are not planned to be dropped out - as sampled trajectory, and we denote it with $\text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})$.

Example 3 Let the state and action at the time k be $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively. The feedback controller is $a_k = \pi_\theta(\mathbf{x}_k, k)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and the dynamics is also $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k, a_k)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = 1.15$. Let's also assume a trajectory of horizon 9 over time-domain (i.e., $\mathcal{K} = \{i \mid 0 \leq i \leq 9\}$) with a trajectory $\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta] = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4, \mathbf{x}_5, \mathbf{x}_6, \mathbf{x}_7, \mathbf{x}_8, \mathbf{x}_9\}$. Suppose, we are in the gradient step $j = 42$, and in this iteration, we want to generate a sampled trajectory with $N = 3$ time-steps, where, $\mathcal{T} = \{0, t_1 = 1, t_2 = 3, t_3 = 6\}$. The control parameters at this gradient step are also $\theta^{(42)} = \{1.2, 2.31, -0.92\}$ that results in the control sequence $\mathbf{a} = \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$. Given this information, we define the sampled trajectory as $\text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta^{(42)}], \mathcal{T}) = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_6\}$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 &= \mathbf{f}_0^{(42)}(\mathbf{x}_0) = F(\mathbf{x}_0, 0 ; \theta^{(42)}), & \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3 &= \mathbf{f}_2^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1) = \mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, 1 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.2), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_6 &= \mathbf{f}_5^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3) = \mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3, 3 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.4), 0.5) \end{aligned}$$

where the constants 0.2, 0.4, 0.5 are the 3rd, 5th, and 6th elements in the pre-evaluated control sequence $\mathbf{a}$, respectively.

Remark 2 The sub-trajectory, $\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}) = \{\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_{t_1}, \mathbf{s}_{t_2}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{t_N}\}$ is simply a selection of N trajectory states with time-steps $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The main difference between the sampled trajectory

$$\begin{aligned} \text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}) = \\ \left\{ \mathbf{s}_0, \text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(1), \text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(2), \dots, \text{smpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(N) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and the sub-trajectory $\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})$ can be stated as follows: Although the elements of the sampled trajectory are independent from the un-sampled portion of the trajectory, the elements of sub-trajectory are dependent to it. In other words, the sampled trajectory is a relaxed version of the sub-trajectory.

4. The set of sampled time-steps for dropout is in fact the set-difference between $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of sampled times steps that is generated to define the sampled trajectory.

4.2 Including the Critical Predicate in Time Sampling

While it is possible to select random time-points to use in the gradient computation, in our preliminary results, exploiting the structure of the given DT-STL formula – specifically identifying and using *critical predicates* – gives better results. We now explain the notion of a critical predicate.

Definition 3 (Critical Predicate) *As the robustness degree of DT-STL is an expression consisting of min and max of robustness values of predicates at different times, the robustness degree is consistently equivalent to the robustness of one of the predicates $h(\cdot)$ at a specific time. This specific predicate $h^* > 0$ is called the critical predicate, and this specific time k^* is called the critical time.*

Example 4 *We again consider Example 1 to clarify the notion of critical predicate. In this example, we have 4 predicates of a unique type, e.g. $h(\mathbf{x}_k) = \mathbf{x}_k > 0$. Thus, the robustness values of the predicate $h(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ at time points 0, 1, 2, 3 are respectively $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$. Assume the trajectory is $\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0; \theta] = [\mathbf{x}_0 = 0, \mathbf{x}_1 = 1, \mathbf{x}_2 = 2, \mathbf{x}_3 = 1]$. Since the robustness function is defined as $\rho(\varphi, 0) = \max(h(\mathbf{x}_0), h(\mathbf{x}_1), h(\mathbf{x}_2), h(\mathbf{x}_3))$, the robustness value is equivalent to $h(\mathbf{x}_2)$. Thus, we can conclude, the critical predicate is $h^* = h(\mathbf{x}_2) > 0$ and the critical time is $k^* = 2$.*

The critical predicate and critical time of a DT-STL formula can be computed using the same dynamic programming based approach that is used to compute the robustness value for a given DT-STL formula. This algorithm has been implemented in the S-Taliro tool Fainekos et al. (2009); we have included in supplementary material for completeness. (Please see Appendix A).

4.3 Safe Re-Smoothing

A difficulty in using critical predicates is that a change in controller parameter values may change the system trajectory, which may in turn change the predicate that is critical in the robustness computation. Specifically, if the critical predicate in one gradient step is different from the critical predicate in the subsequent gradient step, our gradient ascent strategy may fail to improve the robustness value, as the generated gradient in this gradient step is incorrect.

Example 5 *To clarify this with an example, we present a specific scenario in Figure. 3. This figure shows the robustness value as a non-differentiable function of control parameters, that is a piece-wise differentiable relation where every differentiable segment represents a specific critical predicate. The system dynamics is $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = 0.8\mathbf{x}_k^{1,2} - \mathbf{e}^{-4u_k \sin(u_k)^2}$, where*




Figure 3: this figure shows a common challenge in using critical predicate for control synthesis. This figure presents the robustness as a piece-wise differentiable function of control parameter θ (with resolution, 0.00001), where each differentiable segment represent a distinct critical predicate.




Figure 4: This figure shows an example for the relation between control parameters and the resulting robustness as a piece-wise differentiable function. Assuming a fixed initial state, every control parameter is corresponding to a simulated trajectory, and that trajectory represents a robustness value. This robustness value is equal to the quantitative semantics for the critical predicate. Within each differentiable segment in this plot, the control parameters yield trajectories associated with a unique critical predicate.




Figure 5: This figure depicts the sampling-based gradient computation. In our approach, we freeze the controller at some time-points, while at others we assume the controller to be a function of its parameters that can vary in this iteration of back-propagation process. The actions that are fixed are highlighted in red, whereas the dependent actions are denoted in black. The red circles represent the time-steps where the controller is frozen.

the system starts from $\mathbf{x}_0 = 1.15$ and the controller is $u_k = \tanh(\theta \mathbf{x}_k)$. The robustness is plotted based on control parameter $\theta \in [-1, 1]$ and is corresponding to the formula $\Phi = \mathbf{F}_{[0,45]} [\mathbf{G}_{[0,5]} [\mathbf{x} > 0]] \wedge \mathbf{G}_{[0,50]} [1 - 10\mathbf{x} > 0]$. Assume the training process is in the 15th gradient step of back-propagation with $\theta = \theta^{(15)} = 0.49698$ where the critical predicate for this control parameter is denoted by $p_1 := (\mathbf{x}_1 > 0)$. The gradient generated from the critical predicate p_1 suggests increasing the value of θ , resulting in $\theta = \theta^{(16)} = 0.50672$, where the critical predicate is $p_2 := (1 - 10\mathbf{x}_{45} > 0)$. However, in this case, the gradient generated from the critical predicate p_1 is incorrect for this gradient step, since the critical predicate shifts from p_1 to p_2 . The scenario proposed in this figure shows this incorrect gradient computation results in a drastic drop in the robustness value from 8.09 to -6.15 . Therefore, the gradient of critical predicate is useful, only if the gradient step preserves the critical predicate.

Given a predefined specification φ , a fixed initial state, differentiable controller with parameter θ , and a differentiable model, the robustness value is a piece-wise differentiable function of control parameter, where each differentiable segment represents a unique critical predicate (see Figure. 4). However, the Adam algorithm assumes a differentiable objective function. Therefore, we utilize the critical predicate as the objective function when we are in the differentiable segments, and we replace it with the smooth semantics of DT-STL robustness, $\tilde{\rho}$, at the non-differentiable local maxima where the critical predicate is updated. We refer to this shift between critical predicate and smooth semantics as safe re-smoothing. However, it is practically impossible to accurately detect the non-differentiable local maxima, thus we take a more conservative approach and we instead, utilize $\tilde{\rho}$ at every gradient step when the critical predicate technique is unable to improve the robustness.

Algorithm 1: Gradient sampling and training the controller for long horizon tasks.

```

1 Input:  $\epsilon, M, N, N_1, N_2, \theta^{(0)}, \varphi, \bar{\rho}, \hat{\mathcal{I}}, j = 0$ 
2 while  $\rho^\varphi(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}]) \leq \bar{\rho}$  do
3    $s_0 \leftarrow \text{Sample from } \hat{\mathcal{I}}$     $\text{use\_smooth} \leftarrow \text{False}$     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
4   if  $\text{use\_smooth} = \text{False}$  then
5      $\theta_1 \leftarrow \theta^{(j)}$ 
6     //  $\theta_1$  is the candidate for parameter update via critical predicate
7     // The following loop updates  $\theta_1$  via cumulation of  $N_1$  sampled gradients
8     for  $i \leftarrow 1, \dots, N_1$  do
9        $\sigma[s_0; \theta_1] \leftarrow \text{Simulate the trajectory via } \theta_1 \text{ and } s_0$ 
10       $k^*, h^*(s_{k^*}) \leftarrow$ 
11        obtain the critical time and the critical predicate via  $\sigma[s_0; \theta_1]$  from Appendix. A
12
13       $\mathcal{T}, \text{smp}(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(1)}], \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow \text{sample set of } N \text{ time steps } \mathcal{T} =$ 
14         $\{0, t_1, \dots, t_N = k^*\}$  and its corresponding sampled trajectory
15       $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow h^*(\text{smp}(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(1)}], \mathcal{T})(N))$     $d_1 \leftarrow [\partial \mathcal{J} / \partial \theta]_{\text{sampled}}$ 
16       $\theta_1 \leftarrow \theta_1 + \text{Adam}(d_1 / N_1)$ 
17
18      // Update the control parameter with  $\theta_1$  if it increases the robustness value
19      // Otherwise, check for non-differentiable local maximum
20
21      if  $\rho^\varphi(\sigma[s_0; \theta_1]) \geq \rho^\varphi(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}])$  then  $\theta^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \theta_1$ 
22      else
23         $\ell \leftarrow 1$     $\text{update} \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
24        while  $\text{update} \ \& \ (\text{use\_smooth} = \text{False})$  do
25           $\ell \leftarrow \ell / 2$     $\hat{\theta} \leftarrow \theta^{(j)} + \ell(\theta_1 - \theta^{(j)})$ 
26          // Keep the gradient direction & reduce the learning rate
27          // Update the control parameter with  $\hat{\theta}$  if it increases the robustness value
28          if  $\rho(\varphi, \sigma[s_0; \hat{\theta}], 0) \geq \rho^\varphi(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}])$  then  $[\theta^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \hat{\theta}]$     $\text{update} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
29          else if  $\ell < \epsilon$  then
30             $\text{use\_smooth} \leftarrow \text{True}$    // swap the objective with  $\tilde{\rho}$  if  $\ell < \epsilon$ 
31
32      if  $\text{use\_smooth} = \text{True}$  then
33         $\theta_2 \leftarrow \theta^{(j)}$ 
34        //  $\theta_2$  is the candidate for parameter update via smooth semantic  $\tilde{\rho}$ 
35        // Following loop updates  $\theta_2$  via cumulation of  $N_2$  sampled gradients
36        for  $i \leftarrow 1, \dots, N_2$  do
37           $\mathcal{T}^q, \text{smp}(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(2)}], \mathcal{T}^q), q \in [M] \leftarrow$ 
38            Make  $M$  sets of sampled time steps from Eq. (6) & their sampled trajectories
39
40           $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow \tilde{\rho}$     $d_2 \leftarrow [\partial \mathcal{J} / \partial \theta]_{\text{sampled}}$     $\theta_2 \leftarrow \theta_2 + \text{Adam}(d_2 / N_2)$ 
41
42         $\theta^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \theta_2$ 

```

4.4 Computing the Sampled Gradient

In this work, we denote the gradient of original trajectory with '*original gradient*' and the approximate gradient from our sampling technique as '*sampled gradient*'. In the back-propagation algorithm - at a given gradient step j and with control parameter $\theta^{(j)}$ - we wish to compute the sampled gradient $[\partial\mathcal{J}/\partial\theta^{(j)}]_{\text{sampled}}$. The objective function $\mathcal{J}$ in our training algorithm can be either the robustness for critical predicate or the smooth semantics for the robustness of trajectory, $\tilde{\rho}$. The former is defined over a single trajectory state, (i.e., at critical time) while the latter is defined over all the trajectory. In response, we propose two different approaches for trajectory sampling for each objective function.

1- In case the objective function $\mathcal{J}$ is the robustness for critical predicate, it is only a function of the trajectory state $\mathbf{s}_{k^*}$. Thus, we sample the time-steps as, $\mathcal{T} = \{0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$, $t_N = k^*$ to generate a sampled trajectory $\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})$ that ends in critical time. We utilize this sampled trajectory to compute the sampled gradient. The original gradient regarding the critical predicate can be formulated as, $\partial\mathcal{J}/\partial\theta = (\partial\mathcal{J}/\partial\mathbf{s}_{k^*})(\partial\mathbf{s}_{k^*}/\partial\theta)$. However, we define $\mathcal{J}$ on our sampled trajectory and propose the sampled gradient as,

$$\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\theta}\right]_{\text{sampled}} = \left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(N)}\right) \left(\frac{\partial\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T})(N)}{\partial\theta}\right).$$

2- In case the objective function is the smooth semantics for the robustness $\tilde{\rho}$, it is function of all the trajectory states. In this case, we consequently segment the trajectory into M partitions, by random time sampling as, $\mathcal{T}^q = \{0, t_1^q, t_2^q, \dots, t_N^q\}$, $q \in [M]$ (See Example 6), where,

$$(\forall q, q' \in [M] : \mathcal{T}^q \cap \mathcal{T}^{q'} = \{0\}) \wedge (\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{q \in [M]} \mathcal{T}^q). \quad (6)$$

We also denote the sub-trajectories generated by $\mathcal{T}^q, q \in [M]$ as

$$\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q) = \{\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_{t_1^q}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{t_N^q}\}$$

and the sampled trajectories generated by $\mathcal{T}^q, q \in [M]$ as $\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)$. Since the sampled time-steps, $\mathcal{T}^q, q \in [M]$ have no time-step in common other than 0 and their union covers the horizon $\mathcal{K}$, we can formulate the original gradient as,

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\theta} = \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)}\right) \left(\frac{\partial\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)}{\partial\theta}\right).$$

However, in our training process to compute the sampled gradient, we relax the sub-trajectories $\text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q), q \in [M]$ with their corresponding sampled trajectories $\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)$. In other words, the sampled gradient can be formulated as,

$$\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\theta}\right]_{\text{sampled}} = \sum_{q=1}^M \left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{J}}{\partial\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)}\right) \left(\frac{\partial\text{smp}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q)}{\partial\theta}\right).$$

Remark 4 Unlike $\partial \mathbf{s}_{k^*} / \partial \theta$ and $\partial \text{sub}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta^{(j)}], \mathcal{T}^q) / \partial \theta, q \in [M]$ that are prone to vanish/explode problem, their proposed alternatives,

$$\partial \text{simpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta], \mathcal{T})(N) / \partial \theta, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \text{simpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta], \mathcal{T}^q) / \partial \theta, q \in [M]$$

can be computed efficiently⁵.

Example 6 Here, we propose an example to show our methodology to generate sampled trajectories when $\mathcal{J} = \tilde{\rho}$. We again consider the Example 3, but we sample the trajectory with $M = 3$ sets of sampled time-steps $\mathcal{T}^1 = \{0, 2, 4, 9\}$, $\mathcal{T}^2 = \{0, 5, 7, 8\}$ and $\mathcal{T}^3 = \{0, 1, 3, 6\}$. Here, the time-steps are sampled such that their intersection is $\{0\}$ and their union is $\mathcal{K}$. The resulting sampled trajectory for $\mathcal{T}^1$ is $\text{simpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta^{(42)}], \mathcal{T}^1) = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_4, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_9\}$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2 &= \mathbf{f}_1^{(42)}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{f}(F(\mathbf{x}_0, 0 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.1), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_4 = \mathbf{f}_3^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2) = \mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2, 2 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.3), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_9 &= \mathbf{f}_8^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_4) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_4, 4 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.5), 0.6), 0.7), 0.8), \end{aligned}$$

and the resulting sampled trajectory for $\mathcal{T}^2$ is $\text{simpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta^{(42)}], \mathcal{T}^2) = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_5, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_7, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_8\}$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_5 &= \mathbf{f}_4^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_0) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_0, 0 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.1), 0.2), 0.3), 0.4) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_7 &= \mathbf{f}_6^{(42)}(\mathbf{x}_5) = \mathbf{f}(F(\mathbf{x}_5, 5 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.6), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_8 = \mathbf{f}_7^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_7) = \mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_7, 7 ; \theta^{(42)}), \end{aligned}$$

and finally the resulting sampled trajectory for $\mathcal{T}^3$ is $\text{simpl}(\sigma[\mathbf{x}_0 ; \theta^{(42)}], \mathcal{T}^3) = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_6\}$ where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 &= \mathbf{f}_0^{(42)}(\mathbf{x}_0) = F(\mathbf{x}_0, 0 ; \theta^{(42)}), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3 = \mathbf{f}_2^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1) = \mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, 1 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.2), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_6 &= \mathbf{f}_5^{(42)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}(F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_3, 3 ; \theta^{(42)}), 0.4), 0.5) \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that, the introduced sampled trajectories are exclusively generated for gradient step $j = 42$ and we perform a new random sampling for the next iteration.

4.5 A Detailed Discussion on Training Algorithm

In this section, we propose the details of Algorithm. 1. In this algorithm, we use $\rho^\varphi(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta])$ as shorthand for the non-smooth robustness degree of $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0 ; \theta]$ w.r.t. φ at time 0. We terminate the algorithm in Line. 2 if the robustness is greater than a pre-specified threshold, $\bar{\rho} > 0$. We also evaluate the performance of the algorithm through challenging case studies.

During each iteration of this algorithm, we compute the robustness value for an initial state $\mathbf{s}_0$ selected from the pre-sampled set of initial states $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ in Line. 3. This selection can be either random, or the initial state with the lowest robustness value in the set $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$.

The Boolean parameter `use_smooth` is provided to toggle the objective between robustness of the critical predicate and the smooth robustness for the DT-STL formula. We initialize this parameter `use_smooth` in Line. 3 to be `False` and further update it to `True` in Line. 18, in case the gradient from critical predicate is unable to increase the robustness.

5. The efficiency results from the control parameters θ repeating in fewer time-steps over the trajectory, as most of them are fixed.

The Lines. 15,16 and 18 aim to improve the detection of non-differentiable local maxima by employing a more accurate approach. This involves maintaining the direction of the gradient generated with the critical predicate, and exponentially reducing the learning rate until a small threshold ϵ is reached. If, even with an infinitesimal learning rate, this gradient fails to increase the robustness, it suggests a high likelihood of being in a non-differentiable local maximum.

5 LB4TL: a smooth semantics for back-propagation

The existing smooth semantics for gradient computation (Gilpin et al., 2020; Pant et al., 2017; Leung et al., 2019) perform backward computation on a computation graph that is generated based on dynamic programming. Although these computation graphs are efficient for forward computation, they may face computational difficulty for backward computation over the robustness when the specification is highly complex. However, **STL2NN**, directly utilizes the STL tree Donzé and Maler (2010) to generate a feedforward ReLU neural network as a computation graph whose depth grows logarithmically with the complexity of DT-STL specification. This makes back-propagation more feasible for complex specifications. On the other hand, the way it formulates the robustness (Feedforward NN) facilitates the back-propagation process, by enabling vectorized computation of the gradient. However, considering that **STL2NN** is exactly identical to the non-smooth robustness introduced in Eq. (13), using smooth approximations, as suggested in previous studies Gilpin et al. (2020); Pant et al. (2017), has proven to improve the efficiency, particularly in gradient-based techniques. Therefore, we approximate **STL2NN** with a smooth function. It is also preferable that this smooth approximation also acts as a guaranteed lower bound for the robustness. Ensuring its positivity guarantees that the real robustness is also positive. Thus, we approximate **STL2NN** with a smooth under-approximator, and we call this smooth function $\tilde{\rho}$, as **LB4TL**. We also propose a thorough and clear comparison between the performance of **LB4TL** and the previous smooth semantics, available in the literature. To generate **LB4TL**, we firstly replace **ReLU** activations in the $\min()$ operation Eq. (4) with the **softplus** activation function defined as:

$$\text{softplus}(a_1 - a_2 ; b) = \frac{1}{b} \log \left(1 + e^{b(a_1 - a_2)} \right), \quad b > 0.$$

Similarly, we replace the **ReLU** activation functions contributing in $\max()$ operation Eq. (4) with the **swish** activation function:

$$\text{swish}(a_1 - a_2 ; b) = \frac{a_1 - a_2}{1 + e^{-b(a_1 - a_2)}}, \quad b > 0.$$

Next, we show that **LB4TL** is a guaranteed lower-bound for **STL2NN**. To that end, we start with the following proposition,

Proposition 5 *For any two real valued numbers $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have,*

$$y + \text{swish}(x - y) \leq \max(x, y), \quad x - \text{softplus}(x - y) \leq \min(x, y).$$

Proof We know for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\max(x, y) = y + \text{ReLU}(x - y)$ and $\min(x, y) = x - \text{ReLU}(x - y)$. We also know, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{swish}(z) < \text{ReLU}(z)$ and $\text{softplus}(z) > \text{ReLU}(z)$ Ramachandran

et al. (2017). ■

The result of the Proposition. 5, can be utilized to propose the following result,

Proposition 6 *Assume φ_1 and φ_2 are two different DT-STL formulas, and assume $L_1 = \text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1, 0; b) \leq R_1 = \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1, 0)$ and $L_2 = \text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_2, 0; b) \leq R_2 = \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_2, 0)$. Then we can conclude,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0; b) &\leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0), \\ \text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0; b) &\leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Proof Based on Proposition. 5, we know $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0; b) = L_2 + \text{swish}(L_1 - L_2; b) \leq \max(L_1, L_2)$ and $\rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0) = \max(R_1, R_2)$. We also know $L_1 \leq R_1$, and $L_2 \leq R_2$ which implies $\max(L_1, L_2) \leq \max(R_1, R_2)$. Therefore, we can conclude $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0; b) \leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2, 0)$.

Likewise, from Proposition. 5, we know $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0; b) = L_1 - \text{softplus}(L_1 - L_2; b) \leq \min(L_1, L_2)$ and $\rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0) = \min(R_1, R_2)$. We also know $L_1 \leq R_1$, and $L_2 \leq R_2$ which implies $\min(L_1, L_2) \leq \min(R_1, R_2)$. Therefore, we can conclude $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0; b) \leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, 0)$. ■

The result of Proposition. 6 can also be utilized to introduce the following result.

Lemma 7 *For any formula φ belonging to DT-STL framework in positive normal form, and $b > 0$, for a given trajectory $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta] = \mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_K$, if $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi, 0; b) > 0$, then $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta] \models \varphi$, where LB4TL is a computation graph for DT-STL robustness, but with the softplus activation utilized in min operation and the swish activation employed in max operation.*

Proof Let's denote the set of predicates that are contributing to robustness computation of a DT-STL formula φ as, $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0, \dots, a_N > 0\}$. The DT-STL formula, φ can be expanded in terms of $\vee$ and $\wedge$ operations applied to predicates, $a > 0$ where $(a > 0) \in \mathcal{A}$ (see Donzé and Maler (2010)). In addition, for all predicates $(a > 0) \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], (a > 0), 0; b) \leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], (a > 0), 0)$, since both are equal to a . Therefore, we can start from the predicates $(a > 0) \in \mathcal{A}$, and utilize the result of the Proposition. 6 to conclude for any DT-STL formula φ we have, $\text{LB4TL}(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi, 0; b) \leq \rho(\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], \varphi, 0)$. ■

6 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our proposed methodology. We executed all experiments for training with Algorithm. 1 using our MATLAB toolbox. These experiments were carried out on a laptop PC equipped with a Core i9 CPU⁶. In all experiments performed using Algorithm. 1, we utilize LB4TL as the smooth semantics. Later in Section. 6.5, we present another experiment on PyTorch, comparing the efficiency of LB4TL with previous smooth semantics Gilpin et al. (2020); Pant et al. (2017); Leung et al. (2019). We also present an experiment in Section. 6.6 to explain the preference of using NN feedback controllers over open-loop alternatives for deployment. Finally, we conclude this section with a statistical verification of synthesized controllers.

6. We do not utilize GPU for computation.

Case Study	Temporal Task	System Dimension	Time Horizon	NN Controller Structure	Number of Iterations	Runtime (second)	Optimization Setting $[M, N, N_1, N_2, \epsilon, b]$
Quad-rotor	φ_3	12	45 steps	[13,20,20,10,4]	1120	6413.3	[9, 5, 30, 40, 10^{-5} , 5]
Multi-agent	φ_4	20	60 steps	[21,40,20]	2532	6298.2	[12, 5, 30, 1, 10^{-5} , 15]
Quad-rotor & Frame	φ_5	7	1500 steps	[8,20,20,10,4]	84	443.45	[100, 15, 30, 3, 10^{-5} , 15]
Dubins car	φ_6	2	1000 steps	[3,20,2]	829	3728	[200, 5, 60, 3, 10^{-5} , 15]

Table 1: Results on different case studies

Remark 8 *At the start of the training process, we can envision a desired path for the model to track. This path may not satisfy the temporal specification, but its availability is still valuable information, which its inclusion to the training process can expedite it. Therefore, we also utilize a desired path to generate a convex and efficient waypoint function for our training process. However, Algorithm. 1 performs effectively even without the waypoint function. Section. 6.3.1 explores this aspect using a numerical example. Nonetheless, integrating a waypoint function enhances the efficiency of the training process.*

First, we provide a brief summary of results on evaluation of Algorithm. 1. Following this, we elaborate on the specifics of our experimental configuration later in this section.

Evaluation metric. We evaluate the effectiveness of our methodology outlined in Algorithm. 1 through four case studies, each presenting unique challenges.

First, we present two case studies involving tasks with long time horizons:

- 6-dimensional quad-rotor combined with a moving frame with task horizon $K = 1500$ time-steps.
- 2-dimensional Dubins car with task horizon $K = 1000$ time-steps.

Subsequently, we present two additional case studies characterized by high-dimensional state spaces:

- 20-dimensional Multi-agent system of 10 connected Dubins cars with task horizon $K = 60$ time-steps.
- 12-dimensional quad-rotor with task horizon $K = 45$ time-steps.

Table. 1 highlights the versatility of Algorithm. 1 to handle various case studies mentioned above. We also use a diverse set of temporal task objectives that include nested temporal operators, and those involving trajectories from two independently moving objects (Quad-rotor & Moving Frame case study). The detail of the experiments are also discussed as follows.




Figure 6: This figure shows the simulation of trained control parameters to satisfy the specified temporal task in companion with the simulation result for initial guess for control parameters.




Figure 7: This figure show the simulation of the results for Dubins car in the ablation study proposed in section (6.4). In this experiment, the task horizon is 1000 time-steps.

6.1 12-dimensional Quad-rotor (Nested 3-Future Formula)

We assume a 12-dimensional model for the quad-rotor of mass, $m = 1.4$ kg. The distance of rotors from the quad-rotor's center is also $\ell = 0.3273$ meter and the inertia of vehicle is $J_x = J_y = 0.054$ and $J_z = 0.104$ (see (Beard, 2008) for the detail of quad-rotor's dynamics). The controller sends bounded signals $\delta_r, \delta_l, \delta_b, \delta_f \in [0, 1]$ to the right, left, back and front rotors respectively to drive the vehicle. Each rotor is designed such that given the control signal δ it generates the propeller force of $k_1\delta$ and also exerts the yawing torque $k_2\delta$ into the body of the quad-rotor. We set $k_1 = 3mg/4$ such that, the net force from all the rotors can not exceed 3 times of its weight, ($g = 9.81$). We also set $k_2 = 1.5\ell k_1$ to make it certain that the maximum angular velocity in the yaw axis is approximately equivalent to the maximum angular velocity in the pitch and roll axis. We use the sampling time $\delta t = 0.1$ sec in our control process. The dynamics for this vehicle is proposed in Eq. (7), where $F, \tau_\phi, \tau_\theta, \tau_\psi$ are the net propeller force, pitch torque, roll torque and yaw torque respectively. We plan to train a NN controller with **tanh**() activation function and structure $[13, 20, 20, 10, 4]$ for this problem that maps the vector, $[\mathbf{s}_k^\top, k]^\top$ to the unbounded control inputs $[a_1(k), a_2(k), a_3(k), a_4(k)]^\top$. In addition to this, the trained controller should be valid for all initial states proposed in Eq. (7).

Figure. 6 shows the simulation of quad-rotor's trajectories with our trained controller parameters. The quad-rotor is planned to pass through the green hoop, no later than the next 15 time-steps and no sooner than the next 10th time-step. Once it passed the green hoop it should pass the blue hoop in the future 10th to 15th time-steps and again once it has passed

$$\begin{cases}
\dot{x}_1 = \cos(x_8) \cos(x_9) x_4 + (\sin(x_7) \sin(x_8) \cos(x_9) - \cos(x_7) \sin(x_9)) x_5 \\
\quad + (\cos(x_7) \sin(x_8) \cos(x_9) + \sin(x_7) \sin(x_9)) x_6 \\
\dot{x}_2 = \cos(x_8) \sin(x_9) x_4 + (\sin(x_7) \sin(x_8) \sin(x_9) + \cos(x_7) \cos(x_9)) x_5 \\
\quad + (\cos(x_7) \sin(x_8) \sin(x_9) - \sin(x_7) \cos(x_9)) x_6 \\
\dot{x}_3 = \sin(x_8) x_4 - \sin(x_7) \cos(x_8) x_5 - \cos(x_7) \cos(x_8) x_6 \\
\dot{x}_4 = x_{12} x_5 - x_{11} x_6 - 9.81 \sin(x_8) \\
\dot{x}_5 = x_{10} x_6 - x_{12} x_4 + 9.81 \cos(x_8) \sin(x_7) \\
\dot{x}_6 = x_{11} x_4 - x_{10} x_5 + 9.81 \cos(x_8) \cos(x_7) - F/m \\
\dot{x}_7 = x_{10} + (\sin(x_7) (\sin(x_8) / \cos(x_8))) x_{11} + (\cos(x_7) (\sin(x_8) / \cos(x_8))) x_{12} \\
\dot{x}_8 = \cos(x_7) x_{11} - \sin(x_7) x_{12} \\
\dot{x}_9 = (\sin(x_7) / \cos(x_8)) x_{11} + (\cos(x_7) / \cos(x_8)) x_{12} \\
\dot{x}_{10} = -((J_y - J_z) / J_x) x_{11} x_{12} + (1 / J_x) \tau_\phi \\
\dot{x}_{11} = ((J_z - J_x) / J_y) x_{10} x_{12} + (1 / J_y) \tau_\theta \\
\dot{x}_{12} = (1 / J_z) \tau_\psi
\end{cases}
\quad
\mathcal{I} = \left\{ \mathbf{s}_0 \mid \begin{bmatrix} -0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -0.1 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} x_1(0) \\ x_2(0) \\ x_3(0) \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} F \\ \tau_\phi \\ \tau_\theta \\ \tau_\psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & k_1 & k_1 & k_1 \\ 0 & -\ell k_1 & 0 & \ell k_1 \\ \ell k_1 & 0 & -\ell k_1 & 0 \\ -k_2 & k_2 & -k_2 & k_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_f \\ \delta_r \\ \delta_b \\ \delta_l \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_f &= 0.5(\tanh(0.5 a_1) + 1), \\
\delta_r &= 0.5(\tanh(0.5 a_2) + 1), \\
\delta_b &= 0.5(\tanh(0.5 a_3) + 1), \\
\delta_l &= 0.5(\tanh(0.5 a_4) + 1), \\
a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 &\in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

(7)

the blue hoop it should pass the red hoop again in the future next 10 to 15 time-steps. This is called a nested future formula, in which we design the controller such that the quad-rotor satisfies this specification. This temporal task can be formalized in DT-STL framework as follows:

$$\varphi_3 = \mathbf{F}_{[10,15]} [\text{green_hoop} \wedge \mathbf{F}_{[10,15]} [\text{blue_hoop} \wedge \mathbf{F}_{[10,15]} [\text{red_hoop}]]]$$

Figure. 6 shows the simulation of trajectories, generated by the trained controller. The black trajectories are also the simulation of the initial guess for the controller, which are generated completely at random and are obviously violating the specification. We sampled $\mathcal{I}$ with 9 points, that are the corners of $\mathcal{I}$ including its center. The setting for gradient sampling is $M = 9$, $N = 5$. We trained the controller with $\bar{\rho} = 0$, in Algorithm. 1 with optimization setting ($N_1 = 30$, $N_2 = 40$, $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$) over 1120 gradient steps (runtime of 6413.3 sec). The runtime to generate LB4TL is also 0.495 sec and we set $b = 5$. The Algorithm. 1, utilizes gradients from waypoint function, critical predicate, and LB4TL, 515,544, and 61 times respectively.

6.2 Multi-Agent: Network of Dubins Cars (Nested Formula)

In this example, we assume a network of 10 different Dubins cars that are all under the control of a neural network controller. The dynamics of this multi-agent system is,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}^i \\ \dot{y}^i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v^i \cos(\theta^i) \\ v^i \sin(\theta^i) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{aligned} v^i &\leftarrow \tanh(0.5 a_1^i) + 1, a_1^i \in \mathbb{R} \\ \theta^i &\leftarrow a_2^i \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}, \quad i \in [10], \quad (8)$$

that is, a 20 dimensional multi-agent system with 20 controllers, $v^i \in [0, 1]$, $\theta^i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in [10]$. Figure. 8 shows the initial position of each Dubins car in $\mathbb{R}^2$ in companion with their corresponding goal sets. The cars should be driven to their goal sets, and they should also keep a minimum distance of $d = 0.5$ meters from each other while they are moving toward their goal sets. We assume a sampling time of $\delta t = 0.26$ sec for this model, and we plan to train a NN controller with **tanh**() activation function and structure [21, 40, 20] via Algorithm. 1, for this problem that maps the vector, $[\mathbf{s}_k^\top, k]^\top$ to the unbounded control inputs $\{a_1^i(k), a_2^i(k)\}_{i=1}^{10}$. This temporal task can be formalized in DT-STL framework as follows:




Figure 8: agents vs goal sets.




Figure 9: initial guess for $\theta^{(0)}$.

$$\varphi_4 := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{10} \mathbf{F}_{[20,48]} [\mathbf{G}_{[0,12]} [(x^i(k), y^i(k)) \in \text{Goal}^i]] \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\substack{i \neq j \\ i, j \in [10]}} \mathbf{G}_{[0,60]} [(|x^i(k) - x^j(k)| > d) \vee (|y^i(k) - y^j(k)| > d)] \right)$$

Figure. 10 shows the simulation of the trajectories for the trained controller, and Figure. 9 presents the simulation of trajectories for the initial guess for control parameters. We observe that our controller manages the agents to finish the task in different times. Thus, we present the time-steps with asteric to enhance the clarity of the presentation regarding satisfaction of the specification in Figure. 10. Although the task is not a long horizon task, due to the high dimension and complexity of the task, we were unable to solve this problem without time sampling. However, we successfully solved this problem with Algorithm. 1 within 6298 sec and 2532 gradient steps.

We also set the optimization setting as, $M = 12, N = 5, N_1 = 30, N_2 = 1, \epsilon = 10^{-5}, b = 15$. The runtime to generate LB4TL is also 6.2 sec. Over the course of the training process we utilized 187, 1647 and 698 gradients from way point function, critical predicate and LB4TL respectively.




Figure 10: Shows the simulation of trained controller on the multi-agent system of 10 connected Dubins cars. The cars start from an assigned initial position and follow the command of a central NN controller, which we have trained with Algorithm. 1. This controller makes it certain that cars arrive to and stay in their goal sets based on the specification and will always keep a pre-specified distance from each other over the course of traveling. The trajectories are intentionally plotted with astric points to spot the position of cars at every single time-step. The identity of each agent and its assigned goal sets is also available in Figure. 8. Our observation shows that the agents finish their personal tasks (First component of φ_4) in different times.

6.3 6-dimensional Quad-rotor & Frame: Landing a quad-rotor

We use the 6-dimensional model for the quad-rotor dynamics as follows.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} & \dot{y} & \dot{z} & \dot{v}_x & \dot{v}_y & \dot{v}_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v_x & v_y & v_z & g \tan(u_1) & -g \tan(u_2) & g - u_3 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where,} \\ u_1 \leftarrow 0.1 \tanh(0.1a_1), \quad u_2 \leftarrow 0.1 \tanh(0.1a_2), \quad u_3 \leftarrow g - 2 \tanh(0.1a_3), \quad a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (9)$$

Here, $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$ denotes the quad-rotor's positions and $\mathbf{v} = (v_x, v_y, v_z)$ denote its velocities along the three coordinate axes. The control inputs u_1, u_2, u_3 represent the pitch, roll, and thrust inputs respectively. We assume that the inputs are bounded as follows: $u_1 \in [-0.1, 0.1]$, $u_2 \in [-0.1, 0.1]$, $u_3 \in [7.81, 11.81]$.

The horizon of the temporal task is 1500 time-steps with $\delta t = 0.05$ sec. The quad-rotor launches at a helipad located at $(x(0), y(0), z(0)) = (-40, 0, 0)$. We also accept a deviation of 0.1 for $x(0)$ and $y(0)$ and we train the controller to be valid for all the states sampled from this region. The helipad is also 40 meters far from a building located at $(0, 0, 0)$. The building is 30 meters high, where the building's footprint is 10×10 meters. We have also a moving platform with dimension $2 \times 2 \times 0.1$ that is starting to move from $(10, 0, 0)$ with a variable velocity, modeled as, $\dot{x}^f = u_4$. We also accept a deviation of 0.1 for $x^f(0)$, and our trained controller is also robust with respect to this deviation. We define $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ with 9 samples that are located on corners of $\mathcal{I}$ including its center.

The frame is also required to keep always a minimum distance of 4.5 meters from the building. We train a NN controller that controls the quad-rotor and the platform together such that the quad-rotor will land on the platform with relative velocity of at most 1 m/s on x, y and z directions and its relative distance is also at most 1 meter in x, y direction and 0.4 meter in z direction. This temporal task can be formulated as a reach-avoid formula in DT-STL framework as follows:

$$\varphi_5 = \mathbf{G}_{[0,1500]} [\neg \text{obstacle}] \wedge \mathbf{F}_{[1100,1500]} [\text{Goal}] \wedge \mathbf{G}_{[0,1500]} [x^f(k) > 9.5]$$

where the goal set is introduced in (10).

$$\text{Goal} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(k) \\ y(k) \\ z(k) \\ v_x(k) \\ v_y(k) \\ v_z(k) \\ x^f(k) \end{bmatrix} \mid \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 0.11 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} x(k) - x^f(k) \\ y(k) \\ z(k) \\ v_x(k) \\ v_y(k) \\ v_z(k) \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0.6 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \quad (10)$$

We plot the simulated trajectory for the center of set of initial states $\mathcal{I}$, in Figure. 11. The NN controller's structure is specified as $[8, 20, 20, 10, 4]$ and uses the tanh activation function. We initialize it with a random guess for its parameters. The simulated trajectory for initial guess of parameters is also depicted in black. The setting for gradient sampling is $M = 100$, $N = 15$. We trained the controller with $\bar{\rho} = 0$, over 84 gradient steps (runtime of 443 sec). The runtime to generate LB4TL is also 7.74sec and we set $b = 15$. In total, the Algorithm. 1, utilizes gradients from waypoint function, critical predicate, and LB4TL, 5, 71, and 8 times respectively.




Figure 11: This figure shows the simulated trajectory for trained controller in comparison to the trajectories for naive initial random guess. The frame is moving with a velocity determined with the controller that also controls the quad-rotor.

Waypoint function	Critical Predicate	Safe Re-smoothing	Time-sampling	Number of Iterations	Runtime
✓	✓	✓	✓	84	443 sec
×	✓	✓	✓	107	607 sec
✓	×	✓	✓	NF[−0.74]	6971 sec
×	×	✓	✓	NF[−1.32]	4822 sec

Table 2: This table shows the numerical results for the training algorithms. In case the training process does not provide positive robustness within 300 gradient step, we report it with NF[.] which indicates the value of robustness in iteration 300. In this table, we disable the main modules in Algorithm. 1 step by step and report the extent of reduction in efficiency. The symbol ✓ indicates the module is included and × indicates the module is neglected. The time sampling technique is utilized in all the experiments.

6.3.1 INFLUENCE OF WAYPOINT AND CRITICAL PREDICATE ON ALGORITHM. 1

Here, we consider the case study of landing a quad-rotor, and perform an ablation study over the impact of including 1-critical predicate, and 2- waypoint function, in the training process via Algorithm. 1. To that end, we compare the results once these modules are excluded from the algorithm. In the first step, we remove the waypoint function and show the performance of algorithm. In the next step, we also disregard the presence of critical time in time-sampling and train the controller with completely at random time-sampling. Table. 4 shows the efficiency of training process in each case and Figure. 12 compare the learning curves. Our experimental result shows, the control synthesis for quad-rotor (landing mission) faces a small reduction in efficiency when the waypoint function is disregarded and fails when the critical predicate is also removed from time sampling.




Figure 12: This figure shows the learning curve for training processes. This figure shows the Algorithm. 1 concludes successfully in 84 iterations while removing the way point it concludes in 107 iterations. The algorithm also fails if the critical predicate is not considered in time sampling.

6.4 Dubins Car: Growing Task Horizon for Dubins Car (Ablation study on time sampling)

In this experiment, we utilize the Dubins car with dynamics,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos(\theta) \\ v \sin(\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad v \leftarrow \tanh(0.5a_1) + 1, a_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \theta \leftarrow a_2 \in \mathbb{R},$$

and present an ablation study on the influence of gradient sampling on control synthesis. Given a scale factor $a > 0$, a time horizon K and a pre-defined initial guess for control parameters $\theta^{(0)}$, we plan to train a $\tanh()$ neural network controller with structure $[3, 20, 2]$, to drive a Dubins car, to satisfy the following temporal task,

$$\varphi_6 := \mathbf{F}_{[0.9K, K]} [\text{Goal}] \wedge \mathbf{G}_{[0, K]} [\neg \text{Obstacle}].$$

The Dubins car starts from $(x(0), y(0)) = (0, 0)$. The obstacle is also a square centered on $(a/2, a/2)$ with the side length $2a/5$. The goal region is again a square centered on $(9a/10, 9a/10)$ with the side length $a/20$. We solve this problem for $K = 10, 50, 100, 500, 1000$ and we also utilize $a = K/10$ for each case study. We apply vanilla gradient ascent (see Algorithm. 2) to solve each case study, both with and without gradient sampling. Furthermore, in addition to vanilla gradient ascent, we also utilize Algorithm 1 to solve them. Consider we set the initial guess and the controller’s structure similar, for all the training processes, and we also manually stop the process once the number of iterations exceeds 8000 gradient steps. We also assume a singleton as the set of initial states $(0, 0)$ to present a clearer comparison. The runtime and the number of iterations for each training process is presented in Table. 3. Figure 7 displays the simulation of trajectories trained using Algorithm 1 for $K = 1000$

Horizon	Vanilla gradient ascent (No time Sampling)		Vanilla gradient ascent (With time Sampling)		Algorithm 1 (With time Sampling)	
	Num. of Iterations	Runtime (seconds)	Num. Iterations	Runtime (seconds)	Num. of Iterations	Runtime (seconds)
10	34	2.39	11	1.39	4	5.61
50	73	2.46	53	14.01	25	6.09
100	152	8.65	105	112.6	157	90.55
500	NF[−1.59]	4986	3237	8566	624	890.24
1000	NF[−11.49]	8008	NF[−88.42]	28825	829	3728

Table 3: Ablation study. We mark the experiment with NF[.] if it is unable to provide a positive robustness within 8000 iterations, and the value inside brackets is the maximum value of robustness it finds. We magnify the environment proportional to the horizon (see Appendix 6.4 for details). All experiments use a unique guess for initial parameter values.

time-steps (via gradient sampling), alongside the trajectories simulated for the initial guess of controller parameters.

Considering Table. 3, we can see that the inclusion of time sampling decreases the runtime for training process. We also observe that for relatively small horizons $K = 10, 50$, Vanilla gradient ascent performs slightly better than Algorithm. 1 in terms of runtime. However, for $K = 100, 500, 1000$, Algorithm. 1 is much more efficient.

6.5 Comparison with previous smooth robustness semantics

In this section, we compare against the smooth semantics in Gilpin et al. (2020); Pant et al. (2017); Leung et al. (2019) and empirically demonstrate that **LB4TL** outperforms them when used for training NN controllers. We also show that with increasing complexity of the DT-STL formula, the other smooth semantics show significant increases in runtime during gradient computation while **LB4TL** scales well. To make the comparison more clear, we utilize neither the Algorithm. 1 nor gradient sampling with dropout. In this case, we use the vanilla gradient ascent algorithm proposed in Algorithm. 2. Given a fixed initial guess for the control parameters and a fixed set of sampled initial states $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$, we run this algorithm, 4 times, and we utilize the following smooth semantics, each time.

1. The first one is the smooth semantics proposed in Pant et al. (2017) that replaces the $\min()$ / $\max()$ operators in Eq. (13) with:

$$\widetilde{\min}(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) = -\frac{1}{b} \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e^{-ba_i} \right), \quad \widetilde{\max}(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) = \frac{1}{b} \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e^{ba_i} \right).$$

2. The second one is the smooth semantics proposed in Gilpin et al. (2020) that replaces $\min()/\max()$ operators in Eq. (13) with::

$$\widetilde{\min}(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) = -\frac{1}{b} \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e^{-ba_i} \right), \quad \widetilde{\max}(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{a_i e^{ba_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e^{ba_i}}.$$

3. The third one is the computation graph proposed in Leung et al. (2019). This computation graph reformulates the robustness semantics in an RNN like structure and utilizes this graph for back-propagation.
4. The last one is LB4TL that is introduced in this work.

We also set $b = 10$ for all trials. This algorithm checks the accurate robustness value from Eq. (13) every iteration to terminate the training process once the robustness is greater than a threshold $\bar{\rho}$ for all the initial states in $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. To increase the efficiency of our training process, we check for $\min_{\mathbf{s}_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}} (\rho(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta^{(j)}], 0))$ once every 50 gradient steps to make a decision on terminating the training algorithm. We also utilize Pytorch’s automatic differentiation toolbox for training the controller via the proposed smooth semantics. The experiment setup is also described as follows:

Model dynamics, control bounds and initial states: We use a standard 3-dimensional model from (Yaghoubi and Fainekos, 2019a) to represent the dynamics of a simple car. The control inputs to the car are assumed to be the velocity, $v \in [0, 5]$ and the steering angle, $\gamma \in [-\pi/4, \pi/4]$. The dynamics of the simple car is presented as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{\theta} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos(\theta) \\ v \sin(\theta) \\ \frac{v}{L} \tan(\gamma) \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where, } \begin{aligned} v &\leftarrow 2.5 \tanh(0.5a_1) + 2.5, \\ \gamma &\leftarrow \pi/4 \tanh(0.5a_2), \end{aligned} \quad a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R} \quad (11)$$

We assume that initially the car is at $(x_0, y_0) = (6, 8)$, but the heading angle can vary in the set $\theta_0 \in [-3\pi/4, -\pi/2]$.

Controller setting: We assume $\delta t = 0.05$ sec, as the sampling time, and we also train an NN controller with $\text{ReLU}()$ activation functions and the structure $[4, 10, 2]$. The input to the NN controller is the state vector $[\mathbf{s}_k^\top, k]^\top$ and the outputs of the controller are the (unbounded) values $[a_1(k), a_2(k)]^\top$.

Specification: The task objective is for the car to first visit the goal region $Goal_1$ and then visit the region $Goal_2$. Further, we require this sequential task to be finished in 40 time-steps. However, the car should always avoid the unsafe set $Unsafe$. The sets are defined as follows: $Goal_1 = [3, 4] \times [0, 1]$, $Goal_2 = [5, 6] \times [3, 4]$, $Unsafe = [1, 4] \times [2, 5]$. This temporal task can be formalized in DT-STL framework as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_7 &:= \mathbf{F}_{[0,40]} [Goal_1 \wedge \mathbf{F}[Goal_2]] \wedge \mathbf{G}_{[0,40]} [\neg Unsafe \text{ set}] \\ &= \bigvee_{i=1}^{39} [\mathbf{F}_{[0,i]} [Goal_1] \wedge \mathbf{F}_{[i+1,40]} [Goal_2]] \wedge \mathbf{G}_{[0,40]} [\neg Unsafe \text{ set}], \end{aligned}$$

that is a complex specification and is a great candidate to manifest the superiority of LB4TL comparing to the existing smooth semantics in terms of training runtime.




Figure 13: Simulation of the trajectory for training via LB4TL v.s. a random guess for $\theta^{(0)}$. This result refers to the second row in Table. 4.

Algorithm 2: Vanilla Gradient Accent
Backpropagation via smooth semantics

```

1 Initialize variables
2 while  $\left( \min_{s_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}} (\rho(\varphi, \sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}], 0)) < \bar{\rho} \right)$  do
3    $s_0 \leftarrow \text{Sample from } \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ 
4    $\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}] \leftarrow$ 
     Simulate using policy  $\pi_{\theta^{(j)}}$ 
5    $d \leftarrow \nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\rho}(\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}])$  using  $\sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}]$ 
6    $\theta^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \theta^{(j)} + \text{Adam}(d)$ 
7    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 

```

Result of LB4TL: Figure. 13 shows the simulation of car’s trajectories with our trained controller parameters via Algorithm. 2 using LB4TL as the smooth semantics. The black trajectories are the simulation of the initial guess for the controller, which are generated completely at random and are obviously violating the specification. We sampled $\mathcal{I}$ with 3 points ($\theta = -3\pi/4, -5\pi/8, -\pi/2$). We algorithmically generated the LB4TL computation graph with $b = 10$. This computation graph can be generated in 1.31 sec via our MATLAB toolbox.

Comparison of runtime with previous smooth semantics: Since the runtime of the training algorithm is also highly related to the choice of initial guess for the controller, we repeat this experiment 5 times, and we assign a unique initial guess for controller on all the 4 examples in a specific experiment. Table. 4 shows the report of training runtimes for all the experiments. In case the proposed example of smooth semantics in an experiment is unable to solve for a valid controller within 1 hour, we report it as $\text{NF}[\rho^{end}]$, that implies the training did not finish. This also reports the minimum robustness $\rho^{end} = \min_{s_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}} (\rho(\varphi, \sigma[s_0; \theta^{(j)}], 0))$, where

j is the last iteration before termination. Assuming the runtime for $\text{NF}[\cdot]$ to be 3600 sec, the average of the training runtime for the first, second, and third objective functions are 2261, 2026, and 2590⁷ sec, respectively. This is while the average of training runtime for our objective function (LB4TL) is 193 sec, which shows LB4TL is a more convenient choice for the training process when the specification becomes more complex.

Remark 9 Our experimental results show, in case the specification is simple, (like a simple reach-avoid formula) there is no noticeable difference between the performance of LB4TL and the previous smooth semantics. However, by increasing the complexity of the specification LB4TL outperforms the previous semantics in terms of efficiency.

7. Due to presence of nonlinear operators like $\sin()$, $\cos()$ and $\tan()$ in the vehicle’s model running STLCCG on GPU is even more time-consuming.

	Training via $\tilde{\rho}$ from (Gilpin et al., 2020) Runtime(sec)	Training via $\tilde{\rho}$ from (Pant et al., 2017) Runtime(sec)	Training via STLCG Runtime(sec)	Training via LB4TL Runtime(sec)
1 st guess of $\theta^{(0)}$	810	876	1265	89
2 nd guess of $\theta^{(0)}$	1746	1415	1805	145
3 rd guess of $\theta^{(0)}$	NF[−5.2531]	2018	2681	370
4 th guess of $\theta^{(0)}$	NF[−5.8613]	2224	NF[−5.9644]	241
5 th guess of $\theta^{(0)}$	1551	NF[−5.6717]	NF[−3.3614]	124
Average runtime	2261	2026	2590	193

Table 4: This table shows the runtimes for 5 different experiments. Each experiment corresponds to a unique initial guess for controller parameter values. We repeat training the NN controllers with 4 different objective functions corresponding to the different smooth approximations of DT-STL robustness. This table shows LB4TL outperforms the other three smooth semantics in all 5 experiments. In the table, NF represents that the experiment was not able to finish in one hour. Note that each training iteration computes robustness values over the states in $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$, and we want to ensure that the minimum of the robustness values (say $\rho_{\min}$) over all initial states in $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is positive. However, when the training does not finish within an hour, we report the largest $\rho_{\min}$ encountered during training for the corresponding objective function.

6.6 Understanding the preference for NN feedback controllers over open-loop alternatives

In this section, we focus on a control design problem to satisfy an STL specification and compare a design via a feedback Neural Network controller with another design via an open-loop controller. The concentration of our comparison is on the robustness of the controller against the noise and uncertainties. In this experiment, we want to show a feedback controller designed with neural network can tolerate a level of noise in the deployment time, while the open-loop controller fails when it faces noise and uncertainty. We consider the example proposed in Leung et al. (2019) but we include the system noise and also a level of uncertainty on the choice of initial condition,

$$\mathbf{s}_{k+1} = \mathbf{s}_k + u_k \mathbf{d}t + c_1 v_k, \quad \mathbf{s}_0 = [-1, -1] + c_2 \eta,$$

where $v_k, k \in [K]$ and η are both i.i.d random variables with normal distribution. In this example, we plan to satisfy the following condition,

$$\varphi_8 = \mathbf{F}_{[0,44]} [\mathbf{G}_{[0,5]} [\text{Goal}_1]] \bigwedge \mathbf{F}_{[0,44]} [\mathbf{G}_{[0,5]} [\text{Goal}_2]] \bigwedge \mathbf{G}_{[0,49]} [\neg \text{Unsafe}],$$

where the regions Goal₁, Goal₂, and Unsafe are illustrated in Figure. 14 ⁸.

8. We also add the following updates to the original problem presented in Leung et al. (2019),

- We restrict the design process to satisfy the STL specification, and we omit the condition that $\mathbf{s}_K = [1, 1]$ as we do not cover this requirement in this research work. We also remove this requirement from the open-loop controller source code proposed in Leung et al. (2019).

	Training via noise	Training without noise
Success rate for open-loop controller	5.4%	3.7%
Success rate for NN feedback controller	94.4%	65.4%

Table 5: This table shows the robustness of trained controllers to the noise and uncertainty in deployment environment for both NN feedback controller and open-loop controller. The first column is for the controller that were trained in the presence of noise and the second column is for the controllers, trained in the absence of the noise. The success rate is the percentile of simulated trajectories that are satisfying the specification when the controller is deployed in the noisy deployment environment. The percentile is approximated from 1000 different trials.

In the first step of the experiment, we train the feedback and open-loop controllers in the absence of the noise ($c_1 = c_2 = 0$) and deploy the controllers on the noisy environment ($c_1 = 0.0314, c_2 = 0.0005$) and compare their success rate⁹. In the second step of the experiment, we train both the feedback and open-loop controllers on the noisy environment ($c_1 = 0.0314, c_2 = 0.0005$), and we also deploy them on the noisy environment ($c_1 = 0.0314, c_2 = 0.0005$), to compare their success rate. Table. 5 shows the success rate for each experiment. This table clearly shows the neural network feedback controller has a better performance when it faces a stochastic environment. In addition, it can also provide an acceptable level of confidency when it is trained with noise. However, these advantages are not achievable from an open-loop controller.

We utilized STLPG PyTorch toolbox Leung et al. (2019) to solve for the open-loop controller. We also utilized the vanilla gradient ascent proposed in Algorithm 2 (via LB4TL as smooth semantics $\tilde{\rho}$) for training the feedback controllers. We let the training process in Algorithm. 2 and STLPG to run for 5000 iterations, and then we terminate the process. Figure. 14 shows the simulation of trained controllers when they are deployed to the noisy environment. The controllers are trained in the presence of noise. In this figure, we generate 100 random trajectories via trained controllers and plot them in green and red when they satisfy or violate the specification, respectively.

6.7 Statistical verification of synthesized controllers

Assume we have collected a calibration dataset of m different i.i.d random data-points, $R_1 < R_2 < \dots < R_m$ and a test data-point R_{m+1} where all are sampled from a unique distribution P with cumulative density function P_c , we can claim:

$$\Pr[R_{m+1} < R_\ell] \sim \mathbf{Beta}(\ell, m + 1 - \ell).$$

This result has been previously proposed in Vovk et al. (2005). It comes from the fact that, the probability, $\Pr[R_{m+1} < R_\ell]$ is nothing but $P_c(R_\ell)$, and thus independent of distribution

- We increase the saturation bound of the controller to $u_k \leq 4\sqrt{2}$. We also apply this condition to the open-loop controller source code proposed in Leung et al. (2019).

9. To report the success rate, we deploy the controllers 1000 different times and compute the percentage of the trajectories that are satisfying the specification.




Figure 14: This figure shows the simulation of trajectories when the trained controller is deployed on the noisy deployment environment. The controllers are trained in the presence of noise. Figures (a, b) present the trajectories of NN feedback controller, that are satisfying and violating the specification, respectively. Figures (c, d) present the trajectories of open-loop controller, that are satisfying and violating the specification, respectively.

for R_ℓ , it follows a uniform distribution. However, we know that in case a set of uniform random variables e.g., $P_c(R_1) < P_c(R_2) < \dots < P_c(R_m) \in [0, 1]$ are sorted from smallest to highest, then the ℓ -th random variable is constrained to follow the distribution $P_c(R_\ell) \sim \mathbf{Beta}(\ell, m + 1 - \ell)$ Grimmett and Stirzaker (2020). The mean value and variance of the **Beta** distribution are,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Pr[R_{m+1} < R_\ell]] = \frac{\ell}{m+1}, \quad \mathbf{Var}[\Pr[R_{m+1} < R^*]] = \frac{\ell(m+1-\ell)}{(m+1)^2(m+2)} \quad (12)$$

which clearly shows, by increasing m , we can reduce the variance of this **Beta** distribution. In case, we set $\ell = \lceil (1 - \alpha)(m + 1) \rceil$, define $R^* = R_\ell$ and set m sufficiently large, then the mean value of $\Pr[R_{m+1} < R^*]$ is close to $1 - \alpha$ and its variance is close to zero.

This result can also be utilized for verification of DT-STL properties. In order to verify the results, we generate $m = 10^5$ i.i.d random initial states $\mathbf{s}_{0,i} \in \mathcal{I}, i \in [m]$ to generate m different i.i.d trajectories via our trained controllers and sampled initial state $\mathbf{s}_{0,i}, i \in [m]$. We utilize these trajectories to compute for their robustness values $\rho(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_{0,i}; \theta], 0), i \in [m]$, and sort the parameters $R = -\rho(\varphi, \sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta], 0)$ from smallest to highest and denote them with $R_1 < R_2 < \dots < R_m$. We also set, $\alpha = 0.0001$ which implies $R^* = R_{99991}$. For all the trained controllers, we showed the certificate R^* is negative. We know the statements $\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta] \models \varphi$ and $R < R^* < 0$ are equivalent. Let's denote $\Pr[\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta] \models \varphi]$ as δ . Therefore, we can conclude δ is a random variable with $\mu = \mathbb{E}[\delta] = 0.9999$ and $\mathbf{Var}[\delta] = 9.9987 \times 10^{-10}$. We can also utilize the CDF of **Beta** distribution and propose the following guarantee that is defined in the vicinity of the proposed mean value.

$$\Pr[\delta \geq \mu - \kappa] = 1 - I_{\mu - \kappa}(\ell, m + 1 - \ell),$$

where, $I_x(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the regularized incomplete **Beta** function. Thus, assuming $\kappa = 10^{-4}$ we can conclude,

$$\Pr[\Pr[\sigma[\mathbf{s}_0; \theta] \models \varphi] \geq \%99.98] \geq \%99.5$$

7 Conclusion

Using neural network feedback controllers for control synthesis offers robustness against noise and uncertainties, making them preferable over open-loop controllers. However, training these controllers can be challenging due to issues like vanishing or exploding gradients, especially in long time horizons or high-dimensional systems. To address this challenge, we introduced a gradient sampling technique inspired by dropout. Additionally, we proposed incorporating critical predicates into this technique to enhance training efficiency, and we tested our approach on various challenging control synthesis problems. Furthermore, we proposed a new smooth semantics for the robustness of DT-STL specifications, and we show, it can be more efficient than existing semantics, particularly for specifications with higher complexity.

References

- Takumi Akazaki and Ichiro Hasuo. Time robustness in mtl and expressivity in hybrid system falsification. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 356–374. Springer, 2015.
- Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in ai safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*, 2016.
- Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- Anand Balakrishnan and Jyotirmoy V Deshmukh. Structured reward shaping using signal temporal logic specifications. In *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 3481–3486. IEEE, 2019.
- Anand Balakrishnan, Stefan Jaksic, Edgar Aguilar, Dejan Nickovic, and Jyotirmoy Deshmukh. Model-free reinforcement learning for symbolic automata-encoded objectives. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 1–2, 2022.
- Randal Beard. Quadrotor dynamics and control rev 0.1. 2008.
- Luigi Berducci, Edgar A Aguilar, Dejan Ničković, and Radu Grosu. Hierarchical potential-based reward shaping from task specifications. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2110, 2021.
- Kurtland Chua, Roberto Calandra, Rowan McAllister, and Sergey Levine. Deep reinforcement learning in a handful of trials using probabilistic dynamics models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Alexandre Donzé and Oded Maler. Robust satisfaction of temporal logic over real-valued signals. In *International Conference on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems*, pages 92–106. Springer, 2010.
- Georgios Fainekos and George J. Pappas. Robustness of temporal logic specifications. In *Formal Approaches to Testing and Runtime Verification*, volume 4262 of *LNCS*, pages 178–192. Springer, 2006.

- Georgios E Fainekos, Antoine Girard, Hadas Kress-Gazit, and George J Pappas. Temporal logic motion planning for dynamic robots. *Automatica*, 45(2):343–352, 2009.
- Bin Fang, Shidong Jia, Di Guo, Muhua Xu, Shuhuan Wen, and Fuchun Sun. Survey of imitation learning for robotic manipulation. *International Journal of Intelligent Robotics and Applications*, 3:362–369, 2019.
- Samira S Farahani, Vasumathi Raman, and Richard M Murray. Robust model predictive control for signal temporal logic synthesis. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 48(27):323–328, 2015.
- Yann Gilpin, Vince Kurtz, and Hai Lin. A smooth robustness measure of signal temporal logic for symbolic control. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(1):241–246, 2020.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- Geoffrey Grimmett and David Stirzaker. *Probability and random processes*. Oxford university press, 2020.
- Meng Guo and Michael M Zavlanos. Probabilistic motion planning under temporal tasks and soft constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(12):4051–4066, 2018.
- Dylan Hadfield-Menell, Smitha Milli, Pieter Abbeel, Stuart J Russell, and Anca Dragan. Inverse reward design. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Sofie Haesaert, Sadegh Soudjani, and Alessandro Abate. Temporal logic control of general markov decision processes by approximate policy refinement. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(16):73–78, 2018.
- Ernst M Hahn, Mateo Perez, Sven Schewe, Fabio Somenzi, Ashutosh Trivedi, and Dominik Wojtczak. Reward shaping for reinforcement learning with omega-regular objectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.05977*, 2020.
- Mohammadhosein Hasanbeig, Alessandro Abate, and Daniel Kroening. Logically-constrained reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.08099*, 2018.
- Navid Hashemi, Xin Qin, Jyotirmoy V. Deshmukh, Georgios Fainekos, Bardh Hoxha, Danil Prokhorov, and Tomoya Yamaguchi. Risk-awareness in learning neural controllers for temporal logic objectives. In *(ACC)*, pages 4096–4103.
- Navid Hashemi, Bardh Hoxha, Tomoya Yamaguchi, Danil Prokhorov, Georgios Fainekos, and Jyotirmoy Deshmukh. A neurosymbolic approach to the verification of temporal logic properties of learning-enabled control systems. In *ICCPs*, pages 98–109, 2023.
- Gao Huang, Yu Sun, Zhuang Liu, Daniel Sedra, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Deep networks with stochastic depth. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 646–661. Springer, 2016.
- Krishna C Kalagarla, Rahul Jain, and Pierluigi Nuzzo. Synthesis of discounted-reward optimal policies for markov decision processes under linear temporal logic specifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00632*, 2020.

- Bruno Lacerda, David Parker, and Nick Hawes. Optimal policy generation for partially satisfiable co-safe ltl specifications. In *IJCAI*, volume 15, pages 1587–1593. Citeseer, 2015.
- Abolfazl Lavaei, Fabio Somenzi, Sadegh Soudjani, Ashutosh Trivedi, and Majid Zamani. Formal controller synthesis for continuous-space mdps via model-free reinforcement learning. In *2020 ACM/IEEE 11th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs)*, pages 98–107. IEEE, 2020.
- Karen Leung, Nikos Aréchiga, and Marco Pavone. Backpropagation for parametric stl. In *2019 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 185–192. IEEE, 2019.
- Karen Leung, Nikos Arechiga, and Marco Pavone. Back-propagation through signal temporal logic specifications: Infusing logical structure into gradient-based methods. In Steven M. LaValle, Ming Lin, Timo Ojala, Dylan Shell, and Jingjin Yu, editors, *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics XIV*, pages 432–449. Springer, 2021.
- Xiao Li, Cristian-Ioan Vasile, and Calin Belta. Reinforcement learning with temporal logic rewards. In *Proc. of IROS*, pages 3834–3839. IEEE, 2017.
- Xiao Li, Yao Ma, and Calin Belta. A policy search method for temporal logic specified reinforcement learning tasks. In *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 240–245. IEEE, 2018.
- Lars Lindemann and Dimos V Dimarogonas. Control barrier functions for signal temporal logic tasks. *IEEE control systems letters*, 3(1):96–101, 2018.
- Wenliang Liu, Noushin Mehdipour, and Calin Belta. Recurrent neural network controllers for signal temporal logic specifications subject to safety constraints. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6:91–96, 2021.
- Oded Maler and Dejan Nickovic. Monitoring temporal properties of continuous signals. In *Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems*, pages 152–166. Springer, 2004.
- Alexander Pan, Kush Bhatia, and Jacob Steinhardt. The effects of reward misspecification: Mapping and mitigating misaligned models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Yash Vardhan Pant, Houssam Abbas, and Rahul Mangharam. Smooth operator: Control using the smooth robustness of temporal logic. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*, pages 1235–1240. IEEE, 2017.
- Yash Vardhan Pant, Houssam Abbas, Rhudii A. Quaye, and Rahul Mangharam. Fly-by-logic: control of multi-drone fleets with temporal logic objectives. In *Proc. of ICCPS*, pages 186–197, 2018.
- Razvan Pascanu, Tomas Mikolov, and Yoshua Bengio. On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1310–1318. Pmlr, 2013.

- Prajit Ramachandran, Barret Zoph, and Quoc V Le. Searching for activation functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941*, 2017.
- Vasumathi Raman, Alexandre Donzé, Mehdi Maasoumy, Richard M Murray, Alberto Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Sanjit A Seshia. Model predictive control with signal temporal logic specifications. In *Proc. of CDC*, pages 81–87. IEEE, 2014.
- Vasumathi Raman, Alexandre Donzé, Dorsa Sadigh, Richard M Murray, and Sanjit A Seshia. Reactive synthesis from signal temporal logic specifications. In *Proc. of HSCC*, pages 239–248, 2015.
- Alëna Rodionova, Lars Lindemann, Manfred Morari, and George J Pappas. Combined left and right temporal robustness for control under stl specifications. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2022.
- Dorsa Sadigh and Ashish Kapoor. Safe control under uncertainty with probabilistic signal temporal logic. In *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems XII*, 2016.
- Dorsa Sadigh, Eric S Kim, Samuel Coogan, S Shankar Sastry, and Sanjit A Seshia. A learning based approach to control synthesis of markov decision processes for linear temporal logic specifications. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 1091–1096. IEEE, 2014.
- Joar Skalse, Nikolaus Howe, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, and David Krueger. Defining and characterizing reward gaming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 9460–9471, 2022.
- Jonathan Sorg, Richard L Lewis, and Satinder Singh. Reward design via online gradient ascent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 2010.
- Krishnan Srinivasan, Benjamin Eysenbach, Sehoon Ha, Jie Tan, and Chelsea Finn. Learning to be safe: Deep rl with a safety critic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14603*, 2020.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research*, 15(1):1929–1958, 2014.
- Alvaro Velasquez, Brett Bissey, Lior Barak, Andre Beckus, Ismail Alkhouri, Daniel Melcer, and George Atia. Dynamic automaton-guided reward shaping for monte carlo tree search. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 12015–12023, 2021.
- Vladimir Vovk, Alexander Gammerman, and Glenn Shafer. *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer, 2005.
- Jiangwei Wang, Shuo Yang, Ziyang An, Songyang Han, Zhili Zhang, Rahul Mangharam, Meiyi Ma, and Fei Miao. Multi-agent reinforcement learning guided by signal temporal logic specifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06808*, 2023.

Robert D Windhorst, Todd A Lauderdale, Alexander V Sadovsky, James Phillips, and Yung-Cheng Chu. Strategic and tactical functions in an autonomous air traffic management system. In *AIAA AVIATION 2021 FORUM*, page 2355, 2021.

Shakiba Yaghoubi and Georgios Fainekos. Worst-case satisfaction of stl specifications using feedforward neural network controllers: A lagrange multipliers approach. *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, 18(5S), 2019a.

Shakiba Yaghoubi and Georgios Fainekos. Gray-box adversarial testing for control systems with machine learning components. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 179–184, 2019b.

Appendix A. Computing the Critical Predicate and Critical Time

The algorithm for computing the critical predicate employs the recursive technique outlined in the recursive algorithm provided in (13). In accordance with this recursive approach detailed in (13), we compute the robustness while simultaneously appending its critical predicate to the robustness value. This combined information is then returned as a list. The function ρ_min operates on a set of these lists, selecting the one with the minimum robustness value, while the function ρ_max performs a similar operation, returning the list with the maximum robustness value. The following algorithm presents the robustness computation that also returns the critical predicate. However, the critical time is also available from the critical predicate.

φ	$[\rho(\varphi, k), h_{\varphi, k}^*]$
$h(\mathbf{s}_k) > 0$	return $[h(\mathbf{s}_k), (h(\mathbf{s}_k) > 0)]$
$\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$	return $\rho_min([\rho(\varphi_1, k), h_{\varphi_1, k}^*], [\rho(\varphi_2, k), h_{\varphi_2, k}^*])$
$\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$	return $\rho_max([\rho(\varphi_1, k), h_{\varphi_1, k}^*], [\rho(\varphi_2, k), h_{\varphi_2, k}^*])$
$\mathbf{G}_{[a, b]} \psi$	return $\rho_min(\{[\rho(\psi, k'), h_{\psi, k'}^*]\}_{k'=k+a}^{k+b})$
$\mathbf{F}_{[a, b]} \psi$	return $\rho_max(\{[\rho(\psi, k'), h_{\psi, k'}^*]\}_{k'=k+a}^{k'+b})$
$\varphi_1 \mathbf{U}_{[a, b]} \varphi_2$	$[\rho, h] \leftarrow \rho_min([\rho(\varphi_2, k+a), h_{\varphi_2, k+a}^*], \rho_min(\{[\rho(\varphi_1, k''), h_{\varphi_1, k''}^*]\}_{k''=k}^{k''=k+a}))$ for $k' = k+a+1$ to $k+b$ $[\rho, h] \leftarrow \rho_max([\rho, h], \rho_min([\rho(\varphi_2, k'), h_{\varphi_2, k'}^*], \rho_min(\{[\rho(\varphi_1, k''), h_{\varphi_1, k''}^*]\}_{k''=k}^{k''=k'})))$ return $[\rho, h]$
$\varphi_1 \mathbf{R}_{[a, b]} \varphi_2$	$[\rho, h] \leftarrow \rho_max([\rho(\varphi_2, k+a), h_{\varphi_2, k+a}^*], \rho_max(\{[\rho(\varphi_1, k''), h_{\varphi_1, k''}^*]\}_{k''=k}^{k''=k+a}))$ for $k' = k+a+1$ to $k+b$ $[\rho, h] \leftarrow \rho_min([\rho, h], \rho_max([\rho(\varphi_2, k'), h_{\varphi_2, k'}^*], \rho_max(\{[\rho(\varphi_1, k''), h_{\varphi_1, k''}^*]\}_{k''=k}^{k''=k'})))$ return $[\rho, h]$

(13)