

Learning Temporal Logic Properties: an Overview of Two Recent Methods

Jean-Raphaël Gaglione¹, Rajarshi Roy², Nasim Baharisangari³, Daniel Neider^{4, 5*}, Zhe Xu³, Ufuk Topcu¹

¹ University of Texas at Austin, Texas, USA

² Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Kaiserslautern, Germany

³ Arizona State University, Arizona, USA

⁴ TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany

⁵ Center for Trustworthy Data Science and Security, University Alliance Ruhr, Germany

Abstract

Learning *linear temporal logic* (LTL) formulas from examples labeled as positive or negative has found applications in inferring descriptions of system behavior. We summarize two methods to learn LTL formulas from examples in two different problem settings. The first method assumes noise in the labeling of the examples. For that, they define the problem of inferring an LTL formula that must be consistent with most but not all of the examples. The second method considers the other problem of inferring meaningful LTL formulas in the case where only positive examples are given. Hence, the first method addresses the robustness to noise, and the second method addresses the balance between conciseness and specificity (i.e., language minimality) of the inferred formula. The summarized methods propose different algorithms to solve the aforementioned problems, as well as to infer other descriptions of temporal properties, such as *signal temporal logic* or *deterministic finite automata*.

1 Introduction

Learning properties that are interpretable by humans have become a topic of interest with the growing need to explain the behavior of black-box systems. There is strong motivation to infer such properties from examples when the underlying rules are unknown; applications range from explaining and debugging to reverse engineering systems that were designed with the help of artificial intelligence.

Most systems produce sequences of data, and must be described by properties that capture evolution over time. *Linear temporal logic* (LTL), amongst other formalisms, models such temporal properties, and expressing properties in LTL makes them particularly easy for humans to interpret.

Gaglione et al. (2022) assumed noise in the labeling of the examples, and proposed methods for learning temporal properties that are robust to that noise. When collecting demonstrations of real-world systems, some examples might be wrongly categorized as positive or negative due to noise in the measurement or uncertainties in the categorization process. Gaglione et al. (2022) proposed methods

*Part of this work has been conducted when Daniel Neider was at the Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg, Germany
Copyright © 2022, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

to solve the binary classification problem (i.e., from positive and negative examples) for LTL formulas and for *signal temporal logic* (STL) formulas.

Roy et al. (2022) assumed that only positive examples are available, and proposed methods for learning concise temporal properties that are specific to the positive examples. Negative examples are not always available, and can have a cost to obtain (e.g., crashing a self-driving car or hitting pedestrians). Learning temporal properties from positive examples only, i.e., the one class classification (OCC) problem, needs to also learn properties that are specific with respect to the positive examples, to avoid trivial solutions such as tautologies. Roy et al. (2022) proposed methods to solve the OCC problem for LTL formulas and for *deterministic finite automata* (DFAs), using language minimality as a measure for specificity.

We present in this paper the methods and results from both (Gaglione et al. 2022) and (Roy et al. 2022).

2 Problem Statements and Methods

2.1 Learning from Noisy Data

We describe, in Problem 1, the generic form of the problem statement from our first paper (Gaglione et al. 2022).

Problem 1 (infer an imperfect classification of data)

Let S be a labeled sample, i.e., a set of traces labeled as positive or negative. Let be a threshold $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, expressed as a percentage of noise to tolerate in the sample. The problem consists in finding an LTL formula φ that correctly classifies at least $1 - \kappa$ of the sample S . A trace u with label $b \in \{true, false\}$ (respectively, positive and negative trace) is considered correctly classified if $\varphi(u) = b$.

We developed two algorithms to solve Problem 1: a MaxSAT-based algorithm, referred to as $\text{MaxSAT}_{\text{LTL}}$, and an algorithm using a decision tree as an extra layer.

Note that when $\kappa = 0$, Problem 1 becomes a perfect classification problem. This specific case is addressed by Neider and Gavran (2018), and we used it as a baseline. We refer to it as SAT_{LTL} , since it is not a maximization problem.

We also adapted these algorithms to STL formula inference, using *satisfiability modulo theories* (SMT) and MaxSMT instead of SAT and MaxSAT, respectively.

2.2 Inference of LTL Formula from Positive Data

We describe, in Problem 2, the generic form of the problem statement from (Roy et al. 2022), also referred to as *one class classification* (OCC) problem.

Problem 2 (infer a language-minimal classification of data)

Let \mathcal{S} be a sample composed of (positive) traces. Let n be a bound $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for the inferred formula size. The problem consists in finding an LTL formula φ such that $|\varphi| \leq n$, that it is consistent with the sample \mathcal{S} (i.e., it accepts all the positive traces), and that it is language-minimal, i.e., there does not exist any other formula φ' that satisfies the previous constraints and such that $L(\varphi') \subsetneq L(\varphi)$.

We developed three methods to solve Problem 2, the best of them being referred to as $S\text{-SYM}_{LTL}$. We also explored similar approaches applied to DFA inference.

3 Case Studies

We evaluated our algorithms on two types of data. The first type is randomly generated data from arbitrary ground-truth LTL formulas. The second type of data is data generated by policies learned from reinforcement learning (RL) in the context of DARPA’s Competency-Aware Machine Learning (CAML) program, on a Pusher-robot and an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) use cases. This second type of data have also been clustered in different strategies beforehand, and the motivation of LTL formula inference is to explain the underlying rules of these strategies. We present here a selection of results from the summarized papers.

3.1 MaxSAT on Common Ground Truths

We considered 12 arbitrary ground truth LTL formulas, and generated a first set of 148 samples from these formulas. We then created a second set of samples with noise from the first sample, by changing the labels of 5% of the traces.




Figure 1: Inferred LTL formula size comparison of SAT_{LTL} and $MaxSAT_{LTL}$ with threshold $\kappa = 0.10$ and a timeout of 900s on all samples. The area of a circle is proportional to the number of samples it represents. The timed out instances are represented by \emptyset .

On the noisy samples, $MaxSAT_{LTL}$ produced results with running time within orders of magnitude less than SAT_{LTL} , and inferred formulas most of the time when SAT_{LTL} timed out, as demonstrated in Figure 1.

3.2 MaxSMT on the Pusher-robot

Four strategies are identified on the Pusher-robot dataset. For each of these strategies, a sample is created, where 150 positive traces correspond to the considered strategy, and 150 negative traces correspond to other strategies. We inferred STL formulas from these samples using the $MaxSMT_{STL}$ method ($MaxSAT_{LTL}$ applied to STL).




Figure 2: Impact of the threshold κ on the running time of $MaxSMT_{STL}$ for each strategy of the Pusher-robot.

The running time depends on the size of the inferred STL formula, which itself depends on the allowed misclassification rate κ , as presented in Figure 2. For example, on the strategy 3 sample, we could infer the formula $F_{[1,3]} s_0 = 0$ of size 2 with a misclassification rate of 19.33% and a runtime of 37 seconds. On the same sample, we could infer the formula $(s_5 > 0.003) U_{[1,3]}(s_0 = 0)$ of size 3 with a misclassification rate of 15.67% and a runtime of 38 minutes.

3.3 One Class Classification on the UAV

We inferred LTL formulas from three clusters using $S\text{-SYM}_{LTL}$. The heuristics let us work with very large samples: here, we have a total of 10000 positive traces divided into three samples using k -min clustering approach.




Figure 3: Running time of $S\text{-SYM}_{LTL}$ (OOC problem), for three clusters of traces from a UAV.

These three clusters turned out to be not separable, but since we only considered positive data, we still inferred interpretable LTL formulas that ended up characterizing the entire dataset nonetheless. For example, one of the inferred LTL formula was $(F x_3) \rightarrow (G x_3)$ which reads as “either the UAV always glides, or it never glides”. This formula of size $n = 4$ was inferred in 36 seconds of running time. Figure 3 depicts the running time of $S\text{-SYM}_{LTL}$ for different bounds for the formula size.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) (Contract number HR001120C0032), Army Research Laboratory (ARL) (Contract number W911NF2020132 and ACC-APG-RTP W911NF), National Science Foundation (NSF) (Contract number 1646522), and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) (Grant number 434592664).

References

Gaglione, J.-R.; Neider, D.; Roy, R.; Topcu, U.; and Xu, Z. 2022. MaxSAT-based temporal logic inference from noisy data. *Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering*.

Neider, D.; and Gavran, I. 2018. Learning Linear Temporal Properties. In Bjørner, N.; and Gurfinkel, A., eds., *2018 Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design, FMCAD 2018*, 1–10. IEEE.

Roy, R.; Gaglione, J.-R.; Baharisangari, N.; Neider, D.; Xu, Z.; and Topcu, U. 2022. Learning Interpretable Temporal Properties from Positive Examples Only.