

Scaling Up Natural Language Understanding for Multi-Robots Through the Lens of Hierarchy

Shaojun Xu^{1,*,\dagger}, Xusheng Luo^{2,*}, Yutong Huang², Letian Leng², Ruixuan Liu², Changliu Liu²

¹ Tsinghua University, ² Carnegie Mellon University

xusj24@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

{xushengl, yutongh3, lleng, ruixuanl, cliu6}@andrew.cmu.edu

Abstract: Long-horizon planning is hindered by challenges such as uncertainty accumulation, computational complexity, delayed rewards and incomplete information. This work proposes an approach to exploit the task hierarchy from human instructions to facilitate multi-robot planning. Using Large Language Models (LLMs), we propose a two-step approach to translate multi-sentence instructions into a structured language, Hierarchical Linear Temporal Logic (LTL), which serves as a formal representation for planning. Initially, LLMs transform the instructions into a hierarchical representation defined as Hierarchical Task Tree, capturing the logical and temporal relations among tasks. Following this, a domain-specific fine-tuning of LLM translates sub-tasks of each task into flat LTL formulas, aggregating them to form hierarchical LTL specifications. These specifications are then leveraged for planning using off-the-shelf planners. Our framework not only bridges the gap between instructions and algorithmic planning but also showcases the potential of LLMs in harnessing hierarchical reasoning to automate multi-robot task planning. Through evaluations in both simulation and real-world experiments involving human participants, we demonstrate that our method can handle more complex instructions compared to existing methods. The results indicate that our approach achieves higher success rates and lower costs in multi-robot task allocation and plan generation. Demos videos are available at <https://youtu.be/7WOrDKxIMIs>.

Keywords: Natural language, Formal method, Multi-robots, Embodied agent

1 Introduction

The challenge of long-horizon planning arises from factors such as uncertainty accumulation, computational complexity, delayed rewards and incomplete information. A strategy is by leveraging the task hierarchy. Hierarchical models have demonstrated a notable edge over flat models in interpretability and efficiency [1, 2]. However attractive, how to obtain hierarchy still remains an open problem. One pathway is to deduce hierarchy through the observation of task execution [3], which alleviates human effort yet poses a challenge due to a high requirement for abstraction reasoning. Conversely, the other route, which entails acquiring hierarchy directly from human, appears straightforward. Humans excel at hierarchical reasoning and are used to articulate hierarchically through language effortlessly [4]. Nonetheless, the hierarchical insights from humans cannot be readily integrated by algorithms without meticulous engineering. This gap between human preferences and algorithmic formulation impedes the application of hierarchy-based planning algorithms.

LLMs, being trained on extensive textual corpus, exhibit common sense reasoning abilities, thereby efficiently managing everyday task specifications articulated in human languages. Our key observation is that hierarchy can be progressively obtained from human input with the help of a LLM.

*Equal contribution.

\daggerShaojun Xu interned at Carnegie Mellon University when this work was conducted.




Figure 1: Overview of the framework. The non-leaf nodes in the HTT, the language descriptions of sibling tasks, and the flat specifications are color-coded to indicate one-to-one correspondence. Snippet of prompts are included, with further details available in Appendix A.

In light of the above, our work proposes harnessing LLMs as translators to extract task hierarchy from human languages, so that we can handle multiple-sentences complex instructions, while related work primarily focuses on single-sentence sequential instructions. Compared to works that map natural languages directly to robot actions, such as RT-X [5], we adopt the **neuro-symbolic paradigm** [6] where an intermediate formal representation is first obtained from natural languages, and then used by off-the-shelf solvers to plan. This paradigm is data efficient and interpretable [7]. Consequently, our approach can be applied to multi-robot systems with the objective of cost optimization, which differs from most works that focus on single robot scenario and only consider finding feasible solutions. It remains an open question that which formal specification is appropriate [7]. In this work, the formal specification is Hierarchical Linear Temporal Logic, a variant of formal languages introduced in work [8]. Unlike the unstructured and ambiguous nature of natural languages, formal languages are structured and enjoy a unique interpretation, of which LTL has been applied to robotics [9, 10, 11, 12]. Hierarchical LTL is succinct and interpretable compared to its flat counterpart, aligning well with hierarchically represented human instructions. However, the learning curve associated with it is steep. For those not well-versed in the field, expressing tasks through natural language is considerably more intuitive. We perceive LLMs as an efficacious tool to unlock the expressive prowess of temporal logic. The translation of hierarchical human instructions into hierarchical LTL proves to be more straightforward and dependable compared to translating into a cumbersome flat formula, a challenge not solved by existing works [13, 14, 15].

A naive approach to converting human instructions into hierarchical LTL is by employing an end-to-end methodology. However, this technique tends to perform poorly as LLMs are still not good at logical reasoning [16], which is crucial for crafting logical formulas. In this work, we propose a two-step approach to convert instructions into hierarchical LTL. Initially, upon receiving a instruction, we prompt LLMs to generate and gradually refine a task representation which is a simplified version of Hierarchical Task Network [17]. Subsequently, in the second phase, sub-tasks of each task can be translated into a single flat LTL via fine-tuned LLMs. Through iterative processing of all sub-tasks of every task in the intermediary phase, we are able to construct hierarchical LTL specifications. With our methodology, human instructions are ready for use by off-the-shelf planners.

Contributions: Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We proposed a neuro-symbolic paradigm of extracting task hierarchies from instructions to facilitate multi-robot planning for long-horizon tasks;
2. We developed a method that transforms language into hierarchical LTL, thus integrating human-derived hierarchical knowledge in planning solvers;
3. We validated our method through simulations and real-world experiments using instructions to formulate plans for multi-robot manipulation tasks.

2 Related Work

Language-Conditioned Robotic Planning Given instructions, there are two primary methods for generating actions [7]. The first uses deep-learning techniques translate instructions into low-level actions, such as joint states, examples of which include Open-X Embodiment [5] and Octo [18]. Such systems exhibit generalization capabilities across multiple modalities [19, 20], but they depend on large volumes of data. Alternatively, another method initially translates instructions into an intermediate representation, then employing off-the-shelf solvers to generate actions. This approach limits the solution space, thereby reducing the need for extensive data. The intermediate representations employed can vary from formal planning formalisms such as Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) and temporal logics, to less formal structures like code or predefined skills.

PDDL is a model-based planning formalism outlining how to achieve a goal state from an initial state. Xie et al. [21] have explored prompting LLMs to extract goal states from instructions. Liu et al. [22] expand the approach to extract domain descriptions using LLMs. More recently, proposals for extensible benchmarks have emerged, aiming to systematically evaluate the planning capabilities of LLMs for tasks defined in PDDL [23]. LLMs also have shown promise in synthesizing code. ProgPrompt [24] leverages LLMs to call APIs that represent action primitives. Similarly, Code as Policies [25] employs LLMs to generate low-level executable code. Similar approaches are used in [26, 27, 28]. Instead of providing all APIs, Voyager [29] continuously writes executable codes and saves them in the skill library as reusable APIs. Saycan [30] uses LLMs to arrange pre-defined skills requiring precise visuomotor control. Inner Monologue [31] enhances this by integrating closed-loop language feedback to address failures. KNOWNO [32] adjusts LLM-based planners to align uncertainty, enabling the systems to seek assistance when necessary. A commonality is their focus on single-robot scenarios; however, extending these approaches remains largely unexplored.

Natural Language to Temporal Logic Temporal logics are effective in tackling goals that involve temporal constraints and providing performance assurances. Initially, adaptations of natural language into temporal logics adopted grammar-based methods, which are well-suited for structured inputs [33]. More recently, the application of LLMs for such reasoning tasks has become popular [34]. Efforts like prompting GPT-3 to create LTL formulas by relying on established patterns. Cosler et al. [15] use LLMs to facilitate user interactions that help refine ambiguous or incorrect translations. However, these models focus on the translation process and do not tackle the challenges of language grounding in robotics—linking language with physical actions and environments. Pan et al. [35] develop a synthetic dataset of instructions paired with temporal logic formulas, used to fine-tune an LLM. Similarly, [36] translates languages into Signal Temporal Logic (STL) that handles combined task and motion planning. On the other hand, He et al. [37] create neural networks from scratch using synthetic data. Conversely, Patel et al. [38], Wang et al. [39] develop a weakly supervised semantic parser using execution trajectories without explicit LTL annotations. Liu et al. [40] introduce Lang2LTL, a modular system that employs LLMs to convert navigational commands into LTL specifications. Hsu et al. [41] use LLMs to transform natural language queries into First-Order Logic (FOL) programs, which are executed by FOL processors. In a different approach, Wang et al. [42] begin with a predefined LTL specification, with each predicate defined by concise instructions. Our research sets itself apart in several aspects: we address complex instructions using a hierarchical approach and incorporate task allocation among multiple robots.

LLMs to Multi-Robots Recently, there has been a notable trend in adapting LLMs for use in multi-robot systems. SMART-LLM [27] uses LLMs to synthesize code that facilitates task decomposition, coalition formation, and task allocation. Roco [43] pairs a LLM with a robot, adopting a dialogue-based approach to coordinate tasks and generate sub-task plans using predefined skills. LLM-MRS [44] fine-tunes LLMs to generate plans in the form of behavior trees. Chen et al. [45] explore the efficacy of various communication frameworks (centralized, decentralized, or hybrid) where LLMs act as task planners. Garg et al. [46] employ LLMs to address deadlock resolution in navigation scenarios. Co-NavGPT [47] integrates LLMs as global planners to assign exploration frontiers to each robot, enhancing the efficiency of target searches. Wang et al. [48] introduce a decentralized LLM-based planner that allows robots to make individual decisions autonomously. However, the works mentioned above primarily focus on finding feasible solutions. In contrast, our research aims to optimize the cost and time required to complete tasks.

3 Preliminary

Linear Temporal Logic Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) is composed of basic statements, referred to as atomic propositions \mathcal{AP} , along with boolean operators such as conjunction (\wedge) and negation (\neg), and temporal operators like next (\bigcirc) and until (\mathcal{U}) [49]. LTL formulas follow the syntax: $\phi := \top \mid \pi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \neg\phi \mid \bigcirc\phi \mid \phi_1 \mathcal{U} \phi_2$, where \top stands for a true statement, and π is a boolean valued atomic proposition. Other temporal operators can be derived from \mathcal{U} , such as $\diamond\phi$ that implies ϕ will be true at a future time. We focus on a subset of LTL known as syntactically co-safe formulas (sc-LTL) [50]. Any LTL formula encompassing only the temporal operators \diamond and \mathcal{U} and written in positive normal form (where negation is exclusively before atomic propositions) is classified under sc-LTL formulas [50], which can be satisfied by finite sequences followed by any infinite repetitions. This makes sc-LTL apt for reasoning about robot tasks with finite durations.

Hierarchical LTL A hierarchical LTL, denoted by $\Phi = \{\phi_i^k \mid k = 1, \dots, K, i = 1, \dots, |\Phi^k|\}$ where ϕ_i^k is the i -th sc-LTL specification at level k , Φ^k denotes all specifications at level k , and $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality, includes K levels such that each specification at level k , for $k = 1, \dots, K - 1$, is constructed from specifications at the lower level $k + 1$.

We refer to each specification ϕ_i^k in Φ as the “flat” specification. These flat specifications can be organized in a tree-like specification hierarchy graph, where each node represent a flat sc-LTL specification. Edges between nodes indicate that one specification encompasses another as a *composite proposition*. This composite proposition is, in essence, another flat sc-LTL formula. Leaf nodes represent *leaf specifications* at the K -th level that consist only of atomic propositions, while non-leaf nodes represent *non-leaf specifications* made up of composite propositions.

Example 1 (Dishwasher Loading Problem) *Place items into the dishwasher. Robot should put plates, mugs and utensils into the lower rack in any order. After putting items to the lower rack, then put things into upper rack, first put saucers, and then put cups. The hierarchical LTL is:*

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 : \quad \phi_1^1 &= \diamond(\phi_2^1 \wedge \diamond\phi_2^2) \\ L_2 : \quad \phi_2^1 &= \diamond\pi_{plates}^l \wedge \diamond\pi_{mugs}^l \wedge \diamond\pi_{utensils}^l \\ \phi_2^2 &= \diamond(\pi_{saucers}^u \wedge \diamond\pi_{cups}^u), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where ϕ_2^1 and ϕ_2^2 are composite propositions, and the formula $\diamond(\phi_2^1 \wedge \diamond\phi_2^2)$ specifies that ϕ_2^1 should be fulfilled before moving on to ϕ_2^2 . π_i^j represents atomic propositions, denoting the act of placing a specific type of dishware. Note that the lowest level L_2 only includes atomic propositions.

4 Natural Language to Hierarchical LTL

LLMs excel in common sense reasoning yet behavior poorly in logical reasoning [16, 51]. Therefore, we propose a two-stage method for translating natural language into hierarchical LTL using an intermediary structure known as the Hierarchical Task Tree. The framework is displayed in Fig. 1.

Algorithm 1: Construction of hierarchical LTL specifications

Input: HTT \mathcal{T}
Output: Hierarchical LTL specifications

```
1  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{front}} = \emptyset, \Phi = \emptyset;$   $\triangleright \mathcal{V}_{\text{front}}$  is a stack that contains nodes to be expanded
2  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{front}}.\text{push}(v_{\text{root}});$   $\triangleright$  Add root node of the tree
3 while  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{front}} \neq \emptyset$  do
4    $v = \mathcal{V}_{\text{front}}.\text{pop}();$ 
5    $k = \text{GetDepth}(v);$   $\triangleright$  Get the depth of node  $v$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\text{GetDepth}(v_{\text{root}}) = 1$ 
6    $i = \text{Count}(\Phi, k);$   $\triangleright$  Count the number of specifications at level  $k$  in  $\Phi$ 
7   if  $v$  is a leaf node then
8      $\phi_{i+1}^k = \text{ActionCompletion}(v);$ 
9   else
10     $\mathcal{V}' = \text{GetChildren}(\mathcal{T}, v);$ 
11     $\mathcal{V}_{\text{front}}.\text{push}(\mathcal{V}');$   $\triangleright$  Push all children nodes to the stack
12     $\mathcal{R}' = \text{GetTemporalRelations}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{V}');$ 
13     $\phi_{i+1}^k = \text{GenerateLTL}(\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{R}');$   $\triangleright$  Generate the single LTL specification
14     $\Phi.\text{add}(\phi_{i+1}^k);$ 
15 return  $\Phi;$ 
```

4.1 Conversion from human instructions to Hierarchical Task Tree

Definition 4.1 (Hierarchical Task Tree (HTT)) A Hierarchical Task Tree (HTT) is a tree $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R})$, where a) $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ denotes the set of nodes, each representing a task. Each node is associated with a human instruction that describes its respective task. b) $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ represents the edges, indicating a decomposition relationship between tasks. Specifically, an edge $e = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies that child task v_2 is one of sub-tasks of parent task v_1 . The node set \mathcal{V} can be partitioned into multiple disjoint subsets $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m\}$, such that all nodes within the same subset \mathcal{V}_i share the same parent node. c) $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ defines the set of temporal relations between sibling tasks, which are decompositions of the same parent task. Specifically, a relation $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{R}$, where $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, indicates that task v_1 should be completed before task v_2 .

The tree is structured such that it unfolds level by level, where each child task is a decomposition of its parent task. The HTT is a simplified version of the hierarchical task network (HTN) as is specifically designed to align with the structure of hierarchical LTL. The relation \mathcal{R} specifically captures the temporal relationships between sibling tasks that share the same parent. The temporal relationship between any two tasks can be inferred by tracing their lineage back to their common ancestor. This is the primary distinction between HTT and HTN, where HTN includes interdependencies between sub-tasks under different parent tasks. Another difference is that each node in the HTT is solely focused on the goal of a sub-task and does not incorporate other properties like preconditions and effects that are found in HTN. When a task instruction is received, we use LLMs to construct the HTT through a two-step process, as outlined in step 1 of Fig. 1.

1. HTT without temporal relations \mathcal{R} . The first step involves generating the nodes \mathcal{V} and edges \mathcal{E} , excluding the temporal relations \mathcal{R} . Leveraging the LLMs' extensive understanding of hierarchical reasoning, the model decomposes the overarching task into a structured hierarchy. The decomposition continues until a task consists solely of sequential operations performed on a single object. Details of the prompt used for this decomposition are provided in Fig. 6 in Appendix A.1.

2. Add temporal relations \mathcal{R} . We achieve this by iterating over each non-leaf node. For each non-leaf node v , we consider \mathcal{V}' , which represents its child tasks at the level directly beneath it. Using LLMs, we then determine the temporal relations between sibling tasks within \mathcal{V}' . The specific prompt used for querying these temporal relations is illustrated in Fig. 7 in Appendix A.1.

4.2 Generation of task-wise flat LTL specifications

Once the HTT representation is obtained, we advance to generate a single flat LTL specification for each node. This is described in Alg. 1, which employs a breadth-first search.

1. Logical search For every non-leaf node v , we gather its child tasks \mathcal{V}' and the temporal relations among them, defined by $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}' \times \mathcal{V}'$. We then use LLMs to rephrase these child tasks and their temporal relations into syntactically correct sentences aligned with the semantics of LTL specifications (as illustrated in step 2.1 in Fig. 1). These reformulated sentences are input into a fine-tuned LLM that produces a single LTL formula (as depicted in step 2.2 in Fig. 1). The detail of fine-tuning LLMs is in Appendix A.3. It is important to note that we do not substitute the task node with its corresponding human instruction; instead, we use a “lifted” format where specific tasks are replaced with abstract symbols, like “task 1.1 should be completed before task 1.2”. This abstraction allows the fine-tuned LLMs to operate without needing detailed knowledge of the tasks, as demonstrated in [35, 36]. The prompt is shown in Fig. 8 in Appendix A.2.

2. Action completion Given an HTT, each leaf node should represent a simple task on certain object, such as “task 1.1.1 place plates into the lower rack” in Fig. 1. By viewing such simple task as a sequence of action steps, we prompt the LLM to generate a sequence of pre-defined API calls to expand the simple task. For instance, the symbol π_{plates}^l that represents task 1.1.1 can be replaced with LTL specification composed of sequential APIs: $\pi_{\text{plates}}^l = \diamond(\text{Pickup}(\text{plate}) \wedge \diamond \text{Move}(\text{plate}, \text{lower_rack}))$; see step 2.2 in Fig. 1. Such prompt can be found in Fig. 9 in Appendix A.2. After this step, a complete hierarchical LTL specifications is generated; see example in Fig. 10 in Appendix A.2.

Remark 4.2 Assuming the HTT contains $n_1 + n_2$ nodes (n_1 non-leaf nodes and n_2 leaf nodes), our method queries LLMs $2(n_1 + n_2) + 1$ times. Firstly, LLMs are queried once to create the HTT without temporal relations. Subsequently, LLMs are invoked $n_1 + n_2$ times to derive temporal relations for non-leaf nodes and to complete actions for leaf nodes. Finally, a fine-tuned LLM is used $n_1 + n_2$ times to transform each node into flat LTL formulas.

5 Experimental Results

We evaluate the performance both in a simulated environment and through real-world experiments. For simulation, we use the AI2-THOR simulator [52] coupled with the ALFRED dataset [53]. AI2-THOR provides an interactive 3D environment that models various domestic settings. The ALFRED dataset focuses on natural language comprehension and embodied actions. We carried out two real-world experiments: one involving a robotic arm arranging fruits and vegetables on a tabletop, and another where four robotic arms transferred objects through handover. Throughout the evaluation, we employ the LLM ChatGPT-4 and aim to answer three key questions:

1. Is our approach capable of handling complex human instructions effectively?
2. Does our method successfully address tasks involving multiple robots while producing a high quality of solutions?
3. Is our method flexible enough to adjust to the verbal styles of various users?

5.1 Mobile manipulation tasks in AI2-THOR

Tasks The ALFRED dataset contains instructions for tasks with a number of strictly sequential steps, which we classify as *base* tasks. To create more complex tasks, we procedurally combine base tasks from the same floor plan and object configuration to generate *derivative* tasks, which are detailed in Appendix B.1. Derivative tasks are categorized based on the number of base tasks, which vary from 1 to 4. A list of derivative tasks are shown in Appendix B.2. Within each category,

base tasks	robots	success rate %		travel cost (m)		completion time	
		ours (HLTL, PL)	[27]	ours	[27]	ours	[27]
1	1	92 (100,92)	48	2.9±2.0	4.7±3.5	11.5±7.9	14.1±9.6
	2	90 (100, 90)	36	2.7±1.9	6.3±4.7	10.6±8.0	17.8±14.1
	4	88 (100, 88)	22	2.4±2.0	6.0±5.9	9.3±7.8	18.5±22.4
2	1	84 (92, 91)	16	7.1±6.2	10.1±4.8	28.4±24.8	28.8±16.9
	2	82 (92, 89)	10	7.0±6.2	7.3±5.0	22.7±21.2	29.0±19.8
	4	74 (92, 81)	8	5.9±5.7	3.8±3.3	18.6±17.7	15.2±13.1
3	1	78 (86, 91)	46	13.1±8.6	12.7±5.9	52.5±34.4	41.0±22.3
	2	76 (86, 88)	38	12.6±8.3	16.8±10.3	35.0±23.0	50.4±43.1
	4	68 (86, 79)	18	12.4±9.0	14.1±7.2	35.0±25.8	41.6±17.7
4	1	74 (84, 88)	36	12.5±8.3	21.8±5.1	50.1±33.1	70.9±35.6
	2	74 (84, 88)	26	14.0±9.4	13.0±4.8	38.1±26.8	71.5±33.5
	4	64 (84, 77)	18	12.6±7.8	13.2±1.3	33.7±24.8	81.8±31.6

Table 1: Results comparing performance across base tasks and robots. The success rate column first presents the overall success rate, with the success rates for conversion and planning in parentheses.

50 derivative tasks are generated randomly. We then assign 1, 2, or 4 robots, each with randomly chosen initial positions within the floor plan, leading to $4 \times 50 \times 3 = 600$ test scenarios. We use the planner [8] that relies on the search-based approach to synthesize plans for a multi-robot system, accomplishing simultaneous task allocation and planning.

Comparison We compare our method with SMART-LLM [27], which uses LLMs to generate Python scripts that invoke predefined APIs of actions for the purposes of task decomposition and task allocation. We could not compare our method with PDDL-based methods. First, we are not aware of any studies that translate instructions into PDDL for multi-robot systems, especially using the AI2-THOR simulator. Second, existing research on converting instructions into PDDL does not address temporal constraints. Furthermore, approaches that convert instructions into flat LTL are inadequate for handling tasks here, as they are too complex for flat LTL specifications.

Metrics The metrics are as follows: 1) Success rate, which measures whether the target goal states of objects are achieved and if the order in which these states occur satisfies the specified temporal requirements. Additionally, to provide a detailed analysis of the success rate, we further break it down into two separate components: a) conversion, b) planning. 2) Travel cost, measured in meters, is defined as the total distance traveled by all robots, excluding any costs related to manipulation. 3) Completion time, quantified as the number of discrete time steps required to complete the tasks.

Results The dimensions of grid maps range from $(25 \sim 30) \times (25 \sim 30)$ due to floor plans of various size. The statistical results are shown in Tab. 1. These results are organized based on the number of base tasks included in the derivative tasks. SMART-LLM is limited to solving derivative tasks with only one base task, whereas our method can handle up to 4 tasks. When handling tasks comprising more than two base tasks, SMART-LLM’s output exceeds the context window of ChatGPT-4, indicating that it uses a significant number of tokens as it employs LLMs to generate Python scripts. To address this, we introduced an additional layer atop SMART-LLM. Specifically, for a derivative task, we use LLMs to generate a satisfying sequence of base tasks through task decomposition. Each base task is then sequentially processed through SMART-LLM to derive a viable solution. In general, our approach not only achieves a higher success rate but also results in plans that are more cost-effective and quicker to complete. Even with derivative tasks comprising 4 base tasks, we attain a success rate of approximately 84% when converting to hierarchical LTL. However, SMART-LLM exhibits a considerably lower success rate. As the number of robots increases, both travel costs and completion times decrease due to the parallel execution of base tasks. However, the success rate slightly decreases during the planning phase when more robots are involved as the planning time exceeds the five-minute timeout. We hypothesize that the planner [8] employs a best-first search strategy to




Figure 2: From left to right, top to bottom, a series of snapshots for task “First Put the clean spatula in the drawer and put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet in any order. After putting the spatula and the pepper shakers, rinse an apple to put it in the microwave. Finally, wash the spoon on the counter and place it on a plate”. In these images, the spatula and its movement are marked with a green mask, the pepper shaker and its movement with an orange mask, the apple and its movement with a red mask, and the spoon and its movement with a yellow mask.

ensure optimality, facing a substantial challenge due to the vast search space involving long-horizon tasks, action spaces (both navigation and manipulation), and map dimensions. We can handle more robots if the underlying planner is capable. This capability stands out from existing studies where LLMs are tasked to allocate tasks. Note that we only record the travel cost and completion time for tasks that are successfully completed. Therefore, the data for SMART-LLM are not fully representative due to its lower success rate. Tasks of higher complexity, which typically involve greater travel costs and longer completion times, are more likely to fail and are thus excluded from the data. A series of snapshots capturing task execution is displayed in Fig. 2.

5.2 Real-world rearrangement experiments involving human participants

We conduct a real-world tabletop experiment, where a robotic arm places fruits and vegetables onto colored plates. Given the 2D nature of the task, we convert the environment into a discrete grid

task description	success rate/%		travel cost		runtimes/s	
	ours	LLM	ours	LLM	ours	LLM
1. Put the carrot onto the blue plate.	100	100	61.1±23.1	61.1±23.1	2.4±0.1	2.3±0.2
2. First place the red apple, then the green apple, and finally the orange onto the yellow plate.	100	100	172.8±29.4	172.8±29.4	8.0±0.5	4.4±0.2
3. Start with placing the orange in the blue plate. After placing the orange, put the carrot in the pink plate.	88	100	104.9±24.5	104.9±24.5	4.9±0.2	3.0±0.2
4. Start by placing the carrot in the yellow plate. Once the carrot is placed, put the green apple in the blue plate. Finally, place the orange in the pink plate, ensuring each fruit is placed in the given order.	100	100	168.0±20.4	168.0±20.4	7.6±0.9	4.5±0.6
5. Simultaneously place the green apple in the blue plate and the orange in the yellow plate.	100	100	111.2±21.6	111.2±21.6	5.9±0.5	3.5±0.7
6. Place the green apple in the pink plate, the orange in the yellow plate and the red apple in the blue plate. The order of placement is not specified.	100	100	150.6±26.2	160.7±20.4	7.1±0.5	6.7±3.2
7. Place the carrot in the blue plate, the orange in the yellow plate, the green apple in the green plate, and the red apple in the pink plate in any order.	100	100	172.5±36.4	211.3±27.8	11.5±0.3	5.4±0.3
8. Begin by placing the green apple and orange in the yellow plate in any order. Once done, place the carrot and red apple in the blue plate also in any order.	100	100	232.7±37.8	235.3±35.4	25.7±2.4	6.4±0.4

Table 2: Statistical results from real-world tabletop pick-and-place experiments.

world, which the planner [8] uses. The use of one arm simplifies the task compared to the multi-robot scenarios, as it eliminates task allocation. Our evaluation has two aspects: a) the adaptability to verbal tones and styles from various users; and b) the comparative effectiveness of our plan solution against existing methods. To explore the first aspect, we conduct a user study with 4 participants, asking each to rephrase the task instructions according to personal style, while maintaining the original semantics. For the second aspect, we use an LLM as the task planner, which directly generates the sequence of API calls, akin to ProgPrompt [24]. The prompt includes the initial 2D coordinates of all objects along with the robotic arm, which is outlined in Fig. 11 in Appendix C. We developed a dataset containing instructions for eight arrangement tasks, each specified with temporal constraints. To address the probabilistic behavior of LLMs, we conducted 5 queries to the LLMs for each rephrased instruction, resulting in a total of 25 test cases per task. In each scenario, object locations are randomized. The cost metric used is the projected travel distance of the robotic arm within a 2D space. Examples of these rephrased instructions are shown in Tab. 4 in Appendix C.

The results are presented in Tab. 2. As observed, both our approach and the LLM achieve a high success rate, which aligns with the expectations given the task complexities. Regarding cost, for the first four tasks that require strict sequential actions, the costs are identical. For the latter four tasks, which allow for multiple feasible solutions, our method consistently produces lower-cost paths, with the exception of task 5. In this simple task, the LLM manages to create an optimal plan given the placement of fruits. The slightly lower success rate for task 3 is attributed to the HTT mistakenly assigning the sub-task of “placing the orange” to two leaf nodes. The first node includes “placing the orange” and the second, “placing the orange, followed by putting the carrot.” Ideally, there should be one node for “placing the orange” and another for “putting the carrot.” We hypothesize that the issue originates from the phrase “After placing the orange”, as we found out that replacing this with “then” can correct the error. To systematically address such issues, we recommend implementing a syntax checker, as discussed in Section 6, to verify task structures and initiate corrections through re-queries to the LLMs when necessary. Ultimately, the runtimes include the time to obtain the executable action sequence. Our method experienced slightly longer runtimes compared to LLM because it involves querying LLMs multiple times. A list of snapshots between our approach and LLMs for task 6 is displayed in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: Comparative snapshots between our approach and LLMs for task 6. We give an optimal plan, whereas LLMs follow the sequence in which the fruits are mentioned in the instructions.




Figure 4: Four robot arms in straight line or square configurations, where symbols E, F and G represent source locations and H, I and J denote target locations.

5.3 Multi-robot handover tasks

We examine the execution of pick-and-place tasks involving multiple objects by four fixed robot arms, which are either aligned in a straight line or arranged in a square configuration; see Fig. 4. Certain tasks might necessitate the transfer of objects between robots, depending on their proximity. The planner our approach uses, inspired from work [54], produces collision-free trajectories by simultaneously considering task and motion planning. The prompt for the baseline that directly uses the LLM as task planner is illustrated in Fig. 4.

Tab. 3 displays eight multi-stage pick-and-place tasks with temporal constraints. For the LLM-based planner, a planning scheme is deemed successful if it allows for the sequential actions of multiple robots to be executed successfully while adhering to the temporal constraints. It is evident that for tasks involving robot handovers, the success rate of the LLM-based planner decreases due to the need for cooperative planning. Considering the probabilistic output of ChatGPT-4, we conducted 10 tests per task to enhance the diversity of the LLM’s responses. The results indicate that by dividing the planning process into task hierarchical extraction and LTL-based optimization, we can effectively bypass direct control of robots’ low-level operations during task planning, thereby improving

task description	success rate %	
	ours	LLM
1. Transfer three blocks into the opposite. The red block should be placed before the blue block	100	90
2. Put the three blocks into three goal region at region H at, region I and region J each goal region can only be placed with one object.	100	30
3. Please plan a solution to move the three pillars to the placement area (region E, F, G) to the side of the arm a and arm b. Each object cannot be placed on the area other than the target region	80	20
4. Transfer three blocks into the opposite regions. The robot arm cannot touch blue block until any of the robot arm touched the red block. After all of these, you should place yellow block back to region G (where the red block is currently locating	80	20
5. The red block should be placed before the blue block. Please exchange the position of the red block and blue block. At any time, put the yellow block into the opposite side.	80	0
6. The red block should be placed before the blue block. Please place the three objects separately to region G, H and I.	90	40
7. The red block should be placed before the blue block. Please place the three objects one after another to region I, no objects can be placed on region F, G and H during this period.	100	10
8. Please first place the yellow block to region I, then place the yellow block to region G, and move the other two blocks (red and blue) to any empty region at any time	100	40

Table 3: Statistical results from multi-robot handover experiments. The first five tasks involves scenarios where four arms are arranged in a square formation, while the last three tasks involve scenarios where the four arms are aligned in a straight line.




Figure 5: Snapshots depict four robot arms performing real-world tasks of picking and placing objects via handover. The instruction given is, “Please move the blue, green, and colored blocks to the two opposite boxes, place the colored ones after the green ones.” The block being picked is highlighted within a yellow ellipse, and the block at the target location is enclosed in a blue square.

management of multi-stage handover tasks. Moreover, we conduct experiments in a real-world setting with four robotic arms, and a series of snapshots are presented in Fig. 5.

6 Conclusions and Limitations

We proposed a method of transforming unstructured language into a structured formal representation with hierarchical structure. Our simulation and real-world experiment outcomes demonstrated that the framework offers an intuitive and user-friendly approach for deploying robots in daily situations.

Limitations The proposed framework operates as an open loop without feedback. To transition to a closed-loop one, it is essential to integrate a syntax checker and a semantic checker. These components interact continually with LLMs to enhance the success rate. The syntax checker verifies adherence to the hierarchical LTL structure necessary for HTT representation. Meanwhile, the semantic checker offers feedback on errors when the planner fails to identify a solution. Another limitation is that once created, the HTT representation remains unchanged. Recall that we derive an LTL specification by extracting child tasks from a parent task. As more child tasks are included, the accuracy of translation drops. Therefore, to handle tasks with more base tasks, it is necessary to restructure the HTT to restrict the number of child tasks a single parent task has.

References

- [1] J. B. Tenenbaum, C. Kemp, T. L. Griffiths, and N. D. Goodman. How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *science*, 331(6022):1279–1285, 2011.
- [2] C. Kemp, A. Perfors, and J. B. Tenenbaum. Learning overhypotheses with hierarchical bayesian models. *Developmental science*, 10(3):307–321, 2007.
- [3] B. Hayes and B. Scassellati. Autonomously constructing hierarchical task networks for planning and human-robot collaboration. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5469–5476. IEEE, 2016.
- [4] B. A. Purcell and R. Kiani. Hierarchical decision processes that operate over distinct timescales underlie choice and changes in strategy. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 113(31):E4531–E4540, 2016.
- [5] A. Padalkar, A. Pooley, A. Jain, A. Bewley, A. Herzog, A. Irpan, A. Khazatsky, A. Rai, A. Singh, A. Brohan, et al. Open x-embodiment: Robotic learning datasets and rt-x models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08864*, 2023.
- [6] V. Belle, M. Fisher, A. Russo, E. Komendantskaya, and A. Nottle. Neuro-symbolic ai+ agent systems: A first reflection on trends, opportunities and challenges. In *International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 180–200. Springer, 2023.
- [7] V. Cohen, J. X. Liu, R. Mooney, S. Tellex, and D. Watkins. A survey of robotic language grounding: Tradeoffs between symbols and embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13245*, 2024.
- [8] X. Luo and C. Liu. Simultaneous task allocation and planning for multi-robots under hierarchical temporal logic specifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04003*, 2024.
- [9] H. Kress-Gazit, M. Lahijanjan, and V. Raman. Synthesis for robots: Guarantees and feedback for robot behavior. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 1(1): 211–236, 2018.
- [10] X. Luo and M. M. Zavlanos. Temporal logic task allocation in heterogeneous multirobot systems. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 38(6):3602–3621, 2022.
- [11] S. Tellex, N. Gopalan, H. Kress-Gazit, and C. Matuszek. Robots that use language. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 3:25–55, 2020.
- [12] X. Luo, S. Xu, R. Liu, and C. Liu. Decomposition-based hierarchical task allocation and planning for multi-robots under hierarchical temporal logic specifications. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.
- [13] J. X. Liu, Z. Yang, I. Idrees, S. Liang, B. Schornstein, S. Tellex, and A. Shah. Grounding complex natural language commands for temporal tasks in unseen environments. In *7th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2023.
- [14] Y. Chen, R. Gandhi, Y. Zhang, and C. Fan. NI2tl: Transforming natural languages to temporal logics using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07766*, 2023.
- [15] M. Cosler, C. Hahn, D. Mendoza, F. Schmitt, and C. Trippel. nl2spec: Interactively translating unstructured natural language to temporal logics with large language models. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 383–396. Springer, 2023.
- [16] F. Xu, Q. Lin, J. Han, T. Zhao, J. Liu, and E. Cambria. Are large language models really good logical reasoners? a comprehensive evaluation from deductive, inductive and abductive views. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09841*, 2023.

- [17] M. Ghallab, D. Nau, and P. Traverso. Automated planning and acting. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [18] O. M. Team, D. Ghosh, H. Walke, K. Pertsch, K. Black, O. Mees, S. Dasari, J. Hejna, T. Kreiman, C. Xu, et al. Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12213, 2024.
- [19] Y. Jiang, A. Gupta, Z. Zhang, G. Wang, Y. Dou, Y. Chen, L. Fei-Fei, A. Anandkumar, Y. Zhu, and L. Fan. Vima: General robot manipulation with multimodal prompts. In NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop, 2022.
- [20] X. Li, M. Liu, H. Zhang, C. Yu, J. Xu, H. Wu, C. Cheang, Y. Jing, W. Zhang, H. Liu, et al. Vision-language foundation models as effective robot imitators. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01378, 2023.
- [21] Y. Xie, C. Yu, T. Zhu, J. Bai, Z. Gong, and H. Soh. Translating natural language to planning goals with large-language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05128, 2023.
- [22] B. Liu, Y. Jiang, X. Zhang, Q. Liu, S. Zhang, J. Biswas, and P. Stone. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477, 2023.
- [23] K. Valmeekam, M. Marquez, A. Olmo, S. Sreedharan, and S. Kambhampati. Planbench: An extensible benchmark for evaluating large language models on planning and reasoning about change. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024.
- [24] I. Singh, V. Blukis, A. Mousavian, A. Goyal, D. Xu, J. Tremblay, D. Fox, J. Thomason, and A. Garg. Progprompt: program generation for situated robot task planning using large language models. Autonomous Robots, pages 1–14, 2023.
- [25] J. Liang, W. Huang, F. Xia, P. Xu, K. Hausman, B. Ichter, P. Florence, and A. Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), pages 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] W. Huang, C. Wang, R. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Wu, and L. Fei-Fei. Voxposer: Composable 3d value maps for robotic manipulation with language models. In Conference on Robot Learning, pages 540–562. PMLR, 2023.
- [27] S. S. Kannan, V. L. Venkatesh, and B.-C. Min. Smart-llm: Smart multi-agent robot task planning using large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10062, 2023.
- [28] Z. Hu, F. Lucchetti, C. Schlesinger, Y. Saxena, A. Freeman, S. Modak, A. Guha, and J. Biswas. Deploying and evaluating llms to program service mobile robots. IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, 2024.
- [29] G. Wang, Y. Xie, Y. Jiang, A. Mandlekar, C. Xiao, Y. Zhu, L. Fan, and A. Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291, 2023.
- [30] A. Brohan, Y. Chebotar, C. Finn, K. Hausman, A. Herzog, D. Ho, J. Ibarz, A. Irpan, E. Jang, R. Julian, et al. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In Conference on robot learning, pages 287–318. PMLR, 2023.
- [31] W. Huang, F. Xia, T. Xiao, H. Chan, J. Liang, P. Florence, A. Zeng, J. Tompson, I. Mordatch, Y. Chebotar, et al. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. In Conference on Robot Learning, pages 1769–1782. PMLR, 2023.
- [32] A. Z. Ren, A. Dixit, A. Bodrova, S. Singh, S. Tu, N. Brown, P. Xu, L. Takayama, F. Xia, J. Varley, et al. Robots that ask for help: Uncertainty alignment for large language model planners. In 7th Annual Conference on Robot Learning, 2023.

- [33] S. Konrad and B. H. Cheng. Real-time specification patterns. In Proceedings of the 27th international conference on Software engineering, pages 372–381, 2005.
- [34] F. Fuggitti and T. Chakraborti. NI2ltl—a python package for converting natural language (nl) instructions to linear temporal logic (ltl) formulas. In AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2023.
- [35] J. Pan, G. Chou, and D. Berenson. Data-efficient learning of natural language to linear temporal logic translators for robot task specification. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), pages 11554–11561. IEEE, 2023.
- [36] Y. Chen, R. Gandhi, Y. Zhang, and C. Fan. NL2TL: Transforming natural languages to temporal logics using large language models. In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 15880–15903, Singapore, Dec. 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] J. He, E. Bartocci, D. Ničković, H. Isakovic, and R. Grosu. Deepstl: from english requirements to signal temporal logic. In Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, pages 610–622, 2022.
- [38] R. Patel, R. Pavlick, and S. Tellex. Learning to ground language to temporal logical form. In Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL), 2019.
- [39] C. Wang, C. Ross, Y.-L. Kuo, B. Katz, and A. Barbu. Learning a natural-language to ltl executable semantic parser for grounded robotics. In Conference on Robot Learning, pages 1706–1718. PMLR, 2021.
- [40] J. X. Liu, Z. Yang, I. Idrees, S. Liang, B. Schornstein, S. Tellex, and A. Shah. Lang2ltl: Translating natural language commands to temporal robot task specification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11649, 2023.
- [41] J. Hsu, J. Mao, J. Tenenbaum, and J. Wu. What’s left? concept grounding with logic-enhanced foundation models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024.
- [42] J. Wang, J. Tong, K. Tan, Y. Vorobeychik, and Y. Kantaros. Conformal temporal logic planning using large language models: Knowing when to do what and when to ask for help. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10092, 2023.
- [43] Z. Mandi, S. Jain, and S. Song. Roco: Dialectic multi-robot collaboration with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04738, 2023.
- [44] A. Lykov, M. Dronova, N. Naglov, M. Litvinov, S. Satsevich, A. Bazhenov, V. Berman, A. Shcherbak, and D. Tsetserukou. Llm-mars: Large language model for behavior tree generation and nlp-enhanced dialogue in multi-agent robot systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09348, 2023.
- [45] Y. Chen, J. Arkin, Y. Zhang, N. Roy, and C. Fan. Scalable multi-robot collaboration with large language models: Centralized or decentralized systems? arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15943, 2023.
- [46] K. Garg, J. Arkin, S. Zhang, N. Roy, and C. Fan. Large language models to the rescue: Deadlock resolution in multi-robot systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06413, 2024.
- [47] B. Yu, H. Kasaei, and M. Cao. Co-navgpt: Multi-robot cooperative visual semantic navigation using large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07937, 2023.
- [48] J. Wang, G. He, and Y. Kantaros. Safe task planning for language-instructed multi-robot systems using conformal prediction. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15368, 2024.

- [49] C. Baier and J.-P. Katoen. Principles of model checking. MIT press Cambridge, 2008.
- [50] O. Kupferman and M. Y. Vardi. Model checking of safety properties. Formal methods in system design, 19:291–314, 2001.
- [51] F. Petroni, T. Rocktäschel, S. Riedel, P. Lewis, A. Bakhtin, Y. Wu, and A. Miller. Language models as knowledge bases? In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), pages 2463–2473, 2019.
- [52] E. Kolve, R. Mottaghi, W. Han, E. VanderBilt, L. Weihs, A. Herrasti, M. Deitke, K. Ehsani, D. Gordon, Y. Zhu, et al. Ai2-thor: An interactive 3d environment for visual ai. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05474, 2017.
- [53] M. Shridhar, J. Thomason, D. Gordon, Y. Bisk, W. Han, R. Mottaghi, L. Zettlemoyer, and D. Fox. Alfred: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 10740–10749, 2020.
- [54] V. Kurtz and H. Lin. Temporal logic motion planning with convex optimization via graphs of convex sets. IEEE Transactions on Robotics, 2023.
- [55] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825, 2023.

A Construction of hierarchical LTL specifications

A.1 Conversion from human instructions to Hierarchical Task Tree

Prompt for generating HTT task decomposition

When given instructions to finish some tasks, human tend to reason in a hierarchical manner. Please decompose the natural language task description into a hierarchical structure based on tasks logical relationships. Be sure to expand pronouns [e.g., it, them, they] to refer to specific objects, in order to resolve ambiguity.

Example [short description]:

Task: *"Turn on the stove to heat potato, and chill a sliced pear while the potatoes are heating"*

1. Arrange things

(1.1) Fetch a potato, place the potato on the stove, then turn on the stove [Note: Operations on the same object (potato here) cannot be split into two subtasks]

(1.2) fetch a pear, sliced the pear, then place the pear in the fridge

Example [short description]:

Task: *"Put a towel on the toilet, after putting the towel, get a pot and put it into the fridge."*

1. Arrange things

(1.1) Put a towel on the toilet

(1.2) Get a pot and put it into the fridge

Example [long description]:

"First put a black block into the red box, then put a yellow block into the red box. After putting things to red box, you can start to putting toys into the green box (they can be done in any order): put toy bears on the table; dress the doll up before put it into the box. you can put clothes into the blue box in any time, but you need to place all skirts and pants into the blue box before putting in sock into the blue box. eventually, you should pile the red, green, blue box on the table, pile three box can be done in any order",

1. Sort things

- (1.1) Place objects into different box
 - 1.1.1. Place blocks into red boxes
 - 1.1.1.1. Put the a black block into the red box
 - 1.1.1.2. Put the a yellow block into the yellow box
 - 1.1.2. move toys into green box
 - 1.1.2.1. Put toy bears into the green box
 - 1.1.2.2. Dress up the dolls and lays dolls in the green box
 - 1.1.3. Move clothes into blue box
 - 1.1.3.1. Place skirt into the blue box
 - 1.1.3.2. Place pant into the blue box
 - 1.1.3.3. Putt sock into the blue box
- (1.2) Pile the red, green, blue box
 - 1.2.1. Place red box on the left
 - 1.2.2. Place green box in the middle
 - 1.2.3. Move blue box on the right

According to the principle:

Example [tasks can be done in any order should be placed under the same parent task]:
 task: "At any time do [task a]. Mean while, [task b] can be done. After [task a and b], do [task c]."

- 1. Arrange things
 - (1.1) summary of [task a] and [task b]
 - 1.1.1. [task a]
 - 1.1.2. [task b]
 - (1.2) [task c]

Because [task a] and [task b] can be done in any order.

Example [tasks should be executed in sequential should be placed under the same parent task]:

Task : "do [task a] at any time. at any time, do [task b]. After [task a] finished, do [task c]."

- 1. root task
 - (1.1) summary of [task a] and [task c]
 - 1.1.1. [task a]
 - 1.1.2. [task c]
 - (1.2) [task b]

Because [task a] and [task c] should be done in sequence

The requirements for task decomposition are that:

1. Ensure that each parent task has at most 3 child tasks, which means you can increase the depth of the hierarchical structure to make it narrower per level.
2. You do not need to write out the temporal constraints in this step, but when dividing levels, please try to consider tasks relationships.
3. Directly output the hierarchical task representation without any other texts.
4. Please keep the root of the task tree as "1."

Below is a new task: (AI2-THOR task provided by humans) *First Put the clean spatula in the drawer and put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet in any order. After putting the spatula and the pepper shakers, rinse an apple to put it in the microwave. Finally, wash the spoon on the counter and place it on a plate.*

Below is a new task: (Real-world experiment provided by humans) *First place the green apple and an orange into a yellow plate in any order. After that, place the carrot and the red apple into a blue plate in any order, too.*

Possible output from LLM:
 (For AI2-THOR provided by humans)

1. Perform tasks
 - (1.1) Place kitchen utensils
 - 1.1.1. Put the clean spatula in the drawer
 - 1.1.2. put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet
 - (1.2) Prepare apple for microwave
 - 1.2.1. Rinse an apple and put the rinsed apple in the microwave
 - (1.3) Clean and rearrange utensils
 - 1.3.1. Wash the spoon on the counter and place the washed spoon on a plate

(For real-world experiment provided by humans)

1. Place fruits into plates
 - (1.1) Place green apple and orange into yellow plate in any order
 - 1.1.1. Place green apple into yellow plate
 - 1.1.2. Place orange into yellow plate
 - (1.2) Place carrot and red apple into blue plate in any order
 - 1.2.1. Place carrot into blue plate
 - 1.2.2. Place red apple into blue plate

Figure 6: Prompt for generating HTT task decomposition

Prompt for extracting relationships between HTT sibling tasks

Here is a parent task and its child tasks: the parent task is *Task_1 Perform tasks* and child tasks are

- *Task_1.1 Place kitchen utensils*
- *Task_1.2 Prepare apple for microwave*
- *Task_1.3 Clean and rearrange utensils*

Completing all child tasks is equivalent to completing the parent task. Please find the temporal relations between child tasks from the task instruction:

"First put the clean spatula in the drawer and put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet in any order. After putting the spatula and the pepper shakers, rinse an apple to put it in the microwave. Finally, wash the spoon on the counter and place it on a plate."

Please only return the JSON format in the following format:

```

1 {
2   "parent_task_id": "Task_1",
3   "child_task_condition": "(Please find the temporal
4     relationship between child tasks
5     ['Task_1.1', 'Task_1.2', 'Task_1.3']).
6     We assume that each sub task will eventually be
       completed)",
  }
```

Examples of temporal relations for `child_task_condition` are:

- until a finished, b can be done
- a and b and c can be done in any order
- a and b can be done in any order

- a must done before b
- first a, then b, then c

where `parent_task_id` denotes the unique task id of the parent task, `child_task_condition` summarizes the temporal relations between subtasks (priorities and dependencies between children). Use and only use task `[Task_1.1]`, `[Task_1.2]`, `[Task_1.3]` as a substitute for task specific content. Please only return JSON for parent task `[Task_1]`. Please pay attention to its subtasks.

Possible output from LLM:

```

1 {
2   "parent_task_id": "Task_1",
3   "child_task_condition": "first Task_1.1, then Task_1
4   .2, then Task_1.3",

```

Figure 7: Prompt for extracting relationships between HTT sibling tasks

A.2 Generation of task-wise flat LTL specifications

Nature language to LTL formula via a finetuned LLM

Natural language description:
 Task_1.1 and Task_1.2 can be done in any order, Task_1.1 and Task_1.2 must be completed before Task_1.3, Task_1.3 must be completed before Task_1.4.

Possible output from the translator:
 Finally Task_1.1 And Finally Task_1.2 And Finally (Task_1.3 And Finally Task_1.4)
 And (Not Task_1.3 Until Task_1.1) And (Not Task_1.3 Until Task_1.2)

Figure 8: Nature language to LTL formula via a finetuned LLM

Prompt for action completion

Description from the leaf node in HTT for AI2THOR: Place a rinsed spoon into the drawer

Prompt: API functions of the supported objects and actions are (selected environment provided relevant object types by LLM):

- ('spatula', ['pickupable']),
- ('cabinet', ['openable', 'receptacle']),
- ('apple', ['pickupable', 'sliceable']),
- ('microwave', ['openable', 'toggleable', 'receptacle', 'movable']),
- ('spoon', ['pickupable']),
- ('counter', ['receptacle']),
- ('drawer', ['openable', 'receptacle'])

The robot can do these actions (selected environment provided possible actions by LLM):

- `find_object_by_state(object_type, [states])`, states can be “sliced”, “cleaned”, “chilled”, “heated”, “cracked”, “used up”, i.e., `find_object_by_state(pear, [sliced, cleaned])`: find a pear [sliced or cleaned];
- `move_to(object_type)`, i.e., `move_to(banana)` the agent go to a place near banana;
- `pickup_object(object_type)`, i.e., `pickup_object(apple)` pick up an apple;
- `open_object(object_type)`, i.e., `open_object(book)` open book;
- `place_object(object_type)`, i.e., `place_object()` release object in hand;
- `close_object(object_type)`, i.e., `close_object(book)` close book;
- `fill_object_with_liquid(object_be_filled, liquid)`, i.e., `fill_object_with_liquid(cup, coffee)` fill cup with coffee;
- `cook_object(object_type)`, i.e., `cook_object(egg)` cook egg

For the task “Place a rinsed spoon into the drawer” (description from HTT’s leaf node), generate a sequence of actions with the API functions provided above. Please reply in format:

```

1 {
2   "reasoning_and_explanation":
3   "task_sequence":['find_object_by_state(pineapple,heat)',,
4     move_to(pineapple)'](the splitted task sequence),
5 }

```

Possible output from LLM:

```

1 {
2   "reasoning_and_explanation": "To complete the task of
3   placing a rinsed spoon into the drawer, the robot must
4   first locate a spoon that has been rinsed (assuming '
5   rinsed' is a state similar to 'cleaned'). After
6   finding the spoon, the robot needs to move to the
7   location of the spoon to pick it up. Once the spoon is
8   in the robot's possession, the robot must locate a
9   drawer, move to it, and then open the drawer to place
10  the spoon inside. Finally, the robot should close the
11  drawer to complete the task.",
12  "task_sequence": [
13    "find_object_by_state(spoon, [cleaned])",
14    "move_to(spoon)",
15    "pickup_object(spoon)",
16    "find_object_by_state(drawer, [])",
17    "move_to(drawer)",
18    "open_object(drawer)",
19    "place_object()",
20    "close_object(drawer)"
21  ]
22 }

```

Figure 9: Prompt for action completion.

Task instructions:

First Put the clean spatula in the drawer and put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet in any order. After putting the spatula and the pepper shakers, rinse an apple to put it in the microwave. Finally, wash the spoon on the counter and place it on a plate.

HTT:

1. p0 Perform tasks

(1.1) p101 Place kitchen utensils

1.1.1. p104 Put the clean spatula in the drawer

1.1.2. p105 put a pepper shaker in the kitchen cabinet

(1.2) p102 Prepare apple for microwave

1.2.1. p106 Rinse an apple and put the rinsed apple in the microwave

(1.3) p103 Clean and rearrange utensils

1.3.1. p107 Wash the spoon on the counter and place the washed spoon on a plate

Possible output from LLM:

```

1  [
2    {
3      "p0": "<> ( p101 && ( <> ( p102 && <> p103 ) ) )"
4    },
5    {
6      "p101": "( <> p104 ) && ( <> p105 )",
7      "p102": "<> p106",
8      "p103": "<> p107"
9    },
10   {
11     "p104": "<> ( p108 && <> p109 )",
12     "p105": "<> ( p110 && <> p111 )",
13     "p106": "<> ( p112 && <> ( p113 && <> p114 ) )",
14     "p107": "<> ( p115 && <> ( p116 && <> p117 ) )"
15   },
16   {
17     "p108": [
18       "find_object_by_state(spatula, ['cleaned'])",
19       "move_to(spatula)",
20       "pickup_object(spatula)"
21     ],
22     "p109": [
23       "move_to(drawer)",
24       "open_object(drawer)",
25       "place_object(spatula, drawer)",
26       "close_object(drawer)"
27     ],
28     "p110": [
29       "find_object_by_state(pepper_shaker, [])",
30       "move_to(pepper_shaker)",
31       "pickup_object(pepper_shaker)"
32     ],
33     "p111": [
34       "find_object_by_state(cabinet, [])",
35       "move_to(cabinet)",
36       "place_object(peppershaker, cabinet)"
37     ],
38     "p112": [

```

```

39     "find_object_by_state(apple, [])",
40     "move_to(apple)",
41     "pickup_object(apple)"
42   ],
43   "p113": [
44     "find_object_by_state(sink, [])",
45     "move_to(sink)",
46     "place_object(apple, sink)",
47     "find_object_by_state(apple, [rinsed])",
48     "pickup_object(apple)"
49   ],
50   "p114": [
51     "find_object_by_state(microwave, [])",
52     "move_to(microwave)",
53     "open_object(microwave)",
54     "place_object(apple)",
55     "close_object(microwave)"
56   ],
57   "p115": [
58     "find_object_by_state(spoon, [])",
59     "move_to(spoon)",
60     "pickup_object(spoon)"
61   ],
62   "p116": [
63     "find_object_by_state(sink, [])",
64     "move_to(sink)",
65     "place_object(spoon, sink)",
66     "pickup_object(spoon)"
67   ],
68   "p117": [
69     "find_object_by_state(plate, [])",
70     "move_to(plate)",
71     "place_object(apple, plate)"
72   ]
73 }
74 ]

```

Figure 10: An example of generated hierarchical LTL specifications.

A.3 Fine-tuning LLMs to translate natural language to LTL specifications

Firstly, we developed a dataset comprising pairs of natural language descriptions and their corresponding LTL formulas, subsequently fine-tuning the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 [55] model for translation. Training datasets were synthesized from sources including Efficient-Eng-2-LTL [35], Lang2LTL [40], nl2spec [15], and NL2TL [36]. Given the domain-specific nature of these datasets, we substituted specific tasks with generic symbols such as “p101 should be completed before p103” paired with the LTL $\pi = \diamond(p101 \wedge \diamond p103)$. Next, we ask LLMs to reinterpret these “lifted” LTL specifications, creating a domain-agnostic dataset containing approximately 509 unique LTL formulas and 10,621 natural language descriptions produced by LLMs. Following this, the model was fine-tuned using 8-bit quantization over three epochs, achieving a translation accuracy of 98.5% from formal language descriptions to LTL formulas.

B AI2-THOR

B.1 Generation of derivative tasks

We create larger tasks by merging a specific number of base tasks, introducing various temporal constraints to these combinations, which we refer to as *derivative* tasks. Specifically, to ensure that the same object is not included in multiple base tasks simultaneously, we first use an LLM to identify the objects involved in each base task. We then combine base tasks that involve distinct objects and randomly establish temporal relationships between them. Subsequently, an LLM reformulates this randomly combined information into derivative tasks that align more naturally with human expression patterns.

B.2 Derivative tasks with 4 base tasks

A list of these derivative tasks with 4 base tasks is presented below.

1. Put a microwaved egg in the garbage can. Place a rinsed spoon into the drawer. Heat up a slice of potato and put it against the apple. After these are finished, put the tomato in the microwave.
2. First Rinse off a tomato slice and cook it in the microwave. Next, heat and place a potato in the sink. Then, put the statue in the sink. Finally, place a heated mug on a counter.
3. Put a bowl with a credit card on the table at any time. Meanwhile place the watch on the table on a plate in any order. After placing the bowl and the watch, put the box with vase in it beside the laptop on the table. Finally, place newspaper onto the sofa.
4. Place a credit card inside a box and take the box to a shelf. At same time, take the remote controls and place them on the couch. After completing these tasks, move a pillow from the couch to a chair. Finally, place a plate with key chain on it on the table in the corner of the room.
5. Move the plunger to the cabinet under the sink at any time. Put the soap bottle on top of the toilet at any time. in any order, put a towel on the toilet at any time. After placing the plunger, soap bottle, and towel, put a bar of soap on the back of the toilet.
6. Get spray bottle from toilet, place spray bottle on dresser at any time. After that, place a clean bar of soap down on top of the toilet. Once done, store a plunger in a dresser. Lastly, put away candles in the cabinet.
7. Pick up the key chain near the lamp to turn it off. After turning off the lamp, move the laptop from the table to the chair. At any time, take the box from the table and put it on the couch. Lastly, Pick up a watch from the table, and put them on the TV stand.

C Real-world experiments

Prompt for LLMs to generate task plan

Given a tabletop scenario with various fruits and vegetables, and colored plates, a robotic arm is tasked to arrange these items according to instructions. The initial coordinates of each fruit, vegetable, and the robotic arm are provided. Using the available information and predefined API functions like `pickup(object)` and `place(object, target)`, generate a sequence of commands to effectively arrange each item on the correct colored plate.

API:

```
move_to(obj)
pickup(obj)
move_to(plate)
release_obj(plate)
```

task description	paraphrase
5. Simultaneously place the green apple in the blue plate and the orange in the yellow plate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put the green apple to the blue plate and the orange to the yellow plate. The order does not matter. 2. Please put the green apple into the blue plate and orange into the yellow plate in any order. 3. Please place the green apple in the blue plate and the orange in the yellow plate at the same time. 4. You can put the green apple in to the blue plate and the orange into the yellow plate in any order.
6. Place the green apple in the pink plate, the orange in the yellow plate and the red apple in the blue plate. The order of placement is not specified and can be chosen freely.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put the green apple to the pink plate, the orange to the yellow plate and the red apple to the blue plate in any order. 2. Please put the green apple in the pick plate, the orange in the yellow plate and red apple int he blue plate. I do not care about the order. 3. Please place the green apple in the pink plate, the orange in the yellow plate, and the red apple in the blue plate. In any order you prefer. 4. a.place the green apple into the pink plate b. put the orange into the yellow plate c. put the red apple in the blue plate. a and b and c can be done in any order
7. Place the carrot in the blue plate, the orange in the yellow plate, the green apple in the green plate, and the red apple in the pink plate in any order.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put the carrot to the blue plate the orange to the yellow plate the green apple to the green plate and the red apple to the pink plate in the best order. 2. I want the carrot to be in the blue plate, the orange in the yellow plate, the green apple in the green plate. The order is not important. 3. Place the carrot in the blue plate, the orange in the yellow plate, the green apple in the green plate, and the red apple in the pink plate. You can decide the order freely. 4. Place the carrot in the blue plate in any order, the orange in the yellow plate in any order, the green apple in the green plate in any order, and the red apple in the pink plate in any order. all the tasks should be finished in the end
8. Begin by placing the green apple and orange in the yellow plate in any order. Once done, place the carrot and red apple in the blue plate also in any order.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First put the green apple and the orange to the yellow plate, and then put the place the carrot and the red apple to the blue plate in the best order. 2. Start placing the green apple and orange in the yellow plate in any order. After that, then put the carrot and red apple in the blue plate in any order. 3. Please place place the green apple and orange in the yellow plate in any order. Then place the carrot and red apple in the blue plate in any order. 4. First place the green apple and an orange into a yellow plate in any order. after that, place the carrot and the red apple into a blue plate in any order, too.

Table 4: A collection of representative tasks along with their rephrasings.

Initial coordinates:
apple: (1, 2)
banana: (3, 4)
orange: (5, 6)
carrot: (7, 8)

Task: Considering the initial coordinates, output a sequence of API calls to complete the task so that the trajectory of the robot arm has the lowest cost. Make sure that that job can be completed with the objects in the environment. Make sure the environment has all the objects and plates that are mentioned in the task. If the task is not possible, please output 'Invalid input'. If the task can be planned, just output the sequences of API calls in the following format: Plan: 1. xxx 2.xxx

Example:
Input: Place the xxx in the aaa plate and the yyy in the bbb plate.
Output should be like the following:

Plan:
1. move_to(xxx)
2. pickup(xxx)
3. move_to(aaa_plate)
4. release_obj(aaa_plate)
5. move_to(yyy)
6. pickup(yyy)
7. move_to(bbb_plate)
8. release_obj(bbb_plate)

Here is the task input: Place the apple in the red plate and the banana in the yellow plate.

Figure 11: Prompt for LLMs to generate task plan

Prompt for LLMs to generate multi-robot handover task plan

We have arms a, b, c and d . The distance between each robotic arm is 1 meter, each robot arm has a motion radius of 0.8 meters that means each arm can only pick and place the object in the regions besides them. Each goal region can only place one object.

API:
pick(arm_id, object_i, place_j)
drop(arm_id, object_i, place_j)
handover(arm_id_i, amd_id_j)

Initial coordinates :
arm a at (0, 0),
arm b at (0, 1),
arm c at (-1, 1),
arm d at (-1, 0),
block a at region E (0.2, 0)
block b at region F (0.2, 0.5),
block c at region G (0.2, 1).
Goal region:
region J at (-1.2, 0),
region H at (-1.2, 0.5),
region I at (-1.2, 1)

Task: Considering the initial coordinates, output a sequence of API calls to complete the task so that the trajectory of the robot arm has the lowest cost. Make sure that that job can

be completed with the objects in the environment. Make sure the environment has all the objects and plates that are mentioned in the task. If the task is not possible, please output 'Invalid input'. If the task can be planned, just output the sequences of API calls in the following format: Plan: 1. xxx 2.xxx

Here is the task input: Please place the blue block into region I, the red block into region J, the yellow block into region H. Place the red block before placing the blue block. .

Figure 12: Prompt for LLMs to generate task plan for multi-robot handover task