

Optimization of Rulebooks via Asymptotically Representing Lexicographic Hierarchies for Autonomous Vehicles

Matteo Penlington, Alessandro Zanardi, Emilio Frazzoli

Abstract—A key challenge in autonomous driving is that Autonomous Vehicles (AVs) must contend with multiple, often conflicting, planning requirements. These requirements naturally form in a hierarchy – e.g., avoiding a collision is more important than maintaining lane. While the exact structure of this hierarchy remains unknown, to progress towards ensuring that AVs satisfy pre-determined behavior specifications, it is crucial to develop approaches that systematically account for it.

Motivated by lexicographic behavior specification in AVs, this work addresses a lexicographic multi-objective motion planning problem, where each objective is incomparably more important than the next – consider that avoiding a collision is incomparably more important than a lane change violation.

This work ties together two elements. Firstly, a multi-objective candidate function that asymptotically represents lexicographic orders is introduced. Unlike existing multi-objective cost function formulations, this approach assures that returned solutions asymptotically align with the lexicographic behavior specification. Secondly, inspired by continuation methods, we propose two algorithms that asymptotically approach minimum rank decisions – i.e., decisions that satisfy the highest number of important rules possible. Through a couple practical examples, we showcase that the proposed candidate function asymptotically represents the lexicographic hierarchy, and that both proposed algorithms return minimum rank decisions, even when other approaches do not.

I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of an Autonomous Vehicle (AV) is to reach its destination safely, while adhering to road regulations, cultural norms and should the situation arise, contend with ethical dilemmas [1]. However, this inherently represents a fundamentally ill-posed, multi-objective problem. Traffic rules defined by regulators are often ambiguous, leaving human drivers to contend with conflicting regulations [2]. The decision-making challenge is further complicated by the fact that each individual has a unique interpretation of safe driving, resulting in varied responses to identical scenarios [3]. Consequentially, developers have the complex task of designing motion planning algorithms that perform *unspecified*, but yet safe, behaviors.

Although there is no unified formal definition (yet) of *what it means to drive safely*, at its core, solving the multi-objective motion planning problem largely depends on the competency to contend solutions within a hierarchical framework [4]. AV decision-making has been previously characterized as lexicographic [5] – for instance, avoiding a collision is incomparably more important than violating lane-change rules. Thus, this work considers a multi-objective problem where there exists a lexicographic hierarchy over the constraints and objectives.

Existing approaches, such as preemptive lexicographic optimization, are local and impractical in practice [6]. While other methods that embed multi-objective cost functions into planners [7], [8] fail to properly reflect the lexicographic order, thus returning solutions that do not align with the intended behavior specification. The rulebooks formalism [9] sought to decouple trajectory generation and scoring. This approach ensures that out of the generated trajectories, the lexicographic minimum is returned. However, by construction, generated trajectories are not necessarily the lexicographic optimums. Thus, this works reconnects the generation and scoring by providing a cost function that asymptotically represents the lexicographic preferences and can be optimized over with well-known optimization techniques in continuous space.

A. Related work

We first highlight that in general, motion planning approaches rely on a scalar cost function. Depending on the approach, this may be a single objective shortest-path cost such as in [10], [11], or a multi-objective cost [7], [12]. In the former case, the constraint hierarchy must be embedded into the solving approach. Works have illustrated if feasible solutions exist, optimal ones are returned, but are unable to solve the problem if infeasible [13], [14]. In the case of multi-objective cost functions, a common approach is to formulate the multi-objective cost as a weighted sum over the objectives [8]. However, by construction, this formulation allows for trade-offs between the lexicographic constraints. Data-driven approaches, such as inverse reinforcement learning [15] and reinforcement learning [16], seek to directly regress an appropriate reward function and policy respectively, while other works approach the problem more analytically, such as through weighted maximisation [8] and rule hierarchies [17]. However, in these works, the lexicographic hierarchy is not explicitly presented in the eventual cost function, thus returning solutions that may be appropriate for general driving, but lack assurance that returned solutions are minimum violating. Thus, in this work, a formulation is proposed that analytically defines an arbitrary cost function that asymptotically ensures the lexicographic hierarchy is preserved.

Secondly, we highlight that lexicographic optimization solvers exist in literature. These approaches ensure that returned solutions satisfy the hierarchy [18]. Typically, these approaches adopt the preemptive method [19], where a problem with N lexicographic objectives is solved through N sequential optimization problems in decreasing order of importance. Fundamentally, even in scenarios where feasible solutions exist, it is of high complexity [6], and thus has not been deployed within the domain of motion planning. To address this, works have proposed the use of the grossone to

*This work was not supported by any organization

M. Penlington, A. Zanardi, and E. Frazzoli are with the Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zürich, Switzerland mpenlington@ethz.ch.

represent infinitesimals, and thus are able to formulate and solve a scalar multi-objective cost function as one optimization problem. However, thus far, their algorithmic capabilities are limited to linear and mixed-integer programs on infinity computers [20], [21]. Thus, building on the proposed multi-objective cost function, we propose two algorithms that solve a non-linear non-convex optimisation problem, asymptotically returning solutions that satisfy the lexicographic hierarchy.

Finally, we briefly introduce the rulebooks formalism [9]. Rulebooks was introduced as a language specification, thus separating trajectory generation and evaluation. However, to ensure that generated trajectories are minimum violating, the planner must explicitly consider the hierarchy while solving the motion planning problem. Although previous works have focused on integrating rulebooks directly into planners, prior methods did not formulate cost functions that explicitly represents the lexicographic hierarchy of rules [17], [22]. Thus, returned trajectories did not necessarily satisfy the hierarchy (and in fact, in Sec. V, we illustrate this on a common scenario).

B. Contributions

The main contribution of this work is the introduction of a differentiable candidate function that asymptotically represents a lexicographic hierarchy. It consists of a penalty function, where each rule in the hierarchy has a multiplier associated that increases at different rates during optimization.

Furthermore, we introduce the notion of *minimum-rank* decisions, and show that with the proposed candidate function, stationary points asymptotically approach these decisions.

To tractably solve for minimum-rank decisions, two continuation-method inspired algorithms are proposed: one algorithm faithfully converges to stationary points at every iteration, and an approximate that leverages time-scale separation to asymptotically approach minimum-rank decisions.

Manuscript organization: Sec. II introduces the necessary preliminaries, formally defining rulebooks, rank of a decision, and the notion of representability of an ordered set. Sects. III and IV introduce the core contributions, a candidate function that asymptotically represents lexicographically ordered sets and two algorithms that converge to minimum-rank decisions. These notions are then showcased in Sec. V.

II. PRELIMINARIES

The ensuing formalization builds upon the language specification introduced in rulebooks [9], and on the related work on *minimum-violation* planning [23]. We first recall the concept of *rules* organized in a hierarchy (*rulebooks*), then introduce the notion of *rank* of a decision as the index of the most important rule that cannot be satisfied, and conclude by recalling the notion of *representability* of an ordered set. We assume that the reader is familiar with the concepts of order theory [24].

Definition 1 (Decision Space). *A decision space, \mathcal{X} , is a finite-dimensional differentiable space¹. A decision is an $x \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Within the context of robotic motion planning, a decision space could be the configuration space of the robot over a certain horizon. In this work, we consider a robot's inputs

as the corresponding decisions. However, note that higher-level decision spaces, such as tactical decisions $\{go\ left, go\ straight, go\ right\}$, could also be used as long as the notion of differentiability remains.

Definition 2 (Rule). *A rule is a differentiable function $r : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. It maps a decision $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to a non-negative real number that represents the degree to which x violates rule r . It is said that a decision $x \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfies a rule r , if its value is 0. Moreover, we consider rules that have stationary points if and only if they are satisfied, $\nabla_x r(x) = \mathbf{0} \iff r(x) = 0$.*

For AVs, a rule could be any form of regulatory function (e.g., speed limit), cultural behavior (e.g., Pittsburgh left), specified objective (e.g., comfort, lane centering,...). More practical examples can be found in [25], [26].

To prevent more important rules from being traded-off for less important ones (e.g., collision vs comfort), the *rulebook* formalism was introduced in [9], organizing rules in a partially ordered set. In this work, we consider only totally ordered rulebooks, which are the refined ones used in practice for decision making [22].

Definition 3 (Rulebook). *A rulebook $\langle \mathcal{R}, \preceq_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$ is a total order $\prec_{\mathcal{R}}$ on the finite set of rules \mathcal{R} . Each rule in the rulebook is defined with respect to the same decision space \mathcal{X} .*

Notionally, N rules (or combination thereof) are indexed $0, \dots, N-1$ in the hierarchy where the lower indices identify more important rules.

It should be noted that a rulebook induces a total pre-order over the decision space, denoted by $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$, which in this work, is referred to as the preference structure over the decision space.

Furthermore, we associate a *rank* to each decision as the index of the lowest (most important) rule that is not satisfied.

Definition 4 (Rank [27]). *The rank of a decision $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with respect to rulebook $\langle \mathcal{R}, \preceq_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$ is*

$$\text{rank}(x) = \min \{i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\} \mid r_i(x) \neq 0\}. \quad (1)$$

By convention, if none of the rules are violated, the decision has a rank N .

Since no existing method guarantees convergence to the global minima of a motion planning problem, it is useful to consider the lowest achievable rank over the decision space (i.e., the rank of the global optimum).

Definition 5 (Minimum Rank Decision). *We denote the minimum rank i^* as:*

$$i^* = \min \{\text{rank}(x) \mid \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

We finally recall the notion of *representability* (i.e., scalarizability) of an ordered set.

Definition 6 (Representability [28]). *An ordered set $\langle \mathcal{X}, \preceq \rangle$ is representable if there exists a utility function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) \in \prec &\iff \frac{f(x)}{f(y)} < 1, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} \\ (x, y) \in \sim &\iff f(x) = f(y), \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

¹A space that admits a notion of differentiation of functions on it.

We further introduce the notion that a parametric utility function $f(x, \lambda) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ asymptotically represents an ordered set $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$, if for $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$ it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) \in \prec &\iff \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x, \lambda)}{f(y, \lambda)} < 1, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} \\ (x, y) \in \sim &\iff \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1 + f(x, \lambda)}{1 + f(y, \lambda)} = 1, \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Most importantly, we highlight that not all lexicographic orderings are representable. As shown in [29], it is not always possible to construct a utility function representing a lexicographic order, for instance, the set is \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 2$. Nevertheless, necessary and sufficient conditions under which a lexicographically ordered set is representable have been derived [30], [31]. Namely, the decision space must contain countable equivalence classes. Formally, this could rely on defining $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d$ instead of using \mathbb{R}^d . However, since \mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R} , and computers have limited numerical precision, it is argued that this has no practical effect. This implies that for this work we consider that the ordered set of preferences over the decision space, $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$, is representable.

III. ASYMPTOTIC REPRESENTATION OF RULEBOOKS

We hereby introduce the main contribution of this work. A candidate utility function is introduced by adding penalty terms for each rule in the rulebook. Each term is weighted by a ‘‘Lagrange multiplier’’ with a different exponent based on the index of the corresponding rule. The key insight of the method is that during the optimization (e.g., gradient descent), we concurrently increase the value of the multiplier— asymptotically to infinity. Since the multiplier of each rule tends to infinity at different rates, more important rules dominate less important rules, allowing us to asymptotically retrieve decisions that are minimum-rank. The remainder of this section is devoted to formalizing this idea.

Definition 7. Let $\langle \mathcal{R}, \preceq_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$ denote a rulebook (as per Def. 3) with N rules and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We define the utility function $f(x, \lambda) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as:

$$f(x, \lambda) := \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (4)$$

Most importantly, (4) has the following property:

Proposition 8. The utility function Def. 7 asymptotically represents $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$ as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. For f to represent the rulebook $\langle \mathcal{R}, \preceq_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$, f needs to represent both preference ($x \prec y$) and indifference ($x \sim y$) relations, where $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. For the indifference case, $x \sim y \implies \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1+f(x, \lambda)}{1+f(y, \lambda)} = 1$, $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ is trivially true since by definition of indifference, $r(x) = r(y), \forall r \in \mathcal{R} \implies f(x, \lambda) = f(y, \lambda)$. The reverse, $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1+f(x, \lambda)}{1+f(y, \lambda)} = 1 \implies x \sim y$, is also true since two polynomials are equal if their coefficients are all identical - which only occurs if $x \sim y$.

For the strict preference, suppose $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $x \prec y$. Let $j := \min\{i \mid r_i(x) \neq r_i(y), i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ denote the lowest rule index where the rule violations differ. Thus, the sum of all rule violations with indexes below j is equal

for both x, y . Hence the utility function f can be decomposed as follows:

$$f(z, \lambda) = \alpha + g(z, \lambda), \quad z \in \{x, y\} \quad (5)$$

Where $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(z)$ is a constant for any z , and $g(z, \lambda) = \sum_{i=j}^{N-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(z)$.

Taking the limit of $\frac{g(x, \lambda)}{g(y, \lambda)}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$ results in:

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{g(x, \lambda)}{g(y, \lambda)} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=j}^{N-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(x)}{\sum_{i=j}^{N-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(y)} = \frac{r_j(x)}{r_j(y)} \quad (6)$$

Since, $x \prec y \iff \frac{r_j(x)}{r_j(y)} < 1$. Then $x \prec y \iff \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{g(x, \lambda)}{g(y, \lambda)} < 1$. Then it follows that, as α is constant, $x \prec y \iff \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x, \lambda)}{f(y, \lambda)} < 1$. Thus, Def. 7 is satisfied and concluding this proof. ■

It is important to note that the proposed utility function, Def. 7, asymptotically represents $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$. However, there does not necessarily exist a tractable λ such that Def. 6 is computable. Thus, we assume, and later illustrate (Sec. V), that by construction, there exists a finite $\bar{\lambda}$ such that optimizing across $f(x, \bar{\lambda})$ returns minimum-rank decisions.

A. Asymptotic Stationarity to Minimum-Rank Decisions

As required by Def. 2, a rule violation is zero if and only if the derivative is zero, no other assumptions are made on the rules. This results in a possibly non-linear and non-convex utility function (4). However, for any practical relevance, we require the solver to return minimum-rank decisions. Hence, to provide a foundation that solvers can leverage for returning minimum-rank decisions, the asymptotic behavior of stationary points on (4) is described.

Lemma 9 (Gradient of the utility function). Consider the utility function $f(x, \lambda)$ from Def. 7. Furthermore, suppose that an $x \in \mathcal{X}$ has rank j . Then, $\nabla_x f(x, \lambda)$ is given by,

$$\nabla_x f(x, \lambda) = \lambda^{N-j} \nabla r_j(x) + \epsilon \quad (7)$$

where as λ increases, $\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda^{N-j} \nabla r_j(x)}$ asymptotically tends to 0.

In the above, it is important to note that for any finite λ , the gradient is finite, while as λ increases, the contribution of ϵ towards $\nabla_x f(x, \lambda)$ decreases asymptotically.

Proposition 10 (Location of stationary points). Consider the utility function (4) from Def. 7. Then, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ where it holds that

$$\nabla_x f(x, \lambda) = 0,$$

as λ increases, x asymptotically approaches a minimum-rank decision in accordance with Def. 5.

Proof. Let $P \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a set denoting the minimum-rank decisions of \mathcal{X} with a rank i^* . Then $C = \mathcal{X} \setminus P$ denotes the set of non minimum-rank decisions. If C is empty, it trivially holds that all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ are minimum-rank. If C is non-empty, by definition, it holds that

$$f(x, \lambda) < f(y, \lambda), \forall x \in P, \forall y \in C.$$

Since y is not minimum-rank, for all $y \in C$, there exists at least one rule j , where $j < i^*$, for which $r_j(y) > 0$ (in

the case where there are multiple indexes, j denotes the lowest index). Hence, in accordance with Lemma 9, where j is the lowest (most important) violated rule, $\nabla_x f(y, \lambda) = \lambda^{N-j} \nabla r_j(y) + \epsilon, \forall y \in C$. As λ increases, the contribution $\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \implies \nabla_x f(y, \lambda) \rightarrow \lambda^{N-j} \nabla r_j(y) \neq 0, \forall y$. By noting that stationary points exist as a sum of gradients evaluating to 0, and that the contribution of gradients for rules $i > j$ diminishes, stationary points then asymptotically approach the minimum-rank set. ■

In the above, it is important to note that stationary points, for finite values of λ , may exist distinctly outside the minimum rank set. However, the key insight is that the asymptotic behavior, as λ increases, the contribution of ϵ towards the gradient $\nabla_x f(x, \lambda)$ decreases, resulting in stationary points existing infinitely close to the boundary.

IV. OPTIMIZATION OF RULEBOOKS

In principle, if provided with a tractable $\tilde{\lambda}^2$, the proposed utility function (4) can be used directly in any motion planner. However, it is not known a priori for what value of $\tilde{\lambda}$, (4) satisfies Def. 6. Hence, inspired by continuation methods, we formulate an optimization problem, Eq. (8a), where the objective function gradually transforms across the optimization [32], and propose two algorithms to solve it. Ideally:

$$\arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \lambda^{N-i} r_i(x) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \lambda \geq \tilde{\lambda} \quad (8b)$$

The first, Algorithm 1, faithfully returns a central path consisting for stationary points for each λ update. This involves, for each operation of *Solve*, converging to a decision before *UpdateLambda* and the following iteration is run. Since stationary points asymptotically approach minimum-rank decisions, Proposition 10, as long as the selected solver converges to stationary points, so will this algorithm.

Algorithm 1 (Exact central path)

```

1:  $\kappa = 0, \lambda = \lambda_0$ 
2:  $x_\kappa \leftarrow \text{Rand}(\mathcal{D})$ 
3: while notConverged do
4:    $x_{\kappa+1}^* = \text{Solve}(8a)$ 
5:    $\lambda_{\kappa+1} \leftarrow \text{UpdateLambda}(\lambda_\kappa)$ 
6:    $x_{\kappa+1} \leftarrow x_{\kappa+1}^*$ 
7: end while

```

However, this approach has a greater complexity compared with the lexicographic preemptive method – Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot c)$, whereas the preemptive method is $\mathcal{O}(N \cdot c)$, where $m > N$ denote the number of iterations and rules respectively, and c the complexity of the solver considering k iterations). Nevertheless, it provides a mechanism to verify the expected asymptotic behaviors, described in Proposition 8 and Proposition 10.

To address the high-complexity of Algorithm 1, in Algorithm 2, we propose the use of time-scale separation to

²Tractable in this context signifies that $f(x, \tilde{\lambda})$ is numerically computable.

solve one optimization problem³. In this case, λ and the solvers hype-parameters are varied at (potentially) different rates. At most, with a one-to-one time-scaling, where for every *SolverStep*, *UpdateLambda* is run, then Algorithm 2 has a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \frac{c}{k})$, where k is the number of iterations of the solver in Algorithm 1. By construction it is now possible that Algorithm 2 has a lower complexity than the preemptive method.

Furthermore, unlike Algorithm 1, convergence to stationary points for any λ is not guaranteed, but considering the asymptotic behavior of the stationary points, Proposition 10, solutions will asymptotically approach minimum-rank decisions. We later show that for tractable problems, this results in minimum-rank decisions, but not necessarily an optimal minimum-rank decision (Sec. V).

Algorithm 2 (Time-scale separated)

```

1:  $\kappa = 0, \lambda = \lambda_0$ 
2:  $x_\kappa \leftarrow \text{Rand}(\mathcal{D})$ 
3: while notConverged do
4:    $x_{\kappa+1}^* = \text{SolverStep}(8a)$ 
5:    $\lambda_{\kappa+1} \leftarrow \text{UpdateLambda}(\lambda_\kappa)$ 
6:    $x_{\kappa+1} \leftarrow x_{\kappa+1}^*$ 
7: end while

```

In the following section, we demonstrate that for practical examples, Algorithms 1 and 2 return minimum-rank decisions. Furthermore, note that we use gradient descent with steepest descent line search to update the step size, and a time scheduler with rates > 1 for *UpdateLambda*. With Algorithm 2, we demonstrate that with the most aggressive time-scaling (i.e., for every solver iteration we update lambda), the returned solutions are still minimum-rank.

V. PRACTICAL EXAMPLES: MOTION PLANNING

In the following section, we validate the following claims:

- 1) Proposition 8 asymptotically represents the ordered set $\langle \mathcal{X}, \prec_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle$.
- 2) Both proposed Algorithms 1 and 2 converge to minimum-rank trajectories⁴.
- 3) Compared with existing rulebook-like utility function formulations (e.g., [17]), the proposed formulation is the only one to return minimum-rank trajectories.

To support these claims, two case studies in the context of motion planning for AVs are presented. The first case study involves a jaywalker stepping onto the road. We begin by verifying claim 1, demonstrating the asymptotic behavior of Proposition 8 (Fig. 1). Following this, two scenarios are examined: one where it is not dynamically feasible to stop (Fig. 2), and one where it is (Fig. 3). We demonstrate that in both scenarios, regardless of feasibility, Algorithms 1 and 2 return minimum-rank decisions, thus validating claim 2.

The second case study focuses on a post-overtake scenario (Fig. 4). Here, we demonstrate, that compared with the existing rulebook-like utility function formulation in [17] – henceforth

³Note that how to design the time scales is outside the scope of this work. See [33] for an example theoretical framework.

⁴Since trajectories are a by product of the decisions (inputs), trajectories will be used as a synonym for decisions.

referred to as *Differentially Weighted Sigmoid* (DWS) –, since the proposed candidate function, Def. 7, asymptotically represents the lexicographic preferences over the decision space, Algorithms 1 and 2 return minimum-rank trajectories, even when theirs does not, and hence validating claim 3.

Both case studies utilize the rulebook in Table I. For additional implementation details refer to Sec. V-C.

A. Case Study 1: Jaywalker

For the first case study, we consider a scenario in which a jaywalker unexpectedly steps onto the road. Upon noticing the approaching vehicle, the jaywalker freezes in place. We evaluate two distinct situations, one where the AV has sufficient distance to safely come to a complete stop, and another where stopping is infeasible, and consequentially, evasive action must be taken. Furthermore, it should be noted that compared with existing approaches [17], we do not warm-start the optimizer and even if the problem is infeasible, converge to the minimum-rank trajectory.




Fig. 1. Consider the scenario described by *Case Study 1*. a) depicts the scenario. b) and c) depict the preferences over the decisions from the proposed candidate function (Def. 7). Darker colours indicate more preferred decisions, while lighter indicates less preferred decisions. For illustration purposes, plots are generated with a horizon of 0.5s, one time step and with an initial velocity of 5 m s^{-1} .

First we illustrate the asymptotic behavior of Proposition 8. Consider the start configuration depicted in Fig. 1a. For small values of λ , trade-offs between rules are present (Fig. 1b - consider the dark blue level set, minor violations of *LaneCentering* and *AvoidCollision* have the same preference, i.e., value). However, as λ increases, more important decisions dominate over the preference space (Fig. 1c). Thus, validating claim 1. We now consider the two scenarios and validate the convergence of Algorithms 1 and 2.

1) *Infeasible scenario*: Consider the scenario depicted in Fig. 2. Without the presence of obstacles, and given that the AV is currently in the correct lane and satisfying all the rules apart from r_4 : *ProgressTowardsGoal*, the minimum-rank decision (as seen in Fig. 2a) is to continue straight ahead. However, a jaywalker steps onto the road. By construction, it is infeasible to stop the vehicle without colliding with the pedestrian. Consequentially, as per the rulebook (Table I), the minimum-rank trajectory is to “overtake” the pedestrian. This is because r_0 : *AvoidCollision* takes precedence over all other rules (including r_1 : *InsideDrivableArea*). Furthermore,




Fig. 2. Case study 1 - infeasible scenario, with an initial velocity of 50 km h^{-1} . a) depicts the planned trajectory, b) and c) illustrate the executed trajectory once the jaywalker appears, using Algorithms 1 and 2 respectively.



Fig. 3. Case study 1 - feasible scenario, initial velocity of 18 km h^{-1} . a) depicts the planned trajectory, b) and c) illustrate the executed trajectory once the jaywalker appears, using Algorithms 1 and 2 respectively.

since the pedestrian (including the safety distance), takes up the width of the lane, the minimum-rank trajectory is to travel onto the opposing lane. Then once the AV has passed the pedestrian, it returns back to the lane aligned with the direction of travel as it is now possible to satisfy all rules apart from r_4 again. As visible in Figs. 2b and 2c, the returned trajectory is the minimum-rank trajectory that has just been described.

2) *Feasible scenario*: Consider the scenario depicted in Fig. 3, the AV, this time equipped with improved pedestrian prediction, is travelling far below the speed limit (18 km h^{-1}). Consequentially, it is dynamically feasible for the AV to come to a stop. Considering the rulebook in Table I, the minimum-rank decision is thus to stop the vehicle in lane - all rules above r_4 : *ProgressTowardsGoal* can be satisfied. As visible in Figs. 3b and 3c, the trajectories are minimum-rank.

Note that for both scenarios, Algorithm 1 is more aggressive than Algorithm 2. In both Figs. 2 and 3, Algorithm 1 places the AV closer to the pedestrian than Algorithm 2. As discussed in Sec. IV, this is an expected behavior, since decisions returned by Algorithm 1 satisfy the rulebook *better* than with Algorithm 2.

B. Case Study 2: Post-Overtake

In this subsection, we demonstrate that compared with DWS [17], the proposed algorithms return minimum-rank trajectories even when DWS does not.

Consider the slightly altered scenario (Fig. 4), where post overtake, the AV is traveling along the lane of opposing traffic. In this scenario, there are no more obstacles to collide with,

Index	Rule	Description
0	<i>Avoid Collision</i>	The kinetic energy transfer between the AV and pedestrian (including a safety distance).
1	<i>Inside Drivable Area</i>	Extent to which the AV is within lanes matching travel direction.
2	<i>Within Speed Limit</i> (50 km/h)	Extent to which the AV is travelling above the speed limit.
3	<i>Lane Centering</i>	Extent to how close AV is to the centre of current lane
4	<i>Progress Towards Goal</i>	Distance to actual objective, motivates motions towards goal when possible.

TABLE I

THE RULEBOOK USED IN BOTH CASE STUDIES, WITH RULE INDEXES OF 0 AND 4 INDICATING THE MOST AND LEAST IMPORTANT RULES RESPECTIVELY.




Fig. 4. Case study 2 - post-overtake, the AV finds itself travelling along the lane of opposing traffic. a), b) and c) compare the executed trajectories for DWS, Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 respectively.

and as such to satisfy r_1 : *InsideDrivableArea*, the minimum-rank trajectory is to move into the lane of ongoing traffic. This does require violating r_3 : *LaneCentering*. However, since r_1 is lexicographically more important than r_3 , any violation of r_3 should not restrict the travel direction.

However, as visible in Fig. 4a, DWS returns a trajectory that results in the AV to go straight, whereas the proposed algorithms return the minimum-rank trajectory, Figs. 4b and 4c. This is since, going straight violates one less rule than moving back onto the original lane, see [17] for details. Furthermore, for completeness, in Sec. VII we prove that for two trajectories violating the same rules, the DWS formulation does not satisfy Def. 6. Thus, claim 3 is validated.

C. Implementation details

1) *Dynamics*: Due to its light-weight and high-accuracy for small time steps, the bicycle model from [34] is used to model the dynamics of the vehicle.

2) *Planning*: The planning problem is formulated in a receding horizon fashion, where for each time step, the optimization problem is solved. For the simulation, a horizon of 1.5 sec with time steps of 0.5sec is used.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This work introduced a novel approach to optimize over lexicographic preferences. It has introduced a systematic way of building a scalar multi-objective function that asymptotically represents the lexicographic order as the multipliers increase to infinity. Furthermore, taking advantage of Proposition 10, two algorithms, inspired by continuation methods, are proposed. Algorithm 1 returns decisions that are faithful to the preference structure every iteration but at a high complexity ($\mathcal{O}(m \cdot c)$), while Algorithm 2 uses time-scale separation to solve a single optimization problem, returning decisions at reduced complexity (at most $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \frac{c}{k})$). Through

practical AV examples, it was demonstrated that the proposed candidate function asymptotically represents the decisions, and both Algorithms 1 and 2 return minimum-rank decisions, even in cases where existing formulations do not.

This work sparks the curiosity for several future developments. Computational challenges and generalizations to arbitrary orders are among the more significant challenges.

Furthermore, computationally speaking, the proposed objective function only asymptotically represents the lexicographic preference. However, this may introduce numerical instability and intractability for certain scenarios. Thus, motivating research into developing systematic ways of ensuring numerical stability and convergence guarantees.

VII. APPENDIX

A proof that DWS [17] fails to satisfy Def. 6 is provided below; refer to the paper for notation details. Note that higher values of (9) indicate preferred decisions – i.e., $x \prec y \iff R(\rho^{(x)}) > R(\rho^{(y)})$.

Proposition 11. *The reward function below does not satisfy definition Def. 6.*

$$R(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(a^{N-i+1} \text{step}(c\rho_i) + \frac{1}{N} \rho_i \right) \quad (9)$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ be two decisions, for which $x \prec y$, and $\rho^{(x)}, \rho^{(y)}$ denote the robustness vectors of x, y respectively. Consider the rulebook, $\langle \mathcal{R}, \preceq_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$, suppose that x, y both violate two rules r_α, r_β , where $1 < \alpha < \beta < N$. The reward function, Eq. (9), is then decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\rho^{(z)}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha-1} \left(a^{N-i+1} + \frac{1}{N} \rho_i^{(z)} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \rho_\alpha^{(z)} + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=\alpha+1}^{\beta-1} \left(a^{N-i+1} + \frac{1}{N} \rho_i^{(z)} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \rho_\beta^{(z)} + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=\beta+1}^N \left(a^{N-i+1} + \frac{1}{N} \rho_i^{(z)} \right) \\ &= D + \frac{1}{N} \left(\rho_\alpha^{(z)} + \rho_\beta^{(z)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $D = A + B + C$ and $z \in \{x, y\}$.

Noting that $x \prec y \implies \rho_\alpha^{(x)} > \rho_\alpha^{(y)}$, in the case that $\rho_\beta^x \ll \rho_\beta^y \in [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}]$, it is possible that $\rho_\beta^{(x)} < \rho_\alpha^{(y)} < \rho_\alpha^{(x)} < \rho_\beta^{(y)}$. In such a case, $R(\rho^{(x)}) < R(\rho^{(y)})$, which contradicts Def. 6. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] J. De Freitas, A. Censi, B. W. Smith, L. D. Lillo, S. E. Anthony, and E. Frazzoli, "From driverless dilemmas to more practical commonsense tests for automated vehicles," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 118, no. 11, p. e2010202118, 3 2021.
- [2] W. Yu, C. Zhao, H. Wang, J. Liu, X. Ma, Y. Yang, J. Li, W. Wang, X. Hu, and D. Zhao, "Online legal driving behavior monitoring for self-driving vehicles," *Nature Communications* 2024 15:1, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 1 2024.
- [3] J. Craig and M. Nojoumian, "Should Self-Driving Cars Mimic Human Driving Behaviors?" *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, vol. 12791 LNCS, pp. 213–225, 2021.
- [4] S. Malik, M. A. Khan, H. El-Sayed, J. Khan, and O. Ullah, "How Do Autonomous Vehicles Decide?" *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1 2023.
- [5] H. Wang, Y. Huang, A. Khajepour, D. Cao, and C. Lv, "Ethical Decision-Making Platform in Autonomous Vehicles with Lexicographic Optimization Based Model Predictive Controller," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 8164–8175, 8 2020.
- [6] J. Abernethy, R. E. Schapire, and U. Syed, "Lexicographic Optimization: Algorithms and Stability," *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2405.01387 [math.OC]*, 5 2024.
- [7] T. Hu, B. Luo, and C. Yang, "Multi-objective optimization for autonomous driving strategy based on Deep Q Network," *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 12 2021.
- [8] N. Wilde, S. L. Smith, and J. Alonso-Mora, "Scalarizing Multi-Objective Robot Planning Problems Using Weighted Maximization," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 2503–2510, 3 2024.
- [9] A. Censi, K. Slutsky, T. Wongpiromsarn, D. Yershov, S. Pendleton, J. Fu, and E. Frazzoli, "Liability, ethics, and culture-aware behavior specification using rulebooks," in *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 2019-May, 2019.
- [10] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, "Sampling-based algorithms for optimal motion planning," in *International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 30, no. 7, 6 2011, pp. 846–894.
- [11] D. Xiang, H. Lin, J. Ouyang, and D. Huang, "Combined improved A* and greedy algorithm for path planning of multi-objective mobile robot," *Scientific Reports* 2022 12:1, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 8 2022.
- [12] V. Young, J. Hossain, and N. Roy, "Enhancing Robotic Navigation: An Evaluation of Single and Multi-Objective Reinforcement Learning Strategies," *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2312.07953 [cs.RO]*, 12 2023.
- [13] A. Orthey and M. Toussaint, "Sparse Multilevel Roadmaps for High-Dimensional Robotic Motion Planning," *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 2021-May, pp. 7851–7857, 2021.
- [14] J. Schulman, Y. Duan, J. Ho, A. Lee, I. Awwal, H. Bradlow, J. Pan, S. Patil, K. Goldberg, and P. Abbeel, "Motion planning with sequential convex optimization and convex collision checking," *International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 1251–1270, 8 2014.
- [15] J. Hu and R. Xiong, "Trajectory generation with multi-stage cost functions learned from demonstrations," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 117, pp. 57–67, 7 2019.
- [16] J. Xu, F. Huang, Y. Cui, and X. Du, "Multi-objective path planning based on deep reinforcement learning," *Chinese Control Conference, CCC*, vol. 2022-July, pp. 3273–3279, 2022.
- [17] S. Veer, K. Leung, R. K. Cosner, Y. Chen, P. Karkus, and M. Pavone, "Receding Horizon Planning with Rule Hierarchies for Autonomous Vehicles," *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2212.03323v3 [cs.RO]*, 2022.
- [18] L. Lai, L. Fiaschi, M. Cococcioni, and K. Deb, "Pure and mixed lexicographic-paretian many-objective optimization: state of the art," *Natural Computing*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 227–242, 6 2023.
- [19] H. D. Sherali and A. L. Soyster, "Preemptive and nonpreemptive multi-objective programming: Relationship and counterexamples," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 173–186, 2 1983.
- [20] M. Cococcioni, M. Pappalardo, and Y. D. Sergeyev, "Lexicographic multi-objective linear programming using grossone methodology: Theory and algorithm," *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 318, pp. 298–311, 2 2018.
- [21] M. Cococcioni, A. Cudazzo, M. Pappalardo, and Y. D. Sergeyev, "Multi-objective Lexicographic Mixed-Integer Linear Programming: An Infinity Computer Approach," in *Numerical Infinities and Infinitesimals in Optimization.*, Y. Sergeyev and R. De Leone, Eds. Springer, Cham, 2022, vol. 43, pp. 119–149.
- [22] W. Xiao, N. Mehdipour, A. Collin, A. Y. Bin-Nun, E. Frazzoli, R. D. Tebbens, and C. Belta, "Rule-based optimal control for autonomous driving," *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 12th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs '21)*, pp. 143–154, 5 2021.
- [23] T. Wongpiromsarn, K. Slutsky, E. Frazzoli, and U. Topcu, "Minimum-Violation Planning for Autonomous Systems: Theoretical and Practical Considerations," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 5 2021, pp. 4866–4872.
- [24] B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley, *Introduction to Lattices and Order*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 4 2002.
- [25] A. Collin, A. Bilka, S. Pendleton, and R. D. Tebbens, "Safety of the Intended Driving Behavior Using Rulebooks," *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*, pp. 136–143, 2020.
- [26] N. Karnchanachari, D. Geromichalos, K. S. Tan, N. Li, C. Eriksen, S. Yaghoubi, N. Mehdipour, G. Bernasconi, W. K. Fong, Y. Guo, and H. Caesar, "Towards learning-based planning: The nuPlan benchmark for real-world autonomous driving," *arXiv preprint, arXiv:2403.04133v1 [cs.CV]*, 3 2024.
- [27] A. Zanardi, G. Zardini, S. Srinivasan, S. Bolognani, A. Censi, F. Dorfler, and E. Frazzoli, "Posetal Games: Efficiency, Existence, and Refinement of Equilibria in Games With Prioritized Metrics," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1292–1299, 4 2022.
- [28] A. F. Beardon, J. C. Candeal, G. Herden, E. Induráin, and G. B. Mehta, "The non-existence of a utility function and the structure of non-representable preference relations," *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 17–38, 2 2002.
- [29] G. Debreu, "Representation of a Preference Ordering by a Numerical Function," in *Decision Processes*, R. M. Thrall, C. H. Coombs, and R. L. Davis, Eds. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1954, ch. 6, pp. 159–165.
- [30] P. C. Fishburn, "Additive Utilities with Finite Sets," in *UTILITY THEORY FOR DECISION MAKING*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970, ch. 4, pp. 42–54.
- [31] B. Shi, C. Gaowang Wang, and Z. Zhang, "On the Utility Function Representability of Lexicographic Preferences," *MPRA Paper 102561, University Library of Munich, Germany.*, 2020.
- [32] E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, *Numerical Continuation Methods*, ser. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990, vol. 13.
- [33] G. Goel, N. Chen, and A. Wierman, "Thinking Fast and Slow: Optimization Decomposition Across Timescales," *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 27–29, 10 2017.
- [34] J. Kong, M. Pfeiffer, G. Schildbach, and F. Borrelli, "Kinematic and dynamic vehicle models for autonomous driving control design," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*, vol. 2015-August. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 8 2015, pp. 1094–1099.