

Learning-based Formal Synthesis of Cooperative Multi-agent Systems

Jin Dai, Alessandro Benini, Hai Lin, Panos J. Antsaklis, Matthew J. Rutherford, and Kimon P. Valavanis

Abstract—We propose a formal design framework for synthesizing coordination and control policies for cooperative multi-agent systems to accomplish a global mission. The global performance requirements are specified as regular languages while dynamics of each agent as well as the shared environment are characterized by finite automata, upon which a formal design approach is carried out via divide-and-conquer. Specifically, the global mission is decomposed into local tasks; and local mission supervisors are designed to accomplish these local tasks while maintaining the multi-agent performance by integrating supervisor synthesis with compositional verification techniques; finally, motion plans are automatically synthesized based on the obtained mission plans. We present three modifications of the L^* learning algorithm such that they are adapted for the synthesis of the local mission supervisors, the compositional verification and the synthesis of local motion plans, to guarantee that the collective behavior of the agents will ensure the satisfaction of the global specification. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the proposed framework is demonstrated by a detailed experimental study based on the implementation of a multi-robot coordination scenario. The proposed hardware-software architecture, with each robot’s communication and localization capabilities, is exploited to examine the automatic supervisor synthesis with inter-robot communication.

Index Terms—Multi-agent systems, finite automata, supervisor synthesis, compositional verification, regular language learning

I. INTRODUCTION

COOPERATIVE multi-agent systems that consist of a number of agents collaborating through distributed physical interaction and wireless communication to fulfill certain performance objectives have emerged as a hot research topic in the past two decades, due to their wide applications in both academia and industry, ranging from power grids, transportation systems, computer networks to robotic teams. Numerous distributed coordination and control problems have been extensively studied, see, e.g., [1]–[6] and the references therein.

One of the essential problems in cooperative multi-agent systems is how to design control policies for each agent and coordination strategies among them such that certain desirable global specifications can be fulfilled. We are therefore motivated to derive a formal synthesis framework to assure the accomplishment of high-level missions for a team of cooperative agents. In particular, we consider multiple intelligent agents that can move around in a partitioned and uncertain

environment while satisfying a team mission specified by a regular language [7]. We assume that the mission and motion capabilities of each agent can be respectively modeled as two finite automata [8]. A learning-based formal synthesis approach is performed to coordinate the cooperative multi-agent systems as follows. First, the global mission is properly decomposed into local missions that can be executed by the corresponding agents. Towards this end, we present a learning-based algorithm for synthesizing local mission supervisors to fulfill local missions. Secondly, after deducing the local tasks, a learning-based algorithm is provided to compositionally justify whether or not the collective behavior of all agents satisfies the global mission [9]. Finally, a motion plan [10] corresponding to the local mission is generated based on a nominal environment model. In case the motion plans fail to be feasible due to the uncertainties of the real environment, motion replanning is triggered and the global mission will be achieved iteratively. The contributions of our work can be summarized as:

1) Compared to [1], [10], we account for the controllability of the mission events and derive local supervisors that restrict the behavior of each agent properly. Furthermore, we modify the L^* learning algorithm [11] and apply the modified algorithm to the synthesis of the local supervisors to actively learn a manageable local task even if the agent’s model is not known *a priori*, rendering our approach the capability of handling system uncertainties.

2) We adopt compositional verification to examine the correctness of the joint effort of all the agents and mitigate the computational complexity by introducing an assume-guarantee scheme [9]. Another modification of the L^* learning algorithm is developed to generate appropriate assumptions for each supervised agent automatically.

3) In addition to our previous work [12], [13], we further associate synthesized mission plans with appropriate motion plans by presenting a third modification of the L^* learning algorithm. Moreover, replanning schemes of the motion plan in the practical environment are also studied.

4) To examine the effectiveness of the design framework, we apply the theoretical results to a practical multi-robot coordination demonstration. It turns out in the experiment that the robots can cooperatively satisfy a request-response and coordination task even the environment possesses uncertainties.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly review prior work on multi-agent coordination and application of formal methods. In Section III, we give a brief description of the supervisory control theory and compositional verification within the multi-agent system formalism as well as the L^* learning algorithm. Based on the preliminaries, we formulate the multi-agent coordination and control co-design problem and propose an automatic syn-

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF-CNS-1239222, NSF-EECS-1253488 and NSF-CNS-1446288)

J. Dai, H. Lin and P. J. Antsaklis are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA (e-mail: jdai1@nd.edu; hlin1@nd.edu; pja1@nd.edu).

A. Benini, M. J. Rutherford and K. P. Valavanis are with the Unmanned Systems Research Institute (DU2SRI), Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, USA (e-mail: alessandro.benini@du.edu; matthew.rutherford@du.edu; kimon.valavanis@du.edu).

thesis framework to synthesize appropriate local mission and motion plans for each agent in Section IV. Two modified L^* algorithm are presented in Section V to generate appropriate local mission plans via supervisor synthesis and compositional verification. In Section VI, we incorporate the model of the nominal environment with the mission plans to synthesize corresponding motion plans by utilizing a third modified L^* algorithm, and online replanning strategies are proposed to address environment uncertainties. We apply the proposed framework to a multi-robot system in order to examine its effectiveness in Section VII, while Section VIII demonstrates the experimental results for the proposed robotic coordination scenario by deploying three robots that are equipped with dedicated wireless communication capabilities, localization cameras, and the proposed supervisors that are implemented as MATLAB StateFlow machines. Concluding remarks and future work are discussed in Section IX.

II. RELATED WORK

The past two decades have witnessed the development of performance-guaranteed design of cooperative multi-agent systems, and blooming contributions have been made to addressing various distributed coordination and control purposes, such as consensus [3], flocking [14], rendezvous [15], formation control [5] and cooperative learning [16]. The achievement of the global coordination goals is enforced by Lyapunov stability [14], barrier certificates [4] and game theory [17]. Despite fulfillment of steady-state performance objectives, satisfaction of more complicated and temporal specifications is not investigated in these previous works.

The desire to improve the expressiveness of tasks drives our interest towards *formal* specifications, including regular languages, linear temporal logic (LTL) and computation tree logic (CTL) formulas [8]. A recent trend of “symbolic planning” [18], [19] has established the standard procedure for synthesizing correct-by-construction controllers for formal specifications by combining abstraction-based approaches [20], [21] with formal methods [22]–[24]. However, most of the existing works usually assume full knowledge of the environment. To cope with the uncertain environments, Chen et al. [25] designed a control policy to achieve a surveillance mission by combining formal synthesis methods with automata learning of the environment, whereas Lahijanian et al. [26] employed a multilayered synergistic planner to generate trajectories that partially satisfy an LTL specification in uncertain environments; note that both of the aforementioned works focused on single-agent case.

Although control of a single agent to attain formal specifications is tractable, extensions to the multi-agent case are non-trivial. Filippidis et al. [27] proposed a decentralized control scheme to satisfy local LTL specifications with communication constraints among the agents; and this idea was developed by Guo and Dimarogonas [28] to derive a partially decentralized coordination scheme that decomposed the team into clusters of dependent agents to fulfill local LTL specifications. To cope with computational complexity issues, the results were further extended by Tumova et al. [29] by employing receding

horizon planning techniques. Nevertheless, specifying each agent’s individual task is difficult to scale up and usually becomes burdensome for human operators in application.

Our work is most closely related to coordination approaches presented in [1], [30] and [31]. Facing a global LTL specification, Kloetzer and Belta [2] derived a centralized solution and assigned individual tasks for each agent accordingly. Nonetheless, deployment of such approaches suffered from the “state explosion” due to its monolithic design pattern. “Trace-closed” regular language specifications were studied in [1] for automatic deployment of robotic teams. Karimadini and Lin [30] presented necessary and sufficient conditions under which the global tasks can be retrieved by local ones, while Partovi and Lin [32] investigated this problem for CTL specifications. Brandin et al. [33] studied the coordinated planning of multi-agent systems by using an incremental verification approach, whereas Seow et al. [31] investigated the coordination of multi-agent systems from a supervisory control perspective with additional “coordination modules”. These results focused on task allocation and/or design of control policies among multiple agents with known external environment, while in our proposed work, coordination and control co-design in the presence of both system and environment uncertainties are investigated.

III. PRELIMINARIES

This section presents preliminaries in automata theory, supervisory control, compositional verification, and a brief introduction of the L^* learning algorithm [11]. Throughout the rest of this paper, we use the following notations. Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of non-negative integers. For a finite set Σ , let 2^Σ and $|\Sigma|$ denote its power set (set of all subsets) and cardinality, respectively. For two sets Σ_1 and Σ_2 , $\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$ denotes the set-theoretic difference of Σ_1 and Σ_2 ; $\Sigma_1 \Delta \Sigma_2$ denotes the symmetric difference of Σ_1 and Σ_2 , i.e., $\Sigma_1 \Delta \Sigma_2 = (\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2) \cup (\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1)$; and $\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2 = \{\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \mid \sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2\}$, where $\sigma_1 \sigma_2$ stands for the concatenation of two elements σ_1 and σ_2 .

A. Automata and Regular Language Models

For a given finite set (alphabet) of *events* Σ , a finite sequence w composing of elements in Σ , i.e., $w = \sigma_0 \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_m$, is called a *word* over Σ . We use Σ^* to denote the *Kleene-closure* of Σ [8], including the empty word ϵ . The length of a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ is denoted by $|w|$. A subset of Σ^* is called a *language* over Σ . The *prefix-closure* of a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, denoted as \bar{L} , is the set of all *prefixes* of words in L , i.e., $\bar{L} = \{s \in \Sigma^* \mid (\exists t \in \Sigma^*) [st \in L]\}$. L is said to be *prefix-closed* if $\bar{L} = L$. For two languages $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$, the *quotient* is the collection of prefixes of words in L_1 with a suffix that belongs to L_2 , i.e., $L_1/L_2 = \{s \in \Sigma^* \mid (\exists t) [(t \in L_2) \wedge (st \in L_1)]\}$.

To recognize languages over Σ , the definition of deterministic finite automaton [8] is recalled as follows.

Definition 1 (Deterministic Finite Automaton): A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a 5-tuple

$$G = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, \delta, Q_m),$$

where Q is a finite set of states, Σ is a finite set of events, $q_0 \in Q$ is an initial state, $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ is a partial transition function and $Q_m \subseteq Q$ is the set of the marked (accepting) states.

The transition function δ can be extended to $\delta : Q \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow Q$ in the usual manner [7]. We use the notation $\delta(q, s)!$ to denote that the transition $\delta(q, s)$ is defined. A DFA G is said to be *accessible* if $(\forall q \in Q)(\exists s \in \Sigma^*)[\delta(q_0, s) = q]$; G is said to be *coaccessible* if $(\forall q \in Q)(\exists s \in \Sigma^*)[\delta(q, s) \in Q_m]$; G is said to be *trim* if it is both accessible and coaccessible [7].

A *run* of a DFA G on a finite word $w = \sigma_0\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_m \in \Sigma^*$, is a sequence of states $Run(w) = q_0q_1 \dots q_{m+1} \in Q^*$ satisfying $q_{i+1} = \delta(q_i, \sigma_i)$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, m$). The language generated by a DFA G is given by $L(G) = \{s \in \Sigma^* | \delta(q_0, s)!\}$, and the language accepted (recognized) by G is given by $L_m(G) = \{s \in \Sigma^* | s \in L(G), \delta(q_0, s) \in Q_m\}$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be *regular* if there exists a DFA G such that $L(G) = \bar{L}$ and $L_m(G) = L$. We will focus our study on regular languages throughout the rest of this paper.

The *complement language* of a regular language L over Σ is defined as $coL = \Sigma^* - L$. Let \tilde{G} be a DFA accepting L , the *complete DFA* of G , denoted as \tilde{G} , is defined as follows.

Definition 2 (Complete DFA): Let q_e be an ‘‘error state’’. Given a DFA $G = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, \delta, Q_m)$, the complete model of G is defined as a DFA $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{Q}, \Sigma, q_0, \tilde{\delta}, \{q_e\})$, where $\tilde{Q} = Q \cup \{q_e\}$, and

$$\forall \tilde{q} \in \tilde{Q}, \sigma \in \Sigma, \tilde{\delta}(\tilde{q}, \sigma) = \begin{cases} \delta(\tilde{q}, \sigma), & \text{if } \tilde{q} \in Q \wedge \delta(\tilde{q}, \sigma)!, \\ q_e, & \text{if } \tilde{q} = q_e \vee \delta(\tilde{q}, \sigma) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that $L_m(\tilde{G}) = \Sigma^*$. The *complement DFA* coG of G that accepts coL , is formed by swapping the marked states of G with its non-marked states and vice versa, i.e., $coG = (\tilde{Q}, \Sigma, q_0, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{Q} - Q_m)$.

We conclude the review of automata theory by investigating the concurrent operation of two or more DFAs.

Definition 3 (Parallel Composition): [7], [9] Given two finite automata $G_i = (Q_i, \Sigma_i, q_{i,0}, \delta_i, Q_{i,m})$ ($i = 1, 2$), the parallel composition of G_1 and G_2 , denoted by $G_1 || G_2$, is defined as the finite automata $G_1 || G_2 = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, \delta, Q_m)$, where $Q = Q_1 \times Q_2$ is the set of states, $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ is the set of events, $q_0 = (q_{1,0}, q_{2,0})$ is the initial state, $Q_m = Q_{1,m} \times Q_{2,m}$ is the set of marked states, and the $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ is the transition function that is given by:

$$\forall q = (q_1, q_2) \in Q, \sigma \in \Sigma, \delta(q, \sigma) = \begin{cases} (\delta_1(q_1, \sigma), \delta_2(q_2, \sigma)), & \text{if } \delta_1(q_1, \sigma)!, \delta_2(q_2, \sigma)!, \\ (\delta_1(q_1, \sigma), q_2), & \text{if } \delta_1(q_1, \sigma)!, \sigma \notin \Sigma_2, \\ (q_1, \delta_2(q_2, \sigma)), & \text{if } \delta_2(q_2, \sigma)!, \sigma \notin \Sigma_1, \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Remark 1: It is worth pointing out that parallel composition of more than two finite automata can be defined recursively based on the associativity of parallel composition.

The connection between the behavior of the composed DFA and a local DFA is captured by the ‘‘natural projection’’ from the global event set to the local one. For non-empty event sets Σ and Σ' satisfying $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$, the natural projection $P_{\Sigma'} :$

$\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma'^*$ is inductively defined as: $P_{\Sigma'}(\epsilon) = \epsilon$; $P_{\Sigma'}(\sigma) = \sigma$ if $\sigma \in \Sigma'$; $P_{\Sigma'}(s\sigma) = P_{\Sigma'}(s)P_{\Sigma'}(\sigma)$, $\forall s \in \Sigma^*, \sigma \in \Sigma$. The set-valued inverse projection $P_{\Sigma'}^{-1} : \Sigma'^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$ of $P_{\Sigma'}$ is defined as $P_{\Sigma'}^{-1}(s) = \{t \in \Sigma^* : P_{\Sigma'}(t) = s\}$.

Let $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be an index set. For local event sets Σ_i ($i \in I$) and the global event set $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Sigma_i$, let P_i denote the natural projection from Σ^* to Σ_i^* . The *synchronous product* of a finite set of regular languages $L_i \subseteq \Sigma_i^*$ ($i \in I$), denoted by $\|_{i \in I} L_i$, is defined as follows.

Definition 4 (Synchronous Product): [34] For a finite set of regular languages $L_i \subseteq \Sigma_i^*$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$),

$$\|_{i \in I} L_i = \bigcap_{i \in I} P_i^{-1}(L_i). \quad (1)$$

It can be shown that for $G = \|\|_{i=1}^n G_i$, $L(G) = \|\|_{i=1}^n L(G_i)$.

The notion of language separability plays an essential role in the rest of the paper and is defined formally as follows.

Definition 5 (Separable Languages): [34] For the local event sets Σ_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) and the global event set $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i$, a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be *separable* with respect to $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ if there exists a set of local languages $L_i \subseteq \Sigma_i^*$ for each $i \leq n$ such that $L = \|\|_{i=1}^n L_i$.

It has also been shown in [34] that $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is separable with respect to $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ if and only if $L = \|\|_{i=1}^n P_i(L) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i^{-1}[P_i(L)]$.

Remark 2: For the local event sets Σ_i ($i \in I$) and the global event set $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Sigma_i$, let $D(\Sigma) = \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Sigma \times \Sigma | \exists i \in I, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_i\}$. The independence relation is defined as $I(\Sigma) = \Sigma \times \Sigma - D(\Sigma)$ [35]. It follows from [35] that a language $L \subseteq L(G)$ possesses a non-empty separable sublanguage if and only if $I(\Sigma)$ is transitive.

B. Supervisory Control Theory

Given a system modeled by a DFA $G = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, \delta, Q_m)$, let Σ be partitioned into the controllable event set Σ_c and the uncontrollable event set Σ_{uc} , i.e., $\Sigma = \Sigma_c \dot{\cup} \Sigma_{uc}$. A *supervisor* [22], [23] S is another DFA over Σ with the constraint that each state of S is marked. S operates in parallel with G and modifies the behavior of G by disabling certain controllable events. The behavior of G under control of S is denoted as $L(S||G)$. Given a prefix-closed and non-empty specification language $L = \bar{L} \subseteq L(G)$, there exists a local supervisor S such that $L(S||G) = L$ if and only if L is *controllable* with respect to G and Σ_{uc} .

Definition 6 (Controllable Languages): [7], [22] A language $L \subseteq L(G)$ is said to be controllable with respect to G and Σ_{uc} (or controllable for short) if $\bar{L}\Sigma_{uc} \cap L(G) \subseteq \bar{L}$.

If the controllability of L fails, a supervisor is synthesized for the supremal controllable (also prefix-closed) sublanguage of L , denoted as $\sup C(L)$.

C. Compositional Verification

We employ a compositional verification procedure to evaluate the coordinated behavior of the multi-agent system. First, we present the concept of ‘‘property satisfaction’’ in the context of formal verification.

Definition 7 (Satisfaction Relation): Given a system modeled by a DFA $M = (Q, \Sigma_M, q_0, \delta, Q_m)$ and a regular language (property) that is accepted by a DFA $P = (Q_P, \Sigma_P, q_0, \delta_P, Q_{m,P})$ with $\Sigma_P \subseteq \Sigma_M$, the system M is said to satisfy P , written as $M \models P$, if and only if $\forall t \in L_m(M) : P_P(t) \in L_m(P)$, where P_P denotes the natural projection from Σ_M to Σ_P .

Note that when P is represented by a prefix-closed language, the marked languages considered in Definition 7 can be altered by generated languages.

To mitigate the “state explosion” issue arising in verification for systems that consist of multiple components, the assume-guarantee reasoning scheme [9] is employed at this point. In this paradigm, a formula to be checked is a triple $\langle A \rangle M \langle P \rangle$, where M is a system model, P is a property and A is an assumption about M ’s environment, all of which are represented by a corresponding DFA. The formula holds if whenever M is part of a system satisfying A , then the system must guarantee the property P , i.e., $\forall E, E \parallel M \models A$ implies that $E \parallel M \models P$ [9]. The following theorem provides a DFA characterization of the assume-guarantee satisfaction.

Theorem 1: [9] $\langle A \rangle M \langle P \rangle$ holds if and only if q_e is unreachable in $A \parallel M \parallel \bar{P}$ (\bar{P} is the complete DFA of P).

The assume-guarantee scheme summons a series of symmetric and/or asymmetric proof rules to ease the reasoning when the system M consists of multiple components, i.e., $M = \parallel_{i=1}^n M_i$. We apply the symmetric proof rule, namely SYM-N [9], for the compositional verification, where A_i is an assumption about M_i ’s environment and coA_i is the complement DFA of A_i .

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} 1 \quad \langle A_1 \rangle M_1 \langle P \rangle \\ \dots \\ n \quad \langle A_n \rangle M_n \langle P \rangle \\ n+1 \quad L_m(coA_1 \parallel coA_2 \parallel \dots \parallel coA_n) \subseteq L_m(P) \end{array}}{\langle true \rangle (M_1 \parallel M_2 \parallel \dots \parallel M_n) \langle P \rangle}$$

A central notion of the compositional verification is the weakest assumption, which is defined formally as follows.

Definition 8 (Weakest Assumption for $\Sigma_{i,IF}$): (Adapted from [9]) Let $M = \parallel_{i=1}^n M_i$ be a system with local alphabets Σ_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$), P be a DFA representation of a property and $\Sigma_{i,IF}$ be a specified interface alphabet of M_i to its environment. The weakest assumption $A_i^{w, \Sigma_{i,IF}}$ of M_i over the alphabet $\Sigma_{i,IF}$ for property P is a DFA such that: 1) $\Sigma(A_i^{w, \Sigma_{i,IF}}) = \Sigma_{i,IF}$; 2) for any $M_{-i} = \parallel_{j \in I, j \neq i} M_j$, $\langle true \rangle M_i \parallel (P_{i,IF}(M_{-i})) \langle P \rangle$ if and only if $\langle true \rangle M_{-i} \langle A_i^{w, \Sigma_{i,IF}} \rangle$, where $P_{i,IF}$ is the natural projection from $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i$ to $\Sigma_{i,IF}$.

Since then we require that $\Sigma_P \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} \Sigma_i$, and we use the notation A_i^w to denote the weakest assumption for component M_i over $\Sigma_{i,IF}$ being set to Σ_{A_i} such that $\Sigma_{A_i} \subseteq (\bigcap_{i \in I} \Sigma_i) \cup \Sigma_P$ ($i \in I$).

D. L^* Learning Algorithm

Angluin [11] developed the L^* learning algorithm (abbreviated as L^* algorithm hereafter) for solving the problem of identifying an unknown regular language U over an alphabet Σ

and of constructing a minimal DFA¹ that accepts it. Interested readers are referred to [11] for more details.

The L^* algorithm interacts with a *minimally adequate Teacher*, henceforth deemed as the *Teacher*, that answers two types of questions. The first type is referred to as *membership queries*, i.e., the Teacher justifies whether or not a word $s \in \Sigma^*$ belongs to U ; the second type is a *conjecture*, in which the L^* algorithm constructs a DFA M and the Teacher justifies $L_m(M) = U$ or not; the Teacher returns a counterexample $c \in L_m(M) \Delta U$ whenever the conjecture is denied.

In order to construct a conjectured DFA M , the L^* algorithm incrementally collects information about a finite collection of words in Σ^* and records their membership status in an *observation table*. The observation table is a three-tuple (S, E, T) , where S and E are a set of prefix-closed and suffix-closed words over Σ , respectively, and $T : (S \cup S\Sigma)E \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the *membership function* that maps words in $s \in (S \cup S\Sigma)$ onto 1 if they are members of U , otherwise it returns 0. The observation table can be viewed as a 2-dimensional array whose rows are labeled by words $s \in S \cup S\Sigma$ and whose columns are labeled by symbols $e \in E$. The entries in the labeled rows and columns are evaluated by the function $T(se)$. If $s \in S \cup S\Sigma$, then the *row function* $row(s)$ denotes the finite function f from E to $\{0, 1\}$ defined by $f(e) = T(se)$. The following two properties are essential in the L^* algorithm.

Definition 9 (Closeness and Consistency): [11] An observation table is said to be *closed* if $(\forall s \in S)(\forall \sigma \in \Sigma)[\exists s' \in S : row(s\sigma) = row(s')]$. It is said to be *consistent* if $(\forall s_1, s_2 \in S : row(s_1) = row(s_2))(\forall \sigma \in \Sigma)[row(s_1\sigma) = row(s_2\sigma)]$.

If an observation table is not closed, then $s\sigma$ is added to S and T is updated to make it closed where $s \in S$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$ are the elements for which no $s' \in S$ exists. If an observation table is not consistent, then there exist $s_1, s_2 \in S$, $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $e \in E$ such that $row(s_1) = row(s_2)$ but $T(s_1\sigma e) \neq T(s_2\sigma e)$; to make it consistent, σe is added to E and T is updated.

Once an observation table is both closed and consistent, a candidate DFA $M(S, E, T) = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, \delta, Q_m)$ over the alphabet Σ is constructed as follows: $Q = \{row(s) : s \in S\}$, $q_0 = row(\epsilon)$, $Q_m = \{row(s) : (s \in S) \wedge (T(s) = 1)\}$, and $\delta(row(s), \sigma) = row(s\sigma)$.

The Teacher takes M as a conjecture and if $L_m(M) = U$, the Teacher returns “True” with the current DFA M ; otherwise, the Teacher returns “False” with a counterexample $c \in L_m(M) \Delta U$. The L^* algorithm adds all the words in $\{c\}$ to S and iterate the entire procedure to update a new closed and consistent observation table. The following theorem asserts that the sequence of DFAs constructed by the L^* algorithm to be consistent² with T after each counterexample examination is strictly increasing in the number of states.

Theorem 2: [11] If (S, E, T) is closed and consistent, and $M(S, E, T)$ is a DFA constructed from (S, E, T) . Let (S', E', T') be the updated closed and consistent observa-

¹By “minimal” we mean that the obtained DFA contains the least number of states.

²A DFA M is said to be consistent with the function T if for every $s \in S \cup S\Sigma$ and $e \in E$, $\delta(q_0, se) \in Q_m$ if and only if $T(se) = 1$.

tion table if a counterexample t is added to (S, E, T) . If $M(S, E, T)$ has n states, then the DFA $M(S', E', T')$ constructed from (S', E', T') has at least $n + 1$ states.

The correctness and finite convergence of the L^* algorithm are assured by the following theorem.

Theorem 3: [11] Given an unknown regular language $U \subseteq \Sigma^*$, the L^* algorithm eventually terminates and outputs an DFA isomorphic to the minimal one accepting U . Moreover, if n is the number of states of the minimal DFA accepting U and m is an upper bound on the length of any counterexample provided by the Teacher, then the total running time of the L^* algorithm is bounded by a polynomial in m and n .

IV. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND OVERALL APPROACH

A. Automata-based Agent and Environment Models

We study the coordination and control of multiple agents moving in a shared and uncertain environment that admits uncertain elements. For a multi-agent system G that consists of n agents, we model the mission executions of agent $G_i (i \in I)$ as a DFA

$$G_i = (Q_i, \Sigma_i, q_{i,0}, \delta_i, Q_{i,m}). \quad (2)$$

The local mission set Σ_i is partitioned into local controllable missions $\Sigma_{i,c}$ and local uncontrollable missions $\Sigma_{i,uc}$. We are interested in the generated language of G_i and we assume that $Q_{i,m} = Q_i$. The global events, controllable and uncontrollable events are given by $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Sigma_i$, $\Sigma_c = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Sigma_{i,c}$ and $\Sigma_{uc} = \Sigma - \Sigma_c = \bigcap_{i \in I} \Sigma_{i,uc}$, respectively. The collective behavior of the system G is captured by $G = \parallel_{i \in I} G_i$. For a given mission $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $I_\sigma = \{i \in I \mid \sigma \in \Sigma_i\}$. $|I_\sigma| > 1$ suggests that all agents G_i with $i \in I_\sigma$ cooperate to accomplish the mission σ .

All the agents are assumed to move in a shared environment that is partitioned into N regions, and we assume that there are N_d doors placed among these regions. Two adjacent regions in the environment may be connected by one or more doors. The cooperative multi-agent system is provided with the nominal environment *a priori*, which is modeled as a 4-tuple

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = (V, \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_0}, D, F_D), \quad (3)$$

where $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$ is the set of labels for the partitioned regions, $\longrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_0} \subseteq V \times V$ is the adjacency relation among the regions, $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{N_d}\}$ is the set of labels for the doors, $F_D : V \times V \rightarrow 2^D$ is a partial mapping such that for all $(v, v') \in \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_0}$, $F_D(v, v') \subseteq D$ represents all the possible doors that connect the adjacent regions v and v' , whereas $F_D(v, v') = \emptyset$ implies that v and v' are not connected by any doors.

The motion capabilities of agent $G_i (i \in I)$ within the nominal environment \mathcal{E}_0 are abstracted as a trim DFA:

$$G_i^m = (V, D, v_{i,0}, \delta_i^m, V_m), \quad (4)$$

where V and D are defined in \mathcal{E}_0 , $v_{i,0} \in V$ is the initial region of agent G_i , $V_m = V$ and the motion transition δ_i^m is defined as follows:

$$\forall v \in V, d \in D : \delta_i^m(v, d) = v' \Leftrightarrow d \in F_D(v, v'),$$

i.e., an agent can move to an adjacent region whenever there is a door connecting the two regions.

The uncertainty of the multi-agent system arises in two aspects. Firstly, the practical environment \mathcal{E} may differ from the nominal one \mathcal{E}_0 , in the sense that some transitions in F_D may become unaccessible. Secondly, the mission capabilities of G_i 's need not be given *a priori*.

B. Coordination of Cooperative Multi-agent Systems

The integration of mission and motions of the agent G_i is captured by the following local labeling mapping

$$\pi_i : \Sigma_i \rightarrow V, \quad (5)$$

that specifies a region in V in which a mission in Σ_i shall be performed.

The coordination of the agents accounts for both mission and motion plans. Formally, an integrated mission-motion plan is defined as follows.

Definition 10 (Integrated Local Plans): A local integrated mission-motion plan for agent $G_i (i \in I)$ is a prefix-closed language $LP_i \subseteq (V \cup \Sigma_i)^*$ such that

- 1) $LP_i(0) = v_{i,0}$;
- 2) If $LP_i(k) \in \Sigma_i$ and $LP_i(k-1) \in V$, then $LP_i(k-1) \in \pi_i(LP_i(k))$; otherwise, $\pi_i(LP_i(k-1)) = \pi_i(LP_i(k))$
- 3) $P_V(LP_i) \subseteq \text{Run}[L(G_i^m)]$, where P_V denotes the natural projection from $V \cup \Sigma_i$ to V and $\text{Run}[L(G_i^m)] = \bigcup_{s \in L(G_i^m)} \text{Run}(s)$.

We use $L_i^{mo} = P_V(LP_i)$ to denote the *motion plan* component of an integrated local plan LP_i for agent G_i , whereas $L_i^{mi} = P_\Sigma(LP_i)$ stands for the *mission plan* component of LP_i , where P_Σ is the natural projection from $V \cup \Sigma_i$ to Σ_i .

Our main objective is concerned with the synthesis of local mission plans and corresponding motion plans for each agent such that a global mission can be accomplished.

Problem 1: Given a cooperative multi-agent system G that consists of n agents with local mission DFA G_i and motion DFA $G_i^m (i \in I)$ within the nominal environment \mathcal{E}_0 , and a prefix-closed global mission $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ whose independence relation (cf. Remark 2) is transitive, solve the following problems:

- 1) *Mission assignment:* systematically find a feasible local mission specification L_i^{mi} for each agent G_i ;
- 2) *Mission planning:* synthesize a series of local supervisors $S_i (i \in I)$ such that $L(S_i \parallel G_i) = L_i^{mi}$;
- 3) *Motion planning:* synthesize local motion plans $L_i^{mo} (i \in I)$ such that the combination of L_i^{mi} and L_i^{mo} forms an integrated local plan LP_i ;
- 4) *Mission-motion integration:* $\parallel_{i \in I} LP_i \models L$.

C. Overview of the Approach

Without loss of generality, we assume that $L \subseteq L(G)$. We propose a two-layer formal synthesis framework to solve Problem 1 via ‘‘divide-and-conquer’’. The synthesis procedure of the framework is depicted in Fig. 1. In addition, regular language learning algorithms are utilized in the proposed framework to guarantee the performance of the cooperative multi-agent system in the presence of system and/or environment uncertainties. The fact that $\Sigma \cap D = \emptyset$ enables us to solve




Fig. 1: Learning-based coordination and control framework. the mission and motion planning sub-problems in a modular fashion, which can be summarized as iterative execution of the following procedure.

1) *Mission decomposition*: Obtain a prefix-closed and locally feasible mission specification L_i for agent G_i ($i \in I$).

2) *Local supervisor synthesis*: Given the mission specification L_i , we use a modified L^* algorithm to automatically synthesize a local supervisor S_i such that $L(S_i||G_i) = \sup C_i(L_i)$, where $\sup C_i$ stands for the supremal controllable sublanguage with respect to G_i and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$.

3) *Compositional verification*: We employ a compositional verification strategy to justify whether or not all the controlled agents can fulfill the global mission. Specifically, we apply the assume-guarantee paradigm by setting $M_i := S_i||G_i$ ($i \in I$) as component modules and L as the property to be verified. The verifier returns a counterexample $t \subseteq \Sigma^*$ that indicates the violation of L when the compositional verification fails. Such counterexample t is applied for the re-synthesis of the local supervisors until no more counterexamples are detected. Afterwards, local mission plans L_i^{mi} ($i \in I$) are obtained.

4) *Automatic motion planning*: Based on the synthesized mission plans L_i^{mi} , corresponding motion plans L_i^{mo} are generated by incorporating G_i^m ($i \in I$) such that the combination of L_i^{mi} and L_i^{mo} forms a valid integrated local plan LP_i .

5) *Counterexample-guided motion replanning*: Agent G_i implements LP_i in the practical environment \mathcal{E}_0 ; once there exists a mismatch between \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}_0 that makes the current motion plan L_i^{mo} is infeasible, a counterexample is automatically generated to refine L_i^{mo} such that a new integrated plan LP_i can be executed by G_i .

The following sections illustrate the mission and motion planning layers respectively.

V. LEARNING-BASED COMPOSITIONAL SYNTHESIS OF MISSION PLANS

This section concerns with the (offline) mission planning of the proposed framework shown in in Fig. 1. Synthesis of mission plans L_i^{mi} ($i \in I$) consists of two stages: first, we exploit the local mission capabilities Σ_i to develop feasible local missions and mission supervisors; next, we compositionally verify the joint performance of the coordination of the mission plans by using the assume-guarantee scheme [9].

A. Initiation of the Mission Plans

We originate the generation of local missions L_i ($i \in I$) by setting $L_i = P_i(L)$. The local feasibility of L_i is assured by the following theorem.

Theorem 4: Given a cooperative multi-agent system G that consists of n agents G_i ($i \in I$) and a non-empty and prefix-closed specification $L \subseteq L(G)$, languages $L_i := P_i(L)$ ($i \in I$) satisfy $L_i \subseteq L(G_i)$ and $L_i = \overline{L_i}$.

Proof: From Definition 4, the prefix-closeness of L implies that $P_i(L)$ is prefix-closed. Thus we obtain $L_i = \overline{L_i}$. Next, according to Definitions 3 and 4,

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &= P_i(L) \subseteq P_i(L(G)) = P_i\left[\bigcap_{i \in I} P_i^{-1}[P_i(L(G))]\right] \\ &\subseteq P_i(P_i^{-1}[P_i(L(G))]) = P_i(L(G)) = L(G_i), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

B. Automatic Synthesis of Local Mission Supervisors

We aim to synthesize a maximally permissive [7] local mission supervisor S_i that drives G_i to fulfill L_i ($i \in I$). According to Definition 6, applying directly the L^* algorithm to synthesize an appropriate supervisor for agent G_i ($i \in I$) is infeasible when full knowledge of G_i is not given *a priori*. To overcome this computational burden, we modify the algorithm and propose a learning-based algorithm, namely the L_{LS}^* algorithm, for agent G_i to learn $\sup C_i(L_i)$ with the local controllability information $\Sigma_i = \Sigma_{i,c} \cup \Sigma_{i,uc}$ rather than G_i .

The local mission supervisors are constructed on the basis of illegal words. A mission $s \in L(G_i)$ is said to be *illegal* if $s \notin L_i$. A local mission $st \in L(G_i)$ is said to be *uncontrollably illegal* if it becomes illegal due to an uncontrollable suffix, i.e., $s \in L_i$, $t \in \Sigma_{i,uc}^*$ and $st \notin L_i$. Let C_i be the collection of uncontrollably illegal behaviors of agent G_i ($i \in I$). Define $D_{ui}(\cdot)$ as an operator to collect words that are formed by discarding the uncontrollable suffixes of mission behaviors in C_i , i.e., $D_{ui}(C_i) = \{s \in L(G_i) | (\exists t \in \Sigma_{i,uc}^*) [st \in C_i]\}$.

From Section III.D, the L^* algorithm sequentially constructs a series of observation tables to generate a correct DFA that recognizes an unknown regular language. This idea is inherited by the L_{LS}^* algorithm and the observation table is formed with help of C_i . Specifically, let C_i^j denote the set of uncontrollably illegal behavior after the j -th update of the observation table in the L^* algorithm; thus $C_i^{j+1} = \{s_j\} \cup C_i^j$ if a new uncontrollably illegal behavior s_j is added to C_i^j .

The main difference between the L^* and L_{LS}^* algorithms lies on the membership queries and generation of counterexamples. For $t \in \Sigma_i^*$, we let $T_i^j(t)$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) be the membership function for G_i ($i \in I$). Initially, the Teacher justifies the membership of t with respect to L_i ,

$$T_i^1(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } t \notin L_i, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and for $j > 1$, rather than answering the membership question with respect to the unknown $\sup C_i(L_i)$, the Teacher provides

³The subscript “LS” stands for “local synthesis”.

answers for the following queries:

$$T_i^j(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } T_i^{j-1}(t) = 0 \text{ or } t \in D_{ui}(C_i^j)\Sigma_i^*, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, due to the lack of prior knowledge of G_i , we define the following sequence $\{K_j\}(j \in \mathbb{N})$ to facilitate the generation of appropriate counterexamples.

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &:= L_i, \\ K_j &:= K_{j-1} - D_{ui}(C_i^j)\Sigma_i^*. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

With slightly abusing the notations, we also use K_j to denote the DFA that recognizes the language $K_j(j \in \mathbb{N})$. Let $M_j = M(S^j, E^j, T_i^j)$ be the DFA that is consistent with membership function T_i^j , a word $t \in \Sigma_i$ is a counterexample of the L_{LS}^* algorithm with respect to agent $G_i(i \in I)$ if

$$t \in L(M_j)\Delta K_j. \quad (9)$$

The L_{LS}^* algorithm can be viewed as an execution of the L^* algorithm by using membership queries in (6)(7) while generating counterexamples by examining (9). Details of the L_{LS}^* algorithm are presented in Algorithm 1.

C. Correctness of the L_{LS}^* Algorithm

The following lemma helps us investigate the correctness and finite convergence properties of the L_{LS}^* algorithm.

Lemma 1: (Paraphrased from [36]) If L_i and $L(G_i)$ are regular languages, then $\sup C_i(L_i)$ can be computed iteratively as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &:= L_i, \\ K_{j+1} &:= K_j - [(L(G_i) - K_j)/\Sigma_{i,uc}]\Sigma_i^*. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

If there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K_{N+1} = K_N$, then $\sup C_i(L_i) = K_N$. Moreover, if L_i is prefix-closed, then $\sup C_i(L_i)$ is also prefix-closed and can be computed directly as

$$\sup C_i(L_i) = L_i - [(L(G_i) - L_i)/\Sigma_{i,uc}^*]\Sigma_i^*. \quad (11)$$

We now proceed to the correctness of the L_{LS}^* algorithm. In fact, comparing (10) with the dynamical membership queries stated in (6)(7) and the counterexample-related iteration (8), we observe that initially, for $i \in I$, (10) is identical to (8), and $T_i^1(t)$ is consistent with $K_1 = L_i$. Furthermore, when the iteration step $j \geq 2$, counterexamples are generated and based on which C_i^j is formed. When no more counterexamples are generated, the set C_i^j eventually becomes identical to $L(G_i) - L_i$, which includes all the local illegal and uncontrollably illegal behaviors and it turns out that the language consistent with T_i^j is

$$L_i - D_{ui}(C_i^j)\Sigma_i^* = L_i - [D_{ui}(L(G_i) - K_i)]\Sigma_i^*, \quad (12)$$

Note that the right side of (12) coincides with the results obtained in (11), which implies that the output of the L_{LS}^* algorithm is indeed $\sup C_i(L_i)$, provided that it is convergent.

Next we will prove that the L_{LS}^* algorithm synthesizes $\sup C_i(L_i)$ within a finite number of iterations. From Algorithm 1, there are two kinds of ‘‘counterexamples’’ that are used by the L_{LS}^* algorithm: counterexamples used to make an

Algorithm 1: L_{LS}^* Algorithm

Input: Local mission specification L_i , local event sets $\Sigma_{i,c}$ and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$

Output: Local supervisor S_i such that $L(S_i||G_i) = L(S_i) = \sup C_i(K_i)$

- 1: $S = \{\epsilon\}$, $E = \{\epsilon\}$, $j = 1$
 - 2: Construct $T_i^1(S, E, T)$ by answering membership queries (6)
 - 3: **repeat**
 - 4: **while** $T_i^j(S, E, T)$ is not closed or consistent **do**
 - 5: **if** T_i^j is not closed **then**
 - 6: find $s \in S$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ such that $\forall s' \in S : \text{row}(s'\sigma) \neq \text{row}(s)$
 - 7: $S = S \cup \{s\sigma\}$
 - 8: extend T_i^j to $(S \cup S\Sigma_i)E$ using membership queries (6) or (7)
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **if** T_i^j is not consistent **then**
 - 11: find $s_1, s_2 \in S$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_i$ and $e \in E$ such that $\text{row}(s_1) = \text{row}(s_2)$ but $T(s_1\sigma e) \neq T(s_2\sigma e)$
 - 12: $E = E \cup \{\sigma e\}$
 - 13: extend T_i^j to $(S \cup S\Sigma_i)E$ using membership queries (6) or (7)
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: **end while**
 - 16: $M_j = M(S^j, E^j, T_i^j)$
 - 17: **if** the Teacher presents a counterexample $t \in \Sigma_i^*$ according to (9) **then**
 - 18: $S = S \cup \bar{t}$
 - 19: $j = j + 1$
 - 20: extend T_i^j to $(S \cup S\Sigma_i)E$ using membership queries (6) or (7)
 - 21: **end if**
 - 22: **until** the Teacher generates no more counterexamples.
 - 23: **return** $S_i = M_j$
-

observation table T_i^j closed and consistent (lines 4-15), and counterexamples generated by the Teacher (9) to construct a new observation table T_i^{j+1} (lines 17-20). We denote D_i as the collection of the ‘‘true’’ counterexamples that are generated according to (9), while D_i' is used to denote the set of counterexamples that help make an observation table closed and consistent.

Consider an observation table $T = (S_i^j, E_i^j, T_i^k)$ with the corresponding DFA $M(S_i^j, E_i^j, T_i^k) = M$, where S_i^j and E_i^j are the pre-defined S and E after the j -th counterexample from D_i has been added to the table, and T_i^k denotes the current membership function after k -th counterexample in D_i' has been added to update it. Let $n_{k,j}$ denote the number of states of DFA M , n_k denote the number of states of the minimal DFA that is consistent with T_i^k , and n^\uparrow denote the number of states of the minimal DFA that recognizes $\sup C_i(L_i)$. According to membership queries (6)(7) and Lemma 1, the sequence of DFAs that are consistent with T_i^k finally recognizes $\sup C_i(L_i)$, which implies that $n_k \rightarrow n^\uparrow$ (with respect to k) and the convergence is achieved within a finite number

of iterations.

In addition, from Theorem 2, $n_{k,j} \leq n_k$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, it is clear that $\{n_{k,j}\}$ is a monotonically increasing sequence (with respect to j). Therefore, $n_{k,j} \rightarrow n_k$ for a fixed k (with respect to j) is enforced by its monotonicity and upper-boundedness. The fact that $n_k \rightarrow n^\uparrow$ thus yields that $n_{k,j} \rightarrow n^\uparrow$.

The above discussion in fact proves the correctness and finite convergence properties of the L_{LS}^* algorithm, as summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 5: For a non-empty, prefix-closed and locally feasible mission specification $L_i \subseteq L(G_i)$ for agent $G_i (i \in I)$, the L_{LS}^* algorithm with dynamical membership queries (6) and (7), and counterexample generated from (9), converges to a local mission supervisor S_i such that $L(S_i || G_i) = \sup C_i(L_i)$. Moreover, the L_{LS}^* algorithm can always construct the correct S_i after a finite number of counterexample tests.

Remark 3: It follows from Theorem 3 that the L_{LS}^* algorithm also admits a polynomial-time computational complexity. Compared to the conventional supervisor synthesis algorithms proposed in [7] and [36], the presented L_{LS}^* algorithm requires no prior knowledge of the plant.

D. Automated Compositional Verification via Learning

Let $L_i^{mi} := \sup C_i(L_i)$ be the (initial) local mission plan of agent $G_i (i \in I)$ in the cooperative multi-agent system. In case that the global mission L is prefix-closed and separable with respect to $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$, the mission assignment and planning for each agent can be solved in a modular manner by synthesizing local supervisors independently to fulfill the initial local specifications $L_i = P_i(L) (i \in I)$ using the L_{LS}^* algorithm, since according to [34], separability of L implies $L = \parallel_{i \in I} P_i(L)$. Nonetheless, whenever L fails to be separable, it is non-trivial to determine whether or not the concurrent execution of $L_i^{mi} (i \in I)$ satisfies the global mission L . To automate the assume-guarantee strategy, we propose another modification of the L^* algorithm, namely the L_{CV}^* ⁴ algorithm, to learn appropriate and weakest local assumptions for each supervised agent

$$M_i := S_i || G_i (i \in I). \quad (13)$$

Let $M = \parallel_{i \in I} M_i$ denote the mission performance of the controlled cooperative multi-agent system, A_i denote an assumption about M_i 's environment. With slightly abusing the notations, we use L and coL to denote the DFA that recognizes L and its complement language, respectively. The L_{CV}^* algorithm checks $M \models L$ via the assume-guarantee proof rules SYM-N. A two-layered implementation of the L_{CV}^* algorithm is depicted in Fig. 2.

As shown in Fig. 2, in the first layer, the L_{CV}^* algorithm deploys n local Teachers, each of which corresponds to an controlled agent $M_i (i \in I)$, to learn the appropriate and weakest assumption A_i for M_i . At the j -th iteration step, the L_{CV}^* algorithm learns an appropriate assumption A_i^j for the controlled agent M_i , by querying the agent and by reviewing




Fig. 2: Compositional verification via assumption learning.

the results of the previous iteration. As the L_{CV}^* algorithm executes the learning procedure iteratively, it incrementally (in the sense of the number of states) constructs a sequence of assumption DFAs $\{A_i^j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ for M_i , which converges to the DFA that recognizes the weakest assumption A_i^w whose event set is constrained to be Σ_{A_i} (cf. Section III.C).

The implementation of the L_{CV}^* algorithm relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 2: (Adapted from [9]) Given $t \in \Sigma^*$, $i \in I$ and a regular property L , $t \in L(A_i^w)$ if and only if $\langle DFA(t) \rangle M_i \langle L \rangle$ holds, where $DFA(t)$ is a trim DFA such that $L(DFA(t)) = L_m(DFA(t)) = \bar{t}$.

Suggested by Lemma 2, each local Teacher of the L_{CV}^* algorithm answers the following membership queries to construct local assumption DFAs for each controlled agent M_i : for $i \in I$ and $t \in \Sigma^*$,

$$T_i(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \langle DFA(t) \rangle M_i \langle L \rangle \text{ is true,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

In addition to the membership queries (14), the Teacher of the L_{CV}^* algorithm justifies the conjecture $\langle A_i^j \rangle M_i \langle L \rangle$ rather than $L(A_i^j) = L(A_i^w)$. Once the Teacher denies the conjecture, a counterexample $t \in \Sigma^*$ is proposed by the Teacher, and the L_{CV}^* algorithm adds $P_{A_i}(t)$ and all its prefixes back to the local iteration loop to update the observation tables, where P_{A_i} is the natural projection from Σ^* to $\Sigma_{A_i}^*$.

Once the local learning loop of the L_{CV}^* algorithm terminates, we collect a family of local assumptions $A_i := A_i^w (i \in I)$. In addition to the n local Teachers, the L_{CV}^* algorithm deploys Teacher $n+1$ in the second layer in the framework shown in Fig. 2 to justify whether $L(coA_1 || \dots || coA_n) \subseteq L$ or not. If Teacher $n+1$ returns “True”, the synthesis framework terminates with the conclusion that $\parallel_{i \in I} M_i \models L$. Otherwise, Teacher $n+1$ returns “False” with a counterexample $t \in \Sigma^*$. The L_{CV}^* algorithm then determines whether or not the global mission L is indeed violated by the collective behavior of M , which is performed by simulating t on each composed DFA $M_i || coL (i \in I)$ and by checking whether or not t can be accepted. If t is not a violating trace for at least one agent M_i , we treat t in the same way in the first layer and use t to re-construct the local assumption A_i for controlled agent M_i . Otherwise, t turns out to be a common violating word of

⁴The subscript “CV” stands for “compositional verification”.

all agents and the controlled cooperative multi-agent system $\|_{i \in I} M_i$ indeed violates L . As shown in Fig. 1, undesired mission behaviors emerge in the joint execution of synthesized mission plans L_i^{mi} for agent $G_i (i \in I)$; therefore, the re-synthesis of local mission plans is triggered (cf. Section V.E). The correctness and termination properties of the L_{CV}^* algorithm are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6: [9] For the global mission L and controlled agents M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n , the L_{CV}^* algorithm implemented by the framework shown in Fig. 2 with the proof rules SYM-N terminates within finite number of iterations and correctly returns whether or not $\|_{i \in I} M_i \models L$.

E. Counterexample-guided Re-synthesis of Mission Plans

Our proposed mission planning scheme explores the re-synthesis of the local mission plans after a mission-violating counterexample t is provided by the compositional verification procedure. The re-synthesis is accomplished by the following steps: first,

$$L_i^{temp} = L_i^{mi} - P_i(t); \quad (15)$$

next, to apply the L_{LS}^* algorithm for the re-synthesis of the local mission supervisor, it is desired to provide agent $G_i (i \in I)$ with a prefix-closed mission specification; this requirement is fulfilled by setting

$$L_i = L_i^{temp} - coL_i^{temp} \Sigma_i^*, \quad (16)$$

where $coL_i^{temp} = \Sigma_i^* - L_i^{temp}$ is the complement language of L_i^{temp} . The obtained L_i is used as the new initial local mission for agent G_i to update the new local mission supervisor $S_i (i \in I)$ with the L_{LS}^* algorithm.

Since it has been shown in the previous subsections that both the L_{LS}^* and L_{CV}^* algorithms possess finite convergence, we mainly focus on evaluating the performance of the proposed mission planning schemes in this subsection. We introduce the notion of *separate controllability* to characterize the solutions of the multi-agent mission planning.

Definition 11: Given the cooperative multi-agent system that consists of n agents G_i with $\Sigma_{i,c} \subseteq \Sigma_i$ being the local controllable events, $i \in I$, a prefix-closed language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be separately controllable with respect to $\Sigma_i, \Sigma_{i,uc}$ and G_i if

- 1) $L = \|_{i \in I} P_i(L)$;
- 2) $P_i(L)$ is controllable with respect to G_i and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$.

We assert that the separate controllability is a sufficient and necessary condition for the existence of solutions of the cooperative multi-agent mission planning.

Theorem 7: Given a cooperative multi-agent system G that consists of n agents $G_i (i \in I)$ with local controllable events $\Sigma_{i,c}$ and local uncontrollable events $\Sigma_{i,uc}$, and a non-empty and prefix-closed global mission specification $L \subseteq L(G)$, there exists a series of local mission supervisors $S_i (i \in I)$ for each agent G_i such that $L(S_i \| G_i) = P_i(L)$ and $\|_{i \in I} L(S_i \| G_i) = L$ if and only if L is separately controllable with respect to $\Sigma_i, \Sigma_{i,uc}$ and G_i .

Proof: (\Leftarrow) When $L \subseteq L(G)$ is separately controllable with respect to $\Sigma_i, \Sigma_{i,uc}$ and G_i , Theorem 4 yields

that $P_i(L) \subseteq L(G_i)$ is prefix-closed; whereas Definition 11 suggests that $P_i(L)$ be controllable with respect to G_i and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$, which implies that for each $i \in I$, there exists a local supervisor S_i such that $L(S_i \| G_i) = P_i(L)$ [36]. Therefore, $\|_{i \in I} L(S_i \| G_i) = \|_{i \in I} P_i(L) = L$ is guaranteed according to the separability requirement of Definition 11.

(\Rightarrow) Conversely, when local supervisors $S_i (i \in I)$ exist such that $L(S_i \| G_i) = P_i(L)$ and $\|_{i \in I} L(S_i \| G_i) = L$, $L = \|_{i \in I} P_i(L)$ trivially holds. Furthermore, since $L(S_i \| G_i) = P_i(L)$ is a controlled behavior for agent G_i , it is clearly controllable with respect to G_i and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$. ■

The following theorem states that in general, the separate controllability is a strictly stronger notion than the combination of global controllability and separability.

Theorem 8: For the cooperative multi-agent system G that consists of $G_i (i \in I)$, if a non-empty prefix-closed specification language $L \subseteq L(G)$ is separately controllable with respect to $\Sigma_i, \Sigma_{i,uc}$ and G_i , then L is separable with respect to $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ and is controllable with respect to G and Σ_{uc} .

Proof: First, by Definition 11, the separate controllability of L implies that $L = \|_{i \in I} P_i(L)$, which assures the separability of L . Next we show that L is globally controllable. In fact, $P_i(L)$ is prefix-closed and controllable with respect to G_i and $\Sigma_{i,uc}$, i.e.

$$P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G_i) \subseteq P_i(L),$$

it follows from the monotonicity of P_i^{-1} that

$$P_i^{-1} [P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G_i)] \subseteq P_i^{-1} (P_i(L)).$$

Since

$$P_i^{-1} [P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G_i)] = P_i^{-1} [P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc}] \cap P_i^{-1} (L(G_i)),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} L \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G) &\subseteq P_i^{-1} (P_i(L)) \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap P_i^{-1} (P_i(L(G))) \\ &\subseteq P_i^{-1} [P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc}] \cap P_i^{-1} (L(G_i)) \\ &= P_i^{-1} [P_i(L) \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G_i)] \subseteq P_i^{-1} (P_i(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last inclusion always holds for any $i \in I$. Therefore

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} [L \Sigma_{i,uc} \cap L(G)] \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} P_i^{-1} (P_i(L)) = \|_{i \in I} P_i(L),$$

where the last equality holds according to Definition 4. From the definitions of Σ_c and Σ_{uc} , the above equation is equivalent to

$$L \Sigma_{uc} \cap L(G) \subseteq \|_{i \in I} P_i(L) = L, \quad (17)$$

which enforces the global controllability of L . ■

Based on the aforementioned properties of separately controllable languages, the following theorem is established to illustrate the correctness of the proposed mission planning scheme.

Theorem 9: The mission planning procedure shown in Fig. 1 terminates and returns local mission supervisors S_i as well as local mission plans $L_i^{mi} (i \in I)$ for each agent such that the collective behaviors of the cooperative multi-agent system G achieve a separately controllable sublanguage of L , within a finite number of iterations.

Proof: When L is separable, the local mission plans are given by $L_i^{mi} := \sup C_i(P_i(L))$ and the correctness of the proposed mission planning procedure trivially holds.

When L is not separable, we define

$$S(L) = \{H \subseteq L \mid (L = \bar{L}) \wedge (H = \bigcup_{i \in I} P_i(H))\}$$

as the set of prefix-closed and separable sublanguages of L . Under the assumption imposed by Remark 2, $S(L) \neq \emptyset$.

At each iteration step of the L_{CV}^* algorithm, a counterexample t is actually a word that belongs to $\bigcup_{i \in I} L_i^{mi} - L$. The first step (15) of the counterexample-guided replanning thus eliminates all the observationally indistinguishable local mission behaviors with respect to t from the local mission plan L_i^{mi} and generates a temporal mission language L_i^{temp} ; while the second step (16) in fact computes the supremal prefix-closed sublanguage [36] of L_i^{temp} ($i \in I$). Thus,

$$L_i = \bar{L}_i \subseteq L_i^{temp}. \quad (18)$$

Since during the iterative execution of the mission planning, L_i is used as an updated mission specification for the L_{LS}^* algorithm; thus, the updated mission plans of agent G_i , denoted as \tilde{L}_i^{mi} ($i \in I$), after the generation of t , will be

$$\tilde{L}_i^{mi} = \sup C_i(L_i) \subseteq L_i \subseteq L_i^{temp} \subseteq L_i^{mi} \quad (19)$$

which implies that the joint effort of the L_{LS}^* and L_{CV}^* algorithms generates the following ‘‘monotonic’’ sequence of local mission plans for each agent G_i :

$$\emptyset \subseteq \dots \subseteq \tilde{L}_i^{mi} \subseteq L_i^{mi} \subseteq L_{i,0}^{mi} := \sup C_i(P_i(L)) \subseteq P_i(L).$$

When no more counterexamples are produced by the L_{CV}^* algorithm, with slightly abusing the notations, we can write that

$$\tilde{L} := \bigcup_{i \in I} \tilde{L}_i^{mi} \subseteq L,$$

thus $\tilde{L} \in S(L)$. Furthermore, \tilde{L}_i^{mi} , generated by the L_{LS}^* algorithm, is controllable with respect to $\Sigma_{i,uc}$ and G_i . Hence according to Definition 11, $\bigcup_{i \in I} \tilde{L}_i^{mi}$ forms a non-empty and separately controllable sublanguage of L , which solves the mission planning of the cooperative multi-agent system. ■

Remark 4: We use L_i^{mi} to denote the synthesized mission plans for agent G_i ($i \in I$) hereafter.

VI. MOTION PLANNING OF COOPERATIVE AGENTS

A. Automatic Generation of Motion Plans

After the design of feasible local missions L_i^{mi} ($i \in I$), the motion planning problem concentrates on finding a set of motion plans L_i^{mo} associated with each L_i^{mi} such that the integrated mission-motion plans LP_i ($i \in I$) solve Problem 1. A local motion plan actually consists of two parts: a local motion plan $L_i^{mo} \subseteq V^*$ that enumerates all the regions visited by the agent, and a local door profile $D_i^{mo} \subseteq D^*$ associated with L_i^{mo} that records all possible doors through which the agents shall pass. It is desired that the local motion plan is *adequate*, which is defined as follows.

Definition 12 (Adequate Plans): A local motion plan L_i^{mo} for agent G_i ($i \in I$) is said to be adequate if

$$1) L_i^{mo} \models \pi_i(L_i^{mi});$$

$$2) L_i^{mo} \subseteq \text{Run}[L(G_i^m)].$$

From Definition 12, synthesis of the local motion plan starts by exploiting the mission-motion integration relation π_i ($i \in I$) in (5). The intuition behind Definition 12 is that L_i^{mo} shall obey restrictions imposed not only by L_i^{mi} , but by G_i^m as well (adequacy).

It is clear from (5) that the mission-motion integration mapping π_i maps the prefix-closed language L_i^{mi} over Σ_i into a prefix-closed language $\pi_i(L_i^{mi})$ over V . To efficiently compute an adequate motion plan for each agent (which is not known *a priori*), we employ a third modification of the L^* learning algorithm, termed as the L_{MP}^* algorithm, to pursue an adequate local motion plan. Specifically, the Teacher of the L_{MP}^* algorithm is designed to determine the following membership queries for agent G_i : for $i \in I$ and $t \in V^*$:

$$T_i(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathcal{DFA}(t) \models \pi_i(L_i^{mi}) \text{ is true,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{DFA}(t)$ is defined similarly to the membership queries (14) for the L_{CV}^* algorithm, except that the underlying DFA is defined over V . Besides justifying the membership queries (20), the Teacher of the L_{MP}^* algorithm answers the conjecture $L_i^{mo} \subseteq \text{Run}[L(G_i^m)]$. If the conjecture is denied, a counterexample $t \in V^*$ is produced. Since $L_i^{mo} \subseteq \text{Run}[L(G_i^m)]$ is false, we know that t witnesses a difference between L_i^{mo} and $\text{Run}[L(G_i^m)]$; therefore, it is returned to the L_{MP}^* algorithm to update the motion plan L_i^{mo} .

The correctness and termination properties of the L_{MP}^* algorithm can be summarized as the following theorem.

Theorem 10: Given the local mission plan L_i^{mi} and the mission-motion integration mapping π_i , the L_{MP}^* algorithm terminates and correctly constructs an adequate local motion plan L_i^{mo} ($i \in I$).

Proof: (Correctness) The Teacher of the L_{MP}^* algorithm is designed according to the two properties in Definition 12. When a counterexample is generated, the counterexample in fact represents a word in the symmetric difference between $\pi_i(L_i^{mi})$ and $\text{Run}[L(G_i^m)]$; therefore, if no more counterexample is generated, the current learned DFA L_i^{mo} (with slightly abusing the notations) satisfies both of the requirements of Definition 12, which guarantees the correctness.

(Termination) At any iteration step, after a local motion plan DFA L_i^{mo} is conjectured, the L_{MP}^* algorithm reports whether or not L_i^{mo} is adequate and terminates, or continues the construction of L_i^{mo} by providing new counterexamples. By Theorem 3, the learning procedure eventually terminates at some iteration step $j \in \mathbb{N}$, at that time, the L_{MP}^* algorithm produces an adequate L_i^{mo} . ■

Furthermore, the door profile associated with the synthesized local motion plan L_i^{mo} is obtained as

$$D_i^{mo} = \text{Word}(L_i^{mo}), \quad (21)$$

where the operator Word computes all the corresponding words $s \in D^*$ by treating words in L_i^{mo} as runs of G_i^m , i.e., $\text{Word}(L_i^{mo}) = \{s \in L(G_i^m) \mid \text{Run}(s) \in L_i^{mo}\}$.

⁵The subscript ‘‘MP’’ stands for ‘‘motion planning’’.

Algorithm 2: Implementation of LP_i in \mathcal{E}

Input: Local integrated plan LP_i , local motion model G_i^m and local door profile D_i^{mo}

Output: Local implementable integrated plan $LP_i^\mathcal{E}$

```
1: Initialization:  $LP_i^\mathcal{E} = LP_i$ ,  $D_i^m = D_i^{mo}$ 
2: Order the words in  $LP_i$ :  $LP_i = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \overline{LP_i^k}$ 
3: Construct  $D_i^{mo} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \overline{D_i^k}$ :  $D_i^k = \text{Word}[P_V(LP_i^k)]$ 
4: for all  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  do
5:   Let  $LP_i^k = LP_i^k(0)LP_i^k(1) \dots LP_i^k(m)$ 
6:   for all  $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  do
7:     if  $(\exists l)(\exists d) : [LP_i^k(l+1) = \delta_i^\mathcal{E}(LP_i^k(l), d)]$  but
        $[d \notin F_D^\mathcal{E}(LP_i^k(l), LP_i^k(l+1))]$  then
8:       Find  $d' \in D_i^k : LP_i^k(l+1) = \delta_i^m(LP_i^k(l), d')$  and
        $d' \in F_D^\mathcal{E}(LP_i^k(l), LP_i^k(l+1))$ 
9:       Remove the words in  $D_i^k$  that contains  $d$ 
10:       $LP_i^\mathcal{E} = LP_i$ 
11:     else
12:       Check if there exists  $l$  such that  $LP_i^k(l+1) \neq$ 
        $\delta_i^\mathcal{E}(LP_i^k(l), d)$  for all  $d \in D$ 
13:       if such  $l$  does exist then
14:         Find  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p : (LP_i^k(l), v_1), \dots, (v_p, LP_i^k(l+1)) \in \rightarrow_\mathcal{E}$ 
15:          $LP_i^k(l)LP_i^k(l+1) = LP_i^k(l)v_1 \dots v_p LP_i^k(l+1)$ 
16:         Update  $LP_i^\mathcal{E}$  according to  $LP_i^k$ 
17:         Update  $D_i^m$  accordingly
18:       end if
19:     end if
20:   end for
21: end for
22: return  $LP_i^\mathcal{E}$  and  $D_i^m$ 
```

B. Counterexample-guided Replanning in Uncertain Environments

We aim to implement the integrated plans $\{LP_i\}_{i \in I}$ in the real environment \mathcal{E} rather than the nominal environment characterized by \mathcal{E}_0 , which is used for generating motion plans and door profiles. As mentioned in Section IV.A, feasible transitions among adjacent regions in \mathcal{E}_0 may become infeasible in \mathcal{E} since some doors that are supposed to be open are closed. During the online coordination of the cooperative multi-agent systems, the underlying agents may detect the real door mapping $F_D^\mathcal{E}$ and the real region transition diagram $\delta_i^\mathcal{E}$ through sensing capabilities and communication with each other. Here we assume that the motion capacities

$$G_i^\mathcal{E} = (V, D, v_{i,0}, \delta_i^\mathcal{E}, V)$$

of agent G_i ($i \in I$), under the restriction of \mathcal{E} , are also captured by a trim DFA. Based on the online-acquired knowledge of the environment, we develop a new algorithm to address the environment uncertainty, whose outputs include both the feasible integrated plan $LP_i^\mathcal{E}$ and the associated door profile D_i^m for agent G_i ($i \in I$) moving and performing missions in \mathcal{E} .

As detailed in Algorithm 2, the implementation of LP_i in the real environment \mathcal{E} starts with the synthesized local

plans LP_i and corresponding door profiles D_i^{mo} . For $i \in I$, Algorithm 2 first enumerates (line 2) LP_i as a collection of K prefix-closed words over $V \cup \Sigma_i$, i.e., $LP_i = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \overline{LP_i^k}$, while if LP_i^k admits a cycle such that $LP_i^k = uv^*$ for some $u \in \Sigma^*$ and $v \in \Sigma^* - \{\epsilon\}$, we replace LP_i^k by uv . Next for each LP_i^k , we proceed to the investigation of two types of environment uncertainties. On the one hand (lines 7-10), if two adjacent regions in LP_i are connected by multiple doors whereas some of the doors are closed, we require the agent to use alternative (redundant) doors to accomplish the motion plan and hence the integrated local plan LP_i remains the same, while the door profile D_i^m is formed by discarding all the words in D_i^{mo} that contain the symbols of closed doors. On the other hand (lines 12-17), when two consecutive regions v and v' that are supposed to be visited by agent G_i are not connected by any doors in \mathcal{E} , the assumption that $G_i^\mathcal{E}$ is a trim DFA inspires us to replace the motion transition vv' by a sequence of “intermediate” regions v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p such that

$$v_{i,0} \dots vv_1v_2 \dots v_pv' \in \text{Run}[L(G_i^\mathcal{E})];$$

afterwards, we replace all the transition vv' in LP_i by $vv_1v_2 \dots v_pv'$ to construct $LP_i^\mathcal{E}$, and the door profile is updated accordingly.

VII. CASE STUDY: A ROBOTIC COORDINATION EXAMPLE

We examine the effectiveness of our proposed learning-based synthesis framework with a multi-robot coordination case study, whose scenario is shown in Fig. 3.

A. Description of the Multi-robot Coordination Scenario

As depicted in Fig. 3, the cooperative robotic team consists of three robots, namely G_1 , G_2 and G_3 , all of which have identical communication and self-localization capabilities. In addition, G_2 is assumed to be equipped with rescue and fire-fighting capabilities. We assume that all doors are equipped with a spring and are kept closed whenever there is no force to keep them open. Initially, the three robots are positioned in Room 1. Room 2 and Room 3 are accessible using the one-way door D_2 , or the two-way doors D_1 and D_3 , respectively. The nominal environment of the robots is depicted in Fig. 4

From (3), the nominal environment \mathcal{E}_0 is characterized by:

- $V = \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$, where R_j stands for Room j ($j = 1, 2, 3$);
- $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}_0} = \{(R_1, R_2), (R_1, R_3), (R_2, R_1), (R_3, R_1)\}$;
- $D = \{D_1^l, D_1^r, D_2, D_3\}$, where D_1^l and D_1^r represent the left and right half of D_1 , respectively;




Fig. 3: The scenario of multi-robot coordination.

must stay in R_3 . By adding this counterexample back to the L_{CV}^* algorithm, we update the local specifications according to Section V.E, the L_{LS}^* algorithm derives the new local mission supervisors as shown in Figures 9 and 10, respectively.




Fig. 9: Local mission supervisors for G_1 and G_3 .




Fig. 10: The local mission supervisor S_2 .

Intuitively, the updated local mission plans S_1 and S_3 explicitly specify that robot G_1 stays in R_1 , while robot G_3 enters R_3 such that D_1 can be opened jointly. We insert the new $M_i = S_i || G_i$ to the L_{CV}^* algorithm to justify whether the collective behaviors of the local supervisors cooperatively satisfy L ; and in this time the L_{CV}^* algorithm reports no more counterexample, which implies that S_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) drives G_i to accomplish an appropriate local mission. Therefore, Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 are also DFA representations of local mission plans L_i^{mi} ($i = 1, 2, 3$).

Finally, we apply the L_{MP}^* algorithm stated in Section VI to construct local motion plan L_i^{mo} that is associated with L_i^{mi} ($i = 1, 2, 3$), respectively. Towards this end, the local motion plans are established in terms of DFAs:




Fig. 11: Local motion plans L_i^{mo} for robot G_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$).

Based on the local motion plans obtained as shown in Fig. 11, we can construct the integrated local plan LP_i for each robot G_i . Such construction relies on the local mission-integration mapping π_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), which is defined as follows:

1) Robot G_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(h_1) &= \pi_1(Open) = \pi_1(Close) = \pi_1(G_2inR_1) \\ &= \pi_1(D_1open) = \pi_1(D_1close) = \pi_1(r) = R_1, \\ \pi_1(G_1inR_3) &= R_3. \end{aligned}$$

2) Robot G_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2(h_2) &= \pi_2(G_2inR_1) = \pi_2(r) = R_1, \\ \pi_2(F) &= \pi_2(D_1open) = R_2. \end{aligned}$$

3) Robot G_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_3(Open) &= \pi_3(Close) = \pi_3(G_2inR_1) \\ &= \pi_3(D_1open) = \pi_3(D_1close) = \pi_1(r) = R_3, \\ \pi_3(G_1inR_3) &= \pi_3(h_3) = \pi_3(r) = R_1. \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 12, Fig. 13 and Fig. 14 depict the integrated local plans LP_1 , LP_2 and LP_3 , respectively.




Fig. 12: The integrated local plan LP_1 .




Fig. 13: The integrated local plan LP_2 .




Fig. 14: The integrated local plan LP_3 .

It is worth pointing out that, all the LP_i 's are designed with respect to \mathcal{E}_0 , and when implementing LP_i 's in the practical environment \mathcal{E} , the robots may encounter with uncertainties. In this case, the robots shall automatically react to the uncertain environment by online replanning their motion plans. For example, in case the door D_3 is broken and cannot be opened when G_3 needs to return to R_1 , G_3 shall then return to R_1 through D_1 .

VIII. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Experiment Setup

We now proceed to the experimental validation of the theoretical results. The proposed supervisors, implemented as MATLAB StateFlow machines, are tested and evaluated on a team composed by three robots.

The experimental setup for testing the derived supervisors is composed by three main elements, described respectively as follows.

1) *Localization System*: The localization system is constructed on the basis of the Aruco library [37] and provides the status of each robot (position and orientation) and each door (open or close) with a frame-rate of ~ 20 Hz. Each robot is equipped with a unique marker. The localization software detects the position and the orientation of each marker, providing the position data through a UDP socket. The information concerning the position of the robots and the status of each door is encoded using the JSON format. Furthermore, each robot is able to request its position or another robot's position.

The localization software is based on a multi-threading architecture in order to minimize the delay on the transmission of the position information:

- The main thread implements a UDP server waiting for information requests from the robots. The response contains the robot id, its position and orientation and the status of all the doors.

For example, the position of the robot G_1 along with the status of the three doors is represented as follows: $\{G_1 : [+0460.86, +0113.43, +0079.15, 0, 0, 1]\}$.

- The second thread computes the position of each marker and updates the list of detected markers along with their position and orientation. The camera used on the localization system has a resolution of 640x480 and a frame-rate of ~ 30 frames per second.

Figure 15 shows the output of the localization system.



Fig. 15: View of the system from the camera used for the localization system with markers for position and orientation estimation. The localization system provides visual feedback with augmented-reality capabilities: each marker is overlapped with basic information (ID of the marker, orientation).

2) *Local supervisors*: Each of the three supervisors is implemented as a StateFlow machine and manages a pre-defined robot of the team.

The logic implemented follows the theoretical approach described in Section VII. The transition between the possible states is based on the occurrence of one of the pre-defined events, e.g., the opening of a door. The list of possible events is represented in Table I.

The communication between the robot and the corresponding StateFlow machine is realized using a wireless module. The TCP protocol is chosen to provide a reliable exchange of messages.

As an illustrative example, Figures 16 and 17 show the information transition between the robot and the local plan, as well as the StateFlow implementation of the local plan LP_2 for robot G_2 , respectively.

3) *Ground Robots*: The hardware of each robot is designed as a multi-layered architecture.

- The low-level system (LL board), based on xMOS processors [38], is responsible to interact with the sensors and the actuators (Fig. 18). Thanks to the hard real-time performance of the xMOS devices, the low-level system provides deterministic real-time access to all the sensors and actuators connected to the processor.
- The high-level system (HL board) is constructed on the basis of the BeagleBone board and is responsible to




Fig. 16: High-level structure of the local plan LP_2 implemented as Stateflow machine with TCP/IP Receive/Send communication blocks. The TCP/IP Receive module is based on a blocking mechanism: The simulink model makes an iteration each time a new packet is received. Once the results is sent back to the robot, the state flow returns to its blocking state listening for a new packet.




Fig. 17: StateFlow Representation of local supervisor LP_2 using ASCII encoding of the events. Since StateFlow deals only with numbers, the information is codified using the ASCII representation. The data sent back to the robot are then converted to characters.

interact with the corresponding local plan (Fig. 19). The main purpose of the high-level board is to provide a tool for developing high-level control systems, delegating the low-level real-time board for the interaction with the sensors and the actuators.

Taking advantage of the localization system (Fig. 15), each robot is equipped with a unique marker (Fig. 20) that is convenient to be recognized by the localization system. The coordinates of the four corners of the marker are used to estimate the position (in terms of pixel coordinates) of the center of the marker, along with its orientation.

B. Demonstration Results

The flow chart in Fig. 21 describes the interaction between the local plan (represented in DFAs) and the corresponding ground robot.

After the reception of the START signal, the High-level board of the agent initializes the communication system and sends the first request to its local plan DFA. The local plan DFA responds by sending the command back to the HL board. The HL board then reads data from the sensors and computes control actions interacting with the LL board. After reaching a desired position, the HL board sends an ACK (acknowledge)




Fig. 18: Low-level system. The xMOS device is responsible to interact with sensors. The UART over IP module shown in the figure is used for requesting the robot’s position from the localization server. The power supply is realized using a switching regulator.




Fig. 19: High-level system. The Beaglebone board device is responsible to interact with State Flow. The UART over IP module shown in the figure is used for requesting the command to be executed from the localization supervisor. The power supply is based on a 3-cells LiPo battery.

message back to the supervisor. Once the local plan supervisor receives the ACK message, it replies by sending the next action to the HL board of the agent. For example, we implement the local plan LP_2 (Fig. 13) for robot G_2 in the real experiment environment. The path followed by robot G_2 , as defined by the local motion plan L_2^{mo} , is shown in Fig. 22.

In Figure 23, we record the waypoints visited by robot G_2 and plot the actual path. The cloud of points corresponds to the instants in which the robot G_2 reached a pre-defined waypoint and waited for the next command sent from the local supervisor. The position of the robot is expressed in pixel coordinates. The differences between the planned path and the real path are due to hardware limitations, in particular to the difference between the localization rate and the update rate of the servo motors. This problem can be overcome by integrating additional sensors such as Inertial Measuring Unit (IMU) or encoders in order to provide a higher data rate for position estimation, as well as an estimation of the robot’s position even when the marker is not detected. A sensor fusion algorithm is currently under development to overcome both limitations.

IX. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, based on a formal design approach, we present a learning-based automatic synthesis framework to solve the coordination and control co-design problem of cooperative multi-agent systems. Starting from an automata-based characterization of each agent’s dynamics as well as the shared environment in which all the agents perform their mission




Fig. 20: Marker mounted on top of the robot. The localization system is able to detect the position of the center of the marker and its orientation with a frame-rate of $\sim 20Hz$. The Aruco library, used in the localization system, provides the possibility to detect up to 1024 different markers.




Fig. 21: High-level flow chart of the system. The local plan (DFA) is able to communicate with the High Level board of the robot. The HL board will then translate the received command in control action for the motors. The use of acknowledge messages ensures the correctness of the messages transmitted.

and motion behaviors, our proposed framework solves the mission and motion planning sub-problems in a hierarchical architecture. We develop three modified L^* algorithms to synthesize the local mission supervisors, to check the joint efforts of the mission executions via compositional verification techniques, and to synthesize motion plans corresponding to the mission plans. In addition, we also present another algorithm that adaptively replans the mission and motions so that environment uncertainties can be resolved. It has been shown that the proposed synthesis framework can accomplish the global task even if the agents’ models are not given *a priori*. Computational and software tools are also developed to incorporate automatic supervisor synthesis with inter-robot communication in an effort to implement the framework. A demonstration example of multi-robot coordination to achieve a request-response team mission is presented to justify the effectiveness of the proposed framework. Future work includes combining the proposed learning-based automatic synthesis framework with robustness requirements to deal with possible faults.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Chen, X. C. Ding, A. Stefanescu, and C. Belta, “Formal approach to the deployment of distributed robotic teams,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 158-171, 2012.
- [2] M. Kloetzer and C. Belta, “Automatic deployment of distributed teams of robots from temporal logic motion specifications,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 48-61, 2010.




Fig. 22: Path planned for robot G_2 . The path is described as a series of waypoints to be reached by the robot. For some waypoints, additional conditions must be satisfied. For example, robot 2 cannot reach waypoint 5 until D_1 is closed.




Fig. 23: Path followed by robot G_2 . The position is updated with a frame-rate of 20 Hz. The clouds of points correspond to the instants in which the robot reached a waypoint and stopped waiting for the next command.

[3] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1520-1533, 2004.

[4] D. Panagou, D. M. Stipanovic and P. G. Voulgaris, "Distributed coordination control for multi-robot networks using Lyapunov-like barrier functions," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 617-632, 2016.

[5] L. A. V. Reyes and H. G. Tanner, "Flocking, formation control, and path following for a group of mobile robots," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1268-1282, 2015.

[6] K. P. Valavanis and G. N. Saridis, *Intelligent Robotic Systems: Theory, Design and Applications*, New York: Springer, 2012.

[7] C. G. Cassandras, S. Lafortune, *Introduction to Discrete Event Systems*, New York: Springer, 2008.

[8] C. Baier and J.-P. Katoen, *Principles of Model Checking*, Boston: MIT Press, 2008.

[9] C. Păsăreanu, D. Giannakopoulou, M. G. Bobaru, J. M. Cobleigh, and H. Barringer, "Learning to divide and conquer: applying the L^* algorithm to automate assume-guarantee reasoning," *Formal Methods Syst. Des.*, vol. 32, no. 3 pp. 175-205, 2008.

[10] R. R. da Silva, B. Wu and H. Lin, "Formal design of robot integrated task and motion planning," in *Proc. 55th IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, pp. 6589-6594, 2016.

[11] D. Angluin, "Learning regular sets from queries and counterexamples," *Inform. and Computation*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 87-106, 1987.

[12] J. Dai and H. Lin, "Automatic synthesis of cooperative multi-agent systems," in *Proc. 53rd IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, pp. 6173-6178, 2014.

[13] J. Dai, A. Benini, H. Lin, P. J. Antsaklis, M. J. Rutherford and K. P. Valavanis, "Learning-based formal synthesis of cooperative multi-agent systems with an application to robotic coordination," in *Proc. 24th Mediterr. Conf. Control Automation*, pp. 1008-1013, 2016.

[14] R. Olfati-Saber, "Flocking for multi-agent dynamic systems: Algorithms and theory," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 401-420, 2006.

[15] D. V. Dimarogonas and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "On the rendezvous problem for multiple nonholonomic agents," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 916-922, 2007.

[16] H. M. La, R. Lim and W. Sheng, "Multirobot cooperative learning for

predator avoidance," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 52-63, 2015.

[17] J. R. Marden, G. Arslan and J. S. Shamma, "Cooperative control and potential games," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. B*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1393-1407, 2009.

[18] C. Belta, A. Bicchi, M. Egerstedt, E. Frazzoli, E. Klavins and G. J. Pappas, "Symbolic planning and control of robot motion [grand challenges of robotics]," *IEEE Robot. Autom. Mag.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 61-70, 2007.

[19] G. E. Fainekos, A. Girard, H. Kress-Gazit, and G. J. Pappas, "Temporal logic motion planning for dynamic robots," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 343-352, 2009.

[20] M. Kloetzer and C. Belta, "A fully automated framework for control of linear systems from temporal logic specifications," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 287-297, 2008.

[21] P. Tabuada and G. J. Pappas, "Linear time logic control of discrete-time linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 1862-1877, 2006.

[22] P. J. Ramadge and W. M. Wonham, "Supervisory control of a class of discrete event processes," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 206-230, 1987.

[23] P. J. Ramadge and W. M. Wonham, "The control of discrete event systems," *Proc. of the IEEE*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 81-98, 1989.

[24] H. Kress-Gazit, G. E. Fainekos, and G. J. Pappas, "Temporal-logic-based reactive mission and motion planning," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1370-1381, 2009.

[25] Y. Chen, J. Tumova, A. Ulusoy and C. Belta, "Temporal logic robot control based on automata learning of environmental dynamics," *Int. J. Robot. Res.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 547-565, 2013.

[26] M. Lahijanjan, M. R. Maly, D. Fried, L. E. Kavraki, H. Kress-Gazit and M. Y. Vardi, "Iterative temporal planning in uncertain environments with partial satisfaction guarantees," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 583-599, 2016.

[27] I. Filippidis, D. V. Dimarogonas and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Decentralized multi-agent control from local LTL specifications," in *Proc. 51st IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, pp. 6235-6240, 2012.

[28] M. Guo and D. V. Dimarogonas, "Multi-agent plan reconfiguration under local LTL specifications," *Int. J. Robot. Res.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 218-235, 2015.

[29] J. Tumova and D. V. Dimarogonas, "Multi-agent planning under local LTL specifications and event-based synchronization," *Automatica*, vol. 70, pp. 239-248, 2016.

[30] M. Karimadini and H. Lin, "Guaranteed global performance through local coordinations," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 890-898, 2011.

[31] K. T. Seow, M. T. Pham, C. Ma, and M. Yokoo, "Coordination planning: Applying control synthesis methods for a class of distributed agents," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 405-415, 2009.

[32] A. Partovi and H. Lin, "Assumed-guarantee cooperative satisfaction of multi-agent systems," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, pp. 2053-2058, 2014.

[33] B. A. Brandin, R. Malik and P. Malik, "Incremental verification and synthesis of discrete-event systems guided by counter examples," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 387-401, 2004.

[34] Y. Willner and M. Heymann, "Supervisory control of concurrent discrete-event systems," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 1143-1169, 1991.

[35] L. Lin, A. Stefanescu and R. Su, "On distributed and parameterized supervisor synthesis problems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 777-782, 2016.

[36] R. Kumar and V. K. Garg, *Modeling and Control of Logical Discrete Event Systems*. Boston: Kluwer, 1995.

[37] S. Garrido-Jurado, R. Muñoz-Salinas, F. J. Madrid-Cuevas and R. Medina-Carnicer, "Generation of fiducial marker dictionaries using mixed integer linear programming," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 481-491, 2016.

[38] G. Martins, A. Moses, M. J. Rutherford, K. P. Valavanis, "Enabling intelligent unmanned vehicles through XMOs technology," *J. Def. Model. Simul.*, vol. 9, pp. 71-82, 2012.