

# Data-Driven Abstractions for Control Systems via Random Exploration

Rudi Coppola<sup>a</sup>, Andrea Peruffo<sup>a</sup>, Manuel Mazo Jr.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Technical University of Delft, Delft*

---

## Abstract

At the intersection of dynamical systems, control theory, and formal methods lies the construction of symbolic abstractions: these typically represent simpler, finite-state models whose behavior mimics that of an underlying concrete system but are easier to analyse. Building an abstraction usually requires an accurate knowledge of the underlying model: this knowledge may be costly to gather, especially in real-life applications. We aim to bridge this gap by building abstractions based on sampling finite length trajectories. To refine a controller built for the abstraction to one for the concrete system, we newly define a notion of probabilistic alternating simulation, and provide Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) guarantees that the constructed abstraction includes all behaviors of the concrete system and that it is suitable for control design, for arbitrarily long time horizons, leveraging scenario theory. Our method is then tested on several numerical benchmarks.

*Key words:* Abstractions; data-based control; statistical analysis; formal methods; probabilistic guarantees.

---

## 1 Introduction

Data-driven modeling and analysis is undergoing a new renaissance with the advances in machine learning and artificial intelligence enabled by unprecedented computing power. The field of system verification, aimed at providing formal performance and safety guarantees is not alien to this trend. Recent work has been focused on the use of collected data from a system to derive directly (i.e. with no model involved) barrier functions certifying invariance [3,22], or finite abstractions to verify and synthesize controllers [13,17,21]. A popular approach is to employ scenario-based optimization techniques to derive probably approximately correct (PAC) guarantees on the performance metric of interest. The use of scenario-based optimization requires independent samples, generated from the probability distribution that drives the system's uncertainty. A special case considered in many works [13,26] is that of deterministic systems (for which a model is not available), in which the only uncertainty is their initialization, i.e. the initial state is drawn from some probability distribution, and

the control policy, usually chosen from a finite set of possible actions, and the samples consist of individual transitions or, more generally, finite-length trajectories. In this setting the independence of the samples can be derived by independently sampling the initial state; typically a uniform distribution is selected for compact initial sets. If the set of initial conditions coincides with the domain of interest, one can directly sample one-step transitions. However, the scenario-based approach would ensure the satisfaction of *one-step* properties, provided that transitions are indeed sampled independently. On the other hand, one is often interested in inferring long (even infinite) horizon specifications from one-step properties. These approaches are limited to provide guarantees for the time horizon used to construct the data set, as for larger horizons nothing can be directly inferred unless some additional knowledge of the system is available, as for example in [16]. Addressing this limitation in the context of abstraction-based control synthesis is the main objective of this work.

**Contributions.** We consider deterministic control systems with unknown dynamics and a random initialization. Our approach provides a construction of data-driven finite abstractions, built on the notions of alternating simulation and a particular class of abstractions known as Strongest Asynchronous  $\ell$ -complete Abstractions (or Approximations) (SA $\ell$ CAs) [24]. Unlike our previous work [10,11], which treats verification problems, the data-driven abstraction presented in this

---

\* R. Coppola, A. Peruffo and M. Mazo Jr. are with Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, TU Delft, Delft, The Netherlands. [r.coppola@tudelft.nl](mailto:r.coppola@tudelft.nl)

*Email addresses:* [r.coppola@tudelft.nl](mailto:r.coppola@tudelft.nl) (Rudi Coppola), [a.peruffo@tudelft.nl](mailto:a.peruffo@tudelft.nl) (Andrea Peruffo), [m.mazo@tudelft.nl](mailto:m.mazo@tudelft.nl) (Manuel Mazo Jr.).

paper enables the synthesis of a controller for the unknown system to solve reach-avoid specifications. We introduce a notion of probabilistic alternating simulation, instrumental in describing the relation between a deterministic (but randomly sampled) model and a transition system constructed upon the collected system’s behaviors. Leveraging the scenario theory, we establish PAC guarantees for the inclusion of the concrete system’s finite behaviors in those of the abstraction. We clarify the role of the trajectory length used for constructing the abstraction; successively, if the system’s dynamics is *partially known*, we propose sufficient conditions to extend PAC guarantees over *longer* trajectory lengths. This enables the verification of properties, and synthesis of control policies, over an arbitrarily long time horizon while preserving the PAC guarantees for several classes of nonlinear systems.

**Related Work.** Abstractions simplify complex systems by reducing them to finite-state models, aiding in property verification and controller synthesis [25]. Recent methods bypass the need for an explicit model by directly synthesizing abstractions from data. In [12,5,16], a sampled-based interval Markov Decision Process is created using the scenario approach to constrain transition probabilities in a stochastic dynamical model. In [18], PAC over-approximations of monotone systems are employed to construct models; in [15], a sample-based growth rate is used to build an abstraction and synthesize a controller. In [13], the authors pursue a goal, similar to ours, of deriving an abstraction from a black-box system suitable for control, and propose a notion of PAC (approximate) alternating simulation relationship. Unfortunately, the authors’ procedure to derive an abstraction relies on chaining one-step transitions sampled uniformly: this violates the PAC bound assumptions that the authors adopt, thus the abstraction does not satisfy the proposed notion, see [10, Section 3.3].

In contrast, [2] efficiently constructs an abstraction of a deterministic control system with disturbances by estimating reachable sets, assuming the Lipschitz constants are known. In the first part of this work, we show how to derive an abstraction suitable for control for a black-box system for a finite horizon, without assuming any limiting knowledge on the dynamics, in contrast to [2]. Only later, for the purpose of extending this horizon, we introduce additional assumptions, involving for instance the Lipschitz constant.

Our work focuses on a specific type of abstraction known as SAICA [23,24], which offers several useful properties for our purposes. Unlike state-based abstractions, a SAICA can be constructed from complete knowledge of a system’s output trajectories. However, when only partial knowledge is available, such as when using sampled trajectories, certain challenges arise, as detailed in [10]. In [11], the authors extend SAICAs to linear autonomous systems using data-driven approaches. Our work builds on this by extending these methods to nonlinear control systems. SAICAs have been applied in event-triggered control models [19,20]. Recent research

also explored data-driven memory-based Markov models for stochastic systems [6,7], emphasizing the importance of memory in constructing effective abstractions. As we show, memory plays a crucial role in leveraging data-driven SAICAs for control applications.

**Organisation.** Section 2 provides relevant background information. Section 3 describes transition systems and system relations, the primary tools for deriving an abstraction-based controller. Section 4 introduces a data-driven approach to constructing abstractions for *unknown* (black-box) systems, using scenario theory to establish PAC-type guarantees for the horizon used for sampling; Section 5 extends these guarantees to longer time horizons by studying *partially known* systems, making specific assumptions about the dynamics. Section 6 and Sections 7 are dedicated to showcase experimental results, a discussion and a conclusion.

## 2 Notation and Preliminaries

Given a set  $\mathcal{M}$ , we denote its  $n$ -th cartesian product by  $\mathcal{M}^n$ , and its power set by  $\wp(\mathcal{M})$ . Let  $s = m_0 a_0 \dots a_{n-1} m_n$  be any sequence such that  $m_i$ ’s belong to a set  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $a_i$ ’s belong to a set  $\mathcal{A}$ . We denote  $s(i)$  the  $i$ -th element belonging to  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.  $s(i) = m_i$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ ; by  $s[i, i + j]$ , with  $j \geq 0$ , we denote the  $j$ -long subsequence of  $s$  from  $m_i$  to  $m_{i+j}$ , i.e.  $s[i, i + j] = m_i a_i \dots a_{i+j-1} m_{i+j}$ . Given two sequences  $s = m_0 a_0 \dots a_{i-1} m_i$  and  $s' = m'_0 a'_0 \dots a'_{j-1} m'_j$  with  $m_i = m'_0$ , we denote their concatenation by  $s \cdot s' \doteq m_0 a_0 \dots a_{i-1} m'_0 a'_0 \dots a'_{j-1} m'_j$ . Finally,  $s|^{(m)}$  ( $s|^{(a)}$ ) denotes the sequence obtained by removing from  $s$  all the elements that do not belong to  $\mathcal{M}$  ( $\mathcal{A}$ ), and  $s|^{(m)}(i) = m_i$ . For a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b$ , we define  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_b}(x_a) \doteq \{x_b \in \mathcal{X}_b : (x_a, x_b) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . We indicate the inverse relation of  $\mathcal{R}$  by  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$ , i.e.  $(x_b, x_a) \in \mathcal{R}^{-1} \iff (x_a, x_b) \in \mathcal{R}$ . Denote by  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mu_{\omega_i})$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , two probability spaces, where  $\Omega_i$  is the sample space, endowed with a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_i$  and a probability measure  $\mu_{\omega_i}$ . We define the product probability space  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{W}, \mu_p)$  where  $\mathcal{P} = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ , denoted  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$  is the product  $\sigma$ -algebra, and  $\mu_p = \mu_{\omega_1} \times \mu_{\omega_2}$  is the product measure.

### 2.1 Dynamical Models

We consider a time-invariant dynamical system

$$\Sigma(x) \doteq \begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k), \\ y_k = h(x_k), \\ x_0 = x, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $x_k \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is the system’s state at time  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  (natural numbers including zero),  $n_x$  is the state-space dimension,  $x_0$  is the initial state,  $y_k \in \mathcal{Y}$  is the system output where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is an arbitrary output set with  $|\mathcal{Y}| < \infty$ ,  $u_k \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  is the system input at time  $k$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  is a finite input set, i.e.  $|\mathcal{U}| < \infty$ ,  $n_u$  is the input dimension.

We denote as  $\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H$  a sequence of control inputs of length  $H$ . We assume that  $f(\cdot, u)$  is measurable on the standard Borel space associated with  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for all  $u$ .

**Definition 1** Let  $(\mathcal{X}, d_X)$  and  $(\mathcal{U}, d_U)$  be a complete metric spaces. Let the map  $f$  defined in (1) satisfy the inequality  $m_X d_X(x, x') \leq d_X(f(x, u), f(x', u))$ , for  $m_X > 0$  all  $x \neq x' \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then,  $f$  is said to be Lipschitz invertible.

The map  $f$  in (1) is uniformly contracting w.r.t.  $x$  if there exists  $0 < l_X < 1$  such that  $d_X(f(x, u), f(x', u)) \leq l_X d_X(x, x')$ , for all  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Similarly,  $f$  is uniformly Lipschitz w.r.t.  $u$  if there exists  $l_U > 0$  such that  $d_X(f(x, u), f(x, v)) \leq l_U d_U(u, v)$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$ .

## 2.2 Scenario Theory

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a probability space, and consider  $N$  independent  $\mu$ -distributed samples  $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$ . Each  $\omega_i$  is regarded as an observation, or *scenario* [8,14]. We aim at taking a *decision*,  $\theta_N^*$ , e.g. construct a classifier, from a set  $\Theta$ , the decision space. To every  $\omega \in \Omega$  there is associated a constraint set  $\Theta_\omega \subseteq \Theta$ . The scenario theory is a *distribution-free* setting that, under very mild assumptions [14, Assumption 1], offers a way to compute a decision  $\theta_N^*$  satisfying all the constraints  $\Theta_{\omega_i}$  imposed by the set of  $N$  i.i.d. samples while quantifying the probability that a new random sample  $\omega \in \Omega$  would result in the solution  $\theta_N^*$  violating the new constraint  $\Theta_\omega$ . Hence, it quantifies the generalization power of the solution.

**Theorem 2 (PAC bounds [14, Theorem 1])** For a given  $\theta \in \Theta$  let  $\mathcal{V}(\theta) = \{\omega : \theta \notin \Theta_\omega\}$  be the violation set and  $V(\theta) = \mu(\omega \in \mathcal{V}(\theta))$  be the violation probability (or violation for short). For a confidence  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  and decision  $\theta_N^*$ , it holds

$$\mu^N(V(\theta_N^*) \leq \epsilon(s_N^*, \beta, N)) \geq 1 - \beta, \quad (2)$$

where  $\epsilon(\cdot)$  is the solution of a polynomial equation (omitted here for brevity) and  $s_N^*$  is the complexity of the solution – it represents the cardinality of the smallest subset of the samples yielding the same solution  $\theta_N^*$ .

**Remark 3** In this work we consider a discrete sample space  $\Omega$ , therefore we refer to the scenario theory for degenerate problems, as per [14, 8].

## 3 Problem Statement and System Description

We adopt the framework of finite-state abstractions in the form of transition systems.

**Definition 4 (Transition System (TS))** A transition system  $S$  is a tuple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{U}, \delta, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{H})$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the set of states,  $\mathcal{X}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  is the set of initial states,  $\mathcal{U}$  is

the input set,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is the set of outputs,  $\delta \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{X}$  is a transition relation, and  $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is an output map.

We define the set of  $u$ -successor states of a state  $x$  as  $\text{Post}_u(x) \doteq x' \in \mathcal{X} : (x, u, x') \in \delta$  and the set of admissible inputs at  $x$  as  $U_\delta(x) \doteq u \in \mathcal{U} : \text{Post}_u(x) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $U_\delta(x) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $x$ , the system is *non-blocking*. An  $H$ -long internal behavior of the TS,  $\xi = x_0 u_0 x_1 \dots u_{H-1} x_H$ , satisfies  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_0$  and  $(x_{i-1}, u_{i-1}, x_i) \in \delta$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, H$ . An  $H$ -long external behavior,  $\gamma = y_0 u_1 y_1 \dots u_{H-1} y_H$ , satisfies  $y_i = \mathcal{H}(x_i)$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, H$ . We denote the external behavior  $\gamma$  corresponding to the internal behavior  $\xi$  as  $\mathcal{H}(\xi)$ . The sets  $\mathcal{I}_H(S)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_H(S)$  contain all  $H$ -long internal and external behaviors of the TS, respectively.

Given  $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$  and an  $H$ -long input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H$  we define respectively the set of internal and external  $H$ -behavior of a TS  $S$  starting in  $x_0$  under input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$  as

$$\mathcal{I}_H(S, x_0, \mathbf{u}_H) \doteq \{\xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S) : \xi(0) = x_0 \wedge \xi|^u = \mathbf{u}_H\}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_H(S, x_0, \mathbf{u}_H) \doteq \{\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_H(S) : \exists \xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S, x_0, \mathbf{u}_H) . \gamma = \mathcal{H}(\xi)\}. \quad (4)$$

Our technique relies on the concept of memory via  *$\ell$ -sequences*, which are  $\ell$ -long subsequences of external behaviors. Each state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is linked to all possible  $\ell$ -sequences that could lead to it, representing the recent past in terms of inputs and outputs. For initial states  $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$ , following [24], we extend behaviors to negative time indices using the symbol  $\diamond$ , so  $\xi|^x(k) = \xi|^u(k) = \gamma|^y(k) = \gamma|^u(k) = \diamond$  for  $k \leq -1$ .

Consider the set of external behaviors of length  $H$  and an integer  $\ell$  with  $0 \leq \ell < H$ . Each  $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_H(S)$  is divided into  $\ell$ -long subsequences (or  $\ell$ -sequences). The set of all  $\ell$ -sequences from these behaviors is denoted by

$$\Pi_{\ell, H} \doteq \bigcup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_H(S)} \bigcup_{k \in [0, H]} \gamma[k - \ell, k], \quad (5)$$

Each  $\zeta \in \Pi_{\ell, H}$  contains  $\ell + 1$  outputs and  $\ell$  inputs. We omit the dependence of  $\Pi_{\ell, H}$  on  $S$  since it always refers to the concrete system. The set of corresponding external strings (CESSs) of length  $\ell$  for a state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\ell, H}(x) \doteq \{\zeta \in \Pi_{\ell, H} : \exists \xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S), \exists j \in \mathbb{N}_0 . \zeta = \mathcal{H}(\xi[j - \ell, j]) \wedge \xi(j) = x\}. \quad (6)$$

$\mathcal{E}_{\ell, H}(x)$  represents all subsequences of external behaviors with  $\ell$  outputs that the system can generate before reaching  $x$  in at most  $H$  steps. If  $x$  is reached in fewer than  $\ell$  transitions from an initial state, some CESSs will include the symbol  $\diamond$ . For instance, if  $\ell = 3$  and  $x'$  is reached in one transition from the initial state  $x$  by choosing control input  $u$ , then  $\diamond \diamond \mathcal{H}(x) u \mathcal{H}(x') \in \mathcal{E}_{3, H}(x')$ . The equivalence class of an  $\ell$ -sequence  $\zeta \in \Pi_{\ell, H}$  is

$$[\zeta] \doteq \{x : \zeta \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell, H}(x)\}. \quad (7)$$




Fig. 1. Illustration of the TS of Example 5.

**Example 5** Let  $S$  be the TS depicted in Fig. 1, where  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \{x_1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{U} = \{u_a, u_b\}$ , and  $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, y_2\}$ . For a time horizon  $H = 4$  and input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_3 = u_a u_b u_a$ . The internal and external behaviors initialized from  $x_1$ , are given by  $\mathcal{I}_3(S, x_1, \mathbf{u}_3) = \{x_1 u_a x_2 u_b x_4 u_a x_2\}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_3(S, x_1, \mathbf{u}_3) = \{y_1 u_a y_2 u_b y_2 u_a y_2\}$ . For  $\ell = 1$ , following (5) we split  $\mathcal{B}_3(S, x_1, \mathbf{u}_3) \in \mathcal{B}_H(S)$  in subsequences of length 1 and conclude that  $\{y_1, y_2\} = \mathcal{Y} = \Pi_{0,3}$ . Moreover, from (6) we have  $y_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{1,3}(x_1)$ ,  $y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{1,3}(x_2)$ , and  $y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{1,3}(x_4)$ . For  $\ell = 2$ , we have  $\{\diamond \diamond y_1, y_1 u_a y_2, y_2 u_b y_2, y_2 u_a y_2\} \subset \Pi_{1,3}$ . Moreover,  $\diamond \diamond y_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{2,3}(x_1)$ ,  $y_1 u_a y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{2,3}(x_2)$ ,  $y_2 u_b y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{2,3}(x_4)$ , and again  $y_2 u_a y_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{2,3}(x_2)$ .

The system  $\Sigma$  in (1) can be equivalently described as a TS, potentially with an infinite state set, denoted by  $S_\Sigma$ . To account for transitions where  $f(x, u) \notin \mathcal{X}$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we add an absorbing state  $x_{\text{abs}}$  to the state set of  $S_\Sigma$ , where  $f(x_{\text{abs}}, u) = x_{\text{abs}}$  for all  $u$  and with a unique output label  $y_{\text{abs}}$ . We assume  $S_\Sigma$  satisfies Assumption 6.

**Assumption 6**  $S_\Sigma$  has free input, i.e.  $U_\delta(x) = \mathcal{U}$  for all  $x$ , is deterministic: in short  $|Post_u(x)| = 1$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , and has  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X}$ .

The assumption that  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{X}$  simplifies our notation in that it implies that the horizon  $H$  does not affect the definition of (5) and (6), since every  $\ell$ -sequence that the system can generate at any point in time, can also be generated as an initial sequence. Formally, it holds that  $\mathcal{E}_{\ell, \ell+1}(x) = \mathcal{E}_{\ell, H}(x)$  for every  $H > \ell$ . Moreover,  $\bigcup_x \mathcal{E}_{\ell, H}(x) = \Pi_{\ell, H}$ . From now on, we drop the second subscript and denote the CESs strings of a state  $x$  simply as  $\mathcal{E}_\ell(x)$  and the set of all  $\ell$ -sequences of all external behaviors as  $\Pi_\ell$ . The case with  $\mathcal{X}_0 \neq \mathcal{X}$  follows *mutatis mutandis* with no conceptual modifications.

### 3.1 Systems' Relations

We recall two essential concepts: the *alternating simulation relation* (ASR) and the *simulation relation* (SR) [25,24]. The ASR is crucial for refining a policy derived from an abstraction into a controller for the concrete system. As in [24], we define an observation to include both input and output, unlike the more common definition where only the output is observed. This broader observation allows for constructing a more refined abstraction. For simplicity, we assume that the abstraction and the concrete system share the same input space.

**Definition 7 (Simulation relation (SR) [24])** Consider two non-blocking systems  $S_a$  and  $S_b$  with  $\mathcal{Y}_a = \mathcal{Y}_b$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_a = \mathcal{U}_b$ . A relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b$  is a simulation relation from  $S_a$  to  $S_b$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , written  $S_a \preceq_S^{\mathcal{R}} S_b$ , if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- $\forall x_{a0} \in \mathcal{X}_{a0} . \exists x_{b0} \in \mathcal{X}_{b0}$  with  $(x_{a0}, x_{b0}) \in \mathcal{R}$ ,
- $(x_a, x_b) \in \mathcal{R} \implies \mathcal{H}_a(x_a) = \mathcal{H}_b(x_b)$ ,
- $(x_a, x_b) \in \mathcal{R} \implies (U_{\delta_a}(x_a) \subseteq U_{\delta_b}(x_b) \wedge \forall u \in U_{\delta_a}(x_a) . (x_a, u, x'_a) \in \delta_a \implies \exists x'_b \in \mathcal{X}_b . (x_b, u, x'_b) \in \delta_b \wedge (x'_a, x'_b) \in \mathcal{R})$ .

**Definition 8 (Alternating simulation relation (ASR) [25])** Consider two non-blocking systems  $S_a$  and  $S_b$  with  $\mathcal{Y}_a = \mathcal{Y}_b$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_a = \mathcal{U}_b$ . A relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_b \times \mathcal{X}_a$  is an alternating simulation relation from  $S_b$  to  $S_a$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , written  $S_b \preceq_{A.S}^{\mathcal{R}} S_a$ , if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- $\forall x_{b0} \in \mathcal{X}_{b0} . \exists x_{a0} \in \mathcal{X}_{a0}$  with  $(x_{b0}, x_{a0}) \in \mathcal{R}$ ,
- $(x_b, x_a) \in \mathcal{R} \implies \mathcal{H}_a(x_b) = \mathcal{H}_b(x_a)$ ,
- $(x_b, x_a) \in \mathcal{R} \implies (U_{\delta_b}(x_b) \subseteq U_{\delta_a}(x_a) \wedge \forall u \in U_{\delta_b}(x_b) . (x_b, u, x'_b) \in \delta_b \implies \exists x'_a \in \mathcal{X}_a . (x_a, u, x'_a) \in \delta_a \wedge (x'_b, x'_a) \in \mathcal{R})$ .

Observe that, both definitions require that at every step the inputs in the two systems must match.

### 3.2 Strongest Asynchronous $\ell$ -complete Abstractions

In [23,24] the authors introduce a particular class of abstractions known as SALCA, here adapted and reformulated as a TS. One of the advantages of the SALCA is that for its construction we only require the knowledge of the external behaviors, i.e. without the knowledge of the internal mechanisms of the underlying model, motivating our interest in this specific class when combined with data-driven techniques.

**Definition 9 (SALCA [24])** Let  $S \doteq (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{U}, \delta, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{H})$  be a TS satisfying Assumption 6, and consider  $\Pi_\ell$  and  $\Pi_{\ell+1}$ . The TS  $S_\ell \doteq (\mathcal{X}_\ell, \mathcal{X}_{\ell 0}, \mathcal{U}, \delta_\ell, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{H}_\ell)$  is the SALCA of  $S$ , where  $\mathcal{X}_\ell \doteq \Pi_\ell$  is the state set,  $\mathcal{X}_{\ell 0} \doteq \{\zeta \in \Pi_\ell : \exists \xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S) . \mathcal{H}(\xi[1-\ell, 0]) = \zeta\}$  is the set of initial states,  $H_\ell(\zeta) \doteq \zeta(\ell)$  is the output map, and the transition relation is given by

$$\delta_\ell \doteq \{(\zeta, u, \zeta') : \zeta[1, \ell] = \zeta'[0, \ell-1] \wedge \zeta'|^u(\ell-1) = u \wedge \zeta \cdot \zeta'[\ell-1, \ell] \in \Pi_{\ell+1}\}.$$

The state set of the SALCA consists of  $\ell$ -sequences of the system  $S$ . The transition relation  $\delta_\ell$  specifies a transition between two  $\ell$ -sequences  $\zeta = y_0 u_0 \dots u_{\ell-1} y_\ell$  and  $\zeta' = y'_0 u'_0 \dots u'_{\ell-1} y'_\ell$  with input  $u$  if the suffix of  $\zeta$ , i.e.,  $y_1 u_1 \dots u_{\ell-1} y_\ell$ , matches the prefix of  $\zeta'$ , i.e.,  $y'_0 u'_0 \dots u'_{\ell-2} y'_{\ell-1}$ ,  $u'_{\ell-1} = u$ , and if the concatenation  $y_0 u_0 \dots y'_\ell$  belongs to  $\Pi_{\ell+1}$ , meaning it is an  $\ell+1$ -long




Fig. 2. Illustration of the SALCA for the system described in Example 5 for  $\ell = 0$ ,  $S_0$  (left) and  $\ell = 1$ ,  $S_1$ , (right), derived using the set  $\Pi_{1,4}$  and  $\Pi_{2,4}$  respectively.

subsequence of some  $H$ -long external behavior  $\gamma$ . This rule is known as the *domino rule*. Since the SALCA overapproximates  $S$ , the value of  $\ell$  determines the precision of the abstraction: larger  $\ell$  values lead to tighter approximations, formally,  $\mathcal{B}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(S_{\ell+1}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(S_\ell)$ . Note that  $\Pi_\ell$  can be easily derived from  $\Pi_{\ell+1}$ . Referring to Example 5, the corresponding SALCAs with  $\ell = 0$  and  $\ell = 1$  is shown in Fig. 2.

The choice of abstracting the system as a SALCA is motivated by the following properties: (i.) Knowledge of  $\Pi_{\ell+1}$ , derived from all external behaviors of  $S$ , is sufficient to construct the SALCA. (ii.) The set of CES can be defined based on either the *past* or the *future* of a state; defining CES based on the *future* external behaviors is another valid approach, see [24]. (iii.) When CES is defined based on the *past*, as in (6), the relation

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}_\ell : \zeta \in \mathcal{E}_\ell(x)\} \quad (8)$$

is a SR (w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$ ) from  $S$  to  $S_\ell$  and the inverse relation  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$  is an ASR from  $S_\ell$  to  $S$  provided  $S$  has free input. This last claim is suggested in [24, Sec. V.D] but not formally proven. For completeness we formalize the claim in the next proposition, proved in the Appendix.

**Proposition 10** Consider a system  $S$ , let  $S_\ell$  be its SALCA as per Definition 9 and let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the relation defined in (8). Then  $\mathcal{R}$  is SR from  $S$  to  $S_\ell$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Further, if  $S$  has free input,  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$  is an ASR from  $S_\ell$  to  $S$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$ .

In Section 4, we demonstrate how to construct a data-driven version of relation (8) and establish a similar connection with the inverse relation. We conclude by noting that defining CES based on the past means that  $\mathcal{R}$  does not need to be known explicitly. Once the SALCA is constructed, if  $(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$  and applying input  $u$  causes the system to transition from  $x$  to  $x'$  with observation  $\mathcal{H}(x')$ , it automatically follows that there is a transition in  $S_\ell$  from  $\zeta$  to  $\zeta'$  where  $\zeta'[\ell - 1, \ell] \doteq \zeta(\ell)u\mathcal{H}(x')$  and  $(x', \zeta') \in \mathcal{R}$ .

#### 4 Data-driven Abstractions

Constructing a SALCA typically requires knowledge of all possible external behaviors of the system, which can be costly in practice. To address this, we aim to build an abstraction using only sampled external behaviors.

Given a system  $S_a$ , we define the random variable  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a : \mathcal{X}_{a0} \rightarrow \wp(\mathcal{I}_H(S_a))$

$$i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a \doteq \mathcal{I}_H(S_a, x_{a0}, \mathbf{u}_H). \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) defines the set of full behaviors of  $S_a$  for a given  $\mathbf{u}_H$ , starting from the randomly chosen initial condition  $x_{a0}$ . For deterministic systems,  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a$  is a singleton, while for nondeterministic systems, it may be a set of behaviors. Given a system  $S_b$  and a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b$  we define the random variable  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b : \mathcal{X}_{a0} \rightarrow \wp(\mathcal{I}_H(S_b))$

$$i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b \doteq \bigcup_{x_{b0} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_b}(x_{a0}) \cap \mathcal{X}_{b0}} \mathcal{I}_H(S_b, x_{b0}, \mathbf{u}_H), \quad (10)$$

which describes the set of full behaviors of  $S_b$ , for a given  $\mathbf{u}_H$ , starting from all initial conditions that are related to  $x_{a0}$  through  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Using only *sampled* behaviors results in an *approximation* of the SALCA, where only a subset of  $\Pi_{\ell+1}$  is available. We therefore generalize the concept of (alternating) simulation relations to account for randomly sampled initial conditions, introducing the notion of *probabilistic* (alternating) simulation relations.

**Definition 11 (Probabilistic simulation relation (PSR))** Consider two non-blocking systems  $S_a$  and  $S_b$  with  $\mathcal{Y}_a = \mathcal{Y}_b$  and  $\mathcal{U}_a = \mathcal{U}_b = \mathcal{U}$ , and a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b$ . Given the probability space  $(\mathcal{X}_{a0}, \mathcal{G}_a, \mu_{x_a})$ , for a fixed  $\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H$ , and with  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a$  and  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b$  defined as in (9) and (10),  $\mathcal{R}$  is a probabilistic simulation relation from  $S_a$  to  $S_b$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  until horizon  $H$  with probability not less than  $1 - \epsilon$  if

$$\mu_{x_a}(x_{a0} \in \mathcal{V}(S_b, \mathcal{R}, H)) \leq \epsilon, \quad (11)$$

where the violation set  $\mathcal{V}(S_b, \mathcal{R}, H)$  is defined

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(S_b, \mathcal{R}, H) \doteq \{x_{a0} : \exists \mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H \cdot i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a \neq \emptyset \wedge \\ \exists \xi_a \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a \cdot (\nexists \xi_b \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b \cdot \mathcal{H}_a(\xi_a) = \mathcal{H}_b(\xi_b) \wedge \\ \forall k \geq 0 \cdot (\xi_a(k), \xi_b(k)) \in \mathcal{R})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

More compactly, we write  $\mu_{x_a}(S_a \stackrel{H}{\underset{\mathcal{R}}{\preceq}} S_b) > 1 - \epsilon$ , where  $\stackrel{H}{\underset{\mathcal{R}}{\preceq}}$  highlights that the probabilistic simulation relation is referring to the relation  $\mathcal{R}$  and to a time horizon  $H$ .

**Definition 12 (Probabilistic alternating simulation relation (PASR))** Under the same conditions of Definition 11, we say that  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_b \times \mathcal{X}_a$  is a probabilistic alternating simulation relation from  $S_b$  to  $S_a$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  until horizon  $H$  with probability greater than  $1 - \epsilon$  if

$$\mu_{x_a}(x_{a0} \in \mathcal{Q}(S_b, \mathcal{Z}, H)) \leq \epsilon, \quad (13)$$

where the violation set  $\mathcal{Q}(S_b, \mathcal{Z}, H)$  is defined

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(S_b, \mathcal{Z}, H) \doteq \{x_{a0} : \exists \mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H \cdot i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b \neq \emptyset \wedge (i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a = \emptyset \vee \\ \exists \xi_a \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a \cdot (\nexists \xi_b \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b \cdot \mathcal{H}_a(\xi_a) = \mathcal{H}_b(\xi_b) \wedge \\ \forall k \geq 0 \cdot (\xi_a(k), \xi_b(k)) \in \mathcal{Z})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b$  is defined as per (10) considering the relation  $\mathcal{Z}^{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b$ . More compactly, we write  $\mu_{x_a}(S_b \stackrel{H}{\underset{A.S.}{\preceq}} \mathcal{Z} S_a) > 1 - \epsilon$ , where  $\stackrel{H}{\underset{A.S.}{\preceq}}$  highlights that the probabilistic alternating simulation relation is referring to the relation  $\mathcal{Z}$  and to a time horizon  $H$ .

Expressions (11)-(12) bound the probability of drawing an initial condition  $x_{a0}$  such that there exists an input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$ , *admissible* for  $S_a$ , which generates at least one full  $H$ -behavior  $\xi_a$  in  $S_a$  that cannot be related to any  $\xi_b$  in  $S_b$  by  $\mathcal{R}$ . Expressions (13)-(14) bound the probability of drawing an initial condition  $x_{a0}$  such that there exists an input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$ , *admissible* for  $S_b$ , which either generates at least one full  $H$ -behavior  $\xi_a$  that can't be related to any  $\xi_b$  by  $\mathcal{Z}$ , or no full  $H$ -behavior at all, if  $\mathbf{u}_H$  is inadmissible for  $S_a$ . The key difference is in the validity of the input sequence: in the first case,  $\mathbf{u}_H(k)$  must belong to the set  $U_a(\xi_a(k))$ , ensuring  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a \neq \emptyset$ , in the second case it belongs to  $U_b(\xi_b(k))$ , ensuring  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b \neq \emptyset$ . The condition  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a = \emptyset$  in (14) captures initial conditions where  $\mathbf{u}_H$  generates behaviors in  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^b$  but not in  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^a$ , that is  $\mathbf{u}_H$  is inadmissible for  $S_a$  starting at  $x_{a0}$ .

**Remark 13** *If the violation sets (12) and (14) are empty for every choice of  $H$ , then  $\epsilon = 0$ , and Definitions 7 and 8 are equivalent to Definitions 11 and 12, respectively. In this scenario, the difference between the two pairs of definitions is purely notational: the first two use transition-based requirements, while the latter two employ trajectory-based requirements, as in [4, Lem. 1], which are often easier to handle in finite horizon settings.*

#### 4.1 Constructing the Data-driven Abstraction

Consider the probability spaces  $(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{G}, \mu_x)$ ,  $(\mathcal{U}^H, \mathcal{F}, \mu_{\mathbf{u}_H})$ : when sampling the system  $S_\Sigma$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$  and  $\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H$  we assume to have access only to the external  $H$ -behavior of the system, that is  $\mathcal{B}_H(S_\Sigma, x, \mathbf{u}_H)$ : note that by Assumption 6, the latter is necessarily a singleton. In order to construct a data-driven SALCA of  $S_\Sigma$  we pursue a *random exploration* of the system's external behaviors, using random initial conditions and input sequences. In other words, we draw  $N$  i.i.d. pairs  $(x^i, \mathbf{u}_H^i)$  according to the product probability measure  $\mu_p$ , and we obtain the set of sampled external behaviors

$$D \doteq \{\mathcal{B}_H(S_\Sigma, x^i, \mathbf{u}_H^i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}. \quad (15)$$

For  $\ell < H$  we denote by  $\hat{\Pi}_\ell$  the set of all witnessed subsequences of length  $\ell$ , that is

$$\hat{\Pi}_\ell \doteq \bigcup_{\gamma \in D} \bigcup_{k \in [0, H]} \gamma[k - \ell, k]. \quad (16)$$

From now on we use the symbol  $\hat{\cdot}$  as shown above to denote the quantities depending on the  $N$  samples drawn according to  $\mu_p$ . We are now ready to define the data-driven SALCA.

**Definition 14 (Data-driven SALCA)** *Given  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ , the TS  $\hat{S}_\ell = (\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\ell,0}, \mathcal{U}, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}_\ell)$  is called the data-driven (strongest asynchronous)  $\ell$ -complete abstraction*

(SALCA) of  $S_\Sigma$ , where  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\ell \doteq \hat{\Pi}_\ell$  is the state set,  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{\ell,0} \doteq \{\zeta \in \hat{\Pi}_\ell : \exists \xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S) \cdot \mathcal{H}(\xi[1 - \ell, 0]) = \zeta\}$  is the initial set, and the transition relation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}_\ell &\doteq \{(\zeta, u, \zeta') : \zeta[1, \ell] = \zeta'[0, \ell - 1] \wedge \\ &\zeta'^u(\ell - 1) = u \wedge \zeta \cdot \zeta'[\ell - 1, \ell] \in \Pi_{\ell+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Trivially,  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1} \subseteq \Pi_{\ell+1}$ . In the following, we show how to derive a PASR from  $\hat{S}_\ell$  to  $S_\Sigma$  until horizon  $H$  with probability not lower than  $1 - \epsilon$  up to some confidence  $\beta$ .

**Remark 15** *Constructing the SALCA using the set of sampled behaviors  $D$  entails solving a scenario program [11]. Its complexity  $s_N^*$  is the cardinality of the smallest subset of  $D$  (15) which would result in the same set of all witnessed  $(\ell + 1)$ -sequences  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ . To highlight the dependency of the complexity on the parameter  $\ell$  from here on we denote it by  $s_{N,\ell}^*$ . One may use Theorem 2 using any upper bound of  $s_{N,\ell}^*$ ; a close estimate of its value can be obtained using a greedy set cover algorithm.*

The following lemma is a simple consequences of the definition above, and its proof is omitted.

**Lemma 16** *Consider  $S_\Sigma$ , its data-driven SALCA  $\hat{S}_\ell$  constructed from the set  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$  and the relation*

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}} \doteq \{(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_\ell : \zeta \in \mathcal{E}_\ell(x)\}. \quad (17)$$

*If  $(x, \zeta) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $(x, u, x') \in \delta$  with  $\mathcal{H}(x') = y$  then there exists  $(\zeta, u, \zeta') \in \hat{\delta}_\ell$  with  $\mathcal{H}(\zeta') = y$  and  $(x', \zeta') \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}$  if and only if  $\zeta \cdot \zeta'[\ell - 1, \ell] \in \hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$  with  $\zeta'^u(\ell - 1) = u$ .*

By Lemma 16, if a state trajectory of  $S_\Sigma$  results in the same external behavior of a state trajectory of the SALCA at every time step the pair given by the state of the former and the state of the latter are in  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ .

**Lemma 17** *Consider  $S_\Sigma$ , a confidence  $\beta$  and the data-driven SALCA constructed from  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ . It holds that*

$$\mu_p^N(\mu_p((x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \mathcal{T}(\hat{S}_\ell, H)) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \beta, \quad (18)$$

*where the violation set is  $\mathcal{T}(\hat{S}_\ell, H) \doteq \{(x, \mathbf{u}_H) : \mathcal{B}_H(S_\Sigma, x, \mathbf{u}_H) \notin \mathcal{B}_H(\hat{S}_\ell)\}$ , and  $\epsilon \doteq \epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N)$  as defined in Theorem 2.*

Lemma 17, detailed in the Appendix, provides an upper bound on the probability that a sampled external behavior from the concrete system does not belong to the set of external behaviors of the data-driven SALCA. This is related to the concept of *behavioral inclusion* [25]: if the set of all behaviors of one system includes the set of all behaviors of another, we say the first system behaviorally includes the second. If (18) holds, [10] indicates

that  $\hat{S}_\ell$  behaviorally includes  $S_\Sigma$  until horizon  $H$  with probability greater than  $1 - \epsilon$ .

Lemma 17 follows from [8, Section V.C.], where  $N$  samples are drawn from a countable alphabet, identifying unique symbols and bounding the probability of unseen symbols not among the  $N$  samples. We extend this by associating each  $(\ell + 1)$ -sequence with a unique symbol, thus each sample in (15) produces a *set* of symbols; we then bound the probability of drawing a new behavior in  $\mathcal{B}_H(S_\Sigma)$  containing an uncollected  $(\ell + 1)$ -sequence, corresponding to a behavior absent in  $\mathcal{B}_H(\hat{S}_\ell)$ .

For the sample complexity of (18), while the scenario approach for convex optimization with non-degenerate constraints has a sample complexity of  $O(\epsilon^{-1} \ln(\beta^{-1}))$  [9], we consider a finite sample space ( $\mathcal{B}_H(S_\Sigma)$ ) and use recent results on degenerate problems [14]. Here, the quantity  $s_{N,\ell}^*$ , observed *a posteriori*, connects  $N$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\epsilon$ . For fixed  $\beta$  and  $N$ , the violation probability is higher when all  $N$  drawn symbols are distinct ( $s_{N,\ell}^* = N$ ) than when they are identical ( $s_{N,\ell}^* = 1$ ) [8, Section V.C.].

In our case, two factors influence the complexity  $s_{N,\ell}^*$ . The first, is the “intrinsic richness” of a system’s external behaviors: for two systems  $S$  and  $S'$  where  $|\mathcal{B}_H(S)| > |\mathcal{B}_H(S')|$  and the probability of each external behavior is uniformly distributed, we can expect that the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$  of  $S$  will result in a higher complexity than that of  $S'$ . The second factor is  $\ell$ : reducing  $\ell$  decreases the alphabet size and  $s_{N,\ell}^*$ , tightening the scenario bounds: referring to Fig. 2, note how the state set (and the number of transitions) of  $S_0$  is smaller than that of  $S_1$ . However, a smaller  $\ell$  may reduce the  $\text{SALCA}$ ’s precision, as it introduces potential spurious behaviors not present in the original system. For example, in Fig. 2, the behavior  $y_1 u_a y_2 u_b y_2 u_a y_1$  is possible in  $S_1$  and  $S_0$  but not in the original system, while  $y_1 u_a y_2 u_a$  is possible in  $S_0$  but not in  $S_1$  or the original system. Larger  $\ell$  values reduce such spurious behaviors.

Finally, we show that Lemmas 16 and 17 allow us to bound the probability measure of pairs  $(x, \mathbf{u}_H)$  resulting in an internal behavior of  $S_\Sigma$  that cannot be related by  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$  to one of the abstraction  $\hat{S}_\ell$ .

**Proposition 18** Consider  $S_\Sigma$ , the product probability space  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{W}, \mu_p)$  of  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G}, \mu_x)$  and  $(\mathcal{U}^H, \mathcal{F}, \mu_{\mathbf{u}_H})$ , and the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$   $\hat{S}_\ell$  obtained from the set  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ . Given a confidence parameter  $\beta$ , it holds that

$$\mu_p^N(\mu_p((x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \beta \quad (19)$$

where  $\epsilon \doteq \epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N)$  as defined in (2), and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H) &\doteq \{(x, \mathbf{u}_H) : \exists \xi \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H} \cdot (\nexists \xi_\ell \in i_{\mathbf{u}_H}^\ell \cdot \\ \mathcal{H}(\xi) &= \mathcal{H}_\ell(\xi_\ell) \wedge \forall k \geq 0 \cdot (\xi(k), \xi_\ell(k)) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}})\} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

**PROOF.** First, we show that the probability of drawing a pair  $(x, \mathbf{u}_H)$  resulting in an external  $H$ -behavior not contained in the set of all external  $H$ -behaviors of  $\hat{S}_\ell$  is bounded by  $\epsilon$  with confidence  $1 - \beta$ . Consider

the random variable  $w_{x, \mathbf{u}_H} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_H(S)$  defined as  $w(x, \mathbf{u}_H) \doteq \mathcal{B}_H(S, x, \mathbf{u}_H)$ . From Lemma 17,  $\mu_p^N(\mu_p((x, \mathbf{u}_H) : w(x, \mathbf{u}_H) \notin \mathcal{B}_H(\hat{S}_\ell)) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \beta$ . Suppose that  $(x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$ : by Lemma 16, this implies that  $w(x, \mathbf{u}_H) \notin \mathcal{B}_H(\hat{S}_\ell)$ . Since the negation of the latter holds with probability greater than  $1 - \epsilon$  then the negation of the former holds with at least the same probability, up to a confidence of at least  $1 - \beta$ .

The distinction between the sets  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$ , as defined in (12) (considering  $S_b = \hat{S}_\ell$ ) is subtle but important. The first set includes *pairs*  $(x, \mathbf{u}_H)$  that lead to an external behavior in the concrete system absent in the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$ . The second set includes *states*  $x$  for which there *exists* an input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$  causing an external behavior in the concrete system not present in the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$ . However, for the guarantees in Proposition 18 to hold, pairs  $(x, \mathbf{u}_H)$  must be drawn according to the product measure  $\mu_p$ , meaning both the initial condition  $x$  and the input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$  must be randomly sampled. Since our goal is to create an abstraction suitable for control, we need the flexibility to select inputs arbitrarily after constructing the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$ , rather than being constrained by the probability distribution  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$ . We expand the result of Proposition 18 to cover arbitrarily chosen control sequences.

**Proposition 19** Consider  $S_\Sigma$ , the product probability space  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{W}, \mu_p)$  of  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G}, \mu_x)$  and  $(\mathcal{U}^H, \mathcal{F}, \mu_{\mathbf{u}_H})$ , and the data-driven  $\text{SALCA}$   $\hat{S}_\ell$  obtained from the set  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ . If  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$  is uniformly distributed, given a confidence  $\beta$ , with  $\bar{\epsilon} = \min(1, \epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H|)$  it holds that

$$\mu_p^N(\mu_x(S_\Sigma \stackrel{H}{\prec}_{\hat{\mathcal{R}}} \hat{S}_\ell) > 1 - \bar{\epsilon}) \geq 1 - \beta. \quad (21)$$

**PROOF.** For brevity, let  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  represent the sets  $\mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$ , as defined in (12), and  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$ , as defined in (20). In Proposition 18 we have shown that  $\mu_p^N(\mu_p((x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \beta$ . We define the set  $J(x) \doteq \{\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H : (x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}\}$ . Let  $c$  and  $z$  be the densities of  $\mu_x$  and  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$  respectively. Then,

$$\mu_p((x, \mathbf{u}_H) \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} c(x) \int_{J(x)} z(\mathbf{u}_H) d\mathbf{u}_H dx \quad (22)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{V}} c(x) \frac{|J(x)|}{|\mathcal{U}^H|} dx \geq \int_{\mathcal{V}} \frac{c(x)}{|\mathcal{U}^H|} dx = \frac{\mu_x(x \in \mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{U}^H|}, \quad (23)$$

from which follows the thesis  $\mu_x(x \in \mathcal{V}) \leq \epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H|$ , holding with a probability of at least  $1 - \beta$ .

Proposition 19 states that the probability of drawing an initial condition in  $\mathcal{V}$ —where there *exists* an input  $\mathbf{u}_H$  that generates an external behavior not related by  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$  to one in the  $\text{SALCA}$ —is bounded, up to a given confidence. In other words, after sampling  $N$  independent  $H$ -long external behaviors according to  $\mu_p = \mu_x \times \mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$

to construct  $\hat{S}_\ell$ , Proposition 19 establishes a PSR from the concrete system to the abstraction, up to some confidence. If  $x \notin \mathcal{V}$ , any arbitrary input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H$  will generate an external behavior that exists in the (data-driven) SAℓCA; Thus, after constructing the abstraction, control actions in  $S_\Sigma$  can be chosen arbitrarily, not constrained by the uniform distribution  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$ . This property is crucial for the next step, where we show that control actions can be chosen using the SAℓCA once a PASR from the SAℓCA to the concrete system is established.

**Remark 20** *Proposition 19 assumes that  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$  is uniform. The same reasoning applies to other measures, provided the smallest non-zero probability assigned to an element  $\mathcal{U}^H$  is known. However, if  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$  is selectable, the bound in (23) is tightest with the uniform measure.*

Next, we claim that  $\hat{\mathcal{Z}} \doteq (\hat{\mathcal{R}})^{-1}$  defines a PASR.

**Corollary 21** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 19,  $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}$  defines a PASR from  $\hat{S}_\ell$  to  $S_\Sigma$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  until horizon  $H$  with probability not less than  $1 - \bar{\epsilon}$ , with  $\bar{\epsilon} = \min(1, \epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H|)$ , with confidence greater than  $1 - \beta$ , that is*

$$\mu_p^N(\mu_x(\hat{S}_\ell \stackrel{H}{\preceq}_{A.S.} S_\Sigma) > 1 - \bar{\epsilon}) \geq 1 - \beta. \quad (24)$$

**PROOF.** From Proposition 19 we know with confidence  $1 - \beta$  that  $\mu_x(x \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)) \leq \epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H|$ . Hence, it is sufficient to show that  $\mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H) \supseteq \mathcal{Q}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{Z}}, H)$ . Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{Q}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{Z}}, H)$ : since  $S_\Sigma$  has free input, any  $\mathbf{u}_H$  satisfying the first line of (14) is an admissible sequence of inputs for  $S_\Sigma$ , hence  $i_{\mathbf{u}_H} \neq \emptyset$ , which implies that  $x \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)$ .

Once we have established the PASR between the data-driven SAℓCA and the concrete system, we can adopt classical synthesis methods to design a controller enforcing a desired specification, see e.g. [25].

## 5 Beyond the Sampling Horizon

So far, the only assumption made on the system's dynamics is Assumption 6, which is general enough to apply to most black-box or *unknown* systems. We have shown that, with a dataset of trajectories of length  $H$ , we can derive a PAC bound for a PASR between the abstraction and the concrete system for horizon  $H$ . In this section, we extend these guarantees to horizons beyond  $H$ . As demonstrated in [10], without further assumptions, nontrivial bounds for larger horizons are unattainable. Therefore, we introduce *partially known* systems, adding assumptions to provide sufficient conditions for extending the horizon of guarantees. These are less general than Assumption 6 but still fairly broad.

Consider the implications of  $\mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H) \neq \emptyset$ . Recall that  $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_\ell \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}_\ell$ . If  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1} = \Pi_{\ell+1}$ , then, as stated in Section 3.2,  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_\ell = \mathcal{X}_\ell$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$ , since

the data-driven SAℓCA coincides with the (complete) SAℓCA. The converse also holds. The set  $\mathcal{V}$  can be alternatively expressed as the union of equivalence classes of the *missing*  $\ell + 1$ -sequences, i.e., those in  $\Pi_{\ell+1} \setminus \hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H) &= \{x_0 \in \mathcal{X} : \exists \mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H, \exists \xi \in \\ &\quad \mathcal{I}_H(S, x, \mathbf{u}_H), \exists k \geq 0. \xi'(k) \in \mathcal{K}\}, \quad (25) \\ \mathcal{K} &\doteq \bigcup_{\zeta \in \Pi_{\ell+1} \setminus \hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}} [\zeta]. \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that the probability measure  $\mu_x$  assigns to the set of initial conditions that can visit an equivalence class  $[w_{\ell+1}] \notin \hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ —those not captured during sampling—is bounded by  $\epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H|$ . Given that the data-driven SAℓCA was constructed using a set of sampled  $H$ -long external behaviors  $D$ , we now examine how this bound changes when considering the probability of visiting an  $\ell$ -sequence not acquired during sampling over a horizon  $H + T$ , with  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . To do so, we analyze the change in measure under the system's time-reversed dynamics, leading to the lemma detailed in Appendix A.

**Lemma 22** *Given a compact set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $p$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|_p : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and a function  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\|g(x) - g(x')\|_p \leq L\|x - x'\|_p$ , if for constants  $c, q > 0$  it holds that  $q^{-1}\|x - x'\|_p \leq \|x - x'\|_2 \leq c\|x - x'\|_p$  for all  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ , then for any Riemann integrable set  $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  it holds that  $\int_{g(\Sigma)} dV \leq (cLq)^n \int_\Sigma dV$ .*

**Assumption 23** *The map  $f$  in (1) is Lipschitz invertible, where the distance is induced by the  $p$ -norm on  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

**Proposition 24** *Let  $\mu_x$  and  $\mu_{\mathbf{u}_H}$  be the uniform probability measures on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$  and  $(\mathcal{U}^H, \mathcal{F})$  respectively. Consider  $S_\Sigma$  with  $\Sigma$  satisfying Assumption 23, and the data-driven SAℓCA  $\hat{S}_\ell$  obtained from  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ . For any positive integer  $T$  it holds that*

$$\mu_x(S_\Sigma \stackrel{T+H}{\preceq}_{\hat{S}_\ell} \hat{S}_\ell) \leq \nu(\lambda) \mu_x(S_\Sigma \stackrel{H}{\preceq}_{\hat{S}_\ell} \hat{S}_\ell) \quad (27)$$

where

$$\nu(\lambda) \doteq \begin{cases} 1 + \lambda^T \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \lambda^{-i(H+1)} & \text{for } \lambda \geq 1, \\ \lambda^T + \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \lambda^{i(H+1)} & \text{for } 0 < \lambda < 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\tau = \lceil (H + T + 1)/(H + 1) \rceil - 1, \quad \lambda = |\mathcal{U}| \left( \frac{cq}{m_X} \right)^n,$$

and  $c, q$  and  $m_X^{-1} = L$  are defined as in Lemma 22.

Proposition 24, proved in the Appendix, connects the probability of selecting an initial condition that leads to a new behavior, absent in  $\hat{S}_\ell$ , within the time horizon  $H$  used to construct the data-driven SAℓCA, with the probability of this occurring over a horizon *greater* than  $H$ . Note that Assumption 23, and in particular the value






Fig. 3. Plot of  $\nu$  with  $\lambda = 0.5$  (left) and  $\lambda = 1.5$  (right) for different values of  $T$  and  $H$ .

$m_X$ , is not linked to the stability of  $\Sigma$  and it is satisfied by a broad set of nonlinear stable/unstable systems. Fig. 3 shows the function  $\nu$  for different parameters.

### 5.1 Contracting Systems

For the class of contracting systems, it is possible to show that there exists a time  $H$  after which they always produce the same output.

**Assumption 25** *The map  $f$  of the  $\Sigma$  described in (1), is uniformly contracting w.r.t.  $x$  with constant  $l_X$ , uniformly Lipschitz w.r.t.  $u$  with constant  $l_U$ , and there exist  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  s.t.  $f(x^*, u^*) = x^*$ .*

For instance, contractive control-affine systems satisfy Assumption 25 ( $f(x, u)$  depends linearly on  $u$  for a fixed  $x$ ). The following lemma can be easily derived using the triangular inequality for distances.

**Lemma 26** *If  $f$  satisfies Assumption 25, then*

$$d(x_k, x^*) \leq l_X^k d(x_0, x^*) + \frac{l_U}{1 - l_X} \max_{0 \leq i < k} \{d(u_i, u^*)\}. \quad (28)$$

**Proposition 27** *Let  $\Sigma$  satisfying Assumption 25. If there exist a  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $r > \rho$  s.t. for all  $x \in B(x^*, r)$  it holds that  $h(x_k) = y^*$  then for any  $H \geq \bar{k}$  the data-driven SALCA  $\hat{S}_\ell$  of  $S_\Sigma$  satisfies*

$$\mu_x(S \stackrel{H}{\underset{S}{\prec}} \hat{S}_\ell) = \mu_x(S \stackrel{\bar{k}}{\underset{S}{\prec}} \hat{S}_\ell) \quad (29)$$

where

$$\bar{k} = \lceil \log_{l_X} (r - \rho) - \log_{l_X} \psi \rceil, \\ \psi = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, x^*), \quad \rho = \frac{l_U}{1 - l_X} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} d(u, 0).$$

**PROOF.** After  $\bar{k}$  time steps the distance of any trajectory's state  $x_k$  from  $x^*$  is smaller than  $r$ , by Corollary 26 we know that  $x_i$  will remain within that distance for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Moreover, by assumption of the proposition we have  $h(x_k) = y^*$  for all such  $x$ 's. Thus, the next input-output pairs are  $(u, y^*)$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .

The proposition assures that, if there exists a sufficiently large ball around the fixed point of  $f$ , where all points have the same output, the contractivity of the flow  $f$  allows us to determine when all trajectories enter the ball. Hence, if an initial condition does not belong to the violation set defined in the right-hand side of (29), then neither will it belong to the violation set defined in the left-hand side.

**Remark 28** *If the initial conditions of the system can be selected arbitrarily and not following a distribution, and if the Lipschitz constant of the system is known, other methodologies to construct an abstraction are available, see e.g. [2].*

### 5.2 Autonomous Systems

In [10] we provide a framework for the construction of the data-driven SALCA of an autonomous system, which, for example, can be utilized for verifying whether a linear temporal logic formula holds. As a special case, (1) is autonomous if  $|\mathcal{U}| = 1$ . Through Proposition 18 we obtain a guarantee that  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$  is a PSR from  $S_\Sigma$  to  $\hat{S}_\ell$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  until horizon  $H$  with probability not less than  $1 - \epsilon$  (with confidence  $\beta$ ). Lemma 17 implies that  $\hat{S}_\ell$  behaviorally includes  $S_\Sigma$  until horizon  $H$  with the same probability, as per [10, Definition 4]. In summary, we recover the guarantees provided by [10, Proposition 2].

## 6 Experimental Evaluation

**A Linear System** Let us consider the linear system  $x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k$ , where  $\mathcal{U} = \{-0.3, 0, 0.3\}$ ,

$$A = \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ -1.8 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

The state space  $\mathcal{X} = [-3, 3]^2$  is partitioned into 9 regions by a uniform grid, each uniquely labeled and defining the output set  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

We sample  $N = 2 \cdot 10^6$  initial conditions  $(x_0, \mathbf{u}_H)$  uniformly, with  $H = 4$  and  $\ell = 2$ . The sampling process returns  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ , containing 342 sequences, and we construct the corresponding abstraction. Setting  $\beta = 10^{-6}$ , we compute the scenario bounds according to Proposition 18,  $\epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N) = 1.51 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . Additionally, by Corollary 21, with confidence at least  $1 - \beta$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}$  defines a PASR from the abstraction to the concrete system with respect to  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  until horizon  $H$  with probability not less than  $1 - \bar{\epsilon}$ , where  $\bar{\epsilon} \doteq \epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N) |\mathcal{U}^H| = 1.23 \cdot 10^{-2}$ . In order to extend the guarantees from horizon  $H = 4$  to any finite horizon we employ Proposition 27. Using the parameters  $l_X \simeq 0.56$ ,  $\psi \simeq 4.24$ ,  $l_U = 1$ ,  $\rho \simeq 0.68$ ,  $r = 1$ , we obtained  $\bar{k} = 5$ . We then construct a new abstraction after collecting  $N = 10^6$  trajectories with horizon  $H' = 5$ . In

line with the discussion in Section 5, we conclude that  $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}$  defines a PASR from the abstraction to the concrete system until horizon  $H'$ , and hence any horizon, with probability not less than  $1 - \bar{\epsilon}'$ , where  $\bar{\epsilon}' = 6.18 \cdot 10^{-2}$ , and confidence  $1 - \beta$ . Alternatively, instead of resampling, we could have applied Proposition 24; we can extend the guarantee of PASR from the abstraction to the concrete system until horizon  $H$  to horizon  $H'$  with probability not less than  $1 - \nu\bar{\epsilon} = 1 - 1.41 \cdot 10^{-1}$ , where we have used (27) with  $T = 1$  to compute the correcting factor  $\nu = 11.4$ . Proposition 27 provides tighter bounds using half of the samples compared to Proposition 24.

**Mountain Car** We consider and adapt the mountain car benchmark [1]. The domain  $\mathcal{X} = [-1.2, 0.6] \times [-0.07, 0.07]$ , uniformly sampled, accounts for position  $x$  and velocity  $v$ . The goal of the car is to reach any point with  $x \geq 0.5$  (the top of a hill) as fast as possible, in at most 250 time steps. We compare two schemes to derive a controller with guaranteed performance, for a fixed budget of samples  $N = 10^6$ , and confidence  $\beta = 10^{-3}$ : (i.) a single-stage approach where we construct the abstraction from the uncontrolled system as per Section 4 and derive a controller by solving a reachability game [25]; (ii.) a two-stage approach where first we design a controller using standard model-free Q-learning from reinforcement learning and then we provide performance guarantees on the controlled system, as per Section 5.2. The final result are shown in Fig. 4. (i.) We partition the domain in 6 regions, solely across the position axis, that is  $[0.5, 0.6]$  is labeled  $G$ , and  $[-1.2, 0.5]$  is divided by 5 intervals of equal length, labeled  $R_1, \dots, R_5$ . We impose a zero-order hold control input over  $T = 50$  time steps, and observe the system's output accordingly every  $T$  steps: this allows us to shorten the effective control horizon and improve our guarantees, at the cost of a more restrictive controller design. We sample  $N = 10^6$  pairs of initial conditions and input sequences from a uniform distribution, we collect trajectories of length  $H = 5$  and set  $\ell = 2$ . Note that the system runs for  $H \cdot T$  time steps in total. We obtain the set  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$ , containing 1283 sequences, and a complexity of  $s_{N,\ell}^* = 633$ . This means that out of  $10^6$  trajectories, 633 contain all the  $\ell + 1$  sequences that constitute the SALCA. Proposition 18 returns a bound on the violation probability for a randomly extracted pair of initial conditions and input sequences of  $\epsilon \doteq \epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N) = 7.49 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . By Proposition 19 and Corollary 21, with confidence at least  $1 - \beta = 1 - 10^{-3}$ , we can establish a PASR from the abstraction to the concrete system until horizon  $H$  with probability not less than  $1 - \bar{\epsilon}$  where,  $\bar{\epsilon} \doteq \epsilon|\mathcal{U}^H| = 2.40 \cdot 10^{-2}$ . We frame the synthesis of the controller as a reachability game on the data-driven abstraction. We define as goal states all the  $\ell$ -sequences where the last symbol is  $G$ , i.e. the car is in the goal set. The solution of the reachability game returns a set of abstract states and actions that are guar-

anteed to drive the car to the goal set<sup>1</sup>. Among the returned abstract states, there are all five  $\ell$ -sequences of the form  $\diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond y$ , where  $y$  is  $R_1, \dots, R_5$ . Hence, we can refine the controller to drive the car to the goal set from every initial state in at most 250 time steps, with the above guarantees. (ii.) We use a  $32 \times 32$  uniform grid for the domain  $\mathcal{X} = [-1.2, 0.5] \times [-0.07, 0.07]$ , labeled  $R_1, \dots, R_{1024}$  ( $G$  as before), and define the Q-table accordingly. The learning agent receives a reward of  $-1$  for every time step, until the car reaches the goal set. We allocate  $N_{\text{RL}} = 5 \cdot 10^4$  episodes for training (exploration rate of 0.01, learning rate of 0.1) and  $M = N - N_{\text{RL}}$  episodes for verifying the closed-loop SALCA, for which we choose  $\ell = 100$ , and obtain  $\bar{\epsilon} = 1.43 \cdot 10^{-2}$ .




Fig. 4. The difference in time steps required to reach the goal set between controllers (i.) and (ii.) is shown on the domain  $\mathcal{X}$  (left) and its histogram (right), tested on  $10^4$  new initial conditions. On average the controller obtained in (i.) requires 39.3 more time-steps than the one in (ii.).

*Parameter study.* We test our approach with several values of  $N$ ,  $\ell$ , while maintaining a fixed time horizon of  $H = 5$ , see Fig. 5. We observe that, while for  $\ell = 1, 2$  the growth of  $(\ell + 1)$ -sequences (or transitions) rapidly tapers off with  $N$ , this is not the case for  $\ell = 3, 4$ ; nevertheless for  $N > 10^6$  we can derive nontrivial bounds.




Fig. 5. Number of transitions in the abstraction (left) and relative  $\bar{\epsilon}$  bound (right), for  $\ell = 1, \dots, 4$ , and  $\beta = 10^{-3}$ .

## 7 Discussion and Concluding Remarks

We introduced a fully data-driven framework to construct an abstraction for controlling a discrete-time

<sup>1</sup> By limiting the number of iterations of the reachability algorithm to  $H$ , we ensure that every state included in the solution reaches the goal set in no more than  $H$  actions.

deterministic system by collecting random finite length external behaviors and by leveraging a PASR. Our approach, based on the resulting data-driven SAℓCA, avoids the need for reachability analysis—a common bottleneck in model-based abstractions. The number of transitions in the abstraction  $\hat{\Pi}_{\ell+1}$  and consequently the number of states, adapts to the system’s dynamics. The parameter  $\ell$  is adjustable, allowing for more or less refined abstractions. Notably, the abstraction is agnostic to the specification, meaning if the design objective changes it can be reused to synthesize controllers without requiring resampling or reconstruction.

Our analysis shows that the flexibility of our approach comes at the cost of the number of samples required to obtain meaningful bounds, partly because Proposition 18 is based on the scenario approach for degenerate problems, partly because the factor  $|\mathcal{U}|^H$  in (23) can rapidly deteriorate the guarantees; note however that the inequality in (23) is not conservative, since it becomes an equality if each violating initial condition has exactly one input sequence  $\mathbf{u}_H \in \mathcal{U}^H$  that produces a new behavior. This high cost is to be expected, given that Proposition 18 does not leverage any knowledge of the system’s dynamics.

Our experiments indicate that, for a fixed budget of samples, if the control objective is known and fixed, synthesizing a controller with a technique suitable for black-box models as reinforcement learning, and successively verifying the design might result in tighter bounds, since, as argued in Section 5.2, for the closed-loop system the correcting factor of  $|\mathcal{U}^H|$  equals 1, and it might result in better performance. However, designing a reward function when multiple control specifications coexist (as in linear temporal logic) can be nontrivial.

We further prove that we can provide guarantees for a horizon larger than the sampling one, under additional conditions on the concrete model. Future work includes the construction of abstractions for systems with noise.

## A Appendix

**Proof of Proposition 10.** We begin by showing that  $\mathcal{R}$  defines a SR from  $S$  to  $S_\ell$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}$  and use this result to prove the claim of the proposition. Pick  $(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$ , i.e.  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}(x)$ , and observe that by Definition 9 we have that  $\mathcal{H}_\ell(\zeta) = \zeta(\ell)$ , and by (6) there exists an internal behavior  $\xi$  of  $S$  such that  $\zeta = \mathcal{H}(\xi[j - \ell, j])$  and  $\xi(j) = x$  for some non negative integer  $j$ : hence  $\mathcal{H}_\ell(\zeta) = \mathcal{H}(\xi(j)) = \mathcal{H}(x)$  which proves the second requirement of a SR. Next, we prove that the third requirement holds. If  $(x, u, x') \in \delta$  is a transition in  $S$ , then there exists an internal behavior  $\xi$  of  $S$  such that  $\zeta = \mathcal{H}(\xi[j - \ell, j])$  (since  $(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$ ) and  $\xi[j, j + 1] = xux'$ . Let  $\gamma$  be the corresponding external behavior of  $\xi$ , i.e.  $\gamma = \mathcal{H}(\xi)$ : by (5) we obtain that  $\zeta' \doteq \mathcal{H}(\xi[j - \ell + 2, j + 1]) \in \Pi_\ell$  belongs to the state set of the SAℓCA, moreover, since  $\zeta \cdot \zeta'[\ell - 1, \ell] = \mathcal{H}(\xi[j - \ell, j + 1]) \in \Pi_{\ell+1}$ , there exists a transition  $(\zeta, u, \zeta') \in \delta_\ell$  in the SAℓCA. Since  $\zeta' \in \mathcal{E}(x')$

we conclude that the third requirement holds. The first requirement is proved analogously. We established that  $S \preceq_S^{\mathcal{R}} S_\ell$ . To prove that  $S_\ell \preceq_{A.S.}^{\mathcal{R}^{-1}} S$  it is sufficient to prove the third requirement of for ASRs. To see this, observe that if  $(\zeta, x) \in \mathcal{R}^{-1}$  then  $(x, \zeta) \in \mathcal{R}$ , and the third requirement of SRs implies that for every admissible input  $u \in U_\delta(x)$ , if  $x'$  is a  $u$ -successor of  $x$  there exists a  $u$ -successor  $\zeta'$  of  $\zeta$  such that  $(x', \zeta') \in \mathcal{R}$ . If  $S$  has free input, from the above discussion we obtain that  $S_\ell$  has free input too. To conclude,  $U_\delta(x) = \mathcal{U} = U_{\delta_\ell}(x)$ , hence the third requirement of ASRs holds.

**Proof of Lemma 17. Sketch.** In [11, Prop. 1] it was shown that, for a deterministic *autonomous* system  $S_{\Sigma'}$ , and its data-driven SAℓCA  $\hat{S}_\ell$  constructed from  $N$  i.i.d. trajectories of length  $H$  according to a probability measure  $\mu$ , the probability of sampling a new external behavior not existent in  $\hat{S}_\ell$  can be bounded by  $\epsilon$ , with confidence  $1 - \beta$ . Formally,  $\mu^N(\mu(\{x' : \mathcal{B}_H(S_{\Sigma'}, x') \notin \mathcal{B}_H(\hat{S}_\ell)\}) < \epsilon) \geq 1 - \beta$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_H(S_{\Sigma'}, x')$  is the external behavior generated by the autonomous  $S_{\Sigma'}$  when initialized in  $x'$ ,  $\epsilon \doteq \epsilon(s_{N,\ell}^*, \beta, N)$  as defined in Theorem 2, and  $s_{N,\ell}^*$  is as per Remark 15. Since  $\mathbf{u}_H$  is available at time 0, it is sufficient to define  $\Sigma'$  on the domain  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}^H$  as an augmentation of  $\Sigma$ , where  $\mathbf{u}_H$  is part of the initial conditions.

**Proof of Lemma 22.** The volume of a parallelotope  $Q(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k r_i x_i : r_i \in [0, 1] \right\}$  is recursively computed as  $\text{vol}(Q(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \doteq \text{vol}(Q(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}))h$  where  $h$  is the Euclidean distance of  $x_k$  from  $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$  [27]. Let  $de_i$  be the vector of value  $dx_i$  at the  $i$ -th component and 0 elsewhere. The infinitesimal element of volume shifted by  $x$  is given by  $x + Q(de_1, \dots, de_n)$  and  $\text{vol}(x + Q(de_1, \dots, de_n)) = \text{vol}(Q(de_1, \dots, de_n)) = \prod_{i=1}^n dx_i$ . In first approximation, the shifted hypercube  $x + Q(de_1, \dots, de_n)$  is transformed into the shifted parallelotope given by  $g(x) + Q_g^n$ , where  $Q_g^n \doteq Q(g(x + de_1) - g(x), \dots, g(x + de_n) - g(x))$ . We can upper bound its volume as  $\text{vol}(Q_g^n) \leq \text{vol}(Q_g^{n-1}) \|g(x + de_n) - g(x)\|_2 \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \|g(x + de_i) - g(x)\|_2$ . By assumption  $\prod_{i=1}^n \|g(x + de_i) - g(x)\|_2 \leq \prod_{i=1}^n c \|g(x + de_i) - g(x)\|_p \leq \prod_{i=1}^n cLq \|de_i\|_2 = (cLq)^n \prod_{i=1}^n dx_i$ . To conclude, for the infinitesimal volume it holds that  $\text{vol}(Q(g(x + de_1) - g(x), \dots, g(x + de_n) - g(x))) \leq (cLq)^n \text{vol}(Q(de_1, \dots, de_n))$ .

**Proof of Proposition 24.** For any set in  $Q \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  we define the following operations:  $\text{Pre}_u(Q) \doteq \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x, u) \in Q\}$ ,  $\text{Pre}_*^0(Q) \doteq Q$ , and

$$\text{Pre}_*^k(Q) \doteq \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \exists \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U}^k, \xi \in \mathcal{I}_H(S, x, \mathbf{u}_k) \cdot \xi(k) \in Q\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\mu_x^{0,H}(Q) \doteq \mu_x \left( \bigcup_{i=0}^H \text{Pre}_*^i(Q) \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By Assumption 23 and Lemma 22, the pre-image of a set  $Q$  is bounded, specifically  $\mu_x(\text{Pre}_u(Q)) \leq \lambda \mu_x(Q)$ , with  $\lambda = \left(\frac{cu}{m_x}\right)^n$ . By the union bound,  $\mu_x^{0,1}(Q) \leq \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mu_x(\text{Pre}_u(Q)) + \mu_x(Q) \leq (1 + \lambda)\mu_x(Q)$  where  $\lambda = |\mathcal{U}|\eta$ . Note that  $\text{Pre}_*^{k+1}(Q) = \text{Pre}_*(\text{Pre}_*^k(Q))$ . Let  $E_p^q := \bigcup_{i=p}^q \text{Pre}_*^i(Q)$ . Then, for  $\tau = \lceil (H+T+1)/(H+1) \rceil - 1$ , we can express  $E_{i=0}^{H+T}$  in two equivalent forms

$$E_0^{H+T} = E_{j=0}^H \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\tau-1} E_{j=T-i(H+1)}^{H+T-i(H+1)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$E_{i=0}^{H+T} = E_{j=T}^{H+T} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{\tau-1} E_{j=i(H+1)}^{H+i(H+1)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

For  $\lambda \geq 1$ , Using (A.3) and (A.4), we derive the following bounds for  $\lambda \geq 1$  and  $0 < \lambda < 1$  respectively

$$\mu_x^{0,H+T}(Q) \leq \mu_x^{0,H}(Q) \left(1 + \lambda^T \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \lambda^{-i(H+1)}\right), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\mu_x^{0,H+T}(Q) \leq \mu_x^{0,H}(Q) \left(\lambda^T + \sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} \lambda^{i(H+1)}\right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Recall (26) and set  $Q = \mathcal{K}$ . By combining (25) with (A.1) and (A.2) we obtain that  $\mu_x(\mathcal{V}(\hat{S}_\ell, \hat{\mathcal{R}}, H)) = \mu_x^{0,H}(\mathcal{K})$ .

## References

- [1] Mountain car environment. [https://gymnasium.farama.org/environments/classic\\_control/mountain\\_car/](https://gymnasium.farama.org/environments/classic_control/mountain_car/). Accessed: 2023-09-30.
- [2] D. Ajeleye, A. Lavaei, and M. Zamani. Data-driven controller synthesis via finite abstractions with formal guarantees. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:3453–3458, 2023.
- [3] P. Akella and A. D. Ames. A barrier-based scenario approach to verifying safety-critical systems. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(4):11062–11069, 2022.
- [4] R. Alur, T. A. Henzinger, O. Kupferman, and M. Y. Vardi. Alternating refinement relations. In *CONCUR’98 Concurrency Theory: 9th International Conference Nice, France, September 8–11, 1998 Proceedings 9*, pages 163–178. Springer, 1998.
- [5] T. Badings, L. Romao, A. Abate, D. Parker, H. A. Poonawala, M. Stoelinga, and N. Jansen. Robust control for dynamical systems with non-gaussian noise via formal abstractions. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 76:341–391, 2023.
- [6] A. Banse, L. Romao, A. Abate, and R. Jungers. Data-driven memory-dependent abstractions of dynamical systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 891–902. PMLR, 2023.
- [7] A. Banse, L. Romao, A. Abate, and R. M. Jungers. Data-driven abstractions via adaptive refinements and a kantorovich metric. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6038–6043, 2023.
- [8] M. C. Campi, S. Garatti, and F. A. Ramponi. A general scenario theory for nonconvex optimization and decision making. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(12):4067–4078, 2018.
- [9] A. Care, S. Garatti, and M. C. Campi. Fast: an algorithm for the scenario approach with reduced sample complexity. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 44(1):9236–9241, 2011.
- [10] R. Coppola, A. Peruffo, and M. Mazo Jr. Data-driven abstractions for verification of deterministic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01793*, 2022.
- [11] R. Coppola, A. Peruffo, and M. Mazo Jr. Data-driven abstractions for verification of linear systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.
- [12] M. Cubuktepe, N. Jansen, S. Junges, J.-P. Katoen, and U. Topcu. Scenario-based verification of uncertain mdps. In *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 287–305. Springer, 2020.
- [13] A. Devonport, A. Saoud, and M. Arcak. Symbolic abstractions from data: A pac learning approach. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 599–604, 2021.
- [14] S. Garatti and M. C. Campi. The risk of making decisions from data through the lens of the scenario approach. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(7):607–612, 2021.
- [15] M. Kazemi, R. Majumdar, M. Salamati, S. Soudjani, and B. Wooding. Data-driven abstraction-based control synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08069*, 2022.
- [16] A. Lavaei, S. Soudjani, E. Frazzoli, and M. Zamani. Constructing mdp abstractions using data with formal guarantees. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2022.
- [17] R. Majumdar, N. Ozay, and A.-K. Schmuck. On abstraction-based controller design with output feedback. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 1–11, 2020.
- [18] A. Makdesi, A. Girard, and L. Fribourg. Data-driven models of monotone systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [19] A. Peruffo and M. Mazo Jr. Data-driven abstractions with probabilistic guarantees for linear petc systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2022.
- [20] A. Peruffo and M. Mazo Jr. Sampling performance of periodic event-triggered control systems: a data-driven approach. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Networked Systems*, to appear, 2024.
- [21] S. Sadraddini and C. Belta. Formal guarantees in data-driven model identification and control synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 21st HSCC (part of CPS Week)*, pages 147–156, 2018.
- [22] A. Salamati, A. Lavaei, S. Soudjani, and M. Zamani. Data-driven safety verification of stochastic systems via barrier certificates. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(5):7–12, 2021. 7th IFAC Conference ADHS 2021.
- [23] A.-K. Schmuck and J. Raisch. Asynchronous l-complete approximations. *Systems & Control Letters*, 73:67–75, 2014.
- [24] A.-K. Schmuck, P. Tabuada, and J. Raisch. Comparing asynchronous l-complete approximations and quotient based abstractions. In *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6823–6829. IEEE, 2015.
- [25] P. Tabuada. *Verification and control of hybrid systems: a symbolic approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [26] Z. Wang and R. M. Jungers. Scenario-based set invariance verification for black-box nonlinear systems. *IEEE control systems letters*, 5(1):193–198, 2020.
- [27] C. Wu, I. Kanevskiy, and M. Margaliot. k-contraction: Theory and applications. *Automatica*, 136:110048, 2022.