

---

# Learning to Estimate System Specifications in Linear Temporal Logic using Transformers and Mamba

---

**İlker Işık**

Department of Computer Engineering  
Middle East Technical University  
Ankara, Turkey  
ilker@ceng.metu.edu.tr

**Ebru Aydin Gol**

Microsoft  
İstanbul, Turkey  
ebruaydingol@microsoft.com

**Ramazan Gokberk Cinbis**

Department of Computer Engineering  
Middle East Technical University  
Ankara, Turkey  
gcinbis@ceng.metu.edu.tr

## Abstract

Temporal logic is a framework for representing and reasoning about propositions that evolve over time. It is commonly used for specifying requirements in various domains, including hardware and software systems, as well as robotics. Specification mining or formula generation involves extracting temporal logic formulae from system traces and has numerous applications, such as detecting bugs and improving interpretability. Although there has been a surge of deep learning-based methods for temporal logic satisfiability checking in recent years, the specification mining literature has been lagging behind in adopting deep learning methods despite their many advantages, such as scalability. In this paper, we introduce autoregressive models that can generate linear temporal logic formulae from traces, towards addressing the specification mining problem. We propose multiple architectures for this task: transformer encoder-decoder, decoder-only transformer, and Mamba, which is an emerging alternative to transformer models. Additionally, we devise a metric for quantifying the distinctiveness of the generated formulae and a straightforward algorithm to enforce the syntax constraints. Our experiments show that the proposed architectures yield promising results, generating correct and distinct formulae at a fraction of the compute cost needed for the combinatorial baseline.

## 1 Introduction

Linear temporal logic (LTL) is an extension of propositional logic that offers a symbolism for reasoning about how propositions change over time [Pnueli, 1977]. The primary application area of temporal logic is formal verification, for specifying requirements and verifying system behaviors [Clarke et al., 2018, Baier and Katoen, 2008]. Due to their expressiveness and similarity to natural language, temporal logics have become popular as a specification formalism in various fields, *e.g.* dynamic systems [Belta et al., 2017], robotics—especially in motion planning [Kloetzer and Belta, 2007, Shoukry et al., 2017, Fainekos et al., 2009, Sun et al., 2022], and biology [Batt et al., 2005].

Extracting temporal logic formulae, typically as LTL or its variants, from system traces is the basis of specification (requirement) mining. Formulae extraction has many applications such as detecting bugs, testing for regressions, generating new tests, and so on [Bartocci et al., 2022, Puranic et al., 2021, Wang et al., 2020, Bartocci et al., 2019, Vazquez-Chanlatte et al., 2017, Mohammadinejad et al.,




Figure 1: The overview of the problem. The table on the left denotes the input trace and shows how propositions evolve over time. On the right, a possible output is shown, which is a linear temporal logic (LTL) formula satisfied by the input trace. In this example, the formula dictates that the motor will start in the next time step, and the cargo will be carried until reaching the destination.

2020]. The resulting temporal logic formulae can also be used for the purposes of interpretability since LTL formulae are easily understood by human experts [Bartocci et al., 2022]. Figure 1 demonstrates the LTL specification mining problem.

The previous work in specification mining utilized a wide variety of methods, including template-based techniques [Jin et al., 2015], methods based on decision trees [Bombara et al., 2016, Ketenci and Gol, 2019], and many others [Vazquez-Chanlatte et al., 2017, Bartocci et al., 2014]. These existing methods for specification mining either depend on human expertise (as in template-based methods) or suffer from combinatorial explosion problems. In particular, the experiments by Ghiorzi et al. [2023] show that exhaustive combinatorial algorithms [Arif et al., 2020] and SAT-based solvers [Gaglione et al., 2021] exhibit slow runtime performance, especially as the problem size grows, rendering them infeasible for practical applications. Although Ghiorzi et al. [2023] improved these baselines by devising clever optimizations that exploit the properties of LTL, exhaustive combinatorial search scales poorly since the specification mining problem is NP-hard [Fijalkow and Lagarde, 2021].

Deep learning has attained a transformative success in computer vision [Liu et al., 2018] and language modeling, in which the large language models demonstrate impressive common sense reasoning abilities [Zhao et al., 2023]. Additionally, DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021] has exhibited excellent generalization performance in predicting traces from LTL formulae, showcasing that the deep learning models can learn the underlying semantics of LTL. However, despite the success of deep learning in these fields, there are no works that employ deep learning for specification mining to the best of our knowledge. To overcome this deficiency in the specification mining literature, we propose several methods that are adapted from deep-learning-based natural language models.

The architectures we propose can be classified under two main categories. The first one is based on the transformer encoder-decoder architecture [Vaswani et al., 2017], which has proved itself in natural language translation domain. The second one is a series of decoder-only architectures, with the most prominent one being Mamba [Gu and Dao, 2023]. In our transformer encoder-decoder architecture, the specification mining is modeled as a translation problem, with the source language being the input trace and the target language being LTL. Since both the input traces and LTL formulae are artificial languages, we use manually-defined tokenizers unlike how it's done in natural language modeling.

The primary motivation for our decoder-only architectures is based on Mamba [Gu and Dao, 2023], which reports promising improvements in a wide range of application areas, *e.g.* language modeling. To convert our problem into a sequence-to-sequence modeling problem, we merge the input and output vocabularies. The input trace is fed into the model and the model is expected to generate the LTL formula autoregressively. In addition, we introduce a syntax-enforcing algorithm during the token generating phase to incorporate LTL syntax constraints.

We adapt the dataset from Hahn et al. [2021], which was created by generating random LTL formulae and finding the satisfying traces. We introduce a distinctiveness metric that assesses the specificity of the generated formula in relation to the given trace. We present a detailed comparison of all our proposed models, including transformer, Mamba, and a decoder-only model based on Llama. The results show promising results on learning to generate semantically and syntactically correct, and distinct formulae, at a fraction of compute cost needed for combinatorial procedures.

## 2 Related Work

**Formula mining** The problem of mining LTL formulae has been studied from different aspects in the literature, such as by exploiting pre-existing SAT solvers [Neider and Gavran, 2018, Gaglione et al., 2021] or automata [Camacho and McIlraith, 2021], by using template-based algorithms [Lemieux et al., 2015] or anytime algorithms [Raha et al., 2022], and by using Bayesian inference to deliver formulae that contrasts multiple sets of traces [Kim et al., 2019].

However, existing methods either encounter scalability issues and struggle to generate a formula in a timely manner, or make simplifying assumptions such as disregarding the until operator (as in Raha et al. [2022]). The theoretical analysis by Fijalkow and Lagarde [2021] proved that learning LTL formulae from examples is a NP-hard problem.

**Shift towards neural networks** The introduction of neural networks to the temporal logic domain occurred through Signal Temporal Logic (STL), which is a variant of temporal logic that operates on continuous signals instead of propositions. Specifically, Leung et al. [2023] presented STLCG, which is a framework that defines computation graphs for the quantitative semantics of STL formulae, thereby enabling backpropagation through them. This work depends on the fact that robustness metric for STL can be defined in a differentiable way. Unlike LTL, the satisfaction of a STL formula is not binary; a robustness metric which denotes how well a signal fits a given formula can be calculated [Varnai and Dimarogonas, 2020]. This enables numerical optimization methods that are not applicable for LTL.

**Deep learning for temporal logic** Although deep learning is not utilized for LTL formula mining, several papers attacking other problems in temporal logic domain have been published. Most importantly, Hahn et al. [2021] proposes a transformer encoder-decoder architecture to generate a satisfying trace for a given LTL formula, which is the opposite of the goal in formula mining, but still as hard as formula mining (PSPACE-complete as shown by Sistla and Clarke [1982]).

Another problem that captured attention within the temporal logic community was converting natural language statements to LTL formulae. Reflecting the progress in language modeling literature, the first works that attack this problem utilized RNN encoder-decoder architecture [Gopalan et al., 2018, Patel et al., 2020]. Then, the literature moved towards leveraging pre-trained large language models for better generalization abilities, pioneered by Liu et al. [2022]. Despite the fact that both this problem and formula mining involve extracting LTL formulae from another domain, there is no prior work that employs deep learning methods for mining LTL formulae, to the best of our knowledge.

**Language modeling** The transformer architecture [Vaswani et al., 2017], albeit initially developed for natural language translation, has been successfully applied to many other domains including genomic sequence modeling. Mamba [Gu and Dao, 2023] is a novel state-space model that emerged as an alternative to the transformer models with promising results in language modeling, a domain in which previous state-space models struggled. In particular, Mamba language models matched the performance of transformer models twice their size and demonstrated better handling of long-distance relations. We provide a more detailed summary of the Mamba architecture in the following section.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Temporal logic overview

Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) is a superset of propositional logic that enables expressing and reasoning about how propositions change over time [Pnueli, 1977]. The LTL syntax over a finite set of atomic propositions  $P$  is defined as follows:

$$\phi := \mathbf{T} \mid p \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \mathbf{X}\phi \mid \phi_1 \mathbf{U} \phi_2 \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}$  denotes *True*,  $p$  is an atomic proposition with  $p \in P$ ,  $\neg$  and  $\wedge$  are the negation and conjunction operators respectively,  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  are the temporal operators *next* and *until* respectively.  $\mathbf{X}\phi$  holds at time  $t$  if and only if  $\phi$  holds at time  $t+1$ .  $\phi_1 \mathbf{U} \phi_2$  implies that  $\phi_2$  must hold immediately at the current time  $t_1$  or at some point in the future  $t_2$ , and  $\phi_1$  holds for all  $t$  satisfying  $t_1 \leq t < t_2$ . For example, the formula  $\mathbf{XX}a$  requires  $a$  to hold at the third time step. The formula  $\mathbf{TU}a$  requires

$a$  to hold at some point in the future. Finally, the formula  $\mathbf{X}b \wedge a\mathbf{U}c$  requires  $b$  to hold at the second time step,  $c$  to hold at some point in the future and  $a$  to hold at all time points prior to that.

An LTL formula operates on a *trace*, which is a sequence that denotes how the atomic propositions change over time. As in DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021], we consider *symbolic* traces of *infinite* length, represented in a form known as “*lasso*”. Such traces are denoted by  $uv^\omega$ , which comprises two sequences of propositional formulae: the prefix  $u$  and the period  $v$  that repeats infinitely. A symbolic trace represents all traces that satisfy these formulae at their respective time steps. For example, the symbolic trace  $a, a \wedge \neg b, (c)^\omega$ , represents all the traces in which  $a$  holds during the first two time steps,  $b$  does not hold at the second time step, and  $c$  holds continuously from the third time step onward. All of the traces represented by the symbolic trace, thus the symbolic trace itself, satisfy the formulae  $\mathbf{T}Uc$  and  $\mathbf{X}\neg b \wedge a\mathbf{U}c$ . However, the symbolic trace violates  $\mathbf{XX}b$  as  $b$  does not necessarily hold at the third time step. Note that, as in this case, a symbolic trace can be underspecified, e.g.,  $a$  and  $b$  can be in any configuration in the third time step.

### 3.2 Problem definition

Based on this background information, we can express our *problem definition* as follows: Given an input symbolic trace of the lasso form  $uv^\omega$ , find an LTL formula  $\phi$  such that  $uv^\omega$  satisfies  $\phi$ . Moreover, it’s desired that the generated formula is distinctive. In particular, some trivial formulae such as  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\neg(\neg a \wedge a)$  are satisfied regardless of the trace. These formulae, albeit correct, are neither useful nor desirable since they don’t convey any specific information about the traces they are supposed to describe. We define a concrete performance metric for this concept in Section 5.3.

### 3.3 Language models

**Transformers.** The goal of autoregressive language modeling is to predict the next token given the past tokens. The transformer architecture Vaswani et al. [2017] uses attention layers based on a mechanism that predicts query, key and value tensors from inputs. In self-attention, these tensors are created come from the same inputs, while in cross-attention, key and value are predicted from different ones. The transformer encoder consists of self-attention and feed-forward layers, with the decoder adding cross-attention layers. Positional encodings are added to input embeddings to convey token order. Decoder outputs pass through a linear layer to produce logits, converted to probabilities via softmax. Attention masking during training ensures causality.

**State Spaces & Mamba.** Mamba is a new type of state space model that has been proposed by Gu and Dao [2023] as an alternative to transformers for sequence-to-sequence modeling. A state space model is a continuous system (2) that uses the latent state  $h(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  to map the 1-dimensional input  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  to the output  $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$  are trainable model parameters. The state space model can be discretized into (3), introducing the  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$  matrices, which provides RNN-like efficient inference over discrete input sequences [Gu et al., 2021, 2022]. The discrete model can also be converted into the convolutional form (4).

$$\begin{aligned} h'(t) &= \mathbf{A}h(t) + \mathbf{B}x(t) & (2) \quad h_t &= \bar{\mathbf{A}}h_{t-1} + \bar{\mathbf{B}}x_t & (3) \quad \bar{\mathbf{K}} &= (\bar{\mathbf{CB}}, \bar{\mathbf{CAB}}, \bar{\mathbf{CA}}^2\bar{\mathbf{B}}, \dots) & (4) \\ y(t) &= \mathbf{Ch}(t) & & y_t &= \mathbf{Ch}_t & & y = \bar{\mathbf{K}} * x \end{aligned}$$

In Mamba,  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  matrices are derived from the input instead of being constant, which can be seen as a linear attention operator. Furthermore, a Mamba block combines this sequence transformation with an MLP block that operates in the embedding space. Similar to transformer, Mamba blocks are repeated to create the model, and the probabilities are computed using a linear layer and softmax after the last block. Thanks to its recurrent nature, Mamba doesn’t require any positional encoding.

## 4 Proposed Method

We tackle the LTL formula mining problem as an autoregressive language modeling task: given an input symbolic trace and the previous part of the generated LTL formula, the model predicts the next LTL token probabilities. The following subsections explain the specialized tokenizer needed for traces and formulae, architectures, and syntax enforcing algorithm for incorporating LTL syntax constraints. Figure 2 provides a summary.




Figure 2: The visual summary of the proposed method. The input symbolic trace is converted into the prefix notation and then tokenized (Top). The model generates the formula tokens autoregressively, enforcing the syntax constraints if desired (Middle). The generated tokens are decoded and converted into the usual infix notation (Bottom).

#### 4.1 Tokenizer

Our trace and formula syntaxes come from DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021] for data compatibility. In both traces and formulae, we use the Polish notation, in which the operator is written first, e.g.,  $a \wedge b$  is denoted as  $\&ab$ . This allows us to avoid grammar ambiguities without resorting to parentheses.

As explained in Section 3.1, we assume infinite symbolic traces of lasso form  $uv^\omega$  in this work. Alongside the characters used for atomic propositions, constants (True:1 and False:0), and logical operators, “;” character is used as a position delimiter, “{” and “}” mark the beginning and end of the period  $v$ . For example, the string “ $a;\&ab;\{b\}$ ” corresponds to the symbolic trace  $a, a \wedge b, (b)^\omega$ .

Since we work with a formal language with a predefined vocabulary, we define the tokenizer manually instead of training it. Each character in the trace or formula vocabulary is assigned to a separate token. Furthermore, special tokens are defined to mark the start or the end of the sequence, if needed.

#### 4.2 Encoder-Decoder and Decoder-only Architectures

Our model architectures can be grouped under two categories: transformer encoder-decoder models and Mamba/Llama-based decoder-only models, as explained in the following.

**Transformer encoder-decoder.** The first architecture we propose is a Transformer Encoder-Decoder from Vaswani et al. [2017]. The trace tokens and the previous formula tokens are fed into the encoder and decoder blocks respectively, with the cross-modal interactions between these two domains (*i.e.* trace and formula) being handled by the cross-attention layers in the decoder. The LTL formula is generated token-by-token by sampling from the predicted next token probabilities. This architecture is essentially the same as the one in DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021] with input and output swapped.

**Mamba.** Mamba [Gu and Dao, 2023] is a sequence-to-sequence model that doesn’t use any attention layers. Hence, the cross-attention mechanism which forms the backbone of transformer encoder-decoder is not applicable for Mamba. Although achieving the effect of cross-attention using a Mamba architecture is still an open research question, Chen et al. [2024] discovered that a simple, direct concatenation of tokens from different modalities can handle cross-modal interactions effectively, and thereby serve as a counterpart of cross-attention in Mamba-based models.




Figure 3: Model architectures, displaying the inner workings of the “Neural Network Model” block in Figure 2. The transformer encoder-decoder model processes the tokens separately, using cross-attention mechanism to process the interactions between them (Top). In Mamba architecture, the input tokens and the generated tokens are concatenated in a single grammar (Bottom).

Based on this development by Chen et al. [2024], we rearranged our problem as a sequence-to-sequence problem by using concatenation in order to utilize Mamba. Our Mamba model accepts both trace and formula tokens, but it only outputs the probabilities for the formula tokens. During training, trace tokens are fed into the model as usual, but the model’s predictions for these tokens are ignored by the loss function, as in the pad tokens. Using this approach also removes the need for a start token. Since the input trace is given in the same sequence, and “}” token always marks the end of a trace and by extension, the beginning of the LTL formula.

Note that there are common tokens between the input and the output vocabularies, such as the atomic propositions, which may appear in both the input trace and the output formula. Such tokens can either be shared by both traces and formulae, or be duplicated to create the trace and formula variants of the same token. In this work, we duplicate such tokens.

**Llama.** To compare the Mamba model to a more similar transformer-based model, we additionally define a decoder-only transformer model based on Llama [Touvron et al., 2023]. The purpose of this model is to check whether switching to a decoder-only model (as we did for Mamba) improves the performance compared to a vanilla transformer encoder-decoder. Furthermore, as noted by Gu and Dao [2023], Llama is currently one of the strongest transformer recipes and outperforms the standard transformer architecture. In addition, we also aim to observe whether the improvements in Llama, e.g. RMSNorm instead of LayerNorm, SwiGLU activation, rotary embeddings, lead to a better model.

### 4.3 Enforcing syntax constraints

Due to the nature of the sampling, the syntactic validity of the formula generated by the model is not guaranteed. However, we devise a simple sampling method that enforces the syntax constraints. The basic idea boils down to disallowing the tokens that would violate the syntactic rules, inspired from the method for generating JSON-formatted outputs in large language models [Rehg, 2023].

Thanks to the Polish notation, there are only two cases for syntactically invalid formula: either the formula ends prematurely (e.g., in  $Ua$ , the right side of the binary operator  $U$  is missing), or the formula contains excess tokens (e.g., in  $Uabc$ ,  $c$  does not belong to the parse tree). Therefore, we can enforce syntactic validity just by controlling when it is allowed to emit the end token. Following this observation, we devise an algorithm that enforces the syntactic correctness by modifying the logits such that the generation of a syntactically invalid formula is impossible, assuming no limits on the generation length. The details are given in Appendix D.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental setup

We performed most of our experiments on a machine with Intel Core i9-10900X CPU @ 3.70GHz and NVIDIA RTX A4000, but we used different GPUs to train some of the models. For evaluation, we make the models generate predictions for the symbolic traces, and then we use spot framework version 2.11.6 [Duret-Lutz et al., 2022] to check the correctness of the predictions. For each symbolic trace and LTL formula pair, we set the trace checking timeout to 30 seconds, which may be exceeded if the generated formula is too complex. The timeout category also includes the pairs that caused a runtime error (e.g., overflow error) during trace checking.

### 5.2 Quantitative semantic evaluation

We trained multiple models on a preprocessed (Appendix A) LTLRandom35 dataset from DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021], which consists of randomly generated LTL formulae and the corresponding symbolic traces. Based on our hyperparameter analysis (Appendix A), we determined the best performing model for each architecture and trained it three times from scratch in total. We enumerate these models using letters A, B, C, and use the architecture name with the model letter to refer to them. In Table 1, we give the average evaluation results of our these models on the test split of LTLRandom35 dataset, which contains 99038 samples.

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation of the test set results, over three runs. The best variant of each architecture has been selected on the validation set (the details can be found in the appendices).

Architecture	Correct %	Exact %	Incorrect %	Invalid %	Timeout %
Transformer	$94.38 \pm 4.12$	$1.00 \pm 0.02$	$4.45 \pm 3.68$	$0.03 \pm 0.02$	$1.14 \pm 0.50$
Mamba	$98.23 \pm 0.29$	$0.98 \pm 0.01$	$1.38 \pm 0.11$	$0.00 \pm 0.00$	$0.39 \pm 0.18$
Llama	$95.75 \pm 2.09$	$0.93 \pm 0.01$	$1.98 \pm 0.87$	$0.00 \pm 0.00$	$2.26 \pm 2.06$

The most striking result is that although all models generate semantically correct formulae most of the time (Correct %), they hardly ever generate the exact same formula (Exact %) on the test set. This shows that the models have learned the underlying semantics of the LTL formulae instead of memorizing and learning the specifics of the dataset.

**Comparison of architectures.** According to the average results in Table 1, the best architecture is Mamba, followed by Llama. However, the full results (Table 6 in Appendix B) reveal that the performance difference between the best models for each architecture is negligible. Transformer and Llama models have higher variance in their performance, weakening their average results. For a more detailed evaluation with all the models we trained, please see Appendices A and B.

**The effect of syntax enforcing.** Before syntax enforcing, Transformer, Mamba and Llama models generated  $(5.37 \pm 5.85)\%$ ,  $(0.26 \pm 0.22)\%$ , and  $(6.76 \pm 5.23)\%$  invalid formulae respectively on the test set. This shows that our Mamba models are better at complying with the LTL syntax without any external intervention. Syntax enforcing converted 77% of all invalid outputs on the test set into correct formulae. More details are given in Appendix D.

### 5.3 Distinctiveness Evaluation

The correctness of the generated LTL formulae is not the only desired quality. The generated formulae should summarize the unique parts of the input trace to be helpful. For instance, a trivial way to get 100% semantic accuracy is to always generate the formula  $T$ , which evaluates to *True* regardless of the input trace and hence satisfies all traces. To measure the network’s tendency to generate such trivial formulae, we developed a distinctiveness metric. Distinctiveness measure is based on a batch of symbolic traces and defined as in Eq. 5:

$$1 - \frac{\text{Number of other traces that are satisfied}}{\text{Number of other traces}} \quad (5)$$




Figure 4: Execution times of the combinatorial algorithm with various operator count limits and our models. The optional distinctiveness computation checks each formula against 1000 traces to find the formula with best distinctiveness.

Figure 5: The distinctiveness distribution of the Mamba’s predictions (blue) and the average/best (orange/green) of all formulae up to 4 operators.

Figure 6: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values of Mamba reported in Fig. 5 vs. the sequence length of the input symbolic trace (total length of  $u$  and  $v$ ). The line of best fit is shown in red.

Intuitively, the distinctiveness value is 0.0 if the generated formula satisfies all other traces, as it’s the case with  $\mathbf{T}$ . Ideally, the distinctiveness value should be 1.0, i.e., the generated formula should satisfy none of the other traces. Note that the distinctiveness value is only applicable for correct formulae.

Since the calculation of this metric requires checking  $O(N^2)$  pairs, we limit ourselves to a maximum of 1000 predictions to compute the distinctiveness values. We calculated the distinctiveness values on a batch of 1000 samples from the test split of LTLRandom35. Figure 5 visualizes the distinctiveness values for one of our models, Mamba. As shown, the generated formulae have remarkably high distinctiveness values. For this model, the average and the median of the distinctiveness values are 0.95 and 0.99 respectively, with 215 formulae having the perfect distinctiveness value of 1.0. The other models perform similarly (Table 7 in Appendix C).

There are only a few outlier cases in which the distinctiveness value is 0.0. However, upon closer inspection, the symbolic trace is just  $\{1\}$  in these cases, which includes all possible traces. This makes it impossible to come up with a unique formula. Such degenerate cases are a byproduct of how the LTLRandom35 dataset was created.

Figure 6 plots the distinctiveness values against the sequence length of the input trace, with the line of best fit shown in blue. The figure demonstrates a positive correlation, i.e., the longer traces tend to be more specific, and as a result, the corresponding predictions have a high distinctiveness. The same effect can be observed when comparing the values against the trace token count (Figure 10 in Appendix C).

#### 5.4 Combinatorial Baseline

In Figure 4, we compare the inference times of our models to a combinatorial approach that tests all possible formulae up to a certain operator count.<sup>1</sup> Our Mamba model can create a formula  $8327\times$  faster than the combinatorial baseline (max 4 operators) with an average operator count of  $17.74 \pm 11.33$ . Note that the combinatorial approach outputs all formulae satisfying the input trace. As seen in Figure 5, these formulae typically have low distinctiveness values in contrast to our models. Furthermore, we selected the formula with the highest distinctiveness value from those generated for the given trace and showed the results in Figure 5. Although this method yields significantly high distinctiveness values, it also substantially increases the computation time (see Figure 4), to the extent that our Mamba model is  $264019\times$  faster when distinctiveness analysis is integrated into the combinatorial approach. Note that our models demonstrate the capability to attain high distinctiveness values without integrating it into the selection or training criteria.

<sup>1</sup>Rudimentary elimination rules (commutativity, associativity, double negatives, etc.) were implemented.

Table 2: Example formula predictions for the trace samples from the LTLRandom35’s test set. The predictions are semantically correct, unless denoted otherwise.

#	Trace	Predicted formula	Model
1	$a \wedge \neg e, e, d, (1)^\omega$	$a \mathbf{U} e \wedge \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} d$	All 9 models
2	$1, b, d \wedge e, c, (1)^\omega$	$\mathbf{X}(b \wedge \mathbf{X}(d \wedge e \wedge \mathbf{X} c))$	All 9 models
3	$b \wedge \neg d, (b)^\omega$	$\neg d \wedge \neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg b)$	All 9 models
4	$1, a \wedge \neg c \wedge \neg e, (a)^\omega$	$\mathbf{X}(\neg c \wedge \neg e \wedge \neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg a))$	Transformer <sub>A,B,C</sub> , Mamba <sub>A</sub>
		$\mathbf{X}\neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg a) \wedge \mathbf{X}(\neg c \wedge \neg e)$	Mamba <sub>B</sub>
		$\mathbf{X}(\neg c \wedge \neg e \wedge \neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg a))$	Mamba <sub>C</sub> , Llama <sub>A,B,C</sub>
5	$1, \neg b, (1)^\omega$	$\neg(\mathbf{X} b \wedge \mathbf{X}^{30} a)$	Transformer <sub>A</sub>
6	$1, b, e, (1)^\omega$	$\mathbf{X} b \wedge \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} (\neg \mathbf{X}^{25} b \mathbf{U} e)$	Llama <sub>B</sub>
7	$\neg c, \neg c \wedge \neg d, c \wedge \neg d, \neg(\neg c \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} d) \wedge \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} \neg(\mathbf{X} b \mathbf{U} b), (1)^\omega$	$\mathbf{X} \neg d \mathbf{U} c \wedge \neg \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X} b \mathbf{U} b)$	Transformer <sub>C</sub> , Mamba <sub>B</sub>
		( <i>Incorrect</i> )	Transformer <sub>A</sub>
8	$1, 1, c, (1)^\omega$	$\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^{30} c \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} c) \quad (\textcolor{red}{\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^{25} \neg a \mathbf{U} c)})$	Transformer <sub>B</sub>
			Mamba <sub>A</sub>

## 5.5 Qualitative Evaluation

In Table 2, we inspect the predictions by all our models from the previous section. In the first three rows, we show examples for three test traces where all nine models yield syntactically the same semantically correct formulae. There are 11120 (out of 99038) such syntactically unanimous predictions in the test set, which suggests that similar system specification priors are captured by drastically different architectures. Among these, in the first example, the ground truth (not shown in the table for brevity) is exactly the same as the prediction.

However, such exact matches to the ground truth are rare, as expected. In fact, we observe that the models can sometimes make syntactically simpler predictions compared to the ground truth, while being semantically correct. For example, in the example #2 in Table 2, the ground truth  $\mathbf{X}(\neg(b \wedge \neg \mathbf{X} e) \wedge \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X} c \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} ((\neg d \mathbf{U} d) \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} c))$  is clearly more complicated than the prediction. Similarly, in the example #3, the prediction is only a part of the ground truth  $\neg d \wedge \neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg b \wedge \mathbf{X}((1 \mathbf{U} \neg c) \mathbf{U} d \mathbf{U} a))$ . Note that  $\neg(1 \mathbf{U} \neg b)$  means that  $b$  holds in all time steps. Applying De Morgan’s law, the extra part in the ground truth becomes  $\neg \mathbf{X}((1 \mathbf{U} \neg c) \mathbf{U} d \mathbf{U} a)$ , disjunct with the previous statement. This statement, in addition to being unnecessarily complex with nested until statements, does not hold for the given trace, and consequently doesn’t contribute to the formula descriptiveness.

For the following three traces in Table 2, the models yield predictions that are not syntactically unanimous. For the trace #4, the predicted formulas are semantically equivalent despite their syntactic differences. #5 and #6 demonstrate the cases where the models produce subpar formula with  $\mathbf{X}$  operator repeats 30 and 25 times (denoted as  $\mathbf{X}^{30}$  and  $\mathbf{X}^{25}$ ), respectively. This tendency to generate semantically correct formulas with undesirable  $\mathbf{X}$  repeats is an open problem for future work.

The last two traces of Table 2 show semantically incorrect predictions. In #7, the prediction of Transformer<sub>C</sub> and Mamba<sub>B</sub> fails because some of the traces represented by the first symbolic trace satisfies  $\neg c \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} d$ . For instance,  $d$  may hold at the fourth time step, and  $\neg c$  holds until then; therefore, the negation of  $\neg c \mathbf{U} \mathbf{X} d$  is not satisfied due to such edge cases. The Transformer<sub>A</sub> prediction, however, avoids this issue since it doesn’t negate the until operator. Finally, in the last trace, we again observe that the predictions contain ineffective until operators due to excessive  $\mathbf{X}$ s. Here, Transformer<sub>B</sub>’s prediction fails due to an extra  $\mathbf{X}$  before  $c$ , whereas the Mamba<sub>A</sub>’s prediction does not have this issue.

## 6 Conclusion

We have introduced an autoregressive generation approach for extracting LTL formulae from symbolic traces, addressing the lag in applying deep learning to specification mining. We’ve proposed several different architectures for this task based on the ubiquitous transformer and the emerging Mamba, alongside a straightforward method to enforce LTL syntax constraints. Our experimental results

demonstrate the competency of our models in terms of semantic correctness and distinctiveness, which is measured using a metric we devised. Furthermore, we have dissected the output formulae and discussed the qualitative limitations. We believe the future work can improve our method by creating a better synthetic dataset for this task, and define new metrics for formula quality.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This study was supported by Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) under the Grant Number 122E249. We thank to TUBITAK for their support. We also gratefully acknowledge the computational resources kindly provided by METU Imagelab and METU-ROMER, Center for Robotics and Artificial Intelligence.

## References

- M. F. Arif, D. Larraz, M. Echeverria, A. Reynolds, O. Chowdhury, and C. Tinelli. Syslite: Syntax-guided synthesis of pltl formulas from finite traces. In *2020 Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design (FMCAD)*, pages 93–103, 2020.
- C. Baier and J.-P. Katoen. Principles of model checking. 2008.
- E. Bartocci, L. Bortolussi, and G. Sanguinetti. Data-driven statistical learning of temporal logic properties. In *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems*, pages 23–37, Cham, 2014.
- E. Bartocci, N. Manjunath, L. Mariani, C. Mateis, and D. Ničković. Automatic failure explanation in cps models. In *IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, 2019.
- E. Bartocci, C. Mateis, E. Nesterini, and D. Nickovic. Survey on mining signal temporal logic specifications. *Information and Computation*, 289:104957, 2022. ISSN 0890-5401.
- G. Batt, D. Ropers, H. de Jong, J. Geiselmann, R. Mateescu, M. Page, and D. Schneider. Validation of qualitative models of genetic regulatory networks by model checking: analysis of the nutritional stress response in escherichia coli. *Bioinformatics*, 21 Suppl 1:i19–28, 2005.
- C. Belta, B. Yordanov, and E. Aydin Gol. *Formal Methods for Discrete-Time Dynamical Systems*. Studies in Systems, Decision and Control. Springer, 2017.
- G. Bombara, C.-I. Vasile, F. Penedo, H. Yasuoka, and C. Belta. A decision tree approach to data classification using signal temporal logic. pages 1–10, 04 2016.
- A. Camacho and S. A. McIlraith. Learning interpretable models expressed in linear temporal logic. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 29(1):621–630, May 2021.
- G. Chen, Y. Huang, J. Xu, B. Pei, Z. Chen, Z. Li, J. Wang, K. Li, T. Lu, and L. Wang. Video mamba suite: State space model as a versatile alternative for video understanding, 2024.
- E. M. Clarke, T. A. Henzinger, H. Veith, and R. Bloem. Handbook of model checking. In *Cambridge International Law Journal*, 2018.
- A. Duret-Lutz, E. Renault, M. Colange, F. Renkin, A. G. Aisse, P. Schlehuber-Caissier, T. Medioni, A. Martin, J. Dubois, C. Gillard, and H. Lauko. From Spot 2.0 to Spot 2.10: What’s new? In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV’22)*, volume 13372 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 174–187, Aug. 2022.
- G. Fainekos, A. Girard, H. Kress-Gazit, and G. Pappas. Temporal logic motion planning for dynamic robots. *Autom.*, 45:343–352, 2009.
- N. Fijalkow and G. Lagarde. The complexity of learning linear temporal formulas from examples. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Grammatical Inference*, volume 153 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 237–250, 23–27 Aug 2021.
- J. Gaglione, D. Neider, R. Roy, U. Topcu, and Z. Xu. Learning linear temporal properties from noisy data: A maxsat-based approach. In *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 19th International Symposium, ATVA 2021, Proceedings*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics), pages 74–90, Germany, 2021.
- E. Ghiorzi, M. Colledanchise, G. Piquet, S. Bernagozzi, A. Tacchella, and L. Natale. Learning linear temporal properties for autonomous robotic systems. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 8:2930–2937, 2023.
- N. Gopalan, D. Arumugam, L. L. S. Wong, and S. Tellex. Sequence-to-sequence language grounding of non-markovian task specifications. *Robotics: Science and Systems XIV*, 2018.
- A. Gu and T. Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.

- A. Gu, I. Johnson, K. Goel, K. Saab, T. Dao, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. Combining recurrent, convolutional, and continuous-time models with linear state space layers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:572–585, 2021.
- A. Gu, K. Goel, and C. Ré. Efficiently Modeling Long Sequences with Structured State Spaces. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*, Aug. 2022.
- C. Hahn, F. Schmitt, J. U. Kreber, M. N. Rabe, and B. Finkbeiner. Teaching temporal logics to neural networks. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*, 2021.
- X. Jin, A. Donzé, J. V. Deshmukh, and S. A. Seshia. Mining requirements from closed-loop control models. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 34(11):1704–1717, 2015.
- A. Ketenci and E. A. Gol. Synthesis of monitoring rules via data mining. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1684–1689, 2019.
- J. Kim, C. Muise, A. Shah, S. Agarwal, and J. Shah. Bayesian inference of linear temporal logic specifications for contrastive explanations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 5591–5598, 7 2019.
- M. Kloetzer and C. Belta. Temporal logic planning and control of robotic swarms by hierarchical abstractions. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 23(2):320–330, 2007.
- C. Lemieux, D. Park, and I. Beschastnikh. General ltl specification mining (t). In *2015 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 81–92, 2015.
- K. Leung, N. Aréchiga, and M. Pavone. Backpropagation through signal temporal logic specifications: Infusing logical structure into gradient-based methods. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 42(6):356–370, 2023.
- J. X. Liu, Z. Yang, B. Schornstein, S. Liang, I. Idrees, S. Tellex, and A. Shah. Lang2LTL: Translating natural language commands to temporal specification with large language models. In *Workshop on Language and Robotics at CoRL 2022*, 2022.
- L. Liu, W. Ouyang, X. Wang, P. W. Fieguth, J. Chen, X. Liu, and M. Pietikäinen. Deep learning for generic object detection: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 128:261 – 318, 2018.
- S. Mohammadinejad, J. V. Deshmukh, and A. G. Puranic. Mining environment assumptions for cyber-physical system models. In *2020 ACM/IEEE 11th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs)*, pages 87–97, 2020.
- D. Neider and I. Gavran. Learning linear temporal properties. In *2018 Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design (FMCAD)*, pages 1–10, 2018.
- R. Patel, E. Pavlick, and S. Tellex. Grounding language to non-markovian tasks with no supervision of task specifications. *Robotics: Science and Systems XVI*, 2020.
- A. Pnueli. The temporal logic of programs. In *18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Providence, Rhode Island, USA, 31 October - 1 November 1977*, pages 46–57, 1977.
- A. G. Puranic, J. V. Deshmukh, and S. Nikolaidis. Learning from demonstrations using signal temporal logic in stochastic and continuous domains. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(4):6250–6257, 2021.
- R. Raha, R. Roy, N. Fijalkow, and D. Neider. Scalable anytime algorithms for learning fragments of linear temporal logic. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 263–280, Cham, 2022.
- I. Rehg. Syntactically constrained sampling for language models. <https://github.com/IsaacRe/Syntactically-Constrained-Sampling>, 2023.
- Y. Shoukry, P. Nuzzo, A. Balkan, I. Saha, A. L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, S. A. Seshia, G. J. Pappas, and P. Tabuada. Linear temporal logic motion planning for teams of underactuated robots using satisfiability modulo convex programming. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1132–1137, 2017.
- A. P. Sistla and E. M. Clarke. The complexity of propositional linear temporal logics. In *Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 1982.
- D. Sun, J. Chen, S. Mitra, and C. Fan. Multi-agent motion planning from signal temporal logic specifications. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, PP:1–1, 2022.
- H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.13971, 2023.
- P. Varnai and D. V. Dimarogonas. On robustness metrics for learning stl tasks. In *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 5394–5399, 2020.

- A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. u. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- M. Vazquez-Chanlatte, J. Deshmukh, X. Jin, and S. Seshia. Logical clustering and learning for time-series data. pages 305–325, 07 2017.
- F. Wang, Z. Cao, L. Tan, and H. Zong. Survey on learning-based formal methods: Taxonomy, applications and possible future directions. *IEEE Access*, 8:108561–108578, 2020.
- W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, Y. Du, C. Yang, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, J. Jiang, R. Ren, Y. Li, X. Tang, Z. Liu, P. Liu, J. Nie, and J. rong Wen. A survey of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.18223, 2023.

## A Hyperparameter Analysis

In this section, we analyze the impact of different architectural hyperparameter choices.

We use the LTLRandom35 dataset from DeepLTL [Hahn et al., 2021], which contains pairs of randomly generated LTL formulae and the corresponding symbolic traces. For preprocessing, we eliminate the pairs in which the length of the trace is longer than 35 characters in both training and evaluation. Because the formula length distribution, as displayed in Figure 7, reveals that such samples are exceedingly rare.




Figure 7: The distribution of the trace lengths in the training split of the LTLRandom35 dataset.

We trained each model type (transformer encoder-decoder, Mamba, Llama) 15 times with different hyperparameters. We utilized grid search for our Mamba models since the Mamba language model presented by Gu and Dao [2023] exposes only two model hyperparameters (dimension and layer count). For other models, we searched more randomly since they have more hyperparameters to tune.

For all models, we used an AdamW optimizer with  $\beta_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.95$ , weight decay set to 0.1, and gradient clipping set to 1.0, as in Llama [Touvron et al., 2023]. We used a cosine learning rate schedule with 1000 warmup steps and a maximum learning rate of 0.001.

**Model naming conventions** The model naming conventions are given below.

- **Transformer and Llama-based:** ATTENTION\_HEADS-EMBED\_DIM-FF\_DIM-LAYERS
  - ATTENTION\_HEADS is the number of attention heads in all transformer layers.
  - EMBED\_DIM is the embedding dimension (for both encoder and decoder).
  - FF\_DIM is the dimension of the feed-forward layers.
  - LAYERS is the number of transformer blocks.
- **Mamba:** DIMENSION-LAYERS
  - DIMENSION is the model’s embedding dimension.
  - LAYERS is the number of Mamba blocks.
- After the name, suffixes such as “-a” and “-b” can be added to denote the different training runs of the same architecture.
- The full names of the models mentioned in the main paper are as follows, where \* is a, b, or c respectively:
  - Transformer A, B, C: 8-128-512-6-\*
  - Mamba A, B, C: 128-6-\*

– Llama A, B, C: 8-64-128-6-\*

During inference, we used beam search algorithm<sup>2</sup> with a beam size of 3 in conjunction with the syntax enforcing. We limited the generated formula length to 100 tokens, excluding the start token in the case of the transformer encoder-decoder architecture. Please keep in mind that even though the syntax enforcing was enabled, the model can generate invalid formula if it exceeds the token limit.

Tables 3, 4 and 5 show the evaluation results on the validation set. Note that the samples classified as exact matches in “Exact” column are also included in the “Correct” column. The “Invalid” column was omitted in Table 4 because none of the Mamba models generated any invalid formula.

Table 3: Evaluation of the transformer encoder-decoder models on 10000 validation set samples.

Model		Evaluation				
Name	Parameters	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
4-32-64-2	44,142	6523	60	572	2877	28
4-32-64-4	86,894	9476	66	382	98	44
4-32-64-6	129,646	6643	72	243	3074	40
4-64-256-4	469,710	9766	74	117	0	117
4-128-512-4	1,856,910	9829	69	73	0	98
8-64-128-2	170,190	9674	62	284	0	42
8-64-128-4	337,614	9826	80	125	0	49
8-64-128-6	505,038	9748	75	106	2	144
8-64-256-2	236,238	9673	72	233	0	94
8-128-256-2	668,046	9696	73	150	44	110
8-128-256-8	2,655,630	9798	80	73	0	129
8-128-512-2	931,214	9782	76	118	2	98
8-128-512-6-a	2,782,606	9833	79	59	0	108
8-128-512-6-b	2,782,606	8895	78	907	4	194
8-128-512-6-c	2,782,606	9547	78	378	1	74
8-128-512-8	3,708,302	9780	77	77	0	143
8-128-1024-8	5,813,646	9287	78	598	1	114

## B Full Test Set Evaluation

In Table 6, we give the full test set evaluation of the three training runs of the best models for each architecture, which were reported as averages in Table 1.

## C Distinctiveness evaluation

In Table 7, we give the full distinctiveness evaluation of the three training runs of the best models for each architecture, alongside the distinctiveness evaluation of the ground truth formulae for comparison. Figures 10 and 11 compare the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 5 (Mamba 128-6-a) against the trace token count and the generated formula token count respectively. We omit the corresponding plots for other models since the results were very similar. Figures 12 to 15 analyze the distinctiveness values of 1000 ground truth formulae from the LTLRandom35’s test set.

---

<sup>2</sup>For the transformer encoder-decoder and Mamba models, our beam search implementation is based on DeepLTL’s [Hahn et al., 2021] implementation, which in turn was adopted from TensorFlow. On the other hand, we used the HuggingFace’s beam search implementation for Llama.

Table 4: Evaluation of the Mamba models on 10000 validation set samples. The “Invalid” column is omitted because it was all zeros.

Model		Evaluation			
Name	Parameters	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Timeout
32-2	20,960	7730	54	2241	29
32-4	40,864	9485	63	490	25
32-6-a	60,768	9631	65	359	10
32-6-b	60,768	9600	68	375	25
32-6-c	60,768	9611	75	380	9
32-6-d	60,768	9566	65	385	49
64-2	67,520	8981	61	997	22
64-4	132,928	9729	72	245	26
64-6	198,336	9788	76	180	32
128-2	237,440	9455	66	485	60
128-4	470,656	9797	81	154	49
128-6-a	703,872	9843	91	127	30
128-6-b	703,872	9769	93	146	85
128-6-c	703,872	9836	85	137	27
256-2	884,480	9638	76	325	37
256-4	1,760,512	9736	76	197	67
256-6	2,636,544	9129	74	720	151
512-2	3,407,360	9600	82	392	8
512-4	6,797,824	9492	64	492	16
512-6	10,188,288	9501	71	486	13

Table 5: Evaluation of the Llama-based models on 10000 validation set samples.

Model		Evaluation				
Name	Parameters	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
4-32-64-2	21,824	8656	51	1309	0	35
4-32-64-4	42,432	9388	65	555	0	57
4-32-64-6	63,040	9658	67	235	0	107
4-64-128-8	331,136	9155	74	415	0	430
4-128-512-4	1,054,464	8349	80	1108	0	543
8-64-128-2	84,608	9317	68	436	0	247
8-64-128-4	166,784	9672	66	154	0	174
8-64-128-6-a	248,960	9815	76	111	0	74
8-64-128-6-b	248,960	9583	70	338	0	79
8-64-128-6-c	248,960	9273	72	199	0	528
8-64-128-8	331,136	9776	77	109	0	115
8-128-256-2	333,056	8998	63	891	0	111
8-128-256-8	1,317,632	9011	73	391	0	598
8-128-512-2	529,664	9284	67	594	0	122
8-128-512-4	1,054,464	9554	74	327	0	119
8-128-512-6	1,579,264	9430	73	290	0	280
8-256-512-6	3,944,960	8861	72	949	4	186

Table 6: Full test set evaluation.

Architecture	Model Name	Evaluation				
		Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
Transformer	8-128-512-6-a	97595	991	493	0	950
	8-128-512-6-b	87921	979	9274	44	1799
	8-128-512-6-c	94900	1015	3463	40	635
Mamba	128-6-a	97530	981	1238	0	270
	128-6-b	96881	961	1514	0	643
	128-6-c	97434	958	1354	0	250
Llama	8-64-128-6-a	97217	917	1031	0	790
	8-64-128-6-b	95119	925	3109	0	810
	8-64-128-6-c	92161	931	1756	0	5121

Table 7: Distinctiveness evaluation on 1000 samples from the LTLRandom35’s test set. “Avg.” column gives the average and the standard deviation. Columns “Q1” to “Q3” represent quartiles. “Perfect” represents the number of cases in which the distinctiveness value is 1.0, the highest attainable value.

Architecture	Model Name	Distinctiveness				
		Avg.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Perfect
Transformer	8-128-512-6-a	$0.952 \pm 0.125$	0.932	0.989	0.999	223
	8-128-512-6-b	$0.936 \pm 0.171$	0.928	0.992	0.999	219
	8-128-512-6-c	$0.948 \pm 0.129$	0.931	0.989	0.999	217
Mamba	128-6-a	$0.950 \pm 0.126$	0.930	0.987	0.999	215
	128-6-b	$0.951 \pm 0.126$	0.928	0.989	0.999	217
	128-6-c	$0.948 \pm 0.126$	0.921	0.988	0.999	224
Llama	8-64-128-6-a	$0.949 \pm 0.127$	0.926	0.988	0.999	222
	8-64-128-6-b	$0.950 \pm 0.128$	0.930	0.989	0.999	223
	8-64-128-6-c	$0.947 \pm 0.130$	0.932	0.988	0.999	226
Ground Truth Formulae		$0.942 \pm 0.129$	0.926	0.981	0.997	147

## D The Effect of Syntax Enforcing

### Algorithm 1 Enforce LTL syntax constraints

---

```

1: function ENFORCE(input_ids : torch.Tensor, logits : torch.Tensor)
2:   expected_statements  $\leftarrow 1$                                  $\triangleright$  The number of remaining statements.
3:   for token in input_ids do
4:     if expected_statements = 0 then
5:       assert token = EOS
6:       break
7:     end if
8:     operand_count  $\leftarrow$  get_operand_count(token)
9:     expected_statements  $\leftarrow$  expected_statements + (operand_count - 1)
10:    end for
11:    if expected_statements == 0 then
12:      logits[: -1]  $\leftarrow -\infty$            $\triangleright$  The only legal token is EOS, which is last in vocabulary.
13:    else
14:      logits[-1]  $\leftarrow -\infty$            $\triangleright$  More statements are expected, EOS token is illegal.
15:    end if
16:    return logits
17: end function

```

---




Figure 8: The histogram of the distinctiveness values of the formulae predicted by Mamba 128-6-a (Mamba A), calculated using 1000 test set pairs from LTLRandom35.




Figure 9: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 8 vs. the sequence length of the input symbolic trace (total length of  $u$  and  $v$ ). The line of best fit is shown in red.




Figure 10: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 8 vs. the number of tokens in the input symbolic trace. The line of best fit is shown in red.




Figure 11: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 8 vs. the number of tokens in the generated output. The line of best fit is shown in red.

The syntax enforcing algorithm is given in Algorithm 1. As previously explained in the paper, the algorithm avoids the generation of syntactically invalid formulae.

## D.1 On the test set

Table 8 shows the effect of syntax enforcing on the models we evaluated on the test set in Appendix B. In total, our syntax enforcing algorithm converted 77% of the invalid formulae into semantically correct formulae. However, different models vary wildly in terms of how much they benefit from syntax enforcing. In particular, before syntax enforcing, the Mamba architecture displayed a significantly higher tendency to abide by the syntax rules (768 invalid formulae), whereas the transformer encoder-decoder and Llama struggled (15967 and 20078 invalid formulae respectively). Furthermore, although the invalid-to-correct conversion ratio is 93% for the Llama models, this figure is only 57% for the transformer encoder-decoder models. Interestingly, almost all (99%) invalid formulae by the Llama 8-64-128-6-a model became correct after syntax enforcing.




Figure 12: The histogram of the distinctiveness values of the ground truth LTL formulae, calculated using 1000 test set pairs from LTL Random35.




Figure 13: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 12 vs. the sequence length of the input symbolic trace (total length of  $u$  and  $v$ ). The line of best fit is shown in red.




Figure 14: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 12 vs. the number of tokens in the input symbolic trace. The line of best fit is shown in red.




Figure 15: The scatter plot of the distinctiveness values reported in Fig. 12 vs. the number of tokens in the generated output. The line of best fit is shown in red.

## D.2 On the validation set, for all models

Tables 9, 10 and 11 show how syntax enforcing changes the invalid formulae generated by the transformer encoder-decoder, Mamba models, and Llama-based models respectively. This test was performed on the same 10000 validation set samples used in Appendix A. The models that didn't generate any invalid formulae are omitted from the tables.

Excluding the 32 dimensional transformer models which frequently fail to terminate their predictions, 21920 invalid formulae were generated in total across all architectures and models. 18325 (83.6%) of these invalid formulae were converted into correct formulae after syntax enforcing.

Comparing the architectures, once more we observe that the Mamba models have a much lower tendency to generate syntactically invalid formulae when syntax enforcing is disabled. Furthermore, all invalid formulae are eliminated by syntax enforcing in Mamba models in this experiment, which is not the case for other models.

Table 8: The effect of syntax enforcing on the invalid formulae generated by the three training runs of the best models for each architecture on LTLRandom35’s test set.

Model		After Syntax Enforcing					
Architecture	Model Name	Total Invalid	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
Transformer	8-128-512-6-a	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8-128-512-6-b	13392	7739	0	4748	44	861
	8-128-512-6-c	2575	1385	0	1150	40	0
Subtotal		15967	9124	0	5898	84	861
Mamba	128-6-a	1	0	0	1	0	0
	128-6-b	228	6	0	221	0	1
	128-6-c	539	537	0	2	0	0
Subtotal		768	543	0	224	0	1
Llama	8-64-128-6-a	13923	13781	0	27	0	115
	8-64-128-6-b	2092	1027	0	1065	0	0
	8-64-128-6-c	4063	3879	0	17	0	167
Subtotal		20078	18687	0	1109	0	282
GRAND TOTAL		36813	28354	0	7231	84	1144

Table 9: The effect of syntax enforcing on the invalid formulae generated by the transformer encoder-decoder models on 10000 validation set samples.

Model		After Syntax Enforcing					
Name	Parameters	Total Invalid	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
4-32-64-2	44,142	3038	157	0	4	2877	0
4-32-64-4	86,894	583	410	0	63	98	12
4-32-64-6	129,646	3817	691	0	21	3074	31
4-64-256-4	469,710	51	51	0	0	0	0
4-128-512-4	1,856,910	1	1	0	0	0	0
8-64-128-2	170,190	38	14	0	15	0	9
8-64-128-4	337,614	531	524	0	0	0	7
8-64-128-6	505,038	3653	3511	5	24	2	111
8-64-256-2	236,238	0	0	0	0	0	0
8-128-256-2	668,046	48	2	0	2	44	0
8-128-256-8	2,655,630	582	560	0	22	0	0
8-128-512-2	931,214	468	464	0	2	2	0
8-128-512-6-a	2,782,606	0	0	0	0	0	0
8-128-512-6-b	2,782,606	1362	820	0	462	4	76
8-128-512-6-c	2,782,606	264	138	0	125	1	0
8-128-512-8	3,708,302	133	104	0	29	0	0
8-128-1024-8	5,813,646	932	527	0	404	1	0
TOTAL		15501	7974	5	1173	6103	246

Table 10: The effect of syntax enforcing on the invalid formulae generated by the Mamba models on 10000 validation set samples.

Model		After Syntax Enforcing					
Name	Parameters	Total Invalid	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
32-2	20,960	170	129	0	39	0	2
32-4	40,864	1	1	0	0	0	0
32-6-a	60,768	0	0	0	0	0	0
32-6-b	60,768	21	4	0	0	0	17
32-6-c	60,768	6	6	0	0	0	0
32-6-d	60,768	2	1	0	1	0	0
64-2	67,520	104	97	0	2	0	5
64-4	132,928	2	2	0	0	0	0
64-6	198,336	312	311	0	0	0	1
128-2	237,440	622	611	0	4	0	7
128-4	470,656	453	452	0	1	0	0
128-6-a	703,872	0	0	0	0	0	0
128-6-b	703,872	18	0	0	18	0	0
128-6-c	703,872	46	46	0	0	0	0
256-2	884,480	12	1	0	11	0	0
256-4	1,760,512	1	1	0	0	0	0
256-6	2,636,544	299	258	0	41	0	0
512-2	3,407,360	142	20	0	122	0	0
512-4	6,797,824	31	23	0	8	0	0
512-6	10,188,288	20	4	0	16	0	0
TOTAL		2262	1967	0	263	0	32

Table 11: The effect of syntax enforcing on the invalid formulae generated by the Llama-based models on 10000 validation set samples.

Model		After Syntax Enforcing					
Name	Parameters	Total Invalid	Correct	Exact	Incorrect	Invalid	Timeout
4-32-64-2	21,824	3	1	0	2	0	0
4-32-64-4	42,432	8	5	0	3	0	0
4-32-64-6	63,040	884	852	0	11	0	21
4-64-128-8	331,136	637	554	0	76	0	7
4-128-512-4	1,054,464	563	462	0	74	0	27
8-64-128-2	84,608	0	0	0	0	0	0
8-64-128-4	166,784	272	268	0	1	0	3
8-64-128-6-a	248,960	1500	1486	0	7	0	7
8-64-128-6-b	248,960	220	117	0	103	0	0
8-64-128-6-c	248,960	431	404	0	1	0	26
8-64-128-8	331,136	877	857	0	4	0	16
8-128-256-2	333,056	282	252	0	25	0	5
8-128-256-8	1,317,632	1278	837	0	189	0	252
8-128-512-2	529,664	209	177	0	31	0	1
8-128-512-4	1,054,464	940	908	0	29	0	3
8-128-512-6	1,579,264	1306	1167	0	136	0	3
8-256-512-6	3,944,960	2185	1295	0	738	4	148
TOTAL		11595	9642	0	1430	4	519