

# Constrained Optimization for Hybrid System Falsification and Application to Conjunctive Synthesis

Sota Sato<sup>\*,\*\*</sup> Masaki Waga<sup>\*\*\*,\*</sup> Ichiro Hasuo<sup>\*,\*\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan  
(e-mail: {sotasato,mwaga,hasuo}@nii.ac.jp)

<sup>\*\*</sup> The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI),  
Tokyo, Japan

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Japan

---

**Abstract:** The *synthesis* problem of a cyber-physical system (CPS) is to find an input signal under which the system’s behavior satisfies a given specification. Our setting is that the specification is a formula of signal temporal logic, and furthermore, that the specification is a *conjunction* of different and often conflicting requirements. Conjunctive synthesis is often challenging for *optimization-based falsification*—an established method for CPS analysis that can also be used for synthesis—since the usual framework (especially how its *robust semantics* handles Boolean connectives) is not suited for finding delicate trade-offs between different requirements. Our proposed method consists of a combination of optimization-based falsification and *constrained optimization*. Specifically, we show that the state-of-the-art *multiple constraint ranking* method can be combined with falsification powered by CMA-ES optimization; its performance advantage for conjunctive synthesis is demonstrated in experiments.

*Keywords:* control system synthesis, cyber-physical system, constrained optimization, evolutionary algorithm, temporal logic, hybrid system falsification, search-based testing

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Hybrid System Falsification* Quality assurance of cyber-physical systems (CPSs) is a problem of grave social, economic and humanitarian importance. Given the limited applicability of *formal verification* to CPSs—due to fundamental/ challenges such as the inherent hybrid dynamics in CPSs and the absence of white-box system models—one would often turn to so-called *light-weight formal methods*. (*Hybrid system*) *falsification* is one such method that attracts attention from industry and academia alike; see e.g., Ernst et al. (2020).

The falsification problem is to discover a counterexample for a logically-formulated system specification. It is seen as one specific realization of *search-based testing*.

*Problem 1.* (Falsification).

- **Given:** a *model*  $\mathcal{M}$  that takes an input signal  $u$  and yields an output signal  $\mathcal{M}(u)$ , and a *specification*  $\varphi$
- **Find:** a *falsifying input*, that is, an input signal  $u$  such that the corresponding output  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  violates  $\varphi$

Here the system model  $\mathcal{M}$  is typically that of a hybrid system (car, airplane, etc.) and is often given in the form of a Simulink model.

*Optimization-based falsification*, initiated in Fainekos and Pappas (2009), is an established approach to the falsification problem. The key idea of optimization-based falsification is the translation of Problem 1 into minimization of the robustness with which  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  satisfies the specification

$\varphi$ . As we will see in §2, such a degree is incarnated by the *robust semantics*, which assigns an (extended) real number  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi \rrbracket \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$  to an output signal  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  and a specification  $\varphi$ . This allows us to utilize existing optimization algorithms to adaptively choose prospective input signals  $u$  and eventually find a falsifying input.

Note that, in optimization-based falsification, the model  $\mathcal{M}$  in Problem 1 need not be a white-box one. One does not need to understand its internal working; it is enough to be able to observe the output  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  that corresponds to a given input  $u$ .

*Conjunctive Synthesis via Hybrid System Falsification*

One easily figures out that falsification of  $\neg\varphi$  (i.e., to find a falsifying input for  $\neg\varphi$ ) is equivalent to *synthesis* for  $\varphi$  (i.e., to find an input that satisfies  $\varphi$ ). The goal of the paper is to exploit and extend the techniques for optimization-based falsification with the aim of solving the following *conjunctive synthesis problem*.

*Problem 2.* (Conjunctive Synthesis).

- **Given:** a *model*  $\mathcal{M}$  that takes an input signal  $u$  and yields an output signal  $\mathcal{M}(u)$ , and a *conjunctive specification*  $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m$
- **Find:** a *satisfying input*, that is, an input signal  $u$  such that the corresponding output  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  satisfies  $\varphi$

Instances of conjunctive synthesis are omniscient in the real-world system design processes.

*Example 3.* Here is our leading example. The system model  $\mathcal{M}$  is given by a Simulink model for automatic transmission system—a system model commonly used in the falsification literature such as Ernst et al. (2020). The model  $\mathcal{M}$  has two inputs (**throttle**, **brake**) and three outputs (**rpm**, **speed**, **gear**). The specification  $\varphi$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AT1}_p &:\equiv \square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p) \\ &\quad \wedge \square_{[0,30]}(\text{speed} \leq 60) \\ &\quad \wedge \diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3); \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

it means the gear should reach the third without any of RPM and speed getting too large, a requirement common in the break-in procedure. The RPM bound  $p$  is a parameter: the smaller  $p$  is, the harder the synthesis problem becomes.

Conjunctive synthesis tends to be hard when it contains conflicting requirements. This is the case with the above leading example—gear gets larger typically when RPM and/or speed is larger, while the specification  $\varphi$  requires RPM and speed to stay small. In this situation, satisfying all requirements asks for a careful trade-off between them. Automated synthesis of input signals that achieve such delicate trade-offs (between performance and energy-efficiency, safety and progress, etc.) can help system designers who would otherwise spend a lot of time for manual trials and search.

*The Scale Problem* Turning now from the problem itself to a solver for conjunctive synthesis, a falsification solver can be used as an approach since Problem 2 is equivalent to falsification of  $\neg\varphi$  (Problem 1). However, existing falsification solvers can struggle with some problem instances, as we will see in §4. The main obstacle is the *scale problem*, a general problem in falsification that is identified and tackled in Zhang et al. (2019).

To illustrate the scale problem, consider our leading example where the specification  $\text{AT1}_p$  is given in (1). Following the standard definition by Fainekos and Pappas (2009) (see §2), the robust semantics  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \text{AT1}_p \rrbracket \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$  of the formula  $\text{AT1}_p$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \text{AT1}_p \rrbracket &= v_1 \sqcap v_2 \sqcap v_3, \quad \text{where} \\ v_1 &= \prod_{t \in [0,30]} (p - \text{rpm}(t)), \quad v_2 = \prod_{t \in [0,30]} (60 - \text{speed}(t)), \\ v_3 &= \bigsqcup_{t \in [0,30]} (\text{gear}(t) - 3). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This expression clearly shows that, in order for  $\mathcal{M}(u)$  to satisfy the specification  $\text{AT1}_p$  (which is equivalent to  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \text{AT1}_p \rrbracket > 0$ ), all the three values  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  composed with infimum  $\sqcap$  should be positive simultaneously.

The issue here is that the formulation (2) can prevent hill-climbing optimization algorithms from effectively making all the three values  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  positive. For example, imagine that we are in an early stage of the search for a satisfying input signal, and that all the values  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  are still negative. By the nature of the automatic transmission model  $\mathcal{M}$ , the value  $v_1$  is likely to be in the order of (minus) thousands, the value  $v_2$  is likely to be in the order of (minus) tens, and the value  $v_3$  is either  $-2$  or  $-1$ . In this

case, the value  $v_1$  dominates the overall objective function  $v_1 \sqcap v_2 \sqcap v_3$ , masking the contribution of  $v_2$  and  $v_3$ . This obviously does not help to find a delicate balance between  $v_1, v_2$  and  $v_3$ .

This problem—that some specific component dominates the robustness of a Boolean combination and masks away the other components—is exhibited in Zhang et al. (2019) where it is called the *scale problem*. A solution is proposed in Zhang et al. (2019) where conjuncts or disjuncts are thought of as arms in the *multi-armed bandit problem* (MAB) and an MAB algorithm is combined with a hill-climbing optimization solver. However, this solution in Zhang et al. (2019) is dedicated to satisfying the specifications of the form  $\diamond_I(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$  and  $\diamond_I(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$ ; therefore it does not apply to our current problem of conjunctive synthesis (satisfying  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m$ , Problem 2).

*Contribution* Our proposed method for solving conjunctive synthesis (Problem 2) combines optimization-based falsification and *constrained optimization*—optimization of the value of a single objective function but subject to potentially multiple constraints. Specifically, we show that the state-of-the-art *multiple constraint ranking* (MCR) method by de Paula Garcia et al. (2017) can be combined with *CMA-ES*, an optimization algorithm by Hansen (2016) that is commonly used in optimization-based falsification.

In the original work by de Paula Garcia et al. (2017), MCR was introduced as a constraint handling technique (CHT) associated with the canonical genetic algorithm, while it was suggested that MCR could also be associated with other evolutionary algorithms. In this work, we integrate MCR with CMA-ES. MCR address the scale problem in the constraints and/or the objective function, without requiring user-specified parameters or additional computation to estimate scales. The key idea that allows MCR to do so is the use of suitable *rankings*—instead of robustness values of constraints themselves—in prioritizing candidate solutions.

We conduct an experimental evaluation of the proposed method, where we use hybrid system models from the falsification literature (such as Ernst et al. (2020)) and conjunctive specifications for synthesis. The comparison is against the state-of-the-art falsification tool Breach presented in Donzé (2010) (ver. 1.7.0, from January 2020); the experimental results show that our integration of MCR successfully addresses the scale problem and succeeds in conjunctive synthesis more often.

*Related Work* There are various techniques toward formal verification of hybrid systems such as reachability analysis and theorem proving; see e.g. Chen et al. (2013); Frehse et al. (2011); Fan et al. (2016); Platzer (2018). However, they are currently not very successful in the quality assurance of the *real-world* CPSs due to scalability issues and the scarcity of white-box system models.

The scale problem in falsification has been reported and several countermeasures have been proposed. In Dokhanchi et al. (2017) and Ferrère et al. (2019), the scale problem is addressed by adapting the scales of robustness

of subformulas. Moreover, the scale adaptation is automatic. In Zhang et al. (2019), an MAB-based algorithm is proposed: its hierarchical framework considers Boolean subformulas as arms in the multi-armed bandit problem, thus avoiding superposition of robustness values (and in particular the scale problem) altogether. In Zhang et al. (2019), the limit of effectivity of scale adaptation is experimentally shown, too. We note that the technique in Zhang et al. (2019) does not apply to conjunctive synthesis—as we discussed in the above.

*Input constraints*—constraints that a falsifying input signal should satisfy—are important in real-world application of falsification. Efficient handling of input constraints has been studied in some recent works including Zhang et al. (2020a); Barbot et al. (2020); Zhang et al. (2020b). Note that the “constraints” in this paper are mostly on output signals, instead of on input.

Finally, besides MCR from de Paula Garcia et al. (2017), other constraint handling techniques that go along well with CMA-ES are pursued in Ho and Shimizu (2007); Spettel and Beyer (2019); Sakamoto and Akimoto (2019). They differ in target constraint classes; see §3.1.

*Organization of the Paper* §2 introduces some background of optimization-based falsification and give the formalism of conjunctive synthesis by constraint optimization. §3 introduces our algorithm to solve constrained optimization. §4 reports the experiments for assessing the performance advantage of our approach, and §5 concludes the paper.

## 2. CONJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS BY CONSTRAINED OPTIMIZATION

### 2.1 Boolean Semantics and Robust Semantics of STL

Our specifications  $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m$  are given by *signal temporal logic* (STL) formula, as is common in the falsification literature. We fix the finite set  $\mathbf{Var}$  of variables.

*Definition 4.* (signal). A *signal* over  $\mathbf{Var}$  is a function  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{Var}}$ . A signal is called *M-dimensional* when the cardinality of  $\mathbf{Var}$  is  $M$ .

*Definition 5.* (STL syntax). In STL, the set  $\mathbf{Fml}$  of *formulas* is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Fml} \ni \varphi := & \top \mid \perp \mid f(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \mid f(\mathbf{x}) < 0 \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \\ & \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \mathcal{U}_I \varphi \mid \varphi \mathcal{R}_I \varphi \mid \diamond_I \varphi \mid \square_I \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here  $f$  is a function symbol applied to a tuple  $\mathbf{x}$  of variables from  $\mathbf{Var}$ , and  $f(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  is an atomic formula. An example of such  $f$  is  $f(x, y) = 4x - y - 3$ ; it denotes a function  $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for a suitable arity  $n$ .  $I$  is a non-singular interval in  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , i.e.,  $I = [a, b]$ ,  $(a, b)$ ,  $(a, b]$ ,  $[a, b)$  or  $[a, \infty)$  where  $a < b$ .

In the conventional *Boolean* semantics of STL, a signal  $\sigma$ 's satisfaction of a formula  $\varphi$  is given by a relation  $\sigma \models \varphi$  (see Maler and Nickovic (2004)). The Boolean semantics is not suited for optimization-based falsification, which typically relies on hill-climbing optimization algorithms.

The *robust semantics*  $\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket$  of an STL formula  $\varphi$  under a signal  $\sigma$  is the key enabler of optimization-based falsification; it is introduced in Fainekos and Pappas (2006). The robust semantics takes an (extended) real number as its value ( $\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$ ). The value designates how robustly the formula is satisfied.

*Definition 6.* (robust semantics). Let  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{Var}}$  be a signal and  $\varphi$  be a STL formula. We define the *robustness*  $\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$  by induction, as shown in Table 1. Here  $\sqcap$  and  $\sqcup$  denote infimums and supremums of (extended) real numbers, respectively, and  $f(\sigma(0)(\mathbf{x}))$  denotes  $f(\sigma(0)(x_1), \sigma(0)(x_2), \dots, \sigma(0)(x_n))$ .

The following relationship holds between the Boolean and robust semantics.

*Proposition 7.*  $\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket > 0$  implies  $\sigma \models \varphi$  and  $\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket < 0$  implies  $\sigma \not\models \varphi$ .

### 2.2 Conjunctive Synthesis by Constrained Optimization

Noting that the robust semantics interprets conjunction  $\wedge$  by the infimum  $\sqcap$  of real numbers, Problem 2 can be solved as follows.

Consider the following optimization problem:

$$\underset{u}{\text{maximize}} \quad \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m \rrbracket, \quad (4)$$

that is,

$$\underset{u}{\text{maximize}} \quad \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_1 \rrbracket \sqcap \dots \sqcap \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_m \rrbracket. \quad (5)$$

If the discovered maximum is positive, then by Proposition 7, the corresponding value of the optimization variable  $u$  is a solution to conjunctive synthesis (Problem 2).

However, the form (5) that combines different values with infimum  $\sqcap$  often hinders hill-climbing optimization—this is the scale problem that we discussed in §1.

Our main idea in the paper is to regard conjuncts not as objectives (as in (5)) but as constraints, described below.

*Problem 8.* (Conjunctive Synthesis by Constrained Optim.). In the setting of Problem 2, consider the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{u}{\text{maximize}} \quad \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_1 \rrbracket \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_i \rrbracket > 0, \quad i = 2, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

If the discovered maximum is positive, then by Proposition 7, the corresponding value of the optimization variable  $u$  is a solution to conjunctive synthesis (Problem 2).

*Remark 9.* In (6), we picked  $\varphi_1$  as the optimization target, leaving the other conjuncts  $\varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_m$  as constraints. We can do so without loss of generality since the order of the objectives is irrelevant. In practice, we would pick as  $\varphi_1$  the conjunct that we expect to be the most challenging to satisfy.

Via the translation of Problem 2 to Problem 8, we make the major challenge in Problem 2 explicit in the problem formulation. Specifically, the conflict between different conjuncts  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$  is buried away in a single objective function in (5); it is made explicit in (6). However, this translation would lead to an efficient solution only if there exists an algorithm that successfully exploits the structure that is now made explicit. This is the topic of the next section (§3).

$\llbracket \sigma, \top \rrbracket := \infty$	$\llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \rrbracket := \llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \rrbracket \sqcup \llbracket \sigma, \varphi_2 \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \diamond_I \varphi \rrbracket := \bigcap_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi \rrbracket)$
$\llbracket \sigma, \perp \rrbracket := 0$	$\llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \rrbracket := \llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \rrbracket \sqcap \llbracket \sigma, \varphi_2 \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \square_I \varphi \rrbracket := \bigcup_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi \rrbracket)$
$\llbracket \sigma, f(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \rrbracket := f(\sigma(0)(\mathbf{x}))$	$\llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \mathcal{U}_I \varphi_2 \rrbracket := \bigcup_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi_2 \rrbracket) \sqcap \bigcap_{t' \in [0, t)} \llbracket \sigma^{t'}, \varphi_1 \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \square_I \varphi \rrbracket := \bigcup_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi \rrbracket)$
$\llbracket \sigma, f(\mathbf{x}) < 0 \rrbracket := -f(\sigma(0)(\mathbf{x}))$	$\llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \mathcal{R}_I \varphi_2 \rrbracket := \bigcap_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi_2 \rrbracket) \sqcup \bigcup_{t' \in [0, t)} \llbracket \sigma^{t'}, \varphi_1 \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \square_I \varphi \rrbracket := \bigcup_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi \rrbracket)$
$\llbracket \sigma, \neg \varphi \rrbracket := -\llbracket \sigma, \varphi \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \varphi_1 \mathcal{R}_I \varphi_2 \rrbracket := \bigcap_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi_2 \rrbracket) \sqcup \bigcup_{t' \in [0, t)} \llbracket \sigma^{t'}, \varphi_1 \rrbracket$	$\llbracket \sigma, \square_I \varphi \rrbracket := \bigcup_{t \in I} (\llbracket \sigma^t, \varphi \rrbracket)$

Table 1. Definition of robust semantics of STL

*Remark 10.* We note that Problem 8 is a *single-objective* optimization problem under multiple constraints, that should be distinguished from a *multi-objective* optimization problem. The latter’s notion of optimality is more involved (given e.g. by the *Pareto front*), and it would call for very different algorithms. Recall that our ultimate goal is constraint satisfaction  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_1 \rrbracket > 0, \dots, \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_m \rrbracket > 0$ . We need the robustness value of each formula  $\varphi_i$  to be positive, but further optimization beyond 0 is unnecessary.

### 2.3 Optimization-Based Synthesis by CMA-ES

For an optimization problem such as (5), one can adopt any optimization algorithm on (extended) real function, as SA (simulated annealing), GNM (global Nelder-Mead), CMA-ES, and so on.

Our algorithm for conjunctive synthesis (Problem 2) will be based on CMA-ES, an evolutionary computation algorithm introduced by Hansen (2016), whose efficiency in the context of optimization-based falsification is well-established Zhang et al. (2019). Here is its outline.

*Definition 11.* (CMA-ES Hansen (2016)). Given a fitness function  $f$ , CMA-ES operates in an iterative manner, repeating the following regenerational steps until termination. Let  $\mu, \lambda$  be fixed natural numbers with  $\mu < \lambda$ .

- (1) Generate a *population*  $X = \langle u_1, u_2, \dots, u_\lambda \rangle$  by sampling from the distribution  $d_\theta$  on the search space, with the parameter value  $\theta$  that is previously chosen. Specifically, the distribution  $d_\theta$  is a Gaussian distribution, and  $\theta$  gives its mean and covariance matrix.
- (2) Select  $\mu$  individuals  $u_{1:\lambda}, u_{2:\lambda}, \dots, u_{\mu:\lambda} \in X$  that are the fittest on  $f$ .
- (3) Update the distribution parameter  $\theta$  according to the selected individuals.

Specifically, the new mean is the mean of the selected individuals  $u_{1:\lambda}, \dots, u_{\mu:\lambda}$ , and the new covariance matrix is chosen in a suitable manner. See Hansen (2016).

Here we describe the algorithm of (pure) CMA-ES, in the form adapted to the current synthesis problem. In our algorithm later in §3, it will be combined with MCR to address conflicting conjuncts in the specification. Its pseudo code is presented in Algorithm 1, in which three subroutines ASK, TELL, and GEN-SIGNAL appear.

ASK and TELL are interface pattern of CMA-ES, encapsulating its detailed behavior; described in detail in Collette et al. (2010). Optimizers can be seen as a piece of program in the loop that receives evaluation results and generates new candidates to be evaluated next. ASK returns  $\lambda$  sampled point  $\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle$  by parameter  $\theta$  and TELL updates the parameter by receiving sorted points  $\langle x_{s(1)}, \dots, x_{s(\lambda)} \rangle$ .

GEN-SIGNAL is a function that generates an input signal  $u_i$  from an individual  $x_i$ . As usual with hybrid system falsification, we restrict input signals to piecewise constant ones, and represent them by the values of variables at each control point. Therefore our individuals  $x_i$  resides in the set  $\mathbb{R}^{m \cdot |\mathbf{Var}|}$ , where  $m$  is the number of control points and  $\mathbf{Var}$  is the set of input variables to the model  $\mathcal{M}$ .

On the guard for the while loop (Line 4), we terminate if one of the following is the case: 1)  $\text{rb} > 0$  (in which case  $u$  is an input signal we look for); 2) the budget is used up (the budget can be specified by time or by the number of iterations); and 3) CMA-ES is in *termination criteria*, numeric stationarity conditions described in Hansen (2016). For instance, a termination criterion `EqualFunValues` is true if the best objective function values does not change in the last  $10 + \lceil 30n/\lambda \rceil$  generations, where  $n$  is the dimension of the search space and  $\lambda$  is the size of population.

---

#### Algorithm 1 CMA-ES adapted to optimization-based synthesis

---

**Require:** a system model  $\mathcal{M}$ , an STL formula  $\varphi$ , the size of population  $\lambda$ , and an initial parameter  $\theta^0$  of CMA-ES

- 1: **function** CMAES-SYNTHESIZE( $\mathcal{M}, \varphi, \lambda, \theta^0$ )
- 2:    $\text{rb} \leftarrow -\infty$ ;    $u \leftarrow \perp$   
     $\triangleright$   $\text{rb}$  is the greatest robustness so far with signal  $u$
- 3:    $g \leftarrow 0$                       $\triangleright$   $g$  is generation of evolution
- 4:   **while** ( $\text{rb} \leq 0$ , within budget, and) **do**
- 5:      $\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle \leftarrow \text{ASK}(\theta^g)$   
        $\triangleright$  Sample population
- 6:     **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $\lambda$  **do**
- 7:        $u_i \leftarrow \text{GEN-SIGNAL}(x_i)$
- 8:        $\text{rb}_i \leftarrow \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u_i), \varphi \rrbracket$
- 9:       **if**  $\text{rb}_i > \text{rb}$  **then**  $\text{rb} \leftarrow \text{rb}_i$ ;  $u \leftarrow u_i$   
        $\triangleright$  Update robustness and signal
- 10:    **end for**
- 11:     $x_1, \dots, x_\lambda \leftarrow x_{s(1)}, \dots, x_{s(\lambda)}$   
    with  $s(i) := \text{argsort}(\langle -\text{rb}_1, \dots, -\text{rb}_\lambda \rangle, i)$   
     $\triangleright$  Sort individuals in descending order by their robustness
- 12:     $\theta^{g+1} \leftarrow \text{TELL}(\theta^g, \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle)$   
     $\triangleright$  Update parameter
- 13:     $g \leftarrow g + 1$
- 14:    **end while**
- 15:     $u \leftarrow \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \text{rb} > 0, \text{ that is, } \text{rb} = \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi \rrbracket > 0 \\ \text{Failure} & \text{no satisfying input found} \end{cases}$
- 16:    **return**  $u$
- 17: **end function**

---

### 3. OUR ALGORITHM: COMBINING MCR AND CMA-ES

#### 3.1 The Constrained Optimization Taxonomy

In search of a disciplined method for handling multiple (possibly conflicting) constraints, we turned to the taxonomy of constrained optimization problems Digabel and Wild (2015). According to the taxonomy, our current problem (Problem 8) is classified as follows.

- *Simulation-based* as opposed to *a priori*, in the sense that the satisfaction of a constraint is determined only in a black-box manner (we assume a model  $\mathcal{M}$  is complex and thus black-box).
- *Relaxable* as opposed to *unrelaxable*, in the sense that the objective function has well-defined values even if the constraints are not satisfied.
- *Quantifiable* as opposed to *nonquantifiable*, in the sense that the degree of satisfaction of each constraint can be quantified (namely by the robustness  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_i \rrbracket$ ).

We note that constraint handling in CMA-ES is previously pursued in Sakamoto and Akimoto (2019). Their focus is however on a priori constraints, instead of simulation-based constraints that are our current setting.

#### 3.2 MCR in CMA-ES

It turns out that the *multiple constrained ranking* algorithm (MCR) de Paula Garcia et al. (2017) fits the very classification discussed in the above. It works with general evolutionary optimization algorithms, hence also with CMA-ES.

*Definition 12.* (MCR in CMA-ES). Assume the setting of Problem 8, and let us write  $f(u) = \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_1 \rrbracket$  for the optimization objective (the fitness function).

MCR in CMA-ES consists of replacing the use of the fitness function  $f$ , in Step 2 of Def. 11, with the following *scoring function*  $F_X$ . (Note that the function  $F_X$  relies on the current population  $X$ .)

For each individual  $u$ , the value  $F_X(u)$  is a natural number, and those  $u$  with smaller  $F_X(u)$  are deemed fitter. Its value is defined by

$$F_X(u) := \begin{cases} \text{RVNum}_X(u) + \sum_{j=2}^m \text{RCon}_X^j(u) & \text{(if no feasible solution in population } X) \\ \text{RObj}_X(u) + \text{RVNum}_X(u) + \sum_{j=2}^m \text{RCon}_X^j(u) & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here a feasible solution is an individual  $u$  that satisfies all the constraints, that is,  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_i \rrbracket > 0$  for all  $i = 2, \dots, m$ . The functions  $\text{RVNum}_X$ ,  $\text{RObj}_X$ ,  $\text{RCon}_X^j$  all return a suitable “rank” of the input. Specifically,

- $\text{RObj}_X(u)$  is the rank of  $u$  among the population  $X$  in the descending order of the value of the objective  $f$ , i.e.,  $\text{RObj}_X(u) = 1 + |\{u' \in X \mid f(u) < f(u')\}|$ .
- For each  $j \in [2, m]$ ,  $\text{RCon}_X^j(u)$  is the rank of  $u$  among the population  $X$  in the descending order of the value of  $0 \sqcap \llbracket \mathcal{M}(\underline{\quad}), \varphi_j \rrbracket$ , that is, the opposite of the degree of violation of constraint  $\varphi_j$ . This is much like  $\text{RObj}_X(u)$

Table 2. Example; robustness of  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3$  for each individual and their infimum

Individual	$\varphi_1$	$\varphi_2$	$\varphi_3$	infimum
$u_1$	1400	59.9	-2	-2
$u_2$	-9	2	1	-9
$u_3$	-180	2	-1	-180

Table 3. Example; values of ranks and scoring function for each individual

Individual	$\text{RObj}_X$	$\text{RCon}_X^2$	$\text{RCon}_X^3$	$\text{RVNum}_X$	$F_X$
$u_1$	1	1	3	2	7
$u_2$	2	1	1	1	5
$u_3$	3	1	2	2	8

but note that the degree of satisfaction (i.e., positive robustness) is disregarded via  $0 \sqcap$ .

- $\text{RVNum}_X(u)$  is the rank of  $u$  among  $X$  in the *ascending* order of the number of violated constraints, that is, for how many  $j \in [2, m]$  we have  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi_j \rrbracket \leq 0$ .

*Example 13.* Let  $\varphi_1 := \square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq 2400)$ ,  $\varphi_2 := \square_{[0,30]}(\text{speed} \leq 60)$ ,  $\varphi_3 := \diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3)$  in the setting of Example 3. For certain individuals  $u_1, u_2, u_3$ , their robustness values  $\llbracket \mathcal{M}(u_i), \varphi_j \rrbracket$  with respect to  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3$  are shown in Table 2.

Assume that the population  $X$  is  $X = \langle u_1, u_2, u_3 \rangle$ . In this case, the usual robust semantics indicates the input  $u_1$  is the best individual among  $X$ , in the sense that the infimum is the largest. However, once we inspect the input signals  $u_1, u_2, u_3$ , it becomes obvious that  $u_1$  is the farthest from desired—it is in fact the signal in which **brake** is constantly the maximum and **throttle** is constantly 0.

The last mismatch between the robustness-based preference and human intuition comes from the scale problem. The quantity in  $\varphi_3$  (namely **gear**) is smaller in scale compared to those in  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ ; and therefore the robustness of  $\varphi_3$  tends to mask that of others.

In contrast, the MCR scoring function gives different preference, as shown in Table 3. Here we pick the formula  $\varphi_1 \equiv \square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p)$  as the objective (Problem 8 and Definition 12); the others  $\varphi_2, \varphi_3$  are deemed to be as constraints.

The scoring function  $F_X$  indicates the best input is  $u_2$ . This matches human intuition: the input signal  $u_2$  is one with moderate throttle and no braking. The signal  $u_2$  satisfies  $\varphi_2, \varphi_3$  and almost satisfies  $\varphi_1$ , violating the RPM limit 2400 only by 9.

#### 3.3 Integrating MCR with Optimization-based Synthesis

Integrating MCR with Algorithm 1 is easy from the implementation point of view. The resulting algorithm is showed as Algorithm 2. We note that  $F_X$  at Line 15 implicitly depends on the values of robustness  $\text{rb}_i^j$  ( $i = 1, \dots, \lambda, j = 1, \dots, m$ ) according to the definition of (7). Between the resulting algorithm and the original one, the only essential difference is in Line 16—Algorithm 2 uses the MCR rank  $F_{\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle}$ . Therefore we expect that integrating MCR with other evolutionary computation-based falsification solvers can be done in a modular manner, too.

## 4. EXPERIMENTS

We implemented our conjunctive synthesis algorithm (denoted by “MCR”) by combining Breach (Donzé (2010)) with MCR. In our implementation, we replaced the MATLAB implementation of CMA-ES with *pycma* (a standard Python implementation of CMA-ES by Hansen (2016)) and combined with MCR (also implemented in Python).

We conducted experiments to answer the following research questions.

- RQ1** Does MCR successfully address the scale problem?  
**RQ2** How much does the choice of the objective conjunct ( $\varphi_1$  in Problem 8) influence the performance of MCR?  
**RQ3** Does MCR incur critical overheads?

### 4.1 Benchmark Models and Specifications

In our experiments, we used the following benchmark models and specifications. The Simulink models are widely used in the benchmarks for falsification; see e.g. Ernst et al. (2020). Each of the specifications consists of two to three conjuncts (cf. Problem 2).

*Automatic Transmission (AT)* The benchmark model AT was proposed in Hoxha et al. (2015). This model has two inputs *throttle* and *break* each with 5 control points; and has three outputs  $\text{gear} \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$ , *rpm* and *speed*.

---

#### Algorithm 2 Conjunctive Synthesis by MCR

---

**Require:** Same as Algorithm 1

```

1: function MCR-SYNTHESIZE( $\mathcal{M}, \varphi, \lambda, \theta^0$ )
2:    $\text{rb} \leftarrow -\infty$ ;  $u \leftarrow \perp$ 
3:    $g \leftarrow 0$ 
4:   while ( $\text{rb} \leq 0$ , within budget, and) do
      (not stationary)
5:      $X := \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle \leftarrow \text{ASK}(\theta^g)$ 
       $\triangleright$  Sample population
6:     for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $\lambda$  do
7:        $u_i \leftarrow \text{GEN-SIGNAL}(x_i)$ 
8:        $\text{rb}_i^1 \leftarrow \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u_i), \varphi_1 \rrbracket$ 
9:       for  $j \leftarrow 2$  to  $m$  do
10:         $\text{rb}_i^j \leftarrow \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u_i), \varphi_j \rrbracket$ 
11:       end for
12:        $\text{rb}_i \leftarrow \min(\text{rb}_i^1, \text{rb}_i^2, \dots, \text{rb}_i^m)$ 
13:       if  $\text{rb}_i > \text{rb}$  then  $\text{rb} \leftarrow \text{rb}_i$ ;  $u \leftarrow u_i$ 
       $\triangleright$  Update robustness and signal
14:     end for
15:      $F_1, \dots, F_\lambda \leftarrow F_X(u_1), \dots, F_X(u_\lambda)$ 
16:      $x_1, \dots, x_\lambda \leftarrow x_{s(1)}, \dots, x_{s(\lambda)}$ 
      with  $s(i) := \text{argsort}(\langle F_1, \dots, F_\lambda \rangle, i)$ 
       $\triangleright$  Sort individuals in ascending order by  $F_X(x)$ 
17:      $\theta^{g+1} \leftarrow \text{TELL}(\theta^g, \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\lambda \rangle)$ 
       $\triangleright$  Update parameter
18:      $g \leftarrow g + 1$ 
19:   end while
20:    $u \leftarrow \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \text{rb} > 0, \text{ that is, } \text{rb} = \llbracket \mathcal{M}(u), \varphi \rrbracket > 0 \\ \text{Failure} & \text{no satisfying input found} \end{cases}$ 
21:   return  $u$ 
22: end function

```

---

Our goal is to find a satisfying signal for each of the following specifications.

$$\text{AT1}_p \equiv \square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p) \wedge \square_{[0,30]}(\text{speed} \leq 60) \\ \wedge \diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3)$$

$$\text{AT2} \equiv \diamond_{[0,29]}(\text{speed} \geq 100) \wedge \diamond_{[29,30]}(\text{speed} \leq 65)$$

$$\text{AT3}_{p_1, p_2} \equiv \diamond_{[0,10]}(\text{speed} \geq p_1) \wedge \square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p_2)$$

While  $\text{gear} \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we have  $\text{RPM} \in [0, 5000]$  and  $\text{speed} \in [0, 100]$ , and thus the scale problem is expected in  $\text{AT1}_p$  and  $\text{AT3}_{p_1, p_2}$ .

*Fuel Control (AFC)* The benchmark model AFC was proposed in Jin et al. (2014). This model has two inputs *throttle* and *engine*, each with 10 control points. It has two outputs *mode* and  $\mu$ : *mode*  $\in \{0, 1\}$  shows if the system is controlled by feedback control or feedforward control; and  $\mu$  is the deviation of the air-fuel ratio from its reference value. We aim to find a signal that satisfies the following specification.

$$\text{AFC} \equiv \square_{[31,50]}(\text{mode} = 0) \wedge \diamond_{[11,20]}(\text{mode} = 1) \\ \wedge \square_{[0,30]}(\text{throttle} > 40 \Rightarrow \text{engine} < 1000) \\ \wedge \diamond_{[0,50]} \square_{[0,25]}(\text{engine} > 1000)$$

*Wind Turbine (WT)* The benchmark model WT was proposed in Schuler et al. (2017). This model has one input  $v$  with 18 control points, and has three outputs that are the blade pitch angle  $\theta$ , the generator torque  $M_{g,d}$ , and the rotor speed  $\Omega$ . Our goal is to find a signal that satisfies the following specification.

$$\text{WT} \equiv \diamond_{[0,90]} \square_{[0,5]}(15.5 \leq v \leq 15.95 \wedge \theta < 12) \\ \wedge \diamond_{[0,90]}(M_{g,d} \geq 47000) \wedge \diamond_{[0,90]}(\Omega < 9)$$

We used the time horizon of 90 seconds while it is 630 seconds in Ernst et al. (2020). We observed that 90 seconds is long enough to satisfy the specification WT.

### 4.2 Experiment

We compared the performance of our algorithm (henceforth denoted by “MCR”) with the two baseline implementations “Breach” and “Breach\_pycma.” Although they are algorithmically the same, we used both of them since they have some minor differences, e.g., in the handling of input ranges.

- (“Breach”) Breach 1.7.0 with its original MATLAB implementation of CMA-ES
- (“Breach\_pycma”) Breach 1.7.0 with its CMA-ES implementation replaced with the one offered by the *pycma* library in Python Hansen (2016)

Note that these baselines do not include MCR as a constraint-handling technique.

We conducted the experiments on an Amazon EC2 c4.xlarge instance (2.9 GHz Intel Xeon E5-2666 v3, 7.5 GB RAM).

For each problem instance, we executed each of the implementations for 20 times with different initial seeds. We set a timeout in 600 seconds. We measured the *success rate* (SR) that is the number of the successful trials, i.e., the

trials where a signal satisfying the given specification was found. We also measured the *average elapsed time* of the successful trials.

As we mentioned in Remark 9, when one translates optimization-based falsification into constrained optimization, there is freedom in the choice of the objective conjunct ( $\varphi_1$  in Problem 8). This choice affects the performance of MCR. In our experiments, we tried each conjunct in a specification as the optimization target, and we report the performance of the best and the worst choices.

Table 4 summarizes the experiments results. We mark time as “—” if SR is 0, i.e., if all trials failed.

### 4.3 Discussion

We discuss the three research questions in view of Table 4.

#### **RQ1** Does MCR successfully address the scale problem?

The experiment results give an affirmative answer. The advantage of MCR is more obvious in challenging problem instances such as AT1<sub>p</sub>, AFC, and WT. AT2 and AT3 are less challenging ones where the scale problem is less eminent; for these problem instances, too, MCR’s performance is comparable or better compared to plain Breach.

Note that AT1<sub>p</sub> with  $p = 2400$  is the same specification that we discussed in Example 13; we discussed there that the specification is subject to the scale problem. Note also that the problem becomes harder as the parameter  $p$  becomes smaller.

In Table 4, we see that Breach (both with the original and pycma CMA-ES) suffer from the scale problem; notably it succeeds in zero out of 20 trials for the hardest instance (AT1<sub>2300</sub>). In those unsuccessful runs of Breach, the evolutionary computation tends to terminate because of stationarity (Line 4 of Algorithm 1), not because of timeout. This is because the robustness of  $\varphi_3$  (regarding gear) becomes dominant at some stage but  $\varphi_3$ ’s robustness is hard to improve (cf. the masking effect in the scale problem, Example 13).

In contrast, MCR often succeeds to synthesize a satisfying input—almost half the time even for the hardest instance AT1<sub>2300</sub>.

#### **RQ2** How important is the choice of the objective conjunct in MCR?

The problem instance in which the performance gap between MCR (best) and MCR (worst) is the largest is AT1<sub>2300</sub>, the apparently hardest instance in Table 4. Apart from that, the impact of the choice of the objective is seen to be moderate. We also observe that the performance of MCR (worst) is comparable or better compared to Breach without MCR.

#### **RQ3** Does MCR incur critical overheads?

The comparison between Breach and MCR in the execution time is mixed in Table 4. MCR takes longer for AT1<sub>2400</sub>, for example, but at the same time it achieves

much higher success rate. For problem instances such as AT3<sub>80,4500</sub> and WT, MCR finishes earlier while its success rate is the same as or higher than Breach.

In Table 4, the average execution time of MCR is only several times longer than that of Breach, even in the worst instance. Therefore we conclude that the overhead of MCR is admissible, in view of its higher success rate.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose a view of the conjunctive synthesis problem as a constrained optimization problem. This approach enables solvers to use constraint handling techniques i.e., MCR. Our experiments show that the approach remarkably improves the success rate of synthesis when the scale problem involves.

One future work is to extend our idea of using the constrained optimization problem to a more general form of specifications than the disjunctive specifications in the synthesis problem. Investigating a method to choose a good objective conjunct is another future work.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are supported by ERATO HASUO Metamathematics for Systems Design Project (No. JPM-JER1603), JST.

## REFERENCES

- Barbot, B., Basset, N., Dang, T., Donzé, A., Kapinski, J., and Yamaguchi, T. (2020). Falsification of cyber-physical systems with constrained signal spaces. In *Proc. NFM 2020*, volume 12229 of *LNCS*, 420–439. Springer.
- Chen, X., Ábrahám, E., and Sankaranarayanan, S. (2013). Flow\*: An analyzer for non-linear hybrid systems. In *Proc. CAV 2013*, 258–263. Springer.
- Collette, Y., Hansen, N., Pujol, G., Salazar Aponte, D., and Le Riche, R. (2010). On Object-Oriented Programming of Optimizers – Examples in Scilab. In *Multidisciplinary Design Optimization in Computational Mechanics*, 527–565. Wiley. Section: 14.
- de Paula Garcia, R., de Lima, B.S.L.P., de Castro Lemonge, A.C., and Jacob, B.P. (2017). A rank-based constraint handling technique for engineering design optimization problems solved by genetic algorithms. *Computers and Structures*, 187, 77–87.
- Digabel, S.L. and Wild, S.M. (2015). A taxonomy of constraints in simulation-based optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.07881*.
- Dokhanchi, A., Yaghoubi, S., Hoxha, B., and Fainekos, G.E. (2017). Vacuity aware falsification for MTL request-response specifications. In *Proc. CASE 2017*, 1332–1337. IEEE.
- Donzé, A. (2010). Breach, A toolbox for verification and parameter synthesis of hybrid systems. In *Proc. CAV 2010*, 167–170.
- Ernst, G., Arcaini, P., Bennani, I., Donze, A., Fainekos, G., Frehse, G., Mathesen, L., Menghi, C., Pedrielli, G., Pouzet, M., Yaghoubi, S., Yamagata, Y., and Zhang, Z. (2020). Arch-comp 2020 category report: Falsification. In *Proc. ARCH 2020*, volume 74 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, 140–152. EasyChair.

Table 4. Experimental results. SR shows success rates (out of 20 trials); time is the average execution time for successful trials in seconds. MCR (best) (resp. MCR (worst)) represents the best (resp. worst) instance of MCR, in terms of which conjunct we chose as the objective  $\varphi_1$  (cf. Problem 8). For each problem instance, the best combination in terms of the following order is highlighted: (SR, time) is better than (SR', time') if and only if we have SR > SR' or we have both SR = SR' and time < time'. For each instance, the largest SR is shown in blue.

Spec. $\varphi$	Breach		Breach_pycma		MCR (best)			MCR (worst)		
	SR (/20)	time [s]	SR	time	SR	time	objective conjunct $\varphi_1$	SR	time	objective conjunct $\varphi_1$
AT1 <sub>2500</sub>	14	27.3	<b>20</b>	47.9	<b>20</b>	35.6	$\diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3)$	<b>20</b>	101.7	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p)$
AT1 <sub>2400</sub>	4	36.4	7	69.3	<b>19</b>	188.2	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p)$	6	96.4	$\diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3)$
AT1 <sub>2300</sub>	0	—	0	—	<b>9</b>	349.4	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p)$	0	—	$\diamond_{[0,30]}(\text{gear} \geq 3)$
AT2	12	190.8	<b>16</b>	298.0	15	340.1	$\diamond_{[0,29]}(\text{speed} \geq 100)$	13	194.1	$\diamond_{[29,30]}(\text{speed} \leq 65)$
AT3 <sub>80,4500</sub>	<b>20</b>	38.6	<b>20</b>	59.3	<b>20</b>	30.9	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p_2)$	<b>20</b>	43.2	$\diamond_{[0,10]}(\text{speed} \geq p_1)$
AT3 <sub>50,2700</sub>	19	95.2	<b>20</b>	241.4	<b>20</b>	237.5	$\diamond_{[0,10]}(\text{speed} \geq p_1)$	16	254.5	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{rpm} \leq p_2)$
AFC	4	325.3	7	194.0	<b>14</b>	229.8	$\diamond_{[11,20]}(\text{mode} = 1)$	10	230.6	$\square_{[0,30]}(\text{throttle} > 40 \Rightarrow \text{engine} < 1000)$
WT	10	327.9	16	240.4	<b>20</b>	140.7	$\diamond_{[0,90]}(\Omega < 9)$	19	162.4	$\diamond_{[0,90]}(M_{g,d} \geq 47000)$

Fainekos, G.E. and Pappas, G.J. (2006). Robustness of temporal logic specifications. In *Proc. FATES and RV 2006*, volume 4262 of *LNCS*, 178–192. Springer.

Fainekos, G.E. and Pappas, G.J. (2009). Robustness of temporal logic specifications for continuous-time signals. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(42), 4262–4291.

Fan, C., Qi, B., Mitra, S., Viswanathan, M., and Dug-girala, P.S. (2016). Automatic reachability analysis for nonlinear hybrid models with C2E2. In *Proc. CAV 2016*, 531–538. Springer.

Ferrère, T., Nickovic, D., Donzé, A., Ito, H., and Kapinski, J. (2019). Interface-aware signal temporal logic. In *Proc. HSCC 2019*, 57–66. ACM.

Frehse, G., Guernic, C.L., Donzé, A., Cotton, S., Ray, R., Lebeltel, O., Ripado, R., Girard, A., Dang, T., and Maler, O. (2011). Spacex: Scalable verification of hybrid systems. In *Proc. CAV*, volume 6806 of *LNCS*, 379–395. Springer.

Hansen, N. (2016). The CMA evolution strategy: A tutorial. *CoRR*, abs/1604.00772.

Ho, P.Y. and Shimizu, K. (2007). Evolutionary constrained optimization using an addition of ranking method and a percentage-based tolerance value adjustment scheme. *Inf. Sci.*, 177(14), 2985–3004.

Hoxha, B., Abbas, H., and Fainekos, G. (2015). Benchmarks for temporal logic requirements for automotive systems. In *Proc. ARCH 2014 and 2015*, volume 34 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, 25–30. EasyChair.

Jin, X., Deshmukh, J.V., Kapinski, J., Ueda, K., and Butts, K. (2014). Powertrain control verification benchmark. In *Proc. HSCC 2014*, 253–262. ACM.

Maler, O. and Nickovic, D. (2004). Monitoring temporal properties of continuous signals. In *Proc. FORMATS 2004 and FTRTFT 2004*, volume 3253 of *LNCS*, 152–166. Springer.

Platzer, A. (2018). *Logical Foundations of Cyber-Physical Systems*. Springer.

Sakamoto, N. and Akimoto, Y. (2019). Adaptive ranking based constraint handling for explicitly constrained black-box optimization. In *Proc. GECCO 2019*, 700–708. ACM.

Schuler, S., Adegas, F.D., and Anta, A. (2017). Hybrid modelling of a wind turbine. In *Proc. ARCH 2016*, volume 43 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, 18–26. EasyChair.

Spettel, P. and Beyer, H. (2019). A multi-recombinative active matrix adaptation evolution strategy for constrained optimization. *Soft Comput.*, 23(16), 6847–6869.

Zhang, Z., Arcaini, P., and Hasuo, I. (2020a). Constraining counterexamples in hybrid system falsification: Penalty-based approaches. In *Proc. NASA 2020*, volume 12229 of *LNCS*, 401–419. Springer.

Zhang, Z., Arcaini, P., and Hasuo, I. (2020b). Hybrid system falsification under (in)equality constraints via search space transformation. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Aided Des. Integr. Circuits Syst.*, 39(11), 3674–3685. doi:10.1109/TCAD.2020.3013073. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCAD.2020.3013073>.

Zhang, Z., Hasuo, I., and Arcaini, P. (2019). Multi-armed bandits for boolean connectives in hybrid system falsification. In *Proc. CAV 2019, Part I*, volume 11561 of *LNCS*, 401–420. Springer.