

Conformal Temporal Logic Planning using Large Language Models

Jun Wang¹, Jiaming Tong², Kaiyuan Tan¹, Yevgeniy Vorobeychik³, and Yiannis Kantaros¹

Abstract—This paper addresses a novel task planning problem for mobile robots with missions requiring the accomplishment of multiple high-level sub-tasks in a temporal and logical order, where the sub-tasks are expressed using natural language (NL). To formally define the mission, we treat these NL-specified sub-tasks as atomic predicates in a Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) formula. We refer to this novel framework for formal task specification as LTL-NL. Our goal is to design robot plans accomplishing LTL-NL tasks, a problem that cannot be solved directly by existing LTL planners because of the NL nature of atomic propositions defining the sub-tasks. To address this problem, we propose HERACLES, a hierarchical neuro-symbolic planner that relies on a novel integration of (i) symbolic temporal logic planners generating high-level task plans determining what NL-based sub-tasks should be accomplished and in what order to successfully complete the mission; (ii) Large Language Models (LLMs) to design robot plans, defined as sequences of robot actions, implementing the task plans; and (iii) conformal prediction (CP) acting as a formal interface between (i) and (ii). CP allows the proposed planner to reason about the uncertainty of the employed LLM in its outputs. In cases of high uncertainty, the LLM asks for help from the symbolic planner to revise the task plan and, if unsuccessful, from users. We show, both theoretically and empirically, that HERACLES can achieve high mission success rates due to this conformal interface. We provide extensive comparative experiments demonstrating that HERACLES outperforms state-of-the-art LLM-based planning approaches in terms of its ability to design correct plans. The advantage of HERACLES over baselines grows as the mission complexity increases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Several task planners have been proposed recently that can generate robot plans satisfying complex high-level missions expressed as Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) formulas [1]–[15]. To define an LTL task, users must specify multiple atomic predicates (i.e., Boolean variables) to model desired low-level robot configurations, and couple them using temporal/Boolean operators. However, this demands a significant amount of expertise and manual effort, increasing the likelihood of mis-specification for complex tasks. Moreover, complex tasks often result in lengthy LTL formulas, increasing the computational cost of designing robot plans [16].

Natural Language (NL) has recently been proposed as a more user-friendly alternative for specifying robot missions [17]–[33]. NL-based planners typically rely on pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) to design effective

robot plans through conversational interactions [28], [34], [35]. LLM-based planning methods, however, are characterized by two main limitations: (i) they lack correctness guarantees; and (ii) their ability to design correct plans tends to deteriorate with increasing task complexity [32].

To mitigate the above limitations, we propose an alternative approach to *mission specification* and *robot planning* that combines the strengths of LTL and NL. First, we discuss our proposed mission specification framework. We model a complex task as comprised of a collection of simple ‘atomic’ sub-tasks, with temporal and logical relationships among them represented using an LTL specification. The sub-tasks thus serve as atomic predicates in an LTL formula, with the associated predicate being true if the sub-task is successfully accomplished, and false otherwise. Our key departure from conventional LTL specifications is that we specify each such sub-task in NL, rather than directly grounding it in the low-level configuration space. For example, consider a task in which the robot first needs to deliver a bottle of water to the kitchen table, and only afterwards deliver a coke to the office desk. We can define two NL sub-tasks, ‘deliver a bottle of water to the kitchen table’ and ‘deliver a coke to the office desk’, and use an LTL formula to express the logical and temporal relationship between them. We refer to our framework for task specification that composes LTL and NL as an LTL-NL specification (or formula). The advantage of this framework over conventional LTL is that LTL-NL formulas are shorter while capturing the same task, making them more user-friendly to define. In comparison to NL instructions, our framework enables the automatic decomposition of the overall mission (i.e., an LTL-NL specification) into multiple NL-based sub-tasks using existing symbolic task decomposition methods [36]–[38]. We emphasize that such a decomposition is highly challenging to perform automatically for missions expressed exclusively using NL. As it will be discussed later, task decomposition plays a critical role in enabling our planning framework to consistently outperform NL-based planners, especially as mission complexity increases.

Second, we address the challenge of designing robot plans while ensuring their correctness with respect to LTL-NL formulas (something that prior work does not provide tools to do). Specifically, we consider a mobile robot possessing various skills (e.g., mobility, manipulation, and sensing) that is tasked with missions expressed as LTL-NL specifications. Each sub-task in the LTL-NL formula requires the robot to apply its skills to various semantic objects and regions of interest in the environment. While we assume that the locations and semantic labels of these objects are known, the

¹J. Wang, K. Tan and Y. Kantaros (corresponding author - ioannisk@wustl.edu) are with the Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, Washington University in St Louis.

²J. Tong is with the Department of Informatics, University of Zurich.

³Y. Vorobeychik is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Washington University in St Louis.

This work was supported in part by the NSF award CNS #2231257 and the ARL grant DCIST CRA W911NF-17-2-0181.




Fig. 1: This paper proposes HERACLES, a neuro-symbolic planning framework for mobile robots with LTL-NL missions. The framework starts with a symbolic task planner that generates the next language-based sub-task that should be accomplished to make mission progress. Pre-trained LLMs are then deployed to design robot plans for that sub-task. The LLM planner seeks assistance from the symbolic planner either when the robot plan cannot be executed due to environmental constraints or when it is uncertain about how to accomplish that sub-task. Uncertainty of the LLM is quantified using conformal prediction (CP). If the LTL task planner cannot assist, then help from users is requested (not shown). The mission in this figure requires the robot to eventually deliver a pen to location D but only after either an apple or a drink has been delivered to D. The symbolic planner first generates the sub-task ‘deliver a drink to E’. Due to the ambiguity in this task description (glass of water or coke?), the LLM-based planner asks the symbolic planner to generate an alternative sub-task to make progress. The new task is ‘deliver an apple to E’; see also Example 2.1.

geometric environmental structure is initially unknown. The latter may hinder the completion of certain language-based sub-tasks (e.g., when an object is inaccessible). Our goal is to design plans, defined as a sequence of robot actions, satisfying the assigned LTL-NL missions.

To address this task planning problem, we propose a hierarchical neuro-symbolic planner that harnesses the complementary strengths of LLMs and symbolic planners. Specifically, our proposed planner comprises several key components. First, it leverages existing temporal logic planners that dynamically determine, based on the current mission status, the next NL-based sub-task the robot should accomplish to make progress in the mission [36], [37]. Second, pre-trained LLMs are employed to generate robot plans satisfying that sub-task [39]–[46]. If the geometric environmental structure prevents the robot from executing these plans (e.g., obstacles blocking the entrance to regions of interest), the LTL-task planner will generate alternative sub-tasks (if they exist) as in [36], [37]. A novel challenge here is that LLMs tend to hallucinate, i.e., to confidently generate incorrect and unrealistic outputs [47]. Such false confidence in incorrect outputs poses a significant challenge in language-based robot planning. This issue becomes more pronounced by potential ambiguity in NL-specified tasks. Thus, to reason about the correctness of the LLM-generated plans, inspired by [18], [48], we leverage conformal prediction (CP), a statistical tool for uncertainty quantification in black-box models [18], [48]–

[54]. CP constructs on-the-fly prediction sets that contain the ground-truth/correct robot action with a user-specified probability. This allows the LLM to determine when it is uncertain about its predictions. In cases of high uncertainty, indicated by non-singleton prediction sets, the robot seeks assistance. This assistance occurs in two ways. First, a help-message is sent to the LTL planner requesting alternative sub-tasks to make mission progress. If such a sub-task exists, it is forwarded back to the LLM planner. Otherwise, the robot asks for help from a user about how to proceed. This formal interface between the symbolic task planner and the pre-trained LLM gives rise to our planner, called HERACLES, for HiERArchical Conformal natural language planner; see Fig. 1. The generated plans are executed using existing low-level controllers.

We provide theoretical mission success rate guarantees for HERACLES that are also validated by statistical experiments. We also provide extensive comparative experiments showing that HERACLES outperforms state-of-the-art LLM-based planners in terms of planning performance. In these experiments, we manually translate LTL-NL missions into NL instructions which serve as inputs to the LLM-based planners. Our experiments show that the ability of LLMs to design correct plans tends to decrease as the number of temporal and logical requirements in the mission increases. To the contrary, the planning performance of HERACLES remains consistently high as the complexity

of the overall mission increases. The reason is that, using symbolic planners, the mission is decomposed into multiple smaller/simpler language-based sub-tasks that LLMs can handle more efficiently. Additionally, we provide examples demonstrating that LTL-NL formulas are shorter than LTL formulas capturing the same mission and, consequently, more user-friendly to define.

Related works: As discussed earlier, a substantial body of work exists on temporal logic planning, as seen in [1], [7]–[10], [12], [14] and the references therein. We emphasize that existing LTL planners cannot solve the considered problem due to the language-based construction of the atomic predicates. In fact, a major technical challenge that arises in this setup lies in designing mechanisms that can automatically reason about whether a sequence of robot actions (e.g., ‘grab the bottle of water at location A’, ‘go to the kitchen table’, ‘drop off the bottle’) satisfies a language-based sub-task/atomic predicate (e.g., ‘deliver a bottle of water at the kitchen table’) let alone the entire LTL-NL formula. We address this challenge using CP. Related are also the recent works on language-based planning using LLMs; see e.g., [17], [18], [30], [31], [33] and the references therein. A limitation in these works is that they lack performance and safety guarantees. Additionally, it has been shown that existing LLMs cannot efficiently handle tasks with temporal and logical requirements [32] as also validated by our empirical analysis. Among these works, probably the closest one is [18] as it also applies CP for uncertainty alignment of LLMs; however, it addresses a different planning problem. To the best of our knowledge, we propose the first neuro-symbolic planner that tightly integrates symbolic planners with LLMs with formal interfaces enabled by CP.

Contribution: The contribution of the paper can be summarized as follows. *First*, we propose a task specification approach, called LTL-NL, to define complex high-level robot tasks, aiming to bridge the gap between LTL- and NL-based specification methods. *Second*, we introduce a new task planning problem over missions expressed as LTL-NL formulas. *Third*, to address this problem, we present HERACLES, the first neurosymbolic planning algorithm that tightly integrates symbolic planners with LLMs. *Fourth*, we show, both theoretically and empirically, that HERACLES can achieve high mission success rates through a formal interface, employing CP, between the LLM and the symbolic planner. *Fifth*, we provide extensive comparative experiments highlighting that HERACLES outperforms state-of-the-art LLM-based planners in terms of its ability to design correct plans. We argue that these results demonstrate that the true potential of LLMs for task planning problems reveals when they are integrated with existing symbolic planners [55].

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Robot System and Skills: Consider a robot governed by the following dynamics: $\mathbf{p}(t+1) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))$, where $\mathbf{p}(t) \in \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ stands for the state (e.g., position and orientation) of the robot, and $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^b$ stands for control input at discrete time t . We assume that the robot state $\mathbf{p}(t)$

is known for all time instants $t \geq 0$. The robot has $A > 0$ number of abilities/skills collected in a set $\mathcal{A} \in \{1, \dots, A\}$. Each skill $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is represented as text such as ‘take a picture’, ‘grab’, or ‘move to’. Application of a skill a at an object/region with location \mathbf{x} at time $t \geq 0$ is denoted by $s(a, \mathbf{x}, t)$ or, for brevity, when it is clear from the context, by $s(t)$. The time step t is increased by one, once an action is completed. We assume that the robot has access to low level controllers to apply the skills in \mathcal{A} . Hereafter, we assume perfect/error-free execution of these capabilities.

Partially Known Semantic Environment: The robot operates within a semantic environment $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$ with fixed, static, and potentially unknown obstacle-free space denoted by $\Omega_{\text{free}} \subseteq \Omega$. We assume that Ω_{free} is populated with $M > 0$ static semantic objects. Each object e is characterized by its location \mathbf{x}_e and semantic label $o_e \in \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is a set collecting all semantic labels that the robot can recognize (e.g., ‘bottle’ or ‘chair’). The robot is assumed to have knowledge of both the location and label of each object. Objects may also be located inside containers (e.g., drawer or fridge), with their status (open/closed) initially unknown. Also, the occupied space $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{free}}$ may prevent access to certain semantic objects. We assume that the robot is equipped with (perfect) sensors allowing it to detect obstacles and reason about the status of containers containing objects of interest.

Mission Specification: The robot is tasked with a high-level mission with temporal and logical requirements. To formally define such tasks, we employ Linear Temporal Logic (LTL). LTL is a formal language that comprises a set of atomic propositions (AP) (i.e., Boolean variables), denoted by \mathcal{AP} , Boolean operators, (i.e., conjunction \wedge , and negation \neg), and two temporal operators, such as *always* \square , *eventually* \diamond , and *until* \mathcal{U} ; see also Ex. 2.1. A formal presentation of the syntax and semantics of LTL can be found in [16]. For simplicity, hereafter, we restrict our attention to co-safe LTL formulas that is a fragment of LTL that exclude the ‘always’ operator. Co-safe LTL formulas can be satisfied within a finite horizon H . For brevity, throughout the paper, we may use the term LTL instead of co-safe LTL. We define APs so that they are true when a sub-task expressed in natural language (NL) is satisfied, and false otherwise. For example, consider sub-tasks of the form ‘deliver a bottle of water to location X’. Each NL-based AP π is defined so that it can be satisfied by a finite robot trajectory τ , defined as a finite sequence of T decisions, i.e., $\tau = s(t), s(t+1), \dots, s(t+k), \dots, s(t+T-1)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$, for some $T \geq 1$. A robot trajectory τ accomplishing π can be generated e.g., using existing Large Language Models (LLMs) [30]. We call formulas constructed in this way as co-safe LTL-NL formulas. Co-safe LTL-NL formulas are satisfied by finite-horizon robot trajectories τ_ϕ defined as $\tau_\phi = \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, \dots, \tau_N$, where τ_n is a finite robot trajectory of horizon T_n , as defined before. Thus, the total horizon H of the plan τ_ϕ is $H = \sum_{n=1}^N T_n$. We highlight that in τ_ϕ , the index n is different from the time instants $t \in \{1, \dots, H\}$. In fact, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ is an

index, initialized as $n = 1$ and increased by 1 every T_n time instants, pointing to the next finite trajectory in τ_ϕ . Our goal is to design plans τ_ϕ satisfying co-safe LTL-NL tasks.

Problem Statement: This paper addresses the following problem (see Ex. 2.1):

Problem 1: Given a robot with capabilities \mathcal{A} , a partially unknown semantic environment Ω , and a co-safe LTL-NL task ϕ , design a robot plan τ_ϕ satisfying ϕ .

Example 2.1: Consider a robot with skills $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{go to, pick up}\}$. The semantic objects that the robot can recognize are $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{Coke, Pen, Apple}\}$. The environment along with the locations of all semantic objects is shown in Fig. 1. The task of the robot is modeled as an LTL-NL formula $\phi = \diamond\pi_3 \wedge (\neg\pi_3\mathcal{U}(\pi_1 \vee \pi_2))$, where π_1 , π_2 and π_3 model the sub-tasks ‘Deliver Drink to \mathbf{x}_E ’, ‘Deliver Apple to \mathbf{x}_E ’, and ‘Deliver Pen to \mathbf{x}_D ’, respectively. This formula requires eventually satisfying π_3 but only after either π_1 or π_2 is satisfied. Thus, this task can be satisfied by first delivering either a drink or an apple to \mathbf{x}_E and then delivering the pen to \mathbf{x}_D . A plan τ_ϕ to satisfy ϕ is defined as $\tau_\phi = s(\text{go to, } \mathbf{x}_F, 1), s(\text{pick up, Apple, } 2), s(\text{go to, } \mathbf{x}_E, 3), s(\text{pick up, Pen, } 4), s(\text{go to, } \mathbf{x}_D, 5)$.

III. HIERARCHICAL TEMPORAL LOGIC PLANNING WITH NATURAL LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we propose HERACLES, a new hierarchical planning algorithm to address Problem 1. In Section III-A, we present an overview HERACLES. A more detailed description of its components is provided in Sections III-B-III-E. The algorithm is summarized Alg. 1.

A. Overview of HERACLES

HERACLES takes as input an LTL-NL mission defined over a partially known semantic environment. This LTL-NL formula is processed online by a symbolic temporal logic planner that, given the current mission status, determines the next language-based sub-task the robot should accomplish to make mission progress. This symbolic planner is presented in Section III-B and is adopted from [36], [37]. This language-based sub-task serves as an input to a pre-trained LLM that is responsible for generating a feasible robot plan (i.e., a finite sequence of decisions $s(t)$ accomplishing the assigned sub-task); see Section III-C. The LLM planner communicates back to the LTL planner with one of the following messages: (i) A robot plan has been designed and executed, accomplishing the assigned sub-task. In this scenario, the LTL planner generates a new sub-task, if the overall mission has not been accomplished yet, and the process repeats. (ii) A robot plan has been designed but the (initially unknown) geometric structure of the environment ends up preventing the robot from fully executing it. In this case, the LTL planner generates an alternative sub-task to proceed and the above process repeats. If such a sub-task does not exist, the mission terminates unsuccessfully (e.g., the LTL-NL mission may be infeasible). (iii) The LLM is ‘uncertain’ about what the correct plan is. In this case, the LTL planner generates an alternative sub-task to proceed. If such a sub-task does

Algorithm 1 HERACLES: A Hierarchical Neuro-Symbolic Planner

- 1: **Input:** LTL-NL Task ϕ ; Coverage level α ;
- 2: Symbolic planner generates sub-task: π_{next} and Σ^{unsafe}
- 3: Convert sub-task into an initial prompt $\ell(1)$ with empty history of action
- 4: **while** (ϕ not accomplished) \wedge ($\pi_{\text{next}} \neq \emptyset$) **do**
- 5: $\tau = \emptyset$
- 6: **for** $k = 0$ to $T - 1$ **do**
- 7: Compute the local prediction set $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$
- 8: **if** $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| > 1$ **then**
- 9: Request a new sub-task ($\pi_{\text{next}}, \Sigma^{\text{unsafe}}$)
- 10: **if** $\pi_{\text{next}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 11: $t = t + k$, and go to line 5
- 12: **else**
- 13: Obtain $s(t+k)$ from human operator
- 14: **else**
- 15: Pick (unique) decision $s(t+k) \in \mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$
- 16: **if** Ω prevents execution of $s(t+k)$ **then**
- 17: Request a new sub-task ($\pi_{\text{next}}, \Sigma^{\text{unsafe}}$)
- 18: **if** $\pi_{\text{next}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 19: $t = t + k$, and go to line 5
- 20: **else**
- 21: Report mission failure (termination)
- 22: **else**
- 23: Execute decision $s(t+k)$
- 24: Observe environment update $p(t+k)$
- 25: Update $\ell(t+k+1) = \ell(t+k) + s(t+k) + p(t+k)$
- 26: Construct $\tau = [s(t), \dots, s(t+T-1)]$
- 27: Append τ to the plan τ_ϕ
- 28: Current time step: $t = t + T$
- 29: Request a new sub-task ($\pi_{\text{next}}, \Sigma^{\text{unsafe}}$) and check for mission accomplishment

not exist, help from users is requested who either provide the correct decision or decide to halt operation. A detailed description of when the LLM requests assistance (cases (ii)-(iii)) from the symbolic planner is provided in Section III-D. Conformal prediction, outlined in Section III-E, is employed for uncertainty quantification in case (iii).

B. Symbolic Temporal Logic Task Planner: What Language-based Sub-Task to Accomplish Next?

In this section, we employ an existing temporal logic task planner designed to determine what language sub-task the robot should accomplish next to make progress towards accomplishing the LTL-NL task ϕ . A detailed presentation of this planner can be found in [36], [37].

Consider an LTL-NL specification ϕ . Initially, we translate ϕ into a Deterministic Finite state Automaton (DFA). This step occurs offline. The DFA can be conceptualized as a graph structure, with state-space (set of nodes) and transitions (set of edges) between states/nodes. The DFA has an initial node representing the mission’s commencement, a set

of final nodes denoting mission completion, and intermediate nodes representing various stages of the mission. Transitions between nodes occur when specific atomic predicates are satisfied. Mission accomplishment is achieved upon reaching a final state starting from the initial one.

At any time $t \geq 0$, the task planner receives three inputs: (i) an LTL-NL task ϕ ; (ii) the current mission status; and (iii) a set $\Sigma^{\text{unc}}(t)$ of NL-based APs/sub-tasks. The input (ii) is represented by the DFA state that has been reached, starting from the initial one, given the sequence of actions that the robot has applied up to time t . The set in (iii) is initially empty, i.e., $\Sigma^{\text{unc}}(0) = \emptyset$, and is dynamically updated as the robot navigates the world. Specifically, it is updated so that it collects all NL-based APs that the robot is uncertain about how to accomplish or that are physically impossible to achieve (e.g., they require reaching inaccessible objects). The details of its update are discussed in Section III-C.

Given these inputs, the task planner generates: (i) an NL-based atomic proposition, denoted by π_{next} ; and (ii) a set of NL-based atomic propositions collected in a set Σ^{unsafe} [line 2, Alg. 1]. These sets impose two conditions that must be met to make mission progress (i.e., to move closer to a DFA final node). Specifically, the robot should design a plan τ to (a) accomplish the language-based sub-task captured in π_{next} while, (b) in the meantime, not satisfying any of the language-based sub-tasks collected in Σ^{unsafe} . These two requirements act as inputs to an LLM-based planner; refer to Section III-C. The LLM-based planner is responsible for designing a plan τ that satisfies conditions (a)-(b).

C. LLM-based Planner: How to Accomplish the Assigned Sub-Task?

Next, our goal is to design a finite horizon plan τ satisfying conditions (a)-(b) to make progress towards accomplishing ϕ . To synthesize τ , we utilize existing LLMs. A key challenge here is that LLMs cannot necessarily break down the conditions (a)-(b) into low-level instructions that are suitable for robotic execution. Therefore, we will inform the LLM that we want the conditions (a)-(b) to be broken down into sequences of executable robot skills collected in \mathcal{A} .

Particularly, assume that at time t the LTL task planner generates requirements (a)-(b). Hereafter, we simply refer to these requirements as the (language-based) sub-task that the robot should accomplish next. We convert this task planning problem into a sequence of $T > 0$ multiple-choice question-answering (MCQA) problems for the LLM where T is a hyperparameter.¹ The ‘question’ refers to the sub-task along with any actions (if any) that the robot has taken up to time $t+k$, $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ to accomplish it. We denote by $\ell(t+k)$ the (textual) description of the ‘question’. The ‘choices’ refer to the decisions $s(t+k)$ that the robot can make. We collect these decisions in a set denoted by \mathcal{S} . This set is constructed offline using the action space \mathcal{A} and the available objects where each action can be applied. Given $\ell(t+k)$, the

¹Essentially, τ and T refer to τ_n and T_n defined in Section II. For ease of presentation, we drop the dependence on the index n .

System Description	Environment Description												
Action Space: (1, x): Go to location x (2, x): Pick up object x (3): Put down the object (4, x): Open the door of container x (5): Remain idle	Location LA: bottle B in the Fridge F Location LB: pen P Location LC: apple A Location LD: Coke C1 Location LE: Coke C2 Location LF: Can Ca in the Drawer D												
Complete the assigned task using fewest steps. Choose an action from the action space at each time given action history and environment updates.	Response Structure												
Task: Move Can Ca to LB	Example Task: Move bottle B to LE												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="color: #0070C0;">Action History</th> <th style="color: #0070C0;">Environment Update</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(1, F)</td> <td>Fridge F(closed) in LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4, F)</td> <td>Bottle B in the Fridge(open) in LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2, B)</td> <td>Nothing in the Fridge(open) in LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1, LE)</td> <td>Coke C2 in LE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3)</td> <td>Coke C2 and Bottle B in LE</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action History	Environment Update	(1, F)	Fridge F(closed) in LA	(4, F)	Bottle B in the Fridge(open) in LA	(2, B)	Nothing in the Fridge(open) in LA	(1, LE)	Coke C2 in LE	(3)	Coke C2 and Bottle B in LE
Action History	Environment Update												
(1, F)	Fridge F(closed) in LA												
(4, F)	Bottle B in the Fridge(open) in LA												
(2, B)	Nothing in the Fridge(open) in LA												
(1, LE)	Coke C2 in LE												
(3)	Coke C2 and Bottle B in LE												

Fig. 2: Example of the constructed prompt. Only some of the rules used in part (A) are shown.

LLM will select $s(t+k)$. This process occurs sequentially for $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ giving rise to a plan τ . In what follows, first we discuss how $\ell(t+k)$ is structured and then we show how it can be used to compute $s(t+k)$.

Prompt Construction: In what follows, we discuss how we structure the context text (‘prompt’) that will be given as an input to the LLM; see also Fig. 2. The prompt used in this work consists of the following parts. (A) *System description* that defines the action space determining all possible actions $a \in \mathcal{A}$ that the robot can apply and rules that the LLM should always respect in its decision-making process. For instance, in our considered simulations, such rules explicitly determine that the robot cannot grasp an object located in a fridge before opening the fridge door. We observed that explicitly specifying such constraints improved the quality of LLM plans. We additionally require the length of the plan τ to be less than T , where $T \geq 0$ is a user-specified hyperparameter. (B) *Environment description* that describes the locations \mathbf{x}_e of each semantic object e of interest; (C) *Task description* that includes the language-based task π_{next} (condition (a)) as well as language-based constraints (if any), modeled by Σ^{unsafe} that the robot should respect until π_{next} is satisfied (condition (b)); (D) *History of actions & current environment status* that includes the sequence of actions, generated by the LLM, that the robot has executed so far towards accomplishing the assigned task. It also includes the current locations of semantic objects that the robot may have manipulated/moved so far; (E) *Response structure* describing the desired structure of the LLM output for an example task.

Plan Design & Execution: At iteration $k = 0$, part (D) does not include any textual information as a new sub-task has just been announced [line 3, alg. 1]. Given $\ell(t+k)$, the LLM is asked to make a decision $s(t+k)$ among all available ones included in part (A). The LLM selects $s(t+k)$ as follows. Given any $s \in \mathcal{S}$, LLMs can provide a score $g(s|\ell(t+k))$; the higher the score, the more likely the decision s is a valid next step to address the language-instruction provided in $\ell(t+k)$. To get $g(s|\ell(t+k))$, we query the LLM over all potential decisions $s \in \mathcal{S}$ [30].

Using these scores, a possible approach to select the $s(t+k)$ is by simply choosing the decision with the highest score, i.e., $s(t+k) = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g(s|\ell(t+k))$. However, these scores do not represent calibrated confidence. In fact, LLMs tend to confidently generate incorrect actions. Thus,

a much preferred solution is to calibrate these confidence scores and let the LLM make decisions only when it is certain enough [18]. We formalize this by constructing a set of actions (called, hereafter, *prediction set*), denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$, that contain the ground truth action with a user-specified high-probability [line 7, alg. 1]. Hereafter, we assume that such prediction sets are provided; we defer their construction, using conformal prediction, to Section III-E (see (9)). Given $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$, we select the decision $s(t+k)$ as follows. If $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| = 1$, then we select the decision included in $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$ as it contributes to mission progress with high probability [line 15, Alg. 1].² As soon as it is selected, the robot physically executes it using its library of low-level controllers [line 23, alg. 1]. If $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| > 1$ [line 8-13, alg.1] or if $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| = 1$ but the robot cannot physically execute $s(t+k)$ the robot seeks assistance to select $s(t+k)$ [line 16-21, Alg.1]; see Section III-D. Note that the latter may occur if, as the robot executes $s(t)$ and senses the initially unknown obstacles, it realizes that the geometric environmental structure prevents it from reaching desired destinations/objects [37].

Once $s(t+k)$ is selected and physically executed, the current time step is updated to $t+k+1$. Then, $\ell(t+k+1)$ is constructed that will be used to select $s(t+k+1)$. Parts (A)-(C) and (E) in the prompts $\ell(t+k)$ and $\ell(t+k+1)$ are the same. Part (D) in $\ell(t+k+1)$ is augmented by recording the decision $s(t+k)$ as well as incorporating perceptual feedback about the status of containers (if any) that may contain any of the semantic objects. We automatically convert this perceptual feedback into text denoted by $p(t+1)$ (see Fig. 2) [line 24, Alg. 1]; recall from Section II that we assume that the robot is equipped with perfect sensors. With slight abuse of notation, we denote this prompt update by $h(t+1) = h(t) + s(t) + p(t+1)$ where the summation means concatenation of text [line 25, Alg.1]. This process is repeated for all $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ to sequentially select $s(t+k)$. This process generates a plan

$$\tau = s(t), s(t+1), \dots, s(t+T-1), \quad (1)$$

of length T [line 26, alg. 1]. At time $t+T$, part (D) in $\ell(t+T)$ is updated so that it does not include any information since a new sub-task will be announced by the LTL task planner [line 29, alg. 1]. Concatenation of all plans τ for the sub-tasks generated by the LTL planner gives rise to the plan τ_ϕ [line 27, alg. 1] (see Section II).

D. When to Seek Assistance?

Assume that there exists at least one $k \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ so that $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| > 1$. In this case, the robot asks for help in order to proceed [line 8-13, alg. 1]. This assistance request and response occurs as follows. Initially, the robot requests from the LTL task planner an alternative sub-task to make mission progress. To make this help-request, the robot updates the set Σ^{unc} , defined in Section III-B, as $\Sigma^{\text{unc}} = \Sigma^{\text{unc}} \cup \{\pi_{\text{next}}\}$. The resulting set Σ^{unc} along with the current

²By construction of the prediction sets, this action coincides with $s(t+k) = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g(s|\ell(t+k))$; see Section III-E.

mission status (modeled by the current DFA state; see [36], [37]) are sent to the LTL task planner which then generates a new sub-task [line 9, alg. 1]. If such a sub-task exists, the process discussed in Section III-C repeats [line 11, alg. 1]. If there are no alternative sub-tasks to proceed, then the LTL planner fails to provide assistance. In this case, the robot asks for help from a human operator [line 13, alg. 1]. Specifically, the robot returns to the user the current prompt $\ell(t+k)$ along with the prediction set $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))$ for which it holds $|\mathcal{C}(\ell(t+k))| > 1$. The user selects the correct decision $s(t+k)$ if it exists in the prediction set or it halts operation. Help from the LTL planner is also be requested if the robot cannot physically execute the selected $s(t+k)$ (e.g., grabbing a non-reachable or non-existent object) regardless of the prediction set size [line 16-21, alg. 1], as e.g., in [36], [37]; see Sec. V-B. In this case, if the LTL planner cannot generate alternative sub-tasks the mission terminates unsuccessfully (e.g., due to infeasibility of the LTL-NL task) [line 21, alg. 1].

E. Constructing Prediction Sets using Conformal Prediction

In this section, we discuss how the prediction sets $\mathcal{C}(\ell(t))$, introduced in Section III-C, are constructed. To construct them, we employ conformal prediction (CP), a statistical tool for uncertainty quantification in black box models [52]. Our analysis builds upon [18], [48]. Construction of these prediction sets requires a distribution \mathcal{D} from which we sample missions. This is important as application of CP requires the construction of a calibration dataset collecting missions, along with the corresponding ground truth plans, that are independently generated by \mathcal{D} . Then, the prediction sets for a new/validation mission are ‘correct’ as long as the calibration and the validation missions are i.i.d.

Distribution of Mission Scenarios: We formalize the above by defining a distribution over mission scenarios. A mission scenario is defined as $\xi_i = \{\mathcal{A}_i, \phi_i, H_i, \Omega_i\}$. Recall that \mathcal{A}_i , ϕ_i , H , and Ω_i refer to the robot skills, the LTL-NL mission, the mission horizon, and the semantic environment, respectively. The subscript i is used to emphasize that these parameters can vary across scenarios. When it is clear from the context, we drop the dependence on i . We also assume that all scenarios sampled from \mathcal{D} are feasible which implies that the horizon H_i is large enough, the skill set \mathcal{A}_i is rich enough, and that the geometric structure of the environments Ω_i does not prevent the robot from satisfying ϕ_i . Note that \mathcal{D} is unknown but we assume that we can sample i.i.d. scenarios from it. Next, we discuss how the prediction sets are constructed. To illustrate the challenges in their construction, we consider two cases: (i) single-step plans, and (ii) multi-step plans.

Single-step Plans: For simplicity, here we focus on LTL-NL formulas ϕ that can be satisfied by plans τ_ϕ of horizon $H = 1$ (see Section II); later we generalize the results for $H \geq 1$. This also means that synthesizing τ_ϕ requires the LLM to make a single decision s . First, we sample M independent scenarios from \mathcal{D} . We refer to these scenarios as calibration scenarios. For each calibration scenario $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, we construct its equivalent prompt ℓ_{calib}^i .

For each prompt, we (manually) compute the ground truth plan $\tau_{\text{calib}}^i = s_{\text{calib}}^i(1)$ accomplishing this task. We assume that there exists a unique correct decision s_{calib}^i for each calibration scenario. This assumption can be relaxed as in [18]. Hereafter, we drop the dependence of the robot decisions and prompts on the time step, since we consider single-step plans. This way we construct a calibration dataset $\mathcal{M} = \{(\ell_{\text{calib}}^i, \tau_{\text{calib}}^i)\}_{i=1}^M$.

Consider a new scenario drawn from \mathcal{D} , called validation/test scenario. We convert this scenario into its equivalent prompt ℓ_{test} . Since the calibration and the validation scenario are i.i.d., CP can generate a prediction set $\mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}})$ of decisions s containing the correct one s_{test} with probability greater than $1 - \alpha$, i.e.,

$$P(s_{\text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}})) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is user-specified. To generate $\mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}})$, CP first uses the LLM's confidence g (see Section III-C) to compute the set of nonconformity scores $\{r_i = 1 - g(s_{\text{calib}}^i | \ell_{\text{calib}}^i)\}_{i=1}^M$ over the calibration set. The higher the score r_i is, the worse the performance of the LLM is at the i calibration point. Then CP performs calibration by computing the $\frac{(M+1)(1-\alpha)}{M}$ empirical quantile of r_1, \dots, r_M denoted by q . Then, it generates the prediction set

$$\mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}}) = \{s \in \mathcal{S} \mid g(s | \ell_{\text{test}}) > 1 - q\}, \quad (3)$$

that includes all decisions that the predictor is at least $1 - q$ confident in. The generated prediction set ensures the $1 - \alpha$ marginal coverage guarantee in (2), holds. This coverage guarantee is marginal in the sense that the probability is defined over the randomness of the calibration dataset and the validation scenario. By construction of the prediction sets the decision $s = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g(s | \ell_{\text{test}})$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}})$.

Multi-step Plans: Next, we generalize the above result to the case where satisfaction of ϕ requires plans τ_ϕ with $H \geq 1$ decisions selected from \mathcal{S} . Here we cannot apply directly (2)-(3) to compute individual sets $\mathcal{C}(\ell_{\text{test}}(t))$ for the robot, as this violates the i.i.d. assumption required to apply CP. The challenge in this case is that the prompts $\{\ell_{\text{test}}(t)\}_{t=1}^H$ are not independent with each other which violates the i.i.d. assumption required to apply CP. In fact these prompts depend on past robot decisions as well as on the LTL-NL tasks ϕ_{test} . To address this challenge, inspired by [18], we (i) lift the data to sequences, and (ii) perform calibration at the sequence level using a carefully designed nonconformity score function.

First, we construct a calibration dataset as follows. We generate $M \geq 1$ scenarios ξ_i from \mathcal{D} . The LTL-NL formula ϕ_i of each scenario is broken into a sequence of $H_i \geq 1$ prompts, defined as:³

$$\bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i = [\bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i(1), \dots, \bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i(H_i)], \quad (4)$$

³The distribution \mathcal{D} over scenarios induces a distribution over data sequences (4) [18]. These data sequences are equivalent representations of the sampled scenarios augmented with the ground truth decisions.

where each prompt in the sequence $\bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i$ contains a history of ground truth decisions made so far. We define the corresponding sequence of ground truth decisions as:

$$\tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i = s_{\text{calib}}^i(1), \dots, s_{\text{calib}}^i(H_i), \quad (5)$$

This gives rise to the calibration set $\mathcal{M} = \{(\bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i, \tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i)\}_{i=1}^M$. As before, we assume that each context $\bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i$ has a unique correct plan $\tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i$. Next, we use the lowest score over the time-steps $1, \dots, H_i$ as the score for each sequence i in calibration set, i.e.,

$$\bar{g}(\tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i | \bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i) = \min_{t \in \{1, \dots, H_i\}} g(\tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i(t) | \bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i(t)). \quad (6)$$

Thus, the non-conformity score of each sequence i is

$$\bar{r}_i = 1 - \bar{g}(\tau_{\phi, \text{calib}}^i | \bar{\ell}_{\text{calib}}^i). \quad (7)$$

Consider a new scenario ξ_{test} associated with a task ϕ_{test} with horizon H_{test} . This scenario corresponds to a sequence of prompts

$$\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}} = \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(1), \dots, \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(k), \dots, \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(H_{\text{test}}).$$

CP can generate a prediction set $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ of plans τ_ϕ containing the correct one $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}}$ with high probability i.e.,

$$P(\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (8)$$

where the prediction set $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ is defined as

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}) = \{\tau_\phi \mid \bar{g}(\tau_\phi | \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}) > 1 - \bar{q}\}, \quad (9)$$

where \bar{q} is the $\frac{(M+1)(1-\alpha)}{M}$ empirical quantile of $\bar{r}_1, \dots, \bar{r}_M$. The generated prediction set ensures that the coverage guarantee in (8) holds. By construction of the prediction sets, the plan τ_ϕ generated by the LLM belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$.

Causal Construction of the Prediction Set: Notice that $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ is constructed after the entire sequence $\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}} = \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(1), \dots, \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(H_{\text{test}})$ is obtained. However, at every (test) time $t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}$, the robot observes only $\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t)$ and not the whole sequence. Thus, the prediction set needs to be constructed in a causal manner using only the current and past information. Thus, at every time step t , we construct the causal prediction set

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t)) = \{s \mid g(s | \bar{\ell}(t)) > 1 - \bar{q}\}. \quad (10)$$

Then, the causal prediction set for $\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}) = \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(1)) \times \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(2)) \dots \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(H_{\text{test}})). \quad (11)$$

In Section IV, we show that $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}) = \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$.

IV. PROBABILISTIC TASK SATISFACTION GUARANTEES

In this section, we show that given any (validation) scenario $\xi_{\text{test}} = \{\mathcal{A}_{\text{test}}, \phi_{\text{test}}, H_{\text{test}}, \Omega_{\text{test}}\}$ drawn from \mathcal{D} , the probability that HERACLES will design a plan satisfying the LTL-NL formula is at least $1 - \alpha$, where α is the coverage level used to construct the prediction sets. To show this, we need first to show the following result. The proofs follow the same logic as the ones in [18].

Proposition 4.1: The prediction set $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ defined in (9) is the same as the on-the-fly constructed prediction set $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ defined in (11), i.e., $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}) = \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$.

Proof: It suffices to show that if a plan τ_ϕ belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ then it also belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ and vice-versa. First, we show that if $\tau_\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ then $\tau_\phi \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$. Since $\tau_\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$, then we have that $\min_{t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}} g(\tau_\phi(t) | \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t)) > 1 - \bar{q}$ due to (6). This means that $g(\tau_\phi(t) | \bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t)) > 1 - \bar{q}$, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}$. Thus, $\tau_\phi(t) \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))$, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}$. By definition of $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ in (11), this implies that $\tau_\phi \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$. These steps hold in the other direction too showing that if $\tau_\phi \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ then $\tau_\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$. ■

Theorem 4.2: Consider test mission scenarios ξ_{test} drawn from \mathcal{D} . Assume that prediction sets are constructed causally with coverage level $1 - \alpha$ and that the robot seek help from a user whenever the local prediction set $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))$ - defined in (10) - is not singleton; see Section III-D. If the LTL task planning algorithm is complete, then the completion rate over new test scenarios (and the randomness of the calibration sets) drawn from \mathcal{D} is at least $1 - \alpha$.⁴

Proof: If the symbolic planning algorithm is complete, then this means if there exists a solution it will find it. By solution, here we refer to a sequence of sub-tasks in the unknown environment that, if completed, the LTL mission will be satisfied. Since the scenarios ξ_{test} are drawn from \mathcal{D} , this means that they are feasible by assumption (see Section III-E). This equivalently means that if the symbolic task planning algorithm is complete, any failures of Alg. 1 in finding a correct plan are not attributed to the symbolic planner. Under this setting, the following three cases may occur as the robot designs its plan. Case I: We have that $|\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))| = 1, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}$ and $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ where $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}}$ is the ground truth plan and $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$ is defined as in (11). In this case, the robot will select the correct plan. Case II: We have that $|\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))| > 1, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, H_{\text{test}}\}$ and $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$. In this case, the robots will select the correct plan (assuming users who faithfully provide help). Case III: We have that $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \notin \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})$. The latter means that there exists at least one time step t such that $\tau_{\phi, \text{test}}(t) \notin \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))$. In this case, the robot will compute an incorrect plan. Observe that the probability that either Case I or II will occur is equivalent to the probability $P(\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}))$. Due to Proposition 4.1 and (8), we have that $P(\tau_{\phi, \text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}})) \geq 1 - \alpha$. Thus, either of Case I and II will occur with probability that is at least equal to $1 - \alpha$. Since Cases I-III are mutually and collectively exhaustive, we conclude that the probability that Case III will occur is less than α . This implies that the mission success rate is at least $1 - \alpha$. ■

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we provide extensive comparative experiments to demonstrate HERACLES. In Section V-A, we compare the proposed planner against existing LLM planners

⁴Theorem 4.2 implies that HERACLES can achieve $1 - \alpha$ mission success rates even if alternative symbolic planners are used as long as they are complete.

that require the task description exclusively in NL. These experiments show that the performance gap between baselines and HERACLES increases significantly as task complexity increases. In Section V-B, we illustrate the ask-for-help mode of proposed planner on mobile manipulation tasks ; see the supplemental material. In Section V-C, we empirically validate the theoretical mission success rate guarantees discussed in Section IV. Finally, in Section V-D, we compare the effect of defining NL-based predicates against system-based predicates, being used widely in related LTL planning works, on the DFA size. In all case studies, we pick GPT-3.5 [42] as the LLM.

A. Comparisons against LLM planners with NL Tasks

Setup: We consider mobile manipulation tasks defined over objects with labels $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{Coke, Pen, Water Bottle, Apple, Tin Can}\}$ that can be recognized by the robot. The environment is populated with two cans of Coke, one water bottle, one pen, one tin can, and one apple. The water bottle is inside the fridge and the tin can is inside a drawer. Thus, grabbing e.g., the pen requires the robot to first open the drawer if it is closed. The status of these containers (open or closed) is not known a-priori and, therefore, not included in the initial environment description in $\ell(1)$. Instead, it can be provided online through sensor feedback as described in Section III-C. The action space \mathcal{A} is defined as in Fig. 2 includes 5 actions. The action ‘remain idle’ in \mathcal{A} is useful when a sub-task can be accomplished in less than T time steps. Given a prompt $\ell(t)$, the number of choices/decisions s that the LLM can pick from is $|\mathcal{S}| = 17$. Recall that this set is constructed using \mathcal{A} and all objects/locations in the environment where the actions in \mathcal{A} can be applied. We select $T = 7$ for all sub-tasks generated by the LTL planner. Also, we construct a distribution \mathcal{D} to generate scenarios ξ of ‘easy,’ ‘medium,’ and ‘hard’ difficulty, with probabilities 0.2, 0.1, and 0.7, respectively. Each difficulty category comprises a finite number of LTL-NL formulas, with the difficulty level determined by the complexity of the formulas in terms of the number of NL-based predicates and temporal/logical operators. When a difficulty category is chosen, a random LTL-NL formula is selected from the corresponding predefined set.

Baselines: As the baselines for our experiments, we employ two state-of-the-art language-model based planners: SayCan [30] and CMAS [56]. Unlike HERACLES, these baselines require the overall mission to be fully described using NL. Thus, we manually convert LTL-NL tasks into NL ones, which are then used as inputs for the baselines. SayCan generates decisions, taking into consideration the likelihood that the corresponding action will be executed correctly. Since we consider perfect execution of robot actions, the affordance functions in [30] return a value of 1 for all decisions. Then SayCan converts the NL mission planning problem into a sequence of MCQA problems. Then it selects the action with the highest softmax score: $s(t) = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g(s | \ell(t))$ for every MCQA problem. We also




Fig. 3: Case Study I: Execution of a robot plan for the LTL-NL mission: \diamond (‘Move Coke 1 to Location B’) requiring the robot to eventually deliver Coke 1 to location B. The left snapshot illustrates the robot plan generated by HERACLES. The right snapshot shows the environment when the task is completed.




Fig. 4: Case Study II: Execution of a robot plan for the LTL-NL mission: $\phi = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2 \wedge (\neg\pi_1\mathcal{U}\pi_2)$, where π_1 refers to ‘Deliver Apple to A’ and π_2 refers to ‘Deliver Coke 2 to A’. Notice here ϕ requires that the apple should not be delivered to Location A prior to Coke 2. The left two snapshots illustrate the sub-tasks that the robot accomplished in the order that they were generated by the symbolic planner. The corresponding robot plans are also depicted. The right snapshot shows the environment when the task is completed.

compare our method against the CMAS planner [56]. CMAS is originally developed for teams of N robots. We applied it in our setting using $N = 1$. Note that CMAS does not employ the MCQA setup (unlike HERACLES and SayCan). Instead, at every time step, the LLM generates new tokens corresponding to robot actions. We compare the accuracy of all planners over 111 scenarios drawn from \mathcal{D} . For accuracy, we report the percentage of scenarios where a planner generates a plan that accomplishes the corresponding task. To make comparisons fair we have applied the algorithms under the following settings: (i) All the methods are exposed to the same set of actions \mathcal{S} . (ii) All methods share the same prompt structure. The only difference is that part (C) in the prompts for HERACLES includes the description of the sub-task generated by the symbolic planner while part (C) for SayCan and CMAS include the overall mission expressed in NL. (iii) All actions are executed perfectly. (iv) We remove altogether the CP component from our planner (since it does not exist in [30] and [56]). This implies that HERACLES always picks the decision $s(t) = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g(s|\ell(t))$ (as SayCan does too). (v) We consider environments that do not prevent the robot from accomplishing any sub-task included in ϕ . The choices (iv) and (v) also imply that HERACLES will never trigger an assistance request. (vi) We require all methods to complete the plan within $H = T \times K$ steps, where K is the number of predicates/sub-tasks in ϕ and $T = 7$ is the hyperparameter used in Section III-C. In what follows, we group the generated scenarios based on their difficulty category and we report the planning accuracy.

Case Study I (Easy): We consider 25 LTL-NL formulas of the form $\phi = \diamond\pi_1$ where π_1 is defined as ‘Move object c to location \mathbf{x} ’ for various objects $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and locations \mathbf{x} . We manually translate such formulas into NL as ‘Eventually move object c to location \mathbf{x} ’ to use as the task specification for CMAS and SayCan. The accuracy of the proposed planner was 100% while the accuracy of SayCan and CMAS were 96% and 56%, respectively. To compute this accuracy, we manually check the correctness of the designed plans. Notice that the performance of our method and SayCan is comparable due to the simplicity of the task and their MCQA setup. A robot plan, for an ‘easy’ scenario, generated by HERACLES is shown in Fig. 3.

Case Study II (Medium): We consider 15 LTL-NL formulas defined as either $\phi_1 = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2$ or $\phi_2 = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2 \wedge (\neg\pi_1\mathcal{U}\pi_2)$. The task ϕ_1 requires to eventually complete the sub-tasks π_1 and π_2 in any order while π_2 requires π_2 to be completed strictly before π_1 . The APs π_1 and π_2 are defined as before. The accuracy of our planner, SayCan, and CMAS are 93.3%, 40%, and 20%, respectively. Observe that the performance of both baselines drops as temporal and/or logical requirements are incorporated into the task description. A robot plan synthesized for one of the considered scenarios is shown in Fig. 4.

Case Study III (Hard): We consider 71 LTL-NL formulas defined over four to six atomic predicates. Two examples of such LTL formulas are: $\phi_1 = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2 \wedge \diamond\pi_3 \wedge \diamond\pi_4 \wedge (\neg\pi_4\mathcal{U}\pi_1)$ and $\phi_2 = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2 \wedge \diamond\pi_3 \wedge (\neg\pi_3\mathcal{U}\pi_2) \wedge \diamond\pi_5 \wedge (\neg\pi_2\mathcal{U}\pi_5) \wedge (\neg\pi_5\mathcal{U}\pi_1) \wedge \diamond\pi_4$. For instance, ϕ_1 requires the

robot to accomplish π_1 , π_2 , π_3 and π_4 in any order as long as π_1 is executed before π_4 . The predicates are defined as before. The accuracy of our planner, SayCan, and CMAS is 93%, 14.08%, and 0%. Notice that in this case, CMAS failed to generate a feasible plan for any task ϕ . Mistakes made by our planner were mostly because the LLM asked the robot to move to the wrong location to pick up a desired object or the LLM requested the robot to pick up an object inside a closed container without first opening it.

Summary of Comparisons: Observe that the performance gap increases significantly as the task complexity increases. Also, notice that the performance of HERACLES does not change significantly across the considered case studies. The reason is that it decomposes the overall planning problem into smaller ones that can be handled efficiently by the LLM. This is in contrast to SayCan and CMAS, where the LLM is responsible for generating plans directly for the original long-horizon task. Additional comparisons showing that the ability of LLMs to design correct plans deteriorates as temporal and logical requirements are incorporated in the mission can be found in [32]. Also, observe that SayCan performs better than CMAS. We attribute this empirical result to the MCQA framework, as it attempts to eliminate hallucinations. To the contrary, CMAS requires the employed LLMs to generate new tokens to design robot plans increasing the risk of hallucinations. In the above case studies, using HERACLES, the average runtime required for the symbolic and the LLM planner to generate a subtask and a decision was 2.7×10^{-5} and 1.2 secs, respectively.

B. Asking for Help from Symbolic Planner and Users

In this section, we demonstrate HERACLES, using ROS/Gazebo [57], on mobile manipulation tasks using a ground robot (Turtlebot3 Waffle Pi robot [58], [59]) equipped with a manipulator arm with 4 DOFs (OpenManipulator-X [60]). Unlike Section V-A, the robot is allowed to ask for help, whenever needed, as determined by CP with $\alpha = 0.05$. The robot can recognize the following objects $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{Coke, Pen, Bottle of Water}\}$. Particularly, there are two cans of coke, one bottle of water, and one pen (see Fig. 1). The robot knows the exact position of each object but the obstacle-free space of the environment is unknown. As a result, the robot is not aware a priori if there is any object that cannot be reached due to blocking obstacles. We use existing navigation and sensing stacks [61] for Turtlebots as well as the MoveIt! [62] toolbox for manipulation control.

Reacting to Infeasible Sub-tasks: First, we consider the task $\phi = \diamond(\pi_1 \vee \pi_2)$ where π_1 means ‘Deliver Coke 1 to \mathbf{x}_E ’ and π_2 means ‘Deliver Coke 2 to \mathbf{x}_E ’ using the environment described as in Fig. 1. This task requires either Coke 1 or 2 to be delivered to \mathbf{x}_E . Initially, the LTL planner selects π_1 as π_{next} . As the robot navigates the environment to reach Coke 1, it builds an occupancy grid map of the environment that is used, as in [36], to reason about whether the object is blocked by surrounded obstacles or not (see also Fig. 5). Once the robot realizes that Coke 1 is not reachable, it requests help from the LTL planner. In response to that request, the LTL



Fig. 5: Reacting to Infeasible Sub-tasks: As the robot navigates towards Coke 1, it builds the occupancy grid map of the environment allowing it to realize that Coke 1 is not accessible. Once this happens, the robot asks for help from the LTL planner.

planner generates an alternative sub-task, modeled by π_2 , that is eventually accomplished by the robot. Assistance from a human operator was never requested in this case study.

Reacting to Ambiguous Sub-Tasks: Second, we consider a task $\phi = \diamond\pi_1 \wedge \diamond\pi_2$ where both π_1 and π_2 mean ‘Bring a drink to location \mathbf{x}_C ’. Observe that these APs are ambiguous as both water and Coke qualify as drinks. Once the LTL planner generates the sub-task π_1 , the LLM selects the action ‘go to the Coke 2 location’. However, the prediction set includes two actions ‘go to the bottle-of-water location’ and ‘go to the Coke 2 location’. Interestingly, we did not specify in the prompt that both water and Coke qualify as drinks. In this case, the robot asks for help from the LTL planner. The LTL planner cannot provide assistance as there are no alternative sub-tasks to make mission progress. Thus, the robot next seeks help from a user. Once the user selects the desired action and π_1 is satisfied, the LTL planner generates the next sub-task π_2 and the above process repeats until the mission is accomplished.

C. Empirical Validation of Mission Success Rates

The average planning accuracy of our method across the 111 scenarios considered in Section V-A is 94.59%. In what follows, we empirically validate the theoretical guarantees for the mission success rate of HERACLES, i.e., we investigate if we can increase the mission success rate to a desired level $1 - \alpha (> 94.59\%)$ by allowing the planner to ask for help when needed; see Alg. 1. For each validation sequence, we sample 35 calibration sequences from \mathcal{D} to construct prediction sets. Then, for each scenario, we compute the robot plan using Alg. 1 and check (manually) if the generated plan τ_ϕ can satisfy the LTL specification ϕ . We compute the ratio of how many of the corresponding 111 generated plans are the ground truth plans with respect to their corresponding LTL-NL task ϕ . We repeat the above process 100 times. The average ratio across all experiments is the (empirical) mission success rate. When $1 - \alpha = 0.95$, $1 - \alpha = 0.96$, and $1 - \alpha = 0.97$, the mission success rate was 96.19%, 96.65% and 97.10%, respectively, validating Theorem 4.2. Also, when $1 - \alpha = 0.95$, $1 - \alpha = 0.96$, and $1 - \alpha = 0.97$, the average percentage of prediction sets $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\ell}_{\text{test}}(t))$ that were

singletons was 97.44%, 97.37%, and 97.30%, respectively. This equivalently means that assistance was requested in making 2.56%, 2.63%, and 2.70% of all decisions $s(t)$, respectively. Observe that the frequency of help requests increases as the desired mission success rate increases.

D. Effect of Task Specification on the Automaton Size

In this section, we provide examples demonstrating that the length of LTL-NL formulas is shorter than the length of the corresponding LTL formulas with atomic predicates defined over the system state $\mathbf{p}(t)$; Section I. Shorter LTL-NL formulas result in smaller automata size which, in turn, results in more computationally efficient plan synthesis. For instance, consider the formula $\phi = \diamond(\pi_1)$ where the NL-based predicate π_1 is true if the robot delivers a bottle of water to location A . This formula corresponds to a Deterministic Finite state Automaton (DFA) with 2 states and 3 edges. Using system-based predicates, the same task can be written as $\phi = \diamond(\pi'_1 \wedge (\diamond\pi'_2 \wedge (\diamond\pi'_3 \wedge (\diamond\pi'_4))))$ where π'_1 is true if the robot position is close enough to the bottle of water, π'_2 is true if the robot grabs the bottle successfully, π'_3 is true if the robot position is close enough to location A , and π'_4 is true if the robot puts down the water bottle successfully. This formula corresponds to DFA with 5 states and 15 edges. The difference in the automaton size becomes more pronounced as task complexity increases. For instance, consider the LTL-NL formula $\phi = \diamond(\pi_1) \wedge \diamond(\pi_2)$ where both π_1 and π_2 model delivery tasks as before. This formula corresponds to a DFA with 4 states and 9 edges. Expressing the same task using system-based predicates as before would result in a DFA with 25 states and 225 edges.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we proposed HERACLES, a novel neuro-symbolic planner for LTL-NL tasks. We showed, both theoretically and empirically, that it can achieve the desired mission success rates due to a conformal interface between the symbolic planner and the LLM. We also provided comparative experiments showing that it outperforms state-of-the-art LLM-based planners in terms of planning accuracy. Our future work will focus on relaxing the assumption of perfect execution of robot skills as well as designing translation frameworks that can automatically convert NL instructions into LTL-NL formulas.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Kress-Gazit, G. E. Fainekos, and G. J. Pappas, “Where’s waldo? sensor-based temporal logic motion planning,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2007, pp. 3116–3121.
- [2] S. L. Smith, J. Tumova, C. Belta, and D. Rus, “Optimal path planning for surveillance with temporal-logic constraints,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 30, no. 14, pp. 1695–1708, 2011.
- [3] J. Tumova and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Multi-agent planning under local ltl specifications and event-based synchronization,” *Automatica*, vol. 70, pp. 239–248, 2016.
- [4] Y. Chen, X. C. Ding, A. Stefanescu, and C. Belta, “Formal approach to the deployment of distributed robotic teams,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 158–171, 2012.
- [5] A. Ulusoy, S. L. Smith, and C. Belta, “Optimal multi-robot path planning with ltl constraints: guaranteeing correctness through synchronization,” in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*. Springer, 2014, pp. 337–351.
- [6] E. Plaku and S. Karaman, “Motion planning with temporal-logic specifications: Progress and challenges,” *AI communications*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 151–162, 2016.
- [7] 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 *IEEE 56th Conference on Decision and Control*, December 2017, pp. 1132–1137.
- [8] X. Sun and Y. Shoukry, “Neurosymbolic motion and task planning for linear temporal logic tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05180*, 2022.
- [9] Y. Kantaros and M. M. Zavlanos, “Stylus*: A temporal logic optimal control synthesis algorithm for large-scale multi-robot systems,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 812–836, 2020.
- [10] C. I. Vasile and C. Belta, “Sampling-based temporal logic path planning,” in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, Tokyo, Japan, November 2013, pp. 4817–4822.
- [11] Q. H. Ho, Z. N. Sunberg, and M. Lahijanian, “Planning with simba: Motion planning under uncertainty for temporal goals using simplified belief guides,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 5723–5729.
- [12] D. Kamale, S. Haesaert, and C.-I. Vasile, “Cautious planning with incremental symbolic perception: Designing verified reactive driving maneuvers,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 1652–1658.
- [13] J. Wang, S. Kalluraya, and Y. Kantaros, “Verified compositions of neural network controllers for temporal logic control objectives,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 4004–4009.
- [14] L. Lindemann, J. Nowak, L. Schönbacher, M. Guo, J. Tumova, and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Coupled multi-robot systems under linear temporal logic and signal temporal logic tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 858–865, 2019.
- [15] Z. Zhou, Z. Chen, M. Cai, Z. Li, Z. Kan, and C.-Y. Su, “Vision-based reactive temporal logic motion planning for quadruped robots in unstructured dynamic environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 2023.
- [16] C. Baier and J.-P. Katoen, *Principles of model checking*. MIT press Cambridge, 2008, vol. 26202649.
- [17] I. Singh, V. Blukis, A. Mousavian, A. Goyal, D. Xu, J. Tremblay, D. Fox, J. Thomason, and A. Garg, “Progprompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 11 523–11 530.
- [18] A. Z. Ren, A. Dixit, A. Bodrova, S. Singh, S. Tu, N. Brown, P. Xu, L. Takayama, F. Xia, J. Varley, Z. Xu, D. Sadigh, A. Zeng, and A. Majumdar, “Robots that ask for help: Uncertainty alignment for large language model planners,” 2023.
- [19] J. Liang, W. Huang, F. Xia, P. Xu, K. Hausman, B. Ichter, P. Florence, and A. Zeng, “Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 9493–9500.
- [20] D. Shah, B. Osinski, S. Levine *et al.*, “Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 492–504.
- [21] Y. Xie, C. Yu, T. Zhu, J. Bai, Z. Gong, and H. Soh, “Translating natural language to planning goals with large-language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05128*, 2023.
- [22] Y. Ding, X. Zhang, C. Paxton, and S. Zhang, “Task and motion planning with large language models for object rearrangement,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06247*, 2023.
- [23] B. Liu, Y. Jiang, X. Zhang, Q. Liu, S. Zhang, J. Biswas, and P. Stone, “Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.
- [24] J. Wu, R. Antonova, A. Kan, M. Lepert, A. Zeng, S. Song, J. Bohg, S. Rusinkiewicz, and T. Funkhouser, “Tidybot: Personalized robot assistance with large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05658*, 2023.
- [25] A. Zeng, M. Attarian, B. Ichter, K. Choromanski, A. Wong, S. Welker, F. Tombari, A. Purohit, M. Ryoo, V. Sindhwani *et al.*, “Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598*, 2022.
- [26] S. Stepputtis, J. Campbell, M. Phielipp, S. Lee, C. Baral, and H. Ben Amor, “Language-conditioned imitation learning for robot ma-

- nipulation tasks,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 13 139–13 150, 2020.
- [27] S. Li, X. Puig, C. Paxton, Y. Du, C. Wang, L. Fan, T. Chen, D.-A. Huang, E. Akyürek, A. Anandkumar *et al.*, “Pre-trained language models for interactive decision-making,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 31 199–31 212, 2022.
- [28] D. Driess, F. Xia, M. S. Sajjadi, C. Lynch, A. Chowdhery, B. Ichter, A. Wahid, J. Tompson, Q. Vuong, T. Yu *et al.*, “Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378*, 2023.
- [29] W. Huang, F. Xia, T. Xiao, H. Chan, J. Liang, P. Florence, A. Zeng, J. Tompson, I. Mordatch, Y. Chebotar *et al.*, “Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*, 2022.
- [30] M. Ahn, A. Brohan, N. Brown, Y. Chebotar, O. Cortes, B. David, C. Finn, C. Fu, K. Gopalakrishnan, K. Hausman *et al.*, “Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*, 2022.
- [31] J. Ruan, Y. Chen, B. Zhang, Z. Xu, T. Bao, G. Du, S. Shi, H. Mao, X. Zeng, and R. Zhao, “Tptu: Task planning and tool usage of large language model-based ai agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03427*, 2023.
- [32] Y. Chen, J. Arkin, Y. Zhang, N. Roy, and C. Fan, “Autotamp: Autoregressive task and motion planning with llms as translators and checkers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06531*, 2023.
- [33] X. Luo, S. Xu, and C. Liu, “Obtaining hierarchy from human instructions: an llms-based approach,” in *CoRL 2023 Workshop on Learning Effective Abstractions for Planning (LEAP)*, 2023.
- [34] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, “Gpt-4 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [35] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [36] Y. Kantaros, M. Malencia, V. Kumar, and G. Pappas, “Reactive temporal logic planning for multiple robots in unknown environments,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, June 2020, pp. 11 479–11 485.
- [37] V. Vasilopoulos, Y. Kantaros, G. J. Pappas, and D. E. Koditschek, “Reactive planning for mobile manipulation tasks in unexplored semantic environments,” in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021, pp. 6385–6392.
- [38] K. Leahy, A. Jones, and C. I. Vasile, “Fast decomposition of temporal logic specifications for heterogeneous teams,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2022.
- [39] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [40] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [41] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5485–5551, 2020.
- [42] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [43] J. W. Rae, S. Borgeaud, T. Cai, K. Millican, J. Hoffmann, F. Song, J. Aslanides, S. Henderson, R. Ring, S. Young *et al.*, “Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*, 2021.
- [44] R. Thoppilan, D. De Freitas, J. Hall, N. Shazeer, A. Kulshreshtha, H.-T. Cheng, A. Jin, T. Bos, L. Baker, Y. Du *et al.*, “Lamda: Language models for dialog applications,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022.
- [45] J. Wei, M. Bosma, V. Y. Zhao, K. Guu, A. W. Yu, B. Lester, N. Du, A. M. Dai, and Q. V. Le, “Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [46] A. Chowdhery, S. Narang, J. Devlin, M. Bosma, G. Mishra, A. Roberts, P. Barham, H. W. Chung, C. Sutton, S. Gehrmann *et al.*, “Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022.
- [47] Y. LeCun, “Do large language models need sensory grounding for meaning and understanding?” *Workshop on Philosophy of Deep Learning, NYU Center for Mind, Brain and Consciousness and the Columbia Center for Science and Society*, 2023.
- [48] B. Kumar, C. Lu, G. Gupta, A. Palepu, D. Bellamy, R. Raskar, and A. Beam, “Conformal prediction with large language models for multi-choice question answering,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18404*, 2023.
- [49] V. Manokhin, “Awesome conformal prediction,” Apr. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6467205>
- [50] A. N. Angelopoulos and S. Bates, “A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07511*, 2021.
- [51] V. Balasubramanian, S.-S. Ho, and V. Vovk, *Conformal prediction for reliable machine learning: theory, adaptations and applications*. Newnes, 2014.
- [52] A. N. Angelopoulos, S. Bates *et al.*, “Conformal prediction: A gentle introduction,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 494–591, 2023.
- [53] M. Cleaveland, I. Lee, G. J. Pappas, and L. Lindemann, “Conformal prediction regions for time series using linear complementarity programming,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01075*, 2023.
- [54] Z. Mao, C. Sobolewski, and I. Ruchkin, “How safe am i given what i see? calibrated prediction of safety chances for image-controlled autonomy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12252*, 2023.
- [55] V. Pallagani, K. Roy, B. Muppasani, F. Fabiano, A. Loreggia, K. Murgesan, B. Srivastava, F. Rossi, L. Hoeshe, and A. Sheth, “On the prospects of incorporating large language models (llms) in automated planning and scheduling (aps),” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02500*, 2024.
- [56] Y. Chen, J. Arkin, Y. Zhang, N. Roy, and C. Fan, “Scalable multi-robot collaboration with large language models: Centralized or decentralized systems?” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15943*, 2023.
- [57] M. Marian, F. Stîngă, M.-T. Georgescu, H. Roibu, D. Popescu, and F. Manta, “A ros-based control application for a robotic platform using the gazebo 3d simulator,” in *2020 21th International Carpathian Control Conference (ICCC)*, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [58] R. Amsters and P. Slaets, “Turtlebot 3 as a robotics education platform,” in *Robotics in Education*, M. Merdan, W. Lepuschitz, G. Koppensteiner, R. Balogh, and D. Obdržálek, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 170–181.
- [59] OpenRobotics. (2022) Turtlebot e-manual. [Online]. Available: <https://manual.robotis.com>
- [60] A. Dadbin, A. Kalhor, and M. T. Masouleh, “A comparison study on the dynamic control of openmanipulator-x by pd with gravity compensation tuned by oscillation damping based on the phase-trajectory-length concept,” in *2022 8th International Conference on Control, Instrumentation and Automation (ICCIA)*, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [61] A. Pajaziti, “Slam–map building and navigation via ros,” *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 71–75, 2014.
- [62] D. Coleman, I. Sucan, S. Chitta, and N. Correll, “Reducing the barrier to entry of complex robotic software: a moveit! case study,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.3785*, 2014.