

# A Survey on Explainable Reinforcement Learning: Concepts, Algorithms, and Challenges

YUNPENG QING, Zhejiang University, China

SHUNYU LIU, Zhejiang University, China

JIE SONG, Zhejiang University, China

HUIQIONG WANG\*, Zhejiang University, China

MINGLI SONG, Zhejiang University, China

Reinforcement Learning (RL) is a popular machine learning paradigm where intelligent agents interact with the environment to fulfill a long-term goal. Driven by the resurgence of deep learning, Deep RL (DRL) has witnessed great success over a wide spectrum of complex control tasks. Despite the encouraging results achieved, the deep neural network-based backbone is widely deemed as a black box that impedes practitioners to trust and employ trained agents in realistic scenarios where high security and reliability are essential. To alleviate this issue, a large volume of literature devoted to shedding light on the inner workings of the intelligent agents has been proposed, by constructing intrinsic interpretability or post-hoc explainability. In this survey, we provide a comprehensive review of existing works on eXplainable RL (XRL) and introduce a new taxonomy where prior works are clearly categorized into agent model-explaining, reward-explaining, state-explaining, and task-explaining methods. We also review and highlight RL methods that conversely leverage human knowledge to promote learning efficiency and performance of agents while this kind of method is often ignored in XRL field. Some challenges and opportunities in XRL are discussed. This survey intends to provide a high-level summarization of XRL and to motivate future research on more effective XRL solutions. Corresponding open source codes are collected and categorized at <https://github.com/Plankson/awesome-explainable-reinforcement-learning>.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Reinforcement learning**; • **General and reference** → **Surveys and overviews**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Deep Learning, Reinforcement Learning, Explainability.

## ACM Reference Format:

Yunpeng Qing, Shunyu Liu, Jie Song, Huiqiong Wang, and Mingli Song. 2023. A Survey on Explainable Reinforcement Learning: Concepts, Algorithms, and Challenges. *J. ACM* 1, 1, Article 1 (January 2023), 38 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning [202] is inspired by human trial-and-error paradigm [152] in which interacting with the environment is a common way for human learning without the guidance of others [102]. Through interactions, humans acquire experiential knowledge regarding cause and effect, action outcomes, and goal attainment within the environment. This acquired experience is subsequently leveraged implicitly to formulate our mental models [163, 226, 235], enabling us to resolve the encountered tasks efficiently [25, 179]. Similarly, RL autonomously learns from interacting with environments to purposefully understand environment dynamics and influence future events. Technically, RL learns to map from environment state to action so as to maximize

\*Corresponding author

Authors' addresses: Yunpeng Qing, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, [qingyunpeng@zju.edu.cn](mailto:qingyunpeng@zju.edu.cn); Shunyu Liu, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, [liushunyu@zju.edu.cn](mailto:liushunyu@zju.edu.cn); Jie Song, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, [sjie@zju.edu.cn](mailto:sjie@zju.edu.cn); Huiqiong Wang, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, [huiqiong\\_wang@zju.edu.cn](mailto:huiqiong_wang@zju.edu.cn); Mingli Song, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, [brooksong@zju.edu.cn](mailto:brooksong@zju.edu.cn).

2023. 0004-5411/2023/1-ART1 \$15.00  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>




Fig. 1. An overview of the survey. We categorize existing explainable reinforcement learning (XRL) approaches into four branches based on the explainability of different parts in the RL process: agent model, reward, state, and task. The more fine-grained categorization will be discussed detailedly in later sections. Each category is demonstrated with a part of representative works in the figure with different colors.

the cumulative reward [199]. In recent years, the fast development of deep learning [16, 203] promotes the fusion of deep learning and reinforcement learning. Therefore, Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) [48, 66, 144, 145, 186] has emerged as a new RL paradigm. With the powerful representation capability of the deep neural network [6, 58, 240], DRL has achieved considerable performance in many domains [18, 27, 32, 41, 117, 125, 129, 194]. Particularly in game-based tasks such as AlphaZero [194] and OpenAI Five [18], DRL methods have achieved remarkable success by outperforming human professional players. However, in complex real-world scenarios like autonomous driving [28, 43, 83, 222, 223] and power system dispatch [118, 123, 126, 236, 237, 252],

both high performance and user-oriented explainability should be taken into account to ensure security and reliability. Therefore, the lack of explainability in DRL is the main bottleneck for employing DRL in the real world instead of the simulated environment.

Conventional DRL methods are limited by low explainability owing to the intricate backbone of deep neural network (DNN) [72, 103, 195, 204]. It is intractable to track and explain each parameter within a neural and scale up to the entire network. Therefore, we have no idea about which implicit features the DNN takes into consideration and how the DNN handles these features. This drawback leads to the fact that the DRL model is becoming a black box [88, 242] where experts cannot understand how the agent perceives the environment or why the agent chooses a specific action. The lack of transparency in DRL hinders its application, as individuals are reluctant to trust the agent, particularly when the agent action contradicts their expectation without providing an explanation for the decision-making process. For instance, in the context of auto-navigation tasks [37, 164], individuals may experience confusion when the navigator agent provides abnormal guidance without providing a reason, which could be a simple precautionary measure to avoid traffic congestion. Furthermore, the lack of explainability also causes obstacles for inserting human knowledge and guidance into the training process [67, 175]. Despite the availability of prior human knowledge in specific forms [62, 63, 191, 244, 247], agents face limitations in effectively extracting and utilizing this information from human. To remedy the low-explainability problem, many pieces of explainable research have been conducted in several machine learning fields like explainable face recognition [47, 89, 174, 227] in Computer Vision (CV) and explainable text classification [7, 122, 196] in Natural Language Process (NLP). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) aims to enhance the explainability and transparency of models by providing explanations catering to both experts and non-experts. XAI delves into the inner workings of black-box models, automatically extracting or generating explanations to elucidate why a specific input leads to a particular output. Explanations can take various forms, such as natural language explanations [42, 71, 248], saliency maps [61, 87], or even video explanations [187]. By employing XAI techniques, models gain the ability to identify potential flaws and present them to domain experts for further analysis and improvement.

In the field of eXplainable Reinforcement Learning (XRL), many preliminary studies have been done to construct the XRL model and have gained certain achievements in producing explanations. To have a complete view of them and summarize current XRL techniques, several surveys of XRL have been conducted [38, 56, 79, 139, 166, 217, 225]. Heuillet et al. [79] review XRL approaches focusing on the types of explanation and target user and categorize current XRL methods into two distinct groups based on how explanations are generated: *intrinsic* XRL derived from the model structure and *post-hoc* XRL obtained from data processing. This classification is directly derived from the taxonomy of XAI [8]. The preliminary taxonomy for XRL itself is unrelated to RL, which needs further improvement to be specialized by considering specific entities in RL. Puiutta and Veith [166] also adopted the conventional XAI taxonomy, distinguishing between *post-hoc* and *intrinsic* methods based on the timing of explanation generation, as well as *global* and *local* methods depending on the range of available explanations. However, their description only covers a small portion of XRL methods and does not aim to provide a comprehensive overview of XRL. Wells and Bednarz [225] enumerate varieties of XRL approaches. However, their focus is primarily on XRL frameworks that incorporate visualization as a means of explanation. Vouros [217] limit the scope to the state-of-art XRL approaches and simply categorize the explanation content into *agent preference* and *goal influence*. Dazeley et al. [38] proposed a conceptual architecture for XRL from the causal perspective. This theoretical architecture is clear and rigorous, which takes not only *perception*, *action*, and *event*, but also the *goal*, *expectation*, and *disposition* into account. However, current XRL frameworks mostly focus on perceptions and action causes for the outcome of events, which means that the existing XRL technique can only be represented by a much simpler

form of the causal framework. Glanois et al. [56] make a clear bound between explainability and interpretability. Meanwhile, they divide the approaches into three types: *explaining the agent inputs* for understandable representation, *explaining the transition model* for the environment dynamics, and *explaining the preference model* for the action selection of RL agents. It inspires us to focus on the process and structure of RL for the XRL paradigm. Recently, Milani et al. [139] proposed a RL-oriented taxonomy for distinguishing between XRL frameworks based on the primary goals of RL explanations: *Feature Importance*, *Learning Process and MDP*, and *Policy-level*. However, the drawback of their taxonomy lies in the overlapping and inconsistency it introduces, making it difficult to clearly categorize certain methods and creating ambiguity in the placement of different techniques. For example, program-represented policy methods [215, 216] of *learn an intrinsically interpretable policy* in *Feature Importance* category also make explanation for long-term goal under *policy-level* category. Similarly, several methods [124, 131] summarizing with transitions in *policy-level* category also perform identify training points that belong to *learning process and MDP* category. All of these surveys propose new taxonomies on XRL from different perspectives.

However, these surveys have the following limitations: (1) Although many of them proposed their own understanding for XRL [119, 141, 148, 217], the XRL field currently is still lacking standard criteria, especially for its definition and evaluation approaches. (2) Current taxonomies proposed by researchers do not align with the existing XRL methods. One part of the work employs the XAI taxonomy to categorize existing research, ignoring the significant components of RL such as reward and policy, which is unable to cover all the XRL methods comprehensively. Meanwhile, traditional XAI focuses on machine learning predicting with labeled or unlabeled data, which is quite different from RL about interaction with the environment to maximize rewards. This difference in the target leads XAI taxonomy to be inappropriate for XRL. The other part introduces novel taxonomies for XRL but falls short of accurately summarizing and distinguishing existing XRL methods. The XRL community requires a more concise taxonomy directly derived from the RL paradigm to categorize various XRL works clearly. Such a taxonomy is crucial for comprehending and advancing XRL techniques. (3) In current XRL surveys and frameworks, there is a lack of consideration for the role of human participation. Only a limited number of papers have attempted to integrate human prior knowledge, such as sampled trajectories of human annotation [52] and online collaborations involving human command [51], into the XRL learning process. The results of these studies strongly indicate that incorporating human prior knowledge is an effective approach for achieving both high explainability and performance.

To advance the further development of XRL, this survey makes a more comprehensive and specialized review of XRL concepts and algorithms. We first clarify the concepts of RL explainability, then we give a systematic overview of the existing evaluation metrics for XRL, encompassing both subjective and objective assessments. We proposed a new taxonomy that categorizes current XRL works according to the central target of explanation: agent model, reward, state, and task, precisely capturing the central component in the RL paradigm. Since making the whole RL paradigm explainable is currently difficult, all of the works turn to get partial explainability directly on components of RL paradigms. This taxonomy is much more specialized than the general coarse-grained *intrinsic/post-hoc* or *global/local* taxonomies in XAI, providing clearer distinctions among existing XRL methods and a comprehensive illustration of the RL decision-making process. Meanwhile, by assigning each method to a specific category aligning with its primary objective and specific implementation details, the taxonomy avoids ambiguity or confusion in the category process. Meanwhile, given that there is currently only a small amount of research on human-integrated XRL and its importance, we make an attempt to summarize these works and organize them into our taxonomy. As we know, few researchers have looked into this field of integrating human knowledge into XRL. Our work can be summarized below:

- We give a formal definition of XRL by summarizing existing literature. What's more, we also propose a systematic evaluation architecture of XRL from objective and subjective aspects.
- To make up for the shortcomings of lacking RL-based architecture in the XRL community, we propose a new RL-based taxonomy for current XRL works. The taxonomy is based on the explainability of different central targets of the reinforcement learning framework: agent model, reward, state, and task. The taxonomy can be viewed in Figure 2.
- Noticing that currently human-intergrated XRL is an emerging direction, based on our new XRL taxonomy we give a systematic review of these approaches that combines XRL frameworks with human prior knowledge to get higher performance and better explanation.

The remain of this survey is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the necessary basic knowledge of reinforcement learning. Next, we discuss the definition of XRL, as well as giving some possible evaluation aspects for explanation and XRL approaches in Section 3. In Section 4, we describe our categorization as well as provide works of each type and sub-type in detail, the abstract figure of our taxonomy can be viewed in Figure 2. Then, we discuss XRL works that are combined with human knowledge according to our taxonomy in Section 5. After that, we summarize current challenges and promising future directions of XRL in Section 6. Finally, we give a conclusion of our work in Section 7. The structure of this paper and our taxonomy work is shown in Figure 1.

## 2 BACKGROUND

The reinforcement Learning paradigm considers the problem of how an agent interacts with the environment to maximize the cumulative reward, where the reward is a feedback signal according to the response action of the agent in different states. Concretely, the interaction process can be formalized as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) [44]. An MDP is described as a tuple  $M = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, R, \gamma \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the action space,  $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the state transition function,  $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the reward function, and  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  is a discount factor. At each discrete time step  $t$ , the agent observes the current state  $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$  and chooses an action  $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ . This causes a transition to the next state  $s_{t+1}$  drawn from the transition function  $P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ . Moreover, the agent can receive a reward signal  $r_t$  according to the reward function  $R(s_t, a_t)$ . The core object of the agent is to learn an optimal policy  $\pi^*$  that maximizes the expected discounted return  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[G_t] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i r_{t+i}]$ . To tackle this problem, existing reinforcement learning methods can be mainly categorized into two classes: value-based methods and policy-based ones.

### 2.1 Value-based Methods

The value-based methods [145] tend to assess the quality of a policy  $\pi$  by the action-value function  $Q^\pi$  defined as:

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i r_{t+i} | s_t = s, a_t = a \right],$$

which denotes the expected discounted return after the agent executes an action  $a$  at state  $s$ . A policy  $\pi^*$  is optimal if:

$$Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \geq Q^\pi(s, a), \forall \pi, s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

There is always at least one policy that is better than or equal to all other policies [202]. All optimal policies share the same optimal action-value function defined as  $Q^*$ . It is easy to show that  $Q^*$  satisfies the Bellman optimality equation:

$$Q^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot | s, a)} \left[ R(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s', a') \right].$$

To estimate the optimal action-value function  $Q^*$ , Deep  $Q$ -Networks (DQN) [145] uses a neural network  $Q(s, a; \theta)$  with parameters  $\theta$  as an approximator. We optimize the network of DQN by minimizing the following temporal-difference (TD) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,r,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} [(y - Q(s, a; \theta))^2],$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the replay buffer of the transitions,  $y = r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a'; \theta^-)$  and  $\theta^-$  represents the parameters of the target network. After the network converges, the final optimal policy can be obtained by a greedy policy  $\pi(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s, a; \theta)$ . Due to the encouraging results accomplished by DQN, several follow-up works [15, 30, 33, 70, 78, 138, 146, 183, 213, 224] progressively enlarged the family of DQN and has recently demonstrated extraordinary capabilities in multiple domains [29, 120, 158, 214]. However, while these value-based methods can handle high-dimensional observation spaces, they are restricted to problems with discrete and low-dimensional action spaces.

## 2.2 Policy-based Methods

To solve the problems with continuous and high-dimensional action spaces, policy-based methods have been proposed as a competent alternative. One of the conventional policy-based methods is stochastic policy gradient (SPG) [202], which seeks to optimize a policy function  $\pi_\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with parameters  $\phi$ . SPG directly maximizes the expected discounted return as the objective  $\mathcal{J}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\phi} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t]$ . To update the policy parameters  $\phi$ , we can perform the gradient of this objective as follows:

$$\nabla_\phi \mathcal{J}(\pi_\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \rho^\pi, a \sim \pi_\phi} [\nabla_\phi \log \pi_\phi(a|s) Q^\pi(s, a)],$$

where  $\rho^\pi(s)$  is the state distribution and  $Q^\pi(s, a)$  is the action value. To estimate the action value  $Q^\pi(s, a)$ , a simple and direct way is to use a sample discounted return  $G$ . Furthermore, to reduce the high variance of the action-value estimation while keeping the bias unchanged, a general method is to subtract an estimated state-value baseline  $V^\pi(s)$  from return [202]. This yields the advantage function  $A^\pi(s, a) = Q^\pi(s, a) - V^\pi(s)$ , where an approximator  $V(s; \theta)$  with parameters  $\theta$  is used to estimate the state value. This method can be viewed as an actor-critic architecture where the policy function is the actor, and the value function is the critic [45, 59, 73, 144, 184–186, 232].

On the other hand, the policy in the actor-critic architecture can also be updated through the deterministic policy gradient (DPG) [48, 114, 193] for continuous control:

$$\nabla_\phi \mathcal{J}(\mu_\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \rho^\mu} [\nabla_a Q^\mu(s, a)|_{a=\mu_\phi(s)} \nabla_\phi \mu_\phi(s)].$$

where  $\mu_\phi(s) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  with parameters  $\phi$  is a deterministic policy. Moreover, we directly instead approximate the action-value function  $Q^\mu(s, a)$  with a parameterized critic  $Q(s, a; \theta)$ , where the parameters  $\theta$  are updated using the TD loss analogously to the value-based case. By avoiding a problematic integral over the action space, DPG provides a more efficient policy gradient paradigm than the stochastic counterparts [193].

## 3 EXPLAINABLE RL DEFINITIONS AND MEASUREMENT

This section sets the ground for enhancing RL framework with explainability. Although various papers in this field make their efforts to give a precise definition of explainable RL, neither standard criteria nor clear consensus has been reached in the XRL community. Meanwhile, a large number of current works view being explainable as a kind of subjective perception that is unnecessary to focus on. Such a vague definition will hinder the understanding of XRL papers and evaluation metrics of XRL frameworks. After reviewing the existing literature, we make further detailed descriptions of the XRL concepts and summarize the current evaluation metrics of XRL.

### 3.1 Definition of XRL

In this section, we make a formal definition of XRL, which varies slightly among existing literature due to the diverse range of criteria proposed by different pieces of literature on XRL. Reviewing these works, many of them [98, 141] define explainability through interaction with people. Miller [141] define RL explainability as the degree to which human can understand the decision made by the agent, and Kim et al. [98] asset that explainability is the degree to which human can consistently predict the result of the model. Meanwhile, many works [139, 166] directly follow taxonomy from eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) to divide explainability of RL into explainability and interpretability that stands for producing user-oriented explanation and being self-interpretable respectively without give an overall formal definition. Concluding from existing literature, XRL aims to provide explainable and transparent elucidation on the decision-making process undertaken by RL agents in sequential decision-making contexts. RL explainability involves enabling humans to comprehensively understand the decision-making process and outcomes of the agent, facilitating the prediction of its behavior and ensuring the production of user-oriented explanations. Conditioned on the way to the explanation in the surveyed papers, the explainability of current XRL methods can be further categorized as follows:

- (1) *Intrinsic explainability of agent architecture*: The inner agent architecture is able to be designed to be explainable. Such explainability refers to the capability of whether the decision-making and inner logic of the agent are transparent and easy to understand during the whole training and testing process. The typical architecture includes decision tree [192], hierarchical agent [190], logic rule [91], *etc.*
- (2) *Extrinsic explainability of decision outcome*: Extrinsic explainability involves providing supplementary post-hoc explanations that accompany the chosen action output. The extrinsic explanation contains the aspects that the agent takes into account when producing action with specific state inputs. This kind of explanation includes salience map [85], attention distribution [110], shapley value among agent [79], *etc.*

Intrinsic explainability is a kind of capability that is determined while the agent is constructed, while the extrinsic explainability needs to have not only a completed agent but also the input data and execution on it, which makes the extrinsic explainability a post-hoc property. The XRL field is constituted with such two kinds of explanation.

### 3.2 Evaluation Framework

After giving a clear description of explainability, we turn to the evaluation of XRL. Unfortunately, there is still no consensus about how to measure the explainability of RL framework. Some initial work has been made to formulate some approaches or aspects for evaluation. Doshi-Velez and Kim [39] proposed the idea that evaluates explainability in three levels that include application, human, and function. Hoffman et al. [84], Mohseni et al. [147] make further contributions on giving reasonable metrics for explainable AI. We summarize their work and give an evaluation framework for the explainable RL paradigm:

*3.2.1 Subjective Assessment.* Subjective assessment assesses explainable frameworks based on human feedback. Users receive the explanation and construct the mental model of how a person understands the model process and structure [163, 226, 235]. Therefore, conversely evaluating the mental model can be a feasible way to verify the effectiveness of the explanation. The subjective assessment aims to capture and measure the mental model of the user. However, it is hard to directly measure the mental model of human users in their minds. Current approaches to the mental model

are all based on human feedback. Significant metrics for subjective assessment can be categorized as follows:

- (1) *User Prediction (S.UP)*: The accuracy of human prediction on both task and RL agent illustrates the effectiveness of the mental model reconstructed by RL explanation. A quantitative way is to make the user predict the agent decision  $a_{\text{pred}}$ , compare to the real agent action  $a_{\text{RL}}$  and calculate the hit rate  $\sum_N |a_{\text{pred}} - a_{\text{RL}}|^2 / N$ , where  $N$  is the overall test time [11, 95, 154, 171, 173]. The questionnaire method can also quantitatively evaluate the accuracy of prediction [99, 104, 106, 167], in which participants give out their task-related knowledge degree on RL agent decision and agent explanation.
- (2) *User Confidence (S.UC)*: User confidence evaluates the reliability of RL explanation, instead of user prediction metrics fully trusting on RL explanation. User confidence stands for the persuasiveness of RL explainability [21, 53, 105]. The questionnaire method is a feasible approach to measure the confidence of user [17, 35, 115, 116, 134]. For trust and reliance aspects, many researchers [153, 165] track the action and intentions of users in the questionnaire to measure their trust and reliance on the explanations. Lim et al. [116] and Gedikli et al. [53] also explore the complexity of explanation by measuring response time  $\Delta t$  of user.
- (3) *Descriptiveness (S.D)*: A large portion of XRL literature directly gives the descriptions of the explanation in case-study like state feature visualization [61, 238] and specific programmatic policy [215, 216] to illustrate the explainability in case-study. Despite the strong logic of the description in enhancing the persuasiveness of explanations, it should be noted that the description does not provide precise quantitative results. Currently, many XRL papers employ this approach to claim and demonstrate the explainability of their work [110, 121, 162, 206], leading us to consider descriptiveness as an informal subjective metric.

Subjective assessment implicitly evaluates the effectiveness of RL explanation through human feedback. Presently, the development of questionnaire designing methodologies [77, 113] enables the creation of well-designed questionnaires for human users. Questionnaires effectively quantify prediction accuracy as well as user confidence, thereby making them widely used for measuring explainability [134, 187]. However, all of these subjective metrics are susceptible to potential biases stemming from subjective human judgment. Therefore, evaluation performers must ensure the fairness of tested human participants.

**3.2.2 Objective Assessment.** Objective assessment entails the quantitative evaluation of explanations by relying solely on objective outputs, such as agent actions and cumulative rewards, thereby eliminating the need for human feedback. These objective metrics provide quantitative evaluations of the agent effectiveness and avoid the potential biases introduced by subjective human judgment.

- (1) *Decision Performance (O.DP)*: Decision performance refers to the cumulative rewards  $G_\pi$  that RL agent  $\pi$  achieves. It is crucial not to sacrifice performance in favor of explainability. Therefore, O.DP is necessary for all types of XRL methods to evaluate XRL effectiveness while all existing XRL methods do consider it as a fundamental indicator [13, 110, 124, 206, 208, 216].
- (2) *Fidelity (O.F)*: Fidelity measures the alignment between the generated explanation and the explained model, ascertaining the extent to which the explanation accurately portrays the behavior of the agent [147]. The quantification of fidelity varies depending on the employed methodologies. Concerning the intrinsic explanation of agent architecture, fidelity is assessed by measuring the disparity between the unexplainable policy  $\pi_{\text{RL}}$  and the intrinsic explainable policy  $\pi_{\text{XRL}}$ , denoted as  $D(\pi_{\text{RL}}, \pi_{\text{XRL}})$  [127], where the function  $D$  represents a distance metric.

For extrinsic explanations on decision outcome, fidelity can be assessed by exploring how fine-tuning actions on significant states in explanation introduces changes in the accumulative return [65].

- (3) *Robustness (O.R)*: Robustness refers to the stability and reliability of the RL explanation when faced with various changes and disturbances [101, 201]. The assessment of robustness involves evaluating and validating the generated explanation under different conditions. Current evaluation methods add perturbation on state input [22, 22, 151] or model parameters [1, 2, 54], utilizing the difference of generated explanation to determine whether the explanation remains stable.

Objective assessment evaluates RL explainability rigorously and fairly. However, the lack of human feedback may lead to imprecise measurement of explainability correctness. Meanwhile, current objective assessment metrics are limited to the specific type of explanation. The field of RL explainability currently lacks universally accepted measurement methods, necessitating further research attention to address this gap.

## 4 EXPLAINABILITY IN RL

We construct the taxonomy of eXplainable Reinforcement Learning (XRL) based on the central target of explanation under the RL paradigm. These approaches typically do not give explanations for all aspects of the entire RL process like reward and task at the same time due to the complexity and intractability. Instead, they focus on making certain aspects of the RL paradigm understandable to human users while maintaining performance. The underlying model for an RL task can be segmented into several components, namely state, action, reward, agent model, and task. In our taxonomy, we organize existing explainable RL research based on these components: agent model-explaining methods that directly show the decision-making mechanism of XRL agent, reward-explaining methods that show how different factors within reward function influence agent policy, state-explaining methods that illustrate the state features at different time stages affecting agent behavior, and task-explaining methods that explain how the agent divide the complex task into subtasks and gradually complete these subtasks in long term. These XRL methods are further categorized based on the employed technique. We present this taxonomy in Figure 2. The detailed descriptions of these different XRL paradigm methods are presented in the following subsection.

### 4.1 Agent Model-explaining

Classical RL frameworks primarily aim to optimize the decision-making capability of the agent without focusing on the internal decision-making logic. In contrast, agent model-explaining XRL methods not only achieve high-performing agents but also extract the underlying decision-making mechanism of agent model to generate explanations. We categorize current agent model-explaining XRL methods into two types: self-explainable and explanation-generating techniques. Self-explainable methods aim to generate explanations by the transparent inner agent model itself, whereas explanation-generating techniques provide explanations based on predetermined reasoning mechanisms.

**4.1.1 Self-explainable.** A self-explainable model is intentionally designed to be self-explanatory throughout the training process, which is accomplished by imposing limitations on the complexity of the model structure [40, 166]. Such a model is also known as an intrinsic model [166], as it embodies transparency and ease of understanding. The explanation logic is inherently integrated within the agent model itself. Our work provides a comprehensive overview of the current self-explainable agent model in the XRL field and categorizes them into two types based on the approximating target of the explainable agent model: value and policy. This classification can be found in Table 1.

*i): Value-based.* The Q-value in RL measures the expected discounted sum of rewards that an agent would receive from a given state ( $s, a$ ). This value can also be employed to construct a deterministic or energy-based policy[66, 114, 145]. Due to its direct influence on the agent policy, many value-based agent model-explaining XRL frameworks primarily concentrate on the Q-value model.

The Linear Model U-tree (LMUT) [121] combines the concepts of imitation learning (IL) and continuous U-tree (CUT) [211], which can be considered as an advanced version of CUT for value function estimation. Similar to a typical decision tree, LMUT internal nodes store dataset features, while the leaf nodes represent a partition of the input space. However, in LMUT, each leaf node contains a linear model that approximates the Q-value instead of a simple constant. The Q-value approximation, denoted as  $Q_{N_t}^{UT}$ , is obtained from the linear model within the corresponding LMUT leaf node. This approximation acts as an explanation by quantifying the individual effects of different features in LMUT. The researchers outline the training process for LMUT, which involves two steps: (1) data gathering phase counting all transitions  $T$  within LMUT and modifying Q-values;




Fig. 2. Diagrams of different types of explainable reinforcement learning frameworks. These diagrams illustrate how different types of XRL framework makes different parts of the reinforcement learning model produce explanation and help experts get an insight into the reinforcement learning process. Note that these diagrams are just abstractions of the approaches that we will talk about. The more detailed learning process of the agent is not included in these diagrams.  $a, r, s$  refer to the action, reward, and states at time  $t$ . (a) constructs the agent on an explainable model to illustrate the inner mechanism of the agent. (b) reconstructs reward function  $r$  towards an explainable one  $r'$ . And  $r'$  is constructed by quantifying the quantitative impact of various key factors, represented as  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$ , on resolving the task. These key factors encompass crucial elements like final goal features and multi-agent cooperation. (c) adds a state analyzer submodule to quantify the influences of state features for each state input  $s$ . (d) gets an architectural level explainability in complex tasks by task division and multilevel agents. The high-level agent schedules low-level agents by the subtask signal  $g$ , which could be utilized as explanation.

Table 1. Self-explainable agent models in XRL approaches. The venue with \* denotes that the paper was published at the workshop of that venue.

Type	Description	Explanation	Reference	Year	Venue	Evaluation
Value-based	Learn to represent Q-value with explainable models.	Decision Tree	[121]	2018	ECML-PKDD	O.DP, S.D
		Formula Expression	[135]	2012	DS	O.DP, S.D
Policy-based	Learn to represent agent policy with explainable models.	Programmatic policy	[216]	2018	ICML	O.DP, S.D
			[215]	2019	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
			[86]	2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
			[210]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.UP, S.D
		Symbolic policy	[75]	2018	EAAI	O.DP, S.D
			[76]	2019	GECCO	O.DP, S.D
			[107]	2021	ICML	O.DP, S.D
		Fuzzy controller	[74]	2017	EAAI	O.DP, S.D
			[3]	2019	ECML-PKDD*	O.DP, S.D
		Logic rule	[91]	2019	ICML	O.DP, S.D
[159]	2019		arXiv	O.DP, S.D		
[160]	2020		arXiv	O.DP, S.D		
Decision Tree	[176]	2011	ICML	O.DP, S.D		
	[13]	2018	NeurIPS	O.DP, O.R, S.D		
	[209]	2019	AAAI	O.DP, O.F, S.D		
	[36]	2020	arXiv	O.DP, S.D		
	[178]	2020	arXiv	O.DP, S.D		
	[208]	2021	AAAI	O.DP, S.D		
[140]	2022	arXiv	O.DP, S.D			

(2) node splitting phase by Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD). When SGD fails to yield sufficient improvement on specific leaf nodes, the framework splits those leaf nodes to disentangle the mixed features. Experimental results demonstrate that LMUT achieves comparable performance to neural network-based baselines across various environments.

Maes et al. [135] introduced a search algorithm exploring the space of simple closed-form formulas to construct Q-value. The variables within the formula represent the abstractions of state and action components, while the operations performed on these variables are unary and binary mathematical operations. The resulting policy is a greedy deterministic policy that selects the action with the maximum Q-value. The different operations employed in the formula highlight the varying effects of variables on the Q-value, thereby ensuring explainability. However, this method struggles with the combinatorial explosion during searching. The total number of variables, constants, and operations is limited to a small number to solve this problem.

*ii): Policy-based.* Policy representation is considered a more direct approach compared to the Q-value, as it directly represents the decision ability of the agent. In this section, we provide a comprehensive analysis of the potential choices of policy models that have been proposed in the existing literature. In particular, Figure 3 showcases some representative approaches of this nature.

Programmatic Reinforcement Learning (PRL) involves utilizing a program as the representation of the policy, enabling intrinsic explainability through logic rules within the program [86, 210, 215, 216]. This approach operates through two components, as shown in Figure 3a: programmatic policy generator and programmatic policy evaluator. The former updates the current programmatic policy vector within a fixed programmatic space, generating a programmatic policy through vector decoding. The latter involves simulating the generated programmatic policy to optimize the current policy in a one-step fashion. The main challenge in PRL lies in selecting an interpretable programmatic




Fig. 3. Some examples of self-explainable policy-based methods. (a) illustrates current Programmatic Reinforcement Learning (PRL) approaches [86, 210, 215, 216] involving two alternating phases. Programmatic policy generator updates current latent policy vector  $\phi(\pi_{p'})$  with one-step optimization  $\epsilon$  from the policy optimizer, which is then decoded into a programmatic policy  $\pi_p$  for the next step. The programmatic policy evaluator utilizes the programmatic policy to sample batches of trajectories  $\tau_i$  for the policy optimizer to output one-step optimization  $\epsilon$  for the next update. (b) describes the current two types of Decision Tree (DT) policy approaches. DT policy transform methods [13, 140] first train a DNN-based optimal policy  $\pi_{\text{DNN}}$  by DRL methods and then transfer the DNN policy into DT policy. And DT policy shaping methods [121, 178] directly shape a DT policy by interaction with the environment. They maintain the Q-value  $Q(L, \cdot)$  and weight  $w(L)$  of the corresponding DT leaf node  $L$  while splitting the leaf node split for better performance.

policy space. Verma et al. [216] constructs programmatic policy using a domain-specific high-level programming language based on historical data utilization, allowing for a quick understanding of past interactions influence. They propose Neurally Directed Program Search (NDPS) to construct such a policy. NDPS employs the DRL method to find a neural policy that approximates the target policy, followed by iterative policy updates through template enumeration using Bayesian Optimization [197] or satisfiability modulo theory to optimize the parameters. However, Verma et al. [215] argue that this method is highly suboptimal and propose a new framework based on the mirror descent-based meta-algorithm for policy search in the space combining neural and programmatic representations. For multi-agent communication, Inala et al. [86] synthesize programmatic policies based on the generated communication graph of the agents. Additionally, Trivedi et al. [210] learn a latent program space to improve the efficiency of programmatic policy search. Furthermore, the learned latent program embedding can be transferred and reused for other tasks.

Formulaic expressions are also able to represent policies instead of value functions. Such policies are referred to as symbolic policies, comprising simple and concise symbolic operations that provide intrinsic explainability through succinct mathematical expressions [75, 76, 130]. However, searching the entire symbolic space to find the best fit is generally considered a computationally complex problem known as NP-hard [130]. To address this challenge, several studies [75, 76] utilize genetic programming for model-based batch RL to maintain a population of symbolic expression individuals as well as evolutionary operations. In contrast to a direct search for a symbolic policy, Landajuela et al. [107] propose a method where an inexplicable DNN-based anchor policy is utilized to generate an explainable symbolic policy.

The policy can be constructed based on the combination of several fuzzy controllers [3, 56, 74]. Specifically, the agent policy, denoted as  $\pi(a|s)$ , can be represented as a Gaussian Distribution

$N(a|K\varphi(s), \Sigma)$ , with  $K$  stacking actions for the cluster centers,  $\varphi(s)$  returning a weight vector based on the distance, and  $\Sigma$  being a state-independent full variance matrix. By evaluating the distance to cluster centers, the influence of different centers on actions can be analyzed. The policy gradient method is employed to facilitate training of such policies [3]. Additionally, another approach [74] applies parameter training on a world model to construct fuzzy RL policies. Both of them dynamically adjust the number of clusters and achieve explainable policies with high performance.

First-order logic (FOL) serves as a foundational language to depict entities and relationships [12]. It underpins the policy representation in Neural logic RL (NLRL), which fuses policy gradient techniques with differentiable inductive logic programming [254]. The seminal work [91] on NLRL shows the enhancement of explainability through weighted logic rules, clarifying the rationale for action choices. Later advances assign weights to rule atoms, leveraging genetic programming technique for policy formula learning from historical interactions [159, 160]. This evolution positions NLRL as a tool for deriving potent policies with superior explainability and generalizability.

Decision Tree (DT) for XRL has been categorized into policy-based and value-based strategies. While the linear model U-tree stands out as a DT variant in value-based XRL, DT-based policies are utilized to select actions based on distinctive features derived from DTs, thereby providing interpretable observations within RL tasks [13, 140, 176, 208, 209]. Frameworks for policy-based DTs are delineated in Figure 3b. With the efficacy of humans in acquiring policies on DDN via DRL, transforming DNN policies to DT policies is a promising strategy. For this, Verifiability via Iterative Policy Extraction (VIPER)[13] employs model distillation[81] to transmute pre-trained DNN policies to DTs using optimal policy trajectories. Techniques like Q-DAGGER [176] and MAVIPER [140] further refine and extend VIPER to more scenarios like multi-agent settings. Iterative Bounding MDP (IBMDP) [208] and policy summarization [209] also focus on extracting interpretable policies from DNNs. Another avenue pursues direct DT policy shaping. By maintaining weight information at the leaf nodes of DT to approximate Q-value and performing leaf node splits at specific stages, a high-performance DT policy can be obtained. Custode and Iacca [36] employ evolutionary algorithms to evolve the DT structure while applying Q-learning to the leaf nodes. Roth et al. [178] propose Conservative Q-Improvement (CQI), which uses lazy updating and expands the tree size only when the approximation of future discount rewards exceeds a specified threshold.

**4.1.2 Explanation-generating.** Explanation-generate methods employ an explicit auxiliary reasoning mechanism to facilitate the automatic generation of explanations. The acquisition of such an explicit reasoning mechanism for explanation relies on the emulation of human cognitive processes involved in learning novel concepts. In the following, we present a collection of influential works that illustrate these types of explainability, which are summarized in Table 2.

Counterfactual explanations answer the question of "why perform X" by explaining "why not perform Y" (the counterfactual of X) [134, 155, 200, 241]. Olson et al. [155] crafts counterfactual states  $s'$  that have minimal divergence from the current state  $s$ , yet lead to distinct agent actions, while Stein [200] emphasize the Q-value discrepancies between counterfactual action pairs. On the causal front, Madumal et al. [134] leverages the causal model to grasp the world through distinct variables and potential interrelationships to further elucidate both action reasons and counterfactuals. However, the rigidity of the causal model hampers its adaptability, and the method can only be implemented in discrete action space. To bridge this gap, Yu et al. [241] melds attention-driven causal techniques, facilitating causal influence quantification in continuous action spaces and illuminating the long-term repercussions of such actions.

Instruction-based Behavior Explanation (IBE) [49, 50] enhances explainability with formal agent instructions. In basic IBE [50], the agent acquires the capability to explain the behavior with

Table 2. Explanation-generating agent models in XRL approaches. The venue with \* denotes that the paper was published at the workshop of that venue.

Description	Explanation	Reference	Year	Venue	Evaluation
Learn an explicit reasoning mechanism and generate the explanation automatically.	Counteract	[155]	2021	AI	O.DP, O.F, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[134]	2020	AAAI	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[200]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, O.F, S.D
		[241]	2023	IJCAI	O.DP, S.D
	Instruction	[50]	2017	HAI	O.DP, S.D
		[49]	2017	ICONIP	O.DP, S.D
	Answer to query	[71]	2017	HRI	O.DP, S.D
		[23]	2022	IJCAI	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[24]	2023	IJCAI	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
	Verify	[96]	2019	SIGCOMM*	O.DP, S.D
[253]		2019	PLDI	O.DP, O.F, S.D	
[4]		2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D	
[93]		2022	CAV	O.DP, O.R, S.D	

instruction. The learning process includes estimating the target of the agent actions by simulation and acquiring a mapping from the target of the agent actions to the expressions with a clustering approach. However, it is difficult to divide the state space to assign an explanation signal in much more complex tasks. Consequently, in their advanced IBE approach [49], a neural network model is employed to construct the mapping, enabling its adaptability to intricate state space.

With the pre-defined query template, the agent is able to explain its inner mechanism by answering [23, 24, 71]. Hayes and Shah [71] introduce a method wherein queries are mapped to decision-making statements via templates. They harness a graph search algorithm to pinpoint relevant states and summarize attributes in natural language. Although the generated policy explanations align with the expert expectations, their reliability in more complex tasks remains unverified. To address this, Boggess et al. [23] extend this approach to MARL by proposing Multi-agent MDP (MMDP), an abstraction of MARL policy. They first transform the learned policy into an MMDP by a specified set of feature predicates to address "When, Why not, What" questions in MARL. However, the question templates ignore the task process, and Boggess et al. [24] make advancements addressing temporal queries regarding the task order. They achieve this by encoding the temporal query and comparing it with the transition model, resulting in contractive explanations.

Formal verification techniques bolster safety in RL paradigms. Verily [96], for instance, accomplishes erification with the satisfiability modulo theories verification engine for DNN. If the verification result is negative, Verily can generate a counterexample through logical verification to explain the discrepancy. This counterexample can in turn guide the updates of the DNN parameter. Anderson et al. [4] adopt a similar approach, employing the idea of mirror descent shared by Verma et al. [215]. They perform updating and projecting steps between the neurosymbolic class and restricted symbolic policy class to enable efficient verification. Furthermore, Zhu et al. [253] propose a verification toolchain to ensure the safety of learning neural network policies. Likewise, Jin et al. [93] present a verification-in-the-loop training framework, which iteratively trains and refines the abstracted state space using counterexamples if verification fails.

Table 3. Reward-explaining methods in XRL approaches. The venue with \* denotes that the paper was published at the workshop of that venue.

Type	Description	Reference	Year	Venue	Evaluation
Reward decomposition	Decomposing reward function and see the influence of components towards the decision-making process and the correspondence between each other.	[46]	2018	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[94]	2019	IJCAI*	O.DP, S.D
		[220]	2020	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[111]	2021	SIGKDD	O.DP, S.D
Reward shaping	Directly shape an understandable reward function to guide agent training.	[205]	2019	HRI	O.DP, S.D
		[133]	2019	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[231]	2020	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[230]	2021	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[142]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
		[92]	2022	AAAI	O.DP, S.D
		[9]	2022	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D

**4.1.3 Summarization.** Agent model-explaining methods focus on extracting the internal decision-making mechanism of agents in addition to optimizing their decision-making capabilities. Meanwhile, agent model-explaining methods offer notable advantages and potential drawbacks. Firstly, these explanations are logically rigorous since self-explainable methods construct a transparent agent architecture, and explanation-generating methods rely on explicit rigorous reasoning mechanisms. Both of the two types of approaches elucidate the inner decision-making mechanisms of XRL agents [91, 215, 216] in detail, revealing how different task and observation aspects influence agent outputs [96, 134, 160]. Furthermore, such well-structured explanations can be easily verified by human experts through direct simulations [139, 209]. However, taking agent model itself as explanation is often abstract [75, 159], mathematized [3, 107], and specialized [86, 210], which may hinder understanding for non-experts.

In terms of evaluation, self-explainable methods predominantly utilize S.D as an assessment criterion. These methods leverage the agent model itself to provide explanations and illustrate these explanations through case studies. While case studies showcasing intrinsic explainable policy instances, such as decision tree [121, 209] and programmatic policies [86, 210], are intuitively logical and reasonable, the absence of quantitative measurements limits their persuasiveness in demonstrating explainability. Instead, explanation-generating methods utilize various evaluation assessments such as S.UP, S.UC, O.F, and O.R, which are more formal and quantitative. Self-explainable methods primarily rely on agent architecture to provide intrinsic explanations, which are highly formulaic and objectively described in detail. Therefore, objective assessments of O.F and O.R offer a more precise evaluation of the architecture-based explanation. Conversely, explanation-generating methods producing explanations need more subjective assessments of S.UP and S.UC from human feedback since the core of explanation-generating methods is the extrinsic reasoning mechanisms conducting logical reasoning, which can be effectively evaluated via human participants with strong inferential abilities.

## 4.2 Reward-explaining

Reward-explaining methods reconstruct an explainable reward function through the quantification of various key factors that are instrumental in accomplishing the task, such as the degree of multi-agent cooperation and the features of the final goal. The reward function plays a crucial role in RL tasks, serving as the primary factor for estimating actions in the short term and policies in the long

term. The reward-explaining method involves explicitly designing an explainable reward function to provide explanations for the critical factors of the task. Building upon this notion, we categorize current reward-based XRL work into two types: reward shaping and reward decomposition. The approaches within each category are summarized in Table 3.

**4.2.1 Reward Decomposition.** Reward decomposition methods aim to explain the inexplicable value of a reward function by breaking it down into several distinct parts that represent different aspects. The original reward function is a single scalar value influenced by multiple implicit factors. By decomposing the reward function, we can analyze the influence and relationships among these implicit factors. In this section, we introduce several reward decomposition methods.

Horizontal reward decomposition [94] decompose the reward function in the MDP horizontally as  $\vec{R} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  represents the number of reward components. Subsequently, the Q-value is also decomposed as  $Q^\pi(s, a) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} Q_c^\pi(s, a)$ . To explain the decomposition, the authors primarily focus on comparing pairwise actions. One straightforward approach is Reward Difference eXplanation (RDX) in the form of  $\Delta(s, a_1, a_2) = \vec{Q}(s, a_1) - \vec{Q}(s, a_2)$ . RDX informs experts about which components may have an advantage over other factors, but it does not identify the most significant component. Moreover, RDX may offer limited explanations when the number of factors increases. To address this, the authors propose another form of explanation called Minimal Sufficient eXplanation (MSX). MSX is a two-tuple  $(MSX^+, MSX^-)$ , with  $MSX^+$  selecting the minimal set of components where the total  $\Delta(s, a_1, a_2)$  surpasses a dynamic threshold, while  $MSX^-$  checks the summation of  $-\Delta(s, a_1, a_2)$  with the other threshold.

For multi-agent tasks, the widely adopted paradigm is Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution (CTDE), which allows agents to train based on their local view while a central critic estimates the joint value function. The primary challenge of CTDE lies in assigning credit to each agent. One effective tool for assigning credit to each local agent is the Shapley value [177], which represents the average contribution of an entity (or in the context of multi-agent RL, a single agent) across different scenarios. To compute the Shapley value, we can measure the change in the output when the target feature or agent is considered. Considering that the computational costs growing exponentially with the number of agents make it hard to approximate in complex environments, Foerster et al. [46] employs a counterfactual advantage function for local agent training. Nevertheless, this method neglects the correlation and interaction between local agents, leading to failure on intricate tasks. To address this limitation, Wang et al. [220] combine the Shapley value with the Q-value and perform reward decomposition at a higher level in multi-agent tasks to plan global rewards rationally: individual agents with greater contributions receive more rewards. Therefore, this method assigns credit to each agent, enabling an explanation of how the global reward is divided during training and how much each agent contributes. However, one drawback of this network-based method is its dependency on the assumption that local agents take actions sequentially without considering the synchronous running of agents. In contrast, Li et al. [111] employ counterfactual-based methods to quantify the contribution of each agent, which proves to be more stable and effective.

**4.2.2 Reward Shaping.** Directly obtaining an explainable reward function is another viable approach. Several studies [92, 133, 142, 205, 230, 231] have taken the route of directly seeking understandable reward function that explicitly captures the task structure, bypassing the need to explicitly explain the reward function component.

Building upon the interactions between the agent and humans, Mirchandani et al. [142] present a reward-shaping approach that modifies the original sparse rewards with human instruction goals into a dense explainable reward. Similarly, The study conducted by Ashwood et al. [9] employs a

meta-learning approach to acquire multiple goal maps, subsequently modifying the reward function by aggregating diverse goal map weights. Tabrez and Hayes [205] propose a framework that employs the Partially Observable MDP (POMDP) model to approximate collaborator understanding of joint tasks. The authors continually modify and correct the reward function in order to achieve this objective. If they discover a more plausible reward function, they evaluate whether the advantage of adopting it outweighs the cost of abandoning the previous function. Subsequently, a repairing representation is generated if the newly found reward function proves beneficial.

To enhance the explainability of complex tasks, the adoption of multi-level rewards is a viable approach. Unlike task decomposition, where decomposed reward reflects the actual rewards from the environment, multi-level reward encompasses both extrinsic rewards from the environment and intrinsic rewards aimed at facilitating comprehension and explanation. Lyu et al. [133] introduce a two-level framework comprising extrinsic reward standing for real rewards within RL environments and intrinsic reward representing the achievement of inner task factors. Symbolic Planning approaches are utilized to maximize the intrinsic reward. Meanwhile, compared to Lyu et al. [133] utilizing the predefined intrinsic reward to generate plans, Jin et al. [92] extend their work by automatically learning the intrinsic reward, enabling faster convergence compared to the original approach. For the task of temporal language bounding in untrimmed videos, Wu et al. [231] propose a tree-structured progressive RL technique: while the leaf policy receives the extrinsic reward from the external environment, the root policy, which does not directly interact with the environment, evaluates rewards intrinsically based on high-level semantic branch selections. Meanwhile, to address challenges with defining intrinsic rewards resulting in inferior performance compared to extrinsic rewards, Wu et al. [230] introduce the concept of intrinsic mega-rewards to enhance the agent individual control abilities, including direct and latent control. A relational transition model is formulated to enable the acquisition of such control abilities, yielding superior performance compared to existing intrinsic reward approaches.

*4.2.3 Summarization.* The reward-explaining method entails analyzing various factors in the task that profoundly influence agent behavior and incorporating them into the reward function to obtain RL explainability, which quantifies the influence of relevant task aspects to elucidate agent decisions within the updated reward function, thereby providing a clear and detailed depiction of the different task factor influence [94]. Moreover, Considering that the reward function in the MDP context is typically crafted manually with significant effort of RL researchers to improve agent performance, we posit that such explainable reward functions, which offer insights into how rewards affect the agent, can inform and guide the reverse design of reward function for RL researchers. However, it should be acknowledged that comprehending the rewards in the MDP may present challenges for people lacking a background in RL, which makes it challenging to verify such explanations via human users directly.

All of the surveyed reward-explaining methods utilize S.D to assess RL explainability. These explanations in the original paper case study provide visualizations comparing the influences of different aspects of the task within the reward value, offering illustrative examples for case studies in the paper. In order to perform quantitative analysis of these reward-explaining methods in the future, we posit that objective assessment O.F is more required for future research. Different quantitative influences of factors are the backbone of reward explanation, which should be strictly measured for its fidelity objectively. A possible way to measure O.F is manually updating the reward against the reward explanation to see whether the agent performance falls rapidly [65].

Table 4. State-explaining methods in XRL approaches.

Temporal perspective	Description	Reference	Year	Venue	Evaluation
Historical trajectory	Quantify the influence of the occurred state in historical trajectory towards the decision making of agent.	[250]	2014	AAAI	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[143]	2018	SSCI	O.DP, S.D
		[187]	2018	AI	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[245]	2021	TCSS	O.DP, S.D
		[65]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, O.F, O.R, S.D
		[80]	2021	CIM	O.DP, S.D
		[168]	2022	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[97]	2023	ICLR	O.DP, O.F, O.R, S.D
Current observation	Quantify the feature importance among the current state input towards the decision making of agent.	[121]	2018	ECML-PKDD	O.DP, S.D
		[238]	2018	arXiv	O.DP, S.D
		[57]	2018	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
		[61]	2018	ICML	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[162]	2018	ICML	O.DP, S.D
		[87]	2018	AIES	O.DP, S.UP
		[110]	2019	arXiv	O.DP, S.D
		[219]	2019	TVCG	O.DP, S.D
		[5]	2019	AAAI	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[207]	2020	GECCO	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[233]	2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
		[156]	2020	SIGKDD	O.DP, S.D
		[206]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[64]	2021	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D
		[218]	2022	ICML	O.DP, O.F, S.D
[19]	2022	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D		
[161]	2022	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.UP, S.UC, S.D		
		[14]	2023	ICML	O.DP, S.D
Future prediction	Make prediction for the future state and check it in the future.	[212]	2018	arXiv	O.DP, O.R, S.D
		[157]	2019	ICRA	O.DP, S.D
		[132]	2019	ICRA	O.DP, S.D
		[239]	2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
		[108]	2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D

### 4.3 State-explaining

State-explaining methods generate extrinsic explanations based on observation from the environment, which incorporate a state analyzer that allows for the simultaneous analysis of the different state features significance. According to the time stage of different states to construct the explanation, we divide current state-explaining methods into three types: historical trajectory-based methods focusing on past significant states, current observation-based methods emphasizing important features of current state, and future prediction-based methods inferring future states. We provide a brief review of the relevant literature pertaining to state-level explainability in Table 4.

**4.3.1 Historical Trajectory.** Starting from the trace of historical decisions, numerous studies aim to estimate the influence of historical observations on future decision-making by agents.

Sparse Bayesian Reinforcement Learning (SBRL) [250] constructs latent space representing past experiences during training to facilitate knowledge transfer and continuous action search. SBRL offers an intuitive explanation for how historical data samples impact the learning process. Another approach, Visual SBRL (V-SBRL) [143], utilizes a sparse filter to maintain the significant past image-based state while discarding the trivial ones, resulting in a sparse image set containing valuable past experience. Sequeira and Gervasio [187] identify interestingness state elements in historical observations from various aspects, such as the reward outliers and environment dynamics, and present




Fig. 4. Some typical approaches to getting the importance of current state. (a) illustrates the method [5, 110, 161, 206, 207] that by adding specific network structures like convolutional neural network and attention network, the information of region and feature importance can be captured. This kind of importance can both be fed to DRL input for better performance and be provided as explanations for human users. (b) describes how to get importance through perturbation [19, 61, 87, 162, 238]. First, generate different perturbations  $m_i$  and impose them on the state input separately, then they are fed to the DRL policy to get policy  $\pi_{m_i}$ , which will next be compared with the complete state policy  $\pi_s$  according to difference function  $D(\pi_s, \cdot)$ . Thus, the importance of each feature or region will be obtained and delivered to human users.

the detected observations in the video. Ragodos et al. [168] denote the important past experiences as prototypes, which are learned by contrastive learning during training. By integrating these prototypes into the policy network, human users are able to observe representative interactions within the task. Meanwhile, Ragodos et al. [168] generate a broader explanation by comparing current policy output with human-defined prototypes, demonstrating better trustworthiness and performance.

The Shapley value also offers an effective approach for calculating and visualizing the contribution of each feature in prior trajectories. However, the naive computation of the Shapley value faces an exponential complexity. To mitigate this issue, Heuillet et al. [80] employ Monte Carlo sampling to approximate the Shapley value, while Zhang et al. [245] leverage DNN to compute the feature gradients and aggregate them as a Shapley value to develop a 3D feature-time-SHAP map enabling the visualization of the significance of each timestep.

Previous surveyed methods only focus on the historical interactions within an episode, Guo et al. [65] extend their horizon by considering interactions across episodes. They incorporate a deep recurrent kernel of the Gaussian Process that takes inputs of timestep embeddings to capture the correlation between timesteps as well as the cumulative impact across episodes. Furthermore, these outputs can be employed for episode-level reward prediction via linear regression analysis. The regression coefficients obtained from the linear regression model can identify important timesteps, thereby enhancing the explainability of the results.

**4.3.2 Current observation.** Numerous studies aim to identify critical features influencing decision-making in the current state, particularly in image-based environments. These approaches offer extrinsic explanations by analyzing the impact of state features on agent behavior. Different methods that fall under this category are depicted in Figure 4.

The linear model U-tree (LMUT) method [121] introduces an approach for evaluating the importance of features. The impact of an LMUT node is assessed by the certainty of the Q-value and the square weight of the within features, respectively. The paper applies it to some video games and gets pixels with relatively high influence. The explanation denotes such pixels as “super-pixels” that have a great influence on the current decision-making process.

Several studies leverage self-attention, allowing the creation of an attention score matrix, which highlights relationships among input features for improved explainability [5, 61, 87, 110, 161, 206,

207, 233, 238]. In contexts like agent interaction in self-driving scenarios [109], self-attention-based DNN [110] discerns relations amongst multiple entities. Extending this, Tang and Ha [206] use attention neurons for honing in on specific state components. Meanwhile, Annasamy and Sycara [5] integrate attention within DNNs to develop auto-encoders for input state reconstruction. Neuroevolution combined with self-attention [207] selects spatial patches over individual pixels, enabling the agent to focus on task-critical areas, thus amplifying efficacy and clarity. Yang et al. [238] introduce a region-sensitive module post-DNN to pinpoint essential input image regions, serving as an explainable plug-in module integrated into classical RL algorithms [144, 186]. Shifting from pixel-centric states, Xu et al. [233] design a hierarchical attention model for text-based games using a Knowledge Graph (KG), capturing state feature relationships. Building on this, Peng et al. [161] enhance explanations by integrating multiple subgraphs with template-filling techniques.

Saliency maps, distinguishing from attention by highlighting specific parts of scenes, like objects or regions, have been adopted to increase explainability in RL agents. These maps showcase pixel influences on image classifications through gradient measurements of normalized scores. Several notable studies have contributed to XRL domain [14, 61, 64, 87, 156, 162, 218, 221]. Petsiuk et al. [162] gauged pixel significance by applying a random value mask and evaluating its decision impact, extended by Pan et al. [156] for geographic areas. Greydanus et al. [61] introduced perturbation-based saliency, perturbing certain features certainties to discern their impacts on policy. This was employed by Guo et al. [64] to juxtapose human and RL agent attention patterns, indicating RL training potential to humanize agents. Improving on this, Bertoin et al. [19] harnessed unsupervised learning for perturbation-based saliency maps and agent training regularization. Meanwhile, Wäldchen et al. [218] applied convolutional neural networks for partial feature interpretations, whereas Beechey et al. [14] leveraged shapley values to analyze the effects of feature removals. Lastly, the object saliency map [87], an advancement over pixel-based maps, integrates template matching, enabling easier human interpretations by connecting pixel saliency maps with object detection.

In contrast to relying on local spatial information, Goel et al. [57] utilize flow information to capture and segment the moving object in the image. Therefore, the policy can focus on moving objects in a more interpretable manner. Furthermore, Wang et al. [219] propose a specialized framework for visualizing DQN [145] process. This visualization provides insights into the operations performed at each stage and the activation levels of each layer within the deep neural network.

**4.3.3 Future Prediction.** The future prediction type offers explanations by making predictions about the future using the trained agent.

A common approach to predicting the future involves repeated forward simulations from the current state [212]. However, these simulations may be unprecise due to stochastic environmental factors and approximate biases in training [69]. To address this, Yau et al. [239] maintains the discounted expected future state visitations with temporal difference loss to further construct the belief map. The training process of such a belief map is consistent with current value-based inexplorable RL frameworks. This advantage renders it an explainable plug-in for value-based RL methods. Lee et al. [108] combine future prediction with multi-goal RL, facilitating trustworthy predictions of goal for the current state. Semantic Predictive Control (SPC) [157] dynamically learns the environment and aggregates multi-scale feature maps to predict future semantic events. Additionally, Lütjens et al. [132] employ an ensemble of LSTM networks trained using Monte Carlo Dropout and bootstrapping to estimate the probability of future events and predict uncertainty in new observations.

Table 5. Task-explaining methods in XRL approaches.

Type	Description	Reference	Year	Venue	Evaluation
Whole Top-to-Down structure	Subtasks are organized into multi-level task, with lower-level tasks being subsets of higher-level tasks.	[190]	2018	ICLR	O.DP, S.D
		[149]	2020	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
Simple task division	The subtasks are divided on an equal footing, with manually setting a high-level task aiming to schedule these subtasks.	[90]	2019	NeurIPS	O.DP, S.D
		[20]	2019	IROS	O.DP, S.D
		[229]	2020	AAMAS	O.DP, S.D
		[198]	2021	ICML	O.DP, S.D
		[133]	2021	TCCS	O.DP, S.D

**4.3.4 summarization.** State-explaining methods provide extrinsic explanations on states received from the environment, which comprehensively illustrate the quantitative impact of distinct state features [78, 162], offering detailed post-hoc explanations for agent decisions. Moreover, these explanations are presented with intuitive visualizations, making them accessible even to non-experts in RL. However, it is important to note that current state-explaining methods primarily concentrate on feature importance and hardly capture the agent’s long-term motivation and planning. Consequently, while the recipient of the explanation gains an understanding of the relevant features of the agent current behavior, the inner mechanism and ultimate goal of the agent remain undisclosed, which creates obstacles to verify the explanation directly.

Existing state-explaining methods undergo evaluation through various assessments, encompassing both subjective and objective measures. O.R stands out as the predominantly employed quantitative assessment [5, 206]. To further evaluate the quality of explanations in various aspects, it is necessary to utilize more objective methods of O.F and O.R to assess the accuracy and robustness of the RL agent allocation of significance to different features at different times. However, subjective measurement is not applicable since gathering a significant amount of evaluation data through human feedback would be time-consuming and ineffective.

## 4.4 Task-explaining

Task-explaining method explains how to divide the current complex task into multiple subtasks via the hierarchical agent. In a hierarchical agent, a high-level controller selects options, while several low-level controllers choose primitive actions. The option chosen by the high-level controller acts as a sub-goal for the low-level controllers to accomplish. This division of labor in HRL, involving RL tasks and options determined by the high-level controller, enhances the architectural explainability compared to the aforementioned XRL works, providing insight into how the high-level agent schedules the low-level tasks. In this context, we delve into HRL and categorize its approaches into two parts: the whole top-down structure and simple task decomposition according to the scheduling mechanism of high-level agents. These categorized approaches are presented in Table 5.

**4.4.1 Whole Top-to-Down Structure.** In hierarchical tasks with this structure, the task sets are partitioned into multiple levels. The low-level task sets are subsets of the high-level task sets, with the latter possessing task elements that are absent in the lower task sets. This well-defined and coherent structure lends itself to explainability as it aligns with human life experiences and enables observations of how the high-level agent schedules the low-level tasks.

A notable study (STG) proposes an approach to train a hierarchical policy in a multi-task environment. The task division sets, denoted as  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$ , follow a hierarchical structure:  $G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \dots \subset G_k$ . At each level, a policy  $\pi_k$  comprises four components: a base task set policy  $\pi_{k-1}$ , an instruction policy  $\pi_k^{inst}$  for providing instructions  $g$  to guide the execution of base tasks by  $\pi_{k-1}$ , an augment flat policy  $\pi_k^{Aug}$  that directly selects actions for  $\pi_k$  instead of relying on base

tasks, and a switch policy  $\pi_k^{sw}$  that determines whether to choose actions from the base tasks or the augment flat. The state is represented as the pair  $(e_t, g_t)$ , where  $e_t$  signifies time and  $g_t$  represents the instruction. This state, based on a temporal sequence, can be viewed as a finite state Markov chain, enabling analysis of the relationships between states. To train such a hierarchical policy, a two-step approach is proposed. Firstly, basic skills are learned from  $G_{k-1}$  to ensure that the previously acquired policy can be leveraged by instructing the base policy. This stage establishes the connection between the instruction policy and the base policy. Next, samples are collected from  $G_k$  to learn new skills and the switch policy. Both steps rely on the classical actor-critic RL algorithm. The ability to reuse prior skills while acquiring new ones, as well as the resulting explainability, is verified using Minecraft games.

Another idea is about the logical combination of base tasks utilizing bool algebra form [149]. This allows for task expressions to employ logical operations such as disjunction, conjunction, and negation. The proposed framework focuses on lifelong learning, which necessitates the utilization of previously acquired skills to solve new tasks. Consequently, the tasks  $G_i$  follow a sequential relation:  $G_1 \subset G_2 \dots \subset G_{t-1} \subset G_t$ . In this framework, the paper initially learns goal-oriented approximations of the value function for each base task and subsequently combines these approximations in a specific manner. By leveraging this framework, it becomes possible to acquire new task skills without the need for additional learning. Additionally, it successfully represents the optimal policy for the current RL task using Boolean algebra.

**4.4.2 Simple Task Division.** In contrast to a strictly top-down structure, where sub-tasks are hierarchically defined, simply divided sub-tasks exhibit equal status and filter out priority over each other. Within the context of multi-task reinforcement learning, an efficient approach is needed for knowledge transfer among tasks. To address this, metadata can serve as a valuable tool for capturing task structures and facilitating knowledge transfer. In a study by Sodhani et al. [198], the authors leverage metadata to learn explainable contextual representations across a family of tasks. These sub-tasks align with a higher-level overarching goal, leading to the division of tasks into two levels. The low-level tasks typically represent decomposed sub-tasks of the original task, sharing the same status. Conversely, the high-level task focuses on scheduling the sub-tasks within the overall task structure.

Numerous methods involve explicitly dividing tasks and constructing a high-level agent as a scheduler for low-level agents. Jiang et al. [90] train the high-level agent to produce language instructions for the low-level agents. During training, the low-level agents employ a condition-RL algorithm, while the high-level agents use a language model-based RL algorithm. All language instructions generated by the high-level agents are comprehensible to humans. The symbolic planning+RL method [133] employs a planner-controller-meta-controller framework to address hierarchical tasks. The planner operates at a higher level, leveraging symbolic knowledge to schedule sub-task sequences. Meanwhile, the controller operates at a lower level, employing traditional DRL methods to solve sub-tasks. And the meta-controller simultaneously provides a new intrinsic target for the planner to guide better task-solving explicitly. In the Dot-to-Dot (D2D) framework [20], the high-level agent constructs the environment dynamics and utilizes it to provide direction to the low-level agents. The low-level agent receives guidance from the high-level agent and solves decomposed, simpler sub-tasks. As a result, the high-level agent can learn an explainable representation of the decision-making process, while the low-level agent effectively learns the larger state and action space.

Unlike the two aforementioned approaches, Wu et al. [229] adopt a different strategy for task division. They utilize a primitive model instead of directly dividing the task. Initially, the primitive model approximates piecewise functional decomposition. Each specialized primitive model focuses

Table 6. Comparison of different types of XRL approaches. “H” and “L” denotes “High” and “Low” respectively.

Type	Final Objective	Quantification	Fineness	verifiability	Clarity	Need RL prior
Agent model-explaining	Inner mechanism	H	H	H	L	H
Reward-explaining	Specific behavior	H	H	L	H	H
State-explaining	Specific behavior	H	H	L	H	L
Task-explaining	Inner mechanism	L	L	H	H	L

on a distinct region, resulting in corresponding sub-policies specialized in those regions. The sub-policies are subsequently transferred to compose the complete policy for the desired tasks. Through the combination of these sub-policies, this framework retains architectural explainability. The efficacy of this explainability is demonstrated on high-dimensional continuous tasks, both in lifelong learning scenarios and single-task learning. However, the use of the primitive model may not be individually effective for learning to decompose mixed tasks.

**4.4.3 Summarization.** Task-explaining methods elucidate how RL agents accomplish complex tasks by decomposing them into multiple subtasks using HRL, thus generating intrinsic explanations, which provides inherent explainability in reinforcement learning, effectively showcasing how the agent accomplishes intricate tasks. The presented explanation, which focuses on how the agent strategically schedules subtasks to overcome the final objective, proves readily accessible even to non-experts in RL. Furthermore, the fidelity of the explanation can be easily evaluated through interaction, enhancing the confidence of users. However, this type of explanation is only the general intention of high-level policy, which cannot quantitatively analyze the aspects that influence agent behavior for a specific transition.

Currently, all task-explaining methods employ S.D for evaluation. Task-explaining methods provide explanations on task decomposition and scheduling. To measure whether the high-level agent scheduling is correct and reasonable, experienced human is able to provide precise criterion. Hence, we propose that subjective assessments of S.UP and S.UC, utilizing the divide-and-conquer approach of human participants as evaluating criteria, are more suitable for judging the effectiveness of task-explaining methods in dividing tasks.

## 4.5 Selection of Different Methods

Although we have given detailed descriptions of our taxonomy and numerous surveyed papers, there is still doubt about how to select between different types of XRL methods. Here we give a detailed comparison of the characteristics of different XRL types in Table 6. These characteristics are extracted from the summarization of these four types of XRL methods. By Table 6, XRL users can select the desired type of XRL methods based on specific characteristics and their desire.

Considering the beginner for a specific task, the intrinsic RL explanation helps the beginner to understand the task and its solving process. Individuals unfamiliar with a particular task can quickly grasp its structure, objectives, and general problem-solving approaches through task-explaining methods [190, 229]. To gain more specific and professional insights for solving the task comprehensively, the agent model-explaining methods can guide human learning by providing a policy sketch that illuminates the internal reasoning of XRL agents [13, 91, 215, 216]. Experienced human users, who can only solve the task suboptimally, possess a general understanding of the method for solving the task but lack proficiency in the specific behaviors required. Therefore, capturing crucial observational features from state-explaining methods can significantly enhance their short-term

decision-making. Simultaneously, the reward-explaining methods highlight various latent aspects in the task that contribute to performance changes, enabling human users to attentively select actions and improve their long-term performance.

For RL researchers, different types of XRL methods help the RL researchers gain insight into the exploration of agents and dynamics of environments. Agent model-explaining methods [134, 251] illustrate how the inner mechanism of the agent changes during training. And task-explaining methods [9, 142] provide valuable insights regarding the task complexity. These insights can be leveraged to guide fine-tuning of agent architecture for improving performance. Meanwhile, by receiving the explanation of how different factors in the reward function affect the policy of agent [220, 245], researchers can gain a better understanding of how to design an effective reward function to enhance the agent performance [124, 131]. State-explaining methods shed light on the dynamic focus of the agent on state features during training, enabling researchers to comprehend how these features affect the agent's decision-making process.

Different human groups can choose different XRL methods based on their specific requirements to augment their comprehension of tasks and successfully achieve the goals.

## 5 HUMAN KNOWLEDGE FOR XRL

Human-integrated XRL methods with prior knowledge from human have shown high performance and explainability. Currently, the mainstream XRL frameworks previously discussed in our categorization overlook the potential influence of human participation during training. Nonetheless, several studies have demonstrated the advantages of human participation in XRL [31, 60, 63, 100, 112, 246]. To underscore the significance of human-intergrated approaches and promote future research in this area, we dedicate a separate section for their discussion. Human participation helps to incorporate prior human knowledge about the tasks as evaluation criteria and guidance, facilitating high-quality agent behaviors and corresponding explanations, compared to classical RL and normal XRL training methods [137, 169, 170]. Although the human knowledge may not align perfectly with the task, the agent endeavors to effectively utilize and implement it during the training process. This optimization process aligns with the natural human learning process, wherein expert guidance and knowledge are often imprecise but still valuable for efficient learning. Given the efficiency of human-integrated XRL and its limited presence in the current XRL community, we emphasize the importance of this approach by presenting existing works organized according to our taxonomy of XRL.

### 5.1 Fuzzy Controller Representing Human Knowledge

Fuzzy logic can be utilized to represent human knowledge to further construct the agent policy, obtaining intrinsic RL explainability on agent architecture. As discussed in agent model-explaining approaches within XRL, self-explainable agent models are leveraged to approximate the Q-value or policy in the RL framework. However, a crucial consideration in incorporating human knowledge is how to bridge the comprehension gap between human and RL agent. Human knowledge frequently exhibits imprecision and vagueness, particularly when applied to novel tasks, where it may only pertain to a limited subset of the state space. Traditional approaches, such as bivalent logic rules, are ill-suited for the representation of vague knowledge due to their overly deterministic nature. In contrast, fuzzy logic provides an effective paradigm for representing human knowledge in an uncertain and imprecise manner. A notable contribution in this area is the work of Zhang et al. [246], who propose the KoGuN policy network utilizing the knowledge controller to integrate human suboptimal knowledge. The knowledge controller utilizes a set of fuzzy rules  $\{l_i\}$  translated from human knowledge. Given the state input  $s$ , these fuzzy rules representing prior human knowledge

jointly output a preference action  $\mathbf{p}$ , which is then fine-tuned by summing with an additional vector  $\mathbf{p}'$  produced by a hypernetwork. Meanwhile, to tackle the challenge of possible human knowledge mismatch under different states, trainable rule weights  $\beta_i$  are introduced for each rule  $l_i$  in order to facilitate adaptation to new tasks and optimize the performance of the knowledge controllers. This policy network, with prior human knowledge, is trained by the conventional PPO method. Although the final action output is slightly fine-tuned by the hypernetwork, the rules weights  $\{\beta_i\}$  effectively illustrate the influence of different human knowledge towards agent decision-making, exhibiting the intrinsic explainability of agent architecture. Similarly, Rudolf et al. [182] incorporate exact traffic laws into fuzzy logic rules to constraint the self-vehicle behaviors, and Shi et al. [189] establish fuzzy rules containing human knowledge into hierarchical policy, enhancing both fast training and explainability.

## 5.2 Dense Reward on Human Command

The intrinsic dense reward can not only release the ineffective learning under the sparse reward setting but also align with the human command to provide explanations to indicate the agent motivation to get extrinsic RL explainability. Although sparse reward is frequently employed in real tasks due to its simplicity, learning with sparse reward is challenging. Therefore, efforts have been made to define a dense reward function that provides a reward signal for each action performed. Several studies [10, 26, 68, 128, 150] have introduced dense reward functions that focus on state-based novelty. Yet, these studies often fail to provide a clear explanation of the underlying motivation and logical sequence of the task goal. An innovative approach presented by Goyal et al. [60] introduces the Language-Action Reward Network (LEARN) based on natural language command from humans, and LEARN captures the correlation between action and human command. The authors define MDP(+L) as a variant of MDP, denoted as  $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, R, \gamma, l \rangle$ , where  $l$  represents a human-defined language command describing the desired agent behavior, while the other components remain consistent with the elements in MDP. The original reward function in MDP is labeled as  $R_{ext}$ , and the dense reward determined by the language command  $l$  is denoted as  $R_{lan}$ . To assess whether the agent is following the language command  $l$ , LEARN extracts the sequence of past actions  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{t-1})$  and transforms it into an action-frequency vector  $\mathbf{f}$ . LEARN takes both  $\mathbf{f}$  and the natural language command  $l$  as inputs and produces a probability distribution indicating the relevance between the action-frequency vector and the natural language command. This distribution measures the correlation between  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $l$ , which composes the intrinsic language reward  $R_{lan}$ . Therefore, the target optimal policy can be generated based on the new reward function  $R_{ext} + R_{lan}$ . During testing, LEARN generates intrinsic reward according to fixed human command and past action sequence, illustrating the task progress aligned with the human command. The auxiliary reward and the value estimation of the state and action based on the combined reward effectively show the agent quantitative consideration on accomplishing the task based on human command, presenting extrinsic RL explainability for agent specific behavior.

## 5.3 Learn Mattered Features from Human Interactions

Learning the significant features directly from human interaction instead of inferring the influences during RL is an effective way to enhance performance as well as extrinsic explainability. In Section 4.3, we discussed the utilization of attention-based techniques to learn important features from input vectors in images or videos. In the context of imitation learning frameworks, there are corresponding approaches to obtain attention through imitation. Zhang et al. [248] categorizes these methods as learning attention from humans, where human trainers provide explicit weight distribution such as gaze information and attention maps. This kind of explanation can serve as an additional source of evaluative feedback if the RL agent is able to capture it. Zhang et al. [249] first

generate and open the human interaction data with gaze information in Atari games. Guan et al. [63] enhance human attention data by perturbing irrelevant regions. The saliency map serves as human explanation to guide agent effective learning. Li et al. [112] perceive gaze as probabilistic variables that can be predicted using stochastic units embedded in DNNs. Guided by this idea, they develop a gaze framework that selects important features and estimates the uncertainty of human gaze supervisory signals. As for enhancing explainability, Kim et al. [100] employ a visual attention model to train a mapping from images to vehicle control signals, which synchronously generates extrinsic explanations on current state components features towards the actions of the agent. The training data of human interaction trajectories are provided by humans, while the attention alignment technique is leveraged to establish the connection between the controller and explanations. Meanwhile, from the temporal aspect, many methods find the important states during training to extrinsically explain the task-solving process instead of the internal state features based on human expert demonstrations. Luss et al. [131] introduce the concept of meta-state, which encapsulates significant states for task completion based on expert transitions. And the meta-state is obtained from spectral clustering. Concurrently, Liu et al. [124] detect states in expert trajectories as task-specific subgoals by considering the uncertainty of the agent, which is quantified through the variance of the critic value on expert transitions. Although the agent itself is not self-explaining, the meta-states and subgoals effectively represent the task process and provide extrinsic RL explainability for agent behaviors.

#### 5.4 Subtask Scheduling with Human Annotation

In terms of task explanation, leveraging human annotation on scheduling subtasks can be utilized to guide hierarchical agent training and enhance intrinsic explainability within the hierarchical agent. The HRL paradigm involves decomposing complex tasks by constructing a hierarchical agent. Within this hierarchy, low-level agents interact directly with the environment, while high-level agents manage the scheduling. In order to expedite the task decomposition process, Chen et al. [31] incorporate human annotation and demonstration to train a high-level language generator to schedule the low-level policies. The generator is trained using imitation learning and consists of LSTM networks, which take the encoded state (containing explicit goal) as input and produce natural language instructions as output. Instead of output language instruction, Garg et al. [52] generate a discrete latent representation of primitive skills in long-term task with the clustering method to guide low-level agents with human-annotated trajectories. Meanwhile, Gao et al. [51] further improves agent explainability by collaborating with humans in MOBA games, in which the high-level agent learn to generate explainable meta commands from human. These frameworks utilizing natural language instructions facilitate successful task decomposition and exhibit high generalizability to new tasks. Furthermore, Xu et al. [234] propose an approach to decompose tasks by having humans answer yes-or-no questions regarding the task content. These methods leverage different types of human annotations to guide the high-level agent in producing scheduling signals on specific state inputs. The scheduling signals within the hierarchical agent are intrinsically explainable to human, which are then precisely captured by the low-level agent to generate action.

## 6 CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR XRL

Given the early stage of XRL research, there remain uncertainties regarding aspects such as architecture and evaluation metrics. Drawing upon the reviewed literature and materials on XRL, we present several promising directions for future research in the field.

## 6.1 Human Knowledge in XRL

Human-intergrated XRL, which incorporates human prior knowledge as raw explanations or resources, further enhances XRL explainability and efficiency, as highlighted in Section 5. However, obtaining certain types of human prior knowledge can be challenging. For example, annotating massive amounts of data manually can be time-consuming [52] and gathering expert trajectory data for dangerous tasks can be difficult [82]. In such cases, only a limited amount of data containing suboptimal human knowledge with varying quality may be available, posing a challenge for XRL agents to acquire high-quality policies and explanations. To address this challenge, several methods have been proposed to effectively utilize available data. Ghai et al. [55] introduce an explainable active learning approach, which efficiently learns a teacher model from limited human feedback by providing both predictions and explanations to humans. Preference-based RL (PbRL) [228] is another approach that uses human preferences to train the agent and has shown success in tasks with limited annotation [34]. Zhang and Kashima [243] enhance the explainability of PbRL by simultaneously learning the reward function and state importance. They leverage a perturbation analysis method to quantify the learned state importance, enabling high explainability with minimal human annotation. In future research on XRL, it is recommended to explore methods that maximize the utilization of human knowledge data in order to achieve high explainability and performance.

## 6.2 Evaluation Methods

Despite discussing the current evaluation methods for XRL in Section 3, there is still a lack of a widely accepted approach within the DRL community. This can be attributed to the fact that XRL approaches are highly task-specific, making it challenging to establish a universal measurement method due to the diverse forms of explanations. Furthermore, the notion of explainability is often treated subjectively in many papers, with claims of explainability lacking mathematical formulas or rigorous analysis to support their assertions. The establishment of a common evaluation method for XRL would enable the comparison of different approaches and the identification of state-of-the-art techniques. For instance, Shen et al. [188] propose a software platform for self-driving that facilitates the comparison of various XRL agents in the same driving scenario and evaluates the precision of explanations provided by the XRL agent. However, in addition to XRL performance and precision of explanation, legal and ethical aspects must also be considered when devising the evaluation method to ensure real-world applicability.

## 6.3 Multi-part Explainability

The aforementioned XRL approaches, including our categorization work, primarily focus on making only a single component of the RL framework explainable, resulting in partial explainability and improvements in specific areas. However, a crucial challenge is that the remaining parts of the RL framework continue to lack transparency for experts. Tasks of high complexity, such as self-driving, demand comprehensive explainability for enhanced safety. Consequently, reliance on a single explainable component is insufficient and fails to provide convincing explanations. To address this issue, incorporating multi-part explainability into the MDP process can offer a potential solution for RL agents. One approach involves constructing an integrated method that combines various part-explaining techniques. For instance, Huber et al. [85] merge global explanations based on strategy summaries with local explanations derived from saliency maps, which respectively correspond to agent model-explaining and state-explaining. However, the diverse structures and limited applicability of different part-explaining methods make the combination process challenging. A possible approach could involve abstracting these methods at a higher level and subsequently integrating them.

## 6.4 Balance of High Explainability and Effective Training

It is feasible to achieve both effective training and high explainability in RL agents. Explainability is regarded as an additional attribute to agent performance, which typically results in XRL being perceived as requiring more computational resources compared to the conventional RL approach [172]. However, contrasting the unexplainable DNN-based agents that exhibit high performance, several researchers have discovered that employing simpler and more explainable agent models can also achieve excellent performance while maintaining high explainability, such as linear models [136, 180] and decision tree [13, 208]. These findings indicate that the trade-off between explainability and performance is not as rigid as initially perceived, and it is possible to strike a balance between these two factors by exploring alternative techniques [56]. For example, the incorporation of sparsity or explainability constraints into the agent policy, as proposed by Rudin et al. [181], can enhance explainability without compromising performance. Therefore, further research is warranted to determine the optimal balance between explainability and well-training.

## 7 CONCLUSION

Explainability has attracted increasing attention in the RL community due to practical, safe, and trustworthy concerns. It endows the RL agent with the ability to exhibit a well-grounded behavior and further convince the human participants. In this comprehensive survey, we introduce unified concept definitions and taxonomies to summarize and correlate a wide variety of recent advanced XRL approaches. The survey first gives an in-depth introduction to the explainability definition and evaluation metric of XRL. Then we further categorize the related XRL approaches into four branches: (a) Agent model-explaining methods that directly build the agent model as an explainable box. (b) Reward-explaining methods that regularize the reward function to be understandable. (c) State-explaining methods that provide the attention-based explanation of observations. (d) Task-explaining methods that decompose the task to get multi-stage explainability. Moreover, it is notable that several XRL methods conversely leverage human knowledge to promote the optimization process of learning agents. We additionally discuss and organize these works into our taxonomy structure, while the other XRL surveys pay little attention to it. We hope that this survey can help newcomers and researchers understand and exploit the existing methods in the growing XRL field, as well as highlight opportunities and challenges for future research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Julius Adebayo, Justin Gilmer, Ian Goodfellow, and Been Kim. 2018. Local explanation methods for deep neural networks lack sensitivity to parameter values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03307* (2018).
- [2] Julius Adebayo, Justin Gilmer, Michael Muehly, Ian Goodfellow, Moritz Hardt, and Been Kim. 2018. Sanity checks for saliency maps. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [3] Riad Akrou, Davide Tateo, and Jan Peters. 2019. Towards reinforcement learning of human readable policies. In *European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases workshop*.
- [4] Greg Anderson, Abhinav Verma, Isil Dillig, and Swarat Chaudhuri. 2020. Neurosymbolic reinforcement learning with formally verified exploration. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [5] Raghuram Mandyam Annasamy and Katia Sycara. 2019. Towards better interpretability in deep q-networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [6] Alessio Ansuini, Alessandro Laio, Jakob H Macke, and Davide Zoccolan. 2019. Intrinsic dimension of data representations in deep neural networks. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [7] Ines Arous, Ljiljana Dolamic, Jie Yang, Akansha Bhardwaj, Giuseppe Cuccu, and Philippe Cudré-Mauroux. 2021. Marta: Leveraging human rationales for explainable text classification. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [8] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, et al. 2020. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion* 58 (2020), 82–115.
- [9] Zoe Ashwood, Aditi Jha, and Jonathan W Pillow. 2022. Dynamic Inverse Reinforcement Learning for Characterizing Animal Behavior. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- [10] Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Bilal Piot, Steven Kapturowski, Pablo Sprechmann, Alex Vitvitskiy, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, and Charles Blundell. 2020. Agent57: Outperforming the atari human benchmark. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [11] Gagan Bansal, Besmira Nushi, Ece Kamar, Walter S Lasecki, Daniel S Weld, and Eric Horvitz. 2019. Beyond accuracy: The role of mental models in human-AI team performance. In *Proceedings of AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*.
- [12] Jon Barwise. 1977. An introduction to first-order logic. In *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Vol. 90. 5–46.
- [13] Osbert Bastani, Yewen Pu, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2018. Verifiable Reinforcement Learning via Policy Extraction. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [14] Daniel Beechey, Thomas MS Smith, and Özgür Şimşek. 2023. Explaining reinforcement learning with shapley values. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [15] Marc G Bellemare, Will Dabney, and Rémi Munos. 2017. A distributional perspective on reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [16] Yoshua Bengio, Ian Goodfellow, and Aaron Courville. 2016. *Deep Learning*. MIT press.
- [17] Shlomo Berkovsky, Ronnie Taib, and Dan Conway. 2017. How to recommend? User trust factors in movie recommender systems. In *ACM International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*.
- [18] Christopher Berner, Greg Brockman, Brooke Chan, Vicki Cheung, Przemyslaw Dkebiak, Christy Dennison, David Farhi, Quirin Fischer, Shariq Hashme, Chris Hesse, et al. 2019. Dota 2 with large scale deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06680* (2019).
- [19] David Bertoin, Adil Zouitine, Mehdi Zouitine, and Emmanuel Rachelson. 2022. Look where you look! Saliency-guided Q-networks for generalization in visual Reinforcement Learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [20] Benjamin Beyret, Ali Shafti, and A Aldo Faisal. 2019. Dot-to-dot: Explainable hierarchical reinforcement learning for robotic manipulation. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*.
- [21] Mustafa Bilgic and Raymond J Mooney. 2005. Explaining recommendations: Satisfaction vs. promotion. In *ACM International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces Workshop*.
- [22] Alexander Binder, Wojciech Samek, Grégoire Montavon, Sebastian Bach, and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2016. Analyzing and validating neural networks predictions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning Workshop*.
- [23] Kayla Boggess, Sarit Kraus, and Lu Feng. 2022. Toward Policy Explanations for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12568* (2022).
- [24] Kayla Boggess, Sarit Kraus, and Lu Feng. 2023. Explainable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Temporal Queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10378* (2023).
- [25] Christine L Borgman. 1986. The user’s mental model of an information retrieval system: An experiment on a prototype online catalog. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 24, 1 (1986), 47–64.
- [26] Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Amos Storkey, and Oleg Klimov. 2018. Exploration by random network distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12894* (2018).
- [27] Ursula Challita, Walid Saad, and Christian Bettstetter. 2019. Interference management for cellular-connected UAVs: A deep reinforcement learning approach. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications* 18, 4 (2019), 2125–2140.
- [28] Jianyu Chen, Bodi Yuan, and Masayoshi Tomizuka. 2019. Model-free deep reinforcement learning for urban autonomous driving. In *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*.
- [29] Long Chen, Xuemin Hu, Bo Tang, and Yu Cheng. 2022. Conditional DQN-Based Motion Planning With Fuzzy Logic for Autonomous Driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 4 (2022), 2966–2977.
- [30] Qingyun Chen, Wanzhong Zhao, Lin Li, Chunyan Wang, and Feng Chen. 2022. ES-DQN: A Learning Method for Vehicle Intelligent Speed Control Strategy Under Uncertain Cut-In Scenario. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 71, 3 (2022), 2472–2484.
- [31] Valerie Chen, Abhinav Gupta, and Kenneth Marino. 2021. Ask Your Humans: Using Human Instructions to Improve Generalization in Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [32] Yilun Chen, Chiyu Dong, Praveen Palanisamy, Priyantha Mudalige, et al. 2019. Attention-based hierarchical deep reinforcement learning for lane change behaviors in autonomous driving. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [33] Amine Chraïbi, Said Ben Alla, and Abdellah Ezzati. 2021. Makespan Optimisation in Cloudlet Scheduling with Improved DQN Algorithm in Cloud Computing. *Scientific Programming* 2021 (2021), 7216795:1–7216795:11.
- [34] Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [35] Sven Coppers, Jan Van den Bergh, Kris Luyten, Karin Coninx, et al. 2018. Intellingo: An intelligible translation environment. In *ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.

- [36] Leonardo Lucio Custode and Giovanni Iacca. 2022. Evolutionary learning of interpretable decision trees. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [37] Suma Dawn, Utkarsh Saraogi, and Utkarsh Singh Thakur. 2020. Agent-based Learning for Auto-Navigation within the Virtual City. In *International Conference on Computational Performance Evaluatio*.
- [38] Richard Dazeley, Peter Vamplew, and Francisco Cruz. 2021. Explainable reinforcement learning for broad-xai: A conceptual framework and survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.09003* (2021).
- [39] Finale Doshi-Velez and Been Kim. 2017. A roadmap for a rigorous science of interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608* (2017).
- [40] Mengnan Du, Ninghao Liu, and Xia Hu. 2019. Techniques for interpretable machine learning. *Commun. ACM* 63, 1 (2019), 68–77.
- [41] Jiajun Duan, Di Shi, Ruisheng Diao, Haifeng Li, Zhiwei Wang, Bei Zhang, Desong Bian, and Zhehan Yi. 2019. Deep-reinforcement-learning-based autonomous voltage control for power grid operations. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 35, 1 (2019), 814–817.
- [42] Upol Ehsan, Pradyumna Tambwekar, Larry Chan, Brent Harrison, and Mark O Riedl. 2019. Automated rationale generation: a technique for explainable AI and its effects on human perceptions. In *ACM International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*.
- [43] Abdur R Fayjie, Sabir Hossain, Doukhi Oualid, and Deok-Jin Lee. 2018. Driverless car: Autonomous driving using deep reinforcement learning in urban environment. In *International Conference on Ubiquitous Robots*.
- [44] A Feinberg. 1996. Markov decision processes: Discrete stochastic dynamic programming (martin l. puterman). *SIAM Rev.* 38, 4 (1996), 689–689.
- [45] Borja Fernández-Gauna, Manuel Graña, Juan-Luis Osa-Amilibia, and Xabier Larrucea. 2022. Actor-critic continuous state reinforcement learning for wind-turbine control robust optimization. *Information Sciences* 591 (2022), 365–380.
- [46] Jakob Foerster, Gregory Farquhar, Triantafyllos Afouras, Nantas Nardelli, and Shimon Whiteson. 2018. Counterfactual multi-agent policy gradients. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [47] Danilo Franco, Nicolò Navarin, Michele Donini, Davide Anguita, and Luca Oneto. 2022. Deep fair models for complex data: Graphs labeling and explainable face recognition. *Neurocomputing* 470 (2022), 318–334.
- [48] Scott Fujimoto, Herke Hoof, and David Meger. 2018. Addressing function approximation error in actor-critic methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [49] Yosuke Fukuchi, Masahiko Osawa, Hiroshi Yamakawa, and Michita Imai. 2017. Application of instruction-based behavior explanation to a reinforcement learning agent with changing policy. In *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*.
- [50] Yosuke Fukuchi, Masahiko Osawa, Hiroshi Yamakawa, and Michita Imai. 2017. Autonomous self-explanation of behavior for interactive reinforcement learning agents. In *International Conference on Human Agent Interaction*.
- [51] Yiming Gao, Feiyu Liu, Liang Wang, Zhenjie Lian, Weixuan Wang, Siqin Li, Xianliang Wang, Xianhan Zeng, Rundong Wang, Jiawei Wang, et al. 2023. Towards Effective and Interpretable Human-Agent Collaboration in MOBA Games: A Communication Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11632* (2023).
- [52] Divyansh Garg, Skanda Vaidyanath, Kuno Kim, Jiaming Song, and Stefano Ermon. 2022. LISA: Learning interpretable skill abstractions from language. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [53] Fatih Gedikli, Dietmar Jannach, and Mouzhi Ge. 2014. How should I explain? A comparison of different explanation types for recommender systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 72, 4 (2014), 367–382.
- [54] Muriel Gevrey, Ioannis Dimopoulos, and Soivan Lek. 2003. Review and comparison of methods to study the contribution of variables in artificial neural network models. *Ecological Modelling* 160, 3 (2003), 249–264.
- [55] Bhavya Ghai, Q Vera Liao, Yunfeng Zhang, Rachel Bellamy, and Klaus Mueller. 2021. Explainable active learning (xal) toward ai explanations as interfaces for machine teachers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW3 (2021), 1–28.
- [56] Claire Glanois, Paul Weng, Matthieu Zimmer, Dong Li, Tianpei Yang, Jianye Hao, and Wulong Liu. 2021. A Survey on Interpretable Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13112* (2021).
- [57] Vikash Goel, Jameson Weng, and Pascal Poupart. 2018. Unsupervised video object segmentation for deep reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [58] Ziv Goldfeld, Ewout van den Berg, Kristjan Greenewald, et al. 2018. Estimating information flow in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05728* (2018).
- [59] Xiaoyu Gong, Jiayu Yu, Shuai Lü, and Hengwei Lu. 2022. Actor-critic with familiarity-based trajectory experience replay. *Information Sciences* 582 (2022), 633–647.
- [60] Prasoon Goyal, Scott Niekum, and Raymond J. Mooney. 2019. Using Natural Language for Reward Shaping in Reinforcement Learning. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [61] Samuel Greydanus, Anurag Koul, Jonathan Dodge, and Alan Fern. 2018. Visualizing and Understanding Atari Agents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

- [62] Lin Guan, Mudit Verma, Sihang Guo, Ruohan Zhang, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2020. Explanation augmented feedback in human-in-the-loop reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.14804* (2020).
- [63] Lin Guan, Mudit Verma, Suna Sihang Guo, Ruohan Zhang, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2021. Widening the pipeline in human-guided reinforcement learning with explanation and context-aware data augmentation. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [64] Suna Sihang Guo, Ruohan Zhang, Bo Liu, Yifeng Zhu, et al. 2021. Machine versus human attention in deep reinforcement learning tasks. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [65] Wenbo Guo, Xian Wu, Usmann Khan, and Xinyu Xing. 2021. Edge: Explaining deep reinforcement learning policies. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [66] Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2018. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [67] Xiaoxu Han, Hongyao Tang, Yuan Li, Guang Kou, and Leilei Liu. 2020. Improving multi-agent reinforcement learning with imperfect human knowledge. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*.
- [68] Anna Harutyunyan, Will Dabney, Thomas Mesnard, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Bilal Piot, Nicolas Heess, Hado P van Hasselt, Gregory Wayne, Satinder Singh, et al. 2019. Hindsight credit assignment. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [69] Hado Hasselt. 2010. Double Q-learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [70] Matthew Hausknecht and Peter Stone. 2015. Deep recurrent q-learning for partially observable mdps. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [71] Bradley Hayes and Julie A. Shah. 2017. Improving Robot Controller Transparency Through Autonomous Policy Explanation. In *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*.
- [72] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [73] Nicolas Heess, Dhruva TB, Srinivasan Sriram, Jay Lemmon, Josh Merel, et al. 2017. Emergence of locomotion behaviours in rich environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02286* (2017).
- [74] Daniel Hein, Alexander Hentschel, Thomas A. Runkler, and Steffen Udfluft. 2017. Particle swarm optimization for generating interpretable fuzzy reinforcement learning policies. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 65 (2017), 87–98.
- [75] Daniel Hein, Steffen Udfluft, and Thomas A Runkler. 2018. Interpretable policies for reinforcement learning by genetic programming. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 76 (2018), 158–169.
- [76] Daniel Hein, Steffen Udfluft, and Thomas A. Runkler. 2019. Generating interpretable reinforcement learning policies using genetic programming. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*.
- [77] Hubert J Hermans. 1970. A questionnaire measure of achievement motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 54, 4 (1970), 353.
- [78] Matteo Hessel, Joseph Modayil, Hado Van Hasselt, Tom Schaul, Georg Ostrovski, et al. 2018. Rainbow: Combining improvements in deep reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [79] Alexandre Heuillet, Fabien Couthouis, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. 2021. Explainability in deep reinforcement learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 214 (2021), 106685.
- [80] Alexandre Heuillet, Fabien Couthouis, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. 2022. Collective explainable AI: Explaining cooperative strategies and agent contribution in multiagent reinforcement learning with shapley values. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* 17, 1 (2022), 59–71.
- [81] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, et al. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531* (2015).
- [82] Koji Hitomi, Kenji Matsui, Alberto Rivas, and Juan Manuel Corchado. 2020. Development of a dangerous driving suppression system using inverse reinforcement learning and blockchain. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing and Artificial Intelligence*.
- [83] Carl-Johan Hoel, Katherine Driggs-Campbell, Krister Wolff, et al. 2019. Combining planning and deep reinforcement learning in tactical decision making for autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles* 5, 2 (2019), 294–305.
- [84] Robert R Hoffman, Shane T Mueller, Gary Klein, and Jordan Litman. 2018. Metrics for explainable AI: Challenges and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04608* (2018).
- [85] Tobias Huber, Katharina Weitz, Elisabeth André, and Ofra Amir. 2021. Local and global explanations of agent behavior: Integrating strategy summaries with saliency maps. *Artificial Intelligence* 301 (2021), 103571.
- [86] Jeevana Priya Inala, Yichen Yang, James Paulos, Yewen Pu, et al. 2020. Neurosymbolic transformers for multi-agent communication. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [87] Rahul Iyer, Yuezhang Li, Huao Li, Michael Lewis, Ramitha Sundar, and Katia P. Sycara. 2018. Transparency and Explanation in Deep Reinforcement Learning Neural Networks. In *AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*.

- [88] Theo Jaunet, Romain Vuillemot, and Christian Wolf. 2020. DRLViz: Understanding decisions and memory in deep reinforcement learning. In *Computer Graphics Forum*.
- [89] Haoran Jiang and Dan Zeng. 2021. Explainable Face Recognition based on Accurate Facial Compositions. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [90] Yiding Jiang, Shixiang Shane Gu, Kevin P Murphy, and Chelsea Finn. 2019. Language as an abstraction for hierarchical deep reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [91] Zhengyao Jiang and Shan Luo. 2019. Neural logic reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [92] Mu Jin, Zhihao Ma, Kebing Jin, Hankz Hankui Zhuo, et al. 2022. Creativity of AI: Automatic Symbolic Option Discovery for Facilitating Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [93] Peng Jin, Jiayu Tian, Dapeng Zhi, Xuejun Wen, and Min Zhang. 2022. Trainify: A cegar-driven training and verification framework for safe deep reinforcement learning. In *Computer Aided Verification*.
- [94] Zoe Jozzapaitis, Anurag Koul, Alan Fern, Martin Erwig, and Finale Doshi-Velez. 2019. Explainable reinforcement learning via reward decomposition. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [95] Matthew Kay, Tara Kola, Jessica R Hullman, and Sean A Munson. 2016. When (ish) is my bus? user-centered visualizations of uncertainty in everyday, mobile predictive systems. In *ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- [96] Yafim Kazak, Clark W. Barrett, Guy Katz, and Michael Schapira. 2019. Verifying Deep-RL-Driven Systems. In *ACM International Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication Workshop*.
- [97] Eoin M Kenny, Mycal Tucker, and Julie Shah. 2022. Towards interpretable deep reinforcement learning with human-friendly prototypes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [98] Been Kim, Oluwasanmi Koyejo, and Rajiv Khanna. 2016. Examples are not enough, learn to criticize! Criticism for Interpretability. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [99] Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda Viegas, et al. 2018. Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors (tcav). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [100] Jinkyu Kim, Anna Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, John F. Canny, and Zeynep Akata. 2018. Textual Explanations for Self-Driving Vehicles. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [101] Pieter-Jan Kindermans, Sara Hooker, Julius Adebayo, Maximilian Alber, et al. 2019. The (un) reliability of saliency methods. In *Explainable AI: Interpreting, Explaining and Visualizing Deep Learning*.
- [102] Hedvig Kjellström, Danica Kragić, and Michael J Black. 2010. Tracking people interacting with objects. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [103] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2012. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [104] Todd Kulesza, Simone Stumpf, Margaret Burnett, Sherry Yang, Irwin Kwan, and Weng-Keen Wong. 2013. Too much, too little, or just right? Ways explanations impact end users' mental models. In *IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human Centric Computing*.
- [105] Isaac Lage, Emily Chen, Jeffrey He, Menaka Narayanan, Been Kim, Samuel J Gershman, and Finale Doshi-Velez. 2019. Human evaluation of models built for interpretability. In *AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*.
- [106] Himabindu Lakkaraju, Stephen H Bach, and Jure Leskovec. 2016. Interpretable decision sets: A joint framework for description and prediction. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [107] Mikel Landajuela, Brenden K Petersen, Sookyung Kim, Claudio P Santiago, et al. 2021. Discovering symbolic policies with deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [108] Lisa Lee, Ben Eysenbach, Russ R Salakhutdinov, Shixiang Shane Gu, and Chelsea Finn. 2020. Weakly-supervised reinforcement learning for controllable behavior. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [109] Edouard Leurent. 2018. An Environment for Autonomous Driving Decision-Making. <https://github.com/eleurent/highway-env>.
- [110] Edouard Leurent and Jean Mercat. 2019. Social attention for autonomous decision-making in dense traffic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12250* (2019).
- [111] Jiahui Li, Kun Kuang, Baoxiang Wang, Furui Liu, et al. 2021. Shapley counterfactual credits for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [112] Yin Li, Miao Liu, and James M. Rehg. 2018. In the Eye of Beholder: Joint Learning of Gaze and Actions in First Person Video. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [113] Petra Lietz. 2010. Research into questionnaire design: A summary of the literature. *International Journal of Market Research* 52, 2 (2010), 249–272.

- [114] Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. 2015. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*.
- [115] Brian Y Lim and Anind K Dey. 2009. Assessing demand for intelligibility in context-aware applications. In *International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*.
- [116] Brian Y Lim, Anind K Dey, and Daniel Avrahami. 2009. Why and why not explanations improve the intelligibility of context-aware intelligent systems. In *ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- [117] Kaixiang Lin, Renyu Zhao, Zhe Xu, and Jiayu Zhou. 2018. Efficient large-scale fleet management via multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [118] Lin Lin, Xin Guan, Yu Peng, Ning Wang, Sabita Maharjan, et al. 2020. Deep reinforcement learning for economic dispatch of virtual power plant in internet of energy. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7, 7 (2020), 6288–6301.
- [119] Zachary C Lipton. 2018. The Mythos of Model Interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. *Queue* 16, 3 (2018), 31–57.
- [120] Chang Liu, Jie Yan, Feiyue Guo, and Min Guo. 2022. Forecasting the Market with Machine Learning Algorithms: An Application of NMC-BERT-LSTM-DQN-X Algorithm in Quantitative Trading. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* 16, 4 (2022), 62:1–62:22.
- [121] Guiliang Liu, Oliver Schulte, Wang Zhu, and Qingcan Li. 2018. Toward interpretable deep reinforcement learning with linear model u-trees. In *European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases*.
- [122] Hui Liu, Qingyu Yin, and William Yang Wang. 2018. Towards explainable NLP: A generative explanation framework for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00196* (2018).
- [123] Shunyu Liu, Wei Luo, Yanzhen Zhou, Kaixuan Chen, Quan Zhang, Huating Xu, Qinglai Guo, and Mingli Song. 2023. Transmission Interface Power Flow Adjustment: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach Based on Multi-Task Attribution Map. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* (2023), 1–12.
- [124] Shunyu Liu, Yunpeng Qing, Shuqi Xu, Hongyan Wu, Jiangtao Zhang, Jingyuan Cong, Tianhao Chen, Yunfu Liu, and Mingli Song. 2023. Curricular Subgoals for Inverse Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08232* (2023).
- [125] Shunyu Liu, Yihe Zhou, Jie Song, Tongya Zheng, Kaixuan Chen, Tongtian Zhu, Zunlei Feng, and Mingli Song. 2023. Contrastive identity-aware learning for multi-agent value decomposition. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [126] Shunyu Liu, Yanzhen Zhou, Mingli Song, Guangquan Bu, Jianbo Guo, and Chun Chen. 2024. Progressive decision-making framework for power system topology control. *Expert Systems with Applications* 235 (2024), 121070.
- [127] Xiao Liu, Wubing Chen, and Mao Tan. 2023. Fidelity-Induced Interpretable Policy Extraction for Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06097* (2023).
- [128] Yang Liu, Yunan Luo, Yuanyi Zhong, Xi Chen, Qiang Liu, and Jian Peng. 2019. Sequence modeling of temporal credit assignment for episodic reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13420* (2019).
- [129] Zimo Liu, Jingya Wang, Shaogang Gong, Huchuan Lu, and Dacheng Tao. 2019. Deep reinforcement active learning for human-in-the-loop person re-identification. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [130] Qiang Lu, Jun Ren, and Zhiguang Wang. 2016. Using genetic programming with prior formula knowledge to solve symbolic regression problem. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* 2016 (2016).
- [131] Ronny Luss, Amit Dhurandhar, and Miao Liu. 2023. Local explanations for reinforcement learning. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [132] Björn Lütjens, Michael Everett, and Jonathan P How. 2019. Safe reinforcement learning with model uncertainty estimates. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*.
- [133] Daoming Lyu, Fangkai Yang, Bo Liu, and Steven Gustafson. 2019. SDRL: interpretable and data-efficient deep reinforcement learning leveraging symbolic planning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [134] Prashan Madumal, Tim Miller, Liz Sonenberg, and Frank Vetere. 2020. Explainable Reinforcement Learning through a Causal Lens. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [135] Francis Maes, Raphael Fonteneau, Louis Wehenkel, and Damien Ernst. 2012. Policy search in a space of simple closed-form formulas: Towards interpretability of reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Discovery Science*.
- [136] Horia Mania, Aurelia Guy, and Benjamin Recht. 2018. Simple random search of static linear policies is competitive for reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [137] Kunal Menda, Katherine Driggs-Campbell, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. 2019. Ensembledagger: A bayesian approach to safe imitation learning. In *IEEE\RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*.
- [138] Li Meng, Morten Goodwin, Anis Yazidi, and Paal Engelstad. 2022. Improving the Diversity of Bootstrapped DQN via Noisy Priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01004* (2022).
- [139] Stephanie Milani, Nicholay Topin, Manuela Veloso, and Fei Fang. 2023. Explainable Reinforcement Learning: A Survey and Comparative Review. *Comput. Surveys* (2023).

- [140] Stephanie Milani, Zhicheng Zhang, Nicholay Topin, Zheyuan Ryan Shi, Charles Kamhoua, Evangelos E Papalexakis, and Fei Fang. 2022. MAVIPER: Learning Decision Tree Policies for Interpretable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12449* (2022).
- [141] Tim Miller. 2019. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial Intelligence* 267 (2019), 1–38.
- [142] Suvir Mirchandani, Siddharth Karamcheti, and Dorsa Sadigh. 2021. Ella: Exploration through learned language abstraction. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [143] Indrajeet Mishra, Giang Dao, and Minwoo Lee. 2018. Visual sparse Bayesian reinforcement learning: a framework for interpreting what an agent has learned. In *IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence*.
- [144] Volodymyr Mnih, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy Lillicrap, Tim Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1928–1937.
- [145] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, et al. 2013. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602* (2013).
- [146] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, et al. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* 518, 7540 (2015), 529–533.
- [147] Sina Mohseni, Niloofar Zarei, and Eric D Ragan. 2021. A multidisciplinary survey and framework for design and evaluation of explainable AI systems. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems* 11, 3-4 (2021), 1–45.
- [148] Christoph Molnar. 2020. *Interpretable machine learning*.
- [149] Geraud Nangue Tasse, Steven James, and Benjamin Rosman. 2020. A Boolean task algebra for reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [150] Andrew Y Ng, Daiishi Harada, and Stuart Russell. 1999. Policy invariance under reward transformations: Theory and application to reward shaping. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [151] Thu Trang Nguyen, Thach Le Nguyen, and Georgiana Ifrim. 2020. A model-agnostic approach to quantifying the informativeness of explanation methods for time series classification. In *European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases Workshop*.
- [152] Clyde E Noble. 1957. Human trial-and-error learning. *Psychological Reports* 3, 2 (1957), 377–398.
- [153] Florian Nothdurft, Felix Richter, and Wolfgang Minker. 2014. Probabilistic human-computer trust handling. In *Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*.
- [154] Besmira Nushi, Ece Kamar, and Eric Horvitz. 2018. Towards accountable ai: Hybrid human-machine analyses for characterizing system failure. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*.
- [155] Matthew L Olson, Roli Khanna, Lawrence Neal, Fuxin Li, and Weng-Keen Wong. 2021. Counterfactual state explanations for reinforcement learning agents via generative deep learning. *Artificial Intelligence* 295 (2021), 103455.
- [156] Menghai Pan, Weixiao Huang, Yanhua Li, Xun Zhou, and Jun Luo. 2020. xgail: Explainable generative adversarial imitation learning for explainable human decision analysis. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [157] Xinlei Pan, Xiangyu Chen, Qi-Zhi Cai, John F. Canny, and Fisher Yu. 2019. Semantic Predictive Control for Explainable and Efficient Policy Learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*.
- [158] Seongjin Park, Younghwan Yoo, and Chang Woo Pyo. 2022. Applying DQN solutions in fog-based vehicular networks: Scheduling, caching, and collision control. *Vehicular Communications* 33 (2022), 100397.
- [159] Ali Payani and Faramarz Fekri. 2019. Inductive logic programming via differentiable deep neural logic networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03523* (2019).
- [160] Ali Payani and Faramarz Fekri. 2020. Incorporating relational background knowledge into reinforcement learning via differentiable inductive logic programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10386* (2020).
- [161] Xiangyu Peng, Mark Riedl, and Prithviraj Ammanabrolu. 2022. Inherently explainable reinforcement learning in natural language. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [162] Vitali Petsiuk, Abir Das, and Kate Saenko. 2018. Rise: Randomized input sampling for explanation of black-box models. In *British Machine Vision Conference*.
- [163] Aaron Powers and Sara Kiesler. 2006. The advisor robot: tracing people’s mental model from a robot’s physical attributes. In *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*.
- [164] ISWB Prasetya, Maurin Voshol, Tom Tanis, Adam Smits, Bram Smit, et al. 2020. Navigation and exploration in 3D-game automated play testing. In *International Workshop on Automating TEST Case Design, Selection, and Evaluation*.
- [165] Pearl Pu and Li Chen. 2006. Trust building with explanation interfaces. In *ACM International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*.
- [166] Erika Puiutta and Eric Veith. 2020. Explainable reinforcement learning: A survey. In *International Cross-Domain Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*.

- [167] Emilee Rader and Rebecca Gray. 2015. Understanding user beliefs about algorithmic curation in the Facebook news feed. In *ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- [168] Ronilo Ragodos, Tong Wang, Qihang Lin, and Xun Zhou. 2022. ProtoX: Explaining a Reinforcement Learning Agent via Prototyping. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [169] Prajit T Rajendran, Huáscar Espinoza, Agnès Delaborde, and Chokri Mraidha. 2022. Human-in-the-loop Learning for Safe Exploration through Anomaly Prediction and Intervention. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [170] Ramya Ramakrishnan, Ece Kamar, Besmira Nushi, Debadepta Dey, Julie Shah, and Eric Horvitz. 2019. Overcoming blind spots in the real world: Leveraging complementary abilities for joint execution. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [171] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. "Why should i trust you?" Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [172] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. Model-agnostic interpretability of machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05386* (2016).
- [173] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2018. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [174] Brandon Richard Webster, So Yon Kwon, Christopher Clarizio, Samuel E Anthony, and Walter J Scheirer. 2018. Visual Psychophysics for Making Face Recognition Algorithms More Explainable. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [175] Ariel Rosenfeld, Moshe Cohen, Matthew E Taylor, and Sarit Kraus. 2018. Leveraging human knowledge in tabular reinforcement learning: A study of human subjects. *The Knowledge Engineering Review* 33 (2018).
- [176] Stéphane Ross, Geoffrey Gordon, and Drew Bagnell. 2011. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*.
- [177] Alvin E Roth. 1988. Introduction to the Shapley value. *The Shapley Value* (1988), 1–27.
- [178] Aaron M Roth, Nicholay Topin, Pooyan Jamshidi, and Manuela Veloso. 2019. Conservative q-improvement: Reinforcement learning for an interpretable decision-tree policy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01180* (2019).
- [179] Anna L Rowe and Nancy J Cooke. 1995. Measuring mental models: Choosing the right tools for the job. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 6, 3 (1995), 243–255.
- [180] Cynthia Rudin and David Carlson. 2019. The secrets of machine learning: ten things you wish you had known earlier to be more effective at data analysis. (2019), 44–72.
- [181] Cynthia Rudin, Chaofan Chen, Zhi Chen, Haiyang Huang, Lesia Semenova, and Chudi Zhong. 2022. Interpretable machine learning: Fundamental principles and 10 grand challenges. *Statistic Surveys* 16 (2022), 1–85.
- [182] Thomas Rudolf, Mingxiao Gao, Tobias Schürmann, Stefan Schwab, and Sören Hohmann. 2022. Fuzzy Action-Masked Reinforcement Learning Behavior Planning for Highly Automated Driving. In *International Conference on Control, Automation and Robotics*.
- [183] Tom Schaul, John Quan, Ioannis Antonoglou, and David Silver. 2015. Prioritized experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05952*.
- [184] John Schulman, Sergey Levine, Pieter Abbeel, Michael Jordan, and Philipp Moritz. 2015. Trust region policy optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [185] John Schulman, Philipp Moritz, Sergey Levine, Michael Jordan, and Pieter Abbeel. 2015. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02438*.
- [186] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* (2017).
- [187] Pedro Sequeira and Melinda T. Gervasio. 2020. Interestingness elements for explainable reinforcement learning: Understanding agents' capabilities and limitations. *Artificial Intelligence* 288 (2020), 103367.
- [188] Yuan Shen, Niviru Wijayarathne, Peter Du, Shanduojiang Jiang, and Katherine Driggs-Campbell. 2021. AutoPreview: A Framework for Autopilot Behavior Understanding. In *ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- [189] Wei Shi, Yanghe Feng, Honglan Huang, Zhong Liu, Jincai Huang, and Guangquan Cheng. 2022. Efficient hierarchical policy network with fuzzy rules. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics* 13, 2 (2022), 447–459.
- [190] Tianmin Shu, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. Hierarchical and Interpretable Skill Acquisition in Multi-task Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [191] Andrew Silva and Matthew Gombolay. 2021. Encoding human domain knowledge to warm start reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [192] Andrew Silva, Matthew Gombolay, Taylor Killian, Ivan Jimenez, and Sung-Hyun Son. 2020. Optimization methods for interpretable differentiable decision trees applied to reinforcement learning. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*.
- [193] David Silver, Guy Lever, Nicolas Heess, Thomas Degris, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. 2014. Deterministic policy gradient algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

- [194] David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. 2017. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *Nature* 550, 7676 (2017), 354–359.
- [195] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014).
- [196] Blaž Škrlj, Matej Martinc, Nada Lavrač, and Senja Pollak. 2021. autoBOT: evolving neuro-symbolic representations for explainable low resource text classification. *Machine Learning* 110, 5 (2021), 989–1028.
- [197] Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P. Adams. 2012. Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [198] Shagun Sodhani, Amy Zhang, and Joelle Pineau. 2021. Multi-task reinforcement learning with context-based representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [199] William R Stauffer, Armin Lak, Shunsuke Kobayashi, and Wolfram Schultz. 2016. Components and characteristics of the dopamine reward utility signal. *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 524, 8 (2016), 1699–1711.
- [200] Gregory Stein. 2021. Generating high-quality explanations for navigation in partially-revealed environments. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [201] Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. 2017. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [202] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. 2018. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- [203] Vivienne Sze, Yu-Hsin Chen, Tien-Ju Yang, and Joel S Emer. 2017. Efficient processing of deep neural networks: A tutorial and survey. *Proc. IEEE* 105, 12 (2017), 2295–2329.
- [204] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. 2015. Going deeper with convolutions. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [205] Aaqib Tabrez and Bradley Hayes. 2019. Improving Human-Robot Interaction Through Explainable Reinforcement Learning. In *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*.
- [206] Yujin Tang and David Ha. 2021. The sensory neuron as a transformer: Permutation-invariant neural networks for reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [207] Yujin Tang, Duong Nguyen, and David Ha. 2020. Neuroevolution of self-interpretable agents. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*.
- [208] Nicholay Topin, Stephanie Milani, Fei Fang, and Manuela Veloso. 2021. Iterative Bounding MDPs: Learning Interpretable Policies via Non-Interpretable Methods. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [209] Nicholay Topin and Manuela Veloso. 2019. Generation of policy-level explanations for reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [210] Dweep Trivedi, Jesse Zhang, Shao-Hua Sun, and Joseph J Lim. 2021. Learning to synthesize programs as interpretable and generalizable policies. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [211] William T. B. Uther and Manuela M. Veloso. 1998. Tree Based Discretization for Continuous State Space Reinforcement Learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [212] Jasper van der Waa, Jurriaan van Diggelen, Karel van den Bosch, and Mark Neerinx. 2018. Contrastive explanations for reinforcement learning in terms of expected consequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08706* (2018).
- [213] Hado Van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. 2016. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [214] Abhishek Vashist, Sharan Vidash Vidya Shanmugham, Amlan Ganguly, and Sai Manoj PD. 2022. DQN Based Exit Selection in Multi-Exit Deep Neural Networks for Applications Targeting Situation Awareness. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [215] Abhinav Verma, Hoang Le, Yisong Yue, and Swarat Chaudhuri. 2019. Imitation-projected programmatic reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [216] Abhinav Verma, Vijayaraghavan Murali, Rishabh Singh, Pushmeet Kohli, and Swarat Chaudhuri. 2018. Programmatically interpretable reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [217] George A Vouros. 2022. Explainable Deep Reinforcement Learning: State of the Art and Challenges. *Comput. Surveys* (2022).
- [218] Stephan Wäldchen, Sebastian Pokutta, and Felix Huber. 2022. Training characteristic functions with reinforcement learning: Xai-methods play connect four. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [219] Junpeng Wang, Liang Gou, Han-Wei Shen, and Hao Yang. 2019. DQNViz: A Visual Analytics Approach to Understand Deep Q-Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 25, 1 (2019), 288–298.
- [220] Jianhong Wang, Yuan Zhang, Tae-Kyun Kim, and Yunjie Gu. 2020. Shapley Q-value: A local reward approach to solve global reward games. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

- [221] Jingyuan Wang, Yang Zhang, Ke Tang, Junjie Wu, and Zhang Xiong. 2019. Alphastock: A buying-winners-and-selling-losers investment strategy using interpretable deep reinforcement attention networks. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- [222] Pin Wang and Ching-Yao Chan. 2017. Formulation of deep reinforcement learning architecture toward autonomous driving for on-ramp merge. In *International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*.
- [223] Sen Wang, Daoyuan Jia, and Xinshuo Weng. 2018. Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.11329* (2018).
- [224] Ziyu Wang, Tom Schaul, Matteo Hessel, Hado Hasselt, Marc Lanctot, et al. 2016. Dueling network architectures for deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [225] Lindsay Wells and Tomasz Bednarz. 2021. Explainable ai and reinforcement learning—a systematic review of current approaches and trends. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 4 (2021), 550030.
- [226] David M Williamson, Isaac I Bejar, and Anne S Hone. 1999. ‘Mental model’ comparison of automated and human scoring. *Journal of Educational Measurement* 36, 2 (1999), 158–184.
- [227] Jonathan R Williford, Brandon B May, and Jeffrey Byrne. 2020. Explainable face recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [228] Christian Wirth, Riad Akrou, Gerhard Neumann, Johannes Fürnkranz, et al. 2017. A survey of preference-based reinforcement learning methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18, 136 (2017), 1–46.
- [229] Bohan Wu, Jayesh K. Gupta, and Mykel J. Kochenderfer. 2020. Model primitives for hierarchical lifelong reinforcement learning. *International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems* 34, 1 (2020), 28.
- [230] Haiping Wu, Khimya Khetarpal, and Doina Precup. 2021. Self-supervised attention-aware reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [231] Jie Wu, Guanbin Li, Si Liu, and Liang Lin. 2020. Tree-structured policy based progressive reinforcement learning for temporally language grounding in video. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [232] Xin Xin, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Ioannis Arapakis, and Joemon M. Jose. 2022. Supervised Advantage Actor-Critic for Recommender Systems. In *ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*.
- [233] Yunqiu Xu, Meng Fang, Ling Chen, Yali Du, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Chengqi Zhang. 2020. Deep reinforcement learning with stacked hierarchical attention for text-based games. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [234] Yunqiu Xu, Meng Fang, Ling Chen, Yali Du, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Chengqi Zhang. 2022. Perceiving the world: Question-guided reinforcement learning for text-based games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.09597* (2022).
- [235] Roman V Yampolskiy and Joshua Fox. 2012. Artificial general intelligence and the human mental model. In *Singularity Hypotheses*.
- [236] Qiuling Yang, Gang Wang, Alireza Sadeghi, Georgios B Giannakis, and Jian Sun. 2019. Two-timescale voltage control in distribution grids using deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 11, 3 (2019), 2313–2323.
- [237] Ting Yang, Liyuan Zhao, Wei Li, and Albert Y Zomaya. 2021. Dynamic energy dispatch strategy for integrated energy system based on improved deep reinforcement learning. *Energy* 235 (2021), 121377.
- [238] Zhao Yang, Song Bai, Li Zhang, and Philip HS Torr. 2018. Learn to interpret atari agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.11276* (2018).
- [239] Herman Yau, Chris Russell, and Simon Hadfield. 2020. What did you think would happen? explaining agent behaviour through intended outcomes. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [240] Jason Yosinski, Jeff Clune, Yoshua Bengio, and Hod Lipson. 2014. How transferable are features in deep neural networks?. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [241] Zhongwei Yu, Jingqing Ruan, and Dengpeng Xing. 2023. Explainable Reinforcement Learning via a Causal World Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02749* (2023).
- [242] Tom Zahavy, Nir Ben-Zrihem, and Shie Mannor. 2016. Graying the black box: Understanding dqns. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [243] Guoxi Zhang and Hisashi Kashima. 2023. Learning state importance for preference-based reinforcement learning. *Mechine Learning* (2023), 1–17.
- [244] Haodi Zhang, Zihang Gao, Yi Zhou, Hao Zhang, Kaishun Wu, and Fangzhen Lin. 2019. Faster and safer training by embedding high-level knowledge into deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09986* (2019).
- [245] Ke Zhang, Jun Zhang, Pei-Dong Xu, Tianlu Gao, and David Wenzhong Gao. 2021. Explainable ai in deep reinforcement learning models for power system emergency control. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 9, 2 (2021), 419–427.
- [246] Peng Zhang, Jianye Hao, Weixun Wang, Hongyao Tang, et al. 2020. KoGuN: accelerating deep reinforcement learning via integrating human suboptimal knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07418* (2020).
- [247] Ruohan Zhang, Faraz Torabi, Lin Guan, Dana H Ballard, and Peter Stone. 2019. Leveraging human guidance for deep reinforcement learning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09906* (2019).

- [248] Ruohan Zhang, Faraz Torabi, Lin Guan, Dana H Ballard, and Peter Stone. 2019. Leveraging human guidance for deep reinforcement learning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09906* (2019).
- [249] Ruohan Zhang, Calen Walshe, Zhuode Liu, Lin Guan, Karl Muller, Jake Whritner, Luxin Zhang, Mary Hayhoe, and Dana Ballard. 2020. Atari-head: Atari human eye-tracking and demonstration dataset. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [250] Jiangchuan Zheng, Siyuan Liu, and Lionel M Ni. 2014. Robust bayesian inverse reinforcement learning with sparse behavior noise. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [251] Victor Zhong, Jesse Mu, Luke Zettlemoyer, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2022. Improving policy learning via language dynamics distillation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [252] Suyang Zhou, Zijian Hu, Wei Gu, Meng Jiang, Meng Chen, Qiteng Hong, and Campbell Booth. 2020. Combined heat and power system intelligent economic dispatch: A deep reinforcement learning approach. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 120 (2020), 106016.
- [253] He Zhu, Zikang Xiong, Stephen Magill, and Suresh Jagannathan. 2019. An inductive synthesis framework for verifiable reinforcement learning. In *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design & Implementation*.
- [254] Matthieu Zimmer, Xuening Feng, Claire Glanois, Zhaohui Jiang, Jianyi Zhang, Paul Weng, Li Dong, Hao Jianye, and Liu Wulong. 2021. Differentiable logic machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11529* (2021).