
Synthesizing Programmatic Reinforcement Learning Policies with Large Language Model Guided Search

Max Liu^{1*} Chan-Hung Yu^{1*} Wei-Hsu Lee¹ Cheng-Wei Hung¹
Yen-Chun Chen² Shao-Hua Sun¹
¹National Taiwan University ²Microsoft

Abstract

Programmatic reinforcement learning (PRL) has been explored for representing policies through programs as a means to achieve interpretability and generalization. Despite promising outcomes, current state-of-the-art PRL methods are hindered by sample inefficiency, necessitating tens of millions of program-environment interactions. To tackle this challenge, we introduce a novel LLM-guided search framework (LLM-GS). Our key insight is to leverage the programming expertise and common sense reasoning of LLMs to enhance the efficiency of assumption-free, random-guessing search methods. We address the challenge of LLMs' inability to generate precise and grammatically correct programs in domain-specific languages (DSLs) by proposing a Pythonic-DSL strategy – an LLM is instructed to initially generate Python codes and then convert them into DSL programs. To further optimize the LLM-generated programs, we develop a search algorithm named Scheduled Hill Climbing, designed to efficiently explore the programmatic search space to consistently improve the programs. Experimental results in the Karel domain demonstrate the superior effectiveness and efficiency of our LLM-GS framework. Extensive ablation studies further verify the critical role of our Pythonic-DSL strategy and Scheduled Hill Climbing algorithm.

1 Introduction

Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) has achieved great success from beating the world champion in Go [51] to powering the frontier natural language assistants [3, 42], and demonstrated great potential in robotics [28], autonomous vehicles [62], and recommendation systems [11]. However, approximating a policy using a deep neural network makes the decision-making process a black box and, therefore, less interpretable and trustable to human users [25]. Subsequently, carefully designed tools and costly human intervention are often required to deploy trustworthy DRL systems [18]. Moreover, DRL frequently encounters substantial performance declines when applied to previously unseen scenarios [16, 31], revealing another aspect of its challenges in generalization.

Recent programmatic reinforcement learning (PRL) methods have explored representing an RL policy using a program [2, 5, 52, 58]. Instead of learning a state-to-action mapping as in DRL, PRL synthesizes programs written in Domain-Specific Languages (DSLs) as human-readable policies that can be parsed and executed, making human inspection possible as an extra safety guard. Moreover, such structured program policies are shown to be able to capture high-level task-solving ideas, allowing for generalizing to a wide range of task variants [57]. Despite the encouraging results, the state-of-the-art PRL algorithms are notoriously inefficient and require tens of millions of program execution in environments [10, 37, 57]. Under the hood, they are search or RL algorithms without any assumption to the targeting problems. On the one hand, this allows generalization to all kinds of

*Equal contribution.

problems; on the other hand, the search time grows exponentially with increasing DSL complexity, making it intolerable for any practical use case.

Our key insight is that there is likely only a limited set of problems corresponding to specific program policies that are of human interest – hence, we can utilize reasonable assumptions to prune the space. Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have been demonstrated to possess internet-scale knowledge that can be retrieved by a natural language interface [56, 61, 65]. If we view the text on the internet as a “text projection” of human civilization, an LLM as a knowledge base should be able to provide hints to “prune” the program search paths that are out of the “human interest scope.” With this intuition, we conjecture LLMs can be utilized to bootstrap the sample efficiency of search-based PRL algorithms, pushing PRL one step closer to practical adoption.

To this end, we aim to develop a PRL framework that utilizes LLMs to produce task-solving program policies while minimizing the number of program executions in environments. Directly instructing LLMs to synthesize DSL programs for solving PRL tasks faces three fundamental challenges: (1) LLMs may lack the domain knowledge of the PRL tasks, *e.g.* environment dynamics, what an agent can observe or how it can act, (2) the training data of modern LLMs are mostly natural language texts and general-purpose programming languages, *e.g.* Python and C++, which can be quite different from the DSLs used in PRL, and (3) there is no apparent mechanism for optimizing LLMs to produce programs that maximize rewards since the best-performing LLMs are privately owned.

To combat these challenges, we present an LLM-guided search (LLM-GS) framework leveraging the programming skills and common sense of LLMs and the effectiveness of search algorithms. (1) To familiarize LLMs with PRL tasks, we devise domain and task-aware prompts that convey PRL domain knowledge to LLMs while avoiding leaking task-solving information. (2) To mitigate the gap between general-purpose programming languages and DSLs, we design a Pythonic-DSL strategy that allows LLMs to generate more precise and grammatically correct DSL programs by first producing Python programs. (3) To further optimize the LLM-generated programs, we propose a search algorithm, Scheduled Hill Climbing (Scheduled HC), to efficiently improve programs.

We compare our proposed LLM-GS framework in the Karel domain to various existing PRL methods [10, 37, 57]. The experimental results demonstrate that LLM-GS is significantly more effective and efficient than the baselines. Extensive ablation studies show that (1) our proposed Pythonic-DSL strategy leads to a higher ratio of executable (*i.e.* grammatically correct) programs and a higher average return compared to directly generating DSL programs, (2) our proposed search method Scheduled HC achieves the best efficiency among existing search algorithms, (3) initializing the search population of Scheduled HC using LLM-generated programs is significantly more efficient than randomly sampled programs.

2 Related work

Programmatic reinforcement learning (PRL). PRL represents RL policies using more structured and potentially more interpretable and generalizable representations, such as decision tree [5], state machine [27, 32, 36], symbolic expression [6, 33, 58, 59], Logic programming language [29], and program written in domain-specific language (DSL) [2, 10, 37–39, 46, 52, 54, 57, 66]. Liu et al. [37], Trivedi et al. [57] devised PRL tasks in the Karel domain [44] and proposed learning embedding spaces of programs using variational autoencoders [30] and then optimizing program embeddings using cross-entropy method or RL. Carvalho et al. [10] achieve the state-of-the-art results in the Karel domain [44] by searching in a programmatic space of AST structure. Despite the encouraging results and the generality of these methods, they are notoriously inefficient, requiring tens of millions of program executions to obtain task-solving programs. In this work, to devise an efficient PRL framework, we make the first attempt to leverage the knowledge and the reasoning ability of LLMs to generate a set of initial programs to bootstrap search algorithms; moreover, we propose Scheduled HC, a search algorithm that best utilizes the LLM-generated programs.

Large language models for code generation. With a remarkable ability to understand and generate natural languages and codes, LLMs have been widely adopted for code generation [1, 7, 40, 48, 64] via neural program synthesis methods [4, 17, 34, 35, 43, 47, 53, 63]. These works target *general-purpose programming languages* for software development, such as Python and C++, with abundant data on the internet; in contrast, we aim to solve PRL tasks that require writing programs restricted by given domain-specific languages. Prior works exploring using LLMs to synthesize DSL programs via

```

Program  $\rho :=$  DEF run  $m( s m)$ 
Repetition  $n :=$  0..19
Perception  $h :=$  frontIsClear | leftIsClear | rightIsClear |
    markersPresent | noMarkersPresent
Condition  $b :=$  perception  $h$  | not perception  $h$ 
Action  $a :=$  move | turnLeft | turnRight |
    putMarker | pickMarker
Statement  $s :=$  WHILE  $c( b c) w( s w) | s_1 s_2 | a |$ 
    REPEAT  $R=n r( s r) |$  IF  $c( b c) i( s i) |$ 
    IFELSE  $c( b c) i( s_1 i) ELSE e( s_2 e)$ 

```

Figure 1: **The Karel DSL grammar.** It describes the Karel domain-specific language’s actions, perceptions, and control flows. The domain-specific language is obtained from Liu et al. [37].




Figure 2: **An example Karel task – DOORKEY.** The agent first needs to find the key (marker) in the left room, which will open the door (wall) to the right room. Navigating to the goal marker in the right room and placing the picked marker on it will grant the full reward for the task. This sparse-reward task has been found to pose significant challenges to previous PRL methods, as it necessitates a greater capability in long-horizon strategy formulation.

providing LLMs with DSL grammars and few-shot examples, hindsight relabeling, and prioritized experience replay [9, 21, 60]. While these works focus on string and array transformation, and abstract reasoning [15], we leverage LLMs to synthesize DSL program policies to be executed in an RL environment and maximize return.

Search-based program synthesis. Various search algorithms have been developed for program-by-example (PBE) [4, 20, 22, 23, 43, 45], whose goal is to find programs that satisfy given examples, *e.g.* input/output string pairs. Recent works have explored utilizing search algorithms in DSL to learn libraries [19, 21]. In the regime of programmatic RL, Carvalho et al. [10] recently applied the Hill Climbing algorithm to the Karel benchmark, achieving state-of-the-art performance. Instead of randomly sampling programs via search algorithms, we present a framework that integrates knowledge from an LLM with a search algorithm to significantly improve the sample efficiency.

3 Preliminary

The Karel domain. We first review the Karel domain, the *de facto* test bed for programmatic reinforcement learning research [8, 12, 13, 24, 50]. The Karel domain-specific language illustrated in Figure 1 is a robot programming language to control the Karel agent in a 2D grid world. The agent’s actions include moving as well as interacting with the environment by picking up and putting down objects (markers). The perceptions check for obstacles and markers, which allows observing the environment. Lastly, control flows, *e.g.* REPEAT, WHILE, IF, and IFELSE, enable describing complex decision-making logics.

We illustrate a Karel task, DOORKEY, in Figure 2. The agent needs to explore the left room using the DSL actions such as `move` and `turnLeft` as well as the perceptions such as `frontIsClear` and `markersPresent` to find the key (marker). After the key is picked up via `pickMarker`, the wall to the right room will unblock. The agent then needs to place another marker on the goal marker, which appears in the right room, to receive the full reward for the task. Appendix C presents all Karel tasks.

The state-of-the-art performance in Karel is achieved by iteratively searching for improved programs according to their episodic return using search algorithms [10]. Next, we introduce the concept of search space, which defines how search algorithms find neighbor programs from a set of current candidates for improved performance, and then dive into the search algorithm details.

Programmatic space vs. latent space. In the programmatic space, a program P can be represented as an abstract syntax tree (AST), where each leaf node in the AST represents a program token [10]. To obtain its neighborhood program, a node is sampled from its AST, and then replaced by a subtree randomly generated using the DSL’s production rules and sampling strategies. Another choice is to search in a learned *latent space* [37, 57], constructed by training a variational autoencoder (VAE) on randomly generated DSL programs. To sample a neighbor program, a small noise is added to the latent embedding of the current program candidate and the VAE decoder can generate a program from the noise-corrupted embedding. Appendix B contains more details of search spaces.




Figure 3: **Large language model-guided search (LLM-GS)**. (a) With task description and the Pythonic-DSL instruction, LLM generates Python programs that are subsequently converted to DSL programs. (b) These initial programs serve as the initial population of our proposed Scheduled Hill Climbing, which evaluates the episodic return of the neighboring programs to update the current candidate program with increasing neighborhood size over search steps.

Hill climbing (HC). This search algorithm climbs whenever there is a higher place, *i.e.*, moves to a program having a higher episodic return. Given a program, HC generates its k neighborhood programs from the search space. These programs are evaluated in the environment. If one of them has a higher episodic return than the initial program, it is set as the search center program, and then this process repeats. Otherwise, the algorithm halts and returns the best program evaluated.

Cross-entropy method (CEM). CEM [49] first generates k neighborhood programs from its latent space and evaluates their episodic return on the Karel environment [57]. Next, if the average return over the top- E neighborhood programs is higher than the best-seen average return, it continues the process on the mean latent embedding of the top- E neighborhood programs. When the average return no longer increases, the program with the highest episodic return is returned.

Cross-entropy beam search (CEBS). CEBS extends CEM to maintain a set of E candidate programs to perform beam search. In other words, CEBS searches all the neighborhoods of the top- E programs.

Note that HC can search in both programmatic and latent spaces, while CEM and CEBS are designed for continuous search spaces, *i.e.*, latent program space only. All of these search algorithms share the same weakness – they search surrounding programs in a narrow proximity thus the distance between the initial program and the optimal program directly upper-bounds the algorithm’s sample efficiency.

4 Large language model-guided search for efficient programmatic reinforcement learning

The hill climbing algorithm (HC) is the state-of-the-art programmatic reinforcement learning (PRL) approach in Karel, at the cost of *tens of millions* of program interactions [10]. This prevents its application to real-world decision-making problems, where program-environment interaction at this scale is inapplicable. Hence, we aim to maintain the high episodic return while reducing programs executed in the environments, *i.e.*, *improves the sample efficiency* of PRL. To this end, our key insight is to utilize a large language model (LLM), hypothesizing that its abundant world knowledge, including programming skills and common sense, may bootstrap the inherently assumption-less, random-guessing HC. However, to implement this idea, many challenges rooted in the environment’s domain gap (Section 4.1), DSL’s language barrier (Section 4.2), and the inability to optimize closed-source LLMs (Section 4.3) must be addressed.

4.1 Domain and task-aware prompting

An inexperienced LLM user might directly ask an LLM: “Write a program to solve the Karel task DOORKEY,” since this is how average users work with LLM-based software development assistants. Obviously, repeating this until the LLM spits out a correct program will not be more efficient than existing search algorithms. The first challenge we encountered was that the LLM lacks background

Table 1: **Activate LLM’s task awareness.** To bridge the domain gap between the target task and the LLM’s knowledge, we craft a carefully curated prompt with relevant knowledge of solving the task without explicitly dictating the specific programming approach or implementation. Take the task DOORKEY here as an example: given task name, map description, initial position, and task goal, the LLM is encouraged to solve the specified task with its programming skills and common sense. More details can be found in Appendix E.2.

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	DOORKEY
Map Description	The map is a 8×8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6×3 grid and the right chamber is 6×2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers. Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.

knowledge of the PRL task at hand. After all, there is no guarantee that the LLM has seen or learned the text or code content related to the specific PRL task. Therefore, it is crucial to describe the task and the environment to the LLM in detail using natural language so that it makes the right assumptions based on its learned common sense. Here, we devise a prompting strategy that converts the PRL task’s domain knowledge into natural language sentences that LLMs can process and reason. Table 1 shows the prompt we carefully wrote for Karel DOORKEY. Note how the instructions humanly describe the task but *do not leak* the actual programming skills to implement the required navigation. Now that the LLM possesses minimal knowledge of the task, we may further instruct it to generate programs that solve the desired task.

4.2 Generating DSL programs with Pythonic-DSL strategy

Given LLMs’ widespread success in assisting software development, one might assume an LLM can naively generate DSL programs. Yet, precisely generating DSL programs turns out to be quite challenging for LLMs – their training data typically consists of natural language corpus and general-purpose programming language codes, thus specific DSLs used in PRL tasks are actually quite exotic for them. Note that this language barrier is beyond lexical syntax differences. For example, the DSL may specify rules that limit the usage of temporary variables constrained by the actual robotic hardware, which is rarely a concern for common Python / JavaScript code found on the internet.

Despite the issue, we still hope to leverage the best of LLM’s programming skills to synthesize DSL programs. To this end, we derive a solution from the following assumptions: (1) The LLM is proficient in a general-purpose programming language, such as Python, (2) The DSL can be represented by a possibly restricted version of the general-purpose programming language, and (3) The LLM understands the restriction in natural language, if any. Our Pythonic-DSL strategy instructs the LLM to generate Python programs instead, given the Karel rules and constraints we wrote in English, and then later convert it into the Karel DSL. As shown in Table 2, DSL details, including the action, perception functions, and language constraints, are provided.² Thus, the LLM can generate programs based on its innate general programming skills and its understanding of the DSL description. One caveat is that the LLM still occasionally generates Python programs that cause Python-to-DSL parsing failures. An empirical useful mitigation is instructing the LLM to generate the DSL program converted from its own output Python program as a backup. At this point, we have developed the mechanism to instruct an LLM to generate DSL programs given the PRL task and the DSL grammar in natural language.

4.3 Optimizing the program policy with Scheduled Hill Climbing

Although the aforementioned techniques can already instruct the LLM to produce DSL programs that solve the target task to a certain degree, the episodic return can still be far from optimal. Since best-

²Additionally, task-agnostic environment knowledge is also given. See Appendix F for the full prompt.

Table 2: **The Pythonic-DSL instruction.** The Karel DSL is specified via a *constrained* version of Python with pre-defined functions including *Pythonic-DSL perceptions* that allow the agent to observe, and *Pythonic-DSL actions* that enable the agent to interact. This Pythonic-DSL description is fed into the LLM via the system prompt so that it can generate Python code that can later be converted into Karel DSL. We will show that this approach outperforms the direct generation of DSL or Python programs in Table 3. The full prompt is presented in Appendix E.1.

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Pythonic-DSL Perceptions	<pre>frontIsClear(): Returns True if there is no wall in front of the agent. markersPresent(): Returns True if there exist markers on the current cell. ... (more perceptions omitted)</pre>
Pythonic-DSL Actions	<pre>move(): Asks the agent to move forward one cell ... (truncated) turnLeft(): Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees counter-clockwise. pickMarker(): Asks the agent to pick up one marker from the current cell. ... (more actions omitted)</pre>
Language Constraints	<pre>- do not define other functions besides run() - do not define variables ... (more rules omitted)</pre>

in-class LLMs are all proprietary APIs with no fine-tuning service; therefore, conventional gradient-based policy optimization is out of the question. To further optimize the program generated by the LLM, we explore initializing search populations of search algorithms using LLM-generated programs. Via extensive experiments with the HC, CEM, and CEBS search algorithms on both program space and latent space whenever applicable, we discover a key improvement that is crucial when initializing search from LLM-generated programs – program-environment interaction scheduling for a more efficient allocation of the interaction budget. The intuition is that LLMs can often provide good initialization and therefore it makes sense to keep a small *search budget*, *i.e.* with a smaller population. After a while, if an optimal program is not yet found, we can gradually increase the budget and facilitate broader exploration. We design a scheduler based on this intuition:

$$\log_2 k(n) = (1 - r(n)) \log_2 K_{start} + r(n) \log_2 K_{end}, \quad (1)$$

where n represents the number of evaluated programs, $k(n)$ denotes a function indicating the current number of neighborhood programs based on the number of evaluated programs n . This function’s logarithm is a linear combination of the logarithms of two hyperparameters, K_{start} and K_{end} , which signify the initial and terminal numbers of neighbors to search, respectively. The variable $r(n)$ governs the linear ratio, which itself is a sinusoidal function that gradually increases from 0 to 1 throughout the evaluation of a total of N programs (see Appendix A). With this scheduler, the number of neighbors k is a function of the execution budget used, growing from K_{start} to K_{end} . We apply this scheduler to Hill Climbing and call this method Scheduled Hill Climbing (Scheduled HC).

Overall, our best recipe consists of the following steps. First, we sample DSL programs for the LLM using the aforementioned techniques. Next, these programs are evaluated in the environment for the episodic return. In some easy tasks, some generated programs might have achieved perfect returns and thus are optimal programs. If no optimal program is found, we sort the programs based on the total reward decreasingly. Next, programs are selected from the sorted list, each serves as an initial program for the HC search, which is the best-performing search algorithm from our extensive experiments. HC searches k neighbors at each step following the scheduler in Eq. (1). This process is repeated until either the optimal program is found or we meet the maximum program-environment interaction budget allowed (N). Figure 3 presents an overview of our framework.

5 Experiments

5.1 Evaluation setup

PRL tasks. We evaluate our proposed framework LLM-guided search (LLM-GS) using the Karel tasks from the two problem sets: Karel [57] (STAIRCLIMBER, MAZE, FOURCORNERS, TOPOFF, HARVESTER, and CLEANHOUSE) and Karel-Hard [37] (DOORKEY, ONESTROKE, SEEDER, and SNAKE). More details of the task can be found in Appendix C.




Figure 4: **Efficiency in the Karel domain.** We compare our proposed LLM-guided search (LLM-GS) framework against existing methods, LEAPS, HPRL, CEBS, and HC in the Karel and Karel-Hard problem sets. The results show that our LLM-GS is significantly more efficient than these methods.

Baselines. We compare our proposed framework with the following methods: LEAPS [57], HPRL [37], CEBS [10], and Hill Climbing [10] (the current state-of-the-art). More details of these methods are presented in Appendix D.

Metrics. For a fair comparison of the sample efficiency, we use the number of programs evaluated to represent the program-environment interaction budget. A method is a more sample-efficient PRL algorithm if it achieves a higher average episodic return on a fixed budget. Specifically, for each task, the number of task variances is C . One program evaluated means a program is executed on all C task variances to obtain the average return. We set the number of task variances $C = 32$, the maximum number of program evaluation $N = 10^6$, *i.e.*, the interaction budget.

Setup. We use gpt-4-turbo [1] (temperature=1.0, top_p=1.0) as our LLM module to generate the initial search population with 32 programs. The scheduler of our proposed Scheduled HC starts from $K_{start} = 32$ to $K_{end} = 2048$. We evaluate our LLM-GS and HC with 32 random seeds and 5 seeds for LEAPS, HPRL, and CEBS.

5.2 LLM-guided search significantly improves the sample efficiency

Figure 4 presents our full experimental result, indicating that our proposed LLM-GS surpasses all the existing methods by a large margin on almost all the tasks. On the Karel set, our framework completely solves these tasks and exhibits the best sample efficiency. Also, LLM-GS performs extraordinarily well on SEEDER, ONESTROKE, and DOORKEY, which are among the hardest of the Karel-Hard set. We highlight our DOORKEY result, with an efficiency improvement from not even converging at 1M to converge within around 50K. Existing PRL algorithms struggle at DOORKEY due to the fact that it is a two-stage task with a sparse reward function. Therefore, most of the baselines cannot escape the local maxima and converge around 0.5. Curiously, our method starts at an episodic return of ≈ 0.5 from the beginning and converges quickly without being trapped by the local maxima. To analyze, we examine one output program from LLM shown in Figure 5. The LLM clearly understands that DOORKEY is a two-stage task and thus generates a corresponding two-stage structured program, which is much easier for later search to find the optimal program. The full dialogue is presented in Appendix E.




Figure 5: **Example on DOORKEY.** This example shows how our search method improves an LLM-initialized program to an optimal one. The original program (left) has a two-stage structure but lacks navigation ability. The improved program (right) solves this by enhancing its navigating ability on both stages, allowing for solving the task.

Table 3: **Pythonic-DSL strategy ablation.** We compare the programs generated using our proposed Pythonic-DSL strategy to directly generated Python or DSL programs. Our method achieves the highest acceptance rate and best return, justifying the effectiveness of our Pythonic-DSL strategy.


Task	Python		DSL		Pythonic-DSL (ours)	
	Acceptance Rate	Best Return	Acceptance Rate	Best Return	Acceptance Rate	Best Return
STAIRCLIMBER	88.02±3.57%	1.00±0.00	45.31±11.59%	0.75±0.65	88.54±4.54%	1.00±0.00
MAZE	72.40±7.49%	0.94±0.08	57.81±8.12%	0.88±0.07	92.45±3.89%	0.98±0.05
FOURCORNERS	83.07±5.04%	1.00±0.00	93.49±2.43%	1.00±0.00	94.01±2.43%	1.00±0.00
TOPOFF	90.89±2.07%	0.97±0.07	94.53±4.29%	1.00±0.00	96.35±3.08%	1.00±0.00
HARVESTER	67.45±7.51%	0.98±0.03	79.69±7.64%	0.98±0.03	80.21±5.51%	0.95±0.09
CLEANHOUSE	62.50±3.45%	0.27±0.28	76.30±6.16%	0.36±0.14	84.64±4.29%	0.29±0.27
DOORKEY	90.10±3.86%	0.63±0.13	75.78±15.09%	0.55±0.05	94.53±3.60%	0.63±0.14
ONESTROKE	85.42±4.77%	0.77±0.06	85.68±7.54%	0.74±0.09	95.31±3.08%	0.83±0.08
SEEDER	73.70±4.77%	0.93±0.14	88.28±4.88%	0.66±0.10	74.74±7.10%	0.90±0.14
SNAKE	87.50±2.76%	0.09±0.00	30.47±9.02%	0.09±0.00	98.96±1.04%	0.09±0.00

5.3 Ablation studies

Which language to generate, Python or DSL? Do both! To justify the effectiveness of our proposed Pythonic-DSL strategy, we conduct experiments on generating either Python or DSL programs with the same 8 seeds and present the results in Table 3. The *acceptance rate* calculates the ratio of executable DSL programs, while the *best return* refers to the highest episodic return among the legal programs. Our method achieves the highest acceptance rate on **9 / 10** tasks and the highest best return on **7 / 10** tasks. The complete prompts are presented in Appendix F.


Our proposed Scheduled HC is the most efficient search method. We compare various search methods in both programmatic and latent spaces in DOORKEY and CLEANHOUSE. In the learned latent space, we run CEM, CEBS, HC-250 (HC with a fixed population size of 250), and our proposed Scheduled HC; in the programmatic space, we run HC- $k \in \{32, 256, 2048\}$ and our proposed Scheduled HC. The results presented in Figure 6 show that HC in the programmatic space achieves the best performance compared to latent space search. However, HC- k with a fixed population size only specializes in specific tasks. To be specific, HC-32 for CLEANHOUSE and HC-2048 for DOORKEY. In contrast, our proposed Scheduled HC achieves comparatively the best performance in both tasks.

LLM provides a better initial search population. To verify the efficacy of using LLM-generated programs as search initialization for Scheduled HC, we compare it to using randomly sampled programs as initialization in DOORKEY and CLEANHOUSE. The results shown in Figure 7 suggest that initializing the search with LLM-generated programs significantly improves the sample efficiency.



(a) DOORKEY (b) CLEANHOUSE

Figure 6: **Comparing search algorithms.** We compare the proposed Scheduled HC with latent space CEM, CEBS, HC-250, and Scheduled HC, and programmatic space $HC-k \in \{32, 256, 2048\}$. Our method achieves comparatively good efficiency in DOORKEY and performs best in CLEANHOUSE, justifying the efficacy of our proposed search method.



(a) DOORKEY (b) CLEANHOUSE

Figure 7: **Comparing initializations.** We compare initializing the search population using LLM-generated programs or randomly sampled programs. The results show that starting from LLM-generated programs significantly improves efficiency and performance, especially in DOORKEY, highlighting the effectiveness of our proposed framework.

5.4 Beyond initialization – a preliminary attempt on LLM revision

Given the encouraging empirical results from LLM-initialized programs, one might be curious whether LLM can keep revising and improving its programs once given feedback, *e.g.* reward, from the environment. For completeness, we additionally conduct studies with the following LLM-based revision:

- **Regeneration.** Inspired by Chen et al. [14] and Olausson et al. [41], we instruct the LLM to re-generate non-duplicate programs with previously generated programs fed as inputs.
- **Regeneration with reward.** In addition to the historical program list, the episodic return of each program is appended to the LLM’s inputs.
- **Agent execution trace.** Inspired by prior arts that leverage environment knowledge [55, 61] and code repair [14, 41], we feed the program with the best episodic return and its execution traces into the LLM.
- **Agent and program execution trace.** Inspired by Hu et al. [26], we additionally point out the line of the program currently being executed as extra hints to the LLM.

We conduct the LLM revision experiments on DOORKEY for five revision rounds, each round with 32 programs with 5 seeds. The results are presented in Figure 8. “Agent and program execution trace” performs best, indicating the importance of feeding LLM as much information as possible. Yet, the improvement quickly saturates within the first two rounds, and no significant gain is observed with more revision rounds. This indicates that only using LLM to revise the program may not be sufficient to solve the task. On the other hand, our proposed Scheduled HC can converge to an optimal program – and is “free,” *i.e.* no expensive API calls or “API usage has reached your notification threshold” email.

6 Conclusion

We propose an LLM-guided framework (LLM-GS), that leverages the programming skills and common sense of LLM to bootstrap the efficiency of assumption-free, random-guessing search methods. We propose a Pythonic-DSL framework to address the inability of LLMs to generate precise and grammatically correct programs. To further maximize the programs generated by LLMs, we design a search algorithm, Scheduled Hill Climbing, which can explore the programmatic search space to consistently improve the programs. The evaluation result on Karel environment shows the effectiveness of our proposed LLM-guided framework. Extensive ablation studies verify the necessities of our proposed Pythonic-DSL and Scheduled Hill Climbing.




Figure 8: **LLM revision.** The performance gain of LLM revision quickly saturates within the first two rounds.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2, 7
- [2] David Andre and Stuart J Russell. Programmable reinforcement learning agents. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2001. 1, 2
- [3] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022. 1
- [4] Matej Balog, Alexander L Gaunt, Marc Brockschmidt, Sebastian Nowozin, and Daniel Tarlow. Deepcoder: Learning to write programs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. 2, 3
- [5] Osbert Bastani, Yewen Pu, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Verifiable reinforcement learning via policy extraction. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018. 1, 2
- [6] Surya Bhupatiraju, Kumar Krishna Agrawal, and Rishabh Singh. Towards mixed optimization for reinforcement learning with program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.00403*, 2018. 2
- [7] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. 2
- [8] Rudy R Bunel, Matthew Hausknecht, Jacob Devlin, Rishabh Singh, and Pushmeet Kohli. Leveraging grammar and reinforcement learning for neural program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. 3
- [9] Natasha Butt, Blazej Manczak, Auke Wiggers, Corrado Rainone, David Zhang, Michaël Defferrard, and Taco Cohen. Codeit: Self-improving language models with prioritized hindsight replay. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 3
- [10] Tales Henrique Carvalho, Kenneth Tjhia, and Levi Lelis. Reclaiming the source of programmatic policies: Programmatic versus latent spaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23
- [11] Xiaocong Chen, Lina Yao, Julian McAuley, Guanglin Zhou, and Xianzhi Wang. Deep reinforcement learning in recommender systems: A survey and new perspectives. *Knowledge-based systems*, 264:110335, 3 2023. 1
- [12] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Execution-guided neural program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. 3
- [13] Xinyun Chen, Dawn Song, and Yuandong Tian. Latent execution for neural program synthesis beyond domain-specific languages. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. 3
- [14] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 9
- [15] François Chollet. On the measure of intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01547*, 2019. 3
- [16] Karl Cobbe, Oleg Klimov, Christopher Hesse, Taehoon Kim, and John Schulman. Quantifying generalization in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018. 1
- [17] Aditya Desai, Sumit Gulwani, Vineet Hingorani, Nidhi Jain, Amey Karkare, Mark Marron, Subhajt Roy, et al. Program synthesis using natural language. In *International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2016. 2
- [18] Finale Doshi-Velez and Been Kim. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608*, 2017. 1
- [19] Kevin Ellis, Catherine Wong, Maxwell Nye, Mathias Sablé-Meyer, Lucas Morales, Luke Hewitt, Luc Cary, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Dreamcoder: Bootstrapping inductive program synthesis with wake-sleep library learning. In *Proceedings of the 42nd acm sigplan international conference on programming language design and implementation*, 2021. 3

- [20] John K Feser, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Isil Dillig. Synthesizing data structure transformations from input-output examples. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 50(6), 2015. 3
- [21] Gabriel Grand, Lionel Wong, Matthew Bowers, Theo X. Olausson, Muxin Liu, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Jacob Andreas. LILO: Learning interpretable libraries by compressing and documenting code. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [22] Sumit Gulwani. Automating string processing in spreadsheets using input-output examples. *ACM Sigplan Notices*, 46(1), 2011. 3
- [23] Sumit Gulwani, Oleksandr Polozov, Rishabh Singh, et al. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages*, 4(1-2):1–119, 2017. 3
- [24] Kavi Gupta, Peter Ebert Christensen, Xinyun Chen, and Dawn Song. Synthesize, execute and debug: Learning to repair for neural program synthesis. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. 3
- [25] Alexandre Heuillet, Fabien Couthouis, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. Explainability in deep reinforcement learning. *Knowledge-based systems*, 214, 2021. 1
- [26] Xueyu Hu, Kun Kuang, Jiankai Sun, Hongxia Yang, and Fei Wu. Leveraging print debugging to improve code generation in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05319*, 2024. 9
- [27] Jeevana Priya Inala, Osbert Bastani, Zenna Tavares, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Synthesizing programmatic policies that inductively generalize. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2
- [28] Vidhi Jain, Maria Attarian, Nikhil J Joshi, Ayzaan Wahid, Danny Driess, Quan Vuong, Pannag R Sanketi, Pierre Sermanet, Stefan Welker, Christine Chan, et al. Vid2robot: End-to-end video-conditioned policy learning with cross-attention transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12943*, 2024. 1
- [29] Zhengyao Jiang and Shan Luo. Neural logic reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019. 2
- [30] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014. 2
- [31] Robert Kirk, Amy Zhang, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. A survey of zero-shot generalisation in deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 76:201–264, 2023. 1
- [32] Anurag Koul, Sam Greydanus, and Alan Fern. Learning finite state representations of recurrent policy networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12530*, 2018. 2
- [33] Mikel Landajuela, Brenden K Petersen, Sookyoung Kim, Claudio P Santiago, Ruben Glatt, Nathan Mundhenk, Jacob F Pettit, and Daniel Faissol. Discovering symbolic policies with deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 2
- [34] Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 2
- [35] Xi Victoria Lin, Chenglong Wang, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Michael D Ernst. Nl2bash: A corpus and semantic parser for natural language interface to the linux operating system. In *International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, 2018. 2
- [36] Yu-An Lin, Chen-Tao Lee, Guan-Ting Liu, Pu-Jen Cheng, and Shao-Hua Sun. Addressing long-horizon tasks by integrating program synthesis and state machines. *arXiv:2311.15960*, 2023. 2
- [37] Guan-Ting Liu, En-Pei Hu, Pu-Jen Cheng, Hung-Yi Lee, and Shao-Hua Sun. Hierarchical programmatic reinforcement learning via learning to compose programs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 16, 19, 20, 21
- [38] Julian R. H. Mariño, Rubens O. Moraes, Tassiana C. Oliveira, Claudio Toledo, and Levi H. S. Lelis. Programmatic strategies for real-time strategy games. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*, 2021.
- [39] Rubens O Moraes and Levi HS Lelis. Searching for programmatic policies in semantic spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05431*, 2024. 2

- [40] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2
- [41] Theo X. Olausson, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Is self-repair a silver bullet for code generation? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 9
- [42] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 1
- [43] Emilio Parisotto, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, Rishabh Singh, Lihong Li, Dengyong Zhou, and Pushmeet Kohli. Neuro-symbolic program synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. 2, 3
- [44] Richard E Pattis. *Karel the robot: a gentle introduction to the art of programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1981. 2
- [45] Oleksandr Polozov and Sumit Gulwani. Flashmeta: A framework for inductive program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications*, 2015. 3
- [46] Wenjie Qiu and He Zhu. Programmatic reinforcement learning without oracles. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 2
- [47] Mohammad Raza, Sumit Gulwani, and Natasa Milic-Frayling. Compositional program synthesis from natural language and examples. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015. 2
- [48] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023. 2
- [49] Reuven Y Rubinfeld and Dirk P Kroese. *The cross-entropy method: a unified approach to combinatorial optimization, Monte-Carlo simulation, and machine learning*, volume 133. Springer, 2004. 4
- [50] Eui Chul Shin, Illia Polosukhin, and Dawn Song. Improving neural program synthesis with inferred execution traces. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018. 3
- [51] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneshelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 2016. 1
- [52] Tom Silver, Kelsey R Allen, Alex K Lew, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, and Josh Tenenbaum. Few-shot bayesian imitation learning with logical program policies. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*, 2020. 1, 2
- [53] Shao-Hua Sun, Hyeonwoo Noh, Sriram Somasundaram, and Joseph Lim. Neural program synthesis from diverse demonstration videos. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018. 2
- [54] Shao-Hua Sun, Te-Lin Wu, and Joseph J. Lim. Program guided agent. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2
- [55] Hao Tang, Darren Key, and Kevin Ellis. Worldcoder, a model-based llm agent: Building world models by writing code and interacting with the environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12275*, 2024. 9
- [56] Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085*, 2022. 2
- [57] Dweep Trivedi, Jesse Zhang, Shao-Hua Sun, and Joseph J Lim. Learning to synthesize programs as interpretable and generalizable policies. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21
- [58] Abhinav Verma, Vijayaraghavan Murali, Rishabh Singh, Pushmeet Kohli, and Swarat Chaudhuri. Programmatically interpretable reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018. 1, 2

- [59] Abhinav Verma, Hoang Le, Yisong Yue, and Swarat Chaudhuri. Imitation-projected programmatic reinforcement learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019. [2](#)
- [60] Bailin Wang, Zi Wang, Xuezhi Wang, Yuan Cao, Rif A. Saurous, and Yoon Kim. Grammar prompting for domain-specific language generation with large language models. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [3](#)
- [61] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. [2](#), [9](#)
- [62] Letian Wang, Jie Liu, Hao Shao, Wenshuo Wang, Ruobing Chen, Yu Liu, and Steven L Waslander. Efficient reinforcement learning for autonomous driving with parameterized skills and priors. 2023. [1](#)
- [63] Sida I Wang, Samuel Ginn, Percy Liang, and Christopher D Manning. Naturalizing a programming language via interactive learning. In *Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2017. [2](#)
- [64] Frank F Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent Josua Hellendoorn. A systematic evaluation of large language models of code. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, 2022. [2](#)
- [65] Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [2](#)
- [66] He Zhu, Zikang Xiong, Stephen Magill, and Suresh Jagannathan. An inductive synthesis framework for verifiable reinforcement learning. In *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, 2019. [2](#)

Appendix

Table of Contents

A	Schedule hill climbing detail	14
B	Karel DSL details	14
C	Karel tasks	15
C.1	Karel tasks	16
C.2	Karel-Hard tasks	19
D	Baselines and their hyperparameters	20
D.1	Learning Embeddings for Latent Program Synthesis (LEAPS)	20
D.2	Hierarchical programmatic reinforcement learning (HPRL)	21
D.3	Cross-entropy beam search (CEBS)	21
D.4	Hill climbing (HC)	21
E	An example pipeline of our method	22
E.1	The system prompt	22
E.2	The user prompt of the task DOORKEY	24
E.3	The sample response of LLM in the task DOORKEY	24
E.4	Apply post-processing and retrieve the final program	25
F	LLM prompts for ablations and revision	27
F.1	Pythonic-DSL	27
F.2	Python	30
F.3	DSL	31
F.4	Regenerate	32
F.5	Regenerate with reward	33
F.6	Agent execution trace	34
F.7	Agent and Program execution trace.	36

A Schedule hill climbing detail

This Scheduler is designed for HC. n is the number of programs evaluated, and K_{start} and K_{end} are hyper-parameters representing the initial and terminal number of neighbors to search, respectively. $r(n)$ is a sinusoidal function that smoothly increase from 0 to 1 over the course of N total programs evaluated in the environment. We provide detailed equation in Equation (2) and Equation (3)

$$\log_2 k(n) = (1 - r(n)) \log_2 K_{start} + r(n) \log_2 K_{end}, \quad (2)$$

$$2r(n) = \sin \left[\left(\frac{2 \log n}{\log N} - 1 \right) \times \frac{\pi}{2} \right] + 1. \quad (3)$$

B Karel DSL details

There are five symbols in the Karel DSL: statement, condition, action, boolean, and number. The production rules and Python converting rules are listed in Table 4. The statement counts mean total usage of converting one statement into two statements at the root of the abstract syntax tree. And the statement counts are limited to six in search of optimal programs. The program length is the total number of tokens used in string representation. The token limit is set to be forty-four. The depth in DSL is the recursive call of control flows. The depth is limited to four. These limitations are the same as the original settings in LEAPS [57]. The probabilities of the production rules are

listed in Table 6. The mutation process selects one random node in the abstract syntax tree (AST). We can use the production rules to sample a sub-tree to replace the original node. The Karel syntax has many symbol-related parentheses, *e.g.* “i(” and “i)” which are related to the “IF” and “IFELSE”, thus LLM sometimes makes mistakes translating Python to DSL. We list common mistakes LLM made in Table 5 and how we solve these problems.

Table 4: Python to DSL converting rules.

Python	DSL
def run(): s	DEF run m(s m)
while b: s	WHILE c(b c) w(s w)
if b: s	IF c(b c) i(s i)
if b: s else: s	IFELSE c(b c) i(s i) ELSE e(s e)
for i in range(n): s	REPEAT R=n r(s r)
not h	not c(h c)
frontIsClear()	frontIsClear
leftIsClear()	leftIsClear
rightIsClear()	rightIsClear
markersPresent()	markersPresent
noMarkersPresent()	noMarkersPresent
move()	move
turnLeft()	turnLeft
turnRight()	turnRight
putMarker()	putMarker
pickMarker()	pickMarker

C Karel tasks

There are five knowledge we tell the Large Language Model: task name, task map, task agent position, task goal, and task return. Here is all the information about these ten tasks. Appendix F show how

Table 5: These are the common mistakes LLM makes. We implement a simple program to correct these mistakes.

Type	Before	After
Brackets removal	DEF run m(move() m)	DEF run m(move m)
Brackets separation	DEF run m (move m)	DEF run m (move m)
Brackets addition	DEF run m(WHILE frontIsClear w(move w))m	DEF run m(WHILE c (frontIsClear c) w(move w))m
Brackets repairment	DEF run m(move)	DEF run m(move m)
If to IFELSE	DEF run m(IF c(frontIsClear c) i(move i) ELSE e(turnLeft e))m	DEF run m(IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(move i) ELSE e(turnLeft e))m
Redundant symbols removal	DEF run m(move() m m)	DEF run m(move m)
Illegal symbols transformation	DEF run m(WHILE c(True c) w(move w))	DEF run m(REPEAT r=19 r(move r) m)

Table 6: Probabilities of the production rules.

Category	Rule	Probability
Program P	Statement	1.0
Statement S	While	0.15
	Repeat	0.03
	Concatenate	0.5
	If	0.08
	Ifelse	0.04
	Action	0.2
Condition c	Boolean	0.9
	not	0.1
Action a	move	0.5
	turnLeft	0.15
	turnRight	0.15
	putMarker	0.1
	pickMarker	0.1
	Boolean b	frontIsClear
	leftIsClear	0.15
	rightIsClear	0.15
	markersPresent	0.1
	noMarkersPresent	0.1
Number n	$i (0 \leq i \leq 19)$	0.05

these five different components are filled into the placeholders in the user prompt. There are two sets of tasks: Karel [57] and Karel-Hard [37]. Appendix C.1 lists all six Karel tasks, and Appendix C.2 lists all four Karel-Hard tasks. There are six Karel tasks: STAIRCLIMBER, FOURCORNERS, TOPOFF, MAZE, HARVESTER, and CLEANHOUSE. Example figures of Karel tasks are in Figure 9. On the other hand, four of the Karel-Hard tasks are DOORKEY, ONESTROKE, SEEDER, and SNAKE. Figure 10 shows the initial and desired states of the Karel-Hard tasks.

C.1 Karel tasks

C.1.1 The task prompt of STAIRCLIMBER

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	STAIRCLIMBERSPARSE
Map Description	The map is a 12x12 grid surrounded by walls with stairs formed by walls and a marker is randomly initialized on the stairs as a goal.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random position on the stairs facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to reach a marker that is also randomly initialized on the stairs.
Task Reward	If the agent reaches the marker, the agent receives 1 as an episodic return and 0 otherwise. If the agent moves to an invalid position, i.e. outside the contour of the stairs, the episode terminates with a -1 return.




Figure 9: Illustrations of the initial and desired final state of each task in the KAREL Problem set introduced in by Trivedi et al. [57]. Note that these illustrations are from Trivedi et al. [57] except for STAIRCLIMBER, TOPOFF, and FOURCORNERS. We align our setting with Carvalho et al. [10] to evaluate these tasks in a map of 12x12. The position of markers, walls, and agent’s position are randomly set according to the configurations of each task.

C.1.2 The task prompt of MAZE

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	MAZEPARSE
Map Description	The map is a complex 8x8 grid surrounded by walls and a random marker is placed on an empty cell as a goal.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random empty cell of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to reach the goal marker.
Task Reward	If the agent reaches the marker, the agent receives 1 as an episodic return and 0 otherwise.

C.1.3 The task prompt of FOURCORNERS

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	FOURCORNERS
Map Description	The map is an empty 12x12 grid surrounded by walls.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell on the bottom row of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to place one marker in each corner of the map.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of corners with one marker divided by 4.

C.1.4 The task prompt of TOPOFF

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	TOPOFF
Map Description	The map is a 12x12 grid surrounded by walls with markers randomly placed on the bottom row of the map.
Initial Position	The agent starts on the bottom left cell of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to place one extra marker on top of every marker on the map.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of markers that have been topped off divided by the total number of markers. Picking up the marker will terminate the episode with a -1 return.

C.1.5 The task prompt of HARVESTER

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	HARVESTER
Map Description	The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that starts with a marker on each cell.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell on the bottom row of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to pick up every marker on the map.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of picked-up markers divided by the total number of markers.

C.1.6 The task prompt of CLEANHOUSE

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	CLEANHOUSE
Map Description	The map is a complex 14x22 grid made of many connected rooms and is surrounded by walls. There are ten markers randomly placed adjacent to the walls.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a fixed cell facing south.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to pick up every marker on the map.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of picked-up markers divided by the total number of markers.




Figure 10: Illustrations of the initial and final state of each task in the Karel-Hard problem set introduced in by Liu et al. [37]. The position of markers, walls, and agent’s position are randomly set according to the configurations of each tasks.

C.2 Karel-Hard tasks

C.2.1 The task prompt of DOORKEY

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	DOORKEY
Map Description	The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers. Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.
Task Reward	Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

C.2.2 The task prompt of ONESTROKE

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	ONESTROKE
Map Description	The map is given by an empty 8x8 grid surrounded by walls.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to visit every grid cell without repeating. Visited cells become a wall that terminates the episode upon touching.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of visited cells divided by the total number of empty cells in the initial state.

C.2.3 The task prompt of SEEDER

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	SEEDER
Map Description	The map is given by an empty 8x8 grid surrounded by walls..
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The goal of the agent is to place one marker in every empty cell of the map.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of cells with one marker divided by the total number of empty cells in the initial state.

C.2.4 The task prompt of SNAKE

Knowledge	Prompt Text
Task Name	SNAKE
Map Description	The map is given by an empty 8x8 grid surrounded by walls with a marker randomly placed on the map.
Initial Position	The agent starts on a random cell of the map facing east.
Task Goal	The agent acts like the head of a snake, whose body grows each time a marker is reached. (No need to pick it up.) Every time a marker is reached, the body of the agent grows one marker. The goal of the agent is to touch the marker on the map without colliding with the snake’s body, which terminates the episode. Each time the marker is reached, it is placed on a random cell, until 20 markers are reached.
Task Reward	Return is given by the number of reached markers divided by 20.

D Baselines and their hyperparameters

We compares to four baselines proposed by Trivedi et al. [57], Liu et al. [37], and Carvalho et al. [10]. LEAPS, HPRL, and CEBS search programs in the latent spaces. HC search program in the programmatic space. The pseudo-code of CEBS is described in Algorithm 1, and the pseudo-code HC is described in Algorithm 2.

D.1 Learning Embeddings for Latent Program Synthesis (LEAPS)

The hyperparameters of the LEAPS baseline are from LEAPS [57] and HPRL [37]. We downloaded the pre-trained weights of LEAPS and used the parameters for searching programs. We do not use the official implementation of LEAPS, thus we do not have hyperparameters of exponential decay. Also, the unofficial implementation samples candidate from a fixed normal distribution which is hyperparameter in LEAPS [57]. In Table 7, K is the neighborhood size and E is the candidate, σ is the noise scale. In LEAPS and HPRL, they use an elite ratio to represent the candidate programs. For better understanding, we round E to be an integer.

Table 7: LEAPS hyperparameter settings on all KAREL tasks.

TASK NAME	K	σ	E
STAIRCLIMBER	32	0.25	2
FOURCORNERS	64	0.5	13
TOPOFF	64	0.25	3
MAZE	16	0.1	2
CLEANHOUSE	32	0.25	2
HARVESTER	32	0.5	3
DOORKEY	32	0.25	3
ONESTROKE	64	0.5	3
SEEDER	32	0.25	3
SNAKE	32	0.25	6

D.2 Hierarchical programmatic reinforcement learning (HPRL)

HPRL [37] aims to improve LEAPS by composing several programs to represent more complex behaviors. Given a learned latent space, meta-policy learns to predict a sequence of actions, *i.e.* programs, by optimizing the return obtained by executing the composed programs using reinforcement learning. HPRL considers the discount factor γ in the meta-MDP; as a result, the evaluation method is not the same as our problem formulation. To ensure a fair comparison, we record one million programs explored by meta-policy in the training stage. In HPRL, the authors use the training step as a hyperparameter. One training step is one step of meta-policy, and the maximum episode length is set to five as the original setting in the HPRL paper. In Table 8, we list the hyperparameters we modified in the HPRL training script. All other hyperparameters remain the same as described in HPRL.

Table 8: HPRL hyperparameter settings on all KAREL tasks.

TASK NAME	training steps	height	weight
STAIRCLIMBER	50K	12	12
FOURCORNERS	500K	12	12
TOPOFF	5M	12	12
MAZE	50K	8	8
CLEANHOUSE	500K	12	22
HARVESTER	5M	8	8
DOORKEY	5M	8	8
ONESTROKE	5M	8	8
SEEDER	5M	8	8
SNAKE	5M	8	8

D.3 Cross-entropy beam search (CEBS)

CEBS [10] also utilizes the pre-trained VAE weight from LEAPS [57] to search program in the latent space. All the hyperparameter follows the original CEBS with neighborhood K equal to 64, candidate E equal to 16, and noise ratio σ equal to 0.25 for all ten Karel tasks. The pseudo-code is described in Algorithm 1.

D.4 Hill climbing (HC)

HC [10] is a state-of-the-art algorithm solving Programmatic Reinforcement Learning tasks. All the hyperparameter follows the original HC with neighborhood K equal to 250 for all ten Karel tasks. The pseudo-code is described in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 Cross-entropy beam search algorithm [10]

Require: K , number of neighborhood; E number of top candidate; T , the task; VAE, the program encoder and decoder.

Ensure: ρ^* the highest averaged return over 32 task variants.

```
1:  $z \sim N(0, \mathbf{I})$ 
2:  $\rho \leftarrow \text{VAE.decode}(z)$ 
3:  $\text{steps} \leftarrow 0$ 
4:  $\text{Return} \leftarrow \text{evaluate}(\rho, T)$ 
5:  $\rho^* \leftarrow \rho$ 
6:  $\text{Mean} \leftarrow -\infty$ 
7:  $P \leftarrow \text{get-neighbor}(\rho, K)$ 
8: while  $\text{steps} < 1000000$  do
9:    $\text{Candidates} \leftarrow []$ 
10:  for each  $\rho_{\text{new}}$  in  $P$  do
11:     $r \leftarrow \text{evaluate}(\rho_{\text{new}}, T)$ 
12:     $\text{Candidates.append}(r, \rho_{\text{new}})$ 
13:    if  $r > \text{Return}$  then
14:       $\rho^* \leftarrow \rho_{\text{new}}$ 
15:       $\text{Return} \leftarrow r$ 
16:    end if
17:  end for
18:   $\text{Elites} \leftarrow \text{Top-E}(\text{Candidates})$ 
19:  if  $\text{Mean} > \text{get-mean}(\text{Elites})$  then
20:    break
21:  end if
22:  if  $\text{Return} = 1$  then
23:    break
24:  end if
25:   $\text{Mean} \leftarrow \text{get-mean}(\text{Elites})$ 
26:   $P \leftarrow []$ 
27:  for each  $\rho_{\text{new}}$  in  $\text{Elites}$  do
28:     $P.\text{extend}(\text{get-neighbor}(\rho_{\text{new}}, K/E))$ 
29:  end for
30:   $\text{steps} \leftarrow \text{steps} + K$ 
31: end while
```

E An example pipeline of our method

This is our pipeline of getting programs from LLM with the task DOORKEY. Appendix E.1 details the system prompt, Appendix E.2 provides all the information in one specific task, Appendix E.3 lists the LLM response, and Appendix E.4 gives an example how we get the Karel DSL program.

E.1 The system prompt

You're currently navigating within a Karel environment, which is essentially a grid world. In this context, a "world" is referred to as a "map." Within this map, there's an entity known as the "agent," capable of movement, changing direction, as well as picking up and placing markers on the map. Additionally, there are obstacles called "walls" that impede the agent's progress; whenever the agent encounters a wall, it turns around. Furthermore, there are pre-existing "markers" scattered throughout the map at the beginning, though the agent has the ability to both pickup and place these markers as needed.

Your objective is to generate the appropriate Python program based on a given task name and description. This Python program

Algorithm 2 Hill climbing algorithm [10]

Require: T , the task; K , number of neighborhood.
Ensure: ρ^* , the highest averaged return over 32 task variants.

```
1: Initialize  $\rho$  with a random solution
2:  $Return \leftarrow \text{evaluate}(\rho, T)$ 
3:  $\rho^* \leftarrow \rho$ 
4:  $improved \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
5:  $steps \leftarrow 0$ 
6: while  $improved$  and  $steps < n$  do
7:    $improved \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
8:    $Neighbors \leftarrow \text{get-neighbor}(\rho, K)$ 
9:   for each  $\rho_{new}$  in  $Neighbors$  do
10:     $r_{new} \leftarrow \text{evaluate}(\rho_{new}, T)$ 
11:    if  $r_{new} > Return$  then
12:       $\rho^* \leftarrow \rho_{new}$ 
13:       $Return \leftarrow r_{new}$ 
14:       $improved \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
15:      break
16:    end if
17:     $steps \leftarrow steps + 1$ 
18:  end for
19:   $\rho \leftarrow \rho^*$ 
20: end while
```

will encompass actions enabling the agent to engage with the environment, alongside perceptions facilitating the agent's recognition of the environment's dynamics.

Here are the available actions for the agent:

`move()`: Asks the agent to move forward one cell. The agent will instead turn left twice if a wall is blocking its way.
`turnLeft()`: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees counterclockwise.
`turnRight()`: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees clockwise.
`pickMarker()`: Asks the agent to pick up one marker from the current cell.
`putMarker()`: Asks the agent to put down one marker on the current cell.

Here are the available perceptions of the agent:

`frontIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall in front of the agent.
`leftIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's left.
`rightIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's right.
`markersPresent()`: Returns True if there exist markers on the current cell.
`noMarkersPresent()`: Returns True if there is no marker on the current cell.

There are some limitations for the Python program:

- do not define other functions besides `run()`
- do not call other functions
- do not define variables
- do not use `True`, `False`, `break`, `continue`, `return`, `==`, `!=`, `elif`, `or`, and

Python to Karel dsl conversion

1. "def run(): s" to "DEF run m(s m)"
2. "while b: s" to "WHILE c(b c) w(s w)"
3. "if b: s" to "IF c(b c) i(s I)"
4. "if b: s else: s" to "IFELSE c(b c) i(s i) ELSE e(s e)"
5. "for i in range(n): s" to "REPEAT R=n r(s r)"
6. "not h" to "not c(h c)"
7. "frontIsClear()" to "frontIsClear"
8. "leftIsClear()" to "leftIsClear"
9. "rightIsClear()" to "rightIsClear"
10. "markersPresent()" to "markersPresent"
11. "noMarkersPresent()" to "noMarkersPresent"
12. "move()" to "move"
13. "turnLeft()" to "turnLeft"
14. "turnRight()" to "turnRight"
15. "putMarker()" to "putMarker"
16. "pickMarker()" to "pickMarker"

E.2 The user prompt of the task DOORKEY

I'll provide you with the task name and description.

Task name: DOORKEY

Task map: The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.

Task agent position: The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.

Task goal: The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers.

Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.

Task return: Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

1. Generate 1 simple and short Python program to tackle the task, avoid using comments.
2. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.

E.3 The sample response of LLM in the task DOORKEY

```
### Python Program for Task DOORKEY
```

```
```python
def run():
 while not markersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()

 pickMarker()

 turnLeft()

 while not markersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
```

```

 turnLeft ()
 putMarker ()
 ...

Karel DSL Conversion
 ...
DEF run m(
 WHILE not c(markersPresent c) w(
 IF frontIsClear i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 pickMarker m
 turnLeft m
 WHILE not c(markersPresent c) w(
 IF frontIsClear i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 putMarker m)
 ...

```

#### E.4 Apply post-processing and retrieve the final program

For the Python program part in LLM response, we convert the Python program to a DSL program through the rule-based method and apply post-processing to correct minor mistakes. For the DSL part, we directly apply post-processing to correct minor mistakes. Appendix E.4.1 presents the original Python program, the converted DSL, and the post-processed DSL. Appendix E.4.2 shows the original DSL and the post-processed DSL. All of the post-processing rules are listed in Table 5.

##### E.4.1 Python program part

Listing 1: Original Python program

```

def run():
 while not markersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()

 pickMarker()

 turnLeft()

 while not markersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()

 putMarker()

```

Listing 2: DSL program converted through the rule-based method

```

DEF run m(
 WHILE c(not c(markersPresent c) c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(

```

```

 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
pickMarker
turnLeft
WHILE c(not c(markersPresent c) c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
putMarker m)

```

Listing 3: DSL program after post-processing

```

DEF run m(
 WHILE c(noMarkersPresent c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 pickMarker
 turnLeft
 WHILE c(noMarkersPresent c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 putMarker m)

```

#### E.4.2 DSL program part

Listing 4: Original DSL program

```

DEF run m(
 WHILE not c(markersPresent c) w(
 IF frontIsClear i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 pickMarker m
 turnLeft m
 WHILE not c(markersPresent c) w(
 IF frontIsClear i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 putMarker m)


```

Listing 5: DSL program after post-processing

```

DEF run m(
 WHILE c(noMarkersPresent c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(
 move i)
 ELSE e(
 turnLeft e) w)
 pickMarker
 turnLeft
 WHILE c(noMarkersPresent c) w(
 IFELSE c(frontIsClear c) i(

```



(a) This is the initial state of one of (b) This is the last step of the trajec- (c) The program ends at step 47 and  
DOORKEY the task variants. tories in the prompts. no reward is granted.

Figure 11: This is the demonstration of the task DOORKEY. The Karel agent can only reach the surrounding grids at the left chamber in the trajectory.

```

 move i)
 ELSE e (
 turnLeft e) w)
 putMarker m)

```

## F LLM prompts for ablations and revision

**Ablation prompts for program generation methods.** We conduct an ablation study in Section 5.3 to justify that our LLM-generating program method performs best in acceptance rate and best return. Here are the complete prompts. There are three approaches to generating DSL programs: Pythonic-DSL, Python, and DSL. There are two types of prompt, system prompt and user prompt, in all approaches. In the system prompt, both the Python and the Pythonic-DSL approaches contain limitations of Python usage. The DSL approach contains the grammar of the Karel, and the Pythonic-DSL contains the paired Python-like and Karel production rules. All of the system prompts contain the environment physics, action, and perception. On the other hand, the user prompt contains five placeholders for task name, map position, initial position, task goal, and task reward. In Appendix C, all of the task-dependent information can be filled in the placeholders. Appendix E.2 shows the full Pythonic-DSL prompt with the task DOORKEY filled in the placeholders. The Pythonic-DSL prompts are in Appendix F.1, and the Python prompts are in Appendix F.2, and the DSL prompts are in Appendix F.3.

**Prompts for LLM revision.** We list all of the user prompts in the experiment of LLM revision, the system prompt is the same as the one in Appendix F.1. There are four approaches to revising the program: Regenerate, Regenerate with reward, Agent execution trace, and Agent and program execution trace. We ask the LLM to regenerate with all generated programs in the last round without repetition, and the Regenerate prompt is in Appendix F.4. We ask the LLM to regenerate with the program relating to reward, and the revision prompt of the Regenerate with reward is in Appendix F.5. We utilize the execution trace of the Karel agent in the grid world, and the revision prompt of the Agent execution trace is in Appendix F.6. We provided the action/perception call and executing line, and the revision prompt of the Agent and program execution trace is in Appendix F.7. The program Listing 1 is the revision target of our method revision method in Appendix F.6 and Appendix F.7. Figure 11 is the trajectories of the program we used in method Appendix F.6 and Appendix F.7. In the example, the origin program has an average return of 0.5. LLM revision with agent trace can reach 0.640625, and LLM revision with both agent and program traces can reach a great result of 0.8125.

### F.1 Pythonic-DSL

#### F.1.1 System prompt

You're currently navigating within a Karel environment, which is essentially a grid world. In this context, a "world" is

---

**Listing 1** This is the program for LLM revision.

---

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```

---

---

**Listing 2** The revision results of Appendix F.6.

---

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 pickMarker()
 while frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 putMarker()
```

---

referred to as a "map." Within this map, there's an entity known as the "agent," capable of movement, changing direction, as well as picking up and placing markers on the map. Additionally, there are obstacles called "walls" that impede the agent's progress; whenever the agent encounters a wall, it turns around. Furthermore, there are pre-existing "markers" scattered throughout the map at the beginning, though the agent has the ability to both pickup and place these markers as needed.

Your objective is to generate the appropriate Python program based on a given task name and description. This Python program will encompass actions enabling the agent to engage with the environment, alongside perceptions facilitating the agent's recognition of the environment's dynamics.

Here are the available actions for the agent:

---

**Listing 3** The revision results of Appendix F.7.

---

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if rightIsClear():
 turnRight()
 move()
 else:
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```

---

`move()`: Asks the agent to move forward one cell. The agent will instead turn left twice if a wall is blocking its way.  
`turnLeft()`: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees counterclockwise.  
`turnRight()`: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees clockwise.  
`pickMarker()`: Asks the agent to pick up one marker from the current cell.  
`putMarker()`: Asks the agent to put down one marker on the current cell.>

Here are the available perceptions of the agent:  
`frontIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall in front of the agent.  
`leftIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's left.  
`rightIsClear()`: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's right.  
`markersPresent()`: Returns True if there exist markers on the current cell.  
`noMarkersPresent()`: Returns True if there is no marker on the current cell.

There are some limitations for the Python program:

- do not define other functions besides `run()`
- do not call other functions
- do not define variables
- do not use `True`, `False`, `break`, `continue`, `return`, `==`, `!=`, `elif`, `or`, and

Python to Karel dsl conversion

1. "def run(): s" to "DEF run m( s m) "
2. "while b: s" to "WHILE c( b c) w( s w) "
3. "if b: s" to "IF c( b c) i( s i) "
4. "if b: s else: s" to "IFELSE c( b c) i( s i) ELSE e( s e) "
5. "for i in range(n): s" to "REPEAT R=n r( s r) "
6. "not h" to "not c( h c) "
7. "frontIsClear()" to "frontIsClear"
8. "leftIsClear()" to "leftIsClear"
9. "rightIsClear()" to "rightIsClear"

10. "markersPresent()" to "markersPresent"
11. "noMarkersPresent()" to "noMarkersPresent"
12. "move()" to "move"
13. "turnLeft()" to "turnLeft"
14. "turnRight()" to "turnRight"
15. "putMarker()" to "putMarker"
16. "pickMarker()" to "pickMarker"

## F.1.2 User prompt

I'll provide you with the task name and description.

Task name: <<Task Name>>

Task map: <<Map Description>>

Task agent position: <<Initial Position>>

Task goal: <<Task Goal>>

Task return: <<Task Reward>>

1. Generate 1 simple and short Python program to tackle the task, avoid using comments.
2. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.

## F.2 Python

### F.2.1 System prompt

You're currently navigating within a Karel environment, which is essentially a grid world. In this context, a "world" is referred to as a "map." Within this map, there's an entity known as the "agent," capable of movement, changing direction, as well as picking up and placing markers on the map. Additionally, there are obstacles called "walls" that impede the agent's progress; whenever the agent encounters a wall, it turns around. Furthermore, there are pre-existing "markers" scattered throughout the map at the beginning, though the agent has the ability to both pickup and place these markers as needed.

Your objective is to generate the appropriate Python program based on a given task name and description. This Python program will encompass actions enabling the agent to engage with the environment, alongside perceptions facilitating the agent's recognition of the environment's dynamics.

Here are the available actions for the agent:

move(): Asks the agent to move forward one cell. The agent will instead turn left twice if a wall is blocking its way.

turnLeft(): Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees counterclockwise.

turnRight(): Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees clockwise.

pickMarker(): Asks the agent to pick up one marker from the current cell.

putMarker(): Asks the agent to put down one marker on the current cell.

Here are the available perceptions of the agent:

frontIsClear(): Returns True if there is no wall in front of the agent.

leftIsClear(): Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's left.



```
rightIsClear(): Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's
right.
markersPresent(): Returns True if there exist markers on the
current cell.
noMarkersPresent(): Returns True if there is no marker on the
current cell.
```

There are some limitations for the Python program:

- do not define other functions besides run()
- do not call other functions
- do not define variables
- do not use True, False, break, continue, return, ==, !=, elif, or, and

## F.2.2 User prompt

I'll provide you with the task name and description.

```
Task name: <<Task Name>>
Task map: <<Map Description>>
Task agent position: <<Initial Position>>
Task goal: <<Task Goal>>
Task return: <<Task Reward>>
```

1. Generate 1 simple and short Python program to tackle the task, avoid using comments.

## F.3 DSL

### F.3.1 System prompt

You're currently navigating within a Karel environment, which is essentially a grid world. In this context, a "world" is referred to as a "map." Within this map, there's an entity known as the "agent," capable of movement, changing direction, as well as picking up and placing markers on the map. Additionally, there are obstacles called "walls" that impede the agent's progress; whenever the agent encounters a wall, it turns around. Furthermore, there are pre-existing "markers" scattered throughout the map at the beginning, though the agent has the ability to both pickup and place these markers as needed.

Your objective is to generate the appropriate Karel dsl program based on a given task name and description. This Karel dsl program will encompass actions enabling the agent to engage with the environment, alongside perceptions facilitating the agent's recognition of the environment's dynamics.

Here are the available actions for the agent:

```
move: Asks the agent to move forward one cell. The agent will
 instead turn left twice if a wall is blocking its way.
turnLeft: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees counterclockwise.
turnRight: Asks the agent to rotate 90 degrees clockwise.
pickMarker: Asks the agent to pick up one marker from the current
cell.
putMarker: Asks the agent to put down one marker on the current
cell.
```

Here are the available perceptions of the agent:  
frontIsClear: Returns True if there is no wall in front of the agent.  
leftIsClear: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's left.  
rightIsClear: Returns True if there is no wall on the agent's right.  
markersPresent: Returns True if there exist markers on the current cell.  
noMarkersPresent: Returns True if there is no marker on the current cell.

This is the production role of the domain-specific language of the Karel environment.

```
Program p := DEF run m(s m)
Statement s := WHILE c(b c) w(s w) | IF c(b c) i(s i) | IFELSE
 c(b c) i(s i) ELSE e(s e) | REPEAT R=n r(s r) | s s | a
Condition b := h | not c(h c)
Number n := 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,
 16, 17, 18, 19
Perception h := frontIsClear | leftIsClear | rightIsClear |
 markersPresent | noMarkersPresent
Action a := move | turnLeft | turnRight | putMarker | pickMarker
```

### F.3.2 User prompt

I'll provide you with the task name and description.

Task name: <<Task Name>>  
Task map: <<Map Description>>  
Task agent position: <<Initial Position>>  
Task goal: <<Task Goal>>  
Task return: <<Task Reward>>

1. Generate 1 simple and short Karel dsl program to tackle the task, avoid using comments.

### F.4 Regenerate

I'll provide you with the task name, task description, and the programs you generated last time.

Task name: DOORKEY  
Task map: The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.  
Task agent position: The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.  
Task goal: The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers. Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.  
Task return: Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

These are the programs you generated last time, all of these programs cannot yield perfect performance.

Program 1:

```

def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if markersPresent():
 putMarker()

###23 programs are truncated.###

```

Program 25:

```

def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 pickMarker()
 for i in range(19):
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnRight()

```

1. Generate a Python program that is not identical to any of the previous programs to tackle the task, and avoid using comments .
2. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.

## F.5 Regenerate with reward

I'll provide you with the task name, task description, and the programs rewards pairs sorted by their evaluation rewards from 32 task variants.

Task name: DOORKEY

Task map: The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.

Task agent position: The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.

Task goal: The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers. Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.

Task return: Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

Program reward pairs sorted by their evaluation rewards:

```

Program 1:
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()

reward:
0.5

###23 programs are truncated.###

```

```

Program 25:
def run():
 for i in range(19):
 if markersPresent():
 pickMarker()
 while not frontIsClear():
 turnLeft()
 move()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 if markersPresent():
 putMarker()

```

```

reward:
-0.5

```

1. Depending on this information, examine the program pattern that the highest score programs process, but the lowest score programs do not.
2. Generate 1 simple and short Python program according to the pattern to tackle the task, avoid using comment.
3. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.

## F.6 Agent execution trace

I'll provide you with the code you developed previously, with the goal of refining it. To guide your revision, you'll receive the specific task name and a description. Since there are 32 different versions of the task that share the same objective but differ by random seeds, I will identify the specific variant where the performance of the program is most lacking. Additionally, you'll get the initial state of the task, the code, and a detailed trajectory demonstrating how the code operates within this particular scenario. This trajectory will detail each action step-by-step and show a localized snapshot of the environment (a 3x3 area centered on the agent) during

execution. Rewards received by the agent will also be shown during these steps.

Task name: DOORKEY

Task map: The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.

Task agent position: The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.

Task goal: The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers. Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.

Task return: Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

Initial state:

```
Wall(0, 0) ; Wall(0, 1) ; Wall(0, 2) ; Wall(0, 3) ;
Wall(0, 4) ; Wall(0, 5) ; Wall(0, 6) ; Wall(0, 7) ;
Wall(1, 0) ; Empty(1, 1) ; Empty(1, 2) ; Empty(1, 3) ;
Wall(1, 4) ; Empty(1, 5) ; Marker(1, 6, quantity=1) ;
Wall(1, 7) ;
Wall(2, 0) ; Empty(2, 1) ; Empty(2, 2) ; Empty(2, 3) ;
Wall(2, 4) ; Empty(2, 5) ; Empty(2, 6) ; Wall(2, 7) ;
Wall(3, 0) ; Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Wall(3, 4) ; Empty(3, 5) ; Empty(3, 6) ; Wall(3, 7) ;
Wall(4, 0) ; Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ;
Empty(4, 3) ; Wall(4, 4) ; Empty(4, 5) ; Empty(4, 6) ;
Wall(4, 7) ;
Wall(5, 0) ; Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ;
Empty(5, 3) ; Wall(5, 4) ; Empty(5, 5) ; Empty(5, 6) ;
Wall(5, 7) ;
Wall(6, 0) ; Empty(6, 1) ; Empty(6, 2) ; Empty(6, 3) ;
Wall(6, 4) ; Empty(6, 5) ; Empty(6, 6) ; Wall(6, 7) ;
Wall(7, 0) ; Wall(7, 1) ; Wall(7, 2) ; Wall(7, 3) ;
Wall(7, 4) ; Wall(7, 5) ; Wall(7, 6) ; Wall(7, 7) ;
```

Program:

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```

The average reward on 32 task variants is:  
0.5

```

Trajectory:

Step 1:
Agent performs a perception: noMarkersPresent. The result is True.
Partial state:
Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ; Empty(4, 3) ;
Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ;

Step 2:
Agent performs a perception: frontIsClear. The result is True.
Partial state:
Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ; Empty(4, 3) ;
Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ;

Step 3:
Agent performs an action: move.
Partial state:
Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ; Wall(3, 4) ;
Empty(4, 2) ; Agent(4, 3, direction=(0, 1)) ; Wall(4, 4) ;
Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ; Wall(5, 4) ;

###45 steps are truncated.###

Step 49:
Agent performs a perception: frontIsClear. The result is False.
Partial state:
Wall(1, 0) ; Empty(1, 1) ; Empty(1, 2) ;
Wall(2, 0) ; Agent(2, 1, direction=(0, -1)) ; Empty(2,
2) ;
Wall(3, 0) ; Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ;

The total step number is 105, the latter ones are truncated.

The total reward is 0.0

1. Depending on this information, please analyze the reason why
the program failed to achieve 1.0 on this task variant and
generate a new strategy to solve this task.
2. Generate 1 simple and short Python program according to the new
strategy to tackle the task, avoid using comment.
3. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.

```

## F.7 Agent and Program execution trace.

I'll provide you with the code you developed previously, with the goal of refining it. To guide your revision, you'll receive the specific task name and a description. Since there are 32 different versions of the task that share the same objective but differ by random seeds, I will identify the specific variant where the performance of the program is most lacking. Additionally, you'll get the initial state of the task, the code, and a detailed trajectory demonstrating how the code operates within this particular scenario. This trajectory will

detail each action step-by-step, indicate which section of your code is active, and show a localized snapshot of the environment (a 3x3 area centered on the agent) during execution. Rewards received by the agent will also be shown during these steps.

Task name: DOORKEY

Task map: The map is a 8x8 grid surrounded by walls that is vertically split into two chambers. The left chamber is 6x3 grid and the right chamber is 6x2 grid. There is a marker placed randomly on the left chamber as a key, and another marker placed randomly on the right chamber as a goal.

Task agent position: The agent starts on a random cell on the left chamber facing east.

Task goal: The goal of the agent is to pick up a marker on the left chamber, which opens a door connecting both chambers.

Allow the agent to reach and put a marker on the goal marker.

Task return: Picking up the first marker yields a 0.5 reward, and putting a marker on the goal marker yields an additional 0.5.

Initial state:

```
Wall(0, 0) ; Wall(0, 1) ; Wall(0, 2) ; Wall(0, 3) ;
Wall(0, 4) ; Wall(0, 5) ; Wall(0, 6) ; Wall(0, 7) ;
Wall(1, 0) ; Empty(1, 1) ; Empty(1, 2) ; Empty(1, 3) ;
Wall(1, 4) ; Empty(1, 5) ; Marker(1, 6, quantity=1) ;
Wall(1, 7) ;
Wall(2, 0) ; Empty(2, 1) ; Empty(2, 2) ; Empty(2, 3) ;
Wall(2, 4) ; Empty(2, 5) ; Empty(2, 6) ; Wall(2, 7) ;
Wall(3, 0) ; Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Wall(3, 4) ; Empty(3, 5) ; Empty(3, 6) ; Wall(3, 7) ;
Wall(4, 0) ; Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ;
Empty(4, 3) ; Wall(4, 4) ; Empty(4, 5) ; Empty(4, 6) ;
Wall(4, 7) ;
Wall(5, 0) ; Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ;
Empty(5, 3) ; Wall(5, 4) ; Empty(5, 5) ; Empty(5, 6) ;
Wall(5, 7) ;
Wall(6, 0) ; Empty(6, 1) ; Empty(6, 2) ; Empty(6, 3) ;
Wall(6, 4) ; Empty(6, 5) ; Empty(6, 6) ; Wall(6, 7) ;
Wall(7, 0) ; Wall(7, 1) ; Wall(7, 2) ; Wall(7, 3) ;
Wall(7, 4) ; Wall(7, 5) ; Wall(7, 6) ; Wall(7, 7) ;
```

Program:

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```



The average reward on 32 task variants is:  
0.5

Trajectory:

Step 1:

Program:

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent(): # Currently executing this line
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```

Agent performs a perception: noMarkersPresent. The result is True.

Partial state:

```
Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ; Empty(4, 3) ;
Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ;
```

Step 2:

Program:

```
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear(): # Currently executing this line
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()
```

Agent performs a perception: frontIsClear. The result is True.

Partial state:

```
Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ;
Empty(4, 1) ; Agent(4, 2, direction=(0, 1)) ; Empty(4, 3) ;
Empty(5, 1) ; Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ;
```

Step 3:

```

Program:
def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move() # Currently executing this line
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()

```

Agent performs an action: move.

Partial state:

```

Empty(3, 2) ; Empty(3, 3) ; Wall(3, 4) ;
Empty(4, 2) ; Agent(4, 3, direction=(0, 1)) ; Wall(4, 4) ;
Marker(5, 2, quantity=1) ; Empty(5, 3) ; Wall(5, 4) ;

```

###45 steps are truncated.###

Step 49:

Program:

```

def run():
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear(): # Currently executing this line
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 turnRight()
 pickMarker()
 while noMarkersPresent():
 if frontIsClear():
 move()
 else:
 turnLeft()
 putMarker()

```

Agent performs a perception: frontIsClear. The result is False.

Partial state:

```

Wall(1, 0) ; Empty(1, 1) ; Empty(1, 2) ;
Wall(2, 0) ; Agent(2, 1, direction=(0, -1)) ; Empty(2,
2) ;
Wall(3, 0) ; Empty(3, 1) ; Empty(3, 2) ;

```

The total step number is 105, the latter ones are truncated.

The total reward is 0.0

1. Depending on this information, please analyze the reason why the program failed to achieve 1.0 on this task variant and generate a new strategy to solve this task.
2. Generate 1 simple and short Python program according to the new strategy to tackle the task, avoid using comment.
3. Convert the Python program to the Karel dsl program.